UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 98—PART 5

MAY 21, 1952, TO JUNE 10, 1952
(PAGES 5603 TO 7004)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1952

J
11
.R
v.98
pt.5

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2-23-53

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, May 12, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, open to us, we pray Thee, the gates of the morning as at noontide we bow here at this wayside shrine of Thy grace, for these are troublous times; the margin of our inner strength seems often perilously low. We stand in dire need of courage and fortitude and stability. Grant us now the grace of a quiet heart and a humble mind. For the preservation of liberty, for the defeat of all tyranny, for the opportunity still to be free souls, for the redemption of democracy from its failures, for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in all the earth, we lift our hearts to Thee, O God of our salvation. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 20, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES TO HEAR ADDRESS BY GENERAL RIDGWAY

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to announce that Members of the Senate are invited to attend a joint meeting with Members of the House of Representatives at 12:30 o'clock p. m. tomorrow to hear Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway address Members of both Houses. For that purpose Members of the Senate will proceed to the Hall of the House at about 12:15 p. m.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. RUSSELL was excused from attendance on sessions of the Senate for the remainder of this week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CAIN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from today through Thursday of next week.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

On request of Mr. PASTORE, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. MOODY, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

REVISION OF LAWS RELATING TO IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND NATIONALITY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 2550.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2550) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] for himself and other Senators. On this question, under the unanimous-consent agreement, debate is limited, and the time until 4:30 p. m. today is divided equally between the proponents and opponents of the amendment, and is to be controlled by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] in favor of the substitute, and by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] in opposition.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be divided equally between both sides, since the Senate is operating under a limitation of debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona makes a point of no quorum and asks unanimous consent that the time be divided equally between both sides. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield 25 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, we have been discussing the McCarran bill for more than a week. Originally our request was that the McCarran bill be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary for further study. At the same time request was made that Senate bill 2842, introduced by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], myself, and 12 other Senators, be also sent to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to hold hearings on it.

The Senate in its wisdom rejected that motion. So we now have before us an amendment in the form of the bill introduced by myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and 12 other Senators.

We have opposed the McCarran bill because we believe it incorporates in the immigration, naturalization, and denaturalization policy of the United States certain factors which are dangerous not only to the security of our country but to the entire field of civil rights and the rights of citizens and aliens in our country.

The first of the many objections to the McCarran bill which we have stressed, and which I shall stress again very briefly today, are that it does not provide for the pooling of unused quotas. Thus thousands of visas which might be used by freedom-seeking individuals are wasted. Such freedom-seeking individuals would make good citizens. They would come from countries like Greece, Italy, Latvia, Luthuania, Estonia, the Middle East, and oriental countries, and would include German expellees.

The McCarran bill furthermore, unfortunately, and I think dangerously, adds many grounds for exclusion, thus making our immigration laws far harsher and more restrictive without furthering our national welfare. For example, it would bar any alien convicted of two or more offenses, other than political offenses, involving prison terms of 5 years or more in his native land. In that way we would bind our laws to the standards

of other nations, many of them totalitarian. Inasmuch as totalitarian regimes frequently "frame" political opponents on trumped-up charges, this provision might also result in the exclusion of victims of political, racial, or religious persecution.

We have already pointed out that under the McCarran bill Cardinal Mindszenty would have to be excluded from admission into this country, because, in addition to the two political offenses with which he was charged in the trumped-up indictment, there were included two other charges of a nonpolitical nature, namely speculating in the currency of the country and hoarding certain currencies or materials.

The McCarran bill adds a host of new and arbitrary grounds for deportation. It permits the deportation of an alien convicted of even minor criminal offenses no matter how long he may have lived in the United States. An alien who had lived here for 20 years could be deported for a traffic violation, if in the judgment of the Attorney General he is undesirable. It is highly dangerous to grant such arbitrary power to any individual.

The McCarran bill allows deportation of an alien who becomes a public charge regardless of his length of residence in the United States. This inhumane provision would severely penalize noncitizens for conditions often beyond their control.

The McCarran bill requires the Attorney General to deport any alien—and I emphasize this point—even though he had led a model life here for many years, should it be discovered that at the time of entry he was actually in an excludable class. Thus, had he entered the country in violation of a minor technicality, deportation would be mandatory even if the violation were due to error. There would be no discretion lodged in any agency or any officer of the Government to change a ruling by the Attorney General.

The McCarran bill makes deportable an alien who may have engaged in any proscribed activity after entry, no matter how long ago, and even if such activity or affiliation had long since been sincerely repudiated. The provision is inconsistent with another section of the McCarran bill which allows the entry of reformed members of totalitarian organizations.

The McCarran bill withdraws the discretion granted to the Attorney General under existing law to suspend deportation in certain meritorious cases. Present statutes permit the Attorney General to suspend deportation when the alien has resided in the United States for 7 years and has proved himself of good character, or when deportation would result in "serious detriment or hardship" to the alien or his family. The McCarran bill requires proof of "exceptional and extremely unusual hardship," rather than merely "serious detriment," and would make the residence requirement a concurrent rather than an alternative requirement.

The McCarran bill—and I emphasize this point because I think it is one of the very serious defects of the bill—does not provide for a Board of Immigration Appeals which would be independent of Department of Justice officials, to review exclusions or expulsions of aliens. It continues the present exemption of immigration proceedings from the terms of the Administrative Procedure Act, thus blocking correction by the courts of erroneous or unfair judgments of immigration officials.

The McCarran bill sanctions interrogation of aliens by the Immigration Service without a warrant, and imposes harsh penalties for minor infractions, such as failure to carry a registration card at all times, thus surrounding the alien with an atmosphere of repression, which is a poor introduction to the American system of justice for all.

The McCarran bill allows deportation of an alien to any country willing to accept him, even if he has had no prior connection with that country, and even when such deportation might subject him to harsh conditions of life or to racial, religious, or political persecution.

The McCarran bill continues provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950 which have recently caused so much embarrassment to our Government in international relations. Those provisions have been used to arbitrarily exclude such world-famous scientists as Dr. Ernest D. Chain and Prof. Marcus B. Oliphant, and have covered up flagrant errors of judgment, as in the Ellen Knauff case, where the claim of secrecy on security grounds prevented remedial action.

Mr. President, there is no recourse, no appeal, no means of reversing those decisions.

Finally the McCarran bill in determining the number of men and women who are to be permitted to enter this country as legal residents, regardless of the number who may be anxious to take up their residence here in order to qualify for citizenship, bases the computation, unfairly and unjustly, on the 1920 census. That basis of computation excludes all non-whites in the census. It excludes Negroes, Indians, and all other nonwhite residents of this country. After all, we are living in 1952. We certainly should not be bound by a census which was taken in 1920, and use a computation which permits and directs the unfair exclusion of probably 20 or 25 percent of those who otherwise could migrate to the United States.

Mr. President, we have been defeated in our effort to recommit the bill. I deeply deplore that, because all we requested the Senate to do was to realize that the McCarran bill was a voluminous document, consisting of 302 pages and hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of sections and subsections and that it should have hearings and further study.

Aside from those of us who have opposed the McCarran bill and who, I can assure you, Mr. President, have spent scores of hours and, in fact, weeks in studying the bill, I do not believe there are five Members of the Senate who know what is in the McCarran bill or who have the slightest conception of its provisions. I do not believe that even the members of the Judiciary Committee, aside from the distinguished chairman of the committee and, of course, his very expert staff, have any idea what is in the McCarran bill or what is in the bill which 14 Senators have introduced, namely, Senate bill 2842. I believe I am justified in making that assertion because since we began to debate this bill, some 10 days ago, with the exception of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the sponsor of Senate bill 2550, not one member of the majority of that committee has appeared on the floor of the Senate to justify or even to explain that bill or to make himself available for questioning in regard to it. Of course, it will be recalled that the committee divided nine to four, with nine members in favor of reporting the bill and four members opposed to reporting it. Those four members submitted minority views.

Mr. President, we moved to recommit Senate bill 2550 to the Judiciary Committee, with instructions to study it further and also to study our bill and to hold further hearings to report to this body. As I have said, that motion failed.

So we have offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute. Actually the amendment is a bill which was introduced by me, in behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and 12 or 13 other Senators. That bill was introduced away back in October 1951. It also has not been given any hearings and has not been studied. Only a handful of Members of the Senate know what is in that bill.

However, Mr. President, I can say that it is a good bill. It would liberalize and humanize our immigration and naturalization laws. That bill is bipartisan. It was not introduced under the auspices of Democrats alone; it was introduced under the auspices and with the militant support of a number of Republican Members of this body, as well.

Mr. President, I do not claim that our bill corrects all the defects of the McCarran bill, many of which I have mentioned in the last few minutes. But our bill does correct a substantial number of the most important defects, dangers, and threats of the McCarran bill. Our bill provides for the pooling of unused quotas and the making available of unused quotas to immigrants from areas which now have historically based small quotas. Our bill gives preference (a) to the reuniting of families; (b) to persons of special skills; and (c) to religious and political persecutees. Any portions of the pooled quotas not used for the above preferences would be made available for all other especially meritorious cases for whom assurances would be provided by American citizens or by reputable American organizations.

Mr. President, as I have already pointed out, our present immigration law was enacted in 1924, as I recall, and was amended in 1929. The act of 1924 was placed on the statute books during a period of suspicion, hatred, and distrust of all foreigners, as a result of our unhappy experience in the first World War. That act is based on a niggardly quota system which permits the admission into the United States of only 154,000 persons a year. However, that is not the worst feature of that act, Mr. President. Incidentally, I wish to point

out that our bill would not change the quotas.

The 1924 act was based upon a percentage of the persons living in the United States in 1890, enumerated by nationality stock. It disregarded the substantial influx into the United States of other peoples of the world who entered our country between 1890 and 1920—natives of Greece, Poland, Italy, Hungary, Rumania, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and other countries. They were disregarded. That act was a deliberate and successful attempt to confine, in large part, immigration into the United States to natives of the countries of northern Europe. Of course, I realize that the immigrants from those countries have done much for our country. But they are not the only ones who can be placed in that category. Italians and Greeks, for instance, have also done much to build up our Nation. So have Lithuanians, Rumanians, and Hungarians, as well as many persons from the oriental countries.

As a result of that policy, which was adhered to, nearly 80 percent of the 154,000 persons admitted under the quota system to the United States each year came from the countries of Northern Europe—from Great Britain, northern Ireland, southern Ireland, Holland, Belgium, and France—and only approximately 20 percent came from the other countries of Europe. Great Britain alone was given a quota of 66,000; Ireland was given a quota of 26,000; Germany was given a large quota.

Mr. President, our bill would not change those quotas. We want persons to come to the United States from Great Britain and Ireland as they have come in the past because we know that such persons will make a valuable contribution to the life and economy of our country. Under our bill, we would not reduce in the slightest degree the quotas for those countries. What we are saying in our bill is that if people living in England do not want to come to this country—and, although they have a quota of 66,000 a year, only 20,000 a year come here under the quota, leaving 46,000 unused numbers—the unused numbers of their quota should be made available to the people of Italy, Greece, and the other countries I have enumerated. Likewise, in the same way and to the same degree, the unused quota of Ireland should be allotted to other nations. The Irish people have made a magnificent contribution to the life of this country. They have not used more than 30 or 40 percent of their quotas for many years. We want people from England and Ireland to come here; but if they cannot come, or if they do not see fit to accept our invitation, let us not waste those numbers, but let us permit people from other countries, who would make an equally great contribution, to come to this country for the purpose of seeking citizenship.

I believe there has not been 1 year within the past 15 years when even the niggardly quota of 154,000 has been used to the extent of more than 40 or 50 percent. The figures may be found in the RECORD, having been placed there by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and myself. Those figures are pathetic.

Today, under the quota system, we limit the number of people who may come to the United States from Greece to 308, and we limit the number who may come from Italy to 5,800. Twenty years or more ago their quota was nearly 50,000. Why should these people be excluded? Why should the people of other countries who have contributed so much to our Nation be excluded when there is room for them?

We are not asking that they shall receive any special or preferential treatment. They must pass the scrutiny of our Immigration Service, of our State Department, and of other agencies, the same as anyone else. But, Mr. President, let us not enact a law under which not more than 308 people can come to this country from Greece, 100 from Lithuania, 5,800 from Italy, and about 1,700 from Austria. Even those ungenerous numbers have been cut down, because under the Displaced Persons Act an alien who had fled to another country was charged to the quota of his native land. As a result——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota kindly yield me an additional 10 minutes?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield the Senator another 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 10 minutes more.

Mr. LEHMAN. The result is that one-half the quotas of those countries are mortgaged, not for 1 or 2 or 5 years, but in some case for as long as 300 years. The quota of Greece is half-mortgaged today up to the year 2013, I believe. The quotas of Lithuania and Latvia are mortgaged until the year 2220, or approximately that date.

Mr. President, I could speak endlessly on this subject. It simply does not make sense to me that when we have available places for these people we slam our doors upon them and say to the Italians, for instance, "You are not good enough to come into our country. Those who are already in this country are good enough to bear their share in the economy and life of our Nation, but we do not want more than 5,800." We say that to German expellees. We are saying that to refugees from behind the iron curtain, from Poland, Hungary, and Rumania. Mr. President, I submit it does not make sense; it is inhuman, and, in my opinion, it is stupid so far as the interests of our Nation are concerned.

Under the McCarran bill the Attorney General would be given the right to exclude anyone for almost any cause, if, in his opinion, the alien might commit some act 20 years hence which would be prejudicial. No legal appeal of any real consequence is provided. The decision is made by a man appointed by the Attorney General under regulations promulgated by the Attorney General, and the final decision rests entirely within the discretion of the Attorney General. The amendment we have offered establishes a statutory Board of Immigation Appeals, its members to be appointed by the President, subject to confirmation by the Senate. That is what should be provided. The people to whom I am referring, and all other people who may be excluded by the consuls for purely arbitrary reasons when they present requests for visas should have the right to proceed in a legal, formal, and fair way before an unbiased, statutory board. The matter should not be left entirely to the discretion of the Attorney General or entirely to the discretion of officials of our consular service.

Under our amendment we would wipe out from the immigration laws all discriminations based upon race. Much has been said here about how the McCarran bill would wipe out discrimination against orientals. I say the McCarran bill not only would not wipe it out but that it would increase it. It would fix it as a matter of law. It has always been recognized that natives of certain countries may apply for admission to the United States. In the case of every country in the Western Hemisphere we go much further. Those countries are not even covered by the quota system. One hundred and fifty million of them could apply for admission to this country. They have not applied in large numbers, and I do not know that they will. But, even if they should, they would have to pass the careful scrutiny of our Immigration Service. But, Mr. President, 150,000,000 citizens of independent countries of the Western Hemisphere may come into this country outside the quota system, except in the case of orientals. In the case of orientals born in Brazil, the Argentine, Canada, and other countries in the Western Hemisphere, they cannot come into this country under any circumstances, but they are excluded. They do not have the rights of other citizens. An oriental may have resided in Brazil for 40 years, he may have amassed great wealth, and he may be a leading citizen; yet he is excluded. What is more, Mr. President, under the McCarran bill an oriental born in London, of one-half oriental stock—whatever that means; I do not know; that is what the law says—is not charged to the British quota but is charged to the quota of 100 allotted to the oriental country. Furthermore, we say China may send us 100, India may send us 100, Japan may send us 100, and the Philippines may send us 100, but we limit the total number of orientals from all over the world to 2,000 because the McCarran bill would set up an Asiatic or oriental triangle. The McCarran bill allows 100 from each country, but, in the aggregate, the number is limited to 2,000.

In the case of the Philippines, we have taken away a right which has been theirs for a long time. They, too, have been limited, of course, in the number that can enter the United States. They have been limited within the past 2 years, although we gave them the right of naturalization during the war when we still remembered their great contribution to the security of our country and to the peace and security of the world. But even when we limited them to 100 there

was no limitation on the admission of a Filipino if he were a Filipino by birth. If he came from England or Brazil or the Argentine, he came in under the quota of those countries. But that right has been removed, and a Filipino who is adjudged by an American consul, within his sole discretion, to have 50 percent of oriental blood—and I repeat that I do not know what that means, because I do not think it can ever be determined—is not charged to the British quota, but to the Philippine quota, thus reducing by a substantial extent the number of persons who can come in under this ungenerous and inhumane law. I am told the Filipino Government has protested to our State Department against this provision as being a definite and clear discrimination against their people.

Mr. President, in our proposal we have given preferences to fathers, mothers, grandfathers, and grandmothers, who want to come to this country and be reunited with their families. Their families want that kind of reunion.

Under the McCarran bill, anyone, no matter how old he may be, is not only subjected to the test of being able to read and write in his own language, but before he can apply for citizenship in this country, he must demonstrate that he can write in English. There is not one person in 10,000 who comes to the United States from another country at the age of 60 years who can acquire familiarity with the English language sufficiently to write it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield two more minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I beg the Members of the Senate to give heed to what I have said and to what my associates have said. If we pass the McCarran bill, we shall be doing a grave disservice to the people of this country, to our relations with other countries, and to the peace of the world. The McCarran bill contains provisions which are dangerous. Our bill does not cure all the defects, as I have said. We would have to debate the subject for 4 months, I believe, in order to cover all the defects in the McCarran bill. I know we cannot cure them all, and we are not going to undertake to do so. We hate filibusters, and we shall not propose that kind of procedure. But our bill does cure at least some of the major defects of the McCarran bill. It is a liberal bill. It is a humane bill. It is a bill which is in the interest of millions of persons in this country, including aliens, naturalized citizens, and native-born citizens, because there are things in the McCarran bill which would threaten their security.

I cannot believe that the Senate is going to pass that kind of a bill without at least giving the proponents of the other bills which have been introduced an opportunity to be heard, including great religious, civic, and nationality organizations who protest many of the important features of the McCarran bill and who support the bill which we have introduced.

I am sorry, Mr. President, that as is usual the junior Senator from Minnesota and I are talking to empty chairs, but we want the American people to know the situation, and we shall continue to talk and to tell the people about the bad features of the McCarran bill so far as we can, although, as I say, it may take us many months to do it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Monday, May 19, the Senate, by a vote of 44 to 28, rejected a motion to recommit the so-called McCarran bill to the Judiciary Committee for the purpose of further hearings upon that bill and upon the so-called Humphrey-Lehman bill, Senate bill 2842.

I mention this, Mr. President, because I think it is important to take note of the fact that 28 Members of this body felt very strongly that the measure before the Senate should not be acted upon at this time, but that it should go back to the committee, in light of the testimony and evidence presented in the debate, for further consideration and further study.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a galley proof of the statement of the position of certain organizations pertaining to the McCarran bill, Senate bill 2550. I make note of the fact that on the desk of each Senator this morning is a statement of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] endorsing his measure. It is indicated that the National Catholic Welfare Conference, which inadvertently was listed as being in opposition to the McCarran bill in the address of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], has not put itself on record in opposition to the bill. In fact, it supports the McCarran bill.

I want to make note of the fact that the position of the National Catholic Welfare Conference and that of all Catholic organizations was summarized at a meeting from which a statement was released on March 12, 1952, recommending certain changes in Senate bill 2550, section by section. Those changes were not incorporated in the bill, since the bill had been reported before March.

I think it is important to note that there are 16 sections of the pending bill which have the strong opposition of the Catholic organizations which held a general session for the discussion of the measure known as the McCarran bill.

I read from the press release of March 12, 1952:

> By invitation of the executive department, National Catholic Welfare Conference, a meeting was held in Washington on March 3 for the purpose of discussing the broad aspects of the immigration situation, services to refugees, and the outlook regarding future immigration into the United States. Present were representatives of the legal department and Bureau of Immigration, NCWC, the National Council of Catholic Men and National Council of Catholic Women, War Relief Services, NCWC, Catholic Committee for Refugees, and the National Conference of Catholic Charities.
>
> Of special importance in the discussions was the question of arriving at a unified policy for continued collaboration with the Protestant, Jewish, and other groups who have labored so zealously and with great success in servicing the refugees from Europe and are lending their efforts toward creating a more democratic and Christian attitude toward immigrant people.

From there on this entire statement, which I shall not put into the RECORD, but of which I make note, contains a series of recommendations for amendment of the McCarran bill. Some of the amendments we have offered embody those recommendations. That is why we have presented as many amendments as we have. Many organizations saw the inadequacy of the McCarran bill and came forward with a series of proposals, other than the recommendations the Senator from Nevada has placed before us, that are worthy of some comment.

For example, the Senator from Nevada makes note of the fact that the Japanese-American Citizens League supports his measure. I would have the Senate know that the reason for the support of the Japanese-American Citizens League is as stated in the letter of May 8 to the Senator from Nevada:

> As you are well aware, our organization has been in the forefront of those who have urged the extension of naturalization rights to all loyal resident aliens, without regard to race or national origin. In addition, we have strongly advocated the complete repeal of the oriental exclusion acts, which will abolish a needless barrier to understanding between our Government and the peoples of the Far East.
>
> The elimination of these racial prohibitions, as provided by your bill, is not only a matter of long-deferred justice but will have an enormously salutary effect upon our international relations.

I wish to make note of that because the substitute measure, which is now before the Senate, to which I shall soon direct my remarks, provides complete abolition of the racial-discrimination features as they pertain to orientals. I would say to my friends from the Japanese-American Citizens League—and I have many friends in that organization—that their support of the McCarran bill is primarily support, as they have testified, for the areas of the bill which remove all types of discrimination, and which provide for the removal of the oriental-exclusion provisions of the present immigration law.

Mr. President, I shall go through the substitute measure, item by item, and tell the Senate what it seeks to accomplish. Why do we present the substitute? We present it because we believe a bill which is 302 pages long, which, in the minds of 28 United States Senators, should have been recommitted to committee, should not be passed by the Senate until every single aspect of it is clearly discussed and carefully gone over in its relationship to our total immigration policy.

I suppose it is like repeating the same old words to say that the McCarran bill, S. 2550, is more than a recodification. It is an amendment of, it is a change in, it is a fundamental digression from the established immigration policy of the

United States. It is misleading and wrong to state that what it does is merely to liberalize and to recodify. In fact, it restricts as it recodifies; and it not only recodifies, but it builds in a whole new area of immigration law. I do not believe even the proponents of the McCarran bill deny that it contains many new features, features which have been brought out in debate here as being undesirable. Many of those features will be attacked point by point, by amendment, in case our substitute measure should fail, but I think it would be well for the Senate to understand the substitute measure that is before it.

The substitute is a bill 11 pages long, as compared to the McCarran bill with its 302 pages of legislative proposals which embody numerous cross references. With all the due regard and respect I have for my colleagues—and there are many able lawyers in this body—I submit there is not one Member of the Senate who can go through that bill of 302 pages, and on the floor of the Senate, in debate, point out what each and every one of its provisions means, because it is indeed a legislative maze trap. It involves one series after another of changes in immigration policy, cross references to old immigration laws, and a building in of a new series of immigration law. Thus it constitutes a tremendously perplexing legislative problem.

What do we offer? We have something to offer to the Senate. We have an alternative. That is the purpose of the substitute measure. We are not offering our bill, S. 2842, as a substitute. We are not doing so because it, too, is a complicated bill. It, too, involves many, many areas of immigration policy which need to be reevaluated and restated. But we have eliminated what are considered to be the obvious glaring inequities of the present immigration laws, and by the substitute measure to the McCarran bill we are trying to give some relief, some semblance of justice, to the immigration policy at this session of Congress.

What does our substitute provide? First, I may say to the Japanese-American Citizens League, it completely and totally removes racial barriers as a means of disqualification for naturalization and for admission into the United States. In other words, the Exclusion Act is repealed and racial discrimination, insofar as orientals are concerned, is removed. That is No. 1.

Under section 1 of the substitute measure, now on the desk of every Senator:

> No person shall be denied the right to become a citizen of the United States or the privilege to enter the United States as an immigrant solely on the ground of his race, nor shall any applicant for admission be assigned to a quota solely on the basis of his race.

Mr. President, this is unqualifiedly a removal of racial barriers and racial discrimination in immigration policy. I submit this meets the requirements of the Chinese, the Japanese, the Filipino, and others who are so concerned about racial barriers in our immigration laws.

In substance the same features are in the McCarran bill—at least, some of them are—the amendment in the nature of a substitute completely eliminates racial barriers and discrimination and thus meets the need that many a Senator feels so deeply in his heart should be met.

What is the second feature of the amendment? It has been discussed eloquently in some detail by a number of Senators, most recently by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. The second feature relates to pooled quotas. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] on Monday of this week read into the RECORD, and discussed for the purpose of enlightening the Senate, our whole immigration policy from 1890 to 1929, the time of the last major revision of the immigration laws.

The pooled quota provision we recommend is, in substance, this: Out of approximately 150,000 eligible immigrants to the United States each year, we have been admitting from 70,000 to 80,000.

The reason for this is that the major number of immigrants who come under the quota system, which is based on national origins, is allotted to Great Britain and northern Ireland, and those two countries have not been completely using their quotas. Despite all the many unkind words sometimes hurled against the British on the floor of the Senate, there are still people in Britain who seem to like their country, so they stay there and do not come to the United States.

The Senator from Illinois pointed out how the British quota became so large. He showed how certain discriminatory features were written into the immigration law of 1920, so as to place emphasis upon the British quota and deemphasis upon quotas of other countries. I shall not burden the RECORD by going over all that statistical information; it is there for all persons to study. Our pool quota program—and it is the second section of our substitute bill—simply says that quota figures which are not used shall be placed in a pool, and from the pool, visas shall be issued for purposes of immigration on a preferential basis.

What preferential basis do we outline? For example, we say that 25 percent of all unused visas, or 25 percent of the quota pool, shall be for family reunion preference, or for purposes of family reunion. The language simply points out that the qucta shall be available to adult children, brothers and sisters, and other blood relatives, and to spouses, children, parents, brothers and sisters, and other blood relatives of naturalized citizens of the United States. That is what we call family reunion preference under the pool quota. It comprises 25 percent of the total pool.

Another 25 percent of the pool quota would go to persons who, because of their fine education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability, are urgently needed in the United States.

First, we would take people for humanitarian or compassionate reasons. We would give special preference to 25 percent of the pool for family reunion. Secondly, for purposes of our national security and welfare, we would allot 25 percent of the available pool of unused quotas to persons of special skills which are urgently needed.

Thirdly, we would take 25 percent of the pool for religious or political persecutees, people who have had the courage to stand up for and adhere to their religion and politics, or their democratic faith, but yet have been expelled or driven out of their native countries. We feel the United States ought to be a refuge for those good souls, insofar as unused quotas are concerned.

Then there is another 25 percent, which completes the use of this pool, for nonpreference cases. The substitute provides:

> All pooled visas not required for issuance under the foregoing preferences shall be available, on application to the Secretary of State by an American citizen or a reputable American organization, to other immigrants, whose cases because of special circumstances or hardship merit special consideration, in the order of their registration.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Does this section in the substitute affect the usage of the 1920 census?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It does not.

Mr. PASTORE. In other words, this provision would not increase the number who may now come into the country if all the quota numbers were fully utilized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. PASTORE. All this provision does is to establish a program to facilitate the usage of the full number, through the use of the pooling system.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to make clear what the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposes to do. It deals with two important features which have been discussed before the Immigration Subcommittee and which are of public importance. One is the elimination of the oriental racial barriers, so that Japanese, Chinese, people of the Republic of India, and the peoples of southeast Asia would no longer be confronted by any racial barrier excluding them from the United States under its immigration policy. This means a great deal to people of Japanese ancestry, and particularly to the Chinese. The substitute would remove the racial barrier.

Secondly, the substitute takes into consideration the unused quotas, which the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] discussed last week. The unused quotas would then be distributed on the basis of certain preferences.

First, there is the family reunion preference. Second, there is the preference

based on our own national need for immigrants possessing special abilities or skills. Third, there is the preference given to religious and political persecutees. Finally, there is the preference for immigrants who may be brought into this country by reputable American citizens or reputable American organizations. For example, the National Lutheran Council, the National Catholic Welfare Council, or the Bnai B'rith of the Jewish faith, may wish to sponsor an immigrant. Those are fundamental changes in the immigration policy, and I think they are meritorious. We are not entering into a complete rewriting of immigration law. These provisions represent obvious needs.

Another feature is the establishment of a Board of Immigration Appeals. I submit that it is imperative that such a Board be established. We have placed far too much authority in the hands of consuls in various places through the world, who are frequently untrained. We place far too much authority in the hands of the Attorney General. I think we must recognize, as has been recognized on this floor in the debate, that we must not in any way abuse, adulterate, or weaken the processes under the Administrative Procedure Act, a public law enacted by the Congress of the United States.

The Immigration Appeals Board would enable a person who felt that he had been unjustly dealt with, who felt that the facts had not been fully weighed, to have an impartial tribunal before which he could appear. There would be none of the business of judge, jury, and prosecutor all in one man, a situation which, as we have pointed out, would exist under the terms of the McCarran bill.

Finally, we point out that there are certain nonquota immigrants. Who are the nonquota immigrants? They are covered in section 4 of our substitute. In that category we place parents of naturalized American citizens. I do not see how the Senate can turn down this proposal. I do not see how the Congress can rewrite legislation in the field of immigration without recognizing the legitimacy of this argument.

Let us assume that in the city of Providence, R. I., there is a man, his wife, and his family. They are naturalized Americans. Let us assume that they are of Italian ancestry. They have a good business, or the breadwinner is working in a shop or factory. He has a small home, a bank account, and some insurance policies. His children are attending school. The members of his family are good members of the church. They are good members of the community, participating citizens.

Back in the old country is the mother of the breadwinner. She is now 74 years old. She has not seen her son for 40 or 45 years. All she has ever had has been a letter. In the twilight of her life she would like to come to the United States and spend the last 2 or 3 years of her life with her son, her daughter-in-law, and her grandchildren. The McCarran bill would deny her such an opportunity unless she was able to come here under the quota. The quota for her native country is oversubscribed. It is impossible for her to get into the United States for permanent residence. The most she would be able to get would be a visitor's visa; and after she had been here about 60 days she would have to go home. Under such circumstances people go home sick at heart. I have seen such cases. I happen to know of case after case like the one I have described.

I submit that the United States is big enough, strong enough, and rich enough to provide room for the dear old folk who want to come here and spend the twilight of their lives with their sons or daughters and with their grandchildren, and enjoy the blessings of the United States of America. That is what the substitute provides for.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not a fact that the people who would qualify under that particular provision are very limited in number? Are not their numbers fast waning?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The number is very limited.

Mr. PASTORE. The old folk are dying off. Moreover, we would not run the risk that they might displace anyone in this country who has a job, for the simple reason that they are too old to work.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. These are people who would come here and sit in their son's or daughter's parlor for the remainder of their lives. As the Senator has aptly put it, they are in the twilight of their lives. This provision is the most humanitarian we could enact to build up good will among other countries.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think I shall require about 5 minutes more and then I shall take my seat. I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The category of nonquota immigrants also provides for orphans of naturalized American citizens and orphans of certain aliens. There is a large group of persons who may be classified under the designation of orphans.

Provision is also made for members of the Armed Forces of the United States There are other preference categories which I could mention, but I do not wish to take the time to do so.

The final provision in our substitute is for the removal of sex discriminations. The present immigration law has certain discriminatory features in relationship to sex. There is no argument on this point. The McCarran bill has in it a provision similar to the one in our substitute bill.

Another category of preference is reformed members of proscribed organizations. At the present time some persons are denied admittance to this country because at one time they were members of an organization which later became listed as subversive. Perhaps they have left the organization or perhaps they joined the organization without even knowing what its purposes are. Once that fact can be ascertained, both the McCarran bill and our substitute would provide that they may come to the United States.

There are some features in our substitute which are also in the McCarran bill. There are other features in our substitute which are not found in the McCarran bill. My argument is this: We have been able to demonstrate without successful contradiction that there are a number of provisions in the McCarran bill—yes; hundreds of provisions—which are inequitable, which literally threaten the principle of due process of law, which violate the Administrative Procedure Act, which place upon the immigration statute books new barriers in terms of discriminatory features; and I submit that the Senate should not proceed to legislate in this complex and intricate field until we have had an opportunity to give all possible consideration to every single argument which has been considered and brought out in this debate. We have had to do in this debate what I had hoped we could do before the Committee on the Judiciary. We have had to make, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, arguments which should have been taken down as testimony before the Committee on the Judiciary.

I appeal to Senators who feel that some improvement is needed in our immigration policy to study our substitute. I say to them that it is fair. It is equitable. It places America in proper relationship with the rest of the world, particularly the Asiatic area of the world. It provides an opportunity for unusual talent to come to this country under the quota-pooling system. It provides opportunity for parents of naturalized citizens to come to this country, and for orphans, wives, and children of members of the Armed Forces. I believe ours is a measure which will meet the needs. My appeal to the Senate is not to try to enact 302 pages of legislative proposals before we have had an opportunity to understand thoroughly and to consider them, but to enact a bill that is reasonable, fair, and understandable.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not a fact that the so-called Lehman-Humphrey bill, as originally introduced, provided for a pooling of quotas?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. That was the first time that the idea was advanced, was it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. The pooling in that instance was predicated upon the census which was taken in 1950.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. As against the McCarran bill, which provides for the use of a formula which is predicated upon the census taken in 1920.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. The use of the 1950 census as against the use of the 1920

census means that perhaps between 75,000 and 100,000 more people could come in, because there has been an increase in the population of this country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not correct to say that the substitute bill which the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has been discussing is not predicated upon the 1950 census, which would call for an increase in the number of eligible people to come to the country, but is predicated upon the formula which is used in the McCarran bill, so-called, which would still limit the over-all number of immigrants to from 150,000 to 154,000 a year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Rhode Island is correct. We did not include in our substitute measure the 1950 census. Personally I think the substitute is thereby weakened, but I have sensed in the Senate a desire not to change the census base. However, there remains a paradox. While the Senate does not want to change the census base it is apparently perfectly willing to change the whole body of our immigration law insofar as deportation, exclusion, and naturalization are concerned. I believe that the burden of proof rests upon the proponents of the McCarran bill to present reasonable evidence as to why we should not change the census base if we are to change everything else.

Mr. President, we have tried to offer to the Senate a reasonable bill. I would say it is a very conservative and moderate measure which corrects certain errors which are obvious on their face, and deals with areas of our immigration policy in a way which every group I know of has agreed to be desirable and profitable and worthy of attention in the interests of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield myself one more minute in order to answer another question by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota admit that the principal purpose of using the same formula was to satisfy Senators who possibly like the idea of the pooling system, but do not like the idea of an increase in the over-all number of immigrants by possibly 100,000?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Rhode Island is correct. We keep down the number of immigrants but we pool the quotas which are available. We remove racial discriminations and provide for family immigration. I ask those in opposition, who may wish to vote against the substitute bill, to bring forth a legitimate argument against it. It is a reasonable, conservative, and middle-ground proposal. It would give us a basically reasonable immigration policy. It makes good sense, and it meets the needs of every group in the country which has cried out for relief.

I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, later this week I shall discuss at much greater length than time permits this afternoon some of the legal objections which I raise to the McCarran bill.

In the brief time I shall speak this afternoon, I wish at the outset to pay what is a very sincere and, in my opinion, a highly deserved compliment to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. Those two sound liberals and great humanitarians are making a historic record in connection with this bill. It is a record which in due course of time, as Father Time judges the record, will prove them to be eternally right.

Mr. President, here again is before the Senate a piece of legislation which ought to be approached primarily from the standpoint of human values. Its importance ought to be recognized from the standpoint of the fact that, after all, the very strength of our democracy depends upon the extent to which we protect human values. The great tenet that it is the dignity of the individual and the sacredness of human life which count in any system of self-government once again becomes crystal clear in connection with this debate.

It is a matter of deep regret to me to find such obvious apathy in the Senate with regard to the great issues which are involved in this piece of legislation. It is no surprise to me to find the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from New York once again, as they have so many times since they have been Members of this body, making a courageous and far-seeing fight for great humanitarian principles and for the protection of human values. In fact, I would say that in my judgment this is the third great historic debate in which they have participated since they have been Members of this body, which will go down as noteworthy in the history of the Senate, as students of the Senate come to study the record of this parliamentary body in the decades ahead.

I refer first to the great tax debate of the last session of this Congress, when again these two liberal Senators made a record in the tax fight in support of the interests of the common men and women of America. That I think represents a great tribute to their statesmanship. Earlier this year these two sound liberal Senators again made a notable record in connection with the fight on the internal revenue bill, where again the same issues of human rights dominated. They took on all comers in those two debates. The RECORD will speak for itself. In the judgment of the junior Senator from Oregon the major arguments in those two historic debates as advanced by the Senator from Minnesota, and the Senator from New York, remained unanswered at the close of the debate.

Oh yes, Mr. President, we did not have the votes in the Senate to sustain those arguments, but I am willing to let students of history judge whether the merits were not on the side of the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from New York.

The other day the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], made what I predict will go down in polemic literature as one of the most beautiful speeches on sound humanitarianism that has ever been delivered in this body. It is my regret that I was not present to hear the Senator from Rhode Island deliver his speech.

Mr. President, I wish to say at the outset of my remarks today that when students read the speeches of HUMPHREY, LEHMAN, and PASTORE on the immigration bill the question that will be raised in their minds in the years ahead will be: "Why was it that the Senate of the United States unanimously did not recognize the soundness of the premises advanced by those Senators?"

I ascribe it principally to apathy. I say it most respectfully when I say I ascribe it to the fact—and I believe it to be a fact—that a large number of my colleagues in the Senate, as I indicated the other day, have yet to read, let alone study, the 302 pages of the complicated and complex omnibus immigation bill known as the McCarran bill.

I think it is now pretty well known that the full Senate Judiciary Committee never gave thorough study to this bill. The bill is before us really as the bill of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. It is a bill which ought to be laid aside until the Senate can, as it should, take the time to study its implications. It would be very unwise for the Senate to pass a bill such as this which, in my opinion, in the course of time will prove to be very bad legislation, legislation which the Senate will regret, and which in large measure it will have to revise drastically and in part repeal, if we are to live up to and protect the kind of humanitarian principles and human values to which the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from New York, and the Senator from Rhode Island have been directing the Senate's attention for some days.

Of course, Mr. President, I realize that in this period of high emotional tensions in our Nation, a spirit of blind, biased, nationalism seems to be overcoming millions of our fellow citizens. We see such blind nationalism manifest itself in connection with a great many issues, and most prominently in connection with issues affecting foreign policy. Of course, questions of immigration are directly connected with the entire foreign policy attitude of the American people.

I wish to say that if we are going to think in terms of the century ahead—which happens to be the obligation of statesmanship on the the part of Members of Congress at this session—then we had better recognize that we should not try to live unto ourselves alone in connection with immigration problems for, if we do, we shall walk out on the principles and policies of our forefathers which have made the United States the great Nation it is today, and we shall antagonize millions of persons the world around, whose support, cooperation, and alliance we shall sorely need in the century ahead, as we go forward in that troubled period, in the contest between the free way of life and the enslaved way of life, the latter being represented by Russian communism. In my judgment if we follow such a restricted, nationalistic attitude in regard to immigration,

we shall not strengthen the bonds of the freedom way of life around the world, but in my opinion we shall play into the hands of the propaganda of Russian communism.

Mr. President, to take a stand such as I take has already started criticisms coming from various reactionary forces and isolationist forces. These days I am receiving mail and telegrams severely criticizing me because I will not accept a narrow conception for the immigration policies of our Nation. Not long ago I received such a bitter letter from a critic. I replied to that letter as follows:

I have your letter of February 6, in which you urge that the immigration laws be tightened. You say that it "would be tantamount to treason for any Senator or Representative to vote to liberalize the immigration laws at this time."

Of course, Mr. President, the type of name-calling tactic that this person used in her letter to me is typical of the emotions of the time. She would make me out a traitor to my country if I insisted on keeping faith with what I believe has been one of the great strengths of my country, namely, the recognition of humanitarian values in connection with its immigration program.

So, Mr. President, having been called, in effect, a traitor, in her letter, I continued in my reply as follows:

In reply, I ask you to reflect on the following three points:

1. On February 12, 1861—exactly 91 years ago—Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday we observe today, said in a speech to the German people in Cincinnati:

"It is not my nature when I see a people borne down by the weight of their shackles—the oppression of tyranny—to make their life more bitter by heaping upon them greater burdens; but rather would I do all in my power to raise the yoke than to add anything that would tend to crush them."

Mr. President, when we come to vote on the McCarran bill, I believe we had better reflect once again on that great humanitarian doctrine of the immortal Lincoln.

Returning to my letter, Mr. President, the second point I raised with my correspondent was:

2. The following words inscribed on the Statue of Liberty have been an inspiration to millions who have come to the United States:

"Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door!"

Mr. President, as we come to vote on the McCarran bill, I think we can well afford to read again that inspiring inscription on the Statue of Liberty. If we give meaning to that inscription, by means of the action we take in the Senate of the United States on this omnibus immigration bill, we shall lay aside the bill and we shall adopt, for the time being, a substitute proposal similar to the one the Senater from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] have offered to the Senate. Then we shall study the McCarran bill for such length of time as is required to eliminate from it some of its serious shortcomings and some of its sections which in my opinion cannot be reconciled with the great inspirational tenet of Americanism which we find inscribed on the Statue of Liberty.

Again returning to my letter, previously referred to, I said to this critic in the third place:

3. Unless you are a descendant of the native Americans who lived in this country before the coming of the white man, I assume that your ancestors came here as immigrants, no doubt with high hope of living a fruitful and useful life. What would have been their reaction if they had been turned back and told, "You cannot enter; America is for Americans"?

Mr. President, at this time let me make a few references to the substitute proposal; and then I wish to discuss some of the constitutional questions which I believe to be raised by the McCarran bill.

First of all, in the substitute bill we have sought to bring together the particular topics which we believe are of immediate concern to the Senate; and we postpone for final action other topics contained in the long McCarran bill of 302 pages.

We have submitted a simple bill of 11 pages, and in that bill we have included the following topics:

Removal of racial disqualification for naturalization and for admission into the United States.

The latter have just been discussed so eloquently and cogently by the Senator from Minnesota that I need not make further comment.

Board of Immigration Appeals.

Such a board is most important, it seems to me, if we are really going to follow a basic principle of American jurisprudence, namely, that all persons, including aliens, coming within the jurisdiction of our Government, are entitled to a fair hearing and a fair trial.

Nonquota immigrants: Parents, orphans, members of the Armed Forces.

That is a subject which the Senator from New York and the Senator from Minnesota have already discussed today.

Preference categories.
Removal of sex discrimination.

Mr. President, when we take those topics out of the McCarran bill and modify them in the form in which we have modified them in our substitute bill, we then have in one bill the features which are of immediate concern to the Senate and on which I believe we should pass judgment and enact legislation before we adjourn in July.

The other portions included in the 302 pages of the McCarran bill can wait until the Senate, with greater deliberation and with more time to study the implications of its provisions, can pass judgment upon them. I believe the Senate will be able to do that much more fairly and much more intelligently at a later date than it would be able to do if the McCarran bill were forced through the Senate following this debate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I should like to finish the argument, after which I shall be glad to yield.

CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTIONS TO S. 2550

Mr. President, I now desire to call attention to what I consider to be some of the constitutional objections to the McCarran bill. One of the best reasons for voting for the substitute bill is to be found in the fact that the McCarran bill, in my judgment, contains within it a great many legal weaknesses. We ought to go thoroughly into the legal objections to the McCarran bill, clarify them, and, after months of study, return at the next session of the Congress to proceed at that time to pass an immigration bill covering more points than those covered in the substitute bill.

Mr. President, I emphasize that one of the fundamental constitutional principles decided by an early Supreme Court case is that under the due process clause of the fifth amendment a fair hearing must be accorded to an alien before he can be deported. This principle was recently reaffirmed by the highest court of our land, in the now famous case of Sung against McGrath, which I shall discuss in great detail later this week. Nevertheless, in complete disregard of this principle, in my judgment, S. 2550 provides that alien crewmen may be summarily deported without hearings, and that certain aliens entering illegally may be deported without granting them any hearing whatsoever. A committee of the American Bar Association has objected to these provisions denying hearings to deportable aliens. The wording of the bill would seem to grant unconstitutional power to the Attorney General by authorizing him to revoke permanent residence within 5 years of its grant to an alien who may have become a citizen in the meantime.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield me five more minutes?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield the Senator 10 more minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Illegal searches and seizures are authorized. The fourth amendment to the Constitution protects citizens and aliens alike from unreasonable searches and seizures. This amendment prohibits unreasonable searches and seizures and hence requires a showing of probable cause.

Sections 235 and 287 (a) of S. 2550 authorizes any immigration officer or employee to board and search without a warrant any conveyance or vehicle within a reasonable distance from any external boundary of the United States and any such conveyance or vehicle anywhere when it is believed that aliens are being brought into the United States. This means that without probable cause that an alien is being illegally transported into the country, any immigration officer may board and inspect the automobile of a citizen of the United States. This provision is unconstitutional. I respectfully submit, Mr. President, that there is serious question as to the constitutionality of this provision.

Further, section 241 (a) (7) authorizes the deportation of an alien who engages or has a purpose to engage in conduct defined as prejudicial to our interests or who has a purpose to organize, join, or participate in subversive organizations designated by the Attorney General. Lack of knowledge of the subversive character of the organization is a defense only where the alien's participation occurred prior to publication of the name of the organization by the Attorney General in the Federal Register. Hence, an alien may be deportable if he had reason to believe that the organization was subversive prior to its designation by the Attorney General. The Attorney General is the sole judge of the reasonableness of the alien's belief. And by the terms of the bill, if the Attorney General determines in 1952 that any legally resident alien who entered the United States in 1910 was at that time likely to at some time join, for instance, the Washington Book Shop, a subversive organization distributing popular books at a discount, he can deport him without any finding that the alien himself was or is subversive. Because of vagueness of the conception of what may be prejudicial to our interests—see *Jordan* v. *DeGeorge* (341 U. S. 223)—as well as because of the fact that the section would require deportation because of a person's state of mind, it cannot be sustained as being in harmony with our Constitution.

Section 242 (b) would for the first time in our history allow an order of deportation to be made in absentia. Convictions in absentia are not valid and we seriously question the validity of a deportation order entered in absentia, even if an alien has been afforded a reasonable opportunity to be present. It will be noted that in matters of this character, the tendency of the Supreme Court has been to apply criminal standards. See the DeGeorge case, previously cited. Certainly a conviction could not be sustained on the ground that the criminal has been given a reasonable opportunity to be present and refused to take advantage of it. At any rate, such procedure for the deportation of aliens should be abhorrent to us and there is no necessity for the same, in order to protect our national rights and interests. We can do this job, Mr. President, without adopting provisions such as those which are to be found in the McCarran bill, which in my opinion give too wide discretion and arbitrary power to administrative officials.

Section 342 authorizes the Attorney General to cancel citizenship certificates and other documents by written notice sent to a person's last known place of address. Similarly, in section 340 (b), provision is made which authorizes denaturalization where a person is absent from the judicial district in which he last had his residence, by publication, and personal service is not made mandatory in either section. The lack of provision for sufficient notice in sections 342 and 340 (b) has led the American Bar Association to object to these provisions in S. 2550. And when I say American Bar Association, I mean a committee of that association. In the light of *Mullane* v. *Central Hanover Bank and Trust Co.* (339 U. S. 306), the due-process clause would be violated by a statute which authorizes the institution of this type of proceedings by notice sent to a last-known residence or by publication when the whereabouts of the individual are either known or can be obtained so that personal service can be effectuated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has again expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield 8 minutes more to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 8 more minutes.

Mr. MORSE. In the field of expatriation, attention is called to section 350 which for the first time would forbid a native born citizen of foreign ancestry who thereby acquired dual nationality, from residing abroad during certain specified periods in his life. Other native born citizens are not so restricted. This type of discrimination between native born citizens, which is obviously based upon ancestry, offends the Constitution. It will be noted that in *Hirabayashi* v. *United States* (320 U. S. 81, 100) it was stated that "distinctions between citizens solely because of their ancestry are by their very nature odious to a free people."

Section 360 would deny to certain citizenship claimants the right to enter the United States to prosecute a declaratory action for American citizenship. This would have the result of effectively denying a person his day in court, and since he has no administrative hearing on the question of his citizenship, it is believed that due process would thereby be violated.

Mr. President, these are but a few of the legal points I raise by way of objection to the McCarran bill in its present form. They are, however, points which in my judgment justify the adoption by the Senate of a substitute bill which does not involve any of these legal problems. Then, at a later time, with careful deliberation, we should proceed to fine-tooth comb the McCarran bill from the standpoint of what I think are its many legal defects, eliminate such defects, and then at the next session of the Congress consider and act upon a final bill.

Mr. President, because of some of the points I have made in my remarks, I desire at this time to send to the desk an amendment which later I shall offer to the McCarran bill, if the substitute bill is not adopted. It deals with some of the points I have raised during the course of my remarks.

I close, Mr. President, by saying that in my judgment, our substitute bill covers those aspects and provisions which ought to be considered of immediate concern to the Senate at this session of the Congress, thereby leaving us adequate time in the future to consider other sections of the McCarran bill. I sincerely hope that the substitute bill will be passed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is my present purpose to support the substitute bill because I think it is the proper approach to the question. Another reason is that I am one of those who believe profoundly that today the attitude of the United States should be one of extreme helpfulness and friendliness to all people who are resisting totalitarianism and who want to have a haven to which to come. There are a number of persons in my State who have relatives who want to resist totalitarianism, and they desire to know whether, if they do resist, they can come to this country. The only thing that troubles me about the substitute bill is the machinery for determining how the so-called unused quotas will be allocated and whether preference will be given to the type of persons I have mentioned, namely, those who want to get away from totalitarian control. That is the main motivation of my supporting the substitute bill.

Mr. MORSE. That is one of the main motivations for my supporting it. I think it guarantees a fair administrative practice for determining those who can enter this country. I would refer the Senator specifically to the preference section, in which there is language which makes it perfectly clear that the class of persons to whom the Senator from New Jersey has referred will receive preferential treatment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Will the administration of the law, if the bill is passed, be handled by the State Department or by the Bureau of Immigration?

Mr. MORSE. I understand it will be handled by the present immigration officials.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD, following the remarks of the Senator from Oregon, a statement of mine in regard to substitute bill S. 2343.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN IN REGARD TO IMMIGRATION SUBSTITUTE, S. 2343

I wish to speak in favor of the pending substitute, which was formerly S. 2343. With the greatest sincerity and with highest hopes for its passage, I wish to tell you of its virtues.

First, let me say that it is a short bill. It has 8 sections and is printed in 11 pages. Every Senator can read it and understand it at a glance. It is not written with an eye to a detailed and technical revision of the almost innumerable sections in our immigration laws. It chooses those areas most in need of improvement and modification—areas involving the basic principles of our immigration laws—and makes simple, direct, and untechnical changes.

I urge every Senator to read it, or to reread it, because I know its principles will commend themselves.

Second, it is a bipartisan bill. Even as a recent Member of this body, I know that the best bills are those that transcend partisan lines in their endeavor to better the welfare of all of us. With real pride, I call the roll of those Senators with whom I am associated in sponsoring this bill: The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator

from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON].

We ask that you give this substitute your earnest consideration.

Let me state the objectives of this bill briefly and then I will touch upon the individual sections. Briefly, this substitute has these objectives: It would eliminate race as a barrier both to naturalization and immigration, it would pool unused quota numbers so that the persecutees and others of Europe could enter this country, without regard to their nationality and under the present limit of 154,000 on total immigration. It would make other reforms by ending outmoded discriminations in immigration—based on sex and by expanding the nonquota and preference claims of the law—to care for parents and close relatives of Americans and for war orphans and veterans. It would also both do justice and benefit our security by permitting the immigration of reformed Communists and Fascists who can prove they are reformed and are now devoted adherents of democracy, as well as those whose entire membership was when they were under 16. Lastly, the bill would revitalize the entire administration of the immigration laws by applying the Administrative Procedure Act to proceedings under the law and by giving statutory powers to the present Board of Immigration Appeals.

The very first section states that the right to become a citizen shall not be denied because of race. We have come a long way from the dark days when we believed that the color of a man's skin had any bearing on his fitness to be a citizen. You might say that we came to the conclusion by repeated illustration. In the dark days at the beginning of World War II we learned that the Filipino people more than deserved equality in citizenship. And we so provided. Later, as the war went on we appreciated that the color of the skin of Chinese and Indians was equally unimportant, and we made them eligible for citizenship. We have not yet recognized in the law that the Japanese who have lived here for over a quarter of a century, industriously and peaceably, patiently awaiting recognition, were equally deserving. There are some 80,000 of such Japanese, who came here before the day of Japanese exclusion. Almost half of them live in Hawaii. Not one of them was disloyal at Pearl Harbor. Their loyalty had not been shaken by exclusion laws and by the laws denying them the brotherhood of citizenship in the country of their home. We should have known before the war that it was only simple justice to allow them to become citizens. Perhaps we did not realize their devotion until their children enrolled themselves in battle. In any event we realize it now and this body has already once approved a bill to grant them citizenship. Unfortunately it was vetoed because it was tied to other provisions. Today we have an opportunity to enact it again, and to make it part of the law.

I cannot pass the question of racial barriers to citizenship without mentioning also that there are residing in the United States a few thousand other Asiatics now ineligible to citizenship. These are Koreans, Siamese and Burmese. It is particularly fitting at this stage of world history to say to all the people of Asia—both those who are friends and enemies—that they are welcome into our community if they are only friendly. Only their good will toward us and their devotion to freedom and democracy are of interest—not at all the color of their skin.

All of these reasons equally require that we eliminate race as a barrier to immigration. It is not enough to say to Asia that those of your people who are within, we admit to equality and those of you who are without, we will keep out. Each country of Asia must be recognized as a member of the world community. We cannot solicit their friendship and at the same time deny them a quota under our immigration laws. At present only the Philippine Islands, China, and India have quotas. In common justice, every single one of the countries of Asia should have its appropriate quota. The pending substitute will accomplish this. The pending substitute will also end the present practice of charging against the Chinese and Indian quotas the descendants of Chinese and Indians who are native-born citizens of other lands.

You will be told that the moment we do this a horde of orientals will swamp the country. This is the same nonsense that many unhappy years ago led us into the Chinese Exclusion Act. We should know better. There are no hordes. The natives of South America and Europe who happen to be of oriental and part-oriental descent are not significantly different from other South Americans or Europeans. The greatest number of them do not wish to immigrate to the United States. All of them will still be subject to all the requirements of our immigration laws such as their ability to support themselves. They will no more engulf us than do the 15,000,000 Mexicans and the millions upon millions of Indians and the other peoples of South America, who can now enter regardless of race and regardless of quotas.

Let us not be put in the impossible position of saying to a man born in Rio de Janeiro that he may not immigrate because his parents or grandparents or great grandparents were born in China, while his neighbor, of Indian or Portugese or Spanish stock may enter as a Brazilian, entirely free of quota restrictions.

If we apply to all other people the test of place of birth, we cannot apply to these people a test of blood or race or color of skin.

We cannot fool the world. Let us not fool ourselves. If we wish to show our good faith to all of Asia, if we wish to rob the Communists of one of their strongest propaganda weapons in the Far East and wherever in the world there are people with colored skins, if we wish to discard outmoded racist doctrines, if we are not scared of bogeys dreamed up by our opponents, then let us wipe out discriminations in our immigration law based on race. Let us do it and let us do a clean and thorough job of it. We cannot fool the world by half measures. Let us not try to fool ourselves.

I turn to the second section of the pending substitute. It offers an equally happy opportunity to combine a permanent reform of lasting value with the solution of the urgent problem of settlement of the persecuted and excess populations of Europe. That problem threatens the well being of the western bloc of free nations, to whose leadership we are devoting unprecedented efforts.

First, let me tell you what this bill would do. Briefly, it provides that the unused quota numbers under the present law—which are about half of the total of 154,000, are to be pooled, and allotted to the people in the countries of Europe and Asia, ranging from Norway and Holland to Germany and Poland and Italy and Greece, who need and want them desperately.

The pooled quota numbers will be distributed by the Secretary of State. Preferences are provided for those who have suffered persecution because of their religion or race or for their opposition to totalitarianism and devotion to democratic beliefs, for those who are the close relatives of citizens and aliens resident in this country, and for those who by reason of their special skills can make special contributions to the national welfare.

The facts of the present emergency in Europe are known to all of us. The Displaced Persons Act has, for practical purposes, expired. It will leave the quotas for the people in need of them mortgaged for decades and centuries to come. Yet the need is compelling. In his message of March 24, the President outlined the facts. There are 9,000,000 ethnic Germans who were driven from Eastern Europe after the war. Fifteen thousand refugees from behind the iron curtain each month steal across the borders to escape to our side. They come at night, on foot, using every stratagem and at the risk of their lives. They come to freedom but they also come to privation. Germany cannot support these people. Trieste, the focal point for the flight from the satellite Balkan countries, is overcrowded. Greece, which receives its own people who flee the Communist countries, is in an equally serious economic plight. These refugees are Balts, and Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Rumanians, Albanians, Ukrainians, and Russians.

Aside from the refugees, we must face the fact that our allies have their own surplus population. Germany, and Italy and Holland and Greece must resettle large numbers of their own people. Present quotas are miserably inadequate for these people.

The quota for Italy is 5,677. For Greece it is 310. The quotas for the smaller Baltic states against which the refugees must be charged, are mortgaged for generations to come.

The Lithuanian quota is mortgaged for 135 years, the Latvian quota for over 300, the Estonian quota for 194 years. The Polish quota is mortgaged until the year 2000.

These people need help now. Plans for gradual immigration must of course be worked out and we shall help in such plans. But today—this year and next—we are organizing the countries of Western Europe in preparation for the world defense of democracy and freedom. These countries are today seriously impeded in their common efforts by the drain of these refugees and excess peoples. We can relieve that pressure by taking some of them. Not only will we help the common defense, we will increase our own abilities. We need the skills and training of these people. We need some of them in our factories. We need many of them on our farms.

By one act—the reception of a number of these people—we can therefore help our allies, help ourselves, and increase our joint capacity to resist Communist aggression.

This emergency situation arises at a time when our quota system is long overdue for reform. In 1924 we fixed the total immigration which we believed this country could absorb at a maximum of 154,000.

We computed the population as 90,000,000 and estimated that new immigration of one-sixth of 1 percent of that figure could each year be absorbed into the population without any dislocations. Our population today is 150,000,000 and by this same formula, we could absorb over 240,000 immigrants each year.

The pending substitute does not, nevertheless, propose any change in the total number of immigrants permissible each year. Some of us believe the limit should be raised but we also recognize that this may not be the unanimous view. We propose, in this substitute, only that the number presently allowable, actually be given quota numbers. We propose that every quota number be used, be put to work.

The quotas for each country established in 1924 have never been used. The largest

quotas went, of course, to the countries whose national stocks then predominated.

The United Kingdom, for instance, received a quota of 65,721, over one-third of the total. That quota reflected the large number in our population of British descent. It also reflected the large number erroneously believed to be of British descent, on the basis of Anglicized family names. The other countries of western and northern Europe also received large quotas—the total is 126,000, while the smaller countries of Southern and Eastern Europe have aggregate quotas of 25,000.

The larger quotas have never been used. Britain last year used only 21,000 of its quota of 66,000. In fact, over all the 27 years of the quota system only 44 percent of the total quotas of 154,000 have actually been used.

Thus we have a situation where those who do not need, have, and those who do need, do not have. It is not only the need of the smaller countries that should impel us to redistribute—to pool—the unused quotas. We must remember that these smaller countries are entitled to a redistribution by the very basis of the quota system. The quotas were fixed according to the proportions of descendants of immigrants in the population in 1920. Since that time it is the Poles and the Greeks and Italians and east European and Balkan peoples who have immigrated. They are now an integral part of our population. They shared with us in our time of trouble and they contributed to our success and victory. They are entitled to a redistribution which will recognize their greater numbers, their greater proportion and representation in the population. Their compatriots in Europe—and in the Middle East—are today entitled to the benefit of such increased quotas.

We will not, by pooling the unused quotas, deprive England and France and the others of their right to use their large quotas. Only to extent of the part not used, would we pool them. We would say that this country is willing, even anxious, to help meet a common problem facing the free world. We would say we are willing and anxious to offer refuge to a victim of communism, to a religious persecutee, to a skilled farmer, to a brother or cousin of a citizen. We would say we will not ask where he was born or whether his country's quota is filled. We would say that so long as the law allows 154,277 immigrants to come each year we want that number to come. If we do this, we will each year strike 154,277 blows in defense of our country today and forever in the future. "New seed" immigration can only continue the beneficial effects we have had from immigration throughout our history. We have grown from a Nation of 4,000,000 people to one of 150,000,000. We are truly the richest and most powerful Nation on the earth. Yet we face the most serious threat imaginable to our existence and that of all of our allies.

We are meeting that threat on all fronts. Let us do it on the front of immigration as well.

I say to you sincerely and humbly that the pooling of quotas proposed by the pending substitute should be enacted in the interest of justice and equality, in the interest of humanity, and in the interest of increasing our national and international strength in our struggle against the dark forces of aggression and brutality whose name is world communism.

I can say all this with such conviction because this pooling of quotas is not merely my proposal. It is not even the proposal only of the 14 distinguished Senators with whom I am joined in sponsoring this bill. It is the enthusiastic and fervent proposal of more than 30 great religious and other organizations. They include the National Council of Churches, the great Protestant organization, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the leading organization among the Catholics of America interested in this field, and all the national Jewish organizations.

All of these organizations representing every religion and every walk of life cooperated in producing the pending substitute.

There are other provisions of the pending substitute which I commend to your approval.

By this bill we would also solve the problem of reformed totalitarians and those who were members of such organizations when they were children or in circumstances where they were forced to join by law or in order to obtain the necessities of life.

The Internal Security Act barred all totalitarians with no regard to the circumstances of their membership. You will remember our embarrassment as a nation when the Attorney General informed that these provisions excluded some of those reformed Communists who were now powerful enemies of communism. You will remember the harsh and unnecessary effects on some aliens who had joined for a brief period as children or who had been forced to joint a Communist organization.

We attempted to remedy some of these harmful and unintended effects when we enacted Public Law 14, early in this session, a year ago March. Section 7 of the pending substitute strengthens Public Law 14 and permits us to welcome, for this strength and help, the reformed Communist. I think it is generally agreed that such an amendment of the law is highly desirable.

Other provisions contain further reforms of the quota and preference systems.

In the days when we did not recognize the equality of women, and we believed that only men traveled and worked and immigrated, the law gave nonquota status and preference under the quotas only to wives of citizens and to wives of resident aliens. Only certain husbands of Americans received such status. We have come to understand that women play a part in world affairs together with men. The women of our armed services alone have taught us that discriminations based on sex are a relic of the past. The women who went into our factories during the war—and who have not left their machines since—have also confirmed this lesson to us. We therefore propose, in the pending substitute, to remove from our immigration law all discrimination based on sex. Wives and husbands, equally, of American citizens would henceforth be nonquota immigrants. Wives and husbands, equally, of resident aliens, will henceforth have preferences under the quotas. This reform, too, is long overdue and I know it meets with widespread approval.

The pending substitute also proposes certain changes in the classes of immigrants who shall have nonquota status. At present, parents of American citizens receive a preference on 50 percent of the quota for the country of their origin. In the countries with the smaller quotas, this preference is insufficient for the number of parents who wish to join their children here. In Norway, for instance, parents of American citizens must wait for 7 years before they receive a quota. And when finally they get to the top of the list of parents, the grant of the preference to them has the effect of leaving no room for other immigrants. The pending substitute will give all parents of American citizens freedom from quota restrictions, on a par with the husbands and wives of citizens. The total number who will be admitted will not be great—it can hardly run to a few thousand. The total in terms of happiness in reunited families will be an everlasting monument to the humanitarianism of this Eighty-second Congress. We also propose that war orphans coming here for adoption and to live with their relatives be admitted on a nonquota basis. The tragic plight of the orphans of Europe is one of the bitterest legacies of the war. They are a burden on Europe and they could be a blessing to us. They can add to our resources and make hundreds of childless families ecstatically happy. Lastly there are aliens abroad who have served honorably and valuably in our Armed Forces. They have no quota preference, no status. Yet by their service in our Army they have been educated in American democratic ways as no other persons outside this country. Again, we serve ourselves if we bring these people here outside the quota.

With the increase in status of parents, and husbands of American women, we propose that the brothers, sister and adult children, and the parents of resident aliens be given a preference under the quotas.

Lastly, the pending substitute makes a fundamental reform in the administrative procedure under our immigration law. A widely criticized amendment to the law in a recent appropriation act withdrew from immigration proceedings the provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act. We know that the rules of fairness embodied in that act are salutary checks on abuses of power by the lesser administrative officers. A fair hearing and a right of appeal to a disinterested superior body are necessary not so much in the interest of the alien who is the subject of an exclusion or deportation proceeding. It is necessary in the interest of preservation of our system of government which demands that laws and not men shall be supreme. Once we deny due process and a fair hearing, we open the door to every possible abuse of power by men in government. Only by constant vigilance can we protect our system of law and that vigilance is to be observed in the field of immigration as well as in the other areas of the activities of the Government.

It is for these reasons that the pending substitute gives statutory powers to the Board of Immigration Appeals rather than the Attorney General as the administrative body charged with review of exclusion proceedings under the immigration laws. The Attorney General is essentially a prosecutor and his subordinates, who actually sit in these proceedings, are thus imbued with the spirit of the prosecutor and not that of the judge. The separation of the function of prosecutor and judge is essential for fairness in administrative proceedings. The pending substitute thus accomplishes this desirable result by recognizing the valuable function performed by the Board of Immigration Appeals, and strengthening that Board with statutory power.

This is what the pending substitute does. I believe all of it is constructive and will improve both our immigration laws and the service they perform in our foreign relations. These improvements—desired and many many years overdue—will demonstrate at home and abroad that we practice democracy and friendship as well as preach it.

They will be worthy of a nation which today is leading the free nations of the world in the struggle for peace and good will.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I yield a minute to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR].

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, during my absence from the Senate floor on Monday a vote to recommit the McCarran bill was taken. I am sorry that I was absent at that time. Had I been present I would have voted for the recommittal of the bill. However, I should like to state that I think the Humphrey-Lehman bill goes a little too far, and that there is a difference of opinion between what is expressed by supporters of the bill and myself as to the rights of aliens in this country.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the order be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ACTION OF THE AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT UNDER THE TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1951

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me for a few minutes?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on April 7, 1952, I stated to the Senate that Mr. John Breckinridge, who represents the California Fig Institute, had alleged to me in writing that the Secretary of Agriculture had disregarded and circumvented the intent of Congress. Mr. Breckinridge outlined his serious charges in some detail through a letter written to me under date of April 5. This Breckinridge letter appears on pages 3610 and 3611 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 7. I offered the letter for the RECORD out of a need for fairness to the Department of Agriculture, to the State Department, and to Mr. Breckinridge.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Charles F. Brannan, has written to me at some length in response to the charges laid before me by Mr. Breckinridge. Because the fig-industry question under discussion is of importance, and because the Secretary of Agriculture ought to be afforded the same opportunity to be heard as was Mr. Breckinridge, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Brannan's letter be printed in its entirety at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 16, 1952.

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: In inserting a letter from Mr. John Breckinridge on page 3610 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 7 commenting on action taken by me on an application filed by the California Fig Institute under section 8 (a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, you expressed concern about whether his allegations were based on fact. Because of your understandable concern, I am writing to give you the correct facts for your information and for the RECORD.

I am particularly concerned with Mr. Breckinridge's statement that, in his opinion, I was "forced, in this case, to act on instructions from the State Department and/or the White House." Second, he implies that Mr. Flood, of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, in this Department, was chiefly responsible for my decision. And, third, Mr. Breckinridge attacks my selection of Mr. Flood as Acting Director of the Department's Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations on the grounds that he is an employee of the State Department and, is, therefore, not responsible to me.

Because of your expressed concern as to the accuracy of these allegations, I thought you should be informed that none of them is correct.

First, although we consult other departments when it is appropriate, no one in this department consulted the State Department in this case. I personally made the decision in my capacity as Secretary of Agriculture.

Second, I made this decision after consulting with the heads of all the appropriate agencies in the Department responsible on matters of this type, after a careful study had been made of the entire question. These agencies include the Production and Marketing Administration, which has primary responsibility on section 8 (a) actions, the Solicitor, and the Acting Director of our Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

Third, Mr. Flood's responsibility to Agriculture is so well established, and so well known, that it should need no defense. He was born and reared on the farm, and after finishing university training the only employment he has ever had were these: He homesteaded and farmed in Wyoming; he taught at the Nebraska School of Agriculture and at Iowa State College; he edited midwestern farm magazines for several years; and he came to the United States Department of Agriculture 19 years ago. Since then he has served as Assistant to the Administrator of the AAA, Chester Davis; as Assistant to the War Food Administrator, Marvin Jones; and in this Department's Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations. It would be hard to find anyone whose record is more purely agricultural than Mr. Flood's.

In 1947, we recommended Mr. Flood's appointment as agricultural attaché at the United States Embassy in Ottawa, Canada. This was in keeping with our practice of assigning to the Foreign Service able men from the Department of Agriculture to serve as our agricultural attachés instead of relying on nonagricultural men in the Foreign Service. The practice is sound, and has been strongly supported by the House Agriculture Committee and the House Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations. The assignments and the promotion of these men are now decided primarily on the basis of recommendations of this Department.

At the time of Dr. Henry Bennett's tragic death, Stanley Andrews, the Director of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, was temporarily detailed to the point 4 program in the State Department. On Mr. Andrews' recommendation, we brought Francis Flood back from his post in Ottawa to direct the work of our Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations during Andrews' absence.

I am sure you will agree that the above information clearly indicates that the statement that I was "forced, in this case, to act on instructions from the State Department and/or the White House" is not based on fact.

Mr. Breckinridge also misrepresented Congressman HUNTER's description of the interview that Mr. HUNTER and Senator NIXON had with Assistant Secretary Hutchinson and Mr. Flood. Congressman Hunter, on seeing Mr. Breckinridge's letter was kind enough to telephone my office and state that the description attributed to him by Mr. Breckinridge was not fully accurate. In the interview Assistant Secretary Hutchinson and Mr. Flood paid tribute to the California Fig Institute for its splendid record of assistance to the fig producers, and agreed with Senator NIXON and Mr. HUNTER that the fig industry is faced with some serious problems. They do not recall that they "expressed grave concern over the welfare of Greece, Turkey, and other fig-exporting countries," as reported by Mr. Breckinridge.

Having indicated to you what we did not do, I know you will be interested in knowing what we did do.

On March 17 the California Fig Institute requested the Secretary of Agriculture to make a determination under section 8 (a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 that dried figs are perishable, and that a condition exists requiring emergency treatment by the Tariff Commission of the institute's application for relief under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, which was filed on the same day. Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture makes such a determination under section 8 (a), final action by the Tariff Commission and the President must be taken within 25 days. In substantiation of its request, the institute indicated that dried figs are perishable, that dried-fig imports wil be large (6,000 or 7,000 tons) in 1951–52, that these imports are expected to result in a large carry-out in packers' hands, and that this large, unsold tonnage will lead to low grower returns and grower problems in disposing of 1952 crop figs unless imports are controlled for the balance of the 1951 crop year and in 1952–53.

On the basis of the material submitted by the institute and other information available, I determined that the outlook for imports in the balance of the 1951–52 season was not such as to require emergency treatment in the form of an investigation and action within 25 days. Some of the basic facts considered in arriving at this conclusion were these: Dried figs are eligible for consideration under section 8 (a); about 80 percent of imports of dried figs arrive from October to December; as of January 1, 1952, only 300 tons of foreign figs suitable for shipment to the United States during the remainder of the 1951–52 season were available; imports from July 1, 1951, to January 31, 1952, for consumption were only about 3,000 tons (about half the quantity the industry indicated would come in); and domestic shipments of figs so far have been larger than in 1950–51.

The only conclusion we could reach from these facts was that imports during the remainder of the 1951–52 season would be minor, that domestic demand would have to be satisfied almost wholly from domestic sources until the start of the new season, and that therefore a condition requiring emergency treatment did not appear to exist.

We did, however, advise the Tariff Commission on our own initiative that to be of maximum benefit to domestic fig producers any relief under section 7 would have to be granted prior to the industry's new crop year on July 1, 1952. With the expected large carry-over into the 1952 season, domestic dried fig producers could experience substantial hardship if, after July 1, 1952, importers negotiated for and subsequently imported substantial quantities of figs.

My determination was transmitted to the Tariff Commission on April 7, and on the same day I notified Mr. Breckinridge by letter. In addition we informed him we are keeping the problem under surveillance. Needless to say we intend to continue to safeguard the interests of the fig producers as fully as the developing situation and existing legislation permits us to do.

I know that you would want to have the foregoing facts and I will appreciate anything you may do to have them put in the record. I am making copies of this letter available to some of the people who have indicated an interest in the material that appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 7.

If you should desire any further information on this subject we will be glad to hear from you.

Sincerely,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, it is unnecessary for me to urge the appropriate Senate committee to give consideration

to Mr. Brannan's reaction and response to Mr. Breckinridge's letter and charges. I have reason to believe that the committee will be keenly interested in the correspondence, and will seek to reconcile the serious differences of opinion and even fact which are apparent.

Mr. President, I wish to express my thanks to the Senator from New York for his courtesy in yielding to me.

REVISION OF LAWS RELATING TO IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND NATIONALITY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2550) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON].

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, how much time has the Senator from New York remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 17 minutes left.

Mr. BENTON. If I may address a question to the Senator from New York, is my understanding correct that if my remarks require more than 17 minutes, other time will be available?

Mr. LEHMAN. I have been informed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] has agreed to give us additional time which he will not use. I can only yield to the Senator pending the appearance on the floor of the Senator from Nevada, but I understand from the Senator from Minnesota that the Senator from Connecticut may have additional time.

Mr. BENTON. I thank the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Nine minutes have been consumed in the quorum call, which was charged to the side represented by the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I withdrew the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator withdrew it, but already 9 minutes had been consumed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Very well. I understand that the Senator from Nevada will grant some of his time to the Senator from Connecticut or other Senators who may wish to speak.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota is now conferring with the Senator from Nevada, and I shall proceed on the assumption that the conference will result as indicated by the Senator from New York, so that I will have more time than the 17 minutes.

Mr. President, as a cosponsor of S. 2343, I assert that if there is any measure before the Senate or its committees which would strike a quick and strengthening blow for the democratic principles on which our country was established and has thrived since its inception, it is the substitute bill now before the Senate. It is not pretended that our bill is in any sense a codification or substitute revision of our immigration laws. It is no mass of contamination and discrimination, no entrenchment of our past mistakes and past evils, no vast confusion confounded. It is not even a paradise for lawyers. It is a simple bill, a bill easy to understand. Indeed, I believe that anyone could achieve understanding of it at one reading.

The passage of our substitute bill, which can be easily and quickly achieved, would show the peoples of the world our good faith in this hour of crisis, and prove to them that we are not deserting them or erecting a barricade or an iron wall to keep out the tragic multitude of alleged untouchables which the McCarran bill would create.

I have spent some time in my State during the past week. As Senators may know, the complexion of my State has changed very greatly in the past 100 years. I spoke at a communion breakfast in New Haven on Sunday morning, and discovered from the priest, Father McDonnough, that the first Catholic parish in the city of New Haven—and perhaps in the State of Connecticut—was founded in 1851. My father was born in Connecticut in 1850, 1 year before the first Catholic parish was established in the city of New Haven. Today, Bishop O'Brien tells me, 38 percent of my constituents are Catholics.

Something like 60 percent of the people of my State of Connecticut had left Connecticut and gone west before the Civil War. As a young man in his thirties, my father, the eighth generation to be born in the State, left to teach at the University of Minnesota. Such people who went west have been replaced through the great emigration from Europe, until today perhaps two-thirds of the population of my State consists of the various groups which have come in from Europe during the past century—or a little more—the Irish, the Italians, the Czechs, the Germans, the Poles, the Slovaks, the Carpatho-Russians, and many, many others.

As a result of this melting pot within my own State there is great interest in the pending bill. I say to Senators who have not had an opportunity to get home during this debate that they will find in their States a greater interest in the pending bill on the part of various racial groups than they may now suspect. On Monday night I spoke to 800 or 900 delegates at the New Haven convention of the Democratic Party. When, as a part of my talk, I came to the subject of the current debate on the floor of the Senate, I could feel the response of that audience. I could literally see the audience coming to attention when I started to talk about the bill. Thus the pending bill is of tremendous concern to large groups of our own population.

I warn Senators who have not properly read the bill, thought about the bill, or studied the bill, or who have not been back home in contact with their constituents, that if they are prepared to support and vote for the McCarran bill they will hear a great deal about it later from certain groups of their constituents who have a real interest and a real basis, out of their experience, for understanding the nature of the tragic problem.

This is a far more important subject than most of our colleagues realize. It is of concern to large numbers of informed constituents who boast a deep interest in the subject, growing out of their personal and family backgrounds. I find as great an interest in the bill in my State as I have found in any other bill which has been debated on the floor of this body. The newspapers do not reflect the interest which I find personally when I return to the State.

Secondly, the bill is of even greater concern to the relatives and kinfolk of these people overseas. All over the world the eyes of the peoples of foreign countries are focused on the United States. They are interested in what we are going to do about the pending bill. Shortly we shall be debating an appropriation of $6,900,000,000 for mutual aid. On the one hand, we are pouring out our treasure and raising our taxes in order to win the respect, admiration, friendship, and support of the peoples of other nations. On the other hand, by the passage of this one bill we can destroy much of the good will which we otherwise would be achieving with these vast expenditures of money and of blood. Nothing can be more inconsistent than for us to pass the pending bill while at the same time we face growing casualty lists in the Korean war.

I do not believe that many Members of the Senate could possibly have read Senate bill 2550. It requires days to read. I assure Senators that it will take the most expert lawyers weeks and years to understand it. It is 302 pages of verbose, complicated, confused elaboration of what, in my judgment, need only be a simple code covering our immigration and nationality procedures. The immigration and nationality laws of Canada consist of less than 75 pages. They can be read and understood by the average intelligent layman after a single evening of study.

Senate bill 2550, the McCarran bill, is so obtuse that the Senator from Nevada seems to have decided not to explain it to us section by section, as I thought he had agreed to do when the debate on the bill began. Perhaps if he should attempt to explain the bill to us section by section, as he explained the then pending bill before the passage of the Administrative Procedure Act, it would take him so long, and the explanation would be so involved, that he would be accused of engaging in a filibuster.

Mr. President, I submit that we should not enact legislation which is incapable of being read and understood by the majority of the Members of the United States Senate, particularly when the majority consists of lawyers who, in theory, have spent their lives preparing to understand such legislation. I feel that this is particularly true when experienced Senators—such as our colleague from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]—who have studied this bill warn us that it is not only undemocratic but potentially highly dangerous.

Mr. President, no man can calculate the billions which we would have to spend on armaments to achieve a measure of security comparable to what would be added to our security by the defeat of the McCarran bill and the acceptance of this substitute. If we are

no doubt that Senators who are concerned, as the Senator from Connecticut is concerned, about the Japanese exclusion, will find it removed under the terms of the substitute which has been offered by the Senator from New York.

Mr. BENTON. That is the first and the most important point of our six basic and simple objectives.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad the Senator from Connecticut refers to the objectives as simple and basic. That is what they are. There is involved no grandiose rewriting of our immigration laws.

Mr. BENTON. We do not propose to throw over the limitation on the quotas. Perhaps at some future time men of more courage and men who are less practical than we are will be willing to attempt it. However, we have only these six basic and simple objectives. I have given the first—the elimination of racial discrimination.

Second, the substitute bill would remove discriminations based upon sex. Why should we in the United States, to whom the whole world looks with favor because of our attitude toward our women, why should we, after our record of leadership in giving full rights to women, why should we practice discrimination against women in our immigration laws?

An American husband today can bring his foreign wife into the United States as a nonquota immigrant. He can bring her in immediately as a nonquota immigrant. Any German girl who wishes to enter the United States merely has to marry one of our soldiers who is stationed in Germany, or any other American she can persuade; and in that event she will enter the United States, regardless of the date of marriage or regardless of the quota. However, when an American girl marries an alien, she can secure for him only a preference under the quota.

Incidentally, Mr. President, today the preference quotas for Turkey, Greece, and certain other countries are greatly oversubscribed. So if an American girl marries a Greek, for instance, she will be in the unhappy position of being unable to have him admitted to the United States; even if his name is Skouras, she will be unable to have him admitted to the United States. [Laughter.]

The American wife of a Turkish or a Greek or many another national must remain in the United States, separated from her husband, or must leave the land of her birth, to live abroad, waiting until her husband's number shows up on the quota list.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield at this point?

Mr. BENTON. I yield. I can see that the heart of the Senator from Minnesota is wrung by the predicament of American girls who marry aliens.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. So the Senator from Connecticut is really saying that if a young man from the United States in his travels about Europe finds there a charming young damsel who meets his fancy, he can marry her and can bring her home immediately to the United States, to be his "one and only."

Mr. BENTON. Yes; at once he can "bring her home to mother."

Mr. HUMPHREY. However, if a young American girl meets in Europe a young, gallant, gentlemanly, chivalrous young man of powerful physique, for instance, and if she marries him, she will have to wait until he can qualify under the immigration quota, before he will be admitted to the United States. Is not that a fact?

Mr. BENTON. Yes; unfortunately, that is true under present conditions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In fact, in some cases her charming husband might have to wait until the year 2000. By that time he might not be so gallant or so charming or of such powerful physique. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, in the case of an American girl who marries a Turk, for instance, she should make sure that he is a very, very, very young Turk. [Laughter.]

Mr. BENTON. Of course, Mr. President, if an American girl marries a Turk, I think he should be a young one anyway.

Our amendment would remove the discrimination based upon sex, and thus would implement the underlying intention of our immigration laws, in seeking the preservation of the family unit.

Our amendment also contains humane provisions for granting nonquota status to war orphans and to aliens who served in our Armed Forces.

The Senator from Minnesota and I have been particularly interested, over a period of years, in the subject of alien orphans. The war has left in its wake thousands of war orphans, who can find decent homes in the United States and can grow up here to become patriotic and loyal American citizens. These children have suffered not only from the ravages of war, but also from the tragedies which befall innocent youngsters when they lose their parents. These blameless and homeless orphans should not be compelled to stand in quota lines if they are otherwise admissible to the United States under our laws.

Mr. President, as a member of the board of trustees of the Cradle Society, of Evanston, Ill., I can tell you that there are in the United States tens of thousands of families who would immediately line up at the docks at the ports in the United States to wait for these children. Yes; America has hundreds of thousands of empty homes seeking and wanting children. In fact, Mr. President, the quota of babies at the Cradle Society is oversubscribed for a decade—so much so that I constantly receive calls from persons who know friends of mine, or from persons who know friends of friends, who seek me out as one of the members of the board of trustees of the Cradle Society; and those calls are always, in substance, as follows: "Can't you be of some help? I am told that I must wait 10 years before I can get a baby."

In fact, Mr. President, in the United States there are countless empty homes in which the success of the marriage may depend upon obtaining a baby. So here we have this great gaping market for babies in the United States.

Mr. President, as an ex-businessman, perhaps I may use business terms and say that there is a great supply of babies in Europe, and we should permit the supply to come together with the demand. That is needed in order to avert a tragedy not only for the homeless orphans of Europe, but also for hundreds of thousands of empty homes in the United States.

I speak on this subject with special feeling because, as many of you may know, three of Mrs. Benton's and my own four children are adopted children. That is how I became interested in this subject to begin with.

If the couples who are childless, or who have only one child and want more, knew they could get babies, those couples would come forward from virtually every block in every city and town in the country, in numbers that could not be believed except by persons who have had experience in this field and who know the great desire on the part of, I suspect, American families running into the millions. Yes, Mr. President, I have understated the case when I have said that the demand comes only from hundreds of thousands of families. It is from millions.

Accordingly, our amendment contains a provision granting nonquota status to these orphans.

An authorization for the admission of 10,000 war orphans was permitted under the amended Displaced Persons Act, to begin in June 1950, and to terminate by June 30, 1952. Although the authorization calls for a total of 10,000, the Displaced Persons Commission will be able to process only 4,000 by the expiration date of June 30. The reasons for this situation are multiple. For one thing, it has taken a long time for many of the foreign governments in question to gain confidence in the program and to release appropriate children for processing. I recall that when I was in London, last October, an American motion-picture actress, whose name I have forgotten, was there; and a big story in the British press was the British Government's determination to keep her from taking back to the United States a British baby only a few months old. Many foreign governments are not willing to let children leave their countries. The complications of their laws and the adjustment of our complicated laws to their laws constitute one of the reasons why more foreign-born babies have not been processed under this act for admission to the United States. Furthermore, the adoption procedures in our own country, which vary from State to State, must be adjusted in order to meet the laws of

talking about the McCarran bill in terms of our national security, it can be calculated in terms of billions of dollars of damage to the security of the people of the United States. Yes, there are other things involved in our security besides airplanes, atomic bombs, and armaments. What good will it do to arm the peoples of Europe if they do not have the spirit to fight alongside us? In Southeast Asia we have seen armies which on many occasions seemingly have lacked spirit. In China, into which we poured $3,000,000,000 or more of armaments, we saw the Nationalist armies lacking the spirit to fight and to use those armaments. It is measures such as the bill we are now debating, the 302-page immigration bill, which destroy the confidence of the world in us, in our democratic principles, and in our leadership.

Mr. President, I should be surprised to learn that the bill has been read or analyzed by more than a handful of Members of this body. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, told a group of us the other day that the committee itself had never adequately studied the bill, and that it was the work, over a period of time, of the staff, and of a few members of a subcommittee.

Why should we pass this bill this year at this explosive time in world history? There is no pressing need to "codify" or "revise" our immigration laws this year. We should never do it in the manner proposed by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. I say let us have no alleged revision or alleged codification which for one minute tolerates such a shameful example of tragic, shortsighted foolishness as is embodied in S. 2550.

Mr. President, the McCarran bill is offensive to hundreds of millions of people all over the world. Yet our immigration laws need not be endlessly and foolishly offensive.

In 1950 we enacted the Internal Security Act, which was intended to deal with the security problems surrounding aliens and citizens alike. The present Presiding Officer, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], as an ex-member of a university faculty, must have been embarrassed, as I too was embarrassed as an ex-member of a university faculty, by the recent incident in New York dealing with a scientific group whose name escapes me. The scientific society could not meet in New York and had to change its place of meeting to Canada because of the provisions of the internal security law.

I cite that incident if only to show that the Security Act is certainly doing a job in this Nation and that the Nation is not in any danger from a stream of subversives and Communists coming in as immigrants. That incident shows that the welfare of the Nation is in no way at stake if we do not enact immigration legislation this year. On the other hand, the future basis for maintaining our newly gained stature as a world leader would be greatly, adversely, and tragically affected by the passage of the McCarran bill.

Mr. President, the world is too full of folly, deception, and treachery already, without this country instituting a basic law which reeks with unjust and arbitrary inequities in the tradition of a completely foreign concept, to the effect that one race is better than another; for example that a German is better than a Greek or an Italian.

I may say that in my own State of Connecticut, in line with comments that I have just made about the racial groups in my State, and as our civil-rights legislation and the enforcement of our FEPC law in Connecticut demonstrate, there is no basic difference between a German, an Italian, a Ukrainian, a Greek, a Norwegian, an Englishman, or an Irishman. These prejudices, which grow out of our past, and which are ingrained in the McCarran bill, are in defiance of the democratic principles which we are practicing in the State of Connecticut and to which we give allegiance throughout our country.

Mr. President, our proposed amendment in the nature of a substitute affords a real opportunity to improve our immigration practices, to remove racial and sex discriminations from our immigration laws, and to permit for the first time an equitable approach to our quota system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired. It is the understanding of the Chair that an agreement has been reached between the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Minnesota with respect to the remainder of the time. Does the Senator from Minnesota wish to state that agreement for the information of the Chair?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have just discussed the matter with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. I have spoken to him with reference to the use of the remainder of the time for debate available between now and 4:30, when the vote is to be taken on the substitute. The Senator from Nevada informs me that he wishes to begin his remarks at approximately 3 o'clock. He expects to speak for an hour and 15 minutes. In that way he would utilize the remainder of the time available for debate, and then a quorum call would be had at the conclusion of his remarks. He suggested to me that we utilize the time between now and 3 o'clock. With that understanding I yield an additional 15 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair takes note of the understanding. The Senator from Connecticut may proceed.

Mr. BENTON. I thank the Chair and I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I know that the Senator from Nevada seeks to accomplish some of what I have just described in his own 302-page bill and that the bill incorporates a few good provisions along with many bad ones.

Mr. President, our substitute, S. 2343, accomplishes needed revision in 10 or 11 pages, and does it in direct language and in a manner which requires no legal adviser at one's side as he reads each word. It can be easily explained section by section. It is a bill which has six simple objectives. I should like to review the six objectives very quickly at this point.

First, it removes racial discrimination from our immigration and naturalization laws. That is our greatest and most crying need. We must do that if we are to practice what we preach. If we want to give the Voice of America something to talk about all over the world all we have to do is to remove racial discrimination from our immigration laws. This would be a tremendous step forward for the people of the United States in our great effort to take world leadership.

All pending immigration bills claim this as an objective. All theoretically agree that race should play no part in determining whom we shall admit to our shores or our citizenry. The removal of this sore spot from our laws will have a favorable effect upon our international relations throughout the world, particularly in the Far East, where the American antioriental exclusion policy has long been resented.

Once before I mentioned on the floor that I happened to be in Japan in 1937 on the anniversary date of the passage of our Oriental Exclusion Act. I had never heard anything about it until I got to Japan. I certainly heard about it that day, because black flags broke out all over Tokyo. Black flags adorned the buildings. Japan proclaimed a national day of mourning. This would have been avoided by the admission under our quota system of something like 143 Japanese a year.

Mr. President, no man knows the extent to which this Oriental Exclusion Act precipitated the climate of opinion in Japan which brought about the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Every student of history admits that it had tremendous effect. For all we know, it may have been responsible for the attack on Pearl Harbor. What a price to pay for the exclusion of 143 Japanese a year. The McCarran bill would permit the entry of 100 Japanese a year. Thus it takes some of the taint of racial exclusion, so far as the Japanese are concerned, out of our immigration laws.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. Yes; on the Senator's time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Very well. I may say to the Senator that the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which is the pending question, clearly and irrevocably removes from the immigration laws any shadow or any trace of oriental racial discrimination, and that there is

and Naturalization Service and in 1940 recommended that a Board be established devoted solely to quasi-judicial functions. The present Board of Immigration Appeals was established by Justice Jackson, when he was Attorney General to fulfill the recommendations of that 2-year study. In its recent report on H. R. 5678, the so-called Walter omnibus bill, the House Committee had this to say—House Report No. 1365, pages 35–36:

> It is believed that the Board has well served its purpose and has greatly contributed to a fair and equitable administration of justice in immigration, nationality, and naturalization cases.

When the Walter omnibus bill was debated on the floor of the House, an amendment was approved to establish a statutory Board of Immigration Appeals—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 4401, April 24, 1952. Today, the Board is a nonstatutory Board, subject to the control of the Attorney General. Our bill proposes to make this a statutory Board, so that it cannot be abolished summarily at his whim or caprice. The American Friends Service Committee, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and other organizations have recommended that the Board of Immigration Appeals be given stature and permanence so that it can continue to contribute to the fair and impartial administration of our immigration and nationality laws. This should be done by making the Board a statutory body as has been done by the omnibus immigration bill which has passed the House of Representatives on April 25.

Fifth. S. 2343 would permit the entry into the United States of reformed members of totalitarian parties, whose past membership was involuntary or who have since been actively opposed to the doctrines of such totalitarian organizations of which they were members. This provision is similar to the provision contained in S. 2550 at pages 60 and 61.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield one more minute to the Senator, in order that he may complete his remarks.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I understand that this provision is strongly endorsed by the State Department. Is it not manifestly in our own best interests to encourage defections from the ranks of communism and other forms of totalitarianism? When a person has deserted communism or other forms of totalitarianism, and given satisfactory proof of his active opposition to such dogma, and when his entry into the United States has been approved both by the State Department and the Attorney General, there is no reason why he should be barred from asylum in the United States. Our bill provides an added protection in connection with this provision. Each such case which is approved administratively, must be reported to Congress.

The foregoing provision, which is also proposed by the omnibus bill itself, was found desirable as a result of experiences under the operation of the Internal Security Act amendments to our immigration laws. We found ourselves excluding from entry into the United States many proven cases of anti-Communists under a law which was intended to exclude subversives. It nearly stopped all immigration from Italy. It prevented bona fide iron-curtain refugees from entering the United States solely because at one time in the past they have been compelled to be members of Communist organizations. It is for this reason that the Senator from Nevada is in agreement with us that this provision of law is necessary to correct injustice and to treat anti-Communists fairly and properly.

Sixth. Finally, the amendment would restore the Administrative Procedure Act. The Senator from Nevada, who played such a distinguished role in developing the Administrative Procedure Act, in his omnibus immigration bill seeks to accomplish this same purpose. However, the American Bar Association believes that his bill fails to do so. In simple, unmistakable language, our amendment accomplishes what the Senator from Nevada attempts to do in the course of his 302 pages, but may not have achieved. The Administrative Procedure Act was designed to bring impartial administrative justice to Government agencies, to prevent the same man from being prosecutor and judge, from being investigator one day and a judge the next. The McCarran bill would permit commingling of functions by not requiring a complete separation between prosecutor and judicial functions in the immigration service and by not providing for independent examiners who are not subject to supervisors who engage in such investigating or prosecuting functions. S. 2343 maintains the impartial justice required of administrative agencies by the Administrative Procedure Act.

Mr. President, S. 2343, which is in the nature of a substitute, would revise the immigration and naturalization laws to accomplish needed reforms. It would do it in simple language which everyone can understand. It would do it in a proposal without hidden booby traps. Whatever is proposed in our bill is out in the open where it can be seen by all. Our bill does not claim to be one thing and turn out to be another. If my colleagues here today are really interested in removing discriminations from our immigration and naturalization laws and in the fair administration of these laws, they should vote for this amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, before I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I desire to have placed in the RECORD a comparison of the bills, S. 2550 and S. 2842, the latter of which bills is pending before the Judiciary Committee, in reference to the treatment of subversives in the respective bills. There has been considerable comment as to what Senate bill 2842 would do, and I have had an analysis made of the two bills which contains all pertinent information. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. I think the RECORD will bear me out that S. 2842 is very rigid in its terms and surely protects the full national interest of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the comparison was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Treatment of subversives in the omnibus immigration bills

EXCLUSIONS PROVISIONS

Section	Under S. 2550 (McCarran)	Under S. 2842 (Humphrey-Lehman)	Remarks
Sec. 212 (a) (27)	Aliens who the consular officer or the Attorney General knows or has reason to believe seek to enter	Aliens who seek to enter	Both bills set up the same requirements. However, while S. 2550 permits a determination to be made on the basis of the consul's or the Attorney General's "reason to believe", S. 2842 sets up an objective standard which gives reviewing authorities greater latitude.
	Common to both bills		
	the United States solely, principally, or incidentally to engage in activity which would be prejudicial to the public interest, or endanger the welfare, safety, or security of the United States;		
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (A)	Aliens who are anarchists;		Sections same in both bills.
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (B)	Aliens who advocate or teach, or who are members of or affiliated with any organization that advocates or teaches, opposition to all organized government;		Do.
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (C) (i)	Aliens who are members of or affiliated with the Communist Party of the United States;		Do.
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (C) (ii)	Aliens who are members of or affiliated with any other totalitarian party of the United States;		Do.
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (C) (iii)	Aliens who are members of or affiliated with the Communist Political Association;		Do.
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (C) (iv)	Aliens who are members of or affiliated with the Communist or any other totalitarian party of any State of the United States, or any foreign state, or of any political or geographical subdivision of any foreign state;		Do.
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (C) (v)	Aliens who are members of or affiliated with any section, subsidiary, branch, affiliate, or subdivision of any such association or party;		Do.

foreign countries. That process has been slow and cumbersome. In addition, children cannot be brought into most of our States without compliance of the prospective parents, and this takes time.

Because of the June 30 expiration date, more than 6,000 orphans will be excluded from the United States, although under the original authorization the intent of Congress was to have them included and admitted.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Minnesota will assure me that I shall have an additional 5 minutes in which to address the Senate, I shall read some very touching excerpts from some of the letters I have received. On the other hand, if the time is too limited for that, I shall ask that some of the letters be printed in the RECORD, in addition to those I shall read.

Suppose at this time I read one letter, as a sample. If time remains, thereafter, for me to read others, I shall do so. Of course, I shall not read the names given in the letters, because I do not think that would be suitable:

MAY 8, 1952.

Mr. E. M. O'CONNOR,
Commissioner of Displaced Persons,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In regard to your letter of April 29, 1952, concerning D. P. C. 224—

Mr. President, some child was given that number, like a convict—

I was in Greece in December 1951 and saw with my own eyes the poverty, bomb-torn homes, broken families, sickness, and despair. I am heartsick. These two girls, Eléne and Gianoula, are actually sleeping on the ground—no beds, no floor, no shoes, very few clothes, and only makeshift food, with no way of helping themselves and no one else to help them. It is inhuman to leave them to shift for themselves as animals would. Even with the help I could give them from here, it would by no means answer the problem.

I have a home, a steady job, and every intention of doing as much for these girls, who are my blood relations, as I would for our own children. Our children are grown now. Our only daughter is married. We have three sons: Robert is in the Army; Clifford has had his physical examination and is waiting to be called into the Army; and Lee intends to join the Navy. So there will be no reason why these orphans, who have known only the misery of life amidst war could not have a real home and the guidance and help they so desperately need.

While I am not unmindful of the big job you and your organization are doing, I still hope you will find an opportunity to allow Eléne and Gianoula * * * to enter the United States and become the useful, happy people they are capable of being with the necessary help.

Respectfully yours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes more.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, instead of reading any more letters, I ask unanimous consent that any other letters which I may desire to have included in the RECORD may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, let me review rather quickly the other basic, simple objectives of the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The third objective of our amendment in the nature of a substitute is to pool unused quotas for distribution during the following year. These would be distributed without reference to national origin. They could be used to reunite close relatives or to secure the entry of persons who would enhance our national security and economy, or who seek asylum here because of religious, racial, or political persecution.

Mr. President, no other country in the Western Hemisphere, and perhaps no other country in the world, has immigration laws as stringent as those of the United States. Very few countries in this hemisphere have any quota laws at all. Brazil has a flexible quota system which permits the transfer of unfilled quotas to a subsequent year, just as we propose in our amendment in the nature of a substitute. Canada and Mexico have no quota laws, but may impose numerical limitations upon immigration by executive action, when deemed necessary. That system is far more flexible than ours. Peru limits the number of aliens in its country at any one time. That limitation is designed to curtail Asiatic immigration. Britain, France, Sweden, and China have no quota laws, no literacy tests, and no laws which exclude aliens because of race or nationality.

Mr. President, we can and do propose to continue to maintain a quota system in our substitute and restrict aliens numerically. But we most surely should do so only upon the basis of a democratic and flexible quota system which does not discriminate against people because of the color of their face or the alleged color of their blood. We should not continue to seemingly waste quota numbers each year—when in reality we are killing them—when they can be pooled and distributed during the following year to reunite families, to assist refugees from communism and other forms of totalitarianism and to bring to the United States skills and professions which will be of benefit to our country.

There was a time when a citizen who fled from persecution or tyranny in his own country could escape to a new world there to make valuable contributions to the welfare and history of a new democratic republic. That is the way we grew and became great. But today, in the year 1952, when travel is so swift and easy and when great governments are ostensibly and ostentatiously engaged in the work of international organization, a man who loses his country loses his place in the world, too. As a stateless person he has no status in the world community. On December 22, 1946, the Age-Herald of Birmingham, Ala., commented upon this problem, and the comment is so appropriate that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the comment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There was a day when the United States took pride in being a haven for worthy folk who wished to better themselves. Is that day passing?

If so, it is quite an irrational development. Most of us are descendants of foreigners. * * * If we are to be a good neighbor to the rest of mankind we cannot maintain this forbidding role. The time has come to remodel our immigration policy so that it will conform not to our fears but to our resources and our hopes.

Mr. BENTON. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two case stories citing examples wherein the application of present immigration regulations would split families by admitting one or more members of the family, but not all members, to the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. A Czechoslovakian refugee family, personally known to and recommended by a Foreign Service officer who recently served in Czechoslovakia, is now in Liverpool. The family consists of a mother, father, and a daughter who has just passed her twenty-first birthday. The daughter happens to have been born in Budapest.

While it seems likely that the parents might be eligible for immigration visas within a reasonable length of time, the daughter would not be able to accompany them because her visa would be chargeable only to the now heavily oversubscribed Hungarian quota.

2. Mr. and Mrs. Sans, their 24-year-old son and their daughter, were Latvian DP's in Germany. Mr. and Mrs. Sans and their daughter were admitted to the United States under the terms of the Displaced Persons Act and are now living in Grand Rapids, Mich. According to Mr. Sans, the son was refused admission on the grounds that he had lost his DP status because he had left the DP camp in Germany and spent a year in Belgium working as a miner.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, this amendment would pool our quotas for the next succeeding year to enable us to continue to be a haven for the worthy folk who wish to better themselves and who can contribute to our country by making our democracy stronger and greater. This amendment would make our quota system flexible in accordance with our resources and our hopes. This amendment would insure a democratic and just quota system in accordance with our history and traditions.

Fourth. Our bill, S. 2343, now pending before the Senate, would establish a statutory Board of Immigration Appeals. The Board was originally established in 1922 when it was known as the Board of Review. For 2 years the Secretary of Labor made a study of the Immigration

Treatment of subversives in the omnibus immigration bills—Continued

EXCLUSIONS PROVISIONS—continued

Section	Under S. 2550 (McCarran)	Under S. 2842 (Humphrey-Lehman)	Remarks
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (C) (vi)	Aliens who are members of or affiliated with the direct predecessors or successors of any such association or party,	(No corresponding provision in this bill)	This provision of S. 2550 serves no useful purpose. A successor to a Communist association will always be another Communist association by a different name. A member of such a successor association would, therefore be barred under the previous subsection. On the other hand, a predecessor to a Communist association would often be a non-Communist association which was taken over by the Communists. The Communists, who shared in the association after it was taken over would be barred under the previous subsections. What subsection (vi) would do is bar the anti-Communist who got out when the Communists took over.
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (D)	Aliens not within any of the other provisions of this paragraph who advocate the economic, international, and governmental doctrines of world communism or the establishment in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship, or who are members of or affiliated with any organization that advocates the economic, international, and governmental doctrines of world communism or the establishment in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship, either through its own utterances or through any written or printed publications issued or published by or with the permission or consent of or under the authority of such organization or paid for by the funds of, or funds furnished by, such organization;		Do.
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (E)	Aliens not within any of the other provisions of this paragraph, who are members of or affiliated with any organization during the time it is registered or required to be registered under section 7 (b) of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, unless such aliens establish that they did not have knowledge or reason to believe at the time they became members of or affiliated with such an organization (and did not thereafter and prior to the date upon which such organization was so registered or so required to be registered have such knowledge or reason to believe) that such organization was a Communist organization;		
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (F)	Aliens who advocate or teach or who are members of or affiliated with any organization that advocates or teaches (i) the overthrow by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law; or (ii) the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers (either of specific individuals or of officers generally) of the Government of the United States or of any other organized government, because of his or their official character; or (iii) the unlawful damage, injury, or destruction of property; or (iv) sabotage;		Section identical in both bills.
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (G)	Aliens who	Aliens who, in pursuance of any activities specified in subparagraphs (A) through (F), write or publish, or cause to be written or published, or who knowingly circulate, distribute, print, or display, or knowingly cause to be circulated, distributed, printed, published, or displayed, or who knowingly have in their possession for the purpose of circulation, publication, distribution, or display, any written or printed matter, advocating or teaching opposition to all organized government, or advocating or teaching (i) the overthrow by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law; or (ii) the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers (either of specific individuals or of officers generally) of the Government of the United States or of any other organized government because of his or their official character; or (iii) the unlawful damage, injury, or destruction of property; or (iv) sabotage; or (v) the economic, international and governmental doctrines of world communism or the establishment in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship;	The word "knowingly" as used in S. 2550 might mean that a person can be excluded for the acts listed as long as he knows that he is distributing, printing, etc., even if he doesn't have the slightest idea of the contents of the material. S. 2842 merely clarifies this section by spelling out the fact that the people to be excluded are those that engage in subversive activities. It protects the innocent man who is hired to deliver packages the contents of which he doesn't know.
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (H)	Aliens who	Aliens who, in pursuance of any activities specified in subparagraphs (A) through (F), are members of or affiliated with any organization that writes, circulates, distributes, prints, publishes or displays, or causes to be written, circulated, distributed, printed, published, or displayed, or that has in its possession for the purpose of circulation, distribution, publication, issue, or display, any written or printed matter of the character described in paragraph (G);	The difference between S. 2550 and S. 2842 in this section is the same as in (G). The innocent man who belongs to a delivery service or printing firm that handles subversive material but who has no knowledge of the contents of that material is protected.
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (I)	Any alien who is within any of the classes described in subparagraphs (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), and (H),	Any alien who is within any of the classes described in subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), and (H),	S. 2842 gives a former anarchist the same standing as a former Communist or other totalitarian while S. 2550 has no redeeming provision for former anarchists. This may be an oversight in S. 2550.
	of this paragraph because of membership in or affiliation with a party or organization or a section, subsidiary, branch, affiliate, or subdivision thereof, may, if not otherwise inadmissible, be issued a visa if such alien establishes to the satisfaction of the consular officer when applying for a visa and the consular officer finds that (i) such membership or affiliation is or was involuntary,		
Sec. 212 (a) (28) (J)	(No corresponding provision.)	or without knowledge of the aims or purposes of such party, organization, section, subsidiary, branch, affiliate, or subdivision,	S. 2842 excuses former members of subversive organizations who can show that at the time of membership they had no knowledge of the aims and purposes of the organization.
	or is or was solely when under sixteen years of age, by operation of law, or for purposes of obtaining employment, food rations, or other essentials of living and where necessary for such purposes, or (ii) (a) since the termination of such membership or affiliation, such alien is and has been, for at least five years prior to the date of the application for a visa, actively opposed to the doctrine, program, principles, and ideology of such party or organization or the section, subsidiary, branch, or affiliate or subdivision thereof, and (b) the admission of such alien into the United States		
	would be in the public interest.	would not be against the public interest.	The purpose of this entire exemption is to permit involuntary and reformed members of totalitarian organizations to enter this country. Often they will be relatives of American citizens, who have no special claim to fame, no outstanding qualifications. They could not prove that their immigration would actually be "in the public interest" if that provision is applied liberally. In those cases it would be fairer and more reasonable to require that their admission be not against the public interest.
	Any such alien to whom a visa has been issued under the provisions of this subparagraph may, if not otherwise inadmissible, be admitted into the United States if he shall establish to the satisfaction of the Attorney General when applying for admission to the United States and the Attorney General finds that (i) such membership or affiliation is or was involuntary, or is or was solely when under sixteen years of age, by operation of law, or for purposes of obtaining employment, food rations, or other essentials of living and where necessary for such purposes, or (ii) (a) since the termination of such membership or affiliation, such alien is and has been, for at least five years prior to the date of the application for admission, actively opposed to the doctrine, program, principles, and ideology of such party or organization or the section, subsidiary, branch, or affiliate or subdivision thereof, and (b) the admission of such alien into the United States would be in the public interest. The Attorney General shall promptly make a detailed report to the Congress in the case of each alien who is or shall be admitted into the United States under (ii) of this subparagraph;	

Treatment of subversives in the omnibus immigration bills—Continued

Section	Under S. 2550 (McCarran)	Under S. 2842 (Humphrey-Lehman)	Remarks
Sec. 212 (a) (28).....	Aliens with respect to whom the consular officer or the Attorney General knows or has reasonable ground to believe probably would, after entry, (A) engage in activities which would be prohibited by the laws of the United States relating to espionage, sabotage, public disorder, or in other activity subversive to the national security, (B) engage in activity a purpose of which is the opposition to, or the control or overthrow of, the Government of the United States by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means, or	Aliens with respect to whom there are reasonable grounds for believing that such aliens would, after entry,	S. 2842 sets up an objective reviewable standard in this case, where S. 2550 permits the Board or Attorney General to speculate as to the alien's state of mind.
	(C) join, affiliate with, or participate in the activities of any organization which is registered or required to be registered under section 7 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950;	(No corresponding provision)	S. 2842 bars members of Communist and other totalitarian parties and of Communist-front organizations. It also bars aliens of whom there are reasonable grounds of believing that they would in the future join Communist or other totalitarian organizations. However, to bar aliens who in the future might join Communist front organizations would set up too vague and unenforceable a standard and give too much discretionary power to administrative officials.
	DEPORTATION PROVISIONS		
Sec. 241 (a) (6).....	Any alien in the United States (including an alien crewman), shall, upon the order of the Attorney General, be deported who— is or at any time after entry has been a member of any one of the classes of aliens described in paragraph (28) of section 212 (a) of this title, except that this paragraph shall not apply to an alien who was lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence if the conduct, membership, or affiliation which caused the alien to be a member of any such classes		S. 2550 provides for the deportation of aliens who after their entry into the United States participated in subversive activities, even if such activities ceased long ago. S. 2842 provides for the deportation of persons presently engaged in subversive activities. S. 2842 gives a person who can show that he was duped into joining a Communist-front organization without knowing of its aims and of the fact that it was so listed a chance to resign within a reasonable time after deportation proceedings have been commenced.
	ceased to exist prior to such lawful entry into the United States;	has ceased to exist, or	
	(No corresponding provision)	(B) to an alien deportable under this paragraph solely by reason of present membership in, or affiliation with, an organization described in paragraph (28) (E) of such section, if such alien does not have knowledge or reason to believe that such organization is a Communist organization, and if, within a reasonable time after the commencement of the deportation proceedings, such alien terminates such membership or affiliation, or	
	(No corresponding provision)	(C) to an alien deportable under this paragraph solely by reason of past membership in, or affiliation with, an organization described in paragraph (28) (E) of such section, if such alien terminated such membership or affiliation within a reasonable time after acquiring knowledge or reason to believe that such organization was a Communist organization;	S. 2842 gives a person who can show that he was duped into joining a Communist-front organization without knowledge of its aims and of the fact that it was so listed and who learned the truth just before deportation proceedings were started a chance to clear himself by resigning.
Sec. 241 (a) (7).....	is engaged, or at any time after entry has engaged, or at any time after entry has had a purpose to engage, in any of the activities described in paragraph (27) or (28) of section 212 (a), unless the Attorney General is satisfied, in the case of any alien within category (C) of paragraph (28) of such section, that such alien did not have knowledge or reason to believe at the time such alien became a member of, affiliated with, or participated in the activities of the organization (and did not thereafter and prior to the date upon which such organization was registered or required to be registered under section 7 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 have such knowledge or reason to believe) that such organization was a Communist organization;	has been convicted of engaging in any of the activities described in paragraph (27) or (28) of section 212 (a).	These essential differences between S. 2550 and S. 2842 on this point is that S. 2550 grants broad discretionary powers to administrative officials in determining whether a person has a purpose to engage in prejudicial activities while S. 2842 requires that he shall have been convicted in a court of law before he can be deported.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as Members of the Senate are aware, the present quota system is based upon the alleged proportions which the various national groups formed of the total white population in 1920, within an over-all immigration total of approximately 150,000. This leads to a quota assigned to Great Britain and Northern Ireland of approximately 65,800, and a quota for the Free State of Ireland of approximately 17,800, or combined figures of well over 83,000. This is approximately 55 percent of the annual quota total.

Mr. President, in the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from New York and other Senators, we are not proposing to change these quotas, but we are proposing to pool the unused surpluses. This is a matter of great importance, because in practice the British quota is two-thirds unused. I placed in the RECORD on Monday a tabulation of the number of people from various countries who had entered the United States since 1930, and even if we exclude the years of the depression and the war years, we do not ordinarily have more than 20,000 to 22,000 people from Great Britain and Northern Ireland entering the United States. Under the present law the surpluses of unused quota numbers are canceled and are not transferred.

Similarly in the case of the Irish Free State, during the past 4 years the average annual entrants have numbered between 6,000 and 7,000, leaving unused quotas of from 10,000 to 11,000, which are canceled. Furthermore, because of the fact that people of a given nationality group are counted only according to their place of birth, the German quota has been undersubscribed despite the large migrant population in Germany seeking to emigrate. The result is that, because of the cancellation of the unused quotas, instead of admitting 150,000 each year, not more than from 90,000 to 100,000 people each year come into the United States under the quota system.

Now, while the quotas for Great Britain and Ireland are not used, in other countries there is a tremendous excess demand for these quotas. Let us take the case of Italy. In the period prior to World War I, the Italians who came into this country each year numbered approximately 200,000. Yet they are now given a quota of only 5,500. Under the

quota provisions of the present law, which would be continued by the McCarran bill, Italy, with a vast surplus population, finds it virtually impossible to send her people here. Poland, from which enormous numbers of nationals came to this country prior to World War I, has a quota of but 6,500. The Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia have quotas of from 100 to 400. Hard-pressed Greece has a quota of but 310. In other words, the quotas are small for the countries which have surplus populations, and there is no doubt that the act of 1924 was rigged with that in mind. It was so rigged as to make it extremely difficult for persons from southern and eastern Europe to enter the United States.

The position of those of us who are seeking to secure approval of what we believe is a better bill is that the unused quotas should be pooled and then apportioned on some basis other than that of nationality. Perhaps I should point out that the difference between the short bill which has been offered as an amendment, and the long bill which was introduced by the same sponsors earlier in the session is that whereas the long bill would increase the total number of immigrants from 150,000 a year to approximately 250,000 a year, the short bill does not change the total number of 150,000. In the pending substitute we are merely proposing that the unused quotas shall be pooled and transferred on some basis other than that of nationality.

What then is to be the basis for distributing these unused quotas if it is not to be nationality? Twenty-five percent of the unused quotas are to be distributed on the basis of family reunion preferences, to grandparents, children, parents, other blood relatives, and so forth, so that families may be reunited in this country.

Twenty-five percent of the unused quotas are to be distributed on the basis of the need in this country for persons with a high degree of education, technical training, exceptional ability or specialized experience, persons who are urgently needed in the United States. Under this preference category, we may pick out, regardless of nationality, those persons who would be best adapted to the needs of the country.

Twenty-five percent are to be apportioned on a preferential basis to those who have been persecuted abroad or who have been driven from their native lands because of their adherence to democratic beliefs and opposition to dictatorship, or who have been classified as persecutees—people who are in great need.

Twenty-five percent are to be apportioned on the basis of special circumstances of hardship.

We submit that this is a much more humane manner of treatment and a greatly needed improvement in our immigration policy. The Nation can certainly absorb 150,000 immigrants a year. If Great Britain and Ireland do not use their quotas, they should not be canceled, but should be transferred on the basis which I have enumerated. In other words, Great Britain and Ireland would have first call, but they would not shut off others from coming here who were especially qualified. That is one very essential feature of the Humphrey-Lehman substitute which is now before the Senate, and I think it is one that should commend itself to the American people and to Congress.

Mr. President, I now desire to mention another change which the Humphrey-Lehman substitute would bring about, namely, the compulsory application of the Administrative Procedure Act to the Immigration and Naturalization Service and to the section and officers of the Department of Justice who deal with individual immigration cases. I argued this point at length on Monday, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains a rather full statement of my position.

The fundamental purpose of the Administrative Procedure Act was to separate those who were acting in a judicial capacity from the investigative and prosecuting functions before the body of which they were members, so that the same man would not be in himself investigator, prosecutor, and judge. This was done on the ground that no man can be a proper or fair judge in a case in which he is a prosecutor or in which he has done investigative work.

Another purpose of the Administrative Procedure Act was to make judicial officers in administrative departments independent of the heads of those departments, so they could not be disciplined if they made a decision contrary to the wishes of the heads of such departments. So long as examiners can be demoted or transferred or denied increases in salary which otherwise would be theirs, so long as the head of a department can punish an examiner for his acts or withhold normal advancement, we cannot have a truly impartial tribunal inside an administrative agency. That has been a weakness in our system of military justice. The commanding officer can designate certain officers to serve on a court martial, and then the word may go out that the "Old Man" wants such and such a verdict. Of course the officers are reluctant to render an opinion contrary to the desires of their commanding officer. That has been a crucial, weak point in our system of military justice, and it has been a weak point in our system of administrative justice.

The purpose of the Administrative Procedure Act was to make the future of these men independent of the judgment of the heads of the departments or agencies in which they serve, so that their promotion and their salary rating would be fixed by the Civil Service Commission and not by the Attorney General or the head of the department in question.

It is because the McCarran bill does not contain these safeguards that those who are sponsoring the Lehman-Humphrey substitute feel that our measure, with its specific provision to make the Administrative Procedure Act applicable, is preferable.

Mr. President, I placed in the RECORD on Monday an analysis, which was fairly detailed in nature, of this very point. I pointed out that the special inquiry officer provided for under section 242 (b) of S. 2550 conducts the proceedings, administers oaths, presents and receives evidence, examines and cross-examines witnesses, and thus has some prosecuting functions.

While it is said that he shall not be an investigator in the particular case upon which he passes, nevertheless he may be an investigator in other cases.

Senators will remember the so-called Sung case in which the Supreme Court declared to be improper the practice of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, where the hearing officer, while not investigating the case in question, was an investigator in other cases. The case thus ruled on a situation which would be permitted under S. 2550, in which inquiry officer A would investigate alien X and inquiry officer B would investigate alien Y, and then they would simply swap functions when they came to serve as judicial officers. The Supreme Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Jackson, said this was improper, and, in the absence of statutory authority, unconstitutional.

As I read the pending omnibus bill, S. 2550, it is proposed to make legal by statute the taking away from a man that which the Supreme Court said should not be taken away, namely, the right to a hearing before an officer who is not also an investigator or prosecutor. Similarly, the Supreme Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Jackson, emphasized the necessity for the examiner or judicial officer to be independent of the head of the bureau. Yet, Mr. President, the McCarran bill provides that the procedure so prescribed shall be the sole and exclusive procedure for determining the deportability of an alien under this section, and in any case in which an alien is ordered deported from the United States, under the provisions of the act, under law or treaty, the decision of the Attorney General shall be final.

The way is therefore left open under S. 2550 for the so-called special inquiry officer, who is really a hearing officer, to present evidence and to cross-examine, and, in effect, therefore, to prosecute in that very case. He is also free to investigate other cases and, hence, to develop the frame of mind of an investigator.

Furthermore, he is under the control of the Attorney General and the intermediate directors and commissioners. Independence is not given to him. The Attorney General and not the Civil Service Commission can discipline him, can promote or demote him, or change his salary so that he does not have the independence which a judge should have and which it was the purpose of the Administrative Procedure Act to require.

Mr. President, section 8 of the short Humphrey-Lehman bill provides that the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act shall be applicable to all proceedings relating to the exclusion or expulsion of aliens. In this important respect also, therefore, it is far preferable to S. 2550. The Administrative Procedure Act was a splendid act which was passed by the Congress of the United States, and I want to congratulate the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]

for the very fine part which he played in the passage of that act. It was a milestone in administrative procedure. Why should it not apply to human beings as well as to the rights of corporations? Poor and humble persons deserve proper protection equally with the powerful.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to take a minute to thank the Senator from Nevada for the courtesy he has extended to the opponents of the pending bill by granting us additional time. I deeply appreciate his kindness.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is entirely welcome.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All the time of the proponents of the amendment in the nature of a substitute having expired, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a letter over the signature of Miles D. Kennedy, director, national legislative commission, the American Legion, dated May 21, 1952, and I ask that the clerk may read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 21, 1952.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: I understand from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the amendment offered by Senator LEHMAN in the nature of a substitute for S. 2550 comes up for vote this afternoon.

As you have previously been advised by Mr. Donald R. Wilson, national commander for the American Legion, this organization has gone on record as supporting S. 2550. In view of this fact, I trust you will do everything possible to cause the defeat of Senator LEHMAN's proposed amendment.

If you care to do so, please feel free to read this communication into the RECORD during the course of the debate.

Thanking you for your courtesy, I am,
Sincerely yours,
MILES D. KENNEDY, *Director.*

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, some few days ago the proponents of the Humphrey-Lehman bill inserted in the RECORD a statement to the effect that the Humphrey-Lehman bill was being supported by the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the National Council of Catholic Women, and the Catholic Rural Life Conference.

On Monday, May 19, I inserted in the RECORD a letter from the National Catholic Welfare Conference in which it is stated that neither the National Catholic Welfare Conference nor the National Council of Catholic Women have supported the Humphrey-Lehman bill, but do rather favor the McCarran-Walter bill.

I now ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read a letter I have just received from the National Catholic Rural Life Conference signed by Rev. William J. Gibbons, S. J.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL CATHOLIC
RURAL LIFE CONFERENCE,
Des Moines, Iowa, May 17, 1952.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: To avoid any possible misunderstanding, I would like to make clear that no individual, group, or conference body has been authorized to speak on behalf of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, in connection with current discussions on immigration law revision.

The views of our organization were presented formally in writing, with additional oral discussion, on two occasions: at the hearings of July 20, 1948, and again on March 12, 1951, when joint hearings were being held on S. 716 and H. R. 2379.

In March 1951 we also expressed our approval of the statement submitted by the National Council on Naturalization and Citizenship, and joined with certain other organizations in signing a statement on particular points of immigration law. All these statements are a matter of record in the published hearings of the committees which considered the proposed legislation.

Apart from the above instances, when its views were expressed on its own behalf, the NCRLC has taken no official position publicly on these matters. Nor has it recognized use of its name in this connection by others.

Some supplementary observations were made privately in letters to the respective chairmen of the committees, prior to reporting of the bills by these committees.

Very sincerely,
WILLIAM J. GIBBONS, S. J.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution adopted by the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, and ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of New Jersey in the chair). Without objection, the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

IMMIGRATION QUOTAS

Whereas in the closing days of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress, there was introduced in the Senate, Senate bill 2343, sponsored by Senators LEHMAN, HUMPHREY, GILLETTE, IVES, KEFAUVER, and others, to effect certain basic changes in the present immigration and naturalization laws; and

Whereas a comparative analysis of the McCarran-Walter bill with the Lehman-Humphrey bill shows that the Lehman-Humphrey bill would, in effect, destroy our national origins quota system:

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, support and urge the Congress to enact, at the earliest possible moment, the McCarran-Walter omnibus immigration and naturalization bill now pending in the Senate and House of Representatives, and that Congress reject the Lehman-Humphrey immigration bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution adopted by the thirty-ninth annual congress of the National Society of New England Women, and ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

SUPPORT OF THE MCCARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION BILL

Whereas the McCarran-Walter immigration and naturalization bill makes the following changes in our immigration laws: A system of selective immigration, within our quota system; fixed limitations so as to prevent an influx of orientals; more thorough screening, especially on security risks; enforcement agencies, exclusion and deportation procedures are strengthened and naturalization and denaturalization procedures are strengthened to weed out subversives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the thirty-ninth congress of the National Society of New England Women endorse the principles and urge the passage of Senate bill 2550 and House bill 5676, known as the McCarran-Walter bill, now on the Senate Calendar.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a telegram dated May 19, 1952, addressed to myself, and signed by Louis M. Killeen, of Phoenix, Ariz., and Vic Opez, of Glendale, Ariz., which reads as follows:

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *May 19, 1952.*

The Honorable PAT MCCARRAN,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In behalf of the United Mexican-American Citizens' Social League of Arizona, we would like to endorse your sponsored S. 2550. We feel this legislation is needed and necessary improvement of our immigration and naturalization law. We are primarily interested in this bill since it will erase the present discrimination in naturalization. It will strengthen the security of our country by better screening of immigrants, and exclusion and deportation procedures are strengthened.

Regards.

LOUIS M. KILLEEN.
VIC OPEZ,
Member, City Council, Glendale, Ariz.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the adoption of the Humphrey-Lehman substitute would be disastrous to the United States of America. As I shall point out in more detail in the course of my remarks, the amendment would produce forthwith four consequences:

First. The opening of the gates to a flood of Asiatics. So fantastic is this provision of the amendment that it is unalterably opposed by all of the major oriental groups, which, incidentally, have endorsed the McCarran-Walter bill as a fair and reasonable solution of the problem of racial ineligibles;

Second. The destruction of the national origins quota system, which is the foundation upon which is built our protective immigration system;

Third. Increase substantially the number of aliens of all races who would be eligible for admission into the United States for permanent residence; and

Fourth. A shackling of the authorities who are charged with enforcement of the immigration and naturalization laws.

At this point I may say that although the amendment has been offered as a substitute for the committee bill, it does not purport to revise the immigration and nationality laws, as does the committee bill. It does not plug any loopholes in those laws; instead, it would tear huge gaps in them.

I may say, too, Mr. President, that the essence of the so-called substitute was embodied in S. 2343, which was introduced on October 20, 1951, and which was carefully considered and flatly rejected by the seven Senators who constitute the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, and who, with

a staff of experts, worked on this legislation for over 3 years.

Let me point out also that the essence of the so-called substitute was proposed to the seven-man Subcommittee on Immigration of the House of Representatives, and, after careful consideration, was flatly rejected. The essence of the so-called substitute was also proposed in recent weeks to the House of Representatives, which rejected it by an overwhelming vote.

Furthermore, the various segments of this so-called substitute measure were each carefully explored in the exhaustive hearings of the joint congressional committee, but, strangely enough, not one of the sponsors of this so-called substitute measure spoke one word in behalf of the provisions of this amendment.

Mr. President, let me be specific with reference to the several provisions of this amendment.

First, I direct the attention of the Senate to the provisions of this amendment affecting orientals. The amendment would, in one sweep, wipe away all of the provisions of the present law relating to racial ineligibles, without substituting any reasonable limitation in their place. The result is five-fold. First, immediately other provisions of the law become operative for the establishment of quotas for each of several oriental countries; secondly, the provisions of existing law, which provide nonquota status for persons who are born in independent countries of the Western Hemisphere, become operative so that an estimated 600,000 orientals who are natives of nonquota countries of the Western Hemisphere would be immediately eligible for immigration to the United States for permanent residence; third, an estimated million and one-half orientals who are natives of quota countries of the world would be competing for the quotas assigned to the natives of those countries; fourth, under the quota-pooling provisions of the so-called substitute measure, the tremendous population of Asia would be competing with the smaller population of Europe for the pooled quotas; and, fifth, thousands upon thousands of orientals without statutory limitation would become immediately eligible for immigration to the United States for permanent residence because of the greatly expanded nonquota categories which would be established pursuant to the amendment.

Now, Mr. President, let me repeat what I said earlier in my remarks, that these provisions of the substitute bill are so fantastic, so drastic, and so unrealistic that the major oriental groups in the United States are unalterably opposed to the amendment, because they know it would give them the kiss of death. May I say right here that these major oriental groups have endorsed the McCarran-Walter bill without reservation. I have already placed in the RECORD, Mr. President, the resolutions on this subject from the Filipino Federation of America, Inc., by the Japanese-American Citizens League, and the Chinese-American Citizens Alliance.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read a telegram which I have just received from the four principal oriental groups in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read the telegram.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *May 20, 1952.*

HON. PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Four national organizations representing 90 percent American citizens Asian ancestry strongly oppose substituting Humphrey-Lehman bill for McCarran omnibus bill. Humphrey-Lehman substitute ill-advised, impractical, and not in best interest persons of Asian ancestry.

We endorse unqualifiedly McCarran-Walter bill as fairest and most realistic possible approach to immigration and naturalization problems at this time. We, therefore, urge full support of McCarran-Walter bill and recommend defeat of any substitute bill or crippling amendments.

DR. RANDOLPH M. SAKADA,
National President, Japanese American Citizens League.
Y. C. HONG,
Grand National President, Chinese American Citizens Alliance.
GEN. HILARIO C. MONCADO,
Supreme Life President, Filipino Federation of America.
CHIN HA CHOY,
General Manager, Korean National Association.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me pause right here to point out again to the Senate just what the McCarran-Walter bill does with reference to the serious problem of aliens who are, under existing law, racially ineligible for admission into the United States. Under the McCarran-Walter bill, no one is inadmissible to the United States or ineligible to naturalization solely on the basis of race, but all persons of races indigenous to an area designated as the Asia-Pacific triangle are assigned to the quotas for that area. At the expense of being tedious on this very important issue, Mr. President, may I say again that this so-called substitute amendment which would allegedly liberalize those provisions of the immigration laws which contain racial limitations, are vigorously opposed by the very groups which they would allegedly benefit.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the provisions of this substitute amendment for the pooling of unused quotas. Mr. President, the pooling of unused quotas would be in direct conflict with the national origins quota principle which is the foundation of our protective immigration system and which seeks to maintain the relative composition of our population by assigning quotas to the various countries of the world on the basis of the percentage of the population of the United States of each nationality. The effect of pooling unused quotas would be not only to substantially increase the number of aliens coming to the United States for permanent residence, but would, in the course of a generation or so, change the ethnic and cultural composition of this Nation. Mr. President, let no one be misled by the statements made by the proponents of this substitute amendment with reference to the plan and purpose of the national origins quota system. The quotas under the national-origins system, Mr. President, are ceilings, not floors, on the number of visas which may be issued. In other words, the law clearly contemplates that aliens who are to come to this country for permanent residence under the quotas shall come in proportion to the contribution of each nationality to the total population of the United States as it existed in 1920, which was the year of the last census immediately preceding the date of the establishment of the national-origins-quota formula.

Much has been said and is still being said about it being the duty of our country to open wider and wider the gates, in order to alleviate the surplus population of the overpopulated countries of the world. Mr. President, an immigration and nationality code is not the proper vehicle for the solution of the surplus population problems of the world. At the present time, there is pending before the Committee on Rules and Administration, Senate Resolution 270, which I submitted, to make an immediate study and investigation of the problems of surplus populations, of expellees, and of refugees. I have also introduced in the Senate, Senate bill 2567, to provide for the establishment of an agency of this Government to assist in the migration of surplus population of overpopulated areas to underdeveloped and underpopulated areas. I do not know, Mr. President, what the answer may be to this vital world problem; but I do know that the answer will not be found through the destruction of our own immigration system.

It has also been announced that in the very near future a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives will commence hearings on proposals to assist in solving the refugee problems which now exist in the countries of Western Europe. The question of what to do about the surplus population problem of many of the countries of Western Europe, is therefore, receiving active consideration; and I believe that it is exceedingly unwise to attempt to solve the refugee problem in permanent immigration legislation.

The proponents of this substitute amendment speak of the allocation of the unused quota numbers on the basis of family union preferences and national need preferences. Let me say, Mr. President, that under the committee bill, every reasonable provision is made to prevent the separation of families. Let me enumerate some of the provisions of the committee bill which have been carefully worked out to effect this objective:

First. A nonquota status is provided for an immigrant who is the child or the spouse of a citizen of the United States.

Second. A 30-percent preference under each quota is provided for aliens who are the parents of citizens of the United States.

Third. A 20-percent preference under each quota is provided for aliens who are the spouses or children of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

Fourth. Twenty-five percent of any nonpreference portion of each quota is made available for aliens who are the

brothers, sisters, sons, or daughters of citizens of the United States.

Fifth. Under the provision which allocates 50 percent of each quota for aliens who possess special skills or knowledge and whose services are needed in this country, there is also recognition of the policy of preventing the separation of families, because aliens who are the spouses or children of any such immigrant are also entitled to the preference if accompanying the preference-quota immigrant.

Sixth. Those provisions relating to the determination of the quota to which an immigrant is chargeable also contain provisions which permit an alien child accompanied by his alien parent or parents to be charged to the quota of either parent, in order to prevent the separation of the family unit, and which permit an alien chargeable to a different quota from that of his accompanying spouse to be charged to the quota of the accompanying spouse if necessary to prevent the separation of the family unit.

Seventh. Under the nonimmigrant categories of aliens, established for diplomats, semidiplomats, treaty traders, and bona fide representatives of foreign press, radio, film, or other foreign information media, provision is made for the entry of the members of the family of such aliens under the same nonimmigrant status.

Eighth. Under the provisions of the bill which grant nonquota status to certain natives of western hemisphere countries, to alien ministers, and to retired former employees of the United States Government abroad, the spouses and children of such aliens are permitted to enter under the same status, if accompanying or following to join the nonquota immigrant.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I prefer not to yield, for my time is limited. I hope the Senator from Louisiana will pardon me if I do not yield to him at this time.

Mr. LONG. Certainly.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I now invite the attention of the Senate to the provisions of the substitute amendment which would increase substantially the number of aliens of all races who would be eligible for admission into the United States for permanent residence. This is in addition to the increase of about 50,000 a year which would result from the pooling of quotas, and the increase of untold thousands which would result from the provisions of the substitute amendment which would enable orientals born in the Western Hemisphere to enter this country without numerical limitation.

The first new category of nonquota immigrants which the substitute amendment would establish embraces parents of citizens of the United States who, under the present law, are first preference under the quotas. The effect of making parents of citizens nonquota would be, in many instances, to triple the number of aliens who would be admitted into the United States, because this provision would be operative principally with respect to the parents of naturalized citizens. In other words, under this provision, an alien would come to the United States; and as soon as he is naturalized, his parents would be admissible outside the quota limitations.

The second new category of nonquota immigrants which the substitute amendment would establish embraces untold numbers of children under 18 years of age who are separated from either or both parents and who meet certain vague standards prescribed in the amendment. Remember, Mr. President, this amendment would admit these children, without numerical limitation, from every corner of the globe.

The third new, nonquota category which would be established by the substitute amendment embraces all aliens who, at any time, anywhere, serve for even 1 day in any branch of the Armed Forces of the United States, and also includes their spouses and children. I say, Mr. President, that this provision would transfer from the Congress of the United States to the military the determination of the admissibility of untold thousands of aliens, over the course of the next several years.

The fourth new nonquota category which would be established by the substitute amendment embraces all spouses of citizens. The committee bill provides that all spouses of citizens shall be nonquota, but contains certain safeguarding provisions to avoid the use of this provision fraudulently for the purpose of gaining admission into the United States. Let me say in passing, Mr. President, for the enlightenment of the Senate with reference to the present law, that the existing statutes provide nonquota status for the wife of an American citizen, but that nonquota status for the husband of an American citizen is not granted, under the present law, unless the marriage took place prior to January 1, 1948.

Mr. President, I now direct the attention of the Senate to the provisions of the substitute amendment which would have the effect of shackling the officials who are charged with the enforcement of our immigration and naturalization laws.

The substitute amendment would, in one stroke, establish a statutory Board of Immigration Appeals, which would be independent from any supervision or control by the Department of Justice, and would transfer to that Board the powers and duties relating to appeals from decisions of Boards of Special Inquiry, conferred upon the Attorney General. In addition, the substitute amendment contains a sweeping provision that the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act shall be applicable to all proceedings relating to the exclusion or expulsion of aliens.

Mr. President, at first blush these two provisions of the substitute amendment appear to be salutory and sound; in fact, the mind is charmed, at a first reading of these provisions, to believe that by just a few words of statutory language, chaos is changed to order. But, Mr. President, anyone who has studied our immigration procedures and who is concerned with a vigorous and yet fair enforcement of the immigration laws is compelled to conclude that the provisions which I have just recited are intended to assure that we shall not, as a practical matter, exclude or deport any aliens from the United States.

Right here, Mr. President, let me say that I strongly favor the establishment of an administrative court of the United States which, within fixed limitations, would review actions by all administrative agencies of this Government. However, I emphasize that that review would be within fixed limitations, so that we would not have confusion confounded, as we would have under the substitute amendment, where a statutory board, whose power and jurisdiction would be virtually unlimited, would be administering and adjudicating at the same time, often in conflict with the Attorney General, who is the officer charged with the responsibility for the enforcement of the immigration laws. I have pending in the Senate at the present time, Mr. President, Senate bill 14, to improve the administration of justice by the creation of an administrative court of the United States. While I strongly advocate review of administrative determinations, this review must be within fixed limitations and must be set up on a sound basis. Otherwise we shall have chaos. I hope I do not appear immodest, Mr. President, when I say I know whereof I speak, because I was the principal author in the Senate of the Administrative Procedure Act to which I devoted intensive study and which I have closely observed in operation. At present, the Attorney General has created a Board of Immigration Appeals by administrative regulations which operates within fixed limitations to consider appeals from administrative decisions in those cases where a right of appeal to the Attorney General is provided under the law. The committee bill, S. 2550, does not disturb the present authority of the Attorney General to continue the existence of the Board of Immigration Appeals, nor does it require the continuance of a Board of Immigration Appeals. I say, Mr. President, that the question of the review of decisions of the Immigration and Naturalization Service had better not be the subject of impulsive tampering at this time.

Now, Mr. President, the substitute amendment contains a provision which would repeal the present exemption of exclusion and expulsion proceedings from certain of the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act and make the Administrative Procedure Act applicable to all proceedings relating to the exclusion or expulsion of aliens. The committee bill, likewise, repeals the present exemption of exclusion and expulsion proceedings from certain of the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, but the committee bill goes further by writing within the framework of the Administrative Procedure Act specific procedures which are specially

adapted to the exclusion and expulsion of aliens.

Mr. President, in view of the many misleading statements which have been made on the floor of the Senate to the effect that my bill, S. 2550, completely ignores the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, which I sponsored in the Senate and which I shall always support wholeheartedly, I should like to make a few remarks concerning the procedural aspects of S. 2550.

In the case of *Wong Yang Sung* v. *McGrath* (339 U. S. 33), decided on February 20, 1950, the United States Supreme Court held that administrative hearings in deportation cases must conform to the procedural requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act. The effect of that decision was to raise the question of the validity of many of the hearings in deportation proceedings in which the alien had not been deported. As a result, the Immigration and Naturalization Service had to adjust its procedures and regulations to comply with that decision.

It should have made the adjustment when the Administrative Procedure Act became effective; for the act clearly contained no exemption for the Immigration and Naturalization Service. It was the contention of the Immigration and Naturalization Service at a very early date that administrative problems required special procedures in connection with deportation; and at one time, shortly after enactment of the Administrative Procedure Act, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee worked out a bill, in cooperation with the General Counsel of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, for the purpose of establishing necessary special procedures in this regard without granting any blanket exemption from the Administrative Procedure Act. That has always been the important thing in the mind of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

However, the Immigration and Naturalization Service decided it wanted to contest in the courts the applicability of the Administrative Procedure Act; and, therefore, the bill to provide special procedures was dropped. The contest with respect to the applicability of the Administrative Procedure Act in deportation cases came to a head in the Sung case.

Following the Sung decision, the Department of Justice told Congress it would need an additional $4,000,000 to meet the cost of complying with the Administrative Procedure Act. The facts show that this was a gross overestimate, but it was a persuasive argument to the House Appropriations Committee. In the course of the presentation of its case, before the House committee, the Department pointed out that in the majority of deportation cases the issue is simply whether or not the alien entered with proper documents or whether the alien overstayed his period of temporary admission, and that the facts are generally uncontested. In such cases, it was pointed out that the dual-examiner system would hamper effective administration without any compensating advantage. The Department explained in some detail that under its deportation procedures, each alien is given notice of the charges against him and full opportunity to meet those charges, and that in all respects he is provided a full and fair hearing.

On the basis of the case presented by the Department of Justice, the House approved an appropriations bill rider which provided that "proceedings under law relating to the exclusion or expulsion of aliens shall hereafter be without regard to the provisions of sections 5, 7, and 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act." Having been approved by the House, this rider was not subject to a point of order in the Senate; and eventually it became part of Public Law 843, Eighty-first Congress. Thus, at the present time, the deportation procedures of the Immigration and Naturalization Service are completely exempted from the procedural requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Under the provisions of section 242 of Senate bill 2550, this exemption is terminated. The procedural requirements to be followed in the conduct of deportation cases are set out in detail. Except for the failure to comply strictly with the dual-examiner provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, I believe that the procedures set forth are in substantial compliance with the procedural rationale of the Administrative Procedure Act. I further believe that it has been demonstrated that it would be impracticable to adapt the dual-examiner system to the deportation procedures and that the special procedures provided in this bill are not inconsistent with section 7 of the Administrative Procedure Act which specifically exempts from the dual-examiner requirement specified classes, of proceedings before officers specially provided for by, or designated pursuant to, statute.

Let me stress this point, Mr. President: My consistent effort has always been to avoid or eliminate any and all blanket exemptions from the Administrative Procedure Act. This bill eliminates such an exemption in the case of deportation proceedings, but accomplishes such elimination with due regard for the administrative problems of the Immigration and Naturalization Service by providing at the same time the special procedures which these problems require. An important point here is that the Congress is providing these procedures. Under a blanket exemption, the agency would prescribe its own procedures.

Mr. President, in this debate, both on the substitute amendment and on the committee bill, I sense that the sponsors of the committee bill are at a decided disadvantage because the subject matter which they are dealing with is exceedingly technical and highly complicated and, therefore, it is difficult for us to answer sweeping general statements without explaining in some detail the intricacies of a bill which is a result of thousands and thousands of hours of tedious work in which we were constantly advised by numerous experts in and out of the Government. The committee bill comes to the Senate from a duly-authorized committee which, together with the experts, have produced a bill which they believe to be sound and in the best interests of this country. The substitute amendment, as I have pointed out, would tear asunder policies which have been basic in our immigration system for generations. This substitute bill, Mr. President, is dangerous. It could only bring disaster to this Nation. I plead with the Senate to reject it.

During the delivery of Mr. MCCARRAN'S speech,

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request without jeopardizing his right to the floor?

Mr. MCCARRAN. I yield, but I should like to have this discussion follow my remarks.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that after the vote upon the substitute there be a limitation of debate upon amendments or amendments in the nature of substitutes, as follows:

For eight amendments, to be selected by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, 1 hour to each side, and for any additional amendments, 10 minutes to each side, the time to be controlled by the proponent of the amendment and the distinguished Senator from Nevada; that the time for debate on any amendment to an amendment, or upon any appeal or motion, be limited to 10 minutes on a side, the time to be controlled in the same manner; that all amendments must be germane, and that the debate upon the bill be limited to 1 hour on each side, the time to be controlled by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator include in the unanimous-consent agreement the provision that at the conclusion of the vote upon the substitute today a recess be taken until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow?

Mr. MCFARLAND. It is not necessary to include that provision in the unanimous-consent agreement. Some Senators may wish to make speeches after 4:30. If the Senator will accept my word on that subject, it will not be necessary to include such a provision in the unanimous-consent agreement.

I also ask that the limitation shall not begin until tomorrow, after Members of the Senate return from the joint meeting of the two Houses.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Is there to be a joint meeting tomorrow?

Mr. MCFARLAND. General Ridgway will address Members of the Senate and of the House in a joint meeting tomorrow. Immediately after Senators return to the Senate Chamber, the limitation of debate will begin.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. At one point in the suggested agreement I think the Senator from Arizona used the term "substitute." I think he meant "amendment."

Mr. McFARLAND. I meant an amendment, or amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is there likely to be another amendment in the nature of a substitute?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is no such intention, let me say to the Senator from Nevada. It is only a matter of drafting a unanimous-consent agreement on which all parties can agree.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I have no idea that I shall object—there are certain amendments among the one-hundred-and-fifty-odd amendments submitted by the opponents of the bill which my staff and the staffs of Senators who are offering the amendments have gone over. We are prepared to accept about 20 of them and take them to conference, with the promise that we shall get out of them everything that is worthy of being included in the bill, in keeping with the policy of the bill. Such amendments, as I have said, number about 20. As I understand, they will not enter into the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. McFARLAND. It will not take long to dispose of those amendments. They can be accepted. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement relates to a limitation of debate. I am very hopeful that it will not require an hour to a side for each of the amendments. I hope they can be disposed of more rapidly. I hope that we can complete consideration of the bill tomorrow.

Mr. McCARRAN. As to the 20 amendments to which I have referred, which have been gone over by the staffs of the respective sides, they can be offered en bloc, if that is agreeable.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes. That can be done.

Mr. McCARRAN. They will be accepted by the chairman of the committee and taken to conference.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand.

Mr. McCARRAN. Are there eight amendments in addition to those?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it has been suggested that the amendments with respect to which the major portion of time is allotted, that is, an hour to a side, be taken up first, and that the amendments to which the Senator from Nevada is now referring could come up under the 10-minute rule. I think it is entirely probable that we can present them, if not in one block, at least in two or three packages, in order that they may be properly explained and agreed to.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not want to have any misunderstanding on the part of the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee with regard to the possibility of presenting an amendment in the nature of a substitute. There is one amendment which is in the nature of a substitute, which we may wish to offer. I wish to make that clear, so that there may be no misunderstanding.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am trying to deal with the Senator from Minnesota in this matter. I have been dealing with him all morning. I have been trying to be as agreeable as possible. But if we are to be confronted with substitute after substitute we may as well abandon the effort to reach a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. McFARLAND. It would not require any longer to dispose of a substitute under this agreement than to dispose of any other amendment. In other words, there would be the same limitation with respect to the substitute, whatever it might be called.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am not troubled so much on that score as I am about knowing the contents of substitutes. Substitutes are usually more voluminous than simple amendments, and it is more difficult to analyze them and find out what they propose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let us be candid. There are no secrets. The amendment to which the Senator from New York refers is one which pertains to the question of discrimination on the basis of sex, and discrimination on the basis of race. That is one amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. It is not long.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is an amendment which is on the desk. It is one of the amendments which we would undoubtedly have called up, but it is in the nature of a substitute. I believe that all we have to do is to treat each other in good faith, and a unanimous-consent agreement can be arrived at.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection on that score. However, I do not wish to be compelled to study a voluminous substitute within an hour or so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I can assure the Senator that there will be no voluminous substitute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I hear the nature of the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I will state to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that it is the same as the request which was previously presented. The Senator from Oregon wanted some time to study it. I understood that it had been cleared with him.

Senators wanted to have the time until noon tomorrow to study the amendments. I had previously announced that the session would begin at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, but I understand that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota and other Senators associated with him have some amendments to which the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] will agree. The Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Minnesota and his colleagues will decide which amendments can be agreed upon. It was desired that they should have time tomorrow to work on the amendments. There will be no further votes this afternoon, after 4:30. Senators want the time after 4:30 this afternoon and the time during the morning, to study the amendments.

When the Senate reconvenes tomorrow after the joint meeting, which will be addressed by General Ridgway, the debate will be limited to 1 hour to a side on the first eight amendments, and thereafter to 10 minutes to a side, all amendments to be germane, the time to be controlled by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] or the proponent of the amendment, and the distinguished Senator from Nevada, on the other side, in the event he is not in favor of the amendment; and, if he is in favor of it, then by the minority leader or any Senator he may designate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair correctly understand that there is to be 1 hour on each amendment?

Mr. McFARLAND. One hour to a side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On each amendment?

Mr. McFARLAND. On each of the first eight amendments, the eight amendments to be selected by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wonder whether 1 hour, divided equally, would not be sufficient on each of the eight amendments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would prefer that we leave it at an hour to each side. Perhaps there will be some amendments on which we will not want to take all the time allowed. On other amendments we will need all the time. Therefore I would suggest that we leave the agreement as now proposed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, as I hear it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of New Jersey in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does the agreement in any way exclude motions?

Mr. McFARLAND. I included motions in the unanimous-consent request. I did not include them when I was discussing the request with the Senator from Oregon. Motions are included.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that the time consumed in the discussion of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement not be deducted from the time allowed to the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. A vote is to be taken at 4:30, and I shall meet that deadline.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—may I ask whether the majority leader contemplates holding a night session tomorrow night, as heretofore announced, and a morning session beginning at 10 o'clock commencing Friday morning?

Mr. McFARLAND. I think that Senators should hold themselves in readiness for a night session tomorrow night. I hope we shall be able to finish consideration of the bill tomorrow. If it begins to look as though we will have to sit very late, or that we cannot finish consideration of the bill tomorrow night,

we may convene early on Friday. However, announcement with respect to that point will be made tomorrow when we convene.

Mr. WELKER. I wish merely to observe that we may run into 16 hours of work. I am sure that the majority leader will not insist upon that unless it is absolutely necessary.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct; unless it is absolutely necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

The agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That beginning on Thursday, May 22, 1952, after the return of the Senate from the joint meeting of the two Houses at 12:30 p. m., further debate upon amendments or substitutes to the bill (S. 2550) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes, including motions and appeals, shall be limited as follows:

(1) On eight amendments, to be presented by Mr. HUMPHREY, and to be first considered, 1 hour to each side, the time of the proponents to be controlled by Mr. HUMPHREY and of the opponents by Mr. McCARRAN.

(2) That upon any other amendment (including motions or appeals) 10 minutes to each side, to be controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and Mr. McCARRAN in the event he is opposed to such an amendment or motion; otherwise by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided*, That no amendment that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received; and

(3) Debate upon the question of the passage of the bill shall be limited to 1 hour to the side, to be controlled by Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. McCARRAN, respectively.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, is there a limitation of time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is until 4:30, when the Senate will proceed to a vote.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to say to the Senator from Nevada that I desire to say a few words in support of the substitute bill. I understand that the time allotted for debate to the proponents of the substitute bill has been exhausted.

Mr. McCARRAN. I will yield time to the Senator from Wyoming out of my own time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is very kind. I do not intend to take a great deal of time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator tell me how much time he wants?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not believe I shall speak more than 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall be glad to yield that much time to the Senator from Wyoming.

THE IMMIGRANT HAS BUILT AMERICA

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have long been deeply concerned about the problem of immigration and the fears so many people seem to entertain that peoples from some countries of Europe will not make good Americans. This fear is entertained in the face of evidence daily before our eyes that they make good citizens, in the face of the historic fact that many of the philosophical and cultural principles of which we are most proud, to say nothing of our religious beliefs, have come to us from the very races we now seem loath to allow to gaze upon the words inscribed on the Statue of Liberty:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door!"

I think we stand in danger of surrendering to baseless fears at a time when we can advance the cause of humanity most by a more liberal attitude toward the unfortunate peoples of Europe who, like our own ancestors, seek only freedom and opportunity.

In certain portions of my State there are counties, citizens of which have been recruited from almost every country in Europe and from many nations in the New World as well. I am thinking particularly of Sweetwater County, Wyo., the population of which probably is made up of a greater variety of nationalities than any other county in the United States, not excepting New York, or Manhattan, in the city of New York.

Sweetwater County is a coal-mining area. Working in the mines of Sweetwater County there are to be found persons from almost every country and almost every race—Serbs, Croatians, Slovenes, Italians, Albanians, Austrians, Armenians, Basques, Chinese, Czechoslovakians, Danes, Finns, French, Germans, Greeks, Hebrews, Hungarians, Yugoslavs, Lithuanians, Japanese, Norwegians, Mexicans, Poles, Negroes, Rumanians, Russians, Spaniards, Swedes, Turks, Dutchmen, Irishmen, Englishmen, Scots, and Welsh. I am proud to be personally acquainted with many of them and to have visited them in their homes.

I can say without any hesitation that I know of no community in the entire United States, and I have visited many, in which there is a higher standard of intellectual ability, integrity, and of Americanism than is to be found in that county in Wyoming. I could say the same for many other areas in my State, as well as for many similar areas in other States of the Union which I have visited.

One of my problems almost daily is to deal with the sad difficulties which arise when American citizens find it impossible to bring into the United States their relatives from abroad. They cannot come in under the present law because of the quota limitation—a limitation which stands between them and happiness here. It is my recollection that the present law imposes a limitation of 308 on the number of Greeks who may come into the United States each year, and a limitation of 5,645 on Italians. Greeks and Italians are among our best and most progressive people.

Mr. President, we are depriving ourselves of the opportunity of having come to our shores competent, able men and women who would make patriotic citizens and who are seeking to escape the restrictions of Europe to contribute their talents and skills to this land of freedom in order to enjoy the liberty of which we boast. We have erected a terrible iron curtain against these people. We seem to fear to permit them to enter the United States. I cannot understand how such a fear can possibly arise. I think the proposal in the substitute bill, which would permit the allocation of unused quotas from the northern nations of Europe to the southern nations of Europe would be a great blessing to the United States.

I say I am unable to understand the fear which seems to make us tremble at the thought that people of the same strains which have already achieved success here will somehow damage us. Ninety-nine percent of those who would come into this country are seeking only an opportunity to prosper and to promote economic and political liberty in the United States.

Day after day we pick up the newspapers and read accounts of sports events. How is it possible for any person who is interested in baseball or football to be afraid of people from areas upon which we impose these rigid restrictions on immigration? I do not know what the Irish teams of Notre Dame would do without Poles, Italians, Slovenians, and all the rest. I do not know what the record of Notre Dame would be in football without them. Yet we seem to be afraid to grant a little greater liberality in admitting these people.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Has it ever occurred to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming what the United States would have done about building an army of 11,000,000 in World War II if it had not been for the sons of the very people who have overnight become so obnoxious to us?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Why, of course. The Senator from Rhode Island comes from a State in which there is a very large admixture of nationalities from all over Europe. He comes from a great State, where the people stand upon an equal level with citizens of every other State.

As I was saying, it seems to me that we just cannot read the box scores in the newspapers without realizing how absurd it is to be afraid of immigration. The United States was built upon immigration.

Just a moment ago I picked up the New York Times and checked through the sports section to see what terrible mistakes we must have made in the past. Chicago and Brooklyn played a baseball game last Sunday. On the Chicago team I find the names Miksis, Hermanski, Pramesa, Ramazzotti. On the Brooklyn team, Pafko. The umpire was Guglielmo. What strange aberration that we have permitted these men or their fathers to come into the United States? Is it not fantastic that we fear more of the same?

I read the list of batting averages of the Dodgers, the Giants, and the Yankees. This table appeared in the New York Times of Monday, May 19. Here are some of the names of the Dodgers: Abrams, Campanella, Furillo, Shuba, Podbielan, and Schmitz.

On the Giants I find Maglie, Jansen, Bamberger, Yvars, and Koslo.

On the Yankees there are Silvera, Lopat, Kuzava, Cerv, Berra, Rizzuto.

What sort of man is this Rizzuto? Where did he come from? How was he able to get in or squeeze in under the curtain? How did he or his father or his grandfather get in? What penalty falls upon the rest of us that these men can compete upon the baseball field?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course, I was very much interested in the list of names the distinguished Senator from Wyoming read. I wonder whether he would not agree that if he read the list of casualties in Korea, he would find substantially the same kind of names.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, of course that is true. When I was arguing upon the floor in behalf of statehood for Hawaii, I read the list of casualties among Hawaiian soldiers who fought in Korea and who fought in Italy. Certainly the casualties included the names of Japanese and Hawaiians. Throughout World War I and World War II we were proud of our soldiers who came to America from foreign countries, or whose fathers did.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator will not agree with me that the development of our aircraft industry, particularly with respect to war planes, would have been greatly retarded, if not completely interfered with, if it had not been for men like deSeversky, Sikorsky, and Bellanca; and that our atom bomb development would have been greatly retarded, if not completely stopped, if it had not been for persons like Einstein and Fermi, who came to the United States to help us in the development of planes, atom bombs, and other great weapons of defense.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is so correct.

Mr. President, when I learned that I was going to have a few minutes to speak upon this matter, I asked one of the most efficient members of my staff, Mike Manatos, whose parents came from Crete, to jot down the names of some athletes of south European origin, names that might not have come so readily to my mind.

The name of Joe DiMaggio is at the top. Like many another Senator I have been on Joe DiMaggio's father's fish pier in San Francisco. I saw no lack of Americanism there.

Eddie Arcaro. How many rugged Americans of Scandinavian blood, Irish blood, or British blood, living in States which permit racing and betting, have placed their bets upon a horse race because Eddie Arcaro was up?

Here is Guy Lombardo, the orchestra leader.

Tony Canzoneri, a boxer.

There is Gene Sarazen, in golf.

What could have been the matter with our parents that such persons were permitted to come in? Why do we not exclude them all?

Only 308 Greeks and 5,000 Italians may come in next year. If the British, French, Spanish, Welsh, and Irish do not care to come, I should be very glad to have some of the Greeks, Italians, Austrians, Hungarians, and the others in their place. When we think of people whom we know who have come from Italy and Greece, I believe we would all be willing to do the same thing.

Back now to the list. Joe Savoldi made his name at Notre Dame on the Irish team. So did Frank Carrideo, who was a quarterback for the Irish under Knute Rockne, and Tom Kassis, of Cheyenne, who played a star game in the line for the great coach. Is not this exclusion phobia a little fantastic?

Here are the names of Sam Mele, Vic Raschi, Charles Fusari, Tony Janiro.

So we could go down the list. I have cited these names merely to make it clear that none need be afraid of any of them. These people are Americans. They are real Americans.

There are people who were unfortunate enough not to be able to come and who are now held behind the iron curtain of the narrow immigration law passed years ago over the veto of a great Democratic President, Woodrow Wilson. This law is depriving us of blood we need, of brains and brawn we need in this country, to help carry the great burden of the leadership of the world in the fight for the maintenance of civilization.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, before the Senator concludes——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Nevada, who controls the time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I speak only at his mercy, so I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to inform the Senator that he has 20 minutes before the Senate votes on this matter.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am going to suggest the absence of a quorum as soon as the Senator from Wyoming concludes, but I desire to draw the Senator's attention to the fact that all South American countries are nonquota. There are no quotas for South American countries.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator. I understand that, but I am now talking about Greeks and Italians and other European peoples. I said there were people from Latin-American countries who are in the County of Sweetwater, but I did not mean by that to say they were barred under existing law. As I say, I was talking about Greeks, Italians, and other Europeans.

Here are more names of successful Greek athletes: George Zaharias, Jim Londos, Gus Niarhos, and several others I could mention. What wears me down day after day in my office are the appeals which come from families which are broken because our immigration law is so rigid. The aged aunt, or the niece of a Greek family which is successfully engaged in business in the United States and which has eagerly assumed American citizenship, cannot enter our borders because of the quota limitation. Applications are piling high. Why should we not make the proposed change?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator knows, of course, that under the terms of the substitute which is now before the Senate there would be a pooling of the unused quotas, which would make available the opportunity to whom he refers.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is why I am supporting it. I believe that provision for such pooling should be made, so that more people in the categories I have in mind may be permitted to come into the United States. I shall, with a great deal of pleasure and complete conviction that it is in the interest of the United States, vote for the substitute.

Mr. President, I am very much indebted to the Senator from Nevada for permitting me to occupy some of his time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Monroney
Anderson	Hendrickson	Moody
Bennett	Hennings	Morse
Benton	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bricker	Hoey	Murray
Bridges	Holland	Neely
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	O'Conor
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Ives	Pastore
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Clements	Kem	Smathers
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Lodge	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Long	Sparkman
Dworshak	Malone	Stennis
Eastland	Maybank	Taft
Ellender	McCarran	Thye
Ferguson	McCarthy	Tobey
Frear	McClellan	Underwood
Fulbright	McFarland	Watkins
George	McKellar	Welker
Gillette	McMahon	Williams
Green	Millikin	Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Conference of the International Council for Christian Leadership at The Hague.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] are detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

All time for debate has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. LEHMAN and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request for a yea-and-nay vote is sufficiently seconded. The Secretary will call the roll. Senators who favor the substitute will, when their names are called, vote "yea"; Senators who are opposed to the substitute will vote "nay" when their names are called. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

I announce further that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea," and the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Conference of the International Council for Christian Leadership at The Hague.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], and the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—27

Anderson	Humphrey	Murray
Benton	Hunt	Neely
Chavez	Ives	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Kilgore	Pastore
Duff	Lehman	Saltonstall
Gillette	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Green	McMahon	Sparkman
Hendrickson	Moody	Tobey
Hennings	Morse	Underwood

NAYS—51

Aiken	Fulbright	McKellar
Bennett	George	Millikin
Bricker	Hayden	Monroney
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Hoey	O'Conor
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Robertson
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kem	Smith, N. C.
Connally	Long	Stennis
Cordon	Malone	Taft
Dworshak	Maybank	Thye
Eastland	McCarran	Watkins
Ellender	McCarthy	Welker
Ferguson	McClellan	Williams
Frear	McFarland	Young

NOT VOTING—18

Brewster	Hill	Magnuson
Cain	Jenner	Martin
Carlson	Kefauver	Nixon
Dirksen	Kerr	Russell
Ecton	Knowland	Seaton
Flanders	Langer	Wiley

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute, submitted by Mr. LEHMAN, on behalf of himself and other Senators, was rejected.

The amendment on which the above vote was taken is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"REMOVAL OF RACIAL DISQUALIFICATION FOR NATURALIZATION AND FOR ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES

"SECTION 1. (a) No person shall be denied the right to become a citizen of the United States or the privilege to enter the United States as an immigrant solely on the ground of his race, nor shall any applicant for admission be assigned to a quota solely on the basis of his race.

"(b) The following laws are hereby repealed:

"(1) The twenty-seventh clause of the first sentence of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, and the second sentence of such section (8 U. S. C., sec. 136 (n));

"(2) Section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (8 U. S. C., sec. 703);

"(3) Section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to repeal the Chinese exclusion acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes,' approved December 17, 1943 (8 U. S. C., sec. 212a); and

"(4) Sections 4 and 5 of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, and persons of races indigenous to the Philippine Islands, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes,' approved July 2, 1946 (8 U. S. C., sec. 212b and 212c).

"POOLED QUOTAS

"SEC. 2. Section 11 (f) of the Immigration Act of 1924 (8 U. S. C., sec. 211 (f)) (relating to limitations upon issuance of visas to quota immigrants) is amended to read as follows:

"'(f) (1) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, there shall be issued to quota immigrants of any nationality (A) no more immigration visas in any fiscal year than the quota for such nationality, and (B) in any quarter of any fiscal year no more immigration visas than 30 percent of the quota for such nationality.

"'(2) All quota immigration visas available during any fiscal year which are not actually issued during such fiscal year, and all quota immigration visas which were issued in such fiscal year or in a previous year and expired during such fiscal year without being utilized, shall be assigned to a general immigration visa pool and shall be available, without reference to national origins, for issuance at any time during the fiscal year following such assignment as follows:

"'(A) Family reunion preferences: 25 percent of such pooled visas, or such smaller percentage as shall be found by the Secretary of State to be sufficient properly to care for pending applications, shall be available exclusively, in such order as may be determined by the Secretary of State, to adult children, brothers and sisters, and other blood relatives (within the third degree of consanguinity computed according to the rules of the common law) of citizens, and to spouses, children (both infant and adult), parents, brothers and sisters, and other blood relatives (within the third degree of consanguinity computed according to the rules of the common law) of alien residents of the United States who have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

"'(B) National need preferences: 25 percent of such pooled visas, or such smaller percentage as shall be found by the Secretary of State to be sufficient properly to care for pending applications, shall be available exclusively for persons who because of their high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability, are urgently needed in the United States (so far as such needs have not been met within the original quotas), or are likely to be of special benefit to the national economy, cultural interests, or welfare of the United States as determined by the Secretary of State, on the basis of recommendations made by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Labor, or by such advisory committees, representing industry and labor, as the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Labor may establish.

"'(C) Persecutee preferences: 25 percent of such pooled visas, or such smaller percentages as shall be considered by the Secretary of State to be sufficient properly to care for pending applications, shall be available exclusively, in such order as may be determined by the Secretary of State, to persons (including persons temporarily within the jurisdiction of the United States) who have been persecuted abroad in the country of their national origin or in the place of their last residence on religious or racial grounds or because of their adherence to democratic beliefs or because of their opposition to totalitarianism or dictatorship, or who have reason to fear such persecution, and who have been classified as "persecutees" or "possible persecutees" in accordance with such procedures and after such investigations as the Secretary of State shall order.

"'(D) Nonpreference cases: All pooled visas not required for issuance under the foregoing preferences shall be available, on application to the Secretary of State by an American citizen or a reputable American organization, to other immigrants, whose cases because of special circumstances or hardship

merit special consideration, in the order of their registration.'

"BOARD OF IMMIGRATION APPEALS

"SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established a Board of Immigration Appeals which shall be composed of three members to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Board shall be a part of the Department of Justice but, except for administrative purposes, shall not be subject to the supervision or control of any officer or employee of the Department. The President shall, at the time of appointment, designate one member to serve as Chairman. Each member of the Board shall be appointed for a term of 6 years and until his successor is appointed and qualified, except that, of the members first taking office, one shall be appointed for a term of 2 years, one for a term of 4 years, and one for a term of 6 years. Members of the Board shall receive compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949.

"(b) The powers and duties relating to appeals from decisions of Boards of Special Inquiry conferred upon the Attorney General by section 17 of the Immigration Act of 1917 are hereby transferred to the Board.

"(c) A quorum of the Board shall consist of two members. The Board may appoint and fix the compensation of such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems necessary.

"(d) The Board shall have authority to promulgate rules of practice governing the proceedings before it. The provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act shall apply to all proceedings of the Board.

"NONQUOTA IMMIGRANTS: PARENTS; ORPHANS; MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

"SEC. 4. Section 4 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (8 U. S. C., sec. 204) (relating to the definition of nonquota immigrant) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(g) An immigrant who is the parent of a citizen of the United States;

"'(h) An immigrant who—

"'(1) is a child under 18 years of age and, except for the provisions of the twenty-sixth clause of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (39 Stat. 875; 8 U. S. C., sec. 136 (m)), is otherwise qualified under the immigration laws for admission into the United States for permanent residence; and

"'(2) (A) has been made an orphan by the death or disappearance of both parents, or

"'(B) has been abandoned or deserted by, or separated or lost from, both parents, or

"'(C) has only one parent due to the death or disappearance, or abandonment or desertion by, or separation from the other parent and the remaining parent is incapable of providing care for such child and agrees to release him for emigration and adoption; and

"'(3) (A) is entering the United States for permanent residence with a father or mother by adoption, or

"'(B) is entering the United States for permanent residence with a near relative or with a person who is a citizen of the United States or an alien admitted to the United States for permanent residence, or is coming to the United States to a public or private agency approved by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, and such relative, person, or agency gives assurances, satisfactory to the Commissioner, that adoption or guardianship proceedings will be initiated with respect to such child; and

"'(4) with respect to whom assurances, satisfactory to the Commissioner, are given that such immigrant shall be properly cared for;

"'(i) An immigrant who is serving or has served honorably in any branch of the Armed Forces of the United States, and his spouse and his children under 21 years of age.'

"PREFERENCE CATEGORIES

"SEC. 5. Immigrants who are the brothers, sisters, or adult children of citizens of the United States or who are the fathers or mothers of alien residents of the United States who have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, shall be included in that category of immigrants granted a preference for the issuance of quota immigration visas within the terms of section 6 (a) (2) of the Immigration Act of 1924 (8 U. S. C., sec. 206 (a) (2)).

"REMOVAL OF SEX DISCRIMINATIONS

"SEC. 6. (a) The Immigration Act of 1917, the Immigration Act of 1924, and all other immigration laws are hereby amended by striking out the words 'wife' and 'husband' and the words 'wives' and 'husbands' wherever they appear therein and by inserting in lieu thereof the words 'spouse' and 'spouses', respectively.

"(b) The proviso in section 4 (a) of the Immigration Act of 1924 (8 U. S. C., sec. 204 (a)) is amended to read as follows: '*Provided*, That the marriage shall have occurred prior to the issuance of the visa.'

"REFORMED MEMBERS OF PROSCRIBED ORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 7. The first section of the act of October 16, 1918, (8 U. S. C., sec. 137) is amended—

"(a) by inserting after 'That' the following: '(a) except as provided in subsection (b)'; and

"(b) by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(b) Any alien who is within the classes described in subparagraphs (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), and (H) of paragraph (2) of subsection (a) solely because of past membership in or past affiliation with a party or organization or a section, subsidiary, branch, affiliate, or subdivision thereof, may be issued a visa if such alien establishes to the satisfaction of the consular officer when applying for a visa and the consular officer finds that (1) such past membership or past affiliation was involuntary or occurred and terminated prior to the attainment by such alien of the age of 16 years, or (2) (A) such alien is and has been, for at least 2 years prior to the date of the application for a visa, actively opposed to the doctrine, program, principles, and ideology of such party or organization or the section, subsidiary, branch, or affiliate or subdivision thereof, and (B) the consular officer finds that the admission of such alien into the United States would not be against the public interest. Any such alien to whom a visa has been issued under the provisions of this subsection may be admitted into the United States if he shall establish to the satisfaction of the Attorney General when applying for admission to the United States and the Attorney General finds that (1) such past membership or past affiliation was involuntary or occurred and terminated prior to the attainment by such alien of the age of 16 years, or (2) (A) such alien is and has been, for at least 2 years prior to the date of the application for admission, actively opposed to the doctrine, program, principles, and ideology of such party or organization or the section, subsidiary, branch, or affiliate or subdivision thereof, and (B) the Attorney General finds that the admission of such alien into the United States would not be against the public interest. The Attorney General shall promptly make a detailed report to the Congress in the case of each such alien who is or shall be admitted into the United States.'

"APPLICABILITY OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

"SEC. 8. The paragraph headed 'General provisions—Department of Justice' in chapter III of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, is repealed. The provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act shall be applicable to all proceedings relating to the exclusion or expulsion of aliens. Nothing contained in this section shall invalidate, or require any change in, any proceedings which were commenced prior to the date of enactment of this act, or to invalidate any action taken before or after such date in connection with any such proceedings."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the immigration laws so as to eliminate discrimination based on race and sex; to provide for the use of unused immigration quotas; to provide nonquota status for parents of citizens, orphans, and alien members and former members of the Armed Forces; and for other purposes."

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, when the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into this afternoon, it was understood that there would be no more votes upon the pending bill, either this afternoon or tomorrow until after the Senate reconvenes following the joint meeting with the House which had been previously announced. That understanding was reached in order to afford time to the distinguished Senator from Nevada and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota to confer concerning certain amendments which the Senator from Nevada indicated he would accept.

Shortly after the Senate meets tomorrow, it will proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives, where a joint session of the two Houses will be addressed by Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway.

The unanimous-consent agreement provides:

That beginning on Thursday, May 22, 1952, after the return of the Senate from the joint meeting of the two Houses, at 12:30 p. m., further debate upon amendments or substitutes to the bill (S. 2550) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes, including motions and appeals, shall be limited as follows:

(1) On eight amendments, to be presented by Mr. HUMPHREY, and to be first considered, 1 hour to each side, the time of the proponents to be controlled by Mr. HUMPHREY and of the opponents by Mr. McCARRAN.

The unanimous-consent agreement further provides that upon any other amendment, debate shall be limited to 10 minutes to each side; and that debate upon the question of the passage of the bill shall be limited to 1 hour to a side.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that all the time permitted under the agreement will not be consumed, that we may tomorrow finish this bill, and that on Friday we shall be able to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3086, Calender No. 1505, a bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes. After we shall have concluded the consideration of that bill, we shall probably take up Senate bill 3066, Calendar No. 1510, which is a bill to amend the defense housing laws, and for other purposes, provided, of course, that an appropriation bill is not at that time ready for consideration. Tomorrow, in the event the pending bill is disposed of

and the consideration of the mutual-security bill is begun, we shall then determine how much progress can be made and how soon that bill can be disposed of, after which I shall make a further announcement in regard to the program.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Is the Senate to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, in order to expedite matters?

Mr. McFARLAND. No; the Senate will meet at 12 o'clock noon, since Senators on both sides of the pending measure desired to avail themselves of the time tomorrow morning to confer about certain amendments, which it is thought may be agreed to without controversy.

Mr. President, I desire to express my appreciation for the cooperation of Senators who are interested in the pending bill in helping to reach a unanimous-consent agreement on the bill. I hope that Senators will be able to be on the floor tomorrow, because there will be a number of votes taken. As stated, the Senate will meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 762. An act for the relief of Alexander Urszu;

S. 997. An act for the relief of Paula Slucka (Slucki) and Ariel Slucki;

S. 1372. An act for the relief of Mrs. Madelaine Viale Moore; and

S. 1679. An act for the relief of Stephen Gorove.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 880. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Biolzi;

H. R. 1097. An act for the relief of Ethel White, Frankie Ezell, and Ralph James;

H. R. 1098. An act for the relief of the estate of C. G. Allen;

H. R. 1847. An act for the relief of Margaret Frankel;

H. R. 2810. An act for the relief of James Nels Ekberg;

H. R. 2840. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hee Shee Wong Achuck;

H. R. 3275. An act for the relief of Miyoko Nakagawa;

H. R. 3334. An act for the relief of Paul Busbey;

H. R. 3564. An act for the relief of Reuben Krakovsky;

H. R. 3858. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Peter Copeyon;

H. R. 4126. An act for the relief of Ernst Sbaschnik, Sr.;

H. R. 4180. An act for the relief of Joseph Denekar and Mrs. Mary A. Denekar;

H. R. 4504. An act for the relief of Dr. Philip Bloemsma and Mrs. Joy Roelink Bloemsma;

H. R. 4543. An act for the relief of Mrs. Priscilla Crowley;

H. R. 4588. An act for the relief of Mark Yen Hui;

H. R. 5107. An act for the relief of Margarite Mary Fujita;

H. R. 5108. An act for the relief of Nicola, Lucia, and Rocco Fierro;

H. R. 5301. An act for the relief of Leonard Jesse Richards (Michio Inoue);

H. R. 5325. An act for the relief of S. Irby Adams;

H. R. 5864. An act for the relief of Sachiko Kanemochi;

H. R. 6010. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lennie G. Clarkson and William E. Clarkson;

H. R. 6016. An act for the relief of Louis A. Schafer;

H. R. 6109. An act for the relief of Helga Eveline Matz;

H. R. 6505. An act for the relief of Karen Ann Crowley;

H. R. 6850. An act for the relief of Martha Bridges;

H. R. 6870. An act for the relief of Louie Bon Kong;

H. R. 6945. An act for the relief of Katharina Hoffmann;

H. R. 7860. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 454. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 66) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 897) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thanos Mellos, Michel Mellos, and Hermine Fahnl, and it was signed by the Vice President.

SUSIE LEE SPENCER—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 131)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

To the United States Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 1045 "for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer."

This enactment proposes payment of $7,500 to the estate of Susie Lee Spencer, of Spartanburg, S. C., a Federal employee who was killed in 1943 during the course of her employment. Death resulted from the negligence of a fellow employee. The claim of her husband for death compensation under the provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act was denied upon the ground that he was not wholly dependent upon her for support at the time of death.

This enrollment is substantially the same as H. R. 1026, of the Eighty-first Congress, which I returned to the Congress without my approval. In principle, it is also the same a. H. R. 1481 of that Congress, a bill "for the relief of the estate of Julius Zaffareni," which I disapproved on May 3, 1950.

In declining to concur in these enactments, I indicated my belief that bills providing monetary awards in cases such as these circumvent the basic concept of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to provide compensation to those persons only who were dependent upon the deceased employee and were deprived by his death of a means of support. I expressed the view that it was wise and reasonable for the Congress to make the program provided by the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, even though circumscribed in some respects, the exclusive form of recovery from the Government. A Federal employee and his dependents, for whatever other rights of redress they surrender, get in return the assured and orderly protection, independent of the question of fault or negligence, which the law guarantees to them and their surviving dependents when death occurs during employment. I further said that I could find no reason why this principle should apply to the judicial process and not prevail in the legislative process.

S. 1045 is inconsistent with the principles of the dependency requirements and the exclusive remedy provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, even though the exclusive remedy section was not added until 1949. If the Congress believes there is reason to depart from the policy of this act, in order to permit payment of death compensation to a nondependent husband of a Federal employee, I believe this should be done through general legislation rather than by making individual exceptions through the enactment of private relief measures. Such private relief enactments, in effect, would provide preferential treatment for some individuals and would be discriminatory against the general class of persons subject to the provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 21, 1952.*

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. R. 6661. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Building Act, 1926; without amendment (Rept. No. 1586).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 4801. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue certain bonds for flood-control purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1587);

H. R. 4902. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue certain public improvement bonds; without amendment (Rept. No. 1588);

H. R. 4923. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue certain bonds for the construction of the Kalihi tunnel and its approach roads; without amendment (Rept. No. 1589);

H. R. 5071. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the county of Maui, T. H., to issue public improvement bonds for the construction of flood-control projects on Iao stream; without amendment (Rept. No. 1590);

H. R. 5072. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the county of Maui, T. H., to issue public improvement bonds for the construction of new public-school buildings; without amendment (Rept. No. 1591);

H. R. 5386. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation of the Territory of Hawaii, to issue bonds for acquisition of real property for public-school purposes and for construction and replacement of buildings for public-school purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1592); and

H. R. 6675. A bill to authorize the conveyance of lands in the Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation to the State of California or to the Hoopa Unified School District for use for school purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1593).

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2610. A bill providing that excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to certain lands that will receive a supplemental or regulated water supply from the San Luis Valley project, Colorado; without amendment (Rept. No. 1594).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 21, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 897) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thanos Mellos, Michel Mellos, and Hermine Fahnl.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 3207. A bill for the relief of Panos Michalopoulos;

S. 3208. A bill for the relief of Paul Dacut;

S. 3209. A bill for the relief of Virginia Grande; and

S. 3210. A bill for the relief of Karin Rita Grubb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 3211. A bill for the relief of Shizuko Suzuki and Johnny Suzuki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 3212. A bill to approve a contract negotiated with the Midvale irrigation district and to authorize its execution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES) (by request):

S. 3213. A bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 3214. A bill for the relief of Ottavio Saulino and Marcella Saulino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 3215. A bill for the relief of Julia E. Wagner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself and Mr. MAYBANK):

S. 3216. A bill to provide for a television studio to be maintained in connection with the Senate Radio-Television Correspondents' Gallery; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REVISION OF LAWS RELATING TO IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND NATIONALITY — AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2550) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. BENTON, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. MAGNUSON) submitted amendments in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 2550, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HUNT, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. KEM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the executive offices and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

H. R. 880. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Biolzi;

H. R. 1097. An act for the relief of Ethel White, Frankie Ezell, and Ralph James;

H. R. 1098. An act for the relief of the estate of C. G. Allen;

H. R. 1847. An act for the relief of Margaret Frankel;

H. R. 2810. An act for the relief of James Nels Ekberg;

H. R. 2840. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hee Shee Wong Achuck;

H. R. 3275. An act for the relief of Miyoko Nakagawa;

H. R. 3334. An act for the relief of Paul Busbey;

H. R. 3564. An act for the relief of Reuben Krakovsky;

H. R. 3858. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Peter Copeyon;

H. R. 4126. An act for the relief of Ernst Sbaschnik, Sr.;

H. R. 4180. An act for the relief of Joseph Denekar and Mrs. Mary A. Denekar;

H. R. 4504. An act for the relief of Dr. Philip Bloemsma and Mrs. Joy Roelink Bloemsma;

H. R. 4543. An act for the relief of Mrs. Priscilla Crowley;

H. R. 4583. An act for the relief of Mark Yen Hui;

H. R. 5107. An act for the relief of Margarite Mary Fujita;

H. R. 5108. An act for the relief of Nicola, Lucia, and Rocco Fierro;

H. R. 5301. An act for the relief of Leonard Jesse Richards (Michio Inoue);

H. R. 5325. An act for the relief of S. Irby Adams;

H. R. 5864. An act for the relief of Sachiko Kanemochi;

H. R. 6010. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lennie G. Clarkson and William E. Clarkson;

H. R. 6016. An act for the relief of Louis A. Schafer;

H. R. 6109. An act for the relief of Helga Eveline Matz;

H. R. 6505. An act for the relief of Karen Ann Crowley;

H. R. 6850. An act for the relief of Martha Bridges;

H. R. 6870. An act for the relief of Louie Bon Kong; and

H. R. 6945. An act for the relief of Katharina Hoffmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7860. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 454. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

Address delivered by him at the annual State convention banquet of the Catholic War Veterans, Department of Pennsylvania, at Norristown, Pa., on May 17, 1952.

By Mr. PASTORE:

Statement prepared by him, entitled "The Story of Social Security."

By Mr. THYE:

Address entitled "A Look at the Record," delivered by him before the Minnesota Hennepin County Republican Women's Club, Minneapolis, Minn., on May 16, 1952.

Editorial entitled "THYE for the Soil," published in St. Paul Pioneer Press on May 14, 1952.

By Mr. CAIN:
Letter written by him to Mr. John Oakes, of the editorial department of the New York Times, with reference to the tidelands bill.

By Mr. TAFT:
Editorial entitled "We Can Depend on ANDY," relating to Senator SCHOEPPEL, published in the Kingman (Kans.) Journal of May 15, 1952.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:
Article entitled "The Missouri Gang: A National Issue," published in the Reader's Digest.

By Mr. BENNETT:
Resolution adopted by the American Bar Association on the tidelands issue.

By Mr. MOODY:
Editorial entitled "Not Yet Perfected," commenting on the immigration bill, published in the Detroit News of Saturday, May 10, 1952.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:
Editorial entitled "Chennault's Planes," published in the New York Times of May 7, 1952.

By Mr. WATKINS:
Editorial entitled "No Wonder Our Cities Lack So Much," published in the Deseret (Utah) News of May 18, 1952.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:
Article entitled "The Amazing Mrs. Mayes," written by Dorothy Brandon and published in a recent issue of the magazine section of the New York Herald Tribune.

By Mr. O'CONOR:
Article regarding Miss Geneva Harrison, a teacher of blind children, published in a recent issue of the Washington Post.

THE KOJE ISLAND INCIDENT

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, this morning a Miss Isabel Grasty, who identified herself as a relative of Brig. Gen. Francis T. Dodd, former commander of the Koje Island war prisoner camp, called at my office and stated to my executive assistant that General Dodd had received orders from superiors in the Army to coddle and appease the Communist prisoners on Koje Island.

This is a serious charge that should be investigated fully by the proper committees of Congress and not just by the Army itself. If General Dodd did receive such orders, it should be fully determined not only who gave the orders but as well who formulated the policy for such orders—whether such policy was formulated by the Army or by the State Department or by the White House.

INCREASE IN PRICE OF CANADIAN NEWSPRINT

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in a statement in the Senate on Monday, regarding the announced new increase in price of Canadian newsprint, I declared that the Office of Price Stabilization should make it eminently clear to the Canadian authorities that the people of our country resented this apparent desire on the part of the Canadian manufacturers to take advantage of their monopolistic position at the expense of this Nation's newspapers.

I am happy to advise the Senate that the Office of Price Stabilization, through former Gov. Ellis Arnall, its able Director, conferred with ranking officials of the Canadian Government on this matter last Wednesday and later protested the proposed increase to the Canadian Minister of Defense Production as both shocking and alarming.

Mr. Arnall conferred with representatives of the American Newsprint Publishers Association regarding the matter and presented their views to the Canadian Defense Minister.

I am very happy to bring to the attention of the Senate and of our people, generally, the active and alert interest of Mr. Arnall and the Office of Price Stabilization in this matter, which represents an additional burden upon newspapers and, of course, eventually upon the American public.

INTERPRETATION OF PRESIDENT'S INHERENT POWER

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 4, 1952, containing remarks by our distinguished colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO END THE CONFUSION IN STEEL—NEED MANDATORY LAWS ON PRESIDENT'S EMERGENCY POWERS—INTERPRETATION OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S INHERENT POWER BY SUPREME COURT ALSO REQUIRED, SENATOR MORSE BELIEVES—JUSTICES JACKSON AND CLARK ARE ON RECORD IN FAVOR OF BROAD POWERS OF THE PRESIDENCY

(By Raymond P. Brandt)

WASHINGTON, May 3.—The bewildering confusion during the week started by Federal Judge Pine's decision that the Government was in illegal possession of the steel plants brought into sharp focus the ever-recurring but as yet unanswered question of the extent of Presidential power in a national emergency.

The United States district judge's clear-cut conclusion that in his opinion the President has only the power delegated him by the Constitution and voted him by the Congress pointed up two current needs in the current critical period of neither-peace-nor-war.

These are:

1. Interpretation by the Supreme Court of the President's inherent powers as Chief Executive and as Commander in Chief of the armed services.

2. Mandatory, rather than permissive or discretionary legislation that would more definitely outline for a President what he can and cannot do in a national emergency. Use of the Taft-Hartley Act is discretionary with the President.

The need for clarification and definition was emphasized late yesterday when five of the nine justices of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, which stayed Judge Pine's injunction against the Government, said there was "at least a serious question" in their minds about the correctness of the lower court's opinion.

After citing cases going back to 1871, the majority of the appellate court appeared to be answering Judge Pine's conclusion that there was utter and complete lack of authoritative support for the Government's position in the steel seizure.

Until the Supreme Court acts there will be continued confusion about Presidential powers.

The principal advocate in Congress for a Supreme Court interpretation of the inherent power of the President and for mandatory power to the President in national crisis is Republican WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon.

With his background as dean of the Oregon University Law School he speaks as the Senate's most articulate student of constitutional law. His services on various World War II boards and his membership on the Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare Committees in the Senate have given him detailed information on military requirements and labor-management relations.

During the coal dispute of 1950, which in some respects was similar to the current steel controversy, Morse introduced a bill that set out step-by-step procedures under which the Government could seize and operate an essential industry in a national emergency. It was not acted upon by the Senate.

Agreement by the Supreme Court today to review the steel seizure case opens the way to a possible definition of the "inherent" power that Judge Pine said did not exist.

The highest court, while tacitly recognizing over the years the exercise of extraordinary powers by the President as Chief Executive and as Commander in Chief, has carefully avoided specific expressions that could be used generally as definition of this vague power that has been invoked by almost every President from Thomas Jefferson to Harry S. Truman.

Two members of the present Court, Justices Jackson and Clark, are on record, while Attorneys General, upholding the President's powers to act in an emergency without specified authority.

The situation most nearly analogous to the present situation but on a much smaller scale, was in June 1941, 6 months before the attack on Pearl Harbor but during a declared "emergency," when President Roosevelt took possession of the North American Aviation Corp. plant at Englewood, Calif.

Jackson, as Attorney General, had advised the President on his legal power of seizure and the Department of Justice made public the following statement by him:

"The Presidential proclamation rests upon the aggregate of the Presidential powers derived from the Constitution itself and from statutes enacted by the Congress.

"The Constitution lays upon the President the duty 'to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.' Among the laws which he is required to find means to execute are those which direct him to equip an enlarged Army, to provide for a strengthened Navy, to protect Government property, to protect those who are engaged in carrying out the business of the Government, and to carry out the provisions of the Lend-Lease Act.

"For the faithful execution of such laws the President has back of him not only each general law enforcement power conferred by the various acts of Congress, but the aggregate of all such laws, plus that wide discretion as to method vested in him by the Constitution for the purpose of executing the laws.

"The Constitution also places on the President the responsibility, and vests in him, the powers of Commander in Chief of the Army and of the Navy. These weapons for the protection of the continued existence of the Nation are placed in his sole command and the implication is clear that he should not allow them to become paralyzed by failure to obtain supplies for which Congress has appropriated the money and which it has directed the President to obtain.

"The situation in the North American plant more nearly resembles an insurrection than a labor strike. The President's proclamation recites the persistent defiance of Government efforts to mediate any legitimate labor differences. The distinction between loyal labor leaders and those who are following the Communist Party line is easy to observe. Loyal labor leaders fight for a settlement of labor grievances. Disloyal men who have wormed their way into the labor movement do not want settlements; they want strikes.

"That is the Communist Party line which those who have defied both the Government and their own loyal leaders to prevent a settlement of the strike have followed.

"There can be no doubt that the duty constitutionally and inherently rested upon the President to exert his civil and military, as well as his moral authority to keep the defense effort of the United States a going concern."

Earlier the late Frank Murphy, then Attorney General and later an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, was asked by a Senate resolution to specify the powers Roosevelt might exercise under his proclamation of a national emergency.

Murphy politely declined, citing statutes and precedents dating back to the early days of the Nation which held that the Attorney General should give his interpretation of law to the President and heads of executive agencies. But Murphy added, in a letter to Vice President John N. Garner dated October 4, 1939:

"You are aware, of course, that the Executive has powers not enumerated in the statutes—powers derived not from statutory grants but from the Constitution.

"It is universally recognized that the constitutional duties of the Executive carry with them the constitutional powers necessary for their performance.

"These constitutional powers have never been specifically defined, and in fact cannot be, since their extent and limitations are largely dependent upon conditions and circumstances.

"In a measure this is true with respect to most of the powers of the Executive, both constitutional and statutory. The right to take specific action might not exist under one state of facts, while under another it might be the absolute duty of the Executive to take such action."

Years later Tom C. Clark, then Attorney General, now Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, followed the same line of thought, and in fact cited Murphy's letter on the point.

Clark's views were expressed in a letter to former Senator Elbert D. Thomas, then chairman of the Senate Labor committee, which was considering legislation to repeal or modify the Taft-Hartley Act. The pertinent portion of the letter, written February 2, 1949, dealt with Clark's reference to national emergency injunction procedures. On this point he wrote:

"However, with regard to the question of the power of the Government under Title III (the national emergency injunction section) I might point out that the inherent power of the President to deal with emergencies that affect the health, safety, and welfare of the entire Nation is exceedingly great."

Neither layman nor lawyer should have the temerity to predict what any Supreme Court would do with such a controversial issue as the steel seizure even though two present members have expressed themselves—as Attorneys General—on inherent power. It is fairly safe, however, to observe that in most cases, the Supreme Court has tried to limit itself to the narrowest possible issue and has avoided decision when circumstances rendered the issue moot.

Before Judge Pine handed down his decision adverse to the Government on Tuesday, Senator MORSE was emphatic that the President was endowed by the Constitution with unspecified powers to deal with an emergency. After the decision he was equally emphatic about his own views but conceded that he had been "reversed" by the Federal District court here.

"So long as that decision stands," he said on Thursday," I shall urge full compliance with it because it is the law of the land unless reversed.

At one point, MORSE appeared to welcome Judge Pine's decision because it opened the way for a definition by the Supreme Court. He noted that the lower court's opinion "still fails clearly to define what Executive power under the Constitution means."

Pointing out that there had been a divergence of view during nearly the entire life of the Republic about the President's power to meet a crisis before Congress could act, Morse continued:

"Very able scholars and lawyers have stood on both sides of this question. It has been my view and still is my view that the President has broader powers than Judge Pine decreed in his decision the other day. It is my opinion that it would be a great mistake to adopt any tactic for the settlement of this litigation which would avoid placing this issue squarely before the Supreme Court.

"I think it would be most unfortunate if future Presidents, confronted with great crises, should find their freedom of action impaired by the decision of a lower Federal court. I think future Presidents, as well as the present President, are entitled to a clear-cut unequivocal decision on the basic issue involved in this case and a clear determination by the Supreme Court as to what the undefined language in Article II of the Constitution means as a matter of constitutional law.

"I think it is important that such a clear decision come from the Supreme Court, because the decision is now the important thing. Let us find out, now, whether the narrow interpretation of the Constitution as set forth by Judge Pine is the law of the land. The only place where that question can be determined ultimately finally is in the Supreme Court of the United States."

Commenting specifically on Judge Pine's opinion, the Oregon Senator said:

"I say most respectfully that in my opinion Judge Pine's decision is one of those decisions on constitutional law in which the court looks upon the Constitution as a static instrument and not as a dynamic instrument; as a dead-hand instrument, not as a living instrument, adjustable to the dynamic needs of a society living under changing conditions, generation to generation.

"The great strength of the American Constitution has always been its flexible nature, in that it has been interpreted for the most part as a dynamic instrument, adjustable to changing conditions as they confront the free people of this country."

Getting back to the steel seizure, Morse said that Truman in this instance and others, should have consulted with Congress before acting and if possible obtained legislation to authorize his action. He stated that in some cases the President might have had to act before getting congressional sanction, as President Wilson had done when he sent the marines to Nicaragua.

He said that Truman's letter to Vice President BARKLEY calling on Congress to take such action as it saw fit was not enough.

"After all," he continued, "the operation of Government is also a matter of human relations, and I think the attitude and understanding would have been entirely different in Congress and in the country had we been told, even that night (of the seizure) or the first thing the next morning, that the President sought to address a joint session of the Congress to discuss this case.

"I am inclined to think that, had that course of action been followed, we would not be in the situation we are at present in the steel case. But what I say about spilled milk or water over the dam does not change the fact now, and the fact now is that our country is losing, hour by hour, steel production which the safety of America requires."

When MORSE was speaking, the steel workers were still off the job. They began to return yesterday but MORSE and other Congressmen and Senators have been trying to devise legislation that would keep essential production going in an emergency.

In the past, Congress has shied away from legislation that would take away the workers' right to strike in the last resort or specifically to authorize the President, in peacetime, to seize an industry even in an emergency.

MORSE's solution is for the Congress to take an affirmative position and legislate.

"I cannot escape the feeling," he told the Senate this week, "that we are in rather an indefensible position when we argue as a Congress in one breath that the President acted without any legislative sanction, and yet have not put legislation on the books either before or after the fact in coping with the objection we have made. I hold to the point of view that we ought to keep the President in check by way of legislation before and after the fact in matter such as this; and it ought to be mandatory legislation. I repeat that legislation—it ought to be mandatory legislation."

Various proposals along this line have been made for providing the Government with authority for seizing and operating an industry during a period of national emergency.

The latest is a bill introduced in the House Wednesday by Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, coauthor of the wartime Smith-Connally Labor Disputes Act. Under the Smith bill the Government would have power to appoint receivers for union and management to operate an industry indefinitely during the emergency.

The costs of the receivership would be borne equally by labor and management, but there is no provision for the deposition of profits. Wages and conditions of employment would remain in status quo.

A more detailed and carefuly thought out seizure plan has been proposed by Senator MORSE. He broached this first in 1947 during debate on the Taft-Hartley Act and introduced it in the form of a bill in March 1950 during a coal strike.

The essence of MORSE's measure was an effort to be fair to both sides in the dispute. His basic premise was that it should be used only as a last resort, after breakdown of collective bargaining. He tried to make certain that his procedure could not be used arbitrarily by the President, but could be brought into play only after careful consideraiton was given to the recommendations of an Emergency Board both by the President and by Congress.

MORSE told the Senate in offering his legislation that his 15 years of experience in the field of labor relations had convinced him the human factor is controlling in most labor disputes. An opponent of the Taft-Hartley Act, MORSE told the Senate that workers have an entirely different psychological outlook toward working under Government seizure and control of profits than working for a private employer, who controls the profits, against their will.

Procedure under MORSE's bill would be as follows:

When the President finds a national emergency is threatened or exists because a stoppage of work has resulted or threatens to result from a labor dispute in a vital industry which affects the public interest, he is to issue a proclamation to that effect and call on the parties to the dispute to stay on the job, or, if they have left it, to go back to work.

Then the President is to appoint an "Emergency Board" to investigate and try to settle the dispute within 30 days. The report is to be made public. The size of the board is left to the President's discretion.

Any time after issuing the proclamation the President may submit to Congress for action a full statement of the case and any recommendations he sees fit to make.

MUST MAKE STATEMENT

The bill makes it mandatory on the President to submit such a statement if a strike or lockout continues after the proclamation is issued. He is also to submit the report of the Emergency Board if it has been made and may recommend that the United States take possession of and operate the enterprise.

If he recommends possession, he is given automatically the authority to take the action unless Congress within 5 days adopts a concurrent resolution stating the action should not be taken or unless Congress passes legislation intended to resolve the dispute and terminate the emergency, if Congress finds an emergency exists.

During the period of Government possession the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and the Emergency Board are to continue to encourage the settlement of the dispute by the opposing parties.

The agency or department of Government designated by the President to operate the enterprise under seizure would have no authority to negotiate with the employer or the union for a contract or to alter the wages, hours, or conditions of employment existing in the industry before the dispute, except in conformity with the recommendations of the emergency board of congressional resolution.

The seized property would be returned to the owners as soon as they reached an agreement and settled the dispute with the employees or when the President finds that continued Government operation was no longer necessary under the terms of the proclamation.

The bill provided, however, that possession by the Government would be terminated not later than 60 days after the issuance of the report of the emergency board unless the period of possession was extended by Congress.

The United States would hold all income in trust, paying just compensation to the owners, paying operating expenses, reimbursing the Government and depositing any remaining receipts in the Treasury.

COMPENSATION

Compensation to the owners would be determined by a board appointed by the President. The award would be final and binding on both parties unless within 30 days after the issuance of the award either party moved to have the award modified or set aside in the United States Court of Claims according to the rules of the court.

In determining just compensation to the owners, consideration would be given to the fact that the Government took possession of the enterprise when its operation had been interrupted by a work stoppage, or that a work stoppage was imminent; to the fact that the owners or the labor union failed or refused to comply with the recommendations of the emergency board or the conditions determined by the Congress to constitute a just settlement of the dispute; to the fact that the Government would have returned the enterprise to its owners at any time when an agreement was reached settling the dispute; and to the value the use of the enterprise would have had to its owners in the light of the labor dispute prevailing, had the owners remained in possession during the period of Government operation.

While the facility is under Government possession it is to be the duty of labor organizations and their officers to seek in good faith to induce employees to refrain from work stoppages and not to engage in a strike, slow-down, or refusal to work. If such work stoppage occurred, the leaders should try in good faith to induce the employees to return to their jobs.

During the period of possession, the labor and management representatives would be obligated to continue collective bargaining.

DOUBT

A point emphasized repeatedly by MORSE was the element of doubt. He said that unless the disputants were kept in doubt about what the final settlement might be after Government intervention "we play right into the hands of either labor's or the employer's side of the table, which may find it to their advantage to let the procedures of the law run their course."

"In my bill I have left the parties in doubt," MORSE said. "I do not propose a law which would allow either side to sit down and figure out in advance whether it will be to its advantage to look out the window when collective bargaining should be going on in good faith and say, 'No, no, no' to offers made by the other side. I have phrased this bill so that both will be in great doubt as to the economic consequences if they permit a situation to develop such a national emergency that it threatens the health and safety of the country to the extent that the Government has to step in and exercise the arm of the law to protect the public welfare.

"How have I done it? I have done it by leaving to the Government to determine, when seizure has been applied, what the wages, hours, and conditions of employment shall be and what the compensation of operators shall be. Mine is a flexible procedure as far as economic compensation to both parties under Government seizure is concerned."

INCOME IN TRUST

Under MORSE's bill, during the period of Government operation all income would be held in trust for the payment of general operating expenses and just compensation to the owners. This compensation would be based on the facts in each individual case.

If employers were shown by the facts in the recommendations of the emergency board to have been guilty of bad faith, and if it is shown that they should have granted some of the requests of the union, the compensation to the owners would not be as much as in a case in which the board found the union at fault.

This would infuse the element of doubt into the procedure, he said.

All expenses incurred by the Government would be reimbursed out of the income from the operation, if anything remained it would be turned into the United States Treasury.

It is impossible to forecast whether the Morse bill or anything like it would have prevented the steel seizure. There probably will always remain a question about what extraordinary powers a President can exercise in an emergency. There is even the question whether Congress or the courts could define an emergency, especially in these times of Soviet imperialism and worldwide rearmament.

The Supreme Court could, however, begin to answer the question by setting up some boundaries on the President's unspecified powers and the Congress could be more explicit in stating what it thinks the President can and cannot legally do as Chief Executive and Commander in Chief.

ALLAN B. KLINE

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] made a very forceful statement, during the course of which he submitted a list of certain individuals who I am afraid some persons may be led to think are all and sundry in complete support of and in cooperation with the New Deal of recent years.

Because of personal acquaintance, I wish to invite attention to one individual to whom the Senator from Indiana referred. I believe I should add a little bit more to the chronology and history of this gentleman, because he is a long-time personal friend of mine and one of the outstanding men in the United States—Allan B. Kline. I think all his associations and activities were not included in the little biography contained in the statement appearing on page 5559 of the RECORD of yesterday.

The reference to Mr. Kline is as follows:

Allan B. Kline: Government post: Public Advisory Board, Economic Cooperation Administration. Business connections: president, Iowa Life Insurance Co., 1945–47; president, Iowa Farm Mutual Insurance Co., 1944; president, Iowa Plant Food Co., 1945–47; director, Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago.

Mr. President, the persons to whom the Senator from Indiana referred were classified in the RECORD as being tycoons of industry. I am perfectly willing to admit that Allan Kline is one of the outstanding persons in the United States, in his field, but he is not exactly in the classification of a tycoon of industry. He is a practical and thoroughly successful and devoted dirt farmer in Iowa. That is his business and his occupation. He has been active in farm organization work. He was president of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation for several terms and has just been reelected to a third term as president of the National Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. Kline is, at the present time, I believe, a director of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, but he is what is called a class C director. He is not a banker and is not interested in any bank, and he owns not a single share of bank stock. So Mr. Kline is not a director as the result of being a banker in the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I am glad to say that I know Mr. Kline and have known him for many years. In my judgment, there are very few men in the country who have as sound and complete knowledge of economics as has Mr. Kline.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire. The Senator from Indiana was not attempting in any way to disparage Mr. Kline.

So far as Mr. Kline's being president of a life-insurance company is concerned, he was, in effect, ex-officio president as the result of his being elected president of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation. When he ceased being president of that federation he ceased being an officer of the life-insurance company.

He holds, or has held until recently, the post of public advisory member of the Economic Cooperation Administration. I am reliably informed that it was not with the blessing or the approval of the present administration that he was appointed to that post. His appointment was made over the objection of the administration, and it was because of his unique ability along that line.

Mr. TOBEY. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to say that Mr. Kline has forgotten more about such matters than some of us have ever dreamed of.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. Kline is a brilliant man, and I agree generally with the Senator from New Hampshire.

I wanted to make it clear, because of my long acquaintance with Mr. Kline, that he is not in any sense a business tycoon. He is an Iowa dirt farmer with brilliant mental qualifications for the service of the people among whom he lives. He has been president of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation for several terms and is now president of the National Farm Bureau Federation. He is a man of the soil and, furthermore, he is a man of great brilliance, great patriotism, and a determination to serve his country and his people.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am delighted that the senior Senator from Iowa has said what he has, because it gives me an opportunity to say that in making the speech which I made yesterday and placing in the RECORD the names of more than a hundred businessmen who have been associated with the Government, no effort was made to distinguish Republicans and Democrats, and no effort was made to distinguish between big- and small-business men. I felt that all businessmen, big and little, and all farmers, labor leaders, and everyone else ought to take part in government, and that when called upon by the President of the United States or any other high governmental official, they should participate and make the required sacrifice.

What I was trying to point out was that, although these men have over a period of years made great sacrifices and great contributions to the Government, yet the President of the United States is continually harassing them and using almost every term in the dictionary in describing them as men of privilege, condemning them and complaining that the party which I represent is the party of big business.

I simply wanted to show how much hypocrisy the President himself was indulging in when he made such a speech as that to which I made reference and such as he continually makes.

Mr. President, I know Allan Kline. I have known him for years, and I know that he is a dirt farmer in Iowa. In fact, he is one of the successful farmers. He raises a great many hogs and a great deal of corn. He has contributed much to the Government and has offered his services wherever he had an opportunity to do so. He has been against those things in Government which he felt were wrong, and he has likewise been for those things which he felt were right.

I, for one, am becoming tired of hearing the President of the United States single out businessmen in the United States, both small and big, who have contributed to the Government, whom the President personally asked to contribute and to become members of his official family, and then proceed to belittle them and try to make the people of America believe they are a sinister force. He proceeds to call them all sorts of uncomplimentary names, and tries to tell the American people that all the big businessmen in the United States are in the Republican Party. I for one have been getting tired of it, as I did particularly after listening to the President's address a few days ago before the Americans for Democratic Action. I thought that we ought to get the record straight, that we ought simply to show up that kind of speech and that kind of conversation for what it is—just a lot of poppycock. That was the reason why I presented the information for the RECORD. I think that by doing so I contributed a service to the thinking of the American people.

It was not my intention to show that many of those whom the President mentioned were either for or against the so-called New Deal, as the able Senator from Iowa said. That was not the point at all. The point was simply to show that men, like those whose names were on the list I presented, do join the Government from time to time, and make their contribution to the conduct of the Government. Yet they are condemned by the President of the United States, I presume, for having been a little successful in their particular lines of endeavor.

That leads me to ask, when has it become a sin in America to be successful? When has it become a sin in America to make money? Yet the President of the United States would leave the impression with the people of America, or would like to leave the impression, that any man who is in any degree successful, or has some sort of success motive, belongs to the Republican Party only. I presume the inference might be drawn, if one wishes to turn it around the other way, that the unsuccessful people in America belong to the New Deal party, and the successful people belong to the Republican Party.

I might even use names. The able junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], who is standing across the aisle, is a very wealthy man who has been successful in his business. Evidently he is one, I presume, to whom the President of the United States is referring when he talks about men of privilege in Wall Street.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am quite sure the President of the United States did not have me in mind in his remarks. I wish to point out to the junior Senator from Indiana that I have not been in Wall Street for almost 25 years. I retired from active business when I first went into public life in 1929.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am delighted to know that; but I am certain that we are not going to have to pass the hat for the able Senator from New York.

REVISION OF LAWS RELATING TO IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND NATIONALITY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2550) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I wish to take a very few minutes of the time of the Senate to refresh the memory of the Senate on certain aspects of the pending bill. I was very much gratified by the response in my State of West Virginia in the last election, in a campaign based on the record of solid achievements of the national Democratic administration.

I should like to remind the Senate that one of the important features of that record was the enactment of a humane, liberal, displaced-persons law. The first such law passed by the Congress was full of restrictions and limitations, and it did not work. When the life of that law expired, another bill came from the Committee on the Judiciary, but that bill was just as restrictive as the first bill, if not more so.

On the floor of the Senate a new bill was drawn. It was liberal and humane, and has proved workable to such an extent that in August of this year the displaced-persons situation will have been cleared up so far as our obligations and commitments are concerned. As I said, that bill was written on the floor of the Senate, and it is my hope that as to the pending bill similar action can be taken to make the bill workable.

Mr. President, we speak about immigration as if all our people did not come from abroad; as if we were all natives. Everyone of us is a descendant of immigrants, be our name Dworshak, Schoeppel, Mundt, Lehman, Malone, Kilgore, Humphrey, or O'Mahoney. We are all descendants of immigrants, and our ancestors came here at a time when they were welcome. I well remember when immigrants were brought here from Italy and other countries of Europe by the boatload, in order to build our railroads, to help mine our coal, to help build the industries of this Nation, then in their period of construction. Now we look askance at anyone who happened to be born in Italy, Spain, France, Belgium, or Holland.

It is true that immigration from the British Isles—England, Scotland, and Ireland—has dwindled to such an extent that those countries do not use their quotas. But there are still many desirable people in other countries of Europe who could readily and gladly take advantage of the unusued quotas. That is why I was very sorry to see the amendment in the nature of a substitute defeated.

I also wish to call attention to the fact that the pending bill, which is a complete rewriting of the immigration laws, instead of curing inequities, unfortunately creates new ones. Let me cite an example. A man in my State came from Hungary at the age of 16. He was the only son of a prominent Hungarian family, and he settled in West Virginia. He went into business, became well known and prominent, was naturalized, and reared a family. Shortly before Hitler went on the rampage, the man to whom I refer was called back to Hungary, since he was the only son of the family, to settle the estate of his father, who had recently died, and who had owned considerable land in Hungary. He

was caught in Hungary by the Nazi invasion and was placed in an internment camp, together with his eldest son, who had accompanied his father as his legal adviser. He was kept there during the entire war. Then, when the Communists moved into Hungary, he was placed in another concentration camp, because the Communists did not like him.

Yet that man, although he believed in our form of government, lost his American citizenship by reason of being confined in an internment camp for more than 5 years and again became a subject of Hungary, which is now behind the iron curtain. There are many cases similar to the one I have just described, and I could cite many from my own State.

Mr. President, in the consideration of a bill aimed at a codification of the immigration laws provision should be made to take care of such cases as this. Of course, when the original law was drafted, no one ever thought that concentration camps would exist for five or more years. No one thought that the seas would not be safe for navigation for more than 5 or 6 years. The time has come to cure the manifest inequities which exist, and there are many of them. For instance, recently the United States Senate passed a bill to permit a specialist in watch manufacturing to become an immigrant and subject to naturalization, legislative action being necessary simply because there had been lodged against this man in Switzerland a charge designed to keep him from becoming an American citizen, and going to work in the watch-manufacturing industry. The industry wanted his services; they were necessary to improve American production; but Congress had to pass a special act to remove the obstacle. Instead of making people welcome in accordance with the inscription on the famous Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor, it seems that we are striving by this bill to make the situation worse. We place 21 more roadblocks in the way of people coming to this country. We should not cease looking at the woods because we want to see a tree or two.

We always consider that aliens coming to this country come here in order to become citizens. Actually many of them come as visitors or students, or for business reasons; yet they are faced with the same hardships and the same suspicions.

I know of one case, involving a girl from Greece whose brother is a prominent citizen of my State. She had not seen her brother for about 15 years. She wanted to visit him. She had no idea of remaining in this country, because her mother and brothers were in Greece, where they have a beautiful home, and she wanted to stay there. But she wanted to see her brother. She applied for a visitor's visa, but casually asked the question, "Is the Greek quota full?" On the basis of that one question her application was rejected, because it was suspected that she was trying to get in on a visitor's visa in order to become a permanent immigrant. Her word to the effect that she must take care of her mother and remain with the family was totally disregarded.

There are other cases of a similar nature, under the 5-year rule. A woman who was approaching 70, all of whose relatives were in the United States, she being an American citizen, lost her citizenship because of the fact that the war intervened while she and her husband were abroad. Now she cannot even obtain a visitor's visa, because it is suspected that she wants to come back here to stay, since her relatives are in this country and are citizens of the United States.

We must have in mind such cases in considering amendments to the pending legislation. Since the substitute could not be adopted, I hope Members of this body will take into consideration the many inequities which now exist. They should be cured before we throw more stumbling blocks in the road and build up further suspicion and greater ill feeling among peoples who might otherwise be our friends.

Under the terms of the bill which was enacted by Congress, any Spanish citizen who might have been compelled to join the Falangist group of Spain in order to live, was precluded from obtaining a visa to visit this country. That law automatically barred every Spaniard. Feeling against the United States was not too good in Spain. We in this country, and particularly we in the Senate who deal with foreign relations, should realize that we should not throw brickbats at our neighbors across the sea by the passage of laws calculated to antagonize them.

I do not want to invite subversive types of people to come into the United States. I want to keep them out. I do not want to exceed the quota which was fixed a long time ago. I want to see people come in who are healthy, good, and intelligent. At the same time, let us not throw artificial stumbling blocks in their way, so as to make their visit to America either impossible or so unpleasant as to make them give up hope.

SILVER JUBILEE YEAR OF THEODORE GRANIK'S AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the beginning of the silver jubilee year of Theodore Granik's American Forum of the Air, an occasion already noted by the well-known newspaper columnist, Walter Winchell, and others, brings to mind the tremendous strides made by this great public-service broadcast in the last 24 years.

Two Presidents of our Nation, the late Franklin D. Roosevelt and the present Chief Executive, Harry S. Truman, have been guest speakers during its span on the air, as well as Vice Presidents, Cabinet members, industrialists, sports figures, and other noted personalities. So it is not surprising that Walter Winchell should single out Mr. Granik's public-interest program recently and describe it in the Washington Post and in his far-flung syndication of many hundreds of newspapers as interesting, enlightening, and darn good.

It is not hard for me to agree heartily with Mr. Winchell's discerning comment on Mr. Granik's broadcast. Of course, nostalgia also prompts me to recall that I was among the first guests to appear on the program now known as American Forum of the Air more that 24 years ago. I have since watched its progress through the years and now can only add my words of appreciation to those of Walter Winchell.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. BENTON. I join the distinguished Senator from New York in the tribute he has just paid to Mr. Granik and his great program. I have an interest in programs of this kind, because over a period of almost 10 years I was responsible for the programing of the University of Chicago Round Table, a program of similar objectives, a public-service program aimed at the education and illumination of the public.

Mr. Granik has conducted one of the few consistently distinguished public service programs in the radio field. Furthermore, he has been extremely skillful in his ability to handle the networks and the commercial interests with which he has been surrounded in maintaining a good period of time and a consistently high quality of output. I am delighted that the Senator from New York takes this occasion to give him the public notice which I think is his due.

PRICE OF COPPER

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, at 5 o'clock today the OPS issued a press release. They plan to let copper wire and brass mills charge more for their products when made of imported copper and the Office of Defense Mobilization has announced that the Office of Price Stabilization would permit copper wire and brass mills to add to their ceiling prices 80 percent of the increase in cost of foreign copper above the 27½ cents a pound specified in the old Chilean agreement. Chile has been seeking a price of 33 or 34 cents a pound. Acting Director John R. Steelman, of the Office of Defense Mobilization, in issuing the announcement, barred any change in domestic-copper prices in these words:

> It is the policy of the United States Government not to make now and to avoid in the future changes in the existing price ceilings on domestically refined copper, brass mill scrap, or copper alloy scrap.

The Office of Defense Mobilization said that the only alternative to breaking the price line would be a Government-purchase program, with the Government absorbing the higher import price in making resales to American users.

I merely wish to say that while this is a move in the right direction, the Senator from Michigan has been urging for some time that the whole difficulty in connection with the shortage of copper and other commodities is the result of the International Materials Conference, an international cartel, which we entered, prohibiting our domestic producers and users from obtaining copper and other materials except as permitted under the international cartel.

Mr. President, the press release mentions only copper wire and brass mills. I trust the order will not be limited to copper wire and brass mills only, because it would exclude manufactured articles used domestically, such as household articles and many other products, including automobiles. Apparently no other relief would be provided. The Production Authority states that there is no alternative but a Government purchasing program. I do not agree. I wish they had read the terms of a bill which I introduced, S. 2873, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of Senate bill 2873 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "If the domestic production of any commodity is in excess of the amount necessary to meet allocations for defense, stockpiling, and military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress, then no restriction or other limitation shall be imposed under this title upon the right of any person to purchase such commodity in any foreign country and to import and use the same in the United States. No restriction or other limitation shall be imposed under this title if the domestic production of any commodity is sufficient to meet all civilian domestic requirements and the requirements for defense, stockpiling, and military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress."

SEC. 2. Section 402 of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) No rule, regulation, or order issued under this title shall apply to purchases by any person of any material outside of the United States or its Territories and possessions for importation into the United States for his own use or for fabrication by him into other products for resale."

Mr. FERGUSON. The bill provides:

If the domestic production of any commodity is in excess of the amount necessary to meet allocations for defense, stockpiling, and military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress, then no restriction or other limitation shall be imposed under this title upon the right of any person to purchase such commodity in any foreign country and to import and use the same in the United States.

The enactment of the bill would have corrected the situation this new order attempts to relieve. The enactment of my bill would permit purchase of commodities such as copper, and their use in many articles, and would eliminate the necessity for obtaining so-called CMP tickets for the purchase of certain commodities such as copper.

Mr. President, it is very significant that the press announcement should be made at 5 o'clock today. Earlier today it was given to the Committee on Banking and Currency, where my bill was being considered as a part of the revision of the Defense Production Act. I hope that the committee will not allow merely this partial relief, but that it will consider my bill and incorporate it in the new act. It is essential that they do so from the standpoint of not only the automobile manufacturers, but many other manufacturers who use copper, and many other commodities.

I should say that the cost of the copper used in the manufacture of some of these articles is insignificant when compared with the price of the whole article. If the various users of copper were permitted to go into the foreign market—and that is all that we are asking—to buy copper and bring it to this country, the manufacturers would get the relief they are entitled to. A partial relief is being provided. I hope it will not defeat my bill, for we must do away with the international cartel so that our present standard of living will not be reduced.

I make these remarks because the press release came out at this time, when my bill is being considered in the committee.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports were submitted:

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive P, Eighty-first Congress, second session, a consular convention between the United States of America and Ireland, signed at Dublin on May 1, 1950; without reservation (Ex. Rept. No. 8);

Executive N, Eighty-second Congress, second session, a protocol between the United States of America and Ireland, signed at Dublin on March 3, 1952, supplementary to the consular convention which was signed at Dublin on May 1, 1950; without reservation (Ex. Rept. No. 8); and

Executive O, Eighty-second Congress, first session, a consular convention and an accompanying protocol of signature between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, signed at Washington on June 6, 1951; without reservations (Ex. Rept. No. 8).

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 22, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, May 21 (legislative day of May 12), 1952:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior assistant scientists, effective date of acceptance:

Albert L. Burroughs — Richard H. Poote
Clifford O. Berg — Clarence A. Sooter

To be senior assistant sanitarian, effective date of acceptance:

William D. Sudia

Assistant surgeon to be senior assistant surgeon:

Harold M. Silver

Senior assistant sanitary engineers to be sanitary engineers:

Henry J. L. Rechen — Frederick S. Kent

IN THE AIR FORCE

Maj. Gen. Glenn Oscar Barcus, 87A, Regular Air Force, to be commanding general, Fifth Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general with date of rank from date of appointment, under the provisions of section 504, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named midshipman, United States Naval Academy, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 3, 1952, upon his graduation, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947). Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Mitchell Daniel Charneski

IN THE NAVY

Admiral Robert B. Carney, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of an admiral while serving as commander in chief, Allied Forces, southern Europe.

Vice Adm. Jerauld Wright, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander in chief, United States Naval Forces, Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 21 (legislative day of May 12), 1952:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

To be Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

William Sanders

To be Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Windsor G. Hackler
Charles K. Moffly
Donald E. Webster

To be Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Miss Bernice M. Strawn

To be Foreign Service officer of class 5, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Arthur P. Allen

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Una B. Duren, Quinton.

ALASKA

Dorothy Z. Sadlier, Pelican.

ARIZONA

Marie L. Porter, Apache Junction.

ARKANSAS

Nellie J. Murphy, Calion.
James A. Morris, Fordyce.
Garland McGrew, Moutain Pine.

CALIFORNIA

Trusten P. Jennings, Chatsworth.
Edward E. Briggs, Los Gatos.
David W. Cromwell, Yorba Linda.

COLORADO

Vincent J. Federico, Aguilar.
James D. White, Boulder.
Daniel J. Thyne, Cheyenne Wells.
Dallas D. Hopkins, Fleming.
Harold D. Haskins, Georgetown.
Richard A. Clifton, Mount Harris.
Glen E. McCall, Norwood.
Richard I. DeVore, Pagosa Springs.
Audrey M. Ashworth, Strasburg.
Delbert P. Hankins, Jr., Walden.
James J. Tesitor, Walsenburg.

CONNECTICUT

John L. Sullivan, Ridgefield.

FLORIDA

Leona M. French, Flagler Beach.
Hugh C. MacGibbon, Punta Gorda.
Margaret H. Reintjes, Rattlesnake.

GEORGIA

Thomas Randall Bryan, Jr., Brooklet.
Alfred I. Young, Columbus.
Robert L. Lord, Toomsboro.

IDAHO

John W. Hickman, Genesee.
Clark G. Wylie, Melba.
Ethel M. Snyder, Weippe.

ILLINOIS

John E. Duhigg, Davis Junction.
John V. Barnes, Patoka.
Seth W. Lane, Piper City.
Emmett J. Stromberg, Westmont.

INDIANA

Paul R. Cole, Cortland.
James C. Dunn, Fairmount.
Archie E. Lighty, Jr., Hillsboro.
Marion A. Sendmeyer, Poland.
Robert L. Lemon, Reynolds.
Charles E. Fay, Waynetown.
Gilbert G. Souder, Woodburn.

IOWA

Wilfrid T. McDermott, Cascade.
James A. Erpelding, Dike.
Leonard W. Brock, Grinnell.
John V. Conway, Le Mars.
Paul M. Flynn, Ute.
Mary A. Slattery, Waterville.

KANSAS

Wilbur E. Sherbondy, Alton.
Jack E. Hardesty, Ashland.
Vida K. Wise, Conway Springs.
John J. Lawson, Tribune.
John H. Edds, Whiting.

KENTUCKY

Perry R. Brown, Mayfield.

LOUISIANA

Frank Cazanove, Hammond.
Frank E. Foreman, Iowa.
William B. Nash, Lake Charles.
Irvin J. Dufour, Moreauville.
Roy J. Belanger, Morgan City.

MAINE

Ashton M. Mabee, Eastport.
Ruth E. Houghton, North Anson.
Fred C. Stafford, Pittsfield.

MICHIGAN

Nelson F. Kramer, Akron.
Charles Keck, Jr., Ashley.
James J. Wilder, Clawson.
Stanley R. Schliewe, Fruitport.
Roland F. Stoffer, Gregory.
Lloyd G. Smith, Linden.
Arthur G. Rochon, Marine City.
Harry B. Whitson, Traverse City.

MINNESOTA

Martin H. Lindeman, Brownton.
Robert P. Heesen, Osseo.

MISSOURI

James E. O'Connell, Barnard.
Ida K. Look, Kidder.
Albert W. Jeffries, Odessa.
Maurice F. Hogan, Sedalia.

MISSISSIPPI

Marie E. West, Carriere.
Richard T. Prince, Mize.

NEBRASKA

Gerald E. Beltz, Brunswick.
Mildred J. Rounds, Cairo.
Melvin F. Jacoby, Spencer.
Daisy G. Holliday, Stuart.

NEW JERSEY

Sadie M. Chester, Adelphia.
Frances B. Engelsen, Barnegat Light.
Emanuel E. McBride, Berlin.
George J. Holbig, Blawenburg.
Margaret H. Ardin, Chester.
Warren K. Lehr, Columbia.
William Frank Carling, Gibbsboro.
Edward J. Wojcik, Great Meadows.
Harold J. Sadlock, Paramus.
John V. R. Nichol, Pompton Lakes.
Wilmer Johnson, Jr., Seaside Park.
Myrtle J. Stretch, Somers Point.

NEW YORK

Bruce M. Austin, Attica.
Margaret A. Kneuer, Industry.
Jack J. Powers, Montgomery.
Rita H. Wells, Schaghticoke.

NORTH CAROLINA

James B. Darden, Clinton.
John K. Reeves, Hot Springs.
Robert T. Simmons, Roseboro.
Fred J. Baars, Warsaw.

OHIO

Walter E. Boyle, Brecksville.
Joseph H. Frecker, Crooksville.
Cora E. Hesselbart, Lindsey.
Robert E. Lucas, Wauseon.

OKLAHOMA

Florence O. Scott, Delaware.
Vera C. Dittelmier, Mulhall.
Pauline Wallace, Wayne.

OREGON

Eugene D. Wilmoth, Cove.
Roy Bugh, Wecoma Beach.

PENNSYLVANIA

Paul F. Petrillo, Birdsboro.
William P. Kelly, Jr., Clarks Summit.
Henry C. Johnston, Smithton.
Anthony N. Ricchezza, Upper Darby.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Edgar G. DesChamps, Jr., Bishopville.
William K. Williams, Honea Path.
Thomas J. King, Johns Island.

TENNESSEE

Paul T. Meadows, Henderson.
Burleigh L. Day, Pressmen's Home.

TEXAS

Billy B. Vest, Alpine.
James B. Thorn, Jr., Alto.
Iris H. Davis, Clarkwood.
Pat R. Warren, Coleman.
William E. Simpson, Graham.
Andrew T. Davenport, Howe.
Billy O. Jones, Kosse.
Randell L. Barberee, Maud.
Jesse L. Gandy, Meridian.
Ora C. Littleton, Moore.
Mildred L. M. Smith, Round Top.
Glenn S. Feemster, Vera.
Cloy L. Allen, Wingate.

UTAH

Mack C. Crandall, St. George.

VERMONT

James H. McKinnon, Brattleboro.
Irene M. Barrett, Milton.

VIRGINIA

Elmer L. Johnson, Charlottesville.
Margie L. Nicewander, Harman.
Aubrey J. Short, Hurt.
Charles E. Ivey, Jarratt.
John R. Diedrich, Leesburg.
Frank G. Farrier, Newport.
William O. Brittingham, Onley.

WEST VIRGINIA

Ulric W. Grimes, East Rainelle.
Marguerite V. Duncan, Eleanor.
Gladys L. St. Clair, Elkhorn.
William B. Hammond, Kearneysville.
Ralph M. Johnson, Millville.

WISCONSIN

Harry Gelb, White Lake.

WYOMING

Steve A. Grobon, Rock Springs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou merciful and omnipotent God, whose loving kindness and beneficent purposes are always directed toward our welfare and happiness, we pray that we may be more eager to accept and respond to Thy gracious overtures.

We penitently and humbly confess that in these days of misgiving and surrounding darkness our self-willed and rebellious hearts are being softened and made suppliant for we are becoming increasingly aware of our weakness and helplessness and our desperate need of Thee.

We beseech Thee that the time may speedily come when men and nations everywhere shall allow their minds to be guided by the counsels of Thy holy word and all mankind shall seek to incarnate the ideals of our blessed Lord.

Inspire us to give ourselves earnestly and resolutely to the great task of establishing Thy kingdom of righteousness and peace upon this earth.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced

that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1517. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1897, entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for other purposes," as amended, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to sell without advertisement national forest timber in amounts not exceeding $2,000 in appraised value.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AT WEST POINT

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend at this point in the RECORD the address of the President of the United States delivered at West Point on May 20.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point a speech made by the President of the United States on the occasion of the sesquicentennial convocation at the United States Military Academy in West Point, Tuesday, May 20, 1952, as appearing in the New York Times on Wednesday, May 21, 1952:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S ADDRESS AT WEST POINT'S CONVOCATION

Following is the text of President Truman's address yesterday at the sesquicentennial convocation at the United States Military Academy in West Point as recorded by the New York Times:

"General Irving, General Bradley, Dr. Compton, honorable Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and distinguished guests, I want to make a statement, just two short statements, before I start my regular talk. I had a luncheon at noon with nine cadets and I want to say to them—and I am saying it very publicly—that I haven't had a more pleasant luncheon in many a day. I appreciated it very much.

"I have another statement to make. You know the President has several positions in which he works. He's President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States; he's the social head of the state and he's head of the party; and I'm going to work in two of those capacities right this minute.

"As President of the United States under the Constitution, the President has power to pardon anybody for anything but impeachment. Of course he couldn't pardon himself. So exercising my authority as President of the United States under the Constitution, I direct the Commandant of West Point to relieve all this special punishment that's going on on the post today. And as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States I direct General Irving to carry out that order."

A STORY ABOUT BARKLEY

"Now you know I'm in sort of a position Senator BARKLEY found himself in one time, and I want this to be distinctly understood that I enjoyed immensely the two speeches that were made before me. They were wonderful. I hope I can make half the contribution that either one of those wonderful men made.

"But Senator BARKLEY was the last on the program and Senator BARKLEY likes to speak. And he took his watch out and put it on the stand and he spoke for about an hour and he looked at his watch, then picked it up and put it to his ear and shook it. And some old gentleman out in the audience said:

" 'Senator, if it's stopped there's a calendar behind you.'

"But you're not going to need a calendar because this is not that long and I hope that it won't be as boresome as you may anticipate it will be.

"But, it is a real pleasure for me to be here today, and to join in celebrating the establishment of the United States Military Academy at West Point 150 years ago.

"This academy was started during Thomas Jefferson's first term as President. The United States at that time was relatively small and weak, and surrounded by dangers. We had just fought a limited and undeclared war with France to protect the freedom of our commerce and shipping. We were engaged in fighting another limited and undeclared war with the Barbary pirates for the same purpose."

CONTINUING PROBLEM SEEN

"Jefferson, like Washington and Hamilton and other leaders of our young Republic, knew very well that a strong military establishment was vital to the preservation of American liberty. And these patriot leaders knew also that you cannot have effective military forces unless you have well trained, well prepared officers.

"They all knew how Washington had to struggle and experiment all through the Revolution to find officers who could take troops into battle and lead them to victory. That was why they wanted a military academy, as an essential part of a strong, permanent, national defense organization.

"But there was a great deal of opposition to starting a military academy in this country. It took 20 years of argument and persuasion after the Revolution was over before the academy could be started. And it was finally started largely because Jefferson took the position that if the Congress didn't authorize a military academy, he'd start one himself.

"The argument over establishing a military academy was part and parcel of the argument over whether the United States should have strong national defenses. That argument has continued, of course, right down to the present day, and much of the debate after the Revolution is very modern. They are making those same old arguments today just as they made about the Military Academy when Jefferson was trying to start it.

"There were a lot of people in this country in 1800 who were afraid that setting up a military academy and an Army and Navy would make us belligerent and warlike. You can hear echoes of that point of view today in the debate over universal military training.

"There were a lot of other people in 1800 who said that a strong national defense would cost too much, and you could not have a formula for achieving security without having to pay for it. That point of view is not only echoed today—it's loudly shouted in the newspapers and the Halls of Congress."

PREPAREDNESS IS URGED

"Fortunately, these arguments did not prevail against the hard-headed common sense of men like Jefferson. The military academy was set up; and this country has had occasion to be thankful many times since then that our early leaders had so much foresight.

"The Military Academy has repaid this country many times over for every cent it has cost. We have learned from experience that, while it may be expensive to maintain a strong national defense, it is much more expensive not to have one. Time and again we have allowed our Armed Forces to dwindle to a fraction of what they should have been, and then we have had to pay enormously—in money and in lives—because of our lack of preparedness.

"There are people right now who want us to relax and cut down on our defense program. They are just as wrong as they can be. We must pay the cost of preventing a world war—or we will surely have to pay the immensely greater cost of fighting one.

"The other fear of the early opponents of the Military Academy has also proved groundless. Our country has never become warlike or aggressive.

"That is partly because our Constitution nailed down so firmly the principle of civilian control over the military. The most important means by which this was done was by providing in the Constitution that the President, who is the civilian head of the Government elected by the people, shall be Commander in Chief of all the military forces. Many Presidents, including the present one, have demonstrated that those words in the Constitution mean just what they say.

"But, in addition to this, the spirit of our people has never been warlike. Our people came to this country to find peace and freedom. That's what we have always wanted. That's what we want now, and that is what our national policy is designed to preserve."

PEACEFUL BUT NOT PASSIVE

"But there is a vast difference between being peaceful and being passive. We want to achieve peace. But we know we can't have it unless we are willing to stand up for our rights.

"We know we can't have lasting peace unless we work actively and vigorously to bring about conditions of freedom and justice in the world. That is what we are trying to do. And we are having to do it in the face of a concerted campaign of threats and sabotage and outright aggression directed by the Soviet Union.

"The policies of the Soviet Union are exactly the opposite of our own. We want to establish equality and justice and the rule of law among all nations. They want to establish domination and dictatorship and the rule of force over all countries. This makes our situation—the situation of all free nations—difficult and dangerous in the extreme. But I am firmly convinced that it does not necessarily mean a third world war.

"The free countries can, by proper and adequate defense measures, make clear to the Kremlin that aggression would be doomed to failure.

"And the free nations can, by economic and political means, build up their strength so as to be safe from Communist infiltration and subversion.

"But strong and active as we may be, we cannot avoid the risks and sacrifices. They are inherent in the situation and we cannot wish them out of existence. The course of events is not completely in our control."

COURSE IN KOREA CITED

"In Korea we had no choice but to meet armed aggression with military force. If we had not met aggression head-on, the United Nations Charter would have been reduced to a scrap of paper. If Communist aggression had been allowed to succeed in Korea, the Communist conquest of all Asia would have been simply a matter of time. If the United Nations had failed, and Asia had fallen, we would have been well on the way to a disintegration of freedom in the whole world.

"But that did not happen. The valor and sacrifices of United States fighting men—together with the forces of the Republic of Korea and the contingents from 16 other countries—has beaten the aggressors back within their own territory. Our Army, led in large part by men trained here at West Point, has done a superb job.

"From the time our men were first sent into action, in the gallant rear-guard defense down to the Pusan perimeter—from then right on up to the present, the United States Army in Korea has been magnificent.

"And the men who have fought with them, in the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine

Corps, and from the armed forces of the other free countries, have been just as brave and just as effective.

"Last June, 11 months ago, the badly battered Communists offered to confer about a military armistice in Korea. We were willing to conclude such an armistice, and we still are. We don't want any more fighting than is necessary. But we were not interested, and we are not interested now, in any armistice that involves selling out the principles for which we are fighting.

"Patiently and skillfully, General Ridgway and his negotiating team, headed by Admiral Joy, have worked to bring about an effective armistice. They have done a masterful job in the face of great provocation. They have met threats, and abuse, and outright lies, all with great self-control and an unyielding insistence on the essentials of a just and honorable armistice."

ARMISTICE POINTS LISTED

"Gradually, the Communists have come to realize that we will not sacrifice our principles to obtain an armistice. We do not know whether they will finally agree on an honest and workable armistice. So far, they have agreed to some of the points that must be covered.

"They have agreed that the armistice line across Korea should be a defensible military line determined by the location of the opposing forces. They have agreed that no reinforcements shall be brought into Korea by either side during the armistice. They have agreed that an inspection commission shall observe the carrying out of the armistice terms—and are apparently willing to withdraw the request that the Soviet Union should be one of the neutral inspecting nations.

"Up to now, however, the Communists have not agreed on a fair and proper exchange of prisoners of war. The Communists have continued to insist that all the prisoners we have taken must be handed over to them—regardless of whether or not they are willing to be sent back behind the iron curtain, and regardless of what their fate would be if they were sent back.

"It is perfectly clear that thousands and thousands of the prisoners we hold would violently resist being returned to the Communists because they fear the slavery or death which would await them. It would be a betrayal of the ideals of freedom and justice for which we are fighting if we forced these men at bayonet point to return to their ex-masters. We won't do it. We won't buy an armistice by trafficking in human slavery.

"We do not know whether the Communists will accept that position. We may not know for some time yet. Negotiations are continuing under General Clark's direction. We shall remain ready to reach honorable settlements by peaceful gains. But we must also be alert and ready to meet treachery or a renewal of aggression if that should come."

THE RED BUILD-UP

"During these months of armistice negotiations in Korea, the Communists have increased their military strength. They have more men there than they had a year ago, and many more tanks and planes.

"But we have consolidated and increased our strength in Korea also. The morale of our men is high, and our units are well trained, well equipped, and at a peak of combat efficiency. The troops of the Republic of Korea are far better trained and equipped than they were a year ago, and are capable of carrying a much larger share of the defense of their country.

"The situation in Korea is still difficult and uncertain. Everybody should understand that. But everyone should also understand that the sacrifices of the United Nations in Korea have brought tremendous gains toward a world of law and order.

"The plain fact is that the Communists have utterly failed in their objectives in Korea.

"The Communist aggression failed to shatter the United Nations. Instead, the Communist attack has made the United Nations stronger and more vigorous and has demonstrated that it can and will act to defend freedom in the world.

"The Communists failed to win a cheap and easy victory in Korea. Instead, they have suffered more than a million casualties, and have used up enormous amounts of war material—and they are back behind the line where they started.

"The Communists failed to establish tyranny over the Republic of Korea. Instead, the Communist aggression has brought devastation to North Korea—a terrible warning to the other satellites in the Soviet empire of the cost of aggression."

WORLD EFFECTS RECITED

"Furthermore, the Communists failed to break the will of free men in other countries. The attack on Korea was supposed to warn other countries that they must yield to the demands of the Kremlin—or else.

"The Communist aggression did show the world that the Kremlin was ready and willing to try to extend its power by military conquest. But the effect of this was not to send the free countries into a panic of fear. Instead, they immediately stepped up their plans for building military forces, and began to get together on concrete and definite defense arrangements.

"As a result of the resistance to Communist aggression in Korea, the Kremlin knows that free men will stand up and fight against aggression. As a result of the resistance to Communist aggression in Korea, free men around the world know that if they stand up for what is right, they will not be deserted by the United Nations. And, as a result of the resistance to Communist aggression in Korea, the free countries are infinitely better prepared to defend themselves than they were 2 years ago.

"Our own defense production has risen very sharply. Our production of military supplies and equipment is more than three times what it was a year ago. For example, in January 1952, six times the dollar value of ammunition was delivered as was delivered in January 1951. In electronics and communication equipment, five times as much was delivered.

"The production of one of our most important fighter planes was four times as much this spring as it was last. We now have several thousand tanks of a new model which is very much better than the previous models. Our Navy has taken hundreds of ships out of mothballs and has a sound shipbuilding program under way."

ATOMIC THREAT MADE

"An atomic artillery piece has been developed and tested and will have to be reckoned with in the future. The Navy is working on its first atomic-powered submarine. Our over-all atomic production program is in excellent shape.

"In all the vast and complicated field of combat vehicles and military weapons, the research and preparation of the last several years are paying off. The goods are being delivered to the hands of men who are ready to use them in defense of freedom—both in our own forces and among the many trusted friends that we have all over the world.

"The improvement in defense production is not the only indication of an improved situation in the world.

"In the Far East, Japan has rejoined the family of free and democratic nations. The Communist insurrection in the Philippines has been brought under control. In Indochina the forces of France and the associated states have succeeded in holding the Communists in check. The people of Indochina are making progress in the creation of national armies to defend their own independence. Countries like India and Pakistan and Indonesia are making real headway in creating the conditions of economic growth that must underlie solid and stable progress.

"In Europe great steps toward unity are being taken. The Schuman plan and the plans for the European Defense Community are moving forward. We are working to reach final agreement on a new relationship with the Federal Republic of Germany. This will make it possible for Germany to take her place alongside the other independent countries of Europe as a full and equal member of the community of nations.

"These are very remarkable developments. Countries like France, Germany, and Italy, Belgium, Holland, and Luxemburg, with centuries of rivalry between them, are now starting to work together. They are developing common economic and political institutions; they are merging their military forces into one great defensive system.

"No wonder the Soviets are trying to block this advance. No wonder the current Communist propaganda line is trying to persuade the countries of Western Europe that they should stay separate and weak, instead of joining together for strength. The Kremlin knows as well as anyone else that in union there is strength—and that a united Europe can frustrate the Kremlin's dearest wish of absorbing the European countries one by one into the Soviet empire.

"I don't think the people of Europe are going to be fooled by this Soviet propaganda. I believe the firm and concrete steps the Europeans have already taken over the opposition of the Kremlin, are clear indications that they are not going to be stopped. I think the Europeans are going to continue to move toward closer union—for they know that is the way of strength and progress for them and for the whole free world."

PLEDGES NO RELAXATION

"I have been speaking of the progress that is being made. But I don't want anyone to get the impression that there is any basis for relaxing or letting up. These signs of progress are not evidence that the battle for freedom is won—only that we are on the way to winning it. If we halt or falter now, we could ruin the whole structure of peace and freedom we have been so painfully building.

"I have warned the Congress on several occasions that the financial support I have requested for our defense effort and for the mutual security program is absolutely necessary. Any cuts in those items would have extremely serious effects. No one enjoys bearing the heavy costs of national security in these dangerous times, but we should never forget how much smaller they are than the costs of another war.

"No one should assume that the possibility of world war has become remote. The forces of the Soviet Empire are large, well trained, and equipped with modern weapons. The Kremlin's desire to dominate the world is obviously unchanged.

"But I believe we are well on the way to preserving our freedom without paying the frightful cost of world war. We are on the right track. And we must go ahead.

"If we are to succeed, we must have steady nerves and stout hearts. There is no easy way out, no quick solution. But we have with us the overwhelming support of the free countries and the powerful moral forces of liberty and justice. We are using the strength God has given us in this great and wonderful Nation to win the struggle for peace and freedom throughout the world.

"You young men here at West Point are called on to play a great part in the tremendous effort we are making. You are

being trained for a career which, in these times especially, means service for the great good for your Nation and the welfare of all mankind. Your opportunities are great because the task ahead of you is great.

"We need—all of us—to draw on the wonderful tradition of resolution and courage which has been cherished for 150 years in the life of the cadets here at West Point."

CHEESE POLICY

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1951, restricting imports of cheese, seems to me to be the perfect illustration of taking away with the one hand what we have given with the other. This country has tried to help Western Europe to become self-supporting. It has urged Western Europe to increase its exports so that it will be able to earn the dollars it needs for its existence. We have invested a great deal of money and a great deal of effort in this venture.

But as soon as Western Europe responds to these efforts, as soon as it develops the industries and the exports it needs to sustain itself, we systematically develop new trade barriers to make sure that these products will not be sold and that the dollars Western Europe needs will not be earned.

Section 104 makes no sense in terms of our major foreign-policy objectives.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McINTIRE asked and was given permission to address the House for 45 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, on the subject of the potato situation.

REORGANIZED INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE IN ILLINOIS

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, I am holding in my hand an invitation that recently arrived in my office. It reads:

The Secretary of the Treasury requests the pleasure of the company of Hon. EDWARD H. JENISON at installation ceremonies for officials of the reorganized internal-revenue service in Illinois, Tuesday, May 20, 1952, United States courthouse, Chicago, Ill., 10:30 a. m.

Like every other Congressman, I receive some invitations to affairs of one kind or another, but this is one of the fanciest in a long time. I run a small daily newspaper out in Paris, Ill., and I know something about printing, but I must concede this is the kind of job we just do not see frequently out in my part of the country.

I took this invitation to a commercial printing firm here in Washington, and they told me it is indeed a very plush job. The first thing that meets the eye is this large gold seal embossed on the upper part of the card. Then there are seven lines of handsome engraving. The card itself is of heavy stock in a vellum finish, and the envelope is made of high-grade 28-pound paper.

I am informed the cost of producing these invitations is at least 30 cents each. In addition, there is the cost of addressing them by hand and of delivering them by messenger.

I want to remind you that the ceremonies referred to in the invitation mark the start of the so-called reorganized internal-revenue service in Illinois. If this invitation is any indication—and it may be—of how this supposedly new internal-revenue service is going to operate, then it appears the Treasury is going on the gold standard, at least in the spending for its social affairs. I do hope, though, that the Treasury will give some thought to economizing before all the gold in Fort Knox and the taxpayers' patience are exhausted.

RESIGNATION FROM MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a commission:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1952.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith submit my resignation as a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, effective at once.

Respectfully submitted.

WALTER E. BREHM,
Eleventh, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 16, section 715a, United States Code, the Chair appoints as a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission to fill the existing vacancy thereon the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN.

JOINT MEETING OF CONGRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on tomorrow, May 22, 1952, for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 80]

Aandahl	Granger	O'Toole
Albert	Green	Patterson
Armstrong	Harden	Phillips
Bailey	Havenner	Potter
Beckworth	Hays, Ohio	Poulson
Boykin	Herlong	Powell
Bramblett	Hoeven	Sabath
Brownson	Hoffman, Ill.	St. George
Buffett	Holifield	Scudder
Burton	Hunter	Secrest
Camp	Irving	Shelley
Canfield	Jackson, Calif.	Sheppard
Carlyle	Jarman	Sieminski
Celler	Javits	Steed
Chatham	Johnson	Stockman
Chudoff	Kennedy	Tackett
Cooley	Kerr	Taylor
Corbett	King, Calif.	Teague
Coudert	King, Pa.	Van Pelt
Cunningham	McConnell	Vinson
Dawson	McGrath	Welch
Deane	McKinnon	Werdel
D'Ewart	Mansfield	Wheeler
Dingell	Miller, Calif.	Wickersham
Doyle	Mitchell	Williams, Miss.
Durham	Morris	Wilson, Ind.
Engle	Moulder	
Gavin	Multer	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 344 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have permission to sit during the session of the House today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works be permitted to sit this afternoon during the session of the House during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

INAUGURATION OF THE PRESIDENT-ELECT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 69, Eighty-second Congress, the Chair

appoints as members of the joint committee to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States on the 20th day of January 1953, the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. RAYBURN, Mr. MCCORMACK, and Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7005) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7005, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] is entitled to recognition for 3 hours, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is entitled to recognition for 3 hours.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in these difficult and dangerous times when all our problems seem to be infinitely complex it is worth while to try to cut through these complexities and get down to simple fundamentals whenever we can. I, therefore, ask the Members of the House to consider with me some very simple, almost elementary, questions which we cannot and must not ignore as we determine how we shall act on this important legislation.

The first question we must ask ourselves is this: Is our security—our national survival—our way of life—and all the things we hold dear threatened today? I doubt that there is a single Member of the House who would not answer this question with a positive "yes."

The next question, equally simple and fundamental, is this: Do we meet this threat, or do we stand by supinely waiting for the blow to fall upon us? Obviously, no red-blooded American can hesitate for a moment in giving his answer to this question. It is not in our tradition to turn tail and run when we are threatened. It is needless to point out to you that the actions of the Congress itself since 1948 in appropriating to our own defense establishment the staggering sum of $136,363,000,000 prove beyond any question that we have recognized the mortal threat to our national security and decided to meet it head on.

The third question is: Do we realize that this fight for freedom, if successful, must be waged on all the fronts of the world, and that we need armed friends by our side? The answer by the Congress has been unmistakably "yes." How otherwise do you interpret the passage of the Marshall plan in 1948 by a Republican Congress, and the subsequent overwhelming bipartisan support for many billions of dollars in annual appropriations for building up the strength of our allies? If what I am saying is not true, why did we plan and carry through the North Atlantic Treaty, band together with the nations of Western Europe, pledge ourselves to regard an attack on any one of them as an attack on ourselves, and vote more billions each year to help them build up their military strength to resist aggression? Why did the Senate approve the North Atlantic Treaty with only a handful of dissenting votes? Why are we sacrificing the precious lives of our boys in Korea and spending billions of dollars fighting Soviet aggression over there if there is no threat? There has been and there is a mortal threat and we have recognized it and decided, true to our traditions, to meet it here and abroad and not bow down before it. Through this fiscal year, including past appropriations for the Marshall plan, China aid, and the Mutual Defense Assistance Program, we have made available for the purpose of promoting our defense through strengthening our allies a total of $26,000,000,000. If there has been no danger, why have we done all this? If that danger still persists, the only question is: Are we going to quit now? I have no doubt as to the answer of the Congress and the American people.

With these fundamentals agreed on, the decision before us can be stated simply and clearly. That decision is what is the best way to continue to meet the threat adequately and at the least cost in American men and money.

There may be some here still who honestly feel that we should retire within the boundaries of the United States and build up a fortress here instead of using the resources and manpower of other like-minded people in the world who are ready and eager to join us in the struggle for peace and freedom. That is pure defeatism, for without allies we could not have any real security. In addition, if we could have security that way, it would cost a lot more. If all the resources and manpower of the rest of the world were organized against us, we would be forced to read the handwriting on the wall. Without the essential raw materials which we must have from other areas of the world, it would be impossible, with any amount of money, for us to build an adequate defense.

In this era of advanced technology, no single area of the world can hope to be self-sufficient in producing defensive equipment, or even many of the essential components of our civilian economy.

Electronic equipment, jet engines, radar, as well as the older and more conventional types of military items, together with a vast range of items for civilian consumption, require materials which we must obtain from many different parts of the world.

A thought-provoking report by General Collins, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, shows that each new medium tank requires 1,915 pounds of chromium, of which 99 percent is imported; 950 pounds of manganese, of which 92 percent is imported; 520 pounds of nickel, of which 92 percent is imported; 100 pounds of tin, of which 78 percent is imported; 6,512 pounds of bauxite, of which 65 percent is imported; 1,484 pounds of copper, of which 29 percent is imported.

Actually, the degree of our dependency on outside sources for essential materials is even more serious than indicated by General Collins' report. The General based his figures on utilization of scrap materials, presently available here, but which originally had to be imported and still must be.

For example, we must import 99 percent instead of 92 percent of the nickel to make a tank, 42 percent instead of 29 percent of copper, and 100 percent of the tin instead of 78 percent. We produce absolutely no tin in the United States. We are completely dependent for our supply of this most essential metal upon sources in Malaya and Africa, with a part of our requirements available in South America.

I think most of our thinking people fully realize the gravity of our situation. They know that we must meet this threat now, at home and abroad. It is not just a coincidence that, so far, every candidate for the Presidency this year has endorsed the principle of foreign aid and mutual security. Even Mr. TAFT has said that the Mutual Security Program must not be killed and abandoned. Even when he says he wants to cut it substantially below the figure proposed by the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House, he quickly explains that he is sure it will not ruin the program. He would not propose it, he says, if he thought it would ruin the program.

Let's see where we stand then on these basic questions I have asked.

We all agree that there is a threat and a continuing threat to our national survival.

We all agree that we are going to meet this threat.

We agree, at least the overwhelming majority of us, that we are going to meet it with a "Mutual Security Program" and not with a "fortress America program."

The question we should concentrate on, therefore, is what kind of a Mutual Security Program we want. Let us not waste time talking about whether we want one or not.

I think we can all agree also that it would be useless and a waste of money to have an inadequate program.

I think we can also agree on the fact that we want our program to cost as little as possible, both in men and money, and still remain adequate.

The Foreign Affairs Committee has spent about 2 months of intensive work on trying to determine what will be an adequate mutual security program and how best to achieve the maximum results with the least cost. The committee, after this careful examination, determined that the greatest amount that could safely be cut from the administration request was about $1,000,000,000. I know there are Members of this House who propose to cut much more deeply than this. I say to you that I would not wish to take the responsibility of going beyond this figure because that responsibility involves the national survival of our country.

With all my deep concern for the financial position of this country and realizing as I do that if the United States is bankrupted the cause of freedom in the world will be lost, I know that the cause of economy never has had and never will have a greater appeal to the citizens of this country than the cause of national defense and national survival.

I say to you flatly that the man in this House who votes to cut deeply the amount brought before you by the Foreign Affairs Committee, whatever may be his reasons or his motives, is voting to leave a gap in our security defense line.

He may be voting to throw away the one best chance of avoiding World War III, because only as we are collectively strong can we be confident that Soviet imperialism will not attack us.

He is voting to weaken, and possibly to destroy, the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance.

He is voting to take the risk of turning over to Russia the second-largest workshop of the world. This workshop next year will raise and support about 4,000,000 soldiers and produce $3,500,000,000 worth of weapons.

He is voting to increase the cost of our own defense manyfold because if Western Europe were lost, we would need a huge increase in our own Army, Navy, and Air Force to have any chance of meeting Russia on equal terms if trouble should start. He is, therefore, not really voting for economy but, unless he is satisfied to leave us much more defenseless, he is voting for greatly increased expenditures.

He is voting to place more of our young men than necessary in the front line of defense against the threatened aggression of Russia because he is voting to take out of that front line the strong and stanch allies who would fight with us in case of trouble.

He is voting to take the risk that, if World War III comes, the fighting would take place right in our own country instead of many thousands of miles away.

I have enough confidence in the common sense of the American people to know that they will not approve action by this House which will have the effect of breaking down our defenses at home or abroad.

First, let us see what progress has been made by our associates in the military field. Let us cast our minds back to the situation in 1948, when the Marshall plan was launched, or even as recently as mid-1950 when the Communists attacked in Korea. You will remember that then there was literally almost nothing to stop the Red armies if they had marched across Europe. Even our atomic power, the one great military resource of the free world, was hampered by lack of bases. Since that time new divisions have been raised, trained, and equipped, and have taken up positions alongside our own in threatened areas of Europe. Conscription periods in Europe have been lengthened, military budgets more than doubled, military production increased. As a result there is now a substantial force in being. As General Gruenther said, in contrast with a year ago, "we are now dealing with actual forces and not planned forces alone." In addition, our strategic air power, which remains so important an element in the military balance, has acquired a much more satisfactory system of bases through the help and cooperation of the allies whose military strength we are helping to build through this program. Where once there were only scattered, ineffectual national forces, there is now integrated command. It seems to me that only the most stubborn defeatist could fail to be immensely encouraged by the increase and improvement in allied military strength over two short years.

Active forces which stood at 1,407,000 in January 1950 reached the figure of 1,880,000 in January 1952. The figures for January 1953 are classified for obvious reasons, but I can say they represent a very substantial increase over this year's active forces. I should emphasize also that these figures are for active forces. Additional reserves readily mobilizable have also increased greatly over the past 2 years. The amount of increase in this category is also classified. The period of compulsory military service has been increased on the average by 6 months. Defense budgets have been raised from about 6 billion in 1950 to approximately 11½ billion in 1952 and an estimated 14 billion in 1953.

Before going into the details of the bill before you, may I call to your attention some good work done by the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Congress last year.

The Congress wrote into the Mutual Security Act of 1951 provision for bringing the defense program under the unified direction and supervision of a single person in the Executive Office of the President. The Director for Mutual Security was given two jobs: First, to coordinate and supervise the work of the Departments of State and Defense and the Mutual Security Agency on the Mutual Security Program; and, second, to head one of those agencies—the Mutual Security Agency.

Mr. Averell Harriman was appointed Director for Mutual Security. Mr. Theodore Tannenwald, Jr., Assistant Director and Chief of Staff, is Mr. Harriman's principal assistant in the job of directing and supervising the Mutual Security Program as a whole, and acts for him when he is absent. Mr. John W. Kenney serves as Deputy Director for Mutual Security and is in active charge, under Mr. Harriman of the Mutual Security Agency.

Three principal people work with Mr. Harriman and Mr. Tannenwald in the over-all coordinating job, Mr. Lincoln Gordon, Mr. John H. Ohly and Mr. Richard N. Johnson, Mr. Tannenwald and the Director's coordinating staff have no more and no less to do with the Mutual Security Agency than they do with the Department of State and the Department of Defense. Their job is to help the Director be sure that the assistance programs are developed and carried out so as to be mutually supporting, consistent both with each other and with national objectives.

Actual operations are decentralized, with the Director supervising and directing the over-all program. Actual operations of the military assistance program are carried out by the Department of Defense, where the military end items are bought and shipped. Likewise, the point 4 program of the Technical Cooperation Administration is developed and carried out in the State Department.

Mr. C. Tyler Wood is the Associate Deputy Director. Before Mr. Kenney's appointment he was in interim charge of MSA and is now on special duty, coordinating and presenting the programs to the Congress.

Ambassador William H. Draper, Jr., has been appointed special representative in Europe and is responsible for the program in Europe. He is also the United States permanent representative on the North Atlantic Treaty Council. In these two jobs he represents Secretary Acheson, Secretary Lovett, and Mr. Harriman on Mutual Security Program and NATO matters.

SUMMARY OF CHANGES IN BILL MADE BY COMMITTEE

Now we come to the bill before us. The thorough study of H. R. 7005 made by the committee is reflected in the more than 20 amendments made in the text of the bill as reported. To simplify consideration, the committee amendments were consolidated into one new text, so I wish to enumerate the principal ones for the information of the House. They are:

Section 2: Adopted Senate language of section 2 which authorizes assistance to three designated organizations for unifying Europe rather than to any such organization as provided in H. R. 7005 as introduced.

Section 3: Amended Mutual Security Act to mention Spain by name as eligible to receive assistance—was eligible previously.

Cut military authorization by 20 percent from $4,145,000,000 to $3,316,000,000 and authorized carry-over of unobligated rather than unexpended funds. This latter change was made in all authorizations of funds.

Cut defense support 10 percent from $1,819,200,000 to $1,637,300,000.

Retained the authority to transfer 10 percent within title I rather than the 5 percent proposed in H. R. 7005.

Earmarked not less than $25,000,000 for Spain.

Section 4: No alteration of amounts in title II—Near East and Africa—but adopted the Senate form of authorization by specifying the funds for Arab refugees and for refugees coming to Israel and for technical assistance in that area.

Section 5: Struck out exemption of title III funds from section 503 of MSA. This means that TCA will have to take over from MSA the programs in Burma and Indonesia.

Section 6: Redesignated area as American Republics and non-self-governing territories of the Western Hemisphere.

Section 7: Provided that no part of the United States contribution to the Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants

from Europe could be used to pay salary or expenses of the Director General of such committee if a former employee of UNRRA or IRO.

MSA Act amended to authorize distribution of 50 supergrades already provided among all departments and agencies covered in the program. Some of these may be assigned to point 4, State and Defense.

Required a 10-percent reduction—based on January 1, 1952, personnel—of personnel other than blue-collar workers and technical consultants.

Director for Mutual Security required to reduce reporting requirements.

Authorized the transfer of not more than $1,000,000,000 of military items from United States defense program to foreign nations in addition to equipment authorized by this bill.

Required that no less than $1,000,000,000 be earmarked exclusively for offshore procurement.

Authorized total expenditure of not more than $100,000,000, not more than $20,000,000 to any country, without conditions as to eligibility. This would permit giving limited assistance to nations which we wish to help but which may be afraid to enter into agreements with us.

Authorized Director for Mutual Security to develop strategic materials in world deficiency for countries receiving United States assistance.

The Director for Mutual Security required to take suitable and appropriate steps to assure effective use by recipient countries of their own resources for mutual security.

Provided up to $100,000,000 of counterpart to encourage free enterprise.

Permitted up to $100,000,000 of military production and economic and technical assistance funds to be used for subscribing to capital of an International Finance Corporation.

Investment and informational media guaranties continued after June 30, 1952, to all areas where United States assistance is granted.

Required Mutual Security Agency to develop broad criteria for guaranties and to conduct study of impediments to private investment abroad; Department of State required to accelerate commercial and tax-treaty program; Technical Cooperation Administration required to encourage and facilitate greater participation by industrial groups in point 4 programs and to bring investment opportunities in underdeveloped areas to attention of private enterprise.

Section 9: Required counterpart funds used for loans by recipient countries to be redeposited in counterpart special account when loans are repaid so as to give the United States continuing participation in their administration.

Assured that total counterpart fund be available for strategic materials without regard to 5-percent limitation.

Section 11: Authorized $12,000,000 for UNICEF for period ending December 31, 1953, on condition that United States contribution not exceed one-third of contribution from all governments. None of the activities for which these funds are authorized shall duplicate any of the activities of other U. N. agencies.

UNOBLIGATED AND UNEXPENDED BALANCES

A great deal will be said around here today about unobligated and unexpended balances. Let us get the record straight.

As amended by the committee, the bill authorizes a total of $6,901,100,000 in new funds. This is a reduction of $998,900,000 from the $7,900,000,000 requested by the Executive for the fiscal 1953 requirements of the Mutual Security Program.

There has been some misunderstanding about the exact fiscal status of the program. This is only natural in view of its complexity and size. The simplest and most accurate view can be obtained by looking at the entire picture. Like the separate parts of a jigsaw puzzle, the picture clears when the sections are put together.

Starting with the Marshall plan funds and the subsequent related acts from the Eightieth Congress to the present, cumulative funds made available through fiscal 1952 are $26,063,400,000. Of that total, $11,802,400,000 is for strictly military aid and $14,098,500,000 for economic.

On March 31, 1952, cumulative expenditures amounted to $14,700,700,000. At the present rate of expenditure, it is estimated that this will increase to $17,118,300,000 by June 30, 1952. This would leave an unexpended balance of $8,945,100,000 at the end of the current fiscal year.

This has led to much confusion in public statements on the subject and the suggestion has been made that with $8,945,100,000 of unspent funds on hand it would be unnecessary to authorize additional funds for fiscal 1953. However, within a few more weeks, by June 30, all of these unspent funds will have been obligated except for approximately $400,000,000. Obligated funds remain available to meet contract payments for an additional 2 years without further congressional authorization.

As reported by the committee, H. R. 7005 authorizes $6,901,100,000 in new funds, plus a carry-over of unobligated balances estimated at $406,800,000, making an over-all total of $7,307,900,000 available for obligation, of which $4,952,800,000 is for military purposes, $2,305,100,000 for defense support, economic and technical assistance, and $50,000,000 for Spain.

Without these funds there would be no money available with which to place orders after June 30. The funds authorized in H. R. 7005 are required as a basis for contracts to be signed between July 1, 1952, and June 30, 1953. It is necessary to bear in mind that before the Defense Department can make a contract for production of tanks, for example, funds must have previously been appropriated for that purpose.

It may take from 11 months to 2 years to manufacture the tanks. By law, money to pay for them must be available when the contract is signed, even though payment is not made until their delivery over a year later. This time lag can run 2 years or more for aircraft down to 3 months for small arms. This is a complicated process, but it is standard Government procedure and it does not mean that the United States taxpayer pays taxes, the proceeds of which then lie idle in the Treasury. Money appropriated but not spent in the same fiscal year does not add to the deficit of that fiscal year. It is provided through the Treasury only as needed to make payments when the tanks, aircraft, and so on are completed and delivered.

Reduced to its simplest terms, the issue becomes one of "Do we want to allow the Defense Department and the Mutual Security Agency to continue to contract for defense items, economic and technical assistance, or do we want a hiatus in the program?" A delay in appropriating can only mean a consequent delay in delivery of military items. Although we will have $8,900,000,000 unexpended by June 30, practically all of it is already in the pipeline and in the process of being converted from money into military end items and defense support. If we delayed appropriating, we would simply be retarding the conversion process which is changing dollars into tanks, aircraft, machine guns, and other items for our mutual security.

At the end of March there was an unexpended balance of $9,228,600,000 of military funds. A lot of people have gotten an idea that this fact has some connection with the amount of money needed for next year.

In the first place, this unexpended balance should not be thought of as money lying idle. It is really tanks, airplanes, guns, and so forth, in process of production. There are at present over 4,000 tanks worth $2,900,000,000 being completed in United States factories which are to be shipped as part of the fiscal 1952 program. There are today approximately 3,000 jet fighters which cost a total of $2,300,000,000 being completed in our factories which are included in the 1952 program. There are $600,000,000 worth of mine sweepers being completed in shipyards which are to be paid for out of these unexpended funds.

This makes a total of $5,800,000,000 of these unexpended funds which are represented by tanks, planes, and mine sweepers alone which are in process. The remainder is represented by such things as artillery pieces and fire-control equipment which take months to complete.

Unexpended balances are primarily military end items in the course of completion. They do not represent money waiting to be used.

On January 1, 1952, the strength of active and quickly mobilizable world-wide forces of our Western European allies was 5,250,000 men. This is an increase of about 1,500,000 men in 2 years.

The committed NATO combat-ready and reserve ground divisions in Western Europe by December 1952 will be 50 divisions.

Committed front-line NATO combat aircraft in Western Europe by December 1952 will approximate 4,000 aircraft.

Combat vessels—of which approximately one-half are major types—committed to NATO by December 1952 will number over 1,600.

In addition, there are today forces numbering over 1,000,000 men under arms in the eastern Mediterranean and Adriatic areas protecting the southern flank; they include over 50 strong divisions, 800 aircraft, and over 100 ships and vessels

As General Olmstead testified before our committee:

I might add that in terms of Europe, in fact, all of our partner nations, because of the more austere conditions to which they are experienced, the greater simplicity of their missions as compared to the possible missions of United States forces that might have to be committed on short notice in any part of the world, in any climate, our tables of organization and equipment for our partners are more austere than our own.

I will say that regarding those which are planned for commitment alongside our own forces, it would be almost tragic economy if we equipped them on a less effective scale from a fire-power standpoint.

These forces of our allies need to be made strong. Each division must have tanks, anti-aircraft weapons, and artillery. There must be jet fighters to withstand a Soviet attack. The equipment of some forces already in being has to be completed. The division just being organized must receive all of their arms and equipment by the end of this year if the 50 divisions we are counting on are to be ready.

The unexpended balances really represent to a large extent the fire power which the NATO forces will have and must have if they are to carry out their mission.

WHAT IS MEANT BY "OBLIGATION"

When we speak of "obligations" in reference to the military side of this program, we mean only one thing—contracts. An obligation is a contract. As Assistant Secretary of Defense McNeil stated to our committee:

We do not record anything as an obligation until it is a firm deal. Any preliminary discussions, any requests for submissions of proposals, are not recorded as obligations (hearings, p. 419).

A contract may be in the form initially of a letter of intent, which is accepted by the contractor. It will provide for payments being made as the contractor gets under way to accumulate inventories.

Mr. McNeil had this to say about the validity of a letter of intent:

A contract may be half delivered under the letter of intent, because in the making up of the definitive contract you will find the attorneys will be discussing some labor clause or the wording and punctuation of an escalator clause, or in the specifications there may be some discussion as to whether the wing tank will go 14 inches from the left spar or 13 inches. All those things will hold up the final execution of the definitive contract.

But in the meantime there exists a firm deal, a binding contract. It just is not explicit in various minute details. An accepted letter of intent has exactly the same force and effect as a contract except for the detailed specifications (hearings, p. 421).

When we talk about obligations in defense support, the situation is different. Funds are obligated for defense support and for economic aid when the Mutual Security Agency issues a procurement authorization. This is not, however, a contract. The Mutual Security Agency does not buy commodities. Transactions financed with Mutual Security Agency funds are normally handled through ordinary commercial channels. The foreign firm negotiates a contract with a United States supplier after a procurement authorization has been issued. This is really an authorization to sign a contract. There is always a lag between giving the procurement authorization and the signing of a contract. This is necessary if you are going to have commercial dealings rather than Government buying.

DEFENSE SUPPORT

Mr. Chairman, I anticipate that the strongest attack coming from those who want to make meat-ax cuts in the proposed authorization will be made against the so-called defense support items, and I unhesitatingly say that to cut this part of the bill further would be a tragic mistake.

The bill as originally introduced provided $1,819,200,000 for defense support. The committee cut this sum to $1,637,300,000, or 10 percent.

Let us take a look at what defense support money would do toward rearming Europe:

Defense support is a sound investment because it yields many times its own cost in direct additions to NATO's military strength and therefore to our own security. Defense support has a multiplier effect on European production and therefore on the size of the defense program which Europe can support. This multiplier comes about because we supply under defense support only a small fraction of the raw materials and machine tools which go into Europe's workshop. Since the European countries add their own labor, factories, equipment, and materials, the value of the completed production is several times the cost of the defense support we provide. To take one example, $100,000 of American machine tools financed with defense support have enabled the Copenhagen Ammunition Arsenal in Denmark to increase its yearly output of .30 caliber and other ammunition by $460,000.

The defense support requested by the administration for the Lisbon plan countries of NATO, including Germany, amounts to $1,400,000,000. Through its impact on the European economy it will make possible a $1,600,000,000 increase in Europe's expenditures for the production of military hardware alone. This will mean more aircraft guns, jeeps, and destroyers produced in Europe for the European armies. So defense support more than pays for itself just in terms of the additional military production of hard goods which it makes possible. But defense support also results in higher European defense spending for the mobilization and training of troops and for the construction of airfields, barracks, and communication systems. These are especially important parts of the European defense program. Europe must provide the largest share of the ground troops, and all of the airfields, installations, and lines of communication for the Allied forces under General Ridgway's command. Almost half of Europe's defense budgets must go for the pay and training of its military forces. All these things are just as necessary as guns and ammunition if you are to have armies in being which can go into action when needed. Taking into account the additional spending in these areas, the European defense program will be raised in total by the equivalent of $3,333,000,000 as a result of our defense support. This means that each dollar of defense support contributes almost $2.50 to the European defense effort. But even this is not the end of the story as to how dollars for defense support multiply into effective men available to fight if trouble breaks out. Money spent building up forces goes much further in Europe than it does in the United States. European costs for the pay, clothing, and subsistence of its military personnel are about one-quarter of the comparable costs for American personnel. Maintenance and training costs are also substantially lower for European units. In military terms, this $3,333,000,000 of higher defense budgets made possible by our defense support represents the cost of 10 European divisions with that half of their equipment which is produced in Europe, plus 750 aircraft, 40 minesweepers, and 30 destroyer escorts. If the United States were to replace with our own forces and equipment the European forces and equipment only made possible by defense support, it would cost us about five times the amount of that defense support. Thus we are getting about a 5 for 1 return for our defense-support dollars.

The importance of the defense support side of the program is graphically shown by briefly analyzing the loss to our joint defense effort if we were to eliminate it. The $1,400,000,000 provided for eight European NATO countries and Germany in defense support would reduce their production capacity to the point that their own planned expenditures of $13,900,000,000 would have to be cut by $3,300,000,000 to $10,600,000,000.

It has been self-evident from the beginning that Western Europe can be defended only if our partners in the mutual security program make a maximum effort in terms of their own resources. We can only supply a part of the materials. We cannot ourselves build the European defense structure. Defense support, as provided in the present bill, will enable the Europeans to contribute more themselves at less cost to us. The vital importance of the defense support part of the program was stressed by General Gruenther when testifying before the Foreign Affairs Committee.

In reply to a question by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN] the General said:

I think * * * that the economic support and the military support are inseparable. I think from our own self-interest, and I am again not talking about money value because I do not know about that, it is wise to facilitate in every possible way the bolstering of these economies. To give you a specific illustration: The industrial establishments of these countries have received such a blow as a result of the war that to produce some of these items themselves is absolutely impossible. We feel they should be producing them, but the question of raw materials, the question of machine tools, represents, to mention only two items, a very, very difficult problem for them from an economic standpoint.

I have spent much time on the European part of the Mutual Security Program because it is that part that involves the largest authorization of money. But

it is, in the long run, hardly more important than those parts of the program that provide far smaller amounts of money for countries in the underdeveloped areas of the world. For some of those countries, the program would provide armaments; substantial quantities in Indochina and Formosa where the face of aggression is near and ominous, smaller amounts in a few other countries. But in most of the underdeveloped countries the principal objective is and must be to maintain the new found spirit of freedom and independence and to bring the peoples of those countries to a recognition that the West is the custodian and defender of these ideals

This is the heart and purpose of the technical aid program. This concept was examined, considered, and worked over with great thoroughness by the Congress, and particularly by this House. It was enacted into law in 1950. The first appropriation was on the modest scale befitting a slow and long-term enterprise. But here again subsequent acts of Communist aggression have indicated that the point 4 type of program must also be made more immediately and largely effective. Its purpose, its ultimate objective, remain the same, but the goal of strengthening the will, spirit, and stability of these areas must in the present state of the world be reached at an earlier date. Hence these parts of the program are somewhat larger than they have been in prior years.

I should emphasize, however, that they are still small in relation to those parts of the program that deal directly with rearmament, and I should emphasize also that these relatively minor expenditures, if resolutely carried forward, will maintain the stability and strength of these areas so that the vastly more expensive burden of rearmament for their direct defense can, we hope, be avoided.

The members of the Foreign Affairs Committee recognize as well as any in this House the problems of our increasing debt and the dangers of an unbalanced budget. The committee has reduced the amount of this bill by just under a billion dollars. It is our view that this reduction brings the program down to the very limit of tolerable risk. We dare not recommend a deeper cut. This mutual-security program is an insurance policy for the safety and security of our country. When times have been hard, many of us in our own private life have foregone expenditures we would otherwise like to have made, and have indeed borrowed money, in order to meet premiums on policies of personal insurance that we had taken out to protect our families. I regard this mutual security program in precisely that light. This House faces a hard choice between adding heavier burdens to an already heavily laden economy on the one hand and, on the other, risking the national security by making it impossible to build up the defenses of the free world. This bill, onerous though it is, is a necessary insurance premium to guarantee as far as we can that our children and our children's children may live in a free world.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In the beginning the gentleman asked a question as to whether our institutions in this country were in danger and he supplied a partial answer. But President Truman has said that budget cutters were aiding Stalin, and I think he included the gentleman in that general category. I wonder if the gentleman and his committee have given thought to the fact that an economic collapse can ruin the country just as much as a military defeat. I think our institutions are in danger, but how much longer can the taxpayers carry the burden of the world? Have you given any serious consideration to that matter and have you found an answer as to whether our institutions might be in danger, not from Stalin, but from an economic collapse in this country?

Mr. RICHARDS. I think any member of the committee or any Member of this Congress who has not given serious consideration to that has no business being here. I want to make this flat-footed statement to the Congress of the United States: What the world has to depend on more than anything else today is a solvent United States. When the majority of this committee reported the pending bill, we had to calculate and weigh the risk we were taking if we did not do this thing. We had to consider the danger of the United States being required to spend many billions more later on if we failed to make adequate provisions now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we had to take all those things into consideration.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. In reference to the question propounded by the distinguished Member from Nebraska, and I agree with the gentleman from Nebraska; his question is most practical and fundamental. But without regard to the merits of the immediate situation that we are faced with to which the gentleman from South Carolina is addressing himself, in order to keep the record straight I would like to point out to my friend from Nebraska and others who might be interested that the gentleman from South Carolina who is now addressing us is and has been a part of the so-called economy group in this House that has been trying to reduce these expenditures. He is responsible more than anyone else for the billion cut that has already been made in committee on this bill.

I repeat, regardless of one's contentions about the merits of the proposal about which the gentleman is addressing us, he is and has been one of the strongest advocates and practitioners of economy generally. He is motivated here as elsewhere by the highest motives, and by what he thinks is for the best interests of his country.

Mr. RICHARDS. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and, of course, I appreciate the anxiety of the gentleman from Nebraska concerning the matters he is talking about.

Now if you will let me say just a word about that. To my mind the two greatest dangers confronting the United States today are insolvency and the possibility of going to sleep in our battle against communism. To my mind the real issue is whether or not we are going to pay an insurance premium today to protect our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that our committee came to the House with this amount in the bill only because the majority believed that any other course would cost the United States more in the long run, and that if we cut further on this, which would weaken our allies, it would cost us more money, not less? Was it not because we believed this authorization would in the long run save us money which would otherwise have to be spent on our own defense, that reluctantly the majority of the committee came in with this.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman has said it. He has answered the question of the gentleman from Nebraska better than I could.

If I did not believe that the expenditure of these funds as we have cut them down by a billion dollars—and we may have gone a little too far—if I did not believe in the long run it would save money for the United States and save the lives of United States men, I would not be here today advocating it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I want to correct any impression that the gentleman is playing into the hands of Stalin when he cuts a billion dollars off this bill. I do not agree with the State Department and the Chief Executive that the gentleman should be so spoken of. I would have gone along with another cut, of perhaps another billion dollars. But the gentleman is carrying that label all over the world now, and I think it is a label the gentleman should not wear.

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not know what kind of label I may carry all over the world. I am trying to do my duty here. I want to say this, that so far as that billion dollar cut is concerned, we were obligated to make that cut in defense of the taxpayers of the United States if we could do it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do believe there is room for more of a cut.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is up to the House. There are some men here who believe further reductions should be made in this bill. There are some men here who honestly believe we should not appropriate anything. I respect their views, even though I cannot agree with them. All I am trying to assure the gentleman from Nebraska is that I am honest in my own conclusions.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. May I ask the gentleman from South Carolina if I correctly understood him to say that $26,000,000,000 has been appropriated since 1948, the beginning of the Marshall plan?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is right.

Mr. ARENDS. Was that inclusive of this six and nine-tenths billions or outside of that?

Mr. RICHARDS. Outside of that.

Mr. ARENDS. That would make approximately $33,000,000,000 altogether, then?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I want to ask the gentleman two questions. First, I am trying to learn what detailed study the committee made in the estimates in the suggested budget adopted at the Lisbon conference, because I understand the amount you are asking for now is really to implement the United States share, something like three and eight-tenths billions. I am particularly interested in what study might have been made of the details, because part of our problem has been the unrealistic scheduling that the proponents of these vast appropriations have proposed to us.

Mr. RICHARDS. We did go into the detailed scheduling of this very exhaustively. Most of the military end of it is classified. Frankly, I asked the Defense Department to declassify as much of this as it could. But military end items compose most of title I, and the greater part of the bill involves classified information.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I was not asking for that information here. My question was how much detailed study the committee had made. I will tell you why I ask that question. For example, on page 45, last year we appropriated $38,000,000 for South America, and the committee very rightly asked the question as to why those funds were still unobligated as of January 31, 1952, and we have this very interesting statement from the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Miller:

> We had to wait for the Joint Chiefs of Staff to draw up the plans under the appropriation for the best use of the appropriation.

In other words, they get the money and then figure out what they are going to do with it next. Is that the situation we have on this Lisbon matter?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Is it not true that we had to wait upon the making of bilateral agreements between the United States and South American countries before these funds could be obligated, and therefore since the act required these agreements with various nations, the executive branch of the Government could not enter into these agreements with these South American countries.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is correct.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I believe the gentleman made the statement that there would be $400,000,000 in unexpended balances in June, did I correctly understand the gentleman to say unexpended balances? I am sure he meant to say unobligated balances.

Mr. RICHARDS. I meant to say unobligated balance, and I thank the gentlewoman for calling that to my attention.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I wonder if the gentleman would take about 5 minutes to go into the question that you have not touched on yet, and that is this question of economic aid and what is known as technical assistance, which seems to be spread out pretty well all over the world. There are some of us who are disturbed by the wide spread of this aid to practically every country in the world, and every continent on the face of the earth. Frankly, I am one who would like to be convinced on that subject and have not been. I am very sympathetic toward the program. I was rather disappointed when I found that all the cuts in the estimates that had been made came out of Europe, where it seems to me is the hub of our trouble. But these other things, technical aid, and so forth, scattered all over the world, have not suffered any of the cuts. I am just asking the gentleman if he will not go into that subject a little further.

Mr. RICHARDS. I would like to say a little about that. There is almost $5,000,000,000 in title I. That is for Europe. Out of that there is $1,637,300,000 for economic support. We call it defense support. There is no doubt about its being economic aid. There are pages and pages of testimony in the hearings to show what that goes for, end items, such as dynamos, and materials that will go into military plants to enable them to increase their defense production. I remember one instance particularly, where $100,000 in defense support for Denmark resulted in an ammunition production increase of almost a half million dollars a year.

If the gentleman wants me to read to the House, I have detailed breakdowns of what each country gets under the program in the way of defense support, economic and technical assistance, point 4, and so on.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I was just trying to seek the reason behind these contributions of economic aid—or point 4 aid, as you choose to call it—in this widespread area. To be a little more specific, I see here that we are going to contribute to India $115,000,000; to Pakistan, $65,000,000; to Israel, $79,000,000. I wonder in what respect they are contributing to our defense and to the defense of the democratic world. I do not mean to pick on those countries; I just took them because they were the larger items. What is the reason behind it from the standpoint of defense of democracy? The whole business back of my question is the same question of how long and how far we can go in trying to support the economy of the whole world, and please do not regard it as an unfriendly question; I am asking for information.

Mr. RICHARDS. I have great admiration and respect for the gentleman from Virginia; I know how hard he has fought the battle of economy on this floor, but may I say to him that there are some parts of the world where we may invest wisely and moderately in programs promoting self-help. Some have felt that Europe is the main theater in the world conflict against communism. That may be true, but the battle line is drawn out all around the world.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Is there not also a very, very practical consideration here? The United States having the productive capacity it has, yet is dependent for some of its most vital needs on these so-called backward areas that we are aiding. For the benefit of the gentleman from Virginia, I think it should be pointed out that the United States depends for 100 percent of its natural rubber supply on these areas; 100 percent of its tin supply; 100 percent of its chromite; 100 percent of its graphite; 100 percent of its industrial diamonds; 100 percent of its sisal; 99 percent of its nickel; 93 percent of its cobalt; 93 percent of its manganese; 55 percent of its lead; 42 percent of its copper; and 40 percent of its zinc.

If these areas keep up the process of disintegration that the Communists know so well how to capitalize on, we lose all those sources of vital materials. It is a matter of very vital concern to all Americans.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman from Connecticut is just 100 percent correct.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I have been looking over the bill and the report and it seems there are 18 separate agencies set up and it looks to me like a tremendously cumbersome administrative set-up which needs to be completely revamped and cut down to some kind of a businesslike size.

Mr. RICHARDS. I would like to say to the gentleman from New York that we think we have done a pretty good job in that connection. We put this operation under a single unified agency last year, we cut personnel 10 percent and in this bill we cut personnel an additional 10 percent. We have been trying to do the very thing the gentleman is talking about.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one additional minute.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Virginia, it ought to be called to the attention of the House that on pages 48 to 56 of the committee report this technical assistance question is dealt with in considerable detail. But there is one further thing which in all candor must be said. The gentleman from South Carolina and the committee know of my own uneasiness about the fact that there is an awful lot in this bill, sir, that is called technical assistance, but which is not technical assistance. I regret that the various kinds of aid to the underdeveloped areas are not separated in the bill so that they can be laid before the House with exactly the right labels on them.

There are four main kinds of aid in the bill: Military end items to four countries in Asia, and to Western Europe, Greece, and Turkey; the second is defense support to enable them to build up their own arsenals and air bases and economies so that they can produce for themselves the largest possible proportion of their defense needs; the third is technical assistance; and fourth is economic Marshall plan type of aid to some of the so-called underdeveloped areas.

I regretted that I was not able to work out a satisfactory amendment whereby we could break the last two down and be perfectly honest with the House in making clear which is which and why. There are areas where the threat of Communist conquest from within has to be met in the next year or two—certain areas in the Middle East, south and southeast Asias, and a few other places. We have to put with the longer-term and slower-moving technical assistance some economic aid. Whether the amount provided is right or not is questionable, but we have to furnish some aid in essential commodities, in addition to training, or else those countries are going down. In the case of India and south Asia out of the $150,000,000 provided for so-called technical cooperation, only about $13,000,000 is for personnel engaged in technical assistance and $137,000,000 is for commodities. The case for each ought to be made on its own merits. It will endanger future support of a sound technical assistance program to have purely economic aid, however justified, lumped under technical cooperation. I think that, before the debate is over, that will be spelled out in detail so that we understand exactly what we are doing and why.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there is a great degree of unity in our committee; unity in admiration of our fine chairman, in admiration and sympathy for each other, and unity in voting to bring this bill to the floor. There the unity stops this time because there are divergent views on various parts of this mammoth piece of legislation.

A "PACKAGE" BILL

In the first place, this is a package bill. It is labeled "Mutual Security" but there is a great deal of it that is not very mutual and has very little to do with our security. For instance, there are provisions in here for Arab and Jewish refugees, point 4, United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, provisions for ocean freight for relief packages, $10,000,000 for resettlement of refugees, $17,000,000 for United Nations technical assistance. This is a gathering together of practically all the foreign-policy items that require money this year, to authorize them in one bill. I do not disapprove of this package plan; in fact, I helped invent it. In the Eightieth Congress we were faced with a series of bills that had an April 1 deadline, and we realized there would not be time to have hearings and floor debate on each one, so we put them together into a package. The vote against this plan was the only strictly partisan vote in our committee. Our friends of the then minority stormed against the package approach, and their supporters, the pro-administration commentators and columnists, said the Republicans were trying to obstruct and delay, but the package bill that year went through the House March 31, 1948. The package plan has been adopted by the present majority and by the administration ever since. They have never made a deadline such as we made in the Eightieth Congress.

THE COMMUNIST THREAT

But while it is well to have in mind that this is more than a mutual security bill, yet the vast amount in this bill is for military aid, and a large amount of the nonmilitary authorizations have to do with the grim and deadly threat to our security by godless, ruthless communism, clear around the world; a threat that is military, the threat of the use of force; economic, the threat that we may bleed ourselves white in getting ready for a war that may never come; political, the threat that we may lose our liberties at home in the effort to meet these other threats. All this amounts to a very deadly threat. While there are those who would have us withdraw to our own borders in the face of this threat, many millions of our people, particularly our young men, have seen the war-devastated countries of Europe and Asia, and feel that if war must come, we should plan to fight away from home, on friendly soil, if possible, and not fight alone. It is quite interesting to note that because of this every avowed candidate for President on either ticket is in favor of a continuation of some form of mutual security, of military aid to those who are ready and willing to fight in the common cause. Every candidate for President supports that policy. It is also significant that only one candidate for President, Mr. Averell Harriman, who is also the administrator of all this, says of the original administration proposal "If you touch it, I will cry." He says in substance, "We must have all or there is no use of having any." All this leaves a problem of responsibility for the Congress, particularly the House, where we have but one Presidential hopeful, to determine how much should be expended in this effort.

AMOUNTS INVOLVED

Now I want to discuss this matter of how much is involved. If any of you care to turn to the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page A3006, you will find a table I inserted which shows that this bill, as amended, plus the unexpended balance of Mutual Security Act appropriations, plus other planned United States expenditures, will make $18,098,200,000 available for foreign aid beginning June 30, 1952. I said, $18,098,200,000. There is a mistake in the printed table in the RECORD. It should be as follows:

Foreign aid available June 30 1952.

[In millions of dollars]

Unexpended balances June 30 (report, p. 30)	8,945.1
H. R. 7005, authorizes	6,901.1
H. R. 7005, United States military transfers (p. 22 of bill)	1,000.0
United States military expenditures abroad (hearings, p. 1053)	1,052.0
Total	17,898.2
H. R. 7005, excess equipment (p. 29 of bill)	200.0
Total	18,098.2
MILITARY AID	
Unexpended balances	7,894.3
H. R. 7005, authorizes	4,596.0
H. R. 7005, United States transfers	1,000.0
Total	13,490.3
Excess equipment	200.0
Total	13,690.3
ECONOMIC AID	
Unexpended balance, including Spain	1,050.8
H. R. 7005, authorizes	2,305.1
United States military expenditures abroad	1,052.0
Total	4,407.9

For Europe—title I—amounts available are as follows:

MILITARY	
Unexpended	6,540
H. R. 7005	3,316
U. S. Transfers	1,000
Total	10,856
Excess equipment	200
	11,056
ECONOMIC	
Unexpended	828.2
H. R. 7005	1,637.3
U. S. military expenditures	1,052
Total	3,517.5
Grand total	14,573.5

Through off-shore procurement and transfers, military funds can be uscd for additional economic aid in Europe, as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

H. R. 7005 (p. 22) off-shore procurement 10 percent transfers of title I total (MSA, 101b)	1,000
H. R. 7005, title I, 4,953.3, 10 percent	495.3
H. R. 7005, Ribicoff amendment	100.0
Economic aid (see above)	3,517.5
Total	5,112.8

If you will look on page 20 of the report you will find that out of the $11,500,000,000 available for military aid, only $1,796,000,000 was shipped by February 29, 1952.

I have been shocked and disappointed and dismayed year after year to find that the military were not sending abroad the arms that Congress had authorized and appropriated for. It is one of those things where you cannot make it up all in a hurry.

In any case, using the guesses, which have not been very happy guesses in the past, but using the guesses of the executive branch as to what they are actually going to spend and deliver up to June 30, 1952, and it will be a better record than they have ever made before, there will be unexpended balances on June 30, 1952, of $8,945,100,000. H. R. 7005 authorizes $6,910,100,000. That is, there was a cut of $998,900,000 over the executive request.

Then on page 22 of the bill H. R. 7005 you will find authorization for transfer of a billion dollars of our military equipment to this program whenever it is needed. That was part of a suggestion made by our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] last year. He sponsored it and I was sort of a cosponsor in committee. Thus we make a billion dollars of our own gigantic military build-up available to this program, if necessary. I know the military will be reluctant to do this, but that provision takes care of a period in the future when there might be an emergency arise and certain of our planes, tanks, and guns might be needed immediately on the European front, to be used by the forces of other nations rather than by our own forces.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Did I correctly understand the gentleman, then, that if this transfer was effectuated the foreign-aid program could still be seven and nine-tenths billions?

Mr. VORYS. Yes. Let me put it this way: With the military authorization there is now more military and nonmilitary aid available in this bill than there was when the bill came to the committee because the total has been cut $998,900,000, and this additional billion of authorization has been put in, therefore, the net result is that greater amounts are available than when the bill came to the committee.

Mr. ARENDS. There is room for additional cuts.

Mr. VORYS. I think so.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say there were approximately $8,000,000,000 of unexpended funds available?

Mr. VORYS. Unexpended balances. If the gentleman will refer to page 31 of the committee report, he will find the details. The amount is $8,945,100,000.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. How much of that money is unobligated?

Mr. VORYS. All but $350,000,000, it is proposed, will be obligated by the end of the year.

OBLIGATIONS AND EXPENDITURES

Let us talk for a minute on this obligation and expenditure proposition. When money is spent, you know it is spent, but "obligated" is one of the most elastic terms I have heard in Washington for a long time.

For instance, I interrogated Mr. W. J. McNeil, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Defense, and found out that they have not only provision for changes and provision for termination at the convenience of the Government in every contract over $1,000 but they also make contracts subject to future appropriations—hearings page 419. In this bill we provide that money that is de-obligated can be used again without reappropriation because it is quite natural in a vast program, particularly involving intricate military equipment, that after the money is obligated, you may change your mind, for instance, instead of making a thousand of one kind of equipment you may decide to make 500 of something else, and you cancel the original contracts. I asked Mr. McNeil how many military contracts for equipment had had changes in them. He said that for the hard-to-get, long-lead-time items there is practically no contract outstanding in which changes in specifications have not caused price changes or changes of that kind. That is quite natural in this business of planning a military build-up. Every time you find out, particularly in combat, that a weapon can be improved, you ought to change it. So that this obligation fastens an obligation on the contractor, but not on the Government. We find therefore that the NATO-Lisbon program for 25 divisions in being, and 25 more ready, and 4,000 planes by the end of this year is firm so far as the executive departments are concerned, but NATO is provisional after the end of this year. We find that those obligations as far as the Defense Department is concerned are provisional. Everything is to be provisional except what the Congress does. There are a number of us who feel that we should be a little bit provisional and should hold back some of the requested appropriations for the end of this program.

The military program for Europe, which is of course, the big item, involves long lead time on planes, tanks, and naval craft. Not one dime, get this, not one dime of the amount authorized in this bill be spent in fiscal year 1953—not one dime will be spent before July 1, 1953, and of this authorization $1,240,000,000 will not be spent until fiscal year 1955, beginning in June 30, 1954. Of course, we all recognize that we must plan ahead for these items, but it is questionable whether we are justified in making plans that far ahead for Europe when Europe is unable to make firm plans of her own that far ahead.

Again referring to the summary of how we get this $18,098,200,000, I have mentioned the unexpended balances 8,945.1, the amount of this bill $6,900,000,000 and $1,000,000,000 of military transfers. Then, you will find on page 1053 of the hearings, right at the very end of the hearings, this item of United States military expenditures abroad, outside of this legislation, which will go through European banks in the 15 countries that need economic support—expenditures for infrastructure—for buying supplies for our troops, expenditures that give economic aid abroad next year amounting to $1,052,000,000. Then, the bill H. R. 7005 provides $200,000,000 additional in excess equipment. There is a provision in the law for declaring excess equipment, even though we may feel that we do not have any excess. At any rate, we can well count that in the total. That brings the total to $18,090,200,000 of which $13,690,300,000 is military, and $4,407,900,000 is economic.

EUROPE

Let us turn to title I—Europe—and think about that for a minute. The preoccupation with Europe is shown not only in dollars, but in words. Seventy-six percent of the original proposal was for Europe. We have heard from one candidate for President, opposing excessive reductions for Europe. It is quite interesting that 24 percent of the total is for outside of Europe, of which that candidate knows not nearly as much as we know here, but in any case Europe is of particular interest.

It seems to me the great mistake that we have been making is in saying that the defense of Europe is vital to the defense of the United States.

The cold fact of security is that the defense of Europe is very important to us, but not vital. We could live if they fell. If the defense of Europe were vital to our defense, that would mean that if the Soviets overran Europe tomorrow, our vital defense having been stricken down, there would be nothing left for us to do but to surrender. But there is not anyone in the United States who thinks we are going to surrender to the Soviets if Europe is overrun. Therefore, the difference between "vital" and "important" is something that we ought to make clear in these bills, because in Europe every time we say, "The defense of Europe is vital to the security of the United States," they say, "Well, if you want to defend yourselves over here, go ahead. We will help you from time to time with your defense." If we would make clear just what the facts are about our policy, it might be that we could get a little more military effort over there; if we would make clear that we are going to do our part but not their part, they might do more.

DEFENSE SUPPORT

Now, let us look into this defense support for a minute. That is a new label put on something that started with the Marshall plan. You will find in the hearings that defense support, as proposed by the executive, is figured exactly the same way as they figured the Marshall plan money. That is, they had some experts figure out the theoretical balance of payments that the countries ought to have to live in the style in which the experts felt they should live, and that the difference in dollars was the amount that we had to make up. You will find, however, that on this defense support there were no promises made. Mr. Harlan Cleveland is Assistant MSA Director for Europe. Mr. C. Tyler Wood is Associate

MSA Deputy Director. They were the key men in our hearings—see hearings, page 535:

Mr. VORYS. Did we promise $1,400,000,000 defense support at Lisbon?

Mr. CLEVELAND. No, sir; we did not promise any.

* * * * *

Mr. WOOD. There was no dollar commitment at Lisbon.

Mr. VORYS. I have asked for the Lisbon figures and have obtained them from Mr. Harriman's staff, but they are marked in big red letters "Secret." In any case, you are sure that nobody on behalf of the United States Government has promised $1,400,000,000 defense support to anybody. Is that right?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I am sure of that.

NONDEFENSE EXPENDITURES

In this country, we are reducing our nondefense expenditures. In 12 of the 14 NATO countries—see hearings, pages 100–110—nonmilitary government expenditures are to be increased. Britain's remains the same. Turkey alone, of our NATO allies, is to reduce nondefense spending.

THE MULTIPLIER FACTOR

Now, you will hear a lot of talk about a multiplier factor. In some way, if we put in the $1,400,000,000 that we did not promise, in addition to $3,300,000,000 of military aid, in addition to the $1,000,000,000 offshore procurement, in addition to the $1,052,000,000 that our military forces are going to spend there—if we put in this defense-support money, we are supposed to get a multiplier effect, so that we will get a lot more defense for it.

I asked Mr. Cleveland about that—hearings, page 515. I said, after we had heard a lot on this multiplier business:

Mr. Cleveland, as I understand your statement, the hardware goes up $1,500,000,000 and we put in $1,400,000,000; is that right?

Mr. CLEVELAND. That is right.

Mr. VORYS. I think we all ought to bear that in mind when we hear about our contribution being multiplied two or three times.

Now, on page 47 of the committee report you will find an elaborate table that looks as if cutting down on defense support would lose so many vehicles, aircraft, so many weapons, and so forth. I interrogated Mr. Cleveland about that table—hearings, pages 537–540. I asked him:

I wonder if you could just answer the question that I stated. Does the subtraction of the with-and-without defense-support items for aircraft mean the amount of aircraft materials and machinery we would send to Europe?

Mr. CLEVELAND. No, sir. This table does not have anything to do with imports of materials into Europe. * * *

Mr. VORYS. Still looking at your table on defense support, you apparently estimate that without defense support, these countries could do just about as well, within $300,000,000, this coming year as last year.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Somewhat less.

Thus the multiples of one and four-tenths billions gets results of only three hundred million, according to this chart.

ECONOMIC AID FOR EUROPE

Referring once more to the table I have given you they have an unexpended balance in economic aid of $828,200,000 for Europe. The bill proposes that they will get $1,637,300,000 in defense support. Next, military expenditures outside of this bill $1,052,000,000; that is a total of $3,517,500,000. But through off-shore procurement they will get $1,000,000,000 more. That is, the bill provides that we must spend $1,000,000,000 of our military money in Europe where they get the benefit of the dollars, and economic aid through getting the dollars; and it is a good plan. Then they can transfer 10 percent of the total of title I.

That is $495,300,000 there, so that with the Ribicoff amendment of $100,000,000 that could be used in Europe, there are availabilities, through transfers and otherwise of $5,112,800,000 for economic aid to Western Europe. That is the item that I think could stand a reduction without hurting anybody and with great benefit to the taxpayers here.

WINDING UP ECA

I helped to bring the Marshall plan to the floor of this House in the Eightieth Congress in 1948, and one of the battles we had was to hold in the 4-year period. That 4-year period expires June 30, 1952. I regret to say that in conference last year we put in a provision that has been construed by the President as authorizing the President to extend ECA, which would otherwise go out of existence on June 30, by writing a letter—we have legislation by letter writing. The law provided, in section 502 (c) of the Mutual Security Act, "not later than April 1, 1952, the President shall inform the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives which of the powers, functions and responsibilities transferred to the Director by subsection (b) (2) are found by the President to be necessary to enable the Director after June 30, 1952, to carry out the duties conferred upon him by section 503. On March 26, the President sent us a letter. Instead of picking out which powers were necessary he just said "all of them except these seven are necessary." The committee disagreed on one of them and canceled that, so that all of ECA except six somewhat unimportant powers are prolonged, are restored, are prevented from being repealed and this is done by a letter of the President.

I propose to submit an amendment to correct this and have the Congress preserve the proper sections, and I shall ask permission to put it in my remarks at this point:

AMENDMENTS TO EFFECTUATE REPEAL OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT

1. On page 14, line 1, after "and of", strike out "the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501–1522)" and insert in lieu thereof "section 503 of this act."

2. On page 15, line 4, amend subsection (c) to read as follows:

"(c) Amend section 101 (a) (2) to read as follows: 'There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed to provide assistance to any country covered by paragraph (1) of this subsection in accordance with the provisions of section 503 of this act; and in addition balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to this paragraph unobligated as of June 30, 1952, or subsequently released from obligation, are authorized to be continued available for obligation for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the appropriation hereby authorized'."

3. On page 16, line 13, amend subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) Amend section 203 to read as follows: 'In order to further the purpose of this act in Africa and the Near East there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed $55,000,000 to carry out the purposes and provisions of this section; and in addition balances of any appropriations heretofore made pursuant to this section unobligated as of June 30, 1952, or subsequently released from obligation, are authorized to be continued available for obligation for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the appropriation hereby authorized. Funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be available under section 503 of this act and the act for international development (22 U. S. C. 1557)'."

4. On page 18, line 4, strike out "(b) At the end of subsection 302 (a)" and insert the following:

"(b) In the second sentence of subsection 302 (a) strike out the words 'the applicable provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501–1522), and' and insert in lieu thereof 'Section 503 of this act and the applicable provisions' and at the end of such subsection."

5. On page 20, after line 22, insert the following:

"(c) Amend section 503 by inserting '(a)' after '503' by redesignating paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) as (1), (2), and (3) respectively, and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, is repealed.

"'(2) Of the powers, functions, and responsibilities transferred to the Director for Mutual Security by section 502 (b) (2) of this act, only those which are exercised pursuant to the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, enumerated in paragraph (3) of this subsection and are not in conflict with the other provisions of this act, as amended, may be exercised after June 30, 1952. Of the powers, functions, and responsibilities conferred on the President or the Secretary of State by the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, only those conferred by the provisions of that act, as amended, which are referred to in paragraph (3) of this subsection may be exercised after June 30, 1952.

"'(3) The provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, referred to above are the following: Sections 104 (e) and (f); 107; subsections (c) and (d) of section 109; 110 (a) and (b); 111; 112; 113; subsections (d), (h), and (i) of section 114; 115 (a); paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), and (10) of section 115 (b); subsections (d), (h), and (j) of section 115; section 117 (c); section 119; and section 120. Where any of the above provisions refer to the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, such reference shall be deemed to be the purpose of this act, as amended.'

"(d) In subsection (a) of section 504, strike out all after 'Senate' and insert in lieu thereof a period and the following sentences: 'The Deputy Director shall receive compensation of $17,500 per annum. The special representative in Europe shall receive the same compensation and allowances as a Chief of Mission, class 1, within the meaning of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 999) and have the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary. The Deputy Special Representative in Europe shall be entitled to receive the same compensation and allowances as a Chief of Mission,

class 3, within the meaning of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 999) and have the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary'."

Renumber subsequent subsections accordingly.

6. On page 26, lines 12 and 13, strike out the words "the Economic Cooperation Act" and insert in lieu thereof "section 503 of this act."

EUROPEAN UNIFICATION

On unification the committee report says—page 13—"only by unification will Europe ultimately be able to defend and support itself. We have some strong language in the bill, but we should provide that after, say June 30, 1953, military money to Europe goes only to the European army, the European defense community, only to an organization that is by that time hoped to be a going concern. In that way we would know we are not putting military money on a dead horse; in that way we would encourage unification.

POINT 4

Now, let me point out a few figures in connection with point 4. For point 4 they are requesting four times the number of experts they had last year but they are also asking for four times the money to spend on economic aid that they are for experts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is very hard to sort out point 4 because economic aid is carried on under point 4, as the gentleman from Minnesota pointed out, and they have technical experts under MSA. But to give you some sort of interesting figures as to the totals that this bill provides, there will be 4,070 experts and technicians sent all over the world, there will be 8,470 foreigners brought here to learn more about the good way of life; but with all of that we will be spending more than four times that amount for personnel, a total of $440,000,000, for economic aid, wells, dams, water projects, flood-control items and that sort of thing all over the world.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman happens to know that, generally speaking, I agree with his thinking on the subject he has been discussing; but I am wondering if the gentleman will not agree with me that his committee might have met and dealt with this question in a more realistic manner. The gentleman has been discussing point 4. I am wondering if he would not likewise agree with me that point 4 has been criminally abused?

Mr. VORYS. It has been fantastically swollen beyond any possibility of doing the kind of job we thought it should do.

Mr. COX. The gentleman says, in effect, that the purpose of the legislation is to improve our position, to strengthen us in a military sense, and that the intention is to extend assistance to countries in other parts of the world that are making a common cause with us. I would like to ask the gentleman, particularly with reference to what is proposed for India, Pakistan, and Israel, what common cause are those countries making with us? Is not the contribution there made in the nature of relief? As a matter of fact, in making this contribution to India, are we not strengthening and are we not expending that money in a country where Russian influence holds them within a firm, iron grip?

Mr. VORYS. No; I do not think the Russian influence is that strong. You will hear a lot about India before we are through. I can say this about India: During my service on Committee Five in the United Nations, on the crucial questions that came up, the representative of India was not neutral; he was hostile, and at times insulting to my country and to me, and voted with the Soviets. So that I cannot visualize the cooperation, the mutual security, that might be gained through this vast program that Ambassador Chester Bowles, with his ever-expansive ideas, is proposing out there. I cannot see how that is closely tied in with our mutual security.

Mr. COX. The gentleman recalls his visit to Strasbourg last fall where a meeting of representatives was held.

Mr. VORYS. I certainly do.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman recall they took the position almost unanimously that any further assistance extended by the United States should be conditioned upon the European countries meeting certain requirements?

Mr. VORYS. Unification must be a requirement.

Mr. COX. Are those conditions laid down in the pending bill?

Mr. VORYS. They are not laid down sufficiently clearly in my judgment and I hope an amendment to make that more clear will be offered.

Mr. COX. Is there not a lot of boondoggling in here then?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I take this time to comment on section 2, paragraph (b) page 13, to which the gentleman referred when he spoke of the need for unification in Europe. I find this language which I would like the gentleman to interpret, if he will:

> In order to provide further encouragement to such efforts, the Congress believes it essential that this act should be so administered as to support concrete measures for political federation, military integration, and economic unification in Europe.

Do I understand from the gentleman's comment that this provision would give the administrators a chance both to bargain and to exert pressure to effect change in the integral political life and purposes of the individual countries we are supposed to be helping? Would such an attempt not endanger the cooperation that the bill seeks to win?

Mr. VORYS. It would give the Administrator authority to press toward the purposes that have just been stated.

Mrs. CHURCH. In addition, would the provisions of this bill permit us to introduce some good old-fashioned Yankee trading for the protection of our own interests?

Mr. VORYS. It would. I have found our administrators very good at Yankee trading and that is why I suggest we might write in some more forceful language.

Mrs. CHURCH. I certainly hope that the gentleman will be sucessful in that attempt.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I just want to ask this question: The gentleman is for military aid; he is for defense support; he is for technical assistance; he is even for some economic aid, but he thinks we have done too much in the bill; is that not right?

Mr. VORYS. I am for cutting out European recovery money, and that can be done by appropriate amendments; cut it down to defense necessities.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact also that the defense-support provision is essential for materials which have to be bought by the European countries outside of their borders?

Mr. VORYS. No; it is also for commodities. It is for wheat, butter, fats, and oils. Unless merely feeding soldiers is defense support, much of this does not come under that classification. I think we are through with that kind of defense support.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman has referred to an item of something more than a billion dollars for transfer of arms, and so forth. Does that mean transfer of arms manufactured in this country but sent to Europe and other countries?

Mr. VORYS. That amendment means that if in an emergency we had tanks that had been built for our own use and they needed those tanks in a division over there, they could be transferred.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is included as a part of this $1,000,000,000.

Mr. VORYS. That is correct.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I wish to compliment the gentleman for the excellent statement he made on a very obscure aspect of this bill. I would like to direct the gentleman's attention to the requirement that participation by private enterprise be incorporated and note they have now directed the State Department, or the Mutual Security Director and the Technical Cooperation Administration to break down the barriers to private investment overseas. Does the gentleman have any confidence that those agencies are going to accomplish very much in that direction?

Mr. VORYS. Based on past racing form, no. I have given up hope that they will do much except government-to-government programs.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, let us face reality. It is not the last time Congress will be asked to authorize large sums of money for foreign assistance. The passage of this bill will not eliminate Communistic imperialism. Neither will the passage of this bill allow us to withdraw from our worldwide responsibilities.

As long as the United States remains the leader of the free world, and the Soviet of the slave, we as a Nation will be called upon to contribute heavily of our substance. No possible combination of nations without the United States can stop the Kremlin from seeping through the weak dikes of the world and flooding our Western civilization. It is important to have nations go along with us as willing allies.

The American people have the courage, the intelligence, and the determination to face the facts. They will adopt and follow to a successful conclusion the course which these facts show must be taken. But they must know why they are being asked to act.

From the inception of the foreign aid programs, the executive branch has pictured them as short range and crisis induced. The program was to end soon when the particular crisis was over. The particular act was a last push. This thesis accepted by Congress, the reports and the debates continually fall into a pattern of justification either to repair war's devastation, stopping communism or making us militarily strong.

We started foreign military assistance by giving military aid to Greece and Turkey. The law which inaugurated the Marshall plan provided that it was to end June 30, 1952. The Mutual Security Act provides that it is to end in 1954. The entire record consists of measures presented to Congress on the basis that if this specific and limited action is taken, the situation will be normalized. Such an approach is wrong, dangerous, and filled with illusions. Crisis will continue to follow crisis in international affairs. Troubles will be with us for many future and uncertain years.

Congress has collaborated with the executive rationale. Maybe the road to large foreign grants have been smoothed thereby. Such an approach, however, has been self-defeating. No firm foundation has been laid for long range foreign policy. It has placed us in a position of being unable to take any one of a variety of courses of action unless they can be squeezed into military justifications.

This Nation should be wide-eyed and clear as to what we are about. To get around time limits and economic assistance, we substitute the phrase "defense support." Next year it will be another "gimmick." Frustration and anger will atmosphere the legislation instead of understanding.

The effectiveness of the aid programs is watered down. One of the consequences of the policy of basing each foreign assistance program on a current crisis has been that the people of nations receiving our help have been confused. There is no escaping the fact that many people in the world today regard the United States along with Russia as threatening the peace of the world. The United States is feared and suspect inspite of this aid. Communism remains strong in France and Italy. Our wisdom and aims are doubted by nations which should understand us and have confidence in us.

The following of such a course is due to the feeling by many that the American people must be constantly reassured. They must be fed a verbal "pap." However, once aware of the facts of international life, this Nation will assume the burdens of leadership willingly even though unhappily.

First, let every American understand that Russia has under arms, and has had since the end of the war, 175 divisions. Russia has 20,000 airplanes, of which 4,000 are jets. There are 500 submarines in the Soviet Navy. Germany had only 60 submarines at the beginning of the last war. Soviet forces are deployed in Eastern Germany and in the Far East so that they can attack immediately. No calling up of reserves or bringing up of supplies is necessary.

The fact that this military power has not yet been used does not mean that it will not be used. There is no escaping the fact that the Soviets are hostile to the United States and that they are militarily strong.

Nevertheless, it must never be forgotten that the men in the Kremlin prefer subversion, unrest, and revolution to war. They are the greatest masters in history of subversive techniques. Wherever internal unrest, dissension, or weakness are present, the Soviet has an organization and a well-worked-out plan in readiness where a minority, subject to its control, can take over the government. One of the greatest dangers confronting the United States today is that we may concentrate so intently on meeting Soviet military aggression that we neglect the defense against subversion.

A second fact which Americans cannot shut their eyes to is the situation in those parts of the world where new nations have recently emerged from colonial status and where other races feel themselves for the first time free from control by Europeans. Peoples still under the control of foreign nations seek to follow the countries already independent.

In many cases the Soviet did not cause this unrest; they do fan the flames. It cannot be repressed or eliminated. The United States must accept the fact that the situation exists.

The Soviet is ever ready to turn this situation to its advantage. It has the organization and the technique for taking over any government which cannot cope with the problems which have to be faced.

One of the principal challenges confronting the United States is whether or not we can prevent these people, largely in Asia and Africa, from falling under Soviet domination. If these areas fall to the Soviet we will be irreparably weaker and the power of the Kremlin will be greater.

The United States needs not only to spend money to maintain a program of sufficient range to help these people attain a status where they can support and defend themselves, but to supply constructive leadership and statesmanship as well.

A third hard reality confronting the United States is that in important respects we have become a "have not" nation. Our position of world leadership is due, in part at least, to the fact that throughout our history we have had within our own borders nearly all the resources which our industries required and the foodstuffs that our people consumed. To a greater extent than any other nation, we have been able to supply our own needs.

Modern technology, however, has altered this situation. There are a number of minerals today of small importance in terms of tonnage or of dollars but which are of vital importance for the productive capacity of our Nation. The United States is dependent on foreign sources for 100 percent of our industrial diamonds, 100 percent of our tin, 99 percent of our nickel, 93 percent of our cobalt and our manganese, and 92 percent of our mercury, to name only a few. I am making no mention of atomic-energy materials. In addition to this, some of the most important materials which we have always obtained at home are becoming exhausted. Today we import 42 percent of our copper and our steel industry is being relocated to permit the use of imported iron ore.

These facts mean that if we permit ourselves to be cut off from the resources of the rest of the world, transportation and communication as we know it today, automatic and labor-saving machinery, much of the comfort in everyday living and certain of the things we regard as necessities cannot be continued. We must work with other nations to keep supplies of important materials available to us and to prevent them from falling under Soviet domination.

Consideration should be given finally to the importance to the United States of expanding our markets overseas. Our industrial capacity as a whole is now about double what it was in 1940, only a dozen years ago. What are we going to do if it becomes possible for us to curtail military production? We cannot let our factories close and our people remain unemployed. It will be vital to this country that export markets be available to us.

The underdeveloped areas of the world deserve particular attention in this respect. A noteworthy aspect of the postwar boom has been the forward spurt of trade in item after item sold to some countries long characterized by low incomes. Venezuela took $24,000,000 of dairy products in 1950, up from a little more than $1,000,000 in 1938. India took $30,000,000 of industrial machinery in 1950 as against $4,000,000 in 1938. The demand for the produce of American factories exists if the people of the world can be brought into our market.

In this connection it should be emphasized that the United States normally exports several billion dollars more than it imports. Since the war our ex-

ports have exceeded our imports by about $5,000,000,000 per year although this balance was as low as $1,500,000,000 in 1950 and as high as $9,500,000,000 in 1947. Foreign nations cannot pay for our exports unless they have dollars. We discourage their earning dollars by shipping their products to us as indicated by our recent action in raising the tariff on cheese. Is it more politically expedient for the United States to give aid to foreign nations so that they can buy our goods than to lower our import barriers so that they can earn the necessary dollars? If so, let us at least tell the American people they will continue paying a subsidy to our agriculture, mines and industry to make this trade possible and keep our friends afloat. Nevertheless, if the United States is to remain an industrial nation with all it means to us in high productivity and a high standard of living, we must have a world market. We are geared to a world economy. If we have to readjust to a hemispheric economy or a continental economy we will all of us be poorer.

The international adjustments necessary to remove world tensions are proceeding but progress is painfully and disappointingly slow. I think our assistance program might have been administered in a manner that might have given greater incentives to speed in cooperation and provided penalties for delay. Nevertheless, we have to recognize that the political and organizational changes necessary will take many years to complete. Governmental institutions will have to be established, national constitutions modified, industries uprooted and in some cases populations redistributed. There is no way that these things can be accomplished in months. Until they have been accomplished, the United States will feel continuous tension and face a sucession of crises.

All of these things mean that we should approve the legislation before us with our eyes open. It cannot be truthfully said that all we have to do is equip X number of foreign divisions and our problems will be over. We must recognize that that is not the whole story.

Arms are only part of the over-all picture. It is impossible to separate a nation's military requirements from its basic and essential civilian needs. They are all part of the same ball of wax. To force the aid program into military compartments only will get us into actual as well as intellectual difficulties.

The constant talk of arms scares a war-weary world and casts suspicion on our aims. It lets the Soviet, who arm in silence and secrecy, sell its phony peace campaigns under the symbol of the white dove.

The Congress cannot legislate or appropriate the Kremlin out of business. We cannot vote tranquillity for the people in Asia and Africa who believe they are on their way to better things. We cannot by law alter the technology of the electronic and the atomic age. Every one of these situations presents us with complex and long-range problems of foreign policy.

Further, let us not kid ourselves that our problem is military and economic only and that it will end in 1954. We must also recognize that man is a spiritual, emotional, and moral being. He is not a scientific automaton whose actions can be predicted under any given circumstances. The burning concepts of our Declaration of Independence and Bill of Rights reborn for the world could impart more than dollars alone.

It is to be regretted that those charged with the execution of foreign policy do such a poor job of presentation and explanation. However, Congress, too, has a responsibility for policy and the national interest. Congress cannot shirk its responsibility. We must stop looking for the simple and pat answers. We must realize that with international problems 2 plus 2 invariably equals 3 or 5 and not 4.

When these programs are thus approached reality and substance will start filling out the bare bones of our foreign policy. Maturity will give our leadership direction and strength free from frustration and fear.

I would like to spend the remaining time allotted to me in discussing the argument of the gentleman from Ohio. The gentleman from Ohio deserves that particular attention and discussion. There has been no other member of the committee that has worked as hard and as diligently on this legislation. But I think the gentleman from Ohio, too, will admit that there were many other members of this committee that were most critical during the entire conduct of these hearings. In truth, I think it can be safely said that never has there been a chairman of any committee so independent of the executive branch than our own chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]. Constantly he asked the $64 question. I think the gentleman from Ohio, too, will admit that there was no member on the committee that gave our executive branch a harder time in the committee than I did.

The gentleman talks about $18,098,000,000 available instead of the amount that we talk about in the bill of $6,901,000,000. He would lead the House to believe that we have this large reservoir of funds that have not been used and that should be used. As a matter of fact he fails to tell the House that when he talks about these $8,000,000,000 of unexpended funds these are obligated funds. The $8,000,000,000 do not represent money in the Treasury to be used for any particular purpose. It represents goods in the pipelines. The $8,000,000,000 that he talks about being unexpended actually represent contracts that have been let. They represent 4,000 tanks at $2,900,000,000. They represent 3,000 jet fighters at $2,300,000,000. They represent mine sweepers at $600,000,000. They represent artillery pieces, they represent fire-control equipment, they represent guns, and they represent military hardware. These items are in the pipeline. By law money must be available when contracts are signed. Therefore, if we did not authorize the amount set out in the bill, after June 30 of this year the Mutual Security Administrator would have to cut off all future contracts. We have to make up our minds whether we are or are not going ahead with this program. The gentleman from Ohio is not correct when he says there are $8,000,000,000 available to the Mutual Security Agency for expenditures.

I think the House should understand just what a pipeline is. It should be stated that a pipeline is the time between obligation, or let us call it contract, and the expenditures which are made almost indentical with delivery. Most goods that are represented in this pipeline take approximately 2 years to produce. So when the gentleman tells you that this $6,000,000,000 will not be spent until a year or more from now, he is absolutely correct. But why is he correct? The money you appropriated last year is being used to pay for the goods that are coming off the assembly lines this year. When it takes 2 years to deliver a tank and approximately 2 years to deliver a plane, in order to place those orders we make the authorizations—the appropriations. Thereafter when the goods are delivered payment is made from the funds which you are authorizing today. The gentleman is incorrect when he states that there is $8,000,000,000 left. As a matter of fact, by July 1 there would be only about $405,000,000 left of unobligated funds.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. In commenting upon the question of lead time, the gentleman from Ohio made a very amazing remark. He outlined very clearly and indicated his complete understanding of what lead time is on these contracts for matériel. Then, he stated that under no circumstances should we give any further attention, although he is in favor of appropriations for matériel, to contracts to give us the end product in 2½ years unless, mind you, we were fully acquainted and fully informed and fully advised at this time as to what the European countries were going to do 2½ years from now.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The gentleman from Ohio says he is for the program, but he is for less of a program. Basically, what he seeks to do and asks the House to do is to make our Mutual Security Program and our tie-up with our allies so much more ineffective.

That is a problem you are faced with here when you vote on this legislation today. I think the gentleman from Ohio also failed to point out to the membership here that these programs are not only on an annual basis projected just for the current fiscal year. These programs, according to the testimony before our committee, get projected over a period of 2 to 3 years. The planning for these 50 divisions, and the planning for slices up above the 50 divisions of our allies in Europe contemplate a build-up which will continue through 1954 and 1955. All of you know, if we are going to have a program, it has to be carefully thought out and carefully planned. As a matter of fact, if we are just planning here for the next fiscal year, and worried about what we have left of the unexpended funds, we might as well fold up

and eliminate this program in its entirety. But it certainly is foolhardy to come before the House and use arguments for the next fiscal year, when actually we are planning here for the next 3 years.

The gentleman refers in his argument to various other items to indicate large sums of money available, and he quotes from page 1053 of the hearings, United States and military expenditures abroad $1,052,000,000. He would, therefore, lead you to believe that this is money which is available in addition to what we are now authorizing today. But, quoting from the same RECORD and the same statement to which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] refers, the concluding lines of that statement reads as follows:

> These dollar earnings have been taken into account along with all other European dollar earnings before computing Europe's residual dollar needs on which the request for defense support is based.

So when we have defense support of $1,000,000,000 plus, that is the residuum left after taking into account $1,000,000,000 that the gentleman from Ohio says is actually available.

The gentleman from Ohio also will lead you to believe that because of the Ribicoff amendment, $100,000,000 additional is available. If you read the bill, you will find that this section 513 B says "not more than $100,000,000 of the funds made available under the Mutual Security Act of 1952," which indicates that that $100,000,000 is to be taken out of the over-all sum.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. On the transfer that has been spoken of from the Defense Establishment equipment of a billion dollors, which is possible under this bill, it should be noted that transfer is actually from the Defense Department appropriated funds and is not an additional billion dollars so that if that transfer is made, our own defense funds will be that much less.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Yes; that is the so-called Herter amendment. I think the gentleman from Ohio has a point there that this actually could be an additional billion dollars. It might be preferable to have an amendment put in similar to the one we had last year which would provide that this $1,000,000,000 was so allocated under this section that our own Defense Department would have the right to recapture an additional billion dollars' worth of goods from the funds that are being authorized in this bill. However, that is not what the committee voted for as it stands at the present time. There may be some logic in what the gentleman from Ohio points out on this item.

The gentleman from Ohio makes quite an argument over the question of defense support. Here I think the legislative branch is equally responsible with the executive branch because of the misunderstanding that is on the floor of the House. Year after year since these foreign-aid programs have been projected, they have been presented to the House as crises induced and short range. They have been presented, I suppose, to make their paths smoother and easier for passage. That as soon as this bill is passed or that bill is passed we would return to a situation of normalcy. During the debates and during the reports the House itself follows through with that rationale. Consequently, we support military aid. We go along with the Marshall plan and we limit the Marshall plan to June 30, 1952. We then come along with the military-security bill, and we limit the date in 1954.

It is my personal belief that a great mistake is made by the executive branch and by the Congress of the United States when we fall for that type of argument. We get ourselves into a very difficult position, because, as the gentleman says—and I concur with him—this is basically economic aid. They found that they were hoist by their own petard, and consequently they use the term "defense support." I would say, in all truthfulness to the House, that it is not defense support in a purely military sense or it is defense support, but it means the same as economic aid. I suppose next year it will be another gimmick.

The only solution to this particular type of problem is for the House to recognize the facts of international life. The House should recognize the fact that one crisis will follow another crisis in international affairs. As long as we are the leaders of the free world, year after year there will be presented to the floor additional bills for foreign aid. We have no alternative if we are going to hold back the sweeping flood of communism all over the world. Certainly a great disservice is done to the membership of the House and to the American people when we do not tell them the truth and the reality of the world situation as it exists now.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is not the nub of the matter this: that so-called Marshall aid was economic aid, for an economic purpose—recovery—whereas this is economic aid for a military objective? It is not just recovery to enable them to resist internal subversion, but it is to build up their military strength so that they can resist external aggression.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I want to make this statement, and I do not reflect upon the sincerity or good intention of any other member of the committee. This happens to be my own personal viewpoint. My contention is that this is all a part of the same "ball of wax," to use a phrase that has been coined by the gentleman for Ohio [Mr. VORYS]. I do not see how you can separate a nation's economic problems from its military problems. When this House tries to put into channels of military use only all of our aid program, we are defeating what we are actually trying to do. We are conditioning this aid with a lot of frustrations and a lot of fears.

When I was in Europe this year I tried to find out why the United States was feared. The truth is, the United States is disliked. Next to the Soviet Union the United States is suspect. The United States is feared every place you go. Why? We talk peace and we say we are for peace, but every time we come here with an aid program, in order to get it passed, we cloak it completely with military talk. We talk about guns, we talk about tanks, we talk about airplanes, and we talk about means of destruction. What does the Soviet Union do? The Soviet Union during all this time has armed behind the iron curtain. They arm in silence. They are superior to us in almost every category, from manpower, jet planes, and tanks. But they arm always in silence. Therefore, when they send out their phony peace campaign under the symbol of the white dove, it is credible. But we here in the United States, in order to get this legislation through, put around it all this military talk and we say the House will only pass this legislation if we call it military assistance. Instead of making friends we are confusing our allies. We are making people doubt our sincerity.

I say if the time has come when the executive branch is unwilling to look at long-range plans for this Nation, then it is the duty of the Congress to exercise its responsibility. It is not enough to say that the executive branch is charged with the responsibility for foreign affairs. When this House took upon its shoulders and has approved the appropriations and authorizations in all of these bills, we are an equal partner in formulating the foreign policy of the United States of America, and therefore it is our duty to look beyond the so-called cliches and pat arguments.

I think the American people will adopt these programs, will make the sacrifices, will pay their taxes, if they know why they are being asked to do so.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Gladly.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not just as much a cliché to say that we can carry on effective military aid while at the same time we cut out what in this bill is called defense support? As the gentleman from South Carolina said, it is not enough to have men; they have got to have arms. Just the reverse is true also, it is not enough for them to have arms; they must have men who have uniforms, men who have food, men who have hope, men who have will to fight. These come from defense support, so-called.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The gentleman is absolutely correct. You cannot expect a man to fight who does not have something in his stomach, who does not have hope, who is not given something to look forward to.

Mr. JUDD. Or some knowledge that his family is secure and that he will have security and peace as a result of his efforts.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. With reference to that section of the bill known as Economic Aid, if we want these factory workers in Europe to build their own military matériel, is it not just as essential that the factory workers have fats and oils to survive and to work as it is for soldiers

in the field to have the same economic and commodity aid?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Yes; and I would like to point something else out to the House. Basically, I suppose all of us in considering this legislation are acting for the national interest. When you talk about just military aid I think the House must realize that over a period of years, and certainly since the end of the war, our exports have exceeded our imports in a sum averaging $5,000,000,000 a year. These people in order to buy the substance of our farms, and the substance of our mines and the substance of our industry have to have dollars. Where are they going to get them? They are going to get them in two ways: One, if we import goods from Europe so they can earn dollars; and if we do not then we give them the money the way we are doing it here. And let us be very, very candid with the American people and say what we are doing in legislation such as this.

These happen to be the facts of life. Now about this so-called technical assistance. It should be realized that there is a revolution in all of Asia and Africa today. It all has not been Soviet-induced. Sure, the Communists have fanned the blaze wherever there was a blaze. They are organized enough so that where a nation has a weak government and cannot cope with its economic problems the Communists come in and set up an organized minority ready to go, ready to take over the government.

Here we are in America with 155,000,000 people and 6 percent of the world's surface. The Communists have under their control 800,000,000 people and 25 percent of the world's surface. I say to you it is important to have allies, that we need allies for the United States of America.

A bill such as this is for the national interest of the United States. A bill such as this says to the people of the world: "You are our allies. You are our friends. You people are with us." What we in the United States must recognize in this great international contest is that if we are going to continue successful we must make sure that the United States is not out-maneuvered and outpowered by the Soviet Union.

We need a bill such as this. We need this authorization to make sure that America stays a going concern with its ideals and principles to posterity.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW].

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, the Mutual Security Act is for the purpose of increasing the security of the United States by helping the members of the free world to strengthen themselves in the current struggle against the militant and aggressive policies of the Soviet Union. The report of the committee on H. R. 7005 states on page 7:

> The justification for continuing substantial United States expenditures for foreign assistance is the maintenance of the security of the United States. In determining how much to spend and the way such expenditures should be made, an appraisal of the current danger from Soviet aggression is essential.

There has been no decrease in the danger of Soviet aggression. The United States must not relax in its defense efforts and our one hope for the avoidance of an all-out war is in becoming so strong that the potential enemy will not dare to launch an attack upon us. The fundamental principle of the Mutual Security Act is to augment the strength of the free world. This can be accomplished through our aid and by the self-help and the cooperation of the recipient nations. Our investment in foreign affairs is exceedingly high and in continuing to make available assistance, it is imperative to have assurance that all possible efforts will be exercised by those who are receiving our aid to strengthen themselves as rapidly as possible.

We are engaged in a world-wide struggle for survival. The unstable international situation is the result of the unwillingness and the absolute refusal of the Soviet Union to cooperate in establishing a peaceful and stable international society. The Kremlin in its vicious policies of expansion and domination is seeking to tyrannize the earth. It is necessary, therefore, for the free world to gird itself to meet this growing danger, and to protect ourselves from being overrun by aggressive militant international communism. Our trouble today is a direct result of the policies of the Kremlin. We are in the process of strengthening ourselves and strengthening our allies to meet this growing danger.

FOREIGN AID GIVEN BY THE UNITED STATES

In the summary of foreign aid by the United States prepared for the Committee on Foreign Affairs by the Clearing Office for Foreign Transactions, Office of Business Economics, Department of Commerce, we find that the net foreign aid in the war and postwar periods amounts to $73,687,000,000. During the postwar period—July 1, 1945, through December 31, 1951—a total of $32,716,000,000 was expended in net foreign aid. For the current fiscal year the Congress appropriated $7,328,903,976. We are now considering H. R. 7005 which provides for an authorization of $6,901,100,000.

The giving of so much assistance by one country to others is unique in world history. During the last few years we have expended over $4,000,000,000 in Germany alone. Never before has a victorious nation spent so much money in assisting a defeated power. This huge spending in the postwar years represents great sacrifices and the pouring out of the resources of our people. Since the only way this money can be raised is by taxation, every citizen in the land is directly affected by this vast investment in foreign aid. Matters of foreign policy have become of vital interest to every person in the country.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952

H. R. 7005, the Mutual Security Act for 1952, the bill under consideration, provides for a total authorization of $6,901,100,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1953. The difference between the executive request and the recommendations of the Committee is $998,900,000. The committee reduced the request of $7,900,000,000 by $1,010,900,000, and then added $12,000,000 for the children's fund. Thus, we arrive at a total reduction of $998,900,000.

TITLE I

Title I of this measure provides $3,316,000,000 in military assistance for Western Europe. The balances of prior appropriations unobligated on June 30, 1952, or subsequently released from obligation will continue available. The funds carried over may be used for original purposes. The subsequent authorization sections of the measure contain carry-over provisions. The original request for military aid under title I which covers Western Europe was $4,145,000,000. Here the committee made a cut of $829,000,000, or 20 percent.

The Executive requested $1,819,200,000 for defense support in Europe including Greece and Turkey and for economic assistance to Austria and Trieste. The committee cut this item by 10 percent, leaving $1,637,300,000.

Under section 3 of this title, Spain will receive not less than $25,000,000 of the above newly authorized funds, as well as a carry-over of unexpended balances from the appropriation of last year. This is for economic, technical, and military assistance.

TITLE II

Under title II, Greece, Turkey, and Iran—subject to section 202 of the Mutual Security Act—and other countries of the Near East and Africa will receive $606,370,000 in military assistance. Also the Near East and Africa are to receive $55,000,000 in economic and technical aid.

Included in title II is $65,000,000 for UN Palestine refugee relief. Also set aside is $76,000,000 for immigration into Israel. If the funds authorized for these two items cannot be used, the President may spend the money in other sections of the Near East and Africa.

TITLE III

Title III provides $611,230,000 for military and other assistance to countries in Asia and the Pacific. It also makes available $408,000,000 for economic and technical assistance to the nations in this area.

Forty-five million dollars authorized last year for the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency is to continue available for authorization under this bill. The unexpended balances of funds from earlier appropriations are also made available. The Department of the Army is authorized to turn over up to $67,500,000 worth of goods and services which may be charged against the United States pledge to UNKRA when the President determines such a contribution should be made. It should be emphasized that this is not new money, but represents Army money with respect to goods already in its pipeline.

TITLE IV

Latin America will receive $62,400,000 in military assistance under this title. Twenty-two million dollars in technical assistance is set aside for Latin America including non-self-governing territories in the Western Hemisphere all coming

under the Act for International Development.

TITLE V

Under title V, $10,000,000 is set aside for the Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for Movement of Migrants from Europe—PICMME.

Two million eight hundred thousand dollars is provided for ocean-freight charges to carry out the relief-package subsidy program.

Seventeen million dollars is for multilateral technical cooperation, $16,000,000 of which is for U. N. and $1,000,000 for the Organization of American States.

A sum not to exceed $12,000,000 is provided for the U. N. International Children's Emergency Fund between the passage of the bill and December 31, 1953.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The committee decided that $100,000,000 of the funds provided under this act may be supplied without conditions, with not more than $20,000,000 going to any one country.

The Secretary of Defense may furnish without reimbursement military assistance up to $1,000,000,000 out of Defense appropriations for materials of war. This is not new money. Under this provision, Defense Department equipment is transferable to countries in the mutual-defense program.

The act also provides that not less than $1,000,000,000 of military-assistance funds be expended for procurement of military end items from sources outside the United States. This is not additional money, but comes out of mutual-security military-assistance funds. This is the section that provides for offshore procurement.

The act stipulates that the director of this program is permitted to provide military and defense support and, in case of defense support, to furnish funds to NATO, the Schuman-plan organization, and the European defense community, if and when such a community is established.

Within 90 days of the enactment of this bill, the total number of United States citizens working on the program must be reduced at least 10 percent below the January 1, 1952, figure. It is estimated that over 1,000 employees will be affected.

The eligibility section of the Mutual Security Act of last year is amended by setting up further conditions. The Director is empowered to take suitable or appropriate steps to assure effective use by recipients of their resources, including fiscal and budgetary, for mutual security. The Director, in granting assistance, must take into account the progress made by recipient nations. This provision is fine, but I believe it does not go far enough and at the proper time I propose to offer an amendment to strengthen the entire section on eligibility.

The Director is authorized to initiate projects and assist in procuring and stimulating production of materials in short supply among the recipient nations. The purpose of this section is to reduce the drain on the resources of the United States.

The recipient nations must furnish the United States with counterpart funds to be used for purchasing materials in which the United States is deficient.

In carrying out the Mutual Security Act the Director must conduct a study on impediments to private investment abroad and must broaden the guaranty criteria. TCA is required to grant more private contracts to industrial firms. The Department of State is required to accelerate its treaty program relative to private investment abroad.

The equivalent of $100,000,000 in counterpart funds must be used exclusively in stimulating the development of private enterprise.

Investment and informational media guaranties will continue after June 30, 1952.

Up to $100,000,000 worth of defense support, economic and technical assistance funds may be used for subscription to the capital of the International Finance Corporation if such a corporation is created as an affiliate of the International Bank.

This in summary gives the principal proposed authorizations of H. R. 7005. I have also presented the general provisions of the Mutual Security Act. I believe the act can be improved by a further reduction in the authorizations and by the addition of a stronger section setting forth reasonable and precise conditions to accompany American aid.

FURTHER REDUCTIONS

In my opinion the proposed authorizations may be reduced still further without impairing the effectiveness of the mutual-security program. It is my belief that approximately $500,000,000 more could be taken from the several titles without doing harm to the mutual-security enterprise which we have undertaken. I have a feeling that this will help the program because such action would tend to require greater cooperative efforts and more self-help.

The United States is carrying a tremendously heavy burden in defense and foreign aid. During the fiscal years 1951 and 1952 we were spending for defense 13.7 percent of our gross national product. This percentage is far above our allies, the next being France at 9.8 percent. Furthermore, 2.2 percent of our population, or 3,465,000, are in the armed services. This is in excess of any other country, the closest being Belgium-Luxemburg with 1.5 percent. True, the United States is making available aid in terms of its own security, but our country is carrying an exceedingly heavy share, and if a substantial saving can be made without impairing our own security or the security of any other member of the free world, then it is our duty to effect the necessary reductions.

The committee, in considering the bill now before the House, made all of its cuts in title I. Title I provides military aid and defense support for Western Europe. The Executive request for military aid under this title was $4,145,000,000. The committee cut this by $829,000,000. The Executive figure for defense support under title I was $1,819,200,000. This was reduced by $181,900,000. The military aid and the economic and technical assistance in titles II, III, and IV were not reduced. It would seem to me that we could wisely make a further reduction in the proposed military authorization of title I and at the same time effect a percentage reduction in the authorizations proposed by the other titles.

MILITARY AUTHORIZATIONS

Seventy percent of the military funds provided in this bill are in title I. The measure proposes an authorization of $3,316,000. Since this part of the program is the largest, it is subject to the closest scrutiny in proposing additional reductions.

In the first place, we should keep clearly in mind that the total military assistance appropriated since the beginning of the mutual-security program is $11,802,500,000. Of this sum $7,894,300,000 will still be unexpended at the termination of the present fiscal year, June 30, 1952. During the fiscal year 1953 it is estimated that military expenditures will amount to $7,714,000,000. This means the carry-over at the inception of fiscal 1953 will exceed the estimated expenditures for that year. Furthermore, it is estimated that the unexpended balance on June 30, 1952, would be $5,458,000,000 if the entire program is adopted.

There is nothing unusual in the above procedure since contracts can be signed only after funds have been appropriated. It takes a period of time to manufacture the end items. It requires nearly 2 years to construct an airplane after the order has been placed. It should, however, be made perfectly clear that a large part of the military money in this bill upon which we are now acting will have no effect upon deliveries in 1953. A major portion of the funds will result in deliveries during 1954 and later. Therefore, it is well to consider carefully the military provisions in this measure, since the effect of the authorization will be felt far in the future.

In reference to 1954 and thereafter, the Congress does not know, and no one else knows, exactly how many tanks, airplanes, and guns we will need to send to Europe. Europe is moving toward some degree of economic unification under the Schuman plan, and toward some degree of military unification under the plan now being considered for the creation of a European army. The contractual agreements with Germany have yet to be completed. All of this adds up to considerable uncertainty concerning the future course that European history is to take.

It is agreed by statesmen both in the Old and the New World that only by economic, military, and political unification will the Continent be able to stand on its own feet, and only by such unification will it be possible to develop sufficient strength for the protection of Europe. If progress toward unity becomes more rapid in 1953, it may well be that the production of defense materials in Europe will so increase that it will be unnecessary for us to continue to furnish large quantities of end items.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I have such a high regard for my distinguished friend from New Hampshire on this subject that I hope I misunderstand him. The gentleman, of course, is aware that an agreement has been made for a definite number of divisions, battalions of armored troops, and wings of fighter and bomber planes for the various signatory nations. The gentleman is aware that the proper authorities on matériel estimate how much it costs to get the light-tank battalions, the heavy-tank battalions, the fighter wings, and the various component parts. This course of authorization, to be supplemented by a budgetary appropriation, is predicated solely and entirely upon that military chart and that military estimate, per unit and per nation. The gentleman is not suggesting that because those forces are not in being other than by estimate you should not authorize now necessary funds to be appropriated and allocated if and when they are born? Certainly the gentleman does not mean that.

Mr. MERROW. I would say to the gentleman that as far as I have been able to learn the military plans are firm through fiscal 1953, and the major part of these proposed authorizations will not have their effect until 1954 and 1955.

Mr. FLOOD. No doubt about that.

Mr. MERROW. Fiscal 1953 will not be affected by any military reductions that may be made.

Mr. FLOOD. No question about that.

Mr. MERROW. As far as the military plans and as far as the program is concerned for 1954, beginning in fiscal 1954, and thereafter, there is such a degree of uncertainty that I believe for two reasons we can well cut the authorizations. In the first place, there is a great deal of political uncertainty in Europe, and when we get back here next year the Congress will have an opportunity to look at the program again. In the second place, there is a provision in this bill that in the event of an emergency there can be a transfer of a billion dollars worth of end items from our own defense. Therefore, if we decrease the military authorizations, it will be an indication to Europe that we expect them to step up their own military production, and then in a few months when the situation becomes clearer as to the economic unification and the military unification of Europe, we can take another look at the program.

Mr. FLOOD. Then, of course, the gentleman means, and that is what amazes me because of my high regard for his understanding of this problem, what the gentleman just said in reply to my interrogation is this, that by this action of further reduction, you are reducing what you want these other nations to do in direct ratio to the cut that you are now making further in this bill. You are blowing hot and cold. You cannot do both.

Mr. MERROW. I am not reducing what I want the other nations to do.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes, that is what it means.

Mr. MERROW. I would like to see the other nations produce more end items so that the time will come when we will not have to be supplying them. Furthermore, if this program went through at the beginning of fiscal year 1954, which is nearly 2 years away, we would still have an unexpended balance of about $5,000,000,000. That is programing exceedingly far into the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] has expired.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I will yield briefly, I would like to make another point, and I am sorry I do not have too much time.

Mr. FLOOD. I am in complete agreement with that analysis because it cannot be refuted. The point I make is that you are now saying to the military planners for the Nation, who you are insisting should plan further, that you will not permit them to make the plans that you have asked them thus far and agreed that they make. You are now cutting them $500,000,000 in Europe. Is that not so, may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. MERROW. No, this is not what I propose. I am asking for a cut in the entire bill of $500,000,000.

Mr. FLOOD. I referred only to the military part of it at this point.

Mr. MERROW. Yes, I was talking about the military. Now, if I have time, I would talk about the rest of it. But, what I am saying is that we can make a further cut in the military authorization in title I, which will not interfere with the effectiveness of the program because the plans for 1954 and 1955 and thereafter are not firm. There is no doubt of that.

Europe should realize that somehow the problems in connection with developing unified efforts must be solved since the United States cannot continue economic and military aid indefinitely. In view of the great uncertainty in 1954 and in 1955, it is exceedingly difficult to forecast what will be needed and by authorizing great sums of money which will not effect deliveries until 1954 and 1955, it could be said that we are actually making available huge sums before plans are fully crystallized.

The program presented to the committee is for fiscal 1953 and not 1954. True, we know what the Lisbon commitments are. These commitments are for 1953 not 1954. We are being asked to vote money to be spent in 1954 in consideration of commitments as to what the countries who get the money will do in 1953. There is no definite program for 1954 and thereafter.

CUT IN MILITARY WILL NOT ENDANGER PROGRAM

It may be argued that if we do not appropriate all the funds requested at the present time, to that extent we will interfere with future deliveries of planes, tanks, and other items under the mutual security program for 1954 and 1955. However, under the prevailing circumstances, it does not seem to me that this is a strong argument for not reducing the military expenditures in this measure. In the first place, our domestic defense program is sufficiently large to keep our factories in operation until we see what Europe actually requires in 1954 and thereafter. It is my hope, and I am sure it is the hope of everyone interested in this program, that the nations on the Continent will soon be in a position to manufacture their own defense equipment, thereby saving the American taxpayers billions of dollars.

The measure we are now considering authorizes a transfer from United States production up to $1,000,000,000 if in the opinion of the Secretary of Defense an emergency should develop. In this connection let me make it perfectly clear that even though we have reduced the executive request for foreign aid in this measure by $1,010,900,000, we have by the transfer provision given permission to take $1,000,000,000 worth of defense items from our own defense production for mutual security countries. We have saved $1,010,900,000, but technically we have reduced the amount available for foreign aid by only $10,900,000.

The Congress will be in session next year and if it is then clear that in the interest of national security there must be further foreign aid to provide for deliveries in 1954 and thereafter, we can take another look at the mutual security program.

I am convinced that in making additional cuts we will not hurt this program, but on the contrary it will be strengthened for two important reasons—reductions in expenditures will improve the position of our own economy and such cuts will be an indication to the recipients of our aid that we expect an acceleration of effort in order that they may become increasingly more self-sufficient.

DEFENSE SUPPORT

The original request for defense support in this bill has been reduced by 10 percent. The defense support, included in title I, is for the original NATO countries plus Greece and Turkey, now a part of NATO. Defense support has a direct relationship to military production. It is axiomatic that a strong European economy, individually and collectively, is the foundation for an adequate defense. It can be argued that insofar as the economy suffers to that extent will defense production be retarded.

It is estimated that for fiscal 1953 the defense expenditures of eight European NATO countries and Germany would be $13,949,000,000 with defense support, but without defense support the military production would fall to $10,620,000,000. I realize that all of us are anxious to end economic assistance, but to be perfectly realistic economic and defense support is a vital part of the total European defense effort. We have succeeded in strengthening the economies of the several European countries. We would like to see much greater progress in their collective efforts to create a sound continental economy. It seems to me that the committee action in not reducing defense support by a greater percentage is sound policy.

COMMITTEE REPORT ON ECONOMIC PROGRAM

In connection with the economic program the committee report has some very pertinent paragraphs which are

well worth our consideration. Commenting on the $1,637,300,000 authorization by this measure are these words; on page 46:

These funds are to be spent for the imports which the countries of Europe require in order to carry out their military commitments.

Europe is a great workshop possessing highly developed manufacturing plants together with skilled workmen and a highly developed technology. Normally the industries of Europe concentrate on producing for export in order to pay for the imported raw materials and foodstuffs which are obtainable in other areas of the world.

It is essential to the defense program that the industries of Europe be converted to military production. The industries of the United States do not have the capacity to produce all of the equipment required by European forces in addition to that required by our own troops. Furthermore, it is essential that Europe produce for itself so as to relieve the United States of financing as much of the European defense program as possible.

Europe finds itself with little surplus manufacturing capacity to put into military production while leaving normal production for export undisturbed. The European countries were just reaching the point where they could finance their own imports as a result of the Marshall plan. They should and have tightened their belts, but the only way they can produce airplanes, tanks, and weapons is to curtail their production of machinery, automobiles, and electronic equipment for export.

The people of Europe who work in the factories which turn out military end items have to eat imported food and wear clothing made from imported cotton in just the same way they would if they were engaged in export production. The difference is that exports have to pay for the food and clothing required.

As a consequence, the countries of Europe face this dilemma: If they convert from production for export to production for defense without outside help, they cannot feed and clothe their people. These countries are already so much in debt that borrowing is impossible. Their reserves are at the minimum limit. If they do not get United States assistance to pay for necessary imports, they will have to reconvert to export production to keep going.

This is no reflection on the patriotism of the people of Europe or their determination to resist aggression. They must export or die. We do not want their military production to be merely a byproduct of their export production. We face an emergency, and it is in the interest of the United States that they use all possible facilities for the production of arms and military equipment.

The defense-support program has been worked out specifically to meet this situation. The amount of assistance planned for each country has been adjusted to the amount necessary to permit it to do its defense job after taking into account its capacity for military production and making sure that each has tightened its belt to the limit. As a further assurance on this latter point the committee has recommended a 10-percent cut of the defense-support item.

An important part of the defense-support funds will be used to pay for raw materials and machinery used directly by the factories producing military end items in Europe. It would be futile, however, to limit the use of United States funds to such purposes. Each country has more dollars derived from its own exports to spend for imports than the dollars it receives in the form of grants from the United States. Consequently, if it was provided that defense-support money should be used only for copper, machinery, and items going directly to arms factories, the recipient countries would merely buy less of these items with their earned dollars and divert the dollars thus saved to the procurements of wheat and cotton.

It is important that Europe build up her military production as rapidly as possible. After the armies have been supplied, it may not be necessary to keep the military production on such a high level. By adding to the capacity of the European productive system, the time will come when the Continent can manufacture both for defense and for export. Then defense support will be unnecessary.

We have already made a 10-percent cut in defense support. By continuing defense support we will help produce the required expansion of European industry. If industry expands, the need for economic assistance will certainly decrease. We must work toward the end of American foreign aid, but for the present time it would seem to me that too great a cut in defense support would gravely hamper European military production and could well tend to defeat the objectives which we have in mind.

TITLES II, III, AND IV

I would suggest at least a 10 percent cut in these titles, both economic and military. All the reductions should not be made in the first title of this bill. A 10 percent cut in the other titles would amount to a saving of $190,600,000.

The military programs in Greece, Turkey, Formosa, and Indochina are well organized. They are not subject to organizational uncertainties such as exist in Europe. A comparable heavy cut in these areas would not be warranted. The economic and technical assistance in these countries is chiefly devoted to assisting undeveloped nations where there is considerable political unrest.

A 10 percent cut will not retard the program and, furthermore, since we expect these countries to help themselves, it could well have a most salutary effect in bringing about an increase in their efforts. After all is said and done, a rise in the standard of living in undeveloped areas is largely dependent upon the efforts of the local populations.

The United States cannot continue indefinitely to spend its resources in all sections of the world. Billions upon billions have already been expended in foreign aid. It is time that the entire program be given the most careful scrutiny and that all those we are helping do their utmost to assist themselves. The Treasury of this country is not inexhaustible and any saving we can make in this program will strengthen our own economy which in turn means strength for the free world.

In the countries outside of NATO we have two programs—mutual security program and TCA. The economic aid given under the Mutual Security Act must be justified in terms of its military effectiveness. The technical assistance programs are for the implementation of point 4 and are designed to increase the standard of living. There is a grave question as to how much development is actually taking place in backward areas and until we are more certain of results and of the accomplishments of both the mutual-security program and the TCA program, it is well for us to be somewhat cautious in the spending of American funds. A 10 percent reduction in these titles will amount to a saving of nearly $200,000,000 and will not, in my opinion, impair the program.

NEED FOR MUTUAL SECURITY

I have consistently supported foreign aid, both economic and military. It is my sincere belief that in the interest of United States security it is imperative for us to assist our allies in this struggle against international communism which is supported by the militant and aggressive policies of the Soviet Union. I am convinced that proper reductions and the insistence upon certain reasonable and precise conditions will strengthen this joint effort. In making available foreign aid we must keep constantly in mind our own capacities and the capacities of our allies in helping themselves and in giving greater cooperation in the achievement of mutual defense. The United States is ready and willing to do everything in its power by way of leadership and by extending help to increase not only its own strength but the strength of its allies as we gird for the greatest contest which free men have ever faced in history.

Our problems must be faced with courage, determination, and statesmanship, constantly keeping foremost in our minds that upon the soundness of our own fiscal condition depends the future existence of the free world and upon the strength of our economy depends the outcome of the life-and-death struggle for survival against the destructive and sinister forces of international communism led and inspired by the Soviet Union.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the mutual-security bill now before the House. To me it is a part, and an important part, of our national defense. It is mutual security, and I stress those words, that strengthens both ourselves and our friends in the face of Soviet imperialism.

Because I favor this principle does not mean that I cast my vote without adequate evidence to support this measure. The Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member, sat for more than 6 weeks every day, sometimes twice a day, to hear witnesses. More than 40 witnesses testified. Each of them was subjected to a thorough examination by the members. We asked for an analysis of the present world situation—area by area, country by country. We requested a justification for every item that appears in this bill. We heard military, political, and economic experts. The printed hearings on this bill cover more than 1,100 pages. In addition, several hundred pages contain highly classified information. I mention these details only to show that we have conscientiously discharged the responsibilities this House has placed upon us. When it came time to mark up this bill, no one who followed the testimony could plead a lack of information. I am convinced that the committee has strengthened the original bill, I can support it without reservation.

What are the bases of the mutual-security program? As I see it, they are really four in number:

First. The security of the United States is part of the security of the free world. The United States cannot achieve lasting security by its efforts alone. It must act in concert with other free nations. The United States relies on other nations for resources necessary to its own security. Economic and military power of the free world together is far greater than of the United States alone.

Second. The objective of the United States is to build strength in the free world, both as a deterrent to Communist aggression and as a positive force for the fulfillment of the aspirations of free peoples. This means the building of the free world with enough military strength to deter external Communist aggression and the building of economic, political, and moral strength sufficient to remove threats of Communist subversion and point the way to progress so urgently desired by many people. These forms of strength are indivisible. Military strength alone cannot do the job. Economic, political, or moral strength alone cannot do the job. Together they provide the means to withstand Communist aggression and to provide the hope that gives the will to resist and the faith in free institutions.

Third. The mutual security program for the coming year is necessary if the common effort is to be successful. If we are to expect others to devote their resources to the task at hand, we must be prepared to devote our own resources in appropriate measures.

Fourth. The United States can afford the Mutual Security Program. The costs involved, I am convinced, are within the economic capacity of the United States. The cost is a part of the security program of the United States, which is a legitimate first charge upon our resources. Most of the money in this bill is for the advancement of the program in Europe. The Members may properly ask what our goals in Europe are. As I see it, our major goal in Europe is to provide a military build-up as rapidly as possible through a total defense effort, military and economic. Our allies of the North Atlantic Community and ourselves met in Lisbon to determine what the goals for the current year should be and the projecting of forces in 1953 and 1954. The plan worked out at Lisbon calls for a combined defense effort of all the NATO countries during this year. It will provide the following forces: 50 divisions, about half of which are to be in a state of combat readiness, and the balance in rapidly mobilizable reserve units; 4,000 combat aircraft, together with necessary airfields, supporting installations and communications systems; 700 major combat vessels, and 925 smaller types of vessels. I would remind the Members that these sizable numbers do not include the forces of Greece and Turkey, now members of NATO. The forces of those countries will be integrated into NATO defense planning to perform their proper roles.

What will the United States contribute to the European defense build-up in this next fiscal year? An examination of this bill reveals that our contributions to Europe will take four principal forms: military end items produced in the United States; military end items procured in Europe under the offshore procurement program; military training and technical program; and defense support assistance to European economies, such as commodities, machinery, raw materials.

This last form of contribution, defense support, is a matter of some confusion to many people. Defense support takes the form of raw materials, equipment, and commodities which Europe must import in order to expand its production to the extent necessary to sustain the desired level of military effort. Some people argue that defense support is just another name for the Marshall plan. The increased production under the Marshall plan went mostly to expand civilian consumption and investment. The increased production under the Mutual Security Program goes mostly to expand European defense programs. It is the difference in the end result of the two programs that explains the difference in the names. In the analyses presented to our committee it was made clear that the more than $1,000,000,000 defense support spent in Europe would enable those countries to increase their military contributions by about $3,500,000,000. To me this looks like a good investment.

The emphasis that we are giving to Europe in this program is not at the expense of Asia, the Near East, or Latin America. These countries, particularly in Asia, are also under Communist threat. The free nations of that area are holding the line against aggression in Korea and Indochina. They are battling Communist-inspired disorders in Burma, Malaya, and the Philippines. The loss of any of these countries would mean the loss of freedom for millions of people, the loss of vital raw materials, the loss of points of critical strategic importance to the world. Much of the money contained in this bill will be devoted to strengthening those areas.

At the same time that we are giving assistance in the military field we are also giving economic and technical assistance to help friendly countries in building the kind of strength that comes through finding solutions to problems of disease, illiteracy, inadequate food, and economic underdevelopment. These conditions would exist even if there were no Soviet threat to peace, but militant Soviet communism exploits the turbulence in these areas. Positive measures and speed are necessary. In the Near East our programs are designed to assist responsible leaders, orderly reforms, and development in which the energies of the people can find constructive expansion. We are assisting the countries of Asia to establish strong and stable governments. In Latin America we are assisting countries to raise living standards and overcome the weaknesses of their economic structure that contribute to political and economic instability. We are doing these things by providing assistance where the need is urgent, by providing trained people to work with the people in those countries at the grass-roots levels. This is where action can be effective, where "know-how" and "show-how" attack urgent problems at their sources. The funds for these types of assistance are relatively small compared with the European defense program, but the importance of what must be done and what can be done is not comparable in dollar amounts. The effect is what counts. The programs of these areas are tailored to the needs, the priority of the problem, and to the most effective method of getting at it.

If we do not support this program, we then have to consider alternatives to it. One choice is to withdraw to our own shores and gamble our national safety on air and naval power. A glance at some of the vital materials that go into our air and naval power shows how self-defeating this would be. Manganese, tin, and chrome, all essential to our own military effort, come from outside the Western Hemisphere. Should we turn our backs on the rest of the world, these and other precious resources so vital to our own security would not only be lost to us but, what is more important, would probably be added to the military strength of the Soviet empire. Without our friends abroad the threat of aggression would move close to our own shores.

Another choice is to limit this program to the provision of finished military equipment made in this country. This would mean that the relatively small sum marked for defense support would be eliminated. This is the most expensive choice and the one least calculated to bring lasting military strength. A military force could be built on equipment from the United States but—and this point is most important—this means that the United States must continue to support and maintain its own Military Establishment plus a military establishment of the European countries. Defense support is the most economical in terms of the end results.

Still another choice that lies before us is to limit our assistance to a combination of military end items and the necessary support to develop and maintain them. But arms alone do not satisfy the aspirations of people whose demands for change bring economic, political, and social insecurity. To focus our efforts on military-assistance programs alone is to invite the dangerous risk of undermining the bases upon which security rests.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons I am convinced that the bill before us points the direction and gives the emphasis to the type of assistance we can best afford to give and which our friends can best afford to use. I urge the Members to vote favorably on this bill.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, as a junior member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I hitherto thought it wise to get my bearings before attempting to speak on international questions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman may term himself a junior member, but I consider him to be one of the most

valuable members in the committee as well as in the House.

Mr. LANHAM. I appreciate that very much. I might say in that connection that when I first joined the Committee on Foreign Affairs, it was very near the end of the last session, and I sat in with a great deal of interest. But, to tell the truth, I was terribly confused. I knew very little about foreign affairs, and I still do. There were so many alphabetical agencies referred to, that one afternoon I was just so confused, and my head was turning so that I got up and walked out and got some fresh air for a while. But I am beginning to acclimate myself now to thinking in these terms, though I have not yet gotten any striped pants. I understand that after a year or so that will come too. It is unfortunate that our genial chairman lost his pants in Europe several years ago, although I do not think they were striped pants. Even if he did lose his pants, he retained his sense of humor, which carries him over many rough places as he presides over the committee.

Mr. Chairman, to be serious again, I want to say I do approve of the way that this debate has been conducted so far today. It has really been on a high plane. I have been especially impressed with the splendid speech made by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. I just wish we had more men in public life who had the same confidence in the sanity and sound judgment of the American people, and who are willing, as Mr. RIBICOFF is, to tell them the facts of life and not try to sugar-coat this bill of foreign aid.

I have confidence in the American people, and I am sure that if we tell them the facts they will respond and they will pay for this insurance policy, to which the able chairman of our committee has likened this program.

I am still a learner, but no longer a freshman. Even now, I would be holding my tongue if I did not believe that this House is confronted with an extraordinarily crucial decision at one of the tensest moments in human history.

It is my belief that the next 60 to 90 days will determine whether or not we have a united Europe and whether or not we can weld together or mold into a defense community the countries of Western Europe. General Eisenhower has done a tremendous job in Europe and we are just upon the verge of getting unity of the defense community of the Western World. Russia realizes that, and Russia is more disturbed about the prospects of our success in Europe than she is about any other thing that is happening today. Consequently, she has made misleading peace proposals, and has proposed a unification of Germany. That is done for no other purpose than to interfere with the unification of the Western World, and the strengthening and building of a strong defense community. People in Germany are beginning to waver. If we waver now and if we do not face up to the realities of life, to the facts of life and to our obligations, then I do not know whether Adenauer in Germany, Pinay in France, and Schuman will be able to weld this community together and make an effective defense community of Western Europe. These are critical days—the next 30 days. That defense pact must be signed with Germany, and if we weaken now and say that we do not consider the situation in Western Europe and in the world serious enough to do what is necessary to furnish arms to the men who are ready in Europe to serve in this European army, and to furnish economic aid, if you want to call it that, to Europe, because, as the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, has said, while this may be economic aid, it is economic aid with a military purpose—our failure may defeat our efforts to build a strong European defense community—we must not falter now.

The issue before us should not be dealt with on a partisan basis. The democratic process calls for debate. It thrives on differences of opinion. But debate on foreign policy should be on the highest level we can reach. What we do here about this appropriation for mutual aid involves the fate of the free world. We are legislating now for the benefit or the hurt of untold generations to come.

The situation, as I see it, boils down to this. The world is suffering from a terrible disease. All the doctors we have called in are agreed on the remedy. But the prescription is very expensive. In a case of life and death, do we talk about economy, or stop to haggle with the druggist or doctor about their charges? Of course not.

In its report on H. R. 7005, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has recommended a reduction of $1,010,000,000 in the amount proposed by the President. With some misgivings, I joined in that action. I am not at all sure that a larger sum would not have been preferable. General Eisenhower has said that a cut of a billion would be "heavily and seriously felt." General Eisenhower has done a remarkable job in Europe and I am ready to take his word when he talks about our security problem in Europe. Frankly, I do not like the idea of a "heavy and seriously felt" cut in funds to be spent for maintaining the security of the United States.

But I was willing to go along with the rest of the committtee, and I am willing to stand by the decision we reached. In my opinion, however, any effort to reduce the figure set by the committee would be deplorable. Again I accept General Eisenhower's judgment. He said a further substantial cut would endanger the whole NATO military program "essential in the interest of United States security."

I say the issue is not one of economy, but of fundamental American policy and the security of the free world. I am as eager as the next man to keep down costs and taxes. I am not unaware that this is an election year, and that economy is supposed to work some sort of magic where voters are concerned. But there is a true and false economy, and I make bold to assert that using a meat ax on the foreign aid program is not true economy.

To use the meat ax on the foreign-aid program is not true economy.

And may I say that in the consideration of the bill by the Foreign Affairs Committee in making the cuts that we did make, we did not use the meat-ax technique; as a matter of fact, each section of the bill was carefully gone over, and the cuts were made where it was believed they would do the least damage to the program.

Right here I want to pay a tribute to our chairman and to the members of the committee who have worked so hard, both on the majority side and the minority side. There have been differences of opinion; there are still differences of opinion. The gentleman from New Hampshire, and I have the highest regard for him, believes that another $500,000,000 can be cut from the program. I differ with him; I think it would seriously hurt the program if we should.

Old Sam Johnson said that "patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel." He meant "patrioteering," of course. I will not say penny pinching is in the same class. But I will say that sometimes it seems to me that shouting economy is the first resort of a politician.

For what are the facts? The fact is that all the extraordinary expenditures of recent years have not harmed our national economy. The fact is that, while there has been some dislocation, and we have felt some inflationary pressures, our industrial capacity has been expanding tremendously. Nineteen hundred and fifty to 1951, security outlays rose by $16,000,000,000, but our total output rose by $26,000,000,000. Economists tell us that our total output will grow by roughly 5 percent annually in the next 2 years. That would make our gross national output approximately $345,000,000,000 in 1952 and $363,000,000,000 in 1953.

A little press story in the Washington Post for yesterday, May 19, quoted statistics from the Department of Commerce to the effect that, based on the output of the first quarter the total value of the national output would be for 1952 $339,500,000,000. Compare that with $273,000,000,000 in 1947, and $326,000,000,000 in 1951, and you have assurance doubly sure that the economic health of the Nation is in no danger by reason of the money we are spending to build up the military and economic strength of the free world.

I saw somewhere today the statement that the money we are spending in foreign aid is a blue chip investment in national security. I say that states the proposition as clearly as it can be stated.

I repeat the issue is not one of sound husbandry of our resources, but of fundamental foreign policy to protect those resources.

Nobody admits being an isolationist these days, but I observe that only a change of tactics has taken place. The man who used to shout against "entangling alliances" today shows he is still unconverted by working against our wholehearted, full-handed participation in world affairs.

It took us about 2 years after the German surrender to realize that Russia was

trying to wreck the rest of the world in order to communize it. Having found that out, we proceeded to meet this challenge. It was plain that if we were to halt Soviet aggression, we would have to help other countries threatened by this aggression.

So in March 1947 President Truman, calling for aid to Greece and Turkey, announced the doctrine which bears his name, that is, the doctrine that we would "support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure." As a result, Greece and Turkey are today members of NATO, standing shoulder to shoulder with other free countries in a preventive campaign against Soviet imperialism. Ask our top military men in Korea about their fighting qualities. They have been superb.

Then, 3 months later, came General Marshall's proposal calling for a gigantic program for the economic rebuilding of all Europe on a cooperative basis made possible by funds from this country. In 1948, the European recovery plan became a working fact. The result has been all that we expected. By planning together, and by making their contributions to the main account, the democracies of Western Europe regained much of the economic ground they had lost. If Korea had not intervened, it is admitted that their economies would now be on a sound basis. But the strain put upon the nations of Western Europe by the necessity for rearmament was too much for their economies to stand.

So on March 15, 1947, the North Atlantic Treaty was signed, with the United States joining other nations on the proposition that "armed attack against one or more" would be "considered an attack against them all." In September 1949, Congress passed the Mutual Defense Assistance Act appropriating $1,000,000,000 for military aid to the North Atlantic Treaty countries.

What we are dealing with now is a sequel to that action. Since 1949, NATO has welded the European nations together, and one of its projects, the European Defense Community, is to have a supranational army, including German soldiers. It is as Supreme Commander of NATO forces that General Eisenhower has warned us against being miserly at the very moment when the solidarity of Europe is about to be achieved, at the very moment when Europeans are showing the will to stand up for their rights, the will to give out of their limited means for a united front against the Russian marauder.

There is nothing in this bill which can be lopped off without the gravest injury to our European allies and to ourselves. In the kind of world we have, the free peoples must hang together or they risk being hanged separately.

Let no one forget that in helping Europe, we are also helping ourselves. Free Europe must be defended by us if we do not want to defend ourselves alone at home. To stint our contribution to the rising power of the European democracies is to reject our duty as world leader and to renege on our commitment to our friends.

I cannot believe this House will fail to give complete approval to the recommendations of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the time I shall consume will be in discussing the philosophy behind this legislation rather than a consideration of the matter of cuts or the technical phases of it. I was very much interested to hear the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] state that we are a hated people in many parts of Europe. It seems to me that that is one of the things we should take into account as we consider this legislation because, after all, we are trying to help nations who will be friendly to us. It is rather difficult for me to support this kind of legislation when we know that we are not building the thing we want to build, namely, a defense against communism.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY A COMEDY OF ERRORS

Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us involves foreign policy. It is certain to be an issue in the coming campaign. My position is well known by every Member of this House. I am absolutely against it because it has failed. I refuse to follow a leadership that is once again getting us dangerously involved in international affairs which might well precipitate world war III.

So that there will be no question about my position, I am serving notice that I wholly disagree with a member of the Wisconsin delegation in the other body who recently stated that, notwithstanding the mistakes of the present administration, he was ready and willing to follow its foreign policy.

He is further reported to have said, Mr. Chairman, that he would oppose any Member of Congress, in either party who would unjustifiably attack the foreign policy of this administration. Just what he meant by that statement I do not know, but obviously we are at opposite ends of the pole in this matter. This in no way affects our personal friendship as we can disagree without being disagreeable.

Mr. Chairman, the issue in foreign policy is not one of personalities, the only question is what are the foreign policies of this administration doing to and for our country? This involves a matter of leadership—Democratic leadership under our two-party system, if you please—which some people contend is a bipartisan matter. I deny it is or ever has been bipartisan. Whatever it is—as we look at the record since 1938, it has resulted in a comedy of errors. It has lost the peace; it has lost China; it has lost the war in Korea at a cost of 115,000 casualties; it has lost the friendship of 500,000,000 people in Asia; it is losing the friendship of 200,000,000 Moslems in the Middle East and North Africa; it slaps Franco in the face but embraces Tito in a mighty bunny hug; it attempts to stop communism on a 500-mile front in Europe yet the dangerous perimeter is 20,000 miles long. Indecision, instability and inconsistency have marked our foreign policy and it is driving this country to the verge of bankruptcy and the people to utter despair. We have fewer fricnds today than ever before in our history.

This legislation is to support the NATO military alliance, continue economic assistance, under the guise of military support and technical assistance. It is not a new scheme to shear the innocent taxpayer in this country but the continuance of an old one. How long will it continue? Neither Harriman nor Acheson would venture a guess but if the planners in the Department of State and Harriman's hired hands prevail it will be a long, long time.

Mr. Chairman, a year ago, I stated that this foreign spending program was not succeeding. I charged that it was the wrong approach to the Communist threat because it was based on the use of force—guns, tanks, planes, and bombs. Further, that the people of Europe and Asia were fearful that our objectives would lead to more war and a lower standard of living. That fear persists today.

At that time, Mr. Chairman, I did not think that today I would find myself in distinguished company. I ask your indulgence while I quote excerpts from recent addresses by John Foster Dulles, Republican, and Justice William O. Douglas, Democrat. This is a nonpartisan approach to the important issues raised in the bill before us.

On May 12, Mr. Dulles in an address on the subject Foreign Policy Needs said in part:

> With nations, as with men, money is no substitute for character. Our Nation today is spending fabulous sums for security. The target this year is about $50,000,000,000. We have given away, in one form or another, about $40,000,000,000 since 1945. If money could buy security and happiness, we should have them. Yet we have them not. Today we are insecure, we have less good will than ever before in our history, and our people feel a sense of frustration.

"We are insecure, we have less good will than ever before" and this from a man who has been an ardent advocate of some phases of the administration's foreign policy. Here is the admission, yes, a confession, that the purpose in support of this legislation—our own national security—has not been achieved. "Unlimited spending should have purchased security and happiness," says Mr. Dulles, "yet we have them not." Thus he has kicked out the props from under this legislation.

Mr. Dulles, then points out that even though we have joined the United Nations and other international organizations, they have not succeeded. This is what he said:

> However, we would not be honest with ourselves if we did not admit that today large numbers of our people feel disillusioned and unhappy about these collective organizations. They went into them with great hopes and they have seen our Nation spend on them large sums. Now, it seems that the original estimates on which our Nation proceeded were miscalculated because the peril,

which it was said would be removed, persists unabated.

"The peril persists unabated." If that is true how can the proponents of this bill now say this program has been successful?

Now listen to this further indictment that Dulles makes. He says:

Nothing which we have done tackles the No. 1 problem which is that of checking further Soviet aggression everywhere without such vast unproductive military expenditures as would destroy the very values we are trying to protect.

Mr. Chairman, many Republican Members of this House have taken the floor and have made the same charges that I have read from the Dulles address but we have been called isolationists and with giving aid and comfort to our enemies. Those charges, I assure you, will not deter us in the future when the welfare of our country is at stake.

Proof is piling up everywhere, Mr. Chairman, that our pushing for a gigantic military program is causing some alarm in both the East and West. As to that, Mr. Dulles says:

But we must bear in mind that our growing stockpile of atomic weapons subject to our unpredictable use or abuse, is not everywhere reassuring and indeed, in some respects it helps Soviet communism in its political warfare. The hard truth is, as my recent visits, in both East and the West have made clear to me, that many of the peoples of the world have less fear of the Red Army than fear that the United States may rashly precipitate atomic warfare, against which their population centers are utterly defenseless.

Mr. Chairman, every time this administration undertakes a spending program it cries "Wolf." It uses a fear technique to arouse the people in supporting its policies. Mr. Dulles said something about that, too:

As it is, we live through what is represented to be a series of crises. The assumption appears to be that the only emotion that will cause us to act is fear. The Congress and the people are constantly being told that unless we take emergency action, a terrible catastrophe will shortly befall.

He then pointed out that we were told in 1948 that 1950 would be the critical year. In 1950, that 1952 would surely be the dangerous year. Now we are told, 1954 is the one to prepare for. His answer to these arguments is:

I can see no more reason to assume that they—

Soviets—

plan to make open attack in 1954 than in in any other year, past or future.

Justice Douglas, a Democrat and high in the councils of his party, openly challenges the military aspects of our foreign policy. In an address before a forum in Philadelphia last March, he minced no words. He charged that this country is drifting in the direction of repression, drifting dangerously fast.

This is caused—

He said—

by the fact that we carried over to the days of peace, the military approach to world affairs. Diplomacy in our relations to Asia took a back seat. The military approach conditioned our thinking and our planning.

This leading Democrat also charged that our policies were not directed toward the people whose friendship is so greatly needed but rather toward those particular areas where we could setup military bases. Here are his words:

We forgot that democracy in many lands is an empty word; that the appeal is hollow when made to illiterate people living at the subsistence levels. We asked them to furnish staging grounds for a military operation whose outcome, in their eyes, had no perceptible relation to their own welfare.

This was the result of our military thinking, of our absorption in military affairs. In Asia, it has brought us the lowest prestige in our existence.

The military effort has been involving more and more of our sons, more and more of our budget, and more and more of our thinking. The military policy has so completely absorbed our thoughts that we have forgotten that our greatest strength, our enduring power, is not in guns but in ideas.

Today in Asia we are identified not with the ideas of freedom but with guns. Today at home we are thinking less and less in terms of defeating communism with ideas and more and more in terms of defeating communism with military might.

He then called attention to the fact that, notwithstanding enormous expenditures "Soviet imperialism continues to expand and that the expansion proceeds without the Soviets firing a shot. The free world continues to contract without a battle for its survival having been fought."

It becomes apparent—

Says he—

as country after country falls to Soviet imperialistic ambitions, that military policy alone is a weak one; that military policy alone will end in political bankruptcy and futility. Thus fear mounts.

Mr. Chairman, I have quoted at some length statements by two great Americans who say that the major phase of this legislation—the military—will not meet the issue of communism. There is a very great need for a new approach and it is the duty of our committee to undertake such a study. Our attention should be directed to the well-being of people and not to bankrupt socialistic governments. Our concern should be in higher standards of living for people in those areas where communism is expanding.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I shall address my remarks to the money requests in this bill. The asking figure is $6,901,100,000 and for all practical purposes approximately seven billion dollars. If the information submitted to the committee is correct there is no need to authorize or appropriate any additional money for this global give-away program.

In a memorandum prepared by the committee staff on fiscal status of mutual security funds as of March 31, 1952, there are two interesting tables. I shall refer to the one relating to expenditure data. The information contained in the tables was prepared by the Comptroller, Office of the Director for Mutual Security, May 7, 1952, so obviously, it is up-to-date information.

According to that table the net cumulative funds available through fiscal year 1952 were $26,063.4; cumulative expenditures, March 31, 1952, $14,700.7; unexpended balance, March 31, 1952, $11,362.7; estimated expenditures, April 1, 1952, through June 30, 1952, $2,417.6; unexpended balance, June 30, 1952, $8,945.1.

Now there must be added to the unexpended balance, the amount carried in the bill before us, which is $6,901.1; and United States military transfers, $1,000.0; plus, military expenditures overseas, $1,052.0; total, $8,953.1; plus, unexpended balance above June 30, 1952, $8,945.1; total available for expenditures for 1953, $17,898.2; less, estimated expenditures, 1953, $10,345.7; unexpended balance, June 30, 1953, $7,552.5—above figures in millions of dollars.

If my computation is correct, there is no justification to support the full amount requested.

In this connection, I call attention to the position that has been taken by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States which heretofore has always supported the foreign-aid program. In a report issued by the Chamber on April 28, by the Director of Economic Research, Mr. Emerson P. Schmidt, the National Chamber of Commerce takes the position that I do—that because of the unexpended balance available, there is no need for any additional appropriation. On page 7 of its report, the Chamber recommends "that the Congress authorize no more foreign aid for fiscal year 1953."

It is well to keep in mind, Mr. Chairman, that it is not what we authorize or appropriate but what can be produced in the way of material needs to support the program. Real production has not been forthcoming and if the total average for expenditures for 1953 of $17,898,200,000 is correct and if the Mutual Security Administration intends to spend $10,345,700,000, then the unexpended balance as of June 30, 1953, 1 year from now, would be $7,552,500,000.

Mr. Chairman, proponents of this give-away scheme paint rosy word-pictures about the success of our efforts to remake the military and economic life of the NATO countries. They point to the Schuman plan, the so-called European Defense Community—still to be organized—the North Atlantic Treaty, and Lisbon Conference. They close their eyes to political unrest in Italy and France where the Communists hold a balance of power and existing governments are in constant jeopardy. They refuse to face up to the facts of life in the German situation. They ignore facts that indicate the people in Western Europe are resisting rearmament because of the drift to a lower standard of living; they cannot buy more guns and bread, too. Our insistence and persistence to rearm those countries is unmoral. It will not win the battle against communism.

Bertrand de Jouvenel, a French writer said quite recently that the Europeans should naturally want military aid but in fact do not.

And they want it—

Said he—

all the less because it is urged upon them from the outside.

This writer clearly points out that the assumption of leadership by the United

States in the defense of Europe has blinded the bulk of European society to political reality. They are asking the question, "How far shall we contribute to the American effort in Europe?"

We must remember that Europe faces the problem of rearmament, plus obligations now imposed by the welfare state. There is quite obviously a tax burden that must be imposed by political leaders who refuse to assess the necessary taxes and take the attitude that the United States will pay the bill.

Mr. Chairman, it was recently pointed out from 1945 to 1952, France received four billions worth of American aid. The Governor of the Banque de France has reported that gold and hard-currency banknotes have been withdrawn from circulation and clandestinely hoarded by panicky Frenchmen. The people have lost confidence in their government. Twenty billion dollars of French money is now out of circulation. Is it any wonder the French economy is shaky? And so long as American taxpayers pour their dollars into France there is no need to use French money. How simple can we be and how long will we stay that way?

Mr. Chairman, the plain people in Europe are sick to death of the very idea of another war. They do not want another war and they will not pay the cost of rearmament. Yes, the diplomats and the generals profess there is the will to rearm and to fight but the unvarnished facts are that they fear our military program more than communism.

Walter Lippmann has said that our insistence on the formation of a European army must be dropped and that a political settlement between France and West Germany must be put ahead of everything else.

Last February, Mr. Dulles, in a speech in Iowa that did not receive much publicity, charged openly that our policy to contain Russia in military terms "is a self-defeating policy." The way out as he saw it then or the alternative to present policies is "enlightened economic policies that will enable free peoples by orderly methods, gradually and peacefully to improve their domestic conditions and to end any threat of violence that is genuinely domestic."

Mr. Chairman, our present foreign policies are promoting a Western European community based entirely on war. We have ignored the necessity of creating a sound political climate. Our strategic concept is to deter and defend. We can neither deter nor defend in the foreseeable future in spite of the NATO enthusiasts if the Russian military machine starts to move.

Mr. Chairman, Europe cannot afford the NATO war formula. The British Board of Trade figures for January show a British trade deficit still running at $3,000,000,000 a year and that of the entire sterling area of about $2,000,000,000. At that time they only had $2,000,000,000 of sterling available and that is getting pretty close to the bottom of the barrel.

It is little wonder, Mr. Chairman, that the British Labor Party has been needling the Churchill government. The Prime Minister in Parliament has admitted that Bevan was right when he charged that his government could not afford the American rearmament program.

Mr. Chairman, it has been no pleasant task for me to take this floor and speak out against the legislation that is before us. But I cannot remain silent and live with my own conscience.

I respectfully suggest again, Mr. Chairman, to the majority party that the time has come to reconsider the basic assumptions on which our present foreign policies rest. Republicans are ready to help and much can be accomplished around the conference table. As I see it, we can approach our problem by: First, considering a foreign policy of well-defined aims, which will, second, adhere to the basic principles upon which our Government was established, with special emphasis upon, third, assistance to self-help through private productivity, where it is requested. Human beings everywhere can solve their own problems where governments do not interfere. Men are made that way.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McVEY].

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, I am arising in opposition to this bill. It carries the label "The Mutual Security Act of 1952." The title is attractive and to a certain extent impelling, if we do not look beyond the immediate implications. It provides for an expenditure of $6,901,100,000 to be used in assisting other nations in meeting their economic and military responsibilities. The purpose is laudable, there is no question about that. To say that this large expenditure would serve no good purpose would indicate utter disregard of the truth. Certainly it would be helpful to other countries.

There comes a time, however, when we cannot continue such huge expenditures without seriously disrupting our own economy. To my way of thinking, that hour has now arrived. Some of the money we have been appropriating for foreign-aid purposes has gone to countries whose fiscal status is in much better condition than our own. This is particularly true in the case of many of the countries of South America.

It is incumbent upon us at times to take stock of our own financial situation. In the statistics given out a few months ago by our own Department of Commerce and confirmed by the Library of Congress, the purchasing power of our dollar has declined, in terms of the wholesale price index, to approximately 44 cents, using the years 1935–39 as a base—not 1932 but 1935–39. When calculations are made in terms of the Consumers' Price Index, the purchasing power of the dollar is approximately 54 cents.

No matter what index is used, the dollar has declined almost one-half in the last 12 years. Should this decline continue in like amount for the next 12 years, our dollar will hardly purchase a newspaper. What then will be the position of those who are depending upon their pensions, their social-security payments, or other retirement allowances for support during the time when earnings will have ceased? What will have happened to the value of the life-insurance policies into which so many thrifty individuals have placed their hard-earned money?

But, you say, these thoughts are ridiculous. Are they? The lessons of history should be our guide in our thinking on this subject. No nation has been able to survive with a sound currency that has followed our practice in regard to deficit spending year after year. During the last 20 years, we have indulged in deficit spending in the amount of $222,000,000,000; we have balanced the budget only 3 years in 20—and two of those years are to the credit of the Eightieth Republican Congress. Deficit spending furnishes the fertile soil from which inflationary spirals spring, and our President has proposed a budget that will add $14,000,000,000 to a public debt which is now almost twice that of all the free nations of the world combined.

Our national debt is now approaching $260,000,000,000. This Federal debt is 85 percent greater than the combined debts of all nations, excluding China, Russia, Iraq, Lebanon, Algeria, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Germany, and a few other areas for which no public statistics are available. We propose to collect in taxes this year approximately $71,000,000,000, which is only slightly less than the total tax burdens of the remaining free nations.

Taxes paid during the 156 years of our history, beginning with the year 1789 and ending with the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt on April 12, 1945, amounted to $245,000,000,000. The present administration collected between April 13, 1945, and January 31, 1952, a total of $275,000,000,000. In other words, the Truman administration, prior to January 31, 1952, had collected $30,000,000,000 more in taxes than all the Presidents that preceded him. Now, we are told, this is not enough—that we need more—and that we shall face a deficit of approximately $14,000,000,000, if the President's recommendations, in his budget for fiscal 1953, are followed.

There is much danger ahead of us if this huge spending program, and especially the deficit-spending phase, is not curtailed. When I was in Germany, before it entered its inflationary spiral, the German mark was worth about 25 cents. I received four of them in exchange for one American dollar. After Germany had gone to the end of the road in her inflationary spiral, I bought a billion German marks for a dollar and a half. I was in France, also, when she had a sound currency, and the French franc was worth approximately 20 cents. The exchange there gave me 5 francs for an American dollar. On November 19, 1952, the black market in France quoted the exchange on the franc at the rate of 480 for an American dollar, although our own dollar is worth only about half what it was a few years ago. The wholesale price index in France increased 1,917 percent between 1939 and 1949.

Much has been said about losses suffered during the bank-closing which occurred during the depression of the early thirties. I do not propose to minimize those losses. They were severe and

worked great hardship upon many individuals. The loss through bank-closings has been set at $116,565,524. Do you know how that figure compares with losses sustained by reason of the decrease in the purchasing power of the American dollar? The value of life insurance policies, time deposits, and E, F, and G savings bonds has depreciated $1,901,000,000 since the year 1940. This is approximately 60 times the losses suffered in the bank closings which attracted so much attention. The latter erosion in values has taken place gradually over a period of 12 years, and little consideration has been given to it. But it is there just the same, and represents one of the greatest calamities that has ever been perpetrated upon an unsuspecting people.

Now why is the subject of deficit spending of importance in the debate on this measure before us today? It is important because much of that deficit has been created through our efforts to help the rest of the world. We have appropriated for foreign aid since we began our lend-lease program prior to World War II approximately $97,000,000,000. Certain credits must be deducted from that amount, but the books show that during the period beginning in 1938 and ending March 31, 1951, the net foreign aid provided was $69,899,000,000. To this, must be added $7,329,000,000 appropriated during the last session of the Congress—making a total of $77,228,000,000.

This is a sizable sum and while there is no gainsaying that the aid extended has been very helpful to other countries, the time has come, in my opinion, when we must call a halt if we wish to save our own country from disaster. One purpose of foreign aid was to help the countries of Europe recover from the serious effects of World War II—a very worthy motive—much of their industrial potential was greatly damaged by the ravages of war, but the index of production in those countries is now far ahead of pre-war. In proof, I present the following figures taken from the thirteenth report to the Congress of the ECA, page 17:

Production in Atlantic Pact nations (using 1937 production levels as 100 percent)

Austria	157
Belgium	146
Denmark	163
France	143
Greece	130
Italy	139
Netherlands	147
Norway	156
United Kingdom	158

Another factor which has a bearing on the appropriation for foreign aid which is before us today is the balance remaining over from previous appropriations at this time. The latest figures available are as of September 30, 1951. At that time, foreign aid unexpended funds amounted to $17,241,000,000. Since that date, it is estimated that $5,000,000,000 have been spent which leaves a balance of $12,241,000,000. Is it not reasonable to believe—at least to hope—that we can coast along on this unexpended balance for another year without additional appropriations. It seems to me that in view of our own fiscal condition, we might consider this to be a legitimate assumption, and that it will be distinctly unfair to our American taxpayers, should we unload on them an additional $6,901,100,000, as provided in this bill.

There is one other phase of this situation I should like to discuss. We have undertaken to fight a United Nations war in Korea. The President calls it a police action, but in my book, it is war. That war is costing us $5,000,000,000 a year. We are footing the bill for this war to the extent of about 95 percent of all costs. Civilian aid to the people of Korea has cost about $500,000,000—only about $25,000,000 of which has been contributed by other members of the United Nations. Do not these expenditures constitute foreign aid to a large extent? We are not only furnishing the money to fight the war in Korea, we are furnishing the blood of our sons in just about the same proportion as our money. It seems unreasonable that we should be expected to do more. Have we not done more than our share already?

The lessons of history on this subject of spending are written so plainly that he who reads may well understand. We are today, with our foreign-aid program, supporting the bankrupt nations of Europe with our hard-earned money—it is your money and mine—that we are spending in every quarter of the globe. Not only in Europe but in the countries of South America whose fiscal status is in much better condition than our own. Who will pull us out of insolvency when our Nation has exhausted its resources? What Marshall plan will come to the aid of America in that fateful hour?

Our job today is here at home. It is a domestic job. Russia's blueprint for world domination was outlined by Lenin a quarter of a century ago when he said:

England will expand herself into destruction; Germany will fight herself into destruction; and America will spend herself into destruction.

Two nations have gone the Lenin-predicted road, and we are on the way. If we do not reform our fiscal policy, Russia without firing a shot and without the loss of a soldier will have won her conquest of the world.

This is not a partisan fight. It is a fight to preserve America, our freedoms, our way of life.

The peril of this Nation—

Said Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes—

is not a foreign foe. We, the people, are its power, its peril, and its hope.

Here is a challenge for all Americans. Against a background such as I have described, shall we be able to keep a sound currency from being destroyed? Shall we in our attempts to pull the rest of the world back slip into the abyss ourselves? Because of these problems, we face one of the most crucial periods in our history. We face our crucial test of devotion to our American way of life.

We can ill afford the expenditures for foreign aid proposed in this legislation which amount to $6,901,100,000. We must begin to think of saving our own country before it is too late. A vote against this bill is a vote for the preservation of America—our liberties, our freedoms, our way of life—yes, it is a vote to safeguard the whole world because if America goes down, the world is lost with us.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am intrigued by the suggestion of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin that a price tag can be placed on what this Congress and this Nation has been trying to do. I wonder if Mr. DOUGLAS or Mr. Dulles have indicated just how many dollars and just how many cents are necessary to win a victory or win a peace or win a cold war? I wonder whether the gentleman from Wisconsin or whether any Member of this distinguished body at this time can give to this committee a yardstick or a rule of thumb and say: This many dollars will contain atheistic communism—this many dollars in hundreds of millions or in dozens of billions is the answer that we all seek?

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that communism has been contained.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the foreign policy of this administration is very clear and very simple indeed. Whether it has been successful can be debated, as intelligent men are debating it here and throughout the Nation. But, Mr. Chairman, the foreign policy is as plain as the nose on your individual and collective faces. The foreign policy is to fight and fight, and contain atheistic communism any place that it rears its ugly head on the face of this earth, now and forever. That is the foreign policy. Who will deny it? Does anyone object?

Korea: Never in the history of civilized warfare, never in the history of civilized man has any nation thrown down the gauntlet to any nation or any other philosophy or any other idea or ideal as the United States of America and the President of the United States threw down the gauntlet to communism in Korea and raised the standard of hope for freemen and small nations throughout the world when he said, "No. You move here or any place else and this is what you will meet, weak or strong as we may be at the time, as poorly as we are prepared, or as we are not prepared." Which is an entirely different argument as to whether we are or are not prepared, and that is a different point.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I do not yield.

Communism has been contained. Mr. Chairman, communism has been contained in Turkey, and the Turks will fight and die to the man against communism there. Communism has been contained in Greece, and the brave Greeks will fight and die to a man. In Yugoslavia you have an ally. Whether you like them or not, whether you want to go to bed with them or not is your business. I do not. But right now he is mine. And in Spain—agreements are being made in Spain and they will be successful agreements. They will be

successful agreements and Spain will be allied with free people, and the Gibraltar entrance to the Straits will be protected.

Do you think for a moment that the brave, noble Scandinavians, the Swedes, the Norwegians, and Danes have not contained communism?

Do you think for a moment that in brave England communism has not been contained? Fought in France and defeated in Italy? Oh, the Anzacs in Australia and New Zealand will forever be an anchor against any aggression made by communism in the Far East.

When you say nothing has been done, when you say what have we gained for these billions, what makes you think that this is the end? Do you want communism to be contained in 1 day or 1 year? Mr. Chairman, you face half a century or the end of time, but we will face it and defeat it and destroy it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, we are here confronted with extension of a program that is playing a major part in leading this country down the road to ruin.

This proposal calls not only for the spending of additional billions of dollars which American taxpayers can ill afford, but if enacted it amounts to a stamp of approval by Congress of this administration's foreign policy, the chief architects of which are Truman and Acheson.

It is a foreign policy which has led to the shambles of Korea—in terms of men and money the second most costly external war in which the United States has engaged. And the end is not yet.

It is a foreign policy which during recent years has cunningly contrived a series of emergencies and crises by which the administration has been able to dodge the economic facts of life, and from all this stems the arrogant attempts at seizure of power by the present Chief Executive.

Is anyone in this Chamber so blind as not to be able to see the broad delegations of power that have been given the President in international affairs? The bill before you is but one sample of how authority is delegated.

By what constitutional right has the conduct of foreign affairs and the making of war been concentrated in the hands of the President?

In 1793, Thomas Jefferson, patron saint of the Democratic Party, called this "heresy," and James Madison bitterly assailed "the extraordinary doctrine that the powers of making war and treaties are in their nature executive." Madison described such usurpation as British political theory, un-American, and supported only "by foreigners and degenerate citizens among us."

Have we degenerated today to the point where we do not understand or do not care that this foreign policy on which we are embarked, military and economic, is the prime cause of the debauchery of our dollars despite a levying of taxes that promises to be more back-breaking than those carried by any other people in the world?

I warn you now that you have no time to lose in trimming the commitments being made under the foreign policy of the United States unless it is your desire to fulfill the dreams of the Kremlin by causing the moral and financial collapse of this great, free Nation.

And let me add here, for the particular benefit of those supporting candidates for the Presidency who would continue present foreign policies, with all their lavish spending, that they are advocates of further centralization of power in the hands of the Executive.

It is no less than double talk on the part of a presidential candidate or anyone supporting him to say that an administration shall have wide powers in the conduct of foreign affairs and yet be held to strict constitutional checks and balances in the conduct of domestic affairs.

Mr. Chairman, I want to comment briefly at this point on one of the most beautifully perfumed yet evil phrases that has been concocted in recent years, and there have been plenty of them in that time. I refer to "bipartisan foreign policy."

We had scarcely heard of this sweet-smelling monster until the Potsdam Conference began to reveal the colossal mistakes—the number of first mortgages that Stalin had obtained at Yalta and held on the lives and fortunes of those who inhabit these United States.

In an effort to conceal the truth from the American people and stifle criticism in Congress, the bipartisan foreign policy deal was rigged. As a narcotic and a snare it worked well, for under it the Marshall plan blossomed to full flower, to be succeeded by the perfumed alphabetical agency known as the ECA, and now by the honey-titled Mutual Security Assistance Act. I have yet to be advised of the mutuality or security that has been obtained despite the blood that has been spilled and the sweat that has been shed to produce the tax dollars.

In the first place, there is no such thing as a bipartisan foreign policy that is not at one and the same time accompanied by a bipartisan domestic policy. More than that, there is no place in a healthy democracy, except when completely mobilized for war, for a bipartisan policy, foreign or domestic. He who advocates this approach to one-party government is willing to walk the road of the Hitlers and Mussolinis of yesterday, and the Stalins, Titos, Francos, and Perons of today. A policy of bipartisanship, except in the most extreme national peril, will mean the end of representative government in America.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is unacceptable. Our expensive foreign friends who will not support us in Korea, where Americans bear the burden of battle virtually alone, still show little or no inclination to stand with us anywhere else.

We need only to read statements of influential foreign newspapers, magazines, and officials to recognize the unvarnished fact that all too many foreigners despise the United States in spite of the more than 100,000,000,000 American tax dollars handed out all over the world since 1940. Truman, Acheson, Harriman, Eisenhower, and assorted international bedfellows do not make this information available to you, so I will.

At the moment, in the eyes of foreigners, the main American "flopparoo" is the Eisenhower-Acheson NATO international army in Europe. The recent Lisbon announcement, alleging that the NATO army would grow to 50 divisions by the end of 1952, touched off violent reactions.

Almost in the shadow of Eisenhower's headquarters, the Paris newspaper, Le-Monde, says in an editorial:

> It includes on paper 12 French divisions instead of the 14 originally provided for; 7 American divisions, composed of the 6 now in Germany, plus 1 of marines. * * * It is improbable that the figures indicated can be attained. It is already admitted that the total NATO divisions fully ready within 10 months will not add up to more than 30.

Then the French newspaper says:

> Surely the publication of these figures was an attempt at bluff, which has not even the merit of deceiving anybody. * * * The figures in question represent only a ceiling.

With such an attitude prevailing is it any wonder that the French Government collapsed almost as soon as the Lisbon announcement was made because French politicians refused to raise taxes to provide $157,000,000 for the NATO army even though the United States promised to give France, as a virtual bribe to support the NATO proposition, another $300,000,000 in foreign aid and more than a half billion dollars in war contracts. All this, of course, is over and above the billions of American dollars previously poured into the French treasury, as I discussed in these pages at the time.

Incidentally, the French newspaper's reference to one American Marine division was, as far as I know, the first leak that the Pentagon plans to throw American marines into the NATO international military.

Returning to foreign reaction to the Lisbon announcement, the London Times describes the promise of 50 divisions by the end of 1952 as imaginative and the allegation of 85 to 100 divisions in 2 years as still more imaginative. The London paper says:

> There is likely to be a sharp reaction when the American people realize that the 50 promised divisions do not really mean 50 divisions.

The Brussels newspaper, Revue Politique, says Belgium, reportedly committed to the munificent total of two divisions in the NATO military, has fulfilled all her military obligations—which is more than can be said for all her allies.

The Brussels paper continues:

> Belgium cannot agree to make further financial efforts without recompense.

As recompense the Belgium paper suggests that the United States establish another foreign-aid kitty into which all the NATO nations could reach to pay all their military costs. This recalls my prediction of several weeks ago that if

the NATO army will cost $300,000,000,000, as announced at Lisbon, American taxpayers will fork over most of it.

A British magazine, European Review, calls the NATO military force a shadow, saying what is needed on the potential battlefield is the will to fight, not merely paper armies and paper agreements. This magazine apparently sees little hope of a will to fight becoming a reality, declaring:

> Fifty divisions of conscripted robot soldiers, even if they existed and were encased in nylon armor and equipped with atomic weapons, would represent a dangerous substitute for human minds who know what they stand for and love what they know. When the spirit is unwilling, the body is apt to be distressingly weak.

Then the British magazine points to the recent fall of the French Government as evidence that the spirit is indeed unwilling.

In this connection, Andre Philip, former French Minister of Finance, says the young people of France no longer believe in anything.

And British Leftist Leader Bevan tells us to our teeth that the perils of war have been brought appreciably nearer by the ascendancy now given American leadership in foreign affairs. That is the kind of friend the Truman multi-billion-dollar dole has won in Britain.

As thanks for the millions of American loan dollars given to the Spanish dictatorship, Nicolas Franco, Spanish Ambassador in Portugal, suggests that Britain and Spain set up a controlled-economy bloc extending from Scandinavia to the Cape of Good Hope, using as a medium of exchange the British pound sterling, not American dollars. "Such a bloc," he said, "would offset the possibility of either America or Russia doing anything without the consent of Europe."

These are the foreign friends our international spenders talk so glibly about. In this column today you have seen some of these foreigners through their own words.

The policy of trying to bribe and buy friends has failed. That fact should be the foundation for a desperately needed new pro-American foreign policy.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, it serves no useful purpose to discuss the moot point whether we should have initiated a program for the mutual defense of Western Europe and other critical areas of the world. We are already engaged in such a program. However, to keep the record straight, let me just say at this point that the Senate ratified the North Atlantic Treaty and the House had no voice in creating this program. As a matter of fact, when it was first proposed that the Congress should implement this program through the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, I joined with several of my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee in protest against such action for the reasons set forth in the minority report made at that time—House Report No. 1265, part 2, Eighty-first Congress, pages 62–67. Our views did not prevail. Military equipment of all kinds has now been poured into Europe and other areas of the world. Six of our divisions are in Europe as well as large contingents of naval and air forces.

H. R. 7005 is designed to continue and implement this program. Hardly anyone would argue at this late date that we should withdraw all our support from Europe and other critical areas and leave these countries to the mercy of Soviet aggression. We are therefore confronted with the problem not of changing the basic decision that was made when the Senate committed us to the defense of Western Europe by the North Atlantic Treaty, but to what extent we should implement this program at the present time.

Since 1947 we have appropriated in the neighborhood of $28,000,000,000 for foreign aid. From these appropriations specifically earmarked for military and economic aid, it is estimated that as of June 30, 1952, there will be an unexpended balance of approximately $8,900,000,000.

A large portion of this has been obligated, but whether it has been obligated or unexpended is unimportant because eventually it will be available for economic and military purposes for which it was appropriated.

From the $11,500,000,000 already appropriated for military aid only $1,796,000,000 in military end items was shipped by February 29, 1952.

The question then arises—with this large backlog of funds available for military end items and economic support, how much further should we go at this time?

Recently at the Lisbon Conference, according to General Gruenther's testimony, commitments were made by the countries concerned that there should be raised an army of 50 divisions in Western Europe and the necessary air, navy, and infrastructure required to round out such a program. The testimony further discloses that the program agreed upon at this conference can be completed from appropriations already provided except for a certain percentage of spare parts which would require additional appropriations.

While it is of course true there are studies under way to increase the strength of the defense of Western Europe for the years 1953 and 1954, they are in the planning stage and no firm commitments have been made. Yet under these circumstances we are asked to authorize $6,900,000,000 under the pending bill. While this is approximately $1,000,000,000 less than the President requested, let me respectfully call your attention to the fact that in the pending bill, as reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee, it is provided that $1,000,000,000 of our own defense matériel may be transferred for the defense of Western Europe in addition to the $6,900,000,000 provided. So in reality the committee made no cut whatsoever.

Since there are no firm commitments to be fulfilled, other than those already provided for by previous appropriations, why is it not reasonable that both the military and economic authorizations in this bill be cut drastically until such time as we have evidence before us that such expenditures are fully justified?

We must keep in mind our own needs in the Korean war. We all know there have been shortages of important military items for our own fighting forces there. Certainly we should meet our own requirements first.

So far as economic aid is concerned, it seems to me we can make even greater cuts than in military end items. Everyone knows we have spent billions under the Marshall plan for economic aid to Western Europe. The Marshall plan is supposed to end June 30, 1952. We should not continue it under the new name of defense support. This bill provides for $1,637,000,000 for economic aid, having been cut by the Foreign Affairs Committee from $1,819,000,000. The argument is made that because of the additional military effort by the European countries they must necessarily decrease their normal economic requirements. Therefore we must continue aid to make up the difference.

This economic aid is now called "defense support," but it is the same old balance of payments formula with which we are all so familiar.

To put it simply, a country determines its economic requirements; for example, how much raw materials, grain, and so forth, it must import to keep the country at what it believes is its required economic standard of living. It is then determined how much it has available to pay for these imports from its exports and other available assets.

One finds in all these countries that the exports and other assets are not sufficient to pay for their alleged necessary imports, leaving deficits which we are asked to make up.

So, under the guise of defense support, we are really continuing to a large extent economic aid per se the same as we have been doing under the Marshall plan.

Even when you allow for the validity of the arguments that a country's defense effort does cut to some extent its budget, which would otherwise be used for its own economic needs, we must keep in mind that here in this country we are being taxed to the limit. We are spending three-fourths of our budget for our defense. Every day we are going into the red at a phenomenal figure. All of our citizens are required to make sacrifices. Under the circumstances is it asking too much for our friends abroad to also make similar sacrifices?

It is therefore apparent a large cut should be made from the $1,637,000,000 requested for economic aid.

There is another proposal in this bill for technical assistance—that is to rehabilitate a great many of the backward countries of the world. However worthy the objective may be, we must consider the financial stability of our own country. If we go broke we would not be able to help anyone. When we are straining ourselves to the utmost, it seems to me this type of program can be curtailed or even postponed.

As we consider this bill, I would like to comment on four or five provisions:

First. I firmly believe we could cut the defense support items for western

Europe by at least $500,000,000—probably more.

Second. I definitely feel we should cut to the bone the point 4 program—especially where it is not involved in our defense effort.

Third. In my judgment we should also restrict the point 4 program to its original objective, namely, giving technical and scientific assistance toward rehabilitating some of the backward countries—that is, helping them to help themselves. I believe a formula could be worked out which would prevent funds that are available under this program from being used in constructing projects such as dams, power plants, irrigation systems, and so forth. We should confine ourselves to furnishing only the know-how and not create a WPA all over the world.

Fourth. The provision permitting $1,000,000,000 of our own military matériel to be transferred to Western Europe, in addition to the amounts provided in this bill, should not be approved unless out of these authorizations and subsequent appropriations our own defense is fully reimbursed out of foreign-aid funds for these transfers.

Fifth. In almost every bill we have written on this subject, we have expressed the pious hope for both political and military unification in Western Europe. But the State Department has dragged its feet whenever it was proposed to put into law conditions which would bring this about in exchange for our continued aid. Certainly this is not asking too much. There is not a well-informed person in Europe today who does not realize the truth of the old saying of Benjamin Franklin, "We must hang together or we will hang separately."

Unless a substantial number of the recommendations which I have here presented are adopted, I cannot support this measure because I firmly believe its success or failure depends upon approaching the problem with common sense and not as profligate wasters of the taxpayers' money.

We must cut out the gingerbread. We must do first things first and not attempt to do more than we are capable of doing.

Remember this: Just spending money alone will not bring about security or cure all the economic ills of the world. If it could, we would be well on our way to these objectives. It requires the full cooperation and self-help of all the countries concerned.

It is a long haul. We should not attempt it all at once, but should proceed in an orderly fashion with the welfare and security—both military and economic—of our own country considered above everything else. Travel slowly and you will travel far.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I conceive it to be the duty of members of the committee who are discussing this subject in general debate to give to the Committee of the Whole, insofar as they can, the fundamental philosophy which underlies the views of that part of the committee which is for the bill as it is brought on the floor, and to answer the points that have been made against this, upon the fundamental basis that we have participated in the hearings, have studied the subject, and should give the benefit of our opinion to all the other Members. It is in that spirit, Mr. Chairman, that I speak here today.

I am for this bill as it stands. I think it is a fair and reasonable compromise between the conflicting views as the money we can afford to spend and the security which we seek in the world through the expenditure of our money. I think the greatest mistake that can be made in connection with this bill is to consider that it represents hand-outs, gifts, charity, philanthropy, or anything else of that character, for unless we can find that it means in terms of American security, and American well-being, at least dollar for dollar—and I think we can find that it means two and three dollars for every one dollar—if it can be evaluated in terms of money at all—then we have no business to pass this bill, much as I am for it.

I am convinced that this bill represents an integral part of American security. It calls for an over-all expenditure of something in the magnitude of 10 percent of everything that we are spending for our own Armed Forces. For that figure we are getting an enormous amount of additional aid in connection with world security, I think at an extremely low price, certainly far lower than if we were trying to amass all the armament ourselves.

I just heard the gentleman from Iowa refer to presidential candidates. I hope very much that this question will not be brought up in connection with this debate. But if it is brought up it is my deep conviction, as far as the presidential candidate who has expressed himself as supporting this program and as supporting substantially the amount that is called for in the House bill for this program, that I thoroughly agree with that presidential candidate, and I am delighted to be supporting him. It seems to me that the fundamental difference, if there is any difference, as between presidential candidates, is whether or not we shall have a fortress United States of America for ourselves, or whether we should be a world power, carrying world responsibilities, and allied with the free world. The one thing I was pleased to hear this morning was, in substance, from my colleague from Ohio, was recognition of the fact that we were a leading world power, that we had world responsibilities, and that we knew we had to aline ourselves with the free world. All differences in this bill we can resolve, but this is the fundamental difference, and if this represents a fundamental difference between presidential candidates, then I am definitely on the side of General Eisenhower as he has expressed himself on this issue.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman understand that any President elected will have to live with this monstrosity for another year?

Mr. JAVITS. I may say to the gentleman that I do not consider it a monstrosity. On the contrary, I consider this bill an integral and vital part of the policy of the United States, both foreign and domestic.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I would like to draw the gentleman's attention to page 24 of the bill which purports to amend section 516 of the Mutual Security Act, to require the Mutual Security Agency, the State Department, and the Technical Cooperation Administration to take some action to remove legal and other impediments to private investment abroad. I understand the gentleman had some interest in incorporating that language in this measure; am I correct?

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman did, and may I reciprocate to my colleague from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] and say that my colleague has been one of the most effective and forceful Members in the House in trying also to introduce this vital element of private enterprise into this whole program.

Mr. MEADER. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not he thinks that movement of encouraging investment abroad should be an important part of American foreign policy.

Mr. JAVITS. I think it is an indispensable part, and, as I say, I think the gentleman's work in that field has been excellent and has shown its effect and will continue to show its effect because this is essentially a matter of administration. It is when Members of Congress get back of this effort and believe in it that we move the administrators off the small seat upon which they sit in this respect.

Mr. MEADER. May I ask further whether the gentleman has confidence that these three agencies named in this section of the bill will actually accomplish very much more than they have in the past simply because Congress orders them to do what perhaps they should have been doing anyhow?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not have as much confidence as I ought to have considering the fact that I have had a good deal to do with this part of the program. I believe that under the existing situation and without getting into a political discussion we ought to do all we can with this Administration we have. I am certainly hopeful we can get a better and more effective Administration. I would like to say to the gentleman it is only if people like him and me and others in the House who are similarly interested will constantly be back of this effort to utilize private enterprise effectively in the technical and economic phases of the program, armed with the determination of Congress as contained in the bill and as I hope it will mature finally, that we

will get any action at all, let alone adequate action.

Now to recur to my main thesis:

There are a number of contradictions which the opponents of this particular measure and of the whole mutual security program engage in which I think we should understand clearly because they bear upon the fundamental purpose of the bill.

First, let us understand that we are talking in the European program, which is the main program, about fortifying for self-help in connection with security 205,000,000 people who enjoy a gross annual national product, that is, a total production of goods and services, of $153,000,000,000—and that we are 153,000,000 people and our gross national product is $348,000,000,000, more than twice as much. That is the fundamental fact of our time. We have to carry a much greater share of the burden of defense than is prorated or based upon population, because the fundamental and unalterable fact is that we have 50 percent of the industrial production of the world and these figures show it.

What do we expect, then? Do we expect that people who are already poor shall further beggar themselves for our security and their own, or do we expect they will look to us, with much fewer people than they have, and over twice their gross national product, to help them in a material way? Unless we accept that fundamental proposition, this bill does not make any sense, but if we do accept it, then the bill falls into place and makes excellent sense. I submit that it is an unalterable fact that we must accept and cannot overlook.

Now, as to some of the other contradictions:

Some of those who talk here about indiscriminate cutting say, "Let us cut it another 20 percent or more." I ask those gentlemen to make up their minds whether they are just dealing with dollars, or whether they are dealing with security. Is not the real question, What are we going to get in divisions, what are we going to get in armament, what are we going to get in willing help, when we are talking about 10 percent of our own total defense outlay? Is not that the real question, rather than can we save dollars?

Certainly we can save dollars. You can eliminate this program entirely. If we eliminate enough dollars, it is like the Scotchman and his horse, who saved a lot on feeding the horse—that is until the horse got so thin that he died.

Second, some claim the Korean action and the casualties we have taken in Korea are unnecessary. They want us to retreat to fortress America. I ask the question of them, Do they want us to retreat to fortress America and take all the casualties ourselves, or do they want us to share with the rest of the world some of the responsibility of security and, therefore, some of the responsibility and some of the dangers of taking casualties?

Some say that aid which we have given, and one of my colleagues just said that a minute ago, has not gotten down to the rock-bottom base of the people in the various areas which we have aided, and yet those are the same people who are against economic aid. We are certainly not going to get it down to the rock bottom base of the people unless we are willing to give some aid so that it can get down there.

Then, some say that we should give our friends abroad the know-how, but we should not give them goods; that we should just give them know-how and not materials. Yet, these are the very same people who are in the main against technical assistance, and say that this is just boondoggling and wasting our hard-won knowledge all around the world.

It is my deep conviction that all of this represents frustration as to what our American foreign policy ought to be. We know one thing. American foreign policy has to be affirmative. It cannot be negative. I think, therefore, if all who want affirmative action will consider the bill in those terms, then a good bill and an adequate bill in terms of money will be passed.

We all know we do not want to start a preventive war against the Soviet Union. That would be the treacherously easy way. If we started a preventive war, then military defense would really be an offense, and we would be going to the seats of power of communism and destroying them. If we do not want that, and the American people plus our own judgment have settled that issue, then the total amount that we are spending for miiltary security is purely defensive. We know that we can never lick communism solely by defensive effort. Therefore, we have to have an offensive effort. The only offensive we have is the offensive in the economic and technical field and in the ideological field. If at one and the same time we say we do not want a preventive war, and we want to defeat communism, then there may be ample room for differing as to the details, but we must accept the fundamental concept of this bill.

The administration policy of containment is obsolescent. It must now be succeeded by a policy of counterattack. This counterattack must be diplomatic as through the U. N. That is why all efforts toward disarmament, control of atomic weapons, and the elimination of the effect of the veto in the U. N. on halting aggression are so important. It must include the use of economic and technical assistance such as is provided for here in this bill. It must include the speeding up of our information and education program, whether it be through the Voice of America or through books or through publications, we need to do a very much more effective job. The important thing is that we need to do the job.

Even in the military respect, we have to emphasize the idea of counterattack. The best thing I think that Mr. Acheson ever did was when he said the other day that we are not just going to repeal aggression at the point where it occurrs, as we did in Korea, but that the Soviet must understand that from now on, if we are going to have to meet aggression here and agression there and everywhere, they are going to drive us to stopping aggression by action at the seat of the Soviet power.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, all of our colleagues are deeply interested in what will be the indicia of success in this struggle against communism. How do we know that in this program for which we are paying so substantially and making so many sacrifices for—how will we know when we begin to succeed? I say to my colleagues we already know that it has begun to succeed in the defection of Yugoslavia from the Soviet bloc. This defection will ultimately be in my view the single, significant fact of history which showed the recession of the Soviet power. The end of the Soviet power will be when all of the satellites, including China, are detached. But, the beginning of the end of the Soviet power is shown by the defection of Yugoslavia. Certainly, Tito is a Communist, a hard headed and a very practical one seeking the prctection, I believe, of his own power, and that of his group and of his own country. How did he look at it in this cold war as soon as he felt that the Russians could not successfully use force on him. What did he decide? He decided under these policies which are contained in this bill that it was better for him to work with the West than to continue to string along with the Soviet Union. Why? Because he felt that ultimately the Soviet Union and the Communist group which had control of it had to be defeated. It seems to me that Yugoslavia's defection is among the important evidences of the rightness of the general lines of policy dealt with in this bill.

It is an elementary principle in diplomacy and of military affairs that you must ride your strength. You must drive your offensive. That is not the time to quit when you begin to succeed. That is the time to put on the steam and to drive even harder. That is exactly the purpose of this bill. We are beginning to show signs of success in this struggle against communism, and I am for pressing that success to a final and decisive conclusion.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this opportunity to address the Committee to discuss an amendment I intend to offer to the mutual-security bill, which is now before us.

The purpose of my amendment is to take a concrete step toward assuming the initiative in the cold, ideological war between freemen and slave citizens. I propose that we do this by proving to the world that the free economy exemplified in the United States is a better way of life, both materially and spiritually, than the state-owned, state-controlled economy of the totalitarian state exemplified by Communist Russia.

I do not minimize the importance of words and expressions of philosophical principles upon the course of civilization. But I contend that action speaks louder than words. I assert that a demonstration of the free-enterprise system will do more toward winning support on our side of the ideological war than 100 Voices of America.

I propose that we should demonstrate the value of the competitive free-enterprise system by exporting that system to the underdeveloped areas of the world. If we do this effectively, we will launch an affirmative attack upon the false ideology that the state should run everything, leaving no freedom or individuality to the citizens who, through police methods, are forced to do as they are told.

The avenue for accomplishing the export of the free-enterprise system consists in the elimination of the artificial legal and political barriers which now restrain natural economic forces and prevent capital from free nations from flowing into other free areas, more or less undeveloped, to harness the natural resources of those areas for the mutual benefit of the inhabitants of those areas and those supplying the capital and development know-how.

I have yet to discover anyone opposed to this fundamental proposition. On the contrary, it has received universal support even including pronouncements by members of the present administration. Indeed, this proposition is given lip service in existing legislation. As a principle, it is written into the Mutual Security Program and has been espoused in general terms by the President of the United States, as well as the Secretary of State.

I quote from section 516 of the Mutual Security Act the following language:

> It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that this act shall be administered in such a way as (1) to eliminate the barriers to, and provide the incentives for, a steadily increased participation of free private enterprise in developing the resources of foreign countries consistent with the policies of this act.

I point out that the bill now pending before the House of Representatives, H. R. 7005, section 7 J, commencing on page 24, line 16, of the bill, and continuing to page 26, line 9, instructs the Mutual Security Agency, the Department of State, and the Technical Cooperation Administration to study legal and other impediments to private investment and the means whereby such impediments may be removed or decreased and facilitate the flow of private investment and the participation of private industrial groups or agencies in accomplishing the economic objectives of the Mutual Security Program.

Mr. Chairman, my proposal is that these studies and these recommendations be made by an independent commission, calling upon the services of private citizens whose knowledge and whose thinking ought to be enlisted in the attack upon the barriers and impediments now restraining natural economic forces from developing natural resources abroad in accordance with the principles of the competitive free-enterprise system.

For those who may be interested in following this subject in some detail, I include at this point in my remarks a table of references to previous remarks I have made on this point, both on the floor of the House of Representatives and before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives:

Remarks by Representative George Meader on proposal to create a commission to study impediments to private investment in underdeveloped foreign areas

Date	Nature of remarks	Reference
Apr. 27, 1951	Speech on floor of House introducing H. R. 3798	CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 4209–4214.
July 3, 1951	Speech on floor of House, "Let's Export Independence"	CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 7606–7609.
July 20, 1951	Testimony before House Foreign Affairs Committee	Hearings on H. R. 5020 and H. R. 5113, pp. 778–819.
Aug. 16, 1951	Speech on floor of House offering amendment to H. R. 5113	CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10179–10180.
Aug. 17, 1951	Speech on floor of House re amendment to H. R. 5113	CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10289–10290.
Apr. 4, 1952	Speech on floor of House re USIS and Voice of America in connection with an affirmative foreign policy.	CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 3536–3537.
Apr. 28, 1952	Testimony before House Foreign Affairs Committee	Hearings on H. R. 7005, pp. 802–862.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is not the real impediment to the flow of foreign capital from this country to foreign countries the lack of stability of foreign governments?

Mr. MEADER. I think that is an important impediment, but there are others.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. It is true that the impediment is instability. But there is ample room for investment in some other areas that will take 20 times what we are able to do there.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, whether my efforts have had anything to do with it or not, I must say that I believe some progress has been made toward an objective which I regard as being of transcendent importance in developing a sound, vital, effective, and understandable American foreign policy. The administration now appears to have accepted unequivocably the proposition that it should be a part of our foreign policy to promote economic activities of our citizens in the strengthening of the free world. Beyond accepting that objective, however, the efforts of the administration to achieve it have been so puny and ineffective as to raise a doubt of the sincerity of the administration's faith in the validity of the objective they have accepted.

I quote a brief passage from the remarks made by the Secretary of State before the Conference on International Economic and Social Development held here in Washington last April 9:

> I have been working for 12 years on the effort to free international trade from some of its barriers and I regret to say that there are as many now as there were when we began and the outlook is discouraging. But we must continue to fight it and you must continue to help us because this matter of freeing trade throughout the world and bringing about a greater exchange of goods is essential for the purpose that you are meeting here today to consider.
>
> Similarly in the economic field there is the matter of investment. Unless there is a climate to encourage investment abroad you will not get the developments in underdeveloped areas which we are seeking. And unhappily the climate does not seem to be getting better but in many parts of the world to be getting worse. There seems to be an idea that there is something bad about foreign investment in some parts of the world. Companies, people who have put a great deal of money, a great deal of effort into developments in underdeveloped areas are treated as though they were enemies of the country in which they are working. If that goes on it just means that there will not be foreign investment and there will not be, as you all know, governmental capital sufficient to do this job.

Mark this sentence—still Acheson talking:

> And, after all, it doesn't make much difference whether the investment is the property of all the citizens of the country or some of the citizens. If the whole climate for the reception of foreign investment in a country is bad, then the capital will not go there, whether it's private or governmental.

I propose to show, and I hope that I can convince the House, that the provisions of the present bill are wholly inadequate. The first witness in support of that proposition is the Secretary of State himself in the passage I have just quoted.

If the Department of State has been working diligently for 12 years to eliminate the barriers to international trade and investment, and we are no further ahead than we were 12 years ago, what hope can we have that directing the State Department, the Mutual Security Agency and the Technical Cooperation Administration to assail these barriers will produce any appreciable results?

In my initial remarks on this subject before the House of Representatives, I said:

> I say it is conclusively established that no agency or department of the executive branch of the Government is capable of blue-printing this bold new program. The fact is that there has been no inhibition on such agencies and departments in the past from proposing and, indeed, from carrying into effect any of the steps which will be necessary if the underdeveloped areas are to be developed through the force of American initiative and enterprise.

I believe there are several reasons why Government officials in the executive branch of the Government are incapable of solving the difficult problem of encouraging private investment abroad.

First, I charge that the Department of State and its Foreign Service have failed deplorably to assist and encourage American business activities abroad in the past. In fact, instead of being merely indifferent to American business activities, some foreign officials have sought to discourage them. This is in marked contrast to the support which the British Foreign Office has consistently afforded British enterprises.

Second, the desire of the State Department and the Mutual Security Administration officials to build up the economies of free nations has led them actually to discriminate against American businessmen when they are in competition with foreign enterprises.

Third, there is an attitude in many American officials having important responsibilities in foreign affairs and in foreign aid to prefer Government activities in the economic field to those of private citizens. I question whether many of these officials have any sincere sympathy for, or faith in, the competitive free enterprise system as contrasted with a greater degree of Government control and direction of economic affairs. Empire-building and the natural desire of officials to retain power impels them to prefer Government aid to private investment.

Fourth, the fact is that very little new American money has been invested abroad since the end of the war, with the exception of the petroleum industry, and by far the greatest amount of overseas' investment has been in the Western Hemisphere.

I refer again to the sentence in Secretary Acheson's speech which I emphasize as I quoted it:

> And, after all, it doesn't make much difference whether the investment is the property of all the citizens of the country or some of the citizens.

Apparently Dean Acheson makes no distinction between the private investment of American citizens and the investment of taxpayers' funds by the Government. This is a socialistic approach, and in my judgment would render the State Department completely incapable of taking concrete steps toward encouraging the investment of private funds.

Acheson's statement is full support for my charge that officials having responsibilities in foreign affairs have no sincere interest in expanding the economic activities of private citizens in the foreign field.

I recognize that the points I have made are sweeping generalities, yet I believe they will be confirmed by anyone not connected with Government agencies who has had any substantial contact with the manner in which the State Department, the Economic Cooperation Administration, and others have been operating in foreign fields since the end of World War II. I base these charges, not on a comprehensive survey which would obviously be impossible for an individual Congressman to make, but on inquiries made by me, both in the United States and in overseas areas where it has been my privilege to travel extensively in connection with official duties. My own findings and experiences have been confirmed in discussions with, and communications from, others, including foreign representatives of American business concerns and officials of companies having foreign branches or investments.

I dislike to rest a characterization as sweeping as the one I have made on so unsatisfactory an evidentiary basis. I call attention to the effort I have been making for the past year to persuade the Expenditures Committee of the House, of which I am a member, to engage in an investigation of the State Department with the objective of ascertaining—on the basis of a factual inquiry—how effective the State Department has been in discharging its responsibilities in the conduct of our foreign affairs. Any independent, thorough-going investigation of this question seems to have been effectively stymied. Accordingly, any appraisal of State Department performance, as well as the performance of our other overseas agencies, must rest upon individual observations rather than thorough-going inquiries.

If I am correct in my appraisal of the State Department and the other foreign agencies, it is an idle act to entrust them with the duty of removing impediments to private investment abroad. Nothing will happen.

What we need is a new approach. What we need is a penetrating study by individuals who are not responsible for the mistakes, the attitudes, the action, and the nonaction of Government agencies in the past in this field.

We are dealing here with the activities of citizens in their normal economic pursuits. Who should be better qualified to make contributions in this field than those citizens themselves? We need their thinking. We need their experiences. We need the facts they have developed through years of wrestling with these problems. We need their wisdom and their judgment in devising possible avenues of escape from the strait-jacket which now prevents the natural interchange between citizens in economic activities.

No matter how wonderful a blueprint might emerge from the cerebrations of bureaucratic officials, it will not be any good unless it encourages activity on the part of private investors. By its terms, the objective stated in the Mutual Security Act must be accomplished by private citizens in their own voluntary economic efforts. What better assurance of achieving that objective could there be than to permit private citizens to play an important part in the formulation of the program which it will be their major responsibility to carry out?

Mr. Chairman, the basic question involved in the amendment I will propose is how the task can best be accomplished. Everyone is agreed on the objective of removing barriers to private investment overseas. The bill presented by the Foreign Affairs Committee orders the State Department, the Mutual Security Agency and the Technical Cooperation Administration to accomplish that objective. I propose instead that we entrust that task to a special bipartisan commission patterned after the Hoover Commission which will have no other duties or interests than the sole one of breaking down the barriers now impeding natural economic forces.

Since the commencement of World War II, in lend-lease, in surplus property, gifts and abandonments, in UNRRA and other rehabilitation programs, in the Marshall plan aid, and now in mutual assistance, the taxpayers of this country have contributed well over $100,000,000,000 to other nations. In contrast with that, the Department of Commerce estimates that total American overseas private investmens are in the neighborhood of $13,000,000,000. It is my belief that the private dollar invested abroad goes much farther toward sound and lasting development of the areas where it is invested than the tax dollar handled on a government-to-government basis. Furthermore, the dollar privately invested does not cost the taxpayer anything. On the contrary, it relieves the tax burden because it creates wealth and broadens the tax base.

In spite of the fact that high taxes in the United States have contributed an element of pressure toward encouraging American citizens to make investments overseas, statistics of the Department of Commerce conclusively prove that the private investment of American capital overseas since World War II has been pitifully small.

Figures I obtained today demonstrate this point. I include a table showing these figures at this point in my remarks:

AMERICAN OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT

MAY 21, 1952.

Estimated figures from Office of Business Economics, Department of Commerce. These figures are taken from a survey made by the Department in 1943 and brought up to date. A new survey is expected to be published in a few months. The new figures may be quite different from the ones given below. However, this is the best estimate at present.

United States direct investments in foreign countries (direct meaning United States private investment in controlled enterprises)

End of 1945 (end of war) total investments	$8,369,000,000
End of 1950 total investments	13,550,000,000
Increase	5,181,000,000
End of 1951	[1] 14,850,000,000
Increase over 1950	1,300,000,000

[1] The 1951 figures are rough estimates.

Breakdown of increase (1945–50) between Western Hemisphere and rest of world

WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Canadian investments:	
1945–49	$900,000,000
1950	500,000,000
Total	1,400,000,000
Latin American investments:	
1945–49	1,800,000,000
1950	270,000,000
Total	2,070,000,000
Total	3,470,000,000
Rest of world	1,711,000,000
Total	5,181,000,000
Breakdown by industry:	
Petroleum:	
1950	4,072,000,000
1945	1,538,000,000
Increase	2,534,000,000

Mr. Eric Johnston, Chairman of the International Development Advisory Board, called attention to this fact in the following words:

In the backfield of the point 4 team of public-private action, industrial enterprise carries smashing weight. Some idea of its potential may be gleaned from figures recently cited by Mr. Stacy May, economist of the International Basic Economy Corp.

Since the end of the war, according to Mr. May, American private investment abroad has averaged about $1,000,000,000 a year. This year, it may reach one billion two hundred million, or four-tenths of 1 percent of our national income.

But Great Britain, at the peak of its international economic leadership, put fully 10 percent of its national income into investment abroad. Over a period of 30 years, British foreign capital investment maintained a level of 2½ percent of Britain's national income.

I would not venture to suggest the total that our own capital investment abroad might be expected to reach during the present period of American economic ascendency. But I agree completely with the estimate of the partners in progress report—that if industrial enterprise is given opportunity, incentive, and reasonable safeguards, the present total can, and will, be doubled.

The fact that American investments abroad have been so insignificant is the best proof that Government agencies alone are incapable of devising effective methods to increase them. Their record of inactivity and ineffectiveness is before us. The Secretary of State has admitted failure.

I have sought briefly to state the reasons for my position. If we are persuaded of the importance of the objective, the magnitude of the problem and the difficulty of solving it, we will not be satisfied to entrust that task to those who already could have solved it if they had had any interest in solving it and possessed the capacity to do so.

Let us give the American people a chance at this problem. A bipartisan commission with six members from private life and four each from the legislative and executive branches of the Government may get somewhere. At least, it is worth trying.

Under leave obtained in the House, I now include the text of my amendment at this point in my remarks:

Amendment to H. R. 7005 proposed by Mr. MEADER: Page 24, strike out line 19 and all that follows down through line 9 on page 26 and insert the following:

"(b) (1) To assist in carrying out the purposes of this act, through encouraging and facilitating the development of the natural resources of foreign areas by the investment of private capital and eliminating barriers to and providing incentives for engaging in business enterprises in such areas by persons or business organizations who are nonnationals of such areas, there is hereby established a bipartisan commission to be known as the Commission on Aid to Underdeveloped Foreign Areas (hereafter referred to as the 'Commission').

"(2) (A) The Commission shall be composed of 14 members as follows:

"(i) Ten appointed by the President of the United States, four from the executive branch of the Government and six from private life;

"(ii) Two Members of the Senate appointed by the Vice President; and

"(iii) Two Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker.

"(B) Of each class of members, not more than one-half shall be from each of the two major political parties.

"(C) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

"(3) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

"(4) Eight members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

"(5) (A) Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

"(B) The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, plus such additional compensation, if any, as is necessary to make his aggregate salary $12,500; and they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

"(C) The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

"(6) The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(7) The service of any person as a member of the Commission, the service of any other person with the Commission, and the employment of any person by the Commission, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such person within the provisions of sections 281, 283, or 284 of title 18 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

"(8) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection (b).

"(9) (A) The Commission shall study and investigate the problem of aiding underdeveloped foreign areas and shall formulate and recommend to the President and the Congress specific prorgams for carrying out the purposes of this subsection (b).

"(B) The Commission shall report to the President and to the Congress from time to time the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. The Commission shall file its first report within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, and annually thereafter.

"(10) (A) The Commission may create such committees of its members with such powers and duties as may be delegated thereto.

"(B) The Commission, or any committee thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this subsection (b), hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such committee may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before any committee thereof.

"(C) The Commission, or any committee thereof, is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, or any committee thereof, upon request made by the chairman or vice chairman of the Commission or of the committee concerned.

"(D) The Commission, or any committee thereof, shall have power to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the Commission or committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section."

I hope my amendment will be adopted because I believe it is the effective way of accomplishing an important objective.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to follow my colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who stated that H. R. 7005 is wise, sound, and unfortunately necessary. I regret to disagree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] on assistance to Yugoslavia. Our foreign policy must be consistent with basic beliefs of our Nation. No nation should receive aid if the basic beliefs of that nation destroy the values the United States seeks to achieve and uphold—the rights of private property.

Mr. Chairman, the importance of H. R. 7005, known as the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, cannot be overestimated. It is the implementation of our foreign policy. It is the actual dollar cost authorization of what the United States must spend to help other nations achieve self-security. Indirectly, it is for our own preservation.

The men in the Kremlin have caused this situation. Their actions as aggressors in Korea have caused the whole rearmament program of the west to be put into motion. They do not desire peace. They desire world domination at any cost. Their actions are so well known to all of us.

During our early history, the foreign policy of the United States did not involve dollar cost, but with the realization that there is one world with two conflicting ideologies—the rights of free men versus a slave state—and with the rapid development of the science of war used by aggressor nations, it has become necessary for the United States to develop a foreign policy of international cooperation in order to assure its self-preservation. Historic steps were taken when the United States joined the United Nations; established the ECA program;

enacted the mutual defense pact; initiated the Mutual Security Program; and ratified the North Atlantic Treaty and other regional pacts. These laws and treaties are binding on all branches of the Government. H. R. 7005 represents their implementation.

The bill before us today is the recommendation of the House Foreign Affairs Committee for this foreign assistance program. It is the means taken by the United States in accepting its responsibility as leader of the free world. It is testimonial to the fact that we are the last bulwark of democracy. It is for the mutual benefit of all freemen. It is the expression of the United States that we desire to live in peace with all peoples and governments, but that we are determined to safeguard freedom for ourselves and for other freedom-loving people.

The policy of the United States in giving foreign aid has been based upon self-help and mutual cooperation. I believe that this policy must now be developed into a policy of aid given on a step-by-step basis. The amount of aid should be determined by the progress of the recipient nations in carrying out the agreed objectives. I refer here to United Nations actions, to regional collective organizations such as NATO, and the plans for European unification.

We have taken a broad view of our responsibility. We must demand that other nations and peoples take the same broad view and look beyond their own horizons to work with others who have identical aims. With each nation making its own contribution, there will be no shirking of responsibility and progress toward our common goal will be made with greater ease and dispatch.

The foreign aid program of the United States for this year hinges on two decisive factors. Both involve revolutionary plans and, as a consequence, have been slowed up by national and international obstacles. The first factor involves the conclusion of contractual treaty agreements with the West German Republic, and Great Britain, France, and the United States. This treaty, called the Bonn or provisional peace treaty, recognizes Western Germany as a member of the European community of nations. There is a limited status on West Germany until such time when East and West Germany can be unified.

The second factor is the creation of a European army. It is realized that Germany must play a part in self-defense and in the defense of Europe. In the light of past events, it is deemed safer to have the German army included in the European army rather than have independent national armies.

It was France who suggested the creation of this new Europe. It has long been realized that the unification of Europe, both economically and militarily, is essential if Europe is to survive. The Foreign Affairs Subcommittee, in its report on its mission to Europe last fall, stated bluntly, "Europe must unite or perish." In his farewell message to Europe, General Eisenhower stated less bluntly that there can be neither peace nor security for Europe unless it unites.

European unity is a necessity—an urgent necessity—of long-range importance. Its primary aim is not merely military in order to build up a defensive strength and to form a barrier against Russia's overwhelming ambitions. It is a compelling necessity for economic reasons. Europe cannot prosper under separate national economies which are unable to compete in world markets against the vast industrial systems built up in the United States and in Russia.

The hope for this unification is stressed in the amendment to section 2 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 which we are considering. The Congress welcomes the recent progress in political federation, military integration, and economic unification in Europe and reaffirms its belief in the necessity of further vigorous efforts toward these ends as a means of building strength, establishing security, and preserving peace in the North Atlantic area. In order to provide further encouragement to such efforts, the Congress believes it essential that this act should be so administered as to support concrete measures for political federation, military integration, and economic unification in Europe.

It is difficult to understand the slowness in arriving at this goal of unity, since its importance has been recognized by the representatives of those nations. However, we must bear in mind that there are many traditions, customs, language barriers, and historical factors to be overcome.

I believe that much of this obstruction would be eased if Great Britain had been willing to be a partner. The explanation for her refusal is that it would weaken her ties with the Commonwealth countries. That seems to me to be a poor excuse. She is not being asked to choose between the Commonwealth and Europe. England has had other alliances which did not weaken her ties.

Diplomatically, this represents a complete change with the past. The whole equilibrium of the twentieth century was based upon an alliance between France and England. In the present plan, unification or federation will revolve around Germany and France. It is to be hoped that a plan can be devised so that this new Europe can bring about and defend the peace.

The United States has done, and will continue to do, her share. The world should know that our only interest is to benefit the free world, to do all we can to help other nations to be self-sustaining and militarily strong. We ask the cooperation of others toward this aim. It is not a one-way responsibility.

The time for hesitation is past. Now is the time for the Western Powers to move ahead and to sustain the forces and plans jointly initiated and sponsored. It is time for us to prove to the nations whom we are aiding that we want no further bargaining. The haggling within Germany, instigated by the Socialist Party led by Herr Schumacher, is regretted. This opposition, augmented by Russian counterproposals, alines them with the Kremlin. This comes as no surprise to me. This thinking was very evident to me when I was in Germany last fall. Powerful, threatening forces are in the background and, despite Chancelor Adenauer's courageous stand and diplomatic patience, the Socialists, inspired by the Russians, hope to upset the plans of the free world.

A swift realization of the Schuman plan and a quick conclusion of the European Defense Community Pact are the only means for keeping the resources, factories, and skills of Europe free from Soviet control. For that reason, the major portion of H. R. 7005 is earmarked for Europe.

I would like to bring to the attention of the House many noteworthy changes in H. R. 7005.

Section 2: Adopted Senate language of section 2 which authorizes assistance to three designated organizations for unifying Europe rather than to any such organization as provided in H. R. 7005 as introduced.

This change shows the hope and desire for the new Europe implementation of NATO, European coal and steel unification, creation of a European defense community.

Section 3: Amended Mutual Security Act to mention Spain by name as eligible to receive assistance—was eligible previously.

Spain was made eligible for participation in the aid program over a year ago and as yet has not received any assistance. This section includes Spain as part of the pattern for defense in the west.

Military end items in title I are $3,316,000,000—cut $829,000,000 from $4,145,000,000. This is the amount we recommend should be authorized for matériel to supply the European NATO countries under the Lisbon plan. The United States must deliver the major portion of the equipment. Europe must provide the bulk of the forces.

Cut defense support 10 percent from $1,819,200,000 to $1,637,300,000—cut $181,900,000—page 48. To further assist these countries, it is necessary that we authorize $1,637,300,000 for defense support. Call this any term you want—economic aid. Its purpose is to supply raw materials for arms manufactured in Europe. It is the estimated amount needed to assist European countries to divert their industry to defense production. It is to cushion the impact of their arms program. Together these authorizations will assist Europe in meeting its share of the collective rearmament cost of seventeen and seven-tenths billion.

Only through this cooperative effort can there be achieved promptly a buildup of defense strength providing a genuine deterrent to aggression. To cut defense support—cuts the number of men in European forces. I do not support any further cuts in this title but I do believe that this assistance should be given only as the European nations progress toward our mutual objectives.

Retained the authority to transfer 10 percent within title I rather than the 5 percent proposed in H. R. 7005.

Earmarked not less than $25,000,000 for Spain.

Section 4: No alteration of amounts in title II—Near East and Africa—but

adopted the Senate form of authorization by specifying the funds for Arab refugees and for refugees coming to Israel and for technical assistance in that area.

Section 5: Struck out exemption of title III funds from section 503 of MSA. This means that TCA will have to take over from MSA the programs in Burma and Indonesia.

Section 6: Redesignated area as American republics and non-self-governing territories of the Western Hemisphere.

Provided that no part of the United States contribution to the Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe could be used to pay salary or expenses of the Director General of such Committee if a former employee of UNRRA or IRO.

Section 7: MSA Act amended to authorize distribution of 50 super grades already provided among all departments and agencies covered in the program. Some of these may be assigned to point 4 and Defense.

Required by July 1, 1952, a 10 percent reduction—based on January 1, 1952, personnel—of personnel other than blue-collar workers and technical consultants.

Director of Mutual Security required to reduce reporting requirements.

Authorized the transfer of not more than $1,000,000,000 of military items from United States defense program to foreign nations in addition to equipment authorized by this bill.

Required that not less than $1,000,000,000 be earmarked exclusively for offshore procurement. My reason for offshore procurement is that other countries must gear to produce their own weapons. We must not tie up or limit United States industry to defense mobilization and permit other nations to usurp world markets.

Authorized total expenditure of not more than $100,000,000, not more than $20,000,000 to any country, without conditions as to eligibility. This would permit giving limited assistance to nations which we wish to help but which may be afraid to enter into agreements with us.

Authorized Director for Mutual Security to develop strategic materials in world deficiency for countries receiving United States assistance.

The Director for Mutual Security required to take suitable and appropriate steps to assure effective use by recipient countries of their own resources for mutual security.

Provided up to $1,000,000,000 of counterpart to encourage free enterprise.

Permitted up to $100,000,000 of military production and economic and technical-assistance funds to be used for subscribing to capital of an International Finance Corporation.

Investment and informational media guaranties continued after June 30, 1952, to all areas where United States assistance is granted.

Required Mutual Security Agency to develop broad criteria for guaranties and to conduct study of impediments to private investment abroad; Department of State required to accelerate commercial and tax-treaty program; Technical Cooperation Administration required to encourage and facilitate greater participation by industrial groups in point 4 programs and to bring investment opportunities in underdeveloped areas to attention of private enterprise.

Section 9: Required counterpart funds used for loans by recipient countries to be redeposited in counterpart special account when loans are repaid so as to give the United States continuing participation in their administration.

Assured that counterpart fund be available for strategic materials without regard to 5 percent limitation.

Section 11: Authorized $12,000,000 for UNICEF for period ending December 31, 1953, on condition that United States contribution not exceed one-third of contribution from all governments. None of the activities for which these funds are authorized shall duplicate any of the activities of other U. N. agencies.

CONCLUSION

The world is once again at the crossroads. Decisions made this week and next, both here and in Europe, will change the course of history. No matter how large the sums of money involved in this bill, they are small compared to the goal for which we are striving. The political federation of European countries, built upon a unified economic foundation where the laboring classes are dignified by receiving a just income, will form a wall through which the false inducements of communism will not penetrate.

Therefore, I urge the passage of this bill to support Europe toward our objectives in this time of great decision. Directly, this will prove to friend and foe that the United States cooperates constructively toward peace and security.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, we have under consideration today H. R. 7005, a bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951. I wish to congratulate the Committee on Foreign Affairs for at least bringing in a bill as an amendment to the one passed a little over 7 months ago, rather than under a new name. Of course, it might be somewhat embarrassing to change the name when the law has not been in effect for a full year.

When this program was originally presented to Congress it was called interim aid, then the Marshall plan, then the European recovery program, now the the Mutual Security Act, and I would not be surprised to see the bill next year entitled "Point 4 Assistance Program."

Regardless of what you call it, it means the distribution of wealth of the United States to the four corners of the world.

Before the House of Representatives takes action on the present bill, H. R. 7005, I would like to give the Committee the benefit of my observations and findings for its consideration in passing upon the authorization of $7,900,000,000 as recommended by President Truman for the mutual-security program for fiscal year 1953.

During my investigation last year in Europe I checked into how our Marshall plan and ECA funds were being expended.

ENGLAND

The first place I stopped was England. While there I talked with members of the ECA mission from the United States, leaders of both the Labor and Conservative Parties, some of whom are at present in the Cabinet of Great Britain, as well as the shopkeeper, businessman, and the average man on the street. I discussed our Marshall plan and its benefits to them. I was greatly surprised to learn that the average Englishman knew very little, if anything, about what the American taxpayers' money was doing for his country and the total amount that had been appropriated. It was indeed a great disappointment to me to learn that the men in the British Government, while admitting that our funds had done a great deal of good for them economically after the cessation of hostilities in World War II, were damning us in the same breath. We were almost universally accused by members of both the Conservative and Labor Parties for nearly all of their troubles.

Representatives of ECA in London showed me a graph that was being prepared showing the agricultural production in England had increased 40 percent since the war. Naturally, I asked them what was responsible for it. I was immediately informed that it was due to our Marshall plan aid. I told them that I had been advised the grazing land of England had been reduced since World War II from approximately 58 to 41 percent, and I imagined it was just reasonable to assume that a portion of that 18-percent reduction in grazing land had been put into arable land. While they agreed with me in my assumption, I regret they were not able to show me where they had taken that factor into consideration in making their graph.

Anyone will acknowledge that the economy of Great Britain could not have helped being restored to some extent with all the money we gave her, but I cannot help but feel the people of Great Britain should have been advised as to what we have done to help her. Whenever I asked our representatives in England why the English people were not fully informed about what we are doing for them, I generally got the reply that the British are very proud people, and we could not afford to offend their pride.

The conservative leaders blamed our Marshall plan dollars for keeping the Labor government in power. They contended that if we had not given Great Britain so much money, thereby keeping the Labor government in power, they would not have been saddled with the socialist program of nationalizing their industries. The conservative leaders also poo-pooed the information that has been put out by the State Department that if they had not kept the Labor Party in power England might have had a form of government worse than that of the Labor government.. Of course, there is no proof that they would have had something worse, while on the other

hand, there is always the possibility they could have had something better if the conservatives had been returned to power at an earlier date.

Mr. Chairman, I was in England a second time last year, just prior to the general elections which were held on October 25. For several evenings prior to the elections I made it my business to go out and listen to speakers for both the Conservative and Labor Parties. As a matter of fact, two nights before the elections I traveled with Mr. Clement Attlee and listened to his arguments in favor of the Labor Party. The afternoon before the elections I traveled with Mr. Churchill to listen to him. It was very interesting to see that at the conclusion of every talk Mr. Churchill held up his right arm with the famous V for victory. In every instance he never forgot to close his remarks with "And for dear old England." It made one admire a man of his position, who, all through the years had contributed so much to his country and at the conclusion of his remarks expressed his love for his native land in such a splendid manner. I would to God that we had more Americans who thought as much of the United States.

I hold in my hand 128 clippings of various newspapers of Great Britain, including 14 of the Daily Worker, the official Communist paper, in which are recorded the views of the various candidates for office during the general election campaign. They include such men as the following members of the Labor Party:

Mr. Emanuel Shinwell, Minister of Defense.

Mr. Henderson, Secretary of State for Air.

Mr. Herbert Morrison, Foreign Secretary.

Mr. Hugh Gaitskell, Chancelor of the Exchequer.

Sir Hartley Sharncross, President of the Board of Trade.

Mr. Naewvin Bevin, recognized leader of the radical block in the Labor Party.

Mr. Clement Attlee, Prime Minister.

Mr. Strachey, Secretary of State for War.

Mr. Robens, Minister of Labor.

Mr. Webb, Minister of Food.

Mr. P. C. Gordon-Walker, Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations.

Mr. Stokes, Lord Privy Seal.

Lord Jawitt, Lord Chancellor.

In addition to those of the Labor Party you will find among these clippings reports of speeches of such well-known people of the Conservative Party as Winston Churchill, Anthony Eden, Sir John Anderson, Lord Woolton, and Sir David Fyfe.

Also, you will find reports of speeches by leaders of the Communist and Liberal Parties. The reason I bring this to your attention while we have under discussion the mutual security bill is because not a single speaker of any party made mention of or gave credit to the United States for what it has done for Great Britain in aid, with the exception of one occasion. Mr. Anthony Eden, speaking at Old Milverton, Warwickshire, on October 21, 1951, in reply to many criticisms that had been leveled at the United States, said:

> The critics of the United States were ungenerous.

Since returning from England I have repeatedly stated in my numerous lectures that in my opinion the Labor Party had no desire to actually win the election last October. It appeared that they wanted the Conservative Party to win by a small margin but not enough to have a dependable working majority, with the hope and the knowledge that the Conservative Party could not possibly bring Great Britain out of her economic dilemma. The reasoning was that at the next general election the Labor Party would be returned to power with a very large working majority which it did not have in the last Parliament. Frankly, in my opinion, the Labor Party engineered the economy of Great Britain into such a tangled and helpless condition that the Conservative Party will not be able to fulfill its promises made in the campaign, and the Labor Party will be returned to power at the next general election with a much larger majority than it previously had in Parliament.

Lest someone might say that I had purposely selected certain reports of speeches in this collection of only those which did not give credit to the United States for what the taxpayers had contributed to the economic well-being of England. I wish to state that this entire file of news clippings was compiled for me in the United States Embassy in London. This was done that I might know what the various candidates and leaders of the political parties were saying in the campaign, and particularly as to their attitude toward giving credit to the United States for our aid. As a matter of fact, listening to Clement Attlee two nights before the general election he made a great to do about the fact that industrial production in England had increased 50 percent since the war but did not hesitate to emphasize that credit for the entire 50 percent increase was due to Labor and the Labor Party alone. It is easy for anyone to appreciate the fact that after the factories, public works, transportation, and everything else had taken a terrible beating during the war, and production, naturally, was at a very low mark, it would have to improve—even without any aid from the United States.

The British, and particularly members of the Labor Party, blame us for all their troubles in Iran. It came to me as a surprise to find the people of England did not blame the Labor Party at all for the troubles in Iran but only the Americans. On every occasion I received the same explanation, to wit: If the Americans had not gone into Saudi Arabia and Iraq and made contracts with the Government wherein they received fair profits for the oil taken out of those countries, the British could have continued to take oil out of Iran on the basis of their original contracts. These were made many years ago and gave the Iranian Government very little compensation for the oil that they extracted from that country. In most instances I was told the Iranian Government was only receiving a 10-percent royalty from the British companies, while the Governments of Saudi Arabia and Iraq received approximately 50 percent royalty on oil. The Iranian Government asked Great Britain to renegotiate their contracts, which the British positively refused to do. They insisted that the Iranian Government live up to the old contract that was made many years ago which was very unfavorable to Iran in comparison with the American contracts in Iraq and Saudi Arabia. After the British refused to talk about renegotiating the contracts with Iran, the Iranian Government served notice that they would expropriate the British oil properties and nationalize the oil industry in Iran. Although the Labor Government of Great Britain registered a protest against this procedure, it was an ineffective one, in view of the fact that they had just completed nationalizing practically all of the industries in Great Britain. Furthermore, the Iranian Government had precedence for its action because it was only 12 or 13 years ago that the Mexican Government expropriated all the American oil properties in that country. In return it gave the American companies only about 10 cents on the dollar for the investment they had made in building up the oil industry of Mexico.

Outside of Government officials in Great Britain, another startling discovery was that I found no one who had the slightest idea that the greater portion of the 95 percent of our Marshall plan aid known as counterpart funds had been applied directly to reduce the national debt of Great Britain. Members of the Conservative Party pointed to this as one of the main reasons the United States was responsible for the British industries being nationalized as a result of keeping the Labor Party in power for so long.

FRANCE

One of the greatest mistakes the Economic Cooperation Administration made in many European countries, and particularly in France, was that we should have insisted that the Government collect the just taxes from its people before we gave a dollar in Marshall aid. During my two visits to France last year, I made it a point to talk with many people in various types of business. Invariably they informed me that in their opinion the French Government was not collecting within 50 percent of the taxes that should have gone into the treasury. Personally, I believe it would be more correct to say that the French Government only collects 25 percent of the taxes it should. I take the stand that we should have insisted that they correct this evil before any aid whatsoever was given to them. Not that I wish to betray any confidences regarding tax collection, but I was informed that in reality almost every busi-

nessman was carrying the tax collector on his payroll in one form or another.

The most popular game in France seems to be one government falling after another, due to the fact that every premier wants to be sure he doesn't offend any political party or the various splinters of political parties. No one to date has been willing or had the courage to tell the French people the truth about their economic and financial conditions and institute remedies to put their government on a sound basis.

I was informed that approximately 1,000,000 people have been added to the civil payrolls and that once a person is on the payroll it is next to impossible to dismiss him. This is one of the reasons the government-owned French railroads run at such large deficits every year.

Mr. Chairman, if you do not agree that a large portion of the hard earned money of the American taxpayer is going down the sewer, listen to this. The French Government actually subsidizes the Communist-dominated and controlled French trade-unions. A portion of this is our money because for years we have been pumping money into France. This, mind you, is money that the Congress of the United States has appropriated to stop and contain communism.

One of the most flagrant examples of waste of American taxpayers' money in the form of Marshall aid to France has been in rebuilding the French railroads. In numerous instances spurs and branch lines of the French railroad system were rebuilt, including stations and bridges where, for many years, there has been practically no traffic and no revenue. They were only rebuilt because of the influence of local politicians when the communities should not only be served by, but have been and are being served by busses and trucks. These obsolete lines should have been scrapped years ago, the same as we permit railroads to discontinue service and abandon road beds in the United States for economy and efficiency. These branch lines of the French railway system are responsible for tremendous deficits in operating expenses each year.

The French, like most Europeans, think we are crazy to keep pouring the American taxpayers' dollars into the economy of European countries and, in my opinion, they will never knuckle down to business and help themselves to the extent they should as long as they know they are going to get hand-outs from Uncle Sam.

BELGIUM

In all fairness I must report that I believe the ECA mission in Belgium has done a better job of educating the people of the country as to what we have done for them under the Marshall plan, and its effects, than in any other country I visited last summer. Unlike England, the men in charge of our Marshall plan aid in Belgium were able to produce their records, radio script, and newspaper articles, to prove that they had done everything within their power to let the people know exactly what we have done for them. The people were appreciative. They were not too proud to be told that we had come to their economic aid.

The Belgian people as a whole seemed industrious and were working hard. The results showed it. In my opinion, the economy of Belgium is in better condition than any country in Europe, with the exception of Switzerland.

It was, however, rather difficult for me to determine whether the agricultural program as followed by the ECA in Belgium or the one followed in Italy was correct. Over a long period of years the large farms of Belgium, having been handed down to heirs, have been divided so many times that the average size of many farms in Belgium today is around 10 acres. The program of the ECA in Belgium is to consolidate these farms into large ones, whereby it would be economical to use improved mechanized methods of farming.

For fear someone might get the impression that the people who are on these small farms must eke out a living from them, I wish to state that in most cases the people who work them have employment in industry and take care of the farms evenings, week ends, and in their spare time.

However, in Italy I found the ECA's agricultural program was just the opposite of what it was in Belgium. In the southern part of Italy there are many large estates that for years have not been put into production. Instead of using modern, mechanized methods on these large estates to produce food, ECA was splitting them up into small farms, the average size of which is about 10 acres. This will make it impossible to use mechanized equipment on them. In other words, they are establishing a program in Italy which is diametrically opposite to that in operation in Belgium.

COMMUNISM

In every country I visited I went into the question of whether communism is on the decrease or on the increase. My reason for doing this was because the billions upon billions of dollars which have been appropriated for aid under the Marshall plan were obtained from Congress because we have been assured time and again that it is for the purpose of stopping and containing communism. Unfortunately, it has done neither. This is particularly true in France and Italy, where communism is more prevalent today than at any time since the cessation of hostilities at the end of World War II. Nevertheless, the record does show that communism has been on the decrease in Belgium. I was expressly anxious to learn why it had decreased there and not in other European countries. I had the privilege of having a long discussion with Mr. Finet, the general secretary of the General Federation of Trade Unions in Belgium, whom I found to be a very well-informed man, not only on matters of labor but also on economy and government.

After my conference with Mr. Finet I had a long visit with the Minister of Justice on the very same subject. It is the responsibility of the Minister of Justice in Belgium to keep a check on all radical elements within the country—especially Communists. He is recognized as one of the best authorities in Belgium on the subject of communism. His explanation was the same as that of Mr. Finet. They both told me that during the war, when Russia was considered our ally, the Communists in Belgium did very effective work in what was known as the underground. These Communists were not Russians or natives of any foreign country, but Belgian nationals. As such they were either given or obtained far more recognition than they deserved. They were made members of the Belgian Cabinet and were given many high offices in the government. Because of their aggressiveness, propaganda, and organizational methods, they were able to deceive the Belgian people regarding their true objectives and thereby received support at the polls, which enabled them to be elected to various public offices. But after the truth of Yalta, Potsdam, Tehran, and the Korean war became known to the Belgian people, and they learned the truth about communism, they have been repudiating the Communists at the polls more and more each election. Therefore, the Communists have been receiving fewer votes each election.

ITALY

Mr. Chairman, after my survey of the operations of ECA in Italy I was rather curious to ascertain the qualifications of Mr. Mildren L. Dayton, the man in complete charge of ECA operations in that country. As a result, when I returned to Paris, I took occasion to check his application for employment. I was quite surprised to learn, at least in my judgment, that he had no qualifications whatsoever for such a responsible position. I challenge anyone to prove that he did. According to his application he had been employed by the international division of the American Red Cross in civilian relief from May 3, 1943, until the last of May in 1947, when he filed his application for employment with the Department of State. Incidentally, he was recruited for this position by the State Department because on his application he stated his reason for changing employment was at the request of the State Department. At the time he was employed by the American Red Cross, his application shows that he received a salary of $2,400 per year. At the time he presented his application for employment to the State Department he was receiving $4,800 per year, plus full maintenance. Is it any wonder that our entire Marshall aid program has been such a complete failure when a man whose only qualification was that he supervised and distributed packages and participated in civilian relief was put in charge of such an important phase of the program as Italy?

I was told in Rome, Italy, that Mr. Dayton's salary for ECA was $15,000 per year, plus a limousine with a private chauffeur, plus a home and servants, plus a cost-of-living allowance and an unlimited expense account.

The ECA in Rome occupies a large office building almost across the street

from the Embassy. As I left the building one day at the lunch hour I noticed approximately 15 automobiles with chauffeurs around the building. In a few minutes the employees poured from the building into the waiting automobiles and away they went. A short time before the 2-hour lunch period was up I was again in the vicinity and observed the returning automobiles. The employees entered the building while the cars and chauffeurs waited. I mention this for two reasons: First, because the ECA building is in the best location in Rome for bus, streetcar, and taxi transportation; secondly, I consider it an unjustified waste of the taxpayers' money. Excellent restaurant facilities are available in the immediate vicinity.

I do not believe the man over here who carries his lunch in a dinner pail is going to like that. He figures his kids need shoes with the tax money Uncle Sam collects from him a lot more than ECAers need a chauffeur and a leisurely ride to get a 2-hour snack. This is only one instance. I can just imagine the resentment among the working men and women of America over this so-called foreign-aid program if there were some way of bringing the entire story to their attention.

Time will not permit me to go into detail on everything in Italy, let alone some of the various other countries, but let us just for a moment look at one or two situations there. I am sure they are quite representative of how our give-away program of the taxpayers' money has been administered in most of the countries receiving this form of aid.

Mr. Chairman, I want you and the Members of this body to keep in mind that our fundamental and primary objective in this program, according to statements from President Truman, Dean Acheson, and other officials of our Government, has been to stop and contain communism. The man in charge of the ECA Information Program for Italy was one Frank H. Gervasi. Under his misguidance, insistence and direction, 3 concerts were put on to stop communism. These concerts were held in Lucca, Bari, and Rome. So-called artists were imported from all over the world at tremendous salaries and expense accounts and were accompanied by a 65-piece orchestra. The comptroller of ECA funds in Italy informed me that the total cost of these concerts was 18,500,000 lira. When I returned to Paris I checked with the general comptroller of ECA for all of Europe to see what his figures showed. He informed me that the 3 concerts cost 23,500,000 lira. Mind you, this is just the actual expense and does not take into account the time and expense of our large personnel in ECA in Italy and many other items that were not directly charged to the concerts. I shudder to even hazard a guess what the overall cost of these 3 concerts might have been because of the shocking effect it might have on our systems. At any rate, it would be interesting if the full truth about them could be brought out some day.

We all know and appreciate that the Italian people are world renowned for their love of music and for their musical talent. When Mrs. Busbey and I were in Milan we were fortunate enough to get tickets to a concert conducted by the great Victor DeSabata and complemented by a chorus of more than 200 voices. Mrs. Busbey was at one time a concert violinist and we both have on many occasions enjoyed fine concerts in the United States, but I am frank to say in all sincerity that this particular concert was by far the best I had ever had the pleasure of hearing.

Mr. Chairman, on numerous occasions I have asked many people what they thought these 3 concerts had to do with stopping communism. I have yet to have anyone give me a satisfactory answer to that question. To illustrate how ineffective our programs have been in combating communism, let me give you one of the most effective means the Communists have of recruiting favorable opinion to them, particularly in Italy.

In nearly every village there is a small park with a bandstand. The Communists hire a very few pieces of music and invite all the people of the village down to the square to dance and have an enjoyable evening. During the evening they serve the natives free beer and sandwiches and everybody goes home happy and feeling kindly toward the Communists, because they know the Communists did something for them. Whenever the Communists do anything for the people of any of these villages, everyone in the village knows that the Communists did it. Mr. Chairman, I am not advocating free beer and sandwiches. I am merely reciting the facts to illustrate the point that for peanuts, as far as money is concerned, the Communists put over an effective program where our billions have failed.

The people of Italy would be much better off if the money that was spent on these three concerts had been used to build a playground in some slum area so that the children could have obtained benefit. This would have been worth while and everyone would have known that America did it for the people of that area.

As in the case of Mr. Dayton, I was rather interested in the background of Mr. Frank H. Gervasi, who was in charge of the information program for ECA in Italy. When I returned to Paris I looked over his application form for Federal employment. After viewing the names of his reference it was quite understandable to me, at least in part, why our ECA information program in Italy was a complete failure as far as combating communism is concerned. The references given by Mr. Gervasi on the application form in the Paris office were as follows: William Shirer, Leland Stowe, Cornelia Bryce Pinchot, Ralph Hetzel, Nelson Perry.

Mr. Chairman, William L. Shirer, Cornelia Bryce Pinchot, Ralph Hetzel, and Leland Stowe have been affiliated with several organizations designated by the Attorney General as Communist. Mr. Gervasi's application should not have been considered under any circumstances in view of his references, particularly because of the objectives of the ECA organization which we were told were to combat and stop communism through economic aid. Is it any wonder that our European aid program has failed and the taxpayers' money in most instances wasted and the entire operation correctly named "operation rathole."

RAILROADS IN ITALY

During my inspection trip in Europe I used many modes of transportation. I drove approximately 4,000 miles by automobile, in some cases I used commercial airplanes, but in Italy my traveling was done entirely by train. I will not try to tell of my experiences by train because they are beyond description. Even pictures could not do justice. Frankly, it seemed like the entire population of Italy was trying to get on the particular train I was riding. The old expression "packed in like sardines" would not begin to describe the number of people who tried to travel in each railroad car. This method of travel permitted me to observe the railroad stations in the small towns and villages of Italy. I was greatly impressed with the beautiful, modern, up-to-date railroad station in every town. A great deal of our Marshall plan money has gone into building these new stations. While I do not begrudge the Italian people these beautiful, new, modernistic railroad stations, I could not help but compare them to our modest little stations in small towns throughout America and wondered what our people would think if they could see what their hard-earned tax dollars had built for the people of Italy.

The station in Rome is by far the most modernistic station in the world. It is reasonable to say that it is three times larger than the traffic warrants at the present time. It will be many, many years in the future before they will ever have the capacity to utilize such a large station. As long as they had the ground for the station they could have built a portion of it now and the rest when the traffic demanded it.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact it is common knowledge that the businessmen and industrial firms of Italy, as in France, keep two sets of books—in most cases three—and it is impossible to get an accurate profit-and-loss statement or balance sheet, I was interested to determine what method was used by the Finance Division of our ECA mission in Italy to ascertain what company should be granted a loan in preference to another. I had quite a long conversation with Miss Anne R. Friedman, Finance Analyst of the Finance Division, as well as other members of the committee. When we finished, it all boiled down to the fact that they did not have any dependable information on which to base their grants but relied on a committee

in the Italian Government known as IMI. I am sure if one could delve into the situation he would find that many industrial concerns of Italy are receiving ECA financial grants which, in reality, do not need them. It is certainly no secret that tremendous wealth is leaving Italy and France to be invested in Africa and South America, a great deal of it going untaxed.

AMBASSADORS

A very embarrassing thing which has been brought about because of our Marshall plan in Europe is that not only ECA but other missions give our officials the rank of Ambassador. It seems every time we appoint a chairman of some mission to Europe he is sent over there with the rank of Ambassador, to say nothing of our regular Ambassadors who represent our Government and also our roving Ambassadors. In fact, it is quite embarrassing to people who call the Embassy and ask to speak to the Ambassador to have the person answering the telephone inquire, "To which Ambassador do you wish to speak?" For the sake of eliminating a great deal of confusion and misunderstanding, bickering as to protocol at social functions, and so forth, we should discontinue the use of the term "ambassador" in connection with everyone in our missions and confine it to the accredited Ambassador for the State Department. I contend that we should have one Ambassador, and only one, in these various countries.

DISMANTLING IN GERMANY

While I propose to make a detailed report at a later date on the Morgenthau dismantling program in Germany, I wish to state in passing that the reason we are spending money in Germany, under the Marshall plan, is in part due to the fact that we let the British and Russians dismantle the factories of Germany and we are now called upon to furnish the money to rebuild them. It would have been bad enough if the program had been confined to dismantling, but I saw factories where the British just ruined the machinery with tremendous acetylene torches without any attempt to dismantle them. If any program could have been handled worse than the situation since Roosevelt recognized Marxist Russia in 1933, it is the dismantling and occupation program of Germany.

Because we fell for the so-called Morgenthau program, which in reality was the brain child of Mr. Morgenthau's assistant, Harry D. White, who has been identified by Elizabeth Bentley as connected with a Communist cell within a Government agency, all of which has never been disproved, plus the fact that we have let the British make the Administration agree to a plan not to let Germany produce, the American taxpayers are again being called upon to put up untold millions to maintain the economy of Western Germany. I talked to many Germans in various sections of Germany and everyone told me they would not need Marshall or any other kind of aid if the United States would let them produce many items needed for the Western European defense program, including steel. Every industrial man I interviewed in Germany assured me all that was needed was a loan to be amortized over a period of 10 years.

With the shortage of steel it seemed almost like treason to find one of Germany's largest steel mills permitted to operate at only 5 percent capacity, especially in view of the fact that when I was in Frankfurt there was a teletype conference between our State Department and the Steel Board in Germany to determine the possibilities of getting 100,000 tons of steel from Germany to replace the steel lost in the Kansas floods in the spring of 1951. How stupid can we get? No one but the bright boys in the State Department would think up such an inane question under conditions at that time.

SPAIN

Mr. Chairman, I want to say just a word regarding the situation in Spain before I conclude. I believe this is one of the most misunderstood and mishandled problems in Europe. I must say the Communists in the United States have done an effective job in distorting the actual facts. In my conversations with the high-ranking members of the Spanish Government, I asked them what their attitude was toward coming into the NATO program. The answer I received was always the same, "We have not been invited and until we are invited there is nothing to talk about." It was a true answer to my question and I am thoroughly convinced that the reason Spain has not been invited into the NATO program is due in a large part to the economic objections from England and France and the well-planted propaganda by the Communists and their fellow travelers.

I cannot speak for others, but the State Department will never do a very good job convincing me that they are sincere in their attempts to contain and stop communism until they make use of all the anti-Communist forces there are in the world—which includes Western Germany, Spain, and the Chinese Nationalists.

In many instances when I talked to our representatives abroad about bringing Spain into the defense of Western Europe program, they would throw up their hands in horror and want to know if I thought we should have any traffic with a vicious dictator like Franco. While I do not approve of a dictatorship under any circumstances or conditions, I do know that the Spanish people are definitely anti-Communist and they could put an army of 1,000,000 violently anti-Communist, well-trained, hard-fighting men into the field in a period of approximately 4 months.

The inconsistency in the policy of the State Department is that we have been using the taxpayers' money for years to support dictators, particularly in Central and South America, to say nothing of a Communist dictator in Yugoslavia by the name of Tito. This is understandable when one realizes that since the New Deal has come into power the United States has never had a definite foreign policy. We wait until Soviet Russia acts and then we react. We wait until she moves and then we make a countermove. The unfortunate part about it all is that the countermoves that we make are feeble, ineffective, costly, and while we are bleeding ourselves white economically and forcing America into bankruptcy, the Communists go forward with their program of communizing millions and millions of additional people each year and bringing them under the domination and control of Marxist Russia.

If all the anti-Communist manpower that is available were utilized it would not be necessary for the United States to have a single division of American soldiers in Europe. Oh yes, I appreciate the fact that every time a congressional delegation goes out to General Eisenhower's headquarters it is given the usual treatment on what a great thing the presence of the American soldiers has been to boost the morale of the European people. But that is not as I found it when I was over there and talked with people on the highways and byways. As a matter of fact, they resent very much our soldiers being over there and are fearful that we intend to get them into another war and cause their cities and homes to be bombed and the lives of many of their people lost.

To the credit of Spain it must be said that notwithstanding the fact that she has always been one of the poorest countries of Europe and endured a civil war to defeat communism, she has made a remarkable recovery without the help of Marshall plan money.

Mr. Chairman, there is an old saying, "put the oil where the squeak is," and the squeak in this instance is in the lap of the Democratic administration because they and they alone are responsible for world conditions as they are today.

The Congress could vote 10 times as much money as the administration is asking for under this so-called mutual security program and it would not stop communism. Communism is an ideology and you cannot stop an ideology with money or all the weapons and atom bombs in the world. The only way we can defeat an ideology is with a better one and the proper technique and personnel to sell it to the peoples of the world. We have the best ideology and system of government in the world but, unfortunately, the program that the administration has pursued has been a dismal failure and we are in a mess because of it.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, by wasting the resources of the United States we are playing right into the hands of Joe Stalin. We must change the give-away policy of the administration or face the future as a bankrupt nation. At the present time the initiative is held by Stalin and we will never be able to obtain it until we have a positive program administered by men who not only know communism, but are capable of effectively fighting it.

Who is coming to our rescue after we have dissipated our resources? We have reached a point where there is not a single nation we can depend upon in a final show-down. Every time we appropriate five or ten billion dollars for foreign aid every nation is angry because it did not receive a bigger share of the pie.

On May 5 to 7 of this year the State Department held a national conference on United States foreign policy where representatives from 60 to 70 organizations were indoctrinated with the State Department policy in pushing its present foreign-aid bill. The delegates were instructed to go back into their communities and organizations, spread the gospel for foreign aid and whip up sentiment in favor of the bill we have before us for consideration. No one can argue the fact that it would be impossible to throw these billions of dollars into various countries without helping their economy to some extent, but when they are back on their feet, what then?

The people in the State Department realize that the various European countries will reach a stage of overproduction soon. They will then propose to have Congress vote additional billions to take the production off their hands and sustain tremendous losses in an attempt to effect what they call stabilization of world economy. It is the hope of the State Department that the point 4 program will be carried on indefinitely and eventually transferred to the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, little do the people realize that the give-away program of the New Deal has cost the American taxpayers since July 1, 1940, a total of $122,747,400,306, including fiscal 1952 appropriations. If the Congress should authorize the full amount requested in H. R. 7005 for fiscal 1953 in the amount of $6,901,100,000, it will bring the total up to nearly $130,000,000,000. This figure will be startling to many people but it will be more startling to them when they realize that this does not include moneys appropriated for our own Department of Defense.

Looking at the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that accompanied H. R. 7005, I call your attention to line 5 on pages 30 and 31—expenditure data. You will find that as of February 29 of this year, according to this report, there was an unexpended balance for military assistance of $9,471,537,373 and an unexpended balance for economic and technical assistance of $11,760,919,050, or a total of $21,232,456,423 of foreign aid already appropriated by Congress.

Mr. Chairman, sooner or later this entire give-away program must of necessity come to an end. I do not know of a better time than right now when there is an unexpended balance in excess of $21,000,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, if there is one sure way of losing friends, whether individuals or nations, it is to meddle in other people's business. We have at the present time nearly 100 missions of one kind or another telling people all over the world what they should and should not do. It is only natural that they should resent our interference with their habits and customs just as we would resent some other country interfering with ours. We should stop this meddling in other people's business and trying to make them over into the image of the New Deal before it is too late. It is a well-known fact that you cannot buy friendship with money.

Mr. Chairman, because the foreign-aid program of the administration has not been successful in containing or stopping communism and in the interest of keeping the United States economically sound and militarily strong, I sincerely hope that enough Members of this House will stand up and vote their honest convictions and defeat this bill.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, I intend to take only a few minutes, and will confine my remarks largely to expressions of confidence and respect for the chairman of my committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. JAMES P. RICHARDS, who is fighting to get the best program possible out of this debate.

The distinguished chairman of our committee [Mr. RICHARDS] has always fought hard for an enlightened foreign policy in the best interest of our country. At the same time he has been one of those who has kept constantly in mind the necessity of keeping foreign-aid expenditures within safe bounds in relation to the economy and well-being of our country.

All of us know that being chairman of a great committee in the House of Representatives is no easy job. Especially is that true of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It takes a strong man to stand up against tremendous pressure, as the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] is doing today, and hammer out a sensible, effective, long-range program in the interest of preventing world war III and helping our boys on the fighting fronts in Korea when more tangible, more appealing but less valuable benefits are being promised on every side if the House would only vote to cut out the foreign-aid program altogether. I am in agreement with Chairman RICHARDS that the value of our efforts must be measured in terms of saving the lives of our American boys and preserving our great country so that we can continue to enjoy the American way of life. He has drawn fire, as well as members of the committee and those supporting this program, from Congressmen who say that this legislation provides too much money, and from others who say that it provides too little money, which to me lends credence to the belief that possibly this program, as it is being presented by the Committee on Foreign Affairs today, is not too far off base.

From my daily contacts with him I am sure the gentleman from South Carolina, Chairman RICHARDS, realizes emphatically that the United States of America and our taxpayers cannot continue to carry indefinitely the tremendous burden that we have had to shoulder in the past few years. But he realizes also that we cannot live alone as a nation and be successful; and he knows, too, that we cannot solve our problems by running away from them. He has never run away from anything and I know that he is going to be successful in working out a reasonable program with the Members of this House. His dedicated effort deserves our backing.

I would like to point out that so far as the last request for foreign aid is concerned, Chairman RICHARDS personally introduced a new bill cutting off nearly a billion dollars before he even brought that legislation up for consideration before the Foreign Affairs Committee and then the committee made further cuts in it. Under his leadership something was done that a lot of people who challenge the Foreign Affairs Committee said was an impossibility, and that is to cut off the program once it was started. The American people and the recipients of our economic aid had been promised that the ECA program would end last year and he lead the fight to end that program. Direct threats of invasion from Russia necessitated the development of a realistic program of military assistance to our allies as an alternative to letting Europe and Asia go by default to Russia which surely would have multiplied our difficulties and our expenses a hundred times. In such a situation we probably would already be fighting world war III with losses beyond our imagination. The establishment of an independent administrator of this program who incidentally has done a very good job, shows the statesmanlike and independent character of the chairman and the members of the committee who insisted on this policy.

During floor consideration of the original Mutual Defense Assistance Act, H. R. 5895, on August 18, 1949, the gentleman from South Carolina, Chairman RICHARDS, proposed an amendment to cut the original authorization for the North Atlantic Pact countries in half, from $1,160,990,000 to $580,495,000, and to limit the authorization to 1 year instead of 2, as proposed by the committee bill. The Richards amendment was adopted in the House by a vote of 209 to 151. While the reduction was not retained in the latest conference agreement, the limitation of 1-year was kept—with forward contract authorization—so that the Congress insisted on the right to review the program a year later rather than 2 years afterward.

In explaining the purpose of his amendment, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] said:

> The committee amendment proposes a 2-year program and provides the funds for it. It is proposed that about one-half of it be spent the first year, the fiscal year 1950. I propose that this Congress authorize no more than one-half of it now, and when they come back here next year and report to the Congress as to what progress has been made in the field of unification, standardiza-

tion, and cooperation in Europe, we will consider their case on the basis of achievement. Everyone understands that those three elements are essential in any defense plan against communism if it is going to be a success.

So, ladies and gentlemen, the gentleman from South Carolina, Chairman RICHARDS, is realistic about this thing. He deplores waste and inefficiency. He wants the other nations to do their part too. I sincerely believe he is fighting the most effective way for the most precious values of all—the protection of his boys and perhaps your boys in the service and the security of our country so we can continue to live, to worship and act like proud, worthy Americans.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTLE. I yield.

Mr. HARVEY. The gentleman I know has been very much interested in the entire foreign-aid program and has likewise been interested in protecting our own domestic industry and productivity. It came to my attention when I was in Europe in 1949 that from behind the iron curtain in Poland considerable imports of Polish ham were coming to this country. My area represents a very important production area for the meat of this country, particularly pork. I came back home and have since had the opportunity to check into it and I find that we are bringing into this country considerable quantities of Polish ham. I believe in 1950 we brought in about 7,000,000 pounds and about 5,000,000 in 1951. I wonder if the gentleman, who has had an opportunity to study this problem at considerable length, can explain for the benefit of the committee why we who are trying to protect the free people of Western Europe are permitting these extensive imports to come in here in direct competition with our own products and at the same time permit the dollars to escape behind the iron curtain where they most certainly will be used against us.

Mr. BATTLE. I appreciate the contribution that the gentleman has made and also the very pertinent question he has asked. As the gentleman knows, I have been very vitally interested in the proposition of controlling trade behind the iron curtain, especially the curtailment of shipments that would add to the war machine of the Communists. If the gentleman will study the latest figures he will see that all trade to and from the iron curtain has reduced considerably in the past few years. I think and hope that trade coming in this direction at the present time is proving to be beneficial to us rather than to the nations over there.

Mr. HARVEY. I know it has been the policy of our own country, insofar as dealing with our allies in Western Europe is concerned, to discourage further trade with the satellites, with countries behind the iron curtain, and with the Soviet Union insofar as it is possible to do so. It was not only the general effect the bringing of Polish hams here would have upon our industry but it was likewise difficult for me to understand how we could explain our attitude to our allies over there when we were doing the very thing that we suggested they not do.

Mr. BATTLE. Actually, we are insisting that our allies follow our embargo and screening policy with Russia and her satellites at the cost of losing our economic, military, and financial aid because they were trading with the enemy to the detriment of our mutual security long after we had stopped trade of vital materials.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute. If he will yield to me, I would like to say that the gentleman who is speaking now is the author of the Battle Act which establishes the policies just outlined. He has made an extensive study of the question of East-West trade. His bill was passed by the Congress and I am sure that the results will be everything that the gentleman desires in connection with this competition that is coming to us from behind the iron curtain.

Mr. HARVEY. I would like to say that the farmers of Indiana, who have seen a cut of 50 percent in the price of their products, do not take very kindly to seeing billions of pounds of Polish ham coming into this country in competition with our own.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the gentleman knows we are still importing dried eggs from Hong Kong, China, which come out of Communist China. They are not produced in Hong Kong.

Mr. RICHARDS. If the gentleman will send me a Polish ham I shall appreciate it.

Mr. GROSS. I will take the gentleman out here on Rhode Island Avenue and he can get an armful of them this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, this Mutual Security Act amendments now before us authorize an expenditure, more than heretofore authorized of over $6,000,000,000. Those of us who oppose this bill will have very little time to make our objections known. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, is enthusiastically for the bill and on the minority side, the gentleman from Ohio evidences a similar attitude. These two men grant the time to Members who desire to speak. I desire to speak, hence I go to the Republican side and ask permission of the ranking Member, the gentleman from Ohio. He knows I am against the bill and hence I could not expect much time nor did I get it.

The first question asked by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, to soften up the opposition, was this:

> Do you think the United States is in danger? Are we in danger of losing the land we love and its institutions which we cherish?

I did not answer his question then, as I could not have done so without using his time. I answer now, Yes, sir; we are in danger of losing our form of government and the institutions which we cherish, but not from the source you suggest—Russia. We are more in danger from those who advocate the building of a world government through the United Nations, than we are from the Russians. This NATO—the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—is a branch or offshoot of the United Nations, and the chairman who asked that question has always been doing his utmost to support the United Nations. Now he wants us to appropriate more than six billions to support this illegitimate child of the United Nations. If the gentleman would be a little more hesitant in advocating the United Nations, he might observe that the enemy this Nation has to contend with is the very organization that he, in his great wisdom, recommends to the people of this country.

Does he not know that when the Senate approved the Charter of the United Nations that it took away from Congress the power to declare war? Does he not know that as long as we remain in that organization, the Security Council of the United Nations has the power over war that the Congress had under the Constitution? Does he not know that in case we are attacked, we can use our own judgment in the manner we choose to defend, but after the first clash, the future conduct on our part is not determined by ourselves, but by the Security Council of the U. N.?

Does he not know that the love of country and reverence for our institutions, which he is so afraid we shall lose, is being lost this very day through the instrumentality of the U. N., which he supports?

Does he not know that the UNESCO is the publicity agent for the U. N. and the NATO and that a calculated and premeditated course of instruction has been planned and that the children of this country are to be the first to be indoctrinated in this new education to educate the people to become citizens in this world government?

Does he not know that Columbia University is now busy with two phases of this education: First, the selection of the proper textbooks for our schools; and second, the preparation of teachers to go out and teach this new doctrine? Does he not know that this teaching is going on today in our public schools? Does he not know that these teachers say that the love of country and its institutions is a handicap for this new citizenship? Does he not know that these teachers say the love of country taught in the homes of children must be eradicated? The gentleman, I am

sure, is a loyal American and wants to preserve our Government and our institutions, but the irony of it is that the very institutions which he wants to protect are being destroyed by the very organization he supports.

I will further say to the gentleman that there is not a law on the statute books of South Carolina relating to FEPC—a live subject south of the Mason and Dixon's line—that cannot be repealed without any action on the part of the Legislature of South Carolina, or the Congress of the United States. If there is any law in the South on this subject that conflicts with the Charter of the United Nations it will be automatically repealed. Two courts in California have already decided that the provisions of the Charter, as approved by the Senate of the United States, becomes the supreme law of this country. If these court cases are followed, all that would be necessary to accomplish the repeal of all segregation laws in the South would be to bring an action in court. When the gentleman supports this organization he is contributing to the overthrow of State laws on matters of human welfare. In the approval of this Charter every Senator from the South who was present voted for the Charter.

This is a dark day for the forces who wish to preserve the Constitution of the United States and our institutions of society. In this report filed with this bill there is not a single Republican signature dissenting from the majority, and in the vote which follows I will venture the opinion that 80 percent of the Democrats will support it and 50 percent of the Republicans. In other words, this Congress wants to continue our foreign program that is costing us $1,000,000,000 every month; that is fast placing a tax burden on the people of the United States which they cannot bear; that is costing us the lives of our boys—with no end of it in sight. Already 112,000 American boys have been lost in this senseless policy. But this Congress wants to keep it up. The chairman on the Democratic side, the chairman on the Republican side say we must have this foreign policy.

If everyone in Congress wants this foreign policy continued, why have a political campaign at all. Why put Truman out? Kefauver is for the same thing; Eisenhower is for the same thing; Stassen is for the same thing; Dewey is for the same thing. If this Congress is so hell bent on keeping up this foreign policy, why not leave Truman where he is? He can ruin the country just as fast as anybody else who can follow the program.

Well, some say Truman has had a lot of crooks in his administration. That is correct, but I do not believe the President knew what they were doing. If you leave the Republicans in power for 24 years, it is barely possible that a few crooks would turn up, so if you Republicans in this House want to keep and support the Truman foreign policy, why do you not be honest about it and support the man who has been running it?

There is only one feature of this appropriation which I will support, and that is aid to refugees. The United States has been an asylum for the oppressed and discouraged of all countries, and we have kept this asylum here for 150 years. The people who came and found freedom where it did not exist in their homeland have become Americans and have built this great Nation of ours. These refugees who have been downtrodden, helpless, and hopeless should be allowed to come here where our Constitution gives them an equal opportunity with all others to enjoy a government of freedom. We can give this aid in the name of humanity. We should always maintain on these shores this great Nation where people from every nation may come to escape the tyranny under which they have struggled in the land of their birth. We shall lose this great Nation if we do not preserve our Constitution and expend ourselves into a condition where communism will spring right up in our midst.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the yielding of time by the gentleman from Ohio to one who is not a member of the committee. Under the circumstances the time yielded is reasonably generous, although on a subject of this kind it is manifestly impossible to even attempt to cover as broad a problem and as broad a situation as the one with which we are dealing and which I firmly believe to be the most important legislation which will come before the Congress at this session. All of our policies, domestic and otherwise, our taxes, our national debt, our present crisis in Asia, everything stems, in my judgment, from the foreign policy which we have unfortunately adopted.

There is only time to discuss one or two phases of this matter. I think we ought to be a little more skeptical, a little more careful about how we read our headlines and how we listen to our radio commentators from time to time. It was made to appear, for example, when Mr. Acheson returned from the Conference in Lisbon—and his speech emphasized over and over again—that he had made giant strides at the International Conference in Lisbon. Those were the words we heard for some time after he returned: "Giant strides made by these four men conferring in Lisbon." I think we ought to look for a moment to see what some of those giant strides were. One of the things he emphasized most particularly was that by the end of 1952—and after all, that is still some months from now—that we would have 50 divisions in the NATO army in Europe. You read that story just a little bit more carefully, as I think was mentioned by other speakers and by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] a moment ago, and you will find those 50 divisions are not really 50 divisions; they are actually about 25 combat ready divisions, as was apparent in that same statement if it were read carefully enough, and was also made clear by the testimony of Lieutenant General Gruenther before the committee in the other body some weeks after the Acheson speech. These 25 combat ready divisions—and I think even that is optimistic—is not very much of a giant stride in a build-up of defense against the only possible aggressor, which is the army of Soviet Russia, which has in being, I understand, not less than 175 divisions, so that the giant strides do not seem to me to be worth quite so much emphasis as was then given them.

The gentleman from Iowa also mentioned—and this is something which is lost sight of, and I think it has been somewhat disputed of late, too—that when Mr. Acheson returned he said that they had made another stride; they had agreed upon the amount of money necessary to finance this program over the next short period—I think some 2 or 3 years; I think it was 3 years, and that amount was decided to be $300,000,000,000. Well, of course, we have had enough experience to realize that if there is any necessity to raise the sum of $300,000,000,000, that means that the money will be raised by the United States. I emphasize the point made by the gentleman, whom I listened to very attentively, that when these four men got through deciding, they had, of necessity, to go back to their parliaments. Nothing was decided; they just had agreed among themselves to go back to their parliaments and say, "This is what we talked about at Lisbon, and now what can we do to implement it?" And when Mr. Schuman went back to the French Parliament he said, in effect, "Now look, boys, we talked about $300,000,000,000 for the further defense of the NATO army. You have to pay your share. Your share is not too much of this right away, but you will have to raise some millions;" I think it was $157,000,000, and as soon as he mentioned the word "money" the French Cabinet fell.

The point I am seeking to make is this. I have tried since I have been in Congress time and time again to advocate and support a program to build up a common and truly mutual arrangement, but this thing is not mutual and it has not been. We have been looking to our allies to assist us and act with us in good faith. But, they just have not been doing it.

I would like to call your attention to this, which is rather significant. The President said in one of his recent speeches that the French are making contributions to this cause, and while they are not helping us much in Korea—we are paying 95 percent of the cost in Korea as every Member of this House knows, both with respect to casualties and money—while the French are not helping us in Korea, they are joining with us in the common fight against communism, and they are doing their work in Indochina.

Let me suggest for the consideration of the House that in Indochina, although the opponents of the French there are in

all likelihood led by Communists, I am not sure that is a war against communism in Indochina. I am very much inclined to think it is a fight by the French to maintain, to keep hold of, their colonial empire in that territory.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I think it should be pointed out, however, that France is exerting herself in this general effort around the world to resist communistic aggression. We often, in our observations over some failure of France to conform to our foreign policy, overlook the monumental sacrifice that this little country is making. Her population is much less than ours and it is true that her casualties in Indochina are proportionately in excess of ours in Korea.

Mr. HAND. I get the gentleman's point. I think that is a perfectly fair observation to make. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the cream and the flower of the French Army—and they are suffering casualties—are in Indochina, and they are spending there approximately the amount of money the United States is giving them under Marshall plan funds for this collective effort of ours.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman agrees that the expenditures of France in Indochina in an operation that is vital to our defense are in excess of Marshall plan aid, which France has received?

Mr. HAND. I think it is roughly the same. It may be somewhat in excess.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I think the gentleman will find that it has been in excess.

Mr. HAND. While I have a great admiration, as I think we all have, for the past history and traditions of the French people, in this fight against communism we must always bear in mind that the French parliament, is now approximately 30 percent Communist itself, so that perhaps our dependence upon them is not altogether reliable.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Does not the gentleman agree that that indicates that the severity of the struggle in France is accentuated by that? Here is a converging by the Communists on France that puts a greater burden on those who are resisting and who still, we can be thankful, constitute the majority. In other words, the democratic ideal is still prevailing in France.

Mr. HAND. There is no question but that the French people are bearing a burden, but there is this question: There have been lots of remarks made lately that we have to help France because their economy is still violently suffering from the effects of the war. I call to the gentleman's attention a recent article, written, I think, by Mr. Karl Hartman, of the Associated Press, who may or may not be an expert on this situation, who tells us that the French production of steel and coal and the other munitions of war is very much higher now, very much higher than it has ever been, including the period before the war, and that out of the population of France today, which is some forty-three or forty-four million, there are only 33,000 persons in that country unemployed; so that their economy as a matter of fact is quite stable and quite prosperous. I think they could do pretty much their full share.

It occurs to me that this business of supplying all arms for Europe is rather an anomalous situation, because for years and decades and centuries Europe has been quite able to supply its own armies to carry on a continuous series of wars. It seems to me a rather new thing that now they are unable to make arms and unable to use them except those with which we supply them.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I wonder if the gentleman could point out any provision of this bill which will help the political situation to which the gentleman from Arkansas referred.

Mr. HAND. I am sure I know of none. I mean I do not suppose that we could, under any circumstances, and probably would not even desire to interfere, as we say, with their internal affairs.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. And the fact remains that the French Government at the end of the last war could have given at least some independence to the Indochinese, and perhaps avoided what was going on. They invited it.

Mr. HAND. I think that we are carrying water on both shoulders. On the one hand we say that we are against the colonial system, and that we believe in the self-determination of peoples. On the other hand, we support the French in their fight for their colonial empire in Indochina, and we support the British in their fight for their colonial empire in Malaya.

If we examine the President's statement urging this bill with realistic eyes, and with minds actually seeking the truth, we find that in effect it is a series of completely unproved assertions and is a piece of special pleading for the large appropriation which he wants. Now I hasten to say that I think that Mr. Truman is sincere about the program. There is not much else he can do. He has been advocating this aid and assistance to Europe for the last 6 years, and he cannot very well say now that he thinks the whole thing has been a mistake and we had better stop it. He has got no place to go except go on.

In the very beginning of the President's speech, which you probably heard on the radio, or saw on television, he said this:

> The Mutual Security Program is just what its name says. It is the way to get security, security against aggression and war, through mutual effort, through the effort of many nations helping one another. This program is already in effect and is working successfully.

How I wish that that were so. While for many years I have had the gravest doubts about our ability to make a practical working success out of the Government's foreign policy, I have repeatedly said that I believe in and favor the United States participating on an equitable and fair basis with other civilized nations of the world working toward the goal of mutual security and world peace. If such a program were really working effectively, you and I would have great cause to rejoice. But the simple truth is that it is not.

Let us look again at the President's statement that "we are obtaining security through the effort of many nations helping one another." Let us see what nations are really helping to achieve security for themselves and for the United States. In the beginning, we can pretty much dismiss Greece and Turkey from any European defense effort in Western Europe, because they are behind the iron curtain and it is not likely that they can be useful at all unless we are insane enough to contemplate some land action in Asia. The individual soldiers of both armies are courageous fighting men, but both are located badly for any effort in Western Europe; both are financed to a very large degree by American money, and it is a very grave question as to whether they are assets or liabilities. We can certainly dismiss Luxemburg, which is not as large as my congressional district; and we can pretty well dismiss Norway and the Netherlands, because, although they have some of the best people in the world, they have not either the population or the resources to put up a fight, and were beaten to their knees in a matter of days during World War II by strong air attacks.

I have not forgiven and I am sure you have not, the monstrous conduct of the Germans in World War I and II, and I fear the complete revival of the economic and military power of Germany will create as dangerous or perhaps more dangerous a menace than Russia now poses. Notwithstanding this, historically, the German Army has been the most effective fighting force in Europe in modern times, and it is very doubtful whether any defense of Europe can be successful without a full and enthusiastic German participation. There is not a German soldier today in any European army. I do not see any signs whatever of the willingness of the German people to once again militarize themselves, and to once again subject themselves to the hazard of a major war being fought across their territory. And it is certainly safe to say that for a year, or 2 or 3 years, you will not see an effective German Army in the field with the unified European army. If there is a menace, it is now, and not 3 or 4 years from now, and within that time you will not see German participation. Of equal importance is the limited cooperation by France. Now the great bulk of the best of the French Army is, and has for some time, been engaged in fighting a colonial war in Indochina, to

such an extent that they are wholly unable fully to participate in the so-called joint defense of Europe, as they have been completely unable to assist us in our major war in Korea. Not only is that true, but as I just said, the amount of aid under Marshall plan funds and for military aid and other purposes that we have been giving France so generously over a period of years has been all spent—all spent mind you on their colonial war in Indochina. The President admits this in his speech and he says that after all that is their contribution because they, too, are fighting communism. But I am again suggesting to you that although their enemy may be led by Communists, they are really fighting for the preservation of their colonial empire.

France has been taxing our materials and our efforts to build bases in France and for France, and when they were asked to raise their taxes by some 15 percent to participate in the defense of France and of Europe, that the government fell because their parliament refused to raise taxes for that purpose; and the truth is that Europe for the most part, and France in particular, and Belgium notably, are far better off than they were before the war. If they insist on fighting a long-drawn-out, completely fruitless war in Asia, that is their fault and not ours.

The most important point that the President made and the only one in my judgment which is worth much consideration is the fact that he said that if we do not have friends somewhere, there are vital materials which we need that we cannot get. Well, that is not too true, because you can always buy what you need. Indeed France and Germany were buying from each other right during World War I. But he does make a terrific blunder when he talks about our needing steel from somewhere else, when the fact is that we are the great steel producer in the world, and when he talks about possible shortage of copper and aluminum, he overlooks the fact that we do not get those materials from Europe, we get them from the Western Hemisphere. Few materials that we need are not obtainable in enormous quantities either in our own country, or in the other countries of North and South America. If you think we rely on Britain or Malaya, or any other place for rubber, I call to your attention our magnificent efforts in the production of synthetic rubber at the beginning of World War II, and it is a great shame that that production was ever allowed to die out, because we can produce more synthetic rubber than we need without relying on Asian production of natural rubber to any substantial degree.

The President quite naturally backs up his Secretary of State and repeats Mr. Acheson's speech that the agreement made at Lisbon to establish a European army represents one of the greatest advances toward European unity that was ever made. The truth is that there was no international agreement made there at all. There was an agreement between four men which has to be subject to the scrutiny and in some cases the opposition of the parliaments of 14 different nations. When they agree, then it is time to talk about great strides and great progress toward European unity. Mr. Truman makes a great point of what we have been doing in and for Indochina, and that we have been introducing irrigation and providing the pumps to pump water for irrigation and so increasing their supply. Increasing the food supply for whom? For Indochinese natives, who are fighting our ally, France, and unfortunately giving them a hard time, too. Along the same line he talks about the essential steps of boosting food output in India, and generally helping India. Well, the Congress last year passed an appropriation of $190,000,000 to supply wheat for India, and I have not seen the slightest change of the attitude of the Indian nation toward us or toward the United Nations since that gift was made.

I still want to emphasize that a little bit more effort, and a little bit more money, and a little bit more attention to the home front will strengthen more our economy and our ability to defend ourselves, than scattering this money to the four corners of the earth.

The President said in the course of his speech, and I quote:

> This is not a program to carry the world on our shoulders. It is a program to make it possible for the world to stand on its own feet.

If I could believe this, I think I might be for it. It is flatly untrue. It may not be designed for that purpose, but in effect it has been a program for us to carry the world on our shoulders, and I see no signs whatever of their standing on their own feet.

He says again:

> The essence of this whole effort is that it is a joint effort. We do our part and others do theirs.

The criticism that I make is not the theory of this plan, but that in fact we do it all, and others do not do their share. Once more I am obliged to call your attention to the fact that in one place in the world where war has actually broken out, which, of course, is Korea, that 95 percent of the money, of the armaments, and of the blood and casualties of that war have been furnished, not by the United Nations, and not by France, or England, or Germany, or Luxemburg, but by the United States.

Mr. Churchill, with all the good will in the world, said to us when he was before Congress a few weeks ago that if a truce did not result in Korea that the action of the British Government would be resolute and immediate. He has been apologizing for that ever since he got back to England, because I do not think that the British people have any intention of participating in our effort in Korea, or to take any chances of further offending China by an effective alliance with us.

Any time that I am persuaded that we can rely on a really effective and mutual effort in which other nations do their full share and we do ours, I would be willing to look at such a program without prejudice. But so long as the United States is obliged to pick up the whole check, as we have been doing for the last 5 years, I must tell you frankly that I am "agin" it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to add in my discussion to the generalities that have been presented in this debate, around the general purposes of this particular bill. I am more interested in the direct problem of avoiding waste and misappropriation in any bill, and to be sure that in any bill which we pass in this Congress, we are going to get our dollar's worth. I appreciate that the bill before us is not an actual appropriation bill, but that it is an authorization. My experience, however, shows me that if you go ahead and authorize, then the argument that there is authorized is used when the actual appropriation comes up. That is the reason I want to discuss this matter of waste and misappropriation. Loose dollars will always beget waste and corruption. Frequently, when we get into a broad subject as in this bill, there is a lot of generalities and a lot of conflicting philosophies, and we lose sight of the fact that actually there may be some of us who are really concerned about one thing, and that is if we are going to do something, let us be sure that the dollars we say we are going to spend are going to be used for that purpose. Let us tie those dollars down so that there will not be any loose dollars. This bill, as I have gone through it, is full of loose dollars, just as I have noticed that every bill that the State Department has brought in is full of loose dollars. I mean by loose dollars, dollars that are just not justified. Possibly, they could be justified, but at least they have not been justified on the basis of the hearings and on the basis of facts and figures. That was the reason, incidentally, that I directed the attention of the chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, this afternoon, and asked him whether or not the committee had studied the program in detail, which was set up in Lisbon because, after all, this bill is supposed to be for the purpose of enabling that program to go ahead. I was interested to know whether the committee went into the details, the end items that are supposed to be procured, and the scheduling of their production. There is nothing in the hearings other than generalities. I am very much afraid that it's all the committee has had to go on. Herein lies your danger of waste and misappropriation. Last year I debated against the foreign aid bill for the same reason, exactly. I said though the money had been asked for in certain amounts, $8,-

000,000,000, I believe, there were certain funds still available and unspent. I am going to talk a little too about these unobligated items. With reference to the unspent funds, I said you could still go on without appropriating a single cent last year for Mutual Security and it would not affect the program at all. I submit the situation as we find it here on the floor today eminently justifies my statement because only $1,000,000,000 of the appropriated sum was actually spent and here we are today ready to help do what is necessary to keep the program moving.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the committee to the gentleman's comment and his analysis of the meaning of that famous word "obligation." I assume he is going to come to that part of his remarks which should be studied by those who feel that obligations are something sacred and untouchable.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I certainly intend to direct my attention to it, because on page 32 in the committee's report it states:

> Under United States fiscal procedure Government agencies are not allowed to enter into procurement contracts unless the funds have already been appropriated from which payment is to be made against such contracts.

The same statement was made in debate last year and I challenged it on the floor. To check my own judgment I called up the Government Accounting Office to find if that was true. It is not true. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] is under the same misapprehension as the committee report. Actually, you can authorize, for example, the building of a battleship, and then you can appropriate what is to be spent for that particular year of construction of that battleship. Then, the next year you appropriate what is necessary then. You can do the same thing with this whole program. I submit it would be well if we would refer to the Constitution of the United States, which, even if the General Accounting Office did not limit us, limits us in that expenditure. The Constitution says, article I, section 8, the Congress shall have power "to raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years." So you are limited there.

Now there has been a great deal of talk about this obligation of funds and long lead time items. I want to go a little further into this obligation of funds. It is a very complex problem, because if you base your question not on whether you are going to use the funds, but whether you are going to enter into a contract, it is very easy for the Government agency, whether it is the Army, the Navy, or the State Department, to get around the restrictions on appropriations. All you have to do is to enter into a contract, which contract can actually have a late delivery date or a termination clause, and you can say the funds are obligated. The contract itself may be infirm and stupid. Later you may get out of the contract and then you can use the funds for other purposes, and that is exactly the wide open door to waste, corruption, or thwarting congressional will and intent. You must take a detailed look at the obligation contracts.

Let me refer exactly to what I am talking about. I called this matter to the attention of the chairman of the committee a little earlier today. On page 45, of the committee report, where we are talking about the amount of money that was appropriated last year for Latin America, the sum was $38,000,000. This year the committee very wisely asked the State Department why that money was still unobligated—it was not even obligated, mind you, not spent and not obligated as of January 31, 1952. Mr. Edward G. Miller, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs said:

> Before we can absolutely negotiate with the countries concerned we had to wait for the Joint Chiefs of Staff to draw up the plans under the appropriation for the best use of the appropriation.

I hope you get the significance of that. In other words, last year we voted $38,000,000, and nobody knew what it was going to be used for. This Congress failed to go into the details of the matter nor did the committee go into the matter. Actually, if the matter had been gone into, the State Department would have admitted that they had no detailed plans for what they were going to use the $38,000,000. What did the $38,000,000 mean? Obviously it did not mean a thing. It was just a figure to hang some oratory on concerning our fine intentions to our South American friends. I am going to offer an amendment with reference to this item. Today the State Department is asking $62,000,000 more, for South America, and that, too, has not been justified. There are no schedules, no figures, no breakdown. Just pious intentions and well phrased good wishes. Just exactly the sort of thing to slip loose dollars in on. Just exactly the thing that breeds waste and corruption. I think you will find the same thing is true of the $3,800,000,000 that they are asking to implement the Lisbon conference.

I noticed some general remarks were made by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] about the fact that this three and eight-tenths billion was for tanks and airplanes. He used some round figures in a most general sort of way. Now, I know a little something about the production schedule in this country. I will tell you right now that you cannot produce those planes or tanks for Europe in the next year, and you do not need that money because you cannot spend it. Our production schedule will not absorb it. All of this hue and cry that we are going to wreck this program by looking into it and trying to cut out these loose dollars which produce waste and extravagance, all of that talk is just so much malarkey. I noticed somebody pointed out what General Eisenhower had said on this program, that any sizable cut would endanger the program. But then when a reporter, not a Congressman, a reporter pinpointed him a bit, he said, "Surely, any budget can be cut in certain places." Then he added, "After all, I do not run a statistical department over there," or something to that effect. If people do not know the details, I wish they would quit generalizing and enable those who feel we should study the details to go into these details and find out when the money is being properly and realistically appropriated and when it is not.

This is not a question of whether we are for mutual aid or not. I happen to be for a mutual-security program somewhat along the lines of this bill and those preceding it, although that may surprise you a little bit; I am very strongly for the basic idea. But I certainly am not going to vote for something when I do not know where the money is going. And I am talking about details. These things should be looked into. It is Congress' duty to look into details and not just indulge in the happy luxury of generalizing and orating. We expect the committee to examine the details, but the committee has not done it. For that reason the committee may expect many more cuts to this bill, and I hope they will be approved by the membership.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. In the first place, I may say to the gentleman there was complete discussion before the committee as to what end items were going to what specific countries. I think the gentleman will realize that certainly it would be a breach of security if we were to detail on the floor each and every item and to what country those items were going.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Let me ask the gentleman first, Did you make any estimate or study about the delivery schedule of those end items? Did you look into the production schedules? And did the State Department have production schedules for those end items? I am willing to state that the gentleman found no production schedules, and that, indeed, there are no production schedules. That the program to implement the Lisbon Conference is not blueprinted, that the $3,800,000,000 are figures out of the air—pious hopes and glittering generalities. Come back to the House when the program is sufficiently in shape to give us the details, otherwise we will be merely creating more loose dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will recall my statement he will remember that my statement was

that these figures were not projected against the program to produce the items in this particular current fiscal year, but we extended it over 3 or 4 years.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Exactly; and that is my point.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The gentleman should realize that you are actually in a position where contracts have been let for the tanks and the planes that we are talking about. The money we are authorizing in this bill is for additional tanks and for additional planes, none of which will be produced during this fiscal year, because it takes at least 2 years to produce a tank or a plane.

I may say to the gentleman that I have been just as critical as the gentleman and have been critical in the committee of what I considered the slowdown and lag of production schedules. I think the administration has gone too slow, but I believe they are finally on their way.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not want to yield further because I would like to answer that while I have time at my disposal.

That is the whole point; we do not need to appropriate the money in order to enter into those contracts; let us appropriate the money when the day of payment is within clear sight. We can authorize a schedule when you have your blueprint in detail, mind you, not in generalities; go ahead then and make your contracts and your firm schedule and total it up, then appropriate the money as and when it is necessary. This is the only way you stop creating these loose dollars from which spring waste and corruption. This is the only real way to get your dollar's worth.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The gentleman's statement is at complete variance with what has been given to the committee by the fiscal experts in charge of Government funds.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. By the Government Accounting Office? By the Constitution?

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF].

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time, I will offer an amendment to the mutual security bill, the purpose of which is to deny foreign military or economic aid to any country that does not contribute the same proportion of its gross national product to the development and maintenance of its own defensive strength, as the American taxpayer is today being called upon to contribute to the defense of the United States and of the free world.

During the course of the Bonner committee's investigation overseas, American officials in country after country recited to the subcommittee the obstacles to economic recovery and defense production interposed by antiquated and inequitable tax systems—systems which weigh heavily on the underprivileged and allow the wealthy to escape making and substantial contributions to the national revenues.

The highly regressive indirect taxes prevalent in many European countries have serious repercussions not only upon the distribution of benefits from various aid programs, but on the specific activities of our own forces in constructing and maintaining defense facilities. During our conferences in France, the subcommittee was advised that an estimated 15 or 16 percent of United States military dollars expended in France represented taxes paid to the French Government. These taxes were levied mainly on activities related to construction of bases and lines of communications across France. The Department of State is to be commended for its efforts to negotiate with the French Government looking to an agreement that would relieve the United States from paying such taxes in connection with its military expenditures in France.

The more enterprising of our ECA officials have worked diligently, if not always successfully, with the governments of recipient countries to bring about needed reforms in taxes, land tenures, and other fields, to provide a more solid ground work for Mutual Security. Greece and Italy have recently passed tax laws which promise some improvement and France has shown signs of active concern in the matter. However, our efforts must be even more strenuously exerted to promote and encourage measures of self-help to ease in some measure the burdens of the American taxpayer in supporting foreign aid.

The amount proposed to be spent for national security this year is almost four times what we spent for the same purposes in the year before the invasion of Korea. Our policy of containing communism around the entire Soviet periphery could well lead to the Kremlin's primary objective—the collapse of capitalism and free enterprise. It was Lenin who sometime ago predicted that the United States would spend itself into bankruptcy and destruction; and unless we take aggressive action to cut spending wherever possible, we are on the road to a realization of that prediction.

I am convinced, however, that a sound program of mutual security will do much to deter aggression and prevent world war III. It makes sense to put a rifle in the hands of a Turk, a helmet on an Italian youth, and furnish a French squad with a machine gun—provided they are evincing their willingness to fight and defend their countries by doing all within their ability to help themselves. If the program is to be truly mutual, then the cost should be borne mutually by those participating nations, consistent with their economic ability.

Some say that unless we continue to pour billions of our tax dollars into foreign lands, we cannot hope to provide an adequate defense of the free world. But is this true?

Through the Marshall-aid program, industrial production of participating countries far exceeds prewar levels. For example, using 100 as the index for 1938, industrial production in Western Germany in June of 1951 was 153; in Belgium, 144; in Denmark, 155; in Italy, 138; and in Turkey, 152. Shipbuilding and steel production in Western Europe far exceeded prewar levels. The volume of foreign exports of Marshall-plan countries amounted to only $722,000,000 in 1938, whereas in June of 1951, it totaled almost $2,500,000,000.

With these facts in mind and realizing that many of these same countries supported large military forces solely through their own economy prior to World War II, it is difficult to understand why we must continue to pour unlimited American tax dollars into those same countries in order to insure that they are now prepared to defend themselves against communistic aggression.

We have been assured by our military leaders and those advocating continued and expanded military aid to other countries that these recipient nations have the will to resist communism and that they can be counted on when the chips are down to stand by our side. Unfortunately, our only experience to date in this respect has been in Korea.

Now, specifically, just what will my amendment provide? If adopted, the Director of the program will be required to determine for each fiscal year the gross national product of the United States and the proportion of that gross national product which the United States expends for the development and maintenance of its own defensive strength and the defensive strength of the free world. Gross national product is, of course, the total value of all the goods produced and the value of the services rendered in a country. It will include, for example, the value of all of the automobiles, ice boxes, and clothing produced during a given year, as well as the value of services rendered by professional people as measured by their income. This is the yardstick used, for example, by economists and by our own Mutual Security people in measuring the economic ability of a country.

After determining the gross national product of the United States, the Director will then be required to determine the gross national product of a recipient country and the total amount of its gross national product that is being contributed to its own defense. In the event a recipient nation is not carrying its share of the mutual burden, then the Director is to notify that country of his intent to terminate assistance authorized by the Congress.

Now, for the purpose of determining the amount being spent by any nation for the development and the maintenance of its own defensive strength, I have taken into consideration the fact that the American soldier is the best-paid soldier in the world today. In contrast with the pay and allowances received by the American serviceman, the Turkish soldier, for example, receives only about 20 cents a month. Since we choose to pay our soldiers in this way, it does not appear fair to me to include this item of expense in our determinations.

For the purposes of my amendment, I have also excluded our expenditures for military assistance to other nations and our expenditures for atomic energy purposes.

Therefore, these three items would be excluded from the Director's determination as to whether or not a recipient country was contributing the same proportion of its gross national product to it own defense, as was being contributed by the American taxpayer to our share of the mutual burden.

Within 60 days after the Director serves notice on a recipient country, mutual assistance is to be terminated unless the President determines that adequate measures have been or are being taken by the nation concerned to assure that the proportion of the gross national product expended for defense will not be less than the United States, or, that the contribution required by this amendment would seriously jeopardize the political or economic stability of the nation, and that adequate measures are being taken by the recipient nation to make the full contribution to the mutual defense effort that is permitted by the manpower, resources, facilities, and general economic conditions.

Should the President make such a determination and continue the mutual aid to that country, then that fact will be submitted in the report required by the Mutual Security Act.

This is not a new idea. In the case of the Philippines, the United States was compelled to make the extension of further economic aid contingent upon certain internal economic reforms subsequent to the findings and recommendations of the Bell mission. Agreements between ECA and the Philippine Government led to the enactment of a minimum wage law for the first time in the history of that country and reorganization of the tax system, to the extent that 60 percent more in taxes is now being collected by the Philippine Government.

If this remarkable increase in revenues by establishment of a more equitable tax system is any indication of the possibilities in Europe, budgetary deficits now compensated directly or indirectly by American economic aid can be to a large extent eliminated.

Although there are numerous statistics to the contrary, let us accept, for the purpose of this discussion, the figures furnished me by the Mutual Security Agency as to the percentage of gross national product being collected in taxes by the countries receiving our aid. The total in the 14 European countries is 22 percent, as compared with 18 percent in the United States. Those figures represent tax revenues by the Federal Government alone and do not include taxes being collected by subordinate units of the Government.

Now, how is that money being expended by these recipient countries? In the fiscal year 1951, the United States contributed approximately 50 percent of its total budget for defense; whereas, the United Kingdom contributed only 22 percent; Italy, 23 percent; France, 30 percent; and Belgium-Luxemburg, 15 percent. Today, more than three-fourths of our total expenditures will go for major national-security items.

I realize that it might be politically unpopular with the leaders of the other nations to have to deny their people some of the governmental and social services that they demand; however, in America, we are turning a deaf ear to our own needy citizens and doing without many worth-while projects because of the tremendous sums being disgorged from our Treasury for defense and foreign aid. Most of the countries receiving our aid are blissfully unaware of the contributions being made by the United States to their own recovery.

An analysis of the tax structure of the countries receiving foreign aid leads me to the conclusion that our whole program is tending to make the rich richer, and the poor poorer. For example, foreign aid under the mutual assistance program can be extended to the owner of a shipyard in Trieste to build ships for use by Italy in connection with its defense program. The owners of that shipyard will realize considerable profit as a result of our aid. But little, if any, effort is being made to collect income taxes from those same people in order to help finance Italy's defense effort; and when Italy then faces a budgetary deficit, we send more American dollars to Italy in order to balance its budget and keep its economy strong.

At the same time, however, the worker in the Trieste shipyard is being taxed heavily through excise and sales taxes and he sees little, if any, tangible benefits from our foreign-aid program.

As one American official stationed in Trieste stated with respect to the tax situation:

> You can't have a stable, strong society if all of your taxes are of the nature that we have here—highly regressive taxes. There are taxes on our grocery bill and taxes on our cigarettes and salt and sugar and bananas, rather than an income tax.

Additional billions can be raised in each of the countries that we are extending aid to if they will enact sensible revenue laws and collect taxes from those who have the ability to pay.

As an example of what I mean, in the United States we are today raising 71 percent of our total tax revenue from individual and corporate income tax. By way of comparison, in France only 29 percent of its total revenue is derived from such taxes; in Great Britain, 46 percent; in Turkey, 10 percent; and in Italy, 13 percent. Now, obviously, we cannot dictate to these sovereign nations and force them to overhaul their tax systems to our liking; but we can insist that those recipient nations make a comparable effort to that being made by the American taxpayer. That is exactly the purpose of my amendment.

The American taxpayer cannot long continue to carry the whole backbreaking load of defending the world. We are asked to raise more taxes, but we have already scraped the bottom of the tax barrel. If mutual security is to continue, the taxpayers of other countries must assume a proportionate share of the burden. Unless they are so willing, then there is little hope that our pump-priming program will be successful.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTAFF. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BROWNSON. As a fellow member of the Bonner subcommittee that made that trip, I want to compliment the gentleman on his observations and compliment him on this piece of legislation that he is offering as an amendment, which I think is absolutely sound, and something that will do a great deal to reinforce the morale of the American people which I think needs a little reinforcing at this time.

Mr. LANTAFF. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I think it will certainly put a good taste in the mouths of our American taxpayers to realize that the other peoples of the world have at least put their shoulders to the wheel to the same extent that we in the Congress are requiring them to carry the load.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this 1952 Mutual Security Program because I feel it is necessary to the defense and the security of our own country, the United States of America. We on the Foreign Affairs Committee have already cut the administration's figure by $998,900,000 for foreign aid. We, of course, must also have a military budget for our own defense domestically, which Congress has also cut to eliminate waste and inefficiency. The other necessary part of our defense program is the defense of our allies upon whom we will depend for support in case of trouble.

The Mutual Security Director came before the Foreign Affairs Committee and said that he felt that the American men were entitled to have other people share with them in the defense of freedom, and that our American young men are entitled to have well-equipped allies. That is what we are doing by the Mutual Security Program of 1952.

As a matter of fact, the defense policy of NATO and mutual defense has already been basically set. It is not at present in dispute. This bill is simply the third implementation of a policy of military assistance to our allies as part of mutual defense against aggression.

Congress ought to look to see what we are going to get out of the current defense program and what our dollars are going to buy. For example, at the present time we in this country have 3,465,000 men in the Armed Forces. Canada has 91,000. Our United States Air Force is now being expanded to 126 wings and 17 groups. These people in the North Atlantic Treaty area that are being helped by this bill have 1,880,000 men now under arms.

At the Lisbon Conference last February the NATO countries agreed to provide 50 divisions by the end of 1952, 25 of them to be available on D-day and 25 more available at intervals between D-day and D-day plus 30. These NATO countries will provide 4,000 operational aircraft. They will give 704 major combat vessels and 924 smaller combat vessels toward our mutual defense. In addition to that, as you remember, under the Greece and Turkey aid program,

these countries have forged ahead and have become real allies of ours, and they have now in being 25 good divisions. The sum total of this progress in mutual defense is a real threat to any aggressor who might try to disturb the peace of the world.

Our people in industry know that the farmers have a stake in this program. It has not been brought out to date in this debate, and I should like to speak something of that.

Europe is a group of countries that have pretty well exhausted the expansion of their agricultural production. They have gone about as far as they can, so that their expanded agricultural needs will have to be filled from abroad. One out of every three European citizens now depends on food from abroad in order to meet a modest prewar standard.

For example, Europe depends right now on 500,000,000 bushels of wheat from abroad, 300,000,000 to 400,000,000 bushels of feed grains, fifty to sixty million bushels of soybeans and peanuts, 1,000,000 tons of rice, 2,500,000 tons of sugar, six to seven million bales of cotton per year, and 600,000,000 pounds of tobacco.

In fact, in the postwar period, if we look to see what has happened in agriculture in this country we will find that our exports of wheat to Europe have increased 650 percent. Canada increased her export of wheat only 10 percent, Argentina decreased around 50 percent, Australia dropped from 106,000,000 bushels of wheat export a year in the 1946–48 period to 60,000,000 bushels. And, of course, Europe has lost the granary section of Eastern Europe behind the iron curtain.

The head of the Foreign Affairs Department of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Mr. Garnett, was before our committee, and said this:

> One of our important points here is that the basic and natural relationship between the United States and Western Europe is one where Europe is dependent upon American agriculture, not upon American industry.

So that any people from farm areas in Congress who want to keep and maintain a good set of customers and have these customers solvent customers so that they can stand on their own feet and purchase their own food, should vote for this bill. We are helping these free countries defend themselves and lightening the governmental budget load when the burdens of rearmament for mutual security not only have resulted in increased austerity but have threatened to bankrupt economies in several instances.

Our safety and security require us to defend America and together with our friendly nations, to increase our strength so that no attack on the free world can be easily accomplished. We work for peace and security through the mutual security program.

The people from United States industry, and I from the city of Pittsburgh, know that the defense of these areas from which we get our raw materials, is essential to the continued high rate of production which we have in our industrial cities. Our prosperity depends on our having access to the raw materials which we process. We, therefore, want to keep open those areas in a free world so that these raw materials can flow into the United States of America and be processed and sold to our own people, and sold abroad in order to have good trade and good commerce and good defense.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I know there will be arguments on the status of the funds available and obligations and expenditures under the Mutual Security Program, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks at this point such a statement.

Fiscal status of Mutual Security funds

MUTUAL SECURITY—ESTIMATE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE, OBLIGATIONS, AND EXPENDITURES [1]

[Includes funds appropriated through fiscal year 1952 for ERP, China Aid, and MDAP on cumulative basis from inception of programs, and amount requested by the executive branch for fiscal year 1953. Also includes point 4 and other programs authorized in the Mutual Security Act for 1951 for fiscal year 1952 and amount requested for fiscal year 1953]

[In millions]

	Military assistance					Defense support, economic and technical assistance								Assistance to Spain [8]	Total Mutual Security assistance
								Title III							
	Title I	Title II	Title III	Title IV	Total [2]	Title I [3]	Title II [4]	Excluding UNKRA [5]	UNKRA [6]	Total	Title IV [7]	Title V	Total		
OBLIGATION DATA															
1. Net cumulative funds available through fiscal year 1952	$9,556.7	$936.4	$1,271.1	$38.2	$11,802.4	$13,284.8	$160.0	$577.6	$50.2	$627.8	$25.9	.....	$14,098.5	$162.5	$26,063.4
2. Cumulative obligations through Mar. 31, 1952	7,566.0	652.5	812.2	.....	9,030.7	12,802.9	86.2	449.9	10.0	459.9	17.4	.....	13,366.4	82.7	22,449.8
3. Unobligated balance Mar. 31, 1952	1,990.7	283.9	458.9	38.2	2,771.7	481.9	73.8	127.7	40.2	167.9	8.5	.....	732.1	109.8	3,613.6
4. Estimated obligations Apr. 1, 1952, through June 30, 1952	1,782.5	229.5	380.5	22.4	2,414.9	481.9	73.8	127.7	40.2	167.9	8.5	.....	732.1	59.8	3,206.8
5. Estimated total cumulative obligations June 30, 1952 (item 2+4)	9,348.5	882.0	1,192.7	22.4	11,445.6	13,284.8	160.0	577.6	50.2	627.8	25.9	.....	14,098.5	112.5	25,656.6
6. Estimated unobligated balance June 30, 1952	208.2	54.4	78.4	15.8	356.8	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	50.0	406.8
7. Authorization request for 1953 (executive request)	4,145.0	606.4	611.2	62.4	5,425.0	1,819.2	196.0	408.0	.....	408.0	22.0	$29.8	2,475.0	.....	7,900.0
8. Total available for obligation 1953	4,353.2	660.8	689.6	78.2	5,781.8	1,819.2	196.0	408.0	.....	408.0	22.0	29.8	2,475.0	50.0	8,306.8
9. Estimated obligations 1953	4,353.2	660.8	689.6	78.2	5,781.8	1,819.2	196.0	408.0	.....	408.0	22.0	29.8	2,475.0	50.0	8,306.8
EXPENDITURE DATA															
1. Net cumulative funds available through fiscal year 1952	9,556.7	936.4	1,271.1	38.2	11,802.4	13,284.8	160.0	577.6	50.2	627.8	25.9	.....	14,098.5	162.5	26,063.4
2. Cumulative expenditures through Mar. 31, 1952	1,958.3	253.	362.4	.....	2,573.8	11,730.2	44.8	316.2	10.0	326.2	5.5	.....	12,106.7	20.2	14,700.7
3. Unexpended balance, Mar. 31, 1952	7,598.4	683.3	908.7	38.2	9,228.6	1,554.6	115.2	261.4	40.2	301.6	20.4	.....	1,991.8	142.3	11,362.7
4. Estimated expenditures, Apr. 1, 1952, through June 30, 1952	1,058.4	109.5	186.1	.3	1,334.3	726.4	94.0	153.2	40.2	193.4	17.2	.....	1,031.0	82.3	2,417.6

[1] This schedule is prepared on a net appropriation basis with adjustments reflected for actual transfers of funds between appropriations. However, the 1952 figures have not been adjusted for comparability to conform with the minor changes proposed in the 1953 appropriation structure.

[2] Reflects the merger of funds appropriated for the Mutual Defense Assistance program with the funds appropriated for military assistance pursuant to the Mutual Security Act for 1951. Excludes $478.2 million transferred to title I economic under authority of sec. 101 (b) of the Mutual Security Act for 1951.

[3] Reflects the merger of funds appropriated for the ECA European program with funds appropriated for economic assistance under title I of the Mutual Security Act for 1951.

[4] Includes only 1952 funds appropriated for the economic program under title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1951.

[5] Reflects the merger of funds appropriated for assistance to China under the China Aid Act of 1948 as amended with funds appropriated for economic assistance under title III of the Mutual Security Act for 1951. Excludes $125 million appropriated for purposes of sec. 404 (b) of title IV, Public Law 472, 80th Cong., and excludes $10 million transferred to State Department for China-Korea student program pursuant to Public Laws 327 and 535, 81st Cong., as amended.

[6] Includes only the unobligated balance brought forward from funds appropriated for assistance to the Republic of Korea for 1951 pursuant to sec. 303 (a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951.

[7] Includes funds appropriated in 1952 for the Mutual Security Act of 1951 plus a balance at end of fiscal year 1951 brought forward from funds available to the Institute of Inter-American Affairs.

[8] Includes funds appropriated in 1952 for the Mutual Security Act of 1951 plus $62.5 million public debt authorization for loan to Spain authorized in ch. XI "Foreign Aid," Public Law 759, 81st Cong.

Fiscal status of Mutual Security funds—Continued

MUTUAL SECURITY—ESTIMATE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE, OBLIGATIONS, AND EXPENDITURES—continued

[In millions]

	Military assistance					Defense support, economic and technical assistance							Assistance to Spain	Total Mutual Security assistance
	Title I	Title II	Title III	Title IV	Total	Title I	Title II	Title III			Title IV	Title V	Total	
								Excluding UNKRA	UNKRA	Total				
EXPENDITURE DATA—continued														
5. Estimated total cumulative expenditures, June 30, 1952 (items 2 and 4)	$3,016.7	$362.6	$328.5	$3	$3,908.1	$12,456.6	$138.8	$499.4	$50.2	$519.6	$22.7	------	$13,137.7	$72.5	$17,118.3
6. Estimated unexpended balance, June 30, 1952	6,540.0	573.8	742.6	37.9	7,894.3	828.2	21.2	108.2	------	108.2	3.2	------	960.8	90.0	8,945.1
7. Authorization request for 1953 (executive request)	4,145.0	606.4	611.2	62.4	5,425.0	1,819.2	196.0	408.0	------	408.0	22.0	$29.8	2,475.0	------	7,900.0
8. Total available for expenditure, 1953	10,685.0	1,180.2	1,353.8	100.3	13,319.3	2,647.4	217.2	516.2	------	516.2	25.2	29.8	3,435.8	90.0	16,845.1
9. Estimated expenditures, 1953	6,391.7	531.5	806.1	43.0	7,862.3	1,888.9	140.0	346.0	------	346.0	20.0	28.5	2,423.4	60.0	10,345.7
10. Estimated unexpended balance, June 30, 1953	4,293.3	648.7	457.7	57.3	5,457.0	758.5	77.2	170.2	------	170.2	5.2	1.3	1,012.4	30.0	6,499.4

Source: Prepared by Comptroller, Office of the Director for Mutual Security, May 7, 1952.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 7005 is designed to help meet the responsibilities of our country in its present position of free-world leadership. We supply this leadership through our foreign policy. H. R. 7005 is legislation now necessary to further implement that policy. Therefore, a brief evaluation of our foreign policy should be helpful at this time.

Our foreign policy is the average reaction to international affairs of all American citizens, who, as individuals, want, first, to have his or her own chance in life; second, to assure at least as good a chance in life for their children; third, to set their own pattern of life; fourth, to live in peace; fifth, to be a good neighbor. By and large, this concept is consistent with the basic objective of the foreign policy our Government is striving to implement. That objective is to preserve the security of the Nation while helping to create desirable world environment. There is no simple prescription for the making of a democratic foreign policy, and regardless of varied ideas and interests, it remains the same—America seeking a way and a means to transform its hopes for a peaceful world into realities.

The President of the United States has the authority for conducting foreign relations, with the Department of State acting as his right arm. Congress holds the purse strings. Both the President and the Congress are responsible to the people. The American people themselves speak their minds on United States foreign policy in a thousand ways. Through the press, radio, and television, and through the leaders of their churches, clubs, unions, and other organizations. The views expressed reach those who are responsible in making policy recommendations and are taken into account in arriving at policy decisions.

I think we ought to examine some of the basic concepts upon which America's foreign policy rests.

One major premise is that our freedom and our security are directly linked to the freedom and security of the entire free world. The programs under which we are cooperating with our foreign friends in building the collective defensive strength necessary to deter aggression is based on this assumption.

A second premise of our foreign policy is, that it seeks a just and honorable peace. Let me repeat that phrase, "a just and honorable peace." It is certain that we cannot have security for ourselves if we do not have a just and stable peace. It is equally certain that we cannot have security with a peace that was manufactured and dictated by the Kremlin. Peace without justice is not a secure peace.

A third premise of our foreign policy is that America's security is directly affected by the social and economic condition of the other free peoples. I am thinking here of the living standards of the people living in the underdeveloped areas. America will not have genuine security without a stable peace. We will not have a stable peace so long as hunger, illiteracy, and disease are rampant among millions of people who know that there is a better way to live and who are determined to seek that better way. The urgency of the world's need should remind us that promises do not feed the hungry, nor resolutions give them shelter, so we must be willing to act when we are shown what to do. Let us leave empty promises to the exclusive use of the Communists.

Communism feeds on economic discontent and social upheaval. Communism holds out a hope—false though it be—of a better world. And though the Communists' promises are one thing and their actions quite another, we dare not assume that they are not getting temporary results. For the hungry and the sick, the picture the Communists paint is much like the straw for which the drowning man grasps. We are in a position to offer the hope that can become reality.

A fourth premise of American foreign policy is that we must take positive action to promote both economic stability and military strength among our free neighbors. This is a part of the building of a free world strong enough to deter aggression, or, if necessary, to defeat it.

America cannot alone do all in today's world. We are big, but we are not that big. We are a wealthy Nation, but not that wealthy. We need friends. But we need solvent friends; and we must stay solvent ourselves.

If we Americans wish to preserve and strengthen our own freedom through our foreign policy, we must encourage and help the rest of the free world to do likewise. It is a tragic fact that hungry people are as much concerned with bread as they are with freedom. Communism pretends to offer bread. These offers do not develop into realities.

That is why our foreign policy is being implemented economically through the point 4 program. This program offers assistance to the people of underdeveloped areas. Point 4 marks America's awareness of how our own security is related to the standard of living of other peoples.

The underdeveloped areas of the world are being helped to develop their vast resources through the technical assistance and economic development programs carried on both by the United States, directly and through the United Nations. Point 4 is designed to help the peoples of underdeveloped areas to help themselves. It will raise their standards of living by helping them to develop a technological understanding of their own. Point 4 symbolizes the helping hand of Christian doctrine even as it is a positive force against the inroads of communism. It is one of our greatest investments in peace, and one of the least expensive.

Point 4 is at work in practically every field of economic development. American technicians are concerned with water, power, and mineral resources, transportation, public administration, housing, and social welfare. But the bulk of the work is concentrated in the

fields of agriculture, health, and education. With the aid of modern farming methods introduced by their American partners, the people of rural areas are making spectacular gains in food production. This program is at work in countries where governments are weak from the ravages of war and, for the most part, relatively young. It is believed that strong support by the United States in this juncture of their national lives will enable them to counter successfully further Communist pressures. The threat of communism in these countries is not primarily military. It is mainly in the human misery and unrest on which communism feeds. The chief defense against communism and tyranny lies, therefore, in a powerful and concerted attack on poverty, disease, and ignorance, and their attendant miseries.

If point 4 is successful in relieving the economic hardship in these countries, we will have saved many times over the cost of the program. It has been estimated that the entire mutual security program which includes point 4, for the fiscal year 1953, costs only a little more than 1 month of World War II. If we can build a deterrent to total war at less than the cost of 1 month of World War II, it is the best investment in security at the least cost not only in dollars but in lives, that we can make at this time.

The Marshall plan is an example of economic achievement. Though industrial output, intra-European trade, and exports increased considerably under the plan, it would have been hasty to pronounce Europe recovered; however, the vicious circle of which Secretary Marshall spoke had been broken. The structural underpinnings of the European economy had been restored.

The mutual security program is designed to assist economically and it is based on solid foundations such as the Marshall plan. It helps to bring the benefits of an expanding world economy to both the United States and our allies, and to provide the underlying strength required for the common defense. Its aim is to include both military and economic aid and is designed to create the strength necessary to prevent aggression. Economically, it helps to bring the benefits of an expanding world economy to both the United States and our allies, and to provide the underlying strength required for the common defense.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was established to implement our foreign policy militarily when in 1949 the nations of the North Atlantic area joined together in a treaty of mutual defense. Backed by this assurance and by American military assistance, the Western European countries began the costly process of rebuilding their military strength.

Today, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has armed forces in being on the Continent of Europe with plans for continued build-up. General Eisenhower expressed the conviction that well-armed, highly mobile forces will be able to meet attack if it should come.

Under the NATO plan, the United States is providing certain Army, Navy, and Air Force units, military equipment for our allies, training programs, and defense support in the form of raw materials and other commodities. Our contribution is directly related to the contributions of the other North Atlantic Treaty countries. Their contribution takes the form of military manpower and equipment, military supplies, defense construction, and mutual agreements to place forces under unified command.

We have sought to build positions of strength militarily, under the Mutual Security Program. This program also helps to prepare the free world's defenses along the frontiers where aggression most seriously threatens.

Mutual Security is not a one-way street. It costs a small fraction of our expenditures for our own military forces. Yet it gives us strong allies with military manpower far in excess of our own and with an industrial plant vital to the free world. It gives us overseas military bases for use in the common effort. It gives us sources of raw materials essential not only to our own military production but to the normal functioning of our civilian economy. It gives us friends throughout the world who are becoming devoted to a free and abundant pattern of life similar to our own and who will then be with us and not against us in the defense of these common ideals in the years ahead.

Here at home, the Defense Establishment is a major support of our foreign policy. Through selective service and the Reserves, when Korea was attacked, the United Nations was able to prevent a quick Communist conquest of the country because the United States had defense forces in the vicinity. We were able, in the face of appalling difficulties, to strike a retaliatory blow and, although greatly outnumbered, to resist the aggressor while we mobilized further.

Another important factor in implementing our foreign policy is the United States international information program. Its operating tools include press and publications services, radio—that is, the Voice of America—motion pictures, overseas information centers, and the interchange of persons. It deals with ideas. It does not deal with bullets, though there is a very specific relationship between ideas and bullets. It is my belief that ideas can be more powerful than guns. The successful operation of this program can mean the difference between global peace or global war. It is my belief that our security rests in large part upon our ability to promote an honest understanding of America and America's aims as well as to counter the lies and the half-truths which the Communists are spreading.

I am convinced that failure to carry on a vigorous offensive in the field of ideas would be to invite calamity. We are in a war of ideas and we had better stay in it, if we want what we need, namely, allies who understand us and have faith in us. The iron-curtain countries have geared their propaganda to the "big lie." Now, it takes a lot of money to keep up a world-wide "big-lie" campaign. The Soviet Union and its satellites are now spending more than $1,400,000,000 each year on this.

We have geared our program to the "big truth." That costs much less than the "big lie." During the current fiscal year 1952, there was an appropriation of $85,000,000 for the "big truth" campaign. Our campaign of truth is the road to victory in the battle of ideas.

Much is being done in the written word. Press materials go daily to an estimated 10,000 foreign newspapers with a readership of more than 100,000,000.

As for magazines, pamphlets, and other publications, there is a minimum audience of nearly 500,000,000 people and the publications are printed in about 60 different languages.

Motion pictures, in 40 different languages, have proved effective in telling America's story of freedom and abundance abroad. Last year, 500,000,000 people in 86 countries saw these films.

Another important phase of America's campaign of truth is the exchange of persons program. In the past year, nearly 8,000 persons came to this country from abroad or went overseas on United States Government sponsored grants. Right now, there are more than 30,000 foreign students studying on about 1,400 American campuses. Less than 10 percent of these students are supported by United States Government funds. Strong emphasis has been placed on exchange of leaders in all fields—people who are opinion-molders and can exert influence in their home countries. These are people who have learned the truth about America firsthand and can spread the truth among their own peoples when they return.

Perhaps the best evidence of the effectiveness of these programs is the reaction of the Communists themselves to what we are doing. Take the Voice of America. We know that the Soviet Union alone is spending over a billion dollars a year on its propaganda activities. Much of that is being spent to keep our information materials and the Voice of America from penetrating the iron curtain. They are spending almost as much on jamming our radio broadcasts to Russia as we are spending on our entire world-wide radio program. The total Soviet expenditure on propaganda activities is more than 10 times as great as the amount we are spending on our international information activities.

The Communists have gone to great lengths to keep the Voice of America from penetrating the iron curtain, but they have not succeeded. We are getting through the iron curtain. In some of the satellite areas our listening audience is as much as 80 percent of those who have radio receivers. In some areas in the Soviet Union, 75 percent of our broadcasts get through the jamming screen. In Moscow and Leningrad, where the jamming is particularly intense—our average is about 25 percent. We are broadcasting around the clock to the iron-curtain countries in their own

languages. If we don't get through one time, we do another.

We can never win a peace with armaments alone. Ideas and attitudes are equally important. The battle for men's minds cannot be neglected. In the long run, success in this battle may well prevent one of bullets and bombs on the global scale.

The aid we are giving Europe is not charity. It is an investment in free-world stability and in our own security. We are not committed to support foreign economies indefinitely and we should not be. We are committed to helping these economies to become self-supporting.

But we should not make the mistake of thinking of economic and military aid as distinct and separate. They are anything but that, and we should never shut our eyes to the fact that military strength in a free country is a luxury of an abundant economy.

We Americans are traditionally a hopeful people. That spirit is standing us in good stead today. We do not see ourselves in the grip of circumstances over which we have no control and about which we can do nothing. We believe that a great deal can be done to better the world, and that we, in cooperation with the other free people, can do it.

Our foreign policies reflect that conviction.

We believe that the objectives we have set ourselves are possible of attainment. We believe that with hard work and persistence we can accomplish the tasks before us. We can, through friendly cooperation with other peoples, lead the way in building a world in which freedom and abundance can live.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, the title of this act is "the Mutual Security Act of 1951 and other basic legislation with explanatory notes."

I suppose an explanatory note that could be added is an old Chinese proverb which says: "The more you sweat in peace, the less you bleed in war."

I think three challenges faced the United States after World War II: One, to sweeten our civilian economy, to keep it going; the second, to swab the sores left in countries by Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo, to restore to those countries their national honor, based on peace, security, and prosperity: "Allies in war—allies in peace; enemies in war—future allies in peace." I think that was our motto.

The third challenge was to confront an ally turned enemy, which today seeks to give us a bear hug, to break our back and those of our friends wherever the concept of free government applies. I think we have met these three challenges forthrightly and boldly, with daring, vision, and success.

I am happy to be a Member of this Congress. It set a precedent, a precedent in the history of organized man. In the passage of the Mutual Security Act, the Eighty-second Congress took from the ashes of two concepts, something which I think is forging peace, security, and prosperity today and in the days ahead.

Bismarck said, "Empire extends to the end of your bayonet. Encase the nation in armor plate and you will be secure." That is what Kaiser Wilhelm, Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo did, and that concept turned to ashes.

Woodrow Wilson said, "Open covenants openly arrived at." So did the founders of the Peloponnesian, the Delian, and the Aeolian Leagues, as well as the founders of the League of Nations. That, too, turned to ashes.

I think what we have done in this Congress, with the passage of the Mutual Security Act, is to blend those two concepts.

We are closing the gap between our bayonet and our covenant, bringing our bayonet within the shadow of our covenant, never allowing the bayonet to go ahead of the covenant, of what we stand for in organized society; this makes right might, and not might right, as did Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo, and as Stalin is doing today. I think we have done a great job, and I intend to support this bill.

I rise not as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs—which I am not—which has jurisdiction of this legislation, but because, having traveled last year in Europe, and having just returned from an extensive tour of the Orient, I think it my duty to report to the Congress some pertinent certain information, and to ask some questions, such as:

First. Why is it that Indochina for the first time needs to import rice? Perhaps the answer is that it lacks a sense of security, economically, to go ahead and to improve its production abilities.

Second. Why do the Philippines have to import rice? Again, is it because of the lack of a sense of security? Is it because of the inability of the people who work the land to own it; to be able to produce, as people do today, on Formosa?

I intend to point out that Chiang Kai-shek, in my opinion, today faces the greatest challenge of his political career in trying to make not Hong Kong in that part of the Orient, the showcase of democracy, but Formosa. Hong Kong, as I saw it, was a select, tradesman's world, where merchandise was sold. Formosa is democracy's chance in action. Democracy's challenge to southeast Asia and to millions of people in Red China lashed to Red tyranny. Properly led, the performance of democracy in Formosa can truly give hope for better days, and hope for success, in beating back and defeating tyranny in that part of the world, to those enslaved.

Chiang, yours is the chance to make Formosa a true gem in the blue Pacific. Chiang Kai-shek and your legislative Yuan, which I had an opportunity to address, if ever you had a chance to inspire southeast Asia and China, and the free world, for that matter, you have it today.

Another question: Why is it that Egypt, a Nation of 20,000,000, cannot raise an army of 2,000,000 men? Who stops her?

Let us hear a little more about what is happening in economic, social, and political fields, so that we in Congress can feel that the thing we are trying to strengthen, in doing a job, is life, the world around, on a worth-while level. I think we are, and, in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, why not let us create a greater magnet for freedom in the Pacific? We face to the east, as well as to Europe. The Hawaiian Islands are in the center of the Pacific. More nations circle them than anywhere on the globe. Would it not be fitting to establish a United Nations headquarters in the Pacific, on the Hawaiian Islands? I intend to introduce a joint resolution to this effect.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the proposed Mutual Security Act extension, H. R. 7005, calls for the authorization of $6,901,000,000 for foreign aid in addition to $1,000,000,000 of United States military transfers. This new authorization, added to the unexpended balances of funds already appropriated will bring the total available for foreign aid to more than $18,000,000,000.

This situation recalls vividly the estimates made at the time of the original Marshall plan proposal when the estimates that I recall for all foreign aid ranged from $20,000,000,000 downward. Most of the estimates were much lower than that figure. Postwar foreign aid has cost us $32,700,000,000 to date and this bill is for $6,900,000,000 more with no end in sight. We were led to believe that the Greek-Turkish loans, post UNRRA aid, interim aid, and the Marshall plan were the complete picture notwithstanding the fact that the flat announcement was made in the debate on the Greek-Turkish loans that military assistance was included therein for the avowed purpose of fencing Russia in and the Harriman Commission report on the Marshall plan submitted to Congress in November 1947 listed the strategic factor along with the political, economic, and humanitarian factors as the justification for the Marshall plan. Furthermore, the debate on the Interim Aid bill in December 1947 brought out the views of many members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that the Marshall plan could be justified only on the strategic factor. General Marshall himself subscribed to that view.

I had voted in early April 1947 for aid to devastated countries which was based, as I thought, entirely on humanitarian grounds but became alarmed when military assistance was included in the Greek-Turkish loans and from that time forward, even though the Marshall plan was couched in terms of economic assistance, I viewed the entire program as a fuze leading to commitments for foreign military aid beyond our control and under conditions calling for a maximum expenditure for armament within our own land as a part of the world's

greatest armament race known to history.

In my speeches of December 5 and December 10, 1947, I severely criticized General Marshall for his commitment of American economic reserves to the battle front of the cold war without having any control of the time and place of the final decision. I hope it is of interest to turn back to my speeches in the debate here in Congress on December 5 and December 10, 1947, so I include them here:

DECEMBER 5, 1947

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I am not one of the Members who toured the far lands during the past year. I traveled 340,000 miles in the 8 years I served on the Committee on Military Affairs, but I devoted last summer and last fall to the First District of Iowa, 12 counties in southeastern Iowa. What I say here will be my version of their viewpoint, with no effort to cover the entire State of Iowa, just the First District.

There has been a distinction made here in the course of the discussion between strategic moves and war. I have been involved in both. I usually associate strategic moves with war, either in war or as a prelude to war. My people so associated them. I will go along in the statement that there is a distinction between strategic moves and war, but the distinction is dangerously slight.

At the outset let me say this: If there is any doubt about my position when I get through with my remarks on this bill, I am against the bill in its present form.

The bill (H. R. 4604) before us today has for its purpose the extension of aid to European countries with special emphasis on France and Italy. During the closing weeks of the congressional recess last October and November, I had occasion to discuss the proposed European-aid program with many hundreds of my constituents in the First Iowa District. I carried on my discussions with my constituents on this issue throughout the entire congressional recess starting the last of July, but the interest in this issue increased considerably with the developments that led to the calling of the special session. I had an unusual opportunity to cover my district thoroughly for a period of more than 3 months, and I have asked for this time to bring you before you my observations of the thinking of the people of my district on this issue.

In the first place, the people of the First Iowa District favor very strongly our extension of any assistance we can give to Europe if it is given on a humanitarian basis. Their magnificent response to the Friendship Train movement is ample evidence of their support of humanitarian aid. On the other hand, they are just as vigorously opposed to any move that threatens international conflict, and they are seriously fearful of any strategic factors involved in a program of aid.

For the above reasons, I have been especially attentive to the discussion of this legislation in Congress and by the members of the President's Cabinet. When the President's committee on foreign aid made their report on European recovery and American aid—the Harriman committee report—I was disturbed by the following statement on page 2:

"The interest of the United States in Europe, however, cannot be measured simply in economic terms. It is also strategic and political. We all know that we are faced in the world today with two conflicting ideologies. One is a system in which individual rights and liberties are maintained. The opposing system is one where iron discipline by the state ruthlessly stamps out individual liberties and obliterates all opposition."

And again in point 2 in the summary on page 12 of the Harriman report, as follows:

"2. The United States has a vital interest—humanitarian, economic, strategic, and political—in helping the participating countries to achieve economic recovery."

Then, early in the debate on the rule yesterday, the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] in his reply to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] was that he does not think this bill could be justified just on a humanitarian basis and, further, that it is justified solely on concern for the national defense of the United States.

During the course of the debate, I listened with great interest to the discussions and observations offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH]. I am particularly interested in the amendments these gentleman propose to offer because in my opinion such amendments will go far to take out of the proposed legislation the strategic or war factor. The adoption of such amendments would go far to make this legislation acceptable to the people of my district and to me. Somehow I cannot sink to the level of holding our food supply before the hungry victims of postwar chaos in Europe and even hope to use those hungry victims as pawns in a prewar game of power politics and make of them human buffers between us and Russia. In my opinion, this is the worst possible type of imperialism and war planning. I have always contended that war is degrading and that the greatest threat to a victor nation is the possibility of becoming obsessed with the notion that it has been sent to this earth to rule the world. Many other great nations have marched down that road to their downfall and their doom.

In my opinion, the strategic factor in the present legislation qualifies this legislation as our second step into world war III. Our first step was the Greek-Turkish loan. I voted in favor of the aid to devastated countries in Europe last spring and then, later, I voted against the Greek-Turkish loan, because that bill definitely set up the Greeks and the Turks as pawns on our chessboard of world power politics. The Greek-Turkish loan was primarily intended for military assistance and was a brazen step to war. We cannot be so naive as to think we can maneuver against Russia in this way without incurring Russia's hatred for generations to come. Furthermore, our military experts, of whom General Marshall is certainly one, should know that such steps to war cannot be taken effectively without full preparation and placement to meet successfully the logistic requirements for war whenever the proper incident transpires. If the present legislation is openly a move against Russia, then let us admit we are engaged in a world armament race and a cold war simultaneously. The question then is, What is the most efficient and effective preparation for our defense?

I witnessed at close range the analogous steps into World War II: The repeal of neutrality, lifting of the arms embargo, shipping arms and ammunition to England after Dunkerque, and lend-lease. I called all of those steps, steps to war, and I opposed them. The arguments of the proponents still ring loudly in my ears. They were, first, steps to avoid war, then steps short of war, then "We will be the arsenal of democracy," then "Your sons will not be sent overseas to fight." We now know that they were steps to war and the Greek-Turkish loan and the bill now before us have the same implication. When will war come? Just whenever Stalin or his successor thinks we have slid back to unpreparedness and impotency sufficiently to enable them to strike startlingly, swiftly, and successfully.

I have always admired General Marshall for his mastery of military logistics. He demonstrated that ability as one of the distinguished young future generals on the western front in World War I. He demonstrated this ability again most effectively in World War II. If the Marshall plan and this interim-aid bill are based on strategic factors, however, I cannot give General Marshall credit for being a master of logistics in the cold war now in progress. Our moves for preparedness should be more efficient and more direct and more quiet. As this cold war develops, I suggest more emphasis upon adequate national defense and then I hope we can stop making faces at Russia in name calling, and return to the sound doctrine of Theodore Roosevelt, "Speak softly but carry a big stick." In my opinion, that policy will cost us infinitely less and it will win for us the respect of those nations that recognize and respect only power.

Furthermore, we must recognize the necessity of learning to live in a world with other nations having different ideologies. If we cannot learn to live in such a world without meddling with the political and strategic factors in other nations, we have already lost the peace our young men and women fought so gallantly to win.

I opposed going into World War I until Congress declared war. I then went to war the first day men were accepted for the first training camp, and I served 5 years. I opposed going into World War II until Pearl Harbor. I shall oppose taking direct or indirect steps into world war III, but I will join the effort of the Committee on Armed Services as vigorously as I can to build a strong America in this troubled and war-torn world before it is too late.

If the bill (H. R. 4604) is based upon strategic factors and is enacted into law without the Smith or the Andresen amendments, I want to build up our defenses so efficiently and so strongly that Stalin and his successors will not dare to strike us.

DECEMBER 10, 1947

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, during this discussion a great deal has been said on the floor about the generosity of Iowa, and we are proud of that generosity. The program IOWA, "Iowa's Own World Aid" program, and the CARE program and the contribution to the Friendship Train make us proud of Iowa's contribution on a voluntary basis; but let me assure you of one thing, the contribution Iowa has made has been strictly on the humanitarian basis. If this bill were on that basis you would find my attitude toward the bill somewhat different than it is. When the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee come out here and say frankly what their object is, namely, a strategic approach, I appreciate their frankness, but I cannot refrain from holding this measure is a tragic blunder on the basis of a military approach. I have had a commission in the Regular Army for more than 30 years, although I have had only 5 years active military service as an infantry officer and as assistant professor of military science and tactics, and only 8 years experience on the Military Affairs Committee. I do not claim high qualification as a military strategist but I think I do know enough about military strategy to rate this bill as about the worst approach to military strategy that I can imagine. That is my humble judgment. I have the greatest respect for General Marshall as a tactician and as a master of logistics and on the military front he has no peer; but on the economic front if the Marshall plan is a measure of his approach I should like to ask him bluntly what military general or economic general would commit so much of his reserves to the firing line as is contem-

plated in the Marshall plan unless he visualizes a quick decision and a final decision. In the troubled world of today and in this cold war of prospective long duration we should not commit so much of our economic reserve strength to this cold war battlefront. If this course is followed it will sap our strength to the point of seriously endangering our national security at one of the most critical times in our history. That is why I made my speech last Friday in the general debate that was rather critical of General Marshall and the Marshall plan. My criticism of the Marshall plan and of this bill is based on the sheer logistics of the situation since they have been presented to us as national defense measures. On the other hand I sincerely hope we can get some relief for the unfortunate people of Europe on a humanitarian basis, but until you put this bill and the Marshall plan on that basis I am going to have to oppose it.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that a grand total of $73,687,000,000 net has been appropriated for foreign aid of all kinds since 1940. Of this total sum $32,716,000,000 net has been appropriated since the end of World War II. Eight billion, nine hundred and forty-five million dollars of this fund will be unexpended and unobligated as of June 30 this year. Unless otherwise determined by Congress this sum will be held available for future spending over and above any further appropriations made for foreign aid.

The unexpended and unobligated balance, together with the new funds authorized by H. R. 7005 here under consideration, will make a grand total of more than $18,000,000,000 available for foreign aid beginning June 30, 1952.

After 20 years of extravagant and wasteful spending by the Roosevelt and Truman administrations and after several years of war and police action combined with such tremendous sums of money appropriated for foreign aid, it is especially urgent that we survey our own fiscal structure before we add $6,900,000,000 more for foreign aid by the enactment of H. R. 7005 now under consideration.

Brief analysis of our Federal spending budget, our debt, and our Federal tax record should be borne in mind while we have this gigantic foreign aid bill before us.

DEBT, SPENDING, AND TAXATION

Annual Federal spending today exceeds the total spending of any 10 successive years added together up to 1943. And Federal taxation for this fiscal year likewise exceeds the Federal revenue of any 10 successive years added together prior to 1943. The best available estimates are that the Federal spending record from the end of World War II to the end of this year will exceed $400,000,000,000. We have, indeed, reached dizzy heights of spending and taxation far beyond the experience of any other nation, and our Federal debt at the end of next fiscal year will reach $275,000,000,000 compared with the total debt of $152,000,000,000 for all other countries of the world except Russia.

Under present Federal tax laws, if we assume the total personal income of all Americans for this calendar year will stand at $255,000,000,000, their combined personal income after business and personal deductions and exemptions, and after the payment of Federal taxes, would total $70,700,000,000.

TOTAL INCOME OF CORPORATIONS

The total net income of all corporations in America in 1950 after payment of Federal, State, and local taxes was $22,800,000,000 and in 1951 was $17,900,000,000. For the first quarter of 1952, total net income of all corporations in America after payment of Federal, State, and local taxes was at the rate of $16,600,000,000 per annum.

Those sums must provide for all living costs above exemptions, for all spending, and all savings and investments of all individuals and corporations in America. Yet Congress last year appropriated $91,700,000,000 for Federal spending this fiscal year, and our new Federal budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, calls for $85,400,000,000.

Total Federal tax exaction in the last 7 years has already exceeded the total Federal tax collections from the Revolutionary War to 1945.

The American people today are fully aware of the road along which Federal income taxation has taken us over the past 12 years. Under 1940 tax laws a family of four had to have a net income as high as $14,200 before being required to pay a Federal income tax of $1,000. Under 1952 laws, a $1,000 income tax is levied on an income of $6,850.

In 1940 the tax on a $5,000 net income for a family of four was $74.80. Under 1952 laws the tax is $577.20. But with inflation our dollar today is worth only 53 cents as compared with the 1940 dollar, so the $5,000 net income has shrunk to a little under $2,350 of 1940 value because of taxes and inflation.

The foregoing discussion has dealt with corporate income taxes and with personal income taxes.

HIDDEN TAXES THAT HIT THE CONSUMER

Here is how a few of the hidden taxes hit the consumer:

	Real value	Taxes	Price
Soap	$0.20	$0.07	$0.27
Bread	.09	.05	.14
Milk (quart)	.14	.09	.23
Auto tire	19.20	8.80	28.00
Potatoes	.34	.15	.49
Cigarettes	.09	.15	.24
Hosiery	.97	.34	1.31
Telephone (month)	6.60	2.95	9.55
Electricity	3.52	1.08	4.60
Eggs	.49	.16	.65
Coal (ton)	9.00	15.00	24.00
Gasoline (gallon)	.12	.14	.26
Shoes	6.00	3.00	9.00
Candy bars	.07	.03	.10

The Tax Foundation has estimated that a family of 3.2 persons having an income of $70 a week and whose annual income tax is about $300 averages $798 in hidden taxes. They estimate also that a married man with 2 children must earn $11,800 a year for his family to live as well as it did on $5,000 a year in 1939.

TAX LOAD OF UNITED STATES AND ALL OTHER COUNTRIES

The estimate of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation is that in 1949 the total tax load of the other 72 nations of the world, including Russia, was approximately $68,000,000,000 and that the United States annual Federal tax revenue alone under present law will next year reach $71,000,000,000.

Even so, a deficit of $8,200,000,000 is estimated for 1952 and a deficit of $14,400,000,000 is in prospect for 1953.

If all taxable personal incomes over $4,000 were confiscated today, the total additional revenue would be only $9,700,000,000. At present rate of Federal spending, this sum would last our Federal Government only 47 days. With the American dollar today worth only 53 percent of its 1939 value, the taxpayers are really having a most difficult time to meet the increased cost of living and pay their taxes.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

I will discuss one further point in which I have a tremendous interest because of its importance to our own defense.

Last year I made a review of the foreign-aid contributions to the United States strategic materials stockpile program and I included that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 8, pages 10243–10245.

By way of comparison let me call your attention to the fact that the stockpile acquired through foreign-aid programs last year stood at $56,245,000; today it stands at $102,937,000. Our stockpile objective is $9,075,000,000. Our total expenditures on foreign aid to date stands, as I understand it, for economic aid, at $14,800,000,000.

At the rate of foreign-aid spending to date and at the rate of acquisition of strategic and critical materials from this source up to date, it would require $1,440,000,000,000 of economic aid to foreign countries to complete our stockpile program from this source.

At the rate of acquisition today it will require 311 years to acquire our strategic and critical stockpile entirely through exchange for foreign aid.

When I look back through the original debate on the Marshall plan and think of those grand promises of the great help that would come to us in the way of strategic materials through this program I cannot help but wonder how the sponsors of the Marshall Plan can justify those predictions and those boasts back in 1947 when they made the original effort to get the Marshall Plan and other foreign aid programs under way.

Furthermore some consideration should be given to the heavy consumption of our own supply of strategic and critical materials in the production of the military supplies we export in that portion of our foreign-aid program.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs must get away from the strategic and critical materials stockpile as a prime justification for this foreign-aid program.

(Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include speeches and

materials made and prepared by himself.)

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

DEFENSE BILLIONS DEFEND KAISER, NOT UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, the amount of money to be appropriated by this Congress the coming fiscal year for our military establishments is perhaps the most widely discussed of any pending legislation. In my 10 years in this House, I have never seen it turn down any legitimate and honest request for money to make our country secure. In fact, in many instances we have voted more funds than the military establishments could use.

However, I wish to state here and now that I know and have learned a long time ago that our security is not dependent on how much money is appropriated, but rather on how wisely the money we appropriate is spent. As far as I am concerned with the manner in which our procurement officials in the military setup are squandering billions of dollars, we could easily double the military appropriations and still have no security.

I am especially concerned with our Air Force. The lack of Air Force equipment in Korea is tragic. In fact, it is so tragic that if we do not force some changes there soon, this Congress will not deserve the respect of the people we represent.

I visited with many officers of the Air Force in Germany. There, too, our air equipment is tragic. In fact, the officers themselves refer to it as the United States air farce, not the United States Air Force.

Yes, even here in our own country fliers are afraid to fly because of poor equipment, poor planes and poor maintenance and repairs. The mighty Air Force we once knew—today is ragged, poorly equipped and relegated to a status which many of its own officers call the United States air farce.

These tragic conditions caused me great concern. It compelled me to do some research. There is reason why, after hundreds of billions of dollars of expenditures, we still have no adequate air power. The reason is not in the personnel of the Air Force proper. Goodness, no. A finer lot could not possibly be found anywhere in the world.

Where, then, lies the trouble and the responsibility for these shameful Air Force conditions? Members of the House, it lies squarely upon the shoulders of the procurement officials responsible for Air Force equipment procurement. These men—and these men alone—are responsible for the tragic conditions of our air security and preparedness.

Let me give you a case of the manner in which procurement officials of the United States Defense Department squander billions and take care of their friends, rather than procure planes and plane equipment.

A year ago the procurement officials of the Defense Department awarded a contract to Kaiser-Frazer to produce 150 of the Chase airplanes known as the C–123. In spite of the fact that Kaiser-Frazer had the contract for a year not a single such plane has been produced. That is tragic indeed. But that is not all. In spite of this complete flop by Kaiser-Frazer in their first contract, not a single plane in a year, a few weeks ago the procurement officers of the United States Air Force sent a letter of intent to the Munitions Board which would award this same Kaiser-Frazer outfit a contract to produce 250 more C–123's.

For obvious reasons, the Munitions Board questioned this letter of intent. The Air Force procurement admitted that the letter was unusual—but said it was necessary in order to help Kaiser-Frazer "in its other negotiations."

Now Members of the House, when you and I appropriate billions for Air Force procurement, I thought it was to procure planes for our Air Force—not to help Kaiser-Frazer "in its other negotiations." Yet here we have the blatent admission by Air Force procurement officers that plane procurement is not first in their minds—their first interest is helping Kaiser-Frazer in its other negotiations.

Let us go back to the old Kaiser-Frazer contract, a year old for 150 planes, that is the 150 of the Chase airplanes known as the C–123. I said none has been produced during the year the contract was in effect. I must amplify this statement.

You read of that great auto promoter by the name of Tucker, did you not? You read of how he got parts of various automobiles, put them together, called it the Tucker—and swindled millions of dollars from the people of America.

Well, Kaiser-Frazer took a leaf from Tucker's experience. So that nobody could say Kaiser-Frazer has not produced a plane in a year on a 150-plane contract, they proceeded to out-Tucker Tucker. After all, Tucker had only to fool the people. All Kaiser-Frazer had to do was fool the United States Air Force procurement officials.

So here is what happened. About 2 months ago a great extravaganza was held at the Willow Run plant of the Kaiser-Frazer Corp. The press was invited. Air Force procurement officials were lavishly entertained. Rhetoric and champagne almost overflowed the banks of the Willow Run. A lush $50,000 carpet was prominently displayed and rolled out to greet the suckers. The event was the dedication of the Kaiser-Frazer new gigantic C–119 flying boxcar cargo plane. And as the suckers viewed the unveiling and dedication, they looked with awe upon the great spectacle which stood before their eyes and bowed to Henry Kaiser, the great airplane builder, America's giant of industry.

But just a minute, gentlemen of the House, you have not heard all yet. Was this unveiling and dedication a cause for celebration or should it have been a signal to our Air Force procurement officers that a public mourning should take place for the taxpayer. Yes, gentlemen, public mourning with black crepe and doleful music would have been more appropriate than the celebration participated in by Air Force procurement officers. Yes, Kaiser-Frazer out-Tuckered Tucker.

Here is what the public and press were not told, and I doubt if the Air Force procurement officers knew. The boxcar plane C–119 so ceremoniously unveiled and dedicated and almost flooded in champagne and flowers, all at taxpayers' expense, was not built at Willow Run. Like the Tucker car—it was merely assembled there. But this was discreetly hidden from the press and the public. All of the parts for this plane were actually made at the Hagerstown, Md., plant of Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp. These airplanes are not only built but also assembled at Hagerstown. Yet here Kaiser-Frazer just bought the parts, shipped them nearly 1,000 miles, merely assembles them at Willow Run and states to the public, "Look at our great work. Look at the great plane produced by Kaiser-Frazer."

Has this sham paid off? Of course it has. So impressed were the Air Force procurement officers with Kaiser-Frazer genius that Henry Kaiser announced that Kaiser-Frazer will build 17 of these cargo planes during 1952. Yes, Kaiser said they will build 17 cargo planes at Willow Run. The fact is these planes will be built at Hagerstown and only assembled at Willow Run. But Kaiser fooled the Air Force once, so why could not he fool them 17 times?

And here is the tragedy of it all, and why, in spite of billions we have appropriated, our Air Force is still in shambles. The Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp. is an experienced and reliable producer of aircraft and the chief developer of this particular kind of cargo plane. Fairchild can turn out this plane, complete it at a cost to the Government of between $350,000 and $385,000. But to the Air Force procurement officers this is too simple and too cheap. Besides it may result in getting planes, and seemingly that is not what is wanted.

So what happens? Kaiser-Frazer is given a contract for 17 boxcar planes—parts built at Fairchild and shipped and assembled at Willow Run at a cost of between $800,000 and $1,500,000 per plane, or roughly twice or three times as much as they could be built at Hagerstown, Md. Is it any wonder that no matter how many hundreds of billions of dollars we appropriate for air power, it never seems to come about? And that is why we tax our people more and more and more—seemingly without end in sight.

Let us look at Mr. Kaiser's past record as a plane builder and planner. After viewing that record it is incredible that our Air Force procurement officials should award this man almost a quarter-billion dollars in plane contracts and letters of intent. Here is Kaiser's past record as a plane builder and plane planner.

First, the fabulous flying boat. When Kaiser first announced his plans

for building a gigantic aircraft, it was to be constructed of aluminum and he promised mass production in record time. He pictured a fleet of 5,000 of these 70-ton behemoths capable of carrying 500,000 soldiers across the Atlantic 1 day and returning 24 hours later with thousands of tons of food and supplies.

The War Production Board refused to consider the proposition since Kaiser had never built an aircraft in his life but finally agreed when he enlisted the aid of Howard Hughes, a recognized aeronautical expert. After several months had elapsed with no evidence of progress, the project was investigated by a group of Government experts who expressed grave doubt as to the feasibility of the plans. Funds to Kaiser were cut off after this investigation but were resumed by order of the President on condition that Kaiser or Hughes would personally supply the money to complete the project after the Government's $18,000,000 was exhausted.

Shortly thereafter Kaiser removed himself from the picture and Hughes spent $10,000,000 of his own money in a vain attempt to produce a successful airplane. When Kaiser had to put up a dollar of his own, he got out, as fast as he could. It should be noted that this dream of Kaiser's cost the taxpayers $18,000,000 and Howard Hughes $10,000,000. In this plane project Kaiser was a complete flop.

Second, was the Brewster Aeronautical Corp. Incorporated in New York, February 10, 1937, for the creation, design, development, construction and sale of various types of airplanes and aircraft parts. It acquired design rights, jigs, and fixtures on nine types of military trainers and observation planes from Consolidated Aircraft on April 10, 1939.

On April 20, 1942, at the direction of President Roosevelt, the Navy Department took possession of the company's four plants; two at Long Island City, N. Y.; one at Newark, N. J., and one at Johnsville, Pa., in order that they be effectively operated.

The President's order said that possession and operation by the Navy should be terminated as soon as it is determined that the plants will be privately operated in a manner consistent with the war effort. Henry J. Kaiser became chairman of the board in 1942 and took over active operation of one of the Long Island plants in November 1943 with glowing promises for stepped up production.

The company lost $1,436,369 in 1942 and $607,177 in 1943. Production went even lower under Kaiser's supervision and he quietly withdrew in April 1944. The total dollar value of the company's war work was $73,000,000 and on April 5, 1946, the stockholders approved a plan to dissolve the company and liquidate its assets. Again as a plane builder for the second attempt Kaiser again proved a complete flop.

Third, was the Kaiser Fleetwings, Inc. This was organized November 17, 1942 as Kaiser Cargo, Inc., to manufacture airplanes. They obtained $1,000,000 loan from the RFC on March 4, 1943. The names were changed May 29, 1946 to Kaiser Fleetwings, Inc. Its announced purpose was to purchase Fleetwings, Inc., of Bristol, Pa., and to expand wartime facilities for the manufacture of airplanes.

This company likewise never produced any planes. So it contracted with Kaiser-Frazer Corp. to produce automobile doors and deck lids. The price on a cost plus basis was 75–100 percent higher than previous Kaiser-Frazer suppliers. So Kaiser's plant finally turned to the manufacture of bathroom and kitchen equipment and changed name to Kaiser Metal Products. The total capital investment is $500,000. Henry Kaiser and Kaiser companies own 75 percent of stock and balance is held by friends of Kaiser.

Executive offices of the company have been held as follows:

President: November 17, 1942, to January 15, 1944, Henry J. Kaiser.

Vice President: November 17, 1942, to date, Edgar F. Kaiser. November 17, 1942, to date, Clay Bedford.

This third venture into the plane business by Kaiser like all others was a complete and dismal flop.

Here we have three highly publicized ventures by Kaiser in the building of planes. Each attempt was a colossal and dismal flop. Each attempt was as flagrant a failure as it was costly, costly of course mostly to the taxpayers of our Nation and the stockholders, but not to Kaiser. Yet our Air Force Procurement Officials entrust this same colossal failure with almost a quarter billion dollars of defense money to build planes. This is the same failure who has had a contract for 150 planes for more than a year and has not yet produced a single plane. No wonder our boys in Korea, Germany and elsewhere call it the United States air farce. I wonder if the Procurement officials of our Defense Department are more interested in defending Kaiser than they are in defending our Nation with air power?

Even if this time we did take Kaiser at his word, all he can do is assemble—not produce—just assemble 17 cargo planes the coming year. Why then, give him contracts and letters of intent for 400 planes? Especially why when these will cost three to four times more than they could be had from reputable and successful firms. As I indicated before, Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp., which developed the C–119 Flying Boxcar in the first place is prepared to produce this plane and assemble it at a price of $350,000 to $385,000 per plane. The cost through Kaiser is from $800,000 to $1,500,000 per plane. Is there any excuse for such robbery of our defense efforts and money? And get this—in the time that it would take Kaiser just to assemble 17 such planes, Fairchild could manufacture and assemble 165 of the same planes for one-third to one-fourth the cost. Yet, the Air Force has ordered Fairchild to abandon all plans to produce planes in its Chicago plant. Instead the Air Force officials went to the Willow Run unveiling to see Kaiser-Frazer out-tucker Tucker in a gigantic swindle and gave contracts and letters of intent to the smoothest and cleverest swindle of the ages.

How does Kaiser do it? How does he manage to bamboozle the public and suck defense dollars? Simply by placing his own key men in proper departments of the Government. There is an old saying around Kaiser headquarters. It goes like this—defense billions of dollars must defend Kaiser first, his friends in Government second and the Nation third. Here is how he swindles the Government out of millions of dollars a year.

After securing a $25,000,000 loan from RFC on December 5, 1950, Kaiser went directly to a conference with Under Secretary McCone of the Air Force. McCone then gave Kaiser its first big Air Force order for building 150 Fairchild planes. Now who is this man McCone? First, he was associated with Kaiser in the shipbuilding business in World War II. Now get this, while McCone was Under Secretary of the Air Force he was merely on leave of absence from his position of president of Bechtel-McCone Corp. Now in turn the Bechtel family happens—just accidentally—to be holders of 4,200 shares of Kaiser-Frazer common stock. So McCone gets a convenient leave of absence from a Kaiser outfit, becomes Under Secretary of the Air Force and arranges a nice fat gift for Kaiser and that is how Kaiser manages to continue to suck defense dollars while our boys in Korea die for lack of planes and plane equipment.

But Kaiser never misses a bet. He takes no chances on having just one of his men planted where defense billions are handed out. He plays it safe always to see that he sucks every dollar he can at the expense of blood and lives. Here is another example of how he operates. Clay Bedford took a leave of absence from the position of vice president of Kaiser-Frazer. He became a special assistant to Director Charles E. Wilson of the Office of Defense Administration. Later Bedford became Deputy Administrator for Procurement and Production of the Defense Department. Still later Bedford becomes special assistant, believe it or not, to the Secretary of Defense. What a beautiful position to see that certain people get the easy money from the defense billions. Where is Bedford now? You guessed it. After being Secretary of Defense Lovett's expert on breaking production bottlenecks, Bedford suddenly and miraculously became president of Kaiser's Chase Aircraft Corp., the same Kaiser outfit that has not produced a single plane, yet got a contract for 150 and then a letter of intent for another 250 planes. Kaiser's stooges always stay in their Government defense jobs just long enough to take care of Kaiser and then they go right back to Kaiser to get their share of the blood money.

Our defense procurement officers and those close to it are replete with Kaiser

stooges. Warren W. Huff took a leave of absence from his position as purchasing agent of Kaiser-Frazer to follow Bedford to Washington and to become Assistant Deputy Administrator for Procurement and Production. Huff was head of the Steel Division of the War Production Board toward the end of World War II, and the manner in which he left that position to go directly to Kaiser-Frazer parallels the manner in which Walston S. Brown left the Maritime Commission to become secretary of Kaiser-Frazer at the same time. Walston S. Brown is the man who made arrangements for Kaiser to make millions on shipbuilding contracts as I will show a little later in this speech.

Why, just why is there such a Kaiser conspiracy to drain defense dollars into his lap? The answer is simple.

The financial statement of Kaiser-Frazer for the year ending December 31, 1951, shows a loss of $12,300,000. This brings their 3-year operating loss to $65,000,000. In his message to stockholders, the president pointed out that the loss was not as bad as it seemed because it gave the company an operating loss carry-over which it could use to avoid taxes during the next few years. There is a real policy question raised as to whether the Government should award lucrative war contracts to a company which is openly and boastfully in a position to avoid any taxes on profits from such contracts.

The company reports a net worth of $10,000,000. The Wall Street Journal in an article dated May 1, 1952, states the net worth to be $5,600,000. The difference apparently stems from a difference of opinion as to the value of certain assets. In either case, since the company has lost better than a million a month for over 3 years, it is clear that it will soon reach a state of insolvency if it has not already. The only possible hope is for additional Government financing. This raises a further policy question as to the propriety of entrusting vital Government contracts to a company which may soon be in the hands of the receivers.

Another example of the Kaiser method is brought to light in the opinion of Augustus Hand, of the second circuit in the case of Kaiser-Frazer against Otis & Co. That opinion holds that the Kaiser-Frazer prospectus with respect to its 1948 issue was definitely misleading and fraudulent. A prospectus of this sort is ordinarily given very careful scrutiny before being passed by the SEC. Can it be that Henry Kaiser also has friends in the Securities and Exchange Building?

The recent Kaiser-Frazer statement shows a V-loan of $25,000,000 in addition to the various RFC loans, almost all of which are still outstanding. The statement does not revel the existence or the extent of Air Force advances on its various contracts to Kaiser-Frazer but, in view of the limited working capital of Kaiser-Frazer, such advancing must be going on in order for the company to remain in operation.

Here is as true a picture of Kaiser-Frazer Corp. finances as is possible to get:

	Amount	Per share
Stockholders' equity Dec. 31, 1952 (per annual report)	$10,219,776	$2.24
Deduct:		
Facilities not used in operations	3,457,158	.....
Intangibles	542,832	.....
Deferred charges	1,215,000	.....
Prepaid expense	837,818	.....
Other assets	1,316,269	.....
	7,369,077	.62
	2,850,699	.....

A further deduction of $4,000,000 for 1952 estimates losses—$1,000,000 a month at the rate of loss for past year—wipes out the stockholders' equity and leaves the corporation insolvent with a deficit of $1,149,301.

So the picture now becomes clearer and clearer. Kaiser-Frazer Corp. is in financial trouble. At this year's end they will be defunct. So the billions we are appropriating for defense are used to bail out Kaiser-Frazer. Gentlemen, did we appropriate these billions for defense or did we appropriate these billions for personal manipulation so save a defunct corporation?

The procurement officers of the Defense Department should be made to answer the following questions:

(a) What is the total amount of money presently outstanding that the Air Force has advanced to Kaiser-Frazer?

(b) Of this total, how much has been advanced to Kaiser-Frazer with respect to each of the following projects?

First. The Fairchild plane C–119.

Second. The Chase Aircraft plane C–123.

Third. For general machine tooling and facilities.

Fourth. For west coast aircraft projects of Kaiser-Frazer.

Fifth. Any other advances made by the Air Force to Kaiser-Frazer, and for what.

Sixth. The terms and conditions with respect to which the foregoing advances have been made.

And finally these procurement officers should be asked to tell why defense dollars, blood money, that is, should be used to save a defunct corporation instead of purchasing planes and equipment.

This is a shocking situation and one that we cannot allow to go unchallenged in a period when we are asking the humblest laborer to give us over 20 percent of his net taxable income to support defense mobilization. I am told that the Armed Services Subcommittee studying military waste is currently considering the very contracts I describe, but, as great a waste as this contract may entail, I believe it is only a small part of a much more comprehensive fabric and I believe it is our duty to investigate every thread of this fabric in every phase of its intricate pattern. The following facts represent no more than a collection of previously published information and yet, with nothing more, they tell an almost incredible story of how one man has lived and prospered solely at the expense of the American taxpayer. It explains Kaiser's method of using defense dollars to defend himself.

Until the outbreak of World War II, Henry Kaiser's only business experience was as a cement contractor building public dams and bridges in the western part of the country. Almost immediately with the beginning of hostilities, the Kaiser companies jumped into the shipbuilding business and within a short time Henry's methods of operation set the pattern which has typified his activities for the past decade.

Kaiser originally entered his shipbuilding contracts on a cost-plus basis but, as soon as operations had developed to a point where costs could be accurately appraised, he arranged with friends in United States Maritime Commission to change these contracts to a fixed-price basis. This legerdermain enabled Kaiser to realize tremendous profits as compared to the modest return cost-plus contracts would have yielded him. The feat was accomplished through the assistance and good offices of his Walston S. Brown, then a member of the Maritime Commission's committee on awards, now secretary and a director of Kaiser-Frazer Corp. But the pattern is always the same. The person in the Defense Procurement after awarding Kaiser contracts and favors never goes unrewarded. He always lands on Kaiser's payroll.

The United States Government paid for everything that went into the building of the shipyards used by the Kaiser companies. The United States Government paid for all material used in Kaiser ships, it paid for all labor and it paid for all administrative costs for individuals so employed up to $25,000 per year per person. Henry Kaiser invested no capital and took no risks. He merely acted as manager of the Government facilities and for this service he was paid the rather handsome sum of $192,287,284. How can this be rationalized on comparison with the hundreds of small and large contractors who had their profit on Government contracts reduced by renegotiation to a figure in the neighborhood of 10 percent on gross sales?

Kaiser's next Government sponsored project, the steel industry, was a wonderful deal not only because it yielded him a tidy return on almost no investment but also because it provided a wonderful device for rendering his shipbuilding profits practically exempt from Federal taxes. The shipbuilding company paid $100,000 for all of the capital stock of the Kaiser Steel Co. The United States Government loaned the steel company $125,000,000 and also permitted it the privilege of accelerated depreciation on its facilities. Thus, during the early years, while the Kaiser Steel Co. was being organized on Government

funds and was not returning a profit on its own, the profits of the shipbuilding company were being written off for tax purposes by amortization of the steel facilities. While other taxpayers earning a comparable income were being taxed at 90 percent, Henry Kaiser merely converted his profits into lucrative steel producing facilities and thus retained nearly 100 percent. Kaiser always has friends in every Department of the Government who take care of him.

Kaiser's wartime venture into the production of magnesium is also worthy of comment although for a change it does not appear, at least on the surface, that he personally made much of a gain out of the project. Of course he and his fellow shareholders received handsome dividends but they did not end up with anything in the way of valuable Government assets which is usually the case.

Early in World War II, the War Production Board ordered the RFC to build a magnesium plant at Los Altos, south of San Francisco. Kaiser heard about this and rushed to Washington with the proposal that the RFC loan him the money and that Kaiser would build and operate the Los Altos plant. The proposal contemplated no private capital except for $100,000 already invested in the Permanente Metals Corp. which Kaiser had organized. Mr. Jesse Jones himself says:

> The whole set-up looked a little screwy to me, one that would be of doubtful outcome.

Nevertheless with the help of friends in the RFC, Kaiser put his plan across. He got a loan from the RFC which ultimately totaled $28,000,000 and he operated the magnesium facilities until 1945 when he was forced to give up the project because of inability to meet prices in a competitive peacetime market. In this instance the RFC was repaid in full but it nevertheless cost the Government heavily since Kaiser's entire operation was wastefully inefficient. Los Altos never got its production costs below 30 cents per pound whereas the RFC-owned plant near Las Vegas, Nev., which was managed by Anaconda Copper, produced magnesium at 18 cents per pound. In addition, Metals Reserve Company, an RFC subsidiary, had to subsidize Mr. Kaiser to the tune of $2,500,000 by buying his product at higher than market price.

Permanente died as far as magnesium was concerned in 1945, but it was revitalized in 1946 when Henry got his hands on some very valuable aluminum facilities. The facilities in question were built by the Government and operated by Alcoa during the war. Kaiser obtained these facilities on a risk-proof lease-purchase arrangement from the War Assets Administration, along with below-cost contracts for Federal power to operate the facilities from the Federal Bonneville Power Administration.

The rights were first given to Kaiser-Frazer but as soon as their potential value was realized, they were quietly transferred to Permanente Metals wherein Kaiser personally had a much larger share. In the first 11 months of operating these facilities, Kaiser and associates reported a net profit before taxes of over $8,000,000. The original investment in Permanente Metals, now Kaiser Aluminum & Chemicals Corp., has never been added to by Henry Kaiser or associates but at the market close on March 8, 1952, their stock was worth $87,780,000 and they had received cash dividends in excess of $11,000,000 since 1946. The United States gave him these assets for next to nothing. No matter what department of our Government had something to hand out Kaiser was always the first to be taken care of.

It is also quite apparent that Henry's fabled genius falls short when it comes to producing automobiles. Kaiser-Frazer Corp. took advantage of Graham-Paige facilities and a starving automobile market to accumulate an earned surplus of over $9,000,000 by the end of 1948. From that point on, however, the initial advantage was lost and, while the automobile industry generally was experiencing the best years in its history, Kaiser-Frazer production and sales declined steadily and the corporation shows a loss in excess of $60,000,000 over the 3-year period ending in 1951.

Ordinarily we would expect this to close the book on a story, too often repeated, of an individual who prospered in wartime but could not make the grade in the competitive struggle of our peacetime economy. Whatever else can be said of Henry Kaiser, however, he is resourceful and the minute things began to dry up he was back at the public well with his bottomless bucket.

We have already noted how the United States Government sponsored Henry Kaiser's entry into the shipbuilding business, the steel business, the magnesium business, and the aluminum business. Good old Uncle Sam also gave him a big boost into the automobile business by selling Kaiser-Frazer Corp. the huge Willow Run bomber plant. This plant cost the Government $42,300,000 to build during World War II. It was appraised at $67,000,000 in 1949 and at $105,000,000 in December 1950. This plant was sold to Kaiser-Frazer in September 1945 for a paltry $15,100,000, and even that amount was not paid in cash.

The United States Government, through the War Assets Administration, also gave Kaiser-Frazer a tremendous boost by selling it a Utah blast furnace for $782,000, full price deferred, and by awarding it a lease-purchase arrangement on a Cleveland blast furnace, although others had offered considerably more for the rights.

Kaiser-Frazer could not compete, despite these subsidies, however, and in 1949 it turned to the RFC, which had served Kaiser interests so nobly in the past.

On September 23, 1949, Kaiser-Frazer Corp. filed a formal application with the RFC in Washington for a loan of $30,000,000. On September 30, 1949, an RFC examiner got out his report which recommended a loan of about $25,000,000. The Kaisers were faced with repayment demands on a $16,000,000 bank loan and each member of the reviewing committee of the RFC had expressed doubt that the loan could be repaid. Nevertheless, on October 6, 1949, the RFC Board of Directors approved a 10-year loan to Kaiser-Frazer for $34,400,000.

Naturally, it was a terrific problem to find sufficient collateral among the declining assets of Kaiser-Frazer to pledge against a loan of this magnitude and the manner in which this feat was accomplished is one of the greatest examples of a person raising himself by his own bootstraps that history has ever witnessed. The RFC agreed to accept a first mortgage on the Willow Run plant as a principal item of collateral for this loan. The Government had sold this plant to Kaiser-Frazer only a few years earlier for $15,000,000 and $13,590,000 of that amount was still owing. The War Assets Administration very generously agreed to subordinate its claim, however, and the equity of Kaiser-Frazer in the plant was magnified by a timely reappraisal. Thus Henry Kaiser had again accomplished the impossible. He purchased a plant for $15,000,000, paid about 10 percent of the purchase price, and then borrowed $34,000,000 by pledging this same heavily mortgaged plant as collateral.

By any standard of good business judgment, this loan was fantastically ill-advised and dishonest to the core—it smelled to the high heavens. Here again Kaiser out-Tuckered Tucker in bamboozling the taxpayers.

Even beyond its basic unsoundness, however, the manner in which this loan was arranged cried out with evidence of highly irregular procedure and perhaps even more. The application was filed directly in Washington and did not go through the normal field channels required of requests by ordinary mortals. Approval was stamped on the application less than 2 weeks after it was filed and less than 1 week after the examiner's report was given the Board of Directors. The amount authorized was $10,000,000 more than the examiner recommended and even $4,400,000 more than requested in the written application. Here we should ask what happened to the smelly Kaiser RFC deals exposed by the Senate investigating committee?

The RFC has, of course, asserted that negotiations had been going on for several months and were not publicized at Kaiser's request. If that is so, the matter is even more serious, because it means that a Government agency has collaborated with a private citizen in suppressing vital public information until the time when it could be released as practically a fait accompli. Thus the deal could be wound up before the tide of adverse public opinion had a chance to swell. A subcommittee of the United States Senate asked on October 11, 1949, that the loan be held up so that the facts could be studied, but the RFC declined flatly to heed this request. Gentlemen, such rank patronage has no place in the

operations of a properly run governmental agency.

Most men would have been satisfied with $34,000,000, but not Henry Kaiser. On October 10, 1949, Kaiser-Frazer Sales Corp. applied for a $15,000,000 line of credit. The RFC examiner approved immediately but the reviewing committee recommended that the loan not be granted because it was really for the manufacturing corporation and that its ability to produce automobiles was highly questionable. An interesting conclusion to be drawn just a week after this manufacturing corporation had been granted a loan of $34,000,000. In any event, this adverse recommendation was ignored and a loan of $10,000,000 was authorized for Kaiser-Frazer Sales Corp. on October 21, 1949.

One fact which I feel was very significant from the standpoint of the financial soundness of Kaiser-Frazer and the public policy of supporting its continuance in the automobile field was the fact that a real question had arisen as to whether Kaiser-Frazer was being operated to make money as a corporation or only to line the pockets of Kaiser and the ex-Government officials who arranged the deals and the loans.

The shareholders apparently had become tired of sub rosa dealings by Kaiser and others, such as the transfer of the aluminum facilities which we previously discussed, and were suing for an accounting on behalf of the corporation. In the same vein, the Kaiser-Frazer dealers were complaining bitterly about their treatment at the hands of the favored few. This is significant not only because it indicates a crumbling enterprise but also because it appears that Kaiser-Frazer was serving merely as a funnel with the Government pouring money in at the top and Henry Kaiser and ex-Government officials standing below with their wheelbarrows. Despite their importance, these facts were apparently never even considered by the RFC since no mention is made of them in any report I have seen.

With the granting of the above two loans, the total indebtedness of Kaiser interests to the RFC reached a figure of approximately $140,265,000. In November 1949, loans to Henry Kaiser and his brood amounted to 32.4 percent of the total amount of such RFC loans. A Government representing over 150,000,000 people has no business operating a finance company to support 1 out of that 150,000,000 citizens and I cannot believe that objective thinking motivated the RFC when it committed its funds in this ridiculously overbalanced fashion. It was merely a plot of Government officials saying, "Kaiser we will take care of you—but you must take care of us."

The next loan to Kaiser-Frazer was announced December 4, 1950, in the amount of $25,000,000. By the time the application was filed in November 1950, the first two loans had been completely disbursed and Kaiser-Frazer had shown a loss of over $39,000,000 in 1949 and a loss of better than $10,000,000 at that date in 1950. The initial RFC examiner recommended denial of the application because the company's future prospects seemed unfavorable and because it would circumvent regulation W. The agency review committee and the agency manager at Detroit concurred in this adverse recommendation. On November 28, 1950, Examiner Williams recommended approval but the six members of the Washington Review Committee unanimously overruled him on the grounds asserted by the original examiner. Despite all of this, the RFC Board announced the loan of $25,000,000 at a press conference held December 4, 1950.

Gentlemen, I am too old to believe in magic and there is only one other explanation for Henry Kaiser's ability to get loans from the RFC Board when good judgment, common sense and the entire staff of the RFC below the Board are arrayed against him.

Now back to the plane contracts. The day after he got the third RFC loan, Henry Kaiser met with Under Secretary McCone of the Air Force to discuss the production of aircraft. Incidentally, Mr. McCone was a business associate of Stephen Bechtel in the Bechtel McCone Corp., and at the time Stephen Bechtel owned 4,000 shares of Kaiser-Frazer stock. Mr. McCone was definitely in Henry's corner and the RFC also went to bat for him on the theory that, with some plush defense contracts to work on, he would be able to repay the RFC and justify its loans to Kaiser-Frazer. Members of the RFC Board denied any interference with Kaiser's obtaining of defense contracts when they were questioned by the Senate subcommittee, but the report of one of their own examiners, in connection with a $7,000,000 advance to Kaiser-Frazer in February 1951 gives the lie to this denial.

The examiner's report stated that Kaiser-Frazer had received nearly a quarter of a billion dollars' worth of airplane contracts at our request, and it concluded with the observation that Kaiser-Frazer would probably be able to work its way out of its financial difficulties through profitable war contracts, but that it still needed considerably more working capital. This device of getting one Government agency in a spot where it has to help Henry to save itself is an old Kaiser trick. He used it to get his magnesium business subsidized and he tried to use it to get an additional tax advantage for his steel company.

The contracts which Kaiser-Frazer were awarded were of course the contracts to build the C–119 and C–123 at Willow Run. Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp., an old, established airplane manufacturer, had developed the C–119 and stood ready to produce it at a price for less than anything Kaiser-Frazer could hope to offer. When it was suggeted that strategic distribution was the object rather than the price, Fairchild offered to produce the plane in Chicago at the same low price. Nevertheless, this experienced low-cost producer was brushed aside and the contracts were awarded to a very shaky company run by a man who had continually demonstrated his inability to operate without Government subsidy and who had shown a particular lack of ability when it came to aircraft production.

We have mentioned Walston S. Brown, and John A. McCone as possible links in Henry Kaiser's chain of influence. Another good possibility is Clay Bedford, executive vice president of Kaiser-Frazer, who became first assistant to the Defense Mobilization Director in June 1951, and has since been also appointed special assistant to the Secretary of Defense and now is back with Kaiser.

The story that I have sketched for you so briefly is not the story of the C–119 or the C–123 or of the RFC or of shipbuilding profits. The story is that of one man, Henry Kaiser, and of how that one man has fattened himself at the public trough for a period of over 10 years. We cannot hope to untie all the knots in this unholy tangle but we are in a position to free the present defense effort from the bloodletting habits of this human leech and we are also in a position to bar the RFC door to any more of his raids. Since Kaiser and the RFC always work together in silence, it is known that negotiations are under way for a further loan at this very moment. As a matter of fact, from what I know about the present financial condition of Kaiser-Frazer, I strongly suspect that negotiations are in fact going forward at lightning speed.

Gentlemen, this problem can never be solved by piecemeal investigations into various places where the poison has struck. It can only be wiped out by elimination of the source, the dispenser of evil, the bloodsucker growing fatter with every gasp of the American taxpayer.

It is the duty of this Congress, as protectors of the American people, to investigate Henry Kaiser, in all his many guises, to lay bare his methods and his sources of power and to thus assure that this man and these methods shall not continue to thrive on the perils of his country.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, general debate is closed and the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Mutual Security Act of 1952."

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7005) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BRAY (at the request of Mr. VORYS) was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next, May 27, 1952, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

THE CASE FOR GENERAL COLSON

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, as one who has had an unusual and extended opportunity to observe the outstanding service of Brig. Gen. Charles F. Colson, while he was commanding general at Fort Devens, Mass., and as one who is conversant to a considerable degree with his distinguished record of service in the Army, I have been very much upset and deeply concerned by the most regretable turn of events, and comments and insinuations in the press regarding his part in the unfortunate Koje prison-camp incident.

Not many months ago, General Colson left Fort Devens, where he was respected and beloved by all for his fine, able, humane administration, to take up his new assignment in Korea. Like every good soldier, he left with genuine enthusiasm in his heart and mind to continue his loyal, conscientious, conspicuous service in a theater of active combat; in fact he appeared to me as a man eager and actually straining at the leash to move into the conflict against our Korean enemies.

It was, therefore, only by mere chance, one might say, or as the result of the operation of a strange turn of destiny that he happened to be on the scene when General Dodd was taken captive and the uprising of prisoners began. There was no time to lose. He did not have time to map details of strategy or policy. Clearly, General Dodd's life was at stake. Could anyone doubt that his ceptors were fanatical Reds and desperate men? Was there reasonable doubt that they would not gravely injure or slay him? General Colson did not stall, hedge, or delay. He acted with prompt decision and his action unquestionably saved the life of General Dodd.

Morally, ethically, legally, and in every other sense his action was amply warranted. The moral and civil law is clear on the point of the invalidity and nullity of agreements arrived at under duress. I will not argue that point because it is well established by centuries of precedents and cannot be refuted. Any agreements made to save General Dodd's life were of no binding effect on anyone and that fact is known to every moralist, every religionist, and every competent lawyer. Why then all this tirade about General Colson? Is there any sound reason why he should be made the goat for the errors and mistakes of others in the management of enemy prison camps? To my mind, the prisoner situation should be cleared up. Prisoners should be treated decently and humanely and in strict accord with The Hague Convention, but they should not be allowed to riot, create disorder and rebellion in the camps. Above all, under no circumstances should they be permitted to take over, dominate, and control the places in which they are incarcerated.

In my opinion, on the facts I have available at present, instead of censuring or criticizing him, the Army should decorate General Colson for his wisdom and courage in acting promptly, fearlessly and regardless of his own career, interest, and welfare in saving the life of General Dodd.

His was a brave, unselfish act in accordance with the best traditions of the Army. It should be appropriately recognized.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

FULBRIGHT AMENDMENT TO DPA HITS THE NEW ENGLAND UNEMPLOYED TEXTILE WORKERS WHILE THEY ARE DOWN

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, if this amendment passes, the South will win another victory against the hard-pressed textile mills of New England and their thousands of unemployed workers who have no other jobs to go to.

Both the CIO and the A. F. of L. are bitterly opposed to it, and the facts are all on their side.

This amendment would scrap the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act under which the Secretary of Labor can set hours of labor, minimum wages, and child-labor standards on all Federal contracts of $10,000 or more for the manufacture and supplying of goods needed by the United States Government.

The Supreme Court has upheld the act which the Fulbright amendment now attempts to nullify.

The Civil War is being fought all over again in the field of economics, and the South is gaining victories by seceding from the clear intent of the law. It has blocked the channeling of defense contracts to distressed areas. It has turned a deaf ear to our plea for emergency legislation that will increase and extend unemployment compensation benefits to critical areas. And now it is active in turning the clock back to the unwriting of progressive laws, so that they can kidnap industries from the North by beating down the decent standards that we in the Northeast have won through real collective bargaining and progressive legislation.

Our situation in New England textiles is desperate. The facts are plain, unexaggerated, and heartrending to anyone who knows that economics is not solely a subject concerned with plants, and machinery, and contracts, and costs. Stripped of all its jargon, it means the ability of a human being to earn a living. When that livelihood is stolen from him by tricky legislative maneuvers, his very existence is under attack.

We have as many as 20,000 such victims in cities with a population of 100,000 and under up New England way.

The Defense Production Administration and the Surplus Manpower Committee, after much shadow-boxing, have not quite concealed their conclusions which boil down to this; they do not consider it their job to save the Northern textile industry; but they will try to relieve unemployment.

They are not even doing that.

Rosy plans to build defense plants that will take up the slack, look fine on paper. But you cannot put our unemployed textile workers into mothballs and tell them to wait in suspended animation for a solution built on promises and little else.

I have spoken of the apathy here in Washington to the plight of New England.

But this amendment is a direct thrust at our unemployed.

I do not criticize it because it was conceived in a spirit of sectional ambition, reaching to take advantage of an opportune moment. Such maneuvers are usually considered to be enterprising.

But this will swell the ranks of the jobless in New England, and I cannot imagine any American consciously and deliberately assuming responsibility for such a tragedy.

The way to progress and unity is not by undercutting the better living standards that American workers have won. Rather, we should help those whose wages are now substandard. That is the policy of the United States Government, established by law, in the award of contracts under its direct jurisdiction.

The Fulbright amendment is shortsighted, narrow, and dangerous.

For a local and temporary gain, it would set back national improvement in the status of American workers.

They are the customers of American industry.

If this amendment should pass, public opinion will overrule it on November 4.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

MALADMINISTRATION OF THE ISLAND GOVERNMENT OF THE TERRITORY OF GUAM

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, last December the gentleman from New York,

Mr. CHRISTOPHER MCGRATH: the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, and I visited the island of Guam on our return from an inspection tour of the trust islands, Japan, and the Korean war front.

Guam, as you know, was governed by the Navy until August 1, 1950, when it was placed under United States civilian control, and a Governor was appointed by President Truman, who still holds that office.

The island of Guam is approximately 6 miles wide and 30 miles in length and has a native Guamanian population of about 40,000, an armed forces population of about 30,000, and a United States mainland citizen population of about 30,000, or a total population of approximately 100,000 people in all.

The United States American citizen population, commonly referred to in Guam as Stateside, pay a United States Federal income tax, as do all other American citizens; however, it is not sent to the United States Treasury, but is kept in the Guam treasury and spent there for the functions of the Guam government.

On that small island, which is one of our most important military outposts in the Pacific, every branch of our Armed Forces is stationed. In addition to the officials of the Armed Forces and our civilian government, the native Guamanians elect their congress, which is composed of 21 members, hence you may well understand the problems which arise on that small island with so many kinds of governing heads.

Many members of Congress including myself, opposed the transfer from Navy control to United States civilian control before the change was made because Guam is primarily a military outpost, and by all means it should be turned back to the Navy at the earliest possible time in light of the conditions there, and especially since Guam is so close to the Korean theater of war.

While we were in Guam last December we heard rumblings of discontent from people in several of the segments about their economy.

Several weeks ago two gentlemen, who have lived in Guam for years, and who have held responsible positions there, came to Washington on their own initiative and at their own expense, to make the following report to the United States Congress. They are William McKinley and Norman A. Peltier, both citizens of the United States.

We are informed that Governor Skinner is in Washington, D. C., now, hence we are bringing the charges of these two gentlemen to the attention of Congress at this time in order to give Governor Skinner an opportunity to answer these charges while here if he desires to do so. Every American citizen is entitled to his day in court, and I am sure the proper committees of Congress will be only too glad to give him a full hearing on request.

Mr. Speaker, I shall now read the report submitted to us by Mr. McKinley and Mr. Peltier, without further comment on my part:

MALADMINISTRATION OF THE ISLAND GOVERNMENT OF THE TERRITORY OF GUAM

1. It is the desire of the undersigned to bring to the attention of the United States Congress certain facts and allegations relative to fraud, graft, corruption, and mismanagement within the Territorial Government of the Government of Guam.

2. Due to the number of contracts that have been let and the sly manner in which they have been handed to select people and the fact that there is no adequate control of Government funds, the door is wide open to graft and kick-backs.

If the income-tax returns and bank accounts of the 15 to 18 officials, past and present, in key positions were to be checked and a similar check and cross check were made of the people who have been doing such big business with the Government of Guam, in the same manner that the Treasury agents break the rackets in the United States, one of the most fascinating income-tax frauds will be disclosed.

If there is a bank deposit placed with a bank in San Francisco, and checks on Government of Guam are drawn on it, no one in Guam outside of those issuing the checks would know who was being paid large sums of money.

Attorneys Phinton J. Phelan, Jr., and Edward E. Crain, Agana, Guam, filed a taxpayers' suit against the Government of Guam alleging that the income tax levied in Guam was illegal.

It was dismissed in Guam, as are all suits against the Government.

The case was argued in San Francisco, Calif., Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals on February 29, 1952. It is rumored the case may be thrown out on jurisdictional grounds, but the judge made the comment from the bench that they will hold, at the first opportunity, that there is no tax. They indicated that this tax was a fast deal pulled by Interior Governor Skinner, Attorney General Knight Aulsbrook, and Oliphant, formerly of the Department of Internal Revenue.

Governor Skinner told certain members of the Guam Chamber of Commerce that if the question of clarifying taxes out there got to the United States Congress it might wipe out Federal tax sections 30 and 31, possibly taking all moneys collected by authority of Federal law from Guam and giving it all to the United States Treasury. It is believed he is afraid Congress will look at his budget and what he is doing with the money.

The receipts from the sale of the Guam News, the Bank of Guam, and the rehabilitation fund, etc., were not mentioned in the organic act and are probably Federal funds. The government of Guam has been spending these funds as they see fit. The total is between $2,000,000 and $3,000,000. It is suspected they are all gone.

On the rehabilitation fund, there is an opinion of the JAG of the Navy that those funds should be transferred to miscellaneous receipts of the United States Treasury.

3. The students of the George Washington High School and the Catholic schools held an oratorical contest in the Guam Congress building in February 1952. It was reported by the officials of the government of Guam that the children were so bad they will have to be watched, as they are saying things detrimental to the government of Guam. It is reported R. S. Herman, secretary of Guam, threatened the students and stated he will censor all graduation speeches and that the children cannot take part in any more oratorical debates. The children merely told the truth about the whole rotten govenment in a contest.

Excerpts of the speeches were published in the Guam Examiner:

"WHAT THEY SAID

"In any contest, there are losers as well as winners. The keener the contest, the more difficult it is to declare the victors.

"Last fortnight, the judges had to make decisions in the semifinal and final oratorical contests at the Guam Congress Building. Both were sponsored by the local Lions Club. Notwithstanding the decisions, popular acclaim made it conspicously clear that all the young high-school orators were winners; not so much as contestants, but as responsible, wide-awake citizens who demonstrated—too painfully for some—that they can be depended upon to preserve the precious heritage of Americanism.

"Here are thought-provoking excerpts from the oratories of the contestants:

"Jose San Agustin (Duenas Memorial, 1): 'Among the historic rights obtained only after centuries of struggle * * * are those of freedom of speech and of the press. Some innocent persons imagine that these rights are unlimited and confer the license to say anything or print anything that may be desired. * * * These rights are restricted insofar as they include slander, indecency, incitement to rebellion, and similar offenses against the public welfare. Even if statements of indecency are based on facts, freedom of speech does not permit their utterance lest public morals be contaminated.'

"Annie Underwood (Academy of Our Lady, 2): 'The halls ring with the noise of the oratory of men and the rafters absorb their meaningless clatter of phrases. What we really need is a more thorough knowledge of the laws that govern us, instead of the nonsense of what kind of treatment we receive in court after crimes have been committed. Our island will not be improved by swinging human windmills and empty words; it will be bettered only by knowledge of the facts. * * * I dare say that many Guamanians have no idea what the organic act means, nor do they understand the privileges and the duties which are theirs because of that act. We Guamanians who are now American citizens should endeavor in every way possible to prove ourselves worthy of the great heritage which is now ours to enjoy.'

"Randolph Carbullido (Duenas Memorial, 3): 'If we are not wise and enlightened by spiritual values, we may not be a democracy in the future * * * Today, we * * * have to be ever watchful that our Government does not become too powerful, because a powerful government is almost inevitably bad and sooner rather than later, it ceases to be a servant and becomes a master of the citizens. * * * In future elections * * * let us study our rights, let us assert our prerogative, let us not be blinded by sweet promises which are discarded as soon as the candidates are elected.'

"Pedro Guerrero (Duenas Memorial): 'All our rights are God-given. Where God is denied and society is permitted to operate without Him, these rights cease to exist * * * We must have a responsible authority that enforces law without casting aside the laws of God. We must have a police force that understands its obligations and conscientiously tries to fulfill them; we must have a board of education that teaches us the road-map to success on earth and eternal happiness in heaven.'

"Salvador Camacho (Washington High): 'Why should we be denied some of the rights which our fellow citizens are enjoying? Are we not equally created? Or is there such a term as secondary citizenship? The denial of the rights of indictment by grand jury, and trial by jury are two excellent examples

of denial of rights * * * to American citizens here in Guam. * * * Also denied partially is the right of just compensation for land taken for public use. * * * Persons having titles to the land used for the Agana school ground are paid rental fees ranging from $1.50 to $3.50 per month. * * * Has any step been taken by our Guam legislature or by the Governor himself toward securing these rights?'

"Gloria Camacho (Academy of Our Lady): 'Today, when times are critical, when the tide of democracy is slowly ebbing, when communism is threatening all the free countries of the world, we should more than ever abide by the Constitution, obey its laws and defend it from persons who are trying to wreck our ideals of freedom, and who are trying to poison the minds of many to follow their false ideas. We should see that good and able representatives are elected in order to secure the passage of just laws.'

"Bernadita Perez (Academy of Our Lady): 'Many people have the courage to write about what is true, but there are many who are afraid to do so. * * * The man in the village and the woman in the home who lack a channel of free, uncensored information and receive their news from a distorted, mutilated, and misdirected press live with the eyes of their minds blindfolded in the night of unfairness. * * * Freedom of the press is a heritage of the people. Newspapermen are pledged to and are defending it today just as soldiers are defending our liberties, for liberty belongs to mankind.'

"Nancy Pangelinan (Washington High): 'The Constitution is not alone the working plan of a great federation of States under representative government. There are imbedded in it also the vital principles of the American system of liberty. That system is based upon certain inalienable freedoms and which we call the Bill of Rights. Among others, the freedom of worship * * * of speech and of the press, the right of peaceable assembly, equality before the law, just trial * * * freedom from unreasonable search, and security from being deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law'."

In the same issue of the Guam Examiner appeared the following editorial:

"A LETTER TO HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENTS

"This is written for you who are in our high schools today, especially for those of you who are to graduate at the end of the academic year.

"It will be a long time, if ever, before you forget the oratorical contest last month in the hall of the Guam Legislature. We feel you will be interested to know it wasn't long after the final competition that reports from widely different sources began reaching us—about the reaction in diverse quarters to the oratories of your fellow students.

"There have been few events here that have stirred so much interest. People still talk about it today. We want to assure you that the overwhelming majority of the population are pleasingly gratified by the manifestation in this contest of true, courageous Americanism by young representative citizens. On the other hand, you must accept as a cold, hard, inevitability the fact that a minority segment of island residents will have only contempt for those who dare to exercise their rights.

"The general criticism is to the effect that the contestants are mouthpieces of certain individuals and organizations. Don't let this disturb you at all. You can readily recognize this as a cowardly, sour-grapes statement that can come only from intellectual lepers—people whose guilty consciences continue to suffer from the pain of mental abscess. They don't belong to any respectable community.

"How do these people get that way? There are various causes of this malady. But it is basically due to a self-acquired affliction of personal dishonesty which has made it painful for them to accept the truth. They are moral weaklings whose criterion of right and wrong are not based on God's law but on the amount of political, economic, and social blessings they aspire to earn.

"If, indeed, the contestants are mouthpieces, we hope they are the mouthpieces of spiritual leaders, parents, and teachers. For their utterances are expressions of moral beliefs that all of you should be taught in your church, at home, and in school. Your high-school diploma will mean nothing if you graduate without learning these tenets of good citizenship.

"You eventually will select different careers in the years to come. In the practice of your profession—however humble it may be—you will have to make many very important decisions. You will find that in making them you will be confronted also with the necessity of making a choice that may be the turning point in your life.

"You will be guided by many factors; but none of these will be as important as the moral principles that govern human existence. You will discover that you cannot align yourself with God without alienating the devil; that you cannot pitch your tent among good men without being required to sever your association with evil ones. You will find too, that for men and women who espouse righteousness, it is an honorable distinction to be despised by scoundrels.

"These, and more, you will find out for yourselves sooner than most of you think right now. And you may have to give up precious material things to gain the respect and admiration of good and honest citizens. It will be worth the sacrifices you may have to make."

4. That Governor Skinner can no longer control the Guamanian and that they are meeting secretly to defy him and the following is a quote from the Guam Daily News:

"Rumors are flying about a group of prominent Guamanian businessmen and political leaders who held a meeting recently at Palting Ranch from which all Statesiders were barred.

"Here is what some of the speakers discussed:

"One point discussed was the exploitation of Guamanians by Stateside lawyers on land dealings.

"Some of the feeling by those present was against selling land to Statesiders but instead to lease it.

"The group, 200 strong, will meet again on March 23. Membership is $5 and highly restricted."

Publisher Joseph Flores conferred at great length with persons who heard the organization mentioned in the above story.

The committee stated the group was not antiadministration nor discriminatory. Instead they said the objectives of the organization were to bring the Guamanian people together to provide scholarships for deserving students and promote better government and other worth-while programs.

5. That the personnel department is so inefficient and mismanaged that many persons were hired off island and that the positions were so misrepresented that the persons hired left the island at intervals of from 2 days to 4 months and at government expense.

6. That the Territorial and island courts are puppets of the Governor of Guam and dispense only "injustice."

7. That many department heads, both Stateside and native, are unqualified to hold their positions, professionally or otherwise.

8. In 1950 all department heads raised their salaries to GS-14 plus 25 percent TPD to cover income tax payments. This done with approval of Governor Skinner.

9. That the former treasurer of the government of Guam, Ike Warren, and Simeon Provencher, supply officer of the government of Guam, shipped in taxable goods, using government bills of lading as favor to local merchant (Stateside) to avoid payment of duty and transportation. They received expensive gifts at Christmas—such as sets of golf clubs, bicycles, etc.

10. That Knight Aulsbrook, attorney general of Guam, boasted of his close association with Alger Hiss. That he roomed with Hiss in law school and was a close friend while in Washington, and that Mrs. Aulsbrook and Mrs. Hiss were good friends.

12. Guam News, October 22, 1951, published the following:

"A. Exactly what did Guamanians get for the $50,000 paid the Public Administration Service of Chicago?

"B. Why is a new hospital being built when $2,000,000 worth of what could be one stands overgrown by boondocks, north of Tolofoto?

"C. Why did orders for dental supplies 'get lost' while Guamanians were turned away without needed care?

"D. Is former Fire Marshal Peltier's contract being fulfilled to the letter?

"E. Why are positive cases of TB allowed at large on Guam?

"F. Isn't it time for the name of Scambelluri to be cleared? (Former lieutenant of police resigned after trumped up charges were dismissed and his refusal to take orders from chief of police and his assistant who are ex-convicts and who were originally arrested by Scambelluri.)

"H. Why, with the great number of traffic violations, are the granting of liquor licenses not curtailed?

"I. What is the reason for wealthy Guamanians leaving Guam?

"J. Who put the organic act over? (IPR)."

13. Under section 15, article 3, of Public Law 33 (Public Land Act), Governor Skinner appointed a five-man Territorial planning commission subject to confirmation by the legislature to propose and adopt a comprehensive long-term general plan for the physical and economic land development of Guam, the master plan.

In connection with this project and others under the administration's 10-year construction program, the government has obtained the services of two experienced planners and architects, Robert Alexander and Richard Neutra, as consultants.

Terms of a contract between the consultants and the Territorial government provide for a retainer fee of $25,000 yearly for 10 years in addition to travel costs and living expenses, also to be paid by the Government.

Neutra and Alexander also will receive not more than a maximum of $75,000 for any one year's services other than as consultants retained by the government.

The consultants will interview personnel for prospective employment in projects connected with the 10-year plan. The contract also stipulates that the consultants will receive two and one-half times the wages and salaries paid to personnel hired for projects under the plan. Manuel F. Leon Guerrero, director of land management and executive secretary of the planning commission, interpreted this item in the contract in this way: If a worker receives $10 an hour on a project, under the consultants, the consultants will be paid $25 by the government, $10 of which goes to the employee.

Neutra and Alexander also will study the Territorial government's annual capital investment through the completion of the 10-year plan in 1962.

14. That the police and fire departments which constitute the department of public safety are headed by incompetents. That the chief of police, Roberto, and the assistant chief of police, Juan Manibusan, are exconvicts and that 32 members of the police and fire departments have criminal records. This has been brought to the attention of the officials of the Government of Guam and to date nothing has been done about it.

The assistant chief of police, Juan Manabusan, was recommended for attendance at the National Police Academy conducted by the FBI in Washington even though Mandeville C. Frost, the then commissioner of public safety, was aware that he had a record for grand larceny and had a bad conduct discharge from the United States Navy. As a result of this recommendation, letters were forwarded to J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, and Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL. Governor Skinner was advised by letter from J. Edgar Hoover to withdraw his recommendation of Manabusan's attendance.

The police department is overmanned and has one commissioned or noncommissioned officer for each two patrolmen. Many of the men can neither read nor write.

The majority of the police have an overbearing attitude and any person who opposes the actions or thoughts of the administration are subjected to Gestapo treatment.

Many members use the power of their badge to borrow money and run up bills which they never intend to return or pay.

Food and building materials, etc., are removed by members of the police department from Ordot Prison and are converted to private life.

Government vehicles are used by members of the department for private enterprise.

Many members, including officers, are operating liquor establishments in addition to their employment by the department.

When Michael Brennan, Red Cross field director, was murdered by a taxi driver in January 1950, the murderer was recently sentenced to 2 years in prison and fined $10. Why?

The deposed commissioner of public safety, Mandeville C. Frost, was involved in an attempted extortion racket involving the sale of parcels to prisoners for $1,500.

He was cleared by an investigation conducted by Edward Bender, former assistant attorney general (resigned) who also is purported to have been involved in the plot. Frost then investigated and cleared one Jose Leon Guerrero, a police sergeant, the alleged collector. He was brought before the court as the result of a congressional investigation and the case was dismissed because as the judge stated, the man was prosecuted on the wrong charges, and he (the judge) knew the man was guilty.

In January 1951 Norman A. Peltier, fire marshal, was requested to resign because of a difference of opinion between Mrs. Peltier and Commissioner Frost. As he refused to resign he was informed that as Mrs. Peltier was reported to have been a vice crusader in California, she was not wanted on the island. At the request of Albert Slaughter, personnel director, Mr. Peltier was not bothered until March 1951 when he was again requested to resign. He was given an ultimatum to the effect: Resign without prejudice and transportation will be furnished for him and his family back to the United States, but if he fought it he would be blackballed in all Government agencies and his family stranded on Guam. The family is on Guam and Mr. Peltier in Washington, fighting for the right to earn a living for his family.

During his employment there Mr. Peltier served as assistant to the commissioner, chief criminal investigator, and fire marshal. During his tenure as fire marshal he not only organized and trained the fire department, but actually built the equipment being used by that unit at practically no expense to the Government.

He was discharged summarily without trial on the basis of an alleged Army report that Mr. Peltier was unfit to be a Government employee.

The Army in a letter to Mr. Peltier stated no such report existed and refused to accept his tendering of his resignation as a first lieutenant, Military Intelligence Corps, United States Army Reserve.

During Mr. Peltier's absence from the Island of Guam his family have been harassed on numerous occasions by the official politboro of the Government of Guam. For example, we quote, August 27, 1951, editorial from the Guam Daily News:

"GESTAPO TACTICS

"Everyone undoubtedly agrees the Guam police had a legal right last week to throw the Peltier family into the street. They, the police, were backed up by a court order. The case, officially at least, was closed, and eviction proceedings had been under way for something like 3 months. But we question the methods used, methods which began to look like a war of nerves, not a simple eviction action. We can't see that the quarters occupied by Mrs. Peltier and her two sons, needed an armed police guard 24 hours a day.

"Reason given was that the furniture and fixtures needed guarding. Mrs. Peltier with no place to go, could hardly carry off an easy chair, bed or sofa. One police guard said he was on duty there because of 'valuables' inside. Government of Guam furniture, no matter what else, can rarely be put in that category. During the guarding process, a press representative was twice barred by police from entering the house to interview Mrs. Peltier. When it was determined eviction papers did not need to be served, the police continued to stick around under orders. To top it off, after the eviction was suspended following orders for a new investigation in the Peltier case from Washington, the police went home only to return the same evening again. Outside the home, police have trailed the young son of the former marshal, on orders from headquarters, on the highway and in the housing area. He was threatened with vagrancy charges for 'prowling' near the women's area. The boy claims he was not in the area and at any rate the area was not restricted at that time. Meanwhile, the Government's plea is that they are sorry for the Peltier family and wish to do all they can to help. The commissioner of public safety called the whole affair minor."

COMMERCIAL PORT

15. The commercial port facility is operated by a former Guam congressman, Jose Leon Guerrero, who helped establish the position and then resigned his position as congressman to accept the appointment as director of commerce at a salary of $7,000 per annum. He is a former clerk at the Naval Supply Depot and held minor positions in the Government of Guam and is unqualified to head such an operation.

The entire operation is in chaos; pilferage and damage claims are beyond reason. In the past innumerable false claims have been made against the operation by local merchandizers.

When Governor Skinner made Guam a free port, thereby eliminating customs duties, all search of incoming vessels was suspended due to the elimination of the custom force. This made the Guam port accessible for the movement of illegal goods such as smuggled precious stones, narcotics, etc., without any fear of apprehension by the authorities. One of the vessels which uses Guam as a home port is a motor vessel *Arctic*, owned and operated by one Captain Schofield in partnership with a local merchant, Joseph Siciliano. Both men are notoriously known for their alleged illicit operations in and around Manila, such as gun running, black market, etc. Their names are linked with those of Charles Forte, Ted Lewin, Charles Murray (murdered), all well known to ONI, OSI, and Military Intelligence. A complete investigation of these men was made but the report was suppressed by Mandeville C. Frost, former commissioner of public safety, and is believed to be in his possession or to have been destroyed.

Of recent date in their effort to stamp out the traffic in narcotics and illegal operations the *Arctic* was stopped and searched by an armed boarding party of naval personnel. At this writing according to information received from Guam, the *Arctic* is now under marine guard and government of Guam officials have been denied access to the vessel. Captain Schofield was also picked up by the naval authorities. The reasons for this action are unknown to the writers. Captain Schofield is Governor Skinner's appointed head of the Government of Guam Port Authority and occupies government quarters.

That the Government of Guam official family is a clique more interested in lining their own pockets than in running a government for the Guamanian peoples—some of the officials are engaged in other occupations other than that for which hired. The personnel director is local manager for a Seattle creamery and several others are engaged in business using their wives as a front.

Investigate disposition of Government of Guam public works funds—roads (except those in village) maintained by Navy who also run water and power and light systems and telephone hook-up on island. Power, water, and road conditions in most villages are in an extremely pitiful condition.

The following editorial from the Guam Weekly Examiner speaks for a vast majority of the peoples of Guam:

"[From Guam Weekly Examiner of March 20, 1952]

"A LETTER FROM A HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENT

"(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This letter was delivered at the last minute and we consider it timely and important enough to deserve the space on this page. The author is a real, living person—and a 19-year-old American.)

"I am a boy who is very observant of my environment.

"On March 12, I was surprised to find a 'letter to the editor' written by an Elizabeth S. Somebody, on the front page of the Guam Daily News. At first, I thought it was something very interesting that the public should know.

"But reading on down the lines, I discovered it was all filled with flowery talks about a dream of a beautiful city, Agana. I feel that through no other medium than the Guam Examiner can the public know of my opinion of this letter.

"Yes, who will not like Agana to look beautiful? Who will not like Agana to be blocked with buildings like the Guam Daily News? But who will not also like Agana to be dwelt by people who own part of Agana? I would say that if Agana is dwelt by people who used to dwell there, of course with a little improvement here and there, the dream of a beautiful Agana can be made to come true. We need not accept the idea brought forth by the editor of the Guam Daily News. His ideas are merely personal opinions which cannot be adapted to the

problems now encountering the present administration of the Government of Guam. Persons who write letters and editorials about Guam's domestic problems such as 'Mysterious Beth' and Editor Jack Nevin have knowledge of the history of Guam and its people.

"On March 13, in response to 'Mysterious Beth's' letter the Governor informed the public that he will take all necessary steps to protect the capital city of Guam from imminent danger of being blocked with slums as Beth had called them. The Governor should have taken such steps earlier. He should have thought of that a long time ago. We had trusted our governor to be a good one. And being a good governor, we trust him to do some planning for the future. Waiting until some mysterious 'Beth' brings thing out is not the proper time to make a decision and command some action. I know that the Governor and other government officials went on a tour of Rota, Tinian, and other islands. (This junket was made aboard the *Reliable* owned by Joseph Flores, Daily News editor and publisher, and included some members of the legislature.—Editor's note.)

I believe they did the right thing. I personally agree that it is about time they take a week-end vacation to relieve their minds of domestic problems. There are so many of them that need attention, such as: Providing public schools with the right kind of teachers, and proper facilities; lessening the number of fatal accidents; providing proper means of communication; providing a better, if not the best, type of fire-fighting crew and equipment; establishing recreational centers to diminish juvenile delinquency; and many others which will require a good size book to record them all.

"But I also know that the Governor as a leader and the Congressmen as leaders also, will have to sit down and make a thorough examination of their conscience and see whether or not they have been doing their best to help the public whom they are serving.

"They must not forget that they are getting paid to do their jobs, and to do them in the best possible manner. Also, they must not forget and overlook the fact that some of them have secured governmental positions, and now that they have them take advantage and use them wisely.

"They must think first before they act and must take precautions as well. Their aim is to act to please the majority of whom they are serving and not the minority.

"The idea of putting a stop to the business of trucking into Agana junk, rusty Quonsets, and rotten prefabs which might kill the beauty that has been planned is, in all respects, a good idea.

"But I doubt very sincerely if there would be a man or a group of men who can make the people living in Agana change completely the type of housing they are living in from remodeled, rusty Quonsets and rotten prefabs which are more pleasant to live in at times, to newly constructed modern buildings which might lead some people to serving sentence in the Guam Penitentiary. (Salvador Lujan Comacho, senior, Washington High School.)"

"An investigation should be made of the conditions prevailing at the Guam Memorial Hospital.

"The qualifications of the Medical Director, who is alleged to have resigned from the United States Army Medical Corps in lieu of a general court martial" (Dr. Wendell Mathias).

"Abuses heaped on and exploitation of DP doctors. Two doctors were censured and an attempt made to discharge them because they refused to perform a sterilization operation.

"Inadequate medical supplies and equipment.

"Director of personnel at hospital, William Silverman, was rejected by Dr. J. Y. Battenfield, former director of medical services. Dr. Battenfield left island because he was forced to accept unqualified man for position" (Silverman).

"Information received from Guam states that Governor Skinner has indicated that William C. McKinley will never be allowed to return to the island of Guam and that Norman A. Peltier likewise will be banned for his aid to McKinley in this exposé in Washington."

SUMMARY

The following is a summary of allegations of maladministration of the Territorial government of Guam.

1. Income tax frauds by officials of government of Guam.
2. Kickbacks and contract favoritism
3. Territorial income tax for Guam illegal.
4. Where are funds from sale of Guam News, Bank of Guam and rehabilitation fund?
5. Suppression of free speech in schools.
6. Irregularities in police department, including employment of ex-convicts.
7. Santos-Guerrero extortion case.
8. Brennan murder.
9. Administration of personnel office.
10. Public works funds.
11. Guam Memorial Hospital.
12. Illegal removal of fire marshal.
13. Abuses to family of fire marshal.
14. Island and territorial courts, incompetent United States attorney.
15. Juvenile delinquency.
16. Smuggling, narcotics, etc.
17. Irregularities in land sales and seizures.
18. Mismanagement of government quarters.
19. Commercial port.

PERSONAL HISTORY

Norman A. Peltier: Date of birth: May 3, 1908. Place of birth: Boston, Mass. United States address: 229 Hillcrest Avenue., Benicia, Calif. Marital status: married, two children; Education: elementary and high schools, Boston, Mass.; Northeastern University, Boston, Mass. Military: United States Marines, 1928–33 (aviation); served in Haiti, Dominican Republic, Nicaragua; United States Coast Guard, 1942–46, security officer; United States Army, military intelligence officer, commission still active. Civilian occupation: Massachusetts State Police, 1933–47 (resigned); 1946–48, chief safety and security, Benicia Arsenal, Calif., with duties of provost marshal, fire marshal, intelligence officer, safety director and port captain; 1949–51, Guam, safety inspector United States Navy, Assistant to Commissioner of Public Safety, chief criminal investigator, and fire marshal, naval government and civil Government of Guam.

William C. McKinley: Date of birth, August 13, 1912. Place of birth: Cleveland, Ohio. United States address: 2755 Woodshire Drive, Hollywood 28, Calif. Marital status: single. Education: Elementary and high school, Cleveland, Ohio; Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio; Sawyer's Business College, Los Angeles, Calif. Military: United States Army, 1942–4*. Civilian occupation: 1931–36, chief of police, Lorain, Ohio; 1936–40, chief, Ohio State Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation; 1940–42, general superintendent, Jack & Heintz, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio; 1942–44, United States Army, investigations; 1944–46, Twentieth Century-Fox, special security officer; 1947, fraud investigator, State board of equalization, California; 1947–48, investigator, crime laboratory, Los Angeles sheriff's department; 1948–50, naval government of Guam, inspector of police; 1950–52, Vinnell Construction Co., chief security and safety officer. Organizations: 1936–40, president, Ohio State Marshals' Assocation; 1936–40, president, Ohio Police Chiefs' Association.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH], and I when in Guam last December were much disturbed over some of the charges we have heard about. We heard them there. We had called to our attention the charges the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has read, charges made by the two gentleman to whom he has referred. I agree absolutely with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] that every opportunity should be given to Governor Skinner, of the island of Guam, to answer these charges, and I am glad the Governor is today in the city of Washington.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In relation to income taxes, it was 2 years ago last November that I was in Guam and discovered then that they were not paying any income taxes. My amendment to the internal-revenue bill, which provided that withholding and income taxes should be paid, but to the Treasury of the United States, was adopted, but in conference the Interior Committee or someone was able to change it so that the taxes are paid now in Guam. These workers over there, both the construction workers and the United States employees, receive extra pay for being out of the United States, but they were paying no taxes any place at all at that time. Of course, the taxes are now being paid in Guam, but they should come here to the United States.

There is another question I want to bring up. I do not know what the gentleman's charges are.

Mr. JENSEN. They are not my charges or our charges, they are the charges of these two gentlemen before our committee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In our Committee on Insular Affairs we are discussing now, and I have held up the report on it, a bill which would set up a framework for Guam patterned after the things we do in this country, with a poultry industry, recreation, a Reconstruction Finance Corporation, public housing, and a whole list of things that the left-wingers are pushing in this country as the No. 1 objective. I said "No" the only thing they needed to have as far as Guam was concerned was some legislation relative to immigration and the Narcotics Act. Tomorrow morning,

time permitting, that bill will be up before our committee and I expect to have some remarks to make about it. If it ever comes before the House, I know the gentleman will be interested in it. It involves the setting up of a framework for the government of Guam that the people do not want and the people cannot support.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I know the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] has taken a great interest in the problems of all our Territories.

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JENISON. I want to commend our distinguished colleague from Iowa on bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress, for certainly it is timely. I share a degree of familiarity with the problems in Guam because I was in Guam in the military service at the time we reoccupied that island, and I have since returned there as a member of our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It is the concern of all our people that in this transition from military to civilian government we set up a government in keeping with their needs, and not saddle them with a government that will burden them so that it will break down of its very weight. I commend our colleague from Iowa for calling this matter to the attention of the House, and assure him of my interest.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I have not had an opportunity to observe the conditions in Guam since the change-over to civilian government, and I will read the charges with great interest. I take this opportunity to make the observation that I visited Guam in the course of my travels as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs while the island was under naval control. From my recollection, we had a very good report of the control and government of Guam by the Navy throughout the years it was under their jurisdiction. I am a little bit shocked to hear that serious charges are in the making here so soon after Guam was taken away from naval control, which was so successful and so satisfactory.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to say to the gentleman that the charges which are made, and which he may hear and will read in the RECORD tomorrow, are quite serious charges. Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN of Minnesota, and Mr. MCGRATH, of New York, and I felt it our responsibility as representatives of the American people to bring this matter out in the open and let it be aired in the hope that a proper solution could be arrived at.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. After all, we have had these things brought to our personal attention, and if there is anything wrong, I think it is our duty in the Congress to give a forum via the proper committee for these people who do express the charges to prove what they have to say, and if there is anything wrong, let us make it right.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I shall read excerpts from these charges. Time will not permit me to read the complete report. The subject is maladministration in the island government in the Territory of Guam. It is the desire of the undersigned to bring to the attention of the United States Congress certain facts and allegations relative to the fraud, graft, corruption and mismanagement within the Territorial government of the government of Guam.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCMULLEN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PRICE OF NEWSPRINT

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am astounded that Canadian newsprint manufacturers apparently acting systematically and in unison have once again raised the price of newsprint.

Since VJ-day 1945, the price of newsprint has risen $56 per ton. Our Canadian neighbors furnish approximately 58 percent of all the newsprint used in the United States. Since VJ-day, as a result of these huge price increases, the newsprint bill of American publishers has gone up more than $280,000,000 a year.

While there is no price control in Canada, I understand that the latest increase of $10 per ton to a price of $126 a ton has been approved by the Government of Canada and will add another $50,000,000 to the annual newsprint costs of American newspapers.

I understand that the earnings of the Canadian newsprint suppliers indicate that this increase is not required by their financial situation. But the effect here is bound to be most unfavorable upon the newspaper and publishing industry. More than 750 American daily newspapers have suspended publication in the last 20 years. It is also true that a great many of the 1,750 newspapers now published in this country are at present barely able to continue publishing in the light of newsprint price increases. It is fair to assume that many of these publications will be forced to suspend publication, merge, or dispose of their holdings, thus further reducing essential newspaper and press service to the American people.

Shall we admit that this Congress is unable to do anything about this problem, which so vitally concerns the Nation? Free press and free speech are a cornerstone of our entire American system. Are we to stand idly by while Canadian newsprint manufacturers, acting in concert with every indication of a ruthless monopoly, take another more dangerous strangle hold upon the American press?

I have protested this matter to the Department of State and have requested immediate action to try to relieve the situation.

We have cooperated in many ways with our Canadian friends and neighbors and I believe that we are entitled to fair consideration from them in this vital matter. At least they should be willing to protect our free American press from monopolistic and price-gouging practices.

Since I understand that large amounts of newsprint have been purchased from Canadian sources with Marshall-plan and foreign-aid funds, I am urging appropriate officials of that agency to discontinue all such purchases in the future.

Since it is my further understanding that this country is now negotiating for the purchase of large quotas of aluminum from Canadian sources, I am asking officials in charge of these negotiations to withhold action until such time as we can be assured of fair prices for newsprint to our American publishers and newspapers.

Let me add that I have high regard for the Government and people of Canada and I hesitate to say anything here which would reflect in any way upon the fine relations we enjoy with them. However, the Government and the people of Canada are evidently to be distinguished from the gang of economic buccaneers, who have rigged up the unconscionable plan to mulct our American newspaper industry.

Unless we can secure fair prices for Canadian newsprint, it is clear to me that we shall have to explore other possibilities of sources of supply, including synthetic manufacturing so as to free our newspaper industry of what seems to be plain extortion.

There is another phase of this question, which I intend to explore—the effect, if any, of price-fixing rulings by OPS upon the supply of pulpwood, which is used in making newsprint. Every angle of this matter should be scrupulously explored and I am calling for vigorous action on the part of appropriate Government officials to try to find a solution to a situation that threatens our newspapers and publishing industry, indeed, our free press.

I am also bringing this matter to the attention of the President so that he may take such action as to him seems fitting in the dire circumstances.

[From Editor and Publisher of May 17, 1952]

BRITISH PRESS ENJOYS NEWSPRINT PRICE CUT

(By Doris Willens)

LONDON.—Fatter newspapers and cheaper newsprint are on the way for Britain.

As of May 19 the controlled price of newsprint will be reduced by $8 a ton from the current price of about $188 a ton. A larger reduction is expected in the second half of the year.

"The situation has changed in a most remarkable way," F. P. Bishop, chairman of the Newsprint Supply Co., said.

"We have passed almost overnight from a seller's market to a buyer's market in news-

print. The long-term cause is that consumption in the United States has been flattening out for the last few months while production in North America has been increasing.

"The short-term cause is that many markets have suddenly collapsed, Argentina, for example, and we have been able to take some of their supplies at a lower price and build up stock."

The Scandinavians this week offered Britain 73,000 tons for the second half of 1952—25,000 tons more than in the first half of the year. They also agreed to sell at about $55 a ton less than the old price.

In addition, British newsprint plants have been increasing their output by speeding up machinery. By March 1953, new machinery being installed by the Imperial Paper Mills should be running. This has a total capacity of 35,000 tons yearly.

Bowaters have made plans to construct a new machine with a 70,000-ton-a-year capacity at the Kemsley mills.

One of the first results of the cheaper newsprint and the increased supplies of it will be reduced advertising rates. Lord Beaverbrook's Daily Express set the pattern of passing reductions in costs along to advertisers several years ago. The paper has promised to do the same again. And as the Express goes, so goes Fleet Street.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LESINSKI and to include a speech he delivered on May 3.

Mr. RAMSAY on H. R. 287, pertaining to instructions to the jury and the right of the court to comment on the weight of the evidence.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMAS and to include an editorial appearing in the Houston Post of May 18.

Mr. MEADER to revise and extend his remarks on the mutual security bill and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK and to include a quotation from a paper.

Mr. ROSS and to include a speech by Mr. T. V. Houser, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $189.

Mr. HALE and to include a letter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MORTON and to include an editorial.

Mr. MCDONOUGH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SADLAK and to include a resolution.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL in three instances.

Mr. ASPINALL and to include an editorial.

Mr. MURDOCK in two instances and in one to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SITTLER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. HÉBERT and to include an address by Admiral W. K. Phillips on Armed Services Day in New Orleans.

Mr. BLATNIK and to include a magazine article.

Mr. WILLIS and to include an editorial.

Mr. VORYS and to include tables in the remarks he made today.

Mr. REED of New York (at the request of Mr. VORYS) in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCGREGOR (at the request of Mr. VORYS) in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAGUE (at the request of Mr. VORYS).

Mr. MILLER of New York (at the request of Mr. VORYS) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. CARNAHAN) and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 148. An act for the relief of Gerdina Josephina Van Delft;

S. 420. An act for the relief of Gloria Wilson;

S. 603. An act for the relief of Wanda Charwat, and her daughter, Wanda Aino Charwat;

S. 695. An act for the relief of William Greville Birkett;

S. 794. An act for the relief of Mrs. Shu-Ting Liu Hsia and her daughter, Lucia;

S. 869. An act for the relief of Marie Cafcalaki;

S. 897. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thanos Mellos, Michel Mellos, and Hermine Fahnl;

S. 992. An act for the relief of Daniel Wolkonsky and his wife, Xenia Wolkonsky;

S. 1189. An act for the relief of Anthony Lombardo;

S. 1192. An act for the relief of Demetrius Alexander Jordan;

S. 1420. An act for the relief of Pinfang Hsia;

S. 1494. An act for the relief of George Georgacopoulos;

S. 1517. An act to amend the Act of June 4, 1897, entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for other purposes," as amended, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to sell without advertisement forest timber in amounts not exceeding $2,000 in appraised value;

S. 1565. An act for the relief of Andy Dursik;

S. 1765. An act for the relief of Harumi Kamiaka;

S. 1766. An act for the relief of Frederic James Mercado;

S. 1879. An act for the relief of Ernest Nanpei Ihrig;

S. 2033. An act for the relief of Giuseppa S. Boyd;

S. 2034. An act for the relief of Charlotte Elizabeth Cason;

S. 2051. An act for the relief of Naomi Saito;

S. 2145. An act for the relief of certain displaced persons;

S. 2220. An act for the relief of Theresa Hatcher;

S. 2588. An act for the relief of Dulcie Ann Steinhardt Sherlock; and

S. 2770. An act for the relief of Matheos Alafouzos.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 20, 1952, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4949. An act to amend the act of February 10, 1920, so as to provide for free blank ammunition for veterans' organizations for use in connection with the funeral ceremonies of deceased veterans, and for other ceremonial purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 22, 1952, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1453. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed provisions pertaining to appropriations for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1953 (H. Doc. No. 470); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1454. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments rendered against the United States, as provided by various laws, in the amount of $2,133,012.59, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay indefinite interest and costs and to cover increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency (H. Doc. No. 471); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1455. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce on the activities and transactions of the Administration for the period January 1, 1952, through March 31, 1952, pursuant to section 13 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1456. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the sixteenth annual report of the National Labor Relations Board for the year ended June 30, 1951, pursuant to section 3 (c) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1457. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting lists containing the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in the employ or under the supervision of the National Labor Relations Board for the year ended June 30, 1951, pursuant to section 3 (c) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1458. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 7714. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1958). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANFUSO: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 7641. A bill to provide benefits for certain Federal employees of Japanese ancestry who lost certain rights with respect to grade, time in grade, and rate of compensation by reason of any policy or program of the Federal Government with respect to persons of Japanese ancestry during World War II; without amendment (Rept. No. 1975). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 7241. A bill to authorize payment to the Empire District Electric Co. for reasonable costs of protecting its Ozark Beach power plant from the backwater of Bull Shoals Dam; with amendment (Rept. No. 1959). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1855. An act for the relief of Joachim Volk, also known as Steven Craig Delano; without amendment (Rept. No. 1960). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1953. An act for the relief of Midori Sugimoto; without amendment (Rept. No. 1961). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2029. An act for the relief of Debra Elaine Evans; without amendment (Rept. No. 1962). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2462. An act for the relief of Teruo Uechi; without amendment (Rept. No. 1963). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2554. An act for the relief of Eugene Richard Sushko; without amendment (Rept. No. 1964). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2571. An act for the relief of Ernest Daniel Davis, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1965). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2593. An act for the relief of Jean Hamamoto, also known as Sharon Lea Brooks; without amendment (Rept. No. 1966). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2643. An act for the relief of Kathleen Cowley; without amendment (Rept. No. 1967). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2768. An act for the relief of Barbara Ann Sheppard; without amendment (Rept. No. 1968). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2805. An act for the relief of Susan Jeanne Kerr; without amendment (Rept. No. 1969). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1092. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mercedes Hernandez Saguar; with amendment (Rept. No. 1970). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1490. A bill for the relief of Henryk Kramarski; with amendment (Rept. No. 1971). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2166. A bill for the relief of Sister Anita (Vincenzina Di Franco); without amendment (Rept. No. 1972). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2661. A bill for the relief of Mario Farabullini and Alla Farabullini, his wife; with amendment (Rept. No. 1973). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3154. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Liane Lieu and her son, Peter Lieu; with amendment (Rept. No. 1974). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H. R. 7930. A bill to terminate the manufacturers' excise tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 7931. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Old-Age and Retirement Benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 7932. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 7933. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 7934. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 7935. A bill for the relief of the city of Kirkland, Wash.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. J. Res. 456. Joint resolution to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 so as to abolish the Wage Stabilization Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. J. Res. 457. Joint resolution to amend sections 1606 and 1607 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. J. Res. 458. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the taxation and borrowing powers of the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Res. 647. Resolution to amend clause (b) (3) of rule X of the House rules; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HART: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey memorializing the Congress of the United States to return to the State of New Jersey and other States sufficient moneys from taxes raised in the various States for the administration of employment security and to provide adequately for administration of the employment security program in the State of New Jersey and other States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 7936. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Maria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 7937. A bill for the relief of Inge Sanger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 7938. A bill for the relief of Sonia Sookhdeo Wall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 7939. A bill for the relief of Tom Kwok Hee, Tom Kwok Jing, Tom Shim Goon, and Tom Lai Goon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 7940. A bill for the relief of Theresia Hotter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 7941. A bill for the relief of Masako Kato and her minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 7942. A bill for the relief of Evangelos J. Demetriades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7943. A bill for the relief of Jean Rudiano (also known as Ivan Rudenko); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 7944. A bill for the relief of Kerupe Herant Liman, Mrs. Violet Liman and Hilda Annik Liman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 7945. A bill for the relief of Mie Kuniyoshi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 7946. A bill for the relief of Maurice Ghnassia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

739. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the mayor of Cidra, P. R., requesting that the Congress of the United States approve the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received for the first calendar quarter of 1952.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1952:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the RECORD, lengthy answers are abridged.)

File two copies with the Secretary of the Senate and file three copies with the Clerk of the House of Representatives.
This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.
Place an "X" below the appropriate letter or figure in the box at the right of the "Report" heading below:
"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.
"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19.....	REPORT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT	P	QUARTER			
			1st	2d	3d	4th
		(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) In General: This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee," state in Item "B" the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee.")
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer," write "None" in answer to Item "B."
(b) Separate Reports.—An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report.
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING.—(1) State name, address, and nature of business; (2) If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers; except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—Section 302 (e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place ☐ an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) description, (b) quantity distributed, (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed.)

4. *If* this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. *If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C 4" and fill out Items "D" and "E" on the back of this page.* Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

NOTE ON ITEM "D".—(a) In General. The term "contribution" includes *anything of value*. When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302 (a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution, under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOAN:):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value.
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter

5. $_____Received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")

7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more (from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors? Please answer "yes" or "no": _____
14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter, total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor* ("*Period*" from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N. Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(a) In General. "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302 (b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered items is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures

9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of, the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following headings: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7–11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshblanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7–15, 8–15, 9–15: Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D. C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

A. Active Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, post-office box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
C. (2) To aid in the passage of H. R. 1526, H. R. 1995, and H. R. 2273.
D. (6) $1,291.
E. (2) $420.86; (4) $435.64; (5) $51.35; (6) $5; (7) $179.27; (9) $1,092.12.

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Strategic minerals, including manganese.
E. (4) $231.23; (6) $4.35; (7) $124.05; (8) $5.25; (9) $364.88; (11) $364.88; (15) $228.63, the Public Printer, Washington, D. C., reprints.

A. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Generally any legislation which will affect the aircraft manufacturing industry. (3) Annual Report of the President for 1951.
D. (6) $4,705.81.
E. (1) $4,500; (4) $205.81; (9) $4,705.81; (11) $4,705.81; (15) $4,500, Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., public relations counsel; $89.45, The Judges, Inc., Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C., writing letters; $33.61, Lithographic Photo Services, Inc., 1713 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D. C., plates for printing annual report; $82.75, George A. Simonds & Co., 1250 Taylor Street, Washington, D. C., fold, stitch, and trim annual reports.

A. Roy G. Allman, 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Until section 8 of the War Claims Act of 1948 is passed and an equitable treaty to Americans with Japan is passed.
E. (5) $30; (6) $20; (7) $50; (9) $100.

A. American Cancer Society, 47 Beaver Street, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $4,374.99; (7) $656.56; (9) $5,031.55.

A. American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico, Edificio Bearn, Plaza Santos Degollado, Mexico, D. F.
C. (2) I. R. C. section 116 (a), to exempt from United States income taxes income derived from sources abroad by nonresident United States citizens actively engaged in a trade or business abroad.

A. American Coalition, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) American Coalition is a patriotic, nonprofit organization representing organizations of like character, the purpose of which is to promote patriotism and a better understanding of the American form of government and to preserve it against attack.
D. (6) $3,052.27.
E. (2) $750; (4) $96.70; (5) $893.08; (6) $103.49; (9) $1,843.27.

A. American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation involving the practice of medicine and all national health insurance legislation.
D. (6) $62,270.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203–A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the cotton textile industry, including tariffs, corporate taxes, price and production controls.
D. (6) $3,985.82.
E. (2) $3,187.08; (5) $232.70; (6) $107.26; (7) $458.78; (9) $3,985.82; (11) $3,985.82; (15) $1,524.30, Robert C. Jackson, 416 Argyle Drive, Alexandria, Va., salary and expenses; $805.67, C. G. Caffrey, 215 South Royal Street, Alexandria, Va., salary and expenses; $524.35, C. T. Murchison, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary and expenses; $93, Irma J. Irwin, 2120 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary; etc.[1]

A. American Dental Association, 22 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) To protect and further the interests of the public and the dental profession in matters of patents, legislation, and regulations, and to disseminate information which will assist the constituent and component societies in their problems involving the enactment and enforcement of legislation involving the dental health of the public or the practice of dentistry.
D. (6) $7,493.13.
E. (2) $6,278.88; (5) $52.71; (6) $144; (7) $1,017.55; (9) $7,493.13; (11) $7,493.13; (15) $2,425.90, Francis J. Garvey, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill., salary; $1,316.34, B. J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill., salary; $1,041, O. O. Norberg, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill., salary; $741, H. Hofener, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill., salary; $75, E. Harold Gale, 142 Washington Avenue, Albany, N. Y., reimbursement of expenditures for secretarial services; etc.[1]

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; and 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests cover primarily the fields of legislation affecting agriculture. (3) Nation's Agriculture and News Letter.
D. (6) $49,634.
E. (2) $13,624; (4) $3,449; (5) $1,809; (6) $1,654; (7) $574; (9) $21,110; (11) $21,110; (15) $1,133.84, Franklin Duplicating Service, Washington, D. C., mimeographing; $185.50, Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C., dinner expenses; $970.66, Kable Printing Co., Mount Morris, Ill., printing; $1,313.33, Mercury Press, Inc., Washington, D. C., printing.

A. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the interest of working people. (3) American Federationist.
E. (1) $7,159.92; (2) $13,314.98; (4) $3,697.94; (5) $1,025; (9) $25,197.84; (11) $25,197.84; (15) $7,159.92, Furman Feiner & Co., 117 West Forty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y., radio; $3,697.94, Ransdell, Inc., 605 Rhode Island Avenue NE., Washington, D. C., printing; $2,754, W. C. Hushing, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., salary; $2,364, W. J. Mason, 311 Holly Avenue, Takoma Park, Md., salary; $2,364, G. D. Biley, 2100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., salary; etc.[1]

A. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Oppose S. 1202; for S. 1318, H. R. 3599, H. R. 3560, H. R. 3581, H. R. 3640, H. R. 3747, H. R. 3762, H. R. 3769, H. R. 3805, H. R. 3809, H. R. 3836, H. R. 3848, H. R. 3902, H. R. 4912, H. R. 4748, H. R. 4051, S. 2652, S. 1874.
D. (6) $7,462.08.
E. (2) $1,000; (4) $50; (5) $150; (6) $35; (7) $125; (9) $1,360.

A. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation which may affect the ability of hospitals to render good care or which may affect hospital care for the American people.
D. (6) $12,677.66.
E. (2) $7,493.75; (4) $866.23; (5) $940.14; (6) $305.21; (7) $874.62; (8) $747.71; (9) $10,727.66; (11) $10,727.66.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the industry.
D. (6) $19,549.59.
E. (2) $9,218.84; (9) $12,868.43; (15) $3,750, M. O. Ryan, Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C., salary; $1,875, Charles R. Richey, Washington, D. C., salary; $2,250, Edward A. McCabe, Washington, D. C., salary.

A. The American Legion, National Headquarters, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II, and their dependents, on all matters affecting their care, rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanism, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities, with particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agriculture development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil-aviation programs and policies, and the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services, etc. (3) American Legion magazine, Legislative Bulletin, and Merchant Marine Bulletin.
D. (6) $51,230.59.
E. (1) $3,208.15; (2) $12,713.76; (4) $10,222.90; (5) $1,920.87; (6) 441.81; (7) $3,377.49; (9) $31,884.98; (11) $31,884.98; (15).[1]

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All prospective legislation which will or may affect the life-insurance business.
D. (6) $3,845.38.
E. (2) $2,824; (5) $436.11; (6) $40.11; (7) $545.16; (9) $3,845.38; (11) $3,845.38.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) The general legislative interest of the American Medical Association is to advance the science and art of medicine.[1]
D. (6) $225,000.
E. (1) $50,000; (2) $28,933.49; (5) $5,101.25; (6) $841.47; (7) $946.78; (8) $10,456.21; (9) $96,279.20; (11) $96,279.20; (15) $50,000, Whitaker & Baxter, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., public relations; $833.33, H. L. Rust & Co., 1001 Fifteenth Street SW., Washington, D. C., rent; $75, Press Association, Inc., 50 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y., telephone and telegraph; $5,000, J. S. Lawrence, M. D., A. M. A., Washington office, postage, etc.[1]

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Proposed legislation supported or opposed: Price controls, slaughter quotas, hide exports, transportation legislation, meat-inspection appropriation, foot-and-mouth disease, land legislation, etc. (3) American Cattle Producer.
D. (6) $20,510.36.
E. (2) $6,750; (6) $151.24; (7) $1,693.27; (8) $202.64; (9) $8,797.15; (11) $8,797.15.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. American Optometric Association, Inc., 111 East North Street, Fostoria, Ohio.
C. (2) In addition to the bills listed in the previous report, all of which have some relation direct or indirect to the practice of the profession of optometry: S. 2325, S. 2552, S. 2714, S. 2738; H. R. 7320, H. R. 6319, H. R. 6921, H. R. 6720.
E. (2) $3,175; (5) $31.71; (6) $113.54; (7) $27.44; (9) $3,347.69; (11) $3,347.69.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Bills affecting the public health, such as H. R. 910 and S. 2301, Nurses Education Aid; S. 1245 and S. 2337, Emergency Maternity and Infant Care; S. 1140, Federal Department of Health; S. 1, Universal Military Training.
D. (6) $541.93.
E. (4) $89.14; (6) $8.79; (9) $541.93; (11) $541.93.

A. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those affecting the pulp and paper industry, its operations, practices and properties.
D. (6) $295.
E. (2) $250; (6) $25; (7) $20; (9) $295; (11) $295.

A. American Parents' Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C., and 52 Vanderbilt Ave., New York, N. Y.
C. (2) National school health services bill, public-school construction bill, national child research bill, Federal aid for medical education, local public health units, physically handicapped children's education bill, school-lunch appropriation, Children's Bureau appropriation, cabinet status for the Federal Security Agency, Federal aid to day-care centers in defense areas, Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools, emergency maternal and infant care, defense housing and community facilities.
D. (6) $5,903.62.
E. (2) $1,155.18; (4) $37.14; (5) $541.84; (6) $52.09; (8) $336; (9) $2,122.25.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.
D. (6) $32,675.
E. (2) $5,625; (5) $3,400; (6) $258; (7) $1,435; (9) $10,718; (11) $10,718; (15) $3,387.42, J. E. Kane, Washington, D. C., salary and expenses; $3,672.65, J. L. Dwyer, Washington, D. C., salary and expenses; $258, Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone calls.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests include all measures affecting the pulpwood industry, its practices or properties.

A. American Pyrotechnics Association, 6711 Loch Raven Boulevard, Baltimore, Md.
C. (2) Pending and proposed legislation affecting the pyrotechnics industry including, but not limited to the following bills: H. R. 4528, H. R. 4675, H. R. 6722.
D. (6) $5,500.
E. (2) $3,125; (6) $97.96; (7) $177.25; (9) $3,400.21; (11) $3,400.21.

A. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Government, with its suppliers, with its employees, and with its customers.[1]
D. (6) $42,010.03.
E. (2) $8,750; (4) $150.77; (5) $785.83; (6) $430.15; (7) $316.26; (9) $10,433.01; (11) $10,433.01.

A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,869.30.
E. (2) $250; (4) $345.27; (5) $418.27; (6) $52.30; (7) $803.46; (9) $1,869.30; (11) $1,869.30; (15).[1]

A. American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 5505, H. R. 6843, S. 2791.
D. (6) $16,750.
E. (2) $8,706; (4) $1,410.47; (5) $2,986.31; (6) $162.94; (7) $441.11; (8) $808.82; (9) $14,515.65; (11) $14, 515.65; (15) $875.24, Chas. F. Noyes Co., 40 Wall Street, New York City, N. Y., rent and electricity; $46.47, Graham Stationery Co., 26 West Forty-fourth Street, New York City, stationery and supplies; $80.19, Aetna Printing Co., 64 Reade Street, New York City, stationery; $158.37, New York Telephone Co., P. O. Box O., New York City, telephone service; $52, Congressional Quarterly, Washington, D. C., news service; etc.[1]

A. American Textile Machinery Association (formerly National Association of Textile Machinery Manufacturers), Whitinsville, Mass.
C. (2) The general legislative interests of the association consist of matters affecting the textile machinery industry. The specific legislative interest of the association during the period covered by this report was H. R. 1012, relating to the duty-free importation into the United States of textile machinery destined for textile schools.
E. (2) $255.69; (9) $255.69; (11) $255.69; (15) $255.69, Herrick, Smith, Donald, Farley & Ketchum, 1 Federal Street, Boston 10, Mass., fees and expenses.

A. AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Concerned with veterans' legislation, UMT, Reserve legislation, general welfare and Americanism programs. (3) National AMVET.

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 4059, copyright amendment bill, relating to the manufacturing clause; Senate Resolution 253, calling on Tariff Commission to make section 336 investigation on pottery; H. R. 3711, photoengraving; temporary free importation of samples under bond; Senate Joint Resolution 122, bill on executive agreements.
D. (6) $4,142.72.
E. (1) $4,110.76; (5) $40.28; (6) $47.50; (7) $57.07; (8) $4,255.61; (15).[1]

A. Paul A. Amundsen, 919 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Association of Port Authorities, 919 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation involving submerged lands, shipping, Panama Canal tolls, foreign trade zones, river and harbor developments, etc.
D. (6) $1,149.99.

A. Angelina & Neches River R. R. Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.
C. (2) General legislation affecting Texas railroads.[1]

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (2) $4,374.99; (8) $1,214.74; (9) $5,589.73.

A. Richard H. Anthony, 19 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. The American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 5505, H. R. 6843, S. 2791.
D. (6) $3,125.
E. (7) $68.43; (9) $68.43.

A. Hector M. Aring, 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Tax legislation, labor legislation, amendments to the Clayton Act, merchant marine legislation, price basing point legislation, Defense Production Act, wage stabilization legislation, St. Lawrence waterways.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (8) $950.38; (9) $950.38.

A. W. C. Arnold, 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West Forty-fifth Street, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $900; (7) $33.96; (9) $933.96.

A. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the construction industry.
E. (9) $6,500.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Proposed legislation affecting physicians and surgeons in the practice of their profession.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (4) $1,500; (9) $1,500.

A. Association of American Railroads,[1] 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Generally to keep informed with respect to legislation affecting transportation; to support such legislation as members of the Association of American Railroads believe to be in their interest and in the interest of a sound national transportation policy; and to oppose legislation which they believe to be contrary to such interests.[1] (3).[1]
D. (6) $73,931.81.
E. (2) $42,738.87; (3) $10,000; (4) $10,790.33; (5) $4,520.56; (6) $395.10; (7) $636.77; (8) $4,850.18; (9) $73,931.81; (15).[1]

A. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies,[1] 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) $1,661.78.
E. (2) $1,302.85; (4) $39.87; (5) $94.53; (6) $30.69 (7) $72.99; (8) $120.85; (9) $1,661.78.

A. Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any and all Federal legislative proposals which do or may affect the western railroads.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation regarding labor laws and revenue act.
E. (2) $125; (11) $125.

A. Atlantic Union Committee, Inc., 537 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (7) $27,348.79.
E. (2) $18,401.06; (4) $4,565.90; (5) $1,424.37; (6) $1,036.31; (7) $3,902.13; (8) $955.06; (9) $30,284.83; (15).[1]

A. Awalt, Clark & Sparks, 822 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All Federal legislation that might affect electric utilities.[1]
D. (6) $6,250.
E. (6) $9.32; (7) $38.32; (9) $77.64.

A. Charles E. Babcock, route 4, box 73, Vienna, Va.
B. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, 3025–3029 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Restriction of immigration; improvement of free public schools; suppression of communism; any other legislation we consider patriotic to support or object to.
D. (7) $249.99.
E. (5) $60; (6) $7.25; (7) $35.20; (8) $16.30; (9) $118.55.

A. Frazer A. Bailey, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 241, H. R. 4729, S. 2432, S. 2487, S. 1142, Senate Joint Resolution 27, H. R. 6947, H. R. 7072, H. R. 7289. (3) The American Merchant Marine.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. John A. Baker, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (home office); 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C. (legislative office).
C. (2) Legislation of interest to the National Farmers Union.
D. (6) $2,925.

A. Mary Alice Baldinger, 4607 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Civil Liberties Union, 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are antilynching, antipoll tax, omnibus civil rights, FEPC, home rule for the District of Columbia, statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, immigration legislation.
D. (6) $400.
E. (5) $23; (6) $9.06; (7) $11.40; (9) $43.46.

A. H. M. Baldrige, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that refers to sugar generally and the refining of raw cane sugar specifically.
D. (6) $6,000.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Joseph H. Ball, 1713 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Shipowners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Hartman Barber, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation affecting labor, particularly railroad labor.
D. (6) $1,860.45.
E. (6) $175.19; (7) $224.19; (8) $514.62; (9) $914.

A. Fowler W. Barker, 17 Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of Professional Photogrammetrists, 17 Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To get invoked section 251, paragraph 9 of the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949, for photogrammetric map-making contractors to Government.
D. (6) $5,000.
E. (2) $50; (9) $50.

A. James T. Barnes, 203 Capital Club Building, Raleigh, N. C.
B. Medical Society of the State of North Carolina, Raleigh, N. C.
C. (2) H. R. 14, 87, 149, 274, 346, 417, 483, 913, 910, 1140, 1272, 1368, 1502, 1545, 1644, 1752, 1781, 3298, 3456, 4079, 4212, 4371, 4373, 4405, 4473, 4519, 4549, 4569, 4577, 4579, 4605, 4723, 4912, 5414, 5426, 5718, 5853; H. Res. 38; S. 1, 101, 337, 349, 351, 445, 1186, 1328, 2171, 2246, 2247, 2248, 1140, 1714, 1848, 1875, 2301, 2325, 2337.
E. (2) $2,100; (6) $2,100.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation that might affect electric utility companies.[1]
D. (6) $4,562.50.
E. (6) $3.41; (7) $138.24; (8) $23.20; (9) $164.85.

A. Irvin Barney, Jr., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) H. R. 6525 and S. 2639, to amend Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act and all legislation affecting railroad employees in particular and labor in general.
D. (6) $1,900.

A. A. K. Barta, 810 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Proprietary Association, 810 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting proprietary medicines industry.
E. (7) $100; (9) $100.

A. J. A. Beirne, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union.

A. Julia D. Bennett, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting libraries and librarians.[1]
E. (2) $5,805; (3) $16; (4) $144.36; (5) $5; (11) $5,970.36.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) H. R. 6525 and S. 2639, identical bills to amend Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; all legislation affecting railroad employees in particular and labor in general.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Wendell Berge, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Associated Third Class Mail Users, Inc., 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting third-class postal rates.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (8) $8; (9) $8; (11) $8; (12) $500; (14) $2,158.17.

A. Preston B. Bergin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Government, with its suppliers, with its employees, and with its customers.[1]
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (7) $6.50; (9) $6.50; (11) $6.50.

A. Joe Betts, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act; inflation control (Defense Production Act of 1950); Government credit policies; Federal Reserve policy; Federal Food and Drug Act amendment; repeal of resale price maintenance; antitrust legislation; education, immigration legislation; Mexican farm labor importation; method for computing parity prices; farm machinery and supplies; fertilizer; agricultural labor; transportation legislation; Federal contributions to State unemployment insurance payments; Sugar Act extension; Marketing Facilities Act; increased lending authority for Export-Import Bank; amendment of Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; mutual-security program (foreign aid); Customs Simplification Act; amendment of BIR code relating to tax treatment of livestock; legislation to authorize allocation of livestock for slaughter; grazing land; postal rates; St. Lawrence seaway; taxation; tobacco; peanut oil provisions of agricultural legislation; ICC decision on prohibition of trip leasing; National Farmers Day; agricultural appropriations; ACP payments; REA; screw worm research appropriations; meat inspection funds appropriation; appropriation Agricultural Extension Service; Department of Agriculture reorganization; control and eradication of brucellosis; farm program; family farm policy review; establishment of revolving fund for financing exports of farm commodities; selective service, universal military training; fair trade pricing study; United States relationships to North Atlantic Treaty nations; farm credit legislation; appropriations for defense.
D. (6) $303.75.
E. (7) $126.59; (9) $126.59; (11) $126.59.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Marine Underwriters; the Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States; American Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange; American Marine Hull Insurance Syndicate.
C. (2) General questions affecting the insurance of ships and their cargoes against marine risks; reparations; subrogation.
E. (6) $9.42; (7) $36.06; (9) $45.48; (11) $45.48.

A. Norman E. Biorn, 520 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., 520 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Federal and State taxation and governmental expenditures.
D. (6) $155.
E. (2) $150; (5) $4.25; (9) $154.25; (11) $154.25.

A. John H. Bivins, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $600.
E. (7) $500; (9) $500; (11) $500.

A. William Rhea Blake, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $416.67.
E. (7) $218.96; (9) $218.96; (11) $218.96.

A. Charles B. Blankenship, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of this union.
D. (6) $2,892.93.
E. (2) $1,999.98; (6) $17.19; (7) $75.76; (9) $2,892.93.

A. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Insurance and reinsurance of war risks.

A. C. A. Bodary, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) H. R. 6525 and S. 2639 to amend Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; all legislative matters of interest to railway employees and labor in general.
D. (6) $2,275.

A. Morton Bodfish, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership and particularly helpful to savings and loan associations and cooperative banks in carrying out their thrift and home financing objectives and oppose legislation detrimental to home ownership and these institutions.
D. (6) $625.

A. John N. Bohannon, 75 Macon Avenue, Asheville, N. C., and 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting business in general, and particularly any advocated changes in public policy concerning fuels—coal, oil, and natural gas; or, any legislative action which might affect supply, production, gathering, transportation, sales or distribution of natural gas and the demand therefor by consumers.
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (5) $477.54; (6) $207.91; (7) $1,271.81; (9) $1,957.26; (11) $1,957.26.

A. Daniel L. Boland, 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Paint, Varnish and Laquer Association, Inc., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation that more or less specifically affects the paint, varnish, and lacquer industry.[1]
E. (7) $15.50; (9) $15.50.

A. Sanford H. Bolz, 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington D. C.
B. American Jewish Congress, 15 East Eighty-fourth Street, New York N. Y.
C. (2) To oppose anti-Semitism and racism in all its forms and to defend civil rights incident thereto.
D. (6) $125.
E. (6) $4.14; (7) $10.50; (9) $14.64; (11) $14.64.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting industry, including appropriations, tax polices, subsidies, controls over industry, etc.
D. (6) $1000.
E. (9) $191.28.

A. R. B. Bowden, 608 Hibbs Building, Washington D. C. or 100 Merchants Exchange St. Louis, Mo.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange St. Louis Mo.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the grain and feed trade.
D. (6) $4.500.
E. (7) $1,203.15; (9) $1,203.15.

A. H. B. Boyd, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting sugar, particularly the Sugar Act of 1948, and related legislation.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Charles M. Boyer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation for development of a military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security. (3) The Reserve Officer.

A. D. H. Brackett, Post Office Box 622, Atlanta, Ga.
C. (2) Legislation to require responsibility of city policemen and other petty arresting officers by being bonded or prohibited from carrying lethal weapons.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation involving or in the direction of national prohibition, taxation of alcoholic beverages, etc. (3) The Brewery Worker.
D. (6) $167.50.
E. (9) $167.50; (11) $167.50.

A. Harry R. Brashear, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting transportation matters in which members of the association are interested, particularly S. 2351, S. 2352, S. 2355, S. 2358, S. 2361, and S. 2362.

A. James M. Brewbaker, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting industry, including labor and tax policies, expenditures and subsidies, industrial mobilization, Government controls over industry, Government competition with private enterprise, etc.
D. (6) $3,375.
E. (9) $1,733.17.

A. O. O. Bright, 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Southern Pine Industry Committee, New Orleans, La.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the lumber-manufacturing industry.
D. (6) $1,320.
E. (7) $43.73; (9) $43.73; (11) $43.73.

A. M. H. Brightman, 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Dairy Industry Committee, 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the dairy industry.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. H. E. Brinckerhoff, 220 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those of employer.

A. Dawes E. Brisbine, 952 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 952 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation pending before the Congress dealing with Federal grants-in-aid to States for highways, or repeal, modification, or extension of Federal excise taxes on motor vehicles, gasoline, oil, tires, or auto parts.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation related specifically to food processing and farming.
D. (6) $1,200.
E. (6) $150; (7) $370; (9) $520; (11) $520.

A. A. E. Brooks, 408 Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
B. American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico, Edificio Bearn, Plaza Santos Degollado, Mexico, D. F.
C. (2) Internal Revenue Code, section 116 (a), to exempt from United States income taxes income derived from sources

abroad by nonresident United States citizens actively engaged in a trade or business abroad.

A. William P. Brooks, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Grain Trade Council, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting agriculture in general and the grain trade in particular.
D. (6) $5,642.01.

A. C. R. Brown, 10 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) H. R. 6525 and S. 2639, to amend Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; all legislation of interest to railway employees and labor in general.
D. (6) $1,070.82.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the NAEC.[1]
D. (6) $7,500.
E. (2) $6,825; (5) $375; (8) $42.50; (9) $7,242.50; (11) $7,242.50; (15).[1]

A. Paul W. Brown, 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Postal legislation.
D. (6) $712.93.
E. (6) $6.20; (7) $662.29; (9) $668.49; (11) $668.49.

A. Russell B. Brown, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation that might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the association.
E. (9) $10.15.

A. Jack Bryson, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the motion-picture industry when introduced in Congress.
D. (6) $6,280.79.
E. (7) $1,363.52; (8) $583.50; (9) $1,947.02; (11) $1,947.02; (15).[1]

A. Henry H. Buckman, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
C. (2) Potentially interested in all legislation affecting river and harbor works, flood control, and other water use and conservation, and related subjects.
D. (6) $1,350.
E. (6) $12.29; (8) $41.31; (9) $53.60; (11) $53.60.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. Budd Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Corporate income and excess-profits taxes.

A. George Bugbee, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,562.50.
E. (7) $200.50; (9) $200.50; (11) $200.50.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y., and 714 Bond Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y., and National Federation of Independent Business, 714 Bond Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in rubber tires bill, basing point legislation, antitrust law legislation, spare tire monopoly and all legislation affecting independent small business.
D. (6) $2,659.98.

A. Donald T. Burke, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation that might affect member electric utility companies.[1]
D. (6) $1,166.63.
E. (7) $222.31; (8) $23.75; (9) $246.06; (11) $246.03.

A. Harold Burke, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Assn., 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $5,199.
E. (2) $6,032.46; (5) 303.71; (6) $39.42; (7) $222.13; (9) $6,597.72; (11) $6,597.72.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 5653 College Avenue, Oakland, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation for the relief of the Burnham Chemical Co.
D. (6) $2,874.18.
E. (2) $1,360.40; (4) $383.81; (5) $365.09; (6) $22.44; (7) $731.54; (8) $10.90; (9) $2,874.18; (11) $2,874.18; (15).[1]

A. Robert M. Burr, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation regarding excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, electric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, electric fans, and legislation affecting imports of products into the United States.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation dealing with the electrical workers in particular and labor in general, such as attempts made by Congress to reduce annual and sick leave for Federal employees, and to support unemployment insurance coverage and other more liberal benefits for the workers.
D. (6) $2,067.

A. Eugene J. Butler, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting religious, charitable, and educational institutions and organizations.
D. (6) $2,475.
E. (7) $42.80; (9) $42.80; (11) $42.80.

A. George P. Byrne, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.
B. U. S. Wood Screw Service Bureau, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation, etc., for higher tariffs and import quotas for screws, nuts, rivets, and similar fasteners.

A. George P. Byrne, Jr., 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.
B. George P. Byrne, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation, etc., for higher tariffs and import quotas for screws, nuts, rivets, and similar fasteners.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203–A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
C. (2) H. R. 1724, renegotiation of contracts (Public Law 9, 82d Cong.); H. R. 5505, customs simplification, to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930; H. R. 4473 (Public Law 83, 82d Cong.), Revenue Act of 1951; H. R. 1612 (Public Law 50, 82d Cong.); Trade Agreements Act of 1951; Public Law 773, Eighty-first Congress; Public Law 96, Eighty-second Congress; Defense Production Act of 1950; amendments to Defense Production Act of 1951; S. 2645, to amend and extend Defense Production Act of 1950; S. 2557, awarding military contracts, distressed areas; S. 2504, Defense Unemployment Compensation Act of 1952; H. Res. 562, Allen resolution.
D. (6) $760.20.
E. (6) $3; (7) $12.47; (8) $30; (9) $45.47; (11) $45.47.

A. Leonard J. Calhoun, together with the firm of Harter and Calhoun, Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Avon Products, Inc., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, N. Y., and Beauty Counselors, Inc., 17108 Mack Avenue, Grosse Pointe, Mich.
C. (2) Excise tax on cosmetics, H. R. 4473, Revenue Act of 1951.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. Leonard J. Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Cordage Institute, 350 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 1005.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Leonard J. Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Internal revenue measures.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. R. B. Carothers, Paris, Tenn.
B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Inc., Paris, Tenn.; Kentucky-Tennessee Clay Co., Cooley Clay Co., Kentucky Clay Mining, Mayfield, Ky.; Bell Clay Co., Gleason, Tenn.; United Clay Mines Corp., Trenton, N. J.; Old Hickory Clay Co., Paducah, Ky.
C. (2) Retaining percentage depletion allowance for ball and sagger clays, allowed by section 114, Internal Revenue Code, title 26.
E. (6) $32.70; (7) $329.88; (8) $50; (9) $412.58; (11) $412.58.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. T. C. Carroll, President, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) At present working for passage of H. R. 6525 and S. 2639 to amend Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

A. Henderson H. Carson, George Washington Inn, Washington, D. C., and 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio.
B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1405 East Sixth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation of interest to natural gas industry.
D. (6) $3,198.80.
E. (1) $30; (2) $55; (3) $25; (4) $9; (5) $9.60; (6) $42.80; (7) $16.20; (8) $11.20; (9) $198.80.

A. Joseph K. Carson, Jr., Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Albert E. Carter, 1026 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.
B. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Retained to represent the company before administrative agencies and commissions and on legislative matters affecting company's interest.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (5) $634.86; (6) $99.92; (7) $394.29; (9) $1,129.07.

A. Clarence B. Carter, post office box 798, New Haven, Conn.
B. Railroad Pension Conference, post office box 798, New Haven, Conn.
C. (2) For enactment of H. R. 63 and S. 1308, 30-year, half-pay retirement; for enactment of H. R. 6525 and S. 2639, amended to be payable from first day of illness.
E. (7) $48.60; (9) $48.60.

A. D. E. Casey, 419 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Taxpayers Association, Inc., 419 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Lawrence J. Casey, Jr., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $1,109.50.
E. (7) $33.90; (8) $13.10; (9) $47.

A. Benjamin F. Castle, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Statutes or bills which affect the interests of milk dealers.
D. (6) $200.
E. (7) $3.50; (9) $3.50.

A. Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
C. (2) S. 75, Bridge Canyon Act, H. R. 1500 and H. R. 1501, Bridge Canyon Act known more frequently as central Arizona project bill; (3).[1]
D. (6) $5,326.
E. (1) $116.43; (2) $7,869.23; (3) $250; (4) $957.76; (5) $1,373.96; (6) $193.48; (7) $1,058.88; (8) $74.76; (9) $11,894.50; (15).[1]

A. William E. Chace, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eighty-first Congress as H. R. 2756, in the Eighty-second Congress such as S. 1693, and H. R. 1755.
D. (6) $70.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to business.[1] (3) Legislative Daily and Legislative Outlook.
D. (6) $994,134.15.
E. (9) $30,406.48.[1]

A. Walter Chamblin, Jr., 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting industry, labor, and tax policies, expenditures and subsidies, remobilization of industry, controls over industry, Government competition with private enterprise, etc.
D. (6) $10,246.99.
E. (9) $2,246.99.

A. Chase National Bank of the City of New York, 18 Pine Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.

A. Christian Amendment Movement, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.
C. (2) Promoting Senate Joint Resolution 29 and House Joint Resolution 156, a proposed Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States. (3) The Christian Patriot.
D. (6) $3,913.32.
E. (1) $1,115.84; (2) $1,702.45; (4) $668.38; (5) $150.33; (6) $8.46; (7) $75.60; (9) $3,721.06; (15) $527.30, Floyd Burres Printing Service, Harrison Street, Topeka, Kans., printing; $10.50, Arrow Engraving Co., North Kansas Avenue, Topeka, Kans., cuts; $75, Mrs. T. B. Boyle, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans., rent; $11.22, Crane & Co., East Eighth Street, Topeka, Kans., office supplies; $16.21, Capper Engraving Co., West Eighth Street, Topeka, Kans., cuts; etc.[1]

A. Elisabeth Christman, 1034 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

A. Citizens' Committee on Foreign Policy, 100 East Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Foreign policy.

A. David R. Clarke, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Metal Trades Association, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation affecting industry in general.

A. Robert M. Clark, 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Pending and prospective legislation affecting the interest of the railway company, including but not limited to the following bills: Railroad safety, H. R. 269; railroad switching service, S. 446; mail contract investigation, Senate Resolution 23; basing point, S. 719; transportation investigation, Senate Resolution 55; St. Lawrence waterway legislation; various bills to amend Railroad Retirement Act; various general and corporate tax bills; legislation to amend Reorganization Act of 1949; boxcar and railroad equipment shortage, S. 1918 and Senate Resolution 89; United States Code amendment, H. R. 270; all transportation bills pending before Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce under Senate Resolution 50.
D. (6) $4,400.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Oppose any proposed legislation, such as S. 491 and H. R. 4004, Eighty-first Congress, calling for the duplication of class I–A clear-channel frequencies or the limitation of the power of class I–A standard broadcast stations; opposes ratification of the so-called NA RBA agreement signed November 15, 1950.
E. (3) $71.25; (7) $607.36; (9) $678.61.

A. Herman Clott, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, Suite 412, Tabor Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Support all legislation in the interest of membership of organization and for the advancement of interest of membership; national bills favoring economic betterment of membership, wage and price legislation, and legislation dealing with civil rights and democracy.
D. (6) $1,287.

A. W. Frank Clucas, 1016 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Master Plumbers, 1016 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 2907, a bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes, and a continuing interest in all legislation that affects the building construction and piping industries. (3) Plumbing and heating business.
E. (2) $700; (8) $2,000; (9) $2,700.

A. Clarence F. Cockrell, 24 Mallow Hill Avenue, Baltimore, Md.
B. Active—Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
C. (2) To aid in the passage of H. R. 1526, H. R. 1995, and H. R. 2273.
D. (7) $120.
E. (6) $2.20; (7) $34.01; (8) $2.34; (9) $38.55; (11) $38.55.

A. Marcus Cohn, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Genocide, President's Civil Rights program, etc.
E. (2) $93.75; (5) $69.05; (6) $9.10; (7) $2.09; (9) $173.99.

A. C. Fred Coleman, Lewisville, Ark.
B. St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company, Lewisville, Ark.
C. (2) H. R. 6525 and S. 2639.
D. (6) $202.28.
E. (7) $675.75; (9) $675.75.

A. Russell Coleman, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacturer or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eighty-first Congress as H. R. 2756, and bills in the Eighty-second Congress such as S. 1693 and H. R. 1755.
D. (6) $100.

A. Marvin J. Coles, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Promotion of Tramp Shipping Under the American Flag in Foreign Commerce, 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The Committee is interested in amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction differential subsides to American flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades.
D. (7) $10,000.
E. (5) $2; (6) $16.82; (7) $31.25; (9) $50.07.

A. Colorado Associated Businessmen, Inc., 335 Symes Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) General legislative interests of the group is the taxing of competitive business on the same basis without regard to exemptions under section 101 of the present Internal Revenue Code.
D. (6) $170.
E. (1) $300; $28.75; (8) $30; (9) $358.75; (15) $300, Marion Strain, 1440 Welton Street, Denver, Colo., general public relations assistance; $28.75, Edna P. Hubbard, Symes Building, Denver, Colo., stenographic services; $15, Postmaster, Denver, Colo., postage stamps; $15, William P. Helm, Washington, D. C., subscription.

A. Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) All legislation both general and special that affects the Colorado railroads.[1]
E. (2) $280; (7) $242; (9) $522.

A. Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Opposing S. 75 and H. R. 1500, favoring passage of S. J. Res. 26 and H. J. Res. 21.
E. (1) $1,807.27; (2) $10,735; (4) $4,995.32; (5) $3,094.97; (6) $1,036.54; (7) $3,404.74; (9) $25,073.84; (15) $84.88, Advertising Designers, 1240 South Main Street, Los Angeles, art work; $59.07, Aldine Co., 232 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, office supplies; $51.68, Allen's Press Clipping Bureau, 124 West Fourth Street, Los Angeles, clipping service; $1,842.82, Anderson & Ritchie, 1932 Hyperion Avenue, Los Angeles, printing; $60.81, T. G. Armstrong, 548 Spreckels Building, San Diego, luncheon expenses; etc.[1]

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trucking Industry National Defense Committee, Inc.
E. (9) $727.95.

A. John C. Cone, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pan American World Airways, Inc., 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Supporting or opposing any aviation legislation that might have a bearing on the operation of Pan American World Airways, Inc.

A. Conference of American Small Business Organizations, Inc., 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Supporting all bills giving effect to Hoover Commission reports; opposed to S. 2325 and S. 2714; opposed to provision for loan powers in SDPA extension.
D. (6) $22,695.04.
E. (1) $6,680; (2) $6,372.92; (4) $1,458.20; (5) $1,928.13; (6) $213.29; (7) $345; (8) $250.01; (9) $1,274.48.

A. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, property, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives; (3) Legis-letter.
D. (6) $8,195.13.
E. (2) $1,875; (3) $4,000; (4) $617.95; (5) $405; (6) $950; (8) $347.18; (9) $8,195.13; (15) $975, Marguerite Nadonley, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., salary; $900, Patricia Shilby, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., salary; $4,000, CIO Housing Committee, 723 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., contribution; $67.95, Cornelius Printing Co., 912 Burlington Avenue, Silver Spring, Md., printing and distribution costs; $48.96, Congressional Quarterly, 723 Seventeenth Street NW, Washington, D. C., subscription, etc.[1]

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (6) $52.40; (7) $23.20; (9) $75.60.

A. The Consumers' Lobby, 826 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation directly affecting the consumer interest such as price-control provisions in the Defense Production Act (for); fair trade (against); and S. R. 169 (for).
D. (6) $269.
E. (4) $333.05; (5) $230.76; (6) $27.14; (8) $47.80; (9) $638.75; (15) $72.50, Weiss Printing House, 1202 North Fifth Street, Philadelphia 22, Pa., printing; $195, J. B. Willis, 826 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C., rent; $15, Selma Berns, 112 Mineola Boulevard, Mineola, N. Y., mimeographing; $30.60, Congressional Quarterly News Features, 1156 Nineteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C., subscription; $136, Fontana Lithographers, 811 North Capitol Street, Washington 2, D. C., advertising brochure, etc.[1]

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and those affecting the coal industry.
D. (6) $1,800.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Lime Association, 927 Fifteenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and particularly those affecting the lime industry.
D. (6) $4,000.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington 5, D. C.
B. William A. Sutherland, First National Bank Building, Atlanta, Ga.
C. (2) H. R. 3168.
D. (6) $500.

A. Cooperative Health Federation of America, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation which will raise health standards in the United States, particularly by the process of voluntary action on the part of citizens; particularly concerned with the development of public health services, the passage of legislation to help to bring about more adequate training and professional personnel in the medical profession such as legislation for Federal aid to medical schools and colleges.
D. (6) $300.
E. (2) $194; (5) $9; (6) $14; (9) $217.

A. Committee on National Affairs, 100 East Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $103.
E. (3) $100; (4) $12.36; (5) $38.63; (8) $259.65; (9) $410.64; (15) $100, Benjamin A. Javits, treasurer, 630 Fifth Avenue, New York City, for Jacob K. Javits campaign deficit; $100, Friends of Democracy, Inc. 137 East Fifty-seventh Street., New York City, research work; $38.63, Abco Press, Inc., 121 East Twenty-fourth Street, New York City, letterheads; $12.36, New Era Lithograph Co., Inc., 495 Broadway, New York City, photo offsets; $159.65, New Era Letter Co., 495 Broadway, New York City, lettershop work.

A. Committee for the Nation's Health, 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) President Truman's National Health Plan as embodied in H. R. 27, and H. R. 54; also interested in the following measures: S. 337, S. 445, H. R. 1781, H. R. 2152, H. R. 516, H. R. 910, H. R. 274, H. R. 913, H. R. 14, H. R. 342, H. R. 146. (3)[1]
D. (6) $7,768.15.
E. (2) $7,113.62; (4) $1,958.56; (5) $1,414.83; (6) $262.85; (7) $332.46; (8) $105.72; (9) $11,188.04; (15).[1]

A. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, Box 1107, Shreveport, La.
C. (2) Legislation affecting petroleum pipelines; S. 1889, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act as amended and for other purposes, and H. R. 5632, a bill to require interstate oil pipelines to procure certificates of public convenience and necessity before construction of new or extension of existing lines.
D. (6) $69,914.
E. (2) $4,297.70; (5) $4,751.06; (6) $206.33; (7) $235.14; (8) $1,652.76; (9) $11,172.99.

A. Committee on the Present Danger, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The Mutual Security Act of 1951 amendment, etc.
D. (6) $250.
E. (2) $1,346.77; (5) $1,008.04; (6) $196.47; (7) $46.17; (8) $261.24; (9) $2,858.69; (15).[1]

A. Committee for Promotion of Tramp Shipping Under American Flag in Foreign Commerce, 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Interested in amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction differential subsidies to American flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades.
E. (1) $11,250; (11) $11,250; (15) $10,000, Ingoldsby, Coles & Wright, Washington Building, Washington, D. C., legal representation; $1,250, Seth Levine, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., consultant.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union. (3) CWA News and the CWA Newsletter.
D. (6) $1,160,651.15.
E. (2) $3,774.96; (4) $125.17; (6) $20.91; (7) $1,287.11; (9) $5,208.15.

A. John T. Corbett, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L. E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting labor and transportation.
D. (6) $3,295.56.
E. (5) $351.21; (6) $29.06; (7) $24.56; (9) $404.33.

A. Cordage Legislative Committee, 350 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,350.
E. (2) $1,200; (9) $1,200; (15) $1,200, Harter & Calhoun, Fifteenth and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., fee for services rendered.

A. J. G. Corona, suite 101, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General legislative interests cover any legislative proposals affecting the interests of the telegraph company in addition to my administrative duties at the company's Capital offices.
E. (7) $81.50; (9) $81.50.

A. Harold B. Corwin, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay and retirement benefits, and pensions, studying and analyzing bills, preparing statements for presentation to the cognizant committees. (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. John M. Costello, 3434 Porter Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American League for an Undivided Ireland, care of Charles T. Rice, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation which may help to effectuate the unification of all Ireland.
D. (7) $864.24.
E. (1) $114.24; (9) $114.24.

A. Council for Clarification of Pricing Practices, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Good faith competition; S. 719 and H. R. 2820.
D. (6) $1,125.

A. Nathan E. Cowan, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $2,785.
E. (7) $910; (9) $910.

A. W. W. Coxe, 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
B. Norfolk and Western Railway Co., 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.

A. Charles J. Crampton, 700 Insurance Building, San Antonio, Tex.
B. State Tax Association, P. O. Box 2559, Houston, Tex.
C. (2) A continuous study of State and Federal tax legislation and administrative rulings and court decisions in tax matters affecting community property taxpayers inequitably.
D. (6) $231.25.
E. (7) $231.25; (9) $231.25.

A. M. F. Crass, Jr., 246 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 246 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the chemical industry.
D. (6) $244.50.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madson, Wis.
C. (2) Legislation affecting credit unions.
D. (6) $46,646.21.
E. (2) $408.33; (7) $13.75; (9) $422.08.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 922 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) All legislation both general and special that affects the Colorado railroads.[1]

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Refractories Co., 1520 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; A. P. Green Fire Brick Co., Mexico, Mo.; Harbison-Walker Refractories Co., Farmers Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.; North American Refractories Co., Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation involving percentage depletion allowances.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Margery Durant Green, 1 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Conn.
C. (2) To extend to the estates of living incompetents the benefits of the Technical Changes Act of 1949.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of W. D. Johnson, deceased, 900 Walnut Street, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) Amendment of section 1000 (e) of Internal Revenue Code to permit an executor or administrator to release the powers of disposition where the decedent was under a disability during his lifetime.
E. (6) $21.06; (7) $7.25; (9) $28.31.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. New Process Co., Warren, Pa.
C. (2) Legislation and proceedings relating to postal rates.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. John C. Cuneo, Post Office Box 1054, Modesto, Calif.
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) H. R. 2678 and H. R. 2679, the Townsend plan bills.
D. (6) $1,356.52.
E. (5) $544.30; (6) $164.55; (7) $144.27; (8) $241.98; (9) $1,095.10.

A. Ralph E. Curtiss, 944 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting tavern and restaurant industry.
D. (6) $2,100.
E. (4) $15.41; (6) $24.56; (7) $33.10; (8) $1.02; (9) $74.09.

A. William L. Daley, 911 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Editorial Association, 222 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago 1, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 3760, H. R. 2682, H. R. 505, H. R. 2516, S. 1137, S. 719, H. R. 3341, H. R. 5575, S. 436, H. R. 5379, H. Res. 423, H. R. 5056, H. R. 4745, H. R. 5204, H. R. 4741, S. 2170, S. 2645, H. R. 6546, H. R. 5306, S. 658, H. R. 6600, H. R. 6250, H. R. 6239, S. 2504, H. R. 6174, H. R. 7315, H. R. 7326, H. R. 2188, H. R. 1514, S. 672, H. Res. 116, S. 106, H. R. 1768, H. R. 116, H. R. 525, H. R. 7151, H. R. 7072, H. R. 7391, H. R. 7314, H. R. 7269, H. R. 6892, H. R. 7030, H. R. 7434, H. R. 6925, H. R. 7153, H. Res. 561, H. Res. 520, S. 2957, S. 2198, S. 2945, H. R. 7339. (3) The National Publisher.
D. (6) $825.
E. (5) $44.05; (6) $56.69; (7) $100; (8) $72.10; (9) $272.84; (15).[1]

A. William V. Dameron, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

A. John A. Danaher, 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn., and 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.
C. (2) H. R. 227 and similar legislation dealing with distribution of motor vehicle tires and prevention of manufacturers from selling goods at retail.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. John A. Danaher, 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio.
C. (2) H. R. 277 and similar legislation dealing with distribution of motor-vehicle tires and prevention of manufacturers from selling goods at retail.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Paul J. Daugherty, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
C. (2) Proposals in the fields of taxation, general appropriations, old-age and survivors insurance, unemployment compensation, industrial development and other management problems.
D. (6) $2,749.98.
E. (7) $222.36; (9) $222.36.

A. Aled P. Davies, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the meat-packing industry.
D. (6) $2,692.34.
E. (6) $317.87; (7) $4,251.20; (8) $81.39; (9) $4,650.46.

A. Sherlock Davis, 1117 Barr Building, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Anything which pertains to sugar or trade with Cuba.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Homer R. Davison, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the meat-packing industry.
D. (6) $500.
E. (4) $5.16; (6) $9.77; (7) $352.54; (8) $62.41; (9) $429.88.

A. Robert N. Denham, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Continental Baking Co., 630 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) Labor relations and general industrial regulatory legislation.
D. (6) $2,598.70.
E. (6) $37.09; (7) $61.61; (9) $98.70.

A. R. T. DeVany, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,200.
E. (9) $464.90.

A. Gordon Dickie, Keshena, Wis.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.
C. (2) Legislation which will provide for distribution of a portion of the tribal funds on deposit in the United States Treasury to individual members of the tribe and allocate the remainder of the tribal funds for designated purposes indicated by the tribal council; opposed to enactment of H. R. 1551 and favor enactment of H. J. Res. 8, H. R. 264, and H. R. 2495.

A. A. W. Dickinson, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
D. (6) $1,375.
E. (6) $0.20; (7) $16.50; (9) $16.70; (11) $16.70.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 3408 and legislation affecting the motion picture industry.
D. (6) $3,900.
E. (7) $1,300; (9) $1,300; (11) $1,300.

A. Disabled American Veterans, National Headquarters, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) The DAV is interested in all legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans. (3) DAV Semimonthly.
E. (2) $5,066.60; (7) $152.93; (9) $5,218.93; (10) $5,218.93; (11) $5,218.93.

A. Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting disabled veterans and their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans.
E. (2) $2,500; (4) $118.71; (7) $18.75; (9) $2,637.46; (11) $2,637.46; (15) $98.43, Doyle Printing Service, 1219 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., printing; $20.28, Dupli-Kate Service, 1740 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., mimeographing.

A. Walter L. Dislrow, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees Compensation Acts.[1]
D. (6) $1,131.65.
E. (7) $68; (9) $68; (11) $68.

A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests include any matters affecting the natural-gas industry.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ozark-Mahoning Co., Tulsa, Okla.
C. (2) Specific legislation employed for was percentage depletion.
D. (6) $3,625.

A. District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the sale of distribution of petroleum products in the District of Columbia.
D. (6) $556.82.
E. (2) $300; (7) $256.82; (9) $556.82; (11) $556.82.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general.
D. (6) $9,562.25.
E. (2) $4,712.88; (4) $150; (5) $1,332.06; (6) $203.27; (7) $954.31; (8) $1,205.28; (9) $8,557.80; (11) $8,557.80; (15).[1]

A. Homer Dodge, 1244 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) Any proposed legislation or policies involving a constitutional question.
D. (6) $870.

A. William C. Doherty, 1525 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 1525 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal and Federal employees.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. W. J. Donald, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation regarding excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, electric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, electric fans, and regulation with respect to amendment of the Labor-Management Relations Act.

A. James L. Donnelly, 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation of general interest to manufacturers. (3) Industrial Review.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (7) $269.70; (9) $269.70; (11) $269.70.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Robert F. Donoghue, 657 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine, particularly the tanker division thereof, including without limitation, amendments relating to titles 14, 33, and 46 of the United States Code Annotated, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, and Transportation Act of 1940; appropriations relating to agencies charged with the duty of administering laws affecting transportation, etc.
D. (6) $900.

A. Thomas J. Donovan, Tax Council of the Alcoholic Beverage Industries, Inc., 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting excise taxes on alcoholic beverages.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) $99.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees' Compensation Acts.
D. (6) $1,039.13.
E. (7) $35.40; (9) $35.40; (11) $35.40.

A. John E. Dougherty, 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interest of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.
E. (9) $200.60.

A. Robert E. Dougherty, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interest of the lumber-manufacturing industry.
D. (6) $1,750.
E. (7) $128; (9) $128; (11) $128.

A. James W. Douthat, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative programs affecting industry, including labor and tax policies, Federal expenditures and subsidies, Government controls over industry, Government competition with private enterprise, etc.
D. (6) $4,704.65.
E. (9) $954.65.

A. M. J. Dowd, El Centro, Calif.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
C. (2) Interior appropriation bill (H. R. 7176), amendments to 1939 Reclamation Project Act, central Arizona project bill (S. 75).
D. (6) $3,211.50.
E. (7) $590.97; (9) $590.97; (11) $590.97.

A. Adlin M. Downer, Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

C. (2) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the Armed Forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combatting of subversive activities, and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy, etc. (3) VFW Foreign Service and VFW Legislative News Letter.
D. (6) $1,625.
E. (7) $36.50; (9) $36.50; (11) $36.50.

A. Richard S. Doyle, 404 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Budd Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Corporate income and excess profits taxes.

A. W. A. Dozier, Jr., 17 Molton Street, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 537 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Ala.
C. (2) All health matters covered by legislative action. (3) PR Notes.
D. (6) $1,650.
E. (4) $225; (9) $225; (11) $225.

A. Robert M. Drysdale, Jr., Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Transportation legislation.[1]
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (2) $175; (4) $112.10; (5) $382.13; (6) $135.92; (7) $305.37; (9) $935.52; (11) $935.52.

A. Stephen M. DuBrul, 5–141 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) Supported amendments discussed and proposed to S. 2594 and S. 2645.
E. (9) $749.22; (15) $314.86, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., lodging, meals, telephone, telegraph, laundry, valet, etc.; $86.39, Plaza Hotel, New York City, N. Y., lodging, meals, telephone, telegraph, laundry, valet, etc.; $45.87, New York Central Railroad, transportation; $15.41, Eastern Air Lines, transportation; $30.25, Capital Airlines, transportation.

A. Read Dunn, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, post office box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the Council is organized.
D. (6) $187.50.
E. (7) $63.52; (11) $63.52.

A. William M. Dunn, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union.

A. Matthew Dushane, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Seafarers International Union of North America, A. F. of L., 450 Harrison Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) S. 1044, H. R. 3974, H. R. 5695, H. R. 5693.
D. (6) $568.75.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (5) $41.25; (6) $23; (7) $385; (8) $62; (9) $511.25; (11) $511.25.

A. Joseph L. Dwyer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Petroleum legislation.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $672.65.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y., and 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Matters affecting meat packers.
D. (6) $2.34.
E. (2) $32.11; (4) $0.44; (5) $1.45; (7) $2.20; (9) $36.20; (11) $36.20; (15) $16.37, LaRoe, Brown & Winn, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C., counsel fee and expenses.

A. George S. Eaton, 906 Public Square Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. National Tool and Die Manufacturers Association, 906 Public Square Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Bills especially affecting the interests of contract tool and die shops, which are small business.
D. (6) $100.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1003 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Antidefamation League of B'nai B'rith, 212 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Registrant supports legislation which promotes the civil rights of all Americans, and opposes undemocratic discrimination against any Americans; more specifically, the program of the President's Committee on Civil Rights.
D. (6) $140.
E. (7) $15; (9) $15; (11) $15.

A. Joseph H. Ehlers, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Society of Civil Engineers.
C. (2) H. R. 2645; H. R. 3790; H. R. 5426; H. R. 2752; House Joint Resolution 218; H. R. 1637; S. 1144; S. 644. (3) Civil Engineering.
E. (8) $9.50; (9) $9.50; (11) $9.50.

A. Bernard H. Ehrlich, 1367 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 418 Homer Building Thirteenth and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislative proposals that affect private (non-tax-supported) schools, and bills dealing with education for Korean veterans.
D. (6) $900.
E. (6) $85.37; (7) $166.32; (9) $251.69; (11) $251.69.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 6675 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Promotion toward passage of H. R. 2678, generally known as the Townsend Plan.
D. (6) $910.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which will further the country's rural electrification program, resulting from the REA act, as amended, including REA administrative and loan funds for rural electrification and for rural telephone funds; funds for the construction of multipurpose dams; funds for transmission and related facilities to deliver Federal hydropower to rural electric load centers; proposed legislation providing for surveys and development of water resources. (3) Rural Electrification Magazine.
D. (6) $4,908.08.

A. Oatis H. Ellis, 402 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 430 Syndicate Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the business interests of independent oil jobbers.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (9) $1,193.86.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the retail lumber and building materials dealers.
D. (6) $2,750.
E. (7) $319.35; (9) $319.35; (11) $319.35.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 2585, utility relocation necessitated by highway construction, and legislation affecting public power projects generally.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation affecting the city's rights in the Colorado River and related matters, and legislation affecting public power projects.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 512 Sixteenth Street, Oakland, Calif.
C. (2) H. R. 7176, Interior Department appropriations bill, 1953, and legislation affecting social-security coverage for municipal employees, and legislation affecting California water interests generally.
D. (6) $2,239.54.
E. (6) $84.05; (7) $22.27; (8) $32.70; (9) $139.54; (11) $139.54.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
C. (2) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation affecting the district's rights in the Colorado River and related matters.
D. (6) $2,132.17.
E. (6) $17.50; (8) $14.67; (9) $32.17; (11) $32.17.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting California's rights in the Colorado River, including S. 75, to authorize the central Arizona project and H. J. Res. 21 and S. J. Res. 26, Colorado River litigation resolutions; and legislation relating to reclamation and water-resources policies.
D. (6) $7,501.02.
E. (7) $396.27; (8) $18; (9) $414.27; (11) $414.27.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation affecting the Central Valley project and legislation affecting Federal reclamation and public-power policies and projects generally.
D. (6) $1,750.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Resources Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) H. R. 7268, Army civil functions appropriations, 1953, and legislation affecting flood-control projects generally.

A Emergency Committee of Small and Medium-Size Magazine Publishers, 400 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Postal-rate legislation.
D. (6) $2,020.70.
E. (2) $1,500; (4) $77.23; (6) $55.42; (7) $1; (9) $1,633.65; (15) $1,556.42, Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C., legal fees and expenses; $28.50, Magazines of Industry, Inc., 400 Madison Avenue, New York 17, N. Y., printing; $17.31, Fred Keck Co., 305 East Forty-sixth Street, New York 17, N. Y., printing,; $31.92, H. P. Andrews Paper Co., 14 West Third Street, New York 12, N. Y., envelopes.

A. K. Blyth Emmons, 925 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Small Business Men's Association, Inc., 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to small business, either directly or indirectly. (3) Pulling Together.
D. (7) $2,125.
E. (7) $544.66; (9) $544.66; (11) $544.66.

A. Leon J. Engel (chairman, Jewelry Industry Tax Committee), 20 Hopkins Place, Baltimore, Md.
C. (2) Excise taxes.

A. O. F. Erickson, 1016 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Master Plumbers, 1016 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 2907, a bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies and for other purposes, and a continuing interest in all legislation that affects the building construction and piping industries. (3) Plumbing and Heating Business.

A. Walter M. Evans, 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Virginia Associated Businessmen, 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va.
C. (2) All legislation affecting tax equality which is favored by Virginia Associated Businessmen.
D. (6) $2,344.78.
E. (7) $94.78; (11) $94.78.

A. Herman Fakler, National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Interested myself in the repeal of section 104 of the Defense Production Act, and recommended that the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration do not report favorably on S. Res. 169.
D. (6) $312.50.
E. (6) $88.19; (8) $1.74; (9) $89.93; (11) $89.93.

A. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (home office), 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C. (legislative office).
C. (2) The general legislative interests of this organization are all matters affecting the interests of farmers or matters which from time to time may be regarded by the board of directors as affecting the program of the National Farmers Union as set forth in the program adopted by the convention of the National Farmers Union.
D. (6) $145,610.58.
E. (15) $24.54, The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone service; $36.20, Angus H. McDonald, Washington, D. C., travel, telephone, and newspaper expense; $103.84, Dorchester House, Washington, D. C., rent; $20, the Wall Street Journal, New York, N. Y., subscription; $117.60, Tele-Sec, Washington, D. C., secretarial service; $34.05, John A. Baker, Washington, D. C., travel, telephone, and newspaper expense, etc.[1]

A. Charles J. Farrington, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All Small Business Committee legislation; tax revision; funds for public roads; highway safety legislation.
D. (6) $6,249.99.
E. (7) $1,166.49; (11) $1,166.49.

A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is interested in any legislation—local, State, Federal, or international—which affects the broadcasting industry.[1]
D. (6) $11,497.65.
E. (9) $2,702.67.

A. Abner H. Ferguson, 1139 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation affecting savings and loan associations and general mortgage lending.
D. (6) $900.
E. (6) $11; (9) $11; (11) $11.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the natural gas industry.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla.; Fellsmere Sugar Producers Association, Fellsmere, Fla.; American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La.

A. H. L. Filer, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
C. (2) All legislation which might affect the New Haven Railroad and its subsidiaries (the Connecticut Co., New England Transportation Co.).
D. (6) $5,550.

A. Maurice W. Fillius, 703 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Alcoholic Beverage Importers, Inc.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the alcoholic beverage importing industry.
D. (7) $375.

A. Robert I. Fine, 4044 Girard Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. The Consumers' Lobby, 826 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation directly affecting the consumer.
E. (6) $1.50; (7) $312; (8) $15; (9) $328.50; (11) $328.50.

A. James Finucane, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting world peace, such as mutual assistance program, appropriations and supplementary appropriations particularly where they bear on military matters or on the government of occupied areas, manpower legislation including universal military training and service, proposals leading to the drafting of peace treaties, economic assistance (point 4), disarmament, expellees and displaced persons, educational exchange.
E. (7) $188.74; (9) $188.74; (11) $188.74.

A. Bernard M. Fitzgerald, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Brown, Lund and Fitzgerald, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the NAEC.[1]
D. (6) $1,350.

A. Stephen E. Fitzgerald, doing business as the Stephen Fitzgerald Co., 502 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.; and Raymond C. Baker, Jay Richter, and Frank K. Kelly as employees.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Assist the NAEC in articulating and expressing its point of view with respect to general legislative questions which affect the interests of the public and of electric light and power companies. (3)[1]
D. (6) $15,166.67.
E. (4) $946.45; (6) $329.59; (7) $2,501.16; (8) $235.42; (9) $4,012.62; (11) $4,012.62.

A. F. Stuart Fitzpatrick, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Particularly interested in legislation in the general field of public works, city planning, urban redevelopment, and housing.[1]
D. (6) $1,031.25.

A. Roger Fleming, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act; inflation control (Defense Production Act of 1950); Government credit policies; Federal Reserve policy; Federal Food and Drug Act amendment; repeal of resale price maintenance; antitrust legislation; education; immigration legislation; Mexican farm-labor importation; method for computing parity prices; farm machinery and supplies; fertilizer; agricultural labor; transportation legislation; Federal contributions to State unemployment insurance payments; Sugar Act extension; Marketing Facilities Act; increased lending authority for Export-Import Bank; amendment of Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; mutual security program (foreign aid); Customs Simplification Act; amendment of BIR code relation to tax treatment of livestock; legislation to authorize allocation of livestock for slaughter; grazing land; postal rates; St. Lawrence seaway; taxation; tobacco; peanut oil provisions of agricultural legislation; ICC decision on prohibition of trip leasing; national farmers day; agricultural appropriations; ACP payments; REA; screw worm research appropriations; meat inspection funds appropriation; appropriation, Agriculture Extension Service; Department of Agriculture reorganization; control and eradication of brucellosis; farm program; family farm policy review; establishment of revolving fund for financing exports of farm commodities; selective service; universal military training; fair trade pricing study; United States relationships to North Atlantic Treaty nations; farm credit legislation; appropriations for defense.

D. (6) $1,166.66.

E. (7) $89.41; (9) $89.41; (11) $89.41.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

B. Rust Prevention Association, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

C. (2) Legislation affecting funds for research on plant disease control and crop improvement; items in Agriculture Department's budget affecting research and control work on black stem rust through plant breeding and barberry eradication.

D. (6) $1,725.

E. (2) $800; (4) $158.40; (5) $227.80; (6) $75.07; (7) $286.00; (9) $1,547.33; (11) $1,547.33.

A. W. G. Flinn, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizen Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

C. (2) Potentially interested in all legislation affecting river and harbor works, flood control, and other water use and conservation, and related subjects.

E. (2) $1,350; (8) $53.60; (9) $1,403.60; (11) $1,403.60; (15) $1,393.60, Henry H. Buckman, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md., for professional services.

A. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.

C. (2) Proposed legislation of interest to members of Florida Railroad Association.

D. (6) $2,512.50.

E. (2) $1,320; (6) $6.19; (9) $1,326.19; (11) $1,326.19.

A. Herbert Fockler, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.

B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting libraries and librarians. (3) ALA Washington Newsletter.

A. E. F. Forbes, 604 Mission Street, suite 906-907, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, suite 906-907, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting livestock and meat-packing industry.

D. (6) $5,000.04.

A. Aaron L. Ford, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Nicholas B. Perry, 1841 Columbia Road NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Retained to assist in obtaining passage of a private bill to provide compensation from blocked or vested funds to Nicholas B. Perry for losses suffered as a result of seizure of his property by the Governments of Rumania or Hungary, or either of them.

E. (7) $2.25; (9) $2.25; (11) $2.25.

A. Mrs. J. A. Ford, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) H. R. 2678 and H. R. 2679, bills to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys. (3) The Townsend National Weekly.

D. (6) $1,040.

A. Forest Farmers' Association Cooperative, Box 692, Valdosta, Ga.

C. (2) All legislation pertaining to forestry.[1] (3) The Forest Farmer.

D. (6) $175.49.

E. (2) $60; (4) $15; (6) $10; (7) $90.49; (9) $175.49; (11) $175.49.

A. J. Carter Fort, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting transportation.[1]

D. (6) $7,956.68.

E. (7) $147.62; (9) $147.62; (11) $147.62.

A. Charles E. Foster, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, National Headquarters, 1423 East McMillan Street, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) The DAV is interested in all legislation pertaining to war veterans, their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans. (3) DAV Semimonthly.

D. (6) $2,160.

A. George H. Frates, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Retail Druggists, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D C.

C. (2) To oppose legislation detrimental to independent retail druggists and to further legislation favorable to the profession. (3) NARD Journal.

D. (6) $2,800.

E. (2) $675; (5) $399; (6) $105; (9) $1,179; (10) $2,396; (11) $3,575.

A. James Frechette, Keshena, Wis.

B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.

C. (2) Enactment of legislation which will provide for distribution of a portion of the tribal funds on deposit in the United States Treasury to individual members of the tribe and allocate the remainder of the tribal funds for designated purposes indicated by the tribal council, etc.

A. John H. Frederick, 842 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation having anything to do with transportation, including pending bills before the House and Senate.

D. (6) $2,029.69.

E. (7) $79.69.

A. Fred J. Fredrickson, Lafayette Hotel, Washington, D. C. (Home address: 247 Third Street SW., Valley City, N. Dak.).

B. North Dakota Resources Board, 311 Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the development and utilization of the land, water, and other natural resources of North Dakota, including authorizations and appropriations.

D. (6) $2,570.24.

E. (5) $130.74; (6) $119.89; (7) $1,170.61; (9) $1,421.24; (11) $1,421.24.

A. George M. Fuller, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation inimical to the interests of the lumber industry, American industry, and free enterprise.

D. (6) $4,075.

E. (7) $1,296.20; (9) $1,296.20; (11) $1,296.20.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) In favor of H. R. 6846, a proposed amendment with respect to the authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission to prescribe certain fees and charges.

A. Fyffe and Clarke, 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the manufacturing industry.

A. Charles E. Gage, 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting a company engaged in the manufacture and sale of tobacco products.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.

B. Minnesota Railroads.[1]

C. (2) Interested in all matters affecting railroads, and particularly any matters relating to Railroad Retirement Act and pro-

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

posed amendments, Interstate Commerce Act, and proposed amendments, and Federal Employer's Liability Act and proposed amendments.
D. (6) $500.
E. (7) $355.99; (9) $355.99; (11) $355.99.

A. Earl H. Gammons, 801 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation applicable to or affecting the radio and/or television industry, including S. 658 and House Resolution 520.
E. (7) $57.50; (9) $57.50; (11) $57.50.

A. Gardner, Morrison & Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., 143 Liberty Street, New York, N. Y.; agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; and other holders of awards of Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, World War. I.
C. (2) Legislation relating to World War I awards of the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, such as H. R. 6074, Eighty-first Congress; H. R. 4702 and H. R. 5802, Eighty-second Congress.
E. (6) $4.88; (7) $86.67; (8) $4.35; (9) $100.80; (11) $100.80.

A. Gwynn Garnett, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act; inflation control (Defense Production Act of 1950); Government credit policies; immigration legislation; Mexican farm-labor importation; agricultural labor; increased lending authority for Export-Import Bank; amendment of Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; mutual-security program (foreign aid); Customs Simplification Act; United States relationship to North Atlantic Treaty Nations; farm-credit legislation; appropriations for defense.
D. (6) $1,062.48.
E. (7) $54.90; (9) $54.90; (11) $54.90.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops and Legislative Letter.
D. (6) $2,432.97.
E (7) $67.72; (8) $2.75; (9) $70.47; (11) $70.47.

A. Francis J. Garvey, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Explanation and analysis of Federal bills and rendering of advice concerning their relationship to ADA policy. (3) Journal of the American Dental Association.
D. (6) $2,525.90.
E. (7) $250.27; (9) $250.27; (11) $250.27.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which concerns or affects members of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc.

A. Mrs. Paul Gebhard, 1751 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of social education and action, Board of Christian Education.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
C. (2) S. 2298, H. R. 3392, H. R. 30, and H. R. 525.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. M. George, H. K. Brehmer, and C. S. McMahon, constituting the partnership of George, Brehmer & McMahon, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Cos., 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
C. (2) S. 2298, H. R. 3392, H. R. 30, and H. R. 525.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Leo E. George, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal workers. (3) Union Postal Clerk.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. John S. Gibson, Sibbett Building, Douglas, Ga.
B. St. Marys Kraft Corp., St. Marys, Ga.
C. (2) An appropriation for dredging at St. Marys Harbor and up St. Marys River.
D. (6) $750.
E. (7) $209.75; (9) $209.75; (11) $209.75.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislation—Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the Eighty-second Congress relating to public education.
D. (6) $1,340.83.
E. (7) $83.30.

A. C. C. Gilbert, Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free enterprise system and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system.
D. (6) $2,012.50.

A. William Glazier, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, and National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, 86 Commercial Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) General interests in legislation affecting trade unions and their members and the maritime industry as well.
D. (6) $498.34.
E. (2) $303.33; (4) $17.78; (5) $121.20; (6) $121.34; (8) $23.37; (9) $587.02; (11) $587.02; (15).[1]

A. George S. Golstein, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $1,170.
E. (7) $195; (9) $195; (11) $195.

A. A. Richard Gonzales, 825 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

B. National Farm Labor Union, AFL., 825 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Farm-labor legislation, immigration, social security, housing, health, fair-labor standards, and labor relations.
D. (6) $800.
E. (2) $800; (11) $800.

A. Dr. H. T. Gordon, post-office box No. 2214, Washington, D. C.
B. The Townsend Legislative Bureau, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 2678 and H. R. 2679.
D. (6) $910.
E. (7) $381.69; (9) $381.69.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., suite 603, Washington, D. C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Bills affecting the public health, such as H. R. 910 and S. 2301, nurses' education aid; S. 1245 and S. 2337, emergency maternity and infant care; S. 1140, Federal Department of Health; S. 1, universal military training.
D. (6) $375.

A. Government Employees' Council, American Federation of Labor, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation that affects Government employees is of interest to this council.
D. (6) $4,304.49.
E. (2) $3,123.22; (4) $181.24; (5) $428.40; (6) $123.19; (8) $436.81; (9) $4,292.86; (11) $4,292.86; (15) $2,277, Thomas G. Walters, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., services; $819, Gladys M. Monroe, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., services.

A. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation relative to interests of grain and feed trade.
D. (6) $555.45.
E. (4) $30; (7) $50; (9) $80; (11) $80.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318–418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) To promote general interests of locomotive firemen and enginemen.
D. (6) $2.
E. (2) $3,686.55; (5) $535.50; (6) $79.21; (7) $974.93; (8) $32.06; (9) $5,308.25; (11) $5,308.25; (15) $2,499.99, Jonas A. McBride, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C., salary; $1,186.56, Glenn C. Russell, 310 Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C., salary; $337.50, Labor, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C., rent; $26.02, Mallorey Office Supply Co., 732 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C., supplies; etc.[1]

A. Cassius B. Cravitt, Jr., 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation which affects the interests of postmasters. (3) The Postmasters' Advocate.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. David G. Gray, Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
C. (2) Legislation affecting business in general, which includes practically every important measure before Congress.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $1,500.
E. (6) $95; (7) $2,941.97; (9) $3,036.97; (11) $3,036.97.

A. Ernest W. Greene, 731 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Post Office Box 2450, Honolulu, T. H.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 544 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and we are interested in any legislation which affects the coal industry.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Weston B. Grimes, 436 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Agriculture and the processing and transportation of the products thereof; also tax legislation.
D. (7) $10,390.06.
E. (7) $2; (9) $2; (11) $2.

A. Mrs. Enid H. Griswold, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) My legislative interests are in favoring any legislation that tends to support private enterprise and maintain American independence and to oppose any measures that work contrariwise.
D. (6) $300.
E. (7) $35.75; (9) $35.75; (11) $35.75.

A. John J. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills covered by convention-adopted program of organization. (3) ADA World.
D. (6) $1,300.
E. (7) $156.20; (9) $156.20; (11) $156.20.

A. Violet M. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills covered by convention-adopted program of organization.
D. (6) $1,462.50.
E. (7) $466.17; (9) $466.17; (11) $466.17.

A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any and all Federal legislative proposals which may or do affect western railroads.

A. Harlan V. Hagdley, 630 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Taxation Committee, Automobile Manufacturers Association, 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) Respondent is interested in all legislation affecting Federal tax legislation on automotive products.
D. (6) $625.

A. Hugh F. Hall, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Government credit policies; transportation legislation; amendment of Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; amendment of BIR code relating to tax treatment of livestock; grazing land; St. Lawrence seaway; taxation; ICC decision on prohibition of trip leasing; agricultural appropriations; ACP payments; REA; screw worm research appropriations; meat inspection funds appropriation; appropriation Agricultural Extension Service; Department of Agriculture reorganization; control and eradication of brucellosis; farm program; selective service; farm credit legislation; appropriations for defense.
D. (6) $949.98.
E. (7) $39.90; (9) $39.90; (11) $39.90.

A. Radford Hall, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Proposed legislation supported or opposed: Price controls, slaughter quotas, land legislation, etc.
D. (6) $2,350.
E. (6) $33.90; (7) $733.08; (8) $4; (9) $770.98.

A. E. C. Halleck, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) Federation News Service Bulletin.
D. (6) $3,354.12.
E. (7) $454.26; (9) $454.26; (11) $454.26.

A. Harry G. Hamlet, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay and retirement benefits, and pensions, etc. (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $750.

A. Joseph J. Hammer, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,176.86.
E. (7) $1,051.86; (9) $1,051.86; (11) $1,051.86.

A. William A. Hanscom, 1700 I Street NW., Suite 4, Washington, D. C.
B. Oil Workers International Union, CIO, 1840 California Street, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare—oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $1,830.
E. (7) $180; (9) $180; (11) $180.

A. Murray Hanson, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Tax and other legislation affecting the securities business.
D. (6) $600.
E. (2) $97.50; (4) $814.32; (5) $126.24; (6) $98.29; (7) $94.15; (9) $1,230.50; (15) $98.94, Huff Duplicating Co., Inc., 1602 L Street NW., Washington, D. C., printing and mailing; $612.38, Guthrie Lithograph Co., Inc., 1150 First Street NW., Washington, D. C., printing; $83, Speed Dee Que, 1740 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., printing.

A. Ralph W. Hardy, 1771 N. Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is interested in any legislation, local, State, Federal, or international, which affects the broadcasting industry.
D. (6) $4,000.02.
E. (9) $396.35.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation pertaining to transportation.
D. (6) $481.25.
E. (7) $37.90; (9) $37.90; (11) $37.90.

A. Miss Elsie D. Harper, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. National Board, YWCA, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Mutual security program (for), migratory-labor legislation (for), EMIC (for), UNICEF (for), civil rights (for), statehood of Alaska (for).
E. (2) $150; (4) $70; (6) $20; (7) $60; (9) $300; (11) $300.

A. Robert E. Harper, 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Suite 55, Washington, D. C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Suite 55, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) That which affects postal rates of periodicals published by members of the above-named association.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Robert C. Harris, 440 Downing Avenue, Fort Wayne, Ind.
B. National Retired Teachers Association.
C. (2) Forand bill, H. R. 2764.
D. (6) $675.20.
E. (6) $6.10; (7) $588.81; (8) $80.29; (9) $675.20.

A. Winder R. Harris, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Maritime matters: interested in passage of S. 241, to amend Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

A. Merwin K. Hart, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) My legislative interests are in favoring any legislation that tends to support private enterprise and maintain American independence, and to oppose any measures that work contrariwise.
D. (6) $500.
E. (7) $250.43; (9) $250.43; (11) $250.43.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 350 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Interested in general livestock tax matters, including specifically proposed amendments to the Internal Revenue Code concerning capital gains on sale of breeding livestock and deduction of soil conservation, brush control, and other ranching expenditures.
D. (6) $5,135.
E. (9) $491.68.

A. Dow W. Harter, 412–414 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation relating to the maintenance of facilities for the production of an ample supply of man-made domestic rubber in the United States for commercial and national defense purposes; also interested in the repeal or reduction of present excise taxes on tires and tubes, and in certain other changes in our tax structure, and, generally, in other legislative proposals relating to tires and other manufactured rubber products which may come before Congress and committees thereof from time to time.
D. (6) $2,125.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Government, with its suppliers, with its employees, and with its customers.[1]
D. (6) $3,375.
E. (7) $44.45; (9) $44.45; (11) $44.45.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any and all Federal legislative proposals which may or do affect western railroads.

A. John C. Hazen, suite 808, Kass Building, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 1938, LIFO; H. R. 3622 and other Fair Labor Standards Act amendments; H. R. 5505, Customs Simplification Act; H. R. 6174, S. 2504, and all other unemployment-compensation legislation; S. 2170, cotton labeling; S. 1267, fiber labeling; S. 2594, S. 2645, H. R. 6546, and all other amendments to Defense Production Act; S. 2918, H. R. 7256, H. R. 7257, H. R. 7258, and all other bills on flammable fabrics; Senate Resolution 169, H. R. 5189, and all other consumer interest proposals; H. R. 5767, H. R. 6367, and other price-maintenance legislation; all appropriation legislation; all proposals relating to parcel-post size and weight limitations; S. 106, District of Columbia optometry bill; S. 2712 and H. R. 6802, and other similar freight proposals. (3) Stores.
D. (6) $2,125.
E. (6) $15.54; (7) $225.10; (8) $1.25; (9) $241.89.

A. Thomas P. Healy, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2). Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of this union.
D. (6) $1,714.90.
E. (2) $1,624.98; (7) $89.92; (9) $1,714.90; (11) $1,714.90.

A. Felix Hebert, 602 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.
B. Associated Factory Mutual Fire Insurance Companies, 1500 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.
C. (2) Amendment to Internal Revenue Code, section 207.
E. (7) $460.20; (9) $460; (11) $460.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. K. W. Heberton, room 101, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General legislative interests cover any legislative proposals affecting the interests of the telegraph company.
E. (7) $126.90; (9) $126.90; (11) $126.90.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. American Parents' Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) National school health services bill, public school construction bill, national child research bill, Federal aid for medical education, local public health units, physically handicapped children's educational bill, school lunch appropriation, children's bureau appropriation, Cabinet status for the Federal Security Agency, Federal aid to day care centers in defense areas, Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools, emergency maternal and infant care, defense housing and community facilities.

A. Leo J. Heer, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting retail distribution of home goods; renewal of Defense Production Act; retention of Herlong amendment; discontinuance of consumer credit control authority.
D. (6) $500.
E. (7) $100; (9) $100; (11) $100.

A. C. B. Heinemann, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y., and 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Matters affecting meat packers.
D. (6) $875.01.
E. (7) $220.18; (9) $220.18; (11) $220.18.

A. C. B. Heinemann, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Matters affecting meat packers.
D. (6) $1,608.06.
E. (7) $1,355.51; (9) $1,355.51; (11) $1,355.51.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Canners' Association, 1133 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Defense controls and all measures directly affecting the food-canning industry.
D. (6) $2,312.50.
E. (7) $26.60; (9) $26.60; (11) $26.60.

A. Joseph D. Henderson, 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
B. American Association of Small Business, 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
C. (2) Legislation for the best interests of the people, particularly that beneficial to small business, and to oppose legislation harmful to the people, particularly that which is detrimental to small business. (3) Small Business Review.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Ewart A. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Offices of Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any proposed legislation affecting the brewing and wool industries.[1]
D. (7) $2,500.

A. Robert C. Hibben, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which may affect the ice-cream industry.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,398.82.
E. (7) $148.82; (9) $148.82; (11) $148.82.

A. L. S. Hitchner, 528 Barr Building, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 528 Barr Building, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) I have an interest in the current investigation on the use of chemicals on foods.

A. John L. Hoen, 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; and Eastern Steamship Lines, Inc., 40 Central Street, Boston, Mass.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interest of the American merchant marine.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose all legislation detrimental to those objectives.
D. (6) $1,999.98.
E. (7) $4,300; (9) $4,300; (11) $4,300.

A. Robert L. Hogg, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All prospective legislation which will or may affect the life-insurance business.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (6) $12.58; (7) $532.58; (9) $545.16; (11) $545.16.

A. Charles W. Holman, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Coops and Legislative Letter.
D. (6) $4,125.

A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Victor Hood, 4209 Queensbury Road, Hyattsville, Md.
B. The Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists, and Proprietors International Union of America, Twelfth and Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Legislation affecting labor; National Defense Act, veterans' educational legislation, District Barber Act, and any amendments thereto; against H. R. 5234.
D. (6) $1,805.47.
E. (7) $440.47; (9) $440.47; (11) $440.47.

A. Jesse V. Horton, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting postal employees, including supervisors, and the postal service.
D. (6) $2,400.
E. (7) $101.72; (9) $101.72; (11) $101.72.

A. S. H. Howard, 1414 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 6525 and S. 2639, to amend Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; all legislation of interest to railway employees and labor in general.
D. (6) $500.

A. Harold K. Howe, Suite C, 2480 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Box 1187, Joliet, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the laundry industry and the members thereof.
D. (6) $2,649.99.
E. (2) $929; (7) $557.31; (9) $1,486.31; (11) $1,486.31.

A. Robert E. Howe, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.[1]
D. (6) $3,296.

A. Hudson, Creyke & Lipscomb, 400 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. A joint venture organized in June 1950, for the purpose of obtaining relief for applicants for Federal leases on submerged lands and for those persons whose activities led the Federal Government to assert title to submerged lands.
C. (2) To obtain relief for applicants for leases on submerged lands and for those persons whose activities led the Government to assert title to submerged lands.
D. (6) $600.

A. Becher A. Hungerford, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.
B. George P. Byrne, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation for higher tariffs and import quotas for screws, nuts, rivets, and similar fasteners.

A. Carroll B. Huntress, 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y.
B. National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway and power project; H. J. Res. 337 opposed.
E. (6) $93.42; (7) $1,068; (9) $1,161.42; (11) $1,161.42.

A. William C. Hushing, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $2,754.
E. (2) $2,754; (6) $27.85; (8) $236.16; (9) $3,018; (11) $3,018.

A. Sam C. Hyatt, Hyattville, Wyo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, room 1526, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads.
E. (2) $750; (9) $750; (11) $750; (15) $750, J. D. Snyder, room 1040, LaSalle Hotel, Chicago, Ill., salary.

A. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
C. (2) Interested primarily in the preservation of independent banking.
D. (6) $31,690.
E. (9) $10,239.99.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., suite 501, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the natural gas industry.
D. (6) $61,475.54.
E. (2) $5,750; (5) $300; (9) $6,050; (11) $6,050; (15) $3,750, John A. Ferguson, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary; $1,250, W. E. Disney, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary; $750, Louis E. Whyte, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary; $300, Herbert Harvey Real Estate, Inc., 912 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., rent.

A. Carl Indergaard, Belfield, N. Dak.
B. Brooks Keogh, Roy Lillibridge, and John H. Hanson, trustees, operating under the name of Mineral Recovery Trustees, Dickinson, N. Dak.
C. (2) Interested in a bill seeking the recovery of right to repurchase mineral rights by former owners of lands which were sold to the United States.

A. Indiana State Medical Association, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) All bills pending before Congress which would create national health insurance.
E. (2) $722.82; (5) $69.53; (6) $3.63; (9) $795.98; (11) $795.98; (15).[1]

A. Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., Board of Trade Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) Bills affecting equality of taxation.
D. (6) $390.
E. (5) $89.40; (9) $89.40.

A. Indians of California, Inc., 225 Powell Street, San Francisco, Calif., and 2838 Twenty-sixth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Congressional legislation affecting Indians of California.
D. (6) $702.42.
E. (9) $1,008.79.

A. William Ingles, 1624 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting industry.
D. (6) $9,799.
E. (2) $900; (5) $675.60; (6) $187.48; (7) $114.33; (8) $360; (9) $2,237.41; (11) $2,237.41.

A. Iowa Associated Businessmen, Inc., 463 Westwood Drive, Ames, Iowa.
C. (2) Such bills as H. R. 240, H. R. 1177, S. 892, H. R. 4473; in other words, we favor enaction of legislation that will produce real tax equality within the competitive field as relating to net annual incomes, savings, etc.
D. (6) $1,747.50.
E. (2) $886.50; (3) $27; (4) $17.10; (5) $30.06; (6) $29.06; (7) $25; (8) $5.72; (9) $1,030.42.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workingman, including all pending legislation dealing with social security, national health, aid to physically handicapped, labor relations, displaced persons, etc.
D. (6) $1,650.
E. (1) $750; (4) $250; (5) $150; (6) $200; (7) $300; (9) $1,650; (11) $1,650.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers, room 311–222, East Michigan Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) General interest is in Federal and State legislation affecting the interest and welfare of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, including its affiliate local unions and members.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (2) $3,750; (9) $3,750; (11) $3,750; (15) $3,750, Fred A. Tobin, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., services.

A. Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
C. (2) S. 2298; H. R. 3392; H. R. 30; H .R. 525.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Robert L. Irvin, 502 Jergins Trust Building, Long Beach, Calif.
B. Long Beach Harbor Commission, 1333 El Embarcadero, Long Beach, Calif.
C. (2) Tidelands legislation; supporting S. 940 and H. R. 4484.
D. (6) $400.
E. (2) $37.50; (5) $168.20; (6) $15.35; (7) $578.89; (9) $799.94; (11) $799.94.

A. Boyd J. Jackson, Klamath Agency, Oreg.
B. Klamath Tribe of Indians.
C. (2) Legislation relating to Indians; interested in enactment of S. 737, S. 738, S. 1174, S. 1322, S. 1386, H. R. 264, H. R. 1632, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3094, H. R. 3095, H. R. 3368, and H. R. 3808.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203–A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the cotton textile industry, including tariffs, corporate taxes, price and production controls.
D. (6) $1,300.
E. (6) $6.35; (7) $187.95; (8) $30; (9) $224.30; (11) $224.30.

A. Seward H. Jacobi, Insurance Building, 119 Monona Avenue, Madison, Wis.
B. Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 119 Monona Avenue, Madison, Wis.
C. (2) Legislation affecting business and industry.
D. (6) $2,750.

A. C. Clinton James, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District of Columbia Building and Loan League, No. 1 Thomas Circle, Washington, D. C.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) A nominal interest in Federal legislation affecting savings and loan business, consisting of attending committee meetings when convenient to do so.
D. (6) $300.
E. (5) $125; (9) $125; (10) $300; (11) $425.

A. Japanese American Citizens League Anti-discrimination Committee, Inc., 406 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) To promote the welfare of persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.
E. (1) $657.58; (2) $900; (3) $93.34; (4) $74.95; (5) $316.19; (6) $98.60; (7) $78.65; (9) $2,219.31; (15) $600, Mike Masaoka, 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C., salary; $300, Etsu Masaoka, 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C., salary; $42.50, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., United States Code and supplements; etc.[1]

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.
B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn.; Bell Clay Co., Gleason, Tenn.; United Clay Mines Corp., Trenton, N. J.; Old Hickory Clay Co., Paducah, Ky.; Kentucky-Tennessee Clay Co., Cooley Clay Co., and Kentucky Clay Mining Co., Mayfield, Ky.
C. (2) Interested in retaining our present percentage depletion allowance for ball and sagger clays as shown in title 26, section 114, Internal Revenue Code.
E. (6) $14.51; (7) $280; (9) $294.51; (11) $294.51.

A. William T. Jobe, 1706 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Ice Industries, 1706 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General interest in matters affecting ice industry.

A. Peter Dierks Joers, Mountain Pine, Ark.
B. Dierks Lumber and Coal Co., 1006 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation affecting lumber industry.

A. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Tax legislation, labor legislation, amendments to the Clayton Act, merchant marine legislation, price-basing-point legislation, Defense Production Act, wage-stabilization legislation, St. Lawrence waterway.
E. (2) $1,250; (8) $950.38; (9) $2,200.38; (11) $2,200.38.

A. Elmer Johnson, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting retired civil employees. (3) The Annuitant.
E. (7) $50; (9) $50; (11) $50.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation relating to Great Lakes shipping.
D. (6) $2,916.
E. (7) $59.54; (9) $59.54; (11) $59.54.

A. Vernon A. Johnson, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif.
C. (2) All legislation affecting aviation.
D. (6) $3,510.
E. (7) $594.65; (9) $594.65; (11) $594.65.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. W. D. Johnson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors, ORC Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
C. (2) St. Lawrence seaway project, and all legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor, generally, and employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, in particular.

A. Walter R. Johnson, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Attorneys General, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To confirm and establish title in the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries.
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (7) $460; (8) $72.80; (9) $532.80; (11) $532.80.

A. Willard Johnson, 56 Brook Manor, Pleasantville, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interest will continue until Senate ratification of Genocide Convention.
E. (4) $416.75; (8) $0.25; (9) $417; (11) $417; (15) $409.25, Advance Printing Co., 324 East Twenty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y., printing.

A. J. M. Jones, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) Reorganization of Department of Agriculture, special sheepherder bill, McCarran-Walters omnibus immigration bill, customs simplification bill, extension of Defense Production Act, agricultural appropriation bills.
D. (6) $2,500.02.
E. (6) $128.87; (7) $664.19; (8) $184; (9) $977.06; (11) $977.06.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) As previously reported.
E. (8) $13.95; (9) $13.95; (10) $13.95.

A. Lyle W. Jones, 1112 Barr Building, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The United States Potters Association, East Liverpool, Ohio.
C. (2) Interest in all legislation affecting the pottery industry.

A. Robert E. Jones, Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Dairy Industry Committee, Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislative matters affecting the dairy industry.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See p. 3.)[1]
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $254.31; (9) $254.31.

A. The Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists & Proprietors International Union of America, Twelfth and Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) Interest in general legislation affecting labor, the National Defense Act, veterans' educational legislation, the District Barber Act, and any amendments thereto. Against H. R. 5234.
D. (6) 1 percent.
E. (2) 1 percent; (9) 1 percent.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry and its customers.
D. (6) $2,325.
E. (7) $505.60; (9) $505.60; (14) $505.60.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the sale or distribution of petroleum products in the District of Columbia.
D. (6) $300.
E. (7) $256.82; (9) $256.82.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 1525 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 1525 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal and Federal employees.
D. (6) $1,374.

A. Thomas J. Keefe, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Road Builders' Association, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the road building industry.
D. (6) $2,750.
E. (6) $29.50; (7) $1,135.85; (8) $266.51; (9) $1,431.86.

A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 315 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. City and County of San Francisco, City Hall, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to the city and county of San Francisco, including civil functions appropriation, civil defense, payment in lieu of taxes, airports and aviation, merchant marine development, national defense appropriations, housing and urban development, transbay bridge, taxation and government controls.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (5) $825;[1] (6) $334.76;[1] (7) $739.65;[1] (8) $76.93;[1] (9) $1,976.34.

A. Eugene Kelly, 1657 Harvard Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Foundation for Consumer Credit, Inc., 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All consumer credit legislation.
D. (6) $2,499.99.
E. (6) $31.85; (7) $909.10; (8) $31.06; (9) $972.01.

A. I. L. Kenen.
B. American Zionist Council, 305 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 7005.
D. (6) $1,120.
E. (5) $18.11; (7) $390.74; (9) $408.85; (15) $102.05, April 4, 1952, Woodner Apartment, 3636 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., travel; $18.11, March 13, 1952, Herbert Levy Co., 512 H Street NE. (stationery); $57.56, March 13, 1952, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C. (conference luncheon).

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 203 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
C. (2) (a) Amendments to Natural Gas Act of 1938 (H. R. 3285); (b) tidelands legislation (S. J. Res. 20, S. 940, H. R. 4484, etc.); (c) any tax bill that might affect the oil and gas industry; (d) antitrust legislation, that is, bills seeking to amend Sherman Act, Clayton Act, Robinson-Patman Act (H R. 3408, H. R. 1233, and S. 719); H. R. 6157.
D. (6) $500.
E. (2) $125; (5) $75; (6) $50; (7) $60; (8) $25.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) (See statement attached);[1] (3) The American Legion Magazine.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (2) $1; (4) $3.57; (5) $1.23; (6) $4.34; (7) $171.75; (9) $181.89; (15).[1]

A. Brooks Keogh, Roy Lillibridge, and John Hanson, operating under name of "Mineral Recovery Trustees," Dickinson, N. Dak.
C. (2) Seeking the recovery of right to repurchase mineral rights by former owners of lands which were sold to the United States.
E. (1) (See explanation attached)[1]; (2) $986.49; (4) $242.97; (5) $295.42; (6) $2,575.90; (9) $4,100.78.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) (See statement filed with first quarterly report for 1950.)[1]
D. (6) $2,550.
E. (2) $2,550 (includes $2,250 regular compensation plus $300 Washington expense allowance); (9) $2,550.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
C. (2) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents and the welfare of servicemen of the Armed Forces and their dependents; (3) VFW Foreign service and VFW Legislative Newsletter.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $109; (9) $109.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, American Security Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Budd Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Corporate income and excess profits taxes; (a) proposed amendment to the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950 as amended by the Revenue Act of 1951; (b) no bill introduced as yet; (c) 64 Statutes 1137, chapter 1199; 65 Statutes 452, chapter 521; (d) for amendment of the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950 as amended.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sangamo Electric Co., Springfield, Ill.; manufacturer.
C. (2) Employed to seek adoption of amendments to Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950, H. R. 9827, Eighty-first Congress, second session, Public Law 909.
D. (6) $3,000.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Allan B. Kline, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation.
C. (2) Those matters affecting directly American agriculture.
D. (6) $1,250.
E.[1]

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 322 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Alloys Development Co., 2537 Koppers Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) For H. R. 4054, to provide patent extensions.
E. (7) $9.50; (9) $9.50; (10) $62.77; (11) $72.27.

A. Robert E. Kline Jr., 322 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Palmer-Bee Co., Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) Appearing before congressional committees relative to private bills for relief of Palmer-Bee Co., to reimburse company for loss of $725,285.60 in manufacture of radar equipment for Navy. (a) Bill for relief of Palmer-Bee Co.; (b) S. 116 and H. R. 3739.
E. (6) $3; (9) $3; (10) $54; (11) $57.

A. Williford I. King, room 300, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York. N. Y.
C. (2) Favor all constitutional legislation according with sound economic principles.
D. (6) $2,975.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $165.
E. (7) $208.05; (9) $208.05.

A. C. W. Kitchen, United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables, directly or indirectly.

A. W. H. Kittrell, Empire Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.
B. Melben Oil Co., Benedum-Trees Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Legislation affecting oil industry, especially tidelands.
D. (6) $6,000.
E. (6) $349.44; (7) $3,869.22; (8) $40.80; (9) $4,259.46; (15).[1]

A. Burt L. Knowles, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
D.[1]

A. Robert M. Koch, 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) All legislation which directly or indirectly affects the interests of agricultural limestone producers.
E. (7) $25.10; (9) $25.10; (15) $25.10.

A. John Kolanda, room 413, Railway Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Employees' Department, 220 South State Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 6525 and S. 2639 to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. All legislation of interest to railroad employees and labor in general.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. John A. Kratz, 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Peoples Gas Light & Coke Co., 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) For the enactment of S. 1000 and H. R. 3793, identical bills, to amend section 7 (h) of the Natural Gas Act.

A. Alfred U. Krebs, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 1221, ship warrants bill; H. R. 5678, revision of immigration laws; ILO Conventions Nos. 68, 69, 73, and 74; S. 2514, sale of vessels to Philippine citizens; S. 2550, revision of immigration laws; H. R. 5796, Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers Act.
D. (6) $500.

A. Oscar R. Kreutz, 907 Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing. Oppose legislation inimicable to interests of savings and loan industry. Supporting S. 1212, H. R. 6102, H. R. 3177, H. R. 2608.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas and Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting water and power projects, flood control, and reclamation; (a) Department of Interior Appropriation bill (fiscal 1953); (b) H. R. 7176.
D. (6) $3,492.
E. (7) $1,705.73; (8) $196.14; (9) $1,901.87; (15) $1,084.94, February 2, 1952, through March 5, 1952, Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C. (includes room, meals, valet, telephone, and telegraph, stenographic and miscellaneous items); $256.40, February 2, 1952, through March 8, 1952, meals other than at Hotel Statler, including those on train; $193.14, February 2, 1952, through March 8, 1952, taxis, tips, supplies, miscellaneous; $364.39, February 1, 1952, through February 5, 1952, March 5, 1952, through March 6, 1952, train travel via Santa Fe and Southern Pacific.

A. Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Center, Cleveland, Ohio. (See letter.)[1]

A. Alfons Lands, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Director of Trucking Industry National Defense Committee, Inc. No change from previous report.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 1434 West Eleventh Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West Eleventh Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. State Tax Association, post-office box 2559, Houston, Tex.
C. (2) (Stated in attached data.)[1]

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
D. (6) $900.

A. La Roe, Brown & Winn, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Defense Production Act of 1950 amendments. Department of Agriculture appropriation bill (meat inspection), H. R. 7123.
D. (6) $1,500.[1]
E. (5) $2,755.13; (7) $65.88; (9) $2,821.01.

A. La Roe, Brown & Winn, 745 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Defense Production Act of 1950 amendment; Department of Agriculture appropriation bill (meat inspection), H. R. 7123.
D. (6) $4,500.[1]
E. (5) $2,755.13; (6) $134.48; (7) $383.56; (9) $3,273.17.

A. William V. Lavelle, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $1,750.
E. (7) $1,666; (9) $1,666.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See report of American Trucking Associations, Inc.)
D. (6) $6,499.98.
E. (7) $7.35; (9) $7.35.

A. Joseph S. Lawrence, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills (Senate and House) relating to health and welfare. (3) Bulletin and Capitol Clinic).
D. (6) $4,410.92.
E. (7) $758.07; (9) $758.07.

A. John G. Laylin, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Kennecott Copper Corp., 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The general legislative interests are resolutions, bills, and statutes relating to mining, smelting, and refining, and to foreign or international investment, trade, or commerce. Specifically, this includes but is not limited to the Mutual Security Act of 1951, Public Law 165, Eighty-second Congress, second session, October 10, 1951 (65 Stat. 373); ILO; custom duties, including copper such as Public Law 38, Eighty-second Congress, first session, May 22, 1951.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. Clarence F. Lea, 842 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) I am interested in all legislation having anything to do with transportation including pending bills before the House and Senate.
D.[1]
E.[1]

A. League of Women Voters of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (3) The National Voter.
D. (6) $1,707.50.
E. (2) $481.25; (4) $1,600.81; (6) $11.53; (9) $2,093.59.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 30 Pine Street, New York, N. Y., and 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the importation by the United States of sugar produced in Cuba. Sugar Act of 1948 and Public Law 140, Eighty-second Congress, amending the Sugar Act of 1948. Trade Agreements Act. Tariff acts.
D. (6) $6,499.87.
E. (4) $1,570.47; (6) $2[illegible].90; (8) $208.50; (9) $1,799.87.

A. James R. Lee, 604 Albee Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which concerns or affects members of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association.

A. Robert E. Lee, 44 Westbrook Street, South Portland, Maine.
B. Active Retired Lighthouse Employees Association, post-office box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
C. (2) To aid in passage of H. R. 1526, H. R. 1995, H. R. 2273.
D. (6) $300.86.
E. (5) $13; (7) $37; (9) $50.

A. Legislation-Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the Eighty-second Congress relating to public education. (3) (a) Legislative News, (b) Flash.
E. (2) $1,558.96; (4) $2,392.18; (5) $46.68; (6) $28.24; (7) $335.09; (9) $4,361.15.

A. Legislative Committee of Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute (OEMI), 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Joseph P. Leopold, 936 National City Building, Dallas, Tex.
B. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation relating to corporate income taxation.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (7) $343.60; (8) $216.09; (9) $559.69.

A. Wilbur R. Lester, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Kennecott Copper Corp., 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interest relates to mining, smelting and refining, and to foreign or international investment, trade or commerce. Specifically, this includes but it not limited to, the Mutual Security Act of 1951, Public Law 165, Eighty-second Congress, second session, October 10, 1951 (65 Stat. 373); ILO; custom duties, including copper such as Public Law 38, Eighty-second Congress, first session, May 22, 1951.
D. (6) See page 3.[1]

A. Arnold Levy, 829 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Anthracite Institute, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the anthracite industry.
D. (6) $4,557.89.
E. (5) $10.39; (7) $17.50; (8) $30; (9) $57.89.

A. George J. Lewis, Union Station Building, Lexington, Ky.
B. Kentucky Railroad Association, Union Station Building, Lexington, Ky.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the railroad industry.

A. The Liaison Committee of the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Liaison Committee for the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The committee has a continuing interest in all legislation affecting the mechanical specialty contracting industries. The committee's preponderant interest is to keep its constituent associations informed of matters of this nature and to promote and advocate the passage of beneficial legislation concerning fair-bidding procedures, Federal contracting policies, controls, and subcontracting policies and procedures. In this connection the principal legislative interest is in S. 2907, a bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies and for other purposes.
D. (6) $4,266.
E. (2) $4,250; (7) $16; (9) $4,266; (15) $4,250, March 1952, Weaver & Glassie, 1210 Tower Building, Fourteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C., legal fees; $16, March 10, 1952, Carlton Hotel, Sixteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C., luncheon meeting.

A. Frederick J. Libby, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting world peace, such as: Mutual assistance program, appropriations and supplementary appropriations particularly where they bear on military matters or on the government of occupied areas, manpower legislation including universal military training and service, proposals leading to the drafting of peace treaties, economic assistance (point 4), disarmament, expellees and displaced persons, educational exchange.
D. (6) $1,309.64.
E. (7) $84.65; (9) $84.65.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) General education concerning the effect of inflation on the purchasing power of life insurance or proceeds as it relates to Federal policies or measures which are deemed to be inflationary in character. (a-b-c). House Joint Resolution 323 for limiting income tax rates.

E. (2) $2,938.47; (4) $3,478.38; (5) $934.67; (6) $166; (7) $1,871.60; (8) $902.95; (9) $10,292.07; (15)[1]

A. L. Blain Liljenquist, 917 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. E. F. Forbes, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) As Washington representative, I support or oppose legislation affecting the livestock and meat industry. During the first quarter of 1952 my chief legislative interest was to oppose the extention of price and wage controls. These controls are socialistic, arbitrary, unworkable, inequitable, add to the cost of goods, create disrespect for law and government, and should be promptly terminated. Other legislation with which I was concerned in the first quarter were items in the appropriation bills for agriculture and the Department of Defense that relate to the livestock and meat industry.

D. (6) $2,500.02.

E. (7) $45; (8) $38.01; (9) $83.01; (15) $38.01, March 4, 1952, Batt, Bates & Co., Inc., Washington, D. C., mimeographing; $31, March 10, 1952, Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C., luncheon.

A. John W. Lindsey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

C. (2) (a) Amendment to title V of Independent Offices Appropriation Act 1952; (b) H. R. 6846; (c) a proposed amendment with respect to the authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission to prescribe certain fees and charges; (d) in favor of the bill.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5).[1]

D. (6) $3,041.67.

E. (6) $30.85; (7) $499.49; (8) $129.23; (9) $659.57; (15) $58.29, January 14–19, Mayfair Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., room; $15, February 1, National Press Club, Washington, D. C., dues; $20, February 1, Public Utilities Advertising Association, Dubuque, Iowa, dues; $40.10, February 6–12, Mayfair Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., roomfi $16.50, February 11, Mississippi Valley Association, banquet tickets, etc.[1]

A. Norman M. Littell, 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Navajo Tribe of Indians residing in Arizona, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado. Address of Superintendent, Window Rock, Ariz.

C. (2) S. 2954, H. R. 5634, H. R. 6035.

D. (6) $1,875.

A. Walter J. Little, 810 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Southern Pacific Co. et al.

A. John M. Littlepage, 840 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting a company engaged in the manufacture and sale of tobacco products.[1]

A. Gordon C. Locke, 643 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, box 1107, Shreveport, La.

C. (2) Interested in S. 1889 and H. R. 5632. Both provide for amendments to the Interstate Commerce Act. We are opposed to some provisions of S. 1889. We are opposed to the enactment of any part of H. R. 5632.

D. (5) $4,500.

A. F. S. Lodge, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eighty-first Congress as H. R. 2756, "to implement the established national policy of promoting maximum employment, production, and purchasing power, and for other purposes"; and bills in the Eighty-second Congress such as S. 1693, "to regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes"; and H. R. 1755, "to regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes."

D. (6) $25.

A. Benjamin H. Long, 2746 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.

B. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Insurance and reinsurance of war risks. War Damage Corporation Act of 1951 and War Disaster Act of 1951. S. 114, S. 439, S. 1309, and S. 1848, and similar bills in House of Representatives. No position for or against this legislation.

E. (6) $129.37; (7) $106.25; (9) $235.62; (15) March 6, Mr. Long's personal expenses to Washington, D. C., March 4–6, meals, hotel, taxis, etc. (no item over $10), $31.40; Western Union telegram, November 16, Chicago, $1.11; Michigan Bell Telephone, long-distance telephone (legislation and other business), $128.26; B. & O. Railroad, fare to Washington and return, $74.75.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; 500 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Agency of Canadian Car and Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation having relation to World War I claims.

A. Otto Lowe, University Club, Washington, D. C.

B. National Canners Association, 1133 Twentieth Street, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting canning of food products.

D. (7) $1,500.

E. (7) $500; (9) $500.

A. Mrs. Frances B. Lucas, 1776 D Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Defense Committee, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, 1776 D Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) In general, all legislation concerning defense and freedom; all bills concerning world government, such as S. 56, S. 57, and S. 66; and all bills relating to socialized medicine.

D. (7) $100.

E. (7) $13; (9) $13.

A. James C. Lucas, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (See p. 3).[1]

D. (6) $750.

A. Lucas and Thomas, 605 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in aiding company as consultant counsel in connection with Federal tax matters affecting life insurance companies.

D. (6) $1,250.

A. Lucas and Thomas, 605 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation which may deal with credit controls.

D. (6) $1,250.

A. Lucas and Thomas, 605 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Trailer Coach Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) General legislative interest in tax bills and other measures intended to classify trailer coaches as mobile homes.

D. (6) $1,250.

A. Dr. Carl E. Lunn, 2315 East Yale Street, Phoenix, Ariz.

B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) H. R. 2679, the Townsend Plan.

A. Gerald J. Lynch, Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

C. (See statement attached to preliminary report filed June 7, 1951).[1]

D. (6) $1,249.80.

E. (5) $60.45; (6) $36.04; (9) $96.49.

A. A. L. Lynn, vice president, Island Creek Coal Co., Pond Creek Pocahontas Co., Huntington, W. Va.

C. (2) I am interested generally in all legislation affecting the coal industry, such as taxes, transportation, Government controls, Government expenditures, etc.

D. (7) $5,500.

A. John C. Lynn, American Farm Bureau Federation, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) (See attached).[1]

D. (6) $2,156.02.

E. (7) $88.84; (9) $88.84.

A. A. E. Lyon, Railroad Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Employer listed above.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting labor, especially railroad labor. All bills affecting Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Insurance Act.

A. Avery McBee, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Hill & Knowlton, Inc.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Am generally interested in legislation affecting aviation, the steel industry, and other industries which may be clients of Hill & Knowlton.

A. Jonas A. McBride, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, specifically S. 2639 to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and S. 2937 to amend the Railway Labor Act.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Robert J. McBride, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interest is the protection and fostering of the interests of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities. Specific interests: S. 2358, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by establishing certain rules for the operation of irregular common carriers by motor vehicle; S. 2361, a bill to require the supervision, by the Interstate Commerce Commission, of the operations of contract carriers; S. 2362, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to restrict certain operations of private carriers by motor vehicle, and to restrict the leasing of vehicles. Position: Generally in opposition to all three, but favorable to amendments thereof.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Edward A. McCabe, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (7) $231.50; (9) $231.50.

A. John A. McCart, room 716, AFGE, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government employees and District of Columbia government employees.
D. (6) $1,384.67.
E. (7) $15.20; (9) $15.20.

A. Frank J. McCarthy, 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) (See attached statement).[1]

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the Eighty-second Congress relating to public education.
D. (6) $218.13.

A. Bryson deHaas McCloskey, 404 Woodford Avenue, Baltimore, Md.
E. (4) $27; (11) $27.

A. Warren C. McClure, Box 207, Camden, Ark.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation relating to soil conservation and flood control.
D. (6) $1,467.50.

A. Glen McDaniel, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Radio-Television Manufacturers Association, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television manufacturing industry. Special legislative interests are: Extension Defense Production Act, FCC appropriation bill, Walsh-Healey Act, S. 2325 (Bureau of Accident Prevention), S. 2714 (Industrial Safety Act, H. R. 6219) (Household Appliance Instruction Booklet Act).

A. Angus McDonald, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (home office); 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C. (legislative office)

A. A. J. McFarland, 26 North Eighth Street, Sterling, Kans.
B. Christian Amendment Movement, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.
C. (2) Christian amendment bills, House Joint Resolution 156, Senate Joint Resolution 29.
D. (6) $810.
E. (7) $550; (9) $550.

A. Richard McGough, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash
B. Washington Railroad Association.

A. Thomas Edward McGrath, 4012 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Taxpayers, U. S. A.
D. (6) $1.80.

A. M. C. McKercher, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, O R. T. Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Joseph V. McLaughlin, 923 Chestnut Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.
B. Railway Express Agency, Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation in connection with parcel post.
D. (6) $1,460.
E. (7) $678.71; (9) $678.71.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1030 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General: Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants. Specific: See page 3.[1]
D. (6) $287.50.
E. (7) $6.27; (9) $6.27.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) In addition to the bills listed in the previous report, all of which have some relation direct or indirect to the practice of the profession of optometry, S. 2325, S. 2552, S. 2714, S. 2738, H. R. 7320, H. R. 6319, H. R. 6921, H. R. 6720, on behalf of the District of Columbia and American Optometric Association, care of Dr. Samuel L. Brown, 111 East North Street, Fostoria, Ohio; on behalf of Ruth Obre Dubonnet, 50 East Seventy-second Street, New York City, bill to reacquire American citizenship, S. 1772; on behalf of Vera Sarah Keenan, Franton Court, Greens Farms, Connecticut, bill to permit residence in the United States, S. 1126; on behalf of John J. Braund, 900 Alabama Avenue SE., Washington, D. C., H. R. 4507, bill to compensate John J. Braund for use of patents by the United States Government.
D. (6) $3,175.
E. (6) $94.21; (7) $50.80; (8) $9.35; (9) $154.36.

A. Lachlan Macleay, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Matters relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement; the American merchant marine; soil conservation; flood control; regulation of domestic transportation.
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (7) $703.57 (see attached)[1]; (9) 0753.57.

A. Mackoff, Kellogg, Muggli & Kirby, Dickinson, N. Dak.
B. Brooks Keogh, Roy Lillibridge, and John H. Hanson, trustees, operating under the name of Mineral Recovery Trustees, Dickinson, N. Dak.
C. (2) Interested in S. 2563 and H. R. 6368 giving former owners of lands sold to the United States the right to repurchase the minerals in said lands.
E. (6) $106.14; (7) $2,253.10; (9) $2,359.24; (12) $203.98.

A. W. Bruce Macnamee, 1908 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting shipping, including: S. 241, H. R. 4729, amendment of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; S. 2950, wages of crew members; H. R. 6245, remission of duties on dunnage; H. R. 5694, Delaware and Chesapeake Canal, lighting system; Senate Joint Resolution 27, Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway; H. R. 6947, Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952; H. R. 7072, Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953.
D. (6) $1,050.
E. (7) $31.43; (9) $31.43.

A. Harry J. Maginnis, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Postal legislation; (a) rate increase bills.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (6) $107.18; (7) $257.03; (9) $364.21.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the members of the above-named trade association.
D. (6) $600.
E. (6) $19; (7) $157.98; (9) $176.98.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the bituminous coal industry.
D. (6) $2,600.
E. (6) $19; (7) $107.98; (9) $176.98.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 246 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $16,375.[1]
E.[1] (1) $15,000; (8) $1,375; (9) $16,375.

A. Mrs. Olya Margolin, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, 1 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,400.
E. (8) $64.30; (9) $64.30.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members. H. R. 1316, 3022, 1612, 257, 7408, 2658, 1019, 3282, House Joint Resolution 102, 7, 4; S. 1, 1040, 397, 990, 984, 1301, 1310.
D. (6) $3,296.

A. Baird H. Markham, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See attached p. 3 for answers to items 1-3.)[1]

A. Robert F. Martin, 517 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Vitrified China Association, Inc., 517 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Senate Resolution 253 and S. 2473.

A. Mrs. Etsu M. Masaoka, 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, 406 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) To promote the welfare of persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States (legislation is a part of this activity): (a) To provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in occupied Japan, H. R. 2865. (b) To amend the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, S. 865. (c) To revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes, S. 2055 and H. R. 5678 and similar bills.
D. (6) $300.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington D. C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, 406 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) To promote the welfare of persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States (legislation is a part of this activity): (a) To provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in occupied Japan, H. R. 2865. (b) To amend the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, S. 865. (c) To revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes, S. 2055 and H. R. 5678 and similar bills.
D. (6) $600.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Will Maslon, 15 East Eighty-fourth Street, New York City.
B. American Jewish Congress, Inc.
C. (2) To oppose anti-Semitism and racism in all its forms and to defend civil rights incident thereto.
D. (6) $112.50.

A. Walter J. Mason, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $2,364.
E. (2) $2,364; (8) $167.50; (9) $2,550.

A. P. H. Matthews, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See Rider C-2).[1]
D. (6) $4,399.98.
E. (7) $355; (9) $355; (15) Harvey's Restaurant, Washington, D. C., for meals, $62.19.

A. Cyrus H. Maxwell, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Health and welfare.
D. (6) $2,781.53.
E. (7) $60.40; (9) $60.40.

A. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 537 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Ala.
C. (2) All health matters.
D. (6) $16,500.
E. (2) $1,650; (4) $225; (9) $1,875.

A. The Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in legislation pertaining to the practice of medicine and all related services and that affecting the public health, including extension of social security into the field of the practice of medicine.
D. (6) $18,610.
E. (8) $18,610; (9) $18,610.

A. E. A. Meeks, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National League of District Postmasters, 1110 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation which affect the interest of postmasters. (3) The Postmasters' Advocate.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. James Messer, Jr., 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
B. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
C. (2) Proposed legislation of interest to members of Florida Railroad Association; Crosser bill amending Railroad Retirement Act. (H. R. 3669.)
D. (6) $1,320.

A. Ross A. Messer, Room 512, Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D. C. (Room 512 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.)
C. (2) All beneficial legislation affecting custodial employees of the Post Office and GSA. (3) The Post Office and General Services Maintenance News.
D. (6) $500.
E. (7) $40.90; (8) $84.80; (9) $125.70.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1516 Olds Tower, Lansing, Mich.
C. (2) In favor of legislation designed to have all business corporations taxed in the same manner and on the same basis.

A. Mr. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H. Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See attachment "A.")[1]
D. (6) $1,312.
E. (6) $45.01; (7) $34.50; (9) $79.51.

A. Harold M. Miles, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Anything affecting the steam railroads and specifically the St. Lawrence waterway bill, House Joint Resolution 337.
D. (6) $275.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See attached statement, p. 3).[1]
D. (6) $1,831.70.
E. (2) $200; (3) $1,500; (4) $128.20; (7) $3.50; (9) $1,831.70; (15).[1]

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel 372, Washington, D. C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
C. (2) General legislation affecting Dallas and Texas, such as appropriations and revenue bills.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (2) $125; (5) $44.31; (6) $13.80; (7) $474.09; (8) $242.80; (9) $900.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel 372, Washington, D. C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Second National Bank Building, Houston.
C. (2) For adequate river and harbor authorizations and appropriations; H. R. 7268.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (5) $13.49; (6) $58.22; (7) $613.24; (8) $4; (9) $668.95.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel 372, Washington, D. C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y.
C. (2) For retention of existing depletion allowances in tax laws.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (5) $829.84; (6) $62.85; (7) $437.65; (8) $132.58; (9) $1,462.92.

A. Miller, Gorham, Wescott and Adams, and William Simon a partner thereof, Room 3500, One North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Good faith competition—S. 719 and H. R. 2820.
E. (6) $107.04; (7) $1,225.52; (8) $261.70; (9) $1,594.26.

A. Justin Miller, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is interested in any legislation—local, State, Federal, or international—which affects the broadcasting industry.[1]
D. (6) $9,733.39.
E. (9) $963.41.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Miller's National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
E. (2) $312.50; (6) $88.19; (8) $1.74; (9) $402.43.

A. Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., 520 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Federal and State income taxation and governmental expenditures.
D. (6) $1,017.50.
E. (3) $918.10; (4) $31.58; (5) $155; (8) $50.60; (9) $1,155.28; (15) $918.10, National Associated Businessmen, Washington, D. C., contribution; $50.60, Bachman Anderson, Inc., St. Paul, bond and phone; $155, Norman E. Biorn, St. Paul, stenographers and postage; $31.58, St. Paul Letter Co., St. Paul, postage, mimeographing, mailing.

A. Missouri-Kansas Businessmen's Association, Inc., 1210 Waltower Building, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) Association is interested in legislation relating to taxation of independent business, labor legislation, and encroachment of Government into private industry.
D. (7) $40.
E. (4) $843.00; (5) $13.24; (7) $71; (9) $927.33; (15).[1]

A. Missouri Valley Chapter Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., 301–303 Millsaps Building, post-office box 1329, Jackson, Miss.
C. (2) Legislation relating to Government economy, Government regulation of business and taxation, such as Mason bill, H. R. 240, Davis bill, H. R. 1177, and Senator Williams' bill, S. 892.
D. (6) $2,447.50.
E. (2) $503.92; (4) $254.86; (5) $120; (6) $135.68; (7) $101.27; (8) $20; (9) $1,135.73; (15).[1]

A. F. E. Mollin, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Proposed legislation supported or opposed: Price controls, slaughter quotas, hide exports, transportation legislation, meat inspection appropriation, foot-and-mouth disease, land legislation, etc.
D. (6) $4,400.
E. (6) $117.34; (7) $960.19; (8) $198.64; (9) $1,276.17.

A. Donald Montgomery, 734 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Solidarity House, 8000 East Jefferson, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $1,300.
E. (6) $24.30; (7) $417.15; (9) $441.45.

A. William W. Mooney, 406 Bernice Building, Tacoma, Wash.
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Townsend plan bills in the Ways and Means Committee, H. R. 2678 and H. R. 2679. (3) Townsend National Weekly.
D. (6) $1,309.86.
E. (3) $17; (7) $206.73; (9) $223.73.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. George W. Morgan, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of American Shipowners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) S. 2325, S. 2714, S. 2352, S. 2355, and S. 2487. (3) Shipping Survey.

A. Morris Plan Corp. of America, 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Bank holding company bills and similar legislation.

A. Giles Morrow, 1220 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Freight Forwarders Institute, 1220 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Testified in favor of bills S. 2712, to require certificates of public convenience and necessity prior to engaging in service as a freight forwarder; and S. 2713, to provide more definite standards for exemption from part IV of act.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (5) $27.60; (6) $4.42; (7) $27.60; (9) $59.62.

A. Harold G. Mosier, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. The Glenn L. Martin Co., Baltimore, Md.
C. (2) All legislation in the aircraft field.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (6) $114.03; (7) $303.55; (8) $3; (9) $420.58.

A. Moss & Wels, 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Bowling Proprietors Association of America, Inc., 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in the Defense Production Act of 1950 (S. 2645) and such other bills as may pertain to economic controls over industry.
E. (5) $4.25; (6) $29.56; (7) $86; (8) $21.28; (9) $141.09.

A. William J. Mougey, 802 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Movers Conference of America, Sixteenth and P Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the moving industry; in particular, S. 2653, a bill to standardize rates on household goods shipped by the United States Government for its employees, which we support.
D. (6) $832.
E. (4) $832; (9) $832; (15) $16, Walter Conway and Associates, Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C., composition expense; $522, Federal Lithograph Co., 6011 Blair Road NW., Washington, D. C., printing of two letters and testimony given before Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in support of S. 2653.

A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
C. (2) Advocating legislation favorable to labor and opposing unfavorable labor legislation.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., Webster City, Iowa.
C. (2) Legislative interest of employer is to promote the welfare of its policyholders and prevent discrimination against the chiropractic profession.
D. (6) $300.
E. (9) $300.

A. John S. Murphy, 355 Boyce Building, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.
B. American Pyrotechnics Association, 6711 Loch Raven Boulevard, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Ray Murphy, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) $99.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., post-office box 692, Valdosta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, post-office box 692, Valdosta, Ga.
C. (2) H. R. 7314, H. R. 3994, S. 1767, H. R. 2572, S. 1149, H. R. 5474, H. R. 565, H. R. 3527. (3) The Forest Farmer.
D. (6) $60.
E. (6) $10; (7) $90.49; (9) $100.49.

A. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation which directly or indirectly affects the interests of agricultural limestone producers.
D. (7) $749.70.
E. (2) $500; (4) $60; (5) $164.60; (7) $25.10; (9) $749.70.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in laws affecting businessmen, particularly with relation to taxation, labor, Government regulation of business, social security, and tax-privileged corporationz in business. (3) Washington Report.
E. (2) $3,185.54; (4) $90.72; (5) $858.88; (6) $127.03; (8) $379.80; (9) $4,641.97; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Attorneys General, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To confirm and establish title in the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries.
E. (2) $5,087.55; (4) $51.50; (5) $445.88; (6) $298.29; (7) $685.30; (8) $989.01; (9) $7,557.53; (15).[1]

A. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 418–419 Homer Building, 601 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation concerning education of all types, particularly bills relating to GI education for Korean veterans. (3) The Business School News and the Executive.
D. (6) $6,019.42.
E. (2) $3,871.07; (4) $673.37; (5) $2,438.88; (6) $198.49; (7) $2,100.42; (8) $912.74; (9) $10,194.97; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Direct Selling Co.'s, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
C. (2) S. 2298, H. R. 3392, H. R. 30, H. R. 525.
D. (6) $13,262.50.
E. (4) $1.79; (6) $31.14; (8) $5.26; (9) $38.21.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Federal legislation that might affect members as going electric utilities.[1] (3).[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $402,699.88.
E. (1) $11,294.63; (2) $71,950.64; (3) $25; (4) $2,325.66; (5) $6,996.45; (6) $1,784; (7) $4,712.46; (8) $3,682.41; (9) $102,771.27; (15) $11,294.63, The Stephen, Fitzgerald Co., 502 Park Avenue, New York City, public relations services; $235.46, Fox-Jones Co., 509 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., office supplies; $64.84, Gardner Display Co., 1937 West Hastings Street, Chicago, Ill., storage charges; $23.98, M. S. Ginn & Co., 1417 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., office supplies, etc.[1]

A. National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The association has a general legislative interest in statutes or bills which affect the interests of independent tire dealers. (3) Dealer News.
D. (6) $1.52.
E. (4) $1.52; (9) $1.52.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) War Damage Corporation legislation, social security legislation, insurance legislation, tax equality legislation, wage, salary, and manpower control legislation. (3) American Agency Bulletin.
D. (6) $2,633.43.
E. (2) $3,369.62; (5) $427.64; (6) $297.92; (7) $207.68; (8) $120; (9) $4,422.26; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 1525 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal and Federal employees.
D. (6) $241,616.42.
E. (2) $3,674; (4) $3,994.93; (6) $250; (7) $995; (9) $8,913.93; (15) $3,994.93, Ransdell, Inc., 810 Rhode Island Avenue NE., Washington, D. C., printing and mailing; $995, Hamilton Hotel, Washington, D. C., dinner honoring members of Senate and House Post Office and Civil Service Committees.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in passage of H. R. 3207, to amend Navy Ration Statute (34 U. S. C. 902a); interested in any other legislation that may relate to margarine.
D. (6) $56.
E. (2) $50;(7) $6; (9) $56.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) S. 2517 and S. 2564, establishing branch policy for Federal savings and loan associations, both of which the savings banks supported.
D. (6) $164.50.
E. (2) $154.50; (7) $10.25; (9) $164.50; (15) $164.50, Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., services.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, P. O. Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting postal employees, including supervisors, and Postal Service. (3) The Postal Supervisor.
D. (6) $9,992.48.
E. (2) $2,400; (4) $1,791.65; (5) $300; (6) $30; (7) $101.72; (9) $4,623.37; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, Room 512–513 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Beneficial legislation affecting Postal employees and General Service employees, and Post Office Custodial employees and GSA in PBS employees, in particular. (3) The Post Office and General Services Maintenance News.
D. (6) $14,085.46.
E. (2) $644.76; (4) $277.85; (5) $110; (6) $18.71; (7) $40.90; (8) $294; (9) $1,386.22; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, its Public Relations Department and its Realtors Washington Committee, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $75,321.77.
E. (1) $60; (2) $19,022.46; (4) $1,305.56; (5) $2,487.17; (6) $913.86; (7) $3,461.76; (8) $684.54; (9) $27,935.35; (15) $60, Chittenden Press Service, 1372 National Press Building, Washington, D. C., pick-up service for press releases; $583.30, National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., reimbursement for services performed; $1,953.48, John C. Williamson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., legal service rendered; etc.[1]

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting retired civil employees, particularly during this quarter, S. 995, S. 500, and H. R. 6294. (3) The Annuitant.
D. (6) $300.
E. (4) $250; (7) $50; (9) $300.

A. National Association of United States Storekeeper-Gaugers, 4543 North Hicks Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) All legislation affecting Federal classified employees, and that in particular which would affect our position—United States storekeeper-gaugers.
D. (6) $557.40.
E. (2) $500; (9) $500; (15) $500, Robert E. McLaughlin, % Roberts & McInnis, 400 De-Sales Building, Connecticut Avenue and De-Sales Streets, Washington, D. C., legal services.

A. National Board, YWCA, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Mutual security program (for); migratory labor legislation (for); EMIC (for); UNICEF (for); civil rights (for); statehood of Alaska (for).
E. (2) $150; (4) $70; (6) $20; (7) $60; (9) $300.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., suite 55, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) That which affects postal rates of periodical published by members of the above-named association.
E. (2) $600; (9) $600.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Defense controls and all measures directly affecting the food-canning industry.
D. (6) $198,286.44.
E. (2) $3,817.50; (4) $24.71; (6) $19.54; (7) $869.68; (8) $51.61; (9) $4,778.44; (15) $2,312.50, Robert B. Heiney, McLean, Va., salary; $1,500, Otto Lowe, Washington, D. C., legal services; $26.60, Robert B. Heiney, McLean, Va., local transportation; $70.67, Henry P. Taylor, Walkerton, Va., travel expense; $51, Congressional Quarterly, Washington, D. C., subscriptions; etc.[1]

A. National Coal Association, 602 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All measures affecting bituminous-coal industry.
D. (6) $460,450.98.
E. (9) $33,608.01.[1]

A. National Committee for Fair Emergency Excise Taxation, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Fair emergency excise taxation.
D. (6) $1,130.65.
E. (2) $6,839.46; (9) $6,839.46; (15) $6,839.46, Wyatt, Grafton & Grafton, Marion E. Taylor Building, Louisville, Ky., professional services.

A. National Committee To Limit Federal Taxing Powers, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to taxes and the national debt.
D. (6) $774.
E. (4) $112.24; (8) $60; (9) $172.24; (15).[1]

A. National Committee for Strengthening Congress, 1135 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests include any and all legislation dealing with the organization of Congress.
D. (6) $100.
E. (4) $343.23; (6) $16.19; (7) $197.65; (9) $557.07.

A. National Consumers League, 348 Engineers' Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Labor legislation, such as minimum wage, social security, child labor, migratory labor, etc. (3) National Consumers League Bulletin.
D. (7) $2,781.55.
E. (1) $50; (2) $500; (4) $475; (5) $293.58; (6) $82.34; (7) $138.26; (9) $1,539.18.

A. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 586 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn., and 1008 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any matters substantially affecting the cotton compress and cotton warehouse industry.
D. (6) $396.79.
E. (2) $357.50; (5) $27.40; (6) $11.89; (9) $396.79; (15) $312.50, Callaway & Reed, Dallas and Washington, retainer; $45, Louise Paine, Memphis, Tenn., salary.

A. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $5,047.49.
E. (2) $3,825.42; (4) $65.74; (5) $274.53; (6) $12.78; (7) $869.02; (9) $5,047.49; (15) Albert R. Russell, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn., salary and expense, $2,014; Read Dunn, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary and expense, $251.02; William Rhea Blake, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn., salary and expense, $635.63; J. Banks Young, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary and expense, $764.49; Clifton Kirkpatrick, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn., salary and expense, $373.05; etc.[1]

A. National Council Against Conscription, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Its only legislative interest is opposition to peacetime conscription. (3) Conscription News.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $15,420.08.
E. (2) $1,275.95; (4) $10,464.16; (5) $278.54; (6) $95.09; (7) $664.89; (8) $18.91; (9) $12,797.54; (15).[1]

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) S. 2394, and all other similar legislation relating to the postal service.
D. (7) $2,459.76.
E. (1) $833.33; (4) $997.83; (5) $102.86; (6) $12.65; (7) $513.09; (9) $2,459.76; (15) $149.47, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., meals and lodging; $793.27, Geo. F. McKiernan & Co., 1035 West Van Buren, Chicago, Ill., printing; $204.56, Olson Letter Service, 19 South LaSalle, Chicago, Ill., mimeographing; $833.33, Sam O'Neal, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C., public relations counsel; etc.[1]

A. National Council of Coal Lessors, Inc., 316 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the interests of lessors of coal lands.
D. (6) $13,800.
E. (2) $3,897.7 ; (4) $88.50; (5) $104.34; (6) $3.50; (8) $55.22; (9) $4,149.31.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 2357, to restrict application of agricultural exemption for motor carriers (opposed); S. 2362, to restrict certain operations of private motor carriers and to restrict leasing of vehicles (opposed); S. 2518, to change procedure for increasing freight rates (opposed); S. 2319, to redefine the rule of rate-making (opposed).
D. (6) $2,870.
E. (2) $1,688; (4) $84.32; (5) $61.61; (6) $86.92; (7) $103.65; (9) $2,024.51; (15).[1]

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Restriction of immigration, suppression of communism, patriotic legislation, support American free public schools. (3) Junior American.
E. (3) $249.99; (4) $252.50; (6) $91.03; (7) $130.57; (9) $724.09.

A. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting world peace, such as mutual assistance program, appropriations and supplementary appropriations particularly where they bear on military matters or on the government of occupied areas, manpower legislation, including universal military training and service, proposals leading to the drafting of peace treaties, economic assistance, disarmament, expellees and displaced persons, educational exchange. (3) Peace Action.
D. (6) $11,034.23.
E. (2) $5,974.89; (3) $112.50; (4) $1,008.08; (5) $1,814.69; (6) $175.18; (7) $483.81; (8) $1,461.29; (9) $11,230.44; (15).[1]

A. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Our legislative interests are in favor of any legislation that tends to support private enterprise and maintain American independence, and in opposition to any measures that work contrariwise.
D. (6) $38,520.01.
E. (2) $21,845.29; (4) $5,016.79; (5) $4,639.28; (6) $287.78; (7) $1,022.80; (8) $365.54; (9) $35,277.48; (11) $35,277.48.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Education Campaign, American Medical Association, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation for compulsory health insurance, S. 1140, S. 337, H. R. 54, H. R. 274, H. R. 910, H. R. 913, S. 401.
D. (6) $15,233.05.
E. (1) $12,156.21; (4) $3,076.84; (9) $15,233.05; (15) $1,216.54, Low's Letter Service, 205 West Monroe, Chicago, Ill., printing, mimeographing, and mailing; $159.78, Medical Mailing Service, Inc., 2611 Indiana, Chicago, Ill., storage and mailing; $873.09, Norman Letter Service, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., mimeographing and mailing; $144.78, Lincoln Printing Co., 732 Sherman, Chicago, Ill., printing and mailing; $1,800, E. Hofer & Sons, 1405 Southwest Harbor Drive, Portland, Oreg., subscription; $10,356.21, Campaigns, Inc., 1607 De Young Building, San Francisco, Calif., reimbursement for purchase of radio time and newspaper advertising; etc.[1]

A. National Electrical Contractors' Association, Inc., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 2907, a bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes, and a continuing interest in all legislation that affects the building construction and electrical industries. Qualified Contractor.
E. (2) $1,500; (8) $4,027.50; (9) $5,527.50.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers' Association, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation regarding excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, electric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, and legislation with respect to amendment of the Labor-Management Relations Act.
D. (6) $621.

A. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting shipping.[1]
E. (2) $6,931.25; (5) $1,350; (6) $207.04; (7) $267.87; (9) $8,756.16.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The general legislative interests of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., are those which affect favorably or adversely the interests of women in business and the professions. (3) The Independent Woman.
D. (6) $26,474.40.
E. (2) $875; (4) $125; (5) $240.78; (6) $74.28; (8) $24.08; (9) $1,339.14; (15) $125, National Printing Co., Third and N Streets NE., Washington, D. C., printing.

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, room 502, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) The Union Postal Clerk and Federation News Service Bulletin.
D. (6) $157,690.92.
E. (2) $7,537.09; (4) $18,467.96; (5) $380; (6) $395.83; (8) $5,777.48; (9) $32,558.36; (15).[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Federation of Private School Associations, 2601 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislative proposals that affect private (non-tax-supported) schools.
D. (6) $550.
E. (4) $195.28; (6) $170.93; (7) $177.20; (9) $543.41.

A. National Grain Trade Council, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Investigation into grain storage and the various bills to amend the Defense Production Act.
D. (6) $21,420.
E. (9) $17,374.36.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The National Housing Conference is interested in all housing legislation.
D. (6) $18,060.17.
E. (1) $16.80; (2) $7,666.28; (3) $220; (4) $125.89; (5) $2,008.25; (6) $453.92; (7) $647.53; (8) $3,424.21; (9) $14,562.88; (15).[1]

A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Matters affecting meat packers.
D. (6) $123.86.
E. (1) $20.97; (2) $117.82; (4) $50.82; (5) $23.11; (6) $2.74; (7) $22.65; (9) $238.11; (11) $238.11; (15).[1]

A. National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation relating to the tariff and foreign trade.
E. (1) $49.73; (2) $1,649.35; (4) $166.15; (5) $1,227.62; (6) $95.24; (7) $173.12; (8) $70.14; (9) $3,431.35; (11) $3,431.35; (15).[1]

A. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Livestock taxation.
D. (6) $2,414.32.
E. (9) $5,626.68.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of the lumber-manufacturing industry. (3) National Lumber News.
D. (6) $16,001.64.
E. (1) $2,638.30; (2) $3,532.26; (4) $1,549.62; (5) $311.70; (6) $64.42; (7) $1,476.70; (8) $1,325.16; (9) $10,898.16; (11) $10,898.16; (15).[1]

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) Dairy Director and News for Dairy Co-Ops.
D. (6) $54,999.10.
E. (1) $2,732.04; (2) $26,753.06; (3) $5,000; (4) $3,938.32; (5) $2,061.50; (6) $904.63; (7) $3,079.29; (8) $6,238.88; (9) $50,707.72; (11) $50,707.72; (15).[1]

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $600; (7) $22.64; (9) $622.64; (11) $622.64.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Paint, Varnish, and Lacquer Association, Inc., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation that more or less specifically affects the paint, varnish, and lacquer industry.[1]

E. (7) $15.50; (9) $15.50.

A. National Reclamation Association, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Reclamation Act, 1902 (53 Stat. 1187, 43 U. S. C. 485), and all amendatory and supplementary acts thereto; all other statutes relating to water- and land-conservation measures.[1]

D. (6) $11,962.25.

E. (2) $6,354.68; (4) $2,661.30; (5) $2,022.12; (6) $302.17; (7) $1,309.42; (8) $93.75; (9) $12,743.44; (15).[1]

A. National Renderers Association, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation which would specifically have an effect upon the production, consumption, import, export, or taxation of any animal or vegetable fat or oil as well as all legislation generally affecting business, particularly small business.

D. (6) $16,200.

E. (2) $643.90; (4) $103.42; (5) $109.36; (6) $145.19; (7) $327.40; (8) $41; (9) $1,370.27.

A. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; postal legislation; Moody-Dingell bill; H. R. 5767 and H. R. 6925, fair-trade legislation; H. R. 6802 and S. 2713, transportation; H. R. 7256, H. R. 7257, H. R. 7258, and S. 2918; appropriation bills including funds for distributive education; H. R. 5505, Customs Simplifications Act; S. Res. 169 and H. R. 5189, consumer research; H. R. 6160, wage and hour. (3).[1]

E. (2) $2,500; (4) $2,406.45; (5) $517.60; (6) $15.54; (7) $241.30; (8) $2.50; (9) $5,683.39; (15).[1]

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Renewal of Defense Production Act; retention of Herlong amendment; discontinuance of consumer credit control authority.

E. (2) $500; (4) $300; (5) $400; (6) $200; (9) $1,400.

A. National Retired Teachers Association, 440 Downing Avenue, Fort Wayne, Ind.

C. (2) Forand bill, H. R. 2764.

D. (6) $970.76.

E. (4) $15.46; (6) $6.10; (7) $859.55; (8) $89.70; (9) $970.76.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor development, flood control, navigation, irrigation-reclamation, soil and water conservation, and related subjects.

D. (6) $11,747.

E. (1) $81.25; (2) $2,339.73; (3) $20; (4) $98.43; (5) $92.85; (6) $82.86; (7) $1,925.33; (8) $1,067.70; (9) $5,408.15; (15) $10, American Association of Port Authorities, 912 Eleventh Street NW., Washington 1, D. C., dues; $79.61, The C. & P. Telephone Co., 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C.; $289.40, collector of internal revenue, Baltimore 2, Md., withholding tax; $25, Coyle Lines, Inc., Post Office Box 6056, Station A, New Orleans 14, La., refund of duplicate payment; $70.80, Gina's, 1417 New York Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C., stationery; etc.[1]

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation which will further the country's rural electrification program, resulting from the REA Act, as amended, including REA administrative and loan funds for rural electrification and for rural telephone; funds for the construction of multipurpose dams, funds for the transmission and related facilities to deliver Federal hydro power to rural electric load centers; proposed legislation providing for surveys and development of water resources. (3) Rural Electrification Magazine.

D. (6) $9,610.37.

E. (1) $1,274.18; (2) $2,623.10; (4) $1,401.45; (5) $341.49; (6) $157.14; (7) $561.96; (8) $180; (9) $6,539.32; (15) $2,213.82, Collector of Internal Revenue, Baltimore, Md., office overhead; $64.64, District Unemployment Compensation Board, Washington, D. C., office overhead; $35.50, Dupont Paint and Hardware, Washington, D. C., office overhead; $900.78, D. C. Engraving Co., Inc., Washington, D. C., public relations and engraving; $304.98, John H. Denton, Huntingdon, Pa., travel, food and lodging; $508.10, Clyde T. Ellis, Washington, D. C., travel, food and lodging; etc.[1]

A. National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway and power project; House Joint Resolution 337 (opposed).

D. (6) $16,475.

E. (1) $125; (2) $4,862.32; (4) $7,870.87; (5) $672.57; (6) $794.16; (7) $1,318; (8) $90.80; (9) $15,738.94; (15).[1]

A. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing; oppose legislation inimicable to interests of savings and loan industry.

D. (6) $175,553.54.

E. (2) $2,500; (4) $328.42; (9) $2,828.42; (15) $2,500, Oscar R. Kreutz, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C., salary; $307.72, Batt, Bates and Co., Washington, D. C., printing.

A. National Small Businessmen's Association, 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.

D. (6) $5,000.

E. (1) $550; (2) $4,517.50; (5) $1,441.06; (6) $88.02; (7) $110.75; (8) $10.17; (9) $6,717.50; (15) $18.75, Accurate Answering, Washington, D. C., office expense; $73.48, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone; $110.75, Chicago & Northwestern Ry. Co., Chicago, Ill., travel; $39.78, Congressional Quarterly, Washington, D. C.; $169.85, K. Blyth Emmons, Washington, D. C.; $550, K. Blyth Emmons, Washington, D. C., publicity; etc.[1]

A. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) General legislative interests relate to corporate income-tax legislation.

D. (6) $20,471.55.

E. (1) $4,116.55; (2) $4,554.81; (4) $2,615.77; (5) $654.64; (6) $2,052.38; (7) $2,758.08; (9) $16,752.23; (15) $23.39, Railway Express Agency, 317 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill., express charges; $533.16, Joseph P. Leopold, 936 National City Building, Dallas, Tex., fee and expense; $3,990.50, Standard Printing & Letter Service, 517 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., printing; $25.10, Western Union, 427 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill., telegrams; $189.24, Monsen-Chicago, Inc., 22 East Illinois Street, Chicago, Ill., express charges; etc.[1]

A. National Tax Relief Coalition, Box 401, Greensboro, N. C.

C. (2) Tax limitation.

D. (6) $2,050.

E. (2) $375; (5) $500; (7) $1,175; (9) $2,050.

A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

D. (6) $4,553.61.

F. (2) $1,250; (5) $474.67; (7) $178.90; (8) $5.88; (9) $1,909.45; (15) Elizabeth A. Smart, salary, $725; Alice Haffey, salary, $525; Methodist Building, rent, $280; Mrs. D. L. Colvin, travel, $178.90; office expense, telephone, telegraph, postage, etc., $194.67.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

C. (2) S. 1149, reorganization of Department of Agriculture; S. 2549, special sheepherder bill; H. R. 5678, McCarran-Walter omnibus immigration bill; H. R. 5505, customs simplification bill; extension of Defense Production Act; agricultural appropriation bills.

D. (6) $170.

E. (2) $2,500.02; (6) $222.13; (7) $1,714.49; (8) $1,056.60; (9) $5,493.24; (15) $2,500.02, J. M. Jones, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah; $977.06, J. M. Jones, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah; $1,191.16, J. B. Wilson, McKinley, Wyo.; $825, Wyoming Wool Growers Association, McKinley, Wyo.

A. William S. Neal, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Reduction of Federal expenditures, revision of tax laws, maintenance of labor regulatory laws, protection of patent system, maintenance of antitrust laws, opposition to wage and price controls and allocations beyond those necessary for defense.

D. (6) $4,487.13.

E. (9) $737.13.

A. Nebraska Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr.

C. (2) All legislation designed to bring about equality of taxation between private business and cooperatives.

D. (6) $200.

E. (9) $153.09.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the mortgage banking industry.

D. (6) $5,424.68.

E. (2) $258.48; (4) $89.61; (5) $899.74; (6) $441.89; (7) $110; (9) $1,799.72

A. C. Roger Nelson, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Dr. Walter Duschinsky, 93 Perry Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation to grant permanent residence to client (S. 523).

E. (9) $1.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. G. W. Nelson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
C. (2) Soliciting support for legislation favorable to the interests of labor and opposing unfavorable legislation.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in substantially all legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workingman including all pending legislation dealing with social security, national health, aid to physically handicapped, labor relations, displaced persons, etc.
D. (6) $900.

A. Herbert U. Nelson, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $2,926.72.
E. (6) $12.30; (7) $1,664.42; (9) $1,676.72; (15).[1]

A. Donald F. Nemitz, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky.
B. Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky.
C. (2) Removal of exemptions granted by section 101 of Internal Revenue Code.
D. (6) $375.

A. Harold F. Neumann, 112 Bowers Street, Jersey City, N. J.
B. New Jersey Associated Businessmen, Inc., 112 Bowers Street, Jersey City, N. J.
C. (2) Any laws or proposals adversely affecting business.
E. (4) $37.50; (5) $25; (6) $32.49; (9) $94.99.

A. New Jersey Associated Businessmen, Inc., 112 Bowers Street, Jersey City, N. J.
C. (2) Any laws or proposals adversely affecting business.
D. (6) $510.
E. (4) $37.50; (5) $25; (6) $32.49; (8) $355; (9) $449.99; (15) $94.99, Harold F. Neumann, Jersey City, N. J., telephone, telegrams, postage, and stenographer; $355, National Associated Businessmen, Inc., Washington, D. C., dues.

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

A. Russ Nixon, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $1,170.
E. (7) $195; (9) $195.

A. W. R. Noble, suite 509, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Farm Equipment Association, 207 Hotel DeSoto Building, St. Louis, Mo., and National Retail Hardware Association, 964 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) All labor legislation, tax bills, the Defense Production Act, and all legislation affecting the retail farm equipment and hardware trade. (3) Farm Equipment Retailing and Hardware Retailer.
D. (6) $3,375.
E. (6) $158.88; (7) $402.06; (8) $156.08; (9) $717.02.

A. J. S. Noffsinger, 2601 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Private School Associations, 2601 Sixteenth Street, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislative proposals that affect private (non-tax-supported) schools.

A. Christian P. Norgord, 1617 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mel Morse, president, American Humane Association, Albany, N. Y.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation that might affect members as going electric utilities.[1]
D. (6) $4,437.52.
E. (6) $1.85; (7) $166.60; (8) $15; (9) $183.45; (15) $15, National Press Club, Washington, D. C., dues.

A. North Dakota Resources Board, 311 Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the development and utilization of the land, water, and other natural resources of North Dakota, including authorizations and appropriations.
D. (6) $3,100.
E. (2) $2,570.24; (9) $2,570.24; (15) $2,570.24, Fred J. Fredrickson, Lafayette Hotel, Washington, D. C., salary and expenses.

A. Harry E. Northam, 360 North Michigan Avenue., Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All matters concerning the practice of medicine and surgery.

A. Northern Hemlock and Hardwood Manufacturers Association, Washington Building, Oshkosh, Wis.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the timber industries of Wisconsin and Michigan; taxation, forestry, and labor management relations.

A. T. C. Nugent, 1111 Tulane Avenue, New Orleans, La.
B. The California Co., 1111 Tulane Avenue, New Orleans, La.
C. (2) Legislation, regulation, or order affecting the lands of the United States and the procedures by which exploration and production of oil and gas are to be accomplished; interested in the enactment of any law or resolution that will authorize the development of submerged lands of the Continental Shelf.
D. (6) $1,200.
E. (6) $60; (7) $955; (9) $1,015.

A. Peter Q. Nyce, 1266 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation pertaining to land of the United States.

A. Edward H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 27, to provide a national health insurance and public-health program; H. R. 54, to provide a program of national health insurance and public health; S. 2639 and H. R. 6525, to amend Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; H. R. 5594, to provide benefits for survivors of members of the uniformed services.
D. (6) $31,070.12.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General interest in proposed legislation having direct or specific impact on the wool textile industry.
E. (6) $5.12; (8) $5; (9) $10.12.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wilbur-Ellis Co., Inc., 320 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) General interest in any proposed legislation having direct or specific impact on any food products produced or handled by this company.
E. (4) $199.85; (5) $19.49; (6) $76.75; (7) $38; (8) $39.85; (9) $373.94; (15).[1]

A. Ohio Coal Association, 1615 NBC Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation pertaining to mine safety.

A. Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroad interests.
E. (7) $417.66; (9) $417.66; (15) $417.66, E. C. Shively, reimbursement for travel, food, lodging, and entertainment.

A. Fred N. Oliver, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., and Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., and Railroad Security Owners Association, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The general legislative interests consist of any legislation which the mutual savings banks or railroad security owners have a legitimate interest in supporting or opposing.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, rehabilitation, hospitalization, re-education, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanism, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities, with particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agriculture development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil-aviation programs and policies, and the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services, etc. (3) The American Legion magazine and legislative bulletin.
D. (6) $1,929.24.
E. (7) $17.05; (9) $17.05.

A. Sam O'Neal, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Power Distributors Information Committee of Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth and Market Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to public power.
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (7) $100; (8) $60; (9) $160.

A. Order of Railway Conductors of America, ORC Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (2) $2,125; (5) $1,042.52; (6) $60.39; (9) $3,227.91; (15) $2,125, W. D. Johnson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C., services.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, post office box 381, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests are in part but not exclusively exemplified by bills which in the Digest of Public General Bills, Library of Congress, are indexed under "Public officers and employees," "Retirement," and "Income-tax exemptions"; considerable attention has been paid to bills S. 995, on retirement, and S. 1019, dealing with the Federal-State cooperative program, and Senate hearings on general retirement legislation.
D. (6) $207.87.
E. (2) $125; (4) $20.39; (6) $1; (9) $146.39; (15) $20.39, the Trades Unionist, 729 Fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C., addressing and mailing newsletters; $110, Frederick V. Rand, 54 Nash Place, Kensington, Md., services; $15, Lila W. Meyer, Route 1, Box 632, Annandale, Va., services.

A. Thomas R. Owens, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose all legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $1,430.
E. (7) $546; (9) $546.

A. Mrs. Theodor Oxholm, 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Volunteer worker for Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Better laws for maternal and child health and welfare.

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine, particularly the tanker division thereof, including, without limitation, amendments relating to titles 14, 33, and 46 of the United States Code Annotated, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, Transportation Act of 1940, appropriations relating to agencies charged with the duty of administering laws affecting transportation, etc.
D. (6) $200.
E. (2) $900; (9) $900.

A. Lovell H. Parker, 614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, National Council of Coal Lessors, and Television Broadcasters' Tax Committee, all of Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Tax legislation affecting the bituminous-coal industry and the television broadcasting industry.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. George F. Parrish, 706 Security Building, Charleston, W. Va.
B. West Virginia Railroad Association, Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
D. (6) $3,249.99.

A. James G. Patton, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

A. Edmund W. Pavenstedt, care of White & Case, 14 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. International Minerals & Chemical Corp., 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) To amend section 34 of Trading With the Enemy Act to protect interests of domestic corporations owning stock in enemy corporations assets of which have been seized by the Alien Property Custodian.

A. Albert A. Payne, 1737 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (6) 45 cents; (7) $276.52; (8) $29.90; (9) $306.87; (15) $25, January 2, 1952, Washington Board of Trade, 1101 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D. C., dues.

A. Merl B. Peek, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (a) Reclamation Act, 1902 (53 Stat. 1187, 43 U. S. C. 485), and all amendatory and supplementary acts thereto. All other statutes relating to water- and land-conservation measures. (b) H. R. 5097, H. R. 5368, H. R. 5403, H. R. 5738, H. R. 5630, H. R. 5489; H. R. 5735, H. R. 6804, H. R. 2470, H. R. 4268, H. R. 5743, H. R. 6591, S. 1789, S. 2709, S. 1798, S. 2809, S. 2863, and all other bills concerning reclamation, flood control as related to reclamation, water and land conservation.
D. (6) $633.33.
E. (7) $285.05; (9) $285.05; (11) $285.05.

A. Ernest L. Peterson, 164 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Minneapolis Traffic Association, 164 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) All legislation directly affecting air, rail, truck, barge, or other forms of transportation.

A. Hugh Peterson, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation referring to the cane sugar refining industry.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, postoffice box 2097, Dixiland Station, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Alaska Statehood Committee, Juneau, Alaska.
C. (2) Statehood for Alaska, S. 50, for the bill.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (6) $7.70; (7) $347.02; (8) $2.57; (9) $357.29; (12) $356.12; (15) $96.43, February 3, 1952, Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, Lakeland, Fla.; $17.65, February 10, 1952, Washington Terminal Co., Washington, D. C.; $96.43, February 17, 1952, Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, Lakeland, Fla.; $17.65, March 11, 1952, Washington Terminal Co., Washington, D. C.; $17.50, February 9, 1952, George Washington Inn, Washington, D. C.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, postoffice box 2097, Dixiland Station, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Government of Guam, Agana, Guam, M. I.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the welfare of Guam.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (5) $8.50; (6) $8.14; (7) $108.04; (8) $7.50; (9) $132.18; (15) $57.04, January 12, 1952, Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, Lakeland, Fla.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, postoffice box 2097, Dixiland Station, Lakeland, Fla.
B. U. S. Airlines, Inc., 500 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) For legislation favorably affecting freight air carrier and against legislation that would adversely affect them. For certain amendments to S. 436 and other bills separating mail subsidy so as to allow freight air carriers to carry mail.
D. (6) $416.66.
E. (6) $11.88; (7) $133.85; (8) $2.98; (9) $148.71; (12) $148.71; (15) $96.44, March 25, 1952, Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, Lakeland, Fla.; $17.65, March 27, 1952, Capitol Ticket Office, Washington, D. C.

A. Albert T. Pierson, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
C. (2) All legislation which might affect the New Haven Railroad and its subsidiaries (The Connecticut Co., New England Transportation Co.).
D. (6) $1,906.50.
E. (7) $81.20; (9) $81.20; (11) $81.20; (15) $14, February 20–21, 1952, Hotel Mayflower, Washington, D. C., hotel room; $67.20, February 20–21, 1952, transportation, taxicabs, food, etc., in various restaurants.

A. Pierson & Ball, 1007 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Bridgeport Brass Co., Bridgeport, Conn.
C. (2) Excess-profits tax bills.

A. Pierson & Ball, 1007 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Radio Television Manufacturers Association, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Excess-profits tax and excise-tax bills.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.
D. (6) $52.50.

A. Frank M. Porter,[1] 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) (See explanatory statement.)[1]

A. James E. Poulton, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. William I. Powell, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
D. (6) $1,062.54.
E. (7) $6.10; (9) $6.10; (11) $6.10.

A. Kenneth L. Pray, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Schenley Distillers, Inc., and affiliated companies.

A. William H. Press, 204 Evening Star Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Board of Trade, 204 Evening Star Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia, of interest to the Washington Board of Trade.
D. (6) $3,712.50.

A. Allen Pretzman, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Scioto-Sandusky Conservancy District, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. William M. Price, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council of Canal Zone Trade Unions, Balboa, C. Z.
C. (2) All legislation affecting employees on the Canal Zone.
D. (6) $1,200.
E. (2) $250; (3) $110; (5) $145; (6) $50; (7) $1,100; (8) $85; (9) $1,800.

A. Harry E. Proctor, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York City.
C. (2) In support of Federal Savings and Loan Association branch, bills S. 2517 and S. 2564.
D. (6) $154.25.
E. (7) $10.25; (9) $10.25; (11) $10.25.

A. The Proprietary Association, 810 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting proprietary medicines industry. Fair-trade bills.
E. (4) $136.80; (7) $100; (9) $236.80; (15) $100, first quarter, A. K. Barta (miscellaneous) 810 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) General interest in all legislation affecting the business of the company.
E. (2) $2,750; (6) $28.81; (9) $2,778.81; (15) $2,778.81, January 9, 1952, Milo J. Warner, Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Dr. Welter Duschinsky, 98 Perry Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation to grant permanent residence to client (S. 523).
E. (8) $1; (9) $1.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) General legislative interests of clients are those affecting foreign commerce of the United States, including tax and tariff legislation.
D. (6) $250.
E. (9) $6.40.

A. Alexander Purdon, National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are concerned with the declaration of policy as expressed by the Congress in the 1936 Merchant Marine Act and such other legislation as may affect the development of an adequate merchant marine.
D. (6) $406.25.
E. (7) $67.59; (9) $67.59; (11) $67.59.

A. Edmund R. Purves, 1741 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Architects, 1741 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation in relation to the architectural profession. H. R. 4914, military construction bill, support of section 504. Defense housing bill, S. 349, general support but criticizing certain aspects. H. R. 1901, Nevius tract, protesting against this. S. 898, reorganization of national park and planning, against this as it is presently proposed. S. 2645 and S. 2584, Defense Production Act continuation, in support. S. 2137 and H. R. 6598, lease purchase of public buildings, in support. S. 2487, to extend judicial review of administrative decisions in support. H. R. 4371 (Keogh), H. R. 4373 (Reed), individual retirement, in support. H. R. 1171 (Davis), tax adjustment, in support.
D. (6) $200.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
C. (2) General legislative interest in matters affecting railroads.

A. Ward L. Quaal, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), suite 532, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) CCBS will oppose any proposed legislation (such as S. 491 and H. R. 4004, 81st Cong.) calling for the duplication of class I–A clear-channel frequencies or the limitation of the power of class I–A standard broadcast stations. CCBS opposes ratification of the so-called NARBA agreement signed November 15, 1950. (See 1 above).[1]
D. (6) (See page 3).[1]
E. (7) $558.01; (9) $558.01.

A. Earl Quale and Arno Wisness, Watford City, N. Dak.
B. Brooks Keogh, Roy Lillibridge, and John H. Hanson, trustees, operating under the name of Mineral Recovery Trustees, Dickinson, N. Dak., trustees on behalf of former owners of lands sold to United States seeking recovery of mineral rights.
C. (2) Will be interested in a bill seeking the recovery of right to repurchase mineral rights by former owners of lands which were sold to the United States.
E. (8) $282; (9) $282.

A. Frank Quigley, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $7,500.
E. (7) $917.61; (9) $917.61; (15) $95.39, December 7, 1951, Eastern Airlines, Washington to Houston, Tex.; $66.42, December 9–14, 1951, Braniff Airlines, Houston to Dallas to Austin to Dallas to Houston, Tex.; $23, December 15, 1951, Eastern Airlines, Houston, Tex., to New Orleans, La.; $51.75, December 17, 1951, New Orleans, La., to Miami, Fla.; $12.50, November 20 to December 19, 1951, Stanley Peeles Motors Co., car storage; $36.36, December 13, 1951, Nichols Bros. Garage & Auto Parking Co., Dallas, Tex., use of car, all for transportation, for telephone business purposes.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Cancer Society, 47 Beaver Street, New York City, United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 50 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York City, Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York City, National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York City.
C. (2) Public health.
D. (6) $6,874.98.
E. (2) $2,044.85; (5) $348.19; (6) $140.97; (7) $1,020.82; (9) $3,554.83; (11) $3,554.83.

A. F. Miles Radigan, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5.)[1]
D. (6) $1,675.

A. Alex Radin, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the generation, transmission, and distribution of electrical energy by local publicly owned electric systems, and the management and operation of such systems.[1]
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Radio-Television Manufacturers Association, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television manufacturing industry.
E. (2) $3,495; (8) $75.93; (9) $3,570.93; (11) $3,570.93.

A. Leon Raesly, suite 624, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 1671 and S. 1672.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, P. O. box 798, New Haven, Conn.
C. (2) For enactment of H. R. 63 and S. 1398—30-year half-pay retirement. For enactment of H. R. 6525 and S. 2639 amended to be payable from first of sickness.
D. (6) $427.90.
E. (4) $91.67; (5) 28.77; (7) 548.60; (8) $5.78; (9) $174.82; (11) $174.82.

A. Railroad Security Owners Association, Inc., 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables, directly or indirectly.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. DeWitt C. Ramsey, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the aviation industry. No specific bills at this time.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation involving silver H. R. 1321—To repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes.
D. (6) $4,250.06.
E. (7) $859.86; (9) $859.86.

A. Frederick V. Rand, 54 Nash Place, Kensington, Md.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, P. O. box 381, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $110.

A. Jacob Reck, 1346 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Beauty & Barber Manufacturers' Association, 1346 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,100.
E. (8) $9.50; (9) $9.50.

A. Stanley Rector, Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Social security. (3) The Advisor.
D. (6) $4,999.98.

A. Otie M. Reed, Wyatt Building, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Creameries Association, 817 New York Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers and dairy product manufacturing concerns.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (2) $1,000; (4) $170.77; (5) $100; (7) $237.31; (9) $1,508.08.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
(C) (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.
D. (6) $1,181.25.

A. Regular Common Carrier Conference of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interest is the protection and fostering of the interests of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities. Specific interests: S. 2358, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by establishing certain rules for the operation of irregular common carriers by motor vehicle; S. 2361, a bill to require the supervision, by the Interstate Commerce Commission, of the operations of contract carriers; S. 2362, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to restrict certain operations of private carriers by motor vehicle, and to restrict the leasing of vehicles. Position: Generally in opposition to all three, but favorable to amendments theerof. (3) (See p. 3 attached.) [1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (2) $2,698.75; (4) $853.35; (5) $25; (6) $28.25; (7) $399.66; (8) $55.42; (9) $4,060.43; (15).[1]

A. Gerard D. Reilly, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Printing Industry of America, Inc., et al. (See preliminary report.[1])
C. (2) Opposing legislation directed against provisions in Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, relating to supervisors.
D. (7) $916.66.

A. Hubert M. Rhodes, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
C. (2) Legislation affecting credit unions.
D. (6) $408.33 (see schedule attached.)[1]
E. (7) $13.75; (9) $13.75.

A. Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay and retirement benefits and pensions; study and analyzing bills; preparing statements for presentation to the cognizant committees and drafting amendments where indicated; appearing before committees of Congress, principally the Committees on Armed Services, Committees on Veterans' Affairs, and the committees dealing with various privileges, opportunities, and obligations of the personnel involved. (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $18,781.05.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Legislative interests are expected to continue indefinitely. (2) General legislative interests are: Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees Compensation Acts.[1]
D. (6) $4,616.20.
E. (2) $2,640.58; (4) $417.50; (5) $569.05; (6) $58.57; (8) $668.75; (9) $4,354.45; (15) $117.50, January 3 and March 20, Shepherd Printing Co., 110 High Street, Portsmouth, Va., printing membership cards and stamps and Christmas cards; $58.57, January 3, January 28, February 29, and March 28, the C. & P. Telephone Co., post office box 2601, Washington, D. C., telephone and telegraph service; $134.05, January 3, February 1, and March 3, Commercial Office Furniture Co., 915 E Street NW., Washington, D. C., office supplies; $154.41, March 10, Collector of Internal Revenue, Baltimore, Md., withholding and social security taxes, etc.[1]

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation for development of a military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security; (3) The Reserve Officer and ROA Washington Newsletter.

A. Roland Rice, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) S. 2358, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by establishing certain rules for the operation of irregular common carriers by motor vehicle; S. 2361, a bill to require the supervision, by the Interstate Commerce Commission, of the operations of contract carriers; S. 2362, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to restrict certain operations of private carriers by motor vehicle, and to restrict the leasing of vehicles. Position: Generally in opposition to all three, but favorable to amendments thereof. Work consisted of reading and analyzing bills, conferring, preparing testimony, and attending hearings.
D. (6) $825.
E. (7) $6; (9) $6.

A. Charles R. Richey, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (7) $159.30; (9) $159.30; (15) February 18, $18, Hoover Commission Dinner.

A. Siert F. Riepma, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any specific legislation that may relate to margarine. Also interested in passage of H. R. 3207, Eighty-second Congress, first session, to amend Navy ration statute (34 U. S. C. 902a). Also interested in passage of H. R. 5012, which is likewise designed to amend the Navy ration statute.
D. (6) $50 (see p. 3, attached).[1]
E. (7) $6; (9) $6.

A. George D. Riley, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $2,364.
E. (2) $2,364; (6) $22.40; (8) $227.60; (9) $2,614.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 911 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Western Oil and Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Federal legislation affecting the petroleum industry in Washington, Oregon, California, Arizona, and Nevada.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (4) $60; (7) $268; (9) $328; (15) $60, Phyllis Loren, National Press Building, stenographic service; $18, Statler Hotel, Washington, dinner; $140, Statler Hotel, Washington, dinner $110, Statler Hotel, Washington, dinner.

A. Dr. Frederick E. Robin, 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (see attachment A).[1]
C. (2) National health plan as embodied in H. R. 27 and H. R. 54. Also interested in the following measures: S. 445, S. 337, H. R. 1781, H. R. 2152, H. R. 516, H. R. 910, H. R. 274, H. R. 14, H. R. 149, H. R. 342, H. R. 146. (3) (See attachment B).[1]
D. (6) $2,374.98.
E. (7) $61.49; (9) $61.49; (11) $61.49.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Philip L. Rizzo, 826 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. The Consumers' Lobby, 826 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation directly affecting the consumer interest such as price-control provision in Defense Production Act (for), fair trade (against), and S. R. 169 (for).
E. (6) $7; (7) $250; (8) $20; (9) $277; (11) $277.

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Beet Growers' Association, P. O. Box 742, Great Falls, Mont.
C. (2) Legislation that may affect or limit the right of American farmers to grow and market sugar beets.
D. (6) $520.
E. (2) $30; (4) $46.60; (5) $80; (6) $1.21; (7) $334.16; (9) $491.97; (15) $30, Mrs. Ann Glass, Washington, D. C., secretary and collector internal revenue, Baltimore, Md.; $46.60, postmaster, Washington, D. C., Ellicott Addressing Machine Co., Washington, D. C.; $80, Mrs. Miriam Keller, Simpsonville, Md., E. W. Rising, Washington, D. C.; $1.21, Western Union, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.; $334.16, Pennsylvania Railroad Co., E. W. Rising, meals, cab fares, and miscellaneous, Northwest and American Air Lines.

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Suite No. 3, Washington, D. C.
B. National Water Conservation Conference, 341 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) All legislation relative to development, utilization, and conservation of natural resources.
E. (2) $379.01; (4) $123.56; (5) $165; (6) $21.87; (9) $689.44; (15) $379.01, Ann Glass, Washington, D. C., stenographic and collector of internal revenue, Baltimore, Md.; $123.56, Kirby Lithograph Co., Washington, D. C., Postmaster, Washington, D. C., Ellicott Addressograph Machine Co., Washington, D. C., Gist & Chairs, Washington, D. C., supplies, R. P. Andrews Co., Washington, D. C., envelopes, United States Government Printing Office, reprints; $165, Mrs. Miriam Keller, Simpsonville, Md., E. W. Rising, Washington, D. C.; $21.87, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.

A. George B. Roscoe, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D C.
C. (2) S. 2907. Qualified contractor.
D.[1]
E.[1]

A. Roland H. Rowe, 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting interests of wholesale grocers. (a) Fair-trade bills, transportation amendments to Interstate Commerce Act, amendments to Fair Labor Standards Act, (b) H. R. 5767, H. R. 6925, S. 2361, S. 2362. S. 2298, H. R. 5769, H. R. 5775, H. R. 5776. (c) Miller-Tydings Act, Federal Trade Commission Act, Clayton Act, Sherman Act, Interstate Commerce Act, Fair Labor Standards Act. (d) For H. R. 5767; against all other bills cited.

A. John Forney Rudy, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1609 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $450.
E. (7) $168.85; (9) $168.85; (14) $168.85.

A. Edward A. Rumely, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $10,175.

A. Charles J. Rush, 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All local measures affecting the District of Columbia are of interest.

A. Albert R. Russell, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $1,650.
E. (7) $364; (9) $364.

A. Francis M. Russell, 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (7) $238.25; (9) $238.25; (15) $238.25; (16) $47.50, January 8, 1952, Carlton Hotel; $58.75, January 12, 1952, Shoreham Hotel; $86, February 28, 1952, Metropolitan Club; $46, March 21, 1952, Mayflower Hotel.

A. Horace Russell, 7 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation directly or indirectly affecting the savings and loan business.
D. (6) $2,750.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (7) $256.80; (9) $256.80; (15).[1]

A. William Henry Ryan, Room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. District No. 44, I. A. of M., Room 303 Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general.
D. (6) $1,499.94.
E. (7) $15; (9) $15.

A. Sterling St. John, Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 998, 1001), as amended, to provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of foreign-trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes. In opposition to H. R. 5305 (82d Cong.), to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 in order to extend foreign-trade zone privileges to certain types of warehouses.
D. (6) $66.96.
E. (4) $56.55; (7) $688.48; (8) $5.50; (9) $750.53; (15).[1]

A. St. Louis Local Meat Packers Association, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) S. 2504, S. 2325; H. Res. 532.
D. (6) $5.
E. (6) $5; (9) $5.

A. Benjamin P. Saltzstein, 625 North Milwaukee Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. Hedwig Lydia Riedner, Astor Hotel, Milwaukee, Wis.
C. (2) S. 302; H. R. 1620, and H. R. 2656; amendments to Public Law 859, Eighty-first Congress.
E. (4) $5.71; (6) $26.99; (7) $28.95; (9) $61.65; (15) February, C. & P. Telephone Co., $19.25.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Emergency Committee of Small and Medium Size Magazine Publishers, 400 Madison Avenue (eleventh floor), New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Interested in matters affecting second-class postal rates, particularly Public Law No. 233.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (6) $55.42; (7) $1; (9) $56.42; (15) January, C. & P. Telephone Co., $35.62; February, C. & P. Telephone Co., $15.11.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Benjamin P. Saltzstein, 625 North Milwaukee Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
C. (2) S. 302; H. R. 1620 and H. R. 2656; amendments to Public Law 859, Eighty-first Congress.
E. (4) $5.71; (6) $26.99; (7) $28.95; (9) $61.65; (15) February, C. & P. Telephone Co., $19.25.

A. Chas. E. Sands, 4211 Second Street, Washington, D. C.
B. Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, A. F. of L., 525 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Labor and social legislation.
E. (5) $102; (6) $24; (9) $126.

A. L. R. Sanford, Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Sangamo Electric Co., Springfield, Ill.
C. (2) Seeking amendments to Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950; H. R. 9827, Eighty-first Congress, second session, Public Law 909.
E. (2) $3,000; (9) $3,000.

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Nurses' Association, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General legislative interests are in legislation relating to nurses, nursing, or health. Specific legislative interests include support of H. R. 910 (a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide a program of grants and scholarships for nursing education); and support of H. R. 911 and S. 661 (a bill to provide for the appointment of male citizens as nurses in the Army, Navy, and Air Force). (3) The American Journal of Nursing.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Stuart T. Saunders, 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
B. Norfolk and Western Railway Co., 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
C. (2) S. 2226.
E. (7) $30.75; (9) $30.75; (15) $30.75, February 28, 1952, Carlton Hotel, Washington, D. C., food and lodging.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Paul W. Schoen, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (6) $25; (7) $20; (9) $45.

A. Schoene & Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bill to amend Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. H. R. 6525 and S. 2639. For such bill.
E. (6) $3.94; (9) $3.94.

A. Ed D. Schorr, 33 North High Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Ohio Coal Association, 1615 NBC Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation pertaining to mine safety.
E. (2) $4,901; (5) $3,371.89; (7) $2,154.96; (8) $981.83; (9) $11,359.68; (15) $65.05, January 12 to March 6, inclusive, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., books and pamphlets; $124.33, February 12, the Thompson Co., Columbus, Ohio, office supplies; $101.50, January 12 to March 7, inclusive, Jane Mithoff, Columbus, Ohio, clerical services; $91, January 15 to March 7, inclusive, Ruth Harmel, Columbus, Ohio, clerical services; $58.50, January 15, Robert Masters, Columbus, Ohio, clerical services, etc.[1]

A. Mrs. Andrew MacKay Scott, League of Women Voters of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (7) $15.50; (9) $15.50.

A. Jack Garrett Scott, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators.
C. (2) S. 1539, S. 2211, H. R. 6536.

A. John W. Scott, 317 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Harvey B. Jacobson, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 3097, S. 17, and S. 1725 (82d Cong.); and H. R. 1566, H. R. 4446, H. R. 8201, and S. 1928 (81st Cong.); bills to protect the public with respect to practitioners before administrative agencies; (2) H. R. 3760 (82d Cong.) and H. R. 9123 (81st Cong.), proposed bills for general revision and codification of patent laws.
D. (6) $900.

A. Mildred Scott, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 1202—opposed. S. 1318, H. R. 3599, 3560, 3581, 3640, 3747, 3762, 3769, 3805, 3809, 3836, 3848, 3902, 4912, 4748; S. 2652; H. R. 4051; S. 1874—for.
D. (6) $300.

A. Vernon Scott and Loring A. Schuler, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests relate to taxation, Government regulation of business, and other legislation directly affecting business. Specifically interested in legislation affecting businessmen such as H. R. 240.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (7) $48.15; (9) $48.15.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Harry See, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
C. (2) Soliciting support for legislation favorable to the interests of labor and opposing unfavorable legislation.
E. (7) $17.55; (9) $17.55.

A. Selvage & Lee, 1 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y.
B. (1) National Association of Retail Grocers, Washington, D. C. (2) National Association of Food Chains, Washington, D. C. (3) Cooperative Food Distributors of America, Chicago, Ill. (4) Supermarket Institute, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Principals interested in amendments as yet unformulated to Public Law 96, Eighty-second Congress; Defense Production Act Amendments of 1951.
D. (6) $4,000.
E. (1) $389.75; (6) $32; (8) $139.60; (9) $561.35.

A. Selvage & Lee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. New York Coffee & Sugar Exchange, 113 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the New York Coffee & Sugar Exchange.
D. (6) $2,499.99.
E. (6) $33.03; (7) $17.83; (8) $7.54; (9) $58.40.

A. Selvage & Lee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. New York Cotton Exchange, 60 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the New York Cotton Exchange.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (6) $4.37; (7) $31.15; (8) $3; (9) $38.52.

A. Selvage & Lee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trailer Coach Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation affecting trailer coaches.
D. (6) $1,249.98.
E. (6) $30.62; (7) $66.64; (8) $14.31; (9) $111.57.

A. Harry L. Senger, 1539 Larry Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. National Retired Teachers' Association.
C. (2) Forand bill, H. R. 2764.
D. (6) $295.56.
E. (4) $15.41; (7) $270.74; (8) $9.41.

A. A. Manning Shaw, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 7268, 1642, 3146, 5099; S. 517, 1963, 2021; H. R. 5743; S. 2812; H. R. 7072, 7176; S. 2594, 2645; H. R. 6546, 6843.
D. (6) $3,774.99.

A. Mark R. Shaw, 114 Trenton Street, Melrose, Mass.
B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Favor economic aid to Europe and Asia; point 4 program; etc.; favor plans for universal disarmament; favor full cooperation with the U. N. in economic and social welfare, UNICEF; oppose UMT, UMS, and military aid programs; oppose rearming Japan, Germany; other measures related to peace and war. (3) Peace Action.
E. (7) $60.90; (9) $60.90.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 111 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. The Port of New York Authority, 111 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) For S. 2722 (Knowland), to amend Defense Production Act; for S. 2815 (McCarran), to amend Federal Airports Act; for H. R. 4484 (Walter), with respect to submerged lands; against Senate Joint Resolution 20 (O'Mahoney), with respect to submerged lands.
D. (5) $3,750.
E. (6) $1.75; (7) $206.42; (8) $35; (9) $243.17; (15) $17.87, January 11, Hotel Everglades, Miami, Fla., lodging, etc.; $57.59, January 20–21, March 28, Pennsylvania Railroad Co., New York City, transportation and Pullman; $10, March 15, The American Association of Port Authorities, dues as associate member; $25, March 19, Airport Operators' Council, registration fees, annual meeting; $52.56, March 23, Hollywood Roosevelt Hotel, Hollywood Calif., lodging, etc.

A. Robert H. Shields, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting sugar, particularly the Sugar Act of 1948, and related legislation.
D. (6) $10,000.

A. Earl C. Shively, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroad interests. (a) St. Lawrence seaway bills, Senate Joint Resolution 27, House Joint Resolution 337; and railroad unemployment insurance bill, H. R. 6525. (b) Senate Joint Resolution 27, House Joint Resolution 337, and H. R. 6525.
D. (6) $384.81.
E. (7) $384.81; (9) $384.81; (15) February 5, 1952, $28.78, Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Pullman expenses; January 24, 1952, $179.66, Hotel Raleigh, Washington, D. C., hotel expenses; February 11, 1952, $40.50, Hotel Raleigh, Washington, D. C., hotel expenses; March 17, 1952, $126.44, Hotel Raleigh, Washington, D. C., hotel expenses.

A. Silver Users' Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation involving silver, H. R. 1321, to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes.
D. (6) $33,210.
E. (2) $6,528.04; (5) $890.26; (6) $415.58; (7) $859.86; (8) $742.34; (9) $9,436.08.

A. Six Agency Committee, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting California's rights in the Colorado River, including S. 75, to authorize the Central Arizona project, and House Joint Resolution 21 and Senate Joint Resolution 26, Colorado River litigation resolutions; and legislation relating to reclamation and water resources policies.
D. (6) $10,000.
E. (2) $5,480; (8) $421.02; (9) $5,901.02; (15) $3,200, February 4, 1952, Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C., retainer and per diem; $398.27, February 4, 1952, Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C., reimbursement of expenses; $1,000, February 19, 1952, Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C., retainer and per diem; $1,280, March 25, 1952, Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C., retainer and per diem; $22.75, March 25, 1952, Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C., reimbursement of expenses.

A. Stephen G. Silpher, room 512, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) (See attached sheets).[1]
D. (6) $1,150.
E. (7) $19.70; (9) $19.70; (11) $19.70.

A. Anthony W. Smith, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General: Forestry, regional development, resource conservation, labor relations. Specific: St. Lawrence seaway; Frying-Pan, Arkansas; Dinosaur Monument; dyke marsh; tuna tariff; New England power survey; nonferrous mining; Forest Service appropriations.
D. (7) $126.

A. George C. Smith, Jr., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests, including the improvement of Government efficiency, elimination of waste, and economy in Government. Specific interests include appropriations bills, bills to enact recommendations of the Hoover Commission, other reorganization proposals, and substantive legislation involving Government expenditures.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (6) $5.21; (7) $279.13; (9) $284.34.

A. Harold O. Smith, Jr., 400 Investment Building, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 400 Investment Building, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 425 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting directly or indirectly the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co.
D. (6) $2,085.

A. Purcell L. Smith, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5).[1]
D. (6) $16,250.01.
E. (3) $25; (6) $10.40; (7) $228.29; (9) $263.69; (15).[1]

A. Robert E. Smith, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association.
C. (2) House Joint Resolution 323 for limiting income-tax rates.
D. (6) $900.
E. (7) $912.85; (9) $912.85; (12) $4,785.81; (14) $8.63.

A. Calvin K. Snyder, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (6) $4.85; (7) $626.02; (9) $630.87; (15) $42.79, January 27, 1952, Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., dinner conference; $24, January 9, 1952, Duke Zeibert's Restaurant, Washington, D. C., dinner conference; $12, January 25, 1952, Duke Zeibert's Restaurant, dinner conference; $10.65, February 4, 1952, Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., dinner conference; $23.45, March 11, 1952, Congressional Country Club, Bradbury Hills, Md., dinner conference, etc.[1]

A. J. D. Snyder, 1040 LaSalle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, room 1526, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads.
D. (6) $750.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free-enterprise system and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system. (3) Bulletin.
D. (6) $48,169.
E. (2) $13,995; (4) $2,654.67; (5) $1,454.84; (6) $176.74; (7) $586.47; (8) $917.03; (9) $19,784.75.

A. Spence, Hotchkiss, Parker & Duryee, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc.
C. (2) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Same as first session of Eighty-second Congress with addition of appropriation for Federal school-lunch program in second session of Eighty-second Congress. Also supporting S. 2337, emergency maternal and infant care for servicemen's wives and children, title I.
D. (6) $122.
E. (4) $36; (5) $17.80; (6) $7.35; (7) $40; (9) $101.15; (15) $40, March 10, 1952, Mrs. Edward C. Preble, 22 East Seven Hundred and Fourth Street, Orangeburg, N. Y., expenses paid for trip to Washington to testify on hearing of S. 2337; $36, March 19, 1952, Elton T. Cowan, 133 West Nineteenth Street, New York, N. Y., reprint of address delivered at annual meeting.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West One Hundred and Fourth Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West One Hundred and Fourth Place, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 166, H. R. 2129, S. 399, H. R. 2423, H. R. 6228, H. R. 2422, S. 510, H. R. 2688, H. R. 2313, H. R. 2343, H. R. 1313, S. 1125, Public Law 234, Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, and all legislation pertaining to the Railroad Retirement Act, and to secure additional benefits for the rank and file of railroad employees covered by the Retirement Act. (3) Rail Pension News.
D. (6) $1,320.
E. (1) $214.50; (2) $1,320; (4) $1,400; (6) $33.40; (7) $357.30; (9) $3,325.20.

A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies. Numerous House and Senate bills dealing with the subject of bonding of Federal employees, and bills reactivating War Damage Corporation.
D. (6) $150.
E. (7) $6.75; (9) $6.75.

A. Charles I. Stengle, room 716, AFGE, 700 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government employees and District of Columbia government employees.
D. (6) $1,384.56.
E. (7) $38.40; (9) $38.40.

A. Charles T. Stewart, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $3,634.01.
E. (7) $259.48; (8) $74.53; (9) $334.01; (15) $15, National Press Club, Press Building, Washington, D. C., dues, first quarter 1952.

A. Erskine Stewart, suite 808, Kass Building, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 1938, LIFO; H. R. 3622 and other Fair Labor Standards Act amendments; H. R. 5505, Customs Simplification Act; H. R. 6174, S. 2504, and all other unemployment-compensation legislation; S. 2170, cotton labeling; S. 1267, fiber labeling; S. 2594, S. 2645, H. R. 6546, and all other amendments to Defense Production Act; S. 2918, H. R. 7256, H. R. 7257, and H. R. 7258, and all other bills on flammable fabrics; Senate Resolution 169, H. R. 5189, and all other consumer interest proposals; H. R. 5767, H. R. 6367, and other price maintenance legislation; all appropriation legislation; all proposals relating to parcel-post size and weight limitations; S. 106, District of Columbia optometry; S. 2713 and H. R. 6802 and other similar freight proposals.
E. (7) $16.20; (8) $1.25; (9) $17.45.

A. Edwin L. Stoll, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $2,487.56.
E. (7) $15.35; (8) $47.21; (9) $62.56; (15) $15, January 3, 1952, National Press Club, Press Building, Washington, D. C., dues, first quarter, 1952; $10, February 11, 1952, National Association of Real Estate Editors, Memphis, Tenn., annual dues, 1952.

A. Benton J. Strong, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1555 Sherman Street, Denver 5, Colo. (home office), and 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation on matters of interest to the National Farmers Union.
D. (6) $2,750.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., Sixty-first Street, Mobile, Ala.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the American Merchant Marine and transportation generally.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (7) $6; (9) $6.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Paul A. Strachan, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Oppose S. 1202; for S. 1318, H. R. 3599 and similar bills.[1]
D. (6) $700.
E. (7) $ 25; (9) $125.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 4059, S. Res. 253, H. R. 3711, and S. J. Res. 122.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Allied Printing Trades Association, box 728, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) H. R. 4059, copyright amendment bill, relative to manufacturing clause, and S. 2444, liquor advertising bill.
D. (6) $625.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Labor-Management Council, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,624.99.
E. (7) $159.49; (9) $159.49.

A. William C. Stronach, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
B. American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the practice of medicine and all national health insurance legislation.

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Government, with its suppliers, with its employees, and with its customers.[1]
D. (6) $625.
E. (7) $11; (9) $11.

A. J. E. Sturrock, post-office box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Water Conservation Association, post-office box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation concerning the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies; opposed to all legislation creating Federal valley authorities and all legislation seeking to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources.[1] (3) Texas Water.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (2) $46.50; (5) $39.54; (6) $19.45; (7) $1,112.28; (8) $88.03; (9) $1,305.80; (15).[1]

A. Sylvester C. Smith, Jr., 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
B. Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) General interest in all legislation affecting the business of the company.

A. Francis W. Sullivan, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, National Headquarters, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans. (3) DAV Semimonthly.
D. (6) $2,906.60.

A. A. D. Sutherland, 104 South Main Street, Fond du Lac, Wis.
B. Bankers Farm Mortgage Co., Fond du Lac, Wis., in behalf of former bondholders of Bankers Joint Stock Land Bank of Milwaukee, Wis., and F. A. Carlton, 135 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) For H. R. 6813.
E. (6) $7.25; (7) $22; (8) $23.45; (9) $52.70.

A. William A. Sutherland, 1012 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Lowell Liquidation Corp., Lowell, Mass.
C. (2) H. R. 3168.
E. (2) $500; (4) $6.12; (6) $35.94; (8) $15.55; (9) $557.61; (15) $500, Milton Cooper, Washington, D. C., legal services.

A. James A. Tawney, 504 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) All legislation affecting members of the association or their affiliated associations.
D. (6) $1,687.50.

A. Tax Equality Association of Montana, McKay Building, 107 East Main, Missoula, Mont.
C. (2) Repeal of the exemption contained in sections 101 (12) and (13) of the Internal Revenue Code and all bills so to do which apply to the conduct of business competition with goods and services produced for a livelihood by the citizenry.
E. (5) $3.61; (9) $3.61.

A. Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky.
C. (2) Advocating revision of section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code.
D. (6) $430.
E. (2) $521.25; (4) $23.43; (5) $210; (8) $7.84; (9) $762.52; (15) $375, Donald F. Nemitz, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky., salary; $146.25, Dorothy Gates, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky., salary; $210, Kentucky Tax Research Association, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky., joint office expense; $15.03, postmaster, Louisville, Ky., stamps.

A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Hugh W. Taylor, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., 620 South Broadway, Lexington, Ky.
C. (2) Mutual Security Agency and Department of Agriculture appropriations.
D. (7) $2,500.
E. (8) $152.88; (9) $45.42; (10) $198.30.

A. John Thomas Taylor, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general program of the American Legion as outlined by their national convention and executive committee as it affects veterans and their dependents and allied and kindred subjects dealing with our national security.
D. (6) $2,400.60.
E. (7) $720.30; (9) $720.30.

A. Margaret K. Taylor, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Coops and Legislative Letter.
D. (6) $2,365.35.
E. (8) $2.85; (9) $2.85.

A. Tyre Taylor, 1112 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
C. (2) The general legislative program of the council with particular emphasis on legislation favorable to the maintenance of a free enterprise system.
D. (6) $2,156.28.
E. (5) $486; (6) $65.10; (9) $551.10.

A. Donald Teel, 1516 Olds Tower, Lansing, Mich.
B. Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1516 Olds Tower, Lansing, Mich.
C. (2) In favor of legislation designed to have all business corporations taxed in the same manner and on the same basis.

A. Television Broadcasters' Tax Committee, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000.
E. (2) $1,572; (4) $98.96; (7) $1,684.10; (9) $3,355.06; (15) $72, The Fort Industry Co., 199 Pierce Street, Birmingham, Mich., typing service; $53.05, the Litho Press, Miami Beach, Fla., printing; $500, Lovell H. Parker, 614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C., services, etc.[1]

A. Marjorie L. Temple, 1917 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The general legislative interests of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., are those which affect favorably or adversely the interests of women in business and the professions. (3) The Independent Woman.
D. (6) $26,474.40.
E. (2) $875; (4) $125; (5) $240.78; (6) $74.28; (8) $24.08; (9) $1,339.14; (15) $125, National Printing Co., Third and N Streets NE., Washington, D. C., printing.

A. Texas Water Conservation Association, 207 West Fifteenth Street (post-office box 2084, Capitol Station), Austin, Tex.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation concerning the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas' land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies; opposed to all legislation creating Federal valley authorities and all legislation seeking to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources. (3) Texas Water.
D. (6) $4,599.61.
E. (2) $1,767.91; (3) $233; (4) $831.14; (5) $246.12; (6) $127.07; (7) $1,028.78; (8) $1,121.69; (9) $5,355.71; (15) $225, C. S. Heacock, Austin, Tex., office rent; $1,028.78, J. E. Sturrock, Austin, Tex., traveling expenses; $233, National Reclamation Association, Washington, D. C., contribution; $66.60, collector of internal revenue, Austin, Tex., social security and income tax withheld from salaries; $1,205.05, J. E. Sturrock, Austin, Tex., salary; etc.[1]

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Whitney Tharin, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Potato Council, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev.
C. (2) All Senate and House bills and resolutions affecting the interests of Nevada railroads.
D. (6) $675.

A. Chester C. Thompson, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters affecting barge and towing vessel industry and water transportation.[1]
D. (6) $6,166.66.
E. (7) $103.75; (9) $103.75.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 1000 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.[1]
D. (6) $2,016.67.
E. (7) $74.84; (9) $74.84.

A. Arthur P. Tiernan, 201 Southeast Third Street, Evansville, Ind.
B. Vanderburgh County Medical Society, 201 Southeast Third Street, Evansville, Ind.
C. (2) All bills pending before Congress which would create national health insurance.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support of H. R. 5715, H. R. 5603, H. R. 5996.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (7) $18.75; (9) $18.75.

A. E. W. Tinker, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those of employer.

A. William H. Tinney, 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interest of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.
D. (6) $1,902.42.
E. (9) $141.25.

A. S. G. Tipton, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests for the proper advancement of the airline industry.[1]
D. (6) $1,831.72.
E. (7) $38.50; (9) $38.50.

A. Fred A. Tobin, 438 Bowen Building, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, 222 East Michigan Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,750.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops and Legislative Letter.
D. (6) $2,224.92.
E. (8) $46.20; (9) $46.20.

A. John H. Todd, 1008 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 586 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) Any matters substantially affecting the cotton-compress and cotton-warehouse industry.
D. (6) $312.50.
E. (5) $2.59; (6) $8.35; (9) $10.94.

A. Wallace Townsend, 306 Commercial National Bank Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., Shreveport, La.
C. (2) Interest has been in the appropriation for the Southwestern Power Administration in the Department of the Interior appropriation.
D. (6) $5,600.

A. Matt Triggs, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Inflation control (Defense Production Act of 1950); Government credit policies; Federal Reserve policy; repeal of resale price maintenance; immigration legislation; Mexican farm-labor importation; farm machinery and supplies; fertilizer; agricultural labor; transportation legislation; Federal contributions to State unemployment insurance payments; legislation to authorize allocation of livestock for slaughter; grazing land; St. Lawrence seaway; ICC decision on prohibition of trip leasing; control and eradication of brucellosis; establishment of revolving fund for financing exports of farm commodities; selective service; universal military training; fair-trade pricing study.
D. (6) $1,687.50.
E. (7) $65.98; (9) $65.98.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 817 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Plant Food Council, Inc., 817 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Generally interested in legislation affecting the fertilizer industry.

A. Harold J. Turner, Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., Southern Pacific Co., and Union Pacific Railroad Co., Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
C. (2) All bills which directly affect railroads of Oregon.
D. (6) $229.12.
E. (9) $9.42.

A. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc., Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The organization is interested in the over-all field of social security. (3) The Advisor.
D. (6) $42,400.
E. (2) $10,774.98; (3) $60; (4) $2,049.96; (5) $4,813.82; (6) $496.52; (7) $2,427.50; (8) $1,346.08; (9) $21,968.86; (15) $75.07, R. P. Andrews Paper Co., Washington, D. C., office supplies; $1,917.74, Bates Duplicating, 729 Fifteenth Street, Washington, D. C., printing; $423.57, Capital Airlines, Washington, D. C., transportation; $25.12, Chamber of Commerce of United States, Washington, D. C., fee; $496.52, C. & P. Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone and telegraph, etc.[1]

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 50 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $999.99; (7) $37.73; (9) $1,037.72.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.

A. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests are all statutes and bills affecting the importation by the United States of sugar from Cuba, and the tariff rates on such sugar, and those statutes and bills affecting trade between the United States and Cuba, particularly trade in sugar. (3).[1]
D. (6) $31,775.
E. (1) $7,935.33; (4) $1,336.94; (9) $9,272.27; (15) $1,336.94, J. C. Dillon Co., 227 East Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y., printing; $7,935.33, Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., fee.

A. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership and particularly helpful to savings and loan associations and cooperative banks in carrying out their thrift and home financing objectives and oppose legislation detrimental to home ownership and these institutions. (3).[1]
E. (2) $4,040.88; (4) $5,809.26; (5) $700.18; (6) $181.02; (7) $117.68; (8) $367.88; (9) $11,216.90; (15).[1]

A. United States Wood Screw Service Bureau, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation, etc., for higher tariffs and import quotas for screws, nuts, rivets, and similar fasteners.

A. Albert F. Versen, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Missouri Valley Chapter Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Albert F. Versen, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. St. Louis Local Meat Packers Association, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. A. L. Viles, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Virginia Associated Businessmen, 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va.
C. (2) All legislation affecting tax equality which is favored by this association.
D. (6) $5,594.50.
E. (2) $1,500; (4) $420.77; (5) $750; (7) $183.27; (8) $56.63; (9) $2,916.67; (15) $2,250, Walter M. Evans, 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va., salary and expenses; $10.50, Spencer Printing Co., 5 South Fifteenth Street, Richmond, Va., printing; $74.05, Keel-Williams Corp., 10 North Fourteenth Street, Richmond, Va., salary and expenses; $10.50, tiser's Letter Shop, 809 East Franklin Street, Richmond, Va., reproducing and mailing circulars, bulletins, and letters, etc.[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Vitrified China Association, Inc., 517 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Tracy S. Voorhees, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 7005, a bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951.

A. Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. James A. Waggener, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Indiana State Medical Association, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) All bills pending before Congress which would create national health insurance.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation that might affect association members as going electric utilities.[1]
D. (6) $7,062.52.
E. (6) $25.15; (7) $457.97; (8) $40.70; (9) $523.82.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Government Employees' Council, A. F. of L., 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Duties are to represent the member unions and the Government Employees Council on matters affecting them before the Congress.
D. (6) $2,277.

A. Milo J. Warner, 904 Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio.
B. The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) Attention to legislation which may affect the interests of the mutual policyholders of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America.
D. (6) $2,750.
E. (6) $28.81; (9) $28.81.

A. Washington Board of Trade, 204 Evening Star Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia, of interest to the Washington Board of Trade.

A. Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All local measures affecting the District of Columbia are of interest.
E. (3) $500; (9) $500.

A. Vincent T. Wasilewski, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry.[1]

A. J. R. Watson, Room 1, I. C. R. R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
B. Mississippi Railroad Association, Room 1, I. C. R. R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads in Mississippi.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Newton Patrick Weathersby, Room 303 Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, Room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Supporting or opposing as the case may be legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general.
D. (6) $1,999.98.
E. (7) $25; (9) $25.

A. William H. Webb, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor development, flood control, navigation, irrigation-reclamation, soil and water conservation, and related subjects.
D. (6) $2,979.20.
E. (3) $5; (5) $11.35; (6) $18.09; (7) $450.73; (8) $211.68; (9) $696.85; (15).[1]

A. Wayne Weishaar,[2] 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Aeronautical Training Society, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting aviation training or contract overhaul of aircraft which may arise at any time in future.
D. (6) $3,300.
E. (3) $6; (7) $3.90; (8) $1.25; (9) $11.15.

A. W. S. Weismann, Jr., 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting air transportation.
D. (6) $2,750.
E. (7) $135; (9) $135.

A. Bernard Weitzer, 3147 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 50 West Seventy-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Support legislation to carry out the purpose of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America as expressed in preamble to its constitution and to oppose legislation which would tend to frustrate the purpose expressed.
D. (7) $2,999.96.
E. (5) $104.69; (6) $11.37; (7) $236.80; (8) $16.12; (9) $368.98; (15) $256.48.

A. Edward M. Welliver, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,350.

A. William E. Welsh, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Reclamation Act, 1902 (53 Stat. 1187, 43 U. S. C. 485), and all amendatory and supplementary acts thereto; all other statutes relating to water and land-conservation measures.
D. (6) $3,249.99.
E. (7) $512.87; (9) $512.87.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[2] The income of Wayne Weishaar was erroneously reported in the RECORD for the fourth quarter, 1951, as $13,200 instead of $3,300.

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, suite 906-907, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting livestock and meat-packing industry.
D. (6) $54,566.13.
E. (7) $45; (8) $38.01; (9) $83.01; (15) $38.01, Batt, Bates & Co., Inc., Washington, D. C., mimeographing; $31, Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C., luncheon.

A. Edward K. Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Shore Line Oil Co., and Craw Co., Las Vegas, Nev.
C. (2) Measures pertaining to the so-called tidelands oil question.
E. (8) $3.25; (9) $3.25.

A. George Y. Wheeler 2d, 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting National Broadcasting Co., Inc., and/or its affiliated companies.
E. (7) $13.50.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Contract Carrier Conference, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Proposed legislation pertaining to the investigation of domestic land and water transportation under Senate Resolution 50 or to the Motor Carrier Act.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (8) $11.70; (9) $11.70.

A. Clem Whitaker, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Education Campaign, American Medical Association, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation for compulsory health insurance; S. 337, H. R. 54, H. R. 274, H. R. 910, H. R. 913, S. 401, S. 1140.
D. (6) $3,137.50.
E. (7) $157.03; (8) $15.57; (9) $172.60; (15).[1]

A. Leone Baxter Whitaker, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Education Campaign, American Medical Association, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation for compulsory health insurance; S. 337, H. R. 54, H. R. 274, H. R. 910, H. R. 913, S. 401, S. 1140.
D. (6) $3,137.50.
E. (7) $157.03; (8) $15.57; (9) $172.60; (15).[1]

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Association, Cotton Exchange Building, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) Legislation affecting cotton and foreign trade, such as MSA, CCC, commodity futures exchanges, and price control.
D. (6) $250.
E. (6) $6.62; (9) $6.62.

A. Richard P. White, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the nursery industry directly.
D. (6) $3,124.98.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (2) $31.24; (4) $15.41; (5) $14.04; (6) $1.76; (7) $7.79; (9) $71.14.

A. Albert V. Whitehall, 1756 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation which may affect the ability of hospitals to render good care or which may affect hospital care for the American people.
D. (6) $1,812.51.
E. (7) $174.12; (9) $174.12.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all legislation particularly affecting the interests of manufacturers of gas appliances and equipment.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Committee for Fair Emergency Excise Taxation, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Fair emergency excise taxation.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., suite 501, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., suite 501, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the natural-gas industry.
D. (6) $750.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 501 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. American Mutual Alliance, 919 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation affecting mutual fire and casualty insurance companies; including, for example, Federal tax legislation and war damage insurance legislation.
D. (6) $888.15.
E. (2) $400; (5) $173.55; (6) $35.25; (7) $212.10; (8) $67.25; (9) $888.15; (15).[1]

A. Wilkinson, Boyden & Cragun, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Confederated Bands of Ute Indians, Fort Duchesne, Utah, and Ignacio, Colo.
C. (2) In accordance with the stipulation between the tribe and the Government, entered in Court of Claims case No. 47565, a cash judgment will be paid to the Ute Tribe in the event Congress does not, during the Eighty-second Congress, enact legislation to return certain lands to the Ute Tribe, we are interested in having such legislation enacted, although no bill has as yet been introduced.
E. (2) $2.15; (9) $2.15.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden & Cragun, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Indians of California, care of Clyde F. Thompson, post-office box 901, Redding, Calif.
C. (2) Registrants are interested in enactment of H. R. 3979.
E. (2) $10.22; (9) $10.22.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden & Cragun, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.
C. (2) The Menominee Tribe is interested in all legislation relating to Indian affairs; currently favoring enactment of H. R. 264, S. 1396, and H. R. 7104, and is opposed to enactment of H. R. 1551 and S. 2167.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (2) $9.13; (6) $5.27; (7) $26.01; (9) $40.41.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden & Cragun, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Nicholas B. Perry, 1841 Columbia Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 5557, a bill for the relief of Nicholas B. Perry.
E. (2) $8.61; (8) $27.75; (9) $36.36.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay and retirement benefits, and pensions, studying and analyzing bills, etc. (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $1,800.
E. (7) $12.

A. James L. Wilmeth, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. The National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Patriotic legislation, restriction of immigration, suppression of communism, support American free public schools. (3) Junior American.
D. (6) $474.10.
E. (4) $252.50; (6) $91.03; (7) $130.57; (9) $474.10.

A. Frank E. Wilson, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills (Senate and House) relating to health and welfare. (3) Informational bulletins and legislative notes published in Journal of American Medical Association.
D. (6) $3,989.81.
E. (7) $400.02; (9) $400.02.

A. J. B. Wilson, McKinley, Wyo.
B. Wyoming Wool Growers Association.
C. (2) All legislation in any way affecting domestic wool-growing industry such as tariff legislation, agricultural legislation, public land legislation, railroad rates, marketing and research legislation, control legislation, etc. (3) Wyoming Wool Grower.
D. (7) $2,000.
E. (6) $93.26; (7) $1,050.30; (8) $47.60; (9) $1,191.16.

A. Robert J. Wilson, 2003 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Restaurant Association, 2003 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. National Restaurant Association, 8 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Rufus H. Wilson, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Veterans' legislation, UMT, Reserve legislation, general welfare and Americanism programs. (3) National AMVET.

A. Everett T. Winter, 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement; the American merchant marine; soil conservation; flood control; regulation of domestic transportation.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (7) $958.82 (see attached);[1] (9) $958.82.

A. Theodore Wiprud, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Society is interested in legislation pertaining to the practice of medicine and all related services and that affecting the public health, including extension of social security into the field of the practice of medicine. (3) Medical Annals of the District of Columbia.
D.[1]

A. Wisconsin Associated Businessmen, Inc., 231 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting business.
D. (7) $272.50.
E. (2) $75; (3) $43.38; (6) $19.10; (9) $137.48; (16) $75, January 5 for December, February 6 for January, March 12 for February, Loretta Jonas, 231 West Wisconsin Avenue., Milwaukee, stenographic service; $43.38, February 6, 1952, National Associated Businessmen, Washington, D. C., contribution; $19.10, March 12, 1952, Wisconsin Telephone Co., telephone.

A. F. B. Wise, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Renderers Association, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation on production, consumption, import, export, or taxation of any animal or vegetable fat or oil as well as all general legislation affecting business, particularly small business.

A. Harley Z. Wooden.
B. The International Council for Exceptional Children (a department of the National Education Association), 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the exceptional, such as S. 1463, a bill to enable the States to provide for special services required for the education of physically handicapped children of school age, and for other purposes. (3) Exceptional Children.

A. Walter P. Woodul, Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.
C. (2) General legislation affecting Texas railroads. For S. 1657, air mail subsidy separation; H. R. 4483, to amend section 307 (d) of ICC Act; S. 719, clarifying Robinson-Patman Act; S. 2349, S. 2351, S. 2355, S. 2357, S. 2358, S. 2359, S. 2361, S. 2362, S. 2365, S. 2518, S. 2519, all amending the ICC Act. Opposed House Joint Resolution 2 and Senate Joint Resolution 27, St. Lawrence seaway; H. R. 6525 and S. 2639, to amend railroad unemployment insurance; H. R. 1998 and S. 2356, making mandatory certain communication systems.
D. (6) $5,665.86.
E. (6) $88.73; (7) $1,485.99; (9) $1,574.72; (15) $18.47, January 15, Austin Hotel, Austin, Tex., hotel expense; $63.37, January 16, Missouri Pacific Railway Co., Houston, Tex., pullman; $125.92, January 26, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., hotel expense; $141.31, February 2, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., hotel expense, etc.[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 811 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 811 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting oil and gas operations. Specifically interested at present in war power legislation and proposed legislation affecting disposal of submerged lands.

E. (6) $143.85; (7) $849.26; (8) $377.21; (9) $1,370.32; (15) $34.28, January 15, 1952, Esso Standard Oil Co., Baltimore, Md., oil and gasoline bill; $35.44, January 17, 1952, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of Virginia, Arlington, Va., telephone services; $24.97, January 24, 1952, Emerson & Orme, Inc., Washington, D. C., automobile repairs; $17.33, January 16, 1952, Railway Express Agency, Washington, D. C., air express charges, etc.1

A. Frank K. Woolley, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act; inflation control (Defense Production Act of 1950); Government credit policies; Federal Reserve policy; Federal Food and Drug Act amendment; repeal of resale price maintenance; antitrust legislation; education; immigration legislation; Mexican farm labor importation; method for computing parity prices; farm machinery and supplies; fertilizer; agricultural labor; transportation legislation; Federal contributions to State unemployment insurance payments; Sugar Act extension; Marketing Facilities Act; increased lending authority for Export-Import Bank; amendment of Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; mutual security program (foreign aid); Customs Simplification Act; amendment of BIR Code relating to tax treatment of livestock; legislation to authorize allocation of livestock for slaughter; grazing land; postal rates; St. Lawrence seaway; taxation; tobacco; peanut oil provision of agricultural legislation; ICC decision on prohibition of trip leasing; national farmers day; agricultural appropriations; ACP payments; REA; screw worm research appropriations; meat inspection funds appropriations; appropriation agricultural extension service; Department of Agriculture reorganization; control and eradication of brucellosis; farm program; family farm policy review; establishment of revolving fund for financing exports of farm commodities; selective service, universal military training; fair-trade pricing study, United States relationships to North Atlantic Treaty nations; farm-credit legislation; appropriations for defense.

D. (6) $2,109.38.

E. (7) $46.24; (9) $46.24; (11) $46.24.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 900 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting California wine and brandy industry. (1) S. 2444, Eighty-second Congress, second session: "To prohibit the broadcasting over radio and television of advertisements of distilled spirits for beverage purposes, and for other purposes." (2) H. R. 7337, Eighty-second Congress, second session: "To facilitate wine production, to modify present requirements with respect thereto, and for other purposes." (3) H. R. 7338, Eighty-second Congress, second session: same as H. R. 7337. (4) S. 2594, Eighty-second Congress, second session: "To extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended."

A. Wyatt, Grafton & Grafton, 300 Marion E. Taylor Building, Louisville, Ky.

B. National Committee for Fair Emergency Excise Taxation, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Fair emergency excise taxation, H. R. 4473, Revenue Act of 1951.

D. (6) $5,500.

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) S. 2504, emergency unemployment compensation, against. Defense Production Act, continuation, against. Transportation bills (all pending before Senate Interstate Commerce Committee), for and against. H. R. 6174, H. R. 6954, H. R. 4133, H. R. 3391, unemployment compensation, for and against. H. R. 4484, Tidelands Oil, for. H. R. 5505, customs procedure revision, for. Japanese Peace Treaty ratification, for. S. 2444, advertising, against. S. 1310, H. R. 268, mine safety, against. S. 2487, judicial review of Government contracts, for. Senate Resolution 285, Internal Revenue reorganization, for. S. 2639, H. R. 6525, railroad unemployment insurance, against. H. R. 5566, Longshoremen's Act, for. H. R. 5743, Hell's Canyon Dam, against. Foreign aid, for spending limitation. Separation of air-mail subsidies, for.

D. (6) $1,625.

E. (7) $353.83; (9) $353.83.

A. J. Banks Young, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

D. (6) $750.

E. (7) $14.49; (9) $14.49; (11) $14.49.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1952:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy, questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the RECORD, lengthy answers are abridged.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.
PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:
"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19------ ←

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers; except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302 (e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed, (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out Items "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report. ←

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1 ←

A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
C. (2) To aid in the passage of H. R. 1526, 1995, 2273.

A. Richard H. Akagi, 258 East First Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) (a) To revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes; (b) H. R. 5678 and S. 2550; (c) in favor of these bills. (4) No anticipated expenses. No pay or salary.

A. Richard H. Akagi, 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, 406 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) To promote the welfare of persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States (Legislation is a part of this activity.) (a) H. R. 2865. (b) To amend the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917 as amended, S. 865; (c) To revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes, S. 2055 and H. R. 5678 and similar bills. (4) $100 per month.

A. Kate W. B. Alfriend, 910 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, 99 University Place, New York, N. Y.
C. (4) $500 from February 4 to March 8, 1952.

A. American Cancer Society, 47 Beaver Street, New York City.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health. (4) $20,000 per annum.

A. Ethel Percy Andrus, 941 Rosemount Road, Glendale, Calif.
B. National Retired Teachers Association.
C. (2) H. R. 2764.

A. Banks Arendell, 844-46 Insurance Building, Raleigh, N. C.
B. The Liaison Committee for the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 910 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (4) Reimbursement for certain actual expenses only. Only actual expenses paid by the Carolinas (Charlotte) Chapter, National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. ARO, Inc., Box 162, Tullahoma, Tenn.
C. (2) Against rider to H. R. 7391, defense appropriations bill.

A. ARO, Inc., Box 162, Tullahoma, Tenn.
C. (2) Against rider to H. R. 7391, defense appropriations bill.

A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West Forty-fifth Street, New York, City.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health. (4) Fee of $3,600 per annum, plus direct expenses of travel and incidentals.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting physicians and surgeons. (3) Monthly News Letter and a mimeographed bulletin. (4) About $1,500 per quarter for printing and mailing.

A. George W. Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Comite Franc Dollar, 31, Avenue Pierre 4er de Serbie Paris 16e, France.
C. (2) General interest in all matters affecting imports into the United States; tariffs, quotas, etc. Specific interest in supporting S. 2104, bill to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act, and in opposing Ives amendment to S. 2645, to extend section 104. (4) (See separate registration of Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball.)

A. Fowler W. Barker, secretary of association (see below).
B. Association of Professional Photogrammetrists, 17 Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C. (see broachure attached).[1]
C. (2) No legislative interests at present, except to get invoked section 251, paragraph 9 of the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949, for photogrammetric map-making contractors to Government. (4) Estimated $50 for legislative effort; $1,000 a month compensation to A above—see inside cover of brochure[1] for objectives; expenses $1,700 a month, including travel.

A. C. Jasper Bell, 904 Bryant Building, Kansas City, Mo.
B. Oil Seed Products, Post Office Box 3500, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Seeking enactment of H. R. 6292. (4) Anticipate no expenses except my normal living expenses which I expect to be paid by myself. My compensation is $6,000 per month or major portion thereof during term of employment.

A. Frank C. Biggs, 3023 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. J. H. Rose Truck Line, Inc., 3804 Jensen Drive, Houston, Tex.
C. (2) General interest extends to any amendment of Interstate Commerce Act; specific interest in (a) a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by establishing certain rules for the operation of irregular common carriers by motor vehicle; (b) S. 2358; (d) against the bill; (e) for the confirmation of Hon. Charles D. Mahaffie as member of the Interstate Commerce Commission. (4) Annual compensation $6,000 for all services—legislative and nonlegislative.

A. John H. Bivins, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. See explanatory statement.[1]

A. Loring M. Black, 2801 Quebec Street, Washington, D. C.
B. William Henry Lyster, R. F. D. 2, Hicksville, Long Island, N. Y.
C. (2) As lawyer for William Henry Lyster, who desires relief by legislation under immigration laws; bill not yet introduced. (4) Expenses not over $100; $250 retainer; $500 on introduction of bill; $1,750 on enactment into law to attorney.

A. William D. Blatner, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Associated Retail Confectioners of the United States.
C. (4) Secretary's salary, $8,400, annual salary. Only a small, undetermined part, if any, can be construed as expenses for purpose of influencing legislation because legislative activities are irregular and infrequent.

A. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Insurance and reinsurance of war risks; War Damage Corporation Act of 1951 and War Disaster Act of 1951; S. 114, S. 439, S. 1309, and S. 1848, and similar bills in House of Representatives. No position for or against this legislation. (4) Expenses will be for professional employment of attorney at law.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.
C. (4) $4,000 annually.

A. Donald T. Burke, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) See appended statement, page 5.[1] (4) (a) Year; (b) $7,000; (c) indefinite; (d) no specific amount—all traveling and incidental expenses.

A. Carl Byoir and Associates, Inc., 10 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Tile Council of America, 10 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Interest lies in matters affecting import and export duties. (4) See attachment.[1]

A. George P. Byrne, Jr., 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.
B. George P. Byrne, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.
C. (4) No special funds are set aside for this work.

A. George P. Byrne, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.
B. U. S. Wood Screw Service Bureau, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.
C. (4) No special funds are set aside for this work.

A. Dwight L. Casey, 801 Sunnyside Avenue, Charlotte, N. C.
B. The Liaison Committee for the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (4) Reimbursement for certain actual expenses only. Salary and certain expenses paid by the National Electrical Contractors Association.

A. Dwight L. Casey, 801 Sunnyside Avenue, Charlotte, N. C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (3) Qualified Contractor. (4) Reimbursement for certain actual expenses only. Salary and certain expenses paid by the National Electrical Contractors Association.

A. Benjamin F. Castle, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The foundation has a general legislative interest in statutes or bills which affect the interests of milk dealers. Its only specific legislative interest at present is the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and any amendments thereto or extensions thereof which may affect the interests of milk dealers. (4) See attached statement.[1]

A. Abiah A. Church, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry. Specific legislative interests presently are: Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

U. S. C. 151); Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C. 1001); McFarland bill (S. 658); radio fraud bill (H. R. 2948); copyright bills (H. R. 3589, H. R. 2464); bills to establish a National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television (S. 1579, S. J. Res. 76); bills re transmission of gambling information in interstate commerce (S. 1624, S. 2116, S. 1563, S. 1564); bills exempting organized sports from antitrust laws (S. 1526, H. R. 4229-4231); bills to amend section 315 of Communications Act (H. R. 5470, H. R. 7062); resolutions re investigation of radio and television programs (H. Res. 278, H. Res. 520, H. Res. 541, S. Res. 127); bills to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages (S. 2444, H. R. 1514, H. R. 5889); concurrent resolutions to establish election-day holiday (H. Con. Res. 175, H. Con. Res. 176, S. Con. Res. 54); resolutions re televising and broadcasting of congressional committee hearings (H. Res. 62, H. Res. 538, H. Res. 540). (4) Registrant's expenses will be very small and will be primarily for taxi fares and incidentals, normally not exceeding $25 per month. Annual rate of compensation is $5,000.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Comite Franc Dollar, 31 Avenue Pierre 4er de Serbie Paris 16e, France. This organization is a branch of the Counsell National du Patronat, a French manufacturers' association, and is concerned with the development of French exports to North America.

C. (2) General interest in all matters affecting imports into the United States: Tariffs, quotas, etc. Specific interest in supporting S. 2104, bill to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act, and in opposing Ives amendment to S. 2645, to extend section 104. (4) Estimated expenses: $500; compensation: to be agreed upon.

A. Clarence F. Cockrell, Lighthouse Service, Depot Keeper (retired), 24 Mallow Hill Avenue, Baltimore, Md.

B. Active-Retired Lighthouse Keepers Association, postoffice box 2169, South Portland, Maine.

C. (2) To aid in passage of pending bills H. R. 1526, 1995, and 2273. (3) General work in aiding legislation for the benefit of association. (4) $15 per day when away from home and expenses aiding in the passage of the above-mentioned bills, for the association.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. William A. Sutherland, First National Bank Building, Atlanta, Ga.

C. (2) H. R. 3168. (4) No expenses. Reasonable remuneration to be agreed upon.

A. Mr. Dice Crane, Klamath Agency, Oreg.

B. Klamath Tribe of Indians.

C. (2) Legislation relating to Indians; interested in enactment of S. 737, S. 738, S. 1174, S. 1322, S. 1386, H. R. 264, H. R. 1632, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3094, H. R. 3095, H. R. 3368, and H. R. 3808.

A. Caresse Crosby, Peace and "Women Against War," 2008 Q Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) UMT (A) S. 2441 (D) against. A peace bond bill; a secretary for peace (an act): world citizenship based on the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights; World Center for Women's Organizations for Freedom Through Law.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Estate of Arnold Adler, 1011 Commerce Building, Kansas City, Mo.

C. (2) Amendment of Technical Changes Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to grantors dying after January 1, 1951. (4) Expenses not determined; no daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation to be paid.

A. Lester Dickie, Keshena, Wis., official delegate of Menominee Tribe of Indians.

B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.

C. (2) The Menominee Tribe of Indians has authorized its official delegates to obtain enactment of legislation which will provide for distribution of a portion of the tribal funds on deposit in the United States Treasury to individual members of the tribe and allocate the remainder of the tribal funds for designated purposes indicated by the tribal council. Registrant is concerned with this program and with other legislation affecting Indians or Indian tribes. The Menominee Tribe presently is opposed to enactment of H. R. 1551 and favors enactment of House Joint Resolution 8, H. R. 264, and H. R. 2495.

A. Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting disabled veterans and their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans. (4) Approximately $10 per month for taxi fares, etc.

A. Doctors for Freedom, suite 23, 2418 Travis, Houston, Tex.

C. (2) To be interested in all legislation and political campaigns. No compensation for services; contributions to be solicited for printing and mailing expense only.

A. Al Dodge, Keshena, Wis., official delegate of Menominee Tribe of Indians.

B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.

C. (2) The Menominee Tribe of Indians has authorized its official delegates to obtain enactment of legislation which will provide for distribution of a portion of the tribal funds on deposit in the United States Treasury to individual members of the tribe and allocate the remainder of the tribal funds for designated purposes indicated by the tribal council. Registrant is concerned with this program and with other legislation affecting Indians or Indian tribes. The Menominee Tribe presently is opposed to enactment of H. R. 1551 and favors enactment of House Joint Resolution 8, H. R. 264, and H. R. 2495.

A. Robert F. Donoghue, 657 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine, particularly the tanker division thereof, including without limitation amendments relating to titles 14, 33, and 46 of the United States Code Annotated, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, Transportation Act of 1940, appropriations relating to agencies charged with the duty of administering laws affecting transportation, etc. (3) Not applicable. (4) See statement attached (p. 3).[1]

A. James W. Douthat, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C.[1]

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. John Fossum, Keshena, Wis.

B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.

C. (2) The Menominee Tribe of Indians has authorized its official delegates to obtain enactment of legislation which will provide for distribution of a portion of the tribal funds on deposit in the United States Treasury to individual members of the tribe and allocate the remainder of the tribal funds for designated purposes indicated by the tribal council. Registrant is concerned with this program and with other legislation affecting Indians or Indian tribes. The Menominee Tribe presently is opposed to enactment of H. R. 1551 and favors enactment of House Joint Resolution 8, H. R. 264, and H. R. 2495.

A. Joseph C. Fitts, suite 1401, 1250 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N. Y.

B. Heating, Piping and Air Conditioning Contractors National Association, Inc., suite 1401, 1250 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N. Y.

C. (3) Official Bulletin.

A. Herbert H. Fockler, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.

B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting libraries and librarians, S. 1452, H. R. 5229, H. R. 5195, H. R. 5190, H. R. 5216, H. R. 5227, H. R. 5221, H. R. 5222, H. R. 5311. (3) ALA Washington Newsletter. (4) Annual salary (one-fourth time), $1,000; estimated expenses for postage, travel, etc. (per quarter), $50.

A. Samuel W. Gilman, 300 Belmont Avenue, Colonial Terrace, Asbury Park, N. J.

B. The work is being done on behalf of the independent shipping industry of the Free Territory of Trieste and payment therefor is being done by: (1) Luasino Societa di Navigazione; (2) D. Tripcovich Societa di Navigazione; (3) Navigazione Generale Gerolimich & Cia; (4) S. A. di Armamento Marittima Oriente; (5) Carlo and Figlio Martinolich; (6) Fratelli Cosulich, all being of the Free Territory of Trieste.

C. (2) The passage of a bill for the sale of 10 Liberty ships by the United States Government to the shipping industry of Free Territory of Trieste. (3) A printed brief pleading Trieste's case is in preparation in the amount of 1,000 copies with a publication date of March 1, 1952, and is printed by Home News Publishing Co., Oakhurst, N. J. (4) The employment will cease about the end of May 1952. The anticipated expenses for traveling and printing will be about $2,500. The terms of compensation remain unfixed and are presently in the process of negotiation. The payment is contemplated to be in a fixed amount and when it is ascertained a report thereof will be made.

A. Raymond Gittelman, National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Pyrotechnics Association, care of Robert V. Moon.

C. (2) Opposition to H. R. 4528 and S. 1700; promotion of H. R. 6722; regulation interstate carriage of fireworks.

A. L. Selim Glick, the Moslem American Citizens Union (proposed), 3858 North Gratz Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) Among objects and aims of the Moslem American Citizens Union are "to watchfully serve in defense of the American Constitution and American world prestige, particularly in Islamite matters, and to defend and promote the religion of Islam and the welfare of Moslems under the principle of

freedom and equality for all religious denominations." At this time we specifically advocate a religious equality bill for the drafted personnel of the Armed Forces, until enacted or equality is effected in operation of the Armed Forces. (3) Personal correspondence to Congressmen and others shall be employed to influence public opinion. (4) Nominal from volunteer organizers' own pocket for incidentals of mailing letters and arising matters.

A. Margaret E. Gordon, employee of Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 924 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Comite Franc Dollar, 31, Avenue Pierre 4er de Serbie Paris 16e, France. This organization is a branch of the Conseil National du Patronat, a French manufacturers' association, and is concerned with the development of French exports to North America.

C. (2) General interest in all matters affecting imports into the United States: tariffs, quotas, etc.; specific interest in supporting S. 2104, bill to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act, and in opposing Ives amendment to S. 2645 to extend section 104. (4) Estimated expenses (see separate registration of Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball); compensation to be paid directly to Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball and not individually (see separate registration of firm).

A. Lloyd B. Gruman, Jr., Suite 1401, 1250 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N. Y.

B. Heating, Piping, and Air Conditioning Contractors National Association, Inc., suite 1401, 1250 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Official Bulletin.

A. Heating, Piping, and Air Conditioning Contractors National Association, Inc., suite 1401, 1250 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Official Bulletin.

A. Mrs. Reka Hoff, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Association of University Women, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Federal aid to education; ECA and point 4 program; qualified equal-rights amendment; strengthening the United Nations; school construction and teachers' pay; independent status to the United States Office of Education; reciprocal trade agreements without peril points. (3) Mimeographed materials on status of current legislation being supported by the association, sent to State legislative program chairmen.

A. Becher A. Hungerford, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.

B. George P. Byrne, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.

C. (4) No special funds are set aside for this work.

A. Sam C. Hyatt, Hyattville, Wyo.

B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the cattle industry. (3) American Cattle Producer, Cow Business, and various booklets. (4) No compensation. Only actual expenses incurred in connection with activities in behalf of the association, part applying to legislative matters.

A. Carl Indergaard, of Belfield, N. Dak.

B. Brooks Keogh, Roy Lillibridge, and John H. Hanson, trustees operating under the name of Mineral Recovery Trustees, Dickinson, N. Dak. Trustees on behalf of former owners of land sold to United States seeking recovery of mineral rights.

C. (2) Will be interested in a bill proposed to be introduced seeking the recovery or right to repurchase mineral rights by former owners of lands which were sold to the United States; and will contact former owners to secure contributions to support legislation. (3) Circular letter. (4) Undersigned is to receive contingent fee of 2 percent of minerals recovered for the persons who join the trust agreement.

A. Robert L. Irvin, 502 Jergins Trust Building, Long Beach, Calif.

B. Long Beach Harbor Commission, 1333 El Embarcadero, Long Beach, Calif.

C. (2) Tidelands legislation—supporting S. 940 and H. R. 4484. (4) (a) Monthly; (b) $800 fee; $320 office expenses; (c) December 3, 1952; (d) Unknown.

A. Mr. Lyle W. Jones, 1112 Barr Building, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The United States Potters Association, East Liverpool, Ohio.

C. (2) Interested in all legislation affecting the pottery industry. (4) The monthly fee is $833.34. Only long-distance telephone, telegraph, and travel expenses are reimbursable.

A. Robert E. Jones, care of Dairy Industry Committee, 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Dairy Industry Committee, Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the dairy industry—publications such as will keep the dairy industry informed of developments. (4) Expenses—out of pocket expenses while away from home compensation—$1,000 monthly.

A. Isaiah L. Kenen, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. American Zionist Council.

C. (2) Economic Assistance to the Near East and Israel. (4) $1,120 per month and expenses.

A. Earle R. Kennedy, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized. (4) (See attached statement.)[1]

A. Brooks Keogh, Roy Lillibridge, and John Hanson, operating under the name of Mineral Recovery Trustees, Dickinson, N. Dak.

C. (2) Will be interested in a bill proposed to be introduced seeking the recovery or right to repurchase mineral rights by former owners of lands which were sold to the United States. (3) (a) Circular letter with form of acceptance of trust was issued by trustees, addressed to former owners of lands; (b) approximately 1,200 have been distributed; (c) about October 1951; (d) Doherty Printing Co. (4) Trustees are to receive cash out-of-pocket expenses and the contingent fee of 2 percent each of minerals recovered for persons who join the trust agreement.

A. Robert E. Lee, 44 Westbrook Street, South Portland, Maine.

B. Active-Retired Lighthouse Keepers Association, post-office box 2169, South Portland, Maine.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) To aid in passage of H. R. 1526, 1995, 2273. (4) Bookkeeper for association, $15 per week; $25 for preparation and distribution of general letters; $15 per day and expenses while in Washington, D. C., on association business.

A. Herbert Levy, 430 Mathieson Building, Baltimore, Md.

B. Maryland Pharmaceutical Association, Inc., and Baltimore Retail Druggists Association, Inc., 302 West Lombard Street, Baltimore, Md.

C. (2) H. R. 5767 and other legislation to enable the States to legalize effectively vertical resale price maintenance of branded commodities.

A. The Liaison Committee for the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Liaison Committee for the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Advocate the passage of beneficial legislation concerning fair bidding procedures, Federal contracting policies, controls, and subconstracting policies and procedures. (4) For legal fees, meetings, and communications as estimated expenditures of $12,000 for the year is anticipated.

A. Benjamin H. Long, 2746 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.

B. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Insurance and reinsurance of war risks; War Damage Corporation Act of 1951 and War Disaster Act of 1951; S. 114, S. 439, S. 1309, and S. 1848 and similar bills in House of Representatives; no position for or against this legislation. (4) Professional employment as attorney at law. Compensation fixed by professional standards and based principally on time involved; no advance estimate possible. Will be reimbursed for expenses, which will consist principally of traveling expenses and cannot be estimated in advance.

A. Otto Lowe, University Club, Washington, D. C.

B. National Canners Association, 1133 Twentieth Street, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting canning of food products. (4) Monthly: expenses, $125; compensation, $500.

A. McAdams and Associates, Public Relations, 712 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Long Beach, Calif., Harbor Commission, 1333 El Embarcadero, Long Beach, Calif.

C. (2) A public relations program to disseminate information about the States' claims to their tide and submerged lands, bill S. 940 and S. 1988. (4) Compensation: $3,190 per month for all Washington expenses, including office expenses, staff salaries, and all others pertinent to public-relations operation.

A. Joseph P. Marias, 461 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Philippine Steam Navigation Co., Compania Maritima, both of Manila, Philippine Islands.

C. (2) To provide for rehabilitation of interisland commerce of the Republic of the Philippines by authorizing the Department of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Philippines, S. 2514. I shall work for the passage of this legislation. (4) My expenses shall be paid by employers, consisting of travel, living (hotel, meals), telegrams, cables, stenographic assistance, etc., estimated at $1,000 per month. As I have represented one of the firms, Compania Maritima, for

over 20 years and have been compensated at no fixed amount but by estimating the amount of work done, which varies, I cannot say, but I expect on a case of this kind I shall receive approximately $10,000, if successful, and $5,000 if not. My full time is devoted to this work, necessitating additional costs to me in my San Francisco office.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 920 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Atwood Co., 1303 Lexington Building, Baltimore, Md.

C. (2) The employer is interested in an amendment to section 223 of the Revenue Act of 1950. No bill has been introduced as yet. (4) (a) Compensation is to be paid for this particular representation. (b) A retainer of $1,500 plus 20 percent of the tax savings to the employer accomplished by this firm. (c) See answer to (1) above. (d) Ordinary out-of-pocket expenses of lawyers estimated not to exceed $250.

A. H. R. Miller and J. R. Miller, Suite 417, Elg Building, 8641 Colesville Road, Silver Spring, Md.

B. National Paper Novelties Association, 417 Elg Building, Silver Spring, Md.

C. (2) Opposed to Senate bill 1624 and all similar legislation. For amendment to sections 3285 and 3290 of Internal Revenue Code. Until February 1953. (4) Expenses estimated, $1,000; compensation estimated, $5,000.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All bills covered by convention-adopted program of organization.

A. Henry B. Mitchell II, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Comite Franc Dollar, 31 Avenue Pierre 4er de Serbie Paris 16e, France.

C. (2) General interest in all matters affecting imports into the United States, tariffs, quotas, etc. Specific interest in supporting S. 2104, bill to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act, and in opposing Ives amendment to S. 2645, to extend section 104. (4) Estimated expenses (see separate registration of Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball). Compensation to be paid directly to Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball and not individually (see separate registration of firm).

A. Moss & Wels, 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. Bowling Proprietors Association of America, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Interested in the Defense Production Act of 1950 (S. 2645) and such other bills as may pertain to economic controls over industry. (4) $2,500 for the year 1952.

A. Movers Conference of America, corner Sixteenth and P Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) S. 2348, S. 2349, S. 2351, S. 2355, S. 2353, S. 2359, S. 2363, S. 2365, S. 2653. (4) Anticipated expenses will consist solely of printing, postage, and out-of-pocket expenses, such as taxi fares, etc.

A. Rhoads Murphey, 5826 Ipswich Road, Bethesda, Md.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Development of the United Nations into a world federation; international control and reduction of armaments; United States cooperation in world-wide economic rehabilitation and development; protection of recognized civil liberties; adequate recognition of the rights of conscience. Specific legislation being supported: Lehman omnibus immigration bill; appropriations for the International Children's Emergency Fund; Hill amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 20. Specific legislation opposed: Universal military training; McCarran bill (S. 2550). (3) Washington Newsletter of the FCNL.

A. Francis J. Myers, 2026 Land Title Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

B. National Foundation for Consumer Credit, Inc., 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Regulation W; Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended. Act of September 8, 1950, C. 932, 64 Statutes 798, as amended—against.

A. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation which directly or indirectly affects the interests of agricultural limestone producers.

A. National Association of Master Plumbers, 1916 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) S. 2907.

A. National Building Granite Quarries Association, Inc., 114 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Percentage Depletion for granite producers. (4) Monthly retainer fee of $500 with final fee to be determined but not to exceed $7,500.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York City.

C. (2) Appropriations for public health. (4) Fee of $2,400 per annum, plus direct expense of travel and incidentals.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 830 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Philippine Steam Navigation Co., Compania Maritima, Manila, Philippine Islands.

C. (2) To provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Republic of the Philippines by authorizing the Department of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Philippines (S. 2514). (4) The rate of compensation is a retainer of $5,000 for legal services and $10,000 additional for a successful termination of the matter.

A. Ohio Coal Association, 1615 NBC Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) Legislation pertaining to mine safety. (4) Office and travel expenses.

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine, particularly the tanker division thereof, including without limitation, amendments relating to titles 14, 33, and 46 of the United States Code Annotated, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, Transportation Act of 1940, appropriations relating to agencies charged with the duty of administering laws affecting transportation, etc. (4) See statement attached (page 3).[1]

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 2097, Lakeland, Fla.

B. U. S. Air Lines, 500 Sixth Avenue, New York City, and Fort Lauderdale, Fla., Air Lines.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) For legislation affecting favorably freight air carriers, and against legislation that would adversely affect them. For certain amendments to S. 436. (4) Compensation $5,000 per year, payable monthly. This covers legal services as well as legislative. Impossible to estimate exact amount of legislative but probably one-fourth. Reimbursement will be made for actual expenses. Only expenses anticipated: Transportation expenses of undersigned from home to Washington and return and hotel, and small amount of postage and telephone and telegraph. Estimated at $600.

A. Earl Quale and Arno Wisness, of Watford City, N. Dak.

B. Brooks Keogh, Roy Lillibridge, and John H. Hanson, trustees, operating under the name of Mineral Recovery Trustees, Dickinson, N. Dak. Trustees on behalf of former owners of lands sold to United States seeking recovery of mineral rights.

C. (2) Bill to repurchase mineral rights by former owners of lands which were sold to the United States. (4) Undersigned are to receive the contingent fee of 2 percent of minerals recovered for the persons who join in the trust agreement.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Cancer Society, 47 Beaver Street, New York City; United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 50 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York City; Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York City; National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York City.

C. (2) Public health. The specific interest is to present the need for adequate appropriations by the Federal Legislature for research in the fields of diseases which kill and disable people. (4) The annual fees are as follows: ACS, $17,500; UCPA, $4,000; ARF, $3,600; NMSS, $2,400. Estimated annual expenses for office and overhead are $12,000. Expenses for travel and entertainment (reimbursable) are estimated at $5,000 per annum.

A. Otie M. Reed, Wyatt Building, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The National Creameries Association, 817 New York Building, St. Paul, Minn.

C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers and dairy product manufacturing concerns. (4) Applicant is to receive annual salary of $12,000 and reimbursed for actual expenses incurred. This payment covers all work for the association, including such services, if any, as may be rendered in connection with lobbying.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers' Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Gerard D. Reilly, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Foremanship Foundation, 512-20 Harries Building, Dayton, Ohio.

C. (2) Provisions relating to supervisors in Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and bills having bearing on such provisions; for example, H. R. 6239, H. R. 6250, and S. 2503. (4) $5,000, to be paid in monthly installments.

A. George B. Roscoe, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Liaison Committee for the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Advocate the passage of beneficial legislation concerning fair bidding procedures, Federal contracting policies, controls, and subcontracting policies and procedures. (4) Reimbursement for certain

actual expenses only. Salary and certain expenses paid by the National Electrical Contractors' Association.

A. J. H. Rose Truck Line, Inc., 3804 Jensen Drive, Houston, Tex.

C. (2) General interest extends to any amendment of Interstate Commerce Act; specific interest in (a) "A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by establishing certain rules for the operation of irregular common carriers by motor vehicle"; (b) S. 2358; (d) against the bill; (e) for the confirmation of Hon. Charles D. Mahaffie as member of the Interstate Commerce Commission. (4) Annual compensation to attorney, $6,000 for all services, legislative and nonlegislative.

A. William H. Ryan, Room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, Room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (4) Approximately 5 percent of my time, but not more than 10 percent, will be spent on legislative work. My monthly salary is $499.98.

A. Ed. D. Schorr, 33 North High Street, Columbus, Ohio.

B. Ohio Coal Association, 1615 NBC Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) Legislation pertaining to mine safety. (4) Office and travel expenses. Compensation not determined.

A. Salvage & Lee, 1 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y.

B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

(C). (2) H. R. 5012, Navy bill—For. (4) Anticipated expenditures of minor nature. No specific fee involved as this is but a small part of our work for association as public relations council.

A. Salvage & Lee, 1 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y.

B. (1) National Association of Retail Grocers, Washington, D. C.; (2) National Association of Food Chains, Washington, D. C.; (3) Cooperative Food Distributors of America, Chicago, Ill.; (4) Super Market Institute, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Principals interested in amendments as yet unformulated to Public Law 96, Eighty-second Congress; Defense Production Act Amendments of 1951. (4) $4,000 per month.

A. Harry L. Senger, 1539 Larry Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.

B. National Retired Teachers Association.

C. (2) H. R. 2764.

A. Stratton Shartel, 4635 Wyandotte, Kansas City, Mo.

B. Safeway Stores, P. O. Box 660, Oakland, Calif.

C. (2) Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended in 1951. (4) $10,000 retainer, no additional compenation while here. Traveling expenses only.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 111 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. The Port of New York Authority, 111 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) For S. 2722 (KNOWLAND) to amend Defense Production Act; for S. 2615 (McCARRAN) to amend Federal Airports Act; for H. R. 4484 (WALTER) with respect to submerged lands; against S. J. Res. 20 (O'MAHONEY) with respect to submerged lands. (4) Total annual compensation $15,000. Legislative activities minor, but compensation cannot be allocated.

A. Lloyd Vernon Stover, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislative interests of American Trucking Association, Inc., include all bills, resolutions, and investigations affecting the trucking industry. (3) Special legislative bulletins; Transport Topics; Truck Beat. (4) Anticipated expenses: nominal, taxi fares, etc. Annual compensation, $3,600 per annum.

A. Russell J. Taylor, 9170 Fifteenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Shoe Workers of America, CIO, 917 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All labor legislation. In favor of all bills for the betterment of working conditions and opposed to all that are not in favor of the general welfare of the workers. (4) $484.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting disabled veterans and their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans. (4) Salary $10,000 per year, paid semimonthly, as chief administrative officer. Only a small portion of my time will be devoted to legislation. Anticipated expenses $10 per month.

A. George Thomas Underwood, 402 Albee Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Institute of Wholesale Plumbing and Heating Supply Associations, Inc.

C. (2) Defense production controls, taxation, all other legislation affecting the business of members of the American Institute of Wholesale Plumbing and Heating Supply Associations, Inc. (3) National Affairs Bulletin. (4) Annual compensation $15,000 plus $5,000 expenses.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 50 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York City.

C. (2) Appropriations for public health. (4) Fee of $4,000 per annum, plus direct expenses of travel and incidentals.

A. U. S. Airlines, Inc., 500 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) For legislation affecting favorably freight air carriers and against legislation that would adversely affect them. For certain amendments to S. 436. (4) To J. Hardin Peterson $5,000 per year, payable monthly. This covers legal services as well as legislative. Impossible to estimate exact legislative, probably one-fourth; only other expenses are traveling, hotel, and meals; small amount for postage, telegraph, and telephone; estimated $600.

A. U. S. Wood Screw Service Bureau, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) There are no bills, statutes, etc., yet introduced in which we have any interest. (4) No special funds are set aside for this work.

A. F. L. Waggoner, 9541 South Seeley Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. Aldens, Inc., Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Current postal-rate bills and any other legislation relating to the postal service. (4) No compensation other than regular salary and reimbursement for expenses, if any.

A. Henry B. Weaver, Jr., Henry H. Glassie, and Thomas M. Cooley II, Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Liaison Committee for the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation forbidding unqualified and inexperienced contractors from undertaking mechanical specialty work on a cost-plus basis and forbidding bid-shopping after award of fixed-price contracts unless the net saving therefrom accrues to the Government. (4) A retainer fee of $4,250; a monthly retainer of $750 commencing March 1, 1952, plus such additional payments as may be mutually agreed upon from time to time in the future.

A. Charles P. West, Jr., Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in substantially all legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workingman, including all pending legislation dealing with social security, national health, aid to physically handicapped, labor relations, displaced persons, etc.

A. Julius M. Westheimer, Julius Gutman & Co., Inc., Park Avenue and Lexington Street, Baltimore, Md.

C. (2) Against: Fair-trade bills to revive nonsigner clauses, specifically: H. R. 4592, H. R. 4662, H. R. 6925, revised H. R. 6367; for: H. R. 4365, to repeal Fair Trade Enabling Act.

A. Adam Yarmolinsky, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Comite Franc Dollar, 31, Avenue Pierre 4er de Serbie Paris 16e, France.

C. (2) General interest in all matters affecting imports into the United States—tariffs, quotas, etc. Specific interest in supporting S. 2104, bill to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act, and in opposing Ives amendment to S. 2645, to extend section 104. (4) Estimated expenses: See separate registration of Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball.[1]

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 22, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, May 12, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, mid all the traffic of life's ways, bowing at this daily altar of devotion we would lift our souls into the light of Thy presence. From the framing of laws and the forming of policies holding in their reach the woe or weal of our Nation and of the world, we would turn to an inner sanctuary where the world's angry voices die and Thou alone art real. In these times that try our souls and as we gird the might of the Nation to defend our threatened liberties, and even as we say to aggressive tyranny "Thus far shalt thou go, and no farther," we pray that we may take care to strengthen the spiritual foundations of our democracy, knowing that without

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

Thee we build on sinking sand. O hear us when we cry to Thee to make us fit to set men free. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 21, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 148. An act for the relief of Gerdina Josephina Van Delft;

S. 420. An act for the relief of Gloria Wilson;

S. 603. An act for the relief of Wanda Charwat, and her daughter, Wanda Aino Charwat;

S. 695. An act for the relief of William Greville Birkett;

S. 794. An act for the relief of Mrs. Shu-Ting Liu Hsia and her daughter, Lucia;

S. 869. An act for the relief of Marie Cafcalaki;

S. 992. An act for the relief of Daniel Wolkonsky and his wife, Zenia Wolkonsky;

S. 1189. An act for the relief of Anthony Lombardo;

S. 1192. An act for the relief of Demetrius Alexander Jordan;

S. 1420. An act for the relief of Pinfang Hsia;

S. 1494. An act for the relief of George Georgacopoulos;

S. 1517. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1897, entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for the other purposes," as amended, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to sell without advertisement forest timber in amounts not exceeding $2,000 in appraised value;

S. 1565. An act for the relief of Andy Duzsik;

S. 1765. An act for the relief of Harumi Kamiaka;

S. 1766. An act for the relief of Frederic James Mercado;

S. 1879. An act for the relief of Ernest Nanpei Ihrig;

S. 2033. An act for the relief of Giuseppa S. Boyd;

S. 2034. An act for the relief of Charlotte Elizabeth Cason;

S. 2051. An act for the relief of Naomi Saito;

S. 2145. An act for the relief of certain displaced persons;

S. 2220. An act for the relief of Theresa Hatcher;

S. 2588. An act for the relief of Dulcie Ann Steinhardt Sherlock; and

S. 2770. An act for the relief of Matheos Alafouzos.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. IVES was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the week, following the close of the session today.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. McCLELLAN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from today until next Thursday.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FREEDOM OF EMPLOYMENT—PETITION

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, a few days ago I received a petition signed by 144 members of the Cessna Aircraft Co., one of the large airplane manufacturing companies in the city of Wichita, Kans., requesting my help in retaining for themselves and other citizens of this Nation the right to decide for themselves whether or not they will join a union in order to obtain and/or maintain employment.

I believe this to be their right and privilege, and ask that unanimous consent be granted for this document to be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 30, 1952.

UNITED STATES SENATORS FROM KANSAS.

DEAR SIRS: Because we believe your influence can turn the tide of forced membership in an organization in order for citizens of the United States to earn a living for themselves and their families, we hereby petition you to do everything possible to maintain a constitutional freedom for us all—that of individually deciding for ourselves whether we join or do not join a union in order to obtain and/or maintain employment.

We, the undersigned, are a group of employees at the Cessna Aircraft Co., Wichita 1, Kans.

RAY R. GRANTZ,
JOSEPH M. STEELE
(And 142 other employees of the Cessna Aircraft Co.).

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN STATUTORY PROVISIONS UNTIL JUNE 15, 1952—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original joint resolution continuing the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until June 15, 1952, and I submit a report (No. 1595) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 156) continuing the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until June 15, 1952, reported by Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 22, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 148. An act for the relief of Gerdina Josephina Van Delft;

S. 420. An act for the relief of Gloria Wilson;

S. 603. An act for the relief of Wanda Charwat, and her daughter, Wanda Aino Charwat;

S. 695. An act for the relief of William Greville Birkett;

S. 794. An act for the relief of Mrs. Shu-Ting Liu Hsia, and her daughter, Lucia;

S. 869. An act for the relief of Marie Cafcalaki;

S. 992. An act for the relief of Daniel Wolkonsky and his wife, Zenia Wolkonsky;

S. 1189. An act for the relief of Anthony Lombardo;

S. 1192. An act for the relief of Demetrius Alexander Jordan;

S. 1420. An act for the relief of Pinfang Hsia;

S. 1494. An act for the relief of George Georgacopoulos;

S. 1517. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1897, entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for other purposes," as amended, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to sell without advertisement forest timber in amounts not exceeding $2,000 in appraised value;

S. 1565. An act for the relief of Andy Duzsik;

S. 1765. An act for the relief of Harumi Kamiaka;

S. 1766. An act for the relief of Frederic James Mercado;

S. 1879. An act for the relief of Ernest Nanpei Ihrig;

S. 2033. An act for the relief of Giuseppa S. Boyd;

S. 2034. An act for the relief of Charlotte Elizabeth Cason;

S. 2051. An act for the relief of Naomi Saito;

S. 2145. An act for the relief of certain displaced persons;

S. 2220. An act for the relief of Theresa Hatcher;

S. 2588. An act for the relief of Dulcie Ann Steinhardt Sherlock; and

S. 2770. An act for the relief of Matheos Alafouzos.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE:

S. 3217. A bill to facilitate the management of certain land and recreational resources of reclamation projects in or adjacent to the national forests of South Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 3218. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a tract of land in Custer County, S. Dak., to the Crazy Horse Memorial Foundation, and for the reversion thereof to the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3219. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain lands in Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 3220. A bill to authorize the advance on the retired list of First Lieutenant Nicholas Mainiero, United States Marine Corps Reserve (retired), to the grade of captain; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution continuing the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until June 15, 1952, reported by Mr. McCARRAN from the Committee on the Judiciary; ordered to be placed on the Calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCARRAN when he reported the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Brig. Gen. John States Seybold, United States Army, for appointment as Governor of the Canal Zone, vice Brig. Gen. Francis K. Newcomer, United States Army;

Vice Adm. Charles T. Joy, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Superintendent, United States Naval Academy;

Vice Adm. Robert P. Briscoe, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Naval Forces, Far East;

Rear Adm. Ralph A. Ofstie, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander; and

Capt. Ira H. Nunn, United States Navy, to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral (Ex. Rept. No. 9).

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. AIKEN:

Article entitled "Voluntary Procedures and Processes in Labor-Management Relations," written by Senator IVES, and published by the Industry Council Association, Inc., of New York City.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Excerpts from an address delivered by him on May 21, 1952, to Property Owners' Association of Philadelphia.

Editorial entitled "Bring Back the Cavalry?" published in the Harrisburg (Pa.) Evening News of May 20, 1952.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

Article prepared by Mr. Thomas E. Williams, a member of the Senate library staff, concerning the Old Senate Rostrum.

By Mr. KILGORE:

Statement entitled "Government Workers: A Dozen Fables and Facts."

By Mr. FREAR:

Article by David Lawrence entitled "Editor's Nine Questions to RUSSELL, With the Senator's Answers," published in the New York Herald Tribune of May 8, 1952.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

Editorial entitled "New Attorney General," published in the Washington Post of May 22, 1952; and editorial entitled "Enter McGranery," published in the New York Herald Tribune of May 22, 1952.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Article entitled "Farm as a Time Bridge," published in the Kansas City Star of May 11, 1952.

By Mr. BENTON:

Article entitled "Time To Help India Is Now," written by Marquis Childs, and published in the Washington Post of May 20, 1952.

By Mr. MORSE:

Editorial entitled "Are Profits More Important To Steel Industry Than Greater Production?" published in the St. Charles (Mo.) Daily Banner of May 12, 1952.

Editorial entitled "Control Over Government Spending Becomes Essential," published in the Seaside (Oreg.) Signal of March 13, 1952.

Memorandum entitled "The Ascendancy of the Military in American Life," by E. Raymond Wilson, which appears in the Appendix.

JACKASS AS UNITED STATES SYMBOL IN IRAN—ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an Associated Press article published in the Washington Post this morning entitled "Jackass Becoming United States Symbol in Iran." The article starts with the statement:

A floppy-eared, bug-eyed jackass is fast supplanting the familiar figure of Uncle Sam in Iran as the symbol of the United States.

Mr. President, I knew we had gone pretty far in this country, but I did not know that the Democratic administration had come to the point of trying to supplant Uncle Sam, who has been with us since the founding of the country, and carried us through many stormy eras, with the jackass. I presume there must be some reason for this, and perhaps the jackass as a symbol might typify some of the blunders and mistakes which have been made by the administration in some aspects of its foreign policy.

I merely wish to call the attention of the Senate to this attempt to select a new symbol for our country. I knew the jackass was the symbol of the Democratic Party, but I did not know it had become the symbol of the United States. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to go along with Uncle Sam for a while longer. Perhaps, after January 20, 1953, Uncle Sam may come into his own once again and the jackass put out to pasture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator asking that the jackass be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask that the article about the jackass be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, we have to have something to carry our Republican friends through, whether it be a jackass or something else.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JACKASS IS BECOMING UNITED STATES SYMBOL IN IRAN

TEHRAN, IRAN, May 21.—A floppy-eared, bug-eyed jackass is fast supplanting the familiar figure of Uncle Sam in Iran as the symbol of the United States.

Not a day passes but one newspaper or another carries a front-page cartoon showing the jackass in varying moods—sometimes plotting against Iran's independence, sometimes offering the country needed help, avaricious, surly—depending on the paper's political affiliation.

It all began several months ago when point 4 officials handled the shipment of a load of jackasses from Cyprus to Iran in a program to improve the local breed.

Iranian papers, forgetting all the good that point 4 was doing in the country, immediately seized on the "pore crittur."

"What's wrong with Iranian jackasses?" was heard everywhere around Tehran.

Whenever the newspapers thought they spotted something wrong in the point 4 program, they trotted out the floppy-eared, bug-eyed jackass.

When an antigovernment newspaper wanted to lampoon Premier Mohammed Mossadegh for agreeing last month to resumption of United States military aid, it showed him astride a donkey going off to fight America's battles.

The influential Keyham set the tone for the jackass controversy. Its editorial writer said:

"I have looked over the list of aid from the United States to Britain, Turkey, Italy, and Greece and have failed to see any mention of asses. Are we unique in the world in needing donkeys?

"What promises they made and what hopes they raised; and what is the result?—asses."

NEWS COVERAGE OF THE STEEL DISPUTE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief explanation of certain material which I shall ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. A few days ago I expressed some criticism of the fourth estate, many of the members of which I think suffer from a psychological complex of infallibility. The American press, particularly its editors, has failed miserably in presenting an adequate, accurate and fair account of the facts in the Steel case. There have been some exceptions but not many. I reaffirm this morning the criticism I made of the press.

I repeat that the press generally failed to adequately and accurately to present the facts of the steel controversy. By and large, it presented a very slanted report of the facts of the steel controversy. Particularly there was a general failure of the press to point out the contentions of the Lovett affidavit and the Lovett testimony before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to the effect that if the steel mills had been allowed to go down to the point that the furnaces would have cooled which would have taken from 48 to 52 hours, they could not have been placed in operation again for some 2 to 3 weeks, on the average. The loss of that amount of steel production, in case of a war with Russia within the next year, would have been translated into a loss of thousands of American lives. That was the emergency which faced the President of the United States at the eleventh hour of the steel crisis.

Mr. President, let me say that when the American people understand the real situation, then their attitude will be quite different as to the nature of the emergency. Then they will come to understand that the President sought to protect the security of this Nation in a dark hour of crisis.

I asked the Library of Congress to prepare for me a tabulation of the space treatment of the Steel case, including space treatment of the Lovett testimony, on the part of some typical newspapers.

My reply to the editorial in the Washington Star last night—and the editors of the Star I have always found, Mr. President, can dish it out, but, like so many newspapermen, they cannot take it—my reply to the Washington Star is that even the Washington Star, in spite of its protestations in its editorial columns last night, gave inadequate space to a discussion of what I consider to be

some of the most vital testimony in the steel case. The Washington Star gave inadequate space to the testimony of the Secretary of Defense, on whose shoulders rests the whole defense program of this country. His testimony was the most important fact on which the President based his action. The real emergency in the steel crisis was the threat of the shut-down of the steel furnaces to the point that they could not have been placed in operation again for some 2 or 3 weeks, which, in case of war, would have been translated into the loss of American blood.

So a part of my answer to the Washington Star, Mr. President, is a request now that there be printed in the RECORD a compilation of the space treatment of the Steel case by representative newspapers of the United States.

There being no objection, the compilation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

News coverage of the steel dispute by 5 papers: Selected statistics

WASHINGTON STAR

Date and page on which item appeared	Number of columns	Total number inches all columns
JUDGE PINE'S DECISION		
Apr. 30, 1952:		
Headline (1 inch high), page 1		
Comment 1	2	30
Comment 4	5	68
Decision 5	6	85
Comment 6	3	5
Comment 14	1	11
Total columns and inches	17	199
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS DECISION		
May 1, 1952:		
Headline (1 inch high), page 1		
Comment 1	1	10
Comment 5	3	23
Decision 4	7	71
Comment 22	1	7
Total columns and inches	12	111
SECRETARY LOVETT'S TESTIMONY ON NEED FOR STEEL		
Apr. 25, 1952:		
Comment 1	1	[1] 10½
Quote Lovett 3	1	2
Total columns and inches	2	2

NEW YORK WORLD-TELEGRAM

JUDGE PINE'S DECISION		
Apr. 30, 1952:		
Headline, page 1		
Decision 1	1	8
Decision 2	5	22
Comment 12	4	15
Comment 13	3	35
Comment 26	1	11
Total columns and inches	14	91
U. S. COURT OF APPEALS DECISION		
May 1 1952:		
Headline, page 1		
Comment 1	1	9
Comment 2	6	16
Comment 22	1	10
Total columns and inches	8	35
SECRETARY LOVETT'S TESTIMONY ON NEED FOR STEEL		
None.		

[1] In story on wage stabilization with brief passing reference was made to Lovett testimony.

News coverage of the steel dispute by 5 papers: Selected statistics—Continued

WASHINGTON POST

Date and page on which item appeared	Number of columns	Total number inches all columns
JUDGE PINE'S DECISION		
Apr. 30, 1952:		
Headline (2 inches high), page 1		
Decision 1	2	26
Decision 9	7	86
Comment 1	2	24½
Comment 8	7	44
Comment 16	1	11
Total columns and inches	19	191½
U. S. COURT OF APPEALS DECISION		
May 1, 1952:		
Headline (1 inch high), page 1		
Comment 1	2	27½
Comment 2	8	52
Comment 3	2	22
Comment 13	1	13
Total columns and inches	13	114½
SECRETARY LOVETT'S TESTIMONY ON NEED FOR STEEL		
None.		

NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

JUDGE PINE'S DECISION		
April 30, 1952:		
Headline, page 1		[1] (3½)
Decision 1	3	23
Comment 1	1	9
Decision 12	8	140
Comment 13	1	5½
Do	1	13
Do	2	15
Comment 18	1	6
Comment 19	2	24
Total columns and inches	19	235½
U. S. COURT OF APPEALS DECISION		
May 1, 1952:		
Headline, page 1		[1] (3½)
1	2	23
10	3	24
37	2	13
Comment 18	1	10½
19	2	21
Total columns and inches	10	91½
SECRETARY LOVETT'S TESTIMONY ON NEED FOR STEEL [2]		
April 25, 1952: 13	1	1½

NEW YORK TIMES

JUDGE PINE'S DECISION		
Apr. 30, 1952:		
Headline (2 inches high), page 1	1	14
Comment 1	2	12
Do	1	11
Comment 20	7	73
Decision 19	3	28
Comment 19	3	16
Decision 18	5	98
Comment 26	1	10
Total columns and inches	23	262
U. S. COURT OF APPEALS DECISION		
May 1, 1952:		
Headline (2 inches high), page 1		
1	2	29
23	2	21
25	5	24
28	2	15
28	1	21½
Total columns and inches	14	110½

[2] Mentioned in article beginning on p. 1 entitled "Investigation of WSB Steel Wage Proposals Voted in House, 255-88."

News coverage of the steel dispute by 5 papers: Selected statistics—Continued

NEW YORK TIMES—continued

Date and page on which item appeared	Number of columns	Total number inches all columns
SECRETARY LOVETT'S TESTIMONY ON NEED FOR STEEL [2]		
Apr. 25, 1952: 11	1	1½

Summary

	Judge Pine's columns	Decision inches	United States court columns	Appeals inches	Secretary Lovett's testimony
New York Times	23	262	14	110½	1½
New York Herald Tribune	19	235½	10	91½	1½
World Telegram	14	91	8	35	0
Washington Post	19	191½	13	114½	0
Washington Star	17	199	12	111	2
Grand total	92	979	57	462½	5

[1] Mentioned in an article beginning on p. 1 entitled "Court Is Uncertain of Truman's Power to Take Over Steel."

NOTE.—Statistics are for the day following the occurrence of the item indicated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Oregon concerning the editorial comment in the Washington Star. I believe that the only mistake which the junior Senator from Minnesota made in his comments was to have included radio and television, because it is my honest opinion that radio and television did a very good job. They certainly covered our hearings, and they afforded an opportunity for both sides of the question to be heard. I think the Senator from Oregon has well documented his position so far as concerns the space treatment in the columns of the press.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, when the Senate returns from the House I shall try to find a few extra minutes for Senators to make insertions in the RECORD. At this time I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY GENERAL RIDGWAY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if there be no further business at this time, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess, that it assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives

to hear an address to be delivered by Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, and that it reconvene upon the call of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.), the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate, preceded by the Secretary, Leslie L. Biffle, the Sergeant at Arms, Joseph C. Duke, and the Vice President, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to listen to an address to be delivered by Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway.

(For the address delivered by Gen. Ridgway, see House proceedings, pp. 5813–5815.)

At 1 o'clock and 1 minute p. m., the Senate returned to its Chamber, and reassembled when called to order by the Vice President.

REVISION OF LAWS RELATING TO IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND NATIONALITY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2550) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is now operating under a unanimous-consent agreement for a limitation of 1 hour to a side on as many as eight amendments, if offered, and 10 minutes to a side on any other amendments which may be offered. There is now no amendment pending.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I do not see the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] on the floor, but I may say that yesterday the Senator from Minnesota and I had a conference, at which I agreed to go over the 153 or 157 amendments which are on the desk, and to accept those which I could accept with safety to the policy of the bill.

My recollection is that as to approximately 20 or 21 amendments it is agreeable to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary that they may go to conference. Those amendments were selected yesterday, and I tried to make it clear at that time that I desired to have them acted on immediately, if possible. I thought we could clear the atmosphere to that extent. I would be willing to accept those amendments en bloc, if that is agreeable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That would have to be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The agreement was that eight amendments would be taken up first, but the proposal of the Senator from Nevada can be acted upon by unanimous consent.

Mr. McCARRAN. There are two committee amendments I should like to offer, to which I believe there would be no objection. However, I do not know whether we can proceed with them under the unanimous consent agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the eight amendments referred to are to be taken up first. However, the agreement can be modified by unanimous consent.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments which the Senator from Nevada has agreed to accept may be taken up and disposed of first.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, do I understand correctly that the amendments referred to by the Senator from Nevada will displace the eight amendments as to which it has been agreed that each side may speak for an hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Their position would be transposed, so that the amendments referred to by the Senator from Nevada would be disposed of first, and when they are disposed of, the original order with respect to eight amendments, and the time to be allotted to them, would still be in effect.

Mr. McCARRAN. If there is objection to the two amendments I offer, I will withdraw them and reoffer them later. I merely wanted to utilize the time.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, are these amendments being offered by the distinguished Senator from Nevada?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. The first one is designated "FFFF."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised that this amendment provides for a number of technical changes in the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. I wish to make a brief statement, if I may.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada wish to have the amendment read in detail?

Mr. McCARRAN. I think that will not be necessary if I may explain it. The purpose of this amendment is merely to make certain technical corrections in the bill for the purpose of clarification, and to eliminate certain errors in punctuation, grammar, and spelling. The amendment does not make any substantive change in the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment seems largely to be comprised of technical corrections.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as agreed to is as follows:

On page 17, line 11, delete the word "Swain's" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "Swains."

On page 21, line 11, insert a comma after the word "Bermuda."

On page 21, line 15, change the word "Caribean" to "Caribbean."

On page 32, line 3, strike the letter "o" at the end of the line and insert in lieu thereof the word "of."

On page 38, line 21, delete the word "such."

On page 38, line 22, preceding the word "in," insert the words "of such area."

On page 42, line 12, insert after the word "entitled" the word "to."

On page 47, line 17, delete the semicolon and substitute in lieu thereof a comma, and after the word "and," insert "(5)."

On page 47, line 18, delete the words "Not withstanding" and insert in lieu thereof "Notwithstanding."

On page 54, line 11, delete the word "or" at the beginning of the line and substitute in lieu thereof the word "and."

On page 75, line 5, change the word "anv" to "any."

On page 79, line 23, delete the word "naturalization" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "nationality."

On page 88, line 22, delete the word "act" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "Act."

On page 98, line 25, delete the word "and" and insert in lieu thereof the word "or."

On page 99, line 12, delete the word "and" and insert in lieu thereof the word "or."

On page 131, line 2, insert a comma after the word "child."

On page 131, line 23, insert a comma after the word "child."

On page 132, line 20, insert a comma after the word "child."

On page 133, line 18, insert a comma after the word "child."

On page 173, line 1, delete "215 (c)" and insert in lieu thereof the number "214 (c)."

On page 186, line 4, delete the words "armed forces" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Armed Forces."

On page 221, line 22, change the words "armed services" to "Armed Forces."

On page 223, line 8, delete the word "Swain's" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "Swains."

On page 242, line 17, after the word "States" insert the word "citizen."

On page 260, line 19, delete "$10" and insert in lieu thereof "$5."

On page 276, line 10, delete the word "specilized" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "specialized."

On page 281, line 16, delete the word "office" and insert in lieu thereof the word "officer."

On page 288, line 13, delete the word "Swain's" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "Swains."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the next amendment I wish to offer is designated as "EEEE"; and provides for a number of changes in the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 167, beginning with line 17 and extending through line 12 on page 168, it is proposed to strike out all of section 274 and substitute in lieu thereof a new section 274 to read as follows:

SEC. 274. (a) Any person, including the owner, operator, pilot, master, commanding officer, agent, or consignee of any means of transportation who—

(1) brings into or lands in the United States, by any means of transportation or otherwise, or attempts, by himself or through another, to bring into or land in the United States, by any means of transportation or otherwise;

(2) knowing that he is in the United States in violation of law, and knowing or having reasonable grounds to believe that his last entry into the United States occurred less than 3 years prior thereto, transports, or moves, or attempts to transport or move, within the United States by means of transportation or otherwise, in furtherance of such violation of law;

(3) willfully or knowingly conceals, harbors, or shields from detection, or attempts to conceal, harbor, or shield from detection, in any place, including any building or any means of transportation; or

(4) willfully or knowingly encourages or induces, or attempts to encourage or induce,

either directly or indirectly, the entry into the United States of

any alien, including an alien crewman, not duly admitted by an immigration officer or not lawfully entitled to enter or reside within the United States under the terms of this act or any other law relating to the immigration or expulsion of aliens, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,000 or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 5 years, or both, for each alien in respect to whom any violation of this subsection occurs: *Provided, however,* That for the purposes of this section, employment (including the usual and normal practices incident to employment) shall not be deemed to constitute harboring.

(b) No officer or person shall have authority to make any arrest for a violation of any provision of this section except officers and employees of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service designated by the Attorney General, either individually or as a member of a class, and all other officers whose duty it is to enforce criminal laws.

On page 179, beginning with line 1, and continuing through line 5, strike out paragraph (3) and insert in lieu thereof a new paragraph (3) to read as follows:

(3) within a reasonable distance from any external boundary of the United States, to board and search for aliens any vessel within the territorial waters of the United States and any railway car, aircraft, conveyance, or vehicle, and within a distance of 25 miles from any such external boundary to have access to private lands, but not dwellings, for the purpose of patrolling the border to prevent the illegal entry of aliens into the United States; and.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is one of the amendments upon which there is a limitation of 10 minutes on a side. Is there objection to agreeing to the amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to interrogate the Senator from Nevada for a moment.

I understand the amendment designated "EEEE" brings the Senator's bill into conformity with the action of the Senate in connection with the wetback provision heretofore agreed to?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does it conform verbatim with the original proposal?

Mr. McCARRAN. It does.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will continue the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hennings	Moody
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bennett	Hill	Mundt
Benton	Holland	Murray
Bricker	Humphrey	Neely
Bridges	Hunt	Nixon
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	O'Conor
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Clements	Kem	Saltonstall
Connally	Kerr	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kilgore	Smathers
Douglas	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Duff	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Long	Sparkman
Eastland	Malone	Stennis
Ellender	Martin	Thye
Ferguson	Maybank	Tobey
Frear	McCarran	Underwood
Fulbright	McCarthy	Watkins
George	McClellan	Welker
Gillette	McFarland	Williams
Green	McKellar	Young
Hayden	McMahon	
Hendrickson	Millikin	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY and Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Conference of the International Council for Christian Leadership at The Hague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and myself and other sponsors of amendments who are associated with me have agreed upon a bloc of amendments, 21 in number. These amendments have been carefully checked by the respective staffs, as well as by the Senators who are particularly concerned.

The amendments are technical in nature. They do not go to the substance of the measure before us or, as I believe the Senator from Nevada put it, the general purpose and objective of the bill. The amendments are minor, technical ones. We have agreed upon them, and I offer them en bloc. They are numbered. Many of these amendments, with the exception of one or two, now lie at the desk.

I do not believe it will be necessary for the clerk to read each of the amendments, but I should like to have each one of them printed separately in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Perhaps the Senator from Nevada would like to make some comment in reference to the amendments.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I do not know that I have any comment to make. What the Senator from Minnesota has stated is the case.

On yesterday the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Nevada had a conference. I said we would accept certain amendments which had been offered and which did not change the policy or the theme of the bill.

The amendments the Senator from Minnesota now is holding in his hand are the ones we have accepted. I am advised by my staff representative who is here that these amendments are in the same condition as when they were offered. They are satisfactory, and are to be accepted. They may be printed in the RECORD separately.

I wish to be frank with the Senator from Minnesota. When the bill goes to conference the conferees may determine that the amendments he offers may not fit into the places where he has them designated. The worth of the amendments will be considered carefully. They may fit in at some place in the bill. It will be my purpose to try to work out a bill in the conference.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Nevada informed me of this reservation, in our private conversations, and I recognize that that may be the case. We offer the amendments, however, as technical refinements, and as what I consider to be minor adjustments of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the 21 amendments en bloc?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand that these amendments were all agreed upon as between the committee and the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct—and my associate in this matter, who has worked so valiantly, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and other Senators who have sponsored amendments.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the 21 amendments are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that each amendment will be printed separately with proper designation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Each amendment will be printed separately in

the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the proper place.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 20, line 9, strike out "sixteen" and in lieu thereof insert "eighteen."

On page 20, line 15, strike out "sixteen" and in lieu thereof insert "eighteen."

On page 21, line 24, and page 22, line 1, strike out "sixteen" and in lieu thereof insert "eighteen."

On page 32, strike out line 25, and in lieu thereof insert the following: "10 percent of the quota for such year; except that during the last 2 months of any fiscal year immigrant visas may be issued without regard to the 10-percent limitation contained herein."

On page 63, line 3, after "(b)" add the following: "The provisions of paragraph (25) of subsection (a) shall not be applicable to any alien who (1) is the parent, grandparent, spouse, daughter, or son of an admissible alien, or any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or any citizen of the United States, if accompanying such admissible alien, or coming to join such citizen or alien lawfully admitted, and if otherwise admissible, or (2) proves that he is seeking admission to the United States to avoid religious persecution in the country of his last permanent residence, whether such persecution be evidenced by overt acts or by laws or governmental regulations that discriminate against such alien or any group to which he belongs because of his religious faith."

On page 67, line 14, in subsection 212 (e) strike out "Whenever" and insert in lieu thereof: "When the United States is at war or during the existence of a national emergency proclaimed by the President and."

On page 111, lines 4–6, strike out the words, "or hereafter and at any time after entry shall be or shall have been."

On page 75, line 19, insert a new sentence to read as follows:

"An immigrant visa may be replaced under the original quota number during the quota year in which the original visa was issued for a quota immigrant who establishes to the satisfaction of the consular officer that he was unable to use the original immigrant visa during the period of its validity because of reasons beyond his control and for which he was not responsible: Provided, the consular officer is in possession of the duplicate signed copy of the original visa and the immigrant is found by the consular officer to be eligible for an immigrant visa."

On page 79, line 8, amend section 222 (a) by striking the word "and' in the phrase "such relative and friend" and substitute the word "or."

On page 109, strike paragraph (4) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) is convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude committed within 5 years after entry and either sentenced to confinement or confined therefor in a prison or corrective institution for a year or more, or who at any time after entry is convicted of 2 crimes involving moral turpitude, not arising out of a single scheme of criminal misconduct, regardless of whether confined therefor and regardless of whether the convictions were in a single trial."

On page 112, line 18, strike the word "or."

On page 112, line 23, change the period to a semicolon and add the following:

"(14) at any time after entry, shall have been convicted of possessing or carrying in violation of any law any weapon which shoots or is designed to shoot automatically or semiautomatically more than one shot without manual reloading, by a single function of the trigger, or a weapon commonly called a sawed-off shotgun;

"(15) at any time within 5 years after entry, shall have been convicted of violating the provisions of title I of the Alien Registration Act, 1940;

"(16) at any time after entry, shall have been convicted more than once of violating the provisions of title I of the Alien Registration Act, 1940;

"(17) the Attorney General finds to be an undesirable resident of the United States by reason of any of the following, to wit: is now interned under section 4067 of the revised statutes of the United States and the proclamations issued by the President in pursuance of said section under dates of April 6, 1917, November 16, 1917, December 11, 1917, and April 9, 1918, respectively; since August 1, 1914, has been or may hereafter be convicted of any violation or conspiracy to violate any of the following acts or parts of acts the judgment and such conviction having become final, namely, an act entitled 'An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes,' approved June 15, 1917, or the amendment thereof approved May 16, 1918; an act entitled 'An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes,' approved October 6, 1917; an act entitled 'An act to prevent in time of war departure from and entry into the United States contrary to the public safety,' approved May 22, 1918; an act entitled 'An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes,' approved April 20, 1918; an act entitled 'An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States,' approved May 18, 1917, or any amendment thereof or supplement thereto; an act entitled 'An act to punish persons who make threats against the President of the United States,' approved February 14, 1917; an act entitled 'An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes,' approved October 6, 1917, or any amendment thereof; section 6 of the Penal Code of the United States; has been or may hereafter be convicted of any offense against section 13 of the said Penal Code committed during the period of August 1, 1914, to April 6, 1917, or of a conspiracy occurring within said period to commit an offense under said section 13 or of any offense committed during said period against the act entitled 'An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies,' approved July 2, 1890, in aid of a belligerent in the European war, or

"(18) has been convicted under section 278 of this act or under section 4 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917."

On page 157, in lines 11 and 22, change the word "ten" to "thirty" and in line 17, change the word "five" to "ten."

On page 150, line 20, amend section 254 (c) by inserting after the words "shall be paid by" the words "the owner or owners of."

On page 123, line 21, strike out the period and insert the following: "*Provided*, That no alien may be deported pursuant to the provisions of this subsection (f) unless a hearing has been granted to determine (a) the identity of the person, (b) the ground for deportation, and (c) the illegal return of the alien."

On page 203, line 12, amend section 316 (b) by inserting after the word "of" the following: "more than 6 months but."

On page 206, line 24, by changing "three years" in two places to "two years" in each case.

On page 211, line 24, amend section 322 (a) by inserting after the word "one" the following words: "or both."

On page 217, line 16, strike from the heading the word "Filipinos" and substitute in lieu thereof the words: "Philippine citizens."

On page 227, line 5, amend section 330 (a) by striking the words "on or before September 23, 1952," and by substituting in lieu thereof the following words: "within 1 year from the effective date of this act."

On page 243, line 25, amend section 336 (c) by inserting after the word "within" the words "a period of."

On page 244, lines 2–3, amend section 336 (c) by deleting the words "of 30 days."

On page 247, line 18, amend section 338 by inserting after the words "United States,", the following: "except in cases falling within the provisions of section 334 (a) of this title."

On page 260, line 19, strike out "$10" and insert "$5."

On page 281, line 12, amend section 358 by inserting the words "as amended," after the word "1940."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield the floor?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Connecticut desires to make some remarks, I presume that what we shall have to do, under the unanimous-consent agreement, is to take up one of the amendments on which we have an hour's debate. I seek the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The procedure would be more orderly if an amendment were offered and stated by the clerk.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I shall be perfectly willing to submit an amendment or to call up an amendment, and then yield the time to my colleague from Connecticut.

Mr. BENTON. I would appreciate the Senator's doing so, in view of the fact that I do not have an amendment at the moment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is this one of the eight amendments on which there is an agreement regarding the debate?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes, this is one of the eight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. According to the unanimous-consent agreement, those amendments would be presented by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the purpose of the inquiry of the junior Senator from Minnesota was to clarify the situation with respect to the unanimous-consent agreement. It is my understanding that, under the agreement, no Senator may speak unless an amendment is before the Senate. Therefore, since the Senator from Connecticut has an amendment, I suggest that the Chair permit him to present it. He may then make his speech, whether he speaks to the amendment or not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut offer an amendment on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, for the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUM-

PHREY], I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that this is one of the eight amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is one of the eight, as the Chair understands. The clerk will state the amendment.

The Chief Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 35, lines 9 and 10, strike out "; and" and insert a period.

On page 35, beginning with line 11, strike out all through line 15 on page 37.

On page 37, line 16, strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)."

On page 38, line 1, beginning with the word "and", strike out all through the word "section" in line 4.

On page 38, line 5 strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)."

On page 38, line 10, strike out "(e)" and insert "(d)."

On page 38, beginning with the comma in line 19, strike out all through "thousand" in line 23.

On page 32, line 20, strike out "(e)" and insert "(d)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized, and he is speaking in the time of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to have an identification of the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. The amendment is identified as "5–9–52–GGG."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I shall first speak on the subject upon which I desire to address the Senate briefly, and then I shall conclude with a few remarks about the amendment which I have sent to the desk.

Mr. President, I have asked for this opportunity to speak in order to call the attention of the Senate to an event of great importance to the free world, which will take place in Italy next Sunday, May 25. On that day important municipal elections will take place in central and southern Italy. Reports have it that some of the key cities may go communistic. The democratic parties of the center may lose considerable strength not only to the left but especially to a fast-growing neofascism on the right.

Mr. President, when I was in Italy 2 years ago attending the UNESCO conference in the great Province of Tuscanny, more than 90 percent of the cities had Communist mayors. Milan, the greatest industrial city in Italy, had cast 62 percent of its vote in the previous election for the Communist candidate for mayor. Now there is evidence of the same influence of Communist propaganda in the turn toward communism in central Italy and in southern Italy.

Mr. President, I ask, Why has this danger come about? Italy seems in theory to be stabilized. When I was in Rome last November 1 discovered it had one of the hardest currencies in Western Europe. In foreign trade it is a creditor to many of the richest countries. Inflation and budget deficits in Italy have been less than in other countries. Production is about 40 percent higher than before the war, where population has gone up but 10 percent. These all are the traditional indications of a healthy economy. Then why are its people dissatisfied? Why are they listening to the siren song, the false song of the promised land of the Kremlin?

The key to the answer to this question is understanding that the Italian economy has been stabilized at far too low a level. There are 2,000,000 unemployed, and at least another 2,000,000 underemployed. The standard of living even of the employed is far too low. In the year 1950–51 consumption expenditures per person in the United States were $1,327. In Italy they were but 18 percent of that amount, or $241 per person.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks tables 2 and 3 of a report prepared by the MSA, which has just reached me from Europe, and which shows that two-thirds of all the workers studied in this particular survey have incomes of less than 20,000 lire annually.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BENTON. Admittedly, stabilization of an economy at that level is a mixed blessing even for the wealthy few, for they live constantly on a powder keg of danger as the mass of the people search first in one direction, then in another, for the solution of their desperation.

Admittedly things in Italy are not so good today for the average man. But why does he not have hope for better things to come? Prior to 1924, he used to be able to hope he might some day emigrate to the United States, but the bill we seem about to pass will give a final stab to any faint, lingering hope of escape to this land of the free and the not so brave.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I am speaking on limited time given me by the Senator from Minnesota, and I fear I cannot yield for that reason.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut declines to yield.

Mr. BENTON. More recently, in elections since 1948, the Marshall plan has been a bulwark of the democratic center. This great concept in the operation of our foreign policy was dedicated to the principle that the future could be better; it offered the prospect of a rising standard of living as it dedicated itself to assistance in the solution of Italy's economic problems. The people believed in the Marshall plan; they voted democratic; they were willing to wait with hope. ECA has thus been a great and powerful political asset to the forces within Italy fighting communism.

Now the Economic Cooperation Administration is being buried. Its job is supposedly finished. The Mutual Security Agency has taken its place, with its emphasis on rearmament. I am told that the best that can be said for MSA, on the political front, is that it is not a liability. Its promise of jobs through our off-shore procurement program may counterbalance the Communist propaganda which says that MSA is designed to bring war to a weary and discouraged peop'e.

I have taken the view over a period of years that it is not necessary for the Italians to choose between the obvious necessity of rearmament against the threat of communism and a rising standard of living. I have insisted that, through the introduction into Italian industry and agriculture of well-known improvements in the techniques of production, hope can be returned to the people of Italy. With such hope, they have a future and a freedom well worth defending from dictators either of the left or of the right.

In a few days the Senate, during its consideration of the Mutual Security Act of 1952, will have presented to it an amendment earmarking a substantial amount of counterpart funds for the implementation of the Benton amendment and of MSA's Production Assistance Drive. These seek to eliminate restrictive business practices, to raise productivity in Italy, and to assure the sharing of the benefits thereof among consumers, workers, and owners.

Mr. President, I should say that this amendment will not cost anything in direct levy against the Treasury or against the taxpayers, because the funds involved come from the counterpart funds which are turned over to us by Western European countries in return for aid granted and voted them under the MSA.

I hope the Senate will support and vote for this proposal which can help so greatly to bring back to the Mutual Security Act the idealism and hope which made the Marshall plan so appealing to the people of Western Europe.

The techniques to raise productivity and the standard of living in Italy and Western Europe are well known and in daily practices in the United States. There is no technical reason why productivity in the United States is three times as high as that of Western Europe. The people there and here come from the same stock. The people of Europe work harder and longer than we do here and with as much individual skill. The difference in natural resources cannot explain the great divergence. The existence of national boundaries is only a partial explanation, one which is greatly exaggerated. I believe the Benton amendment of last year to the MSA Act pointed up the difficulty. The trouble is historical and psychological, not physical. It is the restrictive mentality which dominates business and industry in Europe, the philosophy to produce little for a small market at a high profit per unit; the failure of political and business leaders to understand and to implement the great principle that the workers of each country could be the best customers for its industries if only they were enabled to work efficiently and share in the benefits of such efficiency.

Let me give a few figures which demonstrate how unreasonable the difference is between the earnings of an Italian worker in Italy and his brother or cousin who migrated to the United States.

It takes 33 minutes of work for an Italian worker to earn enough to pay for a loaf of bread. It takes an American worker but 13 minutes. Similarly, the Italian worker must give 48½ hours of work to buy a pair of overalls; his American counterpart needs only 2 hours against 48½ hours. A pound of butter requires one-half hour of work in the United States; in Italy, 3 hours. A pair of shoes costs the American worker 7 hours of work; an Italian worker must give 55 hours.

These differences are wholly unjustifiable. However, they cannot be solved by speeches or even by laws—though speeches and laws can help. I wish we had more of both. But these differences must be largely solved at the plant level and in the actual market place.

Undoubtedly, the tax burden in Italy can and should be more equitably divided according to ability to pay, and the United States should urge continuously such corrections on the Italian Government.

The tax system of Italy bears principally on the working people and the middle classes. It is very restrictive. A good illustration of the tax structure in Italy is that there are 43 different taxes on a cup of coffee. That is a perfect illustration to show the repressive nature of the Italian tax structure when contrasted with our own.

Income should be more equitably divided among those who contribute to production, and unions should press for a larger share of the joint product for the workers. The efforts to bring about more equitable distribution must continue.

Unfortunately, the unions in Italy are Communist-dominated and Communist-led, are identified with the big cartels and rich industrialists, and will sell out the workers at the drop of a hat if it be in the interest of communism. However, the greatest hope is not in better and more equitable sharing of the existing pie. It lies in greatly increasing the size of the pie. This can come only through cooperation of owner and workers in increasing productivity to the mutual benefit of themselves, and in cutting prices on their products so as to benefit the whole community of consumers.

To aid in that effort the MSA should dedicate a substantial portion of its remaining counterpart resources.

Many of the economists and Government officials of Italy are convinced that the basic problem of their country is demographic—overpopulation. I believe that is wrong. It is the traditional approach, but modern technology has made it obsolete. I agree that Italy is today overpopulated, in ratio to her resources, and I regret deeply the forthcoming Senate action which will fasten upon us an immigration bill which grossly discriminates against the Italians and prevents us from admitting hundreds of thousands of these valuable citizens to the United States. But 10 or 20 years from now, with sound industrial labor and governmental policies, Italy can so step up her productivity that she can support her population.

Italy has too many people today only because of the low state of its industrial, agricultural, and distributive techniques. Much of its economy is still back in the middle 1800's. Italy has now 47 million people. Were Italy to reduce the gap between its own efficiency and that of the United States by only a third, it could support a population 20 percent greater than its present population at a standard of living double what it is now. Here is the key to the future not only of Italy but of Western Europe. Here is the road down which Western Europe and the United States must travel together if we are successfully to resist the evil pressures of communism and to build a free and prosperous world.

Italy needs more job opportunities for its workers in factories and on farms. They must work efficiently, according to modern techniques. Each must share in the benefits of the increased production. The problem is not so much the need for new industries or even for great investment in equipment per worker. The need is largely for the introduction of modern techniques of production into existing plants and of modern distribution methods.

The truth is it would do Italy more good today for half a million trained American technicians to leave the United States and migrate to Italy than it would for us to receive half a million Italians into the United States. I am not talking of sending Italy remittance men who bring or receive American dollars. I mean only sending technically trained men who would bring to Italy the skills learned here—as well as the faith in competition, productivity and free enterprise. The effect of such men on Italy would be so stimulating, I suspect, that no surplus of population would long continue in Italy. They would see to it that Italy shed her Old-World fears and ideas of restricted opportunity for a realistic attitude based on hope and confidence. How to bring that spirit to the people of Western Europe is the basic economic issue of our time. When we can resolve this issue, the economic problems of these countries will solve themselves through the expansion of their economies. I am assuming, of course, that American policy will succeed and that we shall be successful in averting a third world war.

All groups in Western Europe must partake of the new philosophy which is an old philosophy with us. Especially must the business community change its attitude. As the Senate knows, there is a psychological gap between the attitude of the American businessman and that of the Italian businessman, far wider than are the oceans which divide us. When we talk about competition to an Italian industrial leader he does not understand the effect of competition on productivity. There is no Sherman Act in Italy, and there is no Clayton Act; there is no antitrust legislation. The technique of conspiring at the expense of the public to hold back productivity, to raise prices, to produce as little as possible and to sell for as much as is possible, is deeply ingrained in the traditions and habits of the cartels which dominate Italian industry.

From among the ranks of European industry must come progressive leadership to break the bonds which bind the economies to low levels of production and low standards of living.

There are many such progressive industrialists and businessmen in Italy. They will lead the way if only they are given the necessary support and the necessary protection from unfair attacks by the cartels and reactionary interests. The Italian Government and the Mutual Security Agency should give this necessary encouragement and assistance to that new and fresh leadership. Democratic trade unionism should be strengthened to play its role in his movement. In the hands of progressive industry and free trade unionism lies the future of democracy and freedom in Italy and in the rest of Western Europe.

Mr. President, we should watch the Italian elections on Sunday very closely. I fear Communist gains, and the reasons for them are implicit in much that I have said today. The size of the Communist vote, however, will again indicate the urgent need for the approach I have outlined. That approach can be enormously strengthened by the adoption of the forthcoming amendment to the Mutual Security Act, which will provide substantial counterpart funds to implement the MSA program of industrial development.

IMMIGRATION AMENDMENT

Mr. President, I shall speak now on the amendment I have sent to the desk. The present law excludes the immigration of all orientals except Chinese, Indians, and Filipinos. Even Chinese and Indians do not have status equal to that of other immigrants. While other immigrants may qualify for visas on the quota of the country of their birth, persons of Chinese or Indian stock are classified by race, and are counted on the minimum quotas for India irrespective of their place of birth. Thus, an Indian born in South Africa would be charged against the Indian quota, not against the South African quota. However, Filipinos are not discriminated against in this way, under the present law.

The McCarran bill, which we are discussing today, opens the door slightly to some orientals who are at present not admissible, and to that extent is a step forward. It assigns minimum or near minimum quotas to all independent countries in the Orient. However, it retains the discriminatory features of the present law by extending to the entire Orient the principle now governing the admission of Indians and Chinese.

Thus, under the McCarran bill, prospective immigrants will qualify for visas on the basis of their country of birth unless they are orientals. If they are orientals, or even half-orientals, they come under the minimum or near minimum quotas of the Asia-Pacific area. Thus, the child of a British father and an Indian mother, born in London, would qualify under the small Indian quota, while other natives of London would qualify under the British quota.

The amendment sponsored by my associates and myself abolishes all inequality based on race. All persons could qualify for immigration to the United States under the quota of the country in which they were born.

I have spoken on this subject at length previously. With the further brief allusion I have made today, I urge upon the Senate the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

EXHIBIT 1

TABLE 2.—*Doxa study: Distribution of incomes in Italy by sizes, 1948*

Income class (lire per week)	Number of families	Percent of families	Percent of total income
Less than 2,500	305	2.8	0.5
2,500 to 5,000	1,704	15.9	5.1
5,000 to 7,500	2,480	23.1	12.2
7,500 to 10,000	1,906	17.8	13.1
10,000 to 12,500	1,441	13.4	12.7
12,500 to 15,000	845	7.9	9.1
15,000 to 17,500	566	5.3	7.2
17,500 to 20,000	357	3.3	5.2
20,000 to 22,500	211	2.0	3.5
22,000 to 25,000	269	2.5	5.0
25,000 to 31,250	230	2.1	5.0
31,250 to 37,500	158	1.5	4.2
37,500 and over	260	2.4	17.2
Total	10,732	100.0	100.0

Source: Mutual Security Agency, special mission to Italy for Economic Cooperation, Program Division, Family Incomes and Expenditures in Italy, Feb. 20, 1952, p. 5.

TABLE 3.—*Doxa study: Distribution of expenditures by type and region (for 10,732 sample families in 1948)*

[In percentage]

Expenditure by category	Region				All Italy
	North	Central	South	Islands	
Food	54.0	58.8	60.5	61.2	56.1
Housing	12.0	9.2	8.2	12.4	11.2
Clothing	11.0	11.4	10.3	8.3	10.9
Miscellaneous	23.0	20.6	21.0	17.6	21.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Same as for table 2, p. 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York desire to be recognized?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes, Mr. President, I desire to speak very briefly on this subject. It seems to me that the McCarran bill, instead of letting down the bars and recognizing the rights of people of Asiatic birth, slams the door on them to a great degree.

The question of place of birth is a serious one. We know that a great many people of Indian, Chinese, Japanese, or Filipino stock have lived for generations in England, Brazil, Belgium, France, and Ireland. But under the McCarran bill those people, if they have as much as 50 percent of so-called oriental blood, would not be charged against the quota of the country of their birth, but would be charged against the quota, the very small quota—about 100—of the country in which an ancestor lived, perhaps generations ago.

I believe all my colleagues in the Senate were in the Chamber of the House of Representatives about an hour ago, when that great soldier and statesman, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, spoke to a joint meeting of Congress. He emphasized the importance of building up and maintaining friendly relationships with Japan and with the Japanese people. He did not go into the whole question of relationships with Asiatic peoples generally, because, after all, that situation had been outside his jurisdiction, and to a great extent, obviously, that is a matter of diplomacy. But I was deeply impressed by what General Ridgway said about the importance of maintaining not only friendly relations with Japan and its people, but relations of mutual trust, confidence, and respect in the battle which we are waging for the minds and hearts of men, a battle which we are waging, not for self-interest but in order to preserve the peace and security of the world.

Mr. President, we need the good will, confidence, and trust of all freedom-loving peoples. A large proportion of the people of the world live in Asia and the countries of the Pacific. Yet we are deliberately slapping them in the face and taking away from them the self-respect and dignity to which they are entitled by saying, "No; we are not going to allow you to come to the United States except to the extent of a hundred a year."

The people of the Philippines were our allies, our friends, and our stanch supporters. We were very proud to be called friends of the Filipinos and to have their friendship just a few years ago. To Filipinos, also, we are saying, "Even though you may have been born in England or France and may have lived there, or even though your family may have lived there for generations, if you have 50 percent so-called oriental blood"—and I do not know what is meant by oriental blood—"you cannot come to the United States unless you can be charged against the niggardly quota of 100 allotted to your country."

Mr. President, I do not believe that is the way to gain the confidence, trust, affection, and support of that great mass of people, who are human beings just as we are, and who are and can be not only potential but actual allies of ours in the fight to maintain peace and security in the world.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. BENTON. I am very happy the Senator mentioned the address by General Ridgway, to which we all listened. If I recall correctly, in describing the Japanese people he used the adjectives: "Proud, sensitive, diligent, and homogeneous." I recall those words very distinctly; they made a very great impression on me, especially the adjectives "proud" and "sensitive."

I have previously told the Senate, when there were very few Senators on the floor, my experience in Japan in 1937, when by accident I was in Tokyo on the anniversary of the date of the passage by Congress of the Japanese Exclusion Act. On that day the black flags broke out all over Tokyo. As an American, I walked through Tokyo looking at the black flags on the buildings. When I asked why the black flags were flying I was told, "This is Japan's national day of mourning. This is the day on which we go into mourning because of the insult to us involved in your United States Oriental Exclusion Act."

Every student of this subject knows that our Oriental Exclusion Act played a large part in creating the climate of opinion in Japan which led to the attack on Pearl Harbor. The only question is, how large a part. Every student has asked the question, Would there have been an attack on Pearl Harbor if it had not been for our Oriental Exclusion Act?

Does not the Senator agree that these questions involve the peace and security of the United States as we look ahead, and that they are not merely domestic questions involving problems of our domestic economy? Does not the Senator agree that the risk and danger in insulting the great peoples of the east is infinitely too great a price to pay for the kind of discrimination written into this bill, which my amendment proposes to correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. I fully agree with the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. It does not make sense to me that, on the one hand, we talk about the friendship of Japan, the friendship of India, the friendship of the Philippines, and the friendship of Indonesia, and, on the other hand, we slap them in the face and say, "You are an inferior people. We cannot permit more than 100 of you to come into this country each year, regardless of any other conditions."

How can we expect to gain the respect, confidence, and trust of those people? I cannot emphasize too strongly that if we are to succeed in the fight against communism and all the evils of communism we must have the trust, the good will, and the confidence of decent peoples all over the world.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for another question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. BENTON. Does not the Senator agree that it is folly to have spent billions upon billions of dollars on Japan since the end of the war in the effort to rehabilitate the Japanese economy, and then at one blow, in a bill which I am sure not a dozen Members of the Senate have read, a bill containing 302 long, complicated, and difficult pages, to risk throwing overboard the good will we have been developing in Japan, and needlessly to insult that proud and sensitive people? I have no estimate of the amount we have spent. I suppose it has averaged at least $1,000,000,000 a year since 1945.

Mr. LEHMAN. I fully agree with the Senator. However, the argument can be carried much farther than Japan. The Senator from Connecticut and I know of the fine work which has been done in India by our Ambassador, Chester Bowles. We know how eager the great mass of the American people is to have the good will and friendship of the people of India. We passed a bill

providing a large quantity of grain for India, to relieve her starving people, and I hope we shall pass other financial measures which will afford either grants or loans or other forms of relief and help, but then we say to her, "We think your friendship does not amount to much. We do not care. We do not particularly want it. We do not consider you to be good enough to play in our front yard. Only 100 of you may come to the United States, and that is all." It does not make sense to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield the floor?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, does that conclude the hour? We have an agreement for an hour to a side.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thought the Senator from Nevada might wish to make reply at this time.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to make a brief statement at the conclusion of the presentation of the other side.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I have concluded my presentation with respect to this particular amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator's colleagues may wish to make a statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words in reference to this subject, and in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON].

We have gone over this material at considerable length, and I do not believe that we should unduly prolong the debate. The record will speak for itself. The record shows that this amendment is of vital, imperative importance to the national security. The Senator from New York has documented the argument in favor of this amendment, as has the Senator from Connecticut.

In my presentation in opposition to Senate bill 2550 I concentrated the early part of my remarks upon what we call the Asiatic-Pacific triangle, which is involved in the amendment to which we now lend our attention. I stated what is obviously a fact, that the most critical point in our international relations is that of an understanding among the various peoples, and a working relationship on the basis of equality. I pointed out that the people of the countries which lie within the Asiatic-Pacific triangle are highly sensitive. I refer to the Malay States, Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma, Thailand, Indonesia, the islands of the East Indies, and, of course, the great Republic of India. I hope the Senate realizes that in the acceptance of the Tehran proposal, while we provided a minimum quota for those countries, a pooled quota, so to speak, we have, in fact, not provided for the people who may reside in other areas of the world.

The Senator from New York pointed out the aspect of "50 percent oriental blood." That is positively impossible to ascertain. It is always well to have specific provisions in a bill, but in view of the limited birth records, in view of the limited history of families which exists in many of these areas, I say that it is literally and scientifically impossible to ascertain what is 50 percent oriental blood. I also think it is a direct insult to a citizen of Great Britain who may have 50 percent of oriental blood, but who was born in Great Britain, a child of English parentage on the one side, and, let us say, Indian parentage on the other side, to say that if he comes to the United States, he cannot be charged against the British quota, but must be charged against the pooled quota in what we call the Asiatic-Pacific triangle. What justification is there for according different treatment to a British citizen in Great Britain who may be of a different racial or religious background than is accorded to an Anglo-Saxon citizen of Great Britain? It makes no sense.

I was moved today by General Ridgway's address. First of all, it was a factual address. It did not embody polemics or politics. He confined himself, as generals should, to military matters and military policy. He did not wander all over the political arena. That is the prerogative of those in civilian authority.

In that respect General Ridgway performed a monumental service, in view of developments within the past year in American political life. He also pointed out that the Asiatic area was a critical area. He pointed out in particular that Japan was vital to our security. It is vital to our security. Japan, in the hands of an unfriendly government, or in the hands of a hostile power, or in the hands of Communist conspirators, would be a dagger pointed at our heart. Make no mistake about it—the Communists have been making hay throughout the world. They have been making great progress by preaching the doctrine that for some reason or other we do not like their kind of people. The actual public policy of our country substantiates their criticism of it.

The Benton amendment is directed toward the relief of that situation. It is directed in the same manner as we direct mutual security aid. It is directed as the point 4 program is directed, and as the Voice of America program is directed to supply truth and information. It is directed at the hearts of the people of other nations. No amount of money the American Government might spend would buy the friendship of those people. Friendship does not arise from gifts. It arises from mutual respect and understanding.

Mr. President, sometimes you can make enemies with gifts, particularly if you are the only one capable of extending gifts to a poverty stricken and depressed people. In that case they turn against you. How does one build a sound bond of friendship? He builds it through mutual respect, mutual affection, mutual understanding, and mutual recognition of equality. There is seldom any friendship between the rich and the poor on the basis of philanthropy or on the basis of charity. There is seldom any real friendship between the powerful and the weak on the basis of noblesse oblige or on the basis of a paternalistic attitude. Friendship evolves from the recognition of equality of status and by an appreciation of human dignity, of individual souls, spirits, and bodies.

That is what we are seeking by this amendment. What is wrong with the McCarran bill. It is that it does not get to the real heart of the problem when it comes to the treatment of people. We should be legislating on the basis of equality. We should be legislating on the basis of treatment of people, and on the basis of our reaction to and our understanding of them, as well as on our willingness to accept them. We should be legislating in terms of the basic and fundamental policy of democracy, predicated on the principle of human equality.

Mr. President, I must say that the McCarran bill violates that predicate, or at least seriously damages it. The bill adulterates the principle which is at the key and the heart of the democratic philosophy. The key and the heart of the democratic philosophy is recognition of the dignity of the human kind, and of the brotherhood and fraternity of mankind. The least we can do is to treat other peoples on an equal basis. We may not treat them completely in that way, and give them only certain small benefits, but the principle of equality should be present, whether it be with respect to a citizen of Norway or of Great Britain, or of Sweden, or of England, or of Italy, or of Greece, or of Turkey, or whether it be any one from Japan, Indonesia, Burma, India, or Pakistan.

I remind the Members of this august body that the future of the world may well be in the hands and in the hearts and in the bodies and in the minds of a billion and a half people who live in what we call this great area of underdeveloped and underprivileged people. We can be mighty and proud and strong in our economic system and military power, but I remind Members of the Senate that a billion and a half people who have hatred in their hearts, and a feeling of resentment because of inequitable treatment can wreck the United States of America in the long pull. We are legislating in the field of foreign policy, not merely in the field of domestic policy.

Those who want to economize on the budget should realize that the way to economize on dollars is to be generous with the human spirit. Mr. President, we can save money if we are generous with spirit, compassion, understanding, and humanitarianism. However, if we assume a negative attitude toward other people and negate every aspiration they have for equal status in this world, no amount of money the people of the United States can provide will bring us security. Security will not come from a flow of dollars alone. It will come from a flow from the heart of understanding and appreciation for other people's place in this world.

Unfortunately and tragically—and I say it with a real sense of depression and grief for my country—this bill embodies basic principles which make it difficult, if not impossible, to obtain what we need so desperately today, namely, a feeling that all the people of the world stand together and are equal partners.

Mr. President, if we do not accept other peoples as equal partners on the principle of equality, no financial or military power will be able to save us. We

may be safe for a few years, but the events in Korea should serve as a warning. There we see the relentless flow of the hordes of Asiatic manpower upon our Eighth Army. There we see the hundreds of thousands of a vast manpower from the insatiable pool which supplies more and more men. They should have in their hearts a sense of affection for us, as we would justly deserve if we act properly today. On the other hand, they can well have a sense of bitterness in their hearts.

Mr. President, we have history on our side on this subject. The eminent Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is 100 percent historically correct when he says it is fair to say that the Japanese Exclusion Act did as much to bring down upon America the vengeful wrath of the Japanese people as did anything else. We literally wrote the declaration of war in Congress. It was inevitable that war should come. Our Exclusion Act promoted militarism in Japan. Those who wanted peace and brotherhood found no place to turn. The great American brother had rebuked them and called them second-class citizens. They were the little people of the yellow race. Those little people of the yellow race can be very powerful indeed if they have the tools of destruction in their hands. I want them on my side. At least I want to have a chance to work with them on the basis of freedom, equity, and equality.

All we have to do is to announce the principle. We do not have to accept millions of them. We do not have to have the floodgates of America opened up wide. Whatever gate there is, let it be opened equally to all. Let us treat all peoples equitably.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BENTON. Does the Senator from Minnesota recall that if the Japanese had been permitted to come to our country during the 1920's and 1930's on the terms on which quotas applied to other countries, it would have meant only approximately 143 a year?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. BENTON. Thus, for the sake of keeping out only 143 Japanese a year we insulted this proud and sensitive people, as described by General Ridgway. Is it not a dramatic example of the folly of passing laws of this kind, which affect our foreign policy, on the mistaken belief that this is domestic legislation instead of legislation involving the peace and security of the world?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Connecticut is correct. I may say, with all due deference to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], that there is a provision in the McCarran bill which provides a quota for the people of Japan. I think it is a quota of 100 a year. That ostensibly removes the discriminatory future. However, it treats a person of Japanese blood any place else in the world on an inequitable basis as compared with other people. Let us put it this way. If a man of Norwegian ancestry, born in Canada, wants to migrate to the United States, he can come into the United States as a nonquota Canadian. He can be as Norwegian as any Norwegian who comes from Oslo, but nevertheless he can come here as a Canadian. Yet one who was born in Great Britain, with the parentage of nobility on the paternal side and a finished educated background of Indian blood on the maternal side, cannot come into the United States as a British subject, even though he is a British subject and a British citizen, but is allocated to the quota for the Asia-Pacific triangle.

Mr. President, no one is going to be "kidded" about this matter, because, whether we like it or not, the people of the Pacific area have educated and intellectual leadership. They are educated people. How terrible it would be again to place in the hands of the vicious and unscrupulous propagandists of the Kremlin this weapon, which General Ridgway discussed when he spoke of the maliciousness of their lies, their falsehoods, and their exaggerations. Why do we give them that kind of basis on which to build their lies? We can take away from the Kremlin the club with which they have been hitting us on the head, and at the same time protect our national interest. There would be no flood of immigration into the United States.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to draw attention to the fact that the McCarran bill not only fixes a quota of 100 but it goes further and sets up the new-fangled idea of the Pacific-Asiatic triangle. The bill limits immigration from countries within that triangle, which I understand extends all the way from India down to Australia. I believe it includes a part of Australia. The bill limits the total number of men and women from that area who can come into the United States to 2,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yet we are really dealing, as the Senator has pointed out, with 1,500,000,000 people in the Asiatic area.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think the case has been made. We have made it again and again. However, this is a process of education. I had a wonderful experience last evening when I traveled to the city of Newark following the debate on the floor of the Senate. I addressed a housing conference in Newark. Present were several hundred people, and our meeting was concluded at approximately a quarter to eleven.

I spent the next hour visiting with those who came up to talk to me about the immigration bill. I did not realize that the American people were so well informed about what we in the Senate are doing. Those persons included school teachers, businessmen, professional men, civic workers, State employees, city employees, and others. We met in the Civic Auditorium at Newark. The mayor of that city, a fine, civic-minded man, had made the auditorium available for that meeting. By the way, Mr. President, the mayor of Newark is of Italian background. One of the Commissioners, Mr. Moran, I gather to be of Irish background. That meeting was attended by persons of various creeds and nationalities. All of them were deeply concerned with what the Senate is going to do about this immigration bill. They want us to defer the rewriting of our immigration laws, until we have an opportunity to rewrite it in terms of our present position in the world and of the needs of the Republic.

Mr. President, at this time I suggest that the opposition be heard from.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I should like to say a word at this time, if I may.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New York; and, if so, for how long a time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New York whatever time he wishes to use.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief comment about a statement made by the distinguished Senator from Nevada. He said, in effect, "I should like to close the argument on this amendment."

I do not know whether we shall wish to answer him. However, simply for the sake of the RECORD on this amendment and on other amendments which may be offered, I desire to say that we cannot agree in advance to give up any unused portion of our time under the unanimous-consent agreement. In other words, if we have any time left, and if the other side presents an argument which we believe needs to be replied to, we do not care to agree in advance to give up any unused time which may be available to us.

Mr. CASE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does either side yield time to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me inquire about the purpose of the Senator from South Dakota in addressing the Chair at this time.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a few moments ago the distinguished Senator from Minnesota said he thought the opposition should be heard from. If either of the Senators who are in charge of time under the unanimous-consent agreement will yield a little time to me, I wish to speak in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be delighted to have the opposition use time at this point, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is in control of the time in opposition to the amendment. Does he yield any time to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. MCCARRAN. First, Mr. President, I must ask whether the hour available to us has been entirely used.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The opponents of the amendment have used 50 minutes, and have 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Then I yield to the Senator from South Dakota at this time. Let me inquire how much time he wishes to have.

Mr. CASE. I should like to have about 5 minutes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well; let the Senator from South Dakota take 10 minutes, if he wishes to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, although I have not heard all the argument on the pending bill, I have heard much of it. The argument which has been presented in favor of the pending amendment should not rest without an answer, I believe, even though the amendment seems likely to be rejected.

I listened with special interest to the argument advanced a few minutes ago by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON]. Mr. President, if ever there was an argument which did not justify the conclusions advanced in connection with it, it seems to me that would be the argument presented by the Senator from Connecticut.

I heard him say that a great number of Italian cities already have or are likely to elect Communist mayors. The implication of that argument on the part of the Senator from Connecticut was that in Italy, communism is on the increase. By means of that argument, the Senator from Connecticut sought to justify a conclusion that we should open our doors to more immigrants from Italy.

Mr. President, there may be some reason for us to invite more immigrants from Italy, and perhaps their quota should be changed. But the argument that, because it is believed that some Italian cities are likely to elect Communist mayors, we should open our doors to more immigrants from Italy, does not appeal to me; and I do not believe it appeals to the American people.

In the second place, I heard the Senator from Connecticut say that the Japanese exclusion policies of the United States were largely responsible for the attack on Pearl Harbor. Mr. President, it should not be necessary to challenge such a statement in this body; but I do not want the RECORD to seem to show that such a statement goes unchallenged. I daresay that on other occasions the Senator who uttered those words has given some other reason for the attack by the Japanese on Pearl Harbor. Many people believe it was provoked by the policies followed by President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull; or at least that they precipitated the attack, at the time when it came. Others think it was an integral part of a policy originating in Berlin. Others may say it was due to economic pressures. Others, that it was because we told Japan she must not move south, but certainly one cannot say with correctness that it was due to the policy on Japanese immigration which our country has had.

Today I heard General Ridgway speak at the joint session, and I noted his statement that those who wish to see a strong Japan must sit down at a conference table with some understanding of the problems involved and with some desire to reach a solution which will make it possible for Japan to have access to raw materials and markets for the products of those raw materials when processed in order to provide a viable Japanese economy—to use General Ridgway's term. He did not say, however, that we should increase the quota of Japanese to be allowed to enter our country, as a means of avoiding another Pearl Harbor.

The final argument which I believe should be challenged is the suggestion that by our national immigration policy or by continuing a policy of basing immigration on the historic percentages of nationalities in the United States, we shall be playing into the hands of the Kremlin; that if we continue to pursue this policy it will give communism an effective weapon in the cold war.

Mr. President, if that argument were true, it should not be advanced by an American. Do we not have the right to determine who may enter our country?

And, what is the policy of the Kremlin with regard to immigration? Does Russia invite these people to share her resources? I do not know what policies Russia has for all immigration matters, but I have witnessed the result of one of her policies with respect to peoples. She was the instigator of the policy by which 11,000,000 persons were expelled from some of the territories she put behind the iron curtain at the conclusion of World War II. I think it is to the shame of the allies who were associated with Russia in World War II that they sanctioned the movement to uproot millions of persons who, up to that time, had spent all their lives in those countries, and whose forebears had lived there in some instances for 200 years. It is a matter of tragic fact that some 11,000,000 persons were expelled from Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the other territory which was put behind the iron curtain following World War II; and were crowded into what remains of Germany.

Russia has no policy for inviting the immigration of peoples from other parts of the world. If she maintains an iron border against outside nationalities even to the extent of expelling these millions, it is ridiculous to say that because we have a policy of maintaining the historic proportions in this country, we are playing into the hands of the Kremlin.

Mr. President, the suggestion that such a thing could be true should not be made on the floor of the Senate, for if we here are to counter the Kremlin's propaganda, we should be pointing out the expellee policy which the apostles of communism carried out. So far from inviting people of diverse origins, Russia kicked out these millions of people of German ethnic origins who had been living in those lands for 200 years.

Mr. President, I took the floor merely to challenge those three or four points, because although I believe that the amendment will be rejected, I do not like to see such arguments go unchallenged on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada seems not to wish to speak at the moment. If he does not, I should like to reply to the remarks just made by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

I appreciate the willingness of the Senator from South Dakota to join in the debate. That is what we have been hoping for during the past 10 days.

However, Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota is dead wrong in reference to some of his conclusions in regard to the argument which has been made here.

Mr. President, the argument which has been presented to the Senate is not one for opening the gates; neither is the argument which has been presented based on the idea that Communist mayors may be elected in Italy. The argument which has been presented is that the United States, if she wishes to obtain the maximum amount of cooperation from the rest of the world, must treat all the other countries in the world on the basis of equity and equality.

It is candidly admitted that the McCarran bill, as proposed, will give the Japanese a quota. Such a provision is, indeed, an improvement; and it is for that very reason that the Japanese Citizens League of this country is supporting the McCarran bill, because at long last it will do away with what is known as Japanese exclusion. There is no doubt about that, Mr. President. Let us have the record perfectly clear.

However, the Senator from South Dakota does not seem to understand the implications of the section of the bill beginning on page 35, about which we have been speaking. That section of the bill would do away with the entire system of national origins, insofar as it applies to orientals. In other words, it would require that if a person of 50 percent Indian blood, let us say, was born in England—thus obviously being a citizen of Great Britain—that person, whether man, woman, or child, could not enter the United States as an immigrant under the quota for Great Britain, as allowed under the quota system. Yet if a man or woman of whole English blood, 100 percent Anglo-Saxon, were born in Spain, that man or woman could come in as a Spaniard, regardless of the blood, so to speak.

The Senator from Minnesota was pointing out that no member of this body is wise enough to ascertain whether a person has 50 percent of oriental blood, and I doubt whether it would be possible to find very many doctors who would be able to prove it scientifically. In view of the fact that the people in many of these areas keep no proper record, it is going to be a matter of having someone look into their eyes and at their skin.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Minnesota will yield for another question, if he feels that it would be impossible for a doctor or any other person to determine the percentage of blood, why does he object to the provision of the bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to my friend, the Senator from South Dakota, that I want to be most charitable with him, and I want to proceed now cautiously and slowly. I say to the Senator that the bill includes what I have just been talking about. I say that, insofar as persons who are within the so-called Asiatic triangle and persons of oriental blood are concerned, the bill provides that they shall not be treated on the basis of a quota system from a particu-

lar country, but that they shall be treated on the basis of what their bloodstream seems to reveal. Scientifically, there is no difference between the blood of a person from Japan and the blood of a person from Sweden. But somehow or other our consular officers are supposed to possess some sort of medical prophetic insight and vision which will reveal things that modern science has never been able to determine. All I am saying is that the provisions of this bill, first of all, are scientifically unsound. Second, they are tragic in terms of their implications to our foreign relations.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. CASE. If the Senator will permit me to make the suggestion it seems to me that what he wants to do is to establish a legal way of evading the provisions of the quota system.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not at all. What the Senator from Minnesota wants to do is to have a quota system applied equally, not in terms of actual numbers, but in terms of equity of principle. The Senator from Minnesota is simply saying that if a person were born in Great Britain and were now a citizen of France, or if he were born in France and were now a citizen of Great Britain, he should come under the British or the French quota. That is the way Frenchmen are to be treated, if by blood one may speak of them as such. However, if there is anyone who can find any pure races, I should like to know where they are, after the many wars and the migrations of peoples. There are supposed to be some left, I imagine.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. To quote a very significant phrase from the Constitution of the United States—"regardless of race, color, or creed."

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I wish it were more generally applied.

Mr. President, I am going to conclude my argument by saying to the Senator from South Dakota that I know his intentions are right. I know there 's no fundamental disagreement as to the objective. All I am saying is that we do not remove racial discrimination in immigration laws when we literally place a premium or a handicap upon an individual because of his ancestral background. I repeat my example: Let us assume that a person of Indonesian extraction has been living in Holland, which, of course, would not be unusual, since Holland at one time was the colonial power which governed Indonesia. Let us assume that there is a child in Indonesia who speaks the Dutch language, who goes to the Dutch Church; that the father of the child is a Dutchman; and that the mother happens to be Indonesian. That has happened. If the child wanted to emigrate to the United States the child could not come in under the Dutch quota, but would have to come in under the so-called Asiatic-Pacific triangle quota, with its maximum pool of 2,000. A child born in Indonesia of Dutch parentage and Indonesian parentage could come in only under the Indonesian quota. How may that sort of thing be justified in the terms of the relationships we want to establish in this world?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. If the same child were born in America he would be an American.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct; there can be no doubt about it whatever. In other words, if a child were born in the United States of a Polish father and of a mother who came from India the child would be an American and would have all the prerogatives of American citizenship. But if the child were born in Great Britain of a Polish father and of an Indian mother and was educated at one of the finest colleges or schools he could not come into the United States as a British immigrant, even though mother and father and child were British subjects and British citizens; he would have to come in as an immigrant under the Asiatic-Pacific triangle quota or be charged back to the other country. I say that is unfair. I do not think we need belabor the point, except that the Senator from South Dakota must know what the facts are, and I have given him the facts.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Again to accentuate the inequity of that provision, under the McCarran bill, the child referred to by the Senator from Minnesota would have to register in India, though he never had a residence in India and never lived in India, but was born in Holland. Therefore that child, under no stretch of the imagination, could ever emigrate to America.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The registry of residence could be in Holland, too, so far as being able to be charged to a particular quota.

Mr. PASTORE. But that child would not be able to come in under the Holland quota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. And there could not be a clearance from the Indonesian Government.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the effect of this amendment is to remove from Senate bill 2550 those provisions relating to the Asia-Pacific triangle which provide for special treatment of certain Asiatics and natives of Pacific islands under the quotas. Briefly, under those provisions an area described by longitudes and latitudes encompassing generally those Asiatic and Pacific areas from which immigration is presently barred, is established. People attributable by as much as one-half of their ancestry to races indigenous to the Asia-Pacific triangle are chargeable to the quotas for the quota areas within the triangle or to a special over-all Asia-Pacific quota.

Those who advocate the deletion of this provision charge that it introduces new racial discriminations in our immigration laws.

In answer to that argument, I should like to point out to the Members of the Senate that under existing law, the Asiatics and natives of the Pacific islands in question are absolutely barred from admission to the United States as immigrants with the exception of natives of China, India, and the Philippines. It is to be observed that when the racial exclusions were removed in the case of Chinese and Indians, the requirement was inserted in the law—which is the law today—that persons attributable by as much as one-half their ancestry to races indigenous to China or India are chargeable to the quotas of those countries. The theory behind this realistic treatment of orientals, therefore, is not new. Under the provisions of S. 2550, no one will be inadmissible to the United States solely because of race and since the bill is removing discriminations from the law in this regard, it cannot be said that new racial discriminations are being introduced.

The Japanese-American Citizens League, a representative of the race most concerned with the removal of the discriminations, has given this legislation its wholehearted support as has the Filipino Federation of America, Inc. Thus those people most directly affected by the provisions of the bill in question are not the ones who are complaining about the alleged discriminatory treatment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator——

Mr. McCARRAN. Right there I stop the Senator, because it is evidently not a question. I am not going to answer the Senator's wondermen.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall reword my question.

Does the Senator know that the Philippine Government has protested that part of the bill which affects Philippine citizens?

Mr. McCARRAN. I read from a telegram which I inserted in the RECORD, in which the supreme president of the Philippine Federation of America——

Mr. LEHMAN. I am talking about the Philippine Government.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know about the Philippine Government. I am talking about the people.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Philippine Government represents a great many Filipino people.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to point out to the Members of the Senate that if this amendment is adopted, there are approximately 600,000 orientals who are natives of nonquota countries in the Western Hemisphere who would immediately become eligible for a nonquota immigrant status under our immigration laws. Coupled with the orientals born in quota countries outside the Asia-Pacific triangle, it is reliably estimated that approximately 2,000,000 aliens of oriental ancestry would become eligible to enter

the country, either as quota or non-quota immigrants.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield for a question at that point?

Mr. McCARRAN. In a moment.

Mr. President, there is no quota now for Japan. The bill would give Japan a quota of 185 a year.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that the figure of 2,000,000 which the Senator has used is, of course, subject to all the many standards and qualifications which are applied for the admissibility of immigrants into the United States?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, the standards of health and economic ability are standards which would apply to any immigrant?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So the figure would be tremendously reduced because of those standards?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not tremendously reduced.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The standard of literacy is applicable, is it not?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that these persons are likely to be illiterate?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would they not have to show that they will have a job? They would have to give assurance of their ability to take care of themselves economically, would they not?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; that they would not become public charges.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So the figure of 2,000,000 is a theoretical figure. In fact, there are 150,000,000 in the Western Hemisphere who are eligible for migration to the United States.

Mr. McCARRAN. They are coming across the border by thousands.

Mr. HUMPHREY. One hundred and fifty million persons in South America, Mexico, and Canada are eligible for citizenship in the United States.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. How many persons migrated from Brazil?

Mr. McCARRAN. I cannot tell the Senator at the moment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was a very limited number, was it not?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We have the competition of wetbacks from across the Rio Grande. Is there anything to lead us to believe that there is a wetback invasion?

Mr. McCARRAN. The term "wetback" is applied to labor from across the Rio Grande. Orientals are competing in the market.

Mr. HUMPHREY. They cannot swim the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. McCARRAN. They reach here somehow. There are approximately 600,000 oriental natives of countries in the Western Hemisphere who would be eligible.

Mr. HUMPHREY. They would be technically eligible if they could meet the immigration standards.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But those 600,000 persons could not meet the standards, any more than could the Indians.

Mr. McCARRAN. I cannot agree with the Senator, because many of them have had education in the Western World.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is there any indications that citizens of Chile, even the native stock, have wanted to come to the United States? They could come here in hordes, could they not?

Mr. McCARRAN. They can come in now.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But they must first have the necessary money.

Mr. McCARRAN. They usually get it from here and come to the United States on American money.

Mr. HUMPHREY. When we talk about these figures, is it not correct to say that while the theoretical possibility is that under the present law there could be a migration of 150,000,000 persons, the immigration has been but a trickle from South America, Latin America, and Canada?

Mr. McCARRAN. It has been a substantial trickle. There are from 3,000,000 to 5,000,000 people illegally in the country. That has been established.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that most of them are wetbacks?

Mr. McCARRAN. Oh, no.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is not the number approximately 2,000,000?

Mr. McCARRAN. I'o; I do not agree with that. It would run less than a million.

Mr. President, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] for the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and other Senators.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I call up amendment P as in "PASTORE," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island for the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and other Senators.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 42, after line 7, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

POOLING OF UNISSUED AND UNUSED QUOTA NUMBERS

SEC. 203A. All quota numbers available during any fiscal year which are not actually issued during such fiscal year, and all quota numbers which were issued in such fiscal year or in a previous year and expired during such fiscal year without being utilized, shall be assigned to a general quota pool and shall be available, without reference to national origins, for issuance at any time during the fiscal year following such assignment as follows:

(a) Family reunion preferences: Twenty-five percent of such pooled quota numbers or such smaller percentage as shall be found by the Secretary of State to be sufficient properly to care for pending applications, shall be available, in such order as may be determined by the Secretary of State, to adult children, brothers and sisters, and other blood relatives (within the third degree of consanguinity computed according to the rules of the common law) of citizens, and to spouses, children (including those over 21 years of age), parents, brothers and sisters, and other blood relatives (within the third degree of consanguinity computed according to the rules of the common law) of alien residents of the United States who have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

(b) National need preferences: Twenty-five percent of such pooled quota numbers, or such smaller percentage as shall be found by the Secretary of State to be sufficient properly to care for pending applications, shall be available for persons who because of their high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability, are urgently needed in the United States (so far as such needs have not been met within the original quotas), or are likely to be of special benefit to the national economy, cultural interests, or welfare of the United States as determined by the Secretary of State, on the basis of recommendations made by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Labor, or by such advisory committees, representing industry and labor, as the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Labor may establish.

(c) Persecute preferences: Twenty-five percent of such pooled quota numbers, or such smaller percentages as shall be considered by the Secretary of State to be sufficient properly to care for pending applications, shall be available, in such order as may be determined by the Secretary of State, to persons (including persons temporarily within the jurisdiction of the United States) who have been persecuted abroad in the country of their national origin or in the place of their last residence on religious or racial grounds or because of their adherence to democratic beliefs or because of their opposition to totalitarianism or dictatorship, or who have reason to fear such persecution, and who have been classified as "persecutees" or "possible persecutees" in accordance with such procedures and after such investigations as the Secretary of State shall order.

(d) Nonpreferncе cases: Pooled quota numbers not required for issuance under the foregoing preferences shall be available, on application to the Secretary of State by an American citizen or a reputable American organization, to other immigrants, whose cases because of special circumstances or hardship merit special consideration, in the order of their registration.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, this amendment is a very simple one. While I believe that it affects the policy of the McCarran bill, as enunciated by the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I think it represents a policy that should be adopted by the United States in the establishment of its permanent procedure regarding immigration. The amendment does not affect the usage of the 1920 census as a basis for the formula. Nor does it affect the percentage of one-sixth of 1 percent as a basis. Therefore, it means that the over-all number of immigrants entering this country will still be in the neighborhood of 150,000.

I wish to make that abundantly clear at the outset, because yesterday we debated an amendment in the nature of a substitute. While that substitue included the substance of the amendment together with other features which might have been somewhat obnoxious to some Members of the Senate, the purpose of this amendment is to lift out of the substitute amendment the pooling provision and consider it on its own.

Explained in very simple terms, this is all the amendment does. It leaves quotas as they are presently designated

under the McCarran bill. It does not take away from the number who may enter from any particular nation. All it provides is that in the event any nation does not use all its quota in any one year, the number left over will go into a pool. From that pool, within the discretion of the Secretary of State, under four designated classifications, not exceeding in any one classification more than 25 percent of the pool, certain people can come here from countries that have already oversubscribed their quotas.

To be sure, this is a very simple amendment. I myself concede that it does not do complete equity. I have always maintained, and I now contend, that if we are to revise our immigration law on a permanent basis, and if we are to modernize that law and bring it up to date, in order truly to effectuate the statement made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, it should be done in a more democratic fashion. We should adopt the census of 1950, because the census of 1950 truly reflects the nationality pattern of our American society.

I dare say that if we take the census of 1950, it pretty well matches, so far as races are concerned, the American boys who served in the last World War, but if we take the census of 1920, I think the disparity will be amazing. However, I shall not go into that feature. That argument has been made by me before.

This is a very simple amendment, which creates a pool under four distinct classifications. It does not mean that one more person can come to America above the over-all number that would be permitted to come in under the McCarran bill. It means only that when an invitation is extended to a nation to have some of its citizens migrate to the United States, if that nation does not accept the invitation in full, then within classifications protecting the interest of the United States of America, because these categories are pretty well defined, we are extending the invitation to other people who are eligible, who would be willing to come, or who would be willing to accept the invitation, and who can only come, in large part, because of their skills or other reasons for the benefit of the United States.

My reason for citing this is that subsection (b) provides that 25 percent of such pooled quota numbers, or such smaller percentage as shall be found by the Secretary of State to be sufficient to care for pending applications, shall be available for persons who, because of their high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability, are urgently needed in the United States.

It might well be that a time will come when the quota from Portugal might be oversubscribed; a time may come when the quota from Greece will be oversubscribed; there may come a time when the quota from Armenia will be oversubscribed. Yet in one of those countries there might be an individual who has high skills that will be of tremendous benefit to the United States. Yet under the McCarran bill that person could not come into this country as a permanent resident.

If there is a pool system, if there are a number of people from other countries who might have come, but do not come, they can be placed in the pool, and we can bring into the United States that person who might mean so much to our country's security.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Would the Senator's amendment extend an unused quota beyond the immediately succeeding year?

Mr. PASTORE. That is all it would provide for.

Mr. CASE. It would make the unused number available for the year immediately succeeding, but would not be cumulative over a period of years?

Mr. PASTORE. No, it would not.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I did not hear the question asked by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. PASTORE. My understanding of the amendment is that it would include only the unused quota for the preceding year.

Mr. LEHMAN. Two changes would be made. May I explain?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. PASTORE. I asked the Senator from New York the question because he rose at that time. I wish to make it abundantly clear that all that is proposed by the amendment is to take the preceding year's unused quota and carry it over into the pool.

Mr. LEHMAN. Also, it eliminates the 10-percent monthly provision.

Mr. CASE. I do not think that it is perfectly clear as to what is intended. It seems to me that the Senator's amendment might serve a very useful purpose. I recognize the fact that people of special skills might make special contributions. I know of an instance when a Chinese doctor was badly needed because he was a specialist in the field of tuberculosis. We had to work quite a while to find a way to make his skill available. There was a shortage of doctors and he was a specialist whose services were badly needed. There may be many other such cases. I think there might be some question, however, if the unused quotas were to be cumulative and were to be made available not only in 1952, but also in 1953 and 1954 and succeeding years.

Mr. PASTORE. If the language of this amendment does not connote that specifically, I am perfectly willing to have it amended to carry out that thought. As the amendment is written, and as I read it, it means to cover only the preceding year. If it does not carry out that thought, I am perfectly agreeable to having it amended to provide what the Senator from South Dakota has suggested.

Mr. CASE. I have one further question, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. CASE. The Senator used the term "25 percent." Does that place 25 percent of the unused quota into a pool, or is it that 25 percent of the total of unused quotas may be assigned to a particular category of skills?

Mr. PASTORE. No; the 25 percent applies to the pool. In other words, if there were a pool of 100,000—which, of course, there would not be—it would mean that not to exceed 25,000 could be brought here for purposes of family reunion. That would be the first category. The second category would be that of special skills of benefit to the United States. The next category of 25 percent would be the persecutees. Then, of course, the last 25 percent would be the regular immigration.

Mr. CASE. Does the Senator know what the unused quota is at the present time, or what it has averaged over a period of years?

Mr. PASTORE. I think it is safe to say that over a period of years only about 47 percent of the entire quota has been used. That is for the reason that under the present law, and under the McCarran bill, 44 percent of the entire quota is assigned to Great Britain. The countries of southern and eastern Europe have all oversubscribed their quotas. The figure is remarkable, when we realize that 44 percent of the quota of those eligible to come to this country is assigned to Great Britain, and that only 47 percent of the entire quota have actually immigrated to this country. When the quotas of so many nations are oversubscribed, the inequity of the entire bill is pointed up. That has been my argument all along.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from Rhode Island may be opposed to the bill in toto. However, if he wishes to improve the bill, it seems to me that he might make a contribution with an amendment which would make some of the unused quota available for bringing in persons with special skills, or who should be admitted for particular humanitarian reasons. But if the Senator wishes to debate the entire question of national origins, he gets away from the terms of this particular amendment. I was not seeking to open the issues of the whole bill by my questions. I was trying only to see if the amendment was so stated that I could support it, for I feel that if limited in extent it might well be adopted.

What I was trying to determine by my second question was how many people would be affected, that is, what would be the unused quota carried over. Would a relief provision which would permit 5,000 or 10,000 to come in because of special skills or for humanitarian reasons meet the Senator's desire?

Mr. PASTORE. Using the percentage figure which I gave, and not counting displaced persons for whom future quotas are mortgaged, we must have an unused quota, on the average, of 75,000, which would go into the pool, if we are using only 47 percent of the quota over an average period. If we can take into the country only 150,000, those who would go into the pool each year would be about 75,000.

Mr. CASE. It seems to me that to suggest that immigration would be increased by 75,000 might strain the four

categories which the Senator has suggested. That would place half of the quota total into this special pool. Some people might feel that, after all, there might not be that many scientists needed, or there might not be that many hardship cases. I do not know enough about the specific immigration figures to be sure, but I think it might be reasonable to say that of the unused quota, 10,000 might be assigned to the special pools which the Senator suggests. That would be 2,500 for each of the categories. That certainly would take care of the number of urgently needed scientists, doctors, technicians, or experts in other fields, and it would take care of a great many hardship cases. It seems to me that an amendment of that sort might have considerable appeal. But when the Senator suggests 75,000, I do not know.

Mr. PASTORE. I am not suggesting the figure of 75,000. There might be no one in the pool. If tomorrow Great Britain should decide to exercise its rights and send over 66,000 out of 150,000, and if Ireland should take up its quota of 18,000 out of 150,000, there would be no pool at all. We must admit that, as a philosophy, the McCarran bill goes so far as to say that we can conveniently and comfortably absorb in this country about 150,000 immigrants a year.

Mr. CASE. Provided they come from backgrounds which we think would lend themselves to adjustment to American institutions. That is essential.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator from South Dakota presume for a moment that a proper background of the American pattern of society is indicated by allowing Great Britain 66,000 and Portugal perhaps 400? I do not know where we get the background we talk about.

Mr. CASE. If we were to go back and debate the original principles involved in any immigration law whatsoever, we might get back to a discussion of that question. I see in the Senator's amendment a possible contribution to our immigration policy and laws. But it seems to me that if we are to go back and debate the entire question of national origins, we get away from the amendment. The Senator has already suggested that he would not be opposed to having his amendment clarified, if it needs clarification, by saying that this pool shall not carry over cumulatively, but only from one year to the next. If the Senator would go further and say that of the unused quotas not to exceed 10,000 might be placed in a pool, 25 percent of which could be assigned to the various categories, I think the Senator might have an amendment which would command considerable support.

Mr. PASTORE. Something of that kind might be worked out in conference, but I do not think it is fair to ask me to take what I consider a very restrictive compromise and restrict it still further. As I have previously said, there is nothing in the amendment which takes away any rights from anyone. All it does is to create the pool system, whereby, in cases where the interest of the United States was concerned, we could go to a pool system in the event certain countries did not exercise their full rights.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not know how the Senator from Rhode Island was impressed, or how my other colleagues were impressed, by one statement made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, but I thought it was most illuminating when he said that he had no objection to 150,000 immigrants coming into the country provided they had the proper background. Is not that exactly the thing which we are fighting at this time, in the philosophy of the McCarran bill? What makes an immigrant from Great Britain, Ireland, or certain other countries which have unused quotas any more desirable than an immigrant from some other country? What constitutes in him a better background than that of an immigrant from Italy, Austria, Greece, or some other country? It seems to me that the statement made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota discloses the whole philosophy of the McCarran bill. We recognize the people of so-called Nordic strain. We are going to turn thumbs down on people from southern or eastern Europe.

Mr. PASTORE. I completely agree with the Senator from New York. I have said this so often that it has become rather stale. It strikes me that if we are talking about the pattern of racial strains in this country in the year of 1952, after two cataclysmic wars, we should take the roster of the American Army in World War II and look at the racial strains and, upon the basis of those racial strains, judge our immigration law.

But that is not good enough. We go back to 1920, when the situation was so rigged that certain people were considered undesirable immigrants to this country. Where would we all have been—where would the McCarrans and the Pastores have been—if it had not been for the liberal immigration which was permitted in the case of Ireland, Italy, Portugal, and Greece? Where would the boys have come from who wore the American uniform and won the war in 1945 if it had not been for the sons of immigrants who fought and died for the United States? Now, in this day and age, we hear about the proper racial background. What is so sacred about the census of 1920?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota did not use the word "racial." The Senator from South Dakota on the floor of the Senate has defended the people of Hawaii, who include many races. He would join completely with the Senator from Rhode Island in paying tribute to the people of various racial backgrounds which have made such great contributions to our Armed Forces in World War II and in other wars.

What the Senator from South Dakota was trying to do was to ascertain whether an agreement could be reached on the desirable goal in the Senator's amendment, namely, with respect to a provision for the relief of some hardship cases and to permit some people with scientific skills to come into the United States. If the Senator from Rhode Island wishes to go back and debate the original concept of the bill, he may do so, but in that way we are getting away from the issue before us.

I did not use the word "racial." I referred to background in relation to institutions and to the adaptability of persons to American customs. It may be that people can come to this country and in time be just as good citizens as the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from South Dakota. It may be that the digestive processes of the American system can take only so many at a time. I do not know. I did not write the 1924 act. I did not fix the quota system. That is what we are dealing with as a base.

I thought the Senator from Rhode Island was trying to improve the bill by provisions affecting some special situations. The Senator from South Dakota sought to help him. He does not like to have it suggested on the floor of the Senate that he used the word "racial." He did not use that term. He would oppose the use of the term "racial background" as much as would the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I am not accusing the Senator of anything. The Senator did infer that the basis that we have here is the historical and traditional basis of a tested racial strain in this country, when he defended the 1920 census.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota is not defending the 1920 census. Perhaps the 1950 census would be better. However, that is not the issue which is involved in the Senator's amendment. I thought he was trying to meet some special situations and the Senator from South Dakota sought to help him. If the Senator from Rhode Island wishes to go back to the basis of the bill, I shall not press the point.

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator from South Dakota will read the RECORD tomorrow morning he will discover that he defended the census of 1920 as being the historical and traditional policy of our immigration law.

Mr. CASE. No. Background on the basis of sympathy or experience and understanding with constitutional government and principles of free enterprise.

Mr. PASTORE. We are in 1952.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota stated that as a fact. He did not go into the merits.

Mr. PASTORE. What is so holy and sanctifying about the 1920 census that it must be defended in the year 1952?

Mr. CASE. Does the Senator's amendment propose that we change from the 1920 census to the 1950 census? No. I did not understand that that issue was involved.

Mr. PASTORE. We did talk about it, but it was of no avail.

Mr. CASE. That is not the pending amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator says that he does not want to press the point. I am not quite of that mind. The Senator from South Dakota did not say racial background. He did use the word "background."

Mr. CASE. Background, as the basis of experience and understanding with constitutional government and the principles of free enterprise.

Mr. LEHMAN. Then in the most recent colloquy the Senator from South Dakota said that he would be perfectly willing to absorb a certain number of people provided that we could digest them. I wonder whether he means that we would be in any great danger of indigestion if we were to receive only 308 men and women from Greece, a country with the oldest known civilization. Does the Senator fear that we would be in any real danger of getting indigestion if we were to receive as few as 5,800 people from Italy, a country whose civilization is centuries old? Those two countries have given to the world a culture and form of government which we are very glad indeed to follow. Does he think that would bring about indigestion?

Why should people of that kind be kept out of this country merely because we have set an arbitrary limit, which cannot be deviated from in its rigid observance? I wonder whether the Senator from South Dakota knows that not only does it prevent the use of unused quotas in the succeeding year, but goes much further than that. I am speaking of the present law. The law requires that a country can use only 90 percent of its quota in any one month. The unused part of it cannot be used in the following month.

If country X uses only 5 percent of its quota in one month, that country cannot use the remaining percentage in any succeeding month or in any succeeding year, or at any other time. I wonder whether the Senator realized that when a visa is granted and a quota number assigned to an immigrant, if for one reason or another the visa cannot be honored and the immigrant is not admitted into this country, the number on that visa cannot be restored. It is lost forever. That is why in the past many years not more than 45 percent or 47 percent of the quota which was allowed even under the census of 1920 has been used.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I should like to cite some statistics which I think are of tremendous value in this debate with respect to the pending amendment.

Great Britain and Northern Ireland under their quota, were entitled to 65,721 in 1947. They used only 19,218. In the year 1948 they used 27,774. That is 27,000 out of 65,000. In the year 1949 they used 23,543. In the year 1950 they used 17,194. In the year 1951, they used 15,369.

Mr. President, the thing that bothers me is this: The proponents of the McCarran bill state in their majority report that this is a modernization and a bringing up to date of our policy and our philosophy with respect to our immigration laws.

Nevertheless we are incorporating in the bill the same system and the same quota which we have under the present law.

I say, Mr. President, that if we grant a quota of 65,000 to Great Britain and Ireland, and if they in fact use only between 15,000 and 23,000 a year, is it not a fact that it is time for a change, if we are to modernize the law? If we are to modernize it, is it not time for us to review that feature? Is it not time for us to ask: "Why extend an invitation to people who won't accept it? Why not extend this invitation to people who really want it?"

We persist in that line of thinking because we are a little worried about background. I am not so naive as to think that when we talk about immigration law and use the word "background" that we do not in fact mean race. I am not that naive.

Mr. President, I say that while the amendment is not a complete answer to the inequities that exist and have existed for more than 30 years, now is the time and here is the place to change this inequity and now is the time to practice what we preach.

Mr. President, if we mean democracy, let us practice democracy. If we want people to come here, let us not slam the door in their faces. If people do not want to accept our invitation, and have not accepted it for 15 years, let us not keep extending that invitation. If people do not want to come to America, let us bring in those who do want to come.

Mr. President, the amendment is not a complete answer, but if we are going to find a place in our conscience and if we are going to find a place in our hearts, this is the time and this is the place to say: "Let us practice what we preach."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from Rhode Island may, if he wants to, when he uses the word "background" say that he means racial background. The Senator from South Dakota does not mean that. The Senator from South Dakota, when he used the word "background," had in mind sympathy or experience and understanding with such things as constitutional government and the principles of free enterprise. That is the sense in which the Senator from South Dakota uses the term "background." He does not mean racial background. Others may use it and imply racial background, but the Senator from South Dakota does not do so.

Mr. PASTORE. I will give the Senator the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Illinois; and if so, for how long a time?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Rhode Island has control of the time for the proponents of the amendment, who have 29 minutes remaining.

Mr. PASTORE. Then I yield to the Senator from Illinois as much time as he may desire to use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the time has come, I believe, for us to reject or at least to limit, rather than to extend, the principle of racial exclusion which was embodied in the 1924 Immigration Act. Since we may unwittingly carry over the errors of the past, I think it is important for us to realize just what we are doing.

Prior to 1890, approximately four-fifths of the immigrants to the United States came from northern and western Europe. Beginning in that year, the tide of immigration turned toward the southern and eastern portions of Europe. So, Mr. President, in the decade from 1901 to 1910, 75 percent of the immigrants came from southern and eastern Europe. In the next decade—that from 1911 to 1920—80 percent of the immigrants came from southern and eastern Europe.

The first immigration act following World War I, namely the act of 1921, was passed in the closing months of the Wilson administration, but was vetoed by the great Woodrow Wilson. Subsequently it was passed and signed during the administration of Warren G. Harding. Its purpose was not merely to limit the total number of immigrants. A limitation of the total number of immigrants was one of the purposes of that act, and it actually reduced the total number from approximately 800,000 in 1921 to 309,000 in 1922. But, the 1921 act had another purpose, namely, to restrict the proportions of our immigration coming from southern and eastern Europe, because the basis taken for quotas in the 1921 act was 3 percent of the number of the foreign born of various racial or, perhaps I should say, nationality groups living in the United States in 1910. In itself, that provision produced a change by which the total number was to be decreased to not more than 357,000; and the total was to be apportioned between northern and western Europe, on the one hand, and southern and eastern Europe, on the other hand, in a ratio of about 60 percent for the former and 40 percent for the latter.

Italy, which had been sending to this country approximately 200,000 immigrants a year during the decade 1901–10 and more than 100,000 annually in the next decade, had its quota reduced to 42,057; Poland to 30,977; Austria, to 7,342; and Czechoslovakia, to 14,357.

That, however, was not a sufficient reduction to suit those who wished still further to restrict the immigration coming from southern and eastern Europe.

So, Mr. President, during the period following 1921, certain forces, which I do not think we now regard very highly, were at work in America attempting not only to reduce the total number of immigrants, but also to reduce still further the proportion coming from southern and eastern Europe. A plank to that effect was contained in the platforms of

a number of political organizations which were striving for power in some of the States of our Nation.

The result was that in 1924, Congress passed a still more restrictive immigration law. Again I wish to emphasize that that law was not merely restrictive in regard to the total number of immigrants to be admitted. Actually, I do not believe immigration should have been permitted to continue at the rate of 1,000,000 a year; and that law did restrict the total by reducing it from approximately 360,000 a year to approximately 164,000 a year. Even more important, however, was the added restriction which was placed upon those coming from southern and eastern Europe, because at that time, instead of using as the basis the census of 1910, the census of 1890 was used, thus going back, really, 30 years. It was provided that each nationality group would be allowed to send to the United States immigrants in the ratio of 2 percent of the foreign born who were living in the United States in 1890, a year before the big immigration from southern and eastern Europe commenced. Therefore, Mr. President, that provision was deliberately rigged—and I use the term intentionally—to discriminate grossly against persons who wished to immigrate to the United States from eastern or southern Europe.

The result was that under the 1924 act, the quota for Italy, which under the 1921 act had been 42,057, was reduced to 3,845; the quota for Poland, which under the 1921 act had been 30,977, was—under the 1924 act—reduced to 5,982; and so forth. The total effect of the 1924 act was to change to approximately 15 percent the ratio of immigrants from southern and eastern Europe, which under the 1921 act had been 40 percent. That was the great change in our immigration policy made by that act.

I desire to say deliberately that that was done in an endeavor to admit as small a proportion of immigrants as possible from southern and eastern Europe.

The policy thus provided in the 1924 interim act was to be made permanent on a so-called national-origins basis. A commission was established to make a report on the national origins of the white population in the year 1920. That commission studied the subject for approximately 5 years, and then submitted its report. Its findings became law. The commission tried to determine the proportion of our population that was English, the proportion that was Irish, the proportion that was German, the proportion that was Italian, the proportion that was Greek, and so forth. Inasmuch as the strains had been mixed, that endeavor was something like one to unscramble scrambled eggs. A great deal of difficulty was encountered in connection with that effort.

The result was that they went back to the census of 1790, in which the heads of families had been listed by name, thus beginning at a time when the population of the United States, as shown in the first decennial census, was, of course, predominantly English. Then the persons listed in the 1920 census were sorted out by name; and if a man had an English name, he was regarded as being of English stock. Of course, all of us know that a good deal of Anglicizing of names had occurred among persons of German stock, among persons coming from southern or eastern Europe, and in some instances among persons from the Scandinavian countries, who adopted English names in order to escape the social and economic disabilities attached to long, foreign-sounding names.

So, Mr. President, the national-origins system at its very beginning was really padded, because it was largely based on names, and thus overemphasized the English proportion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very glad the Senator from Illinois is bringing out some of the details in regard to the development of the National Origins Act, and, in particular, how names were used as a basis for the determination of national strains.

In that connection, Mr. President, let me say that the bill before the Senate, as it now stands, represents an attempt to restrict immigration by means of a determination of blood lines, which obviously is an impossible task. I make that statement for the reason that when the Government of the United States tried to determine how best it could ascertain the racial strains of the population, it came to the obvious conclusion that the only way to do so readily and with any reasonable degree of accuracy—although certainly it was still very far from being accurate—was on the basis of names.

Yet, Mr. President, the amendment which was adopted a few moments ago, about which I argued with some of my colleagues, uses as a basis of admission or refusal of admission, a determination of whether a certain person has 50-percent oriental blood. I submit that in many instances there is no way by which it can be determined scientifically that a person has 50-percent oriental blood. It was for that reason that the Government of the United States refused to use such a basis in the original immigration law; in other words, at that time the Government refused to use as a basis a determination that a person had 50 percent Norwegian blood, or 50 percent English blood, or 50 percent any other kind of blood.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is my own belief that all good blood is more or less alike. Blood plasma is interchangeable, and I know of no way of differentiating between the blood which flows in the veins of an Englishman, the blood which flows in the veins of an Irishman, the blood which flows in the veins of a Pole, or the blood which flows in the veins of an Italian. There are no nationality tags on blood.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The only two categories I know of are the blue bloods and the real red bloods. I myself prefer the red-blooded ones. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. My question follows the line of thought of the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Minnesota that all blood is identical. Is it not true that if one goes into any foreign military cemetery or into a military cemetery in the United States, he will find buried there persons of English blood, of Italian blood, of Irish blood, of Polish blood, of Chinese blood, and of Jewish blood, all of whom died as Americans?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; and in my division there were Indians from the State of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Some of them were killed. They are buried overseas. Their blood was as good as ours.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the result of the legislation enacted on the basis of national origins was to continue the discrimination against the people of southern and eastern Europe. They were allowed but 23,000 out of a total European quota of 150,000, about one-seventh of the total, or about 14 percent as compared to the 80 percent which they had formed of the immigration in the period from 1911 to 1920.

No matter how one may view the 1924 law, its purpose was not merely to limit the total number. It was also to change the proportions within that total, against southern and eastern Europe. It had within it implicit discrimination against the people from those areas. It was an injustice and, I believe, an implicit insult not only to the people of those countries, but to the American citizens from those countries.

The result has been, as the Senator from Rhode Island has said, that the British quota, which is nearly 66,000 a year, has almost never—I think never—been utilized during this period. In the past few years only between 20,000 and 23,000 of the quota numbers have been utilized, so that the unused portion of the British quota ranges between 44,000 and 46,000 a year. The Irish quota, which is 17,800, has not been utilized within recent years. The average Irish immigration has been between 5,000 and 7,000 a year, and therefore their unused quota ranges between 10,000 and 12,000. Consequently, these two countries alone have unused quotas aggregating in number from 54,000 to 58,000. The unused quotas are then canceled. There is not a great migration from these countries, particularly not to areas which do not fly the British flag.

At the same time, the pressure is enormous in Germany, where there are from 7,000,000 to 9,000,000 ethnic Germans who have been driven out of Communist-controlled countries, many of whom want to emigrate, but cannot even get in on the German quota because they were born outside Germany. They are thrown back on the quotas of the Baltic states, which are from only 100 to 400 for each of the countries; upon the quota for Czechoslovakia, which is down to a few thousand; upon the quota for Poland, which aggregates about 6,000; and so on. So there are from 7,000,000 to 9,000,000 ethnic Germans who are trapped and who cannot get overseas. This is creating grave trouble in Germany.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is that not accentuated by reason of the fact that through the Displaced Persons Act, which mortgages up to 50 percent of future quotas, only 50 percent of those people could come into the United States in any event?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct; and in a future amendment we shall try to deal with that issue.

Italy has an enormous surplus population, yet she is limited to 6,000 a year. Greece has a burdensome surplus population, but only about 310 can be admitted to the United States each year. And the number of persons escaping from Communist tyranny into these free countries grows month by month. In other words, the areas which are in greatest trouble are the areas in which people are most restricted by the law in their eligibility to come to this country. At the same time, people in the areas from which substantial additional numbers could come do not want to come. The purpose of the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island is to distribute unused quotas regardless of nationality, on two fundamental bases: first, the degree to which they can help the United States; and, second, the degree to which these people are themselves in need. In other words, we are trying to cut across the ground of racial discrimination, and to judge eligibility upon the conditions and capacities of the immigrants themselves, not by the country of their birth.

For example, let us consider the question of special skills. As has been said over and over again, the purpose of the amendment which is now being considered is to have one-quarter of the pooled, unused quotas distributed among individuals according to their special skills and the need of those skills in the United States. Thus scientists, artisans, precision workers, handicraft workers, artists, musicians—their skill, too, has a place in life—could be admitted, and the United States could be enormously enriched by distributing one-quarter of the unused quotas, say 20,000 a year, in such a way as to make it possible for 20,000 of the most able people in the world to come here. Another 20,000, or one-quarter of the total, I should say, could be admitted on the basis of special conditions.

Then another two-quarters would be apportioned according to the needs of the people themselves. One-quarter would be made available to reunite families. Every one of us knows of heart-rending cases of families which are separated—a husband in this country, a wife abroad, children separated from parents, and the like. Yet we cannot get them together. The provision for pooled quotas would make it possible to reunite families. The final quarter would be allotted to those who have been persecuted. That means those who have been persecuted by the Communists, because under the Displaced Persons Act we have now taken care of almost all of those who were persecuted by the Nazis.

Under the amendment, therefore, instead of having allotted to the British Isles quotas which are not used, such unused quotas would be made available to individuals who are in trouble and individuals whom America needs, regardless of where they were born. I think it about time we got over the idea that only people from the British Isles are worthy to become first-class citizens of the United States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Under the pending bill, would it have been possible for the thousands of people from outside this country who made Pittsburgh possible, who made Cleveland possible, who made Cincinnati possible, who made Chicago possible, and who dug the subways of New York—would it have been possible for them to come to America?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; had this bill been the law, that would not have been possible. It is well known that first the Irish immigrants and then the Slavic immigrants did the hard manual work upon which the material structure of American civilization has been raised. Slavic peoples are in the great basic industries, generally those engaged in the manufacture and fabrication of steel. The steel industry and others have been built to a large degree by the Slavic population of the country. The clothing industry has been very largely based upon the Jews and the Italians.

These races have built up the material industries of the country. But their contribution has not been confined to that. They have not been merely hewers of wood and drawers of water. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] mentioned the names of numerous baseball players and other athletic figures yesterday. A perusal of the list will disclose that, instead of purely Anglo-Saxon baseball teams, with the Irish mixed in, we now have a large proportion of Italians, a large proportion of Poles and Slavs, as well as Jews; and the people of Spanish stock are now also coming to the fore in baseball.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They are getting Americanized.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is a man by the name of Chico Carrasquel who plays on the Chicago White Sox team, and we are very happy to have him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Do not forget Gomez, of years gone by.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am thinking, now, of Pittsburgh, and of the Lithuanian who helps to produce steel to improve our standard of living. After a while his boy comes along and plays football——

Mr. DOUGLAS. He will probably become a member of the Notre Dame Irish football team.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. In industry, in sports, in politics, in finance, is there any one particular line of ancestry or race which dominates? I recall to this day Howard Chandler Christy's great cartoon after the First World War, containing the names of Lesinski, Gonzales, Murphy, and Butler—Americans all—who fought for this country. Why can it not be that way under our immigration laws?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it should be.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me give the Senate another example, that of Puerto Rico. Any Senator can go to Walter Reed Hospital and see a triple amputee there. He is not a Scandinavian, not a Nordic, not an Englishman, not an Irishman, but a Puerto Rican, an American, who fought for the things about which we boast and try to sermonize to the world.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we should be careful about the language we use. I think the United States Congress made a great mistake when it passed the 1924 bill. I think it gave American history a wrong turning.

I am sure the members of the committee had the best intentions in the world when they brought forth Senate bill 2550. They merely followed the same groove and pattern which had been set under the 1924 act, which was discriminatory against persons from southern and eastern Europe. These folks have greater difficulties with the American language than do the English and the Irish. But the children of the people from Southern and Eastern Europe learn the American language, and they contribute to America as noble and precious things as do the children of other immigrants.

My city of Chicago is really a league of nations. I know the various nationality groups very well. I am not a member of any of them, because as I said a day or two ago, I think my stock is entirely Anglo-Saxon, what is referred to as Nordic. I am proud of my ancestors, although I did not choose them. But I have mingled with the people of other nationality groups, and I know they are as fine citizens as are those of English stock. They are as kind, as generous, and as truly American. But they have been poor. As they get out of their poverty and out of the slums which we created for them, and from which in many cases Anglo-Saxon landlords derive a profit, they rise in life. The reservoir of ability beyond the seas is still full. There are still Italians with the genius of the Italian race; Jews with the genius of the Jewish race; Poles with the genius of the Polish race; and ethnic Germans with their skills and culture who are in trouble. It would be a noble deed if we in America helped them to achieve the American way of life.

Mr. President, I point out that at the most this amendment would mean that instead of admitting, as now, from 80,000 to 90,000 immigrants a year, there would be admitted approximately 150,000. That would mean an addition, at the most, of from 60,000 to 70,000 immigrants a year, a portion of whom would be the cream of the skilled persons of the world, and a portion of whom would be men and women in the greatest trouble. Self-interest and compassion would then move hand in hand. When we fuse those two qualities, when we can serve self-interest and, at the same time, show mercy and compassion, we shall have accomplished much.

I do not think those qualities are matters about which to smile. They are real qualities. They are characteristic of America throughout its history. It is the genius of America that with all our practicality, with all our ability to make money, and to produce goods, we still have mercy and compassion within our hearts, mercy and compassion not merely for people inside the United States but for people all over the world.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I feel the amendment in question is an extremely important one and I hope the Senate will adopt it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. When the good Senator mentioned mercy and compassion it reminded me of an instance in New York City which illustrates the Senator's point, not only as regards racial background but with respect to the opportunity of getting out of the slums.

Five Senators were looking over the condition of the Puerto Ricans in New York City. We went to a small old-fashioned four-story brick school attended by practically none but Puerto Rican children. The teacher was an old lady about ready to retire. She said to us:

> Gentlemen, you worry because the Puerto Rican is in the condition in which you see him, but I have seen the Irish in the same condition when they were recent immigrants. Then they commenced to do well and moved out. Then came the Jews. They suffered as did the Irish. Then they improved their condition and moved out. Then came the Italians. They commenced to do better and marched out. It happens that this is the Puerto Rican era in the making of America.

I think that bears out the Senator's statement.

One hundred and sixty-seven Puerto Rican boys and girls graduated from the John Marshall High School in New York City. That was made possible under the New Deal, after 1933. They are today in banks, grocery stores, in businesses of their own.

I think I am of an ancestry which is as old as that of anyone else. My ancestors were in this country possibly 80 years before the first Anglo-Saxon came here. I want others to have the same chance I had. That is all they are entitled to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his very moving statement.

As I understand our national principle, it is that we will give to the rising generation proper opportunities and then judge them on their individual merits. We believe that virtue is not confined to northwestern Europe, but that it extends over the world as a whole, and that within the limited total which America can absorb, discrimination should not be practiced either openly or covertly on the basis of race or national origin.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. So that the record may be set straight, let me say to the Senate that in 1947 there were admitted 76,951 nonquota and 70,701 quota immigrants, a total of 147,292.

In 1948 there were admitted 78,044 nonquota and 92,526 quota immigrants, a total of 170,570.

In 1949 there were admitted 75,271 nonquota and 113,046 quota immigrants, a total 188,317.

In 1950 there were admitted 51,727 nonquota and 197,460 quota immigrants, a total of 249,187.

In 1951 there came into this country 49,170 nonquota and 156,547 quota immigrants, a total of 205,717.

Mr. President, those figures show an increase in immigration all the way.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. If the Senator does not mind, I prefer not to yield. I did not disturb the proponents of the amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. I am not raising a question of disturbance; I have merely asked the Senator if he will yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. No, I will not yield now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada declines to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator will have to pardon me for not yielding.

Mr. President, the adoption of this amendment to provide for the pooling of unused quota numbers for use by low-quota countries is diametrically opposed to the fundamental philosophy behind the national origins quota system, and would have the direct effect of destroying our protective system of immigration as embodied in the national origins quota system.

Let no one be misled by statements by supporters of the proposed amendment that it is hypocritical to make specific quotas available, and then not to provide for their full use each year. This position is based upon an entirely erroneous conception of our national origins quotas. The fixing of quotas is not an assurance that this country will guarantee the admission of that many immigrants each year. As a matter of fact, the establishment of the quotas is no guaranty that even one immigrant may enter this country, because the ultimate determination of whether an alien who has been issued a visa may enter the country depends upon a finding of admissibility by the immigration authorities when the alien applies for admission at a port of entry.

The quotas under the national origins system are ceilings, not floors, upon the number of visas which may be issued. In other words, it was never the intent of Congress to guarantee that a minimum of approximately 150,000 quota immigrants should enter the United States annually.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McCARRAN. I beg the Senator's pardon. I did not interrupt the Senator; I hope he will not interrupt me.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator object to my asking him to yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada declines to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let that settle the question, please.

Mr. President, rather it was clearly the intent that a maximum of approximately 150,000 aliens should be extended the opportunity to come to this country, if otherwise qualified, in proportion to the contribution of each nationality to the total population of the United States as it existed in 1920. The national origins quotas are that simple, and I cannot admit that the quota numbers are being wasted merely because quotas, for one reason or another, are not filled in any particular year. Bear in mind, if you will, that quotas were never designed for the purpose of bringing aliens to the United States, but instead they are a means by which opportunities are offered to other peoples of the world to come to this country on the basis decided upon by Congress in 1924. Whether or not quotas are used is beside the point, because the underlying theory of the quota system is that the opportunity of aliens of each nationality to immigrate to this country is offered on the basis of the proportionate contribution of each nationality to the 1920 population of this country.

I am firmly convinced that the only sane and sensible way in which to deal with our immigration problem is to continue the fundamental philosophy of the national origins system. In my opinion, to depart from that fundamental philosophy would be a tragedy of the worst sort. Much is said about the large British quota which is never fully subscribed; but would we be justified in taking away the opportunities to emigrate offered to our British allies and transferring those opportunities to other groups who, a short time ago, were our mortal enemies? I say "No," Mr. President. The world-wide quota demand is tremendous at the present time, between 18,000,000 and 19,000,000. If we depart from the fundamental philosophy of our national origins quota at this time, no one is in a position to know what will be the ultimate result, but I, for one, am sure that such a course would be the wedge for opening wide the gates to immigration.

Much has been said, and is still being said, about the sacred duty of this country to accept more immigrants as an aid to the solution of the surplus population problems of the overpopulated countries of the world. Mr. President, an immigration and nationality code is not the proper vehicle for approaching a solution of the world surplus-population problems. The roots of this problem are much deeper, and let no one be deluded by the thought that it is within our power to solve the surplus population problems of other nations. The solution or alleviation of such problems must depend primarily upon action initiated by the nations afflicted with such surplus population problems. I am strongly in favor of having the United States assist in solving the surplus population ills of some countries of the world, but this bill is not the vehicle by which it should be done.

At the present time, there is pending before the Senate Rules Committee Senate Resolution 270, which I submitted as a method of approaching the sur-

plus population problem. Under Senate Resolution 270, which was unanimously approved by the Committee on the Judiciary, $60,000 would be authorized to be expended for a study and investigation of the overpopulation of the countries of Western Europe. I have also introduced my bill, S. 2567, to provide for the establishment of an agency of this Government to assist in the migration of surplus population of overpopulated countries to various areas of the world considered as underpopulated areas. The approval of these two measures would constitute a step in the right direction toward alleviation of the surplus population problems of Western Europe. Even the President, in his message to the Congress with reference to the admission of displaced refugees, did not recommend that any attempt be made to incorporate such provisions in our permanent immigration laws.

Members of the Senate must also bear in mind that besides the countries of Western Europe, there are many overpopulated countries, such as China, India, and other oriental countries.

The national origins quota system has now been in effect for about a quarter of a century and there has been comparatively little difficulty in its operation as compared to the sad experience under our immigration laws prior to the adoption of a national origins formula in 1924. I would be the last one, Mr. President, to deny that the immigrants who have come to this country have made a great contribution to our Nation, but I am firmly convinced that the flow of immigrants must be strictly controlled so that we will not receive more aliens than we can assimilate. I believe it is highly desirable that we continue a policy of admitting annually a reasonable number of immigrants whom we are capable of digesting into our body of citizenry, but I also believe that it would be a great tragedy if we should cast aside the national origins quota system and permit an influx of immigrants in numbers greater than our capacity to digest them. It is most important that when we admit aliens into this country as immigrants that they ultimately become citizens and accept our way of life and join us in preserving the fundamental institutions of this country, but if we admit the aliens in excessive numbers, then our ability to absorb them becomes more difficult with the result that we have alien segments in our population which never become completely adapted to our form of government.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I strongly object to the proposed amendment and most earnestly ask the Members of the Senate to reject the amendment and preserve a sound immigration system for this country.

Mr. President, I hope that this amendment, of all amendments which are offered, it being the most dangerous of all, will be voted down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] for the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For what purpose does the Senator rise?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is the time exhausted?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has 2 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, we talk about immigrants. We are all immigrants.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to say only a few words. It so happens that I was here in 1922. It so happens that I was here in 1924, and helped to frame the immigration law which is now so bitterly assaulted. It so happened then, Mr. President, and it is true now, that the great body of veterans of foreign extraction in this country, as well as the so-called native-born, appealed to the Congress to enact that law.

We cannot have an immigration law which is entirely perfect. Perhaps the ideal law would be one under which immigrants would be selected. But I have lived long enough to know how bureaucracy would operate in the selection of immigrants, and how it operates in the discharge of any other public function. The Bureau would admit the particular immigrants whose admission was demanded by those of their fellows with the loudest voices in various areas in the country who somehow believe that they have the inalienable right of running this country.

Mr. President, I hope the time has not come when one must apologize for being a hateful Anglo-Saxon. I hope the time has not come when one must apologize for being an American.

I know who brought about the enactment of the 1924 law. For fully 2 years we worked upon that bill. The men then in this body who had lately served under the flag were the strongest proponents of that measure—not that they thought it perfect, but we had to have some practical basis on which to administer the immigration laws, or we had to turn the administration over to bureaucrats, who would administer it in behalf of racial strains with the loudest voices.

There was no animosity toward people of Germanic extraction, Italian extraction, or any other extraction; but in those days, when the shots of the First World War had hardly died away, there was not much respect for any immigrant who prefixed his Americanism with "German" or "Italian" or whatever the prefix might be. I have no apology now for being an American citizen.

I know what the trouble has been. I saw the assault made, almost before we had completed writing the law, to break it down. That assault came from the great congested cities in this country. Back of it was politics, pure and simple. That is exactly where the opposition came from then. Year after year the opposition reasserted itself, but we beat down every effort that was made to destroy the national origins basis on which the law was founded. I thought the opponents had been somewhat discouraged; but a new crop of patriots has arisen in this great land. They now lay down the doctrine which, carried to its logical conclusion—and that is where they want to carry it—would mean the abolition of restrictions on immigration. It would mean letting down the bars, and letting them all in.

There is a strange corollary to that doctrine, and that is that somehow people outside this Nation have the right to say what our immigration laws shall be.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is the Senator from Georgia willing to yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I will yield for a question. However, I have asked for only 5 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know the Senator from Georgia wants to be fair.

Mr. GEORGE. I hope so. I have been here long enough to try to be fair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure of that.

Is the Senator from Georgia aware of the fact that the pending amendment does not alter the total to be admitted? It merely provides that unused quotas are to be distributed among individuals according to two standards, namely, their ability to help the industry and life of this country, and individual need. There is no alteration in the total. So I wonder if the Senator from Georgia wishes to repeat his charge that the purpose of this amendment is to eliminate all restrictions.

Mr. GEORGE. I say that is the logic of the amendment. That is the logic of the fight to break down the restrictions, to let down the bars. The Senator knows it, and I know it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Speaking for myself, I wish to say that I know no such thing.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well. I shall try to enlighten the Senator. He enlightened me as to how we learned that there were so many English people in this country by merely examining the names in 1924. I happened to be here. That was not the method which we pursued. There may have been a scrutiny of names where there was doubt about the national origin of a person, but I repeat, Mr. President, that there has been a fight from the beginning to break down the national origins principle. Back of it is a fight to break down the immigration barriers. As a corollary to that unusual doctrine—I will not say it is un-American—we hear the strange theory that somehow people outside this Nation have a right to say what our immigration laws shall be.

Some of my ancestors came from abroad. I have the greatest respect for our citizens who have come from foreign lands. But when they come here they

should be Americans, not German-Americans, and not Italian-Americans. They should be Americans.

The strange corollary——

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President——

Mr. GEORGE. No; I do not yield.

The strange corollary is the most remarkable doctrine, to which I have listened day after day, as to the rights of foreigners to come into the United States. Many pitiable pleas have been made to the effect that we are breaking up families, that we are doing this, that, and the other thing to people who want to come here and become one of us. I have every sympathy for those people. I try to get them in, almost day after day; and I have to go to a bureau.

Let me pause to say to my distinguished friend from Illinois that if he and his colleagues succeed in putting through the pooling arrangement, all the immigrants who will come in through the pool, under the control of bureaucrats, will be from two or three or four countries. The quotas in the pool would not be widely distributed. That is not the purpose. The purpose is to permit the bureaucrats to say how the unused quotas in the pool shall be distributed.

What is the American doctrine, and what is the doctrine of every sovereign nation on the globe? It is that a country has a right to say who shall become one of its citizens. There is no right in any foreign person, whether he comes from the race from which I sprang or from any other race, to demand entrance here. The whole question is, What is a sound policy for America? That is all.

Of course, Mr. President, we do not want to enact into law inhuman and unjust and discriminatory provisions. That is true. However, unless we have a basis for the immigration law we will have a bureaucracy, and that bureaucracy will act in accordance with every other bureaucracy I have known for the 30 years that I have been in Washington. It will act for political reasons. It will act for reasons which are not always in the interest of America. I believe in preserving our immigration laws. That is to say, I believe in restrictions upon immigration in the interest of America and in the interest of the American worker.

There are those who talk about cheap goods being imported into the United States. Yet there are others who say, "Bring in the people who can make the cheap goods. Bring them in in a constantly increasing volume." How are we going to protect American labor? How are we going to protect the American people?

Far beyond that, I do not hesitate to say that in this hour it has become unpopular to be wholly American. The real basic purpose back of the immigration act which we finally enacted in 1924 was to preserve something of the homogeneity of the American people, something of the character of the men who loved self-government, who understood it, and who had some concept of it. It was desired then to protect American labor, as it is the desire now. Mr. President, break down the bars, if you will; let all the aliens who desire to do so come here, if you wish, but, in that event, American labor will suffer as American labor has never suffered before.

Side by side with the men who fought in France in every unit of our American forces in World War I, men of all national extractions, not merely one, side by side with them stood American labor.

Break down all the barriers if you wish. That is the intent and purpose and inevitable consequence of destroying the quota system.

I thank the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). Two minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I desire it to be clearly understood that not only have I been a very active but I have also been a very vociferous opponent of the so-called McCarran bill. In being such an opponent I think my position as an American is just as good as that of any other Member of this body. I was not here in 1924. Therefore, I had nothing to do with the enactment of the law of that year.

But, Mr. President, I know that there are in this country a great many people, just as good as I am and just as good as any other Member of the Senate, who feel that this is a discriminatory bill. It is discriminatory as evidenced by the very statements which have been made here and because of the experiences we have had with the existing law.

It is said that the purpose of the original formula was to preserve the characteristics of American life which all of us want to have endure.

How can they justify in this day and age the giving of a certain quota to one country, to the extent of 66,000? I am not being critical of that country. It has a perfect right to utilize that quota to the fullest extent. But over the years experience has demonstrated that it has utilized no more than 33 percent of its quota.

Do not Senators think that when we write a law at this time that it is well to review our actions of the past and to begin to ask ourselves certain intimate questions, and particularly: Why do not the people of that country come here? Why do they not utilize their quota to the fullest? Why is their quota unfilled year after year?

Can it be that they love their country so much that they do not want to migrate to the United States? That might be the primary reason. Perhaps the figure as originally set was absolutely out of kilter. Might there be other reasons? Why do we stand here in 1952 and say emphatically that what we did 30 years ago will serve us so well today?

Of course, there is a new group of Americans today. There was a new group of Americans in World War II. They are just as good as any other Americans, just as good as anyone in the Senate.

Mr. President, I say that whether a person comes from one country or from another country, he is just as good an American. Loudness of voice does not belong to any particular race or to any particular nationality. It comes from Almighty God. All of us in the Senate seem to be endowed rather generously with a loud voice.

The time has come to do equity. The time has come to do democracy. This bill is discriminatory. Mr. President, when one class of people is favored as against another class there is discrimination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Rhode Island has expired. All time for debate on the amendment has expired.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 5/9/52–O.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is this one of the eight amendments covered in the unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to inquire whether the amendment now being offered by the Senator from Michigan is one of the eight amendments mentioned in the unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has control over the first eight amendments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is this one of the eight amendments?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It has not been cleared with me.

Mr. McFARLAND. Perhaps there are no other amendments to be offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, there are.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into, the Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Certainly.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will give me 1 minute——

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have had my attention drawn to the amendment which the Senator from Michigan is offering. It is an amendment of a very minor nature, merely pertaining to documentation. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Nevada refer to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, I do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall yield for that purpose, if it does not take too much time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does any Senator request unanimous consent to that effect?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am willing to accept the amendment; but if it interferes with the unanimous-consent agreement, I cannot do anything about the amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I can wait. Do I correctly understand that the amendment will be in order after the eight amendments are disposed of?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; it will be.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, the amendment of the Senator from Michigan will be in order after the eight amendments are disposed of.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then I withdraw the amendment at this time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield, to permit me to make an announcement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have been asked whether there will be a night session. I thought I had made it plain that there will be a night session if we do not dispose of this bill. Now is the time for the Senate to drive if we wish to conclude the session by the first of July or anywhere near that time. I am not announcing now that we shall conclude the session by that time, but I am saying that we must drive now if we wish to attempt to conclude the session by then.

The mutual security bill, to which I have previously referred, has been considered by two committees and is ready for disposition by the Senate. We should dispose of that bill without delay.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think all of us should endeavor to cooperate with the majority leader, the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona.

However, this body should realize that although it passed the Federal security appropriations bill 3 weeks ago, and although the Senate has been requesting the House of Representatives to agree to hold a conference on the bill, we have been unable to persuade the House to agree to hold a conference and to appoint conferees on its part. So in many instances the Senate should not be blamed for delay.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am not blaming anyone except myself if I do not do my very best to try to push forward to completion the business of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we shall do so at once.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield at this time to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, for the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I call up the amendment identified as 5-9-52-DDD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 33, in line 6, beginning with the word "The", it is proposed to strike out all through "number of" in line 8, and in lieu thereof insert the following: "The annual quotas of each quota area proclaimed under this act shall not be reduced by any."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to cancel the pledges or mortgages of one-half of the future quotas, as made under the Displaced Persons Act.

Under the two Displaced Persons Acts of 1948 and 1950, respectively, we have admitted into the United States 368,000 persons. We provided in those acts that the numbers admitted from each of the various countries should absorb one-half of the future quotas which otherwise would be allowed those countries under the National Origins Act, which went into effect in 1929. I shall repeat that statement, in order to make the situation clear.

The 368,000 displaced persons who were admitted under the two Displaced Persons Acts were charged, up to 50 percent, against the annual quotas fixed for the various nations.

The result is that the quotas for a number of countries have been pledged very far into the future; or, rather, the rate of flow will be restricted to one-half of what it otherwise would be under the National Origins Act; and, in general, that original number was very low for the countries affected.

For instance, in the case of Austria, one-half of the quota is absorbed until 1955; in the case of Czechoslovakia, one-half of the quota is absorbed until 1958; in the case of Danzig, until 1958 also.

Mr. President, listen particularly to some of the following figures: In the the case of Estonia, half the quotas are pledged to the year 2146, or approximately 200 years in the future; in the case of Greece, to the year 2013, or more than 60 years in the future; in the case of Hungary, to the year 1985, or almost 35 years in the future; in the case of Latvia, to the year 2274, or 320 years in the future; in the case of Lithuania, to the year 2087, or approximately 140 years in the future; in the case of Poland, to the year 1999, or 47 years in the future; in the case of Rumania, to the year 2004; and so forth.

In other words, by that means one-half the already small stream of immigration from those countries is suspended until the dates I have stated; until those dates, the immigration quotas for those countries are reduced by one-half. These are countries where the current need is extremely great.

I believe certain points should be borne in mind, namely, that from 1931 to 1945, we admitted relatively few immigrants. On Monday, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as appears on pages 5423 and 5424, a statistical tabulation giving the total number of immigrants from the quota countries who entered the United States during that time. If we consider those figures, we find that instead of the total of 150,000 which was theoretically permitted in the year 1931, only 54,000 were admitted; in the year 1932, only 13,000; in 1933, only 8,000—I am reading to the nearest thousand—in 1934, 12,000; in 1935, 17,000; in 1936, 19,000.

Thereafter we find there began to be an increase, as follows: In 1937, 28,000; 1938, 43,000; 1939, 62,000.

What happened during the period of the depression was that the consular officers abroad interpreted very strictly the provision that no one should be admitted if he was likely to become a public charge. In reaching their determination as to whether an applicant for admission was likely to become a public charge, those consular officers considered not only the economic condition of the man or woman who wished to be admitted to the United States, but also the economic conditions existing at that time in the United States. Therefore, the consular officers effected an administrative regulation of the migration to the United States, with the result that only a small number of immigrants entered.

Mr. President, I am not complaining about that ruling; I think it was a correct procedure to follow at that time, namely, that during a period of depression, when there are many, many unemployed persons, it is well to shut the gates more tightly than we do during a period of prosperity.

It is a fact, however, that during those years we admitted a relatively small number of immigrants, under the interpretation of the clause "likely to become a public charge."

Then the war occurred, and it became increasingly difficult for persons to migrate to the United States from other countries.

For instance, in 1940, the total number of quota immigrants admitted was 52,000; in 1941, 36,000; in 1942, when we were in the war, only 15,000; in 1943, 9,000; in 1944, 9,000; in 1945, 12,000.

At the end of the war the total number of quota immigrants admitted began to increase a little—for instance, in 1946, to 29,000. In other words, we went through 15 years during which we had very little immigration, first because of the depression; and, second, because of the war.

Then came the period of peace. The conscience of America was touched by the plight of the 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 persons who were refugees from Nazi terror, and a large proportion of whom had been locked up in the infamous concentration camps of the Nazis. Quite a struggle occurred, so I am told, on the floor of this body and throughout this Nation as a whole, in an endeavor to determine whether we would ameliorate the lot of those persons.

I am happy to say that finally Congress passed the Displaced Persons Act. One of the proudest moments of my life was when I voted for that act. I am not ashamed of that act; I am proud of it. As a result, we admitted 368,000 persons who were in need, and who, in the main, will be assets to the United States.

Mr. President, we attached a string, however, to the Displaced Persons Act—we had to do so because of the political conditions on the floor. That string was that the number of displaced persons admitted were to be charged against the already restricted quotas up to one-half of these respective quotas. The result was that this act of generosity on our part was accompanied by a partial reduction in the number who may be admitted in the future.

In view of the fact that we had very little immigration for 15 years, from 1931 to 1946; in view of the fact that there is a continuing need, and also in view of the fact that America will profit from these immigrants—and I emphasize that point—I do not see why we should keep this string tied in the bill before us any longer. The string is tied. The pledging of one-half of the quota is continued in section 201 (e), on page 33 of S. 2550. The purpose of the amendment which I have the honor of submitting is to remove this restriction, and I think it is justified both on the ground of humanity and on the ground of national interest.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield time to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I listened very attentively and with deep concern to the bitter remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I think the statement he made was one of the most remarkable, one of the most disturbing statements I have heard on the floor of the Senate and in my long public career. I shall speak strongly on this subject, because I feel strongly. I shall not speak bitterly. I shall speak in good temper. But I am not one who takes insults lying down, nor one who is always tactful in his approach to matters which he thinks are of public interest.

The senior Senator from Georgia has charged, at least by implication, that Senate bill 2842 and the opposition of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the distinguished Senators from New York and New Jersey, 15 Senators in all, represent an effort to tear down the traditions which have been built up in this country during many years, and to open the doors to a horde of people—of foreigners. I have never thought the word "foreigner" any indication of obloquy or hatred, because after all we are a country of foreigners and immigrants. He has charged, at least by implication, that we should admit only those who, in the opinion of a certain number of people, have what they consider to be a proper background, of history and culture, and a record that coincides with the views held by others. If the implication of the bitter statement of the senior Senator from Georgia be correct, to the effect that the proposals of the opponents of the bill have been offered in order to meet the wishes and the needs of people living in the heavily populated urban centers, and that therefore they represent an un-American viewpoint, I may say to the senior Senator from Georgia that in effect he is charging that only 25 percent of the people of the great cities of New York, Chicago, Minneapolis, and Philadelphia are Americans.

Of course, after all, Mr. President, a great majority of the people living in these urban centers, and now, happily, in other sections of our country, are either immigrants or the descendants of immigrants in the first or second or third generation. I think we have the right to resent the implication of the statement of the Senator from Georgia. I believe that the people of New York City and the people of Chicago and Philadelphia are quite as loyal and quite as truly American as are the people of any other section of this country.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. May I merely complete my thought?

Mr. IVES. The question is directly on the point of the Senator's remark.

Mr. LEHMAN. If I may complete my thought, I shall be glad indeed to yield. They are quite as American, they love their country as much, they have sacrificed for their country as much as those whom the senior Senator from Georgia would place above the rest.

Mr. President, I am the son of an immigrant. I am proud of it. My father came to this country and settled in Alabama, in the great Southland. He was a peddler, he operated a general store, and served in the Confederate Army during the Civil War. After that war he went to New York, where he became one of the leaders of the life of that city. I cannot stand idly by to allow charges such as have been made by the senior Senator from Georgia to remain unanswered. I do not boast of my record or of my career, but I do not think I show a lack of humility when I say I believe that my record is that of a good American who has served his State and his Nation with all the strength and force at his command and, I hope, with some ability, both in war and in peace.

I believe I am the only Member of the Senate who has the Distinguished Service Medal given for service in the First World War. In the Second World War, all my children, including my daughter, were in the service of their country, and one of my children did not return. All my nephews and nieces served. To hear a Member of the Senate imply that those who oppose this bill are less patriotic than he, less patriotic than anyone else in the Senate, I believe is a libel on the patriotism, good faith, and the Americanism of those who stand behind the so-called Humphrey-Lehman bill and who have fought for 2 weeks against the McCarran bill, not to satisfy the whims or wishes or desires or ambitions of politicians, or the people of any race or nationality, not to strengthen the hands of bureaucrats, but merely because we believe that our position is right, humane, liberal, and, above all things, in the interest of our country and in the interest of the peace, security, and good will of the world.

The senior Senator from Georgia—and I am deeply sorry that he is not present; I believe he is in the cloakroom—has dwelt on the harm which he says would come to labor from the passage of our bill. I do not think I am unjust or incorrect or inaccurate in stating that I believe the proponents of the Humphrey-Lehman bill and those who are opposing the McCarran bill have shown at least as great a concern for labor as has the senior Senator from Georgia. We have been fighting that battle. We have sought to protect labor, to raise the standard of living, to give labor justice and an opportunity.

I am not condemning anything the senior Senator from Georgia has done. I am merely saying that I believe I am justified in contending that our record in behalf of the interests of labor and in endeavoring to see that justice is done to labor will compare favorably with that of the Senior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. President, I did not expect to speak so feelingly and so forcefully on this subject as I have spoken, but I have no apologies to make. I am glad I have done so. I repeat that I never expected to hear on the floor of the Senate a colleague of great ability and of great character attack fellow Members of the Senate for their support of or opposition to a bill on the ground of patriotism, loyalty, and Americanism less than his. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to submit the record of my colleagues and of myself for love of country, patriotism, and, to some degree, service, to the consideration of the American people.

I cannot help but speak of my deep concern. I had hoped I would not have to say this, even though the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee in his opening remarks implied that those who fought against his bill and in behalf of the Humphrey-Lehman bill were at least pink in color. I could not help but say what I have said. I am glad I have said it. My only regret is that the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, after completing his remarks, left the Chamber, because I would have been very happy indeed to have subjected myself to any interrogations or any other attack which that distinguished Senator might wish to level against me.

I am now very glad indeed to yield to my esteemed colleague from New York.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I interrupted my distinguished colleague to raise a question at a certain point in his remarks when he was referring to the inhabitants of great cities of this country, including New York and Chicago. In that connection, I should like to ask him if he does not feel that the comment he made in connection with New York and Chicago would apply also to many other cities, practically all of them of far smaller population, at least in certain areas. I do not think we can limit it to cities of great populations. Nowadays cities, regardless of population, contain Americans from all strata. Does not my colleague agree with me?

Mr. LEHMAN. I agree fully. I recall the city of Buffalo.

Mr. IVES. I had Buffalo in mind, and Syracuse, Utica, and other cities in the State of New York, and also Newark in the State of New Jersey.

My distinguished colleague from New York needs no apology made regarding his very distinguished record. We who know him, we who have served with him in New York, have a great affection and a deep respect for him. All he said of himself and his distinguished back-

ground is absolutely true, and I pay my respects to him at this time.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very grateful to my colleague from New York.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] needs no defense anywhere in America. He was for many years a distinguished private citizen and an honorable financier in the city of New York. For 4 years he served with great distinction as Lieutenant Governor of New York, under Franklin D. Roosevelt, and performed a large share of the administrative work of the State of New York during that time.

Then for 10 years he was Governor of the State of New York, which is, I think, the longest record of continuous service in the history of that State. As his able and fine-spirited colleague of the opposing political party has testified, he won the respect of all New Yorkers, regardless of party. He was reelected again and again by the largest majorities ever received by any candidate for Governor of the State of New York. He was known as a man of complete integrity and of honor. He won the respect not merely of New Yorkers, but of people all over the country, including the people of Chicago.

I am as proud of being a Chicagoan as the Senator from New York is of being a New Yorker. If my city continues to be attacked on the floor, I shall at an appropriate time rise in its defense. We admire and love the Senator from New York, and I think the vast majority of Americans love him, too.

After retiring as Governor, and I may say he was undefeated in successive elections, he returned for a period to private life and then became the director of UNRRA. He did this work at great financial cost to himself and at great personal sacrifice. His record in that connection is a most distinguished one. He has twice been elected to the United States Senate and, as we all know, has served with great distinction here. I certainly regard it as an honor to serve with him.

The Senator from New York needs no defense. The people of New York and the people of the United States know, respect, and love him. When everything has been written, the verdict of history will be that the Senator from New York was a truly noble man, a humble man, a man who, having wealth, power, and great ability, was nevertheless as humble and simple in his heart as a child.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois for his encomium, as I thank also my distinguished colleague from New York for his.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield time to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course I do. I yield to the Senator from New York all the time he needs, within the limits of the time we have left.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am not concerned with praise. Unhappily the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] was out of the Chamber at the time, but I rose merely to reply to what I thought was an unjust attack on people living in my city and in the cities of Chicago, Philadelphia, Buffalo, Utica, Syracuse, and Detroit, many of whom—the majority of whom, I may say to my distinguished colleague from Georgia—are immigrants or descendants of immigrants within near relationship.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall yield two minutes to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] who wishes to present a matter for the RECORD.

NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as in executive session from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the nominations for promotion or original appointment of approximately 3,200 officers in the armed services.

The highest rank to which any of these officers is being promoted is the grade of major in the Army and lieutenant—junior grade—in the Navy. These nominations have been before the Committee on Armed Services for several days, and no objections have been received to the promotion or appointment of any officers on the lists. The report of the committee is unanimous.

In order to save the expense of printing in the Executive Calendar all the individual names, I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the nominations be confirmed, and the President notified. Furthermore, I may say that these names have already appeared in the RECORD, having been printed at the time when the nominations were sent to the Senate.

The only reason why I now ask that the nominations be confirmed without having the names printed in the Executive Calendar is that something like $1,600 will be saved by taking this course.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am sorry, but I did not hear the beginning of the Senator's statement. May I ask him to repeat it?

Mr. STENNIS. This is a unanimous-consent request for confirmation of nominations of 3,200 so-called junior grade officers in the Army and Navy.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Officers already in the Army and Navy?

Mr. STENNIS. Perhaps some of them are graduates of the Academies.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Graduates this year?

Mr. STENNIS. I am not certain.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the request have to do with the assignment or commissioning of cadets or midshipmen of the June 1952 class?

Mr. STENNIS. I am under the impression that those appointments have already been confirmed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am of the same opinion, but I wish to be positive for certain reasons. If the Senator can assure me that there are none on this list who are graduating this June, from either of the Academies, I shall raise no objection; that is, if they are all presently commissioned in the Army, Navy, or Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am waiting for such assurance, Mr. President.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am sorry I cannot give the Senator that assurance.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Am I correct in understanding that all the officers on the list are now in temporary grades, and that these nominations are for permanent grades?

Mr. STENNIS. I do not believe they are all permanent appointments. Some of them are temporary; some are permanent. That is the general run of appointments that come before the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, can the Senator from Mississippi assure me that all these persons are presently serving in commissioned grades?

Mr. STENNIS. There may be the names of a few from the Academies who have been confirmed. I know the major number of those from the Academies this year have already been confirmed.

Mr. President, if there is any question about the matter, I shall be glad to withhold the report until tomorrow, when I can be more certain in answering the Senator's question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I ask only that the Senator withhold the report for a few minutes. I have no desire to object to the list as a whole.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I object temporarily, and ask that the matter be brought up again in a few minutes.

REVISION OF LAWS RELATING TO IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND NATIONALITY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2550) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, first we must vote upon the amendment which is now pending. The Senator from Michigan has another amendment which he desires to bring up following the vote.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, before a vote is taken, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to this amendment. The effect of the amendment is to remove the charges against quotas under Displaced Persons Act, section 19 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1917, and under private bills. All the past charges against the quotas which have been made pursuant to those laws would be forgiven with the result that the overall number of aliens entering this country would be tremendously increased.

When we passed the Displaced Persons Act we passed it with the specific understanding that the displaced persons should be charged against the quotas of the countries from which they came. To do other than that at this time would render a moral wrong, because we brought those people in under a specific understanding that they should be charged against the quotas from which they came, under the laws to which I have referred.

I am unalterably opposed to these changes for they are merely another method of increasing total immigration to this country. I urge Members of the Senate to reject this amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield time to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], who has an amendment to offer.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is designated "5-9-52-ZZ."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 26, line 14, after "President", it is proposed to insert "the Board of Immigration Appeals."

On page 30, after line 21, it is proposed to insert the following:

BOARD OF IMMIGRATION APPEALS

SEC. 105 (a) There is hereby established a Board of Immigration Appeals which shall be composed of five members to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Board shall be a part of the Department of Justice but, except for administrative purposes, shall not be subject to the supervision or control of any officer or employee of the Department. The President shall, at the time of appointment, designate one member to serve as Chairman. Each member of the Board shall be appointed for a term of 5 years and shall serve until his successor is appointed and qualified, except that, of the members first taking office, one shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, one for a term of 2 years, one for a term of 3 years, one for a term of 4 years, and one for a term of 5 years. Members of the Board shall receive compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the Board of Immigration Appeals shall have jurisdiction and authority to review, upon appeal by an alien or by the Attorney General, any decision of the Attorney General, of the Commissioner, or of any officer or employee of the Service in proceedings relating to exclusion, deportation, petitions and applications for determination or adjustment of status, applications for suspension of deportation, applications for waivers of grounds of exclusion or deportation, stays, and revocation of status previously granted. The Board shall issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary to enable it to carry out the authority conferred upon it by this subsection.

(c) A quorum of the Board shall consist of three members. The Board may appoint and fix the compensation of such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems necessary, in accordance with the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949.

(d) The Board shall have authority to promulgate rules of practice governing the proceedings before it. Except in the case of proceedings under section 235 (c), the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act shall apply to all proceedings of the Board.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, the hour is growing late. I do not wish to take up any great amount of the time of the Senate on this amendment. I should like to call the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. McCARRAN] to the fact that this amendment would merely place in the statute the present procedure, which is now voluntarily followed by the Department of Justice. The amendment would create a Board of Immigration Appeals. It seems to me that the final authority on immigration cases should not rest with any one man. However fine a man the Attorney General may be, it seems to me that no one man should want to have dictatorial power, without appeal, over the lives of others. I should like to inquire whether the chairman of the committee would be willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, has the Senator from Michigan concluded his remarks?

Mr. MOODY. Yes. I was wondering whether the Senator would be willing to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. McCARRAN. I cannot take the amendment to conference. I must oppose it.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to point out to the Senate that the amendment would merely put into the law what is obviously equitable, namely, a provision assuring anyone who may have been done an injustice the right of appeal.

How in the world can we write into the law a provision which puts into the hands of one man power over the life of another man? One man should not have the power of life and death over human beings in this way. I cannot see any reason why the amendment should be rejected. I believe the amendment speaks for itself, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to this amendment. The effect of this amendment is to provide for the creation by statute of a Board of Immigration Appeals with jurisdiction to review all decisions made by the Attorney General, the Commissioner, or any officer or employee of the Service. Except in cases of proceedings under section 235 (c), relating to security cases, the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act are made applicable to all proceedings before the Board of Immigration Appeals, thereby providing judicial review in exclusion cases.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. Will the chairman kindly explain to me why he feels that such power should be placed in the hands of one man? Why should he be given the power to decide cases like this without appeal?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is not placed in the hands of one man. If the Senator from Michigan will listen, I shall meet that very point in what I have to say.

Mr. MOODY. I shall be glad to hear it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am unalterably opposed to this amendment. The provisions in my bill, S. 2550, do not disturb the present authority of the Attorney General to continue the existence of the Board of Immigration Appeals if he so desires. On the other hand, the bill does not require the continuance of a Board of Immigration Appeals. The determination of whether or not the Board of Immigration Appeals is necessary is left within the discretion of the Attorney General. This has been done, Mr. President, because I have previously introduced a bill, S. 14, to improve the administration of justice by the creation of an administrative court of the United States. Since my bill, S. 14, contemplates an administrative court of appeals to review admissions by administrative agencies, it would, in my opinion, be very unwise to require the establishment of a Board of Immigration Appeals by statute at this time.

I, therefore, request that the Members of the Senate reject this amendment.

Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Michigan that the creation of a Board of Immigration Appeals would only encourage hundreds of thousands of appeals. The result would be to bring about conditions worse than those today, and they are bad enough.

Mr. President, the creation of a board of appeals should be left to the discretion of the Attorney General. The Attorney General has control over the entry of immigrants.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. MOODY. We have heard a great deal of criticism with respect to the delegation of power, and some Senators who support the pending bill have demanded that certain provisions be spelled out in the law. It seems to me that certainly the right of appeal, even if it exists, can be withdrawn tomorrow. I believe that is a correct statement. It seems to me the provision should be spelled out in the law.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Administrative Procedure Act is made applicable to the bill. The Administrative Procedure Act prevails now. The Senator need not worry about its not being in the law, because the Administrative Procedure Act covers the very point which the Senator is attempting to reach.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOODY. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understood that the Senator from Michigan had the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. I understood that the Senator from Michigan yielded the floor.

Mr. MOODY. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have answered the question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, do we have some time remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has time remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely want to say, with reference to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan, that the amendment is very fundamental to our immigration policy. There is considerable controversy between many Members of the Senate with relation to the application of the Administrative Procedure Act to the proposed immigration law. As a matter of fact, the point was gone into in great detail by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and will be gone into subsequently by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

It is my considered judgment that the Administrative Procedure Act is substantially altered and limited by the provisions of the pending bill. It is also my understanding that under an appropriation act passed in the Eighty-first Congress, a rider attached to the appropriation act exempts for all practical purposes the Immigration Service and the Justice Department from the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act. So the Senator from Michigan, in proposing the establishment of a Board of Appeals, is suggesting the granting of basic justice.

The Senator from Nevada has suggested that there would be a great number of appeals. Of course there would be a great number of appeals. That is what a Board of Appeals is designed to handle. Where does the power rest today? The power rests with consular officers, men who very frequently are unskilled. They have complete and total authority in the issuance of visas. The final discretionary power lies in the Attorney General.

I believe the argument of the Senator from Michigan is apropos and very significant with reference to what has been heard in debate in the Senate on many occasions, namely, that we are always hearing Senators argue that we ought not to vest in appointive officers who serve at the will of the President discretionary authority, but should pin the authority down. The amendment would pin down the authority.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the committee says on the one hand that the reason the amendment is not necessary is because he has pending an amendment to create a court.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is not an amendment.

Mr. MOODY. A bill, I should say. He has pending a bill to create a court. We cannot foretell whether the Senate will pass the bill. On the other hand he seems to imply that what I have in mind is already taken care of in the Administrative Procedure Act. If it is already taken care of why is it necessary to establish a court? If the distinguished chairman has introduced a bill to establish a court it seems to me that it shows some flickering doubt in his mind that perhaps new machinery is needed. Therefore, it appears to me the time to take care of the matter is when the Senate is acting on the issue which is before it today.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not have the floor, but——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nevada so that he may make reply.

Mr. McCARRAN. I will say that the rider referred to was attached to the appropriation bill because the statement was made before the Appropriations Committee that it would cost a considerable sum of money to apply the Administrative Procedure Act to immigration matters. I discussed the subject at length yesterday. I shall touch on it just a little if I may at this time. The bill would set aside the rider which was attached to the appropriation bill. The bill provides for administrative procedures and makes the Administrative Procedure Act applicable insofar as the administration of the bill is concerned. I made mention of a bill that I introduced. It has nothing to do whatever with the pending bill. I merely made mention of it in passing.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. My question was: If it is taken care of in the bill which is pending, why should it be necessary at some other time to pass a bill establishing such a court?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is an entirely different matter. It has nothing to do with the pending bill. The Administrative Procedure Act is the law. The administrative court would have nothing to do with the pending bill. It might touch upon immigration, but it would have nothing to do with the pending bill. The administrative board proposed to be established under the provisions of the amendment would pass on admissions, and also on appeals. Such a provision is not at all in keeping with the policy of this bill.

Mr. MOODY. Of course, Mr. President, I am not in agreement with all of the policy of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I realize that.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield, to permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ascertain if I correctly understand the situation with reference to the separate court proposed to be created by means of the bill of the Senator from Nevada. I understand that the court would not at all be a part of the Department of Justice, but would be a separate court to handle administrative procedures.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. I merely mention that in passing.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. As contrasted with the situation suggested by the separate bill of the Senator from Nevada, is it not true that this amendment proposes to establish a Board of Immigration Appeals which would exist in and be a part of the Department of Justice, and would have authority, by vote of a majority of the Board—namely, by a vote of 3 of the 5 members, to overrule and set aside decisions of the head of that department, namely, the Attorney General?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it a fact that the Senator from Nevada disapproves of the amendment because, in effect, it would set up within the Department of Justice a group of employees of that department who would have authority to set aside and overrule the decisions of the Attorney General himself?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. It would handcuff the Attorney General entirely, in that respect.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield, to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to inquire whether it would be possible to obtain an appeal through a writ of habeas corpus, in connection with which the application of the rule of substantial evidence would be determined.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct, and it is done right along.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me, in order that I may ask a question of the Senator from Michigan? I ask unanimous consent to that effect if the Senator from Minnesota will yield for that purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me ask at whose expense the appeal for habeas corpus would be made?

Mr. FERGUSON. I assume the writ itself would not cost any money.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The legal representation and the cost of legal proceedings would be at the expense of the immigrant; and immigrants generally are rather poor.

Mr. FERGUSON. I take it for granted that the same procedure would be had before the proposed Board.

Mr. DOUGLAS. One of the purposes of providing for administrative boards of appeal is to reduce both the time required and the expense—in other words, to reduce the delay and to reduce the cost.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would have no objection at all to the creation of a separate court. In fact, I rather approve of that idea, which, as I understand, the Senator from Nevada is suggesting in another bill.

On the other hand, to have vested in subordinates within a certain department authority to set aside the deliberate decisions of the head of the department, who is charged with the enforcement of a particular law, would, it seems to me, be the height of disorganization and would be exactly the wrong thing to do.

So, Mr. President, unless I hear something to the contrary, on that ground alone I shall have to oppose this particular amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am indeed delighted to hear the Senator from Florida make that statement, because in view of the provisions of the amendment, I know he will soon vote for it.

The amendment provides:

The Board shall be a part of the Department of Justice but, except for administrative purposes, shall not be subject to the supervision or control of any officer or any employee of the Department.

Mr. HOLLAND. That means that except for administrative purposes or matters of administration, the members of the proposed Board would have authority greater than that of the head of the Department in which they would serve.

Mr. HUMPHREY. However, the argument of the Senator from Florida is that he does not wish to have such a Board dominated or in any way interfered with. On the other hand, the bill now provides that the hearing officers, who, in the case of an individual appeal, would be subject to the supervision of the Attorney General, would live by sufferance of the Attorney General; their salaries would be determined by the Department of Justice; their demotions or promotions would be determined by the Department of Justice, and so forth.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Minnesota has entirely misunderstood my position.

In order to make my position perfectly clear, let me say that I believe it to be the height of absurdity to have subordinate officers within a department clothed with authority to upset or set aside decisions made by the head of the department; I further believe that unless this function were vested in a separate court there would be, under the terms of the amendment, a completely disorganized department.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator from Florida takes the position just stated by him, then, of course, he disagrees with the fundamental theory of the Administrative Procedure Act, because the principle of the amendment of the Senator from Michigan is precisely the one embodied in the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946. I read now from subsection (c) of section 5 of the Administrative Procedure Act, which there refers to hearing officers or examiners:

nor shall such officer be responsible to or subject to the supervision or direction of any officer, employee, or agent engaged in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions for any agency.

Then, in section 11, we find the following:

EXAMINERS

SEC. 11. Subject to the civil-service and other laws to the extent not inconsistent with this act, there shall be appointed by and for each agency as many qualified and competent examiners as may be necessary for proceedings pursuant to sections 7 and 8, who shall be assigned to cases in rotation so far as practicable and shall perform no duties inconsistent with their duties and responsibilities as examiners.

Then I ask the Senator to notice the following provision:

Examiners shall be removable by the agency in which they are employed only for good cause established and determined by the Civil Service Commission * * * after opportunity for hearing and upon the record thereof.

Then the act proceeds to provide—and I ask the Senator to note particularly this point—that the examiners shall not be disciplined, promoted, or demoted by their superiors, but shall be independent, and shall be removed only by the Civil Service Commission itself.

The purpose of establishing such quasi-judicial boards and officers within administrative agencies was to provide them with independence, so that the body of administrative law would be as impartial as the ordinary body of common law under the interpretations given by the courts.

As I see the matter, that was clearly the purpose of the Administrative Procedure Act, and again and again I have paid tribute to the distinguished Senator from Nevada for his magnificent contribution in getting the Administrative Procedure Act passed. In fact, we like his child so well that we would like to see it embodied in this measure, for the protection of poor human beings, and not merely for the protection of persons who in other respects are fairly well able to take care of themselves.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Nevada wishes to make a reply.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to dwell on the language of the proposed amendment, which reads in part as follows:

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the Board of Immigration Appeals shall have jurisdiction and authority to review, upon appeal by an alien or by the Attorney General, any decision of the Attorney General, of the Commissioner, or of any officer or employee of the Service in proceedings relating to exclusion, deportation, petitions and applications for determination or adjustment of status, applications for suspension of deportation, applications for waivers of grounds of exclusion or deportation, stays, and revocation of status previously granted.

In short, would not the amendment set up within the Department of Justice, under the Attorney General, a creature capable of destroying the head of that Department or, at least, of setting aside his actions in the case of both administrative and judicial functions?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the argument of the Senator from Nevada is a very persuasive one. However, of course, it would result in the destruction of section 104 of his bill. That section relates to the Secretary of State and to the powers and duties of the Secretary of State in the case of consular officers. In that instance, the bill would establish a separate board with distinct powers and functions which even would supersede those of the Secretary of State himself, insofar as consular officers are concerned.

Mr. President, it is obvious that one cannot blow both hot and cold with the same breath.

The argument against the provision for the creation of a Board of Immigration Appeals is that it would establish within the Department of Justice a board which would be able to review the decisions of even the Attorney General himself. However, the proposed Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, to be established for the purpose of protecting us from infiltration, itself would supersede those particular functions of the Secretary of State and the consular officers, and would be an independent bureau within the Department of State.

If we are not to have the Board of Immigration Appeals, then I could say that really there ought not to be the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs. I do not say that, but at least there is a similarity here which I think ought to be realized by the Members of this body. What we are attempting to do in immigration matters is to provide that, when rules and regulations have been issued and when the immigration officer has acted in a case involving an immigrant, the immigrant shall have a place to which to appeal. This Appeals Board is a unit within the Department of Justice, a unit which is separate and distinct, indeed, from the Attorney General's discretionary powers. It is for all practical purposes a court, so far as the Secretary of State is concerned. Concerning the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, let me read the following language:

SEC. 104. (a) The Secretary of State shall be charged with the administration and the enforcement of the provisions of this act and all other immigration and nationality laws relating to (1) the powers, duties, and functions of diplomatic and consular officers of the United States, except those powers, duties, and functions conferred upon the consular officers relating to the granting or refusal of visas—

And yet through this bill, we create the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs.

Mr. MOODY and Mr. McCARRAN addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. Is it not true that the distinction between having a board of

this sort as an adjunct to the Department of Justice and not having it is the distinction between whether decision of a case is to be made by one man, either by a consul or some other administrative official, up to the Attorney General, or whether a human being who may have been discriminated against for any reason—and we can not now predict what the reason might be—would have some place of appeal? I think it is a matter of fundamental justice. I do not see any reason why it should be opposed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from Michigan that even under the present law and under the McCarran bill the person affected would still have the right to appeal; but he would appeal to an officer appointed by the Attorney General. In other words, the Attorney General would not be able to go through all these separate decisions, but would delegate this authority.

Mr. MOODY. Of course.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He would delegate this authority to someone over whom he has supervision and over whom he can exercise power and authority.

Mr. President, what are we proposing? We are proposing that there be a Board of Immigration Appeals, separate and distinct from the Attorney General, so that appeal cases—and there are still appeal cases—may be funneled into an impartial tribunal, a majority vote of which will be controlling even over the Attorney General.

Mr. MOODY. Is it not true that almost precisely this situation now obtains, and that this amendment merely writes it into the law, in order that some Attorney General in the future may not say, "I am the law; I am going to handle all the appeals myself"?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is my understanding. I desire now to yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Minnesota would say there was any better source to which an appeal could be taken than to the courts of the country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed not.

Mr. McCARRAN. Any aggrieved immigrant, or any aggrieved applicant for entry into this country can and now does resort to the courts; and that is separate and apart from the Department of Justice, and in no wise under the control of the Attorney General.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But I may say that an appeal would still be available even from the Board of Immigration Appeals. We do not deny that process. But what is the purpose of an administrative tribunal? The purpose of an administrative tribunal such as this is to expedite action, and also to make it possible to arrive at decisions without all the formality which is attendant upon judicial process in a formalized court. I do not think we need debate this amendment any longer.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] for the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oregon for the presentation of an amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for an announcement?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, earlier in the day I announced that there would be a Saturday session. Later, my attention was called to something I had said previously which indicated, it was claimed, that there would not be a Saturday session. I want to be fair with the Senate. I do think it important that we press forward on the pending bill, but some Senators have said they relied upon my previous statement which was:

> However, in order not to lose any more time, we shall have a session on Saturday, unless we can dispose of the immigration bill at an earlier time.

We expect to remain in session tonight and to dispose of the pending bill. We shall change a little the schedule heretofore announced, take up Senate bill 3066, Calendar No. 1510, which is a bill to amend the defense housing laws, and which it is thought can be finished within a day. If we can finish the pending bill at a reasonable hour tonight, we may meet at 10 o'clock in the morning. The defense housing bill will be followed by the consideration of Senate bill 3086, Calendar No. 1505, a bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed by Mr. MORSE to strike out all after line 22 on page 115 down to and including line 21 on page 118 (being sec. 242 (b)) and in lieu thereof insert the following:

> A special inquiry officer shall preside as the hearing officer in all deportation and exclusion proceedings arising under this act. Such officer shall be appointed pursuant to section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C. 1010, 60 Stat. 244) and shall have the powers and duties, and limitations prescribed by sections 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C. 1004, 1005, 1006, 1007, 1010; 60 Stat. 239–244). Notwithstanding any provisions to the contrary, no alien shall be denied a hearing either in exclusion or deportation proceedings and every person aggrieved by an adverse order in exclusion or deportation proceedings may obtain court review in an action for declaratory judgment pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 2201, or upon a writ of habeas corpus. In the discretion of the Attorney General, and under such regulations as he may prescribe, deportation proceedings, including issuance of a warrant of arrest, and a finding of deportability under this section need not be required in the case of any alien who admits to belonging to a class of aliens who are deportable under section 241 if such alien voluntarily departs from the United States at his own expense, or is removed at Government expense as hereinafter authorized, unless the Attorney General has reason to believe that such alien is deportable under paragraph (4), (5), (6), (7), (11), (12), (14), (15), or (16) of section 241 (a) or under the act of May 10, 1920, as amended. If any alien who is authorized to depart voluntarily under the preceding sentence is financially unable to depart at his own expense and the Attorney General deems his removal to be in the best interest of the United States, the expense of such removal may be paid from the appropriation for the enforcement of this act.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to turn my attention to my amendment which seeks only to bring the procedures in the administration of the proposed immigration law under the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, in keeping, I may say, with the recommendation of the appropriate committee of the American Bar Association. Frankly, Mr. President, I know of no good reason why the amendment should not be automatically accepted by the sponsors of the bill. As I hope to prove before I finish my discussion, the immigration committee of the American Bar Association has given the matter very careful consideration, and testimony before committees of the Congress leaves no room for doubt as to the soundness of the position of these distinguished lawyers as to the need for such an amendment as that which I have proposed.

Mr. President, important sections of S. 2550 are opposed by a committee of the American Bar Association. A representative of the American Bar Association appeared in opposition to the version of this bill when it was numbered S. 716. The immigration committee of the administrative law section of the American Bar Association filed a list of seven objections to S. 2550 and its companion bill, H. R. 5678, with members of the Judiciary Committee. These objections are as follows:

First, that section 242 (b) of Senate bill 2550 does not provide for independent hearing examiners in deportation cases as required by the Supreme Court in *Sung* v. *McGrath* (339 U. S. 33). Senate bill 2550 provides for a special inquiry officer who may be an investigator or prosecutor for the Immigration Service one day and a hearing officer the next, provided he has not investigated the case he is hearing. In the very case that he hears, the special inquiry officer will be required to develop the case against the alien and then sit in judgment. In addition, contrary to sections 5 and 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act, the special inquiry officer will be subject to the control of district directors and assistant commissioners in the Immigration Service who engage in investigative and prosecuting functions. We all know that a man who has buried himself in one side of an issue is disabled from bringing to its decision that dispassionate judgment which Anglo-American tradition demands of officials who decide questions—see Senate Document 8, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, page 56.

Where the same men are obliged to serve both as prosecutors and judges, administrative fairness is undermined, and public confidence in that fairness is weakened. The final report of the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure reported at page 56:

> These types of commingling of functions of investigation or advocacy with the function of deciding are thus plainly undesirable. * * * Creation of independent

hearing commissioners insulated from all phases of a case other than hearing and deciding will, the Committee believes, go far toward solving this problem at the level of the initial hearing provided the proper safeguards are established to assure the insulation (S. Doc. 8, 77th Cong., 1st sess., p. 56).

And with specific reference to deportation proceedings, it was found that separation of functions was required by the rudiments of fair play and Anglo-American concepts of justice. The Secretary of Labor's Committee on Administrative Procedure reported in 1940 as follows—pages 81–82:

A genuinely impartial hearing, conducted with critical detachment, is psychologically improbable if not impossible, when the presiding officer has at once the responsibility of appraising the strength of the case and of seeking to make it as strong as possible. Nor is complete divorce between investigation and hearing possible so long as the presiding inspector has the duty himself of assembling and presenting the results of investigation (cited in Sung case opinion, p. 44).

To remedy these defects in administrative hearings we enacted in 1946 under the sponsorship of the Senator from Nevada the Administrative Procedure Act. And as noted by the Supreme Court in the Sung case, the administrative hearing in deportation cases furnished "a perfect exemplification of the practices so unanimously condemned. A deportation hearing involves issues basic to human liberty and happiness and, in the present upheavals in lands to which aliens may be returned, perhaps to life itself. It might be difficult to justify as measuring up to constitutional standards of impartiality a hearing tribunal for deportation proceedings the like of which has been condemned by Congress as unfair even where less vital matters of property rights are at stake"—page 50, opinion has further good quotable material; see page 46.

In the Administrative Procedure Act sponsored by the Senator from Nevada, and advocated by the American Bar Association, we condemned hearings held by officials subject to the control of investigating and prosecuting officials.

I may say, Mr. President, that the junior Senator from Oregon stood shoulder to shoulder with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] in debate on the floor of the Senate for the passage of the administrative procedure bill, but I part with the Senator from Nevada in respect to the failure in the immigration bill to carry out what I think is the clear spirit and intent of the administration procedure bill which he so ably advocated not very long ago on the floor of the Senate and which was passed by the Congress and is now the law of the land.

We condemned the practice of permitting hearing officers to act as investigators one day and adjudicating officers the next—section 5 (c) of the Administrative Procedure Act. We required hearing officers who were to be truly independent under section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act as noted by the Senator from Nevada in his outline of the bill during the Senate debates—Senate Document 248, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, page 327.

And it is also noted in the legislative history of the bill that section 7 of the Administrative Procedure Act permitting hearings by officers specially designated pursuant to other statutes was not to be a loophole for the avoidance of the indedendent examiner system and that such exemption only applied to statutory hearing officers "with some special qualifications, as distinguished from examiners otherwise provided in the bill"—Senate Document No. 248, page 268.

All the fine work and effort that has gone into the Administrative Procedure Act to insure administrative justice would be disregarded or nullified in proceedings under the Immigration Act as provided in S. 2550. We were warned by the American Bar Association Journal of January 1948—page 9—that—

Care must be taken that subsequent legislation shall not repeal or whittle down the provisions of the [Administrative Procedure] Act.

That warning was well taken. First, the Immigration authorities sought to whittle down the Administrative Procedure Act by a rider to an Appropriations Act. Now, though the rider is repealed, a further step is taken to make this permanent by this omnibus immigration bill. And soon, other agencies of the Government, the National Labor Relations Board, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and every other Government agency which opposed the Administrative Procedure Act may be tempted to present omnibus bills with provisions whittling down that act. If we enact S. 2550, we are denying the protections of the APA to important cases and are setting a precedent which is in danger of leading ultimately to virtual repeal of the Administrative Procedure Act.

We should heed the objections to section 242 (b) voiced by the American Bar Association. We should heed the warning of Justice Jackson in the Sung case, that any exemption from the Administrative Procedure Act in deportation cases might be unconstitutional. We should heed the warnings that any whittling of the Administrative Procedure Act will lead to its eventual nullification.

Second, the American Bar Association opposes the provision of section 242 (a) which authorizes the Attorney General to deny bail to an alien pending determination of his deportability. This section contains a specific provision that an alien may be successful in court only "upon a conclusive showing in habeas corpus proceeding that the Attorney General is not proceeding with reasonable dispatch." This, then, is a provision to give the Attorney General absolute discretion to deny bail to persons who are held for no crime but solely in a civil deportation proceeding. The Attorney General need not show that the alien would abscond or endanger our security. He only need show that he is proceeding with reasonable dispatch and he can then detain an alien for weeks and months without bail. If the deportation case requires evidence from abroad, or investigation in Europe involving months of work, an alien may be needlessly detained at Ellis Island.

The function of bail is to secure the reappearance of an alien when deportation has been ordered and is to be effectuated. Pending determination of deportability a subversive alien may be detained if his presence at large is a danger to our national security—*Carlson* v. *Landon* (342 U. S. 524). But to make the Attorney General's denial of bail free from judicial review as to reasonableness, as is here proposed, is an infringement of the writ of habeas corpus. Section 242 (a) would permit the Attorney General to detain persons without bail and without court review—persons charged with no crime, convicted of no crime, and accused of no subversive activity—solely upon a showing that he is acting with reasonable dispatch.

I join with the American Bar Association in recommending that we return to a rule of reason, to the constitutional principle that excessive bail shall not be permitted, and to the constitutional admonition that the writ of habeas corpus should not be curtailed except in cases of actual invasion. We should, as the American Bar Association recommends, "maintain present authority of courts to review denial of bail."

Third and fourth, the American Bar Association recommends that sections 242 (f) and 252 be amended to retain the right of hearings in deportation cases to aliens previously deported and to alien seamen. We should as a matter of simple justice give all aliens a hearing before deporting them. We give criminals—even murderers and spies—a hearing before sending them to jail. We give convicted criminals on parole, hearings before revoking their parole. We give a motorist, a hotel owner, a lawyer, and a bondsman a hearing before revoking their licenses. Why should we not give an alien a hearing before revoking his license to stay in America? We have for the past 50 years granted all aliens hearings before deporting them. Is there any sound reason for denying them hearings today? But apart from the question of simple justice, we cannot under our Constitution deprive any alien—including alien seamen—of a deportation hearing. Wong Yang Sung was an alien seaman who overstayed in the United States and became deportable, and in *Sung* v. *McGrath* (339 U. S. 33), the Supreme Court held that due process not only required a hearing, but a fair hearing. Justice Jackson, speaking for the Court, said, at page 49, that under compulsion of the Constitution the Supreme Court long ago held that deportation statutes must provide a hearing for aliens including those here illegally. And that has been the law ever since the *Japanese Immigrant case* (189 U. S. 86). We cannot approve sections 242 (f) and 252 unless we shut our eyes to the Constitution and Supreme Court opinions.

Fifth, the American Bar Association opposes section 360 of S. 2550. This provision relates to declaratory judgment actions by persons claiming American citizenship. The present provisions of law are set forth in section 503 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (8 U. S. C. 903). Section 360 is designed to curtail the

judicial review provided under existing law in several respects. Section 360 denies existing declaratory judgment actions under title 28, United States Code, page 2201, to persons claiming American citizenship against whom deportation or exclusion proceedings have been brought. In exclusion cases, a claim of citizenship may only be brought in court in habeas corpus proceedings. Section 360 permits declaratory judgment actions upon a claim of American citizenship only within 5 years after a final administrative denial and only in the district of the individual's residence. Persons under age who do not know about court proceedings and let 5 years go by, or who are abroad and unable to claim residence in a particular district in the United States, would apparently be without recourse in the courts.

In an article entitled "Improving Administrative Justice," volume 32, American Bar Journal, December 1946, page 24, the Senator from Nevada explained that under the Administrative Procedure Act "every instance of legal wrong shall be subject to judicial review." He said:

> It is a major premise of the statute that judicial review is not merely available but is plenary in every proper sense of the word.

Nevertheless, in S. 2550, contrary to the wise observations of the Senator from Nevada, made in 1946, and contrary to the objectives of the Administrative Procedure Act, we find a bill which will curtail judicial review for persons fighting for their American birthright. We are here dealing not with aliens but with Americans. What is the fear over judicial review of administrators who deny the claim of a native-born American to American citizenship? What is inadequate about existing law? Why should not the courts be as open as they have been in the past for judicial declarations of American citizenship? I join with the American Bar Association in opposing the curtailment of judicial review in citizenship cases.

Sixth, the American Bar Association objects to section 342, which authorizes the Attorney General to cancel certificates of citizenship or naturalization where it appears to his satisfaction that citizenship was illegally or fraudulently procured. This may be done not upon hearing after personal notice but upon written notice to a person's last known address. In *Mullane* v. *Central Hanover Bank and Trust Co.* (339 U. S. 306) it was held that due process required personal service where the whereabouts of an individual was either known or could be ascertained. It is no wonder that the American Bar Association feels that this section contains "unconstitutionally inadequate provisions for notice."

Seventh, section 340 (b) contains the same objectionable feature. It permits denaturalization by substituted service without any showing that personal notice cannot be made. For the same reason, the American Bar Association objects on constitutional grounds to section 340 (b) of S. 2550.

Mr. President, these are the objections of the American Bar Association. They cannot be disposed of lightly. A bill with these major defects should not be enacted into law, but should be recommitted for further study and that is what should be done with S. 2550. However, the Senate has decided to the contrary. I think we ought to make the corrections which the American Bar Association has recommended through its committee on immigration.

Several Senators have laid emphasis on the unfairness of the McCarran bill in its provisions for deportation of members of the foreign-born population. Several have emphasized the injustice of the bill in excluding aliens on small pretext or no pretext. They have also emphasized on a small pretext or on no pretext, those parts of the bill which unfairly give quotas to the countries and the peoples who do not need them and do not use them. These Senators have condemned S. 2550 for its denial of the precious immigration quota numbers to the refugees and persecutees of Europe, for its denial of any help to the excess population of such countries as Holland, Denmark, Italy, Greece, Germany, and Poland, the people who need quota numbers so desperately. And finally, emphasis has been put in the debates on the provisions of the bill which deny the process and the fair hearing which are required by the Administrative Procedure Act.

As to a good many of the objections raised by the junior Senator from Oregon, those of us in opposition to the bill have already been defeated, at least in this stage of the controversy, but I say to the Senate that it is necessary to adopt an amendment which will protect, guarantee, and perpetuate the safeguards of the Administrative Procedure Act.

I agree wholeheartedly with all these criticisms of the McCarran bill. On the basis of those criticisms alone the Senate should reject the McCarran bill. It proceeds on the assumption that aliens are bad people—are suspect people. It seizes upon any pretext to exclude them when they come. It would deport them for a mental purpose, for violation of a trivial municipal ordinance. It would do all this without a fair hearing. It closes the door to refugees from Europe even further than that door is now closed. For all these things, I say, S. 2550 deserves to be rejected. Certainly if it is not rejected, we owe it to ourselves to guarantee the legal rights granted by the Administrative Procedure Act, and to adopt the amendment recommended by the American Bar Association Committee.

But S. 2550 works mischief in still another area. I am referring to the threats in S. 2550 to the rights of American citizens—American citizens at home and abroad, American citizens by birth and by naturalization, American citizens in their early life as children, and American citizens fully mature and grown.

The consequences of this bill upon the rights of citizens are so grave as to provide a separate, wholly sufficient ground in itself for the out-of-hand rejection of the McCarran bill.

Those of my colleagues who have not studied the bill carefully—and since it has 302 pages I can understand why—may not realize that it has four titles. The first consists of the definitions which are often the heart of the provisions in the rest of the act, and as well certain matters of general application. The second title is "Immigration," and it contains most of the sections you have heard so justly criticized. The third title is "Nationality and Naturalization." Only after you read the first 183 pages do you come to this third title. It has three separate chapters. The first is "Nationality at Birth." The second is "Nationality through Naturalization," and the third is "Loss of Nationality."

Senators may have heard mention of these chapters and the sections in them in connection with denaturalization proceedings or in connection with new conditions imposed on the naturalization of American citizens, and I shall refer to those before I am through. But let me point out that this third title, "Nationality and Naturalization," covers much more than naturalization proceedings and denaturalization proceedings. Chapter 1, "Nationality at Birth," will be the law governing the citizenship of all children born in the future. If it is enacted, it will determine whether the unborn children of our neighbors and friends and constituents are American citizens or not. It will determine which children born in the United States and its possessions are citizens and which are nationals. It will determine which children born outside the United States of citizen parents or of alien parents are to be citizens of the United States, when they must return here, and how and when they may lose their citizenship.

Chapter 2, Nationality Through Naturalization, will govern not only naturalization of adult aliens but also the conditions upon which the children of the foreign born will become citizens and also the conditions upon which they shall lose their citizenship.

Because of the significance of these rights and powers which the bill seeks to repose in mere men who are administrative officials, I again stress the importance of seeing to it that we guarantee that the procedures of the Administrative Procedure Act are carefully followed in the administration of this proposed act.

Chapter 3, as I have said, is entitled "Loss of Nationality." I wish to stress that this chapter covers the loss of nationality by both native-born and naturalized citizens. Again, I say to you, this will affect all of us—all of us and our children and our grandchildren and the families of every citizen of the United States, wherever born and wherever located.

I need not tell Members of this body the significance of a loss of citizenship. There is no more precious right of a human being than that of citizenship. And we can proudly say that the right of citizenship in the United States is more eagerly sought after than citizenship in any other country in the world. We who have this right would not give it up for any promise that could be made—for any benefit or for any amount of money—for anything at all. It goes

without saying that if we lose our citizenship, we may lose our job, our fortune, our economic and material advantages. We would lose much, much more. Without that right of citizenship in this country we would lose our homeland. We would lose all that makes our life worth living.

With all sincerity I want to tell you that this bill will cause American citizens to lose their citizenship unknowingly and involuntarily. It will cause them to lose their citizenship where they do not deserve to lose it. So, and I repeat, this bill will affect not only aliens in this country, but it will affect every single one of the citizens of the United States.

Let me tell you how this will happen. Perhaps the most direct injury to citizens in this bill is the opportunity it gives administrative officers to take away the rights of a citizen without proper court review. In some cases, the citizen's right to a court review is limited. In some cases his right to court review is entirely destroyed.

Let us take the case of the native-born citizen living in his home State. It may be any State—my State of Oregon, or the home State of the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee. Let us call this citizen "Johnson," a name borne by two distinguished Senators and by thousands of other fine Americans. Johnson may not realize it, but his citizenship is constantly being passed on by one of the many agencies in the Federal Government. He cannot hold a job for the Federal Government; he cannot enlist in the armed services; he cannot get a grant of public lands; he cannot get a passport unless some Government agency rules that he is a citizen. At almost every step in his life some Government officer or another—high or low, important or unimportant, intelligent or unintelligent—has the right to decide that Johnson is not a citizen and to deny his application for a pension, for a job, for a passport. That Government officer may often act without a hearing and only on the evidence that he thinks is sufficient. He may write Johnson a letter saying, "I deny your application because you are not a citizen," or he may tell him face to face, over his desk.

Now what can Johnson do about this? Under the law today he has the unconditional right to sue that Agency in the Federal courts. He can sue the head of that Department either in the district of his residence or in the District of Columbia. He can ask the court for a declaratory judgment that he is a citizen of the United States. That right gives him what I believe is his unqualified right under the Constitution—his right to a hearing before a judge before anyone can take away his rights as a citizen.

Now what does the McCarran bill do to Johnson when some Government officer denies him his citizenship rights? Let me turn to section 360 (a) of this bill, which appears on page 282 of this 302-page bill. This section changes the law so that if he does not bring the suit within 5 years, he may not bring it at all. That Government officer's decision that Johnson is not a citizen will often come in the most informal manner. Johnson's application will be denied in a conversation or in a letter or perhaps even in a mimeographed form letter. Johnson may realize the significance of the administrative decision and bring suit immediately. If he does, he will get a hearing from a judge learned in the law and completely impartial.

Johnson may, however, not realize that the decision is so vitally important to him. He may be an ignorant man. He may be an uneducated man. He may be a man who does not recognize the significance and importance of any letter or statement which he may receive from a Government official.

He may be only 16 years old—or 18—or 19. He may not know of the 5-year limitation. He may believe, as you and I would believe, that if one is a citizen, then nothing that an administrative officer can do—nothing that anybody can do—can take his rights away. He may find it unthinkable, inconceivable, that there is any restriction on his right to appeal to the courts for protection. Under the McCarran bill, he would be wrong, tragically wrong. Under the McCarran bill, if Johnson for any reason whatsoever does not sue within 5 years, he loses forever his right to sue. The result will be that for practical purposes his citizenship is gone. He was born in the United States. He is a citizen. But some petty Government officer has written a letter and if Johnson does not sue within 5 years that letter is a final, binding decision. No appeal to the court would be permitted if the bill should be enacted into law and finally sustained by the Supreme Court on constitutional grounds. Let me say that on that question I reserve judgment.

What in the world is the justification for this provision? It cuts off the judicial review of administrative decisions—contrary to the basic principles of our law. It deprives an American citizen of his right to go into the courts. Do not think that I am the first to point this out. It was strongly criticized before the Judiciary Committee by the American Bar Association. Let me read the testimony of the representative of the American Bar Association:

> Finally, we are deeply concerned with the provisions of S. 716 and in particular sections 106 and 360 which seriously limit judicial review. It is our opinion that these sections give unbridled authority to administrative officers to act arbitrarily. The sense of these proposals is to oust the courts of review over factual and discretionary decisions of the immigration authorities and to grant them blank checks to do as they will. The administration of our immigration and naturalization laws will thus become an administration of men rather than of laws. There is no compelling reason for these proposals. The checks and balances exercised by the judiciary insure greater impartiality in our administrative officials. Court review is not generally denied under these circumstances to those whose property rights are affected, and we should expect no less for personal rights of life and liberty (hearings, pp. 527, 537).

The American Bar Association has since, again, criticized this section 360 in a letter which is printed in the RECORD for April 25 on page 4441.

Why should we cut off the review by a court of the denial of an American citizen's rights? Why should we allow an administrative officer to have final power over such a question? Why should we not heed the repeated criticisms of the American Bar Association? I call on the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee to answer these questions—to answer the criticisms of the American Bar Association.

The report of the Judiciary Committee on S. 2550 discusses this section 360 on the next to the last page, page 50 of the committee report. Three whole paragraphs, half the printed page, are devoted to section 360. Yet no mention whatsoever is made of this limitation on the right of a native-born citizen living peacefully at home. The many experts who work for the Senate Judiciary Committee found time to write a 51-page report on this bill. They found time to give three long paragraphs to this one section. In all those explanations they did not even once mention this limitation on the right of the native-born citizen to get a hearing in court. They had plenty of notice that it was a change in the law. The American Bar Association, the Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers, and the Nationality Council on Naturalization and Citizenship, all opposed this new section 360. The minority report—signed by Senators KEFAUVER, MAGNUSON, KILGORE, and LANGER—consists of only 11 pages. But the minority members of the committee found time to mention this change of the law to deny rights to American citizens. In the section of the minority report on "Freedom from Administrative Abuse," on page 7, they said:

> Among the primary safeguards of our American way of life is the doctrine of official responsibility, the principle that Government officials are servants and not masters, and that it is more important for the people to scrutinize the conduct of officials than it is for officials to scrutinize the lives of the people. From this it follows that some form of judicial protection shall always be open to the victims of injustice, even if the injustice is committed by persons in powerful positions.

The minority report went on to point out the many instances in which the McCarran bill made administrative abuse possible and in which the McCarran bill emasculated judicial review. Among these, they said, were section 360 and its clause cutting down the time in which the citizen can get court review.

With all this criticism of this clause, the report of the Committee on the Judiciary fails entirely even to mention the change, much less to justify it. Again I call upon the chairman of that committee to explain why any explanation is omitted from the committee report and why his committee proposes, contrary to all these criticisms, that we give administrative officers the power to deny a native-born citizen his rights as a citizen and limit a court review of such an administrative decision.

The right of that citizen named Johnson is cut down even further in some cases. It is limited as to time if the decision is made by some officer in the State Department or in the Army or

in the Interior Department, in fact any officer of the United States except the Attorney General. The Attorney General gets very special treatment. If the Attorney General challenges Johnson's citizenship in a proceeding under the McCarran bill, then Johnson is simply denied his entire right to bring a suit for a declaratory judgment. He is not allowed to bring it within a certain time or on certain conditions. He may not sue at all. He must wait upon the Attorney General, go to jail as an alien under order of deportation, and then bring habeas corpus. So the Attorney General by signing a piece of paper can deprive Johnson of the right that every other citizen has—the right to sue without first going to jail. He can deprive him of the right that you and I and every other citizen of the United States now has under the law.

I believe deeply that this is an unreasonable, unwarranted, and unconstitutional discrimination among citizens. Those whom the Attorney General allows can bring a suit. Those he does not allow cannot sue, but must first go to jail.

This can happen to any citizen of the United States—a citizen living at home, who never ventures out of the country. The citizen who goes out of the country, by this same section 360, is much worse off. He will lose the right to sue entirely, within 5 years or at any other time. Let me tell you of the unfortunate plight of Johnson if he goes abroad on business or with his wife as a tourist.

The citizen abroad whose citizenship is challenged is stranded. If he loses his passport or if he was born abroad of citizen parents and never had a passport, you would say that the American consul will issue a passport to him. But when that consul refuses and says, "I will not recognize you as a citizen because I am not convinced by your proof," what happens then?

Under the law today that citizen may hire a lawyer and bring a suit for a declaratory judgment, in the district court in this city, or in the district of his residence. And he can get a certificate from the consul to allow him to come back to the United States and to confer with his lawyers in order to prosecute that suit. All he has to do is to show that his suit is pending in court, and that it is brought in good faith and on a substantial basis. He will be deported, of course, if the judge decides he is not a citizen and the law today provides safeguards to insure that he will be deported if his claim is denied by the judge.

Now what happens if we enact the McCarran bill? The McCarran bill deprives him of the right to bring a suit and of the right to return to prosecute such a suit. If that citizen can prove to the satisfaction of the consul and the Secretary of State, that his claim is substantial, he can get a certificate to return, but not to return to prosecute a suit. He can return here only as an alien might come. He must sit in detention on Ellis Island while the Attorney General passes on his claim to citizenship and then if the Attorney General denies his claim, he can bring habeas corpus. All this while he sits in jail. All this while others, in the United States, who claim to be citizens can bring a suit for a declaratory judgment and confer with their lawyers outside of jail.

There is even a further denial of rights. This entire procedure, miserable as it is, is open only to the person abroad who has at one time been physically present in the United States. There are children born abroad who are native-born citizens because their parents were citizens. They have never been in the United States. If the consul refuses to give them a passport they are barred completely. They cannot bring a suit for a declaratory judgment. They cannot even get a certificate to come to Ellis Island and plead their case in habeas corpus, while they sit in jail. I cannot tell you what remedy is left to this child. I call upon the chairman of the Judiciary Committee to tell you what that child can do.

Allow me to turn to another new provision in the McCarran Act which threatens the rights of American citizens. I believe it is the right of an American citizen to pass his citizenship on to his children and that a child of an American father has a right to be a citizen of the United States, wherever he is born.

Under the law when an American citizen abroad marries a girl of the citizenship of the foreign country, his children are American citizens. There is a requirement that the children must return here for a period of 5 years' residence between the ages of 13 and 21, but that requirement is not made if the American father is living abroad while employed by the Government or by a bona fide American organization. It may be necessary for children generally to return during their formative years so that they become indoctrinated with American principles. The law recognizes, however, that where the child is living in an American family where the head of the family is doing American business abroad, that child will learn the American way of life in his father's house. The McCarran bill in section 301 (b) ends this exception for children living with American families abroad. Those children must return to the United States before they are 23 and then they must stay here continuously for 5 years, sometime between the ages of 14 and 28. Even a 3-week visit to see their parents abroad will break the continuity of their stay and cause them to lose their citizenship. No exceptions are made. The parents must either return with the child, for 5 years' continuous residence, or send the child to live here for the 5 years. Otherwise, the child will lose his citizenship.

The Humphrey-Lehman bill, in its section 301 (b), makes an exception for the case of a child living abroad with a parent who is a Government employee or an officer in the Armed Forces. That family will not have to be broken up in order to preserve the citizenship of their children. I would like to see the exception broadened to include children living with their parents who are representatives of American firms and organizations. We all know that the citizen who goes abroad for an American bank or an importing firm or a religious or charitable organization, will teach his children American ways. But whether the exception in the Humphrey-Lehman bill is broadened or not, the McCarran bill changes the law and cuts off all exceptions for these American families. Those families will have to be disrupted or the child's citizenship will be lost. Those families that cannot afford to return for 5 years or cannot afford to send the child here for 5 years will suffer a loss of citizenship. This change in the law will hurt American businessmen and representatives of charitable and religious organizations. It will end the right of such American fathers to pass their citizenship on to their children, and it will end the right of a child of an American father to be an American citizen.

A third provision in the McCarran Act will cause American citizens to lose their citizenship merely because they take a job with a foreign government. Countless Americans have taken such jobs. They are advisers in fields ranging from sanitation to finance to oil well drilling. They work as teachers and doctors and agricultural specialists.

Under the law today such an American does not lose his American citizenship when he takes such a job with a foreign government. He does lose his citizenship if he takes an oath of allegiance to that foreign government and he should lose his citizenship if he does that. But the McCarran bill goes further. In section 349 (a) (4) (B) of the McCarran bill it is provided that he will lose his citizenship when he takes that job with the foreign government, whether or not he takes an oath of allegiance, so long as an oath is required for the job. The Humphrey-Lehman bill has the same provision, but an amendment is shortly to be proposed continuing the present law and providing that the citizen is expatriated only if he takes the oath.

The McCarran bill in effect creates a conclusive, unrebuttable presumption that if an oath is required, it was taken. This conclusive presumption was severely criticized by the National Council on Naturalization and Citizenship and the Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers. It will have these effects. Either it will expatriate those Americans who take such jobs or, and I think this will be more likely, the net result of the McCarran bill will be that Americans will not take these jobs. No job for a foreign government is attractive if a loss of citizenship goes with it.

The citizen and the foreign government will not be the only sufferers. Perhaps the greatest sufferer will be the Government of the United States. When an American goes off to work for the Governments of Afghanistan or of Bolivia or of Egypt, as a sanitary engineer or a doctor of tropical medicine or as a teacher of agriculture, both he and that foreign government benefit. But the greatest benefit comes directly to this Government in the form of improved relations with that government. That one American doctor or engineer or teacher can do more to promote good will toward the United States than 10 ambassadors and 100 consuls. When we make it impossible for him to go on such

a mission of good will, we spite ourselves, and only ourselves. We say to friendly governments all over the world that we do not wish them to have the benefit of American ingenuity and training. We say to them that we do not trust our doctors and engineers to take jobs with those countries. We say to them that we are afraid that when they take such jobs, they will become bad people, disloyal to the United States and that we will expatriate them. Those foreign countries ask us almost daily for help in locating technicians. When they find the technician and he refuses the job because in the future it may be held that an oath was required and expatriation took place, the foreign country will not forget our McCarran bill and what it does to them.

Still another clause in section 349 of the McCarran bill causes an unnecessary and unreasonable loss of citizenship. Section 349 (a) (5) provides that it is an act of expatriation to vote in a political election in a foreign state. No qualifications, no exceptions. The bill ignores the fact that many dual nationals find themselves abroad in the country of their other nationality and they casually vote in the local, minor elections. The McCarran bill continues the present law which expatriates them no matter how unimportant the election. There is no need to do this. The consequence of expatriation is much too important to inflict on a man for this alone. It would be enough to provide that expatriation shall occur only if the dual national votes in a national election. There should also be an exception for voting in elections under the auspices of the United States, for example in conquered territory. Both these qualifications are to be found in the Humphrey-Lehman bill.

Next, I have in the McCarran bill an instance of loss of citizenship by a naturalized citizen. We know that he loses his citizenship if he lives for 2 or 3 years in the country of his former nationality—the country of his birth. There are many who disapprove of this provision of law, but I shall pass over it. Much less well known is the provision of the law which causes the naturalized citizen to lose his American citizenship if he lives in some other, entirely different foreign country for 5 years. There are certain exceptions for Government employees and for representatives of American organizations, and similar people, but they do not cover the case of the native of France or Bulgaria or Finland who becomes a citizen of the United States and then goes to some other country, such as Argentina, to work and live for more than 5 years. In section 352 (a) (2), the McCarran bill continues the provision of law expatriating such a man. The Humphrey-Lehman bill does not. Under the McCarran bill the native-born citizen can go to Argentina for 5 years; the naturalized citizen cannot. The evils of this kind of provision are plain. First, it makes the naturalized citizen conscious of his inferior status. We would thus be discriminating between the native-born citizen and the naturalized citizen. Second, when we expatriate this naturalized citizen we lose the benefit he confers upon us by acting as our representative abroad. Several organizations, among them the Department of State, have pointed this out. Let me read to you the testimony on this provision given before the Senate Judiciary Committee by Mrs. Ruth B. Shipley, Chief of the Passport Division of the Department of State:

> One is the loss of nationality by naturalized citizens in a third country. We would like to see that section omitted entirely from the bill, and we feel it would be to the interests of the United States to maintain the friendship of all of these people scattered all over the world who are not in the country of their origin, who hold themselves out as Americans. Many of them grew up in this country, and came here when they were very young, and they were trained here and they are known as Americans, and skilled in various things; but they are not residing in a third country for any of the reasons mentioned in the bill (hearings, p. 247).

These are some of the clauses in the McCarran bill that will invade the rights of American citizens and will expatriate them on trivial grounds.

I should like to turn briefly to the provisions of the McCarran bill which limit the process of naturalization—the method by which the foreign-born can become citizens—the method by which they become full-fledged members of the community. There is a requirement, unless the Attorney General specifically directs to the contrary, that in every case the applicant for naturalization shall be the subject of a neighborhood investigation—section 335 (a). This will only delay naturalization and waste the time of Government investigators. There is the rigid definition of good moral character which will limit the discretion of the judge in disposing of each case on its own merits—section 101 (f). Both of these would be changes in the law. There is the provision that only children under 16 become citizens when their parents are naturalized, as compared with present law, which allows children up to the age of 18 to become naturalized by their parents' naturalization—section 320 (a) (1) and section 321 (a) (4). Another section, again new in the law, will forever reject as possible citizens all conscientious objectors, though they are willing to take an oath to perform noncombatant service or to perform civilian work—section 337.

Mr. President, I think my position in regard to conscientious objectors is fairly well known. I have never been able to understand their philosophy and their point of view. Nevertheless, I have no doubt at all that some of our Quakers and some of our immigrants of Quaker faith have proved to be among our finest citizens. I do not think there should be any blanket disapproval of persons with characters so fine and principles so high as those of the Quakers.

The McCarran bill also contains a clause, first enacted in 1950, requiring that the alien be able to write in English before he can become a citizen—section 312. It is almost impossible for a middleaged man who can hardly write in his own language, to learn to write English. Under the provisions of this bill, that man must remain an alien forever. Another section, criticized by the minority views, will deny citizenship to an alien for 10 years after he joined or gave a small contribution to "the direct predecessor or successor" of any Communist organization—section 313 (a) (2) (F). He will be barred for these 10 years even though the predecessor organization he joined was anti-Communist and he resigned when it was captured by the Communists.

All of these provisions are unreasonable and unnecessary. They can only create resentment among the people at whom they are aimed. When we force a man to remain an alien because he cannot write English, or because of his religious beliefs, or because he joined an organization which later became subversive, we are denying ourselves the strength and support of these people. These are the effects of the McCarran bill in regard to who can become a citizen.

Let me state also the effects of the bill on those who have become citizens—the effects of the bill on the law of denaturalization. Fundamental changes are made, and I believe they are unmitigatedly dangerous to the welfare and security of all naturalized citizens.

At page 45, the committee report admits that section 340 (a) proposes a major change in the law of denaturalization. Denaturalization need no longer be limited to cases of "fraud and illegal procurement." Henceforth, under the McCarran bill, it will be enough to show procurement of naturalization by "concealment of a material fact" or by "willful misrepresentation." The reason for this change is candidly stated in Senate Report 1515, Eighty-first Congress, to which the present committee report refers. At page 769 of that report, the reason given is that concealment of a material fact is "more easily proven" than fraud.

This is hardly a legitimate reason to change the law so as to threaten the citizenship of all those naturalized in the future. Almost any fact—as to age, as to a street address years ago, as to conduct and activities over many years in the past—is material under the McCarran bill. Under the new section, naturalized citizens will throughout their lives remain subject to denaturalization. We cannot make good citizens out of people who live in jeopardy of losing their citizenship because of some unwitting or technical act.

Still other changes in the law are proposed by the McCarran bill.

Some naturalized citizens will be denaturalized without a hearing and by administrative action. In cases where the alien's record of lawful admission is based on an adjustment of status, for instance, a change from the status of nonimmigrant to the status of quota immigrant, the Attorney General will be able within 5 years thereafter to revoke the adjustment if he finds to his satisfaction the alien was ineligible—section 246. No hearing will be necessary; there will be no right to be heard, there are no standards for the Attorney General's decision. The McCarran bill allows the Attorney General to revoke the status if he is satisfied that the alien was ineligible. If that alien has in the meantime been naturalized he will be subject

to denaturalization as a person who concealed a material fact, though the original error for which his adjustment was revoked was an error of law by the Attorney General himself. The Humphrey-Lehman bill requires a hearing before the Attorney General can undo the status on which the naturalization was grounded.

The McCarran bill also affects the proceedings in court for denaturalization. Those aliens who become the subject of denaturalization proceedings will not be entitled to due process. Once the denaturalization proceedings begin, the present law and the McCarran bill—section 340 (b)—provide that if he is absent from the district, service of the legal papers may be made on him by advertising, even though his actual address is known. Many naturalized citizens are abroad at the time of the denaturalization proceedings, and I submit that service by publication is a denial of due process. In the case of *Mullane* v. *Central Hanover Bank and Trust Co.* (339 U. S. 304, 306), the Supreme Court held:

> An elementary and fundamental requirement of due process in any proceeding which is to be accorded finality is notice reasonably calculated, under all the circumstances, to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections.

When the alien is abroad and his address is known, service by publication is not reasonably calculated to give him notice under the circumstances and I submit that this section is unconstitutional. The McCarran bill can be made constitutional, and the Humphrey-Lehman bill does this, simply by requiring that service by publication by advertisement is permitted only if personal service cannot be made. Is it too much to require that the Government send the man a letter, so that the Constitution be observed and he receive notice that his citizenship is being taken away?

I have tried to recount to you, Mr. President, the most striking among the unjust and arbitrary provisions of the McCarran bill with respect to the law of citizenship, naturalization, and denaturalization. Let me remind you also that in this omnibus bill there are provisions for search and seizure without a warrant and there are provisions creating and defining crimes. All of us—whether citizen or alien—would be subject to these provisions.

For instance, section 287 (a) of the McCarran bill, for the first time in the law, would allow any immigration officer to interrogate any person whom he believes to be an alien, as to his right to remain in the United States. Existing law and the Humphrey-Lehman bill limit to aliens this right of interrogation without warrant.

Organization after organization protested this provision to the Senate Judiciary Committee. The National Catholic Welfare Conference said:

> This control, carried to excess, might well develop in our alien population a fear somewhat similar to that associated with the surprise visits of agents in totalitarian countries. It is a well-known fact that local agents of the Immigration Service sometimes become overzealous in carrying out regulations and instructions of their superior officers (hearings, p. 737).

The conference recommended that the section be changed so that it would be limited to aliens only and, as to aliens, only to those whom the officer has reason to believe have no right to be in the United States or have violated the immigration laws. The National Catholic Welfare Conference concluded by saying:

> Certainly no officers should be permitted to enter the abode of an alien without being equipped with a warrant (hearings, p. 737).

Another witness, appearing on behalf of 36 Jewish organizations, said as follows:

> Under this law any person suspected of being an alien may be visited at any hour of the day or night for questioning (hearings, p. 581).

Citizens have a constitutional right, under the fourth amendment, to be secure in their persons. It does not matter to me or to any other citizen that some immigration officer believes that I am an alien. If I am a citizen, I am entitled under the Constitution not to be interrogated without a warrant. The principle that any person may be interrogated by a Government official at any time and at any place prevails only in police states and in this McCarran bill.

The same section, section 287 (a) (3), allows any immigration officer to search any car within a reasonable distance of the Canadian or Mexican borders on the Atlantic or Pacific Oceans. There is no requirement of probable cause for the search. This is the existing law, and I believe it to be plainly unconstitutional. Under such a law, every city on our seacoasts, every city on our land borders, every person in a car near the borders of this country, loses the protection of the fourth amendment. Under the Constitution there must be probable cause for any search without a warrant. The McCarran bill requires none. On the other hand, the Humphrey-Lehman bill requires that there be reasonable ground for believing that an alien is in the car and is attempting to enter the United States unlawfully.

Last of all, I should like to tell you, Mr. President, of the crimes which may be committed by any citizen unknowingly and innocently under this bill, and for which the citizen may be punished by a $2,000 fine and 5 years in jail. Public Law No. 283 of this Congress, which became law on March 20, 1952, provides that any person is guilty of a felony if he "willfully or knowingly" conceals, harbors or shields from detection an alien who is unlawfully in the United States.

Section 274 (b) (2) of the McCarran bill strikes from the law the words "willfully and knowingly." Under the McCarran bill, any person who "harbors" an alien who entered without a visa or who overstayed a temporary visit is guilty of a felony, and may be punished by a fine of $2,000 and imprisonment for 5 years, although he was entirely ignorant of the fact that the alien was here illegally. Mere employment and the furnishing of housing might be construed as harboring. The rancher and the farmer who house and feed their alien farmhands, even the housewife who gives lodging to her maid, all may be guilty of harboring. I need not remind this body—which so recently debated the wetback bill—of the significance of such a change in the law as the McCarran bill attempts to make.

I have spoken of many provisions of the McCarran bill—provisions limiting the rights of citizens, making it impossible for the alien to be naturalized, making it easy to denaturalize the alien who has succeeded in becoming naturalized, making it criminal to harbor an alien. Those provisions follow a consistent pattern. I believe they follow from the premise of the McCarran bill. I believe that the premise of the McCarran bill is a fanatical bias against aliens and a belief that no matter what the cost to our self-respect and to the loyalty of the foreign born, no matter what the Constitution provides, no matter how many innocent persons may be hurt—no matter all this—the aliens and the foreign born must be limited and restricted and feared and suspected of evil intentions toward the United States.

I affirm to the contrary. I believe that the foreign-born and the naturalized citizens and the native-born citizens who travel abroad are not objects of suspicion and are not evil. They must be treated with the warmth and openness and decency that they deserve. Some of them, of course, may become public enemies, just as some of our citizens are criminals and enemies of this Government, and we must fight them constantly. But even against them, we cannot use tactics forbidden by the Constitution. Even against Communists, we cannot use the totalitarian techniques of the Communist police state; and we must guard always against harming the innocent, in our zeal against the guilty. Otherwise, we surrender the very principles of democracy which distinguish us from the Communist state.

Let us be done with imaginary fears of foreigners and foreign places. Our immigrants and their children have made incalculable contributions to our country, and they can continue to make such contributions. We can be strong if we continue to rely upon them. We shall become weak if we hedge them about with restrictions based on distrust and hatred.

Mr. President, a great many provisions of the McCarran bill would, in my judgment, unduly expand the executive powers of the Federal Government.

The McCarran omnibus immigration bill would delegate to the Executive large new powers in the field of immigration, deportation, naturalization, and denaturalization, and would correspondingly remove congressional and judicial restraints upon executive power in four ways:

First. By delegating to the President law-making powers now vested in Congress;

Second. By substituting subjective standards—the opinion or satisfaction of some official—for objective standards

of fact in establishing the tests of exclusion or deportation, thus eliminating effective judicial review;

Third. By expanding the scope of Immigration and Naturalization Service investigations in naturalization and denaturalization cases; and

Fourth. By removing traditional checks upon various executive proceedings, such as notice, the requirement of actual hearing, judicial review, statutes of limitation, rules against retroactivity, and the traditional doctrine of equality of right as between naturalized and native-born citizens.

My amendment, which now is pending, has been offered in an endeavor to prevent, at least in part, such results.

I. PRESIDENTIAL POWER

Section 212 (e) of the McCarran omnibus immigration bill authorizes the President to set up new restrictions or absolute bars upon new immigration, in his plenary discretion, without any legislative or judicial guidance, establishing this power for peacetime, as extensively as such power has been established for wartime under earlier legislation. Among the organizations protesting this extension of Executive power are: Americans for Democratic Action; the Young Women's Christian Association; and the Common Council for American Unity.

II. SUBSTITUTION OF SUBJECTIVE STANDARDS FOR OBJECTIVE STANDARDS

Section 241 (a) (4) authorizes, for the first time, deportation for any criminal offense, including any misdemeanor, not involving moral turpitude "if the Attorney General in his discretion concludes that the alien is an undesirable resident of the United States." No further guidance is given to the Attorney General as to standards of desirability or undesirability for residents of the United States. This provision confers absolute and unfettered discretion upon the Attorney General, or any subordinate officer acting in his behalf, to deport any individual alien who may incur the displeasure of an administrative official if the individual has been convicted of any offense, no matter how trivial. The minority views on Senate bill 2550 comment as follows:

> No standard is invoked to control the personal predilections of the Attorney General. The absence of such limitations upon official decisions virtually eliminates judicial review of administrative abuse.

Section 241 (a) (8) shifts the ground for deportation of public charges from the objective test of whether a person actually is a public charge to the subjective test of whether he is a public charge, in the opinion of the Attorney General. Under existing law, the courts may review the question of whether a person is actually a public charge; and several courts have done so, and have set aside arbitrary rulings by the Attorney General or his subordinates. Under the new test, no court could do this; all it could inquire into would be whether the Attorney General honestly believed the person to be a public charge. If the court found that he had such an honest belief, it could not upset the Attorney General's action. This provision would shift the court's view from a question of economics to a question of judicial psychology.

Similarly, section 241 (c) shifts the test of the good faith of a marital agreement and its performance from objective grounds to subjective grounds, by introducing into the law the phrases, the satisfaction of the Attorney General and the opinion of the Attorney General.

Exclusion, as well as deportation, would be made to depend upon subjective grounds in many cases. For example, section 212 (a) (15), in place of the language of existing law which bars persons likely to become a public charge, prohibits the entry of aliens who, in the opinion of the consular officer at the time of application for a visa, or in the opinion of the Attorney General at the time of application for admission, are likely at any time to become public charges. This means that the naked prediction by a State Department official or a Justice Department official concerning the future economic status of any immigrant will be sufficient to bar that immigrant from admission. So long as such a prediction is not fraudulent, a court would have no way to upset the bar. This would, in effect, eliminate judicial review in exclusion cases, overruling the Supreme Court's decision in the case of *Gegiow* v. *Uhl* (239 U. S. 3).

III. EXPANDING THE SCOPE OF INVESTIGATIONS

Then, too Mr. President, the bill contains a provision which, in my judgment, would unduly expand the scope of investigations.

Under existing law, the proof of good character, which is a prerequisite to the grant of citizenship, is limited to the 5 years prior to filing the petition of naturalization. This limitation is expressly repealed by section 316 (e) of the McCarran omnibus bill. What this would mean in practice is that the entire life of every applicant for naturalization would be opened up to inquiry by the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice. Since evidence of the morality or immorality of a man's conduct becomes more difficult to secure the farther back one goes into his life's history, the practical effect of this change would be to vastly enlarge the task of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in naturalization cases, and by the same token, to make necessary a vast enlargement of the personnel of that Service, with consequent increases in salaries and appropriations.

IV. REMOVING TRADITIONAL CHECKS ON EXECUTIVE POLICE POWER

One of the most ancient of safeguards against administrative abuse is the requirement of actual notice to a party against whom an administrative penalty is to be imposed. This requirement of actual notice is eliminated by section 340 (b) in cases where a naturalized citizen is not found in the judicial district of his residence; and the most terrible of all penalties, namely, denaturalization, is authorized by this section on the basis of notice "by publication." Earlier in my remarks I have made some reference to this point. Likewise, the requirement of notice is eliminated where the Attorney General wants to cancel any "certificate of citizenship, certificate of naturalization, copy of a declaration of intention, or other certificates, documents, or record heretofore issued or made, if it shall appear to the Attorney General's satisfaction that such document or record was illegally or fraudulently obtained from, or was created through illegality or by fraud"—section 342.

Sections 242 (f) and 252 eliminate the requirements of hearings in various cases where hearings are required under existing law and even under the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950.

Judicial review of deportation proceedings is limited by section 242 (a) to issues triable in habeas corpus proceedings, and even in those proceedings the court is limited to giving relief only in cases where "the Attorney General is not proceeding with such reasonable dispatch as may be warranted." Judicial review is further limited by section 360, which applies to native-born as well as to naturalized citizens. Under this section, if any official of the Federal Government hands down a decision denying the citizenship of an American citizen, and if the citizen in question does not challenge the decision within 5 years, he cannot thereafter establish his citizenship in any court, even though he has lived all his life in the United States. The same section denies certain American citizens abroad the access to the Federal courts in this country which they have under existing law for the purpose of contesting an administrative denial of citizenship. The American Bar Association, the Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers, and the National Council on Naturalization and Citizenship have all vigorously protested against this subordination of the most precious right of American citizenship to the convenience of administrative officials.

Section 241 of Senate bill 2550 abolishes statutes of limitations in deportation cases, even where the grounds of deportation are minor or trivial. This has been the subject of special criticism by the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers, and many other organizations.

Section 241 (a) (7) and section 241 (d) make new grounds of deportation retroactive, so that aliens lawfully admitted to the United States and who scrupulously have obeyed every law and regulation applicable to them, may nevertheless be deported for acts which were lawful when they occurred.

Until now, the investigative activities of the Immigration and Naturalization Service have been limited to investigations into the lives of aliens. Only in the case of actual fraud in naturalization proceedings has the Immigration and Naturalization Service had authority to investigate the lives of naturalized citizens. Under section 340 (a) all naturalized citizens are made subject to denaturalization, even where no fraud or illegality can be shown in the naturalization proceedings. This section makes concealment of a material fact a sufficient basis for denaturalization, and thus opens up the entire life of every naturalized citizen to investigation for the

purpose of determining whether any material fact undisclosed at the naturalization proceedings might be sufficient, under the greatly expanded standards of exclusion or deportation which this bill would establish, to authorize a denial of naturalization and, therefore, a withdrawal of citizenship already conferred.

The total effect of the foregoing provisions is to subject several million American voters to the possibility that they, or members of their families, or employees or business associates, may be deprived of rights of citizenship and may be deported, after denaturalization, on grounds which would not be effectively reviewable by any court. This is a threat not only to those who may be denaturalized and deported, but also to the integrity of the democratic process itself, insofar as the caliber of those who serve the American public might be affected by the existence of a substantial bloc of voters whose political independence would be circumscribed by unreviewable executive powers of life and death.

Mr. President, in my discussion of my amendment I have covered a considerable number of topics within the McCarran omnibus bill, over and above those covered by the pending amendment. Yet a single thread runs all through this discussion—and does so clearly, I hope—namely, that all persons who come within the purview of the American system of justice should be guaranteed, as my amendment seeks to do, the protection of the guaranties which have been provided in the Administrative Procedure Act. I respectfully submit that the McCarran omnibus bill in its present form, for the reasons I have set forth in the course of my remarks, would do violence to the guaranties of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Therefore, Mr. President, I sincerely hope the amendment I have offered will be adopted as at least a partial remedy for what I consider to be serious defects in the McCarran bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The Senator from Oregon has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the particular evil of the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon lies in the fact that it upsets a principle of law which has been unchallenged by any nation within the memory of man.

The amendment would accomplish this by granting a right of review to "every person aggrieved by an adverse order in exclusion" proceedings.

The grant of a right of review implies that there is a basic, justiciable, underlying right to be litigated. But, Mr. President, no alien has ever had a right to enter the United States. No alien to any country has ever had a right to enter that country. No country on earth today gives non-nationals any legal, moral, or equitable right, any justiciable right at all, to cross its borders as immigrants. But this amendment would have the United States grant such a right, by necessary implication of the language of the amendment with respect to review of exclusion proceedings, to any and every person anywhere in the world who may at any time in the future desire to come to the United States as an immigrant.

From time immemorial, a sovereign nation has had the absolute right to admit or exclude aliens. If we take the step of waiving that right for this Nation, the next step is likely to be a demand that the adjudication of the alleged right of an alien to come to the United States be vested in an international tribunal set up by the United Nations.

This amendment has technical defects, Mr. President, which I shall not take up the time of the Senate to mention, since I feel sure the amendment will be defeated. For instance, the amendment provides that special inquiry officers shall "have the powers and duties and limitations prescribed by sections 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act." But not all these sections deal with powers and duties of hearing officers, nor with limitations upon such officers. We need not go into that. To adopt this amendment would be to overturn, to the detriment of the United States, one of the basic principles of international law and national sovereignty. I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my reply to the argument of the Senator from Nevada will be very brief. I respectfully submit that the argument of the Senator from Nevada is based upon the false assumption that Mr. Johnson, in the hypothetical case I have used throughout my argument was an alien, a question of fact to be determined. If in fact he happened to be an American citizen, then I say it would be most unfair to deny to him the legal safeguards which I seek to guarantee to him under my amendment, and which I thought we were guaranteeing when we passed the Administrative Procedure Act.

To the contrary, Mr. President, if we passed the McCarran bill, we should be assuming in the first instance the very question of fact to be proved, and we would deny to him the right to a review of the decision of the administrative officer by a court. Indeed, we would make the administrative determination of that officer final as to Mr. Johnson, who, as might be shown in a hearing before a court, in fact was an American citizen.

I certainly cannot go along with my good friend from Nevada in assuming that the individual in question is an alien, when the issue we are trying to determine in a specific case is the question of fact as to whether he is an alien or a citizen. If in fact he is a citizen, he certainly ought to be guaranteed the kind of procedural right which I am trying to protect, and which I thought we were trying to observe when we adopted the Administrative Procedure Act, at which time the majority in the Senate took the position that an administrative officer should not be allowed to be judge and prosecutor and jury, all in one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the Senator from Nevada, if I may, with regard to his construction of a provision which appears in the pending bill. Section 212 (a), found on page 49, provides:

> Except as otherwise provided in this act, the following classes of aliens shall be ineligible to receive visas and shall be excluded from admission into the United States—

A list of classifications follows, in which the following appears on page 54 of the bill:

> (19) Any alien who seeks to procure, or has sought to procure, or has procured a visa or other documentation, or seeks to enter the United States, by fraud, or by willfully misrepresenting a material fact.

I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada whether he would consider from the legislative record that the words "willfully misrepresenting a material fact"——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from New Jersey will suspend for a moment, the Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that there is no amendment pending.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am seeking an interpretation. In the event the interpretation is not satisfactory, I propose to submit an amendment to cover the point I have in mind.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if I have any time, I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon has been disposed of.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey, if I have any time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No Senator now has any time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Since there is no amendment pending, I shall submit a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should be willing to submit an amendment, in order that we might discuss this subject.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Jersey be permitted to interrogate the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have read to the Senator from Nevada a provision, in connection with which I desire to raise a question of interpretation. My question arises from the fact that I have had called to my attention by some friends of mine in Princeton, N. J., where I live, the case of a Russian by the name of Rodion Michael Akulshin, who came into this country through fear of persecution. For fear of being repatriated, he misrepresented his name. He gave his name as Rodion Michael Beresov, and said he was born in Poland.

He has been in this country for some time, and has worked in California where

he did odd jobs and wrote for an anti-Communist newspaper in San Francisco. He is a man who is very much opposed to the whole Russian situation. He voluntarily admitted that his birthplace was Russia, and that his name was Akulshin instead of Beresov. He was immediately arrested in San Francisco on a charge of having entered the United States fraudulently. He appealed, lost the appeal, and was released on $500 bond with orders to leave the country. I immediately introduced a private bill, which will presently be before the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Nevada is chairman. The bill was introduced for the purpose of dealing with this matter as a special case, and of setting forth the actual facts.

I am now advised that, even if this language could be construed to cover a case like this, yet under the circumstances of the case the man should not be deported, despite the words "wilfully misrepresenting a material fact," because he fled from persecution and wanted to avoid repatriation.

I ask the Senator if he can give me a ruling on that question for the RECORD, so that we can know just what the situation will be under the proposed new law as the Senator has presented it.

Mr. McCARRAN. The word "willfully" implies freedom to act under free will. Where duress is used in any form, free will does not operate. The man to whom the Senator has referred was evidently afraid for his life, afraid that if he were repatriated and he assumed his correct name he would lose his life, and therefore he was acting under duress. Therefore he is free from the restrictions to which the Senator has referred. But I want the Senator to understand that we do not want to open the gates for fraud in any way.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with that, of course.

Mr. McCARRAN. But the case cited by the Senator from New Jersey seems to me to be entirely free from fraud, because when a man holds a gun to another person's head and says something to him, under that kind of duress that person is not acting with a free will.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. This specific case will come to the Senator's committee and the committee will deal with it. There are other cases of a similar nature, and I assume the legislative history will be that willful misrepresentation will not apply in the kind of a case which I have cited.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is the interpretation I believe would apply under the bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, an article from the Newark (N. J.) Sunday News dated May 18, 1952.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOULD AID ANTI-RED DP's—SMITH ASKS CONGRESS TO HELP THOSE WHO FALSIFIED NAMES TO AVOID FORCED RETURN TO RUSSIA

WASHINGTON.—Senator SMITH, Republican, of New Jersey, wants Congress to do something to relieve many anti-Communist refugees from the Soviet Union in this country who are suffering from what's called "Beresov's disease."

SMITH has already initiated a cure in one case called to his attention by Gregory P. Tschebotarioff of 21 Wescott Road, Princeton. This he did through introduction of a private bill to take care of Rodion Michael Akulshin who preferred to take his chances on entering the United States under a false name rather than be forcibly repatriated to his native Russia.

There are thousands of refugees here under similar circumstances, SMITH said, and only Congress can ease their ailment. "Legalization of the entries of DP's whose only 'crimes' were to falsify their backgrounds in an effort to save their lives should be accomplished not only in fairness to them but to protect the moral prestige of the United States," the Senator said.

SAME AS KOREAN PROBLEM

It is the same problem of forcible repatriation that has stalled the Korean truce talks at Panmunjom. Today, the United States has set its face against it, but back in 1943 at the Yalta Conference, the United States and Great Britain agreed to repatriate by force, if necessary, DP's born in what is now the Soviet Union. This policy was carried out with decreasing strictness until 1946 and, in a few cases, 1947, despite numerous suicides by DP's for whom return to the Soviet Union would have meant regimentation, imprisonment or death.

To escape such fates, many anti-Communist DP's, born in the U. S. S. R., concealed their identities by using false names or indicating they were born in areas near Russia such as Poland or the Baltic states. Many of them came to the United States. Such a man is Akulshin, an anti-Communist writer. He entered the United States under the alias of Rodion Michael Beresov and said he was born in Poland.

Akulshin went to San Francisco where he has been doing odd jobs and writing for a conservative Russian language newspaper. One day he voluntarily admitted that his birthplace was Russia. Soon after, he was arrested in San Francisco on charges of entering the United States fraudulently. He appealed, lost, and was released on $500 bail with orders to leave the country.

Meanwhile, Tschebotarioff had become interested in Akulshin's case. Two years ago, Akulshin appealed in the New York anti-Soviet Russian language paper, Novoye Russkoye Slovo, for an advance of $300 to enable him to publish a booklet of nonpolitical Russian folk ballads which he had collected in various Russian villages but which he had been unable to publish there because they did not fit the party line.

Tschebotarioff read the appeal and sent Akulshin a check. A few months later he received several copies of the booklet and liked the ballads so much he gave a copy to the Princeton University library.

Learning of Akulshin's arrest in a Russian language paper, Tschebotarioff wrote SMITH. The Senator investigated the case. At the time, the House had passed the Walter bill which provides for legalizing the entries into the United States of people like Akulshin. In the Senate, however, new immigration legislation appeared unlikely to pass before the deadline of Akulshin's departure.

Because of this, SMITH introduced his "private bill" to legalize Akulshin's entry. Akulshin's case, meanwhile, had become so celebrated in the Russian-American press that those newspapers used his alias in coining the phrase "Berezovskaya Bolyezn" or "Beresov's disease" to describe the predicament in which many such DP's find themselves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the Senator from Minnesota any other amendment to offer?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there are a number of amendments on the desk, but it is not my intention to call up any further amendments. I think it is perfectly obvious that they will not be agreed to unless we have the concurrence of the Judiciary Committee, and there seems to be a difference of opinion.

We have tried to argue the question of immigration legislation with vigor, with knowledge of the facts, and with intelligence.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who is at present presiding, knows that it is our hope that the bill will be given the most careful scrutiny after the debate to see what has been done. It is our further hope that the bill will not become law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a number of telegrams, letters, and resolutions inserted in the body of the RECORD, including a letter from the American Psychological Association, Inc., to which is attached a news release which makes clear the effect of the McCarran bill on the free interchange of scientific information.

There is one telegram which I should like to read, because it comes from a long time friend who has been an adviser to me since I have been a Member of the Senate. It is from a great spiritual leader, one who has dedicated a lifetime to service in behalf of underprivileged persons, especially in rural areas. It comes from Monsignor Ligutti, formerly of Des Moines, Iowa, a leading cleric in the Catholic world. Here is what he has to say:

Continue your fight in order to make our immigration laws more truly American, more democratic, more Christian.

That telegram reached me 3 or 4 days ago, Mr. President, and it has been a source of inspiration to me. I have told the distinguished churchman that I would do my level best to make the bill a better immigration bill and to fight for a more sound immigration policy.

I also wish to point out, since there has been considerable discussion as to who is for what and how various organizations stand with reference to the bill, that I have a letter from the Bureau of Catholic Charities, Inc., dated May 17, 1952, reading, in part, as follows:

I wish to congratulate you on your courageous stand taken with regard to the restrictive McCarran immigration bill. As one who has assisted with the resettlement of almost 600 displaced persons, I feel qualified to say that they prove to be an excellent risk.

I ask unanimous consent that all these documents may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 18, 1952.*

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Continue your fight in order to make our immigration laws more truly American, more democratic, more Christian.

Monsignor LIGUTTI.

DENVER, COLO., *May 18, 1952.*

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge support of Humphrey-Lehman S. 2842. Opposed to McCarran bill S. 2550, which endangers reputation of this country. Allows for discrimination and places undue power in hands of subordinate immigration officials. Rather no legislation than passage of McCarran bill.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
UNITARIAN CHURCH.

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 20, 1952.*

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your extensive efforts to defeat McCarran-Walter bill. We are convinced that if people knew what these long bills contained, there would be tremendous expressions of public indignation to help you. Your efforts are the only hope of an informed public. Keep up the good work.

ARTHUR CUSHMAN MCGIFFERT,
Chairman, Chicago Division, American Civil Liberties Union.

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE
FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM,
UNITED STATES SECTION,
Washington, D. C., May 16, 1952.

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Some of our members have been listening to the debate the past 4 days on the McCarran bill (S. 2550), and observing the attempt of yourself and Senators LEHMAN, BENTON, MCMAHON, and others to get a hearing for the Humphrey-Lehman substitute bill.

We are heartily in accord with your bill and would like to go on record as one of the organizations supporting it. We have already sent out newsletters and special memos to our branches urging them to give priority to the defeat of the McCarran bill.

We trust you will win the battle for a full-length hearing on both S. 2550 and the Humphrey-Lehman substitute bill. If there is anything further our organization can do to help you, we would regard it as a privilege to be called upon.

Sincerely yours,
ANNALEE STEWART,
(Mrs. Alexander Stewart),
Legislative Secretary.

P. S.—If you are reading the names of more organizations supporting your bill and against the McCarran bill, please include ours.

A. S.

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE
FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM,
MINNESOTA BRANCH,
May 15, 1952.

To Senator EDWARD THYE, with copies to Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Senate Majority Leader ERNEST MCFARLAND, and Senator PAT MCCARRAN.

Re immigration bills pending in Senate.

The Minnesota Branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, meeting May 13, 1952, at the YWCA in Minneapolis, Minn., urges support of the Humphrey-Lehman immigration bill (S. 2842). We believe that immigration bills should be designed to admit immigrants, not restrict or discriminate against them. In meeting these requirements, the Humphrey-Lehman bill would (1) modernize the quota system by basing quotas on 1950 census; (2) provide more flexibility in the operation of the quota system by allowing for the "pooling" of unused quotas; (3) provide protection against administrative abuse; (4) establish a Visa Review Board to consider appeals from arbitrary consular decisions; (5) cancel the debts placed on quotas by the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

Among the determining factors in our support of the Humphrey-Lehman bill is the basic assumption that world recovery and friendship depends to a great extent on the free interchange of people as well as materials. Europe, for instance, is faced with the tense problem of too many people in too little space. Until problems of this nature are solved, we cannot expect any improvement in the attitudes of these countries toward the United States. The United States is much more fortunate in regard to population distribution and can more easily accommodate immigrants, including refugees or displaced persons.

It is precisely for the above reason that we denounce the McCarran immigration bill—because of its harmful effects to the friendship with other nations which is the basic foundation of strength. Similarly, we believe that the McCarran Internal Security Act should be repealed—a passport should not be denied solely on the basis of membership in an organization.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) ANNE P. GRAVES.

BUREAU OF CATHOLIC CHARITIES, INC.,
Duluth, Minn., May 17, 1952.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE AND DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I wish to congratulate you on your courageous stand taken with regard to the restrictive McCarran immigration bill. As one who has assisted with the resettlement of almost 600 displaced persons, I feel qualified to say that they prove to be an excellent risk. Miss Bessie Arnevich, executive secretary, Jewish Social Service Agency, Duluth, has also assisted with the resettlement of quite a number of displaced persons. She joins me in extending to you congratulations.

I could wish that for the sake of America's reputation in Europe and in the free countries of the world we could legislate the admission of the token 300,000 refugees requested by President Truman. That certainly would not cause us any economic indigestion. As people who have tasted the bitter fruit of communism, they would be a healthy shot in the arm for us Americans.

Very sincerely yours,
BUREAU OF CATHOLIC CHARITIES, INC.,
By (Rev.) WILLIAM D. LARKIN, *Director.*

LUN YEE ASSOCIATION,
New York, N. Y., May 8, 1952.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are writing to you with reference to the McCarran bill (S. 2550) which we understand will reach the floor of the Senate for final action within the next few days.

We urge you to speak and vote against this bill and to support the Humphrey-Lehman bill (S. 2842).

While the former bill on its face has some liberal features such as the removal of racial bars to the immigration of Asiatics, it continues the untenable theory that ancestry and not place of birth should decide the quota under which any person as much as 50 percent oriental in blood regardless of where he may have been born, shall be chargeable to the oriental country of his ancestry.

We, as persons who are loyal to the United States and believe in the American form of government, think that the United States Government will lose friends in Asia and make it easier for communism to push its way to the forefront in that continent, if the McCarran bill becomes the law.

The United States was built by immigrants who entered this country from various countries throughout the world. We are now a great Nation because of our very liberal, intelligent, and humane attitude toward aliens.

The proposed McCarran bill is, in our opinion, a step backward, reflecting a spirit of exclusion, restriction, and isolation, and is certainly inconsistent with the present theory of our Government as a world power, and our activities as one of the leading countries in the United Nations.

On the other hand, the Humphrey-Lehman bill is a step forward toward solidifying our friendship with the other nations of the world. It would definitely strengthen our foreign policy and would bring the United States to its rightful place in the forefront as a liberal and progressive country.

This organization has taken a poll of its members, and after a full consideration of the facts, we have come to the conclusion that the Humphrey-Lehman bill is much more desirable than the McCarran bill. We ask that you vote against the latter bill.

Would you be good enough, if you have the time, to write and inform us as to your reaction in this matter.

Respectfully yours,
LUN YEE ASSOCIATION,
By CHAN PAK, *President.*

NATIONAL CHINESE
SEAMEN'S UNION, INC.,
New York, N. Y., May 8, 1952.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At the request and at the direction of the members of our organization, I am writing to you with reference to the McCarran bill (S. 2550), which I understand will radically change the present immigration laws.

This organization consists of many men who are citizens of the United States, all of Chinese ancestry. We are vitally interested in the immigration problems relating to orientals, as well as to those of every race, color, or creed throughout the world.

We have studied the McCarran bill and compared it with the Humphrey-Lehman bill (S. 2842). It is our considered opinion that if the McCarran bill is passed, and if it becomes the law of the land, it would be a definite step backward in the progressive march of the United States as the great leader of all the nations in the world.

We must eliminate racial bars and discriminations. Although the McCarran bill makes some little effort in that direction, it continues the racial theory that ancestry and not place of birth, as far as it relates to persons of oriental blood, shall determine under which quota he is to be charged. Only orientals are so discriminated against. The bill is completely restrictive in nature and tends to unfairly exclude many persons from the United States and cause persons to be deported in violation of every fair tradition in the United States.

Please remember that some 7,000 persons of Chinese ancestry gave their lives to the allied cause while serving on allied merchant vessels during the past war.

We consider ourselves to be loyal, decent people, and object to being treated as an inferior race.

The Humphrey-Lehman bill, on the other hand, is a step forward in the march of progress toward the liberalization of our laws and toward democracy.

I earnestly ask that you vigorously oppose Senator MCCARRAN'S bill and that you lend every effort toward the passage of the Humphrey-Lehman bill. This organization

will be pleased to hear from you with reference to this matter and will make your views known at our next meeting.

Respectfully yours,

NATIONAL CHINESE SEAMEN'S UNION, INC.,

By HENRY T. CHAN, *Executive Secretary.*

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,

Washington, D. C., May 14, 1952.

DEAR SENATOR: The CIO is greatly concerned over the present move in Congress to force precipitate action on the so-called McCarran-Walter omnibus immigration bill. We are writing to urge you to call upon your colleagues to exercise moderation and wisdom in this matter, which has far-sweeping implications affecting the welfare and happiness of millions of citizens and future citizens as well as the foreign relations of the United States.

S. 2550 and its companion H. R. 5678 which has already been passed by the House after less than 3 days of extremely limited debate, under the pretense of codifying existing statutes would actually make drastic revisions in United States immigration, naturalization, and nationality laws. The McCarran bill proposes more than 100 such changes, nearly all of which have been described by competent immigration authorities as regressive and undermining fundamental democratic principles.

In these crucial times when the attitudes of this Nation toward persons of foreign birth take on new significance in view of their implications and effects in the cold war, the responsibility of Congress, and particularly of the Senate, to exercise caution and judgment in its action on immigration and naturalization matters is obvious.

Nevertheless, sponsors of the McCarran-Walter bill have attempted to rush this new legislation through Congress without adequate hearings or proper study of its effects and implications. For example, the CIO, which has a deep interest in immigration matters, has been denied an opportunity to express its views to the drafting committees of either House. Although we specifically requested time for this purpose from the joint committee a year ago, our organization was not permitted to be heard because of curtailed hearings.

We are informed, moreover, that the Senate Judiciary Committee reported the bill out without waiting for important comment from the Department of Justice on some of its proposed changes. It also took this action in full knowledge that another omnibus bill was being drafted after months of study by Senators HUMPHREY, LEHMAN and a number of other Senators and would be reported in the near future. Four members of the Senate Judiciary Committee itself have warned that S. 2550 contains unprecedented new restrictions running counter to our democratic traditions of justice and equity.

The CIO objects strongly to provisions of the McCarran-Walter bill which perpetuate racial discrimination, create many unreasonable and unnecessary new grounds for exclusion, deportation and loss of citizenship, and emasculate judicial review while authorizing arbitrary administrative practices.

These are, however, only a few of the many provisions of S. 2550 which we are anxious to have an opportunity to criticize in detail. Considering the widespread opposition to the McCarran-Walter bill which has been expressed by many organizations, including such authorities on this particular matter as the American Bar Association and the Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers, it seems obvious that this legislation should receive far more careful and informed consideration than it has yet been accorded.

At the same time, the Lehman-Humphrey Omnibus Immigration bill which has had no consideration with the Senate Judiciary Committee since it was introduced some time ago also deserves a hearing before precipitate action is taken. We strongly urge, therefore, that S. 2550 be referred back to the Senate Judiciary Committee for much needed adequate hearings on both it and the much more constructive substitute proposal.

Sincerely yours,

NATHAN E. COWAN,
Director, CIO Legislative Department.

THE FEDERATION OF CHURCHES OF ROCHESTER AND VICINITY, INC.,

Rochester, N. Y.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am grateful for your leadership and strategy on immigration. The McCarran bill would be disastrous. There is great support for what you seek to do—most of it at the moment latent but we can develop it.

Faithfully yours,

HUGH CHAMBERLIN BURR.

AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION, INC.,

Washington, D. C., May 20, 1952.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: In view of your opposition to the McCarran immigration bill I think you will be interested in the enclosed press release which illustrates the unfortunate effect of the internal security (McCarran) law on the free interchange of scientific information.

I should also like to call your attention to an editorial in this morning's Washington Post entitled "Visaphobia."

Sincerely yours,

FILLMORE H. SANFORD,
Executive Secretary.

FOREIGN PSYCHOLOGISTS TO MEET IN CANADA

Dr. J. McVicker Hunt, president of the American Psychological Association, announced today that the International Congress of Psychology will hold its 1954 meeting in Montreal, Canada. The American Psychological Association will join with the Canadian Psychological Association in being hosts to the 600 or more foreign scientists who will meet with Canadian and American psychologists.

The American Psychological Association had hoped to invite the Canadian group and the International Congress of Psychology to meet in New York City where the American psychologists have scheduled their own 1954 meeting. Because of the delays and embarrassments which foreign scientists experience in attempting to obtain even temporary admission to this country the association decided it could not issue the invitation.

Under the provisions of the internal security (McCarran) law any foreign person, scientist or otherwise, who wishes to enter this country must go through a long, intricate application. And practically no one who has ever had any connection with a group now regarded as subversive or totalitarian can get permission to enter the United States even for a brief visit.

Many American scientists, though in favor of reasonable and necessary security restrictions, strongly object to the law on the basis that it seriously interferes with the exchange of scientific facts and ideas.

Since Canadian procedures for granting visas appear to many scientists more flexible and realistic than those imposed by the McCarran law, the American Psychological Association has given up its hope for a New York meeting and has agreed to an earlier suggestion from the Canadian Psychological Association that Canadian and American psychologists jointly sponsor a Montreal meeting. About 2,000 Canadian, American, and foreign psychologists can be expected to attend the 1954 congress in Canada's foremost convention city.

A number of scientific societies and many prominent individual scientists in this country have urged changes in the internal security law, which they indicate has had the effect of limiting the free interchange of scientific information, so necessary to scientific progress, by refusing visas to many distinguished scientists from abroad, or by making their entry so difficult and complicated that many of them are deterred from visiting the United States.

The board of directors of the American Psychological Association has recently voted to express its concurrence with a resolution adopted in Philadelphia last December by the council of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. The AAAS resolution, while recognizing the need for security safeguards, expressed troubled concern over the manner in which such measures as the McCarran Act are being administered, prohibiting American scientists from going abroad and foreign scientists from coming here to exchange knowledge which does not affect security. The resolution urged changes in the law and in its administration which, while retaining the objectives of necessary security, would minimize injustices and provide for maintenance of free interchange of all knowledge that has no security implications.

Dr. Fillmore H. Sanford, executive secretary of the American Psychological Association, commenting on the decision to invite the foreign psychologists to meet in Canada, said:

"I hope many American psychologists will be glad to travel the few hundred extra miles to Montreal. There they may find facts and ideas that they can use in their effort to advance the science of human behavior.

"I think what scientists object to most in the McCarran law is the fact that it uses an ax in dealing with a problem that needs a razor-sharp approach. The law causes trouble to all foreign scientists who are invited to this country. In effect it prevents a visit from any scientist, however brilliant his ideas, who has ever had any connection for any reason with any group that now is suspicious. Foreign scientists regard this indiscriminate procedure as both ludicrous and dangerous. American scientists see it as a threat to the healthy growth of American science and as a legalized attack upon freedom of communication.

"American psychologists have learned a tremendous amount in the past from foreign psychologists. The first psychological laboratory was located in Germainy. The first test of intelligence was developed by a French psychologist. Many of our present statistical techniques were first used in England. One of our most challenging clinical theories came from Austria. One of our best clinical tests came from Switzerland.

"Our current visaphobia, unless we can control it, will cut us off from ideas from abroad. In time, psychological science existing behind our paper curtain can become as impotent as psychological science has apparently become behind the iron curtain."

BACKGROUND

The International Congress of Psychology meets every 3 years. The last meeting was in Stockholm, Sweden, July 16–21, 1951. Some 700 psychologists from 31 countries heard 161 scientific papers presented.

The invitation to the International Congress has been accepted by the Executive Committee of the International Union of

Scientific Psychology. Dr. H. S. Langfeld, long-time professor of psychology at Princeton University, is secretary-general of the International Union of Scientific Psychology.

The last meeting on this continent of the International Congress of Psychology was held at Yale University in 1929.

The American Psychological Association counts as members most psychologists in this country. About half of its 10,000 members teach and do research in colleges and universities. The remainder are employed by clinics, hospitals, schools, industries, the military, State and Federal agencies, etc.

The next annual meeting of the association is to be held in Washington, D. C., September 1–6, 1952. Some 5,000 psychologists are expected to attend.

The officers of the American Psychological Association are:

President: J. McV. Hunt, University of Illinois.

President-elect: L. F. Shaffer, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Past president: R. R. Sears, Harvard University.

Recording secretary: Dorothy C. Adkins, University of North Carolina.

Treasurer: C. L. Shartle, Ohio State University.

Executive secretary: F. H. Sanford, Washington, D. C.

The board of directors includes, in addition to the above: E. L. Kelly, University of Michigan; Rensis Likert, University of Michigan; Jean Macfarlane, University of California; A. W. Melton, United States Air Force; O. H. Mowrer, University of Illinois; R. L. Thorndike, Teachers College, Columbia University.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT AAAS COUNCIL MEETINGS, PHILADELPHIA, PA., DECEMBER 27–29, 1951

The Council of the American Association for the Advancement of Science is profoundly disturbed over the present world conditions which so severely impede the free interchange of knowledge even among friendly nations. Danger to the future of our Nation is implicit in such restrictions.

The council recognizes the need for measures which will effectively safeguard our security, but expresses its troubled concern over the manner in which such measures, in particular the McCarran Act, are being administered, to prohibit American citizens from going abroad and citizens of other nations from coming here to interchange knowledge of science which does not affect security.

The council strongly urges that the administrative procedures under the McCarran Act be reviewed and modified so as to minimize injustices and to increase both our internal strength and our prestige abroad.

The council further urges revision and improvement of the relevant portions of the act, to retain the objectives of necessary security, but with adequate provisions to maintain free interchange of knowledge that has no security implications.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD certain letters, telegrams, and documents which I have received. They consist of an editorial from the New York Times of May 22, an editorial from the Des Moines Register of April 15, 1952, and various letters and statements from organizations in regard to the McCarran bill.

I wish to invite especial attention to a telegram from the Chinese Benevolent Association, which is particularly pertinent because of the statements which have been made concerning the support of the McCarran bill by organizations of persons of oriental birth and descent in this country.

I also have a statement which I prepared concerning that section of the McCarran bill which restricts and reduces immigration from colonial dependencies in the Western Hemisphere.

I also have an article from the Polish-American Journal of May 17, 1952, and a statement by the well-known commentator, Eric Sevareid. I should like, Mr. President, to discuss a portion of the McCarran bill, but as the hour is late I simply ask that my comments appear in the body of the RECORD.

I should like, also, to read to the Senate a list and then a brief analysis of some of the major differences between present immigration law, the McCarran bill, and, for purposes of comparison, the Humphrey-Lehman bill.

The list and analysis show pretty clearly some of the vital and even unprecedented changes introduced in the present law, inadequate as that is, by the McCarran bill.

In view of the present situation, I ask only that this statement appear in the body of the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that all the documents to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 22, 1952]

SENATOR MCCARRAN'S BILL

If the hard-pressed Members of the United Statese Senate would only take time to familiarize themselves with the details of Mr. MCCARRAN'S massive anti-immigration bill it is difficult to believe that they would accept it in its present form, or even in the slightly better version that has already swept through the House. The measure is so complex—revising and codifying our entire body of naturalization and immigration law—that the little group of opposition Senators (including LEHMAN, HUMPHREY, BENTON, MCMAHON, and DOUGLAS) should be commended instead of reviled for having thrown light on some of its more vicious features which might otherwise have escaped the attention of their colleagues.

The Senate has unfortunately rejected an attempt to recommit this unwise bill, and yesterday it refused to substitute a more liberal measure for it. A better bill would have resulted from some of the several score amendments that have been proposed, but it is unlikely that any of the really important ones will now be approved.

Grave issues are involved. As Mr. LEHMAN has said, the McCarran bill poses the question of our basic national philosophy and of our social philosophy; it poses questions of law, of justice and of civil liberty; it raises problems of foreign policy and of our internal security. The McCarran bill contains provisions that are harsh to the point of ferocity; it strengthens the racial bias of our existing law while making a gesture in the direction of nondiscrimination; it leaves far too great power in the hands of administrative officials; and so far from strengthening our country against its enemies, the net effect in our judgment would be seriously to weaken the United States in the cold war against Communist subversion and aggression. The bill should not be passed in anything like its present form; and if passed it deserves the veto which it will probably receive.

POLISH-AMERICAN JOURNALISTS AND POLISH IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE FIGHT FOR GOOD IMMIGRATION BILL

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Vice President of the United States ALBEN W. BARKLEY and all United States Senators with the exception of Senator MCCARRAN received telegrams from the Associated Polish Language Press of America and from the Polish Immigration Committee urging them to fight the McCarran immigration bill and to support the Lehman-Humphrey bill.

The Polish American journalists stressed in their telegram that the McCarran bill represents a spirit of exclusion, restrictions, and discrimination, while the bipartisan measure S. 2842 sponsored by Senator LEHMAN and others will guarantee basic principles fostering Christian and democratic attitude toward immigration and will bring new hope to all free men and strengthen our policy in the struggle between democracy and Communist tyranny.

The Polish Immigration Committee telegram was as follows:

"The pending McCarran immigration and naturalization bill reflects a policy of exclusion and restrictions foreign to the American traditions. Thousands of freedom-loving people who survived Hitler's tyranny or have escaped from Communist oppression will be waiting for decades and face additional obstacles in seeking asylum in free and democratic America. We ask your support for bipartisan Lehman-Humphrey bill (S. 2842) providing the pooling of unused quotas, relaxing restrictive deportation conditions and reflecting the human and liberal approach to the immigration problems. The bill provides the necessary safeguards and will strengthen our position in the struggle against Communist aggression."

It is expected that other Polish American organizations will send similar telegrams to the Members of the Senate.

[From the Des Moines Register of April 15, 1952]

IMMIGRATION BILLS, BAD AND GOOD

It is significant that two rival proposals for recodifying the permanent immigration laws of the United States aim nominally at the same things—to put an end to discrimination based on race, sex, and nationality; to retain a national origin quota system, but to supplement it with priorities based on desirability; to erect additional safeguards against dope peddlers, criminals, and subversives; and in general to unify and modernize our patchwork of immigration, naturalization, and deportation laws.

Unfortunately, the bills written by the immigration subcommittees of the two Houses contain many bad features. These are the McCarran bill (S. 2550) and the Walter bill (H. R. 5678). They do repeal the old, disgraceful oriental exclusion laws (or what is left of them) and give at least nominal quotas to all countries. But they base the quotas on the obsolete census of 1920. Moreover, they bring in racism by a couple of back doors, and they keep the Displaced Persons Act "mortgages" on the quotas of the Baltic countries and Poland, from which we have gained so many valiant and valuable refugees from communism.

The McCarran-Walter bills also establish a whole group of retroactive causes for denaturalization and deportation, with no adequate provisions for review and appeal, and with deep cuts in the Attorney General's right to make exceptions in hardship cases.

Under them, a naturalized citizen could be denaturalized and deported for minor technical inaccuracies in his answers long ago to questions in naturalization proceedings.

Legal immigrants could be deported for falling into economic difficulties within 5

years after entry, and for becoming mentally ill without harming anybody and without causing any financial burden to the community.

Legal immigrants who had been Communists or in Communist-front organizations in the remote past are automatically deportable, no matter what their recent behavior or present views are.

All this is so raw that a minority reported out different bills, the Humphrey-Lehman bill (S. 2842) and the identical Roosevelt bill (H. R. 7032).

The Humphrey-Lehman-Roosevelt bills are not starry-eyed. They include additional safeguards against dope peddlers, against immigrants who would actually displace American workers in their jobs, against subversive immigrants and subversive aliens who have been long-time legal residents.

But their provisions are not retroactive; they provide review and appeal, and a chance for the accused to demonstrate that his Communist-front membership was innocent in intent, or that they have long since made a genuine break with communism.

The immigration quotas in the Humphrey-Lehman-Roosevelt bills are based on the 1950 census, and any quotas not filled in 1 year are thrown into a pool the next year, available to relatives of United States legal residents and to specially desirable immigrants regardless of national origin.

The whole Western Hemisphere (instead of just the independent republics and Canada) is given nonquota status. So are orphans entering the country for adoption, and immigrants who have served honorably in our Armed Forces.

The Humphrey-Lehman-Roosevelt bill deserves support; the McCarran-Walter bills, in spite of their avowed aims, are confused, frightening, dangerous legislation.

SPEECH ON THE MCCARRAN BILL (S. 2550) CONCERNING ITS PROVISION ON IMMIGRATION FROM THE WEST INDIES (SEC. 202 (C))

Mr. President, I want to speak now on one particular provision of S. 2550 which seems to me to be particularly unjust, restrictive and discriminatory. I am referring to section 202 (c) and the effect it would have on immigration into this country from the area which is commonly described as the West Indies.

Under present law, immigration from this area is covered by the rule that immigrants coming from one of the colonies or dependencies in the West Indian area are without numerical limitation chargeable to the quota established for the mother country. For example, a person immigrating to this country from Jamaica or Trinidad or the Bahamas falls under the British quota. Similarly, immigrants from the French colonies of Martinique or Guadeloupe are charged to the French quota.

It is true that our present law does not treat immigration from these colonies and dependencies as generously as it does immigration from independent countries in the Western Hemisphere. Toward immigration from these countries we have adopted the principle of the open door in order to further the great idea of Western Hemisphere solidarity and cooperation. Thus, immigrants from countries such as Canada, Mexico or any other country of Central and South America are not subject to any quota restriction. It would seem that the idea of Western Hemisphere solidarity and cooperation would require the same treatment of immigrants from those areas in the Western Hemisphere which have not yet reached independence. An immigrant from Jamaica or Trinidad should not be less desirable than an immigrant from Mexico or Bolivia.

Although, as I said before, the present law does not treat immigrants from the West Indian dependencies and colonies as generously as it treats immigrants from the independent areas of the Western Hemisphere, in reality this difference is more of a theoretical than of a practical nature. Actually, immigration from the British West Indies which is, by far, the most important source of our immigration from the West Indian area is controlled by the British quota of approximately 65,000 a year. It is known that this quota which is by far the largest quota granted to any country under our immigration law is never fully utilized. That means that any inhabitant of Jamaica or Trinidad or of any of the other British West Indian colonies or dependencies who seeks to immigrate to the United States can do so provided he qualifies as an immigrant under the various provisions of our immigration law. Substantially the same is true of immigration from the French dependencies. The French quota, a little over 3,000, is, of course, much smaller than the British quota. However, this quota appears to be adequate for the immigration needs of France and French dependencies. This is shown by the fact that a person falling under the French quota can be sure to get a quota number within a very short time, in 1 or 2 months. Therefore, the fact that a would-be immigrant from Martinique or Guadeloupe falls within the French quota does not substantially restrict his chance to immigrate.

Immigration from the West Indies to the United States has been continuous for many years. The major part of this immigration comes from the British West Indies and is, therefore, charged to the British quota. A few statistical data may be of interest. The number of quota immigrants from the British West Indies and Bermuda in the 5-year period, 1946 to 1950, was 11,394. This number breaks up as follows:

Year:	*Immigrants*
1946	1,745
1947	2,007
1948	2,638
1949	2,395
1950	2,609

The island in the British West Indies which supplies us with more immigrants than any other of these islands is Jamaica. The approximate number of immigrants from Jamaica is 1,000 a year.

These numbers show that substantial though the present immigration from the British West Indies is, it cannot be said that it is so large that steps have to be taken to restrict this immigration. There can hardly be any doubt that the United States economy is able to absorb 2,000 English-speaking immigrants from the West Indies a year. This is proved by the fact that immigrants from the British West Indies have adapted themselves well to the life in the United States and have easily become integrated in American life.

Most of the immigrants from the British West Indies are Negroes. In fact, immigration from the West Indies is the main source of Negro immigration into the United States. Again, I would like to give you a few figures. According to Myrdal's report in his famous book, An American Dilemma, in 1940 there were about 84,000 foreign-born Negroes in the United States. Of these, three-fourths were born in the West Indies. These Negro immigrants from the West Indies settled mostly in New York, Boston, Florida, and the Carolinas. The largest part settled in the City of New York where many of them established themselves in the business and professional field. It has been estimated that one-third of the professional population of Harlem comes from the West Indies. Many of the physicians, dentists, and lawyers working in that area are natives of Jamaica, Trinidad, or the other West Indian islands.

A number of West Indian immigrants have made valuable contributions to American cultural life. By way of example, I would like to mention J. A. Rogers, author of many books, among them Superman and Man. Another immigrant from the West Indies was A. A. Schonburg whose collection of books dealing with Negroes has become famous. The collection now forms a valuable part of the public library of New York and is located at the One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Street branch of that library of which Schonburg was a curator while alive.

One of the outstanding characteristics of the immigrants from the West Indies is their devotion to their families. This explains the fact that many immigrants from that area, after having established themselves in this country, have invited their relatives who stayed behind to join them.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the present situation with respect to immigration from the West Indies is completely satisfactory both from the point of view of the number of immigrants as well as from the point of view of their quality. They have contributed thousands of good workers and loyal citizens who now fill important positions in the national economy. If any change at all in the present law as to immigration from the West Indies is contemplated, it seems to me that the West Indian dependencies and colonies should, for purposes of immigration, be placed on the same footing as the independent countries in the Western Hemisphere. Such a change would be an important contribution to unity and cooperation in this hemisphere. We would tell those people living in the British and French colonies that the fact that they are not inhabitants of an independent country should not, in any way, lessen their chances to immigrate to this country as against the chances of citizens of independent countries in the Western Hemisphere. Granting of nonquota status to inhabitants of these dependencies would not have any appreciable practical effects since, as I pointed out before, immigration from these areas is even now pretty well dependent on the desire of an inhabitant to immigrate in view of the British and French quota situation. What such a change would accomplish would be to emphasize that if we speak of Western Hemisphere solidarity we mean the whole Western Hemisphere rather than only part of it.

A number of organizations which testified at the joint hearings in March and April of last year have come out for a change of the present law along the lines just mentioned. Mr. Lewis M. Hoskins, executive secretary of the American Friends Service Committee urged, in behalf of the Quakers, in a letter dated April 6, 1951, that "nonquota status be accorded all natives of the Western Hemisphere without discrimination." (P. 748 of the hearings.) Similarly, Rev. William J. Gibbons, S. J., in behalf of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, stated during the hearings that "it would seem more in accord with the objective of administrative policy to accord nonquota status not only to natives of independent countries but also to natives of colonies and dependencies situated wholly within the Western Hemisphere." (P. 232 of hearings.) Mrs. Arthur Forrest Anderson, in a statement submitted by the YWCA, recommended that natives of the dependent areas of the Western Hemisphere should be treated on the same basis as natives of independent countries in that area. (P. 744 of hearings.) I am glad to note that S. 2842, the omnibus immigration bill introduced by the Senator from Minnesota for himself and for 12 other Senators has adopted these suggestions. I would define the term "nonquota immigrant" so as to include any immigrant "who was born in an independent country, colony, or dependent area situated in the Western Hemisphere and the spouse or the child of any such immigrant, if accompanying or following to join him" (sec. 101 (a) (26) (C)).

Mr. President, I now turn to S. 2550 and I note, with regret, that this bill neither leaves the law with respect to immigration

from the West Indies as it is now nor improves it in the sense which I mentioned, but, on the contrary, seeks to drastically curtail immigration from that area.

Under section 202 (c) of the bill, natives of the dependencies in the West Indies would continue to be chargeable to the quota of the mother country. However, the bill would put a ceiling of 100 immigrants from each of the dependencies and colonies. For example, at present around 1,000 Jamaicans are admitted yearly to this country as immigrants. Under S. 2550, no more than 100 Jamaicans could immigrate in a given year. Thus, immigration from Jamaica would be cut to one-tenth of its present volume.

Not only would this decrease to a mere trickle immigration from the West Indies, but it would also result in discrimination against Negroes. As I mentioned before, the West Indies at present are the main source of Negro immigration into the United States. S. 2550 would virtually cut off this source. Thus, for the first time in United States history, discrimination against Negroes would be written into our immigration law. Is it not ironic that a bill which claims credit for eliminating the ban on immigration of Asiatics at the same time seeks to change our immigration law in a way which would establish discrimination against another race, namely Negroes? I believe that what I have said so far bears out my initial remarks that the provision on immigration from the West Indies as is proposed in S. 2550 is unfair, restrictionist, and discriminatory.

How do the sponsors of S. 2550 seek to justify their proposal? The majority committee report states that the proposal "will prevent undue absorption of a governing country's quota by a colony or a dependency and will preclude colonies or dependencies from having a greater preference than the independent countries which are entitled to minimum quotas." Let us consider these two arguments. As I said before, the British quota under which by far the largest part of West Indian immigrants enter is never fully utilized. Therefore, there is always a large unused portion of the British quota available for the use of any qualified white Englishman who wishes to immigrate to the United States. The same is substantially true with respect to immigrants from France, except that it may take 1 or 2 months after their application before their quota number is reached. It follows that present law in no way works to the prejudice of Englishmen or Frenchmen who want to immigrate to the United States from their mother country. In view of this situation, how can it be claimed that immigration from the West Indies causes undue absorption of Great Britain or France's quota?

The other argument for the proposed change contained in the Senate's report is no more convincing. This argument holds that the proposed change will preclude colonies or dependencies from having greater preferences than the independent countries which are entitled to minimum quotas. In this connection, reference is usually made to Australia and New Zealand which are both members of the British Commonwealth of Nations and, at the same time, independent countries, and each has an annual immigration quota of 100.

Those who, in this context, compare Australia and New Zealand, on one hand, and West Indian dependencies, on the other hand, overlook two things. First of all, they overlook the fact that Australia and New Zealand are not countries from which many people seek to emigrate but that, on the contrary, they are countries which themselves are currently receiving many new immigrants. The West Indies, on the other hand, have been the source of a constant flow of immigrants to the United States. Therefore, the fact that under present law, Australia and New Zealand have a quota of 100 each while there is no such limitation for the British West Indies does not work any hardship against natives of those two dominions. Should somebody be of a different opinion and believe that the quotas for Australia and New Zealand are too small, then the obvious remedy would seem to be to increase the quotas for these two countries rather than to decrease the opportunities for other countries. The argument that only few West Indians should be admitted because few Australians are admitted, reminds me of a statement by Chief Justice Vinson made in his opinion in the famous restrictive covenant case of 1948. In disposing of the claim that a restrictive covenant is not discriminatory because it may occasionally be used not only against a Negro but also against a white person, Chief Justice Vinson said "equal protection of the laws is not achieved through indiscriminate imposition of inequality."

The other point the sponsors of S. 2550 are overlooking when comparing Australia and New Zealand with the West Indian dependencies is the fact that Australia and New Zealand are not situated in the Western Hemisphere. As I pointed out earlier in my speech, our immigration policy has always been against bars to immigration from countries in the Western Hemisphere. Immigrants from Canada and Mexico and Brazil and Argentina are not subject to any quota while immigrants from Europe and Asiatic countries are limited by quotas. S. 2550 does not seek to change this method of favoring independent countries in the Western Hemisphere. It is inconsistent, on the one hand, to maintain this preference with respect to countries in the Western Hemisphere and, on the other hand, to regard the dependencies located in the Western Hemisphere as unduly favored on the ground that immigrants from them are in a better position than immigrants from countries outside the Western Hemisphere.

So it seems to me that there is no validity in either of the arguments adduced by the majority committee report in support of the proposal to set a ceiling of 100 on immigration from the colonies and dependencies in the West Indies. A further argument was put forward by Representative WALTER during the debate in the House of Representatives. He said that the ceiling on immigration from the West Indies is necessary to protect the Virgin Islands from the large immigration to them from Jamaica, and in support of this argument he quoted from a letter written by the St. Thomas Labor Union. It is significant that this argument is not supported by statistics. Nowhere is it said how many persons immigrate to the Virgin Islands from Jamaica. Thus we are left in doubt as to what is meant by "large migrations from Jamaica to the Virgin Islands." Apart from that, I do not think that the status of the labor market in the Virgin Islands, whatever it is, should govern our basic immigration policy applicable to the continental United States. Let us assume that there would be an influx of Puerto Ricans to the Virgin Islands or of citizens from Haiti or the Dominican Republic. All these three areas are much nearer to the Virgin Islands than Jamaica. Would anybody suggest that in case of such an influx, we should change our basic immigration law and pass an act depriving natives of Haiti and the Dominican Republic or Puerto Rico of their nonquota status so that they could no longer immigrate into the United States without limitation? Are we prepared to give up the wonderful principle of hemisphere solidarity because of a minor local situation in the Virgin Islands?

Mr. President, the foregoing remarks dealt only with one, though a very important one, of the many objectionable features of S. 2550. There are many more defects in S. 2550 which have been mentioned in the debate and are still going to be mentioned. However, none of the other defects is a better illustration of the charge made against S. 2550 that it would set back the clocks on our immigration law. S. 2550 is often defended on the ground that it is nothing but a codification of the existing immigration and nauralization law. How incorrect this statement is cannot be demonstrated better than by pointing out the change S. 2550 proposes with respect to immigration from the dependencies and colonies in the West Indies. As I have shown, under the proposal immigration from these areas would be reduced to a mere fraction of its present volume. The new provision would create a new kind of de facto discrimination against Negroes, and it would be a blow to hemisphere solidarity. I hope, therefore, that the Senate by voting against S. 2550 will reaffirm its belief in a liberal, nondiscriminatory policy with respect to natives of the West Indian dependencies and colonies. As pointed out in the minority report submitted by the Senator from Tennessee, a decent attitude toward these colonies will "furnish valuable ammunition to combat the anti-American propaganda of Communist agitators among inhabitants of colonial areas throughout the world."

Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senator IRVING IVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATORS: Careful study of the two proposed immigration bills convinces us that Senate bill 2842 as introduced by Senators HUMPHREY, LANGER, LEHMAN, and 10 other Senators represents a much more farsighted statesmanlike and judicious approach as well as being a basis for a wiser strategic policy designed to advance the national interest and world-wide influence of the United States with particular reference to our present battle for minds and souls of mankind. As a patriotic national organization we sincerely pray that you choose the Humphrey bill as basis for the pending legislation.

EDWARD Y. T. LIN,
Executive Secretary,
Chinese Benevolent Association.
NEW YORK CITY.

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BOSTON, INC.,
Boston, Mass., May 15, 1952.
Senator LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am instructed by our board of directors to call to your attention the recommendations of this agency which has worked with immigrants for 28 years in Boston and which is part of a national agency that has been working to make better citizens of new immigrants for the past 40 years.

Our board of directors, as you will see, is composed of members of old American families and leaders of more recently arrived groups.

Very truly yours,
MRS. PAULINE GARDESCU,
Executive Director.

YOUR PASSPORT

(Published by International Institute of Boston, Inc.)

INDIVIDUAL SERVICES

People of other national origins look forward to satisfying and productive lives in the United States but they vary in the experiences which they bring and the opportunities which they find. A newer American may be a new arrival, a repatriate, or a person who came to this country a number of years ago but is not yet settled in his new homeland.

The Individual Services Department is designed to assist the newer American toward his goals through an understanding of his past and present experiences and a knowledge of the opportunities. His questions

may be, for instance, around employment, education (including English lessons), medical care, involved immigration and naturalization matters, or getting along with himself, his family and friends. Assistance may be given directly or through referral to other agencies.

The professional social workers of the Individual Services Department have special counseling knowledge and skills. They speak a number of languages. (Experienced interpreters are available in most other languages.) They understand cultural differences—what it means psychologically to change from one way of life to another. They know American resources, particularly in greater Boston. They are officially accredited to represent individuals before the the United States Board of Immigration Appeals and the Naturalization Service. Through the institute's national office they can consult on policy and individual matters with Federal departments and international agencies.

These services are available to individuals and to social agencies from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m., Monday through Friday, or in the evening and on Saturday by special arrangement.

COMMUNITY SERVICES

The international institute is a bridge between the community at large and the widely scattered settlements of newer Americans in which much of the social and religious life is still carried on in the native tongue and in the Old World culture patterns. Adapting to another culture is a slow and gradual process.

The institute works steadily toward constructive social integration, stimulating leadership and wider participation in general community life. Invaluable aids in this work are the foreign language press, clergy, and societies.

Interpreter service is given to courts, hospitals, and social agencies, public and private, where not only language is a need but also an understanding of the delicate psychological factors involved.

Documents are translated in all languages—records of birth, marriage, death, good conduct (police), passports, and other items.

Consultation is offered on matters relating to the ethnic communities, and supervision is provided in university fieldwork studies.

Innumerable inquiries are answered on subjects within the institute field of service, such as: backgrounds, traditions and customs of people from other countries; regulations and procedures of immigration and naturalization; consular services; status of quotas; use of Government or international welfare resources to locate or to aid family or friends abroad; responsibilities and rights of aliens in the United States of America; language classes or tutors; resources either within ethnic communities or generally in greater Boston.

GROUP ACTIVITIES

The International Institute House is a homelike center located between Dartmouth and Clarendon on Beacon Street overlooking the historic Charles River. Its varied program of social and educational activities is open to everyone. Here, people of many national origins meet and share talents and experiences to their mutual enjoyment and enrichment. The program is flexible and adapted to changing needs and interests.

In addition to weekly and monthly features, there are annual intergroup projects of wide appeal planned and carried through by volunteer committees.

A calendar of the intercultural activities, with notes describing them, follows.

The house is also a center for more than 40 self-organized ethnic clubs. Through association with the Institute, these clubs are made available for a variety of civic services and for hospitality and practical help to new arrivals from abroad.

The clubs with their meeting times are listed on page 9. Further information about their officers and membership may be obtained from the activities director.

Membership in the institute is voluntary and is open to all who take part in its activities, enjoy its services, or are in sympathy with its purposes. Subscription to the International Beacon is included in membership in the International Institute. See page 8 for particulars.

Volunteers are essential in all areas of institute work. The executive director is glad to consult with anyone who is interested in this field of community service.

MAY 12, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION, INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BOSTON, INC., BOSTON, MASS.

The committee, composed of Dr. Solimene, Mrs. Le Vin, Harry Angelus, Haig Menuelian,, Paul Siu, and Mrs. Gardescu, has met three times. The committee undertook to review limited portions of the proposed immigration and naturalization legislation before Congress in the session. There is general legislation pending and one Special Migration Act of 1952, a temporary measure. The McCarran bill, S. 2550, a so-called omnibus bill, 302 pages long, is intended as an Immigration and Nationality Act to revise all laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality. It has been reported out favorably by the Senate Judiciary Committee, of which Senator MCCARRAN is chairman. Its companion bill, though not entirely identical, is the Walter bill, H. R. 5678, which is 165 pages long and has passed the House.

GENERAL LEGISLATION

There are some improvements over present legislation which the committee approves in the McCarran-Walter bills, as well as some provisions to which the committee takes specific exception. The committee has not undertaken to review every intricate detail but confined its initial review to quota provisions, nationality, and deportations.

As the background of its discussions the basic plan and principles of an international institute were accepted as the governing policy statement; namely, international institutes hold that there should not be discrimination in immigration and naturalization laws based on race, religion, or national origins and that all categories of persons admitted to the United States of America for permanent residence should be eligible for naturalization. In other words, admission to the United States and naturalization should be on a basis of personal and individual fitness rather than country or origin or race. Representative WALTER has repeatedly submitted legislation to make eligible for naturalization all those who are permanently admitted.

The committee approves provisions of the McCarran-Walter bills which—

(1) Make all races eligible to naturalization (at present, certain Asiatics, for example, Koreans, Siamese, Japanese are not; Indian and Chinese are).

(2) Eliminate discrimination between sexes, with respect to immigration (at present, wife of any citizen may enter nonquota but some husbands of citizens must wait for quota numbers).

(3) Eliminate exclusion of Asiatic areas and assign a minimum quota of at least 100 to all independent far-eastern countries—and add a quota of 100 for non-Chinese persons born in China.

(4) Grant to Asiatics the same nonquota and preference-quota status based on relationship to American citizens and permanently admitted aliens.

(At present only the Chinese wife of an American citizen, not the child nor the Chinese husband, enjoys nonquota status, resulting in broken families).

(5) Provide selective immigration-quota preference based on occupational needs of United States of America because it moves toward a basis of personal qualification for immigration rather than racial or national origin.

One provision of the Walter bill provides that aliens be excluded who have sought or procured visas by misrepresenting facts—but exempts from the penalty aliens whose action was caused by fear of persecution because of race, religion, or political opinions and if the misrepresentation was not material. The international institute is interested particularly because of U. S. S. R. citizens who pretended to be of other nationality to escape forced repatriation from Western Europe after 1945 and have immigrated as eligible displaced persons to United States of America in guise of Latvians, Yugoslavs, Poles, etc. The International Institute of Boston is appealing three cases now under threat of deportation for fraud of this nature and otherwise eligible to remain. There may be hundreds more.

The committee opposes provisions of the McCarran-Walter bills which—

(1) Would give the President the authority to suspend the entry of all aliens or any class of aliens at any time—a right he now has only during war or any national emergency.

(2) Would charge to Asiatic-Pacific area quotas all persons with as much as one-half ancestry indigenous to the area, no matter what the country of birth; i. e., a Canadian-born citizen, half Chinese, is chargeable to the quota of China. The committee feels these galling racial discriminations are (a) not only contrary to International Institute principles but (b) detrimental to United States international relations and (c) give valid cause for Soviet anti-United States propaganda.

(3) Would limit to quotas of 100 the dependent or colonial areas of Western Hemisphere which now are unlimited within the quota of the nation to which they belong—Jamaica is part of United Kingdom—all other Western Hemisphere countries are quota-free and discrimination seems poor good-neighbor policy—Dutch and French also have colonies.

(4) Would remove statute of limitations, now 5 years, on deportation as a public charge and for other bases of deportation and denaturalization.

The committee recommends changes:

(1) Basis of quota year to be 1950 (not 1920) as quickly as census can provide statistical data required.

(2) Admission of DP's or similar refugees be divorced from quota provisions for immigrants—some small quotas are now reduced by 50 percent for a half century ahead and impede normal migration, including uniting families.

(3) Unused quotas at the end of any year be redistributed to countries which have filled quotas and in proportion to demand at consulates for visas.

(4) The committee believes the Board of Immigration Appeals should be set up by legislation and that there should be a similar board in the Department of State to review consular decisions on the granting or refusal of visas. At present there is no effective appeal structure over consular decisions. While it is recognized the present Board of Immigration Appeals in the Department of Justice has greatly contributed to fair and equitable administration of justice in immigration, nationality and naturalization cases, yet the committee believes the principle of a statutory rather than administratively established boards is sound.

(5) That in deportation hearings an alien be entitled to examine evidence against him, present evidence, and in general granted fair and impartial hearing and adequate protection of his rights.

The committee also reviewed the Humphrey-Lehman bill, S. 2343, introduced jointly by Republican and Democratic Senators.

General legislation, to amend immigration and naturalization laws, to eliminate discrimination based on race and sex, to provide for use of unused immigration quotas and provided nonquota status for parents of citizens, for orphans and alien members and former members of the Armed Forces.

The committee recommends approval of S. 2343 which, incidentally, has found conservative editorial support in Boston newspapers.

SPECIAL TEMPORARY LEGISLATION

Finally, the committee reviewed H. R. 7376, the Celler bill, Special Migration Act of 1952, to authorize the issuance of 300,000 special nonquota immigration visas over a 3-year period to certain refugees and others, including natives of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, as outlined in the President's message to Congress, March 24. This gives practical force to United States of America policy, stated in the Mutual Security Act of 1951 with its commitments to take part in world-wide planning and accept a share of overpopulation and refugees now creating serious economic and political tensions in Europe.

The United States has joined with 16 countries in recommending resettlement to countries, such as Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and South America republics, seeking additional population. Commissioner Argyle R. Mackey in a speech, March 21, 1952, in New York City says "The Mutual Security Act, as well as proposed legislation, reflects a pattern of expectation for the future. While it is important that our immigration policies of the future be grounded primarily in the needs of the United States, those needs must be evaluated broadly, with due regard for our position of world leadership."

Our national office, the American Federation of International Institutes, has joined an interfaith, interethnic "American Committee on Special Migration" for joint action to pass the Celler bill, and asks that local bodies support it.

The committee recommends the passage of the Celler bill, but asks that it be amended to include some provision for Chinese political refugees to have permanent status in the United States.

SUMMARY

The committee recommends that the board of international institute support sections of McCarran and Walter bills which eliminate racial and sex discriminations and establish selective immigration preferences and that offer relief to Soviet DP's.

It opposes sections which give the President unlimited powers over immigration, which make ancestry or colonial status a test for some, not all, immigrants, and the changes of statutes of limitation for deportation and denaturalization.

It proposes:

(1) Legislative establishment of Boards of Immigration Appeals and appeals over consular decisions on visas.

(2) That basis of quotas be revised to 1950 census as quickly as possible.

(3) Effectiveness of selective immigration be studied as a substitute for the national origin's theory.

The committee recommends the passage of the Humphrey-Lehman bill.

The committee recommends passage of the Special Migration Act of 1952, the Celler bill.

THE PROTESTANT COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
May 9, 1952.

MY DEAR COUNCIL FRIEND: A short time ago I sent to you a letter concerning the immigration laws which are now being presented to Congress. Time is of the essence at the present moment, because the bills are now before the Senate. The House passed the Walter bill, and the Senate is now discussing the McCarran bill.

I am sending you additional material herewith concerning the McCarran bill and also the Lehman bill, S. 2842, which is now before Congress.

The only hope that we have to get some of the humanitarian provisions of the Humphrey-Lehman bill into the new legislature is to have the Senate pass this bill, and then in the conference with the House some of the Lehman bill might be incorporated.

Will you please look at this matter very carefully, and if possible take it up with the proper committee in your organization and see that telegrams are sent immediately to your Senators concerning this matter? I feel that it is of extreme importance, and so I am sending you this additional letter.

With high personal regards and all good wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

J. HENRY CARPENTER,
Executive Secretary.

P. S.—Please note the advertisement which appeared in the New York Times, and the outstanding people who signed it, such as Mrs. Anderson of the national board of the YWCA, Rabbi Goldstein of the American Jewish Congress, Clarence Pickett, and many others. This is really the nub of the question which we are all facing.

J. H. C.

SUMMARY OF MCCARRAN OMNIBUS IMMIGRATION BILL (S. 2550)

Thirteen new grounds for excluding future immigrants, more than 20 new grounds for deporting those admitted in past years, and an undetermined number of new ways of losing one's American citizenship would be written into law by the pending McCarran omnibus immigration bill (S. 2550). This 302-page bill, although advertised as a "codification" statute, would make more than a hundred changes in Federal law governing immigration, deportation, and citizenship. Of these changes, three are in the direction of liberality; (a) Asiatics are made eligible for immigration, under minimum quotas, and citizenship; (b) sex-discriminations are eliminated; (c) reformed totalitarians may be admitted. These liberalizing provisions are also contained in several other pending immigrations, including H. R. 403 (allowing quota immigration from Asia), which passed the House on February 19, 1951, and S. 2842, sponsored by Senators KEFAUVER, LEHMAN, HUMPHREY, GREEN, BENTON, KILGORE, MOODY, DOUGLAS, MURRAY, MCMAHON, LANGER, MORSE, PASTORE.

I. NEW IMMIGRATION RESTRICTIONS

Among other changes in existing law the pending bill would:

1. Limit all future immigration to the United States to immigrants of "high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability" who are "needed urgently in the United States" (sec. 203 (a), and to parents of adult citizens, and spouses or children of admitted immigrants, except to the degree that unused visas, if any, under these categories may be used for immigrants without such special qualifications, except that brothers, sisters, sons, or daughters of United States citizens are given preference in this last category.

2. Eliminate college and university professors from the class of quota-exempt immigrants (sec. 101 (a) (26) (F)).

3. Change immigration quotas for Jamaica and other Caribbean colonies from the never filled United Kingdom quota of 65,721 to a special quota of 100 for each such colony, thus drastically curtailing colored immigration (sec. 202 (c)).

4. Retain as under the present law, special inferior status for any person "attributable by as much as one-half of his ancentry" to Asiatic races, regardless of the citizenship or country of birth of such person, and exclude such persons from the quotas of the countries in which they are native-born citizens (sec. 202 (b)).

5. Authorizes the executive to set up new restrictions, and even absolute bars, against immigration, without legislative or judicial review, in peacetime as well as wartime. (The President now has such power only in wartime (sec. 212 (e)).

6. Repeal the provision of the 1917 law allowing entry of victims of religious persecution who are illiterate (sec. 212 (a) (25)).

7. Repeal a similar dispensation for parents, grandparents, wives and widowed or unmarried daughters of citizens or legally admitted immigrants (sec. 212 (a) (25)).

8. Allows for judgment of courts of foreign nations to set the standards for admissibility to the United States. A conviction of even a Nazi or Communist court, except for a political crime, becomes a bar for entry, even if the offense involved no moral turpitude by American standards. (A violator of a Communist law against religious worship, if sentenced by a Communist court to a 5-year prison term (under S. 2550), becomes ineligible to enter the United States of America, sec. 212 (a) (10).

9. Bar aliens who received a document or visa (even in Communist lands) by willful misrepresentation.

II. DEPORTATION

The broad grounds of deportation set up by the McCarran Internal Security Act of 1950 and various prior laws are considerably widened by the new McCarran omnibus bill, which would:

1. Abolish existing statutes of limitation in deportation cases, thus allowing deportation for alleged acts 50 years past, as to which no witnesses or documents are available (sec. 241).

2. Require deportation of any person who goes to a mental hospital or institution within 5 years after immigration, even if he or his family pays for such care or treatment (sec. 241 (a) (3)).

3. Increases the possibility of deportation because of having become a public charge. The present law limits such possibility to persons who have become a public charge within 5 years after entry. The Senate version modifies this law by removing the 5-year period and by having deportation apply where in the opinion of the Attorney General persons at any time after entry become public charges.

4. Require deportation of immigrants who become addicted to the use of narcotic drugs after entry (sec. 241 (a) (11)).

5. Establish numerous other grounds of deportation. Under section 241 (a) (4), the bill provides for the deportation of any alien convicted of any criminal offense, no matter how minor and no matter how long he has lived in the United States, if the Attorney General in his discretion concludes that the alien is an "undesirable resident" of the United States.

6. Make all grounds of deportation retroactive to cover all immigrants who have hitherto been admitted to the United States (sec. 241 (d)).

III. STATUS OF IMMIGRANTS

In addition to the foregoing new grounds of exclusion and deportation of immigrants, the McCarran bill would change the status of immigrants and visitors in several important respects:

First, the bill would drastically curtail the authority of the Attorney General to (1) suspend deportation in "hardship cases" (sec. 244 (a)); (2) adjust the status of visitors,

students, and other nonimmigrants by "preexamination" and issuance of quota visas (sec. 245); (3) extend the time during which immigrants may make visits abroad without losing the right to return to the United States (secs. 212 (c), 223 (b)).

While section 245 provides for alternative form of preexamination, it is limited to a small group of persons.

Secondly, the bill would subject the acquisition of citizenship to a series of new requirements retroactively covering the entire life of the applicant (secs. 313, 316, 318).

Finally, the bill fails to provide necessary judicial protection to the alien by omitting to make provision for a Board of Immigration Appeals and a Visa Review Board. It explicitly denies further inquiry to any alien who may appear to the examining officer to be excludable under paragraphs 27, 28, and 29 of section 212 (a), relating to subversive classes (sec. 235 (c))—a discretion that is contrary to normal democratic procedures. The bill would deprive immigrants and native-born Americans alike of the protection of court review in many cases. In general, mistakes and abuse of discretion by consuls and immigration officials would be exempted from effective judicial review by substituting subjective standards ("the satisfaction of the Attorney General," "the opinion of the Attorney General," etc.) for present objective standards.

The bill requires that every alien shall "at all times carry with him * * * any certificate of alien registration or alien registration receipt card issued him. * * * Any alien who fails to comply with the provisions of this subsection shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction for each offense, be fined not to exceed $100 or be imprisoned not more than 30 days, or both" (secs. 264, 266).

The bill requires an annual address report by every alien, whether permanently or temporarily admitted; a change of address report within 5 days of such change of address by the alien whether temporarily or permanently admitted; and a quarterly address report by all aliens with "lawful temporary residence status" (sec. 265).

An alien who fails to comply with any of these requirements is to be fined not more than $200 or be imprisoned not more than 30 days, or both. In addition, under the McCarran bill, any alien who fails to make these reports, is to be deported, "unless such alien established to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that such failure was reasonably excusable or was not willful" (sec. 266).

IV. IMPACT OF BILL ON AMERICAN CITIZENS

The right of American citizens to be immune from search or official interrogation without a warrant is terminated by section 287. Any car or vehicle within a "reasonable distance" of Mexico, Canada, or the Atlantic or Pacific Ocean may be searched without a warrant, under section 287 (a) (3); any citizen may be interrogated if an immigration official believes him to be an alien (sec. 287 (a) (1)).

ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE KINDS OF CASES THAT WOULD BE EXCLUDED UNDER THE PRESENT VERSION OF THE MCCARRAN BILL

Section 212 A (1) provides for the exclusion of aliens who have been convicted of two or more offenses (other than purely political offenses), regardless of whether the conviction was in a single trial, or whether the offenses arose from a single scheme of misconduct, and regardless of whether the offenses involved moral turpitude for which the aggregate possible sentence to confinement under the law was more than 5 years; such a provision would serve to exclude persons who unwittingly became involved in situations which may be interpreted under this provision as a basis for inadmissibility.

The provision, as it presently exists in the current immigration laws, section 3 of the hibits the admission into the United States of persons convicted of moral turpitude, etc. This is sufficient safeguard.

The Humphrey-Lehman bill also provides for the exclusion of persons when sentenced for a crime involving moral turpitude. We submit that the McCarran interpretation of this provision would serve to exclude cases which have real merit for admission. For example:

Mr. S is an alien who was born in Poland but had lived in Vienna, Austria, most of his life. He escaped to China when the Nazis began wholesale persecution of Jews. While living in Shanghai this man applied for an America visa. His two sons had emigrated to the United States and both served honorably in World War II, one son having received the Purple Heart and battle injuries which hospitalized him for many months. Because of a technicality, it seemed as if the father could not emigrate.

Mr. S had conducted a second-hand furniture store for 30 years in Vienna, buying and selling second-hand merchandise. During the Hitler regime, stolen goods were located in his store although the applicant had no knowledge that these goods were stolen. He was arrested by the Austrian Government on three different occasions, convicted and fined after each arrest.

Apparently Austria punished persons who were found with property not belonging to them even though they had no guilty knowledge of the nature of the goods. Proof was presented to our Government that the Austrian criminal laws were different from ours. Austria did not interpret as a crime involving moral turpitude, property acquired without knowledge that it was stolen or without intent to deprive the rightful owner of its possession. This was a punishment purely for having bought such goods and having them in his possession. Therefore, this was obviously not a crime falling within the prohibition set up by Congress.

The Visa Division, after reviewing the actual instances of supposed crime, rightfully held that the father of these veterans should not be barred from admission. If the McCarran version of this section was in operation, Mr. S would have been declared inadmissible to the United States despite the fact that this was not a crime involving moral turpitude.

This provision would also serve to exclude persons who under any totalitarian regime, practiced his religion surreptitiously, attending church or synagogue. He could be convicted of crimes which would not be called "political crimes" and which in the United States would definitely not be crimes involving moral turpitude. Nevertheless, such a person could be barred from admission to the United States even though his conduct was exemplary. It is common knowledge that under the Nazi regime, and now under the Communist regime, that trials held before high tribunals for minor offenses are a mockery. Persons are forced to confess and are convicted. They would therefore be forever barred from immigration to the United States if section 212 A (1) of the McCarran Act became law.

Section 212 A (19) in the McCarran bill provides for the exclusion of any alien who seeks to procure or has procured a visa or other documentation or seeks to enter the United States by fraud or by wilfully misrepresenting a material fact, even under certain extenuating circumstances. The Humphrey-Lehman bill provides that such a person would not be rendered excludable if the origin for the misrepresentation rested in fear of religious or political persecution.

Unless a provision in the law is created to provide for an exception of those who had suffered persecution and has concealed their identity for their self-protection, this provision would serve to bar many persons who were forced to protect themselves in this manner.

The facts in the following case dramatically illustrate the need for such a person to use an identity other than her own for the very reasons provided for in the provision in the Humphrey-Lehman bill and in the present immigration laws:

The applicant was a 36-year-old unmarried female, a native and citizen of Poland who sought admission to the United States. The applicant was a Jewess. She was an educated person holding a masters degree in commerce and economy awarded by a French university which she attended for 3 years.

At the outbreak of World War II in September 1939, the applicant was residing in Warsaw, Poland. In 1941 she was forced to live in the ghetto section of that city where her activities and movements were restricted. In 1942 she escaped from the ghetto and a friend obtained false documents under which she was able to live and conceal her identity as a Jew. The false papers belonged to a deceased non-Jew. She lived in various places including a cemetery cellar and in a forest until January 1945 when she was hospitalized. Following her discharge from the hospital she was able to obtain employment with the Polish government food ministry at Warsaw under her assumed name and as a Polish gentile. She remained on government posts in Poland until she was able to obtain a visitor's visa to England. Upon arrival in England she severed her association with the Polish government since this was the first opportunity she had to escape from that country. However, in fear of reprisals, she continued the identity she assumed in Poland. She had become known almost exclusively by that name, outside of old acquaintances and confidantes who continued to advise her that she conceal her true identity.

Thus, when she sought to enter the United States under that assumed name, she was declared excludable. Her excludability was challenged under the current interpretation of the provision which sought to exclude aliens who were charged with misrepresentation. However, when it was discovered that her entry into the United States under the assumed name was not for the purpose of evading the immigration laws and that if she had been able to obtain documents in her original name she would have been admissible to the United States under the immigration law. The document she submitted disclosed her true nationality and the passport which was issued to her was by the government of her nationality. She was known and identified by that name.

In the light of these facts, our Government felt that there was no fraudulent intent in connection with her application, and that the name that she had assumed was for purposes of preventing persecution to her. Under the McCarran version, these extenuating circumstances would not be considered.

In the United States many persons have used different names and identities without any evil purpose. This has not necessarily been frowned on by our society particularly when such identities are used for purposes of protection and the failure to reveal such an identity can be justified. There have been innumerable cases where individuals fleeing from the Communists have continued to use assumed identities because of the pressure of repatriation used by the Russians to claim former nationals.

It has been accepted that as long as the assumed identity does not prevent the United States from checking the facts, then to use an identity other than the individual's real one, should not affect his ability to emigrate to the United States.

Section 212 (25) provides that aliens over 16 years of age who are physically capable

of reading, must be able to read or understand some language or dialect. It eliminates the exemption in the act of 1917, as amended, which permits the following categories of persons to enter the United States:

1. Persons of any of the following relationships to United States citizens, admissible aliens, or legally admitted aliens, when such persons are sent for or brought in by such citizens, admissible aliens or admitted aliens:

(a) Father, if over 55 years of age;
(b) Grandfather, if over 55 years of age;
(c) Wife;
(d) Mother;
(e) Grandmother;
(f) Unmarried daughter; or
(g) Widowed daughter.

2. Persons seeking admission to the United States to avoid religious persecution in the country of their last permanent residence.

One cannot deny the necessity of a father being reunited with other members of his family; one can understand the emotional needs of a family to be reunited with the grandfather and grandmother; one can recognize that a wife and mother are an essential and integral part of a family unit and our basic concepts have always accepted the need to keep a family intact wherever possible; one recognizes that an unmarried daughter or a widowed daughter would need the love and protection of her family. It is therefore inconceivable that any section of an American immigration law could be written without including as basic the requirement of reunion of close members of a family.

The Humphrey-Lehman bill as it is presently phrased and conforming to a provision presently in our immigration act which permits persons seeking admission to the United States to avoid religious persecution, is illustrated in the case of Mr. N., a DP upon whom an injustice would be perpetrated if the exemption for religious persecutees was eliminated:

Mr. N., an unmarried male, a native of and former citizen of Poland, sought to enter the United States for permanent residence as a displaced person under the DP Act of 1948. Mr. N. had been reared in a small community in Poland where he had had no opportunity for formal training. He was a simple, hardworking man whose basic learning was in religious subjects. His entire education was geared toward the learning of the Bible.

When the Nazis invaded Poland he was removed from that country to a concentration camp where he was confined for several years. He was not permitted to do anything but mend shoes while in that camp. He was afforded no opportunity for learning, but experienced such hardships that it was not humanly possible for any individual to apply himself to anything but to preserve life.

When he was freed by the American forces, Mr. N., like many other aliens, could not remain in a country where he had been so severely persecuted, nor could he return to the country of his nationality where members of his family were exterminated. Furthermore, the country of his former nationality was now dominated by the forces of communism.

Mr. N. quite naturally sought to enter the United States where he could work and live in freedom. However, with the present provision of the McCarran bill excluding all persons over 16 years of age who cannot read or write, such an individual as Mr. N. could not have entered the United States. The current immigration laws providing for the exemption of such persons who were persecuted because of their religion and race, made it possible for Mr. N. to enter the country where he is now living and making a fine economic adjustment. Since his arrival in the United States Mr. N. has required no financial help. He obtained work in a shoe factory and has continued to work there getting periodic raises in salary.

ANN RABINOWITZ,
Case Consultant, Migration Services, United Service for New Americans.

RADIO ADDRESS OF ERIC SEVAREID, COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM, MAY 15, 1952

The United States Senate is caught in an unusual predicament. It has before it an incredibly complicated bill, running to over 300 pages, and including 340 subsections. It is a bill prepared chiefly by Chairman MCCARRAN, of the Judiciary Committee, after years of work, to recodify our infinitely diffuse immigration laws and regulations. Codification was long overdue and required an immense amount of painstaking work, a real service to the Government. But this bill goes far beyond mere codification; it changes the rules governing immigrants, aliens already here, and naturalized citizens, in a great many respects; and if approved, is going to have a drastic effect on the lives of millions of people. To a most serious degree, it would probably make second-class citizens out of Americans who did not have the fortune to be born here.

The bill is being fought by a small group of Senators, led by LEHMAN, of New York. They have a substitute bill, almost equally complex, but far more liberal in its provisions. Chairman MCCARRAN, so far, has refused to hold committee hearings on their bill; indeed, as the committee minority protested, he held no hearings on his own bill in its completed form, where it could be debated, section by section. Few Senators can take the time to study the McCarran bill carefully; most are up to their ears in other affairs, including politics; the McCarran bill may be driven through and in an effort to prevent that, to stall for time, opponents have presented more than 200 amendments to the bill for debate; undoubtedly, a filibuster technique, out of desperation in the effort to force new committee hearings and prevent a hasty, perhaps irrevocable act.

MCCARRAN is impatient that his years of labor should now be held up; but dozens of national organizations are protesting his bill. This reporter pretends to no special knowledge at all on this matter, but it is obvious from even a quick glance at the objections that this is a matter on which all responsible Americans should try to inform themselves, on which the Senate simply must not act without the fullest debate and the most earnest searching of conscience.

Many things in the bill are approved by all, such as the naturalization of 80,000 Japanese residents here, the admission as citizens of Japanese war brides. The bill gives a legal immigration quota to all Asiatic countries for the first time—a tiny number would be allowed from each country—but there are several jokers. The bill would continue and freeze, the concept adopted by Congress 30 years ago, when immigration quotas were rigged under the popular myth of the superiority of Nordic blood stock.

The bill gives almost unlimited power to our consuls overseas with no real chance that their decisions can be reviewed. A whole new set of grounds for deportation are enumerated and made retroactive to cover immigrants already in the country, and the decisions of immigration officials which could be entirely arbitrary can be reversed only by the Attorney General himself and not by any established board of appeals.

If an alien came in at a port other than the one stated in his visa application, he could be deported; an alien found to have broken a city ordinance years ago, could be deported under this bill. An alien who enters a mental hospital because of a nervous breakdown or simple depression at any time within 5 years of his arrival, could be deported—surely as heartless a provision as has ever been proposed to the laws of the United States. An immigrant bride or bridegroom could be deported if the Attorney General doesn't like the way he or she obeys the marriage contract. And naturalized citizens could lose their citizenship for acts not held to warrant denaturalization at the time they got their papers. And that would mean a special police regime for 8,000,000 American citizens; the end of their equality under the laws, the very things that so many of them left tyrannical lands and came here to achieve. On any accounting, this is a bill requiring a long, long look by the Senate.

ANALYSIS OF SOME OF THE MAJOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PRESENT LAW, THE MCCARRAN BILL (S. 2550) AND THE HUMPHREY-LEHMAN BILL (S. 2842) ARE AS FOLLOWS:

1. Deportation for mental illness: The McCarran bill (sec. 241 (a) (3)) makes deportable aliens who, within 5 years of entry, become institutionalized because of mental disease, defect or deficiency, though it be a nervous break-down, whether or not the alien can pay his own way and whether or not the cause existed before entry. The Humphrey-Lehman bill (sec. 241 (a) (3)) makes such persons deportable only if they are institutionalized at public expense and if the mental disease, defect, or deficiency existed prior to entry. The Humphrey-Lehman bill follows the present law.

2. Deportation on conviction of any criminal offense: The present law provides for deportation of any alien who, within 5 years after entry, is convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude and is sentenced to confinement for a year or more or who at any time after entry is convicted of 2 crimes involving moral turpitude. The Humphrey-Lehman bill (241 (a) (4)) continues this provision. S. 2550 (241 (a) (4)), however, adds a new ground for deportation. An alien who at any time after entry is or has been convicted of any criminal offense—felony, misdemeanor, or violation of an ordinance, regardless of whether or not it involves moral turpitude—is deportable if the Attorney General concludes that the alien is an "undesirable alien."

3. Limited or unlimited presidential power to suspend immigration: Since the immigration laws are enacted by Congress for execution by the President, the executive branch must carry out the immigration law, as all laws. The McCarran bill (sec. 212 (e)) gives the President plenary power to suspend immigration entirely or restrict it upon conditions, if he finds it would be detrimental to the interests of the United States. There is not even the excuse of possible need for this power in time of war or emergency; the power proposed to be handed over to the President is not limited to such periods, and no other limits are imposed. The Humphrey-Lehman bill rather proceeds on the principle that the executive branch should carry out and not make or frustrate the laws enacted by Congress, except in time of war or national emergency. Accordingly, the Humphrey-Lehman bill gives the President the power to suspend or restrict immigration, but only in time of war or declared national emergency (sec. 212 (e)). The Humphrey-Lehman bill, as well, gives the President the converse power, to suspend the restrictions on immigration and admit aliens for temporary residence, again only in time of war or declared national emergency.

4. Arbitrary denial of visas to people of a whole country: The McCarran bill would add a provision to the law, providing that when a country refuses to accept one of its nationals whom we wish to deport, our consuls shall stop issuing visas to the people of that

country (sec. 243 (g)). This senseless penalty, new in the law and not found in the Humphrey-Lehman bill, would both punish the innocent and not the guilty and give iron-curtain governments a ready opportunity to stop the flight of anti-Communists to our side. Moreover, even a friendly country might reasonably refuse to accept from us an old sick man, who left that country as a child. Since the McCarran Act abolishes the statute of limitations on deportation, such cases would occur frequently.

5. Exclusion for crimes in Communist courts: The McCarran bill, for the first time, excludes aliens who have been convicted of two offenses, except "purely political" offenses (sec. 212 (a) (10)). This will keep out those aliens convicted of trumped-up "nonpolitical" offenses by Communist and Fascist courts. Cardinal Mindszenty, for instance, was convicted of "illegal dealings in foreign currency" and "speculations" as well as for treason. The Humphrey-Lehman bill (sec. 212 (d) (11)) provides for admission of such people, but only on findings by the Attorney General which will safeguard the interests of the United States.

6. New discrimination against Filipinos: The McCarran bill draws a triangle on the earth's surface, from the North Pole, south through Russia, west of Afghanistan, through the Equator and to a point below Capricorn in the Indian Ocean, then east through Australia almost to New Zealand, then north again back to the North Pole, running east of Japan. Any alien, wherever he is born, who traces 50 percent of his ancestry to peoples from this area will henceforth be charged to an "Asia-Pacific" quota of 100. Thus the native of England whose father is Chinese, will be charged to this quota of 100, while every one of his fellow citizens will be charged to the quota of England. This triangle covers 26.5 percent of the earth's surface and the people of one-quarter of the whole earth are thus informed that they and their descendants forever are in our eyes inferior to all other peoples.

This triangle, of course, includes the Philippine Islands. Until now, and under the law today, a child of Filipino parents born in Europe or South America is treated equally with the natives of his country of birth. The McCarran bill would bar the immigration of such people of Filipino stock. The people of the Philippines, our allies and former wards, are not likely to forget the undeserved insult to them in the McCarran bill.

7. Unfair quota treatment of parents of American citizens: Under the law today, parents of American citizens are entitled to a preference up to the first 50 percent of the quota for their home country. Both the McCarran bill and the Humphrey-Lehman bill, recognizing an urgent national interest, provide for a new, first preference of 50 percent for men of unusual ability, such as scientists, especially needed for the welfare of the country. What, then, is to be done for the parents of American citizens? The Humphrey-Lehman bill, recognizing their need and the human need of their citizen children in the United States, provides that the parents are to be nonquota immigrants, free of quota restrictions (sec. 101 (a) (26) (H)). The McCarran bill rather subordinates the parents to a second preference of 30 percent (sec. 203 (a) (3)) with the result that fewer of them will be able to come to join their children, and those that do, will displace other immigrants, who might otherwise come within the quota. The tragic consequences for those countries with oversubscribed quotas, can be appreciated from the cases of Norway, Denmark, and Greece. The quotas of those countries are so crowded that parents of American citizens in those countries are now required to wait as much as 5 years before they can be admitted under the quota.

8. Exclusion on speculation that the alien may become a public charge: The law today excludes aliens likely to become a public charge. The courts have been strict to avoid an abuse of this provision and to upset administrative exclusions on this ground based on speculation and bias against alien arrivals. The McCarran bill would amend the law to permit the exclusion of any alien who in the opinion of the Attorney General or the consul is likely at any time to become a public charge (sec. 212 (a) (15)). This double vagueness, opening up possibilities of exclusion of aliens on mere prediction unsupported by facts, betrays the bias against aliens of the McCarran bill. The Humphrey-Lehman bill continues the present law (sec. 212 (a) (15)).

9. Deportation of aliens who go on relief at any time: Further bias is revealed by the new provision in the McCarran bill for the deportation of any alien who in the opinion of the Attorney General hereafter and at any time after entry shall be a public charge from causes not affirmatively shown to have arisen after entry (sec. 241 (a) (8)). This will permit the inhuman result of deportation of a man who came 20 years ago, if 20 years from now he goes on relief, if he cannot prove to the opinion of the Attorney General that the cause arose after his entry. The Humphrey-Lehman bill merely codifies the present law (sec. 241 (a) (8)) which provides a statute of limitations of 5 years after entry for this ground of deportation and makes no mention of the opinion of administrative officers but leaves it to proof of facts.

10. Perpetuation of quota inequalities: The McCarran bill perpetuates all the inquities of the present quota system. Quotas are now computed on the basis of the smaller, 1920 population. Quotas are now allotted to the countries that do not use them, while the people of Norway, Denmark, and countries of southern and eastern Europe need them desperately. And quotas are mortgaged, in some cases for a hundred years to come, under the Displaced Persons Act.

11. New statute of limitations on the right of a native-born citizen to sue to protect his citizenship rights: With respect to native-born citizens, the McCarran bill (sec. 360 (a)) puts a limit of 5 years on the time in which a native-born citizen can sue to upset a Government agency's determination denying him any rights as a citizen, for example, the denial of a right to a pension, a grant, or a job open only to citizens. The present law does not so limit the right of the native-born citizen and the Humphrey-Lehman bill (sec. 360 (a)) continues the present law.

12. Statute of limitations on deportation: Under existing law practically all deportable offenses are subject to a statute of limitations, and the Humphrey-Lehman bill (sec. 241 (e)) provides a statute of limitations for most deportable offenses. It further provides that in many of the offenses proceedings for deportation must commence within 5 years of entry. Section 241 (d) abolishes the general statute of limitations and will thus deport a man because of a defect in his admission 20 years ago, though he has held a job and raised a family since that time. To the contrary, the McCarran bill provides for deportation of aliens at any time after the offense, and at any time after entry, even where the offense in question was not a deportable one at the time that the alien entered the United States.

13. Literacy test for elderly immigrants: With respect to arriving immigrants, the McCarran bill for the first time in the law imposes a literacy test on elderly parents and grandparents who are sent for by their citizen children (sec. 212 (a) (25)). The Humphrey-Lehman bill (sec. 212 (b)) continues the present law granting these elderly people an exemption from the literacy test.

14. Ability to write English—a requirement for citizenship: With respect to eligibility for naturalization, the McCarran bill continues the law, hastily enacted in 1950, which requires that all aliens who came since 1932 and all who come in the future must be able to write English if they wish to be naturalized (sec. 321). The Humphrey-Lehman bill (sec. 321) omits this requirement, in order to permit the naturalization of aliens who, while they can read in English, are unable to master written English. A poorly educated man often finds it impossible to learn to write in a new language.

15. Deportation for "having a purpose" to engage in activities prejudicial to the public interest: The McCarran bill (sec. 241 (a) (7)) continues the 1950 provision which gives the Attorney General the power to deport an alien if the Attorney General finds that at any time in the past the man "had a purpose" to engage in activities prejudicial to the public interest. The Humphrey-Lehman bill limits this power of the Attorney General to cases of aliens convicted of such activities (sec. 241 (a) (7)).

16. Discrimination against Negro immigration: The McCarran bill reinstitutes discrimination against oriental races and imposes new restrictions on immigration of Negroes from the British and French island colonies in the West Indies. Those natives of colonies are under present law charged to the quotas of the mother countries, quotas, which are not oversubscribed. In fact about 3,000 Negroes emigrate each year from Jamaica, Martinique, and the other colonies in the Caribbean. Under sec. 202 (c) of the McCarran bill, a limit of 100 is imposed for the first time on immigration from each colony. The Humphrey-Lehman bill rejects such discrimination. Rather it give natives of colonies in the Western Hemisphere nonquota status, so that they will be treated equally with all the other natives of the Western Hemisphere, now entitled to nonquota status (sec. 101 (a) (26) (C)).

17. Treatment of persons who have joined political organizations: The McCarran bill (sec. 212 (a) (28) (C)) continues in the law the provision of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, excluding any alien who has joined, the "direct predecessor or successor" of an organization that advocates communism. It is impossible, of course, for a member of an organization to know what its successor will advocate and, as to the predecessor, organizations often deliberately cast themselves off from their predecessors, because of conflict in views.

The McCarran bill makes no exception, moreover, for the alien who has joined a subversive organization in ignorance of its aims (sec. 212 (a) (28) (I)). The Humphrey-Lehman bill excludes all subversive or Communist aliens (sec. 212 (a) (28) (C) (I)), but does not penalize aliens who joined "the predecessor" or "the successor" of a Communist organization, or the alien who was innocent of the aims and purposes of the organization.

18. No naturalization of conscientious objectors: The McCarran bill will prevent the naturalization of those persons whose sincere religious connections prevent them from bearing arms. The McCarran bill (sec. 337 (a)) uncompromisingly demands from all applicants an oath that they will bear arms, and perform noncombatant service and perform civilian work as required. The Humphrey-Lehman bill (sec. 337 (a)) provides that in cases where the applicant shows the court by "clear and convincing" evidence, that his religious convictions bar such an oath, he may take an oath to perform noncombatant service, or, on the same showing of evidence, to perform work of national importance when required by law.

19. Search and interrogation of citizens without warrant: For the first time in the law, the McCarran bill (sec. 287 (a) (1)) authorizes the interrogation of any person if the immigration officer "believes him to be an alien." The Humphrey-Lehman bill (sec. 287 (a) (1)) authorizes the interrogation

only of aliens. Too, the McCarran bill continues the provision authorizing the search without warrant of any car within a "reasonable distance" of Canada or Mexico or the Atlantic or Pacific Oceans (sec. 287 (a) (3)). The Humphrey-Lehman bill (sec. 287 (a) (3)) authorizes such a search only if there are reasonable grounds for believing that an alien illegally attempting to enter is in the car.

20. Deportation to a country where the alien may be subject to racial or religious persecutions: The McCarran bill (sec. 243 (a) (7) (h)) permits an alien to be deported to any country that will take him, though he has no tie of birth, citizenship or former residence with that country, so long as he will not there be subject to "physical persecution." The reference to "physical persecution" is new in the law. The Humphrey-Lehman bill (sec. 243 (h)) permits deportation only to countries with which the alien has some tie, and only if he will not there be subject to physical or racial or religious persecution or persecution because of his political opinions.

21. Loss of citizenship by voting abroad: The McCarran bill (sec. 349 (a) (5)) continues the provision of law which causes even a native-born citizen to forfeit his citizenship if he votes in a political election in a foreign state. It was under this law that thousands of Americans of Italian extraction lost their citizenship when they voted against communism in the Italian elections, in support of the Department of State. The Humphrey-Lehman bill (sec. 349 (a) (5)) attempts to further our own national interests by providing that only voting in a national political election will result in expatriation and excepting entirely cases of voting under auspices of the United States.

22. Loss of citizenship by working for a foreign government: The McCarran bill (sec. 349 (a) (4)) would add a provision to the law to expatriate even the native-born citizen when he takes a job, military or civil, with a foreign government, if an oath of allegiance is usually required for the job, even though he does not take an oath. The Humphrey-Lehman bill now provides similarly (sec. 349 (a) (4)), but an amendment is shortly to be proposed to condition expatriation only on the taking of an oath.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 92, line 9, after the word "identify," it is proposed to insert "issued pursuant to section 360 (b) of this act or any other document of identity."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this is merely a clarifying amendment to cover all alleged citizens and nationals who travel to the United States from a foreign shore with travel documents issued by a United States consular officer and who are allowed to land in the United States after detention and not merely the relatively small portion thereof whose travel documents are technically named "Certificates of Identity."

It gives immunity, as to detention expenses, in cases involving citizens and nationals who land after detention in the same manner that immunity is given in cases involving aliens.

As the bill now reads, in relation to detention expenses aliens are given preferred treatment over citizens and nationals who arrive with travel affidavits issued by a United States consular officer. The amendment cures this technical defect and gives citizens and nationals at least equal consideration with that given aliens.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have considered the amendment, and while the language may have to be polished up or changed, I will accept it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, there was one other place in the bill in which I was very much interested. I understand, however, there has been a clarification.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article by the Right Reverend Monsignor John O'Grady entitled "Crusade for a Christian and Democratic Attitude Toward Immigration." I should like to read briefly from it:

As one observed the tide of the times during the decade following the First World War, one could not fail to be disturbed by the new nationalism, the nativism, the intolerance, the racism that were evident everywhere.

Here and there small minorities began to raise their voices against these prejudices, but it was of little avail. They did not get much encouragement from those who should have gone down the line with them. It was in this sort of atmosphere that our present immigration pattern took form.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRUSADE FOR A CHRISTIAN AND DEMOCRATIC ATTITUDE TOWARD IMMIGRATION

(By the Right Reverend Monsignor John O'Grady)

Catholics in the United States are now making a new examination of conscience in regard to their attitude toward immigration. It may be that they are not ready for a complete review of their attitude over the past 35 years. As I moved around the country, I used to hear rumblings about "enough of this" and "enough of that." I have heard it said that we have had enough of certain types of immigrants. Sometimes this was not said too loudly, but the feeling was there just the same. In the early twenties some people used to tell me about their efforts to get certain leaders of the church to take a somewhat different attitude toward the immigration pattern that was then in the making, about the influence of this attitude on Catholic life and the mentality to which it gave evidence in the Catholic people. But it was all without avail. The records will indicate that most Catholic leaders were satisfied to ride along with the tide. Labor was favorable to a rigid program, and we must go along with labor.

EMERGENCE OF NATIVISM AND RACISM IN THE UNITED STATES

As one observed the tide of the times during the decade following the First World War, one could not fail to be disturbed by the new nationalism, the nativism, the intolerance, the racism that were evident everywhere. Here and there small minorities began to raise their voices against these prejudices, but it was of little avail. They did not get much encouragement from those who should have gone down the line with them. It was in this sort of atmosphere that our present immigration pattern took form. During this chauvinistic period it was not merely a question of restricting numbers coming to the United States; even many who felt that the United States could still benefit by a considerable flow of immigration were willing, and many times anxious, to have some limitation of numbers. They did not want to return to the liberal prewar policy, under which more than 1,000,000 immigrants were permitted to enter our country each year, but they did not want to go along with the doctrine that has set up certain nations of northern Europe as superior peoples as compared with those of southern and eastern Europe. They did not want to see the Congress of the United States establish an immigration pattern that was discriminatory against the people of southern and eastern Europe. They did not want to see anthropological and biological concepts that had no basis in fact accepted by American leaders.

Here and there one found able economists and statisticians who believed that there should not be any restrictions on the free flow of peoples except insofar as they concerned the physically or mentally handicapped, those who might become public charges or those who might threaten the American way of life. They believed that the great progress of American industries in the nineties and in the first decade of this century was due in large part to the immigration of strong, vigorous, and industrious Europeans. They believed that the volume of immigration had pretty well adjusted itself to the ups and downs of the business cycle in this country. In fact, they believed that it was very sensitive to the labor needs of the country, and that in periods of depression there was invariably a considerable emigration from the United States back to Europe.

MOVEMENT FOR RESTRICTIVE IMMIGRATION

It is not easy for one to understand the immigration discussions of the years immediately following World War I without understanding their genesis. The movement for restrictive immigration to this country began with the nineties. During this decade various efforts were made to regulate not only the quantity but also the quality of immigration. This centered largely around the so-called literacy test. During this period labor leaders became very active in the campaign for restrictive immigration. They felt that the free flow of European labor into this country was one of the great obstacles that prevented them from organizing the labor forces. How far their contentions were based on factual data has ever been and will remain a moot question.

Following a popular device of the period, a National Commission on Immigration was set up in 1907. In its 1911 report the Commission found that the "new immigrants" were not inferior to the old, but concluded that they did not assimilate as readily. It suggested the limitation of the number of each race arriving annually to a certain percentage of the average of that race arriving during a given period of years. This, of course, was far less radical than the national origins formula later adopted.

Undoubtedly the report of the National Commission on Immigration gave a strong impetus to the movement for more restrictive immigration to the United States. In every session of Congress new efforts were made to have the literacy test adopted. Legislation to impose a literacy test on immigrants was vetoed by Presidents Cleveland and Taft. Finally it was passed in 1917 over the veto of President Wilson.

EVER MORE RESTRICTIVE MEASURES DEMANDED

The crusaders for new immigration restrictions after the First World War were no longer satisfied with the literacy test of

1917. Many of the more extreme among them wanted to cut off immigration entirely. Finally the Quota Act, passed in 1924, introduced a new formula for computing national quotas, based on the foreign-born population of the United States in 1890 instead of 1910, and reduced the quotas from 3 percent to 2 percent of the base population. The total number of immigrants permitted to come into the United States in any one year was thus reduced to approximately 162,000. The national origins formula adopted in 1929 further reduced this number to 153,000. This formula apportioned quotas relative to the estimated national origins distribution of the white population of the United States in 1920. This is the system by which American immigration policy is governed at the present time. If anything, the system has become more and more rigid. Most of the efforts that have been made to liberalize it have ended in making it more rigid.

DISPLACED PERSONS ACT AMENDED

The only important deviation from the legislation of 1924 has been the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 as amended in 1950. This act permitted approximately 325,000 so-called United Nations displaced persons to be brought into the country during the past 4 years. While this has been regarded as a temporary departure from our immigration policy, nevertheless it has made the displaced persons coming into this country a charge on the quotas of the countries of their origin. It has meant mortgaging the quotas of these countries for future years.

The termination of the Displaced Persons Act, and of the International Refugee Organization charged with its administration, has again brought the people of the United States face to face with their continung responsibilities for the displaced peoples of Europe. We must again face the question as to what part we are going to play as a nation in resettling the displaced persons of German ethnic origin now in Germany, in resettling the seven-hundred-thousand-odd persons of Italian ethnic origin from Greece, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and the former Italian colonies in north Africa who for the most part are living in camps in Italy and for whom there is no place in the Italian economy.

One important move has already been made in the setting up of a new temporary international organization to continue the work of the International Refugee Organization. The Congress of the United States has made available the sum of $10,000,000 to this international organization. While the various American voluntary groups that have worked on the resettlement of displaced persons are giving thought to their continued responsibility for them, they find themselves confronted with a new effort to codify basic immigration legislation. They find themselves confronted with proposals that will make our legislation, if anything, more restrictive. They also find themselves confronted with proposals that would virtually bring to an end all efforts to settle displaced persons in this country.

VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS FACED BY NEW PROBLEMS

The new proposals for immigration legislation that are beng promoted in the Congress raise questions for the voluntary organizations as to how far they can separate permanent immigration legislation from that affecting the immediate problem of displaced persons. It looks now as if there will not be much choice. We are faced with the prospects of finding ourselves saddled with a new and more rigid type of immigration legislation for the next 25 years, legislation that will make impossible any program that is in harmony with our Christian and our democratic ideals.

The United States has assumed a worldwide leadership in maintaining the Christian and democratic way of life. It is therefore interested in building up the economies of other countries and strengthening them in their fight against communism. This cannot be done by material aid alone. No amount of material aid can solve the problems of Italy, or even of Western Germany, and Greece and Holland, without an opportunity of settling some of their people in other countries. On the basis of my recent study of the south Italian situation I have come to the conclusion that these countries must have an opportunity of settling their people in other countries. We are interested in having them do so, but we cannot ask the other countries to accept Italian immigrants if we are not willing to do our fair share. The people of south Italy have studied our immigration traditions. They know very well that our present immigration legislation is discriminatory against them. They keep on asking how soon will America change its attitude and begin to open its doors to some more Italians? As I talked to the hundreds of unemployed and hungry people in south Italy, I found it difficult to answer their questions in regard to Italian immigration, and I kept on saying to myself: "What can we do to hold Italy on our side in face of the onslaught that communism is making in every city and in every town in the peninsula?" The Communists know how to play on our prejudices against the Italian people. Is there nothing we can do to liberalize our immigration policies so as to offer a token of interest to the Italian people? As I moved around the towns in south Italy, I knew with what hope they referred to the fact that from one town 20 families had left for Venezuela during the past week. In another town they told me how in recent weeks 20 families had left for Brazil. To the people of these towns even the small movement of their people to other countries offered a ray of hope for the future.

PREJUDICIAL ASPECTS OF NATIONAL ORIGINS LEGISLATION

All the discussions preceding the enactment of the national origins legislation showed that it was definitely prejudicial to people in southern and eastern Europe. Of the total quota of 153,000 to be admitted into the United States each year under the program the Italian quota was only 5,000 while the British quota was 65,000 and the German quota 26,000. During the past 18 years, less than 44 percent of the quota numbers for northern European countries have been used. This simply means that the countries with large quotas like Great Britain, for example, and Ireland have not been using their quotas, with the net result that only about one-half of the people whose admission was contemplated under the national origins system are admitted to the United States.

A number of basic questions in regard to our immigration policy confront the Catholic people as well as other people in the United States at the present time. The first is the promotion of a Christian and democratic attitude towards immigration. How can we expect, as a people, to retain our leadership among the peoples of the Western World if we stigmatize these peoples as being inferior and unworthy of admission to our country? How can we become leaders of the democratic world if we continue an immigration policy that has all the elements of racism, of extreme nationalism, of natvism? After all, the world is small at the present time. We are called upon to associate with all peoples.

THE HOLY FATHER PROCLAIMS THE CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE

Our Holy Father has set before us as one of the great objectives of the church in our time the promotion of a Christian international attitude toward immigration. He is constantly reminding us of the universalism of our church, of the universality of its charity, of its concern for all mankind and of the concern of all God's children for one another, no matter what their race, their nationality, or their color may be. Surely we must join with our Holy Father in promoting this basic objective of the church in our time. We must spread the gospel of an international brotherhood in our own country, among our own peoples. We must even begin to teach this gospel of universal brotherhood in our colleges, in our high schools, and even in our grade schools.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION MUST NOT MAR IMMIGRATION LAW

We must give consideration to how far the Christian attitude toward immigration is implemented in the bills before our Congress. We know that the omnibus bill cannot possibly be accepted, at least without far-reaching amendments, as an expression of a Christian attitude toward immigration. We feel that the legislation should at least mark a step ahead in making the unused quotas of countries like Great Britain and Ireland available to Italians and displaced persons of German stock with their grave unemployment problems. We feel that this should be a part of any Christian international policy. We feel that no legislation which regards the peoples of other nations as inferior can long remain on the statute books. It certainly is an insult to stigmatize as inferiors the people of Italy with their long cultural and Christian traditions. We know that there is no people to whom the world owes so much—insofar as Christian teaching, the arts, music, literature, archeology and even the great inventions are concerned—as it does to the Italian people. In view of present world conditions it would be a serious mistake and utterly unchristian to adopt any form of immigration legislation that would discriminate against the people of other countries, that would set them down as inferior peoples and that would even brand large numbers of our own people as second-class citizens. It is to be regretted that this appears to be the avowed purpose of the omnibus immigration bills reported out by the Senate and House Judiciary Committees.

SPLENDID WORK OF IRO MUST BE CONTINUED

As a part of the foreign policy of our Government at the present time the Congress should adopt emergency legislation to continue the interest of the United States in displaced persons. We should endeavor to take steps to continue the splendid work of the International Refugee Organization in settling approximately 1,000,000 displaced persons from Europe in various other countries throughout the world. We must continue our interest as a country in helping displaced Italians to find homes in other countries. We must also use our efforts to help to find homes in other countries for displaced Germans, for displaced Greeks, and for displaced Dutch. We are not going to undertake this work alone. We are going to join with other countries as we have in the past in a continuing interest in the resettlement of displaced persons.

Twenty-one governments have already been committed to the new international organization for the resettlement of displaced persons. It is our hope that this organization may have the support of the people of the United States. We should recall at this time that our Holy Father has set up an International Catholic Migration Commission with headquarters in Geneva. This Commission calls for our support, as it does for the support of Catholics in other countries. It is a symbol of the international interest of our church in this field.

UNPRECEDENTED ACHIEVEMENT OF THE CATHOLIC WAR RELIEF SERVICES

It is our hope that the campaign now under way, with the full approval of the bishops of the United States, for the promotion of a Christian doctrine of immigration

will permeate our whole Catholic life, and that it will give our Church an opportunity of taking its proper place as the strongest Church in the world at the present time. It is our hope, too, that in promoting this Christian and democratic approach to immigration on the international level we shall be able to join forces with other religious groups with which we have worked so successfully in the resettlement of displaced persons.

Every Catholic should feel proud of the great contribution of war relief services of the National Catholic Welfare Conference in the resettlement of 120,000 displaced persons in the United States. No voluntary organization in all history can register such an achievement. It is our hope that this work may be continued as an evidence of the continuing international leadership of our Church in these revolutionary times.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if there are no further amendments to be offered, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1416, House bill 5678.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5678) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move as an amendment that all after the enacting clause of the House bill be stricken out, and that there be substituted the text of Senate bill 2550, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 5678) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. WILEY, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. JENNER conferees on the part of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 2550 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I would not be true to my thoughts and my feelings at this moment were I not to give credit where credit is due. The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has been sitting here for days with members of his staff about him. I refer to the able and splendid assistance rendered to the chairman, in writing the bill just passed, by Mr. Drury H. Blair, who sits two from my left, Miss Ethel L. Johnson, an expert on naturalization, who has been at my command on the floor of the Senate, and last, but not least, the head of the staff having immigration in hand, who has for years worked diligently on the bill, Mr. Richard Arens, who sits next to me.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to join in the remarks of the Senator from Nevada, and to say to the Senate that on all occasions the Senator from Michigan, a member of the minority on the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, has received the cooperation of Miss Johnson, Mr. Arens, and Mr. Blair. They have worked tirelessly, and have been of great aid and assistance in perfecting the bill which has been under consideration, and which has just been passed by the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, at this time I wish to say to the Members of the Senate who have remained in attendance long hours while the bill has been under consideration, and have shown unusual interest in the bill, that I am exceedingly grateful to them, and very happy because they had sufficient confidence in the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and in the committee, and in the work which it has been engaged for three long years, to remain in attendance and assist in the adoption of some amendments and the rejection of others and in the passage of the bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, for more than a year now I have been working, studying, writing, and speaking on the subject of immigration.

For the past 2 weeks I have spoken often in the course of the prolonged debate we have had on the subject of the McCarran omnibus immigration bill.

I have felt that no measure of greater significance and scope has been before the Congress since I have been a Member. I felt that the passage of the McCarran bill in substantially the form in which it has passed would be a development of the gravest consequences. I have felt that, should this measure or one roughly similar to it become law, the very meaning of America, as most of us know it, would be radically affected, that hundreds of thousands of aliens in this country, and hundreds of thousands of naturalized and even native-born citizens, would be seriously affected.

I did not contest and do not now contest the fact that there are some desirable and useful provisions in the bill. I, too, would like to see those provisions enacted. But I feel more keenly now than ever that we cannot afford the price of those provisions if we must also buy the rest of the McCarran bill, with all its incipient dangers to our ideals of justice and equity, with all its built-in prejudices and suspicion of foreigners, with all its revalidation of the discredited theory of racial origins.

I do not think we can afford to pay such a price; I do not think we can afford to see enacted into law so many mischievous and trouble-making provisions just in order to get partial lifting of certain racial restrictions, however desirable that may be.

We must bear in mind that the McCarran bill, as passed, reflects a basic discrimination against peoples from eastern and southern Europe; it reflects a basic discrimination against Negroes. It has the potentialities of slamming the door shut upon all but a trickle of immigration into this country. It makes easy the deportation of thousands of people who should not be deported. It makes denaturalization an everyday possibility for naturalized citizens. It creates a great class of second-class citizens in our country.

I am proud of the part I have been able to play in helping lead the fight against this measure, in bringing the incipient evils in the bill to the attention of the Senate and of the public. I hope that we have made a record which the President can study in arriving at his decision on whether to sign or veto this iniquitous measure.

The debate has brought out a basic difference of philosophy between those who support and those who have opposed the McCarran bill. Those of us who have opposed the bill believe in America, in what it has been and in what it will be. We believe that America has become great under the leavening influence of the broad streams of freedom-loving and freedom-seeking immigrants who have come from many lands. We have no fear of and no prejudices against the foreigner as such. We believe that Amercanism is in the air here—not in the blood.

I shall not delay the Senate more. I still trust and hope that this measure will not become law. I can speak for myself, and I think for my associates in this fight, in pledging to continue our efforts to liberalize and humanize our present immigration laws as reflected in the Humphrey-Lehman bill, S. 2842. We shall never give up our fight against such proposals as the McCarran bill, with its overtones or prejudice and discrimination.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague [Mr. LEHMAN] with regard to the struggle in connection with the immigration bill. I want the RECORD to be perfectly clear. On several occasions the majority leader has pointed out that a good deal of time has been spent on the bill; but the time has been well spent, and it will have been well spent for the future welfare of our country. I have that feeling as we come to the conclusion of the consideration of the bill, after two initial votes, the vote on recommittal and the vote on the substitute. Our task as opponents of the McCarran bill was precisely to point up the RECORD with a series of amendments. It was for that reason that we brought up the amendments. We resorted only to voice votes. It was obvious that we did not have a majority of votes, in terms of adopting the amendments. However, it is equally obvious that there was considerable support for the amendments, for the substitute measure, and for recommittal.

I believe that the bill should not become law. I shall do everything within my power to persuade the people to appeal to the President to veto the bill. I think it should be vetoed, in terms of our national interest and national security, and in terms of the status and respect of the American people in the eyes of the world.

I have never worked with a more wonderful group of colleagues than those who have been associated with me in this fight. We have had as our associates the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], who has poured out his heart, his brilliance, and his ever persevering energy in support of the substitute measure and of the many amendments.

I wish to pay tribute to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and his senior colleague [Mr. MCCARRAN] for the work they have done.

I pay tribute also the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who returned from a speaking tour to participate with us in this struggle over the immigration bill.

Last, but not least, I pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who made a brilliant argument this afternoon, which went unanswered, as to the relations of the bill to the Administrative Procedure Act.

Of course, I pay tribute also to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who has shown great interest in the fight.

Let me say with equal candor that I was deeply disturbed by the fact that during the debate on an issue which affects the lives of millions of people, and may well affect the future welfare and policy of the country, there was such a small attendance of Senators. That is not the fault of the majority leader. The consideration of the bill could have been completed much sooner if Senators had been present in the Chamber to do the job of legislating. However, we wanted to make the argument which we did. As the editorials in leading newspapers of America bear witness, as the radio commentators during the past week have borne witness, as thousands of letters which have poured into the offices of Senators and Representatives bear witness, I am proud to say that as the debate progressed leading members of the great churches of America—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish—as well as leading members of fraternal organizations and nationality groups, joined with the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and his colleagues, including myself, in opposition to the bill.

I hope and pray that the President of the United States, when this measure comes back from conference and reaches his desk, will listen to the words of those who have pleaded with sincerity and great feeling that this immigration bill be vetoed. I hope it will be vetoed. I think we shall have a sufficient number of votes in this body to sustain a veto. I think that feeling is justified by the first two votes which were taken, on the subcommittee measure and on the question of recommittal. We shall have the votes to save America from entering upon a path of legislative policy which could cause us great tragedy in the days to come.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I realize that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, the distinguished Senator from New York, and other Senators who have been associated with them in their opposition to the bill, and their advocacy of the substitute and the amendments which have been offered, feel very deeply in regard to the issues which have been the subject of debate.

I wish to express to them my personal appreciation for their cooperation in expediting the consideration of the bill. They have not used all the time at their disposal today. We might have been here until 12 o'clock tonight and after, and still not have completed consideration of the bill.

I also express my appreciation to other Members of the Senate for their cooperation, and for helping us to dispose of the immigration bill at this hour.

Mr. President, I now desire to make a motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

HOUSING ACT OF 1952

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1510, Senate bill 3066, a bill to amend defense-housing laws, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader suggested to me earlier today that perhaps the Senate might meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning and proceed with the consideration of the proposed housing legislation, which has been made the unfinished business.

The distinguished junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is present, and I may say that I was informed that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], would return to the city tonight. I have talked over the matter with the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Ohio, and I think the Senator from Ohio will agree with me that the bill has been shortened by the committee, and that the committee is perfectly satisfied with the provisions of the bill as it is written.

Mr. President, unless extraneous matters arise, I very frankly do not think it will take more than an hour to dispose of the measure, because the only proposals are to extend certain FNMA mortgage authority, provide $1,000,000,000 for FHA, increase community facilities to some degree, help farm housing to a small extent, provide that Guam may be designated as a place where FHA may finance housing, and add a little to the revolving fund for Alaska housing.

I wish to say to the Senator from Arizona that, so far as the members of the committee are concerned, the Senate might meet at 11 o'clock. Of course, we could not bind other Senators, nor would we attempt to do so.

I have had letters from Members of the Senate who are anxious to have extended for the benefit of contractors and business people, FHA mortgage loans which have expired.

I do not think it will be necessary to meet before 11 o'clock. I hope I am not being presumptuous, but I think that if the Senate meets at 11 o'clock, unless something unforeseen arises, we shall be able to finish consideration of the bill. With the permission of the Senator from Arizona, I should like to ask the ranking Republican member of the committee what his thoughts are in this regard.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I concur in what the chairman of the committee has said. I think the bill was worked out pretty well to the satisfaction of all the members of the committee. There was no opposition vote on the part of any member of the committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. Senators wrote me letters as chairman of the committee, urging that the bill be considered.

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct. Furthermore, I think there is no amendment of any substance to the bill, except for a change in the amounts, increasing the amounts so as to take care of the increasing needs in the housing field. So I am confident, without being presumptuous, that it would not require more than an hour or two to complete consideration of the bill, unless some opposition should appear of which the committee members have no knowledge.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is perfectly agreeable to me to have the Senate meet at 11 o'clock a. m. My only purpose in suggesting that the Senate meet at an earlier hour was that I wanted to be sure that the consideration of the bill would be completed tomorrow. We can meet at 12 o'clock if Senators are sure that we can finish consideration of the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. I can speak only for the committee, and for the Members on the Democratic side. I have talked with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], who were present in the Chamber a while ago. I am certain that there will be no difficulty about disposing of the bill. I am certain that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] feel that, unless something unforeseen arises, there will be no difficulty.

Mr. McFARLAND. The two distinguished Senators almost make me feel sorry that we did not plan to complete consideration of the bill tonight.

Mr. BRICKER. I believe that if the majority leader had known what the situation would be, it could have been disposed of this evening.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The bill which we have reported from the committee is a very conservative bill. We were in substantial agreement in the committee, on both sides. I cannot imagine that there will be any real controversy over the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. When does the Senator from South Carolina wish to have the Senate meet tomorrow?

Mr. MAYBANK. Twelve o'clock noon would suit me, in view of the fact that the Appropriations Committee is to meet at 10:30. If the Senate were to meet at 12 o'clock, I believe we could complete consideration of the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is perfectly agreeable to me. If we can complete consideration of the bill in half an hour, we shall proceed to the consideration of the mutual security bill and see if we can make some progress on it.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is my judgment that we can do so.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should be glad to have the Senate make some progress on the mutual security bill tomorrow.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question for the purpose of the record. I think the chairman of the committee has communicated with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

Mr. MAYBANK. My office has communicated with him. The Senator from Indiana is on his way back to the city. He will call us as soon as he reaches here. He is returning from Boston.

Mr. BRICKER. When the bill was reported from the committee, he expressed to me the same feeling which has been expressed here on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. He is returning on the train from Boston. I understand that he is expected to arrive about 9 o'clock.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have talked with the minority members of the Banking and Currency Committee whom I have been able to reach. I have not been able to reach the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me say to the distinguished minority leader that I would never be one to bring a bill up in the absence of the ranking minority member of the committee. However, after talking with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and after calling the home of the Senator from Indiana, I am satisfied that the Senator from Indiana is agreeable. He had told me that he was in agreement with what had been done in the committee, and he so voted.

Mr. BRIDGES. I assume that everything is satisfactory. I believe that if the distinguished majority leader will arrange for the Senate to meet at 12 o'clock, there will be no reason why the bill cannot be disposed of in a reasonable time.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it is with a great deal of satisfaction that I note that we have completed consideration of the immigration bill this afternoon. Some Senators doubted me when I made the statement that the Senate would dispose of the bill this week. I was not sure whether it would or not.

I am happy to make the motion that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 23, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 22, 1952

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art our refuge and strength and our help in time of trouble, we are daily beseeching Thee to bestow upon us the blessings of divine wisdom and guidance.

Thou knowest how greatly concerned and disturbed we are about the present condition and welfare of our beloved country and the problems of its defense and security.

We pray that we may be inspired with an indomitable courage and determination to save our Republic from corruption and degeneracy.

Grant that the virtues of righteousness and the fear of God may be enthroned in our national life, for history shows us very clearly and conclusively that these virtues are the only sure protection against all that is debasing and the only absolute guaranty and assurance of a nation's prosperity and perpetuity.

Wilt Thou create and stimulate in the hearts of all leaders, civilian and military, a lofty and unflinching sense of duty and responsibility in helping our democracy attain unto the highest possible standards of living and efficiency. May our democracy be rich and strong in the spirit of good will and brotherhood.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of our salvation. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to address the House on Wednesday next for 30 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to address the House tomorrow for 10 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. What time is the Senate invited to be here today?

The SPEAKER. Between 12 and 12:30.

Mr. RANKIN. Then, I suggest that marking these seats and depriving the Members of the use of them is nonsense, and I ask that they be removed.

The SPEAKER. There is no prohibition against Members using any seat they desire.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 81]

Aandahl	Engle	O'Brien, N. Y.
Albert	Fugate	O'Toole
Anderson, Calif.	Furcolo	Patterson
Armstrong	Gathings	Phillips
Baker	Gavin	Poulson
Bakewell	Golden	Powell
Barrett	Granger	Ramsay
Beckworth	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Redden
Bonner	Hart	Robeson
Boykin	Havenner	Rogers, Mass.
Bramblett	Hays, Ohio	Sabath
Bray	Hébert	St. George
Buchanan	Herlong	Sasscer
Buffett	Herter	Scudder
Burnside	Hoeven	Secrest
Camp	Holifield	Sheppard
Carlyle	Hunter	Sieminski
Celler	Irving	Staggers
Chatham	Jackson, Calif.	Stockman
Chelf	Johnson	Tackett
Combs	Jones, Hamilton C.	Talle
Cooley	Jones, Woodrow W.	Thompson, Mich.
Corbett	Kearney	Van Pelt
Cunningham	Kelley, Pa.	Vinson
Davis, Tenn.	Kennedy	Walter
Dawson	Kerr	Welch
Deane	King, Calif.	Werdel
deGraffenried	McKinnon	Wharton
D'Ewart	Miller, Calif.	Wheeler
Dingell	Mitchell	Wickersham
Dondero	Morris	Wilson, Ind.
Donovan	Moulder	Wilson, Tex.
Doughton	Murphy	Woodruff
Doyle	O'Brien, Ill.	
Durham	O'Hara, Minn.	
Eaton	O'Konski	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 319 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7005) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7005, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read section 1 of the committee amendment.

If there are no amendments to section 1, the Clerk will read.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in considering this very important subject, I think we should

hear the words of one of the present leaders of the minority party in Great Britain.

As everyone knows, there is a clash of personalities in the present minority party in Great Britain, and it would appear that Mr. A. Bevan may become leader of the socialist Labor Party. At all events, the balance of power in the British Parliament is very slim indeed, and the differences between the two sides are very great. The question is whether or not the Conservative Party may be able long to retain its leadership in the British Parliament. If the Conservative Party should lose its majority, then it is possible that the Bevan wing—the radical wing of the socialist Labor Party—might gain control. The thinking of Mr. Bevan is, therefore, of great interest to the United States.

According to the London Daily Mail of March 17, 1952, Mr. Aneurin Bevan is reported as having attacked the United States for the scale of its rearmament program when he spoke in Jarrow. He is reported to have said in Jarrow:

I believe Western Europe is making a very great mistake in allowing the intellectual and moral leadership of the world to fall into the hands of the United States of America.

I want to make it quite clear that I am not anti-American. I am not anti-anybody. I have very many dear American friends. But I do not believe the American Nation has the experience, the sagacity, or the self-restraint necessary for world leadership at this time. She is engaged at the moment in the most tremendous rearmament program the world has ever seen. Quite honestly, I cannot see any sense in it.

We all know America is very powerful, but at the same time we know that America is carrying on this rearmament program and carrying out fiscal policies like high tariffs that are ruining Western Europe.

A little further in the article he says:

I say to my American friends: "Your economic and fiscal policies are doing more damage to Western Europe than Stalin ever could."

Mr. Bevan went on:

I hope we shall start a great peace movement, not because we want to deceive ourselves——

Mr. SHORT. Would the gentleman mind repeating what he said about Stalin?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, at the request of the gentleman from Missouri I will reread one short sentence. He says—this is Mr. Aneurin Bevan speaking:

I say to my American friends: "Your economic and fiscal policies are doing more damage to Western Europe than Stalin ever could."

Further on in the article he says:

I believe that the dangers from communism, if dangers there are, come not from military plans at all but come from the failure to redress wrongs that exist in western society—

And so on.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. RICHARDS. I am sure the gentleman will not only admit that Mr. Bevan represents a minority party but also that he represents a minority within the minority Labor Party; is not that right?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is exactly what I meant; yes.

Mr. RICHARDS. Then we will agree on one point, that Mr. Bevan is no friend of the United States, just as a great many minorities in the United States are no friends of Great Britain.

Mr. HINSHAW. I agree with the gentleman entirely; and, if the gentleman will permit, I would like to comment further.

I have merely presented this article to demonstrate that the present minority party in the British Parliament, which at any moment could become the majority party, and the leadership of which could very easily fall into the hands of this man, is not at all consonant with the principles of the United States; that in the event that political party should succeed in Great Britain to achieve the majorityship, then any plans we might make here for the defense of western society could very well fall away to nothing, and that we must consider these viewpoints in our present consideration of this program in which we are engaging, we think, for the benefit of all society, including Western Europe and including Great Britain.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(On request of Mr. RICHARDS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HINSHAW was allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.)

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman will also admit that there is not a country in the world which does not have some minority group or minority leader who is unfriendly to this country, is that correct?

Mr. HINSHAW. Of course, that is true and that is one of the great risks we are running in this program.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is a calculated risk and one we have to assume.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that if the United States were to be drastic or indiscreet in handling this program at this particular moment, it might do more than anything else to put Great Britain back into the hands of the people who are most opposed to ourselves?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes. We supported the British Socialist Party for years, we kept them in power by contributing to the welfare of that country during its priod of leadership, and we certainly should not endeavor to reestablish that party in power.

Mr. JUDD. A better party, from our standpoint, is now in power over there than in the last few years. We ought not to weaken its position and power.

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not think we can run their politics, but I think we ought to know full well what we are doing when we enter upon this program.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it not a fact that the so-called Marshall plan was originally the Bevan plan?

Mr. HINSHAW. Possibly so.

Mr. RANKIN. It is now bankrupting the United States and dragging us down the economic path to ruin.

Mr. HINSHAW. They took everything they could get from us and asked for more.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I think the most significant statement to indicate the situation with reference to Bevan that the gentleman read from the article from which he quoted was the one in which Bevan said in regard to communism, "if danger there is."

Mr. HINSHAW. He does not believe there is any danger from communism, but the rest of us do.

The article from which I quoted is as follows:

[From the London Daily Mail of March 17, 1952]

BEVAN: DANGER IS UNITED STATES, NOT RUSSIA—"DOING EUROPE MUCH MORE HARM THAN STALIN CAN EVER DO"

Mr. Aneurin Bevan attacked the United States for the scale of its rearmament program when he spoke in Jarrow last night. He said: "I believe Western Europe is making a very great mistake in allowing the intellectual and moral leadership of the world to fall into the hands of the United States of America.

"I want to make it quite clear that I am not anti-American. I am not anti anybody.

"I have very many dear American friends. But I don't believe the American Nation has the experience, the sagacity, or the self-restraint necessary for world leadership at this time. She is engaged at the moment in the most tremendous rearmament program in the world has ever seen. Quite honestly, I cannot see any sense in it.

"We all know America is very powerful, but at the same time we know that America is carrying on this rearmament program and carrying out fiscal policies like high tariffs that are ruining Western Europe.

"France is on the edge of ruin. We are running into national insolvency as a consequence of the lack of balance between the economies of the Western World and America.

"I say to my American friends: 'Your economic and fiscal policies are doing more damage to Western Europe than Stalin ever could do.'"

PEACE CAMPAIGN

Mr. Bevan went on: "I hope we shall start a great peace movement, not because we want to deceive ourselves that some men in the world don't want war but because the forces of peace are more powerful than the forces of war."

At one point Mr. Bevan said: "Now General Franco is going to become one of the saviors of democracy in the west. When are we going to have some sense of national pride and tell the United States that she can't have Great Britain on any terms? The Americans would understand us. They like plain speaking. Why don't we speak plainly to them?"

On Britain's rearmanent policy Mr. Bevan said: "Stalin is not deterred by atom bombs. * * * There is more reason for the British to concern themselves with the atom bomb.

"Therefore, I don't believe that the Soviet Union, if it has intentions of imperial aggrandizement, is going to make war in that way."

COMMUNISM

"I believe that the dangers from communism, if dangers there are, come not from military plans at all but come from the failure to redress wrongs that exist in western society."

Earlier, in a reference to differences inside the Labor Party, Mr. Bevan complained that the newspapers were trying to create original quarrels. He made bitter allusion to conservative newspapers busy electing leaders of the Labor Party.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, it is rather difficult for me to understand why the gentleman from California injected into this debate some statement made by Mr. Bevan. We all know his views; we all have our opinions. The only inference I can draw is that the gentleman is trying to inject something that by way of reaction might produce a prejudicial state of mind in the minds of some of the Members of the House in relation to the pending bill and that by way of this reaction some Members might vote contrary to what they would vote if they were voting by way of affirmation. There have been some prominent Americans who have spoken in favor of this bill and who have made utterances in favor of this bill. There are any number of whom I could mention, one of whom is a very prominent Republican candidate for President at this time, General Eisenhower.

I give to the House the utterances of General Eisenhower, who is a great American, as compared with the remarks made by my friend from California, who used as the basis of his remarks some statement made by Mr. Bevan.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not believe that the gentleman can place the interpretation upon my words that he has stated.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman give me his interpretation, what he intended for us to infer? I want the RECORD to show that, because I do not want to put on any interpretation that is contrary to the state of mind of any individual.

Mr. HINSHAW. My interpretation of the remarks——

Mr. McCORMACK. What was the gentleman's intent in taking the floor and quoting Mr. Bevan?

Mr. HINSHAW. My intent and interpretation of the remarks——

Mr. McCORMACK. I am talking about intent. There are two different things involved here.

Mr. HINSHAW. My intent was to inform the House of the viewpoint of one of the minority leaders in the British Parliament.

Mr. McCORMACK. Would the gentleman accept this viewpoint as against General Eisenhower?

Mr. HINSHAW. Of course not, and I will state that on this floor. I do not know why the gentleman takes me to task.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have not taken my friend to task.

Mr. HINSHAW. Then I have misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am calling attention to the fact he made a rather unusual speech and called attention to the fact he quoted Mr. Bevan, who is a British subject. I also called his attention to the fact he did not quote an outstanding American who might be the nominee of the Republican Party, at least he is one of the two strong contenders, General Eisenhower. It is going to be rather interesting when the vote is taken to see on the Republican side what influence General Eisenhower has.

Mr. Chairman, anyone who believes in the preservation of western civilization, which is the civilization of God, should not be an isolationist today. The causes that produced isolationism in World War I are entirely different than those of today. The basic issue of today is entirely different. It is greater and broader than nations and peoples. It is greater than national or racial prejudices and feelings. The basic issue facing us today transcends purely nationalistic feeling or emotional reactions. In the determined effort of international communism to dominate and control the world is the enslavement, persecution, imprisonment, and even death of those who oppose international communism. Involved in this is the independence of nations and freedom of peoples in the free world; the hope of enslaved peoples like Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia and other nations behind the iron curtain to regain independence and freedom.

The passage of this bill is vitally important to the people of West Germany, of Italy, of France, of all of the countries that are still free in Europe, including Spain, Portugal, and even Ireland, and Great Britain, to resist communism being imposed upon them. The passage of this bill is vitally important to those people in Communist-dominated countries who are hoping for future freedom and independence. But we might just as well face the facts and recognze the basic issue involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. McCORMACK was allowed to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The basic issue involved is the forces of anti-God, which is the origin of communism; the hate-God origin, destroying His churches, to get control by any means, and once in control destroy, and compel those who survive to comply, and then by force and through fear subject them to the vicious persecution of international communism. We are either going to have a world of God or a world of atheistic communism with its origin of hatred of God and all that His law stands for. It is up to us to determine what kind of a world we shall live in.

This bill is a marked contribution toward meeting the present world menace of atheistic communism. We must realize that we cannot separate or isolate ourselves from the other nations of the world; let them be taken over one by one by the Communists, without presenting great danger to our country and to ourselves. There is no justification today in our own interest for any American following a policy of isolationism, and I am confining my remarks on this occasion to Europe. But, what I have said, would also apply to any other part of the world. Confining myself to Europe, this would mean giving into the hands of Stalin and his gang of world killers Norway, Sweden, Finland, Western Germany, France, the Low Countries, Italy, Switzerland, Spain, Greece, and our ally, Turkey. What Americans, particularly those of French blood, those of Italian blood, those of German blood, and of other European countries that are still free there, Americans or any other racial origin, would want to see this happen?

No matter what may have been those factors and the causes that brought about a feeling of isolationism among some Americans in the past, they do not exist now. This is a changed world. Our thinking, our opinions, our governmental policies must be geared to the world of today, not to the world of 10, 20, 30, or 40 years ago.

If Western Europe with its great productive capacity and 200,000,000 people, with the know-how that exists there, is taken over by the Kremlin, is there anyone present who thinks for one moment that Stalin will leave Ireland and Great Britain alone? The stakes are too high for us to take a chance. They are too high for isolationism at all to exist in the America of today. We can judge the present and form our opinions in relation to the conditions that exist today, and we must do so in the light of the world conditions and not from the angle of from one to four decades ago.

While we are thinking and talking about productive capacity, let us appreciate the productive capacity of Western Europe and what it would mean in terms of our own self-interest if, added to what the Soviet Union controls today, it controlled the productive capacity of Western Europe. At the present time we have about a 4½ to 1 advantage over the Soviet Union and its satellite nations. The United States has an advantage of about 3 to 1 in production terms. Western Europe has an advantage of about 1½ to 1 over the Soviet Union. If the Soviet Union were to get control of western Europe without regard to the 200,000,000 additional people they would get control of, without regard to the know-how they would get control of, the productive capacity of Western Europe, added to that of the Soviet Union, would give the Soviet Union a productive capacity that would make it a serious competitor of our own country, and that would be dangerous to the national interest of our own country.

Further, if the Communists obtained control of Western Europe, is there anyone who thinks that any country in the Western Hemisphere would fight and die for the United States? That would place us in a position where we would be alone in the world of today.

Mr. Chairman, it is too great a calculated risk for any one of us to take.

(On request of Mr. FULTON, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MCCORMACK was allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.)

Mr. FULTON. May I interrupt the gentleman to straighten out something that has occurred here in the colloquy? It is a misunderstanding of the name "Bevan." In Britain there was Ernest Bevin, who was a great friend of America. The Marshall plan was at one time called the Bevin plan. When the gentleman from Mississippi referred to the Bevan plan, he referred to Aneurin Bevan, who was quoted here by the gentleman from California. He is a left-wing Socialist and has no connection with the other man, Ernest Bevin.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The gentleman is absolutely correct, and I think he has made a contribution in having the RECORD show that fact.

Mr. FULTON. May I finish by saying that those of us who are for this bill want Britain allied to us and want it standing with us side by side, but Aneurin Bevan's faction does not. So a vote against this bill is a vote that could be interpreted that we should stand separately.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. The burden of the gentleman's remarks was against isolationism, as I understood it.

Mr. MCCORMACK. No, not against isolationism. The intent of my remarks was to show why in the light of the conditions existing in the world today what is termed isolationism—and I use that term simply descriptively, and in no critical sense—should have no place in the minds of Americans of today in the light of the world conditions existing. That should apply to all Americans, but particularly those Americans who were born in European countries or whose ancestors were born there. That includes Ireland and Great Britain, because if the Communists overrun Western Europe. Ireland and Great Britain would be subjected to Communist pressure and danger. It has special emphasis to the Americans of German and Italian blood.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

(On request of Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MCCORMACK was allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.)

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Will the gentleman not admit that the attitude of Great Britain toward Ireland has brought about an isolationist attitude on the part of Ireland, which is entirely unnecessary. I know your devotion to Ireland, and I think you will admit because of their attitude, that is the attitude of Great Britain toward Ireland, they have isolated that country from the NATO agreement.

Mr. MCCORMACK. My position on the unification of Ireland is well known. But, in the face of the great danger that confronts the world today, which is the greater danger, we should all band together to meet this danger to preserve the way of life we believe in.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. I am not disagreeing with that.

Mr. MCCORMACK. And other questions should be settled during and after we have met the graver and more immediate and primary danger.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. The gentleman admits that Great Britain's attitude has actually isolated Ireland; does he not?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Unfortunately, yes. But, my argument is that despite that, in view of world conditions today, with the grave problems involved and the gravity of the problems confronting all of us, we should stand upon that common ground that we can all stand upon and meet and defeat the danger of international communism, and then to meet other questions which, while important, are secondary to world communism, and settle them after we have met the greater danger, and we can settle the other questions as we go along even now, or particularly after we meet the grave danger that confronts us.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Should we not use our influence to prevent that isolationism of Ireland?

Mr. MCCORMACK. That is another question—there are some of who believe that like my friend from California and I do.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. But, we are supporting Great Britian with funds.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes, but does the gentleman take issue with anything I said, that if the Communists get control of Western Europe, it will not be for the best interests of our country?

Mr. MCDONOUGH. No, I do not take issue with that statement, of course.

Mr. MCCORMACK. No, of course not.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. The gentleman referred to the fact that Poland and the other satellite nations might ultimately regain their freedom.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The only way that can be done is by holding the line in Europe.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman believe that everything should be done in a practical and prudent way, which looks toward the liberation of the present captive nations in Moscow?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Absolutely.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. And that our policies should be pointed in that direction?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes, and it should be pointed in that direction affirmatively. I agree with the gentleman and that is contained in the substance of my remarks. There should be an affirmative approach.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. There should be an affirmative approach that goes beyond the negative and merely defensive position in Poland.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

(On request of Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, and by unanimous consent, Mr. COUDERT was allowed to proceed for five additional minutes.)

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time neither to support nor to oppose the bill, nor to propose an amendment, nor to oppose any amendment. I rise to call the attention of the membership of the House to some facts which I think are very pertinent, which have a very significant bearing on the problem before the House today, particularly as to the amounts to be authorized in this bill and ultimately appropriated in a later bill.

Mr. Chairman, our good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, did not seem to like the reference here in the well to a minority leader of a minority party in Great Britain. Perhaps he would be more interested in the considered conclusions of a leader in the majority party in the United States. In fact, the gentleman is one of the leading candidates for President, of his party, the Democratic Party. I refer to W. Averell Harriman. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] and the Members of the House will have to decide whether they believe in Mr. Harriman No. 1 or in Mr. Harriman No. 2. I am not making any recommendations as to that question, but wish solely to recall to you, the words and conclusions of Mr. Harriman No. 1, speaking in 1947. My attention was called to Mr. Harriman and this matter by a story published in the morning's newspapers. Mr. Harriman No. 2, speaking this morning, Mr. Harriman, Director of Mutual Aid, Democratic candidate for President of the United States. The headline in the New York Times says:

Harriman attacks Congress over aid. Harriman belabored Congress today for considering cut of $1,000,000,000 in foreign aid.

That, I take it, is directed at the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] and his majority colleagues, who had the temerity not to grant in this bill every item that the administration has demanded. I congratulate him on it, but Mr. Harriman No. 2, obviously, does not.

Now, let us get back to Mr. Harriman No. 1.

When I first came to the Congress, as did many other Members here today, in the Eightieth Congress, the Marshall plan was born. At the time it was born many Americans were apprehensive as to how much the United States, how much the American economy, how much the simple American taxpayer could afford to pay for needy, useful, and wise foreign aid, without suffering disastrous inflation and bankruptcy. So, under instructions of the President, there was set up what became known as the Harriman committee. Mr. Harriman, then Secretary of Commerce, set up a very distinguished nonpartisan committee, consisting of bankers, businessmen, leaders of industry, leaders of labor, top men

in the CIO, top men in the A. F. of L., representing all shades and sections of the American public. Out of the deliberations of this distinguished body came a voluminous and carefully prepared report. Let me read to you the letter of transmittal from Mr. Harriman No. 1, speaking in 1947. It is really very interesting:

Dear Mr. President—

Said Mr. Harriman No. 1—

I have the honor to transmit the report of the nonpartisan committee of distinguished citizens which you appointed last June to advise you on the limits within which the United States might safely and wisely plan to extend economic assistance to foreign countries, and on the relations which should exist between such assistance and our domestic economy.

That is the letter of transmittal. How far could we safely spend money, authorize money, appropriate money for foreign aid?

Then, when we go into the body of the report, in the very first section, we read on page 3:

The President's Committee on Foreign Aid was asked to determine the limits within which the United States could safely and wisely extend aid to Western Europe. It has approached this assignment in a spirit of realism.

That is a very distinguished committee of Americans full of zeal for foreign aid, wholly convinced of the need for it, appointed to determine upon the request of the President how much we could afford to do without inflation and disastrous consequences. Then, as the committee report goes on this note runs all through it. There are given categoric answers; there is no quibbling, there is no qualification. The committee comes up with this conclusion as to what is the maximum safe amount:

On the basis of revised estimates, the committee calculates that the cost of the European-aid program to the Government of the United States would be about $5,750,000,000 for the first year; and, in round numbers, between twelve and seventeen billion dollars for the whole program here suggested.

The committee believes that any aid to Europe offered by the United States should be financed out of taxes, not out of borrowing.

And that was a program, you will recall, that was proposed for a period of 4 years, making an average of four and a quarter billions a year stated by that distinguished committee of Americans as the maximum that the United States could safely spend on foreign aid; and remember that was against the background of the budget situation of 1948, $35,000,000,000 of national expenditures against $85,000,000,000 of expenditures planned by the President for this year.

The point is, and I repeat it, I think it is something we have to ponder when we consider these immense amounts with the Government in 1948 spending only $35,000,000,000—four and a quarter billion was considered by Mr. Harriman, not this committee—the maximum amount that the Government of the United States and the people could safely spend for foreign aid.

Yet this very Mr. Harriman, and other representatives of this Government, are planning to spend in fiscal 1953, beginning July 1, not four and a quarter billions, not the $6,900,000,000, that our Foreign Affairs Committee in this bill has reported to the House, but $10,500,000,000. That is Harriman No. 2: $10,500,000,000. Now, there is nothing we can do about that $10,500,000,000 in this bill because there is no way we can limit the use of carry-over appropriations. Perhaps when we get to the appropriation bill itself someone may suggest that some action be taken to limit total expenditures for 1953 by imposing a ceiling as was done on the military bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. COUDERT was allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.)

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mrs. BOSONE. Surely the gentleman from New York knows that in 1947 we may all have had different ideas. When I first read of the Marshall plan and the termination of it in 1952 I thought that was right. But, believe me, when 1950 came along and the Korean situation, I certainly changed my mind.

I would far prefer to have the front lines in Europe and in Korea than on the clotheslines of our homes here in America. I believe we should think of the difference in the times between 1947 and 1952 and the situation we are now in today, 1952.

Mr. COUDERT. I quite agree with the gentlewoman from Utah, and I am glad she made that point. I think we are all in accord on strengthening Western Europe and keeping war away from home.

The reason the amount to be authorized in this bill is important and the reason the proposed total expenditures for 1953 of old and new appropriations is important is the same reason that led the House to limit total military expenditures in 1953. We have nearly all come to realize that the economy, the economic integrity, the solvency of the United States, the security of the American dollar are every bit as important as is the build-up of military strength. They are two sides of the same coin. I say that we must consider in determining the amount to be provided in this bill not only what we would like to be able to contribute in the way of aid but also what we can safely afford to expend in the way of aid on top of the enormous amounts that the administration is planning to spend for the military and all of the other items of the Federal budget. It must be considered as a part of a single whole. For that reason I want to call the attention of the House to these considered, carefully prepared conclusions of this wise and nonpartisan committee of 5 years ago. No foreign foe can defeat the United States. But the United States still can destroy itself by reckless public spending and paralyzing taxation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday afternoon I discussed an amendment which I shall offer to this bill requiring recipient nations to contribute their proportionate part of the burden being carried by the American taxpayer in defense of the free world. Let me read to you an article appearing in the Miami Herald on May 10 by Ernie Hill. It is pertinent to the consideration of this bill and a logical argument for adoption of my amendment:

The American taxpayer, mangled daily by high prices and clipped weekly in the pay check, deserves a lot more credit at home and abroad than anybody here or there appears ready to give him.

He is the guy who—sometimes meekly and sometimes under protest—is shelling out to keep a fantastic number of economic and military projects going on everywhere in the free world.

And all the thanks he gets you could put in your eye.

This unhappy set of circumstances is one of the strongest feelings I have experienced in returning to the United States from 8 months in 10 European and Middle East countries.

Our foreign friends are inclined to take our products of sweat and hard work for granted.

Many of them, in fact, reason by devious means that the American taxpayers have some ulterior motive in keeping them afloat and in some state of military preparedness.

Our military and diplomatic representatives abroad—living on a lavish scale to which they were never accustomed back in Dodge City—also take it in their stride.

Nobody ever feels sorry for or grateful to the man or woman coughing up the 10 or 20 bucks a week back home.

The taxes are one jolt.

But the cost of living, easily the highest in the world because of the siphoning off of goods for our friends, takes even more.

The American dollar will buy two or three times as much abroad as it will here.

In Europe and the Middle East, the people know about Congressmen who favor or disapprove of foreign aid.

They know about generals and atom bombs and politicians and candidates for President.

They are kept aware of President Truman's $7,900,000,000 foreign aid bill and its ups and downs before Congress.

All of this is very interesting and sometimes dramatic.

But they have no idea at all about the little people who work in factories or offices or on farms and what it costs them personally for all this both in taxes and in a higher cost of living here. Maybe it is impossible to tell this story.

Yet I have a feeling that the United States would be a lot more popular than it is today if the people of Europe and the Middle East could comprehend what the American taxpayer is doing for the free world.

It means mothers with large families buying cheap cuts of meat, mixing powdered milk with whole milk, patching worn clothes and making scores of little savings that go to help stop the power-crazed men in the Kremlin from subjugating the free world.

These are the kinds of sacrifices that might be understood.

All they see are the diplomats with striped pants, the embassy attachés with three servants and the military brass with the best of everything.

It would appear that the United States Information Service—press, radio and

films—might well stop bragging about the number of automobiles, radios, electric irons, and refrigerators in this country.

And tell about how much less there is in the refrigerators these days because of the oppressive donations shipped everywhere in the free world.

With the adoption of the amendment I will propose to the Committee we will bring forcibly to the attention of these recipient nations the burdens being carried by the American taxpayer, because the amendment will provide that unless they are willing to carry their share of the load in proportion to what the American taxpayer is carrying, foreign aid will then be denied them.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the Members of the House will be called upon today to vote on certain amendments to this foreign-aid bill. You will be voting your convictions and a new philosophy of government. I have been wrestling with my soul as to the right thing to do on cuts in the bill. I shall vote against the bill. This country cannot carry the world on its back. Our danger is from a crack-up within this country and not from external forces. I say that because of the hysteria that sometimes surrounds remarks upon this major issue. Visitors to and from Europe tell me there is more hysteria in Washington regarding war than there is in all of the capitals of Europe. I wonder why this hysteria and urgency here in the Nation's Capital. This country has few friends, even though we have given away billions of dollars. European cities are under the guns and the cannons of Russia. They are not nearly as much afraid of war, apparently, as we are. It is unfortunate that there is some sort of underground hysteria that drives people on that says "You cannot do this" and "You must do that." Why, it was only 2 years ago that General Bradley came before the Committee on Appropriations and said, "If I ever ask you for more than $14,000,000,000 for war preparation, I ought to be fired." Well, I do not know how many billions of dollars the military now has, but near a hundred billion by July 1 unexpended. I know conditions have changed. We are in an unconstitutional, undeclared police action over in Korea that is sort of an accordion action back and forth, and no one knows where the end might be.

Then the President, bless his heart—I know he has a lot of troubles on his doorstep—speaks in intemperate language that we, who want to save some money are playing into the hands of Stalin. Why yes, you colleagues of mine, you budget-cutters, you are playing into the hands of Joe Stalin because you question wasteful spending. When I heard that remark on the radio I wondered if the President had ever heard about the plans of Stalin. He wants this country to spend itself into bankruptcy. In my book the solemn obligation of the Government, the banks, the insurance companies, and the trust companies is to keep a sound dollar; a dollar that is worth a dollar, because economic collapse in this country can be just as fatal as a military defeat. When America goes broke, who is going to help America? Who can we help when we go broke? Do not say that that cannot happen. The dollar is getting close to the 50-cent mark. We are near economic ruin—on stilts of bankruptcy. The fall would be here now but for spending for war and a give-away of our resources all over the world. I warn you, my colleagues, there is a limit to what this country can do.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I wonder if the gentleman saw the statement by Mr. Acheson to the effect that if any free country would be attacked, it would be our duty to send our boys over there to fight their war. That is what it amounted to.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes, that is the agreement Truman made under the NATO agreement. We have been told to spend to stop communism. I remember lend-lease and UNRRA and the Marshall plan, and now this Mutual Assistance Program. It is to stop communism. We want to stop communism but, my friends, communism has marched steadily on from 170,000,000 to more than 800,000,000 people in 10 years and in the face of all this give-away program. We do not have any friends around the world. They are few and far between. When this country stops our aid we will be hated. The talk of European countries is "how much can we get out of the United States." We are not giving enough attention to our economic capacity. It is limited. I say we are in danger from an economic collapse. The taxpayers of this country are called upon to carry a burden that they cannot carry. I would like to vote just for food, medicine, and clothing, and the things needed, as I did under UNRRA. I supported UNRRA. This spending is different. Without all this spending and its false prosperity, blood money, there would now be unemployment and economic troubles. We must face it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, as I understand this proposal, briefly, it calls for more than $7,000,000,000. What I see in the bill and the hearings and the committee report, and what I have heard here in debate, takes me back to about February 1, 1951, when General Eisenhower stood before our united group over in the auditorium at the Congressional Library and laid down to us three basic propositions:

First. That the world situation is such that we must stand substantially on the alert for 10 years or 20 years, or whatever time is necessary, to meet the day that the enemy decides to strike. Personally, I look upon that as a proposition without a beginning, without a middle, and without an end. I think it is the first time such a proposal was ever made to our people.

Second. The general laid down the proposition that we had no moral responsibility to carry the total burden of the world as related to the propositions contained in this proposal before us.

Third. He emphasized, I believe, some two or three times in his statement to us, that, whatever we assume to be our responsibility, as we proceed to carry it out we must carry it out within solvency, within our ability to pay for it.

That was on or about February 1, 1951.

It was my privilege last October, just before the British elections, to have a long visit with the general and with General Biddle, whom I look upon as General Eisenhower's right-hand man. I shall not quote either of those gentlemen. At that time I brought up for discussion these three propositions which the general had placed before us the prior February, and asked for comments with respect to "How does the picture look to you gentlemen at the present time, after these several months in Europe?" The report I received from both General Eisenhower and General Biddle was indeed discouraging as far as my appraisal was concerned.

I went into some detailed figures with them, and I inquired as to when, in the absence of a major economic collapse in some major country or in the absence of the breaking out of world war III actively in a hot war—how long would we probably be in Europe on this kind of a program. I received impressions to the effect that under the most favorable conditions we would have to be there at least until 1954.

We took the figures of appropriations and authorizations which had been presented to us prior to this present budget and extended the figures up to 1954, and then scaled off, dropping very rapidly from 1954 over the next 4 or 5 years. Then the situation presented itself for inquiry as to "What can we do and keep within solvency?" Just recently General Eisenhower has further remarked with respect to this question of "within solvency."

You can reach your own conclusions as to what we can do and keep within solvency, and I will reach my conclusions. Whether or not there will be a record vote on this bill I do not know.

Mr. MASON. Oh, there must be a record vote on this bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is immaterial to me whether or not there is a record vote because I know what my position is, and I think the people in my district know; and if they do not know, they will know it from this record before the next 3 minutes expire.

I think we have passed the point where we are keeping within solvency, insofar as international obligations are concerned. We have these treaty provisions, and I do not know of any way we can get out from under those treaty obligations quickly. Those are obligations, as I read the Constitution, those treaties constitute at least a part of the supreme law of this land. But what terrifies me is the insistence on the part of President Truman and the administration in general, on stepping outside these treaty provisions, and assuming most every kind of an additional international obligation which can be imagined.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CRAWFORD was allowed to proceed for one additional minute.)

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, if I have the opportunity through some member of the Foreign Affairs Committee offering amendments to this bill, I shall certainly support reductions up to $5,000,000,000, and whether there are any reductions in the bill, or whether it stands as is, I propose to vote against the proposition, because I believe this and other international programs we are now financing, if continued on present scale, will not only bankrupt our economy, but also lead to the destruction of our form of government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it is about time for both Houses of Congress to wake up to the fact that this country is being driven to bankruptcy by this foreign spending.

In this measure you propose to spend $6,900,000,000 for foreign aid. That means that the average county in the district I represent, and in fact the average county in Mississippi and throughout the whole United States, will have to pay $2,300,000 of this amount.

The United States of America owes more money than all the rest of the world put together; and yet we are asked to continue to reach down into the pockets of the overburdened taxpayers of this country and take from them billions of dollars to give to foreign countries.

We are told that these funds are to be used, among other things, to supply armies, to build roads, to build navigation, flood control, and power projects in France, Italy, China, Israel, and other countries throughout the world. Just how much of it will find its way behind the iron curtain nobody knows. We do know that a good deal of it is going to Communist-controlled countries, and probably being used to help kill our boys in Korea.

If we do not stop this foreign waste, this country is headed for bankruptcy. You will remember that Lenin, the Communist leader in Russia, said 30 years ago that the way to get rid of the United States was to bankrupt her. We have certainly gone a long way in that direction, and this appropriation, which, as I said, will amount to $2,300,000 for every county in the United States, on an average, will certainly be another long step in that direction. We simply cannot continue this course if this Nation is to survive.

I was not surprised to hear us fellows who are opposed to this waste called isolationists. I have had that charge hurled at me before, especially by the Reds and their fellow-travelers, whom I have done so much to expose through the Committee on Un-American Activities. When they brand me as an isolationist because I am a nationalist and for America, first, last, and all the time, and for protecting the overburdened taxpayers of this country, they do me a great honor by putting me in a class with those great statesmen who established, built, and perpetuated this Republic, such as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, James Monroe, and the other great leaders who have helped to guide this Nation through the perils of the past and lead the world by precept and example into the most glorious civilization mankind had ever known, and which is now being threatened with destruction by our enemies at home and abroad.

Let us vote down this measure and save our country from bankruptcy, if possible, before it is too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it would be wonderful if we could pull behind our own shores and forget the rest of the world. Evidently some of us believe we could live in that kind of a dream world. It is a philosophy which would lead to the end of all which we hold dear.

"What can we do and remain solvent?" the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] asks. That argument has been used against every important piece of progressive legislation in the last 20 years. We cannot afford to spend money for a sound flood-control program, so we permit our precious topsoil to wash into the sea. We cannot afford proper programs to preserve our forests, so we continue to waste real wealth under the guise of economy. The real wasters in this Congress are those responsible for the tragic waste of real wealth, without which all of our dollars would be meaningless.

Now, we hear the same kind of talk when our freedom and our very survival is as stake. I was interested in the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] and his reference to Mr. Bevan, who was critical of the defense program. Bevan is minority leader of a minority party and was recently rebuked by an overwhelming majority of his own colleagues.

If we are to be influenced by the Bevans, and our true friends in Britain and the free world are to be influenced by our own isolationists, anti-Britishers, and anti-U. N.'ers in the Congress, it would bring disunity in the free world. It would endanger our own freedom and security because it would ultimately force the rest of the free world to deal with Stalin.

The gentleman from California said his intent was to inform the Congress. I ask, For what purpose? Is it to influence this Congress to take a position advocated by the opponents of this legislation to cut or destroy the program which many of us believe is essential in the world struggle to preserve human freedom?

It must make Mr. Stalin happy to know that Mr. Bevan and the opponents of the aid program in this Congress find common cause in opposing this legislation. If Mr. Bevan does not think that communism is a menace, how can his words influence those of us who claim to be its most bitter foes?

It seems to me that Bevan's words should influence us to support this legislation. It is not unusual that those who are most vocal in the fight against communism unconsciously do so much to help it. That has been true not only of foreign policy but also of domestic policy. All we have to do is to look back to those dark days of the 1930's when the seeds of communism took root in this country as a result of conditions brought on by the blind policies of reaction. Such policies point the way to disaster today, just as they have in the past.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(b) The Congress welcomes the recent progress in political federation, military integration, and economic unification in Europe and reaffirms its belief in the necessity of further vigorous efforts toward these ends as a means of building strength, establishing security, and preserving peace in the North Atlantic area. In order to provide further encouragement to such efforts, the Congress believes it essential that this act should be so administered as to support concrete measures for political federation, military integration, and economic unification in Europe. Appropriations made pursuant to paragraphs 101 (a) (1), relating to military assistance, and 101 (a) (2), relating to defense support and economic assistance, of this act may be used, pursuant to the applicable terms and conditions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, and of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501–1522), respectively, to furnish assistance (including, in the case of amounts available pursuant to paragraph 101 (a) (2), transfers of funds) to any of the following organizations: (A) The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, (B) the European Coal and Steel Community, (C) the organization which may evolve from current international discussions concerning a European defense community."

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to see if I can get some information which I have not been able to get from either the statements made yesterday, this morning, or the report.

As I read the bill, although it is said it is to authorize appropriations for only $6,889,000,000, in effect, that is not quite true; in substance it amounts to $7,889,000,000, because on page 22 the Secretary of Defense is authorized to transfer at his discretion a billion dollars of military supplies. That is cutting from one end of the blanket and adding the strip to the other end. What has been advertised as a cut is really no cut at all.

The question I would like to ask is: Upon what showing, upon what authority, upon what control of the Secretary of Defense is there? Is it to be on his own decision based upon any set of facts, upon any conditions? Does he do that on his own?

I ask that question for the reason that we have carefully considered all the military appropriation requests. Defense Department witnesses told us that they had got it down to the very bottom dollar. Then you will recall that the House made certain reductions in the military budget in the Army; we cut it $1,200,000,000 by careful pruning, by scanning every

item that was requested. If there is a billion dollars' worth of fat or excess material that can be transferred to European defense without hurting our own forces we should have been informed of it at the time our appropriation hearings were held. We could have then reduced that request another billion dollars if our Armed Forces did not need all of that requested equipment. Now, the Defense Department has stated to the other body that we cut it too deep. Then, of course, to transfer a billion dollars out of the defense program to the foreign military program would be equivalent to cutting our own defense that billion. Or, on the other hand, if the Secretary of Defense should transfer a billion dollars' worth of it, then next spring the Secretary of Defense could come in and ask for a supplemental appropriation of a billion dollars for our own defense needs to replace the billion dollars he has given away to this Mutual Security Program. Is there any control at all over the Secretary of Defense in making this decision?

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman will find that in the Mutual Security Act of 1951 there are provisions for what matters are subject to the control and jurisdiction of the Secretary of Defense, what matters are under the Mutual Security Director, and certain things are under the Secretary of State. This provision is exactly the provision that was in the law last year except that the words "subject to reimbursement" have been taken out.

The purpose was that since there was a reduction of about $829,000,000 in military aid, and since we were told that all of the arms to be produced were exactly the same kind that we needed, and that this defense of Europe was part of our own defense, there was no reason why we should not make available, regardless of reimbursement, at least a billion dollars of end items that in an emergency could be sent to European forces to use rather than have a legal restriction on doing that, therefore require our men to do all the fighting in that emergency with this equipment.

Mr. SCRIVNER. If there is no remuneration from the foreign military funds that means another billion-dollar cut in the funds for equipment for our own troops, and a few billion for the foreign program. This language says nothing about any emergency at all. All this language on page 22 says is that the Secretary of Defense may furnish military assistance, and so forth.

Mr. VORYS. That is true.

Mr. SCRIVNER. So you are cutting the military supplies by a billion dollars if he takes that action?

Mr. VORYS. No.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Whereas if that had been done under the language in last year's bill there would have had to be a remuneration from your mutual security funds, to replace that taken from the regular military funds.

Mr. VORYS. No. The purpose is that a cut, a reduction, should be made in the military program, the foreign program, but that at least a billion dollars would be made available under the provisions of the act we passed last year so that it could be available as a reserve for either our forces or those European forces.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Sure, but all you have done by that is to take off $800,000,000 from these foreign military funds and take a billion dollars out of the 1953 military appropriations, and add it to the funds requested here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

(On request of Mr. RICHARDS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SCRIVNER was allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.)

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. As a matter of fact, the gentleman knows that the provision giving the Defense Secretary authority to transfer end items from the defense appropriation to this program is entirely permissive. It will add nothing to this bill and will most probably never be utilized.

Mr. SCRIVNER. If the power to transfer is not to be used why put it in this bill? Certainly it will be used if it is granted.

Mr. RICHARDS. So far as I am concerned, it does not have to be in there.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Why not take it out then, when I offer amendment for that purpose? Here is what I should like to point out: The Military Appropriation Committee has put in weeks and months listening to the Defense Department tell us what their actual money needs were for our own military forces. They were all in there telling us, "We are down to the rock-bottom dollar," but in no place or at no time did they tell us they wanted funds to be able to transfer a billion dollars of supplies to the foreign military program.

Mr. RICHARDS. As a matter of fact, in existing legislation they have had authority to transfer that, but none has been transferred. This is nothing new.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Last year there was a reimbursement clause in here. If the Secretary of Defense did transfer items our military funds could be reimbursed out of foreign military aid funds.

Mr. RICHARDS. Last year—and if I am not correct the gentleman will correct me—the term was "with or without reimbursement" when the bill passed the House.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I understood the gentleman from Ohio to say "with reimbursement."

Mr. VORYS. We had to put the reimbursement provision in in conference, but the House always wanted to have it with or without reimbursement. Last year we had long hearings on this exception.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Might I ask one more question for information, and I hope somebody will clear it up later? We have been told so many times that for every dollar we spend on these foreign military programs we are getting four dollars value received. That is pretty steep mathematics, and I hope somebody will give us a full explanation of that during the debate.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7005) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess at this time subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 45 minutes a. m.) the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY GEN. MATTHEW B. RIDGWAY

The SPEAKER of the House of Representatives presided.

At 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m. the Members were called to order by the Speaker.

The Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Senate, preceded by the Vice President and its Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT took the chair at the right of the Speaker and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort our distinguished visitor into the Chamber, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MCCORMACK; the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN; the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. BROOKS; and the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. SHORT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Arizona, Mr. MCFARLAND; the Senator from Texas, Mr. CONNALLY; the Senator from Texas, Mr. JOHNSON; the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. BRIDGES; and the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. SMITH.

The Doorkeeper announced the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the members of the President's Cabinet, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m. the Doorkeeper announced Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway.

General Ridgway, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of Congress, I have the great pleasure and the high privilege of presenting to you Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway. [Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS OF GEN. MATTHEW B. RIDGWAY

General RIDGWAY. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, distinguished Members of the Congress, to be here, before the Members of the Congress of my country, is the greatest honor. To the Senate and the House of Representatives from whence came the invitation, and to the President, who gave his sanction, I express my profound and respectful thanks. Absorbed as you are with a multitude of problems, domestic and foreign, I hesitate to trespass upon your crowded hours. However, having just returned to this country, after nearly a year and a half in the Far East, the last 13 months of which I served there as commander in chief, I feel you would wish me to report briefly on major problems encountered there, and to touch on a few of those matters which seem to me to be of substantial importance in our relations with the peoples of that region.

In outline, the matters I shall cover will be three: the conduct of military operations in Korea, the armistice negotiations, and our relations with the Japanese Government and its people. The first two pertain primarily to the military missions assigned me; the third, to my responsibilities as Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, in which role, acting of course under the policy directives of superior authorities, I had over-all responsibility for all acts of the Japanese Government, as well as for the relations of all Americans and Allied personnel in Japan, both military and civilian, with the Japanese people.

I shall first discuss the conduct of military operations in Korea from Christmas of 1950, the day of my arrival in the Far East, to date.

Assuming command of the Eighth Army on December 26, 1950, I found but three of its seven United States divisions, and these badly depleted in strength, in the combat zone.

Three of the other four had been only recently evacuated from the Hungnam area and of these only the First Marine Division was again ashore in the southern tip of the peninsula. The Third and Seventh Divisions were still aboard ship, while the Second Division was reorganizing and re-equipping as a result of its severe battle losses in the far north.

On a 135-mile front only two of these were on the line of contact, the third in blocking position to the rear. The remainder of this extended front was covered by the Republic of Korea Army, one British, and one Turkish regiment. The Korean divisions were likewise at reduced strength in men and equipment, each with an exceedingly meager artillery component, and all still suffering from the grievous blows they had sustained in the preceding 6 months.

Little time was granted before the first major hostile offensive struck. That time was used for personal visits to all corps and division commanders in their own battle sectors, in order to obtain on the ground, as is possible in no other way, a personal estimate of the character and competence of the commanders and of the problems and conditions confronting them. Based on those visits, decision was made that in the event of major hostile attack, the Army would delay in successive positions. With the instant cooperation of President Rhee, tens of thousands of indigenous laborers were put to work digging trenches and gun emplacements north of Seoul, South Korea's capital.

On New Year's Eve the major hostile attack was launched. It came shortly after dark on that winter evening, with its main effort a converging attack straight south—objective Seoul. By the afternoon of January 3 the situation of our troops on the north bank of the partly frozen Han, with its few bridges within range of enemy guns, became precarious and withdrawal to a secondary delaying position was directed. The withdrawal and establishment of the secondary line south of the Han was accomplished with only light losses in personnel and equipment.

The hostile follow-up was unaggressive, and within a few days the Army was realined intact on its new position. Intelligence had earlier reported an unconfirmed mass of 174,000 Chinese troops within easy striking distance in the west alone, excluding the North Korean forces to the east. To check on this intelligence, aggressive reconnaissance was begun at once and steadily increased in strength.

Based on the combat intelligence so secured, the Eighth Army, with all of its United Nations and Republic of Korea contingents, was launched on January 25, 1951, into a slow, thoroughly coordinated offensive, so designed as to preclude large scale enemy penetrations and the bypassing of substantial enemy forces which might have been a menace to the Army in its then weakened condition. The results of this general offensive action are a matter of historical record. In February and March of 1951 we repulsed two strong hostile counterthrusts, inflicting far heavier losses upon the enemy than we ourselves suffered.

I wish I could pay proper tribute to the magnificent conduct of United Nations troops throughout these operations. It is difficult to single out any one unit or the forces of any one nation, but to illustrate, I shall speak briefly of the Twenty-third United States Infantry Regiment, Col. Paul L. Freeman, commanding, with the French battalion and the normal components of artillery, engineer and medical personnel from the United States Second Infantry Division. These troops in early February of 1951 sustaining two of the severest attacks experienced during the entire Korean campaign. Twice isolated far in advance of the general battle line, twice completely surrounded in near zero weather, they repelled repeated assaults by day and night by vastly superior numbers of Chinese infantry. They were finally relieved by an armored column from the United States First Cavalry Division in as daring and dramatic an operation as the war provided.

I personally visited these magnificent men during both operations and personally directed the attack of the relieving armored column which finally broke through and contributed to the utter and final rout of the enemy forces. I want to record here my conviction that these American fighting men with their French comrades-in-arms measured up in every way to the battle conduct of the finest troops America or France has produced throughout their national existence.

By late March a year ago the Eighth Army knew it had control of the situation. With few checks and with scrupulous concern for the conserving of every possible United Nations life, the Eighth Army, with its magnificent naval and air support, moved steadily forward until by mid-April it stood again, with fighting heart, on or north of the thirty-eighth parallel almost entirely across the peninsula, inbued with unshakable belief in its ability to destroy the enemy whenever and wherever met.

In no way could its splendid spirit have been better displayed than in the next succeeding 6 weeks, when under the conspicuous battlefield leadership of General Van Fleet, the Eighth Army met, checked, and destroyed two more major enemy attacks. Both of these had gained considerable ground and had penetrated deeply into United Nations territory. Subsequently, the entire Army, again with magnificent support of the air and sea arms, passed to the counteroffensive and continued its advance until by November last it stood approximately where now it stands—proud, defiant, and confident of its capability for accomplishing any mission it might be assigned.

In a scant 18 months, beginning with that early July day in 1950, when those first few immortal riflemen and airmen saw the Communist aggressors over their gun and bomb sights, the Eighth Army, comprising our own forces and those of the Republic of Korea, the British Commonwealth, Turkey, Greece, India, France, Ethiopia, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxemburg, the Philippines, Thailand, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Colombia, and Italy, has left a record of fidelity, valor, and cooperation unsurpassed in all military history.

I pass now to the second of my three topics, the armistice negotiations.

For more than 10 months, a group of men, representative of the United Nations Command, and individually and collectively of as high-principled integrity, fidelity, courage, and vision as any group assembled for any similar purpose anywhere, anytime, have sought with full faith and loyalty to achieve an honorable armistice in accordance with the instructions of competent authority. That they have so far been unsuccessful is no slightest mark of failure, but rather, in my opinion, a monumental tribute to their strict adherence to United Nations concepts of human dignity and human rights and to their efforts in the cause of peace. As the military arm of a great democracy, where

that arm is completely, and under all conditions and circumstances, wholly subordinate and responsive to civil authority, they have served well.

Day after day, week after week, month after month, these splendid American soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines, with their colleagues of the Republic of Korea, acting on behalf of the United Nations, have striven with logic and reason, with patience and restraint, and above all with principle and truth, to overcome the blind hatred, the vituperative venom, the vicious falsehoods, deliberately employed, which are all inseparable elements of the technique of Communist negotiation.

I am constrained at this point to refer again to the officially propagated allegations of Communist leaders that the United Nations command in Korea has employed both germ and gas warfare. I wish to reiterate what I have repeatedly stated publicly, that these allegations are false in their entirety; that no element of the United Nations command has employed either germ or gas warfare in any form at any time.

In the whole black record of false propaganda, these charges should stand out as a monumental warning to the American people and the free world—a warning as menacing and as urgent as a forest fire bearing down upon a wooden village. The extent to which Communist leaders have gone in fabricating, disseminating, and persistently pursuing these false charges should impress upon the brains of those who yet fail or refuse to see the purpose of communism, the deadly danger with which it confronts us and the free world.

Today there rests in the Communist hands a logical, reasonable, and honorable proposal for the settlement on equitable terms of the three remaining major unresolved issues—airfield construction, the Communist proposal for membership of the Soviet Union on the neutral nations supervisory commission, and the Communist demands for forcible repatriation of prisoners of war.

The United Nations command delegation, under Vice Adm. C. Turner Joy, that sterling American who has presided over it with such distinction through these 10 months, still stands ready to remove my explanation and clarification, any honest doubts or misunderstandings of the meaning of this proposal which the opposing delegation may harbor. It does not intend to bargain on those issues, the logic of which and the reasons for which have been repeatedly and exhaustively debated.

Acceptance or rejection, cessation or continuance of hostilities in Korea, is now the responsibility of the Communist leaders.

My third and final topic pertains to our relations with Japan.

This relation is of incalculable value and importance to this Nation. Whether Japan grows in strength and resilience sufficient to withstand the impact of the inevitable blows of accidental and deliberate origin, or whether it declines in strength until circumstances or hostile powers succeed in effect in abrogating it, only history will tell. But if I may be pardoned expressing before this august body a personal conviction in a field of responsibility which was formerly mine, I would say the continuance, in fact that an ever-strengthening of the bonds which today make of America and Japan mutually understanding, mutually respecting, and cooperative friends, confident each of the support of the other—I would say, gentlemen, that the attainment and retention for the indefinite future of such a relationship is of vital importance to the national welfare of both nations and to the peace of the world. [Applause.] The Japanese are a proud, sensitive, diligent, and homogeneous people. They have given much to world culture. They have achieved much with little in a brief time. They are capable of far greater contributions within the society of free nations.

In Japan where the basic essentials of life—food, shelter, clothing, and fuel—are in chronic short supply; where past mistakes, which no one recognizes better than do the Japanese as both tragic and lamentable; these people face obstacles in number and magnitude which might make the stoutest hearts quail, but theirs do not. With vision, with resolution, with courage, and with high principle, they propose to build a new Japan, to set before their people a picture of their goal, and to choose a path to take them there. They are asking no charity, but understanding, and the minimum reasonable help which will permit them to reassume in self-respecting dignity the responsibilities which sovereignty, now restored to them by the Japanese Peace Treaty, confers upon them as their own inherent right.

In this presentation I must express other convictions which to me have the stature of mountains viewed from the plain.

Underlying all major problems is Japan's vital need for the creation of a healthy and viable economy. Her present standard of living should be raised. Were it to be depressed, resulting conditions could have potentially grave consequences, for us as well as for them. The nourishing of her population, its employment in gainful occupation, its relations with neighbors both friendly and hostile, its ability to control the small but ever-dangerous Communist threat within her shores, all affect directly the extent to which she can stabilize a basic economy essential to her continued existence as a free and independent nation. In simple sequence, she must have access to raw materials which her industry can convert into products which she can sell in markets in which she must give and receive fair treatment in order to gain the foreign exchange to buy and import the food, fuel, and cloth she herself cannot produce.

The complexity of each of these problems will tax the best in intellect and integrity. That we can find mutually acceptable solutions to these problems is with me a matter of faith. I am convinced we can. I am convinced that if responsible, reasonable men will meet and sit down with a common purpose of finding a common solution, that the Creator of the world will endow their efforts with success. I am convinced that in no other way can success be achieved.

Included among these many problems are ones of singular political difficulty for the present, or any other, Japanese Government. Her military power having been destroyed, her merchant marine, vital to an island people, having been drastically reduced in tonnage, her constitutional limitations against maintaining ground, sea, and air forces now having rendered her incapable of preserving unaided the independence recently restored to her, any government in Japan, the present included, is vulnerable to a degree to all manner of attack by both well- and ill-intentioned opposition.

Despite all this, the overwhelming attitude of the Japanese people toward us today is one of gratitude for the past, of hopefulness for sympathetic consideration in the future, and of very great friendliness.

The unfortunate occurrences on the 1st of May last were reported with accuracy and objectivity from the scene. I believe, however, they received a misleading interpretation in the United States.

Throughout Japan as a whole, that day passed in a generally quiet and orderly manner. The few disorders which occurred, other than in Tokyo, were relatively minor in character. Had they occurred in the United States, they would have excited little or no comment.

The disorders in Tokyo were of a different character. They bore the unmistakable stamp of deliberate Communist design, the target of which would, of course, have been America and all the principles for which she stands. Such was the case. It was marked, however, and I believe the facts will sustain this opinion, by an absolute minimum either of antiforeignism or anti-Americanism. The individual Americans who suffered bodily injury or indignity and the foreign property damaged or destroyed, the latter almost exclusively limited to a few automobiles, happened to be among or in the direct path of the rioting demonstrators. The results could have happened anywhere, and they have, on other occasions, even in our own land.

It would be a grave injustice to both Japanese and Americans to accord to this incident an exaggerated importance. That it revealed to the Japanese people the character and objective of Communist designs is a beneficial byproduct. The overwhelming majority of responsible Japanese opinion has already repudiated these acts in no unmistakable terms. The Japanese Government is alive to the Communist threat and resolved adequately to control it. The full influence of the Emperor, the Prime Minister, and of all responsible members of the present government will be employed to solve this problem in a manner to bring this situation under adequate control with the least practicable delay, and to keep it there.

In short, the Japanese are at our side. Their gaze is lifted to see the same objective we see. They are presently walking with us. Whether they continue or not is a responsibility which rests rather more on us in the immediate future than

on them, for our strength is superior, our resources immeasurably greater, and ours is the role of leadership.

In all these great problems, which though lightly touched upon, have such profound significance for us and the future of our country, we can, I think we must, look for strength to solve them upon that greatest reservoir of America's strength—faith in principle and trust in God. If we draw upon this reservoir with resolution and courage, it will meet all our needs.

I have been greatly privileged to have had the responsibilities which I recently relinquished. I shortly assume new ones. With full reliance on this same reservoir, and on the cooperation of all those engaged in our great crusade for peace and security, I approach our tasks with confidence higher than ever. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m., General Ridgway, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Chamber.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The members of the President's Cabinet.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 1:30 o'clock p. m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS DURING THE RECESS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess today be included in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 82]

Aandahl	Beckworth	Bray
Albert	Betts	Buffett
Anderson, Calif.	Bonner	Camp
Armstrong	Boykin	Cannon
Bates, Ky.	Brambiett	Carlyle
Celler	Herlong	O'Brien, N. Y.
Chatham	Hillings	O'Toole
Combs	Hoeven	Patterson
Cooley	Holifield	Poulson
Crosser	Hunter	Powell
Cunningham	Irving	Redden
Davis, Tenn.	Jackson, Calif.	Reece, Tenn.
Dawson	Johnson	Regan
Deane	Jones,	Sabath
D'Ewart	Hamilton C.	St. George
Dingell	Jones,	Sasscer
Dondero	Woodrow W.	Scudder
Doughton	Kearney	Secrest
Doyle	Kennedy	Sheppard
Durham	Kerr	Stockman
Engle	Kilburn	Tackett
Gary	King, Calif.	Talle
Gavin	Kirwan	Van Pelt
Granger	McKinnon	Vinson
Hall,	Mack, Ill.	Welch
Leonard W.	Magee	Werdel
Harrison, Nebr.	Miller, Calif.	Wheeler
Hart	Mitchell	Wickersham
Havenner	Morris	Wood, Ga.
Hays, Ohio	Moulder	Woodruff
Hébert	O'Brien, Mich.	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and forty-one Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7005) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7005, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose this morning, the Clerk had read through section 2. Are there any amendments to section 2?

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, at the time of the recess there was a colloquy going on between the gentleman from Kansas and the chairman of the committee with respect to the amendment that appears in this bill which has been called the Herter amendment. It is an amendment which provides that the Secretary of Defense may in his judgment allocate to this program up to $1,000,000,000 worth of end items whose manufacture has been provided for by the regular authorizations and appropriations in the regular military bill. In view of the fact that that amendment was discussed, I would like to tell you of the genesis of that amendment and exactly what it intends to do.

Last year, when this matter was before us I felt very strongly that military aid to Europe or to any other section of the world was entirely justifiable as a matter of United States defense and on no other grounds whatsoever; in other words, this program that is often called the foreign-aid program is an American defense program or else there is no justification for it.

That being the case, you find some extraordinary anomalies from the point of view of the division of costs under different bills. The regular defense appropriation bills have already made available to the Defense Department $50,000,000,000 for end items that will be carried over into next year, and $28,000,000,000 more for which we have passed appropriation bills in this Chamber. In other words, today, if the appropriation bill is approved by the Senate, as it probably will be, there are available in the form of end items, that is, guns, tanks, and planes, what they call military hardware, $78,000,000,000 worth.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. May I point out to the gentleman that be that as it may, when these justifications were made to the Military Appropriations Committee there were no funds requested for this transfer to foreign military aid. The funds from which this transfer is to be made are what the military told us were absolutely necessary for the equipping, maintaining, and operating of a certain number of divisions and units that we anticipate having ourselves. They say now, before the Senate, that we have cut them too low. This transfer of end items would be equivalent to cutting another $1,000,000,000 of hardware away from our own troops, robbing our troops to aid the foreign forces.

Mr. HERTER. I fully understand that situation, but nobody is going to persuade me that in the Military Establishment they will know the difference between $72,000,000,000 and $73,000,000,000 worth of this kind of hardware, particularly when they have been very late in the delivery of that hardware, and these appropriations are intended to spread right through until 1955, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. SCRIVNER. But here is the other situation. Let us concede that for a moment. This proposal simply gives the Secretary of Defense, who you now say cannot tell the difference between $72,000,000,000 and $73,000,000,000, authority to transfer $1,000,000,000 worth of hardware to this foreign military program, which is equivalent to adding another $1,000,000,000 to this bill. Then next spring the Secretary of Defense could come in and say, "Gentlemen, we transferred $1,000,000,000 worth of hardware to the foreign military program so we now must have another $1,000,000,000 to replace that hardware for our own troops."

Mr. HERTER. That may be so, but it seems to me that is up to the Military Affairs Committee, where I think this program should have been.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. If the gentleman from Massachusetts will permit me to say this, I believe he said a minute ago that they have end items in the amount of $80,000,000,000 or $90,000,000,000 worth. As a matter of fact, they did not have the end items the gentleman says they have on hand.

Mr. HERTER. No, the money is available to secure them.

Mr. RICHARDS. The money is there or they are in the pipeline?

Mr. HERTER. That is correct.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman does not seek to add $1,000,000,000 to this bill, but he seeks permissive authority for the Secretary of Defense, if he sees fit, to transfer this additional $1,000,000,000.

Mr. HERTER. That is right. If this is an integral part of our defense program, the Secretary of Defense ought to have the right, if he wants to, to take $1,000,000,000 from one program and transfer it to the other program, if he thinks it is in our own best interest to do so.

Mr. RICHARDS. May I say this, to absolve the chairman from any charge that he may be a party to a plan or anything like that to provide an additional $1,000,000,000 in this bill. I wish to say to the House that I have no idea that they will ever get one single end item out of this money, because the authority to do that thing is already in the legislation; but if that is the idea, for the $1,000,000,000 to come from the Defense Department, then I want to say that I have no idea of proposing to the House that this thing go through, the language of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

(Mr. HERTER (at the request of Mr. MAHON) was granted permission to proceed for 5 minutes additional.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Is it the thought of the gentleman that this $1,000,000,000 provided in this amendment for equipment would be for old stock or new stock coming off the line, or would there be any differential between the types of equipment?

Mr. HERTER. There is no differential whatever. The amendment as it is drafted allows the Secretary of Defense to take from any equipment that has been provided for under the military heads, such as he may desire to piece out this program. May I point out that except for one or two minesweepers that are already under construction, that are no longer under consideration, all the end items, whether tanks or planes or guns, are identically the same whether for this program, whether for the domestic program, whether for Indochina or Korea. In your appropriation bills you have had items for foreign programs. You have had items for Korea. You have had items for Indochina. In your construction program money has been provided for construction in Europe which Americans are not going to use. It is a very messy way of appropriating for this program. I have felt the military items should all have been under one military bill, but as they are now scattered there ought to be at least $1,000,000,000 out of the $78,000,000,000 which the Secretary of Defense could transfer to this program if he sees fit to do so.

Mr. MAHON. I share the gentleman's views, that if this is not a national defense program for this country, there is no excuse for it, but let me point out that we are prolonging our defense build-up. We have the so-called stretch-out. Everyone in the Defense Establishment, including the President, the Commander in Chief—officials are proclaiming to the world that the House cuts, the Smith-Coudert amendment, and other cuts are going to disrupt the Defense Department, and they are not going to have the equipment they want and need. I do not want to tempt anybody to take away, by high-pressure methods or otherwise, essential items which our Defense Establishment is going to need. I wonder if Secretary of Defense Lovett has expressed his views on this amendment.

Mr. HERTER. Not that I know of. May I say one word further in regard to what the gentleman has said. The determining factor as to whether or not a plane or a tank or a gun goes to Europe is not the amount of money that is put into this bill. It is the degree of priority that the Defense Department gives to the European program. We could put a hundred billion dollars in this bill for new equipment, and it would not mean that a single thing would go to Europe if there is need for it in Korea or any higher priority area. That is, the Department of Defense determines where it shall go. It makes no difference what we write into this bill.

Mr. MAHON. This would come out of funds appropriated in a different bill, and for another purpose, and it seems to me a very doubtful procedure.

Mr. HERTER. What in effect the gentleman is saying is that with the $78,000,000 of hardware, for which we have already appropriated money, not one red cent can be put into this program. I am saying that at least a billion dollars of that should be made available.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. If you have in this bill $4,000,000,000 for hardware, it is money that has to be spent through the military. It is transferred from the Foreign Military Aid to the Army. The Army places the orders right along with our own orders, paying from funds appropriated to our Military Department. So what you are doing is saying the Army for Defense Department appropriations can buy a billion dollars worth of military hardware, and give it to the foreign military program—free.

Mr. HERTER. No, no. That is not what the amendment says at all.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That will be the result of it.

Mr. HERTER. You cannot tell whether a tank comes from one line or another.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. While this language is permissive, the fact is that such transfers as have been made have been in the other direction. Much more has gone from Mutual Security to our Armed Forces than the reverse. When we passed in October 1949 the first Mutual Defense Assistance Act to start making weapons for Europe, it proved a God-send to ourselves. Because 8 months later the Korean war broke out, and we took the arms being made for Europe and poured them into Korea. That is one major reason why we are behind in our shipments to Europe. So it does not follow that arms planned for our own troops will go to Europe under the amendment. It could go the other way.

Mr. HERTER. Primarily, the only stuff that has gone to Europe is stuff that has been declared excess.

Mr. JUDD. That is why a lot of troops in Europe are already trained and have nothing to fight with. The United States is farther behind in the development of this whole program than the European countries are.

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my only purpose in rising at this time is to say that many months ago I accepted an engagement to address the World Trade Club in Cincinnati, Ohio, tonight, and, therefore, I will not be here to vote against this entire appropriation as I certainly would do if I were here.

I would like to say that my distinguished colleague from South Carolina, a man whom we all love and admire, has done a wonderful job on this bill and I could not let this opportunity go by today without complimenting him on the great work he has done. I really hate to differ with him. However, I think all of us should be courageous about this bill and stand up and be counted. If you are really against it, vote against the entire appropriation, both economic and military. I am opposed to the military part of it, and I will tell you why.

Just north of Maastricht, in Holland, on January 1, 1945, I saw your American pilots in P–47 Thunderbolt planes shoot down, in 5 minutes, 13 German planes without losing one single plane of our own. One airplane today in the hands of an American, competently trained and equipped, is better than 25 planes sent abroad to some of our so-called friends and allies.

I think that dams built on the Missouri River, on the Ohio River, on the Savannah River, or anywhere else in this country, will do more good, thousands of miles from the nearest Russian base, than dams on the Rhone River within 5 or 6 minutes of Russian jet bombers.

I think that the development of tin, rubber, and aluminum in South America is more important to the security of this country and the entire free world than resources developed in Malaya, India, the Middle or Near East within a few miles of Russian and Red Chinese air bases. Yes, we have spent billions of dollars developing these resources which Russia, if she chooses, can take over. Yet we have spent only thousands developing the resources of South America, thousands of miles from Russian air bases which we can defend. It is just plain horse sense to develop those re-

sources which are closer to us and which we can defend. Why build them up for Russia to take over? It has happened in the past. We must give more attention to the heart and core of the free world, North and South America.

We sent billions to China and the Reds are throwing it back at us in Korea.

I am going to vote against the economic provision, or, at least, I will be paired against it. I am sorry I cannot be here personally to vote. I am also going to vote against the military provision.

I warned this House in 1947 and 1948 when I voted against the Marshall plan, spoke all over the country against the Marshall plan, and campaigned as a candidate for the other body, that this money would not prevent war. I spoke on every stump in South Carolina against the Marshall plan in 1948. It defeated me that year, but I am proud to stand here today and repeat again that that money, as this leadership told us here on the floor of the House, did not prevent war. They said: Now, this is simply the last time. If you just pass this appropriation, this Marshall plan, there will be no war and the economic situation of France, Italy and these other countries will be alleviated.

What happened? We have spent billions of dollars. Yet they are in a worse economic condition today than ever before. We have not gained a single friend and have lost millions of traditional friends. We have unprecedented peacetime expenditures, yet we do not have real national defense and security. And we are in a war we either cannot or do not choose to win.

I plead with this House then to spend that money on a great Air Force, on a good Navy, and then we could protect the free world just as we did in the days of the Monroe Doctrine. The Monroe Doctrine did not cost the taxpayers of this country one single red penny.

We can have the same kind of forthright, clear-cut declaration today and enforce that policy by becoming strong ourselves with the money we are foolishly wasting throughout the world. These recipients of our aid, as happened in China, Czechoslovakia and many other countries, turn the product of our aid over to the Red masters in the Kremlin. In the days of the Monroe Doctrine we just told the world that the status quo of South and Central America would be maintained and, if violated, there would be war with the United States. There was no war. We did not try to buy love with money. We did not try to buy friendship with money. And remember the prodigal son in the Bible. Where were his friends when his money gave out? Where will your country and my country be when our money gives out, when we go bankrupt and inflation destroys the economic well-being of this country? Where will our friends be?

Let us put this money, these billions of dollars, into something that will really count. And let us have a forthright leadership that will do like Teddy Roosevelt and tell the world where we stand. Yes, tread softly but carry that big stick in your own hands, not scattered throughout the world.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: Page 14, line 9, strike out the period and insert ", but no part of such appropriation shall be used for providing Yugoslavia with jet planes for its separate military establishment as long as Yugoslavia is not a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to keep the striking force of the United States air power within United States hands. If you will notice, this amendment simply restricts Yugoslavia from being given jet-type planes for its separate military establishment. It does not restrict under the Mutual Security Act the giving of other kinds of planes, propeller combat planes, to Yugoslavia, so that they can defend themselves. But here is a country that is under Communist dictatorship, and we must see no aggressive power placed in Communist hands at our taxpayers' expense. I have put this amendment in at the committee level and believe it should be adopted now. As a matter of fact, I was not going to put the amendment in in the open House, but I find on page 744 of the hearings of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. RIBICOFF presiding, this language:

Mrs. KELLY. The general is going to bring us the numbers of jet planes being sent to Yugoslavia.

Mr. RIBICOFF (presiding). Suppose the general goes ahead.

So now there is no doubt we have this problem. We have a country in Yugoslavia that will not come over to our side and will not expand democratic rights to any great extent. Yugoslavia is still continuing to socialize, to take over the farms, and forcibly collectivize. We have been trying to obtain a stop to collectivization in Yugoslavia through our United States representatives there. We have a country which is being aided as it is, but will under no form make any firm treaty arrangement with the United States or the Western Powers, and simply signs some sort of a contract agreement that it will defend itself. Still, Yugoslavia says that it will remain neutral as between the United States and Russia. We should retain in the hands of the United States our jet striking force, because I do not want it out of our hands. We from the industrial areas in the United States of America know that it is our interceptor jets which are our greatest defense against any people coming in to bomb the United States. We do not have enough jet planes in the United States, let alone Korea.

May I refer, then, directly to Korea? Can any Member rise on the floor of this House and show to me that there are enough jet planes in Korea to protect our boys fighting the battles over there? The United States forces in Korea have the first priority on jet planes, and we all should agree they should be getting them. So, as long as there is a shortage of jet planes in Korea, which we all know will continue during the next year, and while these truce talks are bogging down and bogging along, let us protect the striking force and keep jet planes for ourselves and our own strategic uses.

I was very glad that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] spoke here on keeping the striking force of American air power either within our power or within our control. I agree with that thoroughly. There are countries that we are helping who have jet planes, who are in the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance, who agree to stand with us among the free democracies of the world. But here is a country that will not say that she will stand with the United States, and I, therefore, think, in order for Yugoslavia to come further in our direction, we at this time should put this amendment in the act which specifically says that there shall be no appropriation under this Mutual Security Act used to give jet planes for Yugoslavia's separate military establishment.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I wonder if Yugoslavia has been invited to become a member. It would not be within her own right to secure admission, but was she invited?

Mr. FULTON. As far as I know there was no specific invitation, but in the meantime the United States has no treaty rights, nor substantial commitments from Yugoslavia, either. According to the report that was submitted by the Zablocki committee on a special mission to Germany, Yugoslavia, and other countries we should have agreement with Yugoslavia providing for a greater coordination of the policy of Belgrade with that of the west. There has been no formal invitation from the North Atlantic Treaty organization to Yugoslavia to join.

Mr. COX. The gentleman has been a very diligent student of this whole subject and I wish to applaud him for the work he has done.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COX. I wonder if we can give these European countries credit for full faith, you understand, in an endeavor to unify and cooperate, and build up a force strong enough to resist Russian aggression so long as we refuse to give consideration to Spain. Why should not Spain be treated as a member of the group and be permitted to participate in the endeavor to unify the whole world?

Mr. FULTON. I agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FULTON was allowed to proceed for three additional minutes.)

Mr. FULTON. The rights of the people in Yugoslavia are certainly suppressed, so that the people have few rights and no voice. It is a Communist dictatorship. Why should this country in any respect put any part of our jet fighting force into the hands of a Communist country under this program during the coming year, when we cannot take care of our own boys in Korea?

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. As a matter of fact, the gentleman was opposed to the original aid for Yugoslavia in any way, shape, or form.

Mr. FULTON. I had opposed the original aid to Yugoslavia as long as there were not certain conditions attached to protect the people of Yugoslavia, Greece, Trieste, and religious martyrs. As the gentleman will remember, I introduced an amendment that Yugoslavia would in return for aid first have to give assurances to return the Greek war orphans, to settle the Trieste question, to settle the Carinthian question, to grant religious liberty, to stop religious persecution, and to release people from jail that were being held there because they were members, ministers, and officials of either the Catholic or Protestant churches. It was a conditioned objection. I was willing to go along if Yugoslavia would simply grant those basic human rights, stop further collectivization, and eliminate threats of aggression.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman has made a statement. I wonder if the gentleman realizes how important it is, and whether he has evidence to support it. The gentleman questioned whether our forces in Korea will be deprived of jet aircraft if this provision is not put into the bill. Has the gentleman any evidence that they have been so deprived or that there is any intention on the part of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which has the right to allocate, that they will be so deprived?

Mr. FULTON. If the gentleman understood I had meant to make a charge, I would say "No," but there is no doubt in my mind that we do not have even enough jet planes to supply our own troops. I believe to this date, we have sent all jet planes our Defense Establishment can, to Korea. But no one says the number of United States jet planes in Korea is adequate. It is for the future that I do not want the priority for Korea in any way disturbed by any aid going to people other than the North Atlantic Treaty countries by way of jet planes. This amendment will make sure of it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I would remind the gentleman that only a few weeks ago General Vandenberg admitted that we had lost air superiority in Korea.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. I agree with the gentleman's amendment. Is it not true that Yugoslavia has not shown very good faith recently as to being willing to collaborate with the west as Yugoslavia should? Does not the gentleman think the entire problem and situation of Yugoslavia should be reexamined in relation to our assistance to that country?

Mr. FULTON. I certainly do. May I say this, that the position of Italy, with Yugoslavia being supplied with a jet plane striking force, and headed by a Communist dictatorship, will not be an enviable one. I do not believe the good citizens of Italy should have a jet plane striking force at their very door, in the exclusive control of a Communist dictator.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I can well sympathize with the complaint of the gentleman from Pennsylvania in view of his original position when the first Yugoslavia Aid Act came up here. I can well understand now his desire to give a slap at Yugoslavia. Maybe Tito merits it, maybe he does not, but the fact remains that long ago, in our own national interest, this Congress established the principle of aiding Yugoslavia. Top military people of this country have testified many times before the committees of this House that Yugoslavia's defense will be helpful to the European defense program.

If such an amendment is put into this bill it could do much harm to the defense program. Everybody knows that no jet planes will be sent to Yugoslavia unless our defense at home and the primary NATO defense in Europe can afford it.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. We received testimony of the most secret kind on the military aid to be furnished in this vast bill. It was not printed in the RECORD because of obvious considerations of national security, that we should not let our enemies know what we were sending where, and how much. I regret very much that an amendment has been offered here which involves the disclosure of such information, and I would regret it very much if this House started to attempt to dictate the type of strategy that should be used in his complex and grim question that faces us in this world. We have to trust somebody. We have to trust your committee. The military services have to trust the committee to tell them what is going on and what they intend, with the hope that they will not reveal it. I regret that this amendment involves the revelation of such information.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio for his observation, and I would like to say that it would be just as harmful to tell the world, and particularly Mr. Stalin, that we are not going to send any jet airplanes to Yugoslavia. We do not want to tell him affirmatively and neither do we want to say it to him negatively.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I had stated at the beginning of my talk that I had intended not to offer the amendment. But, I noticed the Defense Department on page 744 of our hearings made this statement.

Mr. RICHARDS. Is the gentleman going to discuss some secret testimony of the Defense Department?

Mr. FULTON. No, it is testimony which was given right out in the open hearings.

The testimony is as follows:

Mrs. KELLY. The general is going to bring us the numbers of jet planes being sent to Yugoslavia.

If that is not open for everybody to see, then they can turn to page 744 of the hearings, and I have not disclosed the numbers, amounts or times, and have specifically limited myself to the negative of the statement appearing in the pages in the hearings on page 744.

Mr. RICHARDS. The fact remains the gentleman does not approve of sending one jet plane to Yugoslavia.

Mr. FULTON. As long as the jet planes are under joint control with the United States troops and run by United States boys, it is perfectly all right. My amendment specifically restricts only jet planes for their separate military establishment where we have no control. As the gentleman well knows, our military advisory group over there is not in direct contact. They are only under the United States Embassy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. KELLY of New York as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 14, line 9, after the period insert "none of the funds appropriated pursuant to this title shall be made available to Yugoslavia."

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I find it necessary to offer this substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] because of the basic principle involved. As we all know, foreign policy has objectives which have far-reaching and tremendous importance. In this field, there can be no wishful thinking on what is hoped for in the unforeseen future. Simply stated, our foreign policy seeks to achieve a lasting peace and to spread our ideals of individual liberty and the principles of democracy to all peoples of the world. Americans believe in these objectives even though their approach to them may differ. Therefore, there is a choice in the means of attaining them. But, the means should not disregard value. Our foreign policy must be consistent with the basic beliefs of our Nation. I do not believe that a government can lead a double life. No government can use any method, which by its objectives destroys the value it seeks to achieve and to uphold. The United States, in its foreign policy aims to unite the nations of the free world individually and collectively in defense against Marxian communism, the recognized enemy of the free world. To the members of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee Study Mission, of which I was fortunate to be a member, Marshal Tito admitted that he is a Marxian Commu-

nist. He stated that he would continue the collectivization program over and above the protests of the peasant farmers who represent 85 percent of the population of Yugoslavia. I do not trust Marxian communism. Marxian communism is communism whether it emanates from Belgrade or whether it emanates from Moscow. It denies the right of the individual his social, civil, and spiritual rights. It seeks to destroy private enterprise, individual initiative and leads only to the enslavement of man. Let me call your attention to several quotations from Marshal Tito. In speaking to the Yugoslav Students' Union recently, he said—and I quote:

> It is the purpose of the universities to build real Communist Party members. It is better to have fewer Communists if they are better Communists. To achieve the aim—

He continued—

> we have determined to return to the old practice.

What does Marshal Tito mean "by returning to the old practices?" Does he mean ruthless and violent purging of the party membership, and intensified persecution of religion? He stated—and again I quote:

> We cannot allow our youth to be poisoned under the pretext of religious rites, and some of our youth has fallen under the influence of religion.

Marshal Tito explained to the students that Yugoslavia had—and these are his words—"received in various forms $1,000,000,000 worth of foreign aid. All this," he said, "was obtained from the United States and the western democracies, without offending against any precepts of Marxism or Leninism." He emphasized the fact that no concession was given to the west in return for their aid.

Is this the type of government we want to support and strengthen? I would like to bring the attention of the membership of this House to a statement on page 745 of the hearings:

> United States aid is used to provide direct support to the defense effort of Yugoslavia through the provision of goods and materials used by the military. Indirect support is given by maintaining minimum civilian consumption standards and encouraging the development of a broader base for the economy as a whole.

What is this broader base that the United States aid is directly encouraging? Is it the system of Marxian communism? I believe it is. The United States, striving for peace among the community of nations, is beset by powerful enemies. It is inconceivable that we here on this floor today are considering further assistance to a nation which fosters materialistic communism and the stamping out of the very ideals for which our Nation has given its all? Are we opposed merely to Soviet imperialism or are we, as a free nation, opposed to the tyranny of ideological communism? I oppose both. I believe in certain absolutes; in a body of unchanging principles, in a teaching and way of life which were true yesterday, true today, and will be true tomorrow.

I urge you to support my substitute amendment.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will turn down the substitute amendment also. The gentlewoman from New York has offered a substitute which provides a meat-ax approach. She does not want to send anything at all to Yugoslavia. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] would let them have munitions, Thunderbolts, artillery, or something else, but not jet planes, and I think both amendments are bad. The committee has carefully considered both approaches.

Before I yield back the remainder of my time, I would like to ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, how much time will that give each of us?

Mr. RICHARDS. Does the gentleman want to speak on this particular amendment?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I will amend my unanimous-consent request to make it 30 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I would like to ask the gentleman if the adoption of either of the pending amendments would not have the effect of canceling out the beneficial effects resulting from what we have already done for Yugoslavia.

Mr. RICHARDS. I think so. Yugoslavia is very much in the European picture of mutual defense, and has been since the Eighty-first Congress. The adoption of either amendment would certainly have the harmful effect the gentleman suggests. It would certainly be a great slap in the face and a reversal of what the House has already done on three different occasions.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Tell us what beneficial effects we have got out of it.

Mr. RICHARDS. That has been debated a good many times here; I would rather not go further into that at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized.

FULTON AMENDMENT

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, what has been proposed here by the amendment and the substitute shows how extremely difficult it is to administer programs of this kind to the satisfaction of anybody.

I think anyone who wants to use any reasonable intelligence whatsoever can refer to the official and the unofficial statements made by those who are charged with the Korean job and be forced to the conclusion that our fellows over there have been short of jet fighting equipment.

I am for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I have no hatreds or animosities against Yugoslavia as such. I have not been in on any of the secret information that has been passed out. I think the gentleman's amendment is good, sound, constructive, protection for the United States. I shall support it and vote against the substitute amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is a preferential motion in order now?

The CHAIRMAN. It would be in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was about to recognize the gentleman for 2½ minutes under the limitation of debate.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I still offer my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman want this time in addition?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the motion is offered in good faith.

I go along with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DORN] and will vote against the bill for the reasons that he advanced.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. It is South Carolina.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Either Carolina is good enough for that kind of motion; either would be proud of the gentleman, the wrong State to be credited with his distinguished record.

Certainly it was interesting, instructive, and encouraging to hear our good colleague from Pennsylvania join in and say that he would go along with those who for so long have opposed the pouring of billions down a rat hole on foreign ground even though he will only admit a partial change of heart.

I heard a long time ago, or read a statement to the effect, that the mills of the gods grind slowly, but they grind exceedingly small.

Experience, the upper and the nether millstones, has ground out the fact of which more are daily becoming cognizant that we cannot continue indefinitely to send money unlimited in amount and men unlimited in number abroad without destroying the welfare of our people, endangering the security of our Nation. As the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] so accurately said one day, you cannot

trust the Communists any where any time.

I gather that the amendment offered by our colleague from Pennsylvania was inspired by that thought, that he is convinced that we cannot trust the government of Yugoslavia because of the communistic influence which there prevails.

Then I learned from our colleague from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] of our Committee on Foreign Affairs, that if the House is to do anything about the danger which we are told confronts this country of ours it would have to trust, depend upon, follow without question the advice of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. That committee in its recommendations is dependent upon, must trust, and follow the military leadership which, in effect, during the past two administrations has been under the thumb of the President. And the President and the military folks depend on Secretary Acheson, and his associates—one of whom was Hiss.

And Acheson and his advisors have been listening to those who follow a policy of appeasement of the Communists.

Permit a restatement.

The House must trust the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which must trust President Truman and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, all of whom must trust Secretary Acheson, who has trusted the Communists, although they, in turn, trust no one—not even God.

Our silver coins carry the legend "In God we trust." But the Communists place no trust in God, for their creed is that there is no God, religion is a fraud, priests and ministers are hypocrites.

So, where are we now? Where do we go from here?

Should we not turn our backs on a foreign policy which to date has served only the purpose of the Communists; make our objective the welfare of our people, the security of our Republic; place our trust in God and, by the conservation of our resources and our manpower, build adequate Armed Forces on a line of defense which we can hold without sacrificing either the liberty of our people or our sovereignty as a nation?

I shall vote for the adoption of the pending amendment, if it be defeated it is my purpose to support both the Fulton amendment and the Kelly substitute. Then, whether they be adopted or rejected, vote against the bill on final passage.

Our colleague from New York [Mrs. KELLY] offers an amendment which would deny any aid carried in this bill to Yugoslavia. Her amendment to or substitute for the Fulton amendment is evidently offered because she does not trust the leadership of that country.

Nor do I trust the leadership there nor place any faith whatsoever in the promise of any Communist anywhere.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Sorry; I cannot.

Our colleague from New York [Mrs. KELLY] talks about a free world. But, for the last 15 years her people have not been able to get a mouthful of food into New York except it came in by sea, unless tribute was paid to Dan Tobin's Teamsters' Union. If it came in by sea that tribute was paid to the longshoremen. Why talk about freedom and liberty in other lands? I have heard about a free people and free nations until I am sick and tired of the words—because I know that today we have an administration which goes along with the doctrine that here in America, supposedly free, no man can work to support his wife, his children or himself until he has paid tribute to an organization which in return votes for that administration and its candidates come election day.

Are we a free people? No! Not for the last 15 years to my personal knowledge has a man been free to work as an employee until he submitted to the will of a "boss"—until he joined a union.

When I wanted to send some products of my farm to Detroit I learned I would have had to pay $25 for every man on a truck to bring it into the city where the farm produce might be used to feed the people of Detroit. I did not send it in. I sold it outside. As long as the people in the cities vote as they do and permit the things that they do permit to continue, I see no reason why farmers or people outside should pay that tribute to any one or why when here in America, in our own country, this land of the free and the home of the brave as in former years it was called, we now knuckle down and submit to domination by any group.

For 15 years or more, the people of the city of New York and of Brooklyn, I might add, have not been free.

Representatives from those cities and from others serving here in Congress have without effective effort forced their people, their constituents, the folks who elected them and sent them here, to submit to what one Justice of the United States Supreme Court described as "highway robbery."

I have listened to the sobbing and the moaning of those who so often cry out in horror because of the hardships suffered by the people of other lands; because of our failure to go along with their efforts to take hard-earned dollars from our taxpayers, spend them to give a greater degree of liberty, a higher standard of living, to people in other lands.

But never have I heard nor witnessed a concerted, determined effort on the part of the Representatives of the city of New York to free the people of that city from the domination and tribute-collecting activities of Dan Tobin's teamsters union.

The word "democracy" is a mouthful, but insofar as it is applied to the people of New York, it is a mockery when they cannot eat until food—yes; merchandise of any kind coming in by truck—has had added to its cost a sum named by the teamsters union and paid to enrich the coffers of that organization, extend the power of its officers.

It is long past the time to begin to free our own people from those who oppress them, permit them to work not only if and after they have paid the tribute demanded by the union officials, but whenever they have work.

It is time that we conserve our resources, whether they be money, arms, or men for our own defense and our own protection instead of sending everything abroad, playing into the hands of Stalin and the Communists by contributing to our own economic ruin. Keep on a little while longer with the present program and we will not only be unable to extend aid to those abroad but we will not be able to defend ourselves.

I shall vote against this bill and I hope that all Members who have the same courage as the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] and a few others will do likewise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 29, noes 89.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, there are two questions before us, one, shall we ship any jet planes to Yugoslavia even if we intend to ship any; and, second, shall we terminate the whole Yugoslav program, which is the amendment of my colleague the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

On the first question, if we are going to start to be armchair generals in this House we are going to make ourselves look very foolish. We can go from deciding about jet planes to armor, to guided missiles, to every type of aircraft and every type of vehicle and to every type of units until we would be lost in a morass of our own creation. Obviously the only proposition which should be discussed is whether or not we should continue with the Yugoslav aid program at all. On that issue I think that the evidence is distinctly that we should. First and foremost, we should continue because we have adopted a calculated policy in which we made a very large investment in world prestige and money, and we are given no reason whatever—that was not the reason at the time we adopted the policy—for abandoning it now. I can think of nothing which would discourage other Soviet satellites more than cutting off in midstream aid to the one satellite, Yugoslavia, which has defected from the Communist bloc. On the contrary, I think it has been demonstrated to us that the defection is real, is sticking, and will be made to stick, that it is a real and effective precedent.

Let me make another very practical point. The exports from Yugoslavia to the United States of a highly strategic metal, lead, have increased sevenfold since Tito's defection a few years ago. I think no reasonable explanation has been given whatever for abandoning the major policy which we undertook in a calculated and deliberate way, because we had to fight fire with fire. There is no justification for us not to take advantage of the 32 divisions in being which Yugoslavia has—right now about the toughest fighting force in Europe outside of the Soviet bloc—when there is every reason to count these divisions on our side or, at the very least, of being neutralized in terms of not being a threat

to the free world and ready to defend their own territory.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. With the arms being sent to Yugoslavia, and the ordinary propeller planes being sent there for their defense, why then should we give them a whole striking force of jet airplanes?

Mr. JAVITS. Because the gentleman has not told us whether it is going to be 1 jet plane for experimental purposes, or 20 for a squadron, nor the strategy involved in that in support of our own forces, or whether the types are in any way connected with our own needed designs. I say we cannot pretend to do the military planning here but we can properly decide the policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I do not have the time to address myself to the original proposition, the Fulton amendment. I think there is much merit to the proposal that we should try to determine what we are going to give each group of nations, because we certainly have given many nations all over the world things that they had no more use for than we have for a flea circus here in the House of Representatives. We have given people all manner of things they could not use at all. We have sent tractors and combines to people who needed mules and plows. We have sent jet planes to people who needed trucks. We should decide what we are going to give to these people. We should decide to give them only what they can use and use them in a way that will be helpful to the United States.

We should not give any nation jet airplanes or anything else just for prestige. We have provided airplanes for too many little countries just to let some officers show off.

Since we are not making these decisions, however, I can see no justification for picking out Yugoslavia and deciding here that we should not send her any certain kind of aid; and surely we should not decide here with 30 minutes' debate that we will give Yugoslavia no aid, while we continue it for other countries. I do not approve the form of the Yugoslavian Government; I do not have any confidence in their attachment to democracy; I do not have any confidence in their desire to help the west. I think those people, like all people, are going to look after their own interest. Tito and the people of Yugoslavia will be with us as long as it is to their advantage. They are not going to be with us just because they like us, and we cannot buy their support, but they are on our side now. I do not propose to question why. On the other hand, I propose to try to make the fact that they are on our side as helpful as possible. I do not propose to single them out for insults, nor do I propose to insist that they must have the kind of government or society I would want, before I will let them join with us in a stand against Russia. They want their own way, and they are willing to fight to protect their own country.

Yugoslavia has the largest army in Europe this side of the iron curtain. I want it on our side if possible. If it does not fight with us, I still do not want it to fight on the side of the bear. If it never fired a shot, if it never put a plane in the air, the very existence of the 33 divisions of the Yugoslavian Army would be the greatest assistance that we could have in all Europe. If we can keep that army from lining up with the Russians and tie down a Russian Army equal to the size of the Yugoslavian Army, we will have gained more in effective military manpower than we can gain by all the aid we can give to the rest of the nations of Western Europe. Yugoslavia means more to us, with the army that it has today; Yugoslavia can be of greater military help to us than many of the nations many times as large in population and in wealth. Let us do the one and only thing we can do at this time to keep on our side the one and only nation that is in a position to help us tie down our enemy.

Yugoslavia's position on the Russian flank certainly would tie down a large Russian force in event of Russian aggression in Western Europe. If the aggression were directed toward the Mediterranean, or the Middle East, this same army would be on the other Russian flank. I think it is worth our while to see that this army has enough equipment to pose a serious threat on either flank of the Russians. To do that we must defeat the Kelly amendment. I think it is worth our while to refrain from gratuitously insulting the Yugoslav Government and people by singling them out for less favorable treatment than other countries. To do that we must defeat the Fulton amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. I do not know whether we need a wheelbarrow in the House, but there are occasions when we need a shovel as well as a wheelbarrow once in a while, especially as in the arguments we have been hearing all day against passage of this bill.

We heard this great General Ridgway just a couple of hours ago in this very Hall describe to us that now we have Japan as a great ally. I heard here several years ago, during the war, many of my colleagues who are now attacking the question of Yugoslavia and this entire bill making the same attack against Japan and the evil yellow race of the Pacific, day after day, during the war. I heard many of the same colleagues attack Germany, and now we are wooing them day and night, Germany and Japan, and two of our greatest allies, we hope, will be Japan and Germany.

I hold no brief for Tito. You have heard my stand on that subject, time and time again. But let me tell you this, Mr. Chairman, the Achilles' heel of Stalinism, the Achilles' heel of that kind of communism, is Titoism. They are not afraid in Russia of the United States or the atom bomb or all your troops and planes, but they are afraid, though, of one thing. They are afraid in Russia, the one thing Bolshevistic, atheistic, Communistic Russia is afraid of is Titoism, Tito, who has preached against and destroyed the infallibility of the Bolshevistic, Politburo, atheistic communism as it exists in Muscovite Russia. That is what they are afraid of. That is the thing that will destroy them. This fellow Tito destroyed the sacred cow of the Moscow Reds, their doctrine of infallibility—here was a deviationist who got away with it—that scares Moscow to death.

In Czechoslovakia today Gottwald is wavering, and Czechoslovakia, we hope and pray, is ready to go. So is Roman Catholic, brave, patriotic Poland.

Now, today, you want to slam the door in the face of this aid to those who break away from Moscow. He may be a devil in sheep's clothing, I do not know. I do not trust him any more than you do. But at least so far he is our devil. It is a sign to the satellites that we will guarantee aid to all nations who join our cause as against Soviet communism and as much as we in America deplore the godless philosophy of communism Yugoslav or Russian or Chinese or any other kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, why is this bill before us? Why is the Congress of the United States appropriating somewhere between sixty and seventy billion dollars for the armed forces of ourselves and other countries? There is only one reason. We are confronted with a mortal threat to our survival. That threat is the Soviet Union and those satellite countries that it is able to control.

How can we overcome that threat? That is the most important business before our country. Everything here at home depends on whether we can successfully overcome that threat. How can we do it? There are two ways. One is to build up our own military strength until we have overwhelming superiority, if that is possible; but everyone here knows what that would cost us in money and reduced standards of living and loss of basic freedoms to live our lives as we please. The other way is to weaken the enemy. The only two real blows the Kremlin has ever had since it first came to power were the defeat Chiang Kai-shek gave the Chinese Reds in 1927, a defeat which it took them over 20 years and a Japanese invasion to retrieve, and the defection of Tito. He did not defect because we were being nice to him or bribing him or appeasing him, for we were being tough with him at the very moment he defected. He broke with the Kremlin in order to save his own neck and his power. Whatever his reasons, his action gravely weakened our major enemy and thereby helped us.

Tito is not to be considered a friend of the United States; certainly he is not a believer in democracy or in favor of our way of life or freedom for his own people. But, whatever Tito may be to his own people, he is not a threat to the security of the United States and the Kremlin is. He has more divisions lined up against the Kremlin today than

the total of all the other countries to which we are giving aid in Western Europe. The more Soviet divisions Tito ties down with his forces, the less danger there is to the rest of Europe and to our own troops there.

I do not like a lot of things that we are doing today. But when my country is confronted with a mortal enemy, the decision becomes very simple. I must oppose whatever assists that enemy of my country, and I must assist, in a practical way, whatever opposes that enemy. Therefore, it seems to me we have to vote against these amendments which would weaken a force that is opposing our mortal enemy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I think both of these amendments open up a problem that has lurked in the background of this entire issue of our fight against Soviet Russia in her aggression against the entire civilized world. We have been groping for an adequate policy to cope with this very strong ideological threat that emanates from Moscow, and it is, as the gentlewoman from New York pointed out, an ideological threat. Our policy in this bill to a very large extent has been one of almost pure expediency. We can never win, I think, in a contest of this kind against an ideological threat, the kind of a threat that strikes and moves men's hearts and touches their souls and influences their minds—we cannot cope with that with pure expediency. Two bandits have fallen out. The small one has defied the larger one. Both of these bandits subscribe to Marxism. Both of these Marxist regimes—both of these ideologies, both the Tito ideology and the Stalin ideology denies all the things that we in the civilized world believe in. I think we must oppose the Marxist ideology with the superior ideology of our Judeo-Christian civilization. The gentleman spoke of the number of divisions in Yugoslavia, and those divisions are based upon the Yugoslav people for whom we should have, and do have, an affection. But, do those people without the concentration camps and without the clubs and whips of the Tito regime—do they really, and would they really, support Tito? If the battle flags do get into the field of conflict, would those divisions follow a nation or a leadership that is purely one of expediency? I think we should examine this policy and what aid we do give the Tito regime should definitely be on conditions that recognize that we do stand for a principle, and that we are not basing our policy purely on expediency.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. Does not the gentleman agree with me that some of those divisions are used to control a very big underground which is ready to overthrow Tito?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I absolutely agree with the gentleman, and our affection and our hand of friendship and our gesture should be toward the Yugoslav people, as it should be toward the people of the other satellite nations behind the iron curtain.

Mr. FULTON. May I say I agree with the gentleman thoroughly.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman I have followed the debate on the Yugoslav amendments with a great deal of interest. I recall when Yugoslavia was first included in any assistance rendered by this country, and I recall at that time the difficulty we had in bringing ourselves to the point where we could approve of that assistance. However, on the basis of evidence which has been presented to our committee for the past 2 or 3 years by such outstanding authorities as American Ambassador to Belgrade, George Allen, and by the agricultural attaché, John Haggerty, as well as by officials of the Defense Department, it seems to me what we are doing is in effect keeping in being something like 33 Yugoslav divisions.

Thirty-three Yugoslav divisions, which form a flank on one end of the strongest line in Europe today. That line extends from Yugoslavia down through Greece and into Turkey. It is a bulwark against the spread of active Soviet aggression. It is the strongest link by far in the chain comprising our area of defense in that part of the world. No one, of course, believes that Tito is anything but a Communist, but Tito has no other place to go. I recall, from personal observation at the U. N., the intense bitterness between the Soviet and satellite delegates on the one hand and the Yugoslavs on the other. What we are doing is trying to keep 33 anti-Kremlin divisions in being, trying to set up an example, if you please, as someone has so aptly put it, to other satellite countries in the hope that they, too, will break away and thereby weaken the strength which Russian communism has in captive countries throughout the world today.

We have a military mission in Belgrade under the command of General Harmony. General Harmony for some years was the chief military attaché in Italy. He has under his control something like 30 or 40 personnel. If my understanding is correct, they have a chance to go to all parts of Yugoslavia to inspect the use to which American equipment is being put, and thereby we can keep a pretty close check on what we are sending to those people. There is no question but that in case of an emergency the people of Yugoslavia will fight. All anyone in this Chamber has to do is to go back to those dark days of 1939, when Hitler did invade the Balkans. Among those who stood up against him were the people of Yugoslavia. This is an investment in the defense of America which, in my opinion, is the real justification for this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] is recognized.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I do hope that both the substitute amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] will be voted down.

As the gentleman from New York said, of all nations, this is the only one that has broken loose from Russia. It would be discouraging to other peoples whom we are trying to get to break loose from the iniquitous Soviet regime if we pass any such amendment as those offered today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 31, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Title I of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 is amended as follows:

(a) In paragraph 101 (a) (1), insert ", for Spain," after "parties to the North Atlantic Treaty."

(b) At the end of paragraph 101 (a) (1) add the following new sentence: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed $3,316,000,000, for asistance pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1571–1604) to countries eligible for assistance under this paragraph; and in addition balances of any appropriations heretofore made pursuant to this paragraph unobligated as of June 30, 1952, or subsequently released from obligation, are authorized to be continued available for obligation for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the appropriation hereby authorized."

(c) At the end of paragraph 101 (a) (2) add the following new sentence: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed $1,637,300,000, to carry out the purposes and provisions of this paragraph; and in addition balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to this paragraph unobligated as of June 30, 1952, or subsequently released from obligation, are authorized to be continued available for obligation for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the appropriation hereby authorized."

(d) Add the following new subsection:

"(c) Not less than $25,000,000 of the funds made available under authority of subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be used for economic, technical, and military assistance to Spain in accordance with the provisions of this act. Unexpended balances of appropriations made available for assistance to Spain pursuant to this section by the act of October 31, 1951 (Public Law 249, 82d Cong.), are authorized to be continued available until June 30, 1953."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: Page 15, line 7, strike out "$1,637,300,000" and insert "$1,022,000,000."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce the economic aid to exactly the amount we furnished under title I to Western Europe last year.

It would cut the bill from $1,637,300,000 to $1,022,000,000, a reduction of $615,300,000.

If this amendment is adopted here is the amount of economic aid and defense support that will be available to Western Europe:

Unexpended balance, $828,200,000.

United States military expenditures, $1,052,000,000.

H. R. 7005, this amendment, $1,022,000,000: a total of $2,902,200,000.

Then add to that $1,000,000,000 for offshore purchases which this bill requires and which will necessitate the spending of money in Western Europe, and, therefore, there will be economic aid, and if you add 10 percent of the new total of matériel and economic items in title I as is provided by law you add $433,800,000. That makes total possible availabilities for economic aid and defense support to Europe, $4,336,000,000.

While it is said these amounts have been considered by the executive branch in the figures they brought to us, I want to point out how deceptively this is presented. For instance, on page 40 of the committee report you will find a diagram or chart saying:

> Most of the funds needed to finance the 1952–53 program in Europe will be borne by Western Europe.

Then, if you try to find out what we furnish you would see defense support, $1,400,000,000; then, for offshore purchases, $1,000,000,000; that makes $2,400,000,000 as all we are going to furnish. As a matter of fact they do not say anything in that chart about the $4,336,000,000 that would be available if my amendment is adopted.

I helped bring the Marshall plan to this floor 4 years ago. I think it was a success in recovery for Europe. It was a success in preventing infiltration of communism in Western Europe to date. The biggest fight I had was to preserve the 4-year period. I told this House that the Marshall plan was going to end on June 30, 1952. I want to see that happen; I want to see that what we furnish from now on will be actually defense support and not merely recovery money, balance-of-payments money. That is why I urge adoption of my amendment.

You will remember there was no promise made that we would furnish any such amount. If you will look at page 5652 of yesterday's RECORD you will see where I brought out certain information in the hearings. I asked Mr. Harlan Cleveland, Assistant MSA Director for Europe:

> Did we promise $1,400,000,000 defense support at Lisbon?
>
> Mr. CLEVELAND. No, sir; we did not promise any.

I also asked Mr. Cleveland:

> In any case, you are sure that nobody on behalf of the United States Government has promised $1,400,000,000 defense support to anybody. Is that right?
>
> Mr. CLEVELAND. I am sure of that.

So we are justified, it seems to me, in cutting this unpromised money back to the amount we furnished last year for the Marshall plan. When I was in Paris with the U. N. I noted the feeling of other areas of the world when they see us pouring into Western Europe, which has the highest standard of living of any area on earth except our own, this great amount of money, when they see us pouring in this lopsided economic aid there.

I hope, therefore, that my amendment will be adopted merely reducing our economic or defense support to what we gave last year.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. Chairman, there is one fact that seems to be running through this entire debate. It is the desire of the Members of this House to see to it that Europe makes as much of a contribution toward its own defense as possible. The gentleman from Ohio tells you that the over-all proposal for NATO was $17,700,000,000. These figures were decided on in Lisbon to finance 50 divisions during the year 1952.

Out of that $17,700,000,000 there was assigned to Europe the duty to provide 13.9 of defense expenditures. Now, in order for Europe to provide 13.9 defense expenditures, it becomes necessary to have this defense-support item of $1,637,000,000.

In the event this defense-support item were contributed by the United States it would mean an over-all total expenditure by Europe for defense in the sum of $13,949,000,000. Without the defense-support item Europe would only be able to provide $10,620,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, the House should understand, and I tried to explain this yesterday, that you cannot separate the economic and military factors of a nation's economy. They are indeed a part of the same ball of wax. Any nation, whether it be France, Turkey, England, or Italy, must eat; it must have clothing; and in order to eat it must import wheat; and in order to have clothing it must import cotton from the United States of America. Before these military expenditures were made necessary these European countries were enabled to produce for the export market and earn dollars, but as soon as you take out of their civilian pursuits, items for tanks, guns, and planes a different situation arises.

Let me read what the European countries will produce with the thirteen and nine-tenths billion: aircraft, artillery, combat vehicles, ammunition and explosives, electronics, weapons and small arms, engineering, transport ships and harbor craft. When you divert a nation's domestic and civilian economy to military items you divert their ability to earn exchange. If they cannot earn exchange they are unable to use that money to import the foodstuffs to feed that nation. What the gentleman from Ohio would really do, if you adopt his amendment, would be to cut definitely the European contribution to this defense expenditure and in its stead the United States would find itself burdened with additional dollars and additional goods to make up for the production we would lose. The best investment that we can make in this over-all program is to make this defense support available in order to allow Europe to manufacture its own defense weapons, and take some of the burden off the shoulders of the United States.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, about 34 years ago I stood in the well of this House and I took an oath to preserve and defend not some other government but our own, and I have tried throughout the years to follow that course of action in this House. We have had wars for 2,000 years. Europe has been the crossroads, and they have come out of those wars, and it has taught them a lesson not to get into another one. I stood on the floor of this House and I argued against the arming of Japan, but no, we went along and we armed Japan.

Now let us see where we are going. I happen to be a member of the Committee on Ways and Means that has to raise the taxes from the people of this country. I do not need to repeat to you that a debt of $260,000,000,000 is a lot of money. I do not need to remind you that the budget now calls for approximately $85,000,000,000, and I do not need to remind you that there is, at least, a developing revolt in this country over the highest annual tax bill of any other country in the world today.

Now here are some things that startle anyone thinking about it. Take, for instance, the Lisbon Conference held not long ago. It was stated that the startling sum of $300,000,000,000 would be needed for the next 3 years for European defense, the United States to furnish the major part of it. The North Atlantic Treaty Pact defense program for 1952 and 1953 will cost $75,000,000,000, and America's share will be $57,000,000,000. This is more than three-fourths of the total cost. The Financial Times of Great Britain gave the following estimates: Britain's share, $4,000,000,000; France's share, $3,300,000,000; Italy's share, $980,000,000. Now the United States of America is expected to put up $57,000,000,000 for rebuilding Europe, after having put up $45,000,000,000 during the last 6 years. Where on earth are we going, gentlemen? Of course, those people will be with us just as long as the money keeps flowing into the foreign coffers, but all the time we are weakening our country, we are weakening our resources, our irreplaceable resources. We just cannot keep going on without dragging ourselves down to the level of these European countries, which have always been more or less at war.

Now that gives you just a little sketch of the amount of money that we propose to dish out over there. And I have some other information here that if time will permit I want to get into the RECORD. Here are some of the interesting items for which our money is being spent.

Here is a waterway in France that we are building up in the Alps, from the Mediterranean to Lake Geneva, which will have 22 dams and 46 power stations. The three dams already completed or under construction cost $685,000,000. What do you think the cost of the whole project will be? It will run into the billions of dollars. Whose money? Our

money. You could not get a project through here to keep from drowning out that whole area in the West. You could not negotiate that; no, sir. You could not even keep a little town in this country from destruction by annual floods, even where there are defense production plants.

In Rome, a great monumental railway station, a mile long, into which you could put the Pennsylvania Station, Grand Central Station, Cleveland Union Station, and all the railroad stations in the Chicago area, and have a few acres left over. And whose money is doing that that is bleeding us white? It is our money.

In Rovigo, a town of 40,000 between Venice and Bologna, there is another tremendous railroad station that would dwarf our stations in Albany, Rochester and Syracuse, with private offices for everybody from stationmaster to lamplighter.

In Milan, and I have been there, is one of the most beautiful buildings in Italy, a new hotel 10 stories high, pure white, balconies that give every room a veranda. The whole place is air conditioned. The interior decorations are sumptuous. All rooms are with baths. There is a lovely roof garden and a fine restaurant. Our money is paying for it.

On Capri is the luxurious hotel Caesar Augustus, perched high and remote. Older, less luxurious and presumably less expensive hotels are boarded up, empty, while they are building this hotel which only the wealthy people, many of them who are making money out of this war, can occupy.

In the outskirts of Milan, Rome, and Naples are literally hundreds of new apartment houses that would put Park Avenue apartments to shame. The rents are approximately $25 per room. We are paying for them. I do not believe our people here want any such program at all. I am against it.

The ECA is supposed to have sent thousands of tractors to Italy. I was there. I saw them. Agriculture was to be revolutionized and production inincreased. They are not being used, because Italian agriculture simply cannot use our large tractors, and ECA refused to buy small ones, possibly because the big tractor companies did not have that type. I saw these things myself. What was more, they never sought to find out what it cost to operate these tractors. Their gasoline over there is a dollar a gallon. They just could not pay any such price for gasoline and operate a farm at a profit. Those tractors would not benefit those farmers, still they shipped them over there by the hundreds.

If you want to buy a motorcycle or even a motorscooter, you can have up to 2 years to pay for it. Credit is easy on small purchases.

Where is the basis for such credit? Can it be the Italian economy, which 4 years ago was practically bankrupt? Is that the reason?

A group of economists in Milan has reported that a large part of the counterpart funds there had gotten into the hands of the already wealthy, and that only an infinitesimal portion had filtered down to the grass roots. They said Italian laborers were as poor or poorer than in the 1920's.

How is this sort of thing going to aid in repelling communism? It is not going to do it. The time has come to stop here and now, and think of America. Stop this financial debauch by the chronic welfare-state spenders.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from New York, who just preceded me, and for whom I have the greatest admiration, and like all other Members of this body, I took an oath when I assumed the office which I now hold. I took that oath without reservation, and I intend to do the best I can to see that it is upheld.

I can well recall as a boy in Montana, before the First War, when the oceans on both sides of this continent of ours meant something, and when the air above was free. We are living in a different age now, and because of the scientific achievements of mankind, distance has shrunk. Whether we like it or not, we are neighbors one with another throughout the world. As distance has shrunk, so has the air become less free. It is up to us, I think, to act as the leaders of the non-Communist free world, act as adults, shoulder our responsibilities, and see to it that the non-Communist world is kept that way and not allowed to fall into the hands of the Communist aggressors.

My good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has made the statement that he wants to make very sure that the Marshall plan will end on June 30 of this year. He knows, of course, that I am in full accord with him in his views on the Marshall plan, but I believe you should know that the Marshall plan has already gone out of existence, and that it is a misleading statement to label such things as "defense support" as a continuation of the Marshall plan. The Marshall plan was for the rehabilitation of the economies of Western Europe, whereas the defense-support program is for the creation of better facilities for the making of armaments so that the defense of Western Europe, and thereby the defense of this country, can be maintained.

It just happens that the Senate of the United States has entered into a treaty known as the North Atlantic Treaty for a 20-year period. This House had nothing whatever to say about the North Atlantic Treaty. But, under the Constitution, a treaty agreed to by the Senate becomes a part of the law of the land. On that basis we either live up to the obligations entered into by the Senate in behalf of the Government of the United States or, if we do not, we should pull out completely. Questions have been raised today about this defense support, which I think is in many respects the most important part of this program. May I say to my colleagues I was the one who was responsible for the more than $800,000,000 cut in the military end item part of the aid to Europe, and that I supported wholeheartedly the 10-percent defense support cut in that part of the program as well. But defense support is something which means that one American dollar can do the work of three if it is put to use in Europe, and at the same time it will give those people over there the opportunity and the chance to bring about necessary manufacturing processes by means of which, for example, such things as spare parts can be manufactured to supplement the initial equipment sent over. If that is not done, then it means in addition to furnishing the article in the first place, we will have to keep on furnishing the spare parts as well. In many instances, as I understand it, the cost of the spare parts will be far more than the cost of the original equipment. My good friend the gentleman from New York, has mentioned something about this railroad station in Rome, and he seemed to indicate or imply that it was built with American funds. I have before me page 674 of the hearings on the Mutual Security Act, and I see where the following statements are made. Mr. CHATHAM was speaking, by the way, I believe, to somebody representing the United States Chamber of Commerce, who had quite a lengthy statement in the hearings. The testimony is as follows:

> Mr. CHATHAM. Then I want to bring up in the record a couple of other things. I have been reading the testimony before the Senate and I see you have left out the railroad station in Rome, which was also an irresponsible statement. Mr. Hulcy, I believe, is your president. I have a quote here because I knew you were coming, and I tried to figure this thing.
>
> Mr. Hulcy said, "Foreign countries are using American aid for such projects as a mile-long railway station in Rome, which will be larger than New York's Pennsylvania and Grand Central Stations, the Cleveland Union Station, and all of Chicago's railroad stations combined." It turns out that not a penny of American funds or counterpart funds was used in the station. You did not quote Mr. Hulcy, but you spoke of a railroad station in Rome in the testimony before the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]. I believe definitely we can do what he proposes to do by his amendment; that is, make a further reduction of foreign economic aid without in any way injurying our security. The time has long since arrived when we must think in terms of our own self-interest, as to what is to the best interest of the United States. In so doing, by keeping this country strong, we will be serving the cause of freedom much more effectively than by dissipating our resources on unrealistic foreign-aid programs.

In his recent letter to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, General Eisenhower stressed that he was forced to make certain assumptions concerning the administration of the MSA program. He said:

> I believe the American approach must always be to weigh these questions in terms of the effects upon the security of the United States. At a time of such heavy costs as the

United States is incurring it is more essential than ever that each dollar be made to count to the maximum.

I wholeheartedly agree with this statement. What is done through this legislation must be done only with full consideration of the effects upon the security of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I have endeavored to check some of the expenditures previously made by MSA and its predecessor, that is, ECA, against the criteria set forth by the general. I shall show the House that the taxpayers' money has been squandered in frivolous projects which could have been eliminated without damaging any of the objectives stressed by General Eisenhower.

Remember, Mr. Chairman, the general has talked about military requirements and expansion programs which develop collective security. Certainly by no stretch of the imagination can expenditures for free tobacco at the expense of the American taxpayer be considered an essential military requirement. During the period starting with April 3, 1948, through December 31, 1951, MSA report that they have authorized procurement of $452,453,000 in free tobacco for foreign nations. Of this amount, $236,500,000 was given to Great Britain; and Western Germany received the second largest gift which amounted to $70,900,000. During this same period the United States Treasury collected $5,124,249,000 in tobacco taxes. In other words, these MSA authorizations for free tobacco represent 9 percent of the taxes received by the United States for tobacco. Mr. Chairman, on the average every American could have enjoyed tax-free tobacco for 1 month each year since the start of ECA without any change in our budgetary position if we had merely discontinued sending free tobacco to other countries.

I have before me one of the more recent tobacco authorizations for Germany. It is dated May 5, 1952. It provides $1,300,000 for cigar-leaf tobacco; $160,000 for fire-cured tobacco; $5,232,000 for flue-cured tobacco, and $1,308,000 for Burley tobacco. This represents total expenditures of $8,000,000. We not only provide the free tobacco, but we also provide the cigarette paper. The recipients of our gifts state the specifications. I note that the Greeks have requested that all cigarette paper be bright pink. I have before me an MSA release announcing the procurement of 14,000,000 booklets, 50 leaves to each booklet, of such cigarette paper for Greece.

Having promoted smoking in Europe, we are now using MSA to purchase tobacco for the Associated States of Indochina. I have here a release, dated March 7, 1952, which authorizes the expenditure of $750,000 for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the countries this side of the iron curtain will collapse if we stop supplying their citizens with free coffee. Since April 3, 1948, through January 31, 1952, we have authorized the procurement of $24,800,000 of coffee. Of this amount, Greece received over 40 percent of the total, or $10,900,000 worth. The population of Greece is about 8,000,000; adults number about 5,000,000. In other words, every Greek adult has received about $2 worth of free coffee since the start of this program.

I have four MSA releases before me, each calling for the procurement of 500 to 600 tons of Brazilian coffee for Greece to be financed by the American taxpayer. One of these releases is dated March 4 and the other is dated March 21, just 17 days apart. These particular releases are issued by the MSA Office of Small Business and are designed to encourage small-business participation in the program. I note that these releases state that bids will be received from all countries, but the source of the coffee must be Brazil. As usual, the releases state that payments will be made in United States dollars by MSA.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(Mr. ARENDS, at the request of Mr. RICHARDS was allowed to proceed for three additional minutes.)

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. There are no funds for tobacco in this organization at all, for any country.

Mr. ARENDS. I understand that, Mr. Chairman, fully; but I am talking from past experience and what we may perhaps face in the future.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. There are no programs for tobacco. The balance of payments funds are being made so those countries can use their own money for tobacco. As long as there are balance of payments funds, of course, you are making loans for tobacco, grain, things like that, but it does not show here.

Mr. RICHARDS. Whatever tobacco is obtained by any of those countries from over here is bought and paid for by those countries during their next fiscal year.

Mr. GROSS. That, however, would not hold true of coffee. It is being paid for by American dollars, as indicated by these sheets.

Mr. ARENDS. Apparently the practice of dentistry in Greece is increasing rapidly. On March 26, MSA announced that this country would be supplied with 150,000 ampules of novocaine. As the total population of Greece, including infants, is less than 10,000,000, they should have an ample supply of novocaine. The next day, March 27, MSA realized that the novocaine would be useless without injection needles so they promptly supplied 23,000 injection needles and 10,000 syringes.

Mr. Chairman, I have been under the impression that Indochina needs weapons to fight the Communists. Apparently, MSA feels it is more important to send them blotters and notebooks. I have before me another of these fabulous small-business circulars which announces that we intend to send Indochina 40 reams of blotters, 100 reams of mimeograph paper, 2,000 reams of white paper, 190,000 notebooks and 2,000 boxes of stencils for Italian duplicating machines. I am sure this procurement struck terror in the hearts of the Communist aggressors.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on for hours but will spare my colleagues the pain of listening to much more of this nonsense of how things are happening today.

I am satisfied that we can drastically cut this authorization without jeopardizing in any way the defense of the free world. It is obvious that as long as the money is available, the bureaucrats will find a way to spend it. We shall never have economy until we cut back the funds which make these expenditures possible. Wild spending and misadministration will continue as long as easy money is made available.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. And when ECA bought 61,000,000 pounds of coffee a few years ago the international speculators immediately got busy and the housewives of America know what has happened to the price of coffee.

Mr. RICHARDS. Will the gentleman support this bill if all economic aid is cut out of it?

Mr. ARENDS. No; I am against the bill unless substantial reductions are made.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thought so.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Vorys amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia to the amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: Strike out "$1,022,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$637,300,000."

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to reduce this item by $1,000,000,000. I do not think the amount by which it would be reduced by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is sufficient; I think it can well stand a cut of $1,000,000,000, and that is the purpose of my amendment to his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when the twelfth quarterly report issued by the Economic Cooperation Administration came out last year it showed that up to that time the recovery of Western Europe amounted to an over-all average of 139 percent of production as compared with its production in prewar years. I feel that a recovery which amounts to 139 percent is sufficient to authorize the cutting back of that program which is costing the American taxpayers so much money.

We find on page 29 of the committee report on this bill a statement of the amount asked by the President and it shows that to be $7,900,000,000. The amount recommended in H. R. 7005 is $6,889,100,000 and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio would cut that by approximately $600,000,000.

I feel that it is not at all unreasonable to cut the amount of the Executive request by $2,000,000,000. We are facing this year a budget request of approximately $84,500,000,000. We have cut from that budget request up to now approximately $6,500,000,000 and I think it

is not at all unreasonable to ask for another cut here where it will not injure our program of another billion dollars.

I see in the committee report over here in the table on page 30 relating to "Mutual security funds in 1952 obligations and expenditures up to February 1952." Down at the bottom of page 31 we see that the unexpended balance on June 30, 1952—that is, there will remain an unexpended balance on June 30, on this economic and technical assistance—of $960,000,000, which is almost $1,000,000,000; under the plans as they now are this sum will remain unexpended on June 30 this year, that is, at the end of this fiscal year.

Of the total estimated expenditure items 4 and 6 there will remain unexpended $2,463,034,000. There will remain unexpended of total assistance, both economic and technical plus military, on June 30 of this year $8,915,040,000.

It seems to me that the time is here to pay some attention to the needs of the American taxpayer and to take some action here to relieve them as well as to do all these various things which we are doing for Europe and the other sections of the world. We have scattered our substance all over the face of the earth in total disregard of the burden on the American taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, this is a reasonable cut which I am proposing and I submit it for the consideration of the committee.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Did the gentleman say "unexpended" or "unobligated," because there is a difference?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I said "unexpended" and that is what the table on pages 30 and 31 shows—almost $9,000,000,000 will remain unexpended on June 30.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. There is much less than that unobligated. There are some $400,000,000 unobligated.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I am sure the membership understands the difference between "unexpended" and "unobligated."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the Vorys amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: Page 15, line 7, strike out "$1,637,300,000" and insert "$1,337,300,000."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is necessary to have these various cuts in the economic aid set out so that we can, as a committee, see the various proposals, and their solution. My amendment is a cut of $300,000,000 from the committee figure for economic aid. The cut of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is a cut of $615,000,000 from the committee figure. The cut of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] is a cut of $1,000,000,000 from the committee figure on defense support.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. As soon as these amendments are disposed of, I intend to offer an amendment to cut out all economic aid.

Mr. FULTON. I would like to explain shortly to the House, the reason for this $300,000,000 cut. To those of you who want an adequate program but still wish to cut the fat out, my amendment is for that purpose. If you will look at the staff report on the fiscal status of mutual security funds as of March 31, 1952, prepared by the staff of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, you will see there is $406,800,000 estimated not even to be obligated, that is, unobligated as of June 30, 1952. This means that for this program for the current year the Department of Defense has left unobligated, and they will not have used, $406,800,000 of the mutual security funds when the program ends in the current fiscal year on June 30, 1952. Because I feel that there might be some part of that, maybe 25 percent of it, that the Department would like to obligate, even in spite of their plans now not even to use it, I have left them some leeway in my amendment. So, I have simply cut $300,000,000 from the defense support program, which is the economic program, that is, cutting out most of the unused or unobligated money estimated by our Foreign Affairs Committee staff available as of June 30, 1952. My amendment will not hurt the program in the least, but it will tighten it up, and make for legitimate economies and savings, and cut out the unprogrammed funds in the program of the current fiscal year.

Again, if the program is a little large next year and there are unobligated funds remaining June 30, 1953, we again should look and cut the fat. As the House will remember last year I put in two amendments—one to cut the military aid program $250,000,000 and another to cut the economic aid $250,000,000—a total of $500,000,000 cut in this program. On the motion to recommit from the Republican side, where $350,000,000 actually was cut out of the program, as you recall, there has been no complaint by anybody or any official before our committee or on this floor that the Mutual Security Agency did not get enough money this year. Why not say to the Agency, "If you have not expended or planned for $406,800,000 as of June 30, 1952, the expiration date of this year's program, why not then cut $300,000,000 out of that $400,000,000," because we have actually had that excess this year.

When Congress gets beyond a certain point on the economic program for Europe, it is more than simple defense; that Congress is then financing our United States competition on machine tools, on fabricating, on basic industries, on manufactured items. This program should be over, probably, in 30 or 35 months, and then there will be all this excess manufacturing equipment, with low wages, in competition against our good United States business people selling abroad. On the other hand, we should in every case see that Europe has the responsibility for the maintenance and repair of this equipment themselves. Congress should supply enough economic aid to see in respect to the military equipment that we send to Europe that these countries are able sufficiently to repair it themselves and that our American taxpayers do not have to pay for that repair during a long period of years. That is why I am for defense support to give them the maintenance and repair facilities that they need for this equipment so the American taxpayers will not have to pay that long-time upkeep expense. But I am against giving any equipment that is not needed for defense purposes and can be later used to compete, with an undue advantage, at the expense of the United States taxpayers.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. First I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his statement and then ask a question that I asked of the committee yesterday, whether or not in your study you went into these contracts that were obligated, to scan those contracts for realism, because there is where you get your loose dollars. It is easy to obligate funds through some sort of fictional contract or very poor contract. Now, did the committee make any study of the contracts that were obligated?

Mr. FULTON. As you know, General Eisenhower, when he made his report, and the general that came before our committee, his chief aide, General Gruenther, each said that they could not come up with money figures for the security program, and they did not discuss it on that basis. The military witnesses did discuss the equipment they needed and the committee specifically went over each country as to what supplies they would get, but we are not at liberty to give it to you. We also went into the balance-of-payments question checking how much each country's budget was out of balance, and the military burden each country would assume for its own defense.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, suppose we examine for a few minutes the present very perilous situation. We know that the Korean negotiations are now at a deadlock as of this minute, at an absolute deadlock. We know, and General Ridgway so testified yesterday, that the Russians are massing great forces on the Chinese border. That we know. The news ticker this morning out here in our lobby told us that the Chinese Reds are starting an attack on the Portuguese border of Macao in China.

Further, we are aware as part of this very perilous situation at this hour today of the negotiations in Germany to bring Western Germany in as an integrated part of the defense, not the defense of Western Europe but, as my brilliant colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] says, the defense of the United States of America. Forget about this

defense of Western Europe, it is the defense of America.

That is the situation, that is the stage setting you are debating on this minute, and you want to cut another billion out of this bill in face of this peril?

I will tell you what General Eisenhower said, and I am reading from the New York Times editorial of this morning. General Eisenhower, who thus far could speak only of the mutual-security bill, for obvious reasons, warned us that while minor cuts—minor cuts, mind you—may be absorbed, a cut of a billion dollars in that program, and that has already been cut one billion by the committee, would be very heavily and very seriously felt, and any further cuts would seriously endanger the whole military build-up regarded as an absolute minimum necessary to safeguard the security; and you are asking me to substitute your opinion for that of General Eisenhower when the national welfare and the security of this Nation are at stake on this subject of military defense.

Many of you were lawyers or crossroads editors of small newspapers, or whatever you were that is, you were the night before election, but the morning after you were elected you think you became Secretaries of State or Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Oh, no, not on a serious matter like this, not for me, not for my country.

I stood here, Mr. Chairman, and I was one of a half a dozen men in 1946 who fought against needlessly rapid demobilization. I argued against bringing the boys home, in too much a hurry, and all of you stood here day after day and cried, "Bring the boys home," regardless of security in the east or west. You demobilized and you wrecked the defense of America. That is what is costing you money today, and that is what you are paying for in this bill and the other defense bills of the past several years—you have been paying to rebuild a defense structure—this bill will continue to build it and keep it strong. Cut this again and you may as well cut out your heart.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I wonder if there could be any agreement as to time on these amendments.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I hope that an agreement can be reached as to time for debate. I do not know whether we can. I see at least 13 Members who want to speak, and in view of that situation, I have no disposition to ask for an agreement to limit debate at this time.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Vorys amendment. It is hard to get the facts. Mr. Chairman, MSA, the European recovery offices have now accumulated enough facts in their own portfolios, and if we Congressmen can only go over there and dig them out, we will get some answers for ourselves. For instance, on this Rome railroad station, which is big enough to house the New York City stations, the Cleveland and the Chicago stations, and yet have 12 acres of space left. Here is a picture of it which I got from MSA files only 2 weeks ago. It is a mile long, it was built with some of our funds. On the back of this picture are these words:

ERP contributed from the Italian counterpart funds 2,170,000,000 lire, the equivalent to about $3,600,000.

And stamped on the back is:

Photo courtesy of MSA; if not used, please return to 800 Connecticut Avenue.

Now, what difference does it make whether $3,600,000 of our money went directly in there, or $1,238,000,000 of our money went to Italy and they thought as a result they could afford a railroad station a mile long like that? Are we stopping communism like that in Italy? Are we building up our military defenses and making allies that way in Italy? Are we making friends?

Here is a picture of the Mondragon Dam in France, on the seaway from the Alps to the Mediterranean, 300 miles long. Here is some American machinery helping to dig the canal. This comes from the files of MSA. Here is what it says on the back:

With a $33,000,000 boost from the Marshall plan, the seaway project stretching between Donzere and Mondragon has moved rapidly toward completion. The new hydroelectric facilities are expected to produce 13,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually, 3,000,000,000 more than America's TVA.

We cannot afford a seaway for ourselves. France, by a popular vote, twice refused to build that project. Our own committee has come back and reported here that the people with capital to invest in France and throughout Europe are taking their money out of Europe and investing it elsewhere. So American taxpayers' money, taken by force from them under the theory of doing charity, is expected to let politicians do good with it around the world. They are expected to do charity for people who will not even invest their own money in their own country. They will not even willingly defend themselves. They are not afraid of the Russians. They dislike us and wish we would mind our own business. That is what we should do. In God's name, when are we going to quit doing good with other people's money? We can never do good in this world that way. Nothing good can come out of compulsory charity. We can support the military program because we have all given the Government the constitutional right to use force in our self-defense. But there is no right in this Congress to compel the taxpayer, against his will, to do such works, in whatever names we may call them.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to have this program at all—and, as was said by the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] yesterday, no presidential candidate or any other person claiming the support of the American people on a major scale has suggested that we kill it—then we should have it on the most economical basis possible. We ought to consider the taxpayer. It is because I think the money for defense support is the most economical and productive part of the bill that I oppose every one of these amendments to reduce it. If you are going to consider the taxpayers, these are the amendments you should not pass, because here is where they get most for their money.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] said his amendment would cut the amount to what the figure was last year. That is true. But it was not brought out that this bill has already cut military assistance from last year's five billion to three billion three hundred million. To cut the amount of so-called economic aid this year back to what it was last year might be justifiable if we were giving the same amount of military aid this year that we gave last year. But if, after cutting down the military aid, we now cut the economic aid further, then in my judgment we are just punishing ourselves, because we do not escape the ultimate burden; we just cut down the results obtainable under the program. The whole objective is to build up these armed forces in Europe, and they will not have effective armed forces if they do not have expanded productive capacity in order to build more arms for themselves or at least be able to carry on maintenance and replacement of spare parts for what we send over.

May I ask you to look on page 1061 of the hearings at a memorandum prepared in response to requests made during the hearings.

For example, on page 567, I had asked this question of the military and economic experts:

How many fewer military end items will they be able to manufacture if they do not get this economic aid?

Then, later I said:

These dollars represent production by them of so many military end items that they could not otherwise produce. Those same military end items, if manufactured by us and sent over by us to them, would cost a larger amount.

How much larger? So that document appearing on pages 1061 and 1062, was furnished by the Department of Defense so we would know what we are doing if we cut out, as the gentleman from Mississippi says he will propose to, all of the economic aid. Of course, we cannot predict what they would take out of their programs, but assuming they cut down roughly the same on all three services, the elimination of the one and four-tenths billion for defense support would mean the loss of 10 European divisions, with supporting units; 30 aircraft squadrons (750 front-line aircraft and their logistic back-up); and the equivalent of 40 coastal minesweepers and 30 destroyer escorts. These are the fighting strength that they will not be able to produce if all defense support is eliminated. It would cost three and three-tenths billion to do what they can do for one and four-tenths billion of defense support.

That is the reason I am against these amendments to cut defense support. In

committee the majority cut military aid 20 percent. It cut economic aid only 10 percent because the committee recognized that we would get more for our money here than we will under the strictly military aid program, where we manufacture end items in this country at higher prices and send the arms over there.

Mr. Chairman, our choice is not between more money and less from our taxpayers. It is how to get the most defense for the least amount of money. It costs us less money, not more, to enable the Europeans to provide a larger proportion of the arms for their men; it costs us more money to make those arms here. Under those circumstances I have no difficulty in deciding what to do with my vote. I have to vote not to cut the economic aid, because to cut out the $1,400,000,000 of economic aid or defense support, produces a cut in their armament of $3,300,000,000.

Look on page 1062 and you will see that it costs to maintain an American soldier for a year $3,038; United Kingdom, $1,211; Belgium, $1,183; Norway, $1,108; France, $1,097, and so on.

If we do not enable them to arm and supply their own forces we will have to send over arms and equipment produced at greater cost and send over more Americans, too, to make up for those 10 divisions which they cannot put in the field. It seems to me that is the most reckless course we could follow with respect to the American taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take the rest of my time; I suppose everybody has got his mind made up already. I just hope that if you are going to cut the bill, you will not cut in the place where when you knock out $1 of defense support, you knock out $2.40 worth of end results.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, there has been more exaggerated talk around here about this multiplier effect than anything I have heard for a long time. I want to point out to you two things from the hearings: Page 515, I asked Mr. Cleveland—he was talking about military production and a lot of tables in there—

> Mr. VORYS. Mr. Cleveland, as I understand your statement, the hardware goes up a billion and a half and we put in $1,400,000,000; is that right?
>
> Mr. CLEVELAND. That is right.
>
> Mr. VORYS. I think we all ought to bear that in mind when we hear about our contribution being multiplied two or three times.

You have got 1.5 for 1.4. But then a little later, page 540, I asked him—I had been trying to pin him down on this multiplier effect to which reference has just been made, and I said this:

> I wonder if you could just answer that question I asked. Does this subtraction of the with and without defense support items for aircraft mean we cannot get aircraft materials, machinery to send to Europe?
>
> Mr. CLEVELAND. No, sir. This table does not have anything to do with imports of materials into Europe.

Then he went on to say it was merely a form of wise guessing and extrapolating. Then I said:

> Mr. VORYS. Still looking at your table on defense support, you apparently estimate that without defense support these countries could do just about as well, within $300,000,000, this coming year as they did last year; is that right?
>
> Mr. CLEVELAND. Somewhat less.

Now, under my amendment I propose that you give them $1,022,000,000. That is just what they got last year. That is a lot of defense support. I think the $1,000,000,000 cut is too high; the $300,000,000 cut is too low.

This program is always presented to us as the absolute minimum that we have got to do or we lose the whole cold war. I would like to quote Secretary of Defense Marshall at last years' hearings in the Senate.

He said:

> As to the $8,500,000,000 program, it is the minimum essential to carry out the arrangements arrived at in our agreements with the NATO countries and with General Eisenhower.

After he aid that you would have thought that when the Congress proceeded to make a cut of $1,016,600,000, that NATO would have fallen apart, that there would have been collapse in all of those countries. We made that cut last year after General Marshall told us what was the absolute minimum, and not only has there been a build-up in NATO, not only has there been an increased recovery in Western Europe, but also we have not had a single complaint about the cuts we made last year.

My proposal is just simply this: Of course, when you put arms in the hands of a soldier of another country and they pay for his upkeep and for his uniform, that is sound economy, but when you do that, and then say you will also render economic aid to help buy uniforms and feed soldiers, you are losing money. We are getting into an atmosphere where we will have a perpetual obligation all over the world to furnish foreign aid.

You will find when you get to point 4 that they are beginning to put foreign aid in there.

What I propose to do is to cut the mere recovery money down to where we can honestly say: We are now furnishing you sufficient defense support for you to go ahead and do the job; we will furnish you a lot of weapons, we will furnish you $1,000,000,000 of offshore procurement for you to get into the business of making weapons and to get dollar aid; we will furnish you $1,052,000,000 of stuff that our troops and our Armed Forces over there use; we will furnish you, under my amendment $1,022,000,000 of defense support. Now, get going under this sum and learn to defend yourselves and to support yourselves.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I want to comment on one thing the gentleman from Ohio said.

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. It is true that for $1,400,000,000 of defense support, we get only $1,500,000,000 worth of military hardware. But the men who use the hardware have to wear uniforms. These countries do not produce cotton, they do not produce wool; they have to buy those commodities abroad and they have to have dollars in order to buy them. Therefore the amount necessary for pay, uniforms, maintenance, construction, and so forth, makes up the difference between one and five-tenths billions of weapons and three and three-tenths billions of total defense effort by them. That is the point that should be taken into consideration.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio is a great man on figures and I have affection for him; but he has juggled these figures so much that he has probably become confused and has convinced himself the juggled ones are right.

The gentleman from Ohio read part of what Mr. Cleveland said, but he did not finish it. On page 517 of the hearings this appears:

> Mr. CLEVELAND. It is the difference between what you would get in the way of defense expenditure in Europe with this $1,400,000,000 of defense support and what you would have in the way of defense expenditure—that total of not only production but pay, maintenance, construction, and the rest of it—without the $1,400,000,000. We figure that you would probably have about $10,600,000,000 worth of defense expenditure instead of the $13,900,000,000 that was on that chart.

The question is simple. If you want an aid program and you want to get that aid program with the least number of dollars you can put out, the funds provided for defense support authorized in this bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we are given a choice of cutting $300,000,000, $600,000,000, or $1,000,000,000. The tragedy of the thing is that I do not believe there are any details that would back up any of those cuts any more than there are details that would back up the committee's recommendation which, of course, came originally from the State Department for the entire sum. I asked the question whether or not the committee had gone into the matter of obligated contracts, because there is one way these funds that have been voted by Congress can be hidden or turned to other purposes. You see, I approach this thing from an entirely different angle, being on the Expenditures Committee. We run into the moneys after they have been spent and we try to trace it back and find why the waste, unintended expenditures, and corruption actually occurred. When you consider the matter from that angle, watching and seeing what our money was spent for and tracing it back then is when you begin to get a little bit worried about some of these methods of letting

contracts and obligating contracts, and actually changing the purpose of contracts.

Now we have all experienced this, that right before an appropriation bill, all of the Government agencies, whether it is the military or it is the State Department or what, immediately run around in a great big hurry to try and obligate any funds they have so that they will not have to appear before us with unobligated funds. That is why it is incumbent upon the committees of the House dealing with these various agencies to at least take a little survey of the obligation contracts to find out whether those are bona fide and realistic contracts. This committee, unfortunately, has not done that, nor has the committee staff taken a look at them. I would just like to know how these billions of dollars that we have previously appropriated have been obligated and whether or not those are realistic contracts that we can actually expect to get some results from.

Now there is one figure that we are all familiar with: $1,000,000,000 worth of goods was delivered last year under the previous appropriations. If that is an indication of what is going to be delivered next year—and I suggest it probably is—we are not talking about very much when we talk about authorizing these additional billions of dollars, because we have many billions of dollars still obligated but unspent, probably much of it obligated under unrealistic or changed contracts, and one-half billion unobligated. They can go ahead and carry on the program. You are not talking about cutting anything at all in this coming fiscal year. If you really want to talk about something, talk about the productive capacity of the United States and how you can gear these particular programs into our productive capacity. There is a limitation on what we can do in this country. It is our productive capacity plus the availabilities of certain metals and other materials that go into fulfilling those contracts that creates this limitation.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman was on the Bonner committee trip and heard witnesses from ECA and military aid missions explain the actual expenditure of some of these funds. May I ask him if he is willing to tell the House whether he thinks our administrators are getting full mileage out of the dollars we have appropriated for these purposes in the past?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Of course we are not. That is why my worry is just where it is and why I began yesterday, in fact, I began last year when I argued against the defense bill at that time. Again I say, I am for a mutual security program and, therefore, I differ from a great many of my friends on this side of the aisle, but I do think we have to justify these things. This is the Congress of the United States, and the people are dependent upon us, even though we might have been just lawyers or little journalists in the outposts of this country, to look into these things and get away from these glittering generalities. We are talking about the defense of this country, and we should be talking in terms of specific details. Let us put an end to all this oratory. I think we are all of us good, patriotic citizens, but as patriotic citizens let's get down to details.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. CHATHAM. I have been on my feet very little because there is a record here of everything that is said, but I would like to say this. I am rather prudent, I think, in my judgment, but I think this bill is probably one or two billion too little. We agree that money has been misspent, but we are up against a country that is geared for war. I want to go on record at this moment that I think one billion, two billion, or three billion, maybe, could be spent if we could gear the production all over the world to the money.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If we could actually match the contracts and our production schedules to these figures we are talking about we might be able to indulge in some of this oratory, but it is pretty hollow oratory when you cannot match our production with the figures we are voting. That is what we ought to get around to.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Vorys amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. We are given the job of the raising of the money to meet the obligations we assume in this body. Most of the obligations we assume here are at the behest of a department of Government which either tells the entire body of Congress what it intends using the money for or as is too often the case, it tells a committee in secret the purpose of an authorization or appropriation. The committee cannot tell this body these secrets, hence we all too often have to vote upon issues and items we know nothing about.

Within a very short time we will have an opportunity of cutting down on the money authorized by this bill. I think we should agree to the Vorys amendment, cutting the bill six hundred million and then give an earnest to the American people that where there exists a grave question of doubt as to whether or not additional money is necessary, we for once give the benefit of the doubt to the American taxpayer.

I want to talk just a bit about personal income taxes. We are collecting in personal income taxes, it is estimated, about $28,500,000,000 from 45,000,000 of your and my neighbors and taxpayers. This means that on the average each personal income taxpayer will pay approximately $730 in income taxes in 1953.

Let us forget about the man who has an adjusted gross income of over $10,000. Consider only the lower income groups. There are 42,000,000 out of the 44,000,000 income taxpayers who pay on adjusted gross incomes of less than $10,000. They are the people you and I know back home. They are the great mass of our people and the great source of the revenue of our country. There are 42,000,000 of them. They are the people to whom in a few minutes we can say, "Where there is doubt, we are going to give the benefit of the doubt to the American taxpayer." There are 42,000,000 who pay on an average of $452 each year income tax. If we will agree to the Vorys amendment, 1,330,000 of these average-income taxpayers, living in your district and mine, who earn not above $10,000 upon which they pay income tax each year—if, I repeat, we accept Mr. VORYS' amendment, and give the benefit of the doubt to the doubt to the American taxpayer, we will take 1,330,000 of them off the income-tax rolls so far as this particular item is concerned. Let us for once, where there is grave doubt as to the necessity of spending money, and where we know there is an ample reserve carried over from last year to take care of any conceivable responsibility or liability imposed upon us this coming year—let us for once take care of that taxpayer back home. Let us give him a break in this issue. Let us agree to and support the Vorys amendment.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate close in 10 minutes.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I object. I hate to do that, but practically all of the speaking that has been done has been done on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that there is a filibuster on, and I move that all debate close in 15 minutes.

Mr. RICHARDS. Will the gentleman withdraw the motion until we can see how many Members want to speak?

Mr. VORYS. I withdraw the motion, but I think we ought to get through with this.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point, and I want it to appear that I favor the Vorys' amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, every dollar spent on foreign aid must be completely justified as being in the defense of the United States. Everywhere that a cut can be made it should be made. There are two major considerations: weapons that can be placed in the hands of free nations only where we know that they will be used, and the crushing tax burdens on the backs of 44,000,000 American taxpayers.

Every dollar spent for waste or unnecessary measures is a blow against the

American economy. An example of how the administration planners favor foreign countries as against America is the building by the ECA in France of two vast inland waterways and power projects in the rugged French Alps which is costing several billions of dollars while Congress stalls for years on beginning construction of the much less expensive and more important St. Lawrence waterway in America.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I am not seeking recognition for the purpose of speaking on these amendments, however, I do have an amendment to offer to this section. After these amendments are disposed of, would this motion include that?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's motion or unanimous-consent request would be to include the pending amendments only and not the section.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair advise the committee how many Members are on their feet seeking recognition to speak on the amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair notes six Members standing.

Mr. RICHARDS. Will the gentleman from Ohio state on what amendments he wishes to limit debate?

Mr. VORYS. On the pending amendment and all amendments and substitutes thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. The request would cover all pending amendments.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman agree to fix the time at 30 minutes?

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on all pending amendments close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is recognized.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the Vorys amendment. As I understand it, there are huge amounts of money that are left unspent and unobligated. I do know that the European countries, when they meet in conference, the question paramount in their mind is how much they are going to get out of Uncle Sam. Europeans are not interested in less money. I am very much interested as to what is going to happen to the taxpayers of this country.

Out on the plains of Nebraska, in the cattle country, when you begin to wean calves they do a lot of bawling. But there is always a weaning day that comes along. I am inclined to feel it is time to wean some of the foreign countries from getting so much economic milk out of the United States. They will do a lot of crying. There will be a lot of noise, but that thing has got to come about.

I do not think we have many friends in foreign countries, and we will probably have fewer when we stop this great spending, give-away program. Permit me to read an item from the Washington Post, on how Iran feels about the United States:

JACKASS IS BECOMING UNITED STATES SYMBOL IN IRAN

TEHRAN, IRAN, May 21.—A floppy-eared, bugeyed jackass is fast supplanting the familiar figure of Uncle Sam in Iran as the symbol of the United States.

Not a day passes but one newspaper or another carries a front-page cartoon showing the jackass in varying moods—sometimes plotting against Iran's independence, sometimes offering the country needed help, avaricious, surly—depending on the paper's political affiliation.

It all began several months ago when point 4 officials handled the shipment of a load of jackasses from Cyprus to Iran in a program to improve the local breed.

Iranian papers, forgetting all the good that point 4 was doing in the country, immediately seized on the "pore crittur."

"What's wrong with Iranian jackasses?" was heard everywhere around Tehran.

Whenever the newspapers thought they spotted something wrong in the point 4 program, they trotted out the floppy-eared, bugeyed jackass.

When an antigovernment newspaper wanted to lampoon Premier Mohammed Mossadegh for agreeing last month to resumption of United States military aid, it showed him astride a donkey going off to fight America's battles.

The influential Keyhan set the tone for the jackass controversy. Its editorial writer said:

"I have looked over the list of aid from the United States to Britain, Turkey, Italy, and Greece and have failed to see any mention of asses. Are we unique in the world in needing donkeys?

"What promises they made and what hopes they raised. And what is the result: asses."

Now, we have made a lot of promises. We have gone into many ridiculous programs. Maybe they need jackasses in Iran, but apparently they are poking fun at the United States, as they are doing in practically every country where we have given aid. It has been maladministered, and not doing the things we had hoped it would do.

So I think it is time to start weaning the program of giving away our resources. I expect to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]. A $600,000,000 cut will not hurt them at all. There must be an end to this give-away program.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] is recognized.

(Mr. SMITH of Mississippi asked and was given permission to yield his time to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM] is recognized.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I hope that motion does not prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICHARDS) there were—ayes 63, noes 84.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. RICHARDS and Mr. VORYS.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 89, noes 123.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I am sure all of us feel just as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON]. He made an eloquent appeal to consider the taxpayers' interest, and that has a special appeal in times like these for I do not suppose there is a Member of the House that is not aware, as he goes among his own people, of the terrific burdens that they are carrying.

I have reacted affirmatively to the appeal. For example I followed my chairman before he was my chairman 2 years ago when he suggested a cut. He insisted in debate yesterday that it was a wise cut, but whether it was or not, I refer to it because it indicates that on the majority side we are not lacking in the same sensibilities expressed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I wish that the entire House could have heard the proceedings of our committee in the serious and conscientious examinations of this very question as to how far we can go with the defense programs without impairing the economic system of our Nation. I asked Secretary Lovett directly, and instead of giving me an emotional response or partisan answer he said, in effect, "I do not know, Mr. Congressman, how far we can go, and I am not offering advice to the Congress as to cuts in the annual budget. I only point out as you weigh the problem in your own minds, any cut at all means buying that much less security." That was an honest, fair answer, and I think it was a correct answer. It posed a difficult question for the committee. Do not forget that we resolved it by a cut of approximately a billion dollars before reporting this bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the gentleman is making a very fine statement and I feel certain that he will back up what I am about to say, to wit, that all of the military people who appeared before us said time and time and time again that they thought that the defense support was at least as important as the military end-items program, and some of them said it was more important. Now if we are going to save taxpayers money it seems to me that on the basis of what our chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] brought out, we get $3 for each one invested and we get away from the possibility that this program may continue longer than anticipated, because we want to get out of this program as soon as possible, and the only way we can do it is to build up on the basis of economic support at the present time which, in my opinion, is

the most important part of this aid program to Western Europe.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I do agree, and I hope the House will hear us also on the point, that there is no substantial distinction between defense support and military end items when we consider the total purpose and the real objectives of this legislation. At page 1061 you will find the defense support figures well documented, certainly the point made by the gentleman from Montana, that $1 off of defense support means a loss of $3 in the defense program of the NATO countries. There is no question about that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, much has been said about the spending of money elsewhere than at home. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] had a good deal to say about that. My friends from Minnesota—and they are all my friends—will not object when I refer to a personal incident which illustrates my own point of view. A member of my family became seriously ill. They went to Minnesota for treatment. It was necessary for our family in Arkansas to send some money to members of our family in Minnesota. Now I would rather have had the money spent in Arkansas for Arkansas doctors, but every dollar sent to Minnesota was willingly sent because my family was there, and the help was needed there, and it could help my family only as it was expended there.

Half of all the men and women in American uniform are in other parts of the world. Talk to me about having no constituency concerned with this program. If the members of our Armed Forces are in danger as the result of the spread of aggression, I will have failed a million and a half constituents if I failed to provide a strong defense at their side. No, I do not have a single Iranian in my district; we cannot help ourselves politically by helping the Middle East but I can help the families of our fighting men to that extent and they are our constituents.

I know you will not misunderstand me. I am not asking our Republican friends to pull their punches. I recognize of course that they are holding us to a strict rule of accountability, but this program has been screened, and we come to you with this because we believe the peril is great, and if it is great, then we do not want any half measures. If the peril is not great, if we are wrong about that we ought not to spend anything. We are proposing these sums because we believe American interests are involved, and only for that reason.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield just a moment, I will give him a minute of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman of the committee is entitled to close debate.

Mr. RICHARDS. I was not rising for that purpose, Mr. Chairman, I was going to make a statement to the House, but I will wait until the gentleman finishes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can yield if he so desires.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. RICHARDS. Will the gentleman yield for me to make a motion?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Before I speak? No.

Mr. RICHARDS. I want to say this: I do not want to appear dilatory or anything like that, but as to this business of the Committee rising a little earlier in the afternoon when the leadership on both sides agreed that we would rise about 5:30, I took the responsibility of telling some Members there would be no vote. I had no authority to do that, but I gave them my opinion that there would be no vote this afternoon on these amendments. For that reason, at the proper time I will make another motion that the Committee rise.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. When the unanimous-consent request was made to vote in 30 minutes, why did not the gentleman say it then?

Mr. RICHARDS. The unanimous consent was not to vote, it was that all debate end at that time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It certainly was to have a vote.

Mr. RICHARDS. It was to close debate, and some of the Members did not use their time. I thought it would be just about 5:30.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Certainly the gentleman had an opportunity to explain his position at that time, when unanimous consent was asked.

Mr. RICHARDS. I am explaining honestly my position.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I was present when the understanding was arrived at about the Committee rising at 5:30, and there was no suggestion at all about not voting. When the limitation was fixed at half an hour, obviously we were going to vote. If we had wanted to do it, it would have been in order to move, even as of now, that all debate close on this amendment and all amendments thereto, but we have not undertaken to do that.

Mr. RICHARDS. If I may say so, it was the consensus of opinion of those there that there would be no vote here this afternoon.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I was there and I had no such opinion.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, in view of the time consumed by other Members in this discussion, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I am for the Davis amendment, for a cut of $1,000,000,000. If that fails I am for the Vorys amendment. I am for any amendment that will cut this bill in any part, or in any way whatsoever.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], and I say this in all kindness and consideration, gave us some headlines a while ago. Do not overlook the fact that when we entered the United Nations Organization and established its headquarters up in New York we set the stage for our people to be bullwhipped and aggravated and chastised every minute of their lives by the headlines rolling in about the emergencies all over the face of the globe. We will have these emergencies and headlines as long as we are mixed up with these international affairs in our efforts to rule the world. We might as well get accustomed to that.

The headlines today are no worse than they were 3 weeks ago or 3 months ago or 2 years ago, and they will be just as bad 2 months from now or 6 months from now or 6 years from now, no doubt about that. We live too much on headlines; millions of our people seek them, read them, look forward to them.

Our armies are scattered all over the world because public opinion in this country and public opinion in the Congress sent them there through endorsing the programs of previous and present administrations. I do not think we are accomplishing very much in those other parts of the world. I do not have very much confidence in this overall program. I am not afraid to state my convictions on it, and I have always been taught that the fellow who has firm convictions is entitled to speak first, before the fellow who has no convictions at all. I have the responsibility to state my position so that my people have no doubt about it. I hope the Davis amendment carries, and if it fails to carry, then let us support the Vorys amendment. Mr. Chairman, may I again say that I believe we have committed ourselves beyond our ability to pay. I again say I believe if we pursue our course it will lead us to general bankruptcy. The debate here today is filled with doubts; with fears about what the full outcome will be; whether or not we have made substantial progress thus far in spending the many billions of dollars we have taxed our people for, to send to foreign lands. We live in hope, and while we wait, we spend and waste and spend again until the whole performance becomes fantastic, confusing to our people, and weakens our whole fabric of life. It is time to set the brakes.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken, and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 109, noes 123.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RICHARDS and Mr. VORYS.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were ayes 134, noes 135.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 10 minutes to close debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, these are very important amendments to title I of the bill. The gentleman from Ohio proposes an amendment that cuts defense support about $600,000,000. The gentleman from Georgia has offered an amendment to cut $1,000,000,000 from

the defense-support funds. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has offered a substitute amendment cutting it about $300,000,000.

As I told the House yesterday, the executive department recommended for defense support the sum of $1,819,200,000. Our committee cut that $181,900,000, a reduction of 10 percent. We cut military end-items 20 percent.

Mr. Chairman, this country embarked upon a program for economic recovery in Europe. We asked that the Marshall plan expire in 1952 and I say it has expired. We embarked on another program for mutual security. We pledged to the nations of Europe that if one of them were attacked we would consider ourselves attacked. We pledged our word and we embarked upon that program.

I am convinced that we have already cut defense support to the point where it would not be safe to cut any further and still be in the best interests of our country. I think funds spent for defense support will help us save dollars in years to come. That is my honest belief. I want to assure you, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that I would never come before the House in the face of what I told you last year and the year before and ask for defense support unless it were essential to the defense program in Europe and unless we could save American dollars by providing this form of aid.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true that on the basis of this legislation we anticipate this program ending in June 1954?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true also that if we do not go through with this program according to schedule it is very likely it will be lengthened out and in the long run we might have to keep our troops in Europe longer than we anticipate?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is right, 100 percent.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, in order that all Members who are so vitally interested in this problem and these three amendments, and who want to vote on them, may have the opportunity, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman's motion is dilatory. He has already made that motion twice.

The CHAIRMAN. There has been debate since that time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It has only been 10 minutes ago that he made a similar motion. It is dilatory when you make it twice within 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a division.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I demand tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RICHARDS and Mr. VORYS.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 138, noes 160.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment, the amendment to the amendment, and the substitute be read.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, why not read the one we are voting on now and read the other two later?

Mr. RICHARDS. I just wanted to see what they were.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment now to be voted upon will be reported by the Clerk.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia to the amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: Strike out "$1,022,000,000" and insert "$637,300,000."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia) there were—ayes 117, noes 167.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RICHARDS and Mr. DAVIS of Georgia.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 117, noes 157.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON]. Without objection the Clerk will again report the substitute.

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. My $300,000,000 amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: Page 15, line 7, strike out "$1,639,300,000" and insert "$1,337,300,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]. Without objection the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: On page 15, line 7, strike out "$1,637,300" and insert "$1,022,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. RICHARDS and Mr. VORYS.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 163, noes 116.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICHARDS) there were—ayes 134, noes 146.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 14, line 20, strike out the semicolon and insert a period and quotation marks in lieu thereof, strike out the remainder of line 20 and lines 21, 22, and 23; and on page 15, strike out lines 1, 2, and 3.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes out language running throughout the bill providing millions and millions of unexpended and previously authorized funds to be added to the billions called for in this measure.

It appears that at least $12,000,000,000 remain in the till, unexpended, according to small-print and virtually buried statistics which Truman is compelled by law to furnish Members of Congress.

And there seems to be another $9,000,000,000 or so in foreign currency in scattered countries, unspent and theoretically available in the form of so-called counterpart funds.

Therefore, the grand total of unspent foreign-aid funds stands at between twelve and twenty-one billion dollars, proof that we have about as much use for appropriating another $7,000,000,000 as we have for a hole in the head.

This twelve to twenty-one billion dollar foreign aid kitty is controlled by the Mutual Security Administration, successor to the Economic Cooperation Administration—ECA—which was initiated in 1948 on Truman's promise that it would die in 1952. As it turned out in 1952, only the name, ECA, ended. Mutual Security took over the rest—buildings, personnel, desks, telephone numbers, and so forth—and your tax dollars at the rate of six to ten billion dollars a year.

Understand clearly that Mutual Security is neither mutual nor security. There is nothing more mutual about the Mutual Security Program than there was cooperation in the Economic Cooperation Administration, with the outgo of American dollars and natural resources in both instances a one-way, dead-end alley, with little or nothing in return.

Significantly, the Mutual Security Administration is headed by W. Averell Harriman, who, as right-hand stooge of the past two Presidents, has made a career of throwing away the taxpayers' money. Naturally, then, he is the most active member of the international lobby intent on flim-flamming American taxpayers out of another $7,000,000,000 to be spewed abroad.

Now here is a postscript to this situation. The Truman administration claims to have earmarked about $9,500,000,000 for foreign military aid, but in

the previously referred to small-print balance sheet, the spenders have to admit that only $1,800,000,000 has actually been delivered in the form of military equipment.

This, added to former Head Mobilizer Wilson's wail that our own military production program is many months behind schedule, makes it clear that we cannot produce fast enough to use up the money already appropriated for our domestic military commitments, much less for foreign commitments. But the spenders still insist on more tax dollars.

A vote for this amendment should save the taxpayers billions of dollars. I hope the amendment will have the support of all those who are interested in the solvency of the United States.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. According to the committee's own report on pages 30 and 31, they have as of February 29, 1952, over $9,000,000,000 of unexpended funds on military assistance and almost $12,000,000,000 of unexpended funds on economic and technical assistance. That is according to their own record.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Illinois is absolutely correct and I thank him for his observation.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that I get the full import of the amendment. The gentleman has talked about unexpended balances at the end of the fiscal year. As a matter of fact, there will be about $8,945,100,000 unexpended funds on June 30 this year. Out of all that, there will be about $400,000,000 in unobligated funds.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Chairman is correct. Something like $350,000,000 will be unobligated on June 30 of this year, and the moneys which the gentleman from Iowa would seek to strike out of the authorization are moneys appropriated and authorized for long-lead items which take 1, 2, and 3 years to manufacture. If the gentleman wants to kill the bill, this is a good way to do it.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not true that we found out during the course of the proceedings on the bill in committee that by other laws obligated funds do not need to be reappropriated? Therefore, as I get the effect of this amendment, it would do one of two things. It might possibly be very paralyzing, but what I think it would do would be to simply invite the departments to hurry up and obligate the unobligated moneys because under other laws, as long as the money is obligated, it is the same as spent.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman is correct. Under existing legislation, obligated funds may be spent in 2 years.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I just wanted to make the same comment, that if we really want to throw away a lot of money, which I do not believe the gentleman from Iowa wants to do, you should vote for his amendment because you will guarantee they will jam through these applications before June 30, especially in view of the cuts that have been made. That is the quickest way to throw away money that I have heard of in a long time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman mean to say that the money will not be spent anyway? Does the gentleman mean to say the money will not be spent? If this amendment is not adopted, it will be spent; will it not? The House has to put a brake on this, and it should adopt this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 21, noes 138.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: On page 15, line 4, strike out all of lines 4, through 14, inclusive.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is not to reduce foreign economic aid. The purpose of this amendment is to cut economic aid out entirely.

A few moments ago we voted on several amendments which would reduce the amount of economic aid that we are giving to these recipient countries. In my opinion, the granting of any economic aid to these countries in continuation of the Marshall plan, which was started in 1948—and I understand this is a part of the Marshall plan—is nothing more nor less than breaking faith with the American people. How well I remember what happened back in 1948. The members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the then chairman of the committee, and the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], who is now chairman, and other members of the committee said in effect: "If you will just dig down in the American people's pockets and force them to pay foreign aid for 4 or 5 years, we will not ask for any beyond 1952." That was known as the Marshall plan. Then, in 1951—to get around that—they brought in a bill to change the name of the Marshall plan and continue it under the name of Mutual Security Program.

You are either for continuing economic aid or you are opposed to it. This bill is divided, as I understand it, into three parts. One is economic aid; the other is the point 4 program, and the other is military aid.

The amendment which I have offered strikes at economic aid only.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], a few minutes ago, stood before the House and said if you adopted the amendment that I was going to offer you would be cutting 10 divisions from the European army. Using his own figures on that, if we can get 10 divisions for $1,500,000,000, then we ought to have 3,000 divisions standing over there now against Russia, because we have spent $40,000,000,000 in the last 6 or 7 years on it. That is simple arithmetic.

Using the same figures and applying them to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], who said that every dollar we spend on economic aid was bringing us three and one-half in military aid, then today we ought to have an army standing in Europe, of Europeans—not Americans—worth $140,000,000,000.

Now, this business just does not make sense to me. I think the time has come to stop this international WPA that we have been operating at the expense of our people. The American taxpayer does not have any choice. He has to dig down in his pocket and pay. If he does not, he goes to jail. He does not mind spending money to defend himself, but I do not think we have any authority, under the Constitution of the United States, to exact money from the pockets of the American taxpayer for the purpose of spending it on unexplained projects abroad.

I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. Will the gentleman vote for this bill if this amendment is adopted?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. If this amendment is adopted the rose will smell much sweeter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a laughing matter; and I am quite certain that the gentleman from Mississippi would not vote for this bill if this amendment were adopted. You have already voted three times on this particular section. The gentleman from Georgia tried to cut it by a billion dollars; the gentleman from Pennsylvania tried to cut it by $300,000,000, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], did cut it by $600,000,000.

The gentleman from Mississippi wants to cut out the whole sum, $1,639,300,000; and then if that were cut out he still would not vote for the bill; in other words, he is just opposed to this bill in its entirety, and he is not trying to seek a reasonable means by which the objectives of this legislation can be accomplished. I want to repeat what the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] has already said.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Surely.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman has intimated that I am attempting to destroy this thing.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am not intimating it; I am saying it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, I am; I am.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And you are admitting it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. And I am attempting to keep faith with the American people, because we told them in 1948 that this thing would wind up in 1952.

Can the gentleman tell me when it will stop?

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the gentleman will let me continue I will try to answer his question.

It is true that the Marshall plan as such was supposed to end on June 30, 1952. The Marshall plan has ended prior to that time, and what we have before us is the mutual security assistance program based primarily——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Pardon me—based primarily on what happened in Korea and what has happened since to the free world.

This is a serious matter, because it is tied up with the defense of this country; and I urge you, please, think this thing through and do not treat this matter lightly.

We are not interested in Western Europe because of Western Europe or in Asia because of Asia; I am interested in this program because I am interested in the defense, in the welfare, and in the security of the United States of America; and with me that comes first all the time.

As far as this particular section is concerned, as the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee has said, this will repay itself two or three times over, because all we are trying to do is to get our friends in Western Europe strong enough so that they can carry on their own armament program, and so we can, under the legislation enacted last year, get out of this particular burden by 1954; that is the termination date.

As far as the Marshall-aid program was concerned, that was for the economic rehabilitation of Europe. As far as this particular program is concerned, it is for the rearmament of Europe, so that its people can become strong enough to look after their own interests, take care of their own defense, and so that if this program works out according to schedule we can, according to General Eisenhower, begin withdrawing American troops in 1953 or 1954.

If you drop this section, it means that we will have to put that much more in the way of our tax dollars into our own defense; the money which we are spending under this program in Europe is in our own behalf primarily. Please keep that in mind all the time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is very clear as to what will be the view of the Committee of the Whole on this amendment by the action which it took regarding the Davis amendment. I would not be bold enough to take this time were it not, I think, necessary in fairness to this bill.

We have had some differences of opinion along strict party lines as to the Committee's rising. I think it would be extremely worrisome to the people of our country and the people of the world if in a mood of irritation or a mood of just swinging with what seems to be a rushing tide we lost our sense of judgment.

Now, we are talking about Europe. Here we have a proposal to destroy what would be a very fundamental element in the whole defense of Europe—defense support. A lot of people here talk about what General Eisenhower has said and what he did not say. I think perhaps it might be a sobering moment to read just a few sentences of what he did actually say in his own words with respect to this very bill.

Before I read this, may I say it does not criticize anybody, it takes full account of the fact that action may be taken such as the Committee has already taken in trimming this program to what it thinks it ought to be. But such action we are being asked now by the pending amendment to take would not be in accord with General Eisenhower's view and would represent a grave setback to everything we are considering today in terms of national and free world security.

Let me read you a very few lines from a dispatch dated May 12, 1952, to a Senate committee, in which the general stated:

> It is clear, however, that the retardation in the build-up of forces which would be necessitated by a cut of the size already proposed would have what would necessarily be classed as a substantial impact in this area. We would of course attempt to make adjustments compensating for this action but would expect to encounter a series of difficult problems, especially with respect to rephasing the related preparations of our European allies. Any reduction substantially greater would add an even more difficult type of complication to our problems here. While I am unable to establish the level at which these retardations could be classed as directly damaging to the security of the United States, I am sure that anything materially greater than the billion mentioned their effect would be profound both in discouraging our friends and in encouraging those potentially hostile to us.
>
> I have repeatedly stated my view that we should build toward adequate levels of strength but only as rapidly as our economic capability permits without endangering its basic soundness. Our security objective should be to shift to a sustaining type of operation with its substantially lower costs as quickly as we can.

Mr. Chairman, the defense support idea is built upon shifting to a "sustaining type of operation with its substantially lower costs" as quickly as we can. If we destroy that, then we are destroying free Europe's ability to do the maintenance job which we expect them to do as soon as the peak of defense preparation is reached.

Let me go now to another point. We are asking free Europe to do a great deal. We are talking here in very broad, general terms without any recognition of the other fellow's problems. Europe's standard of living today is something like one-third of our own. That is true of France and Great Britain. I invite your attention to the fact that by the obligations which it has undertaken at Lisbon to arm, further, free Europe's standard of living—in Great Britain and in France—will be further reduced even if we give them all of the defense support. In Great Britain the already starkly austere standard of living has to go down 3 percent more even with defense support. If we deny them defense support it will go down one eighth. In France if we deny defense support the standard of living of the French people, already so dangerously impaired, will go down by another 6 percent.

What do we expect these people to do? Do we expect them to be on the first line of danger against Communist aggression from the east and yet to be further ground down, to have their standard of living further reduced when they can look across to the United States and see that we have appropriated over $60,000,000,000 for our own armament and have a standard of living twice and more better than theirs? Yet we feel that we cannot afford them $1,000,000,000 for help to a sound defense economy and for the armament production which we are asking them to undertake.

I do not think that we should entertain seriously amendments of this kind or we will be giving our European allies a rebuff which they very well can resent. Remember that there are many people in free Europe who are really giving the dangerous counsel that Communist aggression is inevitable anyhow; that the Americans are going to desert Europe as they did after World War I, and that Europe might as well make the best bargain it can.

We are not entirely on peaches and cream in this situation either and I seriously urge my colleagues—and if they need any reminder—of the grimness of the peril we face that they heed the notice General Ridgway gave to them this morning in pointing out the number of aggressors still around armed and shooting. I urge my colleagues to keep their balanced judgment on this whole business of indiscriminate cutting.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD: On page 15, line 3, after "authorized", strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That after June 30, 1953, not less than 75 percent of the assistance provided by the funds authorized in this paragraph shall be used or distributed by the organization referred to in section (c) of the last sentence of section 2 (b) of this act."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, let me first explain this amendment by asking the Members to turn to the bottom of page 13 and the top of page 14. On the bottom of page 13 of the bill it says, "Appropriations made pursuant to paragraphs 101 (a) (1) relating to military assistance, and 101 (a) (2), relating to defense support and economic assistance may be used," and then over on line 3, page 14, "to furnish assistance—to any of the following organizations: (A) The North Atlantic Treaty Organization; (B)

the European Coal and Steel Community"; that is the Schuman plan organization; and "(C) the organization which may evolve from current international discussions concerning a European Defense Community."

My amendment provides that after June 30 next year not less than 75 percent of the assistance given in this paragraph shall be used or distributed through this organization that is being worked out right now in Europe, called the European Defense Community. You are reading about the contractual agreement and treaty and protocol that our representatives and the French and the West Germans and the Italians and the three Low Countries are endeavoring to create. It would make official a West European army out of the defense forces of these six countries with a common military budget, a common uniform, a common defense plan, and a common command. These six countries are on the Continent. England has said she wants to keep her European forces separate. The Scandinavian countries want to keep theirs separate. The purpose of this amendment is to throw our encouragement and support behind those people in Europe who are insisting on getting together as closely as possible.

May I remind the House, if it will indulge me, that in the original economic cooperation bill of 1948 I offered an amendment saying that it was the policy of the people of the United States to encourage the economic unification and political federation of Europe. It was defeated, and the strongest word in that act was the word "cooperation." On April 11, 1949, I offered the same amendment again and it was defeated. But later that year in the Mutual Defense Assistance Act our committee put the words "unified direction and effort." The next year, 1950, I offered the same amendment again and it was rejected, but the committee did accept the phrase "to encourage the further unification of Europe."

Last year, 1951, I offered the same identical amendment and it was at last adopted, and the MSA Act stated as one of its purposes "to further encourage the economic unification and the political federation of Europe."

When the bill came before us this year, written by the administration, it had those words in it. Section 2 reads:

> The Congress welcomes the recent progress in political federation, military integration, and economic unification in Europe.

It is the same as my 1948 amendment with the addition of "military integration."

I believe it is now past time to use more than words and throw our actual assistance behind this movement. It is fast by the standards of previous years, but too slow for the urgent needs of our day.

There are some countries in Europe that are pushing ahead in the front rank, and some are lagging back. This amendment throws the weight of our influence behind the real pioneers in Europe who realize clearly they will have to hang together or they will all hang separately. It merely says if the European Defense Community has become a reality by next year, those countries not in it will have to get some of their assistance from us not directly, but through this European Defense Community. Twenty-five percent can be parceled out by us to countries individually, but 75 percent of our aid after this coming fiscal year will be given to the European Defense Community to be used or distributed by it in such ways as its members and we decide are most beneficial and effective in building up the defense of Western Europe.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Am I correct in my understanding of the gentleman's amendment that not less than 75 percent will be allocated to the European defense community?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, to be used or distributed by it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What about the Swedes and the Norwegians and the Danes?

Mr. JUDD. The organization does not have to use it all for itself, it can distribute part to other countries in whatever amounts it and we decide contributes most to the strongest defense of the area. A united effort is the only way they will get a real defense of Western Europe.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But only six countries are affected. What about the others that belong to NATO?

Mr. JUDD. The others can join the six countries if they want to or get aid through the EDC. Besides 25 percent can be given to them directly by us; but at least 75 percent will have to be given to this organization of six countries to be used by the organization or to be distributed by it to the other countries that are not in it, in such manner as in the judgment of those who are developing this cooperative defense organization, is the best way to get security in Western Europe.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Here you have 12 European countries in NATO. The gentleman is talking about five and Germany. He would allow 75 percent of the funds to be spent in those countries, leaving 25 percent at the most for the other seven countries which comprise the NATO organization. Yet this is a bill, as I understand it, to back up the North Atlantic Treaty.

Mr. JUDD. Our effort ought to be to back up mainly those people in Europe who want to get together because that will give the strongest defense. I feel sure the European Defense Community would love to have the British come in and the other six countries, too, if they want to come in.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact, and the gentleman will agree with me, that the British are the strongest element of European defense? What the gentleman is proposing, therefore, is that they be forced into the European defense machinery.

Mr. JUDD. No, they are not going to be forced into it, but if the European countries that are to bear the brunt of an attack and we believe that the bulk of the aid and the military strength ought to be concentrated on the Continent, and the British are not willing to cooperate in such a program, then I do not think they should be given quite the same priority, unless the EDC countries believe they will get more actual defense for themselves by giving more to the British. Surely they are as anxious for a strong European defense as we are. I believe this amendment will help achieve the unity which every student of the subject says is absolutely necessary if they are going to be able to defend themselves.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I would hate to see the Committee take quick action on this amendment. I think I know just a little bit about what the gentleman is discussing. I believe if he had an opportunity to present the question to this Committee, and give them an opportunity to understand just what is involved, the Committee would pretty unanimously support the position he is taking. I think the ranking minority member of the committee understands, and he is supporting the amendment. This House sent a delegation abroad last year to meet with these countries in considering some plan for unifying. What the gentleman is offering is the product of that meeting.

Mr. JUDD. Yes, and the gentleman from Georgia was a most valuable member of that delegation. Some would say, as did so many in 1948, 1949, and 1950, "We must not do this, we must not do that to offend or pressure these countries or appear to impose our will on them." This amendment does not do that. Almost every European leader over there, as you well know, said frankly that they could not be strong until they were united. Several of them said, "We wish the United States had thrown and would throw the weight of its influence and its assistance on the side of those who want most to unite." Let us not be too little and too late again on this important essential for the success of the whole program.

(On request of Mrs. KELLY of New York, and by unanimous consent, Mr. JUDD was allowed to proceed for one additional minute.)

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Do I understand correctly, Dr. JUDD, that after June 30, 1953, you want to give the NATO organizations the right to disburse 75 percent of the money?

Mr. JUDD. No. I want not less than 75 percent of the assistance given under this section of the act, after June 30, 1953, to be used or distributed through the European Defense Community.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Then the gentleman means that it shall be distributed?

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. In other words, they can distribute our money?

Mr. JUDD. No, not our money, but our assistance. For instance, there are some $3,300,000,000 of military aid. None of it goes as money, but as tanks and planes and rifles and machine guns.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. But you would give them that right, and you would give them that permission.

Mr. JUDD. Yes, what is the Defense Community for if it is not to be trusted to handle the aid agreed upon by it and our own people? Who is the head of the European Army? General Eisenhower has been the head of it, and General Ridgway is to be the new head of it. I trust them. In addition, it has been my observation that Europeans are generally more hard-boiled and practical with each other than we are. This is the kind of support they need from the United States to get the unity that they all say is necessary in order to get a real defense.

Mr. JAVITS. But the European Defense Community is not in existence, and it is not headed by Eisenhower or Ridgway.

The gentleman's amendment does not say NATO. It says EDC, which is something very different.

Mr. JUDD. No, it says "the organization which may evolve." If there is no such organization, then this amendment would not become operative. But at least 75 percent of the aid would go to the organization they are in the process of trying to evolve, and which we want and need to encourage and help.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. As a general proposition, I do not think there are any two men in the Committee on Foreign Affairs who agree more than the gentleman from Minnesota and myself. Usually I find the gentleman from Minnesota a very realistic individual. What are we faced with today? I am not so sure that the European defense community concept is going to succeed. There are many things that remain to be done in spite of Lisbon. Each one of the European parliaments have to approve the European defense concept. Constitutions have to be changed in these European nations. A great danger still faces the United States, in my opinion, if the European defense community fails. Although I hope it will succeed, yet there remains much to be done despite General Eisenhower, and Averell Harriman, and the architects who seek to build this program. If the European defense community fails, and if the European defense army fails, then the United States will be in a much tougher position than it would be if the European defense community were successful. Under those circumstances, it would become necessary for the United States if it is to remain a great power to enter into the old fashioned balance of power politics. It will become necessary for the United States at that stage of its life to enter into bilateral agreements with England. It will be important for the United States to enter into bilateral agreements with France. It will be important for the United States to enter into bilateral agreements with any nation that has force and has strength and is willing to ally with the United States of America. It would seem to me that if the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota were adopted, the United States would be saying that we just do not want any more allies, and we are really going it alone. For the gentleman from Minnesota, who is so aware of the facts of international life today to throw away the question of getting an accretion of the United States power and preventing the raising of Soviet power is surprising. The adoption of this amendment would be a complete negation of everything that we are trying to do in this bill.

I hope we can eventually get a European defense community. I hope that Europe would unite. I am realistic enough to know that Europe may not unite. I am aware of what is going on in Germany today, and the possibilities in France. Grave issues are being weighed. Great conflicts exist internally within these countries which may cut off the European defense community before it is born. Under those circumstances I say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and to this House that we in this Nation should not tie our hands in such a way that we deliberately cut ourselves off from all potential allies.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I have here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 4, page 4311, a speech by my friend from Connecticut which is almost a duplicate of what he has said today. The gentleman rose in opposition to my unification amendment then. He said, "Harmless as the amendment may sound, it has within it dangerous implications." He said "We are treading on European sovereignty and playing right into the hands of the Communists." Yet, 3 years later the State Department brings us a bill with exactly the same language as that which the gentleman said was dangerous 3 years ago. It was too bad that we lost those 3 years. This amendment does not seek to impose our will on them. It is not being truculent, or imperialistic, or browbeating. It merely says we want our money to be used in the way that will produce the greatest amount of defense in Europe. That requires an army of Western Europe. The boldest pioneers in Europe said to us, "Make us unite and you will be safe; but we cannot unite unless you put pressure on us."

Mr. RIBICOFF. I would say to the gentleman that one of the great weaknesses of the foreign policy of the United States is the insistence of our architects that they are always right. I would say the people of this Nation would be better off if the leaders would say themselves what we are seeking to accomplish as a nation. You cannot have a 100 percent batting average in all of these concepts of foreign policy. Events are marching much faster than words. If the European defense community, as conceived in Lisbon, is not successful, I certainly want allies wherever I can find them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

I drafted the amendment and prevailed upon my colleague [Mr. JUDD] to offer it, for two reasons. One is that he has been a pioneer in this movement toward unification. The other is he was a member of the group of 14 who were at Strasbourg. I was not a member but I went down there and saw them at Strasbourg in their meeting with representatives of the Council of Europe. I heard the unanimous report of the Senators and Congressmen saying substantially, "We regret that all we hear is excuses why they cannot unite instead of reasons why they are going to." Our committee said, on page 13:

> Only by unification will Europe finally be able to defend and support itself.

General Eisenhower in his report says substantially the same thing. There is no hope for Europe, in peace or in war, unless they unite.

What do we do by this amendment? We simply say to Europe, "You have got another year from the coming June 30, and if by that time you have not done the things that Eisenhower and all of your own statesmen say you must do to save yourselves, then there will be only 25 percent of the stuff delivered."

As a matter of fact, right now 64 percent of our military equipment is going to the six nations that would be in the European defense community.

Sixty-four percent would be going there and thus only 11 percent is involved here. This would mean that the organization which may evolve from Lisbon would have 75 percent for use or distribution. That would mean that nations that were not in the organization, to the extent of 11 percent, might have to ask this new organization for arms. I note my colleague, Judge SMITH of Virginia, who was there at Strasbourg. Let me point this out. Here is a headline appearing in a New York paper today: "Deadlock delays six-nation treaty on European arms."

Are they never going to get together? We have written in the Zablocki amendment strong language, to have the Administrator do something about it. What we do by adopting this amendment is to say, "Come a year next June you have got to be together."

The gentleman from Connecticut says that if they never get together we will go on and defend ourselves over there. I do not think so. I think as Secretary Acheson said to us in our committee, this is a year of decision, a year of destiny in Europe. This is not a time when things can stand still; they have got to move forward or they will fall apart. This is, therefore, the year that Europe meets her destiny; and when we say to them that 75 percent of this military equipment will be available for this new organization we are encouraging them to unite and we are letting them

know the seriousness of the situation if they do not get together.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may proceed for three additional minutes.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman still has 1 minute of his own time remaining.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. As a matter of fact, I do not think the statement of Mr. Acheson was correct. Does the gentleman from Ohio think that the statement of Mr. Acheson before our committee was correct?

Mr. VORYS. I think so; yes. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia, whom I see on his feet.

Mr. RIBICOFF. And may I ask the gentleman——

Mr. VORYS. I have answered the gentleman's question; I think Acheson was right. This is a year of destiny and of decision for Europe.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I was not seeking to interrupt the gentleman; I want time in my own right.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I want to recall to the gentleman in regard to the action of the committee, the amendment which some members of the subcommittee which went to Europe sought to offer:

> The Director shall insure that, where suitable or necessary to the success of the mutual security effort, that countries take adequate steps to mobilize their industries for mutual defense and gear their fiscal, budgetary, capital, political, and military resources to the objectives of this act and take appropriate other steps toward self-help and mutual cooperation.

The two sponsors of the pending amendment voted against it.

Mr. VORYS. No; I voted for that. I do not know whether the gentleman voted for an amendment similar to this when I offered it in committee. I suggest to the membership that you look at the Zablocki amendment and you will find that it contains strong language.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment requires a good deal of study.

We do not know at this time whether we want to commit ourselves to the kind of organization that may evolve from what is going on in Europe. It is a very serious proposition.

If you do this you are weakening the hands of the generals in charge of our military activities over there.

I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I think some of you know that I was one of that delegation at Strasbourg. The gentleman from Ohio knows that I do not think there was anyone in that delegation who was more severe in his overt criticism in the presence of those 16 European nations of the selfishness with which they approached this subject of unification. It is a tremendously big thing.

Gentlemen, it would be a tragic mistake to take this up in 5 minutes here and determine a question that may affect the future of all of the European countries. Let us take some time to think about this thing. I do not even know what is in the amendment; I do not know what it would do.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] knows that I was just as strong for the unification of Europe as any.

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. And I berated them just as much as anybody over there did.

Mr. JUDD. This is not a berating amendment, rather it is holding a carrot before them; it just says "Come along into the European defense community. There are advantages."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Then we ought not to do this on the floor now.

Mr. JUDD. This has not come up just now, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not have the floor.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. May I say this amendment was offered in committee and voted down by one vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks made by the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RICHARDS and Mr. VORYS.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 138, noes 145.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was a bit amazed when this amendment was introduced because in truth I am for certain conditions and assurances to be written into the bill. Together with some of my colleagues, I sponsored amendments in committee that I had hoped would be accepted. When the committee saw fit not to accept the amendment we had offered I had prepared a substitute that the Committee on Foreign Affairs did accept, and it is explained in the report, on page 72.

At the proper time the committee will have another opportunity, for it is my understanding that the original amendment, slightly revised, will be offered at the proper place by one of the cosponsors, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW]; and my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] and I will speak at that point to the conditions contained in the proposed amendment are fair. What the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] intends at this point is very harmful to the program. The amendment provides that 75 percent of the money after June 30, 1953, will be disbursed by our allies, and allows only partial supervision and to a certain extent. I believe the Members of Congress do not intend to write a provision into the law that is as far reaching as the amendment we are considering at the present time. I hope his amendment is defeated so that we can properly amend this bill and put the assurances and the conditions that we all desire.

I am sure that all of us are fully cognizant of the fact that whatever the country, they want us to put on a few conditions. They want us to tell them what to do. They recognize the United States as the leader of the world. They know they have internal circumstances that are difficult for them to meet. They desire, that we tell them exactly what they should do to better their internal conditions and problems.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact that though we all have the deepest regard for the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and the thing he is trying to do, that is, to get Europe unified, we must recognize that this amendment will do at least two things which are very harmful and therefore require us to turn down the amendment: First, it will be an effort to drive the British into the European Defense Community. I think, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] properly said, that is a momentous historic decision, and we certainly should not make it by just tacking this amendment onto this bill. That is obviously what is intended, because otherwise there just are not enough funds in this bill to provide for the British armament.

Second, is it not a fact that all procurement for 75 percent of the amount which is going to be spent after June 30, 1953, out of these funds will have to be held up for months, until the European Defense Community is fully ratified and approved and actually takes effect?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Of course, it does not force the British into any constitutional federation or union with Europe. The British are not going into any federation. But it does give an incentive for them to come into a functional organization, which they themselves have said repeatedly was the kind of thing they were willing to do. Since the meeting in Strasbourg last fall, just a few weeks ago the British came out and did what they said they could not do in tying themselves to the Continent. They have guaranteed that if Germany were attacked they would come to her assistance. So they are actually moving in that direction. This gives further incentive.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Does not the amendment in effect say to Britain, "If you do not enter into a European defense army, unify politically, economically, and militarily, you will have a difficult time getting 75 percent of what is left after June 30, 1953"?

Mr. JUDD. No; it does not say anything of the sort. They can get as much of the aid as the European countries in the organization think they need to give the greatest over-all strength. The people of Western Europe want to defend themselves in the most effective way. That requires maximum unity. It says we are putting our support behind those who unify, who realize that it does not make sense for us to give a submarine to this country, a couple of tanks to that one, and a few planes to some other country to parade on its national holiday. Unless there is an Army, a Navy, and Air Force to defend Western Europe, there is no use of Uncle Sam's putting any money into it, because they will not have adequate defense. That is all we are trying to tell them. Those who get together we are willing to help. We have proved it. We have six divisions of our own men over there, and we have put tens of billions of dollars into Europe.

It is like a doctor saying to the patient who called him, "We will give you blood and penicillin, but there are certain conditions you have to meet in order to restore your health. We want to encourage and assist you in that. If you do not want to meet those conditions, that is all right, but you must get another doctor."

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Exactly. That is what I and my colleagues, Mr. MERROW and Mrs. KELLY, had hoped to do with our amendment in committee. However, I seriously regret that Mr. JUDD and Mr. VORYS voted against conditions in committee.

Mr. JUDD. I voted against the gentleman's amendment, and he recalls the reasons I gave at that time. Mine is offered with the idea that is an inducement.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I take this time to bring before the House a matter of importance relative to the House report on this mutual-security bill. Senator SPARKMAN, of Alabama, has written me the following letter to clarify certain parts of this report concerning the children's fund in order to keep the record straight:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,
May 20, 1952.

Hon. LAURIE C. BATTLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LAURIE: I have just been reading the House Report No. 1922 on the Mutual Security bill and am particularly concerned with sections V (G) and appendix II, dealing with the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund.

You will recall that Senator LODGE and myself represented the United States Congress on the 1950 delegation to the fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly, when the future of the children's fund was debated at length. Although the UNICEF Administration was preparing to wind up its postwar emergency feeding operations in Europe at that time, the economically underdeveloped countries insisted that such an action would be discriminating against their children who equally needed this type of assistance.

The major point which clearly emerged from this discussion was that, while postwar emergency feeding operations in Europe should terminate, the work of UNICEF should go forward in the underdeveloped areas of Asia, Latin America, the Middle East, and Africa. You will recall that in my letter to you on February 21 discussing this debate I stated:

"There was unanimity that the work of the fund should be continued in these areas, and it was amazing to see the vigor with which so large a number of the countries emphasized that in their view the children's fund constituted one of the most significant aspects of United Nations activity."

In consequence of this debate, 57 countries unanimously supported resolution 417 (V) approving the policy of the UNICEF Executive Board to devote the "greater share of the fund's resources to the development of programs outside Europe * * * for the purpose of meeting, through the provision of supplies, training and advice, emergency and long-range needs of children and their continuing needs, particularly in the underdeveloped countries, with a view to strengthening, wherever this may be appropriate, the permanent child-health and child-welfare programs of the countries receiving assistance."

Under these circumstances, it is difficult to understand why the House report states that "the organization has embarked upon worldwide projects beyond the scope of those who supported it." Actually, in order to fulfill the very terms of the General Assembly resolution, UNICEF must concentrate its current resources on long-range needs of children in the underdeveloped countries.

In respect to the report's comment that "many of the functions which it (UNICEF) performs should be handled by other specialized agencies," I am convinced that most of the governments represented in the United Nations believe it is essential to supplement the technical advice and services provided by the specialized agencies with strategic supplies necessary to child health and welfare. This assistance to the child segment of the population, moreover, acts as a catalytic agent in the underdeveloped areas to stimulate new interest and initiative in the realm of financing, administrative effort, and personnel training, out of all proportion to the limited monetary value of the program.

The UNICEF technique of assisting large numbers of children at a relatively small cost has so impressed the economically underdeveloped countries that the 1950 General Assembly unanimously decided to "again consider the future of the fund at the expiration of 3 years, with the object of continuing the fund on a permanent basis." Thus, the end of 1953, referred to in the appendix of the report, is not a terminal date but in reality the time at which a permanent basis for UNICEF would be considered.

Over a period of years, this program has become the cause celebre of the small nations in the United Nations. I am convinced that our national interest, as well as our humanitarian concern, demands that we demonstrate strong support for this work.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN.
(JOHN SPARKMAN).

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JUDD) there were—ayes 103, noes 126.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RICHARDS and Mr. CHIPERFIELD.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 140, noes 150.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWELL: On page 15, line 14, after "authorized" insert "*Provided*, That no country shall receive any assistance provided by this act that does not permit technical help in the collection of its taxes."

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment based upon the 5 months that I spent in Europe and the Near East this past fall and winter.

The simple fact remains that the countries we are assisting with our American money do not have the slightest conception of the principles of taxation; nor the slightest conception of how to collect taxation they now have. They need our advice.

In Europe especially, leaving out Great Britain, I found that the tax system was absolutely ridiculous; in other words, we are taking money from our people and ourselves, doing it gladly, and channeling it into Europe where they, in turn, are not paying taxes to support their share of the burden of rehabilitating their countries and of preparing for defense against the common foe.

We send to Europe technical experts, agricultural experts, and military experts. This amendment merely states that no country shall receive assistance that does not from our country accept tax experts to advise in collection of taxes.

When I was in Rome in December, on the front page of every paper, every paper in all of Italy, there was a picture and a headline of the one man in all of Italy who was honest enough to pay his correct taxes. That is a matter of record.

The Premier of France now is doing his best to change the tax structure of France from the standpoint of collections. However, there is not a single penalty in any European country for anyone who does not pay their taxes. Only in Great Britain have the people really put their shoulders to the wheel.

I do not believe it is fair to the American people to spend our money, the money that comes from the pocketbooks of the rich as well as the poor, and let the people at the top in Europe, the cream, get richer, and the milk at the bottom be skimmed more and more.

My amendment is a simple one and I trust it will be adopted.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman agree with me that one of the great marvels in the world of government and in the history of all nations is what has happened here in the United States since 1917, wherein tens of thousands of our people at the end of the income

year sit down and carefully bring their income-tax figures together, compile statistics, pick up 1040 and the other forms, put them in proper shape, reach over and pick up an envelope, stamp it, voluntarily write a check and send it to the collector of internal revenue in the various districts of this country and do it voluntarily?

Mr. POWELL. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I join with the gentleman in his amendment because we have no moral right to impose these burdens on our people and give our consent to what is going on in European countries.

Mr. POWELL. England is doing it.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The fact is that in France they are collecting in taxes as high a percentage of the gross national income as we are in the United States. The difference is in the tax structure. Most of their taxes are indirect and excise taxes under which the poor have to pay the same taxes as the rich. But the taxes collected percentagewise are just as high as in our country. They do not have a graduated income tax such as we have.

Mr. POWELL. That is what the whole Mutual Security Act is: We want the world on our side. If they come on our side we should help them raise their taxes. They do have taxes in France, yes, but the people are not paying them. That is what the Premier of France is trying to do now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. POWELL was allowed to proceed for five additional minutes.)

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I just simply want to say that I am in favor of the gentleman's amendment because in this country since 1940 we have had an increase of 1200 percent in our Federal taxes. In 1940 we collected $5,000,000,000; we are collecting sixty-one to sixty-two billion dollars now which is a 1200 percent in 12 years.

It is time somebody was doing something about this. I have a button here on my lapel which says "TTP." What does that mean? Tired taxpayers, and there are 45,000,000 of us in this country who are tired.

Mr. POWELL. I want to say one thing to my friend from Minnesota. This is not forcing the Government to accept any form of taxation. The amendment merely states that they shall not receive assistance from us unless they accept help in the collection of their taxes; technical help from our internal revenue experts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The fact is, as the gentleman points out, that they are not required under the gentleman's amendment to accept the advice which we give them. They can still have their own tax structure, but the gentleman's amendment simply says that they must accept technical help in fixing up their tax law.

Mr. POWELL. That is correct. I would like to follow that up by saying that I was in France twice. I stayed in France a month on one occasion and I spent 3 weeks in Italy. According to the conversations I had with government leaders, they would gladly accept the know-how advice of Americans in the collection of their taxes. They just do not know how to do it. They are not used to the kind of economy that they are now under.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I agree with the intent of the gentleman's amendment, but your amendment is to title I, is it not?

Mr. POWELL. Yes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Is it your intention to limit by your provision to rectify the very sad conditions and circumstances of tax collections existing in many areas of the world only to Europe or would you like to see the tax structures throughout the entire world corrected?

Mr. POWELL. As we get to the other countries I will offer the same amendment, but right now I am offering it only in Europe.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I would like to advise, as I have announced to the committee earlier when we debated the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, that what you intend to do, three members of the Foreign Affairs Committee have tried to do, and we will again present an amendment to page 23 at what I believe is the proper place. I am sure the amendment Mr. MERROW will introduce will satisfy the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. You mean the committee has an amendment of this nature?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The members of the committee have; yes, sir. In our report on page 72 we say:

> No specific methods were written into the bill. A method suitable or appropriate for one country may not be suitable or appropriate for another and depends upon the part a country has in the mutual-security effort. But it is expected that countries effect tax reform, where needed, and equalize the tax burden where the average citizen is bearing an inequitable share of the tax burden.

Now, on page 23 of the bill, section 511, subsection (c) an amendment directing the Mutual Security Administrator to exact certain conditions was adopted in committee. Further, an amendment is on the Clerk's desk that to a greater degree contains conditions. I think the amendment by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW], and which he is going to present, is a better approach.

Mr. POWELL. I did not know that members of the committee had this in mind. I want to compliment them. At the same time I think this is the proper time, and I therefore prefer my amendment to yours. I would like the amendment to be voted as it affects Europe, the Near East and each country as they come up under this act. I ask for your support now, first, to keep faith with American taxpayers, second, to help put Europe on its feet under its own tax power. If we fail to pass this, the rich of Europe will get richer, the poor—poorer, and all America will go bankrupt.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POWELL) there were—ayes 96, noes 122.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 137, noes 146.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS:
>
> On page 14, line 1, after "and of" strike out "the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501–1522)" and insert in lieu thereof "section 503 of this act".
>
> On page 15, line 4, amend subsection (c) to read as follows:
>
> "(c) Amend section 101 (a) (2) to read as follows: 'There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed $1,022,000,000 to provide assistance to any country covered by paragraph (1) of this subsection in accordance with the provisions of section 503 of this act; and in addition balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to this paragraph unobligated as of June 30, 1952, or subsequently released from obligation, are authorized to be continued available for obligation for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the appropriation hereby authorized'."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, now after all the excitement is over, this is really a very simple proposition. It is whether or not you are in favor of legislation by letter writing. In the Mutual Security Act of 1951 we set up section 503 which says that after June 30, 1952, the Director shall do certain things which are strictly mutual security. In section 502 we provided that none of the powers and functions and responsibilities could be exercised after June 30, 1952, the date of termination of the Marshall plan, except that "not later than April 1, 1952, the President shall inform the Committees" on Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs "which of the transferred powers, functions, and responsibilities are necessary for the Director." And so forth. I thought that meant that the President would send up his recommendations and that the two committees would this spring decide which of his recommendations they would accept and whether we would continue any part or section of the ECA Act,

and if we decided to do so, we would enact those sections into law.

The President takes the position that under this act his merely sending a letter to the two committees on March 26 is all that is needed to unrepeal and keep in force sections of law that otherwise would be repealed. He further takes the position that it is not necessary for him under the law to specify which powers and responsibilities and functions he considers necessary, but he simply said, in substance, "I think everything is necessary with the exception of seven sections." The committee cut out one of those sections so that the whole ECA Act is still in effect under this letter of the President except six sections. This amendment, and this is the first part of it, and the other parts will require consideration in various parts of the bill, does simply this: It wipes out a lot of sections, including the purpose clause, which has no point to it any more; participating countries; encouragement of travel. That is one of the things in ECA that caused the building of hotels with counterpart funds over there. It cuts out the watchdog committee which the President would have left in and which, I understand, some people here do not approve. It strikes out vessels to Italy which are no longer needed; in fact, it strikes out 20 pages and leaves 19 in. It strikes out 16 sections and leaves 9 in. I can say this, the executive branch does not approve of going at it this way. They like legislation by letter writing better, but the counsel for the legislative branch has had an opportunity to review this amendment before I offered it in committee, and since it has been brought to the floor, it was put in the RECORD yesterday, and when in doubt, when they have insisted a section was absolutely necessary, we kept it in. But at least, by this amendment we will do the thing that you have been assured has been done but that I assure you has not been done; we will wind up the European Recovery Act, the Marshall plan act, the ECA Act, as per schedule on June 30, 1952, and whatever we do from now on will be a mutual-security proposition provided by law, with appropriate inclusion of necessary provisions of the law which was repealed, and finally wound up as per schedule June 30, 1952. Now that is all. This is an amendment to take out the reference to the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, in two places in section 3. It will be necessary, if you approve of this, to offer amendments at a few other places, four other places, I believe, but it will not be necessary to explain them again because this is the explanation.

If you believe in legislation by letter writing or Presidential letter writing, then vote against this. If you do not believe in that and believe Congress should legislate, vote "yea" for this amendment.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think anyone here has greater respect for the legal ability of the gentleman from Ohio than I. I agree with the gentleman from Ohio to a certain extent. I believe this basic legislation, which is included in several acts, should be put together. That is a major undertaking, however, and I think it will be a duty of the next Congress, whether it is a Republican or a Democratic Congress, to come in here with a clean bill. It is something that will require a great deal of time to do properly.

To show you how difficult it is to write a clean bill and to get all the testimony we should have, I want you to ask yourselves here and now how many of you understand what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] seeks to do. I see there are only five or six who have raised their hands. That is a good indication of how difficult it is to do what he seeks to accomplish.

The gentleman from Ohio offered this amendment in committee after the committee began to write the bill. He offered it without any testimony having been offered to the committee in support of his amendment.

I do not think the President of the United States, by using a negative message to the Congress and saying, in effect, "I do not need certain powers," is violating the legislative rights of Congress at all. The gentleman from Ohio said he should have made the statement in the affirmative.

I am sure the President met the requirements of law in sending in that message.

Before acting on this important amendment this late in the day, after being in session for the past 10 hours, the Committee should rise and we should come back here fresh in the morning and try to do a good job.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman takes a very fine attitude. In what he says I get an appeal to the discretion and the judgment of the minority of this House to consider his situation and agree that the Committee may rise. I believe the gentleman from Ohio is right in the position he takes. Whether right or wrong, the members of the Committee should have an opportunity to make an examination of and study the amendment. I hope the minority will accept the appeal of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Has not this amendment been before the committee?

Mr. RICHARDS. It was offered to the committee, but no testimony was taken on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VORYS) there were—ayes 111, noes, 105.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. VORYS and Mr. RIBICOFF.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were ayes 151, noes 133.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to be the impression of some that if we carry on diligently we can finish this bill very quickly tonight. To those who hold that opinion I call attention to the 24 pages we still have left to read. There are three separate titles still to be considered. We have so far dealt with only one. If we are fortunate enough to finish this bill tonight I would conservatively estimate that it would be 1 or 2 o'clock before we concluded.

Mr. PATTEN. I think the gentleman is too conservative.

Mr. RICHARDS. I just want to say that for the benefit of the House. A few Members have asked me whether it might be possible to finish this bill in an hour or two if we speeded things up, but I do not see how it can be done.

In view of this situation, Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MANSFIELD and Mrs. BOLTON.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 139, noes 144.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

May I ask the leadership on the other side if it would be possible for the House to meet tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock?

Mr. RAYBURN. Not as far as I am concerned. I do not know what objection there would be from other sources.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the only difficulty is that General Ridgway is scheduled to appear before a joint session of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the morning from 10 to 11:30.

Mr. RIVERS. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has been invited, and we cannot be here by 10 o'clock.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How about 11 o'clock? The majority leader has told me he would agree to 11 o'clock.

Mr. RAYBURN. I certainly would agree to 11 o'clock.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Then, Mr. Chairman, in view of the information that comes to me that we cannot finish this bill in 2 or 3 hours, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7005) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

AIRLINE SUBSIDIES

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, in both the last session and this session the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Commerce, of which I have the honor to be chairman, made the following recommendation:

It is again recommended that legislation be enacted to separate airline subsidies from compensation for the cost of carrying air mail. The subsidy portion, if any, should be paid through a separate appropriation rather than as presently handled through the appropriation for the Post Office Department. (H. Rept. No. 1665, 82d Cong., 2d sess., by Mr. ROONEY, from the Committee on Appropriations.)

Legislation which would accomplish this separation is now pending before the great House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I understand that in the fiscal year 1951, $117,000,000 was paid to the airlines as so-called mail pay, but of that amount at most only about $37,000,000 could be considered compensation for the cost of services actually rendered. In other words, there was a hidden subsidy in that year of over $80,000,000 to the recipient airlines.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point the following editorial of May 21, 1952, from the Washington Post showing the advantages of making an effective separation of these hidden subsidies from the mail pay, by enactment of H. R. 508, rather than adoption of the weak Senate bill which freezes these subsidies even deeper into the Post Office deficit:

DO IT RIGHT

If the House Interstate Commerce Committee is going to report a bill separating air mail pay from subsidy to the airlines, it ought to do an honest job of it. The Senate bill, S. 436, which reportedly is under consideration, was so watered down by amendments that it would defeat the real aim of separation by continuing concealed subsidies. The best approach remains that of the Kennedy-Heselton bill, H. R. 508, which passed the House 2 years ago.

H. R. 508, of course, is not sacrosanct. It is fundamentally sound, however, on two points which ought to be included in any separation legislation. (1) An accurate cost allocation should be the basis for determining reasonable mail pay, and (2) the artificially high Universal Postal Union rate ought to be abandoned for payments to international carriers. This latter point, incidentally, represents the view of the Postmaster General and the Civil Aeronautics Board. The UPU rate of $2.86 a ton-mile is more than three times the luxury passenger rate.

Some airlines have protested that abandonment of the UPU rate would mean that the United States would pay foreign lines more than domestic lines for carrying United States mail. As a matter of national policy, the rates ought to be the same, and certainly the UPU figure ought to be revised through international conference. This should not, however, prevent Congress from righting a wrong. American lines would still receive the UPU rate for carrying foreign mail just as foreign carriers would receive the UPU rate from this country. If any American line suffered as a result, it could apply for subsidy.

Despite the fact that separation was recommended by the Hoover Commission, at least one airline has attempted to smear proponents as members of a Communist front. American taxpayers ought to resent this vicious technique. They paid out some $117,000,000 for carrying air mail last year, and by the CAB's own estimate 80 million of this was subsidy. Certainly the airlines are entitled to what subsidy they can justify in the national interest. But, just as certainly, there can be no legitimate objection to letting the public know the facts.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PRICE RISES WARN AGAINST DISMANTLING CONSUMERS' DEFENSES

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the 0.7 point rise in consumer prices announced Thursday has taken the Consumers Price Index almost back to the highest level on record.

The facts on prices are a stinging rebuke to the false prophets who have been telling us that we can drop our guard against inflation.

They not only sound a warning against any relaxation of our anti-inflation program, but they argue forcibly for better controls, free of loopholes and weakening amendments.

LET THE PRICE FACTS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES

The 0.7 point rise in the index tells only the bare outline of the story. Behind it are individual price rises of great significance to every householder. Let us look first at just a few of the price increases which are closest to home. During April fresh fruits and vegetables have gone up 24.4 points; eggs have gone up 4.6 points; rents have gone up 0.3 points; retail foods have gone up 2.4 points; miscellaneous items have gone up 0.4 points. And prices are generally up against the ceiling on petroleum and chemicals, metals, building materials, automobiles, machinery, and many other commodities. They are hard on materials for national defense.

With respect to wholesale markets, the New York Times financial page on Thursday stated:

Wholesale food prices took the largest jump in 21 months during the week ended on May 20, according to the Dun and Bradstreet index. Prices of food in the index went up a full 10 cents.

WE CANNOT AFFORD TO DROP OUR GUARD

We must keep on guard. Inflationary elements are still in the picture.

National security spending has risen from an annual rate of $47,000,000,000 during the first quarter of 1952 to $53,000,000,000 in April. In addition, personal incomes, in terms of purchasing power, are at almost the highest level in the Nation's history, even after adjusting for taxes and prices. In the first quarter of 1952, personal disposable income was estimated at $226,500,000,000.

PRICES ARE STILL TOO HIGH FOR MANY

Lower income families have no margin to absorb higher prices. They just have to do without. Inflation is causing real hardship to people all over the country.

Pensions, annuities, savings have all diminished in value. Veterans, school teachers, and white-collar workers are special victims. Wages seldom keep pace with rising prices.

BUT NOT HIGH ENOUGH FOR THE FAST MONEY BOYS

The big-business lobbyists who are now making their spring encampment on the Potomac, however, find prices far too low.

Their battle cry is, "amendment, exception, decontrol."

Utterly unscrupulous in their methods, they come up to the Hill and tell us that controls are not needed, that markets are soft, that prices are even now below ceilings. And at the very same moment, their associates are at the OPS offices, less than a quarter mile away, pleading for higher ceilings.

What do these gentlemen seek in Washington?

Higher food prices and profits through the device of the elimination of the one little word, "hereafter" from the Herlong amendment. This will compound the mischief of a provision that has taken millions of dollars from those who can least afford it.

A $25,000,000 prize for cigarette companies, under the guise of an innocent amendment which would prohibit ceilings below State fixed prices.

Quarters instead of nickels from patrons of railroad coin toilets through a little amendment to exempt such services from price controls. This will hit servicemen hardest because they form the largest single group of railroad travelers today.

MORE FANTASTIC PROPOSALS YET TO COME

If these are what they are urging before committees, what will they be trying to put over when the bill reaches the floor?

Many of us are only too vividly aware of the extreme amendments that are submitted in the heat of debate.

I trust that every Member will give due and careful consideration to every attempt to permit higher prices, and solemnly ask himself, "How will this affect the people who depend upon me to represent them?"

CONTROLS CAN AND DO WORK

The average people of your district and mine are not staying at the Statler and the Carlton this week. They are at home, pushing their baskets through the

markets, and complaining about high prices.

But let us make no mistake about it—they are just as much interested in price control as the gentlemen who come down here with the finely drafted amendments and the big cigars. Just as interested—and just as powerful.

They are looking to their Congress to protect them.

I am proud of the fact that the Democratic Party has been their faithful champion in this battle. I am proud of men like President Truman, Mike Di Salle, and Ellis Arnall, who have made the best of a weak law that has been hobbled by inflation.

We have a well-rounded anti-inflation program. High production is its keystone. We have succeeded in raising levels of production. We have sound protection against overexpansion of credit. We are doing our best to pay as we go. Prices are being controlled.

In the first 8 months after Korea, prices rose 8 percent. Then direct price controls were instituted in February 1951. In the 15 months which followed, in spite of the greater strain of heavier military expenses and consequent shortages, prices have risen only 3 percent.

The whole history of price control has been a history of uphill battle by the Democratic Party, representing the average consumer, against the Republican Party, representing the lobbyist, the monopolist, and the fast-money boy.

The job of the Democratic Party is to stop these raids upon the pockets of the consumers. We must protect our constituents by eliminating the Capehart cost-plus amendment, the Herlong higher-profits amendment, and the Butler-Hope black-market amendment. We must resist to the bitter end every attempt to weaken the price-control law.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HELLER in three instances and to include extraneous matter in one.

Mr. AANDAHL (at the request of Mr. LOVRE).

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and to insert certain tables and other information during the debate on H. R. 7005.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN.

Mr. JENKINS in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FISHER (at the request of Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHAFER and to include an article from the American Legion magazine.

Mr. HARVEY and to include an editorial.

Mr. HINSHAW to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and include an article from which he quoted.

Mr. MORANO.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts).

Mr. O'KONSKI and to include two letters.

Mr. MILLER of New York in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JUDD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY and to include an editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle.

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include two editorials.

Mr. LANE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCGREGOR (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts).

Mr. MURPHY (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include an address.

Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include an editorial.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 23, 1952, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1459. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report on the number of officers in the Department of the Army and of the number of officers on or with the Army General Staff on March 31, 1952, pursuant to section 201 (c), Public Law 581, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1460. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "a bill to amend section 62 of the National Defense Act (39 Stat. 166, 198), as amended (32 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 4c), to include Guam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1461. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "a bill for the relief of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1533. An act to designate a Floyd B. Olson Memorial Triangle in the District of Columbia, and to authorize the erection of a memorial plaque in such triangle; without amendment (Rept. No. 1976). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2605. An act to amend certain tax laws applicable to the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 1977). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2735. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes", approved July 2, 1940, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1978). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2736. An act to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia in respect to the recording, in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds, of bills of sale, mortgages, deeds of trust, and conditional sales of personal property, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1979). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6811. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 23, 1924, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1980). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PUCKLEY: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 6856. A bill to extend the duration of the Water Pollution Control Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1990). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 7202. A bill to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress," approved June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 25; 13 U. S. C. 216); with amendment (Rept. No. 1991). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1151. A bill for the relief of Sumiko Yamamoto; with amendment (Rept. No. 1981). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3280. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emi Yasuda and her minor son, Keichiro Yasuda; without amendment (Rept. No. 1982). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3989. A bill for the relief of Ivo Markulin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1983). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3990. A bill for the relief of Paul Frkovic; with amendment (Rept. No. 1984). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4002. A bill for the relief of Sandra E. Dennett; without amendment (Rept. No. 1985). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4250. A bill for the relief of Ruben George Varga and Mrs. Ilona Varga; with amendment (Rept. No. 1986). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4396. A bill for the relief of Elias Papadopoulos; without amendment (Rept. No. 1987). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4503. A bill for the relief of Suzanne Marie Scharts; without amendment (Rept. No. 1988). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5581. A bill for the relief of Yusuf

(Uash) Lazar; without amendment (Rept. No. 1939). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 7947. A bill to facilitate the management of land and recreational resources of reclamation projects in or adjacent to the national forests of South Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 7948. A bill to authorize the Supreme Court of the United States to make and publish rules for procedure on review of decisions of The Tax Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 7949. A bill to provide for the preservation of the frigate *Constellation;* to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 7950. A bill to amend section 206 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, so as to enable the Comptroller General more effectively to assist the Appropriations Committees in considering the budget; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 7951. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 to provide equitable treatment for married women; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 7952. A bill to authorize the combination of the Truck Crop Insect Laboratory and the Citrus Insect Laboratory of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, located at Alhambra and Whittier, Calif., respectively, and to provide for new quarters; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 7953. A bill to provide for the conversion of 10 oceangoing bulk carriers so as to promote ocean transportation in United States flag vessels of ore and other bulk commodities essential to the national defense; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 7954. A bill to provide that no interest shall be assessed on deficiencies attributable to the retroactive application of section 510 of the Revenue Act of 1951; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 7955. A bill to amend section 12 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOOD of Idaho:

H. R. 7956. A bill to change the date for the beginning of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, from the 1st day of July to the 1st day of October, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. J. Res. 459. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKETT:

H. J. Res. 460. Joint resolution to continue in effect certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, notwithstanding the termination of the existing state of war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. J. Res. 461. Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but not beyond June 30, 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. Res. 648. Resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives relative to testimony before committees; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 7957. A bill for the relief of Angelina Lanza Buldo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 7958. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a tract of land in Custer County, S. Dak., to the Crazy Horse Memorial Foundation, and for the reversion thereof to the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 7959. A bill for the relief of Paraskevas George Stamatiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 7960. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hannah Mae Powell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 7961. A bill for the relief of Chiyoko Miki Tomono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 7962. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a tract of land in Custer County, S. Dak., to the Crazy Horse Memorial Foundation, and for the reversion thereof to the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 7963. A bill for the relief of Edward Henry Erbes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 7964. A bill for the relief of Kosta Milisav Bulatovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7965. A bill for the relief of Asako Ikeda Corbin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 7966. A bill for the relief of Edilberto Gonzales-Menchaca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 7967. A bill for the relief of Dr. Morad Malek-Aslani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 23, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, May 12, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, source of all love and wisdom, to whom the distinctions and differences which so often divide us and loom so large in our eyes are but as dust in the balance, brushing aside all illusions and trivialities, grant us now a sense of unity of motive and of purpose amidst all diversities of thought. Our mercy is so soon exhausted, but Thy mercy to all mankind is like the wideness of the sea. Our forgiveness so quickly turns to retaliation, but Thy forgiveness endures even to 70 times 7.

Help us this day to regard one another with the sympathy and understanding of those who face a common destiny, as we dwell together under a divine fatherhood. May we be conscious of the fallible elements in ourselves, even as we deal with our fellows in all the tangled questions which together we share. Amid all the losses which need must come with the corroding years, may we never lose our self-respect nor forfeit the confidence of those who trust us now because we trust in Thee. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 22, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2786) to amend section 106 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5678) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WALTER, Mr. CHELF, Mr. WILSON of Texas, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. GRAHAM, Miss THOMPSON of Michigan, and Mr. CASE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 3221. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, in order to protect the national health and safety against the consequences of certain labor-management disputes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CAPEHART (for Mr. JENNER):

S. 3222. A bill for the relief of Alice Power and Ruby Power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE.

S. 3223. A bill for the relief of Guntram Weissenberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 3224. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to impose a special equalization duty upon agricultural commodities for which price support has been made available and a parity price established; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 3225. A bill to incorporate the National Safety Council; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. J. Res. 157. Joint resolution to advise the President of the United States concerning the will of Congress respecting the labor dispute in the basic steel-manufacturing industry; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LONG submitted several amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3086) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes, which were ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. BRICKER:

Editorial entitled "Let's Keep Our Bill of Rights," written by Donald R. Wilson, national commander of the American Legion, and published in the May 1952 issue of the Kiwanis magazine.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Article entitled "United States-to-Europe TV Is Studied as Global Link," published in the New York Herald Tribune of May 18, 1952, and an editorial entitled "TV to Europe," published in the New York Herald Tribune of May 19, 1952.

NATIONAL MARITIME DAY

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement prepared by me relative to the national observance of Maritime Day.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR IN CONNECTION WITH MARITIME DAY OBSERVANCE, MAY 22, 1952

The Nation yesterday observed National Maritime Day. It would be gratifying in the extreme to be able to say that in recent years the United States has made great progress toward that shipping and ship-construction self-sufficiency which the needs of peace as well as war demand so emphatically.

Unfortunately, such progress cannot be reported. Despite all the efforts of maritime-minded Members of the Congress, our Nation has floundered badly in the matter of building up its dry-cargo fleet, and particularly in the matter of construction of fast passenger vessels, capable of conversion to troop transports in an emergency. But while our Government has fallen short with regard to this most important segment of our national economy, other nations of the world have stepped forward in the matter of ship construction to the point where the United States now occupies a poor seventh place among the shipbuilding countries of the world.

National observance of Maritime Day as a day on which to focus attention on the accomplishments—and the needs—of the merchant marine could, and was intended to, be most effective as a means of promoting the American merchant marine which so badly needs promotion today. Despite all the pleasant statements which have been made in recent years, however, the unpleasant fact remains that very little has been done either in the way of adequate immediate additions to available shipping facilities, or in the development of a long-range shipping program which would insure a continuing supply of modern, competitive vessels, and would enable the shipyards of the country to be maintained on a going basis.

Yes, we have withdrawn a number of old Liberty ships of World War II from the reserve fleet and turned them over to the National Shipping Authority, to a total of approximately 800 since the outbreak of Korean hostilities. What is not so gratifying is that practically all the better cargo ships have been taken out of the reserve and the old Libertys, the only ones now remaining, are poor substitutes at best, to meet the competition of modern shipping needs.

Forced by the emergency, just as we were impelled by even greater emergencies at the outbreak of World Wars I and II, the country has launched a construction program of a faster type of dry cargo vessel worthy to compete with the newer vessels of other nations. Some 35 of these new *Mariner* class vessels were authorized. But this number falls far short of present needs in this field, not to mention the additional requirements which any full-scale emergency would bring.

In the field where our deficiency is greatest, namely, that of passenger-type vessels, suitable for use as troop carriers, the new steamship *United States*, which has just completed its trial runs, is a splendid example of what we should have. But it is one isolated vessel of its type. Capable of handling 14,000 troops in times of emergency, the steamship *United States* nevertheless will be, in the final analysis, but an addition to a woefully undersized passenger-type fleet which now represents less than half of the number of such vessels available at the beginning of World War II, while the actual passenger-carrying capacity of these vessels is little more than a third of what the World War II vessels were able to transport.

In extolling today, therefore, the heroic achievements of the United States merchant marine during World War II and following the initial Korean aggression, let us temper our gratification at these exploits, glorious as they have been, with thought of what might well happen in another emergency, unless the Congress thoroughly realizes the situation as it is, and takes positive steps to put into effect promptly a realistic program of construction and maintenance.

It was my privilege to introduce, in connection with the distinguished Senator from Washington, Mr. MAGNUSON, S. 241, known as the long-range shipping bill, passed by the United States Senate after extended hearings, on August 16. It was presented to the House the following week and hearings have been held by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

At both the Senate and House hearings, representatives of labor and management in the shipping and ship-construction field emphasized the need of a well-considered program, to replace the hit-and-miss emergency programs which were the rule in the three major emergencies that have developed in the last 40 years.

S. 241 lays down certain basic provisions designed to make construction and operation of dry cargo and, particularly, fast passenger-type vessels attractive to private industry. The purposes and provisions of the bill have been so thoroughly propounded that it is needless to detail them now. The thought worthy of real emphasis, however, is that they seek to correct unsatisfactory conditions in the shipping and shipbuilding field, in a manner which has received administration approval and the fullest support of both labor and industry.

I take this occasion, therefore, simply to voice the hope that with the emphasis laid upon current maritime needs in connection with 1952 observance of the day, the country may find itself well on the way, before another Maritime Day observance rolls around, toward a substantial and positive program which will be a guide and an assurance of security through the years ahead.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE WAR POWERS ACT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, does the majority leader care to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Nevada desires to call up Senate Joint Resolution 156, which provides for a temporary extension of the War Powers Act. Our procedure will depend to some extent upon the wishes of the distinguished minority leader.

I understand that the joint resolution provides for an extension of the act for 15 days, and that the joint resolution was unanimously approved by the committee.

Although I shall suggest the absence of a quorum in a few minutes, the minority leader advises me that it is satisfactory with him to proceed with the joint resolution.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I may state that there is on the Calendar Order No. 1524, Senate Joint Resolution 156, a joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until June 15, 1952. This joint resolution provides for a continuation of the War Powers Act as it is at the present time. A study of the act is now being made by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and will soon be completed. The question is also being studied by the Judiciary Committee of the House, but it has been reported to us that there may be some delay on the floor of that body. So we thought it necessary, in view of the fact that the War Powers Act will expire on the 1st of June, to agree to the Senate joint resolution extending the act until June 15.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to do so, if the majority leader is agreeable.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; that is agreeable. The distinguished minority leader says he has no objection.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then I ask that the joint resolution be considered out of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Senate Joint Resolution 156, continuing the effective-

ness of certain statutory provisions until June 15, 1952.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Nevada whether it is not true that the Committee on the Judiciary unanimously reported the joint resolution with the approval of Senators on both sides; that every Senator present indicated his desire that the joint resolution be passed?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until June 1, 1952," approved April 14, 1952 (Public Law 313, 82d Cong.), is amended by striking out "June 1, 1952" wherever it appears in such joint resolution and inserting in lieu thereof "June 15, 1952."

HOUSING ACT OF 1952

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 3066.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3066) to amend the defense-housing laws, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments of the Committtee on Banking and Currency will be stated.

The amendments were stated, as follows:

On page 2, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,500,000,000" and insert: "$1,900,000,000: *And provided further*, That $400,000,000 of said sum shall be available only for the insurance of mortgages for which no insurance contract or commitment to insure under this act was outstanding on June 30, 1952, and which mortgages (1) cover defense housing programed by the Housing and Home Finance Agency in an area determined by the President or his designee to be a critical defense housing area, or (2) are insured under title VIII of this act, or (3) cover housing intended to be made available primarily for families who are victims of a catastrophe which the President has determined to be a major disaster."

On page 3, line 11, after the word "with", to insert "insured"; in line 14, after the word "words", to insert "insured."

On page 4, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,552,000,000" and insert "$1,152,000,000."

On page 5, line 2, after the word "inserting", to strike out "$4,050,000,000" and insert "$3,650,000,000"; in line 11, after the word "substituting", to strike out "$160,000,000" and insert "$100,000,000"; in line 13, after the word "substituting", to strike out "$250,000,000" and insert "$100,000,000."

On page 6, line 7, after the word "inserting", to strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$20,000,000."

On page 9, line 1, after "(3)" to insert "and after 'Virgin Islands,' in section 3"; in line 19, after the word "and", to strike out "such" and insert "an"; in the same line, after the word "additional", to strike out "sums" and insert "$100,000,000"; in line 20, after the numerals "1953", to strike out the comma and "as the Congress may from time to time determine"; after line 21, to strike out:

"(b) At the end of section 512 just before the period insert a comma and the language 'and to make additional commitments on and after July 1, 1953, for additional contributions aggregating not more than $2,000,000 per annum.'

"(c) In section 513 just before the last semicolon insert a comma and the language 'and such further amounts on and after July 1, 1953, as the Congress may from time to time determine.'"

And in lieu thereof to insert:

"(b) In section 512, (1) strike 'and 1952' and insert '1952, and 1953', and (ii) strike 'and $2,000,000' and insert '$2,000,000 and $2,000,000.'

"(c) In section 513, strike 'and $10,000,000 on July 1 of each of the years 1950, 1951, and 1952' and insert '$10,000,000, and $10,000,000 on July 1 of each of the years 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953.'"

And after line 13, to insert:

"SEC. 12. The first paragraph of subsection (c) of section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'In addition to the loans and investments otherwise authorized, such associations may purchase, subject to all the provisions of this paragraph except the area restriction, loans secured by first liens on improved real estate which are insured under the provisions of the National Housing Act, as amended, or insured as provided in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.'"

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act be cited as the "Housing Act of 1952."

SEC. 2. Section 217 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 217. Notwithstanding limitations contained in any other section of this act on the aggregate amount of principal obligations of mortgages or loans which may be insured (or insured and outstanding at any one time) and on the aggregate amount of contingent liabilities which may be outstanding at any one time under insurance contracts, or commitments to insure, pursuant to any section or title of this act, any such aggregate amount shall, with respect to any section or title of this act (except sec. 2), be prescribed by the President from time to time taking into consideration the needs of national defense and the effect of additional insurance authorizations upon conditions in the building industry and upon the national economy: *Provided*, That the dollar amount of the insurance authorization prescribed by the President at any time with respect to any provision of title VI shall not be greater than authorized by provisions of that title: *And provided further*, That at any time, the aggregate dollar amount of the mortgage insurance authorization prescribed by the President with respect to title IX of this act, plus the aggregate dollar amount of all increases in insurance authorizations under other titles of this act prescribed by the President pursuant to authority contained in this section, less the aggregate dollar amount of all decreases in insurance authorizations under this act prescribed by the President pursuant to authority contained in this section shall not exceed $1,900,000,000: *And provided further*, That $400,000,000 of said sum shall be available only for the insurance of mortgages for which no insurance contract or commitment to insure under this act was outstanding on June 30, 1952, and which mortgages (1) cover defense housing programed by the Housing and Home Finance Agency in an area determined by the President or his designee to be a critical defense housing area, or (2) are insured under title VIII of this act, or (3) cover housing intended to be made available primarily for families who are victims of a catastrophe which the President has determined to be a major disaster."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 301 (a) (1) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended—

(1) by striking the words beginning with "insured after April 30, 1948" and ending with the colon at the end of the first proviso thereof and inserting the words: "insured under this act, as amended, or insured or guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended: *Provided*, That no such mortgage, except defense or disaster mortgages as defined in subparagraph (G) hereof, shall be purchased by the association unless insured or guaranteed after February 29, 1952, or purchased pursuant to a commitment made by the association:";

(2) by striking from subparagraph (E) "pursuant to authority contained herein, exceeds 50 percent of the original principal amount of all mortgages made by such mortgagee" and inserting "after February 29, 1952, pursuant to authority contained herein, exceeds 50 percent of the original principal amount of all mortgage loans made by such mortgagee that are insured or guaranteed after February 29, 1952";

(3) by striking the proviso in subparagraph (E) and inserting "*Provided*, That this clause (2) shall not apply to (nor shall any terms therein include) any defense or disaster mortgages as defined in subparagraph (G)"; and

(4) by striking from the proviso in subparagraph (G) "which do not exceed $252,000,000 outstanding at any one time, if applications for such commitments were received by the Association prior to December 28, 1951, or, in the case of title VIII mortgages, if the Federal Housing Commissioner issued his commitment to insure prior to December 31, 1951, but subsequent to December 27, 1951, and if such commitments of the Association relate to" and inserting "and prior to July 1, 1953, which do not exceed $1,152,000,000 outstanding at any one time, if such commitments of the Association relate to defense or disaster mortgages. As used in this title III, 'defense or disaster mortgages' means."

(b) Section 302 of said act, as amended, is hereby amended (1) by striking "$2,750,000,000" and inserting "$3,650,000,000"; and (2) by adding before the period at the end of the first sentence of said section ": *Provided*, That not more than $2,750,000,000 of such total amount outstanding at any one time shall relate to mortgages other than defense or disaster mortgages as defined in section 301 (a) (1) (G)."

SEC. 4. Section 313 of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951 is hereby amended by striking out "$60,000,000" in paragraph (a) thereof and substituting "$100,000,000" and by striking out "$50,000,000" in paragraph (b) thereof and substituting "$100,000,000."

SEC. 5. The first sentence of section 302 (b) of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951 is hereby amended by adding after the words "for reuse at other locations" the words "or existing housing built or acquired by the United States under authority of other law."

SEC. 6. Section 611 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting "or section 313 of this act" immediately preceding the parenthetical clause, and by striking out "to this title" at the end of the parenthetical clause and inserting in lieu thereof "thereto."

SEC. 7. The first sentence of section 3 (b) and the first sentence of section 3 (d) of the Alaska Housing Act, approved April 23, 1949, as amended, are hereby amended by striking "$15,000,000" and inserting "$20,000,000."

SEC. 8. Title II of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new section:

"SEC. 213. In any case where an application for mortgage insurance under section 608 of this act was received by the Federal Housing Commissioner on or before March 1, 1950, and a commitment to insure was issued by said Commissioner in accordance therewith any mortgagee who, prior to the expiration of such commitment, applied for insurance of a mortgage under section 207 of this act with respect to the same property or project shall receive credit for all application fees paid in connection with the prior application: *Provided*, That nothing therein shall constitute a waiver of any requirements otherwise applicable to the insurance of mortgages under section 207 of this act."

SEC. 9. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed from time to time to credit and cancel the note or notes of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator executed and delivered in connection with loans transferred from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Housing and Home Finance Agency pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 23 of 1950 (64 Stat. 1279), to the extent of the net loss, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, sustained by said Agency in the liquidation of defaulted loans. The net loss shall be the sum of the unpaid principal and advances for care and preservation of collateral, together with accrued and unpaid interest on said principal and advances, and all expenses and costs (other than those subject to administrative expense limitations) in connection with the liquidation of defaulted loans, less the amount actually realized by the Housing and Home Finance Agency on account of such defaulted loans.

SEC. 10. (a) The National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended—

(1) by adding at the end of section 8 the following new section 9:

"SEC. 9. The provisions of sections 2 and 8 shall be applicable in the several States and Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, and th Virgin Islands.";

(2) by adding "Guam" after the words "District of Columbia," in each place where they appear in sections 201 (d), 207 (a) (7), 301 (c) (4), 601 (d), and 801 (f);

(3) by inserting in section 214—

(A) the words "or in Guam" after the word "Alaska" in each place where it appears in said section,

(B) the words "or maxima" after the word "maximum", and

(C) the words "or the Government of Guam or any agency or instrumentality thereof" after the words "Alaska Housing Authority" in each place where they appear in said section;

(4) by adding at the end of section 713 the following new subsection (q);

"(q) 'State' shall include the several States and Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands."; and

(5) by deleting the words "or Territory" in section 403 (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Territory, or possession."

(b) The Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, is hereby amended by adding a comma and "Guam," after the words "Puerto Rico" in section 7 thereof.

(c) The Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding "Guam," after "District of Columbia," in section 2 (3) and after "Virgin Islands," in section 3 thereof.

(d) The Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951 is hereby amended by adding at the end of section 401 the following: "This title shall be applicable in the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories and possessions of the United States."

(e) Section 102b of the Housing Act of 1948, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Such powers, functions, and duties may be exercised in the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories and possessions of the United States."

SEC. 11. Title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(a) In the first sentence of section 511 immediately following the phrase "July 1, 1951," strike the word "and" and insert at the end of the sentence just before the period a comma and the language "and an additional $100,000,000 on and after July 1, 1953."

(b) In section 512, (i) strike "and 1952" and insert "1952, and 1953", and (ii) strike "and $2,000,000" and insert "$2,000,000 and $2,000,000."

(c) In section 513, strike "and $10,000,000 on July 1 of each of the years 1950, 1951, and 1952" and insert "$10,000,000, and $10,000,000 on July 1 of each of the years 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953."

SEC. 12. The first paragraph of subsection (c) of section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In addition to the loans and investments otherwise authorized, such associations may purchase, subject to all the provisions of this paragraph except the area restriction, loans secured by first liens on improved real estate which are insured under the provisions of the National Housing Act, as amended, or insured as provided in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, it is my understanding from the minority members of the Committee on Banking and Currency whom I have been able to contact that they are in accord with regard to this bill. None of them are on the floor at the moment, but I assume, from everything I have been able to learn, that they are in accord with the amendments reported by the committee. So on the part of the minority I am registering no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendments having been agreed to, the bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee may have other amendments to offer. In order that he may be present, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 3066) was passed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared regarding the bill just passed by the Senate. The reason why I did not undertake a thorough explanation of the bill was that it was unanimously reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency and there seemed to be no opposition to it.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAYBANK

Senate bill 3066 was reported unanimously by the Committee on Banking and Currency. It consists primarily of increases in defense authorizations which are essential to carrying out the Defense Housing and Community Facilities Act, passed by Congress last year.

I wish to call to the particular attention of the Members of the Senate the table on page 1 of the committee's report on the bill, showing the amounts of the increases in the dollar authorizations both in the bill as introduced and as reported by your committee. It will be noted the committee cut the total amount by almost 50 percent. We firmly believe that we have made the maximum reductions in these authorizations which can be made without preventing urgent defense needs from being met in critical defense housing areas. We believe the amounts are adequate, however, to continue operations under the Defense Housing and Community Facilities Act until the next Congress has had full opportunity to consider any further needs.

Since Congress passed the law last year to meet the urgent need for defense housing and community facilities as a result of the conflict in Korea, the one big problem in providing housing for defense workers has been the lack of private funds for housing mortgages. Unfortunately this private housing program for defense areas has been undertaken during a period of general shortages of mortgage money. Furthermore, the principal mortgage lenders have generally avoided investment in needed defense housing in these areas on the apparent ground that it is more risky than investment in other areas where they feel more certain that the housing need will be permanent. This is similar to the attitude which existed in 1941 at the beginning of the FHA's title VI war housing insurance program.

Because a shortage of private money was developing last summer and because of the need of getting defense housing under way, the legislation passed last year included special provisions to permit FNMA to use up to $200,000,000 of its funds to make advance commitments for the purchase of mortgages to finance defense housing. This has produced the bulk of defense housing on which construction has started. About 80,000 units of defense housing have been programed under the act and construction has started on less than 17,000 units. The advance commitments under the 1951 act have covered about three-fourths of all the units under construction.

The Banking and Currency Committee has been very concerned about this problem for some time. As I explained in my statement at the time S. 3066 was introduced, your committee held extensive round-table hearings on mortgage financing earlier this year. These hearings were attended by representatives of major sources of mortgage funds, by operative builders, and by appropriate Government officials. The entire problem of financing defense housing was thoroughly considered, and all possible means of meeting the problem were fully explored.

From that meeting it was very clear that the only alternatives to financing private construction of defense housing at this time

are: (1) Direct loans by the Government, (2) the advance commitment procedure of the FNMA.

Your committee has been reluctant to agree to the use of FNMA advance commitment procedure. This is due to the considered judgment of your committee, based on experience of FNMA with advance commitments several years ago, that they should be kept at a minimum and not used as a primary source of funds for the housing programs of the Federal Government. In agreeing to the advance commitment authorization of $900,000,000 provided in this bill, these important factors were considered:

First, and most important, as indicated above, there is available no other ready alternative except advance commitments to get the needed defense housing started. There has been too much delay already. There is no prospect of the mortgage market changing in sufficient time and to such an extent as to make an adequate supply of mortgage funds available to meet defense housing needs promptly.

Second, the bill contains very definite limitations on the use of the advance commitment authorization. It is limited to the amount required to meet the needs of programed defense housing under the 1951 act, military housing under the Wherry-Maybank Act, and disaster housing. The authorization is limited to June 30, 1953.

Third, since the transfer in 1950 of FNMA to the Housing Agency the operations of the Association have been tightened up generally, and many of the earlier abuses with which we were concerned have been corrected. The Agency has substantially reduced administrative expenses and has carefully conserved its available authorizations, notwithstanding the tight private mortgage market which has existed. Through proper administration, the advance commitment authorization can be conserved and abuses avoided.

Fourth, the general effect of the provisions is restrictive upon long-range operation. Although the increase in FNMA purchasing authority provided in the bill would release some funds for use in the general housing market, all future FNMA operations in that field would be subject to new restrictions as to the eligible base date and percentage of loans made by a lender that may be sold to FNMA. All of the FNMA operations would be further subject to administrative restriction by the fee provisions of the bill, which permit increases in the fees and which are intended to be flexible enough and broad enough to allow FNMA to prevent wholesale dumping by mortgagees of their less desirable loans and to discourage individual mortgagees from selling all their loans to FNMA.

I hope the Administrator of FNMA will use these powers in accordance with changing market conditions and with courage.

Although there is no express provision in the bill on the subject, the authorization of the prior commitment authority for critical defense areas, etc. will have the effect of releasing about $360,000,000 for regular over-the-counter purchases by FNMA. This will provide an important source of secondary credit for GI home loans as well as some FHA loans in nondefense areas.

The FNMA provisions to which I have just referred are of major interest to the Members of the Senate. However, there are other important provisions of the bill to which I shall only make a brief reference, since most of the Members of the Senate are already quite familiar with the various programs to which they relate. It will be noted how drastically we cut each of the authorizations to what, in your committee's opinion, represents the very minimum possible. I am confident that no one can by the wildest stretch of the imagination accuse us of even prudent generosity. We cut to the bone.

1. FHA: The additional $1,000,000,000 insurance authorization, as originally proposed in the bill, was reduced to a $400,000,000 increase, and the use of the new authorization was limited to programed defense housing in critical defense-housing areas, military housing under the Wherry-Maybank Act, and disaster housing.

2. Community facilities: The proposed increase of $100,000,000 in the present $60,000,000 authorization for community facilities was reduced to $40,000,000, making the total authorization for community facilities $100,000,000, instead of $160,000,000 as originally proposed.

3. Direct housing construction by the Federal Government: The proposed increase of $200,000,000 in the present $50,000,000 authorization for housing under title III of Public Law 139 was reduced to $50,000,000, making the total authorization for housing under that title $100,000,000, instead of $250,000,000 as originally proposed.

4. Alaska housing: The proposed $10,000,000 increase in the present authorization for Alaskan housing was reduced to $5,000,000, making the total authorization for Alaska housing $20,000,000, instead of $25,000,000 as originally proposed.

5. Farm housing: Instead of the open-ended extension of the power to make loans for homes and buildings on adequate farms pursuant to section 502 (a) of Public Law 171, the power was extended for 1 year, with authority to make not exceeding an additional $100,000,000 in such loans.

Instead of the open-ended authorization to make contributions in connection with loans for housing and buildings on potentially adequate farms pursuant to section 503 of Public Law 171, the power was extended for 1 year, with authority to make not exceeding an additional $2,000,000 in contributions per annum.

Instead of the open-ended extension of the power to make special loans and grants for minor improvements for housing and buildings pursuant to section 504 of Public Law 171, the power was extended 1 year, with authority to make not exceeding an additional $10,000,000 in such special loans and grants.

6. Federally chartered savings and loan associations: In connection with federally chartered savings and loan associations, an amendment was added to eliminate the present provisions of law which limit to 15 percent of assets the amount of mortgages which can be purchased outside the 50-mile limit of the institution's home office, FHA-insured loans, or VA-guaranteed loans.

In conclusion, I want to say that this complicated and difficult bill was worked out by the committee in a spirit of harmony and unity of objective. By a process of give and take and a fair and objective appraisal of the need and the means available to meet the problem, in my humble opinion, we have recommended to the Senate a bill which should involve no controversy, and which, I assure Senators, they should have no hesitancy in fully supporting.

Mr. MAYBANK subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to state that, because of the absence of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who was extremely busy in the Committee on Public Works, preparing for the Senate a very important bill on aid to highways, he was unable to offer an amendment to the Housing Act of 1952, which I had agreed to accept. He brought the amendment to my attention last week, and I had the staff of the committee give careful study to it. I also consulted the Housing and Home Finance Agency as to their views on the amendment. Both the staff and the agency agreed that it was a desirable amendment, and, accordingly, I informed the Senator from New Mexico that I would accept his amendment. The bill was passed before the Senator from New Mexico could reach the floor.

I am not going to ask unanimous consent that the bill be reconsidered and the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico be accepted because I realize it may establish a precedent. However, I should like to have this statement appear in the RECORD for the benefit of the Members of the House, in order that some Members of the House may offer the amendment which we had agreed to accept.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I was attending a meeting of the Public Works Committee which has been considering the highway bill. I was delayed until approximately 10 minutes ago. I had discussed the amendment with the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the only thought I had was that I did not wish to establish a precedent in the Senate. I want to make a record for the Senator from New Mexico. As I said, he had discussed his amendment with me and also discussed the amendment with the staff. Of course, I could move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, but I do not want to delay the Senate. I had a minor amendment which I intended to offer myself, providing that the position of President of FNMA be placed in grade GS-17, but rather than delay the bill's passage I did not move it. If the bill is not reconsidered I shall ask the distinguished chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee [Mr. SPENCE] to add these amendments to the bill when the House committee considers it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have given the reason for the delay. The amendment had been discussed with the Senator from South Carolina. As chairman of the committee, he received a report on the amendment from the Housing and Home Finance Agency, under date of May 15, approving the amendment.

I hope the Senate will bear with me, in view of the fact that it was not a matter of neglect on my part. I was delayed in the Committee on Public Works.

The public-roads bill will be reported to the Senate on Monday, probably, at the latest. I hope the Senate will give unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, for the purpose of permitting me to offer a very short amendment. I think it will not take half a minute for it to be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I dislike to object, but if we can establish a precedent for such action as has been suggested, we can establish a precedent for similar action to be taken many days after a bill has passed. So I am constrained to object. I am sorry to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I regret that I did not give notice of the consideration of other bills.

SOME SIGNIFICANT TRENDS OF AMERICAN GOVERNMENT DURING THE PAST TWO DECADES

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, that our country faces dangerous trends both at home and abroad no one will deny—nor can they—and the trend here in the Nation's Capital toward an ever greater concentration of power in the executive branch constitutes one of the greatest threats to free government anywhere in the world.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is encouraging and heart-warming in these crucial days to know that fine citizens are standing by with calm dignity and profound thought to lend aid and comfort to those of us who are charged with the tremendous responsibility of maintaining the constitutional and economic balance of the Republic.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter from a distinguished citizen of New Jersey which bespeaks some very profound thoughts upon the state of our Nation. I not only commend its reading to every Member of the Senate, but I also strongly urge that Senators seriously study the basic truths which the letter encompasses.

In order that it may be available for future reference I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWARK, N. J., *May 1, 1952.*

Hon. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENDRICKSON: One of the most significant trends of American Government during the past two decades has been the enormous inflation of the power of the Chief Executive. Historically this development finds its roots in the conditions which existed in the depths of the depression when the very fact of a change in personnel and sudden dramatic executive action had an electrifying psychological effect on the populace. In succeeding years the Presidents have capitalized on this reaction to seize greater and greater powers. The Congress, on the other hand, largely because of obviously poor press agentry, and because of the fear of opposing what seemed to be the popular will, surrendered its authority.

Good management in any government, as in any household, requires that authority and responsibility be coextensive. Too often in these past years Congress has yielded to executive pressures and has signed blank checks—yet it has left itself in the position of having to take the blame by not fixing the responsibility at the same time. Too much has been left to executive "discretion."

The opportunity is now afforded to correct the trend. The people are encouraged by the courageous action of Judge Pine who saw that in the balancing of conveniences the consequences of a strike in steel, disastrous as they might well be, would be far less a price to pay than the loss of fundamental American liberties.

Now is the very time for temperate yet bold congressional action to maintain the balance originally provided for by our constitutional form of government. The press reports that Senator WAYNE MORSE will introduce a bill to legislate the steel plant seizure. This, though it will technically solve the administration's dilemma, would be no more of a solution of the fundamental problem than was the surrender of the Reichstag to Adolph Hitler.

On the other hand, the press reports that Representative SMITH of Virginia proposes to introduce a bill to provide for the continuance of production in emergencies by the appointment of a receiver for the employer and for the union. This is a step in the right direction and I respectfully offer the following thoughts for your consideration in connection with the debates and with possible amendments to the bill as it proceeds through Congress:

1. Certain industries have become so large as to be "affected with the public interest" in the sense that occasion may demand their regulation in the public interest. So have certain unions.

2. When conditions of emergency arise that threaten to affect the multitude who are innocent of any participation in the dispute or work stoppage, a Government agency should be authorized to seek the appointment of a receiver for both parties.

3. The agency should not be the President. The agency should be one directly interested in the production. In the case of railroads, telephone or telegraph service, radio or television, it should be the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Federal Communications Commission. In the case of steel or coal this responsibility should be vested in the Department of the Interior or the Department of Commerce. In carrying out this responsibility the agency should be responsible to Congress, as is the Comptroller General, and not to the President.

4. The receivers, when appointed, should operate the business of the employer and the union just as a receiver or trustee does under the acts relating to bankruptcy and reorganization. The parties can continue to negotiate. They will be able to do so without the force of pressure which a seizure of one side alone undoubtedly produces. The receivers can assist the parties in their negotiations. In the event of an impasse between the parties themselves, if the receivers can reach an agreement, the agreement can be embodied in a proposed plan which can then be submitted to the stockholders of the employer and to the members of the union. Then, if the required number on both sides approve, the result would be binding in the same fashion as it is in the case of corporate reorganization.

5. Admittedly this is a very sketchy presentation but it is offered for the more mature deliberation of you and your colleagues.

6. Lastly, there is a great danger in the many laws that depend on the declaration of a national emergency by the President. This danger should be eliminated by giving the President plenary powers (with obvious limitations such as a limitation against executions) but for a very limited period. The law should provide that if Congress is not in session a declaration of an emergency may not be made unless the President shall first have called Congress to convene. A limitation of 72 hours would, in view of rapid means of transportation, provide adequate opportunity for Congress to convene and the declared emergency would end unless Congress saw fit to extend it. Finally, any action taken by the Executive under such authority should create a corresponding right to anyone affected by the action so that he may have redress in damages or otherwise if it should be found that the action was unjustly taken. This would discourage the abuse of such total power.

Total power is a dangerous potential force anywhere, anytime. There are admitted constitutional safeguards against the exercise of total congressional power. Even were this not so I would prefer to see the country's fate directed by a half thousand men chosen from every corner of the country than by a single individual, whoever he might be, who might wake up some early morning and decide he was Napoleon.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH J. BIUNNO.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE IN CONNECTION WITH SEIZURE OF STEEL PLANTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there has been a considerable amount of discussion in the Senate between my colleagues and myself concerning the contents of certain hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in connection with the steel case. Several of my colleagues have expressed a desire to have published in the RECORD the testimony and examination of Secretary of Defense Lovett in the steel case, in which testimony he discussed the serious nature of the emergency which existed at the eleventh hour, when the President decided to seize the steel mills. They have also suggested that I insert in the RECORD portions of the testimony of Mr. Feinsinger and Mr. Murray on the union shop issue. Therefore, I am about to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, without taking the time to read it all, the following material.

First, the testimony given at the hearings before the Committee on Armed Services by Secretary of Defense Lovett, covering the questions asked and the answers given at the hearing on the nature of the emergency in the steel case. This testimony was given on April 24, 1952.

Second, the colloquy which took place in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on two different occasions between the junior Senator from Oregon and other Senators and Mr. Feinsinger, Chairman of the Wage Stabilization Board, with respect to the union shop issue. These discussions were held on April 15 and April 30, 1952.

Third, the portions of the hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare which consists of the colloquy that took place between the junior Senator from Oregon and other Senators and Mr. Philip Murray with regard to the union shop issue.

I ask unanimous consent that the material be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF HON. ROBERT A. LOVETT, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, ON NATURE OF STEEL CRISIS, BEFORE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, APRIL 24, 1952

The CHAIRMAN. The hearing will come to order, please.

The witness this afternoon is Robert A. Lovett, Secretary of Defense of the United States, principal assistant to the President on matters within the Department of Defense.

We welcome you here this afternoon, Mr. Secretary, and we will be glad to have you make a brief statement.

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT A. LOVETT, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES

Secretary LOVETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The committee has asked that I appear in connection with the possible effects of a steel strike on the defense programs. That subject was covered in an affidavit which I filed under date of September 14, and if it meets the pleasure of this committee I will read it for the record, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be very satisfactory, sir.

Secretary LOVETT. Robert A. Lovett, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is the Secretary of Defense of the United States and is the principal assistant to the President in all matters relating to the Department of Defense, and, under the direction of the President, he has direction, authority, and control over the Department of Defense, including the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and the Munitions Board.

Pursuant to these statutory duties and in the exercise thereof, he has information relating to the problems of procurement, production, distribution, research, and development concerning the logistics requirements of the Armed Forces of the United States in weapons, arms, munitions, equipment, materials, and all other necessary supplies for the Armed Forces of the United States.

There exists a state of national emergency declared by the President on December 16, 1950. Communist aggression is forcing the free world to fight a limited war on the battlefield and an unlimited war of preparation and production.

United Nations armed forces, largely American, are today fighting a war with Communist armies and air forces in Korea. The French are fighting Communist forces in Indochina. There is a constant threat of further Communist military aggression in other areas. The men actually fighting Communist forces have been armed for the most part by American industry, and they are relying on American industry to supply the weapons and munitions they need in daily combat.

To meet this threat of further aggression, we have deployed military forces in Europe and elsewhere. Friendly nations have joined us and have assigned their own military units to hold the line alone and with our forces. The Russians are warned in the only language they understand that the free world stands united in its determination to remain free. These men on the line which may become the firing line at any time have been armed by western industry, largely American, and they are relying on our industry to supply an essential part of the weapons and munitions they must have to defend themselves and all of us.

We and other nations are training large numbers of men to increase the forces already combat worthy and to replace those who have served their turn and done their duty. In our case, this involves building up the core of our Nation's defense—a well-trained home force, fully equipped with modern weapons and equipment. The weapons and equipment for this great training effort have come and must come largely from American industry.

The steel industry of the United States provides the basic commodity required in the manufacture of substantially all weapons, arms, munitions, and equipment produced in the United States. An adequate and continuing supply of steel is essential to every phase of our defense effort.

The cessation of production of steel for any prolonged period of time would be catastrophic.

It would add to the hazards of our own soldiers, sailors and airmen and of other fighting men in combat with the enemy. It could result in tragedy and disaster.

It would prevent us from adequately arming the military forces now facing the enemy on uneasy fronts.

It would seriously delay us in adequately training and arming their replacements and reinforcements, and in building the core of our Nation's defense, our home force.

For economic and financial reasons our armament program has been "stretched out" approximately a year longer than our military men desired from a purely military point of view. A cessation of steel production at this time would add materially to the risk the stretch-out already entails, thereby increasing the "calculated risk" we are taking to an unjustifiable point.

We are now using, for production of military end items (guns, tanks, planes, ships, ammunition and other military supplies and equipment), the following percentages of our total national steel production:

Carbon steel, 13.5 percent.
Alloy steel, 36.6 percent.
Stainless steel, 32.4 percent.
Super alloy steel, 84 percent.

In addition to such direct military requirements, those activities directly and indispensably supporting our military effort, such as the atomic energy, petroleum, power, and transportation programs and the program for broadening our industrial base and increasing our war potential, require many millions of tons of steel.

Considerations of national security make it impossible to state publicly the breakdown of use of various types of steel in manufacture of different military weapons and equipment. A few examples which can be given will show the crisis which a steel shut-down would produce. For instance, 35 percent of national production of one form of steel is going into ammunition for the use of our Armed Forces and 80 percent of such ammunition is going to Korea.

Since World War II the Armed Forces have made great progress in increasing the fire power of combat units; the fire power of an infantry division is 50 percent greater today than it was in World War II. We have substituted, insofar as possible, such fire power for man power.

Our combat techniques and objectives require a greatly increased use of steel.

Although Korean truce talks are in progress and the battle lines are relatively stable, our troops are still firing a very substantial volume of artillery ammunition. There has been a tremendous decrease in the number of our casualties in Korea. We are holding the line with ammunition and not with the lives of our troops.

Moreover, a sudden and large-scale resumption of combat in Korea may occur at any time; in such case the demand for ammunition as well as many other types of munitions could vastly increase.

Another specific example of a critical shortage is in stainless steel. Fifteen percent of all stainless steel produced in the United States is used in the manufacture of airplane engines, including jets. No jet engine can be manufactured without substantial quantities of high alloy steels.

Therefore, any curtailment in the production of steel even for a short period of time will have serious effects on the programs of the Department of Defense which are essential to national security. A work stoppage in the steel industry will result immediately in serious curtailment of production of essential weapons and munitions of all kinds; if permitted to continue it would weaken the defense effort in all critical areas and would imperil the safety of our fighting men and that of the Nation.

That is signed Robert A. Lovett, Secretary of Defense.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 14th day of April 1952, and signed Ralph N. Stohl, Notary Public. My commission expires January 1, 1956.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions from the members of the committee?

Senator MORSE. I have a few questions, Mr. Chairman, that I wish to ask the Secretary.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, Mr. Secretary, I am deeply appreciative of the fact that it is important that my cross-examination be held to questions that will not seek to elicit information which you certainly would not be justified in giving, and would not give even if the question were asked, that would provide information to the enemy. Yet I want to say by way of preface to my questions that in my opinion the steel case has aroused so much confusion in the thinking of the American people that I believe it very important to impress upon the American people two or three of what I consider to be basic facts in the steel case.

To my way of thinking, as a member of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, the most important fact is the one that you have covered in this affidavit which I want to emphasize by questioning you in regard to it. I present the fact in the form of this question:

Am I correct in my understanding, Mr. Secretary, that a shutdown of the steel industry for any period of time measured in terms of days would be bound to do great injury to the defense mobilization plans of our Government?

Secretary LOVETT. That is correct, Senator MORSE.

Senator MORSE. Am I correct in my understanding, Mr. Secretary, that the only interest that you had in the steel case up to the point of the Presidential seizure was your interest as Secretary of Defense in doing what you could to urge upon all concerned the importance of keeping the steel mills rolling in the interest of national defense?

Secretary LOVETT. That is absolutely correct, Senator MORSE. I think to be somewhat more responsive, the record should perhaps show that the Department of Defense is not aware of the merits in this dispute, and has had no part in the negotiations. Our sole concern, as you have pointed out, lies to make sure that everyone involved in this as a matter of direct responsibility is aware of the enormous consequences of the steel shutdown. That arises in part from the facts which I have covered in the affidavit and in part from the fact that it is my understanding that once the furnaces are cooled, it takes from 2 to 3 weeks to reheat, so that a 1-day stoppage is in effect not a 1-day stoppage, but automatically a stoppage of several weeks.

Senator MORSE. I am very glad you made that point. I was going to cover it in a question, but I will cover it this way now. Prior to the seizure by the President, am I correct in my understanding that the Defense Establishment was very much concerned about the closing down of the furnaces, because the Defense Establishment had been advised that if the furnaces were closed down for a short period of time measured in terms of hours or 1 or 2 days, it would be impossible to get full production back for at least several days thereafter?

Secretary LOVETT. Yes, sir, that is correct.

Senator MORSE. And as you have already testified, a shutdown of the steel operations of this country even for several days would not have been in the interest of the security of this Nation.

Secretary LOVETT. That is correct, Senator MORSE.

Senator MORSE. Am I correct in my understanding, Mr. Secretary, that neither you nor any of your officials participated in any way in the negotiations in the steel case prior to the seizure by the President?

Secretary LOVETT. That is correct, sir.

Senator MORSE. In fact, it is true, is it not, it was the position of the Defense Establishment that it did not want to be made a party to the seizure as far as the assumption of any administrative duty is concerned, because it has all it can do to handle the regular business of the Defense Establishment?

Secretary LOVETT. Yes, sir. The Defense Department took the position, and we pointed out in addition to the fact that we had not only as much as we could handle, but perhaps more, the fact that we would

then be on both sides of the fence, the principal procurer and also the principal manufacturer, and that seemed to be an unwise position.

Senator MORSE. Mr. Secretary, am I correct in my understanding that prior to the Presidential seizure—as I think this affidavit itself also indicates—you did, in carrying out your obligation to the President as Secretary of Defense advise the President as to the serious consequences you think would flow as far as the defense program is concerned if the mills were allowed to go down?

Secretary LOVETT. The President requested the views of the Department as to the consequences of the steel stoppage, and the substance of what is in this affidavit, but given in considerably more detail, was provided. That was the extent of our participation, sir.

Senator MORSE. Please understand, I am not asking for a disclosure of anything confidential that went on between you and the President, but only for a disclosure as to whether or not I am right in my understanding—and you have already testified that I am—that you advised the President as to the seriousness of a shut-down of the steel industry as far as the defense program is concerned.

Secretary LOVETT. Yes, sir.

Senator MORSE. Now, Mr. Secretary, you have already indicated very clearly that you did not participate in the formation of any recommendation for seizure, but that in substance your advice to the White House was that the defense program required a continuous operation of the steel mills. Would I be correct in my conclusion that as Secretary of Defense, it was your view that some appropriate procedure should be adopted by your government at the time the so-called deadline hour for the strike approached that would at least carry us over that period of time that was necessary to prevent a shut-down until the executive branch of the Government, or the legislative branch of the Government could follow some other course of action that would likewise guarantee the continuous operation of the steel mills?

Secretary LOVETT. Senator MORSE, perhaps I can answer that question from a slightly different angle. The Department of Defense, as you have indicated in your questions, was very gravely concerned about any stoppage because of the time element involved. It is not a thing which shuts down today and can be restored tomorrow. It takes several weeks. In view of the critical situation world-wide, as well as our efforts to rebuild some reasonable position of strength in our Western European allies, it was apparent at once that a stoppage held the gravest possibilities for trouble.

Therefore, the Department naturally would look with alarm at a continuation of the stalemate of some sort in these discussions with the furnaces down.

As to the method of continuing production, the method by which the shut-down was stopped, we of course have no opinion, sir. Our concern was that production should continue. The alternative methods of accomplishing that were not raised with us, and we expressed no opinion on it.

Senator MORSE. Do you agree with me that no matter who was President of the United States at such an hour of crisis, there rested upon him the grave responsibility of doing whatever he could within his position as Chief Executive of this land to keep steel production going?

Secretary LOVETT. Yes, Senator MORSE. I do not see how anyone who is President of the United States in a critical time such as this could allow a major stoppage of steel. And the method of preventing that, as I said earlier, I have no opinion on. I am not aware of the alternatives which could have been taken. But the thought of a stoppage itself is something that I would believe any President would find almost impossible to accept.

Senator MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this covers in the main the examination which I wish to put to the Secretary in support of the premise and conclusion that I now state for the record, and if the Secretary believes it is at all a misinterpretation of his views as to the serious situation that existed at the hour the President seized the steel mills, I want him to make a modifying statement in the record at this time.

My statement briefly is this, Mr. Chairman, that I think the American people need to ponder what I think is the fact, the fact to which I think the Secretary of Defense has testified here today, that the defense, the security needs of our country were so serious at the hour the President seized the steel mills that it was essential in protecting the security of this country that steps be taken to keep those steel mills operating without a break in continuity of production. I believe, Mr. Chairman, when all is said and done, that is the underlying operative fact in this entire controversy, and that thereafter it became the duty of both the President and other officials in the executive branch of the Government that determine upon executive policy, and the duty of the Congress, that determines legislative policy, to determine what modifications ought to be put into effect on the seizue order once time permitted reflection and consideration for modification. But irrespective of how the situation got into the serious climax that it had reached at the hour of seizure, the fact remains, as the Secretary of Defense has testified here today, that the defense and security needs of our country were so serious that the obligation rested upon our Government to keep those steel mills in continuous operation. And the one man in our Government who at that hour sat in the position to keep them operating was the President of the United States, and he followed a course of action which many of us in good faith and complete sincerity can disagree with, as far as procedure is concerned. It nevertheless was a course of action that resulted in keeping the steel mills operating. And we now have the opportunity and the time in cool reflection to follow suchever course of action that we, the Congress, may deem advisable, to modify the procedure that the President has adopted, consistent, however, with keeping the steel mills operating.

That is the comment I wanted to make because I do not intend to lose sight of what I think is the most important operative fact in this whole controversy, namely, that at that dark hour when the President seized the steel mills, it was in the security interests of every American citizen that those steel mills be kept operating. And I am going to continue to do what I can to keep the sights of the American people on that fact, and then cooperate as best I can in developing here a legislative program that will make it unnecessary to repeat the procedure that was followed in this case.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator MORSE, for your observation. I wish to say that I feel convinced of the soundness of your judgment and opinion as you have expressed it here at this time, and I am glad to have it in the record.

Senator HUMPHREY?

Senator HUMPHREY. I have only one or two questions, Mr. Secretary. I am going to expand and possibly develop the line of questioning of Senator MORSE.

You made reference in your affidavit to the so-called stretch-out period of our rearmament, and defense program, by approximately 1 year longer. Is it your feeling that that stretch-out period places a greater responsibility upon the Government to maintain a continuity of steel production? In other words, is the stretch-out period plus a threatened strike or cessation of production a further jeopardy to our defense?

Secretary LOVETT. Yes, Senator HUMPHREY. May I answer that at some length, sir?

Senator HUMPHREY. I would like to get your observations because it was a very short paragraph in your affidavit, and I think it has some very important meaning here.

Secretary LOVETT. Going back to the requests of the military department for appropriations, the budget which I recommended to the President for the three military services for fiscal year 1953, total $55,000,000,000, when reviewed by the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Bureau of the Budget, that amount of appropriations would result in expenditures in the fiscal year 1953 of something estimated by the services to approximate $70,000,000,000. The Office of Defense Mobilization was also concerned at the accelerating rate of the take by the military departments out of the civilian economy of certain rare alloys and certain metals that were in short supply. But I believe it was the financial aspect which appeared to be controlling. At all events, we were given a limit of expenditures, expenditures in the technical budget sense being a measure of the amount of goods and services which we receive in any one year.

Having received that expenditure limitation, we then had to go back and refigure the entire contract authority aspect of the budget. The reprograming, the cut-down in the scheduled deliveries as a result of this budgetary necessity, meant that while the ultimate total of aircraft, for example, we would receive, would be the same or in fact might be somewhat larger, we would not receive them as soon as if we had no expenditure limitation.

Therefore, the period of risk before complete modernization of the Air Force was extended substantially by approximately a year in some types. That means, therefore, instead of having an accumulation, a stockage, or instead of accelerating the date of readiness of the various units, we are compelled to rely even more heavily on the reliable daily delivery to us of these items. That runs through the entire fabric of the military production.

Senator HUMPHREY. So current production is even more important with the stretched-out period than if you would have had, let us say, the more compact production program in terms of time.

Secretary LOVETT. That is correct, sir; and it is even more important because we are now in a period of maximum acceleration. I can give you figures which would support that.

The period of maximum acceleration of production in World War II occurred between 1941 and 1942, that is, within a 12-month period, and it amounted to about 220 percent. It is an interesting but I honestly believe a completely useless fact that the rate of production between the end of calendar year 1950 and the end of calendar year 1951 was 222 percent. So the rate of acceleration appears statistically to be the same. Actually we are coming into right now the period when the funds which the Congress gave us in 1950 and 1951 fiscal years are beginning to be delivered. If you recall that it takes 18 to 24 months to make a fighter aircraft, it is clear that funds made available, for example, in January 1951, would not produce the aircraft until a minimum of 18 months thereafter, which would be July 1953. Hence, the stretch-out has had the effect of making more important than ever the rapid build-up to our level-off period of production, and that build-up, even under the stretch-out, requires a doubling of production between December 1951 and December 1952. It is not an easy task at all. It represents doubling production in the 12 months between December 1951 and December 1952.

Senator HUMPHREY. Which observation would lead one to conclude that we are now

just approaching the maximum productive period for this year period of December 1951 to December 1952.

Secretary LOVETT. That is correct, sir.

Senator HUMPHREY. The next question I have is with reference to the figures, and I do not want to probe too deeply on it, with reference to carbon steel, stainless steel, and superalloy steel. Just this very plain and clear-cut question. Are there any stored surpluses of said materials that could have tided us over any period of cessation of steel production?

Secretary LOVETT. Senator HUMPHREY, it is hard to answer in the frame of that question. The materials that the military obtain come through the so-called CMP, the controlled-materials plan, and they are given to us several months in advance on certificates, although they do not go into the work in process stage, we will say, until 6 months after the authority is given. The point, I believe, sir, which you are inquiring about is not that we would run out of steel the day after the strike, or the week after the strike, but with the mills shut down we would, after some period of time which is a matter of guesswork largely, run out.

Senator HUMPHREY. In other words, there would be a lag period as a result of the cessation of production?

Secretary LOVETT. Yes, sir.

Senator HUMPHREY. Your schedule would be interrupted.

Secretary LOVETT. The consequence would be in an alternative. Either we would run out or we would have to take it completely out of the civilian production.

You will recall, sir, that the first protective step which the Office of Defense Mobilization took was to freeze all steel deliveries. That is an indication of what would happen in a more dramatic form if the steel mills shut down.

Senator HUMPHREY. In your final paragraph, where you say, "Any curtailment in the production of steel even for a short period of time will have serious effects on the programs of the Department of Defense which are essential to national security," would you care to give us any general observation on what you mean by "a short period of time," recognizing the intricate nature of steel production as you have noted earlier?

Secretary LOVETT. I tried to bring that out more fully in testimony today, Senator. That was in there for two reasons. We noticed references in the press from time to time that a short shut-down might be the worst we would have to face. Our feeling is that there is no such thing as a short stoppage, because of the peculiarity of the industry, and notably the extraordinarily long time it takes to reheat a furnace once it is cooled. It is a very long process, and of course a costly one. So that even if technically the strike existed only 2 days, that in itself would mean something well over 3 weeks before we got back into production.

Senator HUMPHREY. And if the furnaces were completely cooled—let us say you had a strike over a period of time for 1 or 2 weeks, or let us say 2 weeks—then you would extend somewhat the duration before you could get back into full production; is that right?

Secretary LOVETT. Yes, sir. You have to add the period of the work stoppage to the period of the reheating of the furnaces. It varies between certain types, I am informed. I am not an expert on this. But it is somewhere on the order of 2 to 3 weeks for the average big furnace. So if you had a week's stoppage, you would have to add to that the period of reheating the furnace.

Senator HUMPHREY. And all during that period of time there would be no production of steel, and then you would be faced again with the problem of reestablishing normal plant operations which within itself would call for some time, at least a few days. Would that be a fair statement?

Secretary LOVETT. That is right, sir.

Senator HUMPHREY. The chairman was just mentioning to me the possibility as to whether or not a shut-down of such duration, namely, a shut-down, let us say, to a strike or work stoppage, plus the technical detail involved, that would have some impairment to other industries related to the Defense Establishment?

Secretary LOVETT. Very seriously; yes, sir.

Senator HUMPHREY. So you have steel as a basic commodity fully integrated into the whole defense-production program, and would, therefore, have a carry-over into other aspects of production?

Secretary LOVETT. Yes, sir. It would notably, for example, hit the supporting industries, as for example atomic energy, petroleum, power, transportation. The defense machine, Senator HUMPHREY, is one which rests on industry to a degree that is rarely understood. The form of mobilization which we have undertaken is an effort to avoid the wasteful chewing up of metals and building final end items of the military and then storing them somewhere. It is a little bit like the family who eats off the stove.

They do not cook all of their meals for a month at one cooking, but rely on the grocer and the butcher and the dairyman delivering food daily and cooking it daily. The military are almost exactly that way. We could, of course, go into full mobilization, pay no attention to the consequences of the country, which I think would be devastating, store everything, and then shut the plants down. That would be horribly wasteful, and I think would lead us into a trap which would perhaps shake our economy and thereby please the Soviets. The alternative, therefore, is to have moving, living production lines, and take the equipment off that as needed, and have in those lines the expansion and acceleration characteristics which would be necessary in case of full mobilization.

Hence, the continuity of the line is vital to the military establishment not merely in the end items, but in all the things that go into military establishments and that touches almost every item you can think of.

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Secretary, without making any value judgment on our part as to the manner in which the President acted, the form of his action—which I surely do not ask you to answer—it is to be clearly understood, then, from your testimony that whatever action took place in the light of the circumstances as they existed, that that action had as its first requirement the continuation, the full continuity of maximum production for every single day, is that correct?

Secretary LOVETT. Senator, I, of course, have no knowledge of the advice given to the President by others on this matter.

Senator HUMPHREY. But from the Department of Defense point of view.

Secretary LOVETT. From the point of view of the Department of Defense, any stoppage of steel output was in our opinion an aggravation of a degree of risk that we have already taken to the point where we felt compelled in answer to the President's question to indicate the degree of danger which this country would face if we did not get a reliable daily supply of steel.

Senator HUMPHREY. And as you have noted in your statement, by the stretch-out of approximately a year you had already assumed a calculated risk on the basis of the military requirements.

Secretary LOVETT. Senator Humphrey, the risk is excessive in my opinion right now with the full budget allowed us. My testimony before the Houses of Congress has so indicated.

Senator HUMPHREY. I am very grateful to you, Mr. Secretary. Thank you.

Senator IVES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a few questions, if I may.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator IVES.

Senator IVES. Mr. Secretary, I note in your reference to steel production, you quote percentagewise as it were. Are you at liberty to give the amount of tonnage in any instance?

Secretary LOVETT. No, sir, I am not.

Senator IVES. I think that is a rather important item in all of this. It is very fundamental. For instance, I am curious to know how much tonnage of the total amount of tonnage which I assume is somewhere in the vicinity of 150,000,000 tons at the present rate of production, how much of that tonnage is being used by the Defense Department or in the defense effort.

Secretary LOVETT. We can provide that percentage for you.

Senator IVES. Off the record?

Secretary LOVETT. Yes, sir.

Senator IVES. I see. There is one more question along that line that I would like to ask. Is it your opinion that the amount of steel now being produced is insufficient to permit the dropping of controls over steel? We have been given to understand, for example—I do not know whether it has come to the attention of this particular committee; it has of other committees of which I am a member—that there is ample steel at the present time outside of structural steel. If there is ample steel, and if the Department of Defense does not need structural steel—and I suppose the Department may need structural steel—but if it should not, there would be no need for controls; is that correct?

Secretary LOVETT. That is a very technical question which lies outside my field. I think I can be reasonably responsive from the point of view of the Department's interest in this by saying that in anticipation of the problem of a steel strike—which, of course, we have been apprehensive about for 90 days—we tried to find out if there was some way in which we could concentrate into a certain number of plants all of the military requirements. I do not recall the figures in detail, but in the order of magnitude I suppose that 20 to 30 of the big plants would supply the military and suppose there are a total of 300 in the country; that would mean that 270 approximately would be left for civilian uses. However, the number of different alloys—the number of different kinds of steel which are required—run across the whole spectrum of the steel industry, so that it is virtually impossible, except after the most careful work, which would take months and months, to take out of these hundreds of mills the various percentages that are procured by our contractors because the Department of Defense does not buy the steel. It goes to an engine company and says it wants so many jets—we will say 2,000 jets. The contractor with the Department of Defense then goes to the steel man and his metallurgists agree on the quantity and type of steel, and he himself puts his order in on that basis.

Senator IVES. I see your point. I assume that the one person who would probably be more acquainted with the over-all picture, both domestic and defense, with respect to production of steel would be the Director of Defense Mobilization?

Secretary LOVETT. That is correct; that is his field.

Senator IVES. I thought you might be able to answer, but I appreciate the situation in which you find yourself. There is one question I want to raise. When I came in you and Senator MORSE were on a dissertation of this question of seizure. I agree with the comment that I think both of you agreed on—to the effect that there is not much use now crying over spilled milk. In other words, how we got there. Our job now is to get out of it. There is time enough later when we get in perhaps a political campaign to place blame for the predicament we are in.

But I would like to raise one point. You would not go so far as to say that seizure is the only alternative by which to avoid a stoppage of steel production?

Secretary LOVETT. Senator IVES, I think I covered that point before you came in.

Senator IVES. I did not hear all of it.

Secretary LOVETT. I said we had no knowledge of the various alternative courses of action, that the mechanics, the procedures to keep this thing going were not in our province at all. The question which Senator MORSE asked was, I think, a hypothetical one. Could any President avoid the responsibility of keeping the steel production up?

My answer to that was that I thought in the present critical times steel had to be produced, but that I did not know what the alternatives were or whether there was some other way. I think myself there are several alternatives, but that does not lie in the area in which the Defense Department is concerned.

Senator IVES. I misunderstood your position from your answer before. That is why I wanted to clear it up. What little I have heard of it, I thought you were assuming that seizure was the only alternative. I apologize for not hearing the question.

Senator MORSE. I am sure my good friend from New York would be glad to hear me say it was not the position the Secretary took. I also want to assure him that the junior Senator from Oregon thinks that some other procedures should have been followed than the one that was followed.

Senator IVES. You have already offered some comment, have you not?

Senator MORSE. My question to the Secretary was simply to the point that having reached the eleventh hour, was there any obligation in his opinion on any President, no matter who he might be, in the White House, to do whatever was necessary to keep the steel mills going.

Senator IVES. Mr. Secretary, in order to clear that again, that does not necessarily mean that any President who might be in the White House might choose the correct way to do that.

Senator MORSE. He might make a mistake. But it is still important that he keep them going, and that he did.

Senator HUMPHREY. Lest there be any doubt, Mr. Secretary, whatever the alternative, as I understand it, it required continuity in production.

Secretary LOVETT. Yes.

Senator HUMPHREY. If there had been any cessation of production over a prolonged period of time, let us say 2 or 3 weeks, would it have been necessary for the Defense Department then to have requisitioned even more sternly and more drastically the available steel, and thereby deny other areas of the economy?

Secretary LOVETT. I think that would have been inevitable.

Senator HUMPHREY. Would it, for example, have been necessary for the Defense Department to have required steel which now goes into such civilian items as, let us say, farm machinery? Would there have been a priority for atomic energy development, munitions and artillery over that?

Secretary LOVETT. I think the Office of Defense Mobilization, in considering the requirements, would have had to give a clear and overriding priority to the basic military requirements, and those of the atomic energy, power and similar items associated directly with the military.

Senator HUMPHREY. As the pool becomes restricted, in other words, the essentiality of high priority for end item military equipment would have been increased and augmented?

Secretary LOVETT. That is correct, sir.

Senator HUMPHREY. Are there any other questions? If not, Mr. Secretary, as the temporary acting Chairman, I want to express the gratitude and appreciation of the committee for your attendance. May I say on behalf of Senator MURRAY, the Chairman, that your cooperation has been much appreciated.

We will stand in recess at the call of the Chair for the continuation of these hearings.

Secretary LOVETT. Thank you very much, sir.

TESTIMONY OF MR. NATHAN FEINSINGER, CHAIRMAN OF THE WAGE STABILIZATION BOARD, ON UNION-SHOP ISSUE, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, APRIL 15, 1952

Mr. FEINSINGER. Union shops now exist in the steel producing and fabricating industry. Crucible Steel, a steel-producing company, has a modified union-shop agreement. Several of the largest steel-producing companies which are parties to this case, United States Steel, Bethlehem, Jones & Laughlin, have union shops, some of quite recent origin with their railroad subsidiary, their steamship subsidiaries, their coal-producing subsidiary. In recommending the union shop the Board left the form and type of the conditions to be negotiated by the parties. The Board was faced with the choice of recommending the union shop in this case, or announcing that it would never recommend the union shop in any case. Please remember that Congress itself has authorized the union shop, which today means an open union and protection of a member against loss of his job, even though expelled from the union, provided only that he continues to pay his dues.

Senator TAFT, one of the sponsors of the act, said in advocating this provision in the Taft-Hartley Act, quoting in part, "In other words, what we do in effect is to say that no one can get a free ride in such a shop," and finally, and most significantly, he said, "I think the justice of such an arrangement should be clear."

I believe that to be ample authority for the Board's recommendation, particularly when viewed in the light of the recommendation of a recent emergency board in the railroad industry. It would be quite inconsistent whether you said one is an ad hoc agency and the other is a continuing agency, they are both agencies of the Government, for two agencies to take totally inconsistent positions on such a basic issue.

Remember, we did not do anything beyond endorsing the kind of union shop that Congress had authorized and saying to the parties, "You go back into bargaining and work out the kind of union-shop agreement we should have." That is all I have to say.

Senator MORSE. Do you mind if I interrupt, or are you through with your statement?

Mr. FEINSINGER. Yes.

Senator MORSE. I would like to ask a question or two if I may, because I have some appreciation of the problem this Board is faced with in the so-called union security or union-shop issue. When you refer to Mr. TAFT's statement and to the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law, which legalize the union shop, and illegalize the old closed shop, are you not, however, referring to a law that simply makes a statement of public policy as to the kind of a union-employer relationship and as to the kind of a shop which can exist as the result of free collective bargaining negotiations?

Mr. FEINSINGER. That is correct.

Senator MORSE. And that when the Congress placed its stamp of approval as a matter of public policy upon this kind of a union shop in American industry, subject to the voluntary agreement of the parties in settling individual disputes, it did not in any sense, did it, say that it should be imposed upon an employer by any governmental agency?

Mr. FEINSINGER. That is correct, nor did this governmental agency impose it on the employer. We did not grant the union shop. We could not.

Senator MORSE. That is my next question. It is true that you did not grant the union shop. You did not order the union shop, but as a Government agency you recommended that it be adopted by the parties to the dispute.

Mr. FEINSINGER. That they negotiate a union shop by agreement.

Senator MORSE. That they negotiate a union shop by agreement, leaving the details as to its form up to them.

Mr. FEINSINGER. Such as whether old employees did or did not have to join, whether new employees could escape after a year if they found life unbearable in the union. Those are all matters of form or type or condition to be negotiated by the parties as they are in American industry quite generally.

Senator MORSE. Let me make clear before making my next comment that I fully appreciate that it is easy for me to sit on the sidelines and raise a question as to a public policy of recommending a union shop on the part of any board, whether it is your board, or the railway emergency board or any other, because I cannot answer the question, "Was you there, Charlie?" I did not have to go through the cases as you gentlemen did. But nevertheless, as a Senator, I have certain responsibilities, legislatively speaking, to these matters of public policy, and with that comment, I ask you this question: On the basis of your experience in the field of labor relations, do you think that when you as a Wage Stabilization Board recommended a union shop to these parties, that as far as the union was concerned, they took it for granted they had won a decision on the union shop issue?

Mr. FEINSINGER. I think that is a fair statement.

Senator MORSE. I am not going to discuss this matter much further, because I do not think it would be fair or proper for me to do so because I have my responsibilities as a legislator, and you had your responsibilities as the Chairman of this Stabilization Board.

I want to be exceedingly fair to the Board. Am I correct in my understanding that the parties, both the steel companies and the union, voluntarily submitted evidence and argument and information on the union-shop issue?

Mr. FEINSINGER. That is correct, sir.

Senator MORSE. Did the steel companies at any time say to members of the Board that we just think this issue is beyond the jurisdiction of this Board, and therefore will not present argument or evidence in respect to it.

Mr. FEINSINGER. No, they did not. They could not in the light of the record, which I would like to explore for a moment.

Senator MORSE. You go ahead.

Mr. FEINSINGER. Then I would like to come back to one other comment you made.

The old Wage Stabilization Board, which had no disputes functions, folded up, for all practical purposes, around the middle of February. For several months the Government considered ways and means of getting the Board reconstituted and considered whether or not it should be given disputes jurisdiction.

The Defense Mobilization Advisory Board, with industry dissenting, recommended to the President that the Wage Stabilization Board be reconstituted as an 18-man board, and that it be given jurisdiction to make recommendations for the settlement of labor disputes in a well-defined area, that is, where the Defense Department certified that a dispute, or rather, a strike or interruption of production, would seriously impair the defense effort.

The question raised and discussed during the meetings of the Defense Mobilization Board was whether or not the jurisdiction of such a board in dispute cases should extend to noneconomic issues, which by definition includes the union shop. The President signed the executive order which gave to our Board jurisdiction over noneconomic issues, including the union shop, and economic issues.

When the Board was reconstituted, the same fight was made by industry against the inclusion in the Board's jurisdiction of authority to make recommendations on noneconomic issues, including the union shop. What was the fight all about? Everybody knew that if the steel negotiations resulted in an impasse, that the President would refer that case to the Board, and that one of the issues would be the union shop. Every member of the Board, when he took his oath of office under Executive Order 10233, knew that he would be called upon to pass on the question of the union shop in the steel case or in some other case. It is also before us in the Boeing and A. F. of L. Machinists case. It is before us in the Douglas and UAW-CIO case. As a matter of fact, Senator, a few weeks before the steel case came to the Board, the industry members of our Board, so they tell me, caucused to determine whether they should stay on the Board, in view of the imminence of the steel case, which would involve the union shop. They decided they would stay on, to their credit. I am proud of every member of our Board, all of whom have contributed to what I regard as the most successful record of handling labor disputes in the history of the United States. I make that as a statement for the record, and I am prepared to support it.

The Allen resolution in the House, before its amendment, challenged the jurisdiction of our Board, having in mind particularly the union-shop issue. The revised Allen resolution in the House withdraws that feature of the original resolution, for the plain and simple reason that a simple check of the records will show that it was intended that the Board should have jurisdiction in dispute cases over economic and noneconomic issues, including the union shop.

Our industry members, in their dissent—and it was very vigorous dissent—did not make the charge or the claim or the allegation that we were exceeding our jurisdiction.

One other thing. The public members tried to get the industry members to go along with us on a proposal to send the whole issue back to the parties to settle through collective bargaining. That is where it belongs. In negotiations, as you know, sometimes it is traded off for something else. If it is given, the union gives up some money. If it is not given, the union gets some more money. That is the way those things go. That was our idea: Send it back with the whole kettle of fish, and let the parties settle it.

The industry members wanted it sent back, provided that we would wash our hands of it completely, which would be wrong, in my judgment, because we would have it right back where we started on December 22, because any one issue unsettled would mean that the whole dispute was unsettled, and the President would have to recertify the whole shebang to us.

On a previous comment of yours that it might not be proper for a Government agency under any circumstances to recommend that the parties negotiate a union-shop agreement, I am grateful for your recognition of the distinction between the Government granting or ordering it, and the Government saying to the employer, "We think you ought to negotiate, in the light of the fact that General Motors has it. It is not a communistic organization. It believes in protecting the liberties of its workers." And Allis-Chalmers, which appeared before this Congress on many occasions to protect the liberty of these workers at a time when there was some reason to believe they were not being protected, has recently signed a union-shop agreement of the GM type, to cite two examples.

You say, "Why should a Government agency do it?" You were not with this Board, that is true, but you rendered most distinguished service on the War Labor Board in World War II. You know more about this stuff than I do, Senator.

Senator MORSE. That is not true. That is the only untruthful statement you have made in the hearing, that I know about.

Mr. FEINSINGER. This same question arose in World War II during the President's joint labor-management public conference before our Board was set up, and the employers said, "Let's maintain the status quo. If you have got a closed shop, you keep it. If you have got an open shop, you keep it." That was the only point of disagreement.

You recall President Roosevelt, so the story goes, took a blue pencil and drew a line through that one. He said, "I am interested only in what you agree on, not what you disagree on."

The issue came to our Board when it was set up, with no guideposts. What did we do? After a number of different starts, we evolved the concept of maintenance of membership. The steel companies, employers generally, fought against maintenance of membership on the ground that it was unpatriotic; that it impaired the liberty of the individual, and so forth and so on.

The other day, Douglas Aircraft got up. They had fought against it, too. I said, "You have got maintenance of membership in your contract now, haven't you?" And they said, "Sure, we have renewed it since you gave it to us."

"How do you like it?"

"We like it fine." The maintenance of membership agreement that you voted for was much more drastic than the union shop that we recommended in this steel case, because of the change in legislation since then. The maintenance of membership clause you voted for, Senator, provided at least as to men who were then members, you have got to stay in the union——

Senator MORSE. I drafted it in the Norma-Hoffman case, but I want to say something about it.

Mr. FEINSINGER. Under the maintenance of membership clause by the War Labor Board put into the steel contract, if a man was a member of the union he had to remain a member in good standing. If he lost his membership for any reason whatsoever, if he spat in the face of the business agent—or it did not have to be as drastic as that—if he ran against him in such cases, the union could go to the boss and say, "Fire that man." The boss would have to fire him. Under the union-shop agreement, nobody loses his job in the plant in relation to his union membership, even though he is expelled from the union, as long as he pays his dues. So in contrast with the innovation instituted by the War Labor Board in a comparable period—and believe me, I think this emergency is just as serious as that, if not more so—we were mild in our recommendation.

Senator MORSE. Mr. Chairman, it will take me just a minute further. In fairness to Mr. Feinsinger, I should make this brief comment.

I am very glad he has made the statement he has made, pointing out for the record that there is no question as to the jurisdiction of this Board to pass on the union-shop issue. The parties themselves submitted themselves to that jurisdiction. I am glad he has made that statement.

I am not going to sit here and argue with Mr. Feinsinger on an honest, reasonable difference of judgment as to what the policy of the Government ought to be in taking jurisdiction over the union-shop issue. He has referred to the War Labor Board history. I only want to say this: We were operating under a no-strike, no-lockout agreement on the part of industry and labor, and it was obvious there were attempts on the part of some segments of industry to use that no-strike, no-lockout agreement as a device for busting unions all over this country. Where they had union shops and closed shops or other union arrangements, they would take advantage of this agreement to break the unions.

On the other hand, there were unions that did not have union shops and closed shops that thought they could take advantage of the no-strike, no-lockout agreement to establish union shops and closed shops across this country, because an employer's hands were tied in that he could not lock out any more than the union could strike in these great defense plants.

Mr. Feinsinger is quite right. We had to work out a compromise, and we struggled for weeks trying to work out a compromise getting both industry and labor to come along with us.

My recollection of the compromise is briefly this: As a matter of Board policy, we said, "We are going to work out some kind of a union security or union maintenance provision to protect the unions existing in these plants." And that was the union maintenance clause of the Norma-Hoffman case, based upon the dissenting opinion of the employers in the International Harvester case. It became the standard union maintenance clause of the War Labor Board. It did not establish a union shop or a closed shop, as such, but provided for the security of the unions already existing in defense plants.

Second, we established, as Board policy, the rule that if any employer already did not have a union shop, we would not order one imposed upon him. If he did not have a closed shop, we would not order one imposed on him.

We adopted the policy we would not by Board mandate impose a union or closed shop. In some of the arbitration cases where the parties voluntarily submitted the issue to a Board arbitrator, I think the record will show, as I recall—and I have not refreshed my memory on this for a long time—that in some of those instances the union shops were granted by the arbtirator, but with the express consent of the parties in terms of reference to the arbitrator.

Mr. FEINSINGER. Or where it was common in the industry. You are correct.

Senator MORSE. And the parties submitted the specific issue to jurisdiction of the arbitrator. In some of those cases, they did not come to the Board. They came to the Board only for the purpose of having an arbitrator assigned. The parties said, "We would like to try to bargain this out between ourselves. If we cannot, we will arbitrate it. We ask you to appoint the arbitrators."

We appointed arbitrators who took jurisdiction, but with the express consent of the parties.

I close by saying I was of the opinion then, and I had been of the opinion previous to my service on the War Labor Board as a private arbitrator, that the Board should not take jurisdiction over the union-shop issue and order it, as such, or an arbitrator should not take jurisdiction over it and order it as such, unless the parties by the terms of the arbitration reference agreed that he should be the deciding mind on the union-shop issue.

As a legislator, and knowing what a difficult issue this is from the standpoint of public opinion, I am still of the opinion that as a matter of policy the Government should not follow a course of action that looks as though we are ordering a union shop. I have an honest difference of opinion with

Mr. Feinsinger on that. As a legislator, I am going to do what I can to put my view on this issue in legislative form. I do not know what success I will have.

Mr. FEINSINGER. I would like to pay myself the compliment of believing had you not been a legislator in the last couple of months but had sat in the chair next to mine on the Board, you would have done exactly what we did.

I would like to say this: The War Labor Board had a tough job. You did a great job as a member of that Board. You sat in the spot I am sitting in now on more than one occasion, and defended the Board. You had an all-out no strike, no lockout pledge. We have not.

Senator MORSE. I am frank to say it made my job easier.

Mr. FEINSINGER. You had the patriotic stimulus of an all-out war. We have not. I am all the more proud of the record of this Board because it has been made without the assistance of a no-strike, no-lockout pledge, without the patriotic stimulus of an all-out war, and with nothing but power to make recommendations or suggestions, not even directive orders. And finally, I stated in my opinion, according to the Board's recommendations, that I thought they were fair and equitable, and not unstabilizing. I am still of that opinion.

The President, I was happy to note, endorsed that opinion in no uncertain terms. I am confident that when the gentlemen of this committee and the gentlemen in the House and the Senate and the members of the American public fully understand the Board's recommendations, they, too, will approve.

Thank you very much.

TESTIMONY OF MR. NATHAN FEINSINGER, CHAIRMAN OF THE WAGE STABILIZATION BOARD, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, APRIL 30, 1952, DEALING WITH THE UNION-SHOP ISSUE AND RELATED ISSUES

Senator MORSE. I want to clear up one point as far as my position in the case is concerned. The junior Senator from Oregon has taken the position that under the Constitution of the United States any President, irrespective of who he may be, has the inherent power in an hour of great crisis where the security of this country needs protection to proceed to exercise executive power to protect the people of this country in that crisis, subject to the subsequent check of the Congress of the United States, and that he owes a duty when he exercises such alleged inherent power to proceed forthwith to get the sanction from the Congress of the United States.

That has been the position of the junior Senator from Oregon for years on this highly debatable constitutional point, which for the first time in all our history was settled yesterday in one decision by a lower Federal court.

I am a good enough lawyer, I hope, to recognize that, as long as that decision stands, it is the law of the land and the junior Senator from Oregon intends to comply with that decision and urge all other citizens to comply with that decision, unless a Supreme Court decision subsequently changes that decision.

In other words, I held to a theory of inherent Presidential power which I have felt under the Constitution a President should be allowed to exercise if it is to be a dynamic and not a static Constitution.

If you take the position that the President of the United States is helpless in the hour of crisis, irrespective of what faults he may have committed in getting himself into a position where the hour of crisis arose, then you are sustaining a static conception of the Constitution and not a dynamic one.

If that is the law, then we are going to have to adjust to it. It does not remove one iota the obligation of this Congress to proceed to take legislative action that will protect the interests of this country in an hour of crisis.

May I say I have tremendous respect for the cold logic of the decision that was handed down yesterday, but one does not have to stretch his imagination very far to recognize that you are going to run the danger of needing a dynamic rule of constitutional law if certain events should happen in this country, to wit, suppose as we sit here this afternoon or the Congress in session tomorrow, the whole capital, with its inhabitants were wiped out by a bomb, and the people of the country were confronted with the fact that they had no Congress to which the President might go for immediate legislation.

Why, it is absurd to assume, in my judgment, as a matter of constitutional doctrine, that the Chief Executive of this land does not have the power to take those Executive steps necessary to protect the security of the people of this country under those circumstances.

But we at least now have the duty to pass some legislation that would cover any President in the future under those circumstances by putting on the books some standing legislation that will legislatively regularize the procedure and authorize the President in such an emergency to take those steps such as seizure in this case, to protect the welfare of the country.

May I say that if the Congress will only step up to what I think is its legislative responsibility, it is better that the Congress handle emergency disputes by legislation. On that point I agree with the Senator from Minnesota.

I, too, have shared the view there was a legislative obligation, but I want to make very clear that, as far as the decision of yesterday is concerned, it certainly reversed the junior Senator from Oregon on one point he has held over the years: That under Executive power in article 2 of the Constitution there is an inherent power for the Chief Executive to protect the security of our people in an hour of crisis if that crisis should arise. Until that decision is changed I am going to stand by it as one who recognizes you cannot have a government by law unless you follow the court decree once that court decree comes down.

Senator HUMPHREY. I want to say to the Senator from Oregon again, with his penetrating analysis of the problem with which I associate myself fully, as I have with other analyses of these difficult measures, a great disservice has been done the American public and the American Government by the charges of dictatorship which have been leveled on the President, when, in fact, the whole judicial process has been preserved and there has never been a dictator that ever stayed in by judicial procedure.

I am confident those of us in the Congress and in the executive branch of this Government are going to abide by the law of the land.

The Senator is correct when he says a judicial decision is as much a law of the land as Congress until such decision may be reversed, if it should be.

Again I say there has been this lack of proper definition of terms. It was as in the old days when somebody was for a minimum wage. They called him a Communist. When the President acted in terms of what he thought to be the public interest they said that he is a dictator, which only befuddles the American people as to the understanding of the real meaning of dictatorship, which is the abolition of legislative government and of the judicial process.

It is not only the abuse of the Executive power; it is all three. The sooner we drive that point home for a little elementary political understanding and science in this country, the better off we will be.

Those who have made these charges again have muddied up the waters of political thinking of the American people. The dictatorship means complete abolition of the protection of the law. It means a complete abolition of the constitutional procedures.

I think Judge Pine's decision has proved conclusively beyond a shadow of a doubt this is a Government of law which follows procedures as established in the Constitution and in the public law of this land.

I would again rebuke those who have seen fit, in order to fan emotions, to talk about a dictatorship at a time when the procedures of law were at work in this country and at work objectively and methodically.

I want to give my personal views for the record because I feel we have not only a responsibility to legislate, but we have a responsibility to get the record perfectly clear as members of this committee as to what our views are and how we regard our responsibilities as legislators in this complex case.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it is very important we should have these views that have been expressed in the record. It indicates to me that I should say at this time that I am willing to call a special executive session immediately following the conclusion of this hearing this afternoon. It does seem to me there is a great need for swift action in this matter.

* * * * *

Mr. FEINSINGER. And, incidentally, you asked last time, Senator MORSE, whether the companies had challenged the jurisdiction of the Board to pass on the union-shop issue. We have found a reference. It is panel hearings, February 8, 1952, page 1609:

"Mr. MURRAY. I am not disagreeing with you"—this is Mr. Gall, to whom he is addressing himself.

"I am not disagreeing with you as to what the position of the Board should be with respect to those matters."

This discussion was on the union shop.

"But I am trying to get clear in my own mind the position of the industry here that the Board should not or must not assume jurisdiction over this matter.

"Mr. GALL. It has jurisdiction over this matter.

"Mr. MURRAY. All right."

Mr. Gall is counsel for Youngstown Sheet & Tube.

I don't know that that adds anything, except that it gives you the reference to the record itself.

Senator MORSE. I think it adds a great deal, Mr. Feinsinger. I think it puts the companies in a position where they apparently waived any objection to the jurisdiction of the Board over the union-shop issue.

Mr. FEINSINGER. To make a recommendation on it?

Senator MORSE. To make a recommendation on it.

Mr. FEINSINGER. That is right.

Senator MORSE. In other words, I think it puts the industry in a position somewhat similar to the position of the parties in a private arbitration, where they get into a dispute over the nature of the shop that shall be operated by the employer, and they come to an arbitrator, and they say, "We want you to decide for us on the basis of the record we make before you, whether we should or should not have a union shop.

As I said the other day, I think that if the parties want to make that clear submission of an issue to an arbitrator, and the arbitrator wants to assume jurisdiction over that issue, it is of their making. That, however, is a private matter between the parties and the arbitrator.

There is the second matter involved in this, on which you and I have a respectful difference of opinion as to a question of public policy, whether or not a Government board, even though the parties are willing to have the Government board decide it for them, should, as a matter of public policy,

take jurisdiction over a union-shop issue or say to the parties, "Now, listen. You take that one back to collective bargaining, because, as a matter of public policy, we are not going to rule, even though the evidence would clearly support the recommendation, that we think you ought to adopt a union shop in your plant." You and I understand our honest difference of opinion over that matter, as a matter of public policy.

I just hold to the view that even if the parties say to a Government board, "Please decide this one for us," I think it is a mistake for the Government to put a Government sanction, and that is what it amounts to, on imposing a union shop upon the employers.

But there is certainly great merit to the argument against me on it. I recognize that. And you know that this just happens to go to a view of mine. I think that is one of the points that we ought to always kick back into collective bargaining and say, "Listen, we are not going to be your scapegoat on that one. If you are willing to have us decide it for you, you ought to be willing to spend the hours that it takes to iron it out between yourselves on your own evidence, or you ought to keep it away from us by going out and getting yourself a private arbitrator in no way connected with the Government to decide that one for you."

Now, that just happens to be a position on public policy that I take. But let me say, and I will be through with this, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Feinsinger, that I thoroughly understand the position in which the public members of this Board found themselves on this union-shop matter; and with the waiver of jurisdiction on the part of the steel industry, I do not think they have got a kick coming, as they are kicking in their advertisements. I do not think they have got a kick coming from the standpoint of their activity in this case, with the result that they got from waiving their jurisdiction. After all, they waived the jurisdiction. My criticism of it goes to the matter of governmental policy, and on that I have a respectful difference with the Board.

May I say this, Mr. Chairman, because the witness is now through with his testimony——

TESTIMONY GIVEN BY MR. PHILIP MURRAY ON UNION SHOP ISSUE BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, APRIL 23, 1952

Mr. MURRAY. These companies are not strangers to the union shop. They have agreed to the union shop with the United Mine Workers, with several maritime unions, with the Brotherhood of Carpenters, and even—as these contracts show—with the United Steelworkers of America. They have made these agreements without a strike or threat of a strike and they have done so as recently as November 1951. The great issue of principle which the steel companies are now attempting to pretend in this union shop dispute is a phony and a fraud. It is a smoke screen put up by the companies to hide the real issues.

Senator MORSE. Do you mind if I interrupt at this point, or would you prefer to finish reading all your comments?

Mr. MURRAY. No, I would be perfectly willing to stop.

Senator MORSE. In this last paragraph on page 14, where you talk about these union shop agreements with the United Mine Workers, and the Brotherhood of Carpenters and several other unions, you point out that "They have made these agreements without a strike or threat of a strike and they have done so as recently as November 1951." In each instance they have reached their agreements by collective bargaining, have they not, and not by way of a recommendation or decision of a Government agency?

Mr. MURRAY. I should say that I am not quite sure as to all of that, Senator MORSE. It may be that in some of the railroad situations, they negotiated contracts with our union as the result of the mediation of the union shop issue by the Railway Mediation Board.

Senator MORSE. Let me say I can understand and appreciate your point of view.

Mr. MURRAY. I think in the Mine Workers case, it came out of an arbitration proceeding.

Senator MORSE. I can appreciate and understand your position in regard to the attitude that these companies are taking toward the union shop as far as their emphasis on principle is concerned insofar as their previous commitments through collective bargaining negotiations to a union shop are concerned. But I point out most respectfully that irrespective of the attitude of these parties, we do have a public policy question, with which I find myself in disagreement with most of the union leaders of America, as you well know, as to whether or not the Government as such ought to take the position that as a result of governmental intervention in a case a union shop should be imposed upon an employer unless the parties by free collective bargaining can reach it by agreement. From a legislator's standpoint, from a Congressional standpoint, we just have to face that issue, as to whether or not it is sound public policy for the Government to accord to a board or commission in the absence of a voluntary agreement between the parties, in the absence of a free collective bargaining agreement between the parties, the power to say to any American employer, "You should apply in your plant a union shop."

Mr. Feinsinger before this committee the other day admitted, and he had no choice but to admit it, it seemed to me, in answer to a question I put to him, as to whether or not he did not think that when this Wage Stabilization Board recommended this union shop in this case, as far as the workers are concerned, they felt they won a decision for a union shop. I would feel that if I were a worker; I would feel that if I were you, head of the Steelworkers Union, I got a decision for a union shop. And that raises this question of public policy as to whether the Government, when you people cannot agree between yourselves, should in effect impose it on you. I think it is a mistake to look to the Government for that kind of a union benefit. I think if you cannot get it by free collective bargaining, you are going to hurt yourself in the long run by taking it from the Government.

I asked Mr. Feinsinger the other day on this question of jurisdiction to what extent there was a voluntary submission to the union-shop issue so that a finding might be made—I have not reached any conclusion on it yet because I have not studied the transcript—as to whether in this case what the parties in effect did is what parties sometimes do in voluntary arbitration; they come to an arbitrator and say, "We here and now make the union-shop issue an arbitrable issue, and we say to you, 'We want you to decide it for us on the basis of the record which we make before you, and we agree that your decision shall be final and binding on that issue.'"

I have always held that under those circumstances, a union shop might be granted by an arbitrator, when they make very clear to him that they are making him their judge, although I always say to the parties, "You are foolish to give that kind of jurisdiction to an arbitrator." But if you do, then he can render the decision.

Now, on the question of public policy, Mr. Murray, I think we have to get beyond the steel operators. I do not think you settle it by saying that their attitude, as a matter of principle, is an attitude of fraud and phoniness. It may be so, but that does not change the fact that we in the Congress have a great public-policy obligation, I think, to perform in determining whether or not, legislatively, we ought to countenance an agency of the Government granting a union-shop provision. I think you ought to get it by agreement, and not by Government mandate.

Now, take a crack at it. That is no news to you. You have heard me say that for years.

Mr. MURRAY. I know you and I are in perfect disagreement about that philosophy, and I want to express my point of view on this matter now.

You urge that there should be collective bargaining. All right. What do you do when you do not have any collective bargaining? What do you do when you cannot strike? What do you do when you do not exercise the right through the use of your economic strike as a result of collective bargaining? What do you do when the country interposes itself from the standpoint of either seizure or use of an injunction? What do you do when you are told that under no circumstances can you stop the production of steel? What do you do when you are completely frustrated every step you take in the field of collective bargaining? What are the people supposed to do under these circumstances? Five separate times in this particular situation, due to the urgency of our national needs here, the steelworkers, in response to requests from the President of the United States, have postponed strike action on these questions. What happens? Disagreement ensues. A strike is about to take place. The President says to the steelworkers' union, "You must not strike." An important decision has to be made by the steelworkers' union. True, it is thinking of Korea, true it is thinking of communism, true it is thinking of this world conflict, true it is thinking of the importance of the constant production of steel to meet the needs of our Nation and our allies. Hence, we have no collective bargaining. You cannot by any stretch of the imagination use your economic power. So what happens?

The President of the United States addresses a communication to the industry and one to the union, and he says, "Let us have no quarreling or bickering about this. Let us have no stoppage in the production of steel. The country needs steel. Whatever you are quarreling about, take it to the Wage Stabilization Board, and I can assure you that whatever your disputes may be that have been properly certified to the Board, they will be passed upon on the basis of their merit."

I started out by building the premise here upon which the Board assumed its jurisdiction. The jurisdiction of the Wage Stabilization Board did not come about as a result of a Presidential dictum, but rather a recommendation from the President's Advisory Board to him. He accepted their recommendation. All right. When the dispute went to the Wage Stabilization Board in this situation, all of it went. The dispute was not segregated. The President did not say, "You can take up for settlement with the Wage Stabilization Board a paragraph about military service, seniority, about incentives, about wages," but the President said, "You can take all of your dispute. It is a package. Take it there."

The companies received the same communication I received. I did not want to go to the Government. I like to bargain these issues out, even to the point of where disagreement ensues, exercising what I believe to be our God-given right to strike. But when inhibitions operate that definitely preclude the use of your economic power, and in the national interest you submit your dispute to an impartial tribunal, that is all you can do. So we did that, we did that under the rule, Senator MORSE. We had only one rule to govern us, and that was the code prescribed for the Government of the

Wage Stabilization Board's conduct by the regulations set up for it. And so we took all of our dispute over there.

The companies took the dispute over there. The union took its dispute over there. The companies disagreed with the union about the union shop before the Wage Stabilization Board, but they had a lengthy legal submission on the whole matter. They submitted their case to this court. The union submitted its case. The company said that they did not believe that the decision of the Board could be made mandatory on anything. That is true. But they added that any recommendation that the Board might make with respect to the union shop or any other matter would be sufficiently compelling to require the parties to negotiate an agreement upon its basis.

Now, I can understand, Senator MORSE, the very sincere and natural objections that you may have to things of this description being done where there has been collective bargaining. But in major industry that affects the national interest, particularly in the steel industry, naked experience is more realistic than any other kind of philosophy that either you or I may care to advance. We were confronted with the realities of life here, the facts of life. The fact then was that our organization in a state of complete desperation to meet the needs of the American people postponed its strike for a period of 99 days, and it did so voluntarily in the hope that agreement could be reached by collective bargaining. This is the 23d day of April. It is now 122 days since this dispute originated, and we have gone through that tortuous period of examination before a board, and when our union decided to go before this Board over here in the city of Washington to submit its case, it assumed terrific hazards, hazards because the lives and the health and the welfare of 2,000,000 people were directly involved, 850,000 of them actually employed in the industry.

What do you do under conditions such as this? Do you expose your organization to a national strike where the stoppage of the production of steel might endanger our national defense effort, or do you comport yourself to the wishes of your Government and its people, and take your case before a tribunal. That is what we did.

I have submitted irrefutable evidence here that is not susceptible to any type of successful contradiction, that at no stage of these proceedings did we have bargaining upon anything, including the union shop. It is true that at one stage of the proceedings in the city of Pittsburgh, while the negotiation committee was to meet with the United States Steel Co., Mr. Stephens said, "Well, if you want the union shop, how much are you prepared to give for it." The principle. That type of bartering. Principle. We took our case, it was the only thing we could do, and we took all of it, all of the matters that were certified legally, to the Wage Stabilization Board, and we left ourselves at the mercy of that Board. And the Board made its recommendations, and I swear to God that is above me in this room in this day, as I breathe and I live, I did not like the Wage Stabilization Board's recommendations. I expressed my very sincere displeasure about them, but I accepted them. And in accepting them, I compromised the position of 650,000 steelworkers in the national interest again, done in the national interest, done in the interest of our people.

Yes, the Wage Stabilization Board has made its recommendations on union shop and other matters. It has made its recommendations within the framework of its policies and the regulations established for the conduct of its affairs, and the steelworkers have accepted them. When we will even get them, or any part of them, I do not know.

We have a group of people, Senator MORSE, who are aroused. They are indignant; they are back home today. They have suffered their loss of their wage increases that should have been given them January 1, and they are suffering because their wage standards are lagging, lagging, lagging behind comparable industries all over the United States.

Senator MORSE. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MURRAY. I say to you frankly and candidly, Senator, whatever differences you and I may have, I know they are of the nature that is sincere. But I should point up for the information of the committee, appreciating the sincerity of your position in these matters, that we are in no position to collectively bargain with this industry. We have not been. I do not know how we can. The only bargaining that we have had has been the bargaining before the Wage Stabilization Board. That is the bargaining. We were thrust before the Wage Stabilization Board by our Government, perhaps rightfully so. I am not one of those citizens that take occasion to quarrel with my Government where there is a grave national interest involved in the matter. I am prepared to assume all of the hazards incident to the statements I make here this morning when I say to the millions of organized workers in the national CIO and the steelworkers, no matter what my individual responsibilities may be that run to the members that pay dues to these organizations, my prime interest is in my country, and were it not, I would not be before this Senate committee this afternoon, and I would not have been before a Wage Stabilization Board. I would not be arguing about this thing. So please believe me that we have taken recourse to everything that we could take recourse to under these circumstances to reach agreement with this industry.

Senator MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I want to say something for just a minute or two, because I do not think Mr. Murray asked any rhetorical questions. He and I do not carry on discussions on the basis of rhetorical questions.

Mr. MURRAY. No.

Senator MORSE. He is very sincere in his statement. I am glad he made his statement. I am glad to have it in the record. But I want to say very briefly what I think the matter of public policy in issue really is, and I recognize the position in which Mr. Murray, as the leader of a great union, finds himself in a time of emergency in regard to the various issues coming before the Board. But he asks me what would I do on such matters as this union shop issue, and I will tell him what I would do as a representative of the Government. It is no criticism of what the union has done. If I were Mr. Murray and I could get a board to assume jurisdiction over a union security matter, such as the union shop, and I could get the employers to submit to that jurisdiction and go to a decision on an agreement that whatever the recommendation of the board would be would be binding upon me, I would consider that I had not only served my union well, but I had won a great gain for the union.

But the point I want to stress is that I think Mr. Murray and his union and every other union is in exactly the same spot in this emergency that they were in during World War II, because I happen to hold to the point of view that I think the situation is just about as serious as World War II, in view of the developments on the international front. And therefore, as a matter of public policy, I think it is the duty of the Government when they place restraints upon a union and employer as far as locking out and striking is concerned—and those restraints are on these people today just as strongly as though we had a so-called national no-strike, no-lock-out agreement, or had a law that forbid strikes or lock-outs during the emergency—I think as Mr. Murray has said, the moral obligation is there to keep production going. But there are some basic questions of public policy that I do not think can be ignored in time of an emergency. My answer to his question what would I do if I were a member of a board, I would take the position that during the period of the emergency, I would not let an employer destroy a union, and I would not let a union take advantage of the emergency to get through the Government the type of shop it did not have before the emergency started. I would say for the duration, boys, that issue is out, unless you can reach that one by voluntary agreement. But we will follow a policy that will protect your status, and we will not let the employer destroy you.

I am inclined to think that if you were given protection on the economic front, if your wages and your hours were protected, if you get a fair decision from the Government on those, and your union status as it existed at the beginning of the emergency were protected, you would come through the emergency not with a weak union, but with a strong union.

Therefore, I would say, Mr. Murray, I would hold you, as far as the Government mandate is concerned, to exactly the kind of shop you had when you went into the emergency.

Mr. MURRAY. I want to point out a little inconsistency in what you say, Senator.

Senator MORSE. All right; let us hear it.

Mr. MURRAY. You were on the Board in 1942, when you gave the steelworkers maintenance of membership and union security, were you not?

Senator MORSE. I was. I fought for it.

Mr. MURRAY. There was a war on. There was a union security proposition before your Board at that time.

Senator MORSE. That is right.

Mr. MURRAY. It was a world war.

Senator MORSE. And we took the position——

Mr. MURRAY. And you took the position that the steelworkers should be given union security.

Senator MORSE. No, that you could not have a union shop, you could not have a closed shop, and the employer could not have an open shop; what we would try to do was to work out an agreement that would protect your security and union maintenance.

Mr. MURRAY. I think, Senator——

Senator MORSE. Union maintenance was the agreement. Nobody had to join a union.

Mr. MURRAY. In the most friendly fashion imaginable, I think you are a little inconsistent there.

Senator MORSE. Look at the facts. Did anybody have to join your union?

Mr. MURRAY. Well, of course, if a man joined a union, he had to stay.

Senator MORSE. We did not make anyone join the union.

Mr. MURRAY. You changed the status——

Senator MORSE. We told you——

Mr. MURRAY. Because you required under your rule at that time, Senator—let us be frank about it——

Senator MORSE. We told you what our policy would be.

Mr. MURRAY. I do not want to get into an argument.

Senator MORSE. We said you cannot have a union shop and you did not get one.

Mr. MURRAY. Wait a minute. All right, we did not, but you changed the status during the war. We had no maintenance of membership, Senator.

Senator MORSE. We protected your security because you could not strike.

Mr. MURRAY. Wait a minute. You know what you said. You said, "I am going to change your status, Mr. Murray, and give you a better form of union security because everybody that joins your union now has to

stay and stay put." We did not have that before.

Senator MORSE. If he decides to join.

Mr. MURRAY. Well, before that he did not have to, you see.

Senator MORSE. But that is the question of public policy we faced in protecting union status from open-shop drives by employers. It was a far cry from a union shop.

Mr. MURRAY. But you did make a declaration of public policy on that.

Senator MORSE. Sure we did make a declaration of public policy to not let the employer break you with an open shop, and not let you impose on the employer either a union or closed shop, and it is a public policy that stood the test.

Mr. MURRAY. Let me point this up, and I am not going to get into any argument, with Senator MORSE, of all people in the world.

Senator MORSE. We do not disagree on that.

Mr. MURRAY. At any rate, Senator, you and I are the type of people that like to comport ourselves to the rules of the game, do we not?

Senator MORSE. We insist on it.

Mr. MURRAY. We have a rule in this man's country. It is not the purpose, or I do not suppose that it is your purpose to make your change in rules retroactive, that is, your suggested change. For example, the rule of the game for the present is that the Board can rightfully assume jurisdiction over problems affecting union shop. You do not disagree with me about that?

Senator MORSE. No, we had that jurisdiction, too.

Mr. MURRAY. I know, but the Board has that jurisdiction.

Mr. GOLDBERG. You asserted it actually last time.

Mr. MURRAY. Wait a minute. They have that rule. That is the role we comport ourselves to. That is the kind of game we play now, everybody. Everybody has got to comport himself to the rules. So in comporting ourselves to these rules, we go to the Wage Board with these matters, and the Board under the rules exercise the right to assume jurisdiction.

Senator MORSE. I do not question that.

Mr. MURRAY. Then what is all the argument about?

Senator MORSE. I am raising the question, however, of the over-all public policy——

Mr. MURRAY. But you are not raising the question that affects the rule of the Wage Stabilization Board in this case.

Senator MORSE. I think they have jurisdiction over the union-shop issue. I do not question that. But I question the wisdom of coming forward with a policy that results in effect in having the Government impose a union shop, because I think it is publicly unacceptable.

Senator DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Senator from Oregon a question?

Senator MORSE. Surely.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, you may. We like to have a little diversion once in a while.

Mr. MURRAY. I will get a breath of fresh air now.

Senator DOUGLAS. I would like to ask the Senator from Oregon whether he would object to having the question as to whether or not the union shop should be put into effect submitted to an election of the workers involved; that is, the election not to give the union the right to propose the union shop, as was the original provision of the Taft-Hartley, but as to whether or not the union shop shall go into effect. So that if the vote was favorable, it would not be imposed by the Government. It would not necessarily result from collective bargaining——

Mr. MURRAY. We had that kind of an election, Senator. In the steel industry.

Senator MORSE. Of course, I think the answer to the question of the Senator from Illinois is that the question itself ignores one whole side of the public-policy feature, namely, the managerial side of the question. Do you want to put the vote to the employers, too, and if they both vote for it, then apply it?

Senator DOUGLAS. No. Then you get back into collective bargaining.

Senator MORSE. Surely; that is where I think you ought to have it.

Senator DOUGLAS. The issue as to whether or not an employer would bargain with the union was originally a matter of collective bargaining. The question as to whether or not certain labor practices should be outlawed was originally a matter of collective bargaining. By the Wagner Act these were made conditions antecedent prior to collective bargaining. The query that I am raising now is whether the question of the union shop, not the closed shop, might not be made a condition outside either Government arbitration or collective bargaining, as to the question whether the workers themselves wish it, subject to certain precautions so that it will not be a closed union, subject possibly to protection of individual members once they are in the union.

Senator MORSE. That would be balanced fairly only on condition that the employer was a party to an agreement to that kind of an election and said that if they vote for a union shop, we will put it in our plant.

Senator HUMPHREY. I want to get my interpretation of this, because this is not something new before this committee. I generally agree with my able and distinguished colleague and friend from Oregon, Senator MORSE, but in this issue I was prone to disagree long before he presented this argument. We have discussed this before. Senator MORSE, along with the rest of us, is a member of the committee which published the report which had only one dissent, the individual views of Mr. TAFT, which are here in this report, and I want to read to him a sentence in reference——

Senator MORSE. Do not tell me you have a sleeper in there.

Senator HUMPHREY. There is no such thing as a sleeper in the report from a committee on which the Senator from Oregon is a member. I guarantee you that. It is impossible. He knows every word. This report is the result of a series of hearings before a Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations when we had Mr. Wilson in, Dr. Taylor, Eric Johnston, Dr. Fleming, and other individuals that were concerned with the decision which had been arrived or the recommendation which had been arrived at by the Mobilization Advisory Committee, and its recommendation to the President. We went into the dispute powers of the Wage Stabilization Board, its economic and its noneconomic aspects or functions. I quote:

"Another point at issue was whether the Board should handle noneconomic disputes, and in the case of the chamber of commerce's position, as expressed at our hearings, the handling of economic disputes which could not require action by the Wage Stabilization Board under its wage regulations. In our judgment, the realities of collective bargaining are such that it would be unrealistic to isolate economic from noneconomic disputes as appropriate subjects of Wage Stabilization Board handling. When the union and management bargain, they bargain on a package basis, which includes both economic and noneconomic matters."

Now, I also recall that in the hearings on this there was considerable discussion, and we discussed the so-called package aspect of the presentation of the grievances to the Wage Stabilization Board. As I see it, in this case, the issue as to whether or not the union shop or maintenance of membership or senority, whatever the issue may be, that issue as to whether the Wage Stabilization Board had powers to act in that field has already been settled. It was settled by the Executive order. It was settled by the fact that the Lucas amendment in the House of Representatives was defeated. It was settled by the fact that a similar amendment which was proposed in the Senate was not called up for debate or action because of the defeat in the House. It is clear public policy that the Wage Stabilization Board was to have both economic and noneconomic dispute functions and powers.

Now, the President certifies this dispute to the Wage Stabilization Board. What is the dispute? Let us assume that there was only one thing that was in disagreement. Let us assume you had agreed on wages. Let us assume you had agreed on differential pay, premium pay, incentives. Let us assume that you had agreed on everything but the No. 1 issue which threatened the public security because of the cessation of steel production was the union shop. Let us assume that was the only issue.

Now, I ask my friend from Oregon, if the only issue was the union-shop issue, and yet that was a big enough issue to compel a stoppage of work under the Executive order, under the interpretation of public policy from that Executive order, what would the Wage Stabilization Board do if you did not want a strike? Let us assume that this was the only issue and it easily could be. There have been strikes over less than a union-shop issue. In other words, is the union shop to be ignored?

Senator MORSE. I can give you a very brief reply.

Senator HUMPHREY. Good.

Senator MORSE. First, this paragraph I recall in the report. I agree with that paragraph. It is not my position on the union-shop issue that a board should not take jurisdiction over the so-called noneconomic issues. Contrary, they have to take jurisdiction over noneconomic issues as well as economic issues. The War Labor Board had such jurisdiction, too. We could have adopted a policy of closed shop and union shop. But we adopted a policy which pointed out that it would be very unfair to take advantage of an emergency situation in which employers were not free to lock-out and workers were not free to strike, and they certainly had a moral obligation to do neither, to then impose upon them a kind of employer-worker arrangement that certainly I think ought to be limited entirely to collective bargaining.

Senator HUMPHREY. I understand and appreciate that point of view.

Senator MORSE. My second point is that all I am saying is that as a matter of public policy in an emergency, I do not think the Government should say to the parties, "This closed or union shop you must accept."

Now, your hypothetical: Suppose you got a situation in which you are going to have a strike unless the Government yields to a demand for a union shop, and suppose you accept my other premise, that as a matter of public policy, it is not sound for the Government to impose it upon the employer. Then, believe me, I would use all the force of Government possible to stop that strike, if I adopted the policy that it was not in the interest of public policy to grant a union shop. I think Phil Murray and his union will be so much stronger if they get their union shop eventually by collective bargaining than by way of this Government decision that I am going to continue to say I think as a matter of public policy they should not get it by Government order.

Senator HUMPHREY. Let me say to the Senator from Oregon that if one is willing to accept his assumptions, if one is willing to accept the predicated assumptions he has, then, of course, you come out to the logic of his conclusion. But the simple fact of the matter is that the Wage Stabilization Board, in accepting and being given power to handle

disputes, both economic and noneconomic, did not have any proviso. It did not say provided that you do not talk about union shop, provided that you do not talk about seniority. It was an open-end agreement, so to speak, or an open-end grant of power to the Wage Stabilization Board.

Now, I want to say this in deference to the Senator, that he is not speaking about what the realities are. He is saying if he had his way, if he could have drawn up the Executive order, that he would not have permitted this to happen, and I think that is a plausible argument. I am not denying that. But the fact of the matter is, Senator, you did not have your way. I did not have my way. What actually happened is that the advisory board recommended to the President, the President sent down an Executive order, that Executive order was debated in the Congress, in the Lucas amendment in the House. It was defeated and withdrawn in the Senate of the United States, so public policy has been established. That is my position.

Now, I want to say further, maintenance of membership in 1942 was a new type of union security handed down by the War Labor Board, and it was as big an advance in 1942 as union shop is in 1952, which has been agreed to by the Congress of the United States, even in the Taft-Hartley law, where you have certain provisions for the union shop.

Senator MORSE. My dear Senator, when you protect the status quo, you are not adopting a new policy. You are just maintaining a status quo.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1505, Senate bill 3086.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3086) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3086), to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded, and that further proceedings in connection with the call of the roll be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], I send to the desk an amendment to cut the Mutual Security Act of 1951 by $7,000,000,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator from Idaho offering the amendment?

Mr. WELKER. I offer the amendment, to be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator from Idaho actually offering the amendment, to be pending; or is he merely presenting the amendment, to have it printed and to lie on the table?

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed, and be considered as the pending question.

The amendment offered by Mr. WELKER, for himself and other Senators, is as follows:

On page 3, line 2, strike out "$3,620,317,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,095,634,000."

On page 3, line 15, strike out "$1,588,922,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,358,644,000."

On page 4, lines 9 and 10, strike out "$529,614,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$452,858,000."

On page 4, line 20, strike out "$48,038,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$41,076,000."

On page 5, line 4, strike out "$56,772,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$48,544,000."

On page 5, line 7, strike out "$66,380,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$56,760,000."

On page 5, line 20, strike out "$533,859,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$456,488,000."

On page 6, line 5, strike out "$356,354,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$304,708,000."

On page 8, line 2, strike out "$54,501,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$46,602,000."

On page 8, line 4, strike out "$19,215,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$16,430,000."

On page 10 line 9, strike out "$8,734,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$7,468,000."

On page 10, line 25, strike out "$2,446,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,092,000."

On page 14 line 18, strike out "$14,848,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$12,696,000."

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], I now submit an amendment cutting the Mutual Security Act of 1951 in the sum of $500,000,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. At this time, that amendment can only be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. WELKER. I so understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That will be done.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, unless some Senator wishes to speak at this time, I am about to suggest a recess.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I canceled engagements in my home State for today and tomorrow because I believed the veracity of the majority leader to be unchallengeable. However, I understand that now, at 12:35 p. m., on Friday, it is proposed that the Senate take a recess until Monday. Is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; that is our program. We had before us, for consideration today, the housing bill, which we were informed would require 1 or 2 days of debate before it could be passed. However, that bill was disposed of in less than 30 minutes.

Now, the mutual-security bill has been made the unfinished business, but there does not seem to be present any Senator who wishes to speak on the bill at this time.

Thus, it would seem that the only thing for us to do now would be to take a recess.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Why do we not proceed to vote on the bill?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The original schedule was to have the mutual-security bill considered today, but, on the importunities of the Senator from Arizona, the majority leader, and other Senators, we agreed not to have that bill come before the Senate until Monday, because it was desired to have the Senate consider, first, the housing bill.

Now, because the housing bill has unexpectedly been passed in a short time, whereas it was believed that today would be spent in windjamming, some Senators desire, contrary to agreement to proceed with the consideration of the mutual-security bill.

I have notified many members of the Foreign Relations Committee and other Senators that the mutual-security bill would not be taken up until Monday. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who is a very strong advocate of the bill as it now stands, has made, upon those assurances, an appointment to speak in New Jersey today. Therefore he cannot be here today, inasmuch as he will be in New Jersey.

So, Mr. President, I insist on standing by the original agreement, namely, that on Monday we proceed with the mutual-security bill.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I think other Senators have a right to insist that we follow the schedule originally announced by the majority leader, which was not only that we would have evening sessions this week, but also that we would be in session on Saturday. Is not that what the majority leader announced?

Mr. McFARLAND. Originally I did give notice in regard to a Saturday session, but I qualified it by saying, "If we do not finish the immigration bill before then." Under those circumstances, inasmuch as the announcement was qualified in that way, some Senators now object to having a Saturday session.

It was thought that the defense housing bill could be disposed of today, but that it would require some time. I first said the Senate would meet at 10 o'clock today. However, Senators expressed the opinion that the defense housing bill could be passed easily within half a day.

So the Senate met at 12 o'clock. Instead of requiring a half day, the bill was disposed of within a few minutes. I gave notice that the disposition of the defense housing bill would be followed by consideration of the mutual security bill. Senators have not expected that a vote would be taken upon that bill today; but I should have liked very much to have speeches or statements made today on it. I cannot always know, nor can any other Senator, just how long it will take to consider and dispose of a bill. There is other proposed legislation which I should be happy to have the Senate proceed with, except that it is customary to give advance notice when measures are to be taken up.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is it not true that, 2 weeks ago, when the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] made a motion to refer the mutual security bill to the Armed Services Committee, the majority leader and other Senators criticized, if they did not condemn, those who supported the motion, charging that it would cause unnecessary delay in the consideration of this important measure? Is that not true?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is true; and it did necessarily delay it. It has also delayed the work of the Senate. Had I known, or had there been any way in the world for me to know, that the defense housing bill would require not more than 30 minutes, we would now be considering the mutual security bill, which has been made the unfinished business. If any Senator desires to speak on it, I shall be glad to have him do so. But I repeat, it is impossible for me to know in advance how much time will be required for the consideration and disposition of a bill. It was stated that it would probably take 2 days to consider and dispose of the defense housing bill.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. If Senators who a few weeks ago supported the motion to refer the Mutual Security Act were necessarily delaying action on that vital measure, is it not true that those who today take the position that we can wait until Monday to proceed with the consideration of the pending bill are likewise necessarily delaying its consideration?

Mr. McFARLAND. No, Mr. President. The pending bill is in a different situation. The House is presently considering similar legislation, and quite a number of Senators wanted to wait until the House had acted on it. The House, I presume, will dispose of its bill on the same subject today. That makes the situation altogether different than would ordinarily be the case.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. What is there that can be done to better advantage on Monday or Tuesday than today and tomorrow?

Mr. McFARLAND. Oh, I agree with my distinguished friend that the Senate should be working today.

Mr. DWORSHAK. And also tomorrow, as the majority leader advised us. That notice has resulted in the cancellation of numerous engagements on the part of those of us who have very rare opportunities to return to our respective States, some of which are located 2,500 miles away from Washington. It is unfair to have notice given us that the Senate would be in session Friday, Friday evening, and Saturday, and then to change the entire program.

Mr. McFARLAND. I may say to the Senator from Idaho that the notice which was given in regard to a session on Saturday was not definite. Had it been a definite notice, the Senate would hold a session on Saturday. However, the notice in regard to a Saturday session was qualified. We were to meet on Saturday, if in the meantime we had not disposed of the immigration bill. Possibly the Senator from Idaho knows of a better way of obtaining the presence of Senators on the floor than I have been able to discover, but I venture to say he would find it very difficult to obtain a quorum in the Senate today.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I am merely contending that to change the program now is unfair to Members of the Senate who canceled engagements in their home States in order to be present for the consideration of important business in the Senate. If we are to make a practice of failing to adhere to announced programs, if we not only change a program with respect to a session on Saturday, but also change an announced program for Friday, by sitting not longer than 30 or 40 minutes, then I ask in all sincerity, how shall we be able to rely hereafter upon programs announced by the majority leader? When may we be sure that we are free to make engagements without a probability of having to cancel them later? Can the majority leader advise us in that regard?

Mr. McFARLAND. As the majority leader is able to rely upon Senators, just as the Senator from Idaho may rely upon the majority leader.

Mr. President, I resent any inference that the Senator from Idaho cannot rely upon announcements made by the majority leader, merely because we have taken up a bill and have disposed of it sooner than had been expected. Possibly the distinguished Senator from Idaho would still like to speak on the defense-housing bill, and take all day on it. If so, I should be willing to have him do so.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I had no intention of casting any reflection upon the integrity or veracity of the majority leader. I was merely trying to assist him in adhering to a rigid schedule designed to expedite the transaction of the business of the Senate, in order that Congress might adjourn before Christmas.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from Idaho has been most helpful in that regard. I may say that if every other Senator were as cooperative as the Senator from Idaho has been, Congress would be able to adjourn soon. I understand his position. Like certain other Senators, he lives a long way from Washington. Some Senators do not live far away, and when Friday afternoon comes they disappear. If I could have my way about it, I should like at this time to proceed with the consideration of the pending bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The majority leader will recall that before the recess was taken yesterday the junior Senator from Virginia said that the defense housing bill was in his opinion a conservative bill, that our committee were virtually unanimous in reporting it, and that the Senator from Virginia anticipated neither extended debate nor the offering of many amendments to the bill today. Everyone who was present when the Senate recessed last evening, or who has had the opportunity of consulting the program as it appears today in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, knows that the majority leader had announced that the mutual security bill would follow disposition of the defense housing bill. I feel that the majority leader is eminently correct in his insistence that we proceed with the consideration of that proposed legislation today.

The majority leader indicated tentatively that, if the consideration of the immigration bill were unduly delayed, there might be a session on Saturday.

However, following the disposition of the immigration bill, he indicated that the Senate would not be in session on Saturday, but that we would today proceed with the consideration of the Mutual Security Act of 1952. I think he is very right in insisting that that program be followed.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon, before the Senate recessed, I expressed the hope that the Senate would make good progress in the consideration of the mutual security bill today, provided the defense housing bill was passed in the meantime. I knew that certain Senators did not desire to speak today on the mutual security bill; and, incidentally, I did not think we would reach a vote on that bill on Saturday. Of course, Mr. President, if those who are in charge of legislation do not want to go forward, I have no way of compelling them to do so. That is all there is to it.

JET TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, last week I had the honor of testifying before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with regard to my bill S. 2344, to provide for the payment of a construction differential subsidy to American flag international air carriers. In the course of my testimony, I took occasion to express my views upon the attitude of the Air Force, so far as their attitude was ascertainable, with respect to the development of jet transport aircraft for civil aviation.

From the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, I have received a letter which I think will prove of substantial interest to many of my colleagues. Therefore, I now ask unanimous consent that this letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, May 16, 1952.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: I have carefully noted your testimony appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 14, which you gave before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the development of jet transport aircraft, and I am writing to you to clarify the Air Force position in this regard.

The Air Force has long recognized the necessity for the United States to retain its position of leadership in civil aviation, and has consistently supported efforts to achieve such leadership. Our position has been that the Department of Defense should cooperate in the development of jet transport aircraft for civil aviation in a manner and to the extent consistent with its overall responsibilities. Such development should not, of course, interfere with existing defense programs, nor involve Department of Defense funds.

It is my understanding that the position of the Department of Defense is that it generally favors adequate prototype jet transport development at any time that it can be carried on without interfering with the critically important military aviation program.

Assuming that such interference is avoidable under existing circumstances, it is my personal belief that steps looking toward the development of a suitable jet transport for civil aviation could be initiated at this time.

Sincerely yours,

R. L. GILPATRIC,
Acting Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the important thing in this letter is the statement that the Department of Defense takes the position of favoring the development of prototype jet transport aircraft; and that the Acting Secretary of the Air Force believes that steps looking toward the development of a suitable jet transport for civil aviation could be initiated at this time.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 8 OF THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT OF 1930

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to serve notice that I am interested in a bill which I shall ask to have considered by the Senate after the unfinished business has been concluded, or as soon thereafter as the majority leader will permit it to be taken up. I refer to Calendar No. 1408, Senate bill 2968, to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended. It is a bill sponsored by the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF]. It was reported unanimously by the Committee on Postoffice and Civil Service. When it was reached on the last call of the calendar, some Senator objected, and it was stated at that time that we should give the bill a little further study than could be afforded in 5 minutes, to which I agreed. But I believe we can consider and dispose of the bill in 30 minutes at any time the majority leader thinks it can be brought up for consideration.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is it not a bill that will increase tremendously the cost of the Retirement Act?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It will increase the cost approximately $60,000,000 over a term of years.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. The bill would not require any new appropriation; the money would come out of the funds set aside by the civil-service workers. They have a fund of $4,500,000,000. The provisions of the bill are to apply for a period of 2 years or until a commission is established to decide whether such funds can be used in the future.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is provided that if the cost of living drops below what it was in April 1948 the increase is automatically cut off.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say to the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Florida that I listened this morning, on the Appropriations Committee, to testimony concerning the civil service retirement fund; and I have read something about it. According to the information I received, it must be watched carefully, because there is apprehension on the part of many persons who are contributing to civil-service retirement as to what may happen to the integrity of the fund if it is not safeguarded. I can think of no more disillusioning thing that could happen to retired civil-service employees than to have the fund dissipated. While the bill may be a very fine bill, and for aught I I know, it is, I do think it should be carefully considered. I should want to know more about it than I know today.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We have done for railroad men practically the same thing the bill provides, and it has been done for the military.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to substantiate what the Senator from New Hampshire has said. The House appropriated $321,000,000 which is substantially under the amount which will have to be paid out if interest is to be included. Actually, Mr. Ramspeck estimates that $321,709,000 will be the required cash disbursement from the fund this year. The House appropriated only $321,000,000; the Senate subcommittee this morning voted to restore $709,000 to bring the amount up to the actual cash disbursement.

If I correctly understand the bill, it would add approximately $62,000,000. We have not appropriated enough money; I think what the Senator wants is perfectly proper, but I believe we should consider the bill very carefully in view of what the House has done with relation to the appropriation this year.

I ask the Senator from New Hampshire if I have correctly stated the situation.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator from Massachusetts made a correct statement. The point I want to make is that it would be a cruel disillusionment if we should allow the integrity of the fund to be impaired. The Senate committee had to add to the amount appropriated by the House in order to bring it up sufficiently to meet the payments this year. Therefore, while the objective sought is ideal, I think, nevertheless, because of the jeopardy of the fund, I should like to have the bill looked over very carefully.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no request pending before the Senate in regard to the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am not asking at the present time that the bill be considered, but I serve notice on the Senate that I want it taken up and discussed at an early date. We fully realize that the Government will have to pay into the fund sums in the future as in the past, and probably a little bit more; but in large part the fund is provided by Government workers. So far as the workers are concerned, they are not on social security. Some persons are receiving more out of social security, into which they pay 1½ percent, than these Government workers who pay 6 percent are getting. That is the situation which is developing. I feel that every cent we pay into the fund is well spent, because the workers themselves are matching the Government contribution to a much greater extent than is being done by those under the social security.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am not questioning what the Senator is attempting to do. As I said to the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Florida, for aught I know at the moment, probably they are fully justified in proposing this amendment to the law. The only thing I wish to emphasize is that the integrity of the civil-service fund, about which we have just heard testimony in the Appropriations Committee, must be preserved. I know it is a burden upon the Government from year to year. I know the House did not appropriate sufficient money to keep it in balance this year, and the Senate might have to even the amount.

For these reasons, when the bill comes before the Senate, I hope the distinguished Senator from Florida, who reported it, and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, who is chairman of the committee, will have available all the facts and figures so that we can lay the cards on the table, consider all the circumstances, and know what we are doing.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is what we want to do.

Mr. SMATHERS. I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire that we

held hearings on this bill on four separate days. We had before us the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and also the other two members of the Commission. We took testimony from both sides. We wish to maintain the integrity of the civil service fund as much as anyone else does. On the other hand, there is at the moment an inequity resulting to retired annuitants. The problem is rather complicated, and I do not think this is the time to debate it. However, we hope the majority leader will schedule the bill for an early date, so that we can debate it, bring out all the facts, and let the Senate pass upon it.

Mr. McFARLAND. If I had known that the Senate would have been free so early this afternoon, I would have given notice that the bill would be taken up this afternoon. But under the circumstances, that is not feasible.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 21, 1952, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 897. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thanos Mellos, Michel Mellos, and Hermine Fahnl; and

S. 2463. An act for the relief of Harvey T. Gracely.

REPORT OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 281)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, transmitting the annual report of the Civil Service Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951, which was read and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(For text of President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

PENSION TO CERTAIN VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 473)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, informing the Congress that he had approved the bill (H. R. 4387) to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to certain veterans and their dependents, and the bill (H. R. 4394) to provide certain increases in the monthly rates of compensation and pension payable to veterans and their dependents, and for other purposes, which was read and referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For text of President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are in order. If there be none, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

GOVERNOR, CANAL ZONE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. John States Seybold, United States Army, to be Governor of the Canal Zone.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

IN THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

ARMED SERVICES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations for promotion or original appointment of approximately 3,200 officers in the armed services.

The highest rank to which any of these officers is being promoted is the grade of major in the Army and lieutenant—junior grade—in the Navy. These nominations have been before the Committee on Armed Services for several days, and no objections have been received to the promotions or appointments of any individuals on the lists. The report of the committee is unanimous.

In order to save the expense of printing, in the Executive Calendar, all the names, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed and the President notified.

Mr. President, ordinarily the names would have to lie over 1 day after being reported to the Senate. However, the names having already been published when the nominations were received, they have been before all Members of the Senate and have been before the committee for more than a week. In order to save the $600 or $800 which would have to be expended to print all 3,200 names in the executive calendar, I ask that the usual period of layover be dispensed with, and that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

The President will be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

VICE ADM. CHARLES T. JOY, UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish briefly to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that Vice Adm. Charles T. Joy, United States Navy, whose nomination to be Superintendent of the United States Naval Academy has been confirmed today, is the Admiral Joy representing the United Nations, who has been conducting the truce negotiations in Korea for so long. I am sure a word of appreciation is in order for his long patience, his endurance, and the very fine manner in which he has carried on representing the humanities of the United Nations.

I thought it appropriate to call his special assignment to the attention of the Senate. He will soon be returning to become Superintendent of the United States Naval Academy, where I am sure he will continue his distinguished career in the naval service with credit to himself.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon next Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess to Monday, May 26, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 23 (legislative day of May 12), 1952:

IN THE NAVY

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and Supply Corps as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Rosemarie S. Armstrong	Dolores H. Henry
Marion L. Baird	Katherine V. Iams
Emily C. Bittner	Marjorie H. Kaff
Dorothy A. Borbidge	Elizabeth A. McClean
Margaret L. Boyce	Catherine J. Miles
Claire M. Clark	Eleanor A. Ovitt
Betty M. Corredera	Elizabeth A. Read
Dorothy J. Darr	Ada Lou Reed
Barbara J. Dobson	Susan K. Reed
Nancy A. Dutton	Marjorie L. Richardson
Ludean S. Earnest	Jeanne M. Schrumpf
Margaret M. Fitzgerald	Virginia D. Smith
Gloria J. Folger	Audrey R. Speckman
Leona J. Fox	Allyn R. Thompson
Jimmie R. Fralic	Alice J. Wardenga
Dorothy H. Funk	Joan E. Zook
Mary A. Hawbolt	

SUPPLY CORPS

Debbie P. Belka	Elizabeth B. McQuiston
Alys G. Dauchess	Patricia E. Schulze
Betty J. Emery	
Ruth D. Forman	

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 23 (legislative day of May 12), 1952:

GOVERNOR, CANAL ZONE

Brig. Gen. John States Seybold, United States Army, to be Governor of the Canal Zone.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Charles T. Joy, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Superintendent, United States Naval Academy.

Vice Adm. Robert P. Briscoe, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Naval Forces, Far East.

Rear Adm. Ralph A. Ofstie, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

Capt. Ira H. Nunn, United States Navy, to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations of the following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States:

Maj. Richard deForest Cleverly, O21862.
Maj. Richard Farris Ludeman, O22233.
Capt. John Baker, O24704.
Capt. Frank Ovid Hamilton, O24532.
Capt. Robert Francis Maguire, O37528.
Capt. John TeSelle, O50055.

The nominations of John Edward Aber et al., for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 16, 1952, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Maj. Richard deForest Cleverly, which appears on page 5337, and ending with the name of Margaret Mary Shea, which appears on page 5343.

The nominations of Aloysius F. Bertrand et al., for appointment in the Regular Army, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 16, 1952, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Aloysius F. Bertrand, which appears on page 5335, and ending with the name of Amos D. Glad, which is shown on page 5337.

IN THE NAVY

The nominations of John F. Hardesty et al., for appointment in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 15, 1952, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of John F. Hardesty, which is shown on page 5242, and ending with the name of Samuel F. Leader, which is shown on page 5243.

The nominations of Craig B. Aalyson et al., for appointment in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 12, 1952, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Craig B. Aalyson, which is shown on page 5040, and ending with the name of Marjorie Wilson, which is shown on page 5042.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 23, 1952

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Edward Gardiner Latch, D. D., pastor, Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, Our Father, who art man's rock of refuge in every age and whose creative spirit dost ever summon us to new frontiers of thought and action—we pause in Thy presence to acknowledge our dependence upon Thee and to offer unto Thee the devotion of our hearts.

We pray that we, with all the people of our country, may be open to the leadership of Thy spirit. As man by his scientific inventions has made the world into one neighborhood, grant that he by his spiritual cooperation may make the world into one brotherhood.

Lay Thou Thy hand in blessing upon each one of us. Give us grace to keep Thy commandments, make us gentle and honest, men and women of good understanding and genuine sympathy, a company of Thy children seeking first of all Thy will for us and for our Nation.

Help us to think clearly, to speak kindly, to do justly and to live worthily. We ask these blessings in the name of Jesus Christ, who is the hope of our world. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

REVISION OF LAWS RELATING TO IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND NATIONALITY

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5678) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WALTER, CHELF, WILSON of Texas, DONOHUE, GRAHAM, Miss THOMPSON of Michigan, and Mr. CASE.

CHEESE POLICY

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the restrictions on imports of cheese provided for in section 104 of the Defense Production Act are not in accord with the defense needs of the United States. Our entire defense program is based on strengthening our allies and other friendly countries so that they can withstand aggression from the Soviet Union and its satellites and lessen the current defense burden borne by the American taxpayer.

Yet, in the face of this fact, and in the very law which is supposed to strengthen our own defense production, we have inserted an amendment, a joker, which actually weakens our allies and will increase the need for defense outlays on the part of our own taxpayers.

Our allies urgently need the dollars they were obtaining through their sales of cheese to this country. They need the dollars to purchase raw materials on the world market for their own defense production. They need the dollars also in order to buy food and other products necessary to prevent civilian discontent from becoming a serious political problem. Our alliance cannot exist on empty bellies and substandard living conditions. The amount of dollars lost to our allies and other friendly countries as a result of the cheese restriction is not large, in itself, but the trend which the restrictions portend and their basic irrationality cause anxiety to our friends and feed the fires of distrust and suspicion about our ultimate objectives. Therefore I oppose section 104 of the Defense Production Act and strongly believe that it should be deleted from the 1952 version of the act.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WIDNALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 83]

Aandahl	Eaton	Nelson
Albert	Engle	O'Toole
Allen, Ill.	Gamble	Patterson
Armstrong	Hale	Poulson
Beall	Hall, Leonard W.	Powell
Beckworth	Hart	Reams
Blatnik	Havenner	Redden
Bonner	Hays, Ohio	Sabath
Bosone	Hébert	St. George
Boykin	Herlong	Sasscer
Brambiett	Herter	Scott, Hardie
Bray	Hoeven	Scudder
Buffett	Holifield	Secrest
Carlyle	Hunter	Sheppard
Celler	Irving	Stigler
Chatham	Jackson, Calif.	Stockman
Cooley	Johnson	Taber
Cox	Jones, Hamilton C.	Tackett
Cunningham	Kearney	Talle
Dague	Kennedy	Teague
Dawson	Kerr	Vinson
Deane	King, Calif.	Welch
Dempsey	McGrath	Werdel
D'Ewart	McKinnon	Wheeler
Dingell	Miller, Calif.	Wickersham
Dondero	Morris	Wood, Ga.
Dorn	Moulder	Wood, Idaho
Doughton		
Doyle		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 347 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5678. An act to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. WILEY, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. JENNER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until June 15, 1952.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 52–21.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On May 16, 1952:

H. R. 4262. An act relating to the height of the building known as 2400 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; and

H. J. Res. 445. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim the 7-day period beginning May 18, 1952, as Olympic Week.

On May 19, 1952:

H. R. 5715. An act to increase certain pay and allowances for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

On May 21, 1952:

H. R. 1949. An act to retrocede to the State of Illinois jurisdiction over one hundred fifty-four and two-tenths acres of land used in connection with the Chain of Rocks Canal, Madison County, Ill.;

H. R. 2962. An act for the relief of Maude S. Burman;

H. R. 3401. An act to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system;

H. R. 4902. An act to permit the importation free of duty of racing shells to be used in connection with preparations for the 1952 Olympic Games;

H. R. 5998. An act to amend the excise tax on photographic apparatus;

H. R. 6863. An act to make provision for suitable accommodations for the Bureau of Customs and certain other Government services at El Paso, Tex., and for other purposes;

H. R. 7189. An act to amend the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which relate to machine guns and short-barreled firearms, so as to impose a tax on the making of sawed-off shotguns and to extend such provisions to Alaska and Hawaii, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 422. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State-Far East International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

On May 22, 1952:

H. R. 1499. An act to amend the act approved August 4, 1919, as amended, providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind; and

H. R. 5282. An act to amend section 2800 (a) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code.

RECORDS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON HOUSING

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resolution (S. Res. 316) from the Senate.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be, and it is hereby, respectfully requested to authorize and direct the file clerk of the House to grant permission to the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, or its counsel, to examine the records of the Joint Committee on Housing of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 649).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That in accordance with the request contained in Senate Resolution 316, Eighty-second Congress, the Clerk of the House shall direct the file clerk of the House to grant permission to the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, or its counsel, to examine the records of the Joint Committee on Housing of the Eightieth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMINISTRATION OF GRANTS FOR SLUM CLEARANCE

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2786) to amend section 106 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this is the bill which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate and passed unanimously by the Senate. It was reported unanimously by the Banking and Currency Committee of the House.

It provides that grants for slum clearance may be made as the work progresses. It is the same system that has been authorized in Federal road construction, and airport construction, and in the National Science Foundation. It will enable municipalities to proceed with these projects and effect an economy in the administration of this law.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 106 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949 is hereby amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (6); by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and by adding the following new paragraph:

"(8) make advance or progress payments on account of any capital grant contracted to be made pursuant to this title, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, or any other provisions of this title."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF MAY 26

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to ask the majority leader about the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday will be District day, and I have been informed that 12 bills will come up. If the gentleman wishes me to, I will list them, but I cannot guarantee they will be called up in the order in which they are presently listed:

S. 1342, detention of animals and autos until charges are paid.

S. 1533, designates a Floyd B. Olson Memorial Triangle.

S. 1822, amends juvenile court bill.

S. 2605, amends certain tax laws.

S. 2735, liens on automobiles.

S. 2736, index of mortgages, Recorder of Deeds.

S. 2871, amends section 548, Code of Laws, Recorder of Deeds.

H. R. 5768, amend Boxing Act.

H. R. 6811, increase gasoline tax.

H. R. 6537, employment of minors.

H. R. 6943, seniority rights, Fire Department.

H. R. 7253, conveyance of land to Columbia Hospital.

On Tuesday the bill, H. R. 7340, Federal Aid Road Act of 1952, will be called up for consideration.

On Wednesday and Thursday, House Joint Resolution 430, involving approval of the Puerto Rican Constitution, will be considered.

If a bill is reported out of the Committee on the Judiciary with reference to the extension of emergency statutory powers, that will be considered. I am putting it on the program. It may come up next week. I am announcing that so Members will be aware of the probability of it coming up next week.

Friday, being Memorial Day, there will be no session and, of course, that applies to Saturday also.

The usual reservation is made that any further program will be announced later and conference reports may be called up at any time.

In reference to the tidelands bill, I cannot give the House any information at this time except that if the bill is vetoed, and I have no knowledge that it will, it would have to be acted on by the Senate first.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That bill has been sent to the President?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

COMMUNICATION FROM HER MAJESTY QUEEN ELIZABETH II—LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter from the President of the United States, which was read:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 22, 1952.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am transmitting herewith a copy of a letter I have received from Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, asking me to convey to the Members of the House of Representatives her deep appreciation for their sentiments of sympathy and their tribute to the memory of His late Majesty.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

BUCKINGHAM PALACE, *May 7, 1952.*

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

MR. PRESIDENT: I have received your letter dated the 4th day of March, with which you sent to me the texts of resolutions directed respectively by the United States Senate to my governments in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and in the other countries of the Commonwealth and by the United States House of Representatives to my government in the United Kingdom.

In thanking you for your kindness in forwarding these resolutions and for the personal sympathy which you have expressed toward me in doing so, I request that you will be good enough to convey to the Senate and the House of Representatives my deep appreciation of the sentiments to which they have given expression and of their tributes to the memory of His late Majesty.

My government in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have already received the texts of these resolutions from His Excellency the Ambassador of the United States of America at my court, through whose good offices their thanks have been transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives.

I have communicated the text of the Senate resolution to my governments in the other countries of the Commonwealth and I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to you, Mr. President, the assurances of my invariable friendship and highest esteem.

Your sincere friend,

ELIZABETH R.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7005) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7005, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committe rose on yesterday the Clerk had read through section 3 of the committee amendment. Are there any further amendments to section 3?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in the course of discussing one of the amendments early yesterday, and earlier in the general debate a few days ago, I had a colloquy with one of my colleagues with reference to India when we were debating whether or not we were meeting with any success any place in the foreign policy of this Government and in the containment of or the fight against communism. Then last night I brought to the attention of the Committee the perilous situation as it exists today worldwide.

Mr. Chairman, I brought to your attention the fact that the negotiations in Kore.. are now at an absolute standstill and that the Communists are threatening additional aggression there. I mentioned that General Ridgway told the Senate his staff officers had advised him that the Russians are massing on the Chinese border.

I mentioned as well the delicacy of the negotiations with Western Germany at Bonn. Then, I brought to your attention the border warfare with the Portuguese in the Macao possession of China. Now I direct your attention to the additional fact that the Russians are exerting pressure once more on Iran by bringing to your acquaintance more of the same pattern.

With reference to India, Mr. Chairman, I want to read to you this article from New Delhi, India. It is dated May 22.

NEHRU POLICIES AGAINST REDS WIN APPROVAL

NEW DELHI, INDIA, May 22.—Parliament overwhelmingly approved the Government's anti-Communist policies today after Prime Minister Nehru lashed out against Red "bigots of this new religion."

The voice vote drowned out the objections of the 27-member Communist bloc.

India "will never pay the price the Soviet Union and China have paid to achieve progress," Nehru said. He described Communist slogans and doctrines as completely out of date.

This is additional evidence, Mr. Chairman, of the clearly developing success of our foreign policy, not only in the Far East but bit by bit and step by step on the entire perimeter of the Soviets throughout the world.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, West Point Academy has long afforded an education to the officers of the United States Army comparable to, if not exceeding, that of any other school of higher learning in this world. Americans everywhere take pride in the scholastic record of the Academy and in the accomplishments of the men who have been graduated therefrom. In and out of military life they have distinguished themselves in every field of enterprise.

Superficially, it does seem strange that, despite the law, the curricula, and the training afforded at West Point, the United States Department of the Air Force, which has no special training academy of its own comparable to Annapolis and West Point, could not this year obtain its quota out of the graduating class of 1952.

Primarily, I would say that the cause of the failure of West Point to meet its Air Force quota is directly due the fact that the graduates were taught little or nothing about the Air Force. Therefore, I might ask, how could they be expected to evaluate service to the Nation of the Air Force in terms of the things it had to offer them? General Dorn himself declared that "Training at West Point was geared more to the Army than to the Air Force."

What General Dorn did not point out as one of the possible reasons was that in the full 4-year curriculum now taught at West Point there is a mere 23 hours devoted to instructions with respect to the mission, the organization, and the techniques of aviation.

There is no question but that West Point is more geared to the Army than it is to the Air Force, inasmuch as West Point Academy has turned out probably the most skilled civil, electrical, and hydraulic engineers, as well as the finest Army leaders, in the world. The monumental accomplishments of the United States Army engineers are tributes to their West Point education. The great hydroelectric dams, the massive revetments on the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, and other flood-control projects, the highways which they have builded throughout the world, their conquests of the swamps at Panama, and the building of the locks on the Panama Canal itself are all monuments of triumph to the might of the United States Corps of Engineers.

West Point-trained men lead the world in the development of and the fighting with tanks, antitank artillery, fixed and mobile artillery pieces, huge long-range field guns, bazookas, hand grenades, bridge building, antitank artillery, antiaircraft artillery, and all other types of armament for offensive as well as defensive ground warfare.

No school in the world affords its pupils a greater education in preparing them for Signal Corps operations than does West Point. Skills in wired communications, telegraphy, telephony, coaxial and carrier cables, and lightweight circuits enabled our fighting forces, at the very fighting front in all theaters of World War II, to send as well as receive as many as 18 telephone messages over a single pair of telephone wires with no one voice or conversation impinging itself or interrupting any other.

In addition to extensive courses in logistics, the Academy curriculum covers the fields of mathematics, history, logic, rhetoric, literature, and languages, and is probably second to no other university course in the United States.

Personally, I cannot understand just what General Dorn actually meant when he stated that the Air Force officers at West Point are unimpressive, as compared with the Army officers. Both are graduates of the Academy. Did he mean that the Air Force officers do not have

the power to impress, the power to excite attention? Just what he actually meant, I do not know.

General Dorn further stated that "the Army officers at the Academy looked better, were more direct." By "looked better" did he mean Army officers delve deeper into subjects under study than do the Air Force officers, or did he mean that the Army officers are simply better looking? In other words, are Air Force officers uglier looking than are Army officers? If, perchance, that be the reason for the failure on the part of the Air Force to attract more volunteers from the 1952 graduating class at West Point, then the qualifications and criteria established by the Academy should be changed. They should specify that only physical attractive instructor personnel should be assigned to the Academy in the future.

Is it any wonder that when young West Point cadets visit various air bases they are unimpressed, that their visits created the impression that as young air officers there would be too much in mechanics and techniques to attract them?

Is it any wonder, therefore, that the West Point cadets at the completion of their courses select the infantry, the artillery, the engineers, the Signal Corps, or the armored services, rather than the United States Air Force? How could it be otherwise with but 23 hours of scholastic training in their entire 4-year course devoted to aviation subjects?

Every modern Air Force bomber, be it prop or jet driven, is in itself a virtual scientific laboratory flying at speeds upward of 500 or 600 miles an hour, 8 or 10 miles above the surface of the earth. There is hardly an art or a science known to man that has not been invoked in the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of the modern aircraft. Copper, tin, lead, zinc, steel, plastics of various composition, cotton, linen, ramie, silk, wood, various characteristics of electrical currents, circuits, communications, radio, radar, a veritable catalog of meters activated by alcohol, air, oil, gas, and a thousand and one other materials and gadgets are subject to the personal control of men who, at the same time, must be skilled in astronomy and navigation, the operation of radio, radar, and photography, and who sit at the stick and pilot the ship in battle high above the clouds.

Could any young man comprehend the problems of aviation and the opportunities open to them if their attention was scarcely directed to their consideration in their studies at the Academy? Certainly a pen or pencil slipped somewhere when General Dorn cited the second reason why West Point cadets did not volunteer for Air Force service when he stated:

> Cadets know more about the Army and, therefore, have more confidence in it.

No more persuasive evidence could be offered showing lack of scholastic training and education in aerodynamics afforded the West Point cadet than to have graduates state that "they had no confidence in the Air Force."

Mr. Chairman, remember that this is the Air Force in which the American people have a capital investment of billions of dollars.

Remember that this is the Air Force in which the American people have long had justifiable pride and upon which they depend in a large measure for the peace and security of this country.

Remember that this is the Air Force for which this very Congress appropriated billions, and that the words spoken in derogation thereof have been attributed by an Army spokesman to the young militarily trained men upon whom this Congress and the American people rely to administer and operate the affairs of the United States Air Force in the precarious years that lie ahead.

When certain graduates made statements that "if they chose the Air Force as a career that they would be too much in mechanics and techniques" they were on firm ground. No words could more appropriately express the minimum of training in the field of aviation afforded them at West Point than the realization on their part of their own incompetency to adequately enter upon Air Force duties. For any group of graduates, however, to state that the Air Force afforded "little or no opportunity for leadership in or out of combat" is entirely at variance with the facts and wholly indicative of their patent lack of instruction.

Certainly it is scientific knowledge, highly developed technical skills, and great physical courage that enable men to fly on wings of metal. To state that "aviation is devoid of opportunity for leadership" again shows how completely the West Point curricula and studies failed to impress upon the minds of its student body the tremendous importance of and opportunity afforded for service to this country and for leadership in its Air Force.

When a group, squadron, or flight commander leads his F–86 sabre jets up over the Yalu River in North Korea and encounters large forces of the Russian-Chinese-Communist MIG–15 jets, it is no horde or mass of pilots that win those air battles in the skies. It is altogether individual initiative, leadership, skill, intelligence, and superior training in tactics that have attained and maintained a kill ratio of eight Russian MIG–15's to one in favor of our F–86 pilots.

When a 20-year-old Air Force navigator leads a bomber formation into combat over an enemy target, who is there to gainsay the fact that he is not assuming and discharging a tremendous responsibility? Who is there who will deny the fact that the greatest leadership that can be demonstrated is exemplified by the men of the United States Air Force who stand on guard night and day to defend the 150,000,000 Americans from an attack by enemy planes and the catastrophe that would follow in the wake of such atomic attack?

Mr. Chairman, not alone is there tremendous opportunity for leadership in the air, but the Air Force has never failed to emphasize the need of a highly developed ground leadership in all ranks of service.

Air Force squadron commanders and all officers in the chain of command necessarily must have distinguished attributes of leadership in order to obtain the maximum efficiency from the men in the air—the maximum efficiency in the use of all our resources, the elimination of morale problems—as well as every other requirement that might make for the greatest efficiency and economy in the operation of our great air power.

One reason attributed for the failure to obtain the Air Force quota was that "cadets were unimpressed with the so-called Air Force glamor." We who know Gen. Curtis LeMay, commanding general of the Strategic Air Command, know that he is not the type of leader who puts any glamor-happy boy at the controls of the great intercontinental bombers, our B–36's. Equally well we know that when the Air Force commanders place a quarter-million-dollar jet fighter airplane in the hands of one single lone Air Force pilot, and send him streaking at 600 or 800 miles an hour from his home base on a combat mission, that that is a serious business to be entrusted only to qualified and capable pilots.

Mr. Chairman, I want you to vision with me the enormity of the task of taking West Point or Annapolis graduates, with all of their formal education, and training them in the science of aerodynamics. Not alone do they have to have extended instruction and training in the operations of high-frequency circuits and in all forms of electronics, in the operation of the air-to-ground and air-to-air radios, but also in radar, in all phases of air combat operations, in intelligence, psychological warfare, photography, weather, communication, airplane armament, maintenance, transportation, supply, installation engineering, airplane production procurement, finance, personnel, research and development, and a veritable catalog of other subjects, not one of which was ever touched upon in the military or naval academies.

Without further elaboration, it is only logical to conclude that the Air Force has a tremendous variety of career fields which are apparently and entirely unknown to West Point graduates, and in which they could be of inestimable service both to themselves and to their country.

Mr. Chairman, we in Congress who appoint cadets to both the Naval and Military Academies of the Nation know how ardently one boy might prefer to go to the Naval Academy, while another chooses the Army as his career.

I have made appointments of boys whose ambitions from childhood had been to get in one or the other Academy. Instinctively, some boys want to serve at sea, others want to become great engineers, others want to be commanders of tank squadrons, others choose artillery and other branches of the land or naval forces. It is to be expected that if and when they pass the examinations they will find themselves in the Academy of their choice.

It seems superfluous to point out to this body that the skills afforded at West Point in bridge building, in tank warfare, in the use of light and heavy artillery, in the ground maneuvers common to the infantry, in the use of bazookas, or in

ground communications are worth little or nothing to cadets who, upon graduation from West Point, become pilots, navigators, or bombardiers, in the United States Air Force.

What this Nation needs today, over and above all other things, in order to preserve the peace of this world and insure the defenses of our country against future attack are young men who are altogether skilled and specialized and expert in flying the heavens effectively on man-made wings.

This country needs a source of highly militarily air-minded manpower that can take up and in the future efficiently operate and maintain the United States Air Force with a minimum expenditure of the taxpayers' dollars. That end, Mr. Chairman, can only be achieved through the immediate establishment of a United States Academy of the Air.

The sum of $10,000,000 is needed in order to plan and design the academy and its necessary structures. This planning and designing is of itself a time-consuming job, but, of a certainty, it should be started at once.

Mr. Chairman, $10,000,000 is but a small per centum of the total appropriations made by us in this session of Congress. It is an amount equal to about what the executive department will disburse every 20 minutes of every night and day in the coming year.

Ten million dollars is almost an infinitesimal sum when measured against the appropriations that we will make for foreign aid. It is a small percentage of the vast sums that we are expending for researches in a half-dozen fields—and but a drop in the bucket as compared with the sums that we are spending for developing a newer and a better atom bomb.

In addition to the $10,000,000 needful and necessary for the planning and the designing of the new Air Force Academy—another $10,000,000 would enable the Air Force to start an interim academy in order to begin at once to train the future leaders of our Air Force in the years that will be consumed in the design and the construction of the permanent institution.

I would have you believe with me that the expenditure of this $20,000,000 would be returned to the Treasury Department a hundredfold in the eventual economies and savings in the operation of our Air Force that would be effected by the immediate passage of H. R. 4574 introduced into this House by the honored and respected chairman of the Armed Services Committee, our own beloved CARL VINSON.

Mr. Chairman, I know that this House is today economy-minded. I know that we have slashed and slashed every appropriation that has been brought to this floor. However, I think that the building of a separate Air Force Academy is one measure that would and should meet with the approval of the vast majority of the Members of this House. So let us proceed at once to the adoption and passage of H. R. 4574, looking toward the eventual establishment of a permanent Academy of the Air.

In order that all may acquaint themselves with the release made by any Army spokesman I am including as part of my remarks an article entitled "West Point Cadets List Reasons for Choosing Army Over Air Force," as written by Martin S. Hayden.

The article is as follows:

WEST POINT CADETS LIST REASONS FOR CHOOSING ARMY OVER AIR FORCE

(By Martin S. Hayden)

The reasons of 20 graduating West Point cadets for rejecting Air Force glamor and extra pay in favor of careers with thet lowly Infantry are revealed at the Pentagon in answer to charges that the new officers fear aerial combat.

The fact that the Air Force, for the first time time in history, failed to get its 25 percent quota from the 1952 West Point class was recently reported by some American writers as another facet of the "sit-down strike" by Air Force reservists unwilling to fly. It was subsequently grabbed up by a gloating Radio Moscow.

In answer, the Army revealed that, while passing up pilots' careers, the graduating cadets oversubscribed the quotas for both the infantry and for hazardous training with airborne troops. At the same time, Brig. Gen. Frank Dorn, of the Army Public Relations Division, released a memorandum to his superiors, relating explanations given by one cadet group for preferring the dirt of ground combat to the more glamorized life of a pilot.

REASONS LISTED

The 20 cadets had been brought to the Pentagon for an orientation course. After questioning them, General Dorn reported as follows their 11 reasons for rejecting the chance for pilot training and Air Force careers:

1. Air Force officers stationed at West Point were unimpressive. By comparison, the Army officers at the Academy looked better, were more direct, took more interest in cadets, and, in general, presented the look of leaders.

2. Training at West Point was geared more to the Army than the Air Force. Cadets know more about the Army and, therefore, have more confidence in it.

3. Visits to Air Force bases left cadets unimpressed and created the impression that as young officers they would be too much in mechanics and techniques, but would neither lead nor command men.

4. The Air Force offered little or no opportunity to lead men, either in combat or out of it.

5. The Army's foundation is leadership. This means that, as young officers, they would work with troops and lead men. Continual references were made to leadership and the very strong desires of the cadets to be leaders.

UNIMPRESSED BY GLAMOR

6. Cadets were unimpressed with so-called Air Force glamor and flying pay. The glamor was brushed aside as having no real meaning. The extra pay did not constitute a deciding motive.

7. The Army emphasized the individual, whereas the Air Force and Marine Corps emphasized the group or mass. Rather oddly, this was brought out in relation to the public information programs of the services where the Army's emphasis on the individual soldier was considered to mean a direct interest in the man as an individual.

8. The Army offers more opportunity for advanced education than the Air Force.

9. The Army offers more variety than the Air Force, not only in conventional branches, but in guided missiles, aviation, atomic weapons, airborne, armored, etc.

10. The Army offers better opportunities for promotion than the Air Force; this was a surprising statement but several cadets believed it to be so.

11. In the Air Force, if an officer is not a pilot, or if, for physical reasons, he goes off flying status, he has no chance for advancement or worth-while assignments.

NOT STARRY-EYED

The general's memo added that, "although no one said so, even after a little prodding on my part, I got the definite impression that most of the cadets felt they would be prouder to be in the Army than the Air Force.

"However," General Dorn added, "they were not starry-eyed about their ideas on this subject. All who had chosen the Army plainly indicated that the Army could do more for them, and that they could get more from the Army."

The statistics, as prepared by West Point authorities, show that 208 cadets from a graduating class of 528 showed some interest in pilot training and were given special physical examinations and 173 passed them. But, of this number, only 112 selected pilot training while 15 others, who had failed the extreme physical test, asked for Air Force ground assignment. The total—127 volunteers—was 4 short of the established Air Force quota.

OTHERS OVER QUOTA

By comparison the infantry, with a quota of 172, got 174 volunteers; the armored service got its full quota of 39; the artillery got 99 against a quota of 98, and the Signal Corps got 28 against a quota of 27. West Point assignments of junior officers to quartermaster, ordnance, and other noncombat arms are not made.

Pentagon records show that 117 of the graduates selecting infantry asked for airborne duty, as did 32 of the artillerymen, 15 of the engineers, and two of those seeking armored service. Of this total of 167 wanting either to parachute or glide into combat, it is estimated that there are training places for about 125 and airborne assignments for about 50.

A survey of the Academy selections showed that the top academic men in the class who have first preference as to assignment set the pattern for ground combat. Of the first 16 men in the class at the time selections were made, 4 chose infantry, 3 armor, 7 engineers, 1 artillery, and 1 Air Force.

The five hundred and twenty-eighth, and last man in the class, chose the Air Force.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 15, strike out lines 15 through 24.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment eliminates "not less than $25,000,000" to be handed over to the Spanish dictatorship of Franco, and in addition to the millions previously heaped on that regime of tyranny.

Actually, Spain apparently does not want American dollars. We have the word of the Spanish Ambassador in Portugal, one Nicolas Franco, for that.

Not long ago the London Daily Express quoted this mouthpiece of the dictator as saying, and I quote:

Spain's commercial position, her natural economic future, lies with Britain. Her need (that is, Spain's need) for sterling is far more imperative than her need for dollars.

This is enough, right here, for me to say with enthusiasm, "Let Britain have Spain and let Britain furnish the dole to that country from now on."

But wait. There is more to come from the Spanish Ambassador in Portugal.

After saying Spain is far more interested in sterling—the British pound—he says, and I quote again:

> Spain wants to see the pound strong again because she (Spain) cannot be and does not want to be dependent on the dollar.

As though this is not enough, the Spanish Ambassador declares:

> Europe, with its African possessions, could form a third world bloc for trade and defense. This would extend from Scandinavia to the Cape of Good Hope. Together with her empires she could develop immense economic and industrial resources. Such a bloc—

Now please get this—

> such a bloc would offset the possibility of either America or Russia doing anything without the consent of Europe.

So says the Spanish Ambassador in Portugal, Senor Nicolas Franco. I do not know whether he is related to Francisco Franco, the Spanish dictator, but I say he has given us plenty of additional reasons, other than degrading the American people by doing business with a dictator, to boot Spain out of this bill. My amendment will do exactly that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa because I think that Spain can form a very appropriate area in the defense of the free world against communism. As a matter of fact, I was responsible for including Spain in this particular bill for the first time, because it was my belief that this Congress had acted upon two previous occasions and that nothing had been done. This particular amendment under consideration, as I recall, was offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], and I do not know of any opposition within the committee to it.

I feel that we have a great deal to gain with the inclusion of Spain. I think also that not only can Spain be a bulwark in the Western European defense system but because of her cultural contacts she can strengthen the ties which bind this country, Latin America, and Spain that much more.

I am not talking about dictators because we are supporting dictators in other parts of the world, but I am talking about free, non-Communist countries. I believe that American assistance to Spain will be of great benefit to that country, and perhaps bring about a greater degree of freedom there. I sincerely hope that in view of the facts the committee will vote down this amendment and allow the retention of this amount in the way of funds for Spain.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman from Iowa has stated that Franco is not desirous of cooperation with the United States in the mutual security effort. Is it not true that just the other day over the news wires it was announced that the United States was reported making good progress in negotiating three aid agreements, two military and one economic, with Spain? The agreements will provide for American arms shipments to Spain, especially weapons, transport and communications equipment needed by the Spanish Army. Further plans for training the Spanish army and air officers also may be included. The agreements will give the United States several air bases in Spain along with anchorage rights for American warships in key Spanish ports. Also the negotiations are opening the way for a larger flow of American financial and technical aid to Spain under the Mutual Security Program. Is it not also true that Franco's government is fully cooperating with the United States in the mutual-security effort?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. I think the House should know that the gentleman from Wisconsin who has just now addressed us was the chairman of a subcommittee which spent some time in Spain, and did a very comprehensive and thorough job there.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman for that compliment. May I call the attention of the gentleman from Iowa to the subcommittee supplemental report on Spain, particularly to page 84. The subcommittee reports its observation on the attitude of Spain toward participation in defense.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say also before I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] who has been seeking to ask me a question for some minutes, that every military authority who has been before the committee has said that Spain is vital to Western Europe.

I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How does the gentleman from Montana reconcile the statement made by the Spanish Ambassador to Portugal with the statement just read apparently representing the view of Franco as to all the things he is going to give to the so-called free world?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not know the source of the gentleman's information.

Mr. GROSS. I gave it to the gentleman.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I heard what he had to say, but I will not go on the word of a Spanish Ambassador to Portugal to decide what we should do in this country. I think we ought to keep in mind that as far as Portugal is concerned, it is not defensible unless Spain is brought in.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I want to compliment the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] for opposing this amendment to the bill. If there is any area of Europe where geographically the defense of Western Europe seems to be at a high point, it seems to me it is the Iberian Peninsula, that is, Spain, particularly in view of the Pyrennes Mountains just to the north. I think it is one of the bastions of Europe, and it is very important that it be included in the provisions for Europe.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is no question about it. I hope the House will vote down this amendment.

Mr. RICHARDS. It is a fact, is it not, I will ask the gentleman from Montana, that this $25,000,000 does not add to the over-all amount but is part of the funds provided for?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my strong opposition to the proposed amendment. I believe that the Foreign Affairs Committee has gone thoroughly into this question of assistance to Spain, and its recommendations reflect sound judgment based on the analysis of all available information.

Just a few months ago I had the privilege of heading a special study mission which, among other countries, visited Spain. The subcommittee recommended that assistance be extended to Spain because of the potential value of Spanish contribution to the mutual security effort, and because this potential value cannot be realized without aid.

I want to take this opportunity to recount some of the major factors which motivated that recommendation. The most immediate value of Spain for the mutual defense effort of Western Europe lies in the geographical advantages which Spain offers for air and naval bases. Construction of air and naval bases behind the Pyrenees, which in themselves constitute a natural defense barrier, would greatly supplement other defense installations in Western Europe, which are more immediately exposed to attack. It would give the entire European defense program an added strength, and place at its disposal a strategically important area.

We should also remember that Spain is invaluable in the defense of the Mediterranean, by controlling the west entrance to that sea. I am certain that I need not point out that through the Mediterranean attacks can be directed against the so-called belly of Europe, against Northern Africa, and the Middle East. Consequently, Spain plays a strategic role in the defense of those areas.

Before issuing its recommendations, the subcommittee also considered the potential value of Spanish armed forces to the defense of Europe. At present, Spain has a large but poorly equipped army and a well-trained corps of officers. It is one of the largest and toughest armies in Europe, its manpower strength being estimated at 700,000, of which 400,000 are under arms, including 35,000 officers.

This army, however, is largely equipped with light arms only. They need heavy equipment in quantities. In addition, Spain has a limited fleet and some 300 combat planes in mediocre operating condition. The strength of each can be considerably augmented, bringing them to the level of effective instruments of mutual defense.

We should also bear in mind the marked friendly attitude on the part of the people of Spain and on the part of the Franco government toward the United States. The government has indicated its willingness to enter into military and economic agreements. If we do not conclude such agreements, written in terms of mutual security and mutually beneficient to both nations, we will

be guilty of inexcusable shortsightedness.

I would like to mention one more factor. Spain is a Christian nation, and there is no question that the great majority of its people is strongly anti-Communist. Furthermore, Generalissimo Franco expressed a willingness for Spanish troops to fight communism wherever necessary, not only on Spanish soil.

I feel that these considerations are vitally important, and that they—not any personal prejudices or the dictates of false economy—should determine our attitude and action on the proposed assistance to Spain. The fact remains that Spain can contribute very much to European defense; that her people and government, whatever the shortcomings of its form, are willing to enter into closer ties with us for that purpose; and that her people will fight communism wherever it may be necessary to do so.

It is because of these considerations that I am strongly opposed to the amendment which would eliminate assistance to Spain from this bill, and I earnestly hope that the membership of this body, weighing impartially the help which Spain can give us in this all-out struggle for survival, will defeat the amendment.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is my first mention on this bill. It is not often that I find myself in accord with my Midwest colleague from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], but I want to say that I want to support him on this amendment.

I had every intention yesterday that when we reached section 3 of offering this same amendment.

Let me recall to your attention the occasion yesterday when the amendment to limit aid to Tito was before the House. I want to tell you here and now that I subscribe to the remarks of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY], except that I would like to substitute for the word "Tito" the word "Franco" and substitute for the name "Yugoslavia" the name "Spain." I am not willing here to pay the price that is involved for whatever little advantage may come to us by keeping it in the bill, because I have no more faith in Franco of Spain and the government he represents than I have in Tito of Yugoslavia. Neither one of them are democracies; neither one of them are dependable, and I am not willing to pay that price.

I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 9, noes 107.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: Page 15, line 14, after "authorized", insert a new paragraph as follows:

"Not to exceed $43,000,000 of the money authorized in the preceding paragraph may be spent for Austria."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is a cut of $43,000,000. The amount in the budget for Austria is $86,000,000. It is perfectly true that we have cut the sum total of this section by about $615,000,000. It is possible, of course, to say that you could absorb this particular $43,000,000 cut that I am proposing in the $600,000,000 cut out of the larger figure, $1,600,000,000, but I feel that this should be specifically pointed out so that we actually will save this $43,000,000 and the cut can be applied elsewhere.

In reference to this matter of Austria, there is very little in the hearings, but you will find mention of Austria on page 60 of the committee report and you will find information on pages 761 and 762 of the committee hearings. There is also a chart, which incidentally is not a very revealing one, on page 751 that has to do with Austria. There is some other reference material in the selected tables on the proposed Mutual Security Act, which is a committee print. On page 40 of this committee print you will find the budget for Austria. I might state that all of this information is in the most general terms, as most of this information is, and it is difficult to run details down. Suffice it to say, though, that the $86,000,000 that has been asked for is simply to balance Austria's budget.

In balancing that budget I want to call your attention to what we are doing. On page 762, on top of the page, the committee hearings reveal this:

During fiscal year 1953 Austria will provide local currency equivalent to $23,000,000 to pay French, British, and Soviet occupation costs. The United States Government has been on a pay-as-you-go basis since 1945.

It is very obvious that the United States Government is paying the $23,000,000 for French, British, and Soviet occupation costs. If Austria needs this money and if this is really a mutual program, I submit that certainly our State Department should not permit France and Great Britain to take money from Austria when we in effect are putting it back again. And positively we should not be paying for the Soviet occupation costs.

On the preceding page, 751, you will find in subsection (c) the statement:

The significant economic facts in Austria are:

* * * * *

(c) "The drain of Austrian resources by the U. S. S. R. occupation authorities as the result of (1) unrequited exports from output of the 350 enterprises confiscated by the U. S. S. R. under the pretext that these assets were German property; (2) failure of the Soviet-controlled enterprises to pay taxes."

These are given as some of the reasons for the plight of Austria. Obviously there is a lot of work to be done by our State Department in establishing a firmer position in Austria. It is obvious we are paying blackmail in that country to Soviet Russia.

I want to point out another thing. I refer to Austria's debts, and this will be found on page 20 of the committee print of selected tables. Austria's internal debt is $609,000,000, its external debt is only $12,000,000, and that is only one-third of their gross national products. If you will notice the situation in the case of the United States, we have a national debt of $259,000,000,000 as opposed to gross national products of $321,000,000,000. If you will go down that list you will notice that the nations that have the poorest ratios as far as national debt is concerned, are Great Britain and the United States, the so-called victor nations. Their budget situation is much worse than the countries in Europe who were either neutral or our enemies in the last war, and Austria of course is among these nations.

Mr. Chairman, we know of Austria mainly through history, but actually we are now talking about 6,800,000 people. Austria has been cut to this pitiful size over the years. The United States is responsible among four nations for Austria. The United States area in Austria is one-fourth, and includes less than 1,700,000 people, about the size of metropolitan St. Louis. That is the number that you are asked to vote $86,000,000 for and I am requesting by my amendment that that amount be cut back to $43,000,000 which is more in accord with realism. This is the way to eliminate loose dollars.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Chairman, as we all know, Austria is one of the most critical and vulnerable spots in Europe and the whole defense setup for Europe. I know of no more critical spot at the present time unless it is Berlin itself.

I call the attention of the members of the committee to the fact that the $86,000,000 requested as economic support for Austria has already been affected by the cut made by the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Committee of the Whole. As introduced, title I of the bill carried $1,819,200,000 for economic support. The cuts made by the Foreign Affairs Committee and by the Committee of the Whole have now reduced it nearly 50 percent, to $1,022,000,000. If we are going to do anything in Europe at all, it would be a grievous mistake to put any further limitation on Austria at this time.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The Foreign Affairs Committee, I do not believe, cut that. The amount asked for was $86,000,000. You have given them everything they asked for. It is simply balancing their budget.

Mr. RICHARDS. The $86,000,000 is included in the defense-support figure which was further cut yesterday by the Vorys amendment over a half-billion dollars.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. My $43,000,000 would not be in addition to the Committee of the Whole cut of yesterday. As a matter of fact, if you applied the proportionate cut to Austria, it would be a little more than the $43,000,000 I am trying to cut it back to.

Mr. RICHARDS. I understand that, but the amount in title 1 of the bill was

cut to the bone through the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. Is it not a fact that the situation in Austria is absolutely hopeless as far as getting a treaty is concerned? When I was there last September I had a conference with our Ambassador, Walter Donnelly, who in my opinion is doing a good job, and he said that they had had 259 conferences with the Soviets trying to bring about some kind of a treaty and that they are no further along than when they started.

Mr. RICHARDS. If the position in Austria is hopeless, the position in Berlin is hopeless, the position in Korea is hopeless, and a great many other positions in opposition to communism will have to be defined as hopeless. I am not going to agree that our position in Austria is hopeless.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on this bill because there is a great deal in it I do not understand. I do not know whether it is right to cut this $500,000,000 or whether it is right to keep it in. I do not believe I have heard adequate evidence here indicating that we are either right or wrong in the cut. I have a great deal of doubt in my own mind as to how I am going to vote on that particular issue.

But as to Austria I have no doubt whatever. In the first place, Austria is, according to all the evidence, the most anti-Communist country in Europe. More than that, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs said, if we cannot hold on in Austria then we cannot hold on in Berlin. I believe it is one of the key spots for the defense of the collective security of the free world.

Again, it seems to me that Austria is a listening post to us, a source of valuable information from Czechoslovakia and from Hungary. Much information is received by radio free Europe, for example, from these countries behind the iron curtain by way of Austria. The government of that country is conservative. It has held the line valiantly and bravely. They are loyal friends. The amount involved is not great, and I think it would be a deadly mistake to slap in the face the Austrian Government, beleaguered as it is by our bitter enemy, the Soviets.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. May I make this additional observation to the very pertinent remarks the gentleman has just made?

The record shows that in Austria, occupied as it is, never at any time in any election has more than 5 percent of the Austrian vote gone Communist.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. The gentleman is entirely correct. The Austrian people are brave, stanch friends.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to agree with what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said. Every word is true.

Is it not a further fact that we have an additional responsibility in Austria, because we have an occupying Army in a liberated country, and this Government, which cannot become self-sufficient, is the furthest bridgehead into the Soviets.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. The gentleman is correct.

Every effort we have made to secure a treaty with Austria has been impeded by the Soviet Government, and if we do not give Austria this small amount of money we are minimizing our chances for success.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Is it not correct that, as the chairman has said, our position in Austria is not hopeless, but if we cut this aid Austria's position would then become hopeless?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. It might well so happen.

Mr. RIBICOFF. And that is because of their very difficult economic situation. And is it not true that we are in Austria by virtue of a four-power agreement? If we withdrew or were forced out of Austria, it would be a great blow to America prestige, and it could then be said all over the world that the Soviet Union forced the United States out of its position in Austria.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for bringing to the attention of the Members on the floor the true facts about Austria, one of the best friends the United States has had ever since commencement of negotiations for peace, and the rock upon which we can help to build up the rest of the world. I want to congratulate the gentleman for bringing to the attention of the Members of the House the true facts.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I agree with everything said about the importance of Austria. I do not want to talk in generalities; I want to talk in details. Here is the question and the one question only: $23,000,000 of the occupation costs of France, Britain, and ourselves is being paid by us. Now, this is a mutual program. I am not talking about the importance of Austria, about how to give them money. This is a mutual defense bill. Let us get some work done on it and talk in details instead of generalities. Austria is important, sure.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I respect the gentleman's views.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. I take this position: I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania agrees with me that the amendment which the gentleman from Missouri is offering will not cure the evil he is complaining of. You are merely cutting $86,000,000 in half by supporting that amendment, and if you have the same evil repercussions from $43,000,000 remaining, you are not doing anything by voting for the amendment.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. The gentleman raises a point which I think goes to the whole bill, and that is the policy of the Congress to cut in round numbers or even fractions, and I do not think cutting in round numbers or even fractions indicates that we have carefully worked this thing out in detail. I am not convinced of that. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have no particular interest in the pending amendment. I do, however, want to call the attention of the gentleman from Missouri and the other Members of this House to the fact that this is not an appropriation bill.

I have heard a lot of talk about details. This is not the place for the discussion of details. What the House is doing in this bill is authorizing a program; and, generally, in authorizing a program, we do not place dollar limits on the program that is authorized. It is customary in most authorization bills coming before this House to simply authorize certain activities, and then to leave it to the Committee on Appropriations to determine which of those activities shall be undertaken and how much shall be appropriated by the Congress for those activities.

At the beginning of this program we could have given a general authorization to continue over a period of years, or during the emergency. I am in absolute accord with the action of this House in not following that plan. I think the program should be reviewed annually by the Congress. But you now have before you an authorization bill. It is not intended that this bill shall deal with details; it is a bill to outline a general program.

I have the privilege of serving as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations that will consider the mutual security appropriation bill. After the authorization bill is passed, then our committee will begin hearings on the appropriation bill. We will go into every single detail, and I promise you that we will consider each country. We will not only consider Austria; we will consider Yugoslavia; we will consider every country in Europe; we will consider the countries in Asia which are to receive aid.

I have just returned from an official 30,000-mile trip to the Pacific, where we covered Korea, Formosa, Okinawa, and the other points where this aid will be applied. I have some first-hand information. We will take copious testimony as to the details of this entire program. Then when the appropriation bill comes before this body, you will still have a chance to make any changes in any appropriation, or any item, that you see fit.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I must say I cannot agree with the gentleman when he says it is the duty of the legislative committee to specify where this money is to be spent. The gentleman knows that the Committee on Appropriations does not have the time to go into all these details to any degree comparative to what the legislative committee does.

Mr. GARY. I do not agree with the gentleman at all. Our appropriation subcommittee does go into far greater detail on this program than the legislative committee does.

Mr. JENSEN. The appropriations committee has been criticised no end for writing legislation in appropriation bills, and I think to some degree justly so. Certainly, if the legislative committee does not have the authority to specify where this money shall be spent——

Mr. GARY. I do not yield further to the gentleman. I want to make this statement. I certainly am not questioning the authority of this House to make any change in this bill it desires. What I am saying is that this is an authorization bill, and it does not necessarily follow that the amounts that are authorized in this bill will be appropriated. These amounts will be subsequently considered by the appropriations committee. They will then be considered again by the House. At that time the House will have an opportunity to take up individual items and to make any changes it sees fit to make. Therefore, I think that we should not take the chance of absolutely crippling this program by putting too stringent limitations on the appropriations committee.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina ?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GWINN: On page 15, line 14, after "authorized" insert a new sentence as follows: "Whenever an item authorized for procurement under this paragraph is under either domestic allocation or price controls in the United States, it shall be purchased by General Services Administration and furnished to the recipient nation as a commodity in lieu of dollar grants for their own procurement."

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the emergency of the subject covered here did not give me time to take the subject up with the chairman of the committee. I just received the proposed amendment this morning.

This amendment enables our Government to buy copper, lead, and zinc at our market prices and subject to our price controls and limitations and send the commodity in lieu of dollars to participating countries. It enables the Government to send the commodity itself abroad instead of establishing a credit, as the act provides. By sending dollars abroad the foreign countries go into the Chilean market and bid up the price of these scarce metals to the detriment of our consumers of metal. Our consumers of these metals, particularly copper, are under price controls of 27.5 cents a pound. In all countries where there is price control on these metals, they are in an impossible position to compete in a world market which runs copper as high as 55 cents a pound.

Our Government must be the buyer of these metals and make them available to foreign countries, instead of giving dollars to many foreign buyers who bid up the world prices. If many buyers go about paying whatever price they want to pay to build up, even excessive stockpiles of these scarce materials that obviously makes prices rise higher than one buyer in the market will make.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MORTON. If I understand the gentleman's amendment correctly, if for instance, $1,000,000 goes to England to purchase lead, copper, or some other material, instead of giving them the $1,000,000 we give them the $1,000,000 worth of that material.

Mr. GWINN. That is correct.

Mr. MORTON. You are not cutting in any way the benefits under this act?

Mr. GWINN. We are not cutting in any way the benefits under this act, we are simply changing dollars ourselves, while we have control of the dollars, into the commodity and sending the commodity in lieu of the dollars.

Mr. MORTON. You are also stopping this bidding by four or five governments, with our money, mostly, on these various materials.

Mr. GWINN. That is it. Our own dollars in foreign hands are bidding up the prices so that our own domestic consumers cannot even bid in the market because our consumers are limited to 27.5 cents a pound.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I noticed the language of the gentleman's amendment is mandatory and requires the General Services Administrator to buy the copper.

Does that mean that if the Mutual Security Agency decides to give Greece copper that the General Services Administration is required to buy copper, perhaps domestically, and take it away from the domestic consumers of copper?

Mr. GWINN. It works that way now. Here is a bid. for example, that comes out of Greece, circulated in our own domestic market for copper at a price much higher than our own consumers can pay.

Mr. MEADER. I wonder if the gentleman will yield further?

Mr. GWINN. I yield.

Mr. MEADER. Would he mind making the language of the amendment permissive rather than mandatory? Because I am very much concerned that the automobile industry, for example, which has had limitations because of shortages of copper, might be further limited by taking from our domestic available copper amounts to send to Greece because of a determination made by the Mutual Security Agency?

Mr. GWINN. I think that is a proper amendment.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Is not the practical effect of the gentleman's amendment to say that until we can control the world price, which the gentleman's amendment would not do, that in effect you are going to be taking the stocks of our own natural resources and force us to send those abroad, whereas these foreign countries could buy in the world market and buy stocks up in other parts of the world?

Mr. GWINN. I think not. I think the agency has the power to decide whether it will or not grant those dollars. If it is going to grant dollars, this amendment simply requires them to give copper instead of the dollars.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Under the gentleman's amendment the only place they could get the copper, so long as the world market is not controlled at the same level as our internal price control, the only place to get the copper is in the United States; therefore we would be using up United States raw material.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(On request of Mr. MASON, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GWINN was allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GWINN. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If the gentleman follows my reasoning thus far, then in effect not only will we be using up our own raw materials, but we will be using them up faster than we can produce them and we will be cutting down on the amount available to our own industries, as has been previously brought out.

Mr. GWINN. May I say to the gentleman from New York that we produce about 60 percent of the copper we consume; the rest we get primarily from Chile.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is correct.

Mr. GWINN. This amendment contemplates that we are going to buy this excess copper in Chile, but instead of letting our own dollars go abroad to come back to Chile we control the dollars and to some extent we do control the prices we pay in Chile.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. But that has not worked out so far.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it simply means that the United States itself would go into that world market and purchase this copper to be sent wherever it is to go.

Mr. GWINN. Exactly so.

Mr. MASON. And now our own private industry has to go into the world market to buy that 40 percent of the copper that it needs and we do not produce, and it is competing against these dollars that we send abroad.

Mr. GWINN. Exactly so; and the effect is that our own stocks of copper, lead, and zinc are going down while stocks of these scarce materials of other countries of the world with our dollars are being built up excessively.

Mr. MASON. Personally I think the gentleman's amendment is a good, common-sense amendment and will result in our own private industries having more copper to use rather than less.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. What disturbs me is that this is more interference of Government in private industry; in other words, you are allowing the United States Government to go abroad and make purchases in its own name and therefore compete with private enterprise.

Mr. MASON. No; they are competing with other countries.

Mr. GWINN. Let me answer the gentleman. We have so completely controlled domestically the price of copper, lead, and zinc that our own domestic consumers cannot pay more than 27½ cents a pound for copper.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman from New York offers this amendment in good faith in trying to do something constructive, but at the present time we are in this kind of situation. Of course the General Services Administration does all of the purchasing for the stockpiling items of these strategic and critical materials.

As to just how this would affect the contracts we have with Chile for copper, with India for manganese, and with all these other countries I do not know, but it is so broad and extensive that it goes almost around the world. I do not know how many countries this amendment would involve, but probably many more than we think just on the face of it. For instance, there is no way for us to go into Chile and say to Chile that she has got to sell us copper at 25 cents a pound because we have price control.

Chile today is holding out for 6 cents above the world price right at the present time, and there is no way for us to control it. We have agreements with them, of course, to buy as much copper as we can get. But when that contract runs out that is the end of it, and there is no way to force them to renew it or sell at a lower price.

Copper is but one metal; there are 60 or 70 other strategic and critical material items that will be affected. I am not just sure as to how the General Services can carry out and make effective such an amendment, because at the present time we have already agreed under the international agreement on division of these raw materials.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. As I understand, General Services is acquiring—it is the instrumentality for building up our strategic materials.

Mr. DURHAM. It purchases them all at the present time.

Mr. VORYS. It is the machinery for purchasing strategic materials?

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct; it administers and makes the contracts.

Mr. VORYS. General Services, as I understand, has had nothing to do with procurement in this program at the present time; so this amendment would be bringing something new into this program.

Mr. DURHAM. I do not know how it would affect the international agreement on the distribution of raw materials at the present time. It is rather far-reaching, and I hope the Committee will vote it down.

Mr. VORYS. May I say that our purpose with reference to strategic materials under this bill was to tie it in with the strategic-materials program carried on outside this bill. I fear that this amendment will mess things up as far as strategic materials are concerned. It looks to me as if it would require all of the purchasing to be done in this country which I hope will not be the case.

Mr. DURHAM. That is right. You would have General Services conducting two programs here. It would be trying to secure raw material for the stockpile in this country and also it would be a distribution agency. I do not know whether they would take it and put it in one bag or which bag they would put it in.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. In the purchasing of this under international agreements, so much is allotted to each country?

Mr. DURHAM. Supposedly so.

Mr. MASON. It has a quota assigned?

Mr. DURHAM. Yes.

Mr. MASON. If General Services is purchasing for Greece or Turkey, or some place, they would have to stay within the quota assigned to Greece or Turkey, just as if Greece or Turkey were buying it for themselves with our dollars?

Mr. DURHAM. Yes.

Mr. MASON. So that it would not change the international agreements one particle.

Mr. DURHAM. On the other hand, what are you going to do with your stockpile in this country? Are you going to deplete it? Take cobalt, copper, and dozens of others.

Mr. MASON. I understand that. We are purchasing them all around the world for our stockpile.

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

Mr. MASON. We are purchasing our quota under international agreements. If we become the agent of Greece or Turkey to purchase their quotas, that does not have any effect upon our own.

Mr. DURHAM. Of course, all countries have not entered into this international agreement on the distribution of raw material. This is just a few countries.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. The gentleman is very much interested in our defense stockpile program.

Mr. DURHAM. Yes; so is the gentleman from Michigan. He has been very helpful in that respect, and this country ought to thank him for the rubber quotas today.

Mr. SHAFER. I just wondered if he has any information as to the amount of copper that has been taken out of our defense stockpile program to be shipped overseas?

Mr. DURHAM. As far as I know, none has been taken to be shipped overseas, but there has been some diverted to industry.

Mr. SHAFER. To industry as the result of enormous shipments over to Europe.

Mr. DURHAM. Yes; but from other countries which we could not obtain.

AMERICAN AND FREE WORLD SECURITY

I. The basis of American foreign policy:

A. A sound, democratic foreign policy is designed to preserve the security of the Nation. American foreign policy is no exception to the rule.

B. In today's dangerous world, national security cannot be achieved by any simple formula. Our well-being is directly tied to the security of the other free peoples. It is no simple matter to preserve and build that united strength which the free world must have if freedom is to survive.

C. The foundation stone of American foreign policy today is the mutual-security program. And that program is firmly rooted in the belief that America cannot go it alone.

II. America's need for allies:

A. The threat posed by Soviet communism is so great that—should it get out of hand—America alone could never cope with it. Consider, if you will, the nature of that threat:

First. The Soviets are dedicated to global conquest. The Lenin-Stalinist ideology makes that very clear. Soviet actions since the closing months of World War II make it even clearer. The subversion of Eastern Europe, the attempt to drive the western allies out of Berlin, the effort to take over Greece, the aggression in Korea—all of these things are representative of international communism's designs for global control.

Second. The Soviet threat makes itself felt at every level—the political, the economic, the psychological, and the military. During 1952, the Soviet Union will devote 35 percent of its gross national products—more than $60,000,000,000—to military purposes. It is

spending more than a billion dollars annually on propaganda alone. The budget proposed calls for spending the equivalent of 20 percent of our gross national product for defense purposes during fiscal 1953. Our expenditure for our overseas informational campaign during the current fiscal year is less than one-tenth of what the Soviets are spending.

Three. In terms of raw power, the Soviet threat is very, very real. The Soviet Union, its satellites, and its Chinese allies together control some two-fifths of the earth's land surface, very close to half—more than 800,000,000—of the world's people, a vast share of the globe's natural resources. The Soviet bloc also has available millions of trained ground troops and a seasoned air force. It is estimated that the Soviet Union alone has between 175 and 200 divisions on active duty.

B. Unless America retains her friends in the free world, we will lose the edge we now have in the global struggle for power. The loss of Western Europe, for example, would see us outmanned, outgunned, and outproduced:

First. Take industrial production. Western Europe produces 28 percent or more of the world's steel, about the same percentage of the world's electric power, 32 percent of the world's hard coal. Western Europe also boasts almost half of the world's sea-going merchant tonnage—49 percent. Soviet-bloc figures, percentage, for steel, coal, and electric power are 18, 27, and 15 percent respectively. Therefore, the control of Western Europe would give the Soviets the upper hand in coal and very close to it in the production of steel and electric power.

Second. Take manpower. Western Europe's more than 300,000,000 people, if added to the Soviet bloc's population, would give the latter control of more than half of the world's people.

Third. Take skilled manpower. Europe's skilled manpower pool can be surpassed by no other area but our own. Western Europe's technicians in Soviet hands could be a vital factor in giving the Soviet Union a tremendous technical advantage.

Fourth. Take the problem of strategic position. Loss of Western Europe would mean the loss of land and air bases from which to operate at close range in the event of aggression. Were we to be faced with a global war—with the Soviets in control of Western Europe—we might well have to fight that war on the thresholds of our own homes.

III. Essentials of the Mutual Security Program:

A. The President has asked Congress to appropriate $7,900,000,000 for the Mutual Security Program during fiscal 1953. Of this total amount, the lion's share—$5,425,000,000—is for direct military assistance. One billion eight hundred and nineteen million is for defense-support funds. The remaining $655,800,000 is for economic and technical assistance. These big figures raise two key questions: First, what is the difference between military, defense support, and technical assistance? Second, why is assistance other than that of a purely military nature so terribly important?

First. The three types of assistance:

(a) Military assistance has to do with helping our friends to develop the weapons of defense and the trained manpower to handle those weapons. It is concerned primarily with military products—with munitions. It is concerned—to cite one highly important example—with equipping the NATO forces with the means of deterring aggression. Most of the funds for military assistance will go into the purchase of guns, planes, tanks, and so forth, in the United States for transshipment overseas. Some of these military assistance funds will be used to purchase military equipment manufactured by our allies.

(b) Defense-support funds are designed to supply our allies with raw materials, commodities, and machinery which they must have if they are to produce the sinews of military defense. Defense-support funds will go for cotton and foodstuffs as well as for mechanical equipment. In this connection, I should like to point out that you cannot separate a nation's economic stability from its ability to defend itself. Looking at it realistically, we cannot offer our friends guns unless we also help them to develop the productive plant with which to produce their own guns.

(c) Technical assistance is better known as point 4. To my way of thinking, the point 4 program is one of the most important, both for this Nation's security and for world peace. Under the point 4 program, America is seeking to help the people of the underdeveloped areas of the world to help themselves. We are seeking to help the people of the Near East, southeast Asia, and of parts of Latin America to develop their own technologies.

Why are we doing this? In the first place, it must be pointed out that communism breeds on hunger, disease, and illiteracy. In the areas I have just noted, these conditions are almost universal. In many parts of the Near East, an income of fifty or sixty dollars a year is a reasonable average. In many parts of Asia, the average life span is 30 years or even less. In some parts of Africa and the Near East, 1 out of 10 babies never gets beyond the first year of life.

The point 4 program is a humanitarian program. It is the true Christian doctrine in practice. But equally important, it is contributing much to America's security. By fighting the conditions upon which communism thrives, it creates strong friends even while showing millions of people the road to a decent standard of living.

It is well for us to remember that our interests abroad do not begin and end in Europe, important though Europe is. The peoples of the Near East, Africa, southeast Asia, and Latin America—these people are also part of the free world. These people are also essential partners in building a strong defense against Communist aggression.

IV. Are our allies doing their share?

A. The charge has been made that our friends in Western Europe are not holding up their end of the Mutual Security Program. I should like to answer this charge by citing a few pertinent facts—facts that our more violent critics are likely to overlook.

First. Western Europe, unlike the United States, was devastated by the Second World War. With our help, it has made a remarkable recovery. To impose such defense demands upon our European friends as would cripple their still-shaky economies would be to court disaster for them and for ourselves.

Second. It is well to bear in mind that any major war fought on the land is likely to be fought first on the territory of our allies rather than upon our own. It is the western Europeans who are living under the shadow of Soviet guns.

Third. The overwhelming bulk of the European defense force is made up of European troops. Such will continue to be the case when the target for 1954, as set up at the Lisbon NATO conference, is achieved.

Fourth. In the face of economic ruin—World War II result—and domestic demands for a better standard of living, the Western European nations have reached a productivity level which is some 40 percent above the prewar figure.

Fifth. Much has been made of the statement that the Europeans are not taxing themselves as steeply as we are. It is true that there are tax inequities in parts of western Europe. It is not true that the European man in the street is not carrying his share of the tax burden. Here are just a few of the relevant figures: Tax receipts in the United States for 1951 amounted to 25.8 percent of our gross national product. In the United Kingdom, the comparative percentage was 33.7. In the Netherlands, it was 28.3. In France, it was 30.7. In the Federal Republic of Germany—West Germany—it was 30.3. In some of the western countries, the percentage was somewhat lower than in our own country. But, by and large, western Europe is doing its share in footing the bill for defense and security.

Sixth. It is well worth remembering that France and Britain are actively defending free-world interests in the Near and Far East. It is worth remembering that most of the western European countries are fighting by our side in Korea. It is worth remembering that France—to cite one example—is spending an estimated $1,000,000,000 a year to stave off communism in Indochina and has lost more than 30,000 of her best soldiers there.

V. Conclusion: The mutual-security program is costing the American public a lot of money. There is no denying that. But in paying for the security and defensibility of our free-world neighbors, we are also paying for our own security. It is far better to pay in dollars today than to pay with millions of lives and all of our freedoms tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FORAND). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and amendments to the amendment close in 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, in my humble opinion, with all due respect to the gentleman from New York, this amendment can be far more important than has been represented, and it should not be considered in a few minutes on the floor of this House. Its implications are hard to figure. For example, you might say that if we are going to supply such things as copper instead of money to some of these countries—money or credit—they could take that copper, sell it on the world market for perhaps as high as 100 percent profit. There is that possibility, as I understand the amendment, and it is entirely within the realm of possibility.

Mr. Chairman, before we adopt such an amendment it should have the most careful consideration by the committee responsible for this bill. Therefore, I reluctantly oppose the amendment. Foreign countries could take those products which we would furnish them, perhaps at our controlled price, and sell them on the world market for a profit of as much as 100 percent.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. And they can do that today with what we furnish them.

Mr. HINSHAW. That may be very true, but in this case when you are furnishing raw metals it is a lot different than when you are furnishing guns, tanks, and clothing. This is something which is a world commodity. It is not a piece of armament. I think the amendment ought to have more consideration than we can give it in Committee in the next few minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEADER to the amendment offered by Mr. GWINN: At the end of line 4, strike out "shall" and insert "may."

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will improve the Gwinn amendment, in my opinion. It makes the authority of the General Services Administration to supply the scarce commodity in lieu of the money grant permissive rather than mandatory.

I fear the amendment as drafted by the gentleman from New York would compel the General Services Administration to buy copper, perhaps out of our available domestic copper supply, and thereby limit still further the amounts available for the automobile industry and other industries which are now retarded because of the scarcity of copper. I would not want that to happen.

I do not know that the Gwinn amendment should be adopted at all, but if it is adopted it should give leeway to the General Services Administration. I do not want to harm our domestic economy by an amendment hastily adopted.

The International Materials Conference, about which many of you have heard a good deal, purports to allocate the amount of these scarce materials as between this country and other countries of the world. We have enforcible controls in this country. But many of the other countries who are also members of the International Materials Conference, either do not have any controls at all or do not have as effective and as enforcible controls as we have.

This whole question of the International Materials Conference which has no statutory authority should be very carefully and thoroughly explored by the Congress. Under present circumstances I think it is restricting our own production in this country while it leaves other countries free to engage in speculation in these controlled materials and step up their production of products requiring scarce materials. It is an international cartel set up by the executive branch of our Government. Its allocations are enforcible in the United States but not equally enforcible elsewhere. The question is an important one. It should be gone into thoroughly by the Congress.

I think my amendment will improve the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN]. I, therefore, urge its adoption.

(Mr. SEELY-BROWN and Mr. FULTON asked and were given permission to yield the time allotted them to Mr. SADLAK.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful to my colleagues for yielding me their time.

Mr. Chairman, when I came to the floor this morning I had been entertaining the thought that something along the same line as put forth here by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] might be a good thing to do in this particular bill.

When we have in the neighborhood of a billion dollars set aside for these countries to buy copper and zinc, and then we pay the bill with our American taxpayers' money, why could not we take and purchase the copper from these countries and thereby give them the United States dollars which they are seeking?

I join wholeheartedly in the proposal offered by the gentleman from New York. I objected, Mr. Chairman, because of the shortness of time which would be allotted here, but I am sure that my colleague, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], as he goes into this proposal offered by the gentleman from New York, will find that it has a great deal of importance to the State of Montana. He will find, as has been touched upon by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER], the great ramifications that are involved here with the International Materials Conference, about which I am preparing to make an appearance before the Committee on Banking and Currency on Wednesday, May 28, in connection with the Defense Production Act, because I believe that the International Materials Conference, which has been set up without any statutory authority, is, in my estimation, and in the estimation of a committee of eight which has been appointed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the minority leader, a supercartel operating in the United States. It is keeping from the automobile industry, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] has mentioned, from the electrical and brass companies in Connecticut, causing layoffs and unemployment, and from the other industries involved throughout the United States, the copper and related minerals of which they ought to have the use.

There is so much involved in this proposition, Mr. Chairman, which I would like to remark upon in this short time, but which obviously is an impossibility, as I said, because of the many ramifications. But, as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] has mentioned, I am very much interested to know how much we have in the line of copper and zinc, presuming he may know, because from my observation of the House he has been one of those who has been most meticulous about keeping up the stockpile, as has been the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

As to the International Materials Conference, which is restricting the amount of copper and zinc which our people should have, the amounts that are given on allocations, termed "entitlement of consumption," to all of our industries and for the employers of our country are the same allocations given by the International Materials Conference which are used by the National Production Administration, and so we cannot get it because we cannot buy it. Price is not the deterrent.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADLAK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks, and I think it is an important thing to talk about at the present time. Of course, the stockpile, on the over-all basis of copper, has not been filled by any means and probably will not be, under world conditions, for some time. But the other important point to think about at the present time is in connection with the two and one-half million, lying down here, or approximately, at the present time, in dollars, with authority to purchase, the materials today are not available. This would further aggravate that condition, in my opinion

Mr. SADLAK. The gentleman knows, because we do not go into the world market for copper, that we have been restricted because the allocations are made by the International Materials Conference which again, I say, has been set up without any statutory authority, and time does not permit my going into that. Our stockpiling is, also, thereby

seriously affected and the program impeded, in my opinion.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADLAK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I wonder if the gentleman has been able to get any information out of our agencies on whether or not the other nations who are members of this International Materials Conference have enforcibility laws which govern the allocations of scarce materials which they receive. I have not been able to get it in 3 months' effort out of the departments downtown. Has the gentleman gotten any information?

Mr. SADLAK. I do not have such information from downtown, but the gentleman well knows that the Defense Production Act, the Price Control Act, is only effective in the United States.

Mr. MEADER. Yes; but the other nations in this International Materials Conference do not enforce their allocations, so they are free, but the United States is very rigidly controlled.

Mr. SADLAK. The gentleman is so fully well acquainted with the set-up of the International Materials Conference, knows the serious effect its entitlement decrees have on his constituency and on mine, and he and I could go on for a half hour or an hour today to talk about this program. The time being limited on this amendment, I hope I will have the opportunity before the Committee on Banking and Currency on next Wednesday to discuss the IMC and, more specifically, its relation to the Defense Production Act in my bill H. R. 7157.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADLAK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Just recently we were informed that Canadian newsprint was going up $10 a ton. The International Materials Conference has been the agency that has decided where newspaper produced in the United States shall be allocated to foreign countries. In one instance they allocated some 350,000 tons of newsprint to India, which has reduced the amount of newsprint available to the people of the United States and has had a decided influence on the increase in cost of newsprint from Canadian sources.

There are other materials besides copper that are affected by the International Materials Conference. I certainly agree with the gentleman's statement that it is without statutory authority. It seems to be without any authority at all. It should be thoroughly investigated and the facts revealed.

Mr. SADLAK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly in favor of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, let us get off this international cartel business and talk about the Gwinn amendment for a minute.

At the end of next month we are going to sell about a million dollars worth of horses down in Lexington, Ky., at the Keeneland sales. If a guy wants to sell a horse there and get anything for it, he wants to get about eight people bidding on it. The guy who has only one person bidding on his horse goes home pretty sick.

This Gwinn amendment does this, it stops the bidding on copper. If the copper goes to England, France, Switzerland, or wherever it goes, it means that we buy it. We will then have a greater control over the price than if we give them the money and have them bidding up these critical raw materials that we cannot get.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Each of these countries has other dollars outside of those it gets from us. We cannot by this amendment prevent their bidding.

Mr. MORTON. As I understand this amendment, it requires us to purchase the critical materials, those that are under control and allocation. It requires us to purchase them with the dollars. They get just as much, but it merely means that there are not 15 or 20 people bidding on this poor old nag that cannot outrun an ape, anyhow.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

(Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. MANSFIELD.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I think these two amendments are too far reaching to be given the consideration which they should have in this short period of time.

I can well understand the position of my good friend the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] because he comes from a copper-fabricating State. I can well understand and agree more with my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] because he recognizes the value of copper, as long as we are using that as an illustration, in the manufacture of automobiles and allied products.

I think we ought to keep in mind the fact that this country is facing an annual deficit of 500,000 tons of copper. We are not spending something like $1,000,000,000 in this bill for metals, as stated by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK]. There is not that kind of money allocated for this particular purpose. As far as our strategic mineral stockpile is concerned, it is a very, very small one. You cannot tell when we will need such things as copper, manganese, chrome, and so forth, which we have in low supply at the present time.

I wonder if you realize that we import 40 percent of our copper. A good deal of it comes from Chile. At the present time there is a strike on down there which has been in existence for some weeks. I do not know whether or when it is going to be settled. Further, the government down there has withdrawn its agreement insofar as the export supply of copper is concerned. It wants a higher price than it is getting now. That means, of course, that if this matter is not settled very shortly the pinch in our own country will be that much more severe.

We import 90 percent of our manganese. In my State of Montana we mine 90 percent of the entire supply of manganese in this country. We import 95 percent of the chrome, and we have to depend for 5 percent on our own resources.

I think we ought to consider this matter very, very carefully, because, first, of the impact it will have on American industry, especially in the Detroit area, and, secondly, and perhaps more important, the effect it will have on our strategic stockpile.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. The gentleman knows of the mines which have been recently opened in his State and in the State of Michigan. In upper Michigan, where we are now subsidizing those higher-cost mines, even though they mine copper, we do not get the benefit of it. It goes into the pot for distribution by the IMC.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I make a correction there? They recently opened mines in the State of Michigan, that is true, but as far as the mines in Montana are concerned, they are down below 5,000 feet, and the deeper they go the richer they are.

Mr. SADLAK. Let me refer to an excerpt from the New York Times of May 22, that the United States is lifting the ceilings on copper imports and will now permit a larger price to be paid on copper from Chile. It also says that the price of domestically produced copper has been fixed for some time at 24.5 cents, and officials said today it will remain at that level.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe the price is still too low, because we are faced with a terrible situation insofar as our copper supply is concerned. Twenty-five years from now there will not be a copper camp in the United States and 100 years from now Butte will still be producing. But on a world-wide scale the stuff is not there, and it is going to become more and more valuable as time goes on.

Mr. Chairman, I hope both these amendments are defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MEADER), there were—ayes 39, noes 59.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SADLAK), there were—ayes 30, noes 74.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments to section 3, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. Title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 is amended as follows:

(a) At the end of section 201 add the following new sentence: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed $606,370,000, to carry out the purposes and provisions of this section; and in addition balances of any appropriations heretofore made pursuant to this section unobligated as of June 30, 1952, or subsequently released from obligation, are authorized to be continued available for obligation for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the appropriation hereby authorized."

(b) At the end of section 203, which relates to economic and technical assistance for the Near East and Africa, add the following new sentence: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed $55,000,000, to carry out the purposes and provisions of this section; and in addition balances of any appropriations heretofore made pursuant to this section unobligated as of June 30, 1952, or subsequently released from obligation, are authorized to be continued available for obligation for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the appropriation hereby authorized."

(c) After section 205 add the following new section:

"SEC. 206. In addition to the amounts authorized by section 203, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $65,000,000 for carrying out the purposes and provisions of section 204 of this act, relating to Palestine refugees, during the fiscal year 1953; and not to exceed $76,000,000 for carrying out the purposes and provisions of section 205 of this act, relating to refugees in Israel, during the fiscal year 1953: *Provided*, That amounts appropriated pursuant to this section which the President finds cannot be effectively expended to carry out the purposes and provisions of sections 204 and 205 may be transferred to and merged with the appropriations authorized by section 203."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer three amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. VORYS:

On page 16, line 13, amend subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) Amend section 203 to read as follows: 'In order to further the purpose of this act in Africa and the Near East there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed $55,000,000 to carry out the purposes and provisions of this section; and in addition balances of any appropriations heretofore made pursuant to this section unobligated as of June 30, 1952, or subsequently released from obligation, are authorized to be continued available for obligation for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the appropriation hereby authorized. Funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be available under section 503 of this act and the Act for International Development (22 U. S. C. 1557)'."

On page 18, line 4, strike out "(b) at the end of subsection 302 (a)" and insert the following:

"(b) In the second sentence of subsection 302 (a) strike out the words 'the applicable provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501–1522), and' and insert in lieu thereof 'section 503 of this act and the applicable provisions' and at the end of such subsection."

On page 20, after line 22, insert the following:

"(c) Amend section 503 by inserting '(a)' after (503) by redesignating paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) as (1), (2), and (3), respectively, and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, is repealed.

"'(2) Of the powers, functions, and responsibilities transferred to the Director for Mutual Security by section 502 (b) (2) of this act, only those which are exercised pursuant to the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, enumerated in paragraph (3) of this subsection and are not in conflict with the other provisions of this act, as amended, may be exercised after June 30, 1952. Of the powers, functions, and responsibilities conferred on the President or the Secretary of State by the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, only those conferred by the provisions of that act, as amended, which are referred to in paragraph (3) of this subsection may be exercised after June 30, 1952.

"'(3) The provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, referred to above are the following: Sections 104 (e) and (f); 107; subsections (c) and (d) of section 109; 110 (a) and (b); 111; 112; 113; subsections (d), (h), and (i) of section 114; 115 (a); paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), and (10) of section 115 (b); subsections (d), (h), and (j) of section 115; section 117 (c); section 119; and section 120. Where any of the above provisions refer to the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, such reference shall be deemed to be the purpose of this act, as amended.'

"(d) In subsection (a) of section 504, strike out all after 'Senate' and insert in lieu thereof a period and the following sentences: 'The Deputy Director shall receive compensation of $17,500 per annum. The special representative in Europe shall receive the same compensation and allowances as a chief of mission, class 1, within the meaning of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 999) and have the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary. The deputy special representative in Europe shall be entitled to receive the same compensation and allowance as a chief of mission, class 3, within the meaning of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 999), and have the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary'."

Renumber subsequent subsections accordingly.

On page 26, lines 12 and 13, strike out the words "the Economic Cooperation Act" and insert in lieu thereof "section 503 of this act."

Mr. VORYS (interrupting the reading of the amendments). Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of my chairman, in view of the fact that this amendment was read at some length yesterday evening, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and also that the various sections of the amendment be considered together at this time.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, this is an identical amendment to be put into this section, which was passed in the other section last night, and also that you have identical amendments to go in titles III and IV; is that correct?

Mr. VORYS. They are similar technical changes, and there is an amendment to go in title V, which I discussed at some length yesterday evening.

Mr. RICHARDS. In substance, the amendments are the same? In other words, they are cut to apply to the particular section involved?

Mr. VORYS. That is correct.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, in view of that I see no objection to considering all three amendments, as read, and neither do I see any objection to considering all three amendments at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I shall not detain the committee for 5 minutes. This is a somewhat elaborate series of amendments but has only one purpose, and that is to do away with the possibility of legislation by letter writing, and have Congress legislate, so as to make definitely clear in law what has been stated to be the fact, and that is that the ECA, as such, and the Marshall plan, as such, and the European recovery plan, as such wind up as per schedule on June 30, 1952.

These elaborate sections are necessary to get the program under three acts instead of four. If this amendment is adopted we will then have a single director for the Mutual Defense Assistance Act; the Mutual Security Act; and phases of the act for international development, but we will no longer have four laws, and have him still operating ECA. The appropriate necessary provisions are retained. In view of the fact that the House has already adopted this principle and part of the amendment, I would hope the House would adopt the rest of the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. If the gentleman will permit me, I would like to say to the gentleman that having the natural disquiet of a lawyer I would doubt very much that the President's letter writing could take the place of enacted law. I feel this amendment is designed to tighten up, not to weaken the law. May I say further, to remove any disquiet the chairman may feel, that in conference a very thorough review will undoubtedly be made to be sure that every power that is really needed is actually in the bill.

Mr. VORYS. I thank the gentleman. He had a somewhat similar amendment. Let me say this, that once the House decides that this is what we are going to do and the way we are going to do it, you may be sure that the Government lawyers, the committee staff, and the lawyers of the committee will "nit-pick" this thing to make sure we have made no mistakes.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, last night when a similar amendment came up as to title I of the bill I objected as strenuously as I could and fought the amendment as strongly as I could. I did not think the amendment should be in the bill. But in view of the fact that it was placed by the Committee of the Whole in title I, I agree with the position taken by the gentleman from Ohio that it should also be in titles II, III, and IV; and therefore I will not oppose it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Will there be a roll call vote on all these amendments en bloc? Does the gentleman contemplate that? I think it is a very serious move that we have taken here; I think it is a mistake.

Mr. RICHARDS. It is. There could be a roll call, although I am not saying that we will demand a roll call; and I do not want anybody in the House to get the impression that I favor these four amendments, but in view of the fact that one has been placed in title I, if that is to be retained I think all four should be retained.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Messrs. GROSS and CRAWFORD) there were—ayes 54, noes 76.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RICHARDS and Mr. VORYS.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 101, noes 99.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: On page 16, line 24, strike out the period and insert the following: "*Provided*, That the dollar costs of the United States under the act for international development for the program in any country in any fiscal year for supplies and equipment shall not exceed three times the dollar costs of the United States for United States technicians and the training of local personnel."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, my amendment seeks to limit the dollar costs for supplies and equipment under the act for international development.

There is evidence that that those who are administering the program have inaugurated, as I see it, a great WPA program, on a global scale. It is up to this Congress to determine just how far we are going to permit the planners in MSA to establish a program of technical assistance which is not based on common sense, unless we apply the brakes today there is no telling just how fantastic it will be in the future.

Now, I have here, and I want to put in the RECORD, some evidence which shows how foolishly some of this money is being spent.

I am wondering if you know that during 1951 there were 505 teams from 15 European countries and 33 teams from 6 Far East countries who participated in the ECA and the MSA program.

I have before me a statement prepared by MSA for me as to the number of teams that were here on various projects. I will place that statement in the RECORD, so that all Members may read it. I do not have the time to read it now, but it is fantastic. One might draw the conclusion that what we are trying to do under this program is to make Europe and Asia over in our own image. But here is, page after page, a list of projects involving people from all over the world who have come to this country at the expense of the American taxpayers. This is the most extensive and expensive excursion party ever conducted for free to those who come to this country. Here are 92 teams, for instance, from France, and this is only one instance, and so it goes on and on. I will not take the time to read this exhibit, but it will be in the RECORD so all Members may take their time to read. It will be very revealing, I assure you.

EUROPEANS AND ASIANS VISIT THIS COUNTRY ON VARIOUS PROJECTS AT EXPENSE OF AMERICAN TAXPAYERS

Five hundred and five teams from 15 European countries and 33 teams from 6 far eastern countries were sponsored by ECA-MSA during calendar year 1951. A total of $6,694,353 was obligated to cover the dollar expenses of the European team members, and $699,000 was obligated for the far eastern team members while in the United States.

The cost of the program in 1951 was $7,393,353, and it is anticipated that for 1952 the cost will exceed that of last year.

PART A. FROM EUROPE

PROJECT TEAMS ACTIVE IN THE UNITED STATES DURING 1951

Austria: 16 teams

Trade-union journalists.
Agricultural extension services.
Agricultural organization study.
Chemical wood study.
Agricultural electrification study.
Agriculture extension techniques.
Plant protection study.
Artificial insemination techniques.
In-plant training for engineers.
Young farmers.
MIT foreign student summer project.
Young Women Farmer Trainees.
4-H directors.
Large farmers.
Harvard trade-union program.
Farm management institute.

Belgium and Luxemburg: 25 teams

Chemical research.
Plastics research.
Foundry team.
Forging and stamping team.
Soil study techniques (Congo).
Agricultural prices, marketing, and distribution.
Statistical services (Congo).
Youth leader.
Agriculture economics study.
MIT foreign student summer project.
National income statistics study.
Dairy study.
Grassland study.
Agricultural economics extension.
Agricultural engineering study.
Potato root eelworm control and eradication.
Horticulture production improvement.
Livestock diseases due to mineral deficiencies.
Vitamin deficiencies in poultry.
Livestock feeding.
Wood technology.
Farm machinery.
Soil improvement methods.
Climatology and microbiology (Congo).
Crop forecasting techniques (Congo).

Denmark: 61 teams

Home economics study.
Drainage engineering.
Air traffic control.
Farm machinery study.
Young farmers.
Plant breeding.
Youth leaders.
Artificial insemination methods.
Improvement in seed and seed grain production.
Cattle breeding.
Pig breeding.
Agricultural information.
Quarantine and control measures in agriculture.
Methods in plant breeding.
Insulation and ventilation of agricultural buildings.
Servo-technique.
Paint and varnish study.
Developments in use of concrete.
Hosiery team.
Foundry team.
Storing and canning of fish.
Mastitis in cattle.
Animal diseases.
Power station maintenance.
Chemical analysis of metals.
Foundry machinery study.
Forage crops and hybrid corn.
Agricultural films.
Plant breeding.
Veterinary hygiene.
Quality standards for dairy products.
Synthetic materials in textile industry.
Soil fertility and chemical testing of soil.
Agricultural bookkeeping.
Farm mechanization study.
Meat industry productivity team.
Fractional distillation mission.
Building construction productivity team.
Herbicide, insecticide, and fungicide study.
Dairy research study.
Welding techniques.
Home economics extension.
Cheese-making techniques.
Dairy industry study.
Forestry research.
Poultry study.
MIT foreign student summer project.
Agricultural building design.
Harvard advanced management course.
Mining of nonferrous metals.
Vegetable and fruit canning.
Farm management research.
Ensilage research and experimental work.
Potato breeding.
Lightweight concrete industry.
Harvard advanced management program.
Lime and tile industry productivity team.
Phosphate fertilizer production.
Shipbuilding study.
Civil aviation operational methods.
Manufacture of 50-caliber ammunition.

France: 92 teams

Young productivity trainees.
Secondary nonferrous metals productivity team.
Citrus fruit genetics and production.
Citrus fruit marketing.
Soils study group.
Building construction productivity team.
Export accountant study.
Nonferrous metal mining group (Africa).
Iron and steel productivity team.
Sulfuric acid, phosphate and mixed fertilizers productivity team.
Metal mining productivity team.
Commercial poultry husbandry study.
Industrial training methods study group.
Petroleum engineering trainees group.
Miscellaneous industries market study group.
Plastics manufacturing productivity team.
Handling and stevedoring in ports productivity team.
Insurance productivity team.
Simplification, standardization, and specialization study group.
Railroad equipment productivity team.
Farm work simplification.
Overseas territories farm machinery study.
Wage systems study team.
Plywood, veneer, and wood crates.
Paper and paperboard productivity team.
Optical and precision instruments distribution study.
Glass industry productivity team.
Highway transportation study group.

Plant insect and disease control study group.
Cotton weaving productivity team.
Steel drawing and rolling productivity team.
Rehabilitation of disabled persons.
Rice culture study group (metropole and overseas territories).
Insulated wire and cable industries productivity team.
Rural youth leaders.
French publishers' and editors' productivity study.
Emergency controls and Federal agencies.
Lime and cement productivity team.
Forestry research.
Root diseases study in cereals.
Soil study.
Management-labor relations within industry.
Agricultural cooperatives study.
Corn breeding and selection.
Pastures and forage.
Graphic industries productivity team.
Paint and varnish productivity team.
Fruits and vegetables production and marketing.
Architects, engineers, contractors productivity team.
Motors and turbines productivity team.
Machine tool accessories and power hand tools productivity team.
Alloying, rolling, and drawing of nonferrous metals productivity team.
Plumbing, heating, air-conditioning productivity team.
Foundations, main walls, material lifting equipment study group.
New materials, prefabrication productivity team.
Carpentry productivity team (building construction group).
Metal construction productivity team (building construction group).
Chlorine and chlorine derivatives industry productivity team.
Town planning, legislation, and financing.
MIT foreign student summer project.
Young farmers.
Tile and brick productivity team.
Fruit canning and jam manufacturing productivity team.
Lead and zinc ore smelting productivity team.
Textile dyeing and finishing productivity team.
Glove industry market study group.
Vegetable canning productivity team.
Young farm women trainees.
Silk and artificial fibers throwing and weaving.
Provincial press study group.
Productivity and full employment study.
Government road construction engineers.
Fruit juice processing.
Work accidents and occupational diseases prevention.
Corn improvement study group.
Gas industry technical study group.
Management engineers study group II.
Laundry and dry-cleaning productivity team.
Techniques of collective bargaining.
Meat packing and canning industry productivity team.
Welding industry technical study group.
Men's ready-made clothing study.
Farm management institute.
Woolen industry productivity team.
Union organization and functioning.
Electric power production and distribution study.
Land-tenure conference.
Agricultural economics services.
Integration of the worker within the enterprise study.
Techniques of collective bargaining, group B.
Techniques of collective bargaining, group C.
Business legislation study.

Germany: 29 teams

Techniques of cellulose production.
Telecommunications study.
Telecommunications technology.
Coal mining productivity team.
Farm machinery study.
Bread making.
Control of X-disease in livestock.
Artificial insemination of dairy cattle.
Poultry production.
Agricultural information.
Animal husbandry and livestock feeding.
Irrigation equipment methods and management.
Dairy production management and distribution.
Marketing agricultural products.
Soil conservation.
Agricultural statistics.
Farm machinery extension methods.
Farm credit.
Plant breeding.
Forest tree nurseries.
Retail food distribution.
Manufacture of artificial limbs.
MIT foreign student summer project.
German productivity center team.
Manufacture of fireproofing products.
Harvard advanced management and trade-union program.
Development of agricultural program and legislation.
Land tenure conference and training program.
Chemists study tour.

Greece: 18 teams

Public health training program.
Ground water irrigation techniques.
Union administration program.
Civil aviation training.
Surface water research and irrigation practices.
Nutrition study and training.
Agricultural home economics extension.
Irrigation management and land preparation techniques.
Range management.
Extension study and training.
MIT foreign student summer project.
Agricultural credit specialist.
Cereal and oilseed processing.
Electric power system trainees.
Extension training methods.
Open house for rural youth leaders.
Medical and public health training.
Land tenure conference and training course.

Iceland: 8 teams

Geophysical prospecting study.
Canning and freezing of fish.
Utilization of fishery byproducts.
Soil survey study.
Young farmers.
MIT foreign student summer project.
Labor leaders.
Paint factory in-plant training.

Ireland: 28 teams

Farm management.
Tourist industry development.
Airlines operations.
Air traffic control.
Aeronautical telecommunications.
Weather forecasting.
Poultry production technology and extension.
Port and docks study.
Phosphate fertilizer manufacture.
Higher agricultural education and research.
Farm mechanization study.
Farm management study.
Agricultural credit facilities.
Sugar-beet industry—genetics.
Sugar-beet industry—chemical engineering.
Oatmeal processing study.
Restrictive trade practices.
Animal nutrition.
Young farmers.
Youth leaders.
MIT foreign student summer project.
Airlines study II.
Soil research.
Paper industry productivity team.
Plant nutrition.
Trade union and productivity project I.
Harvard trade union course.
Chemists study tour.

Italy: 18 teams

Civil aviation team.
Livestock genetics and breeding.
Forage crop production study.
Extension techniques in fruit production.
Plant quarantine study.
Nonferrous metals team.
Solid, liquid and gaseous fuels testing.
Telephone team.
Port study.
Industrial organization and management.
Training steam power operators.
Story of budget and fiscal techniques.
Young farmers.
MIT foreign student summer project.
Reclamation and land improvement.
Farm management institute.
Conciliation and arbitration procedures study.
Land tenure conference.

Netherlands: 49 teams

Knitwear team.
Methods of artificial insemination of animals.
Surinam citrus processing.
Organizational efficiency study.
Letterpress productivity team.
Lithography productivity team.
Poultry farming.
Home economics study.
In-plant training—textile industry.
Trade-union productivity team.
Dairy research.
Young farmers study III.
Cotton spinning and weaving productivity team.
Tuberculosis of cattle.
Poultry disease study.
Swine disease study.
Sterility in cattle.
Brucellosis and mastitis study.
Paper and board packing specialist team.
Heavy clothing industry productivity team.
Agricultural productivity study.
Leather research.
Enamelware study.
Grey iron foundry productivity team.
Small fruits production.
Fruits and vegetables processing.
Soil research.
Horticultural engineering study.
Land improvement study.
Taxation and tax administration.
Oak, elm, and birch disease study.
Industrial electrical equipment team.
Farm women trainees.
MIT foreign student summer project.
Seed treatment and testing.
Alfalfa production.
Soil and land classification.
Improvement of production and processing pulses.
Industrial relations study.
Pests and diseases of agricultural crops.
Research on tension and vibrations.
Farm management institute study.
Vegetable seed production and marketing.
Harvard advanced management course.
Cattle feeding.
Electrical appliances and telecommunications.
Equipment industries study.
Land tenure conference and training program.
Gas industry study.
Electroplating productivity team.

Norway: 46 teams

Milk production and processing.
Textile productivity group.
Agricultural engineering.
Management engineering.
Organization of telegraph and telephone service.

Extraction, refining and use of mica and nepheline.
Pulp and paper team.
Agricultural extension service.
Soil conservation and utilization.
Farm youth organization survey program.
Dairy industry.
Animal husbandry extension study.
Seed testing techniques.
Methods of combatting and diagnosing metabolic diseases.
Methods of silage production.
Horticultural extension study.
Agricultural engineering and architecture.
Administration of farm managerial services.
Potato breeding.
Soil surveying and testing.
Labor-management techniques on scientific management.
In-plant training-management.
Industrial management study.
House building industry productivity team.
Rubber reclaiming study.
Propagation of trees and bushes and nursery management.
Young farmers.
Agricultural films study.
Regional planning for industrial improvement.
Highway transportation study.
Mining industry productivity team.
Forestry statistics.
Industrial and public management study.
MIT foreign student summer project.
Farm management study.
Agricultural radio programs.
Young women farmer trainee program.
Agricultural productivity study.
Farm building team.
Harvard advanced management program.
Forest research.
Government regulations in dairy industry.
Harvard trade-union program.
Telecommunication equipment study.
Forestry productivity team.
Chemists study tour.

Portugal: 6 teams

Financial statistical studies.
Foreign Trade Zone study.
MIT foreign student summer project.
Harvard advanced management program.
Agricultural extension.
Soil conservation.

Sweden: 15 teams

Modern woodworking practices.
Management-labor cooperation study.
Iron ore beneficiation.
Agricultural machinery testing and selection.
Young farmers.
Modern woodworking practices.
Soy bean breeding.
Youth leader.
Agricultural film study.
Electric power study.
Statistical methods.
MIT foreign student summer project.
Industrial and business management study.
Farm women trainees.
Harvard advanced management course.

Turkey: 22 teams

Training in meteorology forecasting.
Statistical study.
Irrigation and water development training.
Agricultural technicians.
Agricultural study.
Civil aviation training program.
Methods of reforestation.
Livestock production and meat industry.
Animal nutrition.
Training in telephone administration.
Soils and soil management.
Public roads study.
Sumerbank executives training program.
Ministry of finance trainees.
Maintenance of steam locomotives.
Advanced public administration training.
Meat packing industry study.
MIT foreign student summer project.
Meteorological executive trainees.
Military chemical arsenal study.
Land tenure conference.
Farm management institute.

United Kingdom: 50 teams

Underground gasification of coal.
Soil fertility study.
Scientific and technological training.
Grassland management.
Grassland study.
Cotton classification and selection.
Technical managers team.
Agricultural economics study.
Agricultural extension study.
Tropical housing survey.
Youth leader.
Telecommunication officers training.
Training in management techniques.
Training in technology and management.
Electrical engineers to study power installation (Maltese Government).
Hotel and catering study.
Agricultural statistics.
Machine tool industry study.
MIT foreign student summer project.
Fruit and vegetable grade assessment.
Agricultural economics research.
Tobacco production and breeding.
Spectographic quantometers construction.
Virus research (Tanganyika).
Harvard advanced management and trade-union course.
Grain storage and drying.
Farm management training program.
Training for industry team I (operatives).
Productivity team No. 26 (lithography).
Training for industry team II.
Productivity team No. 29 (iron and steel).
Productivity team No. 27 (coal mining).
Dry grocery industry productivity team.
Training for industry team III (universities and industries).
Productivity team No. 30 (furniture manufacturers).
Specialist team No. 11 (education for management).
Productivity team No. 30 (zinc and aluminum die-casting).
Fruit and vegetable canning industry.
Conservation and substitution of raw and scarce materials.
Processing of fruits and vegetables.
Cake and biscuit manufacturing productivity team.
Provincial newspaper productivity team.
Constructional steelwork industry productivity team.
Short-term storage of fruits and vegetables.
Woodworking machinery productivity team.
Inspection methods in mass-production industries.
Production control methods.
Land tenure conference.
Metalworking machine tool team.
Bristol aircraft technicians.

OEEC: 23 teams

Foreign trade zone study.
BLS study No. 4.
Industrial safety.
Materials handling.
Water, sewage, and garbage treatment.
Industrial cost accounting study.
Nonferrous ore dressing study.
Production and use of printing machinery.
Oil equipment.
Utilization of wood products.
Paper and board packaging study.
Young chemists study tour.
Refining and drilling study.
Highway improvement and utilization.
BLS study No. 5—Productivity measurement.
Forest fire prevention.
Trade-union course.
Industrial census.
Galvanizing techniques.
Heavy metal fabrication.
World Metallurgical Congress.
Nonferrous smelting and refining.
Technical assistance study.

PART B. FROM SOUTHEAST ASIA

Burma: 7 teams

Youth leaders.
Rangoon port rehabilitation.
Inland water transport.
Postgraduate student training.
Land tenure conference and training program.
Agriculture—Training foreign students.
Chemists study tour.

China: 3 teams

Postgraduate students and trainees.
Chemists study tour.
World Metallurgical Congress.

Indochina: 3 teams

Chemists study tour.
Medical training.
Land tenure conference.

Indonesia: 8 teams

Youth leaders.
Public health training.
Animal feeding and breeding.
Cooperative associations.
Chemists study tour.
Wisconsin land tenure training program.
Industrial training.
Improvement of indigenous industries.

Philippines: 3 teams

Land tenure conference and training program.
Agricultural training and information.
Chemists study tour.

Thailand: 9 teams

MIT foreign student summer project.
In-service training of irrigation engineers.
Public health training.
Chemists study tour.
Telecommunications training.
Hydrographic training.
Cartographic training.
Civil aviation training.
Land tenure conference and training program.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES. Can the gentleman advise us at all to what extent these people who come over here with these teams and with their cameras and everything else are screened, as far as their relationship with any Communist areas are concerned, or their responsibility as people representing the democracies?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. They are presumed to be screened. I would not offer any statement to satisfy the gentleman from Wisconsin as to just how extensive that screening is. Anyhow, it is a fantastic program that is being set up, and I think that we should put an end to it.

Now then, when this program was started it was not designed to be a great WPA project; it was designed merely to bring technical knowledge and assistance to those countries where we felt that such assistance would help them to help themselves.

One of the first witnesses we had in support of the program was Assistant Secretary of State Thorp, and he testified that this meant providing surplus, plus whatever materials are needed, for demonstration purposes. Now then, they have gone far beyond that proposition. It is not only a matter of furnishing a few men but an endless number of projects never contemplated when

the point 4 program was considered. I will enumerate a few, and I am reading from a staff memorandum prepared by the staff of our committee:

The program for each country is divided into six major fields of activity plus one for program direction. These are agriculture; forestry and fisheries; health and sanitation; natural resources, public works, and transportation; industry, handicraft, and housing; and public administration and Government services.

That is the extent to which this technical assistance effort is going. I repeat, it is way out of proportion to anything that this Congress ever intended.

Let me continue. Here, for instance, is a water project, one phase of which includes the construction of a diversion dam, tunnel, and power dam. I will not take the time to go into that matter, but it further illustrates how far the MSA people have gone.

In Pakistan, for instance, 10,000 tons of fertilizer, to include ammonium sulfate, is included in the program. They are building a fertilizer plant in Pakistan. So you see how this is going.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin was allowed to proceed for three additional minutes.)

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. We have an educational project in Libya. Of course, the first need was for buildings and equipment, which the Libyan Government is unable to provide because of a deficit situation so far as the budget is concerned. The program for the first year, therefore, is concerned largely with repair and new construction costs in the amount of $475,000.

In Ethiopia there is an agricultural project, which is built around an agricultural college in which the Emperor is greatly interested. Who would not be interested in it? Also there is a rural-development project to serve as a demonstration area. The program in this field calls for 16 United States technicians, costing $64,000, and supplies and equipment costing $478,150.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Is it not true that the aggregate in this bill is greater than the total requested for the State Department, some $300 million before the House cut it 33 percent in the regular appropriation bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is my understanding.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is aware of the fact that the men most interested and active in the point 4 program are concerned about the substitution of large amounts of money for the personal service upon which it was originally based.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes, that is correct, as I have personally talked with some of these men. They are vitally interested, and their hearts are in the program.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks the report from the Board of Consultants to the Food, Agriculture and Resources Development staff, Technical Cooperation Administration, Department of State. It is a letter to Mr. Whipple, the director of that staff, in which they point out very clearly that there is no need for the supplies and equipment that have been going into this program. This group is anxious to see that that program is geared to technical assistance, with a minimum of extras, such as special projects, power projects, fertilizer plants, etc.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Those are the men who are responsible for the success of the program.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Absolutely. There is no doubt about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

(The letter referred to follows:)

MAY 2, 1952.

To: Clayton E. Whipple, Director, Food, Agriculture, and Resources Development Staff, Technical Cooperation Administration, Department of State.

From: Board of Consultants to the Food, Agriculture, and Resources Development Staff, Technical Cooperation Administration, Department of State.

Subject: Recommendations.

The chief purpose of the TCA program is to help people help themselves, in a simple, direct way, rather than to be utilized as an expedient to attain political and/or military policy objectives. TCA should not be required to administer funds not contributing directly to its fundamental aims.

TCA programs can only succeed if governments and people have confidence in the sincerity with which such help is offered.

In carrying out the projects it is necessary that TCA adopt a "grass roots-village" approach. Such an approach will give maximum results with minimum expenditure of appropriated funds. This will require a staff possessing imagination and determination inspired by a spirit of service.

The desire for assistance should arise from a need recognized by a community as important for the achievement of better living.

The full participation of the community should be sought through the utilization of locally available human and natural resources, local institutions and organizations, local leaders, and local labor supply, toward the end of developing local initiative and competence to continue and expand programs.

In the field of agriculture, TCA should emphasize a few key projects that are quickly, economically, and widely reproducible.

In many of these countries there exists a rich fund of proven knowledge and proven practical application of that knowledge which desperately needs to be disseminated to all of the people.

The accomplishment of only a few projects which are simple and already proven will solve the immediate food problem in the underdeveloped countries.

Typical projects are:

Proven varieties for high-yielding crops and improved livestock.

Small farm tools for use with hand and locally available animal power.

Savings of food from loss through proper methods of rodent and insect control and through efficient methods of storage.

Immediate implementation of plans to eradicate rinderpest, hoof-and-mouth disease, and desert locusts.

We believe attention should be given to sound evaluation of water resources and planning for proper control and use of this vital resource through simple methods of application and/or drainage.

In order to provide incentive to farmers and secure to them a greater proportion of the results of their labors, we believe that better methods of marketing and distribution should be instituted everywhere. As an example, in the East this has been amply demonstrated at Hong Kong.

We believe that emphasis on these types of projects represents the basic philosophy and concept of TCA, and, furthermore, that the American people will wholeheartedly support a program of this nature.

In the development of this program we urge the closest possible collaboration with the food and agriculture organization of the United Nations.

Harold B. Allen, Director of Education, Near East Foundation, New York, N. Y.; L. G. Ligutti, Executive Director, National Catholic Rural Life Conference, Des Moines, Iowa; Wm. A. Schoenfeld, Dean Emeritus and Organization Consultant, Corvallis, Oreg.; E. B. Evans, President, Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College, Prairie View, Tex.; Abner Bowen, Farmer and Businessman, Delphi, Ind.; John H. Reisner, Executive Secretary, Agricultural Missions, Inc., New York, N. Y.; Raymond W. Miller, Consultant, Food and Agriculture Organization, United Nations, and Lecturer, Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, Linden, Calif.; C. Leigh Stevens, Agricultural Engineer and Management Consultant, Yemassee, S. C.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do I correctly understand that the gentleman's amendment prohibits us from spending in any country on the point 4 program more than three times the dollars that we pay for United States technicians and personnel under their direction?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is exactly right.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I hope the House will get first things first in regard to this amendment. This amendment does not add any money to this bill for the so-called technical assistance program. It does not deduct any money from the bill. It says that the individual programs, when it comes to scientific help and supplies, must be operated with a certain ratio as to supplies and technical help. It does not even imply, if you vote for this amendment or vote against it, whether or not you favor the point 4 program. It has nothing to do with that. You will have an opportunity later on to vote your individual conscience on that. Right here, if this amendment is adopted in regard to this program, we would be making a serious mistake, not only on account of disrupting programs that have already begun, but laying down a pattern which will cost the taxpayers of the United States more money if any program is authorized to continue at all.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

If the gentleman will look at page 53 of the committee report, the title here of contributions by the host governments, it says in the first sentence of

the second paragraph, "The amount which the host governments contribute," and so on and so forth. What do you mean by host government?

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak to the point involved here. The point involved has nothing to do with host governments at all. The point has to do with the contribution of the United States Government in these programs, and how these programs will be operated. It has nothing in the world to do with the point that the gentleman just raised.

Mr. GROSS. This deals with the technical assistance program, and here you speak euphoniously of the host government.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: Strike out the amendment and insert "*Provided further*, That not more than 50 percent of any funds authorized under this act for international development may be expended for the procurement of materials, supplies, equipment, or commodities."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I am thoroughly in accord with what my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, proposes, only I do not think he goes far enough. He is saying we should limit supplies 3 to 1, and I think we ought to make supplies 50–50, in a program that is advertised as merely exporting know-how. For many years, we have had programs for giving technical assistance to various countries. There have been necessary small amounts of materials and equipment for demonstration purposes. But, this year we have a vast program, proposed where the general average is 4½ to 1 for supplies and equipment compared to personnel costs, and in some instances the ratio goes over 10 to 1. It seems to me that is a mistake. There is danger that the technical assistance, point 4 program, will simply become a new form of world-wide economic aid. Of course, these countries will accept supplies. Of course, they will permit us to dig wells and build flood-control projects, and furnish all kinds of equipment. But, it seems to me that we do not have the wealth to do this justly and equitably all over the world, and that we had better not get into that sort of thing.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Under your amendment, what portion of $115,000,000 for India could be used for materials, supplies, and so forth?

Mr. VORYS. I shall have an amendment to deal with the amounts later on.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I mean assuming that the figure was $115,000,000.

Mr. VORYS. They could use half of it for supplies, and I think over nine-tenths of it is for supplies under the program provided.

Mr. Chairman, this year, during our hearings, we were told we had abroad 698 technicians under point 4. The proposal for next year was that we send out 2,674. We have technical assistance in MSA, and we have economic aid under point 4, and it is a little bit difficult to unscramble them. But let us look at the two together. The proposal under the bill, as it came to our committee, would send United States technicians and experts over the world for this coming year to the number of 4,070, and that we bring foreigners here to learn different things in the number of 8,470, and the cost of all these experts and trainees would be as follows: First, the experts would cost $48,684,000, and the cost for the trainees would be $28,360,000, and the cost for supplies and equipment will be $283,661,000. It seems to me it might be well if we told them not to spend any more for supplies and equipment than they do for people.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. Is it not a fact that the gentleman's amendment to title II could apply to only one country, Iran?

Mr. VORYS. No. The gentleman from Wisconsin modified his amendment so that it applied to all countries and all funds under the act for international development, I believe; and, therefore, I patterned my amendment to his amendment. I think it applies to all funds for international development.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I would like to point out that the amount requested for personnel is $37,900,000; and the amount for supplies and equipment $37,908,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

(On request of Mrs. KELLY of New York, and by unanimous consent, Mr. VORYS was allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.)

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yeld?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Will the gentleman's amendment affect only Near East countries in southeast Asia, Latin America and South America, those countries of the world which we are endeavoring to assist but cannot do it militarily?

Mr. VORYS. The amendment reads:

Provided, That not more than 50 percent of any funds authorized under the act for international development may be expended for the procurement of materials, supplies, equipment, or commodities.

Since this is the first time we have come to point four in the bill it seemed no doubt to the gentleman from Wisconsin and it seems to me that this would be a good time to consider any over-all limitations on point four, and this would cover all funds for the point-four program.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. But it does affect those areas of the world more than any others?

Mr. VORYS. No; the largest amount would be for the Far East. But the language, if adopted here in either the amendment or the amendment to the amendment, would cover all of point four in titles II, III, and IV.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. Does not the gentleman think that if any such amendment is passed, it should be passed after we determine what amount of point-four funds will be affected? As a matter of fact, it does not affect the amount in the bill.

Mr. VORYS. It does not affect the amount; but at the same time I think it would be well for the committee to have such a principle in mind if it is adopted before they consider the amounts.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to both amendments. I think there are some technical objections to the form and place of the amendment, but since the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Ohio have talked about the general merits and embrace all these titles I would like to discuss it on that basis and point 4 as it would be affected.

These amendments show the difficulties you get into when you try to place a strait-jacket on any of these funds. I think the chairman of the committee raised an interesting question: Would not this affect Iran? I would like to give the answer.

Under the proportions set up in title II the only country that would be affected by the cut would be Iran, because the proportion of supplies to personnel in Iran is approximately 4 to 1 and in other countries it is roughly 2 to 1.

I call your attention to what is happening as described in recent newspaper accounts. Russia today is warning what country? Iran. She is warning Iran against the United States. To come to the floor here today when we are discussing a critical proposal of mutual security for the United States and the rest of the world and to pass such an amendment what country is punished? The only country that receives punishment under title II by the Smith or the Vorys amendment is the country of Iran. That certainly would indicate that the United States is not interested in backing up Iran.

This House argued at great length about a year ago over the subject of wheat to India, and after a considerable amount of debate we authorized a wheat loan of $190,000,000 to keep the people of India from starving. As I recall the debates it was the desire of most of the Members of the House to see to it that India became self-sufficient in the production of food.

The amendments offered by the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Wisconsin extended to other titles, as a matter of fact, would give a death blow to the present program to make India self-sufficient economically in food. The present goal in India is with the United States technical assistance to raise substantially her grain production from 50,000,000 to 57,000,000 tons by 1956.

At the present time there are 467 American technicians in India who are cooperating with 17,000 Indian village workers. These workers need supplies, they need tools, they need fertilizers. It is basically, really, a joint enterprise.

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is adopted it would cut considerably the ultimate goal of India to become self-sufficient. Where will we be then? Instead of 22,000,000 Indian farmers being benefited you would have to cut this down to 6,000,000 Indian farmers.

I have often wondered as I listened to these debates just what we Americans are trying to do with ourselves? Are we only interested in giving a piece of lead to the people of the world or are we interested in giving them some food to put in their stomachs as well? Say what you will, you are never going to stop ideas. You are never going to get American idealism across if all you say to people is, We will put a gun in your hand but under no circumstances will we put a plow in your hand or put a piece of food in your mouth. I think that is something the gentleman from Ohio would not advocate.

Just look at the question, What do ideas do? Those of you who are students of Christianity know that for 300 years the Roman Empire tried to keep the idea of Christianity out. In 313 Constantine finally became a Christian and the Roman Empire adopted Christianity. During the preceding period of time when the ideas of Christianity were pressing against Rome and the Romans, all the Christians had was their faith, their belief in the doctrines of Jesus Christ. Yet when the Roman legions came along and threw these Christians into dungeons and into the Colosseum to the lions, the soldiers of Rome constantly saw day after day these people marching to their death yet not losing their faith. What effect did this have? After 300 years it resulted in the Roman soldiers themselves adopting and advocating Christianity.

Is the United States going to say to the people of the world that all we are going to offer you is a gun, a tank, and a plane? This is what you are going to live on. I say if you do that you are really selling America short. You are saying that what America stands for does not count. You are giving Russia the greatest propaganda weapon for saying all the United States is interested in is death and not in life—"They are interested in war, not in peace."

If we are interested in life and peace, let us give some of these people a piece of bread and not just a gun.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

(On request of Mr. HORAN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. RIBICOFF was allowed to proceed for one additional minute.)

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Does not the gentleman know that when the Roman Government took over Christianity and accepted it something died in the consecration of the Christians who had suffered by persecution for 300 years? We are now moving in the missionary field. You can recall the Millspaugh mission to Iran in the twenties, its flop in the forties; you cannot overcome the fact that something has to be born in the hearts of the people that we are trying to reach. American money in itself cannot rebuild the hearts and the inspirations that must be born in the hearts of these people.

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is right. I do not think you can buy anything with American dollars, but I think American idealism as set forth in the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the Declaration of Independence is something that we can export, and I believe that a little compassion on the part of the United States for these people in critical areas, to show that we are interested in their future and in their welfare, will do more for the United States of America than sending a few tanks and guns.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has again expired.

(On request of Mr. BYRNES, and by unanimous consent, Mr. RIBICOFF was allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.)

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES. The gentleman spoke of India and the relationships there to what we were doing under the technical assistance program. On page 50 of the committee report is a table showing what is anticipated by way of technical assistance, both in technicians and in supplies, for 1953. If I read this table correctly, in view of what the gentleman has said, I am wondering if I am correct. As I read the table, it states that you contemplate spending approximately $7,000,000 for technicians in 1953.

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is right.

Mr. BYRNES. And $106,000,000 for supplies and equipment.

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is correct.

Mr. BYRNES. Is that giving technical assistance or is it giving them supplies? It seems to me that proves the point made by the gentleman from Wisconsin who complains that what we are doing is putting the emphasis on supplies rather than on the know-how.

Mr. RIBICOFF. If we are going to let the Indians be able to produce food, what do we have to do? We have to dam some rivers in order to have water for some of their parched land; we have to give them plows; we have to dig wells; we have to give them fertilizers.

The over-all objective is to raise to 57,000,000 tons the productivity of Indian soil, and we are not going to be able to do it with a handful of American technicians. We have approximately 467 American technicians with 17,000 Indian technicians, and then you are going to have this additional amount of supplies and equipment to make possible the production of 57,000,000 tons of grain production. There is a basic problem in India and that is why the supplies are a disproportionate amount.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is this not a program based upon the extension services, as we know it in this country?

If you go back and read the testimony of those who sought to justify the program in the first place, you will find that it was based upon the principle of our own extension service. As I understand the gentleman's argument, it is that the extension service is not so important; that we have got to send in supplies and equipment, and there, I say, we are away out of line.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The extension service is very important but I, for one, as the gentleman knows from the entire debate, refuse to get placed into the straitjacket that our executive department has dug for themselves. I say to the gentleman that you cannot compare an extension service, with an educated American farmer, as the beneficiary with fertile land and with know-how and technical ability, to the backward countries of the world, where they are so primitive. They do not have the know-how and the tools to work with that the American farmer has under the extension service in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has again expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. RIBICOFF was permitted to proceed for one additional minute.)

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. In the gentleman's initial remarks, he stated that either the Vorys or the Smith amendment would affect only Iran. In the latter part of his remarks he seemed to take a different point of view and said that it would affect India likewise. Can the gentleman explain the inconsistency?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Yes. You will recall that the amendment is addressed to title 2 of the bill. Title 2 covers Africa and the Near East, but the gentleman from Wisconsin discussed all areas, so I was discussing the basic philosophy. Actually, in title 2, Iran is affected. India comes in under Asia, which is under title 3. I was making the over-all point so that we would not have to repeat the same argument when we reached title 3 of the bill. As the amendment stands it would affect only title 2, and I am sure that the gentleman from Wisconsin, if the amendment is adopted to title 2, would also introduce a similar amendment to title 3. That is the explanation to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out to the committee that this is an excellent example of attempting to legislate hurriedly here in a few minutes to set up steadfast rules of what the divisional expenditures shall be between supplies and technical assistance under the point 4 program. This program, as you all know, is devoted very largely to food production, health, and education. Now, we are expected to choose between whether or not we shall make this ratio 4 to 1 or 1 to 1, and to me that is an excellent example of just how well the amendments have been thought out.

How can we intelligently select between 4 to 1 and 1 to 1? Why not let the program go ahead as it is intended and let the needs of the program decide what the division should be made?

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I had intended to ask my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] to yield, but everybody else was asking him to. But I want to call the attention of the committee to this fact: That the Ribicoff amendment, which will be found on page 23, line 20, provides $100,000,000 of funds made available under the Mutual Security Act, of which $20,000,000 to any country may be supplied without regard to any conditions as to eligibility. I voted for that. The purpose was to put flexibility in here so that emergency or unique situations, such as Iran or other places, could be taken care of. There certainly will not be enough money in there to carry on Chester Bowles' program in India, but there will be enough money in the Ribicoff amendment to take care of items in countries where there are special conditions. I just wanted the committee to know about this important amendment which I supported and which I hope stays in the bill which gives great flexibility in taking care of special situations. Since this is in here, it seems to me we are justified in putting a modest limit on the amount of economic aid that can be sent around the world under point 4.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I would say to the gentleman regarding the Ribicoff amendment, everybody is climbing aboard to get something out or to get something in. If that continues very long there will not be very much left.

Now, we have many countries involved, and with $100,000,000, with not more than $20,000,000 to one country, it certainly will not take care of the situation sought to be taken care of, either by the gentleman from Wisconsin or the gentleman from Ohio. There are other special needs that may come within this section of which the gentleman from Ohio is well aware.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I honestly feel that the best part of this program is probably the point 4 program if it is properly administered.

The gentleman spoke about the situation in India, to teach the people over there to produce more of their food. As I recollect it, it is not so many days ago that I read an article in the papers that they were reducing their food production and going into the production of more hemp for bagging. It is rather strange that these four-hundred-and-some technicians over there do not carry out the program according to the intent of the drafters of this legislation.

Speaking about the food that the gentleman states we should give the people in India so that they can have something to live on, as a good Christian duty, if they are getting any of the food that we ship over there to the Government and the program is administered in the same way it was in Europe, with the billions of dollars worth of food we sent to Europe, the poor people who do not have any money do not get that food. They have to buy food in order to get it, and they have to buy it from the Government through the regular channels.

I want to make an observation on the technical assistance and supplies program. I had occasion to be a member of the Herter committee, of which the distinguished gentleman from Ohio and other distinguished chairmen of this committee were members. I traveled in all of the countries that were to receive our aid and assistance. I had occasion last year to travel over some of the same countries. I went through the countries to see what they were doing as to food production. I ran into some of our technical experts from the United States. The first place I ran across them was in Western Germany, where I traveled for 2 days with a colleague of mine to see what they were doing to produce their own food. I found the Germans very thrifty and hard working. They were working on their little 5- or 10-acre farms, with one horse, and every member in the family was working. To my amazement I found they were producing about two and one-half or three times as much per acre as we were producing in the United States.

We got down to one of the elegant hotels maintained by the State Department near Bonn, and there I ran into one of our agricultural experts. I said, "What are you doing over here?" He said, "Oh, we are over here trying to tell these people what to produce and how to run their farms." I said, "Don't you know that they are producing two or three times more than we are in the United States, and that we could learn a lot from them?" He said, "Well, I know that." I suppose this man gets $12,000 or $15,000 a year and expenses, and lives on the fat of the land. He said, "I know what they are doing." I said, "Well, then, what are you doing over here?" He said, "We are trying to get these people to use tractors."

I said, "Do you mean to tell me you are trying to get these people who operate these 3-, 4-, 5-, or 10-acre farms to use tractors, where they can do it with one horse and with the aid of members of their family?" He said, "Of course, it would not be practical for them to use tractors." So I said, "What in the world are you doing to earn your money?" He said, "We are trying to get some of the big farmers in France, Germany, and in the other parts of Europe to use these tractors."

I do not think we can teach those people very much. They resent our interference. They resent the fact that we have the men come around there telling them what to do, when they are probably doing in Europe twice as well as we are to produce the food that is necessary to maintain themselves and their economy.

I have also been in other parts of the world. I have not been in Iran, but it seems to me last year I heard they were going to ship over scores of self-propelled combines to Iran and Iraq. What would they do with them? They are farming there in the most primitive manner. They have no need for such equipment. If we can get down to earth with this program and give these people probably a little more modern equipment, a scythe or something to work with, rather than to work with a hoe, and a few other things, then we will be doing something for them rather than something to them, and wasting our resources and injuring them in the long run.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. HARVEY. I, like the gentleman, am prompted to think that some technical assistance is truly worth while, but I recall the attention of the gentleman with regard to Iran, that the present program calls for $28,000,000 for technical assistance to Iran, and ironically enough that is exactly the amount we have appropriated in the agriculture appropriation bill for extension services for the whole United States.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is not very much for what we are doing here to produce food that some of us are asking to give away to the rest of the world.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I just wanted to bring out the point that in India the counterpart funds are being used exactly as in Europe so that the wheat that we send there is sold by the Government to anybody who can afford to buy it, and the money put into the counterpart funds, and out of the funds they make improvements or anything else they want to do.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I take it that the hungry people who do not have the money are still hungry.

Mr. MASON. Of course.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is it not a fact also that it is almost impossible at the present time to get technicians to send to all these different parts of the world?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. When I heard that there were over 400 in India, I just wondered where they got hold of all these technicians. Maybe they picked up men who were in the Army, and who could not get much of a job in the United States, and sent them over there as agricultural experts.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if our chairman might attempt again to secure limitation of time for debate on the pending amendment?

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 15 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Reserving the right to object. That may be all right with some of the Members, but each of us have a responsibility here, and I propose to carry out my responsibility. I want to see first how much time each Member would have to speak.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 20 minutes, which, I believe, would leave almost 4 minutes for each Member.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I think we have reached the place in the debate where it would be helpful if someone on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs would give a technical definition of what constitutes know-how. If you give me a permit to export know-how, at the moment I do not know what you mean. If you give me a permit to export an automobile or a Ford tractor or a Farmall tractor, I would know what you were talking about. The administration and the proponents of this program have led hundreds of people in my district to believe that this know-how program deals basically with the export of technical information. I have been over in the other fellow's chicken yard looking around a little bit, too. I have talked with some of the staff of our commercial departments of the embassies throughout the world and obtained their reactions, and where I have pinned them down, they have said to me, "Now, listen, Congressman, you have raised the question here about a custom or a practice that has been in operation in this country for 100 or 200 or 300 years, and when you ask why we do not attempt to use our know-how to change that custom, we are simply telling you that we are not sticking our noses into that proposition. We have all the trouble we want." I have replied to that very emphatically, "Well, if that is the attitude of the American staff, then I do not propose to vote for the cost of the exportation of know-how." If it is not to be used, why spend the money?

Mr. Chairman, we are a great people for getting down on our knees and praying a prayer under a certain slogan, and in 20 minutes after somebody starts to answer the prayer, we change the slogan and the program. That is exactly what is occurring here with the point 4 program. I am for either one, or both, of these amendments—not that I think we ought to send two-thirds in the form of material and only one-third in the form of technical knowledge, or that we should send 50 percent in the form of material. You are sending all the material that you can get your hands on, and squeezing all of the tax dollars from our taxpayers to pay for it, irrespective of this program.

I am not too anxious to support everything that comes to me, but if you do want the expert American technical knowledge made available to other people and you can get at least the embassies and the ministers and the commercial consulates, and so forth, to go along with you, we might make a little progress with the program. But I will tell you that you are not going to change the situation, for instance, in France, and to where the consumer can get some benefit out of the program. In France, the cartel system, the trust system, combinations in restraint of trade, all continue to economically destroy the poor man. Competitive forces do not operate. You are not going to be able to supply a Ford tractor or a Farm-All tractor to some fellow and make it produce when he is accustomed to using a water buffalo down in Chittagong, India, and train him to use it until you get about 50 years more of civilization and supply bases and gas and other stations for the maintenance of the tractor after it gets there. The tractor fails to perform, and the native pushes it off in the canal or drainage ditch, and returns to his buffalo.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] is recognized.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, what interests me particularly is this effort of point 4 to take money or squeeze money with the help of the sheriff or the tax collector alongside out of an unwilling American taxpayer and assign that money to somebody who says he has the know-how. In the very nature of things that leads to irresponsibility, even to corruption. The thing just cannot and does not start right.

You can get many illustrations from your own office if you are on the mailing list of MSA or ECA. You do not get much mail that is essentially amusing and fantastic. Just ask that your name be placed on the MSA or ECA mailing list, and you will.

Here is an example of how our irresponsible personnel function when they have money given to them that they did not earn. They are not volunteers but paid politicians to go over there to tell them the know-how. Ten of our experts over in Bangkok, in Thailand, were sitting on the bank of a canal enjoying a picnic. The fruit vendors and the officials of Thailand coming along the canal would call out and say: "Hi, Austin, Hi, Austin." So they cabled that information; they wanted to show how good the personal relationship was between our know-how men and their citizens, how it was developing on a friendly basis. You will see the statement at the bottom of this cable: "These despatches have been received by cable from officers of the Mutual Security Agency in western Europe and Asia."

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman care to yield at that particular point?

Mr. GWINN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Who is Austin? It is Austin F. Flegel, of Bangkok, Siam.

Mr. GWINN. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Administrator of ECA, a wonderful personality and a great humanitarian.

Mr. GWINN. With other people's money.

Mr. CRAWFORD. With other people's money, with the taxpayer's money. I know him personally. I have sat there on the canal and talked to him about this program. I said: "Austin, why do you spend this money here?" He said: "Well, Fred, these are our friends; if you are going to give away your money why not give it to your friends." He is very practical about it all.

Mr. GWINN. Here is another one, and there are just dozens of examples of how we are spending this know-how. One of our know-how experts is over in Burma, and here is a cable saying that one of ECA's dilemmas was: Can elephants and water buffalo outwork machinery?

As I get it from this information our know-how men are learning more about water buffalos and elephants that the Burmese know all about than our own foreign bureaucrats know about how tractors should work in Burma.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN] is recognized.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, during the course of the last couple of minutes debate we have heard reference about wheat to India. Just 1 year ago this week, on May 24 of last year, the House voted to grant $192,000,000 for wheat for India; and the plea at that time, like the plea today, was threatened starvation, and to save us from the Russians.

As the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] said a while ago, the thought behind this expenditure is to make possible more production. He has also pleaded for these funds because as he says the Indians are so primitive they do not have the know-how. Let me give you a little information for your benefit. I was one of those who voted against wheat for India last year because I thought we were being taken for a ride. I want to undertake in the minutes I have remaining to cover two points; one is the wheat to India, to save them from starvation, and the other, trying to outdistance Russian propaganda.

In the Madras Legislative Assembly, Food Minister J. L. P. Roche-Victoria spoke of the offer of the Russians to supply them with 50,000 tons of rice. We were bludgeoned with the idea that we had to give more than the Russians because we did not want to be pikers. If you will look at that speech, you will note that the Soviet Union made its offer of rice apparently as fuel for Communist propaganda in India without specifying the price. The Indian Government tried to cancel the order when the price charged was found to be almost double the normal value, but it was too late because the food was being consumed and, therefore, they had to pay the Russian overcharge.

Mr. Chairman, I want to quote from a dispatch by George Weller, of the Daily News Foreign Service. Here is what he says about the grain which was so desperately needed last year:

Granaries are bulging with wheat purchased under the $192,000,000 American loan

and still undistributed. India's food difficulties are due to administrative red tape as well as low production.

He also stated:

There are spot famines in two localized corners of Bengal and Cochin because officials refuse to open granary doors to a public lacking cash. The Government has withdrawn cash and food subsidies to cities to save funds and enable farmers to take advantage of the free market.

The Indians may be rather dumb when it comes to food production and using the tools for raising more farm products, but they are not very dumb when it comes to knowing how to manipulate prices so that somebody can make a dollar.

If the Members will view the record of last year, when we were given the great song and dance about the urgent need, and many Members on the floor spoke about the millions of starving Indians and how badly they needed aid and wheat, they may change their minds. Check with Mr. Weller, check his reputation with any newsman and you will find he usually knows whereof he speaks.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. India may not be so intelligent but she has at least sense enough to know that even though she is a member of the United Nations and she is a nation of 360,000,000 people, there is not one Indian man standing alongside the boys from the United States in Korea.

Mr. SHEEHAN. That is right. Therefore, in thinking of foreign aid, let us think of the American taxpayers and be realistic for a change.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry we are in this difficulty; however, it was foreseen and the people in the Mutual Security Agency and the Technical Cooperation Administration have to take the responsibility. This issue of separating and correctly labeling economic aid and technical assistance was discussed at least 15 times in the committee and we tried our best to get those in charge of the program to help us come down here and be candid and on the level with the Congress.

The so-called point 4 program is the only program we have in many parts of the world that makes sense for the long pull. I am interested in it. Back in the Eightieth Congress we set up its forerunner or prototype when we established the Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction in China. We tied it down so that it could not do anything beyond training and demonstration, and it succeeded spectacularly. It did not get into the sort of commodity program which would try to solve people's immediate problems with transfusions of American goods and not help them get into a position where they could grow their own food through better irrigation and better agricultural methods, and produce more goods, beginning with their little home and village industries, and so forth.

There are certain countries, for example, Iran, Pakistan, and India, where the need for immediate economic assistance is so great, where their internal difficulties are so urgent that they must also have, in my judgment, certain commodity aid of exactly the same sort we gave to France, Austria, and Italy beginning at the end of 1947 and through the Marshall plan. The fact is that in the Middle East and Far East two types of programs are needed; a long-term, inexpensive training program, so-called technical assistance, consisting of specialists to train local personnel, some pilot plants and demonstration agencies; and a more expensive short-range commodity supply program to help them over the present crisis until they can produce or earn for themselves on a more adequate basis. Instead of the TCA people pointing out the two types of programs and making their case for each, they lumped both under the name of point 4 which has become popular throughout the country. For some of the countries of Asia, what is called point 4 is in reality in this bill 90 percent Marshall plan type of aid. I do not object to the provision of economic aid. I think it is necessary. I object to selling something under false pretenses.

Read the hearings and see how often we urged them to be frank with the Congress. We told them that if they had a good program they could sell it to the Congress and the people, but if they tried to sell commodity aid as point 4, all they would get is amendments which would knock out the commodity aid part of it and in the long run it would discredit and destroy the technical training program, too.

If you will read pages 71 and 72 of the hearings you will find some questions I asked of Mr. Harriman. Mr. Harriman had stated:

If there were no danger of subversion, we could carry out programs of technical cooperation in these countries at a slower pace and not speed them up with considerable quantities of equipment and supplies from the United States to support the work of the experts.

I asked him:

Is that an announcement of a basic change in the point 4 program and its character.

He replied:

No; the character is the same, but it is speeded up in these countries, so that faster results can be obtained in those countries where the need for speed is necessary.

Mr. Chairman, you cannot substantially speed up a training program. You cannot take a youngster in the first grade and say that since he needs to get to the twelfth grade more quickly in order to start supporting his relatives, you will give him more vitamins and faster training and he will get there in 8 instead of 12 years. The people in these countries are underdeveloped all along the line; economically, agriculturally, educationally, politically, socially, and neither we nor anyone else can produce all the needed changes overnight. This can only be a slow long-term program. Yet some of the countries also need certain economic aid at once.

So I do not know what to do with these amendments. I think that of the gentleman from Ohio is too drastic. We do not want to prevent proper aid, but we do need to register our disapproval of the methods used in presenting these programs. Then in the conference there should be worked out amendments that will separate the two forms of aid and let each stand on its own merits; if necessary each being brought back to the House for separate votes. Only so, in my judgment, can we act intelligently and wisely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. JAVITS yielded 1 minute of his time to Mr. JUDD.)

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a word about the second unjustifiable feature which is not readily apparent. One error, as I have said, is trying to combine the technical training and demonstration program under the same over-all umbrella with a commodity program, and under the same label. I think that is wrong.

The other is the mistaken soft-headedness that provides for our sending commodities to countries with dollar balances. Burma, for illustration, exports oil and rice; Indonesia, oil, spices, and rubber. Thailand does the same. Their exports to dollar countries exceed their imports. They have dollar surpluses. There are some commodities they have to buy abroad with dollars. But why should we provide Burma, for example, with $1,600,000 worth of chemicals and $1,500,000 worth of cotton, when she has a favorable dollar trade balance? There is no justification for taking the American taxpayers' money to give them items that they can buy with their earned dollars. This whole thing ought to be worked over. In doing so, we ought to have the cooperation and sympathetic assistance, instead of the opposition of those in the agencies handling these matters. I hope that out of the conference will come something that is workable and that we can conscientiously support.

(Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted him to Mr. JAVITS.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I just want to observe, Mr. Chairman, that I hope, using Iran as a horrible example today, that it is not a classic example of doing the wrong thing at the wrong time. I have a bulletin that I just took off the ticker tape out here with the dateline "Moscow," just about 5 minutes ago:

Moscow.—The Soviet Union charged formally today that Iran's acceptance of American military aid violates the 1921 Soviet-Iranian Treaty admitting Russian troops to Iran if that country's soil is used by foreign military forces hostile to the Soviets.

The Kremlin made its protest in a note delivered by Foreign Minister Andrei Y. Vishinsky yesterday to the Iranian Ambassa-

dor here. It accused Iran, a Russian neighbor on the south, of "cooperating with the United States Government in the implementation of the latter's aggressive plans against the Soviet Union."

Observers here consider it likely that, because of the Russian protest, Iran will reconsider her acceptance of the United States aid and, if she does not, the Soviets will follow up with another strong protest.

In Washington a United States official said the Russian protest evidently was designed to intimidate the Iranian Government. He said the Tehran Government had been under heavy Soviet pressure before and is not expected to give in this time.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am sure the gentleman from Michigan did not mean to give the wrong impression to the Committee. He said that there is not one boy from India that is fighting alongside our American boys in Korea. I am sure he will remember that General Ridgway, in his address yesterday, included India with other allies fighting communism in Korea.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, just a comment on what my colleague has said. There is no question about the fact that such units from India as are in Korea are minor; I beleive they are noncombat units. There is little question about the fact that the position of Mr. Nehru with respect to his inflexible opposition to the Soviet in India's voting in the United Nations, has not been what we desire—that is giving the other side the best of it, but it does not make any difference in this argument, so we might as well lay that at rest.

The fundamental point in this argument which seems to be overlooked, and which the gentleman from Minnesota Dr. JUDD, I think, has so very admirably pointed out, is that sure, the administration may be bungling, but the importance of it is, whether bungling or not, we are at least at work on what needs to be done.

It might interest the House to know that with respect to the Near East, which is the very section we are considering now, I, myself, introduced an amendment to carry out what the gentleman from Minnesota had in mind, to separate from technical assistance what was really technical assistance, so that you will find in the bill with respect to this particular section the dollar assistance is set up in a unit.

Now, what these amendments will do, unfortunately, is to kill the very important areas in which we are doing the best job of economic and technical assistance in political terms, and these are, as has been pointed out, India and Iran.

May I call the attention of the Committee to the fact, on page 50 of our committee report, that in India we have $106,517,000 in supplies and equipment as part of the program for India and only $7,400,000 in terms of the salaries and compensation of technicians and trainees.

So that is the program that is going to be hit right on the head.

What is our situation in India? Somebody talked here about a plea. Can we not wake up to the fact that we are not doing business on a street where we have all the trade? Can we not wake up to the fact that we are not legislating in a vacuum? Can we not wake up to the fact that military, technical, and economic assistance have occurred because we have the grimmest, the most deadly, the most dangerous competition which any power on earth has ever had, the competition of the Soviet Union?

My colleague from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN] may have thought he was pointing out a reason for carrying these amendments when he talked about Russian duplicity, but he was giving a very eloquent argument why these amendments should be defeated, because the only way to show up Russian duplicity is by calling their bluff. Would we ever have shown the people of India that the Russians meant them no good, that they intended to overcharge them and double charge them and triple charge them for their rice, if we had not made the Indian grain loan? I emphasize it was a loan, not a grant.

Another thing that is very important is, suppose you had a bill before you today, suppose this bill was unraveled and the administration was unraveled as it should be—I agree with Dr. JUDD—to provide that the payment of technicians should be $7,400,000 for India and we should give them $106,000,000 of supplies. Do you think a majority of this committee would not pass it as such? I deeply believe it would. With 330,000,000 people at stake in India with the knowledge that if the free peoples lose India they are likely to lose Asia, and if they lose Asia they may indeed lose the whole world for freedom.

Who would stop and be a stickler at this amount in view of what we are already appropriating in terms of armed defense?

Let us remember this finally: The only offensive we have in the world, unless we are to fight a preventive war—and it has been repeated again and again that we do not intend to do that, but it cannot be repeated too often—the only offensive we have in the world, in addition to our educational program against communism is these soldiers of peace, these technicians who are going into these areas and doing the job of trying to help people at the grass-roots level. And why? Because we are giving gifts or because we believe that people on the brink of starvation will embrace our competitors, even if they know it will enslave them, if they cannot get some help from us. The best answer is that in a certain area of India where there is starvation, we have had very recently the election of a local Communist-dominated government. If we cannot read that handwriting on the wall, then we are indeed not measuring up to the great job we have to do here for the American people and for the free world.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VORYS) there were—ayes 82, noes 88.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 84, noes 91.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RICHARDS and Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 119, noes 103.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, for 2 days I have been carrying some remarks that I had spent some time on, hoping that the occasion would arise during general debate where I could make them. I shall not ask the indulgence of the House to listen to all that I have committed to paper, but I will put it in the RECORD. I trust it is a thoughtful speech. It is not a happy one, because I am not happy about our situation in the world nor in the United States of America, nor in the House of Representatives.

I see our guests, our constituents, our young men and young women going through this Capitol daily. They have a right to trust us, and I think they do; but sometimes I wonder if we are doing our best for them now or in the generations that are to come with them and after them. I see us here at a time when I think the world is in the worst condition outside of war that I have ever known it; I think it is in the worst condition so far as hope of peace is concerned that anyone now living has seen when we were not in actual war.

During the 175 years of our existence we have engaged in war for 25 years; that is one-seventh of our national life. We have people in the United States who are always saying "There is no danger." They said it before the Spanish-American War; they said it before World War I, and they said it right up to Pearl Harbor.

I remember sitting here and watching and listening to a vote only a few weeks before Pearl Harbor when the draft law was extended by only one vote; in other words, if the vote had been 202 to 203, the other way, we would have taken down instead of built up our Army, our Navy, and all our elements of defense before we were struck at Pearl Harbor. We have people still explaining why they did not vote a small appropriation to dredge the harbor of Guam. They are still explaining that.

We, in this House of Representatives should not have it upon our heads that we are not ready with money, with materials, and with men. When I read what Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Army Chief of Staff, said a few days ago, I first had a feeling of outrage. He said:

Some of the types of ammunition important to our front-line soldiers have been

rationed in Korea because production still does not equal our normal battle expenditures, and World War II stocks have either been exhausted or have approached exhaustion.

General Collins added to my concern when he said if we were attacked tomorrow in Europe that—

> We would have no reserves of some of the most important types of ammunition and our front-line troops would have to limit their ammunition expenditures to what came off the production line.

As I said I reasoned that we are the world's most productive country and asked why we could not adequately supply our soldiers with ammunition.

I felt that if such a situation existed there must be criminal negligence and the responsibility should be fixed promptly.

That was alleviated in my mind to a great extent by the remarks of Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway yesterday when he said, not only in the House but before the committees of Congress, that we had an Army in Korea that could hold the line. I wonder if we are going to hold the line here?

(On request of Mr. McCORMACK, and by unanimous consent, Mr. RAYBURN was allowed to proceed for five additional minutes.)

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I notice this house in glee, and it seemed to me without a great deal of reason, cutting the appropriations in this bill. The committee has already cut a billion dollars below what those in charge and who are supposed to know the most about world affairs said was necessary. Now by one amendment yesterday $600,000,000 more was cut from this bill.

Are we going to be there with too little and yet too late again?

This money, in my opinion, every dollar of it, is being spent for peace, not for war. If we can help our allies and those democracies that are allied with us to get upon their feet so that they can stand to defend themselves and help us defend ourselves and the other democracies of the world, we can cease these appropriations and come back home. But whether or not the amounts we are appropriating here are going to insure that peace that we pray and hope for I do not know.

A little while ago this House reduced the budget estimate for our Armed Forces by $6,000,000,000. I think that was a dangerous and an unwise thing to do. In that same bill we wrote a provision imposing an arbitrary figure of $46,000,000,000 for defense expenditures. No one can think Robert Lovett, Secretary of Defense, is a radical or an excitable man, but here is what he says about that action: "For all three services results are so serious as to indicate a possible critical blow to preparedness efforts and the defense of the country," our country.

Then Mr. Lovett said the result of the limitations if "honestly carried out would be to demobilize a substantial part of our Armed Forces."

That is pretty serious right here at home when we are also reducing amounts tremendously to help our allies get upon their feet to defend themselves and to help defend us.

Let me repeat, those who stand with me and believe as I do and think they know something about conditions around this world want to spend whatever is necessary to make ourselves and those who stand with us so strong that no international desperado will ever dare attack us because he knows he will be beaten into the dust if we, with our natural resources, with our capacity for production, can have the money to carry it out.

We expended three hundred and fifty billion in less than 5 years fighting World War II. But there was the greater tragedy. There was expended the lives and the blood of thousands upon thousands of the flower of our young manhood and womanhood. War is waste. We shot away, we burned, we destroyed strategic materials because we were not prepared.

Suppose we have another war. It will cost more than that; it will be more furious than the last one. If we expend $50,000,000,000 a year for 5 years making ourselves strong, making us feared, that would be only five-tenths of what we expended in World War II, in which we lost all of these lives and all of these properties. Suppose another one comes. It will not only be the soldiers upon the battlefields that will have lost their lives; probably thousands upon thousands of civilians will be bombed out of existence, and billions of dollars worth of private property go to the dust.

Do we want to take those chances? Do we want to hazard these things? We are passing on that question in the House of Representatives in the year 1952 in our defense program and in our mutual-aid programs. Anybody who has a boy, or even a kinsman's son, that boy is more precious to you or to your neighbor than somebody else's millions.

For us peace has become abnormal and war, or preparation for war, normal. And there is little reason to believe that in the next decade or two this situation will change.

Readiness for war is imposed upon us by the stubborn facts of our time. It is the more imperative that we be ready because we are leaders of one great wing of the human race. To be unready now is to jeopardize the survival of this Nation and the whole free world.

When, therefore, we deal with preparedness or with military and economic aids to our allies, we are actually dealing with the life or death of our country and the future of the world for centuries to come.

Someday men will say of us: "They served us well," and bless our names. Or they will say: "They failed us," and bitterly curse us.

We are called, then, to rise superior to ourselves; to stand above pettiness, jealousy, political party preferences, partisanship.

When 176 brave men died recently in the collision between the *Wasp* and the *Hobson*, they died, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Americans. Their loved ones mourn American dead. And those who survived to serve their country again will do so as Americans. Survival is not a matter of party affiliation. Death knows no party labels.

It behooves us, then, in the grave matters of foreign affairs, to conduct ourselves, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Americans. I am a Democrat. I am also an American. As both, it gives me great pleasure to say, and makes me the prouder of my country, that many high-hearted, noble-minded Republicans, in and out of Congress, have made invaluable contributions to the foreign policy of our times.

I have been a Member of this House during the two global wars we have fought. Now we are all in a period without parallel in history.

There have been wars before. But never—until the last war—had there been a true world war. There have been revolutions before. But never before has revolution flamed simultaneously from one end of the earth to the other. There have been times when men, here and there, were changing their attitudes toward the world. But never before our day has there been a time when all mankind was engaged at once in changing its attitudes toward the world.

It follows, therefore, that since our times are without parallel, we must act without parallel.

I do not pretend to a full understanding of our times. I do not believe that any man has this understanding. They will be clearer to those who come after us than to us. But some things are clear.

One is that man's technical development is far ahead of his moral development. And scientific man, when not controlled by morality, is the most dangerous thing ever unloosed upon earth.

The other thing is that man has always been engaged in a struggle between good and evil. But now unadulterated evil roams the world. It does credit to the essential goodness of Americans that they disbelieve in such evil. But self-preservation dictates that we recognize it and move to checkmate it in every way possible.

Other things are also clear.

From Waterloo in 1815 until the outbreak of the First World War in 1914, we enjoyed a century of dynamic growth. We devoted all our energies to building this Nation. We could do so because Britain then policed the earth and largely kept the peace. But in 1914 we moved into a new and dark era.

The first global war then began. It ended in 1918. Thereafter we had an uneasy armistice for 20 years. In 1939 the Second World War began. Technically it ended in 1945. Actually, it has never ended at all. And now, 7 years after, we face the threat of a third world war.

There are two factors to be considered here.

The first is that men have been almost continuously at war for nearly 40 years.

The second is that the time lag between wars grows shorter and shorter, while the wars increase in dimensions and destructiveness.

The convulsions of our times are universal and titanic. It would be foolish to believe that they will quickly subside.

In all our wars, we have been unprepared. In the last war we were taken by surprise although there had been ample warning. We can no longer afford

the dangerous and dubious luxury of unpreparedness.

In his first inaugural address, Thomas Jefferson could say of the United States that it was "Kindly separated by nature and a wide ocean from one-quarter of the globe." Now the world is physically one. In terms of travel time Moscow today is as close to New York as Philadelphia was in Benjamin Franklin's time. Our potential enemy has intercontinental airplanes and the atomic bomb. The words of the Negro spiritual apply to all men everywhere: "There's no hiding place down there."

Several factors worked for us in the great wars of our times. What were they?

We were saved from destruction, or serious injury at home, by the accidents of geography and space. The wars were fought on the soils of other peoples.

But now geography and space no longer work for us. The air is a two-way ocean.

We came late into both the global wars. We could do so because we had powerful allies. They held the enemy at bay until we could come onto the battlefield.

I have unbounded admiration and the deepest gratitude for the courageous men and women of our fighting forces. They fought and died on many a foreign field during two global wars. Yet the wars could not have been won without the factories of America.

But the factors that formerly favored us, either exist no longer or are sharply weakened.

Hitherto, when the enemy got the jump on us, we knew that we could eventually overtake and destroy him. Our factories, invulnerable to attack, almost guaranteed victory. But now our potential enemy has weapons with which to attack them. He knows principal targets. He knows that much of our industry is highly concentrated.

Our borders, therefore, are no longer on the Rhine, the Elbe, or some other foreign stream. They are on the Missouri, the Hudson, the Mississippi.

Our European allies suffered dreadfully in two global wars. Not yet recovered from the first, they were hurled into the second. Today France fights a costly war in Indochina, and Britain a costly war in Malaya, while both must shoulder the burden of rearmament at the same time. And some of our allies struggle with huge Communist Parties at home.

It may be well for us to recall that while the United States in 1914 was a debtor Nation, France was the world's richest country per capita, and Britain was banker to the world. But now we are the richest people on earth and both of these great nations need aid from us.

What is the upshot of all this? It is that we must be prepared for any eventuality and can no longer rely upon allies single-handedly to hold the enemy at bay until, in our good time, we arrive on the battlefield.

But the alarming thing is this: Many democracies seem for a long time to have been losing their instinct for self-preservation.

In passing, I want to say a word about our potential enemy. Powerful, fanatical, determined, he is bent upon world domination. Hitler told all men that he was out to conquer them. But few of us took him seriously. That was a grave error on our part. Now Soviet leaders tell us the same thing. At their weakest moments they have never deviated from their course. Let us, then, take them at their word.

As I see it, we must do the following things:

First. We must adopt a long-run view of world affairs. The race is not always to the swift.

Second. We must accept struggle and peril as part of our daily portion.

Third. We must use our power and intelligence to prevent a third world war, if possible.

Fourth. We must possess ourselves in patience.

In 1936 Winston Churchill, addressing the House of Commons, gave his countrymen sound advice that we might well heed today. He said: "Let us never accept the theory of inevitable war; neither let us blind our eyes to the remorseless march of events."

All this may require a substantial transformation in our temperament; something that is not easy to do. We are impatient. But our potential enemy is endlessly patient. He thinks in terms of decades and centuries. Many of his ambitions of today were his ambitions 400 years ago.

Bearing these general considerations in mind, I come now to considerations of specific acts.

During recent months we have conferred with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and others.

When we deal with them we are in somewhat of a quandry. We are not expert in their field. We cannot pass expert judgment upon their requests. But they also are in a quandary. The military security of the Nation is their grave responsibility. Yet they cannot know precisely what they may need for this would be to know what they cannot know; namely, what is in the mind of the potential enemy. Nonetheless they must be prepared for all sorts of contingencies that may or may not arise.

Thus the Korean conflict came up over night. If it could not have been anticipated, neither could we anticipate that it would be as long and as costly as it has proved to be.

Yet I ask you: Is any Member of this House prepared to stake the security of the Nation upon the assumption that there will not be another Korea tomorrow somewhere else? Or another Pearl Harbor?

We cannot achieve complete military security. We are bound to run risks. But I am in favor of the highest degree of security attainable. We are the enemy's principal target. I would like to see our risks reduced to the smallest margin. Let us remember the old maxim of prudence: "For want of a shoe the kingdom was lost."

Of course the price is high. The price of freedom has always been high. It was high at Valley Forge and Lexington. It was high at the Marne in 1914. It was high in France in 1944. But the price of defeat is death and slavery.

If the price of freedom is eating hoecake and molasses, I am for that.

If its price is hoecake and branch water, I am for that.

I have tried as hard as any man to raise the American standard of living for all the people.

But this Nation will go down in the dust—and deservedly—if it ever lowers its standard of life.

We talk about spending. I advocate the spending for peace and making ourselves so strong that international desperadoes will fear to attack us.

If we curtail appropriations in this bill deliveries of arms to our allies—already delayed—would be further delayed. The gulf betwen American promises and American performance would be widened. Our allies would be disheartened trying to follow a leader who marches backward, not forward.

Thus an announcement that Greece is about to reduce her military expenditures by 10 percent follows our announcement that we are reducing appropriations under the Military Security Pact.

France finds it increasingly difficult to fight in Indochina and honor her pledges to NATO. Britain has been obliged to cut down to avoid a financial crisis. Nonetheless we propose to reduce the aid to NATO members upon which they counted when they went as far as they could go in making their appropriations.

The Lisbon conference of 1952 was based upon two things. The first was an estimate of the ultimate amount the partners could spend on defense without courting bankruptcy. The second was an estimate of the least they could afford to meet the dangers of 1952. The conference was held in February. But now in May the dangers are more apparent than they were then. For example, the German situation may require a greater show of strength than the West has had to make since the war.

If we and other NATO members reduce carefully calculated quotas, western defense will be imperiled. Every time we reduce the defense program of our allies, by so much we reduce our security. A billion now in so-called savings may cost us many billions in the future.

General Eisenhower believes that if we drag out the defense program we shall get only half the result at twice the cost, and might even fail completely.

What we are actually doing is this:

We are tearing down a program before it has been built up.

We are postponing far into the future the day when Western Europe will be able to defend itself.

Under the circumstances I question the wisdom of slashing our appropriations without more soul searching and cold calculation than we seem to have given the matter.

Before going on, let me say this:

Nineteen hundred and fifty-two is election year in the United States.

But it is not election year in Soviet Russia.

Let us never forget this. We are confronted with an election of another kind that far transcends the choice of a President.

We must elect to be wise or foolish; to vacillate or persevere; to survive or perish.

As party members, we may be deeply concerned with the coming election. But the enemy will not hesitate, nor will destiny pause, if we play with the Nation's security for partisan advantage.

Speaking for myself alone, as one man and one Democrat, I would rather see my party go down in defeat and never arise if it should attempt to deceive the American people by holding out to them false promises of a reduction of their burdens based upon the false premises that this Government has done, and is doing, all that it can do to assure the security of the Nation.

I believe that I can illuminate this opinion by two things:

The margin of our atomic superiority over the enemy is daily disappearing.

We have lost air superiority to him.

We have already permitted our Air Force to fall below the minimum necessary for security. And even 2 years hence—according to present plans—it will still be below that minimum. Indeed we shall not reach it until 1956.

This, according to the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Air Force, is to put the country in grave danger.

But 1956—if we should still be alive then—will also be an election year. That will give another chance for us to ask destiny to stand still.

Here let me again quote Winston Churchill. He has said repeatedly it is only our stock of atomic bombs, and our ability to deliver them, that has deterred the Soviets from attempting to overrun Western Europe and start a third world war.

If this be true—and I believe it to be true—then the Air Force has paid for itself a thousand times.

The fact of Soviet air superiority is a galling, and an appalling, fact. Not long ago we could reasonably believe that our strategic air command could hurt the enemy more than he could hurt us. It is not safe to believe this in 1952. By 1954 such an assumption might lead to our destruction.

Once the enemy concentrated upon fighter planes for home defense. Now he is tripling his production of intercontinental bombers. He is increasing his air strength offensively as well as defensively.

Presently we believe we have more atomic bombs than he has. But this is small comfort. For if our industrial potential could be destroyed by x number of bombs, it is of no importance that the enemy does not have x plus y number of bombs.

If force without diplomacy is empty, equally empty is diplomacy without force. A vital part of that strength is the Air Force. It should be adequate to do three jobs:

First. To deter the enemy.

Second. To defend this Nation in war.

Third. To deliver instantaneous hammer blows upon the enemy.

It has still another task; one tied up with our basic strategy of world alliances. Hence the Air Force must be ready not only for global war but wherever the strategy of our enemy and our strategy collide, as in Korea.

What has he done there?

He has raised the Chinese Air Force to the fourth ranking air force of the world. It is composed of about 1,700 planes. One thousand of these are modern jets.

There are certain things to remember about an air force.

No plane is a good plane if a better one can be made. The minute your enemy produces, or is preparing to produce a better plane than yours, your planes become obsolete. In warfare the second best is worth nothing.

Numbers of airplanes are destroyed even if they never see combat. Operational accidents take them. If you begin the year with, say, 100 fighter planes, you will end it with 80. And you will lose a large fraction of bombers and other types.

These things inescapably make an air force expensive in lives and money.

The Army, Navy, and Marines, have parallel duties to perform, and if I have chosen to mention the Air Force at some length it is not special pleading but only by way of illustrating my thesis that we may be cutting our throats trying to save our necks.

We put economic aid to others next to military aid and preparedness at home. Can we afford to be complacent in this field? If anyone is complacent, I call his attention to a New York Times dispatch by Michael L. Hoffman, dated Geneva, May 18, 1952. He says:

> Western leaders who concern themselves with world economic trends are worried about the lack of any clear signs of improvement in production and in the availability of what are commonly thought of as the necessaries of life in the non-Communist underdeveloped areas.

I call your attention to this passage:

> What makes it politically perilous is that the Communist countries have done much better with their underdeveloped regions than the non-Communist regimes of the Middle East and Asia have done with similar regions.

Studies made by the United Nations Economic and Social Council show that good progress is being made in western Europe. But, we are told:

> The economic systems of most of the Middle East, southern and eastern Asia, and even parts of Europe such as southern Italy have not shared in the increases in production.

Asians want technical knowledge and it apparently does not matter to them whether they get it from democracies or Communists since in their eyes the two groups are merely different forms of one civilization.

What is to be done?

This is the Council's answer:

> Western leaders believe that since the West cannot achieve its results as communism does, it must devote very much more of its greatly superior per capita wealth than has even yet been considered—much less allocated—to the instigation of economic progress in the vast poverty-stricken regions of the non-Communist world.

Let me sum up.

We have assumed a dominant position in the world through the workings of destiny.

Never seeking power, we have achieved power.

There rests upon us such a responsibility for the world's freedom that the free world will stand or fall largely by what we do or fail to do.

Inclined to isolationism, we have been thrust into internationalism.

Emerging from the war with our home strength intact, we chose to help those less fortunate than ourselves in a series of acts that for magnitude and generosity are without parallel in man's history.

The only great democratic power able to resist imperialism parading under the guise of communism, we have committed ourselves to that vast task.

With little in our history, philosophy, or temperament, to prepare us for the task of world leadership, we have learned fast. If we have had our defeats, we have also had our triumphs.

Today we stand at the topmost pinnacle of our power.

Standing there, we say to the Communist world and the democratic world that, in our opinion, peace can be had and differences reconciled by good will on both sides. We seek to enslave no one. We are indeed unique in history in this respect: we are the only great nation that ever fought a war to free slaves.

To the underdeveloped countries we say: "Come and take what you will of our technical knowledge. You don't have to take the donor with the gift. We attach only one condition to our aid. It is that you use it efficiently so that you may the sooner help yourselves."

Man, for the first time, can now conquer nature, reduce poverty, banish disease, bring light to those in darkness. We Americans know how to do it. We are willing—even anxious—to do it. But just when man is within sight of the promised land of happiness and prosperity, we must devote our energies—through no fault of our own—to war and preparations for war.

Destiny has a rendezvous, and it is with us. We are the most prosperous people upon the fact of the earth. We must lead this world or it is leaderless. We must bring it back to sanity and to peace if there is to be sanity and peace in this world.

If we in this democracy, Republicans and Democrats alike, all Americans loving our country as we do, stand together, freedom will be ours and democracy will go on to bless the human race for years to come, and the future will say about us that in these crises we did not fail.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. CHATHAM:
> On page 17, line 4, strike out "$65,000,000" and insert "$50,000,000."
> On page 17, line 7, strike out "$76,000,000" and insert "$50,000,000."

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I feel that this is a very picayunish time for me to stand up and talk about a small amount of money after the speech we have just heard. I cannot quite believe what I have seen today, that one political party would vote together for things that I am sure a lot of them do not believe in. I have voted many times with the gentlemen on the left, but when the security and the peace of the world is at stake, as the distinguished Speaker has just said, I want to go on record as saying that I cannot believe my eyes have been true. We have cut this bill very heavily. My amendment is a further cut. Last year we gave Israel $50,000,000 and we gave the Arab refugees $50,000,000. The facts are reported on page 53. The Arab refugees have gone down from 875,000 to 850,000. The Jewish refugees have gone down from 669,000 to 273,000. I can only say that I think it is a matter of common sense that we give these people what they had last year, and I would guess that the Arabs are getting the worst of the deal.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. Does the gentleman know whether or not the report is true that already the Israelis are using the funds they now have under the economic program to retire some of their public debt?

Mr. CHATHAM. Yes; I think that is good business. They are.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Did the gentleman stop to consider that the people of Israel, courageous as they are, constitute the keystone of our defenses in that area of the world?

Mr. CHATHAM. I think that when I offer this amendment I am working for the people of Israel, because some day the Arab world is going to say we are unfair, that we should take no sides. Vote this amendment up or down, but I think when you have 875,000 refugees whose homes have been taken away from them and who are living in poverty, some consideration should be given to them.

Mr. DINGELL. My friend is just dead wrong in his concept of what Israel means to the United States, and, more than that, that is indicative of a philosophy in this House, particularly on the other side of the aisle, that we can afford to squander our sons just so we can save the dollars. I say, forget the dollars. I am for saving the sons of this Nation and preserving peace.

Mr. CHATHAM. I appreciate the gentleman's viewpoint, but I think I am doing a good deed toward Israel by offering this amendment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think the gentleman probably has a good amendment. I have visited some of these Arab refugee camps, and I can tell the gentleman from my observation that they are living out on the desert in tents that are not fit to live in. They have been there for 3 years, and they have no technical aid or assistance that we can observe.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I think it is of interest that, as the bill was submitted to us, for the seven Arab states nonmilitary assistance amounts to 57 cents per capita, and for Israel the nonmilitary assistance amounts to $50.84 per capita. I therefore feel that to do just what we did last year, as the gentleman suggests, while it would not change that ratio much, would be a little more in order than what is proposed.

Mr. CHATHAM. I thank the gentleman from Ohio, because I think that as unpopular as it may seem we are doing something for the Jewish people by putting these people on an equal level. The per-capita cost will still be 10 times what the Arabs are getting.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Would the gentleman say that a democracy is on a level with an autocracy or totalitarian regime? The Arab States are not democratic states. They are autocracies or absolute kingly dynasties. You cannot consider them on the same parity with the democracy that exists in Israel. Would not the gentleman say that where democracy flourishes we must give every degree of aid and comfort to keeping that light of democracy burning, as in Israel? Seventy-six millions is little enough for this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CHATHAM was allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.)

Mr. CHATHAM. May I say to the gentleman from New York that if you are run out of your lands and homes it does not matter whether you believe in democracy or anything else. The Soviet world today has in the Arabs a true opportunity. These people were run out of their lands and homes. They were promised compensation or that they would get their lands back. They have not had either. I would further say that the $15,000,000 of Arab funds impounded in Israel have not been turned loose. They say, "When we get our German funds we will release them." I do not believe in that kind of business.

Mr. CELLER. There are Israeli funds in other parts of the world which are also impounded, and the Israelis are unable to avail themselves of those funds.

With reference to the homes, I think history will tell you that the Jews did not oust the Arabs. They were perfectly willing to keep the Arabs in Israel. It was the exhortations of the effendi and the Arab emirs and rabble-rousing leaders that exhorted the Arabs to leave their homelands and go into the surrounding Arab countries. The Jews did not force them out. They were perfectly welcome to remain there.

Mr. CHATHAM. I refer my distinguished friend from New York to the United Nations report on that. I take it the gentleman believes in the United Nations?

Mr. CELLER. I have read it, and I read it differently than the gentleman does. There was no ousting whatsoever.

I have been in Israel several times. There are thousands and thousands of Arabs still in Israel. There are probably over 200,000 Arabs presently in Israel, living in comfort and decency, holding their heads high, and happy to live in that democracy.

Mr. CHATHAM. I think we are for the same thing. I think Israel is a strong bastion of democracy. I think the Arab world is also important, and I think we have to be fair. That is all I have in mind to do.

Mr. CELLER. I would not want to reduce the Arab allotment. I would just leave it where it is. The reasons for cutting that you indicate are not substantiated. You should not, for light and transient reasons, reduce the amount that the Committee on Foreign Affairs, after mature deliberation, figures to be the proper amount.

Keep the amount set for Arabs.

Keep the amount set for Israelis.

Mr. CHATHAM. Because our report says that the Jewish immigrants not assimilated are down 273,000 people.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 20 minutes, exclusive of the time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT], who now has the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I just want to make a brief observation. Both the Democratic and Republican platforms of 1948 came out strongly in favor of an independent Jewish commonwealth, the Democratic platform for "a free and independent Jewish nation." I might also say that the Middle East is a part of the world that is under great tension today, and requires a great deal of delicacy. I want to say we should appreciate the significance of a free and independent democratic nation such as Israel is in the Middle East. Furthermore, this is the first time that I have ever heard the argument advanced in support of an amendment to reduce an appropriation that you are helping somebody by reducing the appropriation.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank my eminent majority leader, and concur in what he says.

Mr. Chairman, this is a completely unthought-out amendment. The committee has arrived at its two figures after considerable deliberation. Let me urge

the House to consider these two authorizations not as a bloc, but as separate authorizations to separate sections of the bill, and for different purposes. So far as the Arab refugees are concerned, the one authorization would be inadequate if we were to cut it to what it was last year for the simple reason that between last year and today, the United Nations has at last brought forth a plan of rescue and ultimate integration, resettlement, and rehabilitation, for these 850,000 Arab refugees into the Arab communities in the Middle East. Last year we were appropriating for relief, and this year we are appropriating for an integration and resettlement program which will be a 3-year program.

The second part of this amendment, and I regret that this amendment was put in as a single package, is to cut the $76,000,000 authorized for resettlement of Israel refugees to $50,000,000, again on the theory that what we did last year was adequate. It is not adequate because a year has gone by and the circumstances have changed. As you will read in the committee report, the economy of Israel today is a very precarious one. Although the immigration has tapered off, there are still some 396,000 refugees unassimilated in Israel today, and more are coming in every day. If we cut this appropriation today, we are saying in effect to Israel, "Your problem has not changed, and our interest in your welfare has not changed."

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to say that, because Israel is the outpost of democracy, in the most delicate and most dangerous hot spot in the Middle East, in the world today.

Israel's democracy will succeed only if we encourage her economy and her agriculture to get on a stable basis so that the refugees who have gone to this little country will be self-supporting, self-respecting.

Just one thought for a moment: Many of these 700,000 refugees who have gone into Israel in the last 4 years and who have been welcomed into this little community are people whom we were taking care of in the DP camps of Western Europe, and if they had not gone to Israel this Congress would still be appropriating for their care in the DP camps of Western Europe. We must be grateful to the people of Israel for having received them and taken them off our necks.

It is to our interest that both these special problems be solved in the next 3 or 4 years in accordance with the United Nations program of integrating the Arabs into the Arab countries, a plan which has been accepted and is supported by the Arab League, a plan which will end the relief that we have had to carry on for the last 4 years, and that the other program making Israel the great example to that whole part of the world what free human beings can do for themselves in a democracy.

I urge the defeat of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS] is recognized.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I submit that in the instant case this amendment should not be adopted.

I have no special interest in the particular section of this bill except to see that fair play is done. When we had the issue up here some time ago relative to Spain and all the other countries that were involved in this bill it was decided by a majority vote of the Members present that the record stand as written in the bill. I do not believe we ought to let prejudice or bias or individual feeling enter into this bill until all of the various and respective sections of the bill have been disposed of.

To single out this specific appropriation for so drastic a reduction as the amendment calls for in my opinion is unfair and unjust in the light of what has been the attitude of the House relative to all preceding amendments that have been acted upon in connection with this bill. I believe this amendment should not prevail, and I propose to vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I have been to Israel, and I can say this advisedly: There are many nations that are stronger, but no nation that is braver. Remember, a few people, the Israelis, worsted 6 Arab nations, over 30,000,000 strong, but with the courage of the Maccabees and with the fortitude of the prophets they worsted them, and these with a dearth of arms, almost with their bare knuckles. This is the type of people we are asked to help.

I know nations that are richer in worldly goods, but none exceed Israel in hope. I know nations which are stronger in arms, but none have a greater faith than the people of Israel, faith in themselves and faith in God. They do not wear their faith as one would the fashion of a hat, they realize with Browning that faith can move mountains. Those people have performed wonders. They can do anything but fail. For that reason I do hope that this amendment will not carry. Think of what they have done; they have well nigh doubled their population in a period of 3 years. Imagine what chaos and economic confusion would happen in this country if we were almost to double our population in that length of time; yet they smoothly and in a most efficient manner brought in all these refugees from Iraq, Iran, Yemen, North Africa, and from behind the iron curtain; they gave these helpless, hopeless, and homeless persons surcease from their sorrows and their trouble. When they were persecuted and pillaged in all these lands the Israelis said: "We will receive you." Israel would quickly be able to balance her budget if she were to close her doors and bar the refugees, but how can a mother deny her children entrance? It is in that spirit that Israel receives the refugees, but she cannot do that unless we give her help. For that reason, vote down this amendment.

The amazing accomplishment of the state of Israel in its short years of existence has earned the admiration of the world. This is not an economy, as is so often the case, that has lost its stability through lack of self-development, through disinterest in production, and in agricultural progress. The strides in production and agriculture have been so tremendous that the mind looking at it today cannot fully comprehend it. Production increases in just a year average some 24 percent to 50 percent in certain industries. Agricultural output has increased, in some instances, to an extent of 60 percent. New industries are daily being developed.

"Then, why," it may be asked, "is it necessary to include Israel in an aid bill?" It is necessary because Israel is the only country in the world that, despite its hardship, despite its infancy, despite its lack of natural resources, has taken in hundreds of thousands of people and responded to the cry of humanity. Without these hundreds of thousands of immigrants, Israel today, with its original population of 600,000, could have been a thriving, bustling nation, with an economy stabilized and expanding. But with the influx of immigration, the new and little and brave Republic of Israel could not meet the demands placed upon it—the demands, remember, which she herself gladly undertook to answer of hungry, helpless, sick people. Remember, they came at the rate of 30,000 a month.

If we have an interest in democracy anywhere, we must have it everywhere. Here is a little land which is the first democracy, mind you, the very first, in the Middle East area. Here is a democracy which carries forward the basic concept of our civilization—the dignity of the individual. The people of Israel understand the word. It is a practicing democracy. And it is to our ultimate self-interest that this first and only practicing democracy in the Middle East not only survive the hardships it has taken unto itself but expand.

The objections of the Arab leaders to Israel lie in the very fact that the tenets of democracy will spill over the border and teach people that they, too, are individuals entitled to live, as such, under guaranties of liberty and freedom.

There are countries to whom we are giving aid—and I do not say they are less deserving—to whom the light of democracy has yet to be turned on, who are struggling through to democracy. Here are a people who brought democracy with them and built a government on it. I have been to Israel and I know whereof I speak. It is often accused of Communist tendencies. The fact remains that nowhere else—and I have been through Europe—have the Communists less of a grip on its people. They are a variable people, given to free and differing discussions. They are a people who have submitted to austerity, a voluntary austerity, unknown in any other democracy, but they do not, and cannot, and will not submit to tyranny. The people who have gone in the main into Israel are people who, through their very bitter experience, have learned what it actually means to live under totalitarianism. They know its terror and its tragic consequences. They do not have to be sold on freedom. Can we, therefore, afford to disregard the sturdy fruit of democracy planted by Israel in the Middle East?

Today the United States would still be carrying the staggering burden of maintaining the displaced-persons camps were it not for Israel's willingness to receive the DP's. In our own DP pro-

gram, we placed restrictions upon the entrance of these people—restrictions on health, restrictions on skills, and so forth. But Israel placed no such restrictions. She took the hard core of the halt and the lame and the blind, as well as the able-bodied. She did not stop to count the cost, because she placed the human life above the dollar.

The cut in funds here proposed has a thousandfold been returned to the United States. In hard cash it has been returned to us in the money that was saved by Israel's generously emptying the DP camps. It has been returned to us by the growth of democracy in the Middle East. It has been returned to us by Israel's voting in the United Nations against aggression and for peace and on the side of the United States. It has been returned to us by the more than proportionate share of medicines Israel has been contributing to the soldiers in Korea.

Now we propose to cut aid to Israel. Why? Because she has done too much? Because she is a little land? Because she is a democracy? It does not make sense. The needs are desperate in Greece and Turkey. The needs are desperate in Israel, too. Israel has not placed herself before us as a suppliant, with no effort on her own to grow into a self-sufficient economy. She has inaugurated an austerity program which, in its severity, is matched by no other country. She has made and is making a superhuman effort to close the dollar gap by raising and producing as much as she can for export. She has not been afraid to raise her own taxes and so impose these burdens upon her people first. She has launched a $500,000,000 bond drive, sold to the people of the United States at a 3½-percent interest-bearing rate, thus taking a debt into herself which she must herself pay within the next 12 to 15 years. She fought her own battle against aggression with no aid from any country, with no arms. In fact, we ourselves had imposed an arms embargo against her. She has watered her own deserts and made huge technological strides in the direction of synthetic productions. And, in addition to all that, she has taken the hundreds of thousands of the homeless, so that they may regain their dignity, learn again the lesson of freedom, and become once again productive members of a free society.

Toward such endeavor, toward such industry, toward such evidence of democracy, toward such humanity, we cannot remain indifferent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] is recognized.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, in the short time allotted to me it is impossible for me to tell you the many things I would like to tell you about the reasons why this amendment should not prevail. I have been in Israel several times. I have been through some of the Arab states, and I tell you that conditions in both countries, as far as persons who are compelled to live in tents is concerned, is deplorable. In Israel you have more than 200,000 people living in tents awaiting the construction of homes for them. In the Arab states you have a similar situation.

I am not asking you to cut the part that is allocated to the Arabs as against that which is allocated to the State of Israel. I say you should not cut anything that is allocated to either of these areas. They both need every dollar this bill provides, and more. As a matter of fact, the recommendations that were sent in called for much more. The committee recommended, not as much as was needed, but as much as, and no more than, we should be called upon to spend in this area under all the surrounding circumstances. The job we are trying to do in that area of the world is one of saving and rebuilding human lives.

It is not a matter of saving dollars, it is not a matter of building up trade or industry or even war matériel; it is a matter of trying to give these people an opportunity to rebuild their lives, to build homes for themselves, to build for themselves and their children the wherewithal to make themselves useful citizens. Let us give them a taste of the freedom by which they can acquire a decent standard of living by dint of their own labor. If we do we can then be sure they will be people who will stand by us when the time comes to fight the enemy, who would enslave us all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, if adopted, would in effect say that because the people of Israel have helped themselves we are going to cut down on the amount of money we will allot to them. The reduction in the number of refugees in Israel has come about not only because they themselves energetically attacked the problem but also because they have received hundreds of millions of dollars in charity from people in the United States. The Jewish people had a problem, and they tackled it with wisdom and faith and zeal, and with charity in their hearts.

I visited Israel; I also visited Camp Gaza of the Arabs, and in contradiction to what the gentleman from Minnesota said, there is technical assistance there in Gaza. There is a hospital, and there is a staff there from the United Nations trying to help the Arab refugees. If it were up to me I would probably increase the allowance for the refugees of both the Israelis and the Arabs. I certainly would not decrease it. For a long time the Arab States had no plan for the resettlement of Arab refugees. Now that a plan has been adopted perhaps we could increase their allotment.

However, the simple fact remains that the people of Israel welcomed and still continue to welcome the people of Jewish faith from all over the world; they even welcome those people who cannot even speak the Israelic language. In the refugee camps in Israel are learned interpreters who find it almost impossible to understand the language of some of the people coming in from southern Asia and from parts of Africa; yet they welcome these people there, many of whom are old men who could not possibly contribute to the economy, simply because the people of Israel want to do a charitable deed for the unfortunate and persecuted brethren of theirs.

Mr. Chairman, we would be going against a sound program if we adopted this amendment. It seems to me there should be no question but that the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am vigorously opposed to the pending amendment which is designed to make a substantial cut in our aid to the new State of Israel.

This nation is a sister democracy of ours and has the same objectives as our own country in its efforts to promote harmony and preserve world peace. The House Foreign Affairs Committee has carefully considered all phases of the provision in this bill for Israel and I think we must rely upon its judgment as to the amount of assistance which should be extended. If Israel remains strong and free it can well be of great assistance to the rest of the world in preventing the spread of communism in the Near East.

While I am opposed to our gigantic over-all program of foreign-aid spending and intend to vote against this bill in its entirety, I do strongly feel that Israel should be treated on the same basis of fairness and equality as is accorded to the other nations seeking our assistance and hence I shall vote against the proposal to reduce the amount of Israel's aid, and I hope the amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted to Mr. KLEIN was yielded to Mr. JAVITS.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHUDOFF].

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted to Mr. CHUDOFF was yielded to Mrs. KELLY of New York.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to discuss the philosophy of the amendment, as it has been so well handled previously. I join in approval of what the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has said.

I have spent a great deal of time in the Arab world. As a matter of fact, 1 year ago, together with my colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW], I spent several weeks in all of these Arab states.

I have this very practical thing to tell you practical people. If you want a stationary air base on the North African coast, in case you are going to, God forbid, find it necessary to send bombers back of the Ural Mountains, you better have it where you know you will have it, in Israel and not in the chaotic, turbulent Arab world.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, since the Committee of the Whole has limited debate on this amendment, I have not been able to secure time to fully discuss my opposition to it. Mr. Chairman, I am vigorously opposed to it, and heartily commend my three colleagues from New York and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for the splendid remarks and convincing statements they have made in opposition to the pending amendment. I trust the Chatham amendment will be voted down.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the pending amendment.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the State of Israel has proven by its acts that it intends to defend its rights with the maximum military force that it can raise and that this military force will be used in defense of the free world.

In the struggle against Soviet atheistic communism the State of Israel is in the camp of the free world that must be based on the civilization we know as Judeo-Christianity. In this civilization each human being is precious because he is made in the image and likeness of God. I am against cutting aid to the brave little State of Israel.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, about 4 years ago I went on public record that our country should do everything it could to encourage the development and strength and the economic stability of the new Republic of Israel. My judgment at that time has been proved over and over again to have been sound.

This new Republic of Israel is a true democracy, antagonistic to communism and all that godless ideology stands for. Israel today requires its youth to serve in its ever-growing army in the defense of freedom and in opposition to all the enemies of liberty. Indeed, Israel is the greatest hope our country has in our protection against the encroachments of communism in the Near East, that most sensitive spot in the world.

The amendments submitted by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, who I am proud to add is a friend of mine whom I highly respect, would cancel to a certain extent the aid which the United States would extend to Israel in helping to establish itself and solve the perplexing problems that confront it. Rather than reduce this aid, it should be increased and this thought is not prompted by any emotional feeling on my part but because it is just sound, good common sense to aid those and help those who in turn will aid in the protection of the liberty and freedom which we cherish in our Nation. I will vote against these amendments and I feel sure that the House itself will not approve of them.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the Chatham amendment to eliminate the funds for the aid of refugees in Israel. In view of the vast increase in population in the State of Israel and the enormous number of refugees who have migrated to Israel, and now are in need of shelter and other necessities of life, this fund for the aid of these refugees is urgently needed.

One of the outstanding attempts to create a democratic way of life has been the struggle of the Jewish people to create anew the nation of Israel—Israel which now offers peace and dignity to a people who were perhaps the foremost victims of the holocaust of World War II.

In my opinion this authorization of funds for the aid of refugees in Israel will aid the future development of the State of Israel and will develop its strength as a nation. Israel is in a very strategic position in the Near East, and it is of mutual interest to the United States and Israel that she be kept strong.

Since the State of Israel was established in 1948, 684,275 immigrants came into the country in a space of 44 months. The Jewish population of Israel has more than doubled. For the first 3 years this great migration was made possible by the contributions of Jewish communities all over the world and, to an even greater extent, by the sacrifices of the Jewish people of Israel who shared their slender resources and went deeply into debt.

Many immigrants came to Israel from the displaced-persons camps of Europe where they had been maintained by the United States Government and international agencies. Upon their arrival in Israel they became the responsibility of the new State of Israel, which assumed the burden.

However, early in 1951 it became evident that Israel needed additional help. The aid voted by Congress to Israel in 1951 is now being made available for food, fuel, power, irrigation, agricultural, industrial, and communications equipment, and this is helping to put the new immigrants to work and helping to care for them.

In 1951, however, because of the mass exodus of the Jews from Iraq, 174,169 additional immigrants came to Israel. In view of a severe drought, shortages of essential capital goods, and the rise in world prices, the economic problems facing Israel have again become critical.

Housing is urgently needed to care for these refugees. Almost 250,000 people in the State of Israel today live in villages of tents, canvas-wall huts, wooden cabins, and tin shacks. Clothing is strictly rationed. Food is scarce.

Work must be found for the new immigrants, but they are unable to achieve maximum production because there is a shortage of raw materials, tools, and equipment.

Most of the immigrants come to Israel without assets; many are sick or disabled.

I cannot too strongly urge the defeat of the Chatham amendment which would eliminate the funds for the relief of these unfortunate and suffering refugees in Israel.

The State of Israel is a democracy, and a strong Israel promotes the security of our own Nation and of the free world. Because of its stratgic position in the Near East, it is my belief that the United States should render this financial aid to refugees in Israel because such aid will strengthen the economic independence of Israel and will develop its natural resources and industries.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, the amendments would reduce appropriations already inadequate. The refugee problem being handled by Israel would tax the patience, strength, and ingenuity of a much larger and older nation. It is a problem which we must help solve. Failure to do so would be an act of selfishness and blind folly unworthy of a great Nation; unworthy of the great people of the United States whom we are here to represent. I think the people of the Nation want and expect us to help this friendly democracy, which is struggling to integrate hundreds of thousands of unfortunate refugees into its economy and social and political system. When in history has such a new Nation ever achieved so much in the face of such obstacles? When have any people ever demonstrated more fortitude, generosity, or determination? Do the American people want to show their appreciation and admiration by cutting this appropriation? No, of course, they do not. We would fail to accurately express the will of the American people if we voted to cut this appropriation.

We all know Israel is our friend. We can rely upon the people of Israel. Then, too, in helping them to solve their problems and grow strong, we are helping ourselves, helping ourselves in the awful struggle for world peace in which we are engaged.

This appropriation involves several millions of dollars, a large sum, yes, but comparatively small when one considers the importance of its purpose and the magnitude of the job that has to be done by the State of Israel. Let me emphasize that the refugee problem cannot be considered to be only the concern of Israel. It has much larger implications. It is our problem, too. Every humane consideration compels us to do our part to aid the nation which is doing so much to take in and assist the hundreds of thousands of unfortunate families who knock on its gates and ask admission.

Mr. Chairman, we must help keep those gates open. This appropriation does not really involve dollars. It is families. It is little children looking to

us for a home and a chance in life. We must not turn our backs upon them.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I am vigorously and unalterably opposed to the reductions in the amount recommended for Israeli provided by the terms of the two pending amendments.

It should be manifest to anyone who has had an opportunity to observe conditions in the Near East during the past few years that that area is in great distress and suffering marked unrest.

I am anxious that the Congress should do everything possible to promote friendly relations between the Jews and the Arabs in that area.

However, I cannot see any logic or reason in the proposed reduction of the funds which the new-born Jewish homeland of Israeli so urgently requires in order to carry out its gigantic, humane program of resettling and caring for thousands upon thousands of displaced and persecuted persons from virtually every section of the troubled world, including a considerable number from behind the iron curtain.

Instead of seeking to penalize these most commendable efforts, which have been carried out with an unusual degree of efficiency and humane feeling, I humbly believe that we should do everything we can to support and further these efforts because they are contributing to the alleviation of human misery and the relief of oppressed, persecuted peoples and the succor of the weak, helpless, and persecuted of many nations.

In my opinion, the least we can do here is to display in concrete form our feelings of approval and commendation and our willingness to support the valiant work which the new State of Israel has so manfully undertaken and is carrying forward with such zealous and unflinching purpose.

I hope that the House will reject these stultifying amendments and thus extend not only a helping hand but that moral encouragement and inspiration for a great human cause which is implicit in the original provisions of the pending bill.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to any cut in the appropriation recommended for the State of Israel.

We have here two amendments—one to cut the appropriation from $76,000,000 to $50,000,000 and another to cut the recommendation of the Foreign Affairs Committee from $76,000,000 to $65,000,000.

Thus one amendment attempts to cut the recommended appropriation by $26,000,000 and the other by $11,000,000.

To me, both of these proposals appear to be ridiculous. Here we are today appropriating more than $7,000,000,000 to try to win over friends in the world at a time when our own security is in danger. Now with respect to Israel we don't have to win this country over. She already is on our side and presents one of the strongest bastions for peace in that part of the world.

It would have taken us more than the entire $7,000,000,000 appropriation, plus thousands of American lives to establish such a bastion for peace had we been compelled to do so.

Recognizing this fact, does not it appear ridiculous that we should try to cut from the appropriation to this noble young nation what by comparison is a very, very insignificant amount?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. CHATHAM: Page 17, line 7, strike out the figure "$76,000,000" and insert the figure "$65,000,000."

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I just want to express my opposition to the Chatham amendment with its cut, and expect to vote against it.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, what my amendment does is to provide the same amount, $65,000,000, for each of these groups—the Arab refugees and the Israel refugees.

Last year I urged that the House maintain equality of treatment in this area. There is no place in the world where the forces are more explosive today and where more damage could happen to ourselves and our security in 24 hours' notice than in this area. Conditions with respect to relations between the Arabs and Israelis are better today than they were a year ago. At last they appear to be on the road to gradual solution of their problems, and I think it is in part due to the fact that in last year's bill we maintained equality in granting aid to the two groups.

I do not doubt for a moment that the sum of $76,000,000 asked for Israeli this year is justified, but under the circumstances and in view of the larger issue of the security of the United States, which requires peace in the Middle East, I think it may be wise to maintain the same amount for both of these groups of refugees, but that it would be most unwise to reduce the amount of $65,000,000 to $50,000,000 for each one of them.

The hour of show-down with the Soviet Union in this area is approaching; it could blow up at any time in the next day or month or year. I do not believe that the amount to be saved by the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina justifies the additional risk we would be taking if we were to say, by adopting his amendment, at the very moment when a solution of this difficult problem begins to appear possible, that we are reducing our support. I hope that my substitute will prevail rather than that of the gentleman from North Carolina.

(Mr. RICHARDS asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted him to Mrs. KELLY of New York.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to both of these amendments.

First, I want to comment on the amendment just proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] Out of this authorization, you propose a cut for Israel from $76,000,000 now in the bill to $65,000,000. But you propose no cut for the Arab refugees. Also, we must remember that the Arab refugees will be getting more contributions from the U. N. fund besides our own, so that the gentleman from Minnesota is to that degree making an inequitable proposal.

Now, to answer the argument of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM], regarding the point he made about the impounding of the funds in Israel: Humbly I state at this time that I have been working with the State of Israel toward a solution of this problem, and I am very happy to say that as of yesterday there is a solution and an agreement in being to unfreeze these funds, which will take place very shortly. To cut the authorization to Israel is destructive. It will not bring peace to this area nor will it bring peace between the Arab States and Israel. The Committee on Foreign Affairs, on which I have the privilege of serving, carefully considered the needs of the Arab refugees and the needs of Israel and the ability of this great new democracy to contribute to the free world as our allies. The important problems in the Near East are well known to all of us. I firmly believe we would take a very constructive approach to this area by approving the full amount of assistance to Israel.

As my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] explained, we are primarily interested at this time in the resettlement of the refugees in this area and to make them self-sufficient. As far as Israel is concerned, we must encourage and strengthen this friendly, democratic state and we must assist in solving her economic problems. Aside from the fact that Israel is a great fortress of democracy in the Near East, she has the largest and the strongest military force in this area, next to Turkey. I am sure we all agree that this army, if ever needed, will be on the side of the free world and the United States.

In this program 70 percent is for the resettlement program, which includes housing, farm building, and the importation of necessary commodities to strengthen their production. Thirty percent will permit continuation of assistance in expanding and increasing the efficiency of industry and agriculture in this area.

I compliment my colleagues who have risen in opposition to these crippling amendments which would cut down on aid to Israel and I hope this committee will weigh carefully its decision, because I firmly believe you should take the advice of the Foreign Affairs Committee, who considered carefully the arguments

pro and con in bringing forth a plan in this bill. I do hope both of these amendments will be defeated.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentlewoman speaks of the fighting forces they have in Israel today. Can the gentlewoman tell me how many there are in Korea, how many troops Israel has sent there?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Despite her own economic difficulties and her security needs, Israel has contributed ambulances and medical personnel to the United Nations forces in Korea which are sorely needed there.

Mr. GROSS. More troops from Israel in Korea?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I am speaking of Israel's contribution in ambulances and medical personnel—doctors, nurses, and the like.

Mr. GROSS. Is Israel a member of the United Nations?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Yes. And a very strong supporter of U. N. principles.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Supporting the statement just made by the gentlewoman from New York, the Reverend Dan Poling, editor of the Christian Herald and father of one of the famed four chaplains lost in World War II, has written a letter to every Member of the House of Representatives describing Israel as the most reliable bastion in the Near East.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Israel has made contributions to the forces in Korea. She has a medical unit in Korea with a considerable number of doctors and nurses and other manpower.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I wish to commend the gentlewoman from New York, and desire to say that I oppose both the pending amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to both of the pending amendments which would cut down on the amount of aid to Israel and Arab refugees.

The young State of Israel is a very effective, well-organized, and well-ordered democracy. She is a tower of strength, vigor, and hope in a sensitive area of the world—the Near East.

We need strength and democratic forces in that area just as we do in all the other areas of the world.

The bill before us is a mutual-security bill, in the mutual interest of the United States and the countries we are assisting. Israel stands ready to stand by the side of the United States and other free countries. Let us stand by her side and not cut this aid at a time when our young ally needs our helping hand.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to speak in support of the $76,000,000 appropriation in this mutual security bill for the Israel refugee program.

The record of accomplishment of the free State of Israel stands as a beacon of inspiration to all free men everywhere.

My personal observations of the epic struggle for freedom which the Jewish people of Israel have made are set forth in the following speech which I delivered last Friday night to a group of Jewish war veterans in Boston:

The importance of the individual, his dignity, his rights and privileges in a democratic society, has already been recognized in Israel.

There, all citizens, regardless of their religion, color, or national origin, enjoy the same fundamental rights. Although Israelis comes from all the continents of the world, all share equally in their status as citizens of the State of Israel. And whether one is a Jew, a Christian, or a Moslem, the right to practice one's own religion according to the belief of his fathers, is guaranteed by fundamental law.

Twelve years ago, I had an opportunity to spend nearly a month in what was the British Mandate of Palestine. The country was torn in that fateful summer of 1939 by violence and strife; it was a prime example of the British policy of divided rule.

I came away with a feeling of hopelessness for the future. But the interest in the establishment of a national homeland for the Jewish people in this promised land that I had derived from my visit was rekindled at the end of World War II. The tragic plight of the Jewish people in Europe and the daring fight that was being made to build a new home in Israel under the guns of the British and Arabs stirred me deeply. I was, therefore, proud to tell the convention of the New England Zionist region on the same platform with Dr. Silver in 1947 exactly how I felt in these words:

"Today the United Nations has before it the solution of the Palestine problem. It is my conviction that a just solution requires the establishment of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth in Palestine, the opening of the doors of Palestine to Jewish immigration, and the removal of land restrictions so that those members of the people of Israel who desire to work out their destiny under their chosen leaders may do so."

With this long background of my deep interest in the fight for nationhood, it was a tremendous experience to visit Israel last fall with Congressman FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, Jr. What a tremendous change had taken place in the country from my visit of 12 years before, both in appearance and in spirit. Swamps had been filled, deserts had become productive, and the air rang with vitality and energy.

Nothing in my opinion has been more admirable than the tenacity with which the Israelis have maintained their policy of unlimited immigration. Their willingness to increase their population from 600,000 to over 1,200,000 in the past 3 years and to plan to bring in another 600,000 in the next 3 years is testimony to their invincible faith in their future. And the Israelis have been willing to take the hard-core cases of old men and women, the sick and the infirm, whom the rest of the populace would have to support. We can get some idea of the sacrifice that this policy entails on the population by imagining the tremendous burden we in this large country would have to carry if we increased in a 3-year time our population of 150,000,000 to 300,000,000 and then undertook to increase our population to 450,000,000 in the next 3 years.

Keeping the doors open as a place of refuge to Jews who want to come to Israel from iron-curtain countries or Arab lands has put a strain upon the economy of the country. While private philanthropy and private investment can help make Israel economically self-sufficient, the United Nations and our own country also have a role to play. I was glad to see the American Congress recognize last summer that this Israeli policy deserved American support and I was happy to support the appropriation of $50,000,000 for this purpose. In addition, I will vigorously support the passage of an appropriation of $76,000,000 for the Israel refugee program when the House of Representatives considers the mutual security bill next week.

In addition to economic help so that Israel can become self-sufficient, I look upon the development of a free and democratic State of Israel in an area free from threats of aggression, as a goal to which all Americans must commit themselves and the responsibility of the United Nations to fulfill. For the peace of the world it is important that the Arab States recognize the reality of the existence of Israel. Israel is here to stay. The sooner the Arab League is ready to see what the rest of the world has seen for a long time—that a war has been ended, that boundaries have been fixed, and that peace must be established, the sooner this troubled spot of the Near East can be strengthened as an outpost of democracy. Then with free relations between Israel and the Arab States and with the support of our country and the rest of the United Nations, hope can be given to people who live marginal existences in underdeveloped areas for the raising of their standard of living.

This hope can be realized, as Prime Minister Ben-Gurion told Congressman ROOSEVELT and me in Jerusalem last November: "By the emergence of positions of leadership in the Arab States, of liberal, progressive elements, elements genuinely interested in the well-being of all of their people by building mutual confidences and fears of motive will disappear."

When Mr. Ben-Gurion in the same conversation was asked whether or not certain Arab States might not fear aggression by Israel, he asked us: "How could a country like Egypt with a population of 20,000,000 fear invasion by a small nation of less than 2,000,000. Besides, we were once in Egypt and have no desire to return," he added.

This reference by the Prime Minister of the State of Israel to the liberation of the people of Israel in ancient times from slavery to freedom is historic proof of the ability of a people with the will to be free to achieve freedom. What Israel was able to accomplish in ancient times and what the State of Israel has been able to achieve in recent years should serve as a symbol to all men of the invincibility of the human spirit.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I concur in the position taken by Mr. ROOSEVELT, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. JAVITS, and the others who have expressed their opposition to these two amendments because I believe they will seriously interfere with a well-ordered plan to give assistance to Jew-

ish refugees in Israel and thereby help that new nation to strengthen itself among the family of free nations. Israel's strength is a definite asset to the security of the free world.

I believe the proposals in the mutual security bill providing for the relief and resettlement of refugees in Israel, and for technical assistance in Israel are sound and I hope the House will follow the recommendations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We should reject these two amendments cutting the program and I urge my colleagues to do so.

I believe the program as approved by the committee is justified by the urgent needs of the people themselves, the results that can be achieved and the strategic importance of Israel in the area. Within recent months, tension has mounted in this critical region. We must help its peoples strengthen themselves. We must encourage them and equip them to join us in the defense of the free world from Communist aggression.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs says in its report:

> It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of this area to the whole free world. It contains vital resources and is the strategic land bridge between Europe and Asia.

With that statement, I wholeheartedly agree. For this reason I must oppose any effort to cut this program and I hope the majority in this House will agree with me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to close debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Is it not true that one of the purposes of the Mutual Security Program is to encourage business firms in the United States to participate in building up the economic wealth of the countries participating in this program? Is it not true that many large United States corporations, such as Philco, Kaiser-Frazer, Ford, General Motors, Reicholt Chemicals, and a number of other firms have made substantial investments and built large plants in Israel? Is there not a strong industrial bond growing between the United States and Israel?

Mr. JAVITS. It is. There is a good deal of American investment in Israel. The fact that large American companies and other American investors have invested there is an added tie with our country and an expression of their confidence in Israel.

Mr. Chairman, I think the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will bear witness to the fact I have been as devoted a friend of the solution of the Palestine Arab refugee problem as there is on the committee. I am opposed with equal strength to both parts of the pending amendments.

In the first place, with respect to the Arab refugees, they seek to cut the only promising program for their permanent resettlement, the United Nations program for $250,000,000, of which we contibute only a part.

Let me emphasize before we make a mistake on this question of equalization that I appreciate both of these amendments are not unfriendly and I want to emphasize that I feel the people of Israel have not a more devoted friend in the House than the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

In the technical assistance part of this section, in the $55,000,000, there is $23,500,000 for the Arab States and only $3,000,000 for Israel. If you add $23,500,000 to either sixty-five or fifty million the equalization figures offered to us, the Arab part of the bill is still receiving very much more than Israel and this average is emphasized by both these amendments over what it is already in the bill. So you do not get equal amounts even with these amendments.

As to the situation of Israel, I have always argued this question on the floor, and I did it last year, purely as an American legislator. The reason you have a right to aid Israel is the reason just expressed by my colleague from New Jersey, because of Israel's strength in terms of free world security. The reason we give the 396,000 unabsorbed refugees in Israel a somewhat higher amount than we give the 600,000 to 800,000 Arab refugees is that the Israeli refugees are building strength and it costs more to do that, yes even in military terms. Almost the first thing that is done with a young refugee in Israel is that he goes into the army. When I was in Israel I spent a day with the army, and that is exactly what I saw.

Israeli is the one fighting, dependable force in that whole area of the world in terms of the struggle we are fighting. If you need any proof as to the orientation of Israel toward the United States, I point out to you that it is my information that about 160 of Israel's Army, Navy, and Air Force officers have already studied in our military schools. Now, do you think our military people would let them do that if they had any doubt as to where Israel would stand in the event of a show down? This is a strong reason why we should vote for the authorization as it is contained in the bill.

Furthermore, this is not a program that developed in the committee as it did last year. This is the program of the Department of State. They have gone through this thing with a fine-tooth comb. People have said they were at one time unfriendly to Israel. So much the more important when we come to the program this year, which they have brought in, which they have supported, and which they are enthusiastic about, and with reference to which they say Israel has done a fine job with the last appropriation given.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Does not the gentleman agree that the worst thing that could happen in this area, second only to aggression by the Soviet Union, would be for these two groups to be further set against each other with greater friction and bitterness? That is the thing that would make impossible any solution; would it not?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not think we can dedicate ourselves more effectively to achieving peace in that area than by helping these two groups of refugees.

Mr. JUDD. That is why I want the two groups to be drawn together as rapidly as possible so that they will not be working against each other but standing together against the common enemy of both and of our own country—the efforts of the Soviet Union to destroy and enslave them and us.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I congratulate the gentleman from New York for his statement. Certainly the situation in the Middle East is particularly critical. Our efforts to bring some order out of the chaos there have been remarkably successful. I do not want to jeopardize the progress that is being made in this area. Therefore, I shall oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I aske unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am in accord with the committee on this issue and oppose both amendments because they would destroy what they profess to accomplish, fairness; they would demolish effective aid to needy Israel.

I appreciate the forthrightness of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM] and that of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]. Their stated position is greater aid to the Arab League to equalize aid now given to Israel. But, in cutting aid to Israel to help the Arab League, I think fairness is injured.

As I understand it, Israel has tried time and again, and is still trying, to make peace with the Arab States. This, in spite of the ugly rumor that when the Arab League feels strong enough, it will wipe out the State of Israel. Peace with Israel, in the fullest meaning of that word would bring, I am sure, the fullest measure of assistance to the Arab States. And I am told several intelligent and brave Arab leaders are anxious to make peace but two fears bar them.

The first fear, I am informed, arises from an outside source, the second from an inside one.

Will Transjordan or the Hashemite Kingdom be cut off from economic aid if it makes peace with Israel? I am sure the British would not be so crude. Great Britain is dedicated to peace is it not?

Even if the Hashemites hesitate, Lebanon and Egypt could extend their hands in friendship, could they not?

Iran and Syria have some sticky problems to solve, granted.

Iraq? I am advised that the Aramco Oil Co. has done a magnificent on-the-ground public-relations job.

What is the inside fear of some Arab leaders? Just this: If the ugly rumor of revenge and the future destruction of Israel subsided, people would clamor for

economic benefits and a better life which would entail losses to the wealthy.

The choice in the problem is not up to Israel, is it? Then, why hurt her by these two amendments?

The issue is this, it seems to me, the world around: In their 60 to 70 to 80 or more years on earth, men and women are striving more than ever to live in dignity and peace.

Governments and rulers, through the ages, have feared an innocent and kindly triumverate—a man, his wife, and child, feared them because they seek opportunities in peace, which cement-headed rulers thought could be obtained for a select few only in tyranny or war.

This Mutual Security Act is no fool's paradise. It is showing the cement-heads up.

I side with the committee. Israel needs the aid. The amendments should be defeated. I look forward to greater aid for the Arab League, when a step in the above direction is taken.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM] to reduce the appropriation to Israel by one-half and also the substitution amendment submitted by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] to reduce the appropriation by eleven million should be defeated.

The new nation of Israel is an important beachhead for the democratic and free nations in their struggle to curtail the spread of communism in the Middle East. Statements have been made on the floor to compare the appropriation of Israel with that of Arabia. I do not believe these comparisons should apply as far as these two nations are concerned in the battle against the spread of communism. Israel has already created a substantial army to defend its borders against the encroachment of outside tyranny. The foundation of this young nation has already been constructed on a firm, solid, and permanent base and every aid should be extended by this Congress to aid in its fight, both economically and militarily, in its struggle for self-government and freedom from outside aggression.

Jews in America have been generously contributing their private funds toward the aid and welfare of the Israel nation ever since its inception. The millions of Jews in America have not only been extending an outstanding and patriotic service to their blood brethren in Israel, but their sacrifice in times of crisis and war to America has been an illuminating demonstration of American patriotism.

During World War II, the Jewish representation in the armed services was far above its pro rata allotment. A large concentration of Jewish people live in metropolitan centers. Agricultural, mining, and metal industries, and so forth, which were favored by draft exemptions did not apply to metropolitan centers. Besides the relatively large proportion of Jewish boys taken in the draft, there were approximately 35,000 Jewish volunteers. Statistics show that honors conferred on Jewish soldiers for valor in action included no less than 1,100 citations. These included the Congressional Medal of Honor, Distinguished Service Cross, Croix de Guerre, and other decorations. The records also reveal that more than 10,000 Jewish commissioned officers were in several branches of the service. The total of Jewish casualties was from 13,000 to 14,000 including 2,800 who made the supreme sacrifice. The figures tell of a sacrificial devotion and patriotism to their country which is in line with their age-long battle for freedom.

Both the Chatham and Judd amendments should be rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be reread by the Clerk for the information of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD as a substitute to the amendment offered by Mr. CHATHAM: On page 17, line 7, strike out the figures "$76,000,000" and insert the figures "$65,000,000."

Amendment offered by Mr. CHATHAM: On page 17, line 4, strike out "$65,000,000" and insert "$50,000,000." One page 17, line 7, strike "$76,000,000" and insert "$50,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CHATHAM) there were—ayes 66, noes 103.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 5. Title III of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 is amended as follows:

(a) At the end of section 301 add the following new sentence: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed $611,230,000, to carry out the purposes and provisions of this section; and in addition balances of any appropriations heretofore made pursuant to this section unobligated as of June 30, 1952, or subsequently released from obligation, are hereby authorized to be continued available for obligation for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the appropriation hereby authorized."

(b) At the end of subsection 302 (a) add the following new sentence: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed $408,000,000, to carry out the purposes and provisions of this subsection; and in addition balances of any appropriations, heretofore made pursuant to this subsection unobligated as of June 30, 1952, or subsequently released from obligation, are hereby authorized to be continued available for obligation for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the appropriation hereby authorized."

(c) Add the following sentence to subsection 302 (b): Unexpended balances of allocations heretofore made to the Secretary of State pursuant to that proviso shall be continued available until expended."

(d) In the first sentence of subsection 303 (a) after the words "to be appropriated to the President" insert the words "for the fiscal year 1953."

(e) In the second sentence of subsection 303 (a) substitute for the words "1952" the words "1953".

(f) Immediately before the last sentence of subsection 303 (a) add the following: "In addition, the United States Department of the Army is hereby authorized to make available to the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, at the time when that Agency assumes full responsibility for relief and rehabilitation in Korea, goods and services of a value not to exceed $67,500,000 which the Department of the Army then has on hand or on order for civilian relief in Korea and which the President determines should be contributed by the United States to the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency for use in its relief and rehabilitation operations in Korea. The value of goods and services made available pursuant to the preceding sentence shall be credited toward the contribution to be made by the United States to the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency."

(g) The last sentence of subsection 303 (b) is hereby repealed.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS:

On page 18, line 7, strike out "$408,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$208,800,000."

On page 18, line 8, after the word "subsection", insert "In accordance with the provisions of section 503 of this act and not to exceed $88,000,000 to carry out the purposes of the provisions of this subsection in accordance with the applicable provisions of the act for international development."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does two things: It divides Mutual Security from point 4 in title III, just as we have divided point 4 so you can identify it in title II which has just been passed. Thus, you have a chance to consider Mutual Security and defense support as a separate item from the point 4 authorizations in title III.

The committee provided that Burma and Indonesia would no longer come under Mutual Security, because there were no military activities going on there. You see MSA, or Mutual Security, carries on technical assistance; and point 4 carries on economic aid, and they are pretty badly mixed up. This sorts them out a little bit and proposes that for Formosa, Indochina, Thailand, and the Philippines where military assistance is going and, of course, in Indochina there is fighting going on, that the defense support for those countries be cut 10 percent, cut from $232,000,000 down to $208,800,000. That would leave $176,000,000 for point 4 under title III for India, Burma, Indochina, Pakistan, and some other countries; and the amendment proposes to just cut in two the point 4 money for title III.

These amounts are the ones that seem to me to be the wise amounts. It may be the committee will modify them. But we make a 10-percent cut in the defense-support money and we make a 50-percent cut in the point 4 money. That is what the amendment proposes. We have had considerable discussion earlier in

the bill about point 4. The Smith amendment covered the waterfront, the whole world, in that respect. This amendment applies only to title III.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Will the gentleman please tell us actually in dollars how much is cut out over all by virtue of these changes?

Mr. VORYS. The cut would amount to $111,200,000; but that would be a 10-percent cut on defense support and a 50-percent cut on point 4. By doing it this way, identifying the authorizations for point 4 separate from authorizations for mutual assistance, there will be no danger that those who administer the act will slip defense-support money over under point 4. I think the Congress has a duty to authorize separately for point 4. This type of amendment gives the House the opportunity to do that.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask for this time only to make a suggestion. We have been debating and considering this matter all week. I know it is hoped that we can conclude consideration at a reasonable hour this evening. May I make the suggestion that possibly on some of these amendments debate might be limited to 5 minutes for and 5 minutes against. We want to make as much progress as possible, having due regard to the desirability of adequate consideration.

Mr. VORYS. I join in that request, Mr. Chairman, and may I call the attention of the Committee to the fact that although I have made a number of speeches I have not asked for any extension of time.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. We on this side want to cooperate and get through with this matter. However, we have been speaking on a lot of amendments that in no way dealt with an amount of money involved. Now we come along with another meat-ax cut and they talk about limiting debate to 10 or 15 minutes. I want to be reasonable but we have several speeches on this side of the House in opposition to the proposition made by the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 miuntes and that I may have 5 minutes at the end of the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, a number of years ago when this program for economic aid to Europe was started, I was inclined to follow along with the program. At that time Europe was still feeling the severe shock resulting from the greatest war in history. Its people were crushed, without morale, and impoverished. I had occasion to see much of the distress in Europe during and immediately following the Second World War and I was greatly disturbed over the terrible sights of destruction which greeted the eye of even the most casual passer-by. During the interim, this country has done a great deal to help the distressed people of Europe—has encouraged leadership and given financial aid to these people. In my judgment, they themselves have gone to work and have accomplished a great deal. It is certain that some of these people have done an outstanding job of bringing back their own economy, rebuilding their own government, and rebuilding their own country out of the ravage of war. They are to be commended for the part they have done for themselves.

My observations of Europe lead me to the conclusion that economically, Europe is rapidly returning to a normal condition. In fact, in my judgment, many countries of Europe are already in a normal condition financially, the people are aggressive and vigorous, industry is noted for its full smokestacks, throbbing machines, and commerce has again returned to a high level of activity. In these countries, it is my judgment, that no more economic help is needed and the time for cutting down has arrived.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, I voted for many cuts in this bill and I worked to reduce the total over-all amount of the bill. Since then, conditions in Europe have improved further and we no longer need to support further economic aid to Europe unless conditions change very much in the future. At the present time, there are amendments to reduce the provision on page 15 of the bill from $1,637,300,000 to $1,337,800,000; another amendment to reduce the amount to $1,000,000,000 even; and a third amendment to reduce this amount to $637,300,000. In addition to this, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has offered an amendment to cut this provision entirely out of the bill. I favor the last-named proposal, as it will once and for all close this bill of economic assistance and will provide some degree of consideration for our own people.

Many projects throughout the country need financial help from the United States Government. At the same time, the people are heavily burdened by taxes, and I think we must consider our own people in these matters. We must vote to reduce spending. We should reduce the amount authorized in this bill and when the provision for appropriating the money comes up we should see that our people get some relief from the heavy burden of expenditures which rests upon them. If the foreign situation should change in the future, of course, Congress will be in session and we can always appropriate money. Once the money is appropriated, however, it is gone forever from our economy and the burden of taxation rests even more heavily upon people who already most generously have borne the brunt of war expenses.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] to reduce the figures $408,000,000, to $208,000,000.

This so-called point 4 program started out to be a program of technical assistance to the underprivileged areas and peoples of the world. It has long ago grown into a world-wide WPA program. In its first year, according to my information, it had an appropriation for only $35,000,000. The general public believe now that this is a program simply to extend technical aid to underprivileged peoples. As a matter of fact, the technical aid which this bill is intended to provide is insignificant when compared with the supplies and equipment which are intended to be provided.

The effort to provide these supplies and equipment under this so-called technical-aid program is merely an underhanded and back-door method of continuing the Marshall plan and the ECA program, although the sponsors of both of them assured the Congress and the American people that the Marshall plan program and the ECA program would end June 30, 1952.

To illustrate what I mean, it is proposed in this bill to give to India $115,000,000. Of that amount, $6,779,000 would pay the salaries and expenses of 467 technicians, and $1,705,000 the cost of training 341 trainees. The total of the two items would be approximately $8,500,000. One hundred six million five hundred and sixteen thousand dollars of the amount allotted for India is intended to be spent for supplies and equipment. The opposition to the amendment now under consideration have stated, in their arguments against the amendment to cut this point 4 money, that we must continue to give food and the necessities of life to the Indian people.

I voted against giving the $190,000,000 worth of grain to India last year. The information we now have about that grain is that the granaries in India are bursting with grain we have furnished them because of the poor methods of distribution provided by the Government of India. Another bad feature about that grain legislation is that the hungry people, the poor and destitute people, do not benefit from the program. The grain goes to the Government of India, which in turn sells it to the individuals. Thus, the person who needs charity, and who would appreciate our charity, if anyone in fact appreciated it, which I doubt, is the person who does not get the benefit of the grain.

Under this so-called technical-assistance program, or point 4 program, we are doing such things as, and I cite these instances from the contract entered into between our Government and the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan, which is printed on pages 26 and the following of the first report to Congress on the Mutual Security Program:

Appropriations to Water Resources Department.

Appropriations to Department of Agriculture.

Appropriations to Department of Health.

Appropriations to Department of Education.

Appropriations for mineral development.

Appropriations for transportation.

Appropriations for census organization.

Appropriations for industrial development.

Of the sum of $2,780,000 appropriated under a contract between our Government and the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan, made on February 27, 1951, and amended in January 1952, only $100,000 was allotted for the training of specialists, technicians, and other technical aid, while $2,680,000 was allotted to other purposes, which, in plain language, amount to nothing more nor less than a world-wide WPA.

Similar contracts have been entered into between our Government and 32 governments of the world.

Our taxpayers cannot stand this program. We cannot carry all the world on our backs. This program should not only be cut in half—about nine-tenths of it should be cut out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio is having a field day cutting figures off here and there. It should be brought to the attention of the Committee that up to now all cuts have been in the European area.

As I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] he wants to cut the sum of $408,000,000 in title III down to something like $208,000,000, roughly a cut of 50 percent. He states in his remarks that 10 percent of the cut will apply to defense funds for the Far East and 50 percent of the cut will apply to the point 4 program.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that the point 4 program is the only long-range program authorized in this legislation. It is one way of reaching the lesser developed areas of the world, teaching those countries, not American democracy, but how to better their standard of living so that they can live 35 to 40 years instead of the normal 27 years, teaching them to till their soil through better methods so that they can eat two meals a day instead of one, help them to get a better and a more rainproof roof over their heads, and help them to raise their own standards in their own way.

I think it is perhaps the most important long-range program which we have ever had, and if you want to find its genesis you have to go far beyond what the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, has mentioned about the joint reconstruction program in China, which has been a success, and go to the joint Inter-American program which has been in effect 15 years, and which has been the cornerstone of American foreign policy.

Then, this matter of a 10 percent cut in defense funds brings into sharp focus places like Formosa, in which we are all interested; and Indochina, which is of paramount interest at this particular time. I wonder how many Members of this House know that the French have been spending more money each year in Indochina for the past 5 years than they have received each year under the Marshall plan or the Mutual Security program and have suffered tremendous casualties there. I wonder if this House realizes that the French are in that area protecting a vital flank in our common fight against Communist aggression. Think what would happen to southeast Asia if Indochina were to fall or, for that matter, what would happen to all of Asia including Japan, the Philippines and Korea.

It should be stated for the RECORD that France is spending this year, in Indochina, more than one-third of its entire defense budget. This amounts to approximately $1,400,000,000. In addition, France has in excess of 200,000 soldiers in Indochina, comprising its entire regular army, most of its regular noncommissioned officers, and practically all of its younger commissioned officers. If it were not for Indochina, France today could place between 10 and 15 more divisions in Western Europe.

These are things to think about because we are engaged in a world-wide struggle for survival and we should remember that what happens in this part of the world affects the rest of the globe. I hope this amendment is defeated.

(Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted him to Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

REPUBLICAN LEADERS URGE POSITIVE FOREIGN POLICY OF LIBERATION TO REPLACE OUTWORN CONTAINMENT

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the several billions authorized by this bill and the fifty-odd billions appropriated this year for the United States military will be a tragic pyramid of waste if it is used to implement the bankrupt foreign policy of mere containment of communism developed by the Department of State.

Republican leadership should forge the new and affirmative foreign policy of liberation. Such a new policy of liberation is based on the Declaration of Independence. It gives meaning to the dollars spent in the fight against communism. The object of such a policy is victory over communism and not the empty stalemate of a half-free, half-slave world.

"CONTAINERS" ENVISAGE 20-YEAR PROGRAM

The Secretary of State and other advocates of the "containment" policy tell us that it is a long-range policy and that we should be prepared to continue it for 10, 20, or 30 years, with the hope that, maybe, the tyrants of the Kremlin would, after that time, become reasonable and civilized.

I quote from a speech of the Secretary of State entitled "The Peace the World Wants," made before the United Nations in September of 1950.

He stated:

> We need this defensive strength against further aggression in order to pass through this time of tension without catastrophe and to reach a period when genuine negotiation may take its place as the normal means of settling disputes.
>
> This perspective is reflected in the proposals of the Secretary-General for a 20-year program a perspective from which we can derive the steadiness and patience required of us.
>
> This perspective takes into account the possibility that the Soviet Government may not be inherently and unalterably committed to standing in the way of peace and that it may some day accept a live-and-let-live philosophy.
>
> The Soviet leaders are realists, in some respects at least. As we succeed in building the necessary economic and defensive military strength, it will become clear to them that the non-Soviet world will neither collapse nor be dismembered piecemeal. Some modification in their aggressive policies may follow if they then recognize that the best interests of the Soviet Union require a cooperative relationship with the outside world.

CAN WE PAY FOR 20 YEARS OF CONTAINMENT?

Mr. Chairman, let us apply this thinking of the Secretary to the actual economy of the United States—to our actual ability to pay for this kind of a program over a period of 20 years.

Such a 20-year program would not cost us less than $60,000,000,000 a year for the full 20 years. The cost of such a program would probably increase during this period because weapons do not remain the same. We could not rely on the weapons of 1952 to defend us, under the Secretary's program, in the year 1962. The scientists who develop military weapons on the land, in the sea, and in the air, have a way of increasing costs by the square. One very good example of such increase in costs is the comparative price we now pay for jet planes as compared with the planes of World War II.

CONTAINMENT WILL COST EACH AMERICAN FAMILY $32,000

But let us be very conservative and say it would cost us only $60,000,000,000 each year of these 20 years. What does that mean? It would mean that the minimum conservative total cost of such a program would be $1,200,000,000,000. What does that mean? It means that every family of four in the United States would pay $32,000 during this period to uphold the Secretary's Maginot wall of containment. Such a defensive policy that turns the whole world into an armed camp for a period of 20 years or more would almost guarantee the all-out third world war that everyone wants to avoid.

Unless the billions we are authorizing today are used for an affirmative constructive foreign policy, the greater part of the natural resources of the United States will be consumed for nothing.

This purely defensive type policy promises for the American people either bankruptcy or war, or both.

LIBERATION AND SELF-DETERMINATION A POSITIVE ALTERNATIVE TO NEGATIVE CONTAINMENT

But what are the alternatives? The defenders of this bankrupt program say there are none. But the Republican Members of Congress have already shown that there is an alternative. Recently, my colleague, Congressman ALBERT P. MORANO, the gentleman from Connecticut, took a poll of the Republican Members of the House. One of the two questions submitted by Congressman MORANO to his Republican colleagues was: "Do you support the inclusion of the principles of national liberation and self-determination for all the Communist-enslaved peoples as planks in our party platform of 1952?"

REPUBLICAN CONGRESSMEN SUPPORT LIBERATION 82 TO 7

On this question 82 Republican Congressmen declared themselves in favor of such a plank in the party platform and 7 declared themselves not in favor of such a platform. These principles of liberation and self-determination are a positive and effective alternative to the administration policy of perpetual defense. If we embark on this positive policy of rendering assistance to the peoples now enslaved by communism to enable them to eventually free themselves from the Communist tyranny, we can end this threat to our civilization at its very source.

The gentleman from Connecticut also asked his Republican colleagues how they regarded the resolutions—House Concurrent Resolutions 89, 94, 119, 120, 121, 123, 138, 139, and 168—which I introduced last year. Eighty-four Republican Congressmen declared their support of the resolutions, and five declared that they did not support the resolutions.

These resolutions reaffirm the historic friendship of the American people with the oppressed peoples in the Communist-dominated countries. These resolutions express the conviction of the American people that these suppressed peoples have the right of liberation and unqualified self-determination, and to the exercise of their basic inalienable rights and freedoms. Each of these resolutions refers to a different nation now enslaved by communism, namely, the Russian and non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union, Poles, Czechs and Slovaks, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Rumanians, Albanians, and Chinese. They call upon the President to formulate a new and stronger foreign policy which would exclude all further agreements, commitments and recognition of the Communist regimes, and to explore methods whereby the American people may offer aid and moral support to active fighters now struggling for the liberation of their native lands.

The resolutions also call upon the President of the United States to direct our representatives in the United Nations to charge the Soviet Communist regime with aggression in the various satellite countries which it has overrun and to demand the withdrawal of the Soviet Communists from these countries and the establishment of free elections under the supervision of the United Nations. Our U. N. representatives are further requested to urge the United Nations to assist the various peoples within the Soviet sphere to obtain liberation from their present enslavement.

BASE OUR POLICY ON DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

If we continue a policy of fear, appeasement, and containment, we shall have the all-out war that everyone wants to avoid, and possibly lose our freedom.

If we base our policy on the principles of the Declaration of Independence given us by our forefathers, if we have the courage to rely on the magic power of human freedom under God, if we adopt a foreign policy of liberation, we will be true to the America our fathers loved, and more important, we can transmit that America to our children.

MUTUAL SECURITY AMENDMENT CAN BE USED TO IMPLEMENT POLICY OF LIBERATION

Such a foreign policy can be embarked upon under the provisions of the amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1951 which I sponsored last year. This amendment provides $100,000,000 to be used for persons who are residing in or escapees from the Soviet Union and the other Communist dominated countries. This amendment has as its purpose:

First. To assist those people who escape from the Communist tyranny, primarily by forming those who are willing into national army elements which can fight along with the NATO forces; and

Second. To afford practical assistance to people behind the iron curtain who are working to eventually gain their freedom from the Communist regimes.

I am pleased to see that the bill to extend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, H. R. 7005, now being considered provides for the continuation of the program authorized in my amendment to the 1951 act by reappropriating any unexpended balances. I believe that the wording of the bill as it was presented to this committee in H. R. 7005 takes care of the continuation of the program contained in my amendment for the next fiscal year.

PRESIDENT ALLOCATED $4,300,000 FOR ESCAPEES

The importance of this amendment to section 101 (a) (1) of the Mutual Security Act, with respect to one area of activity contemplated by the amendment, was expressed in a letter from Mr. Averell Harriman to President Truman on March 20, 1952. In this letter Mr. Harriman asked the President to approve the allocation of $4,300,000 of the fund in order to improve the reception and treatment and secure the resettlement of qualified people who escape from the iron curtain countries. Said Harriman:

> It is the unanimous opinion of the departments concerned that this program is of immediate and utmost importance. I concur in this opinion and recommend that you determine the assistance planned will contribute to the defense of the North Atlantic area and to the security of the United States.

Mr. Truman thereupon acted in accordance with Mr. Harriman's request and did determine that such assistance was in the interest of the defense of the North Atlantic area and to the security of the United States and allocated the $4,300,000 requested.

NONE OF $100,000,000 HAS BEEN SPENT FOR MAIN PURPOSE

This action of the Mutual Security Director and the President in implementing a phase of activity contemplated under my amendment is a start. But there are apparently some roadblocks in the administration which have prevented any substantial part of the program contemplated under my amendment from getting under way for Secretary Acheson testified on March 29, 1952, before the House Foreign Affairs Committee that not a single dollar of this $100,000,000 had been spent to that date.

Perhaps the State Department has failed to use these funds because it still clings to its outmoded Maginot-line containment policy and regards this program as incompatible with its vested interest in this containment policy.

Or perhaps the State Department just does not know what to do with these funds and lacks the imagination to devise practical methods of implementation.

IMAGINATIVE LEADERSHIP IN NEW AGENCY NEEDED

But in either case it is obvious that the program to be undertaken is of a very flexible character. In no case should it be permitted to remain static. Dynamic, imaginative leadership must be the keynote to the success of this program. Therefore, I recommend that this highly important task be placed in the hands of a special commission or agency of the Government which can be held accountable to Congress for the dynamic, imaginative type of leadership the situation demands.

The following are the reasons in support of this recommendation:

First. The Hoover Report on Foreign Affairs—page 32—states:

> Recommendation No. 7: The State Department as a general rule should not be given responsibility for the operation of specific programs, whether overseas or at home.

In discussing this recommendation, the report further states that the State Department should not undertake operational programs unless unusual circumstances exist. In this connection it also stated that the circumstances in the occupied areas did not appear to be sufficiently unusual to call for an assumption of occupied areas' responsibility by the Department.

Second. The traditional functions and responsibilities of the State Department are of representation, reporting, and negotiation. A long tradition has been built up along these lines which of necessity carries with it a set frame of mind, and an approach which is not suited to the expeditious handling of operational problems outside the area of representation and negotiation.

Third. A special commission or agency of Government which is held directly accountable to the President and to Congress is more likely to bring new and vigorous thinking to play in turning the problems of escapees from communism into real live assets for the free world. Such a commission or agency

should be required to report to the Congress at least semiannually on the progress being made, any unusual handicaps being encountered, and pointing up new opportunities that are ours in the all-out cold war.

MINIMUM OBJECTIVES OF MSA AMENDMENT

The minimum basic actions which should be carried out in order to properly implement this section of the Mutual Security Act are:

First. The establishment of adequate reception facilities for escapees from communism.

Second. The establishment of machinery which will guarantee that the individual assets of each escapee will be recognized and taken advantage of.

Third. In the classification methods particular attention should be paid to the following:

(a) Individuals who are physically fit and otherwise suited for military service. These individuals must be given the opportunity to be formed into military elements of NATO.

(b) Individuals who demonstrate practical qualities of leadership should be trained for special tasks in the interest of the free world. The special tasks for which they would be trained would be a short range and long range character. This determination should be made by the appropriate agencies of government charged with the various aspects of conduct in the cold war.

(c) Individuals who possess technical scientific or other special knowledge useful to the free world should be placed in a position where this information can be put to our best advantage.

(d) Individuals who are not suited for military service or who do not possess special talents or knowledge should be prepared for migration to one of the countries of the free world prepared to offer them resettlement opportunities.

Fourth. Plans should be laid for rendering practical assistance to persons behind the iron curtain that looks toward their freedom.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the program I have outlined provides a positive means whereby we can break through the stalemate which promises to continue in the world indefinitely. I believe that any foreign policy which seeks to guarantee our security behind a Maginot Line of mere containment is doomed to lose for us that very security it purports to preserve.

JOHN FOSTER DULLES FAVORS NEW POLICY OF LIBERATION

I would like to refer to an excerpt from an article in Life magazine of May 19, 1952, by John Foster Dulles on a new foreign policy. I believe that Mr. Dulles' position recently stated is to a large extent the same as I have outlined above. Mr. Dulles states, in part, as follows:

Consider the situation of the twenty-odd non-Western nations which are next door to the Soviet world. These exposed nations feel that they have been put in the expendable class, condemned in perpetuity to be the ramparts against which the angry waves of Soviet communism will constantly hurl themselves. They are expected to live precariously, permanently barred from areas with which they normally should have trade, commerce, and cultural relations. They cannot be enthusiastic about policies which would merely perpetuate so hazardous and uncomfortable a position. Today they live close to despair because the United States, the historic leader of the forces of freedom, seems dedicated to the negative policy of containment and stalemate.

As a matter of fact, some highly competent work is being done, at one place or another, to promote liberation. Obviously, such activities do not lend themselves to public exposition. But liberation from the yoke of Moscow will not occur for a very long time, and courage in neighboring lands will not be sustained unless the United States makes it publicly known that it wants and expects liberation to occur. The mere statement of that wish and expectation would change, in an electrifying way, the mood of the captive peoples. It would put heavy new burdens on the jailers and create new opportunities for liberation.

Here are some specific acts which we could take:

1. We could make it clear, on the highest authority of the President and the Congress, that United States policy seeks as one of its peaceful goals the eventual restoration of genuine independence in the nations of Europe and Asia now dominated by Moscow, and that we will not be a party to any deal confirming the rule of Soviet despotism over the alien peoples which it now dominates.

2. We could welcome the creation in the free world of political task forces to develop a freedom program for each of the captive nations. Each group would be made up of those who are proved patriots, who have practical resourcefulness, and who command confidence and respect at home and abroad.

3. We could stimulate the escape from behind the iron curtain of those who can help to develop these programs.

4. The activities of the Voice of America and such private committees as those for Free Europe and Free Asia could be coordinated with these freedom programs. The agencies would be far more effective if given concrete jobs to do.

5. We could coordinate our economic, commercial, and cultural relations with the freedom programs, cutting off or licensing intercourse as seemed most effective from time to time.

6. We could end diplomatic relations with present governments which are in fact only puppets of Moscow, if and when that would promote the freedom programs.

7. We could seek to bring other free nations to unite with us in proclaiming, in a great new declaration of independence, our policies toward the captive nations.

As the United States News of January 11, 1952, pointed out about this $100,000,000 amendment to the Mutual Security Act:

Louder cries of alarm have been sounded by Russians over these dollars than over the $150,000,000,000 to be spent on United States rearmament.

SOVIET COMPLAINTS AGAINST KERSTEN AMENDMENT

The Soviet Union and its satellites have protested violently to this amendment both to the United States Government and in the United Nations. The gist of their complaints is that passage of the Mutual Security Act with this amendment in it constituted an aggressive act and an intervention in the internal affairs of other countries.

Passage of this amendment is by no means an aggressive act against the peoples of these countries. On the contrary this amendment signalizes our friendship with the suppressed peoples of the Communist countries. It is a formal clasp of friendship through the barbed wire which separates the oppressed victims of communism from the people of the United States. Only the tyrants in the Kremlin need fear it.

AMENDMENT CONFORMS WITH DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

My amendment is in complete harmony with the expression of the basic natural law contained in our own Declaration of Independence. In that document, our forefathers set forth the fundamental God-given right of all peoples to alter or abolish their government and to institute a new one whenever any form of government became destructive of the proper ends of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The Declaration of Independence further stated it was not only the peoples' right but their duty "to throw over such government and to provide new guards for their future security." Clearly, then, since these unfortunate peoples have the right and duty to overthrow their masters in the Kremlin, the American people have a right in every practical way to assist them in such an undertaking.

A VINDICATION OF PRINCIPLE OF NONINTERVENTION

The principle of nonintervention in the internal affairs of other countries is an excellent time-tested principle which should govern the activities of all countries. If the excellence of the principle of nonintervention is to be properly acknowledged and adhered to, it is incumbent upon those devoted to this principle to come to its defense when it is violated and to take positive measures to oppose and end the intervention of outsiders upon the internal affairs of any nation. And it is precisely in defense of this principle, which has been so rudely violated by the Communist gangsters in the Kremlin, that the action taken by the United States in adopting this amendment was so justly warranted.

The Communist outlaws have continuously intervened in the internal affairs of the United States. But more particularly and more disastrously they have intervened in the internal affairs of Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Albania, China, and Korea, and the Soviet Union itself. They improperly seized power in Russia and have since continued to deny all the peoples of the Soviet Union the exercise of their sovereign right to determine their own affairs. Thus, our declaration of intent to render aid to the peoples enslaved by communism is not a violation, but rather a vindication of this principle of nonintervention, and the right of these peoples to govern their own affairs without outside interference.

AMENDMENT HITS AT VITAL WEAKNESS OF COMMUNIST TYRANNY

This new program set forth in the Mutual Security Act provides a new approach to our foreign policy. If we courageously carry out our plan to help the people of the Communist countries to liberate themselves, we can secure world peace by ending the threat of war at its very source.

The anguished complaint of the Soviets about the Kersten amendment indicates that this program of liberation hits at the vital weakness of the Communist tyranny.

The extent of the Kremlin's cries about this amendment to the Mutual Security Act is quite understandable if the nature of the present world conflict is properly understood. In most of the conflicts of the past nations have been pitted against nations but each of them has had the general support of its own people. But the Communists today are trying to redefine the nature of man and make him an animal. Acting thus contrary to human nature the Soviet Communist regime has not even the support of the Russian people, much less the other peoples it has subjugated. It must maintain itself only through force and fear. Consequently today in contrast to past conflicts in world history, in which defections on either side were rare, we can expect and encourage wholesale defections from the enemy camp, if we take proper measures. It is the purpose of my amendment to provide our Government with an opportunity to take further effective measures which take into account this unusual but very important factor of potential wholesale defection which thus far has been largely ignored or abandoned. Thousands of refugees have escaped from the countries under the heel of the Kremlin and are now residing in Western Europe. Official estimates as to the number of refugees who have escaped from the Communist tyranny in the past 2 years indicate that there are a minimum of 18,000 of such people living in Western Germany, Western Austria, Greece, and Turkey. I am also informed that an absolute minimum of 1,000 a month continue to escape, despite the obstacles placed in their way by the masters of the Kremlin.

ESCAPEES STRONG ALLIES AGAINST COMMUNISM

I believe that any student of this problem will agree that those who have lived under the tyranny of Moscow not only have a strong desire to eliminate this universal threat to freemen everywhere, but have practical knowledge of the workings of communism which would enable them to make substantial contributions in the fight against it.

President Truman expressed his views of the desirability of utilizing escapees from behind the iron curtain in his message to Congress on March 24, 1952. He likewise warned of the great loss if we failed to utilize them. Wrote Mr. Truman:

> The miserable conditions in which these fugitives from communism find themselves, and their present inability to emigrate to new homes and start new lives, lead inevitably to despair. Their disillusionment is being effectively exploited by Communist propaganda. These men and women are friends of freedom. They include able and courageous fighters against communism. They ask only an opportunity to play a useful role in the fight for freedom. It is the responsibility of the free world to afford them this opportunity.

Joseph Stalin at the Yalta Conference made a very significant observation with respect to all former Soviet citizens who had been deported to Germany or fled there during World War II. He referred to all these people as "seeds of Soviet disaffection" and demanded that all of them be forcibly repatriated by the Western Allies at the end of the war. Stalin was quite correct in terming these people "seeds of Soviet disaffection." We have abundant proof of the accuracy of this statement in the thousands of displaced persons who have come to the United States under the Displaced Persons Act. They are telling the true story about communism and its every-day workings in thousands of communities throughout the United States. Their hatred of communism and all that it stands for in addition to their desire to tell everyone else their feelings has had a profound effect in bringing to light the evils of communism and the dangers it presents to freedom-loving people.

ESCAPEES NOW BEING NEGLECTED

Emigre groups from the Soviet Union and her satellites are forming organizations in every part of the free world in an effort to acquaint free people with the dangers of the Kremlin plan for world conquest. In the light of these circumstances, it is unfortunate that we, the leaders of the free world, have failed to take full advantage of the great asset the escapees from Communist tyranny present to us. We have even failed to accord them the ordinary decencies of life after their escape from behind the iron curtain. As a consequence the vast majority of them are put into jails or camps or thrown upon an economy that can neither house or feed them, nor give them any opportunity to participate in the fight for freedom. As a first step, therefore, it is necessary that these elementary facilities of reception and care be set up as border hostels in Western Germany, Western Austria, Italy, Greece, and Turkey. I strongly advocate that the necessary steps to this end be taken immediately and in such manner as will cause each of these countries to continue the work they are already doing so that our contribution will be in the nature of a supplement—but a very badly needed one—to what they are already doing.

It might be helpful to our thinking if we would take another look at this question—from the Soviet point of view. What would they do in a situation where 1,000 people a month "escaped" from the free world to the animal farm of the Soviet Union? We can be sure they would exploit such a situation 24 hours a day. They would use such a situation to convince their own suffering millions that conditions in the West were so bad that "refuge" in the East was a gift from heaven. Look what they have already done with the handful of dupes, fellow travelers, and "dummies" who have sought refuge in the East from the capitalistic warmongers of the West. I say "dummies" because it is no secret that the Kremlin has found it necessary to create characters who have escaped from the West in order to offset the lack of escapees from West to East. Yet, we are failing to take advantage of a situation which is all one-sided to our advantage.

NATIONAL MILITARY UNITS

The principal measure to be taken under my amendment and which is spelled out therein is the creation of national military units of escapees from behind the iron curtain. These military units should have their own national flags and emblems, their own distinctive uniforms or identifying insignia. The units should be attached to NATO or the American Army for command purposes.

Free battalions of Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians, Rumanians, Bulgarians, Albanians, Chinese, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Byelorussians, Ukrainians, and Russians would be strong magnets of defection from Stalin's satellite armies and his own Soviet forces. They would weaken the will of the Communist forces to fight the West and might well be catalytic agents in the ultimate liberation of their native lands.

CIVILIAN BORDER HOSTELS

As these young men come through the iron curtain they should receive first aid and care at civilian border hostels. From there they should be taken on a voluntary basis, to military processing centers and formed into their respective national units. As these units would grow and strengthen, the necessity for American troops in Europe would be greatly reduced. As one official in the Pentagon remarked to me, "One Pole, Czech, Hungarian, or other battalions of Eastern European nationals is worth a division of American, British, or French troops in opposing Stalin satellite armies." Such units would, according to a high American official just returned from Europe after spending 3½ years with iron-curtain refugees, disintegrate the morale of Red controlled armies.

To put a hypothetical case: If America were taken over by the Reds and our Armed Forces were under the military control of the Soviets, what effect would the setting up of real American units with American uniforms and American battle flags on the Mexican or Canadian border have? What would be the effect on the will to fight for Stalin on the part of the average young American under this control? Would our sons fight for Stalin?

POSSIBILITIES FOR DEFECTION IN SATELLITE ARMIES

The possibilities for defection exist not only among the satellite countries of Eastern Europe but within the Soviet Union itself. But let me assume for the moment that this policy of cutting away and isolating the Communist apparatus from the peoples it has victimized would only be successful in the satellite countries. In the event of war let us examine how this would substantially and radically change the picture in Eastern Europe.

Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, recently stated that the Soviet armed forces presently consist of 175 Soviet divisions and 60 satellite divisions. The Council of the North Atlantic Treaty in Lisbon recently stated that NATO this year will have approximately 50 divisions in appropriate conditions of combat readiness.

Two hundred and thirty-five Soviet divisions against our hoped-for 50 divisions—more than 4 to 1 against us.

STALIN DISTRUSTS OWN ARMIES

But if we create these free battalions of Hungarians, Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, and the others we let these people behind the iron curtain know in a most practical way that we are willing to assist

them. Then in the event of war, the 60 satellite divisions, which Stalin is now counting on to fight on his side, may well turn their guns around and fight with us instead of against us. These victimized soldiers would come over to join the West singly or in groups, or by mass surrender as they did in the early part of World War II before the Germans mistreated them. Or they may create armed insurrections within their own territory.

Look how this would change the entire picture in Europe: Stalin would lose 60 divisions and we would gain 60 divisions. Thus Stalin would have 175 divisions against our 110. Only a 3 to 2 ratio against us instead of the present 4 to 1. And this does not take into account the excellent possibilities for defection within the 175 Soviet divisions themselves.

EXPERIENCE OF LODGE PLAN

An Associated Press report of April 13, 1952, stated that a report from Heidelberg, Germany, showed that only 220 European DP's had been accepted into the United States Army under the program sponsored by Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE. This program would give American citizenships to European volunteers after 5 years of honorable service in the United States Army. According to the press report, there were more than 5,000 applicants for enlistment in the United States Army under the Lodge plan. Seven hundred and fifty of these were disqualified because they did not fall within the age limit of 17 to 35 years. Another 1,000 did not show up for actual tests, although no information is given as to how long they were kept waiting before they were given actual tests. Still another 1,500 failed to pass the physical, mental, and aptitude tests. Perhaps the reason for this was that the tests were given in English. But even this would leave 1,750 applicants whose applications were not processed, indicating that perhaps the plan is not being properly executed.

LODGE PLAN DIFFICULTIES

Despite the excellent idea of the Lodge plan, it has certain disadvantages, I believe, in comparison to that provided for in my amendment to the Mutual Security Act. Under this amendment there is no promise of American citizenship. Hence any applicant need not be screened to the same extent as would be an immigrant to the United States. Furthermore, the promise of citizenship in the United States is contrary to the very basic psychological urge inherent in my plan. Those most likely to join national units would be those who desire to eventually go back to their own countries when conditions are more favorable, not ones who desire to come to the United States as permanent residents. Such soldiers would be doubly valuable to us in event of war since they would be valiantly fighting for the liberation of their own countries, for the rescue of their loved ones, and the return to their old homes and familiar surroundings.

Under the Lodge plan a European volunteer would be lost in a company of American soldiers, while under the Kersten plan they would be among their own countrymen, with their own friends, with a much higher esprit de corps. While a potential recruit might be reluctant to join under the Lodge plan, he would be an enthusiastic soldier in his own national unit.

Furthermore, it is evident from enlistment figures that the United States Army is reluctant to take foreigners into American units—probably because it makes their training program more difficult. It disturbs the Army routine. For this reason it would appear that the American Army has not promoted the Lodge plan very enthusiastically. I do not, therefore, believe that the number of persons accepted into the American Army under the Lodge plan is any way a criterion of what could be done under the Mutual Security Act, if properly executed.

None of us can predict the future. But in view of today's precarious world situation it is highly important that we move ahead rapidly in creating these military units of escapees. Unfortunately, however, I do not believe that the Government has moved ahead as rapidly as it could have and should have, despite the enthusiasm of many of the members of the Armed Forces.

GOVERNMENT MOVING TOO SLOW IN FORMING MILITARY UNITS

If war should perchance break out before we have created these units, we would lack this potentially tremendous magnet of defection which could undermine the will to fight of the Soviet and satellite troops.

Some of the escapees may be more useful in the cold war in technical or scientific or other special activities than in the military units. Provision should be made to best utilize such escapees, always, of course, on a voluntary basis, however.

Those escapees not suitable for military service or not possessing special skills should be prepared for migration and resettlement in one of the countries of the free world, under the program now being worked out by the various countries.

With regard to aid to persons behind the iron curtain, I wish only to state here that no action is contemplated or intended under my amendment, nor should it be embarked upon, which would set off any premature, abortive revolts or unnecessarily endanger the lives of fearless patriots.

We should, however, proceed without delay in taking the leadership in devising concrete, practical plans aimed to assist in bringing about the eventual peaceful liberation of all the enslaved peoples.

If the people behind the iron curtain can be assured that plans are being made and are being carried into execution to help liberate them, they are more apt to patiently await the propitious moment for freedom than if nothing is done. But if they feel that they have been abandoned they may revolt prematurely in desperation, rather than in hope.

AIM TO AID PERSONS BEHIND IRON CURTAIN SHOULD BE OPENLY PROCLAIMED

Also, this phase of the program—to aid persons behind the iron curtain—should not be concealed or disguised, but openly proclaimed to the world. We must restore hope to those hopeless people and this cannot be done secretly. We cannot assure the people behind the iron curtain of the sincerity of any purpose to help them unless they know that we believe in the basic freedoms for everybody and that it is the announced, open and continuing policy of the United States to help them.

MAGINOT LINE THINKING BASED ON UNSUPPORTED HOPES

Some of our Government officials speak in terms of a 20-year defense program behind our Maginot line, and counsel us to have steadiness and patience. They say that the Soviet revolution may change; that these revolutionists will modify their aggressive policies, and may some day accept a live and let live philosophy. But they have advanced no factual data which would support this rosy outlook.

The evidence rather points to just the opposite conclusion. A live and let Communists live policy would only strengthen the Communists' strangle hold on the people and make less likely any modification of their aggressive policies. These Government officials would stake a 20-year foreign policy and the fate of our country on this unsupported, wishful hope.

CONTAINMENT AIMS AT STALEMATE, NOT VICTORY

And even if their program is 100 percent successful in its own terms it would still leave one-half the world in darkness and misery. It would be well to recall the words of Queen Juliana of the Netherlands in her address to Congress on April 3:

> Mankind should be one kind. A split humanity is like a split personality; it is inclined to go from bad to worse, unless it recovers its unity of purpose, comes to coordinated thinking, and gains sanity and happiness.
>
> The same part of the mind of humanity must always remember it's responsible for the other part. The sound half is the one which is designated to save the other half.

Under my amendment to the Mutual Security Act it is now possible for our Government to launch a program which will lead the sound half of the world to saving the other half, and thus heal our split humanity.

AN END TO STALEMATE POSSIBLE

Such a program offers our own American people a foreseeable end to the continuous drafting of our people for military service, and for the dissipation of our blood and resources in stalemate Koreas around the world.

It provides something better for our American people than 20 more years of confiscatory taxes, 20 more years of harassing bureaucratic restrictions, and 20 more years of burdensome armaments and the possible loss of our own liberties.

It provides a means of lifting this onerous burden from the backs of the American people by destroying the Communist threat of war at its very source.

WORLD WANTS PEACE OF LIBERTY AND JUSTICE

But far more important than lifting this burden from the American people is lifting the infinitely greater burden of the enslaved peoples and the restoration to them of their God-given right to free-

dom. The peace the world wants is not a negotiated peace with Stalin and his gang of criminals, but a peace of liberty and justice for all.

We will then have, not a world half slave and half free, but as Queen Juliana expressed it:

> One human race, under the law and the love of God.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio embodies a very important principle. Aside from the amount of funds involved, it is an attempt to separate several different types of assistance, a thing that we should have done a long time ago. As to the funds involved: I frankly do not know the amount really needed, and I doubt if anyone else does. In this, and other parts of the bill, there is great doubt concerning the needs, but there is a principle involved here which I think is certainly worthy of the support of this House. The amendment proposes to identify the funds authorized by defining the agency administering the program and the purpose for which they are to be used.

I have been very disappointed in the last several years when we have considered this matter that we have not separated these funds in previous legislation in order to determine who is spending the money. Out in the Far East, and Southeast Asia particularly, there are several different agencies doing about the same thing, starting with the transfer of funds from the area of China. You remember that amendment in 1950, I think it was. They have been using those funds in several different places, and by whom I do not know.

Now, we have the point 4 program, we have the military, and we have some other agencies, and it is very difficult to identify where one's work begins and the other stops, except by country. I understand that these agencies do not work side by side in the same countries, but that there are different programs in one country bordering on the other. I think it is high time that we did identify them.

As to the sums, I pass that over for, as I say, I do not know. But I am supporting the gentleman's amendment because of the principle involved in the separation and the identification of the work and the funds which are to be used in that area.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, of all the catch words, slogans, and sugar-sweet titles coined by the political hucksters of the past 20 years or so, none is more nauseating and deceptive than "free world." These words are contained in the bill and throughout the report.

Who and what constitutes the free world? Socialistic Britain? Communist-riddled France and Italy? The dictatorships of Spain and Argentina? Is there individual freedom in the American tradition under kings, dictators, and governments which control every facet of life?

To document the complete idiocy of the term "free world," title 6 of the administration-negotiated pact, under which the United States arms Yugoslavia, alleges that deal to be for the benefit of the free world. What is free about Yugoslavia? It is a Communist police state, run by a Russian-trained Communist dictator, Tito, as ruthless as any dictator on the earth today. The fact that Tito purportedly fails to see eye to eye with Stalin on every issue, certainly makes him no less a Communist and no less a dictator. Yet, in administration language, in black and white, this tyrant, Tito, is part of the free world.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, it is painful for me to have to discuss an amendment of this importance in such a brief period. Nothing more important, it seems to me, is before us in connection with this legislation than the proposal to take so much money from the point 4 program in Asia.

I want to read to the House two or three short sentences from an address delivered in this Chamber a year ago. In speaking of the people of Asia, our visitor said:

> What they seek now in friendly guidance, understanding, and support, not imperious direction; the dignity of equality, not the shame of subjugation. Their prewar standard of life, pitifully low, is infinitely lower now in the devastation left in war's wake. World ideologies play little part in Asian thinking and are little understood. What the peoples strive for is the opportunity for a little more food in their stomachs, a little better clothing on their backs, a little firmer roof over their heads, and the realization of a normal nationalist urge for political freedom.

Those were the words of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Mr. Chairman, the point 4 program is the most practical approach to peace and stability that we could have in the Orient. I have been influenced in my thinking by the contributions to our discussions made by friends on the other side of the aisle. I am grateful to them for the light that they have shed on the problem of helping the people of Asia, because in this fashion, sending our technicians to help people to help themselves, to produce from the soil the things that they need to improve standards of living, as General MacArthur suggested, because it is the least expensive way to do that job and to strengthen our defenses in that area, I am enthusiastic for the technical assistance program.

We spend annually on the whole program around the globe only the equivalent of a few hours expense of our armament program, and here is General MacArthur, a military man, speaking eloquently not of military support but of the strengthening of defense in Asia through nonmilitary means. His words should certainly weigh heavily with the House of Representatives.

I have seen from actual observation in some of the countries what a few hundred thousand dollars will do. In Mexico, for example, in the course of a few years under technical assistance in public and private agencies the production of corn has been doubled. For the first time in 35 years, largely as a result of a cooperative effort under the guidance of practical men they find it unnecessary in Mexico to import corn for their own population.

I cite Mexico because of its longer experience. Asia will profit by such experience. Mr. Chairman, it would be a terrible mistake for us to cut this appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS to the amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: Strike out "$208,000,000" and insert "$232,000,000" and strike out "$88,000,000" and insert "$176,000,000."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, it is just inevitable with the members of the committee making amendments that it takes members of the committee to deal with them. I feel very badly about it. I have taken more than my share of the time, but it is unavoidable because when committee members move the amendments other committee members are supposed to know something about them.

What my amendment seeks to do with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is to use his formula, which I think is sound but to reject the deep cut in amounts, to separate out the technical assistance from the defense support part, but to restore the original figures, which aggregate $408,000,000.

The difficulty with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is this: It goes right to the heart of the proposition, it is not just a question of trimming off fat. In other words, it takes 10 percent off defense support, and if it took another 10 percent off economic and technical aid it could not be argued that the program would die on that kind of reduction, but when it cuts the technical-assistance program, which includes commodities, by 50 percent, then it is really dismembered, for this reason, $315,000,000 out of the total of $403,000,000 is going where? It is going to three countries, which are the most critical in the Far East, to us, right now. It is going to Formosa, it is going to Indochina, it is going to India.

In Indochina there is actually a war against communism. Incidentally let us pay a little tribute to the French here. The French are being really bled white in terms of real blood in Indochina. They are spending a billion dollars a year in the Indochinese war. They are losing the flower of their youth—a very large percentage from among the young people who graduate from their Ecole Militaire—are being killed or wounded in Indochina every year.

Then it is going to Formosa, which is very dear to the hearts of many people in this House as the remaining possibility that ultimately freedom may come back to China.

Finally, it is going to India, where the free peoples are probably fighting for all of Asia, fighting for the devotion to the free peoples of 330,000,000 people. If

vided between economic aid, and training and demonstration projects. I believe it would be a mistake to adopt the amendment of my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] in this case, because he cuts out 50 percent of the aid in one field, technical cooperation, and 10 percent of the aid in the other category, defense support, in that very part of the world where we are taking a licking.

We have not made such drastic cuts in the areas where there is no war, only the possible threat of one. It seems to me that, after listening to General Ridgway yesterday, and knowing the dangerous situation that exists in Asia, this is the last place in the world where we should cut down our support. I am as much in favor as anybody else of separating these items in the bill so that we will be completely forthright in presenting this program to the Congress and to the people of our country and of other countries. But when we have rejected cuts in the Middle East where, to be sure, danger exists, but where actual war has not broken out, it seems unwise for us now to cut as much as 50 percent in the very areas where the United States for the first time in its existence is involved in a major war and not winning it, because we cannot win it now without efforts which are beyond our capacities in view of the enormous Communist buildup in the last few months of fake truce talks and in view of our other responsibilities in the total world situation. Our only hope in most of Asia is to strengthen the areas still free so that, if possible, they can hold the line and keep from being taken over by Communists. It will contribute immeasurably to our own insecurity if they are taken over, and will add immeasurably to our security if they remain free and independent, even though not associated with us in any direct military effort.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I agree with the gentleman that it has been the Republican policy that we equally appreciate the Orient.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I hope the substitute amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] will be adopted. Under it we will do what the gentleman from Texas urged—divide these two programs, but without reducing the amounts so drastically.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman is making a comparison between something in one part of the world that is economic and humanitarian with something in other parts of the world that is purely military. You cannot make that type of comparison in a rational way, which will hold water in the argument.

Mr. JUDD; Yes; but the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio cuts even that which is in support of a military effort. I think it goes too far.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, this is a very, very drastic amendment. The gentleman from Ohio is asking to cut out of the bill for the purpose mentioned something around $111,000,000. Let us take India just as an instance of what is involved. I think there are just $115,000,000 here for India where there are 330,000,000 people. A great deal of criticism has been directed at Nehru. He says he does not believe in war as a means of settling disputes, and most of us agree that war is not a means of settling disputes. But Prime Minister Nehru, who has been criticized sometimes for being soft with communism, has just scored both the Moscow and Peiping regimes, and particularly communism in India. According to an Associated Press dispatch from New Delhi, he said that India "will never pay the price the Soviet Union and China have paid to achieve progress."

He also said:

I doubt if the leaders of the Russian people would pay the price if they had the chance to do it all over again.

Do you not believe that? I do.

The 330,000,000 people of India are disciplined in the faith of Gandhi, who believed in nonresistance. Compared with all the billions we are authorizing in this bill for defensive armaments we should not refuse to invest $408,000,000 in this great area of the world for purposes of peace. These funds are to send scientific, medical, and agricultural missionaries there, if you please. I assert here today that if any good will has come to the people of the United States for what we have done for the people of the world in the way of military or economic aid, it has come from the kind of program we are talking about right now. In the years and years gone by the good will that has come to the people of the United States from countries abroad has come from missionaries of various faiths who have gone from us to sacrifice in those lands. All we are asking for is the opportunity to send some men and women of good will, missionaries of agriculture and engineering, and the medical profession, if you will, to cast bread upon the waters. Although it may not come back to us for many days, I have confidence and faith that if we so invest these funds as carried in the bill, the day will come that you will say it is one of the best investments the United States of America ever made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired, all time has expired on this amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be read before it is voted on.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS to the amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: Strike out "$208,000,000" and insert "$232,000,000"; and strike out "$88,000,000" and insert "$176,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the Javits amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers, Mr. VORYS and Mr. RICHARDS.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 122, noes 91.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The balance of the bill follows:

SEC. 6. Title IV of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 is amended (1) by adding at the end of the center heading "and non-self-governing territories of the Western Hemisphere," (2) by inserting after "Republics" in section 402 the words "and non-self-governing territories of the Western Hemisphere," and (3) by adding at the end of such title the following new section:

"SEC. 403. In addition to the amounts heretofore authorized and appropriated, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed $62,400,000 to carry out the purposes and provisions of section 401 and not to exceed $22,000,000 to carry out the purposes and provisions of section 402. In addition, balances of the appropriation heretofore made pursuant to each such section unobligated as of June 30, 1952, or subsequently released from obligation, are authorized to be continued available for obligation for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the applicable appropriation authorized by this section."

SEC. 7. Title V of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 is amended as follows:

(a) Section 522 is hereby repealed.

(b) In paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of section 501, insert before the period at the end thereof the following: "and the supervision, coordination, and evaluation of all reports prepared by agencies of the United States Government in the course of their operations under this act, in order to prevent duplication of effort and to insure a reduction of reporting requirements to the minimum essential for effective operation."

(c) In subsection (c) of section 504, (1) strike out "transferred to or employed by the Mutual Security Agency" and insert in lieu thereof "employed in the United States on programs authorized by this act" and (2) amend the second sentence of such subsection to read as follows: "Such positions shall be in addition to those authorized by law to be filled by Presidential appointment, and in addition to the number authorized by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended."

(d) Before the period at the end of subsection (d) of section 504, add the following: ": *Provided further*, That, 90 days after the enactment of the Mutual Security Act of 1952, the number of civilian employees who are United States citizens, receiving compensation or allowances from the administrative expense appropriations authorized

there was ever short-sighted economy, it would be to adopt this amendment of the gentleman from Ohio on the Far East.

I do not think this is the question of shaving this figure or of saying that the administration is inadequate, and that the figure ought to go down a few percent. This goes right to the heart of the program and cuts it right to its heart in these critical areas—Formosa, Indochina, and India. It is for that reason, which is a fundamental and substantive reason, that I hope very much the House will turn down the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio and adopt the amendment to it I have proposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. JUDD).

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

TUNISIA IS HOT SPOT

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address the House today on the general subject of our relations abroad. I have long had many cross-currents surging within me, and they boiled to a speech.

This is a year of decision for our country, and I have, I think, some comforting thoughts for the Members of this great legislative body as well as for the millions of Americans they have so honorably and continually tried to serve.

The most comforting thought that I have is that American public opinion, which many times in the past has seemed to be buried and seemed to be silent under the continuous barrage of propaganda that avalanches upon it, is neither buried nor is it silent. It is an inspiring thing to report that this same public opinion—and I regard it as the core of the heart of our country—still is able to assert itself and make known, not only its desires, but its anger, when those desires are thwarted by little men in office.

We have a man in the White House who, unfortunately, is a captive President.

He is the creature of two men—one of whom uses the respected black robes of the Supreme Court to mask his role as a political sorcerer. The other is a man who looks to Britain for guidance. Just at this moment he is on the eve of his departure for Britain to receive the honorary degree from Oxford University and to be made a "bencher" at Lincoln's Inn, no relation to our Honest Abe.

Would to Heaven that, using baseball parlance, we could bench him forever. He is the greatest Secretary of State His Majesty ever could have had. His name is Dean Acheson.

And now we see this strange triumvirate—the black-robed sorcerer, the sorcerer's apprentice, and our captive President.

As a great American used to say—and I refer to the late Alfred E. Smith—"Let's look at the record."

The record is terrible. We emerged victorious from a great war. We even saved bolshevism in the form of the U. S. S. R., and in the scant intervening years since the end of that war, we have seen, in what I term "Alger Hiss-tory," the recipient of our bounty—Soviet Russia—emerge as the greatest threat we have ever encountered to everything we hold near and dear to us in the United States of America.

I used the words "Alger Hiss-tory" because these two chief architects of our misfortune—Felix the Finagler and Acheson the Apprentice—happened to have been the chief protagonists for Alger Hiss, once a seemingly respected figure in the State Department and now a number in the penitentiary.

A captive President termed all this, many times, simply a "red herring."

But, as I said at the outset of my remarks, American public opinion still is true to the traditions of liberty and decency that have characterized it since the birth of our Nation and, thank God, it still can make itself heard.

I wish to call attention to an article in the New York Times of Saturday, May 17. It is a dispatch from Paris by one of the staff correspondents of the New York Times, and it states that we are bringing pressure to bear against the French to speed "implementation"—that horrible government word—"of the program of home rule requirements for Tunisia or face the loss of the United States support." There is a story behind a story in this situation. It is this:

Having lost to the Soviet, the people of China, some 450,000,000 of them, the Frankfurter-Acheson-Truman trio set about promptly to lose our ancient friends, the 400,000,000 persons of the Moslem world. The Tunisians, of course, are members of this second largest segment of human beings.

It is an extraordinary thing that our foreign policy—that is, if we have one—should appear to deliberately alienate what we have long possessed, namely, the respect and the admiration of these peoples. In the first place, the Moslem world always has represented a tremendous bulwark against communism. Like ourselves, Christians, their religion is monotheistic. They believe in one God. Like ourselves, they believe in the right of inheritance and of the maintenance of the dignity of the human being.

These tenets of a basic faith have been abandoned in Russia, but their abolition has not yet been made successful by the men in the Kremlin. Could they but boast of the elimination of God from man's life, and its blind adoption by the 200,000,000 persons under their immediate tyranny, they might indeed feel secure within the walls of that ancient edifice in Moscow.

But they are clever and crafty men and they have used—to their advantage—our mistakes and weaknesses, in dealing not only with the Tunisian question but the entire situation in the Middle East. They know that the peoples in those areas have long resented a decadent colonial imperialism. They know that the peoples in these areas—and largely because of the success and the development of the American Revolution, have striven for, and quite naturally demanded, liberty, independence, and the freedom to conduct their own affairs.

But what has happened in the past few months? The Frankfurter-Acheson-Truman combination has, by its actions, seemed to deliberately affront and antagonize these peoples. We have sided with Britain in her misconduct in Egypt. We have sided with Britain in her dispute with Iran, and most recently, we have sided with France in her irrational actions in Tunisia.

If we were—as is the custom in Washington—to alphabetize the Frankfurter-Acheson-Truman statecraft, we would call it the FAT agency. I can assure you that the FAT is in the fire so far as the 400,000,000 members of the Moslem world are concerned.

But the saving grace of this frightfully un-American conduct of our international affairs is found in the latest developments and again I wish to call to your attention the story in the New York Times. I shall quote a significant paragraph, as follows:

> When the United States abstention from the Tunisian issue drew hostile criticism from the American public, and in Congress, the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, let it be known that the United States would "reexamine" its position if the Tunisian troubles were not settled and the case were to be raised again before the world today.

What the writer refers to is that, for the first time in our history as a Nation we "took a run-out powder" on decency. There never was a single time before in America's great history when we failed to offer sanctuary, assistance and whatever else we had, in moral backing, financial help or otherwise, to those poor wayfarers from far places of the world who, struggling for liberty in those places, and being rebuffed, finally sought assistance from us.

The black-robed sorcerer and his apprentice changed this. They changed American foreign policy, but they could not corrupt the heart and the soul of the American people. In our book, liberty is not local—it is not a precious gift to be enjoyed by us alone. It is something worth fighting for and assisting wherever it raises its voice. That is why I rejoice in the retreat of the State Department from its previous stand in the United Nations on the Tunisian question.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

I agree, as I said earlier this afternoon, that these two types of programs ought to be separated. One is for technical training and economic support of the military effort in four countries, Indochina, Formosa, the Philippines, and Thailand under the MSA. The other is a combination of Marshall plan type commodity aid and technical assistance under the TCA in seven countries in Asia which want and receive no military aid.

The adoption of the earlier amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] makes it certain that when the bill goes to conference, there must be a reexamination of the whole question of how the programs in Asia are to be di-

poses of this act, or (D) any other nation not eligible to join a collective defense and regional arrangement referred to in clause (B) above, but whose ability to defend itself or to participate in the defense of the area of which it is a part, is important to the security of the United States: *Provided*, That, prior to the transfer of any equipment, materials, or services to a nation under this clause (D), it shall provide the United States with assurance that such equipment, materials, or services are required for and will be used solely to maintain its internal security, its legitimate self-defense, or to permit it to participate in the defense of the area of which it is a part, or in United Nations collective security arrangements and measures, and that it will not undertake any act of aggression against any other state: *Provided further*, That, in the case of any such transfer, the President shall forthwith notify the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

"(2) Whenever equipment or material is transferred from the stocks of, or services are rendered by, any agency, to any nation or international organization as provided in paragraph (1) above, such nation or international organization shall first make available the fair value, as determined by the President, of such equipment, materials, or services before delivery or, when the President determines it to be in the best interests of the United States, within 60 days thereafter. The fair value for the purpose of this paragraph shall not be less for the various categories of equipment or materials than the value as defined in subsection (c) of section 403: *Provided*, That with respect to excess equipment or materials the fair value may not be determined to be less than the value specified in paragraph (1) of that subsection plus (a) 10 percent of the original gross cost of such equipment or materials; (b) the scrap value; or (c) the market value, if ascertainable, whichever is the greater. Before a contract is entered into, or rehabilitation work is undertaken, such nation shall (A) provide the United States with a dependable undertaking to pay the full amount of such contract or the cost of such rehabilitation which will assure the United States against any loss on the contract, or rehabilitation work, and (B) shall make funds available in such amounts and at such times as may be necessary to meet the payments required by the contract or the rehabilitation work in advance of the time such payments are due, in addition to the estimated amount of any damages and costs that may accrue from the cancellation of such contract or rehabilitation work: *Provided*, That the total amount of outstanding contracts under this subsection, less the amounts which have been paid the United States by such nations, shall at no time exceed $700,000,000."

SEC. 9. (a) The second proviso in section 115 (b) (6) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, is amended (1) by inserting "from" after "That" and (2) by striking out after "(Public Law 389, 80th Cong.)" the words "shall be used" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "there shall be allocated to the use of the United States Government whatever sums are necessary to meet United States expenditures for materials required by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in its own resources: *Provided further*, That any deposit balance remaining in such account shall be used."

(b) Section 115 (b) (6) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Administrator shall exercise the power granted to him by this paragraph to make agreements with respect to the use of funds deposited in the special accounts of 'participating countries' (as defined in sec. 103 (a) hereof) and any other countries receiving assistance under the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, in such a manner that the equivalent of not less than $100,000,000 in such funds shall be used exclusively in programs furthering the objectives of section 516 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951. The amount to be devoted from each such special account for such use shall be agreed upon by the Administrator and the country or countries concerned: *Provided further*, That whenever funds from such special account are used by a country to make loans all funds received in repayment of such loans shall be redeposited in such special account."

SEC. 10. The Act for International Development is amended as follows:

(a) Add the following proviso before the period at the end of subsection 404 (b) as amended: ": *Provided further*, That for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed $17,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated to the President for use in making contributions under this subsection."

(b) Change subsection 413 (a) to read as follows:

"(a) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an Administrator for Technical Cooperation, who, under the direction of the President or such other officer as he may designate pursuant to section 412 hereof to exercise the powers conferred upon him by this title, shall be responsible for planning, implementing, and managing the programs authorized in this title. He shall be compensated at a rate fixed by the President without regard to the Classification Act of 1949 but not in excess of $16,000 per annum. The President may also appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a Deputy Administrator for Technical Cooperation who shall perform such functions as the Administrator shall designate, and shall be Acting Administrator for Technical Cooperation during the absence or disability of the Administrator or in the event of a vacancy in the office of the Administrator. The Deputy Administrator shall receive compensation at a rate fixed by the President without regard to the Classification Act of 1949 but not in excess of $15,000 per annum."

SEC. 11. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed $12,000,000 to enable him to make contributions to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, this authority to become immediately available and to extend through December 31, 1953: *Provided*, That the contributions shall be made in such a manner as to give assurance that they will not exceed 33⅓ percent of contributions from all governments, including contributions made by governments for the benefit of persons located within territories under their control: *Provided further*, That none of the funds authorized shall be used in duplication of the activities of other agencies of the United Nations.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURLESON: On page 18, line 19, strike out lines 19 to 21, inclusive.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike out lines 19 to 21, inclusive, on page 18. You will notice that there are no funds involved insofar as it is noted in the bill, but this section extends an authorization previously made to spend $45,000,000 for the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency.

May I explain briefly that this money was authorized in a bill last year but no money appropriated therefor. There is now in the fund for the United Nations Reconstruction Agency the sum of $40,200,000 out of $50,000,000 previously appropriated. So they have only spent about $10,000,000. There was $45,000,000 in the bill last year for this purpose but not appropriated.

As far as relief work and reconstruction in Korea is concerned, there is $67,500,000, found on page 19 of the bill, which is to be expended for these purposes by the military. I am not offering any cut in the $67,500,000, but only that portion of the bill which extends the authorization granted last year and on which no appropriation has been made. I know the argument will be advanced here that this is needed because if the truce talks should come to a close the Congress would not have time to appropriate new money. As a matter of fact, it should be separate legislation anyway. It has no place in this bill. This is an issue which should be treated independently because there is no way of knowing what the need will be, and we have $67,500,000 to be used by the Army, regardless of what conditions or what contingencies develop. Therefore, I think we should cut out the appropriation made last year. It would be good legislation to consider separately, and I trust that you will agree with me that this is the thing to do.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, in many ways this seemingly innocuous amendment is most damaging.

Basically what we are doing is telling the people of Korea if we adopt this amendment:

"We have had this great war; we have come there for a great principle; your country has been destroyed in the process; your cities have been laid to waste. Now we in the United States, together with the other members of the United Nations, after having agreed to establish a fund for rehabilitation have decided that we are going to walk out on it.

"Oh, I know that we are giving our Army a certain amount of money to rehabilitate, but from a civilian point of view we are no longer interested in the problems of Korea when this ends."

The strange part about it is that this does not involve any actual sum of money, but it is an authorization. You will have to have an appropriation later on. Basically, the United Nations Korean relief fund contemplates $206,000,000, to which 26 nations of the United Nations have made a pledge, and here for

by this act, employed in the United States and overseas by or assigned to the Mutual Security Agency, or employed by or assigned to the Department of State or the Department of Defense for carrying out programs the appropriations for which are authorized by this act, and the military personnel assigned to such programs, shall be in the aggregate at least 10 percent less than the number so employed or assigned on January 1, 1952, except for such personnel of the Department of Defense engaged in the manufacturing, repair, rehabilitation, packing, handling, crating, or delivery of matériel: *Provided further*, That after the Director has determined the reduction to be effected in each agency, the determination as to which individual employees shall be retained shall be made by the head of the agency concerned."

(e) Amend subsection (c) of section 506 to read as follows:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, beginning with July 1, 1952, the Secretary of Defense may furnish military assistance out of the materials of war whose production in the United States shall have been authorized for, and appropriated to, the Department of Defense: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this act shall authorize the furnishing of military items under this subsection in excess of $1,000,000,000 in value. For the purposes of this subsection (1) 'value' shall be determined in accordance with section 403 (c) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, and (2) the term 'materials of war' means those goods, commonly known as military end items, which are required for the performance of their missions by armed forces of a nation, including weapons, military vehicles, ships of war under 1,500 tons, aircraft, military communications equipment, ammunition, maintenance parts and spares, and military hardware."

(f) Add at the end of section 506 the following new subsection:

"(d) Of the funds made available for military assistance under the amendments made by sections 3 (b), 4 (a), 5 (a), and 6 of the Mutual Security Act of 1952, not less than $1,000,000,000 shall be expended for procurement of military end items from sources outside the United States."

(g) Section 511 is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(c) In addition to the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section, the Director, for the purpose of utilizing most effectively the resources of the United States made available by this act to stimulate and accelerate positive accomplishments toward mutual security, shall take whatever steps he may find suitable or appropriate to assure effective use by recipient countries of their resources, including fiscal and budgetary, for mutual security. In granting assistance under this act, the Director shall take into account the progress made by such countries in the use of such resources for mutual security."

(h) In section 513, amend the heading to read "Special Use of Funds", insert "(a)" after "SEC. 513.", and add at the end of such section the following new subsection:

"(b) Not more than $100,000,000 of the funds made available under the Mutual Security Act of 1952, of which not more than $20,000,000 may be allocated to any one country, may be supplied without regard to any conditions as to eligibility contained in this act, or any other act for which funds are authorized by this act, when the President determines that supplying such funds is in the interest of the security of the United States. The President shall notify the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives upon making any such determination."

(i) Amend section 514 to read as follows:

"STRATEGIC MATERIALS

"SEC. 514. In order to reduce the drain on United States resources and to assure the production of adequate supplies of essential raw materials for the collective defense of the free world, the Director for Mutual Security is authorized to initiate projects for, and assist in procuring and stimulating increased production of, materials in which deficiencies or potential deficiencies in supply exist among nations receiving United States assistance."

(j) Amend section 516 by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 516." and by adding at the end of such section the following new subsection:

"(b) To accomplish the purpose of clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section, under the coordination of the Director for Mutual Security—

"(1) The Mutual Security Agency, cooperating with private business groups and governmental agencies to the fullest extent possible, shall encourage a greater participation by private capital in the guaranty program and shall develop broad criteria to facilitate such participation, including programs consistent with the purposes of the Act for International Development. The Agency shall also, in cooperation with such groups and agencies (including the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development), conduct a thorough study of the legal and other impediments, foreign and local, to private investment abroad, and the methods and means whereby those impediments can be removed or decreased and shall make recommendations thereon to the Director for Mutual Security.

"(2) The Department of State, in cooperation with other agencies of the Government concerned with private investment abroad, and taking into account the study and recommendations described in paragraph (1) of this subsection, shall accelerate a program of negotiating commercial and tax treaties, or other arrangements where more suitable or expeditious, which shall include provisions to encourage and facilitate the flow of private investment to countries participating in programs under this act.

"(3) The Technical Cooperation Administration, taking into account the study and recommendations described in paragraph (1) of this subsection, shall encourage and facilitate a greater participation by private industrial groups or agencies in private contracts awarded by the Administration, and shall, in cooperation with the Department of Commerce and the Mutual Security Agency, find and draw the attention of private enterprise to opportunities for investment and development in underdeveloped areas.

"(c) The reports required by section 513 of this act shall include detailed information on the implementation of this section."

(k) Section 519 (a) is amended by adding immediately after the phrase "may be advanced" the words "out of funds made available for assistance under the Economic Cooperation Act."

(l) Add the following new sections:

"EXEMPTION FROM CONTRACT AND ACCOUNTING LAWS

"SEC. 532. The provisions of section 119 of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1517), shall apply to the performance of functions authorized by this act.

"EMPLOYMENT OF RETIRED OFFICERS OF ARMED FORCES

"SEC. 533. Notwithstanding section 2 of the act of July 31, 1894 (5 U. S. C. 62), any retired officer of any of the services mentioned in the Career Compensation Act of 1949 may hold any office or appointment under this act, and receive compensation in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 30, 1932 (5 U. S. C. 59a).

"MOVEMENT OF MIGRANTS

"SEC. 534. In order to encourage further the movement of migrants from European countries having surplus population, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President $10,000,000 for use in making contributions for the calendar year 1953 to the Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants From Europe established at Brussels, Belgium, on December 5, 1951: *Provided*, That no part of the funds authorized to be appropriated under this section may be used to pay the salary (or expenses) of the Director General of the said committee, if such Director General was at any time employed by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agency or the International Refugee Organization.

"INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION

"SEC. 535. In order to increase the participation of private enterprise and investment in developing the resources of the areas in which assistance is authorized by this act and to mobilize local capital for such development and investment, such amount as may be required, but not to exceed $100,000,000 of the funds made available for assistance to further military production, economic and technical assistance under the provisions of this act may be utilized for the purpose of subscribing to the capital of the International Finance Corporation, an affiliate of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

"OCEAN FREIGHT CHARGES ON RELIEF PACKAGES

"SEC. 536. The authority to pay ocean freight charges on shipments of relief supplies and packages under subsection 117 (c) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1515 (c)), shall be continued and may be exercised after June 30, 1952, by any department or agency of the Government that the President may designate: *Provided*, That not to exceed $2,800,000 are authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 for use in paying ocean freight charges under subsection 117 (c) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

"INVESTMENT AND INFORMATIONAL MEDIA GUARANTIES

"SEC. 537. The authority to make investment and informational media guaranties under section 111 (b) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, shall be fully continued and may be exercised after June 30, 1952, notwithstanding any provision of this act, by any department or agency of the Government that the President may designate."

SEC. 8. The Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1571–1604), is further amended as follows:

(a) Change the period at the end of the proviso in the first sentence of section 403 (d) to a comma and insert thereafter the words "and after June 30, 1952, by an additional $200,000,000."

(b) Change section 408 (e) to read as follows:

"(e) (1) The President may, from time to time, in the interest of achieving standardization of military equipment and in order to provide procurement assistance without cost to the United States, transfer, or enter into contracts for the procurement for transfer of, equipment, materials, or services to: (A) nations eligible for assistance under title I, II, III, or IV of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, or (B) a nation which has joined with the United States in a collective defense and regional arrangement, or (C) any international military organization or headquarters when, in the opinion of the President, such assistance will further the pur-

the first time you have a situation where 26 nations of the United Nations have agreed to make their substantial contributions, and we in the United States say, "No, we want to go it alone." If there was ever an act of bad faith, or if there was ever anything that would cast us in a very poor light, it would be the adoption of this amendment. I sincerely trust that the House, for its own self-respect and for the self-respect of this Nation, will not take that view after going through a period of war on Korean soil, giving aid all over the world and then refuse to go along with the United Nations, with contributions from 26 nations who all look forward to the day when the war will be over and we will rehabilitate that sorely broken and destroyed economy.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Ought we not also in this authorization, which was not appropriated for the last time, because the time had not come—but should we not leave it in here so that if that happy day comes when it is possible to have a postwar Korean relief program, the Committee on Appropriations will have authority to do it? It is just that simple.

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is all it is, and I think the point is well taken.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman from Ohio took the words out of my mouth. I want to concur in everything you said, as well as the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. Is it not true that it would take any agency, whether it was the Army or the Korean Reconstruction Agency, or anyone else, quite a long time to spend more than $100,000,000 in Korea? And that is what you are going to have; you are going to have $67,500,000 plus $40,200,000, and it is going to take a long time for them to spend that money, regardless of the conditions, and the Congress will be back in session then to take a look at what needs to be done.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The great difference, I will say to the gentleman, is that this contemplates an over-all fund to which 26 nations are making contributions. You would leave the situation where only the United States would make the contributions for relief. We are always talking about other nations not paying their share, and here we are in the process of destroying one fund where 26 nations say they will come in and help rehabilitate. I certainly do not follow the reasoning of the gentleman from Texas in this matter.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, this is an authorization that Congress made a year ago but the Committee on Appropriations, in view of the situation in Korea, saw fit not to appropriate.

Can we not just leave it on the books, so that if the happy day comes that we can have a postwar period in Korea, the Appropriations Committee will have authority to consider it?

Mr. RIBICOFF. This is a situation where the United States looks good and does not have to pay anything now, but could look awfully bad without giving the taxpayer any benefit at all.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly because it does not hurt to leave it in, but it might very severely harm our relations with the Korean people and the Orient to cut it out. It would be a great propaganda weapon.

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BURLESON) there were—ayes 32, noes 87.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill close at 5:15 p. m., and that I may have 5 minutes at the close to recapitulate what we have done here today.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS:

Page 24, line 18, strike out "subsection" and insert "subsections."

Page 25, line 17, strike out "commercial and tax"; and after "treaties", insert "of commerce and trade"; and after "other" insert "temporary." On line 4, insert "(c)" before the beginning of the sentence, strike out "Agency" and insert "Department of Commerce"; strike out "also." On line 12, strike out "(2)" and insert "(d)." On line 22, strike out "(3)" and insert "(e)." On line 24, strike out "paragraph "(1)" and insert "subsection (c)."

On page 26, line 7, strike out "(c)" and insert "(f)."

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is agreeable to us.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 23, line 3, strike out the period, insert a colon and *"Provided*, That none of such funds shall be utilized for such procurement at prices higher than those quoted in the United States, adjusted for differences in the cost of transportation to destination and for quality."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to the $1,000,000,000 of required off-shore procurement. The present provision of the bill means $1,000,000,000 of the total amount of equipment to be procured in this program must be required to be procured overseas.

My amendment says that when items are procured overseas, they must nevertheless not buy any products at higher prices than those quoted in the United States, adjusted for differences in transportation, destination, and quality. That means instead of the $1,000,000,000 off-shore procurement being mandatory regardless of price, and without any chance for United States businesses to bid, my amendment lets the American businessmen and the American farmers compete, if their prices are lower.

This amendment will be a protection for the American taxpayer as it requires the awarding of contracts to the lowest bidder. Why should not the American businessman and the American farmer be permitted to get the business when they bid lowest? As a matter of fact, my amendment is part of an amendment which has been prepared and endorsed by the American Farm Bureau for the protection of the people from the United States who want to sell goods, products and commodities to be purchased under this program.

I believe it is wrong to take $1,000,000,000 from the general money under this program and say that the agency and the foreign purchasers cannot buy the goods in America, and that you can only buy abroad with this amount of the appropriation. The present provision of this bill keeps our American farmer and our American businessman out of the program to the extent of $1,000,000,000.

If the American farmer or the American businessman sells cheaper considering transportation, destination, and quality, then the American taxpayer is entitled, under this program, to say, "Under this Mutual Security Program of arms and commodity purchases for our allies, you must buy it where it is cheaper."

We, therefore, by my amendment, permit the participation by the American farmer and the American businessman in the entire procurement program, and we protect the American taxpayer by saying that every item has to be bought where it is the cheapest.

The taxpayers of this country must be protected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 19, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MERROW: On page 23, strike out all of lines 6 through 16 and substitute the following:

"(c) (1) The Congress of the United States finds that mutual security can be realized only to the extent that the countries who receive our aid do their utmost to help themselves and cooperate among themselves and with the United States to the fullest extent in achieving the objectives of the free world. In providing assistance under this act, the Congress of the United States affirms the desire of the United States to continue to use its leadership and

resources for the purpose of uniting the efforts of recipient countries to the end that positive accomplishments toward mutual security may be realized with a maximum of efficiency and a minimum of delay and cost.

"(2) In addition to the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section, the Director, in administering this act, shall insure that, where necessary to the mutual-security effort no country shall receive any assistance hereunder unless it take decisive action to marshal its resources collectively, or individually where more suitable, with integration and unification plans in the appropriate area, and participate in programs which promote collective security in that area. The Director shall insure that, where suitable or necessary to the success of the mutual-security effort, countries take adequate steps to mobilize their industries for mutual defense and gear their fiscal, budgetary, capital, political, and military resources to the objectives of this act and take appropriate other steps toward self-help and mutual cooperation.

"(3) Assistance shall be given on a country-by-country basis to a degree and at a rate commensurate with the rate of progress made in the attainment of the objectives of this act."

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee that made a study of European countries last fall, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] join with me in supporting this amendment which was offered in the committee. For several years I have maintained the position that United States assistance, both economic and military, should be accompanied by reasonable conditions formulated in such manner that the requirements would be mutually advantageous to ourselves and the recipients of our aid.

Certain definite achievements are imperative in realizing the objectives of the free world. If continued progress in this direction is not insisted upon, then our aid may not be used to the fullest advantage in realizing the purposes for which it is given.

There has been considerable progress in the development of a policy requiring the recipients of our aid to adhere to certain definite principles. Last year the Foreign Affairs Committee wrote into the Mutual Security Act a section on eligibility for assistance. In the bill which we are now discussing there is a section that deals with this matter which I proposed to amend.

The purpose of the amendment which has just been offered is to strengthen this section. The proposed substitute is for the express purpose of helping both ourselves and the recipient nations to move more quickly in achieving the objectives of mutual security.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the Merrow amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANTAFF as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. MERROW: On page 23, strike out lines 6 through 16, and substitute the following:

"TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE FOR FAILURE TO MAKE FULL CONTRIBUTION

"SEC. 532. (a) (1) The Director shall determine for each fiscal year (A) the gross national product of the United States and the proportion thereof which the United States expends for the development and maintenance of its own defensive strength and the defensive strength of the free world, and (B) the gross national product of each recipient nation and the proportion thereof which such nation expends for the development and maintenance of its own defensive strength and the defensive strength of the free world.

"(2) All nations receiving United States military, economic, or financial assistance shall be kept informed of the determinations made under this section. If the Director determines that the proportion of any recipient nation's gross national product for any fiscal year which is expended for the development and maintenance of its own defensive strength and the defensive strength of the free world is less than the proportion of the gross national product expended by the United States for such purposes for the corresponding fiscal year, he shall give such nation notice of an intent to terminate assistance authorized by this act.

"(3) The determinations required by this subsection for the first fiscal year of the United States which ends after the date of the enactment of this section shall be made not later than 30 days after such date, and the determinations for the corresponding fiscal year of each recipient nation shall be made not later than 30 days after such date or the date on which such fiscal year begins, whichever date is the later. Determinations for each succeeding fiscal year for each nation (including the United States) shall be made within 30 days after the beginning of such fiscal year.

"(4) For the purposes of this section—

"(A) In determining the amount expended by any nation (including the United States) for the development and maintenance of its own defensive strength and the defensive strength of the free world there shall be included only (i) items (excluding items for the pay and allowances of members of the Armed Forces) corresponding to those for which appropriations were made by the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1952 (Public Law 179, 82d Cong.), under the heading 'Department of Defense Military Functions', (ii) expenditures for military assistance to other nations, and (iii) expenditures for atomic energy purposes.

"(B) If the fiscal year of a nation does not begin on July 1, the fiscal year of such nation which corresponds to the fiscal year of the United States shall be the 12-month period, beginning within the fiscal year of the United States, designated by the Director as appropriate for the purposes of this section.

"(d) All military, economic, and financial assistance to any nation which has been notified under subsection (a) of an intent to terminate assistance shall, upon the recommendation of the Director, be terminated forthwith unless within 60 days after the date on which such notice was given the President determines—

"(1) that adequate measures have been or are being taken by the nation concerned to assure that the proportion of its gross national product expended for the development and maintenance of its own defensive strength and the defensive strength of the free world will not be less than the proportion of the gross national product expended by the United States for such purposes, or

"(2) that (A) the contribution required by paragraph (1) would seriously jeopardize the political or economic stability of the nation, and (B) adequate measures have been or are being taken by the nation to assure that it will make, consistent with its political and economic stability, the full contribution permitted by its manpower, resources, facilities, and general economic condition to the development and maintenance of its own defensive strength and the defensive strength of the free world.

"(e) There shall be included in each report required by section 518 of this act full and complete information with respect to the determinations and actions taken under this section during the period covered by the report."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTAFF. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, these remarks are made under permission granted to me to extend my remarks. The RECORD should clearly show that these remarks were not made on the floor of the House because time to present amendments and debate was cut off in spite of objections made on the floor. At least four persons were on their feet objecting at the time the Chairman put the unanimous request, at 4:30 p. m., that all debate close at 5:15 p. m., the last 5 minutes reserved to the chairman of the committee. The Chair gaveled the request through and then ruled that the objectors had not objected in time.

Mr. Chairman, it is impossible to present an amendment intelligently in 1 or 2 minutes. There were seven amendments at the desk when the debate was shut off. I had three amendments ready to offer, but under the circumstances I withheld them.

The amendment that the gentleman from Florida has presented as a substitute to the amendment from the gentleman from New Hampshire is an amendment that he has spent long hours working out. It is an amendment that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] and myself are quite familiar with and very much concerned about its passage. Our concern is the result of the information we gathered in Europe this last fall as members of the Bonner subcommittee.

The amendment that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] will have to present in 2 minutes time is also an amendment that he has spent long hours in working up. It too is based upon the testimony elicited at the Bonner subcommittee hearings abroad and from rather far-reaching studies made here in Washington. It is a most worth-while amendment, in my opinion it deserved serious consideration.

Some of the other amendments that are at the desk, indeed probably all the amendments at the desk represent hard work and study by the MEMBERS of the House presenting them.

The Speaker of the House took the floor this afternoon to state that the mutual security bill before the House today is one of the most important and far-reaching pieces of legislation that will come before this body. I fully agree

with him on this particular point, although I must beg to disagree with him as to the details which go to make up the legislation. Nonetheless on this important piece of legislation the Chairman and, I must state in fairness that he was reflecting what seemed to be the wishes of the majority of the Members present, cut off debate and consideration of serious and far-reaching amendments to this legislation.

I am going to briefly state what the amendments I was going to offer constituted. Fortunately, unlike Mr. LANTAFF'S or Mr. MEADER'S amendments mine are amendments that can be implemented through the appropriation bill appropriating sums authorized by the bill before us. Nonetheless, the amendments I was to propose are matters that go to the philosophy of the Mutual Security Act and therefore should be considered when considering the legislation and not considered so much in the appropriation. Although I again say they would not be ruled out of order as legislation on an appropriation bill if offered.

On page 20, line 2, I would have offered an amendment to strike out the following words: "not to exceed $62,400,000 to carry out the purposes and provisions of section 401 and". This was a cut in the bill of $62,000,000 for military assistance to Latin America. I refer my colleagues to the committee report, page 45, where this item is discussed and again point out that the $38,000,000 appropriated last year for this purpose has still not been obligated and at the time authorization was sought, and later appropriation, those requesting this sum did not know what they were going to do with it. Now as far as Latin America is concerned, I think it is quite obvious that there is no direct threat there from Soviet Russia. It is impossible to use scare tactics to get us to arm Latin America. The most that Latin America would be used for in a war against Russia is for antisubmarine bases such as we established in World War II. The policy of arming certain Latin American governments is certainly open to grave question. We would in effect be turning over to military dictators the further means of maintaining their dictatorship. Whether the House would agree with this line of reasoning or not I do not know. But I do know that this was a proper and important matter for the House to discuss and decide.

On page 27, line 7, I would have cut the figure $10,000,000 to $5,000,000 for movement of migrants. On page 59 and 60 of the committee report you will see this item discussed. For calendar year 1952 the United States contribution to the PICMME budget of $41,350,660 was $10,000,000. But in that year it was expected that 24,000 of the 31,000 migrants would move to the United States. Under present law there will be little or no movement of migrants to the United States during calendar year 1953. The other countries in this program with the United States are Canada, Australia, Latin America, and New Zealand. None of these countries are war casualties in any way. All of them seem to be anxious to obtain these migrants. Under the circumstances it would appear that the United States portion of the budget should be reduced and that was what my amendment intended to effect.

My third proposed amendment was on page 33, line 5, to reduce the $17,000,000 figure to $9,000,000, effecting a saving of $8,000,000. The program affected is the one under the provisions of the act for international development to international organizations for technical cooperation programs. Sixteen million dollars of the seventeen million dollars was to go to the United Nations for this program. This in effect is the United Nations point 4 program. The total budget for this program is $27,000,000 of which we furnish the $17,000,000, or 63 percent. Now this Congress has clearly expressed itself in this very bill, and in other bills, that it feels the proper percentage of contribution for the United States to United Nations programs is 33⅓ percent. My amendment sought to implement this congressional policy to reduce our contribution to 33⅓ percent.

I am not going to draw any conclusions from the record I have heretofore set out as to how the House of Representatives in May 1952 considered and debated the Mutual Security Act. Unfortunately the procedure is not extraordinary. It is almost common. I have only one further comment to add to complete the record. The program for the House next week is a light one. For the following week it is even lighter. The House is so far ahead of the other body in its legislative program that it is quite obvious that the House will be marking time through June. In other words, it is not for lack of time or because of a crowded schedule that the representatives of the people have failed to devote the proper time and study to the serious legislative matters of the day. The reason, whatever it may be, lies elsewhere.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that has just been offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] is a sound amendment, and I intend to vote for it if my amendment is not agreed to. However in my opinion it does not go far enough.

In brief, the substitute amendment merely says to the recipient nations: To be entitled to our aid you must contribute to your own defense the same proportion of your gross national product as we in America are contributing to defense.

All of us will recall that in 1938 these same nations were supporting large armies through their own economy without benefit of the Marshall plan. Their economies have been strengthened by the Marshall plan, and I believe that today they are fully capable of so reorganizing their tax structures as to contribute much more to our mutual effort. If you will refer to page 18 of the committee report you will see how little these countries are contributing to their own defense. You will see that not one even approaches the portion of our gross national product being contributed by the American taxpayer.

The amendment is workable. I call your attention to what happened in the Philippines. We told them to revise their tax structure to collect taxes from those with the ability to pay. We said unless you do so we will not furnish any more economic aid. Today they are getting in 60 percent more revenue. The same can be done in Europe to benefit the American taxpayer. I regret that the time is so limited as to prohibit further discussion of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is recognized.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, the Lantaff substitute to the Merrow amendment is about as unworkable as the amendments we were considering yesterday. It will be recalled that yesterday I brought to the attention of the committee the fact that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] was going to present an amendment that would be a workable and practical approach. The gentleman from New Hampshire has now proposed such an amendment.

I hope the committee will turn down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida and vote for the well-thought-out amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW].

Mr. Chairman, I think it is the temper of the House and surely it is the temper of our country that the assistance to our allies be effective. Certainly we desire that the moneys expended in assistance be wisely spent. With regard to the House action on the Mutual Security bill, I strongly feel that the extensive additional cuts made in the bill can seriously endanger the entire program. I believe it is wiser to give full assistance with certain conditions.

I was among those who originally felt that substantial reductions could be made in the President's request for mutual-security aid; however, after a sincere study of all of the evidence available I have reached the conclusion, as have a considerable number of people not only in Congress but throughout the Nation, that the cuts made by the Foreign Affairs Committee, which, as you know exceed $1,000,000,000, were about as far as we could go in cutting this bill without crippling the mutual-security program.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to read to the membership a cablegram that the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee has received from Arthur Sloan, chairman of the United States Council of International Chambers of Commerce, who is now on board the steamship *Mauretania* returning from Europe. He has surveyed the situation in Europe and has summarized his observations in this telegram which reads as follows:

> After conferring with business leaders in NATO countries and our own diplomatic and military representatives in Paris and London, strongly feel substantial reduction below the $6,900,000,000 would be detrimental to mutual security and European morale. Fully sympathizing with effort of Congress holding down deficit, but believe further major cuts to this bill a fatal mistake.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Committee will adopt the Merrow amendment and when the Committee rises that

the membership will vote down the crippling cuts.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LANTAFF) there were—ayes 42, noes 69.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER: Page 22, lines 6 and 7, after the words "may furnish", insert "subject to reimbursement from funds appropriated pursuant to this act."

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted to Mr. MAHON was yielded to Mr. SCRIVNER.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas has offered a very valuable contribution to this bill. His amendment restores language which was previously in the bill.

The Herter amendment provides that a billion dollars in military appropriations can be taken from the Department of Defense without reimbursement and devoted to the Mutual Security Program. The pending amendment provides for reimbursement.

I have conferred with Department of Defense officials about this and they are in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER]. It is most important if we are going to have a proper military fiscal policy to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], chairman of the Military Subcommittee on Appropriations, has stated that all this amendment does is to make the language read just exactly as it did in last year's bill. The section as it now stands would provide that the Secretary of Defense could take a billion dollars' worth of arms, tanks, and equipment used by the United States Army, the United States Air Force, the United States Navy, the United States Marines, and transfer it to different foreign countries without any reimbursement to the Department of Defense at all, which would be equivalent to a $1,000,000,000 cut in our military appropriations providing for our own troops. In other words that would be equivalent to a billion-dollar raid on the arms of our own troops.

The situation might arise where there might be some material that we have on hand that some of these foreign nations might have to have in a hurry. If that situation arises and the Secretary of Defense is called upon to provide some of those things in a hurry, right away, that is all right, there is no objection to that, but when such equipment is furnished all this language provides, as last year, is that there shall be reimbursed into the defense appropriation, United States defense appropriation, an amount equivalent to pay for that material out of the appropriation herein provided.

Now, that is the only right and proper way to do it. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has told you that the Defense Department does not want this. They have been before our committee and told us what they needed under their tables of organization and equipment. They have told the Committee on Foreign Affairs that the request for foreign military aid has been based on the needs of the tables of equipment and organization; therefore, if we are to have orderly process, if we are to be able to maintain and keep track of the military expenditures, our domestic and foreign military programs, this is the only commonsense practical way of doing it. In other words, let the Defense Department tell us what they need for our own troops and then let them come in under another authorization and tell what they need for the foreign troops.

I trust the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the language which now is on the bill is, to all intents and purposes, utterly meaningless, because there simply is not a billion dollars worth of arms and ammunition that possibly could be transferred out of the current military stocks or those which are provided for in the fiscal 1953 bill, which has been passed by the House. We have already cut those stocks to the absolute minimum, or they have been used in Korea, or the bill that passed the House was cut to the point that it would not be possible for any of this material to be transferred to other countries without ruinous effect upon our own military services. Therefore the language which has been proposed by the gentleman from Kansas, which would make this reimbursable, is certainly desirable, if the language in the bill is to remain.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. I would like to say to the gentleman from Florida that he is making a fair statement. This amendment was offered by Mr. HERTER in committee. I never thought, and I do not assume now, that this program will not get any benefit out of it. Therefore, I cannot conscientiously oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that 1 minute of my time be given to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and 1 minute of my time be given to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, if we ever have a billion dollars' worth of military equipment that is needed for use by troops of other countries rather than our own for our own security, we certainly ought not to have to stand on ceremony about reimbursing the Defense Department. You talk about reimbursement. The taxpayer does not get any reimbursement. I do not see any reason why, if we get to a situation where we need equipment in our defense, we need to worry and fret about reimbursing the Pentagon. Of course, they like to have reimbursement from all kinds of funds, get all the money they can, and I do not blame them, but it seems to me that we should think first about the best use of the weapons we have for our own security and not about paying the Pentagon back.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order, and to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD under the title "Guilty of What?"

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BREHM addressed the Committee. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 33, strike out lines 8 through 24, and on page 34 lines 1 through 5.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this provision of the bill would be laughable were it not so tragic.

The foreign spending woods are literally full of payrollers. We have about as much use for a $16,000-a-year technical director and a $15,000-a-year deputy technical director as a bull frog has for feathers.

Why is it, practically every time the administration brings in a spending bill, it sets up personnel, an office or sometimes an entire agency to do the spending?

Do not insult the American people by establishing two more, expensive and absolutely unnecessary jobs at their expense. My amendment will halt this election year payroll padding.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this legislation provides for the expenditure of an additional $6,900,000,000, almost all in European countries. It is an addition of $12,000,000,000 already appropriated and unexpended. It means you will have $18,000,000,000 to spend

for mutual assistance in European countries between now and July 1, 1953. Do not forget that none of these funds are for Korea. Not at all. This money goes to Europe with a small share to Asiatic countries.

We are told that about $13,500,000,000 is for military aid, and four and a half billion is for economic aid for these countries.

Before I proceed further, do you realize this $18,000,000,000 is more than the total to be expended in the United States of America, next year outside of military expenditures. Think that over. More money being spent for those countries under mutual assistance than all of the combined civilian agencies in our own country. That includes funds for agriculture, highways, flood control, salaries, and other expenditures combined. Incidentally, it is reported by one of the members of this great committee that we are reducing military expenditures in our own country and increasing military expenditures abroad.

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to be placed in a position of being unwilling to assist other people in their need. I think we ought to cooperate and help people who show a willingness to help themselves. I agree with those who insist that what we need is a better understanding with other people of the world. If I thought for a minute the expenditure of this additional $6,900,000,000 is really needed on top of $12,000,000,000 on hand, in order to help prevent a world catastrophe, I would not hesitate to support it.

Let me quote right here, if I may, from an address delivered only a few days ago by a distinguished American, an authority on foreign affairs. He is a chief adviser on foreign policy for our Government appointed by the President. He is John Foster Dulles. He has already been quoted by a distinguished member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Here is what he says in part. I hope you will weigh his words carefully and thoughtfully:

> With nations, as with men, money is no substitute for character. Our Nation today is spending fabulous sums for security. The target this year is about $60,000,000,000. We have given away, in one form or another, about $40,000,000,000 since 1945. If money could buy security and happiness, we should have them. Yet we have them not. Today we are insecure, we have less good will than ever before in our history, and our people feel a sense of frustration.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of this committee made a most important statement when he said, "We must maintain a solvent United States." I know he means every word of it. I would like to add he is one of the most earnest and sincere Members of this House.

Let me call your attention to a few facts. Our national debt is about $255,000,000,000. That is almost twice the total indebtedness of all the countries we seek to help under this program. Here is another thing. It is estimated that, on an average, only about 50 percent of taxes levied in these countries is really collected. Evidently, the United States of America takes care of a good share of the rest of it. Incidentally, it would help if it could be explained why the French Government should charge our Government 20-percent tax for material we use in building airfields and highways in France, all materials being paid for with money of our taxpayers. Also, why she charges $2 and $3 for every member of the American Armed Forces that lands in France. Where is the mutuality in that transaction? I know these are incidental, but they are relevant.

It might be well right here to remind ourselves again that this mutual assistance is in addition to the hundreds of millions our Government is spending to maintain military personnel abroad, together with housing and equipment of various kinds.

Another thing difficult for our taxpayers to understand is that so much of these funds go for expensive improvements abroad. It is claimed that the amount spent for power dams and flood control abroad is almost as much as the amount spent for flood control in our own country.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think these expenditures are as carefully checked as should be done. Why, for instance, should American taxpayers' money be used for building the biggest and most modern railway station now under construction in Rome?

It ought to be related that the economy in each and every country sought to be assisted under this legislation is in much better condition than prior to World War II. I do not mean they are in good shape. They are not. They will need more assistance. It seems to me that, taking everything into consideration, that $12,000,000,000 now on hand is sufficient. Make sure it is expended carefully and judiciously. Then look the situation over. Do not forget our taxpayers have reached the limit. And please do not forget the deficit for this year is approximately $14,000,000,000.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEADER: On page 24, strike out line 19 and all that follows down to line 9 on page 26, and insert the following:

"(b) (1) To assist in carrying out the purposes of this act, through encouraging and facilitating the development of the natural resources of foreign areas by the investment of private capital and eliminating barriers to and providing incentives for engaging in business enterprises in such areas by persons or business organizations who are nonnationals of such areas, there is hereby established a bipartisan commission to be known as the Commission on Aid to Underdeveloped Foreign Areas (hereafter referred to as the 'Commission').

"(2) (A) The Commission shall be composed of 14 members as follows:

"(i) Ten appointed by the President of the United States, four from the executive branch of the Government and six from private life;

"(ii) Two Members of the Senate appointed by the Vice President; and

"(iii) Two Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker.

"(B) Of each class of members, not more than one-half shall be from each of the two major political parties.

"(C) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filed in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

"(3) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

"(4) Eight members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

"(5) (A) Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

"(B) The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, plus such additional compensation, if any, as is necessary to make his aggregate salary $12,500; and they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

"(C) The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

"(6) The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(7) The service of any person as a member of the Commission, the service of any other person with the Commission, and the employment of any person by the Commission, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such person within the provisions of sections 281, 283, or 284 of title 18 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

"(8) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection (b).

"(9) (A) The Commission shall study and investigate the problem of aiding underdeveloped foreign areas and shall formulate and recommend to the President and the Congress specific programs for carrying out the purposes of this subsection (b).

"(B) The Commission shall report to the President and to the Congress from time to time the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. The Commission shall file its first report within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, and annually thereafter.

"(10) (A) The Commission may create such committees of its members with such powers and duties as may be delegated thereto.

"(B) The Commission, or any committee thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this subsection (b), hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such committee may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before any committee thereof.

"(C) The Commission, or any committee thereof, is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality, information,

suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, or any committee thereof, upon request made by the chairman or vice chairman of the Commission or of the committee concerned.

"(D) The Commission, or any committee thereof, shall have power to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oats; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the Commission or committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section."

Mr. MEADER (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with. It appears on page 874 of the committee hearings and page 5673 of Wednesday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to set up a bipartisan commission, like the Hoover Commission, charged with the task of aiding private investment overseas.

I point out that the bill before you now carries a provision ordering the Secretary of State, the Director of Mutual Security, and the Technical Assistance Agency to encourage private investment overseas by tearing down legal and political impediments to such investments. That is attacking the problem with a feather duster. The Department of State and these other agencies are not going to do anything effective. They could have and should have done that job in the past if they had the capacity and the will to do so. They have not encouraged private enterprise, and have no real interest in doing so.

I hold in my hand the most recent figures on investments overseas since World War II. Do you know that we have only $13,500,000,000 of private investment in foreign areas today, and only $5,000,000,000 of that is an increase since the last World War? Most of that investment is in the Western Hemisphere. Outside the Western Hemisphere the total new investments overseas since 1945 are $1,792,000,000, of which $1,050,000,000 is in petroleum properties. This leaves only $742,000,000, including reinvested earnings, in 5 years, or about $150,000,000 a year of private investments, outside of petroleum properties. At the same time we are spending seven to eight billion dollars a year of taxpayers' money, much of it in economic undertakings.

The proof of the pudding is in the eating. These puny figures on private investment overseas indicate that the administration of our foreign-aid programs has not been helping, but hindering, private investment. These leopards will not change their spots, no matter how earnestly the Congress urges—or orders—them to stand up and fight for free enterprise.

The committee itself does not believe these agencies are going to do much good. It says on page 63 of its report:

In carrying out its programs, the TCA should intensify its implementation of the legislative mandate: "The participation of private agencies and persons shall be sought to the greatest extent practicable." Thus far the TCA appears to have given this provision a most gentle nod, where a push is required.

The provision of the bill is an illusion. We need a new approach and new thinking. The commission, with substantial representation from private life, may solve this difficult problem and provide real impetus for private investment. The executive agencies will not.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MEADER) there were—ayes 34, noes 76.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD: On page 24, line 1, strike out "in the interest of" and insert "important to."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was adopted in committee, and by inadvertence was not contained in the bill.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman from Minnesota is correct about that. This is a perfecting amendment, and we are indebted to the gentleman for calling it to our attention. This should be in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 22, strike out lines 22 through 25, and on page 23, strike out lines 1 through 3.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am certain many American companies and thousands of American workers would be glad to get the billion dollars in military contracts which this bill proposes to give to foreigners. My amendment will prevent this proposed double-cross of American industry and labor.

Is it the purpose of our foreigners-first administration to make us dependent, in part, upon foreign manufacturers and cheap labor for our military needs?

Here is the opportunity for you to make your decision as between American industry and labor and those foreign alleged "friends" who are conspicuous by their absence on the battle front.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 23, strike out lines 17 through 25, and on page 24 strike out lines 1 through 5.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask again, as I have asked so many times on the floor of this House—how many more multi-million-dollar blank checks are we going to give the President under the guise of so-called emergency or national security?

We all know he has millions in his contingent fund, and other expense accounts, to handle any dole not provided for in this bill.

Let us save this $100,000,000 by voting for my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 27, strike out lines 3 through 25, and on page 28, strike out lines 1 through 3.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the American taxpayers have been saddled for more than seven long years with the European refugee problem. I hesitate to say how much money has already been extracted from our people in this connection.

This problem has no place in this bill. Let some of the alleged friends in foreign countries that the administration talks so glibly of take over this European refugee program for a while. My amendment will give them that opportunity.

It will also wipe out the proposed international middleman or middle organization. Why put those fingers in the jam jar? If there is anything more expensive than direct dole, it is indirect dole through a grasping middleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 28, strike out lines 16 through 23.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, why continue this business of virtually gagging and bribing American newspapers in foreign countries with subscriptions and advertising paid for, in some instances, at exorbitant rates—and always with our taxpayers' money?

For example, subscriptions listed in the Rome Daily American as costing about $12.50 were bought with American taxpayers' money at the rate of $15 to $24 each. As a result of my discovering this there have been some so-called downward revisions of these contracts by our striped pants give-away artists, but I have been unable thus far to ascertain how much money, if any, actually has been recovered, and if the recovery is or will be retroactive for several years that this fleecing of the American taxpayers went on.

In addition, Members of this House will be interested to know that the various foreign dole programs, such as this one, included vast sums of American tax dollars for subscriptions to the European edition of the New York Herald Tribune at the rate last reported to me of almost 82,000,000 French francs a year; and to the European edition of the New York Times at the rate, last reported, of more than 86,000,000 French francs a year. I do not know how many dollars these millions of French francs represent, but it is nothing to sneeze at, that is certain. If there is anything worse than a gagged press, it is a bought or bribed press, whether directly or indirectly. Not to mention the alleged bilking the American taxpayers are getting as a result of foreign movies and other films and such projects dished out lavishly by our foreign spenders.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, but I am unable to speak on the amendment at page 27, lines 18 through 25, and continuing on page 28, lines 1 through 3, which strikes out the International Finance Corporation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I believe that amendment was included in the amendments offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] which have just been rejected by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. It appears on examination of the amendment that it bears on a different proposition.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has called the names of all Members on the list who indicated they intended to offer amendments or wanted time to speak. The two remaining are the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, before the Committee of the Whole concludes its deliberations and rises, and before we return to the House, I want to make a few observations in the hope that when we get into the House, the two amendments which will be voted upon, namely the two Vorys amendments, one reducing title I by $615,000,000 and the other reducing title III by $111,000,000 will be defeated. In connection with the threat to our security, as I see it, our job is:

(a) To prevent war; it is our duty to prevent the outbreak of war.

(b) To stop the Soviet Union through its aggressive actions from obtaining its goal sought without war, and that involves the policy of internal subversion by the Communists and also aggressive action through satellites.

(c) If war is forced upon us to make certain that our country and other free countries will win.

As I see it, all three of these factors are necessary in our strategy as it relates to the threat that faces us from international communism and the Soviet Union.

Some years ago in the well of this House I made a speech in which I said that the Soviet Union was using international communism as an ideological approach to win over country by country through internal subversion, and thereafter to follow its imperialistic policy of actually taking over the control of such countries, the ultimate country in mind being the United States of America. I think events that have occurred subsequent to the time I made that speech some 3 or 4 years ago confirm the judgment and the prediction I expressed on that occasion.

By an amendment we have just adopted we have taken away the very basis of the argument of my friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] in offering his two amendments; to wit, that under the provisions of this bill and previous legislation there is an opportunity to transfer or interchange $1,000,000,000 from War Department appropriations to mutual assistance. The Scrivner amendment, adopted by the Committee of the Whole only a few minutes ago, takes away the strength of that argument because that opportunity no longer exists.

Only yesterday we heard General Ridgway address a joint session of the Congress. In a few days he will go abroad to succeed General Eisenhower. He has a very serious task to perform, the same as General Eisenhower had when he received his NATO assignment. General Ridgway spoke to us only yesterday, and yet by our actions of yesterday and today we are limiting his ability to accomplish to the maximum extent possible that which we hope for and that which we desire.

It is only a few days ago that General Eisenhower sent communications to prominent Members of Congress urging the Congress not to make any reductions beyond the $1,000,000,000 already made by the Senate committee and as made by the House committee. General Eisenhower, in those communications, said that while it was dangerous to make the $1,000,000,000 reduction, it would be far more so to make a larger reduction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts 1 minute of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for one additional minute.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. Chairman, I quote another distinguished American gentleman from a reprint in Life magazine of May 19, 1952, in which he said:

> There are a few Republicans and some Democrats who would turn their backs on all the world's problems and place the United States in some magically impregnable isolation. Such policies would really give 100-percent cooperation to the Soviet Communist effort to encircle and isolate us as a preliminary to a final assault once Asia, Europe, Africa, and probably South America were consolidated against us, which effort would be desperate.

The gentleman who made those remarks a few days ago is John Foster Dulles.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 4 minutes to close the debate.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at that point in the RECORD where the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] was considered, my remarks to follow immediately after those of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, before we take final action on this bill I want to call the attention of the Members to the issues involved and say that I expect to demand two roll call votes in addition to a roll call on passage of the bill.

The first roll call will be on the Vorys amendment which would strike $615,300,000 from defense support in title I, and the second roll call will be on the Vorys amendment to title III which reduces the amount of $408,000,000 down to $296,800,000, a net cut of $111,200,000.

Mr. Chairman, we have crossed the plains, we have gone up the incline and are nearing the top of the hill. Like the climbers of Mt. Everest who seek to reach the peak, we must realize that while the last stages of the climb are difficult, there is no place for men to stand like reeds bending in every wind that blows. We must realize that to turn back after reaching the final stages can only mean the loss of the progress we have already attained.

The real issue before us is to decide what course is best for our country. I give full faith and credit to the honesty of purpose, the sincerity and patriotism of every man and woman in this House, and I have the fullest respect for the views of those with whom I have differed in voting on amendments offered to this bill today. This mutual security bill is so vital a measure that on our judgment today depends an issue that will affect not only our children, but our children's children and their grandchildren. We are all concerned and justly so, about the costs of the Mutual Security Program in terms of the strains they make on the economy and the stability of the United States, but, in weighing all the facts which confront us, I sincerely believe that when most of us search deep down in our hearts we will realize beyond doubt that this is a premium we must pay to insure the future of our children and our country.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to question the practical wisdom of this proposal to so dractically reduce the moderate appropriation provision in this bill to sensibly assist the development of

Israel and help solve the Arab refugee problem. I earnestly hope no tragic mistake will be made here today by any hasty action that could well result in diminishing the growing spirit of the courageous people of Israel and destroy any cooperative desire of the Arab States to work toward the establishment of permanent peace in the Middle East trouble zone.

The new state of Israel was founded upon the same fundamental principles of liberty and justice that originated our own national beginning. The leaders and people of Israel have demonstrated consistently courageous determination to erect a cornerstone of democratic example and strength, modeled on the great traditions of the United States, in a part of the world that is dynamic in potentiality to incite world conflict. Israel and the Arab neighbors need full assurance from us that we are most willing to reasonably aid them toward peaceful settlement of the gravely complex difficulties surrounding the birth and growth of any new cradle of freedom. Let us not forget we ourselves once knew the trying days when the withholding of the hand of genuine friendship and help might well have meant our death at birth. The amount of financial aid in this bill is reasonable; its vital need for the particular purpose has been proven. It is designed to give American confidence and encouragement to Israelis and Arabs to steadfastly work with us, and against the Communist enemy, to preserve and promote peace in a harassed world. I urge you, my colleagues, to carefully reflect and reject this untimely amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7005) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 640, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Vorys amendment to title I and on the Vorys amendment to title III, involving amounts.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: On page 14, line 1, after "and of", strike out "the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501–1522)" and insert in lieu thereof "section 503 of this act."

On page 15, line 4, amend subsection (c) to read as follows:

"(c) Amend section 101 (a) (2) to read as follows: 'There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed $1,022,000,000 to provide assistance to any country covered by paragraph (1) of this subsection in accordance with the provisions of section 503 of this act; and in addition balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to this paragraph unobligated as of June 30, 1952, or subsequently released from obligation, are authorized to be continued available for obligation for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the appropriation hereby authorized'."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 221, nays 137, not voting, 73, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

YEAS—221

Abernethy	Eaton	McMillan
Adair	Ellsworth	McVey
Allen, Calif.	Elston	Mack, Wash.
Allen, La.	Evins	Mahon
Andersen, H. Carl	Fallon	Martin, Iowa
Anderson, Calif.	Fenton	Martin, Mass.
Andresen, August H.	Fisher	Mason
Andrews	Ford	Meader
Angell	Fulton	Merrow
Arends	Gamble	Miller, Md.
Auchincloss	Gathings	Miller, Nebr.
Ayres	Gavin	Miller, N. Y.
Baker	George	Mills
Barden	Golden	Morano
Baring	Goodwin	Mumma
Bates, Mass.	Gore	Murray
Beall	Graham	Nicholson
Beamer	Grant	Norblad
Belcher	Gross	Norrell
Bender	Gwinn	O'Brien, Mich.
Bennett, Fla.	Hagen	O'Konski
Bennett, Mich.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Osmers
Bentsen	Halleck	Passman
Berry	Hand	Patten
Betts	Harden	Philbin
Bishop	Harris	Phillips
Blackney	Harrison, Nebr.	Pickett
Boggs, Del.	Harrison, Va.	Poage
Bolton	Harrison, Wyo.	Potter
Bow	Harvey	Prouty
Bray	Hess	Radwan
Brehm	Hill	Rankin
Brooks	Hinshaw	Reece, Tenn.
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman, Ill.	Reed, Ill.
Brownson	Hoffman, Mich.	Reed, N. Y.
Budge	Holmes	Rees, Kans.
Burdick	Hope	Regan
Burleson	Horan	Riehlman
Busbey	Hull	Rogers, Colo.
Bush	Ikard	Rogers, Fla.
Butler	James	Rogers, Mass.
Byrnes	Jarman	Rogers, Tex.
Cannon	Jenison	Ross
Carrigg	Jenkins	Sadlak
Chenoweth	Jensen	Saylor
Chiperfield	Jonas	Schenck
Church	Jones, Mo.	Scrivner
Clevenger	Jones, Woodrow W.	Seely-Brown
Cole, Kans.	Kearns	Shafer
Cole, N. Y.	Keating	Sheehan
Colmer	Kersten, Wis.	Short
Corbett	Kilburn	Sikes
Cotton	Kilday	Simpson, Ill.
Crawford	King, Pa.	Simpson, Pa.
Crumpacker	Lantaff	Sittler
Curtis, Mo.	Larcade	Smith, Kans.
Curtis, Nebr.	Latham	Smith, Wis.
Davis, Ga.	LeCompte	Springer
Davis, Tenn.	Lovre	Stanley
Davis, Wis.	Lucas	Steed
Denny	McConnell	Stockman
Devereux	McCulloch	Sutton
Dolliver	McDonough	Taylor
Dondero	McGregor	Teague
Donohue	McIntire	Thomas
Doughton	Mack, Ill.	Thompson, Mich.
Durham	Madden	Tollefson
Eberharter	Magee	Vail
Elliott	Mansfield	Van Pelt
Feighan	Marshall	Van Zandt
Fernandez	Merrill	Velde
Fine	Mitchell	Vorys
Flood	Morgan	Vursell
Fogarty	Morrison	Watts
Forand	Morton	Weichel
Forrester	Multer	Wharton
Fugate	Murdock	Whitten
Furcolo	Murphy	Widnall
Garmatz	O'Brien, Ill.	Wigglesworth
Gary	O'Brien, N. Y.	Williams, Miss.
Gordon	O'Neill	Williams, N. Y.
Granahan	Patman	Willis
Granger	Perkins	Wilson, Ind.
Green	Polk	Wilson, Tex.
Greenwood	Powell	Winstead
Gregory	Preston	Withrow
Hale	Price	Wolcott
Hardy	Rabaut	Wolverton
Hart	Rains	Wood, Ga.
Hays, Ark.	Ramsey	
Hedrick	Rhodes	
Heffernan	Ribicoff	
Heller	Richards	
Heselton	Riley	
Howell	Rivers	
Jackson, Wash.	Roberts	
Javits	Rodino	
Jones, Ala.	Rooney	
Judd	Roosevelt	
Karsten, Mo.	Sasscer	
Kean	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	
Kee	Shelley	
Kelley, Pa.	Sieminski	
Kelly, N. Y.	Smith, Miss.	
Keogh	Smith, Va.	
Kirwan	Spence	
Klein	Staggers	
Lane	Thompson, Tex.	
Lanham	Thornberry	
Lesinski	Trimble	
Lind	Walter	
Lyle	Wier	
McCarthy	Yates	
McCormack	Yorty	
McGuire	Zablocki	
McMullen		
Machrowicz		
Madden		
Magee		
Mansfield		

NAYS—137

Addonizio	Forand	Marshall
Anfuso	Forrester	Mitchell
Aspinall	Fugate	Morgan
Bailey	Furcolo	Morrison
Bakewell	Garmatz	Morton
Barrett	Gary	Multer
Bates, Ky.	Gordon	Murdock
Battle	Granahan	Murphy
Blatnik	Granger	O'Brien, Ill.
Boggs, La.	Green	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bolling	Greenwood	O'Neill
Bosone	Gregory	Patman
Brown, Ga.	Hale	Perkins
Bryson	Hardy	Polk
Buchanan	Hart	Powell
Buckley	Hays, Ark.	Preston
Burnside	Hedrick	Price
Burton	Heffernan	Rabaut
Camp	Heller	Rains
Canfield	Heselton	Ramsey
Carnahan	Howell	Rhodes
Case	Jackson, Wash.	Ribicoff
Celler	Javits	Richards
Chelf	Jones, Ala.	Riley
Chudoff	Judd	Rivers
Clemente	Karsten, Mo.	Roberts
Combs	Kean	Rodino
Cooley	Kee	Rooney
Cooper	Kelley, Pa.	Roosevelt
Cox	Kelly, N. Y.	Sasscer
Crosser	Keogh	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Dawson	Kirwan	Shelley
DeGraffenried	Klein	Sieminski
Delaney	Lane	Smith, Miss.
Denton	Lanham	Smith, Va.
Dingell	Lesinski	Spence
Dollinger	Lind	Staggers
Donovan	Lyle	Thompson, Tex.
Durham	McCarthy	Thornberry
Eberharter	McCormack	Trimble
Elliott	McGuire	Walter
Feighan	McMullen	Wier
Fernandez	Machrowicz	Yates
Fine	Madden	Yorty
Flood	Magee	Zablocki
Fogarty	Mansfield	

NOT VOTING—73

Aandahl	Hébert	Ostertag
Abbitt	Herlong	O'Toole
Albert	Herter	Patterson
Allen, Ill.	Hillings	Poulson
Armstrong	Hoeven	Priest
Beckworth	Holifield	Reams
Bonner	Hunter	Redden
Boykin	Irving	Robeson
Bramblett	Jackson, Calif.	Sabath
Buffett	Johnson	St. George
Carlyle	Jones, Hamilton C.	Scott, Hardie
Chatham	Kearney	Scudder
Coudert	Kennedy	Secrest
Cunningham	Kerr	Sheppard
Dague	King, Calif.	Stigler
Deane	Kluczynski	Taber
Dempsey	McGrath	Tackett
D'Ewart	McKinnon	Talle
Dorn	Mack, Ill.	Vinson
Doyle	Miller, Calif.	Welch
Engle	Morris	Werdel
Hall, Leonard W.	Moulder	Wheeler
Havenner	Nelson	Wickersham
Hays, Ohio	O'Hara	Woodruff

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Allen of Illinois for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Dague for, with Mr. Moulder against.

Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. McGrath against.

Mr. Taber for, with Mr. King of California against.

Mr. Dorn for, with Mr. Deane against.

Mr. Secrest for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Werdel for, with Mr. Havenner against.

Mr. Ostertag for, with Mr. McKinnon against.

Mrs. St. George for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Mr. O'Hara for, with Mr. O'Toole against.

Mr. Hoeven for, with Mr. Sabath against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Welch against.

Mr. Bramblett for, with Mr. Doyle against.

Mr. Wood of Idaho for, with Mr. Irving against.

Mr. Nelson for, with Mr. Stigler against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Aandahl with Mr. Hays of Ohio.
Mr. Armstrong with Mr. Chatham.
Mr. Buffett with Mr. Dempsey.
Mr. Cunningham with Mr. Engle.
Mr. D'Ewart with Mr. Priest.
Mr. Herter with Mr. Mack of Illinois.
Mr. Hillings with Mr. Kennedy.
Mr. Hunter with Mr. Herlong.
Mr. Johnson with Mr. Robeson.
Mr. Poulson with Mr. Albert.
Mr. Hardie Scott with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. Scudder with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Talle with Mr. Tackett.
Mr. Woodruff with Mr. Wickersham.

Mr. JONES of Missouri changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: Page 18, line 7, strike out "$408,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$208,800,000" and on page 18, line 8, after "subsection" insert "in accordance with the provisions of section 503 of this act and not to exceed $88,000,000 to carry out the purposes and provisions of this subsection in accordance with the applicable provisions of the act for international development (Public Law 535, 81st Cong.)."

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 192, nays 165, not voting 74, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

YEAS—192

Abernethy	Chelf	Harrison, Va.
Adair	Chenoweth	Harrison, Wyo.
Allen, Calif.	Chiperfield	Harvey
Allen, La.	Church	Hess
Andersen, H. Carl	Clevenger	Hill
	Cole, Kans.	Hoffman, Ill.
Anderson, Calif.	Colmer	Hoffman, Mich.
Andresen, August H.	Corbett	Horan
	Cotton	Hull
Andrews	Cox	Ikard
Angell	Crawford	James
Arends	Crumpacker	Jenison
Ayres	Curtis, Mo.	Jenkins
Baker	Curtis, Nebr.	Jensen
Barden	Davis, Ga.	Jonas
Baring	Davis, Wis.	Jones, Ala.
Bates, Mass.	Denny	Jones, Woodrow W.
Beamer	Devereux	
Belcher	Dolliver	Kilburn
Bender	Dondero	Kilday
Bennett, Mich.	Doughton	Larcade
Berry	Ellsworth	Latham
Betts	Elston	LeCompte
Bishop	Fenton	Lovre
Blackney	Fisher	Lucas
Boggs, Del.	Forrester	Lyle
Bolton	Gathings	McConnell
Bow	Gavin	McCulloch
Brehm	George	McDonough
Brooks	Golden	McGregor
Brown, Ga.	Goodwin	McMillan
Brown, Ohio	Graham	McVey
Bryson	Grant	Mack, Wash.
Bunge	Gregory	Mahon
Burdick	Gross	Martin, Iowa
Burleson	Gwinn	Martin, Mass.
Busbey	Hagen	Mason
Bush	Halleck	Meader
Butler	Hand	Merrow
Byrnes	Harden	Miller, Md.
Camp	Harris	Miller, Nebr.
Carrigg	Harrison, Nebr.	Miller, N. Y.
Morton	Roberts	Thompson, Mich.
Mumma	Rogers, Colo.	Vail
Murray	Rogers, Fla.	Van Pelt
Nicholson	Rogers, Mass.	Van Zandt
Norblad	Rogers, Tex.	Velde
Norrell	Sadlak	Vorys
O'Konski	Schenck	Vursell
Passman	Scrivner	Watts
Patten	Shafer	Weichel
Perkins	Sheehan	Wharton
Philbin	Short	Whitten
Phillips	Simpson, Ill.	Williams, Miss.
Pickett	Simpson, Pa.	Williams, N. Y.
Poage	Smith, Kans.	Willis
Potter	Smith, Va.	Wilson, Ind.
Radwan	Smith, Wis.	Wilson, Tex.
Rankin	Springer	Winstead
Reece, Tenn.	Stanley	Withrow
Reed, Ill.	Steed	Wolcott
Reed, N. Y.	Stockman	Wolverton
Rees, Kans.	Sutton	Wood, Ga.
Regan	Taylor	
Riley	Teague	
Rivers	Thomas	

NAYS—165

Addonizio	Fugate	Marshall
Anfuso	Fulton	Mills
Aspinall	Furcolo	Mitchell
Auchincloss	Gamble	Morano
Bailey	Garmatz	Morgan
Bakewell	Gary	Morrison
Barrett	Gordon	Multer
Bates, Ky.	Gore	Murdock
Battle	Granahan	Murphy
Beall	Granger	O'Brien, Ill.
Bennett, Fla.	Green	O'Brien, Mich.
Bentsen	Greenwood	O'Brien, N. Y.
Blatnik	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Neill
Boggs, La.		Osmers
Bolling	Hardy	Patman
Boscne	Hart	Polk
Bray	Hays, Ark.	Powell
Brownson	Hedrick	Preston
Buchanan	Heffernan	Price
Buckley	Heller	Priest
Burnside	Heselton	Prouty
Burton	Hinshaw	Rabaut
Canfield	Holmes	Rains
Cannon	Hope	Ramsay
Carnahan	Howell	Rhodes
Case	Jackson, Wash.	Ribicoff
Celler	Jarman	Richards
Chudoff	Javits	Riehlman
Clemente	Jones, Mo.	Rodino
Cole, N. Y.	Judd	Rooney
Combs	Karsten, Mo.	Roosevelt
Cooley	Kean	Ross
Cooper	Kearns	Sasscer
Crosser	Keating	Saylor
Davis, Tenn.	Kee	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Dawson	Kelley, Pa.	Seely-Brown
DeGraffenried	Kelly, N. Y.	Shelley
Delaney	Keogh	Sieminski
Denton	Kersten, Wis.	Sikes
Dingell	King, Pa.	Sittler
Dollinger	Kirwan	Smith, Miss.
Donohue	Klein	Spence
Donovan	Lane	Staggers
Durham	Lanham	Thompson, Tex.
Eberharter	Lantaff	Thornberry
Elliott	Lesinski	Tollefson
Evins	Lind	Trimble
Fallon	McCarthy	Walter
Feighan	McCormack	Widnall
Fernandez	McGuire	Wier
Fine	McIntire	Wigglesworth
Flood	McMullen	Yates
Fogarty	Machrowicz	Yorty
Forand	Madden	Zablocki
Ford	Magee	
Frazier	Mansfield	

NOT VOTING—74

Aandahl	Eaton	Kennedy
Abbitt	Engle	Kerr
Albert	Hale	King, Calif.
Allen, Ill.	Hall, Leonard W.	Kluczynski
Armstrong		McGrath
Beckworth	Havenner	McKinnon
Bonner	Hays, Ohio	Mack, Ill.
Boykin	Hébert	Miller, Calif.
Bramblett	Herlong	Morris
Buffett	Herter	Moulder
Carlyle	Hillings	Nelson
Chatham	Hoeven	O'Hara
Coudert	Holifield	Ostertag
Cunningham	Hunter	O'Toole
Dague	Irving	Patterson
Deane	Jackson, Calif.	Poulson
Dempsey	Johnson	Reams
D'Ewart	Jones, Hamilton C.	Redden
Dorn		Robeson
Doyle	Kearney	Sabath
St. George	Taber	Wheeler
Scott, Hardie	Tackett	Wickersham
Scudder	Talle	Wood, Idaho
Secrest	Vinson	Woodruff
Sheppard	Welch	
Stigler	Werdel	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Taber for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Allen of Illinois for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Dorn for, with Mr. Deane against.

Mr. Secrest for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Engle for, with Mr. Herlong against.

Mr. Tackett for, with Mr. Moulder against.

Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. McGrath against.

Mr. Dague for, with Mr. King of California against.

Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Havenner against.

Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. McKinnon against.

Mr. Werdel for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Mr. Ostertag for, with Mr. O'Toole against.

Mrs. St. George for, with Mr. Sabath against.

Mr. O'Hara for, with Mr. Welch against.

Mr. Hoeven for, with Mr. Doyle against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Irving against.

Mr. Bramblett for, with Mr. Stigler against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Armstrong with Mr. Kennedy.
Mr. Herter with Mr. Hayes of Ohio.
Mr. Buffett with Mr. Dempsey.
Mr. Patterson with Mr. Mack of Illinois.
Mr. Talle with Mr. Wickersham.
Mr. Wood of Idaho with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Hillings with Mr. Morris.
Mr. Nelson with Mr. Kerr.
Mr. Woodruff with Mr. Robeson.
Mr. Cunningham with Mr. Redden.
Mr. D'Ewart with Mr. Wheeler.
Mr. Poulson with Mr. Chatham.
Mr. Eaton with Mr. Hamilton C. Jones.
Mr. Hardie Scott with Mr. Carlyle.
Mr. Hale with Mr. Boykin.
Mr. Scudder with Mr. Albert.
Mr. Hunter with Mr. Abbitt.
Mr. Kearney with Mr. Beckworth.
Mr. Johnson with Mr. Reams.

Mr. FALLON changed his vote from yea to nay.

Mr. BEALL changed his vote from nay to yea.

Mr. DONOHUE changed his vote from yea to nay.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee substitute as amended.

The committee substitute as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin moves to recommit the bill H. R. 7005 to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, on the vote on final passage I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 246, nays 109, present 1, not voting, 75, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

YEAS—246

Addonizio	Flood	Madden
Allen, Calif.	Fogarty	Magee
Anfuso	Forand	Mahon
Angell	Ford	Mansfield
Aspinall	Forrester	Marshall
Auchincloss	Frazier	Martin, Mass.
Ayres	Fugate	Meader
Bailey	Fulton	Merrow
Bakewell	Furcolo	Miller, Md.
Baring	Gamble	Miller, N. Y.
Barrett	Garmatz	Mills
Bates, Ky.	Gary	Mitchell
Bates, Mass.	Gathings	Morano
Battle	George	Morgan
Beall	Goodwin	Morrison
Bender	Gordon	Morton
Bennett, Fla.	Gore	Multer
Bentsen	Granahan	Murdock
Blatnik	Granger	Murphy
Boggs, Del.	Grant	Murray
Boggs, La.	Green	Norblad
Bolling	Greenwood	Norrell
Bolton	Gregory	O'Brien, Ill.
Bosone	Hall,	O'Brien, Mich.
Brown, Ga.	Edwin Arthur	O'Brien, N. Y.
Brownson	Halleck	O'Neill
Bryson	Hardy	Osmers
Buchanan	Harris	Patman
Buckley	Harrison, Va.	Perkins
Burleson	Hart	Philbin
Burnside	Hays, Ark.	Poage
Burton	Hedrick	Polk
Byrnes	Heffernan	Preston
Camp	Heller	Price
Canfield	Heselton	Priest
Cannon	Hinshaw	Prouty
Carnahan	Holmes	Rabaut
Carrigg	Hope	Radwan
Case	Howell	Rains
Celler	Ikard	Ramsay
Chelf	Jackson, Wash.	Rhodes
Chiperfield	James	Ribicoff
Chudoff	Jarman	Richards
Clemente	Javits	Riehlman
Cole, Kans.	Jones, Ala.	Riley
Cole, N. Y.	Jones, Mo.	Rivers
Combs	Jones,	Roberts
Cooley	Woodrow W.	Rodino
Cooper	Judd	Rogers, Colo.
Corbett	Karsten, Mo.	Rogers, Fla.
Cotton	Kean	Rogers, Mass.
Cox	Keating	Rooney
Crosser	Kee	Roosevelt
Crumpacker	Kelley, Pa.	Ross
Curtis, Mo.	Kelly, N. Y.	Sadlak
Davis, Ga.	Keogh	Sasscer
Davis, Tenn.	Kersten, Wis.	Saylor
Dawson	Kilburn	Scott,
DeGraffenried	Kilday	Hugh D., Jr.
Delaney	Kirwan	Seely-Brown
Denny	Klein	Shelley
Denton	Lane	Sieminski
Devereux	Lanham	Sikes
Dingell	Lantaff	Sittler
Dollinger	Latham	Smith, Miss.
Donohue	LeCompte	Smith, Va.
Donovan	Lesinski	Spence
Doughton	Lind	Springer
Durham	Lucas	Staggers
Eberharter	Lyle	Steed
Elliott	McCarthy	Taylor
Ellsworth	McConnell	Teague
Evins	McCormack	Thomas
Fallon	McDonough	Thompson, Tex.
Feighan	McGuire	Thornberry
Fenton	McMillan	Tollefson
Fernandez	McMullen	Trimble
Fine	Machrowicz	Van Zandt
Fisher	Mack, Wash.	Vorys
Walter	Wier	Wolverton
Watts	Wigglesworth	Yates
Weichel	Williams, N. Y.	Yorty
Widnall	Willis	Zablocki

NAYS—109

Abernethy	Elston	Pickett
Adair	Gavin	Potter
Allen, La.	Golden	Rankin
Andersen, H. Carl	Graham	Reece, Tenn.
	Gross	Reed, Ill.
Anderson, Calif.	Gwinn	Reed, N. Y.
Andresen, August H.	Hagen	Rees, Kans.
	Hand	Regan
Andrews	Harden	Rogers, Tex.
Arends	Harrison, Nebr.	Schenck
Baker	Harrison, Wyo.	Scrivner
Barden	Harvey	Shafer
Beamer	Hess	Sheehan
Belcher	Hill	Short
Bennett, Mich.	Hoffman, Ill.	Simpson, Ill.
Berry	Hoffman, Mich.	Simpson, Pa.
Betts	Horan	Smith, Kans.
Bishop	Hull	Smith, Wis.
Blackney	Jenison	Stanley
Bow	Jenkins	Stockman
Bray	Jensen	Sutton
Brehm	Jonas	Thompson, Mich.
Brooks	Kearns	
Brown, Ohio	King, Pa.	Vail
Budge	Larcade	Van Pelt
Burdick	Lovre	Velde
Busbey	McCulloch	Vursell
Bush	McGregor	Wharton
Butler	McIntire	Whitten
Chenoweth	McVey	Williams, Miss.
Church	Martin, Iowa	Wilson, Ind.
Clevenger	Mason	Wilson, Tex.
Colmer	Miller, Nebr.	Winstead
Crawford	Mumma	Withrow
Curtis, Nebr.	Nicholson	Wolcott
Davis, Wis.	Passman	Wood, Ga.
Dolliver	Patten	
Dondero	Phillips	

PRESENT—1

O'Konski

NOT VOTING—75

Aandahl	Hays, Ohio	Ostertag
Abbitt	Hébert	O'Toole
Albert	Herlong	Patterson
Allen, Ill.	Herter	Poulson
Armstrong	Hillings	Powell
Beckworth	Hoeven	Reams
Bonner	Holifield	Redden
Boykin	Hunter	Robeson
Brambiett	Irving	Sabath
Buffett	Jackson, Calif.	St. George
Carlyle	Johnson	Scott, Hardie
Chatham	Jones,	Scudder
Coudert	Hamilton C.	Secrest
Cunningham	Kearney	Sheppard
Dague	Kennedy	Stigler
Deane	Kerr	Taber
Dempsey	King, Calif.	Tackett
D'Ewart	Kluczynski	Talle
Dorn	McGrath	Vinson
Doyle	McKinnon	Welch
Eaton	Mack, Ill.	Werdel
Engle	Miller, Calif.	Wheeler
Hale	Morris	Wickersham
Hall, Leonard W.	Moulder	Wood, Idaho
	Nelson	Woodruff
Havenner	O'Hara	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Hoeven against.

Mr. Deane for, with Mr. Dorn against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Secrest against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Werdel against.

Mr. Hays of Ohio for, with Mr. Brambiett against.

Mr. Herter for, with Mr. Allen of Illinois against.

Mr. Dague for, with Mr. Buffet against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Poulson against.

Mr. Hillings for, with Mr. Nelson against.

Mr. Kennedy for, with Mr. O'Hara against.

Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Wood of Idaho against.

Mr. McKinnon for, with Mr. Taber against.

Mr. McGrath for, with Mrs. St. George against.

Mr. Doyle for, with Mr. Woodruff against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Powell against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Armstrong with Mr. Reams.
Mr. Hunter with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Aandahl with Mr. Wickersham.
Mr. Hale with Mr. Mack of Illinois.
Mr. Talle with Mr. Dempsey.
Mr. Scudder with Mr. Engle.
Mr. Eaton with Mr. Chatham.
Mr. Hardie Scott with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. D'Ewart with Mr. King of California.
Mr. Patterson with Mr. O'Toole.
Mr. Cunningham with Mr. Albert.
Mr. Ostertag with Mr. Havenner.
Mr. Johnson with Mr. Sheppard.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks in today's RECORD just before the vote on the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALTER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H. R. 7005, just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

PRICE OF NEWSPRINT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, a number of the Members of this body have expressed concern this past week over the proposed $10 a ton increase in the price of newsprint imported from Canada.

I wish to report to the Members that the Subcommittee on Newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been continuously in touch with the situation, has been in daily contact with the appropriate agencies involved. We will have a full review presented to our committee in a special-called meeting on next Monday.

Undoubtedly, the contemplated price increase will seriously affect the publishers in this country, and it is hoped some sort of remedial action will be forthcoming.

POLISH IMMIGRATION

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity given me at this time, by unanimous consent of the House to include testimony in the RECORD given this day on H. R. 7376 before Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

The testimony was submitted on behalf of the Polish Immigration Committee of New York City, 25 St. Marks Place, by Mr. Henry M. Zaleski, vice president of the committee. I here express thanks to Mr. Wladyslaw Zachariasiewicz, executive secretary of the Polish Immigration Committee, who with Mr. Zaleski, journeyed to Washington for this noble cause, and who drew my attention to the testimony below cited. I trust their cause will succeed:

STATEMENT OF VICE PRESIDENT HENRY M. ZALESKI ON BEHALF OF THE POLISH IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE OF NEW YORK CITY, 25 ST. MARKS PLACE, NEW YORK, N. Y., BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, RE H. R. 7376

It is indeed a privilege and an honor for me to have this opportunity to appear before your body, the Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives to testify in support of the bill introduced by Congressman Emanuel Celler, H. R. 7376. The Polish Immigration Committee of New York under the able and splendid leadership of the Right Rev. Msgr. F. Burant, together with a group of Polish-American leaders of various organizations and societies, secured assurances for approximately 24,000 displaced persons, ex-Polish soldiers from Great Britain, and refugees under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. From this number about 20,000 persons were resettled in the United States. We work in close cooperation with the War Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference. We are recognized by the Department of State and the Displaced Persons Commission. We appear here today on behalf of Polish Displaced Persons, escapees, refugees and ex-Polish soldiers in Great Britain.

It is not our intention to review here the glorious and almost continuous fight of Poland over the centuries for freedom, democracy, and independence. However, it is important to mention that once again Poland is indeed partitioned. At the present time Poland is ruled by a satellite Red Russian government and deprived of her freedom, which is so dear and vital to the democratic-loving Polish nation. The first nation to resist the onslaught of the might of the Hitler armies was Poland. This resistance continued even after the fall of Poland. Americans of Polish descent are indeed very proud of the heroic achievements of the exiled Polish army and the gallant and magnificent resistance of the Polish underground.

During World War II 2,000,000 Poles were deported to Germany and 1,500,000 to Russia. A few more million were tragic victims of Hitler's barbarism.

As a result of all this, the Poles now have the biggest number of refugees and displaced persons scattered all over the world. The vast number of these unfortunate Polish victims are still exiled and are not resettled. They well know that the United States has assumed world leadership in the fight for freedom and the democratic way of life. They, therefore, are always vigilant and watchful for a sign of our leadership in order that their hope may not die. The President's message to Congress urging the passage of adequate legislation for many thousands of war victims gives encouraging hope in that direction. The great humanitarian traditions of our country do not permit us to forsake these unfortunates.

This matter of immigration that we are concerned with today deals primarily with surplus population. The problem is indeed a serious and important one. There can be no question but that it has become a grave threat to the political and social stability of the entire world. As a member of the Counterintelligence Corps of the United States Army during the last war, I had a splendid opportunity over a period of approximately 30 months to observe the poverty and distress that gripped overpopulated Italy, especially after the termination of hostilities so that it became a breeding ground for communism.

However, we do believe that displaced persons and refugees should be given equal consideration since they have been forced into exile for such a long time and have no home or country. The Polish-American press and the Polish-American organizations in this country have recently stressed this point very emphatically in connection with their support of the bill now under consideration.

Under the existing immigration laws, the Polish quota is 6,529 out of the annual quota of 153,000 immigrants to the United States. Under the terms of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended, the Poles admitted under said act [like others] will be subtracted from future Polish quotas. Thus, the Polish quota is mortgaged 50 percent until 1999. This is completely unreal and tragic, since the refugees from Communist tyranny are thus barred from entering the United States. The provision of 3 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended, which intends to bring some relief to the problem, for the so-called out-of-zone refugees, fails entirely in its purpose because of the meager number of available visas.

In your consideration of the present bill, it is the sincere hope of our committee that you will provide for the inclusion in said bill of the following four items:

1. Fifteen thousand more displaced persons who are still living in Germany and were covered by the Displaced Persons Act, as amended, but who did not succeed in immigrating to the United States, because they did not obtain visas before January 1, 1952, or were unable to get assurance in time to meet the dead line of July 31, 1951. According to our information the Poles themselves number 52,000, of which about 8,000 qualified under the 1948 Displaced Persons Act, as amended, but failed to obtain assurances or visas in time.

2. Seven thousand ex-Polish soldiers from Great Britain, who were deprived of the privilege of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended, merely because they did not register before June 16, 1950, out of 18,000 visas allotted to this category under said act, only approximately 11,000 were profited from. In view of this, we believe that this proposition or suggestion will not be in any way a disregard of the intention of Congress, concerning the admittance to the United States of these 18,000 ex-Polish soldiers, who fought so bravely and gallantly in the last war, as expressed in the aforesaid act.

3. Section 4 (f) of H. R. 7376, limits the classification of refugees to those who reside in certain countries enumerated therein. We believe that this should be changed to include all European countries so as to embrace the residences of all eligible refugees. (For instance, there are many recent escapees from countries behind the iron curtain presently in Sweden.)

4. The definition of refugees as contained in H. R. 7376 should be changed to exclude the condition "who has not been firmly resettled." Our experience shows that it is almost impossible to determine who is firmly resettled except in those cases where the refugee-resident in the foreign country has applied for citizenship in that country. The use of the above phrase in actual practice makes it almost mandatory that the American consul use his own discretion in determining the question.

Our experience in the field of immigration and resettlement, especially with the Polish element, has been gratifying and pleasing. Indeed, the United States has benefited from the skills, abilities, and culture of the new immigrants. Many of them are now fighting in the United States Army in Korea and are giving an excellent account of themselves as American soldiers.

We, therefore, feel that the Poles, like others behind the iron curtain, merit your careful and serious consideration. Whatever you accomplish here will indeed reach the enslaved people there and I hope your verdict will demonstrate to them that they have not been entirely forgotten.

We respectfully submit for your serious consideration the amendments as above outlined and sincerely hope that you will act favorably upon our recommendations.

FEDERAL MINIMUM WAGE LEGISLATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter from Seymour E. Harris to the Boston Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the letter from Mr. Seymour Harris to the editor of the Boston Herald, which I shall include in my remarks, protests the Fulbright amendment, which, if enacted, would virtually kill Federal minimum-wage legislation. It would still further hurt us in New England, especially our textiles, shoes, jewelry, electrical supplies, and apparel.

Mr. Speaker, the South is indeed in the saddle. Even in the awarding of Government contracts the South is receiving contracts when they are not the low bidders.

The very unfortunate part of it is that businessmen are afraid to fight the awards for fear that they will be further penalized. It is a Russian way of doing things, and it is very unfair.

The article is as follows:

THE MAIL BAG

FULBRIGHT RIDER HITS NEW ENGLAND

To the EDITOR OF THE HERALD:

I am writing about the Fulbright amendment which, if enacted, would virtually kill Federal minimum-wage legislation. The effects of passage of this amendment on the New England economy would be serious indeed, and especially for textiles, shoes, jewelry, electrical supplies, and apparel.

It is important that New England mobilize to fight this amendment. I am glad that the Herald realizes the importance of the issue. But the Herald gives too much credit to the business spokesmen. I have it on excellent authority that it is the failure of business spokesmen to express their opposition as well as in some instances their positive endorsement, which in part account for the failure to reject the Fulbright amendment. Mr. William Sullivan, of the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers, is the only business spokesman of New England interests known to me who has fought

energetically to kill the Fulbright amendment, and he has done a fine job.

Our committee has alerted New England Congressmen, Governors as well as other Northern Congressmen, and others. We have issued two memoranda explaining the issues to our Congressmen. Senators LODGE and SALTONSTALL have now vigorously attacked the amendment. Governor Dever has also intervened. Undoubtely other Congressmen and Governors are interested. Senator BENTON had to fight the amendment (a rider to the Defense Production Act) in the Banking and Currency Committee almost singlehanded; and by one vote a Southern coalition and a few others thwarted the attempt to transfer the issue to the Labor Committee where it belonged, and where it would probably not have received sympathetic consideration.

It will require a concerted effort by all New England interests to save the minimum wage legislation. And they must act quickly. According to the best information available, the origin of this legislation has been an attempt of a large electrical company to get Senator FULBRIGHT to intervene in order that it might establish a plant in Arkansas to exploit cheap labor. Minimum-wage legislation is an obstacle to the exploitation of cheap labor. But the well-organized southern congressional bloc, spearheaded by Senator MAYBANK, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, is behind FULBRIGHT, for they see in minimum wages an attempt on the part of the North to keep from the South its rightful share of industry.

A weakening of minimum wages at this point would be especially costly to the New England textile industry where much excess capacity, a depression in the industry, and the weakening of trade unionism in the South, greatly increase the pressure to reduce wages, and therefore to increase cost differentials—now at record levels.

SEYMOR E. HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on the New England Textile Industry (Appointed by the Conference of New England Governors).

BOSTON.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ANNUAL REPORT OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 281)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Post Office and the Civil Service, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the annual report of the Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951.

Our national defense effort has necessitated a rapid, temporary expansion in Federal employment, particularly in the three military departments. Adapting the civil-service system to meet these emergency conditions has involved many difficult problems. Nevertheless, I directed that the temporary expansion of the civil service be accomplished, to the maximum extent possible, on the basis of open competitive examinations. I am pleased that the Civil Service Commission has performed a highly creditable job in this regard, although I am most desirous that the method of making appointments through the competitive merit system be strengthened and extended as rapidly as conditions permit.

In meeting the urgent personnel needs of the Federal service, the Civil Service Commission has drawn increasingly upon women, older workers, and the physically handicapped. I am glad to note, too, that veterans constituted approximately 50 percent of the placements made during the last fiscal year.

With respect to the legislative recommendations contained in the Commission's annual report, I should like to call attention to some of the measures which will be of especial value in strengthening the civil-service system.

1. The Senate has already approved S. 1135, Eighty-second Congress, the proposed Federal Personnel Recruitment Act, providing for modernization of examining and recruitment procedures. I am hopeful that the House of Representatives will give favorable consideration to this legislation.

2. I have repeatedly recommended to the Congress the elimination of the requirement for Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation of postmasters. This recommendation is carried forward in Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1952, which is now before the Congress. In addition, Reorganization Plans Nos. 3 and 4 of 1952 will bring customs officials and United States marshals into the competitive service. Approval of these three reorganization plans will do much to strengthen our civil-service merit system.

3. Operating experience under the Classification Act of 1949 has demonstrated a need for a larger number of positions in grades 16, 17 and 18 of the general schedule. Existing limitations on the number of positions for these grades have constituted a serious administrative problem. I again urge the Congress to take action to relieve this situation.

4. As a step toward improving the efficiency of the Federal service, the Congress should provide authority for Government agencies to assign selected personnel to educational institutions and other organizations for professional and technical training.

5. Unemployment compensation coverage should be extended to include Federal employees. This is particularly important in view of the provisions for reduction of annual leave benefits which have been enacted into law during the past year.

While these legislative recommendations are of considerable importance, there are many other areas in which the Congress and the executive branch must work together to improve the efficiency and character of the civil service. Through our mutual efforts, I am sure we will continue to solve the many complex problems involved in securing and retaining the best qualified personnel to conduct the public business.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 23, 1952.*

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS FOR VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 473)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I have today approved H. R. 4387, to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to certain veterans and their dependents, and H. R. 4394, to provide certain increases in the monthly rates of compensation and pension payable to veterans and their dependents, and for other purposes. These are companion bills designed to provide for veterans and members of their families a financial offset to rises in the cost of living. The bills are applicable to those who draw compensation for service-connected disability and to those who are on the pension rolls as a result of non-service-connected disabilities.

H. R. 4387 has been justified primarily on the ground that the income limitations now governing eligibility for non-service-connected pensions have not been raised since the 1930's when the present limits were established. I agree that the cost of living has risen markedly since these limits of $1,000 in the case of a veteran without dependents, and $2,500 in the case of a veteran with dependents were established, but it is only with great reluctance that I have signed this measure. I would not have done so if there were available any other practical means of lessening economic pressures upon those veterans and their dependents who have come to rely on pensions as their chief means of support.

Basically, I believe that H. R. 4387 and those provisions of H. R. 4394 which pertain to non-service-connected pensions are bad legislation from the point of view of our long-run objectives. Their enactment will give still another excuse to defer facing up to a difficult decision which we must make in the course of a relatively few years.

There was no social-security system when the veterans pension laws were

passed. When the social-security law was enacted in 1935, the world was at peace and the fact that we were establishing a basic economic security system alongside the existing benefit program for veterans seemed comparatively unimportant. Little attention was paid to the 639,000 cases receiving pensions and compensation from the Veterans' Administration in 1935, and since then no major steps have been taken to integrate and relate the two systems of benefits.

I have pointed out several times in the past my belief that our first obligation to our veterans is to care for those who have disabilities resulting directly from their service to their country. Financial assistance to veterans with non-service-connected disabilities, on the other hand, should be put as soon as possible on the same basis as financial assistance payable to the nonveterans of our population.

World War II left us with over 19,000,000 veterans. World events since then meant that hundreds of thousands more will be added each year. At the same time, we have expanded and perfected our social-security laws so that they now protect most of our people. The consequences are obvious. Thousands upon thousands of veterans and their families have entitlement to Government payments under both laws. This is confusing, wasteful, and, to many people, hard to understand.

Within the next few decades, the relaxation of eligibility standards for pensions under H. R. 4387 will cost over $200,000,000 a year. The increase in non-service-connected pension rates under H. R. 4394 will also cost about $200,000,000 a year ultimately. Neither of these estimates takes in account the large increase in the veterans' population which appears certain. These cost factors, as well as the inequities of present duplication in benefits, make it clear that this is a national problem to which the Congress should give thorough study.

I strongly urge the Congress to authorize at this session a complete study of our veterans benefit programs and their relationships with our social insurance and other general welfare programs. I assure the Congress that it will have the full support and assistance of the executive branch in making such a study.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 23, 1952.*

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

IMPROVEMENTS NECESSARY IN THE SOCIAL-SECURITY LAW

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, last Monday I supported H. R. 7800, the social-security bill up for a vote in the House of Representatives. I have felt for some time that many improvements are necessary in our social-security law and should be made at the earliest possible date. However, many of those improvements will require further study by the committee.

Mr. Speaker, all of the changes provided for in H. R. 7800 are within the scope of studies made by the appropriate committees during the Eighty-first Congress. This bill does not embrace any new subject matter not heretofore thoroughly studied by the Ways and Means Committee during the Eighty-first Congres. In fact, H. R. 7800 may well have included the disability provision passed by the House in 1949 and removed from the bill by the Senate in 1950.

I supported this legislation because it proposed to make some much-needed improvements in our social-security system, and improvements that are urgently and immediately needed. I am hopeful that this legislation will be brought back to the floor of the House for a vote at an early date.

Mr. Speaker, this social-security legislation that was defeated here last Monday gives a little lift, and it is really a little lift, to the people in this country who need it most—the aged, widows with children, the blind, the totally and permanently disabled, the men and women who have left the labor market to enter our Armed Forces. If we are to aid these people at this session of Congress, this legislation cannot be brought back to the floor too quickly.

No useful purpose can be served by reiterating what took place here last Monday evening, because the record speaks for itself. This legislation, as clearly spelled out in the bill, sought to accomplish numerous improvements in our present law:

First. It would add at least $5 per month to the 4,400,000 benefit checks now being paid under old-age and survivors insurance.

Second. It would increase the ceiling on earned income allowed those persons now receiving benefits from $50 to $70 per month.

Third. It would cover members of the Armed Forces enrolled since the conflict started in Korea in the same way that World War II veterans were protected.

Fourth. It would freeze the rights of workers during periods of total and permanent disability so that they would not lose benefit rights because of their disability.

Fifth. It would liberalize the 1950 provisions covering employees of State and local governments.

Sixth. It would make it easier for blind persons to improve their family's condition by earning outside income.

Someone may ask, Why should we increase the benefits under old-age and survivors insurance by around $5 or $6 per month at this time? Ask the 4,400,000 people who are receiving these benefits today in amounts—do not forget—averaging only $42 per month. Ask the 69,429 people in Kentucky who are trying to exist on those benefits, and remember that of this number 29,419 are aged workers, 9,218 are their aged wives, and 4,367 are their widows. Consider how the 4,367 young widows of covered workers in Kentucky and their surviving children—21,391 in number—will welcome this small but important increase in their ability to exist. It is common knowledge that the increase in the cost of living has worked a special hardship on these people. Are we going to fail to make this necessary adjustment? For my own part, I do not think the provisions of the bill are generous enough. But the fact that it will add at least $5 to every one of those benefit checks is one of the main reasons why I strongly support H. R. 7800.

And why should we increase the ceiling on the retirement test from $50 to $70 at a time like this? First of all, ask the man or woman who has lost his benefit check for a month because, during that period, he earned more than $50 in covered employment. The major objection to any retirement test is that it has the effect, too often, of penalizing people for finding part-time work, and discourages thrift. World War II gave older workers a chance to demonstrate just how much they can contribute to the national welfare through full- or part-time jobs. We know that men and women 55 and over formed one-fifth of the labor force in 1944, at a time when we greatly needed them. We know that most workers want to continue working after they retire, even though their earnings are small. We know that they need the chance to supplement their meager benefit checks with outside income in order to adjust themselves to the high cost of living. Let us not permit any law to reduce total income because of work.

Why, too, should the Congress provide that the rights of workers who have the misfortune of becoming totally and permanently disabled be protected? Ask the man who, through no fault of his own, has become completely and totally disabled—say at the age of 45. Or ask his wife and children. As the law now is written, he also surrenders all right to maintain his wage record under old-age and survivors insurance, with the result that his benefit—which is figured for the full years of working life to age 65—is always reduced. Too frequently it disappears altogether.

Representative KEAN in his statement before the House stated, and I quote from page 5473 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 19:

> Under the present law, suppose a worker aged 35 in 1951 becomes permanently and totally disabled after having worked 10 years in covered employment at a yearly average wage of $2,400. By the time he reaches retirement age—65—his total wages spread over a period of 30 years—20 of them without any earnings—will yield an average of $800 rather than $2,400 per year, and his primary old-age insurance benefit would drop from $65 to $33 a month.

Congressman KEAN further stated:

> This is manifestly unfair and this bill, among its other provisions, would provide that the equity the worker built up before becoming disabled should be protected by freezing his wage record. This proposal would make $2,400 his average income so that he will receive a $65 benefit when he reaches the retirement age, instead of $33 which he would receive under the present law. This provision corresponds to the "waiver of premium" provision used by 119 private life insurance companies, most of them for more than a third of a century.

I have always been interested in the inequity in our existing system. Traveling through the district I represent in eastern Kentucky, you will see hundreds of miners permanently and totally disabled, and in most instances their workman's compensation runs out when the need therefor is the greatest. My bill, H. R. 3021, offers even better protection for such unfortunate workers and their families than those contained in H. R. 7800. I urge the Congress not only to pass the provision contained in H. R. 7800, but to improve it by providing cash income for those families in the form of benefits in the manner which my bill proposes.

We cannot overlook the fact that insurance companies themselves provide a "waiver of premium clause" which amounts to the same kind of protection offered in this bill. It seems to me that the Congress should not any longer delay sound and equitable legislation for the benefit of the unhappy victims of the disaster of disability.

H. R. 7800 makes possible that employees of State and local governments now excluded from coverage under old-age and survivors insurance because they have their own retirement plan, should have that right of coverage if they want it. The bill provides, with certain exceptions, these State and local employees can be covered by old-age and survivors insurance if they demonstrate by a two-thirds vote that they wish such coverage and if their employer agrees.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment that we passed during the eighty-first session of Congress provided that all veterans who served in the armed forces in World War II should get wage credits of $160 per month so that they would not be discriminated against in comparison with those who stayed home and worked in covered employment. H. R. 7800 proposed to give the same benefits to the Korean war veterans. There cannot be any logical reason why those who have served in the present emergency should not receive similar treatment.

This bill provides for similar wage credits that were extended to World War II veterans. Certainly, all personnel who are now serving their country are entitled to such credits while they are away from their peacetime jobs.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the reasons why I am so firmly convinced that the improvements which this bill would make in our social-security system are vitally necessary and should be made before the Eighty-second Congress adjourns. In fact, there are many other improvements not embodied in H. R. 7800 that should be made before the closing of this session. If this legislation, or similar legislation, is brought back to the floor at an early date for a vote in order that we may aid the men, women, and children who need it most, we will be rendering much service to our great country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FINE and to include a report.

Mr. LANE in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

Mr. CANFIELD and to include an address by Secretary of the Army Pace.

Mr. ROOSEVELT immediately following the remarks of Mr. JAVITS.

Mr. HOWELL in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee.

Mr. EBERHARTER, to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BENTSEN.

Mr. GRANT (at the request of Mr. PRIEST).

Mr. BURTON and to include a letter he received from a constituent.

Mr. SCHENCK and to include a report from FHA.

Mr. JAVITS to revise and extend remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. TOLLEFSON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include an editorial.

Mr. SHAFER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include a newspaper excerpt, notwithstanding the fact that it is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $273.

Mr. MILLER of New York (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) in three instances and to include excerpts from newspapers.

Mr. DONOHUE (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) to extend his remarks in Committee of the Whole before the vote on the amendment offered by Mr. CHATHAM.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a splendid address recently made by our distinguished colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a fine address recently made by William H. Taylor, of Boston, before the student body of South Boston High School, notwithstanding that it is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $210.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until June 15, 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, May 26, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1462. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Arkansas Motor Freight Lines, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1463. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Walter H. Schumacher, doing business as Schumacher Motor Express, against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1464. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Samuel Shapiro, surviving partner of Louis M. Shapiro and Samuel Shapiro, a partnership, doing business as Hennepin Transportation Co., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1465. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Harry E. Reynolds, as surviving partner of Harry E. Reynolds, and Norman Nold, a partnership, doing business as Tri-State Transportation Co., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1466. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Witte Transportation Co., a corporation, against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1467. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Glendenning Motorways, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1468. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Roiland H. Kinney, doing business as Mohawk Freight Lines, against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1469. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Des Moines Transportation Co., Inc., against the

United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1470. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Hi-Speed Motor Express, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1471. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carriers Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Takin Bros. Freight Lines, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1472. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of George Hart, doing business as Hart Motor Express, against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1473. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of C. E. Mickelson, receiver for Arthur F. Janke, doing business as Janke Transfer Co. against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1474. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Anna C. Koepp, administratrix of the estate of Ernest Robert Koepp, deceased, doing business as Koepp Trucking Service, against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1475. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Holdcroft Transportation Co. against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1476. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Briggs Transfer Co. against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1477. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Gillette Motor Transport, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1478. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Ace Lines, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1479. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Werner Transportation Co., a corporation, against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1480. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Arthur A. McCue, doing business as Minnesota-Wisconsin Truck Line and McCue Transfer Co., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1481. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Midwest Motor Express, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1482. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Charles W. Darling, doing business as Darling Transfer against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1483. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of McCoy Truck Lines, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1484. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claims of Century-Matthews Motor Freight, Inc., as successor in interest to Steve Bonello doing business as Century Motor Freight and Matthews Freight Service, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary

1485. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Rohweder Truck Lines, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1486. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Alvin Brown, doing business as Brown Transfer Co., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1487. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of H. G. Nilles and others, owners of the claim of Midnite Express, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1488. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Lee Way Motor Freight, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1489. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Raymond Bros. Motor Transportation, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1490. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Dakota Transfer & Storage Co., Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1491. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Wilson Storage & Transfer Co., Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1492. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Lena Henneman, executrix of the estate of A. G. Henneman, deceased, successor in interest to A. G. Henneman, doing business as Henneman Transfer Co., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1493. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Watson Bros. Transportation Co., Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1494. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Ralph M. Wallace and Isabel Wallace, a partnership doing business as Northwest Freight Lines, against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1495. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Earl F. Buckingham, Glen D. Buckingham, Harold B. Buckingham, and Oliver L. Buckingham, doing business as Buckingham Transportation Co., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 Stat. U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1496. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Merchants Motor Freight, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1497. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Perry A. Brooks, doing business as Brooks Truck Co., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1498. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Highway Motor Freight, Inc., Omaha, Nebr., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended: to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1499. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of

Bruce Motor Freight, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1500. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Consolidated Freightways, Inc., against the United States pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1501. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Hawkeye Motor Express, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1502. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of the Chief Freight Lines Co. against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1503. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Harry Hess, doing business as Hess Motor Express, against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1504. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Howard Moland, Clarence Moland, Lothard Moland, and H. T. Moland, partnership, doing business as Moland Bros. Trucking Co., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1505. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Denver Chicago Trucking Co., Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1506. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of On-Time Transfer Co., a corporation, against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1507. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Murphy Motor Freight Lines, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1508. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of B. F. Iles, R. A. Brown, H. E. McKinney, doing business as Meadows Transfer Co., successors to Meadows Transfer, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1509. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Commercial Freight Lines, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1510. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of G. & P. Transportation Co., Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1511. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Matthew Leo McKeone, doing business as Red Ball Transfer Co., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1512. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Bos Freight Lines, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1513. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Riss & Co., Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1514. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Floyd Green, Lena Green, and Herbert Jacobs, trustees for liquidation purposes of Ash Truck Lines, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1515. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Union Transfer Co., a corporation, doing business as Union Freightways, against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1516. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Brashear Freight Lines, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1517. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Eugene Pikovsky, special administrator of the estate of Hyman Pikovsky, deceased, against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1518. A letter from the Chairman, United State Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Brady Transfer & Storage Co., Inc., a corporation, Fort Dodge, Iowa, against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1519. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Urban J. Haas and Cyril H. Wissel, doing business as H. & W. Motor Express Co., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1520. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Walter Petersen, doing business as Nielsen and Petersen, against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1521. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Frank H. Prucka, doing business as Frank H. Prucka Transportation Co., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1522. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Bos Truck Lines, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1523. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Tri-State Motor Transport, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1524. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled, "A bill relating to burley tobacco farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1525. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of the Federal Maritime Board and the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951, pursuant to section 207 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U. S. C. 1117) (H. Doc. No. 472); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed.

1526. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a letter stating that proceedings have been concluded with respect to the claim of *Menominee Tribe of Indians, petitioner,* v. *United States of America, defendant* (Docket No. 129), pursuant to section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 959; 25 U. S. C. 70); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1527. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, prepared by the Commissioner of Narcotics, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1951, pursuant to section 1 of the act of June 14, 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1528. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a joint resolution entitled "A joint resolution authorizing the District of Columbia to enter into interstate civil defense compacts"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANTAFF: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 7877. A bill to amend section 1699 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the unloading of mail from vessels; without amendment (Rept. No. 1993). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Sixteenth Intermediate Report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, entitled "Federal Supply Management (Overseas Survey)"; (Rept. No. 1994). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 214. Concurrent resolution to commend Mr. and Mrs. Donald D. Dunn, from the State of Washington, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1992). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKEWELL:

H. R. 7968. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, section 3182, relating to extradition of fugitives from State or Territory to State, District, or Territory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 7969. A bill granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 7970. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to authorize lump-sum payments in lieu of annuities to certain widows of officers and employees to whom such act applies; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 7971. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7972. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 7973. A bill to provide additional pay for combat duty performed by members of the uniformed services in Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 7974. A bill to provide increased annuities to certain civilian officials and employees who performed service in the construction of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 7975. A bill to amend section 112 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the sale of cattle necessitated by drought conditions shall be deemed an involuntary conversion of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 7976. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to extend the application of the special-inducement pay provided thereby to doctors and dentists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 7977. A bill providing for a preliminary examination and survey to determine need for addition to channel in Pensacola Harbor, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 7978. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish space and facilities, if available, to full-time representatives of certain recognized State organizations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 7979. A bill to allow certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on and after June 27, 1950, and prior to a date to be determined by Presidential proclamation or congressional concurrent resolution, to purchase and pursue courses of the United States Armed Forces Institute after discharge or release from active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 7980. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to athletic games and certain other events, where the proceeds inure exclusively to the benefit of a community chest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. J. Res. 462. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. J. Res. 463. Joint resolution providing that the United States shall give no further financial support to the United Nations until the other member nations are contributing at least one-half of the men and matériel required to prosecute the Korean hostilities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. CANFIELD: Joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey memorializing Congress to return to the State of New Jersey and other States sufficient moneys from taxes raised in the various States for the administration of employment security and to provide adequately for administration of the employment security program in the State of New Jersey and the other States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 7981. A bill for the relief of Don B. Whelan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 7982. A bill for the relief of Danica Maria Vavrova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7983. A bill for the relief of Edmund Stevens, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 7984. A bill for the relief of John Southas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 7985. A bill for the relief of Sister Louise Marie Josephine Belloir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7986. A bill for the relief of Sister Jeanne Maria Henneth Langlo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 7987. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Di Scala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 7988. A bill for the relief of Margarete Dillinger and Gudrund Dillinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 7989. A bill for the relief of Sato Hamako; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 26, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, May 12, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God who art the hope of all the ends of the earth: Amid the tragedy of a broken world, at noonday facing the tasks of a new week, in deep humility of spirit we would ascend the altar stairs of this hallowed shrine of our faith in spiritual verities. Before we talk of the Nation's good we would lift our needy hearts to the Nation's God, for in Thee we trust.

Grant unto us that greatness of vision which shall match the vast patterns of this creative day. Save us from setting narrow limits upon our responsibility to our fellow men. May no pettiness in our patriotism rob us of the ruling passion to sacrifice all for the common good. May we never hesitate when the choice is between honor and self-interest. Bring us, we pray Thee, to an enduring peace, when justice shall roll down like the waters and righteousness as a mighty stream. We ask it in that Name above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 26, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, informed the Senate that in accordance with the request contained in Senate Resolution 316, Eighty-second Congress, the Clerk of the House had directed the file clerk of the House to grant permission to the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, or its counsel, to examine the records of the Joint Committee on Housing of the Eightieth Congress.

The message announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7005) to

amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 7005) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MURRAY was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the next 3 weeks, to enable him to attend as a delegate of the United States the meetings of the International Labor Organization Conference in Switzerland.

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KEFAUVER and Mr. MAGNUSON were excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate this week.

On request of Mr. WELKER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. THYE was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. GILLETTE, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. LONG, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services conducting hearings on the reserve bill was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND DEFENSE (S. DOC. NO. 132)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Defense for the fiscal year 1952, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate, or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring the enactment of legislation necessary to relax credit restraints under Regulation X, in order to stimulate the buying of homes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Eighth International Convention of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, at Milwaukee, Wis., relating to the granting of preference in competitive examinations to veterans of the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution 11

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to return to the State of New Jersey and other States sufficient moneys from taxes raised in the various States for the administration of employment security and to provide adequately for administration of the employment security program in the State of New Jersey and the other States

"Whereas the Federal Government under the provisions of the Unemployment Tax Act has collected by taxation in the State of New Jersey from 1938 to 1952 approximately $54,000,000 in excess of amounts actually appropriated and expended for the administration of the unemployment compensation law in this State; and

"Whereas the funds appropriated by the Congress of the United States from taxes raised in New Jersey under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act have been insufficient for adequate administration of the Unemployment Compensation Law of New Jersey and the employment security program, resulting in the handicapping of the State of New Jersey in the administration of its unemployment insurance and State employment service programs: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

"1. That the Congress of the United States be requested to enact legislation such as H. R. 4133, 'Employment Security Administrative Financing Act of 1951,' by which moneys sufficient for the adequate administration of the employment security program will be returned to the State of New Jersey and to other States from the sums raised by the Federal Government by taxation of employers of New Jersey and other States under the provisions of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act.

"2. That the Congress of the United States be requested to enact basic amendments assuring all State employment security agencies of adequate annual amounts for proper administration of their laws, the sums to be payable from the taxes raised by the Federal Government under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act.

"3. That the Congress of the United States be requested to earmark Federal Unemployment Tax Act collections for employment security purposes, instead of permitting the Federal Government to retain a substantial portion of such taxes while larger industrial States, such as New Jersey, experience annually reductions by the Federal administrative agencies of the amount of funds deemed necessary for the proper administration of the State employment security programs.

"4. *Be it further resolved*, That the Secretary of State is directed forthwith to forward copies of this resolution to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Chairmen of the Senate and House of Representatives Committees on Appropriations, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance and to the Members of the Congress from the State of New Jersey.

"5. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately."

IMMIGRATION—TELEGRAM, LETTER, AND MEMORANDUM

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a telegram which I received from Francis J. Wazeter, president of the downstate New York division of the Polish American Congress, on the subject of immigration.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 9, 1952.*

Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The downstate New York division of the Polish American Congress representing over 500,000 Americans of Polish descent and the General Pulaski Memorial Committee authorized me as their president to appeal to you strongly urging your support of the bipartisan Lehman-Humphrey immigration bill, S. 2842, which is based on truly American and democratic principles. At the same time we are emphatically opposed to the pending McCarran immigration and naturalization bill calling for ruthless measures of deportation restrictions and discrimination against thousands of victims of both Nazi and Communist oppression whose displacement and plight are the results of the ill-fated Tehran and Yalta agreements which rendered their native countries uninhabitable to them. These unfortunate people when admitted to the United States following their tragic experiences with totalitarian regimes will be gratified and loyal to America and will be a bulwark here against communism. Abandoning these people to the mercy of enemy oppressors will be an indelible blot on the chart of American history.

FRANCIS J. WAZETER,
President.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter and a memorandum I have received from the New York State Industrial Union Council of the CIO on the subject of immigration legislation which was recently pending before the Senate and is still pending in conference.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK STATE CIO COUNCIL,
New York, N. Y., May 15, 1952.

Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: Enclosed is a copy of a letter sent several weeks ago to all Congressmen on pending revision of our immigration laws. A similar letter has also been sent to Senator IVES.

On behalf of the New York State CIO we wish to express our profound appreciation of the fight you are making to obtain realistic and constructive action on this issue.

We wish you every success,

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS HOLLANDER,
President.

HAROLD J. GARNO,
Secretary Treasurer.

NEW YORK STATE CIO COUNCIL,
New York, N. Y., April 15, 1952.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: There is an urgent necessity for thorough overhauling of the immigration and naturalization laws. However we find that the McCarran-Walter omnibus immigration bill (H. R. 5678) is utterly

inadequate as a reform measure. It fails to correct many of the deficiencies in existing law; on the contrary, it adds new evils and new injustices to the old ones.

We find the following provisions of the bill particularly objectionable:

1. The perpetuation of racial discrimination in respect to Asiatic peoples and West Indians;

2. Bars against skilled and unskilled workers, limiting future immigration to those of advanced education or exceptional talents;

3. Authorization of the Executive to set up new restrictions and even absolute bars against immigrants without legislation or judicial review;

4. Indiscriminate broadening of the grounds for deportation, to include some which are trivial (like traffic offenses) and others which are framed in vague generalities that preclude any possibility of judicial review;

5. Abolishing existing statutes of limitations in deportation cases;

6. Allowing courts of foreign nations to exclude immigrants from admission to United States (this provision would even bar Cardinal Mindszenty); and

7. Subjecting about 10,000,000 foreign-born immigrants to a special police regime operating without regard to due process as hitherto defined.

Such provisions of the bill warrant the impression that the McCarran-Walter omnibus immigration bill is an anti-immigration and anti-alien measure totally out of consonance with the traditions of American democracy. It is a bill that can serve only to alienate and antagonize the freedom-loving peoples of the world whose support and confidence we must have if we are to make real headway in our battle against Communist imperialism.

We strongly urge, therefore, that the bill be referred back to the Committee on the Judiciary. At the same time we urge that careful consideration be given to the Humphrey-Lehman omnibus immigration and naturalization bill (S. 2842).

The Humphrey-Lehman bill would revise the quota system in accordance with present-day considerations, establish regulations which would reflect American principles of justice, eliminate the racial discrimination features of the present law, and provide all necessary safeguards for the national security and well-being.

We are firmly of the opinion that the Humphrey-Lehman bill embodies the principles of American freedom and American democracy. We urge that you give it your support as the substitute for the McCarran-Walter proposal.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS HOLLANDER,
President.
HAROLD J. GARNO,
Secretary-Treasurer.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 2437. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1596).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2229. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire, construct, operate, and maintain public airports in certain areas, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1598).

DEFENSE PRODUCTION POOLS—REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS (REPT. NO. 1597)

Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Select Committee on Small Business, submitted a report relating to defense production pools, which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 3226. A bill to amend section 302 of the Public Buildings Act of 1949 so as to increase the authorization for appropriations for carrying out the program for the renovation and improvement of federally owned buildings outside the District of Columbia from $30,000,000 to $60,000,000; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 3227. A bill for the relief of Nannina Galui Sardelli; and

S. 3228. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts over all civil actions against the United States for recovery of taxes erroneously or illegally assessed or collected under the internal-revenue laws and to permit jury trials in such actions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOODY:

S. 3229. A bill to grant an additional income-tax exemption for children under 15 years of age of unremarried widows and widowers and other single taxpayers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S. 3230. A bill to authorize adjustment of rentals paid for premises leased for use by the Army, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard, or Marine Corps, since December of 1941; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3231. A bill to authorize the restoration of Daniel E. Whelan, Jr., lieutenant commander, retired, to the active list of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NIXON:

S. 3232. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Violet M. Withey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 3233. A bill to authorize certain retired commissioned officers in time of war to accept temporary commissions in a uniformed service other than that from which they were retired; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JENNER (for Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 3234. A bill for the relief of Vaios Constantinos Lampos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the taking of private property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCARRAN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATIVE TO TAKING PRIVATE PROPERTY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relative to the taking of private property. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from Nevada may proceed.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 158) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the taking of private property, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have just proposed an amendment to the Constitution, to read as follows:

> The executive power of the United States shall not be construed to extend at any time to any taking of private property other than in a manner prescribed by law.

I am hopeful that the Judiciary Committee may report the proposed amendment favorably to the Senate in the near future. I shall strive for consideration of the amendment at the earliest possible date.

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to eliminate not only all doubt, if doubt there be, but also all argument over the question of whether the President has any right, inherent or otherwise, to seize an industry, or any other private property, when he has not been authorized to do so by a law passed by the Congress. Under the terms of the amendment, no question of "inherent" powers could arise, or even be argued. The proposed amendment is short, simple, and unequivocal.

The amendment would be a limitation upon the executive power of the United States. There is precedent for such a limitation, in the eleventh amendment, which places a specific limitation upon the judicial power of the United States.

The proposed amendment does not refer to the President by name; but the President exercises no power other than executive power. All the power of the United States is separated into three groups or classes—legislative, executive, and judicial; and the President has neither legislative nor judicial powers. While the military power of the President as Commander in Chief often is referred to as a separate power, it is clear this is but one facet of the executive power.

Adoption of the proposed amendment would eliminate all question of what seizure powers if any may be created as the result of an emergency—and the concomitant question of who is to find or declare the emergency. The proposed amendment will be applicable, by its terms, "at any time." This does not mean that under this amendment the Congress could not make provision for dealing with an emergency, even though such provision might include the grant of special powers to the President; but in the absence of legislation, the question of existence or nonexistence of an emergency would have no effect upon the President's power to take private property, if this amendment becomes a part of the Constitution.

The proposed amendment is not limited in terms to seizures of any particular type or kind of property, whether segregated by ownership, or by type, or

by value, or in any other way; nor to seizures under any particular facts or conditions, actual or hypothetical. The language of the proposed amendment would affect equally all takings of private property; and would have the effect of prohibiting any taking of private property except under authority granted by the Congress, and in a manner provided for by the Congress.

"Prescribed by law," as that term is used in the proposed amendment, means prescribed in an act of Congress. This amendment is intended to become a part of the Constitution. Therefore, if it is adopted, there can be no contention that the Constitution itself is "law" and may be deemed to authorize a taking of private property. The "law" referred to, therefore, will have to be looked for outside the Constitution. But the search for such "law" must not extend outside the laws of the United States, for no other laws could affect the executive power of the United States.

Precedent for the phrase "prescribed by law" will be found in the third amendment, which uses the phrase in connection with a prohibition upon the quartering of troops in private dwellings.

Although the proposed amendment uses the clause "in a manner prescribed by law," it is more than merely procedural, for the quoted clause follows the words "other than," and the amendment as a whole, therefore, requires that if there is to be a taking of private property under the executive power of the United States, it shall be both a taking authorized by act of Congress and a taking which is carried out in accordance with such act.

Under this language, statutes already enacted dealing with the power of the Government to take private property and prescribing procedures therefor would remain in effect.

The President has declared that neither the courts nor the Congress can take away from him what he claims as an implied constitutional power to seize private property in time of national emergency. Not to be overlooked in this connection is the assertion previously made that the President could even seize the press under his alleged "inherent" powers. If the amendment which I have proposed is ratified as a part of the Constitution, there would be no question whatsoever nor room for argument about the fact that the President had no such power.

The President has said that the President has seizure powers and that they cannot be taken from him. If the President does have any seizure powers, they would be taken from him by the adoption of this proposed amendment as a part of the Constitution, except where the Congress decreed that some such power might exist and be exercised in specified circumstances.

It is reported the President has stated that he has not read Judge Pine's decision declaring the steel seizure illegal, and that he does not intend to read it. This proposed amendment is short enough for him to read and he will not need a lawyer to explain it to him.

Justification for this proposed amendment does not rest solely on the present steel industry seizure case by any means. Many other considerations also point to the need for such an amendment.

Such a provision in the Constitution would be a desirable safeguard at any time, for it can never be foretold whether some future President might not be or become despotically inclined, power mad, careless of individual liberties, contemptuous of the Constitution, excessively military-minded, or otherwise inclined to the usurpation of power.

The need for such an amendment as I have proposed is basic, and will remain so, whatever the Supreme Court may decide with regard to the present steel industry seizure case. If the Court should decide that the President had the seizure power in this case, an expression of the will of the people, through the Congress and the State legislatures, would be clearly necessary. On the other hand, if the Supreme Court holds that the President's action in seizing the steel industry was not lawful, the steelworkers' unions may call another strike. They have threatened to do so. The President has indicated that in the event of such a decision he would return the steel mills to their rightful owners. In that case the President might well feel that he was confronted with another and a new emergency which, by his own definition, would require him to seize the steel mills again. In that event this country undoubtedly would be confronted with a most grave constitutional crisis.

It appears that the strike of the railroad brotherhoods has been settled, and that the railroads are to be returned to private control. It should be noted that when the Government seized the railroads, the seizure was under a specific act of Congress, and that the Government did not have and has not attempted to exercise any right to change wages or working conditions. It might well be that, if the President is permitted to continue to assert the right to seize an industry under inherent powers, and without specific statutory authorization, he might in the event of some future labor difficulty affecting the railroads, perhaps a few months from now, or at some later date, decide to seize the railroads again, this time under his claimed inherent powers; and then assert that, under such powers, the Government had the right to increase wages and change working conditions.

It should be noted that this proposed amendment does not in any way contravene the fifth amendment, and will have no effect in any way modifying the provision of the fifth amendment that no person shall be deprived of property without due process of law; nor the provision of that same amendment, that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation. But if these provisions of the fifth amendment are not—and the President of the United States and his attorneys have argued that they are not—enough to protect individual rights, then the need for another amendment which will protect those rights adequately is most urgent.

GABRIEL B. NAPISA

Mr. KERR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 320), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Gabriel B. Napisa, widower of Minnie E. Pool-Napisa, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950 AND HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MUNDT submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2594) to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952—AMENDMENTS

Mr. GILLETTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3086) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 3086) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951. I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief statement relative to the amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table. Without objection, the Senator from Nevada may proceed.

Mr. McCARRAN. The principal amendment here proposed is identical with an amendment contained in House bill 7005.

All this amendment is intended to do is to clarify Spain's position as a recipient nation under the terms of the Mutual Security Act. Under the terms of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, under title I, one of two qualifications had to be met: First, membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; or, second, determination by the President that assistance to a given country was justified on defense and security bases. Accordingly, non-NATO countries under title I could receive aid only on the basis of Presidential determination.

Negotiations are now under way for the establishment of a permanent MSA mission to Spain and it is anticipated that specific appropriations will be made to further the work of that mission. Therefore, since Spain is not a member of NATO but does anticipate the establishment of a regular mission, this qualifying amendment is desirable, for purposes of clarification.

Let those who are now managing this vital military facility and those who are employed there come in and tell their story. That is the public's business.

APPOINTMENT OF WOMEN AS PHYSICIANS AND SPECIALISTS IN ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2552) to authorize the appointment of qualified women as physicians and specialists in the medical services of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, which was, on page 2, after line 21 insert:

The second, third, and fourth sentences of section 201 of the act of August 5, 1947 (61 Stat. 777), are amended by inserting the words "or osteopathy" immediately after the word "medicine."

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. HUNT, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S STATEMENT ON THE SUBMERGED-LANDS BILL

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on Saturday evening May 17, the President of the United States addressed the national convention of Americans for Democratic Action. In the course of his address the President saw fit to discuss some of the issues involved in the so-called tidelands bill, which was recently passed by the House of Representatives by a vote of nearly 3 to 1 and by the Senate by a vote of 50 to 35.

The remarks of the President of the United States on that occasion were, to say the least, so intemperate and ill-considered that Senators who have supported the measure which was passed by the Senate by a large and substantial vote requested of the National Broadcasting Co., which had broadcast the remarks of the President throughout the Nation, the allowance of time to broadcast an answering statement.

On last Saturday night, May 24, pursuant to the courtesy extended by the National Broadcasting Co., for which the Senators who supported the tidelands bill are grateful, the Senator from Florida was privileged to make a statement, which was carried over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my statement, as broadcast at that time, be incorporated in my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HOLLAND'S NATION-WIDE RADIO BROADCAST (NBC) MAY 24, 1952, AT 10:30 P. M., E. D. T., IN ANSWER TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN ON TIDELANDS

Good evening; a week ago at this hour President Truman addressed the national convention of the Americans for Democratic Action. The President discussed the issues under the so-called Tidelands bill which recently passed the House of Representatives by a vote of nearly 3 to 1, and the Senate by a vote of 50 to 35. The President chose to picture the tidelands question as if it related solely to offshore oil. Among other things, he stated, "Talk about corruption, talk about stealing from the people, this would be robbery in broad daylight, and on a colossal scale. It makes the Teapot Dome look like small change." Apparently the President has small respect for the integrity of those who disagree with him, including three members of the United States Supreme Court, the great majority of governors, State attorneys general, and State legislators throughout the Nation, and a large majority of Members of Congress in both the House and the Senate, also including millions of other good citizens who refuse to yield their convictions even to the President of the United States. The President has made many intemperate and ill-considered statements, some of which he has later denied or recalled, but this last statement, just quoted, is perhaps his most flagrant utterance. I am sure that most Americans, regardless of their opinion on the tidelands matter, regret the lack of dignity on the part of the President and the fact that he prefers to use abuse and invective instead of argument. Those of us who strongly believe that the ownership and control of the submerged lands, extending from the shore to the constitutional limits of each coastal State, should be returned to the States, are grateful to the National Broadcasting Co. for allowing us these few minutes to state the facts.

The first basic fact is that since the founding of our Nation the States had the use and control of their submerged lands out to the State boundaries, which are generally 3 miles from shore, and no question was ever raised as to state ownership until about 1937, or for 150 years. Since each of the Original States was a sovereign nation, and no power over its coastal waters or submerged lands was given to the Federal Government by the Constitution except the control of navigation, commerce, and defense, and since the younger States have the same powers as the Original Thirteen, the States fully used their submerged lands and the Federal Government recognized State title in many ways such as by repeated rulings of the Department of Interior and the Department of Justice, by acquiring offshore lands from the States for various Federal uses, and even by many decisions of the Federal courts, as admitted by the statement of Justice Black of the Supreme Court in the California case, which I quote:

"This court has * * * many times * * * used language strong enough to indicate that the court then believed that States not only owned tidelands and soil under navigable inland waters, but also owned soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not."

The second basic fact is that after the discovery of oil in the submerged lands and after the oil was being produced by holders of State leases, some of the Federal officials changed their ruling and brought suit against California and later against Texas and Louisiana. In 1947 the Supreme Court ruled by a divided decision that California did not own its submerged lands and that the Federal Government had what the court called paramount rights therein, though it declined to say that the Federal Government owned these submerged lands. The Texas and Louisiana rulings followed the same course. The closest division of the Supreme Court was in the Texas case when the court split four to three. Obviously no stability can grow out of such a divided court ruling which is subject to change at any time as the membership of the court changes.

The third basic fact is that in 1946, before the court ruled in the California case, Congress, wishing to settle forever the tidelands question, passed the so-called quitclaim bill safeguarding to the States their traditional control in their coastal belts, but the bill was vetoed by President Truman. This same bill, now called the Holland bill, has again passed Congress, by a substantially larger vote than in 1946. Our bill would restore to the States the rights which they formerly had and enjoyed in their submerged lands out to the State boundaries. Congress has the complete right, in determining and carrying out sound public policy, to quitclaim to the States this shoestring of land and water. Congress followed the same course as a matter of sound public policy under the Swamp and Owerflowed Lands Act in 1850 when it conveyed the immense areas of valuable Federal swamp lands to the 15 States in which these public lands lay. Congress believed that this course would result in quicker development and sounder administration of these swamp areas, which were much larger in area and value than the submerged lands covered by our bill, and the States handled the problem successfully, to the great good of the whole Nation.

In determining what kind of a bill Congress should pass to clear up this question, we must look at the many values that are involved in this narrow coastal belt. Since the President confined his remarks to oil, I shall mention oil first though it is not the most important. The highly imaginary figures used by the President applied to the whole submerged area from the shore clear out to the edge of the Continental Shelf. The fact is that our bill covers less than 10 percent of that full area—nine-tenths of the whole area is not within our bill. The proven deposits in the narrow off-shore belt are worth about $700,000,000 to which amount there will be some additions from future exploration. The royalty, whoever receives it, amounts to between one-eighth and one-sixth of the value, and this royalty will be spread out over the entire period of production of some 25 years. Remembering that the Federal Government has offered to give the States 37½ percent of this royalty, it is clear that the true amount in issue over the entire period is insignificant when contrasted with the fantastic figures of forty to one hundred billion which the President mentioned.

It is also clear that this oil value is only temporary, whereas the greater values in the coastal belt will continue throughout the life of our Nation and will be of more importance with each passing year. Our bill would assure to the States their continued control of the taking of fish, oysters, shrimp, sponges, kelp, and other forms of marine life, the use of sand, shell and gravel, the erection of piers, bulkheads, and groins, the filling of new lands and the control thereon of valuable recreational and commercial improvements, and the disposal of sewage and industrial waste. The control of the production of oil from the coastal belt is also restored, important in a few places for a few years, but insignificant when compared with the permanent values which determine the development and the prosperity of our coastal communities. These values involve problems which are so clearly local in nature that we shall continue with all our strength the fight to prevent their transfer to a Federal Government which is already too big, too wasteful, and too far from the people.

Other important features of our bill are those which would quitclaim to the States all rights to submerged lands under inland waters, and under the Great Lakes. The wording of the opinion of the Supreme Court in the California case and the clearly expressed position of the Federal attorneys in that case questioning the soundness of

The subsequent amendments merely permit the renumbering of the subsections so they may conform to the addition of the above proposed amendment.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

Address delivered by him on May 25, 1952, at sixty-third annual Memorial Day exercises of Western Salisbury Church, Emmaus, Pa.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address entitled "The McCarran Iron Curtain Bill," delivered by him on May 21, 1952, and broadcast over the American Broadcasting Co. network.

Editorial entitled "A Veto Deserved," published in the New York Times of May 24, 1952; editorial entitled "The Immigration Debate," published in the New York Herald Tribune of May 23, 1952; and editorial entitled "Immigration Ban," published in the Washington Post of May 24, 1952, all relating to the immigration bill recently passed by the Senate.

By Mr. MOODY:

Statement prepared by him, entitled "Youth Today Can Get Ahead—Thanks to Democratic Policies."

Transcript of program entitled "The Case for a Democratic Congress," telecast by the National Broadcasting Co.

Editorial entitled "Slash in Foreign Aid," published in the New York Times of May 25, 1952.

Editorial entitled "Urge Congress Vote 'No' on McCarran-Walter bills," recently published in the Michigan Catholic of Detroit, Mich.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Address delivered by Director of Price Stabilization Ellis G. Arnall, at convention of Supermarket Institute, at Cleveland, Ohio, on May 13, 1952.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Article entitled "The Man Who Tells Senators How To Behave," referring to the Parliamentarian of the Senate, "Charlie" Watkins, written by Charles Cooke and published in the Washington Sunday Star of May 25, 1952.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

Article entitled "Holding the Consumer's Hand," published in the May 24, 1952, issue of Business Week.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Article entitled "State GOP Farm Leaders Adopt Plank," written by George Mack, and published in the Topeka Daily Capital, of May 21, 1952.

By Mr. NEELY:

Editorial entitled "Protecting Miners," published in the Washington Post of May 26, 1952.

OPERATION OF DETROIT TANK ARSENAL BY CHRYSLER CORP.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week the Department of the Army signed a contract with Chrysler Corp. for eventual operation of the Government-owned Detroit Tank Arsenal, located at Center Line, Mich. I prepared a statement which I intended to present to the Senate, but, instead of taking the time of the Senate to read it, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MOODY

On Tuesday of this week the Department of the Army signed a contract with Chrysler Corp. for eventual operation of the Government-owned Detroit Tank Arsenal, located at Center Line, Mich.

On June 25, 1950, when the Korean war broke out, this arsenal was the only operating tank plant in the United States, thanks to a wise Defense Department policy of maintaining its own ordnance facilities in periods of peace.

For more than a year it was the sole source of tank production in this country. It is still the principal source of medium tank production, and promises to be for some time to come.

First word of the proposal to turn this vital facility over to a private company came 6 weeks ago—not from the Department of the Army, but rather from employees of the arsenal, who seriously questioned the wisdom of the move.

On the 16th of April I wrote to the Secretary of the Army, asking for confirmation of this report, and requested information regarding the savings to the taxpayers and the increase in production which might result from such a change of operation.

There was no immediate reply to this query, but on the 26th of April, following a direct inquiry to the Secretary of Defense, the Under Secretary of the Army Mr. Karl R. Bendetsen, came to my office and discussed with me the reasons for the proposed change of management.

These reasons he subsequently summarized in writing, and these were made public.

The essence of the Army's position was that the arsenal, under Ordnance Corps management, had failed to meet production schedules given it by the Pentagon, largely because of the alleged inability of arsenal management to obtain performance from its subcontractors.

Mr. Bendetsen further told me that a committee of five civilians had surveyed the arsenal in May of 1951 with a view to recommending changes in operation, and at that time recommended against a shift to private operation by a vote of 3 to 2. The findings of this group were reviewed early this year, and the determination to effect a change in operation of the arsenal followed a personal visit to the plant by Mr. Bendetsen and a committee from the Department of the Army.

Now, I have no expert knowledge of matters of this kind. It may be that the Department of the Army is pursuing the wisest possible course in achieving maximum tank output at minimum cost. It may be that the public interest is being fully protected.

But I have been visited by top officials of the Detroit Arsenal, both military and civilian, who seriously question this moved. I have been visited by representatives of the 7,000 men and women who work there, who are deeply concerned.

I am informed I am about to receive a petition bearing 15,000 signatures from employees of the arsenal, their families, and their neighbors in Center Line, protesting this move.

I am reliably informed that top officials of Ordnance Corps question the wisdom of the transfer. And I am told that representatives of the office of the Inspector General have submitted a report indicating serious doubts as to the advisability of the change.

From all these sources come the following assertions:

1. That the reported failure of the Detroit Arsenal to meet production schedules was due to:

(a) Production of the M–47 medium tank before engineering had been completed, resulting in constant change orders during manufacture.

(b) Failure of Army and industry to embark on a program of full mobilization.

(c) Diversion of 30 percent of turrets and hulls from the Detroit Arsenal to a civilian contractor in the east who was (and still is) having difficulty getting into production on the same tank.

(d) Cutbacks dictated from Washington, rather than by conditions within the arsenal.

2. That the Detroit Arsenal presently is producing M–47 medium tanks for $60,000 less, per tank, than the only civilian-operated plant in the country, with further reductions in cost definitely in sight.

3. That the Detroit Arsenal currently is exceeding production quotas assigned to it, and will continue to do so, under military operation.

4. That of the two members of the civilian committee who originally recommended civilian operation of the arsenal, only one actually visited the plant, and then for less than an hour; and that he voted the proxy of the other.

5. That of the approximately one dozen companies invited to bid on the operation of the arsenal, all but one declined after preliminary investigation. These included Ford, General Motors, Willys-Overland, Motor Products, and Chicago Pressed Steel.

6. That manufacturing operations are so closely integrated with research and development facilities at the arsenal that separate management of the two is all but impossible.

Now as to the contract itself, which was signed last Tuesday, these assertions have been made to me:

1. That in providing payment of a quarter of a million dollars to the corporation for the purpose of preparing a bid, this document is without precedent.

2. That the reasons for the agreement, as set forth in the contract—"the broadening of the production base and the training of civilian industry in the tank and combat vehicle program"—are specious.

3. That subcontracts now held by the arsenal with some 2,400 vendors and suppliers will be jeopardized by section 4 (d) of the contract, which gives the corporation a free hand to continue or reject any of the current sources of supply.

Additional complaints have been lodged with my office that the final negotiated contract with the corporation will provide that the corporation may use a substantial portion of the tank plant for civilian production if tank production does not require total capacity.

The opinion also has been expressed that, once installed in the Detroit Arsenal, the corporation may seek to consolidate the tank production at its new tank plant at Newark, Del., with that at the Detroit Arsenal, opening the door to conversion of the Newark facility to automobile assembly.

In view of all of the foregoing, a reasonable doubt has been raised as to the wisdom of turning over this Government tank manufacturing facility to private industry.

I have not either the time myself nor the staff to thoroughly explore this situation. I do know huge sums of the public money are involved here. I do know that the morale of 7,000 employes at the Detroit Arsenal has been struck a severe blow by the proposed transfer.

I do know that opposition to this transfer is widespread and deep-rooted, and that it comes from persons much better qualified to pass judgment on this case than I.

Therefore, I am suggesting that, in the public interest, the proposed transfer of the Detroit Tank Arsenal to private hands be examined by the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, headed by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas.

enforcement thereof in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1533. An act to designate a Floyd B. Olson Memorial Triangle in the District of Columbia, and to authorize the erection of a memorial plaque in such triangle;

S. 2871. An act relating to the manner of appointment of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, the deputy recorders, and the employees of the Office of Recorder, and for other purposes;

S. 2735. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940, as amended;

S. 2736. An act to amend the Code of Law of the District of Columbia in respect to the recording, in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds, of bills of sale, mortgages, deeds of trust, and conditional sales of personal property, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until June 15, 1952.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 2786) to amend section 106 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949, and it was signed by the Vice President.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 26, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2786) to amend section 106 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 3086.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3086) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], for himself and other Senators.

Mr. CONNALLY obtained the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without his losing the floor?

Mr. CONNALLY. With that understanding I will yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, first I should like to make an announcement. It is expected that the Senate will work long hours every day this week when there is a session. There will be no evening session today, but the Senate will continue its work until 6 or 6:30 this evening. Tomorrow there may be an evening session, as well as on Wednesday; and on Thursday it is expected that the Senate will convene at 10 o'clock. I hope that Senators will not ask permission to hold committee meetings on Thursday. It has been announced that there will be no session on Friday, because it is Memorial Day. So we must make up that time by working longer hours on the intervening days.

Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am very much pleased that finally we have reached consideration of the mutual-security bill, which is of so much importance, not alone to our own security but also to the security of the free world, especially the portion of it located in Europe.

This is probably the last major bill I shall be called upon to present to the Senate on behalf of the Foreign Relations Committee. I desire to take this opportunity to express my very deep appreciation to the members of that committee for the fine spirit of cooperation they have always shown. I have the utmost confidence in their patriotism and their ability. At the same time, I want to thank the Members of the Senate who have consistently supported the committee in approving the recommendations submitted by it.

Mr. President, I am proud of the bipartisan record of the Foreign Relations Committee. While our membership is made up of seven Democrats and six Republicans, in our deliberations we have always done our best to act in the national interest.

During the past decade our committee has considered many measures of vital importance to the security and prosperity of our country and to the cause of world peace. It is a source of great satisfaction to me that in almost every instance we have reconciled our differences and have come to the Senate floor with a united front.

COMMITTEE VOTED 12–0

It is with such a united front that we come to the floor now with the Mutual Security Act of 1952. The bill which I present was reported favorably by the Foreign Relations Committee by a vote of 12 to 0—representing the crystallized opinion, the patriotism, and the earnest concern for the welfare of and the security of the United States and for the security of Western Europe.

This program was approved by the Senate last year by the emphatic vote of 61 to 5. The pending bill simply provides for continuation of the same program during the 1953 fiscal year, with a few minor administrative changes which are fully explained in the report, and which I shall not discuss now; but I hope Senators will freely consult the committee report with respect to this bill.

Mr. President, before presenting the bill to the Senate I want to make one important point with respect to our foreign policy. We must never forget that what we do here is of decisive importance to the cause of world peace. We are not simply an isolated nation; we are the world's leader in behalf of peace and democracy and freedom throughout the world. We know that without our strong leadership and our vigorous participation the rest of the free world would find it impossible to organize its strength effectively against the threat of communistic aggression. Our failure to act decisively might mean that peace would slip from our grasp and the lights of civilization would go out again for a long, long time, and bring about another Dark Age, similar to that which preceded the Middle Ages.

UNITED STATES POSITION OF LEADERSHIP

Sometimes I think we in this country fail to understand how important our leadership is to the free world. The fact is that from a military, economic, or political point of view, no other nation or group of nations is in a position to take the lead. If we do not take the lead no one else will. No one else can.

Nor do we know exactly how much time we have in the all-important task of building the collective strength of the free world. There are those among us who would gamble with our Nation's destiny and urge us to conserve our resources and take our time. But those who take this attitude must realize that what we confront is the question of survival itself. Unless we respond to that challenge with vigor and determination it may be too late. A policy of timidity is a prelude to disaster.

This bill follows the same general outline as the bill which the Senate last year passed so overwhelmingly. It provides a total of $6,900,000,000 for military, economic, and technical assistance to our allies throughout the world.

That is in accordance with the recommendations of the committee. The original request was for $7,900,000,000. The Committee on Foreign Relations reduced it to $6,900,000,000. The total is $1,000,000,000 less than the administration requested, and $400,000,000 less than was appropriated last year.

As was the case last year, the great preponderance of the money in this year's bill is for our European partners in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Most of the remainder is for military and economic assistance to Formosa and Indochina and the countries of South Asia and the Near East.

The Indochina program, which accounts for most of the increase over the amount authorized last year for Asia and the Pacific, is particularly important in view of its relationship to the very sizable French contribution to NATO. The French have suffered more casualties killed in Indochina than the United States has in Korea. If France could liquidate her commitment in Indochina, the whole position of Western Europe would be strengthened immeasurably.

There is a relatively small amount in the bill for military assistance to our good neighbors of Latin America to enable them in event of war to take over in this hemisphere defensive duties which were performed by United States troops in World War II. There are also authorizations for relief, resettlement, and economic assistance in the Near East, and for point 4 programs of technical assistance in Asia, the Near East, Africa,

the rule which gives the States control of their inland waters, has given just cause for apprehension to all States of the Nation. Likewise, the statement of the Solicitor General of the United States at the hearings made it clear that he regards the case of submerged lands in the Great Lakes even more complex than that of the inland waters, because of the international boundaries which occur there. It is not surprising, therefore, that inland States and Great Lakes States are deeply concerned about this question, and nearly all of their officials and many of their people are strongly supporting our bill.

Most coastal States where no offshore oil has been found, like my own State of Florida, are strongly supporting our bill. For instance, in New York the Governor, the attorney general, the State legislature by strong resolutions, and the mayor of New York City are all for the rights of the States. One of the able advocates of our bill is the distinguished city construction coordinator of New York City, Mr. Robert Moses, who has recently made two strong statements on the subject. I quote briefly from Mr. Moses as follows: "In Biblical times one of the worst crimes was to remove a neighbor's landmark. Today it is to cloud his title. In this instance the cloud will destroy the work of years not only on private shore-front development but on public reclamation, recreation, conservation, and planning by the States and municipalities. This cloud must be lifted by congressional reassertion of the State ownership of submerged coastal lands."

Mr. Moses was thinking of the multimillion dollar improvements on filled lands on Long Island and Staten Island and in many other places, such as Boston, Atlantic City, and Miami Beach.

Many Nation-wide organizations of the highest standing are strongly supporting our position, such as the Council of State Governments, the American Bar Association, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American Municipal Association, and many others. You will be interested to know the positions on this matter which were taken by the three political parties participating in the last presidential election. In the framing of the Democratic platform, a strong effort was made to have a plank approved supporting the Federal claim, but this effort was soundly beaten. In the Republican platform, an affirmative position was taken in support of the States, as follows: "We favor restoration to the States of their historical rights to the tide and submerged lands, tributaries, waters, lakes, and streams." Only in the platform of the Progressive Party of Mr. Henry Wallace can the President find a plank which supports his position and the Federal claim to the offshore resources.

Those of us who are supporting the bill which has just been overwhelmingly passed by Congress by a majority of both Republicans and Democrats strongly feel that our position is sound and just and will receive the approval of the vast majority of our people who, we believe, agree with us that the important rights enjoyed by the States for 150 years should be restored and safeguarded and that such action is in the interest of sound, economical and democratic government. We shall continue with all our strength, until we are successful, the fight against the nationalization of these vital State and local resources by the hungry advocates of more and more Federal power and ever bigger Federal Government.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in the course of my remarks I made reference to the fact that Congress many years ago, in the passage of the Swamp and Overflowed Lands Act, had, as a matter of recognition of sound public policy to be followed by the Nation, granted to 15 of the States of the Union the swamps and overflowed lands located within their borders.

I stated that the acreage which was involved in that great grant, as well as the values which were involved, largely exceeded the acreage and values which are involved in our proposed quitclaim of the narrow belt of land and water immediately surrounding our maritime States and extending from the shore line out to the constitutional boundaries of the States.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that there be incorporated in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an excerpt taken from an official publication, table 105, page 128, of the 1951 report of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, a listing of the acreage granted to the States as of June 30, 1951, in which States there were located public lands of the United States which fell within the classification covered by and conveyed under the Swamp and Overflowed Lands Act.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Acreage granted to States and Territories as of June 30, 1951, under Swamp and Overflowed Lands Act, approved by the President on Sept. 28, 1850

	For swamp reclamation
Alabama	441,184
Arkansas	7,686,575
California	2,192,678
Florida	20,324,980
Illinois	1,460,164
Indiana	1,259,231
Iowa	1,196,392
Louisiana	9,491,865
Michigan	5,680,310
Minnesota	4,706,503
Mississippi	3,347,853
Missouri	3,432,481
Ohio	26,372
Oregon	286,108
Wisconsin	3,360,786
Total	64,893,482

From table 105, page 128, 1951 report of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in closing I wish to call attention to the fact that the compilation which I have placed in the RECORD shows that under the Swamp and Overflowed Lands Act the Congress found that it was sound public policy to grant to the States and did grant to the States in which the swamp and overflowed lands were located the immense acreage and the immense values which were embraced in that land, the acreage being 64,893,482 acres, or an acreage practically four times as great as the area involved in the submerged lands bill as passed by Congress and now before the President.

Incidentally, this grant under the Swamp and Overflowed Lands Act was made without a dissenting vote in the Senate, in spite of the fact that not one of the Original Thirteen States benefited under the act, and in spite of the fact that not one of the older States which were admitted to the Union in the early days, such as Vermont, Maine, Kentucky, and Tennessee were beneficiaries. It was done by the unanimous vote of the Senate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator from Florida recall anyone describing that legislation as robbery in broad daylight?

Mr. HOLLAND. No; the Senator from Florida is glad to state, after having read the full record, that it appeared after numerous questions had been asked about the bill by Senators from States which did not benefit under it, that it was unanimously determined by the Senate that it was sound public policy to grant that great area to the States which were affected, because it was believed that quicker development and sounder administration would result from the passage of the act. That certainly has proved to be the case, because that great area now comprises some of the greatest tax values and some of the greatest production values to be found in our Nation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The junior Senator from Louisiana during the debate on the Alaska statehood bill pointed out that the administration witnesses and the Secretary of the Interior recommended giving to the proposed new State of Alaska, at its option and to be selected by it from this vast area, more acreage than is involved in the claims of the coastal States who are interested in the tidelands bill. Did the President describe it as robbery in broad daylight when it was proposed that the new State of Alaska be given even a greater acreage than that which would accrue to the three coastal States which are interested in the tidelands issue?

Mr. HOLLAND. No. The President of the United States was a strong advocate of granting statehood to Alaska, as the Senator from Florida understands, under the terms of the bill which was considered by the Senate a short time ago.

Mr. LONG. That bill would have given approximately 20,000,000 acres to Alaska, to be chosen at its option. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. It would also have permitted Alaska in the future to benefit from the Mineral Leasing Act, under which Alaska would have received about 37½ percent of the returns directly and also a share in the reclamation funds, to which the rest of the money would be devoted. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is absolutely correct.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 1342. An act to amend acts relating to garagekeepers and liverymen's liens and the

and Latin America. Slow-working and at times undramatic, these point 4 programs over a period of years promise lasting results for the permanent benefit of the underdeveloped countries concerned and of the United States as well.

All these programs are fully explained in the committee report, which I hope Senators will study carefully. They are widely divergent in nature, but they have one common overriding purpose, namely, building the mutual security of the free world.

LONG HEARINGS HELD

After the request was submitted to Congress, the Foreign Relations Committee held hearings almost daily, and sometimes all day, at which the most searching, detailed questions were asked of the representatives of the Defense Department, the Mutual Security Agency, and the State Department.

The committee also heard every other witness who asked to testify.

At this point I may say that later on there was some complaint that we gave more time to the proponents than to the opponents. That is natural in all cases. But, Mr. President, we heard every witness who opposed the measure and who asked to be heard. We gave them all an opportunity to lay their views before the committee.

A number of additional witnesses, who did not desire to appear in person, filed statements which were made a part of the record and which were considered by the committee.

ECONOMY VERSUS SECURITY

When the committee came to mark up the bill, it was confronted with a painful dilemma, namely, how to balance the requirements of our national security abroad with the stability of our economy at home. In a number of executive sessions, at which a great deal of honest soul-searching went on, the committee tried to take a balanced view which would place in proper perspective all the elements of the complicated and difficult situation in which we find ourselves. On the one hand, we had to consider the importance of allies who are strong militarily and economically and who have stable political institutions. On the other hand, we had to consider the importance, not only to ourselves but also to our allies, of the economic strength and stability of the United States. As our allies are important to us, so are we important to them; and if the American economy goes to pot, most of the world will go to pot with it.

Let me make this point in still another fashion. Our national existence as a free country is threatened today in two very specific ways. In the first place, we confront disaster if we allow our allies to remain weak, for weakness invites aggression, and aggression, under present circumstances, may bring total war in its wake. I repeat what I have said before on the floor of the Senate that the only hope of avoiding war is to strengthen the military posture of the free world so that negotiations with the Soviet Union can be conducted on a basis of equality or even on a basis of superiority.

Yet in this quest for strength we run the risk—if we are imprudent and foolhardy—of becoming infinitely weaker. I am convinced that the Soviet Union would like nothing better than for the United States to spend itself into bankruptcy. But let me say to the men in the Kremlin, Mr. President, that this is an ephemeral hope. Indeed, their recent actions clearly indicate that the Russians are far more alarmed over the growing strength in Western Europe than they are encouraged by the deficit in our national budget.

COMMITTEE CUT BILLION

So, Mr. President, weighing as best we could all the undesirable alternatives which presented themselves, I believe we brought forth the best compromise possible between the two horns of the dilemma on which we struggled. We cut the program by $1,000,000,000—distributed pro rata among all the items involved—and we gave the President the flexibility to transfer up to 10 percent of the funds between purposes within titles, or between titles for the same general purpose.

In other words, Mr. President, in order to make the program flexible and workable and to enable it to meet changing times and conditions, in reducing the authorization by $1,000,000,000 we not only pro rated that cut among all sections of the bill, but we made further provision that 10 percent could be transferred from one purpose to another within the respective titles. We also provided for a transfer up to 10 percent from one title to another title, so long as it was for the same general type of assistance.

The committee considered cutting the bill item by item, but it decided against this procedure because greater unanimity could be obtained for a blanket, horizontal reduction than for specific cuts in individual items. We were also impressed with the need for giving the administration the power to exercise the greatest possible flexibility.

A billion dollars is no insignificant saving.

GREATER CUTS ARE RISKY

At the same time, the committee believes that the reduction will not critically interfere with the mutual security program. None of us would want to take any action which would impair the progress that has already been made.

The 10-percent transferability provision which the committee approved should enable the President to meet changes in the world situation which cannot now be foreseen.

The committee was reluctant to cut the program as much as a billion dollars. It did so only under the compulsion of our own deteriorating fiscal situation. Secretary Lovett testified that even the $7,900,000,000 recommended by the administration was "very close to an imprudent figure on the low side." The committee took the responsibility for reducing this to $6,900,000,000, but it cannot in all good conscience go beyond that. That is as far as the committee believes a cut should go. It believes that any further cut would impair the security of the United States. Three members of the committee voted against going even that far although they voted to report the bill favorably.

GENERAL EISENHOWER'S VIEWS

After the Foreign Relations Committee completed its work on the bill, I sent General Eisenhower a cable asking his comment on the effect of proposed further reduction. I shall quote what General Eisenhower said. He expresses not merely an individual view. He speaks with authority; he speaks from his experience in Europe; he speaks from the responsibility that has been his in guiding the NATO program and making it effective on behalf of the security of the United States and the security of Western Europe against an attack by the Kremlin or any of its satellites. Here is what General Eisenhower said:

> An aggregate reduction of the order of a billion dollars would be heavily and seriously felt. Any cut materially greater than this would create such difficulties that a drastic revision of the whole program might well be indicated and might therefore endanger the proposed military build-up now visualized, and which I consider essential in the interest of United States security.

Who knows better than does General Eisenhower? As he is in Europe and in touch with NATO, does he not know more about the situation than does some politician making a speech in South Dakota? Who knows the most about the military situation—a trained soldier with a distinguished record, or some candidate for office?

No, Mr. President, General Eisenhower said that a cut greater than a billion dollars would create such difficulties that a drastic revision of the whole program might be well indicated and might endanger the proposed military build-up. General Eisenhower opposes a further reduction not solely in the interest of Western Europe, not in the interest of foreign security alone, Mr. President, but in the interest of the security of the United States. Our security and the security of the rest of the free world are so intertwined and intermingled that they almost approach a single unit.

The attainment of our ultimate aim of security and peace, General Eisenhower continued, will become more expensive if it is unnecessarily postponed, dragged out and delayed.

General Eisenhower is on the ground, he has been living with this problem, and his views deserve our attention. His message further serves to strengthen the nonpartisan spirit in which members of both parties on the Foreign Relations Committee have approached this matter.

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE ACTION

Mr. President, when the bill was reported from the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senate referred it to the Armed Services Committee for additionel hearings and study. That committee heard additional testimony and deliberated further on the matter, with the result that it confirmed the previous action of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The Armed Services Committee adopted the attitude of the Committee on Foreign Relations and recommended

that the bill be passed without amendment.

So the bill is now before the Senate for the second time. It is here by a 12–0 recommendation of the Foreign Relations Committee, backed up by the Armed Services Committee. It is here with the endorsement of General Eisenhower and of Mr. Harriman. It has the support, as expressed by their votes in committee, of the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

That is a really impressive display of unanimity and nonpartisanship, especially in such a highly contentious year as is 1952. It is a particularly emphatic tribute to the soundness of the Mutual Security Program, and to the popular support for that program.

THIS IS NOT "FOREIGN AID"

Let me emphasize the term, "mutual security," Mr. President. This measure cannot properly be termed a "foreign aid" bill. It is founded on the concept that the security of any part of the free world is intimately related to the security of all other parts.

It is based on the theory that by helping our allies to become strong and to remain free, we are helping ourselves.

In the vote on the Mutual Security bill last year and in other votes during the past 5 years in favor of such measures as the Greek-Turkish aid program, the European recovery program, and the North Atlantic Treaty, the Senate has demonstrated its firm devotion to the principle of collective security and to the proposition that the national interests of the United States require strong, free, and effective allies in Europe, in Africa, in the Near East, in Asia, and, of course, in Latin America. I do not think that point requires further argument, but I should like to comment briefly on the nonsense I have heard lately about "foreign give-away" programs.

This kind of talk is a straw man set up by people who cannot see beyond the shores of the United States. It raises a dangerously false issue. Everybody knows, Mr. President, that a real give-away program of anything approaching this magnitude could not command a single vote in the Senate.

We have had some experience with programs which might inelegantly be termed "give-away." We are all familiar with the straight relief bills which most of us have voted for at one time or another, whether they were for the relief of famine abroad or for the relief of flood victims in our own Middle West.

But, Mr. President, this bill is no more a give-away program than is the appropriation bill for the Defense Department. This bill is an effort to remove the need for "give-away" relief bills. It is an effort to help other people to help themselves so that they will not need give-aways. Above all, this bill is an investment in American security.

As such, it is justified only if previous investments of the same kind have yielded appreciable dividends. Personally, I could not support this bill if the Mutual Security program had not produced concrete, tangible results. Let us see what these results have been.

RESULTS OF PROGRAM SO FAR

One year ago in Western Europe there were less than 15 divisions adequately trained and equipped for combat and fewer than 1,000 operational aircraft. Further, there was no over-all command structure available for the forces that did exist. I wish I could give the Senate exact figures, but I cannot do that without giving them to the Kremlin at the same time.

Today, the combat-ready ground forces have nearly doubled, the air forces have significantly increased, and there is a functioning international command structure. There are also agreed-to plans to increase the ground forces to 50 divisions and the air forces to 4,000 planes by the end of this year, with an accompanying increase in naval strength.

Within the past year, we have brought into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization the strength of Greece and Turkey, the Senate approving that action by a vote of 73 to 2. Practically unanimously the Senate voted to bring Greece and Turkey into this system. Is it not to our interest to aid them in building up their strength as a bulwark against evil and malicious invasion from Soviet Russia or its satellites?

Negotiations have been started, and I hope are near completion, for the so-called European Defense Community, an arrangement which will make possible the effective utilization of German manpower and resources in the joint defense of Western Europe against aggression.

Mr. President, even now the European defense community in Europe is signing treaties looking to the formation of a European army to resist aggression from the Kremlin or any of its satellites. This morning, in Europe, the foreign Ministers of Great Britain, the United States, France, and Western Germany have signed the contract of alliance which will admit Germany into the Western World. Prime Minister Adenauer publicly gives assurance that Western Germany will be allied with the Western European forces, and will assist in maintaining their safety and security and in resisting invasion and aggression by the Kremlin or any of its satellites.

It is difficult to exaggerate the importance and significance of this step, and provision has been made in the bill for assistance to that organization when it comes into being. That is the European defense community, which seeks European nations as members. This progress has been possible only because the members of NATO have been pulling together. NATO is a one for all and all for one proposition. We quite properly demand the utmost of the countries that are in NATO with us. The Foreign Relations Committee has been most insistent that the representatives of the executive branch of the Government constantly impress this self-help principle upon our allies. I have myself on occasion expressed my dissatisfaction with the effort which some of our allies were making.

But, Mr. President, the record shows that on the whole the countries of Western Europe have responded to the threat of Communist aggression vigorously and promptly within the limits of their capabilities. Their defense expenditures have doubled since 1949, and their military production has nearly quadrupled. All of them have increased their terms of compulsory military service.

LISBON AGREEMENTS

Their capabilities and their plans were studied in minute detail over a period of months by the Temporary Council Committee of NATO, which was headed by Averell Harriman. The TCC made recommendations which were agreed to at the Lisbon meeting of the North Atlantic Council in February.

The Lisbon agreements are important, Mr. President. It is these agreements which provide for raising by the end of this year the 50 divisions and the 4,000 aircraft to which I referred. The funds in this bill for Europe are based on these agreements. The military assistance funds are calculated to provide equipment for the forces at the time the forces are ready for the equipment. If the equipment cannot be delivered from the United States in accordance with the prearranged schedule, the forces that are raised in Europe will be inadequately armed and not fully combat-worthy. The incentive of the countries of Europe to raise additional forces will be decreased; for why should they call up men to be armed with broomsticks?

On the other hand, if for any reason the forces that are scheduled to be raised in Europe are not raised, we are under no commitment to follow through on supplying the equipment. We retain complete control until the equipment is actually in the hands of the units which will use it. General Gruenther, Chief of Staff, NATO, told the committee that there is now in effect "a procedure aimed at assuring that the deliveries of military equipment from the United States for the purpose of bringing units to a full state of combat effectiveness will be made only to such units as have reached combat effectiveness except for this equipment."

The defense support funds are also geared to the Lisbon agreements. They are calculated to increase military production in Europe to the maximum economically possible.

It is only as the countries of Europe become able to produce their own weapons, Mr. President, that we can expect to reduce our own expenditures for purely military assistance to them. If we make drastic cuts in these defense support funds, we will run the risk that the huge military assistance program will continue indefinitely.

HOW DEFENSE SUPPORT WORKS

In his cable from which I have already quoted, General Eisenhower said:

> Reductions in defense support would have a peculiarly adverse effect, since available production facilities in Europe could not be put to use for lack of a critical fraction of their raw materials and other requirements.

That is for the purpose of encouraging them to provide their own equipment if they can secure the raw materials, and the testimony is that it would be quite a bit cheaper than if it were produced in the United States.

Let me give some examples of how defense support works. By supplying $1,000,000 worth of essential parts, we enable the Dutch to produce $5,300,000 worth of locomotives. By supplying $2,000,000 worth of mining machinery, we enable the Norwegians to increase their iron-ore production by $7,500,000 a year. With $30,000 worth of American equipment, the Norwegians are also building a plant which will turn out more than half a million dollars worth of glycerine a year, all of it earmarked for explosives. For a little more than $2,000,000 worth of machine tools we helped to bring about a $60,000,000-a-year increase in jet aircraft engine production in two factories in Great Britain. Production in the 2 plants in question rose from 115 engines a month to 235.

When we demand that our allies do their share, we must remember that they have a right to expect the same thing of us. We cannot ask them to make the sacrifices they are making unless we ourselves are willing to play our full part. If the United States were to withdraw from this program, or to go about it in a half-hearted way, the results in Western Europe would be nothing short of devastating.

GETTING THE MOST FOR OUR MONEY

It is demonstrably in the interest of the United States that we do play our full part in NATO. It has become a truism that the defense of Western Europe is vital to the defense of the United States. The question is, How can the defense of Western Europe be best achieved?

Although Western Europe is vital to the United States, it cannot be defended by the United States alone, nor can aggression be repelled by the United States alone. The defense of Western Europe, as General Eisenhower has well said, must come from within. But by a relatively modest expenditure, the United States can help strengthen that defense and make it effective.

Except for administrative costs, which are less than 1 percent, every dollar of the European military assistance money is spent for military equipment that men can use to fight with. The defense support funds make possible the production of equipment worth on the average two or three times as much as the original investment.

The United States Army, Mr. President, is the most expensive in the world, not only because of the costly equipment it uses, but also because its pay scales and living standards are by far the highest in the world. We recently passed a bill in the Senate raising the pay of a private in the Army from $75 to $77.25 a month. A private in the Turkish Army gets 21 cents a month—about as much in a year as an American soldier gets in a day.

A high proportion of our own defense appropriations goes for the pay and allowances, the food, clothing, and quarters of our own troops—and on a scale that can only be described as lavish when compared to any other country in the world. I am not complaining about our own expenditures for these things. The American people demand it, and the American soldier deserves it. I am only trying to point out how much further the defense dollar abroad goes than it goes in the United States. It is infinitely cheaper to arm Europeans than it is to arm Americans.

But there is a good deal more to this than cold dollars and cents. I agree with the statement to the committee of Mr. Harriman, as follows:

> I do not believe that we should reserve to the young men of this country the exclusive privilege of fighting for freedom. They are entitled to have well-equipped allies.

MUTUAL SECURITY PREVENTS WAR

Mr. President, I have said many times that I do not believe war is inevitable. I will say now that I do not believe it is likely in the foreseeable future. The main reason I think it is unlikely is the growing strength of ourselves and our allies. The Mutual Security Program is the means by which this strength grows. As such, it is the best preventive of war that I know. Compared to the terrible costs of another great world war, it would be cheap at twenty times the price.

Mr. President, this is one of those moments in history when great events will not wait.

We have made a good beginning in building collective defense. We are on the right track, and we are gaining momentum. We cannot stand still. With the relatively modest expenditure authorized in this bill, we can go forward, with increasing speed, toward the day when world peace will be a reality and not merely a dream. If we hesitate now, we lose the headway we have already made and we pull the props out from under the structure of collective security on which we have already spent so much time and effort.

We are not only anxious to preserve the freedom and the destiny of Western Europe and the free world, but we are determined to preserve the freedom and the destiny of the United States. We want to help build up in Western Europe a fortress so strong that no vicious and false propaganda can ever find a solid foothold in that area—a fortress which no hostile arms can ever penetrate. We want the free world to be strong enough to protect itself from the evil, malicious, and destructive doctrines and the armed forces that might seek to enslave it.

Mr. President, inasmuch as I prepared my remarks on the Mutual Security Program before the House of Representatives took final action on its bill last Friday, I should like to add one or two comments at this time.

First of all, let me say that I do not intend to be critical of any action taken by the House. In our bicameral legislature each House is in a sense independent within its own jurisdiction and has a right to its own convictions. Nevertheless, the House cut of 22 percent from the original proposal is so serious that I cannot let it pass without comment.

Mr. President, I remind the Senate of the long and painstaking study which our committee gave the mutual security bill. I remind the Senate that the Armed Services Committee approved our recommendations. I remind the Senate, too, of General Eisenhower's warning that further cuts might jeopardize the build-up of our collective strength in the free world.

The cut approved by the House has been made despite the unanimous recommendations of those who are charged with the principal responsibility for our security. I refer to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Are they concerned with any other interest than the security of the United States? The Joint Chiefs of Staff, great military and naval experts, are for the program as it is now, not for their own self-promotion, but for the security of the United States. The Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President cannot hide their heads in the sand and hope that danger will cease to threaten.

I agree completely with those who argue for economy. But I insist that we cannot afford the kind of economy which puts American security in jeopardy and endangers the conditions of our way of life. Where is there any economy in cutting temporarily a large amount from the bill, with the probable result being a war, which would be a war that would cost 10 or perhaps even a hundred times as much in expenditures as could possibly be saved by an amendment to this bill?

Mr. President, I cannot understand how responsible Members of this body can fly in the face of the facts we see unfolding day by day: Soviet actions in Berlin; Soviet threats to Iran; Communist build-up in Eastern Germany; French commercial aircraft fired on. What do headlines like that mean? Do they mean nothing?

Mr. President, I am convinced that we are making real progress toward our goal in building up the collective defense of the free world.

EXPENSIVE ECONOMY

Mr. President, much is said about economy. I am for economy, but I am for economy with some sense to it. I am for economy on an intelligent basis. I am for economy which is practical and realistic. To those who are so wedded to economy I may say that the way to get real economy is to defeat the bill entirely, and provide no money at all to the mutual security plan. If they do that they will be able to strut their stuff before their constituents and say, "I saved $6,000,000,000, although the world may go to hell."

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. Is it not correct to say that if we should practice so-called economy in that way, the result would be, should there be a strike made by Red Russia, in the face of our failure to build up the NATO forces in Europe, that American boys would have to go over there to fight or might be assigned to go over there to fight, instead of the men of Western Europe carrying guns in defense of their own countries?

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Michigan for his contribution. I am sure he is correct.

Mr. President, we are trying to have ourselves and our allies act in cooperation to protect the free world. I can only say to Senators who want to economize further on this bill, "If you want real economy, if you want to save taxpayers' money, do not vote for anything for mutual security. Then you can go home and make Fourth of July speeches and beat your breast, while war breaks out yonder in the world and while the free world is being overrun by Communists and by totalitarianism, and by the worst tyranny that has ever cursed this earth since the days of the Roman despots."

No, Mr. President; we are not for that sort of arrangement. I cannot understand how responsible men can fly in the face of the facts. I am convinced that we are making real progress.

I want to say to the Senate that those who are seeking to cut radically this program, those who are against this program, are not reflecting the views of the American people.

EDITORIAL OPINION

I invite the attention of the Senate to an editorial which appeared in the New York Times. It is headed: "Slash in Foreign Aid."

That is what it is, Mr. President. It is a slash. It is not a delicate little trimming. It is not a graceful little rearrangement. It is a slash. It is chopping it to pieces.

Mr. President, I read from the New York Times editorial:

In disregard of the solemn warnings of every informed official—

That is what the New York Times thinks. The New York Times is the greatest newspaper in the United States. It is a newspaper of world-wide prestige, whose opinions carry to every place in which English is read. The New York Times says:

In disregard of the solemn warnings of every informed official, including General Eisenhower, the House has meat-axed the mutual security bill—

Mr. President, you have been in butcher shops. You know the kind of weapons used in butcher shops with which dead carcasses are operated on. They have nice, sharp knives, with which they trim out the desirable parts of the meat. Then they have a great, ponderous meat ax, with which what remains of the carcass is chopped to pieces. In another body the bill has been meat-axed. That is what the New York Times says about it.

Let us see what else the New York Times says—

meat-axed the mutual security bill with a slash of almost $1,750,000,000 in an unreasoning—

That is what the New York Times thinks about it; it is unreasoning—

unreasoning and futile gesture toward "economy."

It is merely a gesture. That is what the Times thinks about it. That is what the Times thinks of those who are hollering for economy, forgetting the peril to our institutions, forgetting the danger to every country, forgetting the danger to the lives of our sons, who must defend this Nation, as they have always defended it successfully.

CUTS IGNORE THE DANGER

The lives of our people are involved in this bill. They are not going to surrender. They are not going to be deluded by this false claim of economy.

I say to Senators who loudly proclaim their desire for economy in connection with this bill, "Cut it all out; do not give mutual security a dime." Some say, "We want economy; to hell with the possibility of war. We want economy; the Devil be darned as to our security. We want economy; disband your armies; sink your warships. We are for economy. We are going to have it, regardless of what the result may be."

Mr. President, what else does the New York Times say? I ask unanimous consent to have the entire editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SLASH IN FOREIGN AID

In disregard of the solemn warnings of every informed official including General Eisenhower, the House has meat-axed the mutual security bill with a slash of almost one and three-quarter billion dollars in an unreasonable and futile gesture toward "economy." Spearheading this action were Republicans led by the Taft forces and supported by many Democrats, while the rest of the House apparently floundered around without any effective leadership whatsoever.

The result is that the total 1953 authorization for foreign aid as passed by the House is less than $6,200,000,000, in contrast to the President's request of $7,900,000,000. The House's own Committee on Foreign Affairs, which at least had the opportunity to make a relatively close study of the problem had proposed a billion-dollar slash. That was serious enough; but the additional hacking away at this measure on the floor of the House can have only disastrous effects on the military build-up of our Western European allies, as the Deputy Director for Mutual Security has explained.

The bulk of the cut made on the floor under direction of Representative VORYS of Ohio was in funds for "defense support," meaning the economic assistance to Western Europe necessitated by the rearmament program. It is economic nonsense to suppose that we are saving money by this kind of budget-cutting. For every dollar we save in this manner, we will ultimately have to spend two or three to get the kind of military defense the free world must have against the Communist threat.

How can we expect our European allies, with standards of living enormously below that of the United States, to live up even to the commitments they have already made if we go through with such far-reaching reductions in our own budgets?

This newspaper is in favor of real economy. We are not of the opinion that Presidential recommendations must be accepted in toto. We think there has been waste and that considerable savings in both our military and nonmilitary expenditures can doubtless be made. We believe that Congress must exercise close control over the power of the purse. But we do not think that to make broad slashes in vital authorization measures on the floor of the House in a highly surcharged political atmosphere is the right way to accomplish these ends. Such methods can only defeat their own purpose. In the present instance, the damage is not merely domestic but is international and on a colossal scale. The Senate ought to rectify it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall read one word more from the editorial. What does the New York Times say? It says:

How can we expect our European allies, with standards of living enormously below that of the United States, to live up even to the commitments they have already made if we go through with such far-reaching reductions in our own budgets?

This is the New York Times speaking, not the "Bunkum" County Weekly News. That is what a good many Senators listen to. They ask: "What does the 'Bunkum' County News say?" I have shown what the New York Times says. The Times is in favor of real economy—r-e-a-l, not r-e-e-l. It says:

We are not of the opinion that Presidential recommendations must be accepted in toto. We think there has been waste and that considerable savings in both our military and nonmilitary expenditures can doubtless be made.

They do not know, but they think so. They think so.

We believe that Congress must exercise close control over the power of the purse. But we do not think that to make broad slashes in vital authorization measures on the floor of the House in a highly surcharged political atmosphere—

Mr. President, we are not playing politics with this bill. We are not playing demagoguery. We are playing the national interest. We are playing the defense of the United States of America. We are playing the defense of the free world. We are playing for unity in the free world. It will not be possible to maintain the free world if every nation goes on its own. How long would Denmark last alone against Russia? How long would Holland last against Russia? How long would Belgium, France, or any of the other countries last alone? We must stand united.

The United States has the moral leadership of the world. It has leadership in behalf of peace and security. The United States must assume its proper function. As the Times says:

But we do not think that to make broad slashes in vital authorization measures on the floor of the House in a highly surcharged political atmosphere is the right way to accomplish these ends.

This loud and raucous cry for so-called economy is, says the New York Times, "In a highly surcharged political atmosphere."

And, Mr. President, the closer we get to the national political conventions and to election day, the stronger some get for economy; they want to beat their breasts and talk about economy.

So the New York Times says:

We do not think that to make broad slashes in vital authorization measures on the floor of the House in a highly surcharged political atmosphere is the right way to accomplish these ends. Such methods can only defeat their own purpose. In the present instance the damage is not merely domestic, but is international and on a colossal scale. The Senate ought to rectify it.

In other words, Mr. President, the Senate should make every effort to see that the Senate bill on this subject is enacted into law. That is what the New York Times thinks. Does it know?

Is it informed? It is playing politics? No, Mr. President, the great New York Times is a responsible and influential journal.

WASHINGTON POST COMMENT

I have in my hand an editorial from the Washington Post. I shall not read the editorial now; it is generally similar to the editorial from the New York Times which I have just read. I now ask unanimous consent to have the editorial from the Washington Post printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 26, 1952]

JEOPARDIZING SECURITY

The House of Representatives has chosen a particularly critical moment to ignore the recommendations of its Foreign Affairs Committee on the authorization for foreign aid. Despite the impassioned plea by Speaker RAYBURN and warnings from the administration, the House chopped away at the mutual-assistance program and then imposed clogging amendments. The Foreign Affairs Committee has recommended a $1,000,000,000 cut from the $7,900,000,000 requested by President Truman. Whether the committee cut was necessary or wise only the future can tell with certainty. But it was made after much thought and investigation, and it was supported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which independently made the same reduction. Now the House has trimmed the amount by an additional $750,000,000. It acted against the advice of everyone—from the President and General Eisenhower down—who bears any responsibility for administering this Nation's security programs.

The biggest cut was made, as might have been expected, in the so-called defense-support part of the program. Defense support is an administration euphemism for economic aid, which to the realists on Capitol Hill has an effeminate sound in these hard days when tanks and guns are terribly important. Why the politicians would rather vote dollars to buy an American tank and ship it to France than to advance dollars to France so that it could build its own tanks is one of the mysteries of our time. As economists and military men have said over and over again, it is more sensible and economical for France to build tanks on home soil, some of which might be used in Europe by American soldiers, but their logic escapes the majority on Capitol Hill.

A related amendment, revealing the same temper on the part of the House and approved with what Mr. RAYBURN described as "glee," substantially cut the amount authorized for economic assistance and technical cooperation in Asia. A further hampering amendment by Representative SMITH of Wisconsin placed a limit on the amount that may be spent under the point 4 program for materials and supplies. This amendment would cripple the point 4 program in India, which is primarily an agricultural development program. Since India's greatest need is for food, the point 4 administrators have organized a team to assist Indian farmers. Training and technical assistance are essential, but equally essential to the program's success are expenditures for water pumps, rigs for drilling wells, fertilizer, and steel points for plows. The amendment will do no harm to the point 4 program in some countries; but in India it would all but wreck it by reducing the amount to be spent in the next fiscal year by about 70 percent.

Because the House was not satisfied that the Foreign Affairs Committee had been sufficiently tough, it insisted upon inserting an amendment by Representative MERROW, of New Hampshire, which seems harmless but would have unfortunate effects overseas because it attempts to describe how other nations must cooperate with the United States to obtain Mutual Security funds. It is another ill-advised attempt to be tough for toughness' sake.

When the Senate begins debate on the bill today it will have many opportunities to improve upon the work of the House. But it will have to meet various short-sighted and irresponsible proposals from its own Members. The first order of business, for example, is an amendment by Senator WELKER, of Idaho, and 10 other Republicans to cut the amount authorized a full $2,000,000,000 below the administration request. If the coalition of Taftites and conservative Democrats is as strong in the Senate as it was in the House, the amendment may prevail. But let us hope not. Economy in all things is desirable, but, as Speaker RAYBURN said, the necessity of being ready for war is imposed upon us by the stubborn facts of our time. "To be unready now," he said, "is to jeopardize the survival of this Nation and the whole free world."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I now hold in my hand an article from the New York Herald Tribune of May 26—today. The article brings us word from Europe, from Mr. Draper, the European chief of the Mutual Security Agency. I now read from the article:

William E. Draper, Jr., European chief of the Mutual Security Agency, declared today that the cut made by the House in the foreign-aid bill could seriously damage the entire defensive structure in Europe.

EFFECTS OF HOUSE CUTS

In other words, Mr. President, it could damage not only ours, but the entire defensive structure in Europe.

I read further from the article:

The recent action of the House of Representatives in cutting the total requested for military and economic assistance for Europe by 27 percent and slashing—

He knows what "slashing" means, and he uses the word "slashing"—

more than 43 percent from that part intended for economic defense support will, if concurred in by the Senate, have serious implications for the future security of the United States," he said.

Mr. President, Mr. Draper is an American, and he is in our service. He is concerned with the security of the United States; and he is talking about the security of the United States when he says:

"Such drastic cuts could seriously damage the entire defensive structure that we and our European partners have been so successfully building."

He said he had not protested when a cut of a billion out of the original eight billion for world-wide aid was called for, because that meant a cut of only 12 percent.

"But now it is proposed to slash economic defense support for Europe by nearly one-half, cutting about $800,000,000 from the $1,819,000,000 requested, and to reduce our total military and economic help to Europe by more than one-quarter," he said. "This action comes at a time when increased efforts are expected from our European partners."

Mr. President, in conclusion let me say that those who are advocating tremendous cuts in this bill must take the serious responsibility for their action. They must be responsible, not to those of us here in the Senate, but to the American people; they must be responsible to the boys of the American people, to the sons who already are of military age, and to the sons who are not yet of military age, but will become of military age.

We are pleading for a measure which is designed to help prevent world war III; we are pleading for the safety of our sons and for the sons of all the American people. We are pleading for the security of the United States.

AGREEMENT WITH GERMANY

Mr. President, this morning, in Bonn, Germany, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Foreign Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Eden, the French Foreign Minister, Mr. Schuman, and the Premier of the Western German Republic, Dr. Adenauer, signed a document involving a contractual relationship which will have the effect, when ratified—and it will be ratified here in the Senate—of bringing Western Germany into alliance with the rest of Western Europe, in behalf of what we are seeking to do in the bill now before the Senate. Is the time when that event is occurring a good time to make cuts in the authorization and to send word to Western Germany and to the other signatories to that contract that we are going to slice and slice and cut and cut the funds for the mutual-security program? Is this any time to do that?

On tomorrow, I believe, it is expected that in Paris the foreign ministers referred to and others will sign a treaty of alliance for the conduct of the European defense community. That action will be taken in behalf of six great nations, banded together for their own protec- and for the preservation of freedom and democracy in western Europe. Is the time when that is occurring any time to have the wires throbbing with messages that the United States is getting cold feet, that the United States is cooling off in its desire for security, that the United States is lagging behind in the drive for free government and for democracy, that the United States is getting weak in resisting communism and the aggressive forces of the Kremlin which are trying to overwhelm the free nations of the world?

No, Mr. President; let us take no faint-hearted action here today. To do so would be to destroy what already has been accomplished. Let us press on with courage and conviction, until we can say, with St. Paul, the great Apostle, we have fought a good fight, we have finished our course, we have kept the faith.

If we do that, although we shall have finished our course for the time being, only yet we shall have kept the faith of the free world; we shall have kept the faith of democracy and independence for the nations of the free world; and we shall have kept the faith by resisting aggression by the evil and damnable influences of totalitarianism and tyranny.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I desire to address my remarks to the very pressing provisions of the pending bill. Before doing so, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks certain documents which I hold in my hand. The first is an article en-

titled "What About the Foreign-Aid Bill?", which appeared in Business Week, one of the McGraw-Hill publications. It is dated March 22, 1952. In this article, the critical importance of the foreign-aid bill is emphasized by one of the most important magazines representing the businessmen of America. The second is an editorial entitled "Sensible Trimming," which appeared in the Washington Post on Wednesday, April 30. It appeared at the time that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee made its report deducting $1,000,000,000 from the bill and indicating the best way in which the $1,000,000,000 trimming could be handled. The third is an editorial entitled "How Much Cut in Arms Aid?", which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of May 10, 1952. In this editorial the Christian Science Monitor defends the position taken by the Foreign Relations Committee.

Finally, Mr. President, I have a column which I read in the New York Times this morning, May 26, entitled "Cutting Corners on a Dangerous Road," written by Anne O'Hare McCormick, a well-known writer on foreign affairs. I shall not read the entire article, but I want it added to the other articles at the conclusion of my remarks. I shall, however, read one paragraph from Miss McCormick's column. She says:

> It is almost incredible that Congress should choose this moment of crisis to slash at the mutual security program. The arbitrary cuts made in the items of economic aid designed to enable European nations to manufacture their own arms, are the least justifiable of all cuts and the most extravagant on our part. But even if they are justified, nothing could be more ill-timed and irresponsible, in terms of American interests, than to broadcast them at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 1, 2, 3, and 4.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, at the beginning of my remarks, I desire to pay a brief tribute to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. CONNALLY] who, as he said today, is presenting probably for the last time a major bill under his leadership. Those of us on the committee have become devoted to our chairman. We have appreciated his barbs—and frequently we needed them—but at all times we have sensed behind his barbs an interest he felt in us all and a spirit of cooperation which has meant much to us. I desire to pay him this tribute before I continue with my remarks.

Mr. President, I desire to support wholeheartedly the Mutual Security Act of 1952 as reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It is my strong conviction that any further cuts beyond the $1,000,000,000 agreed to in committee and carefully checked—and I emphasize this—with those responsible for the administration of the act would be a serious blow to the collective security program in Western Europe.

I regret to say so, but I oppose strongly the unfortunate action taken by the House last week, and I hope that the Senate will in no uncertain terms support the committee's program.

Mr. President, since I was first chosen by the people of my State to serve in the United States Senate, I have had one long-range over-all objective in mind. That objective has been the peace of the world. It has been my hope, yes, my prayer, that our country after World War II would accept its responsibility in leading the nations of the world to some form of collective security to preserve the peace. This we have tried to do. But Moscow has blocked our every attempt. Peace has become now only a distant hope. The world is in turmoil. Our own security is threatened.

American security is threatened from two quarters.

First is the threat coming from outside the United States, which atheistic, Soviet totalitarianism poses toward any people that will not accept communism as a way of life. This is the threat which many Americans recognized during World War II. The threat was implicit in the writings of Soviet Marxists, who taught that capitalism and communism could not live side by side. It seeks today by every device at hand to make man the creature of the state, rather than the state the servant of man.

The second threat we face is internal; namely, the threat that our own free institutions and individual freedom may succumb to economic collapse because our Government expenditures exceed our ability to pay taxes. I emphasize those two threats, because they are what faced the Foreign Relations Committee in its consideration of this proposed legislation.

Here are the two big issues before us today: On the one hand, the need for armed collective security, if we are to resist Russian Communist aggression; on the other hand, the absolute necessity of maintaining our economic stability at home.

It will be noted that the bill before the Senate today as reported by the committee would authorize a total of $6,900,000,000. The original bill submitted by the administration called for $7,900,000,000, but it seemed to the committee in view of the enormous financial load which we are carrying, that it was necessary to reduce this total. It was felt by the committee, after careful study and discussion with administration leaders, that $1,000,000,000 could be cut without doing damage to the military program. By the 10 percent flexibility provision we enable the administration to absorb more easily the across-the-board reduction.

I may say for the information of my listeners that in the bill there are four titles, dealing with different areas of the world, and that the bill deals both with direct military items and items which are known as defense support. The latter is aimed primarily at helping the foreign countries to build up their plants for war production. But the provisions of the bill are flexible and give to the administrator of the bill and his associates authority to transfer sums between the titles and the types of items, so that the cut may not have too severe an effect on any one area of the program.

The argument is made that we do not discharge our obligation to freedom if we reduce the total amounts requested by the President for mutual security. I cannot agree with this view. It seems to me that the first obligation we have to ourselves and to the free world is to keep America strong. In two world wars the strength of the United States—a strength built upon our free productive capacity—has saved the world from the regressive forces of totalitarianism. If a third world war should come it is imperative that the United States be as strong internally as externally.

General Eisenhower understands this point. While abroad last summer on a trip to the Atlantic Pact countries I talked with General Eisenhower and his aide, General Gruenther. They understand the point which I have just made—namely, the necessity for our being strong internally. In General Eisenhower's recent report he states:

> The United States cannot long continue such expenditures without endangering her own economic structure. The soundness of that structure is of vital concern to the entire free world, for its collapse would be a world-shaking tragedy.

The committee studied this problem with the greatest care. I believe the solution proposed by the committee, the reduction of the President's request by $1,000,000,000 is sound and justified. It means that our mutual security program must operate on an austerity basis but not that it will be so seriously reduced as to endanger our goal of building strength in the free world as rapidly as is possible.

For the sake of emphasis, let me repeat that statement: It means that our mutual security program must operate on an austerity basis but not that it will be so seriously reduced as to endanger our goal of building strength in the free world as rapidly as is possible. This cut means that we can supply guns and a little bread, but not butter and cake as well.

In my address on Monday a week ago I indicated how savings might be made in the domestic military programs, which would be of a larger amount than those resulting from any further cuts in the mutual security program. I suggested that possibly $6,000,000,000 or $7,000,000,000 might be taken from the $52,000,000,000 asked by the Armed Services Committee for the current year. This, of course, is a matter which will require careful study. I refer to it at this time in order to emphasize my belief that we can meet economy needs without making further cuts in the mutual security program.

I am distinguishing between the budget of $52,000,000,000 and the European program of $6,900,000,000.

As the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations stated a few moments ago, General Eisenhower cabled him in reference to this very matter as follows:

> An aggregate reduction of the order of a billion dollars would be heavily and seriously felt. Any cut materially greater than this would create such difficulties that a drastic revision of the whole program might well be indicated and might therefore endanger the proposed military build-up now visualized, and which I consider essential in the interest of United States security.

Note that General Eisenhower emphasizes United States security. We are thinking in terms of the security of the United States as well as the collective security of the world.

It will be noted that while General Eisenhower says that the billion-dollar cut would be heavily and seriously felt, he indicates that any further cut would probably require a complete revision of the whole program. That might possibly mean a reconsideration of the agreements entered into at Lisbon where it was generally understood that with certain participation by us the various nations would continue building up their strength in manpower during the current year and next year.

I agree with General Eisenhower. I believe that cuts materially greater than those proposed by our committee would not only endanger our own defensive build-up but might also create grave doubts among our Allies as to our sincerity of purpose. We must not now destroy the program which has been undertaken. I think it is vitally important that we do not discourage our allies.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I would not want to interrupt my sequence of thought. I will yield briefly for a question.

Mr. WATKINS. I merely wanted to inquire whether the pending authorization bill includes funds for helping to rearm Germany.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do not think the German program is included. I should have to check up on that question.

I am advised by my staff that it does not include the German program.

Mr. WATKINS. Does it include the cost of armaments we intend to send?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In connection with the German program?

Mr. WATKINS. No, the general European program.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Oh, yes.

Mr. WATKINS. Does it include the cost of the equipment?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It includes the cost of the equipment which the European countries are to utilize under the recent program.

Mr. WATKINS. Can the Senator advise me as to how much is allocated to that particular purpose?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I refer the Senator to the excellent report prepared by the staff of the committee, which gives on pages 5 and 6 the detailed allocations to the different nations. On page 8 the report indicates how the various amounts will be reduced by the $1,000,000,000 adjustment, which is a 12.6 percent reduction. The Senator from Utah will find how each title is divided and what the allocation is to each country. It is a very fine study.

I might say, Mr. President, at this point, that I am very hopeful that all of my colleagues will study the committee's report before they come to their final decision on the bill. In it we have attempted to cover the most important items to which we were permitted to give publicity, and they are assembled for use by the entire Senate. It is such a valuable report that I cannot help emphasizing the importance of Members of the Senate using it.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I have one further question. I have recently been in conversation with some Members of the Senate who claim that the material we are going to send is not included in the authorization; that is, it is not a part of the $6,900,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The only thing I can imagine on which the Senator's question could be based is the proposal raised in the House that possibly, in case of necessity, some of the armament intended for our domestic defense might be transferred to the Mutual Security Program. That would be out of the domestic program rather than out of the foreign-aid program. I do not believe that it would be necessary to do that if we appropriate the amount required for the foreign-aid budget.

The cooperative effort to build collective security must not be endangered by the action of the United States or by any one of our partners. We must all pull together. The choice is between having partners in this disordered world and working together for collective security, or withdrawing to a so-called Gibraltar of our own, isolated and alone. I see no middle ground between the choices. If we are going to have partners, let us carry out the understanding we have with them; and after they have undertaken the building up of their own armed forces to meet the requirements agreed to in Lisbon, let us not let them down by saying, "After reconsidering we find that we cannot give you the equipment needed for your armies."

We have already seen how much can be done in a year's time when determined and effective leadership is applied to the task of developing collective security. Starting practically from scratch, General Eisenhower, with his genius for organization and teamwork, has dispelled much of Europe's doubts and fears, and has fostered a genuine spirit of cooperation within the NATO program. There has been a difference of opinion on that point, but I myself have been abroad, and have talked with the general and his aides. I have also talked with members of the governments and with citizens of the respective countries, and the difference of feeling in Europe between 2 years ago and last summer was amazing. I am told this feeling of determination and hope is increasing all the time.

Under the leadership of General Eisenhower, the Western Europeans are developing a real sense of responsibility, and a willingness to make the sacrifices necessary for their own defense. The earlier pessimism which was evident in 1948 when I was in Europe, and the temptation to assume an attitude of neutrality and to say, "We had better be neutral and not become involved in this movement," are giving way to a new hope, a new pride, and a greater degree of self-respect.

Let me speak again about our partners in this enterprise. I wonder how many of us realize that at this very moment the nations cooperating in the NATO program actually have more men under arms in Europe than the United States has the world over, including our operations in Korea and everywhere else.

Mr. President, in this connection I ask unanimous consent to have two charts printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the charts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHART A.—*Active military forces, Western Europe, United States, and Canada, Jan. 1, 1952 (excludes para military forces)*

	Population	Active forces located in North Atlantic Treaty area	Percent of population
Belgium-Luxemburg	8,980,000	136,000	1.5
Denmark	4,310,000	26,000	.6
France	42,400,000	593,000	1.4
Italy	47,000,000	[1] 314,000	.7
Netherlands	10,300,000	84,000	.8
Norway	3,310,000	30,000	.9
Portugal	8,570,000	73,000	.9
United Kingdom	50,900,000	624,000	1.2
Total, Western Europe	175,770,000	1,880,000	1.1
		Active forces world-wide	
United States	156,000,000	3,465,000	2.2
Canada	14,100,000	91,000	.6

[1] Certain para military forces included.

NOTE.—Western European forces exclude those located outside the North Atlantic Treaty area such as the French forces in Indochina. United States and Canadian forces are world-wide.

CHART B.—*Active and readily mobilizable military forces, Western Europe, United States, and Canada, Jan. 1, 1952 (excludes para military forces)*

	Population	Active and readily mobilizable forces, world-wide	Percent of population
Belgium-Luxemburg	8,980,000	250,000	2.8
Denmark	4,310,000	123,000	2.9
France	42,400,000	1,929,000	4.5
Italy	47,000,000	[1] 852,000	1.8
Netherlands	10,300,000	220,000	2.1
Norway	3,310,000	184,000	5.6
Portugal	8,570,000	168,000	2.0
United Kingdom	50,900,000	1,525,000	3.0
Total, Western Europe	175,770,000	5,252,000	3.0
United States	156,000,000	3,988,000	2.6
Canada	14,100,000	[2]	[2]

[1] Certain para military forces included.
[2] Not available.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, chart A shows the number of active military forces by countries, the United States, Western Europe, and Canada. It shows that the countries located in Western Europe, have a total of 1,880,000 men.

I place these figures in the RECORD because I have been asked so many times, "What evidence have we? What are the official figures of the men today available in active service?" That information is contained in chart A.

Mr. President, chart B shows the number of men in active service, readily mobilizable, under the Lisbon plan. It shows by countries the active and readily

mobilizable forces in Western Europe, and in the United States, and Canada. Under the Lisbon plan, 50 divisions are to be available by December 31, 1952. Twenty-five of those divisions are to be active, and 25 are to be readily mobilizable. That will depend largely on the speed with which we increase our own production and furnish these countries with the equipment necessary to make those divisions mobilizable.

Of the 25 active divisions planned for the end of this year, roughly 80 percent are active divisions as of May 1. I have brought these figures as nearly down to date as I could.

Of the 4,000 operational aircraft planned for the end of 1952, somewhat more than 50 percent are now available. As shown on chart B, the readily mobilizable manpower of Western Europe as of January 1, 1952, for all three services was 5,025,000 men, taking them altogether as of the first of this year. The ground element of these forces was sufficient to man not only the 50 divisions committed to SHAPE—that is the Eisenhower over-all NATO organization—which are receiving matériel under MDAP, but also to man such additional units as home defense forces, territorial guards, and the necessary logistic and tactical support units.

The information relating to the distribution of this manpower I obtained from the Department of Defense, within the last week or so.

These figures, when combined with the other testimony presented to our committee, make it clear that we have already achieved a military force in Europe that would have to be reckoned with by any potential aggressor. Much has been accomplished in a short time. By approving this program at the level which the committee recommends, we believe that the NATO partners can achieve a degree of military preparedness which should deter any immediate aggression. With the completion of the 3-year program in the fiscal year 1954, NATO and the new European army should have strength sufficient to deter any future aggression. This accords with the testimony of General Gruenther and with the testimony of members of the Department of Defense.

In other words, the 3-year plan contemplates approximately $25,000,000,000 for these programs to build up European defense. The plan aims at having Europe in a state of preparedness to resist aggression by the end of the fiscal year 1954, which is to be the final year for the heavy build-up.

It is these forces which we are helping to equip by the appropriations authorized in title I of the pending bill. These are the forces that will be defending their homelands in the case of attack. To the extent these nations are able to defend themselves, so also will our own security be strengthened and future demands on us be progressively reduced. We are accomplishing by this program what we had all hoped for, namely, that the nations of Western Europe could build up their manpower to defend their own lands; that with our aid they could strengthen their economies and ultimately equip their manpower. By doing this we are lessening the potential danger of being called upon to send our troops to Europe in case of a war. I cannot emphasize that point too strongly.

Now let me briefly take up the bill by titles.

Title I provides two types of assistance for Western Europe: First, military assistance of $3,620,317,000 which is the amount reached after the 12½ percent cut was made by the Foreign Relations Committee—and second, defense support assistance of $1,588,922,000. Military assistance will help provide weapons to be used by the 50 divisions anticipated by the Lisbon plan. Furthermore, this money will buy equipment for additional divisions to be brought into being during 1953 and 1954.

In connection with the Lisbon conference understandings, let me call the attention of my colleagues to pages 19 and 20 of the committee report. Again I wish to pay tribute to the committee's staff for getting this report together, because they have placed under appropriate headings the different subjects about which we are all asked questions such as, What was the Lisbon conference? What is the defense spending idea? What is the status of the Far East? And so on. Every one of those items is covered in detail in different sections of the report.

In the bill reference is made to defense support assistance. That does not refer to direct military end items, but to defense support assistance. This is an item frequently attacked by critics who call it economic aid. It is economic aid only in the sense that it is in support of European defense. Furthermore, it is a part, indirectly of our own defense.

There have been some suggestions for limiting our aid to purely military end items, but it is obvious that unless we give this defense support, we will have to continue indefinitely furnishing military end items from this country. We want to get away from that, and to get those countries in a position where they can equip themselves and furnish their own military end items, such as their own artillery, tanks, and airplanes.

However, once we have provided these European divisions with capital equipmen and given the countries of Western Europe the boost they need in order to get their own defense production under way, we should be able to reduce the size of American contributions. I am sure that our European friends expect this, and plan now for the time when our aid will greatly diminish and eventually cease. I have talked personally with a great many of them. It is not good for Western Europe to continue to rely on our help. Free nations must stand together, but no nation is free if it continues for a long period of time either in the role of donor or in the role of beneficiary.

I now leave the subject of title I with the emphasis that what we are doing under title I is giving strength to the European nations to enable them to equip their own divisions for their own home defense, with their own manpower.

TITLES II, III, AND IV

I pass now to titles II, III, and IV. I consider, first, the authorization in those titles for military assistance.

Title II has to do with the Near East and Africa. Title III has to do with Asia and the Pacific; and title IV has to do with the American Republics. I wish to discuss those titles in order, and briefly.

A detailed breakdown of the authorizations requested for 1953 for those countries appears on pages 5 and 6 of the report of the committee. On pages 7 and 8 there is a table showing the reduction, title by title, caused by the committee amendment, cutting $1,000,000,000 from the entire bill. A study of the tables on these pages sets forth clearly the way in which the subject has been handled by the committee.

Without taking the time of the Senate to go into that subject in detail, let me say that I believe that Members of the Senate who will study the tables will see the care with which the committee went into each item, and how the entire bill was built up. The bill was not introduced and then referred to the committee. After the President's message was referred to the committee we produced an original bill, which was reported by the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. CONNALLY].

Considering the military assistance authorization in titles II, III, and IV—and I am emphasizing the military assistance at this moment—let us examine the areas which we are helping, and the reason for the aid.

In the Near East we are helping Greece and Turkey to build and maintain their armed forces. Those countries are now our full partners in the North Atlantic Pact, as the Senator from Texas has pointed out. Each of those states has shown its desire to meet the threat of militant communism, and a determination to fight for its liberty. The strength of those countries poses a great deterrent to a Soviet attack on Western Europe, because of the strategic flank positions which they occupy. When we think of the map of the eastern Mediterranean, and what it would mean to Western Europe if Russia were to swoop down and sweep over those countries, we can see why it was important to bring Greece and Turkey into the NATO picture immediately.

Last July I had the privilege, with eight other colleagues on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, of visiting this area, as well as the other Atlantic pact countries in Europe. In a quick 2-week trip, made for the purpose of gaining some first-hand understanding of the problems of the area, we covered France, England, Spain, Greece, Turkey, Italy, and Western Germany.

We were especially concerned with the Mediterranean area, and visited Spain on the west and Greece and Turkey on the east. In Greece and Turkey we were particularly gratified to find an increase in morale and in the ability of the two countries to contribute to the NATO program. As a matter of fact, in addition to the 50 divisions contemplated for Western Europe at the recent Lisbon

conference, 20 additional divisions from Greece and Turkey can be added to our total strength for the whole Altantic Pact area. Those 20 divisions from Greece and Turkey are today equipped, because of the aid we have given them in the past. They are combat-worthy.

I may add that Iran, Turkey's neighbor, has a frontier with the Soviet Union of about 2,000 miles. Some of our military assistance funds are programed for Iran. We are all aware of the tense situation there at the present time, because of the oil difficulties.

Passing to title III, we come to the Far East, where military assistance is authorized in the amount of $533,859,000. The larger portion of this fund will go to Formosa and to Indochina. Those countries have both shown their willingness to make supreme sacrifices in meeting Communist military attack. In Formosa is the Nationalist army of approximately 500,000 men—few people realize the strength of that army—which is now being trained by our own military experts, I am happy to say, in order to be available, first, for the defense of Formosa against an attack by Communist China, and, second, as a reserve in the event Communist China should attack Indochina.

I digress for a moment to say that, of course, the French are carrying the load of the defense of Indochina at the present time. We have a responsibility to help our French allies in that matter. One of the ways we propose to do it is by building up this backdoor defense, which may be very useful to us in case there should be an attack.

In the event of an attack by the Chinese Communists we would be in a position to attack them from the rear with anti-Communist Chinese troops. In Indochina our aid is primarily to help the French, who are carrying on a defensive war, which the western powers are supporting in order to prevent the possible conquest of the area by Moscow-dictated Communist China.

Under title III, a small amount of military aid will go to the Philippines, Indonesia, Burma, and Thailand, to help strengthen those areas.

I now turn to title IV. Here we have a program for building up the strength of Latin America. The military program calls for an authorization of $62,400,000 to complete the equipment of forces in Latin America able to give the United States military support in this hemisphere in the event of war. I have been especially concerned about the appropriations for Latin America. I wanted to be sure that we are not becoming involved in a military assistance program which would be of no help to us, or which might continue interminably. During the hearings on this bill I asked General Olmsted, who appeared for the Department of Defense, whether in the fiscal year 1954 we would have to repeat this authorization of funds for Latin America.

General Olmsted assured us that this year's program should complete the capital equipment of the Latin American forces required to fit into the hemispheric defense plans, and that thereafter we shall be "over the hill" on capital investment, and will be able to fall back to the "maintenance level."

ECONOMIC AID AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

I now pass to another subject, which has been very controversial and concerning which I think there should be a full explanation. I refer to the subject of economic aid and technical assistance. Thus far I have devoted my attention primarily to the military side of our assistance program. I now wish to direct a few remarks to the programs of economic and technical assistance, especially in the Near East, Asia, and the Pacific.

As my colleagues are aware, I have supported the modest programs of technical assistance which were begun in 1950. I continue to support those programs because I believe that the most critical areas in the world-wide struggle between freedom and communism are those parts of the world where millions of people are living at the subsistence level. In the vast areas of the Middle and Far East millions of people have been living so close to starvation that they would gladly sell what little freedom they have for the mere promise of better things. We all know that the Communists are long on promises but short on performance, but they certainly have been successful in selling their propaganda. Let me add here that we are under great handicaps in dealing with these areas because of the widespread suspicion built up by the Russian propaganda machine, that the western powers have purely imperial and colonial designs. This is a matter that needs our immediate attention.

I believe it is possible that the conflict between communism and freedom may be won or lost in the underdeveloped areas of the Middle East and Far East. Possibly that is because I have been there two or three times and I have gotten the feeling of the area. I have talked with the natives, and I feel rather sure that I know what they are thinking of and groping for. I do not believe, however, that we can ever buy people's loyalties with money alone. It is not primarily monetary aid that I am advocating, but a point of view and a program to assist these people in developing their economies in order that they may earn their own way without aid from the outside. It is probably true that one of communism's strongest weapons in these areas is the distortion of the story of America—a twisting of our economic and industrial success into the lie that Americans believe that money can be used to solve all problems.

We must be extremely careful that programs of technical assistance do not become give-away programs. We cannot take the responsibility for feeding and clothing the millions of Asia. We might like to do it, but we simply cannot do it. It is out of the question. It is a burden no nation could assume. Nor can we assume responsibility for raising the standard of living throughout the entire world. I believe a mistake has been made in some quarters in thinking that we can raise the general standard of living throughout the entire world. I do not share that view. What we can do is to help these people help themselves and give them the benefit of the know-how which years of experience has brought to us. We do have a responsibility in these underdeveloped areas to demonstrate what technology can produce and what our democracy has to offer. At the same time we must make certain that our representatives do not attempt to impose American techniques and standards.

Sometimes when we become enthusiastic we may try to force an idea on others. I am opposed to such a course. We must not allow any of our representatives to go to other countries and try to impose Americanism on them. We can show them that freedom and independence can be won by dedicated and constructive self-help and mutual aid. At a modest cost we can show them what they are capable of doing for themselves. As I see it, we should be moving forward with that concept.

Dr. Bennett, who headed the Technical Cooperation Administration, until his untimely death last year in an airplane accident, stood for the principle of "first things first." First things are the simple things of life. They include know-how in such matters as methods of tilling the soil, in the use of water resources, and in the control of disease. First things definitely do not include mechanization and industrialization for people not yet able to care for their minimum needs. In my opinion, that is a very important distinction which must be made in our approach to these problems.

Let me illustrate by citing a few special cases in which our aid can be of inestimable value. First, let me mention the island of Formosa, to which I previously referred. In addition to the military program there, we can help the people put themselves on a self-sustaining basis and to rehabilitate their island after the years under Japanese occupation.

We all know that the Nationalist Chinese Government has under its command the only substantial, organized group of anti-Communist Chinese in all Asia. That army of 500,000, which I mentioned earlier, is the only organized group of anti-Communist Chinese in Asia. That is a very important point for us to remember. They are on the island of Formosa, where their presence creates heavy economic problems for that normally self-sufficient island. I am advised by all the experts with whom I have discussed the matter that Formosa, without the extra load of the army on its soil, could readily support itself.

Under the program we are presenting to the Senate more than $100,000,000 is tentatively scheduled for economic assistance to Formosa for next year. This money will be used largely to provide the economic backing that is essential if the Chinese forces are to be kept in a state of readiness, not only for their own defense but for use with United Nations forces, should the situation in the Far East so require. These funds will also help to restore the Formosan people to a condition of freedom, independence, and self-sufficiency. This will aid further in building the cooper-

ative spirit on the island today, which those of us who went there saw firsthand, and which has been so well developed by the governor, K. C. Wu, under the direction of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek.

At this point I should like also to pay a tribute to the outstanding work which was done by Mr. Ray Moyer in his work with ECA and the Joint Commission on Rural Rehabilitation. He had a great deal to do with the present peaceful situation which prevails on the island of Formosa and with the cooperation which exists between the Nationalist Chinese and the native Formosans. Dr. Schenck, his successor, is carrying on very effectively in the same field.

ISRAEL AND THE ARAB REFUGEES

Mr. President, I now wish to refer to another area, so as to illustrate further what we can do with effective aid. Direct aid is needed in the case of Israel because of the deplorable condition of the people. On pages 45 through 48 of the committee's report there are outlined two important programs which I wish to emphasize. The first is emergency aid to the new State of Israel, and the second is the Palestine refugee program.

In the bill as reported, the committee has approved the authorization of $66,380,000 for assistance to Israel in order that this new State may be able to deal with the problems created by the heavy influx of European refugees. The State of Israel has courageously assumed responsibility for taking care of millions of homeless people who have fled from persecution in Europe, especially from Germany. It is the settlement of these people that requires our aid at this time. Furthermore, we feel a special interest in and responsibility for the new State of Israel, which has so resolutely started its life under difficult conditions.

In connection with the Palestine refugee program, which is a corollary to the one I have just mentioned, we have provided assistance to help the Arab States meet the problems they face as a result of the influx of nearly a million refugees who fled from Palestine during the recent hostilities there and now live in squalor. The committee bill authorizes an appropriation of $56,772,000 for this fund. This contribution is our share of a program to which many other members of the United Nations contribute.

These two funds for Israel and for the Arab refugees are established to insure a greater degree of stability in the Near East and to give desperately needed aid to resettle thousands of homeless people.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Mr. President, I now come to the general conclusion of my remarks. In summary, let me indicate a few of the premises on which the pending legislation is built:

First. The provisions of the bill with respect to European countries, namely, the countries covered by title I, the Atlantic Pact countries, aim to carry out established congressional policies.

Beginning with the Greek-Turkish Aid Acts in 1947, congressional policy has held that the United States has a vital interest in the defense of Europe against Communist aggression. This policy was crystallized in the Vandenberg resolution in the North Atlantic Pact, in the Mutual Defense Assistance Acts, and finally in the Mutual Security Act of 1951.

Second. The bill reflects certain previous basic decisions as to how this overall policy should be carried out.

It is definitely to the interest of the United States that the European members of NATO should furnish the maximum number of armed forces to the common defense. That is manpower. If this demand on NATO countries of Europe exceeds their economic capabilities—and what we wanted them to contribute did exceed their capabilities—it is to our interest to aid their economies to establish these important results. The alternative would be not to furnish the aid and not to arm their manpower, but to fall back on ourselves. In the event world war III should break out we would have to furnish our manpower and carry on the war in Europe as we did in World War I and World War II.

Third. These congressional policies have been succeeding.

We have only to note the present reasonable stability of Greece and Turkey since we established the Greek and Turkish programs 2 or 3 years ago. We can also note with gratification the great progress in unity growing out of the recent Lisbon understandings.

Fourth. The authorizations in this bill are consistent with the preservation of a sound economy in the United States.

As I stated earlier, my own judgment is that we can make vastly more savings by studying carefully and sharpening our pencils in regard to our domestic military program, rather than by cutting the mutual security program any further.

The building up of European armed forces offers the best method in the long run for reducing the strain on our other defense expenditures. A dollar spent under this program goes further than one spent directly on our own military establishment, because European military costs are lower. As I recall the figures, the cost of maintaining an infantry division in the United States is approximately $160,000,000 annually, whereas the cost of maintaining a division of comparable strength in Europe is approximately $50,000,000 annually. So it is to our advantage to maintain divisions in Europe, rather than to maintain divisions in the United States, if we can get the Europeans to furnish the manpower.

Fifth. The nonmilitary aid programs have a vitally important place in our over-all foreign policy. It is unfortunate that at the present time world conditions prevent us from putting more money into aid of this kind, rather than into a continuing armament race. We are, however, making an important beginning in removing some of the basic causes of turmoil and revolution in the underdeveloped areas of the world. History well may prove that in the long run it is programs of this sort, programs which are working for peaceful change and adjustment, that will have played the most important role in moving us toward the goal of world peace.

FINAL CONCLUSION

So, Mr. President, in final conclusion let me say that I support the Mutual Assistance Act of 1952, as reported by the committee on Foreign Relations without further cuts, because it is a symbol to the world that we are prepared to help our allies and friends to defend themselves, and we wholeheartedly join with them in this program of collective security against Communist aggression.

Let me make this final observation: Neither arms for defense, nor atomic weapons for offense, nor the United Nations, nor other types of leagues for peace, will save America. It is not a mere matter of world organization, however important that may be. A Maginot Line, however strong of itself, is of no avail. The survival of America—and perhaps it may be the very survival of the world that we know—will depend on the careful nurturing of that something that was born years ago and has been struggling to survive ever since: The vision and then the growing reality of man's God-guided destiny, the inherent value of each individual human being, and the release of his own creative energy for his own independent growth. This is, in reality, the cause of the continuing revolt throughout history against the exploitation of the weak by the strong—or, briefly stated, the revolt against human slavery.

Mr. President, this was the wisdom of our forefathers when they paid the price of human sacrifice and suffering for freedom. This is the heritage that has come down to us in America. It is our most precious possession. It is our most valuable weapon to use in the war of ideologies which is sweeping the world. That war of ideologies, Mr. President, is a far more critical war than the war of arms. I am stressing this point because although we are talking about an armaments bill and although I am supporting the bill, I am still maintaining that the war of ideologies is far more important than a war of arms.

So let us arm ourselves militarily because unfortunately that is necessary for our physical security. But let us never forget that this spiritual conflict, grounded in man's faith in his ultimate God-guided destiny, is the real conflict and must be ever before us in the determination of our fundamental international and domestic policies.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MILLIKIN in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, Mr. President, let me congratulate the Senator from New Jersey for his very able speech.

I wonder whether he will clarify some issues which have arisen in my mind in regard to the progress of this movement thus far.

On pages 41 and 42 of the hearings before the Committee on Armed Services,

I note a tabular statement of the amounts which have been appropriated for military assistance, as well as for economic and technical assistance, and the amounts which have been expended, and so forth.

I note that as of January 31, 1952, the Congress had appropriated approximately $14,400,000,000 for these purposes—I read to the nearest $100,000,000. I note further that of that total only $2,300,000,000 had been expended, leaving an unexpended balance of approximately $12,000,000,000.

Furthermore, if that amount is further broken down, as it is on page 41, it is disclosed that of the $10,900,000,000 of the sum which had been appropriated for military assistance, only $1,200,000,000 had been expended, leaving for military purposes an unexpended balance of $9,700,000,000.

Is it the understanding of the Senator from New Jersey that these figures are approximately correct? I refer to the figures appearing on pages 41 and 42.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Those figures were supplied to the Armed Services Committee, were they not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I assume they are the same as the figures which were before the Committee on Foreign Relations. Probably they are the same.

I can say that the Senator from Illinois raises one of the highly important aspects of this entire situation, one to which we have given a great deal of thought and study.

I was disturbed, as was the Senator from Illinois, about what appear to be funds appropriated and unexpended. I have a statement, which I shall place in the RECORD before we conclude this debate, explaining how that has been brought out.

The difficulty under which we are laboring arises because of the fact that unless advance authorizations and appropriations are provided, those who are charged with the responsibility of administering the program are not able to make forward contracts. Many of the things required have to be contracted for in advance; it may take as long as 1, 2, or 3 years to construct them. Under our fiscal policy, we do not permit obligations to be incurred until an appropriation has actually been made. That has been one of our embarrassments. In my own mind, I am not sure that we shall not have to change that practice.

Yet the fact remains that the existence of unexpended balances, so far as the Mutual Security Program is concerned, upon close study does not give me as much concern as I would have if we had different testimony from those in authority.

I am told that by June 1952 all the funds previously appropriated will be obligated, except for possibly $300,000,000 or $400,000,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not an extraordinary situation that when the Congress appropriates $10,900,000,000 under what is declared to be a sense of urgency on the part of the Department of Defense, at the end of January of this year the authorities have been able to expend only approximately $1,200,000,000, leaving unexpended $9,700,000,000?

If these matters were of such urgency, would not we expect the Department of Defense to have made a better record in rushing to Europe the matériel which was said to be so badly needed?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of the criticisms I made when I addressed the Senate last week was based exactly on the point to which the Senator from Illinois is calling attention. The difficulty has been that we have tried to carry on simultaneously a production program of military equipment, military-end items, and what-not, and also our normal program on the home front; and our productive agencies, such as our manufacturing concerns, and so forth, are away behind in their deliveries. We do not pay until the articles are delivered, and delivery has been held up by various factors, with which the Senator is familiar. I am not defending this state of affairs. I agree with everything the Senator says in this regard. I am pointing out, however, the great danger we would be in if we did not authorize the amounts called for in the pending mutual-security bill. I agree with his approach, especially with regard to the domestic military budget. I said in my speech last week that on the $52,000,000,000 domestic program for military expenditures we could probably save from $7,000,000,000 to $8,000,000,000 if we sharpened our pencils and looked carefully at the unexpended balances.

In the case of this program, I feel that there will not be any unexpended balances after the end of fiscal 1952, and that, unless we provide the authorizations contained in the bill we will be cutting off all our military shipments planned for delivery after the fiscal year 1953.

I am advised, from the figures, that what we have committed during the past year will carry through our deliveries and our expenditures during the fiscal year 1953, and that we are now asked to provide authorizations to complete the program in 1954, as was planned at the Lisbon conference. I might enlighten the distinguished Senator by reading a memorandum which was prepared at the request of myself and other Senators on this question. The writer brings up the very point of which the Senator speaks. He says:

> I am somewhat at a loss to understand the source of your information that there is a 7.9 billion surplus for foreign aid left from previous years.

That is the $7,900,000,000 of which the Senator spoke.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; the surplus as of the 31st of January, so far as amounts appropriated but not expended are concerned, as indicated on page 42, is $12,040,000,000, or approximately $12,000,000,000. There may have been subsequent expenditures since the 31st of January, but I should think, at the rate the appropriations were being expended up to that date there would be at least $11,000,000,000 of unexpended appropriations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Irrespective of whether the unexpended balance is $12,000,000,000 or $7,900,000,000, the principle is the same. At any rate, I should like to read this statement. The writer says:

> This figure does not coincide with any which is available here and I can only conclude that it must have been furnished to you by someone who made the common mistake of failing to distinguish between obligations and expenditures. This distinction is of the greatest importance and popular misunderstanding of its precise nature has been the source of much confusion. To explain the distinction properly requires a brief description of what Congress actually does when it makes an appropriation.
>
> When Congress makes an appropriation, we commonly say that Congress is appropriating funds. This naturally gives rise to the impression that Congress is taking physical cash in an amount equivalent to the appropriation and actually placing it in the hands of the executive branch for immediate payment out. This is not the case; instead, Congress is simply granting the executive branch the authority to do two things:
>
> First, to make obligations—

That is, contracts with the producers of needed articles—

> in the amount of such appropriation, that is to make binding commitments (or contracts) to pay out that amount at the date or dates specified in the commitment. When this particular authority to obligate is exercised, and binding commitments are made, we say that the funds are obligated.
>
> Second, to make the expenditures required to carry out such obligations, that is actual payments in cash to the persons to whom such obligations are owed from cash which is available to the Government in the United States Treasury at the time of the payments. At this stage we say that the funds are expended.
>
> Therefore, it is important to remember that under present congressional procedures, the executive branch does not have the authority, unless and until Congress does make an appropriation, either (1) to spend money or (2) to make a contract which will, at some subsequent date, legally require the Government to spend money.
>
> With the foregoing brief explanation of terms, we can turn to the current picture. The facts, as derived from official sources and estimates, are these:
>
> (1) On June 30, 1952, the end of the current fiscal year, it is estimated that of the total amounts heretofore appropriated for foreign-aid purposes, only around $400,000,000 will remain unobligated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But I should like to point out that the $400,000,000 will remain unobligated as well as unexpended.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I continue:

> The balance will either have been "expended," that is, actually paid out in cash, or "obligated," that is, committed to binding contracts for the future delivery of goods. The portion remaining unobligated will be largely, if not entirely related to that part of the foreign-aid program having to do with the furnishing of military assistance. It will consist primarily of three elements: (1) roughly $100,000,000 representing contracts in the process of placement, mostly overseas, which have not been finalized; (2) approximately $100,000,000 for the procurement of items, mostly spare parts, on which final specifications have not been developed; and (3) perhaps $200,000,000, reserved in accordance with sound business practices, to cover future increases in costs, resulting from engineering changes and other ad-

justments, under contracts already placed. This is a normal, not an unusual, situation with respect to military-type procurement at the end of any fiscal year.

(2) On June 30, 1952, it is also estimated that of the total amounts heretofore appropriated for foreign-aid purposes, about $8,900,000,000 will remain unexpended.

However, with the exception of the approximately $400,000,000 referred to in the preceding subparagraph, the entire amount will have been obligated, that is, committed to specific binding contracts. It can be applied only to those contracts. It is not available for any other or new purpose. It will be expended when the goods are ready for delivery, to liquidate these contracts.

(3) Therefore, during the year from July 1, 1952, to June 30, 1953, and in the absence of any new appropriation, the situation would be substantially as follows: existing contracts could be carried out, resulting in the substantial expenditure of the funds which were unexpended but obligated on June 30, 1952. However, apart from the $400,000,000 previously referred to, which though not technically obligated, will be specifically earmarked, the executive branch, insofar as foreign assistance is concerned, would be without authority either to make new contracts (enter into new obligations) or even to expend money for any current requirements except those connected with the liquidation of contracts placed in earlier years.

There is then a further discussion of more of the details of this particular subject.

Mr. President, in the light of the fact that this question has been raised, I ask unanimous consent that the entire statement, which was submitted to me at my request and at the request of other Senators, be incorporated in the RECORD at this point, so that the Senate may have the benefit of the explanation made by the executive branch in regard to unexpended balances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM RE UNEXPENDED AND UNOBLIGATED BALANCES

I am somewhat at a loss to understand the source of your information that there is a "7,900,000,000 surplus for foreign aid left from previous years." This figure does not coincide with any which is available here and I can only conclude that it must have been furnished to you by someone who made the common mistake of failing to distinguish between obligations and expenditures. This distinction is of the greatest importance, and popular misunderstanding of its precise nature has been the source of much confusion. To explain the distinction properly requires a brief description of what Congress actually does when it makes an appropriation.

When Congress makes an appropriation, we commonly say that Congress is appropriating funds. This naturally gives rise to the impression that Congress is taking physical cash in an amount equivalent to the appropriation and actually placing it in the hands of the executive branch for immediate payment out. This is not the case; instead, Congress is simply granting the executive branch the authority to do two things:

First, to make obligations, in the amount of such appropriation, that is to make binding commitments (or contracts) to pay out that amount at the date or dates specified in the commitment. When this particular authority to obligate is exercised, and binding commitments are made, we say that the funds are obligated.

Second, to make the expenditures required to carry out such obligations, that is actual payments in cash to the persons to whom such obligations are owed from cash which is available to the Government in the United States Treasury at the time of the payments. At this stage we say that the funds are expended.

Therefore, it is important to remember that under present Congressional procedures, the executive branch does not have the authority, unless and until Congress does make an appropriation, either (1) to spend money or (2) to make a contract which will, at some subsequent date, legally require the Government to spend money.

With the foregoing brief explanation of terms, we can turn to the current picture. The facts, as derived from official sources and estiamtes, are these:

(1) On June 30, 1952, the end of the current fiscal year, it is estimated that of the total amounts heretofore appropriated for foreign aid pruposes, only around $400,000,000 will remain unobligated. The balance will either have been expended, that is, actually paid out in cash, or obligated, that is, committed to binding contracts for the future delivery of goods. The portion remaining unobligated will be largely, if not entirely, related to that part of the foreign aid program having to do with the furnishing of military assistance. It will consist primarily of three elements: (1) roughly $100,000,000 representing contracts in the process of placement, mostly overseas, which have not been finalized; (2) approximately $100,000,000 for the procurement of items, mostly spare parts, on which final specifications have not been developed; and (3) perhaps $200,000,000, reserved in accordance with sound business practices, to cover future increases in costs, resulting from engineering changes and other adjustments, under contracts already placed. This is a normal, not an unusual, situation with respect to military-type procurement at the end of any fiscal year.

(2) On June 30, 1952, it is also estimated that of the total amounts heretofore appropriated for foreign aid purposes, about $8,900,000,000 will remain unexpended. However, with the exception of the approximately $400,000,000 referred to in the preceding subparagraph, the entire amount will have been obligated, that is, committed to specific binding contracts. It can be applied only to those contracts. It is not available for any other or new purpose. It will be expended, when the goods are ready for delivery, to liquidate those contracts.

(3) Therefore, during the year from July 1, 1952, to June 30, 1953, and in the absence of any new appropriation, the situation would be substantially as follows: Existing contracts could be carried out, resulting in the susbtantial expenditure of the funds which were unexpended but obligated on June 30, 1952. However, apart from the $400,000,000 previously referred to, which, though not technically obligated, will be specifically earmarked, the executive branch, insofar as foreign assistance is concerned, would be without authority either to make new contracts (enter into new obligations) or even to expend money for any current requirements except those connected with the liquidation of contracts placed in earlier years.

You might then properly ask—and this is, in a sense, I believe, the substance of your own inquiry—why it would be serious, in view of the $8,900,000,000 of contracts for foreign aid which will be outstanding on June 30, 1952, and which are scheduled to result in deliveries during the following years, to make no new foreign-aid appropriations for the period June 30, 1952, to June 30, 1953. I shall answer this question in three parts.

(1) A large part of the answer to this question lies in what is known as the problem of lead time, the time it takes from the date on which Congress makes an appropriation (that is, authorizes the making of a contract), to the date when the first item is delivered under that contract. In the case of military procurement, which of course is normally a condition precedent to the delivery of military assistance (and military assistance represents by far the greatest percentage of all foreign assistance) lead time is frequently measured, not in weeks and months, but in years. With respect to aircraft, for example, lead time will vary, depending on the precise type involved, from 2 to almost 3 years. If we are to supply an aircraft for foreign aid in 1954, Congress must authorize a contract for such aircraft now. Consequently, if no new appropriation is made for military assistance for the coming fiscal year, it would mean that no aircraft could be delivered during 1954; foreign aid in the form of aircraft would stop abruptly in 1954; and nothing which Congress or anyone else could do in the following year could possibly correct the situation. There would be an inevitable hiatus in aircraft deliveries of 12 or more months which would be dictated by the simple fact that it takes a minimum of several years to place contracts for, to manufacture, and to deliver an aircraft. While the case of aircraft is extreme, it is to only a lesser degree typical of most of the other major items of military procurement—M-47 tanks (where the manufacturing process alone is 11 months) or mine sweepers (where the comparable figure is 15 months), as further illustrations. And it is precisely this circumstance which accounts for the fact that a large amount of previous appropriations will be obligated but unexpended on June 30, 1952. These unexpended appropriations represent the pipeline which will fill military requirements during the immediately following months. Without a new appropriation, this pipeline would begin to dry up rapidly on June 30, 1953, and could only be rebuilt after the loss of more than a year. Therefore, a decision to make no new appropriation for military assistance procurement at this time necessarily constitutes an immediate decision to abandon virtually all further military assistance to our allies after June 30, 1953.

(2) A second part of the answer to the foregoing question relates to the need for authority during the fiscal year beginning on June 30, 1952, to contract and pay for the costs of packing, transporting to ports, and shipping overseas, the equipment which will be produced during that year under the military-procurement contracts which are represented by the "unexpended" but "obligated" funds on June 30, 1952, and to furnish training in the use of such equipment and other equipment previously delivered. This amount will come to nearly $900,000,000. It cannot be paid for except out of a new appropriation because, as indicated above, all previously appropriated funds will have been obligated—again, of course, with the exception of the $400,000,000 which, though unobligated, is earmarked for specific purposes. In other words, if no such appropriation is made, available equipment could not be delivered and the military-aid program would come to an abrupt halt. It would also be impossible to provide foreign nationals with the training necessary for their effective maintenance and employment of equipment already delivered, and we could expect that our substantial investment in military assistance would be partially dissipated through ignorance on their part of the proper methods for the maintenance, repair, storage, and use of weapons provided.

(3) The final part of the answer pertains to that portion of the foreign aid program

which has to do with defense support, economic and technical assistance. Of the approximately $8,900,000,000 of unexpended but obligated funds on June 30, 1952 (with the exception of the $400,000,000 previously discussed), nearly $8,000,000,000 will represent funds specifically appropriated for military assistance. The balance, slightly over $900,000,000, will represent "obligated" but "unexpended" appropriations for defense support, economic and technical assistance. Many of the considerations which are summarized in the preceding two paragraphs in connection with military assistance are applicable to these other forms of aid as well, with the important qualification (except in the case of machine tools and certain other types of heavy equipment) that the lead-times are much shorter and the necessary pipeline much smaller. Thus, an important portion of the requirements for these other forms of aid during the first months of the year which begins on June 30, 1952, will be, and could only be, met from the "obligated" but "unexpended" balances on that date—the contracts then already placed. However, the funds required to pay the cost of delivering these items, the funds needed to place the contracts necessary to cover requirements for the remainder of the coming year, and the funds essential to carry a modest pipeline into the succeeding year, must all come from a new appropriation. There is no other source, since all previous funds have been "obligated." Failure to provide a new appropriation therefore will inevitably result in a virtual cessation in these other essential forms of aid early next fall. Similarly, the absence of a new appropriation would require the immediate abandonment of the "point 4" program of technical cooperation. That program is dependent upon large numbers of American technicians who are paid on a current basis, and they could not be employed if no new funds were made available.

In summary, therefore, the failure to provide a new appropriation would constitute a decision to terminate all foreign aid. After June 30, 1952, no personnel could be employed and no more goods could be shipped. Moreover, even if a new appropriation covered the costs of shipping goods which had already been contracted for and United States personnel costs incident thereto, it would still represent a decision to abandon all foreign aid at definable future dates—point-4 on June 30; defense support and economic aid a few months hence; and military assistance at a very rapid rate beginning about June 30, 1953. I am sure that you will agree that no more short-sighted and dangerous course could be undertaken by the United States at this time.

This does not mean, however, and again this is a point on which I believe that there is much popular misunderstanding, that because Congress makes a new appropriation for foreign aid for the coming year the amount of such appropriation must be available in cash in the United States Treasury during that year. You will recall my previous statement that the term "appropriation of funds" is really a misnomer, that it means an authorization to make obligations and, when those obligations become due, to make expenditures at that time in discharge of those obligations out of funds then available in the United States Treasury. That means, in the case of that portion of any new appropriation for the coming fiscal year which is to be devoted to military procurement, that most of the cash necessary to cover the resulting contracts will not need to be on hand or represented by Treasury receipts until some time in fiscal year 1954 when these contracts will become due.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the very able Senator from New Jersey a very simple question: Is he satisfied with the deliveries which the Mutual Security Administration has been able to make to foreign countries whom we were supposedly equipping?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No; I am not satisfied with it, and I do not know that we can blame MSA. But we can blame the falling down of production, which is far from reaching the target we expected to reach by this time. I am told we have obtained about 50 percent of what had been expected by this time; so we are behind, not the foreign governments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The foreign countries expected to go ahead. We were behind. Of course, the equipment which is to be delivered is needed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand that. But has the Committee on Foreign Relations gone into the issue as to who is responsible for this failure to effect deliveries?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Committee on Foreign Relations has not conducted an investigation of that situation. I understand that the Committee on Armed Services has given some thought to it. I have had called to my attention by one of the staff the report from which I desire to read briefly. The report of the Committee on Foreign Relations on the pending bill, at page 26, says:

> When asked to explain why shipments of military assistance have been so slow Secretary of Defense Lovett ascribed the delay to the following facts, which apply to domestic military production as well as to the shipments under the military assistance program:
>
> (1) "We were short on machine tools."
>
> (2) "We had inadequate facilities in being."
>
> (3) "Initial scheduling * * * was * * * unrealistic as" it was "based on the peacetime procurement of materials."
>
> (4) "We ran into shortages of all sorts of critical materials like tungsten, columbium, cobalt * * *."
>
> (5) Finally we ran into design complications resulting from the tremendous complexity of much of the present-day military equipment.
>
> Secretary Lovett concluded, however, that the picture is noticeably better today and that shipments should increase rapidly in the months ahead.

So answering the distinguished Senator's question, while we did not go into an exhaustive study of the reasons for the failure to make deliveries, we did, I note from the record, ask Secretary Lovett, and he gave us this summary statement of the reasons.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am informed that the unexpended appropriations for domestic armaments at the end of this year will aggregate almost $55,000,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that the point he has made is the same as the one made by me in my remarks a week ago. I stated at that time that I was confident that if the Foreign Relations Committee and the Committee on Armed Services looked into the matter and they and the Department of Defense could get together and think in terms of amounts definitely obligated and which remain unobligated, we could save in the fiscal year 1953 seven or eight billion dollars. That was my conclusion, and I believe it can be substantiated. I imagine, from what the distinguished Senator from Illinois has said, that he would be glad to cooperate, rather than to favor cutting another billion dollars from the mutual security bill, which has to do with our foreign program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What I am trying to develop is the enormous amount available in the hands of the Department of Defense. They have approximately $55,000,000,000 of unexpended appropriations for domestic defense, to which they are proposing to add $52,000,000,000 more, or a total of $107,000,000,000 which they wish to have available. They had available at the end of January $12,000,000,000 for foreign aid, most of it being for military assistance, and they say that by the end of June they will have $9,000,000,000 available. I think they will have to proceed much faster in the next 30 days than they have in the past if the unexpended balance is to be used.

They are asking for $8,000,000,000 which has been whittled down to approximately $7,000,000,000, and on top of that, approximately $16,000,000,000 for foreign aid.

Mr. President, I have been reading recently the history of the Civil War. There was a young general by the name of McClellan, who, in 1861, until after the peninsula campaign, was the generalissimo. He commanded at the Battle of Antietam. He was constantly calling on President Lincoln for supplies—horses, mules, ammunition, and men—but he was always reluctant to move. I am wondering if the Department of Defense is not a little bit infected with McClellanism, constantly asking for money, money, money, but not possessing a great deal of the sense of urgency to produce results.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If I may distinguish between the Mutual Assistance Program, which has to do with the program of getting divisions organized and equipped in Europe, and the program on the home front, I think the Senator from Illinois and I share the same view. We confront the problem of having materials made and delivered. On the other hand, we are not on a full wartime basis; we are between a full wartime basis and a half wartime basis; and we are in great difficulty in dealing with the problem. As I said a moment ago, we are only approximately 50 percent up to our obligations at this time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has the fault been the lack of appropriations by Congress, or lack of results on the part of industry and the Armed Forces?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Of course, it has been the latter. There have been ample appropriations; there can be no doubt about that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yet every effort is made to place the responsibility on Congress for its failure to appropriate. Congress has been pouring out money.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do not quarrel with that statement, but I want to see the authorization for the program developed at Lisbon carried out, so that we shall not allow our allies abroad, who

are moving ahead, to become discouraged. The worst thing we can do at this moment is to let them get the feeling that we are dragging our heels.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is not the test whether we produce results—not the question of how much we appropriate on paper, but how much stuff we actually send to the countries overseas?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct. If we authorize the program, we should follow through with the appropriations and see that the goods are produced and delivered abroad.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is there not also a responsibility on the part of the Department of Defense to see that the goods are produced and shipped?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct; I agree with the Senator. I am glad he made that point.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from New Jersey, I believe, has properly made the point that the so-called foreign-aid program and the domestic-defense program are really interlocked.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would he approve of, let us say, a possible further cut in foreign aid, with the proviso that if the National Security Council believes that equipping foreign divisions is more important than further equipping our own, there could be a transfer of funds between the domestic-defense appropriation and the foreign-aid authorization and appropriation?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I will say to the Senator that from the careful study which was made—some us went abroad to confer with our allies—I felt when the reduction of $1,000,000,000 was made that I should recommend 10 percent as being the absolute limit we dared to go without jeopardizing the program. Maybe some compromise can be worked out, as the Senator suggests, but I feel that I must defend the recommendations of the committee, because I think we arrived at a sound conclusion. I do not know whether that is a satisfactory answer to the Senator's question, but I sincerely hope there will be no further reduction.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If there were a reduction, any evil effects could be mitigated by a transfer from the domestic-defense appropriation to the foreign-aid program.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think that would have to be explored. With the continuation of the hot war in Korea I would give priority to getting end items to Korea to protect our boys there even at the expense of having partly equipped divisions in America.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That could be left to the judgment of the National Security Council.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. President, in connection with the debate we have just had, there has been handed to me a memorandum on the deliveries of end items under the Mutual Security Program, and I should like to read it into the RECORD if the Senator from Illinois would like to have me do so. It is very short.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to have the Senator read it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The memorandum is furnished by the Mutual Security Agency and reads as follows:

DELIVERIES OF UNITED STATES END ITEMS UNDER THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Although the delivery rate of military matériel under the Mutual Security Program was hard hit by combat demands in Korea and by difficulties in the United States production program, a sharp upswing is now apparent.

Through March 31, 1952, the Department of Defense had supplied $1,925,000,000 worth of military supplies and equipment as grant aid to eligible foreign countries, including $433,000,000 of excess stock. Thus, the average monthly shipments of matériel from new procurement since the start of the program through the end of March were worth about $57,000,000. In March of 1952, matériel to a value of $129,000,000 (including $17,000,000 from excess stocks) was shipped. This increase is not an isolated occurrence; it represents a trend which may be expected to continue.

In terms of measurement tons, the cumulative total, world-wide, as of April 30, 1952, was 3,069,900, not including 311 aircraft and 55 vessels delivered under their own power. Thus, the monthly average is about 113,700 measurement tons, in comparison with the April 1952 figure of 246,550. April shipments could be represented by the departure from United States ports of over one 10,000-ton vessel completely loaded with military equipment every working day during the month of April.

Major items of equipment shipped in April included 1,053 tanks, 7,189 motor vehicles, 501 pieces of artillery, 136 aircraft, and 43 vessels. These figures could be compared with 1,251 tanks, 3,953 motor vehicles, 310 pieces of artillery, 185 aircraft, and 5 vessels in the preceding month and with average monthly figures since the start of the program of 376 tanks, 1,559 motor vehicles, 458 pieces of artillery, 70 aircraft, and 14 vessels.

I think that is an important statement to have in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

[From Business Week of March 22, 1952]

WHAT ABOUT THE FOREIGN-AID BILL?

Big decisions are seldom easy to make. The foreign-aid legislation now before Congress is a good example.

President Truman has asked $7,900,000,000 for defense, defense support, and point 4 assistance to our allies in the next fiscal year. The reaction by and large has been unfavorable. Many Americans wonder if the promised end of foreign aid is ever to come. They feel that foreign aid is being accepted as a permanent budget item both by our Government and by our allies. There is real and justified concern evidenced by the recent statement of the United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce, that this emergency aid is acting like a narcotic, dulling the senses of foreign governments to the critical need for economic and financial reform. Aggravating the situation is the apparent willingness of responsible citizens in some of those countries to indulge in a kind of diplomatic blackmail: Continue your aid, or we will be powerless to build our defenses against communism.

These concerns alone would make the going hard for any new foreign-aid bill. But other factors add still more trouble. There is lack of confidence both in Congress and in the country in what the President and his Secretary of State say is necessary. Congressmen also recall that, even after the Korean war started, the President proclaimed that Marshall-plan recovery in Europe a great success a year and a half and $5,000,000,000 ahead of schedule. To the confusion about Europe's real economic condition is added the President's discount of the immediate Russian threat implicit in stretching out our rearmament program by a full year.

WHERE THE AX IS AIMED

These facts form the background from which have come demands for big cuts in the Presidents' $7,900,000,000 request. The principal target for the slash is the economic aid section, $1,800,000,000 of which $1,400,000,000 is earmarked for the NATO countries. The argument is made that these nations are back to prewar levels of production and, therefore, our help should be limited strictly to military items.

This point is straightforward enough, but the problem stubbornly remains. In the first place, the distinction between military and economic (or defense support) aid is largely a fiction. True, a machine-gun is not the same as a bale of cotton. But the economics of the situation is simply this: The standard of living and the rate of rearmament at any given time in the NATO countries is determined by their internal resources and the help we give them. Less assistance can only mean, in the short run, less rearmament or a lower living standard.

What upset the applecart and caused trouble was the Korean war, which forced these countries to devote a larger slice of production to defense. This threatens living standards that are not yet high enough to take a cut-back in favor of rearmament without trouble.

BAD TIME FOR RETRENCHMENT

Certainly, the time could scarcely be worse for deliberations about what our long-run foreign aid policy should be. Britain's Chancellor of the Exchequer has just revealed that her reserves of gold and dollars are below $1,800,000,000, off more than half a billion dollars in the first 2 months of this year. A conservative government in France is trying to get its roots down in an atmosphere of economic crisis. The European army plan is just emerging.

The issue, it seems to us, is whether we are prepared to face the consequences of a drastic cut in the foreign-aid program now by, say, eliminating all economic aid.

Such a cut means that something in the economies of our allies must give. Is Britain, with a meat ration of less than 20 cents per week, going to pull in her belt some more? Probably not. The more likely result is a cut in the British arms program. That will certainly be the reaction in other countries as well. It should be understood, too, that the cut-back in their defense programs would be more than the reduction in economic aid, since our supplying a critical item can increase their arms output by an estimated $2.50 for every $1 of help. And this cut-back would come at a time when the Russians have just announced a bigger arms budget than ever before in peacetime. Are we prepared to face this consequence?

Such a cut would probably put many of our allies in the position of being forced to resume or expand trade through the iron curtain. Are we prepared to face up to this consequence?

Such a cut might well be the straw that breaks the ability of France to carry on the costly war in Indochina. If Indochina should go by default, that would mean the end of a free southeast Asia, and it would ultimately mean huge American outlays to sustain the economy of an isolated Japan. Are we prepared for this?

These consequences are compelling. They illustrate why the decision before Congress is difficult. They counsel extreme caution in slashing foreign aid drastically at this time. It may be that the way to cure a convalescent is to deny him care and medicine. But it

can lead to a relapse. Contributing to a relapse now among our allies is a big risk to run. It is a risk we should not run. But as we move to meet the problem of the immediate future, we, together with our allies, must summon up the intelligence and energy to find a lasting solution to restore them to economic self-reliance.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Washington Post of April 30, 1952]

SENSIBLE TRIMMING

If the mutual-security bill had to be cut, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee picked a wise way to do it. In paring the over-all request of $7,900,000,000 by $1,000,000,000, or 12.66 percent, the committee applied the reductions pretty much across the board instead of heavily to individual items. Moreover, it left untouched the provision for a 10-percent transfer of funds from one category to another within any particular geographic area. This would enable the administration to meet the most urgent needs and parcel out the cuts where they could best be sustained.

Particularly fortunate, we think, was the decision to retain $1,500,000,000 of the $1,800,000,000 for defense support. This is much more than is implied by certain Members of Congress by the much maligned phrase "economic aid"; it has a direct bearing on what the countries of Western Europe will be able to contribute to defense. To take just one example, France is producing a good jet fighter plane, the Mystere, which is said to be the equal of the Russian MIG–15. This production, however, is a heavy burden on the French economy, and there has been some indication that France cannot support the number of divisions she has promised and continue manufacture of the Mystere at the same time. Defense support funds will enable her to do both.

The bill, of course, has passed only the first hurdle, the authorization rather than the actual appropriation has been approved in committee, and the full Senate must pass on both. We hope that other legislators will be as judicious as the Foreign Relations Committee, recognizing both the need for prudent economy and the fact that certain commitments are irreducible. What is imperative to keep in mind is that the contributions other countries are able to make to the joint defense are closely keyed to what the United States itself does.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the Christian Science Monitor of May 10, 1952]

HOW MUCH CUT IN ARMS AID?

The prevalent American mood—and it is a healthy one in view of the need for national economy—is not to assume that any part of the Federal budget is sacrosanct or immune from possible reduction. Though we believe foreign military and technical aid are of great importance to defense of the United States and the free world, we are not disposed to insist that the full $7,900,000,000 requested by President Truman and the administration for that purpose must be appropriated at all costs.

It does appear to us, however, that the $6,900,000,000 which the Senate Foreign Relations Committee proposes probably represents the bottom level to which that fund can be cut with safety. This deduction is reinforced by the judgment General Eisenhower has expressed to Senator CONNALLY, the committee chairman, in answer to the latter's inquiry.

The allied commander in Paris says that while any cut would retard the build-up of forces, moderate cuts can be asborbed without critical damage, but that substantial reduction in finished military items would slow up the equipping of divisions and reduction in defense support would have a peculiarly adverse effect. Defense support includes the supplying of raw materials for munitions to be manufactured in Europe. It is crucially important in France just now.

The Senate committee's plan would make an across-the-board cut in aid totals, military or economic, for all regions, Europe, Asia, Africa, the Near East, and Latin America, while leaving an administration authority to reallocate up to 10 percent of the various categories according to need. This seems preferable either to a reduction concentrated on the European portion of the funds or to a cut of around $2,000,000,000 or more, which some advocate.

General Eisenhower recognizes explicitly the importance of America's solvency to her own security and the need of balancing the obvious risks of attack against the equally obvious risks of ruinous spending. The attainment of a secure military posture could be delayed somewhat and the stress of rearming be leveled out a bit if America and her allies were absolutely and irrevocably committed to carrying through. But do those who propose deeper cuts mean correspondingly to prolong their efforts?

"My own belief," says the Allied commander, "is that this purpose (ultimate establishment of security and peace) will become more expensive if it is unnecessarily postponed, dragged out, and delayed." This is the expert opinion of a military administrator; but it coincides with the probabilities that a weak American showing in Europe would promote neutralism there whereas vigor in that area is visibly attracting vigor.

American production, it may be noted, has kept up so well with the demands for civilian goods and armaments at the same time as to allow some relaxing of anti-inflation controls. From this it looks as if America can carry a $6,900,000,000 foreign-aid and security program without undue strain.

EXHIBIT 4

[From the New York Times of May 26, 1952]

CUTTING CORNERS ON A DANGEROUS ROAD

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

With the signing today of the treaty giving virtual independence to West Germany the second phase of the struggle for Europe begins. No seasoned observer of the war-shadowed stage on which we live and act, each playing his infinitesimal part in the great drama, doubts that the solemn scene in Bonn this morning is the curtain raiser on a new and climactic act.

Bonn is a frontier town. On the western bank of the Rhine, it is a long way from Berlin and those eastward pulls that have always divided this restless middle ground of Europe, though less than ever before, perhaps, during the present period of actual dismemberment and Russian power. Bonn is the capital of the Germany that looks westward, currently the dominant Germany; but it is a provisional capital of a provisional state, and it would be foolish to pretend that the decision registered today, the most momentous since the war, will not have consequences, for good or ill. For the Germans and the Western Powers it is a calculated risk.

The Bonn treaty marks a turning point in western policy. The three governments responsible for the occupation and revival of West Germany have not reached this turn without disputes, misgivings, and backtracking. Even now France goes along with her partners conditionally and with fingers crossed. It is clear to all the contractual parties, and to the Germans most of any, that the road they open is beset with known dangers and unknown ambushes. But doing nothing and allowing the Russians to take the initiative in filling the power vacuum in the center of Europe is even more dangerous. It is a gamble for the highest stakes. If Korea and Berlin, or Japan and Germany, are focal spots in a conflict as fateful as we believe it to be for the future of mankind, then the choice is between playing boldly with all the cards available or letting the Kremlin win the game.

CRITICAL PHASE TO COME

It is certain that with today's action we enter the most critical phase of the cold war. The decisive battles lie ahead, and these battles require all the visible strength, unified policy, and reserve force the Western World can muster. This is so obvious that it is frightening to perceive Congress and large sections of the American public thinking and acting as if the contest were over and there is no need either to step up our own defense effort or to push and prod our allies in the Atlantic Pact to fill up with arms and men the wide gaps in the thin front line that tempts the aggressor to move through.

It is almost incredible that Congress should choose this moment of crisis to slash at the Mutual Security Program. The arbitrary cuts made in the items of economic aid, designed to enable European nations to manufacture their own arms, are the least justifiable of all cuts, and the most extravagant, on our part. But even if they are justified, nothing could be more ill-timed and irresponsible, in terms of American interests, than to broadcast them at this point. Our main concern just now is to strengthen the majority in Western Europe, which stands with us on the defense program—which stands in front of us, as far as that goes. This majority is being constantly harassed and undermined by a noisy minority crying out against the crushing burden of rearmament and against making Europe the battleground for the Russian-American war. These non-Communist opposition groups will be as delighted as the Communists at signs that the United States is reducing its support of the arms program.

DEFENSE IS THE LOSER

Besides the incredibly bad timing there is the question of how much the whole NATO program will suffer if we begin to knife it. At Lisbon the members were persuaded to agree on a $14,000,000,000 armament budget for 1953 based on a specified amount of aid from this country. If our aid is cut, their appropriations will be pared down also, with the result that the goals will have to be lowered all around and we shall lose in general defense far more than we save.

To lower the goals is courting disaster. It is all very well to say, as increasing numbers of Americans are saying, that aid to Europe "can't go on forever." Certainly it cannot, and quite as certainly defense expenditures can be pruned without impairing their effectiveness. Several objective surveys have demonstrated where savings can be intelligently made. But the overriding fact is that the period of greatest peril is approaching, and the one thing we cannot afford is to deceive ourselves or discourage others by so much as a hint that the strain can be lessened, when in fact it must be increased. The political and psychological effect of the congressional attitude, particularly if it spreads the idea that we are more interested in the party contest at home than in the world contest, could crack the ramparts we are building up at such cost.

They are still only a framework to be filled in. The West is nowhere near the safe plateau of preparedness or the peak of expenditures for defense. The pressing problem is how to get there with the least possible delay. Beyond every other consideration is the necessity of quickening the pace so that there will be force in the West to make the free nations feel secure enough to assume the diplomatic, political, and moral lead which they cannot back up when they

are physically weak. There's not much sense in making a great noise about cutting corners until you have enough wind to round the big corner looming menacingly just ahead.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I have noticed that during the debate on the very important bill which is now the unfinished business of the Senate there have not been 10 Senators on the floor at any time; therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERGUSON in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded, and that further proceedings in connection with the order be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMY IN THE 1953 FISCAL BUDGET

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in my office in the Senate Office Building, I have, like most of my colleagues, several special files. In one of them is a folder which has a little blue label reading "The Butters."

"Butters," in the English language, is the designation of a new group of people.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, would the Senator mind repeating the word?

Mr. BRIDGES. "Butters." I may say to the Senator from Georgia that I shall explain it as I go along. It is a new concoction that has been developed in the language of America. It might be concerned with food or agricultural matters, or something like that, but really it is not.

This special folder keeps letters from the "But people." Senators know whom I mean. I mean the folks who are for or against something, "but" not as it concerns themselves.

Most of the letters going into that file nowadays come from folk who are for economy, but not as it affects something which they personally want from the Government. They say, "Get the budget down to a reasonable level, but don't cut this item from the defense requests," or "Economize, but don't eliminate this special agency under the Independent Offices budget," or "Cut costs, but wait until next year before doing anything.

Most Senators have many "but" people in their States. They are developing all over the country, not by the hundreds, but by the thousands, the ten thousands, and for all I know, by the millions. The people of my State are no different. I think they are a little more conservative "butters" than are to be found in some other sections of the country and I think there are fewer of them in my State. I wish to read a letter which I have received from one of these people:

DEAR STYLES: I understand Harry is asking for quite a lot of money again. That means I'll be working into May to pay my taxes. Up to now I could work for myself after the middle of April.

Now, listen here. You know what a name you've got for stopping this sort of thing. We want our money's worth when we spend anything. Give 'em hell, Styles, and tell them to stop spending money like a drunken sailor. That's our dough they're talking about and we'd like to spend a little of it ourselves.

Yours.

I omit the name of the writer.

Then there is a postscript:

P. S.—When you come to the money for OPS, remember my brother-in-law is still working for them and you know how hard it is to make him work at all. Fact is, he says he still doesn't do so much down there, but the pay is good. If I can keep him on the payroll anywhere, I won't have him up here on my money. He got the job through one of Harry's boys which is bad enough, but don't let's do anything that will get him out of work now.

That is a letter from a personal friend. I omit the name of the man who wrote it, because he is a good citizen. However, he is a "butter."

That is one example of the "but" letters, and it comes from my State. However, I will say that New Hampshire has fewer "butters" than most of the other States. The writer is for economy, but he does not want us to do anything which would take off the payroll one special person among the 2,535,891 Federal civilian employees who are increasing at the rate of 500 a day.

The "but" people are amusing, and they are confusing. They do not fool me, and I do not believe they fool other Senators, particularly those on this side of the aisle. They should not fool us.

The trouble with the "but" clan is that they do not want to face up to the issue. They know that something must be done, or should be done, about the spending "smog" which has been raised around our national operations for the past 20 years. But they have not the courage to surrender their own little whims or selfish desires for the common good of the Nation.

The tragedy of the "but" people is that they do not seem to realize that the longer they put off action the tougher will be the day of reckoning which we all know is inevitable. We know that we cannot avoid settling accounts. We have only to look at history to realize that. Throughout the story of man, nations have tried to use a charge account to ease their way to power and prosperity. Just as night follows day, history shows that such governments have been wrecked by their own loose fiscal policies.

Since 1933 this Nation has been on a spending rampage which was first aimed at restoring prosperity; next it was to win the war. For a brief period it was to maintain so-called good times. Now the object of all the spending is to keep us strong.

I have no quarrel with any of those objectives, if they are truly the aims of the program. But I am firmly convinced that the main purpose of this dollar delirium has been to maintain the Democractic Party in power. If ever there was evidence to support that conviction, it is in the budget which is now before this session of the Congress.

There are some who will quarrel with that conviction. But before they attack me, I suggest that they consider this statement:

We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of Government expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidation of departments and bureaus, and eliminating waste and extravagance to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government.

Well do we remember that language. It is a direct quotation from the Democratic platform of 1932, the one on which the Democratic Party came into power back in that year. They proposed to eliminate all waste in Government, reduce expenditures, to eliminate duplicating departments, and accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the expenses of Government. That is the program on which they came into office.

Let us look a little further. If anyone doubts my statement that the spending program was generated with a view to the party remaining in power, try to reconcile this platform pledge with the fact that on pages 100 and 140 of the current budget proposal there is listed an expenditure of $1,337 for land and structure, under the title of NRA. Imagine that, Mr. President. The NRA was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States 17 years ago. Yet the President sends up a budget this year with an item in it for NRA, which was supposed to go out of business 17 years ago. It is called "a tight budget, an accurate budget." That is "bunk," when there is an item in it for the NRA, which was declared unconstitutional 17 years ago.

The pledge of economy which the Democrats made was never fulfilled. The promise made by one of the leading apostles of the early New Deal, the late Senator Joseph T. Robinson of Arkansas, floor leader of the Democrats during the early years of the Roosevelt regime, has never been fulfilled. According to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 21, 1933, Mr. Robinson said:

It is my conviction, and I am convinced that this conviction is shared by millions of my countrymen, that there is more than hope in the action which the Congress has taken in complying with the President's suggestion that he be given the power to effect the economies which we must have through the application of general principle clearly defined by law. There is promise that we shall reach the objective—balancing of the Federal budget—so sorely needed and so grievously and dangerously delayed by the previous administration. The day of fulfillment cannot come too soon.

Think of that. That was the statement of the Democratic leader who was one of the predecessors of the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND]. He was the Democratic floor leader at the time when the Senator from New Hampshire first came to the Senate.

The statement of Mr. Robinson, the Democratic floor leader at that time, and the statements of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman each year when they delivered their messages to Congress—and I have gone over them—remind me a good deal of Mark Twain. On the occasion of a certain New Year Day, when he was considering New Year resolutions, he said, "This year I am going to live within my income, even if I have to borrow money to do it."

Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Truman, and all the other gentlemen directing the affairs of this administration for the past 20 years

have taken a leaf out of Mark Twain's book. They were determined to live within their income, even if they had to borrow money to do it; and they have borrowed plenty.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall be glad to yield if the Senator from Arizona has something to contribute.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have nothing to contribute. I should like to have a little more information. I was not in the Senate in the dark days of 1933. I wonder whether the Senator from New Hampshire would mind telling me whether he voted for the appropriations back in 1933.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, back in 1933 I was not here either. That was a little bit before my time. I was not elected until 1936. I was not here during those early days. But we can all remember the voice of that great master Franklin D. Roosevelt when he went on the radio. His voice would bring chills to Americans when he spoke about our need to live within our income, like any prudent family, and when he spoke against loose fiscal policies. I did not become a member of the Senate until the 3d of January 1937. When I entered the Senate I was starting to become rather disillusioned. Each year I became more so.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, both of us, then, are free to comment on 1933, 1934, 1935, and 1936 as to what we might have done.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. In a few minutes I shall come to the years when the Senator from Arizona and I became Senators. I wanted to give some background first.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I believe that the Senator from New Hampshire was Governor of his State at the time I was Governor of my State. I wonder whether the Senator recalls that in the days of 1933, 1934, and 1935, 15,000,000 people were out of employment, and the country was on the verge of collapse.

It was only because of the leadership of the then President of the United States, Franklin Roosevelt, that the millions of unemployed in the main returned to work, and that the solvency and the effectiveness of the Nation were saved. I wonder whether the good Senator from New Hampshire recalls that fact.

Mr. BRIDGES. I recall a great deal about those days, let me say to the Senator from New York. I remember, too, that as we edged out of an era of spending, what brought prosperity to the country—and it was a phony prosperity—was World War II. The cost of World War II was in the hundreds of billions of dollars and the loss of hundreds of thousands of American lives. World War II was the contributing factor to our so-called prosperity in that era, just as now, since the development of the Korean situation, in which we have suffered almost 115,000 casualties. No one need talk to me about Democratic prosperity, because it is phony prosperity.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. On the point about the so-called return of prosperity, I should like to invite the Senator's attention to certain facts. I had occasion to check into this subject a few days ago. Under the Republican administration, beginning in 1921 and through 1932, the average national income was sixty-nine-plus billion dollars a year.

Mr. Roosevelt took over in 1933. He was going to save 25 percent and cut down on Federal employment, balance the budget, and so forth. During the peacetime years, and during his complete control of the economy, because of a subservient Congress, from 1933 through 1939, which were the peacetime years of Mr. Roosevelt's reign, the average national income was $58,500,000,000.

It was $10,500,000,000 less a year under the magical influence of President Roosevelt than it was in the peacetime administration of the Republicans, including that terrible year 1932, about which we hear so much and which was such a bad year.

Not only was the annual national income during the stewardship of the Democrats, under their management of the Nation's economy, $10,500,000,000 less than under the Republican administration, but there was an increase of more than $20,000,000,000 in the national debt, which was money borrowed from the accumulation of the public and pumped into savings by way of leaf-raking and other made and false programs of work.

Mr. President, Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle talk about prosperity, but the Senator from New Hampshire is absolutely right when he says that they never brought prosperity under a self-sustaining and self-supporting economy until they put a million men in uniform and gave them a year's training and began to let war contracts and to force the economy in order to get us into World War II.

We have lived on hysteria and fear and threats to the economy to the United States which emanate from the White House periodically. We suffered a million casualties in World War II, and we have suffered approximately 200,000 battle and nonbattle casualties in Korea. Now we have the fear of world war III, and we have borrowed money being pumped into the economy every year. I wanted to know whether the Senator from New Hampshire was aware of those facts.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Iowa has made a very able contribution to the debate. I was not aware of the fact that the income level during the years of the magical Roosevelt touch was on a lower level than when he took over.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It was lower by more than $10,500,000,000 in national income each year during the peacetime operations from the time the Democrats took over.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then came the heartaches of the mothers and fathers of America whose boys marched off to war.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Democratic administration climbed to false prosperity on the bodies of dead sons.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator realizes that in 1932 the national income had fallen to $38,000,000,000. I wonder whether he remembers that today the national income of the country is more than $300,000,000,000. The Senator has referred to edging out of the depression. It sounds to me as though he regrets and begrudges the fact that we got out of the depression. It sounds as if he would have preferred to have us remain in the depression and to have 15,000,000 people out of employment and to have the national income at $38,000,000,000 a year, and thus travel the high road to complete destruction. That is the way it sounds to me when I hear the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire speak on that subject.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New York can interpret my remarks as he sees fit. However, we have a national debt of approximately $260,000,000,000, which I know is a greater national debt than that of all other nations on the face of the globe combined.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it not correct to say that after World War I, when we were preparing for World War II, there were more than 12,000,000 unemployed in the United States?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. That is the prosperity to which the Senator from New York refers. I know unemployment was approximately the same after the magical touch of Mr. Roosevelt had been employed and during the New Deal spending spree prior to World War II as it was in the stormy days of 1932 to which the Senator from New York has referred.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield further?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield further.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it not correct to say also that a part of the large income we now have is in depreciated dollars, because the dollar is now worth half of what it was worth at the time the New Deal administration began?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator from New York forgot to state that fact when he referred to our huge national income. Apparently he forgot to say it was in 50-cent dollars. I had intended to speak on that point a little later in my remarks. However, we may as well discuss it now. It should be remembered that the phony prosperity we have now and the huge national income to which the Senator from New York has referred is based on a 50-cent dollar.

Mr. JENNER. And bloody dollars at that.

Mr. BRIDGES. Bloody dollars; yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield further?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very much amused when I hear about the great

national debt. I regret the great debt. I was very much surprised, however, that the distinguished Senator from Iowa should talk about our casualties in World War II. I regret those casualties; personally, I felt them very deeply. But does the Senator from Iowa or the Senator from New Hampshire now maintain that we should have sat idly by and not fought against the Nazi menace, or not fought against the Japanese menace, or not fought when we were attacked at Pearl Harbor and other places? Such a contention simply does not make sense to me, Mr. President.

Does the Senator from New Hampshire believe that the American people repudiated what was done in 1933, 1934, 1935, and 1936 by the great leader of democracy, a man I admire above all others, Franklin D. Roosevelt? Does the Senator from New Hampshire recall the Landon-Roosevelt election in 1936, when Mr. Landon carried only two States, and President Roosevelt carried all the others? Does the Senator from New Hampshire forget that election? Does it seem to indicate that the American people either repudiated President Roosevelt or were dissatisfied with his administration?

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say to the Senator from New York that I remember very well those days in the late thirties, when Member after Member of the Senate of the United States was voting against preparedness for this country.

Let me say to the Senator from New York and to others, that, in 1937, I submitted a resolution calling for stopping the shipment of scrap iron, steel, and oil to Japan, because I saw the Japanese menace coming. But what happened? Mr. Roosevelt and his administration opposed that resolution; representatives of his administration appeared before the committee hearings and opposed my resolution to stop the shipment of scrap iron and oil and steel to Japan. They said we must not offend that great, friendly country. What happened, Mr. President? The scrap iron and steel came back at us when they were shot into the bodies of American boys. Although I tried to prevent the shipment of oil and aviation gasoline, to Japan, nevertheless they were sent, and the aviation gasoline was used in flying the planes which attacked Pearl Harbor and bombed our fleet there and killed thousands of our boys.

I remember all that, Mr. President. I remember, too, that there were times when I stood almost alone on the floor of the Senate in opposition to some of the proposals of the Democratic administration which it seemed to me would lead to disaster.

What bothers me today is the blindness of some of those who are guiding our country's affairs at the present time, when we are going through a similar period.

Does anyone believe that we do not have as much to fear today? Should not we clean out the Government departments? Should not we recognize and combat to the utmost the Communist menace?

I recall when I stood on the floor of the Senate and protested against having the armed services declare as surplus many articles which were needed for the defense of our country, and when the heads of various of the Government's agencies said, "Oh, no; we shall never need this material, because we have nothing to fear. Russia is a great, friendly power, and is working on our side; we are working with Russia hand in hand." At that time some of us were taken to task by Senators on the other side of the aisle and by the administration's spokesmen, who said we were trying to stir up trouble with a great friendly power.

Mr. President, I am glad that some persons' eyes are being opened today.

Let me say that a few years ago it was not very popular for a Senator to raise any question about Russia and communism. However, I did that. I did not run around making speeches to Soviet-American associations in this country, as some others have done. I did not attend meetings at which some of the Soviet groups were sponsoring friendship pacts, as some persons in this country did.

If it is desired to go into any of those matters, I can dig from the records of reputable journals, articles and statements which show that prominent persons in the United States, some of them aspiring to high office, and some of them holding high office, have gone along in years past hand in hand with the Soviet spokesmen in this country. If we begin to dig into some of those matters, plenty of material can be uncovered on which we can really start to talk here.

Mr. President, I wish to speak a little more about those who merely pay lip service to economy, those who say, "I am entirely in favor of economy, but—." Some of the persons in that group have constantly said that many things were accomplished because they planned it that way. That is most interesting, Mr. President.

As I said, one of the most popular words today is the word "but"; it must be popular because it is so widely used. Time after time we hear various persons in our country, some of them in high office, say, "I strongly favor economy, but."

Mr. President, the most difficult word to say today in the United States is the word "no." I commend the Members of the Senate who have the courage to rise on this floor and oppose some of the wild spending plans, and to say "no" when such plans are advanced. The word "no" is a word of only two letters, but evidently those letters have been dropped from the alphabet which is used by some of officialdom in Washington today.

THE PLAN FOR A BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. President, now let us consider the budget. For many years a balanced budget has been promised. The day of fulfillment finally came, and came only once during the long, 20-year siege of spend and spend and tax and tax. The budget was balanced, but it took the Republicans to do it. Yes, the Republicans, when in control of the Eightieth Congress, made ends meet for the first and only time since 1933, and they accomplished that great job because they planned it that way. The balanced budget did not come about by happenstance. It was not mere coincidence. It resulted from study, hard work, and determination. It is always easier to spend; it is always easier to conduct giveaways. It is always difficult to say "No."

The Republicans said "No" because they felt it was their duty to do so. As a result, the budget was balanced, and we had a surplus which was used to cut down our national debt; and, with all that, we were still able to reduce taxes, which meant a great deal to our citizens. The Republicans did this because they really wanted to. Having the will to do it, they worked at it, and they accomplished their goal.

Would you say the administration now has the will or the determination to stop spending, to make an attempt to balance the budget, to avoid raising taxes? Take a look at the budget and tell me.

Yes; take a look at the budget and remember the provisions of the Reorganization Act relating to economy. Take a look at the budget and remember the pledges of the Democratic Party. Take a look at the budget and reflect on the fact that one-third of our national income is now devoted to operating government at all levels.

I challenge anyone to give us concrete evidence that there has been a sincere effort to balance the budget for the fiscal year 1953. This has been described as a tight budget, as an honest, minimum budget geared to national defense. Can that be a fact?

If so, Mr. President, listen to the item I am about to mention. I have stated that in the budget document there is a reference to the NRA, which 17 years ago was declared unconstitutional. So just listen to this one: Included in the budget now requested there is an item of $100,000 for the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission. You remember that outfit, Mr. President? This is the group which made an abortive attempt to operate a semblance of a World's Fair in Washington during 1950. No doubt most people believe this agency expired at the end of the sesquicentennial—but not at all. If we look at the "tight, minimum budget," we find that the Commission still has several employees and plans on continuing during fiscal 1953.

If this budget is geared to national defense on a "tight, minimum" basis, how can the President ask for $300,000,000 as a preliminary estimate for Federal aid to education, or $30,000,000 for a scholarship project, or $15,000,000 to start the St. Lawrence seaway, or more than $36,000,000 for additional radio facilities for the Voice of America, or $15,000,000 for a preliminary estimate for a District of Columbia dispersal plan?

Balance the budget? I tell you, Mr. President, that was never in the administration's mind. Reduce taxes? On the contrary, the plan is to boost them still higher. Keep an eye on the debt limit? Well, I wonder about that one.

You know the debt limit is now $275,000,000,000. The end of fiscal 1952 will find our actual debt limit at $260,000,000,000. By the President's own estimate, at the end of fiscal 1953, this Nation will be $80,000,000 from the boiling

point beyond which the law says we cannot go. With only that cushion left by the budget we are now considering, I would say the administration definitely had an eye on the debt limit. What was in the mind, however, Mr. President, I will leave up to you.

HOW MUCH IS A BILLION?

Only a few years ago, a million dollars was quite a sum of money. It was airy, indefinable; and we could not even imagine just what a million dollars looked like. But it was a lot of money, we knew. Today in administration terms a million dollars is a trifle to pass over on the road to billions.

The word "billions" is a tough one, too. What does a billion dollars look like? If we cannot imagine the size of a million dollars, how much less likely are we to focus on a billion?

I am not talking about a hundred dollars, nor about thousands of dollars, nor tens of thousands of dollars, nor hundreds of thousands of dollars, nor millions of dollars, nor hundreds of millions of dollars. I am talking about billions of dollars; and, a billion dollars is a thousand million dollars. I think that points up some of the trouble behind the "but" people we were talking about earlier. If they could understand the Nation's budget in every-day terms, they might change their tune a little.

For example, let us take the case of a fmaily man whose yearly wages amount to $7,100. What with taxes, food, housing, and all other living expenses, this man spends $8,500. Common arithmetic tells us he is in debt $1,400. If anyone continues operating his family finances in that manner he will be in trouble—real trouble spelled in capital letters.

What does it all mean in terms of the individual? Simply that the pronouncement of the Declaration of Independence enunciating the principle that all men are created equal has been altered somewhat. It now reads, in spirit, that all men are created equal and endowed with an interest in the national debt.

There was a time when we gave each person in the country a chance to prosper or suffer according to his talents and according to the efforts he made. But today we start off our citizens with a handicap. Do you realize, Mr. President, that today when a baby is born in a hospital in Washington, D. C., or in Muncie, Ind., or in Newark, N. J., or in Phoenix, Ariz., or in Boise, Idaho, he begins life with a $1,700 mortgage hanging over his head? In fact, the first second that baby breathes he has inherited that $1,700 mortgage. That mortgage, by the way, is payable to the Federal Government. It is becoming larger as the minutes, hours, and days pass.

Mr. President, when a child in this country is started off with a $1,700 mortgage with the first breath of life he takes, I do not know what is going to happen. It presents a very serious problem.

Meanwhile, the adults are paying more and more of their earnings to the Federal Government. A person earning $4,500 a year pays approximately $1,100 of that amount in direct and indirect taxes. A purchaser of a new $2,000 car pays $500 of that sum for Federal taxes with more than 200 levies from the start of the steel work to the finished product. Let us get down to the very simple things of life; for example, bread, which is the staff of life. Mr. President, there are 53 direct or indirect taxes on a loaf of bread; 154 on a cake of soap.

VOICE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Now this sort of thing cannot go on. The people—a vast majority of them—are demanding an end to the spending, the increased taxes, the deficit financing. They want a businesslike operation. From all over my State—Keene, Barnstead, Ossipee, Berlin, Dublin, Manchester—and from all types of communities, comes the word: "Stop it, and stop now."

In other words, they want nothing to do with folks who operate on the old New Year's Day resolution of Mark Twain.

Certainly that philosophy seems to be the basis of the fiscal 1953 budget. And from the words of President Truman himself it appears that the administration foresees another such budget for fiscal 1954. In his budget message, President Truman predicted:

> I hope that world conditions and the building of our defensive strength will permit a reduction in Federal expenditures after the fiscal year 1954.

In other words we shall have to pass all the $85,400,000,000 budget and another just like it next year if we want to see the end of this spending spree. It sounds like two more Mark Twain resolutions for the administration.

But the people say "No," and on the basis of what the people want the Congress has been attempting to curtail the expenditures of the Democratic Party. But each time Representatives and Senators have tried to effect some reduction, great or small, there has been a hue and cry and the tar brush of obstructionism has been applied indiscriminately to those of us who stand for some sort of reasoning in Government fiscal operations.

Take the limitation on expenditures which the House has applied to the defense budget. The drums rolled, the cymbals crashed and the familiar strain of "You are crippling the Nation's defense effort" sounded across Capitol Hill and rolled on throughout the country.

DEFENSE COSTS MONEY

Now I do not expect that we shall be fooled about the issue at all. We have got to have a sound defense. Everyone knows that and agrees with it. It is simply a matter of how it is going to be done. In short, what is best for us?

I believe we will all agree that taking the most free spending method is not necessarily the only and the best way simply because it involves spending a lot of money.

We all know defense programs are going to cost a lot of money. We all are prepared to spend a great deal. But how much is another question. I personally believe—on the basis of military spending records—that the principle of imposing a limitation of defense expenditures is sound, and I might add, quite American.

I shall make no definite estimate of the actual amount to which the Department of Defense should be restricted as to its expenditures. It could be the Senate will adopt the House resolution of $46,000,000,000. Or it could be the Senate will set the limit at $48,500,000,000, President Truman's original proposal, or at $50,000,000,000, or at $52,000,000,000. I shall work on the floor of the Senate to be sure that when this bill goes into conference at least the principle of the restriction will be contained in the Senate version of the bill. The point I make is that an expenditures restriction should be imposed in order to regain for the Congress its constitutionally ordained function as keeper of the Nation's purse strings.

As ranking Republican member of both the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees, I shall continue my efforts toward getting a dollar's worth of defense for every dollar spent.

PAYING FOR MISTAKES

It has been said that war is the result of the failure of foreign policy; war has been called the last avenue of effort when wrong policies or procedures have been adopted by a nation. Well, we are now paying approximately three-quarters of every tax dollar for wars—past and present and in preparation for future wars—which, to a large degree, result from mistakes in foreign policy made by the Democratic administration.

A substantial part of every tax dollar collected by this administration is now being used to correct the awful consequences of the mistakes of the leaders in the executive branch. These are the leaders who put their faith in the good will of the men of the Kremlin—men whom the Democrats introduced to the family of civilized nations away back in November of 1933, and who since that tragic error have proved time and again that their word was not to be trusted, their pledges not to be observed, their ambition only to reduce this Nation to defeat.

It was the error of the leaders to whom I have adverted that has caused us to spend dollar after dollar for our defense program. I ask the Senate to inspect that 1953 budget and memorize the huge portion which is to be devoted to defense programs. Of the $85,400,000,000 asked by the President, $51,000,000,000 was planned to be spent by the Defense Department.

This does not include the $7,900,000,000 asked for the mutual aid program which along with carried over funds, will result in expenditures of $10,500,000,000. Nor does it include the cost of conducting the Korean war—or as President Truman phrases it, the police action in Korea—which is costing an estimated eight or ten billion dollars a year.

Now I ask: Is there any other nation in the free world which spends such a high proportion of its budget for defense? Of course there is not. We are the only one attempting the feat of defending not only ourselves but also our friends and neighbors without their shouldering a proportionate share of the responsibility.

Let us examine the mutual aid program. This measure was tagged at $7,900,000,000 in new authorizations when it came before Congress. The House has already reduced that amount by $1,700,000,000. In the Senate Armed Services Committee, a move to cut the amount by $400,000,000 lost by a single vote.

This is a serious matter. I recognize quite fully that with a global scale of thinking in our defense, we can expect our spending for defense to be somewhat on the same basis.

But, I believe the nations receiving aid, financially or materially, should accept some of the responsibility for this program. At a very minimum, I feel they could offer us greater cooperation than we are getting.

After all, Mr. President, my State and your State are contributing to this program. New Hampshire's share of $22,000,000 could run the State government for more than 6 months. And in Massachusetts they are contributing $269,000,000 a year toward this mutual-aid program which is no small amount.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. If the Senator from New Hampshire will yield, I note what he has had to say with reference to other nations assuming some of the obligation for military build-ups. Does the Senator from New Hampshire feel that it is fair for France to charge the taxpayers of this country a tax on unloading men who are sent there to defend France? I understand we have to pay approximately $5 for an officer and $2 for a private soldier. Does the Senator think that is a fair thing for France to do, when we are helping to build up the defense of the free world?

Mr. BRIDGES. No, I do not. I may say to the Senator from Kansas, who is truly interested in economy and has a voting record in that respect, that almost a year ago I called the attention of the Defense Department and the State Department to the fact that France was charging us an import duty on materials we were sending to France. At that time I particularly referred to Morocco, where we were building air bases to help defend the free world against communism. I was promised at that time that the matter would be looked into and some action would be taken. Six months later I found that what was complained of was still going on. A year has gone by, and several new wrinkles have been introduced, to one of which the Senator from Kansas has just referred. I am in favor of mutual aid, but mutual aid means a joint effort, and it must be more than a one-way street.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Hampshire will further yield, I should like to say that one report indicated that the French authorities were charging the Government of the United States about $5,000 for each ship docked there.

Mr. BRIDGES. I understand that to be correct. That is one of the things I have protested. I understand it has not yet been stopped. I think it certainly indicates a lack of cooperation on the part of France.

Let me say to the Senator from Kansas and to the other Senators that for several years the former minority leader, the late Senator Wherry, and I offered with respect to ECA material and equipment amendments under which European recipients would be advised of the source from which the material and equipment were coming. If we are going to create good will, how can it be done better than by letting the people know from whom the products come? The first year the amendment failed by six or seven votes. Last year it failed by only three or four votes. Practically every Senator on the Republican side of the aisle voted for the amendment. Why was it opposed? Because some Senators prodded by the administration did not want to seem to impose on the people of Europe the thought that America was doing a good deed.

I hate apologists for America. There are too many of them in this country. Some of them rise and defend foreign nations against our own Nation. Why, Mr. President, we are coming very near the cross roads for this country. How much longer can we carry this load on our shoulders? I am in favor of contributing a reasonable amount to foreign aid. I have been for it in the past. It was the Eightieth Congress so much despised by the Democratic administration which started the program of aid to Greece and Turkey. It was the Eightieth Congress that initiated the ECA, or Marshall plan. Recently a statement was made by the President of the United States at a meeting of a private organization, Americans For Democratic Action. He condemned several prominent Republican Senators, saying that they sneered and jeered, and that Republicans were lined up against the foreign-aid program.

The program about which he was talking had its birth in a Republican Congress. If the President will look at the record of that Republican Congress he will find that it was an outstanding Congress. It was the only Congress in 20 years that balanced the budget. It was the only time in 20 years when the national debt was reduced. It was the only Congress in the past 20 years that reduced taxes. That is a pretty good record. It is well for us to remind people about such facts.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. I should like to suggest that during the Eightieth Congress 7,000,000 persons in the lower brackets were taken off the tax rolls.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

A day or two ago the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] introduced a list of persons from Wall Street who are in high positions in the Government. One of them is a candidate for President. I refer to Mr. Harriman. I have always heard about the Republicans favoring big business. Certainly one Democratic candidate for President comes from Wall Street——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. How does the Senator explain, after the marvelous things accomplished by the Eightieth Congress, that the Republicans did not elect the next Congress?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the people misunderstood a little bit. I am sorry that more people did not thoroughly understand the record of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. CONNALLY. Whose fault was it, except that of the Republicans, for not telling the people what the Eightieth Congress had accomplished? Whose fault was it that the people did not find out the great glories of the Eightieth Congress? Who is responsible, except the Senator from New Hampshire and other Republican Senators, for not using their blaring voices over the radio and the television so that the people could rise up and call them blessed, instead of kicking them in the pants at the next election?

Mr. BRIDGES. I suppose the blaring voice of the Senator from Texas, in his speeches in Texas, probably contributed to our voices being drowned out.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas did not make a speech on the subject.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is probably why the Democrats won.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought the Republicans were doing such a fine job of committing suicide that I would let them alone.

Mr. BRIDGES. Well, there is a different day coming. I think it is coming this year. I appreciate the help the Senator from Texas gave us when he did not make a speech. He realized, apparently, that his voice would not contribute to the cause he espoused.

It has been suggested to me that there were too many "me, too" Republicans at that time. I think that is partially to blame for the result.

Mr. President, I believe neither the people in the Granite State nor their neighbors in the Bay State, for example, would approve at all if we wrote another mutual-aid check for such an extreme amount without first eliminating all the unnecessary expenditures. Then they would expect us to protect the mutual-aid system against waste and unwarranted expenditures such as payment of duty to France on goods sent from America to help France. We should insist on the abandonment of any and all such demands.

Mr. President, we have got to get tough about this. This is our money and we should not be throwing it away just to be an international jolly good fellow.

Tragic as this is, it is not the worst, by far. The Democrats have actually been siphoning this budget into the domestic economy to such an extent that a substantial part of our national income is now derived from the defense effort. If there is one axiom we should understand, it is that an economy built on the quicksands of war and potential wars can only lead to its own ultimate destruction.

NO QUESTIONS ASKED

There are those in the administration who believe no budget questions should ever be asked of the Defense Department, that we should simply issue a blank check and let them go to it. Suppose we

adopted that attitude; whose word would we take for the total budget of the Defense Department? There is so much confusion as to what is needed and as to how much to spend that I am quite unable to determine which authority to follow. I think the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] discussed this question somewhat the other day.

The President submitted his budget to Congress on January 21, 1952. Of the $85,400,000,000 he requested, it was proposed to expend approximately $50,000,000,000 for defense. This amount included $1,500,000,000 of supplemental requests which as yet have not been acted upon by the House. In short, the President proposed a defense request of $48,500,000,000.

Yet 3 weeks later—remember this—on February 14, the Defense Department officials appearing before the House Appropriations Subcommittee were not interested in defending a $48,500,000,000 program. Instead they presented detailed tables of estimated expenditures totaling $51,056,000,000—an increase of $2,556,000,000 in 3 weeks, or to be more graphic, a $100,000,000-a-day boost over the President's own figures, which had been submitted only 3 weeks earlier.

They are doing pretty well. I do not intend to have these remarks sound like a diatribe against defense spending. After all, the defense budget, however large, is merely a part of the picture, and the 1953 budget is only the latest edition of that picture.

A reproduction of the entire program of the last 7 years shows a pattern of open-handed spending unequaled in the history of the world, and certainly unsurpassed by any previous spender in our Nation's past. That includes, by the way, the late President Roosevelt, who was no mean hand at this sort of thing.

I do not wish to be harsh with President Truman, but let us consider that if he collects all of his proposed taxes during the fiscal year 1953 and adds them to all those collected during the Truman term of office, the grand total will be $339,000,000,000.

This, Mr. President is $45,000,000,000 more than all the taxes collected during all the history of the United States from Washington and ending with Mr. Roosevelt.

Let us stop at this point for a moment. This is something in which I am sure the Senator from Texas will be interested. If Mr. Truman collects, up until the end of June 1953 taxes as projected by the Joint Committee on Taxation and by the Treasury Department, he will have collected $339,000,000,000 in taxes in a little more than 8 years. That is $45,000,000,000 more than every President of the United States has collected from the day George Washington raised his right hand and took the oath of office as first President to the day Franklin D. Roosevelt died. That certainly is a record.

I thought, when in earlier years I lived here and associated somewhat with Franklin D. Roosevelt—in the distance, of course; other gentlemen were very close to him, but I knew him in the distance—that we had seen the deluxe spender of all times. But what Harry Truman has done in the way of collecting and spending makes him, I think, the world champion. Just think of it, $45,000,000,000 more in taxes taken out of your pocket and mine, and from the pockets of other American citizens, than were collected by every President from George Washington to Franklin Roosevelt, from the day Washington took office to the day Franklin Roosevelt died. That is quite a record.

Where will this wide-open spending end? If President Truman has his way, it will mean higher and higher taxes. This conclusion was stated quite simply by the Democratic leader, the late Senator Robinson of Arkansas, when he said:

> There is no inexhaustible source from which taxes may be procured. More appropriations mean more taxes.

It is as simple as that. The appropriations of the Truman administration have meant more and more taxes, and Mr. Truman intends to add to that burden.

A DEMOCRAT SPEAKS HIS MIND

The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], a member of President Truman's own party, and for whom I have great admiration, has something to say on that score. He stated:

> I believe we have reached the safe limit of our taxable capacity and that higher income taxes will destroy a large segment of our free society, impair our productive strength, and add inflationary pressures.

The Senator from Georgia also said:

> Excessive taxation is not the answer to inflation. The cure lies rather in the adoption of an expenditure program tailored to fit the ability of people to pay. There is a limit to this ability and unless we are prepared to permanently surrender our free economy and our free society for a regimented economy and a socialized society, this safe limit, in my judgment, has been passed.

I agree with the very able and distinguished Senator from Georgia, who is chairman of the Committee on Finance. I commend him for his courage in meeting the issue head-on in the forthright statements he has made.

Mr. President, I believe we in the Senate agree wholeheartedly with the statement of our colleague. And we should, in agreement, resolve to do something about this trend of free spending. We could and we should take a lesson from our neighbor to the north, the great Dominion of Canada, which has, with determination, balanced its budget, reduced taxes, brought its dollar from a point 10 percent below ours to a present-day value above our currency, and produced a national surplus each year since the end of World War II.

Mr. President, Canada is probably as nearly like our country as any other country. It is separated from us only by an imaginary line. Yet Canada since the end of World War II has reduced its taxes several times, has balanced its budget, and has achieved such a stabilized condition that Canadian currency, which used to sell at a discount, is, I am informed, selling at a premium today.

We are sending all kinds of missions to the Far East and other places throughout the world to see how we can spend more money. I wonder how many of us would join in sponsoring a resolution to send a mission to Canada to learn from our neighbor how to save money, how to reduce taxes, and how to balance our budget. I think that certainly would be as appropriate as the sending of another mission to Moscow or somewhere else to find ways of spending more money.

I do not contend that the time has come for action. Surely the time for action was some time ago. I recall to the Senate that in January 1951, I asked that the budget for fiscal 1952 be returned to the President for revision. At that time, in connection with that budget, I asked that a revised realistic, economical list of estimates be presented to Congress for action.

Nothing was done at that time. Nor has the executive branch of the Government done anything since that time in the way of revising the system of treacherous deceit which has keynoted too many of the budgets we have received during the 16 years of my career in the Senate.

Mr. President, the time has come to tighten our money belts. The time is at hand to take a firm grasp on our wallets and to look over each spending proposal as it comes to us with an eye to the necessity of the plan, and its contribution, if any, to the over-all welfare of the Nation. Then let us check the amount of money we can afford to spend on our total national budget—we must always keep an eye on that figure—and we can determine which requests we can grant and which we will have to reject.

It is very much like being in a living room in my little community of East Concord or Merrimack, N. H., on a Sunday afternoon. The family is gathered around looking over the big Sunday paper with all its advertisements. Just about everything is desirable to some member of the family. But Dad and Mother reflect on the weekly pay envelope and the amount of the family debt. They decide in their New England thriftiness which purchases must be made and which will have to be delayed or even forgotten.

Just like that family in my State of New Hampshire, this Nation has its limits. As we look over the "Sunday paper" here in the Senate, let us plan to approach our family pocketbook problems as do those frugal folks at home. Spend if we have to, but let us have the courage to say "No" when we come to something we just cannot afford.

TIME TO GO ON RECORD

Mr. President, during the 16 years I have served in the United States Senate, I have devoted a great deal of time and energy to an effort to achieve economy in the growing bureaucracy which is our Federal Government. I have worked to cut back spending which has been authorized, and I have fought spending authority bills and programs. I have been for economy in Government in election years and in years when there were no elections. I have spoken for economy. What is more important, I have voted for economy.

I have no desire to put any Senator on the spot in an election year. However, I think it is only fair to say that I hope we

shall have roll calls from now on when efforts are made on the floor to cut spending bills. In the light of budget events, the time certainly has come for us to stand up and be counted as to our intentions in regard to economy in Government and the stability of our monetary system.

The Senate faces a monumental task in the next few weeks. The House has acted most expeditiously in handling all but a few of the appropriation bills. The subcommittees of the Senate Appropriations Committee have been doing their jobs. But the time has come for us to meet the issue on the floor of the Senate. We cannot back away from our responsibility.

We have been reasonably successful in years past in cutting administration budgets to a certain extent, but we have never been challenged as we are challenged this year. I believe that there should be a greater will for economy this year than in other years. I hope that Senators who believe in a sane fiscal policy will join hands across the aisle in a move to make that policy strong as well as sane.

We all want to safeguard America. I believe that the best way to safeguard America is to protect the economy which made it great. The best method of doing so is to assure our citizens and the rest of the world of sound Federal financing through a balanced budget made possible by a reduction in spending, followed by a reduction in the national debt, and ultimately a reduction in taxes. We can save this country, but this administration is moving in the wrong direction fast.

We are carrying on our shoulders the burdens of a great many nations all over the face of the globe.

I want the United States to contribute to the mutual aid program and to do what is necessary to provide leadership in the free world. But I want Senators to remember that this is a mutual aid program. When men like the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] stand on the floor and point out examples of failure to receive cooperation from other countries with regard to simple, elementary things, I think it is the job of the administration to take steps to see that such conditions are corrected, before we pour out more money to such nations.

Mr. President, I do not think it is the job of this administration to travel all over the world drumming up trade for free spending schemes, as I know we are doing in certain areas. We are limited in what we can do. We think of our Nation as a strong, healthy, wealthy nation. It is a strong, healthy nation, and, as wealth goes, it is wealthy. But there is a limit to our capacity to give. In World War II we poured out our resources to the rest of the world. We gave not only money and American lives, American blood, and American suffering, but we provided raw materials, materials which America will need in times of future emergency.

When we were asked to give $200,000,000 worth of wheat to India, and Senators called attention to the need for monazite sand and some of the other key strategic materials involved in the manufacture of jet fighting plane engines and other equipment, some person, had the nerve to say that we should not ask for a fair exchange. When it came to a vote on that question, the Senate adopted an amendment providing for a fair exchange, but in conference with the House that provision was eliminated.

Mr. President, I do not know how much longer we can continue on the path we are traveling, but I know that it is time that we in the Senate met the issue head-on.

The time is ripe for action. I feel very certain that I speak for the great majority of Members on this side of the aisle when I say that it is not our purpose to cripple any worth-while sound program. It is not our purpose to do anything other than build this Nation and make it strong. This Nation cannot provide the leadership which the world needs unless it is strong at home. Basically that is our primary program. If we can keep this country strong at home, we can give leadership to the world.

What if America should get into trouble? It is said that if Belgium were to get into trouble she might turn to France or Great Britain, and that if France or Great Britain should get into trouble they could turn to the United States. But if the United States should get into trouble, there would be no other great, free, strong nation to which we could turn for help. We are the core of last resistance in the fight for freedom. Those who want to throw money around freely should remember that the one hope for our country, both here and abroad, in providing leadership for the world lies in our ability to remain strong at home. The issue is before us. The challenge confronts us; and I hope the United States Senate will rise to meet it.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. In several Congresses the Senator from New Hampshire was a member of the so-called watchdog committee established by the Senate Committee on Appropriations to watch the various expenditures of funds in connection with the Marshall plan.

I invite the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to a copy of volume I, No. 1 of the Mutual Security News, which contains some first-class propaganda and some interesting articles dealing with the Mutual Security Program in Europe, Asia, and elsewhere throughout the world. I received this publication from the editor of one of the weekly newspapers in Idaho who resented it very much, because he said:

> This is truly government by propaganda, and involves the spending of money of the taxpayers to provide newspapers with free mats and the publicity to support an unlimited foreign-aid propaganda.

I should like to ask the ranking Republican member of the Senate Appropriations Committee whether he has had an opportunity to read a copy of the Mutual Security News.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have not. I should be very much interested in it. I have not had the opportunity to read it.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I should like to have the Senator and other members of the committee give careful consideration to the expenditure of large sums of money for this purpose. I presume that some Senators may seek to justify it as being essential in building up public sentiment throughout the country in support of spending billions of dollars abroad.

We hear a great deal about propaganda these days. Recently the Committee on Government Operations created a Subcommittee To Investigate Propaganda, Censorship, and Suppression of News in the Federal Government. It was to be an investigation particularly of the security order issued last September by the President. It seems to me that we ought to investigate the spending of money for propaganda purposes by the Mutual Security Agency.

A few minutes ago the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] asked the Senator from New Hampshire why it was that the Republican Members of the Eightieth Congress were unable to sell their accomplishments and the record of the Republican Eightieth Congress to the voters of the country during that memorable 1948 campaign. Probably one reason was that the Republicans did not have control of the executive departments of the Government, and were unable to spend millions of taxpayers' dollars on propaganda like the Truman administration did then and has continued to do up to this time to influence voters in the United States. As we approach the election this year, it is obvious, as we consider such information and publicity releases as Mutual Security News, that we ought to take the necessary steps to economize in spending at home, especially for such propaganda. I thought the Mutual Security Act was primarily concerned with the expenditure of money abroad. Have we reached the point where the United States is to be regarded as a foreign nation, so far as the Mutual Security Agency spending is concerned?

Mr. BRIDGES. I did not know that we had.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Can the Senator enlighten me on that question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I cannot, but I think it is something which should be investigated. I had not seen or heard of the publication to which the Senator refers, but I think the situation to which he calls attention is alarming. I believe that the Appropriations Committees of the Congress should certainly look into the subject.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a brief letter written to the editors of newspapers throughout the

country by W. John Kenney, Deputy Director for Mutual Security.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUTUAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., May 15, 1952.

DEAR EDITOR: The United States, through the Mutual Security Program, is "building strength for the free world."

Because the program involves the security of the American people—and the use of part of their taxes—we believe it important that more of our people understand some of its accomplishments, objectives, and problems.

The enclosed copy of Mutual Security News is designed to meet this need. It contains feature material from all parts of the world discussing progress being made to strengthen the free world's defenses against Communist aggression.

We are prepared to send you a similar sheet, along with four mats, each month if you so desire. Sign and mail the enclosed card and we will see that your newspaper is provided regularly through Western Newspaper Union with these timely stories and pictures on the Mutual Security Program.

Sincerely yours,
W. JOHN KENNEY,
Deputy Director for Mutual Security.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. I have enjoyed very much the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire on the mutual security bill. I know that the distinguished Senator is a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I have not had cleared up in my mind the answer to this question. As I understand, General Gruenther, General Eisenhower's right-hand man, came to this country a few weeks ago and testified before the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and before other committees, to the effect that Communist Russia has 175 divisions in being. General Gruenther further testified that the Communist satellites had 60 divisions in being.

Assuming that mutual-security spending goes on at the rate it has been going, and assuming that the cuts are no larger than the ones the House has made, what guaranty do we have that what is being spent over there in the way of mutual-security funds is not being poured into rat holes? As I understand, General Gruenther, General Eisenhower, and the other men in charge of the program—NATO, and so forth—hope to have at the end of 1954 40 or 50 divisions in Europe. Is that the Senator's understandng?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is what I have understood; yes.

Mr. JENNER. What security to Europe, to ourselves, or to anyone else is represented by 40 or 50 divisions a couple of years from now, as against 235 divisions in being now under Communist control? Has that been explained to the Members of the Senate? Or are we merely sending money overseas to have it boondoggled away there?

Mr. BRIDGES. It has not been explained to my satisfaction, I certainly will say to the able Senator from Indiana. There are many things about the foreign program that I do not understand. As the Senator knows I have supported the principle of foreign aid and have supported reasonable amounts in appropriations for it. I had hoped that we would make much more progress than we have made up to today. I have been disappointed by the progress that has been made.

Mr. JENNER. Is it not a fact that there are about $12,000,000,000 to $15,000,000,000 in mutual-security funds which have not been expended? I believe $12,000,000,000 have not been expended.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. JENNER. Might it not be sensible to postpone the appropriation entirely until January? It certainly would not hurt to take a look at the conditions at that time. Although the Senator from New Hampshire has supported the program, when $12,000,000,000 in funds remain unexpended, does he want to spend more? For what? We have 25 divisions over there, standing against 235 divisions in being. The 235 divisions are along the 700-mile corridor across Western Europe. What are we trying to do? Are we trying to create another Dunkirk for those American boys?

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Indiana that I respect him and I respect his judgment, as well as his courage on so many things on which he has patriotically spoken out. There are many things that disturb me about this program. One of the things that disturbs me is the statement, for example, to which the Senator from Indiana has referred. It is the statement which was made by General Gruenther. In one breath he told us of the need for urgency in rushing these things. In the next breath he told us that there is no early prospect of war with Russia. The two thoughts just do not go together. He has made various statements of that kind which are hard for me to explain or to analyze. I believe that the Senator from Indiana has raised some very serious questions of doubt.

As the Senator knows, I have supported substantial cuts in the administration's program, and I have opposed others. However, generally speaking, I have supported the general program, hoping, for example, that the United Nations would develop into an organization which might promote peace. I have been disappointed in the United Nations attitude and its failure to cooperate as it should in Korea. I have been disappointed by the broad promises of NATO countries, which have not materialized. These incidents certainly should be a warning and should make us stop, look, and listen before we proceed on the program in the future.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield further.

Mr. JENNER. This morning I was on a train coming into Washington. On the trip I talked to a colonel in the Air Force who has been stationed in Germany and in other places in Europe. He told me that we are building 30 air bases in England. He said, "If Churchill's Government goes down and Bevan takes over, the 20 air bases are gone." We know what Bevan's attitude is toward us.

He said an air base in France——

Mr. CONNALLY. In England, the Senator said.

Mr. JENNER. This one is in France. It is within 6 minutes of a large community, which is completely Communist.

What are we trying to do? We have 25 divisions in Western Europe. By 1954 we hope to have 40 divisions; perhaps the other nations will cooperate with us and spend our money properly. The Communists have 235 divisions in being. What are we doing? Are we preparing the table for the Communists so that they may capture our supplies, kill our men, and take over our bases?

With $12,000,000,000 in unexpended funds available I do not see why we should rush this program. It could be postponed until January. No one would suffer by postponing it.

We talk about cutting off $1,000,000,000 or $1,500,000,000. That is peanuts, Mr. President, I do not understand what we are doing; I do not know what our objective is. I thought I would bring out the point.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, as the author of the amendment I certainly wish to pay tribute to the distinguished minority leader [Mr. BRIDGES], who has made a profound address to the Senate and to the Nation. I have not the ability possessed by him. Since I undertook to submit an amendment in behalf of the taxpayers of America, I have sometimes regretted that I had the temerity to undertake the task.

In the first place I do not have the benefit of the Mutual Security News or of propaganda agencies to assist me in the job that is mine here briefly this afternoon.

Mr. President, I watched the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I saw him flanked by assistants on both sides. I saw two assistants sitting with the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. Undoubtedly they can inform the Senators correctly on many matters in which I am not at all skilled.

I was prompted to submit this amendment because of the great volume of mail that has come to me from constituents in my State telling me of their desire that a halt be called to this reckless spending in Europe.

At the outset, Mr. President, let me say that I enjoyed very much the remarks made by my distinguished friend the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. There was a touch of sadness in his remarks when he related that this would probably be his last debate on a major issue. I have been honored by being able to call the distinguished Senator from Texas my friend. I regret that he will leave the Senate. I have been the recipient of many of his barbs, but I shall miss him, as I am sure the

Nation will miss him, when he leaves the Senate. Yet, Mr. President, I do not agree with the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee when he says that if we refuse to appropriate all that is asked for by the State Department and the Mutual Security Ageny, civilization will revert to what it was in the Dark Ages. Those were, in substance, the words of my distinguished friend the senior Senator from Texas. I say that unless we call a halt to this crazy spending and these give-away programs, this international WPA, we will revert to the Dark Ages here at home.

All of us realize that the Nation is in debt to the extent of $265,000,000,000. At this very moment the taxpayers of America are faced with an additional debt of $85,000,000,000. Certainly everyone will admit that we will have a deficit of $14,000,000,000. Who is going to pay the freight?

I understand that eight representatives of the State Department are now in the gallery. I am glad they have paid the Senate the tribute of coming here and listening to the debate. I am sorry I do not know all the answers, but I shall give them a garden variety of the philosophy I brought here from the far West in regard to how to pay debts and keep out of trouble.

Does anyone assume for a moment that at some time we shall not have to pay this $265,000,000,000 debt? How do we believe we are going to get away from that debt?

The Senator from New Hampshire has said that today, at the very moment when a baby is born in the United States, a $1,700 mortgage hangs over his head. Most of us were present recently at the hearings at which General Eisenhower testified. He was asked, "How long do you think the emergency will last?" He replied—and I give you his exact words, Mr. President:

> Ten or twenty years, or—yes—perhaps 30 years.

I also recall the speech in which the Secretary of State said this emergency will last for 20 years.

When will the end of the emergency come? It seems that whenever an appropriation bill is before the Senate, either a high-ranking general comes to address us, or Russia drops an atomic bomb, or there is an important conference somewhere. Then there is screaming to the high heaven, "Oh, don't make any cuts in the program or Western Germany will turn her back upon us." That argument was made today, Mr. President.

Certainly I am delighted that Western Germany has seen fit to join the other nations of the free world. I agree that it would be fine to have Western Germany rearm.

Mr. President, not long ago we were told that in some countries of Europe production is more than 40-percent higher than the prewar production. Yet we are told, "Do not cut this program of aid to our friends in Europe, or they will turn their backs upon us." If our friends in Europe are of that sort, and if that is the kind of friendship the State Department has bought with our funds, then I say it is time for us to turn our backs on such a program. If the friends we have bought in that way say they are going to quit us if we do not agree to spend ourselves into bankruptcy, in their behalf, then I say they are not the kind of friends we should have.

Of course, Mr. President, I know that a fighting man cannot be purchased. I simply say that I hope the nations of Western Europe will have a will to get to work, as we here in the United States are doing.

I have heard complaints made about the so-called grievous action which has been taken by the House of Representatives in connection with the cuts it has made in the mutual-aid bill. I heard my friend, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], make such a statement. Mr. President, I say to you that the Members of the House of Representatives are just as smart, just as American, and just as loyal as any of the 96 Members of this body.

Of course, it is popular to say that we who serve in the Senate have a monopoly on brains. I have read all the debates which occurred in the House of Representatives at the time when it acted to make cuts in the mutual-security bill. I venture the assertion that not six other Members of this body have read all those debates. The Members of the House say it is time to call a halt to extravagant, senseless, unwise spending. They say that even at this late hour it is time to think, for a change, of the American taxpayers.

Mr. President, I wonder why it is that whenever anyone rises to take a stand for America, he is accused of tampering with the maintenance of our form of civilization.

Of course, there are a certain number of persons who do not belong to either the Senate Foreign Relations Committee or the House Foreign Affairs Committee, but who, nevertheless, have traveled extensively in Europe, and know a great deal about matters relating to Europe. I have never been to Europe, but I have tried to study the questions involved in our relations with other nations, particularly those who are members of the NATO organization.

I remember the great words of wisdom which were uttered on the Senate floor by the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] when he returned from Europe. He told us exactly what was wrong there. In a speech he made on February 2, 1952, he told what the mutual security boys and the State Department boys have really done. This is a part of what our colleague, the Senator from Louisiana, said about them at that time:

> They have tried to give the impression, by juggling production figures, that further aid is necessary. But it is going to take a lot of cold, hard facts to convince me that we should vote more billions for European recovery.

Let us listen to what the Senator from Louisiana said about France:

> Physically, France is in splendid condition. But France, as a nation, suffers from a psychological disorder. I did not find much enthusiasm among her people; there is a reluctance to do too much, and they are looking to the United States for more assistance. This once proud nation reminds me in many ways of a youngster who has been overmothered, and—now that the time has come for him to go out into the world—is afraid to stand alone. I have no doubt but that France can again become a self-subsisting nation if she tries. True, she has suffered grievous hurts. But if she matches her physical improvement with an improved spirit, she will again take her position as a leader in Western Europe. That is the only course open to her, and I left there convinced that more all-out economic aid from this country would only make her more dependent on us.

In the same speech, the Senator from Louisiana said:

> Belgium and the Netherlands are both in relatively good economic shape. Belgium, in particular, has reached the status of a healthy nation, and I do not believe further aid to her would be justifiable. She is perfectly able to stand on her own feet. Belgian industrial production has risen to 146 percent of prewar, and her agriculture is providing 6 percent more food than in prewar days. The Netherlands is 48 percent ahead of prewar in industrial production, and her agricultural production is 15 percent higher than it was in 1938.

Then, Mr. President, our colleague from Louisiana, who has traveled and studied a great deal, and who made these statements long before the present debate, had the following to say in a speech he made on February 23, 1952, when he was speaking of Britain, our ally:

> There is no more chance of reviving the British economy with additional American dollars than of pumping life into a dead horse. • • •
>
> But the British cannot eat statistics, and it is food and the assurance of a continuing supply of food that is Britain's main problem.

The Senator from Louisiana went on to say that the plight of Britain is that she is overpopulated, and that she should send some of her population to her colonies.

On May 17, 1952, the senior Senator from Louisiana had this to say in regard to the mutual security bill, in a statement he made at that time:

> Wide publicity has been given my statement, made during a press interview last week, that I believe that as much as $2,000,000,000 can be trimmed from the 1953 foreign aid bill without undermining the security of the United States or its allies.

Mr. President, do you remember the speech our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Louisiana, made? He told us of the spending and of the waste all over Europe, where we, a generous Nation, have expended our taxpayers' money to develop water resources, departments of agriculture, departments of health, departments of education, and also have made vast expenditures for mineral developments, transportation, censuses and census organizations, industrial developments, and so forth.

Mr. President, I am speaking extemporaneously, and I wish to hurry along in connection with this presentation. However, I desire to call attention to the fact that the Senator from Louisiana, and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], one of the cosponsors and joint authors of the pending amendment, spoke in the Senate, as Americans, to lay

the situation before us and before the entire American people. They told us of the large terminal station in Rome, and of the great public buildings which were being erected with our dollars, which were supposed to bolster up the economies of various nations. They told us of apartment houses, of hydroelectric plants, of flood-control projects, and of 26 water-power dams, which were being built with our money. I ask, What position shall we be in if, as public servants, we are forced to tell the taxpayers of the country who are straining to get along as of this moment, that we have saddled upon them another $6,900,000,000, although, as the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] said a moment ago, $12,000,000,000 remains unexpended at this time? I want someone to tell me why we cannot wait until January 1.

A moment ago I heard the distinguished Senators from Texas and New Jersey [Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. SMITH] suggest that if we were not to do this now it might be thought by certain of our European allies that we had turned our back upon them and that we had given up hope. Mr. President, how could such a thing be? How could any civilized person think that the United States had forgotten its campaign and crusade against communism? With the flagrant example of Korea before his eyes, could any thinking person say that America had turned her back upon the free world, particularly in the face of the fact that in Korea 95 percent of the men and 95 percent of the material and supplies have been furnished by the American taxpayers? Yet the suggestion is made that a further reduction in the authorization provided by the pending bill might be construed by our friends and allies in Europe that we did not want to fight communism, and had broken faith with them. No, Mr. President. The Korean situation is the best evidence in all the world as to the good faith of the people of the United States in their crusade against communism.

While we are on the subject of Korea, let me ask, Why are we not thinking a little bit more about building up the situation on our home front? If we, as Senators, are worth our salaries, why are we not seeing to it that our air power and military might at home are being built up? Yet we sit idly by, or go to cocktail parties at the State Department, and forget that our fighting men in Korea are flying obsolete B–29's up to the Yalu River in squadrons composed of three of such planes.

Mr. JENNER rose.

Mr. WELKER. Anyone who knows anything about air power will admit that a squadron of three such bombers would afford no protection whatever. Why do we not have more? The answer is because we have not produced more, and, further, that we are shipping everything we possibly can to Europe.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WELKER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JENNER. In connection with that particular point, I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho whether he read the statement made by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] a few days ago, in which he said that our most modern jet planes, instead of being sent to Korea to help our boys who have been over there almost 2 years in the war, are being sent to Western Europe? Did the Senator read that statement by the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. WELKER. I did, I may say to the Senator from Indiana, and I was surprised as well as embarrassed. I may say that I also read the last letter written by Maj. George A. Davis to his wife and babies. George A. Davis was the leading jet ace in the history of the United States. A few days before his death, he wrote to his wife and two children—there was one yet unborn—and he made this statement: "They seem to be killing the people over here, and they do not know why. Our Sabre jet is so far outclassed by the MIG's that something must be done about it. We cannot win this way."

Instead of this great Congress doing what it should be doing, acknowledging that we do not have an adequate air force in Korea, some of us are accused of being un-American because we endeavor to go back to a fundamental law of nature, namely, the law of self-defense. So long as I hear that we do not have adequate air power in Korea, so long as I hear that a bunch of filthy Chinese Communists are able to out-fly and out-shoot our American boys; I shall be found while I am a Member of the Senate fighting against the sending of our wealth and material to other places throughout the world.

Mr. President, I am altogether in favor of a full partnership; yes, 50 percent give and take. But I am not at all satisfied with the present situation, when the fact is that we have been fighting the war in Korea alone. Where is the vigorous will to win, about which we have heard so much? All that the other countries have, apparently, is the American dollar—the wonderful American dollar. Presumably, if we give them that, better fighting people will then be made of our European allies. Where have they been during all the time the Korean war has been in progress. I say the plea does not ring very true to me. In today's press I read of the shocking losses suffered by our air forces in Korea, amounting to a loss of three or four to one, at the hands of a bunch of Chinese Communists, who, prior to the so-called police action in Korea, never had the reputation of being able to push a wheelbarrow down the street.

Mr. President, we know exactly who is back of the fighting and killing in Korea. I wonder when we are to admit it, and when we are going to stand up and either fight to win the war in Korea or to withdraw from Korea. There is no substitute for victory.

Moreover, there is no substitute for the arms which should be sent to our boys in Korea, where about 15,000 of them have already given their lives. I wonder how the American forces in Korea will feel when they read the testimony which I read in one of my home newspapers a few days ago, that it had become necessary to ration ammunition. Yes, Mr. President, I know there are explanations; I have read them. The State Department, the War Department, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff and everyone else promptly gave explanations. But the fact remains that testimony was given, to the effect that ammunition had to be rationed in Korea. Indeed, a few days ago a boy in the Naval Hospital, who had suffered injuries in Korea, corroborated the report, adding that he had been out of ammunition at times. I am wondering how our boys in Korea feel when they hear that we in the Senate are debating whether we are to cut $1,000,000,000 or $2,000,000,000 from the gift which this bill provides for our friends across the sea.

Mr. President, it is about time that we had an explanation from the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee with respect to the questions propounded to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. Why is it that $44,000,000,000 of the armed services budget remains unexpended? Why is it that $12,000,000,000 of funds for foreign aid remain unexpended?

Mr. President, we are going to be held to account by the American people. I speak as a member of the minority, as one who is not a fiscal expert, and as one who is not a member of any of the great committees which have been passing upon these matters, but, in my opinion, the position of the Members of the House of Representatives, who are responsible every 2 years to the people whom they represent, is sound. As I have said, they have studied this bill as much as we have, they have not harmed our country by trying to save the money of the taxpayer.

I think it goes without saying that if Stalin is afraid of the United States, he certainly is not afraid of her armed might at this time, but is afraid of a fine, vigorous United States economy, an economy which has made us the strongest and greatest Nation upon this earth. Is all the money authorized by this bill necessary? If Russia, with 235 divisions ready to move and with more than 20,000 first-line aircraft, intends to attack Western Europe I ask, Mr. President, why does she hesitate? Why does she wait for us to send $7,900,000,000 more aid to our allies in Europe? Is she afraid of the $7,900,000,000? I am convinced that the words used by Lenin many years ago in referring to the United States are still the thinking of the Communists:

> We will force her to spend herself into bankruptcy. We will bleed her white and then take her without firing a shot.

I am more concerned of that than I am of anything else.

Mr. President, it seems in some quarters to be considered almost a disgraceful act to stand on the floor of the Senate and say something in behalf of the forgotten person in America, namely, the taxpayer. I have heard Members of the Congress maligned when they tried to save some money for the taxpayer. They are called politicians who want to go home and sell themselves as great patriots because they have saved a sum of money. Let me get the record straight. If I could bring peace and happiness to

this country by resigning from politics forever, I would do it tomorrow. I do not propose to participate in the liquidation of this country through a bankruptcy proceeding. There is no evidence whatsoever of an intention to save money. I stated in my campaign that I would go along with billions of dollars for defense but not one cent for socialism. I have not been able to understand why there has been no attempt on the part of the administration or anyone else to cut down fiscal spending. We are confronted with the St. Lawrence waterway and other great projects which call for very large appropriations. Yet during this time there is a fund of $44,000,000,000 unexpended, which was appropriated to bring this country up to a strong military might, and I am wondering what is the reason.

I have no desire, as the Senator from Texas said, to make any Fourth of July speeches in behalf of an amendment which would cut another billion dollars from the appropriation. I am not representing the "Bunkum County News," nor does the New York Times influence anything I say upon the floor of the Senate. From my knowledge of what is printed in the Times and in the "Bunkum County News," I would as soon accept the philosophy of a few westerners as to depend upon anything the New York Times has to say.

I am speaking in all seriousness as an American in trying to do what I can to save the taxpayers. Where would this country be if there should be a decline of from 10 to 20 percent in our economy and we still had to carry the present terrific rate of taxation? It would mean the ruin of this country, as everyone must know who will stop to think of it.

Today I read a statement saying that war is not likely. The best preventive of war is a strong economy in the United States. The American people cannot indefinitely pour out billions of dollars.

Mr. President, the interest alone upon our national debt is nearly $6,000,000,000. When will there be a halt to these vast expenditures? Maybe some older and more distinguished and learned Members of this body can give me a little hope for the future. I should like to know what they plan. How are we going to get out from under the vast national debt? How are we going to pay it?

The House of Representatives took one step when it cut off 42 percent. I do not know whether the House wanted to disregard the message of General Eisenhower. If I read the message correctly, he said that any budget cut should be according to the economy of the Nation. I am certain that General Eisenhower does not want to ruin this country any more than I do, but General Eisenhower is a military man. I do not know whether he knows anything more about fiscal spending than I do. Certainly I do not profess to know very much about it.

I have heard it said that this amendment takes on an aspect of politics. It does not carry the name of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], but it does carry the names of some of my colleagues who have honored me in joining in sponsoring the amendment. I have never discussed the matter with the Senator from Ohio. It seems only horse sense to cut down expenditures.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I noted the statement the distinguished Senator from Idaho has made with reference to those who joined with him in his amendment. I regret that I was not in the city on Friday of last week, at which time I understand the Senator offered the amendment. But I want to associate myself with the Senator from Idaho and his colleagues, because I firmly believe he is on the right track and that the measure can stand another billion-dollar reduction.

Mr. WELKER. I wish to thank my distinguished colleague from Kansas, who has done me a great honor.

Mr. President, as has been stated on the floor this afternoon, our national debt is nearly twice the amount of the combined national debts of the other nations we seek to help by this mutual-aid program.

Let me make a brief observation with respect to taxes in the countries which we propose to help. Only approximately half of the taxes levied in those nations in connection with the Mutual Security Act are collected. France charges only 26 percent; Britain charges 46 percent; Turkey, I think, charges 10 percent upon the income and upon the corporate return of their economy. What is wrong with asking those nations to tax at the level we must tax in order to send money to them? I do not see any objection to it. Why should the taxpayer of France, Belgium, or any other country be getting off easy, while the taxpayer of this country is being penalized?

Of course the mutual security bill takes no note of a sum so small as a thousand dollars; but I have been working in the Senate for 6 months for a United States Navy boy who has a bill against the United States for $500 traveling expenses, and I have not been able to get even a hearing in a committee on the matter. That is the kind of treatment that is accorded to an American naval man.

I heard it said a moment ago by one of the proponents of the bill that we should cut down on our domestic military defense bill, and not interfere with the mutual security bill. How is that going to set with the American taxpayer? He at least has some idea of where his money goes if it is spent at home, but does he have any idea as to how his money is being spent all over the world? I suppose he could get the information from the wonderful newspaper which my distinguished colleague [Mr. DWORSHAK] produced a moment ago. If the taxpayer is going to have to rely upon that kind of propaganda, I am afraid he is going to insist that we start cutting foreign aid.

Mr. President, why can we not be fair in this matter? We made the Philippines collect 60 percent more taxes and have better economic reform and pay better wages, but we do not seem inclined to do that in Europe. Why cannot we do it in France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and the other NATO countries?

Mr. President, we have such an example as this: We give our money by way of foreign aid to an individual shipbuilder in Italy, and tell him to go ahead and step up production. As a result of our contribution of money he makes a vast profit. But the salient fact remains that he pays no tax on the profit that was made as a result of the money the American taxpayer contributed to him.

Mr. President, I do not think it is unfair to require the other countries in this program to pay a proportionate share of their wealth in the form of taxes, just as we do in this country. In my opinion, inasmuch as we get 71 percent of our taxes from corporation and individual income-tax returns, we should insist upon Turkey getting a like amount, instead of 10 percent from individuals and corporate taxes; or on Britain getting 71 percent instead of 46 percent; or Italy, which gets only 13 percent instead of 71 percent.

Mr. President, I am about to conclude. I submit to my colleagues that the American people are far ahead of us upon this proposition. They know very well that they pay for tobacco to be smoked in the foreign countries, where live the people to whom we are asked to give all this wonderful aid. The taxpayer knows we have squandered money to buy chewing and smoking tobacco for those people. The fact remains that they know we have bought coffee for them by the shipload. I think the testimony is that in Greece alone every man, woman, and child has received $2 worth of coffee from the American taxpayer. I say that there are heavy lines of danger being drawn around what is called foreign aid, and around other appropriations. The idea of closing our ears to the objections of the American taxpayers against huge spending programs. It is about time for us to realize that the people who are paying this bill ought to be heard.

I agree with everything the House of Representatives has done in connection with this bill. I think they were far more serious than we are, and have studied this question to better advantage. They have to stand the test of public opinion in November of this year. I commend them for doing a good job for their country.

Perhaps I am too high in the figure I have included in the amendment. If I am, I will gladly volunteer to reduce it to correspond with the fine thinking and fine action of the House of Representatives. I think $2,000,000,000 can be cut from the appropriation.

Mr. President, we cannot buy friendship. We cannot throw our weight around with money and expect 100 percent cooperation. We have done our level best. Now the question is one of survival for us. We are waging war in Korea, and that war has not been won. It is a stalemate war. It will go on, it seems, for a long time to come.

I beg my colleagues to think about this amendment. I believe it to be sound. I am honored that 10 of my colleagues have joined with me in sponsoring an additional billion-dollar cut for the benefit of the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY FUND FOR AIR POWER

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations met this morning to consider details of the appropriation for the three branches of the armed services. Secretary Finletter appeared and testified with great eloquence with respect to the Air Corps. I shall not attempt to describe his testimony; it will be made available later. However, I desire to request Senators who have amendments which they wish to offer to the Defense appropriation bill to file the amendments and give the Committee on Defense an opportunity to study them.

I firmly believe the Defense appropriation bill is one of the most important measures which will be considered by the Senate this year, if not the most important. I think it is essential that every suggestion made with respect to the appropriation of funds or the elimination of appropriations should be presented to the committee, so that the committee may have the opportunity of examining such suggestions and of obtaining testimony from appropriate members of the Defense Establishment.

I want the Senate to know that, as chairman of the subcommittee, I have asked the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], who is chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, to come before the subcommittee with respect to facts which his subcommittee has discovered and conclusions it may have reached concerning the reductions of appropriations.

If anywhere cuts in defense appropriations can be made without impairing the military security of the United States, I think the cuts should be made, because inflation is always the result of military expenditures. That is true whether the expenditures are made in the United States or are made abroad, in Europe. I am sure inflation is a development upon which the Soviet Union is depending to wreck the free world. I believe we should undertake by all means at our command to prevent inflation, and we can do that by eliminating unnecessary expenditures. But we should not be misled by a desire to cut expenditures in such a way as would cripple the defense of the United States.

Disclosures which have recently been made with respect to air conflicts in Korea have, I think, a very great significance for every Member of the Senate and for the people of the United States. In my judgment, the war in Korea bears the same relationship to world war III as the war in the Spanish Peninsula bore to World War II. So we cannot afford to lose air superiority to Communist Russia.

Mr. President, in this connection I should like to place in the RECORD the text of a report which I had the honor to file on September 7, 1951, for the Appropriations Committee, concerning its views with respect to air power. It is the full text of a report which the Senate adopted unanimously on the expansion of air power, the statement which was made by the managers on the part of the House when they explained the result of the conference, and the amendment on the expansion of United States air power, which went into the final bill.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

O'MAHONEY REPORT OF SEPTEMBER 7, 1951 (S. REPT. 730, P. 3)

NATIONAL EMERGENCY FUND FOR AIR POWER

It was apparent to the committee that additional air power and supporting forces are required better to prepare the defense of the United States against sudden attack or other emergencies threatening the national security. The committee was unanimous in its belief that no time should be lost in the expansion of air power, but although there is an agreement within the Department of Defense and among the Joint Chiefs of Staff that additional air power and supporting forces are required, the details as to the size and composition of the additional forces have not yet been completed. For this reason there was not available to the committee specific amounts of additional funds required by appropriation. It was decided, therefore, to provide the National Emergency Fund of $5,000,000,000 to be utilized by the Secretary of Defense after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and with the approval of the President, under the restriction, however, that before the funds may be allocated for use, a report must be made to the Appropriations Committees and the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate 10 days prior to the actual transfer.

It is the opinion of the committee that the Department of Defense should expedite the preparation for plans as to size and composition of the additional forces and that these forces to be expanded, include the United States Air Force and the Navy, including the Marines. The committee further recommends that the Armed Services Committees of Congress undertake, at the earliest possible moment, the necessary studies of the kind and character of expansion desirable so that there may be complete cooperation among the services and between the Department of Defense and the Congress.

The purpose of the committee is to make sufficient funds available to permit an immediate start toward acquiring necessary additional air power. The fund here provided is for transfer principally to the following appropriations for the Department of the Air Force, "Aircraft and related procurement," "Major procurement other than aircraft," "Maintenance and operation," "Acquisition and construction of real property"; for the Department of the Navy, "Construction of aircraft and related procurement," "Aircraft and facilities," "Marine Corps troops and facilities," and "Public works." It is not planned to use any of these funds for the expansion of Army aviation, but the committee recognizes that it may be necessary to use the facilities of the Finance Service and the Ordnance Service of the Army and for this purpose not to exceed 5 percent of the aggregate amount authorized in this national emergency fund may be utilized for transfer to these services.

Amendment on national emergency fund

For transfer by the Secretary of Defense for urgent military requirements, after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and with the approval of the President, to any appropriation for military functions under the Department of Defense, to be expended to expedite the procurement and facility programs of the Department of Defense necessary to provide for an expansion of air power and necessary supporting forces for the United States Air Force and the United States Navy to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred, $500,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and $4,500,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph: *Provided*, That the limitation on the availability of any appropriation to which transfers are made hereunder is hereby increased by the amount of any such transfers: *Provided further*, That a report of transfers proposed under this item shall be made to the Appropriations Committees and the Armed Services Committees of the Congress 10 days prior to the actual transfer.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE (H. REPT. 1097, OCTOBER 4, 1951, P. 6)

Amendment No. 3, relating to an emergency fund for the construction of aircraft and related procurement: Provides funds in the amount of $333,000,000 for transfer to the appropriation "Construction of aircraft and related procurement," Department of the Navy, and $667,000,000 for transfer to the appropriation "Aircraft and related procurement," Department of the Air Force, as proposed by the House.

The purpose of this amendment is to provide an additional fund for the procurement of aircraft and related procurement in order that there will be sufficient funds to place orders for long lead time procurement. This amount should be sufficient to enable the departments concerned to make any necessary procurements for the next few months, when proper presentations can be made to the Congress for further consideration of the entire procurement problem.

AMENDMENT ON EXPANSION OF UNITED STATES AIR POWER

For the purpose of providing continuous expansion of United States air power by providing additional construction of aircraft and related procurement, Department of the Navy, $333,000,000; and by providing additional aircraft and related procurement, Department of the Air Force, $667,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let it be said that the Senate added an emergency fund of $5,000,000,000 to expand United States air power so that, through the Navy and through the United States Air Force, this country should have undoubted command of the air. That sum was reduced in the conference from $5,000,000,000 to $1,000,000,000, of which $667,000,000 was made available to the Air Force and $333,000,000 made available to the Navy. That fund has been obligated, I understand, but it was set forth clearly in the report that it was the desire of Congress that further steps be taken to expand the air power of the United States.

DISLOYALTY IN THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "ADA Recovers, 'Rescues' District From U. N. Authority," published in the Washington Sunday Star of May 18, 1952. I call especially to whoever happens to read the article the following langauge:

Roger Baldwin, former head of the American Civil Liberties Union, who was presiding.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADA RECOVERS, "RESCUES" DISTRICT FROM U. N. AUTHORITY

Americans for Democratic Action yesterday almost came out in favor of placing

the voteless District of Columbia under the United Nations Trusteeship Council.

The ADA convention was considering its foreign-policy declaration. One paragraph advocated that all non-self-governing territories should be placed under the Trusteeship Council. It was objected that this might apply to Alaska and Hawaii.

"And the District of Columbia, too," said Roger Baldwin, former head of the American Civil Liberties Union, who was presiding.

The declaration was revised.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point an article entitled "ADA Blasts McCARTHY in Sharp Resolution; Backs Steelworkers," published in the Washington Sunday Star of May 18, 1952.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADA BLASTS McCARTHY IN SHARP RESOLUTION; BACKS STEELWORKERS

(By Francis P. Douglas)

Americans for Democratic Action yesterday swung a blow at Senator McCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin.

The organization also adopted a resolution supporting the CIO steelworkers in their fight for pay increases.

Assailing Senator McCARTHY, ADA urged "a full disclosure of the Senator's public record in hearings now being conducted, so that the people of Wisconsin may be fully informed as to his performance against the public interest and retire him from the Senate."

The hearings mentioned are being held by a Senate Elections Subcommittee.

The organization said Senator McCARTHY has made irresponsible and cowardly attacks on individuals, Government institutions and the press. It said he has intimidated many people in public life.

SINGLE "NO" VOTE

The resolution was offered as the ADA, in its fifth annual convention at the Hotel Statler, plowed through consideration of a long statement on domestic policies. The McCARTHY resolution was adopted by an almost unanimous vote. One "no" vote was heard.

Speakers earlier had condemned "McCARTHYISM" without exception. They included three Democratic candidates for the presidency: W. Averell Harriman, Mutual Security Administrator, Senator McMAHON of Connecticut and Senator KEFAUVER of Tennessee. Senator HUMPHREY of Minnesota, who has his State's "favorite son" indorsement for the presidential nomination, was the keynote speaker.

In the steel resolution ADA said the workers had "loyally cooperated with every request made to them by the United States Government to comply with established stabilization practice and to continue at work."

The steel companies, the resolution said, have attempted to obtain "an unwarranted price increase before engaging in serious bargaining."

HOUSING STIRS DEBATE

The most vigorous debate by members came on a domestic policy declaration which said:

"We oppose discriminatory practices in the administration of programs for publicly aided housing, health and education. We reject legislation for any such legislation unless it contains provisions prohibiting segregation and other discrimination."

A Baltimore delegate moved that the second sentence be deleted. He was supported by others.

The proposal finally was voted down.

In the debate a colored delegate from New York asserted he had been denied food service in the hotel. He said it occurred in the coffee shop. The organization, however, later adopted a resolution accusing the hotel drug store of racial discrimination in this respect.

A committee was appointed to call on the drug store manager and, possibly, to picket the place. The store is not a hotel enterprise but is run by Walter N. Bradshaw. An employee said Mr. Bradshaw was away and would not be back until tomorrow.

OTHER DECLARATIONS

Among the other declarations adopted were ones putting the organization on record as:

1. Supporting Federal aid to public educational institutions which do not practice segregation or discrimination.

2. Criticizing former Mobilization Director Charles E. Wilson on the ground of inadequate planning of the mobilization program and coordinating it with the civilian economy.

3. Opposing universal military training.

4. Asking home rule and the franchise for the District of Columbia.

An effort to strike out a reaffirmation of belief in "free and private competitive enterprise" was soundly beaten by a voice vote. The statement had been called too dogmatic.

DECLARATIONS REFERRED

Because of shortage of time some of the domestic policy declarations were left for action of the ADA national board. These include one favoring transfer of the civil functions of the Army engineers to a single national resources agency.

Consideration of foreign policy declarations likewise was not completed and will be resumed this morning. Generally they call for closer cooperation by the United States with the U. N. One opposed military and economic aid to Franco Spain.

The chief business today will be consideration of ADA's election year political course and election of officers.

Supporters of Senator KEFAUVER have asked an indorsement for their candidate. Friends of Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson have done likewise. There appeared to be a considerable body of opinion, however, that ADA should indorse no particular candidate.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, according to this article, four Presidential candidates appeared before the ADA and criticized McCARTHY's fight against Communists. First, I should like to place some material in the RECORD and ask those four Presidential candidates a few simple questions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a report on Roger Baldwin, received from the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROGER BALDWIN

A check of the public files, records, and publications of the committee has revealed the following information concerning Roger Baldwin.

Roger N. Baldwin was a member of the executive committee of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy, as shown on letterheads of that organization dated November 18, 1936, and February 21, 1938. The American Friends of Spanish Democracy was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 82) as follows: "In 1937-38 the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations * * * such as * * * American Friends of Spanish Democracy."

A letterhead of the Russian Reconstruction Farms, Inc., lists the name of Roger N. Baldwin as a member of the advisory board of that organization (letterhead dated March 20, 1926). The Russian Reconstruction Farms, Inc., was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as a "Communist enterprise which was directed by Harold Ware, son of the well-known Communist Ella Reeve Bloor. It received funds from the Garland fund" (Rept. No. 1131, March 29, 1944, pp. 74 and 76).

Mr. Baldwin sponsored the Mother Ella Bloor birthday banquet in 1936 (program, January 24, 1936, pp. 7 and 9); the celebration in 1937 (Daily Worker, June 14, 1937, p. 8); and he sent greetings to and sponsored the seventy-fifth birthday celebration (undated letterhead, and Souvenir Book, p. 23).

Roger N. Baldwin was a member of the All-American Anti-Imperialist League in 1928, as shown on a letterhead of that group dated April 11, 1928. The All-American Anti-Imperialist League was cited as a "Communist-front organization" by Attorney General Francis Biddle, In re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, page 10. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities also cited the organization as a "Communist enterprise" in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 76).

Letterheads of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, dated April 27, 1938, and January 1940, list Roger Baldwin as a member of the advisory committee of the organization. He was also one of the sponsors of the fourth annual conference of the organization held in Washington, D. C., March 2 and 3, 1940 (letterhead of the fourth annual conference). Attorney General Tom Clark cited the American Committee * * * as "subversive" and "Communist" in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released to the press June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948, by the United States Civil Service Commission. The group was also cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as "One of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States," in its report of March 29, 1944, page 155, and also in a separate report dated June 25, 1942, page 13.

An undated letterhead of the New York Tom Mooney Committee listed Roger Baldwin as a sponsor of the organization. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report dated March 29, 1944 (page 154) cited the New York Tom Mooney Committee as a Communist front and stated that "For many years, the Communist Party organized widespread agitation around the Mooney case, and drew its members and followers into the agitation."

Labor Defender, a Communist magazine as cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities Report, June 25, 1942, page 18, in its issue of July 1931 listed the name of Roger N. Baldwin as a member of the Prisoner's Relief Fund of the International Labor Defense; he sent greetings to the third biennial national conference, as shown on the printed program of that conference. The International Labor Defense was cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948. Attorney General Francis Biddle also cited the organization in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 88, part 6, page 7444, as the legal arm of the Communist Party. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities in reports of January 3, 1939 (pp. 75-78) also reports of January 3, 1940 (p. 9); June 25, 1942 (p. 19); and March 29, 1944 (p. 69) cited it as essentially the legal defense arm of the Communist Party of the United States. Report No. 1115, September 2, 1947 (pp. 1 and 2), of the congressional Committee on Un-American Activities cited the International Labor Defedense— "* * * was part of an international network of organizations for the defense of Communist lawbreakers."

Roger N. Baldwin was one of the sponsors of the North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy (New Masses, September 28, 1937, p. 28). This organization was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in report of January 3, 1940, page 9, and also in a later report of March 19, 1944, page 146.

A pamphlet entitled "Youngville, U. S. A.," lists Roger N. Baldwin as a member of the national advisory committee of the American Youth Congress (p. 62). The American Youth Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark in letters to the Loyalty Review Board which were released to the press December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The organization was also cited by Attorney General Francis Biddle in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 88, part 6, page 7414; also in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, page 10, as follows: "It originated in 1934 and * * * has been controlled by Communists and manipulated by them to influence the thought of American youth." The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as "One of the principal fronts of the Communist Party" and "prominently identified with the White House picket line * * * under the immediate auspices of the American Peace Mobilization." (Reports of June 25, 1942, p. 16; January 3, 1939, p. 82; January 3, 1941, p. 21; June 25, 1942, p. 16; and March 29, 1944, p. 102).

He was a member of the advisory board of the American Student Union as shown in a pamphlet entitled "Presenting the American Student Union." Roger N. Baldwin was a speaker at the fourth national convention of that group (the Student Almanac, 1939, p. 32). The American Student Union was cited as "a Communist front which was the result of a united front gathering of young Socialists and Communists in 1937 * * *." (Report dated January 3, 1939, p. 80; also cited in reports of January 3, 1940, p. 9; June 25, 1942, p. 16; and March 29, 1944, p. 159 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities.)

An undated letterhead of Frontier Films lists the name of Roger Baldwin as a member of the advisory board of that group. Frontier Films was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in report of March 29, 1944, pages 49, 83, and 147.

Roger Baldwin was a contributor to New Masses, issues of November 16, 1937, and May 13, 1941. New Masses was cited as a Communist periodical by Attorney General Francis Biddle in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 88, part 6, page 7448. It was cited as a nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party * * * whose ownership was vested in the American Fund for Public Service (Garland Fund) by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, March 29, 1944, pages 48 and 75; also cited in reports of January 3, 1939, page 80; and June 25, 1942, pages 4 and 21.

Roger Baldwin was a sponsor of the National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance and signed the call to that congress (Unemployment Insurance Review, vol. 1, 1935, p. 3; leaflet, Call to a National Congress for Unemployment * * *). The National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance was cited as a Communist front, held January 5, 6, 7, 1935, in Washington, D. C., and headed by Herbert Benjamin, leading Communist, by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944, pages 94 and 116.

In a pamphlet entitled "The People Versus H. C. L.," December 11–12, 1937, page 2, Roger Baldwin is listed as one of the sponsors of the Consumers National Federation. This organization was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944, page 155.

The Struggle Against War for June 1933 (p. 2) listed Roger Baldwin as a member of the American Committee for Struggle Against War; the same publication, in the August 1933 issue (p. 2), listed him as a member of the arrangements committee for the United States Congress Against War, under the auspices of the American Committee for Struggle Against War; a letterhead of November 1, 1933, of the United States Congress Against War also named him as a member of the arrangements committee. The American Committee for Struggle Against War was cited as a Communist front which was formed in response to directives from a World Congress Against War held in Amsterdam in August 1932 under the auspices of the Communist International. Avowed Communist Donald Henderson was executive director of the American committee. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944, pp. 47 and 119.)

Roger Baldwin was a member of the national executive committee of the American League Against War and Fascism (Fight magazine for April 1934, p. 14; the Call to the Second United States Congress Against War and Fascism, September 28, 29, and 30, 1934, Chicago, Ill., p. 2; and a letterhead of the organization dated August 22, 1935). He spoke at a legislative conference of the group, as shown in the Daily Worker (February 27, 1937); and sponsored a joint meeting of that group with the American Friends of the Chinese People (Daily Worker of September 24, 1937, p. 6).

The American League Against War and Fascism was cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark in letters to Loyalty Review Board released to the press December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. It was cited by Attorney General Francis Biddle, in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, page 10, as a Communist-front organization. He also cited it as being established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 88, part 6, page 7442. The special committee cited the organization in its report of March 29, 1944, page 53; also cited it in reports of January 3, 1939, pages 69 and 121; January 3, 1940, page 10; June 25, 1942, page 14, as follows: The American League Against War and Fascism was organized at the First United States Congress Against War, which was held in New York City, September 29 to October 1, 1933. Four years later at Pittsburgh, November 26–28, 1937, the name of the organization was changed to the American League for Peace and Democracy. * * * It remained as completely under the control of Communists when the name was changed as it had been before.

The organization American Friends of the Chinese People, mentioned above, was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944, pages 40 and 147.

A leaflet entitled "Call to Action, American Congress for Peace and Democracy, January 6–8, 1939, Washington, D. C.," listed the name of Roger Baldwin as one of those who endorsed the congress. He was a member of the national committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy (letterhead of July 12, 1939, and a pamphlet entitled "Seven and One-Half Million—"). He spoke at the united anti-Nazi council of the American League for Peace and Democracy, as reported in the Daily Worker of May 12, 1938 (p. 2). The American League for Peace and Democracy was cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released to the press June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948. Attorney General Francis Biddle in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 88, part 6, pages 7442–7443, cited the organization as established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union. The American League for Peace and Democracy * * * was designed to conceal Communist control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International. It was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as: The largest of the Communist-front movements in the United States is the American League for Peace and Democracy, formerly known as the American League Against War and Fascism, and, at the time of its inception, as the United States Congress Against War. * * * The league contends publicly that it is not a Communist-front movement, yet at the very beginning Communists dominated it. Earl Browder was its vice president. An examination of the program of the American League will show that the organization was nothing more nor less than a bold advocate of treason. (Reports of January 3, 1939, pp. 69–71; March 29, 1944, p. 37; also cited in reports of January 3, 1940, p. 10; January 3, 1941, p. 21; June 25, 1942, pp. 14–16; and January 2, 1943, p. 8.)

Mr. Baldwin contributed to the November 1933 and September 1937 issues of Fight magazine, official publication of the American League Against War and Fascism. (See par. 1, p. 4, for citation on organization.)

The Daily Worker of September 24, 1940 (p. 5), reported that Roger Baldwin had signed a letter of the Communist Party and the American Civil Liberties Union, demanding discharge of Communist Party defendants in Fulton and Livingston Counties. The Daily Worker is the official organ of the Communist Party, United States of America.

The Worker (Sunday edition of the Daily Worker), dated October 30, 1949, page 6, named Roger Baldwin as one of those who had spoken out against the verdict handed down against the 11 Communist leaders.

The New York Times of October 27, 1949 (p. 29), reported that Roger Baldwin, director of the American Civil Liberties Union since its inception in 1920, will resign January 1. After leaving his administrative post with the union, Mr. Baldwin will devote full time to specialized work in the field of international civil rights. The article further stated that Mr. Baldwin would act for the International League for the Rights of Man, an affiliate of the union.

In Report No. 2 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated January 3, 1939 (p. 83), Roger Baldwin is mentioned in connection with the American Civil Liberties Union as follows: * * * The managing director is Roger Baldwin who served a term as a draft evader in the Essex County jail in New Jersey in 1918 and 1919. This excerpt was taken from the above-mentioned report which originally appeared in a report of the United Mine Workers, filed in 1924.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, this is the same Roger Baldwin, incidentally, who was presiding at the time the four presidential candidates made their attack upon my efforts to remove Communists from the Government. I asked the House committee for this report upon Baldwin. I also asked for a report upon the American Civil Liberties Union. Baldwin is the head of the American Civil Liberties Union. I received a citation with reference to the American Civil Liberties Union. I ask unanimous consent that that citation be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Cited by California Un-American Activities Committee, 1943 and 1948, as follows:

"The American Civil Liberties Union may be definitely classed as a Communist front or 'transmission belt' organization. At

least 90 percent of its efforts are expended on behalf of Communists who come into conflict with the law. While it professes to stand for free speech, a free press, and free assembly, it is quite obvious that its main function is to protect Communists in their activities of force and violence in their program to overthrow the Government."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the American Civil Liberties Union was cited, incidentally, as a Communist front in 1943 and in 1948, by the California Committee on Un-American Activities.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the statement of Herbert A. Philbrick, an alleged former undercover FBI agent, who discusses the orders given to him by the Communist Party so far as the American Civil Liberties Union was concerned.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRET INSTRUCTIONS CONCERNING AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION GIVEN TO UNDERCOVER FBI AGENT HERBERT A. PHILBRICK, SECRET AGENT OF THE FBI, IN HIS SYNDICATED ARTICLE, I LED THREE LIVES, WHICH APPEARED IN THE EVENING STAR ON FEBRUARY 6, 1952

"Our instructions were to leave a skeleton force in the Progressive Party, and turn our heavy guns on the Civil Rights Congress, a well-established class A Communist front, and on the liberal Civil Liberties Union, the Massachusetts affiliate of the American Civil Liberties Union.

"We were given secret orders. Mine were to join the ranks of the Civil Rights Congress. Others were given similar instructions concerning the Civil Liberties Union."

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a very vicious attack made by the ADA World, which is the publication for the ADA, upon J. Edgar Hoover. I wish to make it very clear that in inserting this material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I in no way endorse what the ADA has to say about Hoover. I think he is one of the greatest Americans living, next to Douglas MacArthur. I insert this material only to show the type of official publication issued by the ADA.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO, ME?—IT SOUNDS INCREDIBLE, BUT HERE IT IS: "DEROGATORY INFORMATION" (FROM CONFIDENTIAL INFORMANTS) ON A WELL-KNOWN AMERICAN

The following document was not one of those introduced in the Judith Coplon trial. It is not an FBI report, although it sounds like one and has at least as much significance as some of them. If such a document had been introduced, we think it might have read like this.

"Confidential Informant T-1 reports that Hoover, John Edgar, has been on the Federal Government payroll for a period of 32 years, and since 1924 as Director of an organization known as the Federal Bureau of Investigation, many employees of which have joined, and are now members and in some cases functionaries of the Communist Party. When these facts were recently disclosed in part, Mr. Hoover defended the action of his associates on the ground that they were acting in the higher interests of their country.

"Confidential Informant T-2 reported that this was a common explanation made in cases of patent disloyalty. Confidential Agents TB-2, PBY, and H-2-O corroborated this evaluation with Special Agent KT, adding grimly that she had 'heard that song before.'

"Confidential Informant T-4 reported that Subject Hoover's personal attorney is one Morris Ernst, of New York City, one of the founders of the organization known as the National Lawyers' Guild, whose members significantly enough include John Abt, Lee Pressman, and Nathan Witt, all of whom have been accused by Whittaker Chambers (admitted Communist courier) of being part of what has become popularly known as his apparatus.

"Confidential Informant T-5 states that Mr. Ernst, aforementioned attorney for subject Hoover, was excessively sympathetic to, if not a member of, the North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy, recently added to the list of subversive organizations by subject Hoover's alleged superior, the United States Attorney General. Many informants have reported that Mr. Ernst was an exemplary citizen in many respects, although given to sporadic enthusiasm for certain left-wing organizations, and the writing of books defending the dissemination of alleged lascivious literature.

"This last activity of subject Hoover's personal attorney, it was felt by Confidential Informant BB-19, made the association of Mr. Ernst with the subject particularly unfortunate, in view of the subject's widely publicized and undeniable interest in preventing juvenile delinquency.

"Further, Confidential Informant T-6 states that subject Hoover has consistently refused to give duly self-constituted congressional committees pertinent information on Communist activities suitable for afternoon release; and has, despite repeated requests, refused to turn over to them files in his possession. Said informant was unable to state what constitutional immunity subject Hoover was relying upon. It was further undetermined whether or not Mr. Hoover would choose to avail himself of the constitutional privilege against self-incrimination, as resorted to by Dalton Trumbo and John Howard Lawson, whose indictment for refusing to give information to Congress was recently upheld by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

"However, Confidential Informant T-7 did establish as fact and submitted corroborating documents to show that two former Chairmen of the Federal Communications Commission had accused subject Hoover of violating the Federal Communications Act and engaging in what Justice Holmes called dirty business.

"Confidential Informant T-12 reported that although subject Hoover maintains a comfortable bachelor's residence, he is seen dining almost nightly at the third floor grill of Harvey's Restaurant on Connecticut Avenue in Washington, D. C. No adequate explanation has been advanced for this activity, which becomes especially worthy of surveillance since it is known that subject Hoover persists in dining in said restaurant regularly even since Gerhardt Eisler has been seen dining there on occasion (see report of Confidential Informant P-26). The same restaurant has been frequented by Judith Coplon, who, on at least one occasion when she had dinner along with an elderly gentleman, was seen walking from her table to the rear of the restaurant carrying a large shoulder-slung handbag with undetermined contents.

"Confidential Informant T-16 also indicated that subject Hoover has visited the Stork Club repeatedly when in New York City. Dates of the Hoover visits to said night club are being checked to verify the suspicion of Auxiliary Agent 14B that he may have frequented said Stork Club on the same nights that such persons as Fredric March, Charlie McCarthy, and Walter Winchell were there and Florence Eldrige was not. (See abstract of movements of Hollywood figures compiled from H. Hopper and L. Parsons.)

"Furthermore, it has been the considered judgment of Confidential Informant B-34 that over a period of years, Mr. Winchell has had repeated access to confidential information from Government sources that could have been divulged by few others than Subject Hoover. (See report X-236 on clubs, subsection Stork, ready for afternoon release under subtitle 'This Will Bear Watching.')

"Confidential Informant T-21 reports that said organization under direction of Subject Hoover subscribes on a regular basis to a number of subversive magazines and newspapers such as the Daily Worker. Subject Hoover is further known to be conversant with many intraparty Communist publications not distributed to the public and available only to persons enjoying the trust, confidence, and displaying properly colored dues stamps from said Communist Party.

"It should be reported that Subject Hoover suggested that familiarity with such publications was necessary to the work of his organization. However, in the view of said Informants TB-1, PBY, and H-2-O, this explanation has been used far too generally in cases of this kind for it to warrant serious consideration, with Special Agent KT adding acidly in a footnote that she had 'heard this song before, too.'

"Confidential Informant P-26 states that Subject Hoover's agency was the 'weakest link' in the chain of circumstances which made possible the escape of Gerhardt Eisler (see report of C. I. T.-12 dealing with Subject Hoover's frequenting same restaurant as G. Eisler).

"Confidential Informants TB-2, PBY and H-2-O report that a cryptic item decoded as 'Bon Voyage Comrade G' was on the agenda of at least three Communist cell meetings in New York early in May. Special Informant KT supplied the names of two members of the Communist Party of New York who had collected funds for the purchase of non-Mendelian domestic fruit to be carried to a certain pier on the East River in a basket bearing the legend "A. W. G." (decoded as Auf Weidersehen Gerhardt).

"Unless said agency directed by Subject Hoover can be believed to be capable of incredible mismanagement (an explanation not to be lightly advanced), Confidential Informant P-26 reported, 'there is more to this case than meets the eye.'"

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks another news item from the same issue of the ADA World, of June 23, 1949, entitled "Wechsler Named to National Board." This is the same Wechsler, incidentally, who is now editor of the New York Post, and who admits that he was a Communist until some time in the late 1930's. He claims to have reformed since then, but has never, so far as we know, shown any indication of his reformation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WECHSLER NAMED TO NATIONAL BOARD

WASHINGTON.—James A. Wechsler, editor of the New York Post and one of the founders of ADA, is the newest member of the ADA national board. He was chosen at the board meeting June 12. A Washington correspondent for several years before his elevation to the editorship of the Post early this month, Wechsler has written frequently for the Progressive Commentary, the Nation, the New Republic, and Harpers, and is author of Labor Baron, a book about John L. Lewis,

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "High Cost of Loyalty," published in the ADA World of February 16, 1949. On second thought, I think I shall read the editorial into the RECORD, or at least a portion of it. I shall read one paragraph:

The clearance of William W. Remington of charges of disloyalty to the Government was unquestionably the most important and well-publicized decision so far handed down by the Government's top loyalty Review Board. This major civil liberties victory can be credited in large measure to Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., chairman of the ADA national executive committee, who undertook the defense of Remington with the same deep devotion and amazing energy he gives to this organization and to many other liberal causes.

Mr. Rauh, incidentally, is no longer chairman of the ADA national executive committee. I believe that at present he is the national secretary.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the entire editorial referred to.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGH COST OF LOYALTY

The clearance of William W. Remington of charges of disloyalty to the Government was unquestionably the most important and well-publicized decision so far handed down by the Government's top Loyalty Review Board. This major civil liberties victory can be credited in large measure to Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., chairman of the ADA national executive committee, who undertook the defense of Remington with the same deep devotion and amazing energy he gives to this organization and to many other liberal causes.

The bare facts of the case are by now well known. Remington was publicly charged last summer by the self-styled Communist courier Elizabeth Bentley with having given her secret Government data. He has now been vindicated and reinstated as an important Commerce Department official at his former salary.

Despite the magnitude of the Remington victory, his clearance, which took 7 months, offers no final proof that the Federal loyalty program is necessarily equitable or effective. No attempt is made here to judge that question or to propose an alternative procedure for determining a man's loyalty to his country.

We are primarily concerned with a particular phase of the Remington case which dramatizes one of the most appalling injustices in the Government program: the failure to permit the accused to confront his accuser.

In the vast majority of loyalty cases the sources of damaging testimony are kept secret at the discretion of the FBI. So the accused and his attorney grope blindly for the facts and the charges which have cast suspicion on the man whose job and reputation are at stake.

There is little doubt that the outcome of the Remington case rested chiefly on the testimony of Miss Bentley, who had accused Remington before a congressional committee and repeated the charges on a television program. Hence, Remington and his attorney had the advantage of familiarity with the character of the key witness and the nature of her testimony. They insisted that she appear before the Review Board and submit to cross-examination—that there was no reasonable excuse for the Government to prevent her appearance.

Miss Bentley ducked and evaded the invitations of the Board which has no power to subpena witnesses. The Review Board Chairman, Seth Richardson, charged that she lied when she blandly denied to newspapers that she had been asked to testify. Her failure to respond helped to discredit her and to strengthen the Remington case.

As has been pointed out, the circumstances in this case were unique. It is hard to say what the outcome might have been if Remington had been denied, as have most loyalty defendants, (1) the right to know the name of his accuser and the exact charges against him, and (2) the opportunity to publicly challenge his accuser to submit to cross-examination in his presence.

In the overwhelming number of loyalty cases this important democratic procedure of confrontation has been almost uniformly ignored. This is no accident. It is a concession to the FBI, which demands that its sources of information be kept secret and its files withheld even from other Government officials.

A reexamination of the entire Government loyalty program will soon be undertaken by ADA. It will be made in the light of many disheartening and disquieting episodes which have occurred in the Federal loyalty proceedings. It must determine whether the fault lies in the President's executive order or whether the order is being widely misinterpreted by Government officials.

The necessity for the program, which has found over 99 percent of Government workers loyal, must be weighed against the damage wrought by serious invasions of personal liberties. A full study must also recognize that Communists, while they are tolerated in our society, are full-fledged agents of a foreign power whose interests are clearly inimical to those of every democratic nation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "ADA Pamphlet Urges That Congress Repeal Smith Act," published in the ADA World for December 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADA PAMPHLET URGES THAT CONGRESS REPEAL SMITH ACT

ADA has urged all Americans to stand up and be counted in defense of freedom of speech, and announced it will fight for repeal of the Smith Act.

This decision, approved by the October meeting of the national board, was revealed in an ADA pamphlet entitled "Free Speech Versus the Communists—Let's Get Back into Balance."

Francis Biddle, national chairman, emphasized, in releasing the pamphlet, that ADA still seeks repeal of the McCarran Act of 1950.

"We oppose the Smith Act because it proposes to prosecute people for what they think or say rather than what they do," the ADA pamphlet said. "We recognize the need for drastic protection against acts of espionage or sabotage. But the Smith Act is aimed at the advocacy of ideas, rather than the commission of overt acts.

"We are confident that Communist ideas can be beaten—are being beaten—in the forum of public opinion where Americans for Democratic Action has consistently fought them.

"We have not attacked the decision of the Supreme Court upholding the constitutionality of the Smith Act, but we remain firmly opposed to the act, and to the roundups of minor Communist leaders whose prosecutions go beyond the letter and spirit of the Supreme Court decision," the pamphlet continued.

"We find these contrary to President Truman's clear declaration that the right to voice opinions, no matter how loathsome they may be, is a sacred American right. We find in the dissenting opinions of Justices Douglas and Black noble declarations of our traditional freedom."

The greater danger is that in the midst of the world-wide struggle the people of the United States will adopt the methods of the Communists, the pamphlet warned.

"In our concern with the immediate dangers of Communist subversion, we are letting slip from our grasp our precious heritage of freedom of speech. We propose, together with the American Civil Liberties Union, the CIO, and other non-Communist organizations, to fight for its repeal and for the reaffirmation by Congress of our basic freedoms."

Copies of the pamphlet may be obtained from the national ADA office and quantity prices are available upon request.

Mr. McCARTHY. Again, let me make it very clear that I am not inserting these articles because I agree with them, but only to show the nature of the organization before which four Democratic presidential candidates appeared and attacked my fight on communism. I can understand why the ADA should make such an attack. It is a little more difficult to understand why some of the presidential candidates should make such an attack.

The four candidates who appeared before the ADA were the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and Mr. Averell Harriman. In view of their condemnation of McCARTHY, I wish to ask them all several questions at this time.

Since I commenced to expose Communists in Government 10 of the original 81 whose names I gave the Tydings committee have either been convicted or indicted or removed under the loyalty program. I say 10. The number is 11 as of this moment. I have just received word that the eleventh, Mary Jane Keeney, has been indicted today. At the time she was named she was a former State Department employee working with the United Nations. Her indictment, I assume, will remove her from the United Nations, unless she has already been removed, since her appearance before the McCarran committee.

I should like to ask those four Democratic candidates for the Presidency this question: Does this mean that one of their campaign promises is that they will reinstate the 11 whom I have succeeded in removing from the State Department and other branches of Government? Or does it mean that, while they disagree with the method I used in exposing the 11 and getting them convicted or removed under the loyalty program, and while they damn my methods, they still want to keep those innocent people out of their jobs?

In order that there may be no doubt in their minds as to the 11, I shall run over the names very briefly.

No. 1 is John Stewart Service. Service was originally cleared by the Tydings committee. Senators may recall that at the time I first named him, the State Department issued the usual press release damning McCARTHY for smearing

this innocent individual and saying that I was making it difficult for the Department to hire other good, loyal men like Service.

Service was dismissed from the State Department on December 13, 1951, after he had been cleared by the State Deparent Loyalty Board and by the Tydings committee, and after the Loyalty Review Board picked up the case and ordered him discharged under the loyalty security program.

The next name is that of Edward Posnick. That was one of the cases which I presented to the Senate. At the time I presented the case to the Senate I gave the Senate his complete file, including 12 FBI reports. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] took the floor of the Senate and inserted in the RECORD 15 or 20 affidavits defending Posnick.

Posnick resigned while under loyalty board investigation. Since then both Posnick and his wife have been before the grand jury.

The next case is that of Esther Brunauer. Mrs. Brunauer has been suspended from her high State Department job where she was handling top-secret material.

Incidentally, a rather humorous incident occurred in connection with this case. Jack Lait wrote a book in which he pointed out that one of the Senators traveled to Italy with Mrs. Brunauer, and the Senator, who has defended these innocent people constantly, has sued Lait for $2,000,000 because she thought her character was injured to that extent by the story that she had known the Brunauers. Mrs. Brunauer has been suspended.

Stephen Brunauer was the head of the explosives section of the Navy. He was before the Tydings committee also.

While his wife admitted that he became a member of the Young Communist League, he claimed that he had reformed. Incidentally, Brunauer has never been put under oath to testify. Finally, Secretary of the Navy Matthews—and this was one of the good things that Matthews did—called Brunauer before the Navy Department's loyalty board. He refused to be sworn, and he resigned his job. Incidentally, this was after Noel Field, who had been a good friend of Brunauer's, left the country and went behind the iron curtain, undoubtedly taking with him any secrets he possessed.

The next case is that of Peveril Meigs. Meigs was No. 3 on my list. He was not No. 3 in order of importance, but merely accidentally No. 3 on the list. He was allowed to resign from his job with the State Department with a clear record. The State Department made no notation on his record to the effect that he was under investigation. He got a job in the Military Establishment. The Army loyalty board called hearings on Meigs and he was ordered discharged from the Army.

The next case is that of Hans Lansberg. He had been allowed to resign from the State Department with a clear record. He then secured a position as an economist with the Department of Commerce. The Secretary of Commerce ordered Lansberg discharged under the loyalty program. He appealed from that decision. The Loyalty Review Board affirmed the action of the Secretary of Commerce. Lansberg was removed from his position on May 25, 1951.

In mentioning the Department of Commerce I think it would be unfair unless I mentioned the fact that they have been doing an infinitely better job than the State Department has been doing.

The next case is that of Oliver Edmund Clubb. Clubb was director of the State Department's Division of Chinese Affairs. He was cleared by the Tydings committee, but the State Department Loyalty Board unanimously ruled against Clubb. Incidentally, this is the first case in which the State Department has ever ruled against anyone. There are three appeals to Acheson now pending. In any event the State Department Loyalty Board performed the unusual act of unanimously ruling against Clubb. Dean Acheson, as Senators will recall, overruled his board and gave Clubb a clean bill of health, after which Clubb immediately resigned to accept a life pension of $5,800 a year. At the time Club resigned the State Department issued a press release saying that Clubb had been cleared by the loyalty program of the State Department. Thereafter the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and I announced that this was untrue. We stated that Clubb had been ruled against by the Loyalty Board of the State Department and that Acheson had reversed the ruling. Three days later Clubb resigned, obviously with the understanding that if he would resign the ruling in his case would be reversed.

The next case is that of William Remington. That case is too well known to everyone to spend any time on it, except to say that he was cleared by the Tydings committee as one of the innocent people who was smeared by MCCARTHY. He was later, thanks to the good work of the House committee and some excellent spadework by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the excellent work done by a young district attorney, indicted and convicted and sentenced to 5 years in jail. That sentence has been set aside on technical grounds. Remington has been reindicted on five new counts, and the case is now pending.

The next case is that of V. Lorwin. Lorwin was suspended under the State Department's loyalty program, according to a letter received from the Chairman of the Civil Service Loyalty Review Board in June of 1951.

The next case is that of William T. Stone. Stone was ordered removed under the State Department security program while he was assistant to Assistant Secretary of State WILLIAM BENTON, who is now a Senator from Connecticut. BENTON at that time refused to remove Stone. On February 2, 1952, Stone resigned after the Civil Service Commission Loyalty Review Board had selected a panel to rehear Stone's case.

Let me go back a few months. In June 1951, a letter of charges was filed against Stone. In late November 1951 he was cleared by the State Department Loyalty Board. In December or early January the Loyalty Review Board picked up Stone's case and ordered the State Department to furnish additional information and investigation. It ordered a review board panel to sit. At the time I announced that fact, Mr. President, William Stone gave out a press release in which he stated it was all a lie. The State Department said it was not true and that Stone had been cleared.

Yet, during the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations while the hearings were in executive session—and I understand that the testimony is about to be released, so I am sure I am not violating any confidence by stating what happened before the Committee on Appropriations—I asked Mr. Humelsine whether it was not true that Mr. Stone had resigned under pressure while his case was pending before the review board after the review board had ordered a new panel to sit. Mr. Humelsine said it was not true. He said the State Department had no information whatever along that line. I do not want to accuse Mr. Humelsine of lying. I assume he is so busy that he cannot keep track of these things, especially with respect to any case on which they issue a press release.

Nevertheless, the following day, under cross examination, with some of his aides prompting his memory, Mr. Humelsine admitted that what I had said was completely true, namely, that William Stone had been cleared by the State Department Loyalty Board; that the review board picked up his case and had said that they were not satisfied with the case; that the review board stated it was forming a panel to review the Stone case; that they called upon the State Department for further evidence; and that thereupon William Stone resigned.

The eleventh case is that of Mary Jane Keeney. My staff informs me that she was today indicted by a Federal grand jury.

I have given a brief review of these cases, Mr. President, so as to be of assistance to the four Democratic presidential candidates who appeared before the ADA convention and so vigorously condemned my fight against communism.

I believe that the 150,000,000 American people who are being asked to vote for them are entitled to answers to several questions. One of the questions is:

Does their opposition to my exposure of Communists and fellow travelers and some innocent dupes of the Kremlin mean that they are making the American people the solemn campaign promise to reinstate Mary Jane Keeney, to reinstate Service, to reinstate Remington, to reinstate Posnick—in fact, to reinstate all 11 persons I have mentioned; or does it mean that, while they condemn my methods of getting these dangerous people out of Government, they will agree that they should be left out of Government?

I think in fairness to the voters they should answer that question.

Mr. President, I now desire to turn my attention to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE REID F. MURRAY OF WISCONSIN

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to read a resolution into the RECORD:

Whereas the late Hon. Reid F. Murray, Congressman of the Seventh Wisconsin Congressional District, has this morning been called to his eternal reward; and

Whereas Waupaca County has been the home of Congressman Murray since his birth, whereby it has been honored by the outstanding leadership and representation Congressman Murray has given this district; and

Whereas Congressman Murray has at all times courageously championed the cause, the welfare, and the principles of the Republican Party in the interests of the farmer, the workingman, and to business management with equality and justice: Be it hereby

Resolved, That the members of the Republican Party for Waupaca County honor the name of Congressman Murray, and give tribute to the outstanding services he has given to this district and State; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to his bereaved widow and family, and to the Wisconsin Members of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, in connection with this resolution, I should like to say that I feel that the farmers of America lost a real, truly intelligent friend when Reid Murray died. I cannot think of another Member of Congress who can fill Reid Murray's shoes, insofar as the problems of the farmers are concerned. He was the one man to whom any of us could go whenever farm legislation was pending. We always knew that regardless of how he himself might feel about such legislative proposals, he had given them intelligent study, and that we could obtain from him a good, honest résumé of the proposals.

So, Mr. President, I should like to join with some of my friends in the House of Representatives who have had so many fine things to say about Representative Reid F. Murray.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 156) to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until June 15, 1952, and it was signed by the Vice President.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate now stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 27, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 26, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, as we continue to go forth in this new week, may we bear witness to the moral and spiritual mettle of our character by daily walking the path of duty, serenely and steadfastly, humbly and faithfully.

May we never allow our minds and hearts to be mastered by low ideals or become the victims of fear when we face hardships and heavy responsibilities.

Grant that all leaders and representatives in government and in the political life of our Republic may have a clear vision of the glory of being true to their high vocation.

Give us the confidence that nothing can ever eclipse or destroy the greatness and strength of our Nation if we are determined to enthrone righteousness and justice and keep inviolate our devotion to Thy divine laws. Help us to bring peace upon this earth.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 23, 1952, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3066. An act to amend defense housing laws, and for other purposes.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time only for the purpose of bringing to the attention of whatever administrative agencies are concerned the fact that there still exists in the northeastern section of Pennsylvania, more particularly in the hard-coal field and even more especially in my district in that section of the hard-coal field, the chronic unemployed condition that I have been talking about on the floor of this House for many years. I say this today because it has been brought to my attention that the temporary unemployment condition existing in the Detroit area they tell me has now been mopped up and that that surplus labor pool no longer exists there. This shows it can be done and that it can be cleaned up. But, Mr. Speaker, I would like part of that effort to be directed to the chronic unemployed condition still existing year after year and just as bad as it ever was in Luzerne County, Pa.

FARM LEGISLATION

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MARSHALL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the appendix.]

CHEESE POLICY

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have always had a deep concern for the welfare of the American farmer. I have always felt that the backbone of a sound American economy must be a healthy and vigorous agriculture. My opposition to section 104 of the Defense Production Act, restricting imports of cheese, stems from the fact that I am convinced this section will harm our domestic agriculture a good deal more than it will help it.

As far as our agriculture is concerned, we are an exporting nation. We sell two or three times as much of our agricultural products in foreign markets as we buy from foreigners. We even sell three or four times as much dairy products in foreign markets as we import. Every third bale of cotton we produce is shipped overseas; so is every third bale of wheat, and every fourth bale of tobacco. We sell 30 percent of our soybeans to foreigners, 13 percent of our cottonseed, and 40 percent of our peanuts and peanut oil. Without these markets, our producers would suffer. Many would not survive.

What section 104 does is to shrink off these foreign markets. Foreign countries need dollars if they are going to buy American goods. When they cannot sell their products here, they cannot get those needed dollars. In a situation of that kind, the only thing many of them can do is to reduce their buying of American products—American apples, citrus fruits, tobacco, cotton, wheat, and dairy products.

Section 104 will even encourage countries which have the dollars to reduce their purchases of American farm products. For section 104 is a clear invitation to every country of the world to follow the American lead, to protect its domestic agriculture at all costs, even where the protective measures in the end will harm the country and the very producers the measures are designed to help.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to address the House on tomorrow for 25 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF WAR POWERS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 156) to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until June 15, 1952.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us the necessity for the continuance of these powers and also if this is a unanimous report from his committee?

Mr. CELLER. This is a unanimous report from the Committee on the Judiciary. The bill comes over from the Senate, and the Senate Committee on the Judiciary is now wrestling with this very intricate problem of extension of war powers. They have asked for this breathing space of 15 days. All powers involved expire on June 1, and the Senate feels that it cannot act before June 1, and therefore asks this body to concur in this bill so as to give both bodies the opportunity to deliberate and come to a conclusion before June 15. All this does is to extend the war powers now in existence for a period of 15 additional days.

I will say this also, that the subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary has been working on this problem and has reported its bill this morning to the Committee on Rules. We have just concluded considerable work on the bill. But we were not able to finish it today. We hope to be able to finish it shortly. It is in the interest of safety to extend these powers at least the 15 days.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does this resolution have the approval of the Senate?

Mr. CELLER. It has been approved by the Senate. This is a Senate joint resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Masachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, am I correct in understanding that this continues the war powers the President now has?

Mr. CELLER. It continues every power he may have according to the dictates of Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. For how long?

Mr. CELLER. It is an extension of 15 days.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the President is reported to have said he has authority to seize private industry, I want to be recorded as against extension of power to the President as long as he has that attitude. He does not need it, according to his statement. I do not know why we should be called upon to act. I know he does not have the power he claims.

Mr. CELLER. That may be, but this does not affect the situation one way or another.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know, but as long as he claims the power to seize private property I will not vote to give him any power.

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, when this matter was up before, I asked the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] questions as to whether this extension of the war powers authority in any way affected the reservists now in the service. Can the gentleman tell me whether or not it does?

Mr. CELLER. Frankly, I cannot express an opinion. We were just about coming to that in the provisions. Perhaps one of the members of the subcommittee can give the gentleman enlightenment on that better than I can.

Mr. FORRESTER. I did not understand the question. Will the gentleman repeat it?

Mr. GROSS. Will this extension of the war powers in any way affect the reservists now in service?

Mr. FORRESTER. Of course, this extension of 15 days will, yes, because the 15-day extension is to extend all of those powers as they were originally granted.

Mr. CELLER. Whatever they may be, they are extended. Those powers are extended for 15 days, no question about it. That is to give us the breathing spell we need to be able to conclude the bill. The Senate has not been able to do it in the time we wanted to finish it.

Mr. GROSS. This extends it to when, June 15?

Mr. CELLER. June 15, that is all, of this year.

Mr. FORRESTER. May I say to the gentleman that subcommittee No. 4, of which I am a member, has brought in a bill for consideration by the full committee, but the full committee has not passed on it. There were several powers that were considered and there were several that were deleted. This request is due to the fact that the time limit, which was set at June 1, is just about to expire. We joined in the request, and the chairman is making this request at the request of the full Judiciary Committee, that it be given 15 days more in order that we may be able to pass upon the bill the subcommittee has reported. I can assure the gentleman that several important powers have been deleted.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that the reservists have been shamefully treated in the past. I hope there will be no more of this shameful treatment of the reservists by reason of this extension.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in view of the fact that an objection made at this time would be futile, since a rule would be reported on this joint resolution anyway, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until June 1, 1952," approved April 14, 1952 (Public Law 313, 82d Cong.), is amended by striking out "June 1, 1952" wherever it appears in such joint resolution and inserting in lieu thereof "June 15, 1952."

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KAISER-FRAZER CORP.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, last March I turned over to the Armed Services Subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] certain information regarding the Kaiser-Frazer operation at Willow Run. Last week the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] went into considerable detail in exposing the operating methods of the Kaiser Corp.

At a recent stockholders meeting, I have been informed, Mr. Edgar Kaiser told the stockholders that the charge I made against the Willow Run operation was unfounded. He also stated that the congressional committee investigating the charge had given him a clean bill of health. This is not true. Mr. Kaiser apparently made the statement just to satisfy the irked stockholders. He went on to tell the stockholders that they had nothing to fear about the millions of dollars lost to date as the defense contracts that Kaiser-Frazer had and the ones they are about to get would pull the company out of its embarrassing financial position. In the May 26 issue of Automotive News, Mr. Kaiser offers a very weak and unconvincing argument for the losses incurred by the Kaiser-Frazer Corp.

For the benefit of the good honest people who have invested their money in Kaiser-Frazer stock, I wish to inform them that the congressional committee has not completed its investigation, and that Mr. Edgar Kaiser has misinformed them on the status of the inquiry.

It no doubt has been difficult for the investigating committee to get to the bottom of such a complicated set-up as that operated by Kaiser. If qualified production men, engineers, accountants, and so forth, are made available to the committee, I am certain Mr. Edgar Kaiser will have a very red face when the committee finishes its investigation.

The American people are not interested in seeing that Mr. Kaiser's chestnuts are pulled out of the fire. There is nothing fair, by any stretch of the imagination, about giving the Kaiser-Frazer Corp. defense contracts for products which other companies can build faster, better, and cheaper.

I hope the investigating committee will be successful in securing the proper personnel and prevent contracts in the future from going to companies just because of their connections with top officials in the executive branch of our Government.

CORP. JOHN ESSEBAGGER, JR.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include the citation of Corp. John Essebagger, Jr., a Congressional Medal of Honor winner.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this morning it was my privilege to attend the impressive ceremonies in the Pentagon where Secretary of the Army, Frank Pace, on behalf of the President, presented the Medal of Honor to the widow of Corp. John Essebagger, Jr.

The text of the Medal of Honor citation follows:

Corp. John Essebagger, Jr., infantry, United States Army, a member of Company A, Seventh Infantry Regiment, Third Infantry Division, distinguished himself by conspicuous gallantry and outstanding courage above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy near Popsu-dong, Korea, on April 25, 1951. Committed to effect a delaying action to cover the Third Battalion's withdrawal through Company A, Corporal Essebagger, a member of one of two squads maintaining defensive positions in key terrain and defending the company's right flank, had participated in repulsing numerous attacks. In a frenzied banzai charge, the numerical superior enemy seriously threatened the security of the planned route of withdrawal and isolation of the small force. Badly shaken, the grossly outnumbered detachment started to fall back and Corporal Essebagger, realizing the impending danger, voluntarily remained to provide security for the withdrawal. Gallantly maintaining a one-man stand, Corporal Essebagger raked the menacing hordes with crippling fire and, with the foe closing on the position, left the comparative safety of his shelter and advanced in the face of overwhelming odds, firing his weapon and hurling grenades to disconcert the enemy and afford time for displacement of friendly elements to more tenable positions. Scorning the withering fire and bursting shells, Corporal Essebagger continued to move forward, inflicting destruction upon the fanatical foe until he was mortally wounded. Corporal Essebagger's intrepid action and supreme sacrifice exacted a heavy toll in enemy dead and wounded, stemmed the onslaught, and enabled the retiring squads to reach safety. His valorous conduct and devotion to duty reflected lasting glory upon himself and was in keeping with the noblest traditions of the infantry and the United States Army."

On behalf of the citizens of the Fifth Congressional District, I extend the deepest sympathy to the widow of this brave soldier, Mrs. Mary V. Essebagger, his parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Essebagger and his sister, and other relatives. This fine and heroic young man from Holland, Mich., made the supreme sacrifice for his country. His outstanding conduct and deep devotion to duty should be an example to his fellow Americans. May God give us the necessary strength and courage to carry on so our Nation may be forever preserved.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to make a statement about H. R. 7005, the Mutual Security Act of 1952. Owing to my daughter's wedding at the end of the week I was unavoidably prevented from voting on the last two of the three roll calls on Friday, May 23. I supposed that I had made effective pair arrangements to disclose my position on both these roll calls. I am distressed to observe from the RECORD that the pairing was not effected. Had I been present I should have voted against the second Vorys amendment as I did against the first. I should also have voted for the bill.

GENERAL COLSON

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial by Bill Cunningham, of the Boston Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply shocked that the Department of Defense has taken the stars away from General Colson, who was in charge of the prisoners in Korea.

After General MacArthur was removed, the morale in that whole Pacific area was lowered. There were riots in Japan. Prisoners were not treated with sufficient discipline. I thoroughly believe that General Colson is taking the punishment for someone higher up; and remember General Colson was trying to save the name of one of our American generals.

General Colson was for a number of years commanding officer at Fort Devens, in my district in Massachusetts. There never was a finer commanding officer than General Colson, or one more interested in the civilians and in the men, and in being cooperative. In my opinion, he did more for creating good will and appreciation of the Army than anyone who has been at Fort Devens. I think the whole matter should be investigated. I think a fair investigation would show it was not General Colson's fault; and I ask for a fair and impartial reconsideration of the whole incident.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald of May 25, 1952]

TRUMAN'S BLUNDERS MIRE US IN TROUBLE

(By Bill Cunningham)

Those in position to know consider Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, a very fine officer and a thoroughly conscientious and most honorable gentleman. That being the case, he must be extremely embarrassed by the way President Truman is trying to hand down as officially certified history a Trumanized or slanted version of the events in Korea and Japan with which General Ridgway is identified.

At the conclusion of his address marking the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the United States Military Academy at West Point last Tuesday, Mr. Truman called General Ridgway, also a guest of honor, before him and awarded him a second Oak Leaf Cluster on the Distinguished Service Medal he already wore. This was called a dramatic surprise for the distinguished audience of military leaders, diplomats, and West Point cadets.

It must have been more of a surprise to the distinguished recipient, and there must have been some mental discomfort mixed in with the drama as he heard the citation which went with the medal, and which was personally read by the President to the General, the gathering, and the hypothetical millions attuned to radio and TV. There must have been discomfort if not embarrassment, because that citation was, at best, a collection of half-truths and, at worst, a deliberate distortion of established facts.

The name of General MacArthur was not even mentioned, as possibly it shouldn't have been in as personal a thing as a citation to another officer, but none of the MacArthur ground work, either in Korea or Japan, was even suggested.

The gist of the citation was that Ridgway was rushed to the rescue of a lost cause in Korea, that he rallied it brilliantly, turned the tide, and drove a hopeless situation to a successful conclusion. Then switching to Japan, he, with outstanding administrative skill, etc., led that nation back to the high ground of freedom from the tangled morasses of defeat. In short, from anything that was said to the contrary, he was given full credit for the entire job.

RIDGWAY UNCOMFORTABLE

That, of course, doesn't happen to be even close to the truth, and of all living human beings, General Ridgway knows that best. This deliberate slighting, if not actual smearing, of MacArthur must have made his successor squirm, because he knows that MacArthur has in his files the records, messages and communications that prove it untrue. Taking bows that properly belong to his predecessor don't figure to fit with the Ridgway character.

Mr. Truman, of course, is going to have to live down the MacArthur episode for the rest of his life, and, after that, in history. Whether he can, or he can't, remains for the future to say, but there's no gainsaying the facts as they stand at the moment. There's a wide divergence between the real record and the Trumanized version. The points need to be nailed here and now.

Ridgway must have been uncomfortable because he knows, first of all, that he was MacArthur's hand-picked man to take over in Korea after Gen. Walton Walker was killed. MacArthur had trouble getting him. The trouble was with Army Chief of Staff Gen.

J. Lawton Collins, and the Pentagon in general. MacArthur, however, insisted and finally got, in Ridgway, the man in whom he had utmost confidence, and whose talents he felt exactly fitted the exigencies.

General Ridgway also knows the MacArthur files contain some enlightening information on Ridgway's original feelings about Korea. To say they weren't optimistic is stating it mildly. General Ridgway gave some slight intimation when he addressed the joint session of Congress last Thursday. In that address, speaking of the situation in Korea when he assumed the field command, he said:

"Assuming command of the Eighth Army on December 26, 1950, I found but three of its seven United States divisions, and these badly depleted in strength in the combat zone. Three of the other four had been only recently evacuated from the Hungnam area in the north, and, of these, only the First Marine Division was again ashore at the southern tip of the peninsula.

"The Third and Seventh Divisions were still aboard ship while the Second Division was reorganizing and reequipping as a result of its severe battle losses in the north. Thus, on a 135-mile front, only two United States divisions were on the line of contact; the third in blocking position to the rear. The remainder of this extended front was covered by the Republic of Korea Army, one British and one Turkish regiment. The Korean divisions were likewise at reduced strength in men and equipment, and so forth."

RIDGWAY IN DOUBT

So far, so good, but what General Ridgway neglected to tell then was his assessment of the situation, and what proceeded to happen. The truth is, he was stricken with doubt about our ability even to hold—sufficiently, at least—to send a message to MacArthur back in Tokyo suggesting it might be well to set up a plan for evacuating our forces and leaving the victory to the Reds.

When General MacArthur received this, he flew at once to Korea, went into private conference with Ridgway, told him the President, this same Mr. Truman, had said there'd be no evacuation, and that there would be none. I don't know what went on between the two generals, naturally, but I do know MacArthur refused to accept the thought of defeat and told his field commander to proceed, henceforth, in terms of consolidation and offense.

That's only one reason why the slighting of MacArthur, and the giving of a savior's credit to his successor is not only unfair but untrue. But, for that matter, the handling of the entire MacArthur story has been untrue. The Trumanized version is that MacArthur made a fatal guess concerning the intentions and potentialities of the Red Chinese, got a bad whipping from them in North Korea and then wanted to bomb Manchuria, blockade and even invade China in order to save his reputation—risking, in the process, war with Russia.

CHASED THEM TO THE YALU

The facts are that the only orders MacArthur ever was given were those radioed to him when the trouble first broke. They were to meet and destroy the North Korean Army, clear the place of such aggressors and reestablish the Republic of Korea. Nothing was said about the thirty-eighth parallel nor any other limitations.

MacArthur defeated the North Korean armies by stretching their lines of supply almost all the way down to Pusan, then nipping in behind them with the Inchon landing, and similar, if not spectacular, strokes. Then he chased them all the way to the Yalu. After the Chinese "volunteers" struck, the Trumanized version had it that MacArthur's intelligence was no good, that he had no idea how many Chinese there were, how they were equipped, nor what were their intentions.

The only truth in that were the last five words of the previous sentence. MacArthur had perfect intelligence—five kinds of it—his own, that of the other United Nations, South Korean, that of North Korean deserters, and some excellent help from the Japanese who'd long been in Manchuria and still had dependable contacts. He knew the force of the Chinese, their equipment, even the numbers of their regiments. The only thing he didn't know was their intentions, and he figured the thing to do was make a pass at them and find out.

He did. They attacked, and then began the bitter chapter of our great "retreat." Instead of a retreat, this was an exact duplication of the tactics that had stretched and finally destroyed the North Koreans. That Marine commander was telling the literal truth when he made the famous statement, accepted as a gag, "Retreat, hell. We're not retreating. We're only attacking in another direction."

Those there will tell you, MacArthur had the Chinese really licked by the following April. They were stretched to the limit. They hadn't had time to build up then, as they've had through the 11-month period of these alleged truce talks. Their prisoners coming in were starved and out of arms. Those there will tell you that if the Yalu had been taken off bounds to our bombers at that point, the Chinese would have collapsed.

NEVER PLANNED TO INVADE MAINLAND

It was on that point that the trouble came. MacArthur wanted to bomb the "privileged sanctuaries." He was in favor of blockading the China coast, and so was Admiral Joy. The United States Navy had to lie idly in Korean waters and watch the rusty tankers of many nations steam right past it to the Chinese ports carrying oil and supplies to be landed and used immediately against the United Nations forces.

A long-range plan of MacArthur's was eventually to help Chiang Kai-shek's men invade the Chinese mainland from Formosa. He felt we'd have to equip them and support their landing beaches, but, once in China, they might be able to do the rest of it themselves. It was never any part of MacArthur's plan to invade the Chinese mainland with United Nations forces.

There's the truth. The reasoning may have been right, or wrong, but those are the facts, and they differ considerably from the versions ground out by the administration's propaganda mills. MacArthur, of course, was anathema to the Acheson-Lattimore far eastern axis in the Department of State. The Pentagon was on him for reasons of old service jealousies, personified, principally, in General Marshall.

"I had to spend 60 percent of my time covering my rear in Washington," MacArthur said recently. From the latest presidential performance, he can now make that 100 percent. Giving General Ridgway, even by implication, full credit for the reorganization and eventual liberation of Japan is a case exactly in point.

Men can be ruined and whole peoples permanently misled by the deliberate perversion of history. One of the ranking victims of our times has been ex-President Herbert Hoover. A good and innocent man, he'll never be able to live down the lies deliberately manufactured to smear him in the presidential election of 1932.

The Democrats in that one, with F. D. R. as their candidate, came up with a new and a terrible technique. Until then, Presidents and presidential aspirants wrote their own speeches. Here, however, came a new departure, a glamorous candidate with a staff of speech writers, experts in verbal poison. Worse than that was the employment of a staff character assassin. In this case it was an evilly clever New York newspaper alumnus, Charlie Michelson.

PAID TO SMEAR HOOVER

Michelson was paid $20,000 a year and expenses to smear Hoover even while he was President. He started, in fact, in 1929, the year after Hoover was elected, and 3 years before he was to come up for reelection. There's probably no counterpart of Michelson in world political history, unless it was Hitler's Herr Doktor Goebbels, and even then the parallel is faint. Goebbels may have been sincere in his twisted way. Michelson didn't even make the pretense.

Some time before he passed on that whatever reward awaited, he wrote an autobiography that smacked considerably of apology. In that he plainly stated he didn't always believe the things he wrote, but that's what they paid him for. He was only doing a job. The Democrats have been running against Hoover ever since. The indications are they're going to do it again.

It just might prove fatal this time, for more and more the public seems to be coming around to the realization that Hoover was the last really constitutional, and, possibly, the last intellectually honest President this Nation has had. Mr. Truman certainly can't qualify.

Any President, however, has a tremendous advantage. His words are official and are completely carried. This particular one has just said he's beholden to nobody, not even the Supreme Court. If it rules against him in this steel case, he'll abide by the ruling, he says, but the Court will still be wrong, because he has inherent rights nobody can question.

Maybe nobody can, but the truth can, and the gentleman, with such massive mistakes on his record, will eventually have to bow to the truth. At present completely dazzled by power, or possibly too little to admit he could make a mistake, he seems to be trying to cover his awkward tracks by writing the story his way, insisting all others are wrong.

HAVEN'T WON ANYTHING

This line runs through his weird book, Mr. President. It's the theme of all his speeches and public utterances, especially since he's decided not to be a candidate, and so, apparently, feels he can speak his mind. The truth, however, is bigger than any President, and the truth and this President don't say the same things.

Despite his self-satisfied pronouncements, we haven't won anything in Korea. We've lost. Carefully he refrains from mentioning the 108,000-plus casualties, the heavy communistic build-up, the Koje POW mess, and similar unresolved problems. No, "We've proved what we set out to prove; we've won a glorious victory, thanks to General Ridgway," etc.

That's not what the record says—not even Ridgway's record. We're mired in bad trouble, thanks, or no thanks, to Truman's mismanagement. The Republicans don't deserve to win if they let the public forget it. They deserve even less if they stand stupidly by and let this little egomaniac deliberately slant the story to make his own miserable position assume the trappings of nobility.

HERBERT K. PILILAAU

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, among the guests of the House of Representatives today are the parents of the first resident of the Territory of Hawaii

to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor. They are Mr. and Mrs. William K. Pililaau, who are seated to my right in the gallery.

Mr. and Mrs. Pililaau arrived in Washington yesterday to be present at the ceremonies which took place in the Pentagon this morning. They received on behalf of their son, Pfc Herbert K. Pililaau, the Congressional Medal of Honor that was awarded to him for heroic service in the war in Korea.

Pfc Herbert K. Pililaau gave his life to his country on September 17, 1951, after only 6 months of service, near Piari, Korea, where his platoon held a key terrain feature on "Heartbreak Ridge."

In describing this young American soldier's heroism, Gen. James A. Van Fleet said:

His gallant actions are a praiseworthy tribute to the profession of arms, and reflect creditably on his bravery and intrepidity.

It is of interest to note that this award to Private First Class Pililaau, of Hawaii, is the forty-ninth Congressional Medal of Honor to be awarded as a result of the present action in Korea.

Private Pililaau was born at Waianae, Oahu, a member of a large family. He attended grade school at Waianae and high school at Waipahu on the island of Oahu. He was employed for some time at Pearl Harbor before being called to the service of his country.

It is a source of pride to point out that Private Pililaau was Hawaiian by race, and his parents are exceptionally fine representatives of those lovable people whom all of us in Hawaii hold in the greatest affection and respect. Both his father and mother were born at Waianae. His father for many years was one of the great cowboys of that area, an occupation in which Hawaiians long have shown great skill.

The record of the people of Hawaii in World War II is now almost legend. Now a new chapter is being written in the brilliant record of Hawaii's sons in the armed services of our country.

The total of casualties among Hawaii's sons in the Korean action now exceeds more than 1,000. This is at a rate that is 3½ times that for the country as a whole. Although it is a record of which we are proud, it leaves us with a deep feeling of sorrow and a very genuine hope that these sacrifices and these losses will ultimately bring a lasting peace to our country.

The citation with which Private Pililaau was awarded the Medal of Honor, follow:

MEDAL OF HONOR (POSTHUMOUS)

Pfc Herbert K. Pililaau (Service No. U. S. 50,001,702), Infantry, United States Army, a member of Company C, Twenty-third Infantry Regiment, distinguished himself by conspicuous gallantry and outstanding courage above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy near Pia-ri, Korea, on September 17, 1951. The enemy sent wave after wave of fanatical troops against his platoon which held a key terrain feature on "Heartbreak Ridge." Valiantly defending its position, the unit repulsed each attack until ammunition became practically exhausted and it was ordered to withdraw to a new position. Voluntarily remaining behind to cover the withdrawal Private Pililaau fired his automatic weapons into the ranks of the assailants, threw all his grenades and, with ammunition exhausted, closed with the foe in hand-to-hand combat, courageously fighting with his trench knife and bare fists until finally overcome and mortally wounded. When the position was subsequently retaken, more than 40 enemy dead were counted in the area he had so valiantly defended. His heroic devotion to duty, indomitable fighting spirit, and gallant self-sacrifice reflect the highest credit upon himself, the Infantry, and the United States Army.

Born: Waianae, Oahu, T. H.

Entered military service from Territory of Hawaii.

Next of kin: Mr. William K. Pililaau, father, Waianae, Oahu, T. H.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

SOCIAL SECURITY TO PRESERVE INSURANCE RIGHTS OF TOTALLY AND PERMANENTLY DISABLED INDIVIDUALS

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, a week ago today, Monday, May 19, 1952, I voted to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 7800) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to preserve insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals, and to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits.

I wish to call the attention of the House to the following editorial published in the Brooklyn Eagle of Friday, May 23, 1952, which I shall now read:

A BAFFLING DEFEAT

In the defeat of legislation increasing social-security payments, Congress has given to President Truman one of those issues which he knows how to exploit with great effectiveness. Rejection of the proposal was one of the more baffling developments of the session. It was presumed to have substantial bipartisan support. Suddenly, however, the American Medical Association intervened with the vague complaint that a provision of the bill represented an approach to socialized medicine. Defeat was the result.

The bill, as President Truman insists, had many desirable features. The increase in social-security benefits was easy to justify in view of existing economic conditions. Another change would have provided that the veterans of the fighting in Korea should be given credit under the social-security system for the time they spend in Korea. It is difficult to criticize this provision. Nevertheless, the opposition of the AMA prevailed and the bill was defeated.

President Truman does not intend to let the issue die. As a matter of merit, the bill is deserving of bipartisan support. The increased benefits involved, amounting to an increase of only $5 a month, are of the utmost importance to hundreds of thousands of elderly people in every State in the Union. Their resentment of the action of Congress seems certain to be a factor in the coming campaign.

BOUNDARIES OF INLAND OR INTERNAL WATERS—REREFERENCE OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 373, concerning inland and internal waters, and that the resolution be rereferred to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

HON. JAMES McGRANERY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, those who served with Jim McGranery were very glad to know that the President nominated him for the responsible position of Attorney General and were likewise pleased to note the Senate confirmation. We who served with him know of his great capacity and that he is honorable and trustworthy in every respect. He is being sworn in as Attorney General tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock in the Great Hall of the Department of Justice on Tenth Street and Constitution Avenue. I make this announcement so that those who served with him and his friends who desire to do so can be present at the swearing in of our very distinguished friend and former colleague.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia Day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

FLOYD B. OLSON MEMORIAL TRIANGLE

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (S. 1533) to designate a Floyd B. Olson Memorial Triangle in the District of Columbia, and to authorize the erection of a memorial plaque in such triangle, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from South Carolina explain the bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to designate the triangle at Connecti-

cut Avenue, Q Street, and Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C., as the Floyd B. Olson Memorial Triangle, in memory of the late Floyd B. Olson, former governor of the State of Minnesota. The bill would authorize the erection of a memorial plaque thereon without expense to the Federal or District Governments.

The National Capital Parks of the Department of Interior, which has jurisdiction over this plot of land, has no objection to the enactment of this legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the triangle bounded by Connecticut Avenue, Q Street, and Twentieth Street in the District of Columbia is hereby designated the Floyd B. Olson Memorial Triangle in memory of the late Floyd B. Olson, former Governor of the State of Minnesota, and the Surveyor of the District of Columbia is directed to enter such designation on the records of his office.

SEC. 2. Authority is granted to any association or committee organized for the purpose of erecting a memorial plaque in memory of Floyd B. Olson to erect such a plaque in such triangle. The plan and design of such plaque shall be subject to the approval of the National Commission of Fine Arts, and unless its erection is begun within 5 years from the date of the enactment of this act, the authorization hereby granted is revoked.

SEC. 3. Such plaque shall be erected without expense to the Government of the United States, or to the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF DEEDS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (S. 2871) relating to the manner of appointment of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, the deputy recorders, and the employees of the Office of Recorder, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from South Carolina explain the bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purposes of this legislation are to provide for the appointment of a Recorder of Deeds of the District by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and to bring all employees of the Office of the Recorder of Deeds under the civil-service laws and regulations. Under existing law, the Recorder of Deeds is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and the employees in the Recorder of Deeds' Office are all non-civil-service appointments.

The bill also provides that the Recorder of Deeds, to be eligible for appointment, must have been a resident of the District of Columbia for at least 5 years next preceding his appointment.

This legislation has the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 548 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia (D. C. Code, sec. 45–701) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 548. Appointment and duties: There shall be a Recorder of Deeds of the District, appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, who shall record all deeds, contracts, and other instruments in writing affecting the title or ownership of any real estate or personal property in the District which shall have been duly acknowledged and certified, and who shall perform all requisite services connected therewith, and shall have charge and custody of all the records, papers, and property appertaining to his office. No person shall be appointed Recorder of Deeds unless he has been a resident of the District of Columbia for at least 5 years next preceding his appointment."

SEC. 2. Section 549 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia (D. C. Code, sec. 45–702) is amended by inserting after "deputy recorder" the following: "in accordance with the civil-service laws and regulations and to fix his compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949."

SEC. 3. The Act of March 3, 1925 (D. C. Code, sec. 45–703), is amended to read as follows: "That the Recorder of Deeds is authorized to appoint a second deputy recorder in accordance with the civil-service laws and regulations and to fix his compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949. The second deputy recorder may do and perform any and all acts which the Recorder is authorized to do, and all such acts by the second deputy recorder shall have the same legality, force, and effect as if performed by the Recorder. The Recorder of Deeds shall appoint all other employees of his office in accordance with the civil-service laws and regulations and fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949. The number of such employees shall not be in excess of the number actually necessary for the proper conduct of his office."

SEC. 4. The Civil Service Commission shall confer a competitive civil-service status upon those employees of the office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia performing service in such office on the date of enactment of this act who are citizens of the United States, and who, within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, are certified by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, upon recommendation of the Recorder of Deeds, (1) as having been appointed from among the highest available eligibles from an appropriate register of the Civil Service Commission or (2) as having rendered active service in the office of the Recorder of Deeds prior to the date of enactment of this act, and who qualify in such appropriate noncompetitive examinations as the Civil Service Commission may prescribe. Any employee in the office of Recorder of Deeds who fails to meet the requirements prescribed by this section, or who is not certified by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or who fails to take or pass the noncompetitive examination prescribed by the Civil Service Commission, may continue to serve for a period of not more than 30 days after the end of such 6-month period or after the establishment of appropriate registers, whichever is the earlier.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GARAGE KEEPERS' AND LIVERYMEN'S LIENS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 1342) to amend acts relating to garage keepers' and liverymen's liens and the enforcement thereof in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is set forth in the following statement:

First. Under the present law, a garage keeper's lien takes priority over a conditional sales contract, but there are conflicting holdings in the lower courts as to relative priorities of garage keepers' liens and chattle deeds of trust. The latter question has never been decided by the court of appeals. It seemed desirable to eliminate the source of doubt and to treat chattel deeds of trust in the same manner as conditional bills of sale.

Second. With respect to enforcement of garage keepers' liens, the present law requires the filing of a suit in event the value of the property bound by the lien exceeds $50. Under present conditions, almost any motor vehicle has a value exceeding that sum. Suit for enforcement of such a lien entails the delay and expense incident to all lawsuits, and in addition requires the appointment of a receiver or trustee to make sale, and this person must be compensated out of the proceeds of sale and the premium on his bond paid from that source. Such a proceeding, of course, requires the employing of an attorney. A great number of the States provide for enforcement of these liens by public auction after notice, or provide for sale in summary fashion by the sheriff or a similar officer. It is believed that the notice provisions of the proposed bill substantially eliminate the danger of abuses, particularly since the Director of Vehicles and Traffic would, of course, require evidence of compliance with law before issuing a title to the purchaser at such a sale. It was also considered that conditional bills of sale and chattel deeds of trust are enforced every day without court proceedings and, in the case of the former, frequently without any notice or public sale. In fact, deeds of trust on real estate are likewise enforced without any court proceedings; and these practices have resulted in little or no abuse.

Third. Under the law it is doubtful whether any person other than someone occupying the technical status of garage keeper is entitled to any lien, although he may have done all of the things which would have entitled a garage keeper to a lien. It was believed more just to make the lien dependent upon the things done, rather than the status of the person doing them.

Fourth. Under the present law a garage keeper might not be justified in refusing to surrender a motor vehicle, even though entitled to a lien thereon, unless he had first given written notice to the owner. It is believed that the right to detain the vehicle should not be made dependent upon the giving of prior written notice. However, the giving of notice would, of course, be a condition precedent to enforcing the lien.

The bill also provides that any person selling such property in order to satisfy a fraudulent, excessive, or unreasonable lien shall be guilty of a conversion of such property and liable to the owner in damages therefor.

This provision is to protect the owners of such property against an unscrupulous garage keeper.

This bill has the approval of the Board of Commissioners and the Bar Association of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

LIEN OF LIVERYMEN

SECTION 1. That it shall be lawful for all persons keeping or boarding any animals at livery within the District, under any agreement with the owner thereof, to detain such animals until all charges under such agreement for the care, keep, or board of such animals shall have been paid: *Provided, however,* That before enforcing the lien hereby given notice in writing shall be given to such owner in person or by registered mail at his last-known place of residence of the amount of such charges and the intention to detain such animal or animals until such charges shall be paid.

LIEN FOR STORAGE, REPAIRS, AND SUPPLIES FOR MOTOR VEHICLES

SEC. 2. All persons storing, repairing, or furnishing supplies of or concerning motor vehicles including trailers shall have a lien for their agreed or reasonable charges for such storage, repairs, and supplies when such charges are incurred by an owner or conditional vendee or chattel mortgagor (including a grantor of deed of trust in lieu of mortgage) of such motor vehicle, and may detain such motor vehicle at any time they may have lawful possession thereof. Such lien shall have priority over all other items or rights in or to the vehicle except as hereinafter limited with respect to claims for storage. Before enforcing such lien, notice in writing shall be given to the title holder, all lien holders shown by the certificate of title or registry of the vehicle, and any other person known to claimant who have any interest in or lien upon the vehicle. Such notice shall be delivered personally or sent by registered mail to the last-known address of the person to whom given, shall state that a lien is claimed for the charges therein set forth or thereto attached, and shall demand payment thereof. There shall be incorporated in or attached to said notice a statement of particulars of the charge or charges for which a lien is claimed, to which may be added a claim for storage of the vehicle from the date of said notice to the date of payment or sale, which amount shall be set forth at a daily or weekly rate which shall not be in excess of charges prevailing at the time for similar storage, and shall not be in excess of $3 per day or $21 per week, which additional charge shall in no event cover a period in excess of 90 days.

ENFORCEMENT OF LIEN BY SALE

SEC. 3. If the amount due and for which a lien is given by section 1 or 2 hereof is not paid by the end of 30 days after the giving of notice, then the party entitled to such lien may proceed to sell the property so subject to lien at public auction, after giving notice once a week for three successive weeks in some daily newspaper published in the District. Said advertisement shall set forth the date, time, and place of sale, which shall not be less than 15 days from date of the first publication of such notice, that the purpose of the sale is to satisfy a lien, the amount for which said lien is claimed, including storage to date of sale if allowable, the names of all interested parties, and a description of the chattel, including, in the case of vehicles, the make, type, year and model number, serial number and engine number, if any, and State or District license number and year.

Any person selling such property in order to satisfy a fraudulent, excessive, or unreasonable lien shall be guilty of a conversion of such property and be liable to the owner for damages therefor.

APPLICATION OF PROCEEDS OF SALE

SEC. 4. The proceeds of such sale shall be applied, first, to the expenses of such sales and the discharge of such lien; second, to payment of other liens, if any, in the order of their priority; and, third, to the owner of the property.

LIMITATION ON LIEN FOR STORAGE

SEC. 5. To the extent that any lien provided for in this chapter is based on a claim for storage of a motor vehicle in excess of $150, such lien shall be, as to such excess, inferior to the lien of a conditional vendor or chattel mortgagee (as defined in section 2) claiming under an instrument recorded on a date earlier than the period to which such charges are attributable.

REPEALER AND SAVINGS CLAUSE

SEC. 6. Section 1262 of the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1388), as amended, is hereby repealed and sections 1263 and 1264 of said act are hereby made inapplicable to liens provided for in sections 1 and 2 hereof: *Provided, however,* That any liens heretofore acquired under the provisions of said section 1262, as amended, shall be unaffected by the repeal of said section and may be enforced either in the manner provided in said sections 1263 and 1264 or in the manner provided herein.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTOR VEHICLE FUELS TAX

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 6811) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 23, 1924, as amended, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of the first section of the act entitled "An act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 23, 1924 (43 Stat. 106; title 47, ch. 19, D. C. Code, 1940 edition), as amended, is amended by striking the figure "2" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "5."

SEC. 2. Section 14 of said act is amended by striking the figure "2" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "5."

SEC. 3. Article III of the act entitled, "An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 16, 1947 (61 Stat. 328, 359; sec. 47–1901b, D. C. Code, 1940 edition, Supp. VII), as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 4. This act shall become effective on the first day of the first month following its enactment, but not prior to July 1, 1952.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "5" and insert "4."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "5" and insert "4."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word to explain the bill.

The purpose of this bill is to increase the District of Columbia gasoline tax to 5 cents per gallon. Under the act of July 16, 1947--Sixty-first Statute, pages 328, 359—the tax was temporarily increased from 3 cents to 4 cents for the period ending on June 30, 1952. Unless this bill is enacted the tax will revert to 3 cents on July 1, 1952.

In order to relieve the traffic problem in the District the Commissioners have given their tentative approval to a long-range program which they think will benefit the District. Their estimate of immediate needs—covering the period 1952–62—is $96,000,000. As the principal source of funds for highway expenditures is the gasoline tax they feel that the revenue anticipated at 3 cents per gallon would be wholly inadequate.

Anticipated annual revenues from the gasoline tax are estimated as follows:

Year	3 cents per gallon	4 cents per gallon	5 cents per gallon
1951	$6,045,549	$7,851,362	$9,078,137
1952	6,113,800	7,940,000	9,180,000
1953	6,190,800	8,040,000	9,296,000
1954	6,264,720	8,136,000	9,407,000
1955	6,338,640	8,323,000	9,518,000
1956	6,412,560	8,328,000	9,629,000
1957	6,486,480	8,424,000	9,740,000
1958	6,560,400	8,520,000	9,851,000
1959	6,637,400	8,620,000	9,966,000
1960	6,711,320	8,716,000	10,077,000
1961	6,776,000	8,800,000	10,175,000
1962	6,837,600	8,800,000	10,267,000

The amendment adopted by the committee would strike "5 cents per gallon" from the bill and insert "4 cents per gallon" so that after June 30 of this year the gasoline tax in the District of Columbia would remain at 4 cents per gallon rather than revert to 3 cents per gallon as provided under existing law.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I assume someone will want to speak in favor of the committee amendments. I desire to be recognized in opposition to them.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to speak on the amendments.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the matter was reported out by the majority of the committee to reduce the tax from

the 5 cents requested by the Commissioners to the present rate of 4 cents. That motion prevailed, and unless there is some amendment which is to be offered that I might want to appear in opposition to, I have nothing to add to my statement.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the object of this bill is to fix the gasoline tax in the District of Columbia at 5 cents per gallon permanently. I happen to be chairman of the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee. It is the habit of that committee in conjunction with the Senate subcommittee to hold joint hearings on fiscal legislation for the District of Columbia. The Senate subcommittee and the House subcommittee held a joint hearing and the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] is a member and participated in those hearings. So he is thoroughly familiar with the situation.

At that hearing, strange to relate, everybody was in favor of this tax—the American Automobile Association, the Keystone Automobile Association, and even the gasoline dealers themselves came in and appeared in favor of increasing this tax to 5 cents, the purpose being to make much-needed street and bridge improvements within the District.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman overlooks the fact that the citizens' association opposed this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I believe one citizens' association did.

Mr. O'HARA. All of the citizens' associations together opposed it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, here is the situation. The House has been rather chary in giving appropriations to the District. When the District appropriation bill was under consideration the House cut the contribution of the Federal Government by $1,000,000. The District Commissioners have made up their budget as to what is necessary for their street improvements and bridge construction. We have the Anacostia Bridge, which the Congress has authorized.

As you know, the gasoline tax must be used to match funds from the Federal highway appropriation in order to get a proportionate amount of the Federal highway system contributions, and unless you have this money and unless you can make that contribution the District loses the money it would get as the other States of the Union get for those improvements.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BEALL. Is it not a fact that the Engineer Commissioner has asked for the 5-cent tax?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. All of the Commissioners have asked for it. Their budget is based on it. They come and tell us that if they do not get the 5-cent gasoline tax very vital street improvements in the District cannot be made. They have made up their estimate of street improvements here for the next 10 years and this 5-cent tax is a portion of that. If they do not get it they cannot make the street improvements that are necessary.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. McMILLAN. I wonder if the gentleman has had opportunity to review the $96,000,000 road-improvement plan of the Commissioners?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have not gone into it in detail. I am not a road engineer. I do know that the District needs street improvements very badly. The downtown part of Washington is so congested with traffic that the business of the city is drying up. Such stores as the Hecht Co. and Woodward & Lothrop have moved out into the country because of the congestion in the city.

I know that no Member of this House wants to destroy the National Capital. All we are asking here today is to put on a gasoline tax commensurate with all the surrounding areas. It will be a cent under the Virginia tax, it will be the equivalent of the Maryland tax. The District now has one of the lowest gasoline taxes in the country. These things are necessary. If you do not do that you will simply add to the congestion that is going on now, with the result that business in Washington will move out into the country. When business moves out into the country, and the taxes of the people of Washington shrink as a consequence, you are going to have to increase the contribution of the Federal Government.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. As I understood the gentleman from Virginia, the Virginia tax is 6 cents. The tax in Maryland is what?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Five cents. This would make it equivalent to the Maryland tax. The average tax throughout the country is a fraction over 5 cents.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of Virginia was allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.)

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has passed this bill providing for a 5-cent tax. The Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs passed it unanimously and the full committee by one vote voted to amend it and cut it to 4 cents.

Now since that was done by the committee, the various Members of the District Committee have been interviewed, and I have in my pocket a list of 17 of the 25 Members who have, since the vote was taken in the District Committee, expressed their approval of the 5-cent tax. It is a very meritorious thing, and I hope that the committee will do it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I notice in the report it says that unless this bill is enacted, the tax will revert to 3 cents on July 1, 1952, so unless this bill is amended to raise it to 5 cents, it will revert to 3 cents.

Mr. O'HARA. No; it is fixed at 4 cents in the bill.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, is this tax earmarked for public improvements and highways?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It must be earmarked for highways, yes, otherwise you do not get your Federal contribution for highways, just like in the States.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I mean, is it specifically earmarked by statute that this tax must be used for highways?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Not in this bill, but it is allocated for that purpose and has to be in order to get Federal contribution.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. Will the gentleman be kind enough to tell us what the gasoline tax in Maryland and Virginia is?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I just stated that. In Virginia it is 6 cents and in Maryland it is 5 cents. The average throughout the Nation is 5 and a fraction cents.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Did the gentleman offer an amendment to this bill to strike the committee amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; because the committee amendment has to be voted down. The committee amendment cutting it from 5 to 4 is now before the House. If you vote down the committee amendment the bill then remains at what we recommend, namely, 5 cents a gallon.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

(On request of Mr. McCORMACK, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of Virginia was allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is addressing the House on a matter of great importance to the people of Washington and the District of Columbia; in other words he has made a very powerful argument, as I have listened to him, in support of his position. We have the responsibility of legislating for the people of the District of Columbia. Whether we like it or not, it is our responsibility. I am strongly in favor of local government for the people of the District, but it is not there now. It seems to me the gentleman from Virginia has made a very convincing argument, and the parliamentary situation before us is, as I understand, that the gentleman does not

have to offer an amendment, but the House simply votes down the committee amendment. It seems to me also, in view of the statement the gentleman from Virginia has made, no matter how much individual Members may disagree with my friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], on that question, any times he makes a statement we know it constitutes the truth. The gentleman stated that from contacting the members of the District committee, he had gotten assurances from 17 out of 25 that they favored the 5-cent tax. It seems to me it is our duty and responsibility to vote down the committee amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman very much for his contribution. On the question of home government, I might say that the only semblance of home government are the three District Commissioners who are the governing body of the District. They are not only for the bill, but they say that their whole budgetary system will be thrown out of kilter and that they cannot make the necessary improvements unless they get this 5-cent tax.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the committee amendment will be voted down.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Does the gentleman know whether or not the money raised by gasoline taxes goes to street and road improvements, and do they have any other methods of raising money for street and road improvements?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not know what other methods they have. This money, of course, goes to highway improvements, and if it did not go out for highway improvement, they could not get the Federal contribution. The gentleman is familiar with the Federal Highway Act.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman undoubtedly knows that gasoline taxes must be applied to that purpose, otherwise they do not get a share of it.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. In other States, of course, the cities do not participate like the District does.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Of course, the District is a separate government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I think there should be a little more light added onto the general situation which exists so far as gas tax payments are concerned in the District of Columbia. I was one of those who supported very vigorously the so-called tax bill which provided for a tax upon purchases and sales within the District of Columbia, known as the sales tax. We all know that the situation is that some of these people who have the spending of money think that all we have to do is to keep on increasing the taxes. Well, I think the people of the District of Columbia have been loaded with sales taxes and with the other general taxation, which has been increased from time to time. The old gas tax used to be 2 cents here, then it was raised to 3, and now to 4, and now the Commissioners want to raise it to 5, and make it permanent, and I am sure if they get 5 they will want 6. No matter how much they have, it is just an endless stream of payments by people who have to buy gasoline.

The situation, of course, is that this program which the Engineer Commissioner has laid out of some $96,000,000 of expenditures cannot possibly be raised by gas tax contributions. The additional cent of tax means about a million and a quarter of revenue per year. I think that is substantially the figure which has been furnished us on the committee.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] knows very well that I was not present when the Fiscal Affairs Committee reported out this legislation, by, as he says, a unanimous vote, because I expressed my opposition to the increase in taxes.

Too much money has been diverted from the highway funds to building bridges out into Maryland and Virginia, which cost has been borne by the District of Columbia.

I think another example of some very bad planning and very bad thinking is some of this expensive operation like this Dupont underpass, which ran into a terrific amount of money. I do not think you are going to be able to raise enough money, not only from the gasoline tax but from other sources, to follow out some of these excessively costly programs the District of Columbia presents.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think I can help the gentleman some on the revenue this will raise. I have here the estimates of the District Commissioners.

Mr. O'HARA. I hope the gentleman will not take up all my time reading a lot of figures.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I hope we will not be in too much of a hurry about this thing because this is a very important matter.

Mr. O'HARA. I agree to that. The gentleman used considerable time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have complete estimates for the next 10 years on the gasoline tax, based upon the experience in the past. For 1952, for instance, it is estimated the 5-cent tax will raise $9,180,000, and ultimately as much as $10,000,000 a year will be raised, which in the 10 years will be approximately the $90,000,000 which is necessary to carry out this program.

While I have the gentleman's attention, may I say that I notice his reference to building bridges in Virginia. In the first place, they do not build any bridges in Virginia, they build them in the District of Columbia because the Potomac River is in the District of Columbia. But this particular matter here this morning has nothing in the world to do with any bridges across the Potomac.

Mr. O'HARA. No, I agree that is true; but when the Commissioners get the money they seem to be able to make decisions that are very favorable to Virginia and Maryland.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BEALL. The gentleman knows we have had a traffic problem here in the District for a number of years. We have had that matter up before the committee. Does the gentleman have any other suggestions as a lawyer-engineer as to how we could work out this traffic problem?

Mr. O'HARA. Yes. I would say it is a mutual problem, to which the States of Virginia and Maryland should contribute, for the people who use those bridges live and pay taxes in their States and work in the District.

Mr. BEALL. Are they not doing that now? The bridge about which the gentleman is talking is wholly in the District.

Mr. O'HARA. Of course, they are not doing it.

Mr. BEALL. The gentleman referred to the Dupont underpass. That is wholly in the District of Columbia. Does the gentleman think Maryland should contribute to that?

Mr. O'HARA. Not at all. I am talking about bridges.

Mr. BEALL. The gentleman referred to the Dupont underpass.

Mr. O'HARA. As an excessively expensive operation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. O'HARA was allowed to proceed for three additional minutes.)

Mr. BEALL. Does not the gentleman think those engineering problems should be left to the Engineering Department to work out?

Mr. O'HARA. I think the Congress ought to exercise more control over them. I really feel that way.

Mr. BEALL. What are we going to do with the traffic problem when it comes to Congress? Are we equipped to handle it, to solve that problem?

Mr. O'HARA. We will take care of it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is it or is it not true that there have been complaints from the States of Virginia and Maryland because of the differential in the gas tax rate?

Mr. O'HARA. I do not think there is any question but what they feel they would sell more gasoline if they got the gasoline tax up in the District to the same as theirs. I think there would be no question about that.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that he thought Maryland and Virginia ought to contribute to the building of, for instance, the Anacostia Bridge in the District of Columbia?

Mr. O'HARA. Whichever direction it goes. If it is into Maryland, Maryland should contribute. If it goes into Virginia, Virginia should contribute.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. But the Anacostia Bridge is wholly in the District of Columbia.

Mr. O'HARA. That may be true, but you have some other bridges.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. On the same theory, would the gentleman think the District of Columbia ought to pay for bridges in Maryland because the traffic is coming this way?

Mr. O'HARA. No; I am talking about what has happened.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The Anacostia Bridge is one of the large items in this program, and Congress has already authorized the Anacostia Bridge. It is wholly in the District. Is the gentleman contending that Maryland and Virginia ought to help pay for that?

Mr. O'HARA. I think they should, yes; I certainly do.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BEALL. If the gentleman will yield further, does the gentleman happen to know that the District of Columbia receives about as much Federal-aid money as the whole State of Maryland does?

Mr. O'HARA. No, I do not think it does.

Mr. BEALL. It is practically the same; yes, sir.

Mr. O'HARA. I do not know exactly. If the gentleman says so, I will be glad to take his word.

Mr. BEALL. I happen to be a member of the committee.

Mr. O'HARA. There are some other items which are not put into this tax item, which I think should go there. One, for example, is the $3,000,000 item, which is collected from the sale of automobile licenses, which is never put into this highway column at all. There are also charged in the operation of these funds to the metropolitan police for so-called traffic control $1,421,000 on the basis of the last fiscal figures. So there are things which I think, although they are charged up to highways, should properly be classified under some other item. In that way, they would have more money. I am deeply concerned. I do not think I have to apologize to anyone for my interest in the welfare of the people of the District of Columbia. But, I do think, may I say to the Members of the House, that we cannot go on increasing gasoline taxes. We have an area in the District of Columbia which is 10 miles square, and not an area as large as the States like Virginia and Maryland and so on, which have much less of a problem to deal with.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the question of roads, of course, is not only a problem of the District of Columbia, but a problem for every State in the Union. In Nebraska the roads are breaking up and we wonder where we are going to get enough money, not only to build roads, but to keep those in repair which we have already built. The bill, presently before you, would strike out the 5-cent gasoline tax and cut it back to 4 cents. Personally, I voted against it in the committee. I think the gasoline tax ought to remain at 5 cents for several reasons. First, we need roads in the District of Columbia. We need better street repairs. We need to handle the traffic much better. I am of the opinion that there has been in the past some diversion of the gasoline tax to sanitation, street cleaning, safety work, police action, and the paving of some park roads. There should be no diversion of gas taxes. I would oppose any diversion of the gasoline tax. I do believe that if we are going to make the roads in the District good so that people from Maryland, Virginia, Pennsylvania, and the 48 States may enjoy them, we must have some way to handle that traffic after it gets in the city. I have a complaint against the department in that it seems that the more traffic we get into Washington, the less place we have to park our cars. I have taken it up with the Traffic Division several times, saying "Well, now, this street used to have some parking on it. Now, you either have very limited parking or no parking at all." These are big problems, of course. The question of one-way streets and so forth all enters into the picture. I am for the 5-cent gasoline tax for another reason. Virginia has a 6-cent tax and Maryland has a 5-cent tax. If we adopt this bill, the District of Columbia would have a 4-cent tax. We would lose about $1,500,000 a year that should go to build and maintain roads.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. We have no control over the spending of road funds in the States of Virginia and Maryland. If we boost this gas tax in the District of Columbia simply to match or equal the gas tax in those two States certainly we ought to have some control over how the funds are spent there.

Another thing, why this diversion of motor vehicle license fees here?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I may say to the gentleman that I am opposed to any diversion. I think some has been going on; I have not been able to run it down entirely, but I am informed by reliable authorities that there is some diversion.

I am pleading for uniformity in gas taxes; in other words, if Virginia is going to have a 6-cent tax and we have a 4-cent tax, Virginia has the right to complain, for a lot of her people would come to the District to buy their gasoline and clutter up the highways just that much more.

I may say, however, that I think for the sake of the States on either side of the District we ought to have as uniform a gas tax as possible. In that respect I support my colleague from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] in his argument that we turn down the committee amendment and permit the gas tax in the District of Columbia to remain at 5 cents so that the proper roads and bridges and other highway improvements may be proceeded with in order.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this bill as it was introduced provided for a 5-cent gasoline tax. The committee amendment which I oppose reduces that to 4 cents. If the committee amendment is killed and the bill as originally introduced is passed the tax then will be 5 cents.

Generally my attitude is to oppose tax increases. At the beginning of consideration of this legislation I felt that I would oppose the increase to 5 cents. I have, however, discussed this matter with the Engineer Commissioner of the District, General Robinson, and he has explained to me the reasons why it is necessary to have this additional revenue. The program is a good program; it is necessary to have this money, in my opinion, to carry on needed improvements and expansion of the highway and bridge system; and for that reason I am opposed to this amendment and in favor of increasing the tax rate to 5 cents.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment and wish to make just one observation: I think we all remember a number of years ago when we had this discussion about the difference in taxes. Those of us who made a study of the road system in the District of Columbia found they needed additional money here in the District in order to build much needed roads. After a thorough discussion, as indicated by the gentleman from Georgia, many of us felt that the gas tax should be increased this 1 cent in order to supply the additional funds the District of Columbia needs to improve its road and bridge system.

I hope the committee amendment will be defeated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendments.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'HARA) there were—ayes 11, noes 38.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 84, nays 180, not voting 167, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

YEAS—84

Adair	Flood	Merrow
Andersen, H. Carl	Fogarty	Nicholson
Andresen, August H.	Forand	Norrell
Angell	Furcolo	O'Hara
Baker	Golden	O'Konski
Bakewell	Goodwin	Osmers
Bennett, Mich.	Graham	Passman
Berry	Grant	Reed, N. Y.
Betts	Gross	Ribicoff
Bishop	Harden	Rogers, Fla.
Blackney	Harrison, Nebr.	Rogers, Mass.
Boggs, Del.	Harvey	St. George
Bray	Heselton	Schenck
Brooks	Hinshaw	Scott, Hardie
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman, Ill.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Camp	Howell	Scrivner
Carrigg	Hull	Secrest
Case	Jenkins	Shafer
Chenoweth	Kersten, Wis.	Short
Cole, Kans.	Lane	Smith, Wis.
Cooley	Lanham	Thornberry
Crosser	McDonough	Tollefson
Cunningham	McGuire	Widnall
Curtis, Mo.	McMillan	Williams, N. Y.
Dondero	McVey	Wolcott
Eaton	Marshall	Wood, Idaho
Ellsworth	Martin, Mass.	Yates
	Mason	Yorty
	Meader	

NAYS—180

Abernethy	Ford	Murray
Allen, Ill.	Forrester	Norblad
Allen, La.	Frazier	O'Brien, Ill.
Anderson, Calif.	Fugate	O'Brien, Mich.
Andrews	Gathings	Ostertag
Aspinall	Gavin	Patman
Auchincloss	George	Patten
Ayres	Gordon	Pickett
Bailey	Granger	Poage
Barden	Greenwood	Polk
Baring	Hagen	Preston
Bates, Ky.	Hale	Price
Bates, Mass.	Halleck	Priest
Battle	Hardy	Prouty
Beall	Harrison, Va.	Rabaut
Bennett, Fla.	Harrison, Wyo.	Radwan
Boggs, La.	Hedrick	Rains
Bolling	Hess	Ramsay
Bolton	Hill	Rankin
Bonner	Hoffman, Mich.	Reams
Bosone	Hope	Reed, Ill.
Bow	Jackson, Wash.	Rees, Kans.
Brown, Ga.	James	Rhodes
Brownson	Jarman	Richards
Bryson	Jenison	Richman
Buchanan	Jensen	Riley
Budge	Jonas	Roberts
Burdick	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Colo.
Burleson	Jones, Woodrow W.	Ross
Burnside		Sheehan
Bush	Judd	Simpson, Ill.
Byrnes	Karsten, Mo.	Smith, Kans.
Cannon	Kean	Smith, Miss.
Carnahan	Kearns	Smith, Va.
Celler	Keating	Spence
Chiperfield	Kee	Springer
Church	Kilburn	Staggers
Clevenger	Kirwan	Stanley
Cole, N. Y.	Kluczynski	Steed
Cooper	Lareade	Sutton
Corbett	LeCompte	Taber
Cotton	Lind	Teague
Cox	McCormack	Thomas
Crumpacker	McCulloch	Thompson, Tex.
Curtis, Nebr.	McGregor	Trimble
Dague	McIntire	Vail
Davis, Ga.	McMullen	Van Pelt
Davis, Tenn.	Machrowicz	Van Zandt
Davis, Wis.	Mack, Wash.	Vursell
Denny	Madden	Wharton
Denton	Mahon	Whitten
Devereux	Mansfield	Wier
Doughton	Martin, Iowa	Wigglesworth
Eberharter	Miller, Md.	Williams, Miss.
Elliott	Miller, Nebr.	Wilson, Tex.
Elston	Miller, N. Y.	Winstead
Evins	Mills	Withrow
Feighan	Mitchell	Wood, Ga.
Fenton	Multer	Zablocki
Fernandez	Mumma	
Fisher	Murdock	

NOT VOTING—167

Aandahl	Dolliver	Jackson, Calif.
Abbitt	Donohue	Javits
Addonizio	Donovan	Johnson
Albert	Dorn	Jones, Mo.
Allen, Calif.	Doyle	Jones, Hamilton C.
Anfuso	Durham	
Arends	Engle	Kearney
Armstrong	Fallon	Kelley, Pa.
Barrett	Fine	Kelly, N. Y.
Beamer	Fulton	Kennedy
Beckworth	Gamble	Keogh
Belcher	Garmatz	Kerr
Bender	Gary	Kilday
Bentsen	Gore	King, Calif.
Blatnik	Granahan	King, Pa.
Boykin	Green	Klein
Brambiett	Gregory	Lantaff
Brehm	Gwinn	Latham
Buckley	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Lesinski
Buffett	Hall, Leonard W.	Lovre
Burton	Hand	Lucas
Busbey	Harris	Lyle
Butler	Hart	McCarthy
Canfield	Havenner	McConnell
Carlyle	Hays, Ark.	McGrath
Chatham	Hays, Ohio	McKinnon
Chelf	Hébert	Mack, Ill.
Chudoff	Heffernan	Magee
Clemente	Heller	Miller, Calif.
Colmer	Herlong	Morano
Combs	Herter	Morgan
Coudert	Hillings	Morris
Crawford	Hoeven	Morrison
Dawson	Holifield	Morton
Deane	Holmes	Moulder
DeGraffenried	Horan	Murphy
Delaney	Hunter	Nelson
Dempsey	Ikard	O'Brien, N. Y.
D'Ewart	Irving	O'Neill
Dingell	Jackson, Calif.	O'Toole
Dollinger	Javits	Patterson
Perkins	Sadlak	Thompson, Mich.
Philbin	Sasscer	Velde
Phillips	Saylor	Vinson
Potter	Scudder	Vorys
Poulson	Seely-Brown	Walter
Powell	Shelley	Watts
Redden	Sheppard	Weichel
Reece, Tenn.	Sieminski	Welch
Regan	Sikes	Werdel
Rivers	Simpson, Pa.	Wheeler
Robeson	Sittler	Wickersham
Rodino	Stigler	Willis
Rogers, Tex.	Stockman	Wilson, Ind.
Rooney	Tackett	Wolverton
Roosevelt	Talle	Woodruff
Sabath	Taylor	

So the amendments were rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Wolverton with Mr. Harris.
Mr. Allen of California with Mr. Hart.
Mr. Hillings with Mr. Sieminski.
Mr. Aandahl with Mr. Donohue.
Mr. Hoeven with Mr. Shelley.
Mr. Arends with Mr. Sikes.
Mr. Holmes with Mr. Havenner.
Mr. Armstrong with Mr. Addonizio.
Mr. Horan with Mr. Anfuso.
Mr. Beamer with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Hunter with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Belcher with Mr. Klein.
Mr. Jackson of California with Mr. Lantaff.
Mr. Bender with Mr. Wickersham.
Mr. Johnson with Mr. McKinnon.
Mr. Bramblett with Mr. McGrath.
Mr. Latham with Mr. King of California.
Mr. Kearney with Mr. Keogh.
Mr. King of Pennsylvania with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Woodruff with Mr. Dempsey.
Mr. Herter with Mr. Engle.
Mr. Stockman with Mr. Miller of California.
Mr. Talle with Mr. O'Toole.
Mr. Hand with Mr. Garmatz.
Mr. Sittler with Mr. Green.
Mr. Taylor with Mrs. Kelly of New York.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Holifield.
Miss Thompson of Michigan with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Seely-Brown with Mr. Hays of Ohio.
Mr. Velde with Mr. Barrett.
Mr. Leonard W. Hall with Mr. Rooney.
Mr. Vorys with Mr. Rodino.
Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. Weichel with Mr. Morris.
Mr. Werdel with Mr. Donovan.
Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Scudder with Mr. Kennedy.
Mr. Gwinn with Mr. Sabath.
Mr. Saylor with Mr. Sasscer.
Mr. Gamble with Mr. Heffernan.
Mr. Sadlak with Mr. Gregory.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Abbitt.
Mr. Reece of Tennessee with Mr. Heller.
Mr. Dolliver with Mr. Herlong.
Mr. Poulson with Mr. Burton.
Mr. D'Ewart with Mr. Clemente.
Mr. Potter with Mr. Chatham.
Mr. Crawford with Mr. Chudoff.
Mr. Phillips with Mr. Mack of Illinois.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Delaney.
Mr. Patterson with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Nelson with Mr. Dollinger.
Mr. Morton with Mr. Moulder.
Mr. Canfield with Mr. Fallon.
Mr. Morano with Mr. O'Neill.
Mr. Butler with Mr. Fine.
Mr. McConnell with Mr. Gary.
Mr. Busbey with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Lovre with Mr. Walter.
Mr. Buffet with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Brehm with Mr. Robeson.

Mr. EVINS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DONDERO changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CROSSER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CANNON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Were both amendments voted down? There were two.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Both amendments were reported together, voted on together, and they were voted down.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING JUVENILE COURT ACT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 1822) to amend the act creating a juvenile court for the District of Columbia, approved March 19, 1906, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 11 of the act entitled "An act to create a juvenile court in and for the District of Columbia," approved March 19, 1906, as amended (sec. 11–912, D. C. Code, 1940 ed.), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "No such child shall be held in such place of detention for any period longer than 5 days, excluding Sundays and holidays, unless the judge shall order such child detained for a further period."

SEC. 2. The second sentence of section 14 of such act, as amended (sec. 11–915, D. C. Code, 1940 ed.), is amended to read as follows: "In the hearing of any case, the general public shall be excluded and only such persons as have a direct interest in the case and their representatives shall be admitted except that the judge, by rule of court or special order, may admit such other persons as he deems to have a legitimate interest in the case or the work of the court."

SEC. 3. Section 28 of such act, as amended (sec. 11–929, D. C. Code, 1940 ed.), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 28. (a) The court shall maintain records of all cases brought before the court. Such records shall be withheld from indiscriminate public inspection but shall be open to inspection only by respondents, their parents or guardians and their duly authorized attorneys, and by any institution or agency to which a child may have been committed pursuant to section 14 of this act. Such records may, pursuant to rule of court or special order of the court, be inspected by other interested persons, institutions, and agencies. As used in this subsection, the word "records" includes notices filed with the court by arresting officers pursuant to section 11 of this act, the court docket and entries therein, the petitions,

complaints, informations, motions, and other papers filed in any case, transcripts of testimony taken in any case tried by the court and findings, verdicts, judgments, orders and decrees, and other writings filed in proceedings before the court, other than social records.

"(b) The records made by officers of the court pursuant to sections 7 and 23 of this act, referred to in this section as social records, shall be withheld from indiscriminate public inspection, except that such records or parts thereof shall be made available by rule of court or special order of court to such persons, governmental, private agencies, and institutions as have a legitimate interest in the protection, welfare, treatment, and rehabilitation of the child, and to any court before which any such child may appear. The judge may also provide by rule or special order that any such person or agency may make or receive copies of such records or parts thereof. No person, agency, or institution which has received records or information under this section may publish or use them for any purpose other than that for which they were received.

"(c) It shall be unlawful, except for purposes for which records, parts thereof, or information therefrom have been released pursuant to section 28 of this act or except for purposes thereafter permitted by special order of court, and in accordance with any applicable rules of court, for any person or persons to disclose, receive, or make use of, or authorize, knowingly permit, participate in, or acquiesce in the use of any information concerning any juvenile before the court, directly or indirectly derived from the records, papers, files, or communications of the court, or acquired in the course of the performance of official duties.

"(d) Any person or persons who shall violate subsection (c) of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $100 or by imprisonment for not more than 90 days, or by both."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 3, line 10, after the word "governmental", strike out the comma and insert the word "and."

On page 4, line 10, insert before the quotation mark the following new sentence: "Prosecutions for violations of subsection (c) of this section shall be brought in the name of the District of Columbia in the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia by the Corporation Counsel or any of his assistants."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of explaining the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the purposes of this bill are threefold: It would amend the Juvenile Court Act: first, with respect to the detention of children brought by police officers to the receiving home, operated by the Board of Public Welfare, pending disposition of the child by court order. At the present time there is no statutory provision authorizing the detention of a child for any particular length of time. This bill would amend section 11 of the act so as to provide that no child shall be held in a detention home for a period longer than 5 days, exclusive of Sundays and holidays, unless the judge shall order such child detained for a further period. This provision will make it certain that the receiving home shall hold children for a definite period of time unless the court orders a further detention; otherwise the child should be released; second, with respect to the hearing of any case, section 14 of the act—sections 11–915, District of Columbia Code—provides that—

In the hearing of any case the general public shall be excluded and only such persons as having a direct interest in the case and their representatives admitted.

Section 2 of this bill removes this restriction to the extent that the judge be given authority to admit to hearings people who, though they are not directly interested in the case which is being heard, do have a legitimate interest in the case or the work of the court; and, third, with respect to inspection of records of cases, section 28 of the act—section 11–929, District of Columbia Code—provides that—

The court shall maintain records of all cases brought before it. Such records shall be open to inspection by respondents, their parents or guardians, or their duly authorized attorneys, but otherwise only by order of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. The court shall devise and cause to be printed such forms for records and such other papers as may be required.

Sections 7 and 23 of the act impose the duty upon certain officers of the court to obtain information concerning children coming before the court which information, for the purpose of this report, will be referred to as "social records."

A question has arisen as to what records are included within the meaning of section 28 of the act. The judge of the juvenile court has taken the view that she has no authority to permit the divulging of social records to anyone other than the staff of the court. This ruling has had the effect of withholding information from certain agencies, which is needed to properly carry on their work. Section 3 (a) of the bill clarifies this situation and vests the court with discretion to permit the divulging of such information in proper circumstances.

Section 3 (b) of the bill provides that the social records shall be withheld from indiscriminate public inspection, and allows the judge of the juvenile court to make available by rule of court or special order such records or parts thereof to such persons, governmental and private agencies and institutions as have a legitimate interest in the protection, welfare, treatment, and rehabilitation of the child, and to any court before which any such child may appear.

Section 3 (c) makes unlawful the indiscriminate use of such records so received from the court.

This legislation has the approval of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the judge of the juvenile court, the bar association of the District of Columbia.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a few questions of the gentleman from Georgia or some other member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, not in relation to this particular bill but in relation to a matter concerning the courts of the District.

I noted from an article in yesterday's Washington Star that Senator NEELY of West Virginia has introduced a bill to give the Municipal Court judges some discretionary power in the disposition of cases. I was most surprised to read that even in the case of first offenders on minor charges the judges had no such discretion at the present time; does the gentleman from Georgia know whether that is correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I have had the same view of it that the gentleman from Massachusetts has just expressed. If that should be the case it would be a surprise to me.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad to hear that because while I recognize that in certain types of cases there might be justifiable minimum sentences imposed from the angle of protecting our society, nevertheless I have always felt and still feel that considerable discretion should be given to the judges whether of the District of Columbia, of my State, or any other State, or city or political subdivision thereof, and the judges of our Federal courts in the disposition of criminal cases, and particularly those involving minor misdemeanors.

I was surprised to note by this article that there was no discretion in the District judges apparently for the police to release a prisoner who might be arrested for drunkenness for the first time. Up in Boston I think the police have a discretion to release up to three times a year; that is, without bringing him into court. They have discretion one way or the other and that system has worked very satisfactory.

In the case of minor automobile cases it seems to me that it would be unwise not to have discretion in the court to either file a case or to place a person on probation. As I understand it from reading this news item, the court could not impose a suspended sentence. If that is so, it seems to me that the District Committee would be justified in looking into that to give to the courts, particularly in the case of misdemeanors termed malum prohibitum as distinguished from malum in se, and even in malum in se where it is necessary for the Government to prove intent, there should be a wide discretion in the courts because cases are different, circumstances and conditions are different, the record of a person is involved, many things are to be taken into consideration which distinguish cases and individuals from one another, even where they are charged with a violation of a law.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I agree with the distinguished majority leader that there should be more discretion in some of these cases. We do not presently have it in the District of Columbia, even in minor police cases. I think that is one reason why the Police Court and our courts generally are cluttered up and generally far behind in handling some of these cases. Some minor cases get into the courts that should be handled differently.

I agree with the gentleman that the District Committee should take some action to perhaps give more discretionary power to not only police officers in certain cases but to the Juvenile Court.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the gentleman's observation. I simply take the floor at this time because that news item aroused my special interest to make inquiry and to urge the District Committee to carefully and speedily look into this situation. I find that there is a better administration of justice where the court has discretion than where the court is placed in a straitjacket.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECORDING AND RELEASING OF LIENS BY ENTRIES ON CERTIFICATES OF TITLE

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (S. 2735) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 736; title 40, ch. 7, D. C. Code, 1940 edition), is amended by inserting after the word "engine" a comma and the words "serial or identification."

SEC. 2. Section 8 of said act is amended by inserting after the word "engine" a comma and the words "serial or identification."

SEC. 3. Section 13 of said act is amended by inserting after the word "engine" a comma and the words "serial or identification."

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. Will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to amend the motor vehicle lien registration law. That law at the present time requires the Recorder of Deeds to keep not only an alphabetical list of the liens but also a list of the liens according to the engine numbers of the automobiles upon which the liens are filed.

The Ford Co. has now abandoned the practice of using engine numbers. They use only a serial number on the car, and it is my understanding as well as the understanding of the Recorder of Deeds that the other companies will very shortly follow the lead of the Ford Motor Co., so that there will be no way of maintaining a list according to the engine numbers, so the purpose of this bill is to amend the motor vehicle lien registration law so as to permit the keeping of this index according to either the engine, the serial, or the identification number of the car.

For several years most of the companies have abandoned the idea of putting numbers upon replacement engines, and as you probably know, that practice of replacing engines rather than rebuilding is becoming more and more in use. The result is that whenever a new engine is placed in a motor vehicle, a new title has to be obtained giving the new engine number—a number which is assigned by the Director of Vehicles and Traffic. It is the desire of the Director of Vehicles and Traffic to put upon the titles only the serial numbers rather than the engine number so that when a new engine is put into the car a new certificate of title does not have to be procured, but he is unable to adopt that system as long as the liens must be recorded according to engine numbers.

This legislation has the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Director of Motor Vehicles and Traffic, the Recorder of Deeds and the American Automobile Association of the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING CODE OF LAW OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (S. 2736) to amend the Code of Law of the District of Columbia in respect to the recording, in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds, of bills of sale, mortgages, deeds of trust, and conditional sales of personal property, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the provisions of this bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to relieve the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia of the obligation of maintaining obsolete records. Under existing law the Recorder of Deeds is required to preserve all records filed with his office, and the storage problem has become acute. The bill also requires vendors, mortgagees, trustees, and conditional vendors, or their assignees, to execute releases upon satisfaction of the debt. The proposed bill would authorize the Recorder of Deeds to dispose of chattel mortgages and deeds of trusts after the expiration of 7 years from the filing of such instruments; if at that time the debt were not satisfied, its life could be extended for an additional 7 years by the filing of an affidavit showing the amount still due and payable. Under present District of Columbia law, a conditional vendee or holder of a chattel mortgage or deed of trust is under no obligation to give a release or to cause such release to be recorded. The bill would require that such release be delivered and recorded upon demand.

The Corporation Counsel's office of the District of Columbia, made an investigation of 41 or 42 States and it was found that in 36 of these States the practice is to destroy obsolete instruments as would be done by this legislation.

The bill has the approval of the Board of Commissioners, the Recorder of Deeds, and the Director of Vehicles and Traffic.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the first paragraph of section 546, subchapter 3 of chapter 16 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, revised, and reenacted by the act approved March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1103, ch. 417; title 42, sec. 101, D. C. Code, 1940); is hereby renumbered as section 546–A; and (b) section 547 of such subchapter (title 42, sec. 103, D. C. Code, 1940) is hereby amended by striking therefrom the last two sentences and by renumbering such section as section 546–B.

SEC. 2. The second paragraph of section 546 of such subchapter (title 42, sec. 102, D. C. Code, 1940) is hereby renumbered and amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 546–C. It shall not be necessary for the Recorder of Deeds to spread upon the records of his office the instruments filed pursuant to section 546–A or section 546–B of this subchapter, but the same shall be indexed and, except as hereinafter provided, shall be kept on file and shall be open to inspection by the public, and shall have the same force and legal effect as if they were actually recorded in the books of said office."

SEC. 3. Subchapter 3 of chapter 16 of such act is further amended by adding thereto the following new sections:

"SEC. 546–D. Every instrument filed with the Recorder of Deeds pursuant to section 546–A or section 546–B of this subchapter, and instruments filed with said Recorder or presented for recording pursuant to the act entitled 'An act for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes,' approved July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 736; title 40, ch. 7, D. C. Code, 1940), shall be void as against the creditors of the party indebted thereon and subsequent purchasers or mortgagees in good faith after the expiration of 7 years from the filing thereof, unless within 90 days next preceding the expiration of the term of 7 years from such filing and each 7-year period thereafter, the vendor, mortgagee, trustee, conditional vendor, or donor shall make and file an affidavit setting forth the amount then due and unpaid: *Provided*, That no such instrument filed prior to the effective date of this amendatory act shall be void as against such creditors, subsequent purchasers or mortgagees, if such affidavit be made and filed within 90 days before the expiration of 7 years from the filing of such instrument or 1 year from the effective date of this amendatory act, whichever is later, and each 7-year period thereafter. The Recorder of Deeds shall attach such affidavit after the filing thereof to the instrument to which it relates. The Recorder of Deeds may destroy any such instrument which has become void under the provisions of this subchapter, together with any affidavit, release, and assignment relating thereto: *Provided*, That such destruction shall not be effected until the expiration of 1 year from the effective date of this amendatory act.

"SEC. 546–E. When the debt secured by any instrument filed pursuant to section 546–A or section 546–B of this subchapter

has been paid in full, the vendor, mortgagee, trustee or conditional vendor or his assignee shall, within 20 days thereafter, (a) execute or cause to be executed a release thereof, acknowledged before a notary public, and (b) deliver or cause to be delivered such release to the Recorder of Deeds. The Recorder (a) shall file the instrument of release by attaching the same to the instrument to which it relates; and (b) shall enter on the released instrument and on the index record thereof the word 'released,' the date of filing of the instrument of release, and a facsimile of his signature.

"SEC. 546–F. When any instrument filed pursuant to section 546–A or section 546–B of this subchapter has not become void but has, subsequently to the effective date of this amendatory act, been released as provided in section 546–E of this subchapter, the Recorder may, after the expiration of 3 years from the date of the filing of such release, destroy such instrument, the release, and assignments relating thereto.

"SEC. 546–G. Any person intentionally making a false statement with respect to an instrument filed with the Recorder of Deeds pursuant to section 546–A or section 546–B of this subchapter, or who, after receipt of payment in full of the debt secured by any such instrument, shall, for a period of more than 20 days after written demand by the person indebted, neglect or refuse to execute and file with the Recorder of Deeds a release as provided in section 546–E of this subchapter, shall upon conviction be punished by a fine of not more than $500 or be imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. Prosecutions for violations of this subchapter shall be by the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia or any of his assistants in the name of the District of Columbia."

SEC. 4. Section 11 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of aliens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 736; title 40, ch. 7, D. C. Code, 1940), is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence to read as follows: "Whenever any lien has been released as provided in this section for a period of not more than 3 years, the Recorder of Deeds may destroy the instrument which created such lien and the index cards upon which the lien information was entered: *Provided*, That no other unsatisfied lien is shown on any such index card."

SEC. 5. Section 552 of subchapter 4 of chapter 16 of the act, approved March 3, 1901, as amended by the acts of February 4, 1905 (33 Stat. 689, ch. 299), and June 17, 1935 (49 Stat. 384, ch. 265; title 45, sec. 708, D. C. Code, 1940), is amended by striking therefrom so much as reads: "For filing and indexing a bill of sale of chattels, or a mortgage or deed of trust thereof, or a conditional bill of sale of chattels or any release or satisfaction of any such, $1.50.", and substituting in lieu thereof the following: "For filing and indexing a bill of sale of chattels, or a mortgage or deed of trust thereof, or a conditional bill of sale of chattels, including a release of any such instrument, $2: *Provided*, That for the filing of a release of any such instrument filed prior to the effective date of this amendatory act the Recorder of Deeds shall collect a fee of 50 cents.

"For filing an affidavit pursuant to section 546–D of this subchapter, $2."

SEC. 6. This act shall take effect 90 days after its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND ACT TO REGULATE BOXING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (H. R. 5768) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman kindly explain the bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the purposes of this legislation are outlined below:

First. Authorizes the District of Columbia Boxing Commission to assign dates on which boxing contests may be held, and to determine which of two or more promoters may hold a contest on an identical date.

Under existing laws the Commission has not had definite authority to assign dates. In one case the action of the Commission was challenged in the courts by one of the rival promoters, and while the final decision in the case turned on another point not material to the issue herein presented, serious doubt was raised as to the authority of the Commission to assign specific dates to licensed promoters, a doubt which continues to exist. This legislation would provide that when the Commission is required to make a determination as to which of the rival promoters is to be assigned a specific date, such determination is to be made at a meeting of the Commission open to the public, and the decision of the Commission is to be based on the public interest, and the relative ranking of the boxers engaged in the proposed contests. It is believed that such a provision will serve to insure that the decision of the Commission will favor the promoter offering the better contest.

Second. Requires persons holding or conducting boxing contests to pay to the Commission 10 percent of the receipts from such contest, or an amount equal to the actual cost of supervising the contest whichever is the larger amount.

Included among receipts are, first, admission fees; and, second, receipts from the sale, lease, or other exploitation of radio, television, or motion-picture rights, or from other public presentation of such boxing contests. In connection with this proposed change in existing law, it has been noted by the Official Bulletin of the National Boxing Association of America that the effect of television on the financial aspects of boxing has been disastrous. Since the District of Columbia has no statute including in gross receipts any return from the sale or leasing of television rights it has been particularly disastrous to the Boxing Commission in the District of Columbia.

Third. Authorizes the Commission to use for the purpose of defraying its expenses and for reinvestment purposes the interest and the principal amount of certain bonds purchased by the predecessor Boxing Commission prior to December 20, 1944, and since that time held in custody by the Auditor and Secretary of the Board of Commissioners.

A provision under existing law provides that all funds—either in cash or in other form—of the Boxing Commission of the District of Columbia remaining unexpended or unobligated on the effective date of the act shall be paid to the Collector of Taxes, District of Columbia, and be deposited into the United States Treasury to the credit of the account "Miscellaneous trust fund deposit, District of Columbia Boxing Commission." Only $15,000 is allowed to be kept in this account at the end of the year and the balance is paid into the general revenues of the District of Columbia. This has proven to be insufficient to carry on the work of the Boxing Commission.

In order to avoid a recurrence of the present situation the Commissioners of the District of Columbia recommended that the amount which may be carried over at the end of each fiscal year be increased to $50,000 instead of $15,000, as provided in existing law. The amendment adopted by the committee would change this amount to $25,000 rather than $50,000 and was a compromise among all interested parties. This would insure the Commission of an adequate working fund.

This legislation has the approval of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Boxing Commission of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman said it requires the payment of 10 percent of the receipts from the contest. Can the gentleman tell me whether that includes motion pictures, radio, and television rights?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It will give the Boxing Commission the right to determine whether a local bout should be televised?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is my understanding.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In other words, give them the right also to say that the theaters could televise that bout and charge an admission from which they get a 10-percent cut.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. It is my understanding that those are all included in this bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am not going to object to the bill, and I do want the Boxing Commission to get as much money as they need, but I felt, when the bill was before the committee, that that particular section was not clear. I do not like the idea of a boxing bout to be held next Friday night, I believe, or shortly—one of the top bouts—to be sold just to theaters, and if you want to see it, you have to go to a theater because you cannot get it on your own television. That applies to certain sections of the country. The International Boxing Commission has a right to say that Boston, for instance, shall not see a television bout, and Chicago may see it, or

Washington, and I am a little apprehensive here that the Boxing Commission may assume that they have the authority to say that the boxing bout shall be seen only in certain cities. The income from television rights that go with this can be terrific. I believe the committee saw fit to have an amendment adopted which limits the over-all at the end of the year to $25,000. While I am not going to object to the bill, I do think, maybe, that at least the International Boxing Commission has too much authority in denying the individuals in some cities, various places throughout the country, the right to see boxing bouts on television. It becomes a racket. I understand a local bout will not be televised, but the people in Baltimore can see it on their television, and in several other cities the people can see it on television. In some places they can only see it in the theaters. I doubt if the restrictions and regulations are in the interest of the public.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. WITHROW. What percentage of the gross does the Commission get at the present time?

Mr. O'HARA. I was under the impression that the gentleman from Georgia could answer that question. My opinion was that they were getting 10 percent now.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. WITHROW. Then this is really no increase in the percentage at all?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. No; not in that respect.

Mr. WITHROW. I think 10 percent is an awful lot to give the Commission.

Mr. O'HARA. My understanding is that that was about the standard percentage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act entitled "An act to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 823; title 2, ch. 12, D. C. Code, 1940 edition, Supp. VII), is amended by inserting between the first and second sentences the following: "The Commission is authorized in its sole judgment and discretion to assign to licensed promoters dates on which boxing contests may be held, and no licensed promoter shall hold any boxing contest on any date unless specifically authorized so to do by the Commission. When two or more promoters make application to hold separate boxing contests on an identical date not at the time of such application assigned to either or any of the promoters making such applications, the Commission shall, at a meeting open to the public, make its determination as to whether either or any of such applications will be granted, and if so, which, and in connection with such determination shall take into consideration the public interest, local demand, and the relative ranking of the boxers engaged in the proposed contests."

SEC. 2. Section 9 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. Every person holding or conducting any boxing contest for which an admission fee is charged or received, or for which revenue is received from the sale, lease, or other exploitation of radio, television, or motion-picture rights, or from other public presentations of such contest, or for which such fee is charged or received and such revenue is received shall pay to the Commission a sum equal to the larger of the following: (a) An amount equal to 10 percent of the gross receipts realized by such person as a result of holding or conducting such contest, including receipts derived from the sale of admissions to the contest, and receipts derived from the sale, leasing, or other exploitation of radio, television, or motion-picture rights and from other public presentation of such boxing contest, or (b) an amount equal to the total actual cost of compensation of personnel assigned by the Commission to supervise such contest. Payments of money required by this section shall be accompanied by reports in such form as shall be prescribed by the Commission. Each ticket of admission to any such boxing contest shall bear clearly upon the face thereof the purchase price of the said ticket."

SEC. 3. Section 10 of such act is amended by inserting the designation "(a)" immediately before the first sentence thereof, by striking the figures "15,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "50,000," and by adding to such section a new subsection reading as follows:

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, any interest-bearing bonds owned by the Boxing Commission of the District of Columbia prior to December 20, 1944, may be retained by the District of Columbia Boxing Commission, and the said Commission is authorized, when sufficient funds to defray its expenses are not otherwise available, to sell or redeem one or more of the said bonds, to reinvest the proceeds from any sale or redemption of the said bonds, and to use for the purpose of defraying the expenses of the said Commission the proceeds from the sale or redemption of the said bonds, together with the interest from the said bonds, any interest from any bonds or other securities in which such proceeds from such sale or redemption were reinvested, and the proceeds from the sale or redemption of any bonds or other securities purchased by the said Commission for reinvestment purposes, pursuant to the authority herein contained."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 13, strike out "50,000" and insert "25,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMPLOYMENT OF MINORS WITHIN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6857) to amend section 7a of the act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman kindly explain the bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under existing law—section 7a of the act of May 29, 1928, as added by the act of December 26, 1941—the Board of Education of the District of Columbia or its authorized agent has authority to issue a work permit to any minor under 18 years of age to appear on the stage of a licensed legitimate or vaudeville theater, in any professional traveling theatrical production, or act, or in a musical recital or concert. The minor must be at least 14 years of age and have completed eight grades of elementary instruction or a course of study deemed equivalent thereto by the Board of Education. He must not appear on the stage in more than two performances in any one day, nor more than 3 hours in any one day, nor more than 6 days in any week, nor more than 12 hours in any week; nor after 11 p. m. Application for permit must be made by the parent or guardian of the minor at least 14 days in advance of the appearance. The Board of Education or its agent may issue a permit if satisfied that the parent or guardian has made adequate provision for the educational instruction of the minor, for safeguarding his health, and for proper supervision of the minor. This section also authorizes the Board to make rules and regulations for the protection of health, morals, and safety of minors coming within the purview of the act.

H. R. 6857 would amend existing law by striking out the minimum age of 14 years and the requirement that the minor shall have completed eight grades of elementary instruction or a course of study deemed by the Board of Education equivalent thereto. The bill also eliminates the limitations with respect to the hours each day and the days and hours in any week a minor may appear on a stage. In lieu thereof it is provided that no minor shall appear on the stage in more than eight performances in any one week. The limit with respect to the number of performances in any one day, namely, two, is retained. The bill strikes out the requirement that application for permit be filed at least 14 days in advance of the appearance on the stage and inserts in lieu thereof a requirement that the application be filed at such time as the Board of Education may require.

The amendments adopted by the committee would impose a minimum age of 7 years for the age of obtaining a permit and would permit a minor to appear on a stage until the hour of 11:30 postmeridian.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Board of Education of the District of Columbia have approved this legislation with the amendments heretofore referred to.

Mr. O'HARA. I withdraw my reservation of the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the substance of this bill is that it is to reduce the minimum age from 14 to 7?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The minimum age, yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. What were the reasons advanced for that change?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Washington, which is the capital of the world, has been de-

prived of seeing many splendid performances. Many of our finest plays have not been permitted to be shown in Washington because of that minimum requirement of 14 years. Plays like, for example, Mrs. McThing, The King and I, South Pacific, Peter Pan, A Member of the Wedding, in which child actors appear, could not be produced in Washington.

Mr. McCORMACK. Are these stage shows?

Mr. CELLER. They are stage shows.

Mr. McCORMACK. Not moving pictures?

Mr. CELLER. No, this has nothing to do with moving pictures.

Further, there are ample safeguards in the Child Labor Act to take care of the education and health of the children while performing, so there need be no fear on the score that there will be any abuse of these rights or privileges.

The gentleman from Massachusetts can readily appreciate that if the drama is to hold a mirror up to nature, you cannot have dramatists portraying life without children. That portrayal would be imperfect and the mirror then held up would be cracked. It does not seem fair that Washington should be thus circumscribed. Most States permit what we are asking to do by this bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. I reserved the right to object because I felt there should be an adequate explanation made that would be satisfying if not convincing to the Members, of the necessity of reducing the minimum age from 14 to 7. They have to get a permit, of course, or license, or whatever you want to call it, which has to be passed upon by the Board of Education, I believe?

Mr. CELLER. That is correct, and they must be sure that they are properly educated and trained. The touring company must provide for teachers and so forth.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might say I am not convinced, but the gentleman and the committee make out a prima facie case. The success of it will depend upon the manner in which it is administered, and the care by and through which those who must pass upon and approve the applications safeguard and protect these children because when you get to the 7-year-olds, you are talking about mere children. These people will have a grave responsibility with the passage of this bill. I want the RECORD to show we all expect that they will very zealously protect the child and permit no exploitation, but allow a legitimate and honorable part to be played by children in whatever plays they might participate in.

Mr. CELLER. I might say that the general act provides that every child actor must be personally supervised, his education continued, and that the licenses be issued to him by the Board of Education, after it has been assured that provisions for the care of his health and morals and so forth are completely safeguarded.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 7a of the act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 36-207a), is amended, by striking out "*Provided*, That such minor is at least 14 years of age and has completed eight grades of elementary instruction or a course of study deemed by the Board of Education equivalent thereto: *And provided further*, That such minor shall not appear on said stage in more than two performances in any one day, nor more than 3 hours in any one day, nor more than 6 days in any week, not more than 12 hours in any week, and shall not appear on said stage after the hour of 11 postmeridian" and inserting in lieu thereof "*Provided*, That such minor shall not appear on said stage in more than two performances in any one day, nor more than eight performances in any 1 week." The second sentence of such section is amended by striking out "at least 14 days in advance of such appearance" and inserting in lieu thereof "at such time as the Board may require."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 6, after the word "minor" insert the following: "is at least 7 years of age: *Provided, further*, That such minor."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the subject matter of this bill is to my mind noncontroversial, and I hope that after consideration has been given to its purpose, all will be in agreement with me.

In 1928, by act of Congress, minors under 18 were not permitted to appear on the legitimate theater stage. In 1941, this act was amended by lowering the prohibitive age to 14. The bill under discussion now, as amended, would permit all children over 7 years of age to perform after the proper safeguards regarding their health, education, and supervision were assured to the satisfaction of the Board of Education, which Board would then issue a license to the child in question. During the course of the hearing held by the House District Committee on May 6, 1952, two amendments were suggested which I approve. Namely, that an age limit of 7 years be provided as well as a time limit of 11:30 p. m. It was the considered opinion of most of the members that since the New York law concerning child actors had a 7-year limit that it would be satisfactory as a guide to Washington theaters.

I have spoken thus far only about the specific provisions of the bill and now the urgent need for this legislation is something I am anxious to examine. Washington is the Capital of our Nation, and should be the capital of our cultural lives as well. The fact that we do not permit children to appear on the stage has made it impossible for us to see innumerable plays written and acted by some of our greatest artists. To name just a few—Peter Pan, The Member of the Wedding, The King and I, South Pacific, The Innocents, a play based on Henry James, The Turn of the Screw, The Grass Harp, The Happy Time, and Mrs. McThing, a play now on Broadway, written by Mary Chase, the author of Harvey, with Helen Hayes in the stellar role.

The people of the theater write about life and certainly children are part of life and living. We, here in the Capital cannot even see the products of our own artists and writers if they but chance to include a young child in their thinking. How can the stage "hold the mirror up to nature" if young children are excluded therefrom? The mirror is cracked.

Everyone is aware of the need to protect the growth and development of the young, and all of us applaud every effort to do so. But in this case, we have blanketed our eyes to the simple fact that direct, efficient, and careful measures have been taken in the theater to insure its child actors every possible protection and precaution. This bill provides that every child actor be personally supervised, his education continued, and a license issued to him by the Board of Education, after being assured that provisions for the care of health, morals, and safety, are completely safeguarded.

This legislation should be enacted without delay. Washington should not be denied the privilege of viewing some of the finest products of the American theater, because of an unfounded concern that our child actors will be abused.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment on page 2, line 8, before the quotation mark insert a comma and the following: "and shall not appear on said stage after the hour of 11:30 postmeridian."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS—ALBERT O. RAEDER

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 6943) to fix the seniority rights and service of Albert O. Raeder as sergeant in the District of Columbia Fire Department, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of determining the seniority rights and service of Albert O. Raeder, in the rank of sergeant in the District of Columbia Fire Department he shall be held to have been promoted to such rank as of May 1, 1947.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to fix the seniority rights and service of Albert C. Raeder as sergeant in the District of Columbia Fire Department.

Mr. Raeder at the present time is a sergeant in the District of Columbia Fire Department, to which rank he was promoted on September 1, 1948. The bill would fix April 1, 1947, as the date on which he was promoted to such rank.

Sergeant Raeder is a veteran of World War II, having served in the Navy from January 31, 1942, to November 15, 1945. Upon his discharge from the Navy he was restored to his position as private in the Fire Department. In the spring of 1946 the Federal Government requested the Chief Engineer of the Fire Department to recommend and temporarily release for a period of 1 year a man to go to Japan in the classification of fire administrator. Sergeant Raeder, then a private, class 6, at the request of his superior officers, accepted the position and left for Japan in July 1946. He returned to the Fire Department in October 1947. While Private Raeder was in Japan a promotional examination was held in October 1946, for the position of sergeant in the Fire Department. Upon his return to the Fire Department from Japan, Private Raeder filed an application with the Civil Service Commission for a special examination in lieu of the one he missed. His application was approved and the examination was held in July 1948, which Private Raeder passed with a final mark of 99.7. As stated above, Private Raeder was appointed to sergeant September 1, 1948.

Under the regulations governing the fire department one is not eligible to take the examination for promotion to the rank of lieutenant until he has served 3 years continuously in the rank of sergeant. Thus, based on the actual date on which then Private Raeder was promoted to sergeant—September 1, 1948—he would not have been eligible to take the examination for lieutenant before September 1, 1951. As a matter of fact, he took the examination for promotion to lieutenant in October 1950. This procedure was permitted by the Civil Service Commission to avoid giving him a later special examination in the event he were declared eligible. The result of his examination taken in October 1950 has never been disclosed.

This legislation has the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Chief Engineer of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLUMBIA HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN AND LYING-IN ASYLUM

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 7253) to authorize the conveyance to the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum of certain parcels of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to convey to the corporation known as the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum the property commonly known as the Columbia Hospital in the square bounded by Twenty-fourth, Twenty-fifth, L, and M Streets NW., in the District of Columbia. The bill would transfer all the right, title, and interest of the United States and of the District of Columbia in this property to the hospital corporation.

No part of the property conveyed pursuant to the act may be devoted to any purpose other than that of a hospital for women.

There is no cost involved in this legislation, either to the Federal Government or to the District government. The amendment adopted by the committee is to provide for the continuation of the directors of the corporation since this was necessary because of the repeal provisions in section 4.

This bill has the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the Columbia Hospital was incorporated on June 1, 1866, by an act of Congress. It was to take care of a hospital and dispensary for the treatment of widows and other women of the Civil War period for diseases peculiar to women, back in 1866. The Congress bought a little piece of land in 1872 for $25,000, and that is where the hospital was located. The Columbia Hospital has been operating since that time.

It is interesting to note that the Congress has put in about $1,444,000 in the last 62 years; we have had an interest in it, we have owned some of the property, and we have appropriated from $5,000 to $10,000 each year for the maintenance of the heating equipment.

Eight years ago the Speaker appointed me as one of the Members to represent this House on the board of directors. Under the old law of incorporation two Members of the House and one from the other body represented the Congress on the Columbia Hospital Board. I have attended a few of their meetings. The board of directors presently are appointed by the Commissioners. They have excellent individuals serving on that board without pay and running the hospital. It has been keeping its head above water and on the right side of the ledger. The hospital has given service to this community for 85 years. It was established initially as a charitable institution and was supported by the Federal Government. Since its establishment there have been 88,882 children born in the hospital. Last year there were 4,092 children born in the hospital and of that number 993, or 24 percent, were so-called ward or charity cases.

I give you this little bit of information about the hospital because it is unique in that it was established during the Civil War to take care of the troubles of women who were ill at that time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Nebraska is himself a doctor. What is the condition of the hospital now? The gentleman is well-qualified to speak on this subject.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In 1949 the board of directors spent $206,000 of the hospital's own money which they saved from the institution's income and put the hospital in pretty good condition. Oh, it needs some minor repairs here and there; but, generally speaking, I think it is above the average in the District of Columbia. They have recently repaired their kitchen; they have put in some new equipment, operating-room equipment, and some air-cooling units that were needed, and the dispensary has been improved.

They are treating a large number of charity patients. I do not have the figure, but it is a large number.

Mr. McCORMACK. Just what is the condition of the so-called hospital at the present time?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is very good. Passage of this bill permits the board of directors to perhaps come in for some additional funds which are necessary under the Hill-Burton bill and make some additions to the hospital. The Congress will not continue to appropriate the $5,000 annual appropriation for furnace upkeep. The board of directors will control all the details. It has been run in excellent fashion.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I do not think it has been stated that the bill was introduced by the gentleman from Nebraska. [Mr. MILLER]. I want to thank him for the detailed explanation he has given.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The explanation I have given is from figures and information furnished me by Albert W. Kenner, M. D., and medical director of the institution. I trust the bill will pass.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, subject to the provisions of section 2 of this act, the Administrator of General Services and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are directed to convey, without monetary consideration, to the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum, Washington, D. C., a corporation created by the act of June 1, 1866 (14 Stat. 55), all right, title and interest of the United States and of the District of Columbia in and to those pieces or parcels of land in the District of Columbia, described as follows, together with all improvements thereon and appurtenances thereto:

(a) All that piece or parcel of land situate and lying in the city of Washington in the District of Columbia and known as part of square numbered 25, as laid down and distinguished on the plat or plan of said city, as follows: Beginning at the southeast corner of said square and running thence north with Twenty-fourth Street two hundred and thirty-one feet and seven inches; thence west two hundred and thirty feet and six inches; thence north to M Street two hundred and thirty-one feet and ten inches; thence west with M Street two hundred and fifteen feet and six inches to Twenty-fifth Street; thence south with Twenty-fifth Street two hundred and sixty-three feet and five inches; thence east two hundred feet; thence south to L Street two hundred feet; thence east with L Street two hundred and forty-six feet to the beginning; and being the property conveyed to the United States

of America by deed dated October 17, 1876, from the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum, recorded in liber 836, folio 159, of the land records of the District of Columbia.

(b) All that piece or parcel of land situate and lying in the city of Washington in the District of Columbia on the northeast corner of L and Twenty-fifth Streets Northwest, being a part of original square numbered 25, as follows: Beginning at the southwest corner of said square and running thence east with the line of said L Street two hundred feet for a corner; thence north two hundred feet for a corner; thence west two hundred feet for a corner; and thence south two hundred feet to the place of beginning; containing forty thousand square feet of ground; more or less, and being the property conveyed to the United States of America by deed dated July 6, 1872, from the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum and Edward Maynard, recorded in liber 811, folio 481 of the land records of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. The deed conveying the property described in the first section of this act shall provide that no part of said property shall, without the consent of the United States, be devoted to any other purpose than a hospital for women.

SEC. 3. The provisions of the paragraph following the appropriation for the Washington Hospital for Foundlings in the act of March 3, 1893 (27 Stat. 552, 553, D. C. Code, title 32, sec. 1003), creating a lien in favor of the United States with respect to the appropriations referred to therein shall also apply to the appropriations in the aggregate amount of $50,000, granted in the act of June 10, 1872 (17 Stat. 360), and in the act of March 3, 1875 (18 Stat. 386), for the purchase by the United States of the property described in the first section of this act, and the acceptance by the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum of the conveyance of said property shall be deemed an acceptance of and agreement to this provision.

SEC. 4. (a) The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

(1) So much of the second paragraph under the heading "Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum, and other charities," in the act of June 10, 1872 (17 Stat. 360), as reads: "; and that in addition to the directors, whose appointments are now provided for by law, there shall be three other directors appointed in the following manner: One Senator by the President of the Senate, and two Representatives by the Speaker of the House; these directors shall hold their office for the term of a single Congress, and be eligible to a reappointment";

(2) The provisos which immediately follow the appropriations for the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum, in the acts of June 4, 1880 (21 Stat. 157), July 14, 1892 (27 Stat. 164), and March 3, 1893 (27 Stat. 551, D. C. Code, title 32, sec. 315); and

(3) The proviso under the heading "Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum," in the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1147, D. C. Code, title 32, section 314), as amended.

(b) The repeals effected by paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) of this section shall not affect the current term of office of any trustee or director of the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum appointed prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 5, line 7, strike the period and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and the existing directors and their successors shall have all the powers and authority of the original incorporators named in the act of incorporation of said hospital (act of June 1, 1866, 14 Stat. 55) and the power to fill vacancies on the board of directors."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee and the Judiciary Subcommittee of the full District Committee deserve the thanks of the House for these 10 or 12 bills today. They have worked long and hard on them; it has taken about 2 months of their time. I just want to call the attention of the House to how long and how hard they have worked. I think both subcommittees deserve the thanks of the House.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, on the vote on the Mutual Security Act last Friday I was necessarily absent. I asked to be paired for the bill but the RECORD does not so show. I wish to state that had I been present and able to vote I would have voted in favor of the bill.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE] is recognized for 45 minutes.

POTATOES

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, many editorials, newspaper articles, and questions asked by my colleagues prompt me to rise today and address the House on the subject of potatoes and factors that relate to the current short supply.

I want to say at the outset that I do not pose as an expert in the potato industry nor am I speaking particularly on behalf of that industry but only as one who has spent a considerable time as a producer and one who is primarily interested that the consumers of this country have an adequate supply of potatoes at equitable prices and have access to facts regarding the circumstances which surround the industry at this time.

I have been very kindly granted 45 minutes under special order to make this statement and I shall only take a portion of that time, following which I shall be very happy to yield to any of my colleagues in the House in order that we may further bring before the country the current situation in this industry.

The affairs of the potato industry have been aired to considerable extent, over the past few years, by virtue of problems that were generated by war, and by a price support program. In an effort to resolve these problems, it was the decision of the Congress to specifically legislate that no appropriated funds may be used in the stabilization of the potato industry.

This was accomplished through Public Law, 471, Eighty-first Congress. This law required the industry to accept the principle of quotas in a system of controls, but Congress did not provide quota legislation for the potato industry, and, therefore, at the conclusion of the marketing of the 1950 crop no program of price stabilization in the sense of a support vehicle was available to the industry. In our country's prosecution of World War I and II, food was a most important material of war and in the critical period of both wars the potato industry responded by greatly expanding its acreage and production. In World War I no provision was made to protect agriculture against the inevitable recession which follows a major war, and it logically followed that the potato industry passed through a rather extreme economic situation in the early twenties. The industry was also subject to the extreme economic depression of the early thirties. Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the potato industry cooperated with the Federal Government in making adjustments in acreage which were incorporated in programs of agricultural conservation under the provisions of that act. With the advent of World War II, the potato producers, along with all other producers of food in this country, were asked to increase production very rapidly. It was most logical that production of white potatoes be increased, in view of the fact that they could be commercially produced in each of the 48 States. It is generally recognized that, in white potatoes, we have a commodity that is a vitally important food, and it ranks among the very highest of those crops wherein maximum food production can be developed on each acre of land.

Statistics will show that the industry responded very quickly to this encouragement and produced yields per acre and total volume in excess of any previous records in the industry. As contrasted with the plan of our Government in World War I, in World War II there was some assurance given to many producers of food, that Government would assist in the transition period following the close of the war. This was provided in the Steagall amendment to the Price Control Act of 1942 and potatoes, not being classified as a basic commodity, were designated as one of the Steagall commodities. By virtue of the increased acreage and increased yields the industry moved very rapidly into a surplus situation and price supports under the Steagall amendment were made available. At that point the Department of Agriculture recommended

acreage reduction and in each year in which acreage reductions were recommended the industry planted fewer acres than requested by the Department. In view of the substantial investment in price stabilization, the industry accepted a downward revision of the support level and on the 1949 and 1950 crops price support was 60 percent of parity. Increased yields per acre continued to develop substantial surpluses, and the program was discontinued under Public Law 471, Eighty-first Congress.

During this same period per-capita consumption declined by virtue of competition of the great variety of fresh vegetables available to the consumer, and producers of potatoes were struggling to bring their production into balance with the national need. Acreage cuts were recommended by the Department of Agriculture for the 1951 crop. The Department estimated the national need to be 335,000,000 bushels. In view of the fact that no price-support provisions prevailed on the 1951 crop, and on the basis of the recommendations of the Department, further acreage adjustments were made. On November 1, 1951, the United States Department of Agriculture reported the production of the 1951 crop at 335,000,000 bushels, exactly as was indicated earlier as being an adequate supply for our needs.

During these years of adjustments, in which surpluses were a serious problem, and also the same years in which price support operations were in effect, returns to growers were substantially below parity. The crop of 1950 returned to growers 53 percent of parity. Approximately two-thirds of the 1951 crop returned growers only 73 percent of parity. It developed, however, as the 1951 marketing season progressed, that the supply was not in surplus as had been true in previous years, and prices began to strengthen. Beginning with early October it became apparent that the supply situation in Canada was also lower than in previous years, that the supply in the United States was not in surplus, and prices moved upward. On December 29, 1951, the Department of Agriculture officially determined that potato prices received by growers were 105 percent of parity on December 15, 1951. This was the first month prices had reached parity since June of 1948. The United States Department of Agriculture later reported that the supply of potatoes on hand January 1, 1952, was 97,000,000 bushels which was only 5,250,000 bushels lower than the supply of the previous year, excluding Government purchases after January 1, 1951. It seemed to many familiar with the industry that, while the supply was in balance with demand, no serious shortage existed, providing normal economic practices could prevail for the remaining portion of the season. On January 9 the Office of Price Stabilization invoked a ceiling order CPR 113, effective on the 19th of January 1952. This order was, in my opinion, invoked upon the industry without having been given careful consideration, and it specifically was not reviewed by the White Potato Advisory Committee to OPS, as brought out in informal discussion before members of the House Agricultural Committee on January 25, 1952.

The specific order used on January 5 was not reviewed with the committee and from the situation that has prevailed since the initial order it seems rather obvious that the order was invoked with undue haste. It is granted that prices to producers on a national basis had reached 100 percent of parity. However, it was very obvious that the producers had not received 100 percent of parity for much of their crop and that the ceiling order would result in producers receiving less than parity for their total production. This fact is substantiated by a recent BAE estimate which places the national average farm price for the entire 1951 crop at $1.61 per bushel or approximately 91 percent of parity. This parity figure is calculated on the transitional parity formula, and is actually 15 percent below the old parity base. As stated, the effective date of the order was January 19, 1952, and on January 21, 1952, a complete revision of the order was issued. There have been nine amendments to the original order. To those who have not been close to the deal, it is most difficult to comprehend the utter confusion that has prevailed in the industry since January 5. It has been most unfortunate that OPS did not give the original order and subsequent revisions more careful consideration before the measures were invoked. It has been also most unfortunate that the OPS has not had an adequate staff of men sufficiently familiar with the potato industry and its intricate pricing and distributive pattern to constructively interpret the wording of the order into the daily practices of the trade. Since January 5 I have been almost in daily contact with elements of the industry by receiving telephone calls and letters pleading for some opportunity to be constructively counseled as to what practices and business functions could be performed in a legal manner. Many of the amendments have had as their purpose clarification of these problems, but in many instances have resulted only in great confusion.

In my opinion, this order has created a black market and it is my considered opinion that the shortage that exists currently is directly chargeable to the operations of OPS in their complete disruption of the normal distributive pattern of the industry. Maine shipped nearly 1,000 carloads of potatoes to the Pacific coast which is entirely outside of normal distributive area. In addition, it is my opinion that the crop in storage in January has moved to market 10 percent faster than would have been the case had there been some price incentive in holding some portion of the crop for later delivery. The order has affected the acreage planted in the early and intermediate early States. The price available to producers in the southern early States has offered no incentive for orderly marketing. Florida, with only a 6-percent increase in acreage, had shipped, as of April 30, 4,755 carlot equivalents as compared with 1,790 carlot equivalents on the same date in 1951. This has meant that consumers have not had as good quality and the crop was not fully matured. Early harvesting has resulted in a 15-percent lower yield per acre.

On April 26, 1952, Mr. Wayne Darrow, in his Washington Farm Letter, states, and I quote:

> Price-ceiling situation is reported out of hand everywhere except in a few local shipping points. There is an estimated 75 to 80 percent disregard for ceilings. Old timers say mess is worse than in 1943.

I appreciate that black-market operators are always ready to jump into a situation wherein supply is short of demand and control regulations are in effect. I do wish to point out, however, that distributors, both at shipping points and receiving points, have been completely confused regarding the regulations, and many have closed their places of business, because they could not interpret the orders, and would not run the risks of violating the law and be prosecuted months or years later.

The American farmer takes second place to no one in this country in his willingness to produce food for the Nation in peace as well as war. His record in two wars substantiates that fact.

Costs of production are high and becoming increasingly higher. Labor is tight and expensive. Tilled crops, as potatoes, require heavy capital outlay in each current crop year. History has shown that the great problem of the potato industry is one of surplus and not shortage, and it therefore follows, in my opinion, that unless there is an opportunity to recover losses with reasonable gains when supply is in balance with production, then growers will not increase acreage. Those who administer price controls on food production seem to overlook the fact that potatoes are not produced unless they are planted, and there must be some incentive to plant, or we will not get the supply needed for this country.

We can supply this country of an adequate supply of food only by removing all control of prices and allow the profit incentive to develop the needed production. In my opinion, our reserve of foodstuff in this country is low. As a people we have enjoyed an abundant supply. However, costs of production and shortage of labor are most serious factors and when with an ever-increasing population to feed it becomes increasingly important that we maintain and further develop an incentive for increased production, rather than place road blocks in the way of those who are anxious and willing to invest every dollar available to them, devote their full time and energy to the proposition of providing this country with a diversity of food of high quality and at reasonable prices.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman mentioned shipping 1,000 carloads of potatoes from Maine to the west coast. How could they do that? Was the price ceiling different on the west coast, sufficiently high to absorb the freight charges and all the other expense, so as to warrant such shipment?

Mr. McINTIRE. The price ceiling is an f. o. b. price ceiling, and all shipping charges and distributive costs as allowed

under the order are added to the f. o. b. price. While the price in Idaho and other Western States was rolled back from their level above parity to parity levels, it was permissive, in the framework of the order to ship potatoes from the east coast to the west coast and price them higher to consumers on the west coast, than the western potatoes produced nearby.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand it, you shipped some potatoes to Canada from Maine?

Mr. McINTIRE. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Can the gentleman tell us how many carloads, and what the price control situation is in Canada?

Mr. McINTIRE. As far as our Maine industry is concerned, the best figures I have are that Maine shipped approximately 1,000,000 bushels to Canada. In my memory, as a producer of potatoes in Maine, this is the second time we have ever shipped table stock potatoes into Canada. It was due solely to the fact that the supply in Canada was short and there was no price control in that country, which permitted the price in Canada to rise to the point where it drew the supplies toward our friends to the north.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman will recollect that a few years ago we had about 15,000,000 bushels of potatoes coming in from Canada.

Mr. McINTIRE. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me ask the gentleman another question: I had several letters from dealers in potatoes to the effect that potatoes are available in the black market, and potatoes are being sold by those who have them with a side payment of as much as $450 a carload. Does the gentleman know anything about the black market operation, operations of that kind?

Mr. McINTIRE. I have here an editorial from a produce paper, a very fine paper, that I shall read, which points up the situation that prevails in the industry at the present time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I want to compliment the gentleman for discussing this subject, because it is a vital subject. Potatoes are one of the main necessities of life. As far as I can see it, I can agree with the gentleman in his attitude that it is interference of the bureaucrats in Washington with the normal distribution of potatoes throughout the country that has caused this shortage.

Mr. McINTIRE. I am not standing here today to be unduly harsh with those who have a job to do, but I have been pleading with OPS since the very inception of this order for constructive changes in the order. I would say that those who have this job on their hands have, to the extent of their ability, been trying to do something, I think, but it has been appalling to me—and this is no criticism of those who have been trying to do a job—that an industry so extensive, with such an intricate pattern of distribution and prices, has had to subject its whole future, so to speak, to these confusing regulatory provisions. The effects of this situation will continue long in the minds of some of the distributive elements and of some of the producers. These people have been subjected to rules and regulations that have been written by folks who are so uninformed as to the problems within the industry that it would be about like my stepping up to an operating table and trying to perform the functions of a surgeon, knowing nothing about it. The results are almost the same.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, is it not a fact that the men to whom you have referred, who have written these orders, have refused to be guided by the advice of experienced producers and distributors throughout the country?

Mr. McINTIRE. They have been almost avalanched with statistical information, which I question has ever been incorporated or used as the basis or foundation of the orders which have come out. The thing, which I am particularly concerned about, is that the law provides for a white potato advisory committee, as it does with all of these various commodities. I stand here to tell you that the white potato advisory committee was brought in for an organizational meeting on November 15, 1951. The order was issued on January 5, 1952, and no one of that advisory committee had access to that order or any information of what was to be in it. If they have an advisory committee, why can the committee not be trusted with the information which is going to be thrown at their industry when the order goes into effect?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What the gentleman has stated about the advisory committee is typical of the attitude of the administration itself toward advisory committees. They are window dressing, and when they are called in here, they are just told what the agency is going to do to their industry rather than to act upon any advice.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The people of my district cannot get any potatoes. They are asking me if potatoes are being sent to other countries for relief. Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. McINTIRE. To my knowledge, Mrs. ROGERS, no. I have no information to the effect that potatoes produced in this country are leaving the shores of this country other than for our armed services.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield.

Mrs. CHURCH. I want to thank the gentleman from Maine for his very factual, and I would say very fair analysis of "potato history." I think that he has dealt with this point most magnificently as regards the disastrous effect upon the producer of potatoes. But, from my territory, Mr. Speaker, my complaint comes rather from the would-be consumer of potatoes, since the potato has almost vanished from the Thirteenth District of Illinois. In fact, if the gentleman will bear with me, I would like to tell him more or less lightly that I felt it might add a graphic exhibition today of the heights to which the potato has risen, if I could make a short necklace of potatoes for the ladies of the House to wear. In the highly residential territory in which I live, however, there was not a potato Saturday which could have been so strung. Incidentally, of course, I want to assure the gentleman that we meant to eat them afterwards. To speak with due seriousness, the women in my district who rely so strongly upon the good old-fashioned potato as the mainstay of the family table are wondering what possibility of relief there is in prospect.

Mr. McINTIRE. I might say to the gentlewoman from Illinois that if it were possible to get the cooperation of the OPS in canceling this order before the close of this week, there would be potatoes on your market shelves almost immediately. I am not saying that there would be as many as we would like. We are still in a rather short supply, but the utter confusion that exists relative to the manner in which anyone can do business legally has just forced legitimate, normal producers out of the market. Potatoes are moving from the early States, in quantity about 87 percent of last year's volume. If this order could be terminated, you would have potatoes on your market shelves almost immediately.

Mrs. CHURCH. Would the gentleman permit me to express briefly the hope that the department attempting to handle the situation actually realizes—yes, I will say—the actual suffering of the American people when they are without potatoes. Originally, a large part of our population came here because of a potato famine in Ireland. We are rather used to potatoes and rely upon them, and we know the health contained in a good potato. I wonder if I may also add this thought: the American woman who goes out and tries to feed her family on the ever diminishing dollar has rather come to the conclusion that the trouble goes even deeper than bureaucratic dealing with potatoes. It goes back to the whole artificial attempt to control prices. In my district, we have definitely felt that any attempt artificially to control prices or to interfere with the old-fashioned and satisfactory system of supply and demand is an invitation, well, perhaps not to disaster, but most certainly to scarcity—against which we do protest.

Mr. McINTIRE. I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois very much.

I wish to make one further statement to develop my thought as to the relationship of the OPS in the current situation of shortage. As I stated, in my opinion, the late crop moved out of storage 10 percent faster than it would have had there been no regulation because while there was some provision, there was not sufficient provision in the orders, in the matter of price adjustment, to encourage the holding of the crop for later distribution. On top of that, the early States—south Florida, Texas, Alabama, north Florida—had no incentive to follow an orderly harvesting and selling program, and thereby sacrificed a higher yield so badly needed. Between April

30 and May 1 the Florida price was adjusted downward by OPS 70 cents a hundred.

If one is a producer he just naturally is going to get as much of his crop out of the ground and into that April market as he can.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I think the gentleman from Maine should be commended for an excellent statement. The gentleman is very well qualified to make it because he has been a potato grower, and a successful potato grower, for a number of years.

I received a letter from the potato growers of my district about this problem, and I would like to read a letter I have just received from Mr. Arthur A. Clayton, of the firm of Bennett & Clayton, in Prospect Plains, N. J.; and I would like to ask the gentleman if he would comment on the statements made in this letter?

Potato price ceilings always have and always will create black markets thereby diverting potatoes from the regular trade channels to the illegitimate operator for selfish purposes.

He operates on a cash basis without reporting his operation to anyone and reaps the financial reward, while the legitimate shipper is often unable to secure supplies and finds it most difficult to operate with any profit if he is fortunate enough to buy the merchandise. We realize and admit if potato price ceilings were suddenly removed prices temporarily would soar, probably to the point of consumer resistance, but when this happened, black market operations would cease and the available supplies would again find their way back to the regular trade channels and the even distribution would automatically control the price and would benefit the consumer as well as the whole industry in a short time.

We, like everyone else in the industry marketing and distributing a perishable commodity like potatoes, sincerely believe you just can't successfully regulate the price by law, human nature being what it is. Supply and demand will average out every time.

Does the gentleman agree with that statement?

Mr. McINTIRE. I do agree with the gentleman from New Jersey; and I would like to say that I know the firm of Bennett & Clayton. They are a very reputable firm in the industry in New Jersey. I think their opinions ought to be considered very carefully.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. May I continue to quote from his letter:

Last summer (1951) in August our New Jersey farmers were selling their U. S. No. 1 potatoes at $1.55 to $1.70 per hundredweight in new sacks due to heavy supplies from many areas at that particular period and we all know what happened in the fall and winter months when supplies became light, and price ceilings and black market operations began which curtailed the even distribution causing acute shortages in some areas.

Just another result of price ceilings—it definitely causes a reduction in planted acreage as proven by this year's total potato acreage.

The farmers of America will make the necessary adjustment and produce adequate supplies if given the chance without fear of Government regulations.

Can anything be done to eliminate price ceilings on fresh fruits and vegetables thereby helping many people stay honest?

May I ask the gentleman: When OPA was considering putting these price ceilings on potatoes, they paid no attention or gave no heed to the advice given them by the potato industry; is that correct?

Mr. McINTIRE. They would deny that, I may say to the gentleman from New Jersey. It is just a matter of degree. As I have already stated, the very machinery they set up, the advisory committee, to be their counsel in the orders they issued affecting the industry, was not used.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. I wish to commend the gentleman from Maine on his factual presentation as to what is happening to potatoes in this Nation. Bringing the matter home right here in Washington, I personally checked the chain grocery stores in this city just before this order went into effect in January. The week before the order went into effect my Idaho potatoes were selling in Washington for 10 cents a pound in the chain stores, but just before the order went into effect the price had dropped to 9 cents a pound. Under OPS when potatoes had been available the price was still 9 cents a pound.

This order cost the growers in my district in the State of Idaho roughly $10,000,000, yet no one has benefited, for the consumer pays exactly the same price now that he paid before, and the only potatoes now available in some chain grocery stores in the city of Washington are the powdered product of which we in Idaho are not too proud.

Mr. McINTIRE. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I wish to add my expression of appreciation of the statement the gentleman has made. I do not wish to be considered as in any way detracting at all from what has been said. I want to call attention to a possible solution, however. In today's issue of the News I find this:

It seems strange to read in the papers about a black market in potatoes when a short while ago we were hearing people complain about the way potatoes were being wasted, let to rot in the fields. Now there is a black market, with no potatoes to be had at ceiling prices.

Later I will cite the authority, and I am sure the gentleman will accept this authority at least for that statement that there are no potatoes to be had at ceiling prices.

Here is the remedy that is suggested:

Since we have given up our farm at Hyde Park I think I shall have to go shares with some of my neighbors and finance the expense of growing the necessary vegetables for summer use when we will have our hungry brood of children with us. Once school is out and they begin on summer activities, children and their appetites grow apace.

The two quotes come from My Day.

I hope the gentleman and the rest of us who agree with him will not minimize the efforts that will be made in Hyde Park to overcome this shortage of potatoes. It may seem rather amusing, but I do recall back in days long, long ago, perhaps before the gentleman was born, when Mayor Pingree, of Detroit, turned the city parks and the playgrounds of the city into vegetable gardens. In that way the people of Detroit did get by on short rations, of course, for a short time. I think we should all be grateful to the lady if she continues her efforts in Hyde Park to supply this much-needed item of food.

Mr. McINTIRE. Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan we would be much happier in Maine if we had the privilege of supplying those needs in Hyde Park from our commercial rather than from garden production.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have no doubt more successfully and with profit to everyone.

Mr. McINTIRE. I thank the gentleman.

There are two things I want to make sure of getting across as my time is slipping away. They are basically these: For years in the potato industry we have had but one worry and that is surpluses and the accompanying economic impact of low prices. We never have worried much about shortages as they happen so rarely, but we are always concerned about surpluses. These have been with the industry since I have known it, and I have lived close to it all my life.

Coming to this present situation, two things are happening. The distribution pattern has been completely disrupted, and a resistance is being built up against potatoes as a commodity. Only recently the restaurant owners and hotel managers have taken potatoes off their menus because they cannot get them legally and they do not want to get them from the black market. We have been spending thousands of dollars and hours and hours of time in research trying to meet the needs of the consumer in upgrading and packaging this crop. An outstanding program has been developed to stem the tide of declining per capita consumption. This situation on top of what the industry has been subjected to I can assure you does not leave the distributive element nor the producers in a very happy frame of mind because they, the ones who know more about this industry than anybody else, are convinced that we do not have a serious shortage confronting us. We had a moderately short supply, but it has been so traditional that if the late crop were short the early crop would increase in acreage and come out with an increased supply, thereby balancing the late crop shortage. The OPS order has discouraged this type of adjustment.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I think what the gentleman has said would be borne out by all of us who have had any experience with raising potatoes. We know that potatoes will grow in nearly every back yard of the United States. All over the

Nation the potato will grow and is present. For this reason there should not be a shortage of potatoes anywhere. May I say to support the gentleman in his statement with reference to the senseless attempt to control the amount of potatoes that in 1946 when we had the Republican Food Study Committee operating we developed the fact that in the early part of the year many carloads of potatoes from North Carolina were sent up to New England to be made into starch.

Then a little later they took many carloads from Maine down to North Carolina to make potatoes into starch, and as a final result we were called up to New Jersey in the fall of 1946 where the Government had told the farmers to go ahead and raise all the potatoes they could and they would pay $1.80 a hundred for them. We saw tens of thousands of tons of potatoes stored up there in great, big, long racks, like straw racks, and the Government did not take up those potatoes until we compelled them to do so, and then they took them up and sold them. They could not get anybody to buy them, and the brewery or distillery in Philadelphia said they would take them if they would bring them down, with the result that they had to pay 15 cents a hundred more to bring them down. Those transactions cost the Government millions of dollars of wasted money in the handling of potatoes.

Mr. McINTIRE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. I want to compliment the gentleman on the able presentation he has made of a very tragic situation. It again points up what price controls can do to a normal supply in the market. You might be interested to know that last evening I had supper with my neighbor next door. We had Australian potatoes that had been dyed to keep them from competing with what American potatoes you could buy. Also there was a field show held down on the school grounds that afternoon and the children for the first time could not use potatoes in a potato race and had to use stones. It is getting to be a rather tragic situation all the way around, and I hope that the gentleman's able presentation will help to bring pressure to bear so that the price situation can be corrected and OPS regulations taken away from the potato market.

Mr. McINTIRE. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I also want to compliment the gentleman on his very succinct and intelligible explanation of the situation in the potato market. I do so especially because the housewives in my district cannot quite understand why it is that only a short time ago they saw pictures in their daily papers of potatoes being dumped, of their being covered with kerosene and destroyed, and now they cannot go out and get them for their legitimate needs.

I would like to ask the gentleman this one question. He has made this very exhaustive study in this one field in connection with OPS. Does the gentleman not believe that it may also be true in other fields; that these very technical questions are not being tackled by men and women who know the true score, and that the advisory committees and advice of experts is not being listened to in this field? Is it probably not true in other fields?

Mr. McINTIRE. I would say that I have, of course, directed my attention mostly to the potato problem. However, such little information as I have gathered from time to time would indicate that the gentlewoman's statement is very true.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. For that reason I think the gentleman's statement is particularly enlightening.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I want to join the gentlewoman from New York and others in commending the gentleman for his very intelligent presentation of this problem. It will be very helpful to many of us who are not equally well informed regarding the potato situation in answering letters from our constituents regarding this problem. We know that the statements which the gentleman has made come from one who knows his subject from A to Z. I want to express my personal appreciation of the fine presentation he has made here today.

Mr. McINTIRE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I should like to join with all my colleagues in commending the gentleman whose knowledge of the potato industry and potato culture is unrivalled either in or out of Congress. I just want to ask this one question to point up the whole situation. Does the gentleman believe that immediate decontrol is practicable and desirable?

Mr. McINTIRE. Yes, I do, because I am convinced that had there been no ceiling order, the price of potatoes would have been only slightly above what has existed under the order. And for this period in which no potatoes are available, except those on the black market, the average price would have been a little below what is prevailing now in black marketing transactions.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me to cover the situation from the retail angle?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SHEEHAN. First of all, I want to compliment the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE] for his very fine presentation. You gentlemen are mostly interested in the potato situation from the farmer's viewpoint. I do not have a single farmer in my constituency, so I am looking at it from the consumer's standpoint.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain to the Members of the House of Representatives the exact problems of the retailers who are the final link between the grower and the consumer. In the present black market in potatoes, the retailers and jobbers are not reaping black-market profits. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE] has made a very thorough analysis of the potato situation from the farmers' viewpoint, covering the problems of acreage and supply. He had also outlined the effect of Government controls and the support program on the shortage problem as it exists today.

The following facts are actual first-hand information received directly from retailers at the small store, supermarket, and chain store levels, which in my estimation gives an accurate picture of the potato situation in the city of Chicago.

Last Friday an independent retailer reported to me that he is paying 10 cents per pound for potatoes and is selling them at his ceiling price of 7½ cents per pound. He keeps the potatoes in his back room and will only sell to his regular customers, limiting them to 5 pounds each. He refuses to sell at illegal prices and, therefore, is taking an actual out-of-pocket loss on each pound of potatoes he sells. He stated that the wholesale potato jobbers, those who obtain potatoes directly from the growers' associations, had been closed because they refused to pay black-market prices. They had to reopen through force of necessity and some of them, in order to stay in business, offered potatoes to the retailers at the regular ceiling price but the retailers were billed for onions which were not even delivered to them. This went on for only a very short period of time, as I understand that the wholesale jobbers group are closing down again today.

Another independent retailer who operates a small community store stated he is not able to purchase potatoes at the ceiling price and is paying over the ceiling price and charging his customers accordingly. He said that he formerly sold Idaho potatoes at 5 pounds for 49 cents, whereas today Idahos are costing him 14 cents per pound. In order to keep his local business he has to have potatoes and does not desire to sell them at a direct loss. His conclusion, after 20 years in business was: "Any time they put a ceiling price on commodities, someone makes some extra money."

The third gentleman who gave me information owns a very large independent supermarket and stated on Friday that most of the stores are out of potatoes and the only way they are able to get potatoes is to pay from $2 to $3 per bag above ceiling prices. He states that such potatoes as have been offered to him in this manner are on the basis of cash paid on the side with nothing on the invoice to show the extra payment. He also said that there are many tie-in deals which force a retailer to buy other produce, the price of which is not controlled, since the jobber can charge any price he desires for the noncontrolled items.

Two weeks ago I heard from one of the chain-store operators in Chicago

who operates a limited number of stores and he stated:

You can plainly see that we will not deal in any black-market potatoes or pay over ceiling prices. The result is legitimate operators like ourselves are penalized by not having any potatoes to offer our customers. We get a few lots here and there at ceiling prices from outfits we have been doing business with in the past and who happen to secure potatoes through legitimate channels—but we are out of the potato business.

He states that one of the Chicago potato jobbers told him he had just purchased 50 sacks of Idahos at the ceiling price, but had to take 100 sacks of white onions at 50 cents per sack over the market price. Another potato house offered him a car of 10-pound Idahos for which he would have to pay over the ceiling, and in addition would have to take a car of onions for about $300 over the market. A car-lot receiver, who has field men in the South buying potatoes directly from the producing areas, told him that all the growers are being offered extra money. One of his field men reported loading a car of 300 bags for $500 extra. Last week, on Monday, this same gentleman reported to me that he was now obtaining only 5 percent of his potato requirements, but he could get 100 percent of his requirements if he would pay over the ceiling price.

One of the local chain-store operators in Chicago reports the situation as follows:

Buyers of black-market potatoes in turn sell to individual retail stores for cash over the retail ceilings or by tying in other merchandise, cabbage, green beans, onions, etc., at higher than market prices, or by listing items on invoices and not delivering these items. We are advised at the present time that truckers, speculators, and black marketeers are in Alabama contacting growers and paying up to $500 per truckload for new-crop Alabama potatoes. Truckers are furnishing to the growers used burlap bags with instructions to pack unwashed, unbagged field potatoes.

One of the national chain-stores buyers states that in the past 4 weeks they had been unable to purchase a single car of potatoes off track in Chicago, even though there have been limited arrivals, yet they have no specific information as to where or how these limited receipts were sold. He called to my attention the fact that in the past few years there had been extensive advertising by the growers and shippers in the State of Idaho, where they have claimed to provide the best potatoes possible to obtain. Over the past few years Idaho had gained the reputation for high-quality products which moved from the State under strict Federal and State inspection services. After ceilings were placed in effect, the growers and shippers in the State of Idaho voted to discontinue this compulsory shipping-point inspection, and there was an immediate let-down in the quality of the potatoes which this chain was able to obtain. This buyer's very pertinent conclusions were:

After 25 years' experience in the food business, it is my personal opinion that the present potato situation has been seriously aggravated by ceiling prices. I have seen many instances of extreme shortage, but I have always found that when the law of supply and demand is allowed to function, the consumer is the best judge of the price she should pay for perishable conditions.

This chain-store buyer showed me letters from persons who had regularly supplied him with potatoes, in which they explained their situation of not being able to get potatoes at the ceiling price. One of these men concluded as follows:

We have no one to thank except OPS. They have created this situation and cannot even enforce their own rulings. They have had enforcement men in here for several weeks and for all the good they have done they might just as well have been in China.

This shortage and black market profiteering situation is not something that has happened overnight, because as early as April 14, I received a letter from one of my constituents who was telling of his problem in obtaining potatoes at that time. He said that his produce dealer told him that the situation is the worst in his 35 years' experience and has made necessary the tie-in sales of non-controlled commodities or actual payment of cash under the counter.

The situation will apparently get worse before it gets better, and as usual the public is sold a bill of goods about the fine effects of price controls, when their end results are doubtful; and when they are accompanied by scarcity, succeed in breeding lawbreakers.

In a public opinion survey, which I just finished conducting among a cross section of my constituents, one of the questions was, "Do you think the price and wage controls have materially halted inflation?" and 75.6 percent replied in the negative.

Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Congress, I hope that this gives you an actual and factual picture of price controls and their effect on the American housewife's pocketbook.

The operators of most American businesses feel that the old-fashioned law of supply and demand will best meet the needs of the American table, and it would be better for the moral fiber of our country to have honest price variations rather than force people to become lawbreakers. This policy would also save us from the errors of such starry-eyed dreamers as former Price Stabilizer DiSalle, who so mistakenly said, on issuing the potato price regulation:

We believe that the brake this regulation will apply to the accelerated rise in potato prices will save the consumer millions of dollars.

Mr. McINTIRE. I thank the gentleman very much.

The normal receipts in the Chicago market are 400 cars a day. They are receiving now approximately 40 cars a day through normal channels. However, there is nearly a 70 percent of normal movement prevailing right now, but Chicago, with normal receipts of 400 cars, is receiving only 40 cars legitimately.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. I want to thank the gentleman for the presentation he has made. I think the same thing to a lesser extent has been prevailing, but I think in the future it will prevail to a larger extent, in connection with most other food commodities. Attempting to regulate the price will eventually dry up the supply for the consumers. I feel sure that such a program will eventually not only damage the producers but will hurt the consumers, who want an adequate supply of good food as well.

Mr. McINTIRE. I thank the gentleman.

In order to make sure that we have an adequate supply of fresh vegetables, these vegetables should be excluded in any extension of the Defense Production Act. I am referring to the short-cycle vegetables that can be produced in anywhere from 90 to 120 days.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman for his presentation. I wonder why we permitted the importation of 15,000,000 bushels of potatoes from Canada when potatoes were in surplus in this country.

Mr. McINTIRE. That was entirely a trade proposition, one that was set up under trade agreements with Canada under the reciprocal-trade approach.

Mr. GROSS. That is another reason why we should oppose this reciprocal-trade program. We are being paid back now by the Canadians with the discriminatory $10 a ton increase on the price of their newsprint.

Mr. McINTIRE. I am going to make some insertions of editorials and newspaper clippings in the RECORD, which I would appreciate your reading, but there are two or three paragraphs I want to bring to your attention.

One of the most disastrous effects of the OPS order has been the complete destruction of the distributive pattern of the industry. I say "complete," and I say it advisedly because anyone in the industry will confirm this to be a fact. Some of the trade papers that have been very, very careful not to pitch their editorial comment either way when the regulation went into effect have now established, very strongly, that the only answer is to terminate the order and terminate it at once. One of these outstanding papers is, what we call in the trade, the pink sheet. It is the Produce News. Let me quote just a portion of their editorial of May 16:

[From the Produce News of May 16, 1952]

OPS POTATO FIASCO

An intolerable situation has been created by the OPS price control regulation on white potatoes. As is the case with bad unworkable legislation, the situation it created becomes worse with each passing day. This law is now fomenting disrespect not only for the regulation but for law itself.

Not content with having created the present potato famine out of a shortage which would have been only temporary, the OPS has now, in desperation, turned to passing amendments and interpreting its previous rules in such a way as to negate and destroy the established methods of doing business,

causing permanent harm to private individuals.

If consumers were benefiting either as to price or supply, something could be said for OPS. But prices are higher than ever, supplies are lower than ever, and no over-all improvement is possible so long as regulation of prices of a perishable commodity exists. The only thing that would bring prices down would be bigger production—and potato growers refuse to plant their normal acreages in a price-controlled potato economy.

In other words, the potato situation will never improve as long as price control exists. OPS itself may want this, but the American people do not.

Accomplishing nothing in its avowed objective of controlling prices, the OPS is now creating mischief. The OPS is definitely, perhaps deliberately, destroying the independent distributor for the benefit of the chain distributor. The OPS now approves the action of the chain subsidiaries when they buy potatoes from the grower and pay him the 86-cent mark-up to which a distributor is entitled. The chain subsidiary is content to do this because its retail stores profit handsomely from the sale of these potatoes as well as from the advantage of being able to offer potatoes to the housewife. This is, in turn, a handicap sanctioned by the OPS which the independent cannot overcome. He must refrain from doing business, suffering not only present losses but permanent injury.

The independent businessmen of America are willing to face the competition of corporate interests, but they resent interference by their Government taking sides.

They resent also the artificial situation created by the arbitrary web of regulations spun by delegated power. They resent the advantage men with lesser regard for the regulations obtain over them; often the advantage is enough to cause serious losses, as when one firm, law-abiding and sincere, refuses to do any black marketing, thereupon losing out to competitors with more realistic conceptions.

If you abide by this control, you die. OPS is not law; it is delegated power, at first mishandled and now definitely shown to be mischievous.

Now OPS has started on a campaign of enforcement. Fine firms, fighting for their business lives, stand accused under this incompetent law. They are under "criminal indictments" because they seek to continue to make a living in the business they chose long before OPS was even imagined.

Because we see OPS refusing to listen to reason, because we see OPS taking sides against the independent operator, because we respect the rugged independent fighting for his business life, because price control remains ineffective and basically stupid, we refuse to publish the names of any produce men or firms accused by the OPS of violating OPS regulations.

[From Mendelson-Zeller Co., San Francisco, Calif., May 17, 1952]

POTATOES

MAY 17, 1952.—The worst situation I have ever seen in all my experience in the produce business—and that goes back 30 years. During the tightest spots of World War II there was never was a time when an operator couldn't at least buy a fair share of his requirements at the ceiling. Right now there is a situation where everyone between the shipper and the retailer is being bypassed. There is definitely a percentage of black marketing and there is a large volume of potatoes now being delivered on previously made contracts. At the same time the real menace is this frenzied panic to deliver to retail stores thereby taking the entire markup.

This is contrary to every trade practice, certainly contrary to every iota of ethics built up by legitimate distributors over the years and certainly laying the ground for a bitterness that will take years to erase.

We tell you frankly that with practically no exceptions we who under normal conditions would be shipping 40 to 50 cars per day have been unable to purchase a car of potatoes. We are frankly ashamed to tell people with whom we have traded for years and whom we have sold plenty of other commodities that we just can't give them a single car of potatoes. We can understand their complete disbelief when we say we have none and from the looks of things will have very few to offer. Yet it is the entire truth. And we know hundreds of jobbers and a number of chains who haven't had a single sack of spuds in their warehouses for weeks.

This potato situation is reaching throughout the entire industry affecting every other commodity. Let's face it. You have a price for onions with potatoes or there's another price without potatoes. How can anyone intelligently operate in any perishable commodity today under these conditions. I'd like to go on record as saying that the ceiling on potatoes today is one of the most inflationary effects we have ever had in the produce industry. I'd like to say that $10 potatoes distributed widely but at least fairly would in the long run cost consumers less in their weighted volume than the present ceiling which drags every other commodity up with the potato famine.

There is a bit of humor (but not much) in the situation. One fellow told me yesterday "since you went down to Washington all hell has broken loose." In fairness to myself and the other four members of our consultant committee we have had nothing to do with the potatoe ceiling or its ramifications. Our job has been purely on the mechanics of possible future regulations (heaven forbid).

I am convinced that ceilings on any perishable foods is impossible of enforcement and impossible of operating properly. At this writing the potato ceiling has thrown the entire produce industry completely out of kilter and the effects can easily be permanently detrimental if something isn't done about it quickly.

[From the Packer of May 17, 1952]

POTATO WORLD TURNED UPSIDE DOWN—OPS FIDDLING WITH ORDER WHILE PATTERN OF DISTRIBUTION BURNS—NEW GIMMICKS TO REGULATION FAIL TO CORRECT ABUSES—DECONTROL NOW TALK DENIED

(By John C. Cipperly)

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 16.—Distributive trade protests over a maldistribution of potatoes and dislocation of trade functions brought about a top-level study of the situation by the Office of Price Stabilization here this week. The net result was the conclusion that the price agency will try in several ways to insure that all buyers will be given, as far as possible, an equal opportunity to obtain their share of the admittedly short supply at legal ceiling prices.

It was also concluded at OPS that decontrol now would serve no good purpose since decontrol would not produce an additional potato. However there are some at the price agency who say that the potato control order merely produces a fictional saving to the consumer since higher than normal prices now prevail for onions which ordinarily should be selling at lower prices.

It is widely suspected that the alleged black market payments are being absorbed in the prevailing high onion price. On the other hand, OPS spot investigations show that retail price ceilings where potatoes are available are being observed.

One of the chief sources of complaints against the operation of the order is from the distributive trade, which is asking that some form of grandfather clause be imposed which would prevent some sellers from taking over distributive functions of distributors in local markets. The operator whose sole stock in trade is potatoes is in many instances sorely hurt by the present situation. OPS, however, assesses the over-all shortage as the cause of this condition, which they say would occur even without price control.

ARMY ORDER

An example of how some buyers have been cut off from access to supply was found in the case of the Army, and in that instance OPS ordered that the Army buyers could purchase stocks at any location and the seller would be permitted the full margins available to the distributive trade which previously had not been taken. (Amendment 9–CPR 113, effective May 13. See below.)

Another source of concern to OPS is the same unavailability of supply to the potato chip manufacturer. Like the Army buyer, he appears to be shut off from supplies. This type of quality buyer appears handicapped by control, and OPS is trying to devise some method to give them relief.

BYPASSING

Bypassing of local distributors, wholesalers, and jobbers has been taking place where country shippers are reported to have taken over the complete distributive function and making sales direct to retail stores. OPS admits that in many urban areas producers have historically marketed their products direct to retail stores in their own vehicles from their farm. There is no intention to disturb this type of distribution, but, on the other hand, OPS feels that where a distant country point, like Florida or California, would move into the Chicago market and propose to carry out this same type of operation it is clearly an abuse of the normal marketing system.

OPS is planning an amendment to the order CPR 113 which would restrict such direct sales to a less than carload lot shipping movement. Such an action, it is felt, would restore part of the preesnt supply to the local wholesaler, jobber, and potato handler.

An amendment of this kind would not affect the large volume merchandiser who deals directly with the country shipper or grower, and where the big buyer moves the potatoes directly into his own warehouse or supermarket.

OPS TINKERING

One of the wiser of Government officials outside the price agency sees in the potato price control order an error in judgment at OPS which is now magnifying the distribution dislocations which are hitting broadly across the potato market. This individual agrees that OPS may be attempting to ease those conditions with tinkering and patching here and there, but doubts that they will relieve the almost incredible conditions which exist.

This Government man discounts the OPS theory that present dislocations would occur even had there been no price-ceiling order. He insists that the distributive system would not have been brought to the verge of total paralysis had the equalizing effect of price in a free market been permitted to reflect itself.

A further observation of this official is that in so acutely tight a supply situation, price ceiling alone cannot do the job. In this present jam-up, rationing must be added to price-ceiling orders to make the distributive system work.

However, no one here feels for a minute that rationing or even broad general allocation controls will be attempted.

DECONTROL TALK DENIED

It has been rumored that this week's session of the OPS staff also considered the possibility of decontrol as a means of bringing order back into the potato deal. Government officials have denied that the OPS meeting

considered this subject and they feel that a decontrol move must be largely a matter of timing. For example, with virtually all of the storage crop cleaned out and the early States of Florida and Alabama either sold out or past their shipping peak, the country must wait on the peak of the California Kern County crop to fill the gap before the eastern intermediate States start digging.

The citation of the California dominance of the national supply for a 3- to 4-week period would seem to indicate delay on any decontrol action until such time as the South Carolina and North Carolina crops were about ready to bring some lasting relief from the current shortage.

SALES TO ARMY

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 16.—OPS took steps Tuesday to make it just as profitable to sell potatoes to the Armed Forces as it is to some other classes of buyers.

The agency authorized handlers and distributors to add all the distributive markups not already taken by a previous handler or distributor in determining their ceiling prices for sales of potatoes to the military.

This means that if a country shipper sells potatoes direct to the Armed Forces, his ceiling price for such sales will be the country shipper's f. o. b. ceiling plus the full 86 cents a hundredweight distributive markups for handlers between the country shipper and the retailer.

If an intermediate seller made the sale, his ceiling price would be his primary price plus 80 cents.

OPS said the mark-up additions are being authorized upon representation from the Department of the Army that the Armed Forces have had difficulty in obtaining potatoes because sellers have found it more profitable to sell to others from whom they can legally obtain higher mark-ups.

The action is taken by amendment 9 to the white potato ceiling price regulation, CPR 113, revision 1, and became effective May 13.

CHICAGO JOBBERS PLAN TO REOPEN

CHICAGO, May 16.—Chicago potato jobbers reported they would make an attempt to reopen Monday after having been closed for the last 2 weeks on account of lack of supplies. As a general rule the jobbers are not too enthusiastic about the possibility of doing business as supplies are still short coming into the Chicago market and illegal operations on potatoes are reported continuing as in recent weeks. Some operators say the situation is even worse now than it has been in the last 2 weeks. The OPS order which authorized shippers to sell to the Armed Forces and take full mark-ups further complicated the situation in the industry, dealers here stated.

SAYS POTATO MARKETING OUT OF CONTROL—UNITED'S KITCHEN SO TELLS HOUSE GROUP IN OPPOSING CONTROLS

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 16.—Enforcement of the potato price control order has broken down completely, and controls should be abandoned, said C. W. Kitchen, executive vice president of the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, testifying Wednesday before the House Committee on Banking and Currency. He said it is reported that the going black market price is $400 to $500 a car over ceiling.

He said that information coming to the United office is that "growers feel the order is unjust and that after years of low prices they are entitled to and are going to get all they can for their potatoes."

DISRUPTS DISTRIBUTION

"The law did not intend that price control should disrupt the normal pattern of distribution," he said. "The present order has that result, and in my opinion, any order on these perishable commodities will have that effect no matter how conscientious Congress and the administrative agency may be in desiring not to have that happen."

He cited the fact that "just recently 30 wholesale houses in Chicago have closed and the owners say they will remain closed until they can get potatoes without violating the law. Wholesalers in other parts of the country are closing; and others cannot get potatoes. Growers are delivering through various devices, direct to retailers and taking the entire distributive markup allowed in the order. Others are operating at above ceiling prices and tying in other cheaper commodities to break even."

MAINE POTATOES TO WEST

As an example of how so-called price control has ripped up normal channels of distribution and resulted in uneconomical marketing, he said that more than 700 cars of Maine potatoes have been shipped to the west coast, a most unusual situation. Transportation costs were added to the price, as permitted by law. Consumers had to pay more for such potatoes than they would have sold for had they been marketed in their normal trading territory.

EXPORTING TO CANADA

"Large quantities of potatoes are reported going to Canada," Mr. Kitchen told the committee. "There is no price control up there. It is reported that that the retail price in Canadian cities is about 11 cents a pound against a ceiling price here of about 8 cents. Why shouldn't potatoes move in Canada until the new crop comes in there? OPS can't stop such exports to a friendly country.

LITTLE FIRMS FROZEN OUT

The effect of the control order, he charged, is that large retail organizations are getting potatoes, whereas small retailers cannot get them. This is more serious than just a small retailer not having potatoes. It means a general loss of business to him, because consumers will go to the stores where they can get potatoes, or hope to, and while there will purchase other commodities, too.

"I do not believe Congress intended to create such a condition nor that it wants it to continue. The effect of this order is to make crooks, in the eyes of the law, out of reputable people, growers and distributors. I believe a situation which creates a widespread disregard for law is more serious than one in which some consumers may not be able to buy potatoes for a temporary period during which there is plenty of other food available."

CONTROLS IMPRACTICAL

The experience with potatoes is further proof, Mr. Kitchen said, that "price control on perishable fresh produce is impractical and unnecessary under present conditions."

His further testimony was along the lines of that given before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on March 11.

He protested extension of price controls on the basis that "such regulatory power is incompatible with our system of private enterprise and free play of the competitive forces of supply and demand inherent in that system. We believe * * * that such authority should be granted only during periods of grave national emergency and within definite time limits. * * * We know of no evidence which even remotely indicates that a grave national emergency exists at this time so far as the production, distribution, and consumption of fresh fruits and vegetables are concerned."

Mr. Kitchen, after recommending that fresh fruits and vegetables be excluded from price control in the bill now under consideration, suggested that if his recommendation was rejected the committee add three amendments to the existing law as partial remedies.

The first amendment was to the effect that no ceiling prices be established for fresh fruits and vegetables until the Director of Price Stabilization finds that prices to producers will average parity for the crop year in major producing areas.

The second amendment was to the effect that before establishing or lowering maximum prices for any fresh veagetable which is the product of annual or seasonal planting that the Director should give, not less than 15 days prior to the normal planting season in each major producing area affected, notice of the maximum prices he proposed to establish. In the case of perennial crops the Director should give notice of the maximum prices not less than 30 days prior to the normal marketing season. "Normal planting season" and "normal marketing season" are terms that should be defined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

READ PACKER AD

In winding up his testimony, Mr. Kitchen read a statement from the Simplot Produce Co., Burley, Idaho, addressed "To Brokers, Receivers, and Jobbers of Idaho Potatoes Everywhere in the United States." It was printed in the Packer, March 8, 1952.

The statement announced that the company found not only "ourselves but many other good, reptuable shippers (who have tried to comply with the order) unable to buy potatoes in any form at a price which will stay within the legal limits of the OPS order."

"The potatoes were here, as witnessed by shipments of more than 5,000 cars during February, and they will ship about 5,000 to 6,000 cars in March and April. Where they go nobody knows.

"We never thought it could happen to us, but we have been put out of business with a consequent layoff of 85 men in our six warehouses.

"Being good Americans we prefer to stay honest, and go out of business for the balance of this season in preference to being unable to live with our families, our neighbors, and our conscience."

Mr. Speaker, that is the first time in history that that trade paper has ever taken a position like that.

Let me quote another issue of May 23 of the Produce News, in which they said the following:

FORT WAYNE, IND., May 22.—The local Office of Price Stabilization lost its case in Federal court here last Saturday, when Judge Luther M. Swygert refused its request for a temporary injunction against Fruit Distributors, Inc., charged with violating potato ceilings.

The judge said evidence was lacking that the company had willfully violated the law. OPS attorney Warren Barnett said the firm has sold seed potatoes at seed potato prices to grocers to be sold for human consumption, which is contrary to the Price Control Act as amended.

Judge Swygert commented that he was "aghast that a grocery store cannot sell seed potatoes at seed potato prices." Attorney Barnett replied that he was asking for compliance with the law and was not discussing its "equity."

Judge Swygert said the question was apparently whether the company and its officers had misread the law or were using subterfuge in evading it.

Herman Komisarow, president of the company, testified that he had tried to find out whether he was breaking the law, but the OPS would not give him an answer. He said he had been selling several thousand bags of seed potatoes yearly to growers and feed stores, and continued his usual method of selling this year after price ceilings on white potatoes went into effect. He said he told his salesmen to warn retailers that the seed potatoes were not to be sold for eating purposes and he said the invoices on the seed

potatoes were stamped with a similar warning.

Judge Swygert told OPS officials they could apply for a permanent injunction if they made further investigation on the question of whether the grocers and other retailers had sold the potatoes for food or seed, determining whether any misselling was obvious.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure, if you had enjoyed the privilege that has been mine in sitting next to folks who are caught in this swirl of regulations, regulations which cannot even be interpreted for them by the OPS themselves, you would realize the predicament that the legitimate producers in this industry are in. He has been searching for guidance, and he certainly has not gotten it to the extent that many business houses have just closed their doors rather than be caught violating an order, which they could not understand, and prosecuted later on, months or years afterward.

(On the request of Mr. HALE, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MCINTIRE was allowed to proceed for three additional minutes.)

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINTIRE. I yield.

Mr. BUDGE. I wonder if the gentleman from Maine has given any consideration to the amount of money the American taxpayers are paying for this so-called enforcement program. In the small State of Idaho, the salaries of the OPS employees this year amount to over one quarter of a million dollars. I wonder if the same situation does not prevail in the gentleman's State.

Mr. MCINTIRE. It is my understanding that it is slightly over that figure for the State of Maine.

Mr. Speaker, in closing my remarks, I want to say it has been my experience in dealing with some of the men in the OPS that they have been making an earnest effort to interpret and administer the law. I think we have a chance to look over this situation and the impact of this regulation on this particular industry, and give it our careful consideration in any extension of the act. Probably we, as Members of the Congress, have some responsibility inasmuch as provisions of the act did not prevent the OPS from getting into this kind of a situation in regard to perishable commodities. So let us accept our responsibility and make sure that when the Defense Production Act comes up for consideration, eliminate the possibility of a repetition of the situation in the potato industry. I think that we should specifically exempt perishables. Our acreage declined when we needed acreage in the OPA days, and if we continue in this type of a control scheme, the result will be a ceiling price for potatoes over an empty potato bin.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST NORTHERN INDUSTRIES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE] takes his seat, I wish to ask him if he has gone into the matter of the importation of potatoes for the time being. The people in my district are potato-eating people, I will say potato-loving people; they are very much distressed that they cannot get their potatoes. What is the situation on the importation of potatoes?

Mr. MCINTIRE. There are no potatoes available for import. During this past winter a relatively small quantity of potatoes were imported, some 75,000 to 100,000 bags imported from Spain; but at this time of the year there are no potatoes available for import.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I remember at one time tremendously high prices were paid for potatoes, a subsidy was given to keep the prices up, and potatoes were virtually taken off the market and thrown away. It only goes to show that the administration's policy of scarcity has worked great hardship on everybody for a long period of time. You all remember the cut-backs and destruction of wheat and meat in the Roosevelt administration. I think it is high time that the people woke up to what has been going on.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield to permit me to read a letter showing how this OPS operated?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Very briefly, if it will shed light on the present situation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It does not relate to the present situation but it shows what went on in World War I with reference to potatoes and shows how they enforced the regulations then. If the gentlewoman does not care to have me do that I will ask the gentleman from Maine if he cares to insert it as part of his remarks.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Why not read it?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will read it:

Mr. HOFFMAN: I have been working for about 6 years to build a wholesale potato business. My customers knew I put up a good pack and depended on it. However, I had to quit buying in April because I would not pay black-market prices. There was nothing available to me at ceiling. I thought it would be only for a short time, but even with the Chicago dealers' 2-week close down things are much worse now.

Monday, May 19, I was in Chicago to see what I could get and was able to buy 100 bags of No. 1B size Idaho's at ceiling as quoted by their OPS office. I bought these potatoes, brought them here and sold them below ceiling.

At one of the stores there was an OPS agent and he started implying that I was overcharging, causing the store manager to become angry at me.

Last night he came to my home after 8 demanding entrance. He checked my books, demanded a list of my customers and took them with him. He left at midnight.

His attitude implied that I was a criminal and have no rights as a citizen of this country. Must a law-abiding citizen put up with this? I don't know what your stand on OPS is, but it is the most unpopular order yet with the public.

I know that you believe in a free America and would not uphold their "Gestapo-like" actions here. Will you do what you can to right these things so that the small man trying to earn an honest living doesn't have to be whipped by a Government that no longer allows free enterprise?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is very unfair; and I think it is also very unfair the way contracts are being awarded in the textile industry and boot and shoe industry and other industries. It amounts to cheating. I do believe they realize that they are not honest about it, and I think some of them should be prosecuted for what they are doing in not awarding contracts to responsible low bidders in textiles, and boots and shoes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield further?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The writer of this letter has said that—

This agent's attitude implied that I was a criminal and had no right as a citizen of this country. Must a law-abiding citizen put up with this?

What shall I write in reply? I am asking my colleague's advice.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think we should make a change in the administration; I think many things would be very much better then.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think that is the only answer. Get the rascals out, as someone said a long time ago.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am not calling them names, but the gentleman's suggestion is undoubtedly true in some instances.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Those are my words.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Their minds work very curiously. If one of our firms is a low bidder they decide that he is delinquent in filling his orders, but when investigation discloses that they are not delinquent then they found something wrong with the color of the product, and they give half a dozen excuses. It is extremely unfair and very unjust. The workers are very unhappy, for this attitude and action on the part of the administration is taking work away from them; if the factories cannot get orders, employees cannot find employment. There is something very radically wrong.

As I said Friday, it is a Russian way of controlling business. My own people are very impatient, and we are having a very difficult time in our section of the country, because in the North the workers are living up to the wage scale, the minimum-wage scale; in the South they are not living up to the minimum wage. They produce higher market goods for lower wages. In the hearings southern members testified to that effect before the textile panel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

(On request of Mr. HALE, Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts was allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.)

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HALE. I would just like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the gentlewoman has doubtless been advised that the Navy Department has withdrawn the supply-demand control

point from Portsmouth to Philadelphia. That is taking an important industry out of our area. At the very same time, in the same mail that I got a letter from the Navy Department in regard to the supply-demand control point being moved, I got a letter from the Department of Labor calling attention to the fact that the York County area in Maine, with which the gentlewoman is extremely familiar——

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I was born there.

Mr. HALE. Has an actual surplus of labor. So one department of the Government is withdrawing industry while another department of the Government is calling attention to the fact that the area needs additional work opportunities.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman is absolutely correct. Also, they moved many veterans' facilities from the Veterans' Administration at Boston to Philadelphia.

Mr. HALE. That is just what I referred to.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They have moved the insurance offices and death claims, and removed them to Philadelphia, and the work has since gone very badly; claims have been lost; people carrying insurance cannot get their dividends, and their premium payments are not acknowledged and are misplaced. Widows and orphans are not getting their money. There seems to be an exodus to Philadelphia and favoritism is being shown the South. We have laws and we should live up to them. They should be fair. It is a very bad situation.

Mr. HALE. Does not the gentlewoman think that instead of having an exodus to Philadelphia we should have a genesis in Maine?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There is no doubt about that. In World War II many industries came to my district in Massachusetts and to other parts of Massachusetts. Now there is always some reason given for not sending them there. There is very great discrimination against a very great section of the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

MANAGEMENT DAY

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, for some time there has existed in our country the happy custom of setting aside certain days which have been proclaimed by the President to signalize some aspect of our way of life that we wish to call attention to with love or respect.

On this occasion it is my privilege to recommend another such day, as a means of rendering honor and recognition to a group which has seldom—despite its great contribution—received public appreciation or acclaim.

This group, to which I refer, has existed since—and even before—our Republic's earliest days. One of its members, let me recall, was Paul Revere. Another was Benjamin Franklin. This group, I say, never hesitated to shoulder more than average responsibility for its fellow citizens' welfare.

This group is to be credited with the greatest part of the planning, the supervision and the ingenuity that are the very basis of our national high levels of productivity and prosperity.

This group, I should like to add, includes all the participants of business and industrial management in our country, from foremen and supervisors to the heads of our millions of business enterprises, large and small.

It appears to me that they have indeed earned the right that one day in the year be set aside and proclaimed as Management Day, though not as a holiday, just as other such days have been designated as Mother's Day, Labor Day, and Decoration Day.

Need I say more in support of such a proposal than that, by their skills, inventiveness and daring, they have led our country to out-produce the world, so that other nations now send here to learn from them how to raise their own productiveness and standard of living.

It appears to me fitting that the day to be so set aside, and proclaimed as Management Day be December 8—or the preceding Monday, when December 8 does not fall on Monday—which marks the birthday of Eli Whitney, who typified in himself the virtues and skills of our business leadership.

Born in Massachusetts, Whitney worked as a laborer to help pay for his education. Destined for a professional career, chance brought him to Georgia. There events led to his invention of the cotton gin, which contributed immensely to the wealth of the South, and of our country as a whole.

Returning to New England, he set up a factory for the manufacture of firearms at Whitneyville, Conn. There, as an industrialist, respected and honored by his fellow citizens, he ended his days in peace and usefulness.

Gentlemen, let me on this occasion express my indebtedness to the Foreman's Digest, a magazine for foremen and supervisors in industry, for originating and proposing the idea that December 8 be proclaimed as Management Day. The Foreman's Digest has made this recommendation on behalf of more than 2,000,000 foremen and supervisors who are part of our American system of management.

In view of the great contribution of management to our country, and of our debt to them, I have today submitted a joint resolution to establish Management Day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

FRONT-LINE FIGHTERS EARN MORE PAY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, combat troops do not get a business executive's bonus. They are not paid time-and-a-half for the extra hours they put in on the job. And they cannot employ the weapons called strike and lock-out in behalf of their economic rights.

Because a man puts on the uniform of his country, voluntarily or otherwise, does not mean that he should make all of the sacrifices.

Eleven dollars more cash per week in his pocket will not spoil a soldier in a fox hole.

Judged by comfortable civilian standards, it would appear that he deserves some token of extra pay for extra-hazardous duty.

It is not that he is fighting for money, as many people back home are doing, but he would like a little material evidence to show that the most difficult job he is doing for us is being appreciated with more than medals or words.

Fact and conscience clinch the case for him.

But when it comes to providing benefits for those who fight, and sometimes die, the cry of economy is suddenly heard. Enabling legislation tightens up like a miser. Privates are expendable; but the public purse is not, when it comes to the footsoldiers in the lines.

The military pay raise bill was a good move, but it did not go far enough. It was left dangling in the air, incomplete, because it did not cover higher pay for those up front who are bearing the real burdens of this war.

Both underwater and in the air, it is a fixed policy to pay more than standard rates to those engaged in these branches of the Armed Forces, because of the special risks they face.

We applied this principle on a much larger scale during World War II, when combat infantrymen were recognized as entitled to more money than those of their fellow-soldiers who did not see action.

Then came Korea.

Where the dead and the wounded and the exhausted were denied the small credit of having fought in a war, because it suited high policy to pretend that it was something else, for fear of disturbing the feelings of those outside of Korea.

Some of this weird evasion of realities still befuddles our approach to otherwise plain and imperative issues.

The infantryman, face to face with the enemy, is the one man we count on to defend us when the chips are down. With all due respect for the supporting cast, he is our main reliance.

Look at the one-hundred-thousand-odd casualty list from Korea.

Check off the names.

Who took it on the chin?

Ground troops.

More than 90 percent of those who stopped enemy fire with their lives, and their blood, were footsoldiers of the line. Many of them were just kids who never had the satisfaction of money, power, or prestige—only something infinitely greater, courage. The 24-hour kind, day in and day out, with a heart that carries on even when physical endurance is spent.

One would think that, keeping the record straight, they would be entitled to our first consideration.

There are some folks who say that it is only a soldier's duty to suffer the impossible for us, "their's not to reason why. Their's but to do and die."

These shallow creatures never realize that the youngsters holding the line for us in Korea are doing some tall thinking about the way we are fulfilling, or neglecting, our duties toward them, here in the peace, comfort, and security of the United States.

What is going to be our answer to their unspoken questions and their doubts?

Not much that happens in our national life, or in the conduct of Government can be concealed from them, even though they are far from home, on the other side of the world.

Some have already returned and they are openly and immediately critical.

A $45-bonus is not meant to buy off their discontent at what they see; only higher standards in public life can really satisfy them.

But higher pay for hazardous duty will square with the facts of their personal experience. It will be one case of doing the job right; of being fair to them.

A man who has dueled with death to save the skins of others, gets to know fundamental truths. He becomes impatient with sham, with insincerity, with calculated delays, and slippery self-seeking.

He knows the nearness of life to death.

His morale, or the courage of his spirit, is not strengthened by the actions of those who let him down. As a soldier and a citizen he must have confidence in us.

We provided extra pay for extra hazardous duty during World War II. Then we withdrew this recognition for the men whom we sent to fight in the Korean police-action war.

Eleven dollars and a few cents more each week will not save a man from wounds or death, but it will be a visible sign that we are not overlooking or taking for granted the dangerous assignment we have ordered him to carry out because we are unable to do it.

It is from such little things as appreciation and integrity that the two-way communication of helpfulness that we call morale is built. The GI in Asia will not feel alone and forgotten if we back him up in every way.

It is customary to give special awards or medals to the few who have distinguished themselves in battle "above and beyond the call of duty." Sometimes we confer this honor after death.

To those who are able to accept these tokens of our respect and gratitude in person, our recognition does not come too late.

As these men themselves are the first to say courage over and beyond the call of duty is not uncommon under fire, and often passes unnoticed in the life-and-death struggle between bodies of men.

To make up for this oversight, I believe we should provide more recompense for every man who has exposed his life in battle, both for those who have served and those who are now serving in Korea.

This is the only way to give credit to the unhonored and the unsung.

I realize that certain technical details must be worked out before this measure is ready for adoption.

I have every confidence, however, that the United States House of Representatives will approve in the near future, and by an overwhelming vote, the principle of more pay for those who risk everything in combat.

It is our turn to serve them.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 45 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

A. DEVITT VANECH

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, is it too much to ask the new Attorney General how long he intends to keep the United States Deputy Attorney General, A. Devitt Vanech, in his job in the Justice Department? Why the President himself did not request the resignation of this unfit Government official immediately after his testimony before the Chelf-Keating subcommittee is a mystery to myself and many other citizens.

I am not so much concerned that the Deputy Attorney General of the United States flunked the bar examination several times in Washington, D. C., and Virginia, although this is a serious reflection upon his legal abilities. Nor the fact that when he took the Tennessee bar examination he passed by the skin of his teeth. What I am most concerned about and what the Bar Association of Tennessee is most concerned about is Mr. Vanech's affidavit that he was a resident of the State of Tennessee at the time he applied to take the bar examination and the affidavit he made that he intended to practice law in Tennessee if he passed the bar examination.

Now Mr. Vanech's history shows that he was a resident of the State of Connecticut and an active member of the Democratic Party in Connecticut. He came to Washington, D. C., in 1933, where he got a job as a clerk in the Justice Department. While holding this job he went to night law school at Washington College of Law, where he finally graduated in 1936. Vanech's prelegal training consisted of public-school education in Darien, Conn., high-school education in Stamford, Conn., and 1 year at Peekskill Military Academy at Peekskill, N. Y., where he did not receive a degree as he falsely stated he did in Who's Who.

Vanech remained active in Connecticut politics during that period and presumably he is still active in Democrat politics. As previously stated he was unable to pass the bar examination of either Washington, D. C., or Virginia. In 1940 Tennessee was known as one of the easiest States in the Union for passing the bar examinations. This is not said as any reflection on the State of Tennessee inasmuch as its standards today are high and all States have gone through periods when their standards in one field or another have left considerable to be desired. My own State of Missouri, for example, had very lax requirements for passage of the bar in the early twenties. Vanech leaves Washington, D. C., for the time required to take the bar examination in Tennessee. He makes no effort or visible plans to either give up his Justice Department job or move his residence to Tennessee. As a matter of fact, he never did go to Tennessee except to take the bar exam and he did not remain there. In his testimony before the Chelf committee, in attempting to bolster his affidavit that he intended to practice law in Tennessee, he refers to Mr. Paul Luten with whom he says he intended to practice law. The news reports state that Mr. Luten is engaged in the grocery business and has never practiced law nor ever maintained a law office in Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, at this time of grave concern over national affairs which involve serious legal questions such as the seizure of the steel industries, is the Federal Government of this country relying on the legal advice of a department whose second in command is such a person as A. Devitt Vanech? It makes one wonder what the qualification of the other members of this legal department are. And particularly what happens to a person in such a department who is a real student of the law who regards affidavits, his oath, and indeed his own word of some value?

Now that we have a new Attorney General, let us see a drive on against incompetence, corruption, and politics in the Justice Department of the United States. Just what are Mr. McGranery's plans for restoring the public confidence in the integrity of the people's servants? What is he going to do toward the thorough clean-up that President Truman, who has appointed him, promised the American people?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

A RUINOUS FREEDOM-DESTROYING PROGRAM

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, May 23, carries an eloquent emotional but illogical plea by the Speaker of the House for a program of world leadership which, in the opinion of many if followed, would destroy our prosperity, lower our standard of living, threaten our national security.

First. It was not my privilege to hear the oration. My attention was called to it by the press. This morning I read the address and will comment briefly.

Second. On the occasion to which reference has been made our Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], told us, according to the revision in the RECORD, that he had been carrying around in his pocket a talk on which he had spent considerable time. As he did not make all of the remarks, which are carried in the revision as it now appears in the RECORD, from the well of the House—and he so stated—his argument could not be answered at that time.

Nor shall I attempt at this time to dissect that speech on which he apparently spent so much time and point out paragraph by paragraph, as well might be done, the lack of logic or the unsound conclusions which are apparent.

Early in his talk the gentleman—as is his practice and that of the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]—whenever large appropriations are sought from us, called attention to the unsound assumption so often used and sometimes successfully, to sway the judgment of the membership, that if we had not fought and been the decisive factor in the winning of World Wars I and II, civilization would have been destroyed and the world would have returned to the days similar to those of the Dark Ages.

Always when this argument is made—and it is based entirely upon conjecture of what might have been—we are told with an excessive degree of confidence by those who have insisted since the coming of the New Deal that it has been our duty to support the whole world regardless of the efforts of those who receive our aid to help themselves; to furnish the munitions and the men to win every war in which some politically minded greedy nation might involve us; that the advocates of internationalism were right—all who opposed were wrong.

The do-gooders and the internationalists just accept as a fact the thought that they, and they alone, are kinder disposed, more charitable and generous than we and that the rest of us, those who believe in the term "isolationism," are somewhat greedy, selfish, and self-centered.

However, there is some merit in the statement we find in the fifth chapter and eighth verse of I Timothy, where Paul advises and it is written:

> But if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.

Now, it is not my thought that do-gooders or internationalists possess any of the characteristics of an infidel. But it is my charge that the internationalists, the advocates of one world, have, in some degree at least, overlooked the fact that the Lord helps those who help themselves, and that only by making ourselves strong both as a people and as a Nation will we ever be able to help other people or nations.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] said, and I quote:

> I remember sitting here and watching and listening to a vote only a few weeks before Pearl Harbor when the draft law was extended by only one vote; in other words, if the vote had been 202 to 203, the other way, we would have taken down instead of built up our Army, our Navy, and all our elements of defense before we were struck at Pearl Harbor. We have people still explaining why they did not vote a small appropriation to dredge the harbor of Guam. They are still explaining that.

Permit me to respectfully and humbly reply to the gentleman, and to all those who have so often cited that vote, that, with equal logic, it might be said that had we avoided entanglement in the affairs of Great Britain, had we stayed out of World War II, it is just possible that Stalin and Hitler would have fought each other to exhaustion, and that then, with our power unimpaired, our resources undepleted, our manpower intact, we, as the United States of America, might have stood at the crossroads of the world and, as traffic cop, controlled the direction in which both an exhausted Germany and bankrupt Russia should travel toward the harbor of peace.

But no, we followed the course indicated by the gentleman and those of his school of thought and what has been the result? True, Hitler and his armed forces were destroyed but in their place and stead we created a Stalin, as bad as Hitler ever was, raised Russia to a position of world power, made her, through our contributions of dollars and munitions a challenge to the rest of the world, raised her to where the gentleman and those who believe as he does now charge, and no doubt truly, that she seeks to destroy civilization throughout the world.

The one-worlders, the do-gooders, the Internationalists are the father and the mother of present-day Communist Russia. It was their thought, translated into action, which made Russia today's world menace, which lost China to the Communists, which produced the Korean war, and made unlimited, unauthorized, unconstitutional commitments, military and economic, to other nations; formulated and implemented the policies which today have given us the greatest tax load imposed upon any present-day taxpaying people, the greatest per capita debt of any nation in the world.

Our men are dying today in Korea. They are fighting with inadequate weapons thousands of miles from home, in my opinion, because, and only because, the pleas of those who are considered isolationist, those who would think first of the preservation of our own country, the freedom and liberty of our own people, have been disregarded.

The commander of our Air Force, Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg, told us in unmistakable language that our air force in Korea was not only outnumbered but inferior in efficiency to that of the enemy. Referring to a similar charge, the gentleman from Texas last Friday said:

> I felt that if such a situation existed there must be criminal negligence and the responsibility should be fixed promptly.

The party of the gentleman has been in control for lo, these many years. It has had unlimited funds and unlimited authority. For any criminal negligence which exists for any inferiority, either in number or efficiency in the Air Force in Korea, the responsibility rests squarely upon the party of the gentleman who pleads so eloquently for a continuation of our present ruinous policy.

Then the gentleman from Texas, as have so many others who have spoken on the same subject and to the same intent, said:

> Are we going to be there with too little and yet too late again?

The answer to that is that, during the last 11 years, while we contributed $82,000,000,000 toward helping others, toward the aid of our own people here at home, we have during the last 18 years contributed but fifty-eight billion two hundred million. And the further answer is, that while we have given billions upon billions to the Armed Forces, our fighting men are still crying for the implements and the munitions which, to date, they have never received from the Armed Forces, which operates under the direction of the Commander in Chief, Mr. Truman, and his advisers.

As to whether we are or are not adequately armed in Korea let the Armed Forces make an answer. An editorial in today's Washington News on that subject and two articles in yesterday's Sunday Times-Herald and the issue of this morning's Times-Herald, by Walter Trohan, give you the figures on what we have spent abroad and here. I read the editorial from the News:

LET'S HAVE THE TRUTH

If officials of the Defense Department and the Mutual Security Administration could bring themselves to understand that common honesty is still good public policy, Congress and the public might have some confidence in their representations.

For example, Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Army Chief of Staff, made the following statement to a Senate committee May 5:

"If combat in Korea should continue, or if our troops in Europe were attacked, we would have no reserves of some of the most important types of ammunition, and our front-line troops would have to limit their ammunition expenditures to what came off our production line. Some of the types of ammunition most important to our front-line soldiers have been rationed in Korea because production still does not equal normal battle expenditures, and World War II stocks either have been exhausted or have approached exhaustion."

That part of General Collins' statement having to do with ammunition rationing has been categorically denied by Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, who ought to know what he is talking about. He said rationing had been necessary only on some relatively unimportant items.

In the light of such conflicting statements, how can the public know what to believe?

Currently we are told that the reductions the House of Representatives has voted in the foreign-aid bill will have disastrous effects if the cuts are not restored.

But the reduced appropriation is the same amount which was available the past year, and not all of it was used.

In any case, much more needs to be known about the purpose and use of what Mutual Security officials term "defense support" funds. There is a well-grounded suspicion that this term is a mask for an attempt to saddle the American taxpayers with a permanent subsidy for European armament.

This is suggested by the statement of an MSA official that unless Congress votes more money for foreign assistance, the United

States will have to send additional divisions to Europe to make up the difference.

Of course, the United States isn't going to send any additional divisions to Europe, despite such dire warnings. But if the nations concerned cannot support the modest military establishments to which they are committed in 1953, will they be better able to do so in 1954, 1955, 1956, or any year thereafter?

The stories by Walter Trohan I read. The first from yesterday's issue is as follows:

UNITED STATES SUFFERS AS CASH FLOWS TO FOREIGNERS

(By Walter Trohan)

The New Deal and Fair Deal prefer foreigners to home folks in doling out tax dollars.

In the 18 fiscal years from 1934 through 1951, Federal grants-in-aid to State and local Governments and to individuals for direct relief and work relief totaled $56,200,000,000.

In the 11 fiscal years from July 1, 1940, through June 30, 1951, our Government has distributed approximately $82,000,000,000 to foreign countries as grants, loans, and credits.

$21,200,000,000 IN LAST YEAR

In the current fiscal year, the Government has been distributing abroad some $21,200,000,000 in Federal aid and defense programs voted during the fiscal year and left over but allocated from previous fiscal years. The total distribution is now about $100,000,000,000.

Last week, the House slashed $1,700,000,000 from the administration's $7,900,000,000 foreign aid request. The Senate has arranged to call up its own $6,900,000,000 version of the bill tomorrow. The administration hopes to restore $700,000,000 of the House cuts.

The give-away program of the administration is being urged by administration leaders to maintain the national economy. At the same time the purchasing power of the worker and farmer are steadily declining under inflation spurred by the foreign dole, according to congressional critics of the programs.

Since 1946, the labor force of the United States has increased from a monthly average of 60,820,000 to a monthly average of 62,884,000 in 1951. Unemployment has decreased from 2,270,000 to 1,879,000. The net gain in the employment force has been 4.1 percent.

PER CAPITA INCOME DROPS

In 1946 the per capita distribution of national income was $2,910. In 1951, the per capita income was $2,557, a drop of 12.1 percent.

The Department of Agriculture estimates that farmers will suffer a 20 percent drop in purchasing power this year. The drop will result from inflation, which comes from foreign spending for defense and aid.

Many of the foreign aid dollars are going for foreign agriculture. American farmers are being taxed for dollars to aid European farmers with the result that their own income suffers.

20-YEAR SPENDING SEEN

During congressional debate on the foreign aid program, Representative MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, revealed that the administration is thinking of continuing foreign aid spending for the next 20 years on the basis of its commitment to the North Atlantic pact. MANSFIELD is running for the Senate against Senator ECTON, Republican, of Montana.

MANSFIELD argued that it is misleading to label defense support a continuation of the Marshall plan. He argued, with apparent administration approval, that the administration's $7,900,000,000 request is part of its obligation under the North Atlantic Treaty.

"It just happens that the Senate of the United States has entered into a treaty known as the North Atlantic Treaty for a 20-year period," MANSFIELD said. "This House had nothing whatever to say about the North Atlantic Treaty. But under the Constitution, a treaty agreed to by the Senate becomes a part of the law of the land. On that basis, we either live up to the obligations entered into by the Senate in behalf of the Government of the United States or, if we do not, we should pull out completely. Questions have been raised today about this defense support, which I think is in many respects the most important part of this program."

On the Republican side of the House, this argument was accepted as developing a new administration line that we must continue to appropriate for the defense of Europe for the next 20 years because this country has a treaty obligation to do so.

The second reads:

TRUMAN SETS ALL-TIME HIGH FOR SPENDING

(By Walter Trohan)

Postwar expenditures of the Truman administration exceed wartime expenditures of the Roosevelt-Truman administrations by more than $8,000,000,000.

During the five fiscal years of war preparation and war, the expenditures total $321,200,000,000. The expenditures of the Truman administration for the seven postwar years are $329,500,000,000.

TABLES SHOW YEARLY TOTALS

The wartime expenditures for the five fiscal years were as follows:

Fiscal 1941	$13,386,553,742
Fiscal 1942	34,186,528,816
Fiscal 1943	79,621,932,152
Fiscal 1944	95,315,065,241
Fiscal 1945	98,702,525,172
Total	321,212,605,123

During the wartime period the public debt was built up from $48,496,601,693 to a total of $259,115,345,802. On a per capita basis, the wartime spending increased the public debt from $325.61 to an all-time high of $1,852.83.

The Truman administration in seven postwar years has exceeded the wartime spending as shown by the table following:

Fiscal year 1946	$60,705,059,573
Fiscal year 1947	39,288,818,630
Fiscal year 1948	33,791,300,649
Fiscal year 1949	40,057,107,858
Fiscal year 1950	40,166,835,915
Fiscal year 1951	44,632,321,908
Fiscal year 1952 [1]	70,881,017,627
Total	329,520,962,160

[1] Official estimate.

$650,000,000,000 IN 12 YEARS

The combined spending for the last 12 fiscal years amounts to $650,733,527,283. This is an amount exceeding the total estimated value of the physical assets of the United States by more than $50,000,000,000.

The spending record of President Truman is at an all-time record pace. By next January 20, if he leaves office on that date, he will have firmly established himself as the greatest tax spender in history.

Mr. Truman already has the all-time record as a tax collector. By June 30, he will have collected $50,000,000,000 more than all other Presidents combined.

Total taxes of all the other Presidents, from the founding of the country to the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt, were $248,000,000,000. This included the cost of the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and two World Wars.

In a little more than 7 years, Mr. Truman will have collected almost $300,000,000,000.

Yes, when the final showdown comes, the American people may find, too late, that they have too little of their own resources and men to provide either for their continued prosperity, to guarantee their own individual freedom, or to preserve the security of our own Nation.

In spite of the billions upon billions, much of it unexpended, which the taxpayers of this country through the Congress have provided for this administration, we are now told that if any part of the billions now requested is not given to this administration, such a cut will be a possible critical blow to preparedness efforts and the defense of our country and would, according to the Secretary of Defense demobilize a substantial part of our Armed Forces.

Does the Secretary of National Defense or any other sane individual believe that the United States of America can successfully carry on a war wherever Stalin, through the use of his own men, or those who do his bidding, chooses to start a war?

Does the gentleman from Texas and those who accept his thinking, know that there is somewhere a limit to what we can do, either in the way of economic or military aid?

The error in the gentleman's argument and thinking is that he assumes though he hints to the contrary that we can continue indefinitely, regardless of our resources or our manpower, to participate in a war whose combat lines may extend around the world. The gentleman is asking us, with whatever allies we may at any moment possess, to attempt to conquer the world, impose our theories of government upon nations who want none of it.

Why talk about self-determination for other nations or people while we, through our economic and military might, attempt to force other nations to accept democracy, a catch-word for who knows what? Certainly, not to create individual freedom or liberty, has much of our aid—both in dollars and arms—been going to nations which today hold in bondage and seek to project their control over other people.

Then the gentleman rings in the oft-repeated thought that we of the present-day world are all members of one big happy family, or at least we should be.

Quoting Thomas Jefferson, who said, "kindly separated by nature and a wide ocean from one quarter of the globe," the gentleman explains, as do those who follow his thinking, that the world today is physically one. Would the gentleman argue that while our forefathers lived in homes of their own, each on his own plot of land—sometimes large and sometimes small—today, because many of us live in apartment buildings, families should all surrender their identity and live as one big family? That none should retain its own independent ways of thinking and living?

The gentleman from Texas said:

If we have had our defeats, we have also had our triumphs.

True, we were the deciding factor in World Wars I and II. Events which I assume he considers our triumphs. Does the gentleman regard the situation in

Second. On the occasion to which reference has been made our Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], told us, according to the revision in the RECORD, that he had been carrying around in his pocket a talk on which he had spent considerable time. As he did not make all of the remarks, which are carried in the revision as it now appears in the RECORD, from the well of the House—and he so stated—his argument could not be answered at that time.

Nor shall I attempt at this time to dissect that speech on which he apparently spent so much time and point out paragraph by paragraph, as well might be done, the lack of logic or the unsound conclusions which are apparent.

Early in his talk the gentleman—as is his practice and that of the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]—whenever large appropriations are sought from us, called attention to the unsound assumption so often used and sometimes successfully, to sway the judgment of the membership, that if we had not fought and been the decisive factor in the winning of World Wars I and II, civilization would have been destroyed and the world would have returned to the days similar to those of the Dark Ages.

Always when this argument is made—and it is based entirely upon conjecture of what might have been—we are told with an excessive degree of confidence by those who have insisted since the coming of the New Deal that it has been our duty to support the whole world regardless of the efforts of those who receive our aid to help themselves; to furnish the munitions and the men to win every war in which some politically minded greedy nation might involve us; that the advocates of internationalism were right—all who opposed were wrong.

The do-gooders and the internationalists just accept as a fact the thought that they, and they alone, are kinder disposed, more charitable and generous than we and that the rest of us, those who believe in the term "isolationism," are somewhat greedy, selfish, and self-centered.

However, there is some merit in the statement we find in the fifth chapter and eighth verse of I Timothy, where Paul advises and it is written:

> But if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.

Now, it is not my thought that do-gooders or internationalists possess any of the characteristics of an infidel. But it is my charge that the internationalists, the advocates of one world, have, in some degree at least, overlooked the fact that the Lord helps those who help themselves, and that only by making ourselves strong both as a people and as a Nation will we ever be able to help other people or nations.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] said, and I quote:

> I remember sitting here and watching and listening to a vote only a few weeks before Pearl Harbor when the draft law was extended by only one vote; in other words, if the vote had been 202 to 203, the other way, we would have taken down instead of built up our Army, our Navy, and all our elements of defense before we were struck at Pearl Harbor. We have people still explaining why they did not vote a small appropriation to dredge the harbor of Guam. They are still explaining that.

Permit me to respectfully and humbly reply to the gentleman, and to all those who have so often cited that vote, that, with equal logic, it might be said that had we avoided entanglement in the affairs of Great Britain, had we stayed out of World War II, it is just possible that Stalin and Hitler would have fought each other to exhaustion, and that then, with our power unimpaired, our resources undepleted, our manpower intact, we, as the United States of America, might have stood at the crossroads of the world and, as traffic cop, controlled the direction in which both an exhausted Germany and bankrupt Russia should travel toward the harbor of peace.

But no, we followed the course indicated by the gentleman and those of his school of thought and what has been the result? True, Hitler and his armed forces were destroyed but in their place and stead we created a Stalin, as bad as Hitler ever was, raised Russia to a position of world power, made her, through our contributions of dollars and munitions a challenge to the rest of the world, raised her to where the gentleman and those who believe as he does now charge, and no doubt truly, that she seeks to destroy civilization throughout the world.

The one-worlders, the do-gooders, the internationalists are the father and the mother of present-day Communist Russia. It was their thought, translated into action, which made Russia today's world menace, which lost China to the Communists, which produced the Korean war, and made unlimited, unauthorized, unconstitutional commitments, military and economic, to other nations; formulated and implemented the policies which today have given us the greatest tax load imposed upon any present-day taxpaying people, the greatest per capita debt of any nation in the world.

Our men are dying today in Korea. They are fighting with inadequate weapons thousands of miles from home, in my opinion, because, and only because, the pleas of those who are considered isolationist, those who would think first of the preservation of our own country, the freedom and liberty of our own people, have been disregarded.

The commander of our Air Force, Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg, told us in unmistakable language that our air force in Korea was not only outnumbered but inferior in efficiency to that of the enemy. Referring to a similar charge, the gentleman from Texas last Friday said:

> I felt that if such a situation existed there must be criminal negligence and the responsibility should be fixed promptly.

The party of the gentleman has been in control for lo, these many years. It has had unlimited funds and unlimited authority. For any criminal negligence which exists for any inferiority, either in number or efficiency in the Air Force in Korea, the responsibility rests squarely upon the party of the gentleman who pleads so eloquently for a continuation of our present ruinous policy.

Then the gentleman from Texas, as have so many others who have spoken on the same subject and to the same intent, said:

> Are we going to be there with too little and yet too late again?

The answer to that is that, during the last 11 years, while we contributed $82,000,000,000 toward helping others, toward the aid of our own people here at home, we have during the last 18 years contributed but fifty-eight billion two hundred million. And the further answer is, that while we have given billions upon billions to the Armed Forces, our fighting men are still crying for the implements and the munitions which, to date, they have never received from the Armed Forces, which operates under the direction of the Commander in Chief, Mr. Truman, and his advisers.

As to whether we are or are not adequately armed in Korea let the Armed Forces make an answer. An editorial in today's Washington News on that subject and two articles in yesterday's Sunday Times-Herald and the issue of this morning's Times-Herald, by Walter Trohan, give you the figures on what we have spent abroad and here. I read the editorial from the News:

LET'S HAVE THE TRUTH

If officials of the Defense Department and the Mutual Security Administration could bring themselves to understand that common honesty is still good public policy, Congress and the public might have some confidence in their representations.

For example, Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Army Chief of Staff, made the following statement to a Senate committee May 5:

"If combat in Korea should continue, or if our troops in Europe were attacked, we would have no reserves of some of the most important types of ammunition, and our front-line troops would have to limit their ammunition expenditures to what came off our production line. Some of the types of ammunition most important to our front-line soldiers have been rationed in Korea because production still does not equal normal battle expenditures, and World War II stocks either have been exhausted or have approached exhaustion."

That part of General Collins' statement having to do with ammunition rationing has been categorically denied by Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, who ought to know what he is talking about. He said rationing had been necessary only on some relatively unimportant items.

In the light of such conflicting statements, how can the public know what to believe?

Currently we are told that the reductions the House of Representatives has voted in the foreign-aid bill will have disastrous effects if the cuts are not restored.

But the reduced appropriation is the same amount which was available the past year, and not all of it was used.

In any case, much more needs to be known about the purpose and use of what Mutual Security officials term "defense support" funds. There is a well-grounded suspicion that this term is a mask for an attempt to saddle the American taxpayers with a permanent subsidy for European armament.

This is suggested by the statement of an MSA official that unless Congress votes more money for foreign assistance, the United

States will have to send additional divisions to Europe to make up the difference.

Of course, the United States isn't going to send any additional divisions to Europe, despite such dire warnings. But if the nations concerned cannot support the modest military establishments to which they are committed in 1953, will they be better able to do so in 1954, 1955, 1956, or any year thereafter?

The stories by Walter Trohan I read. The first from yesterday's issue is as follows:

UNITED STATES SUFFERS AS CASH FLOWS TO FOREIGNERS

(By Walter Trohan)

The New Deal and Fair Deal prefer foreigners to home folks in doling out tax dollars.

In the 18 fiscal years from 1934 through 1951, Federal grants-in-aid to State and local Governments and to individuals for direct relief and work relief totaled $58,200,000,000.

In the 11 fiscal years from July 1, 1940, through June 30, 1951, our Government has distributed approximately $82,000,000,000 to foreign countries as grants, loans, and credits.

$21,200,000,000 IN LAST YEAR

In the current fiscal year, the Government has been distributing abroad some $21,200,000,000 in Federal aid and defense programs voted during the fiscal year and left over but allocated from previous fiscal years. The total distribution is now about $100,000,000,000.

Last week, the House slashed $1,700,000,000 from the administration's $7,900,000,000 foreign aid request. The Senate has arranged to call up its own $6,900,000,000 version of the bill tomorrow. The administration hopes to restore $700,000,000 of the House cuts.

The give-away program of the administration is being urged by administration leaders to maintain the national economy. At the same time the purchasing power of the worker and farmer are steadily declining under inflation spurred by the foreign dole, according to congressional critics of the programs.

Since 1946, the labor force of the United States has increased from a monthly average of 60,820,000 to a monthly average of 62,884,000 in 1951. Unemployment has decreased from 2,270,000 to 1,879,000. The net gain in the employment force has been 4.1 percent.

PER CAPITA INCOME DROPS

In 1946 the per capita distribution of national income was $2,910. In 1951, the per capita income was $2,557, a drop of 12.1 percent.

The Department of Agriculture estimates that farmers will suffer a 20 percent drop in purchasing power this year. The drop will result from inflation, which comes from foreign spending for defense and aid.

Many of the foreign aid dollars are going for foreign agriculture. American farmers are being taxed for dollars to aid European farmers with the result that their own income suffers.

20-YEAR SPENDING SEEN

During congressional debate on the foreign aid program, Representative MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, revealed that the administration is thinking of continuing foreign aid spending for the next 20 years on the basis of its commitment to the North Atlantic pact. MANSFIELD is running for the Senate against Senator ECTON, Republican, of Montana.

MANSFIELD argued that it is misleading to label defense support a continuation of the Marshall plan. He argued, with apparent administration approval, that the administration's $7,900,000,000 request is part of its obligation under the North Atlantic Treaty.

"It just happens that the Senate of the United States has entered into a treaty known as the North Atlantic Treaty for a 20-year period," MANSFIELD said. "This House had nothing whatever to say about the North Atlantic Treaty. But under the Constitution, a treaty agreed to by the Senate becomes a part of the law of the land. On that basis, we either live up to the obligations entered into by the Senate in behalf of the Government of the United States or, if we do not, we should pull out completely. Questions have been raised today about this defense support, which I think is in many respects the most important part of this program."

On the Republican side of the House, this argument was accepted as developing a new administration line that we must continue to appropriate for the defense of Europe for the next 20 years because this country has a treaty obligation to do so.

The second reads:

TRUMAN SETS ALL-TIME HIGH FOR SPENDING

(By Walter Trohan)

Postwar expenditures of the Truman administration exceed wartime expenditures of the Roosevelt-Truman administrations by more than $8,000,000,000.

During the five fiscal years of war preparation and war, the expenditures total $321,200,000,000. The expenditures of the Truman administration for the seven postwar years are $329,500,000,000.

TABLES SHOW YEARLY TOTALS

The wartime expenditures for the five fiscal years were as follows:

Fiscal 1941	$13,386,553,742
Fiscal 1942	34,186,528,816
Fiscal 1943	79,621,932,152
Fiscal 1944	95,315,065,241
Fiscal 1945	98,702,525,172
Total	321,212,605,123

During the wartime period the public debt was built up from $48,496,601,693 to a total of $259,115,345,802. On a per capita basis, the wartime spending increased the public debt from $325.61 to an all-time high of $1,852.83.

The Truman administration in seven postwar years has exceeded the wartime spending as shown by the table following:

Fiscal year 1946	$60,705,059,573
Fiscal year 1947	39,288,818,630
Fiscal year 1948	33,791,300,649
Fiscal year 1949	40,057,107,858
Fiscal year 1950	40,166,835,915
Fiscal year 1951	44,632,821,908
Fiscal year 1952 [1]	70,881,017,627
Total	329,520,962,160

[1] Official estimate.

$650,000,000,000 IN 12 YEARS

The combined spending for the last 12 fiscal years amounts to $650,733,527,283. This is an amount exceeding the total estimated value of the physical assets of the United States by more than $50,000,000,000.

The spending record of President Truman is at an all-time record pace. By next January 20, if he leaves office on that date, he will have firmly established himself as the greatest tax spender in history.

Mr. Truman already has the all-time record as a tax collector. By June 30, he will have collected $50,000,000,000 more than all other Presidents combined.

Total taxes of all the other Presidents, from the founding of the country to the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt, were $248,000,000,000. This included the cost of the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and two World Wars.

In a little more than 7 years, Mr. Truman will have collected almost $300,000,000,000.

Yes, when the final showdown comes, the American people may find, too late, that they have too little of their own resources and men to provide either for their continued prosperity, to guarantee their own individual freedom, or to preserve the security of our own Nation.

In spite of the billions upon billions, much of it unexpended, which the taxpayers of this country through the Congress have provided for this administration, we are now told that if any part of the billions now requested is not given to this administration, such a cut will be a possible critical blow to preparedness efforts and the defense of our country and would, according to the Secretary of Defense demobilize a substantial part of our Armed Forces.

Does the Secretary of National Defense or any other sane individual believe that the United States of America can successfully carry on a war wherever Stalin, through the use of his own men, or those who do his bidding, chooses to start a war?

Does the gentleman from Texas and those who accept his thinking, know that there is somewhere a limit to what we can do, either in the way of economic or military aid?

The error in the gentleman's argument and thinking is that he assumes though he hints to the contrary that we can continue indefinitely, regardless of our resources or our manpower, to participate in a war whose combat lines may extend around the world. The gentleman is asking us, with whatever allies we may at any moment possess, to attempt to conquer the world, impose our theories of government upon nations who want none of it.

Why talk about self-determination for other nations or people while we, through our economic and military might, attempt to force other nations to accept democracy, a catch-word for who knows what? Certainly, not to create individual freedom or liberty, has much of our aid—both in dollars and arms—been going to nations which today hold in bondage and seek to project their control over other people.

Then the gentleman rings in the oft-repeated thought that we of the present-day world are all members of one big happy family, or at least we should be.

Quoting Thomas Jefferson, who said, "kindly separated by nature and a wide ocean from one quarter of the globe," the gentleman explains, as do those who follow his thinking, that the world today is physically one. Would the gentleman argue that while our forefathers lived in homes of their own, each on his own plot of land—sometimes large and sometimes small—today, because many of us live in apartment buildings, families should all surrender their identity and live as one big family? That none should retain its own independent ways of thinking and living?

The gentleman from Texas said:

If we have had our defeats, we have also had our triumphs.

True, we were the deciding factor in World Wars I and II. Events which I assume he considers our triumphs. Does the gentleman regard the situation in

Korea, where we were—by our Chief Executive, who now announces that he has power to seize private property—thrown into another war regardless of the people's wishes, as a triumph?

According to the testimony of General Ridgway last week, while the Armed Forces think they have a plan and the ability to win a victory political considerations prevent the making of that attempt.

Is it a triumph for our Nation to find itself with hundreds of thousands of men stranded in Korea, knowing not whether to retreat, or to go forward?

Is it a triumph when men stand and fight day, week, month, and perhaps year after year and with—so far as we know—no definite objective in view?

The gentleman said:

We have assumed a dominant position in the world through the workings of destiny.

Rot and nonsense. We are in our present precarious position because of the deliberate planning of an Acheson and those who adhere to his line of thinking.

The gentleman added:

There rests upon us such a responsibility for the world's freedom that the free world will stand or fall largely by what we do or fail to do.

With that statement it is easy to agree and the answer is that if we follow the course the gentleman outlines, civilization for centuries to come may well vanish from the face of the earth, for unless we conserve our manpower and material, remain the citadel of freedom, the oppressed of all the world will seek in vain for a haven of refuge.

Today—

Said the gentleman from Texas—

we stand at the topmost pinnacle of our power.

And he would have us assume world leadership and, as Alexander of old, attempted to bring the world under our domination in our spreading of what we call democracy.

But the gentleman pointed out the impossibility of the success of that thought when he said:

But the alarming thing is this: Many democracies seem for a long time to have been losing their instinct for self-preservation.

The success of our efforts to aid others, is dependent upon their willingness to aid themselves, and that they do not seem inclined to do.

Throughout the gentleman's argument, as through practically every argument on the same subject during the last few years has run the thought that it is our duty "thrust upon us by destiny," to aid free people, free nations.

Time and time again have those who think their first duty is to our own people, our own Nation, pointed out that it is idle to talk about promoting the welfare of our people, preserving the freedom of our Republic unless we, here at home, safeguard our prosperity and our freedom, conserve our natural resources and our manpower.

During the past 15 years, time and again, has it been demonstrated from the well of this House, that our own people are not free to exercise the basic right to work, to earn a livelihood, a competency for themselves or their children.

The recent seizure of the plants of the steel industry is but one of the latest demonstrations of the arbitrary exercise of power, the denial of constitutional rights by a politically minded, vote-buying Chief Executive.

During the past 17 years, many, many times from the well of the House have Members cited specific illustrations of the ever-progressive arbitrary seizure of power by the executive department.

Almost innumerable are the telephone calls, the telegrams, and the letters coming from constituents to the Members of this House, giving factual illustrations of the manner in which law-abiding citizens are denied personal and property rights. A reading of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will disclose hundreds of such instances.

One of the latest which came to me last Friday is a wire from a woman who seeks only for herself and her associates the right through honest toil to earn bread for herself and those dependent upon her.

And this is the point which I desire to make and to read for my statement today grows out of the receipt of this wire which came to me last Friday:

NILES, MICH., *May 23, 1952.*

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I am writing to see what can be done about our problem. My neighbor said that you may be able to straighten out this situation—

And I am powerless to help these workers.

I am employed at Surges Engineering Co., Niles, Mich. I have been there 9 months. Our shop is not a union shop. On April 8 or 9, our boss, Raymond Surges, posted a notice stating that anyone who had not received a raise since January 1 would receive one on April 18. So much would receive none. Those to receive raises got them and he fired six girls because their work was not satisfactory and they were not reliable. Well, they signed union card, CIO union, that is, and they called a few employees to get them to sign. Some signed but most refused to.

So they put the place on strike Monday morning, April 21. They succeeded in scaring some of the workers out of entering the plant. They have been at this now going on 5 weeks. In this time, they have torn clothes from some girls, used force to stop girls from entering the shop, slashed tires, planted nails in parking places.

I hope that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] and the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] will read this recital of a denial of freedom, and that others, including the Republicans on the Foreign Affairs Committee, when they are inclined to talk about restoring freedom to people in other parts of the world will read this wire from this young woman.

The wire continues:

Those who were absent threw stones through windows, cut gas lines, put sand and sugar in gas tanks. They filled light bulbs with yellow paint and threw them against the side of our houses. They even telephoned us that our house is on fire to get us to leave work.

You see, we make fule (??—fuel) cell forms for airplanes and they go to the United States Rubber Co., Mishawaka, Ind. United States Rubber Co. has a union shop and they have never objected because we are not union. They have taken our forms even these last 4 weeks.

Last Tuesday, May 20, we delivered a load of forms to United States Ruboer Co. They were accepted in good condition and unloaded on the docks.

Those forms go into planes which in turn were to be sent to the men in Korea

The wire continues:

Early that night, some of the girls and their husbands went over there and kicked holes in the forms. Yesterday United States Rubber Co. said they couldn't take any more of our forms until we got rid of these girls because they were afraid of a sympathy walk-out.

Understand they went on United States Rubber Co.'s property and destroyed United States Rubber Co.'s property and the Mishawaka police said they couldn't do a thing about it. The Niles police have cooperated to the best of their ability.

Here is our problem: Today is our last day of work. They are closing the shop. Our boss has agreed to have a vote to see whether the union comes in or out. Those on the outside don't want to vote. They want to come in without election, which isn't fair. They have all had letters telling them that work was available and were given 48 hours to report for work.

There are 18 out and 33 in. All the workers inside are satisfied. We don't want a union. We have nothing to gain by a union. Here are some of the benefits we have: Seniority benefits; paid lunch and rest period; vacation with pay; Christmas bonus; Christmas party furnished by company; if injured on the job, hospital and doctor service paid for by the company; satisfactory pay.

The bosses are fair and square with every employee. We are satisfied, so why do thirty-some workers have to be out of work just because a few girls don't want to work?

We need our jobs. We have widows with three to four children to raise without help. They need their jobs. We all need our jobs. Why do we have to draw compensation? Isn't there something that can be done about this situation immediately?

My answer was that as long as we have a Truman in the White House dealing across the board corruptly with labor-union bosses there is little a Congressman, neither one Congressman nor the whole delegation from Michigan, can do to remedy this situation.

I continue to read:

All our wars are for a free Nation. Some of us are beginning to believe that it isn't very free when a few girls can take the food from your table.

Monday, there will be 35 workers in the unemployment office to draw compensation and to try to get another job, not because they want to, but because a few girls are trying to wreck a business, our lives, our property, and our health.

This firm is a partnership. Charles and Raymond Surges are brothers. Both war veterans. One was a prisoner of war for 2 years. They have sacrificed personal income, put time, effort and terrific worry into trying to make a success of this business. Surely the laws of our country will not allow a few radicals to force their views on a satisfied majority.

The name of the company is Surges Engineering Co., Niles, Mich.

EMPLOYEES OF SURGES ENGINEERING CO.,
MAUDIE SMITH, *Representative.*

Later a phone call from the same town advised me that the two employers, both veterans of the World War, are closing their plant because, possibly discouraged by the statements and the acts of the President of the United States, they do not think it possible to continue their business, make a profit, contribute their share to the tax-collector, give employment to thirty-three individuals who need work.

Shame, oh, shame, upon a President, an administration and a Congress which, so solicitious for the welfare of others, neglect the task of caring for their own.

Most humbly, most respectfully, permit me to add, but not in conclusion, that we have less talk about free people and free nations, our duty to assist them, until we have first cleaned our own household, restored liberty and freedom to work, to enjoy the fruits of one's labor to our own people here at home.

I respect our Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], as I do all other Members of the House but I cannot accept his views nor can I permit them to go unchallenged.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House on tomorrow for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FEDERAL SUPPLY MANAGEMENT (OVERSEAS SURVEY)

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, reporting on an overseas survey of supply management in the American Armed Forces, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures under the chairmanship of HERBERT C. BONNER, Democrat, North Carolina, stated that under prevailing separate-department supply concepts, "the Secretary of the Defense has hardly begun to explore the enormous possibilities for eliminating overlapping and duplication." The report noted that the Munitions Board as a staff arm of the Secretary to study and recommend supply unification measures "has not proved to be very muscular." The report stated:

> Directives have been issued in profusion, but the vast military bureaucracies continue relatively undisturbed and frequently operate in ways unknown to the Chairman of the Board, or to his superior, the Secretary of Defense. The cardinal principle of civilian control over the military is vitiated in the process.

The subcommittee's report, which was approved by the full committee, recommended the creation of the Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Supply to assume the functions of the Munitions Board or to act as Chairman of the Board. The job proposed for the new Assistant Secretary is described in the report as follows:

> The primary mission of the Assistant Secretary for Supply should be to work out, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense and without hindrance by representatives of the three departments, a comprehensive program to integrate common supply and service activities among all the military forces, including the recruitment and training of a professional corps of supply personnel in the Department of Defense, the development of standardized Defense-wide procedures and forms, unified procurement, the establishment of common depots and other common supply and service installations throughout the United States, and development of unified logistic organizations overseas. In this capacity the Assistant Secretary for Supply should have advisory assistance from the three military departments.

The subcommittee's report also recommended congressional reexamination of the unification law.

> Five years of disappointing experience under so-called unification legislation—

Said the report—

> are strongly persuasive that the Secretary of Defense needs a stronger and clearer legislative mandate for military unification.

Noting that General Eisenhower concurred generally with its proposal to strengthen the hand of the Secretary of Defense over the three military departments in supply matters, the subcommittee differed with his recommendation to proceed slowly in this field. The report states:

> Similar cautionary utterances were made from the very beginning. Slowness, in the subcommittee's opinion has become dilatoriness. Bad practices have congealed at a tremendous cost to the taxpayers.

In a section devoted to the Air Force supply system, the report asserted that expansion of Air Force supply facilities to store and issue common items previously supplied by the Army constituted "a significant area of unnecessary expenditures." A directive of the Secretary of Defense purporting to put a ban on such expansion was described in the report as "hollow and misleading" and "a belated effort to check a process well underway."

The report asserted that the uncertain status of Pentagon policy with regard to separation of Air Force stocks from Army depots was reflected in overseas theaters, causing confusion and inability to make firm plans for future logistics requirements.

Analyzing the relationship of military supply management to foreign aid programs, the report expressed concern that American military aid missions were not promoting unification in the supply systems of NATO countries. The importance of civilian advice and assistance in conducting the billion-dollar offshore procurement program also was emphasized. The subcommittee recommended that a central agency be established in the European theater for offshore procurement by American officials in the Mutual Security Program.

The report urged American officials abroad to make strenuous efforts to promote and encourage measures of self-help in assisted countries, in order to ease the burdens of American taxpayers and to insure that the benefits of American aid are spread widely among all sectors of the population in these countries. The report stated that "we cannot tolerate the use of American-aid funds or facilities to underwrite or to intensify existing inequities that make many peoples of the world easy prey to Communist propaganda."

In a section dealing with surplus property overseas the report stated "The story of surplus disposal overseas is one of improvisation, careless handling, lack of adequate control or accounting for inventories, and only casual consideration of the ultimate destination of transferred property. The gaps and deficiencies in the disposal process provided numerous opportunities for promoters and dealers to traffic in war surplus and to make large profits."

Concern was expressed lest such property find its way behind the iron curtain. The State Department's supervisory responsibility over surplus disposals abroad is described as "perfunctory in nature."

The subcommittee recommended that the statutory basis for surplus disposal overseas be reexamined and that safeguards be worked out to prevent excess or surplus property from getting behind the iron curtain; also, that disposals be made under arrangements that would enable the United States to reacquire needed items. Criticism was directed at the lack of uniformity among the military services in redistributing excess property and in their procedures for disposal.

In a concluding section the report noted the magnitude of the Secretary of Defense's task in eliminating overlapping and duplication in the military departments which have deep-rooted prejudices and long established practices. The report said that the Secretary's task was rendered the more difficult by the baffling complexity of the military organization and its remoteness from public scrutiny and criticism.

Members of the subcommittee who made the overseas survey were: HERBERT C. BONNER, North Carolina, chairman; HAROLD D. DONOHUE, Massachusetts; JOHN F. SHELLEY, California; SIDNEY A. FINE, New York; WILLIAM C. LANTAFF, Florida; W. J. BRYAN DORN, South Carolina; CECIL M. HARDEN, Indiana; CHARLES B. BROWNSON, Indiana; THOMAS B. CURTIS, Missouri; GEORGE MEADER, Michigan.

FEDERAL SUPPLY MANAGEMENT

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I was very glad to yield to the chairman of the subcommittee which has filed the report I intend to discuss briefly.

I might say at the outset of my remarks that the Honorable HERBERT BONNER, chairman of the subcommittee, is entitled to the thanks of every Member of the House of Representatives as well as the American people for the forthright manner in which he persisted in

pursuing this very important inquiry on supply management in the military services. It is due to his perseverance that the committee was able to come forth with this report which was filed with the House of Representatives Friday last.

I also would like to say that, having been a member of this subcommittee, I am thoroughly aware of some of the obstacles which crossed the path of the committee in pursuing this inquiry. I commend the gentleman from North Carolina on the diplomatic and effective way in which he overcame those obstacles. This report is based in part on investigations conducted in the United States of America, and in part upon an overseas field trip which took the committee all the way around the world. I do not think it is inappropriate for me to say, that it was only after some difficulty, and due to the determination on the part of the gentleman from North Carolina that the overseas phase of this investigation was conducted at all.

As the committee report very well points out, the information we obtained in the field was more complete and not as carefully screened and slanted as the information commonly furnished us here in Washington from the Pentagon. If we had not taken this field trip some of the most important information which the committee obtained never would have been uncovered. The gentleman from North Carolina is entitled to a great deal of credit for overcoming the objections of the Department of Defense, which sought to persuade the Speaker of the House of Representatives not to permit this trip to be undertaken at all.

Again, when the committee was denied access to Korea, the gentleman from North Carolina persisted, and eventually we were permitted to go to Korea and inspect supply operations there. Even then we were hampered in our investigation because it was understood that we would go only as individual Congressmen and not as members of a committee. We conducted no hearings, and were confined to Pusan, the port.

I say to the House that the leadership, the diplomacy, and the determination of the chairman of this subcommittee, the Honorable HERBERT BONNER, is responsible in major measure for the success of this commmittee inquiry which, in my judgment, is far more important than has been appreciated by the press or, so far, by the Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As my colleague from Michigan well knows, I have always regarded with some degree of suspicion some of these investigations carried on by this body. I am very glad, indeed, that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] did persist in this matter, because while knowing nothing at all about the opposition from the department to which the gentleman has just referred, I do know that in other cases they have frequently made a very determined effort to prevent the committees of the House and the Members from getting information which would in any degree tend to show a waste of money or a waste of effort on the part of those who are administering the laws which we write here.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not only that, but the committee, as I see it, and as I read the hearings and the report, was assisted by a very capable staff and, for the first time in a long, long time our Representative, a woman, the gentlewoman from Indiana [Mrs. HARDEN], was on the trip, participated on an equal footing and with equal ability in the hearings. I think we established a precedent of not only having Members of the House who happened to be of the opposite sex go on these trips, but also sending staff members of that sex to represent, what may be mistakenly called the weaker sex.

Mr. MEADER. I want to thank the gentleman for that observation. He is the ranking minority member of our Committee on Expenditures. I also wish to thank him for the additional views filed by him which appear on page 81 of the committee report, in which he eommends the work of the Bonner Subcommittee.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I want the gentleman to know that I gratefully appreciate his personal reference. Yet I would be remiss if I did not rise and say that the success of this entire inquiry has been due in part to the diligence of the membership of the committee and the staff which has so capably assisted us. Personally, I do not know of any member of a subcommittee who has shown more diligent or intelligent application to the subject than has the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER]. I am glad to have him call the attention of the House to the report.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his kind remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I was prompted to request an opportunity to address the House this afternoon because of an editorial in this morning's Washington Post and by a column on the same page by Joseph and Stewart Alsop. The editorial and the column are just additional unjust attacks on the House of Representatives in the same old pattern.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I do not want to anticipate, but the gentleman is not endorsing what those gentlemen recommend?

Mr. MEADER. If the gentleman had waited just a moment, I think he would have no sympathy whatever with the content or the purpose, or the slant, if I may use that expression, of that editorial and that column.

Essentially this editorial and the column, which are the same in subject matter, take the same old line that the Congress is a bunch of stupid nitwits and all wisdom resides in the administration; and that whenever Congress has the temerity to reduce executive budget requests, by even a slight amount, it is using a meat ax.

In fact, the column by the Alsop brothers is entitled "New Lizzie Bordens." I had to ask one of my colleagues who Lizzie Borden was. I found out that she was a notorious murderess of some years past, who was accused of killing her parents with an ax, although I guess she was acquitted of the charge.

In other words, this article compares the House of Representatives in the discharge of its constitutional responsibilities to a murderess.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. As I recall it, she was acquitted, so that the parallel is rather inept, it seems to me.

Mr. MEADER. The editorial not only contents itself with the same old line that all wisdom resides in the administration and not a penny can be reduced from budget items without damaging national security but, in this instance, the editorial of the Post goes on to attack individual Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think the gentleman made one error. He said they contended that all intelligence resided in the executive department. The gentleman has forgotten that they seem to think they know more than the executive department as well as more than the combined membership of Congress. They are much of the time telling us what to do, those Alsop brothers.

Mr. MEADER. I assume they regard themselves as possessing some degree of judgment. They presume to tell the Congress where it errs.

The reason I take the floor is that I have heard criticisms from the Secretary of Defense and from the President and from the newspapers, and especially the left-wing columnists repeatedly, yet I have failed to hear anyone stand up on the floor of the House of Representatives and defend this great body in the exercise of its policy-making responsibilities.

These writers belabor us with these attacks on meat-ax cuts. But let me point out that this Bonner committee report, which in my judgment is one of the most valuable reports I have seen come out of any congressional committee in many a year, was given not one single line in the Washington Post or in the Washington Evening Star. Here was a committee that had spent a year and a half studying one subject, a subject perhaps somewhat prosaic, to be sure, but a subject of tremendous importance. The committee had disclosed for the first time the details of the movement on the part of the Air Force to set up its wasteful, third, independent duplicating supply pipeline for common-use items which it has been getting from the Army up to the present time. But the Washington Post and the Evening Star ignored it. Congress had done something worth while. That is not news.

I spoke on the floor of the House the other day and cited the record to show that the work of this committee, in addition to the filing of this report, had already resulted in the saving of nearly a half billion dollars in appropriation bills. These were not meat-ax cuts but were scientific cuts based on a factual study. In other words, here is a committee that does a scientific job and has the facts, understands the subject in detail and pin points its action, yet there is not a line in the Washington Post or the Washington Evening Star. In the same paper where there should have been commendation of the Bonner committee they attack the House of Representatives for making meat-ax cuts. How can you ever win under circumstances of that kind? It is popular to attack Congress. There is no news in commendation of Congress.

Here was a committee which in my judgment exemplifies the very means by which Congress can regain the power that belongs to it under the Constitution, namely, by going into the details of a subject and being fortified with facts, basing conclusions on fact and logic in the public interest, yet it is not commended or even mentioned in these two newspapers in Washington.

If the press wants to criticize the House of Representatives, for the way it handled the mutual security bill, I have one or two suggestions as to action which they could very well be criticized. I refer to the performance, for which the leadership of the House is responsible, on last Thursday and Friday.

We sat here until after 8 o'clock in the evening on Thursday, and at least 1 hour and one-half of that time, of that valuable time, was consumed by repeated teller votes on whether or not the Committee should rise. Obviously, the leadership knew they could not win because they did not have the attendance on their side. They hardly got one motion voted on before they would offer another one. It was dilatory practice of the worst sort.

Then on Friday what happened? The chairman of the committee asked unanimous consent that the reading of the bill be dispensed with, and then shut off all debate on amendments with only a half an hour available for 15 Members of the Congress to present and discuss the seven important amendments pending. How could Members of the House of Representatives possibly understand the import of seven amendments, which were supposed to be debated in a period of a half an hour? Yet the day before, an hour and a half was wasted, which could have been used in debating those amendments.

I say the leadership of the House is to blame for that disgusting performance, which is not in the interest of good government or sound legislation.

Then, on top of that, on Friday afternoon, this episode occurred to which my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has already referred.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives, who is the highest officer of this body, got up on the floor of the House—for what purpose?—to defend the body of which he is a leader against unjust attacks against it? No—to join in those attacks designed to villify, degrade, and belittle the House of Representatives. The burden of his remarks was in the same tone as press and administration criticism, namely, that the great House of Representatives is a kind of a silly body incompetent to consider, assess, and decide on grave matters of policy. The work of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the views of his colleagues obviously were of lesser weight than press statements by the Secretary of Defense.

I had thought, as a Member of this House, I would see its senior officers defending the House, its powers, and prerogatives and its actions. Loyalty to the body of which they form such an important and influential part should transcend their loyalty to their party and their administration. Yet Friday we listened to the Speaker criticize the membership of the House for denying the full amount of executive appropriation and authorization requests, more or less chiding us as though we were irresponsible children.

I say to my colleagues, if the Executive is always right and we dare not disagree why have a Congress? I think it is about time the Congress stood up for its rights and its power. If it is so weak that it will not resist these unfortunate and unjustified attacks upon it, how can the American public have any confidence in the Congress.

I think the Bonner committee report is a demonstration of the good work of a congressional committee. I have prepared a statement concerning this report, which I ask unanimous consent to have included at this point in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER]?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

BONNER COMMITTEE REPORT

(Statement of Representative GEORGE MEADER, Second District of Michigan, May 23, 1952)

The report of the Bonner committee is, in my judgment, the most effective and forthright contribution toward restoring common sense and businesslike methods in national defense I have seen in my brief service in the House of Representatives.

This report should go a long way toward stopping general disunification and splitting up into little empires of the Defense Department. It should do this by providing for the first time a detailed review of the directives, interservice agreements, and orders through which the Air Force stealthily and surreptitiously has been establishing a third wasteful, duplicating, independent supply pipeline for common-use items which it has heretofore been receiving from the Army.

I use the words "stealthily and surreptitiously" advisedly. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia, admitted he knew nothing about this movement. I quote from his remarks on the floor of the House which appear on page 3642 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 7, 1952:

"Mr. MEADER. I wish to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services whether he is familiar with the movement under way in the Air Force to set up their own separate independent supply system for common-use items which they have heretofore been receiving from the Army.

"Mr. VINSON. Well, I want to say that I believe in unification. I might have been whipped in line, but, nevertheless, I could not whip a majority. If they can have joint utilization and the Army can supply equipment and can do it without additional cost it should be done in the interest of economy. I know of no effort on the part of the Air Force to try to duplicate that which the Army has been doing for it and which can be done for it.

"Mr. MEADER. May I ask the gentleman further if his committee has had any hearings or has given approval to a program on the part of the Air Force to set up its own supply system for common-use items?

"Mr. VINSON. No. We heard much about that, but we do not know all the facts, as yet."

The chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Defense Department appropriation, the Honorable GEORGE MAHON, of Texas, also admitted he knew nothing about this movement. I quote from page 3625 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 7, 1952:

"Mr. MEADER. * * * I would like to ask the gentleman whether he has been able to find in the requests of the Air Force those items which deal with the expansion of their supply system so that they can now supply themselves with what they have been receiving from the Army in the past.

"Mr. MAHON. I would say to the gentleman from Michigan that we were pleased to have the members of the Bonner committee before us: in fact, we have tried to utilize the information developed by the various staffs of various committees and subcommittees of both the House and the Senate.

"We do not want to see a duplicating and unnecessary supply line set up by the Air Force, and we have made some preliminary checks into the information which was presented by your committee about the separate supply line overseas. We will look further into the matter."

Indeed, it is apparent from the testimony before the Bonner committee that neither the Secretary of Defense nor the chairman of the Munitions Board were aware of the progress made by the empire builders in the Air Force in their long-standing program to establish complete, logistical autonomy.

For the first time the membership of the Congress, as well as the press and the public, have available in documented form the story of this wasteful, disunifying program of the Pentagon brass which had been successfully concealed until the explorations of the Bonner committee dragged it into the open.

The Bonner committee report also forthrightly recommends a reexamination of the National Security Act for the purpose of making a reality of the announced objectives of the Congress to unify the branches of our armed services, particularly with regard to the business end as distinguished from the combat activity of our defense forces. The report of the Bonner committee is only a beginning, but it does serve as a sound foundation for those who wish to strengthen our national defense through insisting upon economy, efficiency, and businesslike practices in the most mammoth undertaking in public affairs our country has ever witnessed.

I also wish to commend the committee for its courage in defending the House of Representatives against the unjust attacks by the Secretary of Defense and others in the administration who have, in effect, charged the House of Representatives in its action on military appropriations of sabotaging the defense effort.

Personally I am getting a little tired of the presumption of executive officials in flailing Congress for making cuts in executive budget requests. These officials arrogate unto

themselves the right to announce their requests as sacred figures not to be touched by the Congress. Widespread publicity is given to their claims that their figures are irreducible minimums, that they have cut them to the bone when all of us know that in computing requests the departments have historically added margins of safety so that even after congressional reductions, they have what are, in their own judgment, adequate funds if not, indeed, more than they really hoped to get.

I am particularly disturbed at the attacks the President has made on congressional budget reductions because it is so out of character with the Harry Truman I knew as chairman of the Truman Committee. In that capacity, with a staff which could provide him with some detailed information on Federal expenditures, together with his own efforts, he was probably more critical than any other legislator in recent times of the boondoggling and waste in the Army and Navy. His statements on the floor of the Senate on June 29, 1943, in support of an amendment which would have been a more confining strait-jacket than the Smith-Coudert amendment ever could be, show his belief about defense expenditures at a time when his position did not require him to be the mouthpiece of a huge bureaucratic monster and a spokesman of a political party. I quote from remarks he made on the floor of the Senate on June 29, 1943:

"All the boondoggling which was done—if there was any—in connection with relief appropriations could be completely blotted out by only three examples of the way in which the Army and Navy handle appropriations which we give them without any strings attached. They know how to waste money better than any other organization I have ever had anything to do with. They do an excellent job on the waste side.

* * * * *

"We changed the construction program from the Quartermaster Department to the Engineer Department of the Army, hoping that the Engineers would use their education and their prerogatives to save the tremendous appropriations which we were making. It was the duty of the Special Committee of the Senate To Investigate the National Defense Program to look into the expenditure for camp construction at Camp Blanding, Fla. That was a tremendously wasteful project. Then we had to go to Memphis, Tenn., to look at an ordnance plant, where the waste was even greater than it was at Camp Blanding.

* * * * *

"A week or so ago the committee held a hearing in Kansas City in connection with an ordnance plant known as the Sunflower Ordnance Plant, on which it can be conservatively said that from $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 was thrown away wastefully, because the checks which the engineers are supposed to make on these expenditures are not made. The Engineers claim that they are spread too thin, that there are not enough men of ability to do the job.

* * * * *

"Tremendous sums of money are being expended in the manufacture of airplanes, guns, airplane engines, and almost everything else one can imagine. I could stand here all afternoon and give example after example showing that tremendous sums of money are simply being thrown away with a scoop shovel."

I believe Harry Truman was right when he was a Senator. If he was right then, he must be wrong now.

The public does not realize sufficiently the difficulty of the task of busy Congressmen in exercising their constitutional responsibility of providing for the national defense and in determining what amount of the public funds should be devoted to that purpose. The Defense Department and its expenditures therefore have become so huge that time is required if detailed knowledge of them is to be gained. It is only through detailed knowledge that the Congress may make an intelligent appraisal of defense needs and a wise decision on this important aspect of national policy. The Congress in the past two or three decades has failed to equip itself so as to obtain this detailed knowledge. Proposals for defense originate in the executive departments, are presented to Congress as lump-sum requests which seem calculated to conceal rather than to reveal the manner in which the estimates are arrived at. Lacking an adequate investigative staff to check, screen, and challenge these representations, Congress, for the most part, has therefore done the only thing it could do, namely, to make blanket or so-called meat-ax cuts in the executive requests.

The work of the Bonner committee, as disclosed in the transcript of its hearings and in the report just issued, is a demonstration of what may be accomplished by congressional committees provided the membership of the committees and the staffs concentrate on a specific problem and devote hours of their time to its consideration.

Aside from the value of the report as a remarkable document of congressional thinking and findings in the field of national defense, the Bonner committee was responsible for taking specific action, the results of which appear in dollar savings to the American taxpayer. I summarized some of these savings in the statement I made on the floor of the House of Representatives on May 15, 1952, which appears on page 5279 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date.

I also call attention to the concluding remarks on page 79 of the report. The committee notes the criticism of the congressional cuts in the defense budget by the Secretary of Defense. The committee suggests that the Secretary of Defense and his subordinates might better devote their efforts to eliminating duplication and waste in the armed services, than making blanket condemnation of congressional economies.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, one of those who has been most vigorous in attacking the House of Representatives is the President, the Honorable Harry S. Truman. I served under Mr. Truman when he was a Senator in the other body and chairman of the Truman committee.

Probably no other Senator was more vigorous in his search for economies in the Defense Department than Senator Truman. This was also true of the committee of which he was the head—the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program. And he, individually, was then economy-minded.

Let me quote an amendment which Senator Truman offered to the 1944 War Department appropriation bill:

Notwithstanding any of the other provisions of this act, all appropriations made or contained in this act shall terminate 3 months after the signing of an armistice or agreement for the cessation of hostilities with all the following nations, namely, Germany, Italy, and Japan.

What was the effect of that amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(On request of Mr. GROSS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MEADER was allowed to proceed for 10 additional minutes.)

Mr. MEADER. The effect of that amendment, Mr. Speaker, was to take all War Department funds away from it 3 months after the cessation of hostilities. The War Department would not have had anything to pay its soldiers and its civilian personnel or to buy its equipment or anything else. Ninety days after the cessation of hostilities, all of the funds in that 1944 appropriation act would be denied automatically to the War Department. What amendment could have been more drastic than that amendment offered by Senator Harry Truman, of Missouri? I say that there is nothing that could be more drastic than cutting off wholly the appropriation in the bill. You can talk about a 5-percent cut or a 10-percent cut or cutting here and there in various specific amounts, but what could be worse than taking all of the entire amount?

What happened in that debate? It just happened that the late lamented Senator Vandenberg was on the floor of the Senate at the time, and he said then to the Senator from Missouri, Mr. Truman:

Senator VANDENBERG. If I may borrow the phraseology of the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette, that is another problem which we cannot handle with a meat ax.

Who was using the meat ax in 1943? I continue to quote:

It will involve the entire reconversion program of the United States from war back to peace, and it will desperately involve the entire economy of the country during the period of reconversion immediately following the war.

And a little further on in the debate after Senator BARKLEY had gotten into the discussion and raised a question as to the wisdom of the Truman approach to the cut in the appropriation bill, Senator Vandenberg said:

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I make this contribution in order to terminate the discussion—and I think it will terminate it—I suggest that the amendment is subject to a point of order, and I make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that in the form in which the amendment now appears it has the character of a legislative directive, and therefore is subject to a point of order; and the point of order is sustained.

I said in the statement which has been inserted in the RECORD that I believed that the attitude of Harry Truman at that time toward these huge military expenditures in 1943 was right. But whatever it was, he could not have been right then and be right now.

He now says that we are damaging the national defense if we in Congress arrogate unto ourselves—mind you—the right to take away one penny from what the executive department has recommended. It is absolutely ridiculous to say that budget estimates cannot be reduced.

I want to refer again to the editorial in the Washington Post on the mutual-security bill, which attacks two individual Members, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH],

Of course, the editorial makes note of the three-quarters of a billion dollar reduction in the authorization, but for some reason or other it neglects to give credit to our colleague from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] for the three-quarters of a billion dollar cut which the editorial says is dangerous to our national security.

The amendment of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] was designed to encourage the recipients of our aid to do something to help themselves. The Bonner committee report includes a discussion of the military and economic aid we are furnishing to our allies and calls attention to the situation which the Merrow amendment seeks to correct. The hearings of our committee—and incidentally there are over 3,500 printed pages of those hearings—contain testimony on military and economic aid. In Trieste we took testimony from a Mr. Haraldsan who was the United States Economic Cooperation Administration representative in Trieste. His testimony struck me as being important and authentic on the point at which the Merrow amendment is aimed. This statement came, not from Congressmen, but from a member of the Administration. His description of fiscal and other governmental weaknesses and the lack of vigor of the business economy so impressed me that I had that testimony inserted as a part of my statement to the House Foreign Affairs Committee. It appears on pages 878 and 879 of the hearings on the Mutual Security Act Extension of this year.

Mr. Haraldsan, in effect, told us that we were paying something like $10,000,000 a year toward the support of Trieste which had a total budget of $25,000,000. We were doing it indirectly through ECA aid to Italy.

I asked Mr. Haraldsan what we could do to encourage such countries to bring their economies and their governments into a position where they were more nearly self-sustaining. In an excellent, succinct way, Mr. Haraldsan went on to explain what reforms would be necessary. Among other things he said it would require their taking a little more rational attitude toward some of their socialistic programs, many of which were supported at general taxpayers' expense. He said they were fooling themselves into thinking they were getting something for nothing but actually were paying the long price. It would also require that they enact income tax legislation rather than to depend on the regressive form of use or consumer tax legislation.

That is all that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] was designed to accomplish; namely, to have these recipients start to do these things, which they ought to do in their own interest anyway, to render their economies more nearly self-sustaining and bring their Government budgets more nearly in balance.

Why the Washington Post should seek to attack the gentleman from New Hampshire for a program of that nature I still do not know. It may be because they do not bother to study the matter or it may be that they just want to take another whack at the Congress.

If we are ever going to lighten the burden on the American taxpayers we will have to bring some kind of influence to bear on those countries to take measures which will reform their own economies and render those countries more nearly self-sustaining. Moreover, unless these countries show signs of being able to stand on their own feet, they will not be much use as military allies. They will be only burdens. I say to you the Merrow approach was an intelligent approach, not what the Post called it, an "ill-advised attempt to be tough for toughness' sake." Not only that, the proposed amendment was based upon a study conducted by the gentleman from New Hampshire and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] on which they have written a report. But the editorial says nothing about the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], the chairman of the subcommittee, yet he was equally behind this amendment, as was the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY]. All three were members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

And the same thing could be said of the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH], also a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, who had given extensive study to the problem of bringing the funds and supplies we are giving under the point 4 program somewhere more nearly in line with the technical assistance of which point 4, as interpreted by the administration, is supposed primarily to consist. The Post completely ignores the growing effort to put private enterprise into the business of economic development in line with American principles, leaving economic endeavors to the people rather than the Government.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. In reference to the economic-aid program, the thing that struck me so forcibly on this trip the gentleman has discussed was the fact that all the representatives of the program were terribly interested in the balancing of the budget of various countries at the expense of the taxpayer here and of the United States. Certainly we want to do what we can to rehabilitate those countries, but if they would get their own houses in line and raise revenue in accordance with the degree in which they could raise it and then so balance that revenue with their budgets they would not have to have all this financial aid from the United States Government to balance their budget.

I am interested in the balancing of the budget of the United States first; then, if we can do these other things, of course, charitably, I want to do it.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina. I may say that continuously in all of our hearings around the world he brought home to our representatives abroad the predicament of the United States taxpayers. Representative BONNER repeatedly warned them that we had reached the bottom of the barrel in getting taxes. I think it was a healthy thing for this committee of Congress, whose members have their responsibility for appropriating funds, to have these talks with our administrators abroad.

Mr. BONNER. May I make this personal observation, because I am devoted to the gentleman whose address last Thursday or Friday the gentleman from Michigan has referred to. It so happened I was not here and I did not hear the Speaker's address, nor have I had the privilege of reading it. But I do know that he is devoted to the public service, he is devoted to the membership of this House, and holds in high esteem and high regard the dignity of this House. Whatever may have been said, he said earnestly and sincerely because he felt that the legislation then under consideration should not be dealt with in the manner in which it was being considered at that time. So I disagree with my dear friend when he said the Speaker maligned or abused the membership of the House, because I know if it did seem that way it was not the intention of the gentleman from Texas, SAM RAYBURN, to do such a thing. He is a grand, fine presiding officer and a distinguished Member of Congress. He holds in his heart fine fellowship for the Republican membership as well as the Democratic membership, and I imagine it was in the heat of debate he said things that the gentleman from Michigan did not seem to approve. But, nevertheless, I just wanted to have this chance to say that because I know the Speaker of this House would come to your assistance as quick as he would mine or any other Member. After all, the Speaker has a right to express his views just as any other Member, and his views are entitled to the weight of an elder statesman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

(On request of Mr. BONNER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MEADER was allowed to proceed for three additional minutes.)

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to leave the impression that I was criticising the Speaker for expressing his views. I have the highest regard for him and I know of the high regard in which he is held by the Members of the House.

In my short term of service here I have come to realize that there is almost an attitude of awe toward the Speaker of the House of Representatives. He is treated with the highest deference by the membership. Therefore, I cannot understand why, now and then, the majority leadership of the House, including the Speaker and the majority leader, does not get up and defend the action taken by this body and the majority of this body.

I recall the episode when the present Vice President of the United States was Senate majority leader and President Roosevelt excoriated the Senate for some action it had taken on tax legislation. Senator BARKLEY stood up and defended the Senate against the attack by President Roosevelt. I would like to see a few more of those defenses by someone

who counts here rather than by a freshman minority Member of the House of Representatives.

I did not intend to reflect in any way upon the Speaker. He is a fine gentleman, he is sincere, and he has his beliefs. But I wonder if now and then he could not find it in his heart to defend the House of Representatives, of which he is the principal official, when it is unjustly attacked by the press, the administration, or anyone else.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No one that I know of is criticizing the Speaker for any views he holds or expresses. I can, and I do, agree with all the complimentary things the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] has said. But it does not follow that every Member of this House has to accept without question the views, the political views, of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and when he makes a statement on the floor, from the well of the House, every Member has the right to answer it. The Speaker would be the last to deny that right; he did say, as page 5886 of Friday has, and I quote:

> Mr. Chairman, I notice this House in glee, and it seemed to me without a great deal of reason, cutting the appropriations in this bill.

I did not notice any particular glee on the part of Members. I did notice some satisfaction on the part of a majority of the Members because they seemed to think they were saving a few millions for our own defense later on. There are some of us who believe this country is going down the road to destruction because we are appropriating and giving so many billions of dollars to other nations which waste so much of it, and we do not propose to be criticized without making answer just because the Speaker takes the well of the House and expresses his views. Certainly he has the right to his opinion and those of us who differ are not bound to either agree or remain silent just because he is our Speaker. He would not respect us if we did.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman and I are in thorough accord on reduction of many of these appropriation bills, especially the two bills he is discussing. He and I have seen—others probably in this House have not had the opportunity of seeing—some of the wasteful expenditures of this money that has been beyond the observation of those who bring in the appropriation bills. Therefore, not necessarily with glee, I desire to see these bills reduced, because you will remember I asked in connection with the armed services appropriation bill where we could reach those items in order to cut them, and they could not point them out to us. So we then did have to take a general approach, if that is what you want to call it, because they juggle these funds around, and there is no specific place in the bill where they can be identified.

Mr. MEADER. I will say to the gentleman that we made an estimate but not a meat-ax cut. We cut out far less in the 1953 appropriation bill than there must be in there for setting up the Air Forces' third independent supply pipeline. We could not cut out all the fat, because it was so effectively concealed that the combined efforts of our committee and our staff and the Appropriations Committee and its staff could not find where the brass had hidden it.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BOLLING and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILSON of Texas and to include an editorial.

Mr. JONES of Alabama and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. FLOOD and to include an article.

Mr. WHITTEN and to include two letters.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WIER and to include an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Labor Tribune.

Mr. PRICE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WALTER and to include an editorial appearing in the Washington Star of yesterday.

Mr. DONDERO and to include an editorial.

Mr. MERROW and to include an editorial.

Mr. TOLLEFSON in three instances and to include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. LARCADE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TEAGUE in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK in three separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MORANO (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) and to include an address made by Mr. MORANO.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. ELLSWORTH) and to include an editorial.

Mr. MANSFIELD and to include an article on the oil fields of eastern Montana.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include an editorial appearing in the May 23 issue of the Boston Globe.

Mr. CHENOWETH and to include an address from Maj. Gen. Frederick A. Smith, Jr.

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. HARVEY and to include three editorials.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. LANE) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FURCOLO (at the request of Mr. BONNER) and to include an address by Mr. Roger Putnam.

Mr. SCHENCK and to include a letter from FHA.

Mr. MILLER of New York (at the request of Mr. KEATING) and to include a letter.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3066. An act to amend defense housing laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2786. An act to amend section 106 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949; and

S. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until June 15, 1952.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) for the balance of the week.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 27, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1529. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of March 1952, under the terms of Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1530. A letter from the acting secretary of state, Territory of Hawaii, transmitting a copy of the laws of the special session of 1950 and the regular session of 1951, as enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, pursuant to section 69 of an act of Congress, entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REAMS: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 1828. An act to confirm the status of certain civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities under the Armed Forces with respect to laws administered by the Civil Service Commission, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1995). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REAMS: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 7471. A bill to authorize the modernization and enlargement of the mail equipment shops in Washington, D. C., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1996). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REAMS: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 7806. A bill to authorize the participation by certain Federal employees, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the Armed Forces returned to the United States from abroad for burial; without amendment (Rept. No. 1997). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 7990. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 7991. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, section 396, relating to the importing and transporting of obscene books and other material; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 7992. A bill to make Flag Day a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 7993. A bill to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of the Netherlands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7994. A bill to amend section 62 of the National Defense Act (39 Stat. 166, 198), as amended (32 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 4 c), to include Guam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7995. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to extend the application of the special inducement pay provided thereby to doctors and dentists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. R. 7996. A bill to amend section 1601 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer to a State amounts erroneously paid to the Federal Government which would be deductible from the Federal unemployment tax if paid directly to such State and to allow credit therefor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 7997. A bill to amend section 459 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. J. Res. 464. Joint resolution to provide for setting aside an appropriate day each year to be known as Management Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. J. Res. 465. Joint resolution designating the first Tuesday of June of each year as National Teachers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 216. Concurrent resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 650. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives to study and investigate State and local motor vehicle laws and regulations, their effect on accident and insurance rates and measures which may be undertaken to reduce such rates; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 651. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 650; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 652. Resolution to amend the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. Res. 653. Resolution to amend House Resolution 51, relating to the authority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKEWELL:

H. R. 7998. A bill for the relief of Robert S. H. Mack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 7999. A bill for the relief of Jordan Bros. Lumber Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 8000. A bill for the relief of Berta Wandl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE (by request):

H. R. 8001. A bill for the relief of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 8002. A bill for the relief of Jimmy Lee Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8003. A bill for the relief of Karen Christene Eisen Murdock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

740. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of Mrs. Paul Hultman, Waterloo, Iowa, and approximately 115 other citizens of Black Hawk County urging legislation to prohibit alcohol beverage advertising over the radio and television, and in magazines and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

741. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Wisconsin State Livestock Sanitation Committee requesting the Secretary of Agriculture to formulate and carry out regulations to prevent the importation of bone meal, products containing bone meal, or bones into the United States as feed or fertilizer except when properly processed to kill anthrax spores; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 27, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, May 12, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in this hour of the world's deep distress we turn to Thee, mindful of our insufficiency. We are but broken reeds, lashed by wild winds that mock our boasting pride uttered in days of calm. The arm of flesh is futile. Thine alone, O Lord, is the greatness and the power and the glory and the victory. Thou only art as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land. We are humbly grateful that our America still stands with lamp held aloft, a beacon of freedom for all the earth.

Send us forth to waiting tasks, conscious of a great heritage worth living and dying for, and with a deathless cause that no weapon that has been formed can defeat. We lift our noonday prayer in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 26, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On May 23, 1952:

S. 1765. An act for the relief of Harumi Kamiaka;

S. 1772. An act for the relief of Ruth Obre Dubonnet;

S. 2307. An act for the relief of Holger Kubischke;

S. 2322. An act prohibiting the manufacture or use of the character "Smokey Bear" by unauthorized persons; and

S. 2521. An act to revive and reenact section 6 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes," approved December 22, 1944.

On May 26, 1952:

S. 993. An act for the relief of Robert Wendell Tadlock;

S. 1403. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer to the Department of the Navy certain property at Shumaker, Ark.;

S. 2569. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; and

S. 3100. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment, and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the Third National Jamboree for the Boy Scouts, and for other purposes.

On May 27, 1952:

S. 1517. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1897, entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for other purposes," as amended, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to sell without advertisement national forest timber in amounts not exceeding $2,000 in appraised value; and

S. 1630. An act to amend the provision in the act of March 4, 1911 (36 Stat. 1235, 1253) authorizing the granting of easements for rights-or-way for electrical transmission, telephone, and telegraph lines and poles.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1822) to amend the act creating a juvenile court for the District of Columbia, approved March 19, 1906, as amended, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4511) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Territory of Hawaii certain real property at Kahului, Wailuku, Maui, T. H.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5768. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944;

H. R. 6811. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 23, 1924, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6857. An act to amend section 7a of the act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928;

H. R. 6943. An act to fix the seniority rights and service of Albert O. Raeder as sergeant in the District of Columbia Fire Department; and

H. R. 7253. An act to authorize the conveyance to the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum of certain parcels of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KERR was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate this week.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION BY ELIZABETH II, QUEEN OF GREAT BRITAIN

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a letter from Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, which, with the accompanying letter, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 22, 1952.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
President of the Senate.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am transmitting herewith a copy of a letter I have received from Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, asking me to convey to the Members of the Senate her deep appreciation for their sentiments of sympathy and their tribute to the memory of His Late Majesty.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

BUCKINGHAM PALACE,
May 7, 1952.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

MR. PRESIDENT: I have received your letter dated the 4th day of March, with which you sent to me the texts of resolutions directed respectively by the United States Senate to my Governments in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and in the other countries of the Commonwealth and by the United States House of Representatives to my Government in the United Kingdom.

In thanking you for your kindness in forwarding these resolutions and for the personal sympathy which you have expressed toward me in doing so, I request that you will be good enough to convey to the Senate and the House of Representatives my deep appreciation of the sentiments to which they have given expression and of their tributes to the memory of His Late Majesty.

My Government in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have already received the texts of these resolutions from His Excellency the Ambassador of the United States of America at my court, through whose good offices their thanks have been transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives.

I have communicated the text of the Senate resolution to my Governments in the other countries of the Commonwealth and I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to you, Mr. President, the assurances of my invariable friendship and highest esteem.

Your sincere friend,

ELIZABETH R.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR (S. DOC. NO. 134)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the Department of the Interior, in the amount of $1,350,000, fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. DOC. NO. 135)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, in the amount of $96,000, for the Department of Commerce, fiscal year 1953, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year, as previously amended by his letter of February 15, 1952 (H. Doc. 363) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM (S. DOC. NO. 136)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, in the amount of $175,000, for the Selective Service System, fiscal year 1953, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. DOC. NO. 133)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, in the amount of $125,000, for the Department of Commerce, fiscal year 1953, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF ARMY (S. DOC. NO. 137)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations, for the Department of Defense, Civil Functions, Department of the Army, fiscal year 1953, in the amount of $19,650,000 in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON YUGOSLAV EMERGENCY RELIEF ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report regarding the Yugoslav emergency relief assistance program, for the period December 16, 1951, through March 15, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PAUL D. BANNING

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF FEDERAL BUREAU OF NARCOTICS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, prepared by the Commissioner of Narcotics, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS IN DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AND WITH ARMY GENERAL STAFF

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, confidential reports on the number of officers in the Department of the Army and the number of officers on or with the Army General Staff, as of March 31, 1952 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Foo Cho-Lee, alias Joe Lee, from a report relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on March 17, 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON VIOLATION OF APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT FOR SUPPORT OF PRISONERS, 1952

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, reporting, pursuant to law, a violation of subsection (h), section 1211, Public Law 759, approved September 6, 1950, relating to appropriation entitled "Support of United States Prisoners, 1952"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

BURLEY TOBACCO FARM ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to burley tobacco farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of March 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SURVEY REPORT ON PECOS RIVER WATERSHED, NEW MEXICO AND TEXAS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a survey report of the Pecos River Watershed in New Mexico and Texas (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

INCLUSION OF GUAM UNDER PROVISIONS OF NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 62 of the National Defense Act (39 Stat. 166, 198), as amended (32 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 4c), to include Guam (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce, for the period January 1, 1952, through March 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD AND MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Maritime Board and the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON PERSONNEL OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD AND LIST OF CASES HEARD BY THE BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists containing the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers of the Board for the year ended June 30, 1951, together with a list of all cases heard during the period July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951, and the list of cases in which the Board rendered decisions during the period July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON CLAIM OF MENOMINEE TRIBE OF INDIANS V. UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the conclusion of the claim of the *Menominee Tribe of Indians, petitioner,* v. *United States of America, defendant* (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SESSION LAWS OF LEGISLATURE OF HAWAII

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Hawaii, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of Session Laws of Hawaii, special session, 1950, and regular session, 1951 (with an accompanying volume); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Sixty-two letters from the Chairman of the United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, Kansas City, Mo., transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of claims against the United States which have been concluded by the Commission (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Wilson Storage & Transfer Co., Inc.;
Ace Lines, Inc.;
Arkansas Motor Freight Lines, Inc.;
Floyd Green, Lena Green, and Herbert Jacobs, trustees for liquidation purposes of Ash Truck Lines, Inc.;
Matthew Leo McKeone, doing business as Red Ball Transfer Co.;
Bos Freight Lines, Inc.;
Brady Transfer & Storage Co., Inc.;
Brashear Freight Lines, Inc.;
Briggs Transfer Co.;
Perry A. Brooks, doing business as Brooks Truck Co.;
Alvin Brown, surviving partner of John Brown and Alvin Brown, doing business as Brown Transfer Co.;
Bruce Motor Freight, Inc.;
Earl F. Buckingham, Glen D. Buckingham, Harold B. Buckingham, and Oliver L. Buckingham, doing business as Buckingham Transportation Co.;
Commercial Freight Lines, Inc.;
Consolidated Freightways, Inc.;
Dakota Transfer & Storage Co., Inc.;
Charles W. Darling, doing business as Darling Transfer;
Denver Chicago Trucking Co., Inc.;
Des Moines Transportation Co., Inc.;
Glendenning Motorways, Inc.;
G. & P. Transportation Co., Inc.;
Gillette Motor Transport, Inc.;
George Hart, doing business as Hart Motor Express;
Hawkeye Motor Express, Inc.;
Lena Henneman, executrix of the estate of A. G. Henneman, deceased, successor in interest to A. G. Henneman, doing business as Henneman Transfer Co.;
Samuel Shapiro, surviving partner of Louis M. Shapiro and Samuel Shapiro, a partnership, doing business as Hennepin Transportation Co.;
Harry Hess, doing business as Hess Motor Express;
Hi-Speed Motor Express, Inc.;
Highway Motor Freight, Inc.;
Holdcroft Transportation Co.;
Urban J. Haas and Cyril H. Wissel, doing business as H. & W. Motor Express Co.;
Anna C. Koepp, administratrix of the estate of Ernest Robert Koepp, deceased, doing business as Koepp Trucking Service;
Eugene Pikovsky, special administrator of the estate of Hyman Pikovsky, deceased;
Lee Way Motor Freight, Inc.;
Century-Matthews Motor Freight, Inc., as successor in interest to Steve Bonello, doing business as Century Motor Freight and Matthews Freight Service, Inc.;
B. F. Iles, R. A. Brown, H. E. McKinney, doing business as Meadows Transfer Co., successors to Meadows Transfer, Inc.;
Merchants Motor Freight, Inc.;
McCoy Truck Lines, Inc.;
H. G. Nilles, J. C. Heisler, F. R. Scott, A. C. Elsholtz, Franklin J. Van Osdel, A. R. Mitchell, Ray Warner, W. E. Elsholtz, L. K. Naughton, Elzine Jacobson, R. J. Coughlin, Mrs. Carroll Page, Mrs. Wm. Elsholtz, Emma W. Freeman, E. E. Simonson, Interstate Seed & Grain Co., J. N. Kunkel, B. T. Rath, Jr., Eugene Rath, E. J. Schonberg, H. G. Sayler, owners of the Claim of Midnite Express, Inc.;
Midwest Motor Express, Inc.;
Arthur A. McCue, doing business as Minnesota-Wisconsin Truck Line and McCue Transfer Co.;
Rolland H. Kinney, doing business as Mohawk Freight Lines;
Howard Moland, Clarence Moland, Lothard Moland, and H. T. Moland, partnership doing business as Moland Bros. Trucking Co.;
Murphy Motor Freight Lines, Inc.;
Walter Petersen, doing business as Nielsen and Petersen;
Ralph M. Wallace and Isabel Wallace, a partnership doing business as Northwest Freight Lines;
On-Time Transfer Co.;
Frank H. Prucka, doing business as Frank H. Prucka Transportation Co.;
Raymond Bros. Motor Transportation, Inc.;
Riss & Co., Inc.;
Bos Truck Lines, Inc.;
Rohweder Truck Lines, Inc.;
Walter H. Schumacher, doing business as Schumacher Motor Express;
Takin Bros. Freight Lines, Inc.;
Harry E. Reynolds, as surviving partner of Harry E. Reynolds, and Norman Nold, a partnership doing business as Tri-State Transportation Co.;
Tri-State Motor Transport, Inc.;
Union Transfer Co., a corporation, doing business as Union Freightways;
The Chief Freight Lines Co.;
Witte Transportation Co., a corporation;
Watson Bros. Transportation Co., Inc.;
Werner Transportation Co., a corporation; and
C. E. Mickelson, receiver for Arthur F. Janke, doing business as Janke Transfer Co.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A telegram in the nature of a memorial from Harry A. Cobrin, executive secretary, Clothing Manufacturers' Association, New York, N. Y., remonstrating against the action of the Committee on Banking and Currency denying that association an opportunity to be heard in opposition to the so-called Fulbright amendment, relating to the clothing industry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a petition from sundry students of Germany, participating in the educational exchange program of the State Department, expressing appreciation for the opportunity of participating in the educational program; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Hawaii Farm Bureau Federation, Honolulu, T. H., favoring the enactment of House bill 4799, to amend section 73 (i) of the Hawaiian Organic Act relating to the acquisition of farm lots; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Department of Puerto Rico, San Juan, P. R., signed by F. S. Nishwitz, president, praying for the approval of a constitution for Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the municipal government of San Lorenzo, P. R., favoring the approval of the Constitution of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Resolutions adopted by the Sixty-first Continental Congress of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Washington, D. C., relating to the celebration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary year of independence, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Stevenson-DeLauncey Post, No. 79, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Meridian, Miss., relating to the methods employed by the United States Civil Service Commission in establishing rosters of eligibles for postmaster appointments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Chicago, Ill., relating to a survey of damage along the shore of Lake Michigan at Chicago caused by high lake levels and to compensate the owners of property from Federal funds for such damage, and so forth; to the Committee on Public Works.

A petition signed by sundry members of the Women's Society of Christian Service, of the Methodist Church of Turtle Lake, N. Dak., praying for the adoption of Senate Concurrent Resolution 61, providing for the equipment of a room in the Capitol to be used as a chapel by Members of Congress; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2621. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the State of Arizona; without amendment (Rept. No. 1600).

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 27, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 156) to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until June 15, 1952.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 3235. A bill for the relief of Rabbi Eugene Feigelstock; and

S. 3236. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Czerr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 3237. A bill for the relief of Achille Aquino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 3238. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war and conditions resulting from war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN (by request):

S. 3239. A bill to provide that United States commissioners who are required to devote full time to the duties of the office may be allowed their necessary office expenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 3240. A bill for the relief of Ichiro Iida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NEWSPRINT

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Newsprint. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me relating to the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 78) to establish a Joint Committee on Newsprint, submitted by Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado), was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Newsprint (referred to hereinafter as the "committee") which shall be composed of three Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate, and three Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selections.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the committee (1) to formulate a national policy to meet the immediate and future newsprint needs of the United States, considering specifically, the possible utilization of bagasse, cornstalks and other fibre producing crops, the possible further utilization of existing forest resources, the development of federally owned waterpower sites in the Tongass National Forest of Alaska and elsewhere with a view to long-term leases or contracts for power service to privately owned newsprint manufacturers, such changes in laws and regulations governing loaning services by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or other government corporations that might facilitate extension of capital loans to existing or new newsprint manufacturers, such changes in Federal laws that would facilitate the organization by newspaper publishers of cooperatively owned corporations for the purpose of manufacturing newsprint, and such changes in Federal laws or regulations that would permit part of the timber reserves in the Tongass National Forest to be reserved for ultimate newsprint manufacture; (2) to formulate a feasible set-aside program for a percentage of the output of newsprint produced by manufacturers assisted by the Federal Government through capital loans, long-term power contracts, timber leases or otherwise, but not involving price controls, rationing, or allocations by any Government agency, to the end that smaller newspapers, weeklies, semiweeklies, and dailies, shall be beneficiaries of any newsprint production program recommended to the Congress by the committee; and (3) to report to the Senate and the House of Representatives in a final report not later than December 31, 1952, the results of its investigation and study together with its recommendations. Such report may be made to the Secretary of the Senate if the Senate is not in session and to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized (1) to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties; and (2) to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel, of the various departments and agencies of the Government to the extent that such services, information, facilities, and personnel, in the opinion of such departments and agencies, can be furnished without undue interference with the performance of the work and duties of such departments and agencies; and (3) to request the assistance of not to exceed three representatives of private industry, having knowledge of the scientific, industrial, and economic problems involved in increasing newsprint production, in its deliberations and in preparing its report; and (4) to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-second Congress; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take such testimony; to have such printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services in reporting hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or any member of the committee designated by him and shall be served by any person designated by the chairman or any such member.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of disbursements so made.

The statement by Mr. CASE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE

Ownership of the Nation's newspapers is vested in thousands of individuals and companies, most of them small. This diversity of ownership means much to the country from the standpoint of the independence and freedom of our national press.

However, this diversity of ownership has made it impossible for the newspapers, individually or collectively, to gain control over the supply of the basic raw material of newspaper manufacture, newsprint. This control has been more difficult of attainment for the reason that another nation, Canada, has been supplying 90 percent of the newsprint used in the United States.

Because of this, newsprint supply is a national problem that must be considered nationally. Because the maintenance of a free and independent press is a prime essential of a democracy, newsprint supply is an important problem. And because the price of newsprint, governed by the cost of imports from another nation, has increased more than 100 percent since the end of World War II, jeopardizing the low-cost distribution of information to the American public, newsprint supply is now an urgent problem.

The security of our free press depends, to an important degree, on developing greater production of low-cost newsprint within the United States, its territories and possessions.

To formulate plans for accomplishing this on a national scale, I am introducing today a concurrent resolution in the Senate to set up a Joint Committee on Newsprint.

This committee would consist of three members from the Senate and three from the House of Representatives. It would have authority to request the assistance of three representatives of private industry, familiar with the scientific and economic problems of newsprint manufacture, in its deliberations and in preparing its report. The committee would make recommendations to the Eighty-third Congress.

There have been extensive congressional hearings on the subject of newsprint in almost every session of Congress during the past 10 or 12 years. The proposed committee would not duplicate these hearings but would devote itself to concentrated study and would recommend concrete action.

It appears that greater domestic newsprint production can be secured through greater use of domestic forest resources and through the use of relatively inexpensive fibers such as bagasse, cornstalks, and other farm waste.

The late Dr. Charles H. Herty struggled for decades and before his death saw news-

print made commercially from slash pine. Now the Herty Foundation Laboratories at Savannah, Ga., has made satisfactory newsprint from bagasse, the waste from sugarcane. It is claimed it would cost about 50 percent of what $126 Canadian newsprint costs. And, of course, many small users of print are paying more than $126, while, at the same time, they are much closer to sugarcane than to Canadian paper mills.

Commercial development of this product might be crowded into 2 or 3 years, instead of as many decades, if some encouragement can be provided.

Another possibility lies in the Juneau section of Alaska, where newsprint production from the Tongass National Forest has been talked about for some 30 years and where the forest will be taken over by nonnewsprint producers of paper products if no action is forthcoming.

I expect the proposed committee would consider all these possibilities and outline a comprehensive program for the Congress before next January. The program would permit a set-aside arrangement to assure weeklies and small dailies of a part of the increased production without the necessity of price control, rationing, or allocation by some Federal agency.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2594) to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952—AMENDMENTS

Mr. FERGUSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3086) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CASE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 3086, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 3086, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MOODY (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. BENTON, Mr. IVES, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr FERGUSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. NIXON, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. KILGORE, and Mr. AIKEN) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 3086, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 3086) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be read.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 11, strike out the quotation marks at the end of line 9, and between lines 9 and 10 insert the following:

"SEC. 537. None of the funds herein authorized to be appropriated shall be used to pay for personal services or printing, or for other expenses of the dissemination within the United States of general propaganda in support of the Mutual Security Program, or to pay the travel or other expenses outside the United States of any citizen or group of citizens of the United States for the purpose of publicizing such program within the United States."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 5768. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944;

H. R. 6857. An act to amend section 7a of the act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928;

H. R. 6943. An act to fix the seniority rights and service of Albert O. Raeder as sergeant in the District of Columbia Fire Department; and

H. R. 7253. An act to authorize the conveyance to the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum of certain parcels of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Albert F. Nufer, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Argentina.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. BYRD:

Address delivered by him before the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, in New York City, on April 24, 1952.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Text of radio broadcast by him of program No. 60 in the series entitled "Happenings in Washington."

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

Address entitled "Freedom of the Press and the United Nations," delivered by Senator BRICKER before the Blue Pencil Club, Columbus, Ohio, May 18, 1952.

Editorial in regard to campaigns for the presidential nomination, published in the Madison (Maine) Bulletin of May 15, 1952.

Editorial entitled "Mirror of World Opinion—Canada's Dollar," expressing appreciation by Canada for help given her by the United States, reprinted in the Christian Science Monitor, from the Ottawa (Canada) Journal.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

The voting record of Senator BREWSTER in support of legislation of concern to veterans from the time he entered Congress in 1934.

By Mr. IVES:

Statement by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, endorsing the 1952 campaign of the United Jewish Appeal.

Article entitled "Agencies' Merger Help to Business," published in the New York Times of May 25, 1952.

By Mr. STENNIS:

Sermon entitled "Christianity's Answer to Communism," delivered on May 18, 1952, at St. John's Church, Washington, D. C., by Dr. Charles W. Lowry, rector, All Saints Episcopal Church, Chevy Chase, Md.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

Article entitled "Aviation Honor for Chamberlin and Representative DORN," published in the New York Herald Tribune of May 22, 1952.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "Some Impulses Behind the Appropriations Ax," written by Arthur Krock, and published in the New York Times of May 27, 1952.

In asking to have this column published, I wish to state that I think the observations made by Mr. Arthur Krock should be considered seriously by all of us. Mr. Krock implies that there is real danger of politics being brought into consideration of the pending bill. I think we should consider carefully everything he says, but I sincerely hope that my colleagues will not in any way consider the political implications involved in the pending legislation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME IMPULSES BEHIND THE APPROPRIATIONS AX

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 26.—There is much more than election year politics to the drive in Congress to cut the national defense-foreign aid budget below a mark that enlightened and nonpartisan experts hold to be the peril point. The extra intensity of politics in a presidential election year is a powerful force. But other large elements are: distrust of the administration; conflicting testimony by its spokesmen—both military and economic; a belief that our European partners are not doing all they could and should; the fact that many billions previously appropriated for foreign aid remain unspent; a conviction among many Members of Congress that the economy of the United States has become the primary consideration of our security; the association of the Mutual Security Agency with party politics; and doubt of the judgment of our own armed services.

The wise and patriotic citizens who are striving to save the defense and foreign-aid programs from blind and angry strokes of the economy ax should take these factors into account. Perhaps if recognition were given to the provocations, these appeals to reason would fall on more receptive congressional ground. Perhaps this also would be the result if for years every major attempt to cut the budget had not been assailed edi-

torially with, "We are for economy, but this is not it."

In the mental backgrounds of many Senators and Representatives, when the time comes to vote on budget cuts, are these impressions or convictions:

1. Distrust of the administration. It has had some successes in foreign policy, but it has been obliged to move steadily forward toward the date when, according to repeated assurances, a stable world order would arise. It was slow in correcting the calamitous mistake made by Roosevelt in evaluating postwar Soviet policy, and some of those who were deeply involved in that mistake, and who long ignored documented proof that Soviet spies had infiltrated the Government, remain in high policy posts.

ERRORS NOT CONCEDED

The administration has never conceded its foreign policy errors, including the public notices Secretary of State Acheson gave to the Communists that Korea was not in our orbit of defense; the dust-settling concept that ended with the loss of China; the $3,700,000,000 loan to Great Britain that included no accounting arrangement; and the employment of ground troops on the Asian Continent without reserving to the United States the authority to bring this war to a military conclusion. And only recently there was a basic conflict in military testimony on whether rationing of ammunition was compelled in Korea by budget cuts.

2. Cooperation of Western Europe. Discouragement as to this has doubtless been lessened by the progress of the treaties in Bonn (restoring Western Germany to the family of non-Communist nations) and Paris (to create a single European army). But Congress uneasily awaits their parliamentary receptions and the terms of the guaranty against German withdrawal that the President agreed to recommend to the Capitol. Many Members, noting the slow pace toward an economic union in Europe, echo what is reported to have been General Eisenhower's comment: "What should be done can be done."

3. Our national economy. The argument that the larger risk to the United States in the world has become our mounting deficit and piling national debt has begun to dominate the mail Congressmen are getting from their constituents, and this is election year.

4. The judgment of the chiefs of our armed services. General MacArthur's attacks in this quarter have made an impact even on Members of Congress who think he deserved dismissal by the President and himself was guilty of a great blunder at the Yalu. And the alarming revelations of the weakness of our combat aircraft vis-à-vis Soviet Russia have brought persuasion that incompetence at the Pentagon is more to blame than congressional appropriation policy for the degree of our inferiority.

MR. HARRIMAN'S DUAL ROLE

5. Party politics in the Mutual Security Agency. Beneath the surface of the battle over the foreign aid budget is the adverse factor created by the candidacy of its Director, W. Averell Harriman, for the Democratic nomination for President. Inevitably this has put MSA into partisan politics. Republicans and Democrats who do not want to see Mr. Harriman in the White House feel he has invited certain pressures that his candidacy will make it hard for him to resist, especially since he has gone all out as the prolabor candidate and the most active critic of one of the two chief contenders for the Republication nomination, Senator TAFT.

The MSA distributes funds supplied by all the taxpayers of the United States, regardless of their political affiliations. For this reason the Director of the Marshall plan, Paul G. Hoffman, scrupulously avoided all contact with any form of politics or economic group interests while he was spending public funds for foreign aid. Mr. Harriman not only has deviated from this course, so plainly indicated for a bursar of money provided by all the people through a bipartisan Congress. He has based his Presidential claim on his devotion to the acts and policies of one faction of the Democratic Party that are the source of violent intraparty controversy.

This has stimulated opposition to the budget Mr. Harriman helped to draw and termed "untouchable at $7,900,000,000."

DEFERMENT OF COLLEGE STUDENTS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I do not want to be rated as a kill-joy and I am not opposed to some horse-play in our colleges and universities, but the recent panty raids carried on by students in many of the outstanding universities of the Nation are not wholesome for the morale of our boys who are fighting in Korea.

Not only that, the parents of these boys are expressing themselves in no uncertain terms in regard to the situation in letters to me.

Typical of these letters is one which reads:

BELLEVILLE, KANS., *May 22, 1952.*

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: I am enclosing a number of clippings of instances where college men are raiding women's dormitories. Probably 75 percent of these men are deferred from Army service for educational reasons.

We have one boy on the hospital ship *Haven*, anchored at Pusan, Korea, another boy stationed at Erding Air Base near Munich, Germany, and my brother, a recent enlistee, is in the Air Force.

These boys all come from the farm, but the draft crowded them. Suggest you use your influence to give these dormitory raiders a chance to do some raiding in Korea.

We strongly resent any college deferment. If a student rates college let the Army send them to their own schools.

Respectfully,

CHARLES MIKESELL.

ALEXANDER URSZU

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 762) for the relief of Alexander Urszu, which was, to strike out lines 11 and 12, inclusive, and insert "the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residents pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

Mr. McCARRAN. This is a private immigration bill. The amendment of the House merely transfers the quota deduction from the regular quota as was provided for in the Senate bill to the quota for displaced persons pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

PAULA SLUCKA (SLUCKI) AND ARIEL SLUCKI

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 997) for the relief of Paula Slucka (Slucki) and Ariel Slucki, which was, in line 10 strike out all after "deduct" down to and including "available" in line 12, and insert "two numbers from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)".

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is a private immigration bill. The amendment of the House merely transfers the quota deductions from the regular quota as was provided for in the Senate bill to the quota for displaced persons pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

MRS. MADELAINE VIALE MOORE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1372) for the relief of Mrs. Madelaine Viale Moore, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Madelaine Viale Moore insofar as is involved any conviction or admission of a crime by her of which the Department of Justice and the Department of State have knowledge on the date of enactment hereof.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is a private immigration bill. The amendment of the House merely changes the language so as to more particularly describe just what is being waived under the bill. The language does not change the intent of the bill in any respect.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

STEPHEN GOROVE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1679) for the relief of Stephen Gorove, which was, in line 10, strike out all after "the" down to and including "available" in line 11, and insert "number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is a private immigration bill. The amendment of the House merely transfers the quota deduction from the regular quota as was provided for in the Senate bill to the quota for displaced persons pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 66) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, which was, on page 5, strike out line 1.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is a concurrent resolution respecting the suspension of deportation of certain aliens. The House has amended the resolution by striking out a case which was withdrawn by the Attorney General.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GASOLINE TAX

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, on May 7 the Senate, by unanimous consent, passed S. 2703, a bill to provide a tax on gasoline sold in the District of Columbia. However, in the House, because of an interpretation of the constitutional provision relating to the raising of revenue, the House committee introduced their own bill, H. R. 6811, which is identical with S. 2703, and the bill was passed. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6811.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 6811) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a tax on motor vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 23, 1924, as amended, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6811) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 3086.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3086) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, we are anxious to complete consideration of this bill, as well as of other pending legislation. As I have previously said, we are trying to make a drive this week and next week to see how much can be accomplished, in order to determine whether or not the Congress can adjourn by July 5. I have talked with the distinguished minority leader. In order to accomplish our aim, we must expedite the consideration of legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that beginning tomorrow at 12 o'clock there be a limitation of debate on the pending measure as follows:

One hour on each amendment, to be divided equally, the time to be controlled by the proponent of the amendment and the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] in the event that he is against the amendment, and in the event he favors it, by the distinguished minority leader or any Senator he may designate; that the time for debate on the bill itself to be limited to 1 hour, to be divided equally and controlled, respectively, by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], or anyone designated by him; that all amendments must be germane; and that motions and appeals be also included in the limitation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That, beginning at the hour of 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday, May 28, 1952, debate upon the bill (S. 3086) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1950, and for other purposes, be limited as follows:

(1) One hour on each amendment or motion, including appeals, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and Mr. CONNALLY in the event he is opposed to such amendment or motion; otherwise by Mr. BRIDGES or someone designated by him: *Provided*, That no amendment or motion that is not germane to the subject matter of said bill shall be received; and

(2) One hour on the question of the final passage of the bill, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. BRIDGES.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask a question of the distinguished majority leader. I inquire what his plans are with respect to legislation to be considered after the Senate disposes of the mutual security bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. I was going to ask the same question of the distinguished majority leader. I was wondering whether the plan was to take up the controls bill immediately after the Senate disposes of the mutual security bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is planned to take up the defense production bill after the pending bill is disposed of. I understand that no appropriation bills are ready for action. Therefore, following action on the mutual security bill, we shall proceed immediately to the consideration of the defense production bill. It is my hope that we can finish consideration of the mutual security bill in the early afternoon tomorrow, and perhaps have a call of the calendar tomorrow evening.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, let me say with reference to the control bill, inasmuch as the distinguished majority leader has suggested that it will be taken up after we have concluded consideration of the mutual security bill and after a call of the calendar, that a good many amendments are to be proposed to title 4 and to title 5 as contained in the amendment reported by the committee in the nature of a substitute for the control bill. Title 4 refers to price and wage controls, and title 5 covers labor disputes. I have been discussing the matter with the minority leader, the majority leader, and the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who made a motion in committee to strike out title 4 and title 5.

I believe it would be the part of wisdom, for the benefit of all Senators, if, in considering the committee amendment, we proceed under a unanimous consent agreement to vote first on whether title 4 and title 5 shall be stricken out. If we are to spend a week in considering a great many amendments in order to perfect title 4 and title 5, and then later vote to strike out either or both titles as amended, a great deal of arduous work on the part of Senators will have been wasted after long sessions of the Senate.

I was wondering whether the majority leader and the minority leader have discussed the possibility of entering into a unanimous consent agreement along the line I have suggested. I appreciate the fact that perhaps it cannot be done today. On the other hand, if we do not enter into a unanimous consent agreement I shall have to move to suspend rule XVI of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Such an agreement could be entered into at this time, in order to proceed in that way when the bill is taken up by the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. In view of the fact that I spoke to the majority leader and the minority leader, since the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is in the Chamber, and knowing the situation we will face when the control bill comes before the Senate, I should like to ask the minority leader and the majority leader for their judgment on the suggestion I have made.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have discussed the subject with the distinguished minority leader and with the distinguished Senator from Illinois, and, so far as I know, there is no objection to such a procedure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate begins the consideration of the control bill (S. 2594) a motion to strike from the committee amendment title 4 or title 5, or to strike both titles, may be made, with the understanding and agreement that if the motion does not prevail, any amendment may thereafter be offered to either title.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida will state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the event the course of action suggested by the majority leader should be followed, would it preclude later the renewal of a motion to strike a title, provided amendments proposed to such title were agreed to or rejected, which might change the thinking of a Senator with reference to the desirability of retaining the particular title in the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the agreement suggested by the Senator from Arizona is entered into, the Chair would understand it to mean that a vote would first come on a motion to strike out title 4 and title 5. If the motion were defeated, any amendments would be in order to either title. If the motion prevailed, of course, that would end it, and there would be no title 4 or title 5 in the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. If I may renew my request for a ruling, I understand perfectly well that what the majority leader intends to do is to have a motion made based upon the question of whether title IV—that is the title which deals with price and wage controls—shall remain in the bill. Assuming that such a motion failed, amendments could be offered to title IV. The purpose of my question is to invite a ruling as to whether or not, after amendments have been offered and acted upon, it would be in order to again make a motion to strike title IV.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks it would be in order, after any amendments were agreed to with respect to either of the titles referred to, to move to strike out the title as amended.

Mr. McFARLAND. Of course the striking out would be by way of an amendment, rather than a motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has not seen the bill. Therefore the Chair does not know what the committee amendments may be. There may be one committee amendment. The Chair does not know about it. If a motion to strike out a title is voted on first and it prevails, that takes the title out of the bill. If the motion does not prevail, the title is open to amendment. In that event a motion could be made later to strike out the title as amended.

Mr. MAYBANK. In my judgment the ruling of the Chair is entirely correct. The reason I brought up the point was that it was our desire to ascertain whether the Senate would retain title IV or title V, or both, with the understanding that afterward, if either title were amended, and, as amended, it was unsatisfactory to any one Senator who voted to retain it in the bill, he could, so to speak, reverse himself and vote to strike out the title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. BRIDGES. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—it is my understanding that the unanimous-consent request asked for on the control bill—and of course we are looking somewhat to the future with respect to this agreement—has to do solely with a possible amendment to strike out certain titles of the bill, and, if such an amendment is rejected, to allow amendments to be proposed to the titles without prejudice.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is my understanding that the rule of the Senate provides that if an amendment is offered to strike out a title, and perfecting amendments are offered, it is necessary to vote on the perfecting amendments before it is possible to vote on the amendment to strike out a title. The purpose of the agreement is to get around that rule of the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? Let the Chair state what he understands the request to be. The unanimous-consent request is that when the control bill, S. 2594, is before the Senate, if a motion is made to strike out title 4 or title 5, such motion shall be first voted upon. If the motion prevails, that title goes out of the bill. If the motion does not prevail, amendments to the title are in order, as if the motion had not been made. Thereafter, if amendments are added to such a title, a motion would then be in order to strike out the title as amended.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

The Chair would like to congratulate the majority leader and the minority leader and all other Senators for the obviously sincere effort to make some progress. It is very pleasing to the Chair, one of whose duties it is, of course, to try to facilitate the transaction of business by the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK subsequently said: Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 2594) to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and I submit a report (No. 1599) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that minority views may be submitted later in the day by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], and be printed with the majority report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the minority views may be filed and printed, as requested by the Senator from South Carolina.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3086) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, yesterday I called the attention of the Senate to the No. 1 issue, volume 1, of the Mutual Security News, reflecting the political aspects of the mutual-security program.

I understand that copies of this publicity sheet were mailed to thousands of newspapers throughout the United States, with the accompanying card which I shall read. It is a return postal card:

MUTUAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington 25, D. C.:

Please add our name to the list of newspapers to receive Mutual Security News as issued. It is understood that it will be supplied without charge to us.

Newspaper .....
Publisher .....
Town or city.....
State .....

This postal card is evidence that the Mutual Security Agency is planning to spend, for propaganda purposes, thousands of the taxpayers' very important dollars which are involved in the pending authorization bill.

I am sure that Members of the Foreign Relations Committee which has reported the bill—and particularly the distinguished chairman of the committee—are amazed at the effrontery displayed by the officials of the Mutual Security Agency in proposing to undertake an extensive propaganda campaign to "sell" to the taxpayers of the United States the foreign spending program.

Mr. President, I had been engaged in newspaper work for most of my adult life prior to coming to Congress. I know that there may be some legitimate reason for disseminating information—although probably not so widely as in this case—dealing with the foreign spending program, merely from the standpoint of publicity and information which the people should have in regard to this important subject.

I am sure, however, that all other Members of the Senate will agree with me that when such publicity is handpicked and censored and controlled entirely by the public relations bureau within the Mutual Security Agency, the people of the United States will not get a true, impartial story concerning this program, but can expect only the propaganda which will justify the administration's spending of these billions of dollars abroad.

Mr. President, this morning, after having only partially recovered from the shock I received yesterday when I read a copy of No. 1, volume 1, of Mutual Security News, I was amazed when I read in today's Washington Post—and I assume practically every other Member of this body has read the same story—an article relating to 7-week tour of Europe, to be paid for by the Mutual Security Agency. Inasmuch as it is possible that some Members of the Senate may not yet have read the article, I shall go into detail regarding it, because I am sure all Senators should have this information.

The article reads as follows:

FARM EDITORS FLY TO EUROPE AS MSA PAYS

A 7-week tour of Europe by air, all expenses paid, is being provided a group of farm editors and farm organization leaders by the Mutual Security Agency, successor to the Economic Cooperation Administration.

The group left New York last night by Pan American plane. Its members will visit six or seven countries, a public relations officer for MSA told the Washington Post last night. They will return about July 10.

Estimates of the cost of the trip vary. Transportation to the places indicated by the schedule released by MSA alone would cost between $1,000 and $1,200 for each passenger, Transatlantic Airways report. One MSA official estimated the total cost if made at personal expense would be around $6,000 or $6,500.

On the trip are:

Radio editors: Claude Mahoney, farm program director, Columbia Broadcasting System; Samuel Schneider, president, Radio Farm Directors, KVOO, Tulsa, Okla.; C. W. Jackson, farm program director, KCMB, Kansas City, Mo., and Lawrence Haeg, farm program director, WCCO, Minneapolis, Minn.

Magazines: Earl McMunn, editor Ohio Farm, and correspondent, Capper Publications, Topeka, Kans.; Eugene Butler, the Progressive Farmer, Dallas, and Donald S. Watson, the New England Homestead, Springfield, Mass.

Farm organizations: Ted F. Berry, editor, Washington State Grange News, Seattle; R. S. Gilfillan, editor, Farmers Union Herald, St. Paul, Minn.; Gwynn Garnett, American Farm Bureau Federation, Washington, and Kit Haynes, National Council of Farmers Cooperatives, Washington.

Accompanying the party will be C. H. Bernhard, information specialist, MSA, and Eddy van der Veen, MSA photographer.

The group will arrive in Paris today, and will travel about France, Belgium, Luxemburg and the Netherlands until June 10, with several free days in Paris. On June 10 they will be flown to Rome, where they will visit all sections of Italy and all prominent Italian cities until June 15, when they will go by air to Bonn, Germany. After 2 weeks in Germany, they will go by air to Vienna for another 10-day visit, thence back to Paris. They will return about July 10.

Purpose of the trip, according to Thomas D. Durrance, foreign liaison officer at MSA, is to study the betterment in European rural living as the result of Marshall plan aid and the improvement of living standards and farm production.

That is the entire article which appeared in this morning's Washington Post.

Naturally, Mr. President, I was so amazed by the import and the implications of this news article, that I immediately began to make a check, to determine its authenticity. I looked in the New York newspapers and in other Washington newspapers, and I was surprised to find that in no other newspaper could I find an article along the same line, telling about this junket which has been arranged by the Mutual Security Agency at a time when this body, the Senate of the United States, has under consideration an authorization bill calling for billions of dollars to be spent abroad.

Finally, Mr. President, I called the Washington Post, to ascertain whether it had a "scoop" over other newspapers in the United States, in the case of this particular article. I was surprised to learn that probably that is the fact. Of course, Mr. President, agencies such as the Mutual Security Agency and the other Government bureaus and agencies which purvey public information and have press agents release thousands of circulars or hand-outs when they wish to have publicity of a certain kind reach the American people. But, Mr. President, in this instance I ascertained that the Washington Post had been invited to have a representative of its editorial department accompany this delegation, consequently it was aware of this trip; and because of the invitation it had received it was possible for it to have this very pertinent information at this time. I said, "Well, probably the MSA Press Agency issued several thousand of these releases." I was told that that was not the case, that it was reasonably certain that no publicity had been issued or released by MSA at this time, concerning this junket of publicity agents, editors, and other representatives of American newspapers and radio stations, to spend 7 weeks at public expense checking over the results of the Marshall plan and the ECA.

Yet, Mr. President, obviously more important than that is the implication that, in this election year, when such editors and other representatives will have returned to their respective homes within the United States, they will feel obligated to sell this foreign-aid program to the American people through the agencies of their respective newspapers and radio outlets.

What difference does it make, particularly at this time, what the results have been of the spending of these billions of dollars abroad, if newspapermen can make personal inspections and investigations, so that they may supply certain information to the American people? I know that this is not the only delegation of publicity men and women from this country whose expenses have been paid upon European junkets by MSA and by the State Department and other agencies.

One reason, Mr. President, why I feel compelled to mention this particular fact at this time is that throughout the United States there are newspapers, and people not connected with newspapers, who frequently criticize Members of Congress when they go abroad to make inspections or investigations. Critics immediately label such trips as junkets at public expense. I presume, Mr. President, it is all right for MSA to spend a great deal of money, amounting probably to several million dollars, in order to create favorable publicity in support of the foreign-aid program, whereas if a Member of Congress in the discharge of his official duties were to undertake a comparable trip abroad, he would be subjected to the charge of being on a junket—an unnecessary junket—at public expense.

It may be interesting to note, Mr. President, that a recent official report, submitted by the United States Civil Service Commission, indicates that currently there are about 96,350 civilian employees working abroad, in addition to about 85,000 civilian employees working in our various Territories and possessions. So 96,350 civilian employees are working outside the United States and outside our Territories and possessions. I suppose several thousand of them are engaged in the promotion of MSA and other spending programs which currently are involving many billions of dollars.

I should like to call the attention of the Senators, particularly the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations—because I know they are sincerely eager to see that this program is successful—to certain figures submitted recently in a report by the United States Department of Commerce, showing that from the beginning of World War II to December 31, 1951, a total of $83,000,000,000 had been expended abroad. I shall not take the time to tell about the MSA program, the UNRRA and other similar programs, and various other spending programs abroad, because all Members of this body are fully conversant with those programs. I understand that during the present year $16,000,000,000 are available for various spending programs abroad. The mutual security bill, as recommended by the President, would have made available another $8,000,000,000, making a total of $112,000,000,000 to be spent abroad within the short period of 12 years.

Mr. President, it is unfortunate that any Member of this body should rise upon the floor of the Senate and suggest that if we cut this appropriation for foreign spending we would be turning our back upon our allies.

Mr. President, as a Member of the Senate I resent such an insinuation. I think the Members of this body should recognize their responsibilities and obligations to reflect the thinking of the people of the United States, who are being called upon to pay burdensome taxes to meet a budget of $80,000,000,000, or $85,000,000,000, and the attending inflationary annual deficits. Yet when Members of this body, charged with the responsibility of authorizing appropriations for the Executive Department, undertake to cut by a single dollar any of these spending programs, the representatives of the Commander in Chief stand upon this floor to criticize those of us who believe we are trying to serve the interests of our people who pay the taxes. We must maintain a strong domestic economy, so that, in exercising our leadership in U. N. and NATO and other organizations, we shall be able to help not only ourselves in resisting Red aggression, but also be in a much stronger position to help the free countries with whom we are identified at this time.

Mr. President, I think it behooves the Senate to reflect seriously, if only for a few moments, upon a bill of this magnitude, when it is recognized that no partisanship should be involved. On past occasions, and also during the current debate, we have heard many speakers point out that we ought to have a bipartisan approach. Mr. President, I ask, How can we have mutual understanding and confidence and a bipartisan approach at a time when Averell Harriman, Director of the Mutual Security Agency, is spending all his time, and probably the taxpayers' dollars, traveling over the United States, building himself up as a potential Presidential candidate?

If the party to which he belongs wants Harriman for its nominee, that is its business. But, Mr. President, how can we, the Members of this body, have a nonpartisan approach to the solution of

such problems as those involving the spending of billions of dollars abroad, at a time when we know there is political chicanery, political strategy, and political planning in the minds of Mr. Harriman and his associates, who, I fear, are utilizing the MS program in this particular case to advance their own political interests?

Mr. President, I am calling the attention of this body to these facts, and I am appealing to members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, who are sincere men, to join with me in supporting the amendment which I have submitted, restricting the use of money for such propaganda as is reflected in the MS News, which it is probably planned to issue at intervals throughout the year, and for sending delegations of newspaper editors abroad. I think it needs no real argument to convince Members of this body that in this program we can find little but partisan politics, in addition to the unnecessary spending of millions of dollars which could better be used at home, or upon legitimate projects under the MS Agency abroad.

Mr. President, I have hesitated to make this speech. I have been very reluctant to make it, because I have thought that we should keep this debate on a much higher plane. But I submit that when the MSA undertakes propaganda programs, it immediately becomes the responsibility of every Member of the Senate to investigate some of those activities, and to put restraints upon this spending. Furthermore, if the American people are to continue to support foreign-aid programs, involving billions of dollars, then certainly they should have absolute assurances that partisan politics by the MSA is not an important part of such programs. This is the objective of my amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senate is confronted today with a vitally important but essentially simple proposition.

We have committed six divisions of ground troops to Europe.

We have committed 12 air wings to Europe.

We have established bases in Europe for those divisions and those wings.

We are signatories to the North Atlantic Treaty.

The question before us now is how much money we are going to authorize to back up the men in those divisions and the men in those wings. We are here to determine the extent to which we will support the bases that we have and our treaty obligations.

The Bureau of the Budget—the administration's official spokesman—set the figure at $7,900,000,000. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee both held hearings on that proposal.

In the Senate Armed Services Committee, we called the following witnesses to explain the measure: Secretary of Defense Robert A. Lovett; Secretary of State Dean Acheson; Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Omar N. Bradley; Director for Mutual Security W. Averell Harriman; Secretary of the Air Force Thomas K. Finletter.

In addition to testimony from these gentlemen, we received a cabled statement from Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower commenting on the adequacy of the program.

These are the men to whom we have entrusted the defense of the United States. These are the men to whom we look for the safety and security of our Nation and for leadership in the struggle to defend the principles of freedom upon which this country was founded.

I believe we should consider their testimony carefully. I believe we must give heavy weight to their conclusions and their recommendations. Here is what they said:

The Secretary of Defense said:

> If it is important that we stand firm against attack, it is equally important that our friends are in position to stand firm beside us; that, as the Committee knows, is the basis of the Mutual Security Act.

The Secretary of State said:

> I should like to have an opportunity to say, with a great deal of conviction, to the Committee that I think any reduction in the amount asked for will have very harmful results to the security of the United States.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said:

> The Mutual Security Program is the keystone of the whole collective-security effort of the free world. Without it, the time when we will reach a position of relative security is too far distant and the risk is too great.

The Director for Mutual Security said:

> This program is less costly than any other means by which we may seek to insure our security.

The Secretary of the Air Force, discussing certain types of equipment, said:

> You are buying more security by sending them to NATO than by keeping them here.

General Eisenhower said:

> My personal view is that any cut for this year of much greater magnitude than $1,000,000,000 would in the long run be uneconomic if we are to carry on to the reasonable level of collective security that our own safety demands.

Mr. President, the substance of this testimony can be summed up in two short sentences.

First, the collective defense of Europe and the free world is essential to our survival as a free Nation.

Second, since we have adopted that principle, we must support it with sufficient military and economic strength to insure that the job is done.

That is the viewpoint of our defense leaders. That is the viewpoint to which Congress committed itself when it voted originally to authorize these programs. That is why we have sent 6 divisions and 12 air wings to Europe.

I believe this request can be cut. I have signified already my approval of a 12½-percent cut and I am going to vote to sustain that cut. If a similar cut were made in the entire budget, we would have nearly $9,000,000,000.

But I do not believe we can go below that figure. In my opinion, to cut further would be to risk a dangerous cut in the adequacy of the whole program. It would mean endangering the security of the soldiers we have already sent overseas.

We have spent billions of dollars in getting a start on this program for collective defense. I, for one, cannot pull out at this point. Those who voted against the program from the start can vote without inconsistency now to abandon that which has so painstakingly been built.

But I do not believe the rest of us—the majority of Congress—can consistently follow their lead.

We are, of course, compelled by the realities of economies to cut somewhere along the line. There are not enough resources, facilities, or trained men in the free world to give us everything we should like to have or even everything we need at the time we need it.

We shall not serve either ourselves or the free world by going bankrupt. But neither shall we serve ourselves by abandoning the men and the materials we have committed already to the defense of the free world.

This is a situation which requires the most careful and cold-blooded calculations. We must balance our economic strength and military potential against the threat to our survival. And we must weigh in that balance the realization that every day in which we postpone the attainment of an adequate defense is 1 day further from national safety.

Let us pause for a moment and see precisely what we are doing when we cut the Mutual Security appropriation.

Every $133,000,000 we cut from this bill could result in the loss of one European division to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Every $25,000,000 we cut from this bill could result in the loss of one fighter-bomber squadron.

Every $400,000 we cut from this bill could silence the artillery of one division for a complete day.

To my mind, these are figures of the most serious magnitude. These are the facts which we must consider soberly when we approach this problem.

We can, if we desire, lose ourselves in a maze of percentages. We can argue about a 10-percent cut or a 12½-percent cut, or a 30-percent cut. But under no circumstances should we forget the one overriding percentage figure.

It would be the utmost of folly to be only 10-, 50-, or even 90-percent prepared for a 100-percent war.

Mr. President, let me repeat. I am going to support a 12½-percent cut in this bill as it came to us from the Bureau of the Budget. I am going to vote for a slice of $1,000,000,000 from the $7,900,000,000 which was requested.

I am supporting that cut because I believe that the billion dollars would buy things that are desirable but not absolutely necessary. I hope that this will enable our leaders to eliminate waste without endangering the program.

These are times of staggering economic burdens. Our people are being taxed as they have never before been taxed. Our wealth and our resources are being poured into the greatest military

machine we have ever built in what is technically known as peacetime.

The impact of these burdens is felt by all of us. Throughout the country, the cry is for economy. The Congress is quite properly responding to that call.

The people want us to cut out the waste and it is our duty to heed their expressed desire. But we must remember that there is no waste as great as a job half done.

We do not restrict a wounded soldier to a pint of blood when 2 pints are needed to save his life.

We do not ration a fighting plane to gas for 500 miles when it must fly 800 miles to attack the enemy.

It would be cheaper in terms of money to buy only the pint of blood. But then we would lose both the blood and the soldier. It would be cheaper in terms of money to buy only the gas for 500 miles. But then we would lose the gas, the airplane, and the pilot.

Similarly, it would be cheaper in terms of money to provide our allies, including our six divisions, with only half of what they need to fight communism. But if we make that decision, we shall do so at the risk of losing our six divisions, our allies, and freedom—freedom for ourselves and our posterity.

The lessons of all history are clear. No nation stands to lose so much as the nation that is unwilling to do those things which its security requires. No people can survive who are fearful of the task that is before them.

The task that is before us is obvious. It is to protect ourselves, our children, our free institutions, from the threat of tyranny.

We can, if we wish, turn our faces from the rest of the free world. We can, if we wish, decide to walk alone. We can, if we wish, close our eyes as our neighbors, one by one, are driven from their houses by thieves.

But let us not deceive ourselves as to what we are doing. It does not require all-seeing wisdom to foretell the fate of our allies should we decide to let them "go it alone." The future is written already in the pattern of world-wide Communist aggression. They would fall, and with them would go the six divisions and 12 wings already in Europe.

It does not require divine knowledge to foretell the future of the United States should we permit the rest of the free world to fall. We would lie huddled behind two oceans, seeking frantically to build greater and even greater defenses against what would eventually be the onslaught of the rest of the globe.

Our sea frontiers would be New York Harbor and San Francisco Bay. Our air defenses would be based upon Chicago, Pittsburgh, Birmingham, and Dallas. Our front lines would be the streets and avenues of our great cities and the broad and fertile acres of our plains.

Mr. President, I know there is no serious intent here to abandon Europe and the free world entirely. I do not believe that is the temper of this Congress. I know that is not the temper of our people. But by temporizing, by faint-hearted measures, by half steps, we can gain nothing but a postponement of the evil day.

We must face frankly the fact that the defense of the free world today is impossible without our bold, whole-hearted cooperation. We must acknowledge to ourselves that we and only we have the strength and the resources among the free nations to guide our own destiny.

The other free nations of the earth are spent and exhausted from two world wars which devastated their lands and scarred their cities. They must look to us for leadership.

Their determination to resist will be no greater than ours. That which we cut from this program they may match with cuts of their own. And every cut by any of us means just that much less support for the 6 divisions and the 12 air wings we have committed already.

There are strong temptations bearing upon all of us to take heavy whacks at this bill with a meat cleaver. Those temptations present themselves with particular force in an election year. But I believe there is a rule of thumb for charting a course through the political storms.

No political life is worth a soldier's life. I think that is axiomatic, and the American people will hold us to that axiom.

Mr. President, we have 6 divisions and 12 air wings which we have committed to Europe. Those 6 divisions and 12 air wings, together with their supporting units, represent men, American men.

Should the day come that our common enemy cast the die and turn the cold war into a hot war, those men would bear the brunt of the onslaught. I want none of them to be able to look at me and say:

"Why did you refuse us the support that might have saved us? Why did you abandon us to our fate?"

Mr. President, I am a strong advocate of real economy. My whole record as chairman of the Senate Preparedness Committee is evidence of that point. I am not of the opinion that Presidential recommendations must be accepted without question.

There unquestionably has been waste in both our military and nonmilitary expenditures. It is our responsibility to exercise close control over the Nation's purse and eliminate some of that waste.

Therefore, I am supporting the pending bill as it was brought to the floor of the Senate by two standing committees of the Senate. I believe the cuts they have made are judicious, and afford an opportunity to eliminate waste.

I urge my colleagues to stand by those committees.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names.

Aiken	Dworshak	Ives
Anderson	Eastland	Jenner
Bennett	Ferguson	Johnson, Colo.
Bricker	Fulbright	Johnson, Tex.
Bridges	George	Kem
Butler, Nebr.	Gillette	Kilgore
Byrd	Green	Lehman
Carlson	Hayden	Lodge
Case	Hendrickson	Long
Chavez	Hickenlooper	Malone
Connally	Hoey	Martin
Cordon	Holland	Maybank
Dirksen	Humphrey	McCarran
Douglas	Hunt	McCarthy
McFarland	O'Mahoney	Smith, N. C.
McKellar	Pastore	Stennis
Millikin	Robertson	Watkins
Moody	Russell	Welker
Morse	Schoeppel	Williams
Mundt	Smathers	Young
Neely	Smith, Maine	
Nixon	Smith, N. J.	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS and Mr. UNDERWOOD], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. BRIDGES. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Conference of the International Council for Christian Leadership at The Hague.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as I understand, the vote about to be taken is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], for himself and 10 other Members of the Senate, which would reduce the amount in the pending bill by $1,000,000,000, apportioned among 13 items in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is correct in his understanding. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], for himself and other Senators.

Mr. DIRKSEN and other Senators demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as I understand, the vote is on the $1,000,000,000 amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote about to be taken is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], for himself and other Senators.

Mr. CONNALLY. I desire to advise the Members of the Senate that this would be a disastrous amendment if it were adopted. All authorities, military and high civilian, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff and General Eisenhower, regard the proposed cut of $1,000,000,000 as disastrous. Such a cut would probably force a reconsideration of the whole defensive set-up in Europe. I certainly hope that the Senate will not adopt such an amendment.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] for himself and other Senators. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAYBANK (when his name was called). On this vote I have a live pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]. If the Senator from Connecticut were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS and Mr. UNDERWOOD], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce that the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is paired on this vote with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. If present and voting, the senior Senator from Maryland would vote "nay" and the junior Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

I announce also that on this vote the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Delaware would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR and Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "nay."

I announce also that if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] would vote "yea."

Mr. BRIDGES. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BEATON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Conference of the International Council for Christian Leadership at The Hague.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would each vote "nay."

On this vote the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is paired with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. If present and voting the junior Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the senior Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. If present and voting the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting the Senator from Washington would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. If present and voting the Senator from Montana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maine would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—27

Bennett	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Bricker	Jenner	Mundt
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Butler, Nebr.	Kem	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Long	Smith, N. C.
Case	Malone	Watkins
Cordon	Martin	Welker
Dirksen	McCarthy	Williams
Dworshak	McKellar	Young

NAYS—35

Aiken	Hendrickson	Moody
Anderson	Hoey	Morse
Carlson	Holland	Neely
Chavez	Humphrey	Nixon
Connally	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Ives	Pastore
Eastland	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Fulbright	Kilgore	Russell
George	Lehman	Smathers
Gillette	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Green	McCarran	Stennis
Hayden	McFarland	

NOT VOTING—34

Benton	Hennings	Murray
Brewster	Hill	O'Conor
Butler, Md.	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cain	Kefauver	Seaton
Capehart	Kerr	Sparkman
Clements	Knowland	Taft
Duff	Langer	Thye
Ecton	Magnuson	Tobey
Ellender	Maybank	Underwood
Ferguson	McClellan	Wiley
Flanders	McMahon	
Frear	Monroney	

So the amendment offered by Mr. WELKER, for himself and other Senators, was rejected.

Mr. FERGUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, when the last vote was taken, I had been called from the Chamber; and while I was in the President's room I did not hear the bell which signalled the vote. Had I been in the Chamber, I would have voted in the affirmative. I wish to have this explanation appear in the RECORD following the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I call up the amendment, which previously has been submitted, and which now lies on the table. The amendment is offered by me, on behalf of myself, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this amendment would cut by $500,000,000 the amount now authorized by the mutual security bill; in other words, the cut made by this amendment would be half as much as that proposed in my previous amendment, which has just been rejected.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield for a question?

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The $500,000,000 cut proposed by this amendment, when added to the cut made by the commit-

tee amendment, would constitute a cut of approximately $200,000,000 less than the cut voted by the House of Representatives, would it not? In other words, if this amendment should be adopted, the total cut then made by the Senate in the amount of the authorization would be approximately $200,000,000 less than the cut voted by the House of Representatives. Is that correct?

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, as best I recall, this amendment, if adopted, would result in reducing by approximately $225,000,000 the cut voted by the House of Representatives. As I understand, the House of Representatives has voted a cut of $1,725,000,000, or approximately that amount. This amendment, if adopted by the Senate, would result in a total cut of $1,000,000,0000, which is the amount of the committee amendment, plus $500,000,0000. At the same time it would represent a decrease in the cut which has been voted by the House of Representatives.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Do I correctly understand that if the pending amendment of the Senator from Idaho is adopted, the Senate will be voting, in total, for a larger amount of authorization than the House of Representatives has voted?

Mr. WELKER. That is correct.

Mr. President, perhaps I have not made clear the effect of the amendment. By means of this amendment, if it is adopted, we shall be voting, in total amount, a larger amount of authorization—larger in the amount of approximately $225,000,000, I believe—than the amount of authorization voted last week by the House of Representatives.

Mr. BRIDGES. Vote!

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I very much hope this amendment will not prevail.

Personally, I think it is a mistake—and I wish to emphasize this point as strongly as I possibly can—to cut anything from the amount recommended by the President of the United States and by the Bureau of the Budget. The authorizations provided by the bill have been passed on by two great committees of the Senate, the Foreign Relations Committee and the Committee on Armed Services. Those committees, in their wisdom, have reported—reluctantly, I believe, in the case of some of the members of the committees—a cut of $1,000,000,000 in the amount of authorization proposed in the bill as submitted by the President. I believe that cut is far too great; indeed, in my judgment there should be no cut whatsoever, but the two great committees referred to base their judgment upon the testimony of men in whom we must place our confidence, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Air, and General Eisenhower, all of whom have stated that it would subject this country to great risk if the budget were cut below the point which has been recommended by the two committees.

As pointed out yesterday by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], it is, of course, possible to economize. If we desired to economize, we could cut out the entire amount needed for mutual security. But that would not help our country, it would not promote the peace of the world. We cannot at this time afford to go back on the commitments we have made to our allies. In my opinion, it is important not only that we strengthen ourselves militarily to the fullest possible extent, but also that we strengthen the allies and friends we have abroad, who stand shoulder to shoulder with us in the hope of making this a world of security and of lasting peace.

I know, of course, that it would be possible to make a cut of $1,000,000,000, $2,000,000,000, or more, and then, as the Senator from Texas has pointed out, to go home to talk about it in our Fourth of July orations, and try to impress the people with the tremendous step in economy which had been taken. That, Mr. President, would not save our country.

Either we have an emergency situation in which the security of the free world, including ourselves, is threatened, or we have not. If such an emergency exists, we cannot afford to reduce the appropriations below the line of safety. If we did not have such a threat hanging over us—and I know it does hang over us, as I believe every other Senator in his heart knows it does—we still would not dare cut below the line of safety. I believe the amount of $6,900,000,000 which has been recommended by the two committees, after weeks and weeks devoted to a study of the bill and to the hearing of men who are expert on this subject, men in whom we must place our confidence, is the minimum the Senate should vote.

It is proposed to make an arbitrary, proportional cut not based upon any real study. It cannot be said that money is not needed for this purpose or for that purpose; it cannot be said that money is being wasted upon this activity or that activity, and yet it is proposed to make a blanket cut across-the-board. In my opinion at least that would jeopardize the safety and security of the United States.

Mr. President and Senators, I know that you are all actuated by the same patriotic motives which I believe actuate me. I urge from the bottom of my heart, that this cut be not made, and that the amendment be rejected. To agree to this amendment would jeopardize the security of our country and the security of the entire free world. It would be a step backward in our quest for peace. After all, Mr. President, what we seek is security with peace.

Mr. President, I cannot emphasize too strongly my belief that it would be a mistake to cut a single cent from the $7,900,000,000 which was contained in the bill when submitted to the Congress. I am aware that my views on that subject will not prevail; but, as I view it, every cent taken from that amount would weaken our defenses, would weaken our power to resist Communist aggression, and would weaken the support from our friends and allies, for which we would otherwise hope.

Mr. President, I have listened to hours and hours of oratory in the Senate regarding the menace of communism, and regarding the manner in which we should combat it. With about nine-tenths of that I agree. I think communism is a serious and dangerous threat, which, unless we are alert and are active and vigorous in opposition, may engulf the free world.

Mr. KILGORE rose.

Mr. LEHMAN. But here we are proposing to weaken our power to fight communism. We know what has happened in the world. Deep down in our hearts we know what may happen. Mr. President, and Senators, I cannot state how strongly I hope that this amendment will be defeated. I have never been more sure of anything in my life than I am that we cannot at this time afford, by curtailing the spending of money for mutual security, to jeopardize our power of defense, our power of resistance, our power to oppose aggression and, if aggression should come, our power to repel it. Do not weaken that effort. Vote down this amendment.

I now yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, is it not a fact that in building up the industrial potential of Western Europe, in addition to building up their morale, we are also building up the possibility of their manufacturing for their own needs, for their own defense, along with helping our own defense? Is not that correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. It is absolutely correct.

Mr. KILGORE. In other words, as we help them to get their plants going we are helping them to construct things necessary in defense of democratic ideals in this country and in Western Europe, are we not?

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator is completely correct.

Mr. KILGORE. In addition to that, we are building up the morale of the people with the full knowledge that we are supporting them. There has been a feeling abroad that we might quit, as has been done in the past, and therefore, that possibly they had better compromise. If we plant the compromise theory in their minds, we thereby weaken their will to resist.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is correct. I may say to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia that, in my opinion—and this has been testified to in hearings before the committee—every dollar we cut from the allocations to our European allies for the building up of their armed forces, for the manufacture of munitions, for the preparation of adequate defensive measures, instead of resulting in saving a dollar, will cost the United States $3, assuming that we intend to defend our liberty, assuming we propose to protect our security, and

Mr. DIRKSEN and other Senators demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as I understand, the vote is on the $1,000,000,000 amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote about to be taken is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], for himself and other Senators.

Mr. CONNALLY. I desire to advise the Members of the Senate that this would be a disastrous amendment if it were adopted. All authorities, military and high civilian, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff and General Eisenhower, regard the proposed cut of $1,000,000,000 as disastrous. Such a cut would probably force a reconsideration of the whole defensive set-up in Europe. I certainly hope that the Senate will not adopt such an amendment.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] for himself and other Senators. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAYBANK (when his name was called). On this vote I have a live pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]. If the Senator from Connecticut were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS and Mr. UNDERWOOD], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce that the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is paired on this vote with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. If present and voting, the senior Senator from Maryland would vote "nay" and the junior Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

I announce also that on this vote the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Delaware would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR and Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "nay."

I announce also that if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] would vote "yea."

Mr. BRIDGES. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Conference of the International Council for Christian Leadership at The Hague.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would each vote "nay."

On this vote the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is paired with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. If present and voting the junior Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the senior Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. If present and voting the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting the Senator from Washington would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. If present and voting the Senator from Montana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maine would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—27

Bennett	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Bricker	Jenner	Mundt
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Butler, Nebr.	Kem	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Long	Smith, N. C.
Case	Malone	Watkins
Cordon	Martin	Welker
Dirksen	McCarthy	Williams
Dworshak	McKellar	Young

NAYS—35

Aiken	Hendrickson	Moody
Anderson	Hoey	Morse
Carlson	Holland	Neely
Chavez	Humphrey	Nixon
Connally	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Ives	Pastore
Eastland	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Fulbright	Kilgore	Russell
George	Lehman	Smathers
Gillette	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Green	McCarran	Stennis
Hayden	McFarland	

NOT VOTING—34

Benton	Hennings	Murray
Brewster	Hill	O'Conor
Butler, Md.	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cain	Kefauver	Seaton
Capehart	Kerr	Sparkman
Clements	Knowland	Taft
Duff	Langer	Thye
Ecton	Magnuson	Tobey
Ellender	Maybank	Underwood
Ferguson	McClellan	Wiley
Flanders	McMahon	
Frear	Monroney	

So the amendment offered by Mr. WELKER, for himself and other Senators, was rejected.

Mr. FERGUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, when the last vote was taken, I had been called from the Chamber; and while I was in the President's room I did not hear the bell which signalled the vote. Had I been in the Chamber, I would have voted in the affirmative. I wish to have this explanation appear in the RECORD following the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I call up the amendment, which previously has been submitted, and which now lies on the table. The amendment is offered by me, on behalf of myself, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this amendment would cut by $500,000,000 the amount now authorized by the mutual security bill; in other words, the cut made by this amendment would be half as much as that proposed in my previous amendment, which has just been rejected.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield for a question?

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The $500,000,000 cut proposed by this amendment, when added to the cut made by the commit-

tee amendment, would constitute a cut of approximately $200,000,000 less than the cut voted by the House of Representatives, would it not? In other words, if this amendment should be adopted, the total cut then made by the Senate in the amount of the authorization would be approximately $200,000,000 less than the cut voted by the House of Representatives. Is that correct?

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, as best I recall, this amendment, if adopted, would result in reducing by approximately $225,000,000 the cut voted by the House of Representatives. As I understand, the House of Representatives has voted a cut of $1,725,000,000, or approximately that amount. This amendment, if adopted by the Senate, would result in a total cut of $1,000,000,0000, which is the amount of the committee amendment, plus $500,000,0000. At the same time it would represent a decrease in the cut which has been voted by the House of Representatives.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Do I correctly understand that if the pending amendment of the Senator from Idaho is adopted, the Senate will be voting, in total, for a larger amount of authorization than the House of Representatives has voted?

Mr. WELKER. That is correct.

Mr. President, perhaps I have not made clear the effect of the amendment. By means of this amendment, if it is adopted, we shall be voting, in total amount, a larger amount of authorization—larger in the amount of approximately $225,000,000, I believe—than the amount of authorization voted last week by the House of Representatives.

Mr. BRIDGES. Vote!

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I very much hope this amendment will not prevail.

Personally, I think it is a mistake—and I wish to emphasize this point as strongly as I possibly can—to cut anything from the amount recommended by the President of the United States and by the Bureau of the Budget. The authorizations provided by the bill have been passed on by two great committees of the Senate, the Foreign Relations Committee and the Committee on Armed Services. Those committees, in their wisdom, have reported—reluctantly, I believe, in the case of some of the members of the committees—a cut of $1,000,000,000 in the amount of authorization proposed in the bill as submitted by the President. I believe that cut is far too great; indeed, in my judgment there should be no cut whatsoever, but the two great committees referred to base their judgment upon the testimony of men in whom we must place our confidence, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Air, and General Eisenhower, all of whom have stated that it would subject this country to great risk if the budget were cut below the point which has been recommended by the two committees.

As pointed out yesterday by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], it is, of course, possible to economize. If we desired to economize, we could cut out the entire amount needed for mutual security. But that would not help our country, it would not promote the peace of the world. We cannot at this time afford to go back on the commitments we have made to our allies. In my opinion, it is important not only that we strengthen ourselves militarily to the fullest possible extent, but also that we strengthen the allies and friends we have abroad, who stand shoulder to shoulder with us in the hope of making this a world of security and of lasting peace.

I know, of course, that it would be possible to make a cut of $1,000,000,000, $2,000,000,000, or more, and then, as the Senator from Texas has pointed out, to go home to talk about it in our Fourth of July orations, and try to impress the people with the tremendous step in economy which had been taken. That, Mr. President, would not save our country.

Either we have an emergency situation in which the security of the free world, including ourselves, is threatened, or we have not. If such an emergency exists, we cannot afford to reduce the appropriations below the line of safety. If we did not have such a threat hanging over us—and I know it does hang over us, as I believe every other Senator in his heart knows it does—we still would not dare cut below the line of safety. I believe the amount of $6,900,000,000 which has been recommended by the two committees, after weeks and weeks devoted to a study of the bill and to the hearing of men who are expert on this subject, men in whom we must place our confidence, is the minimum the Senate should vote.

It is proposed to make an arbitrary, proportional cut not based upon any real study. It cannot be said that money is not needed for this purpose or for that purpose; it cannot be said that money is being wasted upon this activity or that activity, and yet it is proposed to make a blanket cut across-the-board. In my opinion at least that would jeopardize the safety and security of the United States.

Mr. President and Senators, I know that you are all actuated by the same patriotic motives which I believe actuate me. I urge from the bottom of my heart, that this cut be not made, and that the amendment be rejected. To agree to this amendment would jeopardize the security of our country and the security of the entire free world. It would be a step backward in our quest for peace. After all, Mr. President, what we seek is security with peace.

Mr. President, I cannot emphasize too strongly my belief that it would be a mistake to cut a single cent from the $7,900,000,000 which was contained in the bill when submitted to the Congress. I am aware that my views on that subject will not prevail; but, as I view it, every cent taken from that amount would weaken our defenses, would weaken our power to resist Communist aggression, and would weaken the support from our friends and allies, for which we would otherwise hope.

Mr. President, I have listened to hours and hours of oratory in the Senate regarding the menace of communism, and regarding the manner in which we should combat it. With about nine-tenths of that I agree. I think communism is a serious and dangerous threat, which, unless we are alert and are active and vigorous in opposition, may engulf the free world.

Mr. KILGORE rose.

Mr. LEHMAN. But here we are proposing to weaken our power to fight communism. We know what has happened in the world. Deep down in our hearts we know what may happen. Mr. President, and Senators, I cannot state how strongly I hope that this amendment will be defeated. I have never been more sure of anything in my life than I am that we cannot at this time afford, by curtailing the spending of money for mutual security, to jeopardize our power of defense, our power of resistance, our power to oppose aggression and, if aggression should come, our power to repel it. Do not weaken that effort. Vote down this amendment.

I now yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, is it not a fact that in building up the industrial potential of Western Europe, in addition to building up their morale, we are also building up the possibility of their manufacturing for their own needs, for their own defense, along with helping our own defense? Is not that correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. It is absolutely correct.

Mr. KILGORE. In other words, as we help them to get their plants going we are helping them to construct things necessary in defense of democratic ideals in this country and in Western Europe, are we not?

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator is completely correct.

Mr. KILGORE. In addition to that, we are building up the morale of the people with the full knowledge that we are supporting them. There has been a feeling abroad that we might quit, as has been done in the past, and therefore, that possibily they had better compromise. If we plant the compromise theory in their minds, we thereby weaken their will to resist.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is correct. I may say to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia that, in my opinion—and this has been testified to in hearings before the committee—every dollar we cut from the allocations to our European allies for the building up of their armed forces, for the manufacture of munitions, for the preparation of adequate defensive measures, instead of resulting in saving a dollar, will cost the United States $3, assuming that we intend to defend our liberty, assuming we propose to protect our security, and

assuming that we want to bring peace to a war-torn world.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact that in modern warfare munitions do not include simply explosives and weapons, but also clothing, food, communications, and many other things that go into the making of modern war? So when we help them to build up a plant to produce munitions, it may be a plant to produce uniforms and clothing, and when we help them to build up their agricultural production, we are helping them to produce the food they need, thus saving is a long haul across the ocean. When we build up mechanical plants, we are building up their potential to make the things they need in order to win. So, that, actually, munitions include all essentials to the life of human beings.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is correct. We also encourage the people to strain every nerve to build up their own defense. I am convinced that they want to do it. I know the people of Europe pretty well. I have lived there at times and have worked there many years. I know they want to defend their own liberties and the liberties of the freedom-loving world. But they cannot do it all by themselves. They are doing a great majority of the work. They are spending the greater portion of the money, and they are risking a large proportion of their manpower in military activities. There is a greater proportion of men under arms in France and in England today than there is in the United States. I say that in spite of what this country has been doing and is doing today.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be very glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. BRIDGES. In that statement the Senator from New York of course is not referring to Korea. In Korea this country is furnishing 91 percent of the manpower, suffering 92 percent of the casualties, and paying 95 percent of the bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is the Senator asking me?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Will the Senator ask me another question. If he does not ask me another one I shall explain——

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall be delighted to hear the Senator's explanation.

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course, we are carrying a great part of the load in Korea, but we went into Korea to fight against communism, to repel it, and I believe it was one of the greatest moves toward lasting peace any country has made, in spite of the tremendous sacrifices which we have been forced to undergo. But France has been spending its manhood and its fortune in fighting communism in Indochina. Her sacrifices has been no less than ours in the common fight against communism. That, I believe, is the thing about which we have to be concerned—a common fight against communism.

I may say further to the Senator, that Great Britain has been spending its manhood and its fortune in a fight against communism in Burma. I do not know whether the distinguished minority leader realizes that we are in a common fight against communism. If we weaken in that common fight against communism, I can say to the distinguished minority leader that we are lost. Our only hope is to stand shoulder to shoulder with our friends and allies of like minds, liberty-loving allies, in our fight against communism.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield further?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Has the Senator ever considered what would be the effect on the United States of America and all other free nations if the Russians obtained control of the Suez Canal, where considerable fighting has been going on for some time?

Mr. LEHMAN. I know we cannot afford to weaken. I know that it is a world struggle, a struggle to defend ourselves by force of arms, a struggle to defend ourselves by gaining the thoughts and the minds and the consciences of men, gaining their confidence, their trust, and their support.

Does the Senator from New Hampshire wish to ask any more questions?

Mr. BRIDGES. No. I wanted to say something when the Senator had concluded.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], when he rose to support the pending bill for extension of the Mutual Security Act, said that three members of the committee had voted against any reduction in the President's request for funds. While I was one of those three, I am not now rising to attempt the impracticable by seeking a restoration of the cuts made by the committee. I am limiting my demands to an earnest appeal to my colleagues to make no further reductions.

World War II cost the United States about $7,000,000,000 each month, and that war lasted 45 months. The Mutual Security Program will cost less than $7,000,000,000 for a full year, a year in which the effective North Atlantic Treaty forces will be built up to 50 divisions, plus an additional 20 divisions from Greece and Turkey; a year in which we expect to build sufficient defensive strength to prevent further Soviet threats of war. Would it not seem unreasonable, under the guise of economy, to support reductions in defense spending which would endanger the goals we seek, and might well cost us 50 times as much?

The word "economy" is a magic word in election years, but, as the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee said on Monday, if it is economy that is desired, the thing to do is to vote against the pending bill in its entirety. The fact is, of course, that we seek security and adequate defense, and we seek these at the least possible cost. But it is also a fact that if what we have for defense is only a fraction of what we need, it is no defense at all.

Last year only five Senators voted against the mutual security bill. I presume those five voted against it because they were opposed to the program of building mutual defenses with our free partners in the world and because they also believed we could carry on alone. I presume also that those who voted in support of the mutual security bill, even though they included some who had sought long and hard to reduce the program substantially, believed that American security requires that we have strong and reliable allies. But we do not want half-strong allies or half-reliable allies. The free men of this world must stand together; we must be strong together if together we are to meet the threat we face.

Those who now advocate further cuts have not said they are against the program of mutual security. They do not wish to kill it. All they want to do is to make the program look as though we were getting security at bargain rates. Economy is a popular election slogan. But this is not a year in which one eye can be kept on the election and the other on our security. Politics and security do not mix. The times are too critical and the stakes too high for us to permit politics to influence our votes on mutual security. Remember, 1952 is not an election year in the Soviet Union!

I have been deeply disturbed at the heavy additional cuts imposed by the House of Representatives in the security measure. The House reduced the President's request by 21 percent, or about $1,700,000,000. The senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] quoted the New York Times as describing this as the "meat-ax approach." We in the Senate owe it to ourselves and our country to weigh carefully the cuts in this program. Thomas Jefferson once described the Senate as "the saucer in which the hot tea of the House is permitted to cool." We here bear a heavy responsibility to the American people, whose security is at stake. We must be guided by our heads and not by our political emotions.

The contest today with the Soviet Union involves the very survival of the freedoms which we trace back to the days of Athenian democracy. During the later centuries we have acquired and maintained our freedoms at great cost in lives and treasure. We are now called upon again to maintain them at great cost. The imminent struggle is worldwide—the greatest mankind has known. It may yet be averted, at great cost, it is true, but, if it cannot be averted, it will be waged at far greater cost in human life, in material treasure, and perhaps in civilization itself. So let us not regret the present cost! In his reply to Lais, Demosthenes wrote:

> I do not purchase regret at such a price.

Unless we are willing to pay the price, and in this case it is the price of the mutual security program, we may well find that economy will purchase regret. We have been too late with too little before. Let us not have that on our conscience again.

There are difficult years ahead of us in dealing with the Soviets on the many outstanding issues. We have learned by bitter experience that the Soviet Union respects only strength. If the free world does not have strength, we shall find our policy will always have to be devised to meet the Soviet threat.

Here is a hard-headed way to build strength which the Communist world can understand. Some who have proposed cuts in the program have called the administration soft toward communism. It seems to me that one way to measure who is soft toward communism is to see whether they support concrete measures to oppose communism.

Not long ago I was in Iran when the Soviet Union was pressing demands on Iran for the use of Soviet experts in the oil fields. America was resisting them. Out of its wide experience as a neighbor of the Soviet Union, Iran rejected those demands outright. Iran knows the direction in which it must look if it is to preserve its freedom.

Only last week the Soviet Union demanded that Iran cease accepting military assistance. The note stated in part that—

> The Persian Army is losing the character of a national army of an independent and sovereign state. The Soviet Government finds it necessary to draw attention of the Persian Government to the fact that by agreeing to accept the so-called United States aid, and consequently taking upon itself definite obligations of a military character with regard to the United States of America, the Persian Government is in actual fact entering the path of cooperating with the United States Government in the implementation of the latter's aggressive plans against the Soviet Union.

Now if one wants to do what Stalin demands, all he need do is to vote for additional cuts in the pending bill. He will be voting in favor of helping the Soviet Union stop cooperation between the United States and Iran. As President Truman sarcastically remarked yesterday, we are showing "real leadership," we are really "standing up to the Soviets," if we now cut military assistance to Iran which has a 2,000-mile border with the Soviet Union.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the Soviet note in full in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the note was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> (Following is the Soviet broadcast of the text of the Russian note to Iran protesting against Iran's acceptance of United States military aid:)
>
> It follows from the exchange of letters that an agreement has been reached between the United States and Persian (Iranian) Governments on the rendering to Persia of military and financial aid by the United States of America, and that the Persian Government, in its turn, has undertaken definite obligations of a military and political character.
>
> From Persian press reports and also from the statements made by the representatives of the Persian and United States Governments, it is clear that the Persian Government, in connection with this agreement, has pledged itself to resume contracts with United States military advisers in Persia. This has been confirmed in official statements on April 27, 1952, by the Persian Minister of Communications, Bushehri, and on April 25 by the Deputy United States State Secretary McDermott.
>
> It is well known that the United States military mission, which had ceased its activities in January 1952, has again resumed its work following the exchange of letters between (Premier) Mossadegh and (United States Ambassador) Henderson while at the same time the agreement between the United States of America and Persia of May 23, 1950, concerning military aid and the United States military mission in Persia has again come into force. Thus as a result of the above-mentioned exchange of letters and the return to force of the Persian-United States military agreement the Persian Government places the Persian Army under the control of the United States Government.
>
> In this way the Persian Army is losing the character of a national army of an independent and sovereign state. The Soviet Government finds it necessary to draw attention of the Persian Government to the fact that by agreeing to accept the so-called United States aid, and consequently taking upon itself definite obligations of a military character with regard to the United States of America, the Persian Government is in actual fact entering the path of cooperating with the United States Government in the implementation of the latter's aggressive plans against the Soviet Union.
>
> These actions of the Persian Government cannot be viewed in any other way but as actions incompatible with the rules of good neighborly relations, the maintenance and strengthening of which is the obligation of the parties signatory to the Soviet-Persian treaty of February 26, 1921.

Mr. GREEN. I might add in the same sarcastic vein that we will be putting real backbone into Western Europe if we cut our assistance program to pieces during this week when we are reading such headlines as "East Germans move to tighten border," "Soviet threatens Bonn agreement," and "Anti-Red ballots lead in Italian returns."

Now is the time for firmness and consistency.

Perhaps one reason it is easy to attack the administration's proposals, backed by the careful study of the Foreign Relations Committee, is that "criticism comes easier than craftsmanship." This is a time for craftsmanship. Even if we are not prepared to be craftsmen, we should not let this body act as a wrecking crew.

I want to invite the especial attention of my colleagues to that part of the pending legislation described as "defense support." This is assistance given to Western Europe to help it build up its own military production.

It must be kept in mind that dies and fixtures, aluminum, wheat, and other similar things are just as much weapons of modern war as are cruisers and bazookas. Some of the things it is proposed to furnish with defense support go directly to increase output of military hardware such as ships, guns, tanks, planes. Other things go into the manufacture of such military softgoods as uniforms and shoes. Still others, such as coal or electric cable, or locomotive parts go into the basic industries whose output must be maintained or expanded if total production and hence military effort, is to increase without producing economic and financial collapse. Such imports enable European industry to produce structural steel for naval and air-base construction; to produce more electric power for manufacturing plants which turn out textiles both for uniforms and civilian clothing, to improve rail transportation to carry heavy machinery that in turn may be used for both military and civilian production.

In the $6,900,000,000 program proposed by the committee, $1,500,000,000 is earmarked as defense support. More than $1,000,000,000 of this sum will be used to finance industrial commodities—raw materials to feed European defense plants which are turning out all types of military equipment; coal and petroleum for Europe's steel, gas, electric power and transportation industries; and capital equipment needed to complete the conversion from civilian to military production. The remainder of the funds will buy essential food and agricultural commodities, provide ocean transportation and finance production-assistance work.

From the standpoint of economy, defense support is good business, because it yields two and one-half times its own costs in direct additions to NATO's defensive strength. With the necessary American commodities, the 10 European "Lisbon plan" countries—9 NATO countries and Germany—could devote $13,900,000,000 for defense in the next fiscal year, but only if the full amount of defense support requested by our administration were available, that is, $1,400,000,000 for this group of countries. Without defense support, these same countries would have to cut back defense spending by $3,300,000,000, to a total of only $10,600,000,000. Thus, $1,400,000,000 buys $3,300,000,000 worth of defense. This is real economy.

These money figures are cold. But they come to warm life when we realize that the loss of this amount of defense support would cost us 10 European divisions, with their European-produced equipment, plus 30 squadrons of aircraft—about 750 planes—plus 40 minesweepers and 30 destroyer escorts. Our defense support helps our allies to be effective allies, what I previously called "strong and reliable allies," and gives us the assurance that our fighting men will have such allied soldiers at their side, if the ultimate test has to come.

Mr. President, in conclusion, let me reiterate once again that every man's vote on this bill must be determined by his own assessment of the action he thinks will best support the interests of the United States. I wish that we could vote for the full amount proposed for mutual security and at the same time vote for economy. But, as an old-time philosopher remarked, "to blow and swallow at the same moment is not easy." Defense is never cheap. But neither is war. And it is war we seek to avoid by this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], for himself and other Senators.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CONNALLY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Case	Ferguson
Anderson	Chavez	Frear
Bennett	Connally	Fulbright
Bricker	Cordon	George
Bridges	Dirksen	Gillette
Butler, Nebr.	Douglas	Green
Byrd	Dworshak	Hayden
Carlson	Eastland	Hendrickson

Hickenlooper	Long	O'Mahoney
Hoey	Malone	Pastore
Holland	Martin	Robertson
Humphrey	Maybank	Russell
Hunt	McCarran	Schoeppel
Ives	McCarthy	Smathers
Jenner	McFarland	Smith, Maine
Johnson, Colo.	McKellar	Smith, N. J.
Johnson, Tex.	Millikin	Smith, N. C.
Johnston, S. C.	Moody	Stennis
Kem	Morse	Watkins
Kilgore	Mundt	Welker
Lehman	Neely	Williams
Lodge	Nixon	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). A quorum is present.

POLITICAL TIDINGS FROM WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President—

> Tidings do I bring, and lucky joys,
> And golden times, and happy news.

So Pistol said to Falstaff in King Henry IV, and so say I to the statesmen in the Senate. My tidings are political. They are from West Virginia, the State in which Yankee Doodle says good morning to Dixie and the East and the West kiss each other good night. West Virginia is the barometer which has unerringly indicated the result of every presidential election since that of 1912.

It was said by the political prophets of old time, "As Maine goes, so goes the Nation." But after the record-breaking Democratic landslide in 1936, this pleasing Republican aphorism of antiquity was, by unanimous consent, reduced to the feeble, weasel words, "As Maine goes, so goes Vermont." During the present generation the Panhandle State has crowded the exclusive proprietor of the Pine Tree emblem from the alluring field of political prophecy. Now those who are well informed and speak the orthodox language of accurate prognostication say, "As West Virginia goes, so goes the Nation." "Sic transit gloria." Our sincere sympathy to Maine; our sincere congratulations and all hail to West Virginia—the promised land of prosperity, the haven of happiness and the home of peace.

As a result of circumstances beyond control, the pleasing news you are about to hear will necessarily be as brief as the tail of Tam o'Shanter's luckless mare.

On the thirteenth day of this month, the Republicans of West Virginia elected 16 delegates to their party's National Convention, to be held in Chicago on and after the 7th day of July. Fifteen of these delegates are enthusiastically for Senator TAFT, and will follow him as the boys in blue followed Sheridan at Cedar Creek. One of the sixteen delegates is enthusiastically for General Eisenhower, and will stand with him as the boys in gray stood with Stonewall Jackson at the Second Battle of Manassas.

For more than 50 years 16 to 1 has been the established Democratic ratio in West Virginia. Nevertheless 15 to 1 is generally considered satisfactory. All these 16 Republican delegates are capable and loyal members of their party. But the only one of them who is a notable liberal is our distinguished and highly esteemed former colleague, Dr. Henry D. Hatfield, of Huntington. He is undoubtedly the greatest progressive Republican Governor West Virginia has ever had. Here end the pleasing Republican tidings.

If those on the other side of the aisle have tears, they should "prepare to shed them now." To my unfeigned regret, duty compels me to report that, to the humiliation and distress of multitudes of thoughtful, self-respecting, loyal Republicans, their party deliberately murdered its last chance and its only hope of a 1952 victory in West Virginia 2 weeks ago today by withholding its gubernatorial nomination from the honorable, capable and deserving, lifelong Republican John T. Copenhaver, the present Mayor of Charleston, and bestowing that high honor upon a notorious, political shelled peasecod, party deserter, demagogue and Democratic renegade who once occupied a seat in this Chamber. In 1940 he sought the Democratic nomination for United States Senator as his own successor. The Democrats decisively defeated him. In 1944 he was a candidate for the Democratic nomination for Governor of West Virginia. The Democrats again decisively defeated him. In 1948 he was a candidate for the Democratic nomination for United States Senator. The Democrats overwhelmingly defeated him.

At last it apparently dawned upon this hopelessly incurable, intolerable and insatiate chronic office seeker that he could never obtain another Democratic nomination in West Virginia. Consequently, in the year 1950 he announced that he had changed his registration to Republican. When the Democrats of the State heard this delightful news, they rejoiced as they had never rejoiced before.

Pythagoras celebrated his discovery of the forty-seventh problem of Euclid by sacrificing 50 white oxen upon the altar of his gods. West Virginia Democrats wished that they could give 50 white elephants to the Republicans for their great service in relieving Democracy of its most irrepressible, intolerable, blithering turncoat, nuisance and pest.

Just 2 days after this renegade announced his Democratic desertion and his registration as a Republican, he impudently flouted every precept of political propriety by brazenly proclaiming his candidacy for the Republican nomination for Congress in the Third Congressional District of West Virginia. To the everlasting regret of a countless throng of regular Republicans, he won that nomination. But a legion of the faithful, nauseated, rebellious members of the great party of Lincoln joined the liberal Democrats in defeating the deserter and electing CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, the opposing progressive, Democratic candidate, by a devastating majority.

For the benefit of the younger Members of the Senate, we now identify the political "dunderhead" who is the alleged Republican candidate for Governor of West Virginia by reading from an editorial which appeared in the widely circulated Washington Times on the 17th day of January 1938, under the heading "Ten Outstanding Senators," as follows:

> If we had been asked also to award the Senate dunce cap it would have gone to Rush Dew Holt, of West Virginia, for having passed up the greatest opportunity in Congress, to become the most blithering senatorial wash-out in many a year.

Mr. President, a political renegade never has been and never will be elected governor by the sane, prudent, and praiseworthy people of West Virginia.

We now turn to tidings which should make those on the democratic side of the aisle as happy as—

> "Larks at break of day arising
> From sullen earth to sing hymns at heaven's gate."

The distinguished and beloved senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] was a candidate for the Democratic senatorial nomination 2 weeks ago. He had two opponents for the high honor he sought. One of them was an honorable businessman by the name of Dallas Tickle, who had not been particularly active in politics. The other opponent was the Honorable J. Hornor Davis, an eminent lawyer, who for many years has been a highly important and influential Democratic official. Mr. Davis, as a candidate for membership in the House of Delegates, six times led his ticket in Kanawha County, which contains more than a tenth of the entire voting population of West Virginia. With distinction, he has served and is still serving as the leader of the Democratic majority in the West Virginia House of Delegates. He is president of the West Virginia State Bank and president of another important corporation. Mr. Davis' character is spotless; his reputation is without a stain. To the best of my knowledge, the nearest approach to a critical charge ever made against Mr. Davis either in the recent primary or in any of the various other campaigns in which he has participated was to the effect that he was a conservative.

According to complete returns from 2,659 out of a total of 2,822 precincts in West Virginia, the results of our Democratic senatorial primary 2 weeks ago are as follows:

Mr. Tickle received 10,203 votes.

Mr. Davis received 55,112.

Senator KILGORE received 231,598—a clear majority of more than 3½ to 1 over his combined opposition.

The Nation's political history will be searched in vain for a more impressive testimonial of a constituency's complete satisfaction with services rendered it by a United States Senator.

Regardless of political affiliations, let us rejoice in the obvious fact that the distinguished, liberal senior Senator from West Virginia will be reelected next November by a vast majority.

West Virginia democracy has nominated former Attorney General William Marland, a loyal, able, and active liberal, for Governor. He was the valedictorian of the class with which he was graduated from his high school. Later he was graduated from the University of Alabama with the degree of bachelor of arts. His legal education at West Virginia University was interrupted for a period of 4 years, during which he faithfully served in the United States Navy through the Second World War. In 1947 he received

his law degree. Thereafter he served as clerk to the Honorable Ben Moore, the eminent judge of the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia. He was appointed Assistant Attorney General of West Virginia. As a reward for meritorious service, he was next appointed Attorney General to complete an unexpired term. In 1950 he was elected Attorney General by a vast majority. He resigned this office before entering upon his recent successful campaign for the Democratic nomination for Governor.

Please mark the prediction. General Marland will be elected the next Governor of West Virginia by a majority of more than a hundred thousand. Furthermore, all the other candidates on the Democratic State ticket will be elected. The six liberal Democratic candidates for Congress from West Virginia will all be elected.

A sincere desire to render our Republican friends—a majority of whom we love—a real service and save them real money impels us to warn them that if their high command sends national funds to West Virginia for campaign purposes in 1952, the bearers of their money bags will find at the border line of the State ominous warning signs such as Dante saw above the entrance to the inferno, "Abandon hope, all ye who enter here."

We trust that the Republicans will heed this warning. If, as usual, they have more campaign money than they need, let them send their surplus to Texas, where it cannot possibly do any Republican good, or to Maine where, with the exception of the unsurpassable, praiseworthy and charming Senator MARGARET SMITH, no conceivable amount of money could make political matters worse than they now are and long have been.

The Republican delegates we have mentioned will need divine protection throughout the sanguinary battle that will be fought to a finish in the Republican convention in July. It is my unfeigned desire that they receive it, and enjoy every waking moment of their visit to Chicago, and in due time return to West Virginia and be exceedingly happy until the morning after the November election. Then they will, as usual, learn that a Democratic President and an adequate number of other Democratic officials have been elected to administer the governmental affairs of the Nation and West Virginia for four more years. Then another defeated Republican nominee for President will, like Whittier, lament:

Of all sad words of tongue or pen,
The saddest are these, "It might have been!"

Senators, the tidings to which you have most patiently and graciously listened are free from the infirmity of illogical thinking or exaggerated speaking. In November, West Virginia will officially proclaim them, as they have been stated here today, and during the interlude between now and then—

All the stars that round her burn,
And all the planets in their turn,
Will confirm these tidings as they roll
And spread the truth from pole to pole.

With the transmutation of our prophetic vision into reality, the people of West Virginia, the Nation and the world can, on the night of the next general election, in hope, faith, and confidence—

Wrap the drapery of their couch
About them, and lie down to pleasant dreams,

in fond anticipation of four more years of record-breaking Democratic prosperity, comfort, happiness, and peace.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, with pleasure, I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The distinguished Senator mentioned a former Senator from his State, Mr. Holt, who is a candidate for governor.

Mr. NEELY. That is true.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is that the same gentleman who served in the Senate for part of a term?

Mr. NEELY. He bedeviled the Senate for 6 years, but he never, to my knowledge, rendered a single service to the people of West Virginia or the Nation during his membership in this body.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is that the gentleman who was not 30 years of age when he was supposed to have been elected?

Mr. NEELY. He is the person to whom the Senator refers.

Mr. CONNALLY. Was he the Senator who, when he was supposed to have been elected, was not 30 years of age?

Mr. NEELY. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. But the folks who were in control of matters told him he should just stay out on the grass and wait until he became 30 years of age, when he would grow into the senatorship. Later, after he had stayed out and had grown into the senatorship, having become 30 years of age, he was seated by this body. Is that the same gentleman?

Mr. NEELY. He is the person.

Mr. CONNALLY. And the Senator says that the gentleman's service here was interrupted?

Mr. NEELY. No, I said that the person mentioned never, to my knowledge, rendered any service.

Mr. CONNALLY. It was the position of those of us who voted against seating him that he was not 30 years of age at the time his term began—not when he was elected. He was elected in November, but when January came and a vacancy in the Senate occurred, in order to have been a Senator he must have been 30 years of age.

Mr. NEELY. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Which he was not. I think I was one of only six Senators who voted against seating him, because of the fact that he did not comply with the constitutional requirement that he be 30 years of age when he became a Senator. When his term begins he is then a Senator; is that correct?

Mr. NEELY. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. I very much appreciate the kindness of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. The Senator from Texas has rendered great service to the Senate, the Nation, and the world. But, in my opinion, his vigorous, patriotic, and prudent effort to prevent the seating of Rush Holt in this body was one of the most praiseworthy actions of the Senator's long and illustrious career.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3086) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the amendment which is now before the Senate, namely, the second proposal of the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] to make a further reduction of $500,000,000 in foreign aid, proportionately distributed over the various component items.

Like many other Members of this body, I feel torn between the conflicting claims of security on the one hand and price and financial stability upon the other; between the need to protect ourselves against the external dangers of aggressive military communism and the internal dangers of inflation.

There can be no doubt that the United States is in a considerable degree of military peril. That is the reason for our rearmament. There is no doubt in my mind that the program of foreign aid is a necessary supplement to domestic rearmament. We need to have with us adequate allies, adequately armed. I have therefore supported in every vote not merely the Marshall plan, but various appropriations which have been called for to implement the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. I believe in the fundamental purposes of that program. I agree that it is not only necessary to give military aid by sending to the NATO countries end items, but also by sending them raw materials so that European labor can work in European factories producing the goods necessary for the defense of the free world.

I believe in the system of what is now called offshore procurement—the purchase of raw materials in the free world with American dollars so that the labor of the free world can be harnessed to produce the necessary implements of war. These purposes are all worthy.

THE PROSPECTIVE DEFICIT

I think we have all been touched and impressed with the sincerity of the arguments of the proponents of the bill as it was reported by the committee. At the same time we should recognize that in the case of this bill there is also involved the problem of domestic financial and price stability, as it is involved in every appropriation bill which comes before the Senate. In January the administration sent to the Congress a budget which called for $85,400,000,000 of appropriations as against only $71,000,000,000 anticipated revenue, or a deficit of $14,400,000,000 in the administrative budget. The administration seemed to

take that deficit rather light-heartedly, as though it were not a matter of deep concern to the financial future of the Nation.

It is quite possible that the deficit will be less than this figure. It is possible that revenues will be higher than $71,000,000,000, and that expenditures will be less than $85,400,000,000. But appropriations for the Korean war and for further extensions of the atomic energy program are still to come. But whatever may happen, the deficit will be of enormous dimensions unless we reduce the appropriations contained in the bills now pending before the Congress.

It may be said that we should take the surplus of some $4,500,000,000 in the social security and other trust funds; that is, the surplus of current contributions over current benefits, and treat, not the deficit of the administrative budget, but the deficit in the consolidated cash budget, as the significant factor. That, I think, is a dangerous policy to pursue in ordinary times, because it means that the present contributions of those who are expecting social-security benefits in the future are used to meet the ordinary expenses of the present without creating assets from which the income will be drawn when the claims of the contributor for benefits fall due.

However, I would be willing to use the cash budget in a period of great strain and to say that we should take as the test not the deficit in the administrative budget, but rather the deficit in the consolidated cash budget. That is making quite a concession to the severity of the present military situation; but even so, and granting that expenditures might not be as high as anticipated, we would still be faced with a deficit of from $7,000,000,000 to $8,000,000,000 plus added expenses for the Korean war, and so forth.

I had hoped that we would be able to plug some tax loopholes and raise perhaps $2,500,000,000 more by removing inequities in our tax system, so that any reduction in military expenditures would be less than would otherwise be the case. But at this late date it is becoming only too clear that there will be no tax legislation reported from the Finance Committee this year. The eminent Senators who are the leaders on that committee have served notice to that effect. Therefore, if the budget is to be balanced, it must be balanced by a reduction in expenditures.

The question is, Should the budget be balanced; and how serious would be the situation if it were not balanced? The budget will probably be out of balance, on the basis of the consolidated cash budget, by $7,500,000,000 at a rock-bottom minimum.

INFLATIONARY EFFECTS OF UNBALANCED BUDGET

Suppose we say that we are not interested in balancing the budget, and that what we want to do is to adopt the military-aid program as it came from the administration, and pass the defense appropriations as they come from the administration. Let us consider the deficit of $7,500,000,000. What would happen then? Let us follow up that subject.

The Government would be compelled, of course, to borrow money. From all present indications it would not be able to obtain a very large fraction of such money from the voluntary savings of individuals and corporations. Last year the people sold $1,700,000,000 more bonds to the Government than they bought from the Government. There was a net loss in the sales of savings bonds. I think perhaps we might improve the situation somewhat by a change in the interest rate. But, on the whole, unless we were to have open, direct war, the people would be reluctant to purchase bonds.

In the main, therefore, the Government would have to float the bonds by asking the banks to buy them. The banks would buy the bonds by creating checking accounts against which the Government would draw for the payment of labor and materials. After all, the banks are in a sense manufacturing concerns. They manufacture monetary purchasing power. They would set up additional checking accounts with which to pay for the bonds, and against which the Government would draw.

We now have in this country comparatively full employment. Not more than 2½ percent of the labor force is unemployed. While there is some unemployment in the textile centers, as well as in New York and Detroit, in the main this is seasonal and transitional unemployment. In the main we have full employment. Therefore, when the Government receives more money with which to pay for labor and material, the effect is to bid up the price of labor and material. That is known as inflation.

If this august body will permit a simple illustration, if one has $10, and one unit of goods is exchanged for that $10, the price of the unit obviously is $10. If the amount of money goes up from $10 to $15, there is a proportionate increase in the price level. Let there be no mistake about it. If we have an unbalanced budget of $7,500,000,000, it means an increase in credit; it means inflation.

CONSEQUENCES OF INFLATION

Let us consider some of the consequences of inflation. Those who have retired on fixed incomes will find that while their monetary purchasing power is the same, their real purchasing power has diminished. Those who retired on an income of $150 a month will find that with a rise in prices they will be able to buy much less. Milk which, to a considerable degree, the aged formerly depended upon for sustenance will be, perhaps, beyond their means. They will move into smaller quarters. They will wear shabby clothing. They will be malnourished. Their real income will be diminished. Those who receive interest payments will suffer.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator to permit me to make a statement by unanimous consent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator wish to have it follow my remarks, or is the statement apropos?

Mr. MAYBANK. It is apropos.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Illinois is speaking about persons who have retired on pensions. As will be brought out in the testimony given by Chairman Ramspeck of the Civil Service Commission in connection with the bill which will be brought out on Thursday, the deficit in the retirement fund, is $4,900,000,000. The Committee on Appropriations will have to ask the Senate to appropriate an additional $700,000 to pay those who live on pensions and annuities this year, as well as those who are paid to take care of those who already are on pensions and annuities. I thought I would mention that point. That bill will be before the Senate next week.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the comment of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. He refers only to Government employees who receive pensions. He does not refer to persons who receive private pensions or who purchased private annuities. They will be badly pinched. There is no assurance of relief for them.

Mr. MAYBANK. Because there is no Congress to appropriate funds for the lack of money in their cases.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. Similarly the same situation is true with respect to the great salaried class of the country. I refer to accountants, bookkeepers, sales people, typists, clerks, managers, engineers, and white-collar workers in general. Their salaries are rather fixed. Their salaries do not respond very readily to changes in the cost of living, and they will find their real income reduced. Consequently they will suffer very appreciably. The unskilled and unorganized workers will find that their wage rates will not keep pace with the increase in the cost of living, and they also will suffer.

While the organized workers are better protected against an increase in the cost of living than they were 20 years ago, nevertheless while their wages go up after an intervening period of rise in the cost of living, they suffer during the intervening period; and the result is a struggle, when contracts expire, as to by how much wages should be increased to keep pace with the rise in the cost of living. We may look forward to convulsive strikes such as that which threatens the steel industry, and raise grave constitutional questions.

Therefore, Mr. President, if we could provide national defense to the degree the advocates of this bill say we should, costlessly, we would be all for it.

Of course we all want national defense. But we are being asked to commit ourselves to assume for national defense what, in my opinion, involves domestic inflation. That is what gives us a hard choice. It is a very hard choice to make. Let me say, however, that the natural tendency in each case is to disregard the danger of an unbalanced budget, and not to see the ultimate consequences of an unbalanced budget, but

to see, instead, the immediate problem in the particular bill which may be pending.

The mutual-security, or foreign-aid, bill is no isolated matter. It is closely bound up with the defense appropriation bill which our sister body considered some days ago, which is now before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and upon which we shall be shortly asked to pass.

The administration asked in that bill for $52,000,000,000. In the mutual security bill it asked for $8,000,000,000; atomic energy nearly $2,000,000,000 with probably more to come, and civil defense hundreds of millions of dollars. In all we have presented to us measures for defense calling for at least $66,000,000,000. That amounts to 22 percent of the national income. The total bill including other items, which we are being asked to meet is 28 percent of the national income. If we include State and local expenditures the aggregate represents 35 percent of the national income.

DEFENSE IS ALSO A LONG-RANGE PROPOSITION

Mr. President, I am not going to inveigh against the pending bill or against the defense appropriation bill. I simply want to say that we must consider not merely the military protection of the United States and of the free world, but the financial, economic, and price stability of the United States and of the free world.

Suppose an attack does not come this year but that Mr. Stalin keeps up this pressure year after year, year after year, as some say is his design. I do not know whether it is his design, but suppose he intends to keep the free world in a state of continued tension. Are we then to have unbalanced budgets and constant inflation year after year? If so, we will ruin America.

France has been greatly weakened by the internal inflation she has suffered.

We must not make the mistake of weakening ourselves by successive deficits, only to have the Communists pounce on us after we have sapped our strength. In short, defense is a long-range as well as a short-range proposition.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I ask the Senator from Illinois whether he does not feel that the Committee on Foreign Relations, in considering a proposal of $7,900,000,000 and reducing it by $1,000,000,000, which is 12½ percent, did not make a pretty good contribution to the economy, the necessity for which he is stressing, and whether, if the other departments of the Government would take the same attitude and accept corresponding reductions, we would not come close to a balanced budget, which all of us feel we should have?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Committee on Foreign Relations showed a very good disposition toward financial and price stability of the country in voting such a reduction. There is some question in my mind, however, as to whether it is adequate. I voted against a $2,000,000,000 cut by voting against the additional reduction of $1,000,000,000. However, I wish to present my argument that we must cut our expenditures by $7,500,000,000.

Mr. President, the most we can reduce nonmilitary expenditures, in my judgment, is by about a billion and a half dollars. I had hoped for a decrease of $1,800,000,000. I think that is virtually impossible. When we take into account interest rates and veterans' benefits, some of which should and in my judgment could be reduced, but which in their aggregate cannot be materially reduced, we find that there is only about $10,000,000,000 of free money in the civilian budget upon which we can operate.

I think we shall be doing extremely well if we obtain a reduction of 15 percent in those items. I hope for a reduction of 18 percent, but I do not think we can achieve it. So, if we are to balance the budget, we must eliminate approximately $6,000,000,000 from the authorizations and appropriations for defense and for foreign aid.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. About a week ago yesterday on the floor of the Senate, I analyzed the domestic defense budget; and I then suggested, as the RECORD will show, that possibly between $7,000,000,000 and $8,000,000,000 could—if we carefully sharpened our pencils—be taken from the domestic defense budget without requiring further encroachment upon the mutual security bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from New Jersey; but I wish to say that although I am relatively new in this body, I always discover that the "pea" of economy is always under some shell other than the one related to the bill under discussion at any particular time. Whenever we have before us a specific bill to which an economy amendment is proposed, it is said, "Oh, no; we should not make a cut in this bill; we should make the cut somewhere else, in some other bill"; but when the "some other bill" comes before us, it is said at that time, "Oh, no; we should not make any cut in this bill. The cuts should be made in another bill."

So, Mr. President, if I were too completely trusting in this matter, I would be like a man rushing down a hotel corridor and opening one door after another, but always having each one slammed in his face. In the present case, I fear that the "pea" will always be said to be under some other shell.

So, Mr. President, I should like to have the cut made in the bill which is now before the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The point I made when I addressed the Senate last week was that the military program must be considered as a whole, namely, both the defense program at home and the military program abroad. When we consider both together, a reduction of $7,000,000,000 in the defense program on the home front and a reduction of $1,000,000,000 in the foreign aid program would reach the $8,000,000,000 total about which the Senator from Illinois is speaking.

Furthermore, if a similar reduction, percentagewise, were made in other authorizations and in the various appropriations, I think we could find that we could very nearly balance the budget. But I submit that the foreign aid program should be approached in such a way as not to endanger our collective security program and our relations with our allies.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, later in this debate I shall throw out a suggestion which will indicate that the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Illinois are not so far apart in regard to the consolidated reduction program as might appear at the moment.

At this time I am saying that we must make total and combined reductions of approximately $6,000,000,000 in the military defense bill and in the foreign aid program if we are to prevent inflation.

We know very well that the opposition will be very great to any attempt to make reductions in the defense budget. The spring offensive on Capitol Hill is in full force; the artillery barrage by the Armed Forces has been under way for some time; the shells are bursting; the pressure is being applied. We are told, "If you cut these authorizations and appropriations by a single dollar you will be weakening the defense of the United States and you will be imperiling our freedom." Such statements give all of us pause.

I wish to point out the extreme difficulty of the task confronting us, because we face a concentrated and powerful group, a patriotic group that is firmly convinced it is correct, is determined to have its way, and is backed by a powerful and sincere group of newspapers.

Furthermore, Mr. President, those who in January were in favor of economy, tend to have their courage disappear when May and June come and the appropriations bills have to be passed.

I believe it was Jimmy Walker who wrote the song, Will You Love Me in December as You Do in May? Mr. President, it is strange how the economizers of December melt away in the warm sun of May and June, and how officialdom has its way in the end. The budgets go through, the deficits increase, and the stability of the country is threatened. These men are patriotic, and I am sure they mean well; but they do not see the total picture. They see only their particular problem. They do not appreciate that the programs as a whole, when they are submitted, call for big governmental deficits, and that those big governmental deficits will cause inflation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, indeed.

Mr. LONG. Does not it stand to reason that those who administer a program are always the greatest enthusiasts for the program?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly that is so.

Mr. LONG. So it is for someone else—usually it is the responsibility of the

President and the Congress—to determine how much can be made available for all the various programs. Is not that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. LONG. On the other hand, we cannot depend upon the enthusiasts for a program to arrive at a proper determination in that respect. Does not the Senator from Illinois believe that is correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; because such persons always are interested in their own programs.

Mr. LONG. In fact, they generally are rather biased.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; they are.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from New York, who I know is going to chastise me reluctantly, perhaps, but no less surely.

Mr. LEHMAN. Oh, no; the Senator from Illinois knows that I have the greatest affection and regard for him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say that is reciprocal.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to point out to the Senator from Illinois that I do not think I am a part of a very powerful bloc.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No.

Mr. LEHMAN. The results of recent weeks and months have shown that although I have fought very hard, I have not been very successful.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In those fights the Senator from Illinois has joined.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes; he has.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And his head, like that of the Senator from New York, is bloody, but unbowed.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is correct.

Mr. President, I think we should have economy——

Mr. DOUGLAS. "But"——

[Laughter.]

Mr. LEHMAN. And I pay taxes as heavy as those paid by any other Member of this body——

Mr. DOUGLAS. "But"——

Mr. LEHMAN. I think it would be wonderful if we could reduce taxes; I think it would be wonderful if we could reduce the size of the national debt. But I have seen our country go through several very, very critical periods, and I have the feeling—and I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Illinois will agree with me on this matter—that the security of our country has no price tag, any more than does the security of a human being.

I am fighting against the proposed reduction; and I am going to fight against a reduction in the military budget, too.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I anticipated that.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to be perfectly frank with the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Because I believe we have our backs against the wall. When we are in that situation, when we are threatened with destruction—not only physical destruction but destruction of all the ideals for which we have lived and for which our parents have lived—I simply do not believe we can lay undue emphasis on the question of expenditures of money, when it has been testified that such expenditures are necessary. The President, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of the Army, and the Secretary for Air all have testified that these expenditures are necessary. So I do not think we can compromise in regard to them. I believe we must provide the means by which our country can defend itself. That is my only thesis.

I do not believe it makes any difference whether we spend $500,000,000 more or less, in comparison to the security we shall gain for our country.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say to my good friend, the Senator from New York, that I am in favor of security, but I am in favor of total security; and total security consists not only of military security but also of financial and economic security as well. We must keep each of these in balance with the other. We cannot afford to sap our strength for the long pull.

It is my criticism of the administration, and it is also my criticism of the Defense Department, that in their emphasis upon military security, they have at the same time disregarded the need for financial and economic security.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. Does not the Senator from Illinois think there is as much danger from economic collapse from within as there is danger to mutual security from without?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is very difficult to appraise correctly the two dangers; but I think there is real danger of inflation. I believe an unbalanced budget will lead to inflation.

Mr. President, our representatives abroad are doing everything within their power to prevent the countries they are aiding from having unbalanced budgets; and those representatives of our country are trying to prevent inflation in those foreign countries. Certainly we ourselves should practice at home what we preach abroad.

Mr. FREAR. Inflation would eventually end in economic collapse, would it not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. We might endure it for a year or two; but if the tension were to be continued over a period of time, it would mean economic collapse; it would mean the elimination of the middle class, the exaltation of the profiteers, and the division of our society into sharply conflicting groups.

Mr. President, I believe in defense just as much as I believe in collective welfare within the confines of the budget in peacetime.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. No; I wish to make an observation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if we get into oratorical contests, I am afraid I shall be diverted from my thesis.

Mr. LEHMAN. I merely wish to have the Senator from Illinois yield to me, so that I may make an observation in connection with what the Senator from Illinois has said.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I cannot deny that opportunity to my friend, the Senator from New York. Therefore, I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not know whether the distinguished Senator from Illinois was in public life in 1940.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I had a very humble office. I was an alderman in the city government of Chicago. The Senator from New York was the Governor of a great State—a noble Governor of a great State.

Mr. LEHMAN. I was in the campaign in 1940, when the United States had a debt of $38,000,000,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It now has a debt of approximately $267,000,000,000.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is true. I was going to come to that. It had a debt of $38,000,000,000 at that time. I believe the Republican nominee in 1940 was Mr. Willkie, for whom I also had a very high regard. We had this great debt, which he said was going to lead us to ruin, destruction, and inflation, to such an extent that everyone in the country would go broke. I remember very distinctly that in the course of the campaign I stated that $38,000,000,000 was, of course, a very large debt, even an excessive debt, but that experts had testified that we would be in no danger until the debt reached $75,000,000,000.

We then became engaged in the war against Japan and Germany. Thank God, we did not worry about our debt, important as it was. We went ahead to equip ourselves as fully as possible, until we were able to turn back the threat of Nazi and Japanese aggression. As a result of those efforts, the debt became not $75,000,000,000, but approximately $260,000,000,000, I believe. We remained solvent. Had we hesitated to expend the enormous sums which were necessary for our defense in that war, I do not believe we would be here today; we would probably be the slaves of the totalitarianism of Hitler and others. But we did not hesitate. We went forward, we did what was necessary to our defense. I believe that what we are doing now, in authorizing the appropriations reported and recommended by the Foreign Relations Committee and by the Armed Services Committee is necessary to our defense. I believe that the cutting down of our defense appropriations would be calamitous and disastrous to our security.

Mr. President, I do not think that security has any price tag. I emphasize that. If an armed thug entered my house, I would not worry as to how much money I had in the bank, or as to what I wanted to keep in the bank, but I would worry about how I could overcome the thug if I could. No other question would appeal to me.

Our backs are to the wall, or else all the talk about communism and the threat of communism is false. I do not believe it to be false. I believe it to be 100 percent true. We are under a threat, and I believe that nothing but the strengthening of our forces will make us safe, even moderately safe, against that threat. Even that will not make us entirely safe, but it will at least enable us to go as far as we possibly can.

Therefore, I think that a proposal to make an additional cut of $500,000,000 simply does not make sense.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from New York, certainly a very fine, ethical gentleman, for whom we all have the deepest respect, has stressed one side of this picture, namely, the need for military security. But, on the basis of the experience of the past, he seems to think that there is no need to consider financial and economic security as well. For the protection of our own freedom, I submit that we must do so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have not yet heard the Senator from Illinois say he is supporting this amendment. Is he supporting it?

REDUCTION COULD BE MADE FLEXIBLE

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is my general feeling that I shall support this amendment, provided it can be so qualified as to tie it in with the general defense program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. May I ask the character of the qualification that the Senator would suggest?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. It is my belief that the defense of the country is integral, that the military assistance program is as much a part of the national defense as is the support of our own Army, Navy, and Air Force. I should like to see the two appropriations integrated, and it is my present intention to vote for the $500,000,000 further decrease, and to try to attach a qualification to it to the effect that if, in the judgment of the President and the National Security Council, $500,000,000 can be better spent in equipping foreign divisions than in equipping our own, they may transfer that sum from domestic defense appropriations to the Mutual Security Program. That would mean a further cut of $500,000,000 in the domestic defense program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If I may say so, the general feeling of the Senator about an over-all cut is one for which I have great sympathy. But let me suggest what I think his support of this cut would mean. The Senator knows very well that foreign-aid bills do not have the local support which domestic bills receive, especially during an election year. There are not as many advocates of this bill as there are of domestic bills, because, with respect to domestic bills, many local interests are involved. In supporting such an amendment, would the Senator not run the risk of not getting a comparable cut in the domestic-defense appropriations?

The effect would be to put an undue burden upon what I happen to feel, and what I know the Committee of Foreign Relations and apparently the Committee on Armed Services feel is a very important part of the program. I would go along with the Senator's general thesis if the mutual-security appropriations and defense appropriations could be regarded as a total sum, so that if we were to cut the total to the extent of 12.6 percent, we would approach about the figure which the Senator has in mind. I do not think I would object to that. But it must be remembered that we have already cut the original request for mutual-security appropriations to the extent of 12.6 percent. I would not agree to any further cut, until I was sure that the other appropriation would be cut. How would we be able to get such assurance?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We cannot get such assurance, because the defense bill is not at present being considered on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But would there not be a very great risk of only cutting this, and not cutting the other? The result would be that the Senator's ultimate purpose would not be achieved, though the balance of the program would be disrupted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We must take each bit of the program as it comes before us. If the Department of Defense will agree to a $4,500,000,000 cut, I should be willing to forego the extra $500,000,000 cut in the pending bill. But the Department of Defense is fighting for every dollar, and they refuse to give up a single bit of privilege.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But the Foreign Relations Committee has already cut this bill 12.6 percent. I think the Senator ought to accept that as having been done in good faith. It is before the Senate. If the Senator insists upon going beyond that, I think the result would be to completely disrupt the balance of the program.

I, myself, knowing the characteristics of this body, felt that it would be wiser not to cut the authorization in committee, but to let it be cut on the floor of the Senate. For some unknown reason, many Senators apparently desire to cut it here on the floor. Had the committee reported the bill in the original amount, and had the Senator succeeded in obtaining his cut from that amount, the chances are that everyone would have been satisfied. But I do not think that is a proper way to approach the matter. We should give due credit to the committee for having already made a reduction of 12.6 percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is not being helpful in insisting on a further cut.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the committee for its initial virtue and express the hope that this tendency toward virtue will continue.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The percentages actually approximate the over-all proposal which the Senator makes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is perfectly well known that there are in the budget some items which are relatively fixed and to which the 12.6 percent cut cannot be applied.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If we take the domestic military expenditures, those for the Atomic Energy Commission, and so forth, and apply the 12.6 percent cut, we will approximate what the Senator has said would be sufficient to balance the budget.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The pay of the military cannot be reduced.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The number of men can be reduced. The over-all expenditures for personnel can be reduced.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the Senator realizes that this type of cut might not necessarily be very wise. About 2 years ago a motion was made to reduce the expenditure for mutual security by $500,000,000, and that motion failed. Nevertheless, the President impounded $500,000,000 which Congress had appropriated for the Air Force. Today we are suffering from a lack of airplanes which we could have had, and we are facing the danger of the superiority of Russian jet fighters? We could not see that any great damage would be done to the national defense by economizing to the extent of $500,000,000 on the original mutual-defense program for Europe. It seems to me that the question of economy will have to be met; but we must make atomic-energy appropriations and appropriations for jet aircraft, and to cut those items may not be the safest way to economize.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Has the Senator made any study which would enable him to say what the prospects may be for a better coordination between the Technical Cooperation Administration and the Mutual Security Administration? As I understand, the Technical Cooperation Administration has about 400 employees in the city of Washington, while the Mutual Security Administration has about 1,200. I also understand that in south Asia the Technical Cooperation Administration group handles much of the mutual security work, whereas in the Near East the reverse holds true.

I am wondering if it is possible for one agency to handle work in other places as well and whether there could be progress along the line of avoiding duplication of effort and expense in other ways in the rest of the field.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure some economies could be made, but I do not think they would run into the hundreds of millions of dollars which are needed. They would not be of major magnitude.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The amounts involved are very small. There is no real duplication in the same country. I think what the Senator has in mind is this: It is true that the Technical Cooperation Administration is not in all countries, but in those countries where the old ECA already had a staff, it took on a very small amount of the technical assistance program, the thought being that it was more economical to permit the agency already present to proceed rather than to start afresh. It is the intention of the committee gradually to

move the Mutual Security Administration out and let the ECA take over.

I should like to invite attention to the fact that in the whole Middle East there is only $155,000,000 involved. The largest proportion is in India, which has been a special case this year. But the total is very small as compared with military aid.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct when he says the total amount is small, but it seems to me the place to set a good example is in connection with administrative costs. If we permit any waste to accumulate in the administrative end of the program, it would be reflected in the expenditure of larger amounts of money. We cannot expect the funds to be spent efficiently and economically in the field where the larger amount of expenditure occurs.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I agree with the Senator from Vermont.

I should like now to bring before the Senate a subject for consideration which at first may seem to be somewhat of a digression from the argument I have been making. I refer to the enormous amount of unexpended appropriations which are piling up for both the Defense Department and for foreign aid.

For example, if my memory is correct, at the end of this fiscal year Congress will have appropriated for the Armed Forces approximately $55,000,000,000 which the Department of Defense will not have spent.

I introduced into the RECORD as of yesterday some figures on the unexpended appropriations for foreign aid and pointed out that as of the 31st day of January, this year, congressional appropriations for foreign aid, since the Marshall plan, had been $14,400,000,000, and that of that amount $10,900,000,000 had been for military assistance and approximately $3,500,000,000 for economic assistance and technical cooperation. But as of that day not more than $1,200,000,000 had been spent for military purposes, or approximately $1 out of every $9 which had been appropriated, and approximately $1,100,000,000 had been spent for economic aid, or $1 out of every $3 that had been appropriated. We had total unexpended balances for foreign aid, therefore, of $12,000,000,000.

I know the defense which the advocates of the bill will make. They will say that these funds, while not expended, have been obligated. I read the testimony of Secretary Lovett, who said that while these funds have not been expended, they have been obligated. The term "obligation," however, has a double meaning. It may mean contracts specifically let, and it may also mean telegrams and letters of intent saying that it is the intention of a given department to spend certain sums of money.

I think it will be found—I do not make a definite charge—that in February and March of this year telegrams of intent went out over the country like snowflakes in a snowstorm, declaring that the Defense Department was ready to spend certain sums of money. When they say the sums are obligated, they may be obligated not on specific contracts but in large part simply on entirely general promises to expend. It makes a better showing, when the departments come before congressional committees, to say that the sums are obligated. But do they promise delivery in the near future, or is it a faint, far-off promise of something coming in 2 or 3 or 4 years?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not sure whether the Senator from Illinois is familiar with conditions that existed in various areas during World War II. At that time there were large appropriations made for the armed services. When the time for new appropriations came around, the armed services had about $35,000,000,000 which had been appropriated, but which had not been allocated or spent. Nothing had been done with those appropriations. At that time the armed services allocated, as they could do, the $35,000,000,000, to the lend-lease program. So when the armed services came before Congress, they did not have that money, it had all been allocated, and the $35,000,000,000 stayed in the lend-lease kitty until the end of the war, and failure to use it resulted in a substantial reduction of the national debt, from $270,000,000,000 to $255,000,000,000 or $256,000,000,000, as I recall. Does the Senator from Illinois believe something like that is going on in the programs of today?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not know. I merely say that Congress has been lavish and generous in its appropriations, but that only a small fraction of the amount which has been appropriated has been spent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to finish my sentence.

It is easy to transfer the blame from the departments to Congress by saying that the trouble was caused by the failure of Congress to appropriate, and then to insist that Congress appropriate additional moneys.

I now yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not the Senator think that, in order to present a little clearer picture, he should also state that for the fiscal year 1952 just about half the total amount appropriated, to which he referred, was not finally appropriated or approved until late October?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of 1951?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of 1951, in late October. There are end items involved in the program, such as military aircraft, for example, with a leeway of approximately 2 years, as well as other very complicated machinery.

In fairness I think the Senator from Illinois should give the whole picture, because it is obvious that in 30, 60, or 90 days an agency cannot seek bids and let contracts for the highly complex machinery of modern war.

I agree with the Senator that I have criticized, as I still criticize, the emphasis upon the purchasing of end items in this country. I think it would be much more beneficial to our defense and to the over-all objective of the plan to permit the manufacture of more of the military machines in the industrial plants of Europe. But that is a different question from that about which we are now talking. Inasmuch, however, as Congress did not appropriate the money until nearly 4 months after the beginning of the fiscal year, I believe in fairness it must be admitted that the departments could not possibly have proceeded during that time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But we had appropriated money in the previous year, and the departments were not utilizing that money.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of the $9,000,000,000, which I think was mentioned, $7,000,000,000 was carried forward in the last appropriations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The total appropriations have been $14,400,000,000.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What was the total carried over for 1951?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not have it by years.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it was roughly $7,000,000,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What I am trying to say is that when a program is as big as this, it is the easiest thing in the world to shift the blame to Congress and say, "It is the failure of Congress to appropriate which has caused the trouble."

Yesterday on the floor of the Senate I mentioned some of the military history of the Civil War, which our southern friends call the War Between the States. The experience of Lincoln with McClellan is very much to the point. Lincoln placed McClellan in command of the Army of the Potomac in the fall of 1861. McClellan drilled an army, but he never wanted to move. He would constantly insist that Lincoln send him more men, more mules, more horses, more equipment, more guns. The Government kept feeding these supplies to him all winter. Finally Lincoln virtually had to kick McClellan forward for the spring offensive. When McClellan got down on the Peninsula, he wanted to stop again. He wanted more troops. After he withdrew from the Peninsula, went north, and fought what we call the Battle of Antietam, which our southern friends call Sharpsburg, he would not follow up his victory; he wanted more supplies.

Lincoln said McClellan had what he called the "slows." McClellan was a great believer in matériel and a great believer in deliberation. He was always transferring the blame from himself to Lincoln, insisting that his lack of success was because supplies had been denied him.

I do not want to single out the Department of Defense or the executive branch of the Government for excoriation, we all have our faults and I am at least partially conscious of my own. But certainly it is a very human tendency for them to try to blame Congress for not appropriating, and to say that this is the reason why the program has been bogging down. Certainly up to date Congress has been most lavish in its appropriations. I somewhat object to Congress being made a whipping boy, in this instance, for a failure on the part of the

administrative departments vigorously to carry through a program of supply and procurement. Perhaps this makes me somewhat allergic to the demand that we appropriate every dollar that is asked for, when the departments have not spent any large fraction of the money which we have already appropriated. It makes me somewhat allergic to the cry coming from the executive departments that we are betraying the Nation by not signing on the dotted line.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. MOODY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont; then I shall yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. AIKEN. I have been interested in the Senator's remarks. Of course, he knows that most of the time, and particularly in an election year, Congress is constituted of the opposing political parties. It is unfortunate that that is so, but apparently we are faced with such a line-up.

Has the Senator from Illinois made a study of the transportation costs involved in the Mutual Security Program?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I have not.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, there is in the appropriation bill a provision that 50 percent of the goods transported must be shipped in American commercial vessels.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In justice to the administration, it must be said, I think, that this amendment came from the floor of the Senate, not from administrative officials.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that 99 percent of the goods are carried in American bottoms. Congress will have to assume at least 50 percent of the responsibility.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think Congress should assume 100 percent of the responsibility.

Mr. AIKEN. It is my understanding that the armament which is transported in such huge quantities to mutual security countries is not generally considered to be adapted for shipment in United States commercial bottoms.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should be perfectly willing to have that provided for in the Mutual Security Act.

Mr. AIKEN. I further understand that probably 75 percent of all the goods appropriated for under the Mutual Security Act are transported in American commercial ships and American warships. I also understand that if we permitted countries with which we cooperate to use their own ships, they themselves would pay the costs of transportation, whereas now we pay the costs.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Vermont planning to offer an amendment to that effect? I would support such an amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. I would support such an amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I, too, would support it.

Mr. AIKEN. I think we would hear wails of indignation from shipping interests, but we could save the American taxpayers a large amount of money.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the Senator from Vermont will offer such an amendment. He will have one vote right off the bat.

Mr. AIKEN. Certainly such a plan would result in transporting the armament and allied material in a much more feasible manner than we are doing now, trying to move it all across the ocean in American commercial vessels, which are not built for that purpose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have been more or less indicting the executive departments for their part, but I think this is our sin. In this particular case the fault is ours.

Mr. MOODY and Mr. FULBRIGHT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I promised to yield to the Senator from Michigan. My friends are laying it on me this afternoon.

Mr. MOODY. As the Senator from Illinois well knows, I have the greatest respect for his views on this subject. I think he has done the greatest job in the economy field that has been done in the Congress for many years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator, but that is not true.

Mr. MOODY. I agree with the Senator that the build-up of our military forces has not been fast enough.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The build-up in manpower has been fairly adequate, within the planned program; but the equipment has lagged.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to ask whether the Senator's objective is not to provide the strength which is needed here and in Europe to deter Red Russia, and to prevent an atomic war, while at the same time reducing the cost. Is not that the Senator's objective?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. I think it is possible to obtain more defense for less money.

Mr. MOODY. That is precisely my objective also.

I should like to read what General Eisenhower said on this subject, because it seems to me that what a general of the Army who has been in charge of this program, and who certainly would not be prejudiced in favor of the Democratic administration, has to say ought to be taken into consideration by the Senate. General Eisenhower said, speaking about a cut of more than $1,000,000,000:

> A specific risk is that of dragging out the program to the point of increasing greatly the total cost. A cut of such a size as to require abandonment or complete revision of basic schedules now guiding the build-up might well have far-reaching repercussions. The nations of Europe would then have to defer such activities as call-up of manpower, building of training installations and airfields, and the placing of contracts for indigenous types of production which are keyed to these basic schedules. One of our prime purposes, of course, is to encourage and permit maximum output on their part.

I thoroughly agree with the objective of the Senator from Illinois, when he says that his objective is to obtain more adequate defense and greater strength, for less money. But I am wondering, in this case, if we make the proposed cut in the name of economy, whether we shall not be getting less strength for more money.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That, of course, is the view of General Eisenhower, who is a very eminent authority and for whom I have a great deal of respect. But he also tends to take a partial view of the situation. He views the immediate problem before him, which is to build up the defense of Western Europe. America is some distance behind him. He does not view the financial situation in which the United States is placed. We must consider that subject. Great as is my respect for General Eisenhower, we are the ones who must ultimately make the decision. We must decide, according to our best knowledge considering the total situation, what is the best course to follow. We must not merely implicitly accept what some five-star general says. We should be as critical in reviewing the advice of one five-star general as in the case of the advice of any other five-star general.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I have no idea of accepting implicitly the statement of anyone. However, I believe that General Eisenhower is perhaps better informed than anyone else on this particular subject.

Mr. DOUGLAS. On the particular problem before him, but not on the financial condition of the United States.

What will it profit us if we heap up armaments and the cold war continues for years, and we have a 5-percent increase in the cost of living each year?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not want the RECORD to convey the impression that only General Eisenhower holds that view.

Mr. MOODY. Not at all.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Secretary Lovett holds that view; and he gave specific examples for the RECORD.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask if Secretary Lovett is in favor of any reduction in defense appropriations?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No, but——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I asked the Senator a question. Is Secretary Lovett in favor of any reduction in defense appropriations?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should say not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not a matter of record that he is opposed to any reduction either in defense appropriations or in foreign-aid appropriations, and that if he had his way, excellent man though he is, we would have a deficit of at least $6,500,000,000 or $7,000,000,000, and probably more, and inflation? He also does not see the total situation. I say that with no disparagement of him, because he is a fine and honest gentleman.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think I should allow the Senator from Arkansas an opportunity to question me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On the question of what we get in value for a dollar spent, which has nothing to do with the overall problem, I think it should be made clear that Secretary Lovett very definitely confirmed the view to which reference has been made. If the Senator is interested, I can cite some of the cases.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly I am interested.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not want to repeat what the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] said yesterday, but on page 167 of the hearings there is a sort of summary statement. Secretary Lovett had already given examples, which I shall not take the time to repeat. In answer to my question Secretary Lovett said:

> Yes, sir, because as I said this morning, and gave examples yesterday, there are certain areas of expenditures which may, through the economic machinery of another country, produce greater military strength than the equivalent we would obtain by purchases of end items in this country. It is just that simple from the military point of view.

He gave specific examples. If I may make an observation, the Senator from Illinois is making a fine speech condemning the extravagance of the military in general. My only point is this: Is it not the duty of the Congress to exercise some discretion in these large programs and try to select and support that portion of them which is the most efficient and the most appropriate, considering the immediate problem in hand? I invite the attention of the Senator to what is going on in Europe today. Yesterday the European Defense Community agreement was signed; and on Friday the German contract. That should be some reassurement that at long last our efforts are beginning to pay off in Europe.

I agree with much of the argument of the Senator with respect to the over-all military situation; but I am not willing to accept his general argument as applied to this specific bill. I would be better satisfied if the Senator could convert me to the belief that this particular bill is a wasteful bill, an ill-advised, or an unworthy bill. He is using an argument applicable primarily, I think, to an entirely different bill, to discredit the pending bill. I do not follow his argument, as between the two. Much of what the Senator is saying about the military situation in general has no application to this particular bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. All I am saying is that if the defense of the United States is integral, as I believe it to be, the two bills should be considered as a whole. They involve expenditures of about $63,000,000,000. If we are to balance the budget we must make, as between those two bills, savings of $5,500,000,000 or $6,000,000,000. This is the only bill at present before us.

I would be willing to provide that $500,000,000 of any cut should be made good by a transfer from domestic defense to foreign aid if in the judgment of the President and the National Security Council that money could be better spent abroad in equipping foreign divisions than if it were spent at home to equip American divisions. But I do not like to be placed in the position in which I am constantly placed in the Senate when a particular bill is before the Senate for consideration. I am constantly told, "This is not the place or the time to effectuate economies. It is some other place, at some other time, in some other bill." That never comes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, that is not our position. The committee has already made an economy based upon a percentage of the end result. If the Senator were handling the bill de novo, his argument might well be sound. But since the bills are not here together, and since the Senator is not able to attach the qualification to which he has referred, will he vote against the pending amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It will subject the Senator from Illinois to a great deal of internal tension and torment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator offering an amendment to the pending amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the Senator from Arkansas, as a good friend, will not prematurely subject me to such tension and torment. That is a matter over which I shall have to pray during the night.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator offering such a qualification to the pending amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to offer it. We have been working all afternoon on the particular parliamentary difficulty of attaching an amendment to the pending Welker amendment. It is not easy, because the Welker amendment is 6 or 7 amendments in one. I hope to attach it to the Welker amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator does not offer the amendment, it cannot be attached.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There has to be a gleam in the eye of the parent before the child is born.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That sometimes does happen.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am throwing out some tentative suggestions which I hope may mature.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad the Senator from Illinois feels that the pending bill together with the military bill should be considered as one.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Because if we do not do so we must decide here and now what the limit shall be.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. And some months later, or a month later, we will have to decide that question again.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Illinois asked whether Secretary of Defense Lovett agreed or in any way indicated that it is possible to take away $1 from this bill or from the defense bill. I should like to say that I not only feel that Mr. Lovett has not done so, but I know of no one connected with the Department of Defense or the State Department who has agreed or said that we could take $1 from this bill or the defense bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is my understanding. I am very glad to have the eminent Senator from Michigan, who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, confirm my understanding.

Mr. FERGUSON. I find that not only do they want the amount which the President recommended, but they tell us now that there ought to be about $2,400,000,000 added to the figure because of the needs of the Air Force.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. So that only can we not take anything off, but apparently we must add something on.

Finally, there will be supplemental bills submitted which will increase the figure. Furthermore, we do not have at the present time in the defense bill appropriations to pay the cost of the Korean war for the next year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is not included in the $85,000,000,000?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is not included in the figure.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That would be at least $2,000,000,000 more, probably.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall try to get the figure. I think it is approximately $5,000,000,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That means that the situation is still worse. It means that the danger of inflation is still greater than I specifically included in my figure.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield with some timidity to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Never mind.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield, but I yield with timidity. The timidity expresses my internal feeling, because I have a faint premonition of what is to come.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not propose to ask the Senator from Illinois to yield under those circumstances. If he cannot yield cordially and freely and courteously, I do not want him to yield at all.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield with perfect cordiality for a question, provided that I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not care to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I know the Senator does not want in any way to be misunderstood. I wish to call his attention to page 419 of the House hearings on the point with respect to obligations. It is very specific.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The House hearing?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. I refer to the House hearings on this bill. I refer to testimony given by the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNeil. I should like to read it, because the witness made quite a point of the question of obligations. It is only a short quotation. I read from page 419 of the House hearings:

> Mr. McNEIL. May I pick up two of three points there? I may have given you reason for a false impression. First, we do not record anything as obligated unless a firm deal is made with a contractor. In other words, any discussions or any requests for the submission of a bid are not classified as an obligation.

So, if anybody gives you obligation figures here, it does not include any of those instances where we have asked people to make a proposal. It only becomes an obligation when the two parties have actually signed a definite and specific agreement.

He reiterates it further down on the same page:

Mr. McNEIL. The point I want to make is that we do not record anything as an obligation until it is a firm deal. Any preliminary discussions, any requests for submission of proposals, are not recorded as obligations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is a very good statement on the part of Mr. McNeil. Did Secretary of Defense Lovett use the term "obligation" in the same sense?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would certainly think so. This is the Assistant Secretary of Defense. Did the Senator from Illinois find anything in Secretary Lovett's testimony which was contrary?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; but there is an ambiguity here. He does not define the term "obligation."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know how anyone could be more definite.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is a very definite statement, but——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It could not be more definite, it seems to me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. However, I should like to have the question probed a little more fully, not merely with the Assistant Secretary of Defense, but with the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Lovett.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As so often happens, assistants know a great deal more about details than does the head of a department. That is likewise true in the case of the Senator from Illinois, I am sure, because his assistants probably know a great deal more about details than does the Senator from Illinois. I mean that is true in my office, not in the Senator's office.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is true in my office.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly, and with cordiality.

Mr. GEORGE. I think if we pursue the question far enough we will find that there is a difference between unexpended balances, obligated balances, allocated balances, and unallocated balances. They have all sorts of terms.

I am in thorough accord with what the Senator is saying about the enormous unexpended balances of the appropriations we have made for the military and for mutual security. I think that the chief vice of it is that it indicates a very lax fiscal policy, which is very bad for any country in the long run.

I am in thorough accord with the Senator about that. I think, however, that the Senator ought to take into consideration that this particular bill in the Committee on Foreign Relations was cut a billion dollars. I think I made the motion. That is, roughly, a cut of 12.6 percent in the total amount.

We followed that up by making the bill flexible, giving to the President and to the Administrator the power to make funds transferable as between items.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is within the Mutual Security Administration.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; within the Mutual Security Administration. We did that on purpose. For instance, if we had to consider the bill item by item, I believe there would have been very few members of the committee who would have desired to cut very much, if anything, from the amounts as broken down in their presentation to us for, let us say, for example, Turkey. The amount itself was not very large, but we would not have wished to cut it even by 12½ percent. However, when there is flexibility, and 10 percent can be taken from one item and applied to another item in the same bill, within the same title, or even in another title, I think the objection to an over-all cut is overcome to some extent.

I am in thorough accord with all that the Senator says about the great danger of inflation—and the danger is very great and it has not passed—and I am in thorough accord with what the Senator is saying about cutting all appropriations. I have voted most of the time for reductions.

In this instance, I feel that a cut of 12½ percent, or $1,000,000,000, in a $7,900,000,000 bill, was not a bad accomplishment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no. It was not bad at all.

Mr. GEORGE. I also feel, and I ask the Senator from Illinois whether he does not entertain a similar view, that we might make a relatively sharp cut in the defense appropriations when that bill comes before the Senate? I entertain that opinion particularly I may say to the Senator, for the reason that if we should overcut the national defense appropriations, Congress, which will be in session all next year—and, as it now looks, for the greater part of this year—will certainly have an opportunity to supplement the appropriations. But, if we should make a mistake and overcut the mutual security appropriations we would very greatly discourage the people in Europe whom we hope to encourage at the time of their greatest possible need.

I should like to ask a question of the Senator. Does he not agree with me that the Government of Russia has never accepted the western Atlantic group of nations as a defensive alliance, but has always insisted that it is aggressive?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; of course. Although the charge is not true.

Mr. GEORGE. No; it is not true. I am coming to that point now. At this very moment, following yesterday at Bonn, and following today in Paris, they have a splendid propaganda opportunity at least to convince the Western European nations, particularly their own people, that the NATO is an aggressive organization. Therefore, it seems to me we ought not cut this authorization deeper than the committee itself has cut it. I submit that as one who is in thorough sympathy with all the reasons the distinguished Senator from Illinois gives for cutting this authorization, and as one who has in mind all the dangers the Senator from Illinois has pointed out.

Yet the situation is such that if we overcut this authorization, there will result a psychological effect upon the European countries in the NATO, and it will give to the Russians an opportunity to say, "We told you so; these Americans have with you nothing but an aggressive alliance, and now they are bringing Western Germany into the picture, and there will be another world war."

Of course the things done at Bonn and the things that may have been done today at Paris—I have not seen the ticker—have not yet been finally ratified. Undoubtedly the Russians will make a desperate effort to prevent ratification of the Bonn contractual arrangement and ratification of the community security agreement which was signed today at Paris.

That being true, if we are going to continue this program at all, if it is justified at all, is it not wise not to cut this authorization more than $1,000,000,000 this year? Furthermore, is it not far wiser to make similar cuts in the domestic defense items of approximately $52,000,000,000 which soon will be before the Senate? If we make a cut of 12½ percent in the 1952 defense budget and if we make a cut of 12½ percent in the pending authorization bill, we shall have gone a long way toward balancing the budget.

I submit this to the Senator from Illinois because of my great respect for his power to evaluate properly the situation now existing in the world. Although I am strongly disposed to agree on all the points the Senator from Illinois has discussed, I cannot escape the conclusion that if we are to continue the mutual security program, now is not the time to cut it deeper than the committee already has cut it.

Let me also say to the Senator from Illinois that the House of Representatives, first through the House committee, and subsequently through action taken on the floor of the House itself—as the Senator from Illinois well knows—reduced the amount of the authorization to approximately $6,200,000,000, in round figures.

So, Mr. President, if we go through with this program as it now stands, at best the difference to be settled in the conference will be between the $6,900,000,000 figure and the $6,200,000,000 figure. Of course, in our conferences with the House of Representatives, generally we have to give and take somewhat.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, let me thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia for his very complimentary and very statesmanlike remarks.

I should like to deal very briefly with two points he has raised.

The first is that I do not quite see how we would play into the hands of the Russians by decreasing by $500,000,000 more the amount of the authorization. The attack the Russians are making against this program is based on their claim that we are appropriating too much money. The Russians could hardly reverse themselves in the middle of the stream—although apparently nothing related to propaganda is too difficult for them to do. In any event, the Russians could scarcely say that we are breaking faith with Europe if we reduce the authorization by $500,000,000, inasmuch as

Russia's complaint has been that we already are appropriating too much.

In the second place, what I have been trying to feel my way toward is the obtaining of some degree of flexibility between the defense authorizations themselves and the authorizations for foreign aid contained within the mutual security bill itself.

I believe that the provision added by the committee to the bill, namely, that the administration would have the power to transfer a given portion of the funds from one purpose to another—is distinctly a good one.

I have been advancing a proposal that, similarly, we should provide for flexibility as between defense authorizations and authorizations for foreign aid. I do not wish to give up the reality of a present economy for the prospect of a future economy which may be illusory, because we know quite well that when the defense bill comes before us, all the power of the executive departments will be turned loose in an effort to see that not 1 cent is taken from that bill as it was sent to us by the administration; and it will be very difficult for us to make any cuts in that bill.

So I do not wish to sacrifice the realities of the present for something which may never materialize. But I would be willing to provide for flexibility as between the two.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to convey to the Senator from Illinois the information I have in regard to Korea, namely, that it is assumed that the operations in Korea will continue during the entire fiscal year 1952, and will terminate with a full combat pipeline, without any significant changes in the number of military personnel. The Department of Defense estimates that the additional cost involved in the support of the Korean operations will be $5,056,697,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That would mean that the administration's budget estimate would be $90,000,000,000 instead of $85,000,000,000?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And then the deficit resulting from the administrative budget, instead of being $14,000,000,000, would be $19,000,000,000; in other words, the deficit in the cash budget would be increased to the extent of $5,000,000,000.

Therefore, Mr. President, the need for economy is intensified.

Let me ask whether the military construction item is included in the $52,000,000,000?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I think not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If it is not, there is a further item of $3,500,000,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is extra, but it may be in the budget finally. I will check on it, and will obtain that figure for the Senator from Illinois.

Furthermore, the Atomic Energy Commission's budget of approximately $4,000,000,000 is not included. In addition, the bill which calls for $2,200,000,000 for airports is not included. Aside from those items, I am not so sure that the others are not included in the budget.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in this case we are dealing with a most difficult problem. I have great respect for the Senator from New Jersey, the Senator from Arkansas, the Senator from Georgia, and the Senator from Texas in regard to the position they have taken. However, it is so easy to postpone economy; it is so easy to say, "We shall economize at some other time."

That was the difficulty which Rip Van Winkle found himself constantly getting into. He was always "swearing off"; but whenever another drink was placed before him, he would always take it.

The verbal advocates of economy have often seemed to me like those who shout for temperance in the intervals between cocktails. [Laughter.] Certainly that is a relatively ineffective form of temperance. If temperance is to be effective, it must be applied in concrete situations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator's last point, namely, that economy must be applied in concrete situations—although with some sense of discrimination, for not all the items in these programs have the same value. But, that is not the point about which I rose to inquire.

I think the Senator from Illinois dismissed with too little consideration the point first made by the Senator from Georgia. The Senator from Georgia said that in this case the European countries are seeking our aid in their effort, for the first time, to work for a federation of Europe. In considerable part they are making that effort at our urging, after having entered into tentative agreements at Lisbon. All the nations involved have important contributions to make in that regard.

My point is that as they take that definite step, they must be prepared to accept the consequences. In other words, Russia may well interpret that action as being the last straw, and Russia may decide, now that the agreement has been signed, that she must take more strenuous means to prevent the successful consummation of that effort.

Now, at that very time, the Senator from Illinois comes along and kicks over the traces; he reneges on what was at least a tentative agreement made at Lisbon; and proposes to cut our part in this effort far beyond anything that had been anticipated.

I think that point is a very serious one. I did not feel that the Senator from Illinois quite grasped the full significance of it. It is very significant when looked at from the point of view of the number of participants in the effort to create a unified defense and to provide sufficient strength to resist the Russians. Looking at it from the point of view of the other participants, I think one must admit that it is very significant. It seems to me they could well feel that, after taking the most drastic step of all, in agreeing to create a single army in Europe, the Americans have turned their backs on them; that they cannot rely on us; that we never do follow through; that we are too effervescent; that we give them too much one day and not enough the next day.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As one who lamented the failure of the United States to go into the League of Nations following World War I, and as one who has in general opposed the so-called isolationist point of view, I have a good deal of sympathy with the general position which the Senator from Arkansas is taking. But I should like to point out that, as of January 31, foreign aid had $12,000,000,000 of unexpended funds; that the proposal to add $6,900,000,000 would make available $18,900,000,000. All that is proposed is to reduce this amount by $500,000,000; and possibly not even that, which would still leave $18,400,000,000, so that at the worst all that is involved is a reduction of 3 percent in the funds available during the next 2 years.

I cannot believe that 3 percent is of such earth-shaking importance as to break up or seriously impair the European alliance.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In a moment. I would be perfectly willing to have a further amendment which would make it possible for the National Security Council to transfer $500,000,000 from the domestic defense appropriations to the mutual security appropriations for Europe; because I regard the two as integral.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Illinois knows that both the Senate and House committees proposed a cut of $1,000,000,000 in the amount originally requested, and he also knows that on the floor of the House an additional cut was made——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Totaling about $1,700,000,000.

Mr. LONG. On the floor of the House a cut has been made in an amount greater than it is here proposed to reduce this authorization.

Has the Senator heard of any world-wide repercussion which would follow if the Senate were to do the same thing the House did?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I have not heard of any world-wide repercussion, although I have heard of the warnings which have been issued by the Department of Defense, which we have all heard.

Mr. LONG. As the Senator knows, more than $4,000,000,000 is what is unexpended now.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As of the 1st of February, there was $12,000,000,000 unexpended.

Mr. LONG. Of course, there is some argument about what the figure is, but, nevertheless, we know that there are many billions of dollars of American money still on the way to Europe.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. LONG. This bill would add at least $6,000,000,000 to the flow going to the European nations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would add at least $6,400,000,000.

Mr. LONG. This country has already appropriated and spent more than $30,000,000,000 in aiding Western Europe to rebuild and to encourage their resistance to communism. Somewhere the point should be reached where we could expect those who want our assistance to be willing to contribute to their own defense. It is completely unprecedented that one nation should do as much as we have done to help other nations to help themselves. Even then, this Nation proposes to maintain the strongest Air Force in the world, the greatest superiority in atomic weapons, and the strongest Navy in the world, in order to assist, and, if necessary, to go to war for the purpose of aiding the nations of Western Europe in the event they should be invaded. It seems to me the undertaking is so entirely lopsided, that anyone who would complain of a small reduction in the appropriations for the European countries would be completely unreasonable.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CASE. How does the Senator propose to accomplish any effective limitation on expenditures? It seems to me that if we are to do that, it will be necessary to place a ceiling upon the expenditures.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the same problem as the one with which Members of the House of Representatives wrestled. They finally wound up with not merely a reduction of the appropriation but a limit on the expenditures so far as the defense bill was concerned. I should prefer not to monkey with that buzz saw in connection with this particular bill.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The estimated unexpended balance and the estimated unobligated balance being as high as they are, it would seem to me that all the Senator's argument about inflation would avail nothing, unless a ceiling were placed upon expenditures in the coming fiscal year. How would the able Senator from Illinois explain that?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that the dilatory tactics of the Department of Defense are forcing many people to the very conclusion which the Senator from South Dakota draws. That is the inevitable consequence, when huge unexpended balances are piling up. The economic decisions of the country, as to how much inflation we are going to have, are being surrendered to the military.

Mr. CASE. I may suggest that that also applies to the anticipated expenditure in 1953, of $10,345,000,000 by the Mutual Security Administration if the full request of the President should be granted. How would it be possible to permit an expenditure of $10,345,000,000 without incurring the inflation which the Senator fears? Even if we were to cut the authorization and provide the amount recommended by the committee, or even if we should cut it another $1,000,000,000, there would be no limitation upon the expenditures; the administration could still spend the $10,345,000,000 next year because of the unexpended balance.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is a great deal of merit in what the Senator from South Dakota suggests.

Mr. CASE. I may say to the Senator that, as a result of listening to the argument this afternoon, it has occurred to me to suggest an amendment, to read as follows:

> Funds authorized for appropriation by this act and unexpended balances made available to the Mutual Security Administration by prior acts shall not be available for obligation in excess of $6,300,000,000 nor for expenditure in excess of $8,300,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not certain that it should be considered, since this is an authorization bill, not an appropriation bill. It would seem to me that any limitation upon expenditure would more appropriately be directed to the appropriation bill, not to the authorization bill. I suggest that this issue can properly come up when we actually make the appropriations. But what we are doing at this time is simply to clear the sums for appropriation. We need not cross that troublesome river immediately.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Illinois to certain facts. We were debating the question whether any amount should be cut from this authorization, and whether the proposed appropriations are entirely and actually for military preparations in connection with the common defense.

I have before me a bulletin from the Mutual Security Agency, dated April 29, 1952. It is MSA Bulletin No. 84. I call attention to the fact that allotments are made for Germany; that is, for the Federal Republic, of flue-cured tobacco, 4,200 metric tons, for the contract period, April 30, 1952, to July 31, 1952, the source being the U. S. A. and possessions. The terminal delivery date is September 30, 1952. It will run over into the 1953 appropriation. The amount is $5,232,000.

With reference to burley tobacco, 1,100 metric tons, July 31, 1952, which is the contract period, with a terminal delivery date of September 30, 1952, $1,308,000.

Cigar-leaf tobacco, 430 metric tons; contract period July 31, 1952; terminal delivery date, October 31, 1952; amount, $1,300,000.

Fire-cured tobacco, 135 metric tons; contract period July 31, 1952; terminal delivery date October 31, 1952; amount, $160,000.

The grand total is $8,000,000.

Does not the Senator feel that with such items as that in the mutual security-aid program we could make some cuts?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think we could make cuts, although it must be realized that we all have desires for luxuries which we insist upon in preference to necessities. It is probably true that if we shut off tobacco from Europe there would be a great deal of discontent there.

Mr. FERGUSON. But does the Senator feel that such things are a part of the military equipment which people believe they are buying for the mutual-aid program?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. But it is a fact that the tobacco-producing sections of the United States like to have those items included; if they were not the Mutual Security Administration would have the tobacco bloc on its neck. We may as well be frank about it.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CASE. A few moments ago the Senator said we would have to cross the bridge when we came to the appropriation bill; but what are we to do about the fact that as of June 30 it is estimated that there will be left an unexpended balance of $8,900,000,000, which assumes expenditures in April, May, and June, of $800,000,000? If we do not spend that much, there will be even a greater amount——

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator makes a very cogent argument, but I suggest that the time to take this matter up will be when we come to the appropriation bill. All we are now being asked to do is to authorize an appropriation. Then the Appropriations Committee can decide how much it wishes to appropriate and what strings on expenditures it desires to attach. I hope we shall not make it more complicated by trying to make every possible cut in this bill.

Mr. CASE. We should lock the barn door before the horse gets out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We are creating financial problems because we give to the military the power to spend a great deal of money. So I have a good deal of sympathy with what the Senator from South Dakota has said.

Mr. President, I think I have completed my formal argument.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It seems to me that if the Senator's program were carried out——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I suppose the Senator has in mind the provision as to transfers?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. There would tend to be a transfer of funds to the military programs, because of commitments of most of the funds available, which would correspondingly reduce the so-called technical aid and the nonmilitary programs. That must be carefully considered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. My proposal is not a transfer from the economic section of the present bill to the military section, but from domestic defense to foreign defense, namely, from one bill to another.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator means from this side to the other side?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. There is to be a flexibility of 10 percent, in order that there may be transfers from title to title and from the economic and technical aid to the military. I think that would inevitably move funds from the nonmilitary to the military side, and the nonmilitary program would be entirely thrown out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I quite agree. What I am proposing is flexibility between home defense and foreign aid, just as we have already provided flexibility in foreign aid itself. But I want some economies now. I want a saving of $500,000,000 now, and I hope for an additional economy of $4,500,000,000 when we take up the defense bill. I do not want always to be told, "Mañana, mañana, mañana—tomorrow, tomorrow, tomorrow, some other day."

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Does the Senator realize that if the program many of us have been advocating were presented in one over-all budget, we would have the very thing for which he is arguing?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe in the consolidated appropriations bill. I am sure I voted against its discontinuance, and I would be in favor of its reinstallation. I believe in the further staffing of our Appropriations Committee, but we have to deal with what we now have.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. We are authorizing now, and the Appropriations Committee will have to atteend to the over-all picture. When it comes time for the Appropriations Committee to act, we will have to deal with these things. The problem which the Senator is considering should be taken care of, but we should not reduce it to too great an extent. The maintenance of an American infantry division costs more than $160,000,000 a year, whereas the cost of an allied division abroad is approximately $50,000,000 a year. It seems to me the Senator is arguing for one of the most extravagant things we could have.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think my record demonstrates that I am in favor of foreign aid. I campaigned for the Senate on the principle of foreign aid. I have supported foreign aid on this floor, but I also have to consider the financial and economic stability of the United States at the same time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I feel the same way, and the committee did, also, when it made an over-all cut of 12.6 percent in the military aid bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The appropriation dollars do not become inflationary until they are actually expended, when they become part of the public debt.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. That is an argument in favor of the proposal of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. FERGUSON. But we have to keep that point in mind when we are appropriating, because all the money appropriated can be used.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have no purpose in trying to hold the floor at great length. I was ready to take my seat a few moments ago. I am simply answering questions.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have listened with great interest to almost all of the Senator's discussions this afternoon. I had to be off the floor for a few minutes, but I have heard a great deal of his argument, and I am generally in accord with the principles he has announced. I shall vote for the proposed cut of $500,000,000 in the authorization.

Perhaps the Senator may have discussed this point while I was off the floor, but is he aware that there are outside the United States more than 175,000 civilian employees of the Federal Government?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I did not know the precise number.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There are more than 175,000 as of 2 or 3 months ago, and I imagine the number has not decreased since that time. To me, that is a fantastic number, which indicates that each civilian employee overseas, with certain exceptions, such as the consular service or certain diplomatic employees, are over there looking for ways and means to dispose of American dollars.

I have supported a great deal of this activity, so when I say that, I am not castigating everyone who is attempting to do a service overseas. But I suggest to the Senator from Illinois that there is a vast area where a determined administrative operation could bring about tremendous savings and greater efficiency.

A moment ago the Senator from Illinois said that he was becoming a little tired, perhaps, of hearing the cry of mañana, mañana, mañana. I should like to call his attention to the fact that when the foreign-aid program, and even the Mutual Security Program, were first put into effect, we had most positive assurances that the military strength of Western Europe would be on the high road to completion long before this time. But we have been going on, year by year, and seemingly getting no closer to the actual creation of forces in being designed to deter aggression than we were a couple of years ago. That is one of the things that discourages me about the situation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to take partial issue with the Senator. So far as I can tell, the military forces in being have increased very materially. I do not know what the statistics of the forces in being were a year ago, but I doubt that they exceeded 12 to 15 divisions. There are certainly probably twice that number or more than twice that number now. Our appropriations now may not affect the program for the remainder of the year, but under the program I think there will be close to 50 divisions. I believe appreciable progress has been made in the military defense of Western Europe. I do not think we should lose sight of that in considering the particular issue now before us. The greatest danger is that we may exaggerate on one side or the other and hence lose the calm sense of balance which is needed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. At that point I respectfully disagree with the distinguished Senator from Illinois, because, in my opinion, based upon whatever I can find, the effective troops in being in Europe today are very little, if any, greater in number or in effective operational strength than they were a couple of years ago.

True, certain papers have been signed, but the minute a document is signed as to what, for instance, France will do, and the Premier goes home to present it before the cabinet, he gets thrown out of office, and another agreement is signed. So the situation stays largely in status quo.

My concern is that there is not in Europe the progress which I think there should be and which I think we are justified in expecting.

I could vote for a great deal more money to be used overseas if the countries abroad would merely produce results under their own power, rather than do what in my opinion they are doing, dragging their feet and expecting the United States to make up the deficiency which they have promised in the past to supply, and which they should, in their own interest and in their own defense, supply.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to the Senator from Iowa that while I appreciate his motives, which are of the best, I have tried personally to refrain from any reflection upon the speed of rearmament of European countries, lest it worsen international relations. I have tried to confine my argument simply to the effects upon the United States itself.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should appreciate it if the Senator would let me make some observations before I address a question to him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. It seems to me that Members of the Senate may be inclined, as certainly the Senator from Florida is inclined, to view this kind of question against the calm, dispassionate, more or less cloistered, academic atmosphere of the Senate Chamber, because this kind of discussion naturally lends itself to that kind of attitude. I have just been reading this afternoon's edition of the Washington Evening Star, and I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the Senate that that same attitude cannot possibly prevail in that part of the world where we hope the result of our action today will be very helpful in bringing about greater mutual security. I have complete sympathy with the attitude and expressions of the Senator from Illinois with reference to his views, but here we have a very difficult question.

Adjusting our desire for mutual security against our desire for greater economy—and I certainly admit it is that kind of situation—if I can make any kind of contribution at all, I think it may be helpful to call attention to the feverish activity, to the terrific tension, which is shown by Associated Press dispatches as being existent in Europe at this very time, as a result of some of the critical events which have happened in the last couple of days, and which are now happening.

The headline in this afternoon's Evening Star, which extends all the way across the top of the page, reads: "Berlin phone lines cut in pact reprisal."

The first of several quotations from the press dispatches is as follows:

The Communists cut telephone communications between East and West Berlin and 17 long-distance lines between West Berlin and West Germany today.

Eight telegraph lines also were shut down.

Again I quote:

It appeared to be the first blow in the promised Communist reprisals for West Germany's signing of a peace pact with the western allies yesterday.

Then, again:

Earlier today the Russian border guards again barred Allied military motor patrols from the city's only highway link with the west.

The next one reads:

West German border police said, however, they had reports from persons crossing the east zone line that 131 Russian tanks were dispersed in the Brunswick area.

Again I quote:

These reports said troop garrisons in the area had been increased in the past few days.

So much, I may say to the Senator from Illinois, with reference to the Berlin situation. The other lead article on the first page has to do with the signing of the documents at Paris to set up a Western European army. I shall not attempt to quote from that long article, but it shows the tremendous, terrific tension, the realization that a great decision has been made, and that the peoples who have made it are subjected, not to the calmness of this quiet room, but to fears and apprehensions, the like of which we can hardly realize without attempting to project ourselves into their places.

The third article which I shall mention is a lead article on one of the inside pages, with reference to the tremendous political controversy in Italy, which has come to a head today in the computing of results in 2,400 municipal elections. The article shows that our very gallant ally, de Gasperi, has fought a good fight and is bringing Italy's critical situation to a constructive head, in spite of the fact that he seems to have lost in some places, in spite of the fact that there appears to have been much violence and much difficulty, which is completely different from anything we have here.

The fourth article—and I apologize for going at such length into these matters—is the very fine article, again from the Associated Press, to the effect that General Ridgway reached Paris today, and there begins to carry out and fulfill his inspiring mission for this Nation, in behalf of all nations which have participated in the great security efforts that are under way.

I shall not attempt to quote in detail from this article about General Ridgway's arrival, but I wish to quote two paragraphs. The first reads:

More than 20,000 French security police had been turned out to make sure that Communists did not successfully cause a disturbance.

That gives some idea of the immensity of the confusion, of the tremendous vigor of the opposition which exists, and of the powerful effort which is being made by our friends and allies to make sure that no untoward incident shall mark the occasion of the arrival of General Ridgway to assume possibly the greatest responsibility that any American commander has ever undertaken.

To show the attitude of the French, let me give one further quotation:

French authorities chose the longer route through the city as a gesture of contempt to Communists who threatened to demonstrate against the arrival. Interior Minister Charles Brune ordered police to crack the heads of anyone trying to start a riot.

Against that background of terrific turmoil and confusion there is a strong showing of willingness on the part of our allies to stand up and be counted by signing yesterday the German peace pact, and by signing today the contract by which a joint European army is created. When our allies take these tremendous security steps, when they stand out against the efforts of the Russians to scare them on the borders of Berlin and the eastern zone of Germany, does not the Senator feel that we ought to go a long way here to avoid doing anything which might appear to them, under those confusing conditions over there, to be a retreat on our part, or to be a showing of unwillingness to follow up two great committees of the Senate which, studying this question from different points of view, have come out with approximately the same answer, namely, that $1,000,000,000 should be cut off the recommended amount—and that is a tremendous cut—but that no further cut can be safely made? In the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Illinois would it not be a very difficult thing for our allies to construe such an act of the Senate as we might construe it here, calmly and dispassionately, as an effort to accomplish a saving of $3.25 to every man, woman, and child in the United States? Would it not be a difficult thing for those people, who are literally fighting for their existence, fighting for a security which they hope will mean their peace and the peace of the world, to construe our act today as anything else than a retreat and a withdrawal from a firm position taken by the acts of our two committees and by our executive department? Does not the Senator believe that, desirable as economy may be, and always is—and it is more desirable now than at any other time within the lives of the Senator from Illinois, and the Senator from Florida—the desire for economy ought to yield in this instance to our very real fear that our allies in Europe, looking at this act, might feel that we had done a dispiriting thing, a discouraging thing, and that we had in a sense turned our backs upon them at a time when they have shown the greatest aggressiveness, the greatest courage, and the greatest desire to stand by us and by our great new commander, who arrived only today to lead them?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, let me say to my good friend from Florida that, of course, we have a very difficult decision to make. I believe that each of us is torn between conflicting purposes, both of them worthy.

I have no criticism to make either of the judgment or of the intentions of those who say that security is so important that we should disregard economy and disregard a balanced budget, and go all the way. I am not going to criticize them. I merely wish to say that we also have a problem of financial and economic stability.

I have noticed that a whole series of emergencies is always developing. At each moment they seem to be almost overpowering. They lead us in the direction of appropriations. However, we tend to forget the long-run effects of an unbalanced budget.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. All I have been trying to do this afternoon is to have us raise our sights from a purely immediate danger—and I grant that there is an immediate danger—to the possible alternative ultimate danger of continued inflation through unbalanced budgets. I say that this is a consideration also to be borne in mind.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not going to yield at the moment, because now I am under full sail.

We liberal Democrats have got ourselves into a somewhat bad habit of mind as a result of the experiences of the past 18 years. We had a depression, and Franklin Roosevelt spent a great deal of money to put idle people to work with idle resources. I think, on the whole, it was money well spent. I would defend a Government deficit in a period of great unemployment.

Then Hitler came along, and we spent a great deal of money to defeat Hitler. In the main, I think that was money well spent. Liberals and believers in international peace threw their hats in the air again and said, "Hurrah." I think however that we have got ourselves into a conditioned reflex, so to speak, in which we tend to approve any appropriation and to disregard economy.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am reminded of the experiments of the great Dr. Pavlov, the physiologist, who worked with dogs. He would ring a bell in the ear of a dog and then give the dog a steak. When the dog ate the steak, of course, the saliva would flow from his mouth. Then the doctor took away the steak, and rang the bell in the ears of the dog, who had become so accustomed to associate the ringing of the bell with the steak that the saliva continued to flow. But after a while the flow became insubstantial. The effect of the ringing of bells in the ears of the dogs became less and less, and the dogs had to be sent to an animal psychiatrist.

I think many liberals and others have got themselves into much the same position. We were in favor of appropriations to get us out of the depression. I am not going to apologize for that program. I think it was a good program. We got ourselves into the habit of approving expenditures to defeat Hitler. Those were good expenditures. But let us not fall into the habit of Dr. Pavlov's dogs and become victims of a conditioned animal reflex, and think that all

appropriations are proper, regardless of their purpose or amount. Let us consider each issue as it arises, and judge whether the immediate gains which we see so clearly are greater than the ultimate costs, which we do not see so readily but which are nevertheless real.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield. If later someone should come along and measure the number of inches which I have taken in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, let me say that I wanted to take my seat 2 hours ago. I have been kept on my feet only by questions. I am delighted to yield to our beloved majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from Illinois spoke of emergencies occurring constantly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator does not mean to imply, does he, that our Government or our allies are in any way responsible for the emergency to which the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has referred?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I am not resorting to the campaign dodge which is sometimes used against my party, to the effect that it is we who create the emergencies. Such emergencies arise unfortunately from the structure of the world. All I am trying to say is that most of such emergencies turn out afterward not to be as serious as they seemed at the time. We need a certain sense of composure in dealing with such matters.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator stated that it was money well spent to put down Hitlerism.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does not the Senator think it is just as important to put down communism as it was to put down Hitlerism?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly; but until we get into a hot war I want the preparedness effort—and I am for a big preparedness effort—to proceed without inflation. That is the point. It should proceed without inflation. The only way it can proceed without inflation is within the confines of a comparatively balanced budget.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator would agree, would he not, that the best use of money that could be made would be to prevent a hot war?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is the object of this appropriation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is the object; but it may create inflation in the process. It is a very difficult problem to weigh. I do not pretend that I have the final answer. All I say is that I have tried to present a set of considerations which customarily tend to be ignored.

Mr. MOODY. Is it not correct to say that the reason crises which have seemed to be so serious at the time have sometimes passed away was because vigorous action was, generally speaking, taken about them? If we had sat by and done nothing about them the world might have come down around our heads.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will say to my good friend from Michigan that whether we make available the total sum of $18,900,000,000 or whether we cut the sum to $18,400,000,000 will not have any real effect upon whether the Russians try to take West Berlin. That question will be partially settled by the determination of our military men and by the policy of our Government. I want to say that if the Russians try to take West Berlin by force I am for resisting them by force. Let there be no mistake. I am not in favor of appeasement in this or any other matter. If the showdown comes, we will appropriate money without stint or limit. However, pending that time let us try to consider the long-range implications of what we do, with a view toward having that peace that people are considering.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. The distinguished Senator from Illinois has made the issue here economy versus the building of strength which our committees have said is necessary. My contention a little earlier was that that is not the issue. If the cut is made, what will happen is not that the volume of things needed to defend the peace and to defend our allies and ourselves will be decreased, but merely that the time of vulnerability will be stretched out, and in the long run the actual cost in dollars will be greater. Therefore, it seems to me that the real side of economy—and I readily admit that the distinguished Senator from Illinois knows much more about the subject of economy that I do, and I recognize his colorful——

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Michigan should not be so apologetic. He has demonstrated a very deep understanding of the nature and causes of inflation, and we have fought together many times for specific economies.

Mr. MOODY. I recognize the colorful reference from his recently published great book, Economy in the National Government, pertaining to dogs and steak. Nevertheless, is it not true that we will have to build up a certain amount of defense in Western Europe, and the question is, When shall we do it? Shall we do it now and cut down the period of our vulnerability, or shall we put it off? I am in favor of doing it as soon as possible, because I believe the danger of war will thus be decreased to that extent. The sooner we can do the job, the less will be the danger of war. The longer the delay, and the more we cut down on our production schedules, the more military items we need to defend ourselves will cost per item, and the greater will be the expense.

Therefore, I submit to my distinguished colleague that, while the amendment which is pending has the illusion of economy, actually it is an extravagant amendment, because it will make the defense of the free world more expensive.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is a very difficult matter. I certainly do not pretend to have the final answer. I should like, however, to warn my good friend to beware of the danger of falling into the conditioned reflex of Dr. Pavlov's dogs.

Mr. MOODY. I am not sure I have not fallen into it, and I am sure the Senator does not mean to say that I have.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, of course not. The Senator has shown too many times that he has not. Nevertheless we should still be on our guard against it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The distinguished Senator from Illinois, in commenting a little while ago on the question which I addressed to him, referred to the fact that liberals had gotten used to appropriating money for every ill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my distinguished friend from Florida that I am not trying to dissociate myself from that group of liberals. In the proper sense of that term I am proud to be called a liberal.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand. The Senator is a liberal in a very proper sense. There are other definitions of a liberal which he and I will agree are inaccurate. I am sure that the Senator from Illinois will agree that I am not anything more than a moderate liberal.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would regard the Senator from Florida as a very nice man.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the high encomium. The Senator from Florida simply wanted to comment that as a moderate liberal, trying to stay pretty close to the middle of the road and trying to keep his feet on the ground, it seems to him in the crisis which exists—and there has been no crisis like it before, because there has been no signing of a German peace treaty before, and there has never before been the signing of a pact by which a joint and united European defense army has been set up—that a realist, whether he be a liberal, a moderate, or a conservative, or what not, must recognize the fact that the action of the Senate today is not going to be interpreted against the calm background of the debate in the Senate, but against the background of terrific tension which exists in the streets of Paris tonight, in the streets of Berlin tonight, and in the streets of Rome tonight; and that those of us who want to be realists must make very certain that we do not ignore the fact that it is the atmosphere which prevails over there which will largely determine the reception with which reasonable men in Europe will greet the news of the action taken here.

The Senator from Florida is strongly of the persuasion that, approaching the matter from that point of view, this is one time when even his good friend the Senator from Illinois will allow his zeal for economy to yield to the undoubted fact that an additional cut, beyond the very large cut of $1,000,000,000 already made by the two great committees, would necessarily be interpreted

as a diminution of zeal on the part of the Congress of the United States as a turning of our backs upon our determination to see this thing through, as a withholding in part of aid and mutual security grants which seemed to be assured, and, most important, as a pulling of the rug from under the feet of General Ridgway at the very moment of his arrival in Europe to accept one of the heaviest responsibilities that any American has ever been asked to accept.

It is from that point of view that the Senator from Florida strongly urges his feeling and his conviction that here is a matter which we should view from the background of what is going to be the effect of our action upon this joint venture on which we have embarked, from which we dare not retreat, from which we do not want to retreat, from which I am perfectly well aware that the distinguished Senator from Illinois does not want to retreat, any more than the Senator from Florida wants to retreat. We must view the matter from the very realistic point of view of how our action will almost necessarily be received by those who are most vitally affected by it, our allies in Europe.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, without unduly going into personal and family matters, the view which has just been expressed by my good friend from Florida is the one which was expressed to me by my wife last night and this morning as we were discussing this issue. Even in the face of the expressed opinion of a person who almost invariably exhibits better judgment than I do, I must, however, make my own decision.

While I have a great deal of sympathy for the Senator from Florida in the expression of his views, nevertheless, it may be that I am getting to be like one of Pavlov's dogs. Perhaps I have been conditioned by constantly seeking economy and always being told: "This is not the time or the place." It may be that in the shell game of economy I am a little "shell-shocked" from my 3 years' experience on the floor of the Senate, when on every issue, whether it is with respect to the internal waterways of Florida, bonus pay for fliers, the reduction of appropriations for irrigation, or whatnot, the answer always comes: "This is not the time."

I may be shell-shocked. I may have been conditioned. It may be that my suppressed Scotch blood is gradually coming to the surface and I am being economical in some place where I ought not to be economical. That is possible. Nevertheless I have heard the same story so many times that I may be pardoned if in this particular case I wish to sprinkle a little salt over it. However, I have been through this experience many times, and always the answer has been the same: "Don't do it now."

So, as I say, my approach to this matter may have been conditioned by my experience, and my reaction may have been emotional, instead of highly intellectual; but I do not think that is so. Certainly there is still the problem of financial and economic stability.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the Chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield. First, Mr. President, I wish to say again that I am not keeping the floor out of conceit or out of a desire to hear the sound of my own voice. I should like to take my seat. However, if the Senator from West Virginia wishes to ask me a question, I shall endeavor to answer it.

Mr. KILGORE. Of course, the Senator from Illinois recalls, does he not, that since the War Between the States and the Spanish-American War, we have engaged in only two major wars, namely, the First World War and the Second World War; and in referring to those wars, I am sure the Senator from Illinois recalls that during World War I, both Britain and France were strong.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. Based upon the strength of Britain and France, we were given the necessary time in which to prepare to meet our enemies.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from Illinois will also agree with me, will he not, that the result of World War I was to pull down to a considerable degree the strength of both Britain and France?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. Furthermore, following that war, both Britain and France engaged in another world war, during which again they gave us time in which to prepare to fight our enemies and to prepare to make our blows effective; and since then both Britain and France have decreased markedly in strength and have gone through a difficult period of reconstruction.

Furthermore, during the last war, Holland, Belgium, and Norway went through most difficult times.

So, Mr. President, to my mind the question is not so much one of extending military aid as it is one of helping to build up in those countries strength and a will to resist and a desire to produce their own military weapons so that they will be able to help us in our hour of need. Does not the Senator from Illinois agree with me on that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia has presented a very logical argument. I do not disagree with the Marshall plan or with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. I voted for both of those proposals, and I believe in them.

Certainly I will vote for an aid bill.

I am saying that in this case we have an opportunity to help protect the financial stability of our country, without appreciably endangering our country's military security. In the present instance we have to weigh both those considerations.

Mr. KILGORE. Then does the Senator from Illinois believe that the military budget now proposed is much larger than necessary?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I simply say that it is somewhat more than necessary, based upon both the measures already in effect and those intended to be put into effect. Furthermore, the financial demands for the atomic-energy program and for the situation in Korea, to both of which the Senator from Michigan has referred previously today, present a further financial danger.

I merely ask that the importance of the various requirements be weighed in respect to each other and to the economic capacity of the country. Some persons may consider one of more importance; some may consider the other to be of greater importance.

Mr. President, having no desire to detain my colleagues, I now yield the floor.

NATIONAL GOLF DAY

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I submit a resolution which I shall read. Then I shall request its immediate consideration. I believe that the Senate will be willing to adopt the resolution unanimously, and that consideration of the resolution will take only a moment.

The resolution I now submit reads as follows:

Whereas there is tremendous need for maintaining and increasing the facilities of the United Service Organization, better known as the USO, to serve our men and women in uniform and their families, in this country and overseas; and

Whereas there also is urgent need for maintaining and increasing the National Golf Fund for its worthy contributions to outstanding charitable causes; and

Whereas the game of golf can be eminently beneficial to the financial needs of the USO and the National Golf Fund by one of the most unusual tournaments in the history of golf; and

Whereas one of the world's outstanding golfers, while playing 18 holes at the Northwood Club, Dallas, Tex., Saturday, May 31, 1952, will be competing at the same time with hundreds of thousands of America's golfers on this country's 4,970 public and private fairways for contributions to be donated in entirety in equal shares to the USO and the National Golf Fund: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that May 31, 1952, be observed as National Golf Day.

Mr. President, I now send the resolution to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. CONNALLY. The resolution should be referred to a committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is not sufficient time to send the resolution to a committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. The committee could meet tomorrow.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have asked for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan for the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 321) was considered and agreed to.

SETTLEMENT OF TAX CASES WITH GAMBLERS AND RACKETEERS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on numerous occasions during the past few years, charges have been made that the Treasury Department was settling tax cases with big-time gamblers and racketeers on a more liberal basis than that

accorded the average taxpayer. First, these charges were made by the California Crime Commission and later repeated by the Kefauver crime committee.

I felt that the best way to determine the accuracy or inaccuracy of these charges was to select specific cases, and then review the record for the past several years to see what, if any, special consideration that class of taxpayer had obtained.

In assembling this information I have attempted to go back at least 10 years, reviewing all delinquencies or compromise settlements as well as obtaining information on the manner in which the tax returns of these individuals have been investigated.

Today I shall report on three cases.

The first case is that of Ralph Capone, 7234 South Prairie Avenue, Chicago, Ill. The Department of Justice' records describe this individual as one of the Nation's most prominent racketeers.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a breakdown of the tax record of Ralph Capone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Taxable year	Symbols [1]	Amount assessed	Paid, abated or credited			Balance outstanding	Remarks
			Date paid	Schedule No.	Amount		
1922	OT	$1,028.00					
	P	257.00		32857	$1,285.00 Ab		Abated.
1922	CT	1,028.00					
	P	257.00					
	I	232.14				$1,517.14	O in C submitted Oct. 13, 1927, rejected. O in C submitted Mar. 1, 1929, rejected. O in C submitted Mar. 4, 1929, rejected. Suit instituted Dec. 17, 1933. O in C submitted Nov. 19, 1942, rejected. Amended O in C submitted Oct. 11, 1943, rejected. O in C submitted Jan. 27, 1949, pending.
1923	OT	1,266.00					
	P	316.50		32857	1,582.50 Ab		Abated.
1923	CT	1,266.00					
	P	316.50					
	I	209.93				1,792.43	Same as 1922.
1924	OT	955.00					
	P	238.75		32857	1,239.94 Ab		
	I	217.94		48840	116.88 Ab	54.87	Do.
1924	CT	955.00					
	P	238.75					
	I	101.06				1,294.81	Do.
1925	OT	603.75					
	P	150.94		32857	754.69 Ab		
	I	65.33		48840	65.33 Ab	None	
1925	CT	816.75					
	P	204.18					
		37.42		32857	20.55 Ab	1,037.80	Do.
United States court case on 1922 through 1925.	F	9,000.00	Jan. 29, 1932		9,000.00 Pd		Fine and cost by United States court.
	F	100.00	Oct. 10, 1933		100.00 Pd		Title 28, sec. 80, U. S. C.
	C	654.90	Mar. 19, 1934		654.90 Pd	None	
1926	DT	11,126.95					
	P	8,345.22					
	I	5,403.89				24,876.06	Lien field, Dec. 10, 1936. O in C submitted May 28, 1937, rejected. O in C submitted Nov. 16, 1939, rejected. O in C submitted Nov. 19, 1942, rejected. Amended O in C Oct. 11, 1943, rejected.
1927	DT	17,301.05					Form 900 in file extending statute of limitations to Dec. 31, 1952. O in C submitted Jan. 27, 1949, pending.
	P	12,975.79					
	I	7,364.32				37,641.16	Same as 1926.
1928	OT	471.71	May 9, 1929		295.33 Pd		
	I	1.05	July 10, 1929		177.43 Pd	None	
1928	AT	13,239.36					
	P	6,619.68					
	I	4,841.07				24,700.11	Do.
1929	OT	669.66	Mar. 14, 1930		669.66 Pd	None	
1930	OT	608.86	Mar. 16, 1931		608.86	None	
1931	OT	96.75	Mar. 15, 1932		96.75 Pd	None	
1932	OT	184.00	Mar. 1, 1933		184.00 Pd	None	
1933	OT	241.02	Mar. 14, 1934		241.02 Pd	None	
1934	OT	833.47	Mar. 15, 1935		233.47 Pd		
	I	6.96	June 15, 1935		200.00 Pd		
1934	AT	98.06	Dec. 10, 1935		200.00 Pd		
	I	8.97	Mar. 2, 1936		200.00 Pd		
			do		6.96 Pd		
			Oct. 12, 1936		107.03 Pd	None	
1935	OT	476.02	Mar. 16, 1936		146.02 Pd		
			June 15, 1936		110.00 Pd		
1935	AT	122.78	Sept. 14, 1936		110.00 Pd		
	I	4.21	Dec. 15, 1936		110.00 Pd		
			Oct. 12, 1936		126.99 Pd	None	
1936	OT	802.95	Mar. 15, 1937		202.95 Pd		
	I	10.73	June 16, 1937		200.00 Pd		
1936	AT	68.94	Sept. 15, 1937		202.49 Pd		
	I	53.17	Feb. 8, 1938		197.51 Pd		
			do		10.73 Pd		
			Jan. 23, 1950		68.94 Pd		
				150760	53.17 Cr	None	Overassessment on other years.
1937	OT	1,283.99	Mar. 15, 1938		323.99 Pd		
			June 15, 1938		320.00 Pd		
1937	AT	112.32	Sept. 14, 1938		320.00 Pd		
	I	79.89	Dec. 14, 1938		320.00 Pd		
			Jan. 23, 1950		112.32 Pd		
				150760	79.89 Cr	None	Do.
1938	OT	961.40	Mar. 15, 1939		250.00 Pd		
			June 15, 1939		230.70 Pd		

[1] NOTE.—OT—Original tax disclosed on return filed by taxpayer.
CT—Corrected tax.
AT—Additional tax assessed on basis of revenue agent's report covering audit of return.
DT—Delinquent tax, returns were not timely filed.
P—Penalty.
I—Interest.
Ab—Abated.
Cr—Credited.
Pd—Paid.
F—Fine.
C—Cost.

Taxable year	Symbols [1]	Amount assessed	Paid, abated or credited: Date paid	Schedule No.	Amount	Balance outstanding	Remarks
1938	AT	$267.82	Sept. 15, 1939		$241.00 Pd		
	I	174.43	Dec. 9, 1939		239.70 Pd		
			Jan. 23, 1950		267.82 Pd		Overassessment on other years.
				159769	141.54 Cr		Do.
				159769	32.89 Cr	None	Do.
1939	OT	$1,402.87	Mar. 15, 1940		352.80 Pd		
			June 13, 1940		352.80 Pd		
			Sept. 13, 1940		350.00 Pd		
			Dec. 14, 1940		347.27 Pd	None	
1940	OT	1,953.64	Mar. 14, 1941		488.41 Pd		
			June 14, 1941		488.50 Pd		
			Sept. 15, 1941		488.50 Pd		
			Dec. 16, 1941		488.23 Pd	None	
1941	OT	7,477.40	Mar. 14, 1942		1,869.35 Pd		
			June 15, 1942		1,872.40 Pd		
			Sept. 15, 1942		1,870.00 Pd		
			Dec. 18, 1942		1,865.65 Pd	None	
1942	OT	4,176.17	Mar. 13, 1943		1,044.17 Pd		
			June 15, 1943		1,100.00 Pd		
				Mim-5621	2,032.00 Ab		Abated under Revenue Act 1943.
1943	OT	2,440.42	Sept. 14, 1943	ES	954.50 Pd		
			Dec. 15, 1943	ES	954.50 Pd		
1943	AT	767.88	Mar. 14, 1944		531.42 Pd		
	I	269.76	Jan. 23, 1950		767.88 Pd		
			June 15, 1950		118.68 Pd		
				159769	151.08 Cr	None	Overassessment on other years.
1944	OT	1,604.11	Apr. 15, 1944	ES	264.45 Pd		
			June 15, 1944	ES	264.45 Pd		
			Sept. 8, 1944	ES	264.45 Pd		
			Jan. 15, 1945	ES	453.68 Pd		
			Mar. 13, 1945		357.08 Pd	None	
1945	OT	646.11	Mar. 12, 1945	ES	200.00 Pd		
			June 2, 1945	ES	200.00 Pd		
1945	AT	29.86	Sept. 12, 1945	ES	200.00 Pd		
	I	6.91	Jan. 15, 1946		46.11 Pd		
			Jan. 23, 1950		29.86 Pd		
			June 15, 1950		6.91 Pd	None	
1946	OT	$1,064.92	Mar. 15, 1946	ES	350.00 Pd		Had an overpayment of $54.01 which was credited to 1947 estimated tax.
			June 10, 1946	ES	300.00 Pd		
1946	AT	957.77	Sept. 9, 1946	ES	150.00 Pd		
	I	164.08	Jan. 15, 1947	ES	264.92 Pd		
			Jan. 23, 1950		957.77 Pd		
			June 15, 1950		164.08 Pd	None	
1947	OT	4,826.50	Mar. 15, 1947	ES	325.96 Pd		Had an overpayment of $167.54 which was refunded Apr. 15, 1948.
			June 16, 1947	ES	325.96 Pd		
1947	AT	1,254.78		90814	54.01 Cr		
	I	139.68	Sept. 15, 1947	ES	351.93 Pd		
			Jan. 15, 1948	ES	3,768.64 Pd		
			Jan. 23, 1950		1,254.78 Pd		
			June 15, 1950		139.68 Pd	None	
1948	OT	1,500.00	Mar. 15, 1948	ES	500.00 Pd		Had an overpayment of $442.06 which was refunded Feb. 16, 1949.
			June 7, 1948	ES	500.00 Pd		
1948	AT	1,487.52	Sept. 15, 1948	ES	500.00 Pd		
The years 1936 through 1948 were reexamined by revenue agent.	I	79.44	Jan. 23, 1950		843.01 Pd		
			June 15, 1950		79.44 Pd		
				159769	104.30 Cr		Overassessment on other years.
				159769	540.21 Cr	None	Do.
1949	OT	4,906.16	Mar. 15, 1949	ES	1,050.00 Pd		Even return.
			June 15, 1949	ES	1,050.00 Pd		
			Sept. 15, 1949	ES	1,050.00 Pd		
			Jan. 15, 1950	ES	1,756.16 Pd	None	
1950	OT	4,100.00	Mar. 15, 1950	ES	900.00 Pd		Had an overpayment of $420.98 which was refunded May 3, 1951.
			June 15, 1950	ES	900.00 Pd		
			Sept. 15, 1950	ES	900.00 Pd		
			Jan. 15, 1951	ES	1,400.00 Pd	None	

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, during the period 1922 to 1928, inclusive, Ralph Capone's income taxes were delinquent. The unpaid assessments for those years total $92,914.38.

These assessments have been allowed to remain unpaid on the books of the Treasury Department for the past 25 years; and as recently as January 1, 1952, the taxpayer was still trying to settle this obligation, through a compromise agreement with the Treasury Department, for a small fraction of the total amount due.

The records also show that it was not until after the recent exposures in the Tax Bureau had begun that any aggressive action was taken by the Department of Justice against this taxpayer.

On March 16, 1951, a complaint had been filed charging Ralph Capone with filing a false statement in connection with his offer in compromise and with concealing assets in connection with this offer.

On September 10, 1951, that case was dismissed.

On November 30, 1951, I called upon the Treasury Department for a record of how they had been handling this particular case; and while perhaps there is no connection between my letter and their action, nevertheless it is noted that on January 16, 1952, Ralph Capone was indicted. His indictment then was for filing false statements with his compromise offer, and not for his failure to pay his taxes.

The net result is that for the past 25 years the Federal Government has been financing Ralph Capone's racketeering operation to the extent of $93,000, without even collecting any interest; and today the Government is on the verge of settling the unpaid claim for an insignificant fraction of its total.

The second case is that of John (Jack) Guzik, Chicago, Ill.

John Guzik, ofttimes referred to as "Greasy Thumb," was a former associate of Al Capone and the treasurer of the Al Capone syndicate, which gang was engaged in various illegal activities in and around Chicago, Ill.

A review of his tax record shows that on March 18, 1942, upon the recommendation of J. P. Wenchel, Chief Counsel of the Treasury Department, and with the approval of Norman D. Cann, Acting Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and John L. Sullivan, Acting Secretary of

Treasury, an $892,283.79 proposed tax liability was settled for $100,000.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a breakdown of these assessments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Year	Tax	Date assessed	6-percent interest assessed	Interest accrued to Feb. 26, 1942	Penalty, 50 percent	Total
1924	$101,387.45	Apr. 19, 1935	$59,124.85	$86,698.62	$50,693.72	$297,904.64
1925	30,533.57	....do....	16,660.87	25,639.90	15,266.79	[1]8,101.13
1926	7,209.92	....do....	3,501.55	5,876.80	3,604.96	[1]0,193.23
1927	66,176.42	....do....	28,168.49	52,310.42	33,088.21	179,743.54
1928	47,046.85	....do....	17,203.03	36,030.33	23,523.42	123,803.63
1936	133,183.88	July 1, 1940	26,408.71	16,285.84	[1]6,659.19	182,537.62
Total	385,538.09		151,067.50	222,841.91	132,836.29	892,283.79

[1] For the year 1936 a 5-percent negligence penalty was asserted and assessed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, since the above deficiencies in income tax, penalties, and interest for the years 1924 to 1928, inclusive, were assessed pursuant to an order of the United States Board of Tax Appeals which had become final, the outstanding liability for those years was declared legally due.

The assessment of the deficiency in income tax and negligence penalty for the year 1936 was made after Mr. Guzik had permitted the statutory period for filing a petition with the United States Board of Tax Appeals to expire without filing a petition for a redetermination of the deficiency in income tax and negligence penalty asserted in the 90-day deficiency notice which had been mailed to him on March 9, 1940. During the years following the assessment of these taxes Jack Guzik made numerous attempts to compromise his $900,000 tax obligation: On October 10, 1936, he submitted an offer of $5,000. On July 26, 1937, this offer was increased to $10,000. On October 23, 1937, this offer was increased to $25,000. On February 19, 1938, this offer was increased to $35,000.

These offers were rejected apparently because Mr. Guzik, on the advice of his then counsel, refused to file a financial statement of his assets and liabilities.

On July 15, 1939, a fifth offer was submitted—amount unknown.

On March 20, 1941, Mr. Guzik offered the Government $75,000 in full settlement of his tax obligation. This offer, too, was rejected on August 7, 1941.

On November 18, 1941, Messrs. Eugene Bernstein and James C. Leaton, attorneys of Chicago, Ill., executed and filed with the collector an $85,000 installment offer on behalf of John Guzik. This compromise offer was rejected on February 3, 1942, one of the reasons given being that again the collector's office had been unable to secure from Mr. Guzik a statement of his assets and liabilities.

On February 2, 1942, Mr. F. R. Shearer, Chicago division counsel, addressed a communication to the Chief Counsel of the Bureau in Washington, advising that Mr. Eugent Bernstein, one of Mr. Guzik's attorneys, had informally stated to a representative of the technical staff that he believed that John Guzik would increase his offer to $100,000 if reasonable assurances could be given that an offer in that amount would be accepted. In that memorandum Mr. Shearer gave his recommendation to such an agreement.

Mr. Daniel J. Conerty, chief field deputy of the Chicago, Ill., office, in a memorandum dated March 9, 1942, transmitting Mr. Guzik's statement of assets and liabilities recommended acceptance of the $100,000 offer on the ground that the amount offered was probably more than could otherwise be collected by the Government. In making this recommendation he pointed out what he described as Mr. Guzik's "reduced earning power."

Guzik's $100,000 offer was accepted by the Government on March 18, 1942, and thereby the Treasury Department wiped the slate clean for this racketeer during the years involved.

With the compromise offer John Guzik filed a net worth statement showing assets of only $41,125.

During the 6-year period in which John Guzik was attempting to settle his outstanding tax obligation for a small fraction of the total amount due, it is noteworthy that his reported income was fairly substantial; for instance:

Year:	Net income
1936	$52,560.00
1937	59,639.00
1938	62,842.00
1939	29,651.35
1940	15,015.50
1941	30,100.00
Total	249,807.85

Thus, we find that during the period in which John Guzik successfully negotiated a deal with the Treasury Department whereby he settled an $892,000 tax claim for $100,000 or about 11 cents on the dollar, his reported net income was approximately a quarter of a million dollars.

The third case is that of Al Capone, Joe Fusco, John (Jack) Guzik, and others, all of Chicago, Ill.

The Tax and Penalties Division of the Department of Justice had in 1935 made an assessment jointly against this group for $119,367 based on their failure to pay the tax on 19,894 half barrels of beer during the prohibition era. This item still remained unpaid in 1942.

On July 1, 1942, the above persons submitted an offer in compromise in the amount of $30,000 as full settlement of the $119,367 claim, which offer was accepted by the Department of Justice.

One of the arguments advanced by the Treasury Department for their compromising the taxes of some of the Nation's prominent racketeers is that this class of operators do not keep books. They point out that racketeers and gamblers conduct the most of their operations in cash, thereby rendering it extremely difficult for the Government to prove their cases regarding their actual earnings.

Treasury officials explain their acceptance of these compromise offers on the basis that since racketeers keep a substantial part of their assets in the form of hidden cash or invested in legitimate business enterprises under fictitious names, it is hard for the Government to collect the taxes due.

This explanation is difficult for the average taxpayer to accept in view of the manner in which the Treasury Department forces him to render an accurate accounting of all financial transactions.

These cases are offered as further examples of the manner in which the New Deal administration has been enforcing the tax laws against some of the Nation's most prominent racketeers as compared to the treatment they have been giving to other taxpayers.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I announced earlier that after the consideration of the pending bill was concluded tomorrow—if it should be concluded—there would be a call of the calendar. I have been informed that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], cannot be ready tomorrow. Therefore the calendar will be called on some other day. Instead of a call of the calendar tomorrow, if time permits I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2968, a bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended. It is Calendar No. 1408.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, one moment. I shall have to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire if it is not a fact that the leadership has been persistent in demanding that the consideration of this important bill be expedited? We are here ready to vote. What is wrong? Why should we postpone action for several days after we received a lecture a short time ago charging the minority with holding up action on this bill?

Mr. BRIDGES. It was the desire, I know, of most of the Members on this side of the aisle that a vote be taken on some of the amendments tonight. I know that what the Senator from Idaho has said is correct. It has been stated by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and other Senators that

there is necessity for quick action on this bill. We are here and are ready to give such action.

Mr. DWORSHAK. We are being penalized again because absent Senators are interfering with and delaying action of the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Apparently some Senators have been advised that there would be no vote tonight, and they have gone home, tired. That perhaps is one of the reasons for not proceeding with the bill this evening.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Did we not vote on one amendment? Is it not a fact that those who go home are not so tired as are those of us who remain here ready for action?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think that is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator from New Hampshire think we can finish this bill by 9 o'clock, and that we might then take up the St. Lawrence seaway measure?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the chances of taking up the St. Lawrence seaway bill are excellent if we can expedite the consideration of other legislation.

Mr. AIKEN. It seems to me that there is some foot-dragging in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The suggestion of the absence of a quorum has been withdrawn.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, addressing the majority leader, I should like to say to him that the minority party is well represented on the floor of the Senate at this time. We are ready to vote and go on with the program which he has many times expressed a desire to finish. But considering all the factors, we are probably going to play the game by allowing a recess of the Senate tonight, so that we can proceed under a unanimous-consent agreement tomorrow.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it seems that it is coming to be one of the chief sports to chastise the majority leader either for his shortcomings or for what he does, and probably justifiably so; but of course that would depend upon the opinions of the various Senators. Certainly I have tried to be just as fair to Senators on one side of the aisle as on the other. I have never tried to take advantage of the minority at any time. So long as I am in the position I now occupy, I never shall. I have never waited until I felt there were more Senators present on this side of the aisle than on the other, and then stated, "We are going to vote."

When we obtained a unanimous-consent agreement, it meant that the progress of the pending bill would be expedited and it would be disposed of in due course. The distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] told me that it was the general understanding that if the agreement were entered into there would not be a vote until tomorrow. So we moved along until it was evident that the Senate would be in session until 6 o'clock, and since there were still other Senators who wanted to speak, it appeared that we might consume at least another hour. So we proceeded accordingly.

One reason why Senators are willing to enter into unanimous-consent agreements and to limit debate is that they may not have to work long hours or work day and night. There is a limit to the number of hours Senators can remain in attendance, transacting the business of the Senate.

When we can reach unanimous consent agreements, and thus expedite the business of the Senate without working at night, it is much better policy to follow that course and thereby conserve the strength of Senators. I dare say that this morning every Senator came to his office around 9 o'clock, and it is now 6 o'clock, so that already they have been working 9 hours, and many will have more work to do before they return to their homes.

I have tried to be considerate of the health and welfare of Members of the Senate. It is only when I have thought it was absolutely necessary that we should push ahead with night sessions that I have ever insisted on having them. We shall have to have some night sessions, but how much would we have gained by having one tonight? Senators came to me and asked if there would be any votes this afternoon. I saw that the session might run into the night. After the distinguished Senator from New Jersey said to me what I have repeated, I replied, "If that is the situation, I do not think it would be fair to push for a vote today."

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to say to the majority leader that I will back him up in his statement. I understood that we had entered into a unanimous-consent agreement earlier in the day, and that that meant we would vote tomorrow on the important measure now pending. I very much regretted that 33 Senators were absent when the first vote was taken. I know that there were some who left after the agreement was made, because they thought that there would be no vote today.

I did say to the majority leader that the bill was one of the most important measures we would vote on this year, and that the least we could do was to have as many Members of the Senate present as possible when this critical vote was taken. I said that to the majority leader. I thought, as other Senators did, that when we had entered into the unanimous-consent agreement earlier, there would be no votes today.

I wish to say to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] that I appreciate his having just requested that the call for a quorum be withdrawn. I think that was a fine act on his part, because it was his amendment which was before the Senate, and which might have been before us tonight. I do not know whether it would have been sustained or voted down. I have no way of knowing. But taking into consideration the number of Senators absent, I did not think we should vote. I have no idea how the vote may go, but it seems to me that neither side will be jeopardized by waiting.

I wish to thank the Senator from Idaho, the majority leader, and the minority leader for going along with the contemplated recess now, rather than forcing a vote tonight. I am willing to take the responsibility. I do not think anybody is to blame for what has happened.

I support the majority leader in his position. I have been doing battle on one particular side of this issue, but I did not try to get this postponement for the purpose of delay. There were many Senators who thought there would be no votes today in light of the unanimous-consent agreement which was made earlier, and some of them left.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I wish to express my thanks to my distinguished colleague from New Jersey for his expressions about me personally.

I had no intention whatever of going against the wishes of the majority of the Senate. However, I should like to make a personal observation. At no time did the author of the amendment, or any of the cosponsors, have any idea that the amendment would not be voted on this afternoon. As a matter of fact, the principal amendment, for a cut of $1,000,000,000, was voted on at 1:25 o'clock this afternoon, after the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into, and I actually felt that the entire bill would be completed this afternoon.

My own personal reflection is that the vote on the $1,000,000,000 amendment was a little too close for the sponsors of the proposed legislation, and therefore we had to listen to a most interesting discourse upon the primary election in the State of West Virginia, which took about an hour and a half. We have listened all afternoon to discussions not too germane to the amendment pending.

However, I am willing and happy to go along with the majority leader, and my distinguished colleagues who are sponsors of the amendment, I hope we will get a vote at an early hour tomorrow.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I was present all afternoon, and was a supporter of the Senator's amendment, and the discussion of it took all the afternoon. I intended to make some remarks about the bill, but the Senator from Illinois occupied practically all afternoon supporting the amendment of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will yield to me to clarify the matter, since my name has been brought into the discussion——

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. The distinguished Senator from Illinois, who supported the amendment, repeatedly asked that he be permitted to take his seat, but sponsors of the bill on the other side took up his time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not believe there is any point in laboring this matter. The Senator from Delaware made some remarks upon an extraneous matter, and such things often

occur on the floor of the Senate. I do not know any way to prevent that from happening, unless the Senate shall adopt the proposal of the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] for a change in the rules.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1342. An act to amend acts relating to garagekeepers and liverymen's liens and the enforcement thereof in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1533. An act to designate a Floyd D. Olson Memorial Triangle in the District of Columbia, and to authorize the erection of a memorial plaque in such triangle;

S. 2735. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940, as amended;

S. 2736. An act to amend the Code of Law of the District of Columbia in respect to the recording, in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds, of bills of sale, mortgages, deeds of trust, and conditional sales of personal property, and for other purposes; and

S. 2871. An act relating to the manner of appointment of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, the deputy recorders, and the employees of the Office of Recorder, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 28, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 27 (legislative day of May 12), 1952:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Albert A. Carretta, of Virginia, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the unexpired term of 7 years from September 26, 1947, vice W. A. Ayres, deceased.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and section 306 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be majors

CHAPLAIN

×Dever, Charles Anthony, 18787A.
Adams, Thomas Earl, Jr., 18788A.

To be captains

AIR FORCE

McCoy, Wayne Eugene, 16093A.
×Johnsen, Ralph Somers, 16398A.
Harris, Louis Rae, 16594A.
Childs, Glen Chadwick, 16959A.
×Stickman, William Robert, Jr., 17034A.
Lind, Charles Louis, 17070A.
×Scales, Lowell D., 17071A.
Pakalka, William, 17072A.
Guerny, Gene, 17073A.
McKusker, Kent Marcus, 17074A.
Cameron, Louis Jackson, Jr., 17075A.
Gillette, Harvey Wendell, 17077A.
×Black, William James, 17079A.
Delafield, Dean Edwin, 20026A.
Lemon, Austin Cecil, Jr., 17080A.
Edmonds, Edmund William, Jr., 17081A.
×Skiffington, Thomas Joseph, 17082A.
Dukes, Joseph, Jr., 17084A.
Erwin, Max L., 17085A.
Jones, Forrest Phillips, Jr., 17086A.
×Newkirk, Mahlon Max, 17087A.
Harbison, John Jeter, 17088A.
×Bellamy, Jack, 17089A.
Lingo, John Ellis, 17090A.
Loepkey, Charles Rudolph, 17091A.
×Nastoff, Daniel, 17093A.
Lane, David Timothy, 17094A.
Walsh, Theodore Harold, 17095A.
Miller, James Micou, 17096A.
×Odiorne, John McFall, 17097A.
Keir, James McLaren, Jr., 17098A.
×Yeaton, Carl George, 17099A.
×Rushlow, Frederick Edward, Jr., 17100A.
Carter, James Baker, 17101A.
Switzer, John Wilbur, 17102A.
×Laroche, Edward Arthur, 17103A.
Stickney, Lawrence Mallory, 17104A.
Hester, James Bert, Jr., 17105A.
Smith, Joe Hill, Jr., 17106A.
Newman, Robert Colea, Jr., 17107A.
Neal, Thomas James, 17108A.
×Rozelle, Vernon Lawrence, 17109A.
Curry, Hayden Charles, 17111A.
Huke, Theodore Campbell, 20027A.
Nelson, Beryl Elwood, 17112A.
Mungenast, Andrew John, 17113A.
Unger, Edward Frank, 17114A.
Perry, William Edward, Jr., 17115A.
Gommel, William Raymond, 17116A.
Stockton, Glen William, 17117A.
Van Liere, William Peter, 17118A.
Neiss, Ainsley Thomas, 17119A.
Coffman, William Frederick, 17120A.
×Humm, Katherine Anna, 21304W.
Hensz, Robert Louis, 17121A.
Lacasse, Wyndall, 17122A.
Peterson, Hilden Eugene, 17123A.
×Bryant, Melvin Harold, 17125A.
Michels, Robert William, 19783A.
Cobb, William Andrew, 17126A.
Kroman, George Franklin, 17127A.
Lawry, Casimir Paul, 17128A.
Castanza, Angelo Nicholas, 17129A.
Patson, George J., 17130A.
×Graves, Norman Calvin, 17131A.
Hodgin, Robert Howe, 17132A.
Brown, Richard Arnold, 20713A.
Griffin, Hiram, 17133A.
Vermeire, Virgil Louis, 17134A.
Kamp, Walter Baird, 17135A.
Fries, William Walton, 17136A.
×Quinn, John Tietjen, 17137A.
Lucy, Robert Stanley, 17139A.
Coates, Robert Eugene, 17140A.
Webb, James Edward, 17141A.
Barish, David Theodore, 17142A.
Graffunder, William Otto, 17143A.
×Robinson, Marion Moore, 17144A.
Graham, Robert Paul, 17145A.
Ratto, Stanley Nicholas, 17146A.
Leonard, James Martin, 17147A.
Grubbs, James W., Jr., 17148A.
Raine, C. O., 3d, 17149A.
×Fields, Jack Harold, 17150A.
×Self, David Anthony, Jr., 17151A.
×Black, Elmer Ellsworth, Jr., 17152A.
Jolliff, Robert Charles, 17153A.
Shearer, Wayne Gordon, 17154A.
×Wiley, Miles Carter, Jr., 17155A.
Flanagan, Jesse Laddie, 17156A.
Sizemoore, Robert, 17157A.
Bowers, Hurst Gray, 17159A.
Drury, George Francis, 17160A.
Oliver, John Walthall, Jr., 17161A.
Smith, Roscoe Beverly, 17162A.
×McCulley, Neil W., 17163A.
×Chapman, Harry Moulton, 17164A.
Warren, Willard, 17165A.
Wareham, Samuel Arnold, 17166A.
Borchert, Francis William, 17167A.
Woolfolk, William Francis, 17168A.

MEDICAL

Worthman, Robert Henry, 19966A.
×Hennessen, John Andrew, Jr., 20013A.
×Mendelsohn, Robert Allen, 20549A.
×Baird, Glenn, Dean, 20845A.
×Anderson, Walter Francis, 23037A.
×Cullum, George Wilson, 23036A.
Martin, John Thomas, 20056A.
×Wartella, Stephen, Jr., 22554A.
×McDonald, Hendley Austere, 20057A.
×Pollock, Clifford Raymond, 21689A.
×Freedman, Martin Jack, 21690A.
Holcomb, Thomas Murray, 22404A.
×Cheatham, James Spencer, 23166A.
Pierce, Le Roy Courtney, 21596A.
Preston, Rhea Sutphen, 19770A.
×Leslie, James Thomas, Jr., 19768A.
×Williams, Robert Leon, 19767A.
×Freedman, Toby, 19772A.
Kern, Sidney Beemer, 19769A.
Douglas, William Kennedy, 19967A.
×Langelier, Paul Remi, 20014A.

DENTAL

Szmyd, Lucian, 19621A.
Cordaro, Salvatore Anthony, 19765A.
Davis, Robert Kingsbury, 20551A.
Sadowski, Alexander Louis, 18968A.
×Welborn, Joseph Frederick, 19766A.
Sherman, John Roy, Jr., 19842A.
Wilson, Howard Russell, Jr., 18969A.
Ambrose, James Alfred, 19622A.

VETERINARY

Kuhn, Ulysses Simpson Grant, 3d, 19012A.
×Fremming, Benjamin DeWitt, 19013A.

CHAPLAIN

Paulk, Ivan Lewis, 20853A.
×Larkin, Timothy John, 21855A.
Glaize, Charles Hetzel, 20854A.
Minor, Earl Wayne, 20855A.

To be first lieutenants

AIR FORCE

Ainslie, Robert Ellsworth, 18635A.
Chambers, Thomas Wallace, 18636A.
Hilliding, Edward, 18637A.
Cobb, Talmage W., 18638A.
×Chartier, Edmund George, 18639A.
Dodson, Raymond Craig, 18640A.
Fiden, Thomas John, 18641A.
Lull, Walter Bordwell, 18642A.
×Anderson, Charles F., 18643A.
×Rhiley, Joe James, 18645A.
Nangle, Donald Leo, 18646A.
Sylvester, George Austin, 18647A.
Sorensen, Eugene Anton, 18648A.
Crawford, Arthur Baiten, 18649A.
Shacklette, Elijah William, Jr., 18650A.
Erich, Theodore E., 18651A.
Casselman, Don Lee, 18652A.
×Harston, David Gordon, 18653A.
Hale, William Robert, 18654A.
Marden, Robert William, 18655A.
Carpenter, Thomas Joe, 18656A.
Knoche, Charles Reginald, 18657A.
Drach, Joseph John, 18658A.
×Saabye, Harold Paulsen, 18659A.
Edgington, James Douglas, 18660A.
Amos, James Huntington, 18661A.
O'Brien, Robert Francis, 18662A.
Dye, Harold Pearson, 18663A.
Driver, William Benjamin, 18664A.
Hagauer, Richard William, 18665A.
Butler, Marguerite, 22794W.
Saunders, Floyd Ellis, 22793A.
Cleary, Dolores Jeannette, 22795W.
Dougherty, Joe Bennett, 22796A.
×Croswell, John Stoaklie, Jr., 18678A.
×Huddleston, Virgil Rudolph, 18671A.
×Chadeayne, Robert Fleming, 18677A.
Brown, Marvin Lee, 18676A.
×Lavanier, Lawrence Leroy, 18683A.
Lile, Elmer Kenneth, 18668A.
Fullerton, Robert Earl, 18672A.
Smith, Ronald E., 18688A.
Fisher, Edward Francis, 18680A.

Blackstone, Tommy F., 18670A.
Plantikow, John Wallace, 18669A.
×Effinger, Clinton W., 3d, 18679A.
Robertson, Gerald B., 18687A.
Bacha, Theodore, 18674A.
Robbins, J. Lee, 18686A.
Adams, James R., 18673A.
×Greenwood, Philip Donald, 18681A.
×Tuttle, Donald B., 18689A.
Phelps, Jackie Truman, 18684A.
Quinn, Luther Thomas, Jr., 18685A.
Breeden, Joseph Skinner, 18675A.
White, Gwynne W., 18690A.
Kincheloe, Iven Carl, Jr., 22797A.
Hamant, Vincent Francis, 21484A.
Mulcahy, William John, 22798A.
×Berry, LeRoy W., 18809A.
Chrisinger, John E., 18811A.
×Pierce, Glenn Harley, 21485A.
Meeker, Thomas Bailey, 22799A.
Fraser, Elwood Stuart, Jr., 22800A.
Hutchison, Thomas Junior, 22801A.
×Karr, Eugene Chestnut, 19588A.
Gall, John C., 19589A.
Thompson, Richard Wayne, 19587A.
Lacey, Robert J., 19586A.
Winter, Clifford Maurice, Jr., 19584A.
×Thompson, Donald Oscar, 19590A.
Smith, Robert Earl, 19591A.
Mitchell, Robert E., Jr., 19585A.
Palmer, Walter G., 19688A.
Erickson, Robert D., 19682A.
×Devanny, Thomas J., 19683A.
Dowell, Douglas C., 19680A.
Guess, David F., 19679A.
Smith, Richard Bird, Jr., 19684A.
×Blakely, Sylvester F., 19685A.
Partin, Benton K., 19686A.
Josephson, William Clasen, 19922A.
Taylor, Harvey Joseph, 22802A.
Folkins, Jack Leland, 19930A.
Hastings, Brian Tuite, 21486A.
Tyndall, Joseph Martin, 22803A.
McDonald, Ned Dew, Jr., 19698A.
Ragonese, Carmen D., 19693A.
Swett, Robert Edward, 19695A.
Roadman, Harry E., 19696A.
Bricker, Jerome G., 19699A.
Maxwell, Robert Fern, 19694A.
Harvey, James E., 19692A.
×Wheat, James W., 19691A.
Holman, William Sherwood, 21487A.
Calafato, Eugene Francis, 19923A.
Green, James F., 19702A.
×Wildman, Francis Marion, 19700A.
Smith, Glenn Carl, 19701A.
Nelson, William R., 19703A.
Dooley, George Wilmer, Jr., 19883A.
Hageman, Robert Gilmore, 22804A.
×Holcomb, Hoyt Franklin, 19882A.
Fowler, Albert Dean, 22805A.
Allshouse, Herman D., 19712A.
Lavally, Norbert Daniel, 19715A.
Barker, George F., 19720A.
Jones, Prentice E., 19710A.
Thompson, Joseph Cagwood, 19713A.
×Hogge, Walter A., Jr., 19716A.
Wade, Charles Henry, Jr., 19718A.
Sherrill, Guy J., 19706A.
Dastillung, Jacques C., 19714A.
Billups, Rufus L., 19722A.
Cochrane, Charles J., 19723A.
Crane, John R., 19719A.
Beeley, John C., 19704A.
Meyer, Joseph, 19708A.
Minton, Joseph Paul, 22806A.
Cox, Frank Edmond, 21489A.
Moberly, John K., 19730A.
Julien, Robin Allyn, 19735A.
Coleman, Mitchell E., 19731A.
McCollough, Chester E., Jr., 19728A.
Spencer, Earl Frank, Jr., 19733A.
Rubino, John Anthony, Jr., 19727A.
×Phillips, Duane M., 19732A.
Rice, Donald E., 19734A.
Saavedra, Joaquin Antonio, 19737A.
Sperry, Edward G., 19738A.
King, William H., 19726A.
Hazlett, Robert W., 19729A.
×Rauscher, Merle Raymond, 19736A.
McMullen, William D., 19725A.
Gautschi, Frederick Henry, Jr., 21490A.
Miller, William Prescott, Jr., 21491A.
Hataway, Curtiss Cranford, 20767A.
Ruoff, Edwin Ellis, 21492A.
Criswell, Wallace Louis, 22807A.
Riepma, Majorie Louise, 22808W.
Williams, Johnny Thornton, 22809A.
Finlay, John Stewart, 3d, 19805A.
Brown, John Douglas, 19802A.
Jenkins, Jake, 19797A.
×Owings, William Adolph, 19800A.
×Walley, Ernest C., 19687A.
Wolter, John Ernst, 19804A.
Hammond, Victor Warren, 19796A.
×Patton, Robert Bruce, 19803A.
Becker, Marion C., 19798A.
Swift, Henry L., 19799A.
Hinson, Pat Neff, 21494A.
Sherburne, John Lewis, 22811A.
Thomas, William George, 22810A.
Kondall, Albert Ralph, 21497A.
Overstreet, John Franklin, Jr., 21496A.
Goodnight, Elmer Kenneth, 21495A.
×Shuler, Lucien Bob, 20768A.
Floyd, Donald Scott, 22812A.
Wilkinson, Mary Bishop, 22815W.
Heater, Grover Lee, Jr., 22814A.
Swearengin, Milton Granvel, 22813A.
Hurley, Kenneth Doyle, 22816A.
Beard, Joseph Owen, Jr., 19817A.
Dunn, Henry Jackson, Jr., 22817A.
Bland, Kenneth Roy, 22818A.
×Holloway, Clarence W., 19808A.
×Grant, Carl W., 19812A.
Hombaker, Arley R., 19809A.
McKinney, Ramon, 19811A.
Viall, Harold Stanley, 19813A.
Harrington, John Henry, Jr., 19974A.
Harris, Coleman McAdoo, 19860A.
Cousins, Theodore Albert, 19850A.
Van Der Karr, Donald Irven, 19876A.
Greissing, Edward Francis, 19866A.
Rogers, Russell Lee, 19874A.
×Mullins, James Patrick, 19879A.
Peter, Fred Singleton, 19849A.
Akehurst, Louis Wesley, Jr., 19853A.
Demont, Ralph Wilson, 19858A.
×Setter, Louis Claire, 19859A.
Egolf, Donald Ulrich, 19862A.
Davis, Homer Allen, Jr., 19863A.
Wisdom, Warren Bacon, 19869A.
×Nance, Joe Conrad, 19870A.
Snavely, James Edward, 19871A.
Totten, Jess Ranson, 19875A.
Keller, Richard Matthew, 19878A.
Timmermans, Anthony John Gerald, Jr., 19861A.
Price, J. Alan, 19865A.
Conley, Eugene Ogden, 19872A.
Tullar, Allan Stanley, 19873A.
×Sauber, Laurence Louis, 19857A.
×Durkee, Richard Taylor, 19855A.
Bennett, George Floyd, 19854A.
Furlong, Raymond Bernard, 19864A.
Creech, Wilbur Lyman, 19867A.
×Baker, John Lee, 19877A.
O'Neal, Howard Franklin, 19856A.
Johnson, Gerald Dexter, 19851A.
×Murphy, James Thomas, 21498A.

MEDICAL SERVICE

Hedblom, Robert Edward, 21648A.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress. The officer whose name is preceded by the symbol (×) is subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be captains

WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST

Knudsen, Harriet Wood, 21194W.
×Gassen, Frances Mary, 22084W.

To be first lieutenant

NURSE

Workman, Betty Jo, 21182W.

NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 27, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal God, in this moment of worship and communion, may we be inspired to reach out to higher levels of thought and living.

Grant that we may be reverently and joyously appreciative of our material and spiritual blessings and always interpret their possession and use in terms of stewardship by our willingness to share them with needy humanity.

We pray that as Americans we may take the duties and obligations of citizenship more seriously and have an exalted conception of what it means to be a free and law-abiding people.

Help us to hasten the time when men everywhere shall follow the teachings of our blessed Lord and do Thy will more perfectly.

In Christ's name we offer our petition. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2552) entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of qualified women as physicians and specialists in the medical services of the Army, Navy, and Air Force"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HUNT, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6811. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 23, 1924, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 762. An act for the relief of Alexander Urszu;

S. 997. An act for the relief of Paula Slucka (Slucki) and Ariel Slucki;

S. 1372. An act for the relief of Mrs. Madelaine Viale Moore;

S. 1679. An act for the relief of Stephen Gorove; and

S. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

CHEESE POLICY

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, if I recollect rightly, section 104 of the Defense Production Act—the amendment limiting cheese imports—was originally introduced on this floor without hearings and without the benefit of a committee report. It is certainly a question whether its implications were really understood by the Members of this body.

Later on, when the Senate Banking and Currency Committee held hearings on the bill to repeal section 104, it developed that there was widespread opposition to the bill among many groups. Two of the Nation's principal farm organizations—the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Farmers Union—went on record against section 104, on the grounds that American agriculture would be harmed by the section. The National Cotton Council is against the section. The CIO and the International Association of Machinists are also in opposition. The United States Chamber of Commerce is on record against section 104. So are the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Tobacco Associates, Inc., the Association of Food Distributors, the American Chamber of Commerce for Trade with Italy, and many other organizations.

It seems to me that this body should frankly recognize the fact that its earlier action was hasty and unnecessary, and vote for the repeal of section 104 before more damage is done to the domestic and international interests which are involved.

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include a complete text of a resolution adopted May 21, 1952, honoring the late Frank B. Keefe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the complete text of a resolution adopted May 21, 1952, by the Sixth Congressional District (Wis.) Republican Committee, honoring the memory of our late colleague, Frank B. Keefe:

Whereas we, Republicans of the Sixth Congressional District of the State of Wisconsin, learned with profound sorrow on February 5, 1952, that the Honorable Frank B. Keefe, former Member of Congress, was called to his eternal reward; and

Whereas we recognize that the late Frank B. Keefe ably represented his constituents and faithfully served his country in the House of Representatives of the United States of America for six terms until his voluntary retirement in January 1951; and

Whereas we have long appreciated his capable and competent leadership, high moral character, and outstanding ability, and we will long remember the many valuable contributions made by him in his lifetime to the Republican Party, particularly in this congressional district: It is hereby

Resolved by the membership of the Republican Party of the Sixth Congressional District (that is Calumet, Fond du Lac, Sheboygan, Ozaukee, Washington, and Winnebago Counties, in caucus assembled this 21st day of May 1952, in the city of Fond du Lac), That we do hereby express our condolence to the members of his family on the loss of a loving husband and father, and a great American; and be it further

Resolved, That the district chairman be and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the members of the family of the deceased.

GENERAL COLSON

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I spoke yesterday and said I felt General Colson who had a star taken from him for his action regarding the freeing of General Dodd from the prison camps, and as the facts develop more and more, I am convinced the blame is higher up and not General Colson's responsibility. It appears that they have had riots in Japan since September. What could be more unfortunate than the things that have taken place there? We certainly are losing face in Japan and Korea and we have lost faith there in the last months in what has been done by those in charge of our forces. The removal of General MacArthur from Japan was one of the greatest tragedies that has ever taken place. If General MacArthur had been allowed to remain in Japan and had remained in charge of the troops, there would have been no rioting in Japan, and there would have been no rioting among the prisoners. There would have been discipline and orderly procedure, respect for the United States. Even prisoners benefit from proper discipline and suffer from the lack of it. The removal of the star from General Colson, a fine gentleman with a fine military record, and reduced to the rank of colonel in great haste without due consideration of all the facts which even to this date have not been presented looks like a covering-up of the responsibility of persons higher up in authority. I am asking that a complete investigation and reconsideration of the case be made by the Army, the Defense, and the State Departments. Appeasement now at any price which has been the administration's policy may prove very costly in lack of morale and in lives, and may lead to war in the Pacific and the Atlantic.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

HON. HARMAR D. DENNY

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this minute to tell of a great honor which has come to one of our colleagues, and I know that whatever honor a Member of this body receives is an honor for each one of us. On May 24 our respected and much beloved colleague, HARMAR DENNY, of the Twenty-ninth District of Pennsylvania, was awarded the Silver Buffalo, the highest award of the Boy Scouts of America, in recognition of his distinguished service to boyhood. The recipients of this award, which was first instituted in 1926, are carefully selected by a Committee on Awards and during this period many prominent men have received this honor, among them being Herbert Hoover, Calvin Coolidge, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, J. Edgar Hoover, Admiral Byrd, and many others. Mr. DENNY was one of seven men selected this year and I am very pleased to read to the Members of the House the citation which accompanied it:

HARMAR D. DENNY, Pittsburgh, Pa. Attorney at law. Served in both World Wars and is now a lieutenant colonel in the United States Army Air Corps. A Representative in the Congress of the United States from the State of Pennsylvania. Member of the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission, and trustee and member of numerous other civic and church enterprises. Entered scouting in 1922, as a member of the executive board of the Allegheny council, and served later as its president. Active on the region 3 committee, and chairman 1934–41. Through his wise and effective counsel the region attained a high record of service to boyhood. Member of the national executive board since 1940. His vigorous and continued leadership in boys' work and scouting over a period of 30 years, has contributed greatly to the advancement of youth agencies and the Scout movement.

May I be privileged on the grounds of long friendship to add a personal word? I have known the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENNY] for almost 50 years and I have never met a man who is more sincere in his devotion to the cause of good government and the promotion of the American way of life. His interest in the boys of America has been outstanding and he has not only honored himself and his friends by his devoted work in aiding the youth of our country but he has made a most valuable contribution to the welfare of all loyal and decent thinking Americans.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I join with the gentleman in congratulating the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENNY] in obtaining this very high award.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I thank the gentleman very much.

CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY TO THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Armed Services, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 4511, an act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Territory of Hawaii certain real property at Kahului, Wailuku, Maui, T. H., with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 12, after "condition", insert "which the Secretary of the Navy may deem to be."

Page 3, line 1, strike out all after "however", down to and including "aid" in line 4, and insert "That the United States shall make just compensation for the acquisition of title to any personal property acquired by the Territory without Federal aid and for any new facilities provided by the Territory without Federal aid which are not in the nature of improvements to or replacements of existing structures."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RATIFICATION OF PUERTO RICAN CONSTITUTION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the resolution providing for the approval of the Constitution of Puerto Rico will be before us tomorrow. Some of the Members were here at the time the rule was before us and know my expressed misgivings about certain provisions of that constitution, particularly section 20 of the so-called bill of rights.

I am inserting as a part of my remarks an editorial appearing yesterday in the New York Daily News bearing specifically upon that proposition. I commend it for the consideration of the membership as they go into consideration of the matter tomorrow:

LET'S INSURE AGAINST THE U. N.

When the Constitution's architects in 1787 included a clause making treaties as well as the Constitution the supreme law of the land, there was no visible danger in such a provision.

Now, however, we have the United Nations and its original Charter. From time to time, this organization is going to be adopting covenants, resolutions, etc., which our Senate will be asked to ratify as treaties.

One of these things is now being cooked up by a committee including Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt—a so-called Covenant on Human Rights. It is more likely to abolish sundry traditional American rights than to protect them, if it ever comes to be part of our supreme law.

A California court has already held that the United Nations Charter, because ratified by the Senate, is superior to State laws which conflict with it. That ruling was knocked out by a higher California court. But the incident illustrates forcibly the danger that the U. N. will gradually worm itself into control over the American people.

Fifty-nine Senators, led by JOHN W. BRICKER, Republican, of Ohio, are now moving to buy the Nation an insurance policy against such a disaster.

What they propose is a constitutional amendment which would do four things: (1) Forbid treaties or executive agreements to touch on United States citizens' constitutional rights; (2) prevent any treaty from giving to any international organization or foreign country any constitutional power of the President, Congress, or the courts; (3) prohibit abridgment of any Federal or State law by any treaty, except as permitted by Congress; and (4) forbid the making of executive agreements—between the President and other nations—which in effect are treaties concluded without the Senate's consent as required by the Constitution.

It seems to us that passage of this amendment by Congress and quick ratification by the necessary 36 States are of urgent importance.

Meanwhile, a U. N.-style fast one will be put over in our own backyard if Congress doesn't look alive and stop it.

The 2,200,000-plus people of our organized dependency of Puerto Rico recently ratified a proposed Constitution for the island, subject to the United States Congress' approval.

In the main, this instrument follows our own basic law. Congressional approval would not make Puerto Rico a state or an independent nation. It would only enlarge somewhat the liberal degree of home rule which the island already enjoys.

Article 2, section 20, however, as part of the proposed Puerto Rican bill of rights, is lifted from the U. N. Declaration of Human Rights. It says every person has a right to a job, grade- and high-school education, plenty of food, clothes, housing and medical care, and "social protection in the event of unemployment, sickness, old age, or disability."

That's a prescription for a hand-out state. No such goodies are guaranteed by our mainland Constitution. If they were, this would be a totalitarian country—and on the experience of Russia, Great Britain, etc., the Government would still be unable to furnish them, try as it might.

The farthest we've yet gone in this direction has been to require child education and set up social security.

If we recognize these rights in the Puerto Rican Constitution, the island government will shortly be called on to furnish jobs, houses, medicine, etc., for all its people—with Uncle Sam being pressured to pay the deficits. And if the hand-out state is set up in one of our dependencies, the mainland hand-outers will argue that the system must be extended to all States of the Union.

Thus socialism or fascism, unwanted by the great majority of Americans, will have crawled in at our back door.

We think Congress had better refuse approval of the proposed Puerto Rican Constitution and politely ask the islanders to write themselves a better one. They're fine people, by and large, and it would do them more harm than good to betray them to the hand-outers.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an address made by the President of the United States on yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(The address referred to follows:)

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES BEFORE THE ELECTRIC CONSUMERS CONFERENCE, MONDAY, MAY 26, 1952

I am more than happy to meet with this conference of farm, labor, and consumer groups. I am a little bit hoarse, I have been talking to the Big Four, two Members of the House and two Members of the Senate. I could not afford to let them outtalk me.

What Mr. Lincoln has said is true for the 155,000,000 people. Now we have some distinguished Senators and Representatives in this town who represent the consumers in their districts, but I am the only person who represents the whole 155,000,000, the people who haven't any pull or any lobby. I am their pull and I am their lobbyist, and they know how to get to me and I try to help them as best I can.

We have two gentlemen here who are looking out for the interests of the people, I can tell you that.

You have come out here to protect the interests of the American people in their own electric-power resources. I want to emphasize that. These power resources belong to the people of the United States and not to anybody else. You are here as consumers, as people who need and want electric power for your homes and your farms or your businesses.

I hope this conference will speak out for the interests of the power consumers. That is most important. There is a terrible barrage of propaganda going around these days on behalf of the poor private power producers. These poor private power monopolies are asking for a fight, and I hope you will give it to them, and I will join with you.

One of the first things I got into when I came here to the United States Senate in 1935 was to be on Senator Wheeler's holding company committee. I presided over it part of the time, and I heard all the weeps and wails and everything that was possible from the people who were trying to repeat just what they were doing at that time. We passed the Holding Company Act, and that Holding Company Act was in the interests of the people and the consumers. Let's keep that interest up because it is absolutely necessary.

I hope you will think about ways and means of answering their propaganda and assuring the American people and Congress what the real facts are.

Propaganda never can face facts. I proved this conclusively in 1948.

This won't be easy. The private power companies are spending millions and millions of dollars on their propaganda program. They have hired a lot of high-priced talent, advertising agencies, and so-called public-opinion research organizations and they are running what I call a most vicious campaign.

I haven't got anything now against private ownership of industry. I want to see the industry of this country in the hands of private owners, but I do not want that private ownership, which is partly a public institution, to have a throat-hold on the people whom they serve. That is all I am fighting for.

That private power company propaganda campaign is based on the old theory of scaring the people, of trying to frighten and confuse them instead of arguing on the basis of facts. There is no question that this is the theory of the power companies' vicious propaganda. They say so themselves in the literature they distribute privately among themselves.

You see, they went about this very scientifically. First they started out with a public opinion survey—one of those Roper surveys, you know, or Gallup, either one; I do not care which. I always think, when I think about public opinion surveys, I always remember what Mr. Roper said on the 9th day of September 1948. He said, "I am taking no more polls and I am making no more comments because the election is over, and there is no use really in holding an election and going to the expense. Just as well swear Mr. Dewey in now and be done with it." He has been apologizing about that ever since.

They went about this very scientifically. First they started out with a public-opinion survey. They asked a lot of people what they thought about TVA. Most people said it was a wonderful thing. Then they asked people what they thought of public power, and most people said that was all right, too.

Well, this surprised the power companies—didn't surprise me. I don't suppose it surprised anyone here. It simply meant that most people know what is good for them when they have the facts in front of them.

Then the company agents asked people what they thought of socialism, and, of course, most people said, "We are 'again' it." Naturally they would say that.

You, of course, know the tale about a couple of men discussing socialism. One was a Socialist and the other was not. The first man said, "John, if you had a million dollars, would you divide it with me?"

"Sure," said Sam.

"Well," said John, "if you had a couple of pigs, would you give me one of them?"

"Now, John," he said, "you know I have got a couple of pigs."

At this point the private companies said, "All we have to do is convince the people that TVA and public power and all the things people think are good for them are all part of some big plot to socialize the country."

You see, my political opponents do not have any issues on which to hang their hats, so they go out and dig up things they use for propaganda; and socialism is one of them. These power companies and the American Medical Association are just tickled to death to have a thing like this. They go around talking about that, but do not tell you the facts. That is what they have been trying to do ever since they made those surveys.

The private power companies are spending millions and millions of dollars on this campaign. They are sponsoring Nation-wide radio programs which cost them thousands of dollars every week. They are running full-page ads in the big magazines month after month. You know, just one full-page ad in "Mr." Clare Booth Luce's Life magazine costs $17,000. And one in the big corporation-controlled Saturday Evening Post costs $12,000. They are turning out pamphlets and leaflets and canned editorials by the score and spreading them around the country.

One of their advertising agencies actually boasted that their technique was so successful that ministers included some of this propaganda with their church notices, and some of their propaganda was posted on the bulletin boards of the Boy Scouts. What these private power companies are actually doing is deliberately, in cold blood, setting out to poison the minds of all our people. They make no bones about it. Their own manuals say their purpose is to influence the mass mind in this country by playing on people's emotions. The mass mind—what a horrible phrase. I think it is one of the most horrible phrases in the language.

They think of the individual human being in this country as part of a mass mind. They set out to play upon the emotions of churchgoers, Boy Scouts, and school children. They try to control the people's thoughts and by using slogans and scare words taking a leaf out of the books of Karl Marx and Adolf Hitler. They are following the Soviet and Fascist line.

This is nothing less than an attack on the fundamental principles of our democratic country. Instead of letting people make up their own minds on the basis of the facts and the truth, this private power company propaganda is deliberately designed to conceal the facts and manipulate people's opinions by appealing to their emotions and not to their reason.

I have got an ad here out of a magazine, paid for by the Wisconsin Power & Light Co. It says, "Do you want to pay for a Government honeymoon at Niagara Falls?" Trying to make you believe that the power companies would like to control the power at Niagara Falls and do it in the public interest without cost to the public. If you believe that, you are more naive than I think you are.

They don't stop to think that the investment of the Federal Government in a project of that kind is an investment for the people of the whole United States, and it is an investment and a self-liquidating investment. I want to say to you that these great power dams which we have built in the Northwest and TVA are an investment that belong to the people of the United States and the people are getting the benefit from them.

Now, I don't object to the power companies making a profit, but I do object to their scaring the life out of the people. In this ad they don't say anything about profits. They imply that if the private power people build this there would be no cost to the public. You know what the costs would be.

You all remember the North American Holding Co. and you all remember the Electric Bond & Share, and even Hobson himself couldn't tell which end was up when he was on the witness stand.

These power companies are public institutions. There is not a single one of them in the cities that is not a monopoly, and they are there because the people allow them to be there. They are regulated by the public service commissions of the States, and they owe a duty to the public. I wonder why they don't talk about Nebraska and Seattle, Wash., and Tacoma, and Kansas City, Kans., and Independence, Mo.? You know, we have a municipal plant on each side of the Kansas City Power & Light Co., and that is the only way we have been able to keep the rates of the Kansas City Power & Light Co. at a reasonable figure.

When I was running the county back there we used to assess these people. I went into the situation as to how they performed. They had one set of figures on which they paid taxes, and they had another set of figures, which was four or five times as great as the one on which they paid taxes, on which they based their rates. I tried my best to get the Legislature of Missouri to say rates and taxes should be based on the same figures, but they had too big a pull in the Missouri Legislature, and I could not get it done.

I am not going to go into this thing in detail, because sometime soon, when the whistle-stop campaign starts, I am going to give all the facts with regard to this power situation.

Nebraska has not a single private power company in it. They are all municipally owned. They don't talk about it. Seattle owns its own plant and Tacoma owns its own plant. I have talked about Kansas City, Kans., and Independence, Mo., keeping Kansas City, Mo., out of a strait-jacket.

I think you people should do everything you possibly can to get the facts on such things as this, and I think also there may be something going wrong under the Corrupt Practices Act because through the rates that these companies charge you are paying for that (referring to ad of Wisconsin Power & Light Co.)—you are paying for that. The tax collections of the Government are not so great because they charge these off as expenses of operation.

I think I will ask the Attorney General, when he gets in office—and I have had a hard time getting the Attorney General in office—to take a look at this situation and see if the Corrupt Practices Act does not apply.

I didn't intend to make a political speech, but since I have gotten to this point about the Attorney General, I can't help but make the remark that they are always saying there is corruption in the Government. Well, now, there is no such thing. There have been several collectors and one or two other fellows who have gone wrong, but whenever it comes to the attention of the President, he has fired them and ordered a grand jury investigation, and some have been prosecuted and sentenced.

I want to call attention to the fact that one time before we did have corruption in Government, and it was at the top and nothing was done about it until a committee of the Senate dug up the Teapot Dome scandal and they had to go to work on it. Nobody has had to force me to do what is right to keep the Government straight and square and never will.

I did not come down here to talk about that because that is another whistle stop subject I am going to discuss.

I am glad you are here. I am trying to call your attention to the fact that you are on the right track and what I said to Murray Lincoln about the consumers not being represented and their interest not being represented except by such Congressmen and Senators who really have the people's interest at heart—they should all get themselves together and come down here because there are so many more of you than there are of these private power companies and you can make them stand on their heads if you want to.

CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF FACILITIES FOR GENERATING HYDROELECTRIC POWER ON THE CUMBERLAND RIVER IN TENNESSEE

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 654, Rept. No. 1998), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 97) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities for generating hydroelectric power at the Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland River in Tennessee. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ACT

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, in the absence of the gentleman from

Texas [Mr. LYLE], I call up House Resolution 634 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7340) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half the time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the bill H. R. 7340, known as the Federal Highway Act, authorizing appropriations in the sum of $550,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 1954.

This is the Highway Act that we have each year. I do not know of any opposition. I have no requests for time at this moment.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is no objection on this side to either the rule or the bill.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

(Mr. FALLON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in the Committee of the Whole and include tables.)

(Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in the Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7340) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended, and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7340, the Federal-aid highway bill, with Mr. SMITH of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] for 1 hour.

The gentleman from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill H. R. 7340 is an authorization for Federal aid to the highway systems of this country. Those of you who have traveled throughout the country know how our highways are deteriorating. They were designed and built for the traffic load of 20 years ago; repairs, improvements, and new construction have not kept pace with the growth of the automobile industry and the trucking industry.

In 1946 there were some 40,000,000 automobiles on the road; today the number has increased to 52,000,000. The highways have about stood still or gone back; so this authorization is, I think, as important as any authorization that has come to the floor this year.

We are spending many millions and billions of dollars in Europe on roads. I have been trying to get information on just how much money is being spent on roads in Europe, but I find that the information is not available; however, it is in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

This bill provides in matching funds with the States $550,000,000 a year for the next 2 years, that is, for 1954 and 1955; it provides $247,500,000 aid to the primary system; $165,000,000 to the secondary system, and $137,500,000 to the urban areas. That is money that is to be matched by the States.

We have further authorizations in here which are outright grants: For our forest highways $22,000,000; for forest roads and trails $19,250,000; Park Service roads $10,000,000; parkways $10,000,000; Indian roads $10,000,000.

Then we have another authorization in here for the continuing of construction on the Inter-American Highway in the amount of $16,000,000, defense access roads $12,000,000, Highway Safety Conference $200,000, the amount authorized to be taken out of the administrative funds annually, and to finish the construction and completion of the Rama Road, $8,000,000. The $12,000,000 for defense access roads is limited to access roads to United States Government-owned timber land and mineral lands, 66⅔ percent to timber and 33⅓ percent for the building of roads into mineral deposits on federally owned property.

The difference between this bill and the 1950 act is that all along the line we have increased the amounts about 10 percent, which is due to the increased index cost of construction. We are trying to put in operation the same amount of roads, no more roads, the same number of miles of highway, as we did in the past 2 years. In order to do that we had to increase the authorization 10 percent.

Sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the bill are authorizations, as indicated, federally matched funds.

Section 1 contains a provision that permits the transfer of funds by any State from a secondary system to the primary system and vice versa with a limitation of 25 percent. In the 1950 act the transfer could be made but no percentage was stipulated; so any amount could be transferred when it was approved by the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The committee is going to offer a couple of amendments?

Mr. FALLON. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have read the amendments, they are very good ones, and I want to compliment the committee on the action taken by it in resolving to offer those amendments subsequent to the bill being reported.

Mr. FALLON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, the existing law permits the District of Columbia, and the States of North Carolina, Virginia, Delaware, and West Virginia to transfer funds from the secondary system to the primary system without limitation.

We held hearings for many months and we heard most of the highway commissioners throughout the country, including many of the mayors of large cities; we heard organizations that are interested in a good highway system for this country. The American Road Builders had their representatives testify. After great deliberation by the committee it agreed unanimously in most part. I understand there will be an amendment offered to cut just one section of the bill. That was the only difference the committee had. Outside of that the bill was reported by the committee unanimously.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Does the gentleman know offhand about how much money the Federal Government takes in in gasoline and oil taxes?

Mr. FALLON. Last year it was $1,699,000,000, and with the increased tax it will be more this year. It is estimated that it may be more like $2,000,000,000.

Mr. NICHOLSON. What happens to the other part of the money? We appropriate something over $500,000,000, but what happens to the balance?

Mr. FALLON. It goes into the General Treasury.

Mr. NICHOLSON. To a highway fund?

Mr. FALLON. No.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Does the Federal Government insist on my State not diverting highway taxes?

Mr. FALLON. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. And yet the Federal Government does it itself.

Mr. FALLON. I agree with the gentleman. If you had attended the hearings of our committee you would find that most members of the committee are against diverting highway funds for general use.

SECTION 1. FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Section 1 of the bill authorizes the appropriation of $550,000,000 for each of

the fiscal years 1954 and 1955. Said annual sum would be available for expenditure as follows: $247,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system; $165,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system; and $137,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system in urban areas. This division is on the same percentage basis as provided in the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1944, 1948, and 1950.

In arriving at the total authorization of $550,000,000 for the Federal-aid highway program, the committee took into consideration the authorization of $500,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1952 and 1953 by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 and increased construction costs experienced since passage of the 1950 act. The total authorized in H. R. 7340 represents a 10-percent increase over the 1950 act authorization for the Federal-aid highway system. It does not now appear likely that this increase will permit the same mileage as that provided for in the 1950 act.

The approximate amounts which each State would receive of the sums authorized by section 1 of the bill have been computed and are shown in the following table:

Approximate apportionment of $550,000,000 Federal-aid highway authorization, pursuant to H. R. 7250

State	Primary ($247,500,000)	Secondary ($165,000,000)	Urban ($137,500,000)	Total ($550,000,000)
Alabama	$5,135,000	$3,984,000	$1,745,000	$10,864,000
Arizona	3,624,000	2,468,000	518,000	6,610,000
Arkansas	4,026,000	3,224,000	745,000	7,995,000
California	11,177,000	5,757,000	11,837,000	28,771,000
Colorado	4,387,000	2,930,000	1,107,000	8,424,000
Connecticut	1,542,000	794,000	2,579,000	4,915,000
Delaware	1,191,000	794,000	273,000	2,258,000
Florida	3,865,000	2,525,000	2,388,000	8,778,000
Georgia	6,040,000	4,610,000	1,941,000	12,591,000
Idaho	3,011,000	2,117,000	256,000	5,384,000
Illinois	9,370,000	5,103,000	9,313,000	23,786,000
Indiana	5,773,000	3,979,000	3,186,000	12,938,000
Iowa	5,914,000	4,325,000	1,581,000	11,820,000
Kansas	5,945,000	4,160,000	1,252,000	11,357,000
Kentucky	4,468,000	3,711,000	1,383,000	9,563,000
Louisiana	3,755,000	2,720,000	1,952,000	8,427,000
Maine	2,051,000	1,467,000	557,000	4,075,000
Maryland	2,129,000	1,300,000	2,260,000	5,689,000
Massachusetts	3,062,000	1,129,000	5,543,000	9,734,000
Michigan	7,565,000	4,617,000	6,198,000	18,380,000
Minnesota	6,405,000	4,517,000	2,168,000	13,090,000
Mississippi	4,341,000	3,616,000	737,000	8,694,000
Missouri	7,006,000	4,740,000	3,279,000	15,025,000
Montana	4,923,000	3,385,000	314,000	8,622,000
Nebraska	4,724,000	3,350,000	781,000	8,855,000
Nevada	3,150,000	2,105,000	101,000	5,356,000
New Hampshire	1,191,000	794,000	386,000	2,371,000
New Jersey	3,152,000	1,064,000	5,829,000	10,045,000
New Mexico	3,981,000	2,734,000	437,000	7,152,000
New York	11,422,000	4,575,000	17,799,000	33,796,000
North Carolina	5,995,000	5,126,000	1,711,000	12,832,000
North Dakota	3,548,000	2,575,000	225,000	6,348,000
Ohio	8,466,000	5,149,000	7,706,000	21,321,000
Oklahoma	5,217,000	3,734,000	1,455,000	10,406,000
Oregon	4,178,000	2,919,000	1,068,000	8,165,000
Pennsylvania	9,548,000	5,682,000	10,081,000	25,311,000
Rhode Island	1,191,000	794,000	952,000	2,937,000
South Carolina	3,284,000	2,717,000	916,000	6,917,000
South Dakota	3,797,000	2,712,000	259,000	6,768,000
Tennessee	5,183,000	4,049,000	1,926,000	11,158,000
Texas	15,736,000	10,535,000	6,380,000	32,651,000
Utah	2,795,000	1,848,000	564,000	5,207,000
Vermont	1,191,000	794,000	207,000	2,192,000
Virginia	4,625,000	3,593,000	2,977,000	10,295,000
Washington	4,033,000	2,694,000	2,009,000	8,736,000
West Virginia	2,651,000	2,307,000	867,000	5,825,000
Wisconsin	5,780,000	4,031,000	2,608,000	12,419,000
Wyoming	3,033,000	2,055,000	145,000	5,233,000
Hawaii	1,191,000	794,000	448,000	2,433,000
District of Columbia	1,191,000	794,000	1,150,000	3,135,000
Puerto Rico	1,260,000	1,317,000	1,145,000	3,722,000

The committee has inserted the word "primary" after the words "Federal-aid" in section 1 (a) to clearly distinguish highways on the Federal-aid primary highway system when compared to those on the Federal-aid secondary highway system.

The bill provides that the sums apportioned to each State under the provisions of section 1 shall be available for expenditure for two fiscal years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized and that any money so apportioned that remains unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse. It further provides that such sums shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects. It, therefore, would follow that any money not expended within the period provided by the law would lapse and be covered into the Treasury. These provisions are identical with those concerning the period of availability of funds authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1948 and 1950.

Section 1 modifies existing law and procedures with respect to transfer of Federal-aid highway funds. It would permit not exceeding 25 percent of the amount apportioned to any State in any year for expenditure on the Federal-aid primary highway system or on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, respectively, to be transferred from the Federal-aid primary system for expenditure on the Federal-aid secondary highway system or from the Federal-aid secondary highway system from expenditure on the Federal-aid primary highway system. Such transfer would be effective only when requested and certified by the State highway department as being in the public interest, and approved by the Secretary of Commerce. This new provision is designed in the interest of flexibility. It would make it possible for transfers to be made from the primary system funds for expenditure in the development of projects on the secondary system, whereas heretofore the law—section 3 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944—authorized the transfer, under certain conditions, of secondary funds only. Under existing law only the States of Delaware, North Carolina, and West Virginia, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico may transfer funds from the Federal-aid secondary highway system to the Federal-aid primary highway system, provided such transfer is requested by their respective highway departments and approved by the Secretary of Commerce.

SECTION 2. FOREST HIGHWAYS AND FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

Section 2 would authorize to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years 1954 and 1955 the sum of $22,000,000 for forest highways and the sum of $19,250,000 for forest development roads and trails, subject to the same terms and conditions as provided by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950. Said sums are $2,000,000 more than were authorized for forest highways and $1,750,000 more than were authorized for forest development roads and trails by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950. Increased construction costs will more than absorb this 10-percent increase in the authorizations of this section.

SECTION 3. ACCESS ROADS

Section 3 of the bill would authorize the additional sum of $12,000,000 for carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended by section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950. It would require that said sum be used for the construction and improvement of access roads to timber and other sources of raw materials on lands to which title is vested in the United States, subject to the requirement that such roads to be eligible for construction under this section shall be certified to the Secretary of Commerce as important to the national defense by the Secretary of Defense or such other official as the President may designate, as is required for other access roads under the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended. It is the sense of the committee that in the expenditure of the sum authorized by this section approximately two-thirds thereof should be utilized for the construction of roads to provide access to timber on lands owned by the United States and that the remaining one-third should be used to provide access to strategic minerals needed for defense purposes. This authorization will supplement section 2 of the bill.

SECTION 4. (A) PARK ROADS AND TRAILS

Section 4 (a) provides an authorization of $10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1954 and 1955, for roads, trails, and bridges in national parks and monuments and approach

roads thereto, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments. The sums authorized are the same in amount as were authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 for the fiscal years 1952 and 1953.

SECTION 4. (B) PARKWAYS

Section 4 (b) would authorize the sum of $10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1954 and 1955, for the construction and maintenance of parkways over lands to which title is vested in the United States. It would also increase from $13,000,000 to $14,500,000 the limitation imposed by the act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 400), on the cost of constructing the Baltimore-Washington Parkway between Fort Meade, Md., and Washington and would make the additional sum of $1,500,000, which it would authorize, available for contract immediately upon the passage of the bill. Aside from the increase in the limitation on the cost of Baltimore-Washington Parkway, the authorization contained in this section is $3,000,000 less than was authorized for parkways under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 for the fiscal years 1952 and 1953.

The following communication from Mr. Thomas H. MacDonald, Commissioner of Public Roads, to the Honorable GEORGE H. FALLON, chairman, Subcommittee on Roads, sets forth the justification for the increased authorization for the construction of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway between Fort Meade and Washington:

SECTION 4. (C) INDIAN ROADS

Section 4 (c) would authorize the sum of $10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1954 and 1955, for the construction, improvement, and maintenance of roads and bridges within Indian reservations and to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands in accordance with provisions of the act of May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750). This sum is $4,000,000 more than was authorized for the same purpose by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 for the fiscal years 1952 and 1953. The increased amount is deemed necessary to implement the withdrawal program of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, so that roads now badly deteriorated, can be put in condition to be taken over by the counties, thus relieving the Government of all future responsibility.

SECTION 5. RAMA ROAD

Section 5 would authorize the sum of $4,000,000 to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1953 and 1954, for the completion of the construction of the road from San Benito to Rama in the Republic of Nicaragua, pursuant to an agreement between said Republic and the United States. The expenditure of said sum would be subject to certain safeguarding conditions and limitations which are prescribed in the section.

SECTION 6. INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

Section 6 would authorize to be appropriated the additional sum of $8,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1953 and 1954, to enable the United States to continue its cooperation with the American Republics in Central America in the survey and construction of the Inter-American Highway within said republics. The appropriations so authorized would be required to be expended subject to the matching requirements and conditions contained in existing legislation except that not to exceed one-third of the appropriation for each fiscal year may be expended without the requirement of matching on the part of any republic if the Secretary of State should find that the cost of constructing the highway in such republic will be beyond its reasonable capacity to bear. The annual sum of $8,000,000 proposed by the bill is twice the amount authorized for the same purpose by section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1951 and 1952, and such sum is considered necessary to accelerate the work in order that the project may be completed within a reasonable number of years.

SECTION 7. HIGHWAY SAFETY

Section 7 is a new provision which would require the Secretary of Commerce to prepare, and reexamine and revise annually, an action program to increase and promote safety on the highways, roads, and streets throughout the United States. The coordination of highway-safety activities of all Federal departments and agencies would be included in such program. The bill would provide that in carrying out such program the Secretary of Commerce shall cooperate to the fullest extent possible with State, local, and private bodies devoted to the promotion of highway safety, and that he shall make an annual report to the Congress setting forth the actions taken pursuant to this section. For such purposes, the section would authorize not to exceed $200,000 to be expended annually out of available administrative funds of the Bureau of Public Roads. Section 14 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 authorized the Bureau of Public Roads to expend not to exceed $75,000 annually for highway safety. The committee is of the view that the program proposed by section 7 is most desirable by reason of the increasingly heavy toll in lives and property damage each year from motor-vehicle accidents as reflected by the following table:

Motor-vehicle accidents, 1945–50 [1]

	Number of accidents	Number of nonfatal injuries	Number of deaths	Property damage
Calendar year—				
1945	5,500,000	1,000,000	28,076	$650,000,000
1946	6,150,000	1,200,000	33,411	900,000,000
1947	8,400,000	1,150,000	32,697	1,100,000,000
1948	8,200,000	1,100,000	32,259	1,100,000,000
1949	7,600,000	1,100,000	31,500	1,100,00,0000
1950	8,300,000	1,200,000	35,000	1,250,000,000
1951	----------	----------	[2] 37,500	----------

[1] Source: National Safety Council's "Accident Facts."
[2] Preliminary estimate by National Safety Council.

Section 8 is a saving provision to the effect that if any section, subsection, or other provision of the bill, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the validity of the remainder thereof.

Section 9 provides for the repeal of all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the bill and that the bill shall take effect upon its passage.

Section 10 provides that the bill may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952."

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] has covered the ground very well. I am always tempted, when I take the floor in behalf of a road bill, to quote again the statement of Lord Bacon made 300 years ago in regard to good roads. This quotation was placed over the doorway of the Transportation Building in Chicago during the World's Fair in 1893. The quotation is this:

> There be three things that make a nation great and strong: Fertile soil, busy workshops, and easy conveyance of men and goods from place to place.

It is with the last sentence that we are concerned today, and that is easy conveyance of men and goods from place to place on good roads.

The gentleman from Maryland has covered the subject so well that there is very little more for me to say except this: If there is any one thing that the American people are conscious about it is good roads. When they drive up to a gas station and say to the attendant "Fill her up" they are conscious of the fact that a part of the bill that they pay is going back to build the roads on which they travel.

We all know that there is a 2-cent-per-gallon tax on gasoline, which is a Federal tax, and there is also a 9-cent-a-gallon tax on oil. As the gentleman has already stated, this year it is estimated that the Federal Government will take from our people something like $2,000,000,000 in such taxes. That money is not earmarked at all. All we are asking is $550,000,000 for the year, for 1954, and $550,000,000 for 1955. This is about 25 percent of what they pay in. The rest of the money goes into the Federal Treasury.

To give you some idea of what has happened in this country in the last 10 years, the number of cars on our highways is about 18,000,000 more than 10 years ago. The number of miles that people travel in the United States has increased from 300,000,000,000 traveled miles to 600,000,000,000 traveled miles, and the number of registered cars in the United States has increased to 52,217,000, or 1 car for every 3 people in our country. No nation on the face of the earth even comes near to equaling that. In England, which I think is the closest, it is about 1 car for every 470 people. That gives some indication of how widespread the wealth of this country is among the people of the United States.

This bill follows the same pattern as the bill of 2 years ago and the bill of 4 years ago. All that the committee did was to take the figures for the matching funds of 2 years ago, 1950, and add 10 percent to it in order to take up the depreciation of the dollar or the increase

in cost. We are not getting as many miles today, by the way, for the money we are spending as we did 6 years ago.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am sure the gentleman wants to keep the record straight. We have added 10 percent over what it was plus an additional amount for certain types of roads such as forest highways and forest trails.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes; but I am speaking of the matching funds that go to the 48 States.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I am wondering if the gentleman's committee has given any serious consideration to the abuse of our Federal highway system by trucks, the systematic violation of the law by trucks, and to the increasing expense of construction caused by the increasing weight of the loads carried over our highways.

Mr. DONDERO. No; because that is not a subject of jurisdiction of our committee. Of course, it was discussed. I might say to the gentleman from Maine, however, that in regard to that subject it was pointed out that the general passenger traffic of the country has increased some 45 percent since the end of the war. Truck traffic, to which the gentleman alludes, has increased something more than that. In my own State of Michigan, our highway commissioner testified, it had increased 85 percent, indicating the vast increase in traffic of both passenger vehicles and trucks.

I might add a little information as to two bridges over the Potomac River. I am told by those who seem to know that those two bridges are the two busiest bridges on earth. While they were estimated to carry some 50,000 vehicles a day, it now reaches 80,000 vehicles a day, simply indicating the vast increase in traffic among the people of the United States.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. The formula under which these funds are apportioned to the States has been quite a mystery to me each year as we have considered this legislation. I am sure there must be some basic explanation. I have had some query in my own mind about it. I wonder if the gentleman could take a moment or two and express in phraseology that would be comprehensible to a high-school sophomore, and give us just a general idea of how these apparently largely varying sums go to States that do have a considerable mileage of highway, sometimes out of proportion to the size of the States.

Mr. DONDERO. That was provided in a formula included in legislation some years ago and it has never been changed. It has been found to work so well and people are so satisfied with it that no change has been sought. I think that is the question the gentleman is asking.

Mr. COTTON. I understood there must be a formula, but, if it is not too elementary, what is the fundamental principle under that formula?

Mr. DONDERO. Area, population, and miles of road, I think, are the three fundamental or basic principles upon which the allocations are made.

Mr. COTTON. Does matching of funds enter into that formula, or is that formula just on the elements the gentleman has mentioned?

Mr. DONDERO. Just on the elements I have mentioned. Of course, each State is given its proportionate share according to that formula. It has worked out in a very satisfactory way.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know why my State pays in about $25,000,000 of this highway business, and we get only $9,000,000 back. I would like to know where the other $16,000,000 goes.

Mr. DONDERO. As has already been stated, we are only taking about 25 percent of the amount collected from people for gas and oil tax. The rest goes into the Federal Treasury. If I had my way about it, and in view of the testimony presented to us in committee to the effect that we are wearing out our roads faster than we are building them, I would allocate a larger sum for the building of roads because they are one of the essential things in this country, and I would say one of the most necessary for defense that we have.

Mr. NICHOLSON. How much does it cost us for this Bureau to administer this money that we pay in? Is it just a matter of bookkeeping with no overhead?

Mr. DONDERO. There is a very slight overhead, I will say to the gentleman. I think we can say with credit to the Bureau that administers these funds, that they do an excellent piece of work at very little cost.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I believe the answer to that question is approximately 3¼ percent is for the administrative costs.

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, furthering what I said a moment ago that the American people are conscious of good roads, today travel on toll roads has gone beyond all dreams of the people who built those roads. People are willing to pay an extra cent a mile in order to ride on a good road. I say that shows how anxious and eager our people are that we have good roads.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I was interested in the statement of the gentleman from Maryland who spoke a few moments ago with respect to the building of roads in other countries. I believe he said, and I think I am correct in my recollection, hundreds of millions of dollars are being expended from our Federal Treasury to build roads in other countries, especially in Europe. Can the gentleman give us any figures on that?

Mr. DONDERO. I cannot give you the amount, but I do know they are building some roads in Europe with American money, but how much I cannot tell you.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am informed, not reliably however, that we are spending about half as much as we are spending on our own roads in America.

Mr. DONDERO. I do know what we are spending on some other subjects, I can say to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. The one-half cent gasoline tax which was recently assessed is for Federal funds, and was not for the purpose of building roads. It was for increasing the general fund; is that not correct?

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct. The one-half cent has yielded something like $300,000,000 annually.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Does the gentleman think that amount could be increased—to give 25 percent back to the States?

Mr. DONDERO. You mean 25 percent more?

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Additional.

Mr. DONDERO. The road builders and some road officials tell us that this money is not enough, and that they could use almost double this amount every year to keep our roads up to standard. Someone said it would take something like $20,000,000,000 in money to bring our roads up to the condition that they ought to be at the present time. But, of course, that amount of money is not in this bill. We are trying to follow a moderate road program in the construction of our highways.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Would the gentleman think that if all of this 2 cents a gallon were turned back to the States, it would be in the right proportion, and that we would overhaul this formula which has been used for so long?

Mr. DONDERO. It would contribute much toward making our road system in this country as fine as any road system anywhere in the world. In fact, they are now. It would make them much better than they are today, and we could maintain them where they are wearing out so fast because of the increased traffic load.

The interstate system of highways was authorized by the Congress in the Federal Aid Act of 1944 and ordered to be a selected system of the most important routes and not to exceed a total mileage of 40,000. This mileage is not new mileage, but is a selected mileage from the present Federal aid primary system in rural and urban areas.

In accordance with the Act of Congress, the State highway department selected a major part of the mileage, with the approval of the Bureau of Public Roads, and designated the interstate system of highways which represents approximately 1 percent of the rural mileage and carries approximately 20 percent of all the rural traffic. It is es-

sentially the most heavily traveled mileage in America.

In 1949 the State highway departments, cooperating with the Bureau of Public Roads, estimated the deficiencies in the existing interstate system in the light of the presently approved standards for highway construction, as prepared and adopted by the American Association of State Highway Officials. At that time, the estimated cost, prepared in a detailed study by the State highway departments, to relieve these deficiencies on the interstate system approximated $11,200,000,000. In the light of increased highway construction costs since that time, the figure would probably be in the neighborhood of 15 percent greater in 1952.

The chief administrative officers of the American Association of State Highway Officials, meeting in Chicago in November of 1951, considered and adopted a national policy on Federal aid for highways preparatory to consideration of the Federal Aid Act of 1952. They recommended, at that time, that a separate section be incorporated in the new act for the interstate system authorizing an amount of $210,000,000 annually for that system.

The membership considered a formula for the apportionment of such funds, it being the general opinion that the old section 21 formula under which primary funds have been apportioned for many years was not an equitable formula for the apportionment of interstate funds. When the Federal-Aid Act of 1944 was under consideration by the Congress, the same question arose with regard to the apportionment of urban funds, and, at the time, upon the recommendation of the American Association of State Highway Officials, the Congress approved a formula of population for the apportionment of urban funds which was a wise and equitable decision. The same philosophies obtained in regard to the apportionment of funds for the interstate system.

The association considered three formulas in Chicago at the meeting previously mentioned: One being the old section 21 formula now in effect on primary funds; two, a formula based on estimated costs of improvement of the system; and three, a formula based on population with a floor set to the end that no State would receive less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the funds to be made available.

The third formula, after much deliberation, was approved and, upon a roll-call vote with 43 member departments represented and voting out of a total of 52, 42 member departments voted for approval of the policy position, with 1 member department—the Bureau of Public Roads—being recorded as not voting. Subsequently the remaining member departments were canvassed by mail, being in total number 9, 7 voting in affirmative support of the policy position, 1 voting in the negative, and 1 not voting; making a total of 49 member departments out of a total of 52 giving their support of the policy position on this matter.

H. R. 7340, proposed new Federal-aid bill as drafted by the House, makes no provision for an interstate system. S. 2437, the Senate version of the bill, includes the interstate system section in the amount of $50,000,000, but sets up a formula for apportionment of these funds identical with old section 21 of the regular Federal-Aid Act, being: one-third area, one-third population, and one-third post road mileage.

As to the general situation, the following information is pertinent: In 1941, at the beginning of World War II, there were approximately 34,000,000 motor vehicles registered in America, of which 4,900,000 were trucks. In 1952, there are approximately 52,000,000 motor vehicles registered in America, of which 9,000,000 are trucks. In 1941, the total vehicle mileage for the year was 333,000,000,000. In 1952, the estimated mileage is 500,000,000,000.

In 1942, in the truck category, Statewide planned surveys showed that 41 truck axles out of each 1,000 exceeded 18,000 pounds per axle. In 1950, 91 truck axles out of each 1,000 exceeded 18,000 pounds per axle. By a gross load comparison, in 1942, 111 units out of each 1,000 exceeded 30,000 pounds gross load. In 1950, 187 units out of each 1,000 exceeded 30,000 pounds gross load. The figures for 1952 would be substantially higher, but they are not available at this time.

In 1941, the Federal Government collected in highway user taxes—gasoline, oil, tires, parts, vehicles, and so forth—$573,000,000. In 1952, it is estimated that the Federal collections from this source will slightly exceed $2,000,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, this bill to authorize continuing of the Federal highway program for another 2 years is, at best, merely stop-gap legislation. It does not, under any circumstances, provide adequately for the vast needs in road construction now going unmet throughout our country.

Someone has pointed out that if all the new highways constructed since 1946 were stretched end to end they would not provide enough room to even park all of the new passenger cars which have been produced in the same period. At the same time that even this limited road construction has been achieved approximately 2 miles of road has become obsolete for each mile constructed.

Highway construction is, of course, a basic responsibility of the States, and should remain so. The Federal Government, however, under the mandate provided in the Constitution to provide roads, has been the instrument of coordinating and developing what progress we have made in the field of an adequate national transportation system. Through the incentive system provided by Federal aid, minimum standards have been established which give the taxpayer and the road user far better highways for his money. We have vast needs in the way of new express freeways for our interstate road system and for the construction of many other modern improvements in the highway system. At the same time, the needs of the farmers of America are far from being properly met, especially in relation to the number of vehicles which now use these roads.

The Public Works Committee, in considering this legislation, recognized the impossibility of authorizing any major expansion in the present road program, only because of the pressing fiscal difficulties which our Government is likely to continue to meet for the next 2 years. I think it is only fair, however, to warn the Nation that this problem cannot be neglected any longer without grave dangers to our over-all economy. The next road program authorization which comes before the Congress should meet this problem head-on. We cannot avoid the responsibility any longer.

The United States has two and a half times as many motor vehicles as all the other countries of the world combined. No other nation on earth relies so heavily on automotive transportation for the mass movement of people and products. More than 40,000 communities are completely dependent on cars, trucks, and busses for all of their transportation needs. Three-fourths of all passenger travel between cities, towns, and farms goes by car or bus. Two-thirds of all freight is shipped by truck during some part of its journey. Therefore, it is vital that the automotive vehicles, on which we so largely depend, be kept moving quickly, economically, and safely.

With automobile registrations increasing every year, this situation will get worse as time goes on, unless steps are taken immediately by towns, cities, counties, States, and the Federal Government, individually and collectively, to modernize our obsolete street and highway systems. Americans are beginning to realize that installing more stop signs, rerouting trucks, reducing car speeds, and other restrictive measures taken in the interest of safety provide no permanent solution to the problem. Last year, the economic loss from traffic accidents totaled $3,500,000,000. This is more than was spent on the entire system of highways, roads, and streets.

Most of our present highways were designed and built during those years, when car speeds were low, when truck loads were light, and when the volume of motor travel was small. Twenty-five years ago, there were only 20,000,000 motor vehicles. Today, there are nearly 52,000,000. Yet, during the past quarter of a century little has been done to expand our highway system to keep pace with the growth in traffic volume.

According to competent authorities, it will take $5,000,000,000 to $7,000,000,000 a year for the next 15 years to build essential roads, to modernize existing highways, and to maintain our present system in a satisfactory condition. This gives us some comprehension of the magnitude of the task that lies ahead.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, first let me pay my respects to the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr.

FALLON] as well as the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY]; they certainly have cooperated in every way in all phases of this problem, and have been especially considerate of the minority side.

Sometimes when we talk about economy, and we find that many people are for economy only in certain phases of life; some believe in "econo-me" with the "me" left out.

The bill before us today, H. R. 7340, is known as the highway bill and authorizes the expenditures for the years of 1954 and 1955.

This bill is the result of several weeks of study by the Committee on Public Works and the consideration of a number of bills which represent an expenditure from $400,000,000 per year to $700,000,000 per year. The highway program is one of the largest programs of our economy. There are three Federal-aid systems—primary, secondary, and urban. They constitute the background of the Nation's transportation plant involving a total of approximately 664,000 miles of highways. Of this total 219,000 miles are on the rural primary, 429,000 miles on the secondary, and 16,000 miles on the urban system. Many of us have different views on the specific need of these systems.

Some years ago the Public Roads Committee of the Congress, upon which I served at that time, decided our Federal funds should be allocated on a percentage basis. The following formula was established—45 percent for Federal-aid primary system, 30 percent for Federal-aid secondary system, and 25 percent for Federal-aid urban system.

This formula was arrived at because we felt all types of roads, either farm-to-market or urban roads, were a part of a system traveled by the general public. The Federal Highway Act of 1944 was the first specific adequate recommendation of our rural road needs written into our basic highway law. We who drafted the legislation felt adequate transportation for the farmer was essential to the continued prosperity of the American people. The crops upon which our economic well-being and continued existence of not only farmers but all the people depend must be transported in large part from the farm to the market and the consumer via our roads. Both, therefore, suffer from an inadequate road system so a good road program is of vital concern to the Nation as well as the State and the people.

There is some question among certain Members of Congress concerning the farm-to-market road system, but your attention is called to the fact that of 3,300,000 miles of roads, alleys and streets in our Nation, 3,000,000 are in rural districts; 23 percent of which are graded and drained but not surfaced, and 31 percent are undrained and not surfaced. Thus, more than half of the roads serving the farmers are not all-weather roads.

Over the secondary and feeder roads 4,000,000 children ride to school daily and one-fourth of our entire population receives its mail over them. These roads carry approximately one-third of all the mileage of the automotive vehicles in the United States.

I hope this explanation of the farm-to-market road program will prove to some of my distinguished colleagues that the rural system of roads plays a very important part in our economy.

H. R. 6094, the bill introduced January 15, 1952, commonly known as the administration bill, set up $400,000,000 for Federal aid for highways. When the authors of H. R. 6094 made a division between Federal and primary, secondary and urban, they completely ignored the percentage formula established several years ago which is working as well as any could be expected to work.

When the Committee on Public Works drafted H. R. 7340, now before us, it returned to the original formula and increased the amount of the administration bill from $400,000,000 to $550,000,0000. This means that the amount allocated under the 1950 act—$500,000,000—was increased 10 percent.

I am certain my record will justify the statement that I believe good roads are a part of our national-defense program. I also recognize, however, that the financial status of our country is a part of our defense program. An object is only as strong as its weakest link. I, therefore, am wondering whether we can afford to authorize an expenditure of $550,000,000 for our road program which will be spent during the years of 1954 and 1955.

May I emphasize that the authorization we are passing here today will not be a part of any appropriation bill for actual construction until the years 1954–55. We sometimes wonder why we continue to authorize expenditures when the Appropriations Committee will not appropriate the amounts authorized. Just a few days ago we passed an appropriation bill of $400,000,000 for highways, yet the 1950 Highway Authorization Act covered by that appropriation called for a grant of $594,650,000 which includes the $500,000,000 for the various types of highways plus various items including forest highways, forest roads and trails, Park Service roads, parkways, Indian roads and public-lands roads, including $8,000,000 for the Inter-American Highway and $10,000,00 for defense-access roads.

I would like to call attention to the fact that on March 31, 1952, the unprogramed balance of Federal highway funds was $393,098,749. I firmly believe there would be far in excess to $100,000,000 as an expended unencumbered balance even if all our obligations were adhered to the various States.

Attention is called to the fact the bill before us for consideration calls for an expenditure of $56,000,000 for the Inter-American Highway and $8,000,000 for the Rama Road. I believe the Rama Road item is one for which we have a definite international commitment and I feel the amount contained in the bill should remain so that our international agreement will be met, but the item of $56,000,000 for the Inter-American Highway defined in this bill sets up $16,000,000 which is twice the amount we authorized for this project in the 1950 act. Certainly, we should not double the amount of money going for highway purposes in foreign countries when we recognize our program here is badly in need of funds and when we are faced with a debt of $268,000,000,000.

Let me call your attention to the fact that revenues derived from road taxes amount to approximately $1,800,000,000 per year. I charge, therefore, that when the President sent up his highway bill drafted by the Budget Bureau he was attempting to set a trap for some of us who believe in an adequate road program so he could say that some people believe in economy until it affects them.

I would challenge anyone and let them check my record in this House—I am for as much economy as anyone else, but I certainly believe that it is time for us to give to the people of the United States and our close neighbors some money so that we can protect ourselves which certainly includes an adequate road program instead of sending so much of it to European countries.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I shall be pleased to yield to the very distinguished gentleman from Iowa, a former member of the Roads Committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman and appreciate the information he has given us very much. I was extremely interested in the gentleman's statement about the $1,800,000,000. I understand that is correct. Under this bill, then, the road system in the United States—that is, the strategic network of roads, farm-to-market roads and urban areas—will get a total per year of less than one-third of the amount of money that has come into the Federal Treasury from the gasoline tax, the highway user, the used car tax, the tax on tires, tubes, and lubricating oil, and so forth.

Mr. McGREGOR. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Can the gentleman tell me where the balance of that money is being used?

Mr. McGREGOR. I wish it were within my knowledge or ability to answer the gentleman's question. I think every American citizen who pays that tax should have that question answered. But we have tried, and I am sure the gentleman from Iowa has tried, to find out where all the road money is going. In my opinion it is going into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States, and then given to some foreign countries under the foreign aid program, to build whatever they might decide or whatever is suggested by some department of the United States.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does the gentleman think it is fair for the Government to collect from the highway users three times as much money as it puts back into the highways?

Mr. McGREGOR. Indeed I do not.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. This bill, as I understand it, is really a continuation of the act we passed in 1946 and amended and passed in 1948, except that the amount is slightly increased over the last act?

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct. The formula of distribution remains the same.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And the formula remains the same. It is the same for the farm-to-market road system as it has been in the past?

Mr. McGREGOR. Yes; some increases have been given to the forest highways and trails and other items—including Inter-American Highways.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In other words, there is no reduction in formula or allocation of amounts in any portion of the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR. It is the same for our own road program, with the exception of an increase of 10 percent over the 1950 act which we thought would take care of partial increases in construction costs.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman, and I wish to congratulate him and all the members of the committee for the good work they have done.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I wish it were possible to increase the allocation of this road program. It is not false economy when you spend money on roads. I know of no phase of our economy that plays such an important part as the road program. I want to pay my respects to Commissioner MacDonald of the Bureau of Public Roads and his staff. They have done a grand job under the conditions existing today. You will probably hear in debate of the unencumbered and unexpended balances in the Bureau of Public Roads. I am submitting for the RECORD a chart showing the unencumbered and unexpended balances for each State. There is in the Bureau of Public Roads an unencumbered unprogramed balance as of April 30, 1952, of $336,321,000.

Status of Federal-aid highway program as of Apr. 30, 1952

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Unprogramed balances	Active program											
		Programed only			Plans approved, construction not started			Construction under way			Total		
		Total cost	Federal funds	Miles	Total cost	Federal funds	Miles	Total cost	Federal funds	Miles	Total cost	Federal funds	Miles
Alabama	9,843	30,684	15,394	477.3	8,210	4,571	123.9	22,335	11,261	439.1	61,229	31,226	1,040.3
Arizona	804	5,747	4,146	133.0	2,210	1,583	36.8	8,881	6,171	140.7	16,838	11,900	310.5
Arkansas	7,722	6,824	3,760	246.5	4,025	2,011	153.7	16,168	8,233	450.0	27,017	14,004	850.2
California	4,258	38,400	13,759	179.9	18,985	8,366	78.8	78,258	37,784	236.7	135,643	59,909	495.4
Colorado	6,225	4,808	2,271	114.4	3,507	1,946	83.3	11,601	6,299	255.5	19,916	10,516	453.2
Connecticut	6,477	3,500	1,800	13.2	1,709	822	2.0	10,516	5,571	19.2	15,725	8,193	34.4
Delaware	2,610	1,600	800	8.0	2,767	1,032	12.1	3,281	1,630	37.7	7,648	3,462	57.8
Florida	4,964	15,034	7,782	219.8	10,922	5,527	183.9	13,974	6,766	200.6	39,930	20,075	704.3
Georgia	8,156	17,286	8,784	501.0	9,324	4,356	134.0	33,816	16,612	509.1	60,426	29,752	1,144.1
Idaho	5,630	11,600	7,305	283.0	1,221	766	39.5	5,395	3,497	127.3	18,216	11,568	449.8
Illinois	14,120	51,635	28,437	427.0	24,986	12,501	263.7	73,735	37,257	591.4	150,356	78,195	1,282.1
Indiana	12,106	36,119	18,773	206.0	11,441	6,142	226.5	24,316	12,637	252.4	71,876	37,552	684.9
Iowa	2,433	17,712	9,355	583.9	11,111	5,580	507.2	16,870	8,398	687.3	45,693	23,333	1,778.4
Kansas	8,856	11,270	5,482	1,288.4	8,187	4,078	371.8	16,744	8,750	629.2	36,201	18,310	2,289.4
Kentucky	5,213	19,497	10,200	283.4	7,398	3,990	133.6	13,587	6,908	248.8	40,472	21,058	665.8
Louisiana	3,142	18,047	8,678	127.6	13,256	6,136	79.5	17,115	8,553	172.8	48,418	23,365	379.9
Maine	3,039	7,973	4,360	45.7	2,019	1,011	10.1	7,168	3,626	63.0	17,160	8,991	118.8
Maryland	8,230	4,079	1,953	56.1	544	275	11.1	11,163	5,833	21.9	15,786	8,061	92.1
Massachusetts	7,362	7,693	3,849	11.1	2,073	836		50,159	24,360	46.6	59,925	29,045	57.7
Michigan	5,915	32,076	15,972	524.2	9,854	4,975	181.8	56,246	24,731	324.1	98,176	45,678	1,030.1
Minnesota	5,468	11,569	6,086	1,167.3	14,711	7,458	811.2	20,056	11,089	664.7	46,336	24,633	2,643.2
Mississippi	4,702	17,744	9,124	626.0	7,010	3,476	215.1	17,866	9,310	466.5	42,620	21,910	1,307.6
Missouri	11,596	30,615	15,451	860.7	12,226	6,113	301.6	43,362	22,760	648.1	86,203	44,324	1,810.4
Montana	9,919	10,234	6,163	232.0	3,954	2,273	104.3	18,844	11,310	300.0	33,032	19,746	736.3
Nebraska	12,183	12,017	6,294	527.1	8,337	4,160	182.8	17,144	8,510	557.6	37,498	18,964	1,267.5
Nevada	2,494	7,727	6,157	314.3	1,278	1,069	46.9	4,498	3,739	162.5	13,503	10,965	523.7
New Hampshire	2,612	3,661	1,974	21.1	629	314	2.2	6,461	3,219	45.0	10,751	5,507	71.3
New Jersey	2,909	13,212	6,486	34.5	5,354	2,665	9.3	31,948	15,634	21.8	50,514	24,785	65.6
New Mexico	2,130	6,776	4,339	262.9	2,469	1,584	60.7	13,399	8,570	303.8	22,644	14,493	627.4
New York	44,554	78,229	40,881	145.2	13,512	6,262	63.3	103,551	47,271	368.2	195,292	94,414	576.7
North Carolina	6,902	22,815	11,110	418.7	6,007	2,631	169.5	22,658	11,363	405.0	51,480	25,104	993.2
North Dakota	2,394	13,249	6,785	1,429.5	5,554	2,789	810.8	8,713	4,397	762.3	27,516	13,971	3,002.8
Ohio	14,906	36,531	17,944	157.0	13,139	6,485	73.6	74,269	37,777	251.6	123,939	62,206	482.2
Oklahoma	4,448	16,029	8,872	257.3	8,088	4,217	167.5	19,813	10,552	201.6	43,930	23,641	626.4
Oregon	1,836	3,789	2,240	61.4	3,629	2,141	73.3	16,849	9,567	225.2	24,267	13,948	359.9
Pennsylvania	5,098	54,807	27,396	161.7	10,127	5,051	15.6	73,765	36,625	192.8	138,699	69,072	370.1
Rhode Island	1,283	5,850	2,925	45.6	581	290	1.2	18,340	9,104	23.3	24,771	12,319	70.1
South Carolina	3,884	11,487	6,204	381.3	3,610	1,775	156.6	14,865	7,600	342.4	29,962	15,579	880.3
South Dakota	1,737	9,330	5,353	743.8	5,081	3,028	317.3	12,440	7,227	681.1	26,851	15,608	1,742.2
Tennessee	6,294	12,677	6,023	436.9	13,189	6,273	227.8	27,089	12,938	356.3	52,955	25,234	1,021.0
Texas	17,782	11,412	6,230	227.4	12,370	6,349	409.5	57,175	29,538	954.8	80,957	42,117	1,651.7
Utah	2,780	3,648	2,801	70.6	3,418	2,672	65.3	6,386	4,699	93.4	13,452	10,172	229.3
Vermont	1,483	4,600	2,484	48.8	1,699	884	21.2	5,497	2,734	35.9	11,796	6,102	105.9
Virginia	7,946	19,985	9,972	377.7	6,227	3,102	139.5	24,285	12,140	387.6	50,497	25,214	904.8
Washington	2,672	15,423	7,500	265.0	2,770	1,439	58.1	22,470	11,404	133.5	40,663	20,343	456.6
West Virginia	6,914	9,125	4,633	82.5	2,798	1,404	42.4	12,308	6,132	110.7	24,231	12,169	235.6
Wisconsin	5,145	28,370	14,883	593.5	17,255	8,290	215.1	18,927	9,693	407.8	64,552	32,866	1,216.4
Wyoming	1,979	2,072	1,360	22.4	1,856	1,311	46.7	8,051	5,208	162.0	11,979	7,879	231.1
Hawaii	1,782	7,270	3,482	13.0	439	220	5.2	10,648	4,267	24.0	18,357	7,969	42.2
District of Columbia	7,801	84	42	.2				3,252	1,819	.9	3,336	1,861	1.1
Puerto Rico	5,583	8,126	3,848	50.5	3,988	1,940	9.2	8,829	4,021	31.5	20,943	9,809	91.2
Total	336,321	830,047	427,900	15,998.4	345,044	174,169	7,216.1	1,235,086	625,048	14,868.5	2,410,177	1,227,117	38,083.0

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. At the rate the projects are being programed, that total amount will be exhausted at the end of the fiscal period, will it not?

Mr. McGREGOR. The fiscal period ends in 1 month. This will add more to this fund.

The other day we again appropriated $400,000,000. There will always be a large balance but I am not objecting to that balance. There must be a balance but I do say there is definitely something wrong with the program, and I will assume my proportionate share of the responsibility, when we have $336,000,000 of an unencumbered, unexpended balance, whether it is at the State level or at the national level. I do not think it is necessary to have that big a balance and I, for one, shall do everything I can to initiate a program, either at State level, at my little township level, or at the Federal level, to get a road program that is at least adequate for our needs. We should use the money authorized by the Congress. Let us get the roads in better shape and we cannot do it by having the money here in Washington.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is characteristic of the lag that usually prevails with respect to the programing of projects?

Mr. McGREGOR. It is my understanding this is not quite as high as it has been in the past, but it is higher than normal. On March 31 the unexpended balance was $393,098,000. I hope that my friend will agree with me that

something should be done to initiate a road program so that we can get the money spent and a program put into effect and not carry such a tremendous balance.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It is going to be rather difficult for us to propose legislation that will cure the fiscal affairs of each respective State in obtaining sufficient funds to keep their matching at a permanent level. It seems to me that it has not been as real a problem as the gentleman says it is at the present time.

Mr. McGREGOR. I think it is definitely a real problem, for this reason: So many of our States, during the war, allowed their roads to get into such a condition that it now requires practically all of their money to maintain them. When their maintenance bills are paid they have no funds left for which to match Federal funds for road construction. I think that is a problem that we are going to have to recognize—and it is unusual for me to say, because I have always objected and have been very careful that no Federal funds are to be used for maintenance—but I think we are going to have to give some additional aid to the States possibly for maintenance for a definite short period of time so that they will have a sufficient amount of money to match Federal funds. I have a list of the States here showing which have unmatched funds. Take, for instance, Ohio, $14,906,000 worth of Federal funds, and I find that my State does not have any money to match those Federal funds, and I think similar conditions exist in practically every State.

We are going to hear this plea of economy again, and some of my good friends will say, "Here is a Republican that wants to increase the President's budget." I am very happy to accept that challenge, because the budget request certainly was not in accord, anywhere near in accord, with the needs of the various States, and I am certain that my good friend from Massachusetts will agree with that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I referred to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Which friend from Massachusetts did the gentleman have in mind?

Mr. McGREGOR. My distinguished friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Having drawn the inference, I want the RECORD to show it. My friend says that he will accept the challenge. What challenge is being hurled at him?

Mr. McGREGOR. Because of the fact that the question is often raised, I think, that the majority floor leader has often said, "Here are fellows hollering for economy, and when it come time to vote they do not vote for economy."

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true; is it not?

Mr. McGREGOR. It is false economy, the highway bill as recommended by the President—only $400,000,000 for the roads of our country—when the people pay nearly $1,750,000,000 yearly for what they think is for road purposes.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true; is it not?

Mr. McGREGOR. What is true?

Mr. McCORMACK. The statement is correct.

Mr. McGREGOR. I will never vote against reasonable economy, I am for economy, but there are lots of times when it is false economy, and the legislation, as submitted by the President, when he says only $400,000,000 out of $1,800,000,000 will be spent on roads, is false economy.

Mr. McCORMACK. This being a nice philosophical discussion, I just want to know who is challenging my friend. I am not challenging him; I am following his leadership.

Mr. McGREGOR. Not being as long in political life as my distinguished friend from Massachusetts, but knowing his tactics, I feel certain that some of these days, he is going to get on the floor and say, "Here is McGREGOR talking for economy, but he increased the President's budget."

Mr. McCORMACK. When has my friend ever heard me take the floor, in relation to any one of my colleagues, specifically mentioning him by name? That is a policy that I do not follow, and the gentleman knows that.

Mr. McGREGOR. I used my own name, so I would not draw anyone else into this very friendly discussion and possibly a prophecy.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no challenge to my friend that I know of. I think the gentleman should change his remarks and say "I am giving leadership that could recognize no challenge."

Mr. McGREGOR. Well, those are very kind words, but still the President's budget calls for $400,000,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. So there will be no misunderstanding by anybody who might read the RECORD—and this is a pleasant colloquy—I want the RECORD to show that I am in agreement with my friend.

Mr. McGREGOR. Well, that is very kind. I appreciate that compliment very much, and I do thank the majority floor leader for his support and also his friendship.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, we are going to have to spend more money on our highways and less on building roads and power dams and flood-control projects in foreign countries, if we are to be prepared to meet possible emergencies.

I want to call attention to one project that has been on the statute books for 18 years that will probably mean more to this country in case of another conflict than any other highway that has yet been proposed. I am speaking of the Natchez Trace, extending from Nashville, Tenn., to Natchez, Miss., the route that Andrew Jackson followed in 1814 on his historic march to New Orleans.

Let me show you what that project means. It will be a wide, straight, direct, hard-surfaced, highway, extending from Nashville to Natchez, with no surface crossings on it. The roads that cross it go either under it or over it.

Nashville is about half way between our two atomic bomb plants, the one at Oak Ridge on the Tennessee River and the one at Paducah on the Ohio; both of which are connected with this Natchez Trace highway at Nashville by splendid, wide, hard-surfaced roads.

In case of necessity, this Natchez Trace could be closed to all traffic, except that in the military service, without paralyzing, or in any way interfering with, the traffic in the areas through which it passes.

This road is absolutely necessary from the standpoint of our national defense; because, if we were to get into another war, no one need kid himself at all, it would be an atomic war, fought largely with airplanes and atomic bombs. This would be the one route of ingress and egress to these atomic-bomb plants that could be used at all times without interfering with the other traffic along the route.

What I am after is to have the Congress increase the appropriations for this highway, in order to speed up the construction of the remainder of this great project, to have it ready in case we need it. If it is not needed for military purposes, it can still be used for passenger traffic, to which it is confined. It will be one of the finest passenger traffic highways in America.

A large portion of this great highway is already constructed and open to traffic. It is one of the finest routes over which a man ever drove. What we need to do is to speed up this construction and finish it as quickly as possible. We never know when we are going to need it for our own protection.

I was surprised that the House Appropriations Committee did not include ample funds to hasten the completion of this vital link in our defense program. I went before the Senate Appropriations Committee and appealed to them to give us an amount that would speed up the construction of this project as rapidly as possible. It ought to be finished with all possible haste, because, as I said, in case of a conflict it will be worth more to us from the standpoint of national defense than any other highway that I could mention. It could be used exclusively for military traffic without interfering with the traffic in the areas along the route, because, as I pointed out, the roads that cross it either pass over it or under it. It would not in any way obstruct the local traffic.

I realize that an appropriation is not in order on this bill. I realize that this is a separate proposition. But I am appealing to the Congress to speed up the completion of this Natchez Trace, in order that we may have it for immediate use in case we should be thrown into a war with any foreign power.

In addition, it will give us the finest passenger highway from Nashville to the Gulf in times of peace that you could possibly imagine, one that would not be loaded with heavy trucks, but would be open for passenger traffic at all times.

As I said, I am not going to offer any amendment here. That is not necessary, because it is already authorized and an

appropriation amendment would not be in order; but I do want to appeal to the Congress to help us secure the funds necessary to speed up the completion of this vital missing link in our defense program.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK], a member of the committee.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, many Members in recent years have spoken from the well of the House about the forgotten man. I desire to talk to you today about the unforgotten man—about the man who is never forgotten by those who write the tax bills or by those who collect the taxes. This unforgotten man is the American automobile owner.

The automobile owner, as a member of a class, pays every tax that all other citizens pay. He pays income, sales, excise, and real-estate taxes. He pays taxes on cigarettes, liquor, cosmetics, admissions, furs, and jewelry. In addition to all of these taxes, the automobile owner also pays billions of dollars into the Federal Treasury each year in taxes that are levied solely and exclusively on him and him alone.

The Federal Government during the last fiscal year, collected $607,000,000 in Federal gasoline taxes from the automobile owners of America. In addition to this gasoline tax, the Federal Government last year collected more than $1,090,000,000 from these same automobile owners in special excise taxes on Diesel oil, tires, accessories, and new cars. In short, the Federal Government last year collected in special taxes levied solely and exclusively on automobile owners, a total of $1,696,900,000.

Enormous and gigantic as this tax take last year from the American motorist was, it will be much greater in the year ahead.

Members of the House will recall that last year Congress over the "nay" votes of many of us enacted a new tax bill. That tax bill increased the tax on gasoline, which for many years had been 1½ cents a gallon, to 2 cents a gallon. This 33⅓ percent increase in the Federal gasoline tax went into effect November 1 of last year. Under this new and higher gasoline tax, the Federal Government will collect more than $800,000,000 from the Nation's automobile owners during the coming year.

Last year's bill also increased the excise tax on new cars from 7 percent of the factory price to 10 percent. Excise taxes on tires and accessories also were increased. This group of new excise taxes, it is estimated, will produce a revenue of more than $1,400,000,000 during the coming year.

In short, during the coming year, the automobile owners will pay into the Federal Treasury in special taxes levied on them and them alone a total off $2,200,000,000.

In return for this $2,200,000,000 in special taxes levied on the automobile owners, this bill proposes to give back to these automobile owners less than $550,000,000 in special benefits in the form of new highway construction.

In other words, from each $1 collected from the automobile owner in special taxes levied solely and exclusively on him, this bill proposes to give back to that automobile owner about 25 cents in benefits in the form of new or improved roads.

Of the tax dollar paid in by the automobile owner in special taxes on him and him alone, 75 cents is diverted from highway building to other purposes of Government, including foreign aid, defense, the salaries of our ever increasing number of public officials, and other things.

In insisting on the diversion of so much of the motorists' tax dollar to other purposes than roads, the administration is most inconsistent. In some of the earlier highway bills there were clauses which said that if a State diverted any of its gasoline tax revenue or automobile license fees to any purpose other than road building that it would forefeit any Federal aid for highways to which that State might be entitled. Even at this very time, residents of New Jersey and Pennsylvania are appearing before our committee and asking that they be permitted to use tolls collected from contemplated interstate bridges to build airports, grain elevators, and other publicly owned installations. Federal administration officials are protesting these tax diversions from road purposes by the States. Yet, inconsistently, while protesting diversion by the States of any automobile tax revenue to any purposes other than roads, the Federal Government is diverting 75 cents out of every dollar it collects in special taxes from the automobile owner and even now wants to divert even more than that.

The Federal Government in Federal gasoline taxes alone will collect $800,000,000 from the motorists but will give them back only $550,000,000 for highways and bridges, thereby diverting $250,000,000 of this gas tax money for the general expenses of Government.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. One dollar out of every eight dollars that is collected in the United States in taxes comes from the automobile manufacturer or the men who sell automobiles. The figure is one out of every eight dollars comes from that source.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I am quite sure the gentleman is correct.

The President in his budget message in January declared that, despite the fact that taxes on the automobile owner had been increased by $600,000,000 during the past year, we should spend less money on our domestic highways than we have been spending.

During recent years the Congress each year has authorized the expenditure of $500,000,000 a year for Federal aid for highway construction. Despite the fact that we will collect this year $600,000,000 more in additional taxes than heretofore, the President in that budget message said that Federal funds authorized for highways should be cut to $400,000,000, or by 20 percent.

In effect, the reduction as the President recommended would mean that, as far as the Federal Government is concerned, only one-half as many new miles of highway will be built during the next 2 years as during the years 1946 and 1947.

The President's recommendation was for a cut of $100,000,000, or 20 percent, in domestic Federal highway authorizations. However, according to the evidence submitted to our committee by Commissioner of Public Roads Thomas H. MacDonald, road construction costs have increased almost 50 percent since 1946. This means that it takes $1.50 today to build as much road as $1 built in 1946. In other words, the reduction to $400,000,000 recommended by the President for this bill, were it accepted, would mean we could do only as much road building as $250,000,000 would have done in 1946. Thus the President's program, if accepted by the committee and House, would mean that only one-half as much Federal purchasing power will be available during the next 2 years for highway construction as was made available in 1946.

Now, it is not good economy to refuse to provide the money to sharpen your saw. It is not economy to refuse to repair the leak in your roof. It is not sound economy for a manufacturer to decline to spend the money necessary to keep his machinery in good repair. It is not good economy to allow the great road system of this Nation to run down and deteriorate.

The strength of America—the main source of her prosperity in time of peace and of her might in the event of war—lies in her unrivaled industrial machine which time and again has demonstrated it can produce goods in greater abundance and better quality than any industrial organization in the world.

Our highways are an integral and vital part of that industrial machine. Without our motor transportation system it would be impossible to maintain our great industrial efficiency.

Highways go where railroads, steamships, and airlines cannot go. The motor truck transports freight direct from the source of supply to the factory and from the factory to the retail outlet or even to the homes. No other transportation system can do that. It is often said there is a truck for every purpose, for little loads or big loads. No other system of transportation is so flexible. Without trucks and automobiles our industrial machine would be far less efficient than it is.

It is not economy to allow this system of truck and motor-car transportation to wear out faster than we build it.

The committee very properly, therefore, I think, rejected the President's plea that domestic road construction be reduced to one-half the 1946 level.

Instead of recommending $400,000,000 for Federal aid to highways as the President suggested, the committee proposes $550,000,000 in this bill which is 10 percent above the sum authorized in most years between 1946 and 1952. Even with this 10-percent increase we will be building fewer miles of Federal highways due to the 50 percent rise in construction costs which according to Road Commissioner MacDonald have occurred in recent years.

How far the administration has gone afield in its foreign mindedness is indicated by the fact that while the President recommends the domestic highway building be cut to one-half the 1946 level, he asked that vastly larger sums of the American automobile owners' tax dollars be spent to build roads in foreign countries.

While the President asked that road construction in this country be reduced to one-half the 1946 level, he asked that where we have been authorizing never more than $8,000,000 for 2 years on Central American highways that this bill authorizes $64,000,000 for the next 2 years for Central American highways or an increase of 800 percent in foreign road construction over the last 2 years and a great decrease in the amount expended on our own domestic roads.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again expired.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The committee also rejected the President's recommendation for a vast increase in foreign road building with American taxpayers' dollars and reduced the amount it recommends for expenditures on foreign highways to $24,000,000. Considering that even this $24,000,000 is three times what was authorized for the past 2 years, it still is a pretty high figure, and one that can be, in my opinion, trimmed with benefits toward keeping our budgetary condition much sounder than it is.

The President recommended $64,000,000 be authorized for new highway construction in Central American countries.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am sure you do not want the Members to think that the President recommended 800 percent additional money for the Pan-American Highway. We made a commitment of $65,000,000. We have expended $8,000,000, or almost that. The recommendation is for $8,000,000 a year until the project is completed. If you want to waste money and slow down construction that you undertake, I do not care what it is, you certainly cannot save money. If you have a given project for $56,000,000, that is what you are committed to.

Mr. MACK of Washington. We are committed to this amount of money over a long period of years. The President recommends that we spend it right away.

Mr. DEMPSEY. If we string out the number of years it will cost us more than $56,000,000.

Mr. MACK of Washington. That might be true of the domestic program also. If we would spend a billion or two billion on domestic highways, we might proceed with greater efficiency and accomplish more than by appropriating less.

Mr. DEMPSEY. There is not any question about it.

Mr. MACK of Washington. We have not done that for the domestic highways, and I do not see why we should do it for highways in foreign countries financed by American taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am wondering if the gentleman, in his opinion, would say that that program to spend $56,000,000 in the near foreseeable future is profitable. That is 28 times as much as they have been getting at any other time.

Mr. MACK of Washington. That is true.

Mr. McGREGOR. Certainly, if they are going to have $56,000,000 instead of $4,000,000, I do not think we should authorize a different program.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman from Ohio has complimented the Bureau of Public Roads for the efficient manner in which it constructs highways. That is their recommendation. They are the most technical men we have.

Mr. McGREGOR. I do not agree with them because I admire them. People will make mistakes and I will disagree with them. Certainly I disagree with them in this instance.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman said they were efficient.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The President recommended $56,000,000 for the Inter-American Highway and $8,000,000 additional for the Rama Road, or a total of sixty-four million. The committee, in this bill, limited the amount to $24,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. In 1950 the Inter-American Highway got $8,000,000. That was $4,000,000 a year. I can see no reason why we should grant to the highways in Central America more money proportionally than we are granting to our own people. I am willing that the Central American countries receive the same as they got in 1951 just as are the people of the United States.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. DEMPSEY. In this specific situation you have a commitment of $56,000,000 to finish the project. You can drag it out and give them $1,000,000 a year, and at the end of the time it will cost double $56,000,000. When you expedite a construction job you are saving money. When you delay it you are wasting money. That is what is proposed right here. They are not giving them $56,000,000 for 1 year. They recommend fifty-six million for 7 years. You want to draw it out to 14 years.

Mr. DONDERO. If we were right in 1950, then we ought to be right now. They got $4,000,000 a year under that bill. This bill gives them $8,000,000.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Now they have become organized. They have the equipment. More countries have joined in this program and they want to finish it. I assume that is what you want to do. You talk about efficiency and you talk about economy. If you can tell me one thing that you can construct and have any economy shown where you delay the construction, I would like to know what that project would be.

Mr. DONDERO. May I say that they are getting $4,000,000 a year under the old bill and they kept right on constructing the road. This will continue construction; it will not slow it down.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The six Central American countries have a population of 9,000,000 people. The six New England States have about the same population, although New England, of course, does have a great many more cars than Central America.

During the past 2 years the six New England States received Federal grants of about $48,000,000 for highway purposes. The six Central American countries in those same 2 years had Federal grants of $8,000,000.

The President's proposal of a 20-percent reduction in Federal funds for domestic highways means that he believes Federal grants to the six New England States should be cut by $9,000,000.

While favoring cutting the money available for the six New England States by $9,000,000, the President wants to increase the highway grants to the South American countries from $8,000,000, the sum allowed for the past 2 years, to $64,000,000 for the next 2 years, an increase of $56,000,000.

A proposal that road building in New England with 9,000,000 people be cut by $9,000,000 and that the 9,000,000 people of the Central American nations be granted an increase of $56,000,000 just does not make sense to me.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ].

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 7340, would continue without substantial change from the pattern established by Congress under the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1944, 1948, and 1950, the Federal-aid highway program.

There is ample proof of the need for expediting the highway-construction program. During the war and for some time after the war, when road construction and improvement was practically at a standstill, the already inadequate system of highways became rapidly worse and definitely unable to carry safely and quickly the ever-increasing volume of traffic imposed upon it.

Maryland is particularly aware of these conditions, because of the tremendous increase in traffic on Route 1, one section of which provides the main artery of traffic from Baltimore to Washington. The traffic problem on this road is unique, as it is the main entrance to the Nation's Capital from the northeastern section of the country.

The present route, linking the North to the Capital, is one of the most heavily traveled and most dangerous highways in the country. Over 40,000 vehicles a day use this route. It has one of the highest accident and fatality rates of any comparable highways in the country, due largely to the many intersecting roads and the development of stores, private homes, and businesses along its entire length.

The amount of $14,500,000 authorized in this bill for the Baltimore-Washington Parkway, will complete the project, which was initiated by the Federal Government on the condition that the State of Maryland provide funds for the work from the Baltimore city line to Fort Meade, the Government to complete the section from Fort Meade to Washington. The route for the parkway from Jessups to the District line was chosen by the Government so that the road would serve the Federal installations in that area. Furthermore, it was intended as a national defense road, to connect Fort Meade and the other Government installations with Washington.

By the end of this construction season, Maryland will have completed the work on its section of the project, a distance of approximately 13 miles. Until the funds authorized in this bill are provided, the Government cannot complete its share of the work on this urgently needed highway.

This road would supplement the present route, greatly relieve the traffic congestion, and provide a through way for north and south traffic to or through Washington. Therefore, I strongly urge the House to approve this appropriation which is justified not only as a vital public necessity, but also as a very important defense contribution.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, during 1952 the Federal Government will collect from the people of this Nation somewhere between $2,000,000,000 and $2,250,000,000 in gasoline and other excise taxes on automobiles and motor transport. Again in 1953 and 1954 that, at least, will be the Nation's annual income from highways.

We have before us today a so-called Federal-aid road act which proposes to appropriate approximately 25 percent of that money for construction of highways throughout the Nation.

I cannot recall any better business deal that Uncle Sam ever has made. Most certainly the diversion of 75 percent of the gross income from the Nation's roads—for only our highways make possible this income—is all that can be expected and something that only a real national emergency can justify.

The people of the country, virtually all of whom pay a share of this vast sum that amounts practically to toll for use of their highways, have every right to demand that those highways shall be improved, made safer, and the mileage increased in keeping with the economic development of the Nation. They want and need highways which will carry efficiently and expeditiously the enormous burden imposed on them by the defense effort which their country in making to insure freedom and future security.

H. R. 7340, which we are considering today, authorizes the use of $550,000,000 a year for that purpose. By no stretch of the imagination, by no contribution by the engineering genius that has made America great, can we hope to keep our Nation's highway system apace with the demands upon it with so-called Federal aid in the amount of $550,000,000. Only the present defense emergency can justify so small an amount of aid to the States in their struggle to build the roads that are so vitally essential to every citizen.

And the Federal Government denies to the States the same right to divert funds, which theoretically and equitably should be devoted to construction and maintenance of highways—funds which come from the same source as those collected by the Federal Government.

Back in 1934, under the terms of the Hayden-Cartwright Act, the Federal Government said to the States: "You cannot divert gasoline tax and similar excise funds from the construction and maintenance of your highways. If you do, you will receive none of the Federal funds which are to be allocated. That will be the penalty you will pay, even though your own citizens have paid their share of the money into the Federal Treasury."

If that pattern were to be followed by the Federal Government, this Nation would have highways, primary, secondary, farm-to-market, and urban, that would go far toward the solution of our transport and safety problems.

It is well to bear in mind also that so-called Federal aid does not extend to the maintenance of our highways—just to their construction. Highway maintenance costs to the States during 1951 are estimated to have been between $550,000,000 and $600,000,000—the full amount which we are today proposing to return to those States as the so-called Federal aid contribution. On that basis, therefore, we merely are paying enough to keep up the highways already built.

Because of that, our highway system has been deteriorating instead of improving, if we consider the over-all picture. The Federal Government has prevented, through parsimony, the construction of roads of the type which would carry the enormous traffic burden and stand up under the strain. Maintenance costs, therefore, have been far greater than they should have been.

It is true the authorization in this bill is 10 percent greater than that in the last one. Still, that is not ample if we take into consideration the fact that highway construction costs—just as all others—have increased between 12 and 15 percent since the last so-called Federal-aid bill was passed in 1950. Even simple arithmetic will show that fewer miles of highways can be built with the funds made available under this bill than were constructed with the funds authorized 2 years ago.

Under normal conditions, in the absence of any emergency such as we have today in international affairs, so-called Federal aid in the amount of $550,000,000 would be entirely inadequate. In my opinion, the citizens of this country who pay gasoline and other excise taxes in the belief that they are making a contribution toward better highways are entitled to a greater utilization of their money for that specific purpose.

After long and careful consideration of the question, the Public Works Committee has reached the determination that the amount authorized by this bill is the absolute minimum that can be authorized under existing conditions for so-called aid to the States. I feel that we would be remiss in our duty and our obligation to the people if we were to fail to authorize this amount.

Let us consider for a moment the factor of safety. An ever-mounting toll of human lives is being taken annually on our highways—too large a percentage of those lives being taken by antiquated roads. There are too many sharp curves and narrow bridges on our present highways. Under present traffic conditions they are veritable death traps. In 1951, according to our National Safety Council, there were more than 8,000,000 highway accidents in our country. In those accidents more than 37,000 lives were lost and more than a million persons were injured. The property damage caused, it is estimated, will not be far from the $1,500,000,000 mark. That is about three times what we are grudgingly proposing to return to the highway users in fiscal year 1953 to build better and safer roads.

In view of that national tragedy, how anyone could object to the provisions of this so-called Federal-aid road bill is inconceivable. No one in this House desires economy in government more than do I, but it must be real economy—not mere dangerous and damaging fund cutting just for the sake of expediency, political or otherwise.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. In connection with the colloquy the gentleman from New Mexico had with our two good friends, the gentleman from New Mexico has been in the construction business all his life, as I remember.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Since I was 13 years of age I have been in the construction business, and I am still in the construction business.

Mr. McCORMACK. And on a large scale.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I would not say too large; I had the little job of building subways in New York City.

Mr. McCORMACK. How many subways?

Mr. DEMPSEY. About three in New York.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is pretty large, I would say.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Let us forget the personal angle; I was considering only the problem we had with this Congress committed to the building in part of the Pan-American Highway. The proportionate participations were set up; we understand that, and we are committed to $56,000,000.

The Bureau of Public Roads advises me that they are equipped now to go ahead, and they want the authorization; that is all. We in the committee thought we should authorize the $56,000,000 at this time, but the majority of the committee recommended $8,000,000 annually for the next 2 years. The vote was in favor of that situation.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. By one vote; is not that the record?

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is not my recollection; but if the gentleman from Ohio says it was by one vote, then I am sure it was by one vote.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman from Ohio has had considerable experience in the construction business himself. Can the gentleman visualize a road program such as the Pan-American Highway being slowed down without the construction costs going up, especially when it is stretched out 14 years?

Mr. McGREGOR. I want to say to my distinguished friend from New Mexico that we are not slowing it down. We gave them $4,000,000 last year; we give them the same amount this year and next. That certainly is not slowing it down. I contend that if we cannot buy the material for our own roads in the United States, let us not help those fellows any more than we help our own people.

Mr. DEMPSEY. If we make a commitment with a sovereign state I am sure we should try to keep that commitment. We have made a commitment with these nations. Now they are gradually coming in more and more on the work and doing their share. Are you going to cut down our aid when that happens?

Mr. McGREGOR. If the gentleman will yield, we have never made a commitment based on an annual contribution; we have made a commitment on the over-all program.

Mr. DEMPSEY. And we still owe $56,000,000; is not that true?

Mr. McGREGOR. That is true; but I recall that some years ago we were told it would cost only $32,000,000 to complete the whole project.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am telling the gentleman that, if we extend the time and extend the time again, the final cost will be not $56,000,000, but double that amount. I, too, want to get the job completed for as small an amount of money as possible.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. In the committee hearings the gentleman from Ohio, interrogating Commissioner MacDonald, propounded this question—this is found on page 46 of the hearings:

> Mr. McGREGOR. Are you taking the position we should reduce the allocation of funds for roads in the United States and send $64,000,000 down to Latin America for roads there?
>
> Mr. MACDONALD. I am taking the position that we should help construct the Inter-American Highway. That amount of $56,000,000 will extend over anywhere from an 8- to a 10-year period.

If, therefore, they have a construction program, let us pursue the program, instead of establishing a new one, by reducing the amount of the annual contribution even though it does not reduce the total amount to be expended on the project.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman, and it is exactly what I am trying to say. When you have a big job, such as confronts us in these countries in South America, if you can speed the program up and go ahead with it, that is economy, but when you attempt to do what you are trying to do here, that is extravagance and waste.

Mr. McGREGOR. From my distinguished friend's reading, Mr. MacDonald said this $56,000,000 or $64,000,000 would extend over 8 or 10 years. Experience has proven to me that if I give my boy $5 and put it in his pocket and ask him to spend that over a year or 5 years, it would be better to give him a dollar a year. I do not think we can give those countries any more for the entire program because they will come back in 4 years and say: "Well, we have made a mistake, give us another $20,000,000."

Mr. DEMPSEY. The situation in connection with the gentleman's boy is not apropos of this one because you have given him the money for no specific purpose. This is a contract we have entered into and the amount of money is definitely set out. I can understand; the way the gentleman hands out money to his son, why it would cost him $5 more in the next few days.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The President in his budget message and in his request for this bill set up a program involving $400,000,000. We rejected that because we did not think the program went far enough.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is true.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That was for the sake of economy and in trying to carry out the various conceivable programs.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is true.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. When we increased it, we increased the program. Why should we increase the program, then decrease the other?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. McGREGOR. The gentleman from New Mexico introduced a bill involving $600,000,000 at one time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman tell us what effect these extraordinary and rapidly spent funds would have in those countries from the standpoint of over-stimulating their economy all at once? It seems to me you have two propositions. You have a shortage of road building material in this country. Down there they have, we will say, a limited number of people to work.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I cannot yield further. I think the gentleman from Michigan can analyze the economy of those countries as well as I can. That is something we should have taken into account when we made this agreement. Would you be for just getting out of the agreement?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Not at all. In the Virgin Islands, which is our own territory, we are spending $10,000,000 on public works, not all at once, of course, because it would wreck their economy through overstimulation of prices and wages. It would be asinine and crucifying to spend it hurriedly. We are spending it over a period of years. I am trying to find out if that is the situation in Central America. I do not know.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am sure the gentleman does not know.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am trying to find out.

Mr. DEMPSEY. There is one thing I would like to call to the attention of the House. We have increased over the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget by some million and a half dollars the domestic part of this road bill. One of the justifiable reasons for that, in the judgment of the committee, is the great number of highway accidents we are having. More than 37,000 people were killed on our highways in the last 12 months, which is more than double the number of our men killed in Korea since the beginning of the war.

We are away behind in the construction of our highways because of the Second World War, when construction was shut down completely. We still have narrow bridges, and sharp radius curves which must be eliminated before the highways will be as safe as we desire them to be—as they must be. We cannot increase the safety of our highways by reducing the amount of money for improvements to roads and highways.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, probably there is no public works carried out by the Federal Government that is more significant than the road program. It not only enters into the social and economic welfare of our country, but must take into account the tremendous transportation system that is required for our industrial economy. This year we are proposing the biennial road bill which calls for an expenditure in the amount of $550,000,000. This amount is broken down into three general categories of roads that are recognized under this legislation: Primary, urban, and rural. We are producing more automobiles and more vehicles than we are constructing highways upon which they can operate. It is estimated that if we were to bring the public highway system of this country up into first class order it would take approximately $11,000,000,000. So you see that with an appropriation of this sum, even as a matching fund for supplying funds required for road construction, we still are not pursuing the problem to the extent of solving this enormous problem.

There is another aspect to this bill that I think needs extraordinary study. That is highway safety. Highway accidents are increasing year by year. In 1950 there were some 35,000 people killed upon our highways. The accident rate increased almost 50 percent from 1945 through 1951.

I would like to point out some very significant figures that relate to the increase of highway accidents that are taking place on our highways today. You noticed, no doubt, a few days ago, there was a report that the insurance companies were naturally having to apply for increased rates due to the fact that there are increased accidents taking place. As to motor vehicle accidents in 1945 as compared with 1950, the list which was supplied by the National Safety Council showed that there had been an in-

crease of 51 percent, from 5,500,000 in 1945 to 8,300,000 accidents in 1950. In 1950 there was a 20 percent increase in the number of fatalities. In 1951 there was an increase of some 2,500 people killed on the highways. At the present time accidents that are causing fatalities will exceed 40,000 this year. The property damage increase was 92 percent. The property damages caused on the highways last year were almost $3,000,000,000. The total property damages being caused in highway accidents is more than we are spending on highway construction.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I wish to compliment the gentleman on his untiring efforts in behalf of the safety program. He has done an excellent job, I am sure, in his own community, and he certainly has done an excellent job in our committee.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

I hope the committee will have an opportunity to give further study to the highway safety features, because we cannot cure all the ills in highway construction since highway construction will not keep up with the increased number of casualties caused by the increased number of vehicle miles now being imposed on our highways.

I understand the desire and the anxiety of the gentleman from Ohio in regard to the total amounts involved in the Inter-American Highway. The Inter-American Highway is a program bearing a schedule of between 8 and 10 years. It is necessary that if we are to make orderly progress on the construction of that road there be $8,000,000 available annually to give some semblance of order to the continuation of that construction. I do hope we will not have a reduction in those amounts.

You will also note from the report that we have been a little more liberal due to the fact that we have had increased costs on the forest highways or forest roads and trails and the park service roads and the parkways, Indian roads, and the public land roads. Those in addition to the three systems of roads that I described earlier bring the total amount to $621,250,000.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The way the bill is drawn we would be doubling the amount for the Inter-American Highway but we would not be doubling the amount for the State of Alabama. How can the gentleman explain to his people the same proportion of money going out of the country when his own people are not getting it?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. In the first place, the State of Alabama does not obtain its Federal funds due to any treaty in which the State of Alabama and the Federal Government are engaged. The second thing is the Inter-American Road is not a matching program in the sense of the scheme of the Federal highway participation program as we have had it continuously since 1916. The situations are not similar and do not bear the same analysis.

The program is going to cost an overall figure of $64,000,000. You are not delaying paying off that obligation by dribbling it out. By delay you are increasing the total amount that is necessary to be expended to carry out our obligation there, a program that has been devised by the engineers of the respective countries to be completed in an 8- to 10-year period. We are coming back and saying, "No, you cannot complete that work. You have to do it in 16 to 17 years." I do not think that is going to be any real economy.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The amount in the bill is $8,000,000. That is almost 50 percent as much money as the entire State of Michigan gets for all its thousands of miles of roads, while here we are granting $8,000,000 to go to just one road. I think if you give them the same amount of money, as we did in 1950, they can continue the construction of that road without it costing any more, and I think without violating any treaty obligation whatever. We ought to do it as a matter of fairness to our own people.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Did the gentleman pursue his argument a little bit further and conclude that it is better not to have any agreement at all, and not participate in it? I am not responsible for, and was not a party to the original agreement, and neither is the gentleman from Michigan. But I would like to see the good faith of the agreement carried out to the letter, and if it is an agreement, let us pursue it and see that it is carried out and the road constructed.

Mr. DONDERO. I was not aware that there was a solemn treaty signed by our Government and the government of Nicaragua. I understood that it was a commitment by the Department of State, about which the Congress of the United States had nothing to say.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. We did not have hearings going behind the agreement but, of course, we could not use any other department of Government to make an international agreement except the Department of State. I do not know of any other way that we could.

Mr. DONDERO. Of course, if there were a treaty, then the other body at least would have acted upon it.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I cannot go back and comment on the virtues of it. I am sorry I cannot go back and relate the conditions that brought about such an agreement between the two countries. But, if there is an agreement, and we have already been carrying out our obligation in the direction of resolving it by building a road, then let us not abandon it when it is half finished.

Mr. DONDERO. I am not advocating abandoning our agreement.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Well, we might as well say we are abandoning it, of course. If the engineers have come up with a program which they have agreed upon, naturally if we are going to use our engineers, then we had better take their advice.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I recall the gentleman reading that Mr. MacDonald said it would take 8 or 10 years to complete this program, and that my distinguished friend said a few moments ago that we would be hindering the program if we did not give them $56,000,000 more. I cannot associate the two statements because Mr. MacDonald said even if he got his $56,000,000, it would take 8 to 10 years to complete the program.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is right.

Mr. McGREGOR. I understood the gentleman said that we would have more efficiency in the construction, if Mr. MacDonald has the entire $56,000,000 at one time.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Did I understand the gentleman from Ohio to say that the gentleman from Alabama said to give them the $56,000,000 now?

Mr. McGREGOR. I understood the gentleman from Alabama said we would be delaying the program, and that it was false economy if we did not give the $56,000,000 at once.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I am sorry if the gentleman misunderstood me. I did not intend to convey the impression that I was in favor of giving the total amount now.

Mr. McGREGOR. Perhaps I am mistaken.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. But, I am in favor of giving the $8,000,000 annually to be available until expended, or until the road is completed.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman made no reference to $56,000,000. He made reference to $8,000,000 a year, and the total over 8 or 10 years, of course, would be $56,000,000.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That certainly was my intention.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman who was advocating cutting it on the basis of economy should know that there is no economy in it at all. It does not reduce the total amount of money that we have agreed to pay.

Mr. McGREGOR. We have not agreed to pay anything, may I say to my distinguished friend from New Mexico, and if so I would like to see the agreement.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted to proceed, I did not interrupt the gentleman from Ohio when he was addressing the committee. I am just trying to correct some of the misstatements made by the gentleman from Ohio. I think certainly you attended the hearings, and should know that no one is trying to increase the amount of money going to those countries. We are trying to get the job done as quickly as possible. This is an extremely important road.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am wondering if the record shows at any place where we agreed to spend any amount of money on this particular highway?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Is the gentleman bringing up the question of the original agreement between the two countries?

Mr. McGREGOR. I was trying to find out how long this so-called commitment is going to run. It started several years ago at twenty million, then thirty million, and so forth and so on.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] is rather late in bringing up the question. He has been a member of the subcommittee for a long time and has voted for it. I do not see why he should raise the question at this late date.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL], a member of the committee.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I hope that we can get away from this other controversy and that I can devote the 5 minutes I have to the domestic road program in the United States.

Roads are the lifeblood of the Nation. Oregon, my native State, was the first State in the Union to provide a gasoline tax. It was debated rather fiercely and objected to and was said to be unconstitutional. It went to the Supreme Court of the United States. Eventually it was approved. Now I understand every State in the Union, the Territories, and the District of Columbia have gasoline taxes. As has already been pointed out, the money derived from these taxes which are imposed upon the road users, and the road users alone, the next fiscal year will be over $2,000,000,000; perhaps $2,200,000,000. Yet under this bill we are allowing only $550,000,000 for the road systems throughout the United States; that is, the three major categories of roads in the United States. Only 25 percent of the total amount that is received from road users themselves. As has been brought out, the roads are wearing out much faster than we are replacing them.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. This $2,200,000,000 is what the Federal Government gets from these automobiles?

Mr. ANGELL. That is right. The roads are wearing out twice as fast as we are replacing them. We should at least give $1,000,000,000 a year. That would be only half the tax levied on the road users, for the maintenance, upkeep and rebuilding of roads that are going out, and putting in new roads. We cannot expend money in any method better than this. We are not taking the money out of the Federal Treasury. We are taking it out of the people who are paying a specific tax levied particularly for this purpose. We are only putting back, as I said, perhaps 25 percent of what we are taking out. Certainly, it is not economy to allow our major roads throughout the United States to wear out and not have them reproduced, when the traffic on the roads is increasing by leaps and bounds every year. Within the last few months they have taken the mail service off of the railroads in the Northwest and put it onto trucks. Trucks are replacing the railways in the handling of traffic. They are replacing use on the waterway systems of the country. We are needing roads more and more every day. Personally, I think it is false economy not to put at least 50 percent of the money we are levying on the people who use the roads back into the roads themselves.

In addition to these three major systems of highways in the United States for which this $550,000,000 is appropriated, there are some additional sums appropriated in this bill for other roads. For instance, there is an authorization of $22,000,000 for forest highways. The Federal Government owns the larger portion of the forests in the United States. As a matter of fact, in the State of Oregon the Government owns over 50 percent of the land, and the Government owns the biggest share of the forests in the State. Much of these forests are overripe. A forest, like any other crop, after years becomes ripe, and then it will deteriorate and rot unless it is cut down and used. It is lost, then, and the economy of the country is losing to that extent.

These funds for forest roads are for the purpose of improving the highways which cross the forests, providing access roads. Access roads to these forests owned by the Federal Government so that the timber which is ripe may be marketed; and in addition to that there are improvement roads, forest trails, which are for protection of the forests from fire and protection of the forests from pests. These small authorizations are carried in this bill, and they are very vital authorizations.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. DONDERO. Following the gentleman's suggestion, does the gentleman think the time may come when this Congress will fix a certain percentage of the gas and oil tax received by the Federal Government to be returned to the States?

Mr. ANGELL. It may have to come to that.

Mr. DONDERO. We may be forced to do that.

Mr. ANGELL. In our State we are really putting back into roads practically every dollar we take from this source.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill will be passed without amendments reducing the authorizations in this bill.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUMMA].

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that in this discussion of the road problem more emphasis has not been put on the turnpike. I believe a large majority of the membership of the House have taken advantage of the Pennsylvania Turnpike in some of their travels. We in Pennsylvania do not claim to be the originators of the turnpike, for they had turnpikes in Germany and Italy before our time, but even the most skeptical people are amazed at what the turnpike does. As everybody knows, New Jersey has just completed a turnpike, and its operation thus far passes their fondest hopes. Ohio is ready to build one; it is now in the discussion stage. Florida has made an inspection of the Pennsylvania Turnpike with the thought of building a similar road through the middle of Florida.

Last fall I had the privilege of arranging a trip for a delegation from Iowa to Harrisburg where the turnpike officials went through the whole deal with them and then took them over the turnpike and showed them everything that could be seen.

One of my purposes in taking this time is to extend an invitation to my fellow Members when they are in contact with their home folks to ask them whether there is a field for a turnpike in their State.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUMMA. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Can the gentleman inform the House whether or not the schedule of payments on the Pennsylvania Turnpike is according to the estimate or in advance of it?

Mr. MUMMA. I think it is at least half again and almost twice what the schedule calls for; I know that in 1 month last year the revenues doubled.

Mr. DONDERO. So the State is far ahead in its schedule of payments on its bonds?

Mr. MUMMA. Definitely.

Mr. DONDERO. I mention toll roads and the financial experience of Pennsylvania in its great turnpike as showing that people more and more are perfectly willing to pay the extra cent a mile to have a good road. This bill proposes to give the people better roads.

Mr. MUMMA. I may say in that regard that the business with which I am more or less connected has a good many trucks, not over-the-road trucks, but delivery trucks. The speed with which you can safely deliver material by truck over such a road as the turnpike is amazing, and the money for any toll is well spent. As to the advantage of such a road to the ordinary passenger car, the Members of Congress who use the turnpike are good witnesses.

In recent years there has been a great deal of discussion as to whether or not trucks in their normal license fees to the various States pay their fair share of highway costs. With a turnpike they come much nearer doing so. It is optional whether they want to or not. Take a road like that which has low grades and plenty of width and try to pass a Greyhound bus going 80 miles an hour.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUMMA. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman will look into the record I am positive he will find that the Pennsylvania Turnpike has been one of the most successful undertakings the RFC has ever participated in since its inception. The record will show that the payments are

ahead and, furthermore, as evidenced by the extension you are making into Ohio of that same turnpike, based on surveys I have made and my associates have made, it will pay right on up to Toledo and from Toledo to Detroit and from Detroit into Chicago. The revenues would astound you if you would put it into operation.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUMMA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I am told by financial experts that turnpike roads are one of the soundest and safest investments that can be made in this day and age in America.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUMMA. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I may say that our colleague from New Jersey has informed me that although the New Jersey Turnpike is new, has just been opened, they are far in advance and way ahead of any estimates in receipts.

Mr. MUMMA. I have already stated that.

Pennsylvania has found that when the eastern extension was built, which took it into Valley Forge from Harrisburg, you may say, it greatly increased the traffic on the middle section. The western section is now completed and it increases in percentage the whole traffic. Ohio will find what was shown in New York. People will want to go there. Indiana should be the next State. I am not trying to tell them how to run the State. I do think that a turnpike will more or less become a transcontinental highway, but it all depends on whether the traffic is dense enough.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, in the last 12 years I have had quite a little experience in my State in reference to highway affairs. I have served in an executive capacity that long in the Kansas State Highway Department. I am fairly conversant, I think, with the needs of the various highway systems throughout the United States because in that time I have attended numerous conventions and also numerous conferences called by the officials of the various States of the United States.

We have a tremendous road problem in the United States that virtually affects all of our people. There is not a congressional district in the United States that is not vitally affected by anything we do in regard to highway legislation.

I enjoy serving on this committee. The membership on both sides of the aisle, as you can observe today, never lacks for something to say. As a matter of fact, things have been rather hot sometimes; but all of the Members are honest, sincere, conscientious men, and it has really been a pleasure for me to serve with them.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I would like to say for the RECORD, as one of the members of the Public Works Committee, that we appreciate the splendid work the gentleman has been doing as a member of that committee. We have full knowledge of the gentleman's splendid background for this type of legislative work, which certainly has played a very important part as far as the functions of the committee are concerned. He is an excellent and capable member of our committee.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman.

There are certain things that have not been said in regard to our highway system in the United States. I refer to the vastness of the program. The public road system of the United States is considered the world's largest. It now consists of the following: 2,661,000 miles of roads and streets not on the Federal-aid system. Ninety-five percent are under the control of local units of government. Five percent are under the control of State highway departments; 416,989 miles of Federal-aid secondary roads, of which approximately one-half are under the control of State highway departments and one-half under the control of local units of government; 234,837 miles of highways on the Federal-aid primary system, under the control of the State highway departments, and the Nation's interstate system of highways totaling 37,800 miles under the control of the State highway departments, which totals slightly more than 1 percent of the total public road mileage, yet the system carries 20 percent of the Nation's motor traffic.

This vast system of public roads represents a capital investment of $45,000,000,000 and in 1949 the needed improvements at that time, and not at some future date, were estimated to be $41,000,000,000 and $47,000,000,000, with $23,000,000,000 needed on the State highway systems, both rural and urban extensions.

In 1950 the State highway departments had at their disposal approximately $2,712,000,000 in State funds for construction and maintenance purposes and this was supplemented by $500,000,000 in Federal-aid funds for construction. The total expenditures for construction and maintenance on the entire public roads system was slightly over $4,000,000,000 per year. As you can well see, this bill that we are considering today only provides $550,000,000 per year for this entire system.

After deducting such amounts as are needed for maintenance and considering the average life expectancy of highway improvements, it all adds up to the fact that we are not replacing our depreciation and obsolescence losses and we are losing ground as far as financing and replacing highways is concerned.

I think that is the reason that this committee did not follow the $400,000,000 recommendation made by the Bureau of the Budget to this congressional committee. We realize that we are living in troubled times but certainly we should go ahead and do some things to protect the life and limb of our own people and to also contribute to our adequate highway transportation system.

The motor vehicle has evolved from being a luxury to one of absolute necessity and it has caused us to completely overhaul and replan our way of living. Over 95 percent of the people in this country use their automobiles now in some phase of conducting their business. In the last year we had 52,200,000 motor vehicles registered in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of the major provisions in this bill.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to propound some questions to the committee. I have, as most of you know, had an opportunity to serve at the State and county level, in both of which we were in a continual quandary about being able to cooperate with the Federal Bureau of Roads in order to secure assistance from Federal funds that I am sure the theory of the law provided.

I am particularly calling attention now to the condition that seems to exist so far as the county in which I live is concerned. In talking with our commissioners in my own county, and discussing the problem of replacing and rebuilding highways and bridges, I very frequently had them say to me, "Well, the standards that the Bureau of Roads insists upon before we can participate in Federal funds are so high and so unrealistic that it is cheaper for us to go out and do it without Federal funds than it is to comply."

Now I cannot quite see that that condition ought to prevail and I wonder if the members of the committee could enlighten me in regard to that problem.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. In answer to the gentleman, when you talk about the standards set by the Bureau of Roads, I do not think the standards are set by the Bureau of Roads. It is the American Highway Commissioners that set the standards. Am I correct in making that statement?

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the commissioners make a recommendation, but the final O. K. on the specifications rests with the Public Roads Administration. The American highway engineers are simply a staff of civilian workers that have no jurisdiction over the public roads. They make recommendations to the Public Roads Administration, and then the Public Roads Administration O. K.'s the specifications.

Mr. FALLON. During the hearings of the committee somebody from the Bureau of Public Roads said the standards were acceptable; they agreed to the standards that were laid down by the State highway commissioners.

Mr. HARVEY. Let me give you an example. There came to my attention one particular instance where a new bridge was to be constructed. The old one had to be replaced. It was found on the best advice of the local county

engineer that a steel culvert would be adequate and in the opinion of everybody concerned that would be the most economical fashion in which this individual replacement could be accomplished; but no, according to the commissioners, the Bureau of Roads would not agree to any program of that kind and insisted upon a costly structure. As they said, it would have cost the county more to participate in that kind of program and build their kind of structure than if they went ahead and put in an adequate structure at their own expense.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I think the gentleman's fear would have been real back in 1948 and 1949 and probably in early 1950. However, the expressions of discontent coming from local governing bodies that had the responsibility of road construction have been resolved to a great extent. I assure the gentleman I have made inquiries into the same subject and find that there are not the complaints that there were back in that time.

Mr. HARVEY. I am very much interested in the gentleman's reply. Can he enlighten me as to just what has been done?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. There has been a closer working relationship with the State highway departments, and I may say that the director of highways of the gentleman's own State of Indiana is one of the outstanding men in this work.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Hadden. Yes; he is considered a very competent and high-class highway authority.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. By close collaboration and discussion between the Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway departments that question has been resolved to a great extent.

May I say further to the gentleman that it is not altogether a question of setting standards too high. Local road districts have not been too careful in making wise planning with respect to building roads so that the maintenance costs would not be disproportionate. Building that type of roads, the maintenance cost has gone up so that the total road program cost has risen. The wisest investment made in good, sound road construction in its inception is one geared to a low-cost maintenance program.

Mr. HARVEY. I think what the gentleman has to say is partially correct. My only contention is that we should at least be realistic. Local authorities should, after all, be the best judges as to the need in individual instances.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GEORGE. The experience in our State has been that our local government units, the county commissioners, have always built roads above the lowest standards the Government set; in other words, the Bureau of Public Roads has not forced our counties and our States to build above the minimum standards. We found it was a matter of good practice, especially in regard to maintenance. It pays to build adequate grades and drainage structures to carry the excessive rainfall when it does come. It saves cutting out fills.

Mr. HARVEY. May I reaffirm my position that it is not for the Bureau of Roads to set such a high standard for road or bridge construction, a standard so high that compliance becomes unrealistic, and thereby either deprives my country of its fair share of Federal funds or forces it to spend more than the amount of Federal funds it might receive in order to comply.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I want to speak particularly with reference to the proviso in the bill found on page 3, lines 6 to 19, inclusive:

Provided, That not more than 25 percent of the amount apportioned to any State in any year for expenditure on the Federal-aid primary highway system or on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, respectively, may be transferred from the Federal-aid primary highway system for expenditure on the Federal-aid secondary highway system or from the Federal-aid secondary highway system for expenditure on the Federal-aid primary highway system when such transfer is requested and certified as being in the public interest by the State highway department and is approved by the Secretary of Commerce, but this proviso shall not be construed to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso of subsection (b), section 3, of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

This proviso makes it permissive for a State to transfer an amount not to exceed 25 percent of these funds from secondary to primary, and from primary to secondary. I am for this proviso. I think it is a good thing. It would help my State.

Mr. H. L. Aitken, the State engineer for Nebraska, has written concerning this proviso as follows:

It is my opinion that the language as written, if enacted into law, would apply to all Federal aid funds apportioned to the States for the improvement of roads on the Federal aid secondary system and for the improvement of roads on the Federal aid primary system, which funds are not under formal agreement between any State and the Federal Government at the time of enactment of such law.

I concur in this interpretation and it is my understanding that the Bureau of Public Roads likewise concurs.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. The reason this provision is written in the bill is to take care of some States that are unable to match certain funds. It was to keep them from losing that amount of Federal aid. In other words, they could transfer from one road fund to the other, and the request has to originate from the States. So the State is protected against the Bureau making a request to them, and the Bureau also holds the veto power over an improper request from the State. I think it is a good provision.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I agree with that. Of course, quoting from the State engineer, he said as follows:

Nebraska has a critical interest in the language in question because as the legislation as a whole now stands and in the face of our present financial condition, we face almost certain loss of a rather substantial amount, perhaps in the neighborhood of $1,600,000 of Federal aid secondary funds on June 30, 1953.

Mr. Chairman, I am for this proviso of the bill before us.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. DONDERO. I have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $550,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

(a) $247,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

(b) $165,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system or as may hereafter be added to such system in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), as amended and supplemented by the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1105): *Provided*, That such funds shall be expended on the secondary and feeder roads, farm-to-market roads, rural mail routes, public school bus routes, local rural roads, county roads, township roads, and roads of the county-road class, with types of construction that can be maintained at reasonable cost to provide all-weather service, and the projects for construction shall be selected and the specifications with respect thereto shall be determined by the State highway department and the appropriate local officials in cooperation with each other. This provision shall not be construed to modify any of the other provisions of paragraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), as amended by the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1105).

(c) $137,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid highway primary system in urban areas.

The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year, respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838): *Provided*, That not more than 25 percent of the amount apportioned to any State in any year for expenditure on the Federal-aid primary highway system or on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, respectively, may be transferred from the Federal-aid primary highway system for expenditure on the Federal-aid secondary highway system or from the Federal-aid secondary highway system for expenditure on the Federal-aid primary highway system when such transfer is requested and certified as being in the public interest by the State highway department and is approved by the Secretary of Commerce, but this proviso shall not be construed to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso of subsection (b), section 3, of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be avail-

able for expenditure in that State for 2 years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects as provided by this act.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of $22,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and (2) for forest-development roads and trails the sum of $19,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: *Provided*, That the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785): *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Commerce may incur obligations, approve projects, and enter into contracts under the apportionment of such authorizations, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof: *Provided further*, That the appropriations made pursuant to authorizations heretofore, herein, and hereafter enacted for forest highways shall be considered available to the Secretary of Commerce for the purpose of discharging the obligations created hereunder in any State or Territory: *Provided further*, That the total expenditures on account of any State or Territory shall at no time exceed its authorized apportionment: *And provided further*, That appropriations for forest highways shall be administered in conformity with regulations jointly approved by the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, owing to the fact that the bill is short, I object to that request.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that section 2 be considered as read, and if there are any amendments to that section that they may be offered at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 2? [After a pause.] If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765), as amended, and section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $12,000,000, which shall be used for the construction and improvement of access roads to timber and other sources of raw materials on lands to which title is vested in the United States, said amount to be available until expended: *Provided*, That the roads authorized to be constructed under this section shall be certified to the Secretary of Commerce as important to the national defense by the Secretary of Defense or such other official as the President may designate.

Mr. DONDERO (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this section also may be considered as read, to be printed in the RECORD, and to be open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that section 4 may be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(Section 4 follows:)

SEC. 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, improvement, and maintenance of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

(b) For the construction, reconstruction, improvement, and maintenance of parkways, authorized by acts of Congress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: *Provided*, That the limitation of $13,000,000 on the cost of construction of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway prescribed by the act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 400), is hereby increased to $14,500,000 and the additional sum of $1,500,000 hereby authorized shall be available for contract immediately upon the passage of this act.

(c) For the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: *Provided*, That the location, type, and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved by the Secretary of Commerce before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request with respect to section 5, that it be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(Section 5 follows:)

SEC. 5. Recognizing the mutual benefits that will accrue to the Republic of Nicaragua and to the United States from the completion of the road from San Benito to Rama in said Republic of Nicaragua, the construction of which road was begun and partially completed pursuant to an agreement between said Republic and the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated $4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, for completing the construction of such road, to be available until expended. No expenditure shall be made hereunder for the construction of said road until a request therefor shall have been received by the Secretary of State from the Government of the Republic of Nicaragua nor until an agreement shall have been entered into by said Republic with the Secretary of State which shall provide, in part, that said Republic—

(1) will provide, without participation of funds herein authorized, all necessary right-of-way for the construction of said highway, which right-of-way shall be of a minimum width where practicable of one hundred meters in rural areas and fifty meters in municipalities and shall forever be held inviolate as a part of the highway for public use;

(2) will not impose any highway toll, or permit any such toll to be charged for the use of said highway by vehicles or persons;

(3) will not levy or assess, directly or indirectly, any fee, tax, or other charges for the use of said road by vehicles or persons from the United States that does not apply equally to vehicles or persons of such Republic;

(4) will continue to grant reciprocal recognition of vehicle registration and drivers' licenses in accordance with the provisions of the Convention for the Regulation of Inter-American Automotive Traffic, which was opened for signature at the Pan-American Union in Washington on December 15, 1943, and to which such Republic and the United States are parties; or any other treaty or international convention establishing similar reciprocal recognition; and

(5) will maintain said road after its completion in proper condition adequately to serve the needs of present and future traffic.

(b) The funds appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall be available for expenditure in accordance with the terms of this act for the survey and construction of the said road from San Benito to Rama and for the survey but not for the construction of a road from Rama to El Bluff in the Republic of Nicaragua without being matched by said Republic, and all expenditures made under the provisions of this act for materials, equipment, and supplies, shall, whenever practicable, be made for products of the United States or of the Republic of Nicaragua.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACK of Washington: Page 7, line 10, strike out section 5 and all of the following printed matter through and including line 12 on page 9 and renumber the remaining sections.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, section 5 provides for the authorization of $8,000,000 during the next 2 years for the construction of what is known as the Rama Road. The Rama Road, is no part of the Inter-American Highway. The Inter-American Highway is a 1,500-mile road that runs from the Texas border south to the Panama Canal Zone. The Rama Road is a 165-mile road that runs east and west from the coast into the interior.

Here is the history of events that led to the projection of this road. In 1913 and 1914 this country was nearing completion of the Panama Canal. There was great enthusiasm for canal building

throughout the country. William Jennings Bryan, who was then Secretary of State, entered into an agreement with the President of Nicaragua to secure for the United States a perpetual right to build a canal across Nicaragua. He secured an agreement with Nicaragua under which the right to build this canal was granted to us in perpetuity. We on our part agreed to pay Nicaragua $3,000,000 for this concession. The agreement was approved by the Senate of the United States in 1916, and the $3,000,000 was paid to Nicaragua for the rights in perpetuity to build a canal across Nicaragua.

On May 22, 1939, President Somoza of Nicaragua wrote a letter to President Roosevelt asking if the United States could not assist Nicaragua in building a barge canal into the interior. He asked specifically only for help in a survey by the United States Army engineers to see whether such a canal was practicable. President Roosevelt said we would make the survey. We did make the survey. The engineers found that the canal was impracticable.

In 1942 the State Department said that inasmuch as we had promised to make a survey on this canal that we had incurred some obligations in the matter and, therefore, in place of building the canal said we would build a road for Nicaragua. It was estimated this canal would cost $2,000,000. The President took money from his emergency fund and spent $4,000,000 on this road. The emergency fund was exhausted. Now they say $8,000,000 more is needed. So to build this $2,000,000 road, $12,000,000 is needed and here the State Department is asking the Congress for $8,000,000 in this bill to complete this highway.

The Secretary of State, it is admitted, wrote a letter to the President of Nicaragua and said, "We will build this road." But the Secretary of State has no authority to obligate the Congress of the United States without asking the Congress to authorize the project or to make appropriations for it.

This Congress has never authorized the Rama Road project. The money to finance work on it has been taken out of the emergency funds of the President to the extent of $4,000,000. Now the State Department in here asks for $8,000,000 to complete this road. If the State Department is going to legislate in that manner then it is legislating and authorizing projects on the basis of writing a letter to a foreign power. The State Department as now constituted lacks the confidence of the Congress or the country. That State Department is in its expiring months. We probably are going to have a new State Department in January, whether we have a Republican President or a Democratic one.

No work has been done on this proposed Rama Road since June 30, 1948. For 4 years we have not turned a shovel full of earth on the Rama Road. Why should we rush into completing it in the last 4 months of the term of the present State Department administration. I think we ought to lay this project over without prejudice, as we sometimes say in connection with consent bills, until we have a new State Department and then have a review of the whole project.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. Is this road the gentleman is pointing out to us, for which an appropriation is asked, exclusively or entirely within Nicaragua?

Mr. MACK of Washington. It is a 165-mile road entirely within Nicaragua. It is a stub road off the Inter-American Highway. It does not go across the country from ocean to ocean.

Mr. JONAS. It is not a part of the transcontinental road at all?

Mr. MACK of Washington. Not at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

(On request of Mr. MEADER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MACK of Washington was allowed to proceed for five additional minutes.)

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. May I ask the gentleman whether this bill, if it is adopted by the House, will be the first time that the Congress has appropriated any funds for the Rama Road?

Mr. MACK of Washington. This will be the first time that the Congress of the United States has ever appropriated any money for the Rama Road.

Mr. MEADER. Up until this time then, everything has been done about the Rama Road by the President or the State Department without any authority whatever from the Congress of the United States?

Mr. MACK of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. The bill recites the fact that mutual benefits will accrue to the Republic of Nicaragua and to the United States on completion of the road. What is the benefit that will accrue to the United States?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I have a letter written by the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Miller, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY], chairman of our committee, and in several places in that letter he makes the statement that he does not contend this road has any value to the United States from a defense angle or from an economic angle. He merely says we ought to build the road because the Secretary of State wrote a letter stating we would build it, without getting any authorization from the Congress.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. Does the gentleman know of any justification for attempting to spend this money at this time for this purpose?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I will insert in the RECORD the letter of Mr. Miller, Assistant Secretary of State, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY], chairman of our committee. In that letter the State Department is apologetic about this whole Rama Road project. The State Department doubts whether it should have offered to build the road in the first place, but now that it made the offer, it says the Congress should back up the State Department. I think we should wait until we have a new State Department before appropriating any money for this road.

Mr. MEADER. I would like to ask the gentleman about the constitutionality of taking public funds derived from United States taxpayers and building roads that have nothing to do with the defense of this country or any other program except just to make somebody happy in some other country?

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Roosevelt as President of the United States did have an emergency fund for defense purposes and in his opinion the road was of defense value; so he used $4,000,000 for that purpose.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. Chairman, in justifying the expenditure for the completion of this Rama Road—and the $8,000,000 will complete it—there are many schools of thought behind the construction of the Rama Road. One, of course, is the building of good will with our neighbors to the south, especially Nicaragua. They have always shown that they are friends, and have proved it on many occasions. In addition to that, this road will run from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean when completed. It will be the only other means of transportation across this peninsula in case the Panama Canal is knocked out. It might be well, and I think very popular, to stand here and complain about the expenditure of money outside of this country; it is especially hard for me, because of the talk that I made in the Committee of the Whole in regard to the conditions of our road system in this; but that example has been set in the past 5 years by the expenditure of our money, our taxpayers' money, for roads in Europe, and when you talk about $8,000,000 and you compare it with figures that I have of $303,000,000—and that is not the total amount that is being spent in Europe today, our own money, in building highways and bridges—you can see what that means.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. On page 9 of the report the statement appears "pursuant to an agreement with said Republic of Nicaragua and the United States." Now is that anything more than a personal understanding? What is meant by the word "agreement"?

Mr. FALLON. Well, I do not know what type of an agreement it was.

Mr. HALE. It is not a treaty, is it?

Mr. FALLON. It is not a treaty, as I understand. It is a signed agreement, but not a treaty.

Mr. HALE. A signed agreement. Who signed it?

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Is it not correct that it is a signed agreement between the President of Nicaragua and the Secretary of State at that time, Sumner Welles?

Mr. FALLON. I think that is correct. That was after a verbal agreement by President Roosevelt and President Simoza in 1939.

Mr. HALE. I suggest to the gentleman it would be better if the report said it was an agreement signed by such and such an individual instead of an agreement between the Republic of Nicaragua and the United States.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MACK of Washington. This obligation was incurred by the State Department in which they said they would build this road in view of their failure to build the canal. Well, there was no agreement to build the canal; it was an agreement to make a survey, and since the survey showed that it would be impracticable they said, "We will give you a road instead." The whole question involved is whether the State Department should incur various obligations without the consent of the Congress. Now they have done so in this instance, and in my opinion I think the Congress shall repudiate it.

Mr. McGREGOR. I want to concur in the statement and say it was a written agreement between the Secretary of State, Sumner Welles, and the President of Nicaragua. Of course, if you are going to raise the question of whether or not you are going to say that the Secretary of State has any authority to write this agreement and we are not going to pay any attention to it, certainly that has application to the foreign aid bill which a number of the Members voted for.

Mr. FALLON. I will say to the gentleman, regardless of who made the agreement, is it either a good thing for this country or is it not? Let us put the value on the road. Should we have another means of transportation in case the Panama Canal is knocked out, or should we not? That is the only basis, and whose State Department it is, whether it be this one or the new one the gentleman suggested, does not make any difference to me. It is a question whether it is going to be valuable to us in time of peril.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio this question: If the State Department should write a letter to the Premier of Canada and say the United States Government will pay its share of the St. Lawrence seaway project, would that not be the same thing, and constitute an authorization by the Congress, and compel the Congress to appropriate money for a project which had never been authorized? They are both in the same category.

Mr. McGREGOR. It certainly is not in the same category, and my distinguished friend knows that without asking that question.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of calling to the attention of the Committee of the Whole and also reminding the committee that brought in this bill, of a fact that makes me favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington. In fact his amendment does not go far enough.

The population of the six New England States, one of which I have the honor to represent here, and the population of the six Central American states, is approximately the same—about 9,000,000. Of course, the New England States have many, many more automobiles and return large amounts to the Federal Treasury in the form of gasoline and other taxes. During the past 2 years about $43,000,000 was distributed in the six New England States under this program, and about $8,000,000 to Central America. Under the President's original proposal, which has of course been modified somewhat by the committee, the six New England States would have their contribution reduced $9,000,000 while the Central American countries would have their contribution increased from $8,000,000 to $64,000,000. The present bill calls for only about $24,000,000 for Central America.

As a representative of a section of this country that is finding itself discriminated against these days, I call the attention of this Committee to these facts. Should there be a roll call or any opportunity to vote against this bill I most certainly shall do so as a protest against the continued discrimination penalizing the section of the country I represent.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I find myself in a rather peculiar position defending the proposal of spending money in foreign countries and adhering to a program that has been established by the State Department, but I am one of those individuals that, regardless of whether a Republican or Democratic leader is in the State Department, whenever a commitment is made and the man making it is in a position of authority in our Government, I think we should live up to the commitment.

My distinguished friend from Washington told you about a series of letters that went through certain secretaries of the Secretary of State. May I read to you a portion of a commitment made on April 8, 1942, signed by Sumner Welles, acting Secretary of State of the United States. It is relative to the situation in Nicaragua:

> Therefore, taking into account the spirit of the communications which were exchanged on May 22, 1939 between President Somoza of Nicaragua and President Roosevelt of the United States, my Government is willing, at its own expense, to carry out the following:
>
> (a) The construction of a highway between San Benito and Rama.
>
> (b) The survey and recommendation of the route of a highway from Rama to El Bluff; the construction and financing of such a road being a matter for the decision of the Nicaraguan Government in the light of the survey, and no obligation in regard thereto being contemplated by this Government.

Then he goes on:

> Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my most distinguished consideration.

It is signed by Sumner Welles, Acting Secretary of State of the United States of America.

That, Mr. Chairman, is a definite commitment by the Secretary of State of the United States. In a period of time when you are looking for friends and the Communist philosophy is to try to tell other nations that we will not live up to our agreements, what are you going to do, when this is our neighbor?

Nicaragua has been, now is, and will continue to be a friend and neighbor of the United States. They expect us to live up to an agreement which they entered into after a series of letters. Are we going to break our word with our neighbor to the south of us when we need friends—and we do need friends? It is rather amusing to me, and I do not want to get personal, but they have raised the question of whether or not the Congress is going to O. K. this treaty. Some of my good friends have been voting for European aid here for a number of years, without any kind of agreements—that we know of and that question has not been raised, and they are still voting for it—I have voted against it—so that the record may be straight on that score. But, I do think that when a commitment has been made by an official of the Government of the United States, the Secretary of State, Sumner Welles, to a neighbor to the south of us, which was given in good faith and accepted in good faith by Nicaragua that that commitment should be kept. Are you going to sell the friendship of the people of that great country for $8,000,000. That is what it is going to cost, no more and no less. It makes no difference to me whether you want to take it in 1 year. I am willing to accept an amendment to make it biennial, if you want to. But, I think that $8,000,000 should be spent there in order to live up to the agreement we have made with our good friends.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. FALLON. It might be well to remind the House that just last week we voted billions of dollars to go to Europe. I have just one breakdown here—the estimated cost of a highway and the improvement of the national highway in Turkey—$53,000,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. In connection with the very powerful argument being made by the gentleman from Ohio, which I think should appeal to all of us concerning the friendly relationships between Nicaragua and the United States for years, and also the fact that Nicaragua is a neighbor of ours, may I call to the attention of my colleagues that I have made speeches on several occasions on the floor of the House with reference to the unfortunate internal conditions in Guatemala, where there is a great deal of communistic domination. Unfortunately also, there is a disturbance arising in Bolivia, which we have noted recently, which of course attracts our attention.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

(On request of Mr. McCORMACK, and by unanimous consent, Mr. McGREGOR was allowed to proceed for five additional minutes.)

Mr. McCORMACK. In the light of the relationship of the South American countries to us, and the Western Hemisphere in general, and in the light of the good neighbor policy, or call it anything that you want to, basic common sense it seems to me would require that we do a great deal of thinking, especially in view of these known disturbances occurring in two of these countries, or at least in one of them, with one manifesting itself in South America. I would think twice before we placed ourselves in a position of breaking a solemn agreement, which has been entered into by our country through our Department of State.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

If I may, I would just like to read to you one statement from the officials of Nicaragua:

> Nicaragua understandably looks upon the agreement as a firm and binding commitment of the United States Government. It confidently expects that the Congress of the United States will honor this agreement by providing funds for its fulfillment.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman from Washington does not disregard the fact that this agreement exists, but merely believes that now is an inopportune time to spend this $8,000,000, and he is merely asking by his amendment that it be delayed; is that not correct?

Mr. McGREGOR. I do not know whether he said that it should be delayed. All I have to go by is the amendment and the amendment calls for striking it out. If he wants to delay it for a period of 2 years, the gentleman could offer a substitute amendment.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman's amendment provides for striking out the $8,000,000, and that would leave it up to the discretion of another Department of State, if we have another one after January, to submit the proposition again to the Congress of the United States, if they so desire. I pointed out that no work has been done on this road since June 30, 1948, which is a period of 4 years and another year's delay will hurt nothing.

Mr. McGREGOR. I may say to the gentleman that will not be well received by our friends in Latin America. They will take the position: "If we enter into an agreement with one administration and that changes, then our agreement is null and void."

Mr. GAVIN. I conclude that the gentleman from Washington feels that eventually this would be done?

Mr. MACK of Washington. No. The gentleman does not feel that way.

Mr. GAVIN. At the present time he does not care to spend this $8,000,000 on the highway, and desires to delay it until a later date. Is that not a somewhat similar position of the State of Ohio and the State of Pennsylvania on this turnpike matter? Was there not some sort of agreement that when Pennsylvania extended the turnpike to the Ohio line, the State of Ohio would immediately go ahead and complete the job across the State of Ohio, but now the State of Ohio, as I read in the press some time ago, is in a controversy about the details and have not proceeded to expedite the building of this highway across the State of Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Now, the gentleman is bringing in a friendly controversy between the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of Ohio. I know nothing about it, except that the Ohio Turnpike up until recently has not been able to sell their bonds. I am certain that the great States of Pennsylvania and Ohio will continue their friendly relations.

Mr. GAVIN. No doubt of that, and the turnpike will be completed in Ohio when Ohio determines what they want to do and how they want to do it.

Mr. McGREGOR. I do want to stress this one point on this legislation: Do you think it is safe to jeopardize our position in the Latin-American countries at this period of time for $8,000,000? The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] says it may come later. Right now we need friends.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Would the gentleman take kindly to the suggestion that we cut it in two?

Mr. McGREGOR. I am perfectly in accord with that. To be honest, I have an amendment on the desk already prepared. If it is the will of this committee to give $4,000,000 this year and $4,000,000 next year, it is all right with me, but I do think we ought to live up to our agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Going back to my grade-school days, I was taught that there was an operation known as the Monroe Doctrine. I have always had faith in that Doctrine.

In my work in my district during the last 2 years I have carried into literally dozens and dozens of meetings a large map of the world that is about 9 by 12 feet in size, and on the map I show the direct responsibility of the United States from the standpoint of military defense, and so forth, and a big red line that encompasses all of the Western Hemisphere. I believe that this country is as much obligated to take care of the military needs of Latin-America in the event of an attack from some foreign country as is the United States to take care of the State of Michigan. We have our traditions and our treaties and our policies down through the years which obligate us to that extent.

I have never been sympathetic to many of the things we have done in Western Europe, Eastern Europe, the Middle East and the Far East. I have always advocated that what we should do first is to strengthen the United States, and secondly the Western Hemisphere. And if after that we have anything to throw away or give away or aid with, then go to the other parts of the world, always keeping within our ability to pay.

Therefore, I am opposed to completely striking out section 5. I would much prefer to see the amount in the bill reduced by 50 percent, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] has just suggested; and if such an amendment is offered, I shall be glad to support that, but I am opposed to striking out section 5.

Let me go a little further. Here we have a little illustration of how deeply we have gotten into this question of the Department of State committing the United States or the Congress, morally or otherwise. It comes up in a little incident like this road project; it is up with your Lisbon Conference; it will be up with your German Conference. Just how are the commitments being made over there? What will we do about them later on? That remains to be seen; I do not know what we will do with them later on.

My father taught his 8 boys to be extremely careful in making obligations; but he said: "Once you make a financial obligation you pay the obligation even if it takes the physical heart out of your body." He taught us to be careful about making them, and then to pay them; and we have tried to do that all through our lives, and we have done a pretty good job of it, if I may brag on the bunch a little bit.

They talk about Congress making obligations; the thing I worry about is that we not only make these treaty obligations as treaties but side dish obligations, we will call them, as well. After making the treaty obligations we get out of here and take on a lot of additional obligations to such an extent that we never know exactly where we are on the spending business. The Truman doctrine is what I call a side dish obligation; the point 4 doctrine is a side dish obligation under the UNO, under the North Atlantic Treaty and so on you will find we get into these side dishes before we take care of the main obligation, the ratified treaty which is part of the supreme law of the land.

I think that we should strengthen Central America and strengthen all of Latin America, insisting that they go along with us assuming their share always, forever, and eternally, and we ought to condition what we contribute, on participation on their part.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman from Michigan feel that Congress is obligated every time the State Department writes a letter and makes a commitment? They seem to feel that when they make a commitment they are in some way obligating this Congress. I cannot accept that philosophy of government at all; I think it is a dangerous philosophy.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman more or less on that; but I

hitch my vehicle to the Monroe Doctrine.

Let us go to this question of spending which our friend from New Mexico raises; suppose you go to those Latin American countries and make a supreme effort and spend the $56,000,000 in 1 year or 2 years; you would completely wreck the economy by overstimulation of prices and wages. By overdoing the thing that way you are neutralizing all the good that you expected to do by the project. That is a very easy thing to do in any Latin-American country—I say in any Latin-American country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CRAWFORD was allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.)

Mr. CRAWFORD. We have that situation in our own offshore areas where if you go spend this money too rapidly you do more harm than good.

I do not know exactly what the situation is down through Central America; I am not as well informed on the road program in those countries as the committee is, but I do not support the proposition of spending either $56,000,000 or $64,000,000 in an all-out straight run to get rid of the project quickly. I would first want to know what that is going to do to their economy locally; and then I would want to know something else. Leaving here by plane Saturday afternoon and returning this morning at 5 o'clock by plane I spent some intervening hours discussing the question of basic supplies which enter into the construction of these big undertakings. One of the big questions involved is the cement-productive capacity in this country to meet the needs of the obligations we are now carrying on or trying to carry on. I have been very busy laboring with the raw materials administration on this question of getting more cement capacity. They do not want to build it; we are short. Here last year and the year before you could ride all over this city looking for a bag of cement without finding one. Building roads calls for cement on a big scale. It may be that we are not in position, even if were foolish enough to do what we are asked to do to pour $56,000,000 of this money rapidly into Central America on a quick operating basis. That is the fundamental question I was raising a while ago. I think we ought to understand more about some of these things.

Finally, I am in favor of spending from one to two billion dollars per year on the highways of this country during the next 5 to 15 or 20 years in order to get a highway system in this country which we need as badly as we need transportation facilities. We are all bottled up and we will have a tough time catching up. I think the report shows that we need $32,000,000,000 of highways now. We are spending four hundred or five hundred million dollars a year. When are we going to catch up with the present transportation needs of the country?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I can add anything in clarification of the question before us, but I do want to say that a treaty was entered into in 1914 between the United States and the Government of Nicaragua to build a canal across Nicaragua. The War Department, after the testimony was all in, ruled against the feasibility of a canal, but it did recommend, and that was accepted, that a road be built to connect the Pacific and the Atlantic. That is the basis for the matter that is before us today. Its basis is in a treaty signed by the parties involved and ratified by the respective congresses of the countries involved.

We have two or three things to consider in this matter. First, shall we honor an obligation? That has been very ably taken care of by the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Michigan. The second thing for us to consider is, Shall we protect an investment already made? During the war President Roosevelt had an emergency fund. Some of that emergency fund was put into this road. I am unable to find from the hearings the amount, but it was a considerable sum that has been invested in this road. Shall we just lay aside this investment and let the jungle get it or shall we take advantage of the money already spent and build this road on across so there will be a passageway in this area between the Atlantic and the Pacific?

The third thing for us to consider, as has already been ably put before you by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] is that in case the worst should come to the worst and hostilities come and the Panama Canal be hit or destroyed or be put out of operation and that section become inaccessible to us, then we will have this road on which to transport our men and materials quickly from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

I hope the committee will not strike out the section, as proposed by my good friend, the gentleman from Washington. I think to adopt the amendment would be going back on a commitment we have already made and it would be throwing away an investment we have already made. Also in this period of stress it would be unwise to not have a substitute way in case the Panama Canal should go out of commission. We all know that would be a prime object of attack in case of difficulties.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is not only having a substitute for the Panama Canal, but here this House just a few hours ago voted for the exportation of know-how. If we are going to utilize our know-how anywhere on earth, why not in Central and South America? Can you utilize American know-how in those areas without highways, without highways per se—not just highways as a substitute for a canal? You have to have highways if you develop a country.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I thank the gentleman for bringing out a point that is very important, which I overlooked. Transportation in these areas is important.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not about time that we got back to the Constitution in relation to this treaty business and quit this idea of some individual going out and making a treaty without any authority under the law?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. That is what I am going to speak about.

Mr. Chairman, the Members of this House have, for many years, apparently forgotten the fact that our only excuse for being here, and our only excuse for existence, comes under the terms of the Constitution of the United States. We were created a country, and this Congress was created a Congress and given its powers by certain definite grants of power by the sovereign people of the United States. It was also placed under metes and bounds as to what it could not do as well as what it could do, and it was not at all assumed by that Constitution that it could do whatever the Constitution did not say anything about. It could only do what the Constitution told Congress it could do. The Constitution nowhere, in any place in which I have been able to find it, says that this Congress is empowered to give away the money of any taxpayer of the United States. This Congress was not empowered to take the earnings of one person and give them to any other person upon the face of the earth, under any pretext whatsoever except as clearly specified by the Constitution. It was given certain powers to raise money for the national defense, to coin money, and compound a system of weights and measures, establish the value of the currency, and to build roads. It was not, in any place that I have been able to discover, empowered to grant charity to any person whatsoever. Now we seem to have gotten so far away from that, and under the Constitution I boldly say here and now that we have no business nor power nor authority to grant any money for relief in Europe or in Nicaragua, or even to our poor in this country; none whatsoever. Such assumed power may be legal, gentlemen, but it is not constitutional. Everything that is legal is not necessarily constitutional. Some day, please God, when this Congress comes to its senses and decides to abide by its charter, and come back to the Constitution, these laws will be declared unconstitutional, as they should be.

Mr. Chairman, the executive is not the only department to arrogate powers to himself never granted by the Constitution. For many years the Congress has also assumed powers in spending the taxpayers' money which were never given to it under that great charter of our liberties.

Some day the sovereign people of this great land are going to call you to account for your malfeasance in office. And when that dread time comes, no amount of eloquence shall save you from their wrath, and the swift retribution which shall be your fate.

God speed the day when America "shall arise like a giant refreshed from sleep, and smite you hip and thigh."

Gentlemen, again consider your oath of office.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGREGOR: On page 7, line 16, after the word "appropriated", strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$2,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire that both his amendments be considered at one time?

Mr. McGREGOR. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGREGOR: On page 7, line 18, after "for", strike out "completing."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simply carrying forward the position I take, and I think a number of others take, that all this money should not be expended at one time. Under the bill, as written, the Rama Road project would be paid for in 2 years at the rate of $4,000,000 per year. I think if we can give them $2,000,000 each year for the next two bienniums we will in fact be showing faith with Nicaragua and integrity with an agreement signed, not as my distinguished friend from Michigan said, by someone in the State Department, but signed by the Secretary of State. Certainly this Government at this critical moment does not want to get into the category of saying to Nicaragua, a friendly neighbor of ours to the south, that we are not going to abide by an agreement that was entered into by the Government of Nicaragua and the Government of the United States through the Secretary of State, not some clerk in the State Department but the Secretary of State, Sumner Welles. He entered into an agreement to construct this Rama Road at a cost of $8,000,000. The other day we sent $6,500,000,000 to certain countries far away, and sometimes some of us wonder how friendly they are—but here you are living up to an agreement with a nation that is friendly to the United States, a close neighbor, and a written agreement signed by our Secretary of State.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. Is it not true that a treaty was entered into in 1914 by the then Secretary of State, Mr. Bryan?

Mr. McGREGOR. I think that is correct.

Mr. FENTON. It was a treaty, as I understand it.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am not familiar with it, but I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania is. I certainly would take his word on that.

Mr. FENTON. That is my understanding.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. The 1914 treaty did not agree to build this Rama Road.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am not familiar with the 1914 agreement, but I did put into the RECORD, and the gentleman heard me read it, a letter from Sumner Welles, Secretary of State, and he specifically designated that we agree to construct this road. To me, this is a definite commitment from a high official, the Secretary of State of this great Government of ours.

I do not think we should cancel an agreement that we have entered into. I do not think we can afford to do it. That is the strategy of the Communists, to say that America will not live up to its agreements. Are we going to give them a field to expand in Latin America, and give them a concrete example? Sumner Welles agreed to it, and he was Acting Secretary of State.

Mr. MEADER. Is there anything in the agreement that Nicaragua is required to do except to accept our funds and accept the highway?

Mr. McGREGOR. Evidently there was quite a lot in it, because the gentleman is familiar with the canal proposal that was entered into. Correspondence was carried on for a number of months, then they decided, "We won't ask you for the canal because it is practically impossible to build it, so we will be satisfied to forget the original agreement if you will agree to the Rama Road." That agreement was entered into, as I said repeatedly, by the Secretary of State.

Mr. FENTON. Long before Sumner Welles came into the picture, a treaty was agreed to, in 1914, as I understand it. When the War Department turned down the canal as not being feasible for construction, they decided they would go in on a treaty for the Rama Road.

Mr. McGREGOR. I understand there was a definite agreement and commitment by this Government on the canal in 1914. I think the gentleman said 1914. Then it was said it was costing us too much money so Nicaragua agreed to release us from that agreement if we were to go ahead with the Rama road at a cost of $8,000,000, which we agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the distinguished majority floor leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Suppose anything serious happened to the Panama Canal. What position might we be in?

Mr. McGREGOR. We have absolutely nothing down there which would adequately take care of any transportation between the east coast and the west coast. I have a map out in the Speaker's lobby which I have not brought into the Chamber because I did not think this was going to take up so much time. But we can show you there is no connection between the east and the west coast.

Mr. McCORMACK. Assuming that something serious happened to the Panama Canal, and this road was built, what contribution would that road make?

Mr. McGREGOR. Everyone certainly knows that this road would be a temporary lifesaver for us.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, it would be of valuable assistance to us in case of necessity.

Mr. McGREGOR. It certainly would, and the thing that influences me is that we should not be losing faith with the good people of Nicaragua. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts for bringing this subject to the attention of the committee. It is most important, directly and indirectly, to both Nicaragua and the United States.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, I will not use the 5 minutes, but I think for the sake of keeping the record straight, if the gentleman from Ohio or the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. FENTON, can give this House the assurance that a treaty was entered into and ratified by the Senate of the United States in accordance with the long-established procedures of this Government, then certainly there can be no objection to the position that we find ourselves in, that is, if we want to advance the diplomatic situation or what is best for our Government and our Nation. There are very few people who would disagree with my able friend, the gentleman from Ohio, or with our friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. FENTON, that this perhaps is the right thing to do. I am going to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. I want to repeat, and I want the RECORD to show, in my judgment it is a dangerous philosophy for any department of this Government to commit the Government of the United States to a financial obligation by simply writing a letter. Let it be in the form of a treaty so that the people of the country know about it. But here we are confronted with a different situation where only a letter has been offered in evidence, a signed letter which the then Acting Secretary of State wrote. If he can commit this Government to an obligation of eight or sixteen million dollars to build a road by simply writing a letter, then I say the procedures of this Government have to be changed because that is a dangerous philosophy. It would mean that he could commit us to any amount of debt which the people of this country might not even be able to pay.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I think there is an explanation due to the Members of the House as to what control the United States will have over the road, assuming that the Panama Canal was destroyed or interfered with. What assurance have we, if we give Nicaragua $8,000,000 to build 165 miles of road, and if we should have difficulty in using the Panama Canal—have we any assurance other than perhaps an oral or verbal understanding, or however the understanding has been made with Nicaragua that will permit us to haul anything or take anything over that road?

Mr. DONDERO. Of course, we want Nicaragua to remain friendly to the

United States. The Panama Canal is of very great importance to us. None of us want to do anything to jeopardize the interests of our country so far as the use of the Canal is concerned in case we get into a war. Of course, nobody can assure us that the Canal is going to remain open because our enemies might cut that road and stop us from getting to the Panama Canal.

Mr. JONAS. If I may ask the gentleman another question; what is the character of the material that is going into this road—is it concrete or reinforced concrete? What is it being built of, when it seems that 165 miles of road is going to be built for $8,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. I understand that it is a concrete road.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. FENTON. The original length was supposed to be 160 miles. The road has been completed with the exception of 35 or 40 miles. It is not of concrete construction, I might say to the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. I understood that it was.

Mr. GROSS. Then how will the road handle any military traffic, if it is not of concrete? Who is going to build the dock facilities? Who is going to build the facilities that will be required at each end of that road, if it is to serve the purpose which is to be accomplished in the event that our military have to use it.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman has asked many good questions. That is what we have been discussing for a long time.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section, and all amendments thereto, close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. MEADER. I object.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

It was my privilege as counsel for the Senate War Investigating Committee, to conduct an investigation of the Inter-American Highway in 1946 and 1947. A report on this investigation, filed with the Senate July 7, 1947, comments on the Rama Road project in Nicaragua, the subject matter of this amendment.

The remarks about a treaty in the debate here have been misleading. Some who have spoken here have indicated that it is as a result of a treaty that the Rama Road is to be built, at a cost of $12,000,000. There is nothing of the kind. The 1914 treaty gave the United States an option to build a canal across Nicaragua if it wanted to. That had nothing to do with the Rama Road.

The money for the Rama Road originally came out of the President's secret emergency fund. It was estimated to cost $2,000,000. Four million United States dollars have been spent on that project. If the Secretary of State entered into any undertaking his obligation would seem to have been discharged. It must have contemplated that the money would come out of that emergency fund. To the extent he has gone beyond that the action of the Secretary of State is ultra vires. This House should say so and stop these people in the executive branch of the Government from attempting to commit the United States Government when they have no power to do so.

The Rama Road has grown from a $2,000,000 project—on which we paid $4,000,000, which ought to have discharged any obligation—to $12,000,000. The Bureau of Public Roads continually gets its foot in the door and then increases construction standards and consequently costs. We can go on building wider roads, with more gently sloping grades, taking out curves and putting on surfaces, and nobody knows what the end cost will be unless we have a fixed agreement.

The Rama Road project is all nebulously tied to a 1914 option we paid for once, an ultra vires, undefined promise by the State Department and an improper diversion of secret war emergency funds, without the slightest iota of consideration or approval of the Congress.

Is this the way we are running the Federal Government today? Should the House now place its stamp of approval on this loose, unbusinesslike, unauthorized executive action? The answer should be a resounding "No."

Under leave obtained in the House I include the following comment on the Rama Road from pages 44–45 of the Inter-American Highway Report of the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, Eightieth Congress, first session, Report No. 440:

The other important United States road construction during the war in Central America was the Rama Road. This road extends from San Benito on the Inter-American Highway, a short distance north of Managua, Nicaragua, to Rama, a river port on the Escondido River, a distance of 160 miles. The purpose of this highway is to provide an overland route from Rama to the central and western part of Nicaragua, connecting the Atlantic and Pacific coastal sections of Nicaragua.

In 1914, the United States obtained an option to construct a canal across Nicaragua. In 1939, the Army engineers completed a survey and located a proposed canal. The estimated cost of such a canal, however, was very high and construction was not recommended. President Anastasio Somoza of Nicaragua, obtained an agreement from President Roosevelt to build the Rama Road instead of a canal. The original estimated cost of this highway, to be built to Nicaraguan highway standards, was $2,000,000. However, the Public Roads Administration recommended that higher construction standards be used in order to provide a road less susceptible to erosion, estimating the cost of such a road at $4,000,000. Construction standards similar to those of the Inter-American Highway, with the exception of width, were adopted. The Rama Road was to be surfaced to a 5-meter width rather than 6 meters.

Rama is a river port. Up to this point, the Escondido River channel is at least 30 feet deep, a sufficient draft for large oceangoing vessels. However, a bar at the mouth of the river, where the depth is only 12 feet, now blocks its navigation by oceangoing vessels.

Mr. E. W. James of the Public Roads Administration testified that about $3,000,000 had been spent on this highway, and that the $4,000,000 estimate to complete the work was no longer accurate, as it was now thought that total construction would cost approximately $6,500,000.

The funds for the Rama Road were taken from the secret or emergency fund of the President, thereby avoiding the need for approval by, or accounting to, the Congress. Although Congress has never had an opportunity to debate the merits of the Rama road, nor even knew about it until this committee's investigation, State Department representatives take the position that the United States is committed to complete this road regardless of how high its cost may be.

The committee does not consider either of these expenditures of United States funds sufficiently related to national defense to have justified them as proper defense expenditures in World War II. Furthermore, with respect to the Rama Road, the use of funds from the secret or emergency fund of the President, an appropriation available only for emergencies affecting the national security or defense, appears questionable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I simply wanted to comment on the question raised by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]. The road across the Isthmus would be no good without dock facilities at the two ends. You do not build a concrete or macadam or good highway across swamps until you do a lot of preliminary work, especially if you travel through jungle areas. You have a lot of solidifying to do. Any of us who has built a road through a swamp or traveled through a swamp knows that. I am talking about road facilities in Central America. If we are going to operate anywhere in the world, we are going to operate down there some day, and you might as well get that fixed in your mind. I am not worrying about this little treaty you are talking about. I am not worrying about the end cost at the moment, because nobody knows the end cost of anything 6 months ahead today with the inflationary forces, and political hazards, and the way we handle the Federal debt; and price controls. You might as well get that fixed in your mind, too.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. On line 18 it says "for completing the construction."

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, you offered an amendment to strike out the word "completing." Is that not correct?

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If you do not want highways in Central America, forget it. I am for them. I do not apologize for it, either. I am for better highways in this country and through Central and South America, and I am not going to apologize for that, because you do not run our type of civilization without good

highways, heavily built highways, and trucks on those highways. You might as well get that fixed in your mind, too. Good highways bring people together and promote good will and peace and commerce. Good roads facilitate peace, and if war must come, roads enable you to use your equipment. I assume we will have substantial control over the Western Hemisphere. If not, that will be just too bad for us.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I certainly think this is a very, very fine project; it is an American project.

A few moments ago the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] mentioned the Monroe Doctrine. I had not heard of that for such a long, long time that I thought it might have been supplanted by Yalta and a lot of other treaties; but I would like to assure you, Mr. Chairman, that Nicaragua is an American country, and it is friendly to the United States.

I had the privilege a short time ago, of visiting in Nicaragua, together with Congressman JAMES, and I know something about this Rama Road and how it would help that country establish itself as one of the great countries of America.

You talk about your point 4 program throughout the world, and yet by your actions here in trying to prevent the construction of the Rama Road, you stifle the progress of a great Central American country.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly am not for throwing money all around the world; and, incidentally, I was against the point 4 program, but since it is in being in this country and we are trying to develop underdeveloped countries all over the world, I think Central America, certainly Nicaragua, is entitled to preference.

Nicaragua is really a friend of the United States, and I feel sure that it will continue as such.

This Rama Road will not only help Nicaragua economically but will also help the United States.

It could be the means of establishing a seaport on the Carribean or eastern coast of Nicaragua, which in turn would facilitate shipping from the United States by many, many weeks. As it is now, there is only the seaport of Corinto on the Pacific coast.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time merely to reply to my good and able friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] about the Pennsylvania Turnpike. The Pennsylvania Turnpike was conceived in Pennsylvania, built and developed by the people of Pennsylvania, and it is one of the greatest investments that we have ever made.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I will agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. I want the gentleman to know that Pennsylvania has a fine system of highways and a State highway department that turns in a fine performance; also that the Pennsylvania Turnpike is paying its way, and eventually the bonds will be retired. What will happen to the road as a toll road after that I do not know, but it is a very important highway and I sincerely hope that Ohio will expeditiously proceed with a program to build a turnpike across Ohio and that it will eventually reach all the way from New York and Philadelphia to Chicago.

My good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] pointed out the value of this proposed Nicaraguan road from the military standpoint. The Pennsylvania Turnpike is very important from the standpoint of military value, and if we build this great turnpike across the country it will make a magnificent contribution to the military strength of the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] is recognized.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if there ever had been a treaty between the United States and Nicaragua offering to build this road, then I would say that Congress was obligated to build it. If Congress had ever appropriated any money to build this road, then I would say Congress was obligated to build it. But Congress has not appropriated any money, and there has been no treaty entered into. Even the Department of State recognizes that a mere promise by the State Department to build a road cannot bind the Congress to appropriate money to build that road. The State Department said to Nicaragua: We will build this road. Emergency fund money in Presidential funds was used to start building it. This Congress has never authorized it.

There is no military or defense benefit in this road. The State Department says so itself, and I will tell you what the Assistant Secretary of State said to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY]:

> I do not represent the road as having present military or other value.

Later in his letter to Chairman BUCKLEY, he says:

> I do not attempt to justify the building of the Rama Road for direct benefits to the United States.

The only thing the Assistant Secretary of State contends is that the State Department wrote a letter in which it said the United States would build a road. I say this Congress must make the decision whether we are going to tolerate department heads writing letters and insisting the Congress must provide funds for anything and everything the State Department promises to other countries. We should either give Nicaragua no money for the road or the full amount.

There has been introduced into the argument the question of the agreement in 1914. That related to a canal across the country that it would cost $2,000,000,000 to build. The engineers have reported it favorably. The canal involved here was a 1939 proposal and not the canal of 1914. We agreed only to make a survey for a canal, and it was shown to be impractical. Now they say: We owe them a road, because the canal project was found to be impractical.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman fom Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope that this Congress does not abandon the construction of the Rama Road. I do feel kindly, of course, to the McGregor substitute. I believe it has some merit. The construction costs can be spread out over a longer period of time because maybe they cannot use too much too soon. But I do feel the Congress would make a serious mistake today in the relationship between this country and our neighbors to the south by not building this road. I do not know of any time in the history of our country when we have to look to our friends and close friends than we do today.

I hope the committee will agree to the McGregor substitute and vote down the Mack amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FALLON and Mr. DONDERO.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 3, noes 78.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventeen Members are present, a quorum.

The question is on the perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR]. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the perfecting amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. MCGREGOR: Page 7, line 16, after the word "appropriated", strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$2,000,000."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MCGREGOR) there were—ayes 59, noes 8.

So the perfecting amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the second amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. MCGREGOR: On page 7, line 18, after "for", strike out "completing."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. MACK of Washington: On page 7, line 10, strike out section 5 and all following printed matter through and including line 12, page 9; and renumber the remaining sections.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MACK of Washington), there were—ayes 36, noes 64.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. Section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide for cooperation with Central American Republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway," approved December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the sums heretofore authorized, the sum of $8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, to be available until expended, to enable the United States to cooperate with the Governments of the American Republics situated in Central America—that is, with the Governments of the Republics of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama—in the survey and the construction of the Inter-American Highway within the borders of the aforesaid Republics, respectively. Not to exceed one-third of the appropriation for each fiscal year may be expended without requiring the country or countries in which such sums may be expended to match any part thereof, if the Secretary of State shall find that the cost of constructing said highway in such country or countries will be beyond their reasonable capacity to bear. The expenditures authorized by this section shall be made in accordance with all provisions and limitations in section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), not inconsistent with this section."

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCGREGOR: On page 9, line 19, after "the sum of", strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "$4,000,000."

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, on page 9, line 18, there is the following provision:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the sums heretofore authorized, the sum of $8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954.

By my amendment I am striking out the $8,000,000 and inserting in lieu thereof $4,000,000, which gives the Inter-American Highway the same amount of money that Congress gave it in 1950.

We are endeavoring to hold down our expenses here in the United States, and we have increased the amount of money we are spending for our own roads in the United States only 10 percent. We certainly should not double the amount of money which is being expended for the roads in Latin America. I might say that the question has been discussed here of $8,000,000 for a period of 7 years. That amounts to $56,000,000. This amendment of mine certainly would not hinder the construction which is already in force because they have only been receiving two or four million dollars a year. But, in the bill as written, they would be doubling that amount. I might say the question was raised that the committee voted for the $8,000,000. The Public Works Committee amendment for $8,000,000 that carried by one vote, defeated my amendment for $4,000,000. My amendment carries the same amount of money as was provided in 1950. I repeat we have only increased our road funds in the United States by 10 percent over 1950. Why should we give the Latin American Highway a 100-percent increase? That is the entire program. I hope you will go along with my amendment, which gives the Latin American Highway money as was authorized in 1950.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. MEADER. I notice on page 205 of the hearings you asked Mr. Miller of the State Department the following question:

Mr. MCGREGOR. Relative to the agreement, will these countries maintain those roads after the highways are built?

Mr. MILLER of the State Department. That is one of the provisions.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am very glad the gentleman brought that out.

Mr. MEADER. I want to ask the gentleman if he can supply the House with a copy of this agreement, which requires the six nations in Central America to undertake to maintain these highways once they are built.

Mr. McGREGOR. I do not know whether I can do that or not. It may be a matter of high priority, but I do take the word of the representatives of the State Department. I appreciate that my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, has brought out whereby upon my question they said that the Latin-American countries would maintain the roads and that there would be no United States funds used for maintenance. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman has brought the subject to the attention of the Committee.

Mr. MEADER. I would like to ask the gentleman whether there is an agreement or any understanding at all, so far as the United States is concerned, that these six small republics will not impose onerous restrictions upon the use of the highway, once it is completed, either in the form of tolls or in the form of excessive gasoline taxes, such as they had when they had a 25-cent gasoline tax in Costa Rica in 1947.

Mr. McGREGOR. I cannot look into the crystal bill any more than my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, can look into the crystal ball. But, to be perfectly honest and sincere about it, if this were the first time that this legislation were coming up, I would say no. But you have spent a tremendous sum of money, approximately $40,000,000 down there, and I do not think the United States Government should be accused at this time of stopping the project. They have the equipment and it is in operation. We can show where this is not an all one-sided proposition. The various countries through which this road passes have put up about $37,000,000 for these projects. They have assured us that they will maintain them so our problem is to keep going along and finishing the program rather than at this critical time saying that we are going to stop it.

Mr. MEADER. I was not arguing against the inter-American highway. What I was asking the gentleman is whether or not the State Department has done what they promised us from 1941 that they would do, namely, negotiate a firm agreement for the maintenance of the highway once it is completed and to prevent the imposition of onerous burdens or restrictions by the unilateral action of one of these six nations.

Mr. McGREGOR. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution, and I hope he will join the gentleman from Ohio in checking on this to see if that is done. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] does not attempt to reduce the cost that the United States Government is obliged to pay for the project. He does not reduce it by one cent. He simply cuts in half the amount recommended for the respective years necessary to pay for the project, which is 7 years. This is supposed to be one of the most necessary highways for the defense of Latin America and the United States. If the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] believes this a defense highway, then perhaps we can delay it, if we know what our enemies are going to do. Otherwise delay would be dangerous.

If we adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, we not only delay the construction for 8 years but we probably will pay 50 percent more eventually than we have agreed to pay now. We are committed to $56,000,000. The Bureau of Public Roads is the technical branch in highway construction in our Government. They recommend $8,000,000 a year. The Bureau of the Budget recommends the same amount. I do not care whether you are constructing a chicken coop, a subway, a ship, or a highway; anytime you delay the construction you lose money. Anytime you expedite it you will save money.

This amendment is a detriment not only to the defense theory but it is not in keeping with our own agreement with South America. We have already put in $40,000,000 and we have fifty-six million more to put in to complete our agreement. We certainly want to go through with the agreement we have made. If this was just something to save money there might be something to discuss, but there is not one dime of saving by virtue of this amendment.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. Is it not a fact that the Bureau of the Budget recommended that we put the whole 56 million in it this year?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes, they did; but we did not do it. We did not want to do that. We wanted to go along in the manner that the engineers of the Bureau of Public Roads recommended.

Something was said that we might cause inflation down there, or that we might shorten the amount of material for the United States in building this concrete highway. When have you seen a highway constructed of concrete in the United States? I do not remember when I did. They are not using concrete for construction, except for culverts and bridges and such things. They have gone into different types of construction. The sum of $56,000,000 would not construct one-third of this road if it were concrete.

This road will do more to get strategic material for the United States than anything else, and it will do more for national defense, if we need defense. I am hoping that we will not need it, but certainly let us not weaken the project and certainly let us not have the people of South America think that we started on a project and then delayed it. If we could spend the whole $56,000,000 in 1 year and get through with the project, I would be here recommending it, but time is of the essence in this proposition, and I would not delay it. It would be 16 years before it could be completed, under the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FALLON. May I remind the gentleman of a point that was brought up on the other side that an agreement is that there will be no tolls or charges of any kind, and that the license plates of all countries will be recognized.

Mr. DEMPSEY. It is agreed that the license plates will be recognized, and there will be no tolls charged for any portion of the road.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. Does the gentleman have a copy of the agreement which makes the provision he is talking about?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. MEADER. Would the gentleman insert that in the RECORD, because it does not appear in the committee hearings?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will insert it in the RECORD.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I hope that the Congress will look at this from a horse-sense standpoint and vote down the gentleman's amendment.

In accordance with the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER], I incorporate herewith the statement by Mr. Edward G. Miller, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, before the Public Works Committee, which includes portions of the agreement germane to the question by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER]:

From a military point of view the highway will provide a land route to the Panama Canal and will be of value in hemispheric defense.

Finally, the Inter-American highway is not a new project. It has been the publicly announced intention of this Government, affirmed by Congress in the language of its enactments, to see its construction through to the Panama Canal. Accordingly, approximately $40,000,000 have been appropriated by the Congress thus far for investment in the Inter-American Highway, at first for reconnaissance surveys beginning in 1930 and then with larger appropriations for construction beginning in 1941.

We are now at a point where the completion of this project is within reach. It is important to carry this work through in order that the United States, as well as the other countries, will realize the full value of the substantial investments already made in the highway.

The Department of State, therefore, supports section 4 of H. R. 6094 which authorizes $56,000,000 to enable the United States to cooperate with the Governments of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Panama, and Nicaragua in the survey and completion of construction of the Inter-American Highway within the borders of those Republics. Note that any of the funds appropriated must conform to the procedure and limitations of section 11 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1950. In brief, section 11 provides that the other cooperating Governments shall provide all necessary right of way, where practicable; will not impose any highway toll, will not levy any fee or tax on United States vehicles or persons of the United States, that does not apply to nationals; will grant reciprocal recognition of drivers' licenses and vehicle registrations; and will provide for the maintenance of the highway after its completion.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will not get the wrong impression from what my able friend the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] has said about delaying the building of this road. If this amendment is adopted we will be doing exactly what we did for these people in the 1950 bill; nothing more and nothing less. There was not a single word said in 1950 when the bill was on the floor that $4,000,000 would delay the building of the road. There was no such argument presented at all. We are doing the same by this amendment. We are giving them $4,000,000 a year. It will not obstruct the building of the road; it will not even hinder it; they can continue with their construction just as they have been. Furthermore, if we adopt the McGregor amendment we will be doing no more or no less for the people of Nicaragua on this road than we are doing for our own people. We are not doubling the amount; if the matter stands as it is contained in the bill, we will have doubled the amount for them while the amount we are leaving for the people of the United States is exactly as it was 2 years ago, plus 10 percent.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman certainly admits that we are committed for $56,000,000 to complete this project. Is that right or not?

Mr. DONDERO. I understand that that is the situation.

Mr. DEMPSEY. All right; if that is the situation, they recommended 2 years ago $4,000,000 a year. Now they have gotten organized and they can go ahead more rapidly and want to complete the road. The gentleman says there will be no hindrance if they do not get $8,000,000 a year. The project will take just twice as long to complete if they do not get the $8,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. So far as the amount is concerned, I may say to the gentleman from New Mexico, I know of no one who said to our committee that they had to have $8,000,000 a year, or even the $56,000,000 in the authorization, to permit them to continue the construction of the road.

Mr. DEMPSEY. But they could continue the construction at only half the speed. Mr. MacDonald, in the gentleman's presence, recommended $3,000,000, did he not?

Mr. DONDERO. Perhaps he did, but I do not know of anybody else; I did not hear anybody else justify that amount.

Mr. DEMPSEY. He was speaking for the Federal Bureau of Roads, and that is the agency that is supposed to know more about this than any other agency.

Mr. DONDERO. I do not think they could proceed with twice the speed they have in the past. Furthermore, the machinery and equipment they have now in operation will be used just as it has been in the last 2 years.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Does the gentleman want to double the completion time?

Mr. DONDERO. No I do not; but I do not want to do any more for the people in Nicaragua than I do for our own people.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Can you complete it for half the amount of money we are committed to?

Mr. DONDERO. They may not be able to continue as fast as they would like to, but certainly they can continue at the rate they have been progressing in the past.

Mr. DEMPSEY. If this road is necessary to our defense, does the gentleman think its completion should be deferred 8 years?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not know that they are going to take 8 years to do it.

Mr. DEMPSEY. This is only an authorization.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I would like to say to my distinguished friend from New Mexico that I do not think that the critical material, the steel, cement, and other things that go into road construction will be available in twice the quantity they are now.

Mr. DEMPSEY. How many thousand tons of steel will be necessary?

Mr. McGREGOR. I do not know.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is what I thought.

Mr. McGREGOR. Does the gentleman know?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; I do not know.

Mr. McGREGOR. Then we are both in the same category.

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; we are not in the same category. Mr. MacDonald assured the committee that by this coming fall steel would be plentiful for highway development.

Mr. McGREGOR. I wish we might depend on that because we have had an awful time in Ohio on the turnpike because we cannot get steel.

Mr. DEMPSEY. As I remember, we pointed that out, too.

Mr. McGREGOR. I do not recall, but I will take my friend's word for it. But the point I am bringing up is that certainly Latin America cannot get facilities to double its road program and we still hold our people down in the United States as we had to 2 years ago.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Let me say to the gentleman from Ohio that here is a project the completion of which we have agreed to. The longer we put it off the more it is going to cost. I do not see how the gentleman can justify that.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the McGregor amendment.

I am in favor of the Inter-American Highway, if it is undertaken in a proper and businesslike way.

I have always thought of the Inter-American Highway as an example of an international public work which could promote international unity in this hemisphere if we would utilize it for that purpose.

As I said earlier, as counsel for the Senate War Investigating Committee, I investigated the Inter-American Highway in 1946 and 1947. Our committee studied and conducted hearings on both the efforts of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Public Roads in Central America. He also considered the work of the Export-Import Bank, the Department of State, and the numerous international conferences on the Inter-American Highway. I personally traveled by automobile over most of the passable sections of the highway and flew over the remainder of the terrain where there are only paths or no roads of any kind.

An international transportation artery along the Central American isthmus, where no land transportation now exists, if properly designed and executed, not alone in the physical sense, but also in the political sense, could contribute immeasurably to the lasting peace and well-being of the peoples of this hemisphere.

If the nations affected worked together for their mutual benefit, each contributing what it is able to contribute, and firmly agreed in advance to maintain the highway as a great international artery of commerce, free from physical or political obstructions and burdens, then truly we would have taken a great stride toward cementing together the nations of this hemisphere by lasting ties.

This might be regarded as visionary, but I do not think so. When the nations of the world begin to emphasize the things they have in common, rather than their differences, their minds will be turned from wars because their attention will be centered upon, and their energy will be absorbed in, wealth-producing undertakings of common benefit.

The Inter-American Highway and the St. Lawrence Seaway are international public works of great promise which should be undertaken in this spirit of mutual interest.

In my opinion, these projects should be planned, built and then managed by International Commissions. Furthermore they should be self-liquidating and be financed by bond-issues, either wholly, or to the maximum possible extent.

I found it curiously interesting that out of one of the international conferences a proposal was made somewhat along the line I have suggested. It was pointed out that the value of land adjoining the route of the highway would be enhanced, that countries which could not contribute cash could contribute land. This could be sold or leased by an Inter-American Highway commission to contribute to the liquidation of the cost of construction and maintenance of the highway. This is not unlike the landgrants which helped build the railroads in the United States.

This impressed me as a sound and businesslike approach to a very interesting experiment in international relations, which if successful might prove adaptable in other international undertakings farther from our borders.

But our State Department has displayed little interest in such an approach. It preferred instead its traditional practice of spending a dollar and getting only 10 cents worth in return.

Without looking ahead, without providing in advance by firm and enforceable agreements for the maintenance of the Inter-American Highway and the prevention of onerous tolls, excessive gasoline taxes or other possible political burdens and obstructions, it has pressed steadily for our Government to tax its citizens to build roads in other countries. Thus we have no assurance that the highway will ever be an international artery of commerce. It may be an instrument of extortion or it may be reclaimed by the jungles as a monument to folly.

The committee report to which I have referred called attention in 1947 to the importance of this phase of the Inter-American Highway on pages 48 and 49 in the following language:

> Anyone who has traveled in the Central American countries without the special blessing of the foreign offices of those countries can appreciate that border controls, such as immigration and sanitary regulations and customs inspections, may well constitute a serious obstacle to the free movement of tourists or of cargoes. The committee does not minimize the rather delicate character of any regulation or restriction on the laws (or the administration of them) relating to border controls. However, the committee believes that if this problem is to be solved it should be through an agreement entered into prior to the actual completion of the highway. Certainly, the United States should not request any of the Central American governments to limit border controls to any greater extent than the United States, itself, is willing to limit its own. However, the committee fears that unless some standard, which is made uniform for all of the countries through which the highway passes, is adopted with respect to borders controls we may finally find ourselves in the position of having created a great international public work only to see it lie idle and unused simply because we failed to provide for sensible and workable border controls.
>
> With respect to taxes, every motor vehicle user in the United States is conscious of license fees, both for vehicle and operator, and gasoline taxes. The committee has obtained, from the State Department, a summary of the direct taxes paid in the various countries involved in this highway on gasoline, and the approximate retail price per gallon of gasoline. This table discloses that gasoline taxes range from a low of 7.95 cents per gallon in Mexico to a high of 24.19 cents per gallon in Costa Rica, and that the approximate retail price of gasoline ranges from 25 cents per gallon in Mexico to 50 cents per gallon in El Salvador and Costa Rica. It is perfectly obvious that with a highway passing through seven separate sovereignties, gasoline taxes, alone, might be imposed by any one of those sovereignties which would be so high as to be extortionate, unless prevented by agreement.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Because of the fact that the Inter-American Highway passes through seven separate sovereignties and because of the continuing future need for maintenance of the highway and the prevention of the establishment of onerous restrictions on its use, and because of the international character of this undertaking, it occurred to the committee that serious and detailed consideration ought to be given to the desirability of establishing a permanent international highway commission or authority. This commission should be responsible for maintaining the highway as an international artery of commerce and for governing its use to a limited extent by coordinating and making uniform the regulations and restrictions affecting the flow of international traffic.
>
> It seemed to the committee that a permanent international commission or authority of this character would provide the flexibility necessary to permit the highway to continue to be in future years the international artery of commerce which it is designed to be by meeting problems as they arise in the economic development of the countries in this hemisphere, and particularly those in Central America, which cannot possibly be foreseen by anyone at this time.
>
> The result of a failure to meet this problem now can well be visualized by those who recall the status of highways in the United States when they were under the exclusive control of local goverment agencies before there was any Federal-aid program and before there were through Federal highways. In the light of the history of the development of through highways in this country, it does not require a great deal of imagination to foresee the type of highway that would result, regardless of the quality of its original construction, if no uniformity of maintenance and regulation is required with respect to the seven separate and independent sovereignties through which this highway passes.
>
> Just as uniformity was obtained in the Federal highway aid program by commitments obtained at the time the grant of funds was extended, the committee believes that commitments from the Central American Republics will be more easily attainable prior to the expenditure of funds than after the United States contribution has been fully made.
>
> During its hearings in September 1946, the committee sought to learn what consideration had been given by our State Department to the creation of an international highway commission. The committee discovered that no one in the State Department had given any thought at all to this proposition.
>
> It should be recalled that in the treaty of 1936, article II provided for the creation of a technical commission for the Pan American Highway. Although the phraseology contained in that article is very broad and the authority of that commission ill-defined, it would appear that the intention was merely to create a commission for the rather limited purpose of considering ways and means of completing the connecting links between existing sections of the proposed highway. It should also be noted that that commission has never been brought into existence. The

committee learned that our State Department had taken no action whatever in this matter.

The committee concludes that the State Department has failed to act diligently in the interests of the United States to solve the problems of maintenance and use of the highway after completion and to carry out the provisions of the treaty of 1936.

Mr. Chairman, I have sought to indicate my strong belief in the importance of the Inter-American Highway because of the possibilities it holds in demonstrating the steps that may be taken in the direction of peaceful, friendly, and mutually profitable relations between the peoples of the world. I regret that such cursory consideration is being given to this subject by the House in this debate. I hope some committee of the Congress will have sufficient interest in the Inter-American Highway to explore its possibilities thoroughly. If they do, I believe they will discover that the State Department is wasting a golden opportunity for the promotion of the peace, stability, and enrichment of this hemisphere and at the same time is wasting huge quantities of tax dollars.

Mr. Chairman, to encourage and assist such a congressional exploration, I include at this point in my remarks the conclusions contained in the report to which I have referred:

INVESTIGATION OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. FERGUSON, from the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, submitted the following additional report:

THE INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

Conclusions

1. The War Department should not have undertaken construction on the so-called Inter-American Highway in Central America as a war project. Thirty-six million dollars were added to the cost of World War II without contributing to the defense of the United States. Indeed, our war effort was hampered by the division of vast quantities of construction equipment, road materials, construction manpower, and shipping in 1942 and 1943, when we were facing shortages on all sides and the universal cry was "too little too late."

2. Like the Canol project—which was approved during the same period, in the spring of 1942—the War Department's Inter-American Highway project was conceived hastily and founded upon an absence of sound planning or reasoning. War Department approval was predicated almost wholly upon information supplied by the Public Roads Administration. These estimates clearly specified the conditions under which a highway could be completed within the time desired. The War Department disregarded the conditions and specifications upon which the Public Roads Administration estimates were based and ordered the highway built, notwithstanding clear evidence that it was impossible to execute the project as ordered.

3. Both before and after approval of the Inter-American Highway project, the official position of the War Department had consistently been that an overland route to the Panama Canal was not required for the logistical support of our forces in Panama. Nevertheless, the Secretary of War, on July 23, 1942, advised the Secretary of State that the construction of the Inter-American Highway was an urgent military necessity. It is clear from the evidence that the urgent military necessity was not military supply, but the promotion of continental solidarity. The committee believes that the War Department invaded the province of the State Department in certifying that the promotion of continental solidarity was an urgent military necessity. The committee further believes that defense funds and scarce manpower, materials, machinery, and shipping should not have been diverted to a project of such questionable and nebulous benefit to our war effort.

4. Execution of the project by the Army engineers was unbusinesslike. Excessive equipment rentals were paid. Records were inadequate. Supervision of contractors was ineffectual. Coordination with the United States Public Roads Administration was poor. Termination of the project was ordered belatedly. Liquidation was slow and expensive. As a result of these and other inefficiencies in handling the project, only 347 miles of road were completed at an expenditure of $36,000,000, although it had been estimated that 905 miles of road could be completed for $14,500,000. Only one-third of the work done by the Army engineers is estimated to be useful to the future Inter-American Highway. Much of the work done by the Army engineers was on roads which will not be used by Public Roads Administration as a part of the Inter-American Highway as presently located.

5. Some contractors' profits were excessive. General provisions to prevent inordinate profits, such as price ceilings, income taxes, and renegotiation, as applied to this project, have not proved effective to date. However, tax recoveries against some of the contractors may yet be achieved.

6. United States representatives in the State Department and the Public Roads Administration were ineffective in securing agreements for selecting a route for some sections of the Inter-American Highway. In general, the route is located through the Cordilleras Mountain Range. This necessitates tremendous cuts and fills, adds to the difficulty and cost of construction, and will result in a tortuous, winding highway traversing mountains as high as 10,000 feet. The utility of the road for commercial or defense purposes is thereby limited. If the route had been located on the Pacific coastal plain, the highway would have been straight over long stretches and traffic could move faster. Economy in the movement of heavy cargoes would result from the greater efficiency of motor vehicles at lower altitudes and from avoiding hauling heavy loads over mountains.

7. The route of the Inter-American Highway in some sections is unnecessarily circuitous. In Nicaragua, the official Inter-American Highway is routed to pass by property owned by the former President. This detour adds 42 miles to the length of the highway. In El Salvador the official Inter-American Highway route makes a detour adding 14 miles for the purpose of serving a port. In Guatemala, a wholly new route, deviating from two existing alternative routes, was selected to connect Guatemala City with the Mexican border. In all three of these instances of unnatural location of sections of the route, there was violent disagreement between the United States Public Roads Administration and the Army engineers. This resulted in an anomalous situation where two United States agencies were doing work on routes paralleling each other, while other sections of the highway, where there was no road at all, were neglected.

8. The United States, since 1942, has spent $3,000,000 for partial construction of a 160-mile road in Nicaragua from San Benito to Rama, a river port. This project, which will cost $6,500,000, was not approved by Congress. The funds used were taken from the so-called secret or emergency fund of the President, available only for emergencies affecting the national security or defense and not requiring detailed accounting. Another $1,200,000 was spent by the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs between 1942 and 1944 to construct the 40-mile Lake Yojoa Road in Honduras. This was admittedly a make-work project to relieve unemployment in Honduras and did not have congressional approval. Although built at the expense of the United States, this country has no rights in these roads and there is not even any agreement that they will be maintained. Neither road is a part of the Inter-American Highway. The committee does not consider either of these expenditures of United States funds sufficiently related to national defense to have justified them as proper defense expenditures in World War II.

9. Our State Department has been remiss in failing to negotiate firm agreements providing for the maintenance of the Inter-American Highway after its completion and in guarding against prohibitive restrictions or regulations which would prevent full use of the highway. Failure to maintain any section of the highway or the imposition of onerous restrictions in any section will render the highway useless as a whole, either for commercial or defense purposes, since there are no alternate routes to the Panama Canal below El Salvador.

10. The Army engineers spent a net amount of United States funds in excess of $36,000,000. The United States Public Roads Administration has expended approximately $30,000,000 to date and $8,000,000 more has been allotted to this work. In addition, the Export-Import Bank has loaned to Mexico and the Central American Governments, principally for the construction of various sections of the Inter-American Highway, approximately $48,000,000. Thus, a total grant of over $74,000,000 and loans of $48,000,000 of United States funds have been committed to this project. However, the highway is not yet half completed. In September 1946 the Public Roads Administration estimated that it would cost an additional $65,000,000 to complete the highway, but in March 1947 the Public Roads Administration declined to give the committee any estimate of the final total cost. Accordingly, a project which was estimated in 1941 to cost the United States a total of $20,000,000 will now cost at least $139,000,000.

11. Immediate study should be given to the advisability of creating an inter-American highway commission or authority to be established by multilateral treaty between the interested governments. Such a commission or authority should have power to insure the maintenance and use of the highway, when completed, as an international artery of commerce and as an instrument of hemispheric defense. The results of such a study should be available prior to any further substantial commitment of United States funds to this highway.

12. This committee believes that it should not take any position on the broad question of policy as to the establishment of a through highway between North and South America at the expense of United States taxpayers. This question is within the purview of authority of other committees of the Congress.

However, if such a highway is to be built in the interest of the economic development of the American continents, to strengthen the commercial and political ties between the American nations and to promote the security and defenses of this hemisphere, then the committee believe that the manner in which this highway project is conceived and executed should be businesslike and should be calculated to achieve the objectives stated. To continue to pour out United States funds for highway developments in other countries without a firm, clear, and enforceable arrangement for insuring that the highway will, in fact, be the international artery of commerce and defense intended, as the committee's study discloses is now being done, will be an unjustifiable diversion of United States public funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McGREGOR) there were—ayes 37, noes 51.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary of Commerce shall prepare and reexamine and revise annually a program setting forth the essential actions which are necessary to increase and promote safety on the highways, roads, and streets of the United States. This program of essential actions shall include, but shall not be limited to, the formulation of desirable uniform legislation and ordinances for enactment by States or local governments, the formulation of standards for highway construction and vehicle control from the viewpoint of safety and for safety features to be incorporated in motor vehicles, the enlistment of public support for highway safety through publicity and information campaigns and otherwise, formulation of a uniform plan for the collection and analysis of accident records, the promotion, in the school systems and elsewhere, of education in traffic safety, the promotion of uniform enforcement of traffic laws, the formulation of uniform procedures for motor-vehicle administration, and the coordination of highway-safety activities of all Federal departments and agencies.

In the furtherance of the objectives of highway safety, the Secretary of Commerce shall, to the extent feasible, carry out such program and in so doing shall cooperate to the fullest extent possible with State, local, and private bodies devoted to the promotion of highway safety, with a view to securing Nation-wide adherence to the program adopted pursuant to this section.

(b) The Secretary of Commerce shall make an annual report to the Congress setting forth the actions taken pursuant to this section. The annual report shall include or be accompanied by the latest version of the program of essential actions prepared in accordance with subsection (a) of this section.

(c) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section not to exceed $200,000 may be expended annually out of available administrative funds authorized by the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FALLON: Page 10, line 14 strike out all of section 7 and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 7. The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized and directed to assist in carrying out the action program of the President's Highway Safety Conference and to cooperate with the State highway departments and other agencies in this program to advance the cause of safety on the streets and highways: *Provided*, That not to exceed $200,000 shall be expended annually for the purposes of this section."

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, this is a committee amendment. The amendment was adopted later by the committee because of the objection that was raised to the language now contained in the bill by many State highway commissioners. The language was not clear and they were afraid that this program on the Federal level might in some way hamper their State programs and State rights.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. My understanding is this is the committee amendment?

Mr. FALLON. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want the chairman to understand that I no longer am in sympathy with his amendment, although I am not going to oppose it at this time.

(Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to refer briefly and with some pardonable pride at a time when we are discussing the Federal aid to roads in Nicaragua, Guatemala, Turkey, and all of the rest of the States of the United States to what can be accomplished by a State in connection with its roads.

I refer to the famous Pennsylvania Turnpike. Here is the situation in which the State recognized a need and saw an opportunity to meet it. The State set up a separate governmental commission called the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission which surveyed the route, sold the idea to the public by the sale of bonds, built the road, and is now operating the road at tremendous and thrilling profits. It has provided a badly needed service to the great trucking companies and to the great amount of traffic that travels between the eastern and western borders of our great State.

All of the income from the road goes to the maintenance of the road or to its extension, thereby guaranteeing that the funds used to pay the tolls are used for the purpose of improving the roads for others who will use them. In a time of war or military necessity this road will be a great asset. It will help to relieve some of the burden on the railroads; it will provide for more effective transportation of materiels and personnel.

I would like to commend this idea to other States. New Jersey, I know, has already constructed a turnpike of its own, the revenues of which have far exceeded the estimates. I would say that in contrast to the fiasco that occurred when the States tried to build canals some 100 or 125 years ago, the feasibility of these toll roads will be determined by the ability of the planners to sell to a public, which has financial discrimination, the bonds which will pay for the roads. To any State that is faced with traffic problems of the kind that Pennsylvania was faced with where there is an overabundance of it, to any State that has need of some freedom from the congestion of traffic that must go through its borders, I commend to them a study of the accomplishments of the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission of the great State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SITTLER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. An investment in bonds for turnpike roads is one of the soundest investments that can be found anywhere in the United States today.

Mr. SITTLER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SITTLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to join with the gentleman in complimenting the State of Pennsylvania and the country for constructing the Pennsylvania Turnpike. I said a while ago I hope it goes on through Ohio.

Mr. SITTLER. Not at Pennsylvania's expense, of course.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, we, the people financed it. Is it not a fact that the RFC bought the original bond issue?

Mr. SITTLER. That is true, as I understand it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And it proved to be a success, and then the people reached for the obligation.

Mr. SITTLER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And it proved one of the finest investments in the country, as our friend from Illinois said.

Mr. SITTLER. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And that is the way to build them.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield ?

Mr. SITTLER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. I would just like to add for the RECORD that the bonds of the New Jersey Turnpike Authority are selling for 106; a very excellent investment.

Mr. SITTLER. Yes; and within a short time after completion of the road.

Mr. HAND. And our traffic count is up to the estimate for 1956, although the road has been in operation but a short time.

Mr. SITTLER. Which proves that turnpikes should be built to not only meet the needs at the present time, but the creative needs that will be brought about due to the increase in the saving of time, and so on.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, whether driving a touring car or a loaded truck, if you stay off the turnpike and make that trip you pay for the turnpike without using it; therefore the tourist and the trucker goes to the turnpike because he saves more than enough operating expenses to pay the toll fee. That is the reason they use it.

Mr. SITTLER. The immutable economic laws prove that it is a sound investment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SITTLER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GEORGE. Does not the gentleman know that if the Congress during a period of years had been appropriating back to the local government units the proper amount of money charged to the motorist, it would not be necessary to build the turnpikes; that the roads would already have been built?

Mr. SITTLER. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. That all acts or parts of acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed, and this act shall take effect on its passage.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FALLON: On page 12, line 5, strike out all of section 9 and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 9. All provisions of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944, and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, not inconsistent with this act, shall remain in full force and effect."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 10. This act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7340) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 634, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, having been informed, and I appreciate it very much, that a motion to recommit will be made, and in good faith, and that an effort will be made to obtain a roll call on it, in order to carry out the agreement made heretofore, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the bill be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR REMAINDER OF WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a brief announcement as to the program for the remainder of the week.

Later this afternoon a conference report will be filed on the bill S. 302, and that conference report will be taken up tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield, what is that bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a bill that lifts the ceiling on certain cases in which the Alien Property Custodian is authorized to make settlements. It applies particularly to American women who married aliens and whose property was seized in World War II. These American women retain their dual citizenship and are still Americans, but technically their property was taken because they are married to aliens.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will this precede the consideration of the Puerto Rican bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. It will take only a few minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. After we finish the bill that was pending today we take up the conference report to which the gentleman has referred, and then go on to the Puerto Rican bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. The bill considered today will be the first order of business, then the conference report, about which there is no controversy, and then the Puerto Rican bill. If the Puerto Rican bill is disposed of tomorrow, I have no further business for the rest of the week.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. PRIEST submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 302) to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

1952 COTTON CROP

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 658, Rept. No. 2004), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5713) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide that Low Middling seven-eighths-inch cotton shall be the standard grade for the purposes of determining parity and price support for the 1952 cotton crop. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideraton of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

MINE DISASTERS

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, 119 miners killed in the West Frankfort mine disaster, 6 in Carpenterville, Pa. All America shudders at these awful catastrophes, and it is natural we should. But if we understand the real facts, these disasters are ordinary and commonplace. What many people do not know and what they should be made aware of is that disasters of this magnitude have been occurring on an average of every 17 working days during the last 50 years. Think of it.

No, all 119 have not been killed in 1 disaster, each 17 days, but they have died singly and in two's and three's. Their maimed and broken bodies have been carried out of the mines at the rate of 119 for every 17 working days for half a century. No, it did not make the headlines in the press, but the tragedy of that man who also died in the bowels of the earth to provide coal to heat our homes and keep the wheels of industry turning is just as stark a tragedy as if he were 1 of the 119.

In fairness to existing safety efforts, I wish to state that the number of accidents has decreased in recent years, but it is still disgracefully high. The death of one man is just as great a shock to his family and friends as were those deaths in the West Frankfort disaster. Another family must go on without their loved one; another man lost to the economy that so sorely needs his services. Yes, if every 17 days for 50 years 119 men had been killed with 1 great blast, public indignation would have forced some action to stop this slaughter. But because this disaster of death in the mines usually happens to one or two at a time, public opinion allows itself to slip into lethargy until a West Frankfort blast awakens it.

If this tragedy can force constructive action to avert future tragedies, these men's lives will not have been lost in vain. This carnage must be stopped. There is far too much blood on the coal that turns the wheels of American industry.

We in the mining regions are familiar with these tragedies. We know what it means to see the horrible row of blackened, fire-scorched, headless, legless, armless bodies that were once living, breathing, human beings. We know what it means to see the wives and children of these men standing dry-eyed, sick with the realization that the inevitable had happened, that their worst

and ever-present fears had finally come to pass.

I remember these mine disasters in my district for years. I remember the awful explosion of the City Mine in Sullivan, the Francisco explosion, the Little Betty at Dugger, the Baker at Sullivan, the Panhandle at Bicknell, and the King at Princeton.

Since coming to Congress in January a year ago, I have discussed this problem with officials of the United Mine Workers of America, with interested Members of Congress, and with the miners themselves. I do not pretend to be an expert on mining. But one thing I do know—our present system is not working successfully, and it never has. For many years industry has opposed changing the State mine laws. It says, "It is our problem. Let us do the job." I am inherently against the Federal Government doing that which can be done by the State. But I have watched the operation of the State laws, and I have found that they alone are not enough. If the State laws in Illinois had functioned properly, this explosion at West Frankfort would not have occurred. Recently an explosion in the Carpenterville Mine in Pennsylvania killed six men and injured four others. The Federal inspectors had pointed out the dangerous defects in the mine three different times, had labeled it gaseous in spite of a State bureau decision to the contrary. Again, one of the defects pointed out was that gas was allowed to come into the mine from old workings, which was one of the causes of the Orient Mine disaster.

These are some of my thoughts, Mr. Speaker, upon this legislation. I think the great American public is becoming increasingly impatient with an industry that continues to slaughter men needlessly and a government that is unwilling to make any attempt to stop it because of opposition pressure, or because of a doctrine that, in my opinion, does not apply.

I have also heard the argument that safety legislation does not fall within the province of the Federal Government. Nothing could be farther from the facts. In many instances laws have been passed by the Federal Government in the interest of safety. These are working to the benefit of all. Let me cite just a few examples:

Locomotives are required to be equipped with safety ash pans. Carriers are prohibited from using any locomotive in interstate commerce unless its boiler, tender, and all parts and appurtenances thereof are in proper condition and safe to operate. Railroads are also prohibited from using on any line in interstate traffic a locomotive engine not equipped with, first, driving wheel brakes and appliances for operating the train-brake system; second, automatic couplers; and, third, grab irons or handholds for security in coupling and uncoupling cars. Common carriers are also required to equip each car with secure sill steps and hand brakes, and in certain cases, ladders and hand holders.

The Motor Carrier Act of 1935 makes it the duty of the Interstate Commerce Commission to establish reasonable requirements for the safety of operation and equipment of motor vehicles operating as common carriers, and imposes upon the carrier the duty of providing safe and adequate service for the transportation of passengers in interstate or foreign commerce.

Carriers of goods shipped by sea are bound to exercise due diligence to make the ship seaworthy and otherwise fit and safe to receive, carry, and preserve such goods; and in the carrying of explosives or other dangerous articles, the commandant of the Coast Guard shall make regulations for the protection against the hazards of health, life, limb, or property created by the carrying of such articles.

I could continue to cite such cases for hours, but the fact is clear. Our Federal Government has been successful in the safety business for years.

Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in the differences of the experts on coal mining. Like every other occupation, it has its experts who differ and argue very learnedly for their theories and their opinions. What I want to do is stop this killing. I am not so much interested in what set off a gas or dust explosion, whether it be unpermissible machinery, sparks from contact of solid bodies, men smoking in violation of the law, or what have you. What I want to know is why gas or dust is allowed to accumulate in the first place. That is the problem. These are the things that experts agree can be prevented by proper ventilation, cleaning up, rock dusting, or use of water. Then why is it not done, so that careless or lawless men, unpermissible machinery, or a fire of any description and content could do no harm? I am getting a bit fed up with the ever-present excuse offered after every catastrophe that some lawless man was smoking. Is it not against the law to allow gas and dust to accumulate to such an extent that a flame could blow 119 men into eternity in a split second? Is it not against the law to allow ventilation to become so bad that it could not dilute a body of gas that has accumulated? Should it not be against the law to allow gas to accumulate in old, abandoned works to be forced out on workingmen and active machinery when a "squeeze" starts? Why do some experts and some States propose that old works be either sealed or the air that ventilates them be directed into a return that does not pass through working places and by active machinery?

It has been said that the United Mine Workers safety committee can withdraw the men from the mine when danger threatens. Apparently such a right, if it exists, is not functioning. In Virginia, after the Federal inspectors pointed out certain dangers in the mine, the mine owners refused to make the necessary improvements to alleviate this danger. The United Mine Workers safety committee demanded that the mine owner eliminate this danger. The mine owners refused and discharged a safety-committee man; the miners struck. Today the United Mine Workers of America is defending a $750,000 suit for damages against them brought in the Federal court of Virginia. Apparently this plan to safeguard the miner was not working. Actually there is nothing in the contract that gives the union or the safety committee any power except to recommend. The management has full control of the working force and can follow or refuse these recommendations without penalty.

I am happy to say that the Subcommittee on Coal Mine Safety of the Committee on Labor and Education has worked out a good bill. Personally, I would like to see a stronger bill. No, it isn't perfect; but it is fair and workable, and will go far toward eliminating this useless maiming and killing of the men working in the mines. It will not injure the mining industry. No one desires a healthy, progressive mining condition more than I. I sincerely hope that in the very near future the full committee will report this bill to the House. Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to analyze the bill with special emphasis on its relation to the present State Mine Safety Legislation.

I have listened to arguments that mine safety is the job of the States; that this mine safety legislation will cause the various State mining bureaus to decay and fall by the wayside because the Federal Bureau of Mines will have usurped their power. The fact is, that State mine safety has accomplished a great deal. That is especially true in my State of Indiana. But I would be the first to admit that there is still plenty of room for improvement and that State mine safety laws or their enforcement are not doing the job. The Courier Journal, published in Louisville, Ky., carried an editorial recently that expresses my opinions far better than I can express them. Let me quote from this editorial:

> The McConnell bill differs from the old Price-Neely bills which have struggled through many a long year, in being less severe and punitive and in this respect a little more acceptable to the unwilling operators. But its basic provision * * * is the one conferring upon Federal mine inspectors the right to close mines in which unsafe conditions continue to prevail after official warning has been given. * * * Mine owners still demand bitterly that the power to close mines should be left with State inspectors. Unfortunately, the record has shown too many State mining departments to be staffed by persons more responsive to the mining industry or to politics than they should be. The Illinois disaster showed a lack of both legislation to enforce safety codes and a mine department strong enough to demand enforcement. If all States were bound by a uniform code and possessed inspectors equally free to enforce the code, the miners' hope of Nation-wide protection from unsafe mines could well be achieved through State efforts. But this is not the case now and as long as short-sighted operators continue to oppose all efforts for stricter safety legislation, it will not be the case for some time to come. Coal operators in Kentucky and other mining States have often seemed to delight in demonstrating the ease with which they control State legislators and get along with State mine inspectors. * * * Outcry still comes from the so-called small operators, but disasters which have made headlines in the past few years were not in small mines. And as a matter of humanity, a mine which is too poor to provide elementary protection against blast and burning for

its employees probably shouldn't remain open at all. Few, if any, of the operators who complain of the cost of enforcing the Federal mine code would like to admit openly that they are deliberately endangering the lives of men who dig their coal.

Under the McConnell bill, the Federal Government is only given power to close a mine when these five specific dangers of mine peril exist: Gas and dust explosions, floods, roof falls on travelways and roadways, and fires. Dangerous conditions prevailing in any mine in these five categories are covered by State laws and State inspectors have the power to close mines where these dangerous conditions exist. This McConnell bill provides that all mines must be inspected at least once a year. Then for 11 months out of each year the State mine inspectors have complete supervision and control of the mines they are inspecting. Once every year a Federal inspector can say to a State mining inspector and a coal operator, "You are operating your mine under dangerous conditions, and if these dangers are not removed within a certain length of time, the men in your employ are to be removed until the mine is made safe." On top of this, the State inspectors have complete charge of the face workings in each mine where 60 percent of all the accidents and fatalities occur. In this particular section of each mine where men are killed or injured singly or doubly, the public pays very little attention to these unspectacular accidents. Yet here is a fertile field for the State inspectors. It is my considered judgment that there will be plenty of work for both Federal and State mine inspectors if they all do an honest and conscientious job.

This bill takes very little authority away from the States. It erects an additional safeguard to protect the lives of the coal miners. It is a good bill, a fair bill, and has the support of the majority of coal operators, the mine workers, and the Federal Bureau of Mines.

I hope that it will be passed with very little opposition and that the majority of my party will give it wholehearted support.

I come from a district where there are miners, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that I know them as well as any man in this House. They are strong, and they have courage. Only men of courage would work in the mines, and only the strong can stand this work. In my Army until in the last war, I fought side by side with miners.

I have even heard arguments against the mine-safety bill which were plainly caused by hostility toward the miners. It is true that some people are critical of the miners, and have voiced strong objections to their strikes and their way of handling union affairs. I am not claiming perfection on the part of the miner, nor do I claim that he has always been right. I could not make that claim for any segment of American life. But the miner has never been guilty of feather bedding. He has increased production in the mine to a height never before dreamed of in other countries.

No group hates and fights communism more bitterly than does the miner. He fought communism even before many of us knew what it was. He had thrown the Commies out of his union, and was fighting communism on all fronts at a time when many of our present, loudest-voiced opponents of communism were playing footsie tootsie with Communists. The coal miner is against all forms of totalitarianism. For at heart he is a rugged individualist. His work has been hard, and his lot has not been easy. He has fought hard, and at times viciously, to raise himself and his family from almost servile, deplorable conditions to a place in the sun, and to realize that most sacred heritage—the dignity of man.

These miners are, as a whole, God-fearing, responsible citizens who work hard, love their families, and patriotically support their Government. There is no group in American life more basically American in philosophy and heritage than the coal miner. Yes, he has fought hard, and perhaps at times other people have been hurt in the fight. This miner wants more of the good things in life in return for his labor—but do not we all? He deeply believes in the American capitalistic system, but he wants more of the capital—but do not we all? Such is America. He has just had a harder fight to get his share of the capital.

The miner knows that he must earn more to save enough to care for his loved ones when his life is snuffed out. Yes; the fight has been rough. Men who are living, sweating, toiling, facing danger every hour naturally do not do their fighting by slapping at the wrist. They have not always been right in their fighting, but what group of Americans has always been right? That fight has helped raise the standard of living in all America at the time it has raised the lot of the miner. No element is any more essential to our economy than coal. Coal and iron are the cornerstones of our economy. We must exert every effort to keep the coal industry sound and the working conditions and safety of the miners as healthy as possible.

Mining is a hard life. Strong men own the mines and strong men work in the mines. So it is not always a pleasant fight, but the American miner with all of his faults and all of his virtues is just as American as Main Street, just as American as apple pie.

For the sake of this miner still living with his loved ones, for the sake of the American economy, this killing must stop. I am no expert on mining, but I know what sudden death means. I have seen it in war and I have seen it in the mines of my district. I am in the fight until something constructive is done. I have studied this matter enough to know that the McConnell bill is a great step toward safety and sanity in the coal-mining industry. I hope my party will not only participate but will take the lead in the fight to get favorable action on this most important matter.

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SITTLER. Our colleague is making an excellent statement on a subject which is very near to me because in my district there are a great many miners, as there are in the gentleman's district. If the mine workers, in Fayette, Somerset, Greene, and Washington Counties, in the State of Pennsylvania were here today, they would cheer the gentleman on in what he is saying about providing safety for the men themselves and security and happiness for their family, and which means production of the basic source of energy for the whole defense effort. I thank the gentleman for his fine statement in behalf of our miners as well as his own.

Mr. BRAY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. I commend the gentleman from Indiana for the very fine statement he is making. As the gentleman knows, the district that he represents joins the district I have the honor to represent. We have many miners who live or work in each other's district. I know you and I both are familiar with the dangers of mining. At most, it is a very hazardous undertaking. In the last 20 years, over 1,250,000 miners have either died or been injured. During the first 2 years of World War II, the casualties in mines were greater than those in our Armed Services. I have been interested in mine safety. For a number of years, when I was in the State legislature, I worked for mine safety legislation. I think in our State, I would say that mine inspection is probably better than it is in some other States, but we know that that is not sufficient. There are 48 different States, and 48 different laws regulating mine inspection.

Under State government there is more danger that the mine inspectors come under local influence. I think the solution to this problem is to get a Federal mine-inspection law with teeth in it, where the mine inspectors have a right to take some action.

I want to commend the gentleman again for the fine statement he is making.

Mr. BRAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana.

Mrs. HARDEN. I congratulate my colleague from Indiana in calling the attention of the membership of the House to this important legislation. There are hundreds of miners in my district who are vitally interested in such legislation. I hope that the Congress will adopt it.

Mr. BRAY. I thank the gentlewoman from Indiana.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is a mine bill which has passed the Senate. There is one in the House committee. I am not going to ask the gentleman about the different bills. I want to assure the gentleman that, as soon as a mine bill comes out of the House committee, the leadership, the Speaker and myself, and I know the leadership on the minority side, will

do everything we possibly can; but speaking for myself, I will do everything within my power to get that bill up just as soon as possible.

Mr. BRAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SITTLER. I appreciate those words, too, from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], but particularly I want to say that the importance of the coal miner in the American economy is somewhat unappreciated. I wonder if our people know or realize that if the per-man-day production of the British coal mines or the mines in any of our foreign countries could be brought up to one-half of what the tons per man-day production in the United States is, there would not be any depression in England and their economic problems would all be solved, because all of their difficulties now lie in the per-man-day production of coal. In commenting on the matter of the Federal mine safety law, I would like to say that our great State of Pennsylvania has long recognized the vital importance of safety, and has been a great leader in this matter. But the reason that we favor such a law is that we believe the rest of the miners throughout the country deserve the same kind of protection that our own men in Pennsylvania have.

Mr. BRAY. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BROWNSON. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman on the careful documentation and study behind this speech. I know well the hours and the days that he has spent on this subject. I think the miners of his district are to be congratulated on being represented by a man who takes their interest so seriously and who is working so diligently in their behalf.

Mr. BRAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GEORGE. Is it proposed in this legislation to supplement the State safety programs, or will it take over and supersede those programs?

Mr. BRAY. No; it will not take over and supersede; it is merely to supplement and help.

Mr. GEORGE. To add strength to the safety program where the State is working on their level.

Mr. BRAY. It is exactly that, and it should raise the entire standards of mine safety throughout our country.

Mr. GEORGE. I think most Members of Congress can certainly support such a program.

Mr. BRAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I would like to take just a minute to compliment the gentleman who is making a very forceful argument in favor of a bill being brought out by the committee and passed at this session of the Congress. I want to commend him for his efforts. He has always been interested in the miners and I join with him in expressing the hope that we do get a bill before the House at this session. Going through the history of the great loss of life, particularly referring to the mine disaster that we had in my district in Illinois some few years ago at Centralia in which 112 men lost their lives, and the more recent one in which 119 were killed at West Frankfort a little before Christmas time, it is my considered opinion that it is the duty of the Congress to do something in reference to the enactment of mine-safety regulations within reasonable limits.

Mr. BRAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BEAMER. I want to commend our capable colleague from Indiana for his presentation of this particular subject. We have no miners in the district which I represent, and I presume many of you do not have miners, but we recognize the necessity of coal and we also recognize the problems that are presented to the coal miners. I want to emphasize one thing that the gentleman representing the Seventh Congressional District of Indiana has so forcibly brought out and that is the fact that the coal miners, probably more so than most others, have opposed the infiltration of communism. I think that we must take our hats off to that particular group for their efforts, and I hope that others will take a page from their record. I again compliment the gentleman.

Mr. BRAY. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

A. DEVITT VANECH

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in taking the journey of life I have a code I follow which brings to me the greatest degree of happiness and contentment. A very important part of my code of life is that "if I cannot say a good word about a person I will not say a bad one." I am going to say a few words about a gentleman whom I have known for the last 18 or 20 years who seems to be on the receiving end, and who does not belong in that position.

Mr. Speaker, it is very easy to be a critic, it is very easy to knock, and it is the easiest thing in the world to tear down. I prize my reputation, that reputation I have earned during the years of my life, and I resent anyone who tries to take my reputation away from me. When I am sitting on a committee of the House of Representatives, whether a standing committee or a special investigating committee—and I have sat on many of the latter—I will fight for the reputation of persons I have never met in my life. I want the evidence; not suspicion. I want the evidence. And, it has got to be convincing to me before I form an adverse judgment or express an adverse opinion about anyone. I might also say that as a member of investigating committees—and I have been a member of many of them—I feel morally bound to say nothing until the investigations are over because, without any reflection upon others who differ with me, I feel when I am on a committee I am hearing evidence under oath, that I sit in the position of a judge, and that I should not make any public statements until the evidence under oath is in and the committee has made its findings, and then I can express my personal views. However, somebody else might feel otherwise and, if so, I sharply disagree with such person.

Shortly after I came down here I accidentally came in contact with a man by the name of A. Devitt Vanech.

Without in any way referring to what any other Member may have said, because I do not want to get into a personal controversy, for again that would violate my code, I am expressing my thoughts about Gus Vanech affirmatively. I have found him to be one of the finest men I have ever met, a fine public official.

It seems that some people think because you are poor and cannot go to college and graduate from law school that is something that is suspicious in itself, if you become a lawyer. I never knew any such theory to be advanced in America, where opportunity was supposed to exist to all under the law. I might in open frankness confess that if that test applied to me I would be subject to the same criticism because I never graduated from a law school, being a product of a law office; and many people think that is a pretty good institution in which to become versed in the knowledge of law.

My friend Gus Vanech came here as a clerk in 1933. He studied nighttimes. True, he took the bar examination here two or three times and failed to pass, but I know many fine lawyers in Massachusetts who did not pass the first time. I was lucky enough to pass the first time, but very lucky, because 66⅔ percent of those who took the examination did not pass, and that is about the average. About 30 to 35 percent of those who take the examination in Massachusetts pass it. That does not mean the other 65 to 70 percent are not qualified, or a good part of them. But somehow or other there is some kind of figure there, and I am not criticizing it, whereby only 30 to 35 percent of those who take the examination pass. Last year or 2 years ago the figure went down to 16 or 18 percent. The public became tremendously disturbed over the fact that such a small percentage of those who took the examination passed or were permitted to pass.

I would like to know when in America it has become a crime for anybody to rise up, and to go forward without a college education. I wish I could have had a college education, but it was denied me. I educated myself, and I admire others who have done it, and who

are doing it. I envy those who did have the opportunity to have a college education, but I admire very much those who, being denied it and not having the opportunity, yet rose up and educated themselves either through night courses or through self-education.

I wonder how many Members here failed the first time they ran for office? I did. I was not nominated for Congress the first time I ran. It was the second time I ran that I was nominated. So I do not think it is any crime to flunk a bar examination, and I do not think it is a crime to flunk being successful in an election to Congress or any other public office.

References have been made to Mr. Vanech's taking the bar examination in Tennessee. That is a matter for Tennessee to pass upon. The charge is made that he said he was a resident of Tennesee. He did not say that, as I understand it. His application specifically showed he was a nonresident, but that he would practice law back there. But he has been in the Government service. I think the reasonable inference is that the evidence is not complete until his services with the Government terminate. Certainly no one would expect a man practicing law in Massachusetts to practice actively there if he holds a position in the Department of Justice in Washington, or any other department in Washington. In that respect the evidence is lacking. It leaves it entirely in a speculative field. We should not find anyone guilty, or make an adverse finding against any person based on speculation.

So, without entering into any personal controversy with the views of others, for they can have their own views, I am here to say a word for Gus Vanech. It is very seldom we hear a good word about anybody in these halls. Thank God, most Members do not talk about others outside. Only a few do. Very seldom do we hear a good word about anyone who is not a Member of this House. But I am here today to say a few good and deserving words about Gus Vanech.

I think the efforts being made to pull him down are unjustifiable. Instead of that, he should be complimented. There is not one thing against him as to his official duties. He has been confirmed at least twice by the United States Senate. There is no charge that he did anything wrong in connection with his official duties. It all goes back to some years ago when he went down to Tennessee and took the bar examination as a nonresident. I think it is small stuff to try to injure and destroy a man under those circumstances.

As far as I am concerned, I know Gus Vanech to be an honorable man. I know him to be a trustworthy man. There is nothing against his character or reputation in his official position. And no person can say anything but good of his personal life. A man should be commended instead of being inferentially or directly smeared, because, being denied a college education, he retained his ambition and went forward with determination, studying at night, and ultimately being admitted to practice law, and then rose step by step to the high position he now occupies, that of Deputy United States Attorney General. I would say the same thing about any other man. It is not a question of politics; it is a question involving the dignity of the human being, and above all, decency. It is a question of the individual. I deeply admire any man who raises himself, whether with or without a college education, but I have particular admiration for those who are denied a college education, but who keep faith and educate themselves under great difficulties and make good. That is the case of my good friend, Deputy Attorney General of the United States, Gus Vanech.

FEDERAL SUPPLY MANAGEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBS). The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is timely to review a matter of vital concern to our country. During the Eighty-first and Eighty-second Congresses the attention of our committee has been directed toward improvement of Federal supply management. This field has particular need for emphasis today because of the immediate military expenditures contemplated by our budget.

Our national defense is a matter of grave concern to all of us. We are interested in a sound and strong defense and assistance for the friendly nations who support our principles.

Great areas for economy are centered where the bulk of the money has been appropriated. Approximately $51,000,000,000 of the budget of the President for 1953 has been earmarked for our military defenses. Another $11,000,000,000 has been set aside for our foreign aid and assistance programs. These international expenses are necessary to build up our allies for our mutual security. These appropriated funds contain huge allocations for procurement and distribution of supplies and equipment. It is in this field that the greatest economies can be realized. It is the prime concern of our committee. The Congress and the American people are aware that budgetary requests could be reduced materially if unification and proper administration were insisted upon within the Department of Defense.

I take the position that a meat-ax cut needs no study. It is a reflection on investigative ability. It is much like the patient who complains to the doctor of a heart pain only to have the doctor amputate his legs as a cure. Thus the good part suffers with the bad. In a meat-ax cut the agency which gages its needs with a careful scrutiny is penalized because of actions against budgetary padding by any other governmental unit.

It is true as gospel that great economies will come from a merging of duplicating functions, the development of decisive and advance planning, the elimination of commercial type enterprises, the tightening up of existing facilities, the standardization of forms, systems, methods, items, controls, and better procurement practices. This can result in greater military effectiveness, and don't let anyone tell you otherwise. Economy and efficiency and thrift have been bywords in our Nation since its beginnings. Some people today feel that they are old-fashion virtues. They are wrong, and any drive you take beyond the District line where thrift still prevails will prove this to your satisfaction.

As a means of countering any aggressive move against us, our defenses must be in the strongest position possible. This cannot be attained when we observe poor planning and wasteful practices in some areas. The military clique always falls back on that expression, "War is wasteful." Witnesses before our subcommittee have used this expression. In a recent edition of Air Force Magazine, the statement was carried:

> When Gen. Hap Arnold was confronted with charges of waste in his Air Force, he had a stock answer for his critics. "War itself is wasteful," he said, and that seemed to handle the situation.

To my mind, it would have been much better if General Arnold had said, "War is costly; let us not be wasteful."

Secretary Stimson had high but unrealistic hopes that the National Security Act of 1947 would achieve economy and unity. He said:

> In World War II we accomplished great things by cooperation between two separate Departments, but from that experience we learned that cooperation is not enough. I will not rehearse the unhappy list of duplications, or the instances of friction and disagreement which then hampered our work. But I would emphasize that each succeeding emergency in the last 50 years has made heavier demands on our armed services. The element of economy in our use of our Armed Forces and supplies might well be critical in any future contest. It came very near being critical toward the end of World War II. I do not mean economy in dollars terms (though in the long run we should greatly gain in that respect too under this * * *), but rather that strategic economy which exerts maximum force with limited national resources. Without increased unity we cannot get that kind of economy; we will continue instead to operate with the wasteful opulence that has characterized much of our work in the past. This provides the framework for the increased unit we need.

On the same subject, General Eisenhower had this to say when he testified before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in the summer of 1947, and I quote:

> But I do say this: The kind of economy that comes from efficiency in war is something most important to everybody here. In this past war we came to the point where we were rapidly approaching the limit of our resources. We fought in France under such conditions that I had to take men out of the port battalions and transport battalions and out of all kinds of base and service units and retrain them, in the height of battle, to become Infantry replacements.
>
> The Air Forces came forward and offered me 10,000 of their men if I would give them back 10,000 men partially disabled in battle.
>
> That was what we were up against. It is the economy that is going to come about in the use of national resources when we get into that sort of thing again, if ever, more than in the immediate dollars you are going to save, but you will finally save dollars.

Unhappily, the waste that flourished in many areas of supply management in World War II has not been eliminated.

It has increased with the establishment of an Air Force supply around the globe. If waste jeopardized our security in the last devastating war, as Secretary Stimson states, we are today in greater jeopardy. Our resources are diminishing while our demands increase. Unnecessary and overlapping demands are a threat to our security from a military and from an economic point of view. They must be reduced to a minimum. This can only be done through better organization and administration without impairing effectiveness.

Secretary Stimson also stated that the proponents of the National Security Act intended to create a powerful officer in the position of Secretary of Defense. As he conceived it, this officer, operating for the burdened Commander in Chief, would be able, through a series of basic and forceful directives, to develop an effective and economical defense supply system. I want to call your attention to the fact that as late as last July, or 4 years after the passage of the National Security Act the Secretary issued a new directive which stated:

> The purpose of this directive, therefore, is to clarify and amplify the basic policies which are to govern the operation of the supply systems in the military departments and to delineate more clearly the delegation of authority and the assignment of responsibility among the Munitions Board, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the military dedepartments.

This is an astounding statement. Four years after the Security Act was passed and 2 years after it was amended, the top officers in the Department of Defense either did not know or refused to concede to each other the scope of their mutual duties and responsibilities.

Today the Secretary of Defense is not the powerful office intended by the original act and its amendments. He is in reality a modern Gulliver, tied hand and foot by the Lilliputians in the departments who are vested by law with authority that places them beyond the control of the Secretary. We all know that this is poor organization. It violates the concept of departmental organization expounded by the Hoover Commission and every management firm that the head of a department must have the authority with the right to delegate as might be required. That situation must be corrected. In confirming a Secretary of Defense, the other body has made plain where it will look for accountability and responsibility—secretarial authority should match this on the positive side.

On May 23 the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments approved House Report No. 1994, which had been unanimously approved by our subcommittee. I commend this report to every Member of the House. It is a further step along the route pioneered by House Report No. 658, Eighty-second Congress, first session, and the report on Field Conferences on Federal Supply Management, which was issued by the subcommittee in May 1951.

These reports, which were made as the result of investigations and hearings in many parts of the world during the past year and a half, contain significant recommendations and the conclusions which, if put into effect, will go a long way toward giving us the national defense so vitally needed.

Some 1,500 pages of pointed hearings soon will be issued by the subcommittee. These contain valuable material and show that our military men in many parts of the world realize the need for more unity in our sprawling Department of Defense. It is in the service schools and the Pentagon that unification must be drilled into the hearts and minds of the top brass.

May I also point out that the April 1952 issue of Purchasing magazine contains the results of a poll of professional purchasing men on the subject, Do Military Procurement Policies Need Overhauling? To the question, "Do you believe that, with better purchasing, the military budget could be reduced without hampering the defense effort?" ninety-eight percent of the professional purchasing people replied, "Yes."

To the question, "What suggestions do you have for improving military purchasing?" the professional purchasing men recommended:

> Consolidation and centralized control of buying for all services was recommended by more than two to one. Standardization of materials and products bought, and unified cataloging for all services was next, closely followed by better planning and scheduling of requirements to permit better inventory control and less unnecessary stockpiling. Cutting red tape and use of regular business practice and procedures was cited next. An equal number called for the employment of trained civilian purchasing personnel, with adequate compensation. Many of these demanded complete civilian control of purchasing, with a civilian head of procurement, with cabinet rank. Better training of purchasing personnel and the elimination of personal and political influence in buying were next. Among the recommendations mentioned several times were: geographical decentralization of military procurement; less changing of specifications on repeat orders; more orders for small business; and screening of government contracts by special committee.

I am sure that the Members of the House will be interested in a brief summary of conclusions and recommendations contained in House Report No. 1994.

First of all, the experience under the so-called unification act has been disappointing. The Secretary of Defense needs a stronger and clearer legislative mandate for military unification.

The Air Force continues a wasteful, useless, and extravagant expansion of a separate supply system for common items. Such a system for common items was not contemplated by the framers of the National Security Act nor the Congress. Triplication now has replaced duplication in military supply—see page 29, Report No. 1994.

To substantiate the statement which I made that the expansion of the Air Force into its present state was not contemplated by the Congress, I refer you to the report, page 29, and the dialog between that distinguished former Member of this House, Mr. Wadsworth, who was also a Senator, in his conversation with General Spaatz:

> Mr. WADSWORTH. Looking into the picture of the future, General, with the establishment of a separate Department of Air, is it your opinion, and of course one can only express an opinion concerning the future, that the furnishing of supplies which are common, we will say, to the ground Army and the personnel of the Air Corps, will still be done by the Quartermaster General?
>
> General SPAATZ. Yes, sir. It is my opinion that cross-servicing and cross-procurement will be entirely practicable and efficient, providing that there is a single department and a head that we can go to so that we can be assured that the services we should get will be given us.
>
> Mr. WADSWORTH. In other words, you do not visualize the establishment of an office such as the Office of Quartermaster General in the Department of Air?
>
> General SPAATZ. No, sir. We will depend upon the Quartermaster Corps for the procurement of our quartermaster supplies.
>
> Mr. WADSWORTH. And the same observation might hold true with respect to the Ordnance Department?
>
> General SPAATZ Yes, sir, and the Signal Corps.
>
> Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course, you have special requirements in the field of ordnance in connection with which you would be very active, but normally the supply of ordnance material would come from the source from which it is coming now?
>
> General SPAATZ. Yes, sir.
>
> Mr. WADSWORTH. You do not anticipate any duplication in that?
>
> General SPAATZ. We do not. There is no intention to establish duplicating services in the Air Force.

Much more needs to be done in the military to develop property consciousness, supply discipline, and training and effective utilization of existing property before buying more. One year after the end of World War II there was as much material left over in the European theater as we had used during 4 years of exhaustive warfare.

The Munitions Board has been an ineffective organization for many reasons. In view of the importance of the work that the Munitions Board should do, the subcommittee recommends that—

> In accord with General Eisenhower's recommendations, the Secretary of Defense should be vested with all necessary authority to improve and integrate military supply systems; and intervening or independent layers of authority in this field should be removed.
>
> The position of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Supply should be created, this officer by direct delegation from the Secretary to assume all functions of the Munitions Board, or to act as Chairman of the Board.
>
> The primary mission of the Assistant Secretary for Supply should be to work out, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense and without hindrance by the departmental representatives, a comprehensive program to integrate common supply and service activities among all the military forces, including the recruitment and training of a professional corps of supply personnel in the Department of Defense, the development of standardized defense-wide procedures and forms, unified procurement, the establishment of common depots and other common supply and service installations throughout the United States, and development of unified logistics organizations overseas. In this capacity the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Supply should have advisory assistance from the three military departments.

It is common knowledge that there is great and useless duplication and overlapping in the military procurement program. This leads to waste of manpower and materials and is decidedly inflationary.

A recent release of the reliable Committee for Economic Development on the subject Tax and Expenditures Policy for 1952 contains this material:

The recommendation to hold down Federal expenditures raises two questions:

1. Can it be done without impairing provision for the national security and other essential Government functions?

2. Is it realistic to expect that expenditures will be held down, even though it be agreed that they can be? We believe that the possibility of success in the effort to balance the budget is indicated by a growing determination on the part of the public, the Congress and certain Government agencies.

We believe that the world situation requires a rapid build-up of our own military forces and assistance to friendly nations in building up their military and economic strength. But, with much of the necessary information not publicly available, we are unable to form a judgment about whether the programs should be of the size contemplated in the budget or, say 10 percent smaller or larger. Accordingly we are assuming here that the objective is to carry out military and foreign-assistance programs of the scale contemplated in the budget. We believe, however, that more economical operation can substantially reduce the expenditures required for the programs contemplated in the budget without reducing the programs themselves. We also believe that foreign assistance—military and nonmilitary—is as necessary to our own security as our own military program.

ECONOMIZING WITHOUT LOSS OF SECURITY

Substantial economies in the security programs can be achieved in the following ways:

1. More rigorous screening of procurement requirements.

2. Reduction of inventory requirements through standardization and integration.

3. More unified procurement.

4. Design of military equipment to permit use of the most economical production methods.

5. Design of military equipment to eliminate unnecessary performance characteristics.

6. Elimination of specifications that unnecessarily limit sources of supply.

7. Use of foreign sources of supply when they are cheaper. (In this connection, we believe that the President should report to Congress each year on the budgetary costs of compliance with the buy American and shipping preference statutes.)

8. Economy in construction.

We believe that with vigorous and discriminating effort a saving of about $4,000,000,000 could be achieved in the annual expenditures of the Department of Defense (including foreign military aid) without impairing the effectiveness of the security programs. This would be a reduction of slightly less than 10 percent in the expenditures of the Department, exclusive of military pay. This rate of saving applied to the Department's program for the next few years would add up to many times $4,000,000,000.

In conclusion I want to say that our defense mobilization effort is not making satisfactory progress. Lack of funds from the Congress is not alone the reason for the lag. The military now have on hand billions of unexpended funds. Money is not the answer to all their problems. Too much easy money makes careless and loose management. Loose management inevitably rots the core. The only true answer to the best defense is better organization and management.

Now I know that this is an old problem. Many Presidents and Congresses have tried to get better management in the military establishment. Effort after effort for the past 100 years has failed or has been only partly successful. But I say to you with the confidence resulting from a great amount of responsible investigation and study that we in Congress must persistently and aggressively exercise our constitutional responsibility to obtain defense within the bounds of economic prudence. It can be done if the Congress wants it hard enough.

It is the old story here that when the camel gets his nose under the tent he eventually gets his body under it, and the Air Force, as magnificent as they are, have got their nose under the tent, and it has been developed by this committee, after repeated denial by high-ranking officers who came before the committee at the time the committee was preparing itself on briefing to go overseas. They denied that this very thing was taking place.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to make this observation. Some 3 years ago when my fellow townsman was named Secretary of National Defense he attempted to carry out the instructions to unify the Armed Forces, and effected a saving of about $2,000,000,000 in our annual expenditure for military purposes, but when trouble started in Korea and we did not have the necessary defense items, the very people—Members of Congress I am speaking about—who were patting him on the back for the good job he did, turned against him, and led the fight that resulted in his ouster as Secretary of Defense. I am wondering, under those circumstances, if you can get capable men to serve their country in a position of that kind.

Mr. BONNER. Later on I will make some reference to the finding by the gentleman you just referred to. He found that that very thing I am discussing here was true, but he did not have the authority and power to cope with it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

(On request of Mr. BROOKS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BONNER was allowed to proceed for three additional minutes.)

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana who has been a most effective and faithful and efficient member of the Subcommittee on Expenditures which got out the recent report, and which has looked into the very important matter which we are discussing, not only in hearings where we had people come before you and tell you this, that and the other, but in personal investigations where we walked through warehouses, where we walked in open storage and saw these things going on. The National Defense heads have bought so much material that they cannot get warehouses built fast enough to put it in; they have to store it now out in the fields. If they had stopped their purchasing for just 60 days, the price of things would have come down a great deal in America. They have enough goods on hand to last them heaven knows how long.

I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. HARDEN. I wish to say that it has been my very happy privilege to be the ranking minority member of the Bonner subcommittee, and I am very grateful for the part I had in making this investigation. The taxpayers of America should be very grateful to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] for his untiring efforts in their behalf. I wish each and every one of them could have heard him in his most efficient and forceful manner all around the world; how he endeavored to impress upon the people in the Foreign Service and the leaders of the military, all branches, that they must practice some economy if we are to preserve America, because the people of America are very much overburdened with taxes.

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentlewoman for her contribution. Were it true that I had not seen any of this I could not say the things I am saying. I have the biggest place in the world in my heart for the men who wear the national uniform; they are great patriots; they are men we all admire, but there is just something wrong in the managerial part of their business. Whatever, it is, it is debatable how to cure it but it is true nevertheless that there is a whole lot of waste that could be cleared up.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I would be the last person in the House to detract one bit from the great ability, the great effort, and the great sincerity which the gentleman has shown in his investigation of this matter, and I am just as strong as the gentleman is in feeling that the armed services must reduce their expenditures to the very minimum that they can reduce them in order to do a good job. I have discussed the matter with the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I may say parenthetically to the gentleman that when the amendment to the Unification Act came before the Committee on Armed Services, I took the lead in supporting that and took the lead in speaking for it on the floor of the House of Representatives when it came here.

My theory has always been that under unification you have to have equality also. Where I think I differ perhaps a little bit from the gentleman in his idea, certainly not in his goal, is that I feel that the Air Force has to be given an equal position in the Defense Establishment. We cannot let the Army, for instance, do the procurement for the Air Force, or let the Navy do the procurement for the Army, and expect all of them to be equal. They are not.

Mr. BONNER. If the gentleman had seen the parallel supply systems I have

seen in France and Germany, and the continued building of warehouses and the vacating of space that cost an enormous amount of money, he would have views similar to mine.

Mr. BROOKS. I do not differ with the gentleman in that respect at all.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I commend the gentleman on his statement and his leadership of the committee that, in my judgment, has produced a report which every Member of the House should read. It should be a basic approach to improvement and the achievement of more businesslike methods in the national defense.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include pertinent evidence and facts on the subject on which I have been speaking. They will clearly show this House that the point I am bringing forth is well substantiated and based on proper grounds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 45 minutes.

THE KOREAN SITUATION

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am today inserting into the RECORD two editorials, one from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the other from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, commenting upon the shocking testimony of General Collins to the effect that there was a shortage of ammunition in Korea and intimating that the recent limitation upon the expenditures of the armed services imposed by the Congress had something to do with the situation. I am also moved to make further comment on this in view of the concern expressed by the Speaker, Friday, during debate on the extension of the Mutual Security Act, on General Collins' statement, and the relief the Speaker said he felt after hearing General Ridgway's report to the House last Thursday.

There have been similar statements recently by other high-ranking officers in the Armed Forces that our preparedness program will be hampered by the recent actions of the House on the military appropriations.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch is charitable, in my opinion, in stating in their editorial that "We prefer to take the Chief of Staff at his word" and not as others might say, this is a Pentagon scare to get its $52,000,000,000 program approved. I am among those who feel the Pentagon is attempting to scare the American people.

However, the essential thing is to get to the bottom of this entire matter and find out just wherein lies the responsibility for the law in end-item production for the armed services. If Congress has indeed been at fault let us find that out. If the civilian production has been at fault, let us find that out.

And if, on the other hand, there is no fault and the military is trying to create a scare, I suggest that some very prompt court martials are in order for certain high-ranking officers in the Pentagon. It is a most dastardly unpatriotic and, indeed, treasonable action to attempt to scare the American people without proper foundation. If the Pentagon leaders are telling the truth, that is one thing, but, if, on the other hand, they are telling half-truths, concealing the real truth or falsifying the facts as to deliberately present a false picture to the American people and the Congress, then indeed we must move and move rapidly against such would-be destroyers of our Republic.

Now I happen to know a little something about the 105-millimeter artillery shell program and the delays experienced in expanding the needed production facilities for this item in the small arms ammunition plant at St. Louis, Mo., where a good bit of this production comes.

In the first part of December 1951 I received a call from one of the executives of a small contracting firm in St. Louis asking what help I could give, if any, in getting released to them sufficient gas pipe of 4-inch and 6-inch diameter, which was necessary in order for them to complete their job of installing new gas facilities needed for the expansion of the small-arms plant in St. Louis. The expansion of the small-arms plant in St. Louis, he informed me, was a top-priority job because of the shortage of 105-millimeter shells which the plant fabricated. I immediately called Washington, D. C., to talk to DPA officials. From there on the merry-go-round began. The Army engineers were in the picture, along with two other agencies. I do not remember how many phone calls I made to different officials, but I well recall coming to the conclusion in a couple of days that somebody had dropped the ball, and the main concern of everyone was to get the blame off their back, and getting the pipe released was of secondary importance. I finally took the bull by the horns and called John Small, Chairman of the Munitions Board, personally. I told him I was sorry to have to take up his personal time but, if the situation was true that this 105-millimeter shell program was of top importance, then I thought his personal time was necessary. He called me back quite shortly, told me that there was no question about the importance of the program, and that he would follow through personally to see that the materials were released. It took him about 24 hours longer than he anticipated to get the job done, but it was done.

Nevertheless, probably 2 months had already been lost in the program. If the contractor had continued going through channels and not called upon me, and I had not taken the initiative to follow through, and we had not had men like John Small in Washington, we would still be waiting for the Army engineer general—whose name I will not divulge at this time—and other people involved to pass the buck for the snafu.

Now, I would like to ask General Collins publicly what has been the follow-through on the Army engineer snafu—if that is where the buck finally rested, and it seemed to me that was where it would end up—and why, when I interposed myself in the picture, the main efforts were not to get the job done, but to cover up mistakes. Further, is this a sample of what lies behind the ammunition shortage, if there is such a shortage? Let us get away from these generalities and pin point our problems. And if General Collins is not presenting a true picture as to the reason for ammunition shortage, or there really is no shortage, then we need a more reliable Chief of Staff.

Now, secondly, I want to discuss briefly another scare statement of the high Army brass set out in the House committee report accompanying the Mutual Security Act of 1952. This is a statement of General Gruenther in summarizing Soviet military strength and it appears on page 8 of the report:

> The Soviets have some 20,000 operational aircraft in the Soviet Air Force. * * * What we say about the Soviet Air Force is that it is an effective air force largely because of its numbers. It has quality but its pilots are probably not as well trained as ours. But anything that they lack in quality they make up in quantity and, if a conflict should take place, the Soviet Air Force would be a very, very potent force against us.
>
> On the naval side * * * There are approximately 300 submarines in the Soviet Navy. * * *
>
> You can get an idea of the importance of this figure when you realize that when the Germans started the last war they had something less than 60 submarines. You will recall the great amount of trouble that those 60 submarines gave. It would be an error, however, to feel that because the Soviets have five times that number that they have five times an effective force. They are not that good as mariners or as submariners yet. They know they are not that good. They are working very hard to improve their techniques.

This is the gist of the statement. It is incomplete. It is slanted. I am certain that General Gruenther is an able general and so I come to no other conclusion but that it is deliberately slanted.

First of all, let me state that I spent 4 years of World War II in the Naval Air Force antisubmarine branch. There is one basic thing about both submarines and airplanes, and I might add about mechanized divisions, which the general also included in his scare remarks about Soviet military strength but which I did not quote. That basic thing is fuel.

The limiting feature of our mechanized Army, our Navy, and our Air Force is fuel. It is not merely the production of fuel alone, it is the transportation of fuel.

Now I would ask General Gruenther to speak truthfully and state whether he believes: First, The Russians have the petroleum production and refining capacity to make an effective fighting force out of 20,000 operational aircraft including 4,000 jet airplanes, whose fuel consumption is so extreme as to amount

What is the matter that production does not now come up to battle needs? What is the reason that so much can be raised in revenue and spent in military activites and this basic requirement not be met after almost 2 years of the Korean war?

There are those who will say that General Collins went to Congress to present testimony that would make our Senators and Representatives afraid to retain a $46,000,000,000 ceiling on military outlays. Some doubtless will see this as a Pentagon scare to get its $52,000,000,000 program approved.

We prefer to take the Chief of Staff at his word. When he says ammunition is rationed, he should be believed. But as soon as he makes such a statement, the American people should know the reason why. How can it be that production is falling so short? What would we do if, through some grave misfortune, the Korean war should turn into a full-scale world war III?

General Collins needs to tell us more—or General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or even Secretary of Defense Lovett. If any type of ammunition which is needed in Korea is in such short supply that it must be rationed, this country should know the full facts. Who is responsible and why?

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of May 7, 1952]

STRANGE TESTIMONY

Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Army Chief of Staff, told a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee that some American ammunition has been rationed in Korea because it is not being produced as fast as it is being used. This is a statement shocking to the whole Nation. It is also deeply confusing.

It did not help the confusion when a communiqué from the Far East command in Tokyo, which arrived by coincidence immediately after General Collins' testimony, declared ammunition is plentiful.

Some types of cartridges and hand grenades are being rationed, it was explained, "to prevent waste * * * a standard procedure in all Army commands." Allocations, according to the communiqué, are adequate to the present situation, and the rationing is simply to create reserves, a normal military precaution.

The Chief of Staff was pleading with Congress against the decision of the House, which voted to cut $4,713,845,216 from the President's $51,000,000,000 defense budget. He also was vigorously opposed to the House ceiling on defense spending—$46,000,000,000 during the next fiscal year.

If General Collins meant to imply that ammunition rationing in Korea had any connection with appropriations for defense, he was far off base. He could not seriously have intended to leave such impression. Yet why did he bring the matter into his argument against paring defense funds?

From the Far East communiqué, it seems there is no shortage of ammunition there. In fact, the command expressly states that. If there were any scarcity, it certainly is not the fault of congressional appropriation. The American public has been shelling out of tax moneys for every branch of defense. Last January the Defense Department reported it had a balance of some $90,000,000,000 on hand, the unspent balance of previous years.

If there is any need for rationing, beyond normal caution against waste, it is because of slow production or faulty military procurement. It is not because of fund lacks. General Collins ought to have made that clear. Failure to do so does not seem candid.

General Bradley, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, also opposed a cut in the defense budget, but he followed a much different tack. He did not want any further major cuts—no military official does—but he particularly emphasized that the $46,000,000,000 limitation on all types of defense expenditure could be militarily disastrous.

With that thesis thoughtful Americans should agree. It would be dangerous to defense programs, really stupid planning, to set an arbitrary ceiling over expenditure of available funds. That does not mean the House reduction in new appropriations may not be justified. We think it is justified. If events should show otherwise, a supplementary allotment could be made later in the year.

In dealing with Congress and the American people, utmost frankness should be expected from our military leaders. There is an obvious suspicion General Collins dragged in the dubious reference to Korean ammunition rationing as a shriveled bit of red herring.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

UNITED STATES MILITARY PLANE OUTPUT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have been appalled by the number of statements, and the number of admissions appearing in the newspapers the last few days concerning the failure of the United States military plane output. I want to quote just briefly from the Washington Evening Star of yesterday's issue:

UNITED STATES STILL FAR BEHIND SOVIET IN PLANE OUTPUT, SMALL TELLS SENATORS—MUNITIONS BOARD CHIEF SAYS LIMIT ON FUNDS WILL CUT PLANNED DELIVERIES

John D. Small, Chairman of the Munitions Board, told Congress today "We are still far behind" Russia in current warplane production, particularly of jet aircraft.

Mr. Speaker, more and more Americans demand to know what has happened to our Air Force:

Why Russian planes outnumber our jets over Korea.

Why MIG Alley has not long ago been blasted out of the sky.

And why this Nation, which emerged from World War II as the most powerful air power the world has ever seen, now stands degraded as an air power.

The major answer to these questions is that brass hats in the Pentagon permitted the United States to lose the battle of aircraft production in one of the most sickening exhibitions of inertia on record.

It seems impossible, but it happened—in spite of $52,000,000,000 appropriated by Congress for the Air Force since 1945, including more than $1,500,000,000 for research and development.

Part of the story has come to light, that is, how Truman, in October of 1949, impounded almost a billion dollars of Air Force funds, refusing to let it grow to 70 groups, as appropriated for by Congress, and instead relegating it to only 48 groups. But, as far as I know, the major portion of the story never was told.

On VE-day or thereabouts, it was discovered that the Germans for some time had been mass-producing aircraft much like the United States mass-produces automobiles, in assembly-line fashion. The Germans were forging in single huge pieces, wing sections, spars, ribs, and frames, stamping them out the way auto manufacturers do the top of a sedan. This process required huge forging and extrusion presses, weighing up to 50,000 tons, standing some five stories hign and requiring special buildings. The Germans had at least three of these presses operating at the end of the war. We got two of them—the two smallest ones of about 20,000 tons—while Russia grabbed the third, by far the best and largest, weighing about 50,000 tons.

Here, then, was the master key to the mass-production of metal aircraft. The Russians recognized it immediately and went right to work copying the German presses and gearing plane production accordingly. As time went on, this process of forging giant pieces became even more valuable. Planes became faster, thereby requiring stronger construction. And single-piece construction is stronger than small pieces welded or riveted together. It is also lighter, giving aircraft more speed and cruising range. And needless to say production by this method is much faster, perhaps 25 percent or more, and much less expensive—to the estimated tune of a billion dollars per 500 planes.

But what did the great brains in the Pentagon do about this master key to production which the Germans left for them on a silver platter and which the Russians quickly grasped to their bosoms? Nothing. Absolutely nothing until the summer of 1951. By then, Air Force brass finally got around to bringing the two German presses to the United States and asking Congress for $210,000,000 to build more such presses. Nearly another year passed, until February 1952, when the brass came before the House Appropriations Committee to ask for about $400,000,000. They had "miscalculated" the amount required when they requested the $210,000,000, they claimed. Eventually a half billion dollars will be needed.

The fund was appropriated but it will not mean mass-production forgings now. "Not until 1953 at the earliest," says the Air Force. It will take that long or longer to get the presses constructed and producing—some 8 or 9 years after finding the key in Germany in 1945. This puts us 8 or 9 years behind the Russians. On top of this, the Air Force claims it is impossible to obtain in the United States the necessary castings for constructing the presses, so a team of experts, mobilizers, and procurement officers, has departed for Europe, with blank checks in hand, to attempt to buy the castings in Germany or France.

Thus we go on and on, laboriously and time-consumingly fashioning planes out of small pieces, in the reluctant words of hindsighted Undersecretary of the Air Force Gilpatrick, while the Russians stamp them out like sedan tops.

A leading aircraft manufacturer said, "If we could forge to size—using presses like those found in Germany in 1945—we would save an incalculable amount of money. It is just good sense to design airplanes with a minimum amount of pieces."

Is it too much to expect "good sense" in our Military Establishment which is the largest and most expensive enterprise on the face of the earth?

to its greatest limitation as a military weapon.

Second. Whether the Russians have the railroads, including the necessary rolling stock, or the equivalent in highways, including the necessary trucks or the pipelines, to effectively deliver gasoline or other fuel from the wells to the refineries to the bases.

The answer to both those questions gives the real answer to Russia's fighting effectiveness in the air and it will differ depending upon which sector of the Soviet Union any battle might occur.

Furthermore, the limitation upon submarines is likewise fuel. It is not so much the consumption of fuel and amount of fuel available as it is getting the fuel to the subs for refueling. In other words, it is bases available for the subs. What effectively defeated the German submarine menace more than anything else was the Bay of Biscay blockade, the blockade of the German sub bases.

Now I do not have to dwell on the extreme limitation of sub bases available to Soviet Russia. In comparison to what Germany had after the fall of France, and that was when we had our problems with the subs, what Russia has is ridiculous. Gruenther's half statement about 300 subs without the qualification of what is necessary to make a sub an effective fighting weapon is "scare talk."

I need hardly mention the mechanized divisions' dependence on fuel. To get fuel to mechanized divisions you need roads or railroads. Has Soviet Russia suddenly come forth with a great highway system? And a great railway system? If so, they have accomplished a miracle. Regardless, these are the limiting factors in Russia's capacity to wage war. General Gruenther knows it, most Americans who fought in World War II know it.

I do not believe in underestimating the power of an enemy. In fact, I would always include a good margin of safety in planning to meet him. But, likewise, I do not believe in trying to fool the American people and scaring them when there is not such a basis for the scare.

The American people and the Congress are willing to face up to the realities of the day but they are not willing to be bamboozled and treated as if the science of war had suddenly become a field that ordinary minds could not comprehend. I shall quote at this point from the father of military scientists. It would do well for all of us to give heed to his words.

This is quoted from Principles of War by Von Clausewitz:

The principles of war are in themselves extremely simple and quite within the reach of sound common sense, even though they require more special knowledge in tactics than in strategy. This knowledge is of such small scope that it does not compare with any other subject in extent and variety. Extensive knowledge and deep learning are by no means necessary, nor are extraordinary intellectual faculties. If, in addition to experienced judgment, a special mental quality is required, it would be, after all has been said, cunning or shrewdness. For a long time the contrary has been maintained either because of a false veneration for the subject or because of the vanity of the authors who have written about it. Unprejudiced reflection should convince us of this, and experience only makes this conviction stronger. As recently as the revolutionary war (German, not American, my note), we find many men who proved themselves able military leaders, yea, even military leaders of the first order, without having had any military education.

Now I appreciate that it will be asserted that these words do not hold true about war today. But I submit they are as completely true then as now. The complexities of war have not grown in military science, if you please, but in matters of design, production, supply, and communication, and all four of those fields are essentially civilian fields, and the greatest experts in those fields today are, and probably always will be, civilians. And this remains true even though the military have been making valiant attempts to move in and take charge of these fields.

The Bonner subcommittee report on military procurement and supply has just become available. I hope every one of the Members of the House will not only read the report of the subcommittee but the lengthy hearings upon which the report is based. I want to call to the House's attention that, coupled with the experience, devotion to duty, and impartiality of the chairman of this subcommittee the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], and I am happy to pay him this tribute that comes from my heart, three of the members—and though I am among the three I will make the statement—were World War II veterans of considerable experience. I refer to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON]. All three of us had responsible positions during the last war which required that we become closely familiar with all phases of military science from logistics through strategy down to tactics in our own branches of the service. Supply and maintenance are two of the greatest problems of modern warfare, and the two are interrelated. In fact, modern warfare is limited by these features as I have suggested in my comments on General Gruenther's scare statements. The Bonner report is not an encouraging report on our own preparedness, when you read between the lines and extend your thinking to logical conclusions. We are not effectively utilizing what we have. But this is not an appropriation problem, it is a production and distribution problem.

Though the subject of the Bonner report is supply and maintenance, I have concluded the greatest problem that faces our defense forces today concerns personnel. It is the personnel system which stems from the indefensible academy system. Here the original selection of our officers is based in politics, from which it never separates itself. Through the academy system we have a built-in military lobby. It was forcefully brought home to me one day when I was discussing a matter with my good and worthy colleague from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], the former chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and now ranking minority member. In his candid way Dewey said to me: "Well, Tom, that's not what my boys tell me." I said, "What do you mean, 'your boys'?" He said, "Why, the officers I appointed to the academy." They start in politics, and their promotions are watched politically. Their careers are tied into politics. But likewise when their budgets come before the Congress for scrutiny their built-in political connections become most effective. Is it any wonder that Reserve officers or officers coming into the armed services in other ways seem to run up against an insurmountable barrier, or that the real military man is constantly passed over by his more politically astute classmate?

I want to conclude with an observation I made in an introduction to an address I delivered in April 1950 before the Korean war entitled "Military Organization in a Democracy":

The military organization in any society must be sufficiently large and efficient to protect the society of which it is a part. However, if it becomes too elaborate and too large in peacetime in a society which is a democracy, it in itself destroys the very democracy which it is set up to protect. The threats to a certain society may sometimes be so great that the society can only endure as a military state. However, any society which concludes that it must forego its pacific organization to become a military state should, it seems to me, proceed quite warily on this course. The 3,000 years of recorded history (of sufficient detail to draw conclusions) reveal too many instances of military states arising as a result of false fears on the part of the citizens, or, in case of well-based fears as a result of a too great and unnecessary regard for security at the sacrifice of all other human values.

Every society must decide for itself as accurately as it can (1) what fears it should reasonably have, and (2) what must be done to protect itself against that which is feared. False fears may be built into the minds of the citizens maliciously so that they, in a panicky way, may rush to the strong for protection. The strong, in turn, as history records it, if they are acting maliciously, will then prescribe a program far and away beyond anything necessary to protect against the fears they have built up, and because of the panic the program prescribed will be adopted.

Because of the multitudinous examples in history where military organizations (the strong) have either maliciously or innocently, but equally effectively, forced a state to become a military state, our founding fathers, who were acutely aware of history, were as fearful of the establishment of a military caste in the new Republic as they were anxious to rid the country of the nobility caste.

We have real cause to pause and reflect in this America of 1952.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 6, 1952]

GENERAL COLLINS' SHOCKING TESTIMONY

Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Army Chief of Staff, must have shocked members of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee when he told them that important types of ammunition have been rationed in Korea. Certainly the news comes as a shock to the rank and file of Americans.

Here the taxpayers are going deep into their pockets to meet the biggest outlay for defense in history and at the same time the highest ranking officer in the Department of the Army can say that "production does not equal normal battle expenditures."

each of us, is proof that our government is neither all corruption nor poorly administered. A casual look at the abundance the masses of our people enjoy is positive evidence that we are not near the end of a wrecked economy. And it is indeed gratifying to so obviously sense and feel the depth of a religious devotion and warmth of a Christian friendship which assures us that we still have moral fiber.

As we all know, we have not attained perfection, and we never will. And, it would be foolish to become satisfied with our accomplishments. We have ample reason to expect continued advancement. But achievements lie ahead. There is no future in going back. We must keep the gains we have made in industry, in labor, in services, and on the farms. And I repeat the basis of our marvelous attainment is the productive abundance of our soil and the strength of our agriculture.

Since the calamity wailers have only criticism for our present abundance and steady progress, and present no practical alternatives, the only conclusion left is that they are opposed to progress and thus think we should turn back. The way back would be easily found. Much more easily found than the unchartered road ahead. The way back is plainly marked. The kerosene lamp would light the path for a while, and when it has burned out, we could use a tallow candle. Worn out fields and gullied hillsides would serve as landmarks. And, then there would be busted banks, smokeless factory chimneys, empty pay envelopes, and bread lines as further guides. Yes, the way back is well marked. And, it can be easily found by just pulling out the keystone that holds up our economic bridge and the whole thing will come tumbling down. To further curtail and destroy our present farm programs, would be a sure first step on the way back.

We must continue to move forward. And, surely those who only find fault and who clamor for drastic changes, and who long for the road back, do not realize just what their course would be like. As I have said, the road back would be easily found because it is so plainly and forcibly marked. We would find along this road 12,000,000 to 15,000,000 people dragging themselves along after being turned out of their jobs. We would find the spots where the bread lines and soup kitchens had been. We would find bleaching on the sands of industrial stagnation, the skeletons of thousands of bankrupt businesses. We would also find the scars left by strike-breakers, "yellow-dog-contracts" and slave labor. Yes, the trail back is well marked—marked by poverty, bankruptcy, and disillusionment.

Before starting back, we should take a good look at what we will have to leave if we go back. Because if we go back, we cannot take the good things we now have with us. The farmer will leave the farm he now owns, equipped with electricity and modern conveniences, to go back to a rented or mortgaged farm without electricity or modern conveniences. He must also leave his bank account and his farm support prices. He will leave his $2 wheat, $1.75 corn, 80-cent oats and 40-cent cotton. From the highest standard he has ever known, the farmer will trudge his weary way if the backward group have their way, to 38-cent wheat, 31-cent corn, 15-cent oats, and 5-cent cotton. Yes, the farmer had better give a good look at what he must leave in order to go back.

The industrial worker also had better do some careful looking before he casts his lot with those who advocate drastic changes. He will, in most cases, give up a home he owns, a savings account, adequate food, and the fullest pay envelope he has ever had, plus social security benefits. From the best economic position, he has ever occupied, he will go back to a rented house, longer hours, less pay, and the ravages of inadequate food and disease with charity thrown in for his old age.

With all the abundance, happiness, freedom, and security which the masses of us enjoy our ownselves, and with the opportunity to advance still further, just who really wants to throw a monkey wrench into this progress machinery and change to something different—something we know not what—only that it is something we must go back to.

Why look back? It is a brighter and better future that we want. And we have ample reason to expect better things ahead. Soil conservation and intelligent use will bring an improved and strengthened agriculture. A more efficient industrial machine, with improvements in both technology and the human element, will add strength to our already abundant economy. And a maintained proper integration and balance between the two will result in a secure and even higher standard of living than we now have. Yes, forward is the direction we want to go. Certainly, there is no future in going back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

"ELECTRIC CONSUMERS CONFERENCE"

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, with extreme reluctance and only from a deep feeling of apprehension I have dropped into the legislative hopper a resolution for the investigation of a meeting now being held in the Willard Hotel, called by its sponsors the self-styled Electric Consumers Conference.

My reluctance comes primarily from the fact that the Congress already is heavily loaded with investigative committees.

Further, it has been frequently said that this, the year 1952, is a political year. By implication a political year must be or is assumed to be a year of blight, of obloquy, of name calling, of abnormal behavior by normal persons.

The truth, of course, is that every year is or should be a political year. In a republic every year should be a political year. It happens that 1952 is a period when our attention is focused more than usually on politics. Any move a man in public life may make is suspect to the suggestion of political motive.

I have no political motive in introducing this resolution.

It happens, however, that as the ranking minority member of the Public Works Committee, I have been subjected to pressures to favor Federal ownership in an area always previously satisfactorily preoccupied by taxpaying private enterprise—electric power production.

The feeling of apprehension which prompts my action today was brought to a crux yesterday in a letter from the vice president and director of organization of the Utility Workers Union of America, CIO, Mr. Harold J. Straub, directing my attention to a recent resolution by the national convention of Electric Utility Workers, which he represents, which I should like to incorporate as part of my remarks. It would appear that the name of this organization is being used in a manner running entirely counter to the duly authorized resolutions of this union which is a part of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The general feeling that this alleged conference is a publicity stunt and not a true expression of the farmers and the workers which the so-called sponsoring organizations are alleged to represent is shared by me.

Congress has many times investigated the legislative pressure activities of the privately owned electric companies. Their lobby is now practically a goldfish bowl.

Never before, however, has an attempt been made by the Congress to examine the motives, the sincerity, and the financing of the vested interests in Federal ownership.

It is an open scandal that when private utilities go to Wall Street to raise money in the form of bonds they must advertise for public bids which usually result in a very narrow margin of profit to the bankers—generally less than 1 percent—while at the same time tax-escaped revenue bonds of public ownership power units are financed by investment bankers at a margin of profit 5 to 10 times greater than they could receive under private enterprise.

In 1947, in 1949, and now in 1952, we have had these electric consumer conferences here in Washington. The first was entitled "Valley Authority Conference," the second was the "National Emergency Conference on Natural Resources." In both instances these so-called conferences were called at a time when the aggrandizement of Federal power ownership was threatened by congressional appropriation reductions.

These alleged conferences proved to be pressure group publicity stunts to save, if possible, appropriations for the Department of the Interior for Federal power.

It would be asking too much of our credulity to suggest that we believe that there is no relation between this third conference and the fact that this week or next the Subcommittee on Appropriations of another body is meeting to consider and decide on the action of that

Perhaps the most important question of all is this: What has become of the much-publicized and vaunted American industrial know-how?

Contemplating Russia's good production facilities of the MIG–15 jet, compared with the Air Force's long sleep with respect to the giant forging presses, Gen. C. B. Stone, Deputy Chief of Staff, sadly admitted to the Appropriations Committee:

> I do not think we can say that we have any monopoly in this country of production brains any more.

There you have the understatement of the year on the subject of brains and the Air Force.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I want to thank the gentleman for bringing this matter up. I refer him to a letter that I inserted in the RECORD today from the United States Air Force Department. The letter stated unequivocally and in no uncertain terms that the cost of planes, the speed of getting planes, the rapidity with which we can get them does not enter into the picture in awarding airplane contracts. I refer the gentleman to that letter. That is the reason why we have no planes.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his observation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

CONTINUED PROGRESS OR RETREAT

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, adequate farm production is indispensable to the health of our people, and to the Nation's economy and its defense. If we are to remain free individuals with abundance, happiness, and security, adequate farm production must be constantly increased and maintained. Food, clothing and shelter are the essential elements in the basic foundation of any standard of living.

Throughout all the years from Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden to this present hour the standard of living, the individual freedom, and the security of all nations and all groups has been set by the quantity and quality of the food and fiber different groups were able to provide for themselves.

Any national group which must use all its available manpower to produce food for the group, has never, and will never develop a desirable standard of living. Such groups will not be able to resist the pressures of expanding communism which is so active in the world today.

In our own early colonial period, a very big share of our manpower was necessary to provide food and fiber. But through the years, a less and less share of manpower was spent in this necessity. One hundred years ago a farm worker in this country provided food and fiber for four persons. Now, one person engaged in agriculture provides these essentials for about 15 people.

This has left more and more of our people free to develop manufacturing plants, transportation facilities, and better means of communication, to build bridges and skyscrapers, to go to school, and to do the numerous things that make us the great country we are today.

Thus, by giving attention to supplying our basic needs through our basic industry, agriculture, we have developed for ourselves the highest standard of living that human beings have ever known since the beginning of time.

Other nations before us have achieved commendable standards but because they failed to correctly evaluate their basic food sources, they have weakened from within, and now their greatness and their individual freedoms are merely incidents of record on the musty pages of history. The ancient Egyptians, the land of the two rivers—the Tigres and the Euphrates—the great Roman Empire enjoyed their days of glory. They mined their glamor from an abundant soil. But that soil without proper care was finally exhausted, and the economic and social structures resting solely upon it, fell into shameful and needless ruins.

To the early scientist, the low and dirty soil was not a proper object for scientific study. The early scientist studied geometry, astronomy, and art. They looked upon tilling the soil as the most humble of tasks. Agriculture was the work for slaves.

Even today, here in this grand country of ours, there are some who still have this feeling. To them, a student of our basic resources—the soil—is not considered quite so learned as one who examines the broken atom or calculates the power of radiation.

It is not my intention to belittle any scientific study, since it all has useful purposes. I do want, however, to emphasize the importance of soils because their study and their study only leads to more and better food. As we learn further how to preserve, and at the same time increase the productive capacity of our farms, we will be able to advance our modern civilization.

We have developed the highest standard of living any people have ever had. We have done this by following to some extent the soil mining tactics of past nations. In my opinion, unless we give adequate attention to the conservation and sensible use of our soil and water resources, we too will inevitably become a has-been.

This high standard of living we enjoy is based upon an adequate, inexhaustible, and ever-increasing supply of the basic commodities—food and fiber. The defense and thus, the continuation of this system, depends upon a proper balance between three groups. Those groups are the farmer, the industrial worker, and the professional service people. Without the industrial worker, the farmer would soon have nothing but the simplest of food. Without the farmer, the wheels of industry would soon stop, and there would be no demand for goods or personal services.

The industrial workers would never get very far just making things for each other. The farm market for products of industry makes the difference between a meager existence and abundance for the industrial worker. Likewise, farmers would get nowhere if they supplied food just for each other. The industrial market for farm products makes the difference for the farmer between a meager existence and abundance. From the enriched living pattern of these two groups, the service group also enjoys an equally high standard.

May I suggest to you then just how extremely stupid and dangerous it is for these three groups to become bitter and jealous of the well being of each other. The industrial worker should have a decent wage. If he doesn't get an adequate wage, he contributes little to the essential farm markets. Of course, the farmer should get a decent price for what he produces. Otherwise, he will produce little and will contribute little to the essential industrial market. And obviously, without decent incomes for both farmer and industrial worker, there will be no money to pay for either goods or services.

Farmers are the last group that should squawk about adequate pay for the industrial worker. And the industrial workers are the last group that should squawk about adequate farm prices. Without adequate pay for the efforts of each group, both groups with the service group thrown in, will soon find themselves all down in the dumps.

What the minimum wage, plus the industrial contract arrived at by collective bargaining, is to the industrial worker the farm support price is to the farmer. If we maintain and improve our standard of living, we must have both. In industry, it is also necessary that the proper balance between management and labor be arrived at and maintained. The best method so far devised for dealing with the management-labor balance is collective bargaining. Its use should be encouraged and accepted by all of us. Failure of the process presents just two alternatives, and neither is desirable. Either government, which is the one force that represents all of us collectively, must step in—or, living standards must tremble.

There are those among us who for some strange reason very bitterly criticize our present situation. They find fault with just about everything. "The Government is corrupt and so poorly administered," they say—"practically no one is dependable any more and we are on the very brink of economic and moral collapse," they wail.

It is extremely difficult for me to understand just how a government so corrupt and poorly run, together with a wrecked economy and a morally decadent people, could be enjoying the freedom, abundance, happiness, and security we have today. To those who are willing to look, just a casual glance at a government that means as much to its people as our priceless government means to

body on the Interior appropriations bill as passed by the House. The House, after lengthy hearings, had relieved the Department of the Interior of the necessity of spending some $60,000,000 for power installations.

The behind-the-scenes organizers of this so-called conference have cleverly—perhaps too cleverly—sounded the bugle call for the meeting as a defensive action to protect what they unwisely call their "preference clause".

There has been a great deal of talk about racial segregation and discrimination in this country in the last few years. They have drafted laws for the purpose of eliminating such discriminations.

And yet the so-called preference clause which the conference is organized to defend is a vicious vested interest under which 80 percent of the American people give a free financial ride to the remaining 20 percent.

The implied contention of the alleged sponsors seems to be that 20 percent of the people have a proprietary interest in a peculiar special privilege. In short, they are assumed to have a vested interest in preserving their asserted rights and privileges of enjoying tax-free status in relation to their electric light bills whether they are the Aluminum Co. of America, the Kaiser-Frazer-RFC interests or the small residential users.

In a political year, as this year is supposed to be, this conference apparently is intended to alert and put on guard those persons who wish to preserve these special privileges and vested interests.

By this I simply mean that, by our own statutes, persons who receive the benefits of Federal power, if they happen to be served by publicly owned utilities—municipal, Federal, or public utility districts—whose wholesale source of power happens to be the United States Government, namely the Department of Interior, those persons enjoy a tax free status under the preference clause. You and I and all of the other 80 percent of the American people who, by chance, are not within that privileged class, make up the difference in their electric light bills out of our own pockets in our Federal taxes.

This is a small item. It would not hurt any of these people to pay their full share nor would it bankrupt any of us to pay the share of these free-loaders. On the other hand, this is an unfair, un-American discrimination that has no relation to economic realism or political common sense.

Nevertheless, the press release of the Electric Consumers Conference of May 12 states that the "focal point in the conference" is to defend this economic segregation and taxpayer discrimination.

A study of the background and the motives of the people who inspired and directed the formulation of this conference should prove as enlightening to the Congress as was the investigation of the private power industry by the Federal Trade Commission a quarter of a century ago.

NATIONAL OFFICE, UTILITY
WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA, CIO,
Washington, D. C., May 22, 1952.

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I enclose a copy of the resolution on public ownership of utility companies which was adopted unanimously by our fifth constitutional convention, held September 28–30, 1951, in Cleveland, Ohio.

The resolution sets forth, simply and concisely, the position of the Utility Workers Union of America, CIO, with regard to the encroachment by Government into the utility business.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD J. STRAUB,
Vice President and Director of Organization.

RESOLUTION ON PUBLIC OWNERSHIP OF UTILITY COMPANIES

Whereas the Utility Workers Union of America has been granted jurisdiction by the Congress of Industrial Organizations for workers employed in the light, heat, power, gas, steam, water, and related industries in the United States; and

Whereas the prime objective of our union is to improve the economic and working conditions of our members, the great majority of whom are employed by investor owned utility companies; and

Whereas we recognize that some of the privately owned utilities have failed in the past and even now, fail to give proper consideration to either their employees or consumers. This short-sighted policy of some utility management, particularly in respect to consumers, has given aid and comfort to those who would abandon our American way of life with its system of free enterprise to a socialistic or even more collective form of government; and

Whereas these socialistic-minded groups have enlisted the support of some politicians, who, in their efforts to secure votes, have advocated the construction of hydroelectric plants, the building of distribution systems, and sale of tax-free electricity to their constituents. The result has been a perverting of the Government program for flood control, navigation, and land reclamation, and increasing Government encroachment into the electric utility industry; and

Whereas it is our firm belief that—

1. Where power is generated in conjunction with worth while water projects, the distribution and sale of such electricity should, under proper regulation, be allocated to private-utility industry.

2. The Government which is now serving one out of every five consumers has gone too far into the field of private business, should curtail further encroachment and should look toward returning the job of furnishing electric service to the private tax paying utility companies.

3. The best interests of all the people can be served and the most favorable conditions of employment for workers in the industry can be secured through collective bargaining in an invester owned utility: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this convention of the Utility Workers Union of America, CIO, go on record as being opposed to any further Government encroachment into the electric utility industry; and be it further

Resolved, That the national officers, local officers, and members use all means available to prevent further nationalization of the utility industry; and be it further

Resolved, That we insist on fair and proper regulation of the utility industry and make every effort to compel utility management to fulfill their obligation to the consumers and employees.

(Adopted September 29, 1951.)

(Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a letter and resolution.)

PUBLIC POWER LOBBY

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, an investigation of the vested interests in the public power lobby as proposed by my courageous colleague from Michigan is long overdue.

If I had had but the slightest thought that this resolution had any chance of enactment with sufficient funds and sufficient staff to carry out its purpose, I probably would have prepared some amendments for the purpose of clarification, to which I am sure its author would have agreed.

I know of a certainty that it was not his intent to cast doubt upon the sincerity of the rank-and-file membership of any of the organizations supposedly or allegedly represented at this so-called conference. It was his thought, I am sure, to separate the sheep from the goats.

The average worker in the CIO and the average member of the other organizations represented here are about as aware of the things that have been and will be said in the name of their organizations by their elected or selected leaders as they are aware of and know or care about the exact footage from Canton, Ohio, to the deepest crater of the moon.

The very fact that the resolution for investigation of this conference was born from the inspiration and possibly from the suggestion of the CIO Utility Workers Union would indicate that the Congress of Industrial Organizations in this instance at least is talking through its hat. The resolution itself is denial of all the oyster dandruff spread upon the records yesterday.

In my opinion, and as I believe the investigation could show, this "dog and pony show" where Harry Truman yesterday leaped through the flaming loop is unrepresentative of the rank-and-file of the great mass of fine American people who, by chance and by circumstance, happened to belong to the organizations carried on the letterhead. These American citizens are, in my opinion, being used by the Federal thought controllers for purposes and ideologies about which they have not been consulted and of which they have not been objectively informed.

These statements of opinion are predicated on long and thorough study. It so happens that in the spring of 1948 I had the honor and the privilege to serve this House as general counsel of a subcommittee appointed to make a study in connection with investigation of publicity and propaganda of Federal officials.

Our subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Mr. Forest A. Harness, gave particular and special attention to the Department of the Interior. We devoted many months of investigation and many days of hearings to this Department.

As a taxpaying Ohio lawyer I found it difficult to believe the facts that came to my attention. It was hard to accept the fact that duly sworn American citi-

zens serving their nation and their country as officials of the Federal Government could so pervert the intent of Congress and so distort the clear meaning of the law. All of this distortion, perversion, misconstruction, and downright, plain-and-simple violation of the law was for the purpose intended and designed by top-level officials of the Department of the Interior to create a fraudulent American public opinion which had no relation whatsoever to the realities and the facts.

While it may be highly improbable that this Congress in this year can find the time and the money to enact this resolution, I feel sure that it must be the forerunner of a truly full-dress investigation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article written by Jesse Fant Evans, one of our very fine newspaperwomen relative to Gertrude L. Warren and the 4-H Clubs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS and to include an essay by a high-school student from his district.

Mr. CLEMENTE in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COLE of New York and to include some tables which he has compiled.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include an address by Roger L. Putnam, notwithstanding it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $252.

Mr. MANSFIELD and to include a prize-winning essay by a sophomore in the Anaconda, Mont., High School.

Mrs. CHURCH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of New York (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCGREGOR to revise and extend his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole today and include certain statements.

Mr. MEADER to revise and extend remarks he made in Committee of the Whole, and also to extend his own remarks on the Inter-American Highway, in both instances to include excerpts from the report on the Inter-American Highway.

Mr. PHILBIN in one instance.

Mr. O'KONSKI and to include some excerpts from editorials, newspaper articles, and some letters.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin.

Mr. MCGRATH.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1942. An act to amend acts relating to garage keepers and liverymen's liens and the enforcement thereof in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1533. An act to designate a Floyd D. Olson Memorial Triangle in the District of Columbia, and to authorize the erection of a memorial plaque in such triangle;

S. 2735. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940, as amended;

S. 2736. An act to amend the Code of Law of the District of Columbia in respect to the recording, in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds, of bills of sale, mortgages, deeds of trust, and conditional sales of personal property, and for other purposes; and

S. 2871. An act relating to the manner of appointment of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, the deputy recorders, and the employees of the Office of Recorder, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. WALTER), for 1 week, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 28, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1531. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of a proposed loan of a ship model of the U. S. S. *Tennessee*, CA-10, pursuant to Public Law 649, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1532. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report of a violation of subsection (h) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, subsection (1) (2), by the Veterans' Administration regional office, Atlanta, Ga., which consisted of the incurring of an obligation in excess of the amount permitted by the agency regulation (Technical Bulletin DB-9, issued pursuant to sec. 3679 (g)); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1533. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the fifth report regarding the Yugoslav emergency relief assistance program, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 897 (the Yugoslav Emergency Relief Assistance Act of 1950), for the period from December 16, 1951, through March 15, 1952; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 654. Resolution for the consideration of S. 97, an act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities for generating hydroelectric power at the Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland River in Tennessee; without amendment (Rept. No. 1998). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 6291. A bill to amend section 218 (f) of the Social Security Act with respect to effective dates of agreements entered into with States before January 1, 1954; without amendment (Rept. No. 1999). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHELLEY: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 2721. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2000). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 6500. A bill to amend the joint resolution of August 8, 1946, as amended, with respect to appropriations authorized for the conduct of investigations and studies thereunder; without amendment (Rept. No. 2001). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Subcommittee on Monopoly Power. Report pursuant to House Resolution 95, Eighty-second Congress, first session, entitled "Organized Baseball"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2002). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRIEST: Committee of conference. S. 302. An act to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act (Rept. No. 2003). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 658. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5713, a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide that Low Middling seven-eighths inch cotton shall be the standard grade for the purposes of determining parity and price support for the 1952 cotton crop; without amendment (Rept. No. 2004). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1203. An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2005). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 449. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Vannevar Bush as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; without amendment (Rept. No. 2007). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7305. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Utah to the Bench Lake Irrigation Co., of Hurricane,

Utah; with amendment (Rept. No. 2006). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 8004. A bill appropriating the sum of $30,000 to complete the grading and draining of the Mercer County Airport, Mercer County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 8005. A bill to provide for the improvement and expansion of physical facilities of the public school system of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H. R. 8006. A bill to provide for an adjustment in the compensation of certain employees transferred from the field service of the Post Office Department to the General Services Administration pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 18 of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 8007. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 8008. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 8009. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 8010. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 8011. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 8012. A bill to exempt official election pamphlets mailed by the government of a State, Territory, or Puerto Rico, or a political subdivision thereof, from the increased third-class mail rates prescribed by the act of October 30, 1951; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE (by request):

H. R. 8013. A bill to increase the efficiency of the Federal Government by improving the training of Federal civilian officers and employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 8014. A bill to amend section 23 of the act of April 26, 1906, in order to remove permanently the limitation in such section permitting full-blooded Indians to devise real property without regard to the laws of the State of Oklahoma with respect to wills; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 8015. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring Tom Shiras and commemorating the dedication of Bull Shoals Dam and Norfork Dam; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Con. Res. 217. Concurrent resolution for consideration of the Tunisian issue; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. Res. 654. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (S. 97) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities for generating hydroelectric power at the Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland River in Tennessee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. Res. 655. Resolution to authorize the appointment of a select committee of the House of Representatives to conduct a complete investigation and study of the self-styled Electric Consumers Conference, its officers, representatives, alleged or actual sponsors, members, and so forth, using their resources for un-American and subversive activities or for purposes not in the interest of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois:

H. Res. 656. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the confidential work of Charles A. Lindbergh in aid of the national defense of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VAIL:

H. Res. 657. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the confidential work of Charles A. Lindbergh in aid of the national defense of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 659. Resolution to authorize an investigation of the shortage of potatoes in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, with reference to submission of an interstate civil defense compact entered into and ratified by the States of South Carolina and Georgia, pursuant to section 201 (g) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 8016. A bill for the relief of Augustin Mondreal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 8017. A bill for the relief of Paula Kurz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 8018. A bill for the relief of George Vourderis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 8019. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Star Blackhawk; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 8020. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Esther M. Robinson; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 8021. A bill to authorize the restoration of Daniel E. Whelan, Jr., lieutenant commander, retired, to the active list of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 8022. A bill for the relief of Klaus Dieter Strehlocke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 8023. A bill for the relief of Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 8024. A bill for the relief of Helga Rossmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 8025. A bill for the relief of Richard H. Backus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 8026. A bill for the relief of Thomas C. Stretch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 8027. A bill for the relief of George Mehalatas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 8028. A bill for the relief of Calogero Tocco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 8029. A bill for the relief of Tokie Hashiguchi and her son, Koichi Hashiguchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 8030. A bill for the relief of Shizue Yamaguchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

742. By Mr. ELLSWORTH: Petition of citizens of Douglas County, Oreg., urging enactment of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2188; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

743. By Mr. HESS: Resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Cincinnati requesting the Congress of the United States to adopt the legislation necessary to relax the credit restraints of regulation X in order to stimulate the buying of homes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

744. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Wausau Taxpayers League of Wausau, Wis., urging the Congress of the United States to confine Federal expenditures to the minimums for essential government, to complete the adoption of the Hoover Report, to adopt any legislation which would make a balanced budget mandatory, and to create a Joint Committee on the Budget; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 28, 1952

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate pastor, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou great indwelling spirit, who art ever attempting to guide the spirit of man to the realization of abundant life, give us a greater sense of expectancy. Deliver us, we pray, from fears that paralyze the will and doubts that breed despair. Let us see Thee, the unchanging, secure foundation upon which we continue to build a glorious heritage of freedom and fidelity. We need the insight of Thy spirit and the all-pervading power of Thy love. To this end grant unto us the divine initiative that, as imitators of the infinite, we may be bearers of light and abundant life to our age. Help us to look upon our purpose and place in the sun with the same sense of mission of the One who staggered the world with the daringness of His faith, the Man of Galilee. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 27, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2552) to authorize the appointment of qualified women as physicians and specialists in the medical services of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VINSON, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. SHORT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 4511. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Territory of Hawaii certain real property at Kahului, Wailuku, Maui, T. H.; and

H. R. 6811. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 23, 1924, as amended, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GILLETTE was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3086) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is now operating under a unanimous-consent agreement limiting debate on all amendments, motions, appeals, and the bill itself.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business, without debate. At the conclusion of the transaction of routine business, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum. I ask that the time consumed by the transaction of the routine business and the call of the roll not be charged to either side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator now make the point of no quorum?

Mr. MCFARLAND. No; I shall do so following the transaction of routine business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator is granted.

MIGRANT LABOR—RESOLUTION OF CONSUMERS' LEAGUE OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Consumers' League of New Jersey commending the President's Commission on Migratory Labor and the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Labor Management Relations on its work for the protection of migrant labor.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION COMMENDING THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON MIGRATORY LABOR AND THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR AND LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Whereas the study made by the President's Commission on Migratory Labor has revealed that agricultural migrants in many sections of this country are denied decent housing, fair wages and working conditions, adequate health care, and the opportunity for a minimum education; and

Whereas migrants suffer these conditions in large part either because they are excluded from the protection which laws provide for residents or because existing laws do not cover their special and particular needs; and

Whereas the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Labor Management has been considering possible legislation providing for such protection particularly for decent housing, the licensing of labor contractors, and the establishment of a Federal Committee on Migratory Labor: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the New Jersey Consumers' League commend the President's Commission on Migratory Labor and the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Labor Management for its excellent work and that it states that it is awaiting with keen anticipation the introduction of such legislation into the United States Senate.

IMMIGRATION—LETTER OF AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter which I have received from the American Bar Association dated May 22, 1952, and a letter dated March 10, 1952, also from the American Bar Association, in connection with the immigration bill recently debated and voted on by this body.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARVARD LAW SCHOOL,
Cambridge, Mass., May 22, 1952.

Senator HUMPHREY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am the chairman of the immigration committee of the administrative law section of the American Bar Association. It was pointed out to me by a member of my committee that you attributed to us certain constitutional views which in his opinion the committee did not adopt. He believes that the views which you attributed to us were in fact the views of another group, some of whom were on our committee. In examining the communication which I sent to Congress on behalf of the committee I find that we did express some constitutional opinions. I do not know which views were in question in your remarks to the Senate, but if they attributed to our committee any opinions other than those expressed in the enclosed communication, I would be very grateful to you if it were possible for you to correct the attribution.

You will understand that I do not mean by this personally to disassociate myself from any views that you may have expressed. It is simply that my authority only went so far as to express those things that the committee formally adopted.

Very truly yours,

LOUIS L. JAFFE.

LAW SCHOOL OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Cambridge, Mass., March 10, 1952.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The committee respectfully urges the following amendments to H. R. 5678: First, amend section 242b to provide for trial examiners appointed under section 11, Administrative Procedure Act, so as to restore law as settled by Supreme Court in Sung case, because the American Bar Association is firmly opposed to exceptions to the Administrative Procedure Act and believes it is contrary to our traditions to discriminate against resident aliens.

For similar reasons we suggest the following amendments: Amend 242a to maintain present authority of courts to review denial of bail; amend 242f to retain present right of hearing before deportation to alien previously deported; amend 242 so as to maintain present constitutional right of seamen to hearing before deportation.

Revise 360 to preserve the present satisfactory procedure for securing declaration of nationality; delete 342 providing for cancellation of certificates of citizenship with its unconstitutionally inadequate provisions for notice; amend 340b insofar as it permits substituted service without any showing that personal notice cannot be made.

We urge these amendments in the belief that the resident aliens, naturalized citizens, and citizens generally, wherever they may momentarily be, are entitled to the protection of fair procedure as established by the Constitution and the Administrative Procedure Act.

Very truly yours,

LOUIS L. JAFFE,
Chairman, Immigration Committee,
Administrative Law Section,
American Bar Association.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 7593. A bill to amend paragraph 1774, section 201, title II, of the Tariff Act of 1930; without amendment (Rept. No. 1601).

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. J. Res. 426. Joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1612); and

H. J. Res. 454. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1602).

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 7072. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1603).

By Mr. MCCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 2064. A bill for the relief of Mathilde Kohar Halebian; without amendment (Rept. No. 1604);

S. 3195. A bill granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 1605); and

S. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the taking of private property; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1606).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 5633. A bill to approve a contract negotiated with the irrigation districts on the Owyhee Federal project, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1607).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2360. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to increase the amounts of securities issued by motor carriers without requiring approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission; with amendments (Rept. No. 1608).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2603. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain lands to the State of Oregon; without amendment (Rept. No. 1610);

H. R. 5314. A bill to authorize the transfer to the regents of the University of California, for agricultural purposes, of certain real property in Napa County, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1611); and

H. R. 6922. A bill to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, so as to extend the benefits of such section to certain colleges in the Territory of Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 1609).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 28, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1342. An act to amend acts relating to garage keepers and liverymen's liens and the enforcement thereof in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1533. An act to designate a Floyd D. Olson Memorial Triangle in the District of Columbia, and to authorize the erection of a memorial plaque in such triangle;

S. 2735. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940, as amended;

S. 2736. An act to amend the Code of Law of the District of Columbia in respect to the recording, in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds, of bills of sale, mortgages, deeds of trust, and conditional sales of personal property, and for other purposes; and

S. 2871. An act relating to the manner of appointment of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, the deputy recorders, and the employees of the Office of Recorder, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 3241. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide office space to State agencies charged with the duty of representing the interests of veterans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 3242. A bill to amend the mineral leasing laws in order to eliminate the waiver of rentals for oil and gas leases; and

S. 3243. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 3244. A bill for the relief of Rose L. Kerrigan; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 3245. A bill to amend section 1 (b) (2) of the act entitled "An act to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes," approved October 24, 1951, so as to provide increases in compensation under such act for employees in grade GS–11 or above whose compensation is paid at rates other than the scheduled rates of such grade; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 3246. A bill for the relief of Mr. Frans Gunnick; and

S. 3247. A bill for the relief of Mr. Gerrit Been; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 3248. A bill for the relief of Mekaru Tatsubo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3249. A bill for the relief of Achilleas M. Michailopoulos; and

S. 3250. A bill for the relief of Theresia Hotter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution authorizing the District of Columbia to enter into interstate civil defense compacts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution designating a 7-day period beginning August 13, 1952, as National Clay Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HENRY BARANCZAK, ROMUALD SACEWICZ, KAZIMIERZ KIRAGA, AND JOZEF MACIEJEWSKI

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference four private bills for four Polish nationals now in this country who are under orders of deportation.

I want to make public reference to these bills and to these four cases because these four individuals are specifically typical of individuals the United States should by general law make eligible and for whom the United States should be safe asylum from the oppression and persecution and tyranny from which these individuals fled behind the iron curtain.

Two of the individuals for whom I am introducing these private bills are especially noteworthy.

The first of them is a young man 24 years old, Henry Baranczak by name, who should be wearing a decoration rather than be under warrant of deportation from the United States. This young man in August or late July of 1951 organized a mutiny on a Polish naval vessel and boldly seized control of the ship along with 11 other freedom-loving Poles and sailed into a Swedish harbor. This young man who had a long record of intransigence and resistance to the Communist ideology, was given asylum in Sweden, and then fearing reprisal, came to the United States as a stowaway. Just the other day it was announced that a Polish court had placed this young man, and his 11 brave comrades, under the sentence of death in absentia.

We should welcome him as a resident of the United States rather than deport him. He should be honored rather than detained on Ellis Island. However, our present immigration laws do not recognize such heroism. They make no special provision for refugees and escapees from Soviet tyranny and so a private bill is necessary. I wish it were otherwise.

Eight of these eleven men who followed Baranczak in his dare-devil feat have already been given permanent asylum in our neighboring country of Canada.

Another of these four cases is that of a young man named Romuald Sacewicz—a hero of World War II and an escapee from the Polish merchant marine who came to this country via Great Britain, also as a stowaway. This young man's record, too, is dotted with heroism. He jumped ship in England and described vividly to the press of that country the treatment accorded to Poles and others in slave labor camps and gave the world another insight into the specific cruelties of Soviet tyranny.

The other two cases—that of Kazimierz Kiraga and Jozef Maciejewski—are less spectacular but equally deserving. I hope that these bills will pass and that their passage will give further evidence to the slave world that the United States is indeed the home of freedom.

There being no objection, the bills were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 3251. A bill for the relief of Henry Baranczak;

S. 3252. A bill for the relief of Romuald Sacewicz;

S. 3253. A bill for the relief of Kazimierz Kiraga; and

S. 3254. A bill for the relief of Jozef Maciejewski.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. LEHMAN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 79), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That subsection 1 of rule XIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"1. (a) Whenever a bill or joint resolution shall be offered, its introduction shall, if objected to, be postponed for 1 day.

"(b) Any bill or joint resolution introduced in the Senate repealing or amending any statute or part thereof shall consist of a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by brackets or capital letters or other appropriate typographical

devices as shall be determined by the Joint Committee on Printing the omissions and insertions proposed to be made."

Sec. 2. Subsection 3 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"3. (a) All other bills, memorials, and resolutions may, in like manner, be delivered, indorsed with the names of Members introducing them, to the Speaker, to be by him referred, and the titles and references thereof and of all bills, resolutions, and documents referred under the rules shall be entered on the Journal and printed in the RECORD of the next day, and correction in case of error of reference may be made by the House, without debate, in accordance with rule XI, on any day immediately after the reading of the Journal, by unanimous consent, or on motion of a committee claiming jurisdiction, or on the report of the committee to which the bill has been erroneously referred.

"(b) Any bill or joint resolution introduced in the House of Representatives repealing or amending any statute or part thereof shall consist of a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by brackets or capital letters or other appropriate typographical devices as shall be determined by the Joint Committee on Printing the omissions and insertions proposed to be made."

PRINTING OF DOCUMENT ENTITLED "COMMUNIST DOMINATION OF CERTAIN UNIONS"

Mr. HUMPHREY submited the following resolution (S. Res. 323), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations 1,600 additional copies of parts II, III, and IV of the committee print and Senate Document No. 89, Eighty-second Congress, first session, all entitled "Communist Domination of Certain Unions."

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 322), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-second Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CIVIL FUNCTIONS ADMINISTERED BY DEPARTMENT OF ARMY — AMENDMENT

Mr. HENDRICKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7268) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952—AMENDMENTS

Mr. IVES submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2594) to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. BRICKER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 2594, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CAPEHART submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 2594, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 2594, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MAYBANK submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: "On page 5, line 2, strike out '619,550' and insert in lieu thereof the following: '$400,000, and in addition, the Commission is authorized to utilize for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation, without dollar reimbursement from this or any other appropriation, foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States in an amount not exceeding $219,550'."

Mr. MAYBANK also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7072, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. MAYBANK submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: "On page 5, line 19, strike out '$1,000,000' and insert in lieu thereof the following: '$500,000, to remain available until expended, and, in addition, the Commission is authorized to utilize for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation, without dollar reimbursement from this or any other appropriation, foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States in an amount not exceeding $4,500,000'."

Mr. MAYBANK also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7072, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Graydon G. Withey, of Michigan to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States, vice Richard L. Disney, resigned.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Albert William Barlow, of Hawaii, to be United States attorney for the district of Hawaii, vice Ray J. O'Brien, resigned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Allen V. Astin, of Maryland, to be Director of the National Bureau of Standards.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. BREWSTER:

Address entitled "Maine Development," delivered by him over the radio on Sunday evening, May 11, 1952.

Address broadcast by him on the subject of tax reduction.

Extract from an address dealing with the Taft-Hartley Act, delivered by him at Houlton, Maine, May 25, 1952.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

Address delivered by Senator CLEMENTS at the State convention of the Democratic Party, at Louisville, Ky., on May 27, 1952.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Address delivered by him on March 30, 1952, before the Ukrainian Central Committee of Newark, N. J., and introduction by Mr. John Romanition.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

Address delivered by Senator O'CONOR before the Maryland Bankers' Association Convention, at Atlantic City, N. J., on May 27, 1952.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

Statement, dated May 11, 1952, by Senator HILL and Senator SPARKMAN in support of the presidential candidacy of Senator RUSSELL.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Article entitled "Fulbright Plan Was Wise Solution of War Materiel Disposal Abroad," written by Roger Swanson, and published in the Kansas City Star of May 17, 1952.

By Mr. NIXON:

Article entitled "Teacher of the Year," published in McCall's magazine, in regard to the selection of Mrs. Gerry Jones, of Santa Barbara, Calif., as Teacher of the Year.

By Mr. WELKER:

Letter from W. L. Snyder, Jerome, Idaho, to the editor of the Jerome (Idaho) News, and published in the Jerome News of May 1, 1952.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Editorial entitled "We Need Sensible Trimming," published in the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune of May 26, 1952.

Article entitled "Help Wanted—Congress," written by Hanson W. Baldwin, and published in a recent issue of the New York Times.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Editorial entitled "Human Rights in Puerto Rico," published in the New York Times of May 27, 1952.

Translation of editorial on the subject of immigration and the McCarran bill, published in the Polish Daily Zgoda of May 20, 1952.

Sundry letters and telegrams relating to immigration legislation recently pending before the Senate.

Statement by Louis H. Pink, entitled "Agenda for the Future," appearing as foreword to annual report to members of American Hospital Service of New York, December 1951.

By Mr. BENTON:

Address delivered by him on Polish Constitution Day, at Hartford, Conn., May 18, 1952.

Tribute to a young Polish-American sailor, Edward C. Kozlowski, of Bridgeport, Conn.

By Mr. MOODY:

Letter addressed to him by Mrs. Margaret W. Patterson with reference to mutual security program.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3086) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Moody
Anderson	Hendrickson	Morse
Bennett	Hennings	Mundt
Benton	Hickenlooper	Neely
Brewster	Hill	Nixon
Bricker	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Robertson
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Russell
Byrd	Ives	Saltonstall
Capehart	Jenner	Schoeppel
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Clements	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Connally	Lehman	Sparkman
Cordon	Lodge	Stennis
Dirksen	Long	Taft
Douglas	Malone	Thye
Dworshak	Martin	Tobey
Eastland	Maybank	Underwood
Ellender	McCarran	Watkins
Ferguson	McCarthy	Welker
Frear	McFarland	Williams
Fulbright	McKellar	Young
George	Millikin	
Green	Monroney	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Conference of the International Council for Christian Leadership at The Hague.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], for himself and other Senators, with respect to which there is a limitation of debate of half an hour to each side. It is not obligatory that the time be consumed, but it is available. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered. If any Senator wishes to debate the amendment, the Senator from Idaho or the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] must yield time to him.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I have expressed my views in full heretofore with respect to the $1,000,000,000-cut amendment which failed by 8 votes yesterday afternoon. I rise again to say that the taxpayers of the Nation demand that the spreading of our money all over the world under the threat of war must cease, because it will eventually make us weaker than those we are attempting to help.

It has been urged on the floor of the Senate and in public debate that perhaps we could take up some of the slack involved in this terrific expenditure by a cut in the armed services appropriations in the sum of $8,000,000,000. I oppose that policy. I believe that what we need in this country is a strong Air Force, an Air Force which is not flying second-hand or obsolete airplanes. Prime Minister Churchill has told us that the threat of the atomic bomb is the only threat that Soviet Russia understands. How are we to deliver the atomic bomb if we do not build air power to the point where it will be the very best? We need a 140-group Air Force. We need $30,000,000,000 to build such an Air Force. When we possess such a threat to Soviet Russia, which understands and appreciates only military might, then we shall put an end to her continuous threats, and to the annual appropriation of billions of dollars for expenditure all over the world. The startling fact remains that at this very moment $12,000,000,000 of mutual security remain unexpended.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELKER. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. With reference to the $12,000,000,000 of unexpended funds which could be available for the construction of airplanes, and considering the fact that since 1948 the Senate has been ahead of the President in authorizing air groups, what would be the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Idaho as to why we are so far behind in the matter of air power?

Mr. WELKER. I would say this, Mr. President, in answer to my distinguished friend from Nevada. There has been some misfeasance somewhere. We have been helping our allies all over the world and forgetting our armed might at home.

It is embarrassing that we must fly obsolete planes in Korea today. Think of it: We are flying B–29's in three-plane squadrons. No airman of any rank will say that B–29's in squadrons of three have any protection whatever.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I should like to ask whether that is the reason we have been losing an average of 4 to 1 in combat airplanes.

Mr. WELKER. Whatever the reason, I say to my friend, it is a dark day for the management of our defense in America. Rather than debate this subject, as we have for the past 2 days, we should establish a joint committee, with membership from the House and the Senate, and attempt, through such a committee, to get some pointed answers as to why at this late hour in the present emergency, which has been an emergency ever since I have been in the Senate, we are still so far behind in air power.

Mr. MALONE. What is the matter with our Armed Services Committee and our Foreign Relations Committee, as well as other committees of the Senate? They are supposed to tell the Senate how we are to fight the war with Russia which they all say is inevitable, or at least indicate is coming.

Mr. WELKER. I will respond to the distinguished Senator from Nevada by saying that I cannot answer for the Committee on Armed Services or the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Senator's inquiry is, indeed, profound. Whether we on the floor of the Senate realize it or not, the people of this country—the taxpayers and the parents who are losing their sons in Korea—are the ones who will require an answer to that question.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WALKER. I can yield for only one more question.

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada intends to offer an amendment this afternoon which would transfer $6,000,000,000 from the mutual security program to do exactly what the

Senator from Idaho wants done, namely, to catch up on our air power and to be able to control the air any place in Asia or in Europe which is important to our ultimate safety.

Mr. WELKER. I will say to the Senator from Nevada that I shall support his amendment. I believe that air power is the solution to the problem that confronts us at this very moment.

Mr. President, how embarrassing it is for us to learn that England is flying jet transports in commercial aviation, when we are unable to do so.

Mr. MALONE. While we are flying B–29's.

Mr. WELKER. That is correct.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. WELKER. I shall be glad to yield for one question.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator, inasmuch as he has made reference to his amendment which called for a cut of a billion dollars, and because we are now considering his amendment which would cut $500,000,000 from the bill, whether he has read the House committee report on the House mutual security bill? I hold the report in my hand. It is the report on H. R. 7005, the House version of the mutual security bill. I read from page 30 of the report. The heading reads: "Mutual security funds available in 1952, obligations and expenditures to February 29, 1952." Under "Expenditure data" for military assistance, I read:

Total available for expenditure, 1952, $10,817,260,805.

Unexpended balance, February 29, 1952, $9,471,537,373.

Under the heading of "Economic and technical assistance," the expenditure data shows:

Unexpended balance, February 29, 1952, $11,760,919,050.

Of course, some expenditures are chargeable against those figures at the present time. But, in view of this enormous unexpended balance, does the Senator from Idaho see any justification for seriously believing that the pending bill cannot be cut by half a billion dollars?

Mr. WELKER. I will reply to my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Kansas, by saying that I certainly agree with him that there is no reason why the bill cannot be cut by half a billion dollars.

Let me emphasize the point that by the amendment which would cut half a billion dollars from the bill we would be restoring nearly $225,000,000 which was cut by the House of Representatives last week from this authorization. I believe the House of Representatives carefully studied the subject. They were logical in their arguments and in their action. Inasmuch as the amendment, if adopted, would restore $225,000,000 of the cut made by the House, I certainly believe that the amendment should be adopted.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an editorial entitled "We've Heard It Before," published in the leading Idaho newspaper, the Idaho Statesman, of May 24.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE'VE HEARD IT BEFORE

General Ridgway's name may be added to the list of those in the Dean Acheson circle. The general told Congress this week that current Communist tactics are a monumental warning that the Reds may plan to use gas or germ warfare. The general added that Allied forces are ready for any eventuality.

We assume that the Ridgway message to the Congress was planned to halt the foreign aid fund trimming which is under way. The House voted this week to cut $615,000,000 from its $6,900,000,000 aid for Western Europe. It seems that every time Congress realizes the seriousness of the expenditures for foreign aid, and starts cutting requests, along comes someone in high authority to issue the warning.

The whole Korean situation is nothing short of a serious joke. Reports from there are like a phonograph record. Our leaders follow the same old policy of fear. Nothing is accomplished.

We would like to see someone stand up before the Congress and tell the Nation how to end the Korean fiasco. Anything else is mockery of our war dead.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the issue before the Senate has given me grave concern. We are confronted with two threats. One threat is on the home front, and is to our fiscal soundness and to our ability to finance successfully all the obligations we are attempting to meet at home. The other threat is the external threat of physical aggression by the combined world forces of communism.

I agree, Mr. President, with the suggestion just made by my distinguished colleague from Idaho that we need to build up our air power. Without knowing a great deal about the technical details as to why the House cut the air power figures as much as it did in the defense appropriation bill, my impression is that the cut was a bit dangerous, and it may be nesessary for us to increase that amount.

I regret, however, that I cannot go along with my distinguished colleague from Idaho, who is in effect suggesting that air power alone would be adequate for our future protection. I cannot agree with that suggestion.

In the first place, I am fully convinced that, although material forces alone are not sufficient to preserve the future peace of the world, they can have a restraining influence until we can bring moral force to bear upon the minds of men who undoubtedly, if enlightened, prefer freedom to slavery.

What would be the logical consequence of our cutting foreign aid to the point where it would be inadequate and then relying upon air power? In the first place, our air power would not be effective unless we had bases closer to the source of a potential attack than the continental confines of the United States. Certainly for the protection of ourselves, as well as of our allies in Europe, we need air bases in Great Britain, Africa, Spain—if a suitable agreement can be arranged to put them behind the protection of the Pyrenees—and in France, although France is more likely to be overrun by a land army than the other areas to which I have referred.

I am disturbed over this issue because my finite mind cannot comprehend even $1,000,000,000, much less the total of this bill.

I cannot say, nor do I believe any other Member of the Senate or any Member of the House can say categorically, down to even a reasonable amount of millions of dollars, what is the irreducible minimum required to protect our security and to do what we can from a physical standpoint to stay the hand of an aggressor and the prospect of a devastating war which, as H. G. Wells once predicted, would leave mankind cowering behind a windbreak or in the disease-soaked ruins of a slum.

Mr. President, how many persons in Europe would say, "Do not bother about our defenses, and do not bother about bases over here, and do not bother about a land army; but when war starts, send your bombers here and let them start bombing"? Who would be hurt in that event? The cities of Europe and the people living in them would be destroyed by our bombers, while our cities remained relatively secure.

So I say the situation is a serious one, especially in view of the fact that the news items of the last week show that tension has been increasing in Germany since the German leaders agreed to proceed to arm and train 10 divisions as a part of the United Nations forces serving in Western Europe.

Mr. President, as I have said, I do not know just how much aid will be required. All I know is that General Eisenhower said that, in his opinion, a cut of more than $1,000,000,000 would be too much and would be dangerous, and that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who planned this program, think that a cut of more than $1,000,000,000 would be too much.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Texas, the chairman of the committee, to yield two more minutes to me.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield two more minutes to the Senator from Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the House committee said that a cut of more than $1,000,000,000 would be too much.

The distinguished Senator from Idaho has said by his amendment we are giving back $225,000,000 which the House cut from the bill. However, Mr. President, we are not giving back anything on the basis of what the committee which heard the evidence sought to have authorized. The $225,000,000 figure is arrived at on the basis of the action voted on the floor of the House, but not on the basis of the action taken by the House committee.

On our side of the Capitol, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has said that a cut of $1,000,000,000 is enough, and the Senate Armed Forces Committee has said that a cut of $1,000,000,000 is enough.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall not vote for the pending amendment to cut the amount of the authorization an additional $500,000,000. But, in view of the figures which have been presented in regard to unobligated or earmarked carry-over funds and in view of my inability to break down those figures in any concise way on the basis of an irreducible minimum, I must confess that I intend to vote for the next amendment, if the pending amendment is rejected.

In other words, Mr. President, if the pending amendment is rejected, I shall vote for an amendment to reduce the amount of the authorization by $400,000,000 more. However, I cannot go along with the pending amendment, because I think a cut of $500,000,000 would be too much.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me, so that I may submit a report from the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. CONNALLY. If the time required for that purpose is not taken from my time, I shall yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Any time required for such a purpose will have to be taken out of the time allotted to either side, under the existing order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time required to submit the report not be taken from the time allotted to either side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order, the Chair cannot recognize any Senator unless he is yielded to by either of the Senators having charge of the time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, under the circumstances I withhold the report.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, as most Members of the Senate are aware, I seldom speak on the floor of the Senate unless the matter under consideration is one which concerns a committee on which I serve.

In the present instance, I have decided to speak because I find myself in the rather difficult position of being alined against many Members of the Senate with whom I ordinarily vote on critical issues, and for whose judgment I have great respect.

Mr. President, I shall oppose the amendment which has been offered by my friend and neighbor, the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and I feel that the reasons for my opposition should be stated. Particularly that is the case since I was impressed, as I am sure many other Members of the Senate were, by the arguments advanced yesterday by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in support of the pending amendment.

I recognize the need for economy during this period. I recognize, as do all Members of this body, that while the struggle in which we are engaged throughout the world is military in character it is also much more than that. The fact that over the past 7 years the Communists have gained, and the free world has lost, 600,000,000 people, without the Russians losing a single soldier in combat is striking proof of the fact that the Communists have developed new tactics and new strategies for aggression which do not contemplate the use of military force. One of those tactics is the method of internal destruction forcing a nation to destroy itself from within, in its efforts to defend itself from within, in its efforts to defend itself against aggression from without. I realize that we are faced with that danger in the United States.

For that reason, Mr. President, as we recognize the necessity for developing our military strength, both at home and abroad, we must constantly bear in mind the necessity of keeping the economy of the United States sound and strong at home. That is why the vote about to be taken will be a very difficult one for every Member of the Senate. Which shall we put first: the economy of our country, or the necessity of maintaining our military strength and that of our allies at a level sufficiently high to deter military aggression from abroad?

I have reached the conclusion that in the present instance it is necessary to sustain the committee. Speaking from the standpoint of economy we cannot consider the so-called foreign-aid program apart from the military budget. Our military budget of $55,000,000,000, is about seven times the amount with which we are concerned in connection with the mutual-security bill.

In our consideration of the military budget of $55,000,000,000 we must recognize that the size of that budget, both at the present time and in the future, will be determined to a great extent by what our allies abroad are able to do to defend themselves.

One of the reasons why that budget is as large as it is is that our allies are not bearing the proportionate share of the load which they should bear in the mutual struggle in which we are engaged. That is why I feel that a vote for the amount recommended by the committee in this instance can be justified—justified, believe it or not, on an economy basis.

I realize that there is a gamble involved—that our allies may not increase their military effort as much as we feel they should.

But I believe that the gamble is worth taking because if through this aid program we are able to create in Europe and in Asia a greater will to resist, our allies will be able to bear a proportionately larger share of our mutual defense burden abroad. Only in this way can we hope eventually to reduce our own military budget at home.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, I ask the chairman of the committee to yield two more minutes to me, please.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield two more minutes to the Senator from California.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California is recognized for 2 minutes more.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, I realize that the State Department has brought upon itself the opposition which has developed in this body both among those who support the pending amendment and among those on the committee who voted for a cut of $1,000,000,000. That is because representatives of the State Department have come to the Capitol time and time again with figures and facts which are not reliable. They have misled the Senate, they have misled the Congress, and they have misled the American people on vital phases of our foreign policy where there was no excuse for not telling the truth. That is one of the major reasons why a cut has been recommended by the committee and why other cuts have been suggested, as, for instance, the one by the proponents of the pending amendment.

Nevertheless we must recognize that the struggle in which we are engaged is world-wide in character and that we cannot contemplate the defenses of the United States apart from the defenses of our allies abroad. If the purpose of this bill were to help the recipients of our aid purely from a humanitarian standpoint we could safely vote for the cut proposed by the amendment and more, too. If its purpose were solely to enable them to defend themselves, we could vote for the cut. But I consider this to be a bill for the defense of the United States. On that basis, and on that basis, alone, I believe that the risk which is involved—a risk which requires that the United States send aid abroad so that our allies will be able to build the defenses which both we and they need—is worth taking.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment which is before the Senate. I realize the very serious financial problems which confront our economy and which confront our Nation. I think the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], in his remarks made a moment ago, put his finger upon the key issue, namely, that the amount of money which is being requested for mutual security is a sound investment on the part of the American people, and that the dollar value to be received in terms of expenditure in the European sector is more than would be received even if the money were to be expended within our own sector.

Mr. President, this is the point I want to emphasize: It is perfectly obvious that we are in a critical stage in our foreign relations. I think it has been obvious to everyone who gave any thought to it that once the treaty with Japan was signed, and once the agreements with the Western German Republic were entered into,

the Communist pressure would be put on with ever-increasing and relentless force. I believe our country must be prepared to withstand a period of threats, of intimidation, of reprisals, and of acts almost leading to the brink of war. But we must not retreat, nor by our actions give any indication of weakening our efforts. We are joined in a great alliance with our friends of Western Europe. We have made commitments to them and they to us. We must keep them and in no way water down our efforts or enthusiasm.

At this particular time I think it would be a rebuke to our allies not to stand by them with everything at our command. We now have under way what we call the European defense community; and to withdraw funds from that European defense community at this time would be to undersell it, to sell it short, and to weaken it.

Mr. President, we desire to say a little bit about the ability of Americans to pay for this program—and I am going to lay it right on the line. As a matter of fact, the American people during the past year have spent more for their alcohol, for their tobacco, and for their luxuries than they have spent for all foreign aid. In light of these evident facts, who can say we are on the verge of bankruptcy, or cannot undertake the costs to maintain our security. Surely our sense of values will not permit us to put pleasures above national security. I do not believe we can protect ourselves from Communist aggression by blowing smoke in the eyes of the Communists, and I do not think we are going to increase our strength—even though we may temporarily feel stronger—by putting cocktails ahead of military preparedness and mutual security with our allies.

Again, to put it on the line, Mr. President, if the American people want to pay for security they can pay for it. It is here to be paid for. There is not one scintilla of evidence which indicates that there is not sufficient capital within the American economy to pay for the costs of mutual security and for the armed strength necessary for our own national security. The profits of industry, the gross income, the real income of individuals, the income of all, up and down this land, is adequate to support the requests which are being made in the terms of our national security.

Since 1947 the average American individual, despite inflation, has improved his standard of living by more than 8 percent. Since 1946, American corporate profits have totaled over $90,000,000,000 after taxes. After all, the power is here and the money is here to be able to take care of the security of the United States. This is our obligation and duty.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I think we have to face up to the fact that every dollar we put into Western European security today will produce from $2 to $3 in return. We are right at the point in history at which we had hoped for years to arrive. We have a type of European integration. We have been able to improve the NATO organization. We have been able to perfect the European defense community. To leave it now without the necessary military sinews, without the strength and power to give it the ability to progress and to defend itself, would be tragic.

I realize that the reduction proposed by the amendment is in the amount of $500,000,000. Someone may say, "Well, they can get by without the $500,000,000." The fact is that national security will have to be paid for. Whether we are willing to pay for it this year, or 5 years from now, is a question which the Senate will have to decide. We cannot expect to have national security and yet delay forever the payment for it. Some day it will have to be chalked up and added up and paid for by the American people.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I conclude with this statement. The question is, Is this generation, are the Americans of this day, willing to pay the costs of national security, or are we to transfer and pass them on to another day, and, by so doing, run the chance of jeopardizing the security of America?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, there has been much debate on the pending bill. Those of us who have been able to be on the floor at least part of the time have heard speeches tinged with politics, and speeches in regard to whether we should have spent money in order to bring about recovery from the depression of the thirties. We have heard references to the money which was expended in order to win World War II. No one can question that it was necessary to stop Hitler; no one can question that it was necessary for this country to lift itself out of the great depression which paralyzed the whole country; but those questions are not before the Senate today. The question is whether the expenditure of the amount of money authorized to be appropriated by the pending bill would help bring about peace in this troubled world. Yes, we need a balanced budget; we need a balanced economy; but it would not do us much good to have either a balanced budget or a balanced economy if we were to become involved in world war III.

If the mutual security bill is a step in the right direction, if the expenditure of the money it authorizes would help prevent world war III, then it is completely justifiable. That is the question which we must decide today. That is the question which confronts the people of the Nation. On a great issue such as this, politics is not involved, nor should it be. I hope the Senate will not consider this as a political question.

It is impossible to separate a nation's military requirements from its basic and essential civilian needs.

On many of the undeveloped areas of the world we are most dependent today in our own basic and essential civilian needs. There was a time in history when our mines, our forests, and other natural resources pretty much supplied the needs of our economy. The hard reality today, however, is that modern technology has changed that picture.

Today the United States is dependent on foreign sources for its raw rubber, its tin, and its industrial diamonds. We are dependent on these sources for a large portion of many of our strategic metals and minerals.

If the undeveloped areas of Africa and Asia and other parts of the world fall into Soviet hands, we are weakened, the Soviet is strengthened. Disintegration in such areas—a process the Communists are experts in fostering—means we lose these sources of vital materials.

Such losses are not solely a matter of military concern. It takes steel and chrome and copper and aluminum, for example, to make an automobile. Many of the things we call necessities in our everyday life would be cut off if sources of the material going into them were to come under Soviet domination.

Our whole economy is geared to maintaining the present division between slave and free worlds. We must expand markets overseas. Our great industrial capacity today is twice what it was in 1940. We need not only friends to fight with us, but friends to buy from. And we need friends to sell our goods to. What would happen if our military production were cut off? We are geared to a world economy and must keep export markets open on our side of the iron curtain.

To readjust our industrial capacity to hemispheric economy or continental economy would write a grim record in unemployment, idle factories—a bogged down economy.

Mutual security is a lot of things fitted into a powerful weapon. Tearing it down and pulling out some of its parts destroys the whole thing. It just will not work with parts missing or with big parts replaced with small parts that do not fit.

I do not desire to take up a great deal of time, particularly in that there are not many Senators present on the floor. That, Mr. President, saddens me, because this is truly one of the most important questions which have confronted the American people within the time I have been a member of the Senate of the United States. It is more important to prevent a war than it is even to win a war, or at least it is equally important; because, if we can prevent war, we shall not have to win it. If we can prevent war, we shall not have to pour forth the blood of the youth and the treasure of the United States.

Will agreeing to the amendment help us to prevent war? Our Government has launched out on this program. I want the Senate to judge it from the standpoint whether it has helped and will continue to help to prevent war. The question is whether the funds proposed to be authorized are sufficient to accomplish the desired result. There is no evidence before any committee that, with the cut now suggested, the amount would be sufficient. On the other hand, those who are trained in such matters and who are supposed to know the facts have testified that if the bill is cut more

than the billion dollars which the committee has already cut it our country will be seriously jeopardized. The distinguished chairman of the committee read a telegram from General Eisenhower in which the general said that "an aggregate reduction of the order of a billion dollars will be heavily and seriously felt." That is what General Eisenhower said; and he is supposed to know all about the program——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask Senators to take the word of men who are supposed to know, and vote against the proposed cut.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, from some of the speeches in the Senate the impression might be gained that the proposed amendment, if agreed to, would rip the intestines out of the body of mutual aid. Since World War II, this Nation has sent across the seas more than $100,000,000,000 in foreign aid of all kinds, including the so-called ECA program. The Greece-Turkey aid program, which was the predecessor of foreign aid, was started in the Eightieth Congress—a Republican Congress. It had its birth there. There are Senators who are sincerely in favor of a program of mutual aid, but they want it to be a mutual program. They do not want our country, with its limited resources, carrying the whole world on its shoulders.

It might be thought, to hear the speeches with reference to the proposed cut, that we were proceeding to abolish the mutual-aid program. That is just so much "bunk," Mr. President. The Foreign Relations Committee, headed by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], after hearing all the facts, made a cut of $1,000,000,000. The committee used its best judgment. I give the distinguished Senator credit for using the best judgment possible on the facts presented.

Some of us heard evidence in the Armed Services Committee of the Senate——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I cannot yield; I have not sufficient time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did the Armed Services Committee approve what the Committee on Foreign Relations had done?

Mr. BRIDGES. Not by my vote. I voted against it. I favored the motion to reduce the amount $400,000,000 more That would not cripple the program at all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask for one more minute.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I yield one more minute to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. The proposed further reduction means, Mr. President, that those administering the bill will have to adjust their sights. It may be that Mr. Averell Harriman, a candidate for the Presidency, who is supposed to administer the act, will have to come home from campaigning and administer it a little more strictly than is being done today. It might mean that we shall need greater cooperation from the nations which we are supplying with foreign-aid funds. But, regardless of that, Mr. President, I think the pending amendment is sound, and it will not cripple the program. If it is adopted the program will continue, but it will be conducted, perhaps, in a better manner and the end result will be better because of the cut.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. May it not also result in discontinuing the propaganda which is being turned on the American people through a magazine issued by the administrators of the act?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think so.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this is the commencement season, when youngsters will be emerging from the schools of the country, and staid and sedate college seniors will be emerging in the robes of Academus and facing the realities of the world. That thought occurs to me, Mr. President, because it was in the commencement season 5 years ago, in June 1947, that General Marshall addressed the students at Harvard and there uttered a paragraph which, in my considered opinion, has become the most costly paragraph that ever fell from finite lips. It has been rolling since that time, and it continues to roll, because in a single paragraph of a commencement speech General Marshall uttered the core of the Marshall plan.

Before that time, in 1945—and that was only a few years ago—we heard passionate pronouncements about what the United Nations Organization was going to do for suffering mankind. It was long on promises and very short on performance. I am not astonished that I find myself in agreement with Walter Lippmann, for a change, as to the failure of this collective action thus far; and the United Nations is now approaching its seventh birthday.

After the United Nations came the Marshall plan, and we have been hearing about it in one guise or another ever since we adopted it. It was stated that it would be cheaper than war, although if war is not now going on in Korea, I do not know what it is. It was going to relieve suffering humanity and do much for us. So we had the Marshall plan and a war along with it. It did not bring stability——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I cannot yield at the moment.

It did not bring tranquility and serenity to our country. It did not bring all the blessings which were to be vouchsafed to the people of the United States.

On top of that—and the timing, of course, is interesting—came the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, making every skirmish in Europe our skirmish. If I correctly remember the testimony, the Secretary of State said, in response to a question propounded to him by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], no troops would be sent unless they were first authorized by the Congress of the United States. But over there the people began to ask for a little more security; they wanted to have a nucleus, and so later on we sent more troops, because sending them would make ECA work better and give a greater sense of assurance to the people of the Old World. Later more troops were sent, so that today there is an astonishing number of troops over there to cope with whatever eventualities may occur.

On the heels of that situation came Korea, which is today the world's greatest ulcer.

Then came 1951, and there was a change in the response on the other side. That means, Mr. President, that the wills of people have failed. We can produce the best weapons in the world, but if the wills of men are weak the weapons are not going to do any good. That, to me, is the most disturbing factor in the whole picture.

The committee said last year we should not reply upon the modest implementation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It took a large-scale program.

So the same passionate announcements, the same averments, the same promises, have been made to the people today and yesterday that have been resounding in this Chamber for a long time. We lift our eyes, as Ishmael did in the wilderness, and we behold instability and fear and danger that is greater now than before these astronomical expenditures were undertaken. Now there is a new ambition. In this proposal we take account of continuing to build economic strength.

Oh, the semantics, the words, of the thing. We are to consider "social upheavals," as we wrote into the bill last year, when we ended the Marshall plan. We hear about the security aspect and the technical aid aspect. We get lost in the terminology and in the buttered phrases.

Mr. President, I start with the premise that this country is the beachhead of freedom. If freedom fails here, it will fail everywhere. We will not be worried, then, about the rest of the world. So, since June 5, 1947, when General Marshall uttered the core of the Marshall plan, there has not been more security; there has been less. There has not been more tranquility in the world and in our own country; there has been less. There has not been more urgency, but less urgency and less real cooperation.

I have not been unmindful of the fact, since I was in Europe when the Harriman committee was there in 1947, that

the Harriman committee measured the capacity of the United States to carry this load. According to the language of the report, in considering the capacity of the United States to bear this burden, the Harriman committee figured we could safely spend $5,750,000,000 the first year, and support an over-all program aggregating $17,000,000,000. We are away beyond that now. Probably, with unexpended balances, $10,000,000,000 will be expended in the next fiscal year.

Who knows what the end of this business will be? What lies ahead? Did not the Secretary of State say we should spend $25,000,000,000 for 3 years? What was the information from Lisbon? I cannot say offhand. Some figures I saw indicated the over-all cost would be $75,000,000,000, and our share would be $57,000,000,000. Those figures portend continued bankruptcy ahead in Europe, and weakness in the United States.

We took Tito unto our bosoms, and we made him a promise about Trieste. The minute there is an indication that the promise will be fulfilled, he beats his breast and begins to roll us back as if we were strangers, notwithstanding the beneficences that have flowed from this country to him.

What about Tunisia, a country of 3,000,000 people, with 30 centuries of culture behind it? When they raise their voice and ask to have their case ventilated before the United Nations, our country and other countries give lip service to the free world and reject their pleas.

What kind of hypocritical nonsense are we inviting with American dollars, and in the face of possible collapse?

The press reports I get say that a paper army exists in Europe at the moment, along with growing neutralism. Incidentally, the testimony always interests me, because estimators are also spenders. I have looked through the list of witnesses to try to find one humble soul who would come and express a contrary view. One would begin to think this is a one-way street.

Another thing interests me. The London Economist said not so long ago that it would be healthier for Europe to receive more dollars to keep its civilian economy steady, and fewer dollars with which to defend frontiers. That is a great statement to reflect the strength of the wills of people to assume their primary responsibility, because defense rests, first, with them.

I am concerned, Mr. President, about waste.

I wonder what there is to the Genissiat program I have heard about. I am against the St. Lawrence seaway because I do not want to charge the budget of this country with a project of that kind, no matter how useful it may be. Yet, if we are correctly informed, here is a 345-mile waterway from Geneva to Marseilles that is to cost more than $600,000,000. I am not going to vote for such expenditures. I intend to support every reasonable amendment to economize on this measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WELKER. I yield 5 minutes more to the Senator from Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for five more minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That waterway runs, as I understand, from Lake Geneva to Marseilles. There will be 22 power dams, 66 power stations, 8 locks, 1 lock 82 feet high, and it is estimated that the dams will generate 14,000,000,000 kilowatts. The cost will be something over $600,000,000, including all the appurtenances, barges, wharves, and equipment necessary to go along with it.

Why has France rejected it? I understand it is now under way over there. Is that the thing with which we are going to burden the taxpayers of the United States? My friend from Minnesota can talk about the money we lavish on luxuries and one thing or another. That is our business, when all is said and done. That is the business of the individual.

But our business here as custodians and stewards of the Government is to make sure that we do not fasten a burden upon our taxpayers that is going to destroy the incentive, risk capital in enterprises, destroy our economy, pour our country into a strait-jacket, and finally invite collapse.

Mr. THYE rose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I must say here, parenthetically, that I had no reference whatsoever a moment ago to my esteemed friend, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

Mr. President, I became a little distressed when the President of the United States, who somehow has lost his vision for economy, should have said the day before yesterday that there are economizers on Capitol Hill who would rather embarrass the White House than checkmate the Kremlin.

I am not interested in embarrassing the White House. It is not necessary any longer. The President has removed himself from the king role. But that is the kind of language that gives me a sense of distress, indeed of fatigue.

One of the best ways to bring comfort to the Kremlin is to weaken the home front of this country, because that would be an open invitation for the disaster; it would play into their hands.

Oh, what an astonishing thing it is to try to save a little money. In fact last session we spent 10 months to complete a tax bill. Then, in one day the House of Representatives completed action on foreign aid to the tune of $8,000,000,000. Mr. President, the passion for spending is here today. If ever an epitaph is written over this country, not the least important of the things that will contribute to the epitaph will be that somehow or other we had forgotten to evaluate the dollars and the burden we placed upon a country that is already almost overburdened.

I am not anxious to raise any suspicion, but there was an interesting line in the President's message on the state of the Union. He said that economic issues and international issues are inseparably connected. The President was right when his statement is read in the light of what fell from the pens and the lips of Government economists last week, when they said a possible cut of the defense program may lead to a recession. Was that an invitation to continue to spend for things to kill, many of the results of which bring rather dubious value to our own country? Is that the invitation they were stressing to the branch of the Government to whom has been entrusted the power of the purse? It is time, I think, to stop, look, and listen.

A dollar that has been diluted to the point where, according to the Federal Reserve Board, it has its lowest purchasing value in 131 years. We have an interesting example in our neighbor to the north. Canada has a surplus in her treasury, a balanced budget, few controls, and a dollar that is worth more today over the counter than the dollar of the United States of America. What more warning do we need to be thinking a little about the stability and the solvency of the one beachhead that must be protected if the hopes of freedom are to be kept intact for humble people everywhere.

I shall not forget the journey I made around the world in 1945.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I yield one more minute to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Leaders in so many countries would grab me and say, "Let nothing happen to America, for if freedom is foreclosed there, then all is lost."

I would not mind an appropriation of a modest amount, but it seems to me that there is no quid pro quo for what we are giving. I think if I had it to do, I would say, "Tell us about your needs. Reduce them to language and to figures, and we will publish them on the front page of every daily newspaper in the United States." It would be interesting to see what the reaction of burdened taxpayers would be.

Mr. President, I subscribe to the amendment which has been offered by my friend and colleague from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and I sincerely hope, in the interest of our own people, that the amendment will prevail.

I yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], for himself and other Senators.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, our distinguished friends talk as though we had accomplished no economy in connection with this particular bill. The Foreign Relations Committee cut the bill by an even $1,000,000,000. We did that after listening patiently to the testimony. The Armed Services Committee, to which the bill was subsequently referred, made the same recommendation by a majority report to the Senate. The House committee, after listening patiently to the testimony presented to it, came up with substantially a $1,000,000,000 cut in the bill. So the bill does

not come before the Senate as though no committee had given it due consideration, and made the cuts which it was felt could be justified.

Reference has been made to what was spent under the Marshall plan. When the Marshall plan was first submitted to the Congress, it called for expenditures of $17,500,000,000; yet through the patient work of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee itself, in large part, and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, the actual expenditures under the Marshall program have amounted to only $12,500,000,000. So there has been a disposition to economize upon the part of those who are responsible on the committees.

Mr. President, I do not wish to make an undue appeal to the sentiments of Senators who are to vote upon this important question. We now have a bill which has been reduced by a total of $1,000,000,000. The House has reduced it almost by an additional three-quarters of a billion dollars. Even if the bill should be passed at the present level, in the conference between the House and Senate there must be some give and take in order to arrive at a final decision. So it seems to me that we have done enough in connection with this particular bill to justify a vote in support of it. Moreover, for the first time Europe has taken definite steps looking toward a federation—not in a political sense, it is true, but in an economic and military sense. That is the essential thing in the preservation of the liberties of this world.

Civilization may be standing at the very brink of the centuries; yet we quibble here over a reduction of $500,000,000 more, at the very time when, to take away this appropriation or cut it too low, would mean not only a cut in the defense of Europe, but the destruction of the very will of the free men of Europe to defend Europe, in the sense which will mean so much for our own security.

As I see it, we cannot afford to gamble upon the proposal now before us. A reduction of $1,000,000,000 in the appropriation is an adequate cut. There is a possibility that there may be a still further reduction in the conference, in order to bring forth a bill which can be enacted into law.

So I express the hope that the Senate will recognize what is involved in this issue. Nothing less is involved than the will of the free men of this earth, especially in Western Europe, to stand up and integrate themselves in a federated system which is the hope of the world.

Does any Senator regret the aid we gave to Greece and Turkey? Does any Senator regret for a minute that Greece and Turkey have been brought into the Western European alliance? Does any Senator for a moment question that the 500,000 or 600,000 soldiers in Turkey would give a great account of themselves if unfortunately war should come again?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the hope of an integrated Europe is in a Germany which is able and willing to fight, and ultimately a Spain which is willing to throw herself in on our side.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, may I inquire as to the time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Each side has one more minute.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a member of the Armed Services Committee I voted for a cut of $1,000,000,000 in the bill, and announced at the time that I reserved the right to vote for a further cut on the floor of the Senate, depending upon the argument and evidence presented there.

In my judgment, those who are urging a further cut are just as sincere and patriotic Americans as those of us who feel that the evidence does not warrant a further cut at this time. It becomes a matter of judgment. After weighing the evidence I have come to the conclusion that I do not believe we can justify running the risk which, in my opinion, would be involved, in view of the great peril which confronts us, if we were to vote for the pending amendment.

PRINTING OF TESTIMONY OF BERNARD BARUCH BEFORE ARMED SERVICES SUBCOMMITTEE (S. DOC. NO. 138)

Mr. President, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] joins with me now in asking unanimous consent to have published as a Senate document the impressive testimony which was submitted to the Armed Services subcommittee this morning by one of the greatest living Americans, Bernard Baruch. On the basis of that testimony I rest my case in support of my vote against the pending amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I do not wish to close this debate without referring to the remarks made by my distinguished colleague from the State of California [Mr. NIXON], who made the statement that because of the fact that in the past 7 years we had lost 600,000,000 people to communism, we should refuse to make the proposed cut. I know of no better argument for this amendment than those very words. We have poured more than $75,000,000,000 down a rat hole, and we are still losing people to communism by the millions. I say it is time the taxpayers of the United States and the economy of this Nation were considered. One Senator says that he is agreeable to a reduction of $400,000,000, but not $500,000,000. I ask, how can the line be drawn that close?

Mr. President, I think this amendment is sound. The taxpayer must at last be considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] for himself and other Senators. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the amendment of the eminent junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, after line 16, it is proposed to add the following:

On page 11, strike out the quotation marks at the end of line 9 and between lines 9 and 10 insert the following:

"SEC. 537. In addition to any amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorizations contained in this act, the President is authorized to expend for any of the purposes of this act the sum of $500,000,000 from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for the Department of Defense or any of its activities. The total amount expended for any purpose pursuant to this section shall not exceed the amount by which (a) the amount requested for such purpose in the estimates accompanying the President's request for enactment of the Mutual Security Act of 1952 exceeds (b) the amount appropriated for such purpose pursuant to authorizations contained in the Mutual Security Act of 1952."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois subject to a point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is not in order as an amendment to the pending amendment. It is an entirely separate and independent proposition. The amendment of the Senator from Illinois would be in order as a separate amendment, but not as an amendment to the pending amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Much as I regret to do so, because I do not believe we should confuse the situation with respect to the pending amendment I make a point of order with reference to the amendment being offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order. The amendment will be in order as a separate amendment, but it is not in order as an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] for himself and other Senators.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. STENNIS (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. McCARTHY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with

the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce that the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. If present and voting, the junior Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

I announce further that the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON]. If present and voting, the senior Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] would vote "nay."

I announce also that if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Conference of the International Council for Christian Leadership at The Hague.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is detained on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting the Senator from Washington would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF]. If present and voting the Senator from Montana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. If present and voting the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—33

Bennett	Dworshak	Millikin
Bricker	Ellender	Mundt
Bridges	Ferguson	Schoeppel
Butler, Md.	Frear	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Smith, N. C.
Capehart	Jenner	Taft
Carlson	Kem	Thye
Case	Long	Watkins
Cordon	Malone	Welker
Dirksen	Martin	Williams
Douglas	Maybank	Young

NAYS—41

Aiken	Hill	Morse
Anderson	Hoey	Neely
Benton	Holland	Nixon
Brewster	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Hunt	Pastore
Clements	Ives	Robertson
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Eastland	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Fulbright	Lehman	Smathers
George	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Green	McCarran	Sparkman
Hayden	McFarland	Tobey
Hendrickson	Monroney	Underwood
Hennings	Moody	

NOT VOTING—22

Butler, Nebr.	Kefauver	McMahon
Cain	Kerr	Murray
Duff	Knowland	O'Conor
Ecton	Langer	Seaton
Flanders	Magnuson	Stennis
Gillette	McCarthy	Wiley
Johnson, Colo.	McClellan	
Johnston, S. C.	McKellar	

So the amendment offered by Mr. WELKER, for himself and other Senators, was rejected.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment just voted on was rejected.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which is designated "5-23-52-A."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by Mr. LONG is as follows:

On page 3, line 2, strike out "$3,620,317,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,410,443,000."

On page 3, line 15, strike out "$1,588,922,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,496,810,000."

On page 4, lines 9 and 10, strike out "$529,614,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$498,912,000."

On page 4, line 20, strike out "$48,038,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$45,253,000."

On page 5, line 4, strike out "$56,772,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$53,481,000."

On page 5, line 7, strike out "$66,380,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$32,532,000."

On page 5, line 20, strike out "$533,859,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$502,911,000."

On page 6, line 5, strike out "$356,354,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$335,696,000."

On page 8, line 2, strike out "$54,501,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$51,342,000."

On page 8, line 4, strike out "$19,215,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$18,101,000."

On page 10, line 9, strike out "$8,734,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,228,000."

On page 10, line 25, strike out "$2,446,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,304,000."

On page 14, line 18, strike out "$14,848,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$13,987,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, inasmuch as this amendment is very much in the nature of amendments previously considered, the amendment need not require long debate. Therefore, I ask that debate on this amendment be limited to 15 minutes to a side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I believe this amendment can be very briefly explained. It proposes to reduce the amount of authorization carried by the bill by $400,000,000, or by $100,000,000 less than the amount of reduction proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Idaho, on which the Senate has just voted.

The amendment I now offer is one which was offered in the Armed Services Committee. The committee members who were present at that time were 5 to 1 in favor of agreeing to the amendment. One member had to leave the room; but if he had been present at the moment when the vote was taken in the committee, the result of the vote would have been 6 to 1. However, it seemed that the armed services and the State Department viewed the amendment with great alarm, and were successful in getting all the absent members of the committee to be represented by proxies, with the result that the next day all six proxies were cast against the cut proposed by the mmebers of the Armed Services Committee who were present. Therefore, by virtue of the six proxies which were voted at that time, after they had more or less been sought all across the country, the amendment was rejected by the committee.

Nevertheless, certainly it was the judgment of the members of the committee who were present at the time when the evidence was heard and certainly it was the judgment of the committee members who were present at the time when the amendment was brought up, that it was wise to reduce the authorization by $400,000,000.

I believe the Senate should know and should take cognizance of the fact that those who are in charge of the administration of a program are invariably its enthusiasts, and they will always recommend to Congress just as much in the way of authorizations and appropriations for their program as they believe there is any possibility of obtaining. So, in the case of this program, those who are in charge of administering it, including even such a great man as General Eisenhower, tend to become much enthused about the program and do not try to pare it down in the way that others would try to do.

For instance, Mr. President, this bill as proposed by the administration first called for authorizations in the amount of approximately $7,900,000,000. The committee which studied the bill proposed that it be reduced in amount by $1,000,000,000. It should be noted that no one has closer contacts with this matter than does the Foreign Relations Committee, whose members have a special opportunity to study the program both at home and abroad. They have the closest contact with the State Department and with the administration of the mutual-defense program; and, being closest to it, they see more of it, and they tend to become greater enthusiasts for it than does the average Member of the Senate.

When the bill was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, even though that committee did not have a chance to study the bill very long, it was by only one vote that this particular amendment failed to be adopted; and it is significant that even when the amendment failed to carry in the committee, two of the votes cast in the committee were by proxy, and at that time were voted with reservations. So, Mr. President, actually the majority of the committee would have tended to be in favor of this amendment.

This amendment would amount to a 19-percent cut in the amount proposed.

It is significant to note what has happened to some other legislative proposals which have been before us. I am one of those who believe in developing the resources of the Nation, and I am one of those who believe that ultimately the strength of our Nation is the strength of the free world. Certainly that is so in large measure. So it is significant to note that a policy of "No new starts" has been adopted by the administration, and that projects not already under way cannot be undertaken. Yet, notwithstanding that, even in connection with the limited budget proposed by the administration, cuts in flood control and navigation projects have already been effected in the House of Representatives to the extent of approximately 30 percent.

Here we have a program which certainly is not so limited in its scope; and it seems to me that a cut of approximately 19 percent would not particularly damage the program. I notice that in the case of all dollar authorizations the administration evidently insists upon the greatest possible flexibility, which indicates that there is no figure in this entire bill which is in any respect sacrosanct. The administrators of the program intend to juggle the funds back and forth in order to get the best results possible for the money available. I believe that by reducing another $400,000,000, we shall in no wise harm this program.

Mr. President, I hear it said that in considering the situation overseas today we should not overlook the significance of the signing of a treaty for a defense community in Europe. It is noteworthy that the timing of this program has always been such that the Congress has always been under the greatest possible pressure at the time a vote occurs. The junior Senator from Louisiana voted on this original program when it was authorized initially. He noted significantly that after that vote occurred in the United States Senate, the President, on the next day, announced that Russia had the atom bomb. There is no doubt in the mind of the junior Senator from Louisiana, inasmuch as the President announced that Russia had had the atomic bomb for some time, that had it been necessary in order to obtain the full amount of the appropriation, the President probably would have made the announcement 1 or 2 days earlier, instead of waiting until after that vote to make the announcement.

I also recall that, when we voted on this program the second time, there were riots in Europe. General Eisenhower was in Europe, and the cry was raised, "Let us not turn our backs on General Eisenhower at this important time, when he is undertaking to get the free world to work together."

Mr. President, we now find that there is another emergency. I submit that the timing of legislation of this character will tend to be such that we shall always find that there is never a right time to reduce appropriations for the program, that it is always the wrong time, and that the program will always come before us at the wrong time to make any cuts or any reductions whatever. The Congress should determine the basic policy. Why should we allow those who are the greatest enthusiasts for the program to go overseas and commit this Nation to $7,000,000,000, $8,000,000,000, or perhaps even $10,000,000,000 or $15,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money, without reserving to ourselves the right to pass upon the question of how much we believe can be pared from the program? The junior Senator from Louisiana feels that a much greater cut could be made without injuring this program, and that there would be no substantial injury to the program, but, on the contrary, a major saving to the taxpayers by reducing the authorization contained in this bill by $400,000,000. Therefore, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, how much time remains on the amendment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Louisiana has 7 minutes; the Senator from Texas, 15.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not want to take 15 minutes. The Senate has just voted on this same proposition and defeated it. There is only a difference of $100,000,000. The principle is the same.

Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana, who offers this amendment, is on the Committee on Armed Services. He voted to send this bill to the Armed Services Committee after the Committee on Foreign Affairs reported it. It was sent to the Armed Services Committee, and that committee voted an amendment, similar to the one now proposed, down. Is there consistency in that? The Senator from Louisiana wanted to obtain the judgment of the Armed Services Committee, where his voice could be heard, and where no doubt it was heard. But that committee voted down the amendment, and, a while ago, the Senate voted down an amendment proposing a slightly greater cut.

Mr. President, I do not want to consume the time of the Senate unnecessarily, but I ask Senators, what is happening yonder in Europe? The United States, together with the prime ministers of certain European countries, have been able to induce Germany to line up with the West, and to become one of the western allies. That was a monumental achievement. Had Germany lined up with Russia, on the other hand, it would have spelled the doom of the western alliance. It would have meant a serious threat to the safety of Western Europe. It would have meant a serious threat to the safety of the United States itself. Can that be doubted? Do we want to send a message to Europe saying, "All right, go ahead, but we are going to trim the mutual-security bill.

We have cold feet. We are not going to carry through?"

No, Mr. President, we cannot send a message of that sort to our European allies. Do we want to discourage them? Do we want to throw cold water upon them? Do we want to tell them that we are going to give them just a little dab, just enough money to make them think we are for them, when in fact we are going to vote the other way? No, Mr. President.

Who knows best about the conditions which exist in connection with the defense of Western Europe? Is it not General Eisenhower, who has been there, who has been in control, who has been in command, and whose duty it was to solve the problems connected with the defense of Western Europe? Does General Eisenhower know less about it than do Members of the Senate? Upon military matters, Mr. President, I think I should prefer to take the judgment of General Eisenhower. He was a good general in World War II. He led the armies that landed yonder on the western coast of France, a feat which it had been said could not be accomplished. He took his army into France. He marched it across France and into Germany. He brought Hitler to his knees in surrender. He gave triumph to the American Flag and to the flags of our allies. Does General Eisenhower not know more about what the military requirements are than does some individual Senator? Will any Senator say to him, "Oh, General Eisenhower, you are a good fellow; you have been a good officer, and all that; but listen: when it comes to running an army and saying what we need in the way of

an army, I am sorry, General, I do not agree with you. I know more than you do."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield more than does the Senator from Louisiana. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, if the Senator will not continue to ask me to yield, I shall yield to him for a question.

Mr. LONG. The committee of which the Senator from Texas is chairman, by a vote of 12 to 0, cut the amount which General Eisenhower judged to be proper, by $1,000,000,000. Does the Senator believe that Members of the Armed Services Committee are the only Senators who have better judgment than General Eisenhower?

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, no.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President——

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment. I want to answer that. When the Foreign Relations Committee acted, we had not obtained the judgment of General Eisenhower in all particulars. However, after we had acted, we asked his opinion. He said that any greater cut than a cut of $1,000,000,000 would threaten our security and would probably require a complete reorganization. I have never said that no one knows anything except members of the Armed Services Committee, because I do not agree with that. But that committee had sense enough to report this bill favorably. It knew enough about the military to say that a cut of $1,000,000,000 was enough. It overruled the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. No. I told the Senator I would yield once, and I do not intend to yield further.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in my time?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; not even in the Senator's time.

Mr. President, I yield. What does the Senator from Louisiana want?

Mr. LONG. Certainly, of the Senators of the Armed Services Committee who were present, those who were in the city, the vote was 6 to 1 in favor of cutting it. It was only through the use of the proxy system across the country that that decision was reversed.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have heard the Senator say that before. A proxy is a proxy, and a Senator who votes by proxy votes as much as does a Senator who is present voting in person. It does not depend upon the muscles of someone whether he is right. It does not depend upon how much he weighs. It depends upon his intellect, upon what his mind tells him. Members of the Armed Services Committee had sense enough to say that a cut of $1,000,000,000 was sufficient, whereas those who would weigh this issue according to avoirdupois say, "There are six beefy members here, and there are members who are thinking about other duties which they must perform." In that case the six beefy members would settle this great question, in the absence of other Senators. But when the Senator who had been absent showed up and voted it down, then they ceased to be good members of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. President, we have Joint Chiefs of Staff, composed of three very eminent men, soldiers and sailors and other distinguished men. What did they say?

"General Bradley, what do you say?"

General Bradley is chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He said that any further cut would not be in the interest of the welfare of the United States or of Western Europe.

"Well, now, General Bradley"—this is a Member of the Senate talking to him—"you are a very nice old man. I have always thought very well of you, but when it comes to military affairs I know a great deal more than you do, General Bradley. It is true that you led the Army successfully in Sicily; you led the Army successfully in Belgium. You have been Chief of Staff of the Army, and now you are Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but, General, you are not so smart a man as I thought you were. I have not talked to you about this matter. If you had talked to me, General, you would not have expressed yourself in the way you have, because I know and you do not know; I know what is right for the Army; I know what is right for Western Europe; I know what we can do and what we cannot do. But, General Bradley, you make a further study. You do not know what you are talking about. I know, and you do not."

That is also true, Mr. President, of the Chief of Naval Operations and of General Vandenberg, Chief of the Air Force:

"Now, General Vandenberg. I want to talk to you. I am a Member of the Senate. Take a chair and let me ask you something. I grant you, you know how to fly. You can get into an airplane and fly all around. I am not much of a flyer. I am a flyer only when campaign years come around. Then I do all the flying I can. But outside of your flying, do you know anything at all about military affairs? I know. You are talking to a man who knows what he is talking about. I know how many troops we should have in Western Europe. I know how much money we should spend. I know what kind of equipment we need. I am sorry, General Vandenberg, that you do not know any more about your business than you seem to know. I voted to confirm your nomination, but I was under a misapprehension. I thought you knew something about military affairs, but I find, when you disagree with me, you do not know a thing about military affairs."

No, Mr. President, we have already had enough debate on this subject. The Senate voted down the $500,000,000 amendment. What is the use of going all over the ground again? We are told that this is a $400,000,000 amendment. We are told, "There is a difference of $100,000,000. The other amendment was offered by another Senator; this amendment is offered by me."

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will speedily dispose of the amendment by rejecting it. It has already been repudiated, denied, and turned down by the Senate on the vote which has already been taken.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. Just one?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Just one.

Mr. CONNALLY. I know the Senator is as full of questions as a dog is full of fleas. But go ahead.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is it not true, I will ask the distinguished Senator from Texas, the beloved chairman of the committee of which I am a member, that the Chief of the Army, the Chief of the Air Force, the chief admiral of the Navy, and other representatives of the Department of Defense came before our committee and unanimously stated that they had to have $7,900,000,000? It was the amendment of the Senator from Texas, who disagreed with the technical military people, which cut a billion dollars from the $7,900,000,000 requested.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will answer the Senator. Those men came before our committee, but they did not say, "We have got to have so and so." They recommended $7,900,000,000, but the committee is not taking dictation. The Senator from Iowa and the risible Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] seem to think that whenever military people come forward Senators must fall down and worship them. The Committee on Foreign Relations does not do that kind of business. We do a little thinking now and then. We do not have the brass collar of any organization around our necks.

Mr. BRIDGES rose.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will not leave the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Oh, no; I am not leaving.

Mr. CONNALLY. I would rather see his front than his rear.

Mr. President, what did the military witnesses say? They recommended the original amount. We conducted an investigation. The Senator from Iowa knows that we had a full and complete hearing on the subject. We did not take their word or the word of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. We held a hearing, investigated the matter, and decided that the necessities of the occasion were very great indeed, but we also decided that they could get along with a billion dollars less, and we so voted. General Eisenhower was more or less satisfied. He said it would be a serious cut and that any greater cut, any substantial cut in addition, would probably wreck the organization which has already been built up and cause a reorganization.

Mr. President, I ask for a vote.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield me a couple of minutes?

Mr. LONG. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have been much interested in the argument of the distinguished Senator from Texas. First, he argues that the military are

completely right, and then he argues that his committee will not be dictated to by the military. It is hard to follow him. I like to follow him, but it is difficult to do so when he argues both ways within a few minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was thinking about what had been said about the military needs, and, on the other hand, I was thinking of the Foreign Relations Committee holding hearings and hearing arguments.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Texas may not think that $100,000,000 is a lot of money, but it is $100,000,000. He says the committee cut the request $1,000,000,000, and that General Eisenhower said we should not make any tremendous cut. If a cut of $100,000,000 is insignificant, there is not much difference between a billion dollars and a billion four hundred million dollars. So I think the distinguished Senator from Texas, whom we all love and highly regard, falls down on his own argument.

I hope most sincerely, Mr. President, that the amendment will prevail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. STENNIS (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], who if present would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am paired on this vote with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MCCARTHY. On this vote I am paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "nay."

I announce also that if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Conference of the International Council for Christian Leadership at The Hague.

On this vote the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea" and the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—37

Bennett	Eastland	Millikin
Bricker	Ellender	Mundt
Bridges	Ferguson	Schoeppel
Butler, Md.	Frear	Smith, Maine
Butler, Nebr.	Hickenlooper	Smith, N. C.
Byrd	Jenner	Taft
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Thye
Carlson	Kem	Watkins
Case	Long	Welker
Cordon	Malone	Williams
Dirksen	Martin	Young
Douglas	Maybank	
Dworshak	McKellar	

NAYS—40

Aiken	Hoey	Neely
Anderson	Holland	Nixon
Benton	Humphrey	O'Conor
Brewster	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Ives	Pastore
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Connally	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Fulbright	Lehman	Smathers
George	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Green	McCarran	Sparkman
Hayden	McFarland	Tobey
Hendrickson	Monroney	Underwood
Hennings	Moody	
Hill	Morse	

NOT VOTING—19

Cain	Kerr	Murray
Duff	Knowland	Robertson
Ecton	Langer	Seaton
Flanders	Magnuson	Stennis
Gillette	McCarthy	Wiley
Johnston, S. C.	McClellan	
Kefauver	McMahon	

So Mr. LONG's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. CASE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield so that I may offer two very brief amendments which I think will be accepted by the chairman of the committee?

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that the time is limited.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I ask the Senator from Louisiana to yield to me in order that I may offer two very brief amendments which I think will be accepted by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am willing to yield provided I do not lose the floor, and provided that none of the time consumed by the Senator from Nevada will be charged to me in the presentation of the amendment I am about to propose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer my amendment designated "C."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, between lines 21 and 22, it is proposed to insert a new subsection, as follows:

(a) In paragraph 101 (a) (1), insert ", for Spain," after "parties to the North Atlantic Treaty."

On page 2, line 22, it is proposed to strike out the first "(a)" and insert therefor "(b)."

On page 3, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "(b)" and substitute therefor "(c)."

On page 3, line 21, it is proposed to strike out "(c)" and substitute therefor "(d)."

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is simply to clarify the present language in the bill as regards Spain. As the Senate knows, the President, under the terms of the bill before us, is given discretionary authority to utilize 10 percent of the funds so as to carry out and meet the best interests of this country.

There are two ways in which a country may be given additional help under this 10-percent discretionary authority: First, either by being a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; or, second, by a determination by the President that it is to the best interests of this country to extend this additional aid. My amendment, therefore, would simply clarify the intention that Spain should

be included within the purview of this discretionary authority.

The final determination as to whether Spain should receive additional aid would be made by the President. However, in order that there would be no misunderstanding as to whether Spain would be eligible, I have offered this amendment and hope the Senate will see fit to adopt it.

I think the chairman of the committee will be willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I will take the amendment to conference. I cannot guarantee what will happen in the conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer another amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 23, immediately following the subparagraph designation "(c)", it is proposed to insert the following sentence: "Not less than $25,000,000 of the funds made available under authority of subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be used for economic, technical, and military assistance to Spain in accordance with the provisions of this act."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am offering an amendment which provides that Spain shall be allocated an additional $25,000,000 of the funds available under title I, relating to Europe, of the Mutual Security Act—S. 3086.

The purpose of my amendment is to insure that Spain in addition to being allowed to receive the $100,000,000 authorized last year shall receive an additional amount of $25,000,000 for the purposes of military, technical, and economic assistance. This $25,000,000 is but an infinitesimal amount of the total that will be finally appropriated for these purposes. It will not meet Spain's needs but it will give this friendly nation a pat on the back, and tell her that we stand together in our fight against the common enemy.

As I have stated before, a mutual security mission is being sent to Spain and I am sure that the work of this mission will be facilitated by this token of encouragement to that country.

Mr. President, I do not believe that there can be any disagreement with the fact that Spain by virtue of its strategic location is vital in the over-all defensive plans for Western Europe. We should, therefore, extend to that country every assistance possible. I hope that the Senate will adopt my amendment.

The House passed a bill, House bill 7005, containing the exact language of my amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Then if I take the amendment to conference, it will be all over. I will agree to carry the amendment to conference. I cannot guarantee what the House conferees will do. They may change their minds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "$1,588,922,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,088,922,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous agreement the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of Senators for a few minutes. I shall be very brief.

I realize that the atmosphere in the Senate today is not conducive to reducing authorizations embodied in the pending bill. Several have been proposed and have failed to win approval. However, I should like to approach the subject from a different angle. Instead of attempting to apply any across-the-board reduction, as the previous amendments have sought to accomplish, I am confining my amendment solely to that part of the bill dealing with economic aid.

If Senators will refer to page 3 of the pending measure, it will be noted that $1,588,922,000 is set aside for economic aid to Western European nations. My amendment would reduce that amount to $1,088,922,000—a net reduction of $500,000,000. I will tell the Senate why I think such a reduction is not only justifiable, but necessary.

Last year it was my privilege to travel through many of the Western European nations. During that trip, I made a study of American expenditures in the West European economic field over the past 3 years. After I returned to Washington I obtained supplemental information from the agencies involved in order to determine the progress made in strengthening the national economies of Western Europe.

To my surprise, and to my great pleasure, the reports I obtained indicated that progress was much greater than dreamed of or anticipated by Mr. Paul Hoffman, the former Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration.

In a colloquy which occurred in 1949 during debate on the 1950 recovery bill before the Senate Appropriations Committee, between the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and Mr. Hoffman, who was then ECA Administrator, the termination date of this vast and expensive undertaking was brought up. Mr. Hoffman, an able administrator, was quite specific as to what percentage increase in industrial production over prewar levels ECA considered to be evidence that our financial aid could be safely, and justifiably, ended. First I shall read what the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] said:

> Senator CORDON. Now, Mr. Hoffman, let us assume success at the end of 1952. Let us assume that your target, which I believe is 130 percent of prewar production, has been achieved at that time.

Mr. Hoffman replied—and I want Senators to mark well what he said:

> Mr. HOFFMAN. I think it goes a little less than that; I think it was about 125 percent, Senator.

Mr. President, in other words, when we started the ECA program, Mr. Hoffman's objective was clear and specific. He did not hedge. He said that the moment the countries of Western Europe reached 125 percent of their prewar production, we could safely terminate all economic aid. Europe could take care of itself.

Let me show what has happened since 1948, the year ECA began pouring billions of dollars into Western Europe. This is the picture I obtained in late 1951 and early 1952 from Mr. Tyler Wood, who at that time was Deputy Administrator of first, ECA and, during 1952, of the Mutual Security Agency. These are the figures. These are not opinions or weasel words. These are the cold, hard facts, Mr. President.

Basing prewar production on 1938 levels as 100 percent, Belgium and Luxemburg in 1951 had reached 146 percent. If we subtract the 125 percent envisioned by Mr. Hoffman from that figure, it indicates that industrial recovery in Belgium and Luxemburg has been 21 percent above the level deemed necessary by Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. President, here are the production figures for other European nations. I ask the Senators to listen well and determine for themselves if there is any necessity for our country to continue to strain its economy, run up a huge deficit, and expand our already enormous national debt to donate more unlimited billions in economic aid to these countries.

Denmark: Prewar, 100 percent; 1951, 162 percent.

France: Prewar, 100 percent; 1951, 138 percent.

Italy: Prewar, 100 percent; 1951, 144 percent.

Yet with all that progress, Mr. President, with all those clear-cut indications of good economic health, we are being asked to dump more billions into these countries.

I continue:

The Netherlands: Prewar, 100 percent; 1951, 148 percent.

Norway: Prewar, 100 percent; 1951, 154 percent.

United Kingdom: Prewar, 100 percent; 1951, 146 percent.

The average for all of the NATO countries in 1951, Mr. President, was 145 percent—20 percent more than Mr. Hoffman thought necessary.

Mr. Hoffman was emphatic and definite in his statement that when West European industrial production reached the goal of 125 percent, our job was to be done, that they could make it alone, under their own steam, from that time on out.

Mr. President, I do not ask the Senate to cut one penny of funds dedicated to military aid at this time, because I am not sufficiently informed on the subject. But I am saying to the Senate that we should by all means, if we are to be fair to our own people, cut the economic aid.

In view of the marvelous progress that has been made by all the countries in Western Europe, that aid is no longer necessary on the vast scale of past years. It can no longer be justified. To continue it will mean bringing bankruptcy nearer in our own United States.

As I pointed out on the floor of the Senate a few months ago, our bureaucrats are the ones who cry the loudest, that this so-called economic aid must be continued. And, I am sorry to say, Mr. President, they do not stop at just words. In order to make a better showing before the Senate and before the committees, our bureaucrats changed the yardstick they have been using to measure the economic progress of West European nations.

In the early days of ECA, the yardstick used was based on a percentage of prewar production. However, that whole picture was so bright, and showed so much progress being made, that the administration saw the handwriting on the wall. Their buggy ride, paid for by our taxpayers, was about to end. So they changed yardsticks. Instead of using the prewar 100 percent figure, the administration now uses 1948 as the 100 percent yardstick.

Of course, if we use 1948 instead of 1938, the whole picture is changed. It is still a good picture, but it makes a better talking point for more billions in economic aid, than the 1938 basis.

Using this new yardstick, Belgium and Luxemburg, for example, instead of showing 146 percent recovery, show 120 percent.

Denmark, instead of showing 162 percent, based on 1938 levels, shows, under the new formula, only 120 percent.

However, notwithstanding the fact that the yardstick has been changed, the average production index for all NATO countries is 125 percent, exactly the goal set by Mr. Hoffman when the program got under way.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the total increase in industrial production over prewar levels for West European nations and a table including this same data based on 1948 as 100, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Industrial production*

[Index 1938=100]

Country	Total industrial production				
	1938	1948	1949	1950	1951 [1]
NATO countries:					
Belgium-Luxemburg	100	122	122	124	146
Denmark	100	135	143	159	162
France	100	111	122	123	138
Iceland					
Italy	100	99	109	125	144
Netherlands	100	114	127	140	148
Norway	100	125	135	146	154
Portugal					
United Kingdom	100	120	129	140	146
Total NATO	100	116	126	138	145
Germany	100	50	72	91	109
Total NATO plus Germany	100	97	110	121	134

[1] Estimated.

TABLE 1.—*Industrial production*—Continued

[Index 1938=100]

Country	Total industrial production				
	1938	1948	1949	1950	1951
Other OEEC countries:					
Austria	100	85	114	134	148
Greece	100	76	90	114	129
Ireland	100	135	154	170	176
Sweden	100	149	157	164	172
Switzerland					
Turkey	100	154	162	165	169
Total OEEC countries	100	99	112	124	136

TABLE 2.—*Industrial production*

[1948=100]

Country	1938	1948	1949	1950	1951 [1]
NATO countries:					
Belgium-Luxemburg	82	100	100	102	120
Denmark	74	100	106	118	120
France	90	100	110	111	124
Iceland					
Italy	101	100	110	126	145
Netherlands	88	100	112	123	130
Norway	80	100	108	117	123
Portugal					
United Kingdom	83	100	107	116	121
Total NATO	86	100	108	116	125
Germany	200	100	144	182	218
Total NATO, plus Germany	103	100	113	125	138
Other OEEC countries:					
Austria	118	100	134	158	175
Greece	132	100	119	150	170
Ireland	74	100	114	126	130
Sweden	67	100	105	110	115
Switzerland					
Turkey	65	100	105	107	110
Total OEEC countries	101	100	113	125	137

[1] Estimated.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senate must be sensible about this matter. More all-out economic aid is not called for. If these countries themselves were sent up here to make a case for themselves, they could not do it.

It is our own people, Mr. President, our own bureaucrats who make a case for the foreign countries. Our own people do not take into consideration our economy. What I fear, Mr. President, and what I can see happening is this: If we continue to spend and spend and spend, and continue to increase our debt to such an extent that taxes become unbearable, we are going to kill the incentive of our people. If we kill incentive we will break our economy. And when our economy breaks, the United States of America is doomed. Nothing could please the Kremlin more than that.

I realize those are discouraging words, Mr. President. I wish they were not. But they are true. Let me call the attention of Senators to a few pertinent facts. Let me give the most recent figures that I have on national debts—European debts compared to our own.

The total debt of Belgium-Luxemburg is $5,000,000,000. The per capita debt is $562.

The total debt of France—and France is going to get a large part of the amount involved in this bill—is $13,000,000,000; total per capita debt, $313.

Here are some more, Mr. President. Compare them with our own.

Italy: Per capita debt, $112.

The Netherlands: Per capita debt, $637.

The per capita debt in the United Kingdom is $1,401.

In the United States, Mr. President, the per capita debt is $1,729.

And yet we are pouring billions of dollars into these countries. Can that be justified?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the total and per capita national debts of several European countries and the United States be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

National public debts [1]

Country	Total public debt [2]	Per capita debt [3]
Belgium-Luxemburg	$5,000,000,000	$562
France	13,000,000,000	313
Italy	5,200,000,000	112
Netherlands	6,500,000,000	637
United Kingdom	70,600,000,000	1,401
United States	260,000,000,000	1,729

[1] Basic data found on p. 79, hearings on 1953 Mutual Security Act.

[2] In round figures as of end of respective fiscal year 1951, expressed in terms of United States dollars.

[3] Computed on population figures for respective nations, not including possessions. Those populations, rounded off, are as follows: Belgium-Luxemburg, 8,900,000; France, 41,500,000; Italy, 46,400,000; Netherlands, 10,200,000; United Kingdom, 50,400,000; United States, 152,000,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, let us now look at what this Nation is doing in the way of defending itself, and compare it with what other countries are doing in their defense. The figures I have here are in percentages.

Government expenditure for defense in Belgium and Luxemburg is 20.7 percent of their total government budget. Denmark is spending 18 percent; France, 22 percent; Italy, 26.7 percent; the Netherlands, 24 percent; Norway, 22 percent, and the United Kingdom, 29 percent.

Greece is spending 27½ percent of her budget for defense, and Turkey, 25 percent. The United States, Mr. President, is spending 68 percent—more than any nation I have mentioned. Yet we are being asked to spend more. And I should like to point this out to Senators, also:

If we add to the 68 percent the amount that we are now authorizing to be spent to assist our friends across the seas, the total figure is 75 percent.

Mr. President, we cannot possibly stand a burden of that kind much longer. It is not only a staggering burden, but an unfair one.

I have been in the Senate only 16 years. When I first came to this Chamber, the amount of money appropriated to operate all departments of Government, including the amount dedicated to paying the then existing debt with interest, along with everything else,

amounted to only approximately $750,000,000 more than is now required to pay the interest—just the interest, Mr. President—on our national debt alone. Yet today we spend many times that amount—and our own Government agencies want us to spend more.

That is the picture. Yet, with all of that, we are being asked to dump more and more and more billions of our tax dollars into West Europe. All this despite the fact we have already spent in the countries of Western Europe sufficient money to increase the industrial capacity of those countries far beyond the original plan of Mr. Hoffman, far beyond the dream of any Senator, and far beyond the dream, I am sure, of any of the countries of Western Europe.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a chart depicting the amounts spent by western European nations and the United States for defense—as expressed in percentages of their respective gross national product and their total government expenditures, be incorporated into the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Defense expenditures by NATO and Allied countries[1] *(fiscal year 1952)*

Country	Percent of gross national product	Percent of total Government expenditures
Belgium-Luxemburg	5.3	20.7
Denmark	2.7	18.0
France	9.3	32.2
Italy	5.0	26.7
Netherlands	7.0	24.0
Norway	5.0	22.2
United Kingdom	9.6	29.5
Greece	8.3	27.5
Turkey	5.4	25.2
United States	14.0	[2] 68.0

[1] Figures appeared in Newsweek issue of Jan. 14, 1952.
[2] This 68.0 figure climbs to 75 percent if our foreign arms aid is included.

NOTE.—United States spending nearly 5 times as much as other 9 nations in dollars.
Average expenditures: 9 NATO and allied countries spending 25 percent of total budgets on defense; United States spending nearly 75 percent. (See above note).

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am sure that if at the beginning of this program we had indicated to the NATO countries that as soon as 120 percent of their prewar production level had been reached we would stop the program, they would have been perfectly satisfied. However, now that they are on the road to recovery quicker than was anticipated; now that they are getting all this fine, free money from us, and now that we are willing to continue dumping it into their laps, they will continue to ask for more. If we are foolish enough to continue hopping every time they say jump, it is no one's fault but our very own.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me this time?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. First of all, I should like to congratulate the Senator from Louisiana for reading into the RECORD some very impressive and very informative statistics which I believe every American citizen should consider most conscientiously and most seriously these days. I hope they will be read by the glib editorial writers who advocate making endless gifts to Europe, in undetermined amounts; and I hope they will also be most seriously considered by various speakers, including administration spokesmen, who like to talk in such terms.

I am sure the Senator from Louisiana will recall that in the early days of the Marshall plan and the ECA, the target was to restore the economies of the other countries to their prewar level. Now that level has been exceeded in country after country.

Mr. ELLENDER. The economy of every West European country which received ECA aid has reached a point from 13 to 37 percent above the estimate made by Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. As a consequence, we see the appalling situation, for the first time in generations, that on the international exchange the American dollar has less value than some foreign currencies. Some day some one will have to be answerable for ruining and wrecking the economy of the United States because of a glittering generality to the effect that it is easy to reach, by way of such a shortcut, the result everyone desires.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, who is a member of the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, whether it is true that some of the projects in foreign countries which would be curtailed as a result of adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana are practically identical to projects in the United States which have had to be curtailed because of a lack of funds with which to construct them?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true; we are being asked to curtail projects which are absolutely necessary if we are to continue to be a great Nation.

Mr. MUNDT. Precisely.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from South Dakota well knows that unless we now arrest the flow into the ocean of the precious topsoil upon which our agriculture depends, we shall not remain the well-nourished and adequately-fed Nation we now are.

Yet because of the tremendous foreign expenditures, which we are being called upon to make in order to increase the industrial capacity of a few nations, far beyond their wildest dreams, many essential projects—such as soil-conservation projects—are being halted. That is being penny-wise and pound-foolish. We are inviting disaster.

Mr. President, unless we take note now, tomorrow it will be too late.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I agree completely with the Senator from Louisiana. As he well knows, not only is the problem of soil conservation a most serious one which presently confronts us, but we are confronted with many other meritorious projects, such as the St. Lawrence seaway and the many programs in our river valleys.

Some of those who now are proclaiming that we should not cut a single dime from this program for foreign aid, also are appearing before the committees and are saying to them, "Find a means of helping these programs of ours."

Today we are faced with the present debt limit of $275,000,000,000. Unless we pay some attention to economy and unless we give some heed to the fact that we must protect the source of all the funds we are making available to foreign countries, we shall find ourselves completely the victim of the grand strategy of the Soviets, as announced by Lenin, namely, "Bankrupt America and you do not have to fight her."

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure the Kremlin has been pursuing that cause—a course based on the approach that the only way to destroy democracy is to destroy it from the inside—bring it to bankruptcy, economic defeat, and wait for the inevitable result. Certainly we are actually doing that now, ourselves, by appropriating far beyond our ability to pay.

Mr. President, if this bill as it now stands is enacted into law, we shall spend billions of dollars in assisting foreign countries. That will mean that a great deal of the money thus authorized and subsequently appropriated will be spent to pay for labor and for other things which those countries need in order to buoy themselves up, just as today, in our own country we are spending—on our own defense—68 percent of all the funds we are appropriating. If it were not for that large defense expenditure, what, Mr. President, do you think would become of our economy?

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, if I may do so. I wish to ask him whether he agrees with me that we should keep in mind that these great spending projects abroad have been undertaken in an era of world-wide prosperity. However, suppose that several years from now we were to confront an era of world-wide depression: Then what would the Senator from Louisiana expect the burden of this country would be, if in such a period we undertook a world-wide WPA program, which as such a time would certainly be more important than it would be in a period of prosperity?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a moment ago I stated that we embarked on the ECA program for the express purpose of trying to fight communism, stopping it from spreading over Europe and the free world, and trying to unite all the freedom-loving people.

If we continue to spend at the rate at which we now are spending, and if war does not come—and I indeed pray that war will not come—we shall have tons upon tons of war matériel on our hands 5 or 10 years from now. The time will come when we shall have to stop these expenditures, unless war comes. Whenever that time comes, it is possible that we shall bring to our own shores the very thing we are fighting against now. In short, it is my considered judgment that unless a government makes available to its people their basic needs,

that country is in for trouble, sooner or later.

So, Mr. President, if we continue to spend at the rate at which we now are spending, and if we continue to dissipate our God-given natural resources at the present rate, the time will not be far distant when our Nation will not be able to provide its people with their basic needs; and the moment that time comes, we are in for trouble.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Louisiana is a great student of communism, and he has made trips throughout the world, studying the behavior of people in their own countries. So I should like to ask him this question: If we were to accept the philosophy of some of our colleagues in the Senate, who apparently believe that the only road to peace is by means of so-called billion dollar diplomacy, and who apparently believe that the only way to stop communism is to spend, abroad, billions and billions and billions of dollars, endlessly and continuously taken from the pockets of the hard-working American taxpayers, when would the Senator from Louisiana think the need for American money to be spent abroad would be the greatest, so far as stopping communism was concerned? In other words, would the need be greatest while the foreign countries were living in a period of prosperity, such as that they now enjoy—at this time when their economy is well over 100 percent of its prewar level; or would their need be greatest in a period of depression, when they would find themselves without work and perhaps without food?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, there can be no question about that; and such a situation may develop here. No one can be sure. Of course, the time will come—for it is just a question of time, and that time is not far off—when we shall have to make reductions in our foreign expenditures—both military and other—if we are to save our own economy.

Mr. MUNDT. Precisely.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, I am assuming that war will not come.

If war does come, what will happen will be anyone's guess.

On the other hand, if we do not check these expenditures—in other words, if we continue to pour our money into the countries of western Europe—the people of those countries will simply continue to think that money grows on trees in the United States. Thereafter, when we finally cut off the gifts, we shall be in just as bad a way with them as at any time in the past. Certainly such a time is coming.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Louisiana has demonstrated the fact that in country after country there is project after project which now is being built with the use of American money—projects which the people of those countries turned down by their own decision during periods of prosperity before the war, when they would have had to spend their own money in order to develop them.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I am highly gratified to hear the distinguished Senator from Louisiana make the argument he is making today.

In 1948, when we first passed the Marshall plan, I was astounded to discover that all the countries of Europe were within 1 percent or 2 percent of recovery. That was the situation in the case of the western European countries, with the exception of Austria and Germany, whose progress was deliberately being held back.

So I ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana whether he is aware that a recent election held in Italy showed more Communist votes than were cast in 1947, before we began the Marshall plan? It is startling to realize that that situation exists after we have spent or invested $1,300,000,000 in our Italian foreign-aid program, and after it is apparent that when we do so we are denying such aid to the taxpayers of the United States, although we are giving it to the Italians. Is the Senator from Louisiana aware of that situation?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, I am; and the reason for the Marshall plan, as I indicated a while ago, was to place those nations in such a position that they could defend themselves, and the rest of the free world, in the event that Russia marched against us. I repeat, now that these nations have reached that position, and especially since production goals have been reached so far ahead of the time our planners originally calculated, they ought to be satisfied. The Senate can and must make this $500,000,000 reduction, which I believe legitimate and necessary if we are to remain strong. As a matter of fact, I intended to ask a $1,000,000,000 reduction, but in view of the recent votes, and the opinion that prevails here today, that seemed out of the question. So I decided I would do my best and at least make a start. I think we can well do just that.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for one more question. I have but 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator whether he recalls, as I am sure he does, that in the debate in 1948 it was said by the junior Senator from Nevada that there was no problem connected with establishing an industrial plant in any country at any place where it is shown that markets existed. It was not shown that they had the markets. They were expecting to divide our markets. It was thought by at least a majority of the Senate, as indicated by the vote, that all that would be necessary would be to build up the industry of Europe, and the problem would be solved. As a matter of fact, that has aggravated the problem. Is that what the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is trying to say?

Mr. ELLENDER. Perhaps not exactly that, but we both have the same goal in mind.

Mr. MALONE. In other words, we divide our markets.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I understand.

Mr. MALONE. We make it necessary, because we do not allow them to sell the goods here. They have as a result greater industrial capacity than they know what to do with.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. WELKER. I shall be very brief. I want to say to my distinguished colleague that his address has been the most profound address I have heard upon this subject since the consideration of the bill began. I ask the Senator whether he is not concerned about the many pairings we have had on these votes, resulting, in other words, in legislation by absenteeism?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is a custom of the Senate.

Mr. WELKER. Yes, but a very bad one.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a moment ago, before I was interrupted—and I did not mind the interruptions—I was pointing out that, percentagewise, the total defense expenditure by the United States is 68 percent. If we add to that the amount called for in the pending bill, the total will increase to over 75 percent. To that should be added the amount we are now appropriating for the veterans of past wars, for the Voice of America, and other international programs. Over 85 percent of our proposed budget for 1953 will go toward helping us preserve our freedom in the future as well as in taking care of liabilities which have resulted from past wars. In the matter of percent of national gross product dedicated to defense, we are far ahead, of course, of all other countries of the world. Belgium spends 5.3 percent; Denmark, 2.7 percent; France, 9.3 percent; the Netherlands, 7 percent; Norway, 5 percent; the United Kingdom, 9.6 percent; Greece, 8.3 percent; Turkey, 5.4 percent; and the United States, 14 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks some additional tables which emphasize why this economic aid must be reduced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Armament expenditures expected during 1953 (fiscal)

	Amount	Percent of estimated national income
West Germany [1]	$2,677,500,000	10.5 (1952 figure none).
United Kingdom	4,846,800,000	12.8 up 3.2 from 1952.
France	3,571,428,571	11.0 up 1.7 from 1952.
United States	[2] 57,000,000,000	17.6 up 3.6 from 1952.

[1] Contingent upon her joining NATO.
[2] Approximate.

NOTE.—These figures set by NATO Executive Board in February 1952.

Comparative expenditures for defense by Allied Powers 1938–52 compared to gross national product (percent)

	1938	1948–49	1949–50	1950–51	1951–52
United States	1.2	4.7	5.1	7.3	14.0
United Kingdom	6.5	6.3	5.8	5.7	9.6
Canada	.7	1.7	2.3	4.4	8.3
France	7.3	5.8	6.1	6.9	9.3
Netherlands	1.5	7.4	4.0	4.6	7.0
Belgium-Luxemburg	2.6	1.7	2.5	2.6	5.3

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

United States has spent nearly $12,000,000,000 (roughly $11,800,000,000 as of December 31, 1951). This breaks down to nearly $80 for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Contribution table

United States	$11,800,000,000
European nations (via counterpart funds)	9,000,000,000

Breakdown of United States funds

Five and five-tenths billions, purchase of industrial commodities.

Five and two-tenths billions, purchase of food and agricultural commodities, such as cotton.

Eight hundred million, cost of ocean freight for goods sent to Europe.

Four hundred and fifty million, creation and maintenance of European Payments Union.

Counterpart funds have built 27 major products for the increase of power (this is biggest use of counterpart funds); built 23 major projects for modernizing and expanding iron and steel production; modernized some 11 major petroleum refining works.

Lend-lease and economic aid for all countries

1940–51	$85,351,000,000
Less returns	10,836,000,000
Net aid	74,515,000,000

This $74,515,000,000 total includes United States investment in the International Bank and Monetary Fund. If this contribution is removed, it drops to $71,130,000,000.

With the United States population at 152,000,000, the per capita cost of the 11-year period is $474.50 for every man, woman, and child in this country.

Foreign grants by the United States (in millions of dollars): Total war and postwar periods, $71,264,535; war period,[1] $48,128,297; postwar period,[2] $23,136,238.

United States expenditures for military services (in billions of dollars)

	Includes lend-lease	Percent of budget
1945	84.6	85.7
1948	11.0	32.4
1949	11.9	29.7
1950	12.3	30.6
1951	20.5	45.8
1952	39.8	56.1
1953	51.2	59.9

NOTE.—Total percent of United States budget for foreign military, economic, and foreign relations (1953):

Domestic military	59.9
International security and foreign relations	+12.7
Total percent of total United States budget	82.6

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the absence of the chairman, and as the only member of the Foreign Relations Committee on the floor at the moment, I yield myself 5 minutes, following which I shall yield to other Senators who may desire to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am very much interested in the suggestions and remarks made by the Senator from Louisiana. I may say that, generally speaking, if the situation were to me what it seems to be to him, I should be in line with his reasoning. But, Mr. President, the committee gave full consideration to this whole situation, and that is why the committee made the recommendation on page 3 to which the Senator has referred. Let us bear in mind that we are dealing with title I of this bill, which has to do with North Atlantic countries and which has to do with taking care of the NATO program. That is what we are discussing.

Mr. President, the ECA was wound up during the past year because, as the Senator from Louisiana so properly said, it had accomplished its immediate objective. As a matter of fact, it accomplished that with a saving of approximately $5,000,000,000 compared to what was originally anticipated. When the ECA was set up under Mr. Paul Hoffman, it was expected that the expense of it over the period it was to run—that is, until 1952—would be $17,000,000,000. When it was finally wound up, the overall expense of it had been $12,000,000,000. The ECA, through legislation enacted last year, was definitely wound up.

Why, then, do we continue foreign-aid appropriations, Mr. President? We do so because of the NATO situation, because of the threat of aggression from Russia, because of the need of military security in Western Europe, because of our negotiations with our allies, under the brilliant leadership of General Eisenhower, to see what they can contribute in manpower and what we can contribute of our financial resources to help build up the collective security. As a result, at the recent Lisbon Conference those countries stated they were prepared to defend themselves with a certain number of divisions. We are not giving them a single division this year or a single man, but we are called upon to meet the need of equipping them, if they are to attain the goal of 50 divisions, as contemplated at Lisbon.

In the bill reference is made to defense assistance. It is to be defense assistance in what form? It is to be defense assistance in the simple form of setting up plants in Europe so that they can begin to make their own military end items for the purpose of equipping their own armies in the future. That is what this item is for. In the original bill the amount was fixed at $1,800,000,000, but following careful study by our committee, it was believed that it could be reduced to one-billion-five-hundred-million-dollars plus.

I have stated the reason for this provision. It is definitely a part of the program. In the report of the Committee on the Present Danger, of which Dr. Conant, of Harvard, is chairman, it is pointed out that as the result of our contributing $5,100,000,000 now, our allies will contribute the equivalent of $14,400,000,000 to this program this year, in order to set up these divisions. There is no other purpose. There is to be no further raising of the economy of Europe at all. It is simply to help them because of the demand upon them for their manpower, which has been taken from their industries, that we make this contribution toward building up these divisions.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator estimate what part of the mutual security funds appropriated by this Congress have ever left the United States?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. A great deal of the money which goes abroad goes in the form of military end items.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not a fact that a very small percentage of it ever leaves this country?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In the case of defense assistance $1,500,000,000 goes to assist the nations abroad in establishing their plants to make their own end items. But that is a very small amount in money. Most of it is in machinery and goods.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield myself another minute to reinforce this point, and then I shall yield 6 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that only a very small part of the appropriations we make ever leaves the United States. They remain here, making business for our industries and our agriculture.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Undoubtedly. The Senator is perfectly correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Sustaining our own economy fully as much as the European economy is sustained.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct.

I want to make it perfectly clear that we are helping foreign nations to build up their plants so that they can make their own end items, to equip their own divisions, to defend their own lands, which they should be doing and not calling on us, in case of another war, to send our boys over there to be killed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator imply from the question of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] that this is an economic-aid program for the benefit of the United States, and because we are spending the money here we should appropriate it?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No; I do not imply that at all. I am simply stating the fact, as the Senator from Vermont pointed out, that in giving this defense aid abroad, the money is to be spent in this country and it does aid us to that extent.

[1] July 1, 1940, through June 30, 1945.
[2] July 1, 1945, through June 30, 1951.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not much of the money go to buy raw materials, such as copper, and so forth?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes, some of it, of course.

Mr. AIKEN. As a matter of fact, the economic prosperity of the United States is not the purpose, but it is the effect?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. President, I now yield 6 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

I have been acting in the absence of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator will continue.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have listened carefully to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. His amendment is, I believe, based on a completely fallacious thesis. He seeks to give the impression that we are giving a "hand-out" to certain European nations. That was shown by the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], who referred to defense support as a world WPA.

Instead of that, I am convinced that economic aid to our friends and allies abroad is of the most outstanding importance. We formed the Marshall plan originally for the purpose of strengthening the economies of the countries of Western Europe. Apparently its success has brought about a movement to lessen foreign aid, important and useful to our country as has been its splendid record.

The growth and the strengthening of the economic life of the freedom-loving nations of Europe has been of tremendous assistance to us. It has improved the economy of the nations of the world and has brought about a stabilizing of our own economy. We now propose to continue our help and to further strengthen their economy and their ability to defend themselves, not for parochial or local interests, but in order to help them to help themselves. This is a partnership, Mr. President. We help those countries to build up their armies first, because we feel we must have a secure Europe and that a secure Europe will mean a secure United States and a secure free world.

When the Congress did away with the Economic Cooperation Administration last year it established the Mutual Security Agency, but it defined very clearly and definitely the exercise of the powers which were given to the Mutual Security Agency. The purpose was to carry out the programs designed to sustain and increase military effort, including production and construction of equipment and matériel in each country.

Mr. President, I want to point out that great emphasis was laid on the use of proposed defense support funds in order to increase the assistance to those countries so that they—who are our partners in Western Europe—will build up their own military defenses. We have urged them to do so. We know that the strengthening of their military defenses is absolutely essential for our own security. Yet, when it is proposed that we give them the means to build up their military defenses through the economic assistance which we propose to render to them, objection is now raised.

The assistance which we give under the defense-support program will be administered, of course, in the same way as aid under the Marshall plan; namely, the United States will provide dollars which will be used by the country receiving assistance. But these dollars will be used only for the purchase of specific commodities and services which can be purchased with dollars.

I want to point out that the commodities purchased will, however, be primarily to assist Western Europe to carry on its expanded defense efforts and not to assist in economic recovery save as such recovery can help our joint defense efforts.

Mr. President, the projected increase in European defense expenditures obviously means that Europe will have less capacity to produce goods for export which is the only means by which dollars can be earned. Therefore more dollars, will, in fact, be needed to buy raw materials, machinery, fuel, and other items essential to support increased military production. The result is that Europe, without our assistance, cannot earn sufficient foreign exchange to pay for the necessary imports. That, in turn, means, Mr. President, that Europe will be deprived of the power and the ability to cooperate with us to the full extent necessary in producing essential military matériel. We have been talking for months and months about the need of Europe holding up its own end in producing military matériel and building up it own armed forces. We are now discussing a plan which would render them substantially impotent to do these very things which we have been urging so long and so vigorously.

I think the amendment which is before us is based on a fallacy, and it is highly dangerous. I believe it would destroy our whole program of mutual security and mutual assistance beyond almost anything else of which I have knowledge. I very much hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield 5 or 6 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I take the floor at this time to express the hope that the Senate, in less than 1 hour of debate, will not upset and overturn by an irresponsible act the judgment of two great committees of the United States Senate.

I do not believe this great body should make a 40-percent cut in the amounts appropriated for economic assistance to Western Europe which is what the pending amendment permits, authorizes, and declares. After both the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, following weeks of study, have determined what should be a part and parcel of our efforts to contain communism and keep the cockpit of the free world of Western Europe from being taken and put behind the iron curtain, I do not believe their recommendations should be turned down by the Senate after only 1 hour's discussion of the important measure now under consideration.

The pending amendment, if adopted by the Senate, will reduce economic aid by $735,000,000 below the President's budget. These sums were investigated, studied, and carefully prepared by some of the finest men who ever have served this Government, men who have worked on ECA and the Mutual Security Pact. They did not arrive at this figure by guesswork or by the use of a slide rule.

They arrived at it by being on the ground, seeing the needs, and determining just what effect our joint efforts for a North Atlantic Pact army was going to have on the thin economy of the countries of Western Europe. Every member of the two great committees I have mentioned with whom I have had a chance to discuss this matter have told me personally that their opinion has been changed from last year to this year, so much so that they believe, speaking from a military standpoint, that the money that will be spent in economic assistance will carry as great a weight in preserving the freedom of Western Europe as the money spent on military matters.

We are not buying friendship in this approach. If we were buying friendship, then we have thrown away perhaps ten or twenty billion dollars.

Europe's friendship is not for sale. We as a great nation do not wish the free peoples of Western Europe to come before us on their knees, thanking us for a crust of bread. We are in this movement because we believe the free way of life is worth fighting to preserve for ourselves and for other human beings.

If it is worth fighting for, it is worth helping to keep free those people whose normal cultural and political relations, whose freedoms and aspirations for living in a free world, are the same as ours.

We are not trying to buy friendship, but we are trying to strengthen the friends we have in this world. We know it is hard to extend friendship once the iron curtain is dropped between us and the free peoples of Western Europe. So I plead that Senators not vote hastily and make the proposed disastrous cut.

I tried to outline how carefully the experts on the ground prepared this budget. Three committees of the United States Senate—not one committee, but three—have figured how much money we need to spend. They have examined the program carefully. No piece of legislation and no expenditures have been subject to finer combing than the bill and the funds for assistance by way of foreign aid to Europe and to Asia.

Our committees not only investigated it one time, through the Committee on Foreign Relations, but we then turned the matter over to the Committee on Armed Services, and then we have another look at it in the Committee on Appropriations.

I say that with that careful consideration, with the budget already care-

fully scrutinized, there will not be many items that will slip by the distinguished men who consider this measure on both sides of the aisle.

In addition, there were two committees of the House of Representatives which considered and checked every item in this bill, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations. I hardly think any members of those great committees would have been inclined to tolerate or permit any waste.

Mr. President, we have an investment in this program. We are going up the hill. We can see victory ahead. But I say this is the wrong time, when we are approaching success, to chop 40 percent from the budget requests that have been made for this type of assistance.

This year we are spending on our own military defense $65,000,000,000. Is that going to be a wise expenditure, if in Europe we do not have free nations that can hope to join and participate in the North Atlantic Treaty armies?

We are asking actually that this cut not be permitted. The $500,000,000 that we and the committee members think is highly important to our own military defense, is but eight thousandths of 1 percent of what we are spending on our own military preparedness.

I say it is pretty cheap insurance to be sure that communism does not collapse these yet remaining free friends we have in Western Europe by internal infiltration. We must go forward there with a program of a well rounded armament, and economic stability that will have a chance to work.

Internal collapse is just as dangerous as military aggression. We have seen the success of this program so far. I think we are winning the cold war in Western Europe. I think the sands have run through the hour-glass on the time when the Kremlin can strike and walk across Western Europe to the English Channel and the Atlantic Ocean, without fear of crippling cost.

If this program is succeeding, then I say it is a poor time today to try to cut down on a program that almost every Member of this body knows is being successful in lessening the chance of world war III from occurring. We are trying to buy insurance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield one additional minute to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. We are trying to buy insurance against the occurrence of world war III. World War II cost $400,000,000,000 in money alone, not to mention the loss in human life. If the same effort went into world war III, the cost today would be $1,000,000,000,000 or more.

The expenditures that are being voted by Congress, and the program we are trying to develop are in an effort to prevent the outbreak of world war III. Let us not wreck that program with a hasty, ill considered, reckless cut in the foreign aid program at this time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in submitting its report on the mutual security bill, the committee felt it had done the best it could. It had arrived at a unanimous agreement, and believed it had made a very earnest approach toward eliminating what I think many of us felt had perhaps been some extravagance in the administration of the Mutual Security Program.

There is a provision in the bill about which I wish to ask the chairman. Concerned, as many of us are, with the American merchant marine, and with the amendment which was adopted to the original act, providing that 50 percent of the matériel sent under the act should go in American bottoms, since we have now taken over control of the seas, by reason of the waiver of the British, we are no longer able to carry the burden, and so the maintenance of our merchant marine is a very vital factor.

I invite the attention of the chairman of the committee to a provision on page 20, section 408 (e), of the act, in which there is a change in the provision which formerly was in effect. It is covered in the committee report on page 57. I am concerned about the amendment to section 408 (e) of the act, that the provisions of section 409, the 50 percent shipping provision, shall not apply to equipment, materials and commodities made available under this subsection.

The committee report says that the amendment applies only to such materials as are furnished to a foreign nation without cost to the United States, and with the foreign nation's free funds.

However, the report also says that such materials may be supplied on a reimbursable basis, and I desire to state it as my understanding that through no financial transaction of refunding or reimbursement can the 50 percent shipping provision be circumvented as to such materials made available under the act at the expense of the United States.

I trust the chairman will indicate that he agrees with this construction which has been placed upon the act.

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree with that view. In cases where the foreign government buys the material in this country and pays for it, then the restriction on the shipment in our vessels does not apply.

Mr. BREWSTER. The case is one which cannot be attributed in any way to origin in this country.

Mr. CONNALLY. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Maine has expired.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Since our time is short, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as I understand the purpose of the pending amendment, it is to strike out a very material part of the defense support aid that is provided for in title I of the bill. I sometimes think perhaps a good many of us do not understand fully just what the defense support program calls for. Some think of it as being merely a continuation of the Marshall plan or as being economic aid. I do not believe it should be thought of in that way. As a matter of fact, it is aid to enable the countries which are raising divisions and which are building the mutual security defense program to manufacture some of the items which otherwise we would have to manufacture and send to them. It was testified many times before our committee that it had been calculated that under the defense support program $1 would provide as much defense as $2.50 of our own money spent in the manufacture of such goods in this country.

It seems to me that this program represents an economical method of obtaining some very good defense, and inducing European countries to do the things which we have been saying they ought to do, namely, to participate in the program to the fullest extent of their own ability. Many of them have productive capacities which may lack machinery, raw materials, or some other element which prevents them from being able to produce munitions and goods which otherwise they could produce. The purpose of this program is to enable them to produce the goods themselves.

Mr. President, I believe that if we were to cut the bill, we could better afford to cut the straight military aid part of the bill than the defense support part, because every dollar which we spend for this purpose is the equivalent of $2.50 of our own money which we would have to spend in order to manufacture the end items to send to our allies.

I should like to read an excerpt from the telegram which was sent to the able chairman of our committee by General Eisenhower when the chairman of our committee asked him to comment on proposed reductions in the bill. I read the portion relating to the defense support part of the bill. General Eisenhower said:

> Reductions in defense support would have a peculiarly adverse effect, since available production facilities in Europe could not be put to use for lack of a critical fraction of their raw materials and other requirements. This would mean of course that nations depending upon receipt of scheduled end items or materials could not make maximum use of available manpower, manufacturing facilities, and training installations.

Mr. President, I close with the statement that when we cut this particular item we are doing the greatest damage we could possibly do to the proposed program.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has four minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], 1 minute to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the remainder of the time to the chairman of the committee [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with what the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has said, I believe that if we were going to change the relationships in the bill, it would be far more profitable and efficient, from our point of view, to put more money into the defense-support angle, and permit the European countries to utilize their industrial potential for the manufacture of the end items, than to undertake to do in this country as much as is provided for in the bill.

The American Farm Bureau Federation presented certain amendments along this line which I sponsored in the committee, recognizing that the real integration of European economy with our own would entail increased industrial production in Europe, under an arrangement whereby we would supply certain raw material. In my judgment this would be the worst possible place to make a reduction in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I hope the Senate understands that this amendment is pinpointed toward a particular item. The two previous amendments, one calling for a reduction of $500,000,000 and the other for a reduction of $400,000,000, applied to the entire bill.

The pending amendment amounts to a reduction of 33⅓ percent in economic aid which is directly related to the defense of Western Europe.

We should have learned by now that "too little and too late" is a disastrous policy. I submit that to cut this item by $580,000,000 would result in too little, and would make the delivery of the necessary goods for the defense of western Europe too late.

What more is needed to emphasize the importance of the international situation than what is going on in Eastern Germany and around Berlin. The Senate ought not to retreat before the Soviet attacks upon us in Western Europe. We ought to make the defense of Western Europe impregnable; and we can do it if we follow the outlines of the pending bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of the time to the chairman of the committee [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I regret to take the time of the Senate. I am very much opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. It represents another "sappers'" movement, as it were. We know what the sappers are in the military world. They cut down and undermine. That is what this amendment would do. I do not mean that it is intended to do so, but the effect of it would be a sappers' operation.

I believe that the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services have done a good job. They have brought forth a bill which, so far as the voting has gone, has been sustained by the Senate. Now, at the last moment, a proposal is made to effect a reduction of $580,000,000. The proponents of reductions say, "Cut it off. Turn it around and we will chop it on the other side. If we fail on that side, turn it over again and we will chop off some on the other side."

Mr. President, I am voting for the bill because I am an American. I am not a Dane, but I sympathize with the Danes. They are close to Russia. When the Russians begin to move, they will bowl over the Danes unless they operate in conjunction with their allies.

I am not a Hollander, but I have sympathy for the Dutch, because Holland is a gallant little country which has written its name in the history of the past. I am not a Belgian, but I am voting to help the Belgians because it helps the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senate will remain true to what it has already done, and reject amendments to slash, cut, trim, mash, and wash the bill down to the point where it will not amount to very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. BRIDGES. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Moody
Anderson	Hennings	Morse
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Benton	Hill	Neely
Brewster	Hoey	Nixon
Bricker	Holland	O'Conor
Bridges	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Robertson
Capehart	Jenner	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Cordon	Lehman	Sparkman
Dirksen	Lodge	Stennis
Douglas	Long	Taft
Dworshak	Malone	Thye
Eastland	Martin	Tobey
Ellender	Maybank	Underwood
Ferguson	McCarran	Watkins
Frear	McCarthy	Welker
Fulbright	McFarland	Williams
George	McKellar	Young
Green	Millikin	
Hayden	Monroney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Several Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. McCARTHY (when his name was called). I am informed by my colleagues that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] felt he had a pair with me on voting on all these amendments. Under the circumstances I must respect the pair, and announce that I have a pair with the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would vote "nay."

I announce also that if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Conference of the International Council for Christian Leadership at The Hague.

If present and voting the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] would each vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting the Senator from Washington would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—34

Bennett	Ferguson	Mundt
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Bridges	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Butler, Md.	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. C.
Butler, Nebr.	Johnston, S. C.	Taft
Capehart	Kem	Thye
Carlson	Long	Watkins
Case	Malone	Welker
Cordon	Martin	Williams
Dirksen	McCarran	Young
Dworshak	McKellar	
Ellender	Millikin	

NAYS—43

Aiken	Hennings	Morse
Anderson	Hill	Neely
Benton	Hoey	Nixon
Brewster	Holland	O'Conor
Chavez	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Clements	Hunt	Pastore
Connally	Ives	Robertson
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Eastland	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Frear	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Fulbright	Lodge	Sparkman
George	Maybank	Tobey
Green	McFarland	Underwood
Hayden	Monroney	
Hendrickson	Moody	

NOT VOTING—19

Byrd	Kerr	Murray
Cain	Knowland	Seaton
Duff	Langer	Smathers
Ecton	Magnuson	Stennis
Flanders	McCarthy	Wiley
Gillette	McClellan	
Kefauver	McMahon	

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 302) to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 32 (A) (2) OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 302) to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 302) to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the third proviso in subdivision (D) of paragraph (2) of section 32 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: '*And provided further*, That the aggregate book value of returns made pursuant to the foregoing proviso shall not exceed $9,000,000; and any return under such proviso may be made if the book value of any such return, taken together with the aggregate book value of returns already made under such proviso does not exceed $9,000,000; and for the purposes of this proviso the term "book value" means the value, as of the time of vesting, entered on the books of the Alien Property Custodian for the purpose of accounting for the property or interest involved;'."

And the House agree to the same.

PAT MCCARRAN,
WILLIS SMITH,
WM. LANGER,
WM. JENNER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

J. PERCY PRIEST,
OREN HARRIS,
DWIGHT L. ROGERS,
CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
By C. H.
CARL HINSHAW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the House already has approved this conference report.

So that my colleagues may understand the effect of the action taken by the conferees, let me speak briefly concerning this legislation and the background for it.

Two years ago the Congress passed, and the President approved, legislation to permit the return by the Alien Property Custodian of property which had been vested—that is, seized—from persons of dual citizenship.

A considerable amount of such property had been seized early in the program, though the policy of vesting the property of dual nationals had been abandoned prior to enactment of the 1950 legislation. That bill, which was passed in 1950, settled the question of policy.

However, that bill was amended in the House of Representatives so as to impose a ceiling of $5,000,000 on the value of property which might be returned pursuant to that legislation.

In the past 2 years, it has been estimated that the total value of all such property, on the basis of its book value at the time of vesting, will be in excess of $7,000,000, with a few claims still outstanding. Furthermore, great administrative difficulty has been encountered by the Office of the Alien Property Custodian, due to the fact that under the language of the 1950 law it is necessary to seek to ascertain the actual value of future interests in connection with any property which is to be returned. This is because the limitation imposed by the 1950 law has been construed to be a limitation upon actual value, rather than upon the value as shown by the books of the Office of Alien Property.

The bill now before us, Senate bill 302, sponsored by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] as it passed the Senate, provided for striking out the limitation. The House amended the bill so as to restore the limitation, but to make it $8,000,000. The conferees have agreed to make the limitation $9,000,000 and to base it upon the book value of vested assets as carried on the books of the Office of Alien Property. It is the judgment of the conferees that this limitation will be adequate to permit the payment of all just claims of this nature.

One other point was in conference: The 1950 act provided that claims were to be paid in the order in which they were filed. In practice, it was found this resulted in unnecessarily delaying certain relatively simple claims because a more complex claim may have been filed earlier. Since the purpose of the bill now before us is to permit doing equal justice to all whose claims are in this class, the Senate bill eliminated this requirement for paying the claims in the order in which they were filed. On this point, the conferees have gone along with the Senate position.

It is my judgment, Mr. President, that this measure as reported from the conference, accomplishes everything the Senate desired in its version of the bill. Accordingly, I ask the Senate to agree to the conference report on Senate bill 302.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3086) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

AIR POWER—CONTROL OF THE AIR—VITAL AIR SUPERIORITY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the Mutual Security Act which will go far toward regaining control of the air.

I send the proposed amendment to the desk and ask that it be read by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That, for the purpose of enabling the United States to regain control of the air, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, in addition to any other amounts authorized to be appropriated to such Department, the sum of $6,900,000,000, which shall be available for expenditure for the maintenance, operation, and administration of the activities of the Air Force and the air activities of the

Navy and Marine Corps, including the acquisition, maintenance, and operation of aircraft and equipment and facilities therefor, and such other expenditures as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of this act.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order that the amendment is not in order.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I would remind the distinguished Senator from Texas that I have the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, cannot I make a point of order on the amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas cannot do so at the present time. He can do so later.

At this time the Senator from Nevada has control of the 30 minutes available to him on his amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement, I wish to make a point of order on the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas can make such a point of order, but not in the time of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not know that the Senator from Nevada had any time.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Texas is in his usual courteous mood.

Let me say that the purpose of the amendment is to conform to the testimony of Mr. Finletter, the Secretary of the Air Force, before the House Foreign Relations Committee that at the present time the United States has lost control of the air—and is far behind in the construction of aircraft, and that the full recommended appropriation for the Air Corps is necessary, in order to regain control of the air—now lost to Russia—according to Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg and Mr. Finletter, Secretary of the Air Corps. If Mr. Finletter is right he should be commended and get his money—if he is wrong he should be fired.

Furthermore, Mr. President, on several occasions Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg has emphasized the danger to our Armed Forces with our potential enemy—Russia—controlling the air.

Recently it has been announced that as a result of the aircraft operations in Korea, our Air Force is sustaining much greater losses than those sustained by the enemy; in fact, our losses in aircraft are in the ratio of 4 to 1 according to press dispatches, as compared to the enemy's losses.

If we do not have control of the air—no money should go outside of this Nation until we have regained control—since our very security and safety may depend upon it. If I believed for a moment that our policy of commitment of American ground troops throughout the frontiers of Europe and Asia to contain Russia was the proper procedure, or that such a policy could possibly be successful, I would not now be voting for a reduction in the foreign aid proposed, but I would favor an increase in the amount, if such an additional amount could be efficiently utilized.

SIX BILLION NINE HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS—MUTUAL-SECURITY BREAKDOWN

The $6,900,000,000 is broken down in the following manner:

Military aid for Europe—$4,145,000,000, $3,620,317,000.

Economic aid for Europe—$1,819,200,000, $1,568,922,000.

Military aid for Near East and Africa—$606,370,000, $529,614,000.

Technical assistance for Near East and Africa, $55,000,000, $48,038,000.

Arab refugees from Palestine—$65,000,000, $56,772,000.

Israel refugees—$76,000,000, $66,360,000.

Military aid for Asia and the Pacific—$611,230,000, $533,859,000.

Economic aid for Asia and the Pacific—$408,000,000, $356,354,000.

Military aid for Latin America—$62,400,000, $54,501,000.

Technical assistance for Latin America—$22,000,000, $19,215,000.

Emigration—$10,000,000, $8,734,000.

Ocean freight—$2,800,000, $2,446,000.

Multilateral aid—$17,000,000, $14,848,000.

The committee added to the bill a $20,962,000 item as a United States contribution.

EUROPEAN ARMY CANNOT DEFEND ITSELF

So far I have not seen any statement, from any responsible source, that our foot army in Europe can defend itself now or at any future time. Many responsible persons say that it cannot ever reach the objectives allotted to it.

Therefore, I feel constrained to say that we have in Europe a tourist army that cannot defend itself either now or at any future time, according to administration plans.

The members of that army have their women and children with them, just like a tribe of Indians hunting pine nuts in the Nevada mountains. All those men and their dependents would be prisoners of war within a period of 30 days, or would be utterly destroyed, according to the whims of the Soviet Army in the unlikely event of world war III.

It is widely suspected that the well-paid American Army in Europe is another method of extending the Marshall plan to Europe.

UNBROKEN LINE OF FAILURES

The administration has an almost unbroken record of failures in Asia and Europe since World War II. That record—strewn as it is, from Yalta to Berlin, with the wreckage of nations which have depended upon the historical integrity of the United States in international affairs—should be proof enough of the utter futility, or worse of the conniving misfits trusted with conducting our affairs.

KOREA—AN INSULT TO AMERICAN INTELLIGENCE

The Korean debacle is an insult to the intelligence of the American people. We sent a foot army into an area that responsible strategists agree is untenable in the event of real war.

We refused to win when we could have decisively settled the controversy and saved China. But we fell into the phony Russian peace trap which has been prolonged as a strategy move to enable the Russians to gain control of the air and to control and dictate peace terms when and if such an agreement is reached.

BRITAIN REFUSED TO JOIN IN AN INTEGRATED ARMY

Mr. President, Britain has flatly refused to join in an integrated European army. There is no mutual security; there is no European Army; and the European nations are not cooperating with us. All this will be public knowledge within a relatively short time, and such information is available now to congressional committees.

FIVE THOUSAND CASUALTIES IN A STUPID, BLOODY WAR

In the 10 short weeks since this bill calling for further authorizations of funds for mutual security was introduced in the House of Representatives, 5,000 men have been killed or wounded in Korea—American youths fighting a forgotten war, a useless, bloody, stupid war called by their Commander in Chief a "police action." Another half million Americans are scattered about the globe, mostly in Europe, with their tens of thousands of dependents, all waiting together to be sacrificed to the errors in judgment and the errors in policy of this administration.

On the same day that our Air Force announced losses of nearly four planes for each one of the enemy in Korea, the chairman of the Munitions Board was saying that we are years behind schedule in our aircraft production. That was Mr. Finletter's statement.

CONTROL OF AIR—CONGRESS PROVIDED FUNDS

Mr. President, it is difficult to understand why our military strength has been allowed to deteriorate while at the same time we have been sending tens of billions of dollars abroad under the guise of national security. We need only to go back to the history of the Eightieth Congress to remember that the Congress of the United States appropriated sums of money to provide the United States Government with 70 groups of aircraft and that, less than 2 years before the Korean war broke out, the President by Executive action, reduced that force to 48 groups.

While newspapermen write bitterly from the Korean battle front that men are dying in hand-to-hand combat against better armed and better equipped Communist fanatics, other newspapermen write of the continued nightmare of pseudo-truce negotiations in Panmumjom and rioting of Communist prisoners who force humiliating terms on an American general at Koje Island.

While we suffer from the lack of artillery and hand grenades on one side of the world we are pouring billions of dollars and millions of weapons into the hand of nations reluctant to use them on the other side of the world.

SHOULD EVALUATE OUR POSITION

Before we can continue with this policy of scattering our men and our treasures throughout the world on one pretext or another, it seems to me that we should take time to evaluate and assess our present position. The billions of dollars now going into Europe and the thousands of tons of equipment, the finished arms and planes and munitions are going to countries which cannot be defended on the ground.

It may well be that the arms we are now sending to the European nations will, in the foreseeable future, be used against us after their capture by victorious aggressors.

A DULL DAY WHEN MORE UNITED STATES TROOPS NOT COMMITTED

Mr. President, it is indeed a dull day in the State Department when Mr. Acheson is deprived of the opportunity of signing an agreement which commits our United States soldiers to protect new areas in the world.

A United Press European dispatch dated May 26 headlines Acheson's action in signing the European Defense Community Treaty. The article, entitled "Troops Pledge Planned," in part says:

Western foreign ministers arrived tonight to complete a diplomatic action on plans to create a single European army, give West Germany almost complete independence and bind the United States to Western Europe defense.

The dispatch says further:

It will pledge Anglo-American interest in seeing the European defense community pact upheld, promise to keep troops on the continent as long as necessary and commit the western powers to defend west Berlin.

SECRET PACTS AND PROMISES

As if the written pact were not enough, Constantine Brown, a scrupulous and factual writer, reports in the Washington Star on May 27—yesterday—following the United Press report that:

In order to satisfy the security demands of the French cabinet, Mr. Acheson agreed that means will be provided, in the assumption of the new responsibilities of North Atlantic Treaty Organization toward the West German republic, to prevent Germany from breaking away from the western coalition after it has organized its new military force of some 400,000 men.

This gratuitous pledge of Mr. Acheson's, to keep Germany whipped into line, is far beyond the written pact and the pledge to the keeping of American troops in Europe for as long as necessary is reminiscent of Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam in 1945 at the end of World War II where Nationalist China was sold down the river without its knowledge or consent and with little hope of recovery.

It was of this action that the notorious Owen Lattimore, in an OWI Government news dispatch on July 17, 1949, said:

The problem was how to allow them, the National Chinese Government, to fall without making it look like the United States had pushed them.

FURTHER SUPPORT FOR COLONIAL POLICY

It is suspected also that we have further pledged ourselves through Mr. Acheson in his off-the-record promises, to support the French policy in Tunisia and Morocco; and further assurances that we will support the French forces, now fighting in Indo-China, with more than military supplies.

Mr. Brown also raises that question in his May 27 dispatch.

HOW TO GET CONGRESS TO RECOGNIZE SECRET FACTS

The problem now might be stated by agile Mr. Lattimore—if he were again in the good graces of Congress—as how to get Congress to approve of these secret agreements without recognizing their full import or the danger to the integrity and to the security of the United States of America.

Mr. President, I have before me a book entitled "Two Worlds," written by William B. Ziff, a book which has proved surprisingly accurate in most of its predictions. I ask unanimous consent that the marked paragraphs on treaties—on pages 52 and 53 of this volume be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the marked paragraphs appearing on pages 52 and 53 of the volume Two Worlds, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INTEGRITY OF TREATIES (TWO WORLDS)

Since a sovereign state is a power form, it and no one else can rule the conditions of life which apply to its citizens. This logic is implicit in the use of the term "sovereign." As long as a state remains sovereign, it is compelled to be guided solely by its own self-interests or by the pressures of internal groups acting upon its policies.

The conception of sovereignty not only involves the idea of equality but that of independent action as well. By maintaining armies, navies and batteries of diplomats, and by control over its own currency, trade and immigration laws, each nation-state serves notice that, in the last analysis, it will seek to gain its ends either by the use or continued threat of force. It will make and break the rules to suit itself, and wherever its vital interests are challenged will have recourse to subterfuge, conspiratorial action or, if necessary, brute force.

• • • • •

The shifting fate of treaty arrangements is pictured in the history of all alliances which ever have been made between so-called equal states. No one has ever been fulfilled beyond the self-interests of the stronger party to the arrangement. The attitude is accurately given by Lenin, a charmingly direct and forthright man, on the occasion of the return of the Russian delegation from Brest Litovsk at the end of World War I, after having been forced to agree to a ruinous treaty with Germany. When the document was laid before him, Lenin did not even bother about reading it. He remarked: "I don't intend to fulfill it anyway, except insofar as I am forced."

The professional diplomat who may be a most moral and decent individual in his personal relationships, must by the character of his task adopt the same impersonal view toward the struggle of mass hordes as is assumed by a military commander in battle. In their essence these attitudes are given squarely in a comment by Thucydides in his classic. The Peloponnesian War. Answering a contention of ethical right raised by the people of Melos following an invasion of their country by Athens, the Melians were coolly informed: "Right, as the world goes, is only a question between equals in power. The strong do what they are able, and the weak suffer what they must."

LOST CHINA—ATTENTION DIVERTED TO EUROPE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it was a cruel hoax on the American people when their attention and their defense material was directed to old Europe while we deliberately lost Nationalist China. Then we refuse to win in Korea against the Chinese Communists in the only way we ever can win—through air and sea power—and then to delay operations through the invitation of our potential enemy while they take control of the air.

PAID FOR PEACE—BUT NOT DELIVERED

The President said in a recent statement that he would not buy the peace, when as a matter of recognized fact he has already paid for it, but the delivery has been delayed .

It is freely predicted that he will get the kind of peace that Russia wants him to have when she is good and ready. In the meantime our boys are being literally murdered out there to make a phony peace look good at the proper political time.

AMERICAN TAXPAYERS FURNISHING MATERIAL TO KILL THEIR SONS

The American people are furnishing the goods and the material to Russia and to the iron-curtain countries through the many and continual gift-loans to the European nations—to maintain Russian control in Eastern Europe and in China—and to build up the air forces to take over Western Europe and the remainder of Asia in their good and proper time.

The American taxpayers have furnished the money and industrial machinery and goods to Europe to finance most of the war and to murder their own sons in Korea. They have been persuaded to do this through the propaganda of the administration led by a pro-European State Department, and by a Congress generally either in agreement or lacking the stamina to tell the people the truth and to refuse to vote appropriations for the purpose.

ANY NAME WILL DO

This procedure started with lend-lease money and goods beyond any reasonable assistance for war purposes, continued with UNRRA—$3,750,000,000 to Britain, Marshall plan, ECA, point 4, and mutual security—not considering the great variety of world banks, including Bretton Woods, the International Bank, the Export-Import Bank, and the many ways of transferring ships and United States property to other flags. Any name for the distribution of American wealth will do.

FAVOR FOREIGN NATIONS—TRADE

Other ways of dividing the wealth are to favor foreign nations in the purchase of strategic minerals and materials and to guarantee a substantial increase in price per pound or per unit over that paid to domestic producers. This favoritism includes zinc, lead, copper, and many other minerals and materials as well as the letting of contracts for the construction of war matériel abroad.

As a matter of common fairness, our domestic producers should be paid the premium—they should receive a larger unit price—the difference roughly between the wage standard of living here and abroad. The premiums should be more than to foreign producers.

SAFETY AND WELFARE OF THIS NATION FIRST

It is time that we put the safety and welfare of our Nation, the maintenance of our own economic structure and the maintenance of our military supremacy including air and submarine power—first.

It is time that we established the rule of simple honesty between nations as the criterion of cooperation with such foreign nations; it is time that we stop supporting the empire-minded preference export and import rates by the colonial nations and the manipulation of the exchange rates of their currency for the trade advantage.

COMMUNIST CHINA—PACTS WITH RUSSIA

The recognition of Communist China by European and Asiatic nations, while we are bleeding our taxpayers white to assist them, is an insult to our intelligence.

The military and economic pacts which both England and France have with Communist Russia, reading startlingly like the Atlantic Pact which they have signed with us and having 14 years more to run—are traitorous acts.

The nearly 100 trade treaties which the Marshall Plan countries have with Russia and the so-called iron curtain countries—selling them everything they need to fight world war III against us including rubber, tin and the many manufactured and processed products which they must have to oppose us, is utter ignorance or worse on our part.

MAKE THE RULES OF THE GAME YOU FINANCE

Let us make the rules under which the game is to be played if we are to finance it.

We represent the new money in the game. When we withdraw the game is over.

Let us direct the play before it is too late.

IMPOSSIBLE TO MEET RUSSIA ON THEIR TERMS

We are presently building up in Europe a great ground force of foot soldiers. We are apparently preparing to meet any possible Soviet aggression on Soviet terms, that is meeting them with ground soldiers instead of destroying them by air and by sea as our technological development would indicate.

DISTINGUISHED AUTHORITIES

One of our most distinguished air officers, Lt. Gen. Harold L. George, said recently:

A powerful American Air Force constitutes the greatest possible power to preserve peace in this unsettled world.

Even this great Nation cannot afford to spend vast billions of dollars indiscriminately over a period of years to create a great Army, a great Navy, a great Air Force, and provide military equipment for other nations without economical bankruptcy. Unless our economic structure is kept strong we cannot for long maintain the military strength essential for our survival.

The man who headed the wartime Manhattan project, and gave this country the greatest weapon in history, the atomic bomb, Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, said:

The great danger of our position is overextension in our commitments both economic and military, our military policy should be based on air and sea where our great technical capabilities can be put to best advantage.

The former Chief of Naval Operations and former Ambassador to the Soviet Union, Admiral William H. Standley, said:

Since my return from duty in Russia, and from knowledge of actual conditions there, I have persistently contended that a shooting war with Russia is highly improbable. Stalin knows that the policies of the United States will wreck our capitalistic system just as surely and possibly more quickly than would a shooting war, so why should Moscow bring on a shooting war? I hope that the American people can be informed in time. It is later than they think.

Col. W. F. Heimlich, a recognized authority on European affairs, says:

Recall our women and children dependents from Europe while reducing our noncombat forces to an absolute minimum. This means the elimination of luxury forces.

Gen. Edwin E. Schwein, retired, a former liaison officer between the French and our own armies, and a recognized student of Russian ambitions and European vulnerability, says of the Russian-European future relations:

In the first place, is there a threat of Russian aggression in Western Europe? I say Russian and not Communist simply because Russia does not have a pure communistic form of government. Russia is a dictatorship by a relatively small hierarchy. As presupposed by communism, there is simply no equality, economic or political, in Russia. To say that Russia is attempting to spread communism is almost a euphemism. It is certainly an error.

Russia today has the same national aspirations as had Russia under the czars. It is essential that we keep these aspirations in mind when dealing with Russia.

I don't want to minimize the threat of communism in this country. That is a very real threat and a very serious one, but it comes from within.

It is right within this country that we must fight it if necessary with violence and ruthlessness until it is completely crushed. There can be no compromise. This includes the entering wedges of socialism and New Dealism.

Let us not however becloud the situation by treating the communistic threat and the Russian threat as synonymous.

Any student of history understands that Russian foreign policy is expansionist. It has been so for centuries. It is perfectly natural and understandable that as a result of the last war, that there should be a conflict between the aspirations of Russia and those of our country.

These two countries are the only great powers left and quite naturally fall into opposition. Russian expansion has always taken its active form to the south (Middle East) and east (Asia).

This expansion has never taken the offensive in the west. Russian strategy has always been the strategic defensive against the west while expanding to the east and south.

There exists little evidence today of any change in this over-all strategy.

There is little danger therefore of an actual military Russian offensive into Western Europe. There is however considerable danger of an infiltration of communism or socialism into this area.

This brings up the reason advanced by its protagonists for economic aid to Western Europe. They advocate the indiscriminate outpouring of our wealth in order to keep the Western European peoples contented with some form of capitalism. This of course is sheer nonsense.

Even presupposing that this aid was going directly to the people (which it is not), any sound economist knows that the best way to make people discontented with their lot is to put them on a dole. Once the will to work and to acumulate therefrom some form of wealth is destroyed or weakened, unearned largesse will only serve to complete the destruction of all morale. That is exactly what is happening in Europe today.

Our economic assistance to Britain for example has resulted only in an extension of their socialistic experiments. Far from combating communism in Western Europe, by our European recovery plan we are actually aiding and abetting the complete destruction of Western European morale. We are keeping in power governments which favor the so-called liberal side.

In estimating such a situation, the military formula requires a consideration of three basic factors:

1. The capabilities of the enemy.
2. Our own means or capabilities.
3. Possible theaters of operation and their choice based on sound strategy.

What are Russian military capabilities or potentials? They have admittedly the strongest ground armies and air force in the world. At the present time, they are easily capable of overrunning Western Europe in a few weeks. They have the advantage of being uncommitted at the present time. Their little show in Korea is being handled very ably by their Chinese satellite. They can move in any direction they choose at the present time with overwhelming power.

They are not vulnerable to attack simply because they are not overextended nor do they present a vulnerable flank. Any attack in any given area on our part can easily be repulsed with disastrous consequences to ourselves. They can bring greatly superior power to bear at any point of their periphery which we may choose to test. They had nearly 500 ground divisions in the last war and they do not fall too far short of that now.

They are not becoming overextended any place and are not committed. However, they have succeeded in overextending us by trapping us in both Korea and Western Europe.

If we now commit a few of our pitifully inadequate forces to the Middle East and some more let us say to the North Pole (not inconceivable) or to India, we will be stretched out along their whole perimeter, weak every place, strong no place, and ripe for the riposte in much the same situation as Eisenhower prior to the Battle of the Bulge.

Solution: Pull out of Europe and Korea, lick our wounds, mend our morale, economics, and financial situation. Wait until Russia becomes overextended and cluttered with ailing satellites. Dissatisfaction is bound to set in among them. Use clever psychological warfare to the limit and bide our time. This may take 10 or 20 years. In other words reverse the roles. Let us play Russia's present game and try to force her into our present predicament.

Build up a modern and powerful Air Force and Navy. Reduce the Army to a very efficient professional nucleus of one or two hundred thousand in which every man is a potential officer, "modeled on pre-1939 German Army."

JUDGMENT OF MEN OF WIDE EXPERIENCE

I submit that these judgments come from men of wide military experience, as wide as that of any of our national leaders.

The present ground armies in Europe, encumbered as they are with their tens of thousands of camp followers and dependents, are immobilized so far as their

ability to take the field against Soviet ground forces is concerned.

We have recently seen the disgraceful picture of an American general being captured by his Communist prisoners and another American general signing humiliating documents in order to effect the release of his comrade.

REMOVE THE WOMEN AND CHILDREN FROM WAR ZONE

Let us project ourselves into the future. If the tens of thousands of American dependents, women and children—babes in arms and grandmothers—still are in Europe and are brought under attack, do you think that American soldiers will abandon their families in order to man road blocks against the enemy? Or will they remain with their families and join them in the rout in a frenzied attempt to reach the English Channel and escape? If war is indeed as close to us as our leaders would have us believe, why then are we exposing these tens of thousands of hapless and helpless civilians in Europe?

What humiliating documents might we be willing to sign to preserve their lives in the event of disaster? If our six divisions of troops in Europe are to be a real fighting force, capable of stopping the offensive action of the Soviet armies, they must be joined by at least three times that many troops from the other nations of Europe supported by unchallenged mastery over the air and sea.

NO INDICATION EUROPEAN NATIONS MAKE SACRIFICES

To date there is no indication that the European nations are prepared to or are willing to make the necessary sacrifices to build such a force.

The same France with the same population and the same resources which she had 12 years ago when she put an army of 90 divisions in the field is today incapable of maintaining an army of 10 divisions.

GROUND ARMIES VERSUS AIR AND SEA POWER

It seems perfectly clear from this and from the warnings of our military leaders that the solution to the protection of the Western European nations is not in ground armies but in air and sea power. Maj. Gen. Hugh Knerr said recently: "The United States possesses all the aces—air power and sea power—but for some reason persists in discarding them and playing with deuces. We are eroding away our superiority and through an unwillingness to face reality."

PRESENT COURSE CAN LEAD TO DESTRUCTION

If that is true, and the evidence seems to be that it is true, then we must indeed pause and appraise our position and unless we do so, the wrong course which we now follow can lead us to destruction.

UNITED STATES PEOPLE AFRAID—FIRST TIME SINCE INDEPENDENCE

We have become obsessed with the philosophy of fear in the United States, for the first time since we became a nation.

What are we afraid of? Each time new billions are demanded by the administration they are demanded through some fear psychology.

If we do not do this thing, our country will be invaded or we will lose face if we do not carry out some ill-conceived and positively dangerous State Department commitment.

At no time in the history of the United States have Americans had cause to fear anything. Yet today we find ourselves spending our Nation into bankruptcy, disrupting the lives of our youths, and endangering the future of our economy all because we are afraid of some vague menace.

It is well known that we must protect ourselves, and that we are the only protection that any nation has from an outside threat. Yet we are suddenly afraid. Let us all ask ourselves, Who among us is responsible?

These billions which we now are sending abroad are the billions to be paid for by generations not yet born.

DAMNING OURSELVES IN EYES OF POSTERITY

Before we damn ourselves forever in the eyes of posterity, let us ask ourselves whether we have the right to take this action or whether we have the duty to preserve the United States. Before we go farther down this road to war, let us examine ourselves closely and wisely.

It is possible that our efforts are in the wrong direction and that we have good reason to distrust the men who have been making our policies. We have reason to question the motives behind those policies.

THE BACK DOOR TO WAR—AMERICAN INTERESTS

Assuming that we are indeed intelligent enough to want the best course for the United States, I cannot believe that any country with which we are allied or on friendly terms would or could take issue with our putting American interests first.

In his authoritative book, Back Door to War, Prof. Charles Callan Tansill, professor of diplomatic history at Georgetown University, says in the very first line:

> The main objective in American foreign policy since 1900 has been the preservation of the British Empire.

The very able professor documents his material, and evidence supports his contention.

It is high time that we now look to preserving the United States in a condition which posterity has a right to expect from us.

If we indeed view our position in the light of mutual security, we may find that we have provided security for neither ourselves nor our friends.

We may find that we have spent ourselves into bankruptcy where the one great hope of the world—the power of the United States—is dissipated and gone and, together with our friends, we stand hapless and hopeless before the ruthless power of our enemies.

FAILURE TO USE OUR STRENGTH

By our failure to play from strength; our failure to make use of our air and sea power; we may find that we have wasted our youth as well as our treasure. If we need no large armies scattered about the globe, we can reorganize our method—of securing large armies through the draft.

MUST WE DISCARD TECHNOLOGY TO STAND GUARD WITH A BAYONET?

Must we, the mightiest technological civilization the world has ever known, suddenly call our young men from the homes and factories and schools to stand guard with a bayonet?

LOST CHINA WHILE ATTENTION DIRECTED TO EUROPE

It is a cruel fact and a cruel hoax on the American people that our attention has been directed to hold Europe while we have lost China. Who is responsible for such a fiasco?

We have refused to win in Korea and we should either win there or get out.

We have not won in Korea because we have not used the power of our only strong military friend in that area—the armies presently on Formosa—and because we have tried to fight an air war with a very minimum of aircraft.

This is not my contention—it is the statement of the Chief of the Air Force, Gen. Hoyt D. Vandenberg.

SAVED COMMUNIST RUSSIA THREE TIMES

Since our recognition of the Soviet Union in 1933, we have three times saved that country from collapse.

In 1933, the Soviet Union was economically, politically, and morally bankrupt. Our recognition, giving her the aura of respectability, allowed the Soviet Union to continue in existence. None of the promises which she made in 1933 to obtain that recognition have been kept. Again, attacked by Hitler in 1940, we went to the aid of the Soviet Union with $11,750,000,000 of lend-lease equipment, supplies, food, and money. The Soviet Union, because of that assistance, was able to withstand the onslaughts of Hitler's divisions.

In 1945, torn internally by dissension and unrest, the Soviet Union received from the United States carte blanche to annex the Baltic states of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia—half of Poland—and to take unto herself as satellites the nations of Eastern and Middle Europe, including half of Germany. At the same time, we were isolating the German nation—our one hope for stability on the continent of Europe. Let us consider for a moment each of our potential allies in turn.

FRANCE HAS NO STABLE GOVERNMENT

France has not had a stable government since the conclusion of the First World War. The multitudinous parties which make only coalition government possible have been unable to reestablish France as a world power since the conclusion of World War II. The Communist Party is one of the largest and most influential parties in France. What military strength the Franch nation possesses today is being drained in a colonial war in the Far East.

ENGLAND DESTROYED HERSELF

England has destroyed herself and the Empire, not through war but through her own fiscal policies and the adoption of a socialistic state. The pattern which the English people have followed is the same pattern which was evident in Czechoslovakia, and Poland, and the other Socialist countries which went down under communism.

The German nation—despite the frightful destruction visited upon it by World War II, has come far on the road to recovery. Not since 1947, when General Clay appealed to the Allied Control Counsel, have we made any attempt to secure the unification of the German nation.

In the Potsdam declaration, we called for a unified Germany to be treated as an economic and political entity. The Soviet Government was a signatory to this agreement.

DESTRUCTION OF GERMANY—MORGENTHAU PLAN

Yet we have made no attempt to implement that agreement, and now the Soviet has taken the propaganda ball away from us and is calling for unification of Germany. It has an enormous appeal in that country, because it is the one issue upon which all Germans are united.

At the end of World War II, when we tried to destroy German industry and reduce her to an agricultural state through the Morgenthau plan, we said in effect that all Germans were third-class citizens and were unworthy of joining the society of nations.

Now we have reversed that stand completely and to the utter confusion of the Germans, as well as the rest of Europe, we are insisting upon full partnership for Germany, in the North Atlantic Treaty Organizations. This insistence is correct, but it should be accompanied with the demand and insistence that Germany should be reunited.

TIME TO REEXAMINE EUROPEAN SPENDING PROGRAMS

Mr. President, when a large segment of our people are forced to borrow money to pay their taxes; when through progressive taxation the administration supported by a subservient Congress has made it impossible for a young man to borrow money to establish a business of his own because of his inability to save enough out of the profits after taxes to repay the loan; and when the people of the European countries with few exceptions do not pay their income taxes, it is time to reexamine the whole European spending program.

Mr. President, as an example of the true tax situation, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as part of my remarks, an article entitled "Deceptive Taxation," published in the Reader's Digest for June 1952.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEPTIVE TAXATION

(Condensed from Newsweek—A special report by the business editors)

Not one taxpayer in a hundred suspects the extent to which buried taxes are cutting into his earnings. He kids himself that he at least isn't footing the heaviest part of the Nation's tax bill. It is the big corporations and the millionaires, he figures, that get hooked for that. He's wrong: through hidden taxes, he, the American consumer, is shouldering the bulk of the load.

Today the average American is turning over 32 cents out of every dollar he earns to one tax collector or another. The Federal income tax is bad enough. More insidious, however, are the hidden levies that hit the taxpayer when he isn't looking—the taxes imposed on manufacturers and merchants, which are quietly passed along to the consumer in the form of higher prices. These also include the excise taxes slapped on by many States and cities.

When a man walks into a showroom and plunks down $2,000 for a new auto, nowhere near that amount reaches the pockets of the dealer, the manufacturer and the suppliers of parts and raw materials. Some $624 has already stuck to the fingers of the Federal, State, and local tax collectors. By the time he shifts into gear, the new owner will have joined in paying taxes on at least 200 separate transactions that went into creating the car.

Hidden taxes multiply rapidly. For example, there are more than 475 taxes on the construction and materials costs that go into a new house. A new spring hat for a woman carries 150 hidden levies, a man's suit 116.

On some items the invisible taxes total more than the real value of the product. This is true of a ton of coal, a gallon of gasoline, a pack of cigarettes (see table). On a loaf of bread, a quart of milk, or a pound of beef the tax comes to at least half the real value.

How direct and hidden taxes—State, local, and Federal—hit everyday items in a typical United States community

	Real value	Taxes	Price
Cigarettes (pack)	$0.09	$0.12	$0.21
Bread (loaf)	.09	.05	.14
Milk (quart)	.14	.09	.23
Beef (pound)	.58	.32	.90
Gasoline (gallon)	.12	.14	.26
Phone (month)	6.60	2.95	9.55
Liquor (fifth)	1.05	3.35	4.40
Coal (ton)	9.00	15.00	24.00

The Tax Foundation, a private research group that keeps an eye on Government spending and taxing, has figured out the load of hidden taxes on families of similar size in several income brackets. Here are the foundation's findings:

On a $3,500 income the family pays out $799 in hidden taxes—$249 to merchants and manufacturers, $302 in retail sales and excises, $140 for social security, and $108 in realty and minor taxes. The family's income taxes, incidentally, total only $299.

On $4,500 hidden taxes come to $1,039; income taxes to $455.

On $7,500 hidden taxes total $1,932; income taxes $869.

On $15,000 hidden taxes come to $4,012; income taxes to $2,606.

With today's visible and invisible taxes, the era is clearly past when a man can hope to get rich on savings out of his salary. Even maintaining a stable standard of living has become no mean feat. The man who has three dependents and earned $5,000 before the war needs $11,800 to live on the same scale now. If he made $25,000 in 1939 he will have to pick up $98,000 this year to live as well as then. And if he was in the $100,000 class in the prewar days he'll have to bring home a million now.

For the single man the job of keeping ahead is even tougher; the $5,000 a year man needs $13,500, the $25,000 a year man $230,000.

One expert argues that up to $5,000,000,000 a year in Government spending could be salvaged by eliminating waste and carelessness. He cites the encouraging examples set at Newburgh, N. Y., a city of 31,000.

Three years ago the Newburgh city council laid on a 2-percent retail sales tax. Sales started promptly to drift away to rival communities. Newburgh businessmen took the matter in hand. They made a survey of municipal affairs on a realistic, nonpolitical basis, combing every office and asking: Where does the money go? How much does each job cost the city? By last November these men were able to spot $450,000 worth of waste in a city budget of $2,000,000. This was the exact amount brought in by the sales tax. Since then, a new city council has been elected and repealed the sales tax.

Whether Washington will profit from such lessons remains to be seen. It is important. Time is running out. Responsible economists warn of danger in the air.

It is widely agreed that a tax load of 25 cents on the average citizen's dollar is about as far as a government can safely go. Up to this point, taxes pay their way and act as brakes on inflation. Above it, taxes push up prices and sap incentive. They make a man think twice before risking his cash to make a profit. They scare off and dry up the flow of equity capital into new plants, equipment and products. And this flow is the foundation on which America's industries are built and on which their future growth depends.

Americans are now taxed an average of 32 cents on the dollar—7 cents above the danger line. Persons with higher incomes, the biggest potential investors, are socked much harder. Unless there is a retreat, unless the Government forces itself to loosen its grip at least partly on the taxpayer's pocketbook, industry's future growth and development stand in jeopardy.

The United States is in real danger of biting off its nose to spite its face.

25-PERCENT OVERPOPULATION OF EUROPE AND ASIA

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I shall not vote to bleed our taxpayers white to send money to the people of the European nations who refuse to help themselves.

I shall not vote to send American boys to Europe when there are already 25 percent more men there than can ever support themselves unless someone—meaning so far the United States—picks up the check.

1950–51 STATEMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. President, I now quote from an address which I made to this august body on April 18, 1951, more than 1 year ago, and prior to the return of General MacArthur, following his discharge from the Far Eastern Command for daring to tell Americans the truth, and I have seen no reason to change my statement and conclusions made as of that date.

Mr. President, I ask that excerpts from my address of April 18, 1951, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Properly prepared, with air power and submarine fleets, together with trained servicemen, this Nation can control the air over any area important to our ultimate security—and can blockade any nation seeking to move into that area.

George Washington said in his often misunderstood statement that "we should avoid permanent alliances with foreign powers"—he pointedly did not say that we should not have temporary alliances and allies for a definite purpose.

His statement is in line with the Monroe Doctrine, which is a policy which gives us control over our own destiny. It is in line with England's 100-year-old policy that she had no permanent friendships or enmities, but only permanent interests.

This principle is in line with common horse sense. I pointedly disagree with England's method of signing rigid economic and military pacts with both Russia and the United States—with the evident purpose of

adhering to the nation, if and when there is a final showdown, which is better calculated to protect her interests.

ENGLAND'S 100-YEAR-OLD FOREIGN POLICY

England, the land of great statesmen and, up to now, the land of an indomitable race, enunciated her real down-to-earth national policy nearly 100 years ago, through one of its great Prime Ministers, Viscount Palmerston.

Palmerston voiced England's policy when he said in June 1858:

"We have no eternal allies, and we have no perpetual enemies. Our interests are eternal and perpetual, and those interests it is our duty to follow."

He did not make that policy of England, Mr. President, but he expressed its most important principle.

THESE ARE ENGLAND'S PRIME INTERESTS

If we could first understand what a small foreign nation's policy must of necessity be if it is to survive over the years, it would help us to better understand why it may be necessary for England to do the things which her present leaders have apparently decided to be her current best interests. These are—

First. Force the United States to recognize the Communist regime in China.

Second. Transfer Formosa to the Chinese Communists.

Third. Trade as usual with Red China—just the same as they had always traded in that area.

Fourth. Trade as usual with Russia, supposedly our common enemy, forcing the United States to bid against her for the tin, rubber, hemp, and so forth, which we so desperately need for our own security and for furnishing arms to Europe, including England—an ironical situation.

Fifth. Trade as usual with the iron-curtain countries.

Sixth. Maintain an independent military and economic treaty or pact with Russia—a pact reading startlingly like the Atlantic Pact which they have with us.

* * * * *

During World War II, when President Roosevelt told Prime Minister Churchill that Great Britain should relinquish her possessions in Hong Kong, Churchill, speaking at the Lord Mayor's luncheon in London, on November 10, 1942, said:

"I have not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire."

Mr. President, that statement lays it on the line as to just what is going to happen when the trouble really starts in Asia.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE

When these facts are fully understood by the American people, then, and only then, will our legislative bodies recognize the correctness of a Monroe Doctrine which did not include specific signed pacts of any kind or nature, but, instead, set forth a flexible foreign policy, laid down by this Nation in the interests of our ultimate security and welfare.

The Monroe Doctrine for the Western Hemisphere, enunciated by President Monroe 128 years ago, met with the instantaneous approval of the South American and Central American countries. We took little, if any, chance in signing an inter-American pact based upon this doctrine, because of the obvious permanent interests due to our contiguous areas.

PERMANENT PACTS—EMBARRASSING AND DANGEROUS

On the other hand, signing so-called permanent pacts with foreign noncontiguous nations—as for example, the Atlantic Pact—could, and probably will, prove to be not only embarrassing but extremely dangerous.

The Atlantic Pact includes the colonial-empire nations of England, France, Belgium, and the Netherlands, and while the areas to be protected are supposedly defined, our moral commitment will involve us, regardless of our own ultimate safety and welfare, when these nations get themselves involved in protecting their interests anywhere—in the Malayan States, Indochina, Africa, the Middle East, or in the Mediterranean area.

PROGRESS

We are making progress in our own country. More and more of our citizens are quickening their interest in public affairs because they suddenly have begun to realize the dangerous inroads that the economic one-worlders, the hothouse economists, the World Federationists, the Socialists, and the slap-happy Frankfurters are making on our Government and our American way of life.

THE DIRECTED TRIO

All these political misfits are held together and directed by the Truman-Acheson-Marshall trio, men who are themselves caught in a sinister, ruthless undertow thoroughly and completely controlled by the British Empire.

OUR BRITISH-CONTROLLED HYBRID POLICY

Apropos of our British-controlled, hybrid domestic and foreign policy, I now quote from the Book of Genesis, chapter 27, the twenty-second verse:

"And Jacob went near unto Isaac, his father; and he felt him, and said, the voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau."

Mr. President, I quote now from an address which I made on the floor of the Senate on March 21, 1951:

"The voice of this foreign policy we are using is the State Department's voice, but the hands are those of Europe, principally those of England, controlling our hybrid domestic and foreign policy.

"This combination is wrecking our national economy and is putting us into an international position which is untenable and indefensible."

ONE ECONOMIC WORLD—COLONIAL SLAVERY SYSTEM

The one economic world objective and the protection of the British-France-Belgium-Netherlands colonial-empire slavery system throughout the world are being firmly established as a permanent policy of this Nation through inflation, free trade, taxes. Our present international policy is calculated to protect these empire systems.

PRESIDENT AGGRAVATES OUR MISFORTUNE

Mr. President, the President of the United States only aggravates our misfortune when he makes today's problem a partisan issue. His psychology works furiously, but what he fails to recognize—and respect—is that he is President of the United States of America, and is not a stump speaker in a local partisan fight.

Mr. President, we face disaster. With courage, let us face it as Americans, protecting the reputation of no man, safeguarding the political position of no man, forcing no partisan issues, but serving, as we have been chosen, to serve the United States of America, our beloved homeland, which with clear minds and with the help of God can be preserved for all time.

SIR ALFORD MAC KINDER—THE HEARTLAND

Sir Alford MacKinder said, in one of his able works early in this century, that any country that controls the heartland of Asia controls the world. He described the heartland of Asia as China, Mongolia, western Russia, and eastern Siberia.

It is generally understood that Russia has decided to make her play for the control of China—and through the control of Asia to control Europe and the world.

Asia is the key to the control of Europe; when Asia falls to the Soviets then Europe will fall whenever Russia chooses to move. Consequently, Communist control of China must be stopped if Russian domination of Asia and later of Europe is to be prevented.

The question is one of procedure.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

First. We should name those areas the integrity of which is important to our ultimate security, and we say to any aggressor nation: "This far and no farther. If you step over the line, we will loose on you from the air—upon your industrial centers, your sources of supply, your supply lines, your war-making machines—everything at our command." We would destroy any nation's war-making capacity which sought to move into any areas whose integrity was considered important to our ultimate safety. Thus we cover with a Monroe Doctrine all territory we wish to deny to the enemy. The necessary foot soldiers would be set up by the area being defended.

Second. We should select the necessary bases for strategic areas and there erect our air power and submarine bases, principally in the Western Hemisphere for long-range bombing operations.

Third. We then concentrate American resources and ingenuity on the creation of unchallengeable air and sea power. If we maintain this position, we can win any war with Russia or any group of nations.

Fourth. We forthwith stop assistance of every nature to the Communist nations and to nations in any way assisting Russia, her captive nations, and communistic China in the consolidation of Soviet gains and in the preparation for world war III.

Fifth. Officially inform both France and England that they must immediately terminate the economic and military pacts which they maintain separately with Soviet Russia.

Sixth. Give no more money, as loans and gifts to any government as such. If necessary such loans might be made to private business in strategic areas without weakening our own economy, in the same manner and on the same terms as the RFC loans funds to private business in this country in times of stress.

Seventh. Further assistance to European nations would be predicated upon an economic union or a United States of Europe, and a free exchange of their currencies and goods.

Eighth. Oppose the admission of Communist China by the United Nations with every means at our command.

Ninth. Forthwith stop supporting colonial slavery in any form, anywhere.

Tenth. Protect and strengthen our own national economy in the interest of world security through the adoption of the flexible import-fee principle as a floor under wages and investments in place of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. Congress should reclaim its constitutional responsibility and authority to regulate foreign commerce which it has transferred to the executive branch of the Government.

Eleventh. Clean up our own Government, throw out the Communists, Communist associates, adherents to foreign ideologies, persons of abnormal moral weakness, and other dangerous security risks.

Twelfth. Start an immediate investigation through the Armed Services Committees of both Houses of Congress, to determine why we are not prepared to fight a war after the expenditure of nearly $60,000,000,000 since 1945.

Thirteenth. Preserve and protect our atomic bomb, guided missile, and other offensive and defense weapon's secrets for our own protection and bargaining power.

Fourteenth. Send no foot soldiers as such into either Europe or Asia—but develop and

utilize to the fullest extent our air power, including long-range bombers, to be based principally on the Western Hemisphere and strategically defensible areas—and naval power, including submarine fleets, to protect our shores and to effectively blockade any nation that seeks to invade any area important to our ultimate security and welfare.

Fifteenth. Bring the foot soldiers out of Korea at the first favorable opportunity—and utilize an all-out air offensive not only against the North Korean and the Communist China armies, but against the supply lines and the war manufacturing and industrial plants in southern Manchuria and eastern China.

Communist China has attacked us, therefore her war-making capacity should be destroyed to save American lives—and to delay indefinitely her usefulness to Russia in the control of Asia.

These recommendations were made substantially in this form, in an address to the Senate on December 14, 1950, and on February 5 and again on March 21, 1951.

NOTE.—The situation has changed since early in 1951—we have since lost control of the air—according to Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg, head of the Air Forces.

DIFFERENCE IN STRATEGY FOR DEFENDING THIS NATION

There is not now and never has been any doubt about this Nation defending any country or area whose integrity is important to the ultimate safety and welfare of the United States of America.

There is a grave difference in strategy and the methods to be utilized in such defense, and that, as far as the junior Senator from Nevada is concerned, is the basis for the great debate.

VESTED INTEREST IN THEIR OWN MISTAKES

A vested interest in their own mistakes is the only explanation that can be offered for the stubborn and senseless attachment of the administration to its continued betrayal of Nationalist China to the Red hordes of Russia.

Mr. MALONE. And I may now add, Mr. President, the stubborn, senseless insistence upon playing the Russian game in Europe while refusing to put the emphasis on the only kind of power with which we can possibly win world war III—supremacy in air and sea power.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I make a point of order against the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] for the reason that the unanimous-consent agreement, reduced to writing, provides that no amendment or motion that is not germane to the subject matter of the bill shall be received. The Senator from Nevada may claim that his amendment relates to defense, but this bill is not on the subject of defense alone; it relates to mutual defense, and mutual security of the countries of Europe; whereas the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada has no reference at all to Europe; it refers only to domestic defense. So I submit his amendment is not germane.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have some time left, have I not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada has 2 minutes.

Mr. MALONE. I would only say in answer to the distinguished Senator from Texas, that the only way we can defend Europe or Asia, or even ourselves, is to control the air and the sea. At this moment, according to the Secretary of the Air Force, we do not control either. I would say that that fact alone indicates that my amendment is pertinent to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has examined the amendment, and has also examined the bill, to ascertain whether the amendment is germane to anything in the bill. The bill is a bill amending the Mutual Security Act, heretofore enacted. The amendment now offered relates to the air forces of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps generally. It will be in order on a bill authorizing appropriations for American forces or for American defense, considered from a domestic standpoint, but the Chair does not think the amendment is germane to the bill now before the Senate, and sustains the point of order.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No Senator can suggest the absence of a quorum unless he is yielded to by some other Senator, because under the unanimous-consent agreement the time is controlled by Senators who offer or oppose amendments to the bill.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator have an amendment to offer?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I have.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 25, it is proposed to strike out the period and to insert "*Provided*, That the dollar costs of the United States under the act for international development for the program in any country in any fiscal year for supplies and equipment shall not exceed 3 times the dollar costs of the United States for United States technicians and the training of local personnel."

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I preface my remarks in presenting the amendment with a statement that I am not proposing a reduction by 1 cent in the total amount of money made available. I am endeavoring to direct how it shall be spent.

This amendment is identical with one that was adopted by the House a few days ago and is contained in the bill as passed by the House. It is designed to preserve the character of the point 4 program as a program of expert and technical assistance, and to prevent it from degenerating into another handout program.

I am sure Congress has intended all along that the point 4 program be directed toward giving other nations the benefit of expert American engineering, scientific, and technical knowledge so that these other countries may improve their living conditions and social institutions on the basis of such advice from American experts. In other words, it is supposed to be simply the export of American "know how." It is not supposed to be the vehicle for another program of giving away large quantities of raw materials or machinery or the construction of large engineering works at American expense.

Instead of sticking closely to this original concept of point 4, it is apparent that the administration proposes to distort its character entirely.

This concept is recognized in the report by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, in which the following paragraph appears on page 37:

The TCA program is primarily one of showing people in the underdeveloped areas how they can improve their lot by themselves. It is not a program for the purpose of giving economic help in the form of commodities and capital equipment. Grants of supplies and equipment are, however, included in technical cooperation programs in order to enhance the effectiveness of the work of the technicians and in some cases these grants are fairly substantial in amount. A large part of the funds should be used for salaries and expenses of technicians sent to these areas and for the training of foreign nationals in the United States, although it is necessary, of course, for technicians and teachers to have supplies, equipment and commodities, in sufficient quantities to enable them to carry on their functions.

The report then goes on to say:

According to information presented to the committee the administration plans during 1953 to spend about $44,252,000 for technicians and trainees and $182,748,000 for supplies and equipment. Thus for every dollar spent for training, more than $4 will be spent for supplies and equipment. The committee calls attention to this fact because it believes that there may be a tendency on the part of some officers concerned with the TCA programs gradually to emphasize commodity and end-item types of assistance rather than technical assistance. The committee feels that changes of emphasis in that direction would be unwise for a number of reasons.

I am calling attention to these statements in the committee report because it is obvious that in many cases point 4 has become a program of giving away commodities rather than extending technical assistance. In Pakistan, for example, they are giving away 10,000 tons of fertilizer. In Libya, we have an educational program. Since the Libyan government has no buildings available, our program consists largely of construction of buildings to the extent of about $500,000.

In India, we have several hundred American technicians who are supposed to be helping the Indians increase their agricultural production through showing them how to use fertilizers, tools, and so forth. However, we have not stopped at giving technical assistance, but we are also supplying the fertilizer and the tools. Actually, about 90 percent of the cost of the program in India is made up of these supplies and items of equipment.

The only way to stop this trend is to place a limit on the funds that may be spent for supplies and equipment and provide that the cost of such supplies shall not exceed three times the cost of the personnel in any country. That is what my amendment will do.

This amendment will not hamper the point 4 program in the slightest if the countries, where it is being conducted, are willing to cooperate with the American experts and supply at least a portion of the supplies and equipment that those experts need. In the long run, those countries are going to have to pay for such supplies for their own

people if this point 4 program is to make any real change in the production methods of those countries. The foreign governments might as well start to recognize that fact now instead of being allowed to get the impression that the United States will pay the cost of all supplies, machinery, and so forth, to reorganize production methods all over the world.

I hope my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have a good deal of sympathy with the point of view of the Senator from Nebraska, as a general proposition. I have discussed this amendment with Mr. Andrews, who is the new director of the point 4 program, with whom many Senators are well acquainted, and in whom I believe Senators have great confidence.

The effect of this amendment in many countries would not be at all serious, but there is one area where it would be very serious. I refer especially to India. As the Senator from Nebraska knows, in the case of India some very special circumstances have arisen recently, as evidenced last year by the grant of grain to India. I believe that we made an outright grant of grain to the extent of $190,000,000 worth, because of the famine which had developed in India. This year there is a drought on a much smaller scale, but there is a chronic lack of food in India. The two items in particular which are involved in the Indian program, to which the Senator from Nebraska has already referred, are fertilizer for the production of food, and tube wells for water. Both commodities are directed solely to the production of food.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I think the distinguished Senator from Arkansas knows as well as any of us that from India we import thousands of tons of jute and burlap running into great sums of money.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is true.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I wonder if it would not be possible for the Government of India to supply the fertilizer and other materials which are necessary for our technicians to work with over there.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will say to the Senator that a very fine fertilizer plant has just been completed, not with gifts, but with funds which India borrowed from the International Bank only within the past several months. I refer to the Sindri plant. I believe that India is making progress, but everything cannot be done at once. There is still a very severe lack of essential materials. The president of the International Bank, Eugene Black, has given us a statement to the effect that the International Bank is making loans for every project of this character which can be reasonable financed by the Bank, and with respect to which there is reasonable chance for repayment. The Bank has representatives in India much of the time. This is a transitional period in India. As the Senator from Nebraska knows, the people of India have just gained their independence. They have recently held an election. I think they are making a fine and sincere effort to bring themselves up to a position of self-sustenance in the matter of food.

As I have said, the program in India is a very special one. To that extent it is contrary to the general idea of the point 4 program. I subscribe in general to the sentiments expressed in the report to which reference has been made. Take all the South American countries, for example. The Senator's formula would have no effect in South American countries, where the point 4 program has been in operation for a number of years. In the more advanced countries, where we have had a program, and the initial steps have been taken, the materials part of the program comes well within the Senator's formula. However, it would create havoc in the case of India. Mr. Andrews tells me that he thinks it would have a disastrous effect upon the Indian program. That is the principal program which would be affected, because the two large items of fertilizers and wells are involved. Wells, of course, are also for the production of food.

We are presented with a difficult situation. We send technicians to India to teach the people how to use modern irrigation methods. The wells referred to are tube wells with small Diesel engines. I think it would be a very difficult thing for the technicians to say to the people of India, "If we furnish a rig to drill a well, and a pump, you ought to do so and so. There is a certain minimum amount which you ought to do."

We are contemplating under this program only 80 of such projects for all of India. The program is based upon the so-called Etawah project. I believe that everyone who read the account by Horace Holmes when he appeared before the committee last year approved it. It is in the very best traditions of our county-agent program. Go back to the beginning of the county-agent program. In the beginning, for demonstration purposes, there was a great deal more emphasis upon the materials which the county agents used to get the ball rolling. Today it is not necessary for county agents to have samples of modern machinery or irrigation equipment, or anything else, because there is plenty of such equipment in this country to serve for demonstration purposes.

As a practical matter all they do today is convey the latest knowledge from the institutions in which it is developed. I submit that in India, where the program is in its beginning stages, there is justification for the amount of material which is involved in the bill.

I would also say that I would not like to see this program continue to grow, and I would object to continuing it in countries such as those of South America, where the experience has been that gradually the local authorities have taken over more and more of the expense, and our expense during the last 5 years has gone down steadily as the contributions of the countries have gone up. India is just now in the beginning stages. I believe that the full impact of the proposed formula would be felt in India, and to a lesser extent in Pakistan, where the problem is similar but not as acute as in India.

The point being made by the Senator from Nebraska is that the countries can do these things themselves. The fact is that India has strained its credit to the limit. They did it for example, in building the fertilizer plant to which I referred.

The Senator knows that recently India has made great progress. I think a friendly gesture when they gave special guarantees to two American oil companies to build refineries. At least the action satisfied two of our biggest oil companies.

There is one other item to which I should like to refer, and that is the making of their steel plow points. For centuries Indians have been plowing with wooden plows, which are incapable of turning under cover crops for fertilizer. That is one of the great difficulties, and it is one of the reasons for the big demand for commercial fertilizer. It is because they have not used the kind of plow that will turn under the green organic matter. That is one of the main objects of this program; it is to teach them how to make and use steel-pointed plows. It is a very simple matter, and the making of the steel-pointed plows does not cost very much for each plow. But of course India is a big country and requires many plows.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I can very readily agree with what the Senator from Arkansas says, but when we not only furnish them the know-how and the technical assistance but also go further and furnish them the supplies and the materials that are necessary, such as fertilizer and plows, we are setting up an example in some communities which will extend all over the country, and in due time a demand will develop among the neighbors of those who received the free material to be furnished the free material also. It will go on and on, and the program will keep on growing. I am in favor of furnishing the know-how. The amendment, however, would restrict the program from being carried forward to the extent of furnishing impossible material. Yet it would provide an ample margin to put the program over.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska and I are not too far apart. The Senator will appreciate that I am speaking under a limitation of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself five additional minutes.

The point is that we are in the initial stages of the program in India. As we all know, when we start anything we must have something to use with which to demonstrate a program. There are

500,000 villages in India and only 80 projects are involved. The Etawah project was a demonstration project, which was used to prove what could be done with these techniques and with fertilizer. Incidentally by the combination of fertilizer and plows they increased the production of wheat in that demonstration project by 46 percent in 3 years. It is a very small demonstration project as applied to India.

The money will not go very far in a big country like India. It will not provide anything more than sample programs, the main object being to prove to Indians that there is something to this matter of fertilizer, to show that it is a good thing, and to show that they should use a modern plow. Then it is certainly expected that they will make their own plows. The purpose of the program is merely to get them started. I would not approve of carrying it on indefinitely. If this were the third, fourth, or fifth year of the project we should be beyond this stage, as we are already beyond this stage in the other countries where the point 4 program has been carried on.

As I said before, it is only in this particular area that the formula would have any impact at all. It would have no effect in the 20 countries of South America and Central America, or in the Middle East countries except Iran. It would have an effect, of course, in Pakistan and in Iran, where agriculture is in the most primitive stages. Certainly it would not have any effect in any of the European countries. I do not think it would have any effect in Indonesia and Malaya.

It would have a bad effect in India, where they are making great progress. At least, the reports show that they are making progress. The testimony before the committee from men who have been in India, particularly Mr. Andrews, is very favorable with respect to the effectiveness of the program last year under the supervision of Mr. Horace Holmes. All that is intended to be done is to multiply, in 80 different communities, what was done under Horace Holmes.

I do hope that the Senate will not adopt an amendment like this. While I do not feel that the committee should have the last word on everything, I do think that this kind of amendment should be submitted first to the committee, where it can be analyzed and so that people from the agencies themselves can examine it.

As I said a moment ago, I discussed this matter with Mr. Andrews. He told me positively that in his opinion such an amendment would practically wreck the proposed Indian program, which is a considerable one and a very important one in the over-all program.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is an attempt to legislate an equal crisis in all parts of the world. Conditions necessarily differ very greatly in different countries. This amendment, as the Senator from Arkansas has pointed out, would affect India almost exclusively. One of our American agricultural agents in India—and the statement applies to almost any other country—says that the native Indian can grow twice as much food if we supply him with chemical fertilizer, irrigation pumps, and steel points for the bullock plows. The Director of Mutual Security believes that the political situation and the food problem in South Asia, including India, is more urgent than in any other underdeveloped area and, therefore, he proposed that we supply fertilizer, irrigation pumps, and steel plow points for the program in India.

The distinguished Senator from Nebraska would legislate a policy of equal crisis in all parts of the world.

The nub of the Indian program is the effort to grow more food. We learned that fact from the debates last year when we voted grants and loans to India.

In 1953 the program submitted by the Director for Mutual Security is calculated to reach 39,000 villages in India, and a population of 22,000,000. The Indian Government is assigning 17,000 village workers to this program. The United States is sending 400 technicians. The Indian Government is furnishing all supplies and equipment for the program which can be produced in India. The United States is sending all needed supplies and equipment that must be purchased outside of India. This is a joint effort to make a substantial increase in food production. The Indian Government is contributing three times as much as the United States to this joint program. If Congress decides that the United States supplies shall be limited in this program to three times the value of the salaries of the American technicians and the trainees, it will destroy the usefulness of much of the outstanding effort of the Indian Government to mobilize its own personnel and supplies. In fact, the amendment ignores the joint character of the program and the work of the 17,000 Indian workers. It means these workers will not have the fertilizer, the irrigation pumps, and the steel points for plows.

A ton of fertilizer will add two tons to a crop of grain. An irrigation pump can produce two crops on the same land which formerly produced one. A steel plow point, when used with a cover crop, can increase the grain production by 46 percent.

Mr. President, countries such as India will, I am convinced, eventually solve their food problems without United States help, if no United States help is provided. The only difference will be the length of time required. That is a vital difference. The United States has the agricultural techniques and equipment to help India achieve in 4 years a rate of food production which otherwise India would require a generation to achieve. Those 4 years will be the critical period in the struggle in Asia against communism.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that it is most important that we make plain to India that we are endeavoring to help her raise her standard of living. I do not think anything else could be more important to India or to the interest of the other peace-loving nations.

The national elections in India, which were completed in February of this year, showed that the Communists were strongest in the areas of greatest food shortage.

Since China went Communist it has often been observed that if a village development program such as the one the ECA began in China in 1948 could have been started 5 years earlier it could have altered the outcome in China.

By their tactics the Communists now reveal that they regard India as the next big prize in Asia. The village development program in India, which is proposed in the pending bill, is of the very type which the China experience has demonstrated could help check communism in India and in the entire Asiatic area.

So, Mr. President, I hope very much that the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska will be rejected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we are now discussing an amendment which is most vital to the successful operation of the so-called point 4 program, or the technical assistance and cooperation program. The effect of the pending amendment, if adopted, would be that in one of the most crucial areas in our world our over-all aid program for India and for Pakistan would be reduced by 70 percent.

I know that the proponent of the amendment has no desire to jeopardize the successful operation of the program of technological and scientific aid on our part in connection with the efforts of those countries to help themselves. Similarly, I know that neither the proponent of the amendment nor any other Member of the Senate wishes to thwart the efforts of the United States to be of assistance to those countries in increasing their food production.

Nevertheless, it is true that by placing such a ceiling on the expenditures for food, on the basis of fixing a ratio of 3 to 1 between the supply cost and the personnel cost components of the program, the result would be to damage most seriously the operation of the program in those countries.

There are some countries in which such expenditures for supplies and for personnel are literally in balance. Some countries may need more dollars for personnel than for supplies or equipment. However, it happens that the United States Government, working in connection with India and Pakistan, has developed a program to supplement very rapidly their food production.

It is imperative that the production of food in those countries be increased quickly. Scientific and technological workers cannot do that work alone. What else is needed, Mr. President?

It has been pointed out that fertilizer is needed for certain kinds of soil, and that water is needed for purposes of irrigation. The water is obtained from deep wells, which require pumps and casing, in order that the water may be reached.

That is why the amount of money being used for supplies and equipment has been unusually large.

I remind the proponent of this amendment that our Government has worked out with the Government of India an arrangement in connection with India's 6-year development program; and representatives of the Indian Government have appeared before Senate committees and have pointed out what the Indian Government is doing in these village and community developments. Approximately 300 villages are involved in one community alone. In fact, Mr. President, more than 200,000 persons will be affected by one program; and there are hosts of such programs.

At this time to put the entire program into an economic strait-jacket would be to ignore the real situation in regard to the production of food.

I shall not now discuss the Communist problem. We should be interested in the production of food, even if there were no Communists. We should be interested in helping to improve the standard of living, even if there were no enemy except the enemy of poverty and malnutrition. I do not think the existence of Communists should be required to inspire us to do a good job.

So I am urging the application of a sensible program to a vital situation. I urge the Senate not to insist upon the application of a severe formula which would make it impossible for us to meet the real problem in the area where the program is to be applied.

So, Mr. President, I ask the Senate of the United States not to cripple a program which just now is getting under way.

The program of technological and scientific assistance represents an effort on the part of Americans to be of assistance to the underprivileged and the underdeveloped areas of the world. It is absolutely essential that we continue this program.

I think I should point out that in south Asia we shall be spending $15,000,000 for technicians and, in 1953, $137,000,000 for equipment and supplies. Of course, Mr. President, it is not possible to obtain a sudden increase in food production by means of the employment of a technician. Obviously, it is also necessary to have supplies and to move large quantities of earth; and in the case of a reclamation project or an irrigation project, large quantities of earth cannot effieciently be moved by having the earth carried in buckets on the heads of the laborers. Bulldozers and other up-to-date equipment are required for efficient operation in such a situation.

The Senator from Arkansas and other Senators have pointed out that the Government of India and the Government of Pakistan and the governments of other countries in Asia and the Near East are contributing far more personnel than we are contributing to this program. This effort is a cooperative one, and I submit that it should not be jeopardized by means of any hasty action taken by the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a statement regarding the amendment printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, this statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The amendment prescribing a fixed ratio of supply costs to personnel in the economic-aid program places a rigidity of operation in a program which should remain flexible.

The effect of such an amendment as far as south Asia is concerned would be tantamount to reducing the over-all aid program for India and Pakistan by 70 percent. This reduction would result in disastrous effects on the program as planned and would not at all satisfy the minimum aims of the program.

The specific needs of underdeveloped countries are different in each case and whereas it might be possible in one specific country to maintain a low ratio of cost between supplies and personnel it also follows that in other countries this ratio, in the initial stages of the program at least, may necessarily be large in order to achieve United States aims in the particular area.

In South Asia and specifically in India and in Pakistan, the United States program has been designed to assist these two countries in the achievement of economic goals within what is generally considered to be a critical period of the next 4 years. These programs have been made up with full consideration of the 6-year development plans which have been established by the countries themselves as minimum goals to be achieved. The funds to be made available by the United States are for programs designed to assist these governments in the fulfillment of their essential economic goals.

Communist gains in South India during the recent national elections have indicated the trend that can be expected if the present democratic government in power does not achieve even slight increases in the standard of living within its tenure of office. The United States has a great stake in the decision which the people of India and Pakistan may have to take in developing their countries along democratic or Communist lines.

The present standard of living in the subcontinent is abnormally low. This can be shown by the fact that compared to an average annual real income of $690 per person in the more developed areas of the world India has $30 and Pakistan only $50. In the more developed countries, the quantity of energy other than food consumed per year is over 600 pounds of coal per person. In India this quantity is only 220 pounds per person, while in Pakistan it is as low as 60 pounds per person.

But the item which does more to stir up people against any form of government and attracts that people to any group which promises relief is the scarcity of food. In India and Pakistan food is not available in sufficient quantities to supply the people with even the minimum daily caloric requirements that are necessary for tropical areas. This minimum has been estimated by the Food and Agriculture Organization as 2,200 calories per person. The people of Pakistan consume on the average 2,030 calories per day while the people of India, the low quantity of 1,660 calories per day. One of the primary reasons for the low supply of food in these countries is the very low crop yield that is obtained there. Indian farmers, for example, produce on the average 10 bushels of wheat per acre and 22 bushels of rice per acre. In Pakistan these yields are a little higher, 14 bushels of wheat and 28 bushels of rice per acre. These yields are only one-half to one-third the average yields which are obtained in the more developed countries. United States experience has shown that increased crop yields result from more water for irrigation, more fertilizer to revitalize the ground, better agricultural equipment, and more scientific agricultural techniques. To affect the large numbers of farm communities in India and in Pakistan in the shortest possible period, it is necessary to make available the necessary supplies and equipment which will support and magnify the work that will be done by American and indigenous technicians to achieve greater food production.

This approach in India has taken the form of the organization and operation of a large number of community-development areas. Each of these areas would encompass 300 villages and will affect directly over 200,000 people. The program in each of these areas is an integrated one and involves better agricultural techniques, distribution of fertilizer, and more efficient farm tools, a public health and sanitation program and an educational and training program. The results obtained in the pilot project on rural development in Etawah promise an increase in food production of 50 percent at the end of 4 years in areas where there is an integrated and concentrated development program. This would mean the drilling of tube wells to tap the underground water for irrigation. It will include the supply of key items of equipment to accelerate the completion of large-scale irrigation projects which would make available vast quantities of irrigation water. It means the importation of various types of fertilizer which can be used by the agricultural technicians to increase crop yields per acre and to convince the very conservative farmer of the value of fertilizer to him and to the community.

Limitation of the supplies that will be required to achieve the minimum aims of the United States program in India and Pakistan by fixing a rigid ratio between supplies and personnel would make the basic attack on the problem thus described completely ineffective. The problem of food production in India and in Pakistan is enormous and requires exceptional effort to solve it in the short period which we deem necessary for the survival of democracy in that part of the world. The supplies and equipment must be made available if our program is to succeed. Technicians with an insufficient amount of supplies and equipment will fail to achieve the desired results.

United States interest in the strengthening and development of the free world makes it mandatory for us to aid in carrying out the most effective program possible in south Asia. The effectiveness of United States programs cannot be assured by imposition of an arbitrary ratio between supply costs and personnel. The cut which would be effected by the proposed amendment directly counters the interests of the United States and the free world.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I have been particularly interested in this subject, not only because of my visit 15 years ago to India and Asia, which was a rather extended visit of more than 6 months, but also because of the information which has been sent to me during the past few months by former Governor Bowles of Connecticut, who is now Ambassador to India. I can confirm, on the strength of this information, the comments just made by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. We have in Washington, visiting us, Mr. President, a most eminent Indian, Mr. Ghosh, who has been responsible for the famous Faridibad project in India. Here, with an investment of only $5,000,000 by the Indian Government, Mr. Ghosh has developed a city to house 50,000 people, and with a vast outlying agricultural area now undergoing rapid development. Mr. President, what has

been needed in order to make such projects productive—what, beside the leadership and the financing of the Indian Government? It is certain American equipment—not American technicians, but American equipment. The Indian Government at this time is training many technicians of their own. The Ford Foundation, our great private philanthropy, under the leadership of Mr. Paul Hoffman, is opening a technical school in Pakistan and has vast projects within India to train Indian technicians to take the leadership among the Indians. But the Indian technicians cannot manufacture the equipment with which to drill the wells. They often cannot get the needed fertilizer; they have not the factories.

The ratio of need in that country, as the Senator from Minnesota has pointed out, and also as applied to southeast Asia, can be a ratio of 10 to 1 for supplies and equipment, rather than the 3 to 1 called for in this amendment. Thus, applied to that particular area of the world, I submit to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that his arbitrary standard is not applicable, and, indeed, it would become a kind of strait-jacket to hold back the progress which is now under way. In India it would result in a drastic cut, a 60-percent or 70-percent cut in available funds.

Mr. President, the Indian Government has a development program of its own for the next several years involving an investment of many billions of dollars. Roughly two-thirds of this it expects to finance itself. Against this great program of its own it will require, in using American funds, a maximum application of dollars to equipment and supplies.

Mr. President, in conclusion I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement on this subject, which I had intended to give the Senate had there been time. This statement illustrates further the fact that the arbitrary ratio called for in this amendment is a handicap to the great bill we are now debating.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENTON

THE EFFECT OF THE AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY SENATOR BUTLER

The only programs under the act for international development which would in fact be affected by the proposed amendment are those for Iran, India, and Pakistan, three of the most crucial areas of United States' interest in Asia. The proposed point 4 programs for India and Pakistan in fiscal year 1953 total approximately $148,000,000. They have been carefully worked out on the basis of a combination of technicians and supplies best suited to attain the basic objective of the point 4 program in these countries. That objective is to help our friends throughout the world through the provision of know-how and supplies in the right proportion to do the job of supplementing their own efforts to improve their lagging economies.

The point 4 concept did not envisage any strait-jacket into which the program must artificially be fitted without regard to point 4 objectives. The point 4 objective in India and Pakistan specifically is to help those countries achieve in the limited time available a perceptible improvement over the poverty in which the large majority of the people of those countries now live. The achievement of this objective could not be as readily reached if the proposed attempt to fit them into the strait-jacket is successful.

Let us take a look at India to see what is happening there and why the proposed United States aid of $115,000,000 cannot, in reason, be asked to suffer this arbitrary approach. The Indian people and the Indian Government are striving desperately to improve their present economic lot. The Indian Government's own plan to do this involves an outlay of several billion dollars in the next few years, of which about two-thirds is expected to come from India's own domestic resources, and a further amount from using up a large part of India's own foreign assets.

The proposed United States technical and economic assistance is designed to work into this program and to supplement India's own efforts. India needs technicians from the United States. India needs to send her students abroad to study. Technical competence is an essential element in India's economic progress and it is fully recognized by both the Government of India and in our own point 4 administration. It is provided for in our 1953 program, but technical assistance, to be fully effective, must be combined in different ratios in different areas with needed assistance in the form of equipment and supplies. Yes, the job requires very different combinations of men and materials in different countries and for different projects.

For example, one of India's main needs is an increase in its own food production. We hope to help India accomplish this in a number of ways. One way India can do this is to increase its use of fertilizer and not only to increase the use of fertilizer but to use it wisely. We hope to help India do this by providing fertilizer—only a part of the fertilizer that India really needs to import to obtain its full objective—and also to provide technicians who will help the Indian farmer to use this fertilizer wisely. The ratio here should not be frozen at 3 to 1: the more fertilizer in ratio to manpower costs, the better it may be. This is an example of a combination of men and materials designed to do the job which is needed in that country.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I shall be willing to consider the merits of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, but what has been pointed out on the floor is unquestionably true in the case of India and in the case of Pakistan. This identical language is in the House bill. If this amendment were adopted there would be nothing in conference, no leeway, no basis upon which a suitable compromise could be effected. As the provision stands in the House bill, some compromise might be effected which would in substance accomplish what the distinguished Senator has in mind, but would except such areas as Pakistan and India, where, if the point 4 program is to be of any real effect, it can be applied to better effect than in almost any other part of the world. I hope the Senator will not insist upon his amendment, for that reason.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska rose.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, does the Senator from Nebraska desire to use some of his time?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has 24 minutes.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I myself do not intend to use the full amount of time remaining to me, but I would say in response to the remarks which have been made in opposition to the amendment that I think no Member of the Senate is more anxious to cooperate with the people of India, or with any other area needing technical advice and cooperation of the sort we can supply, than am I. But I have seen this program carried forward until it involves tremendously large projects, including power projects and irrigation projects, which we in this country have been unable to finance for ourselves. In the case of such projects as that, the program goes far beyond the question of technical advice and assistance. It goes into the matter of furnishing raw materials and commodities in immense quantities.

I thought I had been really charitable in suggesting the Senate adopt the provision which was written into the bill by the House, requiring that not to exceed $3 American money be spent for commodities or materials against $1 spent for technical advice and assistance.

During the past year or two literally thousands of citizens from these countries abroad, countries to which we have sent technicians, have come to the United States. They send teams here, to whom we give all the assistance and all the education we possibly can. We pay for all that, and the cost is considerable. My amendment would provide that an additional amount could be spent for material and assistance and for the purchase of supplies. Therefore, I really think I am charitable in the suggestion I have made.

I know that, as the distinguished Senator from Georgia said, a similar amendment was adopted in the House after some debate. Frankly, it is my purpose to do the best I can to see that the amendment is adopted by the Senate, so that it will not be in conference when the bill shall have been passed by the Senate, because I believe it is a good amendment.

Mr. President, to save considerable time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, at this point, a statement on foreign spending.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

REDUCE FOREIGN SPENDING

I believe it is appropriate to recall at this time that June 30, 1952, was the date originally set for the end of the Marshall plan—the European recovery program—which was supposed, we were told, to bring peace and prosperity to the world, and to bring to an end the need for any further foreign assistance by America to Europe on a large scale.

That date, June 30, 1952, is rapidly approaching. It is about a month away. The very fact that we are now considering this

pending measure—the Mutual Security Act of 1952—is conclusive proof that the Marshall plan failed of its primary purpose. Instead of coming to the end of foreign assistance, we appear to be plunging into bigger and bigger programs. If the President's foreign assistance program is followed, we shall spend $10,345,000,000 for that purpose during the coming year—far more than we have spent for foreign aid during any single year since the end of the war.

Why is it that we find ourselves today in the position where none of these foreign problems has ben solved by our generous gifts, but instead every nation is demanding more and more each year? To give a partial answer to that question, I should like to read from a letter I have just received from an old friend—a former Nebraskan—now stationed in Japan. I believe his letter shows that he is an acute observer with, at the same time, a flexible mind and a fund of good common sense. His letter reads as follows:

"Once before I had occasion to write you that it was my opinion that we were living in and through an era of world-wide political revolution. I still believe that to be true. Vast masses of peoples who have lived in political and economic bondage for centuries have suddenly decided that they have had enough of that and are struggling for a pronounced change. Unfortunately, Communists have succeeded in becoming their leaders and, being demagogues by nature and utterly unscrupulous withal, have promised more than they could fulfill even if they suddenly did become honest and well intentioned. All that they ever can do is to take from the many and give some of it to the chosen few and thus bind these chosen few to the everlasting support of the new regime. In the meantime, though, the whole people feel the exhilaration incident to change and are inclined to accept today's promises for tomorrow's supposed substance, their enthusiasm tends to infect other unhappy peoples, near and far, including, I have no doubt, a good many Americans. Hence, the danger to us and to other democratic peoples of the world.

"Because of all this I believe that America's foreign policy should be such as to insure us strong and able allies. There is no doubt at all in my mind but that we must have such allies and they must be dependable. I don't believe that they can be purchased with money, no matter how great the amount. I believe that in substance that is all that America's foreign policy has amounted to for many, many years now and I am therefore against it. In its stead we must substitute a policy which recognizes the existence of mutual needs and mutual interests and in the ordinary course of international trade take such steps as are necessary to insure that both parties to the contract shall profit. No sane businessman would deliberately destroy a good customer. Yet I feel that to a large degree that is just what we have done or are in the process of doing. By pap feeding the peoples of Europe we have literally destroyed their incentive to work. As a single example, consider the fact that we have been shipping coal to England which has known deposits of readily accessible coal sufficient to last it for not less than 300 years. Japan has to ship in coal at prices up to $40 per ton. But it is Japan and not England which is building cargo ships under contract for such nations as Norway and Sweden, next door neighbors to England. That is ridiculous. Instead of giving England billions of dollars in monetary aid what we should have done and easily could have done was to sell her a plentiful supply of modern coal-mining machinery on credit, the purchase price to be repaid over a long term of years and at minimum cost to her. After that (couched in diplomatic language, of course) we should have said, 'root, hog, or die.' Personally, I believe that they would have cheerfully and industriously worked and saved themselves.

"I am also of the belief that our foreign policy has been wrong where it touches the military contribution to be made by us. I do not believe that it was necessary for us to supply both the material and the manpower that we have supplied for Europe. The least that Europe could have done for herself was to furnish the soldiers needed in a peacetime army over there. Based upon their own pay scales we could have hired several times as many as the thousands that we have furnished and at less cost. Our own young men and their families would have been at home producing rather than consuming.

"I have yet to find a man here who thinks that our present policy in Korea is right. On the contrary, they think that it is all wrong. Who likes to live, let alone fight, without hope? In my judgment we not only walked into another Russian baited trap when we agreed to talk about a possible armistice, but we did it with our eyes wide open and so acted stupidly. By this time even a schoolboy ought to know that Russia is not interested in peace. The kind of a game that she is playing can only be played in a chaotic world. So if anyone back there is supposing that the soldier vote over here is going to go for Mr. Truman or anyone carrying his blessing he is in for a great surprise. These warriors are fed up with a war that is no war, with a struggle that has no plan for an end and which, continued long enough, will spell the end for them. So am I."

I subscribe fully to the thought that we must have strong and able allies. I voted for the Atlantic Pact and have always supported policies of building up close relations with allies we can rely on. But I also fully subscribe to the thought contained in the letter I have just read, of which I will reread a few sentences:

"There is no doubt at all in my mind but that we must have strong and able allies and they must be dependable. I don't believe that they can be purchased with money, no matter how great the amount. I believe that in substance that is all that America's foreign policy has amounted to for many, many years now and I am therefore against it. In its stead we must substitute a policy which recognizes the existence of mutual needs and mutual interests and in the ordinary course of international trade take such steps as are necessary to insure that both parties to the contract shall profit."

Instead of taking these obvious elementary steps, we have done just the opposite. We have not built up a relationship from which both parties can profit. On the contrary, we have built up a relationship under which all the other countries expect and demand that America will shoulder their burdens, finance their extravagant ideas, and pay for their mistakes.

That is why none of these ambitious programs of foreign aid ever succeeds in accomplishing what its sponsors promise. They do not restore economic health because it is our policy to subsidize and support economic folly. They do not restore any nation to a condition of economic self-support because by our policies we have placed a penalty on any nation which attempts to support itself. We cut those nations off the relief roll and reserve our generosity for countries which fail to put their economic houses in order.

I mentioned the fact that the Marshall plan was supposed to come to an end on June 30, 1952. Most Members of the Senate recall the arguments that were made in support of the Marshall plan when it was first proposed. It was supposed to be the plan to bring to an end forever the necessity for any more foreign aid. At that time we were told that all our previous programs had been failures because we did not give enough. The Marshall plan was supposed to be big enough to permit recovery and rehabilitation, not merely relief.

I voted against the Marshall plan. Those of us who did so were severely criticized at that time. We felt that the Marshall plan held out no real hope of success that the international hand-out system would ever come to an end. On the contrary, the Marshall plan represented a long step in the direction of a permanent policy of foreign assistance by the United States. It was a device to prolong the foreign spending for another 4 years. That was what we tried to make the Nation understand at that time, but we were outvoted in the Senate and in the House.

Last year about this time, I presented to the Senate a tabulation showing the complete sum of what had been spent by the United States on foreign assistance throughout the war and postwar periods. At that time I pointed out that the grand total of American hand-outs up until then, including the budget request for fiscal 1952, amounted to $104,000,000,000.

I would now like to bring those figures up to date by showing the total amount of foreign aid which has been granted as of the end of last year, and the additional amounts which have been authorized by Congress or requested by the President through this coming fiscal year. It is shown in the following table:

Gross foreign aid by U. S. Government as of Dec. 31, 1951

[In millions of dollars]

Gross foreign aid extended, wartime (World War II)	49,224
Gross foreign aid, postwar:	
Gross foreign aid extended (through Dec. 31, 1951)	35,571
American investment in International Bank and Monetary Fund	3,385
Gross foreign id authorized but unutilized, as of Dec. 31, 1951	16,105
Proposed foreign aid for fiscal year 1953	7,914
Gross foreign aid, postwar: Extended, authorized, and proposed	62,975
Gross foreign aid, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1953	112,199

Without reading this table, let me say that it shows that the grand total of foreign aid extended, authorized, or requested by the President in his 1953 budget message since the beginning of the war amounts to $112,199,000,000.

Some people may suppose that the bulk of this sum is made up of wartime lend-lease expenditures and the like. That is far from true. On the contrary, well over half of it represents postwar spending—not wartime lend-lease. The total of foreign aid extended during the war amounted to about $49,000,000,000. The cost during the postwar period, including the request for the coming fiscal year, will aggregate nearly $63,000,000,000.

When we discuss these programs, mentioning billions for this and billions for that, it may be difficult for the average man to get any clear conception of just how much the program has cost him. Most of us have never seen a billion dollars, or even a million dollars for that matter. It is a little difficult to visualize the impact of such a sum.

Let us try to illustrate the meaning of these figures by translating them into terms that are a little closer to home. Assuming that the people of Nebraska must pay their per capita share of the Federal tax bill, the proportionate cost to the people in my State

during this period has amounted to $987,000,000—just short of a billion.

That is more, far more, than the total revenue of the State government of Nebraska during this entire 13-year period. It is more than the total expenditures of the State for all purposes—road construction, education, State institutions, the administrative organization, the judicial system, and everything else operated by the State government.

In other words, the people of Nebraska have had to pay out more for the assistance of foreign countries than they have spent on their own needs through their State government.

Let me make another comparison which may bring the cost of foreign aid even closer to home. Most people agree that education is one of the most important functions of our Government. Our public schools today face a serious financial problem. Additional school buildings must be built. Additional teachers must be trained and employed—and we face a severe shortage of teachers. Most people agree that we must raise teachers' salaries in order to induce young people to enter the teaching field—to say nothing of doing common justice to the teachers we already have.

Remember that the President wants to spend over $10,500,000,000 for foreign assistance during the coming year alone. Compare that figure with the $6,000,000,000 which was the total spent on our entire public-school system in this country in 1950—the most recent year for which figures are available.

If our school system today faces a crisis, we need not look very far to find the source of that crisis. State and local revenues which could be devoted to meeting educational needs are being siphoned away by the Federal rearmament and foreign hand-out programs. When the Federal tax collector has already drained the average citizen dry, it is pretty hard to persuade him that he must also support educational and other local functions adequately. In fact, it becomes just impossible for State and local governments to raise the funds they need. The Federal Government has preempted their revenue sources and left them very little to draw on.

I want to emphasize that in computing these figures on the cost of foreign aid, I have given only those costs which can be precisely determined and cannot be challenged. In other words, they are very conservative figures. There is no possible argument about their accuracy. I have not included under foreign aid any cost which cannot be definitely determined or fully verified.

For example, these figures do not include the cost of maintaining our present Military Establishment in Europe or for the Far East. We have today five Army divisions with supporting troops in Europe. I do not know what number of soldiers that may amount to, but there are in the Army today only 20 divisions altogether. The rest of our Army personnel are engaged in activities which support, either directly or indirectly, the striking forces represented by these 20 divisions.

In other words, one-fourth of the striking force of our Army is in Europe, to say nothing of those in Japan, Korea, and other places. On that basis, I believe it is fair to say that approximately one-fourth of our appropriations for the Department of the Army should be charged to European assistance. One-fourth of next year's appropriations would amount to between $3,000,000,000 and $4,000,000,000.

Probably a somewhat similar proportion of the costs of the Navy and Air Force are in the same category. I believe these costs might well be also listed under the category of foreign military aid. A computation on that basis would add billions and billions of dollars to the figures on foreign aid that I have given. However, I have not included any such military costs in the $112,000,000,000 figure on foreign assistance. That figure is made up purely and simply of direct grants or loans to foreign countries.

The arguments in favor of continuing these foreign spending programs are placed on a different basis from those with which we used to be confronted during the period when the Marshall plan, the British Loan, and other such programs were first presented. Now, we are told that these expenditures are necessary to build up military defenses against a possible Communist attack. That is the new line of argument, now that all the old arguments have worn thin.

I tell you the foreign-aid policy has simply changed its name, not its nature. Instead of being called European recovery, it is now called mutual security. Many of the same programs continue just as before. Many of the same commodities—commodities like cotton and coal and wheat—will continue to be shipped just as before at the expense of the United States Government. Assistance which used to be called economic aid is now called defense support.

Even on items of direct military equipment, there has been no real attempt to show that Europe cannot manufacture these items themselves or else pay for them in the normal way.

Surely Europe should today be willing and able to pay for its own defense against aggression. If Europeans will not make the necessary sacrifices for their own defense, why should we think they will make the even greater sacrifices that would be required in case the shooting started? If they have not the will to provide for their own defense, how reliable will they be as fighting allies?

I predict that if the international tension ended tomorrow, the spending would continue under some other excuse. In fact, I suspect that those who dream up these programs have already chosen the vehicle under which the spending is to be continued. When the Mutual Security Program has been completed, I suspect the next big spending program is to be some variation or elaboration of the point 4 idea.

This suspicion is strengthened by the budget estimates which have been presented to us this year for the 1953 point 4 program. As originally conceived, the point 4 idea was supposed to be limited largely to technical advice by American experts. In other words, it was to consist of an export of American know-how, not commodities. It was assumed that the principal cost involved would be for the salaries and expenses of American engineers, scientists, and teachers.

The Senate committee discovered, however, that of the money to be spent for point 4 during the coming year, more than 80 percent is to be spent for supplies and equipment. Only $44,000,000 is to go for salaries and the like, but over $182,000,000 for commodities and materials.

Furthermore, this program is growing rapidly. Appropriations for fiscal 1951 amounted to only $32,000,000. For fiscal 1952, the figure was $140,000,000. For fiscal 1953, the President has asked $227,000,000.

Altogether it seems that the groundwork is being laid for expansion for point 4 if and when military expenditures should die down. At that time, I do not think we should be surprised to see a rapid ballooning of point 4 spending. Obviously, that is already on the schedule.

I say the time has come to call a halt to this constant expansion of all kinds of foreign handout programs under every conceivable excuse. We simply cannot afford the luxury any longer. We cannot afford to continue year after year with our budget unbalanced, with a rising national debt, with an inflationary pressure that is destroying the savings of our people.

We cannot afford to pay for gigantic hydroelectric projects in France at a time when development of our own water resources has been brought to a halt by the "no new starts" policy. We cannot afford to subsidize socialized medicine abroad at a time when we urgently need additional hospitals and additional facilities for medical training in this country. We cannot afford to underwrite socialism abroad when every socialist advance in Europe serves to undermine our own system of economic productivity.

We cannot afford to raise taxes again, and in fact, our people cannot afford to continue to pay taxes at their present rates. Taxes must be reduced, and soon.

In my position on this question, I am sure I reflect the sentiments and the feelings of the people of my State. During the recent primary campaign in Nebraska, I made my position on foreign spending clear on every possible occasion. I told my constituents that I favored cutting down on foreign assistance as much as possible, and cutting it off entirely as soon as possible. They renominated me by a rather large majority. I feel that I have a mandate from the people of Nebraska to insist on drastic reductions in foreign aid.

I understand perfectly well that it is not possible to reverse our policies completely without warning. Commitments have been entered into and agreements have been made. But I feel we must make a start toward changing this policy. The President has proposed for the coming year an increase of over 50 percent in the scale of foreign spending. At a time when our own financial situation is so badly out of balance, such a proposal flies in the face of every dictate of common sense. Our balance sheet tells us that we cannot afford any increase over last year in the foreign spending program. It should be cut back sharply at least down to the level at which it proceeded during 1952. In succeeding years, it should be tapered down further, much further.

I expect to join in amendments providing for sharp reductions in the funds authorized in this bill. Unless drastic reductions are agreed to by the Senate, I shall find myself forced to vote against it on final passage.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The purpose of the Senator's amendment is to emphasize, is it not, the fact which we have been told many, many times, namely, that what these countries need is technical assistance and technical advice and counsel on how to proceed and on how to act—advisory services, rather than commodities, or anything of that kind? That is the theory of the Senator's amendment, is it not?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I may say for the benefit of the Senator from New Hampshire and other Senators that I do not propose the reduction of a single cent in the provision which is made for this fund. My proposal would simply provide that, when we spend $1 for technical assistance, we shall spend not to exceed $3 for material and supplies.

Mr. BRIDGES. In other words, the Senator's amendment would in no way affect the over-all financial significance of the bill, but would merely establish a formula for the giving of expert, technical assistance, in contrast to the furnishing of commodities or some other tangible thing. Is that not correct?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. That is correct. I think one objective would be to prevent the administrators of this fund from establishing abroad a large WPA program, which we would not establish in this country for ourselves.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator's amendment is sound and that his explanation of it is also sound. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I first want to comment on the statement which the Senator from Nebraska has made to the effect that his amendment would not cut the appropriation a dollar. Of course it does not, by its wording, but its effect—and this is something I want every Senator to note—would be to cut the actual operations in India, for instance, by 70 percent, which would be the highest single cut, I believe, that has been proposed at any time in connection with this bill.

Mr. President, we send agricultural experts to India to help the people there learn the fundamentals of agriculture. After all, we are trying to step up in India the production of food and fiber, in order to prevent famines. India calls on us to send instructors, and we send our experts who teach the Indian people to use irrigation. But how can they irrigate without canals, dams, and pumps. We teach them the use of commercial fertilizer. What good is that, if they cannot get the commercial fertilizer? They do not have fertilizer factories. How much better it would be to help them to establish themselves on a cooperative basis and build a fertilizer plant.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have only 3 minutes.

We teach them to dig wells and put casings in. The people of India do not have casings, and someone must furnish them. The bill would enable them to buy casings and put them into deep wells in order to get water for irrigation.

We should teach them how to put a piece of steel on a piece of wood in order to make a plow, from which they will produce more food than with the crooked sticks which they are now using.

This is not one of the great impact programs. It is simply for the purpose of sending experts, the persons the able Senator from Nebraska is in favor of sending there, to enable the people to make practical use of the things we are teaching the farmers to use.

Mr. President, if there is any part of the program which promises to do the thing we all want to do, namely, to make fast friends throughout the world in the nonmilitary field, it is this point 4 program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Alabama has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is essential to let them do the job.

The effect of the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska would be to cut out the part that would enable the people of India to put into effect the things our technical experts teach them should be done.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama is going back to the old give-away theory. I have heard the Senator argue about the point 4 program in his very persuasive way, and I agree with him on that, but he gives himself away completely in reference to this amendment when he says it is not enough. Of course, the nations have got to start doing something for themselves. They have got to realize that this country cannot carry on its shoulders the whole world forever. When we proceed on a point 4 program of technical assistance we are going a long way. The Senator from Nebraska is willing to go further; he is willing to establish a formula of 3-to-1 which should take care of any emergencies.

I have heard a great deal said about India. When there was offered on the floor of the Senate a bill to provide $200,000,000 for wheat for India because of a famine I was for it, but I wanted a little exchange. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and I offered an amendment providing for a fair exchange, exchange wheat for critical war material needed for the defense of our country, which was accepted by the Senate, and it was adopted in conference. What did India do? She has been far from cooperative.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada offered an amendment to that bill when it was established that India was short of dollars. The amendment provided that we were to take India's money at the current rate of exchange in the market of the world, not what India said her currency was worth, but what the market said it was worth. India has enough hemp and manganese for the United States and herself for a hundred years.

Mr. BRIDGES. I remember the amendment in a general way.

Mr. MALONE. We always insist on giving other nations something they do not have. I agree fully with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that we get nothing for anything we give, except ill will.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Republic of India is a great country, and we should like to be friendly with India. We have been friendly. I was in favor of the wheat program, but, after all, there should be a fair exchange. Remember that, when Congress under pressure turns a deaf ear on a fair exchange, we do not get critical defense materials needed for our security.

This will be remembered, and some time, if a great emergency develops about which many persons are talking—and I think there is a real emergency in the world; if the Communist forces are arrayed against America in a great conflict—what will Americans say then when our security is threatened and the enemy is at our door. I should like to see what the reaction of the general public will be at that time toward those who have not stood for a fair exchange.

Let me tell Senators that we are pretty nearly at the crossroads in this country, and it is time for us to look at these things from a practical viewpoint. I am for mutual aid, and I shall support the program; but when the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] says we cannot cut off another dollar because if we do we shall be kicking the free world in the face, of course the Senator from Texas, able and distinguished as he is, is making a statement which is exaggerated, to say the least, in order to gain his point.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator says I have exaggerated to that extent, why not go the full length?

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe in the program. However, when the Senator says it can be cut a billion, but that if it is cut $1,400,000,000 the program will be ruined, I do not believe that by any means.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas did not say that. But if the Senator from New Hampshire keeps on with his slashing knife, cutting here, here, here, and there, it will result in wrecking the program; and that is what the Senator from New Hampshire is trying to do.

Mr. BRIDGES. No; the Senator from New Hampshire is not trying to do that.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from New Hampshire is using a double-edged sword.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire is just as sincerely for this bill as is the Senator from Texas, and the Senator from Texas knows that. The Senator from New Hampshire is practical in the way in which he approaches this matter. When, on the one hand, the Senator from Texas says that we should accept the viewpoint of military leaders, and, on the other hand, he says that the Committee on Foreign Relations is not going to be dictated to by the military leaders he is talking against himself. Let us be practical. This is a technical aid program.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from New Hampshire has a double-edged sword, which cuts both backward and forward, so he swipes at one chunk of the bill. If he misses, he turns around and swipes at another. He says he is in favor of the principle of the bill. He is in favor of it, but he wants to cut its throat, chop off its tail, amputate its head, and let it go. [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. BUTLER).

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me a few minutes?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may need 3 minutes.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield 3 minutes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in my opinion the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska is an excellent one. I think it should be adopted, and that we should close the gate on this situation . I have become increasingly chilly, month by month, from hearing that we must not dare to cut down and become a little economy-minded about our overseas bounties because we may lose friends. I wish to warn Congress that we may make some of those countries angry to such an extent that they will not take our money. They will spite us by not taking our money.

This spring in the Midwest Americans suffered one of the most devasating catastrophes which has ever happened in that region. I may say that the Appropriations Committees have been very good in considering our case. Almost 100,000 people were displaced by the most destructive floods which ever afflicted in the Midwest. More than 2,000,000 acres of the finest farm land that exists in the world were inundated and made useless. There have been destroyed drainage systems which have cost years of effort and millions upon millions of dollars, paid for under the free-enterprise system by the landowners themselves, not by the Government. Yet we are going to pump water out of the wells of India and dig irrigation ditches for India. We had better be spending some money in the Midwest to help rehabilitate Americans who have in many cases lost by reason of the floods everything they had accumulated during their lives.

Mr. President, this is a good amendment. The time has long since passed—it has not just come; it has long since passed—when we had better say to the other nations of the world, "You had better be rendering a considerable portion of what assistance you require for yourself if you want to survive, because we cannot keep you forever in the manner to which you would like to become accustomed." I fear that many places in the world today we are not keeping the countries in the manner to which they have been accustomed, because they have never been accustomed to such a level as that on which we are sustaining them; we are keeping them on a level to which they would like to become accustomed, and in so doing we will eventually cause the people of this country to be deprived of their savings, if we continue to indulge in such extravagant programs.

While I do not have in mind at this moment the exact figure, several months ago more than 176,000 civilian employees of the Federal Government were employed outside the United States, trying to find places where they could spend American dollars. That is fantastic. They were traveling around, trying to arrange for projects to be constructed. They were saying, "How much American money can we use here?" and "Let us start a project there." The American people and their accumulations of savings are being destroyed by such a process. There is no reason for it.

I have supported the principle that we should furnish an opportunity to people who want to learn, not necessarily to those who do not wish to learn, not to those who merely want us to let them in so that they can get more of our money. But as to those who really want to learn techniques, I support the effort to give them advice. I think they ought to pay for it in the end out of the new wealth which such knowledge is supposed to develop, but for the present, let them have it. However, why should we have to give them technical advice, pay for the labor, and furnish the machinery out of our own shortages, then dig their ditches for them and then, I suppose——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Why should we bake their bread for them and then serve it to them at the table? I suppose it will come to that, under the profligate program which we are spreading, instead of curtailing, in the world.

I shall vote for the pending amendment because I think it is a good amendment. I am deeply sympathetic toward India, and have voted help for India, I should like to have India as a friend of the United States, but I call attention to the record of the activities of India in the United Nations, in spite of the bounty and generosity of this country, not only since the last war, but during the war, and in years past. India has received American money, American supplies, aid toward education, and other assistance. That has all been done without cost to India. But not only has it not bought India's friendship; but it has bought India's antagonism to us, in most cases, in the United Nations Organization.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	Malone
Anderson	George	Martin
Bennett	Green	Maybank
Benton	Hayden	McCarran
Brewster	Hendrickson	McCarthy
Bricker	Hennings	McFarland
Bridges	Hickenlooper	McKellar
Butler, Md.	Hill	Millikin
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Monroney
Capehart	Holland	Moody
Case	Humphrey	Morse
Chavez	Hunt	Mundt
Clements	Ives	Neely
Connally	Jenner	Nixon
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Dirksen	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Dworshak	Kem	Russell
Eastland	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Ellender	Lehman	Schoeppel
Ferguson	Lodge	Smathers
Frear	Long	Smith, Maine
Smith, N. J.	Taft	Watkins
Smith, N. C.	Thye	Welker
Sparkman	Tobey	Williams
Stennis	Underwood	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. EASTLAND (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If the Senator from Virginia were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. MCCARTHY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If he were present and voting I am informed that he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Conference of the International Council for Christian Leadership at The Hague.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—29

Bennett	Dworshak	Mundt
Brewster	Ferguson	Nixon
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Bridges	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Butler, Md.	Johnston, S. C.	Taft
Butler, Nebr.	Kem	Thye
Capehart	Long	Welker
Case	Malone	Williams
Cordon	Martin	Young
Dirksen	Millikin	

NAYS—47

Aiken	Hoey	Morse
Anderson	Holland	Neely
Benton	Humphrey	O'Conor
Chavez	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Clements	Ives	Pastore
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Ellender	Kilgore	Smathers
Frear	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Fulbright	Lodge	Smith, N. C.
George	Maybank	Sparkman
Green	McCarran	Stennis
Hayden	McFarland	Tobey
Hendrickson	McKellar	Underwood
Hennings	Monroney	Watkins
Hill	Moody	

NOT VOTING—20

Byrd	Gillette	McClellan
Cain	Kefauver	McMahon
Carlson	Kerr	Murray
Duff	Knowland	Robertson
Eastland	Langer	Seaton
Ecton	Magnuson	Wiley
Flanders	McCarthy	

So the amendment of Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska was rejected.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I ask the clerk to state.

The amendment is being offered by me on behalf of myself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Vermont, [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, between lines 9 and 10, it is proposed to insert the following new section 8:

Section 115 of the Economic Cooperation Act as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(k) of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 101 (a) (2) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, (1) $150,000,000 shall, to the maximum extent practicable consistent with the accomplishment of the policies and purposes of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, be expended in such manner and subject to such agreements as may be necessary to assure that the amounts of local currencies deposited under subsection (b) (6) as a result of such expenditure shall be used exclusively, in accordance with principles developed by the Administrator, to establish revolving funds, which shall be available for making loans, and otherwise carry out programs in furtherance of the objectives of section 516 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, with a view to stimulating free enterprise and the expansion of the economies of those countries with equitable sharing of the benefits of increased production and productivity between consumer, workers, and owners, and (2) the Director for Mutual Security is authorized to transfer not exceeding $2,500,000 to the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, to be used on terms and conditions to be specified by the Director in order to promote the objectives of section 516 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. MOODY. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. I believe we can complete action on the pending bill today. That is what we shall endeavor to do.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. MOODY. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I hope he will accept the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have examined the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan, and I am willing to take it to conference, without any argument.

Mr. MOODY. Very well, Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas. I do not wish to take the time of the Senate, but I should like the RECORD to show why I feel this amendment is so important in our fight to avert atomic war and prevent communism from engulfing Europe. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement which I prepared for delivery in the Senate today, explaining the amendment. Needless to say, I am very happy that my conference with the distinguished chairman of Foreign Relations was fruitful and that it will not be necessary to deliver the statement orally.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MOODY

We have termed this amendment the "Free Enterprise for Europe" amendment.

This is an amendment which will provide positive impetus to the accomplishment of the basic objectives of this act: the internal and external strengthening of the free world, and the rejection, without atomic war, of the false and cruel slavery hidden behind the mask of communism.

The purpose of this amendment is to help Europeans build the sort of an economy in which the distortions and seductions of Red agents will fall on fallow ground; an economy in which standards of living may start progressively to rise, for all those who make a constructive contribution to the well-being of a nation and help it to stand firmly and proudly on its own feet without aid from the United States.

The provisions of this amendment will stimulate productivity and competitive enterprise among our allied countries, Mr. President. It will help European businessmen with the urge to get ahead to compete and break down the bonds and restrictions which have been erected by a near-feudal system in many areas of production. It will strike an effective, stinging and, ultimately, perhaps fatal blow to the grip of Communist-dominated labor unions.

It is pro competitive enterprise, pro collective bargaining, pro high volume, high wage, fair consumer price system, such as has been generally achieved in the United States by the second industrial revolution.

It is anti-cartel, anti-Communist union, anti all of the feudal bars and restrictions and crannies of power which have handicapped the development and the living standards of European countries, and are crippling the expansion of production and keeping the Continent partially dependent on aid from the United States taxpayers even today.

This amendment is quite simple. All of us here in the Senate know that the money we appropriate for aid to Europe is spent for the most part in the United States. Goods bought with this money are then shipped abroad, free, in what amounts to a renewal of wartime lend-lease, because our allies do not have sufficient dollar-exchange to pay for them.

We do this not alone to provide generous help for those who fought with us gallantly to repel Nazi tyrrany and who now live by the same principles of human dignity and human liberty that we do. We do it also because in today's foreshortened world we know that a united and strong free world is essential to the security of all members of it, including the American people.

Senators know that when lend-leased goods reach Europe they are paid for in local currency, and that currency, be it pounds, francs, lire or whatever, is set aside in a fund for development of the country involved. But none of this so-called counterpart can be used on any project unless first approved by the United States Government and the government of the country involved.

That provides us with both an opportunity and a responsibility. It provides us with an opportunity to help enlightened Europeans to get rid of the antiquated internal barriers to their own countries' development. And it provides us with a responsibility to do exactly that, as an indispensable part of strengthening the entire free world against the threat of communism, and of bringing to an end at the earliest possible moment the need for further American aid.

This amendment directs the Mutual Security Administrator, to the maximum extent practicable within the policies and purposes of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, to set aside at least $150,000,000 of counterpart funds to "establish revolving funds in the respective countries, which shall be available for making loans and otherwise carrying out programs in furtherance of the objectives of section 516 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951."

As stated specifically in the language of the amendment, this would be "with a view to stimulating free enterprise and the expansion of the economies of those countries with the equitable sharing of the benefits of increased production and productivity between consumer, workers, and owners."

This is directly in line with the spirit of the amendment included in the law by Congress last year on motion of the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut, Mr. BENTON. It activates and implements that amendment. It is certainly in line with the policy and spirit of the entire program which has been undertaken by the Congress. And it will not cost the American taxpayers one thin dime. We would merely be requiring, as any wise banker would, that the fruits of our appropriations be used wisely, both in our own interest and those of our allies.

It should be emphasized that since this is merely a direction as to how counterparts created in foreign currencies shall, and shall not, be used, it does not involve an American dollar and will cost our taxpayers nothing. I think it is a thoroughly wise provision, Mr. President, and I hope the Senate will adopt it.

I feel Members of the Senate might well be asking themselves these questions, Mr. President:

Are we in truth going to win the security we are seeking by military measures alone?

Is security against Communist aggression, against a Red seizure of the allied countries so important to ourselves, to be won solely by X number of divisions equipped with X number of guns, tanks, and planes provided by appropriations of European parliaments and the United States Congress?

And how long is this country going to have to stay in the aid business?

Of course, we must build up our military forces, and help our friends in the newly consummated European defense community and the North Atlantic alliance to build theirs, to deter and hurl back any possible act of Soviet aggression. As I said in this body last August, after returning from Europe and having talked with General Eisenhower, Ambassador Harriman, and many other statesmen, both of our own and foreign lands, the pace of our military build-up has been not too fast, but if anything, too slow.

But there is more involved in a sure defense of any nation of any people than military strength alone. There is the spiritual side, the psychological side, the human side. There is morale.

People fight and die on battlefields because they believe in what they are defending. And we know that the basic attack of communism, sinister as it is, has been an attempt to shake the common peoples of our allied lands in their belief in the system they have in the past and would again be defending.

We know that however much the peoples of the world share a common belief in democracy with this country, they are obviously not prepared anywhere to defend democracy merely because of what it has been able to do for America.

The democracy they are defending is democracy as they live it and what it means to them in the solution of their day-to-day problems.

The democracy they are defending is the political and economic system under which they live, and it is going to be their judgment, not ours, of whether what they have is worth defending. To me that is an issue of importance coequal with the military evaluation we are called upon to accept.

Let us look for a moment at some of these Western European countries whose governments have accepted their military responsibilities in this crucial struggle.

Let us look at some of the simple economic facts that will determine the extent of the sacrifice these military commitments will require their people to make, even with our economic aid. And let's see whether what they are defending means enough to them—unless a greater measure of hope is added—to inspire the sacrifice that this cold war is going to require of all of us.

Let us look at their economic systems and see whether, unless the right things are done within those countries, the same weaknesses which make necessary the appropriation of American dollars for their aid, does not present the dangerous possibility that that defense, in the broad sense, may not ultimately be successful.

We cannot afford to treat lightly the fact that the Communist Party still draws the largest single party vote in France and the second largest in Italy, and in both countries controls the largest labor organizations. There are reasons for this.

Those reasons relate themselves directly to the questions that I raised a few moments ago. It is a matter of fact and not a matter of speculation that the kind of capitalism that exists in most Western European countries, and which people of those countries are called upon to defend, is not the kind of free-enterprise, opportunity capitalism that we have here in this country.

We cannot afford to underestimate that as a factor in estimating the strength and weaknesses of our defenses against Soviet communism. How much faith will people have in a system in which cartel-minded industrialists persist in treating their workers as a commodity; who refuse to accept their own workers as customers, and who insist on restricting markets and fixing prices beyond the reach of the average man to buy?

Last year when we wrote the Benton amendment into the Mutual Security Act, we gave recognition to the fact that there was something involved here beyond the physical ability of these countries to produce; something making it impossible for them to achieve the necessary level of armaments, and maintain an essential standard of living out of their own resources. We recognized then that there was an economic climate, an attitude of mind that might have an important bearing on the economic capabilities of these countries. I think a few statistics, a few very simple statistics, will indicate the nature of the problem with which we are dealing.

France has a population of 42,500,000 people. In 1951 the gross national product of France was approximately $29,000,000,000.

Remember that for the same year for three and one-half times the number of people, in this country we had a gross national product of better than ten times that. In the same period Italy, with a population of 47,000,000 people, had a gross national product of $15,000,000,000.

How much security can be built in a country in which 47,000,000 people are attempting to share and share inequitably, if you please, this small amount of goods and services? They simply have never discovered the second industrial revolution—the Detroit-style system, if I may be pardoned a reference to my home city, which has not alone made the United States the most productive and powerful Nation in the world, but has also raised our living standards to the highest levels of any nation in history. Communism will never get to first base in America; not alone for moral reasons, but for that reason as well.

Lasting security can never be won anywhere by any amount of military expenditures alone.

The people of Italy want more than poverty from a political and economic system, and they are going to try to find ways of getting more than poverty.

The 6,000,000 people, plus, out of 16,000,000 voting in Italy, did not vote in 1950 for the Communist Party because they believe in Marxist dogma; or because they wanted to trade their liberty for totalitarian slavery Most of the 37 percent of the people in Italy who voted for the Communist Party did not do so because they were loyal to a foreign power, the Soviet Union.

These people voted their dissatisfaction with what they have. And as long as what they have offers little hope for something better in the future, security in that country or any other like it is going to rest on a mighty flimsy foundation.

The dikes against even such a cruel substitute as communism—which we in this country, with the perspective of distance, know can mean only disillusionment and suffering to the little people of Italy—could wear mighty thin if no hope of something better is extended for the future.

Democracy must be made to mean, especially under a barrage of deceitful Red propaganda, more than poverty and the possibility of war.

For the last 4 years we have been trying to solve the problems of Western Europe by providing enough dollars to meet its foreign-trade deficit of payments. We can understand the necessity of doing that for a period of time. But isn't it also proper that during that time we are helping to meet that deficit of payments, we should insist that the unhealthy internal situation that makes them necessary be corrected?

Isn't it our responsibility to know that we aren't using American dollars to construct a pontoon bridge across that dollar gap that will wash out with every economic disturbance that comes along?

We don't want to slap on a poultice. We want our allies to stand beside us in full strength and vigor. And that is what they want.

A great deal of emphasis was placed last year, during the congressional discussions of the Mutual Security Act, on the fact that production in Western Europe had increased 35 percent above 1938 levels. That figure might look impressive if the world stood still on 1938 levels of production and 1938 standards of living. But the world doesn't stand still and people don't want it to stand still.

When we consider the fact that during that same period industrial production in this country increased better than 150 percent, the 35 percent increase for Western Europe doesn't mean very much. Of course, we must recognize the fact that Western Europe suffered the devastation of war, that many of its factories were destroyed and had to be rebuilt, much of its manpower lost, and that normal economic functions had to be restored. We might accept that for a cause if we didn't know so much about these countries in Western Europe.

I have made many trips to Europe as a newspaper correspondent. I have talked to hundreds of people in all walks of life. I think I know a little about the economic thinking that dominates powerful interests who control the economic and in some instances the political life of some of those countries.

I think I know something of the profoundly and selfishly restricted and restrictive mentality which dominates many groups there. The cartel, unfortunately, is merely a surface manifestation. Much more fundamental are the other evidences: the complete distaste for all forms of competition, the setting of prices and wages to keep the most inefficient firms in operation, and the almost universal pattern of selling little for high profits.

The workers of the United States have confidence in our economic system because it is based upon the concept of the ever-expanding economy which promises them a continuously better future. The core of this concept is the progressive increase of productivity and the deepening of consumer markets. It is exactly here that the greatest promise lies for doing something basic for the people of Western Europe. And if it is fundamental to our own security that Europe not be engulfed by totalitarian communism, this is basic to a situation in which Europe can stand on its own feet; in which we can bring the period of "gift dollars" to an end.

We know from our own experience that by expanding and improving the methods of production, it is possible to avoid the choice between arms and an acceptable standard of living.

It is a matter of statistical fact that man-hour productivity in most Western European countries is only a fraction of that in the United States. This isn't because they don't know how to produce. I venture to say that there is more unused technical knowledge in France and Italy than in the rest of the world combined.

The reason it isn't used is because their restricted, cartelized economy won't let it be used. And it is in rebellion against this frozen, feudal state of mind that most workers in France and Italy are voting when they vote Communist. They are voting their dissatisfaction with a state of affairs in which they are denied the opportunity to share the benefits that modern methods of manufacture and production make possible. There are of course agents in Moscow who would sell out the freedom of their own people to a foreign power operating in these countries. But their machinations would fall flat if they did not have the unconscious assistance of the cartelists, those who do not realize that to be prosperous and support an acceptable standard of living a nation must consider all of its people.

In my judgment, it is imperative that we make a more fundamental contribution to Western Europe than its mere reconstruction along the pattern of 1938.

We talk about a 35 percent increase in industrial production over 1938 for Western Europe, but the plain fact is that on a per capita basis, consumption of industrial production is identical with 1936. If translated into living standards, the further plain, simple fact is that the standard of living in most Western European countries is lower not higher than 1938.

Does this not indicate that there is more to our responsibility of giving leadership to the free democratic countries of the world than in helping to fix the amount of their military budget and narrowing down our support to a purely military concept?

I talked a few minutes ago about the gross national product of France and the comparison with that of our own country. Let us look at those figures a little more closely. Let's look at their relationship to the budget of France. I understand that the budget of France for 1952 represents an outlay of $7,500,000,000.

The gross national product figure represents a per capita income of $690 per year. The budget takes $176 per capita. This leaves only $514 available for the living standards of the average Frenchman, at price levels roughly comparable to our own. That is, it would leave that if there were an equitable distribution of income and taxes.

Anyone who knows anything at all about France knows there is not such an equitable distribution. For wage earners and salaried workers the amount available is considerably less. Seventy-five percent of the tax revenues of France are derived from indirect taxes.

It does not take an economist to know that that means the greatest burden of taxation rests on those least able to pay. Here in these figures lies a danger to our defense, less obvious perhaps, but in my opinion just as real, as a deficiency in arms. The standard of living is already too low. Add to that the deterioration resulting from inflation, shortage of materials, diversion of resources to the building of armaments, and I think we can understand why there is a very real possibility that ultimately, unless proper action is taken, the principle weapon in the Soviet's arsenal may prove to be economic.

Do not misunderstand me. I am not offering these figures in an effort to establish that France or any other European country should not carry its share of the burden. I am offering these figures to illustrate how dangerous it would be to place all of our reliance on building and equipping an army. Some Members of Congress would not have us commit ourselves beyond the delivery of military end items. I am attempting to point out to you how dangerous and reckless this would be, and I am taking the figures from one country to demonstrate it.

Tremendous progress has been made in Europe. Many of the things necessary to the situation have been done. However, the economies of many countries, France, and Italy particularly, have not recovered to the point that they are providing an acceptable standard of living to their people.

My point is that when the standard of living is not acceptable, there is always danger of people seeking relief by embarking in desperation upon political adventures that may lead to fascism and communism.

In a world where there is a tremendous evil power seeking world domination, we cannot assume constants for the purpose of projecting a long-range inflexible program. The Soviet Union will, if it can, deliberately upset all our calculations by a Korea or other means because in so doing they add to the possibility of succeeding in their evil purposes.

What is true of France and Italy is true equally or to lesser extent of other countries. We know that unemployment is on an increase in Holland; we know that no appreciable progress has been made toward solving the unemployment problem in Italy. We know that Western Germany is crowded beyond its capacity with people who have fled the iron curtain. We know that Greece and Austria face serious economic problems as the situation stands today.

I call these facts to the attention of Senators to indicate how dangerous it is to believe that this struggle of Democracy against Soviet communism can be won by guns, tanks and planes alone.

I believe that this country as the leader in the struggle of the free world against the slave world has a responsibility to its own people and to the peoples of the world to exercise that leadership in such a way as to make it unmistakably clear that the purpose of the military build-up is to erect a shield behind which free people can go about their business of building a better future.

If this means using the weight of our leadership to persuade governments that they must meet their responsibility for the well-being of their people, then the weight of that leadership must be made to be felt in that direction. Many enlightened leaders in France, Germany and Italy have urged to me that this be done.

If our leadership is to be followed through whatever sacrifices world events may require, we must identify ourselves with the hopes, the aspirations, and the welfare of the people of the democratic countries who are being asked to follow that leadership. If this means attempting to persuade their governments to abandon support for outmoded and restrictive social and economic concepts, and I believe it does, then this country must undertake that act of persuasion.

There is ample evidence that a great deal is known about the restrictions that bind the economies of many of the western European countries. There is also evidence that a great deal of thought has gone into developing methods for attacking this problem.

In July 1951, Mr. William C. Foster, now Under Secretary of Defense, in the hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees on the Mutual Security Act of 1951, proposed a production-assistance drive to increase production and productivity in Western Europe. Mr. Foster proposed the use of $250,000,000 of local currency counterpart to finance such a drive, most of which would go as loans and as technical assistance to individual firms which agreed to improve their productivity under agreements to share the benefits of such increase with their workers as higher wages and with consumers in lower prices.

That program makes sense to me. It is not merely a question of the hope that such a program offers to the people of these countries. It also goes back to the second question I raised at the beginning of my remarks as to how long this country must stay in the aid business. The way to end the need for aid is to insist that the aid be used intelligently.

We are asked to appropriate dollars for military end items and for defense support because the countries to whom these dollars will go are unable to maintain the necessary armaments program and sustain their civilian economies out of their own resources. If they followed modern economic practices in the image of our Detroit, or Flint, or Los Angeles, they could do so without our help.

Some Senators wished to write Mr. Foster's proposal into the Mutual Security Act. They were dissuaded with the assurance that it was not necessary, because the Economic Cooperation Administration already had adequate power. Congress did write a broad statement of its intent that these problems would be met and solved. The Benton amendment was the result and became law. It emphasized the necessity for aiding free enterprise to regain its virility in Western Europe and to break the hold of restrictive practices and cartels on the economies of Western Europe. It also stressed the need for democratic trade-unions and collective bargaining as a means of creating domestic markets and introducing the incentives for the introduction of improved techniques of manufacture. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Connecticut for his statesmanship in presenting it to the Senate and winning its approval.

From all I can learn, however, there is little evidence that this program has been properly implemented. I can't find any evidence that there have been launched programs of the magnitude and breadth that Congress had a reasonable right to expect in response to such a clear and constructive declaration of policy.

Either I must conclude that the MSA missions did not attempt to execute the intent of Congress or that they found themselves too weak in bargaining with ministers of finance. According to present procedures, the counterpart develops in the hands of the local government, regardless of any prior agreement between MSA and the government involved as to how it is to be used.

In spite of this strong commitment to Congress last year, no country to this day has provided counterpart for the production assistance program as outlined before the committees. It is my opinion that if the Congress wishes any substantial sums to be used for the achievement of these objectives, it must act positively and clearly. Otherwise the missions, the ministries, and the parliaments will be in endless and futile debate not only over the sums of the counterpart to be earmarked, but also over whether the countries have not met all the requirements of the Benton resolution by normal budget expenditures.

Many of the great achievements of the United States have their origin in what may be called the second industrial revolution. The first industrial revolution came in Western Europe, but that did not stop the people of the United States from adopting the idea and adapting it to our own environment and culture.

The foreign affairs spokesman of the Board of Commerce of Detroit, made the point very well. Mr. Richard B. Frost said:

"We felt that recovery alone would never be sufficient to accomplish the desired end, and we favored the use of American management and technical skill or know-how by European firms on an industry-to-industry basis.

"We are more concerned today regarding the trends in relief versus permanent industrial improvements * * * Increased wealth can only be produced by greater and more efficient productivity. Without the increase in wealth productivity, we can never expect higher living standards which are so necessary in these European countries today.

Furthermore, without this increased productivity we are building a permanent relief program.

"We feel that the proper use of counterpart funds has been seriously neglected. There seems to be a lack of organization for this work in the Washington office and too little thought and understanding regarding the possible use of these funds in Europe. * * *

"These funds should be utilized for the reestablishment and the promotion of multilateral trade, primarily in Europe and secondarily in other portions of the world where such trade would be beneficial to the reconstruction of Europe; for financing projects and making loans to European industries wherever such projects and loans would enhance European recovery."

The idea we are considering was not developed solely as an American export. It is a European adaptation of an American idea in which many Europeans have participated. This program has been analyzed during the last year and a half with scores of technical assistance teams. For every American interested in "productivité" there are a hundred Frenchmen, Italians, Germans, Belgians, and Austrians enthusiastic over its possibilities in their countries. In fact the phrase "productivité" in Europe has come to have an even broader concept than productivity in the United States.

Here it is essentially an engineering concept; there it has a whole "gestalt" or configuration of meaning in which physical engineering is but a minor part. To the thousands of Europeans who are waiting for a word from the Congress of the United States, it means a new economy in which the benefits of modern technology are shared with workers and consumers; in which workers can and do buy what they produce; in which a mass market is developed to support mass production; in which production is free and unrestricted; and where the conception of the expanding economy replaces the mentality of the restricted market.

There is a great ferment of consideration and discussion of this new philosophy in Western Europe. It is growing each week as larger numbers of people are exposed to the idea and are inspired by it.

When last July a leak occurred in the New York Times to the effect that the United States, through MSA, was preparing to finance a real production and productivity program, the thrill which ran through western Europe was too genuine to be merely synthetic or imported. Within 2 days, over 8 yards of discussion appeared in the metropolitan press of Paris alone.

All parties from Socialist to Gaullist hailed it. Only the Communists were silent. It took them 2 weeks to develop a line of attack on an idea that had so caught the imagination of the European mind. Even the Communists could not attack it directly. Their charge was that it was a speed-up, and that the intent to divide with workers and consumers was not sincere.

I want to call attention to an article on French productivity, written by a famous French economist, de Jouvenel, for Barron's magazine of September 10, 1951, in which he hails the new ECA program. I should like to quote two sentences:

"With a population roughly 28 percent of that of the United States, the French gross national product of 1950 ran to less than 10 percent of that of the United States. Per capita consumption in France works out at little over one-third of United States consumption."

After this analysis de Jouvenel states "Low productivity, rather than unfair distribution, is the prime factor responsible for the low level of French wages."

Mr. de Jouvenel went on in his article to talk about credit and investment. He showed how great was the need for credit for investment in productivity-increasing machinery. He said about the ECA's program for making counterpart funds available for this purpose as follows:

"ECA in aiming for higher productivity in this the Marshall plan's fourth and last year is on the right track.

"But,"—and mark this well—the distinguished French economist added, "there is little evidence that the French Government or ECA personnel in France have understood where French productivity is pinched at its very potential."

That is not an American talking about France. That is an eminent French economist, recognized as one of the foremost of France, talking about his country and how essential this program is to it.

In my judgment there is every reason this amendment should be adopted; none that it should be rejected.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] for delivery on the floor of the Senate, together with press comments from the European press, be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the statement and press comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENTON

The Marshall plan was as successful as its sponsors anticipated. By the first half of 1950 the goal of economic recovery in Western Europe seemed near. Inflationary dangers and the dollar gap had been reduced to manageable proportions. For significant parts of the European population, civilian consumption had been restored to prewar levels. The production index showed considerable improvement over the 1938 level. Communist influence was dwindling. The Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Act told us that the task of this temporary agency was nearing fulfillment.

This was a brilliant achievement in the field of United States foreign policy.

However, it was clear to some of us that even then there were some grave and disquieting and well developed circumstances. In some countries large parts of the population, particularly the laboring masses, had not shared in the economic recovery. Communist propaganda seized upon this fact and argued that American aid had simply restored the wealth and the position of the rich, making the poor in comparison appear even poorer. This propaganda line has been effective. It explains in part the ability of Communist organizations to survive the discernable improvement of living conditions in most countries.

The significance of economic progress in western Europe changed with the Korean aggression. Rearmament threatened to increase the tax load throughout Europe, endanger the value of the currencies, and lower the consumption level.

The situation in Italy illustrates this changed situation. Marshall aid has benefited that country in an amount of $1,400,000,000. Italy has recovered to a miraculous extent from the effects of war and occupation. Production is almost 40 percent greater than prewar. Profits were and are high.

However, the industrial workers of the north and the agricultural workers of the south form a depressed area within this country. There are today 2,000,000 unemployed and perhaps an equal number of underemployed workers. The CGIL, the Communist-controlled labor organization, the strongest concentration of Communist power west of the iron curtain, has somewhere near 4,000,000 members. Its control extends to all strategic occupations. It is strong among the tenant farmers of the south. Its strength constitutes a grave danger for the European defense community. Communist control over the dock workers, to single out only this one occupation, can endanger the security of the crucial Mediterranean area.

Further, large masses of unorganized workers sympathize with the CGIL. Its strength occasionally forces even the free democratic Italian labor unions into "unity of action committees," that is, into Communist collective action for which communism can take credit. In last Sunday's elections both the extreme right and the extreme left scored important gains at the expense of the democratic center. The Communist Party nearly achieved control of Rome. The right-wing neo-Fascist group was able to chalk up significant gains in the rest of the south. Both the Communists and the neo-Fascist votes are protest votes of the propertyless landless agricultural and industrial workers against an economic system which fails to satisfy—or to promise to satisfy—their basic social and economic demands.

The possibility of the Red flag flying over the Roman Forum shows how the disinherited Italian masses would fail to come to the support of their Government in case of conflict.

We have thus far failed to induce the many necessary changes in the internal organization of the Italian and other European societies. Without such changes, these economics lack the ability to satisfy the legitimate demands of working classes.

European business has lost whatever taste for competition it may have once had. It is largely unwilling to undertake risks. It concentrates efforts on insuring the coalition of its predominant economic and political position. The search for security of profit margins and of investments, as a primary business motive, results in restrictive business practices and cartels. Such an attitude seeks refuge in a host of agreed upon private barriers to competition. These barriers also take form in laws and other governmental economic policies.

Because of the dominant Communist unions, and because of the cartels, this Congress, in the Benton amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1952, called upon our administrative officers to act in such a way as to encourage free enterprise, to discourage the restrictive business practices of the cartels, and to support the free, democratic, independent labor unions.

A variety of means were studied to implement this amendment. A most promising approach attacking the failure of the European economic system to give the workers and farmers a stake in the economy has been the production assistance drive.

This amendment to provide funds still further to implement the Benton amendment will further help to promote the restoration of a dynamic and expanding economy. It will help to increase the total amount of goods and services. Thus it will enhance Europe's ability to make the urgently needed military effort without endangering the minimum standard of living. It further strengthens the competitive structure of the western European economy and simultaneously the development and functioning of the free democratic labor unions.

The amendment proposes to employ a very simple mechanism. Through the use of counterpart funds, the technical know-how and the necessary credit for equipment and working capital will be put at the disposition of individual firms, and in turn undertake to share the benefits of increased productivity with the workers, in the form of higher wages. They also will pass their increased efficiency along to consumers in the form of lower prices.

The wage increases will be embodied in collective bargaining agreements with free democratic unions.

Only free democratic and independently organized labor unions can be expected to combat the influence of the extremely well-organized Communist labor organizations;

in Italy, France, and elsewhere. To compete successfully, the free unions must be able to offer to the workers tangible economic benefits. They must be able to offset the Communist doctrine that only a revolution can improve the workers lot. They must present facts which justify reasonable expectations that a new and dynamic free enterprise system is developing which is better able to fill the needs of the working population than the stagnant economies of the past.

Wherever the program of the Benton amendment became known in Europe it was greeted with enthusiasm by progressive elements of the country. The liberal press hailed it as an escape from the existing impasse. This favorable press campaign is still going on.

Many governments established productivity centers with industry and labor representation. Research organizations were set up. The character of the MSA Technical Assistance Program underwent a radical change. No longer has it been sufficient to study American production experience in a narrow technical sense. Instead the foreign visitors have experienced a growing need for understanding the economic and social institutions which account for our high levels of productivity.

World communism has recognized in the program pinpointed by the Benton amendment the most serious threat to its revolutionary message of doom. This constructive economic program, offering immediate improvement and hope for the future, has begun to offset the drawing power of the purely destructive doctrine which only offers pie-in-the-sky to its followers.

Communist posters appeared on all corners, decrying the so-called American speedup. Yet so strong was the groundswell of favorable public opinion that the European cartel leadership has not dared openly to attack the new orientation which the production assistance program has provided. At the same time, even though cartel leadership has paid lip service to this program, it has done its best to stifle the efforts of the progressive business leaders to demonstrate the validity of productivity in their enterprises.

The many progressive business leaders who are now prepared to take leadership need assistance in their fight against the shortsighted restrictive business and antilabor policies of the cartels. They are eager to apply modern management techniques, to improve production methods, to increase output and to look for new markets for their products. Convinced that monopolistic business behavior simply replaces the economic risks of competition by the far greater political risk of internal disorder and external aggression, they are willing to turn their back on what some French have called business Malthusianism. These younger businessmen with a competitive outlook are not philanthropists. By selling a greater output at a lower profit margin, they expect greatly to increase their profits along lines which have built our great American industries. They should be helped if they display a sincere desire for improving their relations with their workers, and if they are willing to recognize the free democratic unions and to embody significant wage increases, relative to productivity increases, in collective bargaining agreements. Such attitudes on the part of businessmen will reduce labor strife, reduce workers' resistance to change, improve industrial morale, and reduce unit labor cost.

The ultimate goal is to strengthen the extremely weak purchasing power of the industrial workers and to produce something which continental Western Europe has never experienced, a healthy, domestic market in depth. What may appear to the cartels as class suicide, offers in fact to these men and to the many farsighted labor leaders of the free unions the only hope for their survival. Where labor shares fairly and equitably in the growing output of its work, it gains hope and regains its belief in the ability of the economic system to satisfy its basic economic demands as well as its indomitable will to maintain individual and collective freedom.

To achieve this goal, progressive business and labor needs assistance. Even against hostile Communists and cartel action, the pioneers should be assured of free access to the available raw material, to the tools of the trade, to managerial and distribution know-how, to markets, and particularly to credit at acceptable terms.

With the adoption of this amendment which provides funds to implement the Benton amendment, the production assistance program can provide for these legitimate and very real needs. MSA, with such funds, proposes to negotiate with the recipient governments for the introduction of Production Assistance Boards and for their financing. The production assistance program expects these Production Assistance Boards, representing the Government, progressive business and free labor unions, to screen the applications of businessmen and then to render the necessary assistance to the most sound and promising ventures. Such assistance will involve an undertaking by the businessmen to share the benefits of increased productivity with wage-earners in the form of higher wages and with consumers in the form of lower prices. These Production Assistance Boards should be permanent institutions designed to carry on this work beyond the initial impetus provided by the American aid program.

With the counterpart funds available under this amendment, the Production Assistance Boards would be provided with revolving funds, that is with loan funds, which, through the continuing repayment of industrial loans, would become self-perpetuating. The European commercial banking system, for a variety of reasons, is not ready for or willing to undertake this great task.

The proposed amendment does not call for any dollar expenditures. It simply earmarks counterpart funds equivalent to $150,000,000 solely for the purpose of stimulating the expansion of the economies of the participating countries.

The amendment I am urging on the Senate proceeds from the assumption that the earmarking of counterpart funds is necessary to provide the Administrator of the Mutual Security Agency with a clear congressional mandate. Such a mandate is deemed necessary to prevent the utilization of these funds for competing ends, as in the past. In earmarking these funds for the aims of the Benton amendment, we can serve best the long-range policy aims of this country and the free world. The interests of the United States require our allies to regain at the earliest possible moment healthy, progressive, and dynamic economies—economies able to withstand internal dissension and external aggression.

To this end, the proposed amendment directs the Mutual Security Agency to insist upon the use of $150,000,000 in counterpart in furtherance of the objectives of the Benton amendment of the Mutual Security Act of 1951. I urge this important objective upon the Congress. In conclusion, I ask unanimous consent that a group of clippings from the European press be inserted in the RECORD at this point. These comments further demonstrate the great opportunity and the urgent need for the program which I have described.

PRESS COMMENTS

European press reaction to ECA's new production assistance drive ranged in tone from outright enthusiasm to the expected hostility of Communist-dominated newspapers, according to a survey of preliminary reports available in Paris.

Widespread news coverage was given the announcement of the program by major segments of the daily press, the survey showed.

While editorial comment was not immediately forthcoming in many sectors, several independent and left-wing papers took the occasion to criticize both governments and management for emphasizing profits over wages and their failure to use Marshall plan funds for improvement or living standards. They praised the more direct methods to achieve this result which were discussed in press accounts of the new program.

Other papers, applauding the drive for its imaginative scope, dwelt on the advantages the plan would bring in American technical aid to Europe's industries, although some asserted that Europe's traditional apathy and restrictionism in industrial affairs would present a formidable obstacle to the plan's success.

Communist and Red-dominated papers were unanimous in condemning the drive as a speed-up system, a means of outright control of continental industry by American capital, or as a device solely intended to hurry Europe's rearmament.

In the Soviet Union, Izvestya, official Soviet mouthpiece, said the plan was a "new attempt against the sovereignty of West Europe countries." The article said the drive aimed at converting sections of Europe's industry to American monopolies, and provided an opportunity for reconversion to arms production.

The greater part of Europe's press has greeted the ECA-sponsored productivity drive with an attitude which is at once friendly and constructively critical, a comprehensive survey of the field has shown.

Since the story broke on July 26, many continental papers have given it phenomenal coverage, ranging from daily page-one treatment to a vast array of editorial comment, which reflected the importance the new program has in reader interest.

Many of the newspapers applauded the policy for its initiative, scope and imagination and emphasized the advantage it would bring to Europe's industry in American technical aid and production efficiency. Others took the occasion to point up the obstacles that would have to be surmounted in wrenching Europe's industrial routine out of its traditional apathy and restrictionism.

That Communist newspapers throughout Europe assailed the new program was not unexpected. Curiously, a few organs of the extreme right, reflecting ownership views, found themselves somewhat abreast with the Communists in meeting the productivity drive with outright hostility and condemnation.

From Paris Press Review of July 30, 1951:

"The week-end and Monday Paris newspapers carried a substantial amount of reaction to the ECA announcement concerning the increased emphasis on productivity. They gave it a total of 278 column-inches.

"Generally speaking, the comment is favorable. The exceptions come from the two extremes of right and left. Naturally, the Communists are against it. And the organs of French big business are resentful or patronizing.

"The Independent Metalworkers Union welcomes the cooperation of American unions in the productivity drive, but says that the success of the whole project depends on a change of 'psychological climate' in French business. It says that too often the workers have been duped and that this time they will demand firm guaranties from management. It wants this guaranty to take the form of greater worker participation in the management of enterprises. In other words, the spokesman says: 'Open your books'."

From Franc-Tireur, Paris, of July 28–29, 1951:

"Here's a shock that is a shock. The administration of the Marshall plan has just announced with full fanfare that the new objective of the plan from now on will be an increase in productivty by raising the living standard of the European workers. Proof that, in spite of all the promises of the governments and the employers of Europe, ours in particular, this standard of living has remained ridiculously low.

"The truth about the red-tape, the stupidity, the ignorance and the incompetence of the men and the system which ought to support the French people is so disgraceful that it has become an international scandal.

"How many times have we said that France, along with Italy, is in the rear-guard of economic progress and of social justice. How many times have we denounced the permanent policy of ultra-conservatism which causes one of the world's most intelligent and industrious peoples simply to vegetate. How many times have we pointed out that the workers' living standard in a divided and poverty-stricken Europe—poverty-stricken because divided—was the chief obstacle to the real defense of liberty.

"Several months ago, Franc Tireur practically echoed the all but explosive report of the opposing trade unionists of the two large American labor organizations, the AFL and the CIO, who, on their return from a tour of Europe, denounced in no uncertain terms the inability, the unwillingness of the French Government and management to change and to better the condition of the worker in France.

"In spite of those who denounce injustice in liberty only to prepare a worse injustice by the destruction of all liberties, the Marshall plan has powerfully aided the reconstruction of France. But, for a long time now, Americans themselves have realized that the Marshall plan has not helped to better the workers' condition. And why not? Because, in spite of all the requests and all the suggestions of the free trade unions, never has labor had the slightest amount of say in the use of the funds. Because, as stated in a report of the American trade unions: 'The European workers' standard of living has not been raised enough since the war, whereas the benefits to business have increased considerably.'

"Therefore, the Marshall plan, useful and indispensable, can be really effective only if it ultimately helps the worker to escape the burden of red tape and selfishness. This watchword, promulgated yesterday to raise the standard of living, is the official condemnation of those in Europe who should have been the agents of prosperity and who in social matters have been nothing but petty 'receivers' and narrow-minded beneficiaries.

"When the organizers of the ECA say that the plan should lower prices and boost wages by increased production, to rationalize and modernize work in the French factories, is it anything but a proof of the sordid mentality of 'pay-little,' 'earn-big' which is characteristic of so many industrial leaders and the politicians who cater to them?

"What's been done with the Marshall plan billions? Factories, dams. Yes. But has anyone thought about 'remaking' the lives of the men who have no factories or dams? And hasn't part of the billions sometimes gone for national 'housekeeping' in which the workers get only the crumbs?

"The average annual income of a French worker is under $500 whereas that of the American worker is $1,500; when you tell the workers in Detroit how their French fellow-workers live, they don't believe you—they who have just won salaries and retirement pensions that the workers here dare not even dream of.

"All sorts of excuses are offered. But the real reasons are: the pettiness, the middle-class extravagance and that continual jealousy that our rich boys experience when they fear that elementary measures toward social justice might break down the scandalous class barrier, which is worse in France than anywhere else.

"It is certainly to be expected that by asking a change in method, the Marshall plan administration is going to provoke the combined wrath of all those who brandish 'national independence' for the sake of their own privileges or for a foreign despotism."

Combat, Paris, of September 13, 1951:

Jean Navier, in Combat, says that increased productivity "is the only chance for our economy to make a lasting recovery," but outlines a number of problems which must be solved before productivity is a success.

"We cannot believe that the battle of production can be won with slogans, such as 'Let's roll up our sleeves' or 'Let's increase productivity.' Without a complete overhauling (of the French economy) and a simplification of commercial and economic channels, it appears difficult to raise French production to a level necessary for a real amelioration of the standard of living." Reforms needed, according to Navier, are "the indispensable expansion of credit, fiscal reform and better administrative methods, state spending, and their being covered by taxes."

Michel Collinet in Franc-Tireur, Paris, of January 11, 1952:

THE FRENCH ECONOMY

Michel Collinet, writing the first of a series on the French economy in anti-Communist leftist Franc-Tireur, warns of the "tragic tendency" of the French working class to "rush toward a regime of slavery" because it is "dissatisfied" with conditions, "and rightly so." According to Collinet, total business transactions in France are less than they were in 1938, "a depression year." "Where do the profits come from?" he asks. "From a decrease in production costs—and this is more serious—from low pay to employees."

"Nothing is more demoralizing to a worker," than the contrast between a salary which has been damaged by a rise in living costs, and high production. If (the worker's) increased fatigue (from greater production) is not remunerated, and does not follow production, the physical and moral conditions together bring resentment and disgust."

DIGEST

Digesting first 2 days Paris press reaction. Most recent treatment highlighted by front-page editorial on productivity in Le Monde. First reactions provincial press impressive both in extent and overwhelmingly favorable treatment. Consistent heavy play given to living standard angle and trade union reactions. Violent Communist attitude indicates probability of continuing all-out Cominform attack. Although Moscow radio reacted immediately, Humanite today published first official answer in form of CGT communiqué which attacks program as "a new step of American imperialism to control French economy, liquidate competing enterprises, seize markets at the expense of the national economy, and find new ways to make production fall into the American war scheme." Meanwhile mission receiving substantial volume mail and telephone requests for additional information and information division swamped with press and radio inquiries. A 40-newspaper cross section of French non-Communist provincial and North African press for July 27, 28, and 30 shows lively reaction and overwhelmingly favorable (often enthusiastic) response to what influential La Depeche du Midi (Toulouse) terms "the new Marshall plan."

The Journal D'Alger: The Journal D'Alger 4-column headline calls the move a "true revolution in our economy" and states that its first result will be lower prices and higher wages. Other angles played include: (1) ECA will deal with enterprises only after prior agreement with the governments concerned, (2) ECA experts will be put at disposal of French industry.

La Depeche du Midi asserting that "labor unions are all for the American initiative" La Depeche du Midi reflects the strenuous Communist opposition by stating that the CGT is "against any effort to increase productivity."

COMMIE OPPOSITION

Productivity

L'Humanite:

"A certain Mr. Joyce, an American citizen on duty in France, has sounded the rallying call of the enemies of the working class," says Benoit Frachon, secretary-general of the Communist-dominated CGT, in this morning's Communist L'Humanite.

Frachon, in a front-page editorial, devotes several paragraphs to attacks on the "American billionaires and their agents in France," and then gets to his principal charge—that production assistance is merely an attempt to split the French labor movement.

"Mr. Joyce, in the name of his boss, Truman, is breaking lances against the CGT, which doesn't give a damn, and against (labor) unity, which interests us very much."

L'Humanite of March 15, 1952:

A violent attack on the productivity program was made in a speech by Communist Party Secretary Auguste Lecoeur. Reporting this speech, the official party daily L'Humanite on March 15 emphasized his call on Communist industrial cells to denounce the program.

Lecoeur warned workers against falling into the trap of productivity bonuses. The French Communist Party, particularly in industry, should "inform workers as to the meaning of the so-called productivity campaign."

L'Humanite quoted Lecoeur as saying, "The working class must be warned that the American plan for increased work and additional hours means that workingmen will produce more dividends for the capitalists, with resulting unemployment, dismissals, and poverty." He went on to assert that the Americans intended to corrupt a section of the workers with the bait of productivity bonuses which would later be taken away again.

Finally, Lecoeur stated that it might be difficult to convince workers that productivity was wrong. This was natural, since the party was in the vanguard of the working class, and ordinary workers had not the same grasp of the problem.

As expected, the Communist press did not fail to attack western productivity. This was done notably by the French official party daily l'Humanite of March 15 in an article reporting a speech by August LeCosur denouncing the program. Contending that the Americans sought to win workers with the bonus bait, the Communist Party secretary was quoted by the paper as saying "the working class must be warned that the American plan for increased work and additional hours means that working men will produce more dividends for the capitalists, with resulting unemployment, dismissals, and poverty."

L'Humanite of November 6, 1951: Communist L'Humanite writes that the CGT metallurgy unions have called on workers "to assure the success of the Week of International Action Against the Acceleration of Work Cadences and Sur-exploitation." It adds that the union has called on all workers to observe a minute of silence "for the victims of infernal cadences." The paper has attacked the productivity drive since its inception as merely a means of stepping up work rhythms in the factories.

CISL END-OF-YEAR PRESS CONFERENCES, JANUARY 2, 1952

Pastore's press conference (CISL)

The secretary general of the CISL, Giulo Pastore, held a luncheon press conference on January 2, 1952, which was attended by about 50 newspapermen. Highlights of the union leader's statement follow:

The need for a higher productivity in Italy and the standpoint of democratic labor on this issue formed the highlights of Pastore's speech.

Wage raises are to be considered in connection with an increased productivity. At this point, Pastore repeated both CISL and Confindustria (manufacturers' association) definitions of productivity. Productivity is far from being a super-exploitation of workers as the Communists, forgetting that Soviet Russia nurtures Stakhanovism and various forms of speed-up, label it. He added that productivity is based on modernization of plants and better use of technological methods as well as on a greater labor yield; it represents the only method of reducing costs. Nor can we accept Confindustria's interpretation that workers will be allowed to benefit from higher productivity only as consumers. Pastore denounced this attitude as typical of the narrow-mindedness of a large segment of Italian industry which "does not accept advice." CISL will insist on its proposal of creation of joint labor-management committees with consultative status and functions as a means to achieve better labor relationships and improve production methods.

"CISL supports the productivity campaign on the assumption that workers will adequately share its benefits. We will go ahead in our policy of productivity, since we are sure that workers will understand and follow it."

The CISL leader expressed his dissatisfaction with Government policy in the economic and social fields. "Finally, after 8 months, the National Productivity Center has been started. We attach great importance to it as a center where the solution of many economic problems will find its right approach."

An explanation for such a negative attitude by the Government could possibly be found in the reality of the existence in Italy of strong Communist organizations which do not exist in other countries. In coping with this situation and with Communists, the Government feels what Pastore termed a "kind of inferiority complex."

Di Vittorio press conference (CGIL)

Rearmament is possible only through the exploitation of working classes. The ECA mission is sponsoring the "Crusade of Productivity." According to scientific principles, increase in productivity means improvement of quantity and quality standards which, in turn, is made possible through the modernization of equipment and better working plans, without expecting an additional effort from workers. From this standpoint, increase in productivity means progress and CGIL is for it.

But rearmament, and not economic progress, is the target of the American productivity crusade. Mr. Joyce, Assistant Administrator for Productivity of ECA, openly declared that productivity plans aim at "increasing production per unit, through the exploitation of labor forces, plants, machineries, and physical space as already existing."

Increased output would thus be attained not with the methods we would be ready to welcome, but through overexploitation of workers' strength. It is not difficult to foresee, therefore, what consequences will derive to the Italian labor force, if American designs are put into execution.

If worker's earning should be based on the attainment of productivity levels, workers themselves should be permitted to participate directly in the management or control of the firm. CGIL will firmly oppose the so-called "Productivity Crusade," in the same way it has always withstood any attempt of overexploitation of the workers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD prior to the vote taken on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], myself, and other Senators, a statement prepared by me on the amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR DOUGLAS ON MOODY-DOUGLAS AMENDMENT

The ECA program gave the countries of Western Europe the boost necessary to restore its war-torn productive capacity. Without it, France and Italy and probably other western European countries would have fallen to the Communists. For without production, living standards are low, discontent rife, and political instability results. These are the conditions which feed the Communists.

With production largely restored, we created the Mutual Security Program to cooperate with Western Europe in providing for the military defense of the free world. The threat of external Communist aggression made this imperative.

My main criticism of the foreign-aid program—and I intend it as constructive criticism—rests on a very fundamental proposition: We need the people of Western Europe on our side.

Our aid has helped all the people of Western Europe by plugging dollar gaps and thus stabilizing their national economies. Furthermore, by restoring production, living standards have improved. Then why aren't the people wholeheartedly for us? To answer this question we need to look briefly at the operation of our aid program.

BACKGROUND OF THE FOREIGN-AID PROGRAM

The basic approach of the foreign economic aid program in Western Europe has been to cover the dollar balance of payments deficits of the participating countries. This aid has enabled these countries to purchase from dollar markets, the needed equipment, raw materials, and agricultural products that they could not otherwise obtain because of the postwar disorganized world trade and the loss of dollar earnings. The aid extended by the United States under the Marshall plan helped Western Europe rebuild and reequip its worn-out and war-destroyed plant and equipment. It thus helped these countries raise industrial production and keep employment at relatively high levels.

United States aid has been essential for the survival of Western Europe as part of the free world. Had we not helped Western Europe, many of the key countries would undoubtedly have fallen into the Soviet orbit. In undertaking the Mutual Security Program, our aid was also directed toward helping these countries build up their military defense against Soviet aggression and, at the same time, maintain the needed economic stability which would withstand internal aggression from local Communist forces.

HOW FOREIGN AID OPERATES

As far as the practical operation of the foreign economic-aid program is concerned in Europe, dollar economic aid gives rise to equivalent local currency in the so-called counterpart funds of the various countries. In cases where a private enterprise is enabled to purchase from dollar markets because of United States aid, the individual owner is obliged to pay for the import in the currency of his own country. Where the Government is the final recipient, the local currency for the counterpart fund is provided from budgetary sources. The individual country, upon concurrence of the United States administrator, has the use of 95 percent of its counterpart fund. The remaining 5 percent is reserved exclusively for United States uses—mainly for administrative purposes and for the purchase of strategic materials.

THE RESULTS

The effectiveness of the aid in restoring the economies and raising living standards depended largely on the existing institutional patterns of the countries. In this regard the aid has been most effective where decent wage-price and fiscal policies were followed. Benefits which accrued as a result of the aid were equitably passed on in the United Kingdom, Scandinavia, and the Netherlands where this was true and the burdens of recovery and defense equitably shared. In those countries where this was not the case, as in varying degrees was the situation in France, Italy, Germany, Greece, and Austria, our aid perpetuated the existing inequities which in France and Italy threaten political stability. In these countries, the beneficial effects of the aid were not adequately felt among the ordinary workers and consumers.

Nevertheless some citizens of these countries did benefit directly. The individual plant owners were enabled to purchase needed equipment and supplies from dollar sources—frequently at prices deflated by the artificial exchange rates. They received raw material, equipment, and services which were available only if paid for in dollars. They received loans from their Government in local currency, which would not have been possible were it not for the counterpart funds, for the purpose of reconstructing, improving, and expanding their business enterprises. The counterpart played an even more important part than the dollars, and great sums went into the basic and heavy industries, like coal, power, gas, railroads, steel, and automobiles. The industries which got help were not the small and medium-size plants which employ the millions in each country, but the few large private enterprises and especially the government-owned socialized industry.

To point to how we have helped all the people of Western Europe by helping the big industries assumes the "trickle down" theory of prosperity; namely, that as big business prospers, this will improve all phases of economic activity and living standards will rise. Higher profits, so the theory goes, make possible higher wages with a resulting increase in demand for consumers goods. This in turn, supposedly brings prosperity to wholesalers, retailers, and small business generally and living standards go up all along the line.

But even those in this country who hold to the "trickle down" theory, and I certainly do not, should recognize the basic differences between our economy and those of the Western European nations. American business, when compared to Western European business, is highly competitive. If we have monopoly problems here, they are nothing compared to the cartels in Europe which are often intertwined with government itself. Wages are not geared to production and even if they were, there is no real incentive to increase productivity and thus little chance of increasing wages.

The ECA officials worked under this assumption that the benefits of the improvements which resulted in these large establishments would trickle down to their workers and to the community at large. In a very imperfect way some trickle-down did occur. The workers in the large establishments, which received the ECA benefits, had a more secure and fuller workweek, and other industries and their workers had a more adequate and more assured supply of the basic and semifinished materials they needed. The gain came largely from fuller operations. Trade and business expanded, and the merchants made higher profits.

CARTEL RESTRICTIONS HINDER EQUITABLE SHARING OF BENEFITS

However, little of the benefits of the increased efficiency of the plants aided by ECA dollars and counterpart was passed on to the workers in increased wages or to the community at large in the form of reduced prices. Firms did not cut their prices or raise their wages in keeping with the increased productivity which resulted from American aid. This is due to the fact that in the atmosphere of the cartel restrictions which dominate all countries in Europe, the advanced as well as the primitive, there is no real competition for the market. Prices are set to keep the inefficient marginal firms in business. Similarly, wages are set for all firms according to the capacity of the marginal firms.

In Europe the efficient plant does not drive the inefficient out of business. The efficient plant welcomes the inefficient as establishing such a low level of labor costs, and such a high level of prices, that on each unit of production the profit of the efficient firm is staggering to any American businessman. The assistance given by the Marshall plan to the larger and more successful establishments in Western Europe has served in the main to enlarge this margin of profit.

Unfortunately this restrictive mentality is so pervasive and so natural in Western Europe that no legislation can get to the heart of it. Even some of the trade-unions are captivated by it, and their industry-wide bargaining and their philosophy of equality of treatment of workers, merely plays into the hands of large industry and its profits.

European industry is dominated by the philosophy of making profit through limiting production. The thought of increasing the volume of profit by greatly expanding sales at a low profit per unit is a strange American concept which is just beginning to make important converts in Western Europe. To most of industry, and to labor as well, competition is something bad which leads to bankruptcy and unemployment. The word competition is never used alone, but always linked with the word cut-throat. Europeans carry on their business, they say, as gentlemen. It is unethical to attempt to steal another's customer by underselling or to take away another's workers by offering higher wages. If anyone steps out of line, the cartels and trade associations are ready to drive him back; his raw material sources may be cut; his bank credits disappear; and even the government may step in to penalize him or threaten him with the loss of his license.

SMALL BUSINESS, CONSUMERS, AND WORKERS SHOULD SHARE BENEFITS

This is the mental environment which creates the problem of Western Europe which keeps its standard of living far below the level which modern techniques of production and distribution make possible, and which make those countries unable to compete as they must in foreign trade. Here is the core reason why Western Europe remains dependent upon the United States, whereas the skills and capacities of its people, its factories, and its resources, make possible something much better. It has a mental sickness, not a physical one, and as is well known this is the hardest sickness to cure.

Furthermore, the United States has a stiff, graduated income tax on individual incomes and a steep corporation income tax as well. We get about 84 percent of our tax revenues from these two sources, while regressive consumption taxes account for only 16 percent of the total. Compared to this 16 percent of total revenues from consumption taxes in the United States, we find a figure of 70 percent in France, 75 percent in Italy, and 55 percent in Germany.

France, Germany and Italy have progressive income taxes, but they are poorly administered.

In short, the "trickle down" theory does not work because cartel restrictions leave no incentive to increase productivity and because of poor enforcement of graduated income taxes.

What is the effect of this shortcoming? The rich get richer, productivity is stifled, small- and medium-sized businesses cannot grow, prices remain high and the worker is lost in the shuffle.

POLITICAL EFFECTS IN WESTERN EUROPE

And what do the Communists do about this? They tell the workers in France and Italy "See, the United States helps only the rich. Your role is merely to work on a low standard of living or be cannon fodder. Vote for us; join our unions. We are the ones who are really for you."

It is easy for us to see through this false propaganda. We know that the only prospect for the European worker under communism is slavery. But what of the worker himself? He is bombarded with this propaganda with the knowledge only that he lives on a miserable scale. So the Communist vote in France and Italy has become so large that it is liable to force non-Communists coalitions with neo-Fascists in order to keep control of the government. This will further strengthen the Communists' hand by assertions that the United States is allied with the Fascists. The increase in the vote of the neo-Fascists in the Italian elections held this week shows that this is truly a great danger.

The non-Communist unions, with leadership that is well aware of the menace of communism, can emphasize the evils of the Russian system. But what can they offer to the average worker in the way of a positive program? Unless something is done to redirect the benefits of our foreign aid program, they can gain few friends to our cause. They are fighting a valiant battle for the free world. Should we politely applaud, continue to feed the cartels and do nothing? If we do, we may find ourselves with a lot of guns for defense against the Communists, but very few people with the will to resist. And those who control the cartels do not serve in the regiments.

WHAT CAN WE DO ABOUT IT?

What can we do to get the people of Western Europe on our side—to strengthen the non-Communist unions and reduce the Communist and neo-Fascist vote? One thing is needed above all else: Productivity. And the value of increased productivity needs to be shared with the people in lower prices and higher wages.

We have, by and large, restored production in Western Europe. But production is not productivity. And production can increase very little without productivity. National products can be increased only by breaking away from cartel restrictions, and by the introduction of new machinery. Even more, is there needed productivity—consciousness and the will to increase output per man-hour with technology, and testing equipment.

Now, when we talk of increased production, European workers think of longer hours and harder work. We need to help them discover means of achieving greater efficiency so that output is not measured in terms of physical labor. And we need to give the workers, consumers, and business a stake in increased productivity.

PRODUCTIVITY WILL INCREASE STABILITY

The continued instability which still exposes these countries to the threat of communism was cause last year for much questioning in Congress about the effectiveness of our aid program. If the basic objective of bringing about political stability is not being met, is there any likelihood that aid can be terminated even after the planned defense build-up provides protection from external Soviet aggression? For the problem countries as well as the rest of Western Europe, this question cannot be answered with any assurance until the restrictive outlook which dominates the economy is overcome. This was clearly recognized last year when Congress at the urging of Senator BENTON, put section 516 into the Mutual Security Act. Essentially, the aid program cannot achieve its objectives unless the economic climate in Europe is changed in line with this legislative mandate.

Our aid program should be directed toward the basic objective of encouraging the countries to overcome institutional barriers to expansion. Industry must become competitive if desired expansion of production is to be brought about. The concept of limited markets, high prices, and low wages that dominates so much of European business must be overcome. Free trade-unions and other democratic institutions can only be strengthened if the economy offers the ordinary people an opportunity to improve their lot.

The attention given to purely military aspects of defense in the Mutual Security Program is important, but so is productivity and morale. Our economic aid should and can be made more effective by use of broader vision in its application. The period of basic reconstruction work and major power and transport investment programs is largely over in Western Europe. Essentially, the job ahead is one of making factories and farms more efficient in the framework of an ever-expanding economy. The resultant increase in total output will help support the heavy defense expenditures and provide for an increase in low living standards. It is only in this context that Western Europe will have the internal strength to withstand Soviet aggression.

MSA FAVORS PROGRAM BUT HAS NOT ACTED

Last July, Mr. William Foster, ECA Administrator, and his deputy, Mr. Richard Bissell, presented to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a creative and imaginative proposal to strike a powerful blow against the restrictive mentality which keeps Western Europe down. They called that proposal "The ECA Production Assistance Drive." Its method and purpose is outlined at length, beginning on page 80, in the 1951 Senate hearings on the Mutual Security Act. This was a proposal to make $250,000,000 available to the participating countries only if they agreed to set aside the resulting counterpart in a special fund under the control and direction of a special board.

This fund was to be loaned to individual firms on the condition that the benefits from their improved productivity would be shared equitably with their workers in higher wages and with the consumer in lower prices. Only firms, which in conjunction with their workers, accepted the philosophy of expanding their production and of their lowering prices to increase their sales would be eligible for loans and for technical assistance in modern methods of production and distribution.

This was a proposal to assist would-be mavericks, and there are many such ambitious entrepreneurs, even in Europe, to attack restrictive practices in the only effective way there is, in the market place. A few of them in each industry could turn the trick. The success of these mavericks, and they certainly will be successful if given adequate support and advice, can break open the shackles which bind Europe, and provide the progressive leadership those countries need.

THE RELUCTANCE OF MSA

Senator GREEN, who was a member of the Appropriations Committee, immediately suggested to Mr. Foster that the Congress should write the proposal into the act and earmark the funds. He was dissuaded by Mr. Foster who said such earmarking was unnecessary. The subject of the more equitable sharing of

the benefits of the Marshall plan was debated, however, on the floor of the Senate and resulted in the passage of the Benton amendment, section 516, which emphasized the need for strengthening free enterprise, fighting restrictive practices, raising productivity, and strengthening democratic trade unionism and collective bargaining. The production assistance drive, as outlined by Mr. Foster and Mr. Bissell, was eminently designed to accomplish all these purposes through a single but balanced instrument.

The administration has just completed an extensive presentation to Congress of the Mutual Security Act of 1952. In their presentation I note an amazing lack of emphasis on the unresolved economic problems of Western Europe. Now, I as much as anyone in this Senate, want to prepare our friends in Europe to resist any possible invasion from behind the iron curtain. However, I believe all matters must be kept in balance. The social and the economic sides to defense must not be slighted. I, especially, would like assurance on what the MSA plans to do with the Benton amendment, and the production assistance drive, which so well implements it.

The MSA may have been afraid of the reaction of Congress. They may have felt there was real danger that this Congress in the heat of an election year would think only of arms as important and would neglect the economic and morale aspects of defense. There is temptation to cut nonmilitary aid drastically in an effort to economize. This is a course which I am sure the people of this country would not wish to take if they understood the consequences of such action.

ECONOMIC AND MORALE NEEDS RECOGNIZED BY THE MILITARY

I do not necessarily accept the word of any 5-star general as the final consideration. But it is significant, I believe, that General Eisenhower, who has observed the operation of our Mutual Defense Organization has recently said: "We must never forget that in the exercise of power in the world, the military is nothing more than the cutting edge of the machine that generates the power. By itself military force is nothing. The strength that a nation, or a group of nations, can develop is the product obtained by multiplying spiritual or moral strength by its economic strength, by its military strength. It is the product, not the sum. Consequently, if any one of these factors falls to zero, the whole is zero. There can be no army unless there is productive strength and a productive power to support it. There can be neither a strong economy nor an army if the people are spiritless, if they don't prize what they are defending."

There has been adequate experience during the last dozen years that the general is right. It would be better to have four guns in the hands of determined fighters than five guns in hands which might turn them over to the enemy when danger became real.

It would be very destructive of the morale of our allies if at the same time we insisted that they increase their rearmament effort we so cut economic assistance as to force a reduction in the standard of living which is already very low. The Communists have been telling the people of the free world that America is not truly interested in their welfare; it has merely been buying allies to sacrifice in war. After 4 years of the Marshall plan, we must not now give substance to such carping charges. We must not now by our failure to understand give rise to a wave of neutralism and anti-Americanism. We have come too far to throw away all we have accomplished in reckless short-sightedness.

The rearmament of the free world is of course the immediate necessity. It should be remembered, however, that arms are but the shield behind which economic improvement must go forward. Rearmament constitutes an appropriate defense against communism, but experience shows that the only effective offense against chaos and revolution is economic and social advance.

I believe that the Marshall plan, in spite of the limitation I mentioned before has done a great deal to lay the foundation for the return of Western Europe to economic and social health. When war broke out in Korea, the Marshall plan was about to undertake a new important phase of its program, a production assistance drive designed to bring the benefits of recovery down to the little people of each land. This work, I insist, must go forward, not only to help the people of Western Europe, but also as a positive defense need.

PROBLEM RECOGNIZED BY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House has passed a provision which directs the Mutual Security Agency to assure that $100,000,000 in counterpart funds be earmarked by the participating countries for the use of the production assistance drive and other related efforts to implement the Benton amendment. I believe that sum is too small to finance the great effort that must be made to free the economies of Western Europe so that they can truly serve the people of those lands. I suggest that the United States endow this effort with $150,000,000 of counterpart. This would be a large enough fund, I believe, to show we are serious. It would be adequate to endow the effort with sufficient funds to run it for several years through a thorough testing period. The $150,000,000 in counterpart funds in this case, is not in addition to the total. It is taken from the total.

An effort to change fundamental institutions, fundamental patterns of thought and action, in 1 year or even 2 is impossible. We shall have to attract important men in each country in Europe to this effort. They must be assured that our interest is not ephemeral.

I want to make it clear. I am not interested in productivity per se. I am interested in productivity as a wedge to break open the restrictive economies of Europe, as a means of introducing an expanding economy of more goods at cheaper prices, with a working population that gets higher real wages and can buy what it produces.

To accomplish this purpose I suggest that the Congress of the United States, out of counterpart funds, stake the sum of 65 cents on the future welfare of each little man, little woman, and little child in free Europe. There are about 250,000,000 such people who love freedom as we do. Sixty-five cents each can raise substantially their low standard of living. I am an economizer, but I think using counterpart funds in this manner is a read bargain.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] for himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 5-27-52-H.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, it is proposed to strike out the quotation marks at the end of line 9, and between lines 9 and 10 insert the following:

SEC. 537. None of the funds herein authorized to be appropriated shall be used to pay for personal services or printing, or for other expenses of the dissemination within the United States of general propaganda in support of the Mutual Security Program, or to pay the travel or other expenses outside the United States of any citizen or group of citizens of the United States for the purpose of publicizing such program within the United States.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, all afternoon we have been considering highly controversial amendments. I am pleased to offer this amendment because I believe it deals with fundamental principles which will receive the wholehearted support of the Senate.

The amendment has only two objectives. The first objective is to place curbs and restraints upon the use of funds for personal services and for other expenses in the dissemination within the United States of general propaganda in support of the MSA program.

I call it general propaganda within the United States. On Monday I invited the attention of Senators to volume I, No. 1, of the Mutual Security News. Anyone who reads this publicity release, with the notation that it is the first of several releases which will be sent out by MSA, will, I am confident, agree with me that this kind of publicity is going far afield, especially when the information is disseminated within the United States.

No one can contend successfully that in resorting to such publicity or information releases we are doing anything abroad to help sell this particular program.

My amendment would in no way interfere with the normal or regular operations involving releases of information in the normal transaction of business by MSA.

The second proviso in the amendment would put a ban upon the use of funds under MSA for the purpose of paying expenses for a 6- or 7-week air tour of Europe by members of the press, radio, and farm organizations, as well as by representatives of other organizations and groups which have no direct interest—or legitimate interest, I may say—which is greater than that of millions of other Americans with respect to this particular program.

I can assure the Senate that this amendment would not in any way place upon the Members of Congress or officials or personnel of the Mutual Security Agency any restraint in connection with the normal discharge of their duties, but adoption of the amendment would curb the abuses in respect to the sending of other groups to Europe.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Idaho to say that the Mutual Security Agency is using public funds to send certain private citizens on tours of Europe?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes; that information has been developed; an article which appeared yesterday in the Washington Post substantiates that fact.

No news release was issued by the Mutual Security Agency; but the Washington Post had been invited to send a representative on the tour, so the Washington Post was aware of the fact that mutual security funds had been diverted for the purpose of paying the expenses of such a tour, although such use of its funds had not been authorized by Congress.

Mr. MILLIKIN. How far has that matter gone? Have all newspaper editors in the United States been invited to participate in such a tour?

Mr. DWORSHAK. No, evidently not; but they may be, if we do not place sufficient restraint upon such activities.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What is the situation in that respect?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I do not know. In my own opinion the officials of the Mutual Security Agency are resorting to devious ways to spread propaganda which will "sell" the foreign-aid program in the United States. In other words, if the Mutual Security Agency sends a group of American citizens on a 6-week or 7-week tour of Europe, at the expense of the American taxpayers, those who participate in the tour, being human beings, will naturally tend thereafter to do everything within their power, by means of the radio, newspapers, farm journals, and all other media at their command, to "sell" the program of that agency.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it true that members of farm organizations also have been sent on such trips?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Who else has been sent on them?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I do not know. We do not know to what extent this activity has been carried on in the past, or to what extent it may be carried on in the future.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is the Senator from Idaho certain that the beneficiaries of this tour to Europe are not public officials?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes, I am.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it correct to state that they are not public officials?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes, that is correct; they are not in any way connected with the Government, with either the legislative branch of the Government or the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is there any authority of law for the spending of public funds for that purpose?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I do not believe so. The purpose of the amendment is to make sure that public funds will not be spent for such purposes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does the Senator from Idaho have any information in regard to whether such use of public funds has been made in the past?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am not able to give the Senator from Colorado that information, but I assume that when hearings are held by the Appropriations Committee in regard to the appropriations necessary to be made pursuant to the authorization presently proposed, an effort will be made to develop all the facts in connection with this matter.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it correct to state that we are confronted with the threat of having sent on tours of Europe some persons who are not public officials, and of having the expenses of such tours paid with funds which have been appropriated by Congress for use in connection with the official business of the Mutual Security Agency?

Mr. DWORSHAK. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is the Senator from Idaho in possession of information regarding the amount of money which in the past has been used for this purpose?

Mr. DWORSHAK. No; but according to the article which appeared yesterday in the Washington Post, several thousand dollars a day would be required to send the delegation in question on a 7-week tour of Europe.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to say that I have written to the Department of Defense, requesting a statement in regard to the amount of public funds used for that purpose. Thus far I have not received a reply to my request.

Does the Senator from Idaho know that the Mutual Security Agency also conducts classes to orient various individuals in such matters?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I suppose that is a part of this program. However, certainly there is no excuse for a Voice of America program to instruct the people here in the United States in regard to the activities of this agency.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I understood the Senator from Idaho to say that some of the funds appropriated for the Mutual Security Agency have been used to sell its program to the people of the United States. Are some of those public funds also used to sell the program to the people of Europe?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I cannot answer that question. I suppose it is difficult to control all the activities of such delegations while they are on tours of Europe. Certainly it would be difficult to control all the observations made or all the conversations carried on by the members of such groups or delegations while they were in Europe. It would be only natural for them to feel obligated to promote, insofar as they were able to do so, the program involved in the trip they were taking.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator from Idaho think it is necessary to persuade the people of Europe to accept the money we are authorizing to be appropriated for expenditure in Europe.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I should not think that would be necessary. Again I stress the point that my amendment deals with the dissemination of propaganda within the United States. That is the point which interests me most.

Mr. WATKINS. I understand that; but I am also interested in determining whether the Mutual Security Administration has spent public funds for propaganda to persuade the people of Europe to accept our money.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I do not know about that.

Mr. WATKINS. I have heard that is the case.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield briefly.

Mr. CASE. During the first year of the ECA, it sent to Europe, for the purpose of encouraging the European countries to request more tobacco from the United States, a man from the Department of Agriculture and a man who had been in industry. I very thoroughly documented that matter in the records of the House of Representatives. Such a missionary effort has been made in the past.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Idaho will yield further to me, let me say that I understand an effort has been made, and is now being made, to persuade the people of Europe to accept our help.

Whether the information I have received in that respect is reliable, I am unable to state. But that information has come from persons who have been in Europe, and who say that the United States Government agencies are spending large amounts of money to persuade the Europeans to accept the money the Congress is voting to be sent to Europe.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Is the Senator from Idaho aware that tourists and other persons from Europe have been brought to the United States, and receive, while they are here, a subsistence allowance at the rate of $10 a day, and all their travel expenses are paid? Would this amendment prevent that?

Mr. DWORSHAK. No, I do not think the amendment would in any way affect that program. The amendment would simply attempt to curb two of the abuses which have been revealed in the past 2 days by newspaper articles dealing with this specific Mutual Security Agency program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield for a question?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Idaho inform the Senate in regard to the degree in which the Department of Defense uses similar tours for American newspapermen abroad, in connection with projects of the Department of Defense?

Mr. DWORSHAK. At this time, I am not dealing with that particular program, because presently we have before us only the authorization bill affecting and governing the expenditures made for foreign aid in Europe, Asia, and elsewhere.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Idaho favor the attaching of a similar limitation to the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes, I shall be glad to support similar restrictions in the case of all the departments.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Idaho, he does not seek to curb the expenditure of any of the funds authorized by this measure, except to prevent their use for purely propaganda purposes in the United States.

Mr. DWORSHAK. If the Senator from Georgia will read the second part of the amendment, he will see exactly what is provided on that point.

Mr. GEORGE. I now read the last 3½ lines of the amendment: "or to pay the travel or other expenses outside the United States of any citizen or group of citizens of the United States for the purpose of publicizing such program within the United States."

Mr. DWORSHAK. I refer to the delegation which left only this week.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Of course, similar delegations would be prohibited from going abroad under the Mutual Security Program in the future. We cannot make it retroactive.

Mr. GEORGE. What the Senator is aiming to do is to prevent the use of this money for propaganda purposes within this country, or for travel expenses of those who come back and who desire to propagandize. Is that not correct?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I want the MSA to be prohibited from diverting funds from the purposes for which they have been appropriated, and using them illegitimately, as, under the existing circumstances, to send delegations abroad, the delegations upon their return home to disseminate propaganda in behalf of this particular program.

Mr. GEORGE. I merely wanted to understand the Senator's amendment. The Senator does not intend, of course, to prevent the Mutual Security Agency from propagandizing abroad, that is, through the putting on of programs, or anything of that kind. Is that correct?

Mr. DWORSHAK. The amendment does not deal with that; no.

Mr. GEORGE. It is not intended to prevent that, is it?

Mr. DWORSHAK. No; absolutely not.

Mr. GEORGE. I wanted to get the statement of the Senator as to the meaning of his amendment, because I am about to suggest to the distinguished chairman of the committee that I can see no reason for resisting an amendment of this kind.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. NIXON. The purpose of my question is to establish clearly the legislative history behind this amendment. The Senator from Idaho in his remarks has pointed out that the amendment is specifically directed, insofar as travel abroad is concerned, to the type of activity which he has described on the floor of the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. DWORSHAK. That is correct.

Mr. NIXON. The reason I asked that question was that the amendment says: "to pay the travel or other expenses outside the United States of any citizen or group of citizens of the United States, for the purpose of publicizing such program within the United States."

In other words, it is conceivable that the Mutual Security Agency might continue paying the expenses of nongovernmental employees abroad, even under this amendment, by claiming that the primary purpose was not that of publicizing within the United States, but for some other purpose which the Agency might suggest in connection with a particular trip. As I understand, the purpose of the amendment—and this is for the purpose of getting the legislative history clearly on the record—is to prohibit exactly the type of activity which the Senator has described.

Mr. DWORSHAK. That is entirely correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield for a question?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator recall that under the original Marshall plan authority was contained in that measure for the sending of lay observers to observe what was going on, in connection with which the administrator of the plan was authorized to pay their expenses plus a fee, say, of $50 a day? Does the Senator recall that?

Mr. DWORSHAK. My understanding is that that was the case. I think this effort has been long delayed. We should have taken action sooner to curb such activities. We should have done so several years ago.

Mr. WATKINS. As I understand, the bills providing for the mutual security program which we have passed since the enactment of the original bill itself have simply been in the nature of amendments to the original act. Is that correct?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I think that is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Under those circumstances, the administration would still have the authority to send so-called experts abroad, paying their expenses plus a fee of around $50 a day, for the purpose of inspecting what we are doing in Europe.

Mr. DWORSHAK. That probably will have to be dealt with in other legislation, or by means of restrictions imposed by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WATKINS. If I may make this observation, I know of several instances of men being sent abroad under the Marshall plan, when about all it amounted to was to give so-called expert citizens a first-class vacation at the expense of the United States. Of course, they returned with glowing reports of what had been accomplished under the program. I doubt that they were impartial experts or observers in view of the circumstances under which they were sent.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I think it could be reasonably assumed that there could be some ulterior motive or some political motive in the sending of such civilians abroad.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. As I understood the statement of policy as enunciated a moment ago by the junior Senator from California, it is intended to have this amendment apply only to the spending of money in the United States, not to the spending of counterpart funds abroad.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I do not think we could have anything to do with counterpart funds.

Mr. MOODY. Is the Senator from Idaho aware that the very trip now being taken by the 11 farm editors, to which he has referred, will not cost the taxpayers of the United States a penny, except for $1,000 of traveling expenses paid in connection with travel from the interior of our country to the coast? Furthermore, is he aware that on this entire trip, on which farm editors are going to Europe not only to find what the facts are, but also to serve, as I understand it, as technical consultants, and to help educate the agricultural groups in Europe, their expenses are being paid entirely out of counterpart funds and do not cost the United States anything?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I may say to the Senator from Michigan, if that is an actual fact, then it is a breach of good faith on the part of our allies in Europe to engage in such activities, which obviously arouse suspicion in this country from a political standpoint.

Mr. MOODY. How does the Senator arrive at that conclusion?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I should like to use some of my remaining time.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me for a question?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield for a question, or I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from California.

Mr. NIXON. The Senator from Michigan has raised the question of the legislative interpretation of this particular provision. I desire to make it clear that it is my understanding, as I believe it is also the understanding of the proponent of this amendment, that we are not concerned with the question of whether the funds to be made available for this type of trip for propaganda purposes come from counterpart funds or from other funds appropriated by the Congress. The source of the funds is immaterial. What we are trying to do by this amendment is not so much to control the amount of money spent as it is to get at the practice by which the State Department or the Mutual Security Agency selects people, such as farm editors, or any other kind of editor, as potential propaganda agents, pays their expenses, by whatever method, sends them to Europe, and when they return uses them for propaganda purposes within the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes. And I think our allies, in the use of counterpart funds, certainly would not ignore or defy any mandate or any recommendation given by this Congress, insofar as these practices are concerned.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield briefly.

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely want to ask the Senator whether it is not true that, if these people go abroad under the guise of consultants, they are paid a per diem of probably $50 a day, plus

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

traveling expenses, and whether the authority is being used as a camouflage for sending to Europe as consultants people who in fact are merely traveling from one place to another, and are not serving as consultants to the farmers and the people of Europe, since they cannot have sufficient time to learn the facts to be used as the basis of such consultation and advice.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I agree with the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that the people to whom reference has been made were transported on an American plane?

Mr. DWORSHAK. It is my understanding that they went on an Air Force plane.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then how were counterpart funds paid for transportation on an American plane?

Mr. DWORSHAK. The information submitted by the Senator from Michigan may be correct; but, so far as I am concerned, I want these dealings to be aboveboard and in accordance with the legal authority given in the Mutual Security Act by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield briefly.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would the Senator agree that counterpart funds are obtained by the spending of the dollars of American taxpayers in European countries, following which the product which is paid for by means of the American dollar is sold, either to the government of the foreign country itself, or to the people, and that the currency thus obtained represents what are called counterpart funds? Then, under a contract, and arrangement we have, is it not true that we can use up to 5 percent of those funds for certain purposes so to that extent the American taxpayer can have the benefit of counterpart funds.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Indirectly. I think the Senator from Michigan is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield briefly to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. It seems to me that the counterpart funds are made possible by our expenditure of cash and by sending products abroad which are sold to those people, for which their own money is paid by them to their own government. That makes the counterpart fund. Without our contribution, there would be no counterpart fund.

Mr. DWORSHAK. That is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield briefly to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it not true that if we were to appropriate no money at this time, there would be no further additions to the counterpart funds, from which the expenses might be paid?

Mr. DWORSHAK. No. There probably would be an accumulation in Europe which would take care of such a program for some time if we did not prohibit it.

Mr. BENNETT. In addition to the counterpart fund, they are to get additional funds on the basis of our vote today.

Mr. DWORSHAK. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. It seems to me that the Senator from Michigan has pointed to a serious deficiency in the Senator's amendment, so that, at an appropriate time, I propose to offer an amendment to the amendment, to read as follows:

> None of the funds herein authorized to be appropriated, nor any of the counterpart funds resulting therefrom, shall be used for these purposes.

As the Senator from Michigan has pointed out, they are now getting away from the act by using counterpart funds for a purpose not intended. I think we should tighten up the amendment and have a clear showdown as to whether the funds are to be used to propagandize American citizens. I should like to have a little time on the amendment, if possible.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I shall yield the Senator from South Dakota 3 minutes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield for a question?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. With reference to the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, I would make it sufficiently broad to cover all counterpart funds, not only those which are the result of the dollars appropriated by this appropriation, but all the others which may be used with the approval of the United States.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be happy to make that amplification of the amendment.

I should like to point out that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] has put his finger on something very vital, something in connection with which we have been flagrantly derelict, in my opinion.

As has been pointed out, the United States has been sending junkets overseas and back again for the purpose of propagandizing persons for the support of the Defense Establishment. There has just been concluded in the State Department a whole series of foreign-policy institutes. They have brought in the presidents of women's clubs, of Rotary Clubs, and all kinds of organization officers for the purpose of propagandizing them in connection with State Department policies.

I have examined the programs very carefully. At none of the State Department's foreign policy institutes have they ever permitted anyone to raise questions or have a part in the program.

I do not object to having Government agencies try to propagandize their particular point of view; but to do so at public expense, to use the taxpayers' money, as has been done, to bring people to Washington and to send them to France or to the Caribbean for the purpose of propagandizing them, is certainly not tearing out just one page of Herr Goebbels' book in Germany; it is taking the whole book. If we are going to have considered public opinion on these questions, it has to be brought about by having persons selected and chosen to speak through their own lips to the people, and not make the people listen to an attempt by Government officials to inbreed ideas by means of assembling the people and high-pressuring them.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to ask why this propaganda is put on? I received a letter today from a representative of a large industrial concern in Michigan who had been invited a number of times to go on one of these trips by the Defense Department. He wrote me in order to call my attention to the fact that having declined all the invitations, his son has now been invited to go on such a trip. He said it would probably involve only a few dollars compared with the millions of dollars spent for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield one additional minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wanted to ask whether the fact that the son is invited clearly indicates that the invitation is for propaganda purposes.

Mr. MUNDT. There can be no question about that. My attention was called to the situation by a very distinguished citizen of Baltimore, Md., a high national officer of a perfectly reputable American association, who bitterly protests that he was brought to the State Department. He favors the Administration's point of view, but he says, "What are we coming to in the United States when we have to pay taxes for government agencies to bring us to Washington and try to propagandize us?"

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield a few minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I know that one of our favorite sports is to make a whipping boy out of any effort of the Government to supply information to any of the small newspapers of the country.

There are literally hundreds of small weekly and daily newspapers which cannot afford to have special writers in Washington. So, in an effort to try to keep a fairly good sized segment of the American public informed as to what $3,900,000,000 of the taxpayers' money is going for, the Mutual Assistance Administration asked if the smaller newspapers would like to receive a clip-sheet showing some of the things for which the money was being expended. Many answers were received, asking that the information be sent to them.

In order not to spend a lot of secretarial time on mimeographing, postage, and other things, they are preparing once a month what is called a clip sheet. It is the Mutual Security News. The purpose is to try to keep the people of America from having an iron curtain between them and the Government in con-

nection with how their money is being spent. I have read it rather carefully. I consider it to be useful information.

It is costing approximately $675 a month to supply those who thought enough of it to write in and ask for it. Money for clerk hire, mimeographing, and folding is saved. I think the paper is fairly well condensed. I do not consider it to be propaganda, although I recognize that anything that might show that America is doing something right once in a while is determined to be propaganda by some Senators on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Oklahoma is presenting something of interest to the American people. We have had a Voice of America, but not a voice for America. The only thing that is done by the clip sheet to which the Senator has referred is to inform the American people about what is going on. I think they are entitled to know it. The difficulty has been that America has not been informed as to what has been going on. I am very glad the Senator from Oklahoma has taken time to show that, after all, Americans should also be informed as to what is taking place.

Mr. MONRONEY. As shown by the cards I have exhibited, certain editors think they should have the information and not have to depend upon the Republican clip sheet which gives the Republican angle. They get their information from a Government source.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. Is it not a fact that it is very well recognized that a good way to get the facts about a situation is to go and see? I have never heard any objection raised when a committee of the Congress wants to go abroad to get facts. It is always justified on the ground that we must have first-hand information in order to act intelligently. Is it not a fact that the persons who have been brought here on occasions are persons, as the Senator from South Dakota said a moment ago, who represent fraternal organizations, farm organizations, and business organizations? Does the Senator think they are a lot of dummies who will take exactly what is handed to them? Is it not good practice to tell the American people what is going on so they can act intelligently on foreign policy?

Any move to shut off information from the American people smacks of censorship, and I do not like it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the Senator from Texas yield me five additional minutes?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield the Senator from Oklahoma five additional minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it apparent from the tear sheet which the Senator holds in his hand that much of the news comes from abroad and by cable?

Mr. MONRONEY. No. Some of it bears a Washington date line. For instance, a recent London date line says "British get United States radar know-how." I do not believe there is anything subversive about letting the people know that the British have used some of our radar know-how.

Mr. FERGUSON. The question is whether or not some of the money is not spent for cables to send this information, so that it may be printed in the tear sheets.

Mr. MONRONEY. Oh, my dear Senator——

Mr. FERGUSON. I am merely asking the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to give the Senator these figures: In 1952, the budget for information for the foreign aid program was $369,500. The budget for the year 1953 is $250,000. That is a decrease of $119,000 from what it was last year. Yet the good Senator from Idaho is fearful that we are wasting a large amount of public money. Anybody who knows how information is sent out knows it can be done cheaper with a clip sheet than it can be done by sending out 50, 60, or 100 separate press releases, involving mailing costs, and the cost of clerical help. The figure of $119,000 in savings must indicate that somebody is trying to watch the dollars on publicity expense.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. CASE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Oklahoma is of course correct. As far as dollars and cents are concerned, they are a small item. The point is that the American people are being informed by the expenditure of a small amount of money of what is going on so far as the Government is concerned. That is the point. We have been telling Asia, we have been telling Europe, we have been telling Sweden, we have been telling Iran, what we have in mind, but the only people who are not informed are the American public, and I think they are entitled to know what is going on.

Mr. MONRONEY. Even the press services, such as the AP and UP, cannot cover fully a program as broad as the Mutual Assistance Pact. They like to have help. I am sure those experienced newspaper men are not going to fall victims to propaganda, slanting their stories because they might have read something in a news release or clip sheet they received.

Four great farm organizations—the National Grange, the Farmers Union, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the National Council of Farm Cooperatives—are sending their editors to Europe. The distinguished Senator from Idaho says those men will be obligated to become propagandists. I know the Farm Bureau Federation and other farm leaders. And I am sure those good farmers could not be obligated to become propagandists for anything they do not see or do not believe in.

I hope we can have a few other people go to Europe to learn something of what is going on. Senators are not the only infallible people in the world who ought to be able to set foot abroad, with expenses paid. Perhaps some of our taxpaying citizens, representing the great farm organizations, could go and do just as much good as do Senators and Representatives traveling at public expense.

The Senator from Idaho could ascertain if he called on the State Department, that this activity cost $1,000 in American money. The rest of the cost comes out of counterpart funds, which were provided in the original ECA Act. Five percent of the counterpart funds, none of which are spendable outside these European countries, are being spent on education and mutual understanding.

Even Pan-American Airlines are taking this group of farm editors to Europe with counterpart funds. Think of it, costing only a thousand dollars to have leaders of the American farmers sitting down in meetings with European farmers, talking about methods of modern farming. If we are engaged in trying to help Europe to help itself, how better can we do it than by getting a few dirt farmers from America to sit down and talk across the table to their counterpart farmers of Europe?

I think this is one of the penny-wise, pound-foolish amendments, which tries to flyspeck a great bill and a great program. I sincerely hope the amendment will be defeated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator from Idaho desire to have any more time yielded?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Texas, the chairman of the committee, that I appreciate his generous offer, but I have had several requests on this side of the aisle to ask for the yeas and nays, so that we may have a show-down to determine just what kind of policy we are going to follow. I thank the Senator from Texas very much.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well. I have been generous to the Senator from Idaho. If he wishes to turn down my offer, that is all right.

Mr. DWORSHAK. It is up to the Senators; they may turn it down if they so desire.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. MOODY. I should like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I would suggest that the Senator take 3 minutes.

Mr. MOODY. That is all right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. How much time does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield 3 minutes.

Mr. MOODY. The Senator from Oklahoma has, I think, well said that every time a bill of this nature comes before the Senate of the United States, someone

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

rises, and, in some guise, offers an amendment which is designed, or if it is not designed would have the effect of tending to shut off from the people of the United States information about the Mutual Security Program.

If a program involving five or six billion dollars is not a program about which the American people should have full information, then I do not understand what the Senate may be doing in voting that much money for such a purpose.

As the Senator from Oklahoma has pointed out, there is in progress a commendable effort by the Mutual Security Administration to cut down the expense of getting information disseminated. The information should go out. Last year we had before us on a similar motion an effort to make a crippling cut of the Information Division of the State Department. At that time the implication was left that the representatives of farm and veterans' and women's organizations who were asking factual information about our programs were not intelligent people, but a bunch of dopes and dummies who would swallow whole anything they were told by the State Department. I think that is an insult to the intelligence of people involved.

I believe the Mutual Security Program to be a worthy one. I look on the pending amendment as dangerous because it would cut off from the people sources of information the people should have. It does not exactly impose censorship, but, as I said a few minutes ago, it smacks of censorship. I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair cannot recognize any Senator unless he is yielded to by those who control the time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I control the time.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a point of order. Do I understand the Chair correctly to rule that I cannot be recognized to offer an amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair did not make such a ruling. Debate on the pending amendment is under control of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. When the debate is concluded, the Chair can recognize the Senator from South Dakota for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. I have an amendment lying on the table.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to associate myself with the views and the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY]. The matter boils down to one issue, that the Congress of the United States is asked to indicate that it is afraid of the American people. The American people have a right to hear from their government. This program has been underwritten by an overwhelming majority of Democrats and Republicans. What are we afraid of? The personnel in the Mutual Security Agency have been screened. They are supposed to be loyal American citizens. The Agency hires competent journalists and news analysts to handle public relations.

I go along with the Senator from Oklahoma, in asking what is wrong with a group of people from farms, factories, businesses, and colleges traveling to the countries of Europe and learning about what America is doing in its great cooperative relationship for the security of this country.

I ask the Senate of the United States, if we are worried about spending a little money for personal services or printing or dissemination of information or propaganda, how about checking the franking privileges for Members of the Congress, how about checking some of the privileges we have in sending committee reports and hearings to the people of the country? It would be ridiculous to assume that the Congress of the United States is not supposed to send out information as part of its work. Yet Congress is now talking about stopping an agency from sending out information about the activities of a program which is endorsed overwhelmingly by both Houses of Congress.

I wish to ask one other question. How about the colleges and foundations in America which may get information about this program? Are the proponents of this amendment suggesting that every little college in America send agents to Washington to meet with the Director of the Mutual Security Administration, or with his public relations people, in order to find out about some project? We are asking colleges, foundations, and philanthropic institutions to enter upon programs of a private nature. This amendment would stop the use of such funds. It is almost unbelievable.

Let me tell the Senate what has happened. On the other side of the aisle there has been an uprising of Senators who say that they do not want any information to get out. Am I to understand that the votes which have been cast for mutual security are not votes which were really believed in? I presume that they were. I know that there is sincerity of purpose. Then what are they afraid of? Why not permit information to get out to the country newspapers, periodicals, the weekly press, and the smaller radio stations?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield me two more minutes?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield two additional minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Why not permit information to get out to colleges? Furthermore, what this country needs is a great exchange of people. The purpose of this effort is to fortify the exchange program. I am surprised that the Senator from South Dakota, who has been one of the proponents of the exchange program, should feel that our American people should not have an opportunity to go to European countries and Asiatic areas to study the problems of those areas. I do not believe that any intelligent American citizen is going to be hoodwinked. I do not believe that any public relations man in the Mutual Security Agency is going to be able to pull the wool over the eyes of the country editors who left on Monday to go to Europe.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. Is there not this point in addition to those mentioned by the Senator from Minnesota: From the standpoint of economy, the portion of this amendment which applies to traveling abroad is utterly phony. As I pointed out a few minutes ago, all the expenses of the traveling representatives of the United States are paid out of foreign currencies, out of money put up by foreign countries, as counterpart funds to the money which is voted by the Congress. If such moneys are not used for the purpose of exchanging information between the people of America and the people of other countries, it will be used by other countries in some other way.

Why is it that every year there is an attempt to curtail or shut off sources of information, to prevent the American people from learning all about the situation? Is it because those opposing this program do not trust the people, or is it because they realize that this is a good program, and are afraid that if the people are fully informed the arguments which they have been making against it will melt into thin air?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Michigan have asked several times, "What are they afraid of?" I suppose reference is made to the proponents of the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. I have been listening for quite awhile. I have come to the conclusion that the proponents of the amendment are afraid that the administration is going to use all the money it can get its hands on in the particular information programs to influence the next election. I think the Senator from Minnesota is entitled to an answer to his question, as to what "they" are afraid of.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not discussing the merits of the question. I am merely attempting to answer the question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator from Vermont is being honest. I think the reason for the opposition on the Republican side of the aisle is the fear which has been expressed.

Mr. AIKEN. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. All I can say in answer to that is that the Mutual Security Agency has conducted its affairs in an honorable manner. There is not a scintilla of evidence to indicate that it has indulged in partisan politics in its activities. I submit that the Mutual Security Program is vital to the defense of this country; and if it is vital to the defense of this country, which may involve the lives of the men of this country, at least the people of America ought to know something about it. To attempt

to draw an iron curtain around information is beyond what I consider to be a democratic procedure or democratic thought. I had hoped that my Republican friends would join in getting more information out to the American people, getting information to friends and foes alike. I submit that the Republican side of the aisle can produce not a bit of evidence to indicate that the people who have been sent on trips to Europe have been blood-tested as to their partisanship or their attitudes, to determine whether they were for mutual security or against it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not yield.

Those people have been selected on the basis of the groups which they represent. To place this amendment in the bill would be to say that we believe in censorship.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I suggest that the answer to all the questions which have been hurled in the past few minutes was suggested in the statement of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who said that he did not want the people to get all their information from the Republican publicity clip sheets. I suggest that what we are objecting to is the use of Government money to make this program a substitute for a Democratic clip sheet.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. We have no objection to a Democratic clip sheet. But when the Senator from Oklahoma says that he does not want the people to get all their information from a Republican publicity clip sheet, he is suggesting that the thing to do is to use this program in lieu of a Democratic clip sheet. I have no objection to the Democrats having a clip sheet, but I do not like to have them use public funds to operate it.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield me 1 minute?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the senior Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I will speak on my own time on my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the debate closed on the pending amendment? If so, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] offers an amendment to the pending amendment, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the pending amendment, on page 1, line 2, after the word "appropriated", it is proposed to insert "nor any counterpart funds" so as to read:

SEC. 537. None of the funds herein authorized to be appropriated, nor any counterpart funds, shall be used to pay for personal services or printing, or for other expenses of the dissemination within the United States of general propaganda in support of the Mutual Security Program, or to pay the travel or other expenses outside the United States of any citizen or group of citizens of the United States for the purpose of publicizing such program within the United States.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I shall not take the full 30 minutes on this amendment, or any considerable portion thereof. However, I present it in this form so that we may have clearly before us the decision to be made by the Members of the United States Senate as to whether or not we are to go on record in the ensuing yea-and-nay vote as endorsing a program of self-propagandization.

I have heard some curious arguments on behalf of the propaganda efforts—they are not information efforts, but raw propaganda—from some of the opponents of this amendment. They would have us believe that the information desired could not be obtained from the Associated Press, the United Press, the International News Service and other news agencies, or from the eyes and ears supplied by the State Department and its Foreign Service officers. They would have us believe that this surreptitious method is necessary. I call it surreptitious because this is an underhand, unauthorized, stealthy method of trying to convey information to the American public. I shall point out why.

I think most Senators know that I have been very much interested in providing adequate information services in connection with the Voice of America. I have frequently taken the floor to solicit additional funds for that purpose. I may do so again. As my associate in the authorship of that bill the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] will testify that when we prepared the Voice of America legislation we specifically provided that none of the funds, talents, or techniques could be used for propaganda within America. It was purely a job of carrying the Voice of America overseas. It was not considered wise then, and I do not consider it to be wise now, to give the State Department, the Mutual Security Administration, or any other branch of Government, public funds with which to propagandize Americans to its own particular advantage. Certainly it is less than wise to approve such official propaganda when the Mutual Security Administrator is running for President of the United States. I do not think we should have an example of public funds which might be used for the advantage of any man who is running for President of the United States. It is his perfect right to run for President but many Americans feel that as a candidate he should resign his mutual security position. I do not believe that this kind of propaganda sheet should be sent out at any time. Let me point out what it says at the top of this sheet. It says:

Round-the-world features—

I suppose it proposes to become something greater than Paramount News Reels, the Voice of America, the Associated Press, the United Press, or the International News Service.

Round-the-world features—

A most ambitious undertaking—

Editors: If you wish to receive a monthly copy of Mutual Security News with matted pictures and charts, please sign and mail the attached postcard. The clip sheet will be mailed to you at no charge.

"Editors If you wish to receive a monthly copy of Mutual Security News"—the editors are urged to ask for it. It is not a matter of MSA responding, as the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has said, to a great ground swell of requests. Editors are urged to send for it. The lures are tossed out and the fish are urged to swallow the hook, all at the taxpayers' expense.

We see the use of public funds—counterpart funds, which are public funds, in terms of foreign exchange—money which should be used to carry out the acknowledged, admitted, and respectable purposes of mutual security aid, to help those countries, used to buy maps, charts, diagrams, and pictographs, to send out propaganda to American newspapers.

Mr. President, it is highly important, if we are to have an efficient American information service in this country that we keep clearly in mind the function of such a service.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] said he was surprised to see me proposing this amendment. I will tell him why I am proposing it. Under the provisions of the Smith-Mundt Act, we provide funds and tactics and authority for taking American farmers and American private individuals on information tours. We recognize it to be a legitimate function. We provide money specifically each year in appropriation bills for that specific purpose.

Not content with the provisions of the Smith-Mundt Act, the Mutual Security Administration now surreptitiously undertakes to expand the program without limit, without control, without authorization of Congress, and without any direction, far beyond the provisions of the Smith-Mundt Act, so that they may engage in pure political propaganda.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. No; I shall not yield at this time. I have spoken only once; and the Senator from Michigan has spoken several times this afternoon. My time is limited.

In connection with our authorized information exchange service, under the Smith-Mundt Act there is no opportunity for propaganda, because the rules and regulations are carefully and specifically drawn. I defy Senators who oppose the amendment to name one outspoken opponent of mutual security aid who has ever been taken on one of these all-expense tours to Europe. In the main it is a carefully selected group. It is a group which is taken from people who are either supporting the program or from big organizations, which are amply able to pay for such trips, many of which organizations can qualify under the terms of the Smith-Mundt Act and could go otherwise than by giving them

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

an all-expense tour in the form of a prepared-opinion tour, a predigested-opinion tour, and all of it part of a program which should be good enough to stand on its own bottom. It is fundamentally a program for which I have had great hopes and for which I shall vote appropriations.

However, Mr. President, if it should ever come to pass that the Senate on a roll-call vote will authorize that kind of propaganda at public expense, so that we cannot arrive at opinions from objective evidence which is brought back by travelers who go to Europe at their own expense or brought to us by UP, AP, INS and other news services, and if we are to follow the suggestion of our good friend from Oklahoma, that editors shall be carefully selected and taken on this tour and then brought back so that they can write effectively, persuasively, and, above all, favorably upon what they saw over there, we are certainly in a big way wasting the taxpayers' money.

Mr. President, let us keep the Mutual Security Administration clean. Let us stop now at the beginning, with volume 1, No. 1, this effort to publish a sort of Herr Goebbels propaganda sheet by the Mutual Security Administration in order to propagandize people. Let us not permit an Administrator, whether he be Mr. Harriman or anyone else—and whether he be running for President or not—use public money to provide predigested information and propaganda to the people of our country.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield briefly for a question.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota whether he can show me any article in this factual information sheet which is unfair or in any way slanted.

Mr. MUNDT. I must say that——

Mr. MOODY. Or whether it was written by a Herr Goebbels or anyone of that stripe.

Mr. MUNDT. I must say that I was completely astounded when I found that our Government was engaging in that kind of effort. I have not read it carefully word by word, paragraph by paragraph. I would assume that volume 1, No. 1, would be almost as clean as the tooth of a South Dakota hound dog. I am wondering what will happen in No. 3, No. 4, and No. 5 once they have begun to feel the full flush of the possibilities of a propaganda sheet like this.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield further?

Mr. MUNDT. Not at this time. Mr. President; this propaganda program is wrong in principle. It is wrong in policy. It is wrong in purpose. Congress sooner or later will have to decide whether, as custodians of the public purse, we will make available public funds for public officials to use in propagandizing our fellow citizens. If we do, we will be approaching very closely the rather disgraceful activities of the parliamentary body in Germany once known as the Reichstag.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I listened to the able Senator's comments about the contents of this issue No. 1 of volume No. 1. I looked at it with the expectation of finding it rather an inoffensive sheet, but I wish to invite the attention of the Senator from South Dakota to the fact that the principal article in point of wordage has to do with propagandizing this very request upon which Congress is passing at this time. The article is entitled: "Building Strength for the Free World."

It is date lined, "Washington, D. C.," and reads:

> Congress this month was buckling down at the task of deciding the form and amount of aid that this country can provide to its allies in the coming year as part of the free world's struggle to build strength against attack from without or subversion from within.

The next sentence reads:

> Of the $7,900,000,000 requested by the President for the 1952–53 Mutual Security Program—

I shall not read further.

It seems to the Senator from Florida that on the very face of this volume 1, No. 1—and apparently no earlier volume or issue number was needed for this work until the very eve of the consideration by Congress of this authorization of mutual security funds—that the principal objectives of this volume 1, No. 1 edition—and whether there will be any other volumes or numbers the Senator from Florida is not apprised—was for the purpose of propagandizing this particular recommendation and request, and making sure that the people at the grass roots know that Congress is considering a $7,900,000,000 request at this time, with all the implications that may be drawn in connection therewith.

So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned he does not believe that there is any unwillingness on the part of the Associated Press, the United Press, or the International News Service, or on the part of any of the farm newspapers or groups of daily and weekly newspapers of the country, so ably represented here, to carry the news about the request of the President of the United States for a $7,900,000,000 program for the Mutual Security Program.

It appears rather clearly that the first purpose of this first issue of the first series is the propagandizing of this particular recommendation. The Senator from Florida merely wishes to call that fact to the attention of the Senator from South Dakota, and to add that in the opinion of the Senator from Florida, on the very face of it, this first document is a lobbying effort of the first degree.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Florida very much for his contribution. I appreciate the fact that he has had an opportunity to read this propaganda sheet more carefully than I have had. I wish to congratulate him on his statement. It is typical of the high statesmanship which he always manifests on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the debate on this subject. I wish to say that I shall support the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota, and the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho. I shall support the two amendments for one controlling reason.

I think it is of the utmost importance that we always do everything possible to protect one of the great freedoms of America, which is the freedom of the press.

In my judgment whenever the Government inaugurates any program which is clearly designed, as I think this program is, to influence the press and to use the forces of Government to obtain from the press the printing of a particular point of view, the freedom of the press has been invaded.

I yield to no one in my criticism of the press. One of my criticisms of the press is that it is not free enough and I do not propose to support a provision in the pending bill which in my judgment would make the press less free than it is already.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I do not control the time.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield 1 minute more so that the Senator from California may ask his question.

Mr. NIXON. I should like to refer to the statement made on the other side of the aisle with regard to censorship. The suggestion was made that if we voted in favor of the amendment we would be in effect voting for a type of censorship, because we would be denying to people information which they should have. As a matter of fact, is not exactly the opposite the case? If we do not vote in favor of this amendment are we not in effect allowing to continue Government-controlled information, which is in effect censorship of a type which we must avoid in this country?

Mr. MORSE. I think we would be encouraging that kind of censorship.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixteen minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall yield 2 minutes to my colleague from South Dakota.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, at this time, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me, so that I may make a brief comment?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to make a brief comment in support of the statement made a moment ago by the junior Senator from California [Mr. NIXON]. I desire to call attention to the fact that perhaps the most active committee now serving the American Society of Newspaper Editors and the other groups of editors and newspaper publishers of the Nation is the one which is complaining vigorously about the matter of handouts

from Government agencies. The gist of its complaint is that such handouts constitute a form of censorship, because they are boiled down into a form which has been approved by the propagandists of the Government agency involved, and thus the information which that agency wishes to reach the public is given out, and it goes out in the precise form included in the handout which is frequently regarded as heavily slanted.

I think that is a form of censorship. It was so held no longer than just a few weeks ago, on the occasion of the great annual meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, here in the city of Washington, at which time those newspaper men protested vigorously and even bitterly against such activities, because they say they constitute a form of censorship, in that they amount to handing out only the things the propagandists wish to hand out and only the items they wish to reach the American people; and in that way the Government agencies seek to form and influence public opinion.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in confirmation of what the Senator from Florida has just said, let me say—as my colleague the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] will recall—that when we were first writing the proposed legislation for the Voice of America, strenuous opposition came from the Associated Press and the United Press, who looked upon the proposed Voice of America as a means of Government control of news and of Government censorship or approval or disapproval or monopolization of the news. Finally we included in that measure strict prohibitions against the dissemination of any kind of news within the United States by the entire Voice of America overseas information setup.

Certainly if such a provision was sound in regard to the Voice of America legislation and I think it was, it would be doubly sound for the Mutual Security Agency legislation.

I hope the great editors of the Associated Press newspapers and of the United Press newspapers, who were so persuasive in arguing against the Voice of America proposal, for purposes which they considered to be valid, and which I believe were valid, will not now forget those arguments. Instead of having a protest only made to a rather meek committee of the House of Representatives, the Foreign Affairs Committee, I hope the Associated Press and the United Press again will load their guns and will oppose this activity. Even though in doing so they must oppose the far more formidable forces of the Mutual Security Administration, the State Department, and the White House.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. In regard to the criticism of the "tear sheet" program, I wonder whether the Senator from South Dakota understands that in the future, following No. 1 of volume 1, the tear sheets will include all the facts in regard to the Mutual Security Agency's program?

Mr. MUNDT. Of course they will not. Anyone would have to be extremely naive to believe that releases of that sort would give adequate coverage to all the pertinent information. Obviously that will not be done. It will always be loaded in favor of the administration of the program.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President——

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President——

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, at this time I am determined to yield to my colleague, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me at this time?

Mr. MUNDT. I shall yield to the Senator from New Jersey at the conclusion of my colleague's remarks.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the amendment submitted by my colleague goes to the use of counterpart funds. In particular, the amendment would affect the use of 5 percent of the counterpart funds which have been used for information.

The counterpart funds have been used to the extent of $53,678,000 for informational activities. I obtain that figure from table No. 3 in a memorandum prepared for the use of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

A total of $433,000,000 has been set aside as the United States share, or counterpart, under the 5-percent provision; and $53,678,000 of that fund has been used for informational and other activities.

The total counterpart funds from April 3, 1948, to November 30, 1951, amount to $7,566,000,000, of which $2,250,000,000 has been used for debt retirement by the other countries.

$1,903,000,000 has been used for road building and for similar construction, and $495,000,000 has been used for other purposes.

One of the highlights in connection with this matter is that approximately $53,000,000 has already been used for informational activities. In that case, I suggest that the amendment submitted by my colleague to the amendment of the Senator from Idaho is very much in order.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield for a question?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. As I recall the debates on the Smith-Mundt Act, this very issue was then before us.

Mr. MUNDT. Precisely so.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. We feared the slanting of news information.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, and the Associated Press and the United Press rightfully feared that very situation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. We took pains to guard against such a situation.

Mr. MUNDT. Certainly we did.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. So, Mr. President, as a cosponsor of that measure, I wish to join the Senator from South Dakota in his present effort; and I wish to say that I feel that he is on the right track, and that we must take care to avoid such kinds of publicity.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Is it not true that, in regard to the matter of taking trips abroad, the Smith-Mundt Act affords a safeguard?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, it does so under the provisions specifically included for that purpose by the Congress; and in that act it is provided that such funds shall not be used for propaganda of that kind.

There is no more use of having these Government funds used for such a special, undercover propaganda purpose than there would be in having a teacup with 17 handles.

This provision has been included in the law; but at this time we are confronted with a definite and determined attempt to circumvent the law which was passed by Congress in order to cover this very situation and to insure that the purpose of Congress would be carried out.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Of course, the very kind of travel we would like to have done abroad or by persons coming to the United States is covered by specific legislation for that purpose.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; and to it I am prepared to vote to devote many more millions of dollars than those now spent for that purpose, because that program is carried out in an appropriate manner, under the proper safeguards.

I am informed by the Senator from Idaho that he is prepared to accept the amendment I have offered to his amendment. However, I do not wish to have him do so if such action would make it impossible for Senators on the other side, who wish to argue against the amendment, to submit their views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho cannot accept the amendment, but he can offer it as a modification of his own amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a while ago I said I was prepared to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. MUNDT. I am referring to the acceptance by my colleague [Mr. DWORSHAK] of my amendment, as a modification of the amendment he has submitted.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator from South Dakota explain the nature of the amendment he has submitted to the amendment of the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. MUNDT. My amendment includes counterpart funds.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator from South Dakota wish to have United States funds used entirely, rather than any counterpart funds? When the counterpart funds are available, they might as well be used.

Mr. MUNDT. I do not want any funds at all to be used for the propaganda purpose to which I have referred, when it comes to directing that propaganda against Americans.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield for a question?

Mr. MUNDT. Certainly.

Mr. MONRONEY. I now read from lines 1 and 2 of the amendment of the Senator from Idaho, as proposed to be

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

be amended by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]:

SEC. 537. None of the funds herein authorized to be appropriated nor any counterpart funds shall be used to pay for personal services or printing, or for other expenses of the dissemination within the United States of general propaganda in support of the Mutual Security Program—

And so forth. Do I correctly interpret the amendment as meaning that no counterpart funds may be used for any propaganda purpose in connection with the Mutual Aid Act?

Mr. MUNDT. In the United States.

Mr. MONRONEY. The amendment does not so provide. Furthermore, the use would be made under the provisions of section 106. Subsection (j), regarding counterpart funds, specifically directs that a part of the counterpart funds must be spent to inform Europe what the United States is doing for Europe.

Thus, this amendment, as now drawn, would strike out a whole section.

Mr. MUNDT. The entire purpose of the amendment is to deal with the use and promotion of propaganda in the United States.

Mr. MONRONEY. I suggest that the Senator should modify the amendment so as to clarify it, because it certainly is not clear.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator need not be concerned. I now have the amendment in my hand. The part which the Senator has in mind says, "within the United States." On line 8, it says "within the United States."

The entire amendment is in one sentence. I do not think it possible to divorce any of the restrictive clauses from the concluding clause "within the United States." Surely, as a result of the debate or discussion which has ensued, it must be clear that, if our amendment is adopted, it would be understood to refer only to a use of funds which resulted in promoting propaganda within this country. I quite agree with what has been said about the importance of telling foreigners the purpose of the Mutual Security Program. Our amendment does not affect that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield? I should like to be heard. There are 30 minutes on each amendment, and a new amendment has been offered to the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely wanted the Senate to know that, if this amendment is adopted, when a constituent in any one of our respective States writes to the Government of the United States for information regarding the Mutual Security Program, the United States Senator whose constituent he is will have to pay one of his high-priced secretaries to prepare an example of the working of the Mutual Security Program. I want to know whether the Senate of the United States wants to deny to thousands and thousands of the American people the right to obtain a pamphlet on mutual security; because that is exactly what this amendment would effect.

If it is desired to carry this doctrine to its logical conclusion, Mr. President, then let us quit printing agricultural year books. If we did that, what a howl would be raised around here. Let us quit printing information about the American Cancer Institute. When it desires to put out some information as to cancer treatment, let us quit printing that, because it is printed by the Government. Government agencies print a great variety of documents. Perhaps they should quit sending out the weather reports, since that involves printing—propagandizing their services.

Mr. President, it is positively ridiculous to deny to the Government of the United States an opportunity to place information in the hands of its own people.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask the Senator from Texas to yield me another minute. The Senate has wasted more time than that.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield the Senator 1 minute, and that is all. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. That will be sufficient.

Mr. President, our friends on the other side of the aisle may not believe that this is the Government of the United States. They may merely think it is the Government of the Democratic Party. But we have such a thing in this country as majority rule, and the Mutual Security Agency belongs to the people of the United States. I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle how they can vote for $6,900,000,000 of appropriations and then deny a Government agency the chance even to print a pamphlet telling the people what we have done? Are my colleagues afraid of what they have done? Are they afraid of their program? Are they afraid of their votes? I shall not rely upon other people to tell the story. I want to rely upon the factual story to be told, and it can only be told by an honest report, which can be prepared by the agency, which knows its business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 second?

Mr. MOODY rose.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator does not have any time remaining. Unless the Senator from Texas yields——

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield a half minute. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I merely wanted to point out, as the Senator from Minnesota has just said, that this is a program of the American people, a program administered, and brilliantly administered, by a Republican, Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, who is now the leading figure in managing the campaign of one of the Republican aspirants for the Presidency. No more ridiculous thing has ever been said on the Senate floor than that this is a Democratic political tearsheet. This is one attempt to make available to the people information on a program of tremendous importance for the safety of our country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did the Senator ever hear the Republicans ask that General MacArthur's publicity program be curtailed? Did anyone ever hear the Republicans ask that General Eisenhower's program be curtailed, or say that it ought to be curtailed? No. But mutual security—that is it.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. DWORSHAK rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I modify my amendment by accepting the amendment offered by the senior Senator from South Dakota, which would include counterpart funds.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho modifies his amendment accordingly. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], as modified.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] on votes taken today. I consulted his office to see whether they knew how he would vote on this amendment. They informed me that they did not know, and suggested that I break the pair on this vote, which I now do. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], if present and voting, would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Conference of the International Council for Christian Leadership at The Hague.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting the Senator for Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 19, as follows:

YEAS—52

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Nixon
Bennett	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Holland	Robertson
Bridges	Hunt	Saltonstall
Butler, Md.	Ives	Schoeppel
Butler, Nebr.	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Case	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Lodge	Smith, N. C.
Dirksen	Long	Stennis
Douglas	Malone	Taft
Dworshak	Martin	Thye
Eastland	Maybank	Watkins
Ellender	McCarthy	Welker
Ferguson	McKellar	Williams
Frear	Millikin	Young
George	Morse	
Hendrickson	Mundt	

NAYS—19

Anderson	Hennings	Moody
Benton	Hill	O'Conor
Clements	Humphrey	Pastore
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Sparkman
Fulbright	Lehman	Underwood
Green	McFarland	
Hayden	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—25

Bricker	Jenner	McMahon
Byrd	Kefauver	Murray
Cain	Kerr	Neely
Carlson	Kilgore	Russell
Chavez	Knowland	Seaton
Duff	Langer	Tobey
Ecton	Magnuson	Wiley
Flanders	McCarran	
Gillette	McClellan	

So Mr. DWORSHAK's amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 762. An act for the relief of Alexander Urszu;

S. 997. An act for the relief of Paula Slucka (Slucki) and Ariel Slucki;

S. 1372. An act for the relief of Mrs. Madelaine Viale Moore; and

S. 1679. An act for the relief of Stephen Gorove.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3086) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I send forward amendments which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendments.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Louisiana proposes the following amendments:

On page 3, line 2, strike out "$3,620,317,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,515,229,500."

On page 3, line 15, strike out "$1,588,922,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,542,866,000."

On page 4, lines 9 and 10, strike out "$529,614,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$514,263,000."

On page 4, line 20, strike out "$48,038,000" and insert in lieu thereof $46,645,500."

On page 5, line 4, strike out "$56,772,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$55,126,500."

On page 5, line 7, strike out "$66,380,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$64,456,000."

On page 5, line 20, strike out "$533,859,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$518,385,000."

On page 6, line 5, strike out "$356,354,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$346,025,000."

On page 8, line 2, strike out "$54,501,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$52,971,500."

On page 8, line 4, strike out "$19,215,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$18,658,000."

On page 10, line 9, strike out "$8,734,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,481,000."

On page 10, line 25, strike out "$2,446,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,375,000."

On page 14, line 18, strike out "$14,848,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$14,417,500."

Mr. LONG. Mr President, this is the same formula which I proposed earlier in the day, except that it is a proposal to reduce the authorization by $200,000,000. The previous amendment which proposed to reduce it by $400,000,000 failed of adoption by only three votes. This amendment would result in a reduction in the dollar amount of only 3 percent. It seems to me that this small amount of reduction would not greatly hamper the program, but the saving of $200,000,000 would be a substantial saving to our taxpayers.

Mr. President, I am agreeable to limiting the time for discussion of the amendment to 10 minutes to each side.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish the Senator would make a part of his remarks the proposal of which he has spoken. I voted for the billion-dollar cut, the one-half billion cut and shall vote for other cuts.

Mr. LONG. The proposal is merely to make a reduction of approximately $200,000,000, treating all items, except the children's fund, alike. The aid to Europe item would be reduced approximately $60,000,000. It would amount to a reduction on each item of approximately 3 percent of the budget request.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator, because I voted against the amendment of the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] because I believed that specific reductions were for the Appropriations Committee to determine.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, this is just another effort to chisel and cut down the bill. We started in the committee and chopped off a billion dollars. We wanted to be fair. Not satisfied with that reduction, an amendment was offered to cut the bill another billion dollars. The Senate debated the amendment. We got the views and the votes of Senators, and the effort was defeated. It was a good vote. [Laughter.]

Senators may laugh, but the amendment was defeated by a majority of this body. That is more votes than Senators who are against the whole program have, including the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Then, Mr. President, what happened? Failing to cut off a billion dollars, these friends of the measure——

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I know the Senator from Texas wants to be fair. Forty-nine votes are a majority in this body, and the Senate did not defeat the amendment by a majority of the body.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not speaking of absent Senators. I have in mind the amendment which was adopted a while ago. Complaint was made about sending some farmers, some grass-roots people, to see things. If it is desired to send a farmer to Europe to find out something it is said, "Oh, we cannot stand for such propaganda. Leave the farmers at home. Let Senators go over there. There are some Representatives to send over, too. We want to send someone with credentials in his pocket, saying 'I am a Senator of the United States. Look at that. Here is a gallery card. If you ever visit the United States, go up in the gallery and see what we are doing in Washington; but for God's sake do not let these farmers know what is going on in Europe'."

Mr. President, why do Senators want to keep chiseling and cutting down the bill? The Senator from Louisiana is pushing his amendment. The Foreign Relations Committee reported a bill, but the Senator from Louisiana was not satisfied with it. He said, "Oh, Mr. President, for God's sake send the bill to the Armed Services Committee, because I am a member of that committee, and I want to cut its throat when it gets there."

It was sent to that committee, and what happened? His own committee, which he is supposed to have in the palm of his hand, the Armed Services Committee, held hearings and looked over the bill. It knew what the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations had done, and the Committee on Armed Services, by a majority of that committee, voted to approve the bill without amendment.

Why did not the Senator from Louisiana get his billion-dollar cut in the committee? Why did he not get his $500,000,000 cut? If he could not get a cut of $500,000,000, why did he not get a cut of $400,000,000? Not getting a cut of $400,000,000, he wants a cut of $200,000,000.

Mr. President, I hope we are not babes in the woods. We are not children. This is the Senate of the United States. On this floor have trod the great men who served here in the years that are gone.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Why should we spend all this time chiseling away, cutting a little dab here and a little dab there, by Senators who say, "Oh, we are for the bill. We are for mutual aid security. We want to build up in Europe a rampart against the attacks of Soviet communism, in order to protect the United States, in order that the Communists may not come upon our own shores and attack us. Oh, we are for the mutual security bill, but let us cripple it a little. We are not so strong for it, after all. We want to hamstring it a little. Let us cut some of the tendons in its feet, so it cannot walk well. Let us cut off its arms—at least one of its arms. Let us cut off a billion dollars. Let us trim it. If we cannot cut off a billion dollars, let us cut $500,000,000. If the Senate will not accept a cut of $500,000,000, let us ram a $400,000,000 cut down their throats."

But the Senate would not stand for that. The Senate would not vote for a cut of $1,000,000,000, it would not vote for a cut of $500,000,000, and it would not vote for a cut of $400,000,000.

I must pay my respects to the Senator from Louisiana for his persistence, for he is a persistent man. If the pending amendment should be defeated, he probably will come back with an amendment to cut off $100,000,000. If that fails, he will return with a proposal to cut $50,000,000. He will finally get down in the basement. Senators know that under big department stores there are basements where cheap goods, the old, sorry goods, the second-hand goods, are placed on sale. The basement is where poor folks go to buy what they cannot pay for upstairs. Is that the strategy of the Senator from Louisiana, and those who are associated with him in this attack, an attack that the Senate has already disapproved of in every vote it has cast?

Mr. President, the Senate has stood by the bill. Do we want to send a crippled man to an international conference?

Mr. WELKER. I would.

Mr. CONNALLY. I know the Senator would. The Senator from Idaho says he wants to send a crippled man to an international conference. He is talking sense. That is what he means. He means exactly that. He would cut off one of the legs, and if he thought the man could get there with the other leg, he would cut that off also.

Mr. WELKER. The Senator is right.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Idaho says I am right. Of course, I am right. I am right when I speak against this amendment, which would cut $200,000,000 from this bill. I know what this bill is. I have sat in the Foreign Relations Committee for weeks, listening to all the people in the United States, both for and against the bill, who asked to be heard by the committee. We heard the opponents, we heard the department, we heard all those who wanted to be heard. When we were finished, we concluded that we could safely cut the appropriation by a billion dollars. That ought to have satisfied the voracious appetite of the economists. That ought to have had some effect on their digestive functions.

But no, that was not enough. They wanted to cut off another billion dollars. When they did not succeed, they said, "Well, the situation is not so bad. We will be satisfied if we can cut off $500,000,000."

The Senate said, "No."

The opponents then said, "Well, since we could not get a cut of $500,000,000, let us try to cut $400,000,000."

Again the Senate said, "No."

Now we have their proposition, "Since we could not get any of those cuts, let us propose a cut of $200,000,000."

They want to cripple the program. They say, "The legs are not cut off entirely, but we want to cripple this creature as much as we can. It may not die from a major wound, but we want to fix it so that at least it will bleed a lot."

Mr. President, what has happened in Europe? The foreign ministers of this country, of Great Britain, and of France went to Bonn, in West Germany. There they induced West Germany to aline itself with the West, to aline itself against the hordes of Communists that might come forth from that far-flung country yonder across the sea.

What does the action in Bonn mean? If the allied countries had not succeeded in alining Germany with the West, and if Germany had alined herself with the East, and had gone behind the iron curtain, it would have meant the doom of the little countries of western European freedom, and ultimately it probably would have meant the doom of the United States itself.

Do we want to send throbbing across the wires to Europe the message that when it comes to mutual security we have lost our courage, that we have got cold feet, that we are not going to help them, except by a little dab here and a little dab there? Or do we want to send a message that we approve what those countries have done in getting Germany to line up with the west; that we approve what France and the other six powers in Europe have done toward guaranteeing a Western European army of defense and resistance against the totalitarian hordes that threaten not not only their liberty, not only their democracy, not only their countries, but ultimately the United States itself?

Mr. President, I am not a Dane. I am an American. Yet I sympathize with little countries like Denmark, that cannot resist alone. They must resist, if they resist at all, by union in Europe, and by the help of the United States.

I am not a Dutchman, but I understand the perils under which the Dutch are suffering. They know that Russia can overrun them in a moment, can destroy their Government, can enslave their people, and can wreak ruin and devastation upon that fair land. I am not lacking in sympathy. I know that Holland cannot resist alone. She must resist in alliance with Western Germany, the countries of Western Europe, and with the United States itself, if she is to be safe, if she is to survive, if she is to live in the years that are to come.

Mr. President, I am not a Belgian. I am an American. That does not lessen my sympathy for Belgium, a country of gallant, brave, and courageous people. How long would Belgium last if she tried to resist alone? She would be engulfed in a wave of military power and military force. Her Government would be extinguished and her people enslaved.

Mr. President, the same is true of France and the other countries of Western Europe. Our country is not doing everything for the defense of civilization. Under this bill, the countries I have mentioned in Western Europe are required to put up many times as much money toward raising and equipping armies and toward manufacturing arms as the United States will contribute to this common enterprise, this enterprise of saving the freedom of the world, this enterprise to preserve the democracy of the world, this enterprise to save the free peoples of the earth from tyranny and from subjugation.

Mr. President, the Senate ought not vote for the cut proposed in the amendment now pending, not because $200,000,000 is such a tremendous sum—it is not—but a cut of even $200,000,000 will be symbolic to the people of Western Europe, to France, Great Britain, Germany, and the other countries that the United States is not a partner in this project, that the United States is losing its courage, that the United States is beginning to get cold feet on the proposition of aiding the defense of Western Europe, not for Western Europe alone, but for our own defense.

We are not defending Western Europe merely for the benefit of Western Europe. We are defending it for the United States of America. We would not be voting millions of dollars except that we believe that the safest way to protect the United States is to bring about a strong force in Western Europe, with arms in their hands, with bayonets at their sides, in order that they may resist and overcome the activities of far-off Moscow which threaten to engulf, enslave, and subject the free world to the most cruel and despotic government that has ever cursed the earth since the days of the Roman despots.

Mr. President, I earnestly hope that the Senate will reject the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. EASTLAND (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. I am informed that, if he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]

did not answer when his name was called. He is in Europe. If he were present I feel——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas is only announcing how another Senator would vote. There is nothing out of order about that.

Mr. CONNALLY. I feel sure that if the Senator from Wisconsin were present, he would vote "nay," because he so voted in the committee, and has been a strong supporter of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I make the point of order that that is not an announcement of how a Senator would vote.

Mr. McCARTHY. On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "nay."

I announce also that if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Conference of the International Council for Christian Leadership at The Hague.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting the Senator from Washington would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF]. If present and voting the Senator from Montana would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea" and the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—37

Aiken	Frear	Robertson
Bennett	Hendrickson	Schoeppel
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Smith, Maine
Butler, Md.	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. C.
Butler, Nebr.	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Capehart	Kem	Taft
Case	Long	Thye
Cordon	Malone	Watkins
Dirksen	Martin	Welker
Douglas	Maybank	Williams
Dworshak	McKellar	Young
Ellender	Millikin	
Ferguson	Mundt	

NAYS—34

Anderson	Holland	Nixon
Benton	Humphrey	O'Conor
Brewster	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Clements	Ives	Pastore
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Fulbright	Lehman	Saltonstall
George	Lodge	Smathers
Green	McFarland	Smith, N. J.
Hayden	Monroney	Sparkman
Hennings	Moody	Underwood
Hill	Morse	
Hoey	Neely	

NOT VOTING—25

Bricker	Gillette	McCarthy
Byrd	Jenner	McClellan
Cain	Kefauver	McMahon
Carlson	Kerr	Murray
Chavez	Kilgore	Seaton
Duff	Knowland	Tobey
Eastland	Langer	Wiley
Ecton	Magnuson	
Flanders	McCarran	

So Mr. LONG'S amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan to lay on the table the motion to reconsider made by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk my amendment 5/27/52–I and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, it is proposed to strike out the quotation marks at the end of line 9 and between lines 9 and 10 insert the following:

SEC. 537. Whenever a commodity authorized for procurement outside the United States under this act is under either domestic allocation or price controls in the United States, it shall be so procured by General Services Administration, or such other agency of the Government as the President may designate for such purpose, and furnished to the recipient country as a commodity in lieu of dollar grants for their own procurement.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this is a very important amendment. The only purpose of this amendment is to prevent United States dollars from being used in the world material market by foreign countries in competition with our own purchasers.

At the present time, when we make authorizations through the Mutual Security Agency for the purchase of certain commodities, such as copper, lead, zinc, nickel, and tin, we just allot the dollars to the foreign nation and let them go into the world market to purchase the material. Their competition runs the price up on these commodities. Under the terms of my amendment, there would be absolutely no reduction in the amount of the aid granted any nation. In fact, I believe my amendment will actually increase the amonut of the aid by eliminating this unwarranted competition for raw materials.

This amendment would authorize the General Services Administration—it is not necessary to create a new agency—or any other agency designated by the President, to buy the materials and furnish the commodity itself to the recipient nation in lieu of the dollar grant.

The amendment is limited in its application to commodities procured outside the United States and consequently will have no effect on the domestic market.

The amount of these commodity allocations to foreign nations under the Mutual Security program is considerable.

I wish to present a summary of the figures.

Procurement authorizations, cumulative from April 3, 1948, to December 31, 1951:

Nonferrous metals and products: Total, $699,700,000 to 17 different countries.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table issued by the Mutual Security Agency entitled "Procurement Authorizations by Commodity Groups and Country of Designation. Cumulative, April 3, 1948, to December 31, 1951—Millions of Dollars." It shows the amount of money which has been allotted to each one of these nations.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Procurement authorizations by commodity group and country of destination, cumulative, Apr. 3, 1948, to Dec. 31, 1951

[Millions of dollars]

Commodity group	Total	Country of destination																
		Austria	Belgium-Luxemburg	Denmark	France	Germany (federal republic)	Greece	Iceland	Ireland	Italy	Netherlands (including Indonesia)		Norway	Portugal	Sweden	Trieste	Turkey	United Kingdom	Yugoslavia
											Netherlands	Indonesia							
Nonferrous metals and products	669.7	9.7	0.7	13.7	151.2	44.4	3.6	0.3	.....	44.3	51.5	1.2	7.0	.....	2.4	0.2	1.6	336.9	1.1
Copper	366.1	5.1	.....	9.9	122.0	25.1	1.8	.2	.....	43.9	29.6	.....	3.9	.....	.....	.1	.1	124.3	.....
Aluminum	125.1	.....	.6	.4	.2	1.2	1.4	.1	.....	.....	5.1	1.2	.....	.....	2.2	.....	.7	111.1	1.0
Zinc	83.5	1.0	.....	1.6	9.0	3.5	.1	.....	.....	.....	2.9	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.5	64.7	.....
Lead	58.5	.8	.....	1.4	6.6	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	12.3	.....	2.7	.....	.....	.....	.2	34.6	.....
Brass and bronze	8.4	1.1	.....	.3	5.1	.8	.....	.....	.....	.....	.6	.....	.3	.....	.1	.....	.1	.....	.....
Nickel	6.3	.3	.....	.....	3.6	1.7	.1	.....	.....	.2	.2	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.1
Tin	1.8	1.1	.....	.....	.....	.6	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Other, including precious metals	20.1	.4	.1	.....	4.7	11.5	.2	.....	.....	.2	.8	.....	.....	.....	.1	.....	.....	2.2	.....

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in the past the United States established a domestic ceiling price of 27½ cents on imported copper and copper produced from imported concentrates in July 1951 and marked the price of domestically produced copper at 24½ cents. The prices for lead and zinc of 17 and 17½ cents, respectively, were maintained until October 1951, as a result, first of voluntary price stabilization and, later, the fixing of price ceilings. On October 2, 1951, the price of zinc was increased from 17½ to 19½ cents and of lead from 17 to 19 cents, and a prohibition was placed on the importation of these metals above these prices.

The prices quoted above cannot be considered as representing a world price for any of these metals. Prices of 55 to 60 cents for copper, 45 cents for zinc, and 25 cents for lead were paid for a part of the supplies sold internationally.

In other words, we were giving dollars to the other countries and they were going into the open market of the world and paying as high as 55 and 60 cents for copper. They were using American dollars and paying 45 cents for zinc and 25 cents for lead.

We have authorized in the period April 3, 1948, through December 31, 1951, procurement of $366,100,000 for copper, $125,100,000 for aluminum, $83,500,000 for zinc, and $58,500,000 for lead.

These materials have been bought in the world market; in the case of copper, a large part of it from Latin America. Our dollars have been used to run up the world price to our own disadvantage. This also means that MSA dollars furnished by the taxpayer does not procure as much material as they would if the GSA did the actual procurement and there was only one place where dollars could be secured, that is, in this country, not in foreign countries.

I hope the Senator from Texas will take the amendment to conference. It is a very important amendment. It would provide more material if we bought all the products rather than having them purchased with our dollars, when we have price control or allotment of materials.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall take the amendment to conference. That is as far as I can go.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and myself, I send to the desk an amendment which I am offering by request. It is a provision which was embodied in an act recently passed by the House of Representatives, and has to do with setting up an international finance corporation to increase the participation of private-enterprise investment in developing the resources of certain areas, and so forth. I shall send the amendment to the desk to be stated. I understand that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations is willing to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator from New Jersey tell us a little more about the amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 13, it is proposed to insert the following:

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION

SEC. 535. In order to increase the participation of private enterprise and investment in developing the resources of the areas in which assistance is authorized by this act and to mobilize local capital for such development and investment, such amount as may be required, but not to exceed $100,000,000 of the funds made available for assistance to further military production, economic and technical assistance under the provisions of this act may be utilized for the purpose of subscribing to the capital of an international finance corporation: *Provided*, That whenever the Director for Mutual Security determines to so utilize such funds he shall forthwith notify the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committees on Banking and Currency of the Senate and of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. How would the amendment coordinate the activities of the proposed corporation with the International Bank, the Monetary Fund, and other existing commitments?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I have difficulty in answering that question, inasmuch as I submitted the amendment by request, in collaboration with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

However, it is clear that the amendment does not call for any further appropriations of funds; it would merely call for assistance to private capital in those areas.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield further?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If the activities conducted pursuant to the amendment would not parallel present activities or would not interfere with them, then I suggest that at least the amendment would open the door to a very large subject which should be considered by the Senate before it agrees to enter that field. In other words, I suggest that the amendment in its present status should not go to conference.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. A similar amendment has been included in the bill which was passed by the House of Representatives; and the amendment is along the lines of the recommendations of the Rockefeller Commission, which had experience in connection with dealings with South America.

The amendment would not require the appropriation of additional sums, but would simply permit the Administrator to set up a corporation of the kind proposed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder how the amendment would foster or help private enterprise, inasmuch as under the amendment a Government corporation would be handling the funds.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The operation would be a banking operation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the amendment contain any provision that the money shall be used only in free-enter-

prise systems, so that it would foster them; or would the money be used for exactly the same purposes as those provided for in other parts of the bill which really foster socialism, inasmuch as the money would go to the governments themselves?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No; the amendment distinctly provides that the purpose is to foster private operation and private investment. I do not think the amendment could be used in any other connection. The amendment is permissive in nature; and if such activities were engaged in they would have to be reported to the specified committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Mr. FERGUSON. However, would there be any way by which the congressional committees could stop such activities if they were opposed to them? Does not the amendment simply provide for the making of a report, at which time it would be too late to stop the activities? Is not that the way the amendment reads?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to have the proviso of the amendment read again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proviso will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That whenever the Director for Mutual Security determines to so utilize such funds he shall forthwith notify the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committees on Banking and Currency of the Senate and of the House of Representatives.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me at this point?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall yield to the Senator from Colorado after the Senator from Michigan has concluded his questions.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I understand the proviso which has just been read to mean that at the time when the report was made or the notification was given to the specified committees, the action would already have been taken, and thus the only effect of the proviso would be to have notice of the activity given to the committees mentioned in the amendment. In short, they would simply be notified of what had already been done. Under those circumstances, any defect in the activity would not be cured.

Furthermore, if an amendment of this sort is already in the House bill, this provision, if now adopted by the Senate as an amendment, could not be taken to conference.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think it could be taken to conference in order to correct any errors.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, under the circumstances, the way to get the amendment to conference is to leave it out of the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, because once the amendment is added to the bill, it will have been adopted by both Houses, and thus will not be a proper subject for a conference.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield.

Mr. IVES. Will the Senator from New Jersey be willing to substitute the words "obtain the consent of" for the words "forthwith notify"? Such a change would be a change in the terminology of the amendment, and thus would result in giving the conferees something they could consider.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The suggestion made by the Senator from New York is a very good one, and fits in with the suggestion made by the Senator from Michigan. So I shall be very glad to accept that suggestion, with the result that the amendment then can be taken to conference.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey modify the amendment accordingly?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am very glad to modify the amendment by inserting the words "obtain the consent of", as a modification of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment as modified will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION

Section 535. In order to increase the participation of private enterprise and investment in developing the resources of the areas in which assistance is authorized by this act and to mobilize local capital for such development and investment, such amount as may be required, but not to exceed $100,000,000 of the funds made available for assistance to further military production, economic, and technical assistance under the provisions of this act may be utilized for the purpose of subscribing to the capital of an international finance corporation: *Provided*, That whenever the Director for Mutual Security determines to so utilize such funds he shall obtain the consent of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committees on Banking and Currency of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, should not the words in the proviso be "consent to use such funds"? In other words, should not the use of the funds be directly referred to at that point?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I accept that modification, and now ask that the amendment as further modified be read.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, before that is done, I suggest that if consent is to be obtained, it should be obtained before the action is taken, not after it is taken.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I now suggest that the word "first" be included in the amendment, as a modification of it, so that at that point the amendment will read:

He shall first obtain the consent of.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Obtaining the consent of the committees specified in the amendment might land a certain element of safety and greater consideration, but it would not change the principle involved.

In this respect we would be embarking upon a most important undertaking. I do not believe it should be gone into without hearings and without very thorough debate on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course the amendment would be in conference.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in view of the points which have been raised and in view of the fact that I have submitted the amendment by request, and after consultation with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and in view of the further fact that such an amendment already is included in the House bill, I think it is wise to withdraw the amendment at this time; and I now do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 13. (a) No economic, financial, or military assistance shall be provided out of any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated to carry out the purposes of any act to provide economic, financial, or military assistance to foreign countries, to any country which exports or knowingly permits the exportation of, to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including Communist China and Communist North Korea), arms, armament, or military matériel, or articles or commodities (1) which the Secretary of Defense shall have certified to the head of the agency administering the program under which such assistance is extended are likely to be used in the manufacture of arms, armament, or military matériel, or (2) shipment of which to the Soviet block is embargoed, or would be refused export licenses, by the United States in the interest of national security; and the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized and directed to make such certification with respect to any article or commodity of the nature or class described.

(b) After the forty-fifth day following the date of enactment of this act, no country shall be eligible for economic, financial, or military assistance under any act providing economic, financial, or military assistance to foreign countries, unless within 30 days prior to the date on which such assistance is to be provided such country shall have certified to the United States that it has not, subsequent to the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this act, exported, or knowingly permitted the exportation of, arms, armament, military matériel, articles, or commodities, which are subject to the provisions of subsection (a) to any of the countries referred to in such provisions: *Provided*, That such certification shall not relieve the Director of Mutual Security or any other officer of the United States Government of responsibility for enforcing the foregoing provisions of this section.

(c) The Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 is repealed effective on the forty-fifth day following the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, on April 19, 1950, I presented to the Senate evidence that our allies in Western Europe were

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

making large shipments of war materials to Russia and her satellites.

Despite repeated efforts by many of us in the Senate, despite the fact that more than 106,000 American boys have been killed or wounded in Korea, these shipments have been permitted to continue.

On May 9, 1951, I submitted, on behalf of other Senators and myself, an amendment to the third supplemental appropriation bill of 1951. That amendment provides that American economic or financial assistance shall be automatically shut off to any country which continues to sell war materials to Russia and her satellites, including Red China.

On May 10, 1951, the Senate approved this amendment unanimously.

Certain changes were made in the conference committee, including the insertion of a provision permitting the United States National Security Council, of which the President of the United States is chairman, to make exceptions "in the security interest of the United States."

Both the Senate, and the House approved the conference report, and it became Public Law 45, Eighty-second Congress.

In taking this action, Congress made clear that it was dissatisfied with the steps which had been taken to halt the flow of war goods to the enemy.

On June 16, 1951, Congress and the American people were shocked and amazed to learn that the National Security Council had suspended entirely the operation of the war-goods-ban amendment.

Later, the Congress repealed the so-called Kem amendment and replaced it with the weak, discretionary Battle Act—Public Law 213, Eighty-second Congress.

The Battle Act prohibits the sending of American assistance to a country which permits shipments of arms, ammunition, implements of war, and atomic-energy materials to countries of the Soviet bloc.

But it permits the President to make exceptions in the case of countries which permit shipments of items other than arms, ammunition, implements of war, and atomic-energy materials.

Earlier this year, the President made use of this "escape clause" in the Battle Act to permit the Government of the Netherlands to ship some $200,000 worth of oil-drilling equipment to Communist Poland, and still be eligible to receive aid from the United States.

According to an article in the Christian Science Monitor of April 23, 1952:

> The President made his decision to ignore the Dutch action on recommendation of W. Averell Harriman, Mutual Security Administrator.

The article went on to say that "this is the first of a series of exceptions that the President is expected to make under his right through the 'escape clause.'"

The Battle Act was approved October 26, 1951.

Since that time, countries of Western Europe have continued to sell large quantities of such items as iron, steel, and rubber to the Reds.

American boys in Korea have continued to fall from Communist shells and bullets.

There can be no doubt that many of the very guns which fire those shells and bullets have been made from materials furnished by our allies.

Our allies continue to take the cash.

Our boys continue to take the casualties.

Mr. President, the failure—yes, the refusal—of President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson to halt this bloody trade makes up one of the most shocking chapters in American history.

There is scarcely any material more vital in modern warfare than rubber. Tanks, planes, guns, trucks—all require rubber.

I have learned that during the first 3 months of 1952 Great Britain sold $49,749,171 worth of rubber to the U. S. S. R. alone. Nearly $50,000,000 worth of rubber from Britain to Russia during the first 3 months of 1952 alone.

There can be no doubt that of the traitorous shipments of rubber from Britain to Russia, some of the rubber found its way into weapons of war used in Korea.

On March 10, 1952, an Associated Press dispatch from Tokyo appeared which read as follows:

> A hitherto secret report in Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway's headquarters asserts: "The main source of supply for present Chinese Communist forces * * * in Korea * * * is from Soviet-furnished material."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the text of this dispatch taken from the Kansas City Star of March 10, 1952.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the text of the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VAST ARMS FLOW—RUSSIAN SUPPORT OF COMMUNIST FORCES IN KOREA REVEALED BY SECRET U. N. REPORT—MANY MODERN SOVIET TYPES—MAIN SOURCES OF SUPPLIES ARE THE U. S. S. R. AND SATELLITE AREAS, RIDGWAY IS INFORMED—SOME HOWITZERS COMPARABLE TO THOSE OF THE ALLIES—VARIETY OF SMALL WEAPONS

TOKYO, March 10.—A hitherto secret report in Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway's headquarters asserts: "The main source of supply for present Chinese Communist forces in Korea is from Soviet-furnished matériel."

Although the United Nations command never has announced the capture of a Russian soldier, virtually all of the equipment now in use by the North Korean army and the Chinese Communist forces is Russian-made.

JETS FROM RUSSIA

So, too, is the swift jet interceptor plane, the MIG–15, which patrols northwest Korea from Manchurian bases.

A staff officer at General Ridgway's headquarters today made available to the Associated Press today the report containing a list of captured guns, vehicles, and other war machinery which the Soviets have turned over to the North Korean and Chinese Communist armies.

Red staff officers drafting truce supervision terms nominated Russia as a neutral observer.

"With the exception of a small amount of Japanese matériel left over from the Japanese occupation of Korea and Manchuria and matériel captured from United Nations forces in Korea, the North Korean army has been entirely equipped and/or reequipped with Soviet matériel," the intelligence report said.

"Recent reports have shown that the main source of supply for present Chinese Communist forces equipping and/or reequipping of units in Korea, or earmarked for Korea, is from Soviet-furnished matériel.

ALL TYPES OF ARMS

"This Soviet-furnished matériel included tanks, self-propelled armored artillery, trucks, artillery, AA guns (antiaircraft), machine guns, and various types of small arms. While some part of this ordnance has been manufactured in North Korea proper, the vast majority has come from either Russia or her satellite countries.

"All of the ordnance matériel listed herein has been captured and positively identified in Korea during present hostilities.

"In the armored field of Soviet matériel identified in Korea, there are the BA-64 armored car, the SU-76 self-propelled gun, and the T-34 tank.

"The T-34 tank is armed with an 85-millimeter gun and was the principal combat vehicle of the U. S. S. R. throughout World War II, the SU-76 is a 75-millimeter gun mounted on a tank chassis providing a mobile artillery support, and the BA-64 is a lightly armored, highly mobile vehicle generally used for reconnaissance purposes."

ARTILLERY AND TANKS

"Soviet field artillery, antiaircraft guns, and antitank guns have been well represented in matériel captured in Korea by U. N. forces.

"These have included 45-millimeter and 57-millimeter antitank guns; 37-millimeter and 85-millimeter antiaircraft guns, and 76-millimeter howitzers, 76-millimeter guns and 122-millimeter howitzers in the field artillery group.

"The 45-millimeter antitank guns are outdated against modern armor and are useful only in close support of infantry in opposing lightly armored vehicles and against dugouts, etc.

"The 57-millimeter antitank gun is still effective against armor at very close ranges.

"Both the 37-millimeter and the 85-millimeter antiaircraft guns are of recent enough design and manufacture to be effective antiaircraft weapons.

"The 76-millimeter gun model 1902/30 is of antiquated design but has been effective in Korean terrain; the 76-millimeter howitzer model 1927 and 76-millimeter gun model 1938, while outdated, have been more than adequate for close infantry support purposes; the 122-millimeter howitzer model 1938 is a very effective weapon used generally for the same missions as the United States 155-millimeter howitzer and the 122-millimeter howitzer model 1931/37 is a powerful long-range weapon normally employed in roles comparable to those of the United States corps artillery."

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] on March 25, 1952, raised the question as to why, since rubber is an item of vital strategic importance, the President has permitted aid to continue to Britain engaged in selling rubber to Russia.

The Senator from Maryland said:

> One important fact in this connection should be kept in mind. That is, that raw rubber would seem to be an item "of primary strategic significance" as laid down in title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, under the heading of "War materials."
>
> However, while title I specifically includes petroleum and transportation materials of strategic value as items that cannot be sent by countries sharing in the financial aid from this country, rubber has not been included in the list. Under what consideration it could have been omitted, when it seems to be so absolutely essential to the movement of all types of mechanized armaments, is difficult to understand.

Members who will recall the discussions on the floor of the Senate last year in the Congress will remember the paragraph in the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 which provides, and I quote:

"It is further declared to be the policy of the United States that no military, economic, or financial assistance shall be supplied to any nation unless it applies an embargo on such shipments to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination."

Then the Senator from Maryland continued:

It would certainly seem to circumvent the directly expressed purpose of the congressional act if the responsible authorities of our country continue to regard rubber as of so little strategic significance as to neglect now to include it in the prohibited list of items that may not be shipped to our Communist enemies.

Every mother and father, every wife and child whose close relatives are serving in Korea will disagree with any official dictum which would permit continuing shipments of vitally needed rubber to our Communist foes to be used against our own men and their companions in arms from other countries. It is a matter that warrants the thorough interest of every Member of Congress, and demands immediate reconsideration by those who are responsible for designation of strategic materials which may not be shipped to our enemies.

Rubber is not the only vital material Britain is making available to the Russians.

The largest electric motors for marine propulsion in the world are being built in Britain for Russia. They weight about 100 tons each.

Our own defense effort has been retarded by a shortage of machine tools. Yet during the first 3 months in 1952 Britain sold $1,541,280 worth of machine tools to Russia.

Britain is not the only country receiving aid from the United States and in turn selling strategic materials to the Reds.

According to the latest information available, France continues to sell iron and steel to Russia.

On January 20, 1952, it was announced that an on-the-spot investigation made by the Subcommittee on Export Controls and Policies that "strategic products, urgently needed by Communist forces, are still flowing to the iron curtain countries through Europe's free ports."

There are strong indications that, unless Congress takes prompt and effective action, the flood of strategic materials from Western Europe to the Reds may increase in the coming months. Startling events transpired at the Moscow economic conference a couple of months ago.

According to an Associated Press dispatch which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of April 14, 1952, datelined Moscow, April 14:

Estimates of new East-West trade which may result from the Soviet-sponsored international economic conference here grew by leaps and bounds today.

The dispatch continues:

The conference ended Saturday but many delegates lingered on in the Soviet capital, reportedly continuing private negotiations.

A source with the British delegation predicted Britain may get 50,000,000 pounds sterling ($140,000,000) worth of new business with Russia, China, and other Communist nations.

Another informant said Red China's delegation alone has made deals to exchange some $80,000,000 worth of goods with western nations, including a swap of $11,000,000 worth of silk, tea, oil, and manganese for metals, machinery, medical equipment, and consumer goods from France.

The British and Chinese last week signed contracts for exchange of $56,000,000 worth of textiles and other goods.

Another member of the British delegation said Harold Wilson, president of the board of trade in Britain's last labor government, soon would visit the Soviet Union to survey possibilities of British purchase of Russian timber and other products.

Mr. Wilson while in the British cabinet negotiated several trade pacts between his government and the Soviets.

Constantine Brown, in an article entitled "Allies Are Falling Into Red Trap," had this to say about a deal between the French and Chinese Reds:

According to reports from Moscow, the Chinese Reds have concluded a trade agreement with French businessmen present at the international economic conference held in the Red capital this month. The total value of goods to be bought and sold does not exceed $18,000,000. But it is interesting to note what this exchange will provide for each country.

The Chinese have undertaken to sell France silks, tea, animal products, handicraft goods, and other such products. The French businessmen whose deal has to be confirmed by their government will provide the Chinese with machinery of publicly unspecified type, medical supplies, and medical raw materials. This is believed to mean that the French pharmaceutical industry will send to China the ingredients necessary to manufacture medical products.

If the reported details of the French-Chinese trade agreement represent the type of deal which the Reds are offering to the business-hungry west our allies are falling into a serious trap. They will be providing the nations behind the iron curtain with products essential to increase their military capabilities. The Red armies in Korea have suffered less from the lack of war materials than scarcity of medical supplies. The French now will fill that vacuum. There is also a shortage of materials to make both summer and winter uniforms. The British manufacturers seem eager to provide that. In exchange the Red Governments will undertake to supply the Western Europeans with totally unnecessary stuff which can be of little help in improving their national economies.

Yes, Mr. President, our allies will fill the gap.

Mr. President, it is now more plainly evident than ever before that if the sales of strategic materials by our allies to the Reds is to be halted, Congress must do it.

Mr. Truman has refused to act.

Mr. Acheson has refused to act.

The Battle Act has proved ineffective.

What we need is an iron-clad law which says in no uncertain terms that no nation can continue to receive assistance from the United States so long as it continues to sell strategic materials to the Reds.

That is exactly what the amendment I have proposed is designed to accomplish.

Mr. President, more than 106,000 American sons have been killed or wounded in Korea.

Who knows how many more will appear on the casualty lists?

The refusal of the President to halt the shameful, outrageous shipments of war materials to the enemy may be part of the strategy of so-called "limited war."

But for the boys on the bleak shell-seared ridges in Korea, there is no limit to the sufferings they must endure.

Surely the American Congress will not fail them.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the statement of the Senator from Missouri, with particular reference to the revelations as to the extent of shipments of rubber. The Senator from Missouri made a very clear-cut statement with respect to the subject, and I should like to ask whether he also has been confronted with the question as to the increase in shipments to Communist-dominated areas from Great Britain, in comparatively recent months. For example, if the Senator will permit me to make one reference——

Mr. KEM. I appreciate the contribution of the Senator from Maryland, who has made such an important contribution to the study of this subject.

Mr. O'CONOR. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

I wanted to ask if the Senator found anything to confirm the view held at the time of the compilation of our report, when we were advised that Great Britain had been shipping a very small amount of rubber at or about the time of the Korean outbreak, but in the latter part of 1951 and in April of 1952, shipments increased very much indeed. For example, in June 1950, shipments of rubber amounting to 18 tons increased to approximately 2,000 tons. In January of the present year, according to information submitted to us, the shipments increased to 12,000 tons in 1 month. I should like to ask the Senator if that corresponds with the information which he has?

Mr. KEM. Yes; it corresponds exactly. I think the fact that the trade is continuing is the most alarming feature of the whole situation.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. O'CONOR. May I ask the Senator another question in that regard?

Mr. KEM. Certainly.

Mr. O'CONOR. Has the Senator seen or heard of any justification or explanation of why shipments in such great quantities have gone forward in recent years while hostilities in Korea were at their height?

Mr. KEM. If there has been any explanation coming from the State Department, the President, or the National Security Council, it has escaped my notice.

Mr. O'CONOR. Is it not also true that if such shipments are not eliminated, the entire purpose of the act may be frustrated or nullified?

Mr. KEM. I think that is exactly what is taking place. The Battle Act is so innocuous that it apparently has

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

no effect of slowing up the trade, because the trade has increased instead of decreased. So, on the record, the Battle Act has been ineffective in accomplishing the purpose for which it was designed.

Mr. O'CONOR. I know the Senator from Missouri has followed this matter over a longer period of time than I have.

Mr. KEM. I appreciate the contribution of the able Senator from Maryland.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Missouri whether he feels the amendment will put a stop to another grave abuse which our subcommittee found, namely, the great number of shipments from so-called free ports, and transit trade. Does the Senator feel that all shipments of strategic materials will be covered by his amendment?

Mr. KEM. That is the purpose of the amendment. I hope the language is sufficiently broad to accomplish that purpose. The purpose is to stop the sending by our allies in Western Europe of strategic war materials behind the iron curtain.

Mr. O'CONOR. I may say to the Senator from Missouri that the committee found the situation to be disgraceful, and we think that certainly some positive action ought to be taken about it.

Mr. KEM. I may say to the Senator from Maryland that I do not think anybody who has looked into the situation has received any other information about it. We have been toying with the situation. We passed an innocuous act, one that was not going to hurt the feelings of our allies. Instead of decreasing this scandalous business, the trade has increased. It seems to me it is time for Congress to take hold of the situation vigorously and to pass a law that will accomplish the objective which should be accomplished.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KEM. I do not wish to yield at the moment; I should first like to have my request for the yeas and nays acted upon.

Mr. MAYBANK. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri has asked for the yeas and nays. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time will be up in 1 minute.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. What was the showing with respect to the demand for the yeas and nays?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays were ordered by a sufficient show of hands.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand there must be 20 percent of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There was a sufficient number. Does the Senator wish to use any of his time to speak on the amendment?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

The VICE PRESIDENT. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield 10 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, do I understand that all the time on the other side has been used?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Has the other side used all its 30 minutes?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is substantially so. The Senator from Missouri yielded to other Senators for the purpose of making insertions in the RECORD.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I realize that. I wanted to know, because of the outcry for a vote. Some Members on this side of the aisle wish to say something on this amendment, as under the rules we are given the right to do.

Mr. President, I shall take but a very few minutes. The able Senator from Missouri on the floor of the Senate has frequently presented a similar amendment to various Senate bills. At times it has been adopted and at other times it has been defeated. I think we are all familiar with it, and understand what the Senator is seeking to do. I wish to say that none of us can quarrel with the objective he seeks. I believe all of us desire to have the purpose accomplished. But, Mr. President, this amendment was offered in various forms to different bills and, I believe, was adopted at least two different times in, perhaps, different language. We know that considerable trouble was encountered in enforcement.

Finally, there came before us last year the Battle Act, which was initiated in the House after long and careful bipartisan study. It was recommended to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives in a strong bipartisan report, and was recommended by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House to the House of Representatives itself by a strong bipartisan vote. I do not recall that there was a single dissenting vote in the committee which reported the bill to the House of Representatives. The bill was considered by the House and was passed.

The bill then came to the Senate and was considered in our committee. We took it up in the Senate last October, debated it at length and had a yea-and-nay vote on it. The Senate passed the bill and it became law on October 26, 1951.

I have not seen a report on the administration of the Battle Act. I do not know whether a report has yet been issued. But, Mr. President, I submit that the Battle Act has not yet had time to show whether it is effective. If it is not effective, I am in favor of scrapping it. If it does not accomplish the purpose for which it was passed, I would be in favor of providing something else that would do so. However, the Battle Act was passed after long and careful study, and I believe it provides a proper way of getting the job done.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able Senator from Alabama if it is not a fact that, as has been stated by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], since the Battle Act became effective, sales of war materials by the countries of Western Europe, who are our allies, to countries behind the iron curtain, have increased in alarming proportions?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I heard the statement made by the able Senator from Maryland. I am certain he and his committee made proper findings of what has been taking place. But I submit that the Battle Act has not been on the statute books long enough to receive a fair trial. I submit that we cannot at this time say whether the administration of the Battle Act has been sufficiently long to enable us to determine whether it can be effective. I believe it can be effective.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have only 10 minutes. The Senator had 30 minutes. But I will yield for a question.

Mr. KEM. I yielded much of my time to Members on the other side.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; a minute and a half and another minute, a total of 2½ minutes. I will correct my statement and say that the Senator from Missouri had 27½ minutes.

Mr. KEM. Does not the Senator from Alabama believe we should profit by experience? We have had an opportunity to weigh the Battle Act in the balance and have found it wanting.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No. I will agree with the first part of the statement. Certainly we should profit by experience, but I say we ought to gather the experience first. We have not had time to gather the experience from the administration of the Battle Act thus far.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator from Alabama know how many American boys have been killed since the enactment of the Battle Act?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. I heard the Senator refer to that point two or three times in the course of his remarks today, but it has nothing to do with the Battle Act. The Battle Act was passed for the purpose of stopping trade in goods which we did not want sold.

I noticed that the Senator from Missouri in his statement talked about the amount of trade with the countries of Western Europe. The Senator will remember that different listings were permitted to be made under the Battle Act. It is entirely possible that some trade has gone on. We have recognized the necessity for the trade. For instance, there was the case of the difficulty of trade between Denmark and Poland. That example could be multiplied dozens of times. Denmark wanted coal; it had to have coal. We cut them off from selling their products in this country under section 104 of the Defense Production Act. They could not get coal here because they could not sell their products and get dollars with which to buy coal. They could buy coal in Poland, and they could buy it with soft currency; but Poland in return required that they trade with her. If the Senator from Missouri were to follow his argument to the logical conclusion, Denmark would be forced from the western orbit into the eastern orbit, in order to find a living for her people. That is the logical conclusion to which this type of legislation would lead, if pushed to the extreme to which the Senator from Missouri apparently would push it.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator from Alabama understand that the Senator from Missouri wishes to apply this amendment to any but strategic war materials?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I hope he does not; but in talking about trade with those countries, he did not limit it to strategic war materials.

Mr. KEM. The only trade I mentioned was in war materials.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Battle Act recognizes that very thing, and makes that distinction. The Senator from Missouri may recall that the Battle Act first sets up a list of absolutely prohibited materials. Then it sets up a list of questionable materials, but materials which may be let in under certain conditions. All the other things constitute trade about which we do not care so much.

Mr. President, I shall not take more of the time of the Senate. I simply wish to make this point: We passed the Battle Act just before Christmas. There has not been time enough to try it out. It is supposed to do a certain job. It is an act which received the most careful study and consideration by the proper committees in both Houses of Congress, and was passed after careful debate, on a yea-and-nay vote in the Senate. I do not recall whether there was a yea-and-nay vote in the House or not, but there was a yea-and-nay vote in the Senate, and the measure was passed by the Senate. I say that we ought to allow it to work.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], covering most of the amendments offered today. I do not know how he would vote on this amendment. I therefore vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Conference of the International Council for Christian Leadership at The Hague.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—40

Aiken	Hunt	O'Conor
Bennett	Ives	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Butler, Md.	Kem	Smathers
Butler, Nebr.	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Malone	Taft
Case	Martin	Thye
Cordon	Maybank	Watkins
Dirksen	McCarthy	Welker
Dworshak	Millikin	Williams
Ferguson	Morse	Young
Hendrickson	Mundt	
Hickenlooper	Nixon	

NAYS—32

Anderson	Hayden	McKellar
Benton	Hennings	Monroney
Clements	Hill	Moody
Connally	Hoey	Neely
Douglas	Holland	Pastore
Eastland	Humphrey	Robertson
Ellender	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Frear	Kilgore	Sparkman
Fulbright	Lehman	Stennis
George	Long	Underwood
Green	McFarland	

NOT VOTING—24

Bricker	Gillette	McClellan
Byrd	Jenner	McMahon
Cain	Kefauver	Murray
Carlson	Kerr	Russell
Chavez	Knowland	Seaton
Duff	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Ecton	Magnuson	Tobey
Flanders	McCarran	Wiley

So Mr. KEM's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. I ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, line 9, it is proposed to strike out the quotation marks at the end thereof and insert between lines 9 and 10 the following:

SEC. 537. (a) Insofar as practicable and to the maximum extent consistent with the accomplishment of the purposes of this act, the Director for Mutual Security shall assist American small business to participate equitably in the furnishing of commodities and services financed with funds authorized under this act (other than funds authorized to carry out the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended) by making available or causing to be made available to suppliers in the United States and particularly to small independent enterprises, information, as far in advance as possible, with respect to purchases proposed to be financed with funds authorized under this act (other than funds authorized to carry out the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended), by making available or causing to be made available to prospective purchasers in the countries receiving assistance under this act information as to commodities and services produced by small independent enterprises in the United States, and by offering additional services to give small business better opportunities to participate in the furnishing of commodities and services financed with such funds.

(b) There shall be transferred to the Office of the Director for Mutual Security the Office of Small Business of the Mutual Security Agency headed by the Special Assistant for Small Business to carry out the provisions of subsection (a). Each report transmitted to the Congress under section 518 shall include a report of all activities under this section. The Technical Cooperation Administration shall adopt the procedure of notifying American business, particularly small independent enterprises, of procurement and other information as far in advance as possible through the facilities of the Mutual Security Agency. The Secretary of Defense shall assure that there is made available to suppliers in the United States, and particularly to small independent enterprises, information with respect to purchases made by the Department of Defense pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, such information to be furnished as far in advance as possible.

(c) Section 112 (i) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, is hereby repealed.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will be glad to take the amendment to conference, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is agreeable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "5-27-52-F," as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill, page 16, it is proposed to add a new section as follows:

SEC. 12. Except as otherwise provided by this act, all counterpart funds of local currencies created by section 115 (b) 6 of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and by acts supplementary or amendatory thereto shall be expended only on such projects of military assistance or defense support projects for which new funds authorized by this act would themselves be available. Officials charged with the administration of this act and with authority to approve withdrawals from the counterpart funds shall certify to compliance with the requirements of this section when such withdrawals are proposed for their approval.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE. Gladly.

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by me on the amendment and some excerpts from a staff memorandum prepared for the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, all relating to the use of counterpart funds.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does it include the modification?

Mr. CASE. It does.

There being no objection, the statement and excerpts from the staff memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE

CASE AMENDMENT ON COUNTERPART FUNDS

This amendment seeks to accomplish the third purpose in an amendment which I offered to the Mutual Security Act of 1951, last August 31. The other two parts or purposes of that amendment offered last year, I am happy to note, are now in substance a part of the bill before us.

To the bill last year, I offered an amendment the first two-thirds of which read:

"SEC. 506A. The President is advised that Congress looks with favor on proposals to form a federation of the free states of Europe. To advance this policy, the Administrator shall use his powers and duties under this act to—

"(1) encourage the economic integration of the free states of Europe;

"(2) assist in the formation of a continental police force to preserve the peace of Europe."

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations was very generous in his comment on my proposal at the time, but he opposed its adoption and it failed of passage by a vote of 25 to 41. I am pleased, therefore, to call attention to the fact that the bill now before us, introduced by the same chairman, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, starts off in its first substantive material by adding a new subsection to the act of 1951 with this language:

"(b) The Congress welcomes the recent progress in political federation, military integration, and economic unification in Europe and reaffirms its belief in the necessity of further vigorous efforts toward these ends as a means of building strength, establishing security, and preserving peace in the North Atlantic area.

"In order to provide further encouragement to such efforts, the Congress believes it essential that this act should be so administered as to support concrete measures for political federation, military integration, and economic unification of Europe."

I submit that the distinguished Senator could hardly have expressed the purpose and idea of my last year's amendment any more precisely had he used the words verbatim as I had proposed them. The purpose of the amendment up to that point has clearly been accepted and written into the bill now before us.

The final subparagraph of my amendment, last year, however, has not been wholly brought into this bill, and the purpose of the amendment now offered is to accomplish that in effect.

That final part of last year's amendment further required the Administrator to—

"(3) Require counterpart funds in local currencies from any country receiving aid under this act to be available to the United States for procurement of strategic materials, acquisition of holdings of claims of European nations in the Western Hemisphere: *Provided, however,* That counterpart funds received for aid assigned in turn by any country to the Federation of Free States of Europe shall be placed in the treasury of such Federation for expenditure as it may determine."

The purpose of that portion of the amendment proposed last year thus was twofold: first, to insure the maximum benefit from the counterpart funds without disbursement on projects either of no special concern to the United States or of little value; second, to make possible the use of counterpart funds in local currencies to be used for the projects of the Western European federation—call it whatever you may, Federation of Free States, Western Europe or North Atlantic Community, or NATO.

It is clear that under the language in the concluding part of this new subsection in the bill before us, and particularly in lines 17 to 19 on page 2, that appropriations made pursuant to what various acts may be used for—

"(c) the organization which may evolve from the current international discussions concerning a European defense community."

But it is not clear that counterpart funds must be so used.

I think counterpart funds could be so used to the extent that the countries providing them agreed to such use, but I do not find any directive to the Administrator to see that they are so used.

The only positive legislative directive on the use of counterpart funds, as far as I recall, is that first provided in the initial appropriation for ECA in 1948, the so-called 5 percent fund. Having proposed that earmarking of a percentage of the counterpart funds for the use of the United States in its expenses abroad or in the procurement of strategic materials, when I was a member of the House Appropriations Committee I have always been interested in how it was worked out.

The most complete and informative résumé on counterpart funds which has come to my attention is a study made by the staff of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and submitted to the chairman of that committee as a staff memorandum dated March 18, 1952. With the permission of the Senate, I shall place that memorandum in the RECORD at the conclusion of this statement.

Reference to the tables in that study will show that counterpart funds have been used for a wide variety of purposes. In all, something over $7,500,000,000 had been withdrawn from the local currency funds up to the end of last November. And of that amount, well over $2,200,000,000 had been used in "debt retirement."

Debt retirement—that simply means that the dollars which we put up to buy supplies shipped to foreign governments and turned over to them had provided those governments with their own local currencies to apply directly to reduction of their national debts in that amount.

If a measure had been proposed without any camouflage for the Congress to have appropriated money raised by the sale of bonds here at home, increasing our own national debt, for the direct purpose of reducing the national debt of other countries, surely it would not have passed or received many votes—or would it? Sometimes, one wonders.

Be that as it may, the time has come, it seems to me, when we should insist that these counterpart funds should be applied solely and directly to the specific purposes of the appropriations made directly by us for the purposes of mutual security.

Hence the amendment I now offer reads:

"SEC. 12. Except as otherwise provided by this act, all counterpart funds of local currencies created by section 115 (b) 6 of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and by Acts supplementary or amendatory thereto shall be expended only on such projects of military assistance or defense support projects for which new funds authorized by this act would themselves be available. Officials charged with the administration of this act with authority to approve withdrawals from the counterpart funds shall certify to compliance with the requirements of this section when such withdrawals are proposed for their approval."

It will be seen that what this amendment does is to say that the counterpart funds instead of being used for debt retirement, or for transportation facilities generally, or for housing or for mining of a nonstrategic character, hereafter shall be used solely and directly for the very purposes for which we authorize new dollars to be spent.

The tables in the staff memorandum previously cited indicate that about $2,000,000,000 have been deposited in the counterpart funds and were not withdrawn as of November last. Whatever the amount was then or now is or may become, the compliance with the amendment I have now proposed will add substantial amounts to the precise and specific purposes of military assistance and defense support with the same requirements as apply to the dollars that we appropriate directly.

To those who are familiar with the counterpart story, this should suggest that this amendment, so far from weakening the bill or its purposes in any respect, will greatly augment and aid them.

Indeed, when I appeared on the television Town Hall Meeting of the Air in New York City a few weeks ago, and expressed this idea, MSA Administrator Averell Harriman, the other party on the program, stated that it was the intent and policy of MSA that counterpart funds should be so used.

However, it was clear from examination of the purposes for which counterpart has been spent up to the end of November, at least, that this has not always been the case. This amendment seeks to insure that this will be the case from now on.

As I turned in the amendment the other day and in the printed form in which it appears on Senators' desks, it would have required that counterpart funds thus acquired for expenditure for the purposes of the program should be counted against the total funds provided by the bill before us. The battle on the amount of funds to be provided, however, has been fought already in this chamber today, several times, and seems to be resolved. So, I have dropped that sen-

tence from the amendment—the last sentence which would have read:

"Amounts authorized for expenditure under this act shall be reduced by the amounts so withdrawn from counterpart funds."

That sentence is not in the amendment as now formally offered and its elimination is part of the modification which the clerk noted when reading it a few minutes ago.

The other modification from the printed form is a change in the first clause. As intended to be proposed, the amendment carried a superfluous clause which read:

"After the effective date of this act, etc."

That has been changed to read:

"Except as otherwise provided by this act, etc."

That modification was made to avoid any conflict with the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], and other Senators, and heretofore adopted. It also related to use of a limited portion of the counterpart funds, and my amendment is not intended to injure his amendment in any way for I am sympathetic to its purposes and voted for it.

In this form, therefore, the amendment contributes to the strength and basic purposes of the bill, and I am hopeful that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations will indicate his favor for it, and that it will be accepted by the Senate and prevail in the conference with the House.

Today we stand committed to the principle of collective security in the North Atlantic community.

We have encouraged the countries of Western Europe to lay aside their rivalries and their fears in political, economic and military integration. We have asked Western Germany to join the federation of free states—an objective which I pleaded for in the report of the House Select Committee on Foreign Aid back in 1946 and 1947.

Today, those countries are coming together. Even as we work on this bill, ceremonies mark the signing of an epochal agreement toward this end.

Therefore, I shall vote for the bill on final passage, and I hope that it will embody those amendments which make it within our capacity and which concentrate its funds on fundamental purposes. Such action will be approved by the country and by posterity.

COUNTERPART—STAFF MEMORANDUM

MARCH 18, 1952.

To: Hon. JAMES P. RICHARDS, Chairman.
From: Roy J. Bullock, staff consultant.
Subject: Counterpart.

Counterpart is being accumulated under the Mutual Security Act of 1951, the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, the China Area Aid Act of 1950, the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, and the Act for International Development. This memorandum summarizes the situation and indicates certain problems which exist.

COUNTERPART SOURCES

Counterpart funds are local currencies deposited in a special account by countries which receive aid from the United States on a grant basis. Such deposits are currently being made under several acts, including section 115 (b) (6) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (Public Law 472, 80th Cong.); section 408 (b) and (d) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (Public Law 329, 81st Cong.); section 202 of the China Area Aid Act of 1950, as amended (title II, Public Law 535, 81st Cong.); section 407 (c) (1) of the act for international development, as amended (title IV, Public Law 535, 81st Cong.). The Mutual Security Act of 1951 (Public Law 165, 82d Cong.) contains a number of provisions which deal with counterpart primarily by amending the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948. New counterpart is being generated, however, only under section 205 in connection with assistance to refugees coming into Israel.

Counterpart balances still remain and are administered by the Mutual Security Agency. They were deposited under the joint resolution providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war (Public Law 84, 80th Cong., sec. 6) and the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 (Public Law 389, 80th Cong., sec. 5 (b)). The Yugoslav Emergency Relief Assistance Act of 1950 (Public Law 897, 81st Cong., sec. 3 (a)) required that local currency be made available for United States administrative and operating expense in Yugoslavia. The Government of Yugoslavia was required to use an equivalent amount of local currency for relief and charitable purposes when relief supplies were sold. This program is now completed.

REQUIREMENTS FOR DEPOSIT

The amounts of local currency required to be deposited varies with the provisions of the different acts. Paragraph (6) of subsection (b) of section 115 of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, provides in part for "placing in a special account a deposit in the currency of such country, in commensurate amounts and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed to between such country and the Government of the United States, when any commodity or service is made available through any means authorized under this title, and is furnished to the participating country on a grant basis."

The Administrator is given discretion to waive this requirement in the case of technical information and assistance and for the charges on ocean transportation to the extent that charges of United States-flag vessels exceed world market rates.

The China Area Aid Act of 1950 authorizes (sec. 202) economic assistance "in the general area of China * * * on such terms and conditions as the President may determine."

Reference is made in this section to the China Aid Act of 1948 (title IV, Public Law 472, 80th Cong.) which requires, in part, in section 403, that "aid provided under this title shall be provided under the applicable provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 which are consistent with the purposes of this title."

Title III of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, under which economic aid to "the general area of China" is now furnished, also follows this pattern and is interpreted as permitting the Director for Mutual Security to hold that certain provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act regarding counterpart are not fully applicable in the general area of China.

Local currency is deposited under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 in amounts determined by agreement with each country in order to cover the local currency expenses of the United States in administering the act in that country. The language of section 408 is, in part, as follows:

"(b) * * * Whenever possible the expenses of administration of this act shall be paid for in the currency of the nation where the expense is incurred, as provided in subsection (d)."

Subsection (d) provides:

"(d) Upon approval by the President, any currency of any nation received by the United States for its own use in connection with the furnishing of assistance under this act may be used for expenditures for essential administrative and operating expenses of the United States incident to operation under this act and the amount, if any, remaining after the payment of such expenses shall be used only for purposes specified by act of Congress."

Shipments to Yugoslavia, Italy, and France of materials, supplied under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act before enactment of the Mutual Security Act, required counterpart by agreement as a result of executive decision although there was no statutory requirement for such deposits. In other cases of this type no counterpart was required.

The Act for International Development makes no requirement for the deposit of counterpart although local currency is being deposited under this act. Subsection (c) of section 407 requires, in part, "that the country being assisted * * * pays a fair share of the cost of the program." Agreements are entered into with each country some of which provide for the deposit of local currency to be used in paying United States expenses. In general, counterpart deposits are required under this act whenever the sale of goods or services provided by the United States generates local currency.

The Mutual Security Act of 1951 contains a number of provisions dealing with counterpart, most of them amending sections of other acts. A new source of counterpart has emerged, however, in section 205, which authorizes $50,000,000 for the relief of refugees coming into Israel "under such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe." An agreement has been reached with Israel that the equivalent of $50,000,000 in local currency will be deposited in connection with assistance provided under this section.

Local currencies were deposited under Public Law 84, Eightieth Congress, section 6, which provided that when a government "sells such relief supplies for local currency (a) the amounts of such local currency will be deposited by it in a special account; (b) such account will be used within such country, as a revolving fund, * * * for relief and work-relief purposes, including local currency expenses of the United States incident to the furnishing of relief."

The unencumbered portions of this account were turned over to the ECA by paragraph (6) of subsection (b) of section 115 of the Economic Cooperation Act to be used as provided in that paragraph.

Public Law 389, Eightieth Congress, section 5 (b), provided for the deposit of local currency as follows: Each country was required "to make, when any commodity which is not furnished on terms of repayment in dollars is made available under this act, a commensurate deposit in the currency of such country in a special account under such general terms and conditions as may, in said agreement, be agreed to between such country and the Government of the United States, and to hold or use such special account for, and only for, such purposes as may be agreed to between such country and the Government of the United States."

The unencumbered balance of these funds was placed under the ECA by paragraph (6) of subsection (b) of section 115 of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948.

It should be noted that, of the laws under which local currencies are currently being deposited, the amounts are determined under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, the China Area Aid Act of 1950, and section 205 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 by the value of United States assistance provided on a grant basis. In the case of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act and the Act for International Development, the amount deposited is not directly determined by the amount of United States assistance given and ordinarily is related to the local currency expenses of the United States in connection with the program.

CONTROL OF COUNTERPART DEPOSITS

The Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, section 115 (b) (6), provides that counterpart will be deposited in special account, the use of which "shall be subject to agreement between such country and the administrator (now the Director for Mutual Security), who

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

shall act in this connection after consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems and the Public Advisory Board provided for in section 107 (a) (of the Economic Cooperation Act)."

This act also provides, section 115 (h), that "not less than 5 percent of each special local currency account * * * shall be allocated to the use of the United States Government for expenditure for"—strategic materials and—"other local currency requirements of the United States, including local currency"—expenses of "appropriate" committees of Congress. This 5 percent counterpart for United States use is transferred from time to time to an account in the name of the United States disbursing officer.

Local currency deposits under the China Area Aid Act are governed by the Economic Cooperation Act except that it has been held that the allocation of 5 percent of the counterpart for United States expenses is not an "applicable" provision in the general area of China. Local currencies are made available for United States expenses by the countries in the area in accordance with the bilateral agreements, but there is no general following of the 5 percent requirement as a firm minimum to be turned over to the United States regardless of United States requirements for administrative expenditures on this program. Amounts somewhat in excess of 5 percent have been required from the Belgian and Portuguese counterpart accounts for United States administrative expenses in those countries.

The arrangement required by the Economic Cooperation Act is being followed in the case of deposits of local currency under the Technical Cooperation Act. An account is opened under joint control from which transfers of the funds to be used for paying United States expenses are made from time to time to a United States account.

The counterpart made available under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act is deposited by each government to the credit of the United States at intervals as provided in the agreement in each country.

RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF COUNTERPART BY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The only legislative direction as to the use of counterpart by foreign countries is in the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended. These provisions are currently held to apply to countries coming under the China Area Aid Act. Local currencies deposited under other laws which are not turned over to the United States for operating expenses can be disposed of in any way the executive branch agrees with the depositing government.

The Economic Cooperation Act, as amended, authorizes the Director for Mutual Security to agree to the use of local currency deposits by foreign nations for the following purposes:

1. The furtherance of the European Payments Union or any other organization for the same purpose;
2. For "internal monetary and financial stabilization";
3. For "the stimulation of productive activity and the exploration for and development of new sources of wealth";
4. For the encouragement of emigration from countries having surplus manpower;
5. For "such other expenditures as may be consistent with" the purposes of this act;
6. Not less than the equivalent of $500,000,000 of counterpart deposited in Marshall plan or Mutual Defense Assistance Program countries must be used exclusively for "military production, construction, equipment, and materiel in such countries";
7. "Where practicable" for "defraying the transportation cost" of relief packages and supplies "from the port of entry of such country to the designated shipping point of consignee."

RESTRICTIONS ON UNITED STATES SHARE OF COUNTERPART

Only the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, directs the amount and use of counterpart turned over to the United States. Section 115 (h) provides that not less than 5 percent of the total in each country shall be allocated to the United States. The bilateral agreements with each country have in general provided that only 5 percent be allocated to the United States for United States requirements without limitation as to type of expenditures. The agreements also provide, however, that amounts necessary for United States administrative expenses under the ECA Act may be drawn down as required if the 5 percent amount is not enough. In "the general area of China" except for the Philippines there is no 5-percent provision and the amounts allocated to the United States are determined by mutual agreement.

A special situation exists in Germany whereby the United States in addition to the 5 percent of the local currency deposited may use GARIOA (Government and Relief in Occupied Areas) local currency account in meeting the responsibilities of the United States in the occupation of Germany. At the beginning of the ECA, assistance was supplied to Germany both by Defense and ECA, and separate local currency accounts were maintained. It was felt that the extraordinary needs of the United States in Germany for local currency made 5 percent inadequate. As a consequence an agreement was entered into with the Federal Republic of Germany that, in addition to a 5-percent allocation for United States use, an agreed percentage of the counterpart would be deposited in the GARIOA account. Legislative approval for this arrangement is provided in subsection (i) of section 114 of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended. Two major items, financed out of the GARIOA account, have been a contribution to the support of Berlin and to the public affairs program. At present 25 percent of the counterpart is allocated to this account. It is expected that this arrangement will continue as long as grant aid is given to Germany.

The use of the United States share of the counterpart is subject to the following directions and limitations:

1. Section 115 (b) (6) provides for payment of "local currency administrative and operating expenditures of the United States incident to operations under this title." On the other hand, subsection (h) of the same section authorizes allocation "for other local currency requirements of the United States, including local currency requirements of appropriate committees of the Congress."
2. Authorization is given for "expenditure for materials which are required by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in its own resources * * *" (sec. 115 (h)).
3. Such amounts "as may be necessary" shall be utilized "to give full and continuous publicity through the press, radio, and all other available media" of the "purpose, source, and character" of assistance "furnished by the American taxpayer" (sec. 115 (j)).
4. The United States share of the counterpart can be used outside the country in which it originates as provided by subsection (c) of section 523 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951.
5. Section 521 of the Mutual Security Act authorizes "any agency" of the United States Government to use any currency of any nation received by the United States for its own use in connection with United States aid for administrative and operating expenses under this act without reimbursement from any appropriation.

UTILIZATION OF COUNTERPART

The following tables show the amounts deposited and the use made of counterpart among the countries included in title I of the Mutual Security Act:

TABLE I.—*Status of European local currency counterpart accounts under Public Laws 472, 84, and 389, cumulative, Apr. 3, 1948–Nov. 30, 1951*

[Dollar equivalents of the local currency, in millions of dollars]

Country	Public Law 472					Total deposits from other public laws[1]	Total deposits available for country use
	Aid requiring counterpart deposits	Deposits	Adjusted dollar equivalents of deposits				
			Total	5 percent for use by the United States	95 percent for use by recipient country		
Total	9,924.5	9,728.7	9,006.5	433.2	8,573.3	717.1	9,290.4
Austria	789.5	737.7	609.9	27.3	582.6	112.1	694.7
Belgium-Luxemburg	22.0	18.5	18.1	1.1	17.0	----------	17.0
Denmark	250.0	240.2	208.0	10.5	197.5	----------	197.5
France	2,334.2	2,283.9	2,256.8	100.4	2,156.4	312.6	2,469.0
Germany (Federal Republic)	1,319.1	1,318.0	[2]1,128.1	59.3	1,068.8	116.0	1,184.8
Greece	803.0	774.8	728.3	34.6	693.7	2.7	696.4
Iceland	17.8	17.3	15.9	.8	15.1	----------	15.1
Ireland	17.1	14.6	14.5	.7	13.8	----------	13.8
Italy	905.6	936.4	905.8	46.0	859.8	173.4	1,033.2
Netherlands	857.5	844.8	772.8	37.8	735.0	----------	735.0
Indonesia[4]	114.9	114.0	47.8	5.3	42.5	----------	42.5
Norway	357.3	350.7	337.2	15.9	321.3	----------	321.3
Portugal	18.2	18.2	17.6	1.1	16.5	----------	16.5
Trieste	36.1	34.7	34.2	1.7	32.5	.3	32.8
Turkey	103.6	88.3	88.3	4.4	83.9	----------	83.9
United Kingdom	1,890.4	1,890.1	1,796.8	85.0	1,711.8	----------	1,711.8
Yugoslavia	28.2	26.5	26.4	1.3	25.1	----------	25.1

Footnotes at end of table.

FUNDS UTILIZED BY RECIPIENT COUNTRIES AND AVAILABLE BALANCES

[Dollar equivalents of the local currency, in millions of dollars]

Country	Total		Public Law 472		Public Laws 84 and 389		Balance available for approval
	Approved for withdrawal	Withdrawals	Approved for withdrawal	Withdrawals	Approved for withdrawal	Withdrawals	
Total	7,566.8	7,418.6	7,002.4	6,855.8	564.4	562.8	1,723.6
Austria	508.6	493.1	399.8	384.3	108.8	108.8	186.1
Belgium-Luxemburg	2.2	2.1	2.2	2.1			14.8
Denmark	118.9	118.9	118.9	118.9			78.6
France	2,453.3	2,453.3	2,140.7	2,140.7	312.6	312.6	15.7
Germany (Federal Republic)	895.8	894.6	895.8	894.6			289.0
Greece	360.4	337.5	360.4	337.5			236.0
Iceland	.9	.9	.9	.9			14.2
Ireland	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)			13.8
Italy	870.7	821.1	727.7	679.7	143.0	141.4	162.5
Netherlands	329.5	271.2	329.5	271.2			405.5
Indonesia [4]							42.5
Norway	200.9	200.9	200.9	200.9			120.4
Portugal	15.4	15.0	15.4	15.0			1.1
Trieste	29.6	29.4	29.6	29.4			3.2
Turkey	71.8	71.8	71.8	71.8			12.1
United Kingdom	1,708.8	1,708.8	1,708.8	1,708.8			3.0
Yugoslavia							25.1

[1] Includes only the unencumbered portions of deposits for which MSA is responsible for approving the utilization.
[2] Does not include the equivalent of $93.3 million transferred to the GARIOA counterpart account in Germany.
[3] Balance of GARIOA counterpart funds remaining after disbursements which have been requested by the United States. However, the United States has priority on use of this balance before any funds become available for use by Germany.
[4] Aid furnished from European program funds.
[5] Less than $50,000.

TABLE II.—*MSA/ECA approvals for withdrawal of European counterpart funds [1] available for country use, cumulative, Apr. 3, 1948–Nov. 30, 1951*

[Millions of dollars]

Country	Total approved for withdrawal	Purpose							
		Debt retirement	Agriculture	Extractive industries	Manufacturing	Transportation, communications, and utilities	Other production	Housing	Other purposes
Total	7,566.8	2,250.9	693.5	485.6	774.7	1,903.8	378.1	584.4	495.8
Austria	508.6	85.0	55.2	22.6	116.3	182.2	4.6	17.9	24.8
Belgium-Luxemburg	2.2		.2				2.0		
Denmark	118.9	88.3	2.7		2.4	2.6	20.7		2.2
France	2,453.3	171.4	233.5	340.6	248.5	1,036.9	128.1	278.9	15.4
Germany (Federal Republic)	895.8		67.6	100.3	207.9	253.4	45.5	62.5	158.6
Greece	360.4		47.2	3.3	13.9	64.1	45.3	59.7	126.9
Iceland	.9					.9			
Italy	870.7		110.3		121.7	296.3	114.1	77.3	151.0
Netherlands	329.5		166.4		56.5	13.7	2.5	88.1	2.3
Norway	200.9	200.9							
Portugal	15.4		3.6		.4	11.4			
Trieste	29.6		.3		.9	28.2	.2		
Turkey	71.8		6.5	18.8	6.2	14.1	13.5		12.7
United Kingdom	1,708.8	1,705.3					1.6		1.9

[1] Includes deposits under Public Law 472 and the equivalent of $564.4 million of counterpart funds deposited under Public Laws 84 and 389.

TABLE III.—*Status of United States (5 percent) portion of European counterpart funds under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 (Public Law 472) cumulative, Apr. 3, 1948–Nov. 30, 1951*

[Dollar equivalents of the local currency, in thousands of dollars]

Country	United States portion of deposits [1]	Obligations				Transfers to United States Treasury from MSA/ECA [2]	Other transfers [3]
		Total	Administrative	Strategic materials	Information and other		
Total	433,182	258,787	40,742	164,367	53,678	47,960	4,356
Austria	27,275	4,459	1,211		3,248	9,878	
Belgium-Luxemburg	1,079	542	491		51		
Denmark	10,487	3,153	815	1,662	676	1,705	
France	100,351	65,494	22,024	25,134	18,336	20,433	2,907
Germany (Federal Republic)	59,336	28,224	2,228	19,099	6,897	2,000	
Greece	34,561	4,776	1,849	1,493	1,034	4,667	
Iceland	807	94	90		4	308	
Ireland	731	250	216		34	25	
Italy	46,046	29,817	4,547	15,958	19,312	3,880	
Netherlands	37,836	12,673	1,072	10,498	1,103	3,026	
Indonesia [4]	5,305	3,648	453	3,173	22		
Norway	13,848	14,411	635	13,525	251	923	
Portugal	1,066	728	478	212	35	288	
Trieste	1,704	390	227		163	791	
Turkey	4,417	1,836	1,258	61	517		
United Kingdom	85,010	78,673	3,126	73,642	1,905		1,549
Yugoslavia	1,323	22	22			28	

[1] Includes deposits in excess of 5 percent of total counterpart deposits in Belgium and France.
[2] Includes transfers to other Government agencies.
[3] A temporary advance of French francs to Indochina and an expenditure of sterling to buy far-eastern currencies for United States programs in that area. Excludes temporary advances to MDAP and USIS.
[4] Aid furnished from European program funds.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Near East

Counterpart for programs financed under the Economic Cooperation Act in the title II area are found in Jordan and in Israel.

Jordan: As of February 29, 1952, there was due the equivalent of $1,253,085, of which none had been deposited and none utilized.

Israel: As of February 29, 1952, the equivalent of $140,000 was due and deposited.

Far East

Deposits and utilization of counterpart in the Far East are shown in the following tables:

TABLE IV.—*Status of Far East local currency counterpart funds, cumulative, June 5, 1950–Nov. 30, 1951*

[Dollar equivalents of the local currencies, in thousands of dollars]

Item	Total	Burma	China (Formosa)[1]	Indochina, Associated States	Philippines	Thailand
Total deposits[2]	74,424	2,492	54,631	10,383	6,218	700
Transferred for United States use	1,893	213	1,036		299	345
Available for country use	72,531	2,279	53,595	10,383	5,919	355
Total approved for withdrawal	41,827	514	27,302	[3] 11,156	2,668	187
Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries	11,183	12	7,520	1,250	2,329	72
Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction	12,950		12,950			
Transportation, power, and other public works	6,817	115	1,846	4,846		10
Military construction and material	3,599		3,599			
Public health	3,115	192	10	2,873		40
Public administration	1,603		534	883	186	
Emergency relief	772		15	604	153	
General engineering	708		707	1		
Education	623	47	110	415		51
Handicraft, manufactures, mining, and other industry	303		11	284		8
Technical assistance and other	154	148				6

[1] Excludes mainland deposits and proceeds of sales of goods safe havened at Hong Kong.
[2] Adjusted dollar equivalents of deposits.
[3] Approvals exceed deposits and are subject to later availability of funds.

NOTE.—In addition to the amounts shown in this table, Indonesia had deposited the equivalent of $1,500,000 which was the amount due on Dec. 31, 1951. None has been spent.

TABLE V.—*Status of Far East local currency counterpart funds for United States use, cumulative, June 5, 1950–Nov. 30, 1951*

[Dollar equivalents of the local currencies, in thousands of dollars]

Purpose	Country						
	Total	Burma	China (Formosa)	Indochina, Associated States	Indonesian Republic[1]	Philippines	Thailand
Total obligations	2,947	381	(2)	1,051	573	516	426
Administration	2,622	377	(2)	827	532	477	389
Information and other	325	4	(2)	224	21	39	37

[1] From ERP aid furnished while part of the Netherlands. Excludes the equivalent of $3,173 thousand expended for strategic materials.
[2] Includes the equivalent of $1,995 thousand transferred from local currency deposits under ERP.
[3] Not available.

Mutual defense assistance program

The status of local currency deposits under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act is shown in the following table:

TABLE VI.—*Status of mutual defense assistance program local currency (dollar equivalent), from inception of program through Dec. 31, 1951*

Country	Deposits	Obligations				Unobligated balance as of Dec. 31, 1951
		Other	Defense	State	Total	
United Kingdom:						
Fiscal year 1950				$231,066	$231,066	
Fiscal year 1951	$2,222,859		$554,497	700,922	1,255,419	
July–December 1951	308,815		309,819	339,088	648,907	
Total	2,531,674		864,316	1,271,076	2,135,392	$396,282
France:						
Fiscal year 1950	262,091		46,019	167,243	213,262	
Fiscal year 1951	1,169,375		403,670	351,087	754,757	
July–December 1951	789,539		244,526	245,159	489,685	
Total	2,221,005		694,215	763,489	1,457,704	763,301
Italy:						
Fiscal year 1950	160,000		20,823	125,378	146,201	
Fiscal year 1951	743,041		295,297	176,649	471,946	
July–December 1951	451,675		150,381	90,331	240,712	
Total	1,354,716		466,501	392,358	858,859	495,857
Denmark:						
Fiscal year 1950	166,280		15,830	67,060	82,890	
Fiscal year 1951	210,355	$852	143,200	84,976	229,028	
July–December 1951	133,913		64,337	43,081	107,418	
Total	510,548	852	223,367	195,117	419,336	91,212
Norway:						
Fiscal year 1950	$224,947		$7,770	$68,950	$76,720	
Fiscal year 1951	210,231	$483	172,394	92,538	265,415	
July December 1951	318,851		88,305	49,124	137,429	
Total	754,029	483	268,469	210,612	479,564	274,465
Belgium:						
Fiscal year 1950	335,000		19,690	95,073	114,733	
Fiscal year 1951	501,722	100,000	324,377	155,580	579,957	
July–December 1951	210,440		163,937	79,316	243,253	
Total	1,047,162	100,000	507,974	329,969	937,943	109,219
Netherlands:						
Fiscal year 1950	277,632		6,847	89,886	96,733	
Fiscal year 1951	249,342	1,351	105,655	85,373	192,379	
July–December 1951	249,211		106,541	43,310	149,851	
Total	776,185	1,351	219,043	218,569	438,963	337,222
Portugal:						
Fiscal year 1950						
Fiscal year 1951	184,429		13,218	100,223	113,441	
July–December 1951	160,804		65,397	61,983	127,380	
Total	345,233		78,615	162,206	240,821	104,412

TABLE VI.—*Status of mutual defense assistance program local currency (dollar equivalent), from inception of program through Dec. 31, 1951*—Continued

Country	Deposits	Obligations				Unobligated balance as of Dec. 31, 1951
		Other	Defense	State	Total	
Yugoslavia:						
Fiscal year 1950						
Fiscal year 1951	$65,000			$63,835	$63,835	
July–December 1951	28,000			43,931	43,931	
Total	93,000			107,766	107,766	[1] ($14,766)
Philippines:						
Fiscal year 1950						
Fiscal year 1951	9,000		$9,000		9,000	
July–December 1951	25,500					
Total	34,500		9,000		9,000	25,500
Thailand:						
Fiscal year 1950						
Fiscal year 1951	76,555			25,000	25,000	
July–December 1951	115,074		73,827	29,785	103,612	
Total	191,629		73,827	54,845	128,672	62,957
Indonesia:						
Fiscal year 1950						
Fiscal year 1951	$50,000			$2,589	$2,589	
July–December 1951				7,493	9,388	
Total	50,000		7,493	4,484	11,977	$38,023
Indochina:						
Fiscal year 1950						
Fiscal year 1951	231,162		68,963	91,126	160,089	
July–December 1951	634,773		216,148	73,110	289,258	
Total	865,935		285,111	164,236	449,347	416,588
Grand total	10,775,616	$102,686	3,697,931	3,874,727	7,675,344	3,100,272

[1] Transfer in process to cover over obligation. Expenditures availability not exceeded.

Prepared by Comptroller, Office of Director for Mutual Security, Feb. 18, 1952.

The balances of counterpart funds generated under authority of Public Laws 389 and 84

The following table gives by country the balances of counterpart funds generated under Public Laws 389 and 84, for the release and utilization of which ECA/MSA approval was (or is) required:

Country	Local currency	Dollar equivalents
		Millions
France	69 billion francs	312.6
Italy	106 billion lire	173.4
Austria	1,159 million schillings	112.1
Greece	269 million drachmas	[1]
Trieste	190 million lire	.3
Total		598.4

[1] Less than $50,000.

Of this amount, the withdrawal of the equivalent of $564,400,000 had been approved by ECA as of November 30, 1951, for purposes given in the following table:

Purpose and amount approved for withdrawal

Purpose	Dollar equivalents
	Millions
Debt retirement	72.5
Promotion of production	477.0
Agriculture	35.9
Coal mining	34.1
Manufacturing	21.4
Electric, gas, and power facilities	169.4
Railroads	129.6
Merchant and fishing fleet	29.6
Other transportation	11.2
Technical assistance	4.0
Undistributed	41.8
Other purposes	14.9
Housing	5.9
Public buildings	4.4
Special relief projects	2.3
Tourism	2.1
Undistributed	.2
Total	564.4

This leaves a remainder after withdrawals of $34,000,000, the status of which is as follows:

Country	Status	Dollar equivalents
		Millions
Italy	Active balance remaining counterpart account under Public Laws 84 and 389.	30.4
Austria	Transferred to counterpart account under Public Law 472.	3.3
Trieste	do	.3
Greece	do	[1]
France	All withdrawn	

[1] Less than $50,000.

Data available for Italy indicate that as of January 31, 1952, the balance available for further permanent programs was about $9,000,000 (dollar equivalent), of which about $7,000,000 were temporarily employed for loans and advances, largely under a shipping credit program, leaving only about $2,000,000 unprogramed.

SECTION 519 OF THE MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1951

Subsection (a) of this section authorized the use of $10,000,000 of section 203 (economic assistance to the Near East) funds and $25,000,000 of section 302 (economic assistance to Asia and the Pacific) funds for advances to countries for equivalent amounts of local currencies. No advances have yet been made under this authority, although a request has been received to use $3,000,000 to purchase Iranian currency for the TCA. The Mutual Security Agency desires that the authority provided in this subsection be kept available.

Subsection (b) of this section authorizes the use of $50,000,000 to acquire local currency for increasing the production of deficiency materials. No use has been made of this authority as yet, but arrangements are being discussed for using this authority in at least one case.

SECTION 523 (E) OF THE MUTUAL SECURITY ACT REQUIRING THE USE OF COUNTERPART FOR MILITARY PURPOSES

The following report has been submitted by the Mutual Security Agency:

"Section 523 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 amends the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 to permit the use of counterpart funds for military production, construction, equipment, and matériel. The act directed that 'the Administrator shall exercise the power granted to him by this section to make agreements with respect to the use of funds deposited in the special accounts of "participating countries" * * * and in other countries receiving assistance under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, in such a manner that the equivalent of not less than $500,000,000 of such funds shall be used exclusively for military production, construction, equipment, and matériel in such countries. The amount to be devoted from each such special account for such use shall be agreed upon by the Administrator and the country or countries concerned.'

"Negotiations for the use of counterpart funds for military purposes were initiated with the various participating countries almost immediately after enactment of the Mutual Security Act in October 1951. As of January 31, 1952, MSA had approved programs for military use of counterpart funds totaling the equivalent of over $236,000,000. Agreements under consideration or made, but for which programs have not been completed, indicate that a total of far more than $500,000,000 in counterpart funds would be earmarked for use in military construction, production, equipment, and matériel from the funds deposited in the special accounts.

"The following table shows the countries and the amounts of counterpart funds approved for program use for these purposes to date:

Country	Local currency	Dollar equivalents
		Millions
France	40 billion francs	114.3
Turkey	169 million lire	60.3
The Netherlands	178 million guilders	46.0
China (Formosa)	162 million new Taiwan dollars	15.7
Total		236.3

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

"In France all of the 40 billion francs had been withdrawn from the special account as of January 31, with the bulk of the funds earmarked to finance major matériel procurement and production and the balance for defense construction. In Turkey over half of 169 million liras had been withdrawn through January, principally to finance military production and procurement. In the Netherlands 100 million of the 175 million guilders released had been withdrawn as of January 31 to finance major matériel procurement and production. In China (Formosa) the counterpart funds were programed for a variety of military purposes, with a little more than half of the funds released withdrawn as of the end of January.

"The negotiation of agreements and establishment of programs for other countries are in an advanced stage; for example, agreement has been reached with the United Kingdom to utilize for defense purposes $252,000,000 in counterpart that will accrue against assistance furnished during the fiscal year."

Further legislation will be required to increase the mandatory minimum amount of counterpart directed to military production under this section above the total of $500,000,000. No provision is made for this in H. R. 7005, as introduced.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF GERMAN STUDY MISSION AS TO USE OF COUNTERPART

The special study mission to Germany of the Committee on Foreign Affairs included in its report, issued February 8, 1952, the following recommendations as to the use of counterpart:

"A substantial amount of ECA and MSA counterpart funds in Germany has been turned over to German banks to be loaned to industries for development purposes. As such loans are repaid, they are reloaned, but the United States no longer retains the further right to participate in the disposition of these funds. The subcommittee recommends that a comprehensive survey of United States policy toward the use of counterpart be undertaken to include consideration of an amendment to the Mutual Security Act to require continuous participation of determining the use of counterpart funds.

"The subcommittee recommends study of the possibility of more extensive use of counterpart funds to provide buildings for United States missions abroad and the housing of their staffs."

The following statements regarding these recommendations have been submitted by the Mutual Security Agency:

"PARTICIPATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE DISPOSITION OF FUNDS ARISING FROM THE REPAYMENTS OF LOANS MADE FROM COUNTERPART FUNDS

"The arrangements for the review and control of the withdrawal and expenditure of counterpart funds reflect the objectives of ECA and MSA and the particular circumstances in the country involved. Initial release of counterpart funds are subject to detailed review in terms of the particular grants and loans made. The further disposition of funds arising from the repayment of loans is usually limited to general review and general arrangements in the making of which ECA and MSA participate. In one or two exceptional cases detailed supervision by ECA and MSA of releases from repaid loans is either provided for or being discussed.

"For illustration, the situation in several of the countries in which counterpart funds are released on a loan basis can be considered. The countries in which there are releases on a loan basis are Germany, Austria, Italy, Trieste, Turkey, Portugal, and France.

"In Germany, counterpart funds generated by United States aid are channeled into three accounts: (a) 5 percent is allocated 'to the use of the Government of the United States of America for its expenditures in the Federal Republic of Germany, including expenditures for procuring and stimulating increased production of materials which are required by the United States * * *'; (b) 25 percent is allocated to the GARIOA account to be available for meeting the responsibilities of the United States in the occupation of Germany; and (c), the balance, 70 percent is available for investment programs directed at developing the industrial and agricultural capacity of the Federal Republic and Berlin.

"The funds in the 70-percent account have been released through four banking institutions: (1) Reconstruction Loan Corporation, (2) Refugee Bank, (3) Agricultural Credit Bank and (4) Industry Bank of Berlin. Except for grants made for a limited number of special projects, principally in the agricultural field, the funds have been made available by these institutions in the form of loans. Initial releases are subject to detailed, specific review in terms of individual projects. Loans made from repayments are subject to the general review which is continuously being made of economic, financial, and investment policies, but are not subject to specific individual review. Furthermore, all of the lending institutions, with the exception of the Industry Bank of Berlin, were established largely at the urging of United States authorities in Germany, and primarily to insure that counterpart would continue to be available for purposes in which the United States has a particular interest, even though detailed supervision of loans by the United States was not provided after the first transaction.

"The special purposes for which loans can be made are defined in the charters of the institutions themselves. The Reconstruction Loan Corporation, the largest of the three, was established to provide long-term credit to old establishments which as a result of the war require credit to rebuild their capacity, and to new establishments requiring credit to begin operation. The Refugee Bank makes credit available only to refugees attempting to establish themselves in Western Germany, and the Agricultural Credit Bank limits its activities to the encouragement of increased agricultural production.

"As soon as repayments of loans are made to these institutions, the money is reloaned. The bulk of the funds, however, are loaned on a long-term basis, and major opportunities for reprograming are not expected to arise for some time.

"In most of the countries in which counterpart funds are released in the form of loans, the arrangements are roughly similar to those in Germany. In Italy, for example, there is a home-development fund established by the Italian Government on the advice of ECA, and a small-industries-loan fund, southern industries and agricultural loan fund, etc., through which counterpart funds are loaned in accordance with the general objectives and criteria of ECA. (There is also a machinery and equipment loan fund, which lends money to finance ERP machinery imports. Repayments on these loans are being held in a special account pending agreement as to their disposition.) In Turkey there is an industrial development bank, established on advice of the World Bank and ECA, through which part of the counterpart loans are made. In Portugal there is a national development fund created in 1949 performing similar functions.

"In Greece, because of exceptional economic circumstances, provision for supervision beyond postinitial releases has been provided. For similar reasons, it is being discussed with the Government in Austria.

"It is felt that the types of arrangements illustrated in the foregoing examples are the ones which best promote the interests of the United States. Having regard to the limited life of the foreign-aid program, it is generally wiser to promote and establish general arrangements which will tend to insure that the funds are handled in a manner most consonant with United States objectives even after the opportunities for detailed United States supervision are not present, than to project detailed supervision into the indefinite future. The general review of the loans from repayments included in the overall economic and financial review will of course continue as long as the program does. A large part of the funds are loaned on a long-term basis so that major occasions for large-scale detailed supervision will not arise for some time. The attempt to project detailed supervision of such an important sector of the European economy far into the future would probably create opposition on the part of the countries involved, the disadvantages of which would outweigh the possible gains. In those cases, for example, Greece and Austria, in which for special reasons continuing supervision is deemed desirable, it has either been provided or is being discussed.

"THE USE OF COUNTERPART FUNDS TO PROVIDE BUILDINGS AND HOUSING FOR UNITED STATES MISSIONS ABROAD

"ECA/MSA has consistently in the past and will in the future use counterpart to provide buildings for its missions abroad where the Department of State has been unable to provide space. Unless the minimum requirements cannot be met by leasing, ECA/MSA has not purchased or constructed any offices or housing; this has resulted from the premise that ECA/MSA is a temporary agency with a termination date provided by law and should not, therefore, commit the Government to office or residential space for a period exceeding ECA/MSA operation unless required by absolute necessity to do so.

"Under section 521 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, 5 percent counterpart is made available to any agency of the Government for its administrative and operating expenses in carrying out the purposes of the Mutual Security Act. An example of an agency which has such expenses is the Department of Defense and, although this Department uses first the local currency available to it under the MDAP program, presumably in some areas 5 percent counterpart could be made available to the Defense Department to house its missions and the staff thereof carrying out mutual security functions.

"With regard to the use of counterpart to provide buildings for United States missions abroad not concerned with carrying out the Mutual Security Act, such use is dependent upon the authority of the agency concerned. An example of such authority is that available to the Department of State for carrying out its responsibilities in Germany and Austria. Under this authority any 5 percent excess to MSP's needs can be made available to the Department of State, and quite possibly some of these funds could be used by it for office and residential space.

"Five percent counterpart has, as a matter of law, other charges on it in addition to that of defraying administrative and operating expenses of agencies carrying out the Mutual Security Program. Examples of these charges are the acquisition of materials in which the United States is deficient, the local currency requirements of the appropriate committees of Congress, and the informational uses directed by section 115 (j) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

"After the requirements outlined above are satisfied, any local currency remaining above foreseeable needs is turned over to the United

States Treasury. Agencies may withdraw these funds as authorized by law. No doubt the committee members are aware that under current legislation the Division of Foreign Building Operations of the Department of State is charged with the initial responsibility of securing the necessary housing for the United States Government abroad and the Congress annually provides the Division of Foreign Building Operations with funds for this purpose, including authority to use local currencies held by the United States Treasury within prescribed dollar-equivalent limitations."

UNITED STATES PURCHASES OF LOCAL CURRENCIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

In addition to the local currencies made available to the United States under the various acts enumerated above, the United States spends dollars in foreign countries to buy local currencies to meet expenses which it incurs there. Such local currency purchasers are not regularly summarized but, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Department of Commerce undertook a compilation of these expenditures.

This compilation covered only the 6-month period July–December 1951 since data were not readily available for earlier months. A summary of the total expenditures by areas follows:

Europe	$126,522,616
Near East and Africa	3,543,397
Asia and Pacific	62,121,391
American Republics	7,654,372
Total	199,841,776

Of this total the Defense Department spent a total of $155,770,963, leaving a balance of $44,070,813 spent by the Treasury and State Departments which might be regarded as representing purchases for United States operating expenses abroad as distinct from defense expenditures.

A breakdown of defense expenditures by countries cannot be given for security reasons. The following table, however, gives a comparison of amounts of local currencies available to the United States in the countries of Europe for paying operating expenses including counterpart and dollar purchases of currencies. Defense Department purchases of local currencies are omitted.

TABLE VII.—*Comparison of counterpart deposits in European countries and United States purchases of local currencies (6-month period, July–December 1951)*

Country	Deposits under Economic Cooperation Act (6 months only)	Under Mutual Defense Assistance Program agreements	United States purchases of local currencies other than by Defense Department
Austria	$583,000	None	$732,067
Belgium-Luxemburg	576,000	$210,440	783,953
Denmark	1,042,000	133,913	240,517
France	9,104,000	789,539	7,158,681
Germany	9,492,000	None	1,604,326
Greece	5,141,000	None	762,094
Iceland	330,000	None	13,779
Italy	6,099,000	451,675	5,000,833
Netherlands	2,972,000	249,211	357,540
Norway	873,000	318,951	210,267
Portugal	185,000	160,804	2,795,512
Trieste	219,000	None	28,450
Turkey	840,000	None	1,022,752
United Kingdom	1,998,000	308,815	1,589,006
Yugoslavia	1,323,000	28,000	196,406
Total	40,777,000	2,651,348	22,496,183

CONCLUSIONS

A review of the legislation providing for local currency deposits and of United States administration of such currencies indicates the following:

1. The executive branch appears to accept the principle for the countries where it has discretion in this matter that in the case of goods or services supplied on a grant basis which are sold in the recipient country, counterpart of commensurate value should be required. The Mutual Defense Assistance Act and the Act for International Development do not require this, however. And although the China Area Aid Act is at present interpreted as requiring such a policy, the executive branch apparently could regard this portion of the Economic Cooperation Act as not "applicable" at its discretion.

2. The principle that the local currency operating costs incurred by the United States should be paid by the recipient country is generally accepted, but it is not required by law. The economic aid bilateral agreements make 5 percent of the counterpart available for this purpose. In some cases amounts in excess of 5 percent have been required from the Belgian and Portuguese counterpart accounts.

3. At present with local currencies being acquired in a single country in several different ways, kept in different accounts and controlled under different acts, there is a certain amount of administrative overlap. In Israel, for example, there is a counterpart account set up by TCA under the terms of the Economic Cooperation Act, a TCA local currency account, a counterpart account under section 205 of the Mutual Security Act (refugees coming into Israel), and the United States also buys local currency there for dollars.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7005, Calendar 1525.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7005) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move that the House bill be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the Senate bill, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BEATON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Conference of the International Council for Christian Leadership at The Hague.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea" and the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 10, as follows:

YEAS—64

Aiken	Ferguson	Hunt
Anderson	Frear	Ives
Bennett	Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.
Benton	George	Johnson, Tex.
Brewster	Green	Kem
Bridges	Hayden	Kilgore
Butler, Md.	Hendrickson	Lehman
Case	Hennings	Lodge
Clements	Hickenlooper	Long
Connally	Hill	Martin
Douglas	Hoey	Maybank
Eastland	Holland	McCarthy
Ellender	Humphrey	McFarland

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

McKellar	O'Mahoney	Sparkman
Millikin	Pastore	Stennis
Monroney	Robertson	Taft
Moody	Russell	Thye
Morse	Saltonstall	Underwood
Mundt	Smathers	Watkins
Neely	Smith, Maine	Williams
Nixon	Smith, N. J.	
O'Conor	Smith, N. C.	

NAYS—10

Butler, Nebr.	Dworshak	Welker
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Young
Cordon	Malone	
Dirksen	Schoeppel	

NOT VOTING—22

Bricker	Gillette	McClellan
Byrd	Jenner	McMahon
Cain	Kefauver	Murray
Carlson	Kerr	Seaton
Chavez	Knowland	Tobey
Duff	Langer	Wiley
Ecton	Magnuson	
Flanders	McCarran	

So the bill (H. R. 7005) was passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 3086 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move that the House bill be printed together with the amendment which has been adopted by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950 AND THE HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2594, Calendar 1529, extending the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, and so forth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2594) to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2594), which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, previously I gave notice that the Senate would meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning because there would not be a Friday session.

Many Senators have asked me from time to time whether Congress will be able to conclude its work before the national conventions convene. We are endeavoring to make a drive to ascertain whether that will be possible. If we are going to try to do that, now is the time to proceed to do so.

Yesterday I gave notice that today we would take up Senate bill 2968, Calendar 1408, a bill which would amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended. However, the hour now is late, and it is felt that there is not sufficient time to take up that bill today. I now give notice that on any day when there is available time, that bill will be considered. It will take only a few moments to dispose of it.

Another bill on the program is Senate bill 3019, Calendar No. 1430, a bill which would amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, in order to extend the application of the special-inducement pay provided thereby to doctors and dentists, and for other purposes. I give notice now that we shall take up that bill on any day when we have time to do so.

Of course, Senators who are in opposition will be notified so as to give them an opportunity to be present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In view of the fact that the Senator from Arizona is making announcements for the guidance of the Senate, I should like to add that a general supposition is abroad in the Senate Chamber that a veto message will be received, probably tomorrow afternoon, of the submerged lands bill. My understanding is that the 10-day period following the submission of the bill to the White House will not expire until Friday; but I assume that in all probability the veto will come, if it does come, on tomorrow afternoon.

That being the case, I wish all Members of the Senate to know that I shall not attempt to have the veto message called up for consideration until after conferences are had with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], so that opportunity will be afforded every Senator who is interested in that measure to be present and to have an opportunity to vote on the question of overriding or sustaining the veto.

I have no reason to believe that the bill can be passed over a veto. Therefore, Mr. President, I should like to say that in the event the veto is sustained, it will be my purpose to seek to have the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs once more report to the Senate the so-called interim bill which the committee formerly reported, and which I and many other Senators feel will be a settlement of the issue, to the extent that the production of oil may be undertaken.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield, indeed, to the Senator from new Hampshire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I desire to make one more announcement, following which I shall yield the floor, so that Senators may ask questions of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Several days ago I gave notice of our intention to meet at 10 o'clock on Thursday. I requested that no committee meetings be scheduled for that day. I hope no committees will ask permission to sit during the session of the Senate tomorrow, because, if they do, I shall be forced to object. The defense production bill is important, and I hope we may make definite progress with it tomorrow.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota is expected to make two addresses in South Dakota on Memorial Day, and another address on Sunday, in connection with the dedication of the Crippled Children's Hospital. I should like to be in the Senate for the vote on the question of the veto.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have stated to several Senators who have spoken to me about it that I would make no attempt to have a vote before the 5th of June. I have so stated to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator refer to the vote on the veto?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; to the vote on the veto.

Mr. CASE. June 5 will give me ample time. I thank the Senator.

PURCHASE BY RFC OF BOLIVIA'S STOCKPILE OF TIN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my attention has just been called to a bit of news from the ticker in regard to the international tin situation, which reads as follows:

> WASHINGTON.—The RFC said today it has bought the bulk of Bolivia's stockpile of tin for $1.21½ a pound, a price the Bolivian producers previously had turned down.
>
> This is the same price the United States is paying other major tin producing nations and the same one the United States was about to offer Bolivia in negotiations that were broken off by the April 9 revolution.

I desire to make a few brief comments regarding this important news item, because it has been my observation that the very good job of economy that is done by congressional committees seldom receives very much attention in the press; but that rather, the press devotes attention to the kind of conflict over economy that often develops on the floor of the House and on the floor of the Senate after committees have done a very good job with their committee work in economizing, on the basis of what a carefully prepared record will show is justified by the evidence.

In regard to the economy represented by the news of the action which has been taken by the RFC on the Bolivian tin matter, I wish to say that when the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee investigating the preparedness program, headed by the exceedingly able Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] started its work, one of the first problems with which we dealt was that of profiteering in tin on the part of those, both in this country and in foreign countries, who held a control of the world's tin supply.

It is my recollection that the going price of tin prior to the outbreak of the Korean war was in the neighborhood of 70 cents a pound. It was interesting to note, Mr. President, that immediately after the outbreak of the Korean war the profiteers, both in this country and in foreign countries, went to work, and again we saw the very sad spectacle of economic forces willing to profiteer at the expense of blood lost on the battlefield. But, under the leadership of the

Senator from Texas, our investigating committee took the position that we would not let our country be blackmailed into accepting the kind of profiteering that those who controlled the tin supply of the world were seeking to impose upon us.

Finally, after very careful investigation, the committee came to the conclusion that any price such as was being asked, in the neighborhood of $2 or $2.01 a pound, was simply an unconscionable case of an international holdup on the part of the countries asking it. As I recall, those controlling Bolivian tin were insisting upon $2.01 a pound. But let me make it clear that this kind of holdup was not limited to Bolivia. It became the position of our committee, and we so advised the RFC after we had submitted our unanimous report on the tin problem, that any price very much in excess of approximately $1.20 simply could not be justified. And so it is a matter of great gratification to me, and I am sure, to the other members of the Johnson subcommittee, that the RFC today announces that it is negotiating for the purchase of the Bolivian tin for $1.215 a pound. It is a demonstration, Mr. President, of what can be done if we agree upon a sound principle and then adhere to it. By the action taken by the Johnson subcommittee, and by the splendid cooperation we have received from RFC in regard to this matter, on this little item alone we have saved the American taxpayers in the neighborhood of $400,000,000.

As a member of that subcommittee, Mr. President, let me say I know something about the pressure which was put not only upon members of the subcommittee, but also on the RFC to yield to the international holdup and blackmail attempt which was made in regard to the tin issue.

Mr. President, I congratulate—and I think congratulations are due—the RFC for the courage and the fearless devotion to what I think is sound principle which they have exhibited in regard to the tin problem. I congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], because, had we not had a chairman with the courage and the fearlessness of the Senator from Texas, there would have been a yielding on this matter, weeks and weeks ago.

It is always good when one is able to report to the American people something favorable in regard to action taken by a committee; and I would say to the public, if they want to know where the real economizing is being done in regard to the budgetary problems confronting the country, they should pay more attention to what is being done in the committees of the Congress. That is where the real economizing is taking place. We do not find in the committees the playing of politics with the economy issue, which is so frequently manifested on the floor of the Senate when a Senator, for political purposes, offers a so-called economy amendment, although he knows that the evidence before the committee does not support his amendment. Yet he will get headlines in the press, and many people will be led to think that he really is proposing an economy, when, after all, a carefully considered hearing upon the matter has shown that the amendment will not promote economy.

The action I am reporting this afternoon, taken by the Johnson subcommittee and by the RFC, shows that men who are devoted to protecting the national economy on the basis of the evidence presented are the ones who really deserve credit for economizing for the American people.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want to commend the distinguished Senator from Oregon for his remarks.

I should like to state at this time that the Senate of the United States requires the Banking and Currency Committee to report bills which it has before it. We are advised by the distinguished majority leader that our committee cannot meet at 10 o'clock in the morning, but I want the public to know that we shall meet at 9:30 o'clock in the morning to report the RFC bill and other proposals which are before the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, before I suggest that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Executive Calendar, I desire to express my thanks and deep gratitude to the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for his generous remarks concerning the work of the preparedness subcommittee. No Member of the Senate has made a greater contribution to the committee than has the Senator from Oregon. His attendance, his fine legal mind, his concern with the strength of the armed services, his insistence that proper procedures be followed to protect the rights of the servicemen, of the officers of the Defense Department, of the Congress, and of all the people, have resulted in the many fine contributions which have been made by the committee. One instance is the decision made by the RFC and the Bolivian Government which will result in saving millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. President, the committee has worked without regard to politics. It has left politics at the committee door. Of the almost 40 reports we have filed, each report has been filed with the unanimous approval of the members of the committee.

I am grateful for the cooperation we have received from the executive departments, and particularly from the RFC in regard to the subjects of rubber and tin.

I am particularly grateful to the Members of the minority for the time they have spent, for their willingness to work long and arduous hours, and for the contributions they have made to the servicemen and the taxpayers of the Nation.

Again, Mr. President, I express my profound thanks to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to say on behalf of the Preparedness Subcommittee and of its chairman, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], that I am sure all Members of the Senate, and especially those on the minority side, have appreciated the promptness and the thoroughness with which reports have come from the subcommittee which the distinguished Senator from Texas heads. I know the words of commendation expressed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] reflect the attitude of all Members of the Senate. I think the committee has rendered very fine service in dealing with many matters which are so important in these days.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the acting minority leader.

PAY OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, postal employees have been notified that they will not be paid because there is no money available.

Democrats and Republicans were present today in large numbers in the meeting of the Appropriations Committee, and have considered a House resolution which authorizes the payment of postal employees until the third supplemental appropriations bill is agreed to, or until the 16th of June. I think every member of the committee, and I know every Member of the Senate, wants these employees to be paid. The matter is safeguarded in every way possible.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that the distinguished chairman and the committee have been trying to get a conference with the House on the third supplemental appropriation bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. We have tried time and again, but we have been unable to succeed, and it is necessary that the postal employees be paid, and that the money be provided to pay them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 426.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that, without disturbing the status of the unfinished business, the Senate act on the joint resolution to which he has referred. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 426) making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 1, line 6, after the word "to", to strike out "carry out the" and insert "pay salaries of Government employees under existing."

The amendment was agreed to.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 1, after the numerals "1952", to insert "or as passed by the Senate on April 22, 1952, whichever is lower."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 5, after "(Public Law 187)", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further*, That no new positions shall be created and no increase in salaries shall be made in any department, bureau, independent office, or other activity of the Government, between the approval of this joint resolution and July 1, 1952, or until the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1952, H. R. 6947, shall be enacted into law."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 8, after the word "or", to strike out "May 31, 1952" and insert "June 16, 1952."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 12, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 4. No part of any appropriation provided by this joint resolution, or any funds made available for expenditures by this joint resolution, shall be used for the purpose of acquiring, seizing, or operating any plant, facility, or other property, unless the acquisition, seizure, or operation of such plant, facility, or other property is authorized by act of Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1952

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, there is an error in Report No. 1599 on the Defense Production Act, which I reported to the Senate yesterday. A paragraph was included on page 31 which should not have been in the report. The staff inadvertently failed to strike it out on a last minute check that was made of the galley proof.

Rather than request a star print of the report, in order to save the Government the expense involved in that, I ask unanimous consent that the paragraph on page 31 to which I have referred be deleted from the report, and not be considered part of it. It reads:

Your committee considered, and rejected, a proposal to change the word "locality," in section 1 (b) of the act, to "city, town, village, or other civil subdivision" (similar to the language in the Davis-Bacon Act), which was subsequently modified to read "local labor market area," in order to include workers in a normal commuting area surrounding the place of manufacture, and avoid the artificial boundaries of a city, town, or county. It is the intent of your committee that its action in rejecting this proposal be without prejudice to future diliberations of the courts concerning the meaning of "locality."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as a part of my remarks I ask that there be included a brief summary of the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1952.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The bill extends until June 30, 1953, the following titles:

Title I. Priorities and allocations.

Provision is also made in this title for import controls (old Public Law 590).

Title II. Requisition and condemnation.

Title III. Loan guaranties and other loans; purchase and development commitments; subsidy payments; authorization for the lending authority.

Title VI. Consumer and real estate credit controls.

Title VII. Administrative provisions and Small Defense Plants Administration.

The bill extends title IV (price and wage stabilization) and title V (settlement of labor disputes) until March 1, 1953.

Amendments the committee adopted are as follows:

Section 101: Import controls on fats and oils. This substitutes the old Public Law 590 for the Magnuson amendments (Sec. 104 of the act).

Section 102: Amends the Capehart amendment to make it clear that it does not apply to retailers and wholesalers.

Section 103 (a): This exempts professional engineers, architects, and accountants from salary stabilization.

Section 103 (b): This is the Knowland-Frear amendment which exempts marine terminals, docks and warehouse facilities from price control, and exempts certain charges made by common carriers (pay washrooms, toilet facilities, and automobile parking charges).

Section 103 (c): This exempts rates, fees, and charges for materials or services which are supplied by the various levels of government.

Section 104: Robertson amendment which strikes out the word "hereafter" from the Herlong amendment. This has the effect of extending to all retailers and wholesalers their historical mark-up. OPS would be required to revise all regulations applying to wholesalers and retailers that have been issued previous to the enactment of the Herlong amendment.

Section 105: The Bricker amendment which requires OPS to adjust their ceiling prices to State minimum sale prices. So-called fair-trade laws have been excepted from this amendment.

Section 106: The Dirksen amendment which abolishes the present Wage Stabilization Board and creates a new Board consisting of all public members. The Board would have no power to make any determinations with respect to labor-dispute questions. Their power would be restricted to determinations with respect to wages.

Section 107: The Maybank suspension-of-controls amendment. A declaration of policy setting forth the criteria under which price and wage controls should be suspended. It would permit the suspension of price controls without suspending wage controls, and vice versa.

Section 108: This section simply protects against liability those contractors who are unable to carry out a contract because their suppliers are prohibited by the priorities and allocations section of this act from making shipments of critical materials or parts to them.

Section 109: Provisions for the extension of the dates of various titles.

Section 201: Extends the Rent Control Act until June 30, 1953.

Section 202: Robertson amendment. Provides that where an area has been decontrolled, before that area can be recontrolled a 30-day notice and a public hearing is required.

Section 301 (a): The Fulbright amendments to the Walsh-Healey Act. The first amendment would modify the "open-markets" exemption so as to make it conform with what the committee believes was the original intent. It would exempt the purchases of materials "of standard type and construction" as are usually sold in the open market "to purchases generally, regardless of the method of procurement used by the Government."

The second amendment assures persons adversely affected or aggrieved by the administrative actions under the Walsh-Healey Act that they shall have proper procedural and jurisdictional safeguards.

GOVERNMENT OF WEIMAR REPUBLIC—LETTER FROM HENRICH BRUNING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently I received a letter from Henrich Bruning, former Chancelor of Germany, concerning the use of emergency powers by the government of the Weimar Republic. Senators will remember that the subject was hotly debated by the Senate. Believing this to be of interest to the Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Bruning's letter to me, dated May 12, 1952, be inserted in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *May 12, 1952.*

The Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: My attention has been drawn to your friendly remarks about myself in the course of your prominent part in the Senate debate on April 21, in which my use of emergency powers as Chancelor in Germany came under discussion. I did not establish a precedent in the use of article 48 of the Weimar constitution. The precedents were established by President Ebert in the revolutionary and inflationary period immediately after 1918. Similar emergency powers were invoked between the two world wars by the governments of almost all European states, including Great Britain, because the problems resulting from the war and the peace treaties, especially from the burden of reparations charges against Germany, could not be solved by normal parliamentary methods.

Emergency decrees under article 48, like British orders-in-council, had to be tabled immediately before Parliament. Parliament might rescind an emergency decree by simple majority as soon as it was promulgated—as happened once in an accidental surprise vote. A parliamentary majority could also alter any part of an emergency decree by its own initiative; the President had either to promulgate the new legislation overriding his decree or to resign.

There was no constitutional precedent in Germany for the government's taking over an industry, nor did it ever happen. It did happen several times that Communist workmen occupied plants and stopped production, against the will of the majority of the employees, and that the government, with the support of the majority workers, expelled the militant Communists.

In connection with your statement that the Weimar Republic failed to take decisive action against the Nazis, I should point out the old German legal tradition that a party could not be banned, or its leaders prosecuted, even on the ground that its program was opposed to the Constitution. Under our legal tradition, the courts could sentence individual leaders of revolutionary

parties only on proof of actual conspiracy to overthrow the Constitution in a specific case. This was the attitude not only of the courts but also of Parliament. It was possible under the Constitution to dissolve Nazi and Communist paramilitary organizations, like the Red front, the S. A. and S. S., but President Hindenburg developed grave constitutional doubts and made my action in this regard a reason for my dismissal.

After Hitler was appointed Chancelor, he made use of the emergency presidential power until article 48 of the Weimer Constitution only once—to dissolve the Communist Party (on the pretext of the burning of the Reichstag) after the Communists in the first election of 1933 had become the strongest party in the Reichstag after the Nazis. He did this, of course, to procure a two-thirds majority in Parliament for an enabling act, such as Stresemann had got in the fall of 1923, at the height of the currency depreciation and in the face of open Communist and Nazi revolts. The enabling act temporarily eliminated the President's powers. This gave Hitler retroactive, legal protection for his dissolution of the Communist Party under the presidential emergency power, and set the precedent for the dissolution of all the other parties. As the leaders of these parties either fled the country or living in hiding, there was no one to bring their cases before the Supreme Court. If President Hindenburg had not been already in failing health, he could have availed himself of constitutional possibilities to invalidate the enabling act—nor would he, of course, have appointed Hitler Chancelor.

It has happened from time to time throughout history that constitutional or legal safeguards designed to protect the rights of the individual have been perverted under completely changed conditions to the opposite end. But for that to be possible, economic and social conditions must be violently disrupted over a considerable period, to a degree that nobody can expect for the United States in the foreseeable future.

Respectfully yours,

H. BRÜNING.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Albert F. Nufer, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Argentina.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, for the RECORD, let me say that I understand that there are no objections to any of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that consideration be given to the confirmation of the nomination of William J. Kennedy, of Ohio, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for a term of 5 years. Objection the day, but he consulted with the mahad been made by a Senator earlier in jority leader and informed him that the objection was removed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William J. Kennedy, of Ohio, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified of confirmations made this day.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 29, 1952, at 10 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 28, 1952:

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

William J. Kennedy, of Ohio, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for a term of 5 years from August 29, 1952.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Albert F. Nufer, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Argentina.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 28, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose will and wisdom are supreme, we are daily beseeching Thee for divine guidance as we seek to build our beloved country on the foundation of righteousness and justice, of peace and good will.

Grant that we may live and labor for its welfare, inspired by loyalty and devotion to our glorious American traditions and by a sincere desire to maintain and enhance them.

May all our citizens be eager to express their gratitude and patriotism by making every sacrifice to defend our democracy against the forces of evil and aggression.

We pray that our hopes and longings for our country may be permeated with something more than a selfish ambition to achieve material greatness, but may it be the goal of all our aspirations to make America a God-fearing and spiritually minded Nation.

Hear us in the name of Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

AMENDING SECTION 218 (F) OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6291) to amend section 218 (f) of the Social Security Act with respect to effective dates of agreements entered into with States before January 1, 1954.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 218 (f) of the Social Security Act, as amended (relating to the effective dates of voluntary agreements for coverage of State and local employees), is hereby amended by striking out "January 1, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1954."

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6291 would amend section 218 (f) of the Social Security Act, which relates to the effective dates of Federal-State agreements for old-age and survivors insurance coverage of State and local government employees, so as to extend from January 1, 1953, to January 1, 1954, the period within which such coverage may be made retroactive to January 1, 1951. The effect of the bill would be to permit State and local government employees covered under an original agreement or a modification of an agreement during the year 1953 to obtain coverage retroactively to January 1, 1951, if they desired. The maximum period of retroactive coverage would be 3 years.

The Social Security Act amendments of 1950 made old-age and survivors insurance coverage available to 1,400,000 employees of State and local governments not covered by State or local retirement systems. Statutory authority is required before a State agency can enter into a coverage agreement with the Federal Security Administrator. Such agreements have been negotiated by more than three-fourths of the States. In other States plans have been made for extending old-age and survivors insurance coverage to State and local employees retroactive to January 1, 1951, but the legislatures of those States do not meet again until 1953. Consequently, under existing law a special session of the legislature would be required to enable those States to provide for their

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

employees the advantages which would accrue from this retroactive coverage.

This bill would grant to the States which have not yet negotiated an agreement with the Federal Security Agency, and to States which may desire to extend coverage to employees not provided for in an original agreement, an additional year in which to enter into an agreement to make coverage of State and local employees retroactive to January 1, 1951. H. R. 6291 was reported unanimously by the Ways and Means Committee, and is favored by the Federal Security Agency.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF QUALIFIED WOMEN PHYSICIANS AND SPECIALISTS IN ARMED SERVICES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2552) to authorize the appointment of qualified women as physicians and specialists in the medical services of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, insist on the House amendments thereto, agree to the conference asked by the Senate, and that conferees be appointed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. VINSON, BROOKS, and SHORT.

CHEESE POLICY

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, in trying to work out my own position on the so-called cheese amendment to the Defense Production Act of 1951, one of the first questions I have asked myself is: How would the repeal of this section affect American agriculture—not just the dairy farmer, or the cotton farmer, or the apple grower, or any other group of agricultural producers, but American agriculture as a whole? It seems to me that the answer is plain enough. These restrictions imposed by section 104 of the Defense Production Act are hurting American agriculture, not helping it. If American agriculture is to be served, these restrictions should be removed at once.

One of the things it is awfully easy for the farmer to forget is that a considerable part of his product, by one route or another, is sold overseas. As these overseas markets shrink and as his product backs up in the pipelines of distribution, the American farmer feels the results here at home. He may never even realize that it is the loss of his foreign markets which is shrinking his cash receipts, but he will not be able to avoid the shrinkage.

Take last year for example: American farmers sold $4,000,000,000 of their products overseas, to foreign consumers they never saw and often never knew existed. These $4,000,000,000 accounted for 12 cents in every dollar that the American farmer earned in that year. On the other hand, American imports of agricultural products which we can grow at home amounted to about $2,000,000,000.

Even the products that section 104 aims at protecting have regularly been on an export basis. Last year we sold the world $25,000,000 worth of American-made cheese; in that same year, our cheese purchases from abroad amounted to $22,000,000. Last year we sold the world about $96,000,000 of other dairy products, while we bought about $3,000,000 of other dairy products from abroad.

Now, section 104 is not going to destroy these foreign markets overnight. But there is no doubt of the direction in which it is headed. Section 104 has served notice on the rest of the world that, as far as the United States is concerned, it proposes to get along without foreign agricultural products wherever they interfere in any way—no matter how trivial—with home-grown products. The section has served notice on the other countries that they cannot expect to continue to earn dollars by selling their agricultural products in these markets.

As far as these foreign governments are concerned, they are not in a very different position internally than the United States. There are always pressures on their legislatures and their officials to keep out agricultural products from overseas. Whether these pressures will make headway depends partly on whether the foreign countries have the dollars to buy agricultural products and whether other countries of the world are following a protectionist policy. With section 104 on the books—denying them dollars and setting them an example on agricultural trade policy—there is no doubt of the direction in which foreign countries will move. Step by step, the American farmer will find that the overseas demand for his wheat, his cotton, his fruits, and his dairy products is shrinking. Step by step, the pressures on our domestic support programs and our domestic farm prices will increase. In the end, the American farmer will be the loser.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

THE CONSTITUTION OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a letter from William Green, president, American Federation of Labor, in support of resolution approving the Constitution of Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(The letter referred to follows:)

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., May 28, 1952.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Majority Leader of the House,
House Office Building, the Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It is my pleasure to express for the American Federation of Labor its full and complete support of Senate Joint Resolution 151, and companion resolution, House Joint Resolution 430, which would give congressional ratification to the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

On May 22, 1952, the executive council of the American Federation of Labor voted to support the constitution of Puerto Rico. The executive council took this action after making a study of the constitution, which revealed it to be a commendable document providing a republican form of government, and fully in accordance with the United States' principles and traditions. The executive council also observed that the constitution has the support of the laboring people of Puerto Rico.

On behalf of the American Federation of Labor, I urge you to do whatever you can to obtain prompt congressional approval of the constitution in order that it may be in operation when the elections are held this fall in Puerto Rico.

That the people of Puerto Rico have met and fully complied with every requirement stipulated by the authorizing legislation, Public Law 600, Eighty-first Congress, has been found by the President and so stated categorically in his message to Congress. I believe it is vitally important now for the Congress to fulfill its obligations in order that we, as a Nation, may show the world that we believe in government by consent for our own people as well as for the other peoples of the world.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

WM. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE SHOULD BE PROTECTED AGAINST EXORBITANT OVERCHARGES FOR THEIR ELECTRIC LIGHTS AND POWER

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] made a speech attacking

the Electric Power Consumer's Conference now in session here in Washington; and at the same time introduced a resolution to have that conference investigated, as stated in said resolution, "to determine whether the conference, its officers, representatives, alleged or actual sponsors, members, participants, and officers of such alleged or actual sponsors, members, participants, and representatives, are using their resources for un-American and subversive activities o. for purposes not in the interest or tradition of the United States, and whether their activities are in violation of any law of the United States or the laws of any State."

If Congress, and the American people, were to take that resolution seriously, it would probably twinkle the lights in every home throughout the United States.

I addressed the members of that conference, and was glad to do so. They are struggling for the betterment of humanity. Instead of being attacked in this unjust manner, they should be praised by every representative of the American people in this House as well as in the other body.

I have led this fight for public power for more than 20 years. I was co-author with Senator Norris of the bill creating the Tennessee Valley Authority, which has wrought the greatest development of ancient or modern times. Its yardstick, showing the American people what electricity is worth, is today saving the power consumers of this country many billions of dollars every year.

I have not only led the fight in this House against Communism, but I have also led the drive here for rural electrification from the beginning; and I can say without fear of successful contradiction, that if it had not been for the battle we have waged in this House the average farmer would not have seen an electric light in his home for the next 50 years; and when he did see it, or I should say when his grandchildren saw it, the rates would have been so high they could not have paid them.

When I entered this fight less than 10 percent of the farm homes in this country even had electric lights in them, while 90 percent of the farms in Japan were electrified; 90 percent of the farms in Germany were electrified; 94 percent of the farms in Italy, and 94 percent of them in France had electricity. Even New Zealand, a new and sparsely settled country, had 65 percent of her farms electrified. Today, as a result of the fight which I have led here, more than 85 percent of the farm homes in this country are electrified; and our farmers are living on a standard of which they never dreamed a few years ago.

The power business is a public business. Electricity has become a necessity of our modern life. It is the life blood of our advancing civilization. The cheaper the rates, the more freely it flows, and the more freely it flows the greater are its benefits to mankind. It must be handled by a monopoly. If a half-dozen or a dozen concerns were supplying electricity to a community, the overhead charges would be so great the people could not pay them.

Besides, the water power of the Nation already belongs to the Federal Government. That was decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in both the Ashwander case and the Appalachian Power case.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Would the gentleman have the other 80 percent now owned by private capital and private investment taken over by the Government? That was proposed at that conference.

Mr. RANKIN. That is not what the conference is about. That conference is to try to protect the consumers of electricity and to keep the power monopoly from taking over the water power developed in our navigable streams, and their tributaries, wrecking our rural electrification program, and plundering the people with exorbitant overcharges, now and for generations to come.

The private power monopoly is spending untold millions of dollars on propaganda and lobbying expenses, trying to get a monopoly of the power business in this country.

I suggest that if Congress is going to investigate anybody, it should investigate the power lobby, which, as I said, is spending millions of dollars trying to get complete control of the power business, so as to rob the American people of untold billions of dollars in overcharges for electric lights and power in the years to come.

The private power interests are making a drive to try to take over the Tennessee Valley Authority, the water power facilities on the Columbia and the Colorado Rivers, and other streams in America, together with the Rural Electrification Administration. If they should succeed, then Heaven save the unprotected users of electricity in every State in the Union, now and for generations to come.

What this outfit is up to is to try to get their hands on the water power at the dams and then rob the American people with overcharges for their own electricity.

We have a right to build these dams on our navigable streams and their tributaries, to control floods, provide navigation, and to generate electricity, which already belongs to the Federal Government. We have a right to build transmission lines to take that power to the various communities where it is needed, and to see that it is supplied to the people at rates they can afford to pay.

It certainly sounds strange to hear anyone from the State of Michigan refer to public power as communistic. One of the finest public power systems in America is owned by the city of Lansing, the capital of the great State of Michigan. It has been in operation for almost 60 years. It has long since paid for itself, and is now providing the people of Lansing with the cheapest electricity in the State. What a pity it cannot supply electricity to the people of the entire State of Michigan, who were overcharged in 1950, $140,810,000, according to the TVA rates, and $138,485,000, according to the Ontario rates.

Ontario, which is just across the line from Michigan, has one of the finest public power systems in the world. It has developed the water power on all of the streams in that great territory, and is supplying it to the people of Ontario at rates they can afford to pay.

I could name you a number of other cities in Michigan that have public power systems, such as Kalamazoo, Bay City, Allegan, and many others. Surely the people who are getting the benefit of this cheap electricity provided by those splendid municipal systems do not regard it as socialistic, or communistic.

If you could develop the water power on the St. Lawrence and the Niagara Rivers and get transmission lines built into those cities, you could not only reduce their electric rates, but you could also provide it to the people in other sections of the State at rates they could afford to pay.

The people of the State of New York during the year 1950 were overcharged $309,208,000, according to the TVA rates, and $302,885,000 according to the Ontario rates. New York is just across the line from Ontario. If the people of that great State had access to that great wealth of power now going to waste in the St. Lawrence, and other streams, the chances are that the effect of its yardstick would reduce the electric light and power rates to the ultimate consumers in New York by hundreds of millions of dollars annually. I am sure the people in those splendid cities that have public power systems, such as Jamestown, Plattsburg, Watertown, and a large number of other municipalities that own their own power systems, do not regard public power as socialistic, or communistic.

But let us look at some other States. Suppose we turn to Ohio. We find that Columbus, the capital of the great State of Ohio, has had a public power system for more than 60 years. How long do you suppose it would take to convince the people of that splendid capital that their city had been communistic for two generations?

They also have public power systems in cities such as Cleveland, which has a population of approximately a million people, and in a large number of other cities, such as Hamilton, Niles, Painesville, Piqua, Reading, Bowling Green, and others too numerous to mention. How long do you suppose it would take for the power trust propagandists to convince those people that they were practicing socialism, or communism, by thus providing electricity to their people at rates they can afford to pay?

Then turn to the great State of Illinois, and you will note that Springfield, the capital of that State, the hometown of Abraham Lincoln, has had a public power system for more than 50 years, and supplies its people with just about the cheapest electricity to be found in the entire State. The same thing might be said of a large number of other splendid cities and towns throughout Illinois, such as Bloomington, Woodstock, Cairo, Salem, Jacksonville, and many other cities and towns in that State.

I can name you the capitals of other States, such as Austin, Tex., Tallahassee,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Fla., Lincoln, Nebr., as well as other leading cities and towns from Maine to California, that have public power systems. Would the friends of the power trust brand the people of all those cities, towns, and communities as communistic, because they are supplying electricity to their own people, their own taxpayers, at rates they can afford to pay?

At this point I am inserting in the RECORD a table, compiled by the finest experts on the subject to be found anywhere in the world, showing the number of consumers, amount of electricity used, the amount paid for it, and the overcharges according to the TVA rates and the Ontario rates, in every State in the Union during the year 1950. I trust that every Member of Congress, and everyone else who reads this RECORD, will study this table carefully. You will note that according to the TVA rates the people outside of that area were overcharged for their electricity during the year 1950, $2,460,460,000; and according to the Ontario rates they were overcharged $2,380,578,000.

The table referred to follows:

TABLE 1.—*Total electric sales, 1950*

State	Estimated sales data for 1950			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—			
	Number of customers	Kilowatt-hours	Revenues	Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	725,075	6,995,918,000	$73,049,300	$45,893,184	$27,156,116	$47,959,017	$25,090,283
Arizona	293,846	1,667,892,000	27,056,400	13,588,111	13,468,289	14,133,391	12,923,009
Arkansas	465,181	2,065,118,000	30,257,000	21,147,085	18,109,915	22,186,421	17,070,579
California	3,667,001	25,234,461,000	373,889,500	256,355,298	117,534,202	269,068,904	104,820,596
Colorado	408,098	1,620,517,000	39,248,100	20,529,275	18,718,825	20,877,559	18,370,541
Connecticut	660,854	3,484,864,000	84,051,000	38,579,163	46,471,837	39,320,846	44,730,154
Delaware	101,525	591,065,000	12,828,500	5,648,415	7,180,085	5,793,843	7,034,657
District of Columbia							
Florida	852,650	3,754,920,000	97,371,100	39,615,488	57,755,612	39,275,370	58,095,730
Georgia	823,224	4,879,843,000	84,834,400	45,283,831	39,550,569	45,577,653	39,256,747
Idaho	196,266	1,830,774,000	22,935,800	14,564,928	8,370,872	14,598,169	8,337,631
Illinois	2,653,133	17,306,945,000	340,098,900	170,311,173	169,787,727	177,536,588	162,562,312
Indiana	1,267,181	8,165,388,000	157,234,800	78,216,765	79,018,035	80,790,388	76,444,212
Iowa	849,577	3,499,536,000	85,420,600	40,882,949	44,537,651	41,343,290	44,077,310
Kansas	604,949	2,647,908,000	60,324,000	29,540,136	30,783,864	30,152,106	30,171,894
Kentucky	717,357	3,830,635,000	68,899,800	37,716,271	31,183,529	38,721,691	30,178,109
Louisiana	670,917	3,488,607,000	62,109,200	29,700,942	32,408,258	30,322,301	31,786,899
Maine	311,427	1,340,542,000	30,067,700	13,895,286	16,192,414	13,975,297	16,112,403
Maryland and District of Columbia	836,659	5,585,014,000	107,349,800	56,083,866	51,265,934	59,079,356	48,270,444
Massachusetts	1,533,260	6,534,798,000	174,177,500	74,144,968	100,032,532	76,027,683	98,149,817
Michigan	1,993,871	13,241,267,000	263,052,000	122,864,464	140,187,536	124,566,596	138,485,404
Minnesota	971,404	4,057,338,000	102,861,700	48,948,420	53,913,280	48,962,994	53,898,706
Mississippi	449,514	1,617,056,000	35,530,300	17,984,797	17,545,503	18,044,799	17,485,501
Missouri	1,179,436	5,477,229,000	113,015,500	60,253,099	52,762,401	61,552,511	51,462,989
Montana	181,282	2,351,265,000	24,824,300	14,909,028	9,915,272	15,606,837	9,317,463
Nebraska	403,416	1,513,151,000	35,304,300	19,200,892	16,103,408	18,984,307	16,319,993
Nevada	49,616	449,668,000	7,427,900	3,750,060	3,677,840	3,843,011	3,584,889
New Hampshire	198,639	831,435,000	20,386,800	9,609,194	10,777,606	9,723,346	10,663,454
New Jersey	1,602,970	8,023,122,000	189,160,500	84,523,403	104,637,097	86,714,864	102,445,636
New Mexico	166,775	643,610,000	16,359,600	7,037,044	9,322,556	7,076,859	9,282,741
New York	4,790,289	26,266,922,000	540,279,400	231,010,654	309,268,746	237,394,063	302,885,337
North Carolina	1,048,053	6,401,531,000	102,365,198	58,437,639	43,927,559	60,420,506	41,944,692
North Dakota	166,088	479,559,000	17,332,300	7,175,516	10,156,784	6,846,262	10,486,038
Ohio	2,475,250	19,318,066,000	336,846,400	171,244,838	165,601,562	178,386,562	158,459,838
Oklahoma	641,178	2,292,417,000	54,766,500	27,603,955	27,162,545	28,315,924	26,450,576
Oregon	503,182	5,903,567,000	58,999,700	42,006,751	16,992,949	42,213,519	16,786,181
Pennsylvania	3,137,845	23,747,217,000	425,310,200	212,918,349	212,394,851	223,288,998	202,021,202
Rhode Island	258,423	1,135,797,000	30,301,800	12,993,828	17,307,972	13,477,690	16,824,110
South Carolina	504,618	3,082,218,000	46,638,002	27,062,338	19,575,664	27,937,719	18,700,283
South Dakota	178,870	513,191,000	17,330,600	6,699,996	10,630,604	6,515,556	10,815,044
Tennessee	824,339	10,236,478,000	84,450,400	64,972,139	19,478,261	66,230,563	18,219,837
Texas	2,124,857	10,625,148,000	207,066,700	109,494,036	97,572,664	113,521,652	93,545,048
Utah	200,816	1,066,684,000	19,860,000	11,388,785	8,471,215	11,379,602	8,480,398
Vermont	124,895	511,574,000	13,427,800	6,280,526	7,147,274	6,354,265	7,073,515
Virginia	811,003	4,324,771,000	85,169,200	43,919,067	41,250,133	44,591,325	40,577,875
Washington	760,026	13,018,717,000	92,180,600	69,039,364	23,141,236	70,232,172	21,948,428
West Virginia	522,903	4,420,396,000	67,486,000	34,020,496	33,466,104	36,220,358	31,265,242
Wisconsin	1,106,656	6,075,079,000	128,734,400	64,933,550	63,800,850	66,816,241	61,918,159
Wyoming	81,903	329,735,000	8,772,900	4,030,695	4,742,205	4,026,768	4,746,132
United States, total	44,986,294	280,538,654,000	5,086,465,000	2,626,004,057	2,460,460,943	2,705,886,052	2,380,578,948

If it had not been for the TVA yardstick, the Ontario yardstick, and the yardsticks provided by the Columbia and Colorado River developments, and by the cities and towns throughout the Nation that own their own power facilities, the chances are that the overcharges throughout the country for the same amount of electricity in 1950 would have amounted to more than $10,000,000,000. You let the Power Trust take over all these facilities and you will see their rates go up by leaps and bounds until the burden will become too heavy for the American people to bear.

Remember that when we entered this fight, as I said, less than 10 percent of the farmers even had electric lights in their homes. Today more than 85 percent of the farm homes are electrified, and, as I said, our farmers are living on a standard of which they never dreamed a few years ago. Nothing on earth has done so much to brighten the home, lift the burdens of drudgery, stimulate the pride, inspire hope, and increase the incomes of the American farmers as our rural electrification program. The farmer has everything now that they have in the cities except the noise, city taxes, traffic jams, parking meters, slums, and a few other inconveniences.

The rural electrification program is paying for itself and enriching the rural areas as nothing else has ever done. Turn it over to the power monopoly and those rates will spiral by leaps and bounds, and the chances are that many farmers will have their electricity taken away from them entirely, as was done by the telephone monopoly when it got control.

When Senator Norris and I took up this fight for the development of the water power of the Nation the average rate for electricity throughout the country was at least five times what it is today. I remember that on a farm which I happened to own at the time, and do yet, the rate was 12½ cents a kilowatt-hour straight, which was paid to the power monopoly. Today the rate on that farm averages around 2 cents a kilowatt-hour, or about one-sixth of what was paid then.

Less than 1 percent of the farm homes in the district I represent had any electricity in their homes at all 20 years ago. Today more than 95 percent of the farmers in that district have their homes electrified, and we are moving forward with all possible haste to get it extended to every house that can be reached by the draft in times of war or that the tax collector can find in times of peace. It is the greatest economic blessing that ever came to the farmers of the Nation.

If the people in my district paid the exorbitant rates now charged by the private power interests in that part of Mississippi outside of the TVA area, it would take an average of 2,000 bales of cotton to the county to pay the overcharges.

There is enough hydroelectric power going to waste in our navigable streams and their tributaries throughout this country to fully electrify every home and every business establishment throughout the Nation, and then have enough left to operate a large portion, if not all, of our industrial machinery. Instead of pouring our money by the billions into the sinkholes of foreign countries, we had better spend more of it developing this great natural resource, and then see that it is distributed at rates people can afford to pay.

In that way we can brighten the homes, lift the burdens of drudgery, stimulate industrial production, aid commercial enterprises, and develop an era of progress and prosperity the like of which our country has never known.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 88]

Aandahl	Brehm	Curtis, Mo.
Albert	Brown, Ohio	Davis, Tenn.
Allen, Calif.	Buckley	Dawson
Anfuso	Butler	Deane
Armstrong	Carlyle	D'Ewart
Bakewell	Carrigg	Dingell
Beckworth	Case	Dolliver
Blackney	Celler	Dorn
Bonner	Chatham	Doughton
Boykin	Cooley	Doyle
Brambiett	Cox	Durham

Eaton	Kilburn	Scott,
Fisher	Kilday	Hugh D., Jr.
Flood	King, Calif.	Scrivner
Gamble	Latham	Scudder
Gathings	Lovre	Secrest
Gore	Lyle	Shafer
Granahan	McKinnon	Shelley
Hall,	McVey	Sheppard
Edwin Arthur	Mack, Ill.	Sieminski
Harrison, Va.	Magee	Sikes
Havenner	Merrow	Spence
Hillings	Miller, Calif.	Springer
Hoeven	Miller, N. Y.	Stanley
Hoffman, Mich.	Morano	Steed
Holifield	Morris	Stigler
Holmes	Morrison	Stockman
Hope	Moulder	Sutton
Horan	Nelson	Tackett
Hunter	Phillips	Taylor
Irving	Potter	Thompson,
Jackson, Calif.	Poulson	Mich.
Jones, Mo.	Powell	Watts
Jones,	Prouty	Welch
Hamilton C.	Redden	Werdel
Jones,	Reece, Tenn.	Wheeler
Woodrow W.	Richards	Wickersham
Kearney	Roosevelt	Willis
Kennedy	Sabath	Wolcott
Kerr	Schenck	Yates

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 315 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ACT

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question of the passage of the bill (H. R. 7340) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill? ?

Mr. McGREGOR. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McGREGOR moves to recommit the bill (H. R. 7340) to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 36, noes 149.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty-five Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 191, noes 30.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 302) to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2003)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 302) to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the third proviso in subdivision (D) of paragraph (2) of section 32 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: '*And provided further*, That the aggregate book value of returns made pursuant to the foregoing proviso shall not exceed $9,000,000; and any return under such proviso may be made if the book value of any such return, taken together with the aggregate book value of returns already made under such proviso does not exceed $9,000,000; and for the purposes of this proviso the term "book value" means the value, as of the time of vesting, entered on the books of the Alien Property Custodian for the purpose of accounting for the property or interest involved;'."

And the House agree to the same.

J. PERCY PRIEST,
OREN HARRIS,
DWIGHT L. ROGERS,
CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
By C. H.
CARL HINSHAW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
WILLIS SMITH,
WM. LANGER,
WM. JENNER.
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 302) to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill, as passed by the Senate, amended subdivision (D) of paragraph (2) of section 32 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

Subdivision (D) now contains a proviso which permits the return of vested property to two classes of United States citizens:

(1) Dual nationals (i. e., individuals who, even though citizens or subjects of an enemy country, were at all times since December 7, 1941, citizens of the United States); and

(2) United States citizens who lost their United States citizenship solely by reason of marriage to a citizen or subject of a foreign country but who reacquired United States citizenship prior to September 29, 1950, if such individuals would have been citizens of the United States at all times since December 7, 1941, but for such marriage.

This authority to return vested property to the aforementioned two classes of United States citizens is subject to a limiting proviso, however, which states that the aggregate value of returns so made shall not exceed $5,000,000.

This bill, as it passed the Senate, would have eliminated this limiting proviso from the present law. The House amendment, which struck out all after the enacting clause of the bill, would have inserted a provision leaving the limiting proviso in the law but increasing the limitation from $5,000,000 to $8,000,000.

The substitute agreed to in conference retains the limiting proviso of the present law but increases the amount specified in the proviso from $5,000,000 to $9,000,000. In addition, the substitute provides that the aggregate value of returns shall be computed on the basis of "book value" of the property, or interest therein, the return of which is involved, rather than actual value. One of the difficulties involved in administering the present law is that the present law has been interpreted by the Office of Alien Property as requiring a determination of actual value. The making of this determination is frequently difficult and costly. Furthermore, actual values are subject to substantial fluctuation because of current inflationary tendencies in the economy. By permitting returns to be measured in terms of "book value," this administrative problem will be greatly simplified. The amendment agreed to in conference defines "book value" as the value, as of the time of vesting, entered on the books of the Alien Property Custodian for the purpose of accounting for the property or interest involved.

J. PERCY PRIEST,
OREN HARRIS,
DWIGHT L. ROGERS,
CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
By C. H.
CARL HINSHAW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, this conference report on the bill (S. 302) amending section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act merely extends the limitation, which is contained under the present law, $5,000,000 to $9,000,000. Furthermore, it defines the term "book value" instead of the present procedure which is used in the administration of the act as actual value. It is a unanimous conference report. Unless there is a desire on the part of some others to discuss the conference report, I shall move the previous question.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. All I want to do is to confirm the fact that the conference report is unanimous.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPROVING CONSTITUTION OF COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 430) approving the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico on March 3, 1952.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 430, with Mr. ROONEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution is brought before us today having been unanimously reported out of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Since this pertains to the approval of a constitution for a young community it is the most serious type of legislation to which we can give our attention. I am sure the Committee will give it the attention it so richly deserves.

House Joint Resolution 430 gives the approval of the Congress of the United States to the Constitution which the people of Puerto Rico have adopted under the terms of Public Law 600, Eighty-first Congress.

What we have before us today is the question as to whether the people of Puerto Rico have adopted a constitution which meets the requirements laid down by Congress when Public Law 600 of the Eighty-first Congress was adopted. In order that we may answer this question, let us then first examine Public Law 600 to see what requirements it laid down for the people of Puerto Rico to abide by in their adoption of their own constitution.

In the first place, Public Law 600 of the Eighty-first Congress fully recognizing the principle of government by consent provided in section 1 that it was adopted in the nature of a compact. As a logical consequence, it then provided in section 2 that it should be submitted to the qualified voters of Puerto Rico for acceptance or rejection through an island-wide referendum conducted in accordance with the laws of Puerto Rico.

If the aforesaid Public Law 600 was approved by the people of Puerto Rico, it would then become effective. If it were rejected by the people of Puerto Rico, it would not become effective, and we would not have this document before us today.

On June 4, 1951, the people of Puerto Rico went to the polls and approved Public Law 600 by an overwhelming majority. On that day, 387,016 voters cast their ballots in favor of Public Law 600. There were 119,169 votes against. In other words, out of 506,185 votes cast, 76.5 percent were favorable to Public Law 600 and only 23.5 percent were opposed. This meant a turnout of 65 percent of the total qualified voters legally registered.

On the fairness of this referendum, a distinguished member of our committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], rendered a report. The gentleman concluded that, in accordance with his personal observation, it was a very fair and peaceful referendum.

There can be no question as to the acceptance of Public Law 600 of the Eighty-first Congress by the people of Puerto Rico.

Having pointed out that the first requirement of Public Law 600 was thus met, let us continue to see what are the other requirements and how they have been complied with.

Under section 2 of Public Law 600, it was provided that, upon the approval of the act by the majority of the voters participating in the referendum, the Legislature of Puerto Rico was authorized to call a constitutional convention to draft a constitution for the Island of Puerto Rico. This the legislature did and elections were held for delegates to the convention on August 27, 1951. Three of the four existing political parties submitted candidates for delegates to the convention. The Puerto Rico Independence Party which polled about 10 percent of the vote cast in the previous general election held in Puerto Rico, having boycotted Public Law 600 to which they were bitterly opposed, refrained from submitting candidates for delegates to the convention. Ninety-two delegates were elected and convened on September 17, 1951.

The distinguished gentleman and scholar, member of our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, presided over the constitutional convention and merits great credit for its ultimate attainment.

The convention sat until February 6, 1952, when on a final vote, the constitution drafted by the convention was approved by 88 out of the 92 delegates. Three voted against, one was absent.

I sincerely feel that the delegates to the constitutional convention of Puerto Rico should be commended for the high conciliatory spirit they showed in compromising their differences of opinion and coming out of the convention almost unanimous in the approval of the document they had adopted in the discharge of the responsibilities they had accepted when elected by the people of Puerto Rico.

On two occasions while the constitutional convention was in session, it was visited by members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Congresswoman BOSONE, from Utah; Congressman BOW, from Ohio; and Congressman ASPINALL, from Colorado. I am sure that at the proper time during this debate they will wish to bring before you their views as to how the convention was conducted.

Section 3 of Public Law 600 provided, as a third requirement, that, upon adoption of the constitution by the people of of Puerto Rico, the President of the United States would be authorized to transmit such constitution to the Congress of the United States if he found that such constitution conformed with certain requirements. Therefore, before the constitution was submitted to the President, it had to be submitted to the people of Puerto Rico and approved by them. This took place on March 3, 1952. On that day, 374,649 votes were cast in favor of the adoption of the constitution, and 82,923 voted against its adoption. This indicates a turn-out of over 50 percent of registered voters participating, and that more than 81 percent of those participating voted for the constitution. The constitution was then presented to the President of the United States. The President has transmitted such constitution to the Congress, and in his message he states:

> I do find and declare that the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico conforms with the applicable provisions of the act of July 3, 1950, and of our own Constitution.

Your committee, itself, has examined the Constitution of Puerto Rico. We found that, as provided in section 2, it created a republican form of government and included a bill of rights. Based on the democratic principle that ultimate authority rests with the people, they have created a representative government with the three classical independent branches of government—executive, legislative, and judicial.

On the Constitution of Puerto Rico, Judge George A. Malcolm, who is recognized to be one of the highest authorities in the field of constitutional law has said as I quote a translation from El Mundo, of San Juan, Thursday, May 8, 1952:

> The Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is a good constitution, but more than that—it is a good constitution for Puerto Rico. It is a short document. It does not come to be a statute or a code. The constitution adheres to established usages. It does not contain any unusual or unheard of provisions. It creates three independent departments of equal category, as it should. Each one of the three powers would act as a check and balance on the other.

I may say that Judge George A. Malcolm was attorney general of Puerto Rico years ago as a presidential appointee after having been a justice in the supreme court of the Philippines. He is the author of various books on constitutional law and received the degree of doctor of jurisprudence of the University of Michigan. He holds other very distinguished academic titles. He is mentioned by Willowby as having written the most exhaustive study of our constitutional provisions regarding territorial powers of Congress and concerning legislation for territories.

The Constitution of Puerto Rico includes a bill of rights. All men are declared equal before the law. Separation of church and state is fully estab-

lished. Freedom of speech and of the press and of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for redress of grievances is guaranteed. The right to life, liberty, and the enjoyment of property is recognized as a fundamental right of man. It is declared that no person shall be deprived of his liberty or property without due process of law. No person shall be denied the equal protection of the laws. No laws impairing the obligation of contracts shall be enacted. The right of the people to be secure in their persons and be protected against unreasonable searches and seizures is guaranteed. Speedy and public trial in all criminal prosecutions is guaranteed to every person. In general, all the fundamental rights and immunities of a citizen guaranteed under the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States have not only been included, but expanded.

There are two other requirements in Public Law 600 which the Constitution of Puerto Rico must meet. The President has found that the constitution meets them and so does your committee so find. Such requirements are the following: First, that the constitution conforms with the applicable provisions of Public Law 600; second, that the Constitution of Puerto Rico conforms with such provisions of the Constitution of the United States as are applicable to Puerto Rico. No provision of the Constitution of Puerto Rico is in conflict with the applicable provisions of the Constitution of the United States nor does it overstep the sphere of authority granted the people of Puerto Rico to be exercised under this constitution in accordance with the provisions of the Puerto Rico Federal Relations Act which will continue to apply to Puerto Rico.

By the Puerto Rico Federal Relations Act is meant such sections of the present organic act which shall not stand repealed once the Constitution of Puerto Rico becomes effective. Under the Federal Relations Act, the rights, privileges, and immunities of the citizens of the United States shall be respected in Puerto Rico to the same extent as though Puerto Rico were a State of the Union and subject to the provisions of paragraph 1 of section 2 of article 4 of the Constitution of the United States.

The statutory laws of the United States, not locally inapplicable, with few other exceptions, shall have the same force and effect in Puerto Rico as in the United States. In other words, when we pass laws here for the United States, such laws will become, in the same way, the supreme law of the land in Puerto Rico as they are the supreme law of the land in the United States.

The legislative authority of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico under the Federal Relations Act, as it is explicitly provided, shall extend to matters of a local character. In a general way, it may be said then that the legislative powers of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico are similar to those of the States of the Union within comparable limitations.

Under the Federal Relations Act, Puerto Rico will continue to be included within the United States tariff system, and the same rates of tariff shall be collected in Puerto Rico as in the United States. Puerto Rico will continue to be subject to our coastwise shipping laws and to our monetary laws. In fact, to all the laws that pertain in the Federal sphere of governmental authority. Again, under the Federal Relations Act, a United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico shall sit in Puerto Rico with similar jurisdiction to that of the United States district courts in the United States. Appeals from the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico may be taken to the First Circuit Court of Boston and ultimately to the Supreme Court of the United States.

The provisions of the Federal Relations Act as continued by Public Law 600 are binding for Puerto Rico. Section 1 of the Constitution of Puerto Rico specifically states that the political power of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall be exercised within the terms of a compact as agreed under Public Law 600. Therefore, there is no possibility whatsoever that neither by amendment of the Constitution of Puerto Rico by the people of Puerto Rico, nor by the enactment of laws under said constitution, they may exercise powers above and beyond the limits set forth by Public Law 600, and explicitly accepted by the people of Puerto Rico.

Amendments to the Constitution of Puerto Rico may be adopted in two ways: First, by initiative of the Legislature of Puerto Rico, with subsequent approval of the people in a referendum; second, by convention subject to the ultimate approval of the people.

Having examined the constitution, and having found that it conforms with all requirements of Public Law 600, Eighty-first Congress, and satisfied that this constitution represents the express will of the people of Puerto Rico, our approval of the constitution by Congress would signify the last step taken in the constitutional process for the creation of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico by the people of Puerto Rico within the framework provided for by Public Law 600, which started with the adoption of said act.

The people of Puerto Rico are citizens of the United States and will continue to be citizens of the United States, now enjoying under both the Federal and their own local constitution the fundamental freedoms for which our citizenship stands, after 50 years of gradual but determined political progress. We have arrived at a system of relations and a system of government for Puerto Rico which fulfills their aspirations, and dispells forever any vestige of reason that might be invoked to maintain that this great Nation wishes to exercise any degree of authority over unwilling peoples and without their enjoying the basic liberties of free citizens.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, the gentleman knows of certain questions which I raised at the time the rule making this resolution in order was before us. Could the gentleman say to us at this time what he proposes, or what the committee proposes in respect to an amendment to this resolution?

Mr. MURDOCK. The committee instructed the chairman to offer during the process of the discussion certain amendments to the measure before us.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand, that has to do primarily with section 20, about which there has been so much question.

Mr. MURDOCK. We found there was a good deal of opposition to section 20 in the bill of rights. I do not entertain such opposition myself, but it does exist, and I was authorized to offer an amendment to eliminate section 20 of the bill of rights as a condition of congressional approval.

Mr. HALLECK. Another thing that has disturbed me about this matter, and possibly the chairman can enlighten us, is this question. Puerto Rico has heretofore been, and is presently governed under what we call the Federal Relations Act. Will this constitution supersede the Federal Relations Act, or will the Federal Relations Act continue to be the dominant measure so far as Puerto Rico is concerned?

Mr. MURDOCK. Not being a lawyer, I prefer to have one of our legal authorities on the committee answer that, if I may.

Mr. HALLECK. I think it is highly important, particularly because it has been urged upon me that since Public Law 600 referred to this arrangement that we undertook to work out, being in the nature of a compact, that our action here might, in truth and in fact, be action consummating a treaty or a compact which would make it superior to any statutory law of the United States, or possibly even our own Constitution.

Mr. MURDOCK. I trust that the able lawyers on my committee will take due note and answer the gentleman.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BENTSEN. It is the committee's understanding that the constitution has to operate within the framework of the Federal Relations Act, just as it does under the Constitution, and that it will not supersede the Federal Relations Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has again expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will yield further, there is one other question. The proposed constitution provides a method for amendment. As far as I can discover it can be amended in any regard or in any way, subject only to the requirement that the constitution continue to provide for a republic, and also to include a bill of rights. Is the authority for amendment vested solely and completely in Puerto Rico or is there a restraining influence in the Congress, either by action that it might take or by reason of the Federal Constitution?

Mr. BENTSEN. The amendments are subject to the Constitution and will be null and void if they are in violation of our Federal Constitution. In addition to that, matters of legal process through

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the courts are finally appealed to the Supreme Court.

Mr. HALLECK. That is the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. BENTSEN. The Supreme Court of the United States; yes, sir.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, not to take more time, I ask the Committee to give this the most serious possible consideration, because we are forming a constitution for generations to come.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has again expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable discussion as to certain sections of the proposed Constitution for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

As the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK], has correctly said, we met this morning in committee. I did not happen to be there because of another commitee meeting, but I approve of their action in which some modification was made in the proposed constitution; namely, that section 20 will be eliminated from the bill and that section 5 will have some modifications.

I intend to vote for the amendments proposed in the committee. If the amendments do not carry, I expect to vote for the bill. I say that because as you look over the proposed constitution you will find there are four sections that deal with the constitution. There are 20 sections that deal with the bill of rights. There are 22 sections that deal with the power of the legislature. There are 10 sections that deal with the executive power. There are 13 sections that deal with the judicial powers. There are 19 sections of general provisions. There are 3 sections which outline how the constitution may be amended. There are 16 sections that relate to the election of Senators and Representatives. So, all in all, I think there are 108 sections in the bill. While I am going to vote for the elimination of section 20 if it is not eliminated, I think the other sections are definitely on the good side, so that I can go along with the measure even with section 20 in the bill. Personally, it is objectionable to me, but many times I have voted for legislation, and I am sure you have, that seemed to be 51 percent good and 49 percent bad. I am sure we have all had to hold our noses on certain legislation that we have voted to approve. I do not think this House is justified to reject 107 sections that are good because 1 section is not approved.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I wonder if the gentleman from Nebraska would be willing to go along with that proviso in the constitution demanding that bail be a matter of enforcement in all cases without any exception so that homicidal maniacs picked up and placed in jail would have the right to demand and receive bail irrespective of any condition whatsoever and that it could not be denied to him except by an act of the legislature?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I appreciate the gentleman's comment. I do want to say that in my opinion there are many sections of this bill which we have etched in that constitution and in that proposal that mirror our own Constitution. There are some things in our own Constitution that I do not like and perhaps would change if I had something to say about it; nevertheless, I accept it wholeheartedly.

But they go further than our Constitution in that they have a prohibition against seizure of private property without the payment of proper damages.

They have a prohibition against the seizure of the press that we do not have in this country. Some of us would like to have it in our Constitution; I am sure the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WOOD] would like to have it in our Constitution. So in some respects they are far ahead of us in their constitutional proposals.

They have another provision in the constitution that no person shall be twice put in jeopardy or punished for the same offense. That is in our Constitution.

They have a provision that every accused shall be entitled to and admitted to bail. I think that is all right.

They have a provision that no person shall be imprisoned for debt; that there shall not be slavery; and all through the proposed constitution you will find mirrored and etched the very things that we have written into our Constitution, with the exception, maybe, of section 20 and one or two other provisions which I would take out of the Constitution if I had my way.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman that there are some things in this constitution which would not have been there if I were writing them. But I wonder about the legal situation, whether under the relationship which we have with Puerto Rico—and I am not familiar with it in detail—whether we would have the power to strike out certain sections. Does the gentleman think we have that right?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The only information I have on it is that I called the clerk of the other body and he had consulted their constitutional lawyer, and he was of the opinion that they do have the right to strike it out.

Mr. KEATING. Then would it have to go back for another referendum to the people?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That I do not know, but his opinion was that we had done the same thing in the matter of the Constitution of Oklahoma, and that merely the delegates of the convention had to take some positive action; that it did not have to go to a vote of the people.

Mr. KEATING. That constitutional convention is still a legal body and is still in existence.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. As I understand, 92 delegates were elected by the people and they spent 62 days kicking these provisions back and forth. The final result was approved by 88 of the delegates; then it was taken to a vote of the people, then approved by the President and brought here. I defer to the gentleman's opinion, he being a distinguished lawyer of the constitutional type.

Mr. KEATING. But I am not a Puerto Rican lawyer, I may say to the gentleman; I am just raising these questions for information.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. MURDOCK. The point was made by some of us when we were discussing the proposed amendment this morning and the suggestion was then made on good authority that the proposed amendment to strike out section 20 of the bill of rights of the constitution would merely require its being referred to the same power that drafted the constitution and when the constitutional convention accepts the condition imposed by this body that is sufficient without sending it by referendum to the people.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I would just like to amplify the response of the gentleman from Nebraska by saying that from a little research I discovered that practically every State constitution which was submitted to the Congress was found to be at variance in some feature or other with what the Congress thought it should be; so on many occasions constitutions were returned to the States for adjustment in line with the congressional position.

It would certainly seem to me, since it is not contended that Puerto Rico is to be a State or to achieve independence, that the least that we could except would be that a highly objectionable section, such as section 20, should be taken out of the constitution upon the insistence of the Congress.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the gentleman is correct in that position. I trust that the people of Puerto Rico and of South America will not interpret our action in modifying the constitution which was so overwhelmingly approved as being in opposition to them or an unfriendly act. I think we ought to be in the position of wanting to be helpful to them and in seeing that they do not adopt anything in their constitution that they might regret later on. I said to them when they were before us: "I am sure you will need some amendments to your constitution. There are some things in here I do not like and I think you will find by experience you will not like them either."

Under the circumstances I think we ought to approve it. I am going to go along even though section 20 is in the bill. I do not like it but I think the effect of kicking the whole thing out would be bad on these folks who are trying to go along and have a constitution adopted which they think is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As a matter of fact, Public Law 600 under which we are operating gives the Congress the authority to completely reject this constitution if it desires to do so?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So that a committee amendment is to be offered completely rejecting section 20, and calling for a modification of section 7.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We are proposing to completely reject section 20.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. When the State of New Mexico was admitted into the Union we were admitted on condition we would submit one or two sections to a vote of the people. I take it this amendment will have the same effect when adopted by the Congress.

I want to say further my position is the same as is the gentleman's. If the amendment is offered, I am going to vote for the amendment, but if it is not adopted I shall vote for approval of the constitution, because the fears expressed in respect to section 20 can take effect only if all the other provisions of the constitution are violated. The other provisions of the constitution will be an effective bar to what is feared may occur. As the gentleman explained, there are many other provisions of the constitution on the plus side which would protect the people against socialistic acts feared with respect to section 20.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Indiana said last week, during the debate on the rule, we do want the people of Puerto Rico to govern themselves to the fullest extent of their capacity, and the history of congressional legislation for Puerto Rico has been a history of extending progressively greater opportunities for self-government. Their right of self-determination is a right which the United States has championed for many years, with respect to the peoples of other countries, and it would be unfortunate, indeed, if we were to be found lacking in the implementation of that right as far as the people of our Territories are concerned.

Our record with respect to Puerto Rico will stand the closest scrutiny. First, we established a government under the organic act and gave the people of Puerto Rico legislative authority with respect to matters of local concern which has been described by the courts as nearly as extensive as the general powers of a State. Then a Puerto Rican was appointed as governor. Following that, we authorized the people of Puerto Rico to elect their own governor, a privilege which has not been extended to any of our other Territories, not excluding the incorporated Territories. And most recently we authorized the people of Puerto Rico to draft and adopt their own constitution, and took the further and highly significant step of giving them an opportunity to indicate whether they wanted to do so, by providing that they must accept or reject our act.

An impressive percentage of the eligible electorate participated in the referendum and the act was accepted by an overwhelming majority. The same pattern was followed when the constitution drafted and adopted by the elected delegates to the constitutional convention was offered to the people. Following their approval, the constitution was submitted to the President and was by him in turn submitted to us, with a recital of his finding that, in the language of Public Law 600, the constitution conforms with the applicable provisions of Public Law 600, and of the Constitution of the United States.

I quite agree with those of my colleagues who have stated that the Congress is not to be a rubber stamp, as it would be if we must merely approve, without more consideration, the constitution submitted to us. We have not, and I think we cannot, so abdicate from our constitutional responsibility for Puerto Rico as long as it remains a Territory of the United States.

It is our duty to examine the constitution, to determine whether it meets the standards we have laid down for it, and then to approve or disapprove it accordingly. But in examining the constitution, and in determining whether to approve it, we are not required to endorse its every provision nor to withhold our approval because we may not be prepared to incorporate all of its provisions into the constitutions of the States we respectively represent. Neither are we required to disapprove the Puerto Rican Constitution if we cannot match every provision with an identical one in the Constitution of the United States.

Our enactment of Public Law 600 has no meaning unless it means that we entrusted to the people of Puerto Rico the responsibility of writing the law on which their government is to be based and that we agreed to permit them to be the judges of what should be contained in that basic law, subject only to the conditions that it make provision for a republican form of government, that it contain a bill of rights, and that it be in conformity with the applicable provisions of Public Law 600 and the applicable provisions of the United States Constitution. If the constitution which we have before us had not provided for a republican form of government, if it were lacking in a bill of rights, if it contained a provision which was in conflict with an applicable provision of the Federal Constitution, I would be the first to vote to disapprove it. But such is not the case.

It does provide for a republican form of government, it does contain a bill of rights, and there is nothing in it which does not conform to the applicable provisions of the Constitution of the United States. I might call the attention of the House to the fact that the Bill of Rights of the Federal Constitution has been held by the courts not to be applicable to Puerto Rico. Therefore, even if Public Law 600 were to be read as requiring the Puerto Rican Constitution to reproduce precisely those provisions of the United States Constitution which are now applicable to Puerto Rico, the requirement would not apply to the Federal Bill of Rights.

Admittedly, there are provisions in the Puerto Rican Constitution which do not appear in the Federal Constitution, but by Public Law 600 we did not forbid the people of Puerto Rico from including provisions which go beyond the provisions of the Federal Constitution. As our colleague from Puerto Rico has so well said, we required only that the Puerto Rican Constitution be in harmony with, be not in conflict with, the Federal Constitution.

If we had required that Puerto Rico adopt a constitution which merely reproduced the Federal Constitution, our act would have been no more than an empty gesture. It would have amounted to a substitution of the Federal Constitution for the organic act, with Puerto Rico acting as the agent of the Congress in enacting it into law. Puerto Rico would in fact have had no say in determining what its constitution was to provide, although in the debates and committee reports, we professed to be giving Puerto Rico a substantial share in determining the basis of its government. The enabling acts by which provision was made for the admission to the Union of the territories on the mainland did not require that the constitutions to be adopted by the new State be carbon copies of the United States Constitution. The States were permitted to adopt constitutions which suited their own needs within certain limits.

There are provisions in the constitution of my State which would surely not be necessary or desirable for the State of New York. By the same token, we should not have required, and did not in fact require, Puerto Rico to reproduce the Federal Constitution or the constitution of any given State. Members of the Congress were not required to endorse for the States they represented all the provisions of a constitution adopted by a new State. There would be even less reason to require such an endorsement of the Constitution of Puerto Rico, which remains a Territory of the United States and is not seeking admission as a State.

I readily recognize that section 20 of article II of the Puerto Rican Constitution delineates certain so-called human rights which are not rights guaranteed to the individual by the Federal or State constitutions. But Puerto Rico does not regard them as guaranteed by the Puerto Rican government either. These rights are, in the constitution, separately cataloged and are coupled with a statement indicating that to bring them into being as practical achievements requires a degree of industrial and agricultural development not yet attained by Puerto Rico. Thus, they are in reality a statement of goals toward which Puerto Rico intends to work.

As such, I am sure they would be endorsed by every Member of the Congress. We would all like to be assured of free elementary and secondary education, of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

employment, of an adequate standard of living, of protection in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability or old age, and so on. I daresay many of us in the course of our campaigns have pledged ourselves to work toward those ends for our constituents. The Governor of Puerto Rico in his appearance before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs assured us that section 20 was not intended to be, nor was it represented to the people of Puerto Rico as being, a present guarantee of rights.

Perhaps some of us would have thought it advisable to omit reference to these goals in a constitution, to avoid any possible misconstruction. I have some personal knowledge of the love of persons with a Latin heritage for resounding phrases and the statement of lofty aims; my State has many citizens with such a background and such tendencies. I do not condemn the incorporation into the constitution of these splendid goals. I can readily understand that the delegates to the convention could not resist the opportunity to set down their aims in their basic document. I do not think we should disapprove the constitution on that account. Rather I think we should applaud the expressed determination of the government of Puerto Rico to work toward those goals for the benefits of its people.

Unless we can conscientiously find that the people of Puerto Rico have submitted to us a constitution which does not meet the requirements laid down in Public Law 600, we must approve this constitution. We are not bound by the findings of the President that the prescribed requirements have been met, though, of course, we should give due deference to that finding. We must reach our own independent conclusion. At the same time we may not impose additional prerequisites for our approval which were not stated in Public Law 600. We did not then tell Puerto Rico that its constitution could include nothing which did not appear in the Federal Constitution, and nothing to which each Member of Congress could not subscribe to as suitable or desirable for his own State.

We did not say that if anything was included in the constitution which in our judgment might more appropriately have been left for legislative enactment we would not approve it. We wanted to assure that certain standards were met and for that reason we required that the constitution come to us for approval before it became effective. If we find that those standards have been met—and I here record my opinion that they have been met in all respects—we must approve the constitution. To do otherwise would be to break faith with the people of Puerto Rico and to lower our standing in the eyes of the world.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. In the event that the Congress expresses its disapproval of any part of this constitution, will it be necessary to submit the amended constitution to the people for approval?

Mr. BENTSEN. We made a study of this in committee this morning, and the legal counsel we have advises us they would merely have to reconvene their constitutional convention. There are some 92 members of that convention. It would not have to be resubmitted to the people in an election.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I take it the gentleman will agree with me that the provision of Public Law 600, requiring approval of the Congress, was something more than a perfunctory matter, and anyone undertaking to draft the constitution must have recognized, as the process went on, that ultimately it would come to the Congress, not for just rubber-stamp approval, but for consideration of the provisions. States that have come into the Union have had to submit their constitutions in that manner.

Mr. BENTSEN. I think what it turns on is our interpretation of the word "approval." My interpretation of it was, in Public Law 600, that approval was predicated on whether or not they had conformed with the provisions set out under Public Law 600. It is my personal opinion that they have. I agree with the gentleman that I would have preferred it had they not put that particular section 20 in the bill.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I am concerned about the legal status of this so-called commonwealth once the Congress passes the resolution before us. I am concerned whether or not the Congress thereby will be making an irrevocable delegation of its authority under article IV, section 3, clause 2 of our Constitution. Will it be beyond the power of Congress to review any legislation adopted under this constitution as it now can do? If the Congress passes a law that is in conflict with a law adopted under this constitution by Puerto Rico, will the law passed by the United States Congress supersede that of the Puerto Rican Legislature?

Mr. BENTSEN. I think the gentleman has raised an excellent point. I will try to answer it, if I may. To me it would do no more in delegating away authority than we delegate away to a State, and I think that is something that we should approach, although we do not give them as complete autonomy as the State; that we will still have every control over Puerto Rico that we have over a State, and still they will not have reached full State status in that they do not have full representation in Congress and in addition they must operate under the Federal Relations Act.

Mr. MEADER. That is exactly what concerns me. I am more concerned now than before because the answer the gentleman gave would seem to be that the Congress, by passing this resolution, would have made an irrevocable delegation of authority to Puerto Rico, similar to that granted when we admit a State into the Union.

Mr. BENTSEN. Yes. In my interpretation, I think we are doing that. I think that is what we should be doing for Puerto Rico, because I think they have shown a great deal of economic and political progress. I see no reason why we should treat them as a vassal or serf. They are working toward self-government. We are taking it step by step. We gave them first a governor who is a native. After they showed more progress we said, "You can elect your own governor." Then, they elected their legislature. Step by step they are becoming more self-governing, just as a State does. This does not mean they become a State yet because they have no vote here in the Congress. I think they have shown a tremendous amount of progress in that country. We are trying to help foster that feeling that they have the responsibility to govern themselves, subject to the Federal Government.

Mr. MEADER. If the gentleman will yield further, I will say that I examined very carefully the hearings of the committee both on Public Law 600 and the report, and I find there was no specific consideration of the legal or constitutional effect and implications of this Puerto Rican Constitution.

I asked the Legislative Counsel of the House to review this matter and give me an opinion on it. The Legislative Counsel could find nothing in earlier hearings on the matter that gave a clear and unambiguous answer to my question. They would not give me a written opinion.

I did, however, obtain a brief written opinion from the American Law Section of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. I showed the opinion to the gentleman from Texas. The opinion of the Legislative Reference Service is diametrically opposed to the opinion the gentleman has just expressed. The opinion of the American Law Section is that Congress in passing this resolution does not in any way make an irrevocable delegation of its constitutional authority under article 4, section 3.

Mr. BENTSEN. I think maybe the gentleman is putting words in my mouth. I said that we do no more to Puerto Rico than we do to a State. I think that is a fact.

Mr. MEADER. In my opinion, when we admit a State to the Union we do make an irrevocable delegation of authority under article 4, section 3. Congress can no longer pass laws with respect to the State of Michigan in the same way that it can with respect to the Territory of Hawaii. If the gentleman's understanding of it is that once we accept this Puerto Rican Constitution they are in the same status as the State of Michigan or the State of Texas, then I say we are really admitting them to the Union as a State.

Mr. BENTSEN. No; I think they are coming a step nearer to it. I cannot see that they are on a par with a State. If the gentleman drew that impression from my remarks, perhaps I did not make my point clear. I meant to. I think we are reaching another step in that direction.

Mr. MEADER. The question is a basic one. It will affect property rights of the citizens of Puerto Rico. It is just like adopting a constitution; it certainly

should be a matter that is clear and unambiguous. Titles and rights of one kind or another may be affected by what we do on this resolution, and our action should not leave that question in doubt.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, when this matter came before us under the rule, fortunately or unfortunately I had looked into it a little and felt compelled to raise a few questions about this constitution and what we were doing.

Certain columnists and some newspaper editors have taken me to task quite severely for even asking those questions. For instance, I question the propriety of writing what should be statutory provisions into the constitution. I did not say that I opposed any such provisions, I merely questioned whether they should be written into the constitution. Everyone who has studied law knows that matters of such nature should be left to the statutes. That has just been voiced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN]. But for even raising such an issue I am accused in a segment of the nation's press as being in favor of child labor. Now let us get away from all that and come on down to the merits of this question.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. My own State of New Mexico has such a provision in its constitution, and we do not think it is wrong for it to be in there.

Mr. HALLECK. Perhaps the gentleman is right. I certainly would not want to get into any quarrel with New Mexico. I think too much of that State, and I am not going to get into any quarrel about it. The question I raised had primarily to do with section 20. A few people have said that even if section 20 does not go out of this resolution they are still going to vote for it. I shall not.

I hope you will listen to what I have to say now, but before you vote on the amendment, I want you to look at page 6039 of the May 27 RECORD. There you will find, in connection with my remarks, an editorial from the New York Daily News, which dealt with this very proposition.

I said the other day in speaking on the rule, that in my opinion section 20 departs completely from the whole philosophy of the Bill of Rights of our own Constitution. Instead of spelling out the areas within which an individual may pursue happiness and life and liberty, it undertakes to create an obligation or a guaranty on the part of the state to give these things to the individual.

After my comment on the floor of the House the other day, an eminent financier and student of governmental affairs telephoned me from New York. He readily admitted that my interpretation of section 20, as contained in this proposed Puerto Rican Constitution, meant exactly what I said it meant: an attempt to establish a guaranty running from the Government to every individual to give him all of these things. But, he said, the safeguard is that the people of Puerto Rico can never afford it.

Why, to my mind, that is no answer at all. Even if a State of the Union today undertook to assert that it could afford to provide these services, certainly no State should write such provisions into its constitution because that just is not the American way and such an attempt would ultimately fail. I insist that if section 20 stays in, we are in truth and in fact approving a philosophy of Government and of economics which is clearly outside our whole concept of government.

Let me point out one further thing to you. As I said the other day, I supported the creation of the United Nations, and I have continued to support it. But some recent developments disturb me. Section 20 was lifted right out of the text of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

What is presently going on in the other body as a result of the prospect of these so-called human rights being written into some sort of a treaty, which might stem from United Nations action? Senator BRICKER, of Ohio, joined by 56 Senators, is now proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to make it doubly sure that any treaty entered into shall not have the effect of superseding our own Constitution.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I agree with what the gentleman says about section 20. This is what they said, which is contained in the report, before the whole Puerto Rican community: "That they could not have those rights unless the whole island of Puerto Rico and all of the Puerto Ricans devotedly worked toward their achievement."

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, that holds out the promise, and as I said before, those are worthy objectives for which all of us should strive, whether it is in the United States or whether it is in Puerto Rico.

May I say to the gentleman from Nebraska, the fundamental issue here is the method by which we strive for them. Do we strive for them under the protection of the liberties and rights and freedoms and opportunities of the individual, or do we strive for them in the socialistic and communistic manner, which says that the Government is going to do it for you? Why, the gentleman from Nebraska, I know, agrees with me completely. Certainly. I say again I cannot see for the life of me how anyone could support section 20, if its implications are sufficiently great to lead the Senate of the United States—56 Senators—to join together in an attempt to protect us against them and their devastating effect on our whole system of Government and our Bill of Rights.

Then, why should we here, for Puerto Rico or for anybody else, put our stamp of approval upon an approach that we know can lead only to ruin?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I agree with the gentleman 100 percent. The Government cannot give, or should not give these people these things. They must work for them as we must work for them in this country. There is no difference between the philosophy of the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Nebraska on that score. That is the reason that I read the explanation of the individual who was responsible for putting section 20 in. Personally, I would like to have it taken out.

Mr. HALLECK. I certainly hope that it is taken out and that this amendment, which is to be offered by the chairman of the committee, is adopted.

Mr. Chairman, since I got into this thing, I have been getting a lot of letters from a lot of people, and some of them evidence a pretty high capacity and understanding.

Let me read to you an excerpt from one letter, which I received from a gentleman in Puerto Rico who was a delegate to the constitutional convention. This is bearing on section 20. He says in his letter:

> By said section every person has the right to demand from the state: food, clothing, housing, medical care, and necessary social services. As a member of said committee I voted against said section, and in the end, against the entire article. I stated then:
>
> "In my opinion every individual should feel responsible for the well-being of himself and his family. It would be destructive of social peace should everyone lean upon the constituted civil society (especially upon one so poor as ours) as the provider of work, food, and medical care, let alone said other necessary social services not mentioned. It is indeed unlike the American ways of life, where men do not yield their own means of procuring subsistence, and where great private institutions undertake the task of helping humanity. This provision will cause the imposition of high taxes until, with the destruction of private wealth, the government will take over and thus become the big employer, the sole provider. Men would then enslave themselves to the government, and their only ambition would be to reach high offices in the government. The writing is on the wall and I hate to foresee its consequences. Please make clear my vote against this improvident section."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairmen, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman speaks of an amendment of some kind here. I do not think we can write a constitution for them. Will the gentleman explain by what method, or in what manner we can amend their constitution?

Mr. HALLECK. I had hoped that the gentleman from Arizona would read his amendment, but without reading it, may I say that a part of it has to do with schools and is rather lengthy, and it says on page 2, beginning on line 11, "strike out all after the word 'states' through line 12, and insert in lieu thereof 'except section 20 of article II of said constitution.'"

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I just want to ask the gentleman, as a matter of law, the gentleman being an eminent lawyer, whether he thinks we can ratify a constitution in part, and throw out part of the constitution. How is that going to be done?

Mr. HALLECK. In my answer a moment ago when a Member yielded to me,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

I said that States submitted their constitutions to the Congress of the United States, and the Congress of the United States has found at times objectionable features in those constitutions, and has sent the offending constitution back to the State to be revised in compliance with what the Congress of the United States said. I do not claim to be an eminent lawyer, although I studied a little constitutional law. I must say this whole proposition is confusing. I do not know how careful we were when we wrote Public Law 600 in the Eighty-first Congress. Right now, with Alaska and Hawaii knocking at the door of statehood, neither one of them is operating under a constitution. I am not sure, and there is a difference of opinion in Puerto Rico, as to whether this creates a separate commonwealth with a high measure of autonomy and independence, or whether these people still continue as a protectorate of the United States under the basic act.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. This is a one-package proposition, a constitution. It is either good or it is bad. If it is good we should ratify it. If it is bad it seems to me we should send it back.

Mr. HALLECK. If this amendment does not go in, I certainly shall vote against the resolution. I do it because in good conscience I just could not approve a provision so radical in its departure from our whole constitutional approach. But it has been urged, and I understand in the other body two Senators, Senators O'MAHONEY and MILLIKIN, are working on this very approach, and the conclusion has been reached that it is legal and proper to approach it in this way.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], the committee has instructed the chairman to offer an amendment first to strike out section 20 of the bill of rights, which is under discussion now, and to clarify the language in section 5.

It was our understanding that this will not need to be referred to a referendum in Puerto Rico, but the constitutional convention over which the good doctor here presided is still a political entity in existence and we would approve the constitution today I hope with this exception, and it will be referred to the reassembled constitutional convention. When they accept the change then, of course, it will be so proclaimed.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, but I am afraid I am taking too much time.

Mr. MASON. The point I want to make is this: Under Public Law 600, this Congress retained the right to reject this constitution in toto. If we retained the right to reject the constitution in toto, it seems to me that automatically gave us the right to reject any part of the constitution.

Mr. HALLECK. I think that is what is called among lawyers a good horseback opinion.

Mr. MASON. That is the only kind of opinion I can give.

Mr. HALLECK. That is frequently the best opinion.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. BOSONE].

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Chairman, years ago when my little daughter entered junior high school she asked me what language she should study. I was a student of French, German, and Latin when I was in school, so when she asked me what language she should study I advised Spanish. I have never regretted that advice. When she finished college last year her major was in Spanish.

I have always thought that probably our best friends were and would be the South American countries. I am convinced since I sat upon the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of this House that our tie, our link with South America is Puerto Rico. Fortunately, two summers ago my daughter had a summer vacation in Puerto Rico and attended the University of Puerto Rico, which has an enrollment of 10,000 students. She was amazed to find so many South Americans in Puerto Rico. She told me about acquaintances and friendships she made of South Americans.

I believe we have one of the most important pieces of legislation that has or will come before us during this session of Congress. What we do with this bill or what we could do to it has worried me; it has more than disturbed me, it has more than concerned me, it has worried me, because I think we have an obligation. I had the opportunity of being the first outsider to address that great constitutional convention down in Puerto Rico last November. I had heard there were some factions in Puerto Rico that were saying: "Do not believe the United States; do not believe the Congress; they are not sincere. They tell us we can draft a constitution, but you wait and see; they do not mean what they say."

Of course I said to them: "I can speak only as one Member of Congress, but I am sincere and I have the firm belief that every Member of Congress is sincere and was sincere when the Congress passed the resolution to give them the honor, the right, and the privilege of drafting their own constitution."

Now we find the trouble lies with section 20. The chairman of the Committee on Human Rights was the chancelor of the university, President Benites, a great university president, a great humanitarian, a great student, and so recognized in this country. To know him and know him well you would know he had no connection with the thinking of the Socialists. He was staking an ideal, an ideal to shoot at. I draw this to your attention.

Section 20 says:

> The right of every person to obtain work.

You cannot take that out of context. You have to go on to the last two sections of section 20 which state:

> The rights set forth in this section are closely connected with the progressive development of the economy of the commonwealth and require, for their full effectiveness, sufficient resources and an agricultural and industrial development not yet attained by the Puerto Rican community.
>
> In the light of their duty to achieve the full liberty of the citizen, the people and the government of Puerto Rico shall do everything in their power to promote the greatest possible expansion of the system of production, to assure the fairest distribution of economic output, and to obtain the maximum understanding between individual initiative and collective cooperation.

There is the statement of their ambition and ideals. When you enter Puerto Rico you get a feeling of strangulation due to the terrific population. You feel depressed. But when you go out and see how those people have gone into new industry and are rebuilding industry with a spirit you have never seen before, then you see this ideal that is here written in section 20 under the title of human rights.

Mr. Chairman, I sometimes think that if we were to write Christ's teachings into legislation we would not pass them. It has come to a pretty state when we cannot state an ideal, tied up with Christianity, without its being attacked. This going to church on Sunday and not living our religion on Monday is entirely wrong.

I have always thought that a constitution was a statement of policy. I have always believed that the constitution of any organization or country should be a statement of policy. I do not think we should put legislation in constitutions, either, but, then, our 48 State constitutions have much legislation.

It was stated that New Mexico had to resubmit its constitution, but, Mr. Chairman, New Mexicans were Americans, English-speaking people, years ago. We are now in 1952, dealing with a Spanish-speaking people. In this case we are setting an example of how we treat a loyal possession of loyal Americans. We have an entirely different world situation in 1952 from 1910.

In my opinion it would be wrong not to pass this constitution, and the effect of it would be tremendous on our good will and in saving face and in the confidence of the Puerto Rican people. All of this will in turn be reflected in our relationship with South America.

You argue there should not be legislation in the Constitution of the United States. Yet the legislatures of 28 States approved the child-labor amendment to the United States Constitution. I was a party to that in the State of Utah 20 years ago. There were 28 States who approved this amendment to the United States Constitution. It fell short, you see, of the necessary 36, but there were 28 State legislatures that thought it should be a part of the United States Constitution.

There is social security written into the constitution of Louisiana. There is legislation for the old people in Missis-

sippi written into the constitution; in Montana there is legislation relative to the infirm and unfortunate people. What do you call that? It is legislation written into the constitution. The same situation exists in the States of New York, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, Florida, and Kansas, and California has plenty written into its constitution. Who says there is not legislation in constitutions? Maybe I do not like it, maybe you do not like it, but it is there.

I want to tell you that when I attended the Puerto Rican Constitutional Convention, I never saw more serious-minded or finer looking people in my life. Those delegates worked 5½ months on this constitution. They read and studied the constitutions of each of the 48 States and our National Constitution many times. I presume they sought plenty of help. They worked all day, many of them well into the night. Let us not have these people lose confidence in us. Let light shine through the misty hills of Puerto Rico, giving hope for a bright and happy future.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we can give Puerto Rico the privilege of going forward and onward under their own democratic constitutional form of government.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I think we are getting a little far afield of what to me appears to be the basic question before the committee this morning.

Public Law 600 provides as follows:

> Upon adoption of the constitution by the people of Puerto Rico the President of the United States is authorized to transmit such constitution to the Congress of the United States if he finds that such constitution conforms with the applicable provisions of this act and of the Constitution of the United States.

I have grown up with the feeling that the Constitution of the United States was a God-given document, and I know that the purpose of the men who wrote that Constitution was to protect the people of this Nation from an autocratic government under which they had lived abroad. Now they have a new concept. We are not to protect the people from an autocratic government, but under section 20 we set up a form of government which to me is absolutely alien to the concept of the framers of our own Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot conscientiously stand here and cast my vote today saying that this constitution, containing section 20, conforms with the Constitution of the United States. Unless section 20 is eliminated by the adoption of the committee amendment, I shall feel constrained to vote against the passage of this resolution. I am attempting to insist upon that amendment being accepted this morning by the Committee, because I know in my own heart that this section is a far departure from the principles upon which this Nation was built and which have made it great. If the people of Puerto Rico desire such a constitution, I shall have no objection, although I do not believe it will achieve the things that they want; but I certainly shall not cast my vote to say that section 20 of this document corresponds with that magnificent document of our own, the Constitution of the United States of America.

My fear is simply this. When a government is set up to distribute the economic benefits called for in section 20 of this proposed constitution, I fear that it must of necessity in achieving those aims destroy the political freedoms guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States.

The setting up of such a government by constitutional process can by no stretch of the imagination be said to be conforming with the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I had prepared to discuss this resolution on somewhat a different basis than I will today before the committee offers its amendment, which I hope will be carried. I would like to say to the very distinguished gentleman from Indiana, for whom I have the highest regard and whom I follow in practically every instance, that I could conscientiously vote for the Puerto Rican constitution if section 20 was not removed. I have studied it, I will say to the gentletman, very carefully; I have given it a great deal of thought. I do not like it. I wish it were not there, but in weighing the question as to what would be the best thing to do, I feel that I should vote for the constitution if the amendment is not adopted. I recognize the work that my distinguished Senator from Ohio is doing on the question of the United Nations Charter.

It is difficult, of course, ever to bring in a constitution that everyone is going to approve of. I think it is impossible.

In some of the research I did on this particular question I read the letter that George Washington on September 17, 1787 wrote to the Congress of the United States when he transmitted our own great document to the Congress of the United States. He was discussing the difficulties between the States and trying to compromise the various positions of the members of that great convention. This he says in his letter:

> It is at all times difficult to draw with precision the line between those rights which must be surrendered, and those which may be reserved; and on the present occasion this difficulty was increased by a difference among the several States as to their situation, extent, habits, and particular interests.

We certainly have that here, the question of the difficulty of the extent, habits, and particular interests of the people.

It had been my pleasure and privilege even before being a Member of Congress to visit Puerto Rico on several occasions and to learn to know the people and many of their leaders well. Let us not confuse ourselves that Puerto Rico is a community made up of people who are just beginning to learn the art of government. For 400 years they were under Spanish rule, that is where I raise the question of their situation, extent, habits, and particular interests. They had good government under the Spanish regime as they saw it. They had over 400 years of the Spanish regime. Ponce de Leon was the Governor of Puerto Rico at one time before he went across to Florida. They are not completely new on this question of government, but they do have, through the Spanish influence, some differences from what you and I may have, therefore the differences in their situation, extent, habits, and particular interests.

One of the things that made me decide I would vote for this Constitution even though section 20 was not removed is the repercussion in Puerto Rico and Central and South America if this Congress does not accept or ratify this consitution.

I was not a Member of this body at the time Public Law 600 was passed, but I took occasion today to review and reread the debates on the floor of this House when law 600 was passed. They are very interesting. They point out many things.

I believe the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] almost put his finger on the situation we have here today. He had offered an amendment, which was not carried, which might have saved some of this question. But there was one thing about law 600 that the Puerto Rican people were watching. You will find it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on roll call 193 in volume 96, part 7, page 9601. It was a motion to recommit law 600. The vote was 1 yea, cast by Mr. Marcantonio, and 260 nays. There was only one dissenting vote in this House on the approval of law 600, under which the Puerto Ricans proceeded then on the question of, Should they accept law 600? On June 4, 1951, 506,185 Puerto Ricans went to the polls and 387,000 of them voted to accept what the constitutional convention provided. I was in Puerto Rico at the time of that campaign, and I knew what the interest of the people was in a constitution, and in holding this constitutional convention. Charges were made then by some of the people in Puerto Rico, who today are charging that this is an improper document; that there were not fair elections; that it was not a fair campaign. I had the opportunity to make that investigation at that time, and found that there was no undue influence on the part of the insular government. It was a fair campaign, and all issues were discussed freely and openly on whether or not law 600 should be adopted.

On August 27, 1951, again the people of Puerto Rico went to the polls and 92 delegates to a convention were elected. They met for 62 days and debated the question. I think that the letter, which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] read, while he had the floor, shows the character of men who made up that convention.

Then on March 3, 1952, of this year, the Puerto Ricans again went to the polls and 82 percent of those voting, voted for the adoption of this constitution. In other words, again 400,000 American citizens in a community voted their approval. Four hundred thousand American citizens voted, relying upon us

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and upon law 600, which carried here in the Congress of the United States with only one dissenting vote. They adopted this constitution.

Mr. Chairman, even if we disregard the overwhelming majority of votes cast in favor of this constitution, as some of our colleagues would do, if there was any great dissension in Puerto Rico, we would have had a great deal of mail in opposition to the constitution. But, we have not had such opposition. The source of opposition in Puerto Rico comes from the Independence Party. The president of the Independence Party is one Gilberto Concepcion, who claims he is the loyal opposition. If that is the case, then the loyal opposition is that he is the opposition to the United States, and they would not give support to law 600, and they are not giving support to this constitution.

Let me tell you just a little bit about the president of the Independence Party, Dr. Gilberto Concepcion. He has been associated in the past with the separatist movement on the island, carried on against the United States. Together with ex-Representative Vito Marcantonio, Dr. Concepcion was the defense counsel for Albizu Campos, and the others after their trial by the Government of the United States in 1936 in their attempt to overthrow the Government of the United States. They were convicted and served terms. Dr. Concepcion has been identified as a member of the legal advisory committee of the International Labor Defense, and has been active as a speaker and worker in that organization. The United States Attorney General has called the International Labor Defense the legal arm of the Communist Party. Even the Congress has held it to be one of the most important of the many auxiliary fronts of the Communist Party in this country. It is Dr. Concepcion and his group, it is the Communist group in Puerto Rico who are most vocal on the island in opposition to this constitution. They would like nothing better than to be able to go to the people there and say that the Congress of the United States has, after approving law 600 and after having hundreds and thousands of Puerto Ricans go to the polls to vote, first that they should adopt law 600, and then that they would have a constitutional convention, and then that their constitution be ratified by the people, to come back and say that it was rejected by the Congress.

The campaign conducted by the Independence Party and Dr. Concepcion against the acceptance of Public Law 600 authorizing Puerto Rico to draft its own constitution, followed the same pattern adopted by Mr. Marcantonio in Congress when he opposed the approval of the act. Furthermore, an open letter from Marcantonio was broadcast over the radio in which he advised and urged the people in Puerto Rico to vote against the law claiming that the constitution that would be drafted under its provisions would turn the Puerto Ricans into slaves of the Wall Street groups. In his letter Marcantonio called Governor Muñoz-Marín a traitor for advising the Puerto Ricans to vote in favor of the acceptance of the law.

On November 1, 1950, 2 days after the October 30 uprising of the Nationalists and the attempt to assassinate Governor Muñoz-Marín at La Fortaleza, the Independence Party headed by this man Concepcion passed a resolution in which it accused the Government of the United States as responsible for the uprising and expressed its deepest regard for those "who have offered and are offering their lives for the cause of Puerto Rican independence."

I ask you, is that the type of person whose opposition to this constitution shall tilt the scales in our consideration of this matter?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. BOW. I would like to say that if we want to feed the propaganda mills of Soviet Russia, where they can send word to Latin, South, and Central America that we are exercising colonialism, then we will turn this constitution down. But if we are to be the show place of Central and South America and prove to those people that we do not believe in colonialism, that we believe in the right of self-government, then we will support this constitution, for the propaganda mills will certainly turn it on against us if we refuse to do so.

I did want to say in closing that I was interested in the fact that both great parties have said we should have statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. We have not done so. The propaganda mills again turned it on. One great party has said Puerto Rico should have statehood and the other has said they should have the form of government they choose. Now is the time to carry out their pledge. I urge the House to approve this constitution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McMULLEN].

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that there is anything I can add to this debate on this most important question. I do want to concur in what my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] has just said with reference to the adoption of this constitution by the Congress.

To my way of thinking, it is unthinkable that the Congress will not approve this constitution for Puerto Rico, with or without the proposed amendments.

The Government of the United States has held itself out all over the world to the people of all Latin and South and Central American countries that we are not dictators; that we believe in so-called States' rights, and that we believe in the governed governing themselves. To save me, I do not see how anyone can advocate States' rights and be opposed to this constitution. The people of Puerto Rico overwhelmingly voted on March 3 of this year and adopted this constitution by a vote of approximately 4 to 1. I say to you it is my opinion that if we go on record and say to those people, "Yes, you say you want this constitution. Well, we are not dictators, we are not trying to dictate to you, we are saying to you that you people in Puerto Rico cannot have a constitution which you voted for yourselves." If we fail to approve this constitution the impact on the people of Puerto Rico will be tremendous and terrific. The impact on all the people of South and Central America will be terrific.

I agree with what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] said, that if we fail to adopt this constitution, in my opinion, we will furnish more ammunition and propaganda to the Communist agencies in Central and South America than they could buy with millions of dollars. I doubt if there is a Member of Congress who believed when we passed Public Law 600 that the Congress ever intended that Congress would have to approve the dotting of every "i" and the crossing of every "t" in that constitution. In my opinion, I think we told those people, "If you comply with Public Law 600, if you have a bill of rights, if you have a constitution that is republican in form, and you have complied with the mechanics of the law we set up for you, we are going to approve your constitution."

I represent a district where there are several thousand people of Latin descent, in Tampa, Fla., and some of the finest citizens we have in that section of the country are people of Spanish descent. They are watching what we do here today. All the people of Puerto Rico and South and Central America are watching what we are doing here today. Let us not furnish the Communist propaganda machines with more ammunition. As far as I am concerned, I am going to vote for this constitution, with or without amendments. As far as I can, I would rather hold out a kind and understanding hand of friendship to those people down in South and Central America, and do all we can to further cement the good and friendly relations we have with them.

Let us do nothing to make it harder for them to understand us; let us say to them that they are capable of governing themselves, that they have worked out this constitution, and that we in the Congress of the United States are not going to set ourselves above them and dictate to them.

I hope this constitution will be adopted.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, the passage of this resolution will make real history not only in the Western Hemisphere but also in the whole world. It is one further irrefutable answer to any charge of American imperialism. It demonstrates by deed as well as word our desire to help all peoples to full self-government. At the same time I am happy to learn that apparently an agreement has been reached on an amendment to the resolution which will make clear that approval of the adoption of this constitution by the people of Puerto Rico does not necessarily constitute approval by us of all of the provisions therein. The amendment has to do with section 20 of

article II, which is different from anything in our Constitution and hence does not conform to it. Heretofore a Bill of Rights has consisted of an enumeration of limitations on the power of a government. Not one of the rights in our Bill of Rights is a guaranty that the Government will do this or that for the citizen; every one of them a guaranty that our Government cannot do this or that to the citizen. Rights are what a government cannot do, not what a government must do. The proposed amendment will make clear that approval by the Congress of the adoption by the people of Puerto Rico of the constitution they have worked out does not imply approval of that section of their so-called bill of rights. I think that is the thing we should do. I myself had prepared an amendment to achieve that end in more general terms, but the one to be offered by the committee in my judgment is more specific and doubtless better; and with the adoption of that amendment I hope the passage of the resolution will be unanimous.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is a man in this House, no matter what his politics, who does not know that this human rights convention lifted bodily from the Human Rights Declaration of the United Nations is unworkable, except it be in a communistic state such as Russia; it is perfectly workable there. But let me say to you that it is a fact that Russia does not admit nor permit the right of private property, and it does permit and use slave labor.

There is not any question in the world but that the human rights convention which is practically taken over bodily in this constitution would work perfectly in Russia. Puerto Rico is not coming under the Soviet communistic form of government. I do not know that there has been any tendency toward that in Puerto Rico. I believe there is not. But we are giving them the right to take over in this strange bill of rights of their constitution an entirely unworkable thing in our form of society, under our system of private ownership, and where slave labor is not recognized. It is entirely unworkable; it can never be an end to which its citizens subscribe in any government so long as the world shall last built upon the rights of private property. The Constitution of the United States is based upon the rights of private property, and as such could not ever entertain such a bill of rights as is here placed in this constitution.

Furthermore, I have one other point which impels me to speak against this constitution, and that is that nowhere in that document is there mentioned the fact that it is setting up a republican form of government; it does say that it is setting up a people's idea of democracy; it does allude vaguely in two places that it shall be a representative form—a representative form—because only in that way could they excuse the election of their senators and representatives. It is merely a sop which they would have to have in there, but I maintain just as strongly that in not a single place is it stated these people are setting up a republic. They are setting up a people's democracy which is foreign to our idea of a representative republic.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, Puerto Rico is almost entirely devoid of communism. There are no more loyal or patriotic citizens to the United States than the Puerto Ricans. I was in Puerto Rico immediately following the incident in 1950 when an attempt was made simultaneously on the lives of the President of the United States and the Governor of Puerto Rico. I have never seen a more humilated people than were the Puerto Ricans over this incident. They thought they had lost our admiration and affection. They were fearful that we would think they were revolutionists and that we would doubt their loyalty and patriotism. In an address I made before a joint session of the Puerto Rican House and Senate I attempted to assuage their concern by telling them that we on the mainland were not disturbed by what took place; that we knew it was a mere handful of Puerto Ricans who tried to perpetrate the affair; that while we were sorry an attempt had been made on our President we were also sorry an attempt was made on the Governor of Puerto Rico; and that we did not blame the Puerto Rico people at all.

Since there are no natural resources in Puerto Rico, the island has until recently been devoid of manufacturing. However, "operation bootstrap," established by the legislature, under which appropriations were made for the establishment and development of industries in Puerto Rico, has shown that the people are resourceful. The program has been in effect for several years now and has been remarkably successful. When it began, it was termed "socialistic," but as these manufacturing plants have been built and developed by the government they have been sold and leased to private individuals and have provided much-needed employment.

I am a great admirer of the Puerto Ricans, having visited there several times. I admire their spirit, fortitude, and perseverance and feel they are entitled to all the aid and comfort we can give them. The acceptance of the constitution by this government will aid considerably in furthering good relations between the United States and the people of Spanish descent in the Caribbean and South America. It is a proof to them of our belief in freedom and liberty.

On one of my visits to Puerto Rico I encountered a prominent and nationally known figure from the States whose business requires his visiting extensively in the Caribbean and South America. He had been a frequent visitor to Puerto Rico for some years. He made the startling statement to me that the "Puerto Rican Government is the most uncorruptible and uncorrupted government in the Western Hemisphere." Later, upon inquiring, I learned that the reason for this is the high type of people engaged in the government of Puerto Rico and the honor system prevailing among them, to the degree that if one of them submits to temptation he is ostracized from society. Along with this is the fact that the civil servants are well paid.

I can easily support this constitution, whether section 20 is eliminated or not. In fact, I would rather see it retained.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I will support the amendment, Mr. Chairman, because I feel it most important that there be no misunderstanding between the good people of Puerto Rico and the United States. The constitution of my own State was approved with the reservation that two sections be resubmitted to the State. I do not think the people of Puerto Rico will be offended by this procedure.

But I want it distinctly understood that in supporting the amendment I do not do so because I have any fears about section 20. The declarations of human rights in section 20 are so well established that they can be taken for granted and, therefore, need not be stated in any constitution.

I believe that the fears expressed with respect to section 20 are due to the fact that those declarations of human rights are not viewed in the proper perspective here.

I am convinced that the people of Puerto Rico neither intended nor expect that their government under the constitution now before us will take the form and exercise prerogatives and powers which some have feared would flow from the declarations in section 20 of article 3 of the constitution.

In my opinion, the people of Puerto Rico understand and appreciate the spirit, the scope, and the limitations of section 20. They have no illusions about it. When a Puerto Rican welcomes you with the words "Mi casa es suya" he means it; but he does not expect to give you a deed to the house and that you will proceed to move in on him. To better understand what they did intend and expect from this proposed constitution it would be well to remember and consider the character of the people themselves.

First of all, they are utterly realistic, which is one reason why communism has failed to take root there.

That trait in the character of its people has been demonstrated in the last 3 weeks. When the gentleman from Indiana first arose on this floor to question the declarations in section 20 they were startled, and some were puzzled. But neither in nor out of Puerto Rican government circles—and I have many friends and acquaintances among them and speak their native language—have I heard one word of condemnation or complaint. None has expressed any doubt as to the motives or sincerity of the gentleman from Indiana and others who expressed fears in this regard.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

On the contrary, they have taken the attitude that it was well for the point to be raised and fully debated, so that there may not be any misunderstanding or misapprehension as to the character, scope, and provisions of section 20, either here, in Puerto Rico or abroad.

That, Mr. Chairman, is one of the finest indications of the character of the people of Puerto Rico, and of those devoted men who worked so diligently and so faithfully in the drafting and adoption of the constitution. Many other provisions of this proposed constitution reflect that realistic trait, and that, I submit, is one of the best guarantees that all the provisions of this document will be in the years to come interpreted in the proper perspective and in the traditions of the country to which they owe allegiance as American citizens, a citizenship they cherish.

As a lawyer my mind has been conditioned to thinking very much as the mind of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has been conditioned to thinking by training and experience as a lawyer, and like him I was startled and somewhat concerned about the language in section 20. So I have given this document a great deal of thought, and have come to the conclusion that there is nothing to be startled about, but that on the contrary the world will indeed be startled if we disapproved it because of the language of section 20. It would be nice ammunition for our enemies and our critics. Nevertheless, if section 20 were repugnant to our Constitution, it would have to be disapproved irrespective of the consequences.

On the other hand, we have no right to disapprove language merely because it does not conform to our ideas of constitutional drafting, so long as it is not repugnant to our Federal Constitution. Whether or not it does conform is under agreement with Puerto Rico the sole and only question before use.

In the act authorizing the adoption of a constitution by Puerto Rico, accepted by them in the nature of a compact through a referendum of the legislature, all that is required is that the constitution be republican in form, and that it conform to the Constitution of the United States. This is in effect what is always required of States being admitted into the Union. The Enabling Act for the admission of my own State into the Union required of us a constitution republican in form and that it "shall not be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States." The word conform is a legal term and the courts have held that "the word conform means to bring into harmony or agreement, and does not mean identical"—*Morgan v. Board of Supervisors* (192 Pacific 2d 236, 87 Ariz. 133). When used in connection with an enabling act such as Public Law 600, it means that it shall not be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States. That is what is always required of constitutions for the admission of States into the Union, and there is no reason whatsoever for assuming that in this instance the requirement is to be more restringent merely because of the different use of words. Were Puerto Rico required to have a constitution in substance identical to ours, then it would not be their constitution but one prescribed by Congress.

Not a single one of the declarations in section 20 is repugnant to our Constitution, our Declaration of Independence, our traditions or our institutions. That they should be stated in a constitution seems odd to us, but their inclusion is not fatal to it.

They seem odd because they are so self-evident that we take them for granted. To see them spelled out in a constitution is so unusual, we begin it seems to associate them with all sorts of progapanda that we instinctively fear.

Our own Declaration of Independence, which is the cornerstone of our Government, says:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men.

We did not specify in our Constitution, as does section 20, that a person has a right to receive free education, nor do our State constitutions, but our forefathers very early recognized that to preserve the right to liberty and to achieve the pursuit of happiness, education was necessary, and as a corollary through the years we have provided free education.

Through the years we have progressively provided additional rights and privileges for the achievement and security of those unalienable rights. Peurto Rico is not alone in recognizing by constitutional declaration that government has some responsibility in promoting liberty and the pursuit of happiness, instead of taking it for granted. The great State of Missouri in its new constitution adopted in 1945 provides in article I of this bill of rights as follows:

> SEC. 2. That all constitutional government is intended to promote the general welfare of the people; that all persons have a natural right to life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, and the enjoyment of gains of their own industry; that all persons are created equal and are entitled to equal rights under the law; that to give security to these things is the principal office of government, and that when government does not confer this security, it fails in its chief design."

It also provides in its bill of rights:

> SEC. 17. Employees shall have the right to organize and to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing.

It is evident from the wording, the arrangement, and from the debate, that Puerto Rico intended section 20 in a slightly different category from the bill of rights set out in the preceding 19 sections. In a pamphlet entitled "Notes and Comments on the Constitution," a paper in the nature of the Federalist written by Hamilton and others with respect to our own Constitution, it is stated with respect to the so-called human rights enumerated in section 20 that the convention "decided to place them in a different category from the rights set forth in the previous sections. Accordingly, this section does not guarantee the rights stated therein, but recognizes them and pledges the Commonwealth to work for their progressive realization."

In other words it could very well be considered as a preamble to the Constitution or to the Bill of Rights, or a prolog, or in the lights of its arrangement, perhaps an epilog which the dictionary defines as a "recapitulation and an exhortation."

Irrespective of the character given to the statement of those human rights, they are not repugnant to our Constitution or our traditions. The first human right enumerated as recognized is "the right of every person to receive free elementary and secondary education." We provide free elementary and secondary education in this country.

"The right of every person to obtain work." We recognize the right of every man to obtain employment, and calling it a human right does not change its character. But there have been fears even in this country that that right which our Constitution took for granted might be denied. Florida by a constitutional amendment in 1944 recognized that right and provided "The right of a person to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization." This is, in effect, what Puerto Rico is saying in section 20, and I am sure the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has no objection to that. It does not mean that because the Commonwealth recognizes the right of every person to obtain work that work will be furnished to every man by the government, and the Puerto Ricans do not expect it. They do expect that the government will do its utmost to see that the right to work is not denied to anyone who can obtain it, and that it will do its utmost to promote industry so this right may have full fruition.

The next human right enumerated as recognized is "the right of every person to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, and especially to food, clothing, housing, and medical care and necessary social services." But it does not mean that the government will provide it, and the utterly realistic Puerto Ricans do not expect it. They do expect that if any such is provided to any extent through any relief program or otherwise there shall be no denial of any person entitled to it by reason of color, creed, or otherwise. It is not repugnant to our Constitution.

The same is true of the other two rights so recognized:

> The right of every person to social protection in the event of unemployment, sickness, old age or disability.
>
> The right of motherhood and childhood to special care and assistance.

Our own Government, and our own State governments have at one time or another, provided in one form or another, special care and assistance to motherhood and childhood, to the unemployed, the sick, the aged, and the disabled. That is proof that these things are not repugnant to our Constitution, but are indeed in conformity with it and with our traditions.

In the same section it is stated that "in the light of their duty to achieve the full liberty of the citizen, the people and the government of Puerto Rico shall do

everything in their power to promote," and so forth. The entire arrangement of this section clearly indicates that the purpose is to set a goal toward which the people and the government shall strive, in promoting liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

The fear which has been expressed here is that if the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico should interpret those declarations of section 20 as rights to be provided by the government, it can only be done by a socialistic dictatorship. To arrive at any such conclusion would be to assume that all the other guarantees found in the bill of rights and throughout the entire constitution would be disregarded. This is most unrealistic. The constitution has to be read as a whole and so interpreted, in order to determine whether a Republican form of government has been established and whether it conforms with our Constitution.

The best proof that Puerto Rico is alert to the danger of dictatorship is article 3, another unique provision not found in our constitutions. Notwithstanding the fact, or perhaps because of the fact, that the party in power in Puerto Rico controls the senate and legislature by overwhelming majorities, this article guarantees representation to minority parties under any and every circumstance. We cherish our two-party system, because we feel that it is the best guarantee of our liberties, but there is nothing in our Constitution to prevent one party controlling completely both the House and the Senate. A one-party government is the favorite instrument of communism, and that is made impossible by this proposed constitution. This is another proof that the people of Puerto Rico are utterly realistic.

Another favorite weapon of communistic governments is capital punishment. That is prohibited under the proposed constitution. Under the organic act the Governor of Puerto Rico has the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus, though it is said he never has exercised it. That power is taken away from him by the proposed constitution and placed in the legislative assembly, in conformity with our own Constitution and the constitutions of the 38 States.

The Government of Puerto Rico as created by this constitution gives the island self-government, but they still remain subject and subordinate to the Federal Constitution. This proposed constitution and its several provisions, if susceptible of two interpretations, must be construed so as to conform with our own, in order to carry out the compact, for it is to be presumed that the constitution makers and the people intended to carry out the compact. That is a well-established rule of construction. Any laws to implement or promote the rights recognized in section 20 would still have to be in harmony with the rest of the constitution, else they will be stricken down. What are we afraid of?

Any attempt on the part of the Puerto Rican Government to exercise powers repugnant to our Constitution under any different interpretation, would be subject to reversal through Federal authority, because the people by their vote in the referendum approving the compact agreed to a government under a constitution that conforms to the applicable provisions of the Federal Constitution.

It would be unworthy of us, and of our great country, if because well-known human rights are recognized and enumerated in this section 20, we were to throw out the entire constitution.

I feel, however, that if through this amendment a way can be found whereby the entire constitution need not be disapproved, and whereby language not necessary or essential to the constitution which might cause dissension may be avoided, I have no objections to such a course. We are pioneering in this field of creating a new status for citizens of the United States in areas situated as Puerto Rico is situated. In the long run, therefore, it is best to proceed with caution and without haste. "No se fundo Zamora en una hora," is a proverb I have heard from my elders since my childhood which simply means that like the great city of Zamora in Spain great institutions are not founded in haste.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] was kind enough to refer to an amendment which I offered when the authorization for the Puerto Rican people to establish a constitution was up for debate in June of 1950. My amendment at that time said as follows, with respect to such a constitution: "And expresses the will of the people of Puerto Rico." That was the only amendment I had to the enabling bill. Our colleague, Mr. Peterson, who was then in charge of the bill on the floor, said that he pledged himself, and I subsequently got a similar expression from the administration, to see that the will of the people of Puerto Rico was expressed in such a constitution. What was expressed in that debate as the primary concern of the Congress was that the will of the Puerto Rican people should be expressed in respect to this constitution. There was no intimation that it would be subject to review when it got here so long as it carried out in its basic provisions the structure of government provided by our own Constitution. As proof of that, if Members will refer to the RECORD of June 27, 1950, they will find that Mr. Marcantonio, who wanted to recommit the enabling bill, introduced literally pages of data into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which he said supported his allegation that they could not have a fair election or a fair vote on a constitution in Puerto Rico. There has been a fair vote, to the satisfaction not only of all the observers down there but of our own House committee which observed, and we have had an overwhelming approval both by those representing the Puerto Rican people in a constitutional convention and by the people themselves. It seems to me that should we now reverse that vote on the grounds which are here stated or seek to bring about basic changes in the constitution so adopted, we would be delivering a blow to our standing in the Caribbean and to our foreign policy.

We must make it clear that we give great weight to the people of the Caribbean and Latin America. These are right at our doorstep. These are the people we have to have by our side first and foremost beyond all others. If we should deny to them as elemental a right as self-determination, what respect could they have for all our protestations that we want people to make up their own minds as to how they will be governed?

In terms of foreign policy it has been one of the great strengths of the United States that it did not seek to interfere in the internal management which a people had provided for themselves. Here we would be proposing, if we should listen to the objections to the constitution, to interfere in such internal affairs in a most conspicuous way, because some happen to disagree with some of the social objectives set forth.

Such conservative newspapers as the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune have come out editorially in favor of this constitution and said there is no reason why the Congress should not approve it.

There is a reservation, a caveat in this constitution, which says about these social rights complained of:

> The rights set forth in this section are closely connected with the progressive development of the economy of the Commonwealth and require, for their full effectiveness, sufficient resources and an agricultural and industrial development not yet attained by the Puerto Rican community.

That certainly indicates that these are aspirations and not guaranties or commitments.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. For that very reason, does not the gentleman think there ought to be a reservation in this resolution dealing with it because the fact of the matter is that it is an aspiration, and to resolve any doubt as to what it means? That is the very reason it should not be in the constitution.

Mr. JAVITS. May I say that I think the constitution itself so protects it that if we put in a reservation, we will be doing something gratuitously which will not be well received in Puerto Rico.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINE].

Mr. FINE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to state my unequivocal support of this constitution for Puerto Rico. I have read it, and see no substantial conflict with our own Constitution. I shall vote for it with or without any amendment, and I shall support it.

I have followed with avid interest the political development of Puerto Rico during the past 5 years. It has been gratifying that the Congress, during this period, has extended, through a series of legislative enactments more and more self-government for these people.

These developments commenced in 1947 when the Eightieth Congress

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

amended Puerto Rico's Organic Act so as to permit the people to elect their own Governor, and were climaxed by the action of the Eighty-first Congress in enacting Public Law 600 authorizing the formation of a constitutional government for the island.

Thus, for the first time, while under the American flag, the people of Puerto Rico were offered the full responsibility of conducting their own affairs under their own government—a government of their own creation. Thus is seen the honesty of the United States in advocating political liberty for all peoples.

In accepting this responsibility within a framework of relations with the United States, which Public Law 600 sets forth, the people of Puerto Rico, in a popular referendum, have reaffirmed their faith in the United States. According to the requirements of Public Law 600, the people of Puerto Rico have drafted a constitution which meets all the requirements of the enabling legislation. They have brought us a constitution which, first, provides a government republican in form; second, contains a bill of rights; third, conforms with the applicable provisions of the Federal Constitution; and, fourth, complies fully with all the provisions of Public Law 600. This is what we asked them to do. This is what they have brought to us.

This product is the result of 4½ months of deliberation by the constitutional assembly and represents the work of 92 delegates. The people of Puerto Rico have expressed themselves three times in popular votes in connection with Public Law 600 and the constitution. First, they voted overwhelmingly to accept the constitution drafted by the convention.

This is truly a constitution of and by the people who will be governed by it. It is what they want. It is a modern constitution. It is a good constitution. I am sure it will stand the test of time.

May I observe that the document before us contains 103 sections. It is the product of many minds, including some of the best minds in Puerto Rico. We must be realistic on this question of agreement with the language and principles expressed in any document of this kind. Probably not a single delegate to the convention agreed with each and every provision, with each clause or with the precise phraseology in every instance, although 88 delegates voted in favor of the draft and only 3 voted against it—1 delegate being absent. Unanimity in such matters is impossible. Our founding fathers had no such unanimity when drafting our own Constitution. Please let us bear that in mind. It is the entire finished product taken as a whole which is important. I say the finished product is good. I believe the people of Puerto Rico are to be commended on this result of their endeavor.

It is possible that the months and years may reveal flaws and faults or omissions in the Puerto Rican Constitution, and it may be necessary for the people of Puerto Rico to amend it from time to time. May I remind my colleagues that it was necessary to make 10 amendments to our Constitution before it became effective. These amendments comprise the very foundation of the Federal Constitution.

I hope my colleagues will have faith in the Puerto Rican people as I have faith in them. A number of Puerto Ricans are included in the constituency of my district. I am proud to represent them in Congress for they are real Americans and fine citizens. And let me tell you that they accept and meet the responsibilities of citizenship as readily and as ably as any other group of American people. The residents of the island of Puerto Rico are also fine American citizens. Their boys are, this moment, fighting in Korea to preserve the principles of freedom which have made our country great. The reputation of the Sixty-fifth Infantry Regiment, composed almost entirely of Puerto Ricans, is known to most of us. Their reputation is a badge of courage and of sacrifice for the Puerto Rican people. The first triple amputee from Korea is at Walter Reed Hospital. He is a Puerto Rican.

The world is watching what we do here today, for here, our approval of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is illustrative of the most modern and effective weapon which can be used to combat communism. Let us benefit by the full effective force of that weapon and pass House Joint Resolution 430 without delay.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the measure which is before us today. I regret really that it has been decided by the committee that it will offer an amendment deleting section 20. I feel, however, that the people of Puerto Rico will not suffer because the Congress of the United States decided that that section should not be approved by it. I am still for those human rights and that is all section 20 means. In my opinion, it makes a declaration of a human right, and does not say anything about their entitlement by legal means of enforcement of those particular rights. It is merely a declaration of intention, and a reaffirmation in fact of what the Puerto Rican people have been getting for the past 54 years, since they were given their liberty by the Government of Spain.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the people of Puerto Rico will not be disappointed by the action to be taken by the House because they really will not suffer any loss of rights. I would like now to express my opinion that the affairs of the government of Puerto Rico has been in the hands of some of the most able Government administrators I have ever had contact with, even in the United States. The heads of their various departments are all well educated and well experienced people who received their education in the United States. They are patriotic to the highest degree. They love America and they love Puerto Rico. This is a great step forward in the history of that great little country. I congratulate them, and I hope the other body will see fit to join the House in approving this resolution in this session of the Congress.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, one of the finest experiences of my life has been the opportunity to associate with people speaking the Romance languages, and especially those people who speak the Spanish language. I consider my recent trip to Puerto Rico the high light of all of such experiences. I can appreciate how the Latin American thinks and how he speaks. I can appreciate the little story that Governor Muñoz told us the other night when we visited with him, that, after all, the people of Puerto Rico had never had the opportunity to express themselves through a declaration of independence, and that they had used the opportunity of drafting their constitution to set forth some of the goals and ideals which they, as a people, have. I think that is a good reason perhaps to have section 20 in their constitution. On the other hand, I know that most of us are not divided by the goals which we seek, but rather we are divided by the meaning of the words we use and the procedures which we employ. Because of such differences—which are apparent in this debate—and knowing full well that there are those here who would read this provision in a different light than I do, I am certainly willing to go along with the amendment which shall be offered.

I wish to suggest to my colleagues that we, in the United States, have reached a new position in regard to our relationship with those areas not known as the sisterhood of states, but which come under our jurisdiction.

We have promised direct statehood to Hawaii and Alaska. Sooner or later this must be an accomplishment of our country. But we have never promised statehood to Puerto Rico. We do not yet promise statehood to Puerto Rico. We must regard many of the island areas in a different manner than we have heretofore treated other areas under our jurisdiction. I think that we are here arriving at a constructive approach in Puerto Rico in giving to them this constitution for their Commonwealth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, if we go back to the 1917 act, which is the real Organic Act for Puerto Rico, and consider the provisions of that act and amendments thereto, under date of August 5, 1947, and then take the provisions of Public Law 600, under which this constitution comes before us, we find that law 600 repeals certain parts of the two previous laws, as set forth in the committee report, No. 1832, on this resolution.

Having considered all of these repeals, and taking the Organic Law of Puerto Rico as it stands at the moment, and with this constitution approved, with the two amendments to be offered by the chairman of the committee, which refer to section 20 of the constitution and section 5 of the constitution, we will find that we are about in this position: Section 2 of the 1917 law, as amended,

will provide that the rights, privileges, and immunities of citizens of the United States shall be respected in Puerto Rico to the same extent as though Puerto Rico were a State of the Union, and subject to the provisions of paragraph 1, section 2, article IV of the Constitution of the United States.

To me that language means that in the adoption of this constitution the Congress of the United States can still completely control affairs in Puerto Rico, as far as the protection of the rights and privileges of the citizens of Puerto Rico, who are citizens of the United States, are concerned.

If we go a step further, we find that this organic act, which the Congress still retains control of, will prohibit the people of Puerto Rico from doing many other things in which the people of the continental United States are particularly interested. Here is where we get into the heart of section 20. We maintain jurisdiction over export duties that are to be levied, tax assessments on property, income taxes, internal revenues, license fees, and bonded indebtedness. This last item I have mentioned is a powerful factor for us to consider. The Puerto Rican people have so managed their internal affairs and their financial affairs that they can go into continental United States financial markets and sell their bonds and debentures and financial paper at exceeding low rates of interest. In other words, the open market approves these bonds at an exceedingly high rate. Financiers of this country reach for that paper. My support to the elimination of section 20, lock, stock, and barrel, as here presented through the amendment to be offered is in that the elimination of section 20 protects the financial structure of Puerto Rico. I am not going to criticize the constitutional convention for having put that section into the proposed constitution, but it is in there. I think it should go out. I am going to support the amendment, as I have said, and I hope the amendment will be carried. I hope the other body will stand up to it completely.

Having referred to the other body, the Committee on Territories over there has been considering this matter very seriously, and they have one or two amendments that they will offer, which will deal with section 20 and section 5.

It seems to me that if we accept this amendment to be offered by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK], pass this bill, send it to the other body, that we will have this thing in first-class shape. I think that is what we ought to do, and I hope there will be no real resistance to that proposition.

Many statements have been made concerning the jurisdiction of the United States or the Congress over the affairs of Puerto Rico hereafter. Puerto Rico is in no position whatsoever to support statehood. I have as a Member of this House said that repeatedly to Puerto Ricans during the past 17½ years; I said it to them repeatedly for 15 years before coming to this House as a Member of this body. Puerto Rico is in no position whatsoever to support independence. There are a few independentistas down there in Puerto Rico and some others who clamor for statehood, and once in a while some of them run for some office, as politicians used to in the Philippines before we granted independence to the new republic over there; which, incidentally, I think we made a mistake in doing and that I would have voted against had I been here at the time. But be that as it may, Puerto Rico is in no position to finance and support independence.

The thinking people of Puerto Rico know that the island cannot finance and support statehood. I have some personal friends there who are supporting statehood as a long-term change but they know good and well that they are in no position to finance statehood at the moment. For instance, let me show you how the financial affairs of the island go. At the present time we are remitting to the insular government of Puerto Rico the export taxes on Puerto Rican rum and other products. It has reached as high as fifty, sixty, sixty-two, or sixty-three million dollars a year and it has dropped as low as four, or five, or six million dollars a year. Congress has the power to cut off the remittance from Puerto Rico any time Congress desires to do so. I am going to yield to the Commissioner from Puerto Rico, Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN, and ask him if that statement is not correct and I wonder if he will join me in it.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. May I have the question again?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does not the Congress have the power to change the law so that the export taxes on Puerto Rican products will not be remitted to the treasury of Puerto Rico?

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. That part of of the law is in the statute of Federal relations.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. That will continue in effect. It is not a provision of the constitution.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And any future Congress can repeal that law. Suppose you did repeal that law; suppose Puerto Rico misbehaved, let us say, and you decided to call them to task, to spank them a little bit, and repealed that law, took away that great flow of revenue from the Puerto Rican treasury, you know what will happen. So, in my judgment, the good Puerto Ricans are not going to do anything of consequence that at any time runs contrary to the rights of the citizens of Puerto Rico who, may I again say, are citizens of the United States.

I have no fear therefore about that. I personally feel that the Congress is retaining the necessary power even if it were required to use that power on special occasions. I therefore am for this resolution, for the adoption of this constitution, with section 20 eliminated; and may I again emphasize, because this thought has not been expressed by anyone before, that section 20, so that no one who may hereafter desire to purchase the bonds issued by the Puerto Rican Government will not hesitate the least in purchasing those bonds at low rates of interest through fear of the active provisions of section 20 should that section ever become effective if that were left in the law. Puerto Rican bonds have a tremendously fine standing in the financial markets of the country. The Puerto Ricans have done a beautiful job handling their financial affairs. They do not come to the Federal Treasury for assistance in connection with the internal affairs of their country. Once in a while the Congress does extend to them through the passage of some of these socializing acts and so forth certain benefits which naturally they accept; but they have built their own independent financial market with the bankers all over the United States. As the gentleman from Indiana referred to a while ago, bankers all over the United States are watching this section 20 with a great deal of interest. I think that the credit standing of Puerto Rico will advance the very hour the ticker tape carries the story that the House has eliminated section 20 from this bill.

Mr. Chairman, Puerto Rico is largely an agricultural community. It has an excess of humanity, but a shortage of land and a shortage of natural resources. Therefore, the Congress should give serious consideration to the idea of letting Puerto Rico use its natural resources consisting of its agricultural climate and its human beings to the greatest extent possible for the welfare of the people of Puerto Rico.

In the future, when matters come up concerning the welfare of Puerto Rico with respect to marketing quotas in the United States, I hope the Congress will be a little more generous with Puerto Rico than we were last year and some 3 or 4 years ago. That question will again come up.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN, Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOWELL. I am very much in favor of the passage of this resolution and also am opposed to the amendment pertaining to section 20.

I would not contend that two relatively brief visits to Puerto Rico as a member of subcommittees of the House Committee on Education and Labor would qualify me as an expert on the affairs and government of Puerto Rico. However, in the course of these two trips in which we were concerned mainly with the operation of the special provisions of the minimum-wage bill, and with the Territory's school needs, I did gather some understanding of many of Puerto Rico's problems.

I also was pleased to find that under the distinguished leadership of their first elected Governor, Hon. Luis Muñoz-Marín, and the many capable young men who hold important posts in his administration, democratic government of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Puerto Rico was progressing in a fine manner. Puerto Rico's problems—many of which are common to those of other Latin-American communities—are in many respects difficult to solve.

A large and growing concentrated population of this relatively small island makes solution to unemployment and provision for housing and health conditions very difficult. Progress is being made at a fairly rapid pace, largely as a result of "operation bootstrap."

The development of industry to supplement the island's sugar economy has made long strides under Mr. Teodoro Moscosa and his associates.

I believe the further extension of self-rule, which adoption of the new constitution affords, will provide an additional incentive to Governor Muñoz and to the distinguished Resident Commissioner, Dr. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN. Puerto Rican people will continue to solve their own problems in a democratic way, and to become even more valuable American citizens under Commonwealth status which this constitution provides.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Chairman, 2,200,000 American citizens in the Island of Puerto Rico are now in great expectancy for what we do here. They know that we are debating House Joint Resolution 430. If House Joint Resolution 430 is approved today by the House it will be a day of great joy in Puerto Rico. If it should be rejected it would be a day of great sorrow.

The people of Puerto Rico have lived in their little island since 1508. Ponce de Leon was the first Puerto Rican. He founded Puerto Rico. He started Puerto Rico. He started the Puerto Rican people on their way.

For 400 years we were a part of the Spanish Empire. Fifty-four years ago something that had to happen some day in history took place because of the intervention of the United States of America. The United States of America carried out a mandate of destiny. We could not continue to be a colony of a European power. We belong on this side of the ocean. We are Americans not only geographically but also politically and ideologically. When General Miles landed in Puerto Rico he told the people in a proclamation:

> I do not bring war to you; I am not making war on the people of Puerto Rico. I have come here to bring you the blessings of the institutions of the United States.

I was 3 years old at the time, and when I first went to school I went to a school under the American flag. All my education has been in Puerto Rico and in the States, so I am familiar with what transpired in the past. I saw them, heard about these occurrences, and I read about them. But, our life, my life, and those of us who now struggle in Puerto Rico, is the American life.

The Treaty of Paris, which transferred sovereignty over the island of Puerto Rico from the Crown of Spain to the United States, did not determine the political status of the people of Puerto Rico. Up to that time we were Spanish subjects. From that moment we ceased to be Spanish subjects, but our political status was not determined. The treaty, itself, states that the political status of the inhabitants of Puerto Rico would be determined by the Congress.

Now we have had in Puerto Rico for a good many years political parties, and since the whole island, all the people there, have always felt that some day they could live as American citizens, with all the freedoms of American citizens. They have tried to find out in what way that could be accomplished. There have been those who consistently have upheld the idea of statehood. Others have despaired of the remoteness of statehood and think that Puerto Rico should follow the same historical path of all other former Spanish colonies in the New World. They claim and still hold that Puerto Rico should become an independent country. But, by far the largest number of Puerto Ricans, those who elected me in 1948 by 290,000 votes to 180,000 for my nearest opponent, that great bulk of the population of Puerto Rico, have found a formula for a manner of living, in accordance with American ideals and institutions, without creating the problem of statehood either for Puerto Rico in an economic sense or in the mainland in a political sense, nor resorting to separation and isolation in this world of today where there is no room for the weak unless they are protected in the enjoyment of liberty by the strong, lest the weak are destroyed or absorbed by those who would conquer mankind and submit it to slavery.

We know that we are members of this great community of the United States, in our own way, in that little island in the Caribbean. But we should not exist as a new possession. How can 2,200,000 American citizens be only a possession? We must be free people in a free American commonwealth. That is what Public Law 600 did or allowed to be done. This is really the first time this has been done. But every day is a new day, and history must go on. Conditions in the world today are not those of 100 years past. We have created this commonwealth under Public Law 600 passed by Congress 2 years ago. I remember my great joy that day when this House passed Public Law 600 with only one vote in opposition. That vote was cast by a former Member of this House, Mr. Marcantonio. The people of Puerto Rico have gone forward and acted strictly within Public Law 600, and they have brought their constitution to Congress for final approval. We, in Puerto Rico, do not believe that all Congress has to do is to accept our constitution without even looking at it. We have not believed the functions of Congress in this case to be merely perfunctory. We understood that our constitution was coming to Congress to determine whether or not we had complied, to see whether we had lived up to our agreement, because there is an agreement, and that is why we voted, when we went to the polls, to accept or reject Public Law 600. To what did we agree? To simply draft a constitution? To act as a drafting committee of Congress for a constitution? Public Law 600 reads, "To adopt a constitution." When adopted by the people of Puerto Rico the constitution is to be approved, if it meets with the conditions set forth by Congress. This means, if it is republican in form, if it contains a bill of rights, if it is not in conflict with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, applicable to Puerto Rico and with the provisions of Public Law 600, itself.

What are the provisions of Public Law 600? Public Law 600 provides that the people of Puerto Rico should accept Public Law 600; provides that in a referendum, the people of Puerto Rico should elect delegates to a convention to draft a constitution, and that the people of Puerto Rico later should pass on the constitution drafted by the convention. Then the constitution would come to the President and Congress. It also provides that upon the constitution of Puerto Rico becoming effective, about 20 sections of the present organic act of Puerto Rico will continue in effect as a Statute of Federal Relations for Puerto Rico. In other words, the constitution of Puerto Rico creates a government which cannot go beyond that framework created for the government of Puerto Rico by the Statute of Federal Relations and by the applicable provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. To the extent that the Federal Relations Act is in operation, and I concur in what the gentleman just said about that act, the Puerto Rican people, as we use the term "free" in the Continental United States, will not be free and independent as we refer to people who have a republican form of government similar to the Philippines. The gentleman will agree with me on that?

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. We will not be independent from the United States any more than a State is.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the point I am developing.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. But we will be free, possibly more than if we were independent.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman on that, but we do not want people referring to this here later on to the effect that Puerto Rico is a free and independent country because this is adopted. The gentleman knows that some people will attempt to do that. I am simply throwing this into the debate so that everybody will be on notice that the Federal Relations Act, as amended by what is stricken out in Public Law 600, which is a part of this deal we are now putting through, still operates, and the people of Puerto Rico are still definitely tied in under the supervision of Congress and under the protection of the provisions of the Federal Relations Act.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. The gentleman from Michigan is absolutely correct.

May I read now part of section 9 of the Federal Relations Act, that will continue in effect:

> That the statutory laws of the United States not locally inapplicable, except as hereinbefore or hereinafter otherwise pro-

vided, shall have the same force and effect in Puerto Rico as in the United States.

In other words, when Congress legislates for the United States it is legislating for Puerto Rico as well as for the rest of the United States.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HEDRICK. What percentage of the population of Puerto Rico speak only Spanish?

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. All the population of Puerto Rico speak Spanish to start with. Does the gentleman mean speak English?

Mr. HEDRICK. What percentage speak both?

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. I would say about 30 percent, at least, of the population speak both, although most of the population understand English to the extent to which they have been educated.

Mr. HEDRICK. But the majority of the population still speak Spanish?

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. The community language of the island is Spanish. Puerto Rico is a community of Spanish extraction completely. Naturally, the people speak Spanish in the family, from father to child, as English is spoken in the United States.

Mr. HEDRICK. About 30 percent speak English fluently?

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Fluently. That grows and grows, of course, as the school system develops, and there are more opportunities for the children going to school to learn English.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In addition to what the good doctor from West Virginia asked, is it not necessary for the school children to learn English in the islands?

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. From the first grade on, it is compulsory.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It is compulsory that they must speak the English language?

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. They must, and the pity is that we do not have more schools so that more children could go to school, and more children could have the opportunity to learn English.

Mr. HALLECK. Section III of the Federal Relations Act provides for a limitation of the indebtedness that may be incurred in Puerto Rico, certain sections limiting it to 10 percent and others to 5 percent.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. Section II of article 6 of the new constiution provides among other things the power of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to contract and to authorize the contracting of debts shall be exercised as determined by the legislative assembly.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, the Constitution of Puerto Rico means the end of a long period of uncertainty in which the people of Puerto Rico have lived for half a century. At long last, on adopting their constitution, they thought they had arrived at the end of a long road of anguish. I am not thinking of material considerations. I am speaking of spiritual considerations. For over 4 months, under the gaze of the whole community of Puerto Rico, 92 men struggled, debated, disagreed, compromised, agreed, and at the end when, on February 6 the Constitution of Puerto Rico was before that constitutional convention, over which I had the honor to preside, we had before us the result of our efforts which did not cost us blood, because we live in peace in mutual respect of brotherly love; but it has cost us the sweat of our toil and it was sanctified by our tears of joy.

We are now to pass as judges upon the achievements of the people of Puerto Rico in this respect. Have the people of Puerto Rico created a government republican in form? We must admit that the people of Puerto Rico did as declared under article 1, section 2, which reads:

The Government of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall be republican in form and the legislative, judicial, and executive branches, as established by this constitution, shall be equally subordinates of the sovereignty of the people of Puerto Rico.

Did we include a bill of rights? We did—to such an extent that if any opposition has been raised to this constitution, it is because we have recognized more rights than in other constitutions adopted years before the day in which we are now living.

Does the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico conform with the applicable provisions of the Constitution of the United States? The constitution reads in article I, section 1:

That the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is constituted with political powers emanating from the people of Puerto Rico to be exercised in accordance with their will but within the terms of the compact agreed upon between the people of Puerto Rico and the United States of America.

May I say that there are doubts as to the wisdom of ratifying the Constitution of Puerto Rico because of our declarations of human rights in section 20 of the bill of rights. Also there is some language which I agree should be corrected in section 5 of the bill of rights. I agree that if, in the wisdom of Congress, section 20 should not appear in the constitution because of the possibility of misinterpretation, it be left out of the constitution as conditional to its approval.

My plea now is that the Constitution of Puerto Rico be approved and that the Congress of the United States extend its blessings to the people of Puerto Rico for their enjoyment of full freedom within this great community of American citizens of which we are a part.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico has expired; all time has expired.

The Clerk will read the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the act entitled "An act to provide for the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico," approved July 3, 1950, was adopted by the Congress as a compact with the people of Puerto Rico, to become operative upon its approval by the people of Puerto Rico; and

Whereas the people of Puerto Rico overwhelmingly approved such act in a referendum held on June 4, 1951, and a constitution for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was drafted by a constitutional convention held as provided by such act from September 17, 1951, to February 6, 1952; and

Whereas such constitution was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico, by a vote of 374,649 to 82,923 in a referendum held on March 3, 1952; and

Whereas the President of the United States has declared that the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico conforms fully with the applicable provisions of such act of July 3, 1950, and of the Constitution of the United States, that it contains a bill of rights, and provides for a republican form of government, and has transmitted the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to the Congress for its approval; and

Whereas the Congress has considered the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and has found it duly to conform to the above requirements: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was drafted by the selected delegates to the Constitutional Convention at Puerto Rico and adopted by the people of Puerto Rico in a referendum of March 3, 1952, in accordance with the act entitled "An act to provide for the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico," approved July 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 119; 48 U. S. C., secs. 731b–731e), is hereby approved by the Congress of the United States, effective as of the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURDOCK: On page 2 beginning on line 11, strike all after the word "States" through line 12 and insert in lieu thereof "except section 20 of article II of said constitution; *Provided*, That section 5 of article II thereof, shall have no force and effect until amended by the people of Puerto Rico under the procedure prescribed by article VII of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, by adding to such section 5 the following declaration: 'Compulsory attendance to elementary public schools to the extent permitted by the facilities of the state as herein provided, shall not be construed as applicable to those who receive elementary education in schools established under nongovernmental auspices': *Provided further*, That the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico hereby approved, shall become effective upon the Constitutional Convention of Puerto Rico declaring in a formal resolution its acceptance in the name of the people of Puerto Rico of the conditions of approval herein contained, and upon the Governor of Puerto Rico being duly notified by the proper officials of the Constitutional Convention of Puerto Rico, that such resolution of acceptance has been formally adopted."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment to which reference has been made during the general debate on the resolution. It is hoped that by the adoption of this amendment that certain opposition, now apparent, will be answered, thereby permitting the passage of the resolution this afternoon, letting our good neighbors and fellow citizens in Puerto Rico understand that we have approved of their action, with the exceptions contained in these amendments.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

You will notice that this amendment strikes from the resolution section 20 of the bill of rights.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Just let me say as one Member that if this amendment is adopted I expect to support the resolution.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank the gentleman very much.

The second part of the amendment has to do with section 5 of the bill of rights, which section relates to educational opportunities within the island or the proposed Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The reason for this is that it is thought by some that unless this amendment, which we offer at this time, is placed in the resolution, that the nonstate schools, or those schools financed and administered under nongovernmental auspices, will not have the right at some future date to operate within the island. Of course, that is as far from the wishes of the people of Puerto Rico as anything could be.

It is also not in accordance with our wishes as Members of Congress.

The amendment goes further and states that as to the proposed amendment to section 5, the constitution will not become effective for any part of said section 5 until the people, operating under the amending procedures provided for in their constitution, have amended the constitution as required in the amendment.

Then, this amendment goes even further and states that the approval—and I use the word advisedly—by the Congress of the Constitution of Puerto Rico will not be effective until the constitutional convention has again been convened and has by resolution accepted this contingent approval of the Congress of the United States, and have notified their Governor to that effect.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. May I say that in spite of the act that I believe the language in section 20 is not in any way against any American principle, we are agreeable to the amendment because it removes all possible misunderstanding about it. The same thing concerning the rest of it, with respect to education and so forth.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank the gentleman. I can appreciate his position, and I wish you to know that my position is similar to yours. It is only in a spirit of rendering service definitely to the people of Puerto Rico that I have brought myself into this position where it appears a compromise is necessary and advisable.

Now, permit me to suggest this before I close my remarks. This is not new procedure. This has been done in relation to the ratification of constitutions of our sister States. I refer particularly to the Constitution of New Mexico. I quote from footnote to the Constitution of New Mexico in volume 3, New York State Constitutional Convention under date of 1938 at page 1064:

> Framed by a constitutional convention which met at Santa Fe, N. Mex., from October 3, 1910, until November 21, 1910, and ratified by the voters on January 21, 1911. The joint resolution of Congress admitting New Mexico as a State in the Union was conditioned on the adoption of an amendment to the article providing for amendments. This amendment was adopted at the following State election (November 5), and on January 6, 1912, the President issued his proclamation by which New Mexico was admitted as a State, and on that day the constitution became effective.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in common with the membership of this House I find it a very definite thrill to have a part in one of the great steps that is being taken currently by the people of Puerto Rico in their steady march toward autonomy. I have listened with the deepest interest to the debate on our agreement in the matter of their constitution in which there has been much said of the spendid advances made during the recent past.

It would seem to me that a part of our function today is to be very alert to all possible problems that might arise as a result of this constitution.

Because I have heard no word relative to a matter that has caused me no little concern in my study of section 20 of the constitution, I feel I must place before you certain possibilities that should be taken into account in the final consideration of our action. I wonder if those who favor the bill as presented have thought through the implications it contains. Thoughtful men who know the island, who love its people, want its government to become and to remain a representative republic. Section 20, which the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] has just advised us is to be deleted, was a danger spot. It is no reflection upon the people of this brave little island but I remind this House that if section 20 remained in the constitution, hundreds and perhaps thousands of civil service personnel would be required to put these many rights into effect. Such a personnel is simply nonexistent in Puerto Rico. Where shall such an army of trained men and women be found other than in the United States? And we shall most surely be told we must supply them as we have instituted the system. Could anything be a better mouthful for all who wish us ill to throw at the freedom-loving islanders? "The United States says she has freed Puerto Rico" they will say—"but see what she has done; she has bound her with human chains that will grow in strength as the bureaus established by this constitution are set up and put into action. What hypocrisy."

Then, bit by bit, as the program fails to brnig the millennium which the poverty-stricken rank and file have been led to believe in as their right, the whole democratic way of life will seem to have failed; the West will have been proven impotent, and a very strong argument will have been put into the hands of enemies of freedom.

Mr. Chairman, it is with the greatest pleasure that I as one of the Members of this House accept the deletion of section 20 of the bill of rights as suggested by the chairman of the committee.

May I commend the chairman, my Ohio colleague, the Honorable FRANK BOW, and all the members of the committee for the splendid work they have done and express my personal sense of satisfaction that this step in development is being taken in this island of the Caribbean.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am very strongly in favor of this resolution for the approval of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona is quite important. I do not like section 20 of the so-called bill of rights of the Constitution of Puerto Rico, but I am not fully convinced that the amendment will completely accomplish our desires for I am of the opinion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]: The constitution is before us an entire document, and if we adopt it with this amendment which I am in favor of, I think it will have to have some additional action by the constitutional convention in Puerto Rico.

If we adopt this resolution with what amounts to a reservation then we have not adopted or ratified or approved the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico 100 percent; we have approved it with certain conditions. Actually the constitution is not before us for amendment or change.

Most important of all to me is the fact that we are here today taking part in a very important historical event. We are recognizing the rights of Puerto Rico and giving the people of this island a constitution of their own. By this resolution Puerto Rico practically attains dominion status. The constitution does not look forward to statehood or to independence, but what is more important—freedom, freedom of action, freedom to work out the island's ultimate destiny. I am heartily in favor of this step. Puerto Rico, so far as I know, is the only place under the American flag where Christopher Columbus actually set foot. Historians may dispute that, but I maintain that the island of Puerto Rico is the only place under the Stars and Stripes upon which Christopher Columbus, child of destiny, actually set his feet. The discovery of the New World in 1492 is the greatest single event

in the history of mankind since the birth of Christ.

Puerto Rico has been on our doorstep since 1898 when we fell heir to this island possession as a result of the Spanish-American War. The island will still have economic problems. I do not think the adoption of this constitution or the approval of it by the Congress of the United States will remove all of the difficulties of Puerto Rico.

I visited that island with a former colleague of ours, Mr. Jasper Bell, of Missouri, chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs, a number of years ago when we studied the economic conditions in Puerto Rico. As one of the gentlemen said, I believe it was the Resident Commissioner [Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN], there are over 2,000,000 people on the island of Puerto Rico in an area 100 miles by 35, 3,500 square miles. In the State of Iowa, which is perhaps the richest land area on the face of the globe, there are about 2,500,000 people, and the area is 56,000 square miles as compared with 3,500 square miles in Puerto Rico, with almost the same population.

The economic problems of Puerto Rico will not be completely solved by the approval of this constitution today, but we are taking a great step forward, and I am heartily in favor of it. I commend the committee and those folks who got together this amendment, taking a step in the right direction, but I am not certain that we are approving the constitution when we adopt an amendment asking that certain parts of the constitution be deleted. I see in the first paragraph of the report it is stated:

> The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs having under consideration House Joint Resolution 430, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the joint resolution do pass.

We have an amendment here called a committee amendment and offered by the chairman of the committee; so it occurs to me that the committee has revised its thinking on the subject, particularly with respect to section 20 of the bill of rights.

The Puerto Rican people are a lovable, pleasure-seeking people and industrious. During the war years they contributed their share in the defense of America and the American way of life. I am glad to be present in this House when we are approving a constitution for the island of Puerto Rico.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I favor this constitution. After giving it a great deal of thought I would favor it with or without section 20 in it. I hope we will find it possible to approve this constitution today.

I feel that the things which may seem to some people to be socialistic in the provisions of section 20 are actually but enunciations of the aspirations of these people. We should not fear these things. They are not promises or guaranties on the part of the Government that the stated goals shall be achieved.

In our American Declaration of Independence there were announced certain aspirations of the hearts of the men who then led us. Some of their ideals and goals have not been achieved, even in 1952. Yet, who among us are unhappy that they said in that day such things as the following phrases?

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

And then in the preamble to the Constitution of the United States, we read more of the ideals of our forefathers, and of ourselves, when we read:

> We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Even in the body of the Constitution of the United States we read that Congress shall have power to "provide for the general welfare"—article 1, section 8. Yes, there were many high hopes announced in the early days of our country which seemed impossible of fruition. Some of the hopes have been achieved and some have not.

In approaching the problem now at hand we should bear in mind that the proposed Constitution of Puerto Rico, in setting out hopes for full employment, adequate education, and social protection against disease and misfortune, nevertheless recognizes that no guarantees are possible in these fields. Who can say that the aspirations are bad? Admittedly they are good. The fact that I personally doubt that any government can succeed which attempts broad guarantees to individuals, does not prevent my speaking for the right of the people of Puerto Rico to assert their hopes and goals. As a believer in States' rights, and in local government, I favor approval of the Constitution of Puerto Rico, with or without section 20, the section on human rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, in closing the debate I would like to ask the gentlewoman from Utah to voice the sentiments of the women of Puerto Rico in regard to this constitution.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to give you this news or this fact: When the people of Puerto Rico thought that the Congress of the United States might not approve its constitution or might object to some of its provisions, within 48 hours some 40,000 women of Puerto Rico signed a petition asking the Congress of the United States to approve their constitution which we are considering today.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. MEADER: On page 2, line 12, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as an irrevocable delegation, transfer or release of the power of the Congress granted by article IV, section 3, of the Constitution of the United States."

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered for the purpose of attempting, if possible, to clarify the legal implications and the legal effect of the adoption of this resolution.

We are here creating a commonwealth. That has never been done in United States history before. We have admitted 35 States to the Union. The legal effect of admitting a State is clear. The legal effect of creating a commonwealth is not clear.

I made certain inquiries after this matter first came up, and sought the best legal advice I could get from the Legislative Counsel and from the American law section of the Legislative Reference Service.

Under the organic act now in effect it is clear that the Congress retains full power to amend or repeal that act. The delegation of authority for local self government is clearly revocable.

If House Joint Resolution 430 is adopted, the questions in my mind are these: May the Congress thereafter amend or repeal (a) the constitution of Puerto Rico, or (b) laws enacted pursuant thereto? If the Congress in the future passes laws applicable either to territories and possessions generally, or to Puerto Rico specifically, which are inconsistent with either the Puerto Rican Constitution or laws enacted pursuant thereto, which law will take precedence? Is the delegation of this authority in this resolution irrevocable? That is the question.

Does Puerto Rico hereby become sovereign and independent with respect to local matters in much the same sense that a State is sovereign? Can it pass laws governing property rights, criminal laws, laws of inheritance? Can the Congress, if it so desires, either pass inconsistent laws or repeal or amend laws that Puerto Rico passes? Clearly under the present situation we can. If this Puerto Rican Constitution is approved, can we?

The legislative counsel was unable and unwilling to give me a written opinion on the subject. The Library of Congress opinion, which I obtained, says this:

> While the adoption of this constitution with the approval of Congress may create a moral obligation not to override the compact made with the people of Puerto Rico

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

pursuant to Public Law 600, Eighty-first Congress, it would not diminish the constitutional power of Congress to deal with this Territory as it deems best.

This seems to be the consensus of the legal opinion I was able to assemble within the limited period I had, namely, that the approval of the Puerto Rican Constitution does not constitute an irrevocable delegation of the authority of the Congress under article IV, section 3, of the United States Constitution.

My amendment simply and plainly says exactly that, and would eliminate the doubt. If the prevailing legal opinion I have been able to obtain is correct, I think the amendment should be adopted. If that opinion is not correct and we are doing something more, it seems to me that in fairness to the people of Puerto Rico we ought to spell out clearly the legal powers of this new governmental unit called a Commonwealth.

Property rights will be affected. I can visualize that because of the doubt now existing under the present wording of this resolution there will be interminable litigation involving great cost to the citizens of Puerto Rico.

Unfortunately, this question has not been considered as fully as it ought to be. I do not represent myself as an authority on this question. I only say these doubts have arisen in my mind. It seemed to me there should be a caveat in the record of the discusion of this subject on the floor of Congress. Perhaps in the Senate the question can be clarified. Somewhere it ought to be clarified so as to avoid raising doubts as to property rights in Puerto Rico.

I had hoped the discussion of committee members here in debate would clarify congressional intent, but up to now, I confess, I believe it has only added more confusion.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment is not in order because it goes beyond the scope and purpose of this bill. This kind of amendment might have been in order on law 600, but it is too late and improper on this particular resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must reluctantly rule that the gentleman's point of order comes entirely too late. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I must say that I am somewhat at a loss to try to explain the implications of this amendment. My good friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] has not seen fit to give it to the committee. How far it would reach in its effect is very difficult to say.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I did discuss this with the Clerk and with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN], and I interrogated the gentleman from Texas on it during his remarks. I have also discussed it briefly with members on the other side of the committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. What I suggested was that we had not heard of this amendment in the committee. I still stand by my statement.

It seems to me at this time that this committee must be very careful or we will be placed in the position of the individual who gave a piece of candy, something very much desired, to a child, and then, before the child could get his hands on it, it was drawn away from him.

I understand the feeling that the gentleman from Michigan has relative to certain possibilities in the future, but may I suggest this, as I tried to suggest in my remarks in general debate: This procedure is something entirely new in the history of the Government of the United States. We are not treating Puerto Rico as a State and we are not treating Puerto Rico as a possession. We are trying to treat Puerto Rico as something in between which will cement her friendship to the people of the United States, she being composed of fellow citizens of ours, so that she can operate in this peculiar new status and we can have the benefit of her services and she can have the benefit of ours, under the jurisdiction of the Star-Spangled Banner.

I believe the amendment is too far-reaching for discussion or for action at this time, and I suggest that we oppose it and defeat it.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment for the following specific reasons:

The organic law, called the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act, remains in effect whether or not we adopt or reject this new constitution for Puerto Rico. Section 2 of that organic law states:

> The rights, privileges, and immunities of citizens of the United States shall be respected in Puerto Rico to the same extent as though Puerto Rico were a State of the Union and subject to the provisions of paragraph 1 of section 2 of article IV of the Constitution of the United States.

Section 5 of the same organic act, which remains in effect whether we adopt or reject this constitution provides that all citizens of Puerto Rico will remain as citizens of the United States.

Section 9 of that fundamental or organic law, which covers the relations which exist between the United States and the people of Puerto Rico today, and which will continue to control and govern the relationships of the people of the United States with those who reside in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, still provides and will provide:

> That statutory laws of the United States, not locally inapplicable, except as hereinbefore or hereinafter otherwise provided, shall have the same force and effect in Puerto Rico as in the United States except the internal revenue laws.

Over and above that, further and more important than that, the same organic law provides that all process shall run in the name of the United States of America. To quote the law specifically, section 10 provides:

> That all judicial process shall run in the name of "United States of America, ss, President of the United States," and all penal or criminal prosecution in the local courts shall be conducted in the name and by the authority of "The people of Puerto Rico."

What more in the way of safeguard, what more in the way of protection anybody could conceivably want is beyond my imagination. I think this amendment for these specific reasons should be voted down.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONOVAN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I concur in what the gentleman has said, and I still say the Federal Relations Act between the United States and Puerto Rico gives us all the protection that anyone could possibly ask for, and I think the gentleman has properly explained the proposition.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONOVAN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I agree that the amendment should not be adopted because section 2 states that the rights, privileges, and immunities of citizens of the United States shall be respected in Puerto Rico and so forth. The amendment is not necessary, and we should not clutter up this constitution with these useless and meaningless amendments.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONOVAN. I yield.

Mr. MEADER. I was not quite clear whether the gentleman thought the amendment was unnecessary, and that my statement of the law as given to me by the Legislative Reference Service was correct in the gentleman's opinion.

Mr. DONOVAN. I think the amendment is unnecessary, and I think the statement of law given to the gentleman by the Congressional Library is entirely inadequate.

Mr. MEADER. Inadequate?

Mr. DONOVAN. Inadequate. If they had made a closer study of it, they would have found that the answers to your doubts are set forth specifically in the organic law as it stands today.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the concern of the gentleman from Michigan. I am not sure that I know what the effect of the amendment is. If I understand it right, it would have been subject to a point of order, but even if it were not, it would be entirely out of order, I think, for the Congress to make such a condition now. We must remember that Public Law 600 was passed not merely as a law permitting the adopting of the constitution, but a law in the nature of a compact which had to be approved by the people of Puerto Rico in a referendum. They went through an expensive election to approve by a referendum that law in the nature of a compact, and the conditions which were required are in that law. That law or compact contains the conditions with

respect to the organic act that the people of Puerto Rico were to agree to in exchange for a constitution. For this Congress to come in at this late date and put in additional conditions, would constitute a breach of faith on our part, and would be unfair to the people of Puerto Rico.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I would like to clarify the fact that I am not opposed to this resolution. I am for it. All I am trying to do is to forestall litigation that may arise out of it from creating this new kind of governmental unit, namely a commonwealth. I was hopeful that this discussion would bring out that clarification.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That clarification is made in Public Law 600, which was submitted to the people of Puerto Rico. That is a compact which, if we change by any additional conditions, such change would constitute a breach of faith with the people of Puerto Rico.

Mr. MEADER. It is only a question of technical draftsmanship.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I am vigorously supporting the resolution approving the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico at an election on March 3, 1952. The approval of this constitution for the people of Puerto Rico is one more step in welding the mutual friendship and self-respect of the free people of the Western Hemisphere. It should not be delayed or qualified.

There only appears to be one serious question raised in respect to the constitution approved by the people of Puerto Rico at their election. It involves the provisions of section 20 of article II on human rights.

Without discussing each of the items mentioned in section 20, or endeavoring to determine whether or not each so-called right should be defined and set forth in the Puerto Rican Constitution as a human right, the more serious question to my mind is whether or not this House has any right to question the inclusion of these items in the Puerto Rican Constitution or to force their deletion from that document.

Even conceding that it may be a mistake to call some of the things set forth in section 20 human rights rather than human aspirations, I have grave doubts as to our right of power to criticize them as a part of the Puerto Rican Constitution either one way or the other. Certainly it was never intended when we authorized the Puerto Rican people to draft a constitution that each and every provision of it should be subject to the approval of the Congress of the United States. If such was the case, it would have been more sensible for us to write the constitution in the first place, or at least through one of our committees to have participated actively in the constitutional convention. It was never intended when we passed Public Law 600, which authorized the drafting of this constitution, that we should tell them what to put in it or to leave out of it with only two significant exceptions.

We said in Public Law 600 that their constitution should guarantee a republican form of government and should include a bill of rights. We further provided the procedures for a constitutional convention and an island-wide referendum. In short, we only wanted to be sure that the constitution was fairly drafted and presented to the people of Puerto Rico, that it guaranteed a republican form of government, including a bill of rights, and conforms with the Constitution of the United States.

It is indisputable that the constitution presented does provide for a republican form of government, including a bill of rights, does conform to the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, and was adopted according to the procedures prescribed by Congress and submitted to and approved by the people of Puerto Rico.

Public Law 600 says that the constitution shall then become effective upon approval by the Congress, but the approval called for in Public Law 600 did not mean an approval of all of its details and all of its specific provisions, but only approval by Congress that the basic requirements of Public Law 600 had been met; namely, that the procedures prescribed in Public Law 600 had been followed and that the constitution provides a republican form of government, including a bill of rights.

It has been stated that the Puerto Rican Constitution does not conform to the Constitution of the United States because of section 20 of article 2 with the so-called definition of human rights. That depends on what is meant by the word "conform." If by the word "conform" in Public Law 600 we meant that their constitution should be identical with our Constitution, then we were wasting time in asking them to draft a constitution, because such conformity would have required identical language, or substantially identical language. In my opinion, the word "conform" in Public Law 600 meant that their constitution should not be in conflict with the Constitution of the United States, and should be in conformity with the basic concepts and principles of government embodied in our Constitution. Section 20 as an expression of ideals goes beyond things expressly set forth in our Constitution, but that does not mean that that section is in conflict with our Constitution or the basic concepts and principles of government set forth in it. As a matter of fact, many States and the Federal Government now have in operation programs carrying out partially most, if not all, of the objectives set forth in section 20. Some of these have been the subject of serious debate on the floor of this House and in the legislatures of the respective States.

It is a limitation, in my opinion, of the freedom of choice and freedom of self-government for which we have always stood to tell the people of Puerto Rico they cannot include these matters as objectives of their government in their constitution. I vigorously protest any such limitation and I assert that to voice it here on the floor of the House is a denial of the very thing we stand for. Even though I should disagree, and I might disagree with some of the so-called rights set forth in section 20, I still challenge the correctness or the power of Congress putting limitations on the people of Puerto Rico in respect to those things or limiting, as has been proposed here, the provisions of their constitution along the same lines.

We believe in self-government, local government, and States' rights. This issue involves the highest assertion of States' rights, local government, and government by the people.

We are eminently sound, I believe, in insisting on fair procedures in the adoption of this constitution and in insisting that a republican form of government—and by that I mean a representative democracy—be assured to the people of Puerto Rico, and that a bill of rights be included in the constitution; but when the people of Puerto Rico present us a document which measures up to those three yardsticks, we are not entitled, we have no right, and we have no legitimate power to go inside the four corners of the document and quarrel with them about the details of it.

The power of self-government implies the power of free choice and even the power to make mistakes in self-government. If some of these provisions are mistakes, the people of Puerto Rico under the appropriate provisions of this constitution can make proper correction and should be given the free choice of doing so or failing to do so and learning from their mistakes. The paternalism of this country should end when the yardsticks for the document in its general concept have been met; beyond that it is none of our business.

I have made this statement to make it abundantly clear how I feel about the proposed amendment which will be offered striking section 20 and modifying section 5 of article II. I would prefer to vote for the resolution without the amendment, but I will vote for it in any event and I take some consolation in the fact that even though section 20 is stricken and section 5 is modified as appears may be the case, that such action on our part is in no sense a deprivation of the people of Puerto Rico of the things they seek in both those sections. The objectives of human rights set forth in section 20 will still be proper and legitimate objectives of their government within the framework of their constitution and through their own legislature. Striking section 20 from the constitution, if such occurs, will be no abridgement of the powers of the legislature with reference to these human-right objectives, any more than the absence of the same provisions from the Constitution of the United States or the constitutions of our respective States has prevented either this Congress or our State legislatures from making provision in these fields, as has been done from time to time.

I think the people of Puerto Rico should be told that this matter has come

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

into controversy before the House because some here have taken the narrow view that voting for approval of the constitution under Public Law 600 requires a general approval of every specific line and item in the constitution, and there are some here who would prefer not to be committed to so broad a program of social and economic objectives. As I have previously pointed out, that is not what is involved in approval of this document even though some here think so. Approval of the document by the House means that we have found that the procedures set up have been followed, that a republican form of government, including a bill of rights, has been included and provided for, and that this constitution is in conformity with our Constitution in the sense that it is not in conflict therewith and embodies and sets forth the basic concepts and principles of our own Constitution. I hope that the people of Puerto Rico will understand that and will understand that these discussions have originated from a misconception in some minds as to the meaning and import of the approval that we are required to give.

For my own part, I will vote for this constitution and I would prefer to vote for it without any amendment—not that I agree with all that is in it, but that I assert the power and the right of the people of Puerto Rico to self-government and freedom of expression and choice according to their own standards, seeking such objectives of government as they think proper within the framework of the basic premises established in Public Law 600.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the resolution (H. J. Res. 430) approving the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico on March 3, 1952, pursuant to House Resolution 636, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 89]

Aandahl	Harris	Phillips
Albert	Harrison, Va.	Pickett
Allen, Calif.	Havenner	Potter
Armstrong	Heffernan	Poulson
Bakewell	Hillings	Powell
Barden	Hoeven	Priest
Beckworth	Hoffman, Mich.	Prouty
Bentsen	Holifield	Ramsay
Blackney	Holmes	Redden
Blatnik	Hope	Reece, Tenn.
Bonner	Horan	Reed, Ill.
Boykin	Hunter	Richards
Bramblett	Irving	Roosevelt
Brehm	Jackson, Calif.	Sabath
Brown, Ohio	Jackson, Wash.	Sasscer
Buckley	Johnson	Schenck
Butler	Jones, Mo.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Carlyle	Jones, Hamilton C.	Scrivner
Carrigg	Jones, Woodrow W.	Scudder
Case	Judd	Secrest
Celler	Kearney	Shafer
Chatham	Kennedy	Sheppard
Cooley	Kerr	Sikes
Curtis, Mo.	Kersten, Wis.	Springer
Davis, Tenn.	Kilburn	Staggers
Deane	Kilday	Stanley
D'Ewart	King, Calif.	Stigler
Dingell	King, Pa.	Stockman
Dolliver	Latham	Sutton
Donohue	Lovre	Tackett
Dorn	Lyle	Taylor
Doughton	McKinnon	Thompson, Mich.
Doyle	McVey	Watts
Durham	Mack, Ill.	Welch
Ellsworth	Magee	Werdel
Elston	Merrow	Wheeler
Fisher	Miller, Calif.	Wickersham
Flood	Morano	Willis
Frazier	Morris	Wilson, Ind.
Gamble	Morrison	Wolcott
Gore	Moulder	Wood, Ga.
Granahan	Nelson	Woodruff
Gregory	Norblad	Yates
Hall, Edwin Arthur		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 302 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

APPROVING CONSTITUTION OF COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks on the joint resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND ADJOURNMENT OVER FROM THURSDAY TO MONDAY

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to find out, if possible, the legislative program for tomorrow and next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman's inquiry so far as tomorrow is concerned, there is no legislative business, and if my colleague will permit me at this time, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday the Consent Calendar will be called. Some bills will be taken up under the suspension of the rules. I cannot state in what order the Speaker will recognize Members to suspend the rules, but H. R. 7714, the National Guard bill, will be taken up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What does that bill do?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is to amend the Universal Military Training Service Act relative to the National Guard.

The bill would authorize the President to retain the unit organizations and the equipment thereof, exclusive of the individual members thereof, of the National Guard, Air National Guard, and other Reserve components in the active Federal service for a total period of five consecutive years. The bill in no way extends the period of service required of individuals under present law, but only pertains to the retention of the unit designations, records, colors, and so forth, and equipment. Under the terms of the bill, at the end of the 5-year period, or sooner if possible, the unit designations, together with pertinent records, colors, histories, trophies, and other historical impedimenta, will be returned to the States.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand that is a unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is my understanding also.

The program further, Mr. Speaker, if it does not get by on the Unanimous-Consent Calendar, the bill, H. R. 6856, will be taken up to extend the duration of the Water Pollution Control Act until June 30, 1956. Then there is the bill, H. R. 7656, the Korean GI bill of rights.

On Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called. Then the bill, H. R. 5713, a bill relating to the cotton parity standards.

I might say on Monday the primaries will be held in Iowa, and on Tuesday the Alabama, California, and South Dakota primaries will take place.

The program for Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday is undetermined at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, of course the leadership wants to make the usual reservations as to the announcement of any further program later. Conference reports, of course, may be brought up at any time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman advise us as to what the procedure will be in the event that any roll-call votes develop during the first 3 days of next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. For the benefit of the House, I think it is only fair to state in view of the primaries that are taking place next week, if there should be any roll-call votes which would ordinarily take place on Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday, it is the agreement of the leadership on both sides that those votes will go over until Thursday; is that not correct, may I ask my colleague from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman is correct. That will give the California Members a chance to get back. It was felt that they needed an extra day at least.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; that is only fair to them.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is the GI bill of rights coming up?

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday next, under suspension of rules.

A number of Members are giving consideration to the tidelands bill. I would like to give the Members of the House such information as I have. If a veto should come up tomorrow on that bill, it is my understanding, based on information I have received from sources that I consider to be reliable, it will not be taken up in the Senate before June 5. Whether or not the Senate will act on that date no one can tell, but that is the information I have which I pass on to the membership of the House. If it should be acted upon, and the veto overridden, and it comes to the House, the best information I have is that it will probably be taken up forthwith.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand further there is a strong possibility that a conference report on the Mutual Recovery Act might be taken up.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; that is so. The mutual assistance bill is going to conference and there is reasonable expectation that the conferees may agree on that before Thursday next, in which event it will be taken up.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. My understanding is that the so-called Korean GI bill of rights will come up under suspension on Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But if there is a record vote it will go over until when?

Mr. McCORMACK. If there is a record vote on anything on Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday, that is, as distinguished from a quorum call, the agreement of the leadership is that they will go over until the following Thursday.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Monday is an inconvenient day, but I think it is extremely important that the GI bill of rights should be taken up under suspension. It is 2 years since the war started in Korea and still nothing has been done for those veterans.

Does the gentleman know if there is any chance of the supplemental appropriation bill coming back from conference?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to answer that. I have no information.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows the Senate has not acted on the money for the automobiles for the disabled veterans, and pay for the widows and orphans. We have passed a continuing resolution, but they have not acted.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct, but the gentleman from Massachusetts has no control of that.

THE KOJE ISLAND RIOTS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include copies of four resolutions introduced by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that I introduced today four resolutions calling for pertinent facts and complete information regarding riots in Japan and in the prison camps on Koje Island, Korea. I am very positive that the Department of the Army acted and took away the star from General Colson without ascertaining complete facts as to his activities or lack of activities regarding the Koje prison camp. Additional information should be given to the American public. We should have been told of the continuing riots in Japan since last September.

I think the criticism should be leveled at the people at the top rather than at General Colson.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

SHOES SHOULD BE DECONTROLLED

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, OPS price control on shoes is robbing the consumer of millions of dollars in bargains a year.

Due to excessive warehouse stocks, big bargains in shoes are in store for the American people but the Office of Price Stabilization will not let the consumers enjoy these bargains. If OPS would quickly suspend controls on shoes, these big windfall bargains would be given to the people of this country. If they delay much longer, the bargains will vanish.

Since January 1, the Office of Price Stabilization has refused to make these bargains available to the people because they say they want to study the situation some more. In the meantime, OPS controls make it difficult and in some instances impossible for the shoe industry to reduce prices when they sincerely desire to do so.

While the top experts and theorists at the Office of Price Stabilization study the situation the public goes on paying higher prices for shoes than is necessary while thousands of OPS employees joyfully ride the gravy train as time marches on.

Prices of shoes can be decontrolled at the manufacturer and retail levels without any danger of prices going up. With the price of leather having gone down 13.8 percent below pre-Korean levels, and hides from which leather and shoes are made now selling at 44.4 percent below pre-Korean price levels certainly leather and shoes can and should be decontrolled without any fear that the removal of controls will start an increase in the price of shoes. There are millions of hides in storage hanging over and depressing the market for the future which would prevent the possibility of an inflationary rise.

There are thousands upon thousands of pairs of shoes in factory warehouses begging for buyers at substantially reduced prices. But, retailers will not buy them because they will lose money if they do buy them. OPS regulations are so rigged that they rob retailers of their traditional merchandising flexibility which in normal times makes lower-priced bargains available to the people.

Not only are the regulations robbing the American people of bargain prices for distress merchandise in factory warehouses, but they are also preventing wholesale prices to drop further because retailers will lose money if they buy their shoes cheaper.

This is the strangest story I have ever heard. Here we have an agency set up by this Congress to bring prices down and it is doing just the opposite. This story is so strange that I am sure it needs explaining—it certainly begged for explanation when I first heard it.

This is the way this situation comes about:

Ceiling Price Regulation 7 under which retail margins are controlled sets up an inflexible method by which retailers figure their mark-ups. The mark-up OPS permits the retailer to apply to shoes differs with each type of shoe he sells, and each price at which he buys them. This is based on each individual's historic pattern. Once established on his OPS pricing chart, the mark-up cannot be changed to meet different conditions. It is a strait-jacket into which the retailer has been forced by OPS. Under the method he uses to figure his mark-up, the retailer may have a mark-up of 28 percent on shoes for which he pays $4, 38 percent on those costing him $5 and so on.

Today, as a result of depressed conditions in the industry, manufacturers have thousands upon thousands of pairs of shoes of good quality which they are willing to sell at substantially reduced prices in order to get money to buy supplies to make fall shoes.

But, retailers trapped in this statistical, inflexible strait-jacket cannot buy these shoes without running the risk of heavy financial losses. This is an absurd

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

situation because, in normal times, retailers are constantly prowling through the wholesale markets looking for such good buys. Bargain shoes are used to stimulate business, increase traffic in the store and give the retailer a chance to sell other shoes he has in stock.

Mr. Speaker, I can best illustrate what is happening throughout the country by giving an example:

A retailer has 1,000 pairs of shoes in stock for which he paid $6 a pair and on which he is permitted a markup of 40 percent.

While he is trying to sell these shoes at $10, he comes across a batch of the same shoes in a manufacturer's warehouse which the manufacturer is willing to sell for $4 a pair despite the fact that the regular wholesale price was originally $6. On the pricing chart, the retailer is allowed a markup of 28 percent on shoes he buys for $4. These shoes, if they sold at regular prices would easily be worth $10 a pair at retail.

By applying the 28 percent mark-up to the bargain shoes, he finds that he can sell them for $5.55 a pair. If he brings those bargain shoes into his store, they will be competing with his regular $10 shoes.

As a result, he will probably sell all the bargain shoes he can get at $5.55—but, he won't sell enough of the regular $10 shoes to give him a profit due to the competition from the bargain shoes which are every bit as good as the regularly priced shoes. His only alternative is to mark down the regular $10 shoes to meet the competition from the bargain shoes and take a heavy loss. The small margin of profit he makes on the bargain shoes will not cover the losses he suffers by marking down the regular $10 shoes. Only an aspirin and red ink will solve his problem.

Hence, the retailer can escape this dilemma only by refusing to buy the bargain shoes. In the end, the consumer is robbed of a terrific bargain.

Now, if OPS were not meddling in the affairs of this retailer, he would buy the bargain shoes at $4, take a heavier markup of 50 percent giving him a substantial margin. He would then mark down his regular $10 sellers to meet the competition from the bargain shoes. This would give him a markup of 25 percent on his regular $10 shoes and a mark-up of 50 percent on the bargains.

The money he loses on the 1,000 pairs of shoes he had in stock and which cost him $6 a pair is made up by the margin he makes on the bargain shoes and he comes out with black ink on his pen. And, what is most important, the consumer enjoys a terrific bargain saving about $2 a pair.

Mr. Speaker, another way in which OPS controls are stealing money from the American people's pay checks stems from retailers' resistance to lower prices from manufacturers. This is an even stranger paradox. Again CPR 7 of OPS is the culprit.

The retailers' pricing chart is so set up that if a manufacturer wants to reduce his price by say 25 cents a pair, the reduction will put that particular type of shoe in a different category and call for a lower mark-up. The 25-cent reduction just barely puts the shoe in the next lower category and means that the retailer's profit margin is further squeezed. Hundreds of cases like this have been reported to me.

If OPS were not in the picture, the retailer would take advantage of the 25-cent reduction and apply a mark-up which would give him a profit. As things stand now with OPS meddling, the retailer just refuses to buy the shoes for less money. Again the American people pay the bill—a tribute to OPS bungling.

Besides robbing the American people of these big shoe bargains, OPS is forcing thousands of small retailers to be accountants instead of merchants.

There are about 15,000 shoe stores throughout the country whose annual volume of business is less than $50,000 a year, according to the latest census report. And, many of these are below the $25,000 a year level.

It is these people who are being hurt the most by OPS regulations. If the situation in the industry made regulation necessary, one could see the sense in exacting such a toll on the small retailers of this country. But the facts prove otherwise as I shall demonstrate in a moment.

The utter absurdity of continuing controls over this industry is revealed beyond a shadow of a doubt by even a cursory examination of price and production trends in recent months.

Mr. Speaker, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, prices of hides are down by 44.6 percent as compared with pre-Korean levels. Leather prices are down 13.8 percent from pre-Korean levels, and shoes of all types are up since the Korean outbreak by 10.7 percent. OPS is keeping them up.

Compare these declines with the situation in cotton, wool, and synthetic textiles over which OPS suspended controls this week.

Cotton is up by 8.6 percent and wool is up 3.9 percent and synthetic textiles are up 4.5 percent since before Korea, yet they decontrol these items.

Plain common sense is taking an awful beating in this situation. How can OPS justify the suspension of controls over commodities which are selling above the levels obtaining before Korea, and at the same time blithely say that they cannot suspend controls over leather which is selling 13.8 percent below the pre-Korean prices?

One cannot escape the obvious conclusion that the bureaucrats are having a tough time relinquishing their control over the economy of this Nation when the facts and the law dictate otherwise.

Controls over hides were recently suspended. But, controls on leather are still in effect despite these glaring facts.

But, OPS says that leather and shoes do not meet the standards set up by them to justify suspension. It seems obvious to any intelligent person who looks at the figures I have just mentioned that this statement is ridiculous when applied to leather. I will now show that it is equally ridiculous when applied to shoes.

Factory prices of shoes are down by from 10 to 15 percent, according to both Government and industry figures. They are trying to go down further.

According to the Census Bureau, the average factory value of shoes last March—the latest figure available—was down 10 percent from the same month last year.

Just the other day, the Navy opened bids on 300,000 pairs of shoes and the lowest bid was $2.32 a pair below the lowest bid submitted for the same shoes last year when prices were near peak levels. The low bid the other day was $4.26 a pair as compared with $6.58 a pair last year.

The 10-percent decline which was reported in March by the Census Bureau does not take into account the cuts made during April and the first part of this month as manufacturers expend every effort to increase sales. It is estimated that these reductions range from 5 to 10 percent.

And, more cuts are on the way on fall shoes. This is an important factor because under the OPS suspension standards a product must not only be selling below ceiling, but there must be no danger that the price may rise. Now, if manufacturers have already announced their intentions to reduce prices on fall shoes which are already coming off the production lines, and they have, it seems to me that this product certainly meets the latter requirement. The cuts proposed for fall shoes range from 5 to 10 percent.

Mr. Speaker, those making the decisions at OPS tell me they are delaying suspension over shoes because they do not believe that prices are down at retail. To the casual observer or to one who does not know the practical side of merchandising shoes, this statement carries a lot of weight.

It carries little weight with those people working for OPS who know the shoe industry—but, unfortunately, these people are not charged with making the decisions. It has been reported to me that the OPS people at the lower or operating level for months have recommended suspension of controls over shoes and leather.

The delay comes from the top echelon where the theorists and economic planners hold full sway.

At present markets are falling. In such a situation, the retailer moves shoes from the higher-priced level to the next lower level and maintains a lower inventory on the higher-priced points.

Manufacturers of branded lines who also have built up a reputation for certain price points are doing the same thing.

As an example of how this works, a large producer in St. Louis last year had a line of shoes covering 50 styles. Twenty of those sold at $11.95, 20 at $10.95 and the remainder at $9.95. Next fall, these 50 styles will be sold at lower prices by making 10 available at $8.95, 10 at $9.95, 20 at $10.95 and 10 at $11.95.

How much of a price cut does this represent? Even those who made the switch at the factory could not figure it our precisely percentagewise. But, it is a reduction any way one looks at it.

The experts at OPS not fully familiar with merchandising cannot see this, however.

Therefore, they say there is not sufficient indication that prices at retail have come down. The facts as they are known to intelligent merchandisers are different.

Not only have there been outright price cuts at retail which amount to from 10 to 15 percent, but retailers have made price reductions by using one of the oldest merchandising techniques known to shoe retailers.

These people are extremely jealous of the price points with which the consumer identifies them. They have spent years and great amounts of money to be so identified in the consumers' mind. Some retailers specialize in shoe selling at $8.95, $9.95, $10.95, and $11.95; others for shoes at $3.99, $4.99, $5.99, and $6.99 and so on.

In an effort to maintain their competitive position, these retailers go to a lot of trouble to keep their price points unchanged, sometimes selling shoes at a loss. This desire to maintain price points holds during rising markets as well as falling markets.

Here are some more facts which dictate the removal of onerous controls over a depressed industry:

Shoe production is running at an annual rate of 490,000,000 pairs, which is slightly under that of last year when the military was buying more heavily.

Rubber products prices have been declining and the General Services Administration will return rubber to the free market as of next June 30.

The National Production Authority has removed all controls over hides, skins, and leather and almost all controls over rubber.

Shoe price movements are not volatile. From June 1950 to April 1951, shoe prices rose only 20.4 percent, as compared with 34.1 percent for raw cotton, 59.2 percent for wool products, and 28.8 percent for cotton products, all items over which controls have been suspended.

Consumer demand for shoes has been relatively constant over a period of many years and the industry has an excess productive capacity of upward of 200,000,000 pairs.

This clearly shows that shoe price rises are caused by rising raw materials prices and not demand. Hence, if controls can be safely suspended on hides, why does not the same hold true for shoes?

Not one shoe manufacturer in the country is getting ceiling or above-ceiling prices for his product. Yet, he is forced to make complicated computations to prove this to OPS every time he makes a new shoe.

Leather production is running at a rate of 7 percent of the peak levels of last year. This heavy demand last year was caused by the fear of shortages which never developed and inflated estimates of military requirements. The current production of leather is down not because of any lack of raw stock but due to a reduced demand.

Hide production is running higher than last year and there are many instances when surpluses of 2,000,000 hides or so hang over the market to depress prices.

Military buying has been reduced by from 75 to 80 percent below the rate of last year.

Months ago NPA removed hides and leather from the critical list of items needed for the Armed Forces.

Imports of goatskins from which is made kid leather are running at a high rate and the price of kid leather is at the lowest point in 12 years.

With these facts before them, how can the OPS planners say that the situation does not yet warrant removal of controls on shoes and leather?

Common sense is under severe attack from the bureaucrats who are anxious to keep their meddlesome finger in the pie of free competitive markets.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Does the gentleman from Illinois know how many people are on the payroll of the agency dealing with shoes and leather?

Mr. VURSELL. Not of this particular agency but I believe there are about 12,600 employees in OPS generally.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to make a statement to the effect that one of the oldest established tanneries in the country located in my own town has been forced to close its business by reason of this tremendous drop in the price of leather.

I join with the gentleman in his observations to the effect that these two items should be decontrolled. I will go a step further: It seems to me that in consideration of the new Defense Production Act which will soon be up for consideration that we should write into that law specific language that no consumer item should come under price control until the President absolutely finds and declares that the quantities available are less than the demand. In other words, so long as the quantity available is greater than the demand, on what grounds can you contend the item should be price controlled?

Mr. VURSELL. The able gentleman from Michigan is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I congratulate the gentleman on his statement.

Mr. VURSELL. I testified before the Committee on Banking and Currency along that very line yesterday.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I want to say to the gentleman that I am very glad he is making this speech in an endeavor to bring about the decontrol that he seeks. I understand both labor and management in the district I have the honor to represent, one of the great shoe-producing centers of the country, are strongly in favor of the objective he seeks. I hope his remarks will be conducive to that end.

Mr. VURSELL. I thank the very able gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the able gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I should like to endorse the remarks made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]. In the Fourth Congressional District of Ohio we have one of the largest if not the largest tanneries in the State of Ohio. That tannery is confronted with the same condition that the tannery in his district is confronted with. I, too, am of the opinion that the time has come to end controls when the supply is greater than the demand. If there is ever any excuse for controls in America it is only in times when there is a short supply of the essentials of life. I congratulate the gentleman from Illinois for bringing this matter before the House so that everyone will have the benefit of the information he is supplying before we will have to come to a conclusion on another extension of wage and price controls.

Mr. VURSELL. I thank the gentleman. Tanneries have contacted me along the line reporting the same conditions as the able gentleman from Ohio reports.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VELDE. I congratulate the gentleman on his fine presentation. I have no large shoe producers in my district but we have quite a few people, about 314,000 who use shoes. If decontrol brings prices down my people will appreciate that. May I ask the gentlemen, what is the chief reason the OPS refuses to decontrol shoes at the present time?

Mr. VURSELL. In reply to the able gentleman's question, I would say that the head of one of the biggest OPS divisions with reference to shoes told me last December that they were strongly of the opinion that shoe ceilings should be suspended. I have been in touch with the Washington office and they have told me as long as a month ago they agreed and were preparing to take such action. Now they have backed away from it on the very flimsy premise that shoes have not been reduced enough at retail; at least, they are not certain about it; and they want to study it for a few weeks more. That is the only reason they gave me. I feel they are wrong in their conclusions.

The facts are that the inflexibility of the control standards of the OPS are preventing the retailers from reducing shoes as much as they would like. This is a very strange story when you come to think that OPS is supposed to stabilize prices and help to keep prices down. In this instance nearly any shoe manufacturer or retailer in the Nation will tell you that OPS regulations make

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

it more difficult to bring the prices of shoes down.

One reputable shoe manufacturer told me that he was reducing his prices and that he had contracted to supply a chain outlet of 300 shoe stores. That after they got the first bill of goods and found that they had to do so much remarking, and that after marking the shoes down they would be in a lower profit rating, they called up and canceled the order. Hundreds of chain stores and independents are caught in the OPS strait-jacket, making it difficult to bring prices of shoes down.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Might I conclude from what the gentleman from Illinois has said that this is just another example of a Federal bureau being given a grant of power and then refusing to relinquish it after the cause for its use no longer exists?

Mr. VURSELL. Well, I fear you may be right.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. Does the gentleman from Illinois think that under the present administration there is any possibility of getting rid of controls as long as they continue to ship needed materials out of the United States and create shortages as an excuse to keep coming back to Congress repeatedly to have us continue controls?

Mr. VURSELL. There is much fact in the question the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] raises. I think the administration's policy of shipping billions of dollars as gifts in agricultural products, as well as manufactured items, to foreign countries are, of course, very inflationary and are responsible very largely for price controls.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at this whole shoe situation, you find it will greatly benefit the consumer, provide steady employment for thousands of shoe workers, and strengthen the entire shoe industry. As the gentleman from Massachusetts said a few minutes ago, it is approved not only by the manufacturer but by the retailer and by the workmen who make the shoes. It would seem to me that with the great supply we have, and with prices trying to come down, and coming down in spite of the OPS, it is the responsibility of Congress to do something about it. I hope it will be done when the bill comes before the House.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

TIDELANDS LEGISLATION

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, we are indeed living in a world of change. Not only are we seeing daily changes in the field of science; our Government and our social concepts are changing. Change is necessary if we are to progress, but change has no virtue unless it leads to something better than the old condition. I doubt seriously that any change from our system of constitutional government of limited powers is in the public interest although there are millions of people the world over, some of them within our own land, who contend that the arbitrary methods of government by inherent power is more efficient than constitutional democracy. I know that no change in the principle of honesty in both public and private life can be properly considered as progress. The Government of the United States as well as every citizen thereof should still be expected to abide by its solemn contract.

Last week the President gave us an example of change by delivering a veto message not to Congres which passed the legislation, and to which the Constitution says vetoes shall be directed, but by delivery of this veto message to a political meeting of a group who call themselves Americans for Democratic Action. These people had a perfect right to hold a meeting and the President had a perfect right to attend their meeting, but it seems that he must have gotten the wrong address, or maybe he made the wrong speech at the right address. In any event, he used this gathering to express his opinion of the action of the Congress in again confirming the title of the coastal States to the submerged lands within their borders. I would be happy if the President were to leave his veto in the hands of this extra legal assemblage and allow the will of the overwhelming majority of both Houses of the Congress to stand, but I have received information that he has at long last located the address of the Congress of the United States and is even now sending a carbon copy of the veto to us. This innovation in the method of addressing veto messages might be of relatively little importance, even though it seems to be a studied attempt to express Presidential contempt for the legislative branch of government.

We cannot, however, dismiss as of slight consequence the change in our national attitude toward a governmental contract which this veto evidences. Nor do I believe that this Nation can long expect to retain the confidence and cooperation of any of the leaders of other nations of the world if we repudiate our international obligations with the complete nonchalance evidenced by the four Justices of the Supreme Court and the President in the Texas tidelands case. To take these lands, which even the majority of the Court admits were the property of the Republic of Texas, simply because the Federal Government now has the physical power to do so is as crude a breach of international honesty as was the German invasion of Belgium in 1914 or the modern-day tactics of Joe Stalin. When Kaiser Wilhelm entered Belgium, he is reported to have said that the treaty between Belgium and his country was only "a scrap of paper." We joined the rest of the world in condemning that act. How can we condemn Kaiser Bill's repudiation of his international agreements and condone an equally flagrant violation by our own country?

Let us look at the obligation of the United States of America.

In 1844 the Republic of Texas was an independent nation, recognized as such not only by the United States, but also by the leading European nations. That republic admittedly owned, as well as held sovereignty over, all the public lands within its boundaries. Those boundaries extended 3 leagues seaward—no one has ever disputed this, and 4 years later, the United States itself insisted on this line, and wrote into the Treaty of Guadalupe—Hidalgo a description of the boundary between the United States and Mexico beginning at a point 3 leagues seaward from the mouth of the Rio Grande River. Since the only claim the United States has ever had to any territory near the mouth of the Rio Grande arises as the successor to the sovereign rights of the Republic of Texas, it can hardly be argued that the Federal Government did not recognize, adopt, and profit from the boundaries claimed by the Republic of Texas.

Now back to 1844. That year the Secretary of State of the Republic of Texas came to Washington to negotiate an annexation treaty. The State Department of this Government worked out such a treaty. Among other things, it provided that all of the public lands of the Republic of Texas should become the public lands of the United States, just as some judges and politicians would like to make them at this time. That treaty also provided that the Federal Government should assume and pay the public debt of the Republic of Texas, just as it had done for each of the Original Colonies, and has since done for every other State which has entered this Union. That treaty was submitted to the United States Senate for ratification, and was rejected in 1844. In the course of debate, it was urged that it would be folly for the United States to pay the debts of the Republic of Texas, and was stated that "all the lands in Texas are not worth $10,000,000"—the approximate amount of the debts at that time.

Next year, in 1845, the advocates of annexation in the United States succeeded in passing a joint resolution through both the House and Senate which offered Texas annexation on terms set out in the resolution. Doubtless, in order to get votes in the United States Congress, the proponents of the resolution changed the provisions which had been contained in the treaty of annexation, and provided specifically that the State of Texas should pay all of the debts of the Republic and that the State should retain title to all of the vacant and unappropriated lands within its boundaries. The State did later pay these debts.

The Congress of the Republic of Texas submitted the offer to the people of Texas who in a convention assembled for that purpose accepted the offer on July 4, 1845. On February 16, 1946, the Republic of Texas, in reliance on the honesty and good faith of the United States, turned over to the State of Texas all of its title to the lands in question. It had no misgivings for the United States of America then enjoyed a reputation of

keeping its word, a reputation of common honesty in its dealings with other people. Three Presidents of the United States had recently confirmed the title of Texas to these lands, and they had clearly done so with the purpose of influencing Texas to accept annexation.

In 1837 while Texas was still an independent nation, President Andrew Jackson said:

The title of Texas to the territory she claims is identified with her independence.

December 3, 1844, President John Tyler, in his annual message to Congress, while negotiating with the Republic of Texas for annexation, said:

We could not with honor take the lands without assuming the full payment of all encumbrances upon them.

On June 15, 1845, President James K. Polk gave this assurance to the Texas people while negotiating about annexation:

Of course, I would maintain the Texas title to the extent she claims it to be.

For 100 years the United States followed the rule of honesty laid down in the smoke of Mount Sinai.

Again and again, this agreement between Texas and the United States was recognized and confirmed. Many opinions of the courts, both State and Federal, recognized the agreement and the boundaries. Many opinions of executive agencies, including the State Department and the Interior Department, cited and approved this agreement. This three-league boundary was actually surveyed again and agreed upon as the international boundary between the United States and Mexico in 1911. So in both its internal and external relations, the United States stood by this agreement for more than 100 years.

Just 5 years ago, Mr. Justice Tom Clark, then the Attorney General of the United States, on the day he argued the California case, March 13, 1947, handed to the press a written statement:

Texas had been an independent nation, a republic, for 10 years before joining the Union. As a republic it owned all of the lands within its boundaries, including the marginal sea commonly called tidelands. This area similar to that involved in the California case extended into the Gulf of Mexico and was under the sovereignty of Texas during the Republic and was retained by it under the provisions of the Act of Admission.

President Truman at Austin, Tex., on September 20, 1948—just 6 weeks before the election while on a campaign tour, said:

Texas is in a class by itself; it entered the Union by treaty.

Newspapers throughout Texas praised the President for his stand. Texans generally applauded the President. They trooped to the polls on November 4, 1948, and gave him the biggest majority he received in any State in the Union. One of the chief reasons for this large majority was that our citizens believed the President was going to maintain the integrity of the Federal Government. One month and four days after the election, the President directed the Attorney General of the United States to file suit against Texas, and to thereby repudiate the annexation agreement. The President has not yet called this international obligation of the United States a "scrap of paper," but he has said that it would be "robbery in broad daylight" to insist on the rights which that solemn obligation of our Government granted to the people of a small nation.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. First, I trust my colleague will not mind my interrupting his most interesting speech. I want to join with him in supporting his very able statements and subscribing entirely to everything which he has enunciated as a moral principle and as a legal right. Will the gentleman agree that there is an analogy in the action of the Federal Government's attempt to rob the State of Texas of its tidelands with the treaty obligations on which we are about to enter with foreign nations, several of which have been recently consummated? Is it possible and reasonable to imagine that a great Nation such as we are and a great people such as we are, founded upon the principles of honesty and fair dealing such as he just pointed out, can repudiate its agreement with one of its own States but honor those with foreign nations?

It seems to me that the inconsistency of such action is beyond all reason.

Mr. POAGE. I think that there is an exact parallel and I believe that the distinguished gentleman, who is one of the outstanding members of the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House, will agree that we have no way of expecting to secure the cooperation of the people of Western Europe unless they can rely upon our pledged words. We have no way of even asking them to take the chance of Russian aggression unless they can rely upon the promises of the United States. If they should find the history of the United States to be one of repudiation of contracts when it has the power to do so, why should they expect us to spend our treasury, our lives, and our effort to give them the mutual defense which we promised them? I see no reason for the small governments of Europe to expect any better treatment at the hands of the United States than the United States accords to a small republic in its own hemisphere. I would, therefore, warn that far more than the value of these lands is at stake.

Mr. BURLESON. Will the gentleman also agree that the United States in recent years and immediately following the war, entered into certain agreements constituting treaties which has proved disadvantageous to our Nation, but we are honoring those agreements in spite of what we now see by hindsight to have been mistakes?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, and I am happy to say this abrogation of the annexation agreement with the Republic of Texas stands out as a horrible example distinguished from and unlike all the rest of our actions in regard to foreign relations. This is not typical of our foreign relations and I hope it never becomes so because it is not something of which we can be proud.

While this strange drama of change is not something of which we can be proud, it has not been confined to the President and to the Supreme Court. After the repudiation of governmental agreements by the Executive I suppose it was but natural that we should observe an effort on the part of others to share in the loot. Probably we should not, therefore, have been surprised at the proposal that a part of the proceeds of these lands for which the State of Texas paid just as truly as any citizen of this country ever paid for his own home, should be distributed to the cause of education, largely in those States whose preannexation debts had been paid by the United States. Please always keep in mind that Texas is the only State in the Union which paid its preannexation debt, and that it paid it with the express and written understanding with the United States that the State of Texas should own these lands.

The idea of giving part of ill-gotten gains to a worthy cause is not new. Throughout history highwaymen, aggressor nations, common gamblers, and even second-story operators have salved their conscience by giving part of their "take" to some worthy charity. What charity could have a wider appeal than the public schools? We all want to provide for the schools. Why not dedicate the natural resources of the tidelands to such a worthy cause? Who can oppose such a move? Sounds good, does it not? All but one little item—the property that these modern Robin Hoods proposed to give to the school children of America belongs and has belonged to the school children of Texas. The idea of dedicating natural resources to public education occurred to the Texas Legislature long before it occurred to any Federal official. I suppose this happened because no one in the Federal Government thought of repudiating the annexation agreement until a host of claim jumpers—in the main represented by former Federal Government officials began to try to get these tidelands without having to pay the States for the leases. The State of Texas has leased its lands for an average of $20 per acre. It was possible for these parasites to get the land for 25 cents per acre if they could get it out of State ownership. And this same group is still in Washington trying to reap where they have not sowed. On page 5724 of the RECORD of May 21—just 1 week ago today—you will find in the quarterly report of registered lobbyists the firm of Hudson, Creyke & Lipscomb, of Washington, D. C. Their own report shows that this is a joint venture organized in June 1950—the same month the Supreme Court abrogated the Texas annexation resolution, and I quote: "For the purpose of obtaining relief for applicants for Federal leases on submerged lands and for those persons whose activities led the Federal Government to assert title to submerged lands."

In other words, the lobbyists openly admit that they are not only seeking rewards for the claim jumpers but also for the people "whose activities led the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Federal Government to assert title to submerged lands."

I know that there are Members of this House who have honestly believed that the oil companies were trying to keep these lands in State ownership because it was supposed that in some manner they would get a more favorable deal from the States. Actually, the oil companies that hold no leases could get leases cheaper from the Federal Government than from the States—at least this has been the history of the past. Only those oil companies that now have already paid for leases stand to lose anything by Federal ownership and what they are afraid of is the unscrupulous activities of the claim jumpers and their lobbyist friends. I challenge you to read the record and then search your own conscience as to whether you want to be associated with this kind of rotten racket.

I do not believe that the majority of the Members of this Congress, in House or Senate, will be willing to say that the ends justify the means. I refuse to believe that a majority of Congress or of the American people are willing to take that which does not belong to them just because it can be used for a worthy purpose.

If we have reached this low level of public morality, we should be frank enough to go all the way and take all property for use by the public.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Under this new theory of paramount title announced by the Supreme Court, that no lawyer ever heard of before, is not the logical conclusion that would be reached the taking over of private property in inland States, or wherever it might lie?

Mr. POAGE. Of course it is, and the danger is not confined to property belonging to the States. It must extend to property belonging to individuals as well.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. And are not the people in the inland States, who got their land through United States patents, in worse condition than the people in Texas when the Federal Government starts in to take over the lands of this country for any purpose they want to use them for?

Mr. POAGE. I would not try to compare the unhappy plight of the people in different sections of the country when the Government repudiates its obligations, because any government that will repudiate its solemn obligations with a small nation, like the Republic of Texas was at the time they entered into this contract, will repudiate its obligation to the individual or to anyone else. No title in the United States will be worth any more than Belgium's treaty with "Kaiser Bill" was if this is allowed to stand.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. The point I was making a minute ago is this: The land owned by the people in the State of Texas comes from a Texas patent, does it not?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. And the land owned in the other States by the individuals comes from United States patents. Those people, when the Government starts in to take over, will not even have lip-service defense of saying that "We did not even get our lands from you."

Mr. POAGE. I think that is right. I think the gentleman is exactly right in suggesting that there will be many who some day will wake up and find that their idea of acquiring something that belongs to their neighbor is soon working to their own disadvantage.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I commend the gentleman on the wonderful speech he has made here today and the fine work he has done on the tidelands question ever since this fight has been going on.

Mr. POAGE. I certainly thank the gentleman for his statement.

If we have reached the low level of public morality which we seem to have reached, we ought to be frank enough to admit, as the gentleman says, that it reaches to all property, and that there is no such thing as private property in the United States. The Communists are honest enough to advocate such a course, but they are too practical to carry it out. The Socialists of Great Britain used almost the same arguments of "paramount right" and "public use" that have been used to justify this breach of contract, but they at least tried to pay for the property taken.

When a bill similar to this one was before President Truman in 1946, he vetoed it, and said that he did so because the question was then before the Supreme Court and that the Congress should not act while the Court had the matter under advisement. Now the Court has acted, and the President tells this Congress, by speaking to third parties, that Congress has no right to act because the Court has ignored the treaty obligations of our country and has held that the United States has "paramount right" in these lands. Even the Supreme Court itself specifically refused to hold that the United States "owned" these lands. Specifically striking from the decree proposed to the Court by the Justice Department the word "proprietor," the Court injected into the body of the law a new cancer, a new, novel—not to say revolutionary—doctrine. This doctrine was denominated as "paramount right," which is a shorthand way of saying that Karl Marx was right when he opposed any private ownership of property.

So what is the choice which faces this Congress in regard to the matter of ownership of submerged lands. On the one hand, you have a large majority of both Houses of Congress agreed as to a policy—a congressional policy of good faith and performance of contractual obligations. On the other hand, you have a policy which was and is being hatched up by other agencies of Government. If we vote to override the veto, we vote for a congressional policy. We vote to assert our Constitutional prerogatives—to meet the responsibilities and duty of the Congress of the United States. If we vote to sustain the veto, we have given away, once again, a little more of this body's power and, more importantly, once again we have failed not only to do our duty, but have become active participants in the repudiation of a solemn contract of our country. This may be change, my friends, but it is not progress.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. BURLESON. Again I compliment the gentleman upon his very fine statement. With reference to the veto which appears certain—at least I suppose we can assume as much from the Chief Executive's recent statement to the Americans for Democratic Action, and as he has reportedly made similar remarks in subsequent conversation, we can assume he is going to veto the bill which is now before him. As I understand it, it is a Senate bill. Of course, we all know that many bills were introduced in the House on this matter. The House passed its own bill, but finally, as the bill emerged from the conference, it went to the President as a Senate bill, offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. Is it correct that if the President vetoes the bill and it comes back, it will, by reason of being a Senate bill, go to the other body first?

Mr. POAGE. That is my understanding.

Mr. BURLESON. If the other body fails to override the veto of the President, that will preclude further action in the House would it not?

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. BURLESON. I regret very much that the House will not have a chance, in the event the veto is not overridden by the other body, to work its will in overriding the President's veto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McGRATH). The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(At the request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. POAGE was allowed to continue for two additional minutes.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to concur in the opinion, or idea expressed by the gentleman from Texas, that the other body might not see this matter as we hope it will see it, and maintain the contractual obligations of the United States. I still have confidence in the United States Senate to maintain the obligations of the United States.

Mr. BURLESON. If the gentleman will permit me, I was simply taking a hypothetical case.

Mr. POAGE. Yes, I am sure the gentleman was.

Mr. BURLESON. I certainly trust that the Senate will override the veto, and that the House will have a chance to act also.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I merely want to say to the distinguished gentleman from Texas that I cannot permit him to take his seat without commending him very highly on the very studious effort he has devoted to this problem, and the very persuasive statement he has made. I surely hope that reason will again pre-

vail in Washington, and that our people of Texas may again call our own that for which our forefathers fought at the Alamo and at San Jacinto.

Mr. POAGE. I greatly appreciate the gentleman's comment.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WALTER and to include an address delivered recently by Father Guthrie, president of Georgetown University.

Mr. PRICE and include a speech delivered at the commencement of the McHenry College, Lebanon, Ill., by Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson.

Mr. WIER and to include an editorial from the A. F. of L. News Reporter, of Washington, D. C.

Mrs. KEE and to include a statement by F. Ray Power, State director of vocational rehabilitation in West Virginia.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho and to include an article.

Mr. CORBETT and to include a short article from the League of Women Voters magazine.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LECOMPTE and to include resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Colfax, Iowa, on the subject of flood control.

Mr. RADWAN and to include an article.

Mr. COLE of Kansas and to include an address by the Honorable Alf M. Landon.

Mr. REES of Kansas and to include a statement that he made before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE and to include an editorial.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN and to include a resolution adopted by the Lyon County, Minn., Republican Conference relative to integrity in government.

Mr. RHODES.

Mr. ROONEY and include an editorial from today's Washington Post.

Mr. JENKINS with reference to the Federal Aid Highway Act.

Mr. BROWNSON (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) in two separate instances, in each to include certain articles.

Mr. PHILBIN in two instances.

Mr. BOW in two instances.

Mr. MULTER in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YORTY in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include an article.

Mr. FURCOLO in two instances and to include extraneous material in each.

Mr. BENDER in eight instances.

Mr. MCGREGOR and to include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matters.

Mr. MCCULLOCH and to include a statement.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MEADER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) to include two editorials.

Mr. TEAGUE in two instances and to include extraneous material.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4511. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Territory of Hawaii certain real property at Kahului, Wailuku, Maui, T. H.; and

H. R. 6811. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 23, 1924, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 762. An act for the relief of Alexander Urszu;

S. 997. An act for the relief of Paula Slucka (Slucki) and Ariel Slucki;

S. 1372. An act for the relief of Mrs. Madelaine Viale Moore; and

S. 1679. An act for the relief of Stephen Gorove.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SCRIVNER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), until June 2, 1952, on account of official business.

Mr. HARRISON (at the request of Mr. BURTON), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. STANLEY (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Virginia), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness in his family.

Mr. BURDICK, for 12 days, on account of campaigning for reelection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 29, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1534. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of obligations incurred in excess of amounts permitted by the administrative regulations promulgated by the Department of Agriculture pursuant to the requirements of section 3679, Revised Statutes, as amended by section 1211 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1535. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a survey report dated July 1950, of the Pecos River watershed in New Mexico and Texas, made under the provisions of the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 475); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HART: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 2748. An act authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1952; without amendment (Rept. No. 2008). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 8031. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 8032. A bill to amend the act of May 26, 1948, entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 8033. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code (Crimes and Criminal Procedure) to make unlawful the transportation or importation of false and defamatory statements designed to arouse intergroup conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8034. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 8035. A bill to amend section 206 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, so as to enable the Comptroller General more effectively to assist the Appropriations Committees in considering the budget; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 8036. A bill to rehabilitate and stabilize labor conditions in the textile industry of the United States, to prevent unemployment, to remove obstructions to interstate commerce, to regulate wages and hours in said industry, to protect and foster the defense effort, to safeguard and promote the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOW:

H. J. Res. 466. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning August 18, 1952, as National Clay Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. J. Res. 467. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday of June of each year as National Teachers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIER:

H. J. Res. 468. Joint resolution providing for a joint study and investigation of the problem of integrating Federal employees into the community of Washington, to be conducted by the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. J. Res. 469. Joint resolution to assist the Polycultural Institution of America in expanding further its program and activities for the purpose of promoting universal understanding, justice, and permanent peace, to assist such institution in providing for its permanent plant and equipment in the Nation's Capital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. Res. 660. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to investigate the massacre of American soldiers taken prisoner of war during the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 661. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Army to furnish to the House of Representatives full and complete information with respect to insurgency in prisoner-of-war camps in Korea and Communist-inspired disturbances of the peace in Japan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. Res. 662. Resolution requesting the Secretary of Defense to furnish to the House of Representatives full and complete information with respect to insurgency in prisoner-of-war camps in Korea and Communist-inspired disturbances of the peace in Japan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. Res. 663. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Army to furnish to the House of Representatives full and complete information with respect to the reduction in grade of Col. Charles F. Colson; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. Res. 664. Resolution requesting the Secretary of State to furniah to the House of Representatives full and complete information with respect to insurgency in prisoner-of-war camps in Korea and Communist-inspired disturbances of the peace in Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 8037. A bill for the relief of Francisco Tedesco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 8038. A bill for the relief of Wilhelm Friedrich Asmus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 8039. A bill for the relief of Maria Eva Wend; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 8040. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Laura J. McClure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 8041. A bill for the relief of Emma Gronowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREENWOOD:

H. R. 8042. A bill for the relief of Edeltraud Krauss and Waltraud Krauss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 8043. A bill for the relief of Chin Yam Yee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8044. A bill for the relief of Lope B. Rimando; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 8045. A bill for the relief of Rossana Gatti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8046. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Gargano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 8047. A bill for the relief of Victor Michael Ivanov and Mrs. Zinaida Alexsandrovna Ivanov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 8048. A bill for the relief of the E. J. Albrecht Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 8049. A bill for the relief of Robert J. McGarry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 8050. A bill for the relief of Kikue Ito and Sarie Ito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 8051. A bill for the relief of Doctor Paul Keuk Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 8052. A bill for the relief of Al-Ling Tung Tsou and her son, Moody Tsou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOOD of Idaho:

H. R. 8053. A bill for the relief of V. A. Verhei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

745. By Mr. RIEHLMAN: Petition of Miss Mary L. Smith, of Minoa, N. Y., and other residents of Onondaga County, N. Y., urging consideration of H. R. 2188; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

746. By the SPEAKER: Petition of American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, Madison, Wis., relative to endorsing the principle of veterans' preference in competitive examinations for persons who have served in the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

747. Also, petition of the clerk of council, Cincinnati, Ohio, requesting that the Congress and the Federal Reserve Board adopt the legislation necessary to relax the credit restraints of regulation X in order to stimulate the buying of homes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 29, 1952

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 28, 1952)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Albert Joseph McCartney, National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the only source of wisdom, power, justice, goodness, and truth, our hearts are heavy with the terrific problems that confront us as legislators on every hand. The going is becoming very rough, and we feel our helplessness and utter inadequacy to resolve these problems in our own meager might and wisdom. In deep humility we confess before Thee and before the world our failure to measure up to the great responsibilities that have been placed upon us but Thou knowest, O Lord, that we have tried and we will try again, for our hope is in Thee, and our faith in the goodness of our fellow man is unfaltering. Look upon us in mercy and renew our wills again this day, so we wait for that wisdom which cometh down from above and is profitable to direct. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 28, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, May 29, 1952, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 156) to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until June 15, 1952.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SPARKMAN was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate on Tuesday of next week.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED LOAN BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF SHIP MODEL U. S. S. "TENNESSEE" TO TENNESSEE STATE MUSEUM

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting pursuant to law, that the Tennessee State Museum, of Nashville, Tenn., had requested the loan of a ship model of the U. S. S. *Tennessee*, for display purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON VIOLATION OF SECTION 3679, REVISED STATUTES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, a violation of section 3679, of the Revised Statutes, relating to an obligation incurred in excess of the apportionment established by the Bureau of the Budget for applicable appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON VIOLATION OF SECTION 3679, REVISED STATUTES

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, reporting, pursuant to law, a violation of subsection (h), section 3679, of the Revised Statutes, relating to the incurring of an obligation in excess of the amount permitted by regulation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter from the State director of civil defense, Atlanta, Ga., transmitting a copy of an interstate civil-defense compact entered into by that State (with an accom-

panying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the director of civil defense, State of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C., transmitting a copy of an interstate civil-defense compact entered into by that State (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the international executive board of the American Newspaper Guild, protesting against the increase in export price of Canadian newsprint; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A petition signed by S. L. Descartes and sundry other citizens of San Juan, P. R., praying for the early approval of the Constitution of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the executive secretary, First Guam Legislature, Agana, Guam, transmitting a copy of Resolution No. 70, adopted by the Legislature of Guam relating to the admission of certain Ryukyuan fishermen into Guam (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the National Institute of Municipal Clerks, at Dallas, Tex., protesting against the centralization of certain functions in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Boy Scouts of America, New York, N. Y., signed by Arthur A. Schuck, chief Scout executive, expressing the thanks of the National Council of the Boy Scouts for the support of the Scout movement extended by Members of the Senate; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. 2651. A bill relating to telegram, long-distance telephone, and special-delivery and air-mail postage allowances of Senators; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1614).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2357. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to restrict the application of the agricultural and fish exemption for motor carriers; with amendments (Rept. No. 1615).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 7314. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1619).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 3554. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 1620).

AMENDMENT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, pursuant to the order of the Senate of April 23, 1952, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, with further amendments, the bill (S. 515) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, and I submit a report (No. 1618) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

ACCEPTANCE OF STATUES OF DR. JOHN McLOUGHLIN AND REV. JASON LEE FROM STATE OF OREGON

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Concurrent Resolution 70, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution, submitted by Mr. MORSE on April 8, 1952, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the statues of Dr. John McLoughlin and the Reverend Jason Lee, presented by the State of Oregon, one to be placed in Statuary Hall, are accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of the Congress be tendered said State for the contribution of the statues of two of its most eminent citizens, Dr. McLoughlin, illustrious as a great humanitarian, and first to govern the Oregon Country, who often is called the Father of Oregon, and Reverend Lee, illustrious as the first missionary and colonizer in the Oregon country; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the Governor of Oregon.

TEMPORARY PLACEMENT IN ROTUNDA OF STATUES OF DR. JOHN McLOUGHLIN AND REV. JASON LEE, OF OREGON

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Concurrent Resolution 71, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution, submitted by Mr. MORSE on April 8, 1952, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Oregon Statuary Committee is hereby authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol the statues of the late Dr. John McLoughlin and the Reverend Jason Lee, of Oregon, and to hold ceremonies in the rotunda on said occasion; and the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make the necessary arrangements therefor; and be it further

Resolved, That one statue shall be permanently located in Statuary Hall.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ENTITLED "INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS"

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Concurrent Resolution 59, and I submit a report (No. 1617) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution, submitted by Mr. McCARRAN on February 6, 1952, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary not to exceed 7,500 additional copies of part 1 and subsequent parts of the hearings entitled "Institute of Pacific Relations," held before a subcommittee of the above committee during the Eighty-second Congress.

ESTATE OF TIMOTHY MURRAY

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution to pay a gratuity to the estate of Timothy Murray, late an employee of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 324) was read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to the estate of Timothy Murray, an employee of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol at the time of his death, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Murray was an employee of the Senate for about 40 years. This resolution involves a gratuity of 6 months' salary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

INTERNAL SECURITY OF UNITED STATES—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 314, and I submit a report (No. 1616) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution, reported by Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary on May 7, 1952, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the limitation of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, Eighty-first Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States, agreed to December 21, 1950, is hereby increased by $163,800, and such sum, together with any unexpended balance of the sums previously authorized to be expended under such resolution, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee and covering obligations incurred under such resolution on or before January 31, 1953.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this resolution provides for continuation of the

activities of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary until January 31, 1953. The amount authorized is $163,800.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 307, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution, submitted by Mr. MURRAY on April 18, 1952, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-second Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this resolution involves an additional $10,000 for the committee, because of the fact that it has exhausted its funds for the printing of hearings.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT RELATING TO TAXATION OF CORPORATE SURPLUS ACCUMULATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 318, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of Senate.

The resolution, submitted by Mr. O'MAHONEY on May 16, 1952, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report 1,000 additional copies of the joint committee print, entitled "The Taxation of Corporate Surplus Accumulations," prepared for the said joint committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. The cost will be $359. There are orders for about 5,000 copies, to be sold by the Public Printer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

SALE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED SURPLUS TANKER VESSELS—INTERIM REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (REPT. NO. 1613)

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, I submit a unanimous interim report which the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations has made to the Committee on Government Operations concerning its investigation into the sale of Government-owned tanker vessels.

The primary objectives of the subcommittee in this investigation were to determine whether Government-owned tanker vessels were purchased and sold in accordance with the laws and regulations and further to ascertain whether the various individuals and corporations which made substantial financial gains in these tanker deals escaped the payment of Federal taxes. As is set forth in the findings and conclusions of our subcommittee report, we found that various corporations and individuals involved in these tanker transactions did evade the spirit and in some instances the letter of the civil provisions of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, and related statutes. We also found evidence indicating that various criminal statutes may have been violated by some of these individuals. All of the civil and criminal aspects of these cases are now under review by the Department of Justice and we have recommended in this report that the Department take prompt and vigorous action to bring these cases to a logical conclusion.

Our subcommittee also found that various schemes were used by the corporations and individuals involved to escape the payment of Federal income taxes. Our inquiry indicates that the present Federal income tax laws and regulations adequately provide for the possible recovery of a substantial portion of the Federal taxes which may have been avoided as the result of these schemes and the Bureau of Internal Revenue is now making inquiries with a view to collecting the taxes which may be due the Government. However, the subcommittee has recommended that the Congress consider legislation which would require any tax-free charitable organization that is actively engaged in operating a business in competition with other taxpaying business ventures to pay taxes on that income which is derived from its actual business operations. As a member of the Finance Committee I propose to ask for the consideration of this recommended legislation.

After this case was referred to our subcommittee by the RFC Subcommittee on Banking and Currency, our staff spent 10 months and the subcommittee held 14 public hearings in developing all of the facts in this case. The members of our subcommittee devoted considerable time and effort to this case and I wish to commend them for their diligence in developing all of the pertinent facts. I wish also to commend our staff, and in particular Assistant Counsel William A. Leece, for their fine work in this investigation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 29, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 762. An act for the relief of Alexander Urszu;

S. 997. An act for the relief of Paula Slucka (Slucki) and Ariel Slucki;

S. 1372. An act for the relief of Mrs. Madelaine Viale Moore; and

S. 1679. An act for the relief of Stephen Gorove.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 3255. A bill to amend subsections (c) and (d) of section 3 of the Postal Salary Act of July 6, 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOODY:

S. 3256. A bill for the relief of Soly S. Bencuya; and

S. 3257. A bill for the relief of John Mroczek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 3258. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, and the acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 11-1401); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 3259. A bill relating to burley tobacco farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 3260. A bill for the relief of Heinrich Hafner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN (by request):

S. 3261. A bill to revise the procedure in the district courts relating to the disposition of the wages and effects of deceased and deserting seamen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCCARRAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

S. 3262. A bill for the relief of M. G. Huff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD (for himself, Mr. MOODY, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 3263. A bill relating to the rate of postage on certain publications entered as second-class matter prior to June 28, 1932; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 3264. A bill for the relief of Mary Shizue Hirano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 3265. A bill making provision for judicial review of certain tax court decisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF PERSONAL EFFECTS OF CERTAIN SEAMEN

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to revise the procedure in

the district courts relating to the disposition of the wages and effects of deceased and deserting seamen, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief statement regarding the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from Nevada may proceed.

The bill (S. 3261) to revise the procedure in the district courts relating to the disposition of the wages and effects of deceased and deserting seamen, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN (by request), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, under date of May 15, I received a communication from the administrative office of the United States courts, transmitting a proposed bill, recommended by the judicial conference of the United States.

I have not had time to study and analyze this bill, which would revise the procedure in district courts of the United States relating to the disposition of the wages and effects of deceased and deserting seamen. However, because of the very eminent sponsorship of the proposal, I am introducing it, as requested; and it will be my purpose to appoint a special subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary to make a study of the matter.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the RECORD the text of the letter to which I have referred, with which this bill was transmitted; and also the text of certain excerpts from the report of the committee of district judges, dealing with this matter.

There being no objection, the letter and excerpts from the report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE
UNITED STATES COURTS,
Washington, D. C., May 15, 1952.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
Vice President of the United States,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: At the direction of the Judicial Conference of the United States I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress, a proposed bill to revise the procedure in the district courts of the United States, relating to the disposition of the wages and effects of deceased and deserting seamen. The reasons for the proposed revision are as follows:

Pursuant to the direction of the Judicial Conference of the United States at its annual meeting which convened on September 27, 1948, the Chief Justice of the United States designated a committee of seven district judges, with Judge William C. Coleman, Baltimore, Md., as chairman, "to consider some more satisfactory method of dealing with the wages and effects of deceased and deserting seaman than that presently provided for under existing law." The other members of the committee were Judge Herbert W. Christenberry, New Orleans, La., Judge Francis J. W. Ford, Boston, Mass., Judge Louis P. Goodman, San Francisco, Calif., Judge Charles H. Leavy, Tacoma, Wash., Judge Vincent L. Leibell, New York, N. Y., and Judge Thomas F. Meaney, Newark, N. J.

The designation of this committee resulted from a feeling which had existed for a number of years among some of the district judges in our larger seaports and also among some attorneys at such places who were accustomed to represent alleged deserting seamen as well as the estates of deceased seamen, that the existing statutory provisions governing the disposition of the wages and effects of both deceased and deserting seamen are unsatisfactory for two primary reasons: (1) They impose an undue burden, essentially administrative in character, upon the district courts since these statutory provisions require that the courts not merely adjudicate the rights with respect to the wages and effects of both deceased and deserting seamen, but constitute the courts custodians of such wages and effects, pending their final disposition, often years after custody is taken of them, by court action or through lack of any claimants, and (2) as respects the cases of deserting seamen, by the procedure authorized by these existing statutory provisions the district courts have found it virtually impossible in most instances to ascertain the facts prerequisite to a judicial finding as to whether the particular seaman has, in fact, deserted, and therefore, to determine with reasonable certainty what disposition should be made of the impounded wages and effects of such seamen.

After full, detailed study of the subject entrusted to the committee, it made unanimously its report and recommendation to the Judicial Conference of the United States at its annual meeting convened in September 1950. The basic proposed amendment to existing law embodied in these recommendations is to effectuate the transfer of the custody and administration of the wages and effects of deceased and deserting seamen from the district courts to the Coast Guard, through the implementation of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C. A., secs. 1001–11), but preserving a right of review in the district courts. In accord with its policy, the conference thereupon directed that the report be received and circulated throughout the judiciary in order that the views and suggestions of the various judges might be ascertained, and that in the light of such additional information, the committee submit a further report to the conference.

The committee's report and recommendations were so circulated and at the annual meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States convened in September 1951 the committee reported to the conference that an overwhelming majority of those judges who are called upon to adjudicate cases involving wages and effects of deceased and deserting seamen favored the recommendations contained in the committee's report. Each of the procedural steps, and each of the amendments to existing law which were recommended by the committee were reviewed and discussed by the conference. Thereupon the conference approved the report and recommendations of the committee with only one slight amendment and instructed the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, to advise the Congress of this action and to request that the proposed legislation be enacted as promptly as possible. It is in accordance with this instruction of the conference that the draft of amendments to the existing law which has been prepared by the administrative office, embodying the changes approved by the conference, as aforesaid, is herewith submitted.

In order that you may have before you more detailed information with respect to the amendments in existing law recommended by the judicial conference, I also enclose excerpts from the report made by the committee to the conference.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY P. CHANDLER.

EXCERPTS FROM REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF DISTRICT JUDGES TO CONSIDER SOME MORE SATISFACTORY METHOD OF DEALING WITH THE WAGES AND EFFECTS OF DECEASED AND DESERTING SEAMEN, THAN THAT PRESENTLY PROVIDED FOR UNDER EXISTING LAW

BASIC RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIZED

As a result of its studies, the committee is unanimous in its belief that the district courts should be relieved of the custodial and administrative duties which the existing law now imposes upon them, and that they should function merely as courts of review, similar to the jurisdiction which they exercise, for example, in appeals from orders of referees in bankruptcy and from deputy commissioners under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. It is not merely a question of how great is the burden imposed upon the district courts under existing statutes with respect to the administration of both wages and effects of (1) deceased seamen and (2) deserting seamen. Admittedly, the number of cases of both types is now, generally speaking, not very large. For example, in 1949 in the southern district of New York a total of only 73 cases involving wages of alleged deserting seamen were filed and the amount of money deposited with the court in connection therewith was $7,357.93. The corresponding figures for the same year with respect to cases involving wages of deceased seamen are 180, involving $38,511.83 deposited with the court in connection therewith. In the Maryland district, in 1949 only 8 deserter cases were filed and the amount of money deposited with the court in connection therewith was only $791.26. For the same year, 27 deceased seamen's cases were instituted, involving a deposit of $8,027.03.

Of course during the last war, the number of cases, especially those of deceased seamen, distressingly increased. For example, in the southern district of New York during the years 1945 to 1948, inclusive, a total of $707,656 was deposited with the court; $775,902 was disbursed and as of June 30, 1948, the balance still on deposit was $526,322. In the years of intensified submarine activity prior to the summer of 1944, the figures were much higher. But the real point is that the present statutory procedure is an anomaly in that even in normal times it calls for a large amount of clerical and accounting detail by the district court clerks, and as respects alleged deserting seamen's cases, is inadequate to enable the district courts to ascertain the full facts necessary for a proper decision.

This anomalous procedure, whereby the district courts are constituted both custodians and administrative tribunals, is a survival of the admiralty tradition that seamen, lacking the opportunity to assert the rights open to those who work on land, were entitled to special protection, and therefore should be treated as wards of the admiralty. But certainly, the present-day status of seamen is radically different. They can no longer be said to suffer, with the highly unionized character of their calling, from lack of legal protection open to other types of workers. Most of the sections of the law with which we are concerned date back over 75 years, that is, they are derived from the act of June 2, 1872 (ch. 322, sec. 52, 17 Stat. 274). Our investigations disclose no other instance in which the district courts are required by any statute or rule to perform similar custodial and administrative functions. Of course, funds and other property are constantly placed under the district courts' jurisdiction in various types of litigation pending a determination of the rights therein. However, as respects the effects and wages of both deceased and deserting seamen, by the present statute the United

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

States Shipping Commissioners (now displaced by Coast Guard officials to whom the duties of Shipping Commissioner have been delegated by 1946 Reorganization Plan No. 3, secs. 101–104, effective July 16, 1946, 11 F. R. 7875, 60 Stat. 1097), are merely conduits for the transfer of the wages and effects of both types of seamen to the district courts and, thereafter, all responsibility for their custody and ultimate disposition devolves upon the district courts.

THE EXISTING LAW

The provisions of the law that have to do with the wages and effects of deceased and deserting seamen are sections 621–628, inclusive, 701, paragraph first; 702, 705, and 706 of title 46 United States Code Annotated.

Sections 621–628, inclusive, relate to the disposition of the wages and effects of deceased seamen. Briefly summarized, the method prescribed for disposition of deceased seamen's effects by these sections is as follows: (1) Upon the seaman's death during the voyage, the master may in his discretion sell the seaman's personal effects. (2) Within 48 hours after the vessel's arrival in a United States port, the master shall deliver to the Shipping Commissioner at such port any of the effects remaining unsold and any money received from their sale and the balance of wages due the deceased. (3) The master shall make similar accounting to a United States consular officer if the latter so requires, if the vessel touches and remains at some foreign port before coming to the United States. (4) Penalty is provided for the master's neglect to make an accounting as aforesaid, not more than treble the value of the seaman's money and effects or, if such value is not ascertained, not more than $200. (5) The Shipping Commissioner shall, within 1 week after receiving any money, wages, or effects of the deceased seaman, deliver the same to the district court of the district in which the commissioner resides, less such expenses as may be allowed by the court, under penalty of not more than treble the value of such money and effects if not so accounted for. (6) If the money and effects do not exceed in value $300, the court may deliver same to any widow or children of the deceased seaman upon proof of their right thereto. If such money and effects exceed in value $300, the court is required to account for same to the legal personal representatives of the deceased. (7) The court, may, in its discretion, at any time, direct that all or any part of the deceased seaman's effects be sold and hold the proceeds. If no claim for the effects or money or wages deposited with the court is substantiated within 6 years after the receipt, the court may, in its discretion, if any subsequent claim is made, either allow or refuse the same, and the court shall from time to time pay any moneys arising from the unclaimed wages and effects which in the court's opinion it is not necessary to retain for the purpose of satisfying claims, into the United States Treasury, such money to be a fund for the relief of disabled and destitute seamen belonging to the United States Merchant Marine Service.

Sections 701, paragraph first; 702, 705, and 706 relate to disposition of the wages and effects of deserting seamen. Briefly summarized, they provide as follows: Section 701, paragraph first, provides for forfeiture of "all or any part" of the wages, emoluments and personal effects of deserting seamen; section 702 provides for entry of the offense on the vessel's logbook, and for its production in subsequent court proceedings, and authorize the court to refuse to receive evidence of the offense if the log entry is not produced; section 705 relates to enforcement of forfeitures and provides that any question concerning the forfeiture of, or deduction from, a seaman's wages "may be determined in any proceeding lawfully instituted with respect to such wages," even though there has not been, but could be, a related criminal proceeding; and section 706 covers disposal of effects and wages so forfeited, by providing that the master or owner of the vessel shall deposit same, less any expense incurred by reason of the desertion, with the Shipping Commissioner at the port of destination and that the shipping commissioner shall account for same to the district court within 1 month after receipt, "to be disposed of by him in the same manner as is prescribed for the disposition of money, effects, and wages of deceased seamen." Upon neglect or refusal to make such an accounting, the master or owner of the vessel is made liable for a penalty of double the amount to be accounted for, the same to be recoverable by the Shipping Commissioner in the same manner that seamen's wages are recovered.

The committee has found that in the great majority of cases where a seaman fails to join his vessel, the master logs the seaman as a deserter without making more than a superficial inquiry to ascertain whether the seaman did in fact intend to desert, or whether he merely missed the ship for any one of several reasons common to seagoing men. Upon the termination of the voyage, the master deposits the alleged deserting seaman's wages and personal effects with the Shipping Commissioner who is not required and makes no effort to ascertain whether the seaman was really a deserter, but relies upon the master's log entry, and in due course simply deposits the earned wages and effects with the district court.

Under the second paragraph of section 701 of title 46, there is a penalty of "two days' pay or sufficient to defray any expenses which shall have been properly incurred in hiring a substitute," provided to cover those cases where a seaman neglects or refuses, without reasonable cause, to join his vessel, or is absent without leave at any time within 24 hours of the vessel's sailing from any port. However, generally speaking, masters do not utilize this provision of the law, but in most cases are accustomed arbitrarily to log the seaman as a deserter and to follow the procedure required under section 706. There are, of course, in many instances unavoidable impediments and delays incident to a master making a reasonable investigation to ascertain whether the seaman who has failed to rejoin his vessel is actually a deserter in the legal sense.

Sections 701, paragraph 1, 705, and 706 are derived from the original act of June 7, 1872 (ch. 322, 17 Stat. 273). There have been no material changes in sections 705 and 706 since that time. Section 701, paragraph 1, as originally enacted in 1872, provided for imprisonment as well as forfeiture. This was amended in 1898, and imprisonment was restricted to cases of desertion in a foreign port, in the discretion of the court, and then in 1915 the imprisonment provision was removed entirely from this part of the law.

PRESENT PROCEDURE

Despite the language of section 706, which we have heretofore quoted, requiring disposition of the wages and effects of deserting seamen to be made by the district court "in the same manner as is prescribed for the disposition of money, effects, and wages of deceased seamen," the same distribution obviously was not intended to be followed since it would lead to a very anomalous result, and so it has been held in the district of Massachusetts in In re Zanicki (65 F. Supp. 447). Also, since the statute is silent as to whether the Government shall be made a party to any proceeding for the recovery of the impounded wages of alleged deserting seamen, the committee has found that there is considerable variation in the practice adopted in the different districts. That is to say, in some districts the practice is to notify the Attorney General through the local United States Attorney in order that the Attorney General may become a party to the proceeding if he so elects on the ground that the Government has a contingent interest in such wages as may be withheld from the seaman since by section 628, wage funds not disbursed to seamen are appropriated to a fund for the relief of sick, disabled, and destitute seamen belonging to the United States Merchant Marine Service. Such procedure is followed, for example, in the district of Massachusetts, see In re Zanicki (65 F. Supp. 447); in the district of New York, see petition of Meyers (74 F. Supp. 154) and in the western district of Washington, northern division, see *Humes* v. *Alaska Transportation* (180 F. (2d) 534). Admiralty rule 42 merely provides that due notice shall be given "to the adverse parties, if any," in any proceeding brought by "any person having an interest in any proceeds in the registry of the court," for delivery of such proceeds to him.

Generally speaking, where the seaman desires to recover his wages or effects he is required to file with the court a formal petition for same, whereupon the vessel owner is served with a copy of the petition or notified of its filing and given an opportunity to answer. The same procedure is followed with respect to the Government in those jurisdictions where, as above stated, the Government is considered either an appropriate, if not in fact a necessary party. In some districts, as for example, Maryland, a show-cause court order follows the filing of the petition requiring the shipowner to show cause, if any he has, why the impounded funds should not be released in whole or in part. However, taking into account the rather numerous variations in the procedures followed in the different districts, it is virtually impossible in the vast majority of cases for the court to ascertain the actual facts with respect to the seaman's status for the reason (1) the shipowner generally does not care to incur the trouble or expense of being represented at the hearing, and (2) he generally is not in position to supply the court with information other than what the log indicates on account of inability to produce as a witness the master or to contact him within a reasonable period because of his absence from the country. Thus, in most instances, as a practical matter, it is impossible for the court to make accurate findings on the question of desertion. Perhaps the Shipping Commissioners, had the duty of making such findings been entrusted to them instead of to the court, would have experienced some of the same difficulty and the same may be true with respect to the Coast Guard if the same duty is imposed upon them as hereinafter recommended. However, because of their kindred duties and experience in administrative dealings with seamen, it would seem far better and less costly in time and effort to have had them perform the entire duty involved in determining the disposition to be made of deserting seamen's wages, such determination to be subject to review by the district courts.

EVOLUTION AND FUNCTIONING OF THE OFFICE OF SHIPPING COMMISSIONER

It will help toward a better understanding of why the committee makes the recommendations that it does hereinafter in this report if we consider a brief chronology of the creation and functioning of the office of Shipping Commissioner. This had its genesis in the Shipping Commissioner's Act of 1872. Under this act, the Shipping Commissioner was charged with certain specific statutory duties. He was under the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department and a political appointee of the Secretary of the Treasury. His compensation was contingent upon the receipt of certain fees authorized by statute and his tenure of office was subject to the will of the Secretary. Adminis-

tratively, he was directly under the Commissioner of Navigation who was under the Treasury Department.

In 1886 the status of the Shipping Commissioner was changed in that there were no longer any fees to be charged for his services and he was placed on a salary basis. In 1903, the office of the Commissioner of Navigation, together with the offices of Shipping Commissioners in the several ports, were transferred to the newly created Department of Commerce and Labor. In 1912, upon the creation of a separate Department of Commerce, the Commissioner of Navigation and the Shipping Commissioners were placed under the administrative control of the Secretary of Commerce. In 1931, Shipping Commissioners were made civil-service appointees. In 1932 the Bureau of Navigation was consolidated with the Steamboat Inspection Service as a bureau known as the Bureau of Navigation and Steamboat Inspection. In 1936 the name of the Bureau was changed to that of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation. During these latter changes no changes were made in the status or duties of the Shipping Commissioner. His duties have long been (1) to supervise the contractual obligations of seamen; (2) to act as statutory arbiter of controversies arising between seamen and masters and owners of vessels; (3) to supervise the discharge of seamen and insure proper payment of their wages; (4) to interpret administratively the logs of vessels; and (5) to accept and transfer to the district court the wages and effects of deserting seamen—the duty with which we are here concerned.

Due to the war, by Executive Order 9083, dated March 1, 1942, the duties of the Shipping Commissioner, together with the many other varied duties of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation relating to vessels' safety, were transferred to the United States Coast Guard, which was put under the Navy on a temporary war basis. In July 1946, by virtue of Reorganization Plan No. 3, 1946, the President transferred permanently to the Commandant of the Coast Guard (which was transferred from the Navy to the Treasury Department on January 1, 1946) all of those functions which he had theretofore temporarily transferred to the Coast Guard under Executive Order 9083. This reorganization plan specifically abolished the office of Shipping Commissioner and placed all of the duties theretofore performed by him in the Commandant of the Coast Guard, to be thereafter performed by the Commandant or such subordinates as he might, in his discretion, designate. Because of the familiarity of merchant seamen with the term "shipping commissioner," the Commandant has continued to designate, in his own discretion and for such terms as he might see fit, the personnel performing the duties formerly performed by shipping commissioners, as "shipping commissioners." As a result, these duties are now performed by a varied group, some of whom are commissioned officers of the United States Coast Guard; some are enlisted personnel; and in a few isolated instances, some remain in a civilian status. These officials continue to function in the same manner as did their statutory predecessors. By Reorganization Plan No. 26 adopted in 1950, and the President's executive order effectuating this plan, all of the functions of the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, and all of the functions of the Coast Guard as such have been transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury who has redelegated all such functions back to the Commandant of the Coast Guard on a temporary basis pending study. However, this transfer expressly provides that the use by the Coast Guard of examiners, pursuant to the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, is not affected. In view of the present critical international situation, it is not unreasonable to anticipate that the Coast Guard may be again transferred to the Navy Department, as it was during the last war. However, such a transfer will not alter the proposed statutory changes which we herein recommend, because the Coast Guard will continue as an entity in naval service, and also will presumably continue to perform the same civilian functions which it is currently performing and which include those relating to seamen in the merchant marine. Furthermore, the Administrative Procedure Act exempts only military functions from its scope, and functions having to do with civilian merchant seamen would not come within such an exemption.

DETAILS OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS

As would seem clear from the aforegoing, the Shipping Commissioners have been, from the time when their offices were first created in 1872, the logical officials to have the custody of seamen's wages and effects and to adjudicate in the first instance the rights of claimants thereto. There is precedent for this under British law in that in England the British Board of Trade performs these administrative duties. But as has been pointed out, in the United States, the doctrine that seamen were wards of the admiralty being stressed, they were given a preferred court status ab initio. However, as heretofore stated, we believe that whatever may have been true in the early days, such status has become, for practical purposes, a mere fiction insofar as the questions presented to the committee for consideration are concerned. Therefore, were the Shipping Commissioners as such still in existence, that is to say, had their functions not been taken over by the Coast Guard, we can see no sound reason for not amending the law so as to impose upon the Shipping Commissioners the custodial and administrative duties now imposed upon the district courts, restricting the function of the latter to that of a court of review of the action of the Shipping Commissioners. This being true, we see no reason why the same reasoning is not applicable to the Coast Guard provided it has adequate personnel, with sufficient experience to deal with both types of seamen's cases here under consideration.

This brings us to our second major conclusion which is that the Coast Guard is an appropriate and well qualified agency to assume the custodial and administrative duties now imposed upon the district courts through utilizing the procedure provided in the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C. A. sec. 1001–1011). We reach this conclusion for the following reason:

I. The Coast Guard is an "Agency" embraced by the act, section 1001 (a).

II. The procedure provided by the act could be utilized to adjudicate the question of whether a seaman is a deserter, and whether his wages and effects should be returned to him or withheld, with right of review by the district court, but not right to trial de novo (sec. 1004).

III. It could be made compulsory that the initial hearing requisite under the act be conducted by a civilian examiner who is a civil-service appointee (sec. 1010).

IV. Such civilian examiner would have power to issue subpenas for witnesses and for the production of evidence; he could administer oaths and take or cause depositions to be taken, et cetera (sec. 1005 and 1006).

The Coast Guard is now using civilian examiners appointed pursuant to the act for the purpose of hearing cases involving misconduct, inattention to duty, negligence, willful violation of law, etc., by holders of merchant marine licenses or certificates. Most if not all of these present examiners are required to be lawyers; they are under civil-service regulations, and are not subject to removal except after formal hearing and a showing of incompetence. The Coast Guard now has some 15 such examiners. For example, there are four in New York and one each in Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Portland, Oreg., San Francisco, and Los Angeles.

The use of such examiners in alleged deserting seamen's cases should obviate the reported objections on the part of seamen, through the seamen's union, to having any personnel of the Coast Guard itself conduct the initial hearings on application of seamen for return of their wages and effects, since these objections are based upon the fact that the Coast Guard is a military organization, and that its rules and regulations are considered by seamen as unnecessarily strict for the merchant marine.

If it be assumed that in any amendments to the existing statutes defining the procedure for disposition of alleged deserting seamen's wages and effects, the United States should be made a necessary party to such proceedings in conformity with the decision of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in *Humes* v. *Alaska Transportation Co.* (180 F. (2d) 534), and with that of the District Court of Massachusetts in *Zanicki* v. *United States* (65 F. Supp. 447), it would seem that the Department of Justice should have no ground for objecting to the initial hearing being before an administrative examiner of the character that could be required under the Administrative Procedure Act.

V. While under the act the Coast Guard, as the administrative agency has rule-making power (sec. 1003), the civilian examiner is by the act given broad powers in the conduct of the hearings which would not be according to strict rules of procedure, including admissibility of evidence, inherent in court proceedings, but would be more informal (sec. 1006).

VI. Upon the seaman's appeal to the district court to review the civilian examiner's findings, the scope of the district court's review would be restricted to determining whether the civilian examiner's findings were based on substantial evidence, and in accordance with law. It would not be a trial de novo (sec. 1009).

We are aware of no legal impediment to implementing the Administrative Procedure Act as above outlined. We believe there can be no sound objection from the aspect of admiralty jurisdiction on the ground that to implement the Administrative Procedure Act would be tantamount to diminishing the admiralty jurisdiction as it existed at the time the Constitution was adopted by transferring property rights in admiralty from the jurisdiction of the Federal courts to an administrative agency not appointed by such courts. To this objection we think it sufficient to say that the proposed action is merely to withdraw a statutory duty which Congress at an earlier date imposed upon the admiralty courts, and we find nothing which proclaims that such duty is necessarily inherent in and inseparable from the admiralty courts. See *Crowell* v. *Benson* (285 U. S. 22).

Likewise, we find no existing statutory impediment to adopting the procedure of the Administrative Procedure Act. The proposal is in no sense one that relieves the admiralty courts of their constitutional function to adjudicate the rights of all claimants with respect to the effects and wages of both deceased and deserting seamen. The proposal is merely to relieve these courts of making the initial finding, with the right at all times for any claimant to contest such finding in the admiralty court.

Before reaching the conclusion which we do, we have given careful consideration to the question whether the desired end might not be as well or better accomplished by imposing these administrative duties upon the United States Commissioners or upon special commissioners appointed by the admiralty court. As to utilize United States Commissioners, suffice it to say that, as a practical matter, this would appear to be not nearly so feasible as utilizing the

Coast Guard, first, because the former do not have, and the latter does have adequate facilities for the custody of seamen's wages and effects; and secondly, because United States Commissioners have, generally speaking, no training in matters maritime, whereas the examiners utilized by the Coast Guard do have such training, as well as legal training.

As to utilizing special commissioners, suffice it to say that such would be entitled to adequate compensation which would have to come out of the seamen's wages, an impractical and unfair procedure, whereas under the proposed plan, the Government absorbs the costs of the hearing before the Coast Guard Examiner. If it be suggested that the Coast Guard Examiners should be appointed special commissioners of the admiralty courts, we see no legal necessity for so doing, and this would merely be continuing in these courts, although in a vicarious manner, the very administrative functions of which we are satisfied these courts should be completely relieved. At this point we desire to make clear that we do not think any change in existing procedure will be adequate or really worthwhile which merely provides that the Coast Guard shall retain the custody of the wages and effects of both types of seamen until the admiralty court has passed upon the rights of claimants thereto. Such partial change not only would not give to the admiralty courts relief from the administrative duties to which we believe they are entitled regardless of whether or not such administrative duties are actually burdensome, generally speaking, but it would fail to accomplish what we believe is the major object that should be accomplished, namely, a form of procedure which will insure the ascertainment of the material facts in a reasonably efficient and expeditious manner by competent persons which experience indicates the admiralty courts have not done and cannot do.

We call special attention to the proposed change in section 702 providing specifically that upon the commission of any offense enumerated in section 702, the entry thereof by the master in the official log book shall "set forth in detail the full circumstances of the offense." This amendment is recommended because of the fact that the committee has found it is the much too common practice of masters of vessels to wash their hands, so to speak, of further concern with the cases of seamen reported absent without prima facie authority, by logging them as deserters and giving at most very scanty statements of their reasons therefor. The committee's investigations have disclosed that in most cases when the alleged deserter files a formal claim, either in person or through his attorney, for his impounded wages and effects, statements of facts are made which if true, would refute desertion. However, the court cannot accept such statements without proof, and a hearing usually results in no additional proof. The master rarely if ever appears as a witness; likewise, no one else appears to represent the shipowner, or if he does, he knows nothing about the case except what appears in the master's log. In other words, insofar as the average hearing is concerned, it remains virtually an ex parte affair. We believe that the master could greatly facilitate the ascertaining of the exact facts with respect to whether or not the seaman had any valid excuse for his absence if the log entry with respect thereto were written up in precise detail.

As ancillary to this, there is to be noted a further amendment which we recommend be made in section 702, namely, the requirement that the Coast Guard official shall forthwith upon receipt of the log containing any entry of desertion by a seaman, take the necessary steps for obtaining sworn detailed statements, and when possible, to take depositions in the usual formal manner, of the master and first mate of the vessel with respect to such offense. The object of this proposed amendment is to overcome, insofar as practical, the conditions which have long existed under the present law, namely, that the vessel's personnel usually leave the country, often to be absent continuously for many months or more, without any effort being made to ascertain their side of the case. We do, however, find that since the Coast Guard assumed the functions of the Shipping Commissioners, efforts have been made to obtain statements from the ship's personnel with reasonable promptness.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO MEMBERSHIP OF STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. CASE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 325), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That section (1) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended—

(1) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (c) (relating to the Committee on Armed Services) and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen";

(2) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (f) (relating to the Committee on the District of Columbia) and inserting in lieu thereof "nine";

(3) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (g) (1) (relating to the Committee on Government Operations) and inserting in lieu thereof "eleven";

(4) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (h) (relating to the Committee on Finance) and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen";

(5) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (i) (relating to the Committee on Foreign Relations) and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen";

(6) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (k) (relating to the Committee on the Judiciary) and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen"; and

(7) by striking out "thirteen" in subsection (o) (1) (relating to the Committee on Rules and Administration) and inserting in lieu thereof "eleven."

SEC. 2. Section (4) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more; except that Senators of the majority party who are members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service or of the Committee on the District of Columbia and Senators of the majority party who are members of the Committee on Government Operations and have not been first elected to membership on the Committee on Appropriations after the end of the Eighty-second Congress may serve on three standing committees and no more."

SEC. 3. Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"(5) A Senator who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations shall not be eligible to be a member of any other standing committee except (A) the Committee on Government Operations, (B) the Committee on Rules and Administration, or (C) in case he was a member of the Committee on Appropriations at the end of the Eighty-second Congress, any standing committee of which he was a member at the end of the Eighty-second Congress."

SEC. 4. This resolution shall become effective on the day the Eighty-third Congress convenes.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH EMIGRATION OF REFUGEES FROM WESTERN EUROPEAN NATIONS

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 326), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a thorough and complete study, survey, and investigation of the problems in certain Western European nations created by the flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny to the Western European nations, and to make recommendations on—

(1) the methods most likely to relieve such problems;

(2) the ways and means of assisting worthy refugees who have escaped from Communist tyranny, and the methods best suited to encourage future disaffection and escape so as to strengthen the forces seeking affiliation with the free world; and

(3) the manner of coordinating the activities and programs of the various agencies of Government having responsibilities with respect to United States participation in intergovernmental programs for the care, rehabilitation, education, utilization, and emigration of refugees from communism, and the integrating of such refugees into the forces of the democratic nations.

The committee shall report to the Senate from time to time the results of its study, survey, and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate to the accomplishment of the purposes of this resolution.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings in or outside of the continental United States; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate during the Eighty-second Congress; to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, without regard to the civil-service rules and regulations and the Classification Act of 1949; to request such information from any department or agency of the Government; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report the hearings of the committee shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $65,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

All authority conferred by this resolution shall terminate on April 1, 1953.

PRINTING OF TESTIMONY OF SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS (S. DOC. NO. 140)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a copy of the testimony which was given before the Subcomittee on Defense Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations by the Secretary of the Air Force, the Honorable Thomas K. Finletter.

I have consulted the majority and minority leaders. The Subcommittee on

Defense Appropriations is of the opinion that this should be printed as a Senate document. It is within the 50-page rule.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me add that I understand, on yesterday the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], with much approval, requested that the testimony of Mr. Bernard Baruch before the Armed Services Committee also be printed as a Senate document. I recommend a reading of both of these documents to the Members of the Senate, the Members of the House of Representatives, and the general public.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1952—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2594) to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. IVES, and Mr. LODGE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 2594, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 2594, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 2594) to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table, and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment submitted by Mr. IVES is as follows:

On page 6, beginning with line 10, strike out through line 11 on page 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) (1) There is hereby created, in the Economic Stabilization Agency, a Wage Stabilization Board (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the "Board"), which shall be composed, in equal numbers, of members representative of the general public, members representative of labor, and members representative of business and industry. The number of offices on the Board shall be established by Executive order.

"(2) The members representative of the general public shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The members representative of labor, and the members representative of business and industry, shall be appointed by the President. The President shall designate a Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board from among the members representative of the general public.

"(3) The term of office of the members of the Board shall terminate on March 1, 1953. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

"(4) Each member representative of the general public shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 a year, and while a member of the Board shall engage in no other business, vocation, or employment. Each member representative of labor, and each member representative of business and industry, shall receive $50 for each day he is actually engaged in the performance of his duties as a member of the Board, and in addition he shall be paid his actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949 while so engaged away from his home or regular place of business. The members representative of labor, and the members representative of business and industry, shall, in respect of their functions on the Board, be exempt from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

"(5) The Board shall, under the supervision and direction of the Economic Stabilization Administrator—

"(A) formulate, and recommend to such Administrator for promulgation, general policies and general regulations relating to the stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation; and

"(B) upon the request of (i) any person substantially affected thereby, or (ii) any Federal department or agency whose functions, as provided by law, may be affected thereby or may have an effect thereon, advise as to the interpretation, or the application to particular circumstances, of policies and regulations promulgated by such Administrator which relate to the stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation.

For the purposes of this act, stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation means prescribing maximum limits thereon. Labor disputes, and labor matters in dispute, which do not involve the interpretation or application of such regulations or policies shall be dealt with, if at all, insofar as the Federal Government is concerned, under the conciliation, mediation, emergency, or other provisions of laws heretofore or hereafter enacted by the Congress, and not otherwise: *Provided, however*, That the Board may undertake to mediate and/or arbitrate labor disputes involving wages, salaries, and other compensation, if the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service certifies to the Administrator of the Economic Stabilization Agency that all remedies available to the Service have been exhausted, and (i) the parties themselves request the Board to mediate and/or arbitrate, or (ii) the President requests the Board to mediate and/or arbitrate the dispute and the parties consent: *Provided further*, That in any effort to mediate and/or arbitrate a labor dispute referred to the Board pursuant to the terms of the foregoing proviso, a panel of the Board, the membership of which is constituted in the same proportion as is the Board itself, may act on behalf of the Board.

"(6) Paragraph (5) of this subsection shall take effect 30 days after the date on which this subsection is enacted. The Wage Stabilization Board created by Executive Order No. 10161, and reconstituted by Executive Order No. 10233, as amended by Executive Order No. 10301, is hereby abolished, effective at the close of the twenty-ninth day following the date on which this subsection is enacted."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 2594) to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments are as follows:

On page 2, between lines 8 and 9, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 101. Section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'If the domestic production of any commodity is in excess of the amount necessary to meet allocations for defense, stockpiling, and military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress, then no restriction or other limitation shall be imposed under this title upon the right of any person to purchase such commodity in any foreign country and to import and use the same in the United States. No restriction or other limitation shall be imposed under this title if the domestic production of any commodity is sufficient to meet all civilian domestic requirements and the requirements for defense, stockpiling, and military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress.'"

Renumber succeeding sections accordingly.

On page 5, line 24, strike out "a new subsection (1)", and insert in lieu thereof "two new subsections."

On page 6, line 5, strike out the quotation marks.

On page 6, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

"(m) No rule, regulation, or order issued under this title shall apply to purchases by any person of any material outside of the United States or its Territories and possessions for importation into the United States for his own use or for fabrication by him into other products for resale."

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. MORSE:

Address on the subject of Development of the Power Resources of the United States and the National Security, delivered by him before the Electric Consumers Conference, in Washington, D. C., on May 27, 1952.

By Mr. CASE:

Address delivered by him at a dinner of the Gold Standard League, at the Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, D. C., on May 5, 1952.

Article entitled "The Constitutionality of Home Rule for the District of Columbia," written by Carl L. Shipley, and published in the January 1952 edition of the Federal Bar Journal.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by W. John Kenney, Deputy Director, Mutual Security Agency, on May 22, 1952, before annual spring conference of the Society for Advancement of Management.

Editorial entitled "How To Amend the McCarran Bill," published in America for May 10, 1952.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

Editorial entitled "In Our Own Back Yard," published in the New York Daily News of May 26, 1952, dealing with the status of Puerto Rico.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

Associated Press dispatch and editorial appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of May 29, 1952, concerning the sentiment of the people of Maryland toward the Republican nomination for President.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes on a matter of personal privilege.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on page 6149 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, there appears the vote taken yesterday on the so-called Kem amendment. In previous years I have voted against the Kem amendment, because I felt its enforcement presented administrative difficulties. I still feel this is true, although I am in entire accord with the objective of the amendment. I supported the Battle bill last year and hoped it would offer a solution.

In reading yesterday's RECORD, I noticed that it might be possible for Members of Senator KEM's party to give him a unanimous vote of confidence for the courageous way in which, year after year, he has worked for his convictions. Frequently I have differed with him, and we have voted against each other many times, especially on issues affecting our foreign policy. But there is no one who has greater respect for Senator KEM than I have. I honor him because of his fair and constant presentation of his honest convictions and his fine sportsmanship.

The senior Senator from Missouri was elected to the Senate in 1946. I was reelected in 1946. So we are in the same senatorial class. We are both going back to our States to seek votes of confidence from our constituents this year. I would be happy to join with my colleagues here in the Senate in giving Senator KEM a party vote of confidence for his courageous support of his convictions.

I am informed by the Parliamentarian that I can do that by getting unanimous consent to change my vote on the Kem amendment from "nay" to "yea" provided that the change in my vote would not affect the action taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may not vote, change his vote, or withdraw his vote after a vote is taken, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to change my vote on the Kem amendment from "nay" to "yea" in order that the party vote may be unanimous.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that he now be permitted to change his vote.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, granting this request would establish a precedent which, if followed, would lead to trouble. If a Senator had a right to change his vote when it did not affect the result, the same privilege would have to be extended when it did. I feel that to grant this request would establish a precedent; therefore, I am forced to object.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Arizona to withhold his objection for a moment? This is a matter of personal tribute to a friend, with whom I have frequently differed, because I believe it would be a handsome compliment, to have his party colleague give him this vote of confidence. I notice from the RECORD that I am the only member of Senator KEM's party who voted against his amendment. That is why I ask for this privilege. I hope the majority leader will withdraw his objection.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the willingness of the Senator from New Jersey to commend his colleague, but I think that can be done as well by words as by action. I feel compelled to object because of the precedent that would be established for the future.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona objects.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCLELLAN

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, under leave of absence granted by the Senate, I was not present during the debate and final vote yesterday on the mutual security bill. The RECORD states that had I been present I would have voted for the final passage of the bill. I would have done so reluctantly; and had I been present I would have voted for amendments reducing the amount, down to $6,000,000,000. The bill which was passed yesterday is only an authorization bill. We still have the opportunity, in the matter of appropriations, to control the actual expenditure, and I intend to vote accordingly on appropriations.

AMENDMENTS TO ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY · JOINT RESOLUTION—PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR AIKEN

Mr. AIKEN. Mr President, yesterday in the course of the debate on the mutual security bill the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] made this statement:

I am against the St. Lawrence seaway because I do not want to charge the budget of this country with a project of that kind, no matter how useful it may be.

Apparently the junior Senator from Illinois is not familiar with the amendments which nine other Members of this body and I submitted to that bill, which provide that the St. Lawrence seaway shall be self-financing, self-liquidating, and self-sustaining, without any charge to the taxpayers. I am sure that there are others who are also unfamiliar with those amendments, so I ask that they be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. MOODY, Mr. THYE, Mr. TAFT, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER) to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 27) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the development of the resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for national security and continental defense of the United States and Canada; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the end of the joint resolution, add a new title as follows:

"TITLE II—ST. LAWRENCE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

"CREATION OF CORPORATION

"SEC. 201. There is hereby created a body corporate to be known as the St. Lawrence Development Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation"). The Corporation shall be an instrumentality of the United States and shall have the powers and duties hereinafter set forth.

"BOARD OF DIRECTORS

"SEC. 202. (a) The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Board of Directors consisting of three members to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than two members of the Board shall be members of the same political party. One of the members shall be designated by the President as Chairman at the time of appointment.

"(b) The terms of office of members of the Board shall be 6 years except that (1) the terms of office of the members first appointed shall run from the date of enactment of this joint resolution and shall expire one at the end of 2 years, one at the end of 4 years, and one at the end of 6 years, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, and (2) a member appointed to fill a vacancy caused by the death, resignation, or removal of a member prior to the expiration of the term for which he shall have been appointed, shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term.

"(c) Each member of the Board shall be paid compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum. No member shall, during his continuance in office, be engaged in any other business.

"(d) Two members shall constitute a quorum for transaction of the business of the Board, and vacancies in the Board, so long as there are two members in office, shall not impair the powers of the Board to execute the functions of the Corporation.

"FUNCTIONS OF CORPORATION

"SEC. 203. The Corporation is authorized and directed to carry out on behalf of the United States (a) the undertakings contained in article III of the agreement approved by section 1 of this joint resolution insofar as such undertakings relate to the works in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River, (b) the authority of the United States under article IV (a) of such agreement, and (c) such other powers or duties under such agreement or under title I of this joint resolution as may be designated by the President.

"CORPORATE POWERS

"SEC. 204. (a) For the purpose of carrying out its functions under this joint resolution the Corporation—

"(1) shall have succession in its corporate name;

"(2) may adopt and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

"(3) may sue and be sued in its corporate name;

"(4) may adopt, amend, and repeal by-laws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and the powers vested in it may be exercised;

"(5) may make and carry out such contracts or agreements as are necessary in the conduct of its business;

"(6) shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as the executive departments of the Government;

"(7) shall be held to be an inhabitant and resident of the northern judicial district of New York within the meaning of the laws of the United States relating to venue of civil suits;

"(8) may appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as may be necessary for the conduct of its business, define their authority and duties, delegate to them such of the powers vested in the Corporation as the Board may determine, require bonds of such of them as the Board may designate, and fix the penalties and pay the premiums on such bonds; and

"(9) may acquire, by purchase, lease, condemnation, or donation such real and personal property and any interest therein, any may sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such real or personal property, as the Board deems necessary for the conduct of its business.

"CAPITAL STOCK

"SEC. 205. The Corporation shall have a capital stock of $10,000,000 which shall be subscribed by the United States. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury the sum of $10,000,000 for the purpose of enabling the Secretary of the Treasury to make payment for such capital stock when payment is called by the Board. Receipts for payment by the United States for or on account of such capital stock shall be issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury and shall be evidence of stock ownership by the United States.

"OBLIGATIONS OF CORPORATION

"SEC. 206. (a) In order to finance its activities, the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue, and to have outstanding at any one time in an amount not exceeding $485,000,000, its notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations. Such obligations shall mature not more than 50 years from the dates of their issue, shall be redeemable at the option of the Corporation before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in such obligations, shall bear interest at such rate or rates, not exceeding 3 percent per annum, and shall be subject to such other terms and conditions, as may be determined by the Corporation after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury. Obligations of the Corporation shall not be purchased by the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof.

"(b) All such obligations shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed both as to interest and principal by the United States and such guaranty shall be expressed on the face thereof. In the event that the Corporation shall be unable to pay the principal of or interest on any such obligations when due, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, and thereupon to the extent of the amounts so paid, the Secretary of the Treasury shall succeed to the rights of the holders of such obligations.

"(c) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to prepare suitable forms for the notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations, and otherwise to make the facilities and services of the Department of the Treasury available to the Corporation in the issuance and sale of such obligations. The Corporation shall reimburse the Secretary of the Treasury for any expenses incurred by the Department of the Treasury under this subsection.

"DEPOSIT AND EXPENDITURE OF CORPORATE FUNDS

"SEC. 207. (a) All moneys of the Corporation not otherwise employed may be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States subject to check by authority of the Corporation or in any Federal Reserve bank, or may, by authorization of the Board, be used in the purchase for redemption and retirement of any notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations issued by the Corporation, and the Corporation may reimburse such Federal Reserve bank for its services in such manner as may be agreed upon. The Federal Reserve banks are authorized and directed to act as depositaries, custodians, and fiscal agents for the Corporation in the general performance of its powers.

"(b) All expenses incurred by the Corporation in carrying out its functions, including administrative expenses, shall be paid for from funds obtained from the sale of its obligations under section 206 or from revenues derived from its corporate activities, except that until such time as funds from such sources are available amounts paid by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 205 may be used for such purposes.

"(c) Sections 105 and 106 of the Government Corporation Control Act, requiring annual audits by the General Accounting Office and reports thereof to the Congress, shall be applicable to the Corporation.

"EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION

"SEC. 208. The Corporation, its property, franchise, and income are hereby expressly exempted from taxation in any manner or form by the Federal Government or by any State, county, municipality, or any subdivision or district thereof.

"SERVICES AND FACILITIES OF OTHER AGENCIES

"SEC. 209. (a) The Corporation may, with the consent of the agency concerned, accept and utilize, on a reimbursable basis, the officers, employees, services, facilities, and information of any agency of the Federal Government, except that any such agency having custody of any engineering or other data relating to any of the matters within the jurisdiction of the Corporation shall, upon request of the Board, make such data available to the Corporation without reimbursement.

"MISAPPROPRIATION OF FUNDS

"SEC. 210. (a) All general penal statutes relating to the larceny, embezzlement, conversion, or to the improper handling, retention, use, or disposal of public moneys or property of the United States shall apply to the moneys and property of the Corporation and to moneys and properties of the United States entrusted to the Corporation.

"(b) Any person who, with intent to defraud the Corporation, or to deceive any director, officer, or employee of the Corporation or any officer or employee of the United States, (1) makes any false entry in any book of the Corporation, or (2) makes any false report or statement for the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"(c) Any person who shall receive any compensation, rebate, or reward, or shall enter into any conspiracy, collusion, or agreement, express or implied, with intent to defraud the Corporation or wrongfully and unlawfully to defeat its purposes, shall, on conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"REPORTS TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 211. The Corporation shall transmit to the Congress at the beginning of each regular session an annual report of its operations under this joint resolution.

"SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

"SEC. 212. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainer of the Act and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby."

On page 1, between lines 2 and 3, insert "Title I—Approval of Agreement."

On page 4, strike out lines 11 to 16, inclusive, and in line 17 strike out "(b)" and insert "SEC. 4."

Mr. AIKEN. People generally are unfamiliar with these amendments because the Foreign Relations Committee reported the old bill without recommendation, and therefore did not consider the amendments. So we have the same old bill on the calendar, which provides for Government financing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement debate is not in order.

Mr. AIKEN. It would be by unanimous consent. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me say to my friend from Vermont that I am entirely familiar with the amendment to which he refers. I also have a proposal of my own in the file, which I am ready to submit at the proper time.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder if the Senator from Illinois would not submit his proposal for the RECORD, so that the rest of us may become familiar with it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. All in good time, Mr. President.

THE WEBER BASIN PROJECT, UTAH, AND FOREIGN RECLAMATION PROJECTS UNDER FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a speech which I had prepared for delivery today on the subject of reclamation, with particular reference to the Weber Basin project in Utah, together with insertions of supplemental matter.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WATKINS

THE WEBER BASIN PROJECT—UTAH, AND FOREIGN RECLAMATION PROGRAMS UNDER FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS

We have just concluded debate on another phase of our gigantic foreign aid program. We have heard much talk of economy. While I voted for the amendments which would have reduced the amount of our foreign aid, in the end I voted for the program.

According to a tabulation I had prepared by the Library of Congress, we have authorized 16 major aid programs to foreign nations since July 1, 1945, for a total of $55,051,000,000. To this amount we have just added approximately $7,000,000,000. By and large, I have not opposed these foreign aid programs. However, our first consideration should be the welfare of our own people, both from an economic and a military basis. It is just plain folly to add to the economic and military potential of foreign nations while restricting our own development.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

Associated Press dispatch and editorial appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of May 29, 1952, concerning the sentiment of the people of Maryland toward the Republican nomination for President.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes on a matter of personal privilege.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on page 6149 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, there appears the vote taken yesterday on the so-called Kem amendment. In previous years I have voted against the Kem amendment, because I felt its enforcement presented administrative difficulties. I still feel this is true, although I am in entire accord with the objective of the amendment. I supported the Battle bill last year and hoped it would offer a solution.

In reading yesterday's RECORD, I noticed that it might be possible for Members of Senator KEM's party to give him a unanimous vote of confidence for the courageous way in which, year after year, he has worked for his convictions. Frequently I have differed with him, and we have voted against each other many times, especially on issues affecting our foreign policy. But there is no one who has greater respect for Senator KEM than I have. I honor him because of his fair and constant presentation of his honest convictions and his fine sportsmanship.

The senior Senator from Missouri was elected to the Senate in 1946. I was reelected in 1946. So we are in the same senatorial class. We are both going back to our States to seek votes of confidence from our constituents this year. I would be happy to join with my colleagues here in the Senate in giving Senator KEM a party vote of confidence for his courageous support of his convictions.

I am informed by the Parliamentarian that I can do that by getting unanimous consent to change my vote on the Kem amendment from "nay" to "yea" provided that the change in my vote would not affect the action taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may not vote, change his vote, or withdraw his vote after a vote is taken, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to change my vote on the Kem amendment from "nay" to "yea" in order that the party vote may be unanimous.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that he now be permitted to change his vote.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, granting this request would establish a precedent which, if followed, would lead to trouble. If a Senator had a right to change his vote when it did not affect the result, the same privilege would have to be extended when it did. I feel that to grant this request would establish a precedent; therefore, I am forced to object.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Arizona to withhold his objection for a moment? This is a matter of personal tribute to a friend, with whom I have frequently differed, because I believe it would be a handsome compliment, to have his party colleague give him this vote of confidence. I notice from the RECORD that I am the only member of Senator KEM's party who voted against his amendment. That is why I ask for this privilege. I hope the majority leader will withdraw his objection.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the willingness of the Senator from New Jersey to commend his colleague, but I think that can be done as well by words as by action. I feel compelled to object because of the precedent that would be established for the future.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona objects.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCLELLAN

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, under leave of absence granted by the Senate, I was not present during the debate and final vote yesterday on the mutual security bill. The RECORD states that had I been present I would have voted for the final passage of the bill. I would have done so reluctantly; and had I been present I would have voted for amendments reducing the amount, down to $6,000,000,000. The bill which was passed yesterday is only an authorization bill. We still have the opportunity, in the matter of appropriations, to control the actual expenditure, and I intend to vote accordingly on appropriations.

AMENDMENTS TO ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY JOINT RESOLUTION—PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR AIKEN

Mr. AIKEN. Mr President, yesterday in the course of the debate on the mutual security bill the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] made this statement:

> I am against the St. Lawrence seaway because I do not want to charge the budget of this country with a project of that kind, no matter how useful it may be.

Apparently the junior Senator from Illinois is not familiar with the amendments which nine other Members of this body and I submitted to that bill, which provide that the St. Lawrence seaway shall be self-financing, self-liquidating, and self-sustaining, without any charge to the taxpayers. I am sure that there are others who are also unfamiliar with those amendments, so I ask that they be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. MOODY, Mr. THYE, Mr. TAFT, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER) to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 27) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the development of the resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for national security and continental defense of the United States and Canada; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the end of the joint resolution, add a new title as follows:

"TITLE II—ST. LAWRENCE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

"CREATION OF CORPORATION

"SEC. 201. There is hereby created a body corporate to be known as the St. Lawrence Development Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation"). The Corporation shall be an instrumentality of the United States and shall have the powers and duties hereinafter set forth.

"BOARD OF DIRECTORS

"SEC. 202. (a) The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Board of Directors consisting of three members to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than two members of the Board shall be members of the same political party. One of the members shall be designated by the President as Chairman at the time of appointment.

"(b) The terms of office of members of the Board shall be 6 years except that (1) the terms of office of the members first appointed shall run from the date of enactment of this joint resolution and shall expire one at the end of 2 years, one at the end of 4 years, and one at the end of 6 years, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, and (2) a member appointed to fill a vacancy caused by the death, resignation, or removal of a member prior to the expiration of the term for which he shall have been appointed, shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term.

"(c) Each member of the Board shall be paid compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum. No member shall, during his continuance in office, be engaged in any other business.

"(d) Two members shall constitute a quorum for transaction of the business of the Board, and vacancies in the Board, so long as there are two members in office, shall not impair the powers of the Board to execute the functions of the Corporation.

"FUNCTIONS OF CORPORATION

"SEC. 203. The Corporation is authorized and directed to carry out on behalf of the United States (a) the undertakings contained in article III of the agreement approved by section 1 of this joint resolution insofar as such undertakings relate to the works in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River, (b) the authority of the United States under article IV (a) of such agreement, and (c) such other powers or duties under such agreement or under title I of this joint resolution as may be designated by the President.

"CORPORATE POWERS

"SEC. 204. (a) For the purpose of carrying out its functions under this joint resolution the Corporation—

"(1) shall have succession in its corporate name;

"(2) may adopt and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

"(3) may sue and be sued in its corporate name;

"(4) may adopt, amend, and repeal by-laws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and the powers vested in it may be exercised;

"(5) may make and carry out such contracts or agreements as are necessary in the conduct of its business;

"(6) shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as the executive departments of the Government;

"(7) shall be held to be an inhabitant and resident of the northern judicial district of New York within the meaning of the laws of the United States relating to venue of civil suits;

"(8) may appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as may be necessary for the conduct of its business, define their authority and duties, delegate to them such of the powers vested in the Corporation as the Board may determine, require bonds of such of them as the Board may designate, and fix the penalties and pay the premiums on such bonds; and

"(9) may acquire, by purchase, lease, condemnation, or donation such real and personal property and any interest therein, any may sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such real or personal property, as the Board deems necessary for the conduct of its business.

"CAPITAL STOCK

"SEC. 205. The Corporation shall have a capital stock of $10,000,000 which shall be subscribed by the United States. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury the sum of $10,000,000 for the purpose of enabling the Secretary of the Treasury to make payment for such capital stock when payment is called by the Board. Receipts for payment by the United States for or on account of such capital stock shall be issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury and shall be evidence of stock ownership by the United States.

"OBLIGATIONS OF CORPORATION

"SEC. 206. (a) In order to finance its activities, the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue, and to have outstanding at any one time in an amount not exceeding $485,000,000, its notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations. Such obligations shall mature not more than 50 years from the dates of their issue, shall be redeemable at the option of the Corporation before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in such obligations, shall bear interest at such rate or rates, not exceeding 3 percent per annum, and shall be subject to such other terms and conditions, as may be determined by the Corporation after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury. Obligations of the Corporation shall not be purchased by the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof.

"(b) All such obligations shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed both as to interest and principal by the United States and such guaranty shall be expressed on the face thereof. In the event that the Corporation shall be unable to pay the principal of or interest on any such obligations when due, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, and thereupon to the extent of the amounts so paid, the Secretary of the Treasury shall succeed to the rights of the holders of such obligations.

"(c) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to prepare suitable forms for the notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations, and otherwise to make the facilities and services of the Department of the Treasury available to the Corporation in the issuance and sale of such obligations. The Corporation shall reimburse the Secretary of the Treasury for any expenses incurred by the Department of the Treasury under this subsection.

"DEPOSIT AND EXPENDITURE OF CORPORATE FUNDS

"SEC. 207. (a) All moneys of the Corporation not otherwise employed may be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States subject to check by authority of the Corporation or in any Federal Reserve bank, or may, by authorization of the Board, be used in the purchase for redemption and retirement of any notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations issued by the Corporation, and the Corporation may reimburse such Federal Reserve bank for its services in such manner as may be agreed upon. The Federal Reserve banks are authorized and directed to act as depositaries, custodians, and fiscal agents for the Corporation in the general performance of its powers.

"(b) All expenses incurred by the Corporation in carrying out its functions, including administrative expenses, shall be paid for from funds obtained from the sale of its obligations under section 206 or from revenues derived from its corporate activities, except that until such time as funds from such sources are available amounts paid by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 205 may be used for such purposes.

"(c) Sections 105 and 106 of the Government Corporation Control Act, requiring annual audits by the General Accounting Office and reports thereof to the Congress, shall be applicable to the Corporation.

"EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION

"SEC. 208. The Corporation, its property, franchise, and income are hereby expressly exempted from taxation in any manner or form by the Federal Government or by any State, county, municipality, or any subdivision or district thereof.

"SERVICES AND FACILITIES OF OTHER AGENCIES

"SEC. 209. (a) The Corporation may, with the consent of the agency concerned, accept and utilize, on a reimbursable basis, the officers, employees, services, facilities, and information of any agency of the Federal Government, except that any such agency having custody of any engineering or other data relating to any of the matters within the jurisdiction of the Corporation shall, upon request of the Board, make such data available to the Corporation without reimbursement.

"MISAPPROPRIATION OF FUNDS

"SEC. 210. (a) All general penal statutes relating to the larcency, embezzlement, conversion, or to the improper handling, retention, use, or disposal of public moneys or property of the United States shall apply to the moneys and property of the Corporation and to moneys and properties of the United States entrusted to the Corporation.

"(b) Any person who, with intent to defraud the Corporation, or to deceive any director, officer, or employee of the Corporation or any officer or employee of the United States, (1) makes any false entry in any book of the Corporation, or (2) makes any false report or statement for the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"(c) Any person who shall receive any compensation, rebate, or reward, or shall enter into any conspiracy, collusion, or agreement, express or implied, with intent to defraud the Corporation or wrongfully and unlawfully to defeat its purposes, shall, on conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"REPORTS TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 211. The Corporation shall transmit to the Congress at the beginning of each regular session an annual report of its operations under this joint resolution.

"SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

"SEC. 212. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainer of the Act and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby."

On page 1, between lines 2 and 3, insert "Title I—Approval of Agreement."

On page 4, strike out lines 11 to 16, inclusive, and in line 17 strike out "(b)" and insert "SEC. 4."

Mr. AIKEN. People generally are unfamiliar with these amendments because the Foreign Relations Committee reported the old bill without recommendation, and therefore did not consider the amendments. So we have the same old bill on the calendar, which provides for Government financing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement debate is not in order.

Mr. AIKEN. It would be by unanimous consent. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me say to my friend from Vermont that I am entirely familiar with the amendment to which he refers. I also have a proposal of my own in the file, which I am ready to submit at the proper time.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder if the Senator from Illinois would not submit his proposal for the RECORD, so that the rest of us may become familiar with it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. All in good time, Mr. President.

THE WEBER BASIN PROJECT, UTAH, AND FOREIGN RECLAMATION PROJECTS UNDER FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a speech which I had prepared for delivery today on the subject of reclamation, with particular reference to the Weber Basin project in Utah, together with insertions of supplemental matter.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WATKINS

THE WEBER BASIN PROJECT—UTAH, AND FOREIGN RECLAMATION PROGRAMS UNDER FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS

We have just concluded debate on another phase of our gigantic foreign aid program. We have heard much talk of economy. While I voted for the amendments which would have reduced the amount of our foreign aid, in the end I voted for the program.

According to a tabulation I had prepared by the Library of Congress, we have authorized 16 major aid programs to foreign nations since July 1, 1945, for a total of $55,051,000,000. To this amount we have just added approximately $7,000,000,000. By and large, I have not opposed these foreign aid programs. However, our first consideration should be the welfare of our own people, both from an economic and a military basis. It is just plain folly to add to the economic and military potential of foreign nations while restricting our own development.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Utah, the cradle of Anglo-Saxon irrigation and reclamation projects, has received less benefit from this national program than almost any other western reclamation State.

This is not because Utah does not have the potential for reclamation projects. For example, a relatively small reclamation project, known as the Weber Basin project, was authorized for construction by Public 273 of the Eighty-first Congress. The total construction cost is estimated at $70,000,000. By far the major portion of these funds will be repaid to the Treasury by the water users of that area.

Compare this figure, keeping in mind the fact that the money will be repaid, with the amount of money the American taxpayers have been called upon to donate as outright gifts to foreign reclamation and allied programs in foreign reclamation.

According to a tabulation prepared by the Library of Congress, these foreign reclamation and allied programs financed at the expense of the American taxpayer, total $1,893,695,000.

The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress informs me that this figure does not include the total cost since they were unable to secure some figures relating to these items.

Mr. President, I am going to briefly outline the scope to which American taxpayers' dollars have been used to provide reclamation and allied projects in foreign nations.

From July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1951, United States assistance to foreign countries for land reclamation and power projects were as follows: $146,339,000 under the European recovery program; under counterpart funds, $1,200,300,000. It should be remembered that these counterpart funds are a direct drain on the American taxpayer. They are not repaid to America; aid to far eastern nations, from July 1950 to June 30, 1951, we donated $5,692,000. This totals $1,353,695,000.

These figures do not include loans made by the Export-Import Bank on machinery, nor assistance under the point 4 program. Nor do they include $111,800,000 in aid to Italy as part of a $450,000,000 foreign-aid program called agriculture programs except land reclamation, but which includes drainage canals, reclaimed land programs, and similar items. The total expenditure of American taxpayers' dollars in foreign countries for reclamation projects amounts to $1,893,695,000.

United States assistance for land reclamation and power facilities in foreign countries, July 1, 1945–June 30, 1951

(Data from Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress)

A. EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM EXPENDITURES

France	$23,420,000
Italy	62,667,000
Turkey	15,020,000
Greece	22,375,000
Netherlands	3,372,000
Iceland	5,065,000
Denmark	5,070,000
International	540,000
Portugal	2,100,000
Spain	6,700,000
Total	146,339,000

B. COUNTERPART FUNDS (95-PERCENT PORTION) (ELECTRIC, GAS, AND POWER FACILITIES)

Austria	$77,500,000
Denmark	500,000
France	827,800,000
Germany	188,900,000
Greece	33,900,000
Iceland	4,600,000
Netherlands	50,600,000
Portugal	12,700,000
Turkey	3,800,000
Total	1,200,300,000

C. FAR EAST AID PROGRAM, JULY 1, 1950–JUNE 30, 1951

Formosa	$4,278,000
Thailand	1,414,000
Total	5,692,000

D. AGRICULTURE PROGRAMS EXCEPT LAND RECLAMATION, BUT INCLUDING DRAINAGE, CANALS, RECLAIMED LANDS, ETC.

Total	$540,000,000

Totals

A. ERP expenditures	$146,339,000
B. Counterpart funds	1,200,300,000
C. Far East program	7,056,000
D. Agriculture programs	540,000,000
Total	1,893,695,000

Mr. President, it will be of interest to note an article contained in the Reclamation Era, the official publication of the Bureau of Reclamation for July 1951. It appears on page 136 and is entitled "Reclamation Under the Marshall Plan in Italy." This article states that under the various foreign-aid programs the "United States made available to Italy about $600,000,000 for the first year of operation (1948–49)." The article then continues, about $117,000,000 was allocated to agriculture. "Of this amount, $70,000,000 was allocated for reclamation projects. This program envisaged a total expenditure for reclamation projects of about $300,000,000 during the period of ECA assistance (until July 1, 1951)."

Notice the item "$70,000,000" allocated for reclamation projects out of the first appropriation. This is almost exactly the amount needed for the completion of Weber Basin project in Utah. On the one hand, the costs of the Weber project will be repaid by the water users to the United States Treasury. On the other hand, the $70,000,000 to reclamation projects in Italy is an outright gift from American taxpayers. Notice further that this $70,000,000 was to have been spent over a short period of time. The $70,000,000 contemplated in construction of the Weber Basin project would be spent over a 10-year period.

It is also interesting to note that when the Library of Congress first sent the tabulation to my office as a result of my request, no figures were included for Italian reclamation facilities. It was only when I recalled reading the above-mentioned article in the official publication for the Bureau of Reclamation, and called it to the attention of the Legislative Reference Service, that the figures were found. In view of this, is it not likely that there are further items which are hidden under other designations which make it impossible for the Legislative Reference Service to locate them? I believe that this is the case.

The Weber Basin project passed the Senate unanimously and the House with over a two-thirds vote. The President reluctantly signed the bill. As a matter of fact, he directed the Bureau of Reclamation to do additional work on the project before he would permit the Bureau of Reclamation to request funds for construction. This, of course, was in line with his "no new starts" policy. This additional work has now been completed.

The Bureau of Reclamation in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture and the State of Utah has completed the necessary study and the report is now available.

The Bureau of the Budget and the President have no further excuse for delaying the initiating of construction on this project.

I have appeared before the Appropriations Committees of both the House and the Senate for the last 3 years, urging that funds be included for this project. Mr. President, it is imperative from a defense standpoint that funds be made available for immediate construction on this project. No other additional water source is available in that area. By far the largest water user from the project will be Ogden City, the second largest city in the State. Contiguous to this city are four vital defense establishments.

These are Hill Field Air Force Base, Ogden Arsenal, the Clearfield Naval Supply Depot, and Ogden General Depot, which is located entirely within the city limits of Ogden, and dependent entirely on that city's water supply. It is interesting to note that when the Ogden General Depot was first constructed, a well was drilled in an effort to secure an independent water supply. The water from this well developed in excess of 2,000 parts of chloride per 1,000,000 and under public-health standards this is unsafe. The well was therefore abandoned. This same chloride content has been found in other wells which have been drilled in this area.

Let me point out that this general depot has its own fire-fighting equipment, but since it is totally dependent upon the Ogden city water supply, its safety has a direct ratio to the pressure in the water mains.

I am informed that there is an investment in excess of $1,000,000,000 in material and buildings in this depot alone. Over $5,000,000,000 are invested in the buildings and supplies in these four major defense installations. If for no other reason than insurance from fire, from the investment at these defense installations, construction should be initiated on these projects.

However, this is only one phase of this important question. It is interesting to note that Utah, with a population of approximately 600,000 people, has 30,000 civilian Government employees. Approximately two-thirds of these employees are directly employed at these four installations. The latest available figures are:

Utah General Depot	3,908
Hill Field	10,437
Ogden Arsenal	2,650
Clearfield Naval Supply Depot	3,281

Note the effect of this population increase by percentage in the area. From 1920 to 1940, the population increase was 17 percent per decade. Since 1940, however, the population increase has been in excess of 50 percent.

The command at the Hill Air Force Base recognizes the importance of water to the depots and to the personnel. The Weber Basin Water Conservancy District, formed to sign the contract for operation, maintenance and repayments, received the following letter from the Ogden air material area, Hill Air Force Base:

"Gentlemen: The proposed Weber Basin development, under the jurisdiction of the United States Bureau of Reclamation, has been discussed with representatives of this command with particular reference to the desirability and necessity of supplementing domestic water supplies for communities in this area. It appears that this project, to provide both supplemental irrigation and domestic water for the Ogden Valley, is both economically feasible and a necessary adjunct to the water supply of the area. The economic well-being of the Ogden Valley is vital to the national defense effort in that the living conditions of employees of this command must necessarily be such as to maintain a highly efficient working force and one which is desirous of remaining domiciled in the immediate area.

"In addition to the city of Ogden, there are some 25 small communities in the valley in which reside a large number of the personnel employed at Hill Air Force Base. All of these communities, including the city of Ogden, are faced with a situation in which the locally available water supplies are progressively deteriorating in quality and rapidly diminishing in quantity per capita. The

Weber Basin project will provide ample domestic water supplies of good quality for these communities. While it is anticipated that such supplemental water will not, even under an accelerated construction program, become available until about 1953, it is believed that if the situation is not alleviated by that date, there will then exist difficult problems in connection with the maintenance of the status of the working forces at this base.

"It is obvious that, from the standpoint of the economic and physical well-being of the approximately 8,200 (latest figures show 10,437 civilian employees at this base) employees at this base, the construction of the Weber Basin project is of importance to this command, as further delay in the implementation of this project will have an extremely adverse affect, from the standpoint of employee morale, upon the accomplishment of the mission of the Ogden Air Material Area.

"Yours very truly,

"C. B. ROOT,
"Colonel, USAF, Commanding."

It should also be kept in mind that this terrific civilian employment does not tell the full story. The majority of the military personnel live within Ogden and are dependent upon that municipality's water supply for culinary purposes.

Let me briefly review the details of the project. It is to be built at the center of a farming, manufacturing, mining, smelting, and refining area. It is to provide supplemental irrigation for approximately 27,000 acres and upon completion will bring 50,000 acres of new ground under cultivation.

Ogden, Utah, is the intermountain railroad hub of the transcontinental railroad activities. Several important intermountain industrial activities, such as canning, meat packing, milling, and manufacturing are located in and near Ogden, all within the area to be served by the project. It should be reiterated that no other available additional water supply exists within the area. In addition to Ogden, approximately 25 separate towns or communities will receive water for culinary and related usages.

We are now undergoing flood conditions within the State. Two counties to be served by the project are among 13 which have been designated as disaster areas by the governor to receive flood relief under Public Law 875. Had this project been initiated 2 years ago, a substantial portion of the damage which has been done in these areas would have been alleviated. It is important that these flood waters which now go to waste and do inestimable damage during these spring runoffs, be harnessed for later beneficial use. It is abundantly clear that no excuse exists for further delay in the construction of this project.

All that is necessary to begin construction on this project is $1,350,000. Compare this figure with the previous figures I have discussed relative to foreign aid reclamation programs. We are even now spending more money on foreign reclamation programs than we are on our domestic reclamation programs. To my mind, this is folly.

Remember we are not asking for $70,000,000 all at once. The project is to be built in units, the first and most important of which is the Weber-Davis aqueduct, transporting the water from the Weber River through various means to the communities in the area. This aqueduct system will be supported by raising the Pine View Dam and constructing the Wanship Reservoir. These facilities will go a long way toward reducing flood damage and toward assuring that no serious catastrophe to the military, civilian, and industrial life of the area would result from a water shortage.

I have written a letter to the President in which I urge that he instruct the Bureau of the Budget to send to the Congress the approval of the Executive for the $1,350,000 necessary to initiate construction on this most vital project. I ask unanimous consent that it be included as a portion of my remarks.

In summary, keep these points in mind:

1. The project has a direct bearing on the defense potential of the Nation since the water made available would be serving directly four defense plants.

2. The civilian and military personnel at these plants will benefit directly from culinary water and from the city services such as fire protection and sewage disposal, so vital to the health and welfare of the communities.

3. With this increase in population, it is necessary that the additional acreage be placed under cultivation to supply the necessary foodstuffs.

4. The President has no further excuse to hold up construction on this project since all conditions precedent have been completed and the report is now available.

5. The construction should be initiated on this project for future flood protection.

MAY 29, 1952.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You will recall signing Public Law 273, Eighty-first Congress, to authorize the construction of the Weber Basin project, Utah. The injunction you placed on the Bureau of Reclamation prohibiting construction of this project until further data were assembled is still in effect. I am advised, however, that the Bureau of Reclamation in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture and the State of Utah has fully completed the assembling of this data. I am further advised that this report is now before the Bureau of the Budget for their consideration. I am confident, therefore, that no further obstacles should be raised and no further reasons exist for refusing to approve the necessary funds to initiate construction of this most vital project.

I am sure you are aware that this project falls within the exception to your "no new starts" order since it is so directly related to the defense program. While I have no doubt you are fully informed as to the direct bearing this project has to the defense effort, I should like to briefly point out the following facts: Within the area contiguous to Ogden, Utah (the second largest city in the State) are four vital defense installations. There are the Hill Field Air Force Base, the Ogden Arsenal, the Clearfield Naval Supply Depot, and the Ogden General Depot which is located entirely within the city limits of Ogden and is entirely dependent on that city's water supply.

You will recall, I am sure, that during the construction of the Ogden general depot, an endeavor was made to secure an independent water supply by drilling wells. The water from the first well developed in excess of 2,000 parts of chloride per million, which is far in excess of Public Health standards. It was therefore unusable and abandoned. No other water source exists in the area.

Approximately two-thirds (over 20,000) of the total civilian Government personnel within the State of Utah is employed at these four defense installations. In addition to the civilian employment, there are thousands of military personnel at these installations. All of these people live in Ogden or in the communities surrounding Ogden, all of which will be served by this project. Culinary water at their homes is a basic need of these people. It is also a basic need at these bases.

Fire protection and sewage disposal, as well as all other functions essential to the health and welfare of the area must be considered. You are aware, I am sure, that the Ogden General Depot, which as I have said is within the city of Ogden, has its own fire-fighting equipment. Without any independent water supply, however, it is totally dependent upon the pressure from the city water mains for fire protection. I have been advised, and you can confirm my information, that there is an investment of in excess of $1,000,000,000 in material and buildings at one depot alone. Over $5,000,000,000, I am advised, is invested in buildings and supplies at these four defense installations. From an insurance viewpoint alone, you should urge the early construction of this project.

You recently authorized expenditure of $250,000 for emergency flood relief under Public Law 875 for damage done by floods within the State of Utah. Two of the counties to which these funds will be allocated would be benefited by the construction of the Weber Basin project. The floods in these two counties washed out highways, inundated farm lands and did an immense amount of other miscellaneous damage, all of which could have been prevented had the project been completed. Even the construction of the first phase of the project would provide a substantial amount of protection from these flood disasters. The $1,350,000 request is to initiate this first phase of construction. The completion of the first phase would control the flood runoff on the Weber and Ogden Rivers.

The Interior Department appropriations bill is now being considered in the Senate committee. I urge your immediate action in instructing the Bureau of the Budget to send to the Congress supporting data for the appropriation of $1,350,000 to initiate construction on this project which has such a vital relation to our defense effort.

Very sincerely yours,

ARTHUR V. WATKINS.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2594) to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business is Senate bill 2594, for which the Committee on Banking and Currency has reported an amendment in the nature of a complete substitute. Without objection, for purposes of amendment the committee amendment will be considered as the original text of the bill.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That this act may be cited as the 'Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952.'

"TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

"PRIORITIES AND ALLOCATIONS

"SEC. 101. Section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 104. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, and the amendments to existing law made by such title are hereby revived and shall continue in effect until June 30, 1953, for the purpose of authorizing and exercising, administering,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and enforcing of import controls with respect to fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, and soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products and coconuts and coconut products), peanuts, butter, cheese and other dairy products, and rice and rice products, upon a determination by the President that such controls are (a) essential to the acquisition or distribution of products in world short supply, or (b) essential to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks owned or controlled by the Government: *Provided, however,* That such controls shall be removed as soon as the conditions giving rise to them have ceased. This section shall not be construed to limit the authority contained in sections 101 and 704 of this act.'

"PRICE AND WAGE STABILIZATION

"SEC. 102. Paragraph (4) of subsection (d) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply in the case of a seller of a material at retail or wholesale within the meaning of subsection (k) of this section.'

"SEC. 103. (a) Subsection (e) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding after the word 'profession' in paragraph (ii) thereof the following: '; wages, salaries, and other compensation paid to professional engineers employed in a professional capacity by an engineer or firm of engineers engaged in the practice of his or their profession; wages, salaries, and other compensation paid to professional architects employed in a professional capacity by an architect or firm of architects engaged in the practice of his or their profession; and wages, salaries, and other compensation paid to certified public accountants licensed to practice as such employed in a professional capacity by a certified public accountant or firm of certified public accountants engaged in the practice of his or their profession.'

"(b) Declaratory of existing law, paragraph (v) of subsection (e) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(v) (1) Rates and charges by any common carrier or other public utility, including rates charged by any person subject to the Shipping Act, 1916 (Public Law 260, 64th Cong.), as amended, and including compensation for the use by others of a common carrier's cars or other transportation equipment, charges for the use of washroom and toilet facilities in terminals and stations, and charges for repairing cars or other transportation equipment owned by others; charges for the use of parking facilities operated by common carriers in connection with their common carrier operations; and (2) charges paid by common carriers for the performance of a part of their transportation services to the public, including the use of cars or other transportation equipment owned by a person other than a common carrier, protective service against heat or cold to property transported or to be transported, and pick-up and delivery and local transfer services: *Provided,* That no common carrier or other public utility shall at any time after the President shall have issued any stabilization regulations and orders under subsection (b) make any increase in its charges for property or services sold by it for resale to the public, for which application is filed after the date of issuance of such stabilization regulations and orders, before the Federal, State, or municipal authority, if any, having jurisdiction to consider such increase, unless it first gives 30 days' notice to the President, or such agency as he may designate, and consents to timely intervention by such agency before the Federal, State, or municipal authority, if any, having jurisdiction to consider such increase;'.

"(c) Subsection (e) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(viii) Rates, fees, and charges for materials or services supplied directly by the States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, and their political subdivisions and municipalities, the District of Columbia, and any agency of any of the foregoing.'

"SEC. 104. Subsection (k) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out the word 'hereafter' in the first sentence thereof.

"SEC. 105. Section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (l) as follows:

"'(l) No rule, regulation, order, or amendment thereto issued under this title shall fix a ceiling on the price paid or received on the sale or delivery of any material in any State below the minimum sales price of such material fixed by the State law (other than any so-called "fair trade law") or regulation now in effect.'

"SEC. 106. Section 403 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by inserting '(a)' after '403.' and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) (1) There is hereby created, in the Economic Stabilization Agency, a Wage Stabilization Board (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the "Board"), which shall be composed exclusively of members representative of the general public. The number of offices on the Board shall be established by Executive order.

"'(2) The members of the Board shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall designate a Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board from among its members.

"'(3) The term of office of the members of the Board shall terminate on March 1, 1953. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

"'(4) Each member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 a year, and while a member of the Board shall engage in no other business, vocation, or employment.

"'(5) The Board shall, under the supervision and direction of the Economic Stabilization Administrator—

"'(A) formulate, and recommend to such Administrator for promulgation, general policies and general regulations relating to the stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation; and

"'(B) upon the request of (i) any person substantially affected thereby, or (ii) any Federal department or agency whose functions, as provided by law, may be affected thereby or may have an effect thereon, advise as to the interpretation, or the application to particular circumstances, of policies and regulations promulgated by such Administrator which relate to the stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation.

For the purposes of this act, stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation means prescribing maximum limits thereon. Except as provided in clause (B) of this paragraph, the Board shall have no jurisdiction with respect to any labor dispute or with respect to any issue involved therein. Labor disputes, and labor matters in dispute, which do not involve the interpretation or application of such regulations or policies shall be dealt with, if at all, insofar as the Federal Government is concerned, under the conciliation, mediation, emergency, or other provisions of laws heretofore or hereafter enacted by the Congress, and not otherwise.

"'(6) Paragraph (5) of this subsection shall take effect 30 days after the date on which this subsection is enacted. The Wage Stabilization Board created by Executive Order No. 10161, and reconstituted by Executive Order No. 10233, as amended by Executive Order No. 10301, is hereby abolished, effective at the close of the 29th day following the date on which this subsection is enacted.'

"SEC. 107. Title IV of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SUSPENSION OF CONTROLS

"'SEC. 411. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the President shall use the price, wage, and other powers conferred by this act, as amended, to promote the earliest practicable balance between production and the demand therefor of materials and services, and that the general control of wages and prices shall be terminated as rapidly as possible consistent with the policies and purposes set forth in this act; and that pending such termination, in order to avoid burdensome and unnecessary reporting and record keeping which retard rather than assist in the achievement of the purposes of this act, price or wage regulations and orders, or both, shall be suspended in the case of any material or service or type of employment where such factors as condition of supply, existence of below ceiling prices, historical volatility of prices, wage pressures and wage relationships, or relative importance in relation to business costs or living costs will permit, and to the extent that such action will be consistent with the avoidance of a cumulative and dangerous unstabilizing effect. It is further the policy of the Congress that when the President finds that the termination of the suspension and the restoration of ceilings on the sales or charges for such material or service, or the further stabilization of such wages, salaries, and other compensation, or both, is necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, he shall by regulation or order terminate the suspension.'

"SEC. 108. The first sentence of section 707 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out the word of 'his.'

"SEC. 109. (a) Section 717 (a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Titles I, II, III, VI, and VII of this act and all authority conferred thereunder shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1953; and titles IV and V of this act and all authority conferred thereunder shall terminate at the close of February 28, 1953.'

"(b) Paragraph (4) of subsection (a) of section 714 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1952,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1953.'

"TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947, AS AMENDED

"SEC. 201. Subsection (e) of section 4 and subsection (f) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, are each amended by striking out 'June 30, 1952' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1953.'

"SEC. 202. Section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(p) Except in the case of action taken after full compliance with subsection (k) of this section, the President shall not reestablish maximum rents in any defense-rental area which has previously been decontrolled under this act until a public hearing,

after 30 days' notice, has been held in such area.'

"TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

"PUBLIC CONTRACTS

"SEC. 301. (a) Section 9 of the act entitled 'An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes', approved June 30, 1936 (41 U. S. C. 35–45), is amended by striking out that portion of the first sentence thereof which precedes the semicolon and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'This act shall not apply to purchases of such materials, supplies, articles, or equipment of standard type and construction as are usually sold in the open market to purchasers generally, regardless of the method of procurement used by the Government.'

"(b) Such act is further amended (1) by redesignating sections 10 and 11 as sections 11 and 12, respectively, and (2) by inserting immediately following section 9 a new section 10 as follows:

"'SEC. 10. Notwithstanding any provision of section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act, such act shal be applicable in the administration of sections 1 to 5 and 7 to 9 of this act. All orders, determinations, rules, and formal interpretations of general applicability under such sections shall be made on the record after opportunity for a hearing. Review of any such order, determination, rule, or interpretation may be had in the manner provided in section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act by—

"'(1) any person adversely affected or aggrieved thereby;

"'(2) any manufacturer of, or regular dealer in, materials, supplies, articles, or equipment purchased, or to be purchased, by the Government from any source; and

"'(3) any of the employees of such manufacturer or regular dealer, or any labor organization recognized by such manufacturer or dealer, or duly certified by the National Labor Relations Board, as representing such employees.'"

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Morse
Anderson	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bennett	Hennings	Neely
Benton	Hill	Nixon
Bridges	Hoey	O'Conor
Butler, Md.	Holland	O'Mahoney
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Pastore
Capehart	Ives	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Connally	Kilgore	Smathers
Cordon	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Long	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Martin	Sparkman
Duff	Maybank	Stennis
Dworshak	McCarran	Thye
Eastland	McCarthy	Tobey
Ellender	McClellan	Underwood
Ferguson	McFarland	Watkins
Frear	McKellar	Welker
Fulbright	Millikin	Williams
George	Monroney	Young
Gillette	Moody	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senators from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER and Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Conference of the International Council for Christian Leadership at The Hague.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as I understand the parliamentary situation, under the unanimous-consent agreement before we take up the committee amendment, titles IV and V, the wage-control and price-control titles, will first be voted on, together with any amendments which may be offered to them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair did not quite understand the agreement in that way. The Chair understood that the agreement was that if an amendment were offered to strike out titles IV and V, such an amendment would be voted on prior to voting on any amendments to those titles.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Chair is correct, as always.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has examined the bill and the amendment in the nature of a substitute. The latter, as reported, does not contain titles IV or V, except by reference.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is also correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Therefore, although the unanimous-consent agreement would apply to those titles, in that connection some Senator would have to offer an amendment relating to them.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Chair is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. An amendment of that sort, having the effect of striking out titles IV and V, is now at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not yet been offered, of course; it has simply been printed, and lies at the desk.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No amendment, other than the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill, is now pending. Therefore, if the Senator from Illinois or if other Senators desire to offer the amendment to which the Senator from Illinois has referred, and let it be the pending question, the Chair will recognize any Senator for that purpose, unless the Senator from South Carolina desires to deliver an address on the bill itself.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I prefer to have the Senator from Illinois submit the amendment, and then we can speak on it, because in this case the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is really the bill itself.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which now lies at the desk, and I ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, beginning with line 6, it is proposed to strike out through line 16 on page 9.

Page 9, after line 16, insert the caption "General Provisions."

Page 9, line 17, strike out "Sec. 108." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 102."

Page 9, line 20, strike out "Sec. 109." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 103."

Page 10, line 3, strike out "February 28, 1953" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1952."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that, in effect, this amendment strikes out titles IV and V of the original act, to which the pending bill is an amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the amendment is agreed to, the purpose contemplated the other day by the unanimous-consent agreement will be accomplished.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, what the Chair has just said is eminently correct, namely, that the amendment would strike out titles IV and V of the original act.

In other words, if the amendment of the Senator from Illinois is adopted, price controls will be abolished on July 1, and wage controls will be abolished on July 1; and then there will remain in the act only the following: Title I, which is connected with priorities and allocations of strategic materials such as copper, and so forth; title II, I may say that the requisition and condemnation section of the old law, which gave the Government certain condemnation rights in the interest of the national defense, is contained in this bill. Then there is title III. The Interior Department and other agencies are using at this time the loan guaranties and other loan features and the RFC is also using them in connection with tin smelters, and in connection with new deposits of scarce materials. Title VI, relates to consumer and real estate credit controls.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Title VII contains general provisions, and the authority for the Small Defense Plants Administration.

Mr. President, I think every Senator is fully familiar with the control act as it now stands on the statute books. We have heard much about it from the people of the country. Every Senator's mail has been flooded at times with complaints about rulings made by the Administrator, or with complaints about inflation or about trouble in the enforcement of the law.

The Banking and Currency Committee voted, and I again refer to the old act, titles IV and V, rather than to the various sections of this bill, because they are better known to Senators as titles IV and V, to continue titles IV and V until March 31, believing that if Congress should be able to complete its work, as we hope it will, so that we may adjourn for the conventions in July, it would be nothing short of a tragedy if there were no law left on the books.

No one knows what will happen in October, November, and December. No one is able to guess what may happen. No one knows how much longer the situation may continue in Korea, or how much worse it may become, or how far the conflict may spread. But every Senator knows that the military is going to have more than $100,000,000,000 in unexpended appropriations, contract authority, and new money, to be spent in the development of the armed services. Everyone knows that the cost of living continues to rise, according to reports by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

As I have frequently said heretofore, I regret that the law was not put into effect earlier, and that wage and price controls were not made effective by those in charge of the administration of the law. But even if they did act promptly, I do not want to be charged, as a Member of the Senate and as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, with having voted to allow the law to expire, and, therefore, to have no law whatever upon the books. That is the issue, Mr. President. It is a question of whether we want to do away with wage and price controls, or whether we wish to extend them until March 31.

There are, of course, several amendments to the old act which have been proposed by the committee.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Is there a provision in the bill calling for a discontinuance of the administration of controls, in the event prices drop, let us say, below 100 percent, or below parity?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; there is a provision on suspending controls. Let me read that to the Senator.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me while he is looking for that——

Mr. MAYBANK. No, I want to read it, so that the Senator from Minnesota may have the answer to his question. I can explain it, but I want to read what we propose to put into the act, in order that there may be no misunderstanding on the part of those in authority who are administering the act, no misunderstanding of what our committee intended to write into the report. I call the attention of the Senator to the following section on page 8 of the pending bill:

SUSPENSION OF CONTROLS

SEC. 411. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the President shall use the price, wage, and other powers conferred by this act, as amended, to promote the earliest practicable balance between production and the demand therefor of materials and services, and that the general control of wages and prices shall be terminated as rapidly as possible consistent with the policies and purposes set forth in this act; and that pending such termination, in order to avoid burdensome and unnecessary reporting and record keeping which retard rather than assist in the achievement of the purposes of this act, price or wage regulations and orders, or both, shall be suspended in the case of any material or service or type of employment where such factors as condition of supply—

This is what the Senator is interested in—

existence of below ceiling prices, historical volatility of prices, wage pressures and wage relationships, or relative importance in relation to business costs or living costs will permit, and to the extent that such action will be consistent with the avoidance of a cumulative and dangerous unstabilizing effect.

The purpose of the section is to enable the administrator to decontrol the price of any so-called soft product which has been or is selling below the ceiling prices which were set.

Mr. THYE. There would then be no administration or enforcement of the ceiling price, or in other words, there would be no one going about the Nation, spending the taxpayers' money, checking on the retailer or merchandiser when the index figures showed that a particular product was being sold below the ceiling price. Is that correct?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator has correctly stated my thoughts on the matter. We do not want business people to be harassed by being required to keep books and to hire auditors and lawyers when they deal in commodities at prices far below the ceiling. We do not want the money of the taxpayers to be spent for the purpose of employing people to go from place to place to check up on such matters.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I had a hand in formulating this amendment, and I want to say to my distinguished colleague from Minnesota that this is not a mandatory decontrol bill. There is expressed both in the language of the bill and in the report our wish and hope that when a given product is selling below ceiling prices, or is in ample supply, or is inconsequential in the economic situation sought to be stabilized or controlled, the OPS will decontrol that product and thus relieve merchants and others of the burden of reports, records, and what-not. But no one should be under any delusion that this is a mandatory decontrol provision. It is not.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield for another question?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Then if it is not mandatory, what would happen to the staff of investigators now in the field? Are they to stand by and mark time, or will OPS reduce its staff?

Mr. MAYBANK. I may answer that question by saying that that is a matter pertaining to appropriations, and I understand reductions are to be made. I may say also that Mr. Arnall, who is conducting the administration of the law, since Mr. DiSalle resigned, as the Senator knows, has already suspended controls on numerous important items, such as textiles, hides, and tallow.

Mr. THYE. The next question which occurs to my mind is, what about the administration of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division?

Mr. MAYBANK. The amendments proposed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would knock out the Wage Stabilization Board entirely. The committee has agreed upon amendments to change the set-up of the Wage Stabilization Board; but I was not addressing myself to that. In fact, the Senator from Illinois, himself, has an amendment to provide an all-public Board. There are several amendments pending on that subject.

My reason for bringing up the question of the elimination of titles IV and V at this time was merely to ascertain whether the Senate desired to eliminate them entirely, or whether it wanted to revise and perfect the titles by writing a new title. So what I have in mind is not the final bill, because the committee itself has many amendments to propose. But what we are endeavoring to ascertain is whether it is the wish of the Senate to eliminate the titles entirely, rather than amend them.

I may say that some time would be required in order for me to answer the questions which the Senator from Minnesota is asking, and which other Senators may wish to ask, because the amendments to the law are all presently in the form of committee amendments. But we desired under the unanimous-consent agreement to have a vote on the question of striking out the two titles before we considered the committee amendments and their possible amendment.

Mr. THYE. The committee chairman does have in mind that when we are no longer threatened with an inflationary trend in connection with wages, the OPS Administrator and the Wage and Hour Administrator should cease to function in that specific field of activity. Insofar as the Defense Production Act is concerned, the mechanics of controlling inflation, if wisely administered, should cease to operate and function when there is no need for control——

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that there is no mandatory provision in that regard. We tried to figure out some mandatory way by which controls would be suspended, but we did not arrive at anything in that connection which we could properly recommend.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I should like to say to the Senator from Minnesota that all we can be assured of doing is to give information to the agency administering the law. We cannot guarantee to give them understanding, but there will be a "watchdog committee," and whenever we find a situation which clearly calls for decontrol, and it is not acted upon by the OPS Administrator, the "watchdog committee" can call him on the carpet and put him over the jumps. That is about all we can do.

Mr. THYE. If such a watchdog committee had been in existence during the past 6 months when so many prices dropped below ceiling, would the watchdog committee have ordered OPS out of that field?

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me say to the Senator that the watchdog committee had hearings during that time, and the following articles were decontrolled: Cattle hides, kips, calfskins, tallow, lard, animal waste materials, vegetable soapstock, crude cottonseed oil, crude soybean oil, crude corn oil, burlap, wool, wool waste, wool tops, wool noils, alpaca.

I will say to the Senator that we are now working on another list in connection with suspending control.

Mr. THYE. Did the watchdog committee make any criticism of OPS in the field of retail businesses?

Mr. MAYBANK. It has made many reports and has criticized some of the actions of OPS. I do not have all the reports before me, but there are approximately 18 reports.

Mr. THYE. Businessmen to whom I have talked have been greatly disturbed because of the constant investigational activities of OPS.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not deny that. There was hardly any industry witness before the committee who did not oppose the continuation of titles IV and V. So, if the Senator wants to vote with the business people, he can vote to eliminate titles IV and V.

Mr. THYE. What is the committee's recommendation?

Mr. MAYBANK. We have a fear of what may happen when Congress adjourns. But as soon as it is possible to decontrol or to suspend control, it should be done. That is the committee's attitude.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield further?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I should like to say further to my distinguished colleague from Minnesota, that we do not know yet what the wage increase will be for the steel workers. We know there will be an increase. It may be all that they are asking. We also know that when the steel workers receive an increase over and above what the others have previously received, the others are going to ask to be brought up to a level. That, in itself, will increase the cost of production.

We know there will be a deficit of from $5,000,000,000 to $6,000,000,000 when we finish this fiscal year. The joint staff on internal-revenue taxation, of the tax committees of the House and Senate, one of our very best agencies in evaluating receipts and disbursements, has estimated that we shall spend, making allowance for all the economies provided, approximately $80,000,000,000 next year, and the deficit next June will be approximately $11,800,000,000. So we have in anticipation two inflationary trends. One is increased wages, which means increased cost of production, and the other is a tremendous increase in the currency stream which will be making more dollars available to compete for approximately the same supply of goods, and that will be inflationary.

We are all sympathetic with the manufacturers. We all have friends among them. They want to eliminate title IV. I think all of them would like to have it cut out. But any merchant who does not have as many as 500 customers is eventually going broke, and where there is one man who wants to be relieved of price controls, there are many others who do not. Inflation has cost the Nation approximately $20,000,000,000. It is more budensome than are taxes, because it cannot be escaped.

So we have said that until we know better what the inflationary trend will be, we should have a decontrol provision which has previously been explained, and continue price and wage controls under a different set-up and see what happens between now and late next winter. Let us continue controls until the last of next February. Then if there is no inflation and everything is stabilized, if the threat of Russia has been limited and we cut down on our Military Establishment, no one would rejoice more than would the junior Senator from Virginia if we could abolish the whole program. But we are not willing to take the chance of tremendous inflation when we see strong inflationary factors on the horizon.

Mr. MAYBANK. I know how hard the Senator from Virginia has worked in connection with the subjects covered by this bill; but let me say that by concurrent resolution we can abolish the Act at any time, if there should be a special session, or at any time in January. It runs only until next March. We thought some statute on the subject should be on the books when we leave here for the conventions in July. When military spending reaches its peak in October and November, no one knows what may happen. There should be some stand-by controls. We hope they will be interpreted as stand-by controls. Many businessmen have been pleased with the suspensions which have been put into effect, because controls were no longer necessary. Controls should be taken off when they are not necessary. But I think it would be a great mistake for Congress to adjourn and go to Chicago for the conventions and say that nothing is going to happen.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield further?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to say to the able and distinguished chairman of the committee that I recognize the wisdom of his statement. I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I came from a meeting which was considering the Armed Services appropriations in order to answer the quorum call. We are faced with a tremendous budget request for military purposes, not only for the Air Force, but for the other branches of the military service.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina has the floor; he may hold it.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to add just one thought. When I came to the floor this morning, as the Senator knows, there was left with me as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Committee on Appropriations a secret document indicating the plans of the Atomic Energy Commission, which are going to the House of Representatives. A bill is to be brought before the House providing for a substantial additional appropriation. I thought the appropriation would be made yesterday in the amount of $1,300,000,000. If we add that amount for atomic energy, it will increase the over-all expenditures, as the Senator, a member of the committee, well knows.

I merely wished to call attention to that, because the Senator knows how much the appropriation is going to be.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I personally have a feeling that we shall have to expand our military expenditures. That will have one effect on the production of civilian goods, and also upon the number employed in defense establishments. Therefore, I concur with the chairman that a defense-production law must be enacted, because inflation would cause a depreciation in the dollar value, and a dollar would buy less defense equipment. That in itself would seriously handicap the very endeavors in which we are engaged, namely, the development of our defense.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota is eminently correct, because we would then have to impose more taxes to pay the higher prices for steel, copper, and everything else.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may answer the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Minnesota, who is a former governor of his State, and a member of the Committee on Appropriations, knows that what we call money, bank notes, has no value except what the Government can give it. It is nothing but a ticket. It is not wealth; it is a medium of exchange.

If a person in Minnesota producing a tub of butter wants to buy a pair of shoes, he puts a tub of butter in the national warehouse, where someone else has put a pair of shoes which will fit him. Then he gets so many tickets for his butter and he goes to the warehouse and ask for a pair of shoes.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

If one butter ticket would buy one pair of shoes, but two tickets are issued for the butter, two tickets will have to be given for the shoes. Especially will that happen when the tickets are increased, on the one hand, and through diversion from peacetime production to defense production on the other we are decreasing the supply of those things which go into the warehouse where we want to exchange products or services for what somebody else has contributed.

It is a very simple economic problem, and demonstrates that money has no intrinsic value. Currency is nothing but a ticket. Wherever two tickets are given where one would do the work, the cost of living is doubled. The problem cannot be figured in any other way.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield further?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield further to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I wish to make the comment that if the OPS administrators would get out of the field of administrative price regulations whenever there was no inflation threat in connection with a commodity, a product or a supply of merchandise, there would not be criticism. But when they continue to function when prices are far below the established ceiling, there is a great waste of manpower and one of the worst nuisances a businessman or manufacturer could be faced with. That is what I am trying to discourage so far as the Government is concerned.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Minnesota. When a price goes well below the ceiling price, and there is no longer an inflationary trend, the control should be suspended. I have said so on the Senate floor many times, as the Senator from Minnesota well knows.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I will support the defense production bill, but I wish to make certain that in the act or in the report there will be provisions which will take the administration of the Defense Production Act out of the field of control when prices go below the established ceiling price or the pre-Korea inflationary trend market level. If we can accomplish that, then I am sure the people in general will give us a vote of thanks for having reenacted an extension of the Defense Production Act.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia wishes to remind the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that we have had fine cooperation up to this point with the new OPS Administrator, former Gov. Ellis Arnall. We believe he is an honest man. We think he is sincere. We believe he is trying to carry out the law as we have written it, and as we are explaining our intent today. However, we cannot guarantee that he we will not have around him some types of bureaucrats like those the Government had in 1825, in the time of John Randolph, of Roanoke, who said of a bureaucrat:

> His mind is like the Susquehanna flats, naturally poor, and made less fertile by cultivation. Never has ability so far below mediocrity been so richly rewarded—not since Caligula's horse was named "Consul."

If the Senator from Minnesota knows when the day will come when we will not have any of that type of officials in Government, we can raise the flag of real freedom.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I would say, with respect to the Defense Production Act and the report, that if a proper law and a proper administrative regulation are written, we are going to get the OPS out of the field whenever they cease to function properly or become a nuisance to society by their very actions.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to answer the able Senator from Minnesota with respect to the suspension of controls on page 8, section 411. He must understand that that is not mandatory. He must understand that it is merely a statement on the part of Congress, but the administrator is not obligated to follow the direction if he does not care to. No particular formula or yardstick is provided. However, it is indicative of the intent of the committee and the intent of Congress as to what is to be done. There is nothing in the provision to force the administrator to do anything. It is not compulsory; he may do what is mentioned, but he does not need to do it. He is to be the sole judge, depending on existing conditions, as to whether he wants to do it or not.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct; it is left to the administrator. We tried to work out a plan by which Congress could take the necessary action, but it would not work.

Mr. CAPEHART. We may have a plan, but the bill has in it nothing more than a pious statement that it is the intention of Congress that certain things should be done. However, there is nothing mandatory about it. The administrator does not need to act. He is to be the sole judge of whether he does or does not. If he does not, Congress cannot do anything about it, under the legislation as proposed at the moment.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Minnesota was on his feet only because the Senator from Indiana was explaining to me one provision of the act. My question has been answered.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to invite the attention of the chairman of the committee to a situation whereby controls on certain items have been lifted. For instance, I was thinking about what happened in the case of cottonseed oil, on which the price was lifted, but in effect the announcement was made that ceilings might be imposed later, and they might be lower ceilings.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is absolutely correct. That situation was corrected by the watchdog committee immediately, and since then, Governor Arnall has made a statement with respect to the suspension of controls on cottonseed oil, that there would be no so-called roll-back when the suspension was removed. In fact, I may say that is another thing the watchdog committee did.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further on that very point?

Mr. MAYBANK. We included such a statement in the report. However, I may say to the Senator from Mississippi that Governor Arnall assured me last week, if I am not mistaken, that this would never happen again. We then wrote in the report:

> Upon terminating the suspension order price ceilings shall be reimposed at levels no lower than those in effect when the suspension order was issued.

That is on page 16.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator was reading from the report?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. Does the sentence the Senator was reading apply to all commodities, or only to one?

Mr. MAYBANK. To any suspension that may be put into effect.

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator feel satisfied that that provision will cover conditions which may arise in the future?

Mr. MAYBANK. It will apply to any suspension which may occur in the future. The Senator is familiar with one reason why it took the administrator a little longer to suspend ceilings. Let us consider, for instance, a subject with which the Senator from Mississippi is thoroughly familiar. I refer to cotton and to textiles. In the case of Minnesota, I would refer to soybeans. The reason why the suspension was delayed was that ceilings on textiles could not be suspended without suspending ceilings on the raw materials from which the textiles are made. The ceiling on a certain raw product which is to be canned cannot be suspended merely because the price of the raw product is below the ceiling because the price of the canned product might be above the ceiling.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Chairman, and commend him and the committee for their handling of this problem.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Mississippi. He discussed with me the situation as it related to cotton, and I told him, as chairman of the watchdog committee, that we would hold a meeting. As a result of our conversation a meeting was held. As the Senator knows, the ceiling was set at the suspended price of last February.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Will the Senator from South Carolina explain more in detail the operation and functioning of the watchdog committee? If

there is nothing mandatory in the bill—and I understand there is not—how does the committee make its wishes felt, so as to bring about the result cited in the report, with respect to things which have been decontrolled?

Mr. MAYBANK. I will say to my good friend from Maryland that as chairman of the committee I usually receive copies of the complaints which Senators receive. Such complaints come to the committee. For example, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] received hundreds of complaints with respect to the tallow situation. The staff made a study and found that the price was far below the ceiling price. We called Governor Arnall's attention to the situation and told him that the controls should be removed. He said that he would make an immediate study of the situation. He did so, and removed the controls.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is that the general experience of the Senator's committee with the Administrator?

Mr. MAYBANK. It has been since Governor Arnall took office. He has been perfectly fair and square with us. He has cooperated with us in every way. Every member of the committee, whether he believes in titles IV and V or not, will agree that Governor Arnall has cooperated.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Has the Senator from South Carolina any solution for the flagrant violations of the law which the OPS indulges in—for example, as in the case of fixing the price of soybeans by manipulating the ceiling prices of meal and oil? Is there any solution for the deliberate law violations which the OPS has been engaging in?

Mr. MAYBANK. I cannot comment on that subject, because I do not know just what the Senator is referring to. If the Senator would send to the committee any statements or evidence which he has showing that the law has been deliberately violated, the committee would appreciate it. We are to have a hearing on Monday on the subject of aluminum. I shall be only too glad to call the matter to the attention of the staff, and to have Governor Arnall appear before the committee. If the law is being deliberately violated, the committee would like to know about it. As the Senator knows, I would never stand for such a thing as chairman of the committee if I could stop it.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not believe the OPS has advised the Committee on Banking and Currency that it is violating the law.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not suppose the OPS officials would do so if they were violating the law. The only way we could find out about it would be for someone to tell us.

Mr. AIKEN. I can furnish the proof. The OPS will not furnish the proof.

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall be very happy to receive the proof.

Mr. AIKEN. They violated the law and forced the price of soybeans down 67 cents a bushel below the legal ceiling, through the simple process of fixing a less-than-cost price for the meal, and then fixing ceilings at double the actual market price for the oil. Theoretically, they fixed a ceiling price on the entire soybean crop. Actually they forced the price of soybeans 67 cents below the legal minimum, and they know it, as I shall be glad to prove to the committee through their own memorandum. They engaged in maneuvering.

Mr. MAYBANK. I know something about the situation as it relates to cottonseed. The price of cottonseed went down because there was a big cotton crop. There was a 17,000,000-bale cotton crop. I understand that there was also a big soybean crop. Was there not a big soybean crop?

Mr. AIKEN. The largest soybean-processing plant in America has been closed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Was there not a good crop of soybeans?

Mr. AIKEN. There was a very good crop; but the growers are not permitted to sell the crop for anywhere near the ceiling price.

Mr. MAYBANK. No one is prevented from buying cottonseed or soybeans above the market, provided the price is not above the ceiling price.

Mr. AIKEN. The OPS put the price of the meal down to the point where our dairymen could not get it. It just was not being put on the market. The ceiling on oil was placed at twice the market price. This has been done with the connivance and cooperation of the Department of Agriculture. That was the effect, if not the purpose.

Mr. MAYBANK. If the Department of Agriculture connived at such a thing, I certainly believe that the question should be taken up with the Department of Agriculture through the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. AIKEN. I shall be very happy to place in the RECORD memoranda showing clearly that the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Stabilization have worked together to the end that prices to farmers would be forced down and there would be encouragement to raise the prices to the consumers. There can be no question about that. If it were not on the Senator's time, I should be very happy to read the evidence into the RECORD at this point.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

Mr. AIKEN. The evidence is certainly going into the RECORD. It is clear that the Secretary of Agriculture has agreed with Mr. Arnall to do these things.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator would not blame the Committee on Banking and Currency for not keeping up with the Department of Agriculture. We have a Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. We shall be glad to go fully into any evidence which the Senator submits. We shall be glad to call Mr. Arnall and Mr. Brannan before the committee, and find out whether they rigged the market, as the Senator says they did, and why. That is in substance what it amounts to.

Mr. AIKEN. Before the Senate takes a recess, for the benefit of other Members of the Senate I shall be happy to place the evidence in the RECORD. I hope the committee will consider it.

Mr. MAYBANK. I can assure the Senator that we will. I am not saying that everything is perfect. I deplore some of the mistakes which have been made.

Mr. AIKEN. They have been before the committee and have said, in effect "We have broken the law in 16 different directions." Memoranda from their own files will prove that they have done so.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to inquire of the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee a little more fully with respect to the functions of the watchdog committee. I should like to find out whether one of the functions of the watchdog committee is to make certain that the money appropriated by Congress is used by the Administrator of OPS for the purpose of helping to maintain proper wage and price regulations, or whether it was intended by the committee that a part of the money appropriated by Congress should be used by the officials of OPS to enunciate their own particular and peculiar economic, social, and political philosophies.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Committee on Banking and Currency has never gone into the business of the Appropriations Committee. However, I will say to the Senator that, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have been insisting in that committee that any money allotted to the OPS be strictly limited to giving out proper information about their orders and regulations, so that none of it could be used for publicity purposes on the radio or television. That has not been the function of the watchdog committee. The watchdog committee has gone into cases involving prices on textiles and other things. It has gone into the question of aluminum. It is studying the question of whether we should enlarge the three big aluminum companies, or whether we should make some engagement with Canada to buy aluminum. We went into the Chilean copper situation fully in executive session, but we have never gone into the matter of appropriations. I have always felt that that was the business of the Appropriations Committee.

What I have been trying to do on the Appropriations Committee, along with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and other members of that committee, has been to insist that appropriations be properly spent. The same question arose in connection with the deficiency bill, which contained appropriations for the DPA, the NPA, and other agencies.

Mr. MUNDT. Is the chairman himself a member of the watchdog committee?

Mr. MAYBANK. I am.

Mr. MUNDT. May I ask whether or not it is one of the functions of the watchdog committee to make certain that the employees of OPS are doing the job for which the legislation is designed?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct?

Mr. MUNDT. Is not that one of the functions of the watchdog committee?

been a bundle of contradictions and anomalies, to say the least.

First of all, in dealing with inflation we spent money riotously, unexceeded by any other Congress in peacetime certainly, and thus fed the fires of inflation. At the same time we passed a burdensome tax bill in the hope of siphoning off some of the spending money. Mr. President, that is like pulling the fire from under a boiler and then putting gasoline on the fire to make it burn better.

We orate very eloquently that production is a hedge against inflation, and then by this kind of measure we put a road block in the way in order to prevent acceleration of production and make production just as difficult as possible.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield at this point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield with the greatest of pleasure.

Mr. ROBERTSON. With all due deference to the majority viewpoint, would it be fair to say it is that in an emergency of this kind, it is felt that producers should be sufficiently patriotic to increase production as they are permitted to do so on the basis of a fair return, without gouging the consuming public for the last dollar that an emergency might enable the producers to obtain in the absence of restraints?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The frustration of the producers of the country does not arise from a lack of confidence on their part in their ability to meet every development in the United States market. That frustration arises from the road blocks which are put in their way.

I trust that no one is so naive as to believe that because of the lovely stump speech which is contained in the bill, there will be a diminution of personnel of this agency. The record shows—I asked the Office of Price Stabilization for it—that they had 11,478 employees on the payroll in January, and that they had 12,500 employees on the payroll in June, or a clear increase of more than 1,000 persons.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield at this point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I admit all of the Senator's soft impeachment. However, is it not true that during Warld War II this agency had on its payroll more than 65,000 persons who were doing the same kind of job the present agency is doing?

Mr. DIRKSEN. As a matter of fact, the agency had more than 65,000 employees on its payroll; and when we consider the number of volunteer workers, the total number goes away up into the hundreds of thousands.

As I remember the last estimate which came from that very able Administrator of price control, Mr. Chester Bowles, he finally asked for $201,000,000. The OPS has presently been asking for $71,000,000. Why? Simply to stimulate production in the country. So, Mr. President, I think the time has come for the Senate to come to grips with this matter.

Mr. President, let us not attempt to put the blame on Mr. Truman; let us not attempt to put the blame on anyone else. On the contrary, let us assume the responsibility for the actions we take here. If the epitaph for the free-enterprise system of the United States is to be written, let us write it honestly, and let us put on its tombstone, "The free-enterprise system came to its end by the action of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States."

Mr. President, I wish to accept my full share of responsibility. Last year in the committee I was the only one who voted against the bill, and, at this time, I intend to raise my voice in opposition to the pending bill, because I am not going to have the history books record that I became a Member of this body for the purpose of liquidating the free-enterprise system of America.

On such occasions as this, I think the best sort of testimony to be submitted is simply the kind we obtain by examining the record of the testimony which was submitted at the hearings. I was reasonably diligent in my attendance on the committee, and I heard a great deal of regaling testimony in regard to the bill which now is before the Senate.

First of all, let me refer to the canners of the Nation. After all, it is no sin to be in business today, and it is no sin for a man to direct his own business, although today there are in Government some ideological experts who would almost make it appear to be a sin to be a businessman and to make a profit.

I think the Apostle Paul once wrote, "Be not slothful in business." I think that is a very good admonition to bear in mind during the present period.

Let us return to exhibit 1. A representative of the National Canners Association stated to the committee that 83 percent of their products were selling below the ceiling prices. The astonishing thing was that while there was such a large supply of canned goods in inventory, with the result that 83 percent of them were selling below the ceiling prices, the Department of Agriculture—in setting goals on the production of vegetables—has reduced the goal for 1952 by 1,100,000 tons, in order to hold down production. Of all stupidity and nonsense, that takes the cake.

The canners testified that their stocks have increased by 25,000,000 cases, over last year. That was the testimony which was submitted before the committee.

So now the tonnage is reduced, and the price is forced up, and then a ceiling—almost like a hunk of cement—is maintained, to hold down the prices and more or less to squeeze them between the upper and the nether millstones.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me at this time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask my friend please to let me proceed to summarize a little of the testimony which was presented to the committee.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Certainly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think probably the most stimulating witness I have heard in my public service for a long time was Mr. Cliff D. Carpenter, president of the Institute of American Poultry Industries. Mr. President, at no time since this act went into effect has the price of chickens been up to the ceiling price. However, there is a ceiling price, and those engaged in that industry have to do all the paper work and all the bookkeeping required by the regulations, and have to examine their books and a great variety of regulations, in order to ascertain whether they are in compliance with the ceiling or whether they are in violation of it.

The price of eggs has never been up to the ceiling price, but today the producers of eggs have to keep books and have to go through all the folderol and all the nonsense that is required by the Government.

The price of turkeys has never been up to the ceiling price.

Mr. President, it is sort of a follow-down process; the prices never reach the ceiling price, so the ceiling price is lowered. In other words, lower ceilings are imposed, and the result is to destroy the entire flexibility of our economic system.

In the case of ducks, it is necessary to point out that three orders on ducks were issued. Those orders cost one large producer $150,000, but not a single one of the orders would work. I suppose the trouble was that the ducks could not read the regulations. [Laughter.]

So that is the sort of business with which we are confronted today. How in heaven's holy name can anyone run a business under such circumstances?

Let us examine exhibit No. 3, which is for the special benefit of my genial friend, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. His colleague, Representative HERLONG, came before the committee and told us that the prices of citrus fruits and juices have never been up to the ceiling prices; yet the producers must comply with all the complicated work required under the OPS regulations.

The master of the National Grange came before the committee and said, in effect: "If you are going to have any control, you simply must have rationing." However, he urged that the controls be removed.

Then Mr. John J. Riggle, assistant secretary of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, came before the committee. The farmers he represents are very patriotic citizens who are interested in the welfare of the country. Mr. Riggle urged that controls be removed.

Then Mr. Mark W. Pickell, executive secretary of the Corn Belt Livestock Feeders' Association, appeared before the committee. He has spent a lifetime in the cattle-raising business, and he knows that business. He urged that the controls be removed.

Then Mr. Benjamin F. Castle, executive director of the Milk Industry Foundation, appeared before the committee to urge that Congress remove the controls.

Mr. President, one of the most stimulating witnesses, however, was a very humble citizen who operates at the counter of a supermarket, Mr. Stanton W. Davis, of Brockton and New Bedford, Mass. He is an independent; and he brought along some lamb chops and some

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I cannot make any particular audit of complaints. We have had a great many complaints, as the Senator knows.

Mr. MUNDT. My inquiry was whether that was not a proper function of the watchdog committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. There would not be time enough—and I say this with full appreciation of the Senator's thought—to read all the letters that come to the committee containing complaints. No member of the committee would have time enough to read all the letters. They must be passed on to staff members to check on them. Sometimes there are as many as a thousand letters a day.

Mr. MUNDT. My inquiry to the distinguished chairman of the committee is whether a case in point, which I have before me, is something which he feels should come within the purview of the watchdog committee, or whether he feels this type of activity on the part of OPS officials is what his committee is now asking Congress to support by a continuation of control legislation. I have in my hand an incident mentioned in an editorial from the daily newspaper of the second largest city in South Dakota, the Rapid City Daily Journal. The editorial is entitled "Alien Philosophy Slaps Sturgis Rotarians." Sturgis is a community a short distance from Rapid City, but is in the newspaper territory served by that great daily newspaper.

The editorial states:

> So the business and professional men of Sturgis who make up the Rotary Club of that wide-awake community, were thrown into confusion and consternation when an agent of a bureau of the Federal Government, who had come to speak to them, told them that America no longer had a free economy, and that the free enterprise system was dead.

Does the chairman of the committee feel that to be a proper function in which an OPS director should engage?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from South Dakota knows that yesterday I supported the amendment offered by the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. I supported his amendments on all controls ever since the Senator has been in the Senate. The Senator will testify to that. I did that even when the Senate was meeting in the old Supreme Court Chamber before the Senate resumed its sessions in its own Chamber. I will say to my good friend from South Dakota that I cannot be held responsible for what a crackpot who is working for the Government may say. Unfortunately we have crackpots in the Government. But there are crackpots working in private industry also. There is bound to be a certain number of crackpots everywhere.

Mr. MUNDT. I am not saying that the chairman is responsible. I am inquiring whether he feels such activity to be a proper function of an OPS director.

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not hear the question of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I am not saying that there is any responsibility on the part of the chairman of the committee. I am inquiring whether he feels that such an activity is a proper function on the part of an OPS director?

Mr. MAYBANK. I feel that any man who makes such a statement, to the effect that our economic system has been destroyed, makes an erroneous and false statement, with which I am in thorough disagreement.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure of that fact. I, too, am in thorough disagreement with such a socialistic philosophy. I am inquiring whether it is a proper complaint to place before the watchdog committee. I am inquiring whether the Government should keep in its employ and finance the tirades of that kind of person who goes around the country preaching that sort of nonsense, traveling at the expense of the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. MAYBANK. In the declaration of policy, which is contained in the act itself, there appears the following:

> It is the objective of this act to provide the President with authority to accomplish these adjustments in the operation of the economy. It is the intention of the Congress that the President shall use the powers conferred by this act to promote the national defense, by meeting, promptly and effectively, the requirements of military programs in support of our national security and foreign policy objectives, and by preventing undue strains and dislocations upon wages, prices, and production or distribution of materials for civilian use within the framework, as far as practicable, of the American system of competitive enterprise.

If an employee goes around the country and makes a speech to the effect that that is not what Congress intended to do, I cannot be held responsible.

Mr. MUNDT. No; but we have a watchdog committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. If the Senator from South Dakota will give me the name of the person who made the speech, I will send for Mr. Arnall and ask him about it.

Mr. MUNDT. It is Prof. Arthur R. Shoemaker, director of the district Office of Price Stabilization in South Dakota. I will be glad to supply the editorial to the committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. I will appreciate it. I shall ask Mr. Stevenson, of the committee staff, to check into the matter on Monday.

Mr. MUNDT. I will supply all the material to the watchdog committee. I also have some letters and messages which have been sent to me by some of the most distinguished businessmen in South Dakota protesting against Professor Shoemaker's effrontery.

Mr. MAYBANK. I believe that distinguished businessmen should call these matters to the attention of the Senator. I am glad that they have done so. If anyone says that we are passing laws which destroy the competitive system, he is certainly wrong. I know that the Senator from South Dakota has always supported the private enterprise system, not only in the Senate, but also when he was a Member of the House.

Mr. MUNDT. That is also true of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Mr. President, let the RECORD be perfectly clear. Mr. Shoemaker is a former professor. I do not believe he said that Congress passed laws which destroy the private enterprise or free competitive system in our country. He was traveling around the State as OPS director, on money appropriated by Congress. He is reported to have said that the American free enterprise system was dead. He said that the OPS was necessary because 200 corporations in America are artificially, greedily, and avariciously jacking up prices and holding them up deliberately out of precise motives of selfishness.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is his statement. A great many charges are made, not only by OPS, but on the floor of the Senate as well. I have not made them.

Mr. MUNDT. I know that. I wanted to know what the official attitude of the committee was. I shall be glad to supply the material to the committee. I shall supply all the evidence I have in my possession, and I hope the committee will make a report on it.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator can appreciate that we get a great many complaints. He can appreciate that such complaints should be taken up by the people with their Senators. I shall be very glad to look at the material.

Mr. President, I have nothing further to say.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate the amendment which is pending at the present time has the effect of repealing or terminating title IV and title V of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

Title IV deals with wage-and-price controls. Title V is the so-called labor disputes title. If the amendment is adopted there will be an end of price control, meaning that it will terminate on June 30, 1952. I sincerely hope that the Senate will see fit to approve the amendment in the interest of the country.

I am not unmindful of the fact that in the Committee on Banking and Currency we wrote a stump speech into the bill. It was offered by my very genial colleague the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. It is a nice aggregation of English language. It is a pious statement of congressional policy. There is not so much as a bicuspid, let alone a molar, in it so far as effective language is concerned. It is merely a statement of policy by Congress that "the President shall use the price, wage, and other powers conferred by this act, as amended, to promote the earliest practicable balance between production and demand therefor." It expresses the reverent hope that perhaps there can be a termination ultimately of these powers. That is precisely as far as it goes.

My friend from Virginia, devoting himself to the old dictum that open confession is good for the soul, has certainly stated the case in language, which has no legal or binding effect whatever.

There is present before the Senate now the question of continuing the powers. I sincerely hope that the powers will be terminated. I may say to my colleagues in the Senate that if some future bone picker ever evaluates the Eighty-first Congress, about the best that he will be able to do in one paragraph is to say that its actions and its decorum have

from Illinois said about certain businesses being burdened with all the regulations on fresh fruits and vegetables, which sold at prices below the ceiling, that that may have been a fact some time ago—and I, of course, would never question what the distinguished Senator from Illinois says—but recently that has not been the case. One of the staff members called me a while ago and stated that they were never required to keep books on articles selling below the ceiling prices; so there could be no cost on that account.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am merely stating to the Senator what I was told. I thought it ought to be in the RECORD.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the fact of the matter is that the authority to issue the regulations is there.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And so long as the authority is there, no watchdog committee and no one else is going to bring the thing to a conclusion. The only way to conclude it is to withdraw the authority. Businessmen could then follow out the thesis of our free economy.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, which we agreed to act on first. That is what he wanted done. I merely wanted to state that no books or records are required to be kept in connection with things selling under the ceiling prices, so I am told.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Before I get too far away from the question raised by the Senator from Michigan, I desire to invite attention to this headline: "Staley closes big soybean plant Saturday. Says OPS has squeezed company's profits."

That is dated May 7, 1952. Staley is the largest soybean processor in the United States. The plant has closed its doors, according to the statement.

Let me refer to some items which have come to my desk relative to the potato shortage. Try to buy potatoes at any store in Washington—they are like gold; it is practically impossible to find them. I was in Detroit not long ago and saw hundreds of trucks backed up at the wholesale market. There were no potatoes. The wholesalers were protesting OPS regulations which made potatoes impossible to get. Today there is a growing, flourishing black market in the field of potatoes.

To satisfy myself I went to a store on Massachusetts Avenue NW., in this city, and said I wanted to get a peck of potatoes. There was not a potato in the store.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did the Senator see the item in this morning's newspaper to the effect that certain restaurants would serve potatoes if anyone would bring them, and would not charge anything for frying or boiling them? That indicates that there is a black market in potatoes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. Before we get away from potatoes, I want to refer to another item just to nail the matter down. I have in my hand a recent Associated Press dispatch stating that during a drought a few years ago the United States shipped potatoes to Spain. Spain is now sending cheaper potatoes to the United States. The article cites the fact that a ship left for New York with 3,600 long tons of potatoes destined for sale to wholesalers in New York, Washington, Philadelphia, San Juan, and so forth, for less than 1 cent a pound. The potatoes were grown from seed purchased in the Netherlands. A spokesman in the Office of Price Stabilization had this to say:

> The incoming shipment is of no concern to OPS as long as the selling price does not not go above the ceiling price.

It is of no concern so long as the price is maintained. We can starve for want of potatoes, but that is not important. One can get nourishment from looking at a chart on the wall and knowing what is the ceiling price on potatoes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Following up the matter of shipping potatoes from Spain, does the Senator remember that when we were shipping food to Germany and France we had such large surpluses of potatoes that it was said by the Agricultural Department that we could not ship potatoes to Europe, that they would spoil before they got there? Does not this demonstrate that when they come the other way they can be safely landed?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is true.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I congratulate my colleague from Illinois on the able speech he is making with reference to the potato situation about which I want to say something, myself, a little later. But I should like to return for a moment to the exchange between the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from South Carolina with reference to citrus fruit, and especially with reference to the appearance made by Representative HERLONG, of Florida, before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency during the course of the hearings. Both Senators are correct in their statements, but I think I may perhaps clarify the matter by a brief statement.

The testimony given by Representative HERLONG appears at pages 355 to 359 of the record of the hearings. The Senator from South Carolina was correct in saying that as to that part of the citrus fruit which is sold in fresh fruit markets there is no need for complaints as to ceilings or the keeping of records such as would be required on other commodities. But more than two-thirds of the entire citrus crop of my State is processed, going either into cans, frozen, or made into concentrate. The point made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois is entirely correct, and the testimony of Representative HERLONG shows that more than two-thirds of the Florida citrus crop in the past season was subjected to the difficulties of selling at a time when the highest price being received by the growers was 31 percent of parity, and effect upon the growers of my State of the imposition of the ceiling upon the processed fruit which was selling every day in competition with the fresh product everywhere in the Nation was terrific.

I congratulate and compliment the Senator from Illinois for having invited attention to that fact. When more than two-thirds of the crop is going into a processed product which appears on the market at the same time as the fresh fruit appears and which competes daily for the attention of the housewives, certainly the growers are hurt very badly when that two-thirds is subjected to ceilings at a time when the grower himself is getting less than one-third of the cost of production at his end of the line.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suppose I should remain in character, like Cato of old, who signed every letter "delenda est Carthago"—Carthage must be destroyed.

I shall be glad to join with my friend in offering an amendment to take care of the situation which he has mentioned.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the invitation. I expect to offer an amendment, myself, unless it is better to include it in the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois. The purpose would be to remove fresh fruits and vegetables entirely from ceilings, because the havoc which has been created in my State this year is so enormous that I would be doing less than my duty if I did not offer such an amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator from Florida.

I now yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to add another chapter to the potato story? The States of Utah and Idaho adjoin, and at the point where they join there is a very rich agricultural area. The slide-rule boys decided that potatoes grown in Idaho should have a 20-cent higher rate than should potatoes grown in Utah. The farmer had to be very careful where he ran his plow to make sure where he separated the high-ceiling potatoes from the low-ceiling potatoes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suppose the theory was that because of the soil content in Utah there would be a few more calories in the soil of Idaho.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. May I add that not only is there confusion on geographical lines, as recited by the Senator from Utah, but in my own State there is a situation brought about by ceiling control whereby potatoes marketed up to the last minute of the last day of April were worth 70 cents more per 100 pounds than potatoes out of the next field which did not arrive at the packing house until a minute after midnight of that day, that is, on the first of May. That is certainly an artificial distinction that cannot be justified by any sort of reasoning.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The OPS astronomers must have taken account of the sun to see whether or not some of its blistering and vigorous rays had not got down to the soil after April 1, even though the potatoes were underground. But certainly because of the obliquity of the ray it was not so sharp, and there must have been a difference.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

steaks to demonstrate to the committee how he has to trim the meat at the expense of the housewives in order to comply with the stupidities that are uttered in the form of regulations by the Office of Price Stabilization. Just think of it, Mr. President. When Mr. Davis was before the committee he demonstrated, certainly to the satisfaction of the committee and to my satisfaction, that he is operating under such difficulties that finally the consumers become the real victims of these regulations.

Probably the humblest citizen who appeared before the committee was a crossroads grocer who operates at Highland Springs, Va. His name is Mr. John J. Dratt. His entire volume of business is only $120,000 a year. As I recall, he testified that his wife and his brother work in the store, and that they hire a delivery boy to work part time.

The first thing I observed was that he brought two huge volumes into the committee room. They looked like volumes of the Commerce Clearing House, perhaps sufficient in size to set forth the vagaries of the income-tax law, or something of the sort. Those volumes were very thick, and were bound in such a way as to appear to be official documents. In fact, they looked very forbidding. One of the members of the committee said to him, "What are these?" Mr. Dratt replied, "These are the regulations under which I operate." Both the volumes, Mr. President, appeared to be of the size of an unexpurgated edition of the Sears, Roebuck catalog. He said, "I am expected to be familiar with it—over a half million words."

He comes from the great Commonwealth of my esteemed friend, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I think the Senator was present and heard the testimony of his constituent. I thought it was interesting, indeed, because he was speaking for the small grocers. But he had to familiarize himself with all those regulations. For instance, on pork loins, I think—and I am drawing on memory a little—on pork loins weighing less than 16 pounds there was a regulation of more than 15,000 words to show how the meat had to be cut up and how it had to be sold.

Mr. President, talk about destroying the flexibility of the American system—this is it. So today we have two trains on the track, the train of free enterprise and the train of control. They are headed for a collision. And the effect is not going to be recited in happy words when that collision comes.

What we forget is that the armament program will take perhaps 15 percent of national production. Is that a reason for putting our entire free enterprise system into a strait-jacket? Yet that is what we have today.

I have merely recited some of the evidence. Then came a man named Bertram Turner, from Cranston, R. I., who operates a little store. He brought pictures. He works long hours, and hard. He is "in the red." He says, "I am not comparatively in the red, I am really in the red, because of difficulties in operating under the regulations."

The other day a friend of mine from Minnesota sent me a tearful account of a small baker who had locked his door. It had a special appeal to me, because, once upon a time, I was a bench baker in white clothes, impregnated with flour, making tea rolls, doughnuts, pies, and bread. When I hear about my compatriots in that industry, who contrive succulent dainties to tease the palates of the people, it always excites something within me. As I go about the country, Mr. President, ever so often I drop into a bakeshop simply to get that fragrance into my nostrils again, to see whether the craftsmen are carrying on in accordance with the ancient tradition. Mr. Turner, to whom I have referred, found it necessary to lock his door. He could not make the grade any longer, as the result of OPS.

A Mr. Schreiber—and I want to deal with him, now—had a retail coal business in New Hampshire. He came to complain of the fact that, being a salesman of a competitive fuel, he could not obtain justice from OPS; and he explained the difficulties which resulted. However, I thought the high spot in the testimony was when the American Municipal Association representatives came to testify that the original OPS administrator in St. Louis had actually interdicted the use of parking meters there, because the place where they were put had been used previously for free parking. The city thought it was going to get a little revenue from the parking meters, whereas the parking had been free theretofore. When meters are placed on a former free-parking space, the result is to raise the price. So the OPS administrator officially intruded himself into that picture. Of course, it was subsequently remedied, but it illustrates how nonsensical this business can become.

The Safeway Stores appeared. They operate 2,000 stores. Their volume runs probably over a billion dollars' worth of groceries a year. Among other things, they have been after OPS for a year, trying to get justice, trying to get a survey, trying to get a fair day in court. They could not get it, and so, speaking through some of their merchandizing experts, they pointed out to the committee and listed hundreds of commodities which were selling under the ceiling. Nevertheless, they had to cooperate under the regulations and go through all the bookkeeping that is required.

The American Farm Bureau Federation, consisting of a great segment of men who till the soil in America, through its spokesman said to the committee that price controls ought to be permitted to languish. I am intrigued by one statement of Allan B. Kline, the very distinguished president of the American Farm Bureau Federation. He said, "We can out-produce the Soviet Union, but we cannot out-control them." That, in my judgment, is just as right as can be.

The handkerchief industry came, to be sure, a small industry. One of their largest producers in New England somewhere went out of business. He simply could not take it. He simply could not do business under these complicated regulations.

It has been said that there has been a suspension of control on certain items. That is quite true. But probably the real reason is that the situation became so disgraceful that something had to be done. That would be notably true, for instance, in the case of kid and calf skins and hides.

Mr. John K. Minnoch, executive director of the National Hide Association, came to testify. He said:

> The prices of hides and skins are now so far below the latest ceiling of December 14, 1951—

Which was their second roll-back—

> that there is no excuse whatsoever for continuing ceilings on hides and skins.

He testified also that whereas a key type of hide was selling at ceiling price of 36 cents in August it had declined to 24 cents by early November, which is 1 cent below pre-Korea price. He then asked, "How far down do hide prices have to go before ceilings would be removed?"

Hides were spoiling on them. Foreign hides were coming into the country. They were experiencing difficulty in selling their heavy hides. It seems that we are in the process of putting the industry out of business.

Mr. President, someone must raise his voice against this insanity. That is what it amounts to; and, of course, it is going to continue if we grant the authority. Oh, Mr. President, let us not be beguiled by the naive and soothing words written into this measure as a beautiful stump speech. I quote from them:

> It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress—

Oh, how many times we adopt resolutions declaring the sense of the Congress. They are as evanescent and as transient as the fragrance of a rose on a morning breeze—they are gone. That is all the declaration of policy amounts to. It is not going to last; and let us not be beguiled by it.

Other organizations and associations whose business is not to gouge the consumer have given testimony. How are they to continue in business if the philosophy of OPS is to follow? Their business is to produce more, and to follow out the American economic thesis of more goods for more people in more places, in quantities they want, at prices they can afford to pay. When they depart from that thesis they are done, in a competitive arena.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Illinois was speaking about the glittering generalities of the policy statement of the committee, generalities which sound very good in reading the bill. But is it not true that those generalities do not reach out to the man who has to operate under the bill and who has to pay the increased payroll resulting from controls, when they are not needed?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is so correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the chairman of our committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wanted to say in connection with what the Senator

Mr. HOLLAND. The approach of the Senator from Illinois is comforting, but I am afraid the potato growers of my State will not recognize its healing value.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is exactly correct, I may say to the Senator from Florida. That is the difficulty. When we evaluate the practical effect of the control, it becomes a nuisance and harassment upon the business community of the country, which is trying to keep the production engine going.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. I do not wish to get into this "hot potato" deal, but I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Illinois, whom I respect very highly.

I believe that in his remarks he stated that the Department of Agriculture had demanded of the farmers that they reduce by some large amount the normal acreage of potatoes. However, I wonder if the Senator from Illinois would like to see the farmers overproduce, and sell to whoever buys from them at ridiculously low prices, of which the consumer rarely ever gets the benefit.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When the officials cease rigging the economy of this country—and that goes for the farmers—the economy will go into better balance than if we have to resort to price supports. The operation will probably be not quite so costly.

How long has it been since the Government bought hundreds of millions of dollars worth of potatoes and sprinkled them with colored salt and kerosene, and had the tractors go over them? Now there are no potatoes. Yet a few people are going to be indicted because of violation of the potato ceiling at the time when there is a black market. We could not expect anything but a black market under these circumstances.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. As I said, I do not wish to become involved in the potato deal, but the Senator has brought out something in which I am interested. As to any agricultural product, whether it be corn, wheat, potatoes, cotton, or anything else, the farmers are entitled to a fair market and a fair proportion of the consumer's dollar. If the Department of Agriculture, or some other agency, for which we appropriate millions of dollars a year, wants to give an advantage to the producers of any commodity, whether there is overproduction or underproduction of any specific commodity, I am sure the Senator from Illinois does not wish to take away from the farmers any benefit they may gain.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed not. The Senator from Illinois recognizes fully that not the most endowed bureaucrat can take account of the weather and God's sunshine so as to be able to tell what the crop is going to be. Why do they not let it alone, and then see where we get and what production we can have? Then, if for any reason it is necessary to use a price-support program in order to have potatoes for America, or to subsidize the growers a little, we can make sure that the growers get a fair return. But how can that be done when we control at both ends and keep the farmers between the millstones?

Mr. FREAR. Do I understand the Senator from Illinois to say that he is in favor of subsidies?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; not as such; but I recognize that we have a support program and a commodity-credit program today that has been with us for a long time, and I have gone along with it pretty well in other days.

Mr. FREAR. I did not understand that the Senator from Illinois had a proposal to regulate. I perhaps misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The law is on the books, and is clear with respect to virtually all kinds of commodities, whether they come under parity or under a comparable price law. Why should we belabor the whole commodity credit program and the whole price-support program today in connection with this bill, because it has only a corollary effect?

Mr. FREAR. I do not want the Senator to misunderstand my question. I do not want him to think I am going to support such things. Not at all. What I want to get the Senator from Illinois to admit is that the producers, especially producers of food products, should have some advantage arising from overproduction or underproduction. I do not even say we should give them any subsidies at all.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As a matter of fact, I do not subscribe to the word "advantage." I think we should treat them fairly, and make sure that they get a fair income and fair return upon the commodities they produce. That has been the approach of Congress ever since I can remember. The Senator from Illinois takes no exception to it.

Mr. FREAR. I do not believe the farmers desire anything but a fair return.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct. I have found that to be the view of farmers everywhere.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I can realize why the Senator from Utah might have expressed some resentment over the fact that the OPS gave the Idaho potato a little higher price ceiling in Order No. 113, issued last January, but I should like to point out that the record will show that at the time of the rollback the Idaho potato commanded a premium of $1.40 per sack, and that the OPS arbitrary order rolled back by 30 percent the prevailing prices of Idaho potatoes at that time. So the record shows that the Idaho potato was the greatest victim of that arbitrary action.

I should now like to ask the Senator from Illinois a question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Before the Senator asks his question, I merely wish to comment that I do not desire to be injected into the civil war between Idaho and Utah potato growers.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I appreciate that. If the Senator from Illinois will yield further, I simply wish to say that at the time negotiations were in progress to place ceilings upon potatoes, those representing the potato industry served notice upon OPS officials that there would be no result except to force potatoes into the black market. Subsequent developments proved that that forecast was accurate.

I would like to ask the Senator from Illinois if he does not agree that in any roll-back of prices of potatoes by the OPS the consumer would save a great deal of money, if he could purchase potatoes if they were available. But apparently the OPS does not recognize that even if potatoes were given away, and there were none available in the normal markets, the consumer would not gain in any respect.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct. The prospect would become just a mirage, and would certainly furnish no sustaining power for the humble citizen who had his tongue out a mile for a succulent potato. That is the difficulty today.

It has been stated, "If you will just be patient a little while, a new crop will come in." That is like the item in connection with the Japanese Treaty, in which it was said, "Be patient, take a little while, and these people will orient themselves toward Formosa and other places." But perhaps in the next 5 or 10 years 2,000,000 of them could die before orientation bore any fruit.

So we might be without potatoes for a long time, and that is not in the manner of the American economy, for the capacity of the soil, the talent, the genius, the money, the seed, everything is here to produce potatoes, and they will make a mountain higher than the Tower of Babel.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I just read in the press reports this morning that consumers are being forced to buy macaroni and other substitutes because potatoes are not available. I wish to say to the Senator from Illinois that potato growers in the State of Idaho are willing to cooperate in every way to furnish an adequate supply of this essential food. But so long as the OPS and the bunglers and meddlers persist in discouraging production of potatoes in my State by obstacles and roadblocks, so long as we operate under such a program, there will not be an adequate supply of potatoes available for the consumer at reasonable prices.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I am always interested in the mellifluous presentations of the Senator from Illinois. I wish to ask him if the burden of his presentation is that the shortage of potatoes is due to price control.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, no.

Mr. MOODY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The officials are just confusing the market. If they had sought the most skillful confusers in the country, with doctor of philosophy degrees, they could not have done better.

Mr. MOODY. May I ask the Senator one more question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. MOODY. Does the Senator contend or believe that price supports for farm products are a sound part of our economy?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, I do not want to get into a discussion of price supports now, because that question is not before the Senate.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to point out to the Senator that the reason why there is a shortage of potatoes is that after the Congress had passed a rather complicated series of "yesses" and "noes" on this particular question, finally price supports were lifted. Then, as I think everyone knows, a shortage developed, and price controls were imposed. I am glad to hear that the Senator does not contend that the price controls are responsible for the potato shortage.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. I merely say that the agency of Government which deals with production and the agency which deals with prices are all a part of the same administration, there is the same responsibility for the confusion, and the Senator can select the agency he desires to blame.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The shortage of potatoes this year, up until the time the new crop was supposed to come on the market, was due to the fact that 20 percent of the 1951 crop rotted in the field in some areas. That is the primary reason why potatoes are short. Now that the new crop is coming on the market, the shortage is due to the OPS ceiling of 100 percent. Potatoes are a gambling crop, and if a farmer has only half a crop, he is licked if he must take a low price fixed by an inconsiderate Government agency. He must get more than what would be a fair price in the event he had a big crop. The grower must put about $300 an acre into a crop of potatoes before he even starts to raise them. When he gets a short crop, as many growers did in 1951, he is assured by the OPS that he is faced with disaster, because he cannot possibly charge enough to cover the cost of growing the potatoes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Maine potatoes can be bought in Toronto or Montreal, even though they cannot be bought in Washington.

Mr. AIKEN. There are no price ceilings on potatoes in Canada, and when a grower has only two-thirds of a crop, he must get more money for it if he can.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I would never be one to defend the potato regulation. The State of South Carolina is a great potato-producing State. We have been sidetracked, as has Florida, and the State of Idaho gets a better price. What the Senator from Vermont says is correct. If a grower has a short crop, he has a loss. Some members of my own family plant potatoes, so I know something about the subject. If they have a short crop they have a loss. But it is equally true that many times when a grower has a big crop, if he ships the potatoes to commission merchants in New York, all he receives in return is a freight bill, with nothing for the potatoes.

I merely wished to add my testimony to what the Senator from Vermont said about potatoes being a gambling crop. I am glad to hear the Senator from Illinois say that the control bill has nothing to do with the shortage of potatoes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. While my friend the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is present, I wish to refer again to the soybean question. I have just stated to the Senate that the largest soybean plant in the country, operated by A. E. Staley & Co., and located at Decatur, Ill., was forced to close.

Mr. AIKEN. They were deliberately and intentionally forced out of business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The soybean plant of Swift & Co., at Fostoria, Ohio, also had to close, because of the fact that the squeeze was on as a result of the action of OPS. That plant simply could not make the grade.

I do not know what is being done, but I have a copy of the memorandum to which the Senator from Vermont referred a moment ago——

Mr. AIKEN. They know that they are violating the law.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This memorandum says:

> Soybean meal prices were related directly to cottonseed meal prices for the years 1930–49. A coefficient of determination of 0.96 was obtained.

So, I suppose, notwithstanding supply, notwithstanding demand, notwithstanding the number of cattle feeders, notwithstanding the outlet for soybean oil and its market at home and abroad, all one has to do is to put down the number of years and the prices of soybean meal, and obtain a coefficient of determination of 0.96.

All one has to do is to multiply, and there is the magic number, which is expected to keep people in business. Is that the substance of this program?

Mr. AIKEN. They know better than that. They deliberately took such action as would force the price of soybeans far below the legal ceiling, and even below the support level, the purpose being to put the farm price down, and to encourage an increase in price to the consumer of oleomargarine, shortening, and other commodities made from oil. The administration officials deliberately fixed the ceiling on the oil at twice the market price, to encourage raising the price to the consumer. There is no getting away from that. The memorandum which the Senator has before him tells the whole story. The OPS officials admit that they were violating the law. They admit that they were doing it with the full knowledge, consent, and approval of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is one more effect.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator from Illinois does not place the entire memorandum in the RECORD, I intend to do so. I shall also place in the RECORD a memorandum from one of the OPS officials, advising the OPS administrators that they were doing something terribly wrong. Yet he was overruled.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I hope my friend will place the statements in the RECORD.

To go to another matter, a very well trained reporter was sent to Chicago to look into the situation with respect to one of the packers, and also with respect to Marshall Field. I have before me an article under the heading "Life with OPS," published in the Wall Street Journal of April 14, 1952. This dispatch is dated April 14, 1952. The first subhead is: "Big meat maker finds 1,000 price rules 'neath a cow critter's hide."

The next subheading is: "With 90 percent of tonnage below ceiling, Armour keeps 300 busy unraveling red tape."

The final subhead is: "Crisis of the sausage ceiling."

This reporter went through the plant of Armour & Co. in Chicago to see what regulations it must conform to. What a piece of madness it finally becomes.

This same reporter, Mr. John S. Cooper, also went through the Marshall Field operation. I have before me an article from the Wall Street Journal of Wednesday, April 9, under the same heading "Life with OPS."

The first subhead is: "Giant retailer flounders (in sextuplicate) in morass of paper work."

The next subhead is: "The case of the booby-trap bride hamstrings four Marshall Field executives."

This is the most fascinating reading one could possibly find. The next subhead is: "CPR–7 and 26,000 forms."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two articles to which I have referred be printed in full at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of April 14, 1952]

LIFE WITH OPS—BIG MEAT MAKER FINDS 1,000 PRICE RULES 'NEATH A COW CRITTER'S HIDE—WITH 90 PERCENT OF TONNAGE BELOW CEILING, ARMOUR KEEPS 300 BUSY UNRAVELING RED TAPE—CRISIS OF THE SAUSAGE CEILING

(By John S. Cooper)

CHICAGO.—The next time you are driving in the country and see a steer grazing in a field, take a good long look.

The critter isn't as simple as he seems. Concealed in his beefy carcass are at least 75 different OPS meat price ceilings. And that is just a beginning.

If he is kosher slaughtered, add another completely different set of ceilings. If his sirloins and sweetbreads are to be eaten in a restaurant, on shipboard, or in an Army mess hall, still other ceiling prices will be required. It will make a difference whether the cuts are tenderized or whether they are wrapped in kraft paper, a banana bag or peach paper, or shipped in a crate rather than a barrel. If the meat is sold in Clearwater, Fla., it will have a different ceiling than in Oscaloosa, Iowa—freight differentials, you know. It even makes a difference whether the retailer is located in the Bronx or Bridgeport.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

So far, that steer has more than 1,000 possible wholesale price ceilings under his hide. Now if there are other steers in the field, perhaps a little fatter or leaner, start multiplying: There are five basic meat grades, each with a different set of ceilings. Add a calf, a hog and some sheep to the livestock in the field, and a count of different price ceilings runs into the realm of Irish sweepstake ticket accounting.

THE LIGHTS BURN LATE

This explains why, for more than a year now, lights have been burning late at Armour & Co., one of the Nation's largest manufacturing enterprises, saleswise.

"About 90 percent of our tonnage is selling well below ceiling prices, but we still have the equivalent of 300 people working full-time just to comply with the technicalities of the OPS regulations," an Armour official says.

Armour President Frederick W. Specht is more outspoken. He says: "Confusion compounding confusion has been imposed on our industry and still is burdening us with a tremendous bookkeeping bill for no reason whatsoever. It not only hasn't done any good, it has actually hurt the public as well as the industry."

In 1 month alone a small army of Armour accountants and clerical workers piled up close to $200,000 in overtime sorting over old records for the OPS.

Regardless of whether they ever examine the documents, the Federal controllers demand detailed records of nearly everything connected with the packing company.

How much Armour paid for each lot of cattle it buys, the date, the transportation costs from market to the slaughtering plant, date of slaughter, dressed weight of the animals; these and a myriad of other details must be filed with OPS, even though the Government—for reasons perhaps political—has studiously avoided putting ceilings on the farmers' own prices for their animals.

ARMOUR'S FORM-FILING PROBLEM

That's less than half of Armour's form-filing problem. When the company sells the meat, it has to provide even more detailed information. Every invoice, in addition to names, addresses, and dates of sale, also carries an elaborate code—"PM," "W," "CD," "HSH," "P," "ID," "SS," and "PBH," which indicate types of buyers and sellers.

Each code may require a different ceiling price. Failure to put this information on the invoice makes the company subject to various penalties and even criminal prosecution. Other things must be included on the ticket also—down to the number of miles an Armour truck traveled to make delivery.

The OPS-brought paperwork blizzard is serious enough for a small concern. For a giant like Armour it reaches fantastic proportions. Consider the size of Armour. Last year it sold about 4,000,000,000 pounds of meat—roughly 26 pounds for every person in the United States. It bought some 16,000,000 animals raised in nearly every State of the Nation. Its Chicago plant is the largest abattoir in the world, and there are 33 regional slaughtering plants besides.

In addition there are 240 branch houses, which serve as distribution points and also may do some processing like making sausage or slicing bacon. Then there are 60 creameries, tanneries, oil refineries, pharmaceutical plants, and soap works. Every week this mammoth oganization generates more than 2,000,000 sales tickets.

PROPAGATION OF BUREAUCRACY

Throw Government regulation into this complicated business mechanism and you really gum up the works. On food sales of $2,000,000,000 last year, this branch of the business produced earnings of only $3,540,134, less than a fifth of a penny per dollar of sales. And in the first quarter of this year, earnings were only a fifth of what they were during the first 3 months of 1951.

Government bureaucracy has forced the company itself to become more bureaucratic. Local sales managers must see to it that each of the millions of invoices is checked for compliance with the regulations and is initialed. The accounting department has had to devise 30 new forms to make the company's internal operations conform to the Federal strait-jacket.

On top of the present OPS bookkeeping chores, the huge company still is not unwound from the red tape of the old OPS. Invoices dating back to August 1938 have piled up in the company's storage vaults. Even slaughter orders, usually thrown out after 6 weeks, have to be saved for years now. At the Armour plant in Peoria, among others, the growing mountain of paper has forced the renting of outside storage space.

Armour currently is operating under more than 17 price regulations, plus hundreds of amendments and supplements. "Some have been amended so much there is more patch than kettle," an official comments.

ANALYZING AN ORDER

The issuance of a new OPS order usually results in a regular cabinet meeting of the top officers of the company.

"Our lawyers and accountants get together. Sometimes it takes 2 or 3 days to crystallize our ideas on what the Government is trying to tell us to do. Then instructions have to go out to the sales and production force. Plant superintendents are notified and conferences on OPS meat-cutting requirements are held," A. B. Blunck, official in charge of plant accounting, says.

Sometimes the OPS itself apparently doesn't know what it wants. When the agency issued its first big order, the general ceiling-price regulation, it specified that packers' prices be limited to the prices received on the top 10 percent of sales during the base period of December 19, 1950, to January 25, 1951.

Armour officials frantically phoned the OPS in Washington to find whether the 10 percent applied to the number of sales, or tonnage, or dollar volume; they were told it meant number of sales.

"OOPS"—MISTAKE

Imagine their surprise when an amendment came through a few days later specifying that the 10 percent meant dollar volume. This meant going through 11,000,000 invoiced items all over again, a waste of thousands of hours of tedious clerical labor.

As the present price control agency attempts to improve on its predecessors in World Wars I and II by plugging up loopholes, its orders have grown more and more complicated.

"A combination of the fine print on an insurance policy and Gray's Anatomy for third year medical students" is how one Armour official describes their readability.

"Even in a big company like ours it takes a panel of 'experts' to really understand these orders," another comments.

OVERSEEING COMPLIANCE

A committee of four Armour executives in Chicago—the branch house general manager, the general plant sales manager, and the heads of plant accounting and branch house accounting—oversee attempts to comply with the regulations. Under this committee is a working committee of members of the branch house sales department, the law department and the comptroller's office to see that OPS policies are carried out.

When a new OPS edict is issued, the company sends a special bulletin of instructions to 250 production executives and 1,050 sales managers and others. So far as this volume of simplified Armour versions of OPS price orders is 690 pages thick.

A statistically minded Armour accountant estimates this is equal to four man-years of continuous reading. "Figuring it took everyone 2 minutes a page to read the bulletins, and that is speedy for this stuff, it means that 1,300 of our people spent 29,900 man-hours or 1,245 days just reading, much less understanding, the material."

RAIL RATE CONFUSION

Whenever the Interstate Commerce Commission approves a change in railroad rates, Armour has to completely rejuggle its schedules of thousands of local price ceilings. Some idea of the problem can be gotten from this: For beef, the transportation differential is based on a theoretical shipment from Omaha or Denver to the place where the meat is sold; on veal actual transportation costs are figured in the ceiling.

Even the local mileage, from Armour's branch house to the eventual purchasers, alters the ceiling by a few cents. Some salesmen have to worry about as many as 15 different ceiling prices on one item in their line. Pity S. E. Watkins, manager of Armour's Denver sales division, which extends from Canada to Mexico. He has 11,000 different ceilings on veal alone.

Some meat items are too complicated for even the OPS to try to regulate by applying dollar-and-cents ceilings. On these the agency permits the packer to set his own ceiling by an intricate formula.

THE SAUSAGE SITUATION

Sausage is a good example of this. Armour makes more than 150 different kinds. But whenever OPS changes the method of computing ceilings, Armour has to notify each one of its more than 100,000 customers of the new ceiling price for each kind.

The sausage regulation, incidentally, was in the process of revision during the entire last 9 months of 1951, while the packers waited uneasily for OPS to make up its mind.

OPS insistence that packers cut meat the OPS way and no other is a source of constant irritation to Armour's production men.

"For years we have provided a beef tenderloin trimmed to the exact specifications of a big national restaurant chain," an Armour production man says. "The meat was trimmed to enable the restaurant chefs to cut it into uniform steaks. Now the OPS tells us we can't sell that type of a cut."

NEW PRODUCTS BALKED

"The door is closed to the development to many new items, too," he adds. "Take our line of frosted meats. They are in an 8-ounce pack, designed to fit into the ice cube compartment of any refrigerator. So far they have been a tremendous success. Luckily we had started with about six items before the OPS freeze went in. But now we'll have to wait for the OPS to end before adding to the line."

Every once in a while, amidst great hue and cry, the OPS sets out after alleged violators of its many regulations.

A suit filed this year in the Federal district court in Chicago is fairly typical. Amid flaring newspaper headlines, the Chicago regional director of OPS charged that 19 packing firms had bilked Chicago housewives of more than $1,000,000 by leaving a few fractions of an inch too much fat on pork loins and butts.

When the suit finally was filed, only five packers—Swift & Co., Armour & Co., Illinois Meat Co., Miller & Hart Co., and the Tobin Packing Co., were named.

DON QUIXOTE WEPT

Judge Michael L. Igoe speedily threw the case out of court. It developed that instead of dozens of complaining retailers there was only one; and he didn't show up at court. It also developed that the old OPA had brought the same charges 8 years ago.

At that time, Chester Bowles, OPA Administrator, had conceded. "We realize that the fat on a pork loin or butt is not to be measured with machine-tool precision. We

realize also that the mere presence of a few loins or butts which may have something more than one-half inch of fat does not constitute the type of violation which would be the basis for enforcement action."

[From the Wall Street Journal of April 9, 1952]

LIFE WITH OPS—GIANT RETAILER FLOUNDERS (IN SEXTUPLICATE) IN MORASS OF PAPERWORK—THE CASE OF THE BOOBY-TRAP BRIDE HAMSTRINGS FOUR MARSHALL FIELD EXECUTIVES—CPR-7 AND 26,000 FORMS

(By John S. Cooper)

CHICAGO.—The young bride-to-be was frantic. It was late Friday afternoon and she was to be married Saturday. Her bridal gown had to be altered, the sleeves lengthened and the waist ta'en in. Would Marshall Field & Co. please help her?

Field's did. The big Chicago department store has spent 100 years building up a reputation for coddling its customers and this was just one more little crisis to meet. A part-time seamstress in the alterations department broke store policy and volunteered to take the dress home with her. It was ready the next morning.

The bride never knew what a mess she had left in her wake. This special favor to a customer was booby-trapped with such a cluster of intricate Government regulations that it took four top store executives most of a morning to solve the riddle.

How much was the store to charge under the Office of Price Stabilization's Ceiling Price Regulation 34 covering special services? And what was the store to pay the seamstress for her time? By the time a company lawyer, the alterations section head, the personnel manager, and the store's price control expert had reached a conclusion the amount of executive salary spent was more than double Field's bill to the bride.

At the onset of the Government's current economic stabilization effort, Marshall Field & Co. set up a Government regulations department with nine people. The personnel department also added three new employees to cope with the complexities of wage and salary stabilization. But this increase in nonproductive salary expense is picayune, say company executives, when compared to the cost of thousands of hours of typing and checking involved in complying with just one Government regulation or to the indirect cost of disruption of established buying and merchandising practices.

Take the OPS' so-called margin order, CPR 7. This was highly touted as enabling the retailer to keep his normal profit margins. It requires the merchant to list what he paid for each item of merchandise in stock on a given date, the invoice number, and the percentage of mark-up and price asked by the store. This then became his ceiling chart for that particular category of merchandise.

CRYSTAL TO KLEENEX

Marshall Field carries about 750,000 different items, from Jacques Fath suits, Palter DeLiso shoes and Steuben crystal to things like Kleenex and bobby pins. Just to catalog them is a mighty chore.

"More than 20,000 hours of work by section managers and assistants were needed for the job," says a harried Field's official. "Twenty-six thousand pages of forms were used and more than 20,000 sheets of carbon paper."

The store's clerical staff was too small to do all the typing required and $5,000 worth of work at $1.95 an hour had to be farmed out to private stenographic services. Extra comptometers had to be rented by Field's huge toy department to figure the mark-up on each toy soldier and teddy bear. Field's attorneys made nine trips to Washington and even the china buyer and the meat buyer had to junket to the Nation's Capital to iron out tricky points in the regulation.

All told, CPR 7 cost Marshall Field & Co. several hundred thousand dollars—$75,000 in buyers' time alone. True, it resulted in forced price reductions totaling about $125,000, but a good many of the affected goods were luxury items or Field exclusives with only a remote bearing on the cost of living. The store normally carries an inventory of more than $20,000,000 worth of goods.

TWO-THOUSAND-PAGE SCHEDULE

The product of all this labor, Marshall Field's CPR-7 price schedule, 2,037 pages thick, is twice the length of Gone With the Wind and is done in sextuplicate to satisfy the demands of the price controllers. It covers 230 different categories of merchandise, but contains more than 1,300 separate price lists for these categories. The discrepancy is due to the fact that Field's 400-section store organization doesn't jibe with the OPS break-down of merchandise categories and there is much overlapping. The bedeviled buyer for the men's sportswear section, for example, had to make up 42 different category charts.

The basis for determining ceilings under CPR-7 was not the store's price on one given day, but the price in four different base periods, depending on the type of merchandise. Says a store executive: "We spent days combing through dusty file warehouses looking for invoices necessary to complete the records."

CPR-7 is just one of 131 separate price orders issued by the OPS to date. There are hundreds of amendments and supplements.

Occasionally, though, the retailer gets a break when the price agency puts out one of its "General Overriding Orders" freeing some commodity from controls. Like GOR-5, labeled "consumer durable goods," which exempted such things as artificial or preserved grass and plant stems, shoe horns, pin cushions, incense burners and bird cages. Or GOR-7 freeing imported cocoa, fried worms, frozen hollandaise sauce, wild rice, and smoked turkey soup. Or the one that took Campfire Girl and Boy Scout equipment out from under.

GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS STAFF

But still about 95 percent of the merchandise in Chicago's big State Street store is subject to controls. Keeping tabs on the price legality of all this widely assorted stuff is the Government Regulations Staff, launched by two veterans of old OPA days, Miss Dorothea van Westrenien and Mrs. Carolyn Millard, and now headed by Mrs. Millard. They try to interpret and simplify the painful OPS prose and put out a little newspaper of their own called the Price Control Bulletin which goes to the store's executive mailing list of about 500. The controls staff also is on hand for personal consultation with harassed section managers on their price problems.

The Field's staff members emphasize that their troubles are with the regulations rather than with the people the Government pays to administer them. The big store bends over backwards to comply with every letter of the law, and its relations with OPS personnel have been "as pleasant as possible, considering the regulations they have to work with."

Mrs. Millard remarks: "For weeks last year we worked around the clock and on week ends. One night I went to the symphony to relax. It was no use. Right in the middle of Brahms' Third I discovered I was figuring percentage markups in my head."

COULDN'T CATCH UP WITH CALLS

One morning she found 40 blue slips on her desk, indicating interoffice phone calls from frantic section managers. "I would go home at night still not caught up with all my phone calls," she says.

By now the little group has been through so many crises that they can take with humor some of the insane situations that develop from the Federal controllers' efforts.

The store staff can see the ridiculous side while scrupulously trying to find the basis for a ceiling price for the services of Aurora Brown, who designs linings for bassinets. Or while meticulously cataloguing with OPS such Field services as monograming baby's diapers, repairing dolls, buying theater tickets and rebinding rare books.

HARD TO SMILE

Some of the red tape is hard to smile at, the Field people admit. "Our price chart on toys was almost finished on the basis of markups in the October 1–December 10, 1950 period that the OPS asked for," Mrs. Millard recalls, when someone in Washington apparently discovered that department stores buy a lot of their Christmas toys earlier in the year, so the base period was changed to July through December. We started checking invoices all over again, a full month's work."

The rememorance of the early stages of the CPR-7 ordeal is gruesome to most retailers. On February 27, 1951, the OPS asked them to file complete price charts on 167 categories of merchandise by March 29. When that proved a physical impossibility for the nation's merchants, the deadline was put off till April 30, and 53 more categories were added, some overlapping those covered before so that stores had to redo many of their original tallies. "A reprieve accompanied by another load of buckshot," Mrs. Millard calls it. Then on April 29 there was another postponement until May 30. It was discovered that May 30 is a Memorial Day holiday in most States. So the OPS issued another clarification, allowing retailers to wait until May 31 to file their charts.

These section price charts now have become the buyers' bibles. They take them to market and try to concentrate their purchases in the particular areas on the chart where adequate markups are allowed.

DESTROYS INCENTIVES

"The present price system completely destroys the normal incentives of a buyer, trying to get a bargain or a good deal on a particular item," one Field section buyer comments.

Take the chart for log grates and andirons. If, for example, Field paid $6 for a fire screen that retailed for $8 during the base period, henceforth that 33 percent markup is the maximum that can be charged for any hearthside merchandise costing the store $6. It may have paid $6.10 for an item retailing for $9.95. Say the buyer now goes to market looking for new merchandise. What advantage can he gain by working his purchase price for fire screens down from $6.10 a unit to $6? All it would mean would be a tighter markup limit.

On one item for which the retail price was $3.95, Field thought the customer appeal would be greater if it were wrapped in cellophane. The manufacturer said he would do this for 50 cents extra a dozen. But this would raise the cost of the item to a bracket where the retail ceiling is $3.85, a loss to the store of 10 cents each. No cellophane.

HEADACHES IN CHINA

Field's biggest pricing headaches have been in china and toys, not usually conceded to be important factors in the battle against inflation. Here both CPR-7 and CPR-31 (imports) are in effect and a veritable jungle of price ceilings is the result.

The magnitude of the store's china problem arises from the fact that Field's has the world's largest china department, challenged only by Hudson's in Detroit and Macy's in New York. The store's china chart is the longest of any of the categories, running close to 100 single-spaced typed pages.

Even finding where to file a required price form is sometimes complicated. Marshall

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Field sells most of its merchandise from its big downtown store. Yet it operates three suburban branches, which makes it a chain store in the eyes of OPS, and most of its price charts have to be filed in Washington. However, the store has five tearooms and restaurants and more than 30 service establishments like dry cleaning shops, fur storage, and hair dressing. These prices must be filed in Chicago. Prices of imported goods generally are filed in the Chicago district office of OPS, but if the store imports something new to it, that price must be filed in Washington.

A MANUFACTURER, TOO

Marshall Field is a manufacturer as well as a merchant. Tucked away in the big store are candy kitchens, engravers, bakeries, ice-cream plants, gunsmiths, shirt makers, milliners, furriers, and dozens of other production operations which subject it to a wholly different series of price orders from the regular retail rules. The manufacturing side brings Field into contact with yet another Federal agency, the National Production Authority, on procurement of materials. And its frozen-foods department makes it subject to all sorts of grocery price rules.

For years, Field's has been importing linens and laces from Ireland and sending them to Puerto Rico for expert trimming and make-up. OPS rules have now pretty well monkey-wrenched this, the store's officials say.

"It seems that despite all the Government's talk about encouraging foreign trade they are doing everything they can to make it difficult," one of them adds.

In dealing with the NPA, the store's expert on this agency says: "It's a continuous battle to keep informed. For example, our electrical-appliance workshops haven't experienced much difficulty in getting materials to date. The chief difficulty is in learning what forms to fill out and how to go about getting them."

METAL-SAVING PROBLEMS

Not long ago NPA Order M-65 came out, titled "Conservation of Metal in Printing Plates." Field's had to send out several thousand letters to customers who had plates at the store for cards and personal stationery, notifying them that unless they responded their plates would have to be scrapped. This notification process now must be carried through every 3 months, by Government edict.

Over in personnel, things are just about as hectic. Lloyd Richmond, who handles the wage- and salary-stabilization problems of the store's 10,000 employees, has been trying to take a Sunday off for weeks. And without much success.

He remarks: "Our store has 400 sections and the method of compensation in each section is a little different from that of other sections. Some are on hourly rates, some on incentive rates, and some are on straight salary. Then there are many departments working on salary plus commission and some on straight commission with a minimum drawing account."

Employees who are paid on a commission basis are subject to Wage Regulation 20, which finally was issued on February 13, 1952. This ruling is so complicated that Samuel Edes, chairman of the Chicago Regional Wage Stabilization Board, at a recent personnel clinic here, frankly admitted that he had read it several times and still didn't know what it meant.

MISTAKES ARE HAZARDOUS

A mistake in interpretation of a WSB order is ultra-hazardous. Not only can the added wage bill be disallowed as a corporate-income-tax deduction, but the Government can levy stiff penalties against a company.

For this reason Field's has had to centralize its wage policy making and become more bureaucratic on its own. Says Mr. Richmond: "Formerly, every 6 months division heads could make their own salary review and recommend raises, which were granted, and then submitted to personnel for a postaudit."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Think of the cost which is involved, the time, and the nuisance value. The harassment is without end.

Somehow other countries seem to know better than we do. I notice from a dispatch to the New York Times from Michael L. Hoffman, that over in Holland they have shown that an economy on crutches can throw away those crutches and not only stand but also walk better and with more confidence than before. So the Dutch removed the controls. They receive mutual security aid from us, so they removed the controls. We go without mutual security aid, and we remain under controls.

Canada had no controls to speak of in the first place, and is getting rid of what she had, including some credit controls. The astonishing thing is that if one goes across the line and buys something for a dollar, the clerk will say, "Three more pennies, if you please, because our dollar is more valuable than yours." Canada has no controls. A free system is operating up there—certainly freer than ours. Yet we propose, according to the recommendation of the committee, to keep this country in a strait-jacket.

One could discuss this subject from now until doomsday, but there would be no point in doing so. I shall wind up my part of the discussion by saying that we are burdening a free economy, although probably only 15 percent of our entire national product is involved. Why do we not give our economy a chance? Why do we depend upon incompetent bureaucrats to do the job? With a little adjustment we could find our way into the clear, because there is a flexibility about a free economy which cannot be matched by any other kind of economy. Must we persist in having a potato black market? Probably we shall have other black markets before we are through.

We hear the argument that it is only for a few months. I remind Senators that rent control has been in operation for 10 years. I ask, How much longer? I am not swayed by the assurance that all that is at interest here is to get on an even keel. I am not forgetting that the bill introduced by my friend Representative SPENCE, of Kentucky, which was the core of controls, was introduced on the 15th of February 1949, 16 months before Korea. Is there someone so loyal to a strange new doctrine that he is more interested in placing America in a strait-jacket than he is in production? This is a good time to test it. This is a good time for the Senate to rise to its responsibility by supporting the pending amendment to terminate on June 30, 1952, a harassment of American business which is like a road block in the way of production.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. CAPEHART, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays; and the yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays having been ordered on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, is the amendment subject to debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to discuss the situation, although I shall be rather brief.

Mr. President, I believe that no one in the country has been more disappointed with the administration of the Defense Production Act—which the Congress approved about the first of September 1950, as I recall—than I have been. I think it has been one of the most bady abused and badly manipulated pieces of legislation that this Congress or any other Congress has enacted.

When we recall the days of the late summer of 1950, we realize that at that time Congress felt that there should be some authority to impose price controls and wage controls in the United States. At that time it seemed that there might be a world-wide conflict. So we gave the President the authority he requested, and we also provided authority for the imposition of wage controls and price controls.

Mr. President, wage controls and price controls treat the symptoms of inflation, but they do not cure it. Wage controls and price controls are a means of holding prices and wages within reason, while more effective, long-range methods get into operation.

The President did not see fit to impose either wage controls or price controls in the fall of 1950, when they could really have been effective. I believe that was pointed out only yesterday by Mr. Bernard Baruch, when he appeared before one of our committees. Not only did the President not see fit to impose wage controls and price controls when wages and prices were at a level which would have made such application of controls really effective; but instead of doing that, the administrative authorities took several steps which had the effect of inducing inflation in the country. They opened up—I am using the brief description of it—approximately $8,000,000,000 of new credit, which was made available to speculators and processors. Approximately 60 percent of it was bor-

rowed by speculators and processors, who promptly went into the market to buy war materials, and in that connection bid against each other, and thus bid up prices. In particular, the price of cotton soared almost high enough to reach the sky, and the price of wool and the prices of other commodities rose markedly—all as a result of the action of the administrative officials of the Federal Government in making available, for speculative purposes, those large amounts of new money.

That situation was very descriptively pointed out by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in an address he made to the Senate on Washington's Birthday, 1951. If anyone wishes to find out how prices happened to shoot skyward in the United States, if he will read the speech made on February 22, 1951, by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], he will learn at least one reason why prices rose so high.

In the late fall and early winter of 1950–51, high Government officials scared the daylights out of the consumers by repeatedly and continually predicting a scarcity of commodities and high prices, although commodities were not scarce and need not have been at all high priced. In fact, afterward that fact developed. Those Government officials created a buying panic by consumers, with the result that—naturally—prices rose; the consumers bought tremendous amounts of the goods then immediately available in the stores, and prices rose and rose, reaching levels so high that about the first of February 1951, as I recall, the President imposed wage controls and price controls.

At about that time prices leveled off—although not because of the imposition of price controls and wage controls, but because the Government stopped putting paper money on the market—as can be pointed out by the Senator from Illinois and others who are very familiar with that situation. Prices then leveled off, and stayed at fairly reasonable levels for some time.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I was wondering, after hearing the Senator's observation, whether prices rose to the OPS ceilings?

Mr. AIKEN. I shall touch on that point a little later.

Since the time when prices leveled off more or less, in the spring of 1951, the principal function of the OPS has been to impress upon the people of the United States that the existence of the OPS is necessary at this time, and that its future existence is also necessary.

Mr. President, it is safe to say that for the last year and one-half, the prices to consumers have, on the whole, been higher than they would have been if no price controls at all had been applied or if there had not been any stimulation by Government officials of panic buying by consumers.

I shall not discuss in detail the Wage Stabilization Board. I believe its operations have not been in the interest of the people who work in the small towns and the small plants. I base that observation on reports which have come to me from working people in some of the smaller plants. In one instance, a delegation of laboring people called on me and complained because in one town, where there was a new plant, the employees had a wage ceiling of $1.10 an hour, but in another town—only 15 miles away—the employees in a plant where similar work was done had a wage ceiling of $1.85 an hour.

I do not wish to go into that. I am not sufficiently familiar with it. But my personal observation is that the wage-stabilization efforts have been of a perverted variety and have not functioned as they should have. What I wanted to do specifically was to point out what was happening in the agricultural field as a result of OPS manipulations and cooperation with the Department of Agriculture. I want to cite two or three instances to show how their operations have been depressing prices to farmers, causing them to lose money, and putting prices up to consumers.

I should like to talk about hogs and pork for a moment. As the Members of the Senate know, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to support pork prices up to 90 percent of parity. The purpose of this, of course, is to insure an adequate supply to the consumer, and to assure the farmer that if he produces an adequate supply he will not run the risk of losing his shirt, so to speak, by so doing. Pork prices for several years have been fairly satisfactory. During the past winter, pork prices began to fall. They continued to fall, finally to as low as 15 cents a pound, I think, or around 15 cents a pound. The Secretary of Agriculture had the full authority all this time to support those prices at 90 percent of parity. He did not do so. The result was that farmers in the great hog-producing areas of the United States, including Minnesota and Iowa and other States in that part of the country, this spring sold their brood sows. They sold a great many of them, hundreds of them, thousands of them, just as it was time for them to farrow their pigs. The price became so low that the farmers could not see any sense in keeping them for the purpose of raising more pork, to be sold at a very low price, so they sold them. After those hundreds and thousands of sows had been sold, the Secretary then came forward with a pork-buying program, which started the price up again.

Mr. President, it is almost a certainty that there will be a shortage of pork next fall. It cannot be otherwise. As the result of failing to support the price of pork last winter, the Government officials have guaranteed a shortage of pork with consequent high prices next fall, immediately before election time.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Before I yield to the Senator from Minnesota, I should like to emphasize that, by failing to support the price of pork, as authorized by law, Government officials forced the farmers of this country to sell their brood sows, thereby guaranteeing that pork would be scarce and prices high next fall. I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in the remarks of the senior Senator from Vermont. He has made a very pertinent statement on this question. The price of pork to the producer went down throughout the winter months. In fact, the decline began late last fall, and it continued persistently for several months. There were those of us serving on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who in February and also in the month of March called the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture to the fact that the price of pork was far below parity and that the supply of pork to consumers in the calendar year 1953 was threatened because of the reduction in the number of brood sows upon the farms.

The Secretary did not sympathize either with the position of the farmers or with the views expressed by the members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. He did not make pork purchases until the heavy run of fall pigs had ended, in February, March, and April of this year. When the pork was off the farm and in the hands of the processor and the wholesaler, the Secretary then purchased pork, forcing the market up from $15.35 to $23 plus, within a few weeks. Who received the benefit? It was not the producer who raised the pork. It was not the consumer who purchased at the retail establishments throughout the country.

I want to support the very able and distinguished Senator from Vermont in his statement, because nothing has been more injurious to the farm-support program and to the producers than the action of the Secretary of Agriculture within the past 5 months, relating to pork prices. The Secretary has authority under the act to make purchases, he has section 32 funds to be used in making purchases, and he should have purchased. The school-lunch program should have had the benefit of that, and the result would have been to stabilize the agricultural economy as it should have been stabilized. I merely wanted to support the very able and distinguished Senator from Vermont in his statement on this question.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Minnesota is entirely correct. He has described the situation accurately. I recall that in early April I received a letter from a hog grower from the Senator's State, reporting the sale of 25 or 30 brood sows that had been just ready to farrow perhaps 200 young porkers, which would have been available for market this fall, had they not gone to market in their mothers this spring.

The Department of Agriculture had full congressional authority to prevent that, yet the Department did not see fit to support the price of pork until the brood sows had been marketed and the price had begun to rise. The Department then went into the market and bought, causing the price to rise suddenly to 23 cents. It rose from 15 cents a pound to 23 cents a pound. No one

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

knows how much higher it will go. I am expecting to hear any day from the OPS that they are imposing a ceiling, Mr. President, which will simply be the result of the failure of the Department of Agriculture to support the price.

I now desire to say something about potatoes. Much has been said about potatoes. As I pointed out when the Senator from Illinois was speaking, the shortage of old potatoes during the past winter was caused by the fact that approximately 20 percent of them rotted in the field in some areas because of adverse weather conditions. There simply were not quite enough to go around. Yet that shortage could easily have been made up through heavier plantings of early potatoes in Florida and in other early-potato-growing sections, had it not been that Mr. DiSalle saw fit to impose a 100 percent ceiling on potatoes, applicable to early potatoes as well as to the old late potatoes .

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I cannot too strongly support the statement just made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont. I have quite a number of letters from producers of early potatoes in my State, the State of Florida, written in the winter and early spring, stating that they simply were afraid to plant their acreage of potatoes with the ceiling staring them in the face, and that they did not plant. That meant, of course, as the Senator has said, that there were fewer early potatoes.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct. They could not afford to plant early potatoes, with the certainty that if they had a big acreage they could not obtain a price that would not justify the risk involved, and that, if they marketed those potatoes before they were fully grown, as is done in the early producing sections, they were certain to incur a loss.

The report of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics on the vegetable situation for January, 1952, bears out what we have been saying. I read a short excerpt from the report:

ADEQUATE POTATO STOCK JANUARY 1, 1952

Stocks of 97,000,000 bushels of merchantable potatoes were held on January 1, 1952, by growers and local dealers in or near the areas where produced. While these holdings are 40 percent smaller than the record stocks a year earlier, they are only about 5,225,000 bushels smaller after excluding the 59,000,000 bushels of merchantable potatoes the Government purchased after January 1, 1951. This relatively small net difference could be offset by possible increases in production this year in early States.

That is the significant part of the statement.

Mr. DiSalle slapped a hundred percent ceiling on, which precludes farmers in the early-growing States from planting potatoes.

I was very much shocked and surprised when it was done, because farmers could not possibly take a chance with that 100 percent ceiling, and on January 9, 1952, I wrote a letter to Mr. DiSalle which I should like to read into the RECORD:

JANUARY 9, 1952.

Mr. MICHAEL V. DISALLE,
Director, Office of Price Stabilization,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: I read with interest your order establishing ceiling prices on potatoes at 100 percent of parity. You have made a bad mistake in doing this.

Potatoes are high this year because there are not enough to go around. The effect of this order will be to guarantee an even shorter supply for next year. What you are doing in effect is telling the farmers that no matter how much they may lose during periods of low prices, they can never hope to get more than a fair normal as the highest prices.

The Price Control Act in effect during World War II provided for a minimum of 110 percent of parity ceiling on agricultural commodities. This minimum made allowance for fluctuating prices throughout the year so that farmers could hope for a fair average price the year around.

Your action in fixing ceiling at 100 percent of parity guarantees that the potato grower cannot hope for a fair average price. Such action could well lead to a 1952 crop so small as to necessitate rationing.

Instead of rationing we got black markets.

Your action will also guarantee to the consumer that she cannot hope to secure potatoes this coming year for less than what she is paying today.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE D. AIKEN.

My letter was not very effective. Mike wrote back a very nice reply, but he did not do anything about it, and we have the potato situation as it is today and as it is likely to continue for some time. There may temporarily be some relief, but it is not coming from the earliest-producing sections which could have filled the gap between supply and demand, and, in all probability the potato growers this year will plant less than they did last year. Unless there is an exceptionally good crop, we shall go to another year without anywhere near enough potatoes to go around.

Mr. President, I want to speak briefly with reference to the manipulating of the soybean market by the OPS.

The income from soybeans comes from two processed commodities, oil and meal. The meal is used largely by livestock feeders and by dairymen and poultrymen. The oil goes into the manufacture of oleomargine, shortening, and other commodities which the housewife uses in cooking. I forget when it was that the OPS placed a ceiling of $74 a ton on meal and a ceiling of 22 cents a pound on oil. The market price on oil went to 9½ cents a pound. The processors could not buy soybeans and sell the oil for 9½ cents a pound and the meal at $74 a ton. As has been pointed out, the largest processor, the Staley Co., of Illinois, has stopped the processing of soybeans. It just could not go on. But in the early spring there was so much protest that the OPS officials realized they had to take some cognizance of the situation. So they considered raising the ceiling on soybean meal.

I have here, Mr. President, a copy of a memorandum dated April 14, 1952, addressed: "All Subsequent Signers," signed by Francis C. Jones, Assistant Director, Food and Restaurant Division of the OPS. The title of the memorandum is "Justification for Proposed Action on Soybean Meal."

The proposed action, which subsequently became effective, was raising the price of meal to $81 a ton, and lowering the ceiling on oil to 16½ cents a pound.

As was pointed out by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], they used some antiquated method of arriving at the ceiling price. It was an utterly impracticable method. I shall not go into it here except for one purpose. I have mentioned that the action of OPS was taken with the full knowledge and approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, and I read this paragraph on page 1 of the memorandum of Mr. Francis C. Jones:

The argument has been advanced that since protein meals are in tight supply, we should set these ceilings at a level higher than that indicated by the historical price relationship to corn in order to encourage efficient use of the protein feeds. Until such time as the Secretary of Agriculture may suggest this, I do not believe that we should make such an adjustment.

There are dairy people in the United States, Mr. President, crying for proteins which they cannot get, and the OPS, with the full knowledge and approval of the Department of Agriculture, made it impossible to relieve that situation.

I go to page 2 of the memorandum and read further from it:

It should be noted that the current price of soybean oil (9.5 cents as compared with a proposed ceiling of 16.5 cents) together with the proposed ceiling for soybean meal will reflect only $2.56 per bushel compared with the legal minimum price of $3.23. An actual realization of $2.56 would be also slightly below the current support price announced by the Department of Agriculture for 1951 crop beans. In view of the Secretary of Agriculture's letter to Governor Arnall, these facts do not seem to disturb the Department, at least for the remainder of the crop year. If we were to set our soy bean meal ceiling at a point where the combined meal ceiling and actual oil price would reflect the legal minimum price to growers, we would have to increase it to $109 per ton.

That paragraph shows conclusively that the OPS knew they were violating the law. It shows conclusively that they were deliberately putting a ceiling on soybeans 69 cents a bushel below the legal limit established by law, and it shows conclusively that the Secretary of Agriculture was not in the least disturbed by it. That is why I asked the Senator from South Carolina what, if anything, could be done to prevent the deliberate and flagrant violations of the law by the Office of Price Stabilization.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield. I knew the Senator knew nothing about this situation when I asked him the question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, I have nothing but contempt for anyone who violates the laws of Congress. My information was that the price went down because there was a big crop. I know the price of cottonseed went down because there was a big cotton crop. I

want to assure the Senator again that if the laws are violated the committee will look into it. I know something about cottonseed. The price dropped because of a 16,000,000-bale crop and a small export demand.

The same thing happened in the case of soybeans. As the Senator stated, when a big crop is produced, as, for example, in the case of potatoes, the price goes down. The law of supply and demand begins to operate.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct, as far as the information given his committee is concerned. However, this memorandum shows conclusively that the price went down because the OPS forced it down by making it impossible to sell meal.

Mr. MAYBANK. The same thing happened in the case of cottonseed. I had to suffer with my own friends at home. I regretted so much that the farmers who raised cotton did not get $100 or $80 or $60 for cottonseed, but the price went down and down because they raised a big crop.

Mr. AIKEN. Well, the price is going down on protein meal, but people in the great dairy producing areas of New York, New Jersey, and New England could not get it, because it was impossible to put it on the market.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not know about the impossibility of putting it on the market, but I must admit that the dairy people had complaints because they could not buy at low prices. But they also want a high price for milk.

Mr. AIKEN. I know the Senator from South Carolina does not condone what went on.

Mr. MAYBANK. No.

Mr. AIKEN. I know he is probably the last Member of the Senate who would condone this sort of thing.

I should like now to read from the records of the OPS.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate the Senator's statement. I have read from the OPS reports, and some of the things I read from them I could never condone. Nevertheless, the price of cottonseed went down because the farmers made a big crop; and the price of potatoes went down because they made a big crop.

The Senator argues about the price of potatoes going up. Support prices were taken away from potatoes by the Senate and House after we had spent millions and millions of dollars to keep the price up. The potatoes were burned. Then the price went up because potatoes were not planted, for the reason that the Government was not going to buy the surplus.

Mr. AIKEN. I read further from the OPS memorandum by Mr. Jones:

Justification for raising soybean meal ceiling.

The decision as to whether or not we should increase the soybean meal ceiling at this time is a rather close one to make.

This was April 14, 1952.

If we increase the ceiling, no faction will be particularly satisfied. The Secretary of Agriculture will not like it, and the soybean meal crushers will not be satisfied. The only action that would satisfy the crushers would be either decontrol or setting the meal ceiling at the free market level (which, of course, is practically the same thing as decontrol). On the other hand, if we do not increase the ceiling, we will be more vulnerable to attack from the crushers since our ceiling would not be in line with ceilings for other feeds.

We believe that our feed ceilings should bear correct relationships to each other, and and for this reason, recommend that the ceiling price for soybean meal be increased to $81 per ton bulk, Decatur.

Decatur happens to be the home of the soybean processing plant which was affected by their action.

Our position will be considerably strengthened if this is done.

Mineralized meal and toll charge problems.

In order to evade our $74 soybean meal ceiling, the crushers have produced mineralised meal and instituted the practice of toll charging. This has resulted in a realized price of about $90 per ton for soybean meal. The net effect of these practices has not been a wider margain to the processors, but has been a higher price to soybean growers. These evasive devices were evidently started by the expeller type processor in an attempt to stay in business and then adopted by the solvent processors. As the solvent processors came into the mineralized meal and toll charge picture, the expeller's advantage was lessened and his profit margin presumably reverted to its original position. Thus, in the final analysis the only net gain was to the growers in the form of a higher price for beans.

So what bothered the OPS was that not the processors, but the growers got this extra price which was secured through, we might say, a method of legally evading their rules by adding certain minerals, and so forth, to the meal, and selling it for a higher price.

The letter continues:

We propose to tighten our regulations so that the soybean meal ceiling cannot be evaded via mineralized meal and toll charge avenues. This action probably will result in a lowering of the price paid growers for beans to about the support price level. It may be that if the Secretary of Agriculture had known that this supplementary action was to be taken, he would not have recommended against an increase in the price of soybean meal.

That does not jibe at all with the inference given the Committee on Agriculture by the Secretary the other day, that he did not connive with the OPS in any way in holding down the farm price.

I finish the statement:

We believe that the Director should inform the Secretary of these proposed actions.

I do not know whether he did or not.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire memorandum printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 14, 1952.

To all subsequent signers.
From Francis C. Jones, Assistant Director, Food and Restaurant Division.

JUSTIFICATION FOR PROPOSED ACTION ON SOYBEAN MEAL

DERIVATION OF IN-LINE SOYBEAN MEAL CEILING

Since the original justification for an advance in soybean meal ceilings to $88 per ton bulk, Decatur, was written, further analysis has been made of price relationships between the major high-protein feeds and corn. In the original analysis soybean meal was related directly to corn for the years 1948 to 1950. Earlier years were excluded on the grounds that the supply of and demand for soybean meal had changed substantially since pre-World War II years. The analysis presented here is of a somewhat different nature, and, we believe, produces better in-lineness of prices within the high-protein feed category and between high-protein feeds and corn.

Recognizing that there is a much tighter relationship between the prices of the various high-protein feeds than between the price of any one protein feed and corn, we have related the price of cottonseed meal to the price of corn over a long period of years, determined the price ceiling for cottonseed meal based upon the parity price of corn, and the historical relationship indicated by this long-term analysis; and then derived ceilings for the other high-protein feeds from the ceiling for cottonseed meal and the historical price relationship between each individual feed and cottonseed meal. Cottonseed meal was selected as the tie-in commodity to corn rather than soybean meal because it has been produced in considerable volume for a long period of years. By this process of making one tie-in to corn and deriving all other high-protein feed ceilings from the cottonseed meal ceiling, we will arrive at sounder price ceiling relationships between the protein feeds than if we derived each protein ceiling from a direct tie-in to corn.

The cottonseed meal-corn analysis made use of the following factors:

X_1—Cottonseed meal price.

X_2—Corn price.

X_3—Percent oilseed meal supply of corn supply.

X_4—Time.

The analysis included the years 1926–50, excluding the war years of 1942–45. The coefficient of multiple determination was .955. Based on the parity price for corn, the equivalent price for cottonseed meal bagged at Memphis is $84.50 per ton.

The argument has been advanced that since protein meals are in tight supply, we should set these ceilings at a level higher than that indicated by the historical price relationship to corn in order to encourage efficient use of the protein feeds. Until such time as the Secretary of Agriculture may suggest this, I do not believe that we should make such an adjustment.

Soybean meal prices were related directly to cottonseed meal prices for the years 1930–49. A coefficient of determination of .96 was obtained. There was no indication of an increase in demand for soybean meal relative to cottonseed meal during this period. With cottonseed meal at $84.50, the in-line price for soybean meal bulk, Decatur, would be $81 per ton.

The argument has been presented previously that we should start with the historical relationship, and then increase the soybean meal price by a few dollars to take account of potential increases in demand for soybean meal relative to cottonseed meal due to the addition of antibiotics and vitamins to mixed feeds using soybean meal. Such an adjustment would be purely subjective since we have no past experience to go on.

GROWER PRICE REFLECTION AND FAIR AND EQUITABLE MARGIN TO PROCESSORS

The recommended price ceiling for soybean meal together with the previously recommended revision in the soybean oil ceiling to 16.5 cents per pound will, if realized by crushers, reflect the legal minimum price to growers and a 35 cent per bushel margin

to solvent processors. The margin for processors using the expeller process would be only about 8 cents per bushel, obviously resulting in a net loss for this type of processing. We do not believe it makes economic sense to set the oil and meal ceilings at a level that will theoretically reflect an adequate margin for expeller type processors for two reasons. First, the expeller type has been losing out to the solvent type over a long period of years and today represents only about 20–30 percent of total crushing capacity. Second, if this is done, it will only mean that the solvent crusher will bid up the price of beans to the point where he puts a squeeze on the expeller crushers' profit. Thus, the only thing that would be accomplished by the Office of Price Stabilization would be a higher price for oil and/or meal.

It should be noted that the current price of soybean oil (9.5 cents as compared with a proposed ceiling of 16.5 cents) together with the proposed ceiling for soybean meal will reflect only $2.56 per bushel compared with the legal minimum price of $3.23. An actual realization of $2.56 would be also slightly below the current support price announced by the Department of Agriculture for 1951 crop beans. In view of the Secretary of Agriculture's letter to Governor Arnall, these facts do not seem to disturb the Department, at least for the remainder of the crop year. If we were to set our soybean meal ceiling at a point where the combined meal ceiling and actual oil price would reflect the legal minimum price to growers, we would have to increase it to $109 per ton.

JUSTIFICATION FOR RAISING SOYBEAN MEAL CEILING

The decision as to whether or not we should increase the soybean-meal ceiling at this time is a rather close one to make. If we increase the ceiling, no faction will be particularly satisfied. The Secretary of Agriculture will not like it, and the soybean-meal crushers will not be satisfied. The only action that would satisfy the crushers would be either decontrol or setting the meal ceiling at the free market level (which, of course, is practically the same thing as decontrol). On the other hand, if we do not increase the ceiling, we will be more vulnerable to attack from the crushers since our ceiling would not be in line with ceilings for other feeds.

We believe that our feed ceilings should bear correct relationships to each other, and for this reason, recommend that the ceiling price for soybean meal be increased to $81 per ton bulk, Decatur. Our position will be considerably strengthened if this is done.

MINERALIZED MEAL AND TOLL CHARGE PROBLEMS

In order to evade our $74 soybean-meal ceiling, the crushers have produced mineralized meal and instituted the practice of toll charging. This has resulted in a realized price of about $90 per ton for soybean meal. The net effect of these practices has not been a wider margin to the processors, but has been a higher price to soybean growers. These evasive devices evidently were started by the expeller type processor in an attempt to stay in business and then adopted by the solvent processors. As the solvent processors came into the mineralized meal and toll charge picture, the expeller's advantage was lessened and his profit margin presumably reverted to its original position. Thus, in the final analysis the only net gain was to the growers in the form of a higher price for beans.

We propose to tighten our regulations so that the soybean-meal ceiling cannot be evaded via mineralized meal and toll charge avenues. This action probably will result in a lowering of the price paid growers for beans to about the support-price level. It may be that if the Secretary of Agriculture had known that this supplementary action was to be taken, he would not have recommended against an increase in the price of soybean meal. We believe that the Director should inform the Secretary of these proposed actions.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it is said that perhaps the OPS did not know that what it was doing would have a distressing effect upon soybean producers, dairymen, and stock feeders.

I hold in my hand another memorandum, dated April 17, 1952, 3 days after Mr. Jones' memorandum was submitted to his superiors. This memorandum is from J. W. Zipoy, Chief of the Feed Section, Grains, Feeds, Seeds, and Bakery Branch.

Subject: Objection to setting the ceiling of soybean meal at $81 per ton.

I quote as follows from Mr. Zipoy's memorandum:

I cannot express too strenuously my objections to the change in decision whereby the ceiling price of soybean meal was set at $81. I am of the opinion that, on the basis of all sound and realistic principles, a ceiling price of less than $88 per ton is wholly indefensible. The reasons set forth in justification of the $88 ceiling price in the memorandum originally submitted by Mr. J. W. Klein, remain valid, and are in no way weakened by the arguments set forth in the justification memorandum of Mr. Francis C. Jones. More specifically, I object to the ceiling of $81 per ton for the following reasons:

1. The ceiling price of soybean meal must be based on factors other than the past historical soybean meal, corn or soybean meal, cottonseed meal price relationships.

2. Adjusting these historical price relationships for the new uses and for the present and future short- and long-run demand for soybean meal should yield a ceiling price of at least $88 per ton.

3. Setting a ceiling price of less than $88 per ton will put the entire soybean crushing industry in a loss position.

In other words, Mr. Zipoy said the soybean processing plants would be closed if the OPS went through with their proposed plan:

4. Setting a ceiling price of less than $38 per ton will result in greatly aggravating the present critical shortage of protein feeds.

They could talk about a big crop, but they could not market it. He told them there was a shortage, which there was, as we folks in the Northeast know.

5. Setting a ceiling price of less than $88 will create unmanageable enforcement problems.

6. Setting a ceiling price of less than $88 is very poor policy from the standpoint of public relations with the farmer, with the soybean crushing industry, and with the mixed-feed industry.

7. An increase in soybean oil meal does not necessitate an increase in any other protein feeds.

Those were the reasons set forth by Mr. J. W. Zipoy, protesting against the manner in which the OPS was manipulating the soybean market.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point Mr. Zipoy's complete memorandum.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 17, 1952.

To all subsequent signers.
From J. W. Zipoy, Chief, Feed Section, Grain, Feeds, Seeds, and Bakery Branch.
Subject: Objection to setting the ceiling of soybean meal at $81 per ton.

I cannot express too strenuously my objections to the change in decision whereby the ceiling price of soybean meal was set at $81. I am of the opinion that, on the basis of all sound and realistic principles, a ceiling price of less than $88 per ton is wholly indefensible. The reasons set forth in justification of the $88 ceiling price in the memorandum originally submitted by Mr. J. W. Klein, remain valid and are in no way weakened by the arguments set forth in the justification memorandum of Mr. Francis C. Jones. More specifically, I object to the ceiling of $81 per ton for the following reasons:

1. The ceiling price of soybean meal must be based on factors other than the past historical soybean meal, corn or soybean meal, cottonseed-meal price relationships.

2. Adjusting these historical price relationships for the new uses and for the present and future short- and long-run demand for soybean meal should yield a ceiling price of at least $83 per ton.

3. Setting a ceiling price of less than $88 per ton will put the entire soybean-crushing industry in a loss position.

4. Setting a ceiling price of less than $88 per ton will result in greatly aggravating the present critical shortage of protein feeds.

5. Setting a ceiling price of less than $88 will create unmanageable enforcement problems.

6. Setting a ceiling price of less than $88 is very poor policy from the standpoint of public relations with the farmer, with the soybean-crushing industry, and with the mixed-feed industry.

7. An increase in soybean-oil meal does not necessitate an increase in any other protein feeds.

A discussion of each of these points follows:

1. The ceiling price of soybean meal must be based on factors other than the past historical soybean meal, corn or soybean meal, cottonseed-meal price relationships. The revolution in recent years in the use to which soybean meal is being put and the unprecedented increased demand for this product makes any historical price relationship between either soybean meal and corn or between soybean meal and cottonseed meal a wholly unreliable basis upon which to set a ceiling price for soybean meal. This revolution in the use and demand for soybean meal is a result of two factors:

The first is an unprecedented increase in poultry numbers. Since soybean meal is a basic ingredient in all poultry feeds, an unprecedented increase in the demand for soybean meal has resulted. This increase is charted in schedule I.

Second, the use of soybean meal in mixed feed has increased tremendously since the discovery that the animal protein factor could be combined with soybean meal to replace animal protein feeds. Today the average ton of poultry ration will contain 360 pounds of soybean meal instead of the 220 pounds that was formerly used. This is an increase of 61 percent in demand that occurred almost entirely in the past 2 years, while under price control. Had there been no controls, the price would have soared in proportion to the demand increase.

Corn- and cottonseed-meal usage renders an APF combination unfeasible and no de-

mand increase for that reason has occurred in these ingredients. As a result, the historical relationships used to justify a $81 ceiling price for soybean meal should have no relevance insofar as establishing realistic ceilings is concerned, except to the extent to which the relationship can and must be adjusted to reflect the recent paramount importance of soybean meal in the feed ingredient, feed, grain, and mixed-feed picture. Nothing more clearly illustrates the unreliability of applying historical price relationships than a comparison of present soybean-meal prices and present corn prices. The present selling price of soybean meal is about $90 per ton, or $16 above the soybean-meal ceiling price. An explanation of how the soybean-meal ceiling has been pierced to this extent is set forth about $1.81 per bushel, or 19 cents below ceiling price undamaged. It is to be noted that below-ceiling prices for corn have prevailed through the past season even though the supply of undamaged corn is low as a result of climatic conditions. If historical price relationships, however, were any reliable indicia of relative values and relative demand, soybean meal should now be selling at no higher than its present ceiling price of $74 per ton. Consequently, we object to the basis upon which a ceiling price of $81 per ton was arrived at; namely, the basis of a straight historical relationship without any adjustments whatsoever.

2. Adjusting these historical price relationships for the new uses, and for the present and future short- and long-run demand for soybean meal should yield a ceiling price of at least $88 per ton. An objection has been raised in Mr. Jones' memorandum to the adjustment of historical relationships because such an adjustment could not be based upon the same wealth of data upon which the historical relationship itself is predicated. It is also alleged that any adjustment would be subjective and not based on any past experience. Nothing could be further from the truth. The radical change in the extensive use and the demand for soybean meal is an actual fact which past and present experience clearly establishes. Of course, the absence of the same degree of data that we have for historical relationships is no justification for refusing to adjust that relationship. This is especially so where the alternatives are an application of historical relationships and unrealistic ceilings on the one hand and an adjustment of historical relationships in the establishment of sound ceiling prices based upon the intelligent exercise of judgment on the other hand. This Agency can and must often base its decisions upon incomplete data when realistic decisions cannot be held in abeyance until such data has accumulated or until problems demanding action become historical problems rather than present ones. A downward revision in soybean-oil ceiling prices, for instance, is being put into effect simultaneously with the issuance of the soybean-meal regulation when present conditions indicate that the present ceiling prices for the oil are unrealistic. At the present time, the ceiling price and the selling price for soybean meal is, in effect, $90 per ton. From all indications, the future short- and long-run demand for soybean meal will increase—not decrease—for reasons already set forth. Accordingly, if a ceiling price for soybean meal is set to reflect the demand and this value, approximately reflected in the $90 price as well it must, the ceiling price for the product must be set at about that level. A ceiling price of $88 per ton is, therefore, the lowest level that can soundly be justified.

3. Setting a ceiling price of less than $88 per ton will put the entire soybean-crushing industry in a loss position. In addition, a ceiling price of less than $88 is without justification insofar as its effect on the soybean meal crushing industry is concerned. Even assuming a market price of 11 cents per pound for soybean oil, that is a price that is 2 cents per pound over the present probable future price for oil, and using soybean prices which are considerably below ceiling prices, a price for meal of less than $88 per ton would put the solvent crushers in a loss position. Figures clearly indicating this to be so are set forth in schedule II of this memorandum. Since the solvent crushers are the most efficient operators in the industry, this, of course, means that a ceiling price of less than $88 per ton will put the entire soybean-crushing industry in a loss position.

4. Setting a ceiling price of less than $88 per ton will result in greatly aggravating the present critical shortage of protein feeds. It is clear that if a price of less than $88 per ton is set for soybean meal, the crushers will simply cease operating rather than operate at the heavy losses that they will experience under that lower ceiling. As a result, there will be no soybean production to supplement the already critical shortage of high-protein feedstuffs. Since soybean meal is by far the most important high-protein feedstuff both from the standpoint of tonnage and from its irreplaceability as a high-protein feed ingredient, the result will be the development of a national emergency insofar as animal feeding is concerned rather than simply a critical high-protein feed shortage.

5. Setting a ceiling price of less than $88 will create unmanageable enforcement problems. Soybean meal crushers are presently evading the $74-per-ton ceiling either by mineralizing soybean meal and claiming that the product is a mixed feed or by engaging in toll crushing operations. Standards by which legitimate mineralizing and crushing operations can be distinguished from evasions of the soybean meal regulations are difficult, if not impossible, to establish. The only way to stop the spread of this practice is by setting an equitable ceiling price for soybean meal. In absence of a ceiling price of less than $88 per ton, this agency will have to clamp down on these practices, which will involve difficulties of setting standards and of enforcing them that far outweigh the sense of setting a realistic ceiling in the first place.

6. Setting a ceiling price of less than $88 is very poor policy from the standpoint of public relations with the farmer, with the soybean-crushing industry, and with the mixed-feed industry. Setting a ceiling price of less than $88 per ton will seriously damage the regard of this agency held by the farmer, the soybean-crushing industry, and the mixed-feed industry, since a ceiling price of less than $88 per ton will not permit the soybean-crushing industry to realize a break-even profit position. The industry will, of course, be unable to pay anything near the legal minimum price for soybeans because the soybean-crushing industry is the complete user of soybeans. This agency will create a situation whereby it will be absolutely impossible for farmers to realize parity prices of soybeans under any and all conditions. For this reason and because the result will force the farmer to reduce his intended acreage planting of soybeans, the proposed ceiling price of $81 will create hostile farmer opposition. The reaction of the soybean-crushing industry to a ceiling price of less than $88 per ton is evident. Insofar as the mixed-feed industry is concerned, the opposition to a price of less than $88 per ton will be equally strong and uncompromising. That is, such a ceiling will require them to deal in a soybean meal black market or to experience the serious inconveniences of dealing with mineralized soybean meal mixtures or of meal crushed for them on a toll basis. Moreover, if soybean meal substantially disappears from the market, they will have to cease the production of the majority of mixed feeds. It is not surprising, therefore, that some of the strongest requests for equitable ceiling prices for soybean meal have come from the feed industry.

7. Adjusting historical relationships in the case of soybean meal will not serve as a precedent for adjusting historical relationships involving other high protein feed ingredients. It has been stated that adjustments should not be made in long run price relationships involving soybean meal because this will serve as a precedent for upward revisions of the ceiling prices of other high protein feed ingredients, in the same manner. I submit, however, that the principles applied in arriving at an $88 ceiling price for soybean meal can be limited to this product. It is only in the case of soybean meal that there has been such a sharp change in the price relationship to corn or other basic feeding stuffs. Furthermore, the soybean meal crushing industry is the only one which will be put in a loss position if a historical price relationship is used as the exclusive basis for setting ceiling prices. The reasons for modifying the historical price relationships approach in this case do not apply to other high protein feeds.

SCHEDULE I

Increase in poultry numbers in last 3 years showing increased demand for soybean meal:

	Birds
1948	355,785,000
1949	501,417,000
1950	616,185,000

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture.

SCHEDULE II. MARGINS OF SOLVENT CRUSHERS BASED ON VARIOUS CEILING PRICES FOR SOYBEAN MEAL

The figures in part A of this schedule indicate the gross margins over soybean costs realized by solvent crushers based upon the current price per pound of 9½ cents for soybean oil and upon the price currently being paid of $2.85 per bushel for soybeans, f. o. b. Decatur. The figures also indicate gross margins based on oil prices of 11 cents per pound, that is 2 cents per pound over present market prices and soybean costs of $3 and $2.85 per bushel. It is to be noted that the ceiling for soybeans is $3.23 per bushel, or considerably above the soybean costs used in this schedule. A breakdown of costs, other than soybean costs, is set forth in part B of the schedule. The figures in part A and part B indicate that, at the current prices paid for beans and received for oil, the crusher will not realize more than a break-even position on his operations.

PART A.—*Gross margins for solvent operators over soybean costs alone*

Oil price	Meal ceiling price	10.6¢ oil value	47.0¢ meal value	Gross return	Bean cost	Margin above bean cost
(93487)						
11	$78	$1.17	$1.83	$3.00	$3.00	$0.
11	80	1.17	1.88	3.05	3.00	+.05
11	82	1.17	1.93	3.10	3.00	+.10
11	84	1.17	1.97	3.14	3.00	+.14
11	86	1.17	2.02	3.19	3.00	+.19
11	88	1.17	2.07	3.24	3.00	+.24
0.095	78	1.01	1.83	2.84	2.85	+.01
0.095	80	1.01	1.88	2.89	2.85	+.03
0.095	81	1.01	1.91	2.92	2.85	+.07
0.095	82	1.01	1.93	2.94	2.85	+.09
0.095	84	1.01	1.97	2.98	2.85	+.13
0.095	86	1.01	2.02	3.04	2.85	+.19
0.095	88	1.01	2.07	3.08	2.85	+.23

PART B.—*Operating costs per ton of soybean meal and per bushel of soybeans*

Type of cost:	Cost per ton
Extraction	$4.27
Toasting	.85
Grinding	.60
Elevator handling	1.28
Packing	.25
Loading and shipping	.30
Freight loss (average $1.95 rate point less 98.13 percent transit recovery)	1.12
Operating costs per ton	8.67
Operating costs per bushel of soybeans [1]	.217

[1] Costs per bushel of soybeans obtained by dividing costs per ton of meal by the number of bushels of soybeans (40) required to yield a ton of soybean meal.

	At $68 for meal	At $81 for meal
	Cents	*Cents*
Minimum return above material cost	+0.230	+0.010
Operating cost	.217	.217
Profit margin	+.013	−.207

This schedule is based on cost data submitted by the crushing industry, data on oil meal yields and analyses developed by the Grain, Feeds, Seeds, and Bakery Products Branch.

SCHEDULE III

Comparison of estimated amounts of corn, cottonseed meal, and soybean meal used for feed, 1930–51 [1]

Year	Corn (million bushels)	Cottonseed meal (1,000 tons)	Soybean meal (1,000 tons)
1930	1,873	1,940	123
1931	2,290	1,942	133
1932	2,625	1,938	113
1933	2,254	1,869	99
1934	1,575	1,700	285
1935	1,991	1,824	633
1936	1,519	2,090	532
1937	2,020	2,333	719
1938	2,099	2,013	1,020
1939	2,231	1,762	1,276
1940	2,258	1,862	1,491
1941	2,500	1,821	1,785
1942	2,909	2,078	3,074
1943	2,866	1,790	3,323
1944	2,718	1,932	3,627
1945	2,762	1,433	3,655
1946	2,701	1,434	3,745
1947	2,295	1,983	3,383
1948	2,617	2,271	4,156
1949	2,909	2,372	4,514
1950	2,844	1,825	5,725
1951	2,975	2,550	5,400

[1] This shows an increase in the demand and value of cottonseed meal of 31½ against 4,390 percent gain in soybean meal.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President the result of what has been done in fixing ceiling prices on soybean oil and soybean meal at such levels, so as to bring the price of soybeans a little below the support price, has three major effects:

First, it forces prices down to the farmers, and consequently forces income to the farmers down, in this year 1952.

Secondly, by fixing a ceiling on soybean oil at twice what it was actually selling for on the market, every encouragement is given to the manufacturers of oleomargarine, shortening, and other oil products used by the housewife to raise their prices to the consumer.

Lastly, by fixing the selling prices which can be received by the soybean producer at a little below the support price fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture, they are sure that with that condition prevailing the Government will become the sole owner of the soybean crop.

I wish I did not have to point out these things. They are all a part of a pattern these days, to scare the daylights out of the farmer with the threat of low prices, and scare the consumer with the threat of high prices, so that they will accept all kinds of Government domination and control as a result of their fears. It is a wicked thing to do, but that is what is being done today. I have pointed out a few instances, using the memoranda of Government officials to show just what they are up to.

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT REGARDING DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has received a letter from the President of the United States concerning the pending legislation. He lays it before the Senate and asks the Secretary to read it.

The legislative clerk read the letter, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 29, 1952.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
President of the Senate.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I understand that the Senate is beginning debate on S. 2594, amending and extending the Defense Production Act of 1950. I want to call to the attention of the Senate the serious implications of two of the proposed amendments in this bill—one dealing with the Wage Stabilization Board and the other with the Walsh-Healey Act.

The first of these amendments, Section 106 of the bill, would abolish the existing tripartite Wage Stabilization Board—composed of representatives of management, labor, and the public—and substitute a public board in which management and labor representatives are denied membership. The amendment would also strip the Board of its present responsibilities in handling labor disputes.

These changes would have a direct effect upon our ability to maintain essential production under our mobilization program. I cannot emphasize too strongly that the main burden of the defense program lies ahead of us. Because of the high rate of consumer savings and the increase in productive capacity, we have been able to relax some of our controls. But we are by no means at the point where we can afford to jeopardize the mobilization program by failing to provide an adequate system for maintaining a sound wage stabilization program and for handling labor disputes affecting the defense program. And that is just what is involved in this amendment.

We should not lose sight of the fact that in determining the composition of the Wage Stabilization Board we are dealing with far more than a mechanical problem of administration. In giving labor and management an equal voice, we are encouraging them to share in the responsibility of making our wage stabilization program work. We are placing our faith in the capacity of responsible parties to help work out solutions to their problems in the national interest.

The effectiveness of the tripartite approach has been well demonstrated both in wage stabilization and in the handling of labor disputes. Through this approach we utilize the experience of labor and management and take advantage of the best advice and counsel available.

The fact is that the present tripartite set-up is working well. The representatives of industry and labor have been of great assistance in the development of the wage-stabilization program and up to now have made a unique contribution in seeing to it that the wage stabilization rules have been complied with. The members of the Board have worked together to meet their responsibilities. The public interest has been adequately protected. The record shows that most of the general regulations and policies of the Board have been adopted by unanimous vote. The record also shows that in petitions for approval of wage increases submitted to the Board—which represent 99 percent of the cases coming before the Board—the Board has been unanimous in over 90 percent of its rulings. Of course, some disagreements are to be expected under a tripartite arrangement, but the record shows that the public members, in both wage stabilization and dispute cases, have done a conscientious job in resolving such differences, voting in accordance with their best judgment.

The Congress should bear in mind that the tripartite approach has proven its worth in two previous periods of national emergency—and it is proving its worth again. We should not arbitrarily abandon this approach in favor of a system which denies to the Government the experience, the wisdom, and the effective participation of labor and management in the stabilization program.

The proposed amendment not only would change the composition of the Board but would deprive it of its responsibilities for handling labor disputes. This presents a very serious problem.

There is a good reason why the Government must provide machinery for the settlement of labor disputes which threaten the defense program. Under normal circumstances, labor and management are free to bargain collectively to determine wages and working conditions and, when they cannot reach agreement, they are free to resort to strikes and lock-outs. But in a defense economy, the free play of collective bargaining, including the freedom of strike action, must necessarily be restricted. There are some instances where the national security, and indeed the very lives of our troops in Korea, cannot be adequately protected if a defense plant closes down. In these circumstances, the Government must use its mediation and conciliation powers to the fullest in order to induce the parties to settle their disputes. And, if all else fails, we must, as a last resort in cases where vital defense production is involved, provide some practical alternative for the traditional test of economic strength.

That is why the Government is providing, through the disputes functions of the Wage Stabilization Board, a system which offers the parties every assistance in avoiding work stoppages. In establishing disputes responsibilities in the Board, we have deliberately sought to give as much play as possible to collective bargaining and to mediation and conciliation during this emergency period. For this reason, the Board may make final and binding decisions only in those cases where both parties agree in advance to be bound by the Board's findings. The Board only hears those disputes which the parties themselves submit for recommendation or decision, or which the President certifies to the Board for recommendation. Under this arrangement, we rely primarily on the good sense and patriotism of the parties to reach a settlement on their own after an impartial third party has recommended a fair settlement. We have not reached the point, and I hope we never reach it, of compulsory arbitration, where we substitute Government dictation of wages and working conditions for collective bargaining.

By and large, this system for handling labor disputes is working well. It is now evident that there was no basis for the fear that every labor dispute would be dumped on the Board. Furthermore, strikes have generally been averted. Of the 12 dispute cases certified to the Board by the President, disputes where at least one of the parties wanted to fight it out through resort to work stoppages, the Board has been generally successful, primarily because of its tripartite character, in avoiding a strike. Vital defense production has been maintained. In the 33 dispute cases submitted voluntarily by the parties, there has not been one instance of interrupted production.

The one notable exception in the Board's successful record in getting settlements has been the steel case. The failure to reach a settlement thus far in the steel case is not the fault of the Board, for its recommendations provide a sound and sensible basis for reaching agreement on the issues in dispute. And, in any event, the lack of a settlement in this case could not possibly justify abandoning the machinery that has been successful in so many other cases.

If there had been no forum to hear the disputes which have been before the Board, the defense program would have been damaged by crippling strikes. Further, the Congress should remember that in all the labor disputes now before the Board the parties are continuing production at the request of the Board while their case is being heard. If the Board is deprived of its authority to recommend a fair settlement of those disputes, the major inducement to the parties to refrain from resort to economic pressures and to use the peaceful alternative provided by the Government as a means of settling their differences will be removed.

If there is no peaceful alternative to strikes, then we will have strikes. I cannot believe that the Congress will close its eyes to this inescapable fact.

Many people seem to feel that the Taft-Hartley Act meets our needs for industrial peace during the mobilization period. That just is not so. The emergency provisions of that act were not designed for a mobilization economy and by their very terms do not apply to labor disputes in single defense plants. In any event, the emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act are inadequate. At best, the Taft-Hartley Act simply delays a strike for 80 days. It makes no positive contribution toward settlement of the dispute but simply gives the parties a respite from the pressures of collective bargaining. The boards of inquiry authorized under the act are expressly forbidden to make any recommendations for settlement. Yet recommendations for settlement by some impartial tribunal are precisely what is needed if the parties are to be given assistance and if the force of public opinion is to be brought into play to encourage a settlement. Thus, it is obvious that the emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act fall far short of meeting the needs of the defense emergency.

I want to make it absolutely clear to the Congress what is at stake here. We cannot meet our production goals and keep our economy stable if we fail to provide a sound and fair system of wage stabilization and disputes settlement. If the Congress prohibits the participation of labor and management in wage stabilization, it will, in effect, be declaring its lack of confidence in the integrity and public-spiritedness of both labor and management. If the Congress will not provide some forum where labor disputes may be heard and considered, it will, in effect, be encouraging strikes and lockouts.

I also want to call to the Senate's attention the serious effects of the amendment in section 301 dealing with the Walsh-Healey Act. That act provides for the determination of wage and working standards for workers employed on Government procurement contracts. It was passed in 1936 to advance the public interest in sound labor standards and to protect fair-minded businessmen by ruling out unscrupulous dealers and unprincipled manufacturers who were able to submit the lowest bids for Government contracts only because of their exploitation of workers. The act was aimed at preventing the resort to "sweatshop" working conditions and child labor in carrying out Government contracts. As such, the Walsh-Healey Act has been a major force in encouraging sound labor standards in this country.

The amendment in section 301 of this bill, however, would seriously retard the effectiveness of the Walsh-Healey Act. In the first place, it would drastically cut down the present coverage of the act by excluding Government purchases of materials which are sold in the open market to purchasers generally. I am advised that by restricting the act to contracts for those articles which are specially made for the Government, fully half of all contracts now covered might be exempt. The proportion of contracts excluded would increase in normal times when the Government does not purchase the great quantities of specially made items required for military purposes during a mobilization program. As a result, the purchasing power of the Federal Government would once again be instrumental in depressing labor standards to the detriment of businessmen who wish to adhere to advanced working standards in their plants and factories.

Second, the amendment would place very serious procedural obstacles in the way of effective administration of the Walsh-Healey Act. The net effect of these new procedural requirements is to distort the original intent of the Administrative Procedure Act. That act already provides adequate protection to private parties affected by Walsh-Healey interpretations and rulings, and the Secretary of Labor not only has scrupulously abided by its spirit but has gone beyond its specific requirements in assuring full hearings to interested parties. In short, these procedural changes would pave the way for harassing litigation by those who want to make the Walsh-Healey Act ineffective.

It should be noted that this amendment is, in effect, a "rider." Although proposed in a bill dealing with temporary, emergency authority, it would incorporate revisions in permanent legislation. The Walsh-Healey Act has served as a landmark for sound labor standards in this country and has served us well in protecting those standards, particularly during World War II. I, therefore, urge the Senate not to take any action which would arbitrarily destroy an essential safeguard of the decent working conditions which we have carefully built up in this country over the past 16 years.

These two amendments deserve the most critical analysis of the Senate. They have serious and far-reaching consequences. This is no time to lose sight of the urgent requirements of our mobilization program or of the enduring need to protect sound labor standards in our country.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, we are now debating the Defense Production Act. It is quite possible that defects and weaknesses exist in the act. It may very well be, too, that the administration of the act has not been perfect, and that improvements can be made. There is no doubt that during the days that lie ahead the Senate will be considering amendments to the act, some of which it may wish to adopt in its wisdom, which may improve the operation and the purposes of the act. But we have before us now an amendment proposed by the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] which to all intent and purposes would take the very guts out of the Defense Production Act and make it completely ineffective.

I shall take up very little time of the Senate. However, I believe there are certain conditions, which I believe should be pointed out to my colleagues and to the American people, and which should be given very careful consideration before any amendment, which would

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

weaken the operation and the effectiveness of the Defense Production Act, is adopted.

Mr. President, there can be no doubt in the mind of anyone that we are confronted today with greatly unsettled world conditions. They are conditions which unhappily do not show any indication of improvement within the very near future. There is undoubtedly an ever-present threat of a widening of the area of armed and diplomatic conflict. Everything points to and underlines and emphasizes that threat, which I believe must be recognized and acknowledged by every Member of the Senate.

Furthermore, Mr. President, we are now engaged in an ever increasing effort in defense mobilization. It is an effort which will lead to greatly enlarged defense production during the months which lie immediately ahead. That will of course lead to an attendant and corresponding increase in Government spending. On the other hand, we are patiently confronted with a lessened availability of civilian goods by reason of the increased production in military matériel and by our stepped up defense mobilization effort.

Mr. President, today there is no doubt that consumption in our country is at its very highest. Every statistic clearly demonstrates that fact. There is also no doubt that the savings of the people of this country, in savings banks, in home savings associations, and in similar organizations as well as in insurance policies, are at an absolute record high; and they are increasing week by week. There is no doubt that wages as well as corporation earnings are at a new record high at the present time. I am happy that such savings, high consumption, high wages, and high corporation earnings exist. They denote a prosperity and a well being for which we may well be grateful.

But all these things which I have enumerated and many others point clearly, in my opinion, to the great likelihood of further inflation which, if uncontrolled, may be disastrous.

We are planning now to complete the labors of the Senate within the next 4 to 8 weeks. It is hoped that we may find it possible to adjourn at that time. Personally I have very grave doubts about whether that will be the case, because we have so much work to do and we should complete it before we adjourn. However, that is the plan. Certainly an effort will be made to consummate that plan.

Mr. President, I believe it would be the height of recklessness for us to fail to safeguard and strengthen the only means at our command to control wages and prices and rents and to protect the many other things which go into making up the daily lives and well-being of the people of the United States. I believe we cannot possibly afford to take the risk of sabotaging the only effective machinery now at our command.

Much criticism has been raised on the floor of the Senate regarding the slowness with which the provisions of the act were put into effect by the administration. It may well be that some of that criticism is justified. Of course, those who were charged with the administration of the act were under the obligation and necessity of building a great organization to do the work effectively, and they had to build up that organization from the very ground floor. Yet now it is proposed that we disband the organization, and that we face a future of uncertainty, without having any weapons with which to control inflation if it comes—and in my opinion it will come unless safeguards are provided. If the safeguards were not provided, the result would be that when inflation came, we again would be confronted with the necessity of building up the organization from the very ground; but at that time the task would be an almost impossible one.

Obviously, Mr. President, it is always more difficult to control inflation after it has begun, instead of in advance.

So it seems inconceivable to me, that at the present time this body would—regardless of what would happen—take a step to make substantially impossible any effective controls which would keep our economy on at least a reasonably stable level and would prevent runaway inflation. Let me say that I have seen the effects of runaway inflation in a number of parts of the world. I hope and pray we will never see it here.

Last of all—but, Mr. President, to my mind it is by no means the least in importance—the Congress must take steps to protect the interests of the consumers, who otherwise would be mulcted and forced to pay unreasonable prices based on a demand greater than the supply—in fact, a demand so great that people with their great buying power would be persuaded to pay exorbitant prices in order to be able to satisfy their needs or their desires.

So, Mr. President, I very much hope that the amendment of the junior Senator from Illinois will be rejected. In my opinion its adoption would be disastrous.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I propose to be very brief in my comments today on the pending bill and the pending amendment.

Little need be said in opposition to the pending amendment, after listening to the message the President of the United States has sent to the Senate in opposition to the amendment.

Probably it would be good politics to attack that message; in fact, I am inclined to believe that in an election year it probably would be good politics to attack the bill which now is before the Senate. But, in this instance I shall continue, as I always have tried to do in the past, to direct my attention to what I regard as the basic principles involved in any given legislative proposal, and to consider the relationship of those principles to the welfare of my country. On the basis of that political philosophy, I wish to say that I shall vote against the pending amendment and then I shall vote for a continuation of the price-and-wage-stabilization program. I believe such a program is necessary for the maintenance of both economic stability in our country and the protection of our national security.

I shall vote for amendments to the bill if, on the basis of the argument and the evidence advanced, I can be convinced they will strengthen the bill and will help alleviate certain abuses which I am satisfied have developed in the administration of the stabilization law which has been on the statute books. I shall not, however, vote for amendments which would have the effect of emasculating wage control and price control. Neither shall I vote against the bill, for in my judgment if the act were repealed, the result would be to leave the consumers of the Nation the easy victims of the tremendously powerful and inordinately greedy forces that, I am confident—and I am willing to take judicial notice of the facts—would proceed to exploit the people of the United States. Such an exploitation of the consumers of the country would be the inevitable result of the abnormal economic conditions in which we live because of the defense effort.

Mr. President, I cannot vote against the bill, because in my opinion to do so would be to vote to victimize the American people in the operation of the law of supply and demand, at a time when the uncontrolled operation of that law would work great havoc on the economic welfare of the citizens of the United States. The uncontrolled operation of that law at this time would accrue to the great profits benefit of certain powerful, selfish forces that always seem to lack the social consciousness which would prompt them to place the public good above their materialistic interests.

So, Mr. President, in the present instance we are confronted, once again, with the duty of having the Government exercise the minimum controls necessary to protect the public interest.

It is my desire to vote only for a Defense Production Act which will provide the minimum controls necessary to protect the interests of the public from the forces which would take advantage of them if the Government did not step in and say, "Thou shalt not."

Mr. President, at this time Congress cannot be justified in leaving the American people subject to the ravages of the uncontrolled operation of the law of supply and demand. I make that statement because I believe it is obvious and elementary that the economy of the United States at the present time cannot be described by the word "normal," nor can it be described by any phrase which would seem to indicate that free competition is operating today in the United States.

The only time I think it is safe, from the standpoint of the consumer, to let the law of supply and demand operate unchecked in any way by minimum Government control is when a competitive system is actually working without intervention by the Government in the Nation's economy. But now, Mr. President, we have the Government exercising a tremendous influence in directing the productive forces of the country, in determining in large measure in many segments of the national economy what shall and what shall not be produced. The defense program has disrupted our normal economy. A large segment of

our economy is in a very real sense being directed by Government needs and demands. With part of the economy operating as a defense economy and the rest as a civilian economy there are bound to develop great distortions and dislocations in the economy. It simply does not make sense to argue that it would be safe to let the competitive system, upon which the law of supply and demand really rests, operate unfettered by governmental intervention in these times.

One would think it would not be necessary to point out that when we have a divided economy, as our present economy is, into a defense production economy and a civilian economy, it would be dangerous to let the law of supply and demand operate. If in such circumstances, it were allowed to operate we simply could not escape the horrible danger, the cruel danger so far as the consumers are concerned, of inflation. We already have far too much inflation because we have not controlled the economy enough. I simply do not know of any economic textbook containing a chapter on the causes and effects of inflation which does not point out that when our economy is divided in such a manner that large quantities of the materials and goods are directed by the Government into nonproductive purposes, so far as the economy as a whole is concerned, the threat of inflation is inevitable.

I happen to be one who believes that just a little bit of inflation in its economic effects acts somewhat like a drug in the case of a drug addict. Those who enjoy the stimulation of the first injection of inflation are usually those who want to repeal any economic drug act which would seek to keep from them the stimulation of further injections of such false values as accompanying inflation.

I have called for—it has not arrived on the floor yet; I wish I had it before me, the impressive testimony of one of the greatest living Americans, one of our true elder statesmen, Bernard Baruch, as he testified before our subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee yesterday. I am perfectly willing to rest my case upon the question of inflation control as presented by the brilliant testimony yesterday of Bernard Baruch.

In recent speeches I have used the figure $14,000,000,000 as having been lost down the inflation drain as a result of our failure to put effective inflation controls into operation at the outbreak, or even before the outbreak of the Korean war. That was the figure I had most frequently read in the statements of economic experts in regard to what had happened to our economy since the outbreak of the Korean war, so far as inflation was concerned. But yesterday Bernard Baruch said he thought the figure was at least $20,000,000,000; and he, personally, as I think his testimony will show, said that the loss may have been as much as $24,000,000,000.

A great many people have much to answer for, Mr. President, in connection with that tremendous loss of values. The executive branch of the Government has a great deal to answer for, because, even on the basis of the defense production law which Congress passed, and which set forth what I believe to be the most inadequate system of controls, I think the administration could have done a much better job than has been done in checking inflation. But, as I said to Mr. Baruch yesterday, I have no intention, so far as I am concerned, of relieving the Congress of all responsibility, because, when we come to analyze the law which we passed and look into the record of the amendments to that law which were proposed when it was pending, but which were defeated, I think it perfectly clear that the Congress has not done its job, either. There were a few of us—not very many, but a few—who took the position when this subject matter was first before the Congress of the United States that, if we were really serious in our desire to check inflation, we should have adopted the Baruch plan as it was submitted to us at that time.

As we all know, the Baruch plan stood for a complete freeze of wages and of prices, and for putting into effect credit controls and monetary controls. Had we followed the advice of this great elder statesman, in my judgment we would have saved for the American people most of the approximately $20,000,000,000 which Bernard Baruch now testifies we have lost down the inflation drain because we did not adopt an inflation control law.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate what the Senator from Oregon has said, and I should like to have his comment on the statement that the Banking and Currency Committee did the best it could do to pass a stronger bill than was recommended to us in the fall of 1950.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator had only waited a moment——

Mr. MAYBANK. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad the Senator raised the question, but I was just about to describe the situation as we found it at the time the law was passed.

Mr. MAYBANK. I asked Mr. Baruch to come before the committee, in June or July, I think it was, to give us his advice, and we asked for the advice of others who had been through World War I, World War II, and other situations connected with inflationary spirals and programs. As a result of Mr. Baruch's testimony and that of other witnesses we reported a bill which was passed.

I beg the Senator's pardon for making the statement, because he said he was about to reach that point.

Mr. MORSE. I was about to say that in our fight for a stronger control law we had the support of the Senator from South Carolina and of some other members of the Banking and Currency Committee. I think they came forward with the strongest bill they believed they had any chance of getting a majority vote for in the Senate of the United States. That was the parliamentary situation which confronted the Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. President. But, so far as I was concerned, I felt then and I feel now that we should have adopted the Baruch plan in toto. That would have brought to the conscience of the people the understanding that, as Mr. Baruch pointed out yesterday, we are in great peril. If we are not, then I am in favor of letting the law of supply and demand operate. If we are not in peril I am in favor of cutting into the defense mobilization budget by billions of dollars. If we are not in peril then the sooner we get back to as nearly normal an economy as is possible, the better.

So far as I am concerned, the kernel of the argument rests on this question of fact: America is either in peril or she is not. If we are in peril, Mr. President—and one cannot listen to such a great adviser as Bernard Baruch without becoming convinced that we are in great peril—we should not adopt the pending amendment. Rather we should strengthen the bill which is pending before the Senate so as to provide more effective inflation control, because if the peril materializes as expected, if the Defense Establishment is right when it says that 1954, in all probability, will be the target date if a war with Russia is to break out, then the people of the United States had better mobilize more rapidly, sacrifice more greatly, and submit more enthusiastically to restrictions upon their economy in the interest of protecting the security of the Nation.

In connection with this part of my argument, Mr. President, I ask unanimouse consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point the testimony of Mr. Baruch as he gave it before the Armed Services Committee yesterday. With that insertion I rest my case on the economic issue of whether we should continue controls.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONLY STRENGTH WILL WIN THE PEACE—TESTIMONY OF BERNARD M. BARUCH BEFORE THE PREPAREDNESS INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES AT WASHINGTON, D. C., WEDNESDAY, MAY 28, 1952, AT 10 A. M.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it is an honor to appear before you. As your chairman stated in his letter inviting me here, I have had no part in administering the defense program but if my thoughts can be of assistance to you, I am happy to offer them.

There are two enormously important questions before this committee:

1. Is it safe to be slowing our defense effort or should we actually be pressing to do more to make peace secure?

2. Is the defense effort which has been undertaken being carried out wastefully or efficiently, with necessary consideration of the soundness of our economy?

My own answers to these two questions can be summarized as follows: I do not think that the huge sums which have been appropriated for defense are being expended as economically and effectively as they should be. Later I will make some specific recommendations for correcting this situation. However, any budget cuts that are made must not reduce our fighting strength—in men or in weapons. Far from slowing down, our security requires that we step up our defenses both in speed and scale—if the peace is to be won.

PLAYING POLITICS WITH DEFENSE

Ours is a fearful dilemma. Because we are not in all-out war, with the whole globe aflame, it is tempting to nibble at the defense budget, to lift controls, to shirk even the relatively mild denials which rearming requires. The wastefulness of the mobilization and the unfairness which which the burdens of the cold war are being distributed increase the pressures for doing less. This being a Presidential election year adds the further lures of playing politics with our national security and of distracting ourselves with domestic quarrels even while a foreign foe relentlessly plots our destruction.

As a result, hardly a week passes without fresh evidence of let-down. Yet who can say now whether a new offensive is not brewing in Korea or along some other front? Tension over Germany mounts, yet the erection of NATO's defenses, scarce begun, is being dragged partly because of our own slow deliveries, partly because of a slackening up by our allies.

Moreover what is done—or not done—today will determine how ready or unready we are 2, 3, and even 5 years from now.

CUTTING THE BUDGET

In taking what seems the easy course at present we could be building up a horrible retribution for the future.

Nor is the decision before us being made any easier by confusing statements which picture us winning the cold war one month and in mortal peril the next.

When the budget now before Congress was submitted early this year, it called for stretching out aircraft production, among other defense items, so that 143 air wings would not be achieved until late 1955 or 1956, instead of mid-1954. When this decision was announced, I protested to our defense heads. Slowing our preparations, I warned, would invite our allies to slow their efforts. Where in the world, I asked, had the risks of aggression been sufficiently reduced to justify such a let-up?

CEILING ON SPENDING

Then the House of Representatives imposed a limit on defense expenditures for next year, reducing the budget even further than the Executive already had cut it. This action has brought dire warnings from our highest military leaders. Gen. Omar Bradley, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has testified that it is the considered judgment of the Joint Chiefs that 1954 will be the year of maximum peril. By then, he has warned, the Soviet atomic stockpile may be large enough so our superiority in atomic weapons will no longer serve as a sufficient deterrent against possible aggression.

Other military leaders have testified that Russia is producing considerably more jet airplanes than we are. Even after we match their output, the Soviets still will enjoy the advantages of reserves built up over the last years.

THAT "CALCULATED RISK"

How are we to reconcile these recent warnings from our highest military leaders with the earlier decision to postpone air readiness? The heads of the defense agencies, testifying before Congress early this year, called the stretch-out "a calculated risk." But was the risk really calculated? By whom? By the Joint Chiefs? If we were acting on the basis of their expressed judgment, the new budget should have called for intensifying, not relaxing, our production effort.

Is it any wonder that the American people are confused when their highest military authority states that we will be lucky if we have more than the next 2 years for preparedness and yet no program for achieving readiness within that time is even advanced?

Is it surprising that Members of Congress should conclude that if building our Air Force can be delayed a year or two why cannot the whole defense program be relaxed proportionately?

GIVE PUBLIC THE FACTS

May I repeat that I am opposed to the ceiling on defense expenditures, even as I opposed the earlier reduction ordered by the Executive. But I can understand why Congress and the public would be puzzled by the contradiction between the dire estimates of danger given us and the inadequate program put forth to meet that danger.

Are we in peril or not? Your committee will be performing an invaluable public service if you reveal to the American people exactly what is the basis of this so-called "calculated risk" to which we are being asked to expose ourselves and all that we hold dear.

HAVE WE A PLAN?

What does this phrase "calculated risk" mean?

Clearly, it is intended to give the impression of a group of planners, carefully listing all the dangers which threaten, including evaluations of the enemy's preparations and of what our many foreign commitments may lead to. Against that, the planners presumably weigh what would have to be done militarily to counter these risks and what such action would cost in terms of available resources. After full consideration, a balance is struck between the risks we are willing to take and the costs of surmounting these risks.

If that is what is meant by "a calculated risk," then it follows that the defense program should change with the risks. When perils abroad rise, our defense efforts should be speeded. If our rearming is slowed, it should reflect a reduction in danger.

But that is not how things have operated. In the past, we have cut down our defenses even though the risks abroad remained unchanged at best. We have also failed to quicken our defenses despite the most obvious increase in the danger of aggression.

YEAR WAS LOST

For example, when the North Atlantic Defense Treaty first was signed, General Bradley testified that 3 to 5 years would be required to build a minimum defense force in Western Europe, at the rate of rearming then planned. Not many weeks later came the announcement from the White House of an atomic explosion in the Soviet Union. One would have thought that our defense schedules would have been accelerated promptly since, as was asked at the time, "If 5 years was considered a safe timetable before this explosion, how can it be a safe timetable today?"

Actually, little was done to speed our rearming or the defenses of our Western European allies until the invasion of South Korea. A whole year was lost—a year for which we have paid dearly.

If we actually were operating on the basis of a calculated risk, why wasn't the defense program quickened when our calculations changed, as they must have, with the explosion of an atomic bomb in the Soviet Union?

WAS KOREA CALCULATED?

Similarly, what were the calculations behind the slowing of our defense timetable which was decided upon early this year? Was it assumed that we would have a Korean truce by this time? If so, what if we must now increase our forces in Korea? Was the mounting tension over Germany foreseen? Was trouble expected on any other front? Was it realized that our allies would also stretch out their defense schedules slowing the whole defense timetable that much more? Were all these things part of that calculated risk?

It is important that your committee give the public the answer to those questions, so the American people will know whether the tempo of rearming is really being changed on the basis of a fully thought through master plan of defense or by the sort of wishful thinking that could believe "peace was never nearer" only a few weeks before the outbreak in Korea.

Is our military program really part of what has been called total diplomacy and which necessitates an over-all global strategy in which military, diplomatic, political, economic, and spiritual factors are parts of one whole, embracing all the many fronts in the struggle for peace? Or are we still operating by piecemeal patchwork, waiting for the next crisis to hit us? Is anybody trying to formulate such a global strategy?

SOUND GERMAN POLICY

We simply cannot make peace unless we are militarily stronger. Take the issue of Germany. In pressing for her inclusion in the North Atlantic Treaty Organizaiton we inevitably quickened all the tensions over Germany. How much further advanced will this struggle for the key to Europe be 3 years from now? Will we be ready militarily?

If Germany remains divided as at present, we must expect an effort to rejoin the partitioned halves sooner or later, perhaps by force. If Germany is "unified" by some four-power agreement, such a Germany would shiver in constant peril of subversion from within, of subversion likely to be reinforced by the use of Soviet satellite troops from Eastern Europe in the manner of Korea.

To negotiate safely over Germany, we must be certain that an adequate military force is in being (not on paper) in France, the Low Countries, and Britain, which is capable of being thrust into action without delay, to forestall any Soviet coup.

AVOID SOVIET TRAP

To slow the rearming of Western Europe and at the same time begin negotiations over Germany is to put not one foot but both feet into a Soviet trap.

May I emphasize this because it is so awfully important. Any "solution" sought in Germany will prove worthless unless Western Europe is adequately armed. You simply cannot have a sound German policy until the present disparity in military strength between Soviet Russia and ourselves and our allies is bridged.

The existence of this arms disparity should never be lost sight of. Whatever the assurances from those in high places, let us never be deceived. It can never truly be said that "we are winning the cold war" until this disparity is overcome. We may be able to show gains here and there, important in themselves, but no decisive victory in the cold war is possible as long as the Soviets hold as terrifying an edge in military readiness over the West as they do today. As long as this disparity exists there is no basis for peace in the world.

WEAPONS NOT FACTORIES

This disparity is one of actual weapons on hand. It can be filled only by the actual production of our own weapons. It cannot be filled by getting ready to produce or by merely expanding productive capacity.

I am entirely in favor of enlarging our basic capacity in steel, aluminum, copper, electric power, and other segments of the economy. New processes for using low-grade ores should be encouraged along with chemical developments which make us less dependent upon strategic imports from abroad. But additional plant capacity is not what is most critically needed for our defense.

Compare our astonishing productive power demonstrated during the last war—and considerably expanded since—with the productive capacity of the Soviets who suffered such terrible devastation in the war, and whose economy never could provide more than the barest subsistence for its hard-toiling people.

MYTH OF SHORT NOTICE

No; the disparity which menaces us and all the other freedom-loving peoples of the world is not in productive capacity but in the airplanes, ammunition, tanks, and other weapons available for immediate retaliation against aggression or fomented civil war. In increasing our plant capacity we strengthen ourselves where we already are strong. We do not strengthen ourselves where we are most vulnerable.

Nor should we be lulled by assurances that this new productive capacity will be available for arms production on short notice. How many months does short notice mean? Even after these stand-by plants are erected, I doubt that they can be brought to full production within a year and probably longer.

The whole defense program should be reviewed to determine whether too heavy an emphasis has not been placed on building new facilities and too little on turning out weapons.

OBSOLESCENCE A MYTH

All sorts of reasons are raised against putting weapons into production. Some have merit. Others should be weighed most carefully against factors which often are overlooked.

Consider the much talked-of matter of obsolescence. Obviously, we must strive constantly to improve our weapons. But no aggressor was ever stopped by blueprints. What is obsolete must also be judged by what the enemy has and by the value of even older weapons in dire emergency.

DANGER OF SABOTAGE

Who would have thought that our overage destroyers and stocks of Lee-Enfield rifles could have proven so important to Britain? What would we be doing today without our mothball fleet, air reserves, and ammunition stocks left over from the last war?

If all-out war does come, much of our plant capacity might be destroyed in an atomic blitz. The dangers of sabotage in such a conflict will be greater than during the last war. Reserves of weapons would be priceless insurance against both these risks.

SOVIET VULNERABILITY

Then, take a good, long look at Soviet Russia's border. No nation has ever had so extended a frontier. Were Russia to plunge the world into all-out war, she would be open to counter invasion at innumerable points, that is if the peoples along her frontier could be armed quickly. The stocks of weapons we have on hand could be deployed around the globe so as to pin down and immobilize a sizable portion of Russia's own armed strength, if she decided to go to war.

Even during the current stage of undeclared war, the existence of this stockpile of weapons would be an enormous boon to the free peoples of the world. Such weapons would enable us to render swift and possibly effective assistance to any nation threatened by aggression in the future. We could take instant advantage of any opportunity that might arise for arming some ally. We would be prepared if events forced an abrupt increase in our Armed Forces, since men can be recruited more rapidly than munitions.

TO TAKE THE INITIATIVE

The struggle for peace is a global one. It cannot be fought successfully if most of our available military strength is required to conduct a holding action on one front. To forestall persistent Soviet aggression, we must be capable of opening other fronts where we can choose the conditions of struggle—where we can take the initiative. The existence of a sizable stock of wapons and ammunition would give us that potential.

Without these weapons we will always be lagging 2 to 3 years behind the need. With these weapons, we would be able to act anywhere in a few months, even weeks. These reserves of weapons would lift our foreign policy from the mire of military weakness and give it a new mobility which would help stabilize the whole world.

In Korea today our position is set by our military power. We are no stronger or weaker diplomatically than the forces we can put into Korea.

RACE FOR SURVIVAL

Tragically unpleasant as it is, we have been forced into an arms race—with our very survival at stake. Do the reports from Russia tell of a let-up in arming? Far from it. Only last February the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe stated that the Soviet Union is making a greater military effort today than in 1940, when the Second World War was already under way. Other reports, some based on official Soviet announcements, have told of tractor factories being shifted to making tanks and of other conversions from civilian to military production.

If true, these reports are warnings we dare not ignore. To convert a factory from tractors to tanks is no easy decision for the Soviet leaders since tractors are a desperate necessity in Russia. That applies with almost equal validity for all of Russia's resources. The Soviets have virtually no "fat" in their economy. When the Kremlin orders resources into armaments it pays a harsh price in terms of living standards, in terms of repairing the devastation of the last war, even in terms of future military strength. Every ton of steel put into armaments is a ton less steel that might go into expanding Russia's basic steel capacity, or building new railroads or drilling new oil wells.

KREMLIN'S CALCULATIONS

We can be sure that these decisions were not taken without exacting calculations of the prospects of war. The reports of Soviet industrial mobilization do not yet show that the Kremlin is on the verge of precipitating an all-out war. But they do make clear that the Soviets are intensifying—not easing—their war preparations.

I make no pretense at predicting what the Soviets are likely to do. I do know this, that it entails the cruelest exactions from the Russian people for the Soviets to keep as many men under arms and to produce as many airplanes, tanks, and other weapons as they are reported to have. Eventually most of these weapons will be obsolete. But will the Soviet leaders allow those weapons to rust and spoil—considering the cruel price paid for them—or will those weapons be used before they become obsolete?

WE CAN LOSE ALL

And if a nation, whose people have so little, can devote so much of its resources to arms production, how much less can we afford to do—we who have so much to lose.

How long can we continue to put comforts above survival, to postpone for another year and still another year the small and temporary denials which arms production requires, to lull ourselves with the illusion that we are getting ready to be strong instead of producing the weapons which alone can make us militarily strong? Is it not better to be sure and safe—than sorry?

You gentlemen may not be prepared to accept my own appraisal of the risks ahead. In any case I urge you to cut through the befogging confusion by giving the American people the facts they need to form their own judgment on whether we should be relaxing or intensifying our defensive efforts.

Specifically I recommend—

1. That this committee tell the American people exactly what has happened to the huge sums appropriated for defense, what our actual production of munitions is—not dollar values but actual production figures—and whether we have been getting our money's worth. On what prices are the budget estimates based?

2. That you lay bare the basis of our so-called calculated risk so the public can judge whether we are being needlessly exposed to unwarranted danger.

3. That Congress adopt a defense budget which fits the risks we face. Cut the budget where you can with safety—not where it will imperil our security.

4. That you consider whether the risks ahead do not justify ordering the expansion of our Air Force to 143 wings without any stretch-out.

5. That you consider whether these risks do not justify stepping up other munitions schedules sufficiently to provide a sizable reserve of weapons, considerably in excess of our own troop requirements.

6. That Congress undertake a detailed study of the whole program of plant expansion to determine how much of it represents a real contribution to security and whether it is worth the price in taxes and other resources as against the added security which a greater output of weapons would furnish.

GET PRODUCTION TARGETS

7. That Congress insist that the defense agencies reduce the arms program to specific production targets—both in quantities and time—and that all mobilization controls be adjusted to insure these goals being met.

8. That the President be granted every necessary power to carry through this program, including price and priority controls.

9. But, at the same time, that Congress strengthen its committees dealing with defense by equipping them with an adequate staff, vigorously led, and capable of regaining control over the budget for Congress.

10. That your committee obtain from the military a single, unified strategy, covering the whole Defense Establishment, and which is part of an over-all global strategy which integrates our own defense efforts with what our allies can do.

WHAT ECONOMY CAN STAND

In making these recommendations I appreciate that both in this country and among our allies the prevailing mood appears to incline toward doing less. Nor would I want to leave the impression that I do not appreciate the justifiable concern of those who are worried over how long we can continue to spend such huge sums on defense without wrecking our economy.

Once the gap between our own defenses and Soviet military strength is overcome, we should be able to relax somewhat, provided always that we continue to pace ourselves in relation to what the Soviets are doing and the risks of war. But to let up now is unsound strategically and economically. Before peace can become possible, this gap in military readiness will have to be overcome. The longer we stretch things out, the more costly it will prove in the end.

GETTING OUR MONEY'S WORTH

Since the outbreak in Korea more than $100,000,000,000 has been appropriated for defense—an enormous sum. Why has it produced proportionately so little in the way of actual weapons?

What blame are we to lay to the failure to use the available powers to prevent inflation? As you know, as soon as the military began placing contracts, prices were allowed to run away from them. This made more difficult a task difficult at best. No industry has ever been called upon to spend such immense sums so quickly and, at the same time, to be denied the necessary controls.

The armed services do need a driving production authority of their own—of the caliber of the late William Knudsen—to see that orders are properly placed and followed up—vigorously, constantly. The services also need a clear-cut point of decision to determine when designs are to be frozen and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

with a procedure for the quick settlement of labor disputes that arise in defense plants, because time is always of the essence in the settlement of a labor dispute. When we take away from the parties their economic weapons, we cannot justify saying, "Denied your economic weapons, you must now wait until the long delaying process of procedures on the statute books, such as the Taft-Hartley law, have time to operate as they would operate in normal times and under normal conditions."

So I say, Mr. President, we must provide a procedure for the quick settlement of labor disputes in defense plants, in view of the fact that we have the right to insist that labor and management appreciate the fact that in a time of crisis and emergency they have no moral right to resort to economic action.

Some may say, "Oh, but they do not always live up to their moral obligation." How well I know it.

Yet one of the remarkable things about the operation of the tripartite system, as we found in World War II, and as we have found to a surprising degree during this defense mobilization period, is that when representatives of the parties to a labor dispute, sitting on a board that has been granted jurisdiction over the dispute, bring to bear upon the parties their judgment as to what ought to be done in the settlement of the dispute, in most instances a quicker and fairer settlement of the dispute is reached than if there is a system whereby only the so-called public representatives sit back, adjudge the case, and then issue orders as to what the parties shall do. A board composed only of public members makes fine theory. A plausible case can be made out for that kind of set-up, Mr. President, but I respectfully submit that in many, many cases that kind of system will not prove to be successful, if its success is to be judged from the standpoint of whether uninterrupted production in the interest of prosecution of the defense effort is continued.

For the foregoing reasons I submit, Mr. President, that in my opinion the President is right, in the message he has sent to us, in urging the continuation of a tripartite board, because I believe such a board puts management and labor on the spot and puts them in such a position that when any labor group or any management group takes a defiant attitude toward the Board that has been set up to handle labor disputes during the emergency, the labor members of the Board and the employer members of the Board can exercise tremendous pressure upon such a recalcitrant labor or management group, and get them to comply with what the Board has decided is a fair and equitable solution of the dispute.

Mr. President, we were very proud of the fact that during World War II, although on some occasions there were dissents on our Board—in the decisions, labor sometimes would dissent or management would dissent—but there was never a case in all the history of the Labor Board, in which the Board was not unanimous in insisting that the decision be carried out by the parties to the dispute. Some of the strongest decisions for enforcement were written by employer members of the Board against employer parties to a dispute, because of the attitude assumed by some employer who would try to defy the decision of the Board.

In a few instances, such as in the Toledo, Peoria & Western Railroad case, where seizure was resorted to, the strongest enforcement decision was written by an employer member of the board. In many of the labor cases, where some hot-headed union leaders of local unions for a few hours thought they were bigger than the Government, and pulled a "quickie" strike in defiance of the War Labor Board, it was the labor members of the War Labor Board who went into action on those local unions and made very clear to them that they had better either go back to work or they could be certain that the public members of the board would follow what we always said would be our position, namely, recommend the exercise of whatever force of Government was needed under those circumstances to break such a union. So, I believe the President of the United States is right in his message when he points out the advantage of maintaining a tripartite board. In the settlement of many disputes there will be differences of opinion as to whether a decision was right or was wrong.

Let me state what I think our approach in Congress ought to be with regard to the Wage Stabilization Board. Our approach should not be one of destroying the structure of the board or the authority of the board. Our approach should be to lay down a few legislative blueprints in regard to principles of public policy which the board should be required, by congressional mandate, to follow. I think that is the statesmanship job to be done.

For example, I believe we should have in legislative form the requirement that as a matter of public policy, the Wage Stabilization Board cannot grant a union shop as a part of a decision in a Wage Stabilization Board opinion. The Senate knows my views on that question. In our hearings in connection with the steelworkers' case, I went into that quite at some length. Briefly, I wish to say I have always held to the position that it is unsound public policy for the Government, in a labor dispute, to order a union shop upon any employer by way of governmental mandate.

I happen to think that is a nonarbitrable issue. I happen to think it is an issue that can be settled only by collective-bargaining negotiations between the parties. During the period of this emergency, both parties ought to be told, by way of legislation, that, as a matter of public policy, if they cannot settle the issue between themselves, then the issue is to be postponed until the emergency is over, and that in a defense plant, the production of which is essential to the prosecution of the defense effort, the right to strike over that issue is "out" for the period of the emergency.

There are some other legislative blueprints by way of public policy which I think we could lay down, but, Mr. President, that is a far different thing from taking the position that we should abolish the board and leave nothing in this period of defense mobilization for the settlement of labor disputes in defense plants but the Taft-Hartley law. In my judgment the Taft-Hartley law is not worth the paper it is written on for the handling of a dispute in a defense plant during an emergency period if we are to attempt to get labor and management to recognize their moral obligation not to resort to economic force during the period of the emergency.

I am still waiting for the American press, as a press, Mr. President, to clarify what I submit has been its gross misinformation to the American people in regard to the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law, in relation for example, to the pending steel controversy. I am still waiting for the press to do the educational job I think it owes the American people in regard to the operations of the Taft-Hartley law in an emergency dispute. The press should point out that that law does not contain a sentence which will stop a strike at the hour of crisis when a strike is threatened.

The operation of the procedures of the Taft-Hartley law require many days, and during those days of functioning prior to the time the Attorney General is ready to go into court and ask for an injunction, there is nothing in that law which would prevent the strike from occurring. That is exactly what would have happened in the steel case.

So I say that we have a job to do in the Congress with regard to legislating on the subject of emergency disputes; but that job is not to repeal the section of the law which establishes the only tribunal available today for the expeditious handling of labor disputes in defense plants, namely, the Wage Stabilization Board.

I am still accepting all reasonable amendments and revisions to the bill which I introduced the day after the President seized the steel mills, because I am as convinced now as I was then that it happens to be the legislative duty of this Congress to place on the statute books a law which will provide a procedure and remedy for the immediate handling of a threatened work stoppage in a defense plant. That is why in my bill there is a certain section which, so far as I know, is opposed by every labor organization in the country. That makes no difference to me, because they happen to be wrong in their opposition; and whenever labor is wrong, I am as willing to oppose the position of labor as I am to oppose the position of an employer who may be wrong on some issue. Thus, as I say, I have in my bill a provision which authorizes the President of the United States to proceed to ask his Attorney General to go into a Federal Court and obtain an injunction at the very time he is convinced that there is going to be a strike, if it is not enjoined. It is also provided that such injunction shall stand for the period of time required for the Government, through the Board of Inquiry which is provided for in my bill, to ascertain what the facts are and make recommendations to the President, and for the period of time required for the President, in turn, to present to the Congress his proposals

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

weapons put into production. Changes in design are costly both in time and dollars. Some clearly designated person must decide when to stop improving and start producing.

CONTROL OF BUDGET LOST

The Secretary of Defense has been struggling manfully and making progress with these and other problems. You can help him best not by imposing some dollar limit on defense expenditures but by making your own thorough study of what is wrong. To regain control of the military budget—which you must do—Congress must become as well informed on these matters as the executive agencies. As was recommended by the Hoover Commission, you need a greatly expanded permanent staff, vigorously directed, and which can work with the Defense Department through every step of the budgetary process. Go beyond the mere requests for money to how the appropriations are actually being spent, and even into such basic problems of military organization as to why so large an overhead is required in relation to the forces actually fighting. Other nations get more fighting power for the same resources than we do. Why?

You might take a whole year or more for such a study. We will be at the business of defense for a long time, I fear, and no matter how long it takes, if you do the job at least once in full intensity, the knowledge acquired will yield astounding savings and improvements in efficiency.

LIBERTIES ABOVE MONEY

The surgeon puts his knife to the diseased spot. In cutting the military budget you must be equally judicious in applying the scalpel so that it helps—not hurts—our security. If we spend a little too much money, we can recover. If we lose our freedom, we can never recover it.

One discipline you might impose is to require the military to justify their budget requests according to a scale of priorities—which items are of most vital importance, which next in importance and so on down the list. These priorities, in turn, should reflect a truly unified military plan in which the missions entrusted each service are parts of one integrated whole. We cannot get our money's worth in defense if appropriations are parceled out among the services by some balanced percentage allocation.

BAD MOBILIZATION

No one could be more concerned over the necessity of maintaining a healthy economy, even while arming. However, the main threat to our economy since Korea has not lain in the size of the defense program. The inflationary havoc we have suffered has been mainly the result of the failure to mobilize properly.

Because we were undertaking only a "partial" mobilization in the military sense, those in responsibility reasoned that "partial," piecemeal controls were all that were needed. Although there was little or no slack in our economy, the mobilizing authorities seemed to think that several million men could be drawn into the Army and unknown but large amounts of matériel taken from the regular market without serious disturbance. They ignored the clear lesson of both World Wars that a full set of mobilization controls must be imposed over the whole economy at the very outset of the emergency.

Congress actually passed the necessary legislation for such an across-the-economy program. But these powers were not used for months during which living costs soared, all savings were cheapened, and the real purchasing power of every defense dollar was slashed by one-fifth.

TWENTY BILLIONS WASTED

This needless inflation already has cost us $12 billions in higher costs of defense and is likely to exact another $10 billions in needless tribute over the next fiscal year. These sums are far in excess of what it would cost to continue with the original aircraft production program. These sums are far in excess of the economies which might be realized under the limitations proposed by the House of Representatives.

In other words, had a proper mobilization been undertaken at the outset, we could press ahead today with a greater defense effort at less cost than the weaker effort now proposed. Under the program which was adopted, we have gotten neither adequate security, nor a healthy economy.

NO POLITICS AS USUAL

We still can step up our defense program and avoid further inflation by reducing all unnecessary and postponable expenditures—Senators BYRD and DOUGLAS and others in Congress have been waging a courageous fight on this score—by, I repeat, cutting out all unnecessary and postponable expenditures, by imposing the necessary controls and accepting the temporary denials and disciplines which would be entailed. Of course, we cannot rearm to the extent that our security requires, if we persist in profits as usual, social reforms as usual, and politics as usual.

We have the highest living standards in the world and, like you, I would like to see them enlarged. Increased living standards no longer mean bread alone, but better housing, better clothing, hygiene, medical care, education, transportation, and amusement. But all these things become mere ashes in our mouths if we lack the means with which to defend them. While we struggle to survive, actual needs not postponable wants must have first call.

FIRST THINGS FIRST

Our economy can do all that our security requires—and more—provided there is the will to do so and the courage of administration to channel our resources from less essential to more essential activities and to share the costs of the struggle equitably.

Today the main burdens of the cold war are being borne by the few whose loved ones are at the fighting fronts and by those who do not have a pressure group to represent them in the race of selfishness that is tearing the Nation apart.

Our problem is to find a substitute for the disciplines which war brings. If we are to be able to avoid war, we must be able to discipline ourselves so we can mobilize our strength in time to prevent the shooting and bombing from starting.

DISCIPLINE OF URGENCY

Because self-discipline is the test of national survival, it will not suffice to say merely that we should follow a middle course between arming for all-out war and doing nothing. How are we to adjust this middle course to changing conditions? Are we to do it at random and by wishful thinking? Or are we to do it by facing up to our best calculations of the risks which threaten, drawing up a worked-out plan to surmount these risks and organizing ourselves to see it through?

Without a sense of disciplined urgency, the whole mobilization may fall to pieces. Bear in mind that the synchronizing force of any mobilization is the priority power—the decision as to what must come first, second, third, and so on. To determine what production should be held back so more essential production can be speeded one must know what quantities of weapons are needed by when. We must set ourselves to attain these production goals with the same urgency as if we were at war.

If it makes little difference whether planes are produced next year or the year after, why deprive some civilian industry of scarce materials? Why stop research on a new weapon to get it into production? Why hurry to make deliveries to our allies?

When you live under the shadow of war, as we do today, all actions must be valued in terms of time. It is time which our young men fighting in Korea have been buying for us. If their sacrifices are not to prove in vain, we must know exactly what we propose to do with that time. We must organize ourselves so that first things come first through our entire economy, through everything we do. That is our responsibility to our men in Korea, in Europe, and other fronts.

THIS IS THE ISSUE

In conclusion, may I state what I consider to be the real and crucial issue before this committee, before the whole Congress, before all of the people? Our highest military authorities have stated, unequivocally, that from now through 1954 will be the period of maximum peril for this Nation. Yet we deliberately are doing less than we can do to achieve readiness by that date.

Nowhere have I seen any justifiable reason offered for such recklessness, particularly since it would cost so little in temporary denials to make our safety secure. I believe it is the responsibility of this committee—and it is a very grave responsibility—to give the American people the facts of our defense situation, without fear or favor, without regard to politics or wishful thinking or to cover up past mistakes—give the people the facts they need to know so they can demand a defense program which will mobilize our strength in time to prevent further aggression.

We must strengthen ourselves militarily if we are to succeed in our objective of preventing a third world war and building and keeping a lasting peace.

WAGE STABILIZATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall now proceed to the second part of my argument which will be even briefer than the first part.

There is very little I can add to the argument which the President has advanced in his letter advocating the continuation of the Wage Stabilization Board in the form of a tripartite board. From my experience as a member of the War Labor Board during World War II I seriously question whether a no-strike-no-lockout agreement would have survived during the war if there had not been brought into the adjudicating process of disputes coming before the Board the judgment, experience, and the cooperation of representatives of industry and of labor as well as of the public.

It is true, Mr. President, that a tripartite board is not a court, but I wish to testify today that the War Labor Board found itself to be a quasi-judicial tribunal, and in most instances—yes, Mr. President, in an overwhelming majority of instances—on the major issues the Board was unanimous in its decisions. Of course, the unanimity of decisions was frequently reached by the give-and-take process, by the methods of approach which must characterize any board that has had assigned to it the function of settling a labor dispute in the midst of an emergency.

But, Mr. President, if it be true, as I believe it to be, that in this emergency, in this period of defense mobilization, no group of workers, no labor union, has any moral right to call a strike in a defense plant, and, likewise, no employer has any moral right to call a lockout in a defense plant, then we must provide American labor and employers

votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RICHARDS, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. CHIPERFIELD, and Mr. VORYS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6291. An act to amend section 218 (f) of the Social Security Act with respect to effective dates of agreements entered into with States before January 1, 1954;

H. R. 7340. An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 430. Joint resolution approving the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico on March 3, 1952.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 302) to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles, and referred or placed on calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 6291. An act to amend section 218 (f) of the Social Security Act with respect to effective dates of agreements entered into with States before January 1, 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 7340. An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

H. J. Res. 430. Joint resolution approving the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico on March 3, 1952; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 29, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 302) to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2594) to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

Mr. CAPEHART obtained the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield for that purpose, provided I do not lose the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator may yield for that purpose.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the pending amendment and all other amendments to the bill be limited to 15 minutes to a side, to be controlled by the author of the amendment and the chairman of the committee, respectively. If such an agreement can be made we can finish this bill before a recess is taken this evening. Otherwise, there is no assurance as to when we can finish it. A great many Senators plan to go away late this evening for Memorial Day addresses and what not, and they will not be here Monday. We know that we shall not have a quorum Monday for the transaction of business.

The Senator from Virginia plans to be here tomorrow, and he was anxious to work tomorrow. He will be here Monday. But nearly 30 Senators are away today, not knowing perhaps that this important measure might be voted on. We have had present as many as 33 Senators. In all my legislative experience I have never seen such absenteeism as afflicts our legislative program at the present time. Unless we impose some limitation on debate, we shall be here when the snows falls, or if not, we shall leave unfinished many measures which ought to be acted upon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I expect to object—it seems to me altogether out of order to try to complete the work on this vitally important piece of legislation today. The distinguished Senator from Virginia has already pointed out that there are a great many absentees.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to say that the Senator from Virginia spoke to me about this matter. I did not understand him to suggest that the bill would be completed today, but that the time for debate on each amendment would be limited to 15 minutes.

Mr. IVES. That may be, but, Mr. President, I still do not think that at this particular time we should place a limitation on debate. I believe we ought to let the debate take its course this afternoon, to be continued later on. Possibly we could enter into a unanimous-consent agreement in connection with the matter next week. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York objects.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the Senate has just voted to continue price and wage controls in the pending bill. I have been one of the strongest advocates of price and wage controls up to this time. In fact, I offered an amendment to the original 1950 Production Act, to freeze all prices and all wages as of midnight, on the night the Nation went to war in Korea. I have always said, and I still say and believe, and always will, that we ought to have a permanent law on the statute books providing in effect that, at any time America goes to war, all prices and wages would automatically be frozen. From that point controls should be continued as long as necessary, and then be eliminated.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an amendment, which was ordered to be printed and lie on the table. It now lies on the desk of each Senator. It is designated by the letter "H." I invite the attention of Senators to the amendment which is on the desks.

Mr. President, I see both sides of this question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The attention of the Chair is called to the fact that the Senator from Indiana has not offered his amendment. It has been printed and lies on the table. Is the Senator offering the amendment?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am not offering it at the moment. I may do so at the conclusion of my remarks. I may say, in case there is any doubt about it, that my purpose at this time is merely to make a brief statement by way of an explanation of the amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from South Carolina for the purpose of propounding a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that the Senator is preparing to speak, and I shall listen with interest to what he may have to say. I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senate has voted upon the so-called Dirksen amendment. As I understand, we now return to a parliamentary situation in which committee amendments, under the Senate rules, take precedence over all other amendments, and we proceed in the regular way. Am I correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is but one committee amendment to the bill, and that is in the form of a complete substitute. All amendments would be to the substitute, not to the text of the bill. The parliamentary situation with respect to all amendments is the same as though nothing had been done, but that is what has happened.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand that nothing has been done, except for the vote on the Dirksen amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments which will now be offered to the text of the substitute will be offered and will have the same parliamentary status as though the Senate had not voted on the other amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Chair.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I hold in my hand this amendment lettered "H," which was printed and which lies on the table, as well as upon the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

for the handling of such disputes, subject to the checking right of the Congress to approve or disapprove. That is my notion, and always has been my notion, of what the check-and-balance system of the Constitution means. It has always coincided with my view that the Congress has the legislative power under article II of the Constitution to check a President in the exercise of any power he may claim for the settling of disputes.

That is the legislative approach which I believe Congress ought to make. Until we do it, I think we shall have failed in our legislative responsibility. I recommend that approach as preferable to the approach which is made in the pending amendment, because I think the pending amendment, if adopted would leave us with no effective machinery for the handling of labor disputes in defense plants. All we could fall back upon then would be the Taft-Hartley law, and if that is the only remedy we can offer the parties to labor disputes in defense plants, while at the same time we insist that they live up to their moral obligation not to strike or not to lock out, then I say, for whatever it may be worth, that on the basis of my experience in this field, we shall have a great amount of industrial trouble, rather than industrial peace. But we can have industrial peace if we provide for the legislative blueprint for which I have been pleading during these many weeks in the Senate.

In the President's message—not encompassed in the pending amendment—there is reference also to the Fulbright amendments, dealing with the Walsh-Healey Act. I shall reserve comment on that subject until the time when the Fulbright amendments are brought up on the floor.

I now close by saying that I rest my case for the continuation of controls on Bernard Baruch's testimony of yesterday, and I rest my case for the continuation of a tripartite Wage Stabilization Board on the basis of the experience which I have had in many cases under the operation of a tripartite War Labor Board during World War II.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have spoken once. I feel that I am entitled to speak a second time. I do not know when I have been called upon to vote on a measure on which it has been more difficult for me to reach a decision than on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois. I have pointed out some of the unconscionable abuses that have occurred under the price control provisions. Prices are being rigged to the disadvantage of farmers and consumers, and the free market in this country is being disrupted. That situation will continue, I am afraid.

Yet I agree with Senators who say it is not safe to leave the country without some controls on the statute books which can be used in case of necessity. I also realize, if the provisions for price and wage controls are voted out of the bill, that in this election year of 1952 we can expect almost anything to happen. It would be a very easy matter for those who would be resentful at our action to create an inflationary condition which would be far greater than we have experienced so far.

As I say, Mr. President, it is one of the most difficult decisions that I have had to make. I think for the safety of the country it is necessary to keep controls on the books for a few months more, or at least until we can get a new administration that we can trust to apply fairly the provisions that we write.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senators from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER and Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Conference of the International Council for Christian Leadership at The Hague.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is detained on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. If present and voting the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—18

Bennett	Dirksen	Millikin
Bridges	Dworshak	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Ellender	Schoeppel
Capehart	Ferguson	Welker
Case	Gillette	Williams
Cordon	McCarthy	Young

NAYS—52

Aiken	Hunt	Nixon
Anderson	Ives	O'Conor
Benton	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Butler, Md.	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Clements	Kilgore	Russell
Connally	Lehman	Saltonstall
Douglas	Long	Smathers
Eastland	Martin	Smith, N. J.
Frear	Maybank	Smith, N. C.
Fulbright	McCarran	Sparkman
George	McClellan	Stennis
Hayden	McFarland	Thye
Hendrickson	McKellar	Tobey
Hennings	Monroney	Underwood
Hill	Moody	Watkins
Hoey	Morse	
Holland	Neely	

NOT VOTING—26

Brewster	Hickenlooper	Magnuson
Bricker	Humphrey	Malone
Byrd	Jenner	McMahon
Cain	Kefauver	Murray
Carlson	Kem	Seaton
Duff	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Ecton	Knowland	Taft
Flanders	Langer	Wiley
Green	Lodge	

So Mr. DIRKSEN's amendment was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7005) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing

desk of each Senator. I can see both sides of the controversy as to whether we should or should not completely eliminate price and wage controls. Or, Mr. President, to put it the other way around, whether we ought to have a law on the statute books to take care of the control of prices and wages, if and when necessary.

The amendment which I shall propose should I satisfy those who favor the dropping of price and wage controls at the moment, those who are in doubt about it, and those who are as sincerely interested as I am in seeing to it that the people of the Nation are not subjected to the perils and hardships of runaway inflation. The amendment proposes to keep the price and wage-controls law on the statute books, to keep the organization for the purpose of imposing price and wage controls; but to suspend all price and wage controls unless the consumers' index should rise three points.

The Consumers' Index at the moment stands at 188. That, by the way, is the index now used in the escalator clauses of our labor contracts, it is the index which was prepared by the Labor Department, and it is the index which has been used in the writing of other legislation. Under my amendment all price and wage controls would be suspended forever unless the Consumers' Index should rise to 191, or 3 points above what it is now, or unless there was a declaration of war by the Congress.

My honest opinion is that if we were to retain the law on the statute books, but suspend wage and price controls at the moment and provide that if the consumer index should rise three points the law would have full force and effect, we could eliminate controls for the time being at least, and bring about a reduction in prices in America. My opinion is that if we do not do that, there will be an increase of prices even under the existing law, or under the law as it may be amended, because the tendency at the moment in America is reflected by these facts: The Government has set ceiling prices. Most articles are selling below ceiling prices. Those which are not selling below ceiling prices are, in my opinion, selling at ceiling prices, simply because the position is taken that since the Government has set ceiling prices they may be assumed to be a fair price, and to represent the price the seller ought to receive. So I am sincere and honest in saying that I believe, if we want to see a reduction in prices in America we should remove price and wage controls, get rid of the reporting, get rid of the expense, and get rid of all the trouble to which American business is subjected.

We could then say to the consuming public in America, "We now have a law, under which, if anyone starts to chisel, if prices start to run away, or if they start to rise and do rise more than 3 points on the consumers' index, then price and wage controls will automatically be resumed." When we shall have done that, we shall have satisfied the consuming public. The public is entitled to that protection.

If we remove price and wage controls I think we shall get a reduction rather than an increase in prices. If we retain controls, particularly with the bill as it is written—and I do not know how to write a better one; I am not criticizing it—it is inherent in any price or wage control law that there must be some flexibility. I think the answer to the whole problem is to suspend price and wage controls. I think Congress should do it, and then say to the OPS Administrator, "Maintain your staff, because the bill expires in February of next year"—if it is passed as it is now written.

There can be no question that durable goods are selling at very much below ceiling. There can be no question that there is an oversupply of durable goods in America. Anyone who is at all familiar with business knows that to be true. The President and our Military Establishment have extended war production from what they intended originally to be a 2-year period to a 4- or a 5-year period. The result will be that they will take more than 15 percent of the normal productive facilities of America. Who knows but what we may have to maintain that 15 percent for 10 or 15 years? I do not know and I do not think anyone else knows. Are we going to have controls with us for 10 or 15 or 20 years? Who knows?

Another angle which I think has been completely overlooked is that we have practically full employment in the United States today. We have a $300,000,000,000 national income from civilian production plus a certain amount of governmental activities. For many years the spending by the Government is going to be very great. No one can deny that. Are we saying to ourselves that, with full employment in America, with enormous production, and with a national income of more than $300,000,000,000 under the private-enterprise system, that sort of an economy will not work without Government controls? Is that what we are saying to ourselves? I should like to ask this question: When are we going to be able to take off controls if we can ever take them off? Is it when we have fifty, sixty, or seventy million persons unemployed? Is it when our national production drops from $300,000,000,000 to $200,000,000,000?

What are the arguments in favor of price controls at the moment? They are that we have a gross national income of $300,000,000,000, that all our people are employed, and that our corporations are making huge profits. The argument is made that we must have governmental controls because we have what I am certain everybody wants, namely, full employment and a certain amount of prosperity. When are we going to remove controls?

We shall have the same arguments advanced and the same economic conditions facing us next June or next March that we have today. The only difference is that next year will not be an election year. With that exception, in my opinion, Senators will be making the same argument they are making today. We shall find the same conditions existing as those which exist today. What we are saying is that so long as all our people are employed, so long as we have a $300,000,000,000 national gross income, we are going to have price and wage controls in America.

I do not believe that, Mr. President, I think that is wrong. I believe that what we should do now is to suspend controls on prices and wages and write into the law a provision that they shall remain suspended and decontrolled until the Consumers' Index rises 3 points, or there is a declaration of war by the Congress.

I have always been sold on the idea that if we go to war we should have price and wage controls the minute it occurs, because people become hysterical and start buying and pushing prices up because they do not know how long the war will last or whether they will be able to buy goods later, or what the prices may be. So I think we should have price and wage controls the moment we go to war, and in peacetime if the Consumers' Index rises 3 points beyond what it is now, the President should immediately reimpose price and wage controls.

Let us give business, labor, and everyone else a breathing spell in America. Let us give them some flexibility. I am suggesting 3 points. Maybe that is too much, or maybe it is not enough. I am speaking at the moment of a formula. That is the way to do it.

The argument has been made that Mr. Arnall, the OPS Director, has already decontrolled many commodities. The able Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] read a list of the items which have been decontrolled. It is quite a long list. He also said that Mr. Arnall had told him, as he has told me, that he is going to decontrol other items. That is indicative, of course, that certain items are selling below the ceiling prices and should be decontrolled.

Mr. President, I have the idea that it is all wrong to try to decontrol in a piecemeal fashion.

It has been said that if wool goes below the ceiling price, wool should be decontrolled; when shoes go below the ceiling price, shoes should be decontrolled; when something else goes below the ceiling price, it should also be decontrolled. But that is wrong, in my opinion, because if we decontrol one article and do not decontrol the elements which go into its manufacture, or if we do not decontrol the wages of the workers who make the particular article, we get a very unbalanced budget in America, and we do the very thing we do not want to do.

If it is good business to decontrol these items individually, if it is a good thing to decontrol them because they go below the ceiling price, then why is it not a good thing to suspend all controls on prices and all controls on wages and say to the American people, "We have you protected with an umbrella. We are not going to permit prices to go up more than 3 points." Why is not that the proper way to proceed? We say to the American people, "We do not want you to be burdened with runaway inflation." We say to them that if the Consumers' Index rises 3 points above what it is today,

which would be 191, because it is now 188, controls will be reimposed and the American people will be given the protection to which they are entitled.

We say to American business and agriculture—to big-business men and to small-business men, of whom there are approximately four million—just as we say to labor organizations, large and small, "You no longer have to worry with wage controls so long as the index remains at 191 or below." In my opinion, if we will do that, we will find prices going down instead of going up. If I am wrong about it, as I might be, and prices should go up to 191 on the Consumers' Index, then automatically price and wage controls would become effective.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am interested in the Senator's argument, and I should like to ask him how he visualizes the keeping together of an organization, so that when the moment of danger comes, the organization will step in to keep things moving. Does the Senator propose to keep the entire price control organization all the time?

Mr. CAPEHART. The life of this bill, as it is written at the moment, is only until next February 28. I would recommend keeping the staff and appropriating money to keep it intact until that time. I certainly would make that recommendation. After February 28, next year, if there have been no further emergencies or wars, I would favor a continuation permanently of such a law as I propose. I would be willing to offer an amendment or a bill to provide that if the Nation goes to war, there would automatically be price and wage controls I think that certainly we ought to continue such a law as my amendment envisions beyond February 28 of next year. I am talking about setting a ceiling beyond which we in Congress will not permit inflation to go.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Would it not be fair to assume that after the index had risen three points, there would be a substantial lag before new controls began to operate?

Mr. CAPEHART. There would not need to be a lag at all, because the President could issue one Executive order freezing all prices and wages at the rates existing on the day the Executive order was issued. He could issue an Executive order by a stroke of the pen, just as he did on July 26, 1951, and freeze all wages and prices in America, and the proposed law could proceed from that point by Executive order. The President could simply freeze prices and wages. In fact, the law would require that he do it. The law would require that when the Consumers' Index reached 191, or whatever point we desired to write into the formula, the President by Executive order would simply freeze wages and prices at that point, just as he did on July 26, 1951.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not particularly like this amendment. I do not like any wage and price control laws. I have not seen any that I have been happy with. They are troublesome and bothersome. They just do not fit into our kind of government. But sometimes we have to do things we do not like to do. Sometimes we have to accept something as the lesser of two evils.

A moment ago I voted to discontinue price and wage controls, because I felt that the Nation would be better off without them. However, I am offering my amendment because I feel it possibly embodies a better method than eliminating price and wage controls without having a law affording protection in case of what we ordinarily term "runaway inflation."

It also has one other advantage. As I have said many, many times on the floor of the Senate, on the air, and in other places, we ought to have a permanent statute which would provide that when the Nation goes to war, automatically at the very moment we go to war the control of prices and wages should begin to operate. There was no such law when the Korean war began. The Korean war started, as I recall, on June 25, 1950. On September 8, if my memory serves me correctly, Congress passed a law controlling wages. The President did not put it into effect until January. However, I do not wish to go into that matter now; it has been discussed over and over again. The Korean war is now 2 years old. Its beginning is 2 years behind us. That is a period of time longer than we participated in World War I.

Most articles in America are selling below the ceiling price. I think practically all farm products are selling below the ceiling; that means the price the farmer gets is below parity; and, of course, parity is the ceiling under the act. Farm products are selling below the ceiling price.

If Senators will check the durable-goods industry, or goods such as textiles, they will find prices are soft. Not only will they find that prices are soft, or below ceiling, but they will likewise find an abundance of goods; they will find the warehouses bulging. It is quite likely that in the next 6 months, if we do not clean up the matter of price and wage controls, there will be a so-called depression, rather than inflation.

With the extension of the defense effort over a period of about 5 years, instead of getting the job done in 2 years with an overproduction of durable goods, with a tremendous stock of wheat, with soybean stocks high, though corn stocks are not quite so high, with the prospects today of the production of good crops of foodstuffs, with more cattle on the farms than ever before, and a large supply of pork, we are more likely to have a declining market than an inflationary market. That is particularly true if there is a desire to bring prices down. My opinion is that it can be brought about by eliminating price and wage controls.

I know, first, that the business interests of America, who have been agitating for the removal of price and wage controls, are not particularly going to like this suggestion. They are going to say, "It puts us in a strait-jacket. We do not like it." I can well understand that. I can understand other organizations saying, "We do not like it, because it may cause another plateau of prices," in other words, the prices might go up a little higher.

If I can quote correctly the OPS director, Mr. Arnall, himself, and I certainly will not be far wrong, and Mr. Wilson, when he was chief mobilizer, and I think Mr. Putnam, the best they would guarantee before the committee was that prices would not go up more than three points within the next year.

So let us get rid of price and wage controls. Let us pass a law to protect Americans against runaway inflation. Let us breathe some new life into business in America, and into labor organizations, which are troubled and bothered, as business is, with wage controls. Let us proceed on the premise that perhaps we are going to have to spend many, many billions of dollars for national defense for a period of 10, 15, or 20 years. Let us proceed on a basis which is sound to meet conditions which may last for many, many years. I do not see much chance of reducing our expenditures for armaments within 5 years to much lower a figure than the present one. The figure is about $60,000,000,000 this year. If it goes down to $40,000,000,000, that will be a reduction of 33⅓ percent. If we can reduce it 50 percent, the expenditures will still be $30,000,000,000. If they are now $60,000,000,000, and if now 15 percent of our civilian production is going into war materials, and we reduce military expenditures to $30,000,000,000, which would be a 50 percent reduction, 7½ percent of our civilian production would still be going for defense purposes.

So when are we going to get rid of price and wage controls? When? Will someone tell me what must happen in America before Congress will be willing to eliminate price and wage controls? I wish someone would tell me what the signs of their abandonment will be. Will one of the signs be 10,000,000 men unemployed, or 15,000,000 men unemployed? Or will it be when business drops back from $300,000,000,000 of national production to $200,000,000,000? Is that what Senators want? Is that going to be the sign? Where is the yardstick? Tell me what the signs will be. Will somebody tell me?

Mr. President, I wish someone would give me the yardstick or paint a picture on the wall for me showing what the signs are, or showing at what state our economy must arrive before Senators would be willing to vote to eliminate price and wage controls. What is the yardstick? Are we merely floating downstream? Will someone tell me what the yardstick should be? I know that Senators are not going to tell me that they want to see 15,000,000 men unemployed, so that we can eliminate wage and price controls. I know that Senators are not going to tell me that they want to see business in America drop off a third so that we may remove price and wage controls. It seems to me that if we are to give our people full employment, have 60,000,000 employed, and produce $300,000,000,000 worth of national products each year, we must find some way to do

it under the private enterprise system, and without Government controls. If we maintain Government controls on prices and wages, we shall find them gradually going down.

What is the standard When are we going to be able to reach our objective? Who can tell me now that we shall not be compelled to spend $30,000,000,000 or $40,000,000,000 a year for the next 5 or 10 years on national defense?

The only sensible way to reach the desired objective is to raise an umbrella, and say that any time the consumer's index crosses a certain point we shall have price and wage controls, but that so long as the index is below that point we shall not have price and wage controls. We should provide that any time the Nation goes to war by virtue of a declaration of war by the Congress, price and wage controls shall automatically be applied. What is wrong with that? Why is not that the proper way? Who would be hurt by such a system? Why would not everyone gain? Why do we ask the 4,000,000 businessmen and the 15,000,000 farmers in America to come under price and wage controls if it is not necessary? What are we adding to the economy of the Nation by maintaining the kind of price and wage control which is written into the bill, when we can enact a law establishing a ceiling? Who is going to to win, and who is going to lose?

Mr. President, I shall not offer this amendment today, but I shall offer it on Monday or Tuesday, when we continue to vote upon amendments to the bill.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, as has been pointed out, the bill for the extension of the Defense Production Act, which the Banking Committee has at long last reported out, is weakened considerably. The bill publicly recognizes the need for economic controls, but blatantly bestows favors on those who are strongly opposed to any controls.

The bill has been the victim of the feelings aroused by the President's seizure of the steel mills. The Supreme Court has not yet ruled on the constitutionality of the President's action. I am ready to abide by the Court's judgment. The President has indicated that this is also his view.

Certain members of our committee have not liked the hold-the-line policy of the Economic Stabilization Agency with respect to steel. I freely recognize the right of anyone to disagree with administration policy on the steel dispute or on anything else. But I think it is poor statesmanship—and, if I may say so, poor politics—to take out one's disagreements with the administration's steel policy by punishing the American consumer and our national defense program.

This is in no way a reflection on the distinguished chairman of our committee. He has throughout this heated controversy displayed the temperance, the fairness, the leadership that makes me proud to serve with him. I would say it is due in no small measure to his firm leadership that we were able to report out any bill at all.

The representatives of the steel industry came before our committee and before other committees of Congress and frankly took the attitude that in view of the steel wage and price policy we should scrap our whole stabilization program—all our price and wage controls, as the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] has just advocated. When the senior Senator from New York asked Admiral Moreell, of Jones & Laughlin, whether he thought the price of steel would stay down without controls, the admiral said—and I quote from page 2223 of the hearings:

> I think the price of steel might rise for a period, for a short period, and then eventually would come down, provided we were not subjected to very large wage and other costs, such as, for example, the materials and services that we buy, including freight.

We have heard about prices coming down—after a while—after the controls are removed. I remind the Senate that we heard it back in 1946, and we know that what happened after the controls were removed was exactly the reverse. Now the steel companies are making that same doubtful promise—take off the controls, and steel prices—after a while—will come down—maybe.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to the argument just advanced by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. I suggest that the testimony of Mr. Arnall before the Banking and Currency Committee is very convincing evidence that some prices, at least, would go up and would go up sharply if controls were now to be removed. Mr. Arnall said:

> The food retailers want higher ceilings. The milk people want higher ceilings. The meat people want higher ceilings. The machinery people, the petroleum people, the steel people, the cement manufacturers, and many others want higher ceilings.

Why are those people after higher ceilings unless they want to raise their prices and would raise their prices if price controls were removed, as advocated by the Senator from Indiana?

Their attitude is, of course, understandable. I am not criticizing them individually. As they see it, they are acting according to their own self-interest, in line with the tradition of the American business system. The steel companies do not like the impact of controls on their business, any more than anyone else likes controls, so they ask that the controls be removed.

The attitude of the majority of the committee would have been more understandable if it had voted to abolish all controls in a belief that the steel dispute showed that such controls did more harm than good. But the committee majority did not vote to abolsh controls. The majority in its report says clearly that the extension of controls is necessary to protect the public interest.

Yet while agreeing on the need for the extension of all controls there are elements in the bill which can wreck the very price and wage controls which the report agrees are necessary. Surely this is not logical.

There are two major ways in which the committee bill injures price and wage controls.

The first is by allowing only an 8-month extension of price and wage controls. Mr. President, is it sensible that title I, which includes power to establish priorities and allocations, should continue to June 30, 1953, but at the same time the law should terminate price and wage controls on February 28? Or that titles II and III, which grant authority to requisition and condemn, and to expand productive capacity and supply should continue to June 30 while wage and salary controls terminate on February 28?

The second is by abolishing the present tripartite wage board, with its jurisdiction on wage disputes as part of the over-all wage-stabilization program substituted for the present Board is all public and a board without power to handle disputes.

The committee bill says that all titles of the Defense Production Act, with the exception of titles IV and V are extended until June 30, 1953. Titles IV and V are extended only until February 28, 1953.

Let me quickly review the three titles in this bill, which are the cause of most of the present controversy.

Title IV, the title to which the Senator from Indiana has just been addressing himself, deals with price, wage, and salary controls. Title V deals with an unused method of handling wage disputes—calling a conference of labor, management, and the public—and setting up, if the conference should agree, a sort of War Labor Board procedure for what amounts to the compulsory arbitration of labor disputes. I think it is evident from the other sections of the bill that the committee does not contemplate that title V shall be put into effect. I understand the President has not used title V because of the difficulty of getting a labor-management-public conference to reach agreement. The committee, in extending this title, cannot have any expectation that it will be used in the future. Further proof of this is the Dirksen-Bricker amendment in title IV which calls for the all-public wage board and abolishes the disputes function of the present Board.

Title VI deals with the authority of the Federal Reserve Board to regulate consumer credit and housing credit. As it happens, regulations W and X have been suspended, or largely suspended. Therefore at the present time title VI is practically inoperative.

Turning to my first major criticism of the bill, Mr. President, I point out that the committee bill provides for rent control, including rent control in critical defense areas. It thus assumes that there will be continued pressure from the defense program on housing at least until June 30 of this year, but that pressures from the same program on prices and wages can be expected to end in February. Here again we see an inconsistency, if we extend price and wage controls only until February 28 and extend rent controls until June 30.

Mr. President, if we do not believe that the need for price and wage controls will really end on February 28, why should we not extend these particular controls to June 30? I believe that the average consumer, in reading about this debate today and the proposed February

28 termination date, may conclude with some justice that the administrators of the law are being punished for administering it according to their honest light, instead of kowtowing to powerful pressure groups.

Do we indeed want to threaten such public servants as Mr. Putnam, Governor Arnall, and Mr. Feinsinger for not yielding to attempts to raise steel prices far beyond the requirements of the Capehart amendment? Do we want to say to them that if they or their successors expect controls to be renewed after next February 28 they had better learn the facts of life and not offend powerful pressure groups during the next 9 months? Can we blame them if they decide that if the administrators of controls shall not have properly calculated and rendered things safe for the pressure groups by next February, then the date will not be extended?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BENTON. I gladly yield for that purpose.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it is my hope that we can finish consideration of the pending bill today. Certainly I trust that we can make more progress before taking a recess for the day than we have made up to this point. If, however, consideration of the bill is not concluded today, I ask unanimous consent that beginning on Monday at 12 o'clock there be a limitation on debate of 1 hour——

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall have to object to an agreement beginning on Monday at 12 o'clock. I am perfectly willing to agree to have the limitation on debate begin at 12 o'clock on Tuesday.

Mr. McFARLAND. I regret very much that the Senator from Indiana must object. I feel that the time has come when the Senate will have to begin to drive forward if it is to finish its work by the time the national conventions are scheduled to convene. That is what we are endeavoring to do, namely, to determine whether, by working hard this week and next week, we can attain that goal.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would it not be possible to call the calendar on Monday and then begin the limitation of debate on the pending bill at 12 o'clock on Tuesday?

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that beginning on Tuesday at 12 o'clock there be a limitation on debate of 1 hour on each amendment involving the Wage Stabilization Act or the Walsh-Healey Act, and that the time be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the proponent of the amendment and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if at any time, when I am in control of the time on an amendment I do not oppose such amendment, I shall ask the ranking member of the committee who is opposed to it to control the time. I want to be perfectly fair about it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand. In the event the Senator from South Carolina is in favor of an amendment, the time in opposition to the amendment is to be controlled by the distinguished minority leader or any Senator designated by him. Further I ask unanimous consent that debate on all other amendments be limited to 30 minutes, to be divided equally and controlled in the same manner; that all amendments must be germane; that debate on the bill itself be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the distinguished minority leader, or any Senator designated by him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona include motions and appeals?

Mr. McFARLAND. Provided further that debate on all motions and appeals be limited to 30 minutes, to be divided equally and to be controlled in the same manner.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask whether the Senate will take up the calendar on Monday?

Mr. McFARLAND. It was my intention to ask unanimous consent to have a call of the calendar beginning at 12 o'clock on Monday. Following the calendar call, if no Senator desired to speak on the pending bill, the Senate could proceed to the consideration of the three bills which I mentioned yesterday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, would the majority leader consider taking up those bills first before having the call of the calendar? Such an arrangement would be convenient to certain Members of the Senate. I have no personal preference in the matter.

Mr. McFARLAND. I would prefer to have the call of the calendar first. In that way all Senators would know that the calendar would be called at a certain hour. Otherwise, they would not have that information. It is very important that there be a call of the calendar at regular intervals. If we consider the other bills first, it may very well be that a long debate may ensue in connection with one of the bills. If a Senator is interested in any particular bill it could be called up by unanimous consent after the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has been advised by the Secretary that five bills are to be called up before the regular call of calendar bills on the next call of the calendar.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is my understanding. However, we have not yet reached an agreement on the call of the calendar. I wanted to reach an agreement first on the pending bill. However, I can include the request.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the agreement with respect to the call of the calendar be included in the request I have made. I add to my previous request the unanimous-consent request that beginning on Monday the calendar be called for the consideration of unobjected-to bills, beginning where the call was concluded the last time, and including the bills which went over by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I regret exceedingly that the decision is being reached that we cannot conclude consideration of the pending bill today. I realize the truth of the statement made by the distinguished majority leader that the time has come when we must expedite the business of the Senate.

I have never, during the time I have been in the Senate, objected to a unanimous-consent agreement such as this; nor have I ever asked that a measure go over or that some special arrangement be made to suit my convenience. I am not going to do so now. But, Mr. President, under the reservation of my right to object I should like to say that many weeks ago I made an engagement to speak at a national meeting on next Tuesday. It is one of sufficient importance in my judgment to prevent my being in the Senate on that day.

Personally I wish very much that the Senate could proceed with the consideration of the bill tomorrow, and even on Saturday, if necessary, as well as on Monday. Here we are on Thursday going over until Tuesday in order to suit the convenience of a Senator or Senators.

I am not going to object, but if it is permissible to do so at this time I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the session of the Senate on Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the leave is granted.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish to thank the able Senator from Alabama for his consideration. We shall do everything possible to obtain a pair for him on any vote that takes place on Tuesday.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, in view of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Alabama, I object to the Tuesday arrangement. The Senator from Alabama and I are members of the committee. We are deeply interested in the bill. We shall have to be absent on Tuesday. I will be absent through no fault of my own. I must spend all day on Tuesday with lawyers, and I do not like it. I do not look forward to it. Certainly it is through no fault of my own.

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator from Connecticut withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. BENTON. For a moment; yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. All I am trying to do is to expedite the business of the Senate. The Senate will be in session on Tuesday if a quorum is present; and it will not make much difference whether a particular Senator is present or absent. I would much rather have had the unanimous-consent agreement entered for Monday. But, after all, I did give notice of a calendar call, and I have wanted the calendar to be called. Nothing would be lost by following the procedure I am proposing.

I wish to say here and now that the time has come when all of us, including myself, must be on the floor when the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Senate is in session. If a Senator is not on the floor, he will simply have to take his chances, and will have to have a pair. Of course, that is why we have the pair system.

There may be times when Senators will necessarily have to be absent. I myself will have to be absent before the session is over, and I hope some of my colleagues will accommodate me with pairs.

So I hope Senators will not object if the proposed arrangement will not accommodate them. After all, it is very likely that the next time such an arrangement is proposed, it will not accommodate me.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. As chairman of the committee, I wish to say that I hope some agreement may be reached in regard to this bill.

I should like to say to my friend, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], who is a member of the Banking and Currency Committee and also to my friend, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who likewise is a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, that so far as I am concerned, if at anytime there is any difference between those two Senators and myself—although I believe there is none—I shall be willing to give them a live pair.

Mr. BENTON. I deeply appreciate the courtesy of my chairman, and am most grateful to him, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I yielded to the majority leader, but I continue to object to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement. I share the views of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. I should like to have the Senate proceed with the bill both today and tomorrow. Why should Tuesday be selected for the vote, when two members of the committee—the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and myself—must be absent at that time? If we were not members of the committee, of course, the situation would be different.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Connecticut will yield further to me——

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to answer the distinguished Senator from Connecticut by saying that some time ago inquiries were made as to whether the Senate would meet on Memorial Day, which is tomorrow. It has been a general practice for many Senators to make Memorial Day speeches, and so notice was given some time ago that there would be no session on that day.

So far as I personally am concerned, I would just as soon have the Senate meet tomorrow. However, it is obvious that a quorum could not be obtained at that time. We shall not have a session tomorrow for the reason that many Senators will be absent, in any event.

If I were able to keep Senators here on the floor, the job of majority leader would be easy; but, I do not have such control.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. As a practical matter, if the requested unanimous-consent agreement is not made in regard to voting on Tuesday, and if on Monday, when we meet, no such unanimous consent is given, the debate on the bill will continue during both Monday and Tuesday, and the Senator from Connecticut will still be absent. That is the practical situation with which we are faced.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. As the majority leader has said, a call of the calendar has been suggested.

As many Senators know, I happen to be one of the minority Members who endeavors at various times to discharge a responsibility in connection with the calendar.

I wish to say frankly, for the benefit of some of the Members of the Senate, that I have been on this floor or else in the city, subject to call to the floor, practically every time the Senate has been in session.

I realize that there are many matters which require the attendance of Senators at other places. However, I wish to say for the benefit of my friend, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], that if a call of the calendar is had on Monday, the situation will be difficult, inasmuch as counsel who have been assisting the minority calendar committee has been ill. He will be available soon.

I wish to say for the benefit of some Senators who have engagements elsewhere that that situation would require two of us, who are members of the minority calendar committee, to work on Sunday. We are willing to do that in order to make it possible to have the calendar called on Monday, if that is the desire of the Senate. Of course, a call of the calendar on Monday would be likely to consume perhaps 3 or 4 hours of the session on that day.

We have received many requests, as I know the majority leader has, too, to have the calendar called, and to get many of the measures now on the calendar behind us. We are willing to proceed in that way, and I hope an arrangement similar to the one suggested by the majority leader will be worked out in this instance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I did not object; but I understood the Senator from Connecticut to object, and I believe he should have a chance to object at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will give the Senator from Connecticut an opportunity to object, if he wishes to do so.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement proposed by the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, in the case of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement as regards Tuesday, I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I wish the majority leader would accept my suggestion in regard to Wednesday.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to follow the suggestion of the Senator from Connecticut, and have the vote held a month from now, but that would not enable us to end the session in time.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Several Senators have asked me whether further votes would be taken this afternoon. Accordingly, I should like to inquire about that situation, so that by means of telephone calls I may inform the Senators who have communicated with me. In that connection, I refer to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and other Senators.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senate convened at 10 o'clock this morning, I have told various Senators and others who wished to leave that the Senate would not remain in session later than 5 o'clock today.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I am sure I have taken the right attitude in the present case, even though heretofore I have not taken such an attitude. In the past I have observed that other Senators have taken a similar position.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and I are only two members of the committee, only two-thirteenths of the committee, but, perhaps unfortunately, we represent a position that is not shared by many other members of the committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement the Senator from Connecticut has made, but I wish the RECORD to show that he was absent from many of the committee's hearings, whereas the chairman and other members of the committee remained at the meetings.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I cannot deny what has been said by the chairman of the committee. Of course, I have not learned the trick that some of my colleagues seem to have learned, namely, to be in two places at the same time.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I do not intend to have the committee criticized. All Senators have a number of committee assignments; I myself am a member of several committees. Nevertheless, it is our duty to be present when the Senate is in session. I may say that I have been invited to make speeches before national conventions; for instance, I have been invited to attend the convention of the National Cotton Association, at Brunswick, Ga., and to address that convention. However, I am attending to the business of the Senate.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, my absence from the Senate on Tuesday will not be because of an engagement to make a speech or because of any desire on my own part to be absent. I shall be ab-

sent reluctantly, unwillingly, and at great personal cost to myself, as well as, I may say, personal inconvenience and displeasure.

If my distinguished Republican colleagues and friends will accommodate me, I shall be able to participate in the debate on this measure next week, which is what I should like to do.

The distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee was not on the floor when I paid him a high tribute.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have nothing but the highest regard for my distinguished friend, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] as he well knows. I realize the situation which faces him and the charges he has to meet. I understand that that is the situation which requires his absence from the Senate on the coming Tuesday. Let me say that I intended no personal criticism of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I thank the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. When I suggested that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and I were two-thirteenths of the committee, I meant no reflection on the committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder whether we can reach an agreement on this matter if the Senator from Indiana will be amiable enough to agree to the suggestion originally made by the majority leader, namely, that we proceed to vote on this bill on Monday.

I am sure the Senator from Indiana does not wish to tie up the proceedings of the Senate, and I believe that he will agree to have voting begin on Monday, which was the original proposal made by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I could not quite understand the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was inquiring whether the Senator from Indiana will consent to the proposal to have the Senate proceed to vote on this measure on Monday. I make that suggestion out of a desire to accommodate the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. I am sure the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] wishes to cooperate in this matter. Therefore, I inquire as to the possibility of having the Senate agree to the original proposal made by the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the regular order, the Senator from Connecticut will proceed.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to inquire of the majority leader whether there is any real reason why we cannot make for today an arrangement similar to the one under which we operated yesterday.

Let me say that I was absent a few minutes ago, when it was necessary for me to leave the Chamber briefly.

Mr. President, I wish to pay high tribute to the majority leader. He has been doing a wonderful job. I believe that we might as well remain in session and vote on this bill today, and then proceed to some other measure.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to have the Senate do that, but I do not think there is any possibility of making that arrangement.

If we now had a unanimous-consent agreement calling for a limitation on debate, probably we could conclude consideration of this bill today. However, no such agreement has been entered into.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Connecticut will permit, may I ask if the Senator from Arizona will yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I will yield in a moment. I had told Senators that the Senate would meet at 10 o'clock today. Some of them want to go away for the purpose of making speeches on Friday, and, inasmuch as we are going to give them that opportunity, they should be free tonight to proceed to their destinations. After having told them that they would be free to leave, even though it was done privately, I do not feel that I should go back on my word. I always try to live up to my word to the best of my ability.

Mr. MOODY. The Senator always does keep his word.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to accommodate everyone, but as I say, I simply do not feel that I can comply with the suggestion at this time. If we could finish this bill tonight, nothing would please me more; but I do not think we could. I know the manner in which Senators protect each other when they get ready to depart from the city, and we must necessarily face the factual situation. I do not even like the idea of not proceeding with the consideration of the pending bill Monday, but I gave notice that there would be a call of the calendar and that, if possible certain other measures would be considered.

I should have much preferred to proceed with the consideration of the pending bill Monday; but when it comes to letting it go over until Wednesday, in the middle of the week, I think that is a little too much to ask of the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I was not referring to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] in the request I made. I was of the opinion, first, that we should proceed with the control bill on Monday. I hope the minority leader will consent to Monday, inasmuch as he has a very important amendment of his own. To be perfectly frank, I do not intend to vote for the amendment, but I shall be here. I shall rise to say that I am opposed to the amendment. But, in justice and fairness and accuracy, the senior Senator——

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I call for the regular order, and let us proceed with the consideration of this bill at 12 o'clock Monday. There will be much to talk about on Monday afternoon. I think we shall have much to talk about on this side. I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, if the Congress enacts this bill as it stands, it will be saying to the American people that in its judgment the national defense emergency, as outlined in the preamble of the Defense Production Act, will continue until June 30, 1953 in all respects except that the inflationary pressures on prices, wages and salaries, will expire 4 months before other controls can be safely lifted. Does the committee majority really believe in the logic of such a proposition? I do not think so, Mr. President.

However, Mr. President, if we do not believe that the need for price, wage and salary controls will really end on February 28, 1953 then the enactment of this termination date for these controls is public notice that the Senate has substituted spite for logic. Mr. President, the average consumer may conclude with some justice that the administrators of the law are being punished for administering it according to their honest lights instead of kowtowing to powerful pressure groups.

Do we indeed want to threaten such public servants as Mr. Putman, Governor Arnall and Mr. Feinsinger for not yielding to attempts to raise steel prices far beyond the requirement of the Capehart amendment? Do we want to say to them that if they or their successors expect the controls to be renewed after next February 28, they had better learn the facts of life and not offend powerful pressure groups during the next 9 months? Can we blame them if they decide that if the administration of the controls shall not have been properly emasculated and rendered "safe for the pressure groups" by next February, then the date will not be extended? Most assuredly the pressure group lobbies will crowd the Capitol after inauguration date next January. Most certainly they will seek to prevent the passage of an extension bill before the dead line at midnight of February 28. Is this a pleasant prospect for the Eighty-third Congress?

The committee majority report states that by the end of February 1953, "a new Congress will have had the opportunity to appraise the economic situations and to decide whether price and wage controls are still necessary."

Mr. President, a new Congress will take office on January 3. The new President will not assume his office until 40 days before the expiration date provided in this bill. Do any of us think this is enough time "to appraise the economic situation"? Do any of us think this is what the new Congress will be doing in January and February? I submit, Mr. President, that January and February will only give a new Congress an open invitation to torpedo the remaining price and wage controls.

Mr. President, I think the man in the street would interpret a February 28 termination date as an oblique attempt to knock price and wage stabilization on the head. And I do not think the

man in the street would be far wrong in his judgment.

May I turn now to the so-called Dirksen-Bricker amendment which abolishes the tripartite Wage Board and does away with the Board's labor disputes functions as part of the stabilization program? This provision is clearly a wrecking provision. As a writer in the Wall Street Journal recently put it, "there is still a chance Congress will let price-wage controls die on schedule June 30." But the likelier prospect, as the writer points out, is that this particular "Congress' 'cure' for stabilization controls will prove fatal."

The method under which opponents of controls expect the Dirksen-Bricker amendment to kill them is by driving labor to pull out of its participation and cooperation in the wage-stabilization program. This in turn would lead, so this theory goes, to the abandonment of wage controls. Since price controls are closely tied to wage controls under the law, price controls would then have to be abandoned as well.

Mr. President, wage stabilization cannot be made to work without labor and management participation. Wage stabilization cannot be administered in the same way as price stabilization because the problems are radically different. In an inflationary period, when the Government sets a maximum price for a certain commodity, it means that the merchant or manufacturer can charge that maximum price. He does not have to engage in any extensive collective bargaining with representatives of consumer organizations or of purchasing organizations. He just puts that maximum price into effect, period.

The situation is different with wages. A Government board—let us forget for a moment how it is constituted—sets maximum limits on wage increases. Does that mean that the wage workers automatically get these authorized maximum wages? Not at all. The wage workers simply receive a hunting license which entitles them to receive as much of these wage increases as they can persuade their employers through collective bargaining to grant to them. And the workers are supposed to do the persuading without resort to strikes—at least in the defense industries—because this is a national emergency.

But, Mr. President, what are workers supposed to do if they come up against a stone wall? Are they supposed to feed their families with Wage Board resolutions?

It is to prevent the obvious injustice of giving price increases to businessmen and giving workers only paper resolutions that the device of a tripartite Board to adjudicate disputes was incorporated into the heart of the wage-stabilization program. The Congress set up a tripartite Board—composed of management, labor, and public members—to develop wage-stabilization policies. We empowered the same Board to adjudicate disputes.

Mr. President, both our strike record and our rate of wage movements compare favorably with the record in World War II—when the sense of war danger was, of course, far greater than it is today. This is high tribute to our program of stabilization, to our labor and business leaders.

The only big case in which the present procedure for handling disputes has not worked well has been the steel case. This case is infamous or famous enough—according to which side you are on—without letting it impulsively affect our wage procedures and structure. Mr. President, an amendment such as that proposed by Senators DIRKSEN and BRICKER, should be considered in a clear, calm light, not amidst the heat of passion and angry voices.

Mr. President, if the Congress enacts the Dirksen-Bricker amendment incorporated in the committee bill, it will be telling the whole country that the steel industry is calling the tune on stabilization. The policy of the steel industry seems to be that we should have a stabilization program without adequate wage adjustments and that we should attempt to dragoon workers into accepting such a program by the use of Taft-Hartley injunctions and prohibitions of strikes. And if this does not work—as it most assuredly will not—then let the whole stabilization program break up, let everybody raise his prices as much as he wants, and let us play ostrich with the threatened scourge of inflation.

Mr. President, the Dirksen-Bricker provision is not a constructive one. Its proponents, like the leaders of the steel industry, have never made any secret of their opposition to the direct controls of the stabilization program. The new type of wage board—which they unfortunately have persuaded a majority of the committee to accept—is really only an optional way of killing controls. If controls cannot be killed outright on June 30, they are to be given the privilege of suffering a lingering death with an effort to put the blame on labor for their eventual death by giving labor no alternative except to pull out of wage stabilization.

Mr. President, if the majority of the Senate is now opposed to the continuation of controls, I would like to hope that they will now have the courage to stand up and say so. Let us not confound confusion by killing controls by indirection. I urge my colleagues to read the minority views submitted by Senators DOUGLAS, MOODY, and myself. In this we ask certain unemotional questions that should be answered before any action on the proposed amendment should be contemplated. Our attitude is not pro-labor and anti-industry. It is not pro-industry and antilabor.

Another rather unobtrusive but effective dent in the inflationary wall has been made by what has become known as the Pennsylvania Railroad comfort station amendment. This will have the effect of invalidating the OPS suit against the railroad for past overcharges. It also exempts such charges from price control in the future. When the implications of this amendment are clearly understood, it makes an eloquent case against itself.

In addition to the various amendments designed to ease the stabilization program into a moribund condition, the bill before us contains an amendment to a permanent statute on a subject that has no real long-range connection with the defense emergency, with defense production, or the stabilization program. This is the provision calling for the amending of the Walsh-Healey Act so as to broaden the meaning of the act's open market exemption. Under the law as it was originally passed in the mid-thirties, and as its policy has been repeatedly ratified in successive Congresses, only those items are exempted from the wage-and-hour standards of the Walsh-Healey Act which the Government buys on the open market instead of through specific contract.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What does the Senator mean when he says that the policy has ben repeatedly ratified in successive Congresses? In what instance did Congress ever ratify the interpretation?

Mr. BENTON. I think that is a very proper correction, Mr. President. It was repeatedly ratified by successive Secretaries of Labor and successive administrative officers who have allowed the interpretation to continue. No Congress in the past 17 years has acted to modify or change the interpretation. So we have a history of 17 years without congressional action correcting interpretations of administrative officers.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is a very different thing.

Mr. BENTON. It is different.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There has been no affirmative action taken by the Congress on the question since 1936.

Mr. BENTON. I accept that clarification, Mr. President.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The interpretation has been by Secretaries of Labor as to what the original act meant, and there has been no judicial review. Is not that correct?

Mr. BENTON. To the best of my knowledge, that is correct.

The provision in the committee bill would amend the Walsh-Healey Act to exempt all articles which are available for purchase on the open market by the general public as well as by the Government—whether the Government buys them there or not.

It is estimated the effect of such a provision would be to reduce the scope of the Walsh-Healey standards by 50 percent or more.

I am vigorously opposed to this provision. This is no time to weaken our wage and hour standards. Further, I am vigorously opposed to the procedure of bringing up such a provision as an amendment to a bill to extend the Defense Production Act. This is similar to the procedure of attaching legislative riders on remote subjects to important appropriation bills, relying on the practical impossibility of vetoing the appropriation bills.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not wish to heckle the Senator, but I do not understand that to be the case. What does the Senator mean by reducing the standards by 50 percent or more?

Mr. BENTON. It is my understanding that there is an estimate by the Secretary of Labor that this amendment takes from the purview of the Walsh-Healey Act approximately 50 percent of the Government purchases to which the act now applies.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The application of the act would be reduced by following the original language and the intent of the original act, but it does not affect and does not attempt to affect the rates of pay or any restrictions upon the standards which are set in those cases where the law does apply.

Mr. BENTON. That is correct. I have no way of knowing whether it is a correct estimate. But by exempting approximately half of the items to which the act now applies, I understand from the Department of Labor that the application of the act will be reduced by approximately 50 percent.

We are up against a dead line in getting a satisfactory controls extension law passed and signed by the President before June 30. Such a sweeping amendment, which has not even been considered by the Senate Labor Committee, should not be attached to this emergency controls bill. It should be pulled out of this bill and introduced as separate legislation. It is big enough and important enough to stand by itself, to be considered by itself, and to be judged on its over-all effect not only on emergency controls but, more fittingly, on its great potential injury to the future working standards of our people.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to consider the questions we have asked in the minority report. I ask them to join the committee minority in its efforts to hold the line against inflation. I ask them to reject the Bricker-Dirksen amendment, to lengthen the expiration date of wage and price controls to June 30, 1953, and to send the Walsh-Healey amendments to the Senate Labor Committee where they belong.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BENTON. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the majority leader and of the minority leader. There is pending on the calendar the independent offices appropriation bill which, under the Reorganization Act, will have been on the desk for 3 days by the time we can consider it, because I filed it, together with the report, yesterday. I am wondering if the majority leader and the minority leader would be willing to have that bill considered on Tuesday and enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to start voting on the pending bill at 10 o'clock Wednesday morning, so that we might conclude consideration of the bill some time on Wednesday, holding, if necessary, a night session under the conditions laid down by the majority leader.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, that is agreeable to me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Reserving the right to object, I did not quite understand the suggestion.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I tried to work out a unanimous-consent agreement limiting debate, starting on Monday at 12 o'clock, with an hour on each amendment involving the Walsh-Healey Act or the Wage Stabilization Act, with 30 minutes on other amendments. There was objection to that. The Senator from Indiana thought he had to object. We then tried to work it out for Tuesday. There was objection to that also.

I dislike very much to have objections interposed on the ground that some Senators have to be absent, because it sets a bad precedent. It makes it very difficult to expedite the work of the Senate, because Senators feel that if votes are postponed to accommodate some Senators, they are entitled to the same consideration. That is the reason why the Senator from Connecticut felt that because action was postponed until Monday he was entitled to make the same objection as to action on Tuesday. I hope that in the future such objections will not be made. I want to impress Senators with the importance of attendance on the floor of the Senate. In going over the work before the Senate I feel that we can probably expedite the work of the Senate by entering into a unanimous-consent agreement. So I repeat the unanimous-consent agreement which I last stated, except as to starting at 10 o'clock on Wednesday.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall object if the Senate is to meet at 10 o'clock. I expect to be in town, and I am not going away to speak, but I have had a standing appointment for 10 o'clock on Wednesday. If the majority leader wishes to have the session start at 12, that will be satisfactory. But I am not going to change my appointment.

The Senate met at 10 o'clock this morning. I had to postpone a committee meeting, to which we had invited a Cabinet officer to speak on an important matter. We have not accomplished anything of importance. Postponing the committee meeting scheduled for 10 o'clock this morning, for what good reason I cannot see, caused great inconvenience. I shall object to opening the session Wednesday at 10 o'clock.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I take exception to the Senator's statement that we have not accomplished anything. We have voted upon an amendment which could well have taken 2 days of debate instead of 1 day. I think we have accomplished much upon the pending bill.

Of course, if I must agree to have the session start at 12 o'clock, I will do so. I merely wish to say that it is very discouraging to me to have to postpone unanimous-consent agreements from day to day—and I am not saying this in any critical manner—and then to have a point made as to the hour of meeting.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am ready to proceed now, or Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday; but I object to starting at an hour in the morning when we have other obligations, and also on Monday there is to be a meeting of our joint committee. We have put the matter off for today. If we could have gone ahead with it, we could have been through.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to make a suggestion that might pour oil on the troubled waters. My suggestion is that the Senate meet at 10 o'clock, but that the amendment in which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is particularly interested, shall not be taken up until 12 o'clock.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would be satisfied with an understanding that the amendment to the Walsh-Healey Act would not be considered before 12 o'clock.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona will restate his proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is becoming a little involved, but I will do my best.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that beginning next Wednesday at 10 o'clock a. m. there be a limitation of debate upon the pending measure, as follows: That on any amendment involving the Walsh-Healey Act or the Wage Stabilization Board, or that part of the bill——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not care about the Wage Stabilization Board.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from Arkansas may not care about it, but other Senators do.

I ask unanimous consent that as to such amendments there be a limitation on debate of 1 hour, the time to be divided equally between the proponents of the amendment and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]; and in the event the Senator from South Carolina is in favor of the amendment, then the time is to be controlled by the distinguished minority leader, or any Senator he may designate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Any Senator who is opposed to the amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator kindly let me complete my statement?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader has already said too much for me. Complying with the suggestion so far would mean we would be on this bill all of next week, and there is no occasion for that.

Mr. McFARLAND. It does not mean that we will be on this bill all next week. It means we will finish the bill next Wednesday.

Mr. ROBERTSON. But the majority leader has asked for an hour on each amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. That involves only two phases of the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Two amendments.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Walsh-Healey Act and the Wage Stabilization Board Act.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from Virginia said I had already gone too far. Will the Senator let me finish my unanimous-consent proposal without interruptions? Then if he wishes to object, that is his privilege, and I shall not care.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona will restate the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well; I will do my best. I would ask Senators not to interrupt me until I have finished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Presiding Officer ask a few questions?

Mr. McFARLAND. Certainly.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it proposed in this agreement to undo in any way what has been done with reference to Monday?

Mr. McFARLAND. We have not done anything with reference to Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader has stated there would be a call of the calendar.

Mr. McFARLAND. No; that was included as part of the other unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand that the unanimous-consent request will include——

Mr. McFARLAND. If the Chair will permit me to do so, I will do my best to complete my statement of the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will observe his own direction given to others.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that beginning next Wednesday, at 10 a. m., there be a limitation of debate upon the pending measure, as follows:

One hour on any amendment involving the Walsh-Healey Act or the Wage Stabilization Board Act, the time to be divided equally between proponents and opponents of the amendment and to be controlled by the proponent of any such amendment and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, in the event he opposes the amendment; if he is in favor of the amendment, then the time in opposition to be controlled by the distinguished minority leader or any Senator he may designate; that as to all other amendments, motions, and appeals, the time be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to a side, the time to be controlled in the same manner; all amendments to be germane.

I further ask unanimous consent that on next Monday there be a call of the calendar for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection, beginning at the end of the last call, and including bills carried over by unanimous consent from the last call.

Also, I ask unanimous consent that no vote affecting the Walsh-Healey Act be taken before 12 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Presiding Officer ask a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator mean to include in his unanimous-consent agreement the suggestion by the Senator from South Carolina with reference to an appropriation bill to be taken up on Tuesday?

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not think it is necessary to include that in the unanimous consent agreement. That can be done by motion.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I have the floor. I merely desire to congratulate the majority leader, and then yield the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. One other condition is that there be a limitation of 1 hour of debate on the bill itself, the time to be divided equally, and to be controlled by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina and the minority leader.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am sure the distinguished majority leader realizes that when we have set an hour for a limitation of debate, with the understanding that there will be no votes on controversial issues until that time, we have absolutely delayed action on the bill until that time arrives, in the middle of the following week. Is not that true?

Mr. McFARLAND. I may say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Virginia, that we expect to have a call of the calendar on Monday, and between now and next Wednesday we expect to take up and dispose of three bills which I mentioned yesterday, and also the independent offices appropriation bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I was about to make inquiry as to that bill. At least three important appropriation bills are ready for action.

Mr. McFARLAND. Only one.

Mr. MAYBANK. There are two that will have to lie on the table for 3 days.

Mr. ROBERTSON. But they will be ready for action by the time the recess we are about to take is over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement as proposed by the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I merely wish to say that I am very much disturbed by the failure of the Senate, in one of the most crucial years of our history, to function successfully. The only reason I can advance is that about a third of the Members of the Senate do not stay here, and the other two-thirds do not want to work more than half the time.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Virginia does not mean to say we do not work all the time. The Senator has been in committee with me for several days.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Senators must be on the floor attending to consideration of legislative proposals, if Congress is to get away from here by the 7th of July. I am not going to block the consent agreement the chairman of my committee desires, but I must say I think action on a very important bill is being unduly delayed, as the Senator from Oregon so forcefully said this morning.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Virginia.

Is it not true that for week after week since this session of the Congress began we have given to bills only 3 days a week, and that bills have not been reported by committees? There has been very little for us to do. Now suddenly we are in a rush, and we must do everything in a moment. I call that situation to the attention of the Senator.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The committees were late in getting the essential legislation before the Senate; but when we know that bills are coming before the Senate, if there is to be only 1 month more of the present session, we should use our best efforts to finish during that month. The Senator from Virginia knows that Senators who are running for reelection must be absent to some extent. He is not criticizing them. All of us are carrying a heavier load. We have more correspondence than ever before. The bills which we have before us are more troublesome than the average run of legislation. This is a critical period nationally and internationally. However, that does not excuse us, if we have only 1 month left, from remaining here and working a full day in an effort to get these measures through.

Mr. WATKINS. I think it ought to be said, with reference to the question which I just raised, that Senators who are not present and who are being criticized for not paying attention to their work were present during the months past, when there was very little to do. The committees had not reported bills, and legislation was not before the Senate.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia does not criticize any of his colleagues. He merely appeals to them to put forth their best efforts during the coming month.

Mr. WATKINS. I am agreeable to that.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the junior Senator from Utah reserve the right to object?

Mr. BENNETT. I do. I should like to address a question to the majority leader with respect to the proposed unanimous consent agreement. Will the debate on the Walsh-Healey Act begin at 12, or is that the time for the vote?

Mr. McFARLAND. I stated that those amendments would not be taken up before 12 o'clock. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] wishes to be present when they are taken up. Before 12 o'clock we shall proceed with other amendments. We shall have plenty of work to last for 2 hours. I hope we shall not, but I am afraid we shall.

Mr. BENNETT. I wanted to make sure that it was not the debate which could not begin before 12 o'clock.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask if the hour on each of the amendments with respect to the Wage Stabilization Board and the Walsh-Healey Act means an hour equally divided, 30 minutes to a side, or an hour to a side.

Mr. McFARLAND. Thirty minutes to a side.

Mr. MORSE. I did not hear the majority leader make reference to the final disposition of the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Debate on the bill itself is to be limited to 1 hour.

Mr. MORSE. For each side?

Mr. McFARLAND. No; 30 minutes to a side.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the distinguished majority leader inform me whether or not the time on amendments and motions is to be 30 minutes?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; 30 minutes on motions and appeals, 15 minutes to a side.

Mr. WELKER. I thank the Senator. I shall not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That on Monday, June 2, 1952, at the hour of 12 o'clock noon, the Senate proceed to the consideration of unobjected-to bills on the calendar, the following calendar numbers to be first called, namely: Nos. 1419, 1440, 1068, 1427, and 1434; and that thereafter the call shall commence with No. 1442. (May 29, 1952.)

Ordered, That beginning at the hour of 10 o'clock a. m. on Wednesday, June 4, 1952, debate upon the bill (S. 2594) to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, be limited as follows:

(1) One hour on any amendment proposed to the so-called Walsh-Healey or the Stabilization Board provisions of the bill, and 30 minutes upon any other amendment or motion (including appeals): *Provided*, That no vote shall be taken before 12 o'clock noon on said day on any amendments or motion to the Walsh-Healey provisions: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received;

(2) That the time on any amendment or motion (including appeals) shall be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and Mr. MAYBANK, in the event he is opposed to such amendment or motion; otherwise by the minority leader or someone designated by him; and

(3) One hour on the question of the final passage of the bill, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. BRIDGES. (May 29, 1952.)

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish to make an announcement.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to make one statement.

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In my judgment the Senator from Arizona has succeeded in obtaining a unanimous-consent agreement which will operate for the benefit of the Senate and for the benefit of the country. As the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] pointed out earlier, through the testimony of Mr. Baruch in his statement before the committee on yesterday, this control bill affects 150,000,000 people. I think the Senator from Arizona has done a wise thing in obtaining an agreement to limit debate beginning on Wednesday. Otherwise it might have required a week or 2 weeks to complete consideration of the bill. I am sorry that it was not possible to obtain an agreement for Monday or Tuesday. I am sorry that we cannot complete consideration of the bill today; but I congratulate the distinguished majority leader for obtaining this agreement.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. I wish to make an announcement. I may forget about it if I listen to a few more such compliments, which I greatly appreciate.

First, I wish to thank Senators who have been helpful in reaching the agreement, including the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and other Senators. I am always appreciative of any assistance in reaching agreements which expedite the work of the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Fulbright Versus Walsh-Healey," published in the Washington Evening Star of May 24, 1952. This editorial deals with the so-called Walsh-Healey amendment.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULBRIGHT VERSUS WALSH-HEALEY

Senator FULBRIGHT won a well-merited victory when the Senate Banking and Currency Committee approved the so-called open market amendment to the Defense Production Act.

The effect of the amendment is to let the Government purchase standard articles, if available on the open market, without applying the requirements of the Walsh-Healey Act. Under these requirements, as now applied, manufacturers of such articles, in order to sell to the Government, must abide by the minimum wage standards set by the Secretary of Labor under the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act.

Actually, the Walsh-Healey Act itself does not impose such compulsion, and contains in section 9 a specific exemption for purchasing of such items "as may usually be bought in the open market." The Secretary of Labor, however, by what Senator FULBRIGHT has termed a "strained interpretation," has applied this exemption only to such items "as may usually be bought in the open market by the Government." Since the Government ordinarily purchases by bid rather than in the open market—even in the case of standard articles that are readily available—this exemption is automatically narrowed by the ruling. It is further restricted, too, by the Secretary's ruling that when identical articles are bought from one manufacturer by bid and from another in the open market the second seller, as well as the first, must qualify under the Walsh-Healey Act.

Generally speaking, larger firms do, and are better able to, pay higher wage rates. Obviously then, as the Senator contends, the above application of the Walsh-Healey Act is damaging to small firms, either in forcing them to pay higher wages than are economically feasible for them or in precluding them entirely from selling to the Government. It works, also, to the disadvantage of firms in low-wage areas. If they do not accept the industry-wide wage minimums set up by the Secretary they are not eligible to sell to the Government; if they do accept them they are placed in an unfavorable competitive situation for non-Government business in their normal marketing area. And there is a dislocating potential, too, in firm A accepting a minimum wage floor, while firm B, in the same area and employing people for comparable work that is not under Government contract, has a lower scale. The logical result here is that manpower gravitates to firm A, perhaps to the serious detriment of firm B and any number of other neighboring enterprises.

All of this, the Arkansas Senator argues, is contrary to the intent of Congress when the Walsh-Healey Act was passed and is destructive of one of the stated purposes of the Defense Production Act, namely, to prevent undue strains and dislocations upon wages and prices.

The committee adoption of the Fulbright proposal came by a divided vote. It is probable that there will be a further contest on the matter on the Senate floor with labor and some of the industry interests of the high-wage areas joined in opposition. The Senator has made a persuasive case, however, for legislation which should help bring two basic acts into conformity with each other and, in the long run, serve to save the taxpayers' money.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Also, as a part of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a portion of a statement which I have prepared explaining the two amendments which will be considered on next Wednesday, dealing with the Walsh-Healey Act. I offer this statement for the information of the Senate. There has been considerable misunderstanding of the effect of the amendments to which I refer. It is the theory of the sponsors of those amendments that they in no way change the original intent of the Congress in the Walsh-Healey Act, but, on the contrary, simply require, in the two instances dealt with, that the administration of the Walsh-Healey Act be in accord with what we believe to be the clear intent of Congress in passing the original Walsh-Healey Act. That is certainly the theory of the sponsors of the amendment. We did not intend to amend the intention of the original sponsors of the act of 1936.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

In the 20 months since Congress enacted the Defense Production Act of 1950, an attempt has been made to subvert its basic purpose and to capitalize on the national emergency in a manner contrary to the intent of that act. That attempt, which has a serious impact, both on the cost of the production for defense and on the private-enterprise system, and particularly small business, has been made by the Department of Labor through a misuse of the Walsh-Healey Act in a manner never contemplated by the Congress when the statute was enacted. Therefore, I propose, by making clear that original intent, to plug this loophole that has developed in the Defense Production Act.

First, let us look at what we sought to do in 1950 with the Defense Production Act. The declaration of policy of the Defense Production Act of 1950 states:

"It is the intention of the Congress that the President shall use the powers conferred by this act to promote the national defense, by meeting, promptly and effectively, the requirements of military programs in support of our national security and foreign policy objectives, and by preventing undue strains and dislocations upon wages, prices, and production or distribution of materials for civilian use, within the frameworwk, as far as practicable, of the American system of competitive enterprise."

When we wrote that act, we recognized that we were focusing the power of the Government behind the acceptance and performance of Government contracts. We gave the President authority to impose priorities and allocations, and to compel the performance of Government contracts. At the same time we recognized the dislocating effect that such power could have on the free-enterprise system, and we sought to protect it from the damage to it, which could result from the uncontrolled impact of the Government purchasing power. We sought to stabilize wages and prices in their proper relationships. We sought to encourage small business to participate by creating a Small Defense Plants Administration. It now develops that those protections have not and will not be sufficient unless we check an otherwise uncontrollable tendency to dislocate the private

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

enterprise system and to promote inflationary forces.

Let us see what has happened. Notwithstanding our express purpose in 1950 and also contrary to the clear legislative history of the Walsh-Healey Act, to which I shall refer again, the Secretary of Labor has taken several steps, and contemplates further action, which go far to increase prices and wages and to discourage Government contracting, particularly by small-business men. Unless those practices are stopped, much of what we did in 1950 and are trying to do today may be defeated. Fortunately, they can be stopped by the relatively simple device of making clear at this time what the legislative history shows was the intent of the Congress when it passed the Walsh-Healey Act, and by adding a further safeguard of judicial review which will protect us in the future against otherwise uncontrollable administrative action.

This amendment makes no change whatever in the clearly expressed intention of Congress as set forth in the original Walsh-Healey Act. It merely rewords the original section 9 in such a way as to carry out the intent of Congress rather than the strained interpretation that was subsequently placed on it by the Secretary of Labor.

The first sentence of section 9 of the Walsh-Healey Act reads as follows:

"This act shall not apply to purchases of such materials, supplies, articles, or equipment as may usually be bought in the open market."

Obviously, the sense of this provision is that standard commercial articles, generally available to the public and the Government alike in the open market, were to be exempt. This construction is supported fully by the legislative history of the act. Without going into the details, let me submit for the record a statement of the legislative history on this question.

Disregarding the act and the history, the Secretary of Labor has construed this provision to exempt only purchases usually bought in the open market by the Government. Since the Government does not generally purchase in the open market, but must purchase after advertising for bids, even carpet tacks are not exempt. According to a memo submitted by the Labor Department to this committee, it bases this strained interpretation on the title of the act, which reads "to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies." "Supplies," the Labor Department says, "having been defined by the Attorney General, as 'materials or articles as may usually be bought in the open market,' (27 Opin. A. G. 534)." Therefore, the Department says, this purpose would be nullified by my amendment.

In other words the Department is saying this:

"Congress gave this act a title. The Attorney General says the word 'supplies' in that title means 'articles usually purchased on the open market.' Therefore, Congress did not mean what it said in the act itself when it exempted, in almost the identical language of the Attorney General, 'materials, supplies, articles or equipment as may usually be bought in the open market.'"

This amendment therefore only clarifies the original intention of Congress that the Government in no way proposed to dictate wages paid by a contractor of a standard article merely because some portion of his production might at some time be purchased by the Government.

The second part of my amendment provides for judicial review, to be available to contractors, unions, and employees as a protection against arbitrary actions of the Secretary of Labor. It is made necessary by the decision of the Supreme Court in the Lukens steel case. This case held that courts have no jurisdiction since no rights of the contractors were involved—doing business with the Government was a privilege and not a right.

The administration of the Walsh-Healy Act by the Secretary clearly demonstrates the necessity for judicial review. For instance, the Walsh-Healey Act, itself, provides that it shall apply to "all persons employed by the contractor." As a matter of fact, the Walsh bill, as it passed the Senate, specifically included subcontractors and suppliers within its scope. But the final bill, as passed by the House and agreed to by the Senate, deleted this provision, thus specifically rejecting the notion that it should apply to subcontractors and suppliers. Notwithstanding this clear history, being free of any judicial review under the Lukens steel case, the Secretary of Labor has now issued proposed new regulations to become effective July 1—attempting to apply national wage determinations to all subcontractors—indirectly by requiring the prime contractor to police his subcontractors and suppliers as to their compliance with the labor stipulations to which the prime contractor himself has agreed; and directly, by holding the subcontractor as well as the prime contractor liable for violations.

This proposed regulation, very clearly, in my opinion, will have two immediate effects, both of which are in direct contradiction to the whole spirit and purpose of the Defense Production Act.

1. It will encourage prime contractors to perform as much of their own manufacturing as possible, in order to avoid penalties which they will incur by reason of violations by their subcontractors and suppliers—over whom they have no control and no method or right to police.

2. The subcontractors themselves will be most reluctant to undertake subcontracts whereby they will subject themselves to the wage stipulations required of the prime contractor. For many subcontractors this will be more than they can pay.

For example, suppose a Walsh-Healey wage determination is made for the automotive industry, as is proposed. This is one of the highest paid industries in the country, so that under any circumstances the wage rate will be high. Assume a small wood-working plant in Michigan or Arkansas is supplying General Motors with wooden pegs for the tailgate of Army trucks. Under the proposed regulation, the wood-working plant (unless specifically exempted at the sole discretion of the Secretary) could be held liable to pay the minimum-wage rates to which General Motors agreed in its contract with the Army.

Assume, if you wish, that no Government bureau would be so arbitrary and unfair. My constituent in Fort Smith did. Nevertheless, the threat and the power are there, and they do not encourage small businesses to perform subcontracts, much less to contract directly with the Government.

I am told that some aircraft manufacturers, for example, now use as many as 5,000 subcontractors and suppliers, and as their Government contracts multiply, I am sure they would normally require more farming-out of their work. The same thing is true in the automotive and electronic industry, and many others.

The Defense Production Act will not preserve our economic system unless it protects small businesses who do not have the capacity to perform contracts directly, or who are ignored by Government procurement officers, or who are strangled by the red tape involved in Government procurement. Indeed, I recall that it has been one of the primary purposes of this committee, the "watchdog committee," and the Small Business Committee to see that more subcontracting was encouraged. This is absolutely necessary if many businesses are to continue operating—otherwise they will be unable to obtain priorities and allocations of the materials necessary to keep them going.

I agree with the congressional intent expressed in the Defense Production Act that we should meet the requirements of the military programs but simultaneously prevent undue strains and dislocations upon wages and prices within the framework of the American system of competitive enterprise. I have therefore proposed these amendments to the Defense Production Act—not to change the law but merely to restate it—in order to compel the Secretary of Labor to carry out the clearly expressed will of Congress in the Walsh-Healey Act, itself, and in keeping with the express purpose as well as the spirit of the Defense Production Act. Unless we do so, we will find ourselves in the peculiar position of the Wage Stabilization Board telling a contractor that if he builds a new plant, his wage rates shall be comparable to those in the same local labor market and the Secretary of Labor then advising the contractor, "But if you want to do business with the Government you must raise your wage rates to meet the national minimum I have declared."

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1952

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 454, making additional appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes, appropriating funds for flood sufferers in the West. The joint resolution was unanimously passed by the House and unanimously reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee. I hope the Senate will adopt it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the resolution on the calendar, or is the Senator from Tennessee now reporting it?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the joint resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 454) making additional appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 454) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I believe the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] are agreeable to going ahead with a bill this afternoon with respect to which I gave notice on a previous occasion. I refer to Senate bill 2968.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the calendar number?

Mr. SMATHERS. Senate bill 2968 is my bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should have referred to Calendar No. 1430, Senate bill 3019. We hope to complete consideration of that bill this afternoon, and sometime between now and Wednesday we hope to complete consideration of the bill which I first mentioned. Also, if necessary, on Monday, after the call of the calendar, it is our intention to work late and finish another bill, Senate bill 2437, a bill to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act. It is very important to dispose of that bill during the present session.

With those bills and the appropriation bills, I think we shall have plenty of work to keep the Senate busy on Monday and Tuesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to address one further question to the majority leader. Was definite notice given with reference to taking up the appropriation bill, and if so, as of what date?

Mr. McFARLAND. The appropriation bill is to come up at 12 o'clock on Tuesday, unless the Senate meets at an earlier hour. I forgot to mention that. I refer to the independent offices appropriation bill.

SPECIAL-INDUCEMENT PAY TO DOCTORS AND DENTISTS IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3019.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3019) to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to extend the application of the special-inducement pay provided thereby to doctors and dentists, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended by—

(a) Amending subsection 203 (a) to read as follows:

"(a) The term 'commissioned officers,' as used in this section, shall be interpreted to mean only (1) those commissioned officers in the Medical and Dental Corps of, or designated as medical or dental officers in, the Regular Army, Navy, and Air Force and commissioned medical and dental officers of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service who were on active duty on September 1, 1947; (2) those commissioned officers in the Medical and Dental Corps of, or designated as medical or dental officers in, the Regular Army, Navy, and Air Force and commissioned medical and dental officers of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, who were retired prior to September 1, 1947, and who thereafter but prior to July 1, 1953, have been or may be assigned to active duty; (3) those officers who, heretofore but subsequent to September 1, 1947, have been or who, prior to July 1, 1953, may be commissioned in the Medical and Dental Corps of, or designated as medical or dental officers in, the Regular Army, Navy, and Air Force or as medical and dental officers of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service; (4) such officers who on September 1, 1947, were or who thereafter have been or may be commissioned in the Medical and Dental Corps of, or designated as medical or dental officers in, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the United States Air Force Reserve, the Naval Reserve, the National Guard, the National Guard of the United States, the Air National Guard, the Air National Guard of the United States, the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, or as medical and dental officers of the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service and who heretofore, but subsequent to September 1, 1947, have been called or ordered to extended active duty of 1 year or longer, or who may, prior to July 1, 1953, be called or ordered to extended active duty of 1 year or longer; (5) general officers appointed from the Medical and Dental Corps of, or previously designated as medical or dental officers in, the Regular Army, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, the National Guard of the United States, the Army of the United States, the Regular Air Force, the United States Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard, the Air National Guard of the United States, and the Air Force of the United States who were on active duty on September 1, 1947; and (6) general officers who, subsequent to September 1, 1947, have been or who may be appointed from those officers of the Medical and Dental Corps of, or from those officers designated as medical or dental officers in, the Regular Army, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, the National Guard of the United States, the Army of the United States, the Regular Air Force, the United States Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard, the Air National Guard of the United States, and the Air Force of the United States who are included in parts (1), (2), (3), or (4) of this subsection."

(b) Deleting the second proviso of subsection 203 (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided further*, That the commissioned officers described in subsection (a) (4) of this section who are called or ordered to active duty without their consent shall not be entitled to receive the pay provided by this subsection for any period prior to September 9, 1950."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 828, ch. 939), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. Section 1 of this act shall be effective as of October 1, 1949. Appropriations currently available for pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services shall be available for retroactive payments authorized under this act.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, the pending bill originated with the Defense Establishment. It was presented to the Committee on Armed Services, and I was requested to handle it on the floor of the Senate. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. President, from January 1, 1945, to the passage of the so-called Procurement Act of 1947, physicians and dentists were leaving the military services in great numbers: 1,537 resignations from the Navy and 169 resignations from the Army, or a total of 1,706 resignations within approximately a 2-year period.

Recognizing that some emergency measure must be adopted to stop this trend of resignations if the medical and dental services were to be maintained at a high standard, or in fact were to be maintained at all, the Medical Officers Procurement Act of 1947 was passed by the Congress.

This act provided an equalizing pay to medical and dental officers of $100 a month over and above that of officers in the other branches of the services and accomplished just what the act was designed to accomplish. The number of resignations immediately declined to an annual average of 80.

The Surgeon General, Major General Armstrong, speaking for the various services, stated to the committee that the sizeable decline in resignations, as well as a definite increase in procurement, would strongly indicate that the special pay authorized for physicians and dentists is the most effective method of not only retaining experienced career officers in the services, but of increasing the number willing to accept commissions.

At the outset, it should be pointed out that the $100 per month received by physicians and dentists over and above that paid line officers of the same rank, should not be considered merely an incentive pay increase. It should not be considered merely extra pay, for it is, in every sense of the word, truly and only an equalizing pay.

As previously pointed out, the medical services following World War II found themselves unable to maintain, on a voluntary basis, a Medical and Dental Corps competent to administer even a minimum standard of medical and dental services to our Armed Forces.

Also, as previously mentioned, procurement was at a standstill and serious depletion by resignation was being experienced. In great part this was due to the wide disparity between the income of physicians and dentists in civilian life as compared with physicians and dentists in the military services.

In the Army after the war, the officer needs of all the branches of the Department of Defense were on a voluntary basis.

There were five applicants for every commission, except in the medical and dental corps, where there was but only one applicant for every three commissions.

Extensive hearings were had to explore ways and means of meeting this critical situation, and making military services more attractive to these professional people.

During the course of the hearings, it became very evident that entirely apart from the question of disparity of earnings between medical officers on the one hand and civilian physicians and dentists on the other, that a basic inequity in pay structure of the Armed Forces existed wherein medical and dental officers were at a considerable disadvantage in terms of total earnings in comparison with that of other officers.

I refer solely to service pay as between medical, dental, and line or other officers. The medical officer is at such a financial disadvantage in the services that this $100 a month is clearly an equalizing payment. A comparison between a line officer and a medical officer over the normal 30-year period of service establishes the fact that a career medical officer is to a disadvantage of roughly $40,000.

A line officer at the age of 22, having graduated from college with a bachelor

of arts or a bachelor of science degree, as the case may be, meets the educational requirements for an appointment as a second lieutenant or as an ensign, gets a commission and his service pay begins.

In contrast, a medical or dental student, after completing 4 years of college, must, to attain a degree in medicine, spend 4 years in a medical school with 1 year as an intern. He is then qualified to be commissioned in either branch of the armed services, 5 years later and older than the line officer, and has reached the average age of 27.

During these 5 years, after the line officer receives his commission and before the medical officer can receive his, the line officer has earned in income roughly $21,000. While during this same 5-year period, the medical officer, in acquiring the most expensive of all educations, conservatively estimated has an expenditure of $10,000.

Therefore, before the medical officer receives his commission, there is a disparity of over $30,000 as between the two officers; except in the case of West Point and Annapolis graduates, where the disparity equals another, conservatively estimated, $20,000, or, in the case of these two graduates, a $50,000 difference.

Throughout the 30 years' service, the line officer's income is roughly $212,000. The medical officer's income, without the equalizing pay, is $172,000, representing roughly $40,000 difference to the advantage of the line officers.

With the equalizing pay, the medical officer will earn a total in the 30-year service of $202,000. So with the equalizing pay, the medical officer has still approximately $10,000 less total income than his running mate, the line officer.

But with reference to the disparity of income as between the line officer—who we will consider as an engineer—and the medical officer, we have additional financial disadvantages to consider:

First. Since the line officer enters the service at 22, he is subject to retirement—30 years' service—at the age of 52, or a full 5 years before the medical officer entering the service at 27 may retire at 57.

Second. If the line officer is in good health at time of retirement and is an engineer, he will, the office of education advises me, estimated on the year 1949, earn approximately $6,000 a year for the 5-year period, while the medical officer is still in the service.

But there are other financial disadvantages to the medical officer. The medical officer in civilian life, computed on the basis of 1949, would be having a net income of $11,000 a year. While the average line officer would, in that same period of time, be earning an estimated net of $6,000 a year. So the medical officer again, throughout a period of 30 years, would be sacrificing an income of approximately $5,000 a year for each year in the service, as compared with his running mate, the line officer.

Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is very anxious, I understand, to catch a train. Therefore, I shall be glad to yield now to him, and then resume my remarks after he has spoken, if I may obtain unanimous consent to that effect.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I really think we would make progress if the Senator from Illinois would take the train. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure that would be very popular.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? Without objection——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to present an argument, and to have at least a voice vote on this matter tonight. If necessary, I shall cancel my engagement, and shall remain here, in order that action on this matter may be completed.

Therefore, Mr. President, if the Senator from Wyoming wishes to continue his remarks at this time, that will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. HUNT. Then I shall proceed in the regular order, Mr. President.

I think it is entirely unnecessary to elaborate further on the financial disadvantage to which a medical officer is subjected by serving his country in the Military Establishment; but I do think one further point should be emphasized—namely, that the armed services are receiving from the medical officer services valued in dollars and cents far in excess of like services of the line officer valued in dollars and cents.

Mr. President, there has been some comment to the effect that perhaps the medical officers are not subjected to the same dangerous situations to which the line officers are subjected. However, in passing let me point out that the first officer to be killed in the present Korean conflict was a dental officer by the name of Major Armstrong.

Mr. President, Senate bill 3019, which now is before the Senate, would extend for a period of 10 months, to July 1, 1953, this $100 a month equalizing pay for physicians and dentists, since the Career Compensation Act of 1949, which reenacted the extra-pay provisions of the Medical Officers Procurement Act of 1947, did so only for a period of 5 years, which will terminate on September 2, 1952.

Should the bill under discussion fail of enactment, we would then have a situation whereby physicians and dentists entering the military services on any date—for instance, on September 2, 1952—would not receive the additional $100 per month, while the physician or dentist entering the service on August 31, 1952, would receive the equalizing pay. An intolerable situation would be created if men of equal educational qualifications and equal rank, in the same branch of the service, working side by side, worked on different pay schedules, with one receiving $10 a month more than the others.

COST OF THE BILL

An estimate of the net cost of this bill during the 10-month period is $382,500. This is arrived at by estimating the number of officers coming on duty in the 10-month period and the number of officers leaving the services in the 10-month period. So the total cost of the bill is under $400,000, which is a very small amount to be expended to insure adequate medical services for the 3,500,000 men of our Armed Forces.

We have discussed the bill as an equalizing pay bill, but I also want to explain its necessity as an incentive pay bill. True, under Public Law 779, the Physicians and Dentists Draft Act of 1951, we have a method which is a compulsory device to bring into the armed services medical and dental officers up to age 50.

This bill sets up priorities designed to bring into the service relatively young and inexperienced physicians and dentists. However, these young and inexperienced men do not possess the qualifications required for assignment to command and staff-type positions, or to duties requiring highly specialized qualifications. The operation of efficient medical services within the Armed Forces requires strong regular corps for the most responsible positions. These positions constitute 50 percent of all positions for the medical and dental officers.

These command and staff officers can be obtained only from the ranks of the regular or career corps. Experience in military medical practice determines the usefulness of these officers in the medical service, and short-time, compulsory service cannot provide such experienced officers.

I am advised by the services that this group of career professionals is currently at the absolute minimum for efficient operation of the service. There exists today in the authorized strength of the Armed Forces a shortage of 2,311 career medical officers and 291 career dental officers. I am further advised that the present number of career officers would have been impossible to obtain without this equalizing pay.

In the armed services today are many mature Reserve and National Guard medical and dental officers who were involuntarily called to duty during the current emergency, and who are holding responsible positions. It is to be expected that within the next few months these officers will return to their civilian practices.

With these mature officers leaving the services, and with young men entering them through Public Law 779, if the regular corps are to satisfactorily meet their responsibilities and to fill the responsible positions I have mentioned, they must be brought up to their authorized strength in the shortest possible time.

The maintainence of this equalizing pay is definitely an incentive, and is essential if in the procurement field maximum benefit is to be derived by the Armed Forces during this period.

This pay will help the armed services to afford continued encouragement to what we hope are the best of the younger physicians and dentists to seek a career in the Armed Forces. I contend most emphatically that the standard of medical and dental services in the Armed Forces should in every way measure up to that in civilian life. In fact, I think the men in the services are entitled to

the best the medical services can afford; and if there has to be any difference, I contend that those of us not in the service should receive the substandard medical service.

There has been some discussion of the introduction of a measure to discontinue to all of those in the service this equalizing pay.

No thinking man can doubt that the medical officers who accepted commissions under the 1947 law did take into consideration this total compensation, although it may not have been the deciding factor. However, the fact remains they left the civilian opportunities which almost everyone of them could reasonably have expected to enjoy, and they entered the military service. To withdraw from them at this time equalizing compensation which was promised to them to encourage their assumption of military status, in my humble opinion would be a most unjust treatment, an unfair treatment, a treatment which in the eyes of the ordinary citizen would appear to be a promise broken, a failure by the Congress to live up to a contract entered into in good faith, regardless of the legal validity of the situation.

To return to that unfair pay scale, and to repudiate the contract previously made in 1947, and again in 1949, and to break the promise as well as the contract made with those now in the service, would, I emphasize—and the services also emphasize this point—certainly end voluntary medical-officer procurement.

At the present time, voluntary retirement or even resignation by career medical officers has been forbidden. So it would be almost a dishonest act to reduce the pay of such a captive group. Such action would be such a glaring injustice that I am sure the Congress would never countenance it.

In the future, as in the past, medical officers will be 5 or 6 years behind their fellow officers of the other branches, in respect to accumulative earnings. It would be most difficult for them to understand—and entirely inexplicable to officers entering the medical and dental corps after September 1, 1952—why they should be denied the special pay now authorized.

The proposed legislation being presented at this time is in the nature of emergency or stop-gap legislation to prevent the expiration on September 1, 1952, of the authority for this special pay. Under this proposal, the whole subject will be reviewed by the Congress prior to July 1, 1953, the date of the termination of the physicians and dentists draft law. At that time it will be necessary to review the entire problem of ways and means of procurement and of stabilizing the careers of medical and dental officer personnel.

In the event the Physicians and Dentists Draft Act is not reenacted before July 1953, far greater effective procurement inducements than those currently in effect will be required.

After September 1 this year, even if the Korean situation is resolved and even if the whole world situation is such as to permit of a sizeable reduction in our Armed Forces, the military services will, of necessity, continue to have need for replacements, both because of the return of Reserve officers to civilian life and the loss of Regulars through retirement, death, and resignations.

It happens to have been my privilege to have served in the Dental Corps of the United States Army for 2 years, and I still retain my Reserve commission. So I believe I have a rather intimate understanding of the over-all problem of recruiting medical and dental officers to serve as procurement and assignment officers. If the present compensation were reduced by the amount of the equalizing pay which they now receive, the adverse effect on the personnel of the medical services would be immeasurable.

I am sure that no Member of this body would knowingly have the Senate take action which would reduce the standard of medical services afforded our men in the Army, Navy, and Air Corps. But the inevitable would follow, namely—except under conditions of all-out war—that only the less qualified would volunteer, and the civilian medical advisory boards would naturally retain in civilian practice the best medical personnel.

Perhaps the greatest injury would be done through the loss of so-called medical-career personnel. Starting at the end of World War I, but more especially during and since World War II, the professional competency and ability of military medical personnel have improved greatly, and are receiving increased recognition by the two professions.

The services advise me that men just out of college, plus Reserve officers in the services for only a 2-year period, cannot maintain at a high degree of competency the professional services in the Armed Forces.

I am convinced that losses of Regulars by resignation—and in all fairness such resignations must be accepted—will surpass all previous totals. That is the opinion of those who are best informed. The Armed Forces unquestionably would be faced with increased expenditures of time, effort, and money to procure even a token number of physicians and dentists for the regular services in the future.

The end result of failure to extend this equalizing pay for the 10 months, as provided in the bill, would in the long run mean that the medical services would be made up of increased numbers of Reservists who would be required to leave their communities. Of course, an acute shortage of physicians already exists in nearly every community. Such Reserve officers would need to lock their offices, but in all probability they would maintain their offices intact, in anticipation of their return. I need not mention to this body the hardship cases that have resulted from the calling in of Reserve officers, especially those who served in World War II. Aside from depriving the communities of much-needed medical and dental services, the financial injustice thus heaped on the Medical Reserve officer is far in excess of that imposed upon any other group or segment of our economy.

Mr. President, in order to assist the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I shall take my seat as soon as I have referred briefly to the number of physicians now in the armed services and the rapidity with which numbers of them are leaving the services.

There are 13,181 physicians in the Department of Defense. Nine hundred and seventy-five, or 7 percent, of these officers receive flight pay. That number divided as follows: 605 in the Air Force, 1 in the Army, 369 in the Navy.

These officers receive $141.59 a month. Only one or two dentists receive flight pay, but the 7 percent receiving flight pay include those receiving paratroop pay.

The total annual flight surgeon's pay is $1,737,380. The following officers are included in that group: 3 major generals, 10 brigadier generals, 124 colonels, 212 lieutenant colonels, 110 majors, 271 captains, 245 first lieutenants.

As is the case of all other officers, 450 medical officers receive station allowances in overseas areas, to compensate for the excess cost of living in those areas as compared with the cost of living in the United States.

The annual total is $621,075.

Speaking of the shortage of career medical officers in the Army, we have 4,604 physicians, of whom only 1,682 are career officers, and of whom 3,922 are nonregulars. It will be mentioned perhaps that physicians and dentists receive education at the expense of the Government. I wish to say that only 20 percent of those in the medical and dental services today received all or part of their education at the expense of the Government. From June 30, 1952, to July 1, 1953, the Defense Establishment expects to lose 6,269 physicians, and dental losses will be somewhat in the same percentage.

In the Navy, under the V-12 program, 11,174 medical officers received partial training. Of that number 8,926 have been on active duty. Approximately the same percentage holds true with reference to dentists. The 3,582 officers partially educated under the V–12 program include approximately 2,000 former ASTP students, who have already entered the services and are now approaching the time when they are leaving the service with great regularity. They have been doing so.

Mr. President, at the present time the services are finding it necessary to augment the medical officers by employing contract physicians, there being 96 physicians so employed.

In addition there are 16 civil-service dentists and 70 medical officers on duty at various installations. These civil-service medical and dental personnel are permanent and will not be replaced at any time in the foreseeable future.

This bill has been reported unanimously by the committee. There were no witnesses appearing against the bill, unless the testimony of the Senator from Illinois would be considered in opposition. But he was specifically testifying against flight pay, overseas pay, and overseas increased allowances to meet costs of living in excess of the cost of living in the United States.

Mention has been and will be made that many of the medical and dental

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

officers receiving the $100-a-month equalization pay were educated at the expense of the Government.

I have mentioned the number of physicians and dentists who were educated at Government expense, upon whom we had no hold of any kind until the passage of the Physicians and Dentists Draft Act of 1951.

This bill provided for calling and recalling physicians and dentists in priorities, priority 1 being those physicians and dentists educated by the Government and who served less than 90 days, and that group has now been exhausted.

Priority 2 was those dentists and doctors educated at the expense of the Government and having served more than 90 days and less than 21 months, which category is also exhausted.

And many are now being called under category 3, being those who have had no military service since September 16, 1940. In this group physicians and dentists may be drafted up to 50 years of age.

I think, Mr. President, that it is of vital importance to the health and welfare of the men in the service that we pass this legislation which, as I have set out, is only for a 10-month period and which will equalize the situation as between the physician, dentist, and line officers until such time as the so-called Doctor's Draft Act expires, at which time the entire situation will need restudy and survey.

Time is getting short in this session and there is not ample time to conduct extensive hearings and write extensive new legislation before adjournment.

Mr. President, my bill continues the extra pay only until July 1, 1953, when the entire question will again be before the Congress. I am very hopeful that the Senate will see fit to continue this equalizing pay, primarily for the reason that it is so necessary if we want to maintain the standard of medical and dental services to which the men in the service are entitled.

Mr. President, I say, and I think I know from experience, having spent 2 years in the Dental Corps of the Army, and I still hold my Reserve commission in that corps, that whether we call this incentive pay or whether we call it extra pay, or whether we call it equalizing pay, above all, Mr. President, I say it is just compensation.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUNT. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I inquire of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming whether his bill covers the small number of medical and dental officers who have not previously been provided with incentive pay.

Mr. HUNT. It does. As I think the Senator from Washington is aware, it is only a very small group, consisting of retired officers, who do not come under the provision of $100 a month extra, and who have now been called back into active duty. This bill would take care of that small number.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming is making it clear that within recent months there have been a number of medical and dental reserve officers recalled to active duty, who were not provided with the incentive pay which has been a part of the monthly compensation of other doctors and dentists in the military service.

Mr. HUNT. Yes; and that was to a very, very small number. In fact, that was only true in the case of the few who did not volunteer under the so-called Physicians and Dentists Draft Act of 1951.

Mr. CAIN. I merely wanted to be certain that the Senator from Wyoming had cured what has been admitted within the Armed Services Committee to be a serious inequity in the present status.

Mr. HUNT. We attempted to take care of that, I may say to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUNT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand that the bill of the eminent Senator from Wyoming continues this differential pay for 10 months, and then extends it to the added groups?

Mr. HUNT. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, that while the added costs may apply only to approximately 300 persons, the bill continues payment to some 13,000 who are already enjoying it. Is that correct?

Mr. HUNT. I think I should explain to the Senator from Illinois that this has no bearing on the number of career officers who are now receiving the $100 a month extra, for it is my understanding, and I am so advised by the services, that those now receiving it would continue to receive it, but those taken into the service after September 2, 1951, or 1952 would not be covered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUNT. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I rise to suggest that this is not a proper time to take up the bill. I am sure we could not at this particular time obtain a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has already been taken up.

Mr. FERGUSON. But it cannot be voted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That would depend upon the pleasure of the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not want to suggest the absence of a quorum, but it is certainly no time for action on this bill, when there are but six Senators on the floor. I do not know whether I shall be for or against the bill, but I think we at least ought to be in a position to obtain a quorum. If the Senator from Wyoming desires a vote on the bill at this time, I shall have to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator whether he happened to be on the floor while I was explaining the bill?

Mr. FERGUSON. No, but even though I were for the bill, I would not think it right for the Senate to be considering such a measure at this hour, when there is unfinished business before the Senate to be considered. I do not think it would be appropriate to lay aside the unfinished business and to take up another bill. I feel sure that this is a bill which could be passed on the call of the consent calendar. If it is not, I should have to suggest the absence of a quorum before the taking of a vote.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator from Michigan be agreeable to a unanimous-consent agreement being entered into that this measure shall be voted upon on Monday, immediately following the call of the calendar?

Mr. FERGUSON. No, I could not do that, because, while the Senator from Michigan is not going to be out of town and would be able to be here on Monday, there are other Senators who will not be here. On Monday I should have to suggest the absence of a quorum. I would not object to taking it up on Tuesday. I do not want to delay at all the vote on the bill, but I simply feel it is not a proper time to take action upon it. I have no idea as to what cost the bill would involve. I note that it would involve an expenditure of money, for, on page 4, section 3 reads:

> Section 1 of this act shall be effective as of October 1, 1949. Appropriations currently available for pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services shall be available for retroactive payments authorized under this act.

Mr. HUNT. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that, if my memory serves me correctly, I gave the costs involved in the bill in the course of my remarks.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan has been in an Appropriations Committee meeting, with representatives of the State Department, and has just returned to the floor.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that I shall not demand a vote this evening, but this is another instance of a condition I have noticed ever since I have been a Member of the Senate. There is always some way whereby the procedure of the Senate can be delayed. I want to say very frankly to my colleagues that sometimes we operate less effectively than a group of boy scouts would operate. Any State legislature in the United States would make the Senate of the United States look very bad in connection with procedure. I have many times been more than provoked by the absence of Senators from the floor, necessitating the postponement of important measures awaiting their return. I do not think that is good procedure.

Mr. FERGUSON. I could join the Senator in some of his remarks. I do not think they apply to me.

Mr. HUNT. The Senator from Michigan has been on the floor and attending to his business.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the attention of the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Wyoming for a moment.

The majority leader has already announced the program for Monday, which is a call of the calendar, and, following the call of the calendar, the con-

sideration of certain bills specified in his announcement, the numbers of which I do not at the moment recall.

I should like to suggest to the consideration of the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Michigan that if time permits on Monday, after we have concluded the call of the calendar and the consideration of bills included in the announcement of the majority leader, we then proceed with the consideration of the bill which has been discussed by the Senator from Wyoming. All the parliamentary rights of the Members of the Senate will be protected. If some Senator wants to suggest the absence of a quorum, I am sure there will be no difficulty about that.

In view of the fact that we have had this discussion this evening, and it is in the RECORD, it is only fair and equitable that we proceed on Monday with the bill referred to after we have concluded the call of the calendar.

Mr. HUNT. That would be agreeable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the bill in question is one of three to which the majority leader referred as being available to be taken up on Monday afternoon after the call of the calendar.

Mr. FERGUSON. It takes care of itself, then.

Mr. HUNT. That is very agreeable to the Senator from Wyoming.

BURLEY TOBACCO FARM ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, earlier in the day I introduced, by request, Senate bill 3259, relating to burley tobacco farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. I failed to ask in connection with the introduction of the bill that a letter to the Vice President from the Department of Agriculture be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., May 22, 1952.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: At the invitation of the Department, some of the Senators and Representatives from the burley tobacco producing area met with Department officials recently to discuss problems relating to the burley tobacco marketing quota program. In keeping with the request of Senators and Representatives attending the meeting the Department submits herewith suggested legislation to provide a more uniform, a more equitable, and a sounder economic basis for the establishment of burley tobacco acreage allotments.

The Department is confronted with serious difficulty in establishing allotments under present provisions of law and, in our judgment, these difficulties are such that they may make it virtually impossible to continue operation of the program successfully. The facts cited below will bring out the problem:

1. Public Law 43, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved April 29, 1943 (57 Stat. 69), provides that the burley tobacco acreage allotment which would otherwise be established for any farm having a burley acreage allotment in 1942 shall not be less than one-half acre.

2. Under Public Law 276, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 31, 1944 (58 Stat. 136), the allotment for any farm having a burley tobacco acreage allotment in 1943 cannot be less than 1 acre or 25 percent of the cropland, whichever is smaller.

3. Burley allotments are distributed as follows:

(a) Three hundred and four thousand eight hundred and forty-seven farms share 475,000 acres of allotment in 1952, an average of 1.56 acres per farm. Tobacco on many farms is grown by two or more families and the average burley allotment per family is about 1 acre.

(b) One hundred and ninety thousand eight hundred and thirty-six farms have allotments of 1 acre or less and an additional 13,540 farms have allotments of 1.1 acres each in 1952.

(c) The estimated number of farms having burley allotments of 1 acre or less in 1953 is 95,000.

4. Farms with allotments above 1 acre have had their allotments reduced 32 percent since 1945, while smaller allotments have remained the same or increased.

5. With a normal crop in 1952, burley allotments in 1953 would need to be reduced by at least 20 percent below 1952 in order to bring supplies in line with demand.

6. If only the allotments above 1 acre are reduced by 20 percent in 1953, the net reduction will be only 13 percent. Any reduction in subsequent years would be even less effective because more allotments would be reduced to 1 acre and, therefore, be protected. Thus, it would become increasingly difficult to maintain supplies in line with demand.

7. The average yield per acre of burley tobacco in the 5 years 1939–43 was 985 pounds, whereas the average in the 5 years 1947–51 was 1,271 pounds. Thus, seven-tenths of an acre of burley tobacco now is equivalent to 1 acre in 1944 from the standpoint of production, and the yield trend is still upward.

Although the Department did not object to Public Law 276 at the time of its enactment as a wartime measure, we have been greatly concerned about its application and have twice before called this to the attention of the Congress. Protection of a farm having an allotment in 1943 through a specific legal minimum (the smaller of 1 acre or 25 percent of the cropland) and denial of that protection to an adjoining farm across the road or fence, because the allotment for that farm was established in 1944 or 1945, would create misunderstanding and dissension among the growers. Recognizing this, the Department has used permissive provisions of the law to avoid reducing allotments of 1 acre or less which were not specifically protected under Public Law 276. However, in view of the necessity for further adjustment of supplies of burley tobacco and the ever-increasing number of allotments that have not shared in these adjustments, the Department is unable to justify continuation of this protection to allotments of 1 acre or less not protected by Public Law 276. Therefore, unless the law can be amended in time to permit application of the amendment in the establishment of allotments in September and October of this year for the 1953 crop, there will be around 95,000 farms—about one-half of the so-called small allotments—on which the allotments should be reduced in 1953, leaving the other 95,000 farms protected under Public Law 276.

The Department recommends that the law be amended to provide that the farm acreage allotment for burley tobacco for any year shall not be less than the smallest of (1) the allotment established for the farm for the immediately preceding year, (2) five-tenths of an acre, or (3) 25 percent of the cropland in the farm. This amendment would (1) place all small allotments on a uniform basis, (2) bring the over-all job of adjusting supplies in line with demand within sounder and more manageable limitations, and (3) eliminate the virtually impossible administrative burden arising out of record keeping over an indefinite period of years in relation to a specified earlier year.

The enclosed draft of a bill would accomplish the objectives recommended by the Department. The Department urgently recommends that the proposed bill be enacted.

The enactment of this proposed bill would entail no additional administrative expenses.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that from the standpoint of the program of the President, there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Sincerely,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 139)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States. The Chair wants to be sure that this veto message, in which the Chair has very little interest [laughter] is read before the Senate takes a recess this afternoon. The clerk will read the message from the President of the United States.

The message from the President was read, and, with the accompanying joint resolution, ordered to lie on the table as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I return herewith, without my approval, Senate Joint Resolution 20, entitled "Joint resolution to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources."

This joint resolution deals with a matter which is of great importance to every person in the United States. I have studied it very carefully, and have taken into account the views and interests of those who support this legislation, as well as of those who are opposed to it.

I have concluded that I cannot approve this joint resolution, because it would turn over to certain States, as a free gift, very valuable lands and mineral resources of the United States as a whole—that is, of all the people of the country. I do not believe such an action would be in the national interest, and I do not see how any President could fail to oppose it.

The lands and mineral resources in question lie under the open sea off the Pacific, the Gulf, and the Atlantic coasts of our country. Contrary to what has been asserted, this resolution would have no effect whatever on the status of the lands which lie under navigable rivers, lakes, harbors, bays, sounds, and other navigable bodies of water that are inland waters. Neither would it have any effect on the tidelands—that is, the lands along the seashore which are covered at high tide and exposed at low tide. All such lands have long been held by the courts to belong to the States or

their grantees, and this resolution would make no change in the situation.

The only lands which would be affected by this resolution extend under the open ocean for some miles seaward from the low-tide mark or from the mouths of harbors, sounds, and other inland waters. What this resolution would do would be to give these lands to the States which happen to border on the ocean.

It has been contended that the joint resolution merely restores to the States property which they owned prior to the 1947 decision of the Supreme Court in the case of United States against California. This argument is entirely erroneous.

Until recent years, little or no attention was paid to the question of who owned these lands under the open sea, since they were for all practical purposes without value. But, about 20 years ago, oil began to be produced in substantial quantities from the submerged lands off the coast of California. Then, for the first time, the legal question of ownership became important and was given serious consideration.

There was uncertainty for a number of years over whether these were State or Federal lands. Even so careful and zealous a guardian of the public interest as the late Secretary of the Interior, Harold Ickes, at first assumed that the undersea lands were owned by the States. When he subsequently made studies of the matter, however, he concluded that the United States had interests in these lands which should be determined by the courts.

Whatever may have been the opinion of various people in the past, the legal controversy has now been finally resolved in the only way such legal questions can be resolved under our Constitution—that is by the courts, in this case by the Supreme Court. It has been resolved by that Court not once but three times. First in 1947, in the case of California, then twice in 1950, in the cases of Louisiana and Texas, the Court held that the submerged lands and mineral resources underlying the open waters of the ocean off the coast of the United States are lands and resources of the United States, and that the various coastal States, as such, do not have and have never had any title to or property interest in such lands or resources. Texas, of course, before it became a State and while it was an independent republic, had whatever rights then existed in the submerged lands off its coast, but the Supreme Court ruled that any such rights were transferred to the United States under the annexation agreement when Texas entered the Union.

Consequently, the law has now been determined, and it applies uniformly to all coastal States. Lands under the open sea are not owned by the coastal States, but are lands belonging to the United States—that is, they are lands of all the people of the country.

Accordingly, the real question presented by this joint resolution is not who owns the lands in question. That question was settled by the Supreme Court. The real question this resolution raises is: Should the people of the country give an asset belonging to all of them to the States which happen to border on the ocean? This resolution would do just that. Despite all the irrelevant contentions which have been made in favor of this resolution, its real purpose and its sole effect would be to give to a few States undersea lands and mineral resources which belong to the entire Nation.

I cannot agree that this would be a wise or proper way to dispose of these lands and mineral resources of the United States. Instead, I think the resources in these lands under the sea should be developed and used for the benefit of all the people of the country, including those who live in the coastal States.

I would not agree to any proposal that would deprive the people of the coastal States of anything that rightfully belongs to them. By the same token, I cannot be faithless to the duty I have to protect the rights of the people of the other States of the Union.

The resources in the lands under the marginal sea are enormously valuable. About 235,000,000 barrels of oil have already been recovered from the submerged lands affected by this joint resolution—nearly all of it from lands off the coasts of California and Louisiana. The oil fields already discovered in these lands are estimated to hold at least 278,000,000 more barrels of oil. Moreover, it is estimated that more than 2,500,000,000 additional barrels of oil may be discovered in the submerged lands that would be given away off the coasts of California, Texas, and Louisiana alone. In addition to oil and gas, it is altogether possible that other mineral resources of great value will be discovered and developed beneath the ocean bed.

The figures I have cited relate only to the submerged lands which are claimed to be covered by this resolution—that is, the marginal belt of land which the sponsors of the resolution say extends seaward 3 marine leagues—10½ land miles—from the low-tide mark off the coast of Texas and the west coast of Florida, and 3 nautical miles—3½ land miles—off all other coastal areas.

The Continental Shelf, which extends in some areas 150 miles or more off the coast of our country, contains additional amounts of oil and other minerals of huge value. One oil well, for example, has already been drilled and is producing about 22 miles off the coast of Louisiana.

While this resolution does not specifically purport to convey lands and resources of the Continental Shelf beyond a marginal belt, the resolution does open the door for the coastal States to come back and assert claims for the mineral resources of the Continental Shelf lying seaward and outside of this area. The intent of the coastal States in this regard has been made clear by actions of the State Legislature of Louisiana, which has enacted legislation claiming to extend the State's boundary 27 miles into the Gulf of Mexico, and of the State Legislature of Texas, which has enacted legislation claiming to extend that State's boundary to the outer limit of the Continental Shelf. Such an action would extend Texas' boundary as much as 130 miles into the Gulf of Mexico.

I see no good reason for the Federal Government to make an outright gift, for the benefit of a few coastal States, of property interests worth billions of dollars—property interests which belong to 155,000,000 people. The vast quantities of oil and gas in the submerged ocean lands belong to the people of all the States. They represent part of a priceless national heritage. This national wealth, like other lands owned by the United States, is held in trust for every citizen of the United States. It should be used for the welfare and security of the Nation as a whole. Its future revenues should be applied to relieve the tax burdens of the people of all the States and not of just a few States.

For these reasons, I cannot concur in donating lands under the open sea to the coastal States, as this resolution would do.

I should like to dispose of some of the arguments which have been made in support of this resolution—arguments which seem to me to be wholly fallacious.

It has been claimed that such legislation as this is necessary to protect the rights of all the States in the lands beneath their navigable inland waters. It has been argued that the decisions of the Supreme Court in the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases have somehow cast doubt on the status of lands under these inland waters. There is no truth in this at all. Nothing in these cases raises the slightest question about the ownership of lands beneath inland waters. A long and unbroken line of Supreme Court decisions, extending back for more than 100 years, holds unequivocally that the States or their grantees own the lands beneath the navigable inland waters within the State boundaries.

Long Island Sound, for example, was determined by the courts to be an inland water many years ago. So were Mobile Bay, and Mississippi Sound, and San Francisco Bay, and Puget Sound. Chesapeake and Delaware Bays, and New York and Boston Harbors, are inland waters. The Federal Government neither has nor asserts any right or interest in the lands and resources underlying these or other navigable inland waters within State boundaries. Neither does it have or assert any right or interest in the tidelands, the lands lying between the high- and low-water marks of the tides. All this has been settled conclusively by the courts.

If the Congress wishes to enact legislation confirming the States in the ownership of what is already theirs—that is, the lands and resources under navigable inland waters and the tidelands—I shall, of course, be glad to approve it. But such legislation is completely unnecessary, and bears no relation whatever to the question of what should be done with lands which the States do not now own—that is, the lands under the open sea.

The proponents of this legislation have also asserted that under the Supreme Court rulings the Federal Government may interfere with the rights of the States to control the taking, con-

servation, and development of fish, shrimp, kelp, and other marine animal or plant life. It is also asserted that the Federal Government may interfere with the rights to filled-in or reclaimed lands, or the rights relating to docks, piers, breakwaters, or other structures built into or over the ocean. I can say simply and categorically that the executive branch of the Government has no intention whatever of undertaking any such thing. If the Congress finds any cause for apprehension in this regard, it can easily settle the matter by appropriate legislation, which I would be very happy to approve. But these assertions provide no excuse for passing legislation to give to a few States—at the expense of the people of all the others—rights they do not now have to very valuable lands and minerals beneath the open sea.

I have considered carefully the arguments that have been advanced to the general effect that—regardless of the decisions of the Supreme Court—the coastal States ought to own the lands beneath the marginal sea. These arguments have been varied and ingenious. I cannot review all of them here. Suffice it to say I have found none of these arguments to be persuasive.

The fact is that the Federal Government, and not the States, obtained the rights to these lands by the action of the Executive, beginning with a letter from Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson in 1793, when he asserted jurisdiction, on behalf of the United States as against all other nations, over the 3-mile belt of ocean seaward of the low-tide mark. Neither then nor at any other time did the Federal Government relinquish any authority over this belt. The rights to this ocean belt, in other words, are and always have been Federal rights, maintained under international law by the national Government on behalf of all the people of the country.

It has been strongly urged upon me that the case of Texas differs from that of the other coastal States, and that special considerations entitled Texas to submerged lands lying off its coast. I recognize that the situation relating to Texas is unique. Texas was an independent republic for 9 years before she was admitted to the Union, in 1845, " on an equal footing with the existing States." During those 9 years, it had whatever rights then existed in submerged lands of the marginal sea.

Texas entered the Union pursuant to a joint resolution of annexation, enacted by the Congress. Some of the provisions of the annexation resolution are not clear in their meaning as they apply to the present question. Thus, the resolution granted to Texas "all the vacant and unappropriated lands lying within its limits," but at the same time it also required Texas to cede to the United States "all ports and harbors and all other property and means pertaining to the public defense."

The legal question relating to ownership of submerged lands off the coast of Texas may have been different and more difficult than the legal question with respect to California and Louisiana. But the Supreme Court decided that when Texas entered the Union on an equal footing with the other States, thereupon ceasing to be an independent nation, it transferred national external sovereignty to the United States and relinquished any claims it may have had to the lands beneath the sea.

Not only has the Supreme Court ruled upon the difficult legal question, but in enacting Senate Joint Resolution 20 the Congress decided that all the coastal States should be treated in the same manner as Texas. In view of this, it obviously is impossible for me to consider the resolution exclusively from the standpoint of the unique situation relating to Texas.

As to those parts of the Continental Shelf that lie beyond the marginal belt that would be transferred by Senate Joint Resolution 20, the States have no grounds for asserting claims. There can be no claim that these lands lay within the boundaries of any States at the time of their admission to the Union. Neither can there be any claim of an historical understanding that these were State lands. More important, the Nation's rights in those lands, as in the case of the marginal belt, are national rights based upon action taken by the Federal Government.

In 1945, the President issued a proclamation declaring that the natural resources of the subsoil and sea bed of the Continental Shelf beneath the high seas appertain to the United States, and are subject to its jurisdiction and control. This proclamation asserts the interests of the United States in the land and resources under the high seas well beyond the 3-mile belt of territorial sea established in Jefferson's time. This jurisdiction was, of course, asserted on behalf of the United States as a whole, and not just on behalf of the coastal States.

In view of the controversy of the last 15 years or so over the disposition of the lands underlying the marginal sea belt, and the more recent problem relating to rights in the remainder of the Continental Shelf, I should like in this message to indicate the outlines of what would appear to me to be a reasonable solution.

First, it is of great importance that the exploration of the submerged lands—both in the marginal sea belt and the rest of the Continental Shelf—for oil and gas fields should go ahead rapidly, and any fields discovered should be developed in an orderly fashion which will provide adequate recognition for the needs of national defense.

Senate Joint Resolution 20, as originally introduced by Senators O'MAHONEY and ANDERSON, and as reported from the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, would have filled this need on an interim basis, pending further study by the Congress, by providing for Federal leases to private parties for exploration and development of the oil and gas deposits in the undersea lands. But, as it was amended and passed, the resolution would only make possible the development under State control of the resources of the marginal belt; it makes no provision whatever for developing the resources of the rest of the Continental Shelf.

I wish to call special attention to the need for considering the national defense aspects of this matter—which the present bill disregards completely.

In recent years, we have changed from an oil-exporting to an oil-importing Nation. We are rapidly using up our known reserves of oil; we are uncertain how much remains to be found; and we face a growing dependence upon imports from other parts of the world. We need, therefore, to encourage exploration for more oil within lands subject to United States jurisdiction, and to conserve most carefully, against any emergency, a portion of our national oil reserves.

Senate Joint Resolution 20, as it reached me, does not provide at all for the national defense interest in the oil under the marginal sea. Indeed, the latter half of the ambiguous and contradictory terms of section 6 (a) of the resolution appears to bar the United States from exercising any control, for national defense purposes or otherwise, over the natural resources under the sea. While section 6 (b) gives the Government, in time of war, the right of first refusal to purchase oil, and the right to acquire land through condemnation proceedings, these provisions avoid completely the main problem, which is to make sure, before any war comes, that our oil resources are not dissipated.

In contrast to these provisions, Senate Joint Resolution 20, as originally introduced by Senators O'MAHONEY and ANDERSON, provided in section 7 (a) that the President could, from time to time, withdraw from disposition any unleased lands of the Continental Shelf and reserve them in the interest of national security. In passing the resolution now before me, however, the Congress omitted entirely this or any other similar provision It is not too much to say that in passing this legislation the Congress proposes to surrender priceless opportunities for conservation and other safeguards necessary for national security. I regard this as extremely unfortunate, and it is for this reason especially that the Department of Defense has strongly urged me to withhold approval from Senate Joint Resolution 20.

I urge the Congress to enact, in place of the resolution before me, legislation which will provide for renewed exploration and prudent development of the oil and gas fields under the open sea, on a basis that will adequately protect the national defense interests of the Nation.

Second, the Congress should provide for the disposition of the revenues obtained from oil and gas leases on the undersea lands. Senate Joint Resolution 20, as introduced by Senators O'MAHONEY and ANDERSON, would have granted the adjacent coastal States 37½ percent of the revenues from submerged lands of the marginal sea. I would have no objection to such a provision, which is similar to existing provisions under which the States receive 37½ percent of the revenues from the Federal Government's oil-producing public lands within their borders.

Another suggestion, which was offered by Senator HILL on behalf of himself and 18 other Senators, was that the revenues from the undersea lands, other than

the portion to be paid to the adjacent coastal States under the O'Mahoney-Anderson resolution, should be used to aid education throughout the Nation. When you consider how much good such a provision would do for school children throughout the Nation, it gives particular emphasis to the necessity for preserving these great assets for the benefit of all the people of the country rather than giving them to a few of the States.

Third, I believe any legislation dealing with the undersea lands should protect the equitable interests of those now holding State-issued leases on those lands. The Government certainly should not impair bona fide investments which have been made in the undersea lands, and the legislation should make this clear. Here again, Senate Joint Resolution 20, as introduced by Senators O'MAHONEY and ANDERSON, provided a sensible approach.

But unfortunately, Senate Joint Resolution 20 was converted on the floor of the Senate into legislation which makes a free gift of immensely valuable resources, which belong to the entire Nation, to the States which happen to be located nearest to them. For the reasons stated above, I find neither wisdom nor necessity in such a course, and I am compelled to return the joint resolution without my approval.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 29, 1952.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). The message of the President will be printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was planning to discuss an entirely different subject than the President's veto message on the so-called tidelands bill, but I shall take a moment or two to make comment on the veto message.

I think the President of the United States is to be commended for the clarity of this message and for reducing the explanation of the problem to premises which I am sure the people of the country will understand. This message sets forth very clearly the major principles which the two major newspapers in my State, the Portland Oregonian and the Oregon Journal, set forth in recent editorials in opposition to the so-called tidelands bill. I commend the President for making so clear, in such understandable language, what I think is the controlling fact in the whole issue, and that is that these submerged lands are encompassed by the doctrine of sovereignty.

In the speech which I made in opposition to the so-called tidelands bill I sought to point out that the discussion, throughout the Senate debate, of the so-called Pollard case of 1845 by the proponents of the program to give the submerged lands to the States was based upon a misinterpretation and a misconception of the Pollard case. The Pollard case rests on the doctrine of governmental sovereignty, and the facts of the Pollard case leave no room for doubt about the fact that the land concerned was tideland, that is, land this side of low-water mark. All the Court held in the Pollard case was that under the doctrine of governmental sovereignty such lands, being within the boundaries of the State, were subject to the sovereignty of the State.

The proposal of the proponents of this legislation is to give the submerged lands, which are not tidelands, to the coastal States. All the Pollard case really holds is that the doctrine of sovereignty applies to the facts of whatever case is before the Court. The facts in connection with this particular issue leave no room for doubt that these lands are beyond the low-water mark, beyond the sovereignty of the States, and within the sovereignty of the Federal Government. Therefore the principle of sovereignty or the doctrine of sovereignty involved in the Pollard case applies in like manner to the facts of this controversy. But when we apply it to those facts we enter into the realm of national sovereignty as contrasted with State sovereignty. When we face that fact, there is no question about the soundness of the President's position in this veto message, when he points out that these lands belong to all the people of the United States.

I think he has done what any President of the United States should do—and I hope we shall never have a President of the United States who will do less, namely, place the interests of all the people above the narrower interests of a selfish few who would seek to take away from all the people, for the benefit of the few, what in my judgment, as a matter of law and as a matter of sound public policy applied in this case, belongs to all the people. I believe, and fervently hope, that as the clarity and statesmanship of this veto message come to be understood by the American public in the days immediately ahead, they, too, will take the same position as the two great Oregon newspapers to which I have just referred, the Portland Oregonian and the Oregon Journal, have taken in regard to the disposition which ought to be made of these submerged lands, namely, that they ought to be retained by all the people of the country. The Congress of the United States, supposedly representing all the people, should live up to what I think is its clear obligation by sustaining the veto.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I should like to commend the Senator from Oregon on the very clear and compelling statement which he has just made. I join with him in his commendation of the President in the very fine and, I believe, unanswerable veto message which he has sent to Congress on the submerged lands bill. The position of the President, as we know, is exactly the position which the Supreme Court of the United States took after the issues involved were argued thoroughly before that Court in three different cases. No one could have summed up the whole issue presented by the bill and by the veto message better or more logically or more compellingly than the Senator from Oregon has done this afternoon.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Alabama for his comment. I want to say for the RECORD, because it should be stated for the RECORD, that the leadership and statesmanship which the Senator from Alabama has demonstrated throughout the long debate which we had on this issue will forever stand to his credit and to his service in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the Defense Production Act, which is now pending before the Senate. It reads as follows:

At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

"SEC. —. Paragraph (3) of section 402 (d) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'No ceiling shall be established or maintained for any perishable agricultural commodity (including potatoes, sweetpotatoes, or onions) unless the adjustments in such ceiling for grade, location, and seasonal differentials shall reflect the average percentage differentials for that commodity for the years 1947 through 1951 as certified by the Secretary of Agriculture'."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. MORSE. I shall speak on the amendment at greater length next week. I want to say about the amendment tonight, as I said earlier this afternoon when I discussed another section of the Defense Production Act, that I stand ready to vote for any amendment to the act which will in my judgment strengthen the act, which will help to improve its administration and which will help to eliminate some of the abuses and some of the mistaken policies which the OPS followed with respect to certain matters under the act.

I had hoped that OPS would by regulation and administrative order change the policy that it has been following in connection with perishable products, based upon the sad, unfortunate experience which OPS and the producers of this country in the field of perishable products have had to date in connection with OPS policies in regard to those products.

But believing that I could not justify relying on just hope that OPS would not repeat what was certainly a disastrous boner and blunder which it committed last year in regard to perishable products, when it did such great injustice, may I say to the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] whom I see on the floor, to the potato growers of Idaho, Washington, and Oregon, and would do a similar injustice to the producers of other perishable products if it followed the same policy and course of action that it did last year, that I felt compelled to submit this amendment.

I shall debate it at length next week when I call it up for a vote.

Suffice to say, now, Mr. President, that such an intolerable injustice was done

to the potato producers of my State, and correspondingly to the potato producers of the Northwest States, that I would be derelict in my duty of representing those producers in the Senate if I did not seek to have adopted an amendment which will prevent a repetition of what I think was a case of very bad judgment on the part of OPS during last year.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Does the Senator from Oregon believe that his proposed amendment has sufficient teeth in it to prevent in the future beyond peradventure such foolish and tragic occurrences as the Senator has made reference to with reference in particular to the Pacific Northwest?

Mr. MORSE. I am satisfied that it does, because I have used mandatory language. I have eliminated any possibility of bureaucratic arbitrary and capricious discretion in the matter. I may say to my good friend from Washington—and I am sure that he agrees with me on this legislative principle—that I think we need to do more of that in the passing of legislation in the Senate. I think we ought to limit the granting of discretion and do more of setting out a clear blueprint of direction for administrative agencies to follow.

That is why, if the Senator had been here earlier this afternoon, he would have heard me criticize the Defense Production Act as we passed it in the first instance, because we did not write into it in unequivocal language what I think ought to have been the intent of Congress, namely, that we would freeze, as Bernard Baruch recommended, wages and prices, and adopt some effective monetary controls and some effective credit controls in the interest of really controlling inflation. If we had done that the great elder statesman would not be able to come before the Senate Committee on Armed Services, as he did yesterday, and point out that because effective controls had not been put into effect we have wasted since the outbreak of the Korean war $20,000,000,000, which went right down the inflation drain. In this amendment I have sought to keep faith with what I have said so many times in the Senate and so many times in my State, namely, that I think we ought to do a better job of specifying in greater detail the policies and regulations and the rules that these administrative agencies should follow.

Mr. CAIN. A majority of the mistakes to which the Senator from Oregon is presently taking exception results from the exercise of discretion on the part of administrative agencies, and naturally we condemn such interpretations by the executive branches. However, is it not true that very often the language employed in legislation is neither sufficiently clear nor sufficiently mandatory to give a crystal-clear picture to those who are expected to administer our legislative wishes?

Mr. MORSE. That is true. If the Senator from Washington will permit me to do so, I should like to say that I think one of the reasons why I have to admit that it is true is that too frequently the Senate permits the governmental agencies to propose their own legislation, and then we rubber stamp it. Too much proposed legislation which reaches the Senate really is drafted in the first instance in the executive agencies which subsequently will administer it.

That does not happen to be true in the case of the present bill amending the Defense Production Act, for I happen to know that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the very able staff of his committee have done their own pencil work in connection with the bill now before the Senate. However, that has not been true in the case of some of the measures which have given us the greatest difficulty when it comes to having in them provisions which would permit the exercise of discretion which frequently I have felt has taken the form of arbitrary and capricious discretion.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to congratulate my colleague for his determination to have the Senate adopt an amendment so clear and explicit in terms as to leave no possible doubt in the minds of those administering it—with the consequence that there will be no recurrence of the economic tragedies which have occurred in the months gone by.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the comment of the Senator from Washington, and I wish him to know that that is my intent, although I realize that when an amendment drawn in the English language is placed in the hands of persons who are determined to misapply and misinterpret it, the result might be that some loopholes might be found in the present amendment as I propose it. However, I am not aware that any loopholes exist in the amendment.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, if the amendment of the Senator from Oregon is adopted, I believe it will be found that there are no loopholes in it.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to address myself briefly to another matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

MEETING OF THE ARMED FORCES COMMITTEE IN REGARD TO THE KOJE ISLAND PRISONER-OF-WAR SITUATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a few days ago an executive session of the Armed Services Committee was held in regard to the Koje Island prisoner-of-war problem. About one hour and one-half ago I was called off the floor and was briefed in detail by a member of the press in regard to what happened at that meeting. Although in my judgment nothing which occurred at that meeting could not very suitably have been made public, nevertheless I can understand how in the wise discretion of the chairman of the committee and of the members of the Military Establishment who were present at the meeting, they did not desire to have what occurred there made a matter of public knowledge.

I believe it is most unfair for part of the press to be fully informed—as was the particular newspaperman who talked to me this afternoon, for obviously he is informed regarding what occurred at that meeting—and not to have other parts of the press have the same information.

I shall not disclose here on the floor of the Senate any information which in my judgment would to the slightest extent whatsoever violate the requirements of that executive session. However, in view of the fact that the newspaperman referred to asked me some very direct questions, on the basis of wishing to know whether it was true or was not true that I had taken certain positions at that meeting, let me say that I intend to make a public statement at this time, so that the entire press may know the positions I took on those particular questions. As to those questions I do not feel myself bound any longer, in any way whatsoever, by any executive session requirements of that meeting. It seems to me that if part of the press is to know about what occurred there then, so far as I am concerned, the entire press is going to know about it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Has the Senator from Oregon gained an impression that someone may have obtained information regarding the meeting, although in the national interest it would have been best if that information had not been disclosed?

Mr. MORSE. I do not think the information should have been disclosed, although I do not believe its disclosure affects the national interest.

However, as long as we were meeting in executive session, I do not think the information should have been disclosed.

Mr. LONG. I agree with the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have been caught in this "bite" before. Perhaps what I am about to do this afternoon will set a precedent sufficient to insure that in the future no member of our committee will be caught in such a situation.

The Senator from Louisiana was at the meeting to which I refer, and I am glad he is here on the floor of the Senate now, for I wish him to follow very carefully the remarks I make; and as he follows my remarks and sees where they are leading—as I know he, with his great intellect, will do—if he believes I should not say what he will realize I will be about to say, I shall appreciate it very much if he will request that I yield to him; and perhaps in that way we can have a little discussion about the matter.

Mr. President, I am a little tired of reading in the newspapers what happens at some executive meeting, and then having each one of us on the spot, so to speak, as to the source of the information.

This afternoon I was asked whether it was true that at the meeting of the Armed Services Committee I requested that General Dodd and General Colson

and General Yount at their convenience and at the convenience of all other parties concerned be brought to the United States for a discussion with the Senate Armed Services Committee, in executive session of the Koje Island issue. The answer is that I did.

Not only that, but I wish to announce this afternoon that I am going to press for that hearing because I am satisfied—as I said at the meeting—that we have not yet reached the bottom of the Koje Island prisoner problem. Apparently there are others who are in doubt as to whether we have reached the bottom of it, because only yesterday I read with great interest that the British Government apparently will send Field Marshal Alexander to Korea to check into that particular matter from the standpoint of the British Government, as one of the United Nations, to determine why we have these problems on Koje Island.

Of course, it happens to be my view that there is absolutely no excuse for a general officer of the United States Army entering into negotiations with Communist prisoners in the first instance, or signing an agreement with them, in the second instance, or for another general officer to be so careless of his physical well-being as to get himself inside a compound with no proper bodyguard, where he can be physically seized, with humiliating results to the prestige of the United States.

So what I am about to say, Mr. President, is to be premised upon my view that the negotiations, themselves, the conduct which led to the capture of General Dodd, the failure on the part of the general who was primarily in charge, although he was at Pusan, General Yount, to make perfectly clear to General Colson that there should be no negotiations and that there should be no signing of any document, certainly justifies the disciplinary action which has been taken to date.

But I want to be sure we have all the facts, and so when this newspaper reporter asks me this afternoon, "Is it true that you raised the question the other afternoon as to whether we had all the facts?" the answer to that question is, "Yes, I did." And I do so again today, now, publicly. I happen to think it the duty of the Armed Services Committee to get the facts. That is why I have asked for a continuation of this study. It may be that before we get through with it the Armed Services Committee, through a subcommittee, should do some investigating on the spot over there, as apparently the British Government thinks it should do by sending Field Marshal Alexander over there.

Mr. President, I think it was exceedingly wise for General Clark, the new commander, for Secretary of the Army, Mr. Pace, and for the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, General Collins, to take the disciplinary action that they have taken to date. I think that was their duty. But I also think it the duty of the Armed Services Committee and of the United States Senate as a whole to make clear to the Military Establishment that we are going to take the steps necessary to make certain that we have all the facts in regard to this incident. That is why I say, Mr. President, I do not think we should consider it a closed incident. It is my understanding—and the present occupant of the chair [Mr. LONG] was there—it is my understanding that my suggestion, which has been made available to part of the press, that there be a continued investigation and study of this matter, met with the approval of my colleagues present at the meeting. I have one other comment I want to make.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a question?

Mr. MORSE. Oh, yes; any question.

Mr. CAIN. The distinguished Senator from Oregon has stated he understands that the British Government is shortly to direct Field Marshal Alexander to go to the Far East for the purpose of examining into the Koje incident, the feeling as to the seriousness of which I share with the Senator from Oregon. The Senator from Oregon may be entirely correct; but I have read that Field Marshal Alexander is going to Korea and Japan at the personal invitation of General Clark, who is now our United Nations Supreme Commander in the Far East. During World War II, Field Marshal Alexander was the commanding general of the Fifteenth Army Group, of which the Fifth Army, commanded by Gen. Mark Clark, was a part. I raise the question only to help keep the record as accurate as possible, and to determine whether my understanding with respect to the approaching visit of the field marshal to General Clark is correct, namely, that the field marshal is going there as a personal friend, rather than as an official observer or as one ordered by the British Government to look into the particular Koje episode.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall feel much happier about the situation if a full disclosure of the facts shows that the facts are as the Senator from Washington reports them. But my understanding as I have reported it is based only on a newspaper story I read, which did not contain the information which the Senator from Washington has just now given me. The newspaper story that I read was to the effect that the field marshal was being sent to Korea, and I interpreted the language that he was being sent to Korea as indicating that he was going at the request of the British Government, because of the fact that the British Government, being one of the United Nations, with responsibility for the prisoners on Koje Island as far as obligations under the Geneva Convention are concerned, wants to know what the facts are. That was my interpretation of the newspaper story that I read.

Mr. CAIN. The source of my information, I may say, was likewise a newspaper story. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Oregon in permitting me this interpretation. I am inclined to believe that the RECORD ought to show the source of both of the stories which we have put into the RECORD at this point.

Mr. MORSE. There is one other feature of the Korean situation which disturbs me, Mr. President, and that, too, is based upon newspaper information, and causes me to say here this afternoon that I think both the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, and the Armed Services Committees of both branches of the Congress ought to proceed with an investigation into the facts and circumstances upon which the reports we are reading nowadays as to the developments in South Korea are based. I find it very disturbing, Mr. President, to read in the newspapers that in spite of the fact that the United Nations forces are really in occupation of South Korea, coexistent with the South Korean civilian government, it has been necessary for the President of South Korea, if the newspaper stories are correct, to declare martial law.

I am also concerned, Mr. President, about the newspaper stories to the effect that the President of South Korea is meeting with American military officials in regard to conditions in South Korea. I infer that, necessarily, in such conferences, there would be bound to be some discussion of and consideration given to the reasons and causes for a declaration of martial law in an area where, supposedly, the United Nations officials, represented by the military establishments and the diplomatic officers of the United Nations and the officers of the South Korean Republic, are working together in a cooperative manner.

I am concerned about it, Mr. President, because I am always concerned about the vicious, lying propaganda tactics of our Communist enemies. I do not talk about potential enemies, Mr. President, because I believe in calling a spade a spade. I think Russia and her Communist satellites have demonstrated to us for a long time past that they are not potential enemies; they are enemies. They mean us no good, and they have not been conducting themselves in a manner which has resulted in any good for us.

I have not seen, although I shall call for them, the transcripts of the Russian radio broadcasts which I assume our State Department has collected since martial law has been declared in South Korea, but I know enough about what Russia has done in the past, by way of her vicious propaganda technique over incidents that have aroused much less interest than has the incident of martial law in South Korea, to cause me to express a fear that another incident has now occurred that will give Russia a great deal more ammunition for her propaganda machine guns. I shall be very much surprised if she does not inform people in areas which have not yet fallen victim to the enslavement of Russian communism that the South Koreans now find themselves under a military dictatorship, with United Nations troops occupying their land, and under the domination of civilian leaders who apparently thought they could not maintain control of the people except by resort to martial law.

I do not think that is a healthy state of affairs, Mr. President. I think we should know why it was necessary to declare martial law in South Korea. I think we should know it, Mr. President,

for a good many reasons, but, at least, for one reason, namely, to allay fears, if there are any bases in fact for those fears, that an election of a President of South Korea is just a few short weeks away, and that under the Constitution of South Korea, he is not elected by the votes of the people, but by the elected representatives of the people who, in turn, are sent to a South Korean Congress. With an election such a short time away, Mr. President, there are bound to be many questions raised and many views expressed as to whether there are any political implications in the declaration of martial law.

If we are going to win the minds and the support of the masses of free people still left in Asia beyond the boundaries of Russian Communist domination, we must always be alert to see to it that a course of action is not followed within the orbit of our influence which would play into the hands of Russian Communist propaganda.

So, Mr. President, in closing these comments this afternoon, I express this request, namely, that the Armed Services Committee of the Senate and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate—those are the only two committees to which I, as a Member of the Senate, have any right to address the request, although I hope that corresponding committees of the House will do likewise—will take up without delay, with the Defense Establishment and the State Department, this matter of martial law in South Korea, and ask both of those Departments just one simple question—"How come? What combination of forces within South Korea resulted in such a deterioration of the situation in regard to their civilian government that it became necessary to declare martial law."

I think it would be fair to ask another question, namely, Was it motivated for the purpose of retaining in office a president who might not be the choice of the South Koreans if they were in a position to exercise their choice, or who might not be the choice of the representatives of the South Korean people if there were no interference with their freedom of choice? If this is a martial-law situation in which freedom of choice with reference to almost any political matter is imperiled, then we ought to know about it.

Mr. President, we must keep ourselves in such condition that we can defeat Russia and her satellite allies quickly, through military strength if necessary, and we must also keep ourselves in such condition that, short of war, we can lick Russia in the fight for men's minds in this great battle for the perpetuation of the freedom way of life, in contrast with the enslavement policies of communism.

Mr. President, it is a little difficult for me to understand how we are going to do that if, within the orbit of our influence, deterioration develops in the management of human affairs within the jurisdiction of a government we are supporting, to such a degree that it becomes necessary to declare martial law. I think all that the development of such a situation does is to play right into the hands of Russian propaganda. I do not purport to know what the situation is in South Korea, but there is not a Member of the Senate who is not aware of the fact that reports and rumors coming back to us from that country are not good in regard to what is happening within the civilian government of the Republic of South Korea.

As one who is always devoted to the finding of the facts, I have made these comments this afternoon because I think it very important that the appropriate committees of the Senate obtain for us the facts and speak for us on the facts. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I wish to say I am always glad to have the cooperation of the military officials of our Government in connection with any problem we are investigating, but I repeat what the present Presiding Officer, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], has heard me say more than once in the Committee on Armed Services, that the Pentagon Building must never be considered a substitute for the carrying out of the functions of the Armed Services Committee by the Armed Services Committee itself. The responsibility of obtaining such facts as I am asking for this afternoon, insofar as they involve military policy, rests on our committee; and insofar as they involve so-called diplomatic relations, the responsibility rests upon the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. President, once I have the facts I am asking for this afternoon, then, for the first time, will I sit in judgment on the very simple but exceedingly vital and important questions which I have raised on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2594) to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I sent to the desk earlier today amendments to the bill which was being considered at that time, the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952. I wish to make a few remarks with relation to the amendments for the benefit of the Senate when they are voted on, and I feel I should explain them now.

The amendments I offered were on page 2, between lines 8 and 9, insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 101. Section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "If the domestic production of any commodity is in excess of the amount necessary to meet allocations for defense, stockpiling, and military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress, then no restriction or other limitation shall be imposed under this title upon the right of any person to purchase such commodity in any foreign country and to import and use the same in the United States. No restriction or other limitation shall be imposed under this title if the domestic production of any commodity is sufficient to meet all civilian domestic requirements and the requirements for defense, stockpiling, and military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress."

Renumber succeeding sections accordingly.

On page 5, line 24, to strike out "a new subsection (l)", and insert in lieu thereof "two new subsections."

On page 6, line 5, to strike out the quotation marks.

On page 6, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

(m) No rule, regulation, or order issued under this title shall apply to purchases by any person of any material outside of the United States or its Territories and possessions for importation into the United States for his own use or for fabrication by him into other products for resale.

Mr. President, so that the Senate may be advised of the purpose of these amendments, I wish to make a few remarks at the present time. On another day, but before the vote is taken, I shall have something further to say on the subject of what took place before the Senate Committee on Finance in 1947.

The International Materials Conference was established following former Prime Minister Attlee's visit to this country in December 1950. The invitations to join the Conference were issued by the United States Department of State. Early in 1951 the Conference was organized into a series of commodity committees, and the existing committees have since allocated the world's supply of copper, zinc, tungsten, molydenum, nickel, cobalt, and sulfur to countries participating in defense and to all other non-Communist countries as well. The IMC has assigned each country a so-called entitlement for consumption of the total amount of the free world's supply which it may consume either from its own domestic production or imports. This entitlement, by its nature, sets arbitrary limits on each national economy. While there are at present only seven functioning committees, a central group of eight countries, together with a representative of the Office of American States and the Office of European Economic Cooperation, claims the authority to appoint new committees to deal with any other commodities where such action in its judgment is necessary. The IMC Report on Operations, recently published, described these committees as follows:

The committees were created as autonomous bodies in the interest of expediting action and allowing the countries which were principally concerned with the commodities in question to deal with the problems involved without being subject to review by any other body.

I wish to stress that these committees regard themselves as above review by any other body, including the Senate of the United States.

The State Department claims that the power to participate in such an organization stems from the authority of the President to conduct foreign affairs. Mr. Fleischmann testified before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency that the allocations of the International Materials Conference could not

be made effective in this country without using the Defense Production Act.

The allocations of the IMC, implemented by powers granted in the Defense Production Act, have been used to restrict American industry. For example, users of copper are denied the use of freely available copper in world markets to maintain employment and production in this country. This is accomplished by charging any imported copper against the Controlled Materials Plan allocations of copper for each user. The total allocation issued under the Controlled Materials Plan to all United States copper consumers is designed to maintain American consumption within our so-called entitlement for consumption. Sulfur furnishes another example. The NPA has restricted domestic users of sulfur to 90 percent of their 1950 consumption. This restriction is necessary in order to create an artificial surplus available for export at prices below those prevailing for sulfur in other countries. This action is taken in order to meet the United States export quota as set by the IMC. One further example shows how domestic price controls were used to implement IMC allocations. Last September, international allocations were established for zinc. United States price ceilings were deliberately set below the world price in order to prevent zinc imports reaching the United States in normal volume.

My amendments are designed to make it impossible to take similar actions in the future.

In effect, the IMC is operating a series of intergovernmental commodity agreements. The original proposals for the ITO drafted by the State Department in 1945 included provisions for such agreements and these provisions were incorporated in the Habana charter as chapter 6. Senator MILLIKIN in conducting the hearings on the ITO before the Senate Finance Committee in the Eightieth Congress asked the State Department whether any intergovernmental commodity agreements which might arise under this chapter would receive specific congressional approval. He was advised by the present Secretary of State, who was then the Acting Secretary, that—

> Insofar as such commodity agreements impose any obligations on the United States requiring legislative implementation in any way, it is the intention of the Department that they should be submitted to the Congress.

Congress has never received any request for approval or for legislative implementation of the intergovernmental commodity agreements presently being carried out by the IMC. Instead, the provisions of the Defense Production Act have been used without direct knowledge or approval of the Congress. Furthermore, the Congress refused ever to give its approval to the idea of intergovernmental commodity agreements by refusing to approve United States participation in the International Trade Organization.

A careful examination of the hearings before the banking committees of both the Senate and the House and the congressional debates indicate that Congress never intended to establish an organization such as the IMC when it passed the Defense Production Act.

I fear that if we do not remove the implementation powers behind this Conference at this time we will suddenly find that we are committed to a permanent system of international controls and allocations despite the assurances of mobilization officials that the program will not become permanent. In this connection, a report of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, entitled "Measures for International Economic Stability," prepared by a committee of experts, which was submitted to the Secretary General in November of 1951, is of importance. The conclusions of this report recommend additional intergovernmental commodity agreements as a permanent means of stabilizing commodity markets. The report also states that no new international agency is required, as "international bodies such as the Interim Coordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements and the IMC already exist and can be used for this purpose."

The British Economist, one of the oldest and most respected publications in England, discussed the IMC in its December 29 issue. It repeatedly emphasized the fact that the United States was willing to set the example in order to assure the success of IMC by going further than anyone else. In discussing the work of the sulfur committee, it stated:

> It is worth emphasizing first that the United States was willing to run down its reserves in order to set the example of international cooperation.

In discussing zinc, the British Economist article explains that Belgium had been selling refined zinc to the United States and wished to continue earning the dollars such sales would bring. The United States "entitlement for consumption" of zinc did not permit our buying the supplies formerly sold by Belgium. Belgium was forced to give way, in other words, to sell the zinc to the sterling block, and this country again, through payments to the European Payments Union, had to make up Belgium's dollar deficit. The article continues to state that the IMC member countries are in fact put on their honor—they cannot say that they wish to cooperate and then do nothing. Finally, the major powers, and, in particular, the United States, set the example by making the first contribution.

I am even more disturbed that our mobilization officials have been so anxious to make the first contribution that they have not only sacrificed our civilian economy but they have interfered with the execution of Public Law 520, Seventy-ninth Congress, which provides for the security of the United States through a military stockpiling program. The IMC in their report on operations say that they have discussed the stockpiling problem and are unable to make any further provision at this time for stockpiling of those materials in critically short supply.

The Munitions Board in its most recent report to the Congress admits that as of December 31, 1951, the control agencies diverted over $120,000,000 of materials under stockpile contract and $40,000,000 of aluminum, copper, and lead already in the stockpile was removed from the stockpile inventory. The report further indicates that in the case of copper, 163,500 short tons of copper under stockpile contract were diverted and 55,000 tons actually were removed. Furthermore, only last week it was announced that a further 22,000 tons of copper would be withdrawn immediately from the stockpile and supplied to domestic consumers.

These diversions from the strategic stockpile were necessary because the IMC did not provide sufficient copper to compensate the United States for its tremendous defense requirements. The IMC, in determining its international allocations, gave the United States a smaller share of the world's copper than was received in 1950 and made no allowance for stockpiling.

The amendments which I propose to offer are contained in S. 2873, which was under consideration by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency last week. While the members the committee were considering the problems raised by IMC, they were given advance information of a new order by the Office of Defense Mobilization to permit brass mills and copper wire mills to add to their ceiling prices an amount representing 80 percent of any increase in cost of foreign copper above the 27½ cent ceiling which formerly prevailed. It seems to me that this action was taken in order to lead the committee to believe that the copper shortage in the United States could be solved by merely raising the price for foreign copper. Actually, the purpose of the order is to keep the IMC in existence, as copper usage in accord with its allocation is controlled by the issuance of Controlled Materials Plan tickets and not by price. There is nothing in the release of the Office of Defense Mobilization to indicate that any copper user will have greater freedom in buying easily available copper in the world market without CMP tickets than before. If such permission were granted, this Government would not be implementing the decisions of the IMC to restrict our copper usage to 49.1 percent of the free world's copper.

My amendments are designed only to be effective after all defense needs are met, including those for authorized military assistance to foreign nations and procurement for the stockpile. They are designed merely to remove this unauthorized use of the DPA to implement international allocations which have never been submitted to Congress and which represent agreements between nations of paramount importance to all our citizens.

Additional information on the International Materials Conference is available in my remarks appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 31, February 4, February 18, February 28, and March 3, and in the testimony before both the Senate and House Committees on Banking and Currency.

As I previously stated, I shall make further remarks on what took place before the Finance Committee, in order that we may see clearly what has been going on in the minds of those who have been operating the International Materials Conference.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Midshipman Paul S. MacLafferty (Naval Academy) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that the consideration of the Executive Calendar begin with the new reports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Graydon G. Withey to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States for the unexpired term of 12 years from June 2, 1948.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Allen V. Astin to be Director of the National Bureau of Standards.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Albert William Barlow to be United States attorney for the district of Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 2, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 29 (legislative day of May 28), 1952:

IN THE NAVY

Midshipman Paul S. MacLafferty (Naval Academy) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps in the Navy, subject to physical qualification and approval by the Secretary of the Navy.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 29 (legislative day of May 28), 1952:

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Graydon G. Withey, of Michigan, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States for the unexpired term of 12 years from June 2, 1948.

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Allen V. Astin, of Maryland, to be Director of the National Bureau of Standards.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Albert William Barlow, of Hawaii, to be United States attorney for the district of Hawaii.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 29, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art man's infallible counselor, grant that our perplexing social, economic, and political problems, which we are daily struggling with, may make us more conscious of our need of Thee.

We penitently confess that we so frequently try to solve these problems without seeking Thy divine guidance, only to find that our plans and efforts terminate in futility and failure.

Help us to feel that our primary and most pressing responsibility is to lead our groping and troubled world back to God and to help build the kingdom of righteousness and peace upon this earth.

We pray that in all our proposals and programs for the well-being of our country, we may never forget that righteousness alone will exalt us and that blessed is that people whose God is the Lord.

Hear us in the name of the Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7005. An act to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 426. Joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 302) entitled "An act to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act."

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 7005, an act to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. RICHARDS, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. CHIPERFIELD, and Mr. VORYS.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 45 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

THE SOCIAL SECURITY BILL

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, we meet today with no legislative business before the House. I assume we will adjourn without handling any legislative business as such. I point this out to show that the calendar of business for the House is apparently not overburdened. The majority leadership, therefore, cannot blame failure to bring up the bill H. R. 7800, the social-security bill, on pressure of other business.

Although the House refused to suspend the rules in order to pass this bill last week, the bill is still on the Union Calendar; it has not been defeated on its merits. Is there any reason why the Democratic leadership has not obtained a rule and brought this matter up for consideration on its merits? They have had almost two full weeks in which to do it.

Mr. Speaker, the only excuse for this failure is politics; they are playing cruel and petty politics with a bill in which 4,500,000 persons are directly interested.

Let it be remembered that a majority of this House has already gone on record in favor of the bill. The vote on May 19 was: ayes 150; nays 140. Under normal procedures a majority is all that is necessary to pass a bill.

H. R. 7800 should be brought up under the usual procedures, debated, amended if necessary, and passed by the House without further delay.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

COMMUNIST EMBASSIES ARE CENTERS OF ESPIONAGE

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the use of a Communist Czech consular office in this country to hold sex perversion parties involving Americans in order to blackmail secret information from them as disclosed yesterday before the McCarran committee, should awaken the American people to the danger of permitting any of the Communist diplomats in this country.

The embassies and consular offices of the Communist satellite countries as well as the Soviet Union, in Washington and elsewhere in this country are used primarily for espionage against the United States.

There are presently approximately 800 Communist nationals in the United States in the Soviet and satellite diplomatic services. The majority of these people are dangerous spies and are plotting to pervert the foreign policy of the United States, as well as the overthrow of our Government.

Stalin permits to come to this country only the most dangerous, experienced, and hardened members of the Communist apparatus. They seek only to undermine our country. Normal diplomacy cannot possibly be carried on between our State Department and these Communist diplomats any more than normal negotiations can be carried on with Communists in the truce talks in Korea.

I demand that action be taken on the resolutions that I have introduced calling for the severing of all diplomatic relations with the Communist countries on the basis that they do not represent the peoples of Poland, the Czechs or Slovaks and the other satellite countries, as well as of the Russian people. The present Communist governments are the enemies of the millions enslaved by them. The present maintenance of diplomatic relations with Communists actually increases the danger of all-out war. The present Communist regimes should be ostracized from world affairs in the interest of world peace.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

INVESTIGATION OF RADIO AND TELEVISION PROGRAMS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 278, adopted a few days ago, the chairman of our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce designated me as chairman of a special committee to conduct a study and investigation of radio and television programs. Other members appointed to the Committee by the chairman are Mr. KLEIN, of New York; Mr. CARLYLE, of North Carolina; Mr. THORNBERRY, of Texas; Mr. O'HARA, of Minnesota; Mr. CHENOWETH, of Colorado; and Mr. DENNY, of Pennsylvania.

The committee is fully aware of the difficult assignment due to the controversial nature of such an undertaking. An unusual amount of interest has been manifested in this matter. It is believed by a great many that such an investigation could result in more desirable programs going into the homes of almost every family throughout the country. We realize there are difficult problems involved in this undertaking, but shall undertake to carry out our responsibilities as directed by the House. We hope that we can do a constructive job and will make every effort to approach this undertaking with that objective.

The subcommittee met in executive session yesterday and decided on a program and procedure.

The resolution directs this committee to make an investigation and study to "determine the extent to which the radio and television programs currently available to the people of the United States contain immoral or other offensive matter or place improper emphasis upon crime, violence and corruption."

As a policy, the committee in its meeting yesterday agreed that the investigation would be conducted within the terms of the resolution but not be broadened to cover other such matters that do not relate to programs of radio and television.

The committee decided as a matter of policy to obtain reaction and information from those who listen and observe television and radio programs. Criticism of any such programs will be in order and it will be the desire of the committee to receive suggestions on what would be considered higher type programs.

The question of films or canned programs will be a matter of consideration in view of their necessary part of radio and television.

The committee will hold its first public hearing on Tuesday, June 3, at which time the author of the resolution, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS], is invited to appear as a first witness. Other Members of Congress interested are hereby extended an invitation to give the committee the benefit of any information they may have or any suggestions in connection with this undertaking.

The hearings will continue June 4 and 5. Following the appearance of Members of Congress, representatives of civic clubs and organizations who desire to be heard will be given an opportunity to appear.

In connection with the subcommittee work, we will undertake the study of programing techniques, including the question of responsibility for and control over the content of radio and television programs on the part of broadcasting licensees.

We expect to receive such information as can be made available regarding complaints which the Federal Communications Commission may have in regard to such programs.

At the appropriate time, individual broadcasters and representatives of the broadcasting industry will be heard and given an opportunity to explain the conduct of the industry, their code of ethics, and such other information as relates to this investigation.

INVESTIGATION OF THE KOJE PRISON INCIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a little over 2 weeks ago I introduced a resolution directing the Committee on the Armed Services to carry out a full-scale investigation of the Koje prison incident and to make a full and complete report to the Congress by July 1 of this year. I note on yesterday that one of the outstanding members of that committee has likewise requested that his committee conduct this investigation immediately. I refer, of course, to the statement made by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CLEMENTE].

Since the introduction of my resolution a great deal has occurred on Koje Island and in other parts of Korea which make it more than mandatory that the Congress know the full truth of the situation and also to investigate its inceptions in the past.

It is my hope that the Committee on Armed Services will very shortly conduct hearings in reference to this matter. If they do not, I intend to direct to that committee a resolution of inquiry which will make it mandatory for the Department of Defense to furnish the necessary information within a period of 7 days.

RETIREMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a statement I made before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on retirement legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, we are beginning the hearings on various bills which, by their terms, will provide general increases in the retirement of Federal employees. Some of these bills provide percentage increases combined with flat dollar increases. Others substitute new formulas for computing annuities while still a third group would completely rewrite the Retirement Act.

At the outset of the hearings, I wish to state my position frankly and plainly on all of the pending bills. I am strongly opposed to the enactment at this time of any legislation which would increase the retirement benefits or annuities in any manner, shape or form since the retirement fund is not now actuarially sound. It is in the red nearly $5,000,000,000 insofar as having sufficient funds to meet its obligations and liabilities is concerned. Even if we were just to consider amounts to those already retired which, based on their life expectancy, total $2,016,051,658, and add to that the amount due present Federal employees, if they desired to withdraw their money in their individual retirement accounts, we would find that the funds credited to our Federal civil service retirement system could not meet these obligations. In fact, it would fail to do so by nearly $150,000,000.

Any increase in the annuities of those already retired must be taken from the taxpayers or from the equities in the fund of those who will retire in the future. Those who are now retired have, in the great majority of cases, received in annuities already many times the amount of their contributions. To this particular group our Government has been most generous. In the first place, they have received full credit for their years of service prior to August 1, 1920 without having to make any contributions whatsoever to the retirement fund. Secondly, during the years in which they made contributions to the retirement fund, they paid 2½ percent to the fund for 6 years; they paid 3½ percent into the fund for 16 years; and 5 percent for 6 years. Only those retiring since 1948 have made any payments of 6 percent.

Meanwhile, these retired employees seek increases in retirement and survivors' annuities which are largely comparable to those which will be received by employees who will be contributing 6 percent of their annual salaries the entire length of their service with the Federal Government.

As an indication of what has been received by those already retired compared to their contributions to the fund, I have had developed the following statistics. According to a statement furnished me by the Civil Service Commission, the 166,000 annuitants on the rolls as of June 30, 1951, made total contributions of approximately $240,000,000. The annuities paid these individuals already constitute approximately $947,000,000. Based upon the estimated life expectancy of those presently on the rolls, there will be payments made to them of over $2,186,000,000. In other words, these employees who have already retired will receive more than $3,000,000,000 and their contributions amount to only $240,000,000, a better than 12 to 1 return.

Everyone who is retired with a fixed income is faced with the same problem as the retired Federal employee. It would be unfair to take from taxpayers additional money to provide what amounts to a cost-of-living increase for a select group of people who are receiving annuities from the Federal Government and who had the privilege of Federal jobs throughout their working career.

I have been concerned for several years over the attitude of many people that the Federal Government owes them security or financial protection from the cradle to the grave. It is unfortunate that many present and retired Federal employees have the idea that our Government owes them a living after their retirement and that it is up to the Government to take care of them for the remainder of their lives from the date of their retirement.

Too many employees look upon the retirement fund as a welfare fund and do not concern themselves with the actuarial soundness of the fund. Federal employees should take pride in the soundness of the retirement fund and should be interested in the present obligations and liabilities so that the fund may meet its contracts for future retirements.

The balance in cash and investments and obligations of the United States as of last June 30 was $4,419,927,112.89. Taken by itself this appears to be a substantial sum and because of this creates a false impression or sense of security when examined alone. To be properly appraised, however, it is important also to take a look at liabilities to present and former employees. Again as of last June 30, these liabilities total $9,294,927,112.89. Deducting the balance available from the total liabilities, it becomes clear that there exists an actual deficit in the fund. The excess of liabilities over assets is $4,875,000,000.

The Federal civil service retirement system today is the best and most liberal of any retirement system in the world. As the Commission has pointed out in reports on retirement legislation to this committee:

> The retirement system is an instrument of personnel policy similar to provisions concerning pay, leave, and working conditions. Taken together these constitute the Government's competitive offer in the labor market. They may be revised from time to time as conditions change, but the primary reason for such revision is the need for the Government to maintain a competitive position as an employer.

There are some who may point to isolated instances of other systems where benefits are granted, but these examples invariably relate to short-term employees. The retirement system is intended to encourage a career of Government service and is weighted in favor of the career Government employee of many years' service. For the temporary employee we have provided an opportunity for old-age and survivors' insurance under social security.

With more than 160,000 former Federal employees on the retirement rolls, it is understandable that if one looks hard enough he can find many pitiful hardship cases. On the other hand, we must consider that, under the present circumstances, many retired Federal employees have taken jobs in private industry and are receiving or will be eligible for social security benefits in addition to their retirement. There is no limitation upon the amount that a retired employee may receive in private employment in order to continue to receive his annuity.

The President, following his approval of an increase in the annuities for veterans, has requested Congress to make a special study of the duplication of payments. Even if we were to agree to the principle that the Federal retirement fund is a welfare fund, and I am unalterably opposed to this viewpoint, such a change in policy should be prefaced by an investigation of duplication of payments from tax funds.

I have the deepest sympathy for any annuitants who are in financial distress. I appreciate the plight of those in need. I am not hard-hearted, callous, or hardened toward annuitants as some individuals are charging. We all regret the decline in the value of the dollar and the inflationary trends today.

Not only have annuitants suffered but, also, those who have private resources as annuity incomes from private insurance policies, interest on bonds and notes, and income from dividends on stocks. All of these have felt the effect of the decline of the purchasing value of the dollar.

Our Government has never guaranteed that annuities would be increased proportionately to an increase in the cost of living or because of an increased cost of living. Every member of the committee, I am sure, is intensely interested in the financial soundness and integrity of the retirement fund so that it may meet all future liabilities and obligations. It is unwise and unfair to leave the responsibility of payment for the annuities as a tax obligation or as a loadstone on the next generation of Federal employees or the taxpayers generally.

In the Retirement Act revisions of 1948, we did make a gift to all of those who were already retired of a 25 percent or $300 increase, whichever was the lesser, in their annuities or the option of providing an annuity of $600 for their surviving spouse. Later, in the Eighty-first Congress, this was amended to provide both the increase in the annuities of retired employees and the annuities for the surviving spouse. The fact that we made this gift to those already retired did not in any way commit our Government to the policy of future revisions in the annuities of those already retired.

I trust that no one makes such a contention for if it is made it creates an untenable situation whereby what we do today is making a commitment not only now but in the future for a policy of meeting increased costs of living by increased Federal annuities.

The increase given to Federal employees by the 1948 act, and amended in the Eighty-first Congress, to which I have just referred, amounted to about 50 percent in the annuities of those who received the benefits of both increases in their annuities and annuities for their surviving spouses. This is more than increases given to other annuitants under any other system since the increase in the cost of living.

I want to again emphasize that I am not unaware of the grave problems faced by retired people in all categories who have small annuities and are faced with

the reduction of the purchasing power of the dollar. I, for one, insist that we must treat all citizens alike and we cannot give special benefits to a select few. These benefits must either be paid for from taxes or from funds contributed by others.

Those now in the Federal service should be intensely interested in the future actuarial soundness and the present obligations and liabilities of the retirement fund in order that the fund can take care of its contracts for future retirements. The fund today is not in a sound condition and Chairman Robert Ramspeck, of the Civil Service Commission, is requesting Congress to undertake a program of amortizing the deficiency of the fund within the next 30 years. This produces an appropriation request for the fiscal year 1953 of nearly $458,000,000, which is approximately $150,000,000 above recent appropriations to the fund. I think it is important to note that the House Committee on Appropriations this year declined to report the additional $150,000,000 requested by the Civil Service Commission. As a matter of fact, the House in voting on the independent offices appropriation bill actually voted an amount which will not quite meet the anticipated disbursements from the retirement fund this year. Loose and unfounded statements that annuities of those already retired can be increased without either increasing the Federal contributions or the contributions of employees have made it increasingly difficult to obtain the necessary appropriations to guarantee the integrity of the fund. The consideration of this committee with respect to increasing annuities must of necessity be conditioned by this recent House action.

If the financial integrity of the fund is further materially weakened or impaired by liberalizing or increasing the annuities, the day is then fast approaching when the civil service retirement system will be merged or consolidated with social security to which I am strongly opposed. I have yet to hear a single Federal employee say that he would prefer to be placed under social security rather than continue under the civil service retirement system.

These bills before our committee today vary in their cost but the minimum cost of the least expensive one runs into many millions of dollars a year. The retirement fund is certainly in no position or condition to stand these additional costs and, if favorable consideration is given to any of these measures, then Congress should appropriate the necessary funds to cover the costs. However, I am opposed to such action as I feel that I have an obligation to our taxpayers to help balance the Federal budget, reduce appropriations wherever possible, and consistent with the actual needs of our Government, to stop deficit spending and increasing our national indebtedness, and to give some relief, as soon as possible, to our people from the present burdensome taxes imposed upon them.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is recognized for 45 minutes.

CUTS IN THE MILITARY BUDGET

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over the cuts that have been made by the House in the military budget as proposed by the President.

The House will recall that the budget originally submitted by the President was in the amount of $52,400,000,000. This budget was prepared most carefully within the Defense Establishment and was subjected to the close scrutiny of the Bureau of the Budget and other representatives of the executive branch. Indeed the original budget as submitted by the Department of Defense was in the amount of $55,000,000,000, and before it came to the Congress this amount was cut to $52,400,000,000. The purpose of the cut was to make certain that the aggregate expenditures for the Department of Defense—that is, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force—and the military portions of the Mutual Security Program, did not exceed the sum of $60,000,000,000 during fiscal 1953.

This budget was part of a great national plan to build a defense establishment and to maintain it steadily throughout the years—a defense establishment which would be capable of carrying out the great policy on which this country has embarked—the policy of having a military force so strong that no enemy would be tempted to attack us or the free world of which we are a part.

The House has made certain cuts in this budget as submitted by the President. I have thought much on this subject and I have come to the conclusion that these cuts are unwise—that if allowed to stand they would be interpreted as a weakening of our resolution to maintain our strength in the face of the Soviet menace.

I believe that these cuts should be restored in their entirety. If the Senate does, I urge the House to do so. I make this statement from profound conviction. Despite all our efforts to keep it together, the world as we used to know it has broken in two. The other half has withdrawn into iron seclusion, and its sealed-off economies are being transformed into a massively integrated machinery of aggression. If our half—the half represented by the United States and the association of free nations of which it is the leader—is to survive, then we must from this point on look primarily to our armed strength for security.

Now I do not say that armaments by themselves are the only answer to the danger facing us. Nor do I intend to convey the impression that the prospects of war with the Soviet Union are measurably closer than they were, say, last year, or the year before. However, one can never tell. My point is that ideas, good works, and hope by themselves are no longer enough. In the other, closed-off part of the world an already huge and growing military power is in the process of being deployed against us. Unless we bring into place without delay sufficient armed strength to match and hold off this gathering threat, everything else that we may attempt—all our ambitious and costly projects for the peaceful rehabilitation of the world and the preservation of a liberal society—all this is certain to go under, not necessarily in a sickening rush, but through a slow crumbling away of our positions from one end of the world to the other.

The sum total of military power called for in the President's military budget is not guaranteed to tilt the world balance of power in our favor. It will not begin to provide, even after the most optimistic allowances for the possible contributions of our allies, anything like the strength the Soviet Union and its satellites already command on the ground. It will not match, at least in numbers of aircraft, the weight of Soviet air power in being and in prospect. Only on the surface of the sea, in the field of atomic weapons, in the greater scope and versatility of our industry, and in the higher quality of our military skills does the advantage rest with us.

By any standards of measurement, the military margins of safety represented by the President's budget are closely drawn. Responsible military men have unanimously described the forces therein prescribed, particularly the air forces, as minimum forces—minimum, that is, in the sense that anything less would not be enough. Enough to convince our enemies that should they be tempted to break the world's peace our retaliation would be swift, summary and condign. Enough to enable us to fulfill our considerable commitments to friendly nations. And enough, finally, if war should come to enable us to hold at bay the first savage thrusts of the aggressor who can be depended upon to strike without warning, counting upon the power of the new mass destruction weapons to leave us prostrate. And this latter is vitally important.

The essence of the strategy embodied in the President's budget can be simply stated. The fundamental purpose, as the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Lovett, has stated is to prevent war from happening. It is to make this Nation so strong that our enemies will shrink from the risk of our vengeance. That hope may fail. War may come in spite of all our efforts to prevent it. In that event the military forces proposed by this budget will keep us from losing it. They should enable us to weather safely the first furious and possibly decisive engagements and give us time to mobilize our full resources.

In short, the underlying purpose of this budget is to provide this Nation with both a powerful weapon of retaliation and a cushion in time and space wherein, if another great war is to be our fate, we shall find the necessary respite to draw upon our vast potential for the means of eventual victory.

However, there is still another vital ingredient implicit in this budget. The opposing halves of the world have, as we all know, moved into an intermediate condition between peace and war,

Henceforth the flow of diplomatic and political advantage across the crucial strategic areas will be governed according to the power that the opposing sides are able to bring to bear at the threatened points. Already in Asia the proximity of Soviet power, combined with a lavish input of Soviet weapons and Soviet technicians, has wrenched from western influence the largest single segment of humanity. In Korea we have arrested that tide of power, but only after a close call and at the expense of a considerable part of our small stock of ready military capital. Meanwhile the growing strength of Soviet power presses distractingly upon other vulnerable areas. The additional purpose of the President's military budget is to end the present disequilibrium; to redress the balance in our favor; and to provide our national policy with a firm foundation of strength from which, all in the proper time, it may be able to take the initiative.

These are worthy ends. They are consistent with our national ideals. But they are also realistic ends. They reflect a common-sense appreciation of the military realities produced by the spectacular rise of Soviet military power in conjunction with the evolution in weapons which have made this Nation vulnerable in a manner previously unknown to us.

In discussing the specifics of the President's military budget, and the damage to our military program entailed by the House's earlier actions, if sustained, I intend to devote the bulk of my remarks to the Air Force.

However, the fact that I have chosen to emphasize this one service, rather than deal equally with all three, does not mean that I judge the needs of the other two to be less pressing. Each has been charged with certain essential strategic tasks. One is indispensable to the other. But the Air Force today stands in a unique relationship to the rest of our Military Establishment, and for that reason I have decided to concentrate on its needs, believing that if the House will make the right decision with respect to its budget requests a right solution for the other services will be found.

Of the three military services, the Air Force has the farthest to go in order to reach a satisfactory level of strength. It is charged with defending our cities and our industries from atomic attack. It has the responsibility, in the event of war, of seeking out and destroying the long-range enemy air forces that constitute a new and terrible threat to our existence, as well as the atomic facilities that would arm these air forces, and the other war-making resources of our enemies. In addition, the Air Force is charged with supporting our own ground forces and those of our allies wherever they may be in action.

In recent years this Nation has been prone to take its supremacy in the air for granted. No other nation can match the comprehensiveness of our experience in this realm. But our complacency has lately been jarred by certain events. The Soviet Union is plainly embarked upon a determined bid for air supremacy. The technological revolution ushered in by the development of jet propulsion rendered obsolescent air power based primarily upon the piston engine. Seizing upon the opportunity the Soviet Union, directly after the last war, began reorganizing its aircraft industry on a massive scale, conferring upon it the highest priorities, and providing it with unlimited access to the highest technical skills.

The products of that vast effort, carried on in secrecy, are now becoming visible. Beginning from nothing, it has created a long-range atomic air force approaching our own in numbers, while expanding without interruption its short-range tactical air forces which numerically are much greater than our own. When to these developments are added the undoubted Soviet progress with the large-scale manufacture of atomic weapons and the other apparatus of war, including guided missiles and radar techniques, the true dimensions of the Soviet threat to our security stands forth in all their somber outline.

Against this threat the Air Force must serve both as the Nation's shield and its primary weapon. Its business is to fight for, to gain and to hold control of the air without which none of the other great enterprises of war, however essential to the final outcome, could possibly go forward. But now there is grave doubt as to whether this Nation is in a position to control the air. Some believe that as a practical matter air superiority has actually passed to the Soviet Union. I am in no position to say whether this is so or not. But of one thing I am convinced: the very existence of this doubt argues that we proceed with all the energy and resolution at our command to raise our air strength to a point where American primacy in the air will be reestablished beyond peradventure of doubt.

The 126-combat wing program as spelled out in the President's budget is a long step in that direction. It will not take the Air Force as far as the Air Force feels it ought to go. The Joint Chiefs of Staff and the civilian Secretaries recommended last fall that this force be brought into a full state of readiness by 1954. Under the President's budget the date for its completion was pushed back to mid-1955. The push-back will inevitably dilute the strength of the Air Force during the period it is being assembled, and moreover will postpone by at lease 12 months, and possibly longer, the date of its conversion to the latest types of aircraft. In light of other compelling considerations, the Air Force accepted this limitation, believing that force level thus provided will at least supply the minimal means for carrying out its assigned major missions. But it insists that the additional imposition of the House cuts, if allowed to stand, will weaken our air strength dangerously, and condemn us in the critical years ahead to a secondary position in the air.

The House actions on the Air Force share of the budget took two forms. First, the obligational authority was reduced from $20,700,000,000 requested by the Air Force to $19,200,000,000. Second, under section 638 the Air Force's actual spending during fiscal year 1953 was limited to $17,400,000,000. These two actions, and most particularly the latter, would have the effect, I am told, of pushing the "readiness" date of the 126-combat wing Air Force from 18 to 24 months beyond the July 1955 date contemplated in the President's budget—that is, to the end of 1956 and possibly to mid-1957.

I cannot believe that the House, on sober reconsideration, will sustain this double limitation on the Air Force—a straitjacket within a straitjacket. The Smith-Coudert amendment actually and for all practical effects is a default upon obligations that the Air Force in good conscience has already assumed. It would mean the direct elimination from the Air Force procurement program of 3,000 modern aircraft between the fiscal period about to begin and mid-1954—the period which the military chiefs judge to be most dangerous. It would postpone indefinitely the modernization of the Air Force. It would rob the great project of rebuilding our air power of all sense of urgency. I have faith in the common sense of the House. It will strike off this self-imposed shackle.

But let us not suppose that we shall have solved the basic problem merely by getting rid of this limitation on expenditures. The House limitation on the Air Force's obligational authority is no less serious and its effects could be extremely complex.

These cuts have fallen, in the main, on four major areas of Air Force activities—in the procurement of aircraft, in the area known as maintenance and operations, in major procurement other than aircraft, and finally in personnel.

These cuts, if retained, will have a cumulative effect upon the force as a whole. Most conspicuously they will reduce the number of aircraft available to the force. They will reduce the pool of trained skills in that force. They will reduce its operating rate and therefore its level of efficiency. And, finally, they will reduce the supply of ammunition, guns, spare parts, and other gear with which this force is expected to work. The net effect of these successive amputations would be a drastic lowering of the national supply of air power at a time when our first concern should be to raise it. If I have correctly read the sense of the House, this is the last thing that we desire.

I propose, now, to examine the effects of these cuts upon the Air Force, beginning in the area of military personnel.

The end strength toward which the Air Force was building under its budget estimates was 1,061,000 by the end of fiscal year 1953. It asked for $3,300,000,000 toward this end. The House committee, in recommending that $150,000,000 be struck from this item, stated expressly that it did not propose to reduce by a single person the military strength requested. The House itself deepened the cut to $167,739,000.

Now the Air Force estimates that with further belt-tightening it can absorb $31,000,000 of this cut without serious

impairment of its state of readiness or its operating efficiency. But it insists that if the whole slash is allowed to stand three serious set-backs will follow:

First. Its strength at the end of fiscal year 1953 will drop to 964,200 personnel, equal to a fall of 96,700 below the planned levels.

Second. It will arrive at the end of the next fiscal period with a net loss of approximately 9,000 personnel from its present level.

Third. In consequence of the cumulative effects of this loss of trained personnel, the readiness date of the proposed force will be pushed back to mid-1957, regardless of what may be done in other segments of the program.

I repeat that this condition is contrary to the intentions of the House. As I understand it, these conditions will result from the fact that the major cost items in this particular category—pay and allowances plus subsistence, which between them claim 95 percent of the total sum in request—are not susceptible to curtailment except through the direct elimination of personnel.

Concerning the question of flight pay, it is my personal conviction that while the present arrangements may stand in need of reexamination and possible reform, the relatively small savings possible in this direction would not begin to make up for the damage to the morale of the Air Force that would inevitably result from a sudden and unreasonable blow at the economic status of many officers who have served their country well. The existing national supply of air skills is already dangerously low. Our immediate concern is to hold what we have while developing a new supply among the younger generation. The American system is based upon reward for exceptional risk and skill. Let us not make the error of removing from this crucial area of endeavor the incentives that supply one of the principal driving forces of American life.

Inasmuch as no important reductions are possible in these principal items, it follows that the only way the Air Force can live under the House restriction is to try to get along with fewer people. As I have already said, if it is obliged to absorb this particular cut it will arrive at mid-1953 with an end strength of 9,000 fewer people than it possesses today. In brief, the net effect of the House action would be to arrest and, indeed, to reverse the build-up now under way.

However else one may choose to regard it, the Air Force is a community of special skills, one fitting into and supporting the other. Its growth is an organic process that cannot be hurried beyond a certain speed. The lead-time factor in the training of air crews and maintenance men is no less binding than is the case with the production of aircraft. Indeed, a jet bomber can be built on the factory floor faster than crews can be trained to operate it.

The Air Force needs a total of 1,210,000 personnel to man its 126 combat wings and replenish the Nation's ready supply of flying skills. It is well along with that task. Were the process to be interrupted now, were the training program suddenly to be dwarfed or truncated at this critical stage in the build-up, no action in the power of succeeding Congresses could possibly repair the damage before 1957.

I appeal to the reason of the House. If there is any doubt as to the Spartan standards which the Air Force has applied to this area of activities, it should be dispelled by its proposition to raise its combat strength by 50 percent with only a 14-percent increase in its military manpower.

The same kind of chain reaction, almost as crippling in its effects, is certain to be reproduced unless the Senate lifts the cut it has directed at the maintenance and operations area of costs and the House agrees to the same. Here the Air Force asked for $4,389,817,000. The House knocked $628,026,858 from that request. The Air Force asks that all but $345,000 of that cut be restored.

Now the particular attraction of this area for the economy-minded is that a cut can presumably be inflicted here without depriving the Air Force of a single airplane or pilot. This is wrong thinking.

The maintenance and operations segment of the Air Force budget actually represents the funds required to fly the Air Force. It pays for gasoline and lubricants. It pays for the spare parts needed to repair the wear and tear on aircraft that is inseparable from the daily operation of an air force. It pays for the modification, which is to say the continued improvement of aircraft toward the end of making them safer and more efficient. It pays for the gear that goes into the air bases that support the flying force. It pays, among other things, for the equipment, supplies and the running costs of the depots where the Air Force stores its spare aircraft, engines, and other supplies without which it could not sustain its operations. And finally it pays the salaries of the civilian workers in these depots.

Now a cut of the magnitude imposed by the House, even with the most judicious selection, cannot help but strike deeply into all these segments.

It would reduce by a million hours the number of hours the Air Force will be flying during the next fiscal year.

It would reduce the numbers of spare engines and spare parts available for the repair and overhaul of aircraft, along with the number of aircraft that can be modified for improvement.

And finally it would mean the direct elimination, during the next year, of a considerable number of the civilian workers whom the Air Force desperately needs for the ground support of its operations.

Is this the kind of saving the House really desires? Certainly it makes no sense when we must look, as in Korea, to the qualitative superiority of our airmen to make up for our quantitative deficiency in force, to penny-pinch the funds that control the breadth of their experience. To create a costly air force and then deny it the means to perfect itself strikes me as something less than common sense.

Moreover, the loss of efficiency deriving from a reduction in flying hours would be compounded by the drop in operating efficiency that would follow the cut-down in the supply of spare engines and spare parts, the diminution of depot services, and the resources for modifying aircraft. Fewer engines would be overhauled; fewer airplanes would be returned to flyable condition; the accident rate would almost certainly rise; and the Air Force's general level of efficiency would fall—all because the airmen would lack sufficient time in the air, and their aircraft would lack proper maintenance.

I come now to the area of aircraft procurement. The Air Force asked for $1,000,000,000 with which to buy aircraft during the coming fiscal year. The House has reduced this sum by $560,000,000. I am told now by the Air Force that this action will produce two serious results. First, it will mean the direct elimination of a substantial number of aircraft from the program as a whole. Second, it will postpone the desired date of the modernization of the Air Force by from 6 to 9 months beyond mid-1955.

Dollarwise, the cuts in this item are equal to only 5.5 percent of the amount originally asked for by the Air Force. If one assumes that amount were to be spent evenly over the 52 weeks of the year represented by the budget estimate, the cut is equal to the elimination of about 2½ weeks of production from the proposed schedules. This calculation has persuaded some Members of this House that the cut could therefore be absorbed at the far end of the program with only minor inconvenience to the Air Force and inconsequential delay to its state of readiness.

The arithmetic may be sound, but the trouble is that it simply is not relevant to the economics of the factory floor. It would make no sense to run a production line at full tilt and then bring it to a sudden stop. A production line is only the final gathering and assembly point for bits and pieces fabricated by myriad subcontractors. Its economical operation is determined by the carefully timed inflow of thousands of separate parts from it many and scattered sources. Since there is an optimum rate in these matters the practice is to distribute the volume of production more or less evenly over the entire production cycle. Otherwise the spasms of expansion and contraction would be disruptive to the entire industrial community, and costly in the extreme.

The House limitations on the Air Force's procurement could be extremely damaging to the existing production schedules. These schedules are the product of a prodigious industrial effort that began 18 months ago. Now at long last, after costly investment in plants and tools and the painstaking assembly of materials and all the other complicated apparatus of production, the aircraft industry is on the verge of breaking out of its postwar doldrums. The mere trickle of production that gave rise to so much criticism and frustration during the beginning stage of the build-up is steadily rising and if allowed to attain its proper momentum it soon will become a steady stream.

To choke off or otherwise dam this flow now, on the narrow assumption that

it would save the taxpayer money, would be an act of gross self-delusion. Any extensive cutback in production schedules at this midway point of the build-up must bring about a general slow-down in the production rate which in turn is certain to increase the unit cost of aircraft. Indeed, as unit costs go up, it is altogether likely that the final loss to the Air Force as a result of the budget cut may go far beyond the immediate elimination of a specific number of aircraft now included at going costs in its schedules. The higher unit costs spreading over the rest of its program is almost certain to oblige it to forego many more for want of funds.

All this is serious enough. But the most serious thing of all is that the limitation on obligational authority will slow down and push back perhaps as much as 9 months in time the modernization of the One Hundred and Twenty-sixth Combat Wing Air Force.

I cannot believe that this condition is truly desired by the Members of this House. In the statement of the House Committee on Appropriations occurs the sentence:

> It is not the purpose of the committee in recommending this reduction that the number of aircraft to be procured should be reduced.

I take that to mean that the House committee, even if it were somewhat indefinite as to how the desired economies were to be achieved, was anxious that nothing should be allowed to impair the readiness date of the Air Force, nor to bring the force level below the level recommended by the Air Force. Yet precisely that situation would follow from the cuts the House has imposed.

Specifically, the House committee recommended that the Air Force make good the lost $560,000,000 without diminishing its intake of aircraft by closer pricing policies and also through a reduction in its requirement for spare aircraft, spare engines, and other spare parts.

Now I have looked into these particular areas at some length. Part of the optimism of the House committee, it seems to me, derives from certain important economies already effected by the Air Force in these two areas and particularly in the reorganization of its pipelines. But the major savings thereby accomplished are already reflected in the present budgets. The possibility of further immediate savings on the same scale in these areas is therefore remote. For my own part, I can say that I have been impressed by the vigor and imagination with which the Air Force, and indeed all the military services, have utilized the most advanced business practices toward the control of costs. We can expect these new management techniques to produce additional economies in the future. But meanwhile we cannot expect to legislate savings by fiat when the opportunities for such savings have been temporarily exhausted.

The House limitation has struck the Air Force in another critical area—the one budgeted as major procurement other than aircraft. Like maintenance and operations, this is one of those omnibus categories. It includes, among other essential items, ammunition, electronic gear—including radar—training equipment, bomb sights, in fact a whole catalog of things.

The Air Force asked for $1,300,000,000 in this category. The House cut out $300,000,000 from that amount—nearly twice as much as was recommended by the House Committee. The Air Force now says, after a careful resurvey of its requirements, that no important money savings are immediately possible in this area except (a) through the direct elimination of essential gear and (b) through a general lowering of its efficiency.

This is an extremely complex area—an accountant's nightmare, and I do not propose to discuss it in any detail, except to note the effect of the House cut, first, on the Air Force's ammunition requirements, and next on the lead-time factor of certain essential gear.

As to ammunition: New types of guns, the product of long development, are in the process of being installed upon our B–47 medium jet bomber and the F–84 fighter bomber. I am told that unless this cut is restored these important airplanes would lack sufficient ammunition for combat operations. Moreover, the amount of ammunition available for training purposes would be greatly reduced. The extraordinary success of our airmen in combat over Korea, in the face of heavy odds, is in large measure due to their superior marksmanship. I cannot believe that the House would wish to place any hindrance on the continued perfection of our aerial gunnery.

As to my second point: The bulk of the mechanical gear in this area takes about a year to produce. The electronic gear, and most notably the heavy radar sets intended for the national radar warning and control system, takes twice as long. A curtailment of the forward procurement program on the scale proposed would inevitably push back the readiness date of the 126-combat wing Air Force to mid-1956, a full year's delay.

This concludes my detailed examination of the Air Force budget. And the point I wish to hammer home—the point that the House in further reflection cannot fail to perceive—is that the ultimate and possibly disastrous consequences of the restrictions that we have imposed will be to push back the readiness date of the 126-combat-wing Air Force from the mid-1954 date that the Joint Chiefs of Staff deem desirable, from the mid-1955 date established by the President's budget, clear into mid-1957. Moreover, the striking power and efficiency of this force between now and 1955 will be seriously affected.

Indeed, if section 638 should be allowed to stand, the reduced input of new aircraft measured against the inroads of obsolescence would be such that the 126-combat Air Force, in the sense of being a fully modernized force, would never actually come into being.

Now many Members of the House are, I am sure, puzzled and disturbed by the argument that a $2,000,000,000 cut imposed by this House—only 10 percent of a $20,000,000,000 goal—could produce such a drastic lengthening out of the Air Force program.

I have given this matter much thought, and have concluded that this is the result of two circumstances. The first is that the Air Force program as submitted forms a homogenous whole. Its major parts are both interrelated and interdependent. The estimates for personnel are closely interwoven with those for aircraft procurement, and the latter in turn determines the level of maintenance and operations, which is to say the operating rate of the Air Force. Similarly, the number of wings is tied closely into the base structure, just as the training program is fitted to the ultimate manning requirements of the entire force. Moreover, the development of each part must proceed at a certain predetermined cadence so that the whole forces comes logically and harmoniously into being at a certain point in time. The actions taken by this House could, if sustained, wreck this carefully contrived process. The earlier judgment of the House should be rectified as soon as possible and the sums the Air Force asks for appropriated.

I have examined the military budget at length. And the conclusion has been forced upon me that notwithstanding various allegations of waste and padding, it is by and large the most efficient budget of the kind ever submitted to the Congress.

It has successfully withstood searching examination. I do not recall that the debates that preceded the House actions on these various budgets exposed any significant flaws or shortcomings in the underlying justifications. On the contrary, my impression is that the present budget was the most tightly constructed set of military requirements ever brought before the consideration of this House. Congress has labored hard over the years to perfect a military budget based upon sound management practices. Now that these labors have begun to bear fruit, let us not reverse the process by demanding miracles. At this point in the world's history, it is too big and too dangerous a calculated risk to take.

Mr. Speaker, if I did not think the situation was extremely serious, I would not take the time today under special order—and this is the third or fourth time in my 24 years here that I have asked for a special order—to call this matter to the attention of my colleagues. I think it is vitally important for us to develop our strength as quickly and as rapidly as we possibly can. I think any action on the part of the Congress that will put off the development of our air strength to 126 wing groups and 17 supporting wing groups, making 143 in all to the latter part of 1956 or mid-1957 would be a calculated risk on our part, which constitutes grave danger to our country.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. I think the majority leader is doing a great service to the Defense Department in this address to the House. The cut which the House put on the defense appropriation bill, both in the Davis amendment and in the Smith amendment has caused our committee, and particularly our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from

Georgia [Mr. VINSON] a great deal of concern. I think we owe our majority leader a great debt of gratitude for bringing this to the attention of the Nation so forcefully. We can ill afford to lose time, which the cut will cause militarily. It will seriously cripple the planning of our Air Force. Our committee is now considering a 126-group program, and we can ill afford to wait. The planning will be disrupted. It will take 2 years at least to get the pipeline filled. As I say, the chairman of our committee and I are in strict accord with the gentleman. We hope that the other body will bring in an increase in the appropriation, which will give us an opportunity to work this out in conference because the repercussions of what the House has done will result in a tremendous and disastrous delay in the program of the Armed Forces, and in our preparedness program because nobody knows what is around the corner, or what is in the minds of the Communists.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate very much the contribution made by my good friend. I feel so concerned about this—not as a Democrat, and I am not speaking to my colleagues as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans. I am deeply distressed that at this point in the world's history we should not go forward as quickly as possible because over and above everything else is the preservation of our institutions of Government and the way of life we all believe in. We may disagree on this or that question, but we all stand on common ground, and on those fundamentals which we all believe in, which constitute our way of life.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I agree with what the distinguished majority leader is saying in reference to our Air Force. We cannot afford to cut the Air Force far beyond the safety point. I think the Air Force is vital to the preservation of our country. When I think that these cuts are going to rob the Air Force of 3,100 planes—planes that are badly needed—badly needed in Korea today, and badly needed in Europe and elsewhere, I join with the gentleman in saying that we must have enough money to put our Air Force in position to preserve the United States of America from destruction. I certainly thank the gentleman for his valuable contribution.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate very much the remarks made by my distinguished friend, which as always are consistent with the constructive and penetrating consideration he gives to all public questions.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HALE. I fully share the gentleman's concern as to the necessity of building up our aircraft program to the utmost possible degree.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I want it to be fully understood that what I say is not in disregard of the other branches of the service.

Mr. HALE. I would be perfectly willing to vote accordingly on the building up of our aircraft program, but I would like to ask the majority leader if it is not true that there was a cut-back in the production schedule of aircraft last January?

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot argue or dispute what the gentleman says. I am unable to say, of my own recollection now, that it is correct, but I am sure my friend would not say so unless he had information upon which to base his statement. But, I am not discussing the past now; I am discussing the present and the future, and trying to call it to the attention of the House insofar as I can, and trying to call to the attention of the people of the country so far as it is humanly possible, the vital importance of building up our military strength as quickly as possible, so far as the overall development of our military strength is concerned, and particularly the importance of building up a 143-wing group by not later than 1955, and if possible by 1954. But certainly 1956 or 1957 might be too late.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to my friend from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to commend the gentleman on the much-needed speech he is making to the House this afternoon and to assure him I am in full accord with what he is saying. However, is it not true that in addition to the aircraft program being cut back to the extent of something like 3,000 planes, as the gentleman from Louisiana has indicated, the tank program and other programs are likewise being cut back because of this particular amendment in the defense appropriation bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no question about it. On this particular occasion I want to emphasize the crippling effect that the amendments will have upon our Air Force, and how vitally important it is that we develop our Air Force as quickly as we can. While I am emphasizing the Air Force, I want no one to construe that as meaning that I am disregarding any other branches of our service.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am interested in the gentleman's remarks, and of course I agree with him. I wonder if his memory goes back—this is a little political needling——

Mr. McCORMACK. If my friend would permit, I welcome that, as he knows. But on this occasion the farthest thing from my mind is any political consideration.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am sure the gentleman remembers the Eightieth Congress appropriated money for a 70-group Air Force and a supercarrier, and someone in the administration said we could not do that. Does the gentleman think that had we gone on with the 70-group Air Force, which the Republicans provided in the Eightieth Congress, we might be in better shape today?

Mr. McCORMACK. Again, that refers to yesterday, and in reply to an inquiry or observation the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] made, I said I am thinking of today and tomorrow. I would rather let my remarks today rest on that rather than going back.

I think it is vitally important in the interest of our country that we, with the direct responsibility upon our shoulders as Members of Congress, should develop our power, and I am not confining it to our military power alone but to our spiritual strength as well, but from the military angle develop our power as quickly as we possibly can.

In relation to the Air Force, the cuts that the House made, in my opinion, are unwise and most unfortunate. If they are restored in the Senate, I urge my colleagues in the House, upon reconsideration, to see the wisdom of building up our air strength as quickly as possible, and for the House to concur in the action taken on the part of the Senate, if it is taken, the effect of which will permit the development of our Air Force and our military power as quickly as possible, particularly our Air Force by 1955.

I sincerely trust that the Senate will go beyond that and put in appropriations or contract authority that will enable the development of our Air Force to the 143-wing group by 1954, as recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and by the civilian secretaries.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following any other special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

HAZARD DUTY PAY FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 7973, which will provide for the payment under certain specified conditions of extra pay to certain ground combat personnel in Korea who are subjected to enemy ground fire for a minimum period of 6 days in any 1 month. What I have proposed here is in the final analysis, not a new concept but only a recognition of the clear duty of the Congress and the American people to extend the accepted principle of extra pay for extra hazardous duty into that area which constitutes the most hazardous of all duties—the daily life of the ground combat man.

We have long recognized in this country, both in the civilian economy and in the military, the equity and justice of providing additional pay for those who engage in activities more hazardous than

those required of the average individual. In the civilian economy we give extra pay to the topper in the lumber camp, the sandhog, the mucker, and the explosive expert. In the military we have long provided additional pay for fliers, submariners, divers, parachutists, demolition men and others. What we have failed to recognize is that in adapting the pattern of additional pay from the civilian economy to the military, we have failed miserably to make comparable provisions for those men whose occupation has no counterpart in the civilian economy, yet whose daily life is the most hazardous, the most uncomfortable, and the least desirable of any known to man.

There are many controversies and many disagreements in our daily lives but I feel that if there is one point on which you could obtain universal agreement within this country of ours, it is that the man who meets the enemy on the ground, in the mud, heat, snow, and cold and who daily wrests from him a small piece of ground at the point of a gun or bayonet, is the man who really bears the brunt of the dangers, tortures, and discomforts of war.

Ernie Pyle who knew and loved these men, gave a clear picture when he said:

> The line moved on, seemingly endless. All afternoon men kept coming round the hill and vanishing eventually over the horizon. It was one long tired line of antlike men. There was agony in your heart and you almost felt ashamed to look at them. They were just guys from Broadway and Main Street but you wouldn't remember them. They were too far away now. They were too tired. Their world can never be known to you, but if you could have seen them just once, just for an instant, you would know that no matter how hard people are working back home they never kept pace with these infantrymen.

The term "infantrymen" which Mr. Pyle used could well be extended to include men of all the uniformed services who perform their mission side by side with and under the same terrible conditions as the traditional dogface. It is not a question of branch, rank, insignia, or service—it is rather the proposition that all men who fight under the conditions which are the normal lot of the doughboy should be recognized and treated the same as he.

I am aware that in past discussions on bills similar to mine there have arisen in the minds of our Members many questions regarding the feasibility and desirability of such a bill. I feel that there can be no question whatsoever as to the desirability of my measure. It seeks to remedy an inequity which has existed for many years in our military-pay system and which exists today even after the passage of the Career Compensation Act of 1949; to recognize our obligation to provide additional compensation for those soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen who play the most dengerous game of all—combat on the ground. It is highly significant and pleasing to me to examine the record and find that over 30 Members of this Congress have sponsored legislation which in varying forms would provide additional compensation for these men—the unsung heroes who have exposed their lives in actual battle.

Regarding the feasibility of my bill, I feel confident that it will work. Too many of our Members have dismissed it in the past with the subjective feeling that such a thing would be administratively impossible. Having had such feelings myself, I took the liberty of doing a little digging to find out just how the bill would be administered. Although I do not think it appropriate or necessary to go into any great amount of detail at this time, let me repeat that I am confident that the military services can and will administer properly the provisions of this bill. The greatest objection has come in regard to the administration of the retroactive feature of the bill. The question has been asked, "How can anyone possibly determine the eligibility for combat pay of the many thousands of individuals who have served in Korea since the outbreak of hostilities there on June 27, 1950?" I have personally examined actual samples of the several kinds of service records which will be used to determine this eligibility. I am frankly amazed at the completeness and accuracy of the records maintained by the military even under the most heated conditions of combat.

Briefly, the system which is planned for use by the Army—which will, of course, be the major participant under the terms of this bill—is this: The Far East Command will determine from its daily combat records those units which qualify under the terms of the bill as specified by Congress; that is, those units which were in actual contact with the enemy. Once the qualified units are determined, it then becomes a matter of determining the eligibility of individual members of those units, past and present. This will be done on the basis of individual applications from those members which applications will be verified by the Adjutant General, Department of the Army, prior to payment. Verification will be based upon a check of the applications against the retained records of the individual soldier. As I said before, I am confident that the records on file in the Department of the Army will be adequate for this purpose, and that this procedure can be accomplished in comparatively short time, and at relatively small cost.

Once the retroactive payments have been completed, the daily administration of this bill will present no problem whatsoever and can be accomplished at no additional cost. It will involve merely an additional entry on existing records by administrative personnel already provided for such purposes. I am informed that as early as November 1950, when combat in Korea was at its most intense level, the commander in chief, Far East Command, in support of his request for recognition of the man in combat, notified the Department of the Army that the administrative problem to be encountered in the administration of a bill such as I have submitted would be relatively minor and that he was confident that administration could be effectively and equitably accomplished.

In summary, I am convinced that my bill, H. R. 7973, is designed so as to correct existing inequities, with fairness to the Government, the respective services, and the individuals within each service. That such a law can and will be administered properly, and at a cost which is not at all prohibitive. I feel that the utter justice of such legislation is most evident, and that our duty to take immediate action is both clear and impelling. Let this present Congress show to these brave men—over 70 percent of whom are not volunteers—that our hearts are with them as they march away, and that the gratitude of this great Nation follows them to the very front lines, where, with unfaltering courage, they stem the tide which, unchecked, would overwhelm us all. May our action be as forthright and timely as theirs.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. REED of New York in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BEAMER and to include two editorials.

Mr. ADAIR and to include an editorial.

Mr. MITCHELL in two separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANKIN and to include an address he delivered over the radio last night before the Daughters of the Confederacy.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin, in three separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENSEN and to include a letter from a farmer, Mr. Oscar Wentstrand on governmental matters, and his ideas on the condition of our economy.

Mr. BROOKS in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAND and to include an editorial.

Mr. PRICE (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) and to include a speech by Governor Stevenson, of Illinois, notwithstanding the fact that the additional cost will be $189.

Mr. SAYLOR and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROSS and to include a series of five articles by Edward J. Mowery appearing in the World-Telegram beginning May 12, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit, and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $224.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION WITH SENATE AMENDMENTS REFERRED

Pursuant to clause 2, rule XXIV, the joint resolution of the following title, together with the amendments of the Senate thereto, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

H. J. Res 426. Joint resolution making temporary appropriation for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 902. An act to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4511. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Territory of Hawaii certain real property at Kahului, Wailuku, Maui, T. H., and

H. R. 6811. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 23, 1924, as amended, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. STIGLER, indefinitely, on account of illness, beginning Monday, June 2, 1952.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

GI BILL FOR KOREAN VETERANS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, for some 2 months the members of the Veterans Affairs Committee sat in session and considered the provisions of that bill commonly known as the GI bill for Korean veterans. For the most part I believe that H. R. 7656 is excellent in concept and must be commended for its simplification of administrative processes and for other reforms which will be accomplished through its enactment. However its stated purpose I believe can be more clearly achieved and its objectives more easily reached by the adoption of the Springer amendment. This amendment would provide numerous benefits without adding to either cost or administrative machinery provided for in H. R. 7656.

BENEFITS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO H. R. 7656

First. It comes closer to the avowed principles of H. R. 7656 of allowing the veteran to follow the original course he would have pursued if he had not been in the Armed Forces by encouraging him to choose either a private or a public school.

Second. It encourages the veteran to exercise greater freedom of choice in selecting the particular school—private or public—that offers greatest promise of developing his particular talents.

Third. It gives him an opportunity to attend a small institution as well as a large one.

Fourth. It eliminates a type of discrimination, caused by the complete reversal of policy reflected in H. R. 7656, against the Korean veterans whose freedom of action would be considerably limited in comparison with that accorded World War II veterans.

Fifth. It recognizes the fact that private institutions, which have frequently set the pattern in educational development and in research, have a distinct function to perform for those Korean veterans who would like to attend them.

It is my considered opinion that the particular question of whether private or public schools would gain should not be the paramount question. We are here legislating for the veteran himself. It is my belief that the welfare of the veteran is more nearly safeguarded under the Springer amendment than it is in the present bill as written.

However, on May 26 the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], on page A3231 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, states as follows:

Now that a bill has been reported, apparently a small group of private schools have decided that they have a proposal which will insure them a greater take in Federal tuition payments.

My only purpose in calling this particular sentence to the attention of the House is that a poll was taken by the American Counsel on Education in August 1951 of both State and private schools. From that poll it will be noted that 967 schools voted that payments be continued directly to the schools as it was under the World War II GI bill. Forty-four schools favored payment directly to the veteran. In other words an overwhelming number of universities and colleges in America favored payment directly to the university or college rather than to the veteran.

As I say, I do not believe this should be the deciding factor in determining whether or not you support the Springer amendment. I merely point to this poll to show that it is not a small group of private schools who wish this to be continued, but by far the number of schools, both private and public, wish payments continued directly to the university.

A poll has been conducted within the last week. Over 420 colleges and universities in the country have responded to the poll thus far. Less than a dozen have indicated that they would like to have the payment not made to the university. I believe this conclusively proves where the colleges and universities, both public and private, stand on this particular question.

Of far more importance are the benefits to be accomplished from the amendment itself. I believe this amendment will encourage the individual veteran to exercise more freedom of choice in the selection of the institution most likely to develop his talents, without emphasis of the cost of tuition which would result in H. R. 7656 as presently written. In the second place this amendment will instill in the veteran a realization that he has control over the educational service that he receives from the schools by creating specific tuition allowances in their names. The veteran is thus given a direct responsibility for the prudent expenditure of funds granted him by the United States. Third, it encourages the veteran to add to Federal education benefits from his own personal resources and thereby profit in experience and self reliance.

It will prevent the overcrowding of the public tax-supported institutions and the added strain on State and local fiscal systems which will result from such overcrowding. This amendment therefore would reduce the cost to the taxpayers. Last, it would eliminate the possibility of sharp practices and abuses referred to on page 25 of House Report No. 1943 by circumscribing the payment of tuition allowances.

ADMINISTRATIVE MACHINERY

This proposed amendment would not require any greater administrative detail than under H. R. 7656 as now written. Only one voucher and one check would be necessary in each transaction with the veteran. The Veterans' Administration would have virtually no dealing financially with the educational institution other than this certification.

TOTAL COSTS

The proposed amendment would require no greater costs in terms of total benefits disbursed than under H. R. 7656 as now written. The separation of the training allowance into two parts does not add to the total amount of benefits to be paid by the Government to or on behalf of all eligible veterans, as provided by the "package allowance" now contained in the bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If the gentleman's amendment to the bill is adopted, it would make the bill conform more nearly to the original GI bill that benefited the veterans of World War II?

Mr. SPRINGER. This will make the provisions of World War II, as applied to this particular situation, applicable to the GI of the Korean war.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Without the gentleman's amendment, this bill will not be the same for the educational title as it was for the veterans of World War II?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does the bill, with or without the gentleman's amendment, designate what is going on in Korea as a war or as a police action?

Mr. SPRINGER. The amendment does not have anything to do with that particular situation at all; in fact, I think the gentleman will find that the bill does not even mention the type of action that is going on. It only sets a date of beginning and a date of ending of benefits under the bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does the bill have any provision with respect to the markers on the graves of the boys who lose their lives in Korea and the inscription thereon?

Mr. SPRINGER. I would not state it for sure, but my recollection is that there is nothing in the bill with reference to that.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The reason I asked that is that last week I was told by an undertaker that some of the markers that are being furnished for the graves of the boys killed in Korea have the inscription, "Killed in the Korean police action," instead of "in the Korean war."

Mr. SPRINGER. If that is true, I think it certainly should be considered by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It should be corrected by an amendment to this bill, in addition to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I would say that if it is not done by amendment to this bill it certainly should be done by direct legislation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I commend the gentleman. He is rendering a service to the veterans of this country.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

I would like to emphasize this. I have been gone now for about 2 days. Upon appearing here last evening, I was notified that this bill would be brought up under suspension of the rules on Monday. Under suspension of the rules, debate is limited to 40 minutes, and no amendments may be offered. If there was ever a gag rule that was imposed upon any particular piece of legislation which was so vital to a certain group of people in the Armed Forces, it is the action of these people trying to pass this bill under a suspension of the rules. In other words, here is an attempt to gag Members of the House from offering any amendment to this particular bill. We have all of next week to debate this bill, and as the members of this Committee on Veterans' Affairs know, we appeared last week before the Committee on Rules, and the Committee on Rules indicated very fully it intended to grant a rule. I think they intended to grant a rule whereby committee members could introduce amendments, which had been discussed and were considered in committee. So far as I know, this is the only amenlment that is sought at this time. I think the way in which they are seeking to do this is the worst factor which is to be considered. That is, they are attempting to scare the Members of the House into getting this bill through under the suspension of the rules, without any consideration for the veterans of the country, because they believe that any Member of the House who votes against this particular bill will be in fact voting against the veteran. That is what they intend to tell the public. That, to me, is the worst type of legislation you can bring up on the floor of the House at any time, to try to gag Members from offering amendments and to prevent full consideration by limiting debate to 40 minutes, and in the third place attempting to scare the Members of the House into voting for a piece of legislation and to prevent any amendment at all to it.

I am a veteran of World War II, as are some of the other members of this committee. I think the members of the Armed Forces will despise us far more if we come out with a measure that is incomplete and not considered as fully as it should be. I believe it would be unwise for this House to vote this bill under suspension of the rules when we have all next week to discuss it and make whatever amendments we may wish to offer.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. Is the gentleman's amendment being placed in the RECORD, so that someone can know what the amendment is?

Mr. SPRINGER. I will be glad to give you a copy.

Mr. TEAGUE. Is it different from the amendment that was offered in committee?

Mr. SPRINGER. It is not.

Mr. TEAGUE. It is the same amendment?

Mr. SPRINGER. It is.

Mr. TEAGUE. Would the gentleman state whether or not in hearing any member of this group appeared before the committee or asked to appear before the committee to testify in behalf of this amendment?

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman please state his question again?

Mr. TEAGUE. We had hearings for a considerable length of time. I do not remember the exact number of days, but there are about 2,000 pages of testimony concerning the bill. Did any member or any person who was interested in this amendment—and it is a very important amendment—did any person ask to come before the committee or did any witness testify in behalf of this amendment?

Mr. SPRINGER. I will tell you why that was not done. They relied upon certain people. When the poll by the American Council on Education was taken, it was voted almost 18 to 1 to have this particular amendment in the bill. The people who took that poll came before your committee and they did not render the testimony that was reflected in this poll, which represents the people I am talking about.

Mr. TEAGUE. It is our committee, not my committee. You and I are both members of the committee.

Mr. SPRINGER. The Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. TEAGUE. Is it not a fact that there was not a single word in behalf of the amendment, and is it not also a fact that this amendment was offered in committee and voted down?

Mr. SPRINGER. I will say this, as far as the inference of your first question is concerned, it is wrong. This poll reflected the views of the colleges, which of course did not come down here. However the president of the American Council on Education certainly did not reflect the views of the members of that particular council. He knew that that poll was 967 to 44 in favor of my amendment, but he never testified to that before your committee. But when the colleges and universities found it out they then came forward and asked that an amendment like this be introduced. That is when they found this out, that their actual views had not been expressed before our committee at all. In fact, what was expressed by the council before our committee was in direct contradiction of what the poll reflected.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. TEAGUE), Mr. SPRINGER was given five additional minutes.)

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE. Will the gentleman tell who offered the amendment in committee?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. TEAGUE offered the amendment in committee. Mr. TEAGUE offered the amendment and then opposed it, and spoke against it, and worked against it.

Mr. TEAGUE. That is correct. I told this group I was trying to be fair, and I offered the amendment, and I spoke against it. My second question was whether or not it was defeated in committee.

Mr. SPRINGER. It was defeated, 9 to 6, in committee.

Mr. TEAGUE. Would the gentleman tell us what was the relationship of this group as to the American Council on Education.

Mr. SPRINGER. These are colleges and universities generally.

Mr. TEAGUE. Can the gentleman tell us who the American Council on Education represents, and how large a group, and who they are?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think the American Council on Education very well represents the colleges and universities of the country.

Mr. TEAGUE. And this group is a part of that group?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is right. You are talking about the American Association of Colleges and Universities.

Mr. TEAGUE. Of course, I know, as the gentleman knows, that this question was argued back and forth within the council, and how they decided I do not know, but the head of the American Council on Education, who represents this group, came before us and said they supported 100 percent the principle of direct payment to the veterans.

Mr. SPRINGER. Whatever is in the testimony is what he said, but I am not conceding that that was the opinion of the members of the American Council on Education or the American Association of Colleges and Universities. It was not. The overwhelming vote was exactly in support of this amendment. There has been a poll taken within the past 7 days, and thus far we have received replies from something like 424, and less than a dozen supporting your position on this bill. In other words, 400 out of 424 support the provisions of this particular amendment.

Mr. TEAGUE. Does the gentleman agree that the letter that was written which was signed by the president of Southern California, which said that this bill, as presently written, would cause one-third of the potential students of the private colleges to go to tax-supported schools, does the gentleman support that statement? And it does not state the fact.

Mr. SPRINGER. I would not state that I would support that because I have never seen it.

Mr. TEAGUE. I would like to say to the gentleman that letter which was sent out to private colleges was one of

the most unfair and dishonest pieces of lobbying I have ever seen by any group. They did not appear before our committee; they did not ask for a thing until they thought it was about to come up for a vote.

The gentleman mentioned that the Members were being scared, that this was an effort to try to scare the Members of Congress. I am not trying to scare any Member of Congress. If the gentleman thinks that he is certainly incorrect.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is the gentleman the one who was responsible for calling it up under a suspension of the rules or seek to get it up under suspension of the rules so it could be adopted?

Mr. TEAGUE. The gentleman knows——

Mr. SPRINGER. Did you or not?

Mr. TEAGUE. The gentleman knows that I first opposed any suspension. Under present circumstances I do not oppose a suspension.

Mr. SPRINGER. You supported the suspension of the rules to prevent this amendment from being considered.

Mr. TEAGUE. I opposed it 100 percent. If the gentleman wants that amendment he should go over to the Senate and get it in over there. The gentleman did not present the matter to the committee; they never appeared before the committee or did anything until there was a vote imminent; then they sent that completely unfactual, dishonest, untrue letter to private colleges. They should have appeared before the committee to present their case.

Mr. SPRINGER. I say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] they are being heard in this House; this is their place to be heard; this is their forum, right here in the House, to be heard, and this is where they intend to be heard. They are going to oppose any motion to suspend the rules to prevent its adoption.

Mr. TEAGUE. Let them appear before the committee.

Mr. SPRINGER. If you want to talk about being dishonest and of doing a thing that is not true, the president of the American Council on Education testified that they reflected the sentiment of all the people of this association who submitted the matter to a poll. But the gentleman did not represent anywhere near the majority opinion of the members of the American Council on Education, which makes up about 1,100 colleges and universities. They voted overwhelmingly the other way.

Mr. TEAGUE. Of course, my answer to the method of the American Council on Education——

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is asking me why they did not appear.

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. The president was supposed to represent them and he did not do it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

(On request of Mr. TEAGUE, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SPRINGER was allowed to proceed for one additional minute.)

Mr. TEAGUE. The gentleman knows that the statement has been made over and over again that they were not opposed to the principle of direct payment in this bill, and not one college and not one college president, not one vocational school ever came to me or ever said one word about opposing this type of payment, and it was not opposed in the hearings before our committee. But after the bill is written they come in with this amendment and they send out this letter to Members of Congress which I consider to be unfair.

Let them go to the Senate and present their case; if they can put it over, well and good. But it is not fair to wait until you get to a vote and then present a matter of this kind which was never presented to or considered by our committee.

The gentleman, by the way, keeps referring to this as my committee. It is the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, not my committee; and the gentleman himself is also a member of that committee.

Mr. SPRINGER. All right; are you through?

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think the gentleman will agree—I being a lawyer look at this from that point of view—that people have certain rights. These people thought they were being represented and had the right to feel that they were being taken care of by the American Council on Education; but almost too late they found out that the committee had closed the hearings and reported out this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

(On request of Mr. ADAIR, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SPRINGER was allowed to proceed for five additional minutes.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I would like to get the gentleman's judgment; does he not think that in the case of controversial legislation it is bad policy to bring it up under suspension of the rules?

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman from Florida, I think, is exactly right. And I think it is all the more important that a matter of this kind be brought up in the House where it can be fully debated and considered, and perfected. Just a few days ago we appeared before the Rules Committee for an hour and a half; they were ready to grant a rule. As a matter of fact, as I understand, a rule has been prepared. It is satisfactory to them; they were perfectly ready to report out a rule.

Mr. TEAGUE. It is not satisfactory to them.

Mr. SPRINGER. It is satisfactory to the Rules Committee.

Mr. TEAGUE. It is not satisfactory to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. SPRINGER. It was satisfactory to the Rules Committee; it is satisfactory to me.

Mr. TEAGUE. It is not satisfactory to us.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am recognizing the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] right now.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I just want to make this observation, that the other day we were considering the amendment to the social-security legislation. A number of Members of the House, including myself, voted against the suspension of the rules. But when it was reported by the Associated Press and the United Press they gave the impression that we who voted against suspension of the rules were against an increase in social benefits. That was not so. I am sure that the gentleman voted like I did. I voted for the purpose of getting an amendment in which we would do away with the limitation on the amount of social-security benefits one could receive irrespective of what he might make, either by self-employment or by employment. I think that is wrong.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think the merit the gentleman had in his suggestion on that bill can be applied to this bill exactly. We should not consider this bill under suspension of the rules when we have time to consider it and when we can get a rule.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Let me say further that I hope the Rules Committee will report out a rule on social-security legislation upon which we can vote to give the old folks an increase in benefits without tying it up with socialized medicine or some other problem that you and I do not support.

Mr. SPRINGER. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I would like to underscore the point the gentleman from Florida made that this should not be considered under suspension of the rules. May I ask the gentleman from Illinois if it is not true that in his opinion there are in the proposed bill points of controversy in addition to the one to which he particularly addressed himself, and that these other points might be explained and clarified, and probably solved if we had public debate with less restraint?

Mr. SPRINGER. Exactly. I am going to be perfectly honest with the House. I do not see how anyone can disagree with this. About 60 days have been used in considering this matter. Now we are going to debate a bill in 40 minutes and pass it under suspension of the rules, and this involves a bill that took over 60 days of hearings. I do not think it is fair.

Mr. ADAIR. Is it not true, and I am sure this has been brought to the attention of the membership, that this bill has a new approach to the problem of education for veterans? It differs from the former bill. Therefore all the more reason why it should have complete debate. It is going to affect a large number of our young people for an undetermined period of time in the future. It is something that we should not act upon on the spur of the moment.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I have received a number of communications in reference to these private colleges; for instance, in the State of Louisiana where I come from, a very outstanding Baptist school and another school of Methodist denomination over 100 years old. They have appealed to me and the appeals seem to be proper. They want to be in on the program.

Mr. SPRINGER. I have received any number of communications from Catholic institutions as well.

Mr. BROOKS. All of the denominations wish to come into the program. What is wrong with working out some situation that would let colleges of prestige and of standing and with an accredited curriculum in a great State have the opportunity to share in the program?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not think this is a question of benefiting the schools. I do not think that is the main principle. This is the principle: The veterans should have the right to go around and choose whatever school he wants to, either a State institution, private school or secular school. He should not be handicapped in this respect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SPRINGER was allowed to proceed for five additional minutes.)

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I think the things I have outlined in this particular program refer to benefits that will accrue as a result thereof. I think the veteran himself is the important one to be considered. I do not think the private college ought to be discriminated against. That is the situation.

Mr. BROOKS. Does not the gentleman think an institution that is a hundred years old should be considered and that it would benefit a veteran to go there?

Mr. SPRINGER. Exactly. Let me say this: In my own State the University of Illinois was not founded until 1870. The type of education that was carried on at the college and the university levels was done by the private colleges spread over the whole State of Illinois long before the State university was founded. I do not think there is any reason for us to discriminate against them now, and I think that is what you are doing.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I asked the gentleman to yield because he said there would be an hour of debate under the rule. Under suspension of the rules there would be 40 minutes of debate, which allows about 6 seconds per Member of the House.

Mr. SPRINGER. I stand corrected; 40 minutes instead of an hour.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. For one question.

Mr. TEAGUE. I just want to say to the gentleman from Louisiana if he believes that this bill in any way, form, or fashion keeps any veteran from going to any school which is a good school and a legitimate school in these United States, that he does not properly understand the situation.

Mr. BROOKS. I am merely asking for information, and what I wanted from the gentleman from Illinois was the assurance that those schools would be in the program. One of them is Louisiana College at Alexandria, La., and the other is Centenary College at Shreveport, La. They have both appealed to me and I want to be sure that the veterans have a right to go to those schools in Louisiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. There is nothing to prevent them going to any school, as far as that is concerned. I think your tuition at Louisiana State University is about $120, and I think at Centenary it is about $450. Now we set up in this bill about $360 a year for tuition for the veteran. If he goes to Louisiana State he is only going to use a portion of that. In other words, I think he is going to shop around and go to the cheapest school and use part of the money that we set aside for his tuition for other purposes.

Mr. BROOKS. It seems to me from what the gentleman has said that Louisiana College and Centenary are going to lose out on the program.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is exactly my belief.

Mr. BROOKS. I think these great institutions ought to be permitted to participate in the program, and that the veterans who want to be benefited by the fine education that those schools can give should have full and equal opportunity to attend them.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE. Is it not a fact that we have a group of American young men going to school, and whether we have a GI bill or whether we do not, they will have a certain amount of money to go to school, and is it not further a fact that we are adding to that amount of money——

Mr. SPRINGER. Wait a minute.

Mr. TEAGUE. Let me make my statement.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thought you wanted to ask one question.

Mr. TEAGUE. All right. There are a great many American boys that have a certain amount of money to go to school. Through the GI bill we are saying to those young men that you have had military service, so we are going to add to the amount of money in order that you may go wherever you please, and we have the same differential with this that you had before, except possibly they have more money. For instance, I went to Texas A. & M., a tax-supported institution. If I had the money that the GI's get I might have gone to a private college. There is no discrimination in any form or fashion. A veteran can go to any school he wants. We considered the veteran and the taxpayer. We gave him a scholarship and said he can go wherever he wants to. This is nothing more than adding Federal aid to the GI bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. There is no Federal aid in this bill. If there is, it is the entire program. The whole bill is Federal aid under any circumstances.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say that we are trying to legislate for the veterans and not for private schools. This measure was taken up and discussed pro and con in the committee for days and days, you might say, and when the vote was finally taken——

Mr. SPRINGER. I yielded to the gentleman for a question and not for a speech.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman has been speaking for some time, and, in my opinion, I think the Congress ought to know the facts, and that the Members ought to be here to hear them.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am perfectly willing to yield for a question.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if this is what we have to submit to, if we have to listen to this kind of tirade not based on the facts, the Members ought to be here to hear the answer. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] A quorum is not present.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 2, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1536. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1953 in the amount of $3,341,000,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority (H. Doc. No. 476), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MANSFIELD: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 2042. A bill to extend certain privileges to representatives of member states on the Council of the Organization of American States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2009). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 8054. A bill to revise the procedure in the district courts relating to the disposition of the wages and effects of deceased and deserting seamen, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 8055. A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1948, to authorize the erection of appropriate Government headstones or markers in cemetery plots in memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died while serving in the overseas theaters of operations and whose bodies have not been recovered or identified or have been buried at sea; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 8056. A bill to increase the normal tax and surtax exemption and the exemption for dependents from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 8057. A bill to change the name of the Great Falls Air Force Base at Great Falls, Mont., to the "Earl T. Vance Air Force Base"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PICKETT:

H. J. Res. 470. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the taking of private property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 471. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a memorial to Dr. J. Finley Wilson, in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. Con. Res. 218. Concurrent resolution approving conveyance by the Tennessee Valley Authority of terminal properties now owned by the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, with reference to submission of an interstate civil defense compact entered into and ratified by the States of Georgia and South Carolina, pursuant to section 201 (g) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Governor of Guam relative to permitting the entry of selected Ryukyuan fishermen into the island of Guam for the purpose of aiding in the establishment of a fishing industry in aid of the economy of the island; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 8058. A bill for the relief of Luigi Mascitti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREENWOOD:

H. R. 8059. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Sonya Goldschmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 8060. A bill for the relief of Karin Rita Hopf (Karin Rita Grubb); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 8061. A bill for the relief of Alessandro, Carmela, Pasqualina, Massimo, and Michele D'Antonio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 8062. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Turner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 8063. A bill for the relief of Pantelis Morfesis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8064. A bill for the relief of Lilburne D. Sheats; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8065. A bill for the relief of William E. Aitcheson, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

748. Mr. REED of New York presented a petition of Dunkirk Aerie No. 2447, Fraternal Order of Eagles of Dunkirk, N. Y., with reference to the uncontrolled waters of the rivers of this country, which are causing so much devastation to life and property, and urging the creation of a governmental commission, composed of authorities in the field of flood control whose sole duty it will be to study methods for combating these awesome floods and their terrifying consequences, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 2, 1952

Rev. Mr. Benjamin Lynt, pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church of the United States, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, who didst reveal Thyself to us in the person of Christ Jesus, imbue each of us, we beseech Thee, with a sense of personal responsibility for those whose lives we help govern. Renew within us the consciousness that we do not function in a vacuum, that we cannot strike our words and deeds from the record which Thou dost keep, that Thou hast not made us in Thine image for the performance of petty things.

Toughen Thou, therefore, our moral fiber so that we do not fall apart under the pressures of this day's work, but may be enabled to do great things. Let all said and done here bring credit to ourselves, to those whom we serve, and to Thee, whose guidance we seek. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 29, 1952, was dispensed with.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KEFAUVER and Mr. RUSSELL were excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate this week.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to transact routine business, without debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PETITION

Mr. ELLENDER presented a resolution of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Senate Resolution 5

Whereas it has come to the attention of the senate that Camp Polk, near Leesville, La., is being reactivated as a training center for infantry and armored divisions of the Army of the United States; and

Whereas Camp Polk was found to be ideally suited for such purpose during World War II; and

Whereas the proper authorities have no doubt seen fit to reactivate this camp as a training center because of the nature of its terrain and facilities; and

Whereas Barksdale Field, near Shreveport, La., is the only permanent installation in the State of Louisiana which is devoted entirely to aviation; and

Whereas the need for a suitable location for the training of infantry and armored divisions is self-evident; and

Whereas the need for such installation as Camp Polk will continue in the future because of unsettled world conditions: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Louisiana, That we earnestly appeal to our President, Hon. Harry S. Truman, to the commanding general of the Army Ground Forces, and to the congressional delegation of the State of Louisiana to use their good offices to make Camp Polk a permanent Army post in the State of Louisiana; be it further

Resolved, etc., That the secretary of the senate be and is hereby directed to send, without delay, a certified copy of the resolution to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America; to the commanding general of the Army Ground Forces; to the Louisiana Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives of the United States.

C. E. BARHAM,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution forwarded to me by Charles F. Nolan, secretary of the Republican Party of Wisconsin for the Sixth Congressional District.

The resolution endorses the constitutional amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and now being studied by a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee dealing with the significant matter of the effect of treaties and executive agreements.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and be thereafter referred to the Judiciary Committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICAN PARTY OF WISCONSIN, SIXTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

(Chairman: Ronald Stephenson, Cedarburg; vice chairman: Mrs. Konrad Testwuide, Jr., route 1, Sheboygan; secretary: Charles F. Nolan, Oshkosh National Bank Building, Oshkosh; treasurer: Norton J. Williams, 116 South Commercial Street, Neenah.)

Resolved by the membership of the Republican Party of the Sixth Congressional Dis-

trict of the State of Wisconsin in caucus assembled this 21st day of May 1952, in the city of Fond du Lac, That we do hereby endorse Senate Joint Resolution 130, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; further

Resolved, That the district secretary be authorized and directed to transmit copies of this resolution to our Congressman, WILLIAM K. VAN PELT, and to our Senators, ALEXANDER WILEY and JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY.

COMMEMORATIVE STAMP FOR RECOGNITION OF TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA—LETTER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we are all aware of the tremendous number of commemorative stamp issues which are proposed for various purposes. We recognize that Congress and the Postmaster General receive far more requests for such issues than can possibly be fulfilled and that only anniversaries, organizations, individuals, and so forth, of the highest national importance can be honored.

One such proposal which I feel should be honored is for appropriate recognition of the twenty-fifth anniversary in 1953 of the Future Farmers of America, a splendid grass-roots organization which has contributed so much to the Nation's young manhood and to the Nation's agriculture.

At this time, I send to the desk a letter which I have received from C. L. Greiber, Wisconsin State director for vocational and adult education. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Greiber's letter in favor of an FFA stamp be printed in the RECORD, and thereafter be appropriately referred.

I trust that the Postmaster General will indeed take due note of it and of similar appeals.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
STATE BOARD OF VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION,
Madison, May 27, 1952.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: For some time an effort has been made to have the Post Office Department publish a special post stamp honoring the Future Farmers of America in 1953 in commemoration of the FFA's twenty-fifth anniversary.

The FFA in Wisconsin is sponsored by the State board of vocational and adult education and is an organization of more than 13,000 farm boys who are enrolled in the approximately 272 departments of vocational agriculture which are financed partially from Federal funds under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts. The FFA is a vital influence in the building of fine American citizens who will have a sincere appreciation of their civic, social, and economic responsibilities.

It has been brought to my attention that Senator FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas, has introduced bill S. 3002 in the Senate of the United States in order to authorize and direct the Postmaster General to issue a special postage stamp in commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Future Farmers of America.

I hope that you may give your kind consideration to the merits of this bill. Passage of this legislation would be a fine recognition of the outstanding service which is being performed by the FFA in the development of the basic principles of good citizenship.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

C. L. GREIBER,
State Director, Vocational and Adult Education.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 2908. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress," approved June 18, 1929; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1621).

By Mr. MAYBANK (for Mr. ROBERTSON), from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 2938. A bill to amend section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1623); and

H. R. 160. A bill to amend section 5192 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to the reserves of certain national banks; without amendment (Rept. No. 1624).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2653. A bill to standardize rates on household goods shipped by the United States Government for its employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 1625); and

S. 2829. A bill to amend section 1 (17) (a), section 13 (3), and section 13 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to extend to the Interstate Commerce Commission power to prescribe the discontinuance of certain railroad services in intrastate commerce when found to be unreasonably discriminatory against interstate commerce; with amendments (Rept. No. 1626).

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 6909) to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and I submit a report—No. 1622—thereon. The bill grants the authority to the Federal Reserve banks to buy direct obligations of the United States, or obligations fully guaranteed by the United States, in an amount not to exceed $5,000,000,000 held at any one time directly from the Treasury. The grant of authority is for a 2-year period which expires July 1, 1954. At the request of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors I introduced S. 2841 which would have made the aforementioned authority permanent. The House passed H. R. 6909 granting temporary extension of the authority, and I join with the other members of the Committee on Banking and Currency in the adoption of the House bill which provides that this authority must be reviewed in 2 years before any further extension of such authority is made.

I appreciate that the bill cannot be acted on at this time, but I call the attention of the majority leader to the fact that unless the bill is passed on the next call of the calendar there will be difficulties experienced in connection with the Treasury Department's policy of refinancing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 3266. A bill for the relief of the city of Kirkland, Wash.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAIN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCKELLAR:

S. 3267. A bill to amend the Water Pollution Control Act to raise the limit on the size of the loans which may be made under such act for the purpose of assisting local governmental agencies in the construction of works for the treatment of sewage and other wastes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 3268. A bill for the relief of Annalyn Earley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 3269. A bill for the relief of Maria Del. C. R. Jabionski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 3270. A bill authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors at Anacortes Harbor, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See remarks of Mr. CAIN when he introduced the above bill, which appears under a separate heading.)

CITY OF KIRKLAND, WASH.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the mayor of the city of Kirkland, Wash., has brought to my attention a serious financial problem and has asked for assistance in solving it. The problem arises out of a grant or loan of $20,000 made by the Federal Government under the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944. There is a real difference of opinion between the city government and the Housing and Home Finance Agency over the extent to which the money must be repaid by the citizens of Kirkland. The sum in question presents a sizable financial burden to the citizens of Kirkland. The city government has offered a compromise settlement which has been rejected by the Agency. I believe that this question merits full study and consideration by the Congress. Accordingly I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of the city of Kirkland.

The bill (S. 3266) for the relief of the city of Kirkland, Wash., introduced by Mr. CAIN, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS AT ANACORTES HARBOR, WASH.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for the construction of certain public

works at Anacortes Harbor in the State of Washington.

This is an essential project which was approved by the Corps of Engineers as far back as September 1950.

The matter was returned by the Budget Bureau for further consideration because some of the work involved would be largely of local benefit and would require a cash contribution locally. The decision as to the amount of that local contribution is still under study by the Corps of Engineers.

It now seems clear that any further delay in submitting proposed legislation on this subject will make impossible action by the Congress this year.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I am introducing the bill in the hope that the basic study can be completed by the Public Works Committee while the Corps of Engineers is studying the problem of the local contribution. Thus, much of the time needed for committee action can be disposed of by the time we obtain the report of the engineers.

I ask unanimous consent that the reports of the Corps of Engineers on this matter be printed as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the reports will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3270) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors at Anacortes Harbor, Wash., introduced by Mr. CAIN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The reports are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D. C., August 1, 1950.

Subject: Anacortes Harbor, Wash.
To: The Secretary of the Army.

1. I submit herewith for transmission to Congress the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in response to resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate, adopted June 17, 1947, requesting the Board to review the report on Anacortes Harbor, in the State of Washington, submitted on May 10, 1933, and previous reports, with a view to determining the advisability of making improvements in the harbor facilities at Anacortes, Wash.

2. After full consideration of the reports secured from the district and division engineers, the Board recommends modification of the existing project for Anacortes Harbor, Wash., to provide for a mooring basin 12 feet deep at mean lower low water, 570 feet wide, and 960 feet long, adjacent to the north side of Capsante waterway, protected by a pile breakwater 380 feet long about 50 feet east of the mooring basin, generally in accordance with the plan of the district engineer and with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable, at an estimated cost to the United States of $150,000 for construction and $3,500 annually for maintenance in addition to that now required, subject to the condition that local interests agree to (a) furnish without cost to the United States, all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil disposal areas suitably bulkheaded where necessary, for construction and maintenance of the improvement, when and as required; (b) hold and save the United States free from all damages due to construction and maintenance of the improvement; (c) provide and maintain adequate mooring facilities and a public landing with service and supply facilities open to all on equal terms; and (d) maintain to project dimensions those portions of the basin where mooring facilities are provided.

3. After due consideration of these reports, I concur in the views and recommendations of the Board.

LEWIS A. PICK,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, May 29, 1952.

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: Reference is made to your letter dated April 23, 1952, your file No. 3102, addressed to the district engineer at Seattle, Wash., concerning our report on Anacortes Harbor, Wash. Reference is also made to the Seattle district engineer's reply dated April 28, 1952, informing you that additional information on the status of the report on Anacortes Harbor would be furnished by this office. I am pleased to give you the current status of the report at this time.

As you know this report was approved by the Chief of Engineers and transmitted to the Bureau of the Budget on September 19, 1950, recommending modification of the existing project to provide a mooring basin 12 feet deep, and 570 by 960 feet in area protected by a pile breakwater 380 feet long, all at an estimated Federal cost of $150,000 for construction and $3,500 annually for maintenance.

On January 26, 1951, the Bureau of the Budget returned the report to this office for reconsideration of the recreational benefits and of the allocation of costs on the basis of the small-boat formula, which was adopted subsequent to the time the report was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget. A review of the report by the reporting officers, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and by this office indicated that, on the basis of the small-boat formula, it would be necessary to alter the requirements of local cooperation in connection with the recommended project.

It has been determined that, in addition to the requirements of local cooperation set forth in the report of the Chief of Engineers dated August 1, 1950, a copy of which is inclosed for your ready reference, a cash contribution will be required from local interests to help defray the first cost of the improvement. This cash contribution is required because of the amount of benefits that will accrue to the local community as compared with the amount of general benefits which will accrue to the Nation as a whole.

This office is currently engaged in making a study to determine the amount of local cash contribution that will be required in addition to the usual items of local cooperation. Upon reaching a decision on the amount of the local cash contribution required the reporting officers will meet with the Anacortes Port District to set forth and explain the revised requirements of local cooperation. After determination of the willingness of local interests to comply with the revised requirements the report will be resubmitted to the Bureau of the Budget prior to transmittal to Congress by the Secretary of the Army.

Every effort will be made to expedite our study on this matter and I will be pleased to keep you advised of future progress, both in this office and at field level.

I trust this additional information is sufficient for your present needs on this matter. However, should you require additional information, I shall be pleased to furnish it upon receipt of your request.

Sincerely yours.

C. H. CHORPENING,
Brigadier General, United States Army, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works.

APPROVAL OF CONVEYANCE BY THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY OF TERMINAL PROPERTY IN CERTAIN CITIES IN TENNESSEE AND ALABAMA

Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 80), which was referred to the Committee on Public Works:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress, pursuant to section 4 (k) (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (55 Stat. 599–600, 16 U. S. C. 831c (k) (b)), hereby approves the conveyance by the Tennessee Valley Authority in the name of the United States, by deed, lease, or otherwise, for the purpose of said section 4 (k) (b) and on the basis of the fair sale or rental value determined by the Tennessee Valley Authority, of the public use terminal properties now owned by the United States and in the custody of the Tennessee Valley at Knoxville, Chattanooga, and Harriman, Tenn., and Decatur and Guntersville, Ala.

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—AMENDMENT

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2594) to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In his capacity as a Senator the Chair submits an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2594) to extend the

provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

The amendment will be printed and will lie on the table, and without objection, the amendment, together with a letter from W. M. Farris, of Nashville, Tenn., will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The amendment is as follows:

At the proper place in the bill, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That the Office of Price Stabilization in the exercise of its rule-making and regulatory powers pertaining to products of the soil (forestry products) shall not classify or separate for pricing purposes any areas or boundaries which conflict with long-established trade customs or which are contrary to geologic maps or forestry surveys officially recognized by the various States or which are contrary to the United States Geological Survey."

The letter is as follows:

FARRIS HARDWOOD LUMBER CO.,
Nashville, Tenn., May 29, 1952.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: With reference to your telegram dated May 23, which reads as follows:

"Re your call amendment referred to not included in DPA bill as reported in the Senate. Shall be glad to do what I can when this measure is before the Senate.

"Regards,

"KENNETH MCKELLAR."

We thank you for your prompt reply and cooperation although the message is naturally quite a disappointment. Anything you can do to get the amendment in question included in the bill when it comes before the Senate will, needless to say, be greatly appreciated by the Nashville and other middle Tennessee sawmill operators who have been so unfairly and unnecessarily discriminated against by the OPS in the adoption of a timber boundary line purporting to separate one price region from another.

The boundary as established is contrary to long-established custom and geologic map of Tennessee compiled by the Division of Geology and the United States Geological Survey.

We have sought relief from the OPS but have been unsuccessful.

In our opinion only the inclusion of the amendment or expiration of the entire bill will take care of the situation.

Enclosed is a copy of the amendment, the same as left with you on March 13.

Respectfully yours,

FARRIS HARDWOOD LUMBER CO.,
W. M. FARRIS.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (S. 2594) to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to make a brief statement concerning the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the Senator from South Dakota may proceed.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the amendment would reincorporate section 104 in the new legislation.

Senators will recall that section 104 is a part of the Defense Production Act, and provides protection for peanuts, butter, cheese, and other dairy products. The Senator from North Dakota and I are suggesting, in this amendment, the addition of oats, rye, barley, and wheat other than for human consumption; and rice and rice products, because of the fact that these products are all in serious distress.

If section 104 were to expire without the kind of protection which would be afforded by the amendment the American taxpayers are likely to find themselves confronted with the necessity of providing support prices for products of this nature wherever they are raised in the world. We are aware of the fact that foreign countries are making plans to dump excess amounts of these products on our shores immediately after the expiration of this section.

I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD at this point a short statement explaining in further detail the provisions of section 104 as revised and submitted by the Senator from North Dakota and myself.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MUNDT

The amendment would continue for another year section 104 of the present act providing for import controls of fats, oils, peanuts, butter, cheese and other dairy products, and rice and rice products with the addition of oats, rye, barley, and wheat other than for human consumption.

First, I would like to comment on the need for extending import controls on dairy products.

The dairy industry of the United States is traditionally operated on a self-sufficient basis. Between 1925 and the outset of World War II dairy imports exceeded exports by a very small margin which amounted to about 1 percent of our total milk production. During and since World War II the exports from this country have risen tremendously. However, this rise was not a natural or normal one.

For instance much of the increase has been made up of exports to former Allies of World War II. Belgium, France, Greece, and the United Kingdom were recipients of 30.1 percent of United States dairy exports between the years 1949 and 1951. In 1939 these same countries accounted for less than 4 percent of our exports. In 1939 Germany and Japan received less than one-tenth of 1 percent of our total dairy exports. In the 1949–51 period those nations accounted for 10 percent of our total exports of dairy products.

The increases which I have mentioned above are directly associated with various types of export subsidization programs such as ECA, UNRRA, Army relief feeding, purchases for export by agencies to which the United States has contributed funds, such as the United Nations Children's Fund and the International Refugee Organization of the United Nations, and these are only a few of the programs. We cannot expect that these programs will be continued into the future for very much longer. The nations receiving such aid have been able to build back their own dairy herds and with the exception of Austria and Switzerland production in each of the countries now exceeds that of the pre-World War II period.

In short, we shall be returning to a period very similar to that previous to World War II, when American dairy products were largely consumed domestically. If we should submit to competition from foreign sources who, through their lower costs of labor and production, are able to supply milk to this country at a market level below that of domestic dairy producers, then we will by one fell stroke be tolling the death knell for thousands of American dairy producers who will be forced to sell their herds off for beef.

I would now like to comment on my reasons for the inclusion of oats, rye, barley, and feed wheat in this amendment.

The prairie Provinces of Canada have certain advantages in reaching the eastern feed-consuming markets of the United States, as well as the far western markets, because their transportation costs have not advanced as rapidly as those of the United States. This advantage coupled with the fact that farm wages in this country are higher and are advancing faster than those in Canada, makes it not surprising at all that Canada is able to supply feed grains to certain areas of the United States at a market price lower than can the domestic producer.

The 1952 price supports announced for oats, barley, and rye are approximately 82 percent of transitional parity. The clear intent of the agricultural legislative programs is to assist farmers to obtain parity. It is then, unthinkable that parity can be realized while imports absorb a substantial part of our demand. Imports depress prices and effectively prevent them from advancing to parity. They will also cause more grain to go under price support and more to be taken into the Government's possession at a greater cost to the American taxpayer.

I expect to be discussing this amendment in further detail at the time we are considering S. 2594, at which time I will go into further detailed reasons to indicate that it is essential.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. CARLSON:

Address delivered by him at the annual conference of the International Council for Christian Leadership, The Hague, The Netherlands, on May 24, 1952.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

Editorial entitled "These Honored Dead" published in the May 31, 1952, issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Article entitled "The America We Lost," written by Mario A. Pei, and published in Saturday Evening Post.

By Mr. BYRD:

Address entitled "Giant Government: Can We Make It Efficient?" delivered by Dr. Robert L. Johnson, president of Temple University, and National Chairman, Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, before the thirty-sixth annual meeting of the National Industrial Conference Board at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York, on May 15.

JUVENILE COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1822) to amend the act creating a juvenile court for the District of Columbia, approved March 19, 1906, as amended, which were, on page 3, line 10, strike out "governmental," and insert "governmental and", and on page 4,

line 10, after "both." insert "Prosecutions for violations of subsection (c) of this section shall be brought in the name of the District of Columbia in the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia by the Corporation Counsel or any of his assistants."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7005) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, on May 23, 1952, the House of Representatives passed the bill (H. R. 7005) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes. On last Wednesday, May 28, 1952, the Senate passed the bill with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. On Thursday, May 29, the House requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appointed their conferees. I move that the Senate accept the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey conferees on the part of the Senate.

ACTUARIAL STUDY OF GOVERNMENT PENSION SYSTEMS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Virginia may proceed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, last week I unsuccessfully urged the Appropriations Committee to approve an item for the Civil Service Commission to make a study of the actuarial soundness of all the Government pension systems. I felt the facts developed by such a study will be needed to enable us to act intelligently on recurring proposals to increase pension benefits.

I still believe that this study should be made but meanwhile, before we pass on the pending proposals for an increase in the pensions of retired civil-service employees, I believe every Member of the Senate should consider the facts contained in the statement made to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee last Thursday by its chairman, the Honorable TOM MURRAY.

I ask, therefore, Mr. President, that Mr. MURRAY's statement be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. TOM MURRAY, CHAIRMAN, POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AT OPENING OF HEARINGS ON RETIREMENT LEGISLATION, THURSDAY, MAY 29, 1952

We are beginning the hearings on various bills which by their terms, will provide general increases in the retirement of Federal employees. Some of these bills provide percentage increases combined with flat dollar increases. Others substitute new formulas for computing annuities while still a third group would completely rewrite the Retirement Act.

At the outset of the hearings, I wish to state my position frankly and plainly on all of the pending bills. I am strongly opposed to the enactment at this time of any legislation which would increase the retirement benefits or annuities in any manner, shape or form since the retirement fund is not now actuarially sound. It is in the "red" nearly $5,000,000,000 insofar as having sufficient funds to meet its obligations and liabilities is concerned. Even if we were just to consider amounts to those already retired which, based on their life expectancy, total $2,016,051,658, and add to that the amount due present Federal employees, if they desired to withdraw their money in their individual retirement accounts, we would find that the funds credited to our Federal civil-service retirement system could not meet these obligations. In fact, it would fail to do so by nearly $150,000,000.

Any increase in the annuities of those already retired must be taken from the taxpayers or from the equities in the fund of those who will retire in the future. Those who are now retired have, in the great majority of cases, received in annuities already many times the amount of their contributions. To this particular group our Government has been most generous. In the first place they have received full credit for their years of service prior to August 1, 1920, without having to make any contributions whatsoever to the retirement fund. Secondly, during the years in which they made contributions to the retirement fund, they paid 2½ percent to the fund for 6 years, they paid 3½ percent into the fund for 16 years, and 5 percent for 6 years. Only those retiring since 1948 have made any payments of 6 percent.

Meanwhile, these retired employees seek increases in retirement and survivors' annuities which are largely comparable to those which will be received by employees who will be contributing 6 percent of their annual salaries the entire length of their service with the Federal Government.

As an indication of what has been received by those already retired compared to their contributions to the fund, I have had developed the following statistics. According to a statement furnished me by the Civil Service Commission, the 166,000 annuitants on the rolls as of June 30, 1951, made total contributions of approximately $240,000,000. The annuities paid these individuals already constitute approximately $947,000,000. Based upon the estimated life expectancy of those presently on the rolls, there will be payments made to them of over $2,186,000,000. In other words, these employees who have already retired will receive more than $3,000,000,000, and their contributions amount to only $240,000,000, a better than 12-to-1 return.

Every one who is retired with a fixed income is faced with the same problem as the retired Federal employee. It would be unfair to take from taxpayers additional money to provide what amounts to a cost-of-living increase for a select group of people who are receiving annuities from the Federal Government and who had the privilege of Federal jobs throughout their working career.

I have been concerned for several years over the attitude of many people that the Federal Government owes them "security or financial protection" from the cradle to the grave. It is unfortunate that many present and retired Federal employees have the idea that our Government "owes them a living" after their retirement, and that it is up to the Government to take care of them for the remainder of their lives from the date of their retirement.

Too many employees look upon the retirement fund as a welfare fund and do not concern themselves with the actuarial soundness of the fund. Federal employees should take pride in the soundness of the retirement fund and should be interested in the present obligations and liabilities so that the fund may meet its contracts for future retirements.

The balance in cash and investments and obligations of the United States as of last June 30 was $4,419,927,112.89. Taken by itself this appears to be a substantial sum and because of this creates a false impression or sense of security when examined alone. To be properly appraised, however, it is important also to take a look at liabilities to present and former employees. Again as of last June 30, these liabilities total $9,294,927,112.89. Deducting the balance available from the total liabilities it becomes clear that there exists an actual deficit in the fund. The excess of liabilities over assets is $4,875,000,000.

The Federal civil-service retirement system today is the best and most liberal of any retirement system in the world. As the Commission has pointed out in reports on retirement legislation to this committee—"The retirement system is an instrument of personnel policy similar to provisions concerning pay, leave, and working conditions. Taken together these constitute the Government's competitive offer in the labor market. They may be revised from time to time as conditions change but the primary reason for such revision is the need for the Government to maintain a competitive position as an employer."

There are some who may point to isolated instances of other systems where benefits are granted but these examples invariably relate to short-term employees. The retirement system is intended to encourage a career of Government service and is weighted in favor of the career Government employee of many years service. For the temporary employee, we have provided an opportunity for old-age and survivors insurance under social security.

With more than 160,000 former Federal employees on the retirement rolls, it is understandable that if one looks hard enough he can find many pitiful hardship cases. On the other hand, we must consider that, under the present circumstances, many retired Federal employees have taken jobs in private industry and are receiving or will be eligible for social security benefits in addition to their retirement. There is no limitation upon the amount that a retired employee may receive in private employment in order to continue to receive his annuity.

The President, following his approval of an increase in the annuities for veterans, has requested Congress to make a special study of the duplication of payments. Even if we were to agree to the principle that the Federal retirement fund is a welfare fund, and I am unalterably opposed to thie viewpoint, such a change in policy should be prefaced by an investigation of duplication of payments from tax funds.

I have the deepest sympathy for any annuitants who are in financial distress. I appreciate the plight of those in need. I

am not hard-hearted, callous, or hardened toward annuitants as some individuals are charging. We all regret the decline in the value of the dollar and the inflationary trends today.

Not only have annuitants suffered but, also, those who have private resources as annuity incomes from private insurance policies, interest on bonds and notes, and income from dividends on stocks. All of these have felt the effect of the decline of the purchasing value of the dollar.

Our Government has never guaranteed that annuities would be increased proportionately to an increase in the cost of living or because of an increased cost of living. Every member of the committee, I am sure, is intensely interested in the financial soundness and integrity of the retirement fund so that it may meet all future liabilities and obligations. It is unwise and unfair to leave the responsibility of payment for the annuities as a tax obligation or as a loadstone on the next generation of Federal employees or the taxpayers generally.

In the Retirement Act revisions of 1948, we did make a gift to all of those who were already retired of a 25 percent or $300 increase, whichever was the lesser, in their annuities or the option of providing an annuity of $600 for their surviving spouse. Later, in the Eighty-first Congress, this was amended to provide both the increase in the annuities of retired employees and the annuities for the surviving spouse. The fact that we made this gift to those already retired did not in any way commit our Government to the policy of future revisions in the annuities of those already retired.

I trust that no one makes such a contention for, if it is made, it creates an untenable situation whereby what we do today is making a commitment not only now but in the future for a policy of meeting increased costs of living by increased Federal annuities.

The increases given to Federal employees by the 1948 act, and amended in the Eighty-first Congress, to which I have just referred, amounted to about 50 percent in the annuities of those who received the benefits of both increases in their annuities and annuities for their surviving spouses. This is more than increases given to other annuitants under any other system since the increase in the cost of living.

I want to again emphasize that I am not unaware of the grave problems faced by retired people in all categories who have small annuities and are faced with the reduction of the purchasing power of the dollar. I, for one, insist that we must treat all citizens alike and we cannot give special benefits to a select group. These benefits must either be paid for from taxes or from funds contributed by others.

Those now in the Federal service should be intensely interested in the future actuarial soundness and the present obligations and liabilities of the retirement fund in order that the fund can take care of its contracts for future retirements. The fund today is not in a sound condition and Chairman Robert Ramspeck, of the Civil Service Commission, is requesting Congress to undertake a program of amortizing the deficiency of the fund within the next 30 years. This produces an appropriation request for the fiscal year 1953 of nearly $458,000,000, which is approximately $150,000,000 above recent appropriations to the fund. I think it is important to note that the House Committee on Appropriations this year declined to report the additional $150,000,000 requested by the Civil Service Commission. As a matter of fact, the House in voting on the independent offices appropriation bill actually voted an amount which will not quite meet the anticipated disbursements from the retirement fund this year. Loose and unfounded statements that annuities of those already retired can be increased without either increasing the Federal contributions or the contributions of employees have made it increasingly difficult to obtain the necessary appropriations to guarantee the integrity of the fund. The consideration of this committee with respect to increasing annuities must of necessity be conditioned by this recent House action.

If the financial integrity of the fund is further materially weakened or impaired by liberalizing or increasing the annuities, the day is then fast approaching when the civil-service retirement system will be merged or consolidated with social security to which I am strongly opposed. I have yet to hear a single Federal employee say that he would prefer to be placed under social security rather than continue under the civil-service retirement system.

These bills before our committee today vary in their cost but the minimum cost of the least expensive one runs into many millions of dollars a year. The retirement fund is certainly in no position or condition to stand these additional costs and, if favorable consideration is given to any of these measures, then Congress should appropriate the necessary funds to cover the costs. However, I am opposed to such action as I feel that I have an obligation to our taxpayers to help balance the Federal budget, reduce appropriations wherever possible, and consistent with the actual needs of our Government, to stop deficit spending and increasing our national indebtedness, and to give some relief, as soon as possible, to our people from the present burdensome taxes imposed upon them.

DEDICATION OF GREATER PITTSBURGH AIRPORT

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a minute and a half.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Pennsylvania may proceed.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, last Saturday there was dedicated at Pittsburgh, Pa., one of the finest airports in the world.

Allegheny County, in which the airport is located, was joined in the dedicatory ceremonies by its neighbors of southwestern Pennsylvania, northern West Virginia, and eastern Ohio.

Approximately 50,000 citizens of those areas, including civic and industrial leaders and members of the clergy assembled to witness the ceremonies.

The airport, with its terminal building and other facilities, was constructed at a cost of about $33,000,000. It will serve the greatest center of industrial production in the world and will advance the economic welfare of all the people of the United States.

I am certain that information concerning this airport will be of general interest and I therefore ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, a compilation of interesting facts describing this great masterpiece of progress in aviation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Greater Pittsburgh Airport, a modern masterpiece of airport design and construction, will place the Pittsburgh district in the front ranks of the world's air centers. The economic and civic consequences of this magnificent installation are immeasurable.

Eleven years of planning and building have developed, on this 1,600-acre site about 14 miles west of Pittsburgh's Golden Triangle, a skyport which is larger than New York's LaGuardia Field and Washington's National Airport combined with the largest terminal building in the world.

An outstanding feature of this spacious airport, whose mile-long runways are cut into the bedrock of Pennsylvania hills, is the main seven-story terminal building which houses a hotel, a theater, restaurants, observation decks, a bank, and many other facilities. Architectural innovations in the design of the terminal building—which is built of granite, marble, brick, and stone—will serve as a model for other airports for years to come.

FACTS ABOUT GREATER PITTSBURGH AIRPORT

Location: About 14 miles west of the Golden Triangle, in Moon and Findlay townships, Allegheny County.

Accessibility: Connected with downtown Pittsburgh by means of a high-speed, limited-access parkway which will cut auto traveling time to about 20 minutes. Served by bus lines and limousine service.

Parking: Facilities for 5,000 cars. Driveways under the main building and at each dock, at the elevation of the loading apron, will permit public conveyances to load and unload passengers at each gate, reducing the average walking distance for passengers to 225 feet. There is also an indoor garage.

Cost: About $33,000,000. The airport will run on a self-sustaining basis. It represents investments by Allegheny County, the Civil Aeronautics Authority, the Pennsylvania State Aeronautics Commission, and Federal and State funds for United States Air Force and National Guard.

Size: 1,600 acres.

Runways: East-west runway is 5,500 feet long with a 2,500-foot extension.

Northwest-southeast runway is 5,900 feet, with a 300-foot extension.

Northeast-southwest runway is 5,770 feet long.

All runways are 150 feet wide. They are built to take a 75,000-pound wheel load, but engineers believe they can withstand much more because of their rock substructure.

Terminal building: Cost about $9,500,000. Semicircular, 460 feet in diameter; over-all width is 575 feet; over-all length, including south dock, is 1,060 feet. The ultimate development of this 7-story (including control tower) building calls for 3 docks, 600 feet long, radiating east, south, and west from the main building. Only the south dock is to be constructed in the first stage. These will provide waiting lounges for passengers, observation decks with ultimate capacity of 10,000 people, and such standard facilities as radio, dispatchers, maintenance, and storage rooms.

Terminal facilities: Two passenger observation lounges. Two public observation lounges. Airline ticket and information space. Coffee shop, 450 capacity. Motion picture theater, 330 capacity. Drug store. Haberdashery. Post office. Barber and beauty shops. Branch bank. Operating personnel offices. Sky-view dining room, 550 capacity. Sky-view dining terrace, 250 capacity. Cafeteria to accommodate 3,000 employees. Weather bureau airways communication. Civil air control and tower. Florist and other commercial shops. Public garage. Sixty-two room hotel. Recreation center.

Exhibits: There are 138 display windows and 2 large exhibit rooms which will make up a new world exposition.

Employees: About 2,500 will be permanently employed by the airlines and other businesses and agencies offering services at or near the airport.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUPREME COURT DECISION IN STEEL MILL SEIZURE

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 20 seconds.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There has just come over the press ticker, timed at 12:05 p. m. today, the statement which I shall read. I know no more than what is carried on the ticker. The statement is as follows:

The Supreme Court ruled today that President Truman's seizure of the steel mills on April 8 was unconstitutional.

I pray that the report is accurate.

Mr. TOBEY. Hurrah. Thank God for the Supreme Court.

ADDRESS BY FORMER SENATOR ASHURST BEFORE ARIZONA STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there are now 18 Members of this body who served with my former colleague, Henry Ashurst. None of them has forgotten the eloquence which he so frequently displayed at the desk at which I now stand. A newspaper account of an address which he delivered in Prescott, Ariz., on May 24, 1952, reads as follows:

Henry Fountain Ashurst came home to Arizona Saturday and demonstrated that the years have not dimmed his gift of oratory.

Members of the State bar of Arizona overflowed the Elks Lodge—their nineteenth annual convention momentarily forgotten—to hear the 78-year-old former Senator deliver a stirring address that won him a standing ovation.

Ashurst held his audience spellbound with a 30-minute oration in which he voiced a firm confidence in the future of America.

Erect and vigorous despite his years, Ashurst was mobbed by well-wishers when he concluded his talk.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the text of the address delivered by former Senator Ashurst.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

During the course of a long lifetime, many honors have come to me but none that I shall store away in the treasure house of my heart more tenderly than this invitation of the State bar of Arizona to address its annual convention.

When such an honor comes, and it comes so seldom and to so few, one finds difficulty in adequately expressing one's gratitude and thankfulness.

Such an invitation is an especially gracious act when extended to one who, like myself, is destitute for what the world calls "influence" and who is existing in an obscurity so deep that one is not of much interest, even to a zoologist.

Many things have vanished into history and many changes have come since that faraway day, 55 years ago when I was admitted to the Arizona bar. All the lawyers who were members of the Arizona bar when I was admitted, except perhaps a scant half-dozen, have departed this life and have gone beyond the sunset's purple hills, but it is gratifying to know that the Arizona bar which, of course, includes the bench, has enriched the annals of American jurisprudence and that the Arizona bar of this day is concurrently holding high the standards of our profression and is vindicating justice and civil liberty, as is its duty and its great privilege.

About 1 year before the close of the nineteenth century, I went to Washington not as an official, but as a small-town lawyer from the Territory of Arizona to attend to a matter of a legal nature before one of the departments of Government. I did not know and could not know that in entering Washington I was entering a city which would become the locus standi, locality or nerve-center whence would be radiated energies, ideologies, and financial-credits which, during the first half of the twentieth century, would influence and alter events throughout all Christendom.

I did not know and could not know that the United States was upon the threshhold of almost incredible achievement in art, science, transportation, growth, wealth, chemical discoveries, mechanical inventions, and national power—an achievement of which history furnishes no parallel. Governments which then seemed invincible have since been supplanted by governments bearing strange symbols. Now it is a bisected world—occidental and oriental.

At the close of the nineteenth century, our covered-wagon period had ended. The pioneers had conquered our continental area. America was glowing with high emprise. We were happy in our then present and eager to enter into the further opulence then seemingly assured, but neither a wild flight of fancy nor a remote excursion of the imagination could have predicted the world-wide changes that would come within the next 50 years.

During the first half of the twentieth century three distinct nations, that had been subverted for centuries: Egypt, Israel, and Ireland were restored to national identity and independence and resumed their respective seats in the family of nations from which they had so long been excluded.

Cambyses, the Persian, overwhelmed Egypt 2,500 years ago; Vespasian and Titus, Romans, overwhelmed Israel 1,882 years ago, and Richard de Clare, the Englishman, nicknamed "Strongbow," overwhelmed Ireland 780 years ago. Each of the three subverted nations possesses an immortal vigor and a culture and a history extending back into prehistoric times, and in depicting the restoration of these governments of antiquity, one needs must resort to the lines of the prologue in Shakespeare's play, King Henry the Fift: "O for a muse of fire that would ascend the brightest heaven of invention! a kingdom for a stage, princes to act, and monarchs to behold the swelling scene!"

When the nineteenth century closed the Orient was a sleeping giant; the Manchu Dynasty of China, established in 1644, had not then collapsed; Mr. Mohandas Ghandi was an obscure barrister who had not yet emerged to change the map of India and become the voice of India's hopes; Czar Alexander II, of Russia, had some years before, by his emancipation edict, freed the Russian serfs but unhappily not a spark of that Virgilian light, taken to England by Julius Caesar (which furnished a system of ordered rule based upon natural justice for all sorts and conditions of men, for example: Respect for the dignity of life; fair and public trials of accused persons; acquisition of property, large or small; and that diamond pivot upon which civil liberty depends and revolves, namely: the concept of the government as the servant—not the master of the citizen) not a spark ever touched Russia and Russia stumbled along never illumed by that Virgilian light.

England, through the centuries, had evolved and passed along to us the wisest and most nearly perfect system of judicature yet devised; she had woven from the Anglo-Saxon and the Latin and Greek tongues a language of wondrous beauty, amplitude, and grandeur; and when the nineteenth century ended, Great Britain was at the crest of her empire—at the apex of her power and glory; her drum beats ruled 450,000,000 persons (now 120,000,000); she was the world's workshop, her Navy was stronger than the combined fleets of her two most powerful rivals; if a British diplomat of first rank and high grade took a pinch of snuff there was a titillation of olfactory nerves and not a little sneezing in every chancellery on earth; she was master of the world's purse, mistress of the tranquil ocean, and of the wrathful ocean. Queen Victoria reigned, but the pound sterling ruled; London, the capital of her island kingdom and world encircling empire, was a city of fashion, elegance, and metropolitan life; English ladies were wasp-waisted and English statesmen were wasp-witted, but the two all-destroying world wars decimated the peoples and scattered the treasures of England and continental Europe.

Now, this generation, not only in England and continental Europe but in vast stretches of our Western Hemisphere, has been taken by a stupendous tragedy into the iron clutch of fear of Karl Marx communism * * * a fanatical delusion, embraced by those who demand that the problems of this life shall be solved for them by the labor and ability of those who are capable and are willing to toil; embraced by those whose ambition or enthusiasm far exceeds their talents, intellectual and spiritual resources. Communists forget—if they ever knew—that indolence, ignorance, and incompetency can never have the same reward as wisdom and skill and that communism would deprive labor of its wages, industry of its stimulus, and character of its respect. Livable conditions of life do not come by waving a magician's wand but, like our daily bread, must be earned.

In my opinion, this delusion will evaporate and there is no reason for this generation or any succeeding generation to sink into fear or to despair. History is but a record of mankind in conflict with circumstances. If all the refreshments of adventure, risk, and hazard were eliminated, human life would be flat and insipid—a life almost intolerable.

In the realm of human behavior and in the domain of human emotions we do not hate and fear those who have injured us—it is the other way around—we hate and fear those whom we have injured; therefore any fear that may settle upon our country is unreasoning—America has injured no nation—therefore, hates no nation—fears no nation.

One shuns a person upon whom one has inflicted an irreparable wrong; one avoids a creditor to whom one owes a debt that one can never pay. America has inflicted no wrong upon any nation; has never contracted a debt that she cannot pay, therefore America walks in the clean, fresh air, shunning no nation, avoiding no nation.

Doubt as to his survival, has come to mankind at regular intervals, not only in modern times but in medieval and antique times. Everything that man has invented is susceptible of two uses—good and evil—but happily mankind possesses the discretion—the judgment enabling him to decide to what use—good or evil—an invention shall be put.

The midwives of nuclear science and nuclear physics have recently delivered some lusty infants; the atom bomb and its synthetic half brother, the hydrogen bomb and

become troublesome creatures since, by them, man presumes to take into his own hand the fire and force of Old Sol himself. The birth of these infants reminds one of the speech addressed by the Duchess of York to her unscrupulous son King Richard III, "A grievous burden was thy birth to me—tetchy, and wayward was thy infancy."

I take no stock in the gloomy jeremiads constantly chanted that the human race will destroy itself; I do not subscribe to the defeatist attitude that human beings are but the helpless zanies of witless fate and thoughtless chance which will overthrow the wisdom of the wise, the valor of the brave, and the trophies of truth. I reject such philosophy and assert that mankind is endued with reason, conscience, and ample power of self-direction and has his fate in his own hands. Those explosive forces which have brought such specters of dreadful terror to so many persons, will be the self-same forces that soon shall heat and illuminate man's habitation, transport him and his commerce, and heal and cure many of his physical ills and agonies.

Of this, at least, we may be certain: Arrogance and injustice always lead to a national downfall, and we find comfort in the assurance that our own opulent and powerful America, while she has never chosen the violet emblem of modesty and self-effacement as her national flower, she has not stood in stiff Lucifer pride and haughtiness; she has walked becomingly before the world, has given bounteously to the world, and in troublous times she has been the world's constant and competent nurse. Efficient in war, she has always been generous and clement in victory, and, paraphrasing the lines of a famous character, allow me to exclaim, "All things for America; she is the vital axle of the restless wheels that bear me on; beyond the map of America my heart can travel not, but fills that limit to its farthest verge."

There is in this world a law known as the law of compensation, called by some persons the law of natural justice, which soon or late does its perfect work. This law may not be repealed, not even amended. Under the sure workings of this law, the thief robs himself, the tyrant oppressor inflicts upon himself a deeper wound than the one that kills his victim, and with every tyrant oppressor there walks a spirit with uplifted blade—the unerring sword of retributive justice.

The world at times seems to be a runaway orb, and many thoughtful persons wonder just what sort of civilization is being gestated, but are much encouraged to know that America possesses many durable values—the kindness of Providence; the justness of nature; a vast, bountiful, and beautiful land with its rich soils and mines; the amplitude of our harbors; American enterprise; American love of fair play; American respect for the individual without regard to his station in life; the heritage of the inventions and skills of the past; the corpus that is the body of the combined wisdom and experience of preceding generations of Americans. These may not be taken away; we need no more; it would be ungracious to ask for more.

In the fullness of time the nations will, after patient negotiations, reach a legal basis for the solution of national problems, meanwhile let us remember that disarmament is not a one-way street and it is impermissible for one first-rate world power to disarm unless disarmament is general and reciprocal.

A river of wisdom is ever slowly but surely carrying mankind toward the great ocean of beneficent achievement; aiding mankind ultimately to conquer all the arts and sciences and subject them to the good—not the destruction—of his species.

The human race will be victorious in its dramatic and arduous struggle upward and onward if it but realize that Lucifer-pride, wars and injustice will bring to any nation, people, or dynasty a decline and fall in power and opulence.

When we go out into a cloudless night and glance skyward, we observe the stars; we call some of them by their names—Venus, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, Arcturus, the Pleiades, and the galaxy of the Milky Way. They shed light upon our pathway but astronomers tell us that more than one-half of all the blended radiance of the stars that falls upon our pathway comes from stars we never see. They are invisible; they have no name on earth and seem to have no place in the heavens, yet they light us on our way.

Thus it is with human life and destiny; a few persons may become bright particular stars in the political, financial, social, or economic sky, but we all may be, if we will, a part of that invisible host of stars that serenely shed their kindly lights upon the path of all mankind.

THE TAX BURDEN

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as part of my remarks an article entitled "Let's Quit Kidding About Taxes," published in the June 4 issue of the Pathfinder magazine.

I regret that the illustrations which accompany the article cannot be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is a very interesting and stimulating article on an issue which is very vital to the people of this Nation; namely, the impact which taxes are having on the income of the American people and on our standard of living.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S QUIT KIDDING ABOUT TAXES—BABY IS "IN HOCK" BUT GOOD—AND IS GOING TO HAVE TO PAY THE BILL

These babies are the real victims of spending and waste by the mushrooming Federal Government. They will keenly realize that when they reach taxpaying age.

From the day of their birth the tax burden piled on their parents has been growing. It is a burden which, in large part, these babies must take upon their own shoulders in the years of reckoning to come.

Taxes are depriving them of many things. Taxes menace their living standards, their education and welfare. Taxes are reducing their inheritance. Inflation is thinning it.

On these pages Thomas G. Sabin, veteran TV producer-director, presents a distinguished young cast in a novel presentation of the facts of life—and taxes. The photos are by Constance Bannister, famous baby photographer.

"BUT I'M DOWN TO MY DIAPERS ALREADY"

1. In 157 years (1789–1945) the Federal Government took $254,000,000,000 in taxes. In the last 7 years (1946–52) the Government took $307,000,000,000 in taxes, or $53,000,000,000 more, in 7 years, than in all of the preceding 157 years.

And the trend is steadily upward. Federal money is not free money. The money the Government takes—and spends—is the money you earn.

"LEAVE MY PIGGY BANK ALONE"

2. Too late, Sonny; the Government taxes even savings banks now. Taxes add $2,000 to the cost of a new $8,000 home. Taxes add $664 to the price of that new car the family needs. Taxes every day put the bite on the average pack of cigarettes, 12 cents; the average gallon of gasoline, 6¾ cents; TV sets, radios, refrigerators, 10 percent; the family local phone bill, 15 percent; cosmetics, 20 percent; travel by rail, bus, ship, plane, 15 percent; tickets to movies, theaters, etc., 20 percent; tires (per pound), 5 cents; luggage, jewelry, 20 percent.

A family in the $3,000–$4,000 income-tax bracket pays more than $1,000 in Federal, State, and local taxes, or almost a third of its total income.

"SUMPIN'S GOTTA BE DONE, AND QUICK"

3. If the Government grabbed all personal earnings of more than $25,000 a year, it would get enough money to keep it running for about 10 days at its present rate of expenditures.

For every man, woman and child in this country, it costs $455 to run the Government this year.

And every man, woman and child in this country now owes $1,650. Their debt rises with every breath they take.

More than half of every dollar in profits earned by the corporations of this country is taken away in taxes.

"The power to tax is the power to destroy."

"MY FUTURE IS IN YOUR HANDS"

4. The only way to get more money is (1) from the lower incomes or (2) printing more "worthless" money or (3) more borrowing. So, for your babies' sakes, let's plug up the leaks and stop unnecessary spending, mismanagement and extravagance. Those who occupy public office should be even more careful of public money than they are of their own money. They are the trustees of the future.

"YOU'RE WORRIED; LOOK WHAT I'M FACING"

5. The Federal Government spent in 157 years (1789–1945), $489,000,000,000; in the past 7 years (1946–52, $330,000,000,000; total spending, $819,000,000,000; total taxes, $561,000,000,000; total national debt, $258,000,000,000; or a debt of $6,600 for every family of four in the United States.

"WISE GUYS ECONOMIZE"

6. We can't afford to keep adding three new civilian employees to the Government payroll every working minute of the year. To run the State Department now cost 14 times as much and to run the Commerce Department 28 times as much as it did just 12 years ago.

Here is how big Government spending feeds the flames of inflation:

	1939	1951
Average 5-room house	$4,500.00	$10,000.00
All-wool man's suit	35.00	57.50
Average small car (at factory)	774.00	1,735.00
Milk (quart)	.11	.23
Round steak (pound)	.36	1.09

Brother, that's inflation.

"WHAT ABOUT USING MOM'S HOUSEKEEPING METHODS?"

7. In 1939, Washington took 39 cents of each dollar paid in taxes; your State and local governments 61 cents. By 1950 Washington took 69 cents of every tax dollar; your State and local governments only 31 cents. Let's eliminate waste, duplication, corruption and extravagance in the Federal Government. Then your States, counties and towns can have more money for better paid teachers, policemen, firemen, etc.—without increasing taxes!

"HOW YOU CAN CORRECT CONDITIONS"

8. You can take an active and intelligent interest in Government affairs. • • • You can vote for candidates for public office who are pledged to enforce economy. • • • You can insist that the Government stop spending your tax money to go into business in competition with private citizens. • • • You can insist that your Senators and your Representative in Congress work for economy.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further routine business, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the call of the calendar is next in order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on a previous call of the calendar two bills, H. R. 643 and H. R. 646, were passed over at the request of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. He desired to propose amendments to them. On the following call of the calendar the bills were again passed over because the Senator from West Virginia was not present. The Senator from Kansas has informed me that he wishes to withdraw his objection to consideration of the bills, because he has obtained additional information which has led him to that decision.

I now ask unanimous consent that the two bills be included in today's call of the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that under the unanimous-consent agreement there are five bills which are to be considered first. Then the Senator from West Virginia will be recognized to make his request.

Mr. KILGORE. Very well.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS TO FLORIDA FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES—BILL PLACED AT THE FOOT OF THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the first of the five bills ordered to be considered prior to the regular call of the calendar will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 556) authorizing the transfer of certain lands in Putnam County, Fla., to the State Board of Education of Florida for the use of the University of Florida for educational purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that heretofore this bill was considered, the amendments agreed to, and the bill passed. Subsequently, a motion was made and agreed to to reconsider the votes whereby the bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving my right to object, I wish to say frankly that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] registered an objection to the consideration of this bill. I understand that the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has an explanation to offer with reference to the bill, and I shall withhold my objection on behalf of the Senator from Oregon until I have heard what the situation is. I am hopeful that the explanation will meet the objection of the Senator from Oregon and that the bill may be disposed of at this call of the calendar.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Kansas. I am sorry that the junior Senator from Oregon is not present. He had left word with the calendar committee that he objected to the bill, and the calendar committee accordingly objected to its consideration on the last call of the calendar and requested that the bill go over to the next call of the calendar so that it could be considered at this time.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. If it is of any consequence I should like to say that I expect to object to the bill at this time with or without amendments. I shall ask that it go over to the next call of the calendar.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I prefer to make my explanation, and then the Senator may act as he thinks he should. I hope that the members of the calendar committee on the other side of the aisle will be able to follow what I am about to say.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I was engaged in conversation with the senior Senator from Oregon and I did not hear the remark which the Senator from Florida was addressing to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. HOLLAND. I was requesting the distinguished Senator from Kansas to give attention to what I am about to say, because I hope it will enable him to work out a satisfactory solution of the situation.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield again?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon was under the impression that the first bill being called on the calendar was Calendar No. 1440, Senate bill 2959. I am advised that the bill under consideration now is not Calendar No. 1440, but No. 1419, Senate bill 556.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Oregon is correct. The bill now under consideration is Calendar No. 1419, Senate bill 556. It relates to a tract of 55 acres of land in the State of Florida.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon has no objection to that bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the attitude of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon. I wish it were shared by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon. The bill relates to 55 acres of land now belonging to the fish hatchery project in Putnam County, Fla. The 55 acres, although in the same area and although contiguous to the fish hatchery tract, are not actually used in the operation of the fish hatchery. Both the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice have stated that the continued ownership of that tract by the Federal Government is unnecessary. Furthermore, both of them approve the proposed transfer of this small tract of land to the University of Florida, for the purpose for which the university needs the tract.

That purpose is for the location on the tract of buildings to be constructed by the University of Florida in connection with its field and forestry project which is a part of the land utilization and forestry activities of the University of Florida. The university is located at Gainesville, Fla., whereas this field and forestry project is located at Welaka, Fla., in a remote area a considerable distance from Gainesville. Buildings are needed at Welaka for the operation of the field forestry project.

It happens that these 55 acres are immediately contiguous to, and would be a part of, the field and forestry operation of the University of Florida. The field and forestry operation is conducted on land on which there is a 95-year lease. That land formerly was held by the Department of Agriculture, and formerly was a part of a resettlement program there.

Under existing law, the land upon which the field forestry program is being conducted cannot be procured by the University of Florida; but the 55 acres which adjoin that tract are available, provided that title to the land can be obtained, so that the university will be justified in proceeding to construct the buildings which are needed there.

This bill, if enacted, would provide all the customary safeguards. In the first place, provision would be made that the land would be used for educational purposes only. In the second place, the act would contain a reversionary feature to the effect that the land could not be transferred to another or applied to any other use, and that if the land ceased to be used for educational purposes, as designed under this measure, it would immediately revert to the Federal Government. Furthermore, the mineral and oil rights are reserved to the Federal Government.

Mr. President, if ever there was a justifiable transfer of a small acreage of almost valueless land—and the very able report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shows that the land cost only $309 when bought in 1935, as a part of a resettlement project—this is such an instance.

I am perfectly willing to have this matter handled in any other way that may appear to be reasonable. One would be to provide that the cost price, namely, $309, be paid by the University of Florida to the Federal Government. In the event that were done, we would not expect the act to contain any reservation of mineral rights or any reversionary clause, because then the Federal Government would have been paid for the land.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I note that the Senator from Florida has indicated that the oil, gas, and mineral rights would be reserved to the Federal Government.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Let me ask this question: Is $309 the appraised value of

the property? I understand that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has consistently made objection to bills of the type of this one, on the ground that those who would receive the property should pay one-half of the actual or the determinable appraised value of the land.

Can the Senator from Florida give us any indication as to a comparison between the $309 and the actual value of the property?

Mr. HOLLAND. Having in mind the fact that realty values in general in Florida have increased, I would think that the actual, present value of this land is more than $309; but I do not know how much it is actually worth. This land is in an undeveloped section of our State. I do not suppose there has been any appraisal of the value of the land. As a result, I could do no more than guess wildly as to what the value may be.

However, the point is that the Senator from Oregon has not insisted in all cases upon including in such a measure a provision in regard to payment of one-half of the value. I am advised that there is on the calendar today a measure which would convey to his State of Oregon a more valuable tract without following the rule to which the Senator from Kansas has referred. I had not thought to object to that measure, because it seemed to me the reasons behind it were completely justifiable, just as they are in the case of the bill we are discussing at this time.

If the Senator from Kansas wishes to submit an amendment providing for the payment of one-half of the appraised value, that would be satisfactory to me, but not if there is to be coupled to such a provision a reversionary clause or a provision that the oil and mineral rights shall be reserved to the Federal Government, because if the State of Florida pays the value of the land, I think it should obtain the full title to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is operating under the 5-minute rule, and the time available in connection with this measure has expired.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Florida be allowed an additional 5 minutes, because I should like to ask some questions of him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be very glad to yield for the purpose of answering questions, Mr. President.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, a moment ago there were some interruptions on this side of the aisle, and I could not hear all of the latter part of the remarks of the Senator from Florida.

Do I correctly understand him to say that he has information regarding what might be the estimated actual value of the property involved in this instance?

Mr. HOLLAND. No; I stated that I would be unable to give anything except a wild estimate as to the value of the land, because I have not visited this location and actually seen the land, for it is in a wild and undeveloped part of the State. I do not think the value can be large, but I would not care to express any fixed opinion as to its value. Nevertheless, I feel that if the State of Florida is required to pay either half the value of the land or is required to pay the full price which was paid at the time when the land was acquired in the past, in either case the inclusion in the bill of a reservation of the oil and mineral rights or the inclusion of a reversionary clause to the effect that in certain situations the title would revert to the Federal Government, would not be fair.

In other words, I feel that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is no more entitled to take the position he is presumed to take in this case than he would be to take a similar position in the case of the lands which, under a measure now on the calendar, are proposed to go to his own State. The latter bill will come up a little later, of course.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will yield further, I wish to make a request. In view of the statements which have been made by the Senator from Florida, I now ask unanimous consent that this bill go to the foot of the calendar, with a view that we may be able to clear up some of these matters. I make that request if that course is agreeable to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, let me inquire what the Senator's request is; there was some confusion in the Chamber at the moment when he was making the request.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I ask unanimous consent that this bill go to the foot of the calendar, in view of the explanation made by the Senator from Florida. I make the request in order that probably before the bill is reached again, we shall be able, as a result of further discussion with the Senator from Florida, to reach some determination in regard to the value of this land.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I gladly accede to that request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE STATE OF TENNESSEE—BILL PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (S. 2959) authorizing the transfer to the State of Tennessee of certain lands in the Veterans' Administration Center, Mountain Home, Tenn., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and, by request, I must object, in behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]—let me say that I shall be glad to withhold the objection, in order that an explanation of the bill may be made.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I shall be glad to have objection withheld in order that an explanation may be made. Following the explanation, I shall ask that this bill take the course which has been taken by the bill preceding it on the calendar, namely, that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar and be taken up again when the foot of the calendar is reached.

I make this request because, although I appreciate anyone's interest in conserving the property of the United States Government, nevertheless it sometimes becomes a very minor undertaking on the part of the Senate, as I see it, to object to a bill of the character of this one.

Mr. President, this bill proposes the transfer from the Veterans' Administration to the State of Tennessee of 30 acres of land of a tract of approximately 485 acres. The purpose of the transfer is to afford facilities to enable the State of Tennessee to train its National Guard. The land is to be used strictly for military purposes. All mineral rights in the property are reserved to the Federal Government. The value of the property is said to be about $15,000.

In this bill there is also a provision that, in case of war or of national emergency, the entire property, together with all improvements which the State of Tennessee may make upon it, will revert to the United States.

Mr. President, it seems to me that objection to the bill is captious, and I therefore ask that it follow the other bill, at the conclusion of the calendar, for further consideration, if the distinguished President pro tempore, the author of the bill, wishes to follow it up today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Chair would like to state, also, that there is a provision in the bill under which, if the property were not maintained by the State of Tennessee, it would revert immediately to the United States Government.

Mr. GEORGE. It would revert immediately in that case, or in case of war. The property is to be used only by the State of Tennessee, and only for military purposes. There are two minor amendments. One relates to the description of the property, the other requires the State of Tennessee to maintain a small cemetery on the land at its own expense.

ADJUSTMENT OF CONFLICTS IN DIVORCE DECREES IN VARIOUS STATES—BILL PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (S. 1131) to further implement the full-faith-and-credit clause of the Constitution was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, this is a measure which was to be taken up and considered on the present call of the calendar. Since the able Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is not present, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar, to be considered at that point, or at some other time when the Senator from Nevada is present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CONSTRUCTION OF AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6336) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment on page 2, line 13, after the word "appropriated", to strike out "such sums of money as may be necessary," and insert "not to exceed $19,700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5048) relating to the statute of limitations in the case of criminal prosecutions of offenses arising under the internal revenue laws was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over, by request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard, and the bill goes over.

MRS. INEZ B. COPP AND GEORGE T. COPP

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, if we have finished with the five bills which had been set down for special consideration, I desire now to renew my unanimous-consent request, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 1183 and 1184, in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none. The clerk will state the first bill.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 646) for the relief of Mrs. Inez B. Copp and George T. Copp.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to have a brief explanation of these two measures in the RECORD on the part of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I can explain both measures in one statement, because but one incident is involved. Two men, with their wives, were driving past a military reservation in California, when a Marine Corps jeep, operated by a member of the Marine Corps, an enlisted man, came out of the gate, proceeded to the wrong side of the road, and crashed into the car which was being driven by Mr. Copp, resulting in injury to all the occupants of the car. All of them were more or less permanently injured.

One of the bills, House bill 646, involves $11,000; the other, $2,800, as I recall.

An action was brought under the Federal Tort Claims Act, in the Federal court. At that time, the attorney for the parties endeavored to obtain a record as to whether the car in question was at the time being used upon authorized business of the Government. Despite the fact that a trial had been had in a court-martial proceeding, in which the driver had been acquitted, it was stated in the findings of the court that he was on an authorized trip, on official business. Those records were subpenaed, but there was a refusal to turn them over to the Federal court. The case had to be dismissed without prejudice. That was more than a year ago. Upon ascertainment of that fact this bill was introduced. I succeeded in getting before the Judiciary Committee of the Senate a transcript of the court record, which showed that the driver of the truck was on authorized business for the Marine Corps, and that the claim, therefore, came under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

The purpose of these two bills is to save money for the Government and to remove an injustice which the parties have suffered by reason of the fact that the Marine Corps, through the Acting Commander, simply refused to furnish the records, and it was necessary that the case be dismissed, by reason of the fact that the contents of those records could not be proved. We have now had access to the records, as I stated to the Senator from Kansas. The jeep was plainly shown to have been used at the time in question upon authorized business. There is no question as to the negligence, there is no question that the sole cause of the collision was the negligence of the driver, and there is no question as to the extent of the damages. All that was amply proved. In a court action, a verdict might have been obtained in a larger amount.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to say that at the time the two bills were previously called, Calendar 1183, which is House bill 646, and Calendar 1184, which is House bill 643, the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] had some question about the very phase of these cases which has been cleared up by the statement of the able Senator from West Virginia. I felt that these two bills should be called up today, and I was happy to see them called up, because we had previously stated to the Senator from West Virginia that we wanted them to go over for further study, suggesting they be postponed until the next calendar call. The able Senator from West Virginia was not able to be here at that time, so I feel that in all fairness, not only to his interest in the bill, but to the parties involved in these two measures, they should be acted upon today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 646) for the relief of Mrs. Inez B. Copp and George T. Copp, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, line 7, after the word "California", to strike out the period and the words "The operator of such vehicle was not operating within the scope of his employment."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. VIVIAN M. GRAHAM AND HERBERT H. GRAHAM

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 643) for the relief of Mrs. Vivian M. Graham and Herbert H. Graham which has been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 8, after the word "California", to strike out the period and the words "The operator of such Marine Corps truck was not operating within the scope of his employment."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION IN WEATHER MODIFICATION

The bill (S. 2225) to create a committee to study and evaluate public and private experiments in weather modifications was announced as next in order.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask that that bill go over.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. CORDON. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this bill was originally introduced by several Senators. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and his staff did a tremendous amount of work to draft a bill which seemed to meet all objections. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] also joined in that effort. While I recognize the reason for the objection today and for the desire to have the bill go over, I should appreciate inserting in the RECORD at this point a statement which the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and his staff prepared, which deals with the liability features of this bill about which there has been some question.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROVISIONS OF S. 2225 (WEATHER CONTROL) AUTHORIZING EXPERIMENTATION

The liability feature of S. 2225 (sec. 10 (b)) has been objected to under the mistaken apprehension that it makes the Government potentially liable for large damage suits.

Actually, liability would be limited just to experimentation undertaken by the Federal Government.

If the agencies of the Government undertook weather experiments (and the Departments of Interior, Commerce, and Defense have already done so under different authorization), the Government would be liable for damages that might be caused by this experimentation. The liability provisions of S. 2225 simply provide that the Government can, if it wishes, assume liability for experiments that contractors carry out on behalf

of the Government—by indemnifying these contractors on the Government's terms.

Few, if any, of these reasearch projects would be large-scale outdoor experiments of the type that private concerns and organizations have been carrying on freely. Most, if not all, of the research and experiments, undertaken by contractors for the Government, would involve no risk whatsoever. Typical of these experiments might be:

1. Work leading to development of a mechanical nuclei counter.
2. Work leading to development of statistical methods for evaluation.
3. Study of electrical charges in the atmosphere.
4. Various controlled laboratory experiments.
5. Fog-cutting experiments.
6. Outdoor experiments over the sea or in remote land areas.

However, section 10 (b) was put into the bill for a good reason. There might be some experiments involving some degree or risk which should be carried out in the national interest.

For example, there have been suggestions that seeding methods might be used to break up hurricanes. A large company considered such experimentation off the coast of Florida only a few years ago but decided against it because of the risk. Conceivably weather treatment might divert a hurricane so that instead of doing $1,000,000 damage in one area it did $100,000 damage in a smaller or less developed area. In such a case the inhabitants of the latter area might be able to establish that the damage to their property resulted from the experimentation. A private company would shy away from such an experiment because of this risk. However, the knowledge that hurricanes could be treated and modified would be of the highest significance and would ultimately prove of tremendous public benefit.

To the small extent that the Government does assume liability for its own experiments carried out by contractors, according to the terms of S. 2225, it should assume this liability. If weather-control methods can produce large-scale results, it is in the public's interest to develop this information at the earliest possible moment.

Why should the Government sponsor weather research and experimentation?

Private concerns and institutions are now carrying out this research and experimentation. However, these concerns and institutions are not likely to perform some types of research that is immediately needed and should be done.

1. Some types of research must be done so that the Advisory Committee on Weather Control, created by S. 2225, can properly evaluate private experiments. Certain instruments must be developed and statistical methods devised.

2. Much basic research must be done before judgments on weather control measures can be made. Private concerns are particularly interested in practical application but not so much in basic or theoretical research.

Weather control is a matter of the broadest public concern. The small cost of weather experiments compared to the potentially tremendous benefits to the public justify efforts to accelerate research and experimentation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, it is quite clear that there must be a limitation on Government experimentation and that there must be the right on the part of the Government to contract with a private contractor to perform weather experimentation, and with provision for suits to be filed against the Government and not against the contractor.

An example used was the case of a hurricane which had started out to sea from the Florida coast. For some reason the hurricane turned back against the coast. Its force was dissipated very quickly, but it could have caused millions, perhaps hundreds of millions, of dollars damage, and the private contractor, a large corporation, would have found itself in a bad situation.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico knows I am very much interested in this proposed legislation. I asked that the bill go over predicated on the fact that I had not had an opportunity to study the committee amendment. I am hopeful that when I look into it further I can either offer an amendment or withdraw the objection and ask that the bill may come up on another call of the calendar.

Mr. ANDERSON. The question of liability was not raised by the Senator from Oregon. Other Senators had raised it, and I was much interested in the telegram which the Senator from South Dakota helped to prepare.

I should like to say that the Senator from Oregon was most helpful to the group who were trying to find some method of determining whether practical use could be derived from weather modification. Temperatures are rising, particularly in the intermountain States, and there is a shortage of water in every stream fed from those areas. We think that weather modification offers some possibility of help. We all appreciate the fine attitude which the Senator from Oregon has shown; and I want to express my personal gratification for the work which the Senator from South Dakota has done.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that I have had certain misgivings about the open-end phase of this matter. I was exceptionally glad to hear what the Senator from New Mexico said with reference to working out that phase of it.

I should like to say on behalf of the junior Senator from South Dakota that he has left a suggestion with the senior Senator from Kansas that if there was objection to the bill the Senator from Kansas would ask unanimous consent that it be included in the next calendar call if that would permit sufficient time to enable the distinguished Senator who has just spoken on the measure to work out some of the other questions.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think that is a fine suggestion, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to see the bill included in the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS TEMPORARILY PASSED OVER

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, following Senate bill 2225, all the bills down to Calendar 1502 have been reported by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now start with Calendar 1502, House bill 5693, and that the bills which I have requested be passed over temporarily may be called at the conclusion of the call of the calendar when the Senator from Nevada will be present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the next bill on the calendar in accordance with the request of the Senator from Arizona.

TARIFF ON TUNA FISH

The bill (H. R. 5693) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to impose certain duties upon the importation of tuna fish, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I think this is a bill which should be discussed at greater length than it can be discussed under the present 5-minute rule. It is a bill, however, which should be given preferential treatment, and I sincerely hope that the majority leader and the policy committee will assign it for hearing. It would probably take not more than 2 or 3 hours, at the most. It is an important bill to the tuna fishing fleet on the west coast and to the tuna fishing industry. I do not think it can be disposed of under the 5-minute rule. I hope the Senator from Arizona will assign a hearing to this bill at any convenient time, for an hour or so, and I think the bill can then be disposed of.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, we shall be glad to consider the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be passed over.

EXEMPTION OF COCONUT OIL FROM ADDITIONAL TAX

The bill (H. R. 7188) to provide that the additional tax imposed by section 2470 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code shall not apply in respect of coconut oil produced in, or produced from, materials grown in the territory of the Pacific islands was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this measure?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this bill comes from the House of Representatives, and was recommended by the Senate Finance Committee without any dissent. The bill would simply extend to coconut oil derived from copra, originating in the trust territory of the Pacific Islands, the same exemption from the additional processing tax of 2 cents a pound imposed by section 2470 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code now provided with respect to coconut oil derived from copra originating in the Philippine Islands or in any possession of the United States. The basic processing tax of 3 cents a pound imposed under section 2470 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code would still apply.

The exemption applies only to the additional 2 percent processing tax in which the growers of soybeans and cottonseed, in my section, as well as in other sections of the country, are very much interested. On inquiry, we find that the total amount involved would not be in excess of $200,000 a year. So that the

tax is negligible. The bill would simply put the trust islands in the Pacific on the same basis as the Philippine Islands, so far as the additional tax is concerned, leaving the regular processing tax of 3 percent to apply.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 7188) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPEAL OF ALASKA RAILROADS TAX

The bill (H. R. 156) to repeal the Alaska railroads tax was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this bill provides for the repeal of a tax in the nature of an excise tax on Alaska railroads of 1 percent upon gross income. Inadvertently, it is believed, that the tax was not repealed in the act of September 7, 1949, which repealed all similar taxes in Alaska. It will not cost the Federal Treasury anything, because, under the law as it exists, the tax, if collected, goes back to the Territory of Alaska. The Treasury Department and the Interior Department have asked that the tax be removed.

The act of September 7, 1949, passed by the Eighty-first Congress, entitled "An act to repeal section 460 of the act of March 3, 1899, as amended," providing for certain license taxes in the Territory of Alaska, repealed all other similar taxes, but inadvertently, this particular tax on the Alaska railroads was not repealed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 156) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRESENTATION OF DISTINGUISHED FLYING CROSS TO COL. ROSCOE TURNER

The bill (H. R. 696) to authorize the President of the United States to present the Distinguished Flying Cross to Col. Roscoe Turner was announced as next in order.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, this bill seeks to recognize the outstanding national contribution of a great American patriot by way of sincere compliment to Col. Roscoe Turner. I wish to offer for the RECORD several paragraphs submitted to the House Committee on Armed Services by Eugene M. Zuckert, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, when he wrote, under date of February 5, 1951, in support of this bill the following:

> The purpose of the bill is to authorize the presentation of the Distinguished Flying Cross to Col. Roscoe Turner in recognition of his meritorious achievements in and his contributions to the advancement of the science of aerial flight.
>
> Under the existing law, such award cannot be made administratively, inasmuch as Colonel Turner has never held a federally recognized commission, his military status having arisen out of appointment to the staffs of the governors of various States.
>
> Colonel Turner has spent the greater part of his life in the development and improvement of aerial science in America. His name has become intimately identified with the progress of aviation, both here and abroad, and his exploits and accomplishments have been many and varied. He has won the Thompson Trophy Race three times; on three occasions he placed third in the Thompson Trophy Race; he won second place in the speed division of the MacRobertson International Air Race; he has placed first, second, and third in various runnings of the Bendix Transcontinental Air Race, and is the only person who has placed in all three positions in that race; and he has broken the transcontinental air-speed record on seven separate occasions.
>
> Colonel Turner has merited fully the award of the Distinguished Flying Cross by the very substantial contributions which he has made to the progress and development of the science of aviation.
>
> The Department of the Air Force, on behalf of the Secretary of Defense, recommends the enactment of this bill.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has an intimate knowledge of, and a personal high regard for, Colonel Turner. I know the Senator from California is distressed by his inability to be present today. I am grateful to be able to speak in his name these few words of compliment about one of the finest Americans of our time.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I certainly shall not object to this bill, but I wish to add my word to that of the distinguished Senator from Washington in the interest of the enactment of the bill. It falls to the lot of the senior Senator from Kansas to know Colonel Roscoe Turner personally, and something about the fine service he has rendered. I am happy to see this recognition come to this distinguished gentleman.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 696) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SHOSHONE INDIAN MISSION SCHOOL LANDS—CANCELLATION OF IRRIGATION MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION CHARGES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2646) to cancel irrigation maintenance and operation charges on the Shoshone Indian Mission School lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 2, line 3, after the word "owners", to insert "but in no event to exceed a period of 5 years", so as to make the bill read:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That all unpaid irrigation maintenance and operation charges against the lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation, owned by the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America and described as the north half of the southwest quarter, the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter, and northwest quarter of the southeast quarter, section 8, township 1 south, range 1 west, Wind River meridian, Wyoming, are hereby canceled and no such charges shall hereafter accrue against said lands so long as they continue to be held by the present owners, but in no event to exceed a period of 5 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I have an amendment to offer to this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Wyoming.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> That all unpaid irrigation maintenance and operation charges against the lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation, owned by the trustees of church property of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Wyoming, a Wyoming corporation, and described as the north half of the southwest quarter, the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter, the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter, section 8, township 1 south, range 1 west, Wind River meridian, Wyoming, are hereby canceled and the accrual of such charges shall be suspended for such period, not to exceed 5 years, as said lands continue to be held by the present owners.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the junior Senator from Wyoming if the amendment undertakes merely to correct a mistake in the name of the church organization?

Mr. HUNT. That is all the amendment accomplishes. It is simply to correct the name of the church organization.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming tell us how much this will cost the Federal Government?

Mr. HUNT. I shall be glad to. I think perhaps a brief history would be helpful to the Senator from Louisiana.

This bill has to do with approximately 160 acres of land belonging to an Episcopal Church mission known as the Shoshone Indian Church Mission, which was established by Dr. Roberts, an Episcopalian minister, in the late 1880's.

Dr. Roberts constructed a ditch to these Indian mission lands, and also built a mission. Years later the Government decided to enlarge the irrigation facilities in this area, and made arrangements with Dr. Roberts whereby the Government would utilize his ditch. In return for utilizing his ditch, the Government agreed to deliver to Dr. Roberts water for his mission. That arrangement continued for a great many years—I think for about 30 years, possibly more.

At a later date the Bureau of Indian Affairs suggested to Dr. Roberts that perhaps he had received sufficient benefit for giving this ditch to the Government, and that payments would start, and payments did start, and the doctor continued to make them. There are no payments in arrears.

Year before last this wonderful, fine gentleman passed on, at the age of 93, leaving a maiden daughter still living in the mission and teaching a small class of Indian girls.

The income from the land is simply not sufficient to pay the current water costs. Understand, there are no back charges; they have been paid in full. In view of the fact that her father turned over the ditch to the Government, the daughter has requested that the charges be canceled for a period of 5 years. I think the maiden lady, now quite mature herself, having no income at all except the small amount she derives from teaching a few Indian children, should be entitled to receive water free for a period of 5 years. The cost will be $251 a year.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is to last for only 5 years?

Mr. HUNT. It is to last for 5 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. Thereafter, the land will be subject to the same charges that are now sought to be imposed?

Mr. HUNT. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PER CAPITA PAYMENT TO RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS

The bill (H. R. 6133) to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the proposed per capita payment to the Red Lake Indian Band is from their own funds. There is more than $1,000,000 in the fund, and the per capita payment of $100 would draw out $290,000 from the $1,000,000 fund. It is their own money, accumulated from earnings from the saw mill, the sale of timber, and other income from the reservation.

I personally visited the Indian Reservation last fall, and I definitely feel that the Indians are entitled to draw from this fund. The per capita payment will aid them in the preparation of their gardens and in the preparation of their fishing equipment, which will permit them to earn their living expenses during the coming winter. I certainly hope that this bill will be passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 2, line 3, after the word "prescribe", to insert a colon and the following: *"Provided*, That such payment shall be made first from any funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Red Lake Band of the Chippewa Indians, of Minnesota, drawing interest at the rate of 5 per centum and thereafter from funds drawing 4 percent."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. ANN MORRISON

The bill (H. R. 1842) for the relief of Mrs. Ann Morrison was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to request an explanation of this measure. The Senator from Kansas is somewhat in doubt as to the precedent which might be established by the bill. I am not questioning the merits of the bill. I am wondering if it would go so far as to indicate that if one allowed his policy to lapse and later sent in his payment, the bill would establish a precedent for reinstatement of policies in other cases.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this bill came to the Senate Finance Committee after the House had passed it. It was not considered by the Veterans Committee in the House, although it deals with veterans' insurance. It was considered by the Judiciary Committee.

The Committee on Finance looked into the bill with some care. We thought, contrary to the recommendation of the Veterans' Administrator, that there was a basis on which this insurance policy could be paid.

It seems that the insured did not intend to permit his policy to lapse, but that he had a limited time, a fixed time under the policy, within which he might renew his policy. On the very day that he received notice that he could renew his policy, he had sent a check to pay the premium which was due, which indicated that he was doing something to keep his insurance alive. However, he died on the day the notice was received. Evidently the House felt that under the circumstances in the case the insurance policy could be paid.

Of course, the bill does run counter to the policies of the Veterans' Administration. It does establish a precedent. There is no doubt about it. The policy had actually lapsed, but within the period within which the veteran could renew his policy as a matter of right, he had forwarded a check, but did not ask for reinstatement of his policy, presumably because, as I have already stated, he died on that date, before he had received the notice from the Veterans' Administration.

The committee felt that, in the circumstances, it would be just to pay this insurance.

The committee reported an amendment to the bill which undertakes to preserve the order of payments under the policy as it was originally taken out, that is, to preserve the priority of the beneficiaries. Under the bill as it passed the House, the entire amount of the insurance would have been payable to the claimant in this case. The committee was of the opinion that that should not be done, but that if the bill were to be enacted it should preserve the priority of the beneficiaries named in the original policy.

I am very frank to say, on behalf of the committee, that while the committee decided to report the bill favorably, it did so with some misgivings, because it does constitute a precedent.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I appreciate the explanation by the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the national service life insurance in the amount of $10,000 (N-3187200) granted to the late Leonard Morrison, who died on June 25, 1948, shall be held and considered to have been in effect at the time of his death. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall pay such insurance in accordance with the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, except that any payments made as a result of enactment of this act shall be made directly from the national service life insurance appropriation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

DEATH OF ALBERT DAVIS LASKER

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on Friday last, while the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] was en route to Geneva as our official delegate to the ILO, death called a man for whom the Senator from Montana felt deep affection and respect. I refer to Albert D. Lasker, a very great American known, I am sure, to many of our colleagues. He was Chairman of the Maritime Commission during World War I.

Burdened with grief, yet acutely conscious of the fact that Albert Lasker's passing should not go unmentioned here, the Senator from Montana wrote down some of his thoughts on the great contributions which Mr. Lasker has made to our way of life and on how much he has meant to our country.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these words, which the Senator from Montana would have spoken to us today if he were here, be set forth in the body of the RECORD as a tribute to a fine and worthy man whose loss we mourn.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALBERT DAVIS LASKER, AMERICAN

(By Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana)

On the morning of Memorial Day—a day set aside for paying homage to our heroic dead—a truly great American passed on to his reward. As his friend, I feel a deep sense of personal loss. But as a citizen I feel even more deeply that in his passing our entire Nation has lost something fine and of great value. I refer, Mr. President, to Albert Davis Lasker, an American of whom all Americans can be proud. If, as has been well suggested, this country were to give awards of merit to outstanding citizens for distinguished service to their country, then Albert Lasker would

be one of the first to be so honored; for, truly his services have been selfless and unending. His contributions to the development of our modern American economy, to the building of better understanding of one another amongst our people, and to the creation of a fuller, healthier, happier life for our people have been innumerable and of incalculable value.

Mr. President, I am known here in the Senate as a fighter for the rights of labor, for the rights of the working man and woman, for the farmer, and for the small-business man. Whatever legislative talents I may have, I have devoted to advancing the interests of those many millions of Americans who, doing our country's work, producing its food, and operating its small plants and business establishments, make up the backbone of this country. Yet today, Mr. President, I speak with grief and a sense of terrible loss not of a worker in industry, nor a farmer, nor a small-business man, but of a great American capitalist—of a man whose wealth reached such proportions as might seem truly awesome to most of our people. But, Mr. President, in so doing, I shall be speaking of a man who, in the acquisition and utilization of that wealth, proved himself in all respects one of history's finest figures.

Albert Lasker was, as he was fond of saying about the many progressive measures he supported, as American as corn or apple pie. He was born into a Texas family and came of age just at the time when our great theoretical pundits were insisting that America's frontiers were gone. Albert Lasker, with all those dynamic qualities so apparent among our friends from Texas, knew the claim to be nonsense. Geographic frontiers might well have seemed to be closing down, but with a vision which few men of business or industry had in those days at the turn of the century, Albert Lasker knew that so long as we held true to the traditions of our Nation, men would forever be able to find new frontiers for exploration and development. He, himself, proved it to be true both as regards our business world and our methods of doing business. As regards the first, he knew in his heart, and all his life proved in his actions, that our economy—our ability to produce, distribute, and to consume goods could be expanded almost without limit. This, of course, was an idea sensed by many who because of their strict adherence to outworn methods of doing business were unable to bring the idea to fruition. But Albert Lasker knew that to achieve new frontiers in business and in industry it would be essential to develop new techniques, new methods of doing business, new relationships between the various groups that participate in a well-rounded economy. Growing up at a time when history seemed to indicate that power and wealth and business success came most certainly to those who were ruthless in their exploitation of others, Albert Lasker was one of the first great American men of business to prove that wealth could be acquired, not through the exploitation of the men who did the actual work of production in the shops or in the office, but by working with them: by raising wages, by shortening hours of labor, by building respect for the individual dignity, the integrity, and the right to happiness and a decent life for every man participating in an industrial enterprise. He was, in short, one of the first of our modern and enlightened men of business. It was through his sort of attitude and his type of operation that our new, prosperous, and always-expanding American economy came into being.

When Albert Lasker entered the world of business, American technological genius had already developed to an amazingly high point our ability to produce; but earning power was low, our means of distribution were relatively primitive, and the average producer's horizons were limited to his immediate community. Albert Lasker clearly saw that the next frontier to be crashed was that of making the results of our technological genius available to the tens of millions of Americans throughout the length and breadth of our country, rather than leaving them available only to the few. Knowing this, he translated his interest in a wider distribution of the good things of life to the field of advertising. He was one of the small handful of men who created those concepts of modern advertising which lie at the heart of our present system of mass production and the mass distribution of goods.

Starting his advertising career with the firm of Lord & Thomas in 1898 at $10 a week, Albert Lasker rose in 12 years to sole ownership of a firm which under his control placed more than $750,000,000 in advertising. During his management of Lord & Thomas, modern advertising as we know it today was born. Advertising as nothing but a way of keeping a name before the public was transformed into an instrumentality for intelligent mass education on values and productiveness. A business medium once scorned by many large firms became an agency now used by every concern as the method for making the products of American inventiveness available to everyone everywhere. Advertising, which did a total business of about twelve millions a year when Albert Lasker first joined Lord & Thomas, was talking in terms of billions when he retired from the field. Modern advertising which has meant so much to our Nation's prosperity owes a great debt to Albert Lasker, the man who taught it to think of itself as salesmanship in print. Through his work American business and industry learned the absurdity of producing on the assumption that only the well-born, prominent, or well-to-do of our citizens would ever be able to afford more than the bare necessities of life. Albert Lasker helped prove what we in America now take for granted and which the rest of the world is slowly learning. He was one of the first to insist that when the working men and women of a country are paid what they are worth, when they are able to buy what they produce, when decent houses and cars and refrigerators and radios, and all the things we now take for granted are made available to the many, then everyone—worker and businessman, consumers, industrialists, managers, stockholders—everyone concerned profits.

I repeat, Mr. President, I am speaking today with deep affection of an American capitalist, of one who acquired wealth by not thinking of how to acquire wealth; of a man to whom wealth came because he thought instead of how better to produce, to package, to distribute, to promote for the benefit of all his fellow citizens those things which might make life better, easier, and richer. Because of his new approach, Mr. President, Albert Lasker was a tremendously successful man of business, a man of many and varied interests, a man of power and influence in almost every phase of our Nation's economic life throughout those all-important decades of this century when our new economy was developing. But, Mr. President, throughout this period and throughout his life Albert Lasker was anything but the popular concept of the dynamic, aggressive, successful man of business. He was a driving force. He was most certainly aggressive. He was without doubt successful. But he was most certainly not the single-minded character thinking of nothing but profit and loss which we so commonly associate in our minds with the concept of the great businessman. Albert Lasker never let himself become absorbed in the immediate job to the exclusion of all else. Never did he sacrifice his heart, his soul, or his family to the objective of achieving business or financial success. Albert Lasker was at all times a whole man. He was interested and well versed in the arts, a lover of fine books and paintings. He was one of the greatest patrons of the American theater and Mr. President, let me stress this—because strangely enough so many superficially sophisticated people seem to think that these things somehow do not go together—let me stress the fact that in addition to his devotion to the arts and to the legitimate stage, he was also, as I know to my pleasure, a lover of western movies and devoted to America's national sport, baseball. It was Albert Lasker who, when baseball was threatened with complete collapse as a result of the White Sox scandals in 1919, devised the Lasker plan under which our national pastime was completely reorganized and Commissioner Landis placed in charge of maintaining the integrity of the baseball world. Never since have those young Americans, whose first stirrings of loyalty and heroism were aroused by the Babe Ruths and the Lou Gehrigs of their day, been let down.

Yes, Mr. President, Albert Lasker was truly a well-rounded man. If his appetite for achievement was as unquenchable as his appetite for knowledge and for serving others, so, too, was his appetite for enlightened enjoyment. He loved every aspect of life that brought use or beauty. He loved people. He loved parties, theater, fine china, movies—even bad movies—and good food. He loved horseback riding, poker, swimming, and dancing. He loved to talk and he was one of the most explosively stimulating and eloquent talkers I have ever met. In short, Albert Lasker was a man who loved life, who seized it eagerly and adventuresomely, who laughed as he gave it value and meaning, and who saw to it that as he lived his life, life became a finer thing for others, too.

I have spoken, Mr. President, of those attitudes of mind and those qualities which went into the making of this great American citizen and which characterized his attainment of success. I should like to point out as another reason why this country shall miss him so, that Albert Lasker was also a man who was at all times conscious of the responsibilities which should attend success. Nowadays many of our people are making more and more money as a result partly of their own efforts but in large measure because of the great productivity and the genius for work which characterizes all of our people. All too often these same individuals are taking full-page ads in newspapers and periodicals to whine and protest about the great taxes they are paying and are plaguing their legislators on Capitol Hill in an unending drive to reduce taxes at no matter what cost to our economy or to our national defense. Albert Lasker was an American who not only paid taxes in amounts which very few others in this country have ever been called upon to pay, but a man who gloried in the opportunity. I find it hard to tell you what a thrill it was for me when I heard this man, whom at that time I did not know well, tell our Committee on Labor and Public Welfare how happy he was to be able, through paying taxes, to discharge in part his obligations to the Nation which had enabled him to succeed and to live well. He, not I, Mr. President, spoke of "the opportunity to pay taxes." He was an example of that type of businessman citizen to whom the Nation in its turn owes much; for so long as Albert Lasker's ideas as to the proper relationship between the man of business, his government, and his fellow citizen obtains, then we in this country need never fear the upsurge of those feelings which in other lands threaten the complete extinction of our capitalistic society. Albert Lasker was a businessman, Mr. President, a tough and aggressive man in business, but he was an intelligent businessman, too, and as such he was a citizen of these United States first and a

businessman secondly. America could well use millions of citizen-businessmen like him.

In paying my profound respects to Albert Lasker, Mr. President, I must make mention also of the way of life he chose for himself in his later years. Albert Lasker was one of those few men, successful in the world of business, who knew how to apply the rule of the golden mean to his own life as well as advocating it for others. Having reached the pinnacle of success in the business world, Albert Lasker decided that life held other things of equal importance. At a time when similarly situated men all too often can think of nothing else to do with themselves other than to increase their power and their influence, Albert Lasker decided that the time had come to turn his talents from servicing a few score advertising clients to servicing 150,000,000 clients—the people of America. Having built the firm of Lord & Thomas to a place of preeminence in the advertising world to a point where it alone was placing between $30,000,000 and $50,000,000 worth of advertising a year, Albert Lasker, to the stunned surprise of the advertising world, casually scrapped it in 1942. He had simply decided to devote the balance of his life to doing as much for the people of this Nation and the world as he felt they had done for him. Seeking a cause worthy of his skill and energy, Albert Lasker remembered the one thing that had caused the most intense heartbreak in his own personal life and which time and time again had brought suffering and anguish into the lives of his friends.

He thought of the ravages caused by disease and illness. Of disease which could have been prevented but wasn't. Of disease for which treatments were known but which were not available to those in need. And of diseases of which we know little or nothing and on which we had spent millions for palliatives but only pennies on the research which might teach us their causes and their cures. He thought of these things and of the ravages they had wrought in the lives of his friends. Parenthetically, Mr. President, may I say that when I speak of his friends I speak of people in all walks of life. To Albert Lasker the copy boy in his office, clerks, cab drivers, his barber, cooks, gardeners, and maids were as much his friends as were the artists, the magnates, and the statesmen who were privileged to share his table. Thinking of these people and of the one recurring, devastating, and unpredictable threat which hung over their lives, Albert Lasker, aided, encouraged, and joined in his objective by his wife, Mary Lasker, a wonderful woman of exceptional charm, intelligence, drive, and purposefulness, decided to devote himself to work in the field of health. Setting up the foundation which bears their names, Albert and Mary Lasker plunged into the task of attacking disease and the problems it leaves in its wake. It is to them more than to anyone else that we owe the great popular awakening of interest in this country to the possibilities of sooner or later finding the cause and the cure for such terrible scourges of mankind as cancer and heart disease, arthritis and rheumatism, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, and blindness. It was they who, being shocked to learn that while we were spending untold millions on the care of victims of these dread diseases we were spending but pennies trying to find out how to prevent them, transmitted that sense of shock to all our people and to their Government. Their work in the field of health was as effective as was his earlier work: To it he contributed the same spate of new ideas and fresh points of view that had made his advertising career so spectacularly successful.

The Lasker Foundation gives grants for medical research and in other fields and makes awards for outstanding contributions to health through medical research and administration. Several health agencies, including the American Public Health Association and the National Committee for Mental Hygiene designate the recipients through awards committees.

The Lasker award quickly came to be regarded as America's top medical honor—the accepted Oscar of the medical profession. Among the winners have been Dr. Thomas Parran, former Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service; Dr. William Menninger, of the Menninger Foundation and former chief of psychiatry for the United States Army; Dr. G. Brock Chisholm, of Canada, now the Director of the World Health Organization; Dr. John Rawlings Rees, of England; Dr. Abraham Stone; Dr. Thomas Francis; Dr. Fred Soper; Dr. Carl Cori, later a Nobel prize winner; Dr. Philip Hench; and Dr. E. C. Kendall, who won the Nobel prize for use of cortisone.

Among recipients of special grants from the Lasker Foundation to aid them in their researches have been Sir Howard Florey, the codiscoverer of penicillin; Dr. Selman A. Waksman, discoverer of streptomycin; and Dr. Charles Huggins, first to discover that the use of the female sex hormones would produce a palliative effect on cancer of the prostate, and, in some cases, cures after 5 years of treatment.

Mr. and Mrs. Lasker in 1944 proposed to the American Cancer Society, which had never conducted a major national campaign or raised any funds for research, that they would supply funds for such a campaign in 1945, provided 25 percent of the amount collected was devoted to cancer research. Until that time, the entire amount spent nationally for cancer research was less than $1,100,000 from Federal and private sources.

It was as a result of that offer and the implementation of that plan, in which they were most active, that national interest in cancer research was awakened.

In 1944 the American Cancer Society raised $850,000 nationally and none of the money was used for research. In 1945, over $4,000,000 was raised and 25 percent or $1,000,000 spent on research. Since then the American Cancer Society alone has raised $20,000,000 for cancer research through 1951.

As a result of the public education resulting from the campaigns of the American Cancer Society, the United States Public Health Service National Cancer Institute has had an annual increase of funds for both research, education and control from $550,000 in 1945 to $17,000,000 in 1952.

Albert Lasker, in 1946, devised and submitted to Michael Reese Hospital in Chicago a proposal for the establishment of a teaching and research institute for psychosomatic and psychiatric training and research, the first of its kind to be established in the center of the United States, and in itself an important experiment in the development of psychosomatic medicine. With his two daughters, he contributed a substantial amount toward the research and building fund.

Supporting their belief in the great need for health insurance, the Laskers had earlier helped to organize and had contributed to the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York and the Group Health Insurance, Inc., two of the country's most important voluntary health insurance groups.

They, with friends, established and were active in the National Heart Committee, which organization was successful in inducing Congress to pass the National Heart Act in June of 1948. This legislation established a National Heart Institute in the United States Public Health Service, and through research, education and control, provides for the first broad Federal attack on the No. 1 killer of the citizens of the United States.

Such, Mr. President, were the fine and worthy objectives to which Albert Lasker devoted his remarkable abilities during these later and anything but declining years. Vigorous, intellectual, alert, and agggressively purposeful up until the moment of his final illness, Albert Lasker spent the decade since 1942 discharging what he and only he would have regarded as a debt of obligation; attempting with all his great heart to repay humanity for having, consciously or unconsciously, provided him the millieu and the opportunities through which to bring his talents and his greatness to full fruition. Only a man truly humble in heart despite the outshowing trappings of affluence could have regarded it as a debt. Only a man of great character and conscience and understanding could have called on himself to discharge such a self-imposed obligation. And only Albert Lasker, with the constant aid and guidance and encouragement of Mary Lasker, could have discharged it so well. Now, having so well paid what he called his debt to society, Albert Lasker has left us—a Nation and a world forever in his debt.

Mr. President, I have tried to tell the Congress and, through the Congress, the people of the United States what manner of man my good friend Albert Lasker was. I have but sketched the methods and the attitudes through which he achieved success for himself and for the business world in which he moved. I have given but the barest glimpse into the ways through which he reacted to that success. I could go on for hours recounting detailed instances of his magnanimity, of his understanding, and of his character. I could speak at length of that one trait of character which above all else we need in our men of prominence and power; a trait which is so often lacking in many such people but which Albert Lasker displayed consistently—a willingness to change one's mind when confronted with new facts; a refusal to be hidebound by a professed opinion or a political dogma; an insistence on living the truth despite past truths. For this insistence on being intellectually honest with oneself at no matter what the cost in changed opinion and so-called loss of face also marked the Albert Lasker whom we knew. In his early days a leader in the fight against our food and drug law because, in the economic atmosphere of the early 1900's, he believed it could lead to socialism, Albert Lasker later insisted on voluntarily testifying to the Senate that the law had proved a boon to the food and drug industry. Once an active isolationist along with Harold Ickes—another great American with whom he had much in common—later as he saw the developments in our changing world interrelationships, he became an ardent advocate of the idea that we live in one world and that, if that world is to endure, each nation must consciously play its part as one of many; of the idea that the motto "E pluribus unum," which is inscribed above the Senate Chamber, just as it applies now to 48 States rather than to Thirteen Colonies, must in the future apply to all the nations of the world rather than to these United States alone. And, with that same high regard for fact and total disregard for innate prejudices, this man, who had once been assistant to the chairman of the Republican National Committee, supported Franklin Delano Roosevelt and voted for Harry Truman once he was convinced that the party of his youth was more devoted to its myths than its mind, more concerned with profits than with people.

Such was the intellectual honesty that characterized Albert Lasker, Mr. President. And that is but one of the many admirable facets of his character which meant so much to his friends and on which those friends could discourse for hours. But rather than so discourse, permit me to conclude this tribute to a great American by speaking very briefly about how his life, now that it is over,

can still have meaning to the causes he believed important.

We have been speaking of a most brilliant, most fascinating, and most fabulous man. A man of great soul, a man of great decency, a man of great integrity. And we have been speaking too of a great capitalist; of a man who through his own efforts and ability became possessed of great wealth and yet a man who, if he had not had a penny, would nevertheless have left his mark on the world. And this man was an American capitalist. One of our greatest, one of our finest. One whose life story should be told by every means and through every agency to all those peoples who in this time of fear and uncertainty and warping of values have been led to doubt the validity and promise of freedom as we in America know it. For his life story would be a revelation to those now swayed by Stalinism. Here, in Albert Lasker, peoples of the world from Indonesia through Israel, in Italy and France and Britain have had an opportunity to see modern capitalism and the truly great American capitalist at their very best. In his life story others not fortunate enough to know him in his lifetime could and would learn how inventiveness, brilliance, industry, courage, and integrity put to work in a free society to make life easier, better, and richer for millions of people paid off in millions of dollars, in social and political prestige, and in power. This would be half of the picture of modern, enlightened capitalism—the making of a modern capitalist. And the other half of the picture—that which also makes a mockery of the mouthings of Marxism—lies in the use which Albert Lasker made of the wealth, the position, and the power thus honestly acquired. For how did Albert Lasker use these things? Not for personal gain, not in a blind search for more and more power, not to exploit his fellows, but rather to make life longer, more abundant, and infinitely richer for 150,000,000 of his fellow Americans.

It is on this note, Mr. President, that I would close. Not with a recitation of the soft-rounded, fulsome adjectives which occur as one thinks of a departed friend. They would most certainly apply and might well be uttered in all sincerity as regards Albert Lasker. But the friend I knew would not like that. I think the Albert Lasker I so well remember would rather that we who are still living turn our attention to furthering the causes to which he had been devoted. And so, now that his innate modesty no longer stands in the way, I would close with a suggestion that we take his name and his life story and make use of it to advance that one cause which meant most to him—the cause of freedom. Specifically, Mr. President, I would make a suggestion to his many friends in the advertising world. I would suggest that, insofar as they may influence the writers of those full-page advertisements which, as "institutional advertising" so unnecessarily attempt to sell the American people on the American way of life, they use their influence to have those pages recount the story of Albert Lasker, leader in business, leader in citizenship.

I make this suggestion—and I make it too to those who write our Voice of America and other freedom programs—in all sincerity. I make it not because I think the average man or woman in America need be told this story of this one man's rise to fortune and of his devotion to his country and its institutions. They will like it, of course. They will find it heartening and heart-warming reading. But they are, by and large, people who know and are thoroughly sold on the abundance of opportunity which America and its free institutions hold out to all. The American people will glory in the story of Albert Lasker's life. They will see in it the embodiment of the finest things to which they aspire. But it is not for them that I make the suggestion that his story be thus set forth.

It is rather with two very specific groups in mind that I take up advocacy of this cause. The first consists of our own American men of business and of industry. For many such, life could be far more rewarding if they knew of and patterned their own lives on those principles to which Albert Lasker clung so steadfastly. In his life they can see a man who most certainly shared to the full their own terrific drive for achievement, for power, for success. But in the life of Albert Lasker they will also find that not only can these things be had as concomitants of decency and integrity but also how they can be used so as to give one's own life a new and precious depth of meaning and satisfaction while at the same time giving life new savor to millions of their fellow men. The men who wield power and influence in the financial and business life of our country cannot learn too quickly that only insofar as they use these things they have won here in America for America and its people as did Albert Lasker—only insofar as they pattern their conduct on his—will the institutions to which they owe so much be able to withstand the attacks to which they are now subjected. It is for this reason that I hope the Albert Lasker story will be so publicized as to reach every man of business in this country and more especially every young man setting out in the business world. If from Albert Lasker's life they learn but one idea—his insistence that "a man can pay too much for money"—our efforts will have been well rewarded.

The second group to whom I would have Albert Lasker's story told includes the peoples of Europe on both sides of the iron curtain. Those who, plagued by war and its evil aftermath, have begun to doubt the validity of democratic processes and the decencies which can characterize enlightened capitalism. Those who have begun to doubt and those who, having succumbed to doubt, have freedom to regain. To these people the plain and straight-told story of Albert Lasker, American, the story of what he made of his life under our institutions, could well mean the difference between despair and total capitulation on the one hand and, on the other, a stirring reaffirmation of faith in the individual and in a society run by and for the individual. For that is what Albert Lasker has meant to me and to those scores of others who have known him. That is what he would mean to the millions I hope will learn about him.

Mr. President, I will close now. I have not spoken of the warmth and graciousness and generosity of the man whose loss I grieve. I have talked of the man in relation to his times. Of the extent to which he and the century we live in have interacted on each other. I have talked of the meaning which such a man and his ways of living and thinking have had on our past and will have for our future. I have done so without apology. I have done so because it was inescapable. Because Albert Lasker played a major role in the history of our times; because he helped make that history. To have talked of him in other terms would have been to talk of the shadow and not of the great, vibrant reality he was. Should our society and our way of living, our institutions and the beliefs we glory in, triumph over the evil forces now loose in the world, it will be because such men as Albert Lasker lived to make that society and those institutions strong. If we are to have a history it will be because men like Albert Lasker with true enlightenment shaped that history. And so it was in these terms that I have chosen to pay tribute to a truly great businessman, to one of the finest of Americans, to a whole man, a warm friend, and a thoroughly fine person—to Albert D. Lasker.

As a final word, I should like to extend to his friend and counselor and partner in all good causes, his fine and brilliant wife, Mary Woodard Lasker, my deepest sympathy in this hour of her pain and loss. And I would have her know with what a sense of certainty, I and all her many friends know that she will bear this burden with that same warm, outgoing courage which marked her every action during those last trying days of Albert's mercifully ended illness.

EXCLUSION FROM GROSS INCOME OF PROCEEDS OF SPORTS PROGRAMS FOR BENEFIT OF AMERICAN RED CROSS

The bill (H. R. 7345) to exclude from gross income the proceeds of certain sports programs conducted for the benefit of the American National Red Cross was announced as next in order.

DECISION OF SUPREME COURT IN STEEL SEIZURE CASE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 7345?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to proceed under the 5-minute rule.

Earlier in the day the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] read an item from the news ticker located in the Senate lobby. The item stated merely that the Supreme Court had held today that the President of the United States had exceeded his constitutional authority as Chief Executive and as Commander in Chief when he seized the steel mills of the Nation on April 8, 1952.

I have been able to obtain copies of the majority opinion and the concurring or dissenting views of various members of the Supreme Court. The opinion of the Court was delivered by Mr. Justice Black. Mr. Justice Jackson concurred in the judgment and opinion of the Court, as did Mr. Justice Burton, Mr. Justice Clark, Mr. Justice Douglas, and Mr. Justice Frankfurter.

The three members of the Court who dissented from the majority judgment and opinion were Mr. Chief Justice Vinson, Mr. Justice Reed, and Mr. Justice Minton.

Mr. President, it is obvious to me that every word in both the majority opinion and the dissenting views will be read by literally millions of Americans, and carefully studied by every Member of the Congress of the United States. I think it would serve a constructive public service if such opinions, in their entirety, were printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where they would be that much more easily available to Americans everywhere. I shall ask that such authority be granted.

Mr. President, in reply to a question submitted to me this morning by members of the press, I said this: "A strike at any time is a sad and unfortunate thing. A strike in time of a national

emergency is always a tragedy. But worse things than strikes can happen to our Nation. The Supreme Court has declared that our Constitution is not to be employed to serve the purposes and whims of individual men. The Constitution is to remain inviolate. The executive and legislative branches of our Government must now consider more effective and reasonable legislation to minimize or eliminate strikes in periods of national emergency. The Supreme Court has provided another opportunity for our Nation to remain a government of law rather than of men."

I now ask unanimous consent that the opinion of the Supreme Court, and the several concurring and dissenting views in the steel seizure case be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the opinion and the several concurring or dissenting views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

(Nos. 744 and 745, October term, 1951)

744—THE YOUNGSTOWN SHEET AND TUBE CO. ET AL., PETITIONERS, V. CHARLES SAWYER

745—CHARLES SAWYER, PETITIONER, V. THE YOUNGSTOWN SHEET AND TUBE CO. ET AL.

(On writs of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.)

(June 2, 1952)

Mr. Justice Black delivered the opinion of the Court:

We are asked to decide whether the President was acting within his constitutional power when he issued an order directing the Secretary of Commerce to take possession of and operate most of the Nation's steel mills. The mill owners argue that the President's order amounts to lawmaking, a legislative function which the Constitution has expressly confided to the Congress and not to the President. The Government's position is that the order was made on findings of the President that his action was necessary to avert a national catastrophe which would inevitably result from a stoppage of steel production, and that in meeting this grave emergency the President was acting within the aggregate of his constitutional powers as the Nation's Chief Executive and the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States. The issue emerges here from the following series of events:

In the latter part of 1951, a dispute arose between the steel companies and their employees over terms and conditions that should be included in new collective bargaining agreements. Long-continued conferences failed to resolve the dispute. On December 18, 1951, the employees' representatives, United Steelworkers of America, CIO, gave notice of an intention to strike when the existing bargaining agreements expired on December 31. Thereupon the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service intervened in an effort to get labor and management to agree. This failing, the President on December 22, 1951, referred the dispute to the Federal Wage Stabilization Board [1] to investigate and make recommendations for fair and equitable terms of settlement. This Board's report resulted in no settlement. On April 4, 1952, the union gave notice of a Nation-wide strike called to begin at 12:01 a. m. April 9. The indispensability of steel as a component of substantially all weapons and other war materials led the President to believe that the proposed work stoppage would immediately jeopardize our national defense and that governmental seizure of the steel mills was necessary in order to assure the continued availability of steel. Reciting these considerations for his action, the President, a few hours before the strike was to begin, issued Executive Order 10340, a copy of which is attached at the end of this opinion as an appendix. The order directed the Secretary of Commerce to take possession of and operate most of the steel mills throughout the country. The Secretary immediately issued his own possessory orders, calling upon the presidents of the various seized companies to serve as operating managers for the United States. They were directed to carry on their activities in accordance with regulations and directions of the Secretary. The next morning the President sent a message to Congress reporting his action. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 9, 1952, p. 3912) Twelve days later he sent a second message. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 21, 1952, p. 4131.) Congress has taken no action.

Obeying the Secretary's orders under protest, the companies brought proceedings against him in the district court. Their complaints charged that the seizure was not authorized by an act of Congress or by any constitutional provisions. The district court was asked to declare the orders of the President and the Secretary invalid and to issue preliminary and permanent injunctions restraining their enforcement. Opposing the motion for preliminary injunction, the United States asserted that a strike disrupting steel production for even a brief period would so endanger the well-being and safety of the Nation that the President had inherent power to do what he had done—power "supported by the Constitution, by historical precedent, and by court decisions." The Government also contended that in any event no preliminary injunction should be issued because the companies had made no showing that their available legal remedies were inadequate or that their injuries from seizure would be irreparable. Holding against the Government on all points, the district court on April 30 issued a preliminary injunction restraining the Secretary from "continuing the seizure and possession of the plant * * * and from acting under the purported authority of Executive Order No. 10340" (103 F. Supp. 569). On the same day the court of appeals stayed the district court's injunction (— F. (2d) —). Deeming it best that the issues raised be promptly decided by this Court, we granted certiorari on May 3 and set the cause for argument on May 12.

Two crucial issues have developed: First. Should final determination of the constitutional validity of the President's order be made in this case which has proceeded no further than the preliminary injunction stage? Second. If so, is the seizure order within the constitutional power of the President?

I

It is urged that there were nonconstitutional grounds upon which the district court could have denied the preliminary injunction and thus have followed the customary judicial practice of declining to reach and decide constitutional questions until compelled to do so. On this basis it is argued that equity's extraordinary injunctive relief should have been denied because (a) seizure of the companies' properties did not inflict irreparable damages, and (b) there were available legal remedies adequate to afford compensation for any possible damages which they might suffer. While separately argued by the Government, these two contentions are here closely related, if not identical. Arguments as to both rest in large part on the Government's claim that should the seizure ultimately be held unlawful, the companies could recover full compensation in the Court of Claims for the unlawful taking. Prior cases in this Court have cast doubt on the right to recover in the Court of Claims on account of properties unlawfully taken by Government officials for public use as these properties were alleged to have been. (See, e. g., *Hooe* v. *United States* (218 U. S. 322, 335–336); *United States* v. *North American Co.* (253 U. S. 330, 333). But see *Larson* v. *Domestic & Foreign Corp.* (337 U. S. 682, 701–702).) Moreover, seizure and governmental operation of these going businesses were bound to result in many present and future damages of such nature as to be difficult, if not incapable, of measurement. Viewing the case this way, and in the light of the facts presented, the district court saw no reason for delaying decision of the constitutional validity of the orders. We agree with the district court and can see no reason why that question was not ripe for determination on the record presented. We shall therefore consider and determine that question now.

II

The President's power to issue the order must stem either from an act of Congress or from the Constitution itself. There is no statute that expressly authorizes the President to take possession of property as he did here. Nor is there any act of Congress to which our attention has been directed from which such a power can fairly be implied. Indeed, we do not understand the Government to rely on statutory authorization for this seizure. There are two statutes which do authorize the President to take both personal and real property under certain conditions.[2] However, the Government admits that these conditions were not met and that the President's order was not rooted in either of them. The Government refers to the seizure provisions of one of these statutes (§ 201 (b) of the Defense Production Act) as "much too cumbersome, involved, and time-consuming for the crisis which was at hand."

Moreover, the use of the seizure technique to solve labor disputes in order to prevent work stoppages was not only unauthorized by any congressional enactment; prior to this controversy, Congress had refused to adopt that method of settling labor disputes. When the Taft-Hartley Act was under consideration in 1947, Congress rejected an amendment which would have authorized such governmental seizures in cases of emergency.[3] Apparently it was thought that the technique of seizure, like that of compulsory arbitration, would interfere with the process of collective bargaining.[4] Consequently, the plan Congress adopted in that act did not provide for seizure under any circumstances. Instead, the plan sought to bring about settlements by use of the customary devices of mediation, conciliation, investigation by boards of inquiry, and public reports. In some instances temporary injunctions were authorized to provide cooling-off periods. All this failing, the unions were left free to strike if the majority of the employees, by secret ballot, expressed a desire to do so.[5]

It is clear that if the President had authority to issue the order he did, it must

[1] This Board was established under Executive Order 10233, 16 Fed. Reg. 3503.

[2] The Selective Service Act of 1948, 62 Stat. 604, 625–627, 50 U. S. C. App. (Supp. IV) sec. 468; the Defense Production Act of 1950, title II, 64 Stat. 798, as amended, 65 Stat. 138.

[3] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, pt. 3, pp. 3637–3645.

[4] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, pt. 3, pp. 3835–3836.

[5] Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, 61 Stat. 136, 152–156, 29 U. S. C. (Supp. IV) secs. 141, 171–180.

be found in some provisions of the Constitution. And it is not claimed that express constitutional language grants this power to the President. The contention is that presidential power should be implied from the aggregate of his powers under article II of the Constitution. Particular reliance is placed on the provisions which say that "the executive power shall be vested in a President * * *"; that "he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed"; and that he "shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States."

The order cannot properly be sustained as an exercise of the President's military power as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. The Government attempts to do so by citing a number of cases upholding broad powers in military commanders engaged in day-to-day fighting in a theater of war. Such cases need not concern us here. Even though "theater of war" be an expanding concept, we cannot with faithfulness to our constitutional system hold that the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces has the ultimate power as such to take possession of private property in order to keep labor disputes from stopping production. This is a job for the Nation's lawmakers, not for its military authorities.

Nor can the seizure order be sustained because of the several constitutional provisions that grant executive power to the President. In the framework of our Constitution, the President's power to see that the laws are faithfully executed refutes the idea that he is to be a lawmaker. The Constitution limits his functions in the lawmaking process to the recommending of laws he thinks wise and the vetoing of laws he thinks bad. And the Constitution is neither silent nor equivocal about who shall make laws which the President is to execute. The first section of the first article says that "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States * * *." After granting many powers to the Congress, article I goes on to provide that Congress may "make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

The President's order does not direct that a congressional policy be executed in a manner prescribed by Congress—it directs that a Presidential policy be executed in a manner prescribed by the President. The preamble of the order itself, like that of many statutes, sets out reasons why the President believes certain policies should be adopted, proclaims these policies as rules of conduct to be followed, and, again, like a statute, authorizes a Government official to promulgate additional rules and regulations consistent with the policy proclaimed and needed to carry that policy into execution. The power of Congress to adopt such public policies as those proclaimed by the order is beyond question. It can authorize the taking of private property for public use. It can make laws regulating the relationships between employers and employees, prescribing rules designed to settle labor disputes, and fixing wages and working conditions in certain fields of our economy. The Constitution did not subject this lawmaking power of Congress to Presidential or military supervision or control.

It is said that other Presidents without congressional authority have taken possession of private business enterprises in order to settle labor disputes. But even if this be true, Congress has not thereby lost its exclusive constitutional authority to make laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers vested by the Constitution "in the Government of the United States, or any department or officer thereof."

The founders of this Nation entrusted the lawmaking power to the Congress alone in both good and bad times. It would do no good to recall the historical events, the fears of power, and the hopes for freedom that lay behind their choice. Such a review would but confirm our holding that this seizure order cannot stand.

The judgment of the district court is affirmed.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter:

Although the considerations relevant to the legal enforcement of the principle of separation of powers seem to me more complicated and flexible than may appear from what Mr. Justice Black has written, I join his opinion because I thoroughly agree with the application of the principle to the circumstances of this case. Even though such differences in attitude toward this principle may be merely differences in emphasis and nuance, they can hardly be reflected by a single opinion for the Court. Individual expression of views in reaching a common result is, therefore, important.

APPENDIX

APRIL 8, 1952.

EXECUTIVE ORDER DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO TAKE POSSESSION OF AND OPERATE THE PLANTS AND FACILITIES OF CERTAIN STEEL COMPANIES

Whereas on December 16, 1950, I proclaimed the existence of a national emergency which requires that the military, naval, air, and civilian defenses of this country be strengthened as speedily as possible to the end that we may be able to repel any and all threats against our national security and to fulfill our responsibilities in the efforts being made throughout the United Nations and otherwise to bring about a lasting peace; and

Whereas American fighting men and fighting men of other nations of the United Nations are now engaged in deadly combat with the forces of aggression in Korea, and forces of the United States are stationed elsewhere overseas for the purpose of participating in the defense of the Atlantic Community against aggression; and

Whereas the weapons and other materials needed by our Armed Forces and by those joined with us in the defense of the free world are produced to a great extent in this country, and steel is an indispensable component of substantially all of such weapons and materials; and

Whereas steel is likewise indispensable to the carrying out of programs of the Atomic Energy Commission of vital importance to our defense efforts; and

Whereas a continuing and uninterrupted supply of steel is also indispensable to the maintenance of the economy of the United States, upon which our military strength depends; and

Whereas a controversy has arisen between certain companies in the United States producing and fabricating steel and the elements thereof and certain of their workers represented by the United Steelworkers of America, CIO, regarding terms and conditions of employment; and

Whereas the controversy has not been settled through the processes of collective bargaining or through the efforts of the Government, including those of the Wage Stabilization Board, to which the controversy was referred on December 23, 1951, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10233, and a strike has been called for 12.01 a. m., April 9, 1952; and

Whereas a work stoppage would immediately jeopardize and imperil our national defense and the defense of those joined with us in resisting aggression, and would add to the continuing danger of our soldiers, sailors, and airmen engaged in combat in the field; and

Whereas in order to assure the continued availability of steel and steel products during the existing emergency, it is necessary that the United States take possession of and operate the plants, facilities, and other property of the said companies as hereinafter provided:

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, and as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed to take possession of all or such of the plants, facilities, and other property of the companies named in the list attached hereto, or any part thereof, as he may deem necessary in the interests of national defense; and to operate or to arrange for the operation thereof and to do all things necessary for, or incidental to, such operation.

2. In carrying out this order the Secretary of Commerce may act through or with the aid of such public or private instrumentalities or persons as he may designate; and all Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Secretary of Commerce to the fullest extent possible in carrying out the purposes of this order.

3. The Secretary of Commerce shall determine and prescribe terms and conditions of employment under which the plants, facilities, and other properties possession of which is taken pursuant to this order shall be operated. The Secretary of Commerce shall recognize the rights of workers to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing and to engage in concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining, adjustment of grievances, or other mutual aid or protection, provided that such activities do not interfere with the operation of such plants, facilities, and other properties.

4. Except so far as the Secretary of Commerce shall otherwise provide from time to time, the managements of the plants, facilities, and other properties possession of which is taken pursuant to this order shall continue their functions, including the collection and disbursement of funds in the usual and ordinary course of business in the names of their respective companies and by means of any instrumentalities used by such companies.

5. Except so far as the Secretary of Commerce may otherwise direct, existing rights and obligations of such companies shall remain in full force and effect, and there may be made, in due course, payments of dividends on stock and of principal, interest, sinking funds, and all other distributions upon bonds, debentures, and other obligations, and expenditures may be made for other ordinary corporate or business purposes.

6. Whenever in the judgment of the Secretary of Commerce further possession and operation by him of any plant, facility, or other property is no longer necessary or expedient in the interest of national defense, and the Secretary has reason to believe that effective future operation is assured, he shall return the possession and control thereof at the time possession was taken under this order.

7. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to prescribe and issue such regulations and orders not inconsistent herewith as he may deem necessary or desirable for carrying out the purposes of this order; and he may delegate and authorize subdelegation of such of his functions under this order as he may deem desirable.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 8, 1952.*

Mr. Justice Frankfurter, concurring:

Before the cares of the White House were his own, President Harding is reported to have said that government after all is a very simple thing. He must have said that,

if he said it, as a fleeting inhabitant of fairyland. The opposite is the truth. A constitutional democracy like ours is perhaps the most difficult of man's social arrangements to manage successfully. Our scheme of society is more dependent than any other form of government on knowledge and wisdom and self-discipline for the achievement of its aims. For our democracy implies the reign of reason on the most extensive scale. The founders of this Nation were not imbued with the modern cynicism that the only thing that history teaches is that it teaches nothing. They acted on the conviction that the experience of man sheds a good deal of light on his nature. It sheds a good deal of light not merely on the need for effective power, if a society is to be at once cohesive and civilized, but also on the need for limitations on the power of governors over the governed.

To that end they restructure of our central government on the system of checks and balances. For them the doctrine of separation of powers was not mere theory; it was a felt necessity. Not so long ago it was fashionable to find our system of checks and balances obstructive to effective government. It was easy to ridicule that system as outmoded—too easy. The experience through which the world has passed in our own day has made vivid the realization that the framers of our Constitution were not inexperienced doctrinaires. These long-headed statesmen had no illusion that our people enjoyed biological or psychological or sociological immunities from the hazards of concentrated power. It is absurd to see a dictator in a representative product of the sturdy democratic traditions of the Mississippi Valley. The accretion of dangerous power does not come in a day. It does come, however slowly, from the generative force of unchecked disregard of the restrictions that fence in even the most disinterested assertion of authority.

The framers, however, did not make the judiciary the overseer of our Government. They were familiar with the revisory functions entrusted to judges in a few of the States and refused to lodge such powers in this Court. Judicial power can be exercised only as to matters that were the traditional concern of the courts at Westminster, and only if they arise in ways that to the expert feel of lawyers constitute "cases" or "controversies." Even as to questions that were the staple of judicial business, it is not for the courts to pass upon them unless they are indispensably involved in a conventional litigation. And then, only to the extent that they are so involved. Rigorous adherence to the narrow scope of the judicial function is especially demanded in controversies that arouse appeals to the Constitution. The attitude with which this Court must approach its duty when confronted with such issues is precisely the opposite of that normally manifested by the general public. So-called constitutional questions seem to exercise a mesmeric influence over the popular mind. This eagerness to settle—preferably forever—a specific problem on the basis of the broadest possible constitutional pronouncements may not unfairly be called one of our minor national traits. An English observer of our scene has acutely described it: "At the first sound of a new argument over the United States Constitution and its interpretation the hearts of Americans leap with a fearful joy. The blood stirs powerfully in their veins and a new luster brightens their eyes. Like King Harry's men before Harfleur, they stand like greyhounds in the slips, straining upon the start." (The Economist, May 10, 1952, p. 370.)

The path of duty for this Court, it bears repetition, lies in the opposite direction. Due regard for the implications of the distribution of powers in our Constitution and for the nature of the judicial process as the ultimate authority in interpreting the Constitution, has not only confined the Court within the narrow domain of appropriate adjudication. It has also led to "a series of rules under which it has avoided passing upon a large part of all the constitutional questions pressed upon it for decision." (Brandeis, J., in *Ashwander* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (297 U. S. 288, 341, 346).) A basic rule is the duty of the Court not to pass on a constitutional issue at all, however narrowly it may be confined, if the case may, as a matter of intellectual honesty, be decided without even considering delicate problems of power under the Constitution. It ought to be, but apparently is not a matter of common understanding that clashes between different branches of the Government should be avoided if a legal ground of less explosive potentialities is properly available. Constitutional adjudications are apt by exposing differences to exacerbate them.

So here our first inquiry must be not into the powers of the President, but into the powers of a district judge to issue a temporary injunction in the circumstances of this case. Familiar as that remedy is, it remains an extraordinary remedy. To start with a consideration of the relation between the President's powers and those of Congress—a most delicate matter that has occupied the thoughts of statesmen and judges since the Nation was founded and will continue to occupy their thoughts as long as our democracy lasts—is to start at the wrong end. A plaintiff is not entitled to an injunction if money damages would fairly compensate him for any wrong he may have suffered. The same consideration by which the steelworkers, in their brief amicus, demonstrate, from the seizure here in controversy, consequences that cannot be translated into dollars and cents, preclude a holding that only compensable damage for the plaintiffs is involved. Again, a court of equity ought not to issue an injunction, even though a plaintiff otherwise makes out a case for it, if the plaintiff's right to an injunction is overborne by a commanding public interest against it. One need not resort to a large epigrammatic generalization that the evils of industrial dislocation are to be preferred to allowing illegality to go unchecked. To deny inquiry into the President's power in a case like this, because of the damage to the public interest to be feared from upsetting its exercise by him, would in effect always preclude inquiry into challenged power, which presumably only avowed great public interest brings into action. And so, with the utmost unwillingness, with every desire to avoid judicial inquiry into the powers and duties of the other two branches of the Government, I cannot escape consideration of the legality of Executive Order No. 10340.

The pole star for constitutional adjudications is John Marshall's greatest judicial utterance that "it is a constitution we are expounding" (*McCulloch v. Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316, 407)). That requires both a spacious view in applying an instrument of government made for an undefined and expanding future *Hurtado* v. *California* (110 U. S. 516, 530), and as narrow a delimitation of the constitutional issues as the circumstances permit. Not the least characteristic of great statesmanship which the framers manifested was the extent to which they did not attempt to bind the future. It is no less incumbent upon this Court to avoid putting fetters upon the future by needless pronouncements today.

Marshall's admonition that "it is a constitution we are expounding" is especially relevant when the Court is required to give legal sanctions to an underlying principle of the Constitution—that of separation of powers. "The great ordinances of the Constitution do not establish and divide fields of black and white" (Holmes, J., dissenting in *Springer* v. *Philippine Islands* (277 U. S. 209)).

The issue before us can be met, and therefore should be, without attempting to define the President's powers comprehensively. I shall not attempt to delineate what belongs to him by virtue of his office beyond the power even of Congress to contract; what authority belongs to him until Congress acts; what kind of problems may be dealt with either by the Congress or by the President or by both, cf. *La Abra Silver Mine Co.* v. *United States* (175 U. S. 423); what power must be exercised by the Congress and cannot be delegated to the President. It is as unprofitable to lump together in an undiscriminating hotch-potch past presidential actions claimed to be derived from occupancy of the office, as it is to conjure up hypothetical future cases. The judiciary may, as this case proves, have to intervene in determining where authority lies as between the democratic forces in our scheme of government. But in doing so we should be wary and humble. Such is the teaching of this Court's role in the history of the country.

It is in this mood and with this perspective that the issue before the Court must be approached. We must therefore put to one side consideration of what powers the President would have had if there had been no legislation whatever bearing on the authority asserted by the seizure, or if the seizure had been only for a short, explicitly temporary period, to be determined automatically unless congressional approval were given. These and other questions, like or unlike, are not now here. I would exceed my authority were I to say anything about them.

The question before the Court comes in this setting. Congress has frequently—at least 16 times since 1916—specifically provided for Executive seizure of production, transportation, communications, or storage facilities. In every case it has qualified this grant of power with limitations and safeguards. This body of enactments—summarized in tabular form in appendix I—demonstrates that Congress deemed seizure so drastic a power as to require that it be carefully circumscribed whenever the President was vested with this extraordinary authority. The power to seize has uniformly been given only for a limited period or for a defined emergency, or has been repealed after a short period. Its exercise has been restricted to particular circumstances such as "time of war or when war is imminent," the needs of "public safety" or of "national security or defense," or "urgent and impending need." The period of governmental operation has been limited, as, for instance, to "60 days after the restoration of productive efficiency." Seizure statutes usually make Executive action dependent on detailed conditions: for example, (a) failure or refusal of the owner of a plant to meet governmental supply needs or (b) failure of voluntary negotiations with the owner for the use of a plant necessary for great public ends. Congress often has specified the particular executive agency which should seize or operate the plants or whose judgment would appropriately test the need for seizure. Congress also has not left to implication that just compensation be paid; it has usually legislated in detail regarding enforcement of this litigation-breeding general requirement.

Congress in 1947 was again called upon to consider whether governmental seizure should be used to avoid serious industrial shut-downs. Congress decided against conferring such power generally without special congressional enactment to meet each particular need. Under the urgency of telephone and coal strikes in the winter of 1946, Congress addressed itself to the problems

raised by national emergency strikes and lock-outs.[6] The termination of wartime seizure powers on December 31, 1946, brought these matters to the attention of Congress with vivid impact. A proposal that the President be given powers to seize plants to avert a shut-down where the health or safety of the Nation was endangered was thoroughly canvassed by Congress and rejected. No room for doubt remains that the proponents as well as the opponents of the bill which became the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 clearly understood that as a result of that legislation the only recourse for preventing a shut-down in any basic industry, after failure of mediation, was Congress.[7] Authorization for seizure as an available remedy for potential dangers was unequivocally put aside. The Senate Labor Committee, through its chairman, explicitly reported to the Senate that a general grant of seizure powers had been considered and rejected in favor of reliance on ad hoc legislation, as a particular emergency might call for it.[8] An amendment presented in the House providing that where necessary to preserve and protect the public health and security the President might seize any industry in which there is an impending curtailment of production was voted down, after debate, by a vote of more than 3 to 1.[9]

In adopting the provisions which it did, by the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, for dealing with a national emergency arising out of a breakdown in peaceful industrial relations, Congress was very familiar with Government seizure as a protective measure. On a balance of considerations Congress chose not to lodge this power in the President. It chose not to make available in advance a remedy to which both industry and labor were fiercely hostile.[10] In deciding that authority to seize should be given to the President only after full consideration of the particular situation should show such legislation to be necessary, Congress presumably acted on experience with similar industrial conflicts in the past. It evidently assumed that industrial shut-downs in basic industries are not instances of spontaneous generation, and that danger warnings are sufficiently plain before the event to give ample opportunity to start the legislative process into action.

In any event, nothing can be plainer than that Congress made a conscious choice of policy in a field full of perplexity and peculiarly within legislative responsibility for choice. In formulating legislation for dealing with industrial conflicts, Congress could not more clearly and emphatically have withheld authority than it did in 1947. Perhaps as much so as is true of any piece of modern legislation, Congress acted with full consciousness of what it was doing and in the light of much recent history. Previous seizure legislation had subjected the powers granted to the President to restrictions of varying degrees of stringency. Instead of giving him even limited powers, Congress in 1947 deemed it wise to require the President, upon failure of attempts to reach a voluntary settlement, to report to Congress if he deemed the power of seizure a needed shot for his locker. The President could not ignore the specific limitations of prior seizure statutes. No more could he act in disregard of the limitation put upon seizure by the 1947 act.

It cannot be contended that the President would have had power to issue this order had Congress explicitly negated such authority in formal legislation. Congress has express its will to withhould this power from the President as though it had said so in so many words. The authoritatively expressed purpose of Congress to disallow such power to the President and to require him, when in his mind the occasion arose for such a seizure, to put the matter to Congress and ask for specific authority from it, could not be more decisive if it had been written into sections 206–210 of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. Only the other day we treated the congressional gloss upon those section as part of the act (*Bus Employees* v. *Wisconsin Board* (340 U. S. 383, 395–396)). Grafting upon the words a purpose of Congress thus unequivocally expressed is the regular legislative mode for defining the scope of an act of Congress. It would be not merely infelicitous draftsmanship but almost offensive gaucherie to write such a restriction upon the President's power in terms into a statute rather than to have it authoritatively expounded, as it was, by controlling legislative history.

By the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, Congress said to the President, "You may not seize. Please report to us and ask for seizure power if you think it is needed in a specific situation." This of course calls for a report on the unsuccessful efforts to reach a voluntary settlement, as a basis for discharge by Congress of its responsibility—which it has unequivocably reserved—to fashion further remedies than it provided.[11] But it is now claimed that the President has seizure power by virtue of the Defense Production Act of 1950 and its amendments.[12] And the claim is based on the occurrence of new events—Korea and the need for stabilization, etc.—although it was well known that seizure power was withheld by the act of 1947 and although the President, whose specific requests for other authority were in the main granted by Congress, never suggested that in view of the new events he needed the power to seizure which Congress in its judgment had decided to withhold from him. The utmost that the Korean conflict may imply is that it may have been desirable to have given the President further authority, a freer hand in these matters. Absence of authority in the President to deal with a crisis does not imply want of power in the Government. Conversely the fact that power exists in the Government does not vest it in the President. The need for new legislation does not enact it. Nor does it repeal or amend existing law.

No authority that has since been given to the President can by any fair process of statutory construction be deemed to withdraw the restriction or change the will of Congress as expressed by a body of enact-

---

[6] The power to seize plants under the War Labor Disputes Act ended with the termination of hostilities, proclaimed on December 31, 1946, prior to the incoming of the Eightieth Congress, and the power to operate previously seized plants ended on June 30, 1947, only a week after the enactment of the Labor-Management Relations Act over the President's veto (57 Stat. 163, 165, 50 U. S. C. App. (1946 ed.), sec. 1503). See Legislative History of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (published by National Labor Relations Board, 1948), 1145, 1519, 1626.

[7] Some of the more directly relevant statements are the following: "In most instances the force of public opinion should make itself sufficiently felt in this 80-day period to bring about a peaceful termination of the controversy. Should this expectation fail, the bill provides for the President laying the matter before Congress for whatever legislation seems necessary to preserve the health and safety of the Nation in the crisis." (S. Rept. No. 105, 80th Cong., 1st sess., 15.)

"We believe it would be most unwise for th Congress to attempt to adopt laws relating to any single dispute between private parties." (Senate minority report, id., pt. 2, at 17.)

In the debates Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, said, "In the event of a deadlock and a strike is not ended, the matter is referred to the President, who can use his discretion as to whether he will present the matter to the Congress; whether or not the situation is such that emergency legislation is required.

"Nothing has been done with respect to the Smith-Connally Act. There is no provision for taking over property or running plants by the Government. We simply provide a procedure which we hope will be effective in 99 out of 100 cases where the health or safety of the people may be affected, and still leave a loophole for congressional action" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, pt. 4, p. 4281).

The President in his veto message said, "It would be mandatory for the President to transfer the whole problem to the Congress, even if it were not in session. Thus, major economic disputes between employers and their workers over contract terms might ultimately be thrown into the political arena for disposition. One could scarcely devise a less effective method for discouraging critical strikes" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, pt. 6, p. 7487).

[8] Senator TAFT said:

"If there finally develops a complete national emergency threatening the safety and health of the people of the United States, Congress can pass an emergency law to cover the particular emergency.

"We have felt that perhaps in the case of a general strike, or in the case of other serious strikes after the termination of every possible effort to resolve the dispute, the remedy might be an emergency act by Congress for that particular purpose.

"But while such a bill [for seizure of plants and union funds] might be prepared, I should be unwilling to place such a law on the books until we actually face such an emergency, and Congress applies the remedy for the particular emergency only. Eighty days will provide plenty of time within which to consider the possibility of what should be done, and we believe very strongly that there should not be anything in this law which prohibits finally the right to strike" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, pt. 3, pp. 3835–3836).

[9] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, pt. 3, pp. 3637–3645.

[10] See, for instance, the statements of James B. Carey, secretary of the CIO, in opposition to S. 2054, 77th Cong., 1st sess., which eventually became the War Labor Disputes Act. Central to that act, of course, was the temporary grant of the seizure power to the President. Mr. Carey then said:

"Senator BURTON. If this would continue forever it might mean the nationalization of industry?

"Mr. CAREY. Let us consider it on a temporary basis. How is the law borne by labor? Here is the Government-sponsored strike breaking agency, and nothing more.

* * * * * *

"Our suggestion is a voluntary agreement of the representatives of industry and labor and Government, participating in calling a conference in a democratic way. The other one is the imposition of force, the other is the imposition of seizure of certain things for a temporary period; the destruction of collective bargaining, and it would break down labor relations that may have been built up over a long period." (Hearing before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on S. 2054, 77th Cong., 1st sess., 132.)

[11] Clearly the President's message of April 9 and his further letter to the President of the Senate on April 21 do not satisfy this requirement. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 9, 1952, p. 3912; id., April 21, 1952, p. 4131.

[12] 64 Stat. 798 et seq., 65 Stat. 131 et seq., 50 U. S. C. App. sec. 2061, et seq.

ments, culminating in the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947. Title V of the Defense Production Act, entitled "Settlement of Labor Disputes," pronounced the will of Congress "that there be effective procedures for the settlement of labor disputes affecting national defense," and that "primary reliance" be placed "upon the parties to any labor dispute to make every effort through negotiations and collective bargaining and the full use of mediation and conciliation facilities to effect a settlement in the national interest." [13] Section 502 authorized the President to hold voluntary conferences of labor, industry, and public and Government representatives and to "take such action as may be agreed upon in any such conference and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title," provided that no action was taken inconsistent with the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947.[14] This provision [15] was said by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency to contemplate a board similar to the War Labor Board of World War II and "a national labor-management conference such as was held during World War II, when a no-strike, no-lock-out pledge was obtained." [16] Section 502 was believed necessary in addition to existing means for settling disputees voluntarily because the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service could not enter a labor dispute unless requested by one party.[17] Similar explanations of title V were given in the conference report and by Senator IVES, a member of the Senate committee to whom Senator MAYBANK during the debates on the Senate floor referred questions relating to title V.[18] Senator IVES said:

"It should be remembered in this connection that during the period of the present emergency it is expected that the Congress will not adjourn, but at most, will recess only for very limited periods of time. If, therefore, any serious work stoppage should arise or even be threatened, in spite of the terms of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, the Congress would be readily available to pass such legislation as might be needed to meet the difficulty." [19]

The Defense Production Act affords no ground for the suggestion that the 1947 denial to the President of seizure powers has been impliedly repealed, and its legislative history contradicts such a suggestion. Although the proponents of that act recognized that the President would have a choice of alternative methods of seeking a mediated settlement, they also recognized that Congress alone retained the ultimate coercive power to meet the threat of "any serious work stoppage."

That conclusion is not changed by what occurred after the passage of the 1950 act. Title V remained unimplemented for 7½ months. On April 21, 1951, the President by Executive Order 10233 gave the reconstituted Wage Stabilization Board authority to investigate labor disputes either (1) submitted voluntarily by the parties, or (2) referred to it by the President.[20] The Board can make only "recommendations to the parties as to fair and equitable terms of settlement" unless the parties agree to be bound by the Board's recommendation. About a month thereafter subcommittees of both the House and Senate Labor Committees began hearings on the newly assigned disputes functions of the Board.[21] Amendments to deny the Board these functions were voted down in the House,[22] and Congress extended the Defense Production Act without changing title V in relevant part.[23] The legislative history of the Defense Production Act and its amendments in 1951 cannot possibly be vouched for more than congressional awareness and tacit approval that the President had charged the Wage Stabilization Board with authority to seek voluntary settlement of labor disputes. The most favorable interpretation of the statements in the committee reports can make them mean no more than "We are glad to have all the machinery possible for the voluntary settlement of labor disputes." In considering the Defense Production Act amendments, Congress was never asked to approve—and there is not the slightest indication that the responsible committees ever had in mind—seizure of plants to coerce settlement of disputes. We are not even confronted by an inconsistency between the authority conferred on the Wage Board, as formulated by the Executive order, and the denial of presidential seizure powers under the 1947 legislation. The Board has been given merely mediatory powers similar to those of agencies created by the Taft-Hartley Act and elsewhere, with no other sanctions for acceptance of its recommendations than are offered by its own moral authority and the pressure of public opinion. The Defense Production Act and the disputes-mediating agencies created subsequent to it still leave for solution elsewhere the question what action can be taken when attempts at voluntary settlement fail. To draw implied approval of seizure power from this history is to make something out of nothing.

---

[13] Secs. 501, 502, 64 Stat. 798, 812, 50 U. S. C. App., secs. 2121, 2122.

[14] Secs. 502, 503, 64 Stat. 798, 812, 50 U. S. C. App. secs. 2122, 2133.

[15] The provision of sec. 502 in S. 3936, as reported by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, read as follows: "The President is authorized, after consultation with labor and management, to establish such principles and procedures and to take such action as he deems appropriate for the settlement of labor disputes affecting national defense, including the designation of such persons, boards or commissions as he may deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title." That language was superseded in the conference report by the language that was finally enacted. (H. Rept. No. 3042, 81st Con., 2d sess., 16, 35.) The change made by the conference committee was for the purpose of emphasizing the voluntary nature of the cooperation sought from the public, labor, and management; as Senator IVES explained under repeated questioning, "If any group were to hold out, there would be no agreement [on action to carry out the provisions of this title]" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, pt. 10, pp. 14071–14072). Chairman MAYBANK of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency said, "The labor disputes title of the Senate was accepted by the House with amendment which merely indicates more specific avenues through which the President may bring labor and management together." (*Id.*, at 14073.)

[16] S. Rept. No. 2250, 81st Cong., 2d sess., 41; H. Rept. No. 3042, 81st Cong., 2d sess., 35. It is hardly necessary to note that congressional authorization of an agency similar to the War Labor Board does not imply a congressional grant of seizure power similar to that given the President specifically by sec. 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act of 1943. The War Labor Board, created by sec. 7 of the 1943 act, had only administrative sanctions. (See 57 Stat. 163, 166–167; see Report of Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, The Disputes Functions of the Wage Stabilization Board, 1951, S. Rept. No. 1037, 82d Cong., 1st sess., 6.) The seizure power given by Congress in section 3 of the 1943 act was given to the President, not to the War Labor Board, and was needed only when the War Labor Board reported it had failed; the seizure power was separate and apart from the War Labor Board machinery for settling disputes. At most the Defense Production Act does what section 7 of the War Labor Disputes Act did; the omission of any grant of seizure power similar to sec. 3 is too obvious not to have been conscious. At any rate, the Wage Stabilization Board differs substantially from the earlier War Labor Board. In 1951 the Senate committee studying the disputes functions of the Wage Stabilization Board pointed out the substantial differences between that Board and its predecessor and concluded that "The New Wage Stabilization Board * * * does not rely on title V of the Defense Production Act for its authority." Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, The Disputes Functions of the Wage Stabilization Board, 1951, 82d Cong., 1st sess., 4–6.

[17] S. Rept. No. 2250, 81st Cong., 2d sess., 14.

[18] See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, pt. 10, p. 14071.

[19] Id., at 12275. Just before the paragraph quoted in the text, Senator IVES had said: "In fact, the courts have upheld the constitutionality of the national emergency provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, which can require that workers stay on the job for at least 80 days when a strike would seriously threaten the national health and safety in peacetime. By the terms of the pending bill, the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 would be controlling in matters affecting the relationship between labor and management, including collective bargaining. It seems to me, however, that this is as far as we should go in legislation of this type."

[20] 16 Fed. Reg. 3503.

[21] See hearings before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, Disputes Functions of Wage Stabilization, 82d Cong., 1st sess. (May 28–June 15, 1951); hearings before the Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations of Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Wage Stabilization, and Disputes Program, 82d Cong., 1st sess. (May 17–June 7, 1951). The resulting report of the Senate committee, S. Rept. No. 1037, 82d Cong., 1st sess. 9, recommended that "Title V of the Defense Production Act be retained" and that "No statutory limitations be imposed on the President's authority to deal with disputes through voluntary machinery; such limitations, we believe, would infringe on the President's constitutional power." The committee found, id., at 10, that the "Wage Stabilization Board relies completely on voluntary means for settling disputes and is, therefore, an extension of free collective bargaining. The Board has no powers of legal compulsion." "Executive Order No. 10233," the committee found further, "does not in any way run counter to the * * * Taft-Hartley Act. It is simply an additional tool, not a substitute for these laws." Of particular relevance to the present case, the committee declared: "The recommendations of the Wage Stabilization Board in disputes certified by the President have no compulsive force. The parties are free to disregard recommendations of the Wage Stabilization Board. * * * There is, of course, the President's authority to seize plants under the Selective Service Act [a power not here used], but this is an authority which exists independently of the Wage Stabilization Board and its disputes-handling functions. In any case, seizure is an extraordinary remedy, and the authority to seize, operates whether or not there is a disputes-handling machinery." (Id., at 5).

[22] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 97, pt. 6, pp. 8390–8415.

[23] 65 Stat. 131.

It is one thing to draw an intention of Congress from general language and to say that Congress would have explicitly written what is inferred, where Congress has not addressed itself to a specific situation. It is quite impossible, however, when Congress did specifically address itself to a problem, as Congress did to that of seizure, to find secreted in the interstices of legislation the very grant of power which Congress consciously withheld. To find authority so explicitly withheld is not merely to disregard in a particular instance the clear will of Congress. It is to disrespect the whole legislative process and the constitutional division of authority between President and Congress.

The legislative history here canvassed is relevant to yet another of the issues before us, namely, the Government's argument that overriding public interest prevents the issuance of the injunction despite the illegality of the seizure. I cannot accept that contention. "Balancing the equities" when considering whether an injunction should issue, is lawyers' jargon for choosing between conflicting public interests. When Congress itself has struck the balance, has defined the weight to be given the competing interests, a court of equity is not justified in ignoring that pronouncement under the guise of exercising equitable discretion.

Apart from his vast share of responsibility for the conduct of our foreign relations, the embracing function of the President is that "he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed" (Art. II, sec. 3). The nature of that authority has for me been comprehensively indicated by Mr. Justice Holmes. "The duty of the President to see that the laws be executed is a duty that does not go beyond the laws or require him to achieve more than Congress sees fit to leave within his power" (*Myers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52, 177)). The powers of the President are not as particularized as are those of Congress. But unenumerated powers do not mean undefined powers. The separation of powers built into our Constitution gives essential content to undefined provisions in the frame of our Government.

To be sure, the content of the three authorities of Government is not to be derived from an abstract analysis. The areas are partly interacting, not wholly disjointed. The Constitution is a framework for Government. Therefore the way the framework has consistently operated fairly establishes that it has operated according to its true nature. Deeply embedded traditional ways of conducting Government cannot supplant the Constitution or legislation, but they give meaning to the words of a text or supply them. It is an inadmissibly narrow conception of American constitutional law to confine it to the words of the Constitution and to disregard the gloss which life has written upon them. In short, a systematic, unbroken, executive practice, long pursued to the knowledge of the Congress and never before questioned, engaged in by Presidents who have also sworn to uphold the Constitution, making as it were such exercise of power part of the structure of our Government, may be treated as a gloss on "executive power" vested in the President by section 1 of article II.

Such was the cause of *United States* v. *Midwest Oil Co.* (236 U. S. 459). The contrast between the circumstances of that case and this one helps to draw a clear line between authority not explicitly conferred yet authorized to be exercised by the President and the denial of such authority. In both instances it was the concern of Congress under express constitutional grant to make rules and regulations for the problems with which the President dealt. In the one case he was dealing with the protection of property belonging to the United States; in the other with the enforcement of the Commerce clause or with raising and supporting armies and maintaining the Navy. In the Midwest Oil case lands which Congress had opened for entry were, over a period of 80 years and in 252 instances, and by Presidents learned and unlearned in the law, temporarily withdrawn from entry so as to enable Congress to deal with such withdrawals. No remotely comparable practice can be vouched for Executive seizure of property at a time when this country was not at war, in the only constitutional way in which this country can be at war. It would pursue the irrelevant to reopen the controversy over the constitutionality of some acts of Lincoln during the Civil War. See J. G. Randall, Constitutional Problems under Lincoln (revised ed. 1951). Suffice it to say that he seized railroads in territory where armed hostilities had already interrupted the movement of troops to the beleaguered Capital, and his order was ratified by the Congress.

The only other instances of seizures are those during the periods of the first and second World Wars.[24] In his 10 seizures of industrial facilities, President Wilson acted, or at least purported to act,[25] under authority granted by Congress. Thus his seizures cannot be adduced as interpretations by a President of his own powers in the absence of statute.

Down to the World War II period, then, the record is barren of instances comparable to the one before us. Of 12 seizures by President Roosevelt prior to the enactment of the War Labor Disputes Act in June, 1943, three were sanctioned by existing law, and six others were effected after Congress, on December 8, 1941, had declared the existence of a state of war. In this case, reliance on the powers that flow from declared war has been commendably disclaimed by the Solicitor General. Thus the list of executive assertions of the power of seizure in circumstances comparable to the present reduces to three in the 6-month period from June to December of 1941. We need not split hairs in comparing those actions to the one before us, though much might be said by way of differentiation. Without passing on their validity, as we are not called upon to do, it suffices to say that these three isolated instances do not add up, either in number, scope, duration or contemporaneous legal justification, to the kind of executive construction of the Constitution revealed in the Midwest Oil case. Nor do they come to us sanctioned by long-continued acquiescence of Congress giving decisive weight to a construction by the executive of its powers.

A scheme of Government like ours no doubt at time feels the lack of power to act with complete, all-embracing, swiftly moving authority. No doubt a government with distributed authority, subject to be challenged in the courts of law, at least long enough to consider and adjudicate the challenge, labors under restrictions from which other governments are free. It has not been our tradition to envy such governments. In any event our Government was designed to have such restrictions. The price was deemed not too high in view of the safeguards which these restrictions afford. I know no more impressive words on this subject than those of Mr. Justice Brandeis:

"The doctrine of the separation of powers was adopted by the Convention of 1787, not to promote efficiency but to preclude the exercise of arbitrary power. The purpose was, not to avoid friction, but, by means of the inevitable friction incident to the distribution of the governmental powers among three departments, to save the people from autocracy" (*Myers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52, 293)).

It is not a pleasant judicial duty to find that the President has exceeded his powers and still less so when his purposes were dictated by concern for the Nation's well-being, in the assured conviction that he acted to avert danger. But it would stultify one's faith in our people to entertain even a momentary fear that the patriotism and the wisdom of the President and the Congress, as well as the long view of the immediate parties in interest, will not find ready accommodation for differences on matters which, however close to their concern and however intrinsically important, are overshadowed by the awesome issues which confront the world. When at a moment of almost anxiety President Washington turned to this Court for advice, and he had to be denied it as beyond the Court's competence to give, Chief Justice Jay, on behalf of the Court, wrote thus to the Father of his Country:

"We exceedingly regret every event that may cause embarrassment to your administration, but we derive consolation from the reflection that your judgment will discern what is right, and that your usual prudence, decision, and firmness will surmount every obstacle to the preservation of the rights, peace, and dignity of the United States" (letter of August 8, 1793, 3 Johnston, Correspondence and Public Papers of John Jay (1891), 489).

In reaching the conclusion that conscience compels, I too derive consolation from the reflection that the President and the Congress between them will continue to safeguard the heritage which comes to them straight from George Washington.

---

[24] Instances of seizure by the President are summarized in appendix II, infra.

[25] One of President Wilson's seizures has given rise to controversy. In his testimony in justification of the Montgomery Ward seizure during World War II, Attorney General Biddle argued that the World War I seizure of Smith & Wesson could not be supported under any of the World War I statutes authorizing seizure. He thus adduced it in support of the claim of so-called inherent Presidential power of seizure. (See Hearings before House Select Committee to Investigate the Seizure of Montgomery Ward, 78th Cong., 2d sess., 167–168.) In so doing, he followed the ardor of advocates in claiming everything. In his own opinion to the President, he rested the power to seize Montgomery Ward on the statutory authority of the War Labor Disputes Act, see 40 Ops. Att'y Gen. 312 (1944), and the Court of Appeals decision upholding the Montgomery Ward seizure confined itself to that ground. *United States* v. *Montgomery Ward & Co.* (150 F. 2d 369). What Attorney General Biddle said about Smith & Wesson was, of course, post litem motam. Whether or not the World War I statutes were broad enough to justify that seizure, it is clear that the taking officers conceived themselves as moving within the scope of statute law. (See n. 3, Appendix II, infra.) Thus, whether or not that seizure was within the statute, it cannot properly be cited as a precedent for the one before us. On this general subject, compare Attorney General Knox's opinion advising President Theodore Roosevelt against the so-called stewardship theory of the Presidency. (National Archives, Opinions of the Attorney General, Book 31, October 10, 1902 (R. G. 60); Theodore Roosevelt, Autobiography, 388–389; 3 Morison, The Letters of Theodore Roosevelt, 323–366.)

APPENDIX I—*Synoptic analysis of legislation authorizing seizure of industrial property*

Statute	Duration		Scope of authority	Limitations on its exercise	Terms and conditions of employment during seizure	Compensation
	As enacted	As extended or repealed				
1. Railroad and Telegraph Act of 1862, 12 Stat. 334. Enacted 1/31/62; amended, 12 Stat. 625, 7/14/62.	Not "in force any longer than is necessary for the suppression of this rebellion."		President may "take possession of" telegraph lines and railroads; prescribe rules for their operation; and place all officers and employees under military control.	a. "When in his [the President's] judgment the public safety may require it." b. President may not "engage in any work of railroad construction."	None.	President shall appoint three commissioners to assess compensation to which the company is entitled and to report to Congress for its action.
2. § 120 of National Defense Act of 1916, 39 Stat. 166, 213, 50 U. S. C. § 80, as amended. Enacted 6/3/16.	No time limit.		President, through the head of any department, may seize any plant and may operate plants through the Army Ordnance Department.	a. Exercisable "in time of war or when war is imminent." b. Plant is equipped for making "necessary supplies or equipment for the Army" or "in the opinion of the Secretary of War" can be transformed readily to such use. c. Owner refuses to give government order precedence or to perform.	None.	Compensation "shall be fair and just."
3. Army Appropriations Act of 1916, 39 Stat. 619, 645, 10 U. S. C. ? 1361. Enacted 8/29/16.	No time limit.		President, through Secretary of War, may take possession of and utilize any system or part of any system of transportation.	Exercisable "in time of war."*	None.	Compensation "shall be fair and just."
4. Naval Emergency Fund Act of 1917, 39 Stat. 1168, 1192-1195, 50 U. S. C. § 82. Enacted 3/4/17. (*Cf.* Emergency Shipping Fund Act of 1917, *infra.*)	No time limit.		President may 1. "take over for use or operation" any factory "whether [or not] the United States has . . . agreement with the owner or occupier." 2. "take immediate possession of any factory" producing ships or war material for the Navy.	Exercisable "in time of war" (or of national emergency determined by the President before 3/1/18). a. Owner fails or refuses to give precedence to an order for "ships or war material as the necessities of the Government"; refuses to deliver or to comply with a contract as modified by President. b. Exercisable within "the limits of the amounts appropriated therefor."	None. None.	President shall determine "just compensation"; if the claimant is dissatisfied, he shall be paid 50 percent of the amount determined by the President and may sue, subject to existing law, in the district courts and the Court of Claims for the rest of "just compensation."
5. Emergency Shipping Fund Act of 1917, 40 Stat. 182. Enacted 6/15/17.	To 6 months after peace with the German Empire, 40 Stat. 182, 183.	Repealed after 3 years, § 2 (a) (1), 41 Stat. 988, 6/5/20.	President may 1. "take over for use or operation" any plant, "whether [or not] United States has . . . agreement with the owner or occupier." 2. "take immediate possession of any . . . plant" "equipped for the building or production of ships or material."	Exercisable "within the limits of the amounts herein authorized." Failure or refusal of owner of ship-building plant to give Government orders precedence or to comply with order.	None. None.	Same as next above, except that the prepaid percentage when the owner is dissatisfied is 75 percent.
6. 1918 Amendments to Emergency Shipping Fund Act of 1917. A. 40 Stat. 535. Enacted 4/22/18.	To 6 months after peace with the German Empire.	Repealed after 2 years, 41 Stat. 988, 6/5/20.	President may 1. "take possession of any street railroad."	a. The street railroad is necessary for transporting employees of plants which are or may be hereafter engaged in "construction of ships or equipment therefor for the United States." b. Exercisable "within the limits of the amounts herein authorized."	None.	Same as next above.
B. 40 Stat. 1020, 1022. Enacted 11/4/18.	To 6 months after peace with the German Empire.	Repealed after 1½ years, 41 Stat. 988, 6/5/20.	2. extend seized plants constructing ships or materials therefor and requisition land for use in extensions.	Exercisable "within the limits of the amounts herein authorized."	None.	
7. Food and Fuel Act of 1917, 40 Stat. 276. Enacted 8/10/17. § 10, 40 Stat. 276, 279.	To end of World War I with Germany.		President may— 1. requisition foods, fuels, feeds, etc., and storage facilities for them.	The requisitioning is "necessary to the support of the Army or the . . . Navy, or any other public use connected with the common defense."	None.	President "shall ascertain and pay a just compensation"; if the owner is dissatisfied, he shall be paid 75 percent of the amount determined by the President and may sue in the district courts, which are hereby given jurisdiction, for the rest of "just compensation."

*Governmental possession of the Nation's railroads taken on December 28, 1917, was specifically terminated by statute on March 1, 1920, prior to the end of the "war." See § 200 of the Transportation Act of 1920, 41 Stat. 456, 457.

APPENDIX I—*Synoptic analysis of legislation authorizing seizure of industrial property*—Continued

Statute	Duration		Scope of authority	Limitations on its exercise	Terms and conditions of employment during seizure	Compensation
	As enacted	As extended or repealed				
7. Food and Fuel Act of 1917—Continued. § 12, 40 Stat. 276, 279.			President may— 2. take over any factory, packing house, oil pipeline, mine, or other plant where any necessaries are or may be "produced, prepared, or mined, and to operate the same."	a. President finds "it necessary to secure an adequate supply of necessaries for . . . the Army or . . . the Navy, or for any other public use connected with the common defense." b. President must turn facility back as soon as further Government operation "is not essential for the national security or defense."	President may make regulations for "the employment, control, and compensation of employees."	Same as in the Emergency Shipping Fund Act of 1917, *supra*.
§ 25, 40 Stat. 276, 284.	To end of World War I with Germany.		3. "requisition and take over the plant, business, and all appurtenances thereof belonging to such producer or dealer" of coal and coke, and may operate it through an agency of his choice.	Producer or dealer a. Fails to conform to prices or regulations set by the Federal Trade Commission under the direction of the President, who deems it "necessary for the efficient prosecution of the war," or b. Fails to operate efficiently, or conducts business in a way "prejudicial to the public interest."	President may "prescribe . . . regulations . . . for the employment, control, and compensation of the employees."	Same as next above.
8. Joint Resolution of July 16, 1918, 40 Stat. 904.	"during the continuance of the present war."	Terminated on 7/31/19 by repeal, 7/11/19, 41 Stat. 127.	President may "take possession . . . of [and operate] any telegraph, telephone, marine cable or radio system.	President deems "it necessary for the national security or defense."	None.	Same as next above.
9. § 16 of Federal Water Power Act of 1920, 41 Stat. 1063, 1072, 16 U. S. C. § 809. Enacted 6/10/20.	No time limit.		President may take possession of any project, dams, power houses, transmission lines, etc., constructed or operated under a license from the Federal Power Commission and may operate them.	a. President believes, as "evidenced by a written order addressed to the holder of any license hereunder [that] the safety of the United States demands it." b. Seizure is "for the purpose of manufacturing nitrates, explosives, or munitions of war, or for any other purpose involving the safety of the United States." c. Control is limited to the "length of time as may appear to the President to be necessary to accomplish said purposes."	None.	Owner shall be paid "just and fair compensation for the use of said property as may be fixed by the [Federal Power] commission upon the basis of a reasonable profit in time of peace, and the cost of restoring said property to as good condition as existed at the time of the taking over thereof, less the reasonable value of any improvements . . . made thereto by the United States and which are valuable and serviceable to the [owner]."
10. § 606 of Communications Act of 1934, 48 Stat. 1064, 1104, 47 U. S. C. § 606 (c). Enacted 6/19/34.	No time limit.		President may "use or control . . . any such station and/or its apparatus and equipment by any department of the Government under such regulations as he may prescribe."	a. President proclaims that there exists (1) war or threat of war or (2) a state of public peril or disaster or other national emergency, or b. It is necessary to preserve the neutrality of the United States.	None.	President shall ascertain just compensation and certify it to Congress for appropriation; if the owner is dissatisfied, he shall be paid 75 percent of the amount determined by the President and may sue, subject to existing law, in the district courts and the Court of Claims for the rest of "just compensation."
11. Amendments to Communications Act, 56 Stat. 18, 47 U. S. C. § 606 (d). Enacted 1/26/42.	No time limit.		Same power as in § 606 (c), Communications Act of 1934 next above.	a. President proclaims a state of threat of war. b. President "deems it necessary in the interest of national security and defense." c. Power to seize and use property continues to "not later than six months after the termination of such state or threat of war" or than a date set by concurrent resolution of Congress.	None.	Same as next above.
12. § 8 (b) of National Defense Act of 1940, 54 Stat. 676, 680. Enacted 6/28/40.	No time limit.	Repealed in less than 3 months, 9/16/40, 54 Stat. 865, 893.	Secretary of Navy, under President's direction, may "take over and operate such plant or facility."	a. Secretary of Navy deems any existing plant necessary for the national defense. b. He is unable to reach agreement with its owner for its use or operation.	Secretary of Navy may operate the plant "either by Government personnel or by contract with private firms."	Secretary of Navy may "fix the compensation."

APPENDIX I—*Synoptic analysis of legislation authorizing seizure of industrial property*—Continued

Statute	Duration		Scope of authority	Limitations on its exercise	Terms and conditions of employment during seizure	Compensation
	As enacted	As extended or repealed				
13. § 9 of Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, 54 Stat. 865, 892, 50 U. S. C. App. (1946 ed.) § 309. Enacted 9/16/40; amended by War Labor Disputes Act, 57 Stat. 163, 164, *q. v., infra.*	To 5/15/45, 54 Stat. 865, 897.	Extended to 3/31/47, 60 Stat. 341, 342.	President may "take immediate possession of any such plant." (Extended by amendment to "any plant, mine, or facility" capable of producing "any articles or materials which may be required . . . or may be useful" for the war effort. 57 Stat. 163, 164).	*a.* Plant is equipped for or capable of being readily transformed for the manufacture of necessary supplies. *b.* Owner refuses to give Government order precedence or to fill it.	None.	"The compensation . . . shall be fair and just."
14. § 3 of War Labor Disputes Act of 1943, 57 Stat. 163, 164, 50 U. S. C. App. (1946 ed.) § 1503. Enacted 6/25/43.	To termination of this Act by concurrent resolution by Congress or of hostilities. Plants seized previously may be operated until 6 months after termination of hostilities.		President may "take immediate possession" of "any plant, mine, or facility equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required . . . or which may be useful" for the war effort.	*a.* Finding and proclamation by the President that (1) there is an interruption on account of a labor disturbance, (2) the war effort will be unduly impeded, (3) seizure is necessary to insure operation. *b.* Plant must be returned to owner within 60 days "after the restoration of the productive efficiency."	Same "terms and conditions of employment which were in effect at the time [of taking] possession," except that terms and conditions might be changed by order of the War Labor Board, on application. §§ 4, 5, 57 Stat. 163, 165.	Same as next above.
15. Title VIII, "Repricing of War Contracts," of Revenue Act of 1943, 58 Stat. 21, 92, 50 U. S. C. App. (1946 ed.) 1192. Enacted 2/25/44.	To termination o hostilities.		President may "take immediate possession of the plant or plants . . . and . . . operate them in accordance with section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended."	*a.* The Secretary of a Department deems the price of an article or service required directly or indirectly by the Department is unreasonable. *b.* The Secretary, after the refusal of the person furnishing the article or service to agree to a price, sets a price. *c.* The person "wilfully refuses, or wilfully fails" to furnish the articles or services at the price fixed by the Secretary.	None.	Same as next above.
16. Selective Service Act of 1948, 62 Stat. 604, 625, 50 U. S. C. App. § 468. Enacted 6/24/48.	No time limit.		President may "take immediate possession of any plant, mine, or other facility . . . and to operate it . . . for the production of such articles or materials."	*a.* President with advice of the National Security Resources Board determines prompt delivery of articles or materials is "in the interest of the national security." *b.* Procurement "has been authorized by Congress exclusively for the use of the armed forces" or the A. E. C. *c.* Owner refuses or fails to give precedence to Government order placed with notice that it is made pursuant to this section, or to fill the order properly.	None.	"Fair and just compensation shall be paid."
17. § 201 (a) of Defense Production Act, 64 Stat. 798, 799, 50 U. S. C. App. § 2081 (a). Enacted 9/8/50; amended, 65 Stat. 131, 132, *q. v., infra.*	To 6/30/51. But see § 716 (a), 64 Stat. 798, 822.	Extended to 7/31/51, 65 Stat. 110. Extended to 6/30/52, § 111, 65 Stat. 131, 144.	President may "requisition" "equipment, supplies or component parts thereof, or materials or facilities necessary for the manufacture, servicing, or operation of such equipment, supplies, or component parts." 64 Stat. 798, 799. Restricted in the main to personal property by § 102 (b), 65 Stat. 132.	President determines that *a.* its use is "needed for national defense," *b.* the need is "immediate and impending," "will not admit of delay or resort to any other source of supply," *c.* other reasonable means of obtaining use of the property erty have been exhausted.	None.	President shall determine just compensation as of the time the property is taken; if owner is dissatisfied, he shall be promptly paid 75 percent of the amount determined by the President and may sue within three years in the district courts or the Court of Claims, regardless of the amount involved, for the rest of "just compensation."
18. § 102 (b) (2) of Defense Production Act Amendments of 1951, 65 Stat. 131, 132, 50 U. S. C. App. § 2081 (b). Enacted 7/31/51.	To 6/30/52, 65 Stat. 131, 144.		Court condemnation of real property in accordance with existing statutes.	President deems the real property "necessary in the interest of national defense."	None.	Under existing statutes for condemnation. Immediate possession given only upon deposit of amount "estimated to be just compensation," 75 percent of which is immediately paid without prejudice to the owner.

APPENDIX II.—*Summary of seizures of industrial plants and facilities by the President*

CIVIL WAR PERIOD

Plant or facility seized	Duration of seizure		Order effecting seizure	Authority cited	Reason for seizure	Operations during seizure
	From	To				
Railroads and telegraph lines between Washington and Annapolis, Md.[1]	4/27/61	(?)	Order of Secretary of War dated 4/27/61 appointing Thomas A. Scott officer in charge. War of the Rebellion, Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies, Ser. I, Vol. II, 603.	None	Communications between Washington and the North were interrupted by bands of southern sympathizers who destroyed railway and telegraph facilities.	Northern troops guarded railway and telegraph facilities; they were repaired and restored to operation under orders of the Secretary of War.
Telegraph lines.	2/26/62	(?)	Order of Secretary of War dated 2/25/62 appointing Anson Stager officer in charge. Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, Lincoln, Order of Feb. 25, 1862.	"by virtue of the act of Congress" (presumably Railroad and Telegraph Act of 1862, 12 Stat. 334).	To insure effective transmission and security of military communications.	Lines operated under military supervision; censorship of messages; lines extended and completed subject to limitations of Joint Resolution of July 14, 1862, 12 Stat. 625.
Railroads.	5/25/62	8/8/65	Order of Secretary of War dated 5/25/62. Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, Lincoln, Order of May 25, 1862.	"by virtue of the authority vested by act of Congress" (presumably Railroad and Telegraph Act of 1862, 12 Stat. 334).	To insure effective priority to movement of troops and supplies.	Railways operated under military supervision; lines extended and completed subject to limitations of Joint Resolution of July 14, 1862, 12 Stat. 625; interruption of regular passenger and freight traffic.

WORLD WAR I PERIOD[2]

Bigelow-Hartford Carpet Co., Lowell, Mass.	12/27/17	12/31/19	Order of Secretary of War, Req. 20 A/C, Ord. No. 62, dated 12/27/17.	Constitution and laws.[3]	Requisitioned for use of United States Cartridge Co. for cartridge manufacture.	
Railroads.	12/28/17	3/1/20	Presidential proclamation, 40 Stat. 1733.	Joint resolution of April 6, 1917. Joint Resolution of Dec 7, 1917. Act of Aug. 29, 1916. "all other powers thereto me enabling."	Labor difficulties; congestion; ineffective operation in terms of war effort.	Wage increase; changes in operating practices and procedures.
Liberty Ordnance Co., Bridgeport, Conn.	1/7/18	5/20/19	Order of Secretary of War, Req. 26 A/C, Ord. No. 27, dated 1/5/18.	Constitution and laws.[3]	Inadequate financing and other difficulties leading to failure to perform contract for manufacture of 75 mm. guns.	Turned over to American Can Co. for operation.
Hoboken Land & Improvement Co., Hoboken N. J.	2/28/18	4/1/19	Order of Secretary of War, Req. 37 A/C, Ord. No. 516, dated 2/26/18.	Constitution and laws.[3]	Requisitioned for use of Remington Arms-U. M. C. Co. for cartridge manufacture.	
Bijur Motor Appliance Co., Hoboken, N. J.	4/1/18 8/15/18	5/1/19	Order of Secretary of War, Req. 37 A/C, Ord. No. 516, dated 2/26/18.	Constitution and laws.[3]	Requisitioned for use of Remington Arms-U. M. C. Co. for cartridge manufacture.	
Jewel Tea Co., Hoboken, N. J.	4/1/18	9/2/19	Order of Secretary of War, Req. 37 A/C, Ord. No. 516, dated 2/26/18.	Constitution and laws.[3]	Requisitioned for use of Remington Arms-U. M. C. Co. for cartridge manufacture.	
Telegraph lines.	7/25/18	7/31/19	Presidential proclamation, 40 Stat. 1807.	Joint Resolution of July 16, 1918. "all other powers thereto me enabling."	Labor difficulties.	Antiunion discrimination terminated.
Smith & Wesson, Springfield, Mass.	8/3/18	1/31/19	Order of Secretary of War, Req. 709 B/C, Ord. No. 604, dated 8/31/18.	Constitution and laws.[3]	Labor difficulties.	Antiunion discrimination terminated; operation by the National Operating Co., a Government corporation.
Federal Enameling & Stamping Co., McKees Rocks, Pa.	9/11/18	12/13/18	Order of Secretary of War, Req. 738 B/C, Ord. No. 609, dated 9/11/18.	Constitution and laws.[3]	Failure to fill compulsory order.	
Mosler Safe Co., Hamilton, Ohio.	9/23/18	2/25/19	Order of Secretary of War, Req. 781 B/C, Ord. No. 612, dated 9/23/18.	Constitution and laws.[3]	Failure to fill compulsory order.	
Bush Terminal Co., Brooklyn, N. Y.	(?)	(?)	(?)	Act of Aug. 29, 1916, Food and Fuel Act of 1917.	(?)	(?)

See footnotes at end of table.

APPENDIX II.—*Summary of seizures of industrial plants and facilities by the President*—Continued

WORLD WAR II PERIOD [1]—SEIZURES CONNECTED WITH LABOR DISPUTES

1. Before Pearl Harbor

Plant or facility seized	Duration of seizure		Executive order	Statutory authority cited [5]	Duration of stoppage		Changes in conditions of employment during seizure [7]	Basis for changes	Reported legal action [8]
	From—	To—			From—	To—			
North American Aviation, Inc., Inglewood, Calif.	6/9/41	7/2/41	8773. 6 Fed. Reg. 2777.	None. (Order cites contracts of company with Government and ownership by Government of machinery, materials and work in progress in plant.)	6/5/41	6/10/41	Property returned on agreement of parties to wage increase and maintenance of membership.	Agreement of parties on National Defense Mediation Board recommendation.	
Federal Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., Kearny, N. J.	8/23/41	1/6/42	8868. 6 Fed. Reg. 4349.	None. (Order cites contracts of company with Government and ownership by Government of vessels under construction, materials and equipment in yard.)	8/6/41	8/23/41	Maintenance of membership during period of seizure.	National Defense Mediation Board recommendation.	
Air Associates, Inc., Bendix, N. J.	10/30/41	12/29/41	8928. 6 Fed. Reg. 5559.	None. (Order cites contracts of company with Government and ownership by Government of facilities in plant.)	7/11/41 9/30/41	7/27/41 10/24/41	Strikers reinstated over replacements hired by company prior to seizure.	Agreement of parties on National Defense Mediation Board recommendation.	

2. Between Pearl Harbor and the Passage of the War Labor Disputes Act, June 25, 1943

Toledo, P. & W. R. Co.	3/21/42	10/1/45	9108. 7 Fed. Reg. 2201.	None.	12/28/41	3/21/42	Wage increase during period o. seizure.	War Labor Board recommendation.	*Toledo P. & W. R. Co.* v. *Storer*, 60 F. Supp. 587 (S. D. Ill. 1945).
General Cable Co., Bayonne, N. J., plant.	8/13/42	8/20/42	9220. 7 Fed. Reg. 6413.	None.	8/10/42	8/13/42	None.	War Labor Board recommendation.	
S. A. Woods Machine Co., South Boston, Mass.	8/19/42	8/25/45	9225. 7 Fed. Reg. 6627.	None.	None.	None.	Maintenance of membership.	War Labor Board recommendation.	
Coal Mines.	5/2/43	10/12/43	9340. 8 Fed. Reg. 5695.	None.	4/22/43 6/1/43 6/20/43	5/2/43 6/7/43* (?)*	Six-day week; eight-hour day. (To increase take-home.)	Order of the Secretary of Interior.	*United States* v. *Pewee Coal Co.*, 341 U. S. 114; *NLRB* v. *West Ky. Coal Co.*, 152 F. 2d 198 (6th Cir. 1945); *Glen Alden Coal Co.* v. *NLRB*, 141 F. 2d 47 (3d Cir. 1944).
American R. Co. of Porto Rico.	5/13/43	7/1/44	9341. 8 Fed. Reg. 6323.	None.	5/12/43	5/13/43	Wage increase.	War Labor Board recommendation.	

3. Between June 25, 1943, and VJ Day

Atlantic Basin Iron Works, Brooklyn, N. Y.	9/3/43	9/22/43	9375. 8 Fed. Reg. 12253.	War Labor Disputes Act.	None.	None.	Maintenance of membership.	War Labor Board recommendation.	
Coal Mines.	11/1/43	6/21/44	9393. 8 Fed. Reg. 14877.	War Labor Disputes Act.	10/12/43 11/1/43	11/4/43*	Changes in wages and hours.	Agreement with Secretary of Interior.	
Leather Manufacturers in Salem, Peabody, and Danvers, Mass.	11/20/43	12/13/43	9395B. 8 Fed. Reg. 16957.	None.	9/25/43 (sporadic)	11/24/43* (sporadic)	None. (Jurisdictional strike.)	None.	
Western Electric Co., Point Breeze plant, Baltimore, Md.	12/19/43	3/23/44	9408. 8 Fed. Reg. 16958.	War Labor Disputes Act.	12/14/43	12/19/43	None. (Strike in protest of War Labor Board nonsegregation ruling.)	None.	
Railroads.	12/30/43	1/18/44	9412. 8 Fed. Reg. 17395.	Act of Aug. 29, 1916.	None.	None.	Control relinquished when parties accepted Presidential compromise of wage demands.	Presidential arbitration based on Railway Labor Act Emergency Board recommendations.	*Thorne* v. *Washington Terminal Co.*, 55 F. Supp. 139 (D. D. C. 194).
Fall River, Mass., Textile Plants.	2/7/44	2/28/44	9420. 9 Fed. Reg. 1563.	War Labor Disputes Act.	12/13/43	2/14/44*	Property returned upon agreement by parties on seniority provisions.	War Labor Board recommendation.	
Department of Water and Power, Los Angeles, Calif.	2/23/44	2/29/44	9426. 9 Fed. Reg. 2113.	War Labor Disputes Act.	2/14/44	2/24/44	None.	None.	
Jenkins Bros., Inc., Bridgeport, Conn.	4/13/44	6/15/44	9435. 9 Fed. Reg. 4063.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended.	None.	None.	Wage increase.	War Labor Board recommendation.	*In re Jenkins Bros., Inc.*, 15 W. L. R. 719 (D. D. C. 1944).†

See footnotes at end of table.

APPENDIX II.—*Summary of seizures of industrial plants and facilities by the President*—Continued

WORLD WAR II PERIOD—SEIZURES CONNECTED WITH LABOR DISPUTES—continued

3. Between June 25, 1943, and VJ Day—Continued

Plant or facility seized	Duration of seizure		Executive order	Statutory authority cited [5]	Duration of stoppage		Changes in conditions of employment during seizure [7]	Basis for changes	Reported legal action [8]
	From—	To—			From—	To—[6]			
Ken-Rad Tube & Lamp Co., Owensboro, Ky.	4/13/44	6/15/44	9436. 9 Fed. Reg. 4063.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended.	None.	None.	Changes in wage scales; maintenance of membership.	War Labor Board recommendation.	*Ken-Rad Tube & Lamp Corp.* v. *Badeau*, 55 F. Supp. 193 (W. D. Ky. 1944).†
Montgomery Ward & Co., Chicago, Ill., facilities.	4/25/44	5/9/44	9438. 9 Fed. Reg. 4459.	None.	None.	None.	None. (Government extended expired contract pending NLRB election to determine bargaining representative.)	War Labor Board recommendation.	*United States* v. *Montgomery Ward & Co.*, 150 F. 2d 369 (7th Cir. 1945).†
Montgomery Ward & Co., Hummer Mfg. division, Springfield, Ill.	5/21/44	7/2/45	9443. 9 Fed. Reg. 5395.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended.	5/5/44	5/21/44	Maintenance of membership; voluntary check-off.	War Labor Board recommendation.	
Philadelphia Transportation Co., Philadelphia, Pa.	8/3/44	8/17/44	9459. 9 Fed. Reg. 9878.	Act of Aug. 29, 1916. First War Powers Act of 1941. § 9 of Selective Service Act of 1940, as amended.	8/1/44	8/7/44[9]	None. (Strike in protest of WLB nonsegregation ruling.)	None.	*United States* v. *McMenamin*, 58 F. Supp. 478 (E. D. Pa. 1944).†
Midwest Trucking Operators.	8/11/44	1/1/45 11/1/45	9462. 9 Fed. Reg. 10071.	Act of Aug. 29, 1916. First War Powers Act of 1941. § 9, Selective Service Act of 1940, as amended by the War Labor Disputes Act.	8/4/44	8/11/44	Wage increase.	War Labor Board recommendation.	
San Francisco, Calif., Machine Shops.	8/14/44 8/19/44	9/14/45	9463. 9 Fed. Reg. 9879. 9466. 9 Fed. Reg. 10139.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940, as amended.	Sporadic.	Sporadic.	Union agreed not to discipline employees who worked overtime. Cancellation of employee draft deferments, gas rations, and job referral rights.	War Labor Board recommendation.	*San Francisco Lodge No. 68 IAM* v. *Forrestal*, 58 F. Supp. 405 (N. D. Calif. 1944).
Anthracite Coal Mines.	8/23/44 9/19/44	2/24/45	9469.[9] 9 Fed. Reg. 10343.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by the War Labor Disputes Act.	6/29/44 8/7/44	8/23/44 9/7/44[10]	None.	None.	
International Nickel Co., Huntington, W. Va., plant.	8/29/44	10/14/44	9473. 9 Fed. Reg. 10613.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended.	8/18/44	8/29/44	None.	None.	
Hughes Tool Co., Houston Tex., facilities.	9/2/44	8/29/45	9475A. 9 Fed. Reg. 10943.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended.	None.	None.	Maintenance of membership during period of seizure.	War Labor Board recommendation.	
Cleveland Graphite Bronze Co., Cleveland, Ohio.	9/5/44	11/8/44	9477. 9 Fed. Reg. 10941.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by the War Labor Disputes Act.	8/31/44	9/5/44	Union agreed to arbitrate grievance which had precipitated the strike.	War Labor Board recommendation.	
Twentieth Century Brass Works, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.	9/9/44	2/17/45	9480. 9 Fed. Reg. 11143.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended.	8/21/44	9/9/44	Wage increase.	War Labor Board recommendation.	
Farrell Cheek Steel Co., Sandusky, Ohio.	9/23/44	8/28/45	9484. 9 Fed. Reg. 11731.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by the War Labor Disputes Act.	9/11/44	9/23/44	Wage increase; maintenance of membership during period of seizure.	War Labor Board recommendation.	
Toledo, Ohio, Machine Shops.	11/4/44	11/6/44	9496. 9 Fed. Reg. 13187.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by the War Labor Disputes Act.	10/27/44	11/5/44	None. (Jurisdictional strike.)	None.	
Cudahy Bros. Co., Cudahy, Wis.	12/6/44	6/31/45	9505. 9 Fed. Reg14473.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by the War Labor Disputes Act.	None.	None.	Maintenance of membership; voluntary check-off.	War Labor Board recommendation.	
Montgomery Ward & Co., Detroit, Mich., and other facilities.	12/27/44	10/18/45	9508. 9 Fed. Reg. 15079.	War Labor Disputes Act. § 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended.	12/9/44	12/27/44	Maintenance of membership and voluntary check-off during period of seizure.	War Labor Board recommendation.	*National War Labor Board* v. *Montgomery Ward & Co.*, 144 F. 2d 528 (D. C. Cir. 1944).
Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., Cleveland, Ohio.	1/13/45	1/15/45	9511. 10 Fed. Reg. 549.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended.	1/12/45	1/13/45	None.	None.	
Bingham & Garfield R. R., Utah.	1/24/45	8/29/45	9516. 10 Fed. Reg. 1313.	Act of Aug. 29, 1916. First War Powers Act of 1941. War Labor Disputes Act.	1/23/45	1/24/45	Property returned upon agreement by parties on wage scale for certain positions.	Railway Labor Act Emergency Board recommendation.	

See footnotes at end of table.

APPENDIX II.—*Summary of seizures of industrial plants and facilities by the President*—Continued

WORLD WAR II PERIOD [1]—SEIZURES CONNECTED WITH LABOR DISPUTES—continued

3. Between June 25, 1943, and VJ Day—Continued

Plant or facility seized	Duration of seizure		Executive order	Statutory authority cited [2]	Duration of stoppage		Changes in conditions of employment during seizure [7]	Basis for changes	Reported legal action [8]
	From—	To—			From—	To—[6]			
American Enka Corp., Enka, N. C.	2/18/45	6/6/45	9523. 10 Fed. Reg. 2133.	War Labor Disputes Act. Selective Service Act as amended.	2/7/45	2/18/45	None. (Strike over question of contract interpretation submitted to arbitration.)	War Labor Board recommendation.	
Coal mines: Bituminous.	4/10/45	5/12/45 10/25/45	9536. 10 Fed. Reg. 3939.	§ 9, Selective Service Act as amended by the War Labor Disputes Act.	4/1/45	4/11/45	Wage increase.	Agreement of parties.	
Anthracite.	5/3/45	6/23/45	9584. 10 Fed. Reg. 5025.		5/1/45	5/24/45*	Wage increase.	Agreement of parties.	
Cities Service Refining Corp., Lake Charles, La., plant.	4/17/45	12/23/45	9540. 10 Fed. Reg. 4193.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by the War Labor Disputes Act.	(?)	4/17/45	None. (Strike over housing conditions.)	None.	
United Engineering Co., Ltd., San Francisco, Calif.	4/25/45	8/31/45	9542. 10 Fed. Reg. 4591.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by the War Labor Disputes Act.	4/12/45	(?)*	Union's privileges under contract revoked.	War Labor Board recommendation.	
Cocker Machine & Foundry Co., Gastonia, N. C.	5/20/45	8/31/45	9552. 10 Fed. Reg. 5757.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by the War Labor Disputes Act.	(?)	5/20/45	Wage increase; maintenance of membership during period of seizure.	War Labor Board recommendation.	
Chicago, Ill., Motor Carriers.	5/23/45	8/16/45	9554. 10 Fed. Reg. 5981.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by the War Labor Disputes Act. Act of Aug. 29, 1916. First War Powers Act of 1941.	5/19/45 6/16/45	5/24/45 6/27/45*	Wage increase.	War Labor Board recommendation	
Gaffney Mfg. Co., Gaffney, S. C.	5/28/45	9/9/45	9559. 10 Fed. Reg. 6287.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by the War Labor Disputes Act.	(?)	5/28/45	Wage increase and maintenance of membership during period of seizure.	War Labor Board recommendation.	
Mary-Leila Cotton Mills, Greensboro, Ga.	6/1/45	8/31/45	9560. 10 Fed. Reg. 6547.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by the War Labor Disputes Act.	4/1/45	6/1/45	Contract extension; maintenance of membership and voluntary check-off during period of seizure.	War Labor Board recommendation.	
Humble Oil & Refining Co., Ingleside, Tex., plant.	6/5/45	9/10/45	9564. 10 Fed. Reg. 6791.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by the War Labor Disputes Act.	None.	None.	Maintenance of membership during period of seizure.	War Labor Board recommendation.	*Eighth Regional War Labor Bd.* v. *Humble Oil & Refining Co.*, 145 F. 2d 462 (5th Cir. 1945).†
Pure Oil Co., Cabin Creek oil field, Dawes, W. Va., facilities.	6/6/45	9/10/45	9565. 10 Fed. Reg. 6792.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by the War Labor Disputes Act.	5/14/45	6/6/45	Maintenance of membership during period of seizure.	War Labor Board recommendation.	
Scranton Transit Co., Scranton, Pa.	6/14/45	7/8/45	9570. 10 Fed. Reg. 7235.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by § 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act. Act of Aug. 20, 1916. First War Powers Act of 1941.	5/20/45	6/14/45	None.	None.	
Diamond Alkali Co., Painesville, Ohio.	6/19/45	7/19/45	9574. 10 Fed. Reg. 7435.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by the War Labor Disputes Act.	6/15/45	6/19/45	Property returned upon agreement by parties to wage increase.	None.	
Texas Co., Port Arthur, Tex., plant.	7/1/45	9/10/45	9577A. 10 Fed. Reg. 8090.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by the War Labor Disputes Act.	6/29/45	7/1/45	None. (Strike over racial discrimination.)	None.	
Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.	7/4/45	8/30/45	9585. 10 Fed. Reg. 8335.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by the War Labor Disputes Act.	6/20/45	7/4/45	Agreement by union to submit future disputes to federal agency.	(?).	
Sinclair Rubber Co., Houston, Tex., butadiene plant.	7/19/45	11/19/45	9589A. 10 Fed. Reg. 8949.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by the War Labor Disputes Act.	None.	None.	Change in union security arrangements.	War Labor Board recommendation.	
Springfield Plywood Co., Springfield, Oreg.	7/25/45	8/30/45	9593. 10 Fed. Reg. 9379.	§ 9. Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by the War Labor Disputes Act.	(?)	7/25/45	None.	None.	
U. S. Rubber Co., Detroit, Mich., facilities.	7/31/45	10/10/45	9595. 10 Fed. Reg. 9571.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by the War Labor Disputes Act.	7/14/45	7/31/45	None.	None.	

See footnotes at end of table.

APPENDIX II.—*Summary of seizures of industrial plants and facilities by the President*—Continued

WORLD WAR II PERIOD[1]—SEIZURES CONNECTED WITH LABOR DISPUTES—continued

4. Between VJ-day and the expiration of the Wage Labor Disputes Act Seizure Powers, Dec. 31, 1946

Plant or facility seized	Duration of seizure		Executive order	Statutory authority cited[3]	Duration of stoppage		Changes in conditions of employment during seizure[7]	Basis for changes	Reported legal action[8]
	From—	To—			From—	To—[4]			
Illinois Central R. Co.	8/23/45	5/27/46	9602. 10 Fed Reg. 10957.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by § 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act. Act of Aug. 29, 1916. First War Powers Act of 1941.	None.	None.	None. (Jurisdictional strike.)	Railway Labor Act Emergency Board recommended against change.	
Petroleum Refineries and Pipelines. (One-half national refining capacity.)	10/4/45	12/12/45 2/7/46	9639. 10 Fed. Reg. 12592.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by the War Labor Disputes Act.	9/16/45	10/5/45	Plants returned on agreement of owners to 18 percent wage increase.	*Ad hoc* fact-finding board recommendation.	
Capital Transit Co., Washington, D. C.	11/21/45	1/7/46	9658. 10 Fed. Reg. 14351.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by § 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act. Act of Aug. 29, 1916. First War Powers Act of 1941.	11/6/45 11/20/45	11/7/45 11/21/45	Facilities returned when parties agreed to arbitration award on wages.	*Ad hoc* arbitration board award.	
Great Lakes Towing Co., Cleveland, Ohio.	11/20/45	12/18/46	9661. 10 Fed. Reg. 14291.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by § 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act. Act of Aug. 29, 1916. First War Powers Act of 1941.	9/4/45 11/1/45	11/20/45	Wage increase.	National Wage Stabilization Board recommendation.	
Meatpacking Industry.	1/24/46	3/12/46 5/22/46	9685. 11 Fed. Reg. 989. 9690. 11 Fed. Reg. 1337.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by the War Labor Disputes Act.	1/16/46	1/28/46*	Plants returned as companies agreed to wage increase recommended by fact-finding board.	*Ad hoc* fact-finding board recommendation approved by National Wage Stabilization Board.	
New York Harbor Tugboat Companies.	2/5/46	3/3/46	9693. 11 Fed. Reg. 1421.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by § 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act. Act of Aug. 29, 1916. First War Powers Act of 1941.	2/4/46	2/13/46*	Properties returned after agreement of parties to arbitrate dispute.	None.	
Railroads.	5/17/46	5/26/46	9727. 11 Fed. Reg. 5461.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by § 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act. Act of Aug. 29, 1916. First War Powers Act of 1941.	5/23/46	5/25/46*	Properties returned after unions agreed to Presidential compromise of wage demands.	Railway Labor Act Emergency Board recommendation as modified by President.	
Bituminous Coal Mines.	5/21/46	6/30/47	9728. 11 Fed. Reg. 5593.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by the War Labor Disputes Act.	4/1/46 5/25/46	5/11/46 5/30/46*	Wage increase, welfare and retirement fund, mine safety provisions, and recognition of UMW as representative of supervisory employees during period of seizure.	Contract between union and Secretary of Interior.	*United States* v. *United Mine Workers*, 330 U. S. 258; *Jones & Laughlin Steel Co.* v. *UMW*, 159 F. 2d 18 (D. C. Cir. 1946); *Krug* v. *Fox*, 161 F. 2d 1013 (4th Cir. 1947).†
Monongahela Connecting R. Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.	6/14/46	8/12/46	9736. 11 Fed. Reg. 6661.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended by § 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act. Act of Aug. 29, 1916. First War Powers Act of 1941.	6/10/46	6/14/46	None. (Property returned on recession of union from wage demands.)	None.	

5. Since the expiration of the War Labor Disputes Act Seizures Powers, Dec. 31, 1946

Railroads.	5/10/48	7/9/48	9957. 13 Fed. Reg. 2369.	Act of Aug. 29, 1916.	None.	None.	Property returned on agreement of parties to wage increase.	Railway Labor Act Emergency Board recommendation as modified.	*United States* v. *Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers*, 79 F. Supp. 485 (D. D. C. 1948).
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific R. Co.	7/8/50	5/23/52	10141. 15 Fed. Reg. 4363.	Act of Aug. 29, 1916.	6/25/50	7/8/50	Property returned on agreement of parties to wage increase.	Railway Labor Act Emergency Board recommendation as modified.	
Railroads	8/27/50	5/23/52	10155. 15 Fed. Reg. 5785.	Act of Aug. 29, 1916.	12/10/50 1/29/51 3/9/52	12/15/50 2/19/51 3/12/52	Agreement reached by carriers and some of the Brotherhoods put into effect. Property returned on agreement of parties to wage increase.	Railway Labor Act Emergency Board recommendation as modified.	

See footnotes at end of table.

APPENDIX II.—*Summary of seizures of industrial plants and facilities by the President*—Continued

WORLD WAR II PERIOD—SEIZURES CONNECTED WITH LABOR DISPUTES—continued

Plant or facility seized	Duration of seizure		Executive order	Statutory authority cited[1]	Reasons for seizure	Changes instituted during seizure
	From—	To—				
Grand River Dam Authority, Oklahoma.	11/19/41	7/31/46	8944. 6 Fed. Reg. 5947.	§ 16, Federal Power Act.	This was a State power project, financed by federal loan and grant. Seizure was based on (1) State default on loan interest; (2) refusal of State legislature to issue bonds to complete financing; (3) failure to meet scheduled completion date in power-short defense area.	Federal Works Administrator replaced management and completed the project. Transferred to Department of Interior, Executive Order No. 9373, 8 Fed. Reg. 12001, 8/30/43. Returned pursuant to Act of July 31, 1946, 60 Stat. 743.
Brewster Aeronautical Corp., Long Island City, N. Y., Newark, N. J., Johnsville, Pa.	4/18/42	5/20/42	9141. 7 Fed. Reg. 2961.	None.	(1) Inefficient management; (2) failure to operate at full capacity; (3) failure to maintain delivery schedules on Army and Navy aircraft. (Congressional investigation suggested labor difficulties as well, due to employment of enemy aliens.)	New board of directors and officers installed; majority shareholders established 2½ year voting trust in favor of new president.
Triumph Explosives, Inc., Maryland and Delaware plants.	10/12/42	2/28/43 6/5/43	9254. 7 Fed. Reg. 8333.	None.	Overpayments (presumably bribes) of $1,400,000 to procurement officers.	New board of directors and officers; indictments against former officials.
Howarth Pivoted Bearings Co., Philadelphia, Pa.	6/14/43	8/25/45	9351. 8 Fed. Reg. 8097.	None.	Inefficient management.	Designees of Secretary of Navy operated plant for duration of war.
Remington Rand, Inc., Southport, N. Y., plant.	11/23/43	9/30/44	9390. 8 Fed. Reg. 16269.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended.	(1) Norden bombsight parts production of unacceptable quality; (2) deliveries behind schedule.	Designees of Secretary of Navy supervised operations for duration of seizure.
Los Angeles Shipbuilding & Drydock Corp., Los Angeles, Calif.	12/8/43	8/25/45	9400. 8 Fed. Reg. 16641.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended.	(1) Excessive costs; (2) production behind schedule.	Operated by contractor (Todd Shipyard Co.) for duration of war.
York Safe & Lock Co., York, Pa.	1/23/44	3/15/45	9416. 9 Fed. Reg. 936.	§ 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended.	(1) Inefficient management; (2) deliveries behind schedule.	Designees of Secretary of Navy operated company for duration of war, except for a portion which was condemned and transferred to Blaw-Knox Co.
Lord Mfg. Co., Erie, Pa.[11]	10/24/44	8/25/45	9493. 9 Fed. Reg. 12860.	Tit. VIII, Revenue Act of 1943. § 9, Selective Service Act of 1940 as amended.	Refusal to deliver items at "fair and reasonable prices" fixed by the Secretary of the Navy in contract renegotiation.	Designees of Secretary of Navy operated company for duration of war.

[1] Clyde B. Aitchison states that on March 31, 1861, the Federal authorities took "under military control the Philadelphia, Wilmington & Baltimore Railway to insure uninterrupted communication between the North Atlantic States and Washington." Aitchison, War Time Control of American Railways, 26 Va. L. Rev. 847, 856 (1940). He adds that the return of the road to its private owners followed "shortly thereafter." *Ibid.* Original documents on this seizure are unavailable and it has, therefore, not been included in the table.

[2] The material in this table is taken from original documents in the National Archives and Hearings before the Senate Special Committee Investigating the Munitions Industry, 73d Cong., Part 17, 4270–4271 (1934).

[3] Although no specific statutory authority was cited in the seizing order, it is clear from correspondence and reports in connection with the administration of the program that the seizure was effected under wartime legislation. See, *e. g.*, Davisson, History of the Advisory Section, Administrative Division, Ordnance Office in connection with the Commandeering of Private Property, National Archives, Records of the War Department, Office of the Chief of Ordnance, O. O. 023/1362, Nov. 1920; Letter from Ordnance Office, Administrative Division to The Adjutant General, National Archives, Records of the War Department, Office of The Adjutant General, AG 386.2, Jan. 7, 1919.

[4] The material in this table is summarized from a number of sources, chief of which are the War Labor Reports, contemporary accounts in the New York Times, United States National Wage Stabilization Board, Research and statistics report No. 2 (1946), and Johnson, Government Seizures and Labor Disputes (Philadelphia, Pa., 1948) (unpublished doctoral dissertation at the University of Pennsylvania.) Question marks appear in the tables in instances where no satisfactory information on the particular point was available.

[5] Each of the Executive Orders uses the stock phrase "the Constitution and laws" as authority for the President's action as well as his position as Commander in Chief. Only specific statutory authority relief upon is given in this table. The form of reference of the particular Executive Order is used. Statutes referred to in the table are analyzed in Appendix I, *supra*. For convenience, their citations are repeated here:

(1) Army Appropriations Act of Aug. 29, 1916, 39 Stat. 619, 645, 10 U. S. C. § 1361.
(2) Federal Water Power Act of 1920, § 16, 41 Stat. 1063, 1072, 16 U. S. C. § 809.
(3) Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, § 9, 54 Stat. 865, 892.
(4) War Labor Disputes Act, § 3, 57 Stat. 163, 164.
(5) Revenue Act of 1943, Tit. VIII, "Repricing Contracts," 58 Stat. 21, 92.

When seizures of transportation facilities were effected through agencies other than the War Department, the First War Powers Act of 1941, 55 Stat. 838, was cited. Title I of that Act permitted the President to shift certain functions among executive agencies in aid of the war effort. The Act of Aug. 29, 1916, authorizing seizure of transportation facilities, specified that it should be accomplished through the Secretary of War.

[6] Stoppages continuing during seizure are indicated by an asterisk (*).

[7] Unless otherwise indicated, changes in conditions of employment instituted during seizure were continued by management upon the return of the facilities to its control.

[8] Validity of seizure was challenged in comparatively few cases. Most litigation concerned the consequences of seizure. Cases in which the validity of the seizure was attacked are indicated by a dagger (†).

[9] This order was followed by a series drawn in the same terms extending the seizure to additional mines. The Executive Orders were: No. 9474, 9 Fed. Reg. 10815; No. 9476, 9 Fed. Reg. 10817; No. 9478, 9 Fed. Reg. 11045; No. 9481, 9 Fed. Reg. 11387; No. 9482, 9 Fed. Reg. 11459; No. 9483, 9 Fed. Reg. 11691.

[10] A series of strikes for recognition by supervisory employees at the various mines were usually, though not always, terminated on seizure of the affected property.

[11] See *Lord Mfg. Co.* v. *Collison*, 62 F. Supp. 79 (W. D. Pa. 1945).

Mr. Justice Douglas, concurring:

There can be no doubt that the emergency which caused the President to seize these steel plants was one that bore heavily on the country. But the emergency did not create power; it merely marked an occasion when power should be exercised. And the fact that it was necessary that measures be taken to keep steel in production does not mean that the President, rather than the Congress, had the constitutional authority to act. The Congress, as well as the President, is trustee of the national welfare. The President can act more quickly than the Congress. The President with the armed services at his disposal can move with force as well as with speed. All executive power—from the reign of ancient kings to the rule of modern dictators—has the outward appearance of efficiency.

Legislative power, by contrast, is slower to exercise. There must be delay while the ponderous machinery of committees, hearings, and debates is put into motion. That takes time; and while the Congress slowly moves into action, the emergency may take its toll in wages, consumer goods, war production, the standard of living of the people, and perhaps even lives. Legislative action may indeed often be cumbersome, time-consuming, and apparently inefficient. But as Mr. Justice Brandeis stated in his dissent in *Myers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52, 293):

"The doctrine of the separation of powers was adopted by the Convention of 1787, not to promote efficiency but to preclude the exercise of arbitrary power. The purpose was, not to avoid friction, but by means of the inevitable friction incident to the distribution of the governmental powers among three departments, to save the people from autocracy."

We therefore cannot decide this case by determining which branch of government can deal most expeditiously with the present crisis. The answer must depend on the allocation of powers under the Constitution. That in turn requires an analysis of the conditions giving rise to the seizure and of the seizure itself.

The relations between labor and industry are one of the crucial problems of the era. Their solution will doubtless entail many methods—education of labor leaders and business executives; the encouragement of mediation and conciliation by the President and the use of his great office in the cause of industrial peace; and the passage of laws. Laws entail sanctions—penalties for their violation. One type of sanction is fine and

imprisonment. Another is seizure of property. An industry may become so lawless, so irresponsible as to endanger the whole economy. Seizure of the industry may be the only wise and practical solution.

The method by which industrial peace is achieved is of vital importance not only to the parties but to society as well. A determination that sanctions should be applied, that the hand of the law should be placed upon the parties, and that the force of the courts should be directed against them, is an exercise of legislative power. In some nations that power is entrusted to the executive branch as a matter of course or in case of emergencies. We chose another course. We chose to place the legislative power of the Federal Government in the Congress. The language of the Constitution is not ambiguous or qualified. It places not some legislative power in the Congress; article I, section 1, says, "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

The legislative nature of the action taken by the President seems to me to be clear. When the United States takes over an industrial plant to settle a labor controversy, it is condemning property. The seizure of the plant is a taking in the constitutional sense (*United States* v. *Pewee Coal Co.* (341 U. S. 114)). A permanent taking would amount to the nationalization of the industry. A temporary taking falls short of that goal. But though the seizure is only for a week or a month, the condemnation is complete and the United States must pay compensation for the temporary possession (*United States* v. *General Motors Corp.* (323 U. S. 373); *United States* v. *Pewee Coal Co.*, supra)).

The power of the Federal Government to condemn property is well established (*Kohl* v. *United States* (91 U. S. 367)). It can condemn for any public purpose; and I have no doubt but that condemnation of a plant, factory, or industry in order to promote industrial peace would be constitutional. But there is a duty to pay for all property taken by the Government. The command of the fifth amendment is that no "private property be taken for public use, without just compensation." That constitutional requirement has an important bearing on the present case.

The President has no power to raise revenues. That power is in the Congress by article I, section 8 of the Constitution. The President might seize and the Congress by subsequent action might ratify the seizure.[24] But until and unless Congress acted, no condemnation would be lawful. The branch of Government that has the power to pay compensation for a seizure is the only one able to authorize a seizure or make lawful one that the President had effected.[25] That seems to me to be the necessary result of the condemnation provision in the fifth amendment. It squares with the theory of checks and balances expounded by Mr. Justice Black in the opinion of the Court in which I join.

If we sanctioned the present exercise of power by the President, we would be expanding article II of the Constitution and rewriting it to suit the political conveniences of the present emergency. Article II which vests the "executive power" in the President defines that power with particularity. Article II, section 2 makes the Chief Executive the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. But our history and tradition rebel at the thought that the grant of military power carries with it authority over civilian affairs. Article II, section 3 provides that the President shall "from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient." The power to recommend legislation, granted to the President, serves only to emphasize that it is his function to recommend and that it is the function of the Congress to legislate. Article II, section 3 also provides that the President "shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed." But as Mr. Justice Black and Mr. Justice Frankfurter point out, the power to execute the laws starts and ends with the laws Congress has enacted.

The great office of President is not a weak and powerless one. The President represents the people and is their spokesman in domestic and foreign affairs. The office is respected more than any other in the land. It gives a position of leadership that is unique. The power to formulate policies and mold opinion inheres in the Presidency and conditions our national life. The impact of the man and the philosophy he represents may at times be thwarted by the Congress. Stalemates may occur when emergencies mount and the Nation suffers for lack of harmonious, reciprocal action between the White House and Capitol Hill. That is a risk inherent in our system of separation of powers. The tragedy of such stalemates might be avoided by allowing the President the use of some legislative authority. The framers, with memories of the tyrannies produced by a blending of executive and legislative power, rejected that political arrangement. Some future generation may, however, deem it so urgent that the President have legislative authority that the Constitution will be amended. We could not sanction the seizures and condemnations of the steel plants in this case without reading article II as giving the President not only the power to execute the laws, but to make some. Such a step would most assuredly alter the pattern of the Constitution.

We pay a price for our system of checks and balances, for the distribution of power among the three branches of Government. It is a price that today may seem exorbitant to many. Today a kindly President uses the seizure power to effect a wage increase and to keep the steel furnaces in production. Yet tomorrow another President might use the same power to prevent a wage increase, to curb trade unionists, to regiment labor as oppressively as industry thinks it has been regimented by this seizure.

Mr. Justice Jackson, concurring in the judgment and opinion of the court:

That comprehensive and undefined Presidential powers hold both practical advantages and grave dangers for the country will impress anyone who has served as legal adviser to a President in time of transition and public anxiety. While an interval of detached reflection may temper teachings of that experience, they probably are a more realistic influence on my views than the conventional materials of judicial decision which seem unduly to accentuate doctrine and legal fiction. But as we approach the question of Presidential power, we half overcome mental hazards by recognizing them. The opinions of judges, no less than executives and publicists, often suffer the infirmity of confusing the issue of a power's validity with the cause it is invoked to promote, of confounding the permanent executive office with its temporary occupant. The tendency is strong to emphasize transient results upon policies—such as wages or stabilization—and lose sight of enduring consequences upon the balanced power structure of our Republic.

A judge, like an executive adviser, may be surprised at the poverty of really useful and unambiguous authority applicable to concrete problems of executive power as they actually present themselves. Just what our forefathers did envision, or would have envisioned had they foreseen modern conditions, must be divined from materials almost as enigmatic as the dreams Joseph was called upon to interpret for Pharaoh. A century and a half of partisan debate and scholarly speculation yields no net result but only supplies more or less apt quotations from respected sources on each side of any question. They largely cancel each other.[26] And court decisions are indecisive because of the judicial practice of dealing with the largest questions in the most narrow way.

The actual art of governing under our Constitution does not and cannot conform to judicial definitions of the power of any of its branches based on isolated clauses or even single articles torn from context. While the Constitution diffuses power the better to secure liberty, it also contemplates that practice will integrate the dispersed powers into a workable Government. It enjoins upon its branches separateness but interdependance, autonomy but reciprocity. Presidential powers are not fixed but fluctuate, depending upon their disjunction or conjunction with those of Congress. We may well begin by a somewhat oversimplified grouping of practical situations in which a President may doubt, or others may challenge, his powers, and by distinguishing roughly the legal consequences of this factor of relativity.

1. When the President acts pursuant to an express or implied authorization of Congress, his authority is at its maximum, for it includes all that he possesses in his own right plus all that Congress can delegate.[27] In

---

[24] What a President may do as a matter of expediency or extremity may never reach a definitive constitutional decision. For example, President Lincoln suspended the writ of habeas corpus, claiming the constitutional right to do so. *See Ex parte Merryman*, 17 Fed. Cas. No. 9, 487. Congress ratified his action by the act of March 3, 1863. 12 Stat. 755.

[25] Mr. Justice Brandeis, speaking for the Court in *United States* v. *North American Co.*, 253 U. S. 330, 333, stated that the basis of the Government's liability for a taking of property was legislative authority, "In order that the Government shall be liable it must appear that the officer who has physically taken possession of the property was duly authorized so to do, either directly by Congress or by the official upon whom Congress conferred the power." That theory explains cases like *United States* v. *Causby*, 328 U. S. 256, where the acts of the officials resulting in a taking were acts authorized by the Congress, though the Congress had not treated the acts as one of appropriation of private property. Wartime seizures by the military in connection with military operations (cf. *United States* v. *Russell*, 13 Wall. 623) are also in a different category.

[26] A Hamilton may be matched against a Madison. 7 The Works of Alexander Hamilton, 76–117; 1 Madison, Letters and Other Writings, 611–654. Professor Taft is counterbalanced by Theodore Roosevelt. Taft, Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers, 139–140; Theodore Roosevelt, Autobiography, 388–389. It even seems that President Taft cancels out Professor Taft. Compare his "Temporary Petroleum Withdrawal No. 5" of September 27, 1909, *United States* v. *Midwest Oil Co.* (236 U. S. 459, 467, 468) with his appraisal of Executive power in "Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers," 139–140.

[27] It is in this class of cases that we find the broadest recent statements of Presidential power, including those relied on here. *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Corp.* (299 U. S. 304) involved, not the question of his President's power to act without congressional authority, but the question of his right to act under and in accord with an act of Congress. The constitutionality of the act under which the President had proceeded was assailed on the ground that it

these circumstances, and in these only, may he be said (for what it may be worth), to personify the Federal sovereignty. If his act is held unconstitutional under these circumstances, it usually means that the Federal Government as an undivided whole lacks power. A seizure executed by the President pursuant to an act of Congress would be supported by the strongest of presumptions and the widest latitude of judicial interpretation, and the burden of persuasion would rest heavily upon any who might attack it.

2. When the President acts in absence of either a congressional grant or denial of authority, he can only rely upon his own independent powers, but there is a zone of twilight in which he and Congress may have concurrent authority, or in which its distribution is uncertain. Therefore, congressional inertia, indifference or quiescence may sometimes, at least as a practical matter, enable, if not invite, measures on independent Presidential responsibility. In this area, any actual test of power is likely to depend on the imperatives of events and contemporary imponderables rather than on abstract theories of law.[20]

3. When the President takes measures incompatible with the expressed or implied will of Congress, his power is at its lowest ebb, for then he can rely only upon his own constitutional powers minus any constitutional powers of Congress over the matter. Courts can sustain exclusive Presidential control in such a case only by disabling the Congress from acting upon the subject.[21] Presidential claim to a power at once so conclusive and preclusive must be scurtinized with caution, for what is at stake is the equilibrium established by our constitutional system.

Into which of these classifications does this Executive seizure of the steel industry fit? It is eliminated from the first by admission, for it is conceded that no congressional authorization exists for this seizure. That takes away also the support of the many precedents and declarations which were made in relation, and must be confined, to this category.[22]

Can it then be defended under flexible tests available to the second category? It seems clearly eliminated from that class because Congress has not left seizure of private property an open field but has covered it by three statutory policies inconsistent with this seizure. In cases where the purpose is to supply needs of the Government itself, two courses are provided: One, seizure of a plant which fails to comply with obligatory orders placed by the Government,[23] another, condemnation of facilities, including temporary use under the power of eminent domain.[24] The third is applicable where it is the general economy of the country that is to be protected rather than exclusive governmental interests.[25] None of these were invoked. In choosing a different and inconsistent way of his own, the President cannot claim that it is necessitated or invited by failure of Congress to legislate upon the occasions, grounds, and methods for seizure of industrial properties.

This leaves the current seizure to be justified only by the severe tests under the third grouping, where it can be supported only by any remainder of executive power after subtraction of such powers as Congress may have over the subject. In short, we can sustain the President only by holding that seizure of such strike-bound industries is within his domain and beyond control by Congress. Thus, this court's first review of such seizures occurs under circumstances which leave Presidential power most vulnerable to attack and in the least favorable of possible constitutional postures.

I did not suppose, and I am not persuaded, that history leaves it open to question, at least in the courts, that the executive branch, like the Federal Government as a whole, possesses only delegated powers. The purpose of the Constitution was not only to grant power, but to keep it from getting out of hand. However, because the President does not enjoy unmentioned powers does not mean that the mentioned ones should be narrowed by a niggardly construction. Some clauses could be made almost unworkable, as well as immutable, by refusal to indulge some latitude of interpretation for changing times. I have heretofore, and do now, give to the enumerated powers the scope and elasticity afforded by what seem to be reasonable practical implications instead of the rigidity dictated by a doctrinaire textualism.

The Solicitor General seeks the power of seizure in three clauses of the Executive Article, the first reading, "The Executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America." Lest I be thought to exaggerate, I quote the interpretation which his brief puts upon it: "In our view, this clause constitutes a grant of all the Executive powers of which the Government is capable." If that be true, it is difficult to see why the forefathers bothered to add several specific items, including some trifling ones.[26]

The example of such unlimited Executive power that must have most impressed the forefathers was the prerogative exercised by

---

delegated legislative powers to the President. Much of the court's opinion is dicta, but the ratio decidendi is contained in the following language: "When the President is to be authorized by legislation to act in respect of a matter intended to affect a situation in foreign territory, the legislator properly bears in mind the important consideration that the form of the President's action—or, indeed, whether he shall act at all—may well depend, among other things, upon the nature of the confidential information which he has or may thereafter receive or upon the effect which his action may have upon our foreign relations. This consideration, in connection with what we have already said on the subject, discloses the unwisdom of requiring Congress in this field of governmental power to lay down narrowly definite standards by which the President is to be governed. As this Court said in *Mackenzie* v. *Hare* (239 U. S. 299, 311) 'As a Government, the United States is invested with all the attributes of sovereignty. As it has the character of nationality it has the powers of nationality, especially those which concern its relations and intercourse with other countries. We should hesitate long before limiting or embarrassing such powers.'" That case does not solve the present controversy. It recognized internal and external affairs as being in separate categories, and held that the strict limitation upon congressional delegations of power to the President over internal affairs does not apply with respect to delegations of power in external affairs. It was intimated that the President might act in external affairs without congressional authority, but not that he might act contrary to an act of Congress. Other examples of wide definition of Presidential powers under statutory authorization are *Chicago & Southern Air Lines* v. *Waterman Steamship Corp.* (333 U. S. 103) and *Hirabayashi* v. *United States* (320 U. S. 81). But see, *Jecker* v. *Montgomery* (13 How. 498, 515); *Western Union Telegraph Co.* v. *United States* (272 F. 311; aff'd, 272 F. 893; rev'd on consent of the parties, 260 U. S. 754); *United States Harness Co.* v. *Graham* (288 F. 929).

[20] Since the Constitution implies that the writ of habeas corpus may be suspended in certain circumstances but does not say by whom, President Lincoln asserted and maintained it as an executive function in the face of judicial challenge and doubt. *Ex parte Merryman* (17 Fed. Cas. 144); *Ex parte Milligan* (4 Wall. 2, 125); see *Ex parte Bollman* (4 Cr. 75, 101). Congress eventually ratified his action. Habeas Corpus Act of March 3, 1863 (12 Stat. 755). See Hall, Free Speech in War Time (21 Col. L. Rev. 526). Compare *Myers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52), with *Humphrey's Executor* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 602), and *Hirabayashi* v. *United States* (320 U. S. 81), with the case at bar. Also compare *Ex parte Vallandingham* (1 Wall. 243), with *Ex parte Milligan*, supra.

[21] President Roosevelt's effort to remove a Federal Trade Commissioner was found to be contrary to the policy of Congress and impinging upon an area of congressional control, and so his removal power was cut down accordingly. *Humphrey's Executor* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 602). However, his exclusive power of removal in executive agencies, affirmed in *Myers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52) continued to be asserted and maintained. *Morgan* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (115 F. 2d 990, cert. denied, 312 U. S. 701); *In re Power to Remove Members of the Tennessee Valley Authority* (39 Op. Atty. Gen. 145); President Roosevelt's Message to Congress of March 23, 1938, the Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, 1938 (Rosenman), 151.

[22] The oft-cited Louisiana Purchase had nothing to do with the separation of powers as between the President and Congress, but only with State and Federal power. The Louisiana Purchase was subject to rather academic criticism, not upon the ground that Mr. Jefferson acted without authority from Congress, but that neither had express authority to expand the boundaries of the United States by purchase or annexation. Mr. Jefferson himself had strongly opposed the doctrine that the State's delegation of powers to the Federal Government could be enlarged by resort to implied powers. Afterwards in a letter to John Breckenridge, dated August 12, 1803, he declared: "The Constitution has made no provision for our holding foreign territory, still less for incorporating foreign nations into our Union. The Executive in seizing the fugitive occurrence which so much advances the good of their country, have done an act beyond the Constitution. The Legislature in casting behind them metaphysical subtleties, and risking themselves like faithful servants, must ratify and pay for it, and throw themselves on their country for doing for them unauthorized, what we know they would have done for themselves had they been in a situation to do it." 10 The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, 407.

[23] Selective Service Act of 1948, sec. 18, 62 Stat. 625, 50 U. S. C. App. (Supp. IV) sec. 468 (c).

[24] Defense Production Act of 1950, sec. 201, 64 Stat. 799, amended, 65 Stat. 132, 50 U. S. C. App. (Supp. IV) sec. 2081. For the latitude of the condemnation power which underlies this act, see *United States* v. *Westinghouse Co.* (339 U. S. 261), and cases therein cited.

[25] Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, secs. 206–210, 61 Stat. 136, 155, 156, 29 U. S. C. (Supp. IV) secs. 141, 176–180. The analysis, history, and application of this act are fully covered by the opinion of the court, supplemented by that of Mr. Justice Frankfurter and of Mr. Justice Burton, in which I concur.

[26] "He may require the opinion, in writing, of the principal officer in each of the executive departments, upon any subject relating to the duties of their respective offices" (United States Constitution, art. II, sec. 2). He "shall commission all the officers of the United States" (United States Constitution, art. II, sec. 3). Matters such as those would seem to be inherent in the Executive if anything is.

George III, and the description of its evils in the Declaration of Independence leads me to doubt that they were creating their new Executive in his image. Continental European examples were not more appealing. And if we seek instruction from our own times, we can match it only from the executive powers in those governments we disparagingly describe as totalitarian. I cannot accept the view that this clause is a grant in bulk of all conceivable executive power but regard it as an allocation to the Presidential Office of the generic powers thereafter stated.

The clause on which the Government next relies is that "the President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States." These cryptic words have given rise to some of the most persistent controversies in our constitutional history. Of course, they imply something more than an empty title. But just what authority goes with the name has plagued Presidential advisers who would not waive or narrow it by nonassertion yet cannot say where it begins or ends. It undoubtedly puts the Nation's Armed Forces under Presidential command. Hence, this loose appellation is sometimes advanced as support for any Presidential action, internal or external, involving use of force, the idea being that it vests power to do anything, anywhere, that can be done with an army or navy.

That seems to be the logic of an argument tendered at our bar—that the President, having, on his own responsibility, sent American troops abroad derives from that act affirmative power to seize the means of producing a supply of steel for them. To quote, "Perhaps the most forceful illustrations of the scope of Presidential power in this connection is the fact that American troops in Korea, whose safety and effectiveness are so directly involved here, were sent to the field by an exercise of the President's constitutional powers." Thus, it is said he has invested himself with war powers.

I cannot foresee all that it might entail if the Court should indorse this argument. Nothing in our Constitution is plainer than that declaration of a war is entrusted only to Congress. Of course, a state of war may in fact exist without a formal declaration. But no doctrine that the Court could promulgate would seem to me more sinister and alarming than that a President whose conduct of foreign affairs is so largely untrolled, and often even is unknown, can vastly enlarge his mastery over the internal affairs of the country by his own commitment of the Nation's Armed Forces to some foreign venture.[37] I do not, however, find it necessary or appropriate to consider the legal status of the Korean enterprise to discountenance argument based on it.

Assuming that we are in a war de facto, whether it is or is not a war de jure, does that empower the Commander in Chief to seize industries he thinks necessary to supply our Army? The Constitution expressly places in Congress power "to raise and support armies" and "to provide and maintain a navy." This certainly lays upon Congress primary responsibility for supplying the Armed Forces. Congress alone controls the raising of revenues and their appropriation and may determine in what manner and by what means they shall be spent for military and naval procurement. I suppose no one would doubt that Congress can take over war supply as a Government enterprise. On the other hand, if Congress sees fit to rely on free private enterprise collectively bargaining with free labor for support and maintenance of our Armed Forces can the Executive because of lawful disagreements incidental to that process, seize the facility for operation upon Government-imposed terms?

There are indications that the Constitution did not contemplate that the title Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy will constitute him also Commander in Chief of the country, its industries and its inhabitants. He has no monopoly of war powers, whatever they are. While Congress cannot deprive the President of the command of the Army and Navy, only Congress can provide him an army or navy to command. It is also empowered to make rules for the "Government and regulation of land and naval forces," by which it may to some unknown extent impinge upon even command functions.

That military powers of the Commander in Chief were not to supersede representative government of internal affairs seems obvious from the Constitution and from elementary American history. Time out of mind, and even now in many parts of the world, a military commander can seize private housing to shelter his troops. Not so, however, in the United States, for the third amendment says, "No soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law." Thus, even in war time, his seizure of needed military housing must be authorized by Congress. It also was expressly left to Congress to "provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions."[38] Such a limitation on the command power, written at a time when the militia rather than a standing army was contemplated as the military weapon of the Republic, underscores the Constitution's policy that Congress, not the Executive, should control utilization of the war power as an instrument of domestic policy. Congress, fulfilling that function, has authorized the President to use the Army to enforce certain civil rights.[39] On the other hand, Congress has forbidden him to use the Army for the purpose of executing general laws except when expressly authorized by the Constitution or by act of Congress.[40]

While broad claims under this rubric often have been made, advice to the President in specific matters usually has carried overtones that powers, even under this head, are measured by the command functions usual to the topmost officer of the Army and Navy. Even then, heed has been taken of any efforts of Congress to negative his authority.[41]

We should not use this occasion to circumscribe, much less to contract, the lawful role of the President as Commander in Chief. I should indulge the widest latitude of interpretation to sustain his exclusive function to command the instruments of national force, at least when turned against the outside world for the security of our society. But, when it is turned inward, not because of rebellion but because of a lawful economic struggle between industry and labor, it should have no such indulgence. His command power is not such an absolute as might be implied from that office in a militaristic system but is subject to limitations consistent with a constitutional republic whose law and policy-making branch is a representative Congress. The purpose of lodging dual titles in one man was to insure that the civilian would control the military, not to enable the military to subordinate the presidential office. No penance would ever expiate the sin against free government of holding that a president can escape control of executive powers by law through assuming his military role. What the power of command may include, I do not try to envision, but I think it is not a military prerogative, without support of law, to seize persons or property because they are important or even essential for the Military and Naval Establishments.

The third clause in which the Solicitor General finds seizure powers is that "he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed."[42] That authority must be matched against words of the fifth amendment that "No person shall be * * * deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." One gives a governmental authority that reaches so far as there is law; the other gives a private right that authority shall go no further. These signify about all there is of the principle that ours is a government of laws, not of men, and that we submit ourselves to rulers only if under rules.

The Solicitor General lastly grounds support of the seizure upon nebulous, inherent powers never expressly granted but said to have accrued to the office from the customs and claims of preceding administrations. The plea is for a resulting power to deal with a crisis or emergency according to the necessities of the case, the unarticulated assumption being that necessity knows no law.

---

[37] How widely this doctrine espoused by the President's counsel departs from the early view of Presidential power is shown by a comparison. President Jefferson, without authority from Congress, sent the American fleet into the Mediterranean, where it engaged in a naval battle with the Tripolitan fleet. He sent a message to Congress on December 8, 1801, in which he said: "Tripoli, the least considerable of the Barbary States, had come forward with demands unfounded either in right or in compact, and had permitted itself to denounce war on our failure to comply before a given day. The style of the demand admitted but one answer. I sent a small squadron of frigates into the Mediterranean * * * with orders to protect our commerce against the threatened attack * * *. Our commerce in the Mediterranean was blockaded, and that of the Atlantic in peril * * *. One of the Tripolitan cruisers having fallen in with, and engaged the small schooner *Enterprise*, * * * was captured, after a heavy slaughter of her men * * *. Unauthorized by the Constitution, without the sanction of Congress, to go beyond the line of defense, the vessel being disabled from committing further hostilities, was liberated with its crew. The legislature will doubtless consider whether, by authorizing measures of offense, also, they will place our force on an equal footing with that of its adversaries. I communicate all material information on this subject, that in the exercise of the important function confided by the Constitution to the legislature exclusively, their judgment may form itself on a knowledge and consideration of every circumstance of weight." (I Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 314.)

[38] United States Constitution, art. I, sec. 8, cl. 14.

[39] 14 Stat. 29, 16 Stat. 143, 8 U. S. C., sec. 55.

[40] 20 Stat. 152, 10 U. S. C., sec. 15.

[41] In 1940, President Roosevelt proposed to transfer to Great Britain certain overage destroyers and small patrol boats then under construction. He did not presume to rely upon any claim of constitutional power as Commander in Chief. On the contrary, he was advised that such destroyers—if certified not to be essential to the defense of the United States—could be "transferred, exchanged, sold, or otherwise disposed of," because Congress had so authorized him. Accordingly, the destroyers were exchanged for air bases. In the same opinion, he was advised that Congress had prohibited the release or transfer of the so-called "mosquito boats" then under construction, so those boats were not transferred. In the Matter of Acquisition of Naval and Air Bases in Exchange for Overage Destroyers (39 Op. Atty. Gen. 484). See also Matter of Training British Flying Students in the United States (40 Op. Atty. Gen. 58).

[42] United States Constitution, art. II, sec. 3.

Loose and irresponsible use of adjectives colors all nonlegal and much legal discussion of presidential powers. "Inherent" powers, "implied" powers, "incidental" powers, "plenary" powers, "war" powers, and "emergency" powers are used, often interchangeably and without fixed or ascertainable meanings.

The vagueness and generality of the clauses that set forth Presidential power afford a plausible basis for pressures within and without an administration for Presidential action beyond that supported by those whose responsibility it is to defend his actions in court. The claim of inherent and unrestricted Presidential powers has long been a persuasive dialectical weapon in political controversy. While it is not surprising that counsel should grasp support from such unadjudicated claims of power, a judge cannot accept self-serving press statements of the attorney for one of the interested parties as authority in answering a constitutional question, even if the advocate was himself. But prudence has counseled that actual reliance on such nebulous claims stop short of provoking a judicial test.[42]

[42] President Wilson, just before our entrance into World War I, went before the Congress and asked its approval of his decision to authorize merchant ships to carry defensive weapons. He said: "No doubt I already possess that authority without special warrant of law, by the plain implication of my constitutional duties and powers; but I prefer in the present circumstances not to act upon general implication. I wish to feel that the authority and the power of the Congress are behind me in whatever it may become necessary for me to do. We are jointly the servants of the people and must act together and in their spirit, so far as we can divine and interpret it." XVII Richardson, op. cit., 8211. When our Government was itself in need of shipping whilst ships flying the flags of nations overrun by Hitler, as well as belligerent merchantmen, were immobilized in American harbors where they had taken refuge, President Roosevelt did not assume that it was in his power to seize such foreign vessels to make up our own deficit. He informed Congress: "I am satisfied, after consultation with the heads of the interested departments and agencies, that we should have statutory authority to take over such vessels as our needs require" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 87, pt. 3, p. 3072); The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, 1941 (Rosenman), 94. The necessary statutory authority was shortly forthcoming (55 Stat. 242).) In his first inaugural address President Roosevelt pointed out two courses to obtain legislative remedies, one being to enact measures he was prepared to recommend, the other to enact measures "the Congress may build out of its experience and wisdom." He continued, "But in the event that the Congress shall fail to take one of these two courses, and in the event that the national emergency is still critical, I shall not evade the clear course of duty that will then confront me. I shall ask the Congress for the one remaining instrument to meet the crisis—broad Executive power to wage a war against the emergency, as great as the power that would be given to me if we were in fact invaded by a foreign foe." The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, 1933 (Rosenman), 15. On March 6, 1933, President Roosevelt proclaimed the Bank Holiday. The proclamation did not invoke constitutional powers of the Executive but expressly and solely relied upon the act of Congress of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411, sec. 5 (b)), as amended. He relied steadily on legislation to empower him to deal with economic emergency. The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt 1933 (Rosenman), 24. It is interesting to note Holdsworth's comment on the powers of legislation by proclamation when in the hands of the Tudors. "The extent to which they could be legally used was never finally settled in this century, because the Tudors made to tactful a use of their powers that no demand for the settlement of this question was raised" (4 Holdsworth, History of English Law, 104).

The Solicitor General, acknowledging that Congress has never authorized the seizure here, says practice of prior Presidents has authorized it. He seeks color of legality from claimed executive precedents, chief of which is President Roosevelt's seizure on June 9, 1941, of the California plant of the North American Aviation Co. Its superficial similarities with the present case, upon analysis, yield to distinctions so decisive that it cannot be regarded as even a precedent, much less an authority for the present seizure.[44]

[44] The North American Aviation Co. was under direct and binding contracts to supply defense items to the Government. No such contracts are claimed to exist here. Seizure of plants which refused to comply with Government orders had been expressly authorized by Congress in section 9 of the Selective Service Act of 1940, 54 Stat. 885, 892, so that the seizure of the North American plant was entirely consistent with congressional policy. The company might have objected on technical grounds to the seizure, but it was taken over with acquiescence, amounting to all but consent, of the owners who had admitted that the situation was beyond their control. The strike involved in the North American case was in violation of the union's collective agreement and the national labor leaders approved the seizure to end the strike. It was described as in the nature of an insurrection, a Communist-led political strike against the Government's lend-lease policy. Here we have only a loyal, lawful, but regrettable economic disagreement between management and labor. The North American plant contained Government-owned machinery, material and goods in the process of production to which workmen were forcibly denied access by picketing strikers. Here no Government property is protected by the seizure. See New York Times of June 10, 1941, pp. 1, 14, and 16, for substantially accurate account of the proceedings and the conditions of violence at the North American plant. The North American seizure was regarded as an execution of congressional policy. I do not regard it as a precedent for this, but, even if I did, I should not bind present judicial judgment by earlier partisan advocacy. Statements from a letter by the Attorney General to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, dated February 2, 1949, with reference to pending labor legislation, while not cited by any of the parties here are sometimes quoted as being in support of the inherent powers of the President. The proposed bill contained a mandatory provision that during certain investigations the disputants in a labor dispute should continue operations under the terms and conditions of employment existing prior to the beginning of the dispute. It made no provision as to how continuance should be enforced and specified no penalty for disobedience. The Attorney General advised that in appropriate circumstances the United States would have access to the courts to protect the national health, safety, and welfare. This was the rule laid down by this Court in *Texas & N. O. R. Co.* v. *Brotherhood of Steamship Clerks*, 281 U. S. 548. The Attorney General observed: "However, with regard to the question of the power of the Government under title III, I might point out that the inherent power of the President to deal with emergencies that affect the health, safety, and welfare of the entire Nation is exceedingly great. See opinion of Attorney General Murphy of October 4, 1939 (39 Op. A. G. 344, 347); *United States* v. *United Mine Workers of America*, 330 U. S. 258 (1947)." Regardless of the general reference to inherent powers, the citations were instances of congressional authorization. I do not suppose it is open to doubt that power to see that the laws are faithfully executed was ample basis for the specific advice given by the Attorney General in this letter.

The appeal, however, that we declare the existence of inherent powers ex necessitate to meet an emergency asks us to do what many think would be wise, although it is something the forefathers omitted. They knew what emergencies were, knew the pressures they engender for authoritative action, knew, too, how they afford a ready pretext for usurpation. We may also suspect that they suspected that emergency powers would tend to kindle emergencies. Aside from suspension of the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus in time of rebellion or invasion, when the public safety may require it,[45] they made no express provision for exercise of extraordinary authority because of a crisis.[46] I do not think we rightfully may so amend their work, and, if we could, I am not convinced it would be wise to do so, although many modern nations have forthrightly recognized that war and economic crises may upset the normal balance between liberty and authority. Their experience with emergency powers may not be irrelevant to the argument here that we should say that the Executive, of his own volition, can invest himself with undefined emergency powers.

Germany, after the First World War, framed the Weimar Constitution, designed to secure her liberties in the western tradition. However, the President of the Republic, without concurrence of the Reichstag, was empowered temporarily to suspend any or all individual rights if public safety and order were seriously disturbed or endangered. This proved a temptation to every government, whatever its shade of opinion, and in 13 years suspension of rights was invoked on more than 250 occasions. Finally, Hitler persuaded President Von Hindenberg to suspend all such rights, and they were never restored.[47]

The French Republic provided for a very different kind of emergency government, known as the "state of siege." It differed from the German emergency dictatorship particularly in that emergency powers could not be assumed at will by the executive, but could only be granted as a parliamentary measure. And it did not, as in Germany, result in a suspension or abrogation of law, but was a legal institution governed by special legal rules and terminable by parliamentary authority.[48]

Great Britain also has fought both world wars under a sort of temporary dictatorship created by legislation.[49] As Parliament is not bound by written constitutional limitations, it established a crisis government simply by delegation to its Ministers of a larger measure than usual of its own unlimited power, which is exercised under its

[45] United States Constitution, art. I, sec. 9, clause 2.

[46] I exclude, as in a very limited category by itself, the establishment of martial law. Cf. Ex parte Milligan (4 Wall, 2); *Duncan* v. *Kahanamoku* (327 U. S. 304).

[47] 1 Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression, 126–127; Rossiter, Constitutional Dictatorship, 33–61; Brecht, Prelude to Silence, 138.

[48] Rossiter, Constitutional Dictatorship, 117–129.

[49] Defense of the Realm Act, 1914, 4 and 5, Geo. V, ch. 29, as amended, ch. 63; Emergency Powers (Defence) Act, 1939, 2 and 3, Geo. VI, ch. 62; Rossiter, Constitutional Dictatorship, 135–184.

supervision by Ministers whom it may dismiss. This has been called the "high-water mark in the voluntary surrender of liberty," but, as Churchill put it, "Parliament stands custodian of these surrendered liberties, and its most sacred duty will be to restore them in their fullness when victory has crowned our exertions and our perseverance." [50] Thus, parliamentary control made emergency powers compatible with freedom.

This contemporary foreign experience may be inconclusive as to the wisdom of lodging emergency powers somewhere in a modern government. But it suggests that emergency powers are consistent with free government only when their control is lodged elsewhere than in the Executive who exercises them. That is the safeguard that would be nullified by our adoption of the "inherent powers" formula. Nothing in my experience convinces me that such risks are warranted by any real necessity, although such powers would, of course, be an Executive convenience.

In the practical working of our Government we already have evolved a technique within the framework of the Constitution by which normal executive powers may be considerably expanded to meet an emergency. Congress may and has granted extraordinary authorities which lie dormant in normal times but may be called into play by the Executive in war or upon proclamation of a national emergency. In 1939, upon congressional request, the Attorney General listed 99 such separate statutory grants by Congress of emergency or wartime Executive powers.[51] They were invoked from time to time as need appeared. Under this procedure we retain Government by law—special, temporary law, perhaps, but law nonetheless. The public may know the extent and limitations of the powers that can be asserted, and persons affected may be informed from the statute of their rights and duties.

In view of the ease, expedition and safety with which Congress can grant and has granted large emergency powers, certainly ample to embrace this crisis, I am quite unimpressed with the argument that we should affirm possession of them without statute. Such power either has no beginning or it has no end. If it exists, it need submit to no legal restraint. I am not alarmed that it would plunge us straightway into dictatorship, but it is at least a step in that wrong direction.

As to whether there is imperative necessity for such powers, it is relevant to note the gap that exists between the President's paper powers and his real powers. The Constitution does not disclose the measure of the actual controls wielded by the modern presidential office. That instrument must be understood as an eighteenth century sketch of a government hoped for, not as a blueprint of the Government that is. Vast accretions of Federal power, eroded from that reserved by the States, have magnified the scope of presidential activity. Subtle shifts take place in the centers of real power that do not show on the face of the Constitution.

Executive power has the advantage of concentration in a single head in whose choice the whole Nation has a part, making him the focus of public hopes and expectations. In drama, magnitude and finality his decisions so far overshadow any others that almost alone he fills the public eye and ear. No other personality in public life can begin to compete with him in access to the public mind through modern methods of communications. By his prestige as head of state and his influence upon public opinion he exerts a leverage upon those who are supposed to check and balance his power which often cancels their effectiveness.

Moreover, rise of the party system has made a significant extraconstitutional supplement to real executive power. No appraisal of his necessities is realistic which overlooks that he heads a political system as well as a legal system. Party loyalties and interests, sometimes more binding than law, extend his effective control into branches of government other than his own, and he often may win, as a political leader, what he cannot command under the Constitution. Indeed, Woodrow Wilson, commenting on the President as leader both of his party and of the Nation, observed, "If he rightly interprets the national thought and boldly insists upon it, he is irresistible. * * * His office is anything he has the sagacity and force to make it." [52] I cannot be brought to believe that this country will suffer if the Court refuses further to aggrandize the Presidential office, already so potent and so relatively immune from judicial review,[53] at the expense of Congress.

But I have no illusion that any decision by this Court can keep power in the hands of Congress if it is not wise and timely in meeting its problems. A crisis that challenges the President equally, or perhaps primarily, challenges Congress. If not good law, there was worldly wisdom in the maxim attributed to Napoleon that "the tools belong to the man who can use them." We may say that power to legislate for emergencies belongs in the hands of Congress, but only Congress itself can prevent power from slipping through its fingers.

The essence of our free Government is "leave to live by no man's leave, underneath the law"—to be governed by those impersonal forces which we call law. Our Government is fashioned to fulfill this concept so far as humanly possible. The Executive, except for recommendation and veto, has no legislative power. The executive action we have here originates in the individual will of the President and represents an exercise of authority without law. No one, perhaps not even the President, knows the limits of the power he may seek to exert in this instance, and the parties affected cannot learn the limit of their rights. We do not know today what powers over labor or property would be claimed to flow from Government possession if we should legalize it, what rights to compensation would be claimed or recognized, or on what contingency it would end. With all its defects, delays, and inconveniences, men have discovered no technique for long preserving free government except that the Executive be under the law, and that the law be made by parliamentary deliberations.

Such institutions may be destined to pass away. But it is the duty of the Court to be last, not first, to give them up.[54]

Mr. Justice Burton, concurring in both the opinion and judgment of the Court:

My position may be summarized as follows:

The validity of the President's order of seizure is at issue and ripe for decision. Its validity turns upon its relation to the constitutional division of governmental power between Congress and the President.

The Constitution has delegated to Congress power to authorize action to meet a national emergency of the kind we face.[55] Aware of this responsibility, Congress has responded to it. It has provided at least two procedures for the use of the President.

It has outlined one in the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, better known as the Taft-Hartley Act. The accuracy with which Congress there describes the present emergency demonstrates its applicability. It says:

"Whenever in the opinion of the President of the United States, a threatened or actual strike or lockout affecting an entire industry or a substantial part thereof engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or with foreign nations, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce, will, if permitted to occur or to continue, imperil the national health or safety, he may appoint a board of inquiry to inquire into the issues involved in the dispute and to make a written report to him within such time as he shall prescribe." [56]

In that situation Congress has authorized not only negotiation, conciliation and impartial inquiry but also a 60-day cooling-off period under injunction, followed by 20 days for a secret ballot upon the final offer of settlement and then by recommendations from the President to Congress.[57]

For the purpose of this case the most significant feature of that act is its omission of authority to seize an affected industry. The debate preceding its passage demonstrated the significance of that omission. Collective bargaining, rather than governmental seizure, was to be relied upon. Seizure was not to be resorted to without specific congressional authority. Congress reserved to itself the opportunity to authorize seizure to meet particular emergencies.[58]

---

[50] Churchill, The Unrelenting Struggle, 13. See also id., at 279–281.

[51] 39 Op. Atty. Gen. 348.

[52] Wilson, Constitutional Government in the United States, 68–69.

[53] Rossiter, the Supreme Court and the Commander in Chief, 126–132.

[54] We follow the judicial tradition instituted on a memorable Sunday in 1612, when King James took offense at the independence of his judges and in rage declared: "Then I am to be under the law—which it is treason to affirm." Chief Justice Coke replied to his King: "Thus wrote Bracton, "the King ought not to be under any man, but he is under God and the law'." 12 Coke 63 (as to its verity, 18 Eng. Hist. Rev. 664–675), 1 Campbell, Lives of the Chief Justices, 272.)

[55] "ARTICLE I

"SECTION 1. All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States. * * *

* * * * *

"SEC. 8. The Congress shall have Power * * *;

* * * * *

"To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States * * *;

* * * * *

"To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

[56] 61 Stat. 155, 29 U. S. C. (Supp. IV), sec. 176.

[57] 61 Stat. 155–156, 29 U. S. C. (Supp. IV), secs. 176–180.

[58] The chairman of the Senate committee sponsoring the bill said in the Senate: "We did not feel that we should put into the law, as a part of the collective-bargaining machinery, an ultimate resort to compulsory arbitration, or to seizure, or to any other action. We feel that it would interfere with the whole process of collective bargaining. If such a remedy is available as a routine remedy, there will always be pressure to resort to it by whichever party thinks it will receive better treatment through such a process than it would receive in collective bargaining, and it will back out of collective bargaining. It will not make a bona-fide attempt to settle if it thinks it will receive a better deal under the final arbitration which may be provided. We have felt that perhaps in the case of a general strike, or in the case of other serious strikes, after the termination of every possible effort to resolve the dispute, the remedy might be an emergency act by Congress for that particular

The President, however, chose not to use the Taft-Hartley procedure. He chose another course, also authorized by Congress. He referred the controversy to the Wage Stabilization Board.[59] If that course had led to a settlement of the labor dispute, it would have avoided the need for other action. It, however, did not do so.

Now it is contended that although the President did not follow the procedure authorized by the Taft-Hartley Act, his substituted procedure served the same purpose and must be accepted as its equivalent. Without appraising that equivalence, it is enough to point out that neither procedure carried statutory authority for the seizure of private industries in the manner now at issue.[60] The exhaustion of both procedures fails to cloud the clarity of the congressional reservation of seizure for its own consideration.

The foregoing circumstances distinguish this emergency from one in which Congress takes no action and outlines no governmental policy. In the case before us, Congress authorized a procedure which the President declined to follow. Instead, he followed another procedure which he hoped might eliminate the need for the first. Upon its failure, he issued an Executive order to seize the steel properties in the face of the reserved right of Congress to adopt or reject that course as a matter of legislative policy.

This brings us to a further crucial question. Does the President, in such a situation, have inherent constitutional power to seize private property which makes congressional action in relation thereto unnecessary? We find no such power available to him under the present circumstances. The present situation is not comparable to that of an imminent invasion or threatened attack. We do not face the issue of what might be the President's constitutional power to meet such catastrophic situations. Nor is it claimed that the current seizure is in the nature of a military command addressed by the President, as Commander in Chief, to a mobilized nation waging, or imminently threatened with, total war.[61]

The controlling fact here is that Congress, within its constitutionally delegated power, has prescribed for the President specific procedures, exclusive of seizure, for his use in meeting the present type of emergency. Congress has reserved to itself the right to determine where and when to authorize the seizure of property in meeting such an emergency. Under these circumstances, the President's order of April 8 invaded the jurisdiction of Congress. It violated the essence of the principle of the separation of governmental powers. Accordingly, the injunction against its effectiveness should be sustained.

Mr. Justice Clark, concurring in the judgment of the Court.

One of this Court's first pronouncements upon the powers of the President under the Constitution was made by Chief Justice John Marshall some 150 years ago. In *Little* v. *Barreme*,[62] he used this characteristically clear language in discussing the power of the President to instruct the seizure of the "*Flying Fish*," a vessel bound from a French port: "It is by no means clear that the President of the United States whose high duty it is to 'take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and who is Commander in Chief of the Armies and Navies of the United States, might not, without any special authority for that purpose, in the then existing state of things, have empowered the officers commanding the armed vessels of the United States, to seize and send into port for adjudication, American vessels which were forfeited by being engaged in this illicit commerce. But when it is observed that [an act of Congress] gives a special authority to seize on the high seas, and limits that authority to the seizure of vessels bound or sailing to a French port, the legislature seem to have prescribed that the manner in which this law shall be carried into execution, was to exclude a seizure of any vessel not bound to a French port."[63] Accordingly, a unanimous Court held that the President's instructions had been issued without authority and that they could not "legalize an act which without those instructions would have been a plain trespass." I know of no subsequent holding of this Court to the contrary.[64]

The limits of Presidential power are obscure. However, article II, no less than article I, is part of "a constitution intended to endure for ages to come, and, consequently, to be adapted to the various crises of human affairs."[65] Some of our Presidents, such as Lincoln, "felt that measures otherwise unconstitutional might become lawful by becoming indispensable to the preservation of the Constitution through the preservation of the Nation."[66] Others, such as Theodore Roosevelt, thought the President to be capable, as a steward of the people, of exerting all power save that which is specifically prohibited by the Constitution or the Congress.[67] In my view—taught me not only by the decision of Chief Justice Marshall in *Little* v. *Barreme*, but also by a score of other pronouncements of distinguished members of this bench—the Constitution does grant to the President extensive authority in times of grave and imperative national emergency. In fact, to my thinking, such a grant may well be necessary to the very existence of the Constitution itself. As Lincoln aptly said, "[is] it possible to lose the Nation and yet preserve the Constitution?"[68] In describing this authority I care not whether one calls it residual, inherent, moral, implied, aggregate, emergency, or otherwise. I am of the conviction that those who have had the gratifying experience of being the President's lawyer have used one or more of these adjectives only with the utmost of sincerity and the highest of purpose.

I conclude that where Congress has laid down specific procedures to deal with the type of crisis confronting the President, he must follow those procedures in meeting the crisis; but that in the absence of such action by Congress, the President's independent power to act depends upon the gravity of the situation confronting the Nation. I cannot sustain the seizure in question because here, as in *Little* v. *Barreme*, Congress had prescribed methods to be followed by the President in meeting the emergency at hand.

Three statutory procedures were available: those provided in the Defense Production Act of 1950, the Labor Management Relations Act, and the Selective Service Act of 1948. In this case the President invoked the first of these procedures; he did not invoke the other two.

The Defense Production Act of 1950 provides for mediation of labor disputes affecting national defense. Under this statutory authorization, the President has established the Wage Stabilization Board. The Defense Production Act, however, grants the President no power to seize real property except through ordinary condemnation proceedings, which were not used here, and creates no sanctions for the settlement of labor disputes.

---

purpose. I have had in mind drafting such a bill, giving power to seize the plants, and other necessary facilities, to seize the unions, their money, and their treasury, and requisition trucks and other equipment; in fact, to do everything that the British did in their general strike of 1926. But while such a bill might be prepared, I should be unwilling to place such a law on the books until we actually face such an emergency, and Congress applies the remedy for the particular emergency only. Eighty days will provide plenty of time within which to consider the possibility of what should be done; and we believe very strongly that there should not be anything in this law which prohibits finally the right to strike." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, pt. 3, pp. 3835–3836. Part of this quotation was relied upon by this Court in *Bus Employees* v. *Wisconsin Board* (340 U. S. 383, 396, note 21).

[59] Under titles IV and V of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 803–812, 50 U. S. C. App. (Supp. IV), secs. 2101–2123; and see Executive Order No. 10233 (16 Fed. Reg. 3503)).

[60] Congress has authorized other types of seizure under conditions not present here. Section 201 of the Defense Production Act authorizes the President to acquire specific "real property, including facilities, temporary use thereof, or other interest therein" by condemnation (64 Stat. 799, as amended, 65 Stat. 132, see 50 U. S. C. App. (Supp. IV) sec. 2081). There have been no declarations of taking or condemnation proceedings in relation to any of the properties involved here. Section 18 of the Selective Service Act of 1948 authorizes the President to take possession of a plant or other facility failing to fill certain defense orders placed with it in the manner there prescribed (62 Stat. 625, 50 U. S. C. App. (Supp. IV), sec. 468). No orders have been so placed with the steel plants seized.

[61] The President and Congress have recognized the termination of the major hostilities in the total wars in which the Nation has been engaged. Many wartime procedures have expired or been terminated. The War Labor Disputes Act (57 Stat. 163 et seq., 50 U. S. C. App., secs. 1501–1511) expired June 30, 1947, 6 months after the President's declaration of the end of hostilities (3 CFR, 1946 Supp., p. 77). The Japanese Peace Treaty was approved by the Senate March 20, 1952 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 2594), and proclaimed by the President April 28, 1952 (17 Fed. Reg. 3813).

[62] 2 Cranch 170 (1804).

[63] Id., at 177–178.

[64] Decisions of this Court which have upheld the exercise of presidential power include the following: *Prize Cases* (2 Black 635 (1863)) (subsequent ratification of President's acts by Congress); *In re Neagle* (135 U. S. 1 (1890)) (protection of Federal officials from personal violence while performing official duties); *In re Debs* (158 U. S. 564 (1895)) (injunction to prevent forcible obstruction of interstate commerce and the mails); *United States* v. *Midwest Oil Co.* (236 U. S. 459 (1915)) (acquiescence by Congress in more than 250 instances of exercises of same power by various Presidents over period of 80 years); *Myers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52 (1926)) (control over subordinate officials in executive department) [but see *Humphrey's Executor* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 602, 626–628 (1935))]; *Hirabayashi* v. *United States* (320 U. S. 81 (1943)), and *Korematsu* v. *United States* (323 U. S. 214 (1944)) (express congressional authorization); cf. *United States* v. *Russell* (13 Wall. 623 (1871)) (imperative military necessity in area of combat during war); *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.* (299 U. S. 304 (1936)) (power to negotiate with foreign governments); *United States* v. *United Mine Workers* (330 U. S. 258 (1947)) (seizure under specific statutory authorization).

[65] Chief Justice Marshall, in *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316, 415 (1819)).

[66] Letter of April 4, 1864, to A. G. Hodges, in 10 Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln (Nicolay and Hay ed. 1894), 66.

[67] Roosevelt, Autobiography (1914 ed.), 371–372.

[68] Letter of April 4, 1864, to A. G. Hodges, in 10 Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln (Nicolay and Hay ed. 1894), 66.

The Labor Management Relations Act, commonly known as the Taft-Hartley Act, includes provisions adopted for the purpose of dealing with Nation-wide strikes. They establish a procedure whereby the President may appoint a board of inquiry and thereafter, in proper cases, seek injunctive relief for an 80-day period against a threatened work stoppage. The President can invoke that procedure whenever, in his opinion, "a threatened or actual strike * * * affecting an entire industry * * * will, if permitted to occur or to continue, imperil the national health or safety."[69] At the time that act was passed, Congress specifically rejected a proposal to empower the President to seize any "plant, mine, or facility" in which a threatened work stoppage would, in his judgment, "imperil the public health or security."[70] Instead the Taft-Hartley Act directed the President, in the event a strike had not been settled during the 80-day injunction period, to submit to Congress "a full and comprehensive report * * * together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make for consideration and appropriate action."[71] The legislative history of the act demonstrates Congress' belief that the 80-day period would afford it adequate opportunity to determine whether special legislation should be enacted to meet the emergency at hand.[72]

The Selective Service Act of 1948 gives the President specific authority to seize plants which fail to produce goods required by the Armed Forces or the Atomic Energy Commission for national defense purposes. The act provides that when a producer from whom the President has ordered such goods "refuses or fails" to fill the order within a period of time prescribed by the President, the President may take immediate possession of the producer's plant.[73] This language is significantly broader than that used in the National Defense Act of 1916 and the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, which provided for seizure when a producer "refused" to supply essential defense materials, but not when he "failed" to do so.[74]

These three statutes furnish the guideposts for decision in this case. Prior to seizing the steel mills on April 8 the President had exhausted the mediation procedures of the Defense Production Act through the Wage Stabilization Board. Use of those procedures had failed to avert the impending crisis; however, it had resulted in a 99-day postponement of the strike. The Government argues that this accomplished more than the maximum 80-day waiting period possible under the sanctions of the Taft-Hartley Act, and therefore amounted to compliance with the substance of that act. Even if one were to accept this somewhat hyperbolic conclusion, the hard fact remains that neither the Defense Production Act nor Taft-Hartley authorized the seizure challenged here, and the Government made no effort to comply with the procedures established by the Selective Service Act of 1948, a statute which expressly authorizes seizures when producers fail to supply necessary defense matériel.[75]

For these I reasons I concur in the judgment of the Court. As Justice Story once said: "For the executive department of the Government, this Court entertain the most entire respect; and amidst the multiplicity of cares in that department, it may, without any violation of decorum, be presumed, that sometimes there may be an inaccurate construction of a law. It is our duty to expound the laws as we find them in the records of state; and we cannot, when called upon by the citizens of the country, refuse our opinion, however it may differ from that of very great authorities."[76]

DISSENTING OPINIONS

Mr. Chief Justice Vinson, with whom Mr. Justice Reed and Mr. Justice Minton join, dissenting:

The President of the United States directed the Secretary of Commerce to take temporary possession of the Nation's steel mills during the existing emergency because "a work stoppage would immediately jeopardize and imperil our national defense and the defense of those joined with us in resisting aggression, and would add to the continuing danger of our soldiers, sailors, and airmen engaged in combat in the field." The district court ordered the mills returned to their private owners on the ground that the President's action was beyond his powers under the Constitution.

This Court affirms. Some members of the Court are of the view that the President is without power to act in time of crisis in the absence of express statutory authorization. Other members of the Court affirm on the basis of their reading of certain statutes. Because we cannot agree that affirmance is proper on any ground, and because of the transcending importance of the questions presented not only in this critical litigation but also to the powers of the President and of future Presidents to act in time of crisis, we are compelled to register this dissent.

I

In passing upon the question of Presidential powers in this case, we must first consider the context in which those powers were exercised.

Those who suggest that this is a case involving extraordinary powers should be mindful that these are extraordinary times. A world not yet recovered from the devastation of World War II has been forced to face the threat of another and more terrifying global conflict.

Accepting in full measure its responsibility in the world community, the United States was instrumental in securing adoption of the United Nations Charter, approved by the Senate by a vote of 89 to 2. The first purpose of the United Nations is to "maintain international peace and security, and to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace. * * * "[1] In 1950, when the United Nations called upon member nations "to render every assistance" to repel aggression in Korea, the United States furnished its vigorous support.[2] For almost two full years our Armed Forces have been fighting in Korea, suffering casualties of over 108,000 men. Hostilities have not abated. The "determination of the United Nations to continue its action in Korea to meet the

---

[69] 61 Stat. 155, 29 U. S. C. (Supp. IV), sec. 176.

[70] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, pt. 3, pp. 3637-3645; cf. id., at pp. 3835-3836.

[71] Stat. 156, 29 U. S. C. (Supp. IV), sec. 180.

[72] E. g., S. Rept. No. 105, 80th Cong., 1st sess. 15; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, pt. 3, pp. 3835-3836; id., at vol. 93, pt. 4, p. 4281.

[73] The producer must have been notified that the order was placed pursuant to the act. The act provides in pertinent part as follows:

"(a) Whenever the President after consultation with and receiving advice from the National Security Resources Board determines that it is in the interest of the national security for the Government to obtain prompt delivery of any articles or materials the procurement of which has been authorized by the Congress exclusively for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States, or for the use of the Atomic Energy Commission, he is authorized, through the head of any Government agency, to place with any person operating a plant, mine, or other facility capable of producing such articles or materials an order for such quantity of such articles or materials as the President deems appropriate. Any person with whom an order is placed pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be advised that such order is placed pursuant to the provisions of this section.

* * * * *

"(c) In case any person with whom an order is placed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) refuses or fails—

* * * * *

"(2) to fill such order within the period of time prescribed by the President or as soon thereafter as possible as determined by the President;

"(3) to produce the kind or quality of articles or materials ordered; or

"(4) to furnish the quantity, kind, and quality of articles or materials ordered at such price as shall be negotiated between such person and the Government agency concerned; or in the event of failure to negotiate a price, to furnish the quantity, kind, and quality of articles or materials ordered at such price as he may subsequently be determined to be entitled to receive under subsection (d);

"the President is authorized to take immediate possession of any plant, mine, or other facility of such person and to operate it, through any Government agency, for the production of such articles or materials as may be required by the Government" (62 Stat. 625, 50 U. S. C. App. (Supp. IV), sec. 468). The act was amended in 1951 and redesignated the Universal Military Training and Service Act, but no change was made in this section (65 Stat. 75).

[74] 39 Stat. 213; 54 Stat. 892.

[75] The Government has offered no explanation, in the record, the briefs, or the oral argument, as to why it could not have made both a literal and timely compliance with the provisions of that act. Apparently the Government could have placed orders with the steel companies for the various types of steel needed for defense purposes, and instructed the steel companies to ship the matériel directly to producers of planes, tanks, and munitions. The act does not require that Government orders cover the entire capacity of a producer's plant before the President has power to seize. Our experience during World War I demonstrates the speed with which the Government can invoke the remedy of seizing plants which fail to fill compulsory orders. The Federal Enameling & Stamping Co., of McKees Rocks, Pa., was served with a compulsory order on September 13, 1918, and seized on the same day. The Smith & Wesson plant at Springfield, Mass., was seized on September 13, 1918, after the company had failed to make deliveries under a compulsory order issued the preceding week. Communication from Ordnance Office to War Department Board of Appraisers, entitled "Report on Plants Commandeered by the Ordnance Office," December 19, 1918, pp. 3, 4, in National Archives, records of the War Department, Office of the Chief of Ordnance, O. O. 004.002/260. Apparently the Mosler Safe Co., of Hamilton, Ohio, was seized on the same day on which a compulsory order was issued. Id., at 2; letter from counsel for Mosler Safe Co. to Maj. Gen. George W. Goethals, Director of Purchase, Storage, and Traffic, War Department, December 9, 1918, p. 1, in National Archives, records of the War Department, Office of the General Staff, PST Division 400.1202.

[76] *The Orono* (18 Fed. Cas. No. 10,585 (Cir. Ct. D. Mass. 1812)).

[1] 59 Stat. 1021, 1027 (1945); CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 91, pt. 6, p. 8190 (1945).

[2] U. N. Security Council, U. N. Doc. S/1501 (1950); statement by the President, June 25, 1950, United States Policy in the Korean Crisis, Department of State publication (1950), 16.

aggression" has been reaffirmed.[3] Congressional support of the action in Korea has been manifested by provisions for increased military manpower and equipment and for economic stabilization, as hereinafter described.

Further efforts to protect the free world from aggression are found in the congressional enactments of the Truman plan for assistance to Greece and Turkey[4] and the Marshall plan for economic aid needed to build up the strength of our friends in Western Europe.[5] In 1949, the Senate approved the North Atlantic Treaty under which each member nation agrees that an armed attack against one is an armed attack against all.[6] Congress immediately implemented the North Atlantic Treaty by authorizing military assistance to nations dedicated to the principles of mutual security under the United Nations Charter.[7] The concept of mutual security recently has been extended by treaty to friends in the Pacific.[8]

Our treaties represent not merely legal obligations but show congressional recognition that mutual security for the free world is the best security against the threat of aggression on a global scale. The need for mutual security is shown by the very size of the armed forces outside the free world. Defendant's brief informs us that the Soviet Union maintains the largest air force in the world and maintains ground forces much larger than those presently available to the United States and the countries joined with us in mutual-security arrangements. Constant international tensions are cited to demonstrate how precarious is the peace.

Even this brief review of our responsibilities in the world community discloses the enormity of our undertaking. Success of these measures may, as has often been observed, dramatically influence the lives of many generations of the world's peoples yet unborn. Alert to our responsibilities, which coincide with our own self-preservation through mutual security, Congress has enacted a large body of implementing legislation. As an illustration of the magnitude of the over-all program, Congress has appropriated $130,000,000,000 for our own defense and for military assistance to our allies since the June 1950 attack in Korea.

In the Mutual Security Act of 1951, Congress authorized "military, economic, and technical assistance to friendly countries to strengthen the mutual security and individual and collective defenses of the free world, * * *."[9] Over $5,500,000,000 were appropriated for military assistance for fiscal year 1952, the bulk of that amount to be devoted to purchase of military equipment.[10] A request for over $7,000,000,000 for the same purpose for fiscal year 1953 is currently pending in Congress.[11] In addition to direct shipment of military equipment to nations of the free world, defense production in those countries relies upon shipment of machine tools and allocation of steel tonnage from the United States.[12]

Congress also directed the President to build up our own defenses. Congress, recognizing the "grim fact * * * that the United States is now engaged in a struggle for survival" and that "it is imperative that we now take those necessary steps to make our strength equal to the peril of the hour," granted authority to draft men into the Armed Forces.[13] As a result, we now have over 3,500,000 men in our Armed Forces.[14]

Appropriations for the Department of Defense, which had averaged less than $13,000,000,000 per year for the 3 years before attack in Korea, were increased by Congress to $48,000,000,000 for fiscal year 1951 and to $60,000,000,000 for fiscal year 1952.[15] A request for $51,000,000,000 for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1953 is currently pending in Congress.[16] The bulk of the increase is for military equipment and supplies—guns, tanks, ships, planes, and ammunition—all of which require steel. Other defense programs requiring great quantities of steel include the large scale expansion of facilities for the Atomic Energy Commission[17] and the expansion of the Nation's productive capacity affirmatively encouraged by Congress.[18]

Congress recognized the impact of these defense programs upon the economy. Following the attack in Korea, the President asked for authority to requisition property and to allocate and fix priorities for scarce goods. In the Defense Production Act of 1950, Congress granted the powers requested and, in addition, granted power to stabilize prices and wages and to provide for settlement of labor disputes arising in the defense program.[19] The Defense Production Act was extended in 1951, a Senate committee noting that in the dislocation caused by the programs for purchase of military equipment "lies the seed of an economic disaster that might well destroy the military might we are straining to build."[20] Significantly, the committee examined the problem "in terms of just one commodity, steel," and found "a graphic picture of the overall inflationary danger growing out of reduced civilian supplies and rising incomes." Even before Korea, steel production at levels above theoretical 100 percent capacity was not capable of supplying civilian needs alone. Since Korea, the tremendous military demand for steel has far exceeded the increases in productive capacity. This Committee emphasized that the shortage of steel, even with the mills operating at full capacity, coupled with increased civilian purchasing power, presented grave danger of disastrous inflation.[21]

The President has the duty to execute the foregoing legislative programs. Their successful execution depends upon continued production of steel and stabilized prices for steel. Accordingly, when the collective bargaining agreements between the Nation's steel producers and their employees, represented by the United Steelworkers, were due to expire on December 31, 1951, and a strike shutting down the entire basic steel industry was threatened, the President acted to avert the complete shutdown of steel production. On December 22, 1951, he certified the dispute to the Wage Stabilization Board, requesting that the Board investigate the dispute and promptly report its recommendation as to fair and equitable terms of settlement. The Union complied with the President's request and delayed its threatened strike while the dispute was before the Board. After a special Board panel had conducted hearings and submitted a report, the full Wage Stabilization Board submitted its report and recommendations to the President on March 20, 1952.

The Board's report was acceptable to the union but was rejected by plaintiffs. The union gave notice of its intention to strike as of 12:01 a. m., April 9, 1952, but bargaining between the parties continued with hope of settlement until the evening of April 8, 1952. After bargaining had failed to avert the threatened shutdown of steel production, the President issued the following Executive order:

"Whereas on December 16, 1950, I proclaimed the existence of a national emergency which requires that the military, naval, air, and civilian defenses of this country be strengthened as speedily as possible to the end that we may be able to repel any and all threats against our national security and to fulfill our responsibilities in the efforts being made throughout the United Nations and otherwise to bring about a lasting peace; and

"Whereas American fighting men and fighting men of other nations of the United Nations are now engaged in deadly combat with the forces of aggression in Korea, and forces of the United States are stationed elsewhere overseas for the purpose of participating in the defense of the Atlantic Community against aggression; and

"Whereas the weapons and other materials needed by our Armed Forces and by those joined with us in the defense of the free world are produced to a great extent in this country, and steel is an indispensable component of substantially all of such weapons and materials; and

"Whereas steel is likewise indispensable to the carrying out of programs of the Atomic Energy Commission of vital importance to our defense efforts; and

"Whereas a continuing and uninterrupted supply of steel is also indispensable to the maintenance of the economy of the United States, upon which our military strength depends; and

"Whereas a controversy has arisen between certain companies in the United States producing and fabricating steel and the elements thereof and certain of their workers represented by the United Steelworkers of America, CIO, regarding terms and conditions of employment; and

"Whereas the controversy has not been settled through the processes of collective bargaining or through the efforts of the Government, including those of the Wage Stabilization Board, to which the controversy was referred on December 22, 1951, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10233, and a strike has been called for 12:01 a. m., April 9, 1952; and

"Whereas a work stoppage would immediately jeopardize and imperil our national defense and the defense of those joined with us in resisting aggression, and would add to the continuing danger of our soldiers,

---

[3] U. N. General Assembly, U. N. Doc. A/1771 (1951).

[4] 61 Stat. 103 (1947).

[5] 62 Stat. 137 (1948), as amended, 63 Stat. 50 (1949), 64 Stat. 198 (1950).

[6] 63 Stat. 2241 (1949), extended to Greece and Turkey, S. Exec. E, 82d Cong., 2d sess. (1952), advice and consent of the Senate granted. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 7, 1952, p. 930.

[7] 63 Stat. 714 (1949).

[8] S. Execs. A, B, C, and D, 82d Cong., 2d sess. (1952), advice and consent of the Senate granted. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 20, 1952, pp. 2594–2596, 2606.

[9] 65 Stat. 373 (1951).

[10] 65 Stat. 730 (1951); see H. Doc. No. 147, 82d Cong., 1st sess. 3 (1951).

[11] See H. Doc. 382, 82d Cong., 2d sess. (1952).

[12] Hearings before Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on the Mutual Security Act of 1952, 82d Cong., 2d sess. 565–566 (1952); Hearings before House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the Mutual Security Act of 1952, 82d Cong., 2d sess. 370 (1952).

[13] 65 Stat. 75 (1951); S. Rept. No. 117, 82d Cong., 1st sess. 3 (1951).

[14] Address by Secretary of Defense Lovett before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Washington, April 18, 1952.

[15] Fiscal year 1952, 65 Stat. 423, 760 (1951); fiscal year 1951, 64 Stat. 595, 1044, 1223, 65 Stat. 48 (1950–1951); fiscal year 1950, 63 Stat. 869, 973, 987 (1949); fiscal year, 1949, 62 Stat. 647 (1948); fiscal year, 1948, 61 Stat. 551 (1947).

[16] See H. Rept. No. 1685, 82d Cong., 2d sess. 2 (1952), on H. R. 7391.

[17] See H. Rept. No. 384, 82d Cong., 1st sess. 5 (1951); CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 97, pt. 10, pp. 13647–13649.

[18] Defense Production Act, title III (64 Stat. 798 (1950), 65 Stat. 138 (1951).

[19] Note 18, supra, titles IV and V.

[20] S. Rep. No. 470, 82d Cong., 1st sess. 8 (1951).

[21] Id., at 8–9.

sailors, and airmen engaged in combat in the field; and

"Whereas in order to assure the continued availability of steel and steel products during the existing emergency, it is necessary that the United States take possession of and operate the plants, facilities, and other property of the said companies as hereinafter provided:

"Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, and as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, it is hereby ordered as follows:

"1. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed to take possession of all or such of the plants, facilities, and other property of the companies named in the list attached hereto, or any part thereof, as he may deem necessary in the interests of national defense; and to operate or to arrange for the operation thereof and to do all things necessary for, or incidental to, such operation. * * *" [32]

The next morning, April 9, 1952, the President addressed the following message to Congress:

"To the Congress of the United States:

"The Congress is undoubtedly aware of the recent events which have taken place in connection with the management-labor dispute in the steel industry. These events culminated in the action which was taken last night to provide for temporary operation of the steel mills by the Government.

"I took this action with the utmost reluctance. The idea of Government operation of the steel mills is thoroughly distasteful to me and I want to see it ended as soon as possible. However, in the situation which confronted me yesterday, I felt that I could make no other choice. The other alternatives appeared to be even worse—so much worse that I could not accept them.

"One alternative would have been to permit a shut-down in the steel industry. The effects of such a shut-down would have been so immediate and damaging with respect to our efforts to support our Armed Forces and to protect our national security that it made this alternative unthinkable.

"The only way that I know of, other than Government operation, by which a steel shut-down could have been avoided was to grant the demands of the steel industry for a large price increase. I believed and the officials in charge of our stabilization agencies believed that this would have wrecked our stabilization program. I was unwilling to accept the incalculable damage which might be done to our country by following such a course.

"Accordingly, it was my judgment that Government operation of the steel mills for a temporary period was the least undesirable of the courses of action which lay open. In the circumstances, I believed it to be, and now believe it to be, my duty and within my powers as President to follow that course of action.

"It may be that the Congress will deem some other course to be wiser. It may be that the Congress will feel we should give in to the demands of the steel industry for an exorbitant price increase and take the consequences so far as resulting inflation is concerned.

"It may be that the Congress will feel the Government should try to force the steelworkers to continue to work for the steel companies for another long period, without a contract, even though the steelworkers have already voluntarily remained at work without a contract for 100 days in an effort to reach an orderly settlement of their differences with management.

"It may even be that the Congress will feel that we should permit a shut-down of the steel industry, although that would immediately endanger the safety of our fighting forces abroad and weaken the whole structure of our national security.

"I do not believe the Congress will favor any of these courses of action, but that is a matter for the Congress to determine.

"It may be, on the other hand, that the Congress will wish to pass legislation establishing specific terms and conditions with reference to the operation of the steel mills by the Government. Sound legislation of this character might be very desirable.

"On the basis of the facts that are known to me at this time, I do not believe that immediate congressional action is essential; but I would, of course, be glad to cooperate in developing any legislative proposals which the Congress may wish to consider.

"If the Congress does not deem it necessary to act at this time, I shall continue to do all that is within my power to keep the steel industry operating and at the same time make every effort to bring about a settlement of the dispute so the mills can be returned to their private owners as soon as possible." [33]

Twelve days passed without action by Congress. On April 21, 1952, the President sent a letter to the President of the Senate in which he again described the purpose and need for his action and again stated his position that "The Congress can, if it wishes, reject the course of action I have followed in this matter." [34] Congress has not so acted to this date.

Meanwhile, plaintiffs instituted this action in the district court to compel defendant to return possession of the steel mills seized under Executive Order 10340. In this litigation for return of plaintiffs' properties, we assume that defendant Charles Sawyer is not immune from judicial restraint and that plaintiffs are entitled to equitable relief if we find that the Executive order under which defendant acts is unconstitutional. We also assume without deciding that the courts may go behind a President's finding of fact that an emergency exists. But there is not the slightest basis for suggesting that the President's finding in this case can be undermined. Plaintiffs moved for a preliminary injunction before answer or hearing. Defendant opposed the motion, filing uncontroverted affidavits of Government officials describing the facts underlying the President's order.

Secretary of Defense Lovett swore that "a work stoppage in the steel industry will result immediately in serious curtailment of production of essential weapons and munitions of all kinds." He illustrated by showing that 84 percent of the national production of certain alloy steel is currently used for production of military-end items and that 35 percent of total production of another form of steel goes into ammunition, 80 percent of such ammunition now going to Korea. The Secretary of Defense stated that: "We are holding the line [in Korea] with ammunition and not with the lives of our troops."

Affidavits of the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Secretary of the Interior, defendant as Secretary of Commerce, and the Administrators of the Defense Production Administration, the National Production Authority, the General Services Administration, and the Defense Transport Administration were also filed in the district court. These affidavits disclose an enormous demand for steel in such vital defense programs as the expansion of facilities in atomic energy, petroleum, power, transportation, and industrial production, including steel production. Those charged with administering allocations and priorities swore to the vital part steel production plays in our economy. The affidavits emphasize the critical need for steel in our defense program, the absence of appreciable inventories of steel, and the drastic results of any interruption in steel production.

One is not here called upon even to consider the possibility of Executive seizure of a farm, a corner grocery store or even a single industrial plant. Such considerations arise only when one ignores the central fact of this case—that the Nation's entire basic steel production would have shut down completely if there had been no Government seizure. Even ignoring for the moment whatever confidential information the President may possess as "the Nation's organ for foreign affairs," [35] the uncontroverted affidavits in this record amply support the finding that a work stoppage would immediately jeopardize and imperil our national defense.

Plaintiffs do not remotely suggest any basis for rejecting the President's finding that any stoppage of steel production would immediately place the Nation in peril. Moreover, even self-generated doubts that any stoppage of steel production constitutes an emergency are of little comfort here. The union and the plaintiffs bargained for 6 months with over 100 issues in dispute—issues not limited to wage demands but including the union shop and other matters of principle between the parties. At the time of seizure there was not, and there is not now, the slightest evidence to justify the belief that any strike will be of short duration. The union and the steel companies may well engage in a lengthy struggle. Plaintiff's counsel tells us that sooner or later the mills will operate again. That may satisfy the steel companies and, perhaps, the union. But our soldiers and our allies will hardly be cheered with the assurance that the ammunition upon which their lives depend will be forthcoming sooner or later, or, in other words, too little and too late.

Accordingly, if the President has any power under the Constitution to meet a critical situation in the absence of express statutory authorization, there is no basis whatever for criticizing the exercise of such power in this case.

II

The steel mills were seized for a public use. The power of eminent domain, invoked in this case, is an essential attribute of sovereignty and has long been recognized as a power of the Federal Government. (*Kohl* v. *United States* (91 U. S. 367 (1876)).) Plaintiffs cannot complain that any provision in the Constitution prohibits the exercise of the power of eminent domain in this case. The fifth amendment provides: "nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation." It is no bar to this seizure for, if the taking is not otherwise unlawful, plaintiffs are assured of receiving the required just compensation. (*United States* v. *Pewee Coal Co.* (341 U. S. 114 (1951)).)

Admitting that the Government could seize the mills, plaintiffs claim that the implied power of eminent domain can be exercised only under an act of Congress; under no circumstances, they say, can that power be exercised by the President unless he can point to an express provision in enabling legislation. This was the view adopted by the district judge when he granted the preliminary injunction. Without an answer, without hearing evidence, he determined the issue on the basis of his "fixed conclusion * * * that defendant's acts are il-

[32] Executive Order 10340, 17 Fed. Reg. 3139 (1952).

[33] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 9, 1952, p. 3912.

[34] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 21, 1952, p. 4131.

[35] *Chicago & Southern Air Lines* v. *Waterman S. S. Corp.* (333 U. S. 103, 111 (1948), and cases cited.

legal" because the President's only course in the face of an emergency is to present the matter to Congress and await the final passage of legislation which will enable the Government to cope with threatened disaster.

Under this view, the President is left powerless at the very moment when the need for action may be most pressing and when no one, other than he, is immediately capable of action. Under this view, he is left powerless because a power not expressly given to Congress is nevertheless found to rest exclusively with Congress. •

Consideration of this view of executive impotence calls for further examination of the nature of the separation of powers under our tripartite system of government.

The Constitution provides:

Article I, section 1: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States • • •."

Article II, section 1: "The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America • • •."

Section 2: "The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States • • •."

"He shall have the power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur • • •."

Section 3: "He shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; • • • he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed • • •."

Article III, section 1: "The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish."

The whole of the "executive power" is vested in the President. Before entering office, the President swears that he "will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of [his] ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States" (art. II, section 1).

This comprehensive grant of the executive power to a single person was bestowed soon after the country had thrown the yoke of monarchy. Only by instilling initiative and vigor in all of the three departments of Government, declared Madison, could tyranny in any form be avoided.[28] Hamilton added: "Energy in the Executive is a leading character in the definition of good government. It is essential to the protection of the community against foreign attack; it is not less essential to the steady administration of the laws; to the protection of property against those irregular and high-handed combinations which sometimes interrupt the ordinary course of justice; to the security of liberty against the enterprises and assaults of ambition, of faction, and of anarchy."[27] It is thus apparent that the Presidency was deliberately fashioned as an office of power and independence. Of course, the framers created no autocrat capable of arrogating any power unto himself at any time. But neither did they create an automaton impotent to exercise the powers of Government at a time when the survival of the Republic itself may be at stake.

In passing upon the grave constitutional question presented in this case, we must never forget, as Chief Justice Marshall admonished, that the Constitution is "intended to endure for ages to come, and, consequently, to be adapted to the various crises of human affairs," and that "[i]ts means are adequate to its ends."[28] Cases do arise presenting questions which could not have been foreseen by the framers. In such cases, the Constitution has been treated as a living document adaptable to new situations.[29] But we are not called upon today to expand the Constitution to meet a new situation. For, in this case, we need only look to history and time-honored principles of constitutional law—principles that have been applied consistently by all branches of the Government throughout our history. It is those who assert the invalidity of the executive order who seek to amend the Constitution in this case.

III

A review of executive action demonstrates that our Presidents have on many occasions exhibited the leadership contemplated by the framers when they made the President Commander in Chief, and imposed upon him the trust to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed." With or without explicit statutory authorization, Presidents have at such times dealt with national emergencies by acting promptly and resolutely to enforce legislative programs, at least to save those programs until Congress could act. Congress and the courts have responded to such executive initiative with consistent approval.

Our first President displayed at once the leadership contemplated by the Framers. When the national revenue laws were openly flouted in some sections of Pennsylvania, President Washington, without waiting for a call from the State government, summoned the militia and took decisive steps to secure the faithful execution of the laws.[30] When international disputes engendered by the French revolution threatened to involve this country in war, and while congressional policy remained uncertain, Washington issued his Proclamation of Neutrality. Hamilton, whose defense of the Proclamation has endured the test of time, invoked the argument that the Executive has the duty to do that which will preserve peace until Congress acts and, in addition, pointed to the need for keeping the Nation informed of the requirements of existing laws and treaties as part of the faithful execution of the laws.[31]

President John Adams issued a warrant for the arrest of Jonathan Robbins in order to execute the extradition provisions of a treaty. This action was challenged in Congress on the ground that no specific statute prescribed the method to be used in executing the treaty. John Marshall, then a member of the House of Representatives, made the following argument in support of the President's action:

"The treaty, which is a law, enjoins the performance of a particular object. The person who is to perform this object is marked out by the Constitution, since the person is named who conducts the foreign intercourse, and is to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. The means by which it is to be performed, the force of the Nation, are in the hands of this person. Ought not this person to perform the object, although the particular mode of using the means has not been prescribed? Congress, unquestionably may prescribe the mode, and Congress may devolve on others the whole execution of the contract; but, till this be done, it seems the duty of the Executive department to execute the contract by any means it possesses."[32]

Efforts in Congress to discredit the President for his action failed.[33] Almost a century later, this Court had occasion to give its express approval to "the masterly and conclusive argument of John Marshall."[34]

Jefferson's initiative in the Louisiana Purchase, the Monroe Doctrine, and Jackson's removal of Government deposits from the Bank of the United States further served to demonstrate by deed what the framers described by word when they vested the whole of the executive power in the President.

Without declaration of war, President Lincoln took energetic action with the outbreak of the Civil War. He summoned troops and paid them out of the Treasury without appropriation therefor. He proclaimed a naval blockade of the Confederacy and seized ships violating that blockade. Congress, far from denying the validity of these acts, gave them express approval. The most striking action of President Lincoln was the Emancipation Proclamation, issued in aid of the successful prosecution of the Civil War, but wholly without statutory authority.[35]

In an action which furnished a most apt precedent for this case, President Lincoln directed the seizure of rail and telegraph lines leading to Washington without statutory authority.[36] Many months later, Congress recognized and confirmed the power of the President to seize railroads and telegraph lines and provided criminal penalties for interference with Government operation.[37] This act did not confer on the President any additional powers of seizure. Congress plainly rejected the view that the President's acts had been without legal sanction until ratified by the legislature. Sponsors of the bill declared that its purpose was only to confirm the power which the President already possessed.[38] Opponents insisted a statute authorizing seizure was unnecessary and might even be construed a limiting existing Presidential powers.[39]

Other seizures of private property occurred during the Civil War, just as they had occurred during previous wars.[40] In *United States* v. *Russell* (13 Wall. 623 (1872)), three river steamers were seized by Army quartermasters on the ground of "imperative military necessity." This Court affirmed an award of compensation, stating:

"Extraordinary and unforeseen occasions arise, however, beyond all doubt, in cases of extreme necessity in time of war or of immediate and impending public danger, in which private property may be impressed into the public service, or may be seized and

---

[26] The Federalist, No. XLVIII.

[27] The Federalist, No. LXX.

[28] *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316, 415, 424 (1819)).

[29] *United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299, 315–316 (1941)); *Home Building & Loan Association* v. *Blaisdell* (290 U. S. 398, 442–443 (1934)).

[30] 4 Annals of Congress 1411, 1413 (1794).

[31] IV Works of Hamilton (Lodge ed. 1904) 432–444.

[32] 10 Annals of Congress 596, 613–614 (1800); also printed in 5 Wheat. App. pp. 3, 27 (1820).

[33] 10 Annals of Congress 619 (1800).

[34] *Fong Yue Ting* v. *United States* (149 U. S. 698, 714 (1893)).

[35] See The Prize Cases (2 Black 635 (1863)); Randall, Constitutional Problems Under Lincoln (1926); Corwin, The President: Office and Powers (1948 ed.), 277–281.

[36] War of the Rebellion, Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies, series I, vol. II, pp. 603–604 (1880).

[37] 12 Stat. 334 (1862).

[38] Senator Wade, Congressional Globe, 37th Cong., 2d sess. 509 (1862); Representative Blair, id., at 548.

[39] Senators Browning, Fessenden, Cowan, Grimes, id., at 510, 512, 516, 520.

[40] In 1818, the House Committee on Military Affairs recommended payment of compensation for vessels seized by the Army during the War of 1812 (American State Papers, Claims (1834), 649). *Mitchel* v. *Harmony* (13 How. 115, 134 (1852)), involving seizure of a wagon train by an Army officer during the Mexican War, noted that such Executive seizure was proper in case of emergency, but affirmed a personal judgment against the officer on the ground that no emergency had been found to exist. The judgment was paid by the United States pursuant to act of Congress (10 Stat. 727 (1852)).

appropriated to the public use, or may even be destroyed without the consent of the owner."

* * * * *

"Exigencies of the kind do arise in time of war or impending public danger, but it is the emergency, as was said by a great magistrate, that gives the right, and it is clear that the emergency must be shown to exist before the taking can be justified. Such a justification may be shown, and when shown the rule is well settled that the officer taking private property for such a purpose, if the emergency is fully proved, is not a trespasser, and that the Government is bound to make full compensation to the owner." [41]

In *In re Neagle* (135 U. S. 1 (1890)), this Court held that a Federal officer had acted in line of duty when he was guarding a Justice of this Court riding circuit. It was conceded that there was no specific statute authorizing the President to assign such a guard. In holding that such a statute was not necessary, the Court broadly stated the question as follows:

"[The President] is enabled to fulfill the duty of his great department, expressed in the phrase that 'he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed.'

"Is this duty limited to the enforcement of acts of Congress or of treaties of the United States according to their express terms, or does it include the rights, duties, and obligations growing out of the Constitution itself, our international relations, and all the protection implied by the nature of the Government under the Constitution?" [42]

The latter approach was emphatically adopted by the Court.

President Hayes authorized the widespread use of Federal troops during the railroad strike of 1877.[43] President Cleveland also used the troops in the pullman strike of 1895 and his action is of special significance. No statute authorized this action. No call for help had issued from the Governor of Illinios; indeed Governor Altgeld disclaimed the need for supplemental forces. But the President's concern was that Federal laws relating to the free flow of interstate commerce and the mails be continuously and faithfully executed without interruption.[44] To further this aim his agents sought and obtained the injunction upheld by this Court in *In re Debs* (158 U. S. 564 (1895)). The Court scrutinized each of the steps taken by the President to insure execution of the "mass of legislation" dealing with commerce and the mails and gave his conduct full approval. Congress likewise took note of this use of Presidential power to forestall apparent obstacles to the faithful execution of the laws. By separate resolutions, both the Senate and the House commended the Executive's action.[45]

President Theodore Roosevelt seriously contemplated seizure of Pennsylvania coal mines if a coal shortage necessitated such action.[46] In his autobiography, President Roosevelt expounded the "stewardship theory" of Presidential power, stating that "the Executive is subject only to the people, and, under the Constitution, bound to serve the people affirmatively in cases where the Constitution does not explicitly forbid him to render the service." [47] Because the contemplated seizure of the coal mines was based on this theory, then ex-President Taft criticized President Roosevelt in a passage in his book relied upon by the District Court in this case. Taft, Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers (1915), 139–147. In the same book, however, President Taft agreed that such powers of the President as the duty "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed" could not be confined to "express congressional statutes." *In re Neagle*, supra, and *In re Debs, supra*, were cited as conforming with Taft's concept of the office, id., at pages 88–94, as they were later to be cited with approval in his opinion as Chief Justice in *Myers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52, 133 (1926)).[48]

In 1909, President Taft was informed that Government-owned oil lands were being patented by private parties at such a rate that public oil lands would be depleted in a matter of months. Although Congress had explicitly provided that these lands were open to purchase by United States citizens (29 Stat. 526 (1897)), the President, nevertheless, ordered the lands withdrawn from sale "in aid of proposed legislation." In *United States* v. *Midwest Oil Co.* (236 U. S. 459 (1915)), the President's action was sustained as consistent with executive practice throughout our history. An excellent brief was filed in the case by the Solicitor General, Mr. John W. Davis, together with Assistant Attorney General Knaebel, later Reporter for this Court. In this brief, the situation confronting President Taft was described as "an emergency; there was no time to wait for the action of Congress." The brief then discusses the powers of the President under the Constitution in such a case:

"Ours is a self-sufficient Government within its sphere. (*Ex parte Siebold* (100 U. S. 371, 395); *In re Debs* (158 U. S. 564, 578)). 'Its means are adequate to its ends' (*McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316, 424)), and it is rational to assume that its active forces will be found equal in most things to the emergencies that confront it. While perfect flexibility is not to be expected in a government of divided powers, and while division of power is one of the principal features of the Constitution, it is the plain duty of those who are called upon to draw the dividing lines to ascertain the essential, recognize the practical, and avoid a slavish formalism which can only serve to ossify the Government and reduce its efficiency without any compensating good. The function of making laws is peculiar to Congress, and the Executive cannot exercise that function to any degree. But this is not to say that all of the subjects concerning which laws might be made are perforce removed from the possibility of Executive influence. The Executive may act upon things and upon men in many relations which have not, though they might have, been actually regulated by Congress. In other words, just as there are fields which are peculiar to Congress and fields which are peculiar to the Executive, so there are fields which are common to both, in the sense that the Executive may move within them until they shall have been occupied by legislative action. These are not the fields of legislative prerogative, but fields within which the lawmaking power may enter and dominate whenever it chooses. This situation results from the fact that the President is the active agent, not of Congress, but of the Nation. As such he performs the duties which the Constitution lays upon him immediately, and as such, also, he executes the laws and regulations adopted by Congress. He is the agent of the people of the United States, deriving all his powers from them and responsible directly to them. In no sense is he the agent of Congress. He obeys and executes the laws of Congress, not because Congress is enthroned in authority over him, but because the Constitution directs him to do so.

"Therefore it follows that in ways short of making laws or disobeying them, the Executive may be under a grave constitutional duty to act for the national protection in situations not covered by the acts of Congress, and in which, even, it may not be said that his action is the direct expression of any particular one of the independent powers which are granted to him specifically by the Constitution. Instances wherein the President has felt and fulfilled such a duty have not been rare in our history, though, being for the public benefit and approved by all, his acts have seldom been challenged in the courts. We are able, however, to present a number of apposite cases which were subjected to judicial inquiry."

The brief then quotes from such cases as In re Debs, supra, and In re Neagle, supra, and continues:

"As we understand the doctrine of the Neagle case, and the cases therein cited, it is clearly this: The Executive is authorized to exert the power of the United States when he finds this necessary for the protection of the agencies, the instrumentalities, or the property of the Government. This does not mean an authority to disregard the wishes of Congress on the subject, when that subject lies within its control and when those wishes have been expressed, and it certainly does not involve the slightest semblance of a power to legislate, much less to 'suspend' legislation already passed by Congress. It involves the performance of specific acts, not of a legislative but purely of an executive character—acts which are not in themselves laws, but which presuppose a 'law' authorizing him to perform them. This law is not expressed, either in the Constitution or in the enactments of Congress, but reason and necessity compel that it be implied from the exigencies of the situation.

"In none of the cases which we have mentioned, nor in the cases cited in the extracts taken from the Neagle case, was it possible to say that the action of the President was directed, expressly or implicdly, by Congress. The situations dealt with had never been covered by any act of Congress, and there was no ground whatever for a contention that the possibility of their occurrence had ever been specifically considered by the legislative mind. In none of those cases did the action of the President amount merely to the execution of some specific law.

"Neither does any of them stand apart in principle from the case at bar, as involving the exercise of specific constitutional powers of the President in a degree in which this case does not involve them. Taken collectively, the provisions of the Constitution which designate the President as the official who must represent us in foreign relations, in commanding the Army and Navy, in keeping Congress informed of the state of the Union, in insuring the faithful execution of the laws and in recommending new ones, considered in connection with the sweeping declaration that the executive power shall be vested in him, completely demonstrate that his is the watchful eye, the active hand, the overseeing dynamic force of the United States." [49]

This brief is valuable not alone because of the caliber of its authors but because it

---

[41] 13 Wall. at 627–628. Such a compensable taking was soon distinguished from the noncompensable taking and destruction of property during the extreme exigencies of a military campaign. *United States* v. *Pacific R. Co.* (120 U. S. 227 (1887)).

[42] 135 U. S. at 64.

[43] Rich, The President and Civil Disorders (1941), 72–86.

[44] Cleveland, The Government in the Chicago Strike of 1894 (1913).

[45] 26 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 7281–7284, 7544–7546 (1894).

[46] Theodore Roosevelt, Autobiography (1916 ed.), 479–491.

[47] Id., at 378.

[48] *Humphrey's Executor* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 602, 626 (1935)), disapproved expressions in the Myers opinion only to the extent that they related to the President's power to remove members of quasi-legislative and judicial commissions as contrasted with executive employees.

[49] Brief for the United States, No. 278, October term, 1914, pp. 11, 75–77, 88–90.

lays bare in succinct reasoning the basis of the executive practice of which this Court approved in the Midwest Oil case.

During World War I, President Wilson established a War Labor Board without awaiting specific direction by Congress.[50] With William Howard Taft and Frank P. Walsh as cochairmen, the Board had as its purpose the prevention of strikes and lockouts interfering with the production of goods needed to meet the emergency. Effectiveness of War Labor Board decision was accomplished by Presidential action, including seizure of industrial plants.[51] Seizure of the Nation's railroads was also ordered by President Wilson.[52]

Beginning with the bank holiday proclamation[53] and continuing through World War II, executive leadership and initiative were characteristic of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration. In 1939, upon the outbreak of war in Europe, the President proclaimed a limited national emergency for the purpose of strengthening our national defense.[54] By May of 1941, the danger from the Axis belligerents having become clear, the President proclaimed "an unlimited national emergency" calling for mobilization of the Nation's defenses to repel aggression.[55] The President took the initiative in strengthening our defenses by acquiring rights from the British Government to establish air bases in exchange for over-age destroyers.[56]

In 1941, President Roosevelt acted to protect Iceland from attack by Axis powers when British forces were withdrawn by sending our forces to occupy Iceland. Congress was informed of this action on the same day that our forces reached Iceland.[57] The occupation of Iceland was but one of at least 125 incidents in our history in which Presidents, "without congressional authorization, and in the absence of a declaration of war, [have] ordered the Armed Forces to take action or maintain positions abroad."[58]

Some 6 months before Pearl Harbor a dispute at a single aviation plant at Inglewood, Calif, interrupted a segment of the production of military aircraft. In spite of the comparative insignificance of this work stoppage to total defense production as contrasted with the complete paralysis now threatened by a shut-down of the entire basic steel industry, and even though our Armed Forces were not then engaged in combat, President Roosevelt ordered the seizure of the plant "pursuant to the powers vested in [him] by the Constitution and laws of the United States, as President of the United States of America and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States."[59] The Attorney General (Jackson) vigorously proclaimed that the President had the moral duty to keep this Nation's defense effort a going concern. His ringing moral justification was coupled with a legal justification equally well stated:

"The Presidential proclamation rests upon the aggregate of the Presidential powers derived from the Constitution itself and from statutes enacted by the Congress.

"The Constitution lays upon the President the duty 'to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.' Among the laws which he is required to find means to execute are those which direct him to equip an enlarged army, to provide for a strengthened navy, to protect Government property, to protect those who are engaged in carrying out the business of the Government, and to carry out the provisions of the Lend-Lease Act. For the faithful execution of such laws the President has back of him not only each general law-enforcement power conferred by the various acts of Congress but the aggregate of all such laws plus that wide discretion as to method vested in him by the Constitution for the purpose of executing the laws.

"The Constitution also places on the President the responsibility and vests in him the powers of Commander in Chief of the Army and of the Navy. These weapons, for the protection of the continued existence of the Nation are placed in his sole command and the implication is clear that he should not allow them to become paralyzed by failure to obtain supplies for which Congress has appropriated the money and which it has directed the President to obtain."[60]

At this time, Senator CONNALLY proposed amending the Selective Service and Training Act to authorize the President to seize any plant where an interruption of production would unduly impede the defense effort.[61] Proponents of the measure in no way implied that the legislation would add to the powers already possessed by the President[62] and the amendment was opposed as unnecessary since the President already had the power.[63] The amendment relating to plant seizures was not approved at that session of Congress.[64]

Meanwhile, and also prior to Pearl Harbor, the President ordered the seizure of a shipbuilding company and an aircraft parts plant.[65] Following the declaration of war, but prior to the Smith-Connally Act of 1943, five additional industrial concerns were seized to avert interruption of needed production.[66] During the same period, the President directed seizure of the Nation's coal mines to remove an obstruction to the effective prosecution of the war.[67]

The procedures adopted by President Roosevelt closely resembled the methods employed by President Wilson. A National War Labor Board, like its predecessor of World War I, was created by Executive Order to deal effectively and fairly with disputes affecting defense production.[68] Seizures were considered necessary, upon disobedience of War Labor Board orders to assure that the mobilization effort remained a "going concern," and to enforce the economic stabilization program.

At the time of the seizure of the coal mines, Senator CONNALLY'S bill to provide a statutory basis for seizures and for the War Labor Board was again before Congress. As stated by its sponsor, the purpose of the bill was not to augment Presidential power, but to "let the country know that the Congress is squarely behind the President."[69] As in the case of the legislative recognition of President Lincoln's power to seize, Congress again recognized that the President already had the necessary power, for there was no intention to "ratify" past actions of doubtful validity. Indeed, when Senator Tydings offered an amendment to the Connally bill expressly to confirm and validate the seizure of the coal mines, sponsors of the bill opposed the amendment as casting doubt on the legality of the seizure and the amendment was defeated.[70] When the Connally bill, S. 796, came before the House, all parts after the enacting clause were stricken and a bill introduced by Representative SMITH of Virginia was substituted and passed. This action in the House is significant because the Smith bill did not contain the provisions authorizing seizure by the President but did contain provisions controlling and regulating activities in respect to properties seized by the Government under statute "or otherwise."[71] After a conference, the seizure provisions of the Connally bill, enacted as the Smith-Connally or War Labor Disputes Act of 1943, 57 Statutes 163, were agreed to by the House.

Following passage of the Smith-Connally Act, seizures to assure continued production on the basis of terms recommended by the War Labor Board were based upon that act as well as upon the President's power under

---

[50] National War Labor Board. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bull. 287 (1921).

[51] *Id.*, at 24–25, 32–34. See also, 2 Official U. S. Bull. (1918) No. 412; 8 Baker, Woodrow Wilson Life & Letters (1939), 400–402; Berman, Labor Disputes and the President (1924), 125–153; Pringle, The Life and Times of William Howard Taft (1939), 915–925.

[52] 39 Stat. 619, 645 (1916), provides that the President may take possession of any system of transportation in time of war. Following seizure of the railroads by President Wilson, Congress enacted detailed legislation regulating the mode of Federal control. 40 Stat. 451 (1918).

When Congress was considering the statute authorizing the President to seize communications systems whenever he deemed such action necessary during the war, 40 Stat. 904 (1918), Senator (later President) Harding opposed on the ground that there was no need for such stand-by powers because, in event of a present necessity, the Chief Executive "ought to" seize communications lines, "else he would be unfaithful to his duties as such Chief Executive." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 56, pt. 9, p. 9064 (1918).

[53] 48 Stat. 1689 (1933).

[54] 54 Stat. 2643 (1939).

[55] 55 Stat. 1647 (1941).

[56] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 86, pt. 10, p. 11354 (1940) (Message of the President). See 39 Ops. Atty. Gen. 484 (1940). Attorney General Jackson's opinion did not extend to the transfer of Mosquito boats solely because an express statutory prohibition on transfer was applicable.

[57] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 87, pt. 6, p. 5868 (1941) (Message of the President).

[58] Powers of the President To Send the Armed Forces Outside the United States, report prepared by executive department for use of Joint Committee of Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, 82d Cong., 1st sess., committee print 2 (1951).

[59] Executive Order 8773, 6 Fed. Reg. 2777 (1941).

[60] See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 89, pt. 3, p. 3992 (1943). The Attorney General also noted that the dispute at North American Aviation was Communist-inspired and more nearly resembled an insurrection than a labor strike. The relative size of North American Aviation and the impact of an interruption in production upon our defense effort were not described.

[61] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 87, pt. 5, p. 4932 (1941). See also S. 1600 and S. 2054, 77th Cong., 1st sess. (1941).

[62] Representatives May, Whittington; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 87, pt. 6, p. 5895, 5972 (1941).

[63] Representatives Dworshak, Feddis, Harter, Dirksen, Hook; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 87, pt. 6, p. 5901, 5910, 5974, 5975 (1941).

[64] The plant-seizure amendment passed the Senate, but was rejected in the House after a conference committee adopted the amendment. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 87, pt. 6, p. 6424 (1941).

[65] Exec. Order 8868, 6 Fed. Reg. 4349 (1941); Exec. Order 8928, 6 Fed. Reg. 5559 (1941).

[66] Exec. Order 9141, 7 Fed. Reg. 2961 (1942); Exec. Order 9220, 7 Fed. Reg. 6413 (1942); Exec. Order, 9225, 7 Fed. Reg. 6637 (1952); Exec. Order 9254, 7 Fed. Reg. 8333 (1952); Exec. Order 9351, 8 Fed. Reg. 8097 (1943).

[67] Exec. Order 9340, 8 Fed. Reg. 5695 (1943).

[68] Exec. Order 9017, 7 Fed. Reg. 237 (1942); 1 Termination Report of the National War Labor Board 5–11.

[69] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 89, pt. 3, p. 3807 (1943). Similar views of the President's existing power were expressed by Senators Lucas, Wheeler, Austin, and Barkley. Id., at 3885–3887, 3896, 3992.

[70] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 89, pt. 3, p. 3989–3992 (1943).

[71] S. 796, 78th Cong., 1st sess., secs. 12, 13 (1943), as passed by the House.

the Constitution and the laws generally. A question did arise as to whether the statutory language relating to "any plant, mine, or facility equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials" [72] authorized the seizure of properties of Montgomery Ward & Co., a retail department store and mail order concern. The Attorney General (Biddle) issued an opinion that the President possessed the power to seize Montgomery Ward properties to prevent a work stoppage whether or not the terms of the Smith-Connally Act authorized such a seizure.[73] This opinion was in line with the views on Presidential powers maintained by the Attorney General's predecessors (Murphy [74] and Jackson [75]) and his successor (Clark [76]). Accordingly, the President ordered seizure of the Chicago properties of Montgomery Ward in April 1944, when that company refused to obey a War Labor Board order concerning the bargaining representative of its employees in Chicago.[77] In Congress, a Select Committee To Investigate Seizure of the Property of Montgomery Ward & Co., assuming that the terms of the Smith-Connally Act did not cover this seizure, concluded that the seizure "was not only within the constitutional power but was the plain duty of the President." [78] Thereafter, an election determined the bargaining representative for the Chicago employees and the properties were returned to Montgomery Ward & Co. In December 1944, after continued defiance of a series of War Labor Board orders, President Roosevelt ordered the seizure of Montgomery Ward properties throughout the country.[79] The Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit upheld this seizure on statutory grounds and also indicated its disapproval of a lower court's denial of seizure power apart from express statute.[80]

More recently, President Truman acted to repel aggression by employing our Armed Forces in Korea.[81] Upon the intervention of the Chinese Communists, the President proclaimed the existence of an unlimited national emergency requiring the speedy build-up of our Defense Establishment.[82] Congress responded by providing for increased manpower and weapons for our own Armed Forces, by increasing military aid under the Mutual Security Program and by enacting economic stabilization measures, as previously described.

This is but a cursory summary of executive leadership. But it amply demonstrates that Presidents have taken prompt action to enforce the laws and protect the country whether or not Congress happened to provide in advance for the particular method of execution. At the minimum, the executive actions reviewed herein sustain the action of the President in this case. And many of the cited examples of presidential practice go far beyond the extent of power necessary to sustain the President's order to seize the steel mills. The fact that temporary Executive seizures of industrial plants to meet an emergency have not been directly tested in this Court furnishes not the slightest suggestion that such actions have been illegal. Rather, the fact that Congress and the courts have consistently recognized and given their support to such Executive action indicates that such a power of seizure has been accepted throughout our history.

History bears out the genius of the Founding Fathers, who created a Government subject to law but not left subject to inertia when vigor and initiative are required.

IV

Focusing now on the situation confronting the President on the night of April 8, 1952, we cannot but conclude that the President was performing his duty under the Constitution "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed"—a duty described by President Benjamin Harrison as "the central idea of the office." [83]

The President reported to Congress the morning after the seizure that he acted because a work stoppage in steel production would immediately imperil the safety of the Nation by preventing execution of the legislative programs for procurement of military equipment. And, while a shut-down could be averted by granting the price concessions requested by plaintiffs, granting such concessions would disrupt the price stabilization program also enacted by Congress. Rather than fail to execute either legislative program, the President acted to execute both.

Much of the argument in this case has been directed at straw men. We do not now have before us the case of a President acting solely on the basis of his own notions of the public welfare. Nor is there any question of unlimited executive power in this case. The President himself closed the door to any such claim when he sent his message to Congress stating his purpose to abide by any action of Congress, whether approving or disapproving his seizure action. Here, the President immediately made sure that Congress was fully informed of the temporary action he had taken only to preserve the legislative programs from destruction until Congress could act.

The absence of a specific statute authorizing seizure of the steel mills as a mode of executing the laws—both the military procurement program and the anti-inflation program—has not until today been thought to prevent the President from executing the laws. Unlike an administrative commission confined to the enforcement of the statute under which it was created, or the head of a department when administering a particular statute, the President is a constitutional officer charged with taking care that a "mass of legislation" be executed. Flexibility as to mode of execution to meet critical situations is a matter of practical necessity. This practical construction of the "take care" clause, advocated by John Marshall, was adopted by this Court in In re Neagle, In re Debs, and other cases cited supra. See also *Ex parte Quirin* (317 U. S. 1, 26 (1942)). Although more restrictive views of executive power, advocated in dissenting opinions of Justices Holmes, McReynolds, and Brandeis, were emphatically rejected by this Court in *Myers* v. *United States*, supra, members of today's majority treat these dissenting views as authoritative.

There is no statute prohibiting seizure as a method of enforcing legislative programs. Congress has in no wise indicated that its legislation is not to be executed by the taking of private property (subject of course to the payment of just compensation) if its legislation cannot otherwise be executed. Indeed, the Universal Military Training and Service Act authorizes the seizure of any plant that fails to fill a Government contract [84] or the properties of any steel producer that fails to allocate steel as directed for defense production.[85] And the Defense Production Act authorizes the President to requisition equipment and condemn real property needed without delay in the defense effort.[86] Where Congress authorizes seizure in instances not necessarily crucial to the defense program, it can hardly be said to have disclosed an intention to prohibit seizures where essential to the execution of that legislative program.

Whatever the extent of Presidential power on more tranquil occasions, and whatever the right of the President to execute legislative programs as he sees fit without reporting the mode of execution to Congress, the single Presidential purpose disclosed on this record is to faithfully execute the laws by acting in an emergency to maintain the status quo, thereby preventing collapse of the legislative programs until Congress could act.

The President's action served the same purposes as a judicial stay entered to maintain the status quo in order to preserve the jurisdiction of a court. In his message to Congress immediately following the seizure, the President explained the necessity of his action in executing the military procurement and anti-inflation legislative programs and expressed his desire to cooperate with any legislative proposals approving, regulating or rejecting the seizure of the steel mills. Consequently, there is no evidence whatever of any Presidential purpose to defy Congress or act in any way inconsistent with the legislative will.

In *United States* v. *Midwest Oil Co.*, supra, this Court approved executive action where, as here, the President acted to preserve an important matter until Congress could act—even though his action in that case was contrary to an express statute. In this case, there is no statute prohibiting the action taken by the President in a matter not merely important but threatening the very safety of the Nation. Executive inaction in such a situation, courting national disaster, is foreign to the concept of energy and initiative in the Executive as created by the founding fathers. The Constitution was itself "adopted in a period of grave emergency * * *. While emergency does not create power, emergency may furnish the occasion for the exercise of power." [87] The framers knew, as we should know in these times of peril, that there is real danger in Executive weakness. There is no cause to fear Executive tyranny so long as the laws of Congress are being faithfully executed. Certainly there is no basis for fear of dictatorship when the Executive acts, as he did in this case, only to save the situation until Congress could act.

V

Plaintiffs place their primary emphasis on the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, hereinafter referred to as the Taft-Hartley Act, but do not contend that that act contains any provision prohibiting seizure.

---

[72] 57 Stat. 163, 164 (1943).

[73] 40 Ops. Atty. Gen. 312 (1944). See also hearings before House Select Committee To Investigate Seizure of Montgomery Ward & Co., 78th Cong., 2d sess., 117–132 (1944).

[74] 39 Ops. Atty. Gen. 343, 347 (1939).

[75] Note 60, supra.

[76] Letter introduced in hearings before Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on S. 249, 81st Cong., 1st sess., 232 (1949) pointing to the "exceedingly great" powers of the President to deal with emergencies even before the Korea crisis.

[77] Executive Order 9438, 9 Fed. Reg. 4459 (1944).

[78] H. Rept. No. 1904, 78th Cong., 2d sess., 25 (1944) (the committee divided along party lines).

[79] Executive Order 9508, 9 Fed. Reg. 15079 (1944).

[80] *United States* v. *Montgomery Ward & Co.* (150 F. 2d 369 (C. A. 7th Cir. 1945)), reversing 58 F. Supp. 408 (N. D. Ill. 1945). See also *Ken-Rad Tube & Lamp Corp.* v. *Badeau* (55 F. Supp. 193, 197–199 (W. D. Ky. 1944)), where the Court held that a seizure was proper with or without express statutory authorization.

[81] United States Policy in the Korean Crisis (1950), Dept. of State Pub. 3922.

[82] 15 Fed. Reg. 9029 (1950).

[83] Harrison, This Country of Ours (1897), 98.

[84] 62 Stat. 604, 626 (1948), 50 U. S. C. App. (Supp. IV), sec. 468 (c).

[85] 62 Stat. 604, 627 (1948), 50 U. S. C. App. (Supp. IV), sec. 468 (h) (1).

[86] Title II, 64 Stat. 798 (1950), as amended 65 Stat. 138 (1951).

[87] *Home Building & Loan Assn.* v. *Blaisdell*, 290 U. S. 398, 425–426 (1934).

Under the Taft-Hartley Act, as under the Wagner Act, collective bargaining and the right to strike are at the heart of our national labor policy. Taft-Hartley preserves the right to strike in any emergency, however serious, subject only to an 80-day delay in cases of strikes imperiling the national health and safety.[29] In such a case, the President may appoint a board of inquiry to report the facts of the labor dispute. Upon receiving that report, the President may direct the Attorney General to petition a district court to enjoin the strike. If the injunction is granted, it may continue in effect for no more than 80 days, during which time the board of inquiry makes further report and efforts are made to settle the dispute. When the injunction is dissolved, the President is directed to submit a report to Congress together with his recommendations.[30]

Enacted after World War II, Taft-Hartley restricts the right to strike against private employers only to a limited extent and for the sole purpose of affording an additional period of time within which to settle the dispute. Taft-Hartley in no way curbs strikes before an injunction can be obtained and after an 80-day injunction is dissolved.

Plaintiffs admit that the emergency procedures of Taft-Hartley are not mandatory. Nevertheless, plaintiffs apparently argue that, since Congress did provide the 80-day injunction method for dealing with emergency strikes, the President cannot claim that an emergency exists until the procedures of Taft-Hartley have been exhausted. This argument was not the basis of the district court's opinion and, whatever merit the argument might have had following the enactment of Taft-Hartley, it loses all force when viewed in light of the statutory pattern confronting the President in this case.

In title V of the Defense Production Act of 1950,[31] Congress stated:

"It is the intent of Congress, in order to provide for effective price and wage stabilization pursuant to title IV of this act and to maintain uninterrupted production, that there be effective procedures for the settlement of labor disputes affecting national defense" (sec. 501).

Title V authorized the President to initiate labor-management conferences and to take action appropriate to carrying out the recommendations of such conferences and the provisions of title V (sec. 502). Due regard is to be given to collective bargaining practice and stabilization policies and no action taken is to be inconsistent with Taft-Hartley and other laws (sec. 503). The purpose of these provisions was to authorize the President "to establish a board, commission or other agency, similar to the War Labor Board of World War II, to carry out the title."[32]

The President authorized the Wage Stabilization Board (WSB), which administers the wage stabilization functions of title IV of the Defense Production Act, also to deal with labor disputes affecting the defense program.[33] When extension of the Defense Production Act was before Congress in 1951, the Chairman of the Wage Stabilization Board described in detail the relationship between the Taft-Hartley procedures applicable to labor disputes imperiling the national health and safety and the new WSB dispute procedures especially devised for settlement of labor disputes growing out of the needs of the defense program.[34] Aware that a technique separate from Taft-Hartley had been devised, Members of Congress attempted to divest the WSB of its disputes powers. These attempts were defeated in the House, were not brought to a vote in the Senate and the Defense Production Act was extended through June 30, 1952, without change in the disputes powers of the WSB.[35] Certainly this legislative creation of a new procedure for dealing with defense disputes negatives any notion that Congress intended the earlier and discretionary Taft-Hartley procedure to be an exclusive procedure.

Accordingly, as of December 22, 1951, the President had a choice between alternate procedures for settling the threatened strike in the steel mills: One route created to deal with peacetime disputes; the other route specially created to deal with disputes growing out of the defense and stabilization program. There is no question of bypassing a statutory procedure because both of the routes available to the President in December were based upon statutory authorization. Both routes were available in the steel dispute. The union, by refusing to abide by the defense and stabilization program, could have forced the President to invoke Taft-Hartley at that time to delay the strike a maximum of 80 days. Instead, the union agreed to cooperate with the defense program and submit the dispute to the Wage Stabilization Board.

Plaintiffs had no objection whatever at that time to the President's choice of the WSB route. As a result, the strike was postponed, a WSB panel held hearings and reported the position of the parties, and the WSB recommended the terms of a settlement which it found were fair and equitable. Moreover, the WSB performed a function which the board of inquiry contemplated by Taft-Hartley could not have accomplished when it checked the recommended wage settlement against its own wage-stabilization regulations issued pursuant to its stabilization functions under title IV of the Defense Production Act. Thereafter, the parties bargained on the basis of the WSB recommendation.

When the President acted on April 8, he had exhausted the procedures for settlement available to him. Taft-Hartley was a route parellel to, not connected with, the WSB procedure. The strike had been delayed 99 days as contrasted with the maximum delay of 80 days under Taft-Hartley. There had been a hearing on the issues in dispute and bargaining which promised settlement up to the very hour before seizure had broken down. Faced with immediate national peril through stoppage in steel production on the one hand and faced with destruction of the wage and price legislative programs on the other, the President took temporary possession of the steel mills as the only course open to him consistent with his duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

Plaintiffs' property was taken and placed in the possession of the Secretary of Commerce to prevent any interruption in steel production. It made no difference whether the stoppage was caused by a union-management dispute over terms and conditions of employment, a union-Government dispute over wage stabilization or a management-Government dispute over price stabilization. The President's action has thus far been effective, not in settling the dispute, but in saving the various legislative programs at stake from destruction until Congress could act in the matter.

VI

The diversity of views expressed in the six opinions of the majority, the lack of reference to authoritative precedent, the repeated reliance upon prior dissenting opinions, the complete disregard of the uncontroverted facts showing the gravity of the emergency and the temporary nature of the taking all serve to demonstrate how far afield one must go to affirm the order of the district court.

The broad executive power granted by article II to an officer on duty 365 days a year cannot, it is said, be invoked to avert disaster. Instead, the President must confine himself to sending a message to Congress recommending action. Under this messenger-boy concept of the Office, the President cannot even act to preserve legislative programs from destruction so that Congress will have something left to act upon. There is no judicial finding that the executive action was unwarranted because there was in fact no basis for the President's finding of the existence of an emergency[36] for under this view, the gravity of the emergency and the immediacy of the threatened disaster are considered irrelevant as a matter of law.

Seizure of plaintiffs' property is not a pleasant undertaking. Similarly unpleasant to a free country are the draft which disrupts the home and military procurement which causes economic dislocation and compels adoption of price controls, wage stabilization, and allocation of materials. The President informed Congress that even a temporary Government operation of plaintiffs' properties was thoroughly distasteful to him, but was necessary to prevent immediate paralysis of the mobilization program. Presidents have been in the past, and any man worthy of the office should be in the future, free to take at least interim action necessary to execute legislative programs essential to survival of the Nation. A sturdy judiciary should not be swayed by the unpleasantness or unpopularity of necessary executive action, but must independently determine for itself whether the President was acting, as required by the Constitution, "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

As the district judge stated, this is no time for timorous judicial action. But neither is this a time for timorous executive action. Faced with the duty of executing the defense programs which Congress had enacted and the disastrous effects that any stoppage in steel production would have on those programs, the President acted to preserve those programs by seizing the steel mills. There is no question that the possession was other than temporary in character and subject to congressional direction—either approving, disapproving, or regulating the manner in which the mills were to be administered and returned to the owners. The President immediately informed Congress of his action and clearly stated his intention to abide by the legislative will. No

---

[29] See *Bus Employees* v. *Wisconsin Board* (340 U. S. 383 (1951)).

[30] Secs. 206–210, Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 (29 U. S. C. (Supp. IV) secs. 176–180).

[31] 64 Stat. 132 (1950).

[32] H. Rept. No. 3042, 81st Cong., 2d sess., 35 (1950) (conference report). See also S. Rept. No. 2250, 81st Cong., 2d sess., 41 (1950).

[33] Executive Order 10161, 15 Federal Register 6105 (1950), as amended, Executive Order 10233, 16 Federal Register 3503 (1951).

[34] Hearings before the House Committee on Banking and Currency on Defense Production Act Amendments of 1951, 82d Congress, 1st sess., 305–306, 312–313 (1951).

[35] The Lucas amendment to abolish the disputes function of the WSB was debated at length in the House, the sponsor of the amendment pointing out the similarity of the WSB functions to those of the War Labor Board and noting the seizures that occurred when War Labor Board orders were not obeyed (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 97, pt. 6, pp. 8390–8415). The amendment was rejected by a vote of 217 to 119. Id., at 8415. A similar amendment introduced in the Senate was withdrawn (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 97, pt. 6, pp. 7373–7374). The Defense Production Act was extended without amending title V or otherwise affecting the disputes functions of the WSB (65 Stat. 132 (1951)).

[36] Compare *Sterling* v. *Constantin* (287 U. S. 378, 399–401 (1932)).

basis for claims of arbitrary action, unlimited powers, or dictatorial usurpation of congressional power appears from the facts of this case. On the contrary, judicial, legislative, and executive precedents throughout our history demonstrate that in this case the President acted in full conformity with his duties under the Constitution. Accordingly, we would reverse the order of the district court.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am glad the distinguished Senator from Washington has placed in the RECORD the opinion of the Supreme Court. The Senator from Michigan has read the majority opinion, written by Mr. Justice Black. It is clear that Mr. Justice Black, in writing the opinion, came to the conclusion which we so devoutly wished the Supreme Court would reach, namely, that we have a government of laws, not of men; that it is a government in which sovereignty rests in the people; and that Congress has the responsibility of declaring legislative policy in this great Republic.

In a few words, I should like to refer to the majority opinion, because I believe it to be extremely vital to the people of the country, particularly because it comes at a time when there was a feeling that the executive and the military, in the opinion of some people, possessed greater power under the Constitution than the Constitution gave to them. The people's representatives in Congress are entrusted with determining the policy of the Government. They are closest to the people back home.

The Supreme Court in its decision discusses first the President's exercise of military power as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. The Government cited a number of cases involving a military commander who is engaged in day-to-day fighting in a theater of war. Cases exist which allow a commander engaged in fighting in the field to do certain things with relation to property which he could not ordinarily do. Of course, he was not taking such property for the Government for the purpose of operating it but to preserve his army in the field. The Court says in this connection:

> Such cases need not concern us here. Even though "theater of war" be an expanding concept, we cannot with faithfulness to our constitutional system hold that the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces has the ultimate power as such to take possession of private property in order to keep labor disputes from stopping production.

In other words, Mr. President, that is an entirely different situation than is involved in the case at bar. In the first instance an Army commander was acting in a theater of war. The steel seizure case did not involve the taking of property for the purpose of sustaining an army in the field of battle. I quote further from the opinion:

> This is a job for the Nation's lawmakers, not for the military authorities.

Mr. President, it is very vital that we understand the full meaning of that statement. Our school children must be brought up on the idea that it is the job of the law makers, not a job for the Commander in Chief or the generals or the admirals.

I continue to read from the majority opinion:

> Nor can the seizure order be sustained because of several constitutional provisions that grant executive power to the President.

That is the power which the Government was relying on if the Commander in Chief theory was not sustained by the Court. I am glad that the Supreme Court did not accept that theory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, many Senators are in the Chamber because the calendar is being called. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] must sit all through the calendar call, without lunch, and I shall have to ask for the regular order. I do not think we should have speeches on extraneous matters when we are considering the measures on the calendar.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my remarks, when I conclude them later, may be consolidated with what I have said, my entire remarks to appear at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to incorporating the subsequent remarks of the Senator from Michigan as part of his remarks at this point in the RECORD? The Chair hears no objection, and it is ordered.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am unable to yield. My time under the 5-minute rule has expired.

EXCLUSION FROM GROSS INCOME OF PROCEEDS OF SPORTS PROGRAMS FOR BENEFIT OF AMERICAN RED CROSS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 7345) to exclude from gross income the proceeds of certain sports programs conducted for the benefit of the American National Red Cross.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the measure?

Mr. GEORGE. The bill excludes from gross income the proceeds of certain sports programs conducted for the benefit of the American National Red Cross. When the bill came from the House it dealt with that one subject. The Committee on Finance was of the opinion that there were other charities that should also enjoy the same privilege, and we accordingly amended the bill. The amendment does not change the portion of the bill as passed by the House but does increase from 15 percent to 20 percent the amount which an individual may give to a charity, excluding from gross income the 20 percent contributed when full contribution is made by the individual.

The committee was of the opinion that many hospitals, small colleges, and charitable institutions were very helpful in various communities, and that we should permit an individual who wished to give as much as 20 percent of his income the privilege of doing so.

Particularly, we wanted to give a corporation the right to carry on an athletic program and devote the whole proceeds of such a program for a day, let us say, to the National Red Cross.

There are many other charities which wished to be included, but the committee is of the opinion that to include, for example, the Community Chest and various other charities, would defeat the whole object of the bill. It is obvious that no baseball club in the American League or the National League could afford to give away successive days of its income for charitable purposes, whereas we had some indication that the American League would give 1 day's proceeds to the National Red Cross, and perhaps the Washington team itself would be glad to give 1 day of its proceeds to the National Red Cross.

Of course the Red Cross holds a Federal charter. The President of the United States has the power to appoint certain directors of the National Red Cross. The chairman who is in active charge of its affairs is designated by the executive branch of the Government. The National Red Cross engages in many governmental functions and discharges many obligations, both locally and nationally. The House having seen fit to give the National Red Cross the opportunity of obtaining 1 day's proceeds from an athletic program, the Senate Committee on Finance let that provision stand but decided to give to any individual the right to increase his contribution for charitable purposes from 15 percent to 20 percent.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The distinguished Senator from Georgia may recall that the junior Senator from Colorado offered an amendment to include the Community Chest. It was developed, however, that if we include the Community Chest, we would have to include many other worthy organizations which serve a public purpose. It was pointed out that if we enlarged the list, the result would probably be that baseball would not give any free days because they would have to make a selection, and that would be regarded as discrimination. Is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct, and that is what controlled the committee. The committee, as I have said, will be glad to have an increase made from 15 to 20 percent, in the case of contributions made by individuals to any charity.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the explanation which has been given by the Senator from Georgia in regard to how the amendment would broaden the contribution field. I am sure the amendment was very, very badly needed by a great many of the smaller religious colleges and other educational institutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7345), to exclude from gross income the proceeds of certain sports programs conducted for the benefit of the American National Red Cross, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments on page 3, line 6, after the word "by", to insert "the first section and section 2 of"; and after line 9, to insert:

SEC. 4. (a) Section 23 (o) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions by individuals for charitable contributions) is hereby amended by striking out "15 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "20 percent."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1951.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to exclude from gross income the proceeds of certain sports programs conducted for the benefit of the American National Red Cross, and for other purposes."

FREE IMPORTATION OF ALTARS, PULPITS, ETC., FOR RELIGIOUS USE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I dislike very much to request the consideration of a bill out of order, but I wonder whether I may obtain unanimous consent to have the Senate consider at this time House bill 7593, calendar 1531. That bill has not yet been reached on the calendar, but I apprehend that there is no objection to it. Inasmuch as I have to leave the floor in a moment, I should like to have that bill disposed of at this time. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia for the present consideration of House bill 7593, calendar No. 1531?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7593) to amend paragraph 1774, section 201, title II, of the Tariff Act of 1930.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this bill will merely permit a church to import, duty free, articles for church purposes, which can now be imported duty free if the donor sees fit to have the shipments made in his own name. However, in some instances the church itself wishes to have such articles imported. I refer, for instance, to bells, or other articles for religious services or purposes. The bill would exempt the payment of duty only when such articles were imported for such purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 7593) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the courtesy of Senators in connection with the bill which has just been passed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT

The bill (H. R. 4323) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into lease-purchase agreements to provide for the lease to the United States of real property and structures for terms of not less than 8 or more than 25 years and for acquisition of title to such properties and structures by the United States at or before the expiration of the lease terms, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Would it be in order, after this bill is taken up, to amend it by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the text of Senate bill S. 2137, which is on the calendar? In that way, we would, in effect, pass the Senate bill, which is a substitute for the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first question is whether there is objection to the present consideration of the House bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Before I determine whether I wish to object, I desire to have my parliamentary inquiry answered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Arkansas that after the House bill is considered, it can be perfected by way of amendment, and then can be passed. In that way, if the House bill is considered and if an amendment which includes the text of the Senate bill is offered to the House bill, following its enacting clause, the purpose suggested by the Senator from Arkansas can be achieved.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have received from the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] a request to have this bill go over. Of course I hope that the procedure suggested by the Senator from Arkansas can be followed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let me say to the majority leader that my only purpose is to have the bill go to conference. That is why I suggested that the text of the Senate bill be substituted for the text of the House bill. If that can be done, the result will be to have the bill in conference.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I hope such an arrangement can be made, for this measure is an important one. However, at the request of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I must ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2592) to amend section 403 (v) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to permit the granting of free or reduced rate transportation to ministers of religion was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TOBEY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill goes over.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS ACT, 1926

The bill (H. R. 6661) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I may say that I have no objection to consideration of the bill, but I wish to indicate that at the proper time I desire to submit an amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, at this time I offer the amendment to which I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 2, it is proposed to strike out "by striking out the last sentence thereof," and to insert in lieu thereof: "by amending the last sentence thereof to read as follows: 'In the case of the buildings and grounds authorized by this act, after the initial alterations, repairs, and furnishing has been completed, subsequent expenditures for such purposes may be made out of the appropriations authorized by this act in amounts authorized by the Congress each fiscal year'."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with the bill which has just been passed, a brief explanation of the amendment which has been submitted and adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT TO HOUSE BILL 6661

As reported from committee, section 2, among other things, would delete the last sentence in section 4 of the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended, which reads as follows: "In the case of the buildings and grounds authorized by this act, after the initial alterations, repairs and furnishings have been completed, subsequent expenditures for such purposes shall not be made out of the appropriations authorized by this act."

The committee report justifies this deletion on the ground that it "will permit the expenditure of the authorized and appropriated funds for continuing alterations, repairs, and furnishings. It seems reasonable

to bring all such expenditures into one place in the interest of effective management, sound budgeting, and a correct over-all point of view."

This deletion has objectional features, however, since it would endorse a policy which would permit advance authorizations for maintenance and operations, without the requirement of Congressional approval or authorization. This circumvents congressional control, hitherto required annually, over expenditure of whatever funds may be used for this purpose. It would endorse a policy whereby no distinction is made between appropriations intended for initial construction and repairs on the one hand and maintenance and operations on the other. It is furthermore believed that the deletion suggested by the committee might promote waste in stimulating expenditure of otherwise appropriated but unspent funds for repairs, furnishings, and maintenance that may be unnecessary.

The language of the suggested amendment would still permit the use of dollar credits, however, to the extent approved in the annual appropriations.

The suggested amendment has been informally endorsed by the General Accounting Office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois seek recognition?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, I do. The bill was passed before I had a chance to read it. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee whether my understanding of the bill is correct, namely, that it authorizes the expenditure of $90,000,000 for quarters for United States foreign service personnel serving overseas. Am I correct in my understanding of the bill?

Mr. CONNALLY. The bill involves purely a bookkeeping transaction, in order to reimburse the Treasury. The bill does not involve any expenditure whatever of United States funds.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Where will the money come from?

Mr. CONNALLY. It will come from the counterpart funds. If we do not use them, they will lapse, and we shall not obtain the benefit of them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. However, if we use the counterpart funds in that way, we shall thus diminish the degree to which we could use the counterpart funds to provide supplies to our allies.

Would not this bill involve the use of $90,000,000 for the buildings referred to, instead of using the $90,000,000 to equip French divisions, for instance?

Therefore, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to advise the Senator from Illinois that the Chair asked whether there was objection, and none was heard, and the bill was passed.

Does the Senator from Illinois desire to ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed be reconsidered, so that we may return to consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, I make that request, Mr. President. When the calendar is called, things move rather rapidly; and I did not have a chance to read the bill until just at the moment when the bill was passed.

Ninety million dollars is quite a large sum of money. I think there is a very real question as to whether the security of the United States would not be better served by using the money to equip foreign divisions, instead of using the money to erect more handsome buildings to house members of the Foreign Service.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is objecting; yet this measure will not cost the Treasury of the United States one dollar. We have millions of dollars tied up in Europe in what are called counterpart funds, which were supplied by the other governments in consideration of our having given them ECA aid and other assistance.

Unless the counterpart funds are used, they will lapse, and we shall lose them.

This measure simply provides that the counterpart funds can be used to repair and construct buildings which otherwise would have to be repaired and constructed at the expense of the Federal Government, if the Federal Government is ever to obtain them.

The Senator from Illinois wishes to have the money used for mutual security aid. The other day when we had that question before us, the Senator from Illinois wished to drag in the entire defense program of $55,000,000,000. Why should almost every bill which comes before the Senate be complicated by having the Senator from Illinois drag into it a bill relating to the national defense? The Senator from Illinois was not here when this bill was passed. However, he could have been here, as other Senators were, to attend to the objection he had in mind.

So I wish to make these remarks in respect to the observations and inferences of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Is the Senator from Kansas correct in the assumption that this matter would have to be passed upon by the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committee at the proper time, in the event a request were actually made for these funds?

Mr. CONNALLY. To be sure. There is no request at all for dollars, none whatever. If these funds are not used in the foreign countries, we shall not get them. We would then have to come back to the Senate to request an appropriation of dollars from the United States Treasury. Is that what the Senator from Illinois desires? Does he want more dollars to be expended out of the United States Treasury? Or does he want the United States to obtain some of the foreign counterpart funds and use them for purposes which otherwise would be charged later on against the Treasury?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is it appropriate for me to say anything in reply to the statements which have been made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the question is whether there are not alternative uses for these funds, more important to the United States of America, than erecting more handsome Government buildings overseas. We have the counterpart funds there. Certainly they do not have to lapse. We can use them for an alternative purpose. The Senator from Texas agrees that these are counterpart funds. In NATO countries they can be used directly for the equipment of divisions, thus saving money which we otherwise would set aside. To the degree that these funds are in the non-NATO countries, perhaps they could be used for economic purposes.

Mr. President, I may be old-fashioned, I may seem old-fashioned to the Senator from Texas——

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is new-fangled.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope I am not cantankerous, but $90,000,000 still seems to me to be a large sum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois to reconsider the votes whereby House bill 6661 was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed?

Mr. CONNALLY. I merely want to make a brief observation. I have before me the report from the Committee on Foreign Relations regarding this matter, from which I read:

> From a strictly commercial investment standpoint, this form of capital investment in buildings by the Government is especially attractive because of the comparatively low interest rates involved, the favorable amortization periods applicable to Government buildings and because of the general freedom from taxation accorded diplomatic and consular properties. Since 1947, over $19,000,000 has been saved in dollar rentals and quarters allowances by Government ownership of property.

Mr. President, what does the Senator from Illinois want to do? Does he want any foreign consular or embassy buildings? We constantly have requests and demands in the form of bills for facilities of that kind. Does the Senator want to have none of them provided? Does he want to spend all the money on arms and upon the military? The Senator from Illinois says he may be old-fashioned. No, Mr. President, he is not old-fashioned; he is new-fashioned. He is against everything except a few pet ideas of his own.

Mr. President, this is an actual saving to the Government of $90,000,000, which the Senator from Illinois, by inference, wants to dig out of the Treasury in the form of United States dollars.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and the bill is before the Senate.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 6661) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

FLOOD CONTROL, CITY OF HONOLULU

The bill (H. R. 4801) to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue certain bonds for flood-control purposes was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—may we have an explanation of this measure? I may say there is a series of bills, Calendar Nos. 1516 to 1521, both inclusive, of the same tenor. In the spirit of expediting the matter, I should like to ask the distinguished and able Senator from Wyoming whether he would make a statement explaining the general nature of the proposition involved in this and the other bills.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, as the Senator from Kansas has said, Senate bill 4801 is one of a series of bills unanimously approved by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, authorizing the city and county of Honolulu, the county of Maui, in several instances, in the Territory of Hawaii, to issue certain bonds for flood control, for public improvement, for public-school purposes, and the like.

The necessity for legislation of this kind arises from the fact that the Organic Act of the Territory of Hawaii provides, in section 55, as I recall, that no bonds may be issued without the consent of Congress in excess of 5 percent of the debt limit. The debt limit in Hawaii is controlled, of course, as in other subdivisions, but the values in Hawaii are very much greater than the assessed valuation would indicate. Therefore, a debt limitation based upon assessed values does not present an accurate picture of the fiscal situation in the islands. The committee was very careful about these bills, and asked for a complete report from the Department of the Interior, so that it would be clear that we were not authorizing the Territory of Hawaii or the municipality of Honolulu, or the counties, to extend themselves by the issuance of bonds.

It would appear that, by and large, the actual market value of property in the Territory of Hawaii, within the areas covered by these particular bills, is three or four times greater than the assessed valuation of the real property schedules throughout the Territory. The purpose is to bring the assessed valuation of such real property into appropriate relationship to the actual value. The situation in the city and county of Honolulu will be made clear when I say that the present assessed valuation of property in Honolulu, for determining debt limitation, in accordance with organic act, is $253,785,190. The outstanding indebtedness is only $15,180,000, and the bills which are on the calendar, H. R. 4801, H. R. 4802, H. R. 5386, and H. R. 4923 would authorize an additional bonded indebtedness of $28,783,713.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may conclude this brief statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it would amount to approximately 11.3 percent of the present assessed valuation; and inasmuch as the assessed valuation is considerably lower than the actual market value of the property, the committee felt that the authority should be granted, because rehabilitation of the parks, flood control, public schools, and the other public improvement projects which have been endorsed by the legislature should be carried forward.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4801) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS RELATING TO HAWAII CONSIDERED AND PASSED EN BLOC

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, in view of the explanation which has been made and its acceptance by the Senator from Kansas, that Calendar Nos. 1517, House bill 4802; 1518, House bill 5386; 1519, House bill 5071; 1520, House bill 5072; and 1521, House bill 4923, be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H. R. 4802) to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the city and county of Honolulu to issue certain public improvement bonds; the bill (H. R. 5386) to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, municipal corporation of the Territory of Hawaii, to issue bonds for the acquisition of real property for public-school purposes, and for construction and replacement of buildings for public school purposes; the bill (H. R. 5071) to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the County of Maui, T. H., to issue public-improvements bonds for the construction of flood-control projects on Iao stream; the bill (H. R. 5072) to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the county of Maui, T. H., to issue public-improvement bonds for the construction of new public-school buildings; and the bill (H. R. 4923) to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the city and county of Honolulu to issue certain bonds for the construction of the Kalihi tunnel and its approach roads, were severally considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN INDIAN LANDS IN CALIFORNIA

The bill (H. R. 6675) to authorize the conveyance of lands in the Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation to the State of California or to the Hoopa Unified School District for use for school purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN LANDS FROM RECLAMATION LAWS

The bill (S. 2610) providing that excess-land provision of the Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to certain lands that will receive a supplemental or regulated water supply from the San Luis Valley project, Colorado, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, bills similar to this have been before the Congress for a number of years. One of them was passed by the Senate on a previous occasion. The area involved is in a very high altitude. There is a very short growing season, and 160 acres, or anything short of what is asked for in the bill, cannot provide a proper living scale for the farmers. There is a dam involved, but it is not being used because of the limitations which now exist. The enactment of the bill will make it possible to use the dam which has been built by public funds.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2610) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not be applicable to lands or to the ownership of lands which receive a supplemental or regulated supply of water from the San Luis Valley project, Colorado: *Provided, however*, That, in lieu of the acreage limitations contained in such provisions, no landowner shall receive for such project a supplemental or regulated water supply greater in quantity than that reasonably necessary to irrigate 480 acres of land served by such project: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this act are intended to meet the special conditions existing on the lands served or to be served by the San Luis Valley project, Colorado, and shall not be considered as altering the general policy of the United States with respect to the excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2437) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over. I do not think it is a measure which should be considered on the call of the calendar.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it is one of the bills which we gave notice we would take up later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

OPERATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC AIRPORTS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2229) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire, construct, operate, and maintain public airports in certain areas and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments on page 1, line 6, after the word "in" to insert "the continental United States in, or in close"; in line 7, after the word "proximity", to strike out "to" and insert "to,"; on page 2, line 22, after the word "act", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be held to authorize the Secretary to acquire any land, or interest in or over land, by purchase, condemnation, grant, or lease without first obtaining the consent of the Governor of the State, and the consent of the State political subdivision in which such land is located"; and on page 3, line 3, after "SEC. 3.", to strike out "Notwithstanding any other provision of law" and insert "In order to carry out the purpose of this act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the "Secretary") is hereby authorized to plan, acquire, establish, construct, enlarge, improve, maintain, equip, operate, regulate, and protect airports in the continental United States in, or in close proximity to, national forests when such airports are determined by him to be necessary for proper protection and administration of the national forests: *Provided*, That no such airport shall be acquired or constructed unless such airport is included in the then current revision of the national airport plan formulated by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Airport Act: *Provided further*, That the operation and maintenance of such airports shall be in accordance with the standards, rules, or regulations prescribed by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics: *And provided further*, That no airport owned or controlled by a State or a political subdivision thereof shall be acquired or taken over without the consent of such State or political subdivision.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purposes of this act, the Secretary is authorized to acquire necessary lands and interests in or over lands; to contract for the construction, improvement, operation, and maintenance of airports and incidental facilities; to enter into agreements with other public agencies providing for the construction, operation, or maintenance of airports by such other public agencies or jointly by the Secretary and such other public agencies upon mutually satisfactory terms; and to enter into such other agreements and take such other action with respect to such airports as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be held to authorize the Secretary to acquire any land, or interest in or over land, by purchase, condemnation, grant, or lease without first obtaining the consent of the Governor of the State, and the consent of the State political subdivision in which such land is located.

SEC. 3. In order to carry out the purposes of this act, the Secretary is hereby authorized to sponsor projects under the Federal Airport Act either independently or jointly with other public agencies, and to use, for payment of the sponsor's share of the project costs of such projects, any funds that may be contributed or otherwise made available to him for such purpose (receipt of which funds and their use for such purposes is hereby authorized), or may be appropriated or otherwise specifically authorized therefor.

SEC. 4. All airports acquired or taken over under the provisions of this act, unless otherwise specifically provided by law, shall be operated as public airports available for public use on fair and reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination.

SEC. 5. The terms "airport," "project," "project costs," "public agency," and "sponsor," as used in this act shall have the respective meanings prescribed in the Federal Airport Act.

SEC. 6. Section 9 (c) of the Federal Airport Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) Nothing in this act shall authorize the submission of a project application by the United States or any agency thereof, except in the case of a project in the Territory of Alaska, the Territory of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or in, or in proximity to, a national park, national recreation area, national monument, or national forest."

SEC. 7. Section 3 (c) of the Federal Airport Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) In making annual revisions of the national airport plan pursuant to the provisions of this Act, the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics shall consult with and consider the views and recommendations of the heads of the departments concerned with respect to the need for development of airports in, or in proximity to, national parks, national monuments, national recreation areas, or national forests."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL CEMETERIES IN ARIZONA

The bill (S. 2621) to provide for national cemeteries in the State of Arizona was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in Arizona there is a veteran population of approximately 72,000 persons. There are no available national cemeteries in the nearby States. The nearest one is some 400 or 600 miles distant. A few plots in private cemeteries have been available, but these plots are rapidly becoming filled, and it will be only a short time until there will be no plot available for the burial of veterans living in Arizona. The veterans of my State are anxious that a cemetery be established. There are two main hospitals in which from time to time many veterans are patients. Unfortunately, some of them pass away, and there is no place to bury them unless their bodies can be sent back home. The bill is very important to the veterans of my State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2621) to provide for national cemeteries in the State of Arizona, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed (1) to establish one or more national cemeteries at a location selected by him in the State of Arizona and (2) to acquire, by donation, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, such land as may be required for the establishment of such national cemeteries.

SEC. 2. When requested to do so by the Secretary of the Army, the Administrator of the General Services is authorized and directed to transfer to the Department of the Army, without reimbursement or transfer of funds, any Government-owned land in the State of Arizona, which the Secretary of the Army has determined to be suitable for the purposes of this statute and which is otherwise surplus to Government needs. In addition, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to utilize when practicable, for the establishment thereon of a national cemetery or cemeteries, such Government-owned lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army which are located within the State of Arizona and which are no longer needed for military purposes.

SEC. 3. Upon selection by the Secretary of the Army of such land, as provided in sections 1 and 2 hereof, he is authorized to establish such national cemeteries and to provide for the care and maintenance thereof.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary for the administration of this act.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry into effect the purposes of this act.

MATHILDE KOHAR HALEBIAN

The bill (S. 2084) for the relief of Mathilde Kohar Halebian was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mathilde Kohar Halebian shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

GRANTING JURISDICTION TO COURT OF CLAIMS TO HEAR AND DETERMINE CERTAIN CLAIMS

The bill (S. 3195) granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States Court of Claims be, and hereby is, given jurisdiction to hear, determine, and render judgment, notwithstanding any statute of limitations, laches, or lapse of time, on the claim of any owner or operator of a gold mine or gold placer operation for losses incurred allegedly because of the closing or curtailment or prevention of operations of such mine or placer operation as a result of the restrictions imposed by War Production

Board Limitation Order L–208 during the effective life thereof: *Provided*, That actions on such claims shall be brought within 1 year from the date this act becomes effective.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT—JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED TO NEXT CALL OF CALENDAR

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 158) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the taking of private property was announced as next in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, at the request of numerous Senators, I ask that the joint resolution be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the joint resolution will be passed over.

Mr. FERGUSON subsequently said: I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 1537, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 158) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the taking of private property, be included in the next call of the calendar. I understand there was objection to the joint resolution, which proposed a constitutional amendment to prohibit the seizure of property, except as provided by an act of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution was passed over.

Mr. FERGUSON. While the joint resolution may be thought unnecessary by some, by reason of the today's Supreme Court ruling, I believe it is a matter which should receive very careful and present attention by the Senate. I merely ask unanimous consent that it may be placed on the next call of the calendar; that is, that it may be considered on the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

APPROVAL OF CONTRACT WITH IRRIGATION DISTRICTS ON THE OWYHEE FEDERAL PROJECT

The bill (H. R. 5633) to approve a contract negotiated with the irrigation districts on the Owyhee Federal project, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have a short explanation of this measure?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall be very happy to explain the bill. It affects four irrigation and reclamation projects. The Reclamation Project Act of 1939 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate modifications of the repayment contracts under certain circumstances. These circumstances arise when engineering difficulties, as in the past, because of conditions of unfavorable land or in respect to irrigation render certain areas unavailable to be brought into irrigation and to grow crops and make it unjust to charge the settlers with repayment for excessive amounts which cannot be produced from crops on the project.

The House of Representatives has passed three bills, one of which affects the Owyhee project in Idaho and Oregon, and the others the Milk River project in Montana, and the Frenchtown project in Montana. The Senators from Montana have supported the two Montana projects. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] introduced a bill which was a companion to the House bill. The fourth project is the Riverton project in Wyoming. In each instance the committee, having examined the contracts and the circumstances under which the repayments were deemed to be made necessary, felt that the contracts were proper and should be approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5633) to approve a contract negotiated with the irrigation districts on the Owyhee Federal project to authorize its execution, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the contracts referred to in sections 2 to 5 of this act, which have been negotiated by the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to section 7 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), are hereby approved, and the Secretary is authorized to execute them on behalf of the United States.

OWYHEE PROJECT, IDAHO-OREGON

SEC. 2. The amendatory repayment contract dated August 29, 1951, with the Gem irrigation district, the Ridgeview irrigation district, the Owyhee irrigation district, the Ontario-Nyssa irrigation district, the Advancement irrigation district, the Payette-Oregon slope irrigation district, the Crystal irrigation district, the Bench irrigation district, and the Slide irrigation district.

RIVERTON PROJECT, WYOMING

SEC. 3. The contract with the Midvale irrigation district, which contract was approved by the electors of the district on May 14, 1952.

MILK RIVER PROJECT, MONTANA

SEC. 4. The contract with the Malta irrigation district which was executed by said district pursuant to the laws of the State of Montana and in conformity with the order of the District Court of the Seventeenth Judicial District of the State of Montana, in and for the county of Phillips, dated March 6, 1951, in the confirmation proceedings on said contract before said court; and the contract with the Glasgow irrigation district which was executed by said district pursuant to the laws of the State of Montana and in conformity with the order of the District Court of the Seventeenth Judicial District of the State of Montana, in and for the county of Valley, dated October 1, 1951, in the confirmation proceedings on said contract before said court.

(a) The 1947 reclassification of the lands of the Malta irrigation district and the Glasgow irrigation district of the Milk River project, Montana, made in accordance with the provisions of section 8 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 and approved by the Board of Commissioners of the Malta irrigation district by resolution, dated June 24, 1948, and by the Board of Commissioners of the Glasgow irrigation district by resolution, dated July 1, 1948, is approved.

(b) Contingent upon the execution of the contract with the Malta irrigation district, approved in this section, there shall be deducted from the total costs of the project, as the Malta irrigation district's share thereof, the sum of $663,644 on account of 12,128 acres, within the Malta irrigation district, found to be permanently unproductive by the 1947 reclassification of lands.

(c) Contingent upon the execution of the contract with the Glasgow irrigation district, approved in this section, there shall be deducted from the total costs of the project, as the Glasgow irrigation district's share thereof, the sum of $5,691 on account of 104 acres within the Glasgow irrigation district, found to be permanently unproductive by the 1947 reclassification of lands.

(d) There shall be deducted from the total costs of the project on account of nondistrict lands found to be permanently unproductive by the 1947 reclassification of lands, which reclassification as to nondistrict lands is hereby approved, the sum of $7,661 on account of 140 acres formerly excluded from the Glasgow irrigation district and not intended to be included within said district.

(e) The Secretary is authorized, in his discretion, to cancel and deduct from the total costs of the Glasgow division of the Milk River project, Montana, the construction charge obligation against any of the lands within said division of said project which are not actually included within the Glasgow irrigation district. The amount of said cancellation and deduction shall be computed by the Secretary by multiplying the total number of acres of land formerly intended to be included within the irrigation district but not so included by the sum of $54.72 per acre.

(f) The Secretary, at any time subsequent to the execution of the contracts approved in this section, and not later than January 1, 1960, shall reclassify and designate as either class 1, 2, 3, 4, 4a, 4b, or 6, as provided in said contracts, all lands within the Malta and Glasgow irrigation districts designated as class 5 by the 1947 reclassification of lands, and the reclassification and designation as class 6 of any of said lands shall reduce the construction charge obligation of the district in which such class 6 lands are situated by the sum of $54.72 per acre.

(g) The amounts deducted from the construction charge obligation of either or both the Malta and Glasgow irrigation districts, and from the total costs of the Milk River project, as provided for herein and adjusted in the contracts approved in this section, shall be charged off as a permanent loss to the reclamation fund, but no adjustment shall be made by the United States by reason thereof with any individual landowner by way of refund of or credit on account of sums heretofore paid, repaid, returned, or due and payable to the United States, by way of exchange of land, or by any other method.

FRENCHTOWN PROJECT, MONTANA

SEC. 5. The contract dated September 6, 1951, with the Frenchtown irrigation district.

SEC. 6. All costs and expenses incurred by the United States in negotiating and completing the contracts approved under sections 3 and 4 of this act and in making the investigations in connection therewith and in future determinations under said contracts with respect to the productivity of temporarily unproductive lands shall, contingent upon the final confirmation and execution of the contracts, be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable under the Federal reclamation laws. The water rights formerly appurtenant to the permanently unproductive lands referred to in the contracts aforesaid shall be disposed of by the United States under the reclamation laws with a preference right to the water users on the respective reclamation projects.

SEC. 7. This act is declared to be a part of the Federal reclamation laws as those laws are defined in the Reclamation Project Act of 1939.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to approve contracts negotiated with irrigation districts on the Owyhee, Riverton, Milk River, and Frenchtown Federal reclamation projects, to authorize their execution, and for other purposes."

INCREASE IN SECURITIES ISSUED BY MOTOR CARRIERS

The bill (S. 2360) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to increase the amounts of securities issued by motor carriers without requiring approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like an explanation of this bill, because the Interstate Commerce Commission does not now have sufficient money with which to function. Their backlog of cases is very great. If we pass this authorization bill, there is not going to be any money to meet the costs involved. The funds for the Commission are appropriated in the independent offices appropriation bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not wish to interfere with the passage of the bill, but the financial condition of the Interstate Commerce Commission is critical. I hope the Senate will go along with the Senate committee and provide certain appropriations for the Commission which the House has omitted. If we place any more work upon the Interstate Commerce Commission, unless we allow them increased appropriations, they are not going to be able to function properly. They are about 3 years behind in their work in certain cases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

TRANSFER OF LAND TO THE STATE OF OREGON

The bill (S. 2603) to authorize the transfer of certain lands to the State of Oregon, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas whether the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has lodged an objection to Calendar No. 1541 (H. R. 5341), which is the bill following the one just called.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I may say to the Senator from California that the junior Senator from Oregon has lodged objection to the request for consideration of that measure.

Mr. NIXON. In that connection, I notice that Senate bill 2603 authorizes the transfer of certain lands to the State of Oregon. Calendar No. 1541 (H. R. 5314) authorizes the transfer of certain lands to the University of California, an instrumentality of the State of California.

I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas on what ground the junior Senator from Oregon objects to the bill which grants lands to the University of California, but does not object to the granting of lands to the State of Oregon.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, if I may reply to the Senator from California, I desire to read a short statement the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] left with me. This is what his statement says:

> Since Senate bill 2603 contemplates a transfer of land by the Federal Government to the State of Oregon, I have requested that this brief statement be inserted in the RECORD following consideration of this bill during today's calendar call.
>
> Under the so-called Morse formula regarding Federal land transfers, I have maintained the position that no Federal land should be transferred by the Federal Government without at least 50 percent of the appraised fair market value being paid if the land is to be used for public purposes, and 100 percent of the appraised fair market value being paid if the land to be used for private purposes.
>
> However, there have been several cases before the Senate where the land involved had originally been donated to the Federal Government without cost by the same entity which would be the recipient of the land under the legislation involved. In such cases, where there have been no valuable improvements made by the Federal Government during the time that it held the land, I have not objected to the retransfer of that land back to the original donor. I am informed that S. 2603 deals with such a case and I therefore have made no objection to it.

I may say to the Senator from California that that seemingly covers the explanation which the Senator from Oregon has left with the calendar committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. As was indicated by the statement just read by the Senator from Kansas, the difference between Calendar No. 1540 (S. 2603), which is now under consideration, and Calendar No. 1541 (H. R. 5314), is that in the case of S. 2603 the State of Oregon had donated 46 acres-plus for certain purposes, whereas the land transfer involved in H. R. 5314 was purchased by the Federal Government for an experiment station. The State Commission of Fisheries in Oregon is desirous of building a fish hatchery on 2 acres of this land. It is really a return of the 2 acres of land which was previously given by the State of Oregon to the Federal Government.

Mr. NIXON. Is the Senator aware of the bill which involved a return to the State of Oregon of a dry-land experiment station last year, to which the Senator from Oregon did not object?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I am not.

Mr. NIXON. What I am getting at is that it seems that whenever the Senator from Oregon applies his formula that no grant should be made by the Federal Government to a State in cases of this type, he generally finds against other States, but in those instances where the State of Oregon is involved, usually an exception can be made, and the cases can be distinguished.

I am not suggesting that the junior Senator from Oregon has not convinced himself, in those instances where the State of Oregon is involved, that the case can be distinguished, but, on the other hand, I should like to point out, so far as Calendar No. 1541 (H. R. 5314), which involves the State of California, is concerned, even if we follow what I would term the strict legalistic approach of the junior Senator from Oregon, we find that the case involving the University of California falls within his formula.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to me?

Mr. NIXON. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am very much surprised—as a matter of fact, I am disappointed—at the attitude taken by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon with respect to calendar 1541 (H. R. 5341), because in that case, it is true, the Federal Government purchased the land for $15,000 and made improvements on it costing about $11,000, representing a total investment of $26,000. But this land will be taken over by the University of California to carry on the same work which is now costing the Federal Government many dollars.

As I understand the purpose of the bill, it is to permit the University of California to carry on experiments with grape culture. The moment that the university fails to carry on that work, or similar agricultural work, this property will revert to the United States.

Mr. NIXON. In that connection, so that the junior Senator from Oregon in reading the RECORD will understand that this is a case which should fall within his formula, I point out that the report reads as follows:

> The effect of the transfer will be to permit the grape experimental program, which would otherwise be discontinued, to continue at very little cost to the United States.

Why is the United States Department of Agriculture discontinuing the program?

I read further:

> For budgetary and other reasons the Department of Agriculture is no longer conducting an active experimental program on this property, although there is the recognized need for further experimental field work in grapes.

Getting to the point, I think it is extremely important to note that, first of all, there is a quid pro quo within the formula which the junior Senator from Oregon lays down, because the United States is to receive the benefit of the work done by the University of California. The whole country will benefit, because grapes are grown in Ohio, New York, and other States as well as in California. It is true, we Californians contend they are not so good as those grown in California, but all grape-growing States would still get the benefit of the experimental work.

The second point which should be mentioned is that what is sought in H. R. 5314 is certainly in line with the principle toward which we are all working these days, namely, to develop more

State and local responsibility for research activity of this type, thus taking the burden from the Federal Government. That is exactly what would be accomplished by this bill. This is a needed program, which the Federal Government can no longer afford, which the State has assumed the responsibility for carrying on.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am hopeful that my good friend from California will not object to the consideration of Senate bill 2603. It is possible that we can talk the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] into withdrawing his opposition to Calendar No. 1541, House bill 5314.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that the calendar number under discussion is 1540, Senate bill 2603.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand. I am coming to that bill now.

Senate bill 2603 involves only 2 acres of land located in the State of Oregon. I understand that the State of Oregon has already spent some money for a fish hatchery on that location. The State has been leasing land from the Federal Government for that purpose. It is not desirous of continuing to spend its own funds unless it has title to the land.

I ask my good friend from California to withdraw his objection.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] may be recognized for five additional minutes. His original time has expired by reason of questioning. I ask unanimous consent that he be recognized for five additional minutes in connection with Calendar No. 1540, Senate bill 2603.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from California is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, I should like to point out the third reason why the California bill is one which I think falls within the formula of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and also one which should commend this legislation to all Members of the Senate.

The major reason for the development of the formula of the junior Senator from Oregon—and I do not question the need for that kind of watchdog activity on the floor of the Senate—was his interest in economy at the Federal level. From the standpoint of economy, what we must recognize in this case is that the State of California will be doing work which must be done by some Government agency. If it is not done by the State of California, through its university extension work, the grape growers will be back here asking Congress to appropriate funds to carry on the work. So, from the standpoint of economy, we find the University of California spending far more each year in this experimental work than the $26,000 investment of the Federal Government, and all portions of the country in which grapes are grown will benefit from this expenditure.

The Federal Government indirectly receives the benefit in that it will not have to put out the funds it is now spending in doing that work itself. Under the circumstances, it seems to me that this is a bill which should recommend itself not only to Members of the Senate who are now present, but also to the junior Senator from Oregon, in whose absence objection is interposed on his behalf.

I realize that if I were to follow a narrow legalistic approach on a quid pro quo basis, I should, of course, object to the pending bill, which grants 2 acres of land to the State of Oregon. I shall not do so. I believe that the Oregon bill has merit, and I believe that it should stand or fall on its own merit. I do not object, but I do suggest that the junior Senator from Oregon read and study this record carefully, because I am sure that he will then reach the conclusion that not only does the California bill fall within the legal terms and provisions of his formula, but that in the interest of true economy the bill granting this property to the University of California should be approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 2603?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the State of Oregon, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following-described lands comprising a portion of a tract of land acquired by the United States by gift from the State of Oregon: Beginning at the northwest corner of section 8, township 2 north, range 8 east, of the Willamette meridian, which is marked with a United States Army Engineers' land monument; thence north eighty-nine degrees forty-five minutes east two hundred sixty-three and ninety-two one-hundredths feet; thence south one degree thirty-nine minutes thirty seconds east two hundred ninety-one and twenty-four one-hundredths feet to an iron pipe which is the point of beginning of the tract herein described; thence south eighty degrees fifty-seven minutes thirty seconds west three hundred eighty-six and thirty-four one-hundredths feet; thence south fifty degrees twenty-four minutes thirty seconds west four hundred twenty-four and five one-hundredths feet; thence north twenty-eight degrees fifty-one minutes west two hundred twenty-nine and seven one-hundredths feet; thence north seventy-four degrees thirty-nine minutes thirty seconds east eight hundred forty-eight and thirty-five one-hundredths feet; thence south one degree thirty-nine minutes thirty seconds east ninety-four and eight one-hundredths feet to point of beginning, containing two acres more or less.

TRANSFER OF PROPERTY IN NAPA COUNTY, CALIF., TO UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—BILL PASSED TO NEXT CALL OF CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 5314) to authorize the transfer to the regents of the University of California, for agricultural purposes, of certain real property in Napa County, Calif., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President——

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, before the Senator objects, will he allow me to say a few words?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I reserve the right to object. Does the Senator desire to speak?

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say a few words on the bill.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I withhold my objection.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that the transfer of this great experiment station to the University of California would be very helpful, from the standpoint both of the State of California and the entire Nation, to which the results obtained would be available.

In this case the property would have to be continued in operation as an experiment station, or it would revert to the Federal Government. It seems to me that this is a very worthy case. The Department of Agriculture plans the abandonment of this station because of a shortage of funds. If this land were not transferred to the university, not only would the work itself be lost to the country, but also a considerable part of the money which the Federal Government has already invested would be lost. Instead of the Federal Government saving money, in all probability it would lose money. I do not know at what price the property could be sold.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. NIXON. It would probably mean that the property would not be used for this purpose under any circumstances, because the Federal Government is unable to spend the money for this experimental program. The property is probably worth much less for any other purpose than it would be worth if it were to be continued in use as an experiment station.

Mr. AIKEN. It seems to me that this is a case in which, in order to save what has already been spent by the Federal Government, it would be advisable to turn the land over to the University of California to continue the work under such agreement as might be reached between the Department of Agriculture and the university authorities.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I point out to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that according to the report the value of the land has not increased since its acquisition by the Government several years ago. As has been stated, the University of California is willing to undertake the work of agriculture which has been done by the Department itself, perhaps on a more extended basis. All the data which have been collected would be available, as my good friend from California [Mr. NIXON] stated, not only to the people of California, but to the people of all the country. Because of a curtailment in appropriations of the Department of Agriculture, the Department had to reduce some of its expenses in connection with experiment stations. This experimental station is one of the victims.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, in line with the suggestion made by the Senator from Louisiana, if the experimental work were to be continued, the result might possibly be that grapes grown in Ohio, New York, and other States would equal in quality those grown in California,

which would be a great improvement, as most of us in California would admit.

I point out also that the bill contains a provision that the property shall revert to the United States if at any time the university ceases to use it for the general purposes for which it is to be transferred, which means that there would be an implied agreement on the part of the University of California to continue to use the property for that purpose.

Under the circumstances, it seems to me that the Federal Government is getting from the University of California a quid pro quo, within the formula of the junior Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 5314?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say to the able Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] and the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] that I must object. However, in making my objection, I wish to submit a request. While I must object, in order to carry out my responsibility to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], in view of the explanation which has been made by the Senator from California and the colloquy which has taken place on the floor of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 1541, House bill 5314, be passed over until the next call of the calendar, and that it be eligible to be called at that time. I make this request out of fairness to the Senator from California, inasmuch as the Senator from Oregon is not present. I am hopeful that the Senate will agree to my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Kansas in stating his objection to the consideration of the bill will be agreed to. The bill will be passed over until the next call of the calendar.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have received a request that this bill be called up for consideration. That could not be done today without notice. The bill seems to be of importance. I give notice that it may be called up any day. I hope the Senator from California can make arrangements with the Senator from Oregon so that the bill may be considered some day soon, and that the differences may be thrashed out.

The bill (H. R. 6922) to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, so as to extend the benefits of such section to certain colleges in the Territory of Alaska, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TELEGRAM AND OTHER ALLOWANCES OF SENATORS—BILL PASSED OVER TO NEXT CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The bill (S. 2651) relating to telegrams, long-distance telephone, and special-delivery and air-mail postage allowances of Senators was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and probably I shall object—the minority leader, who could not be here today, has not had an opportunity to study certain phases of the bill to the extent he would like to study them.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over to the next call of the calendar. During the interim, Senators will have an opportunity to discuss the bill with its sponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be passed over to the next call of the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF ICC ACT TO RESTRICT APPLICATIONS OF CERTAIN EXEMPTIONS FOR MOTOR CARRIERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2357) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to restrict the application of the agricultural and fish exemption for motor carriers, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That clauses (4a) and (6) of subsection (b) of section 203 of the Interstate Commerce Act are amended by inserting after "agricultural" in each such clause the following: "(including horticultural)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide that horticultural commodities shall be included within the term 'agricultural commodities' for the purpose of the agricultural exemption for motor carriers in the Interstate Commerce Act."

AMENDMENT OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION ACT

The bill (S. 515) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over. It is not a bill which should be considered on the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill goes over.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1953

The bill (H. R. 7314) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. By reason of the previous agreement entered into, this measure should go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CARRY-OVER OF MARYLAND TOBACCO TO BE DETERMINED AS OF JANUARY 1—AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

The bill (H. R. 3554) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. The sole purpose of the bill is to change the date for computing the carry-over of Maryland tobacco. At the present time, the carry-over is computed as of October 1st of each year. The bill would make the carry-over date January 1st of each year. This change would conform to present practices with reference to the marketing of tobacco in the State of Maryland. The net result would be to reduce the carry-over and total supply by the disappearance of Maryland tobacco during the period October 1 to January 1, and consequently would require a larger marketing quota in order to bring the total supply up to the reserve supply level.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3554) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments on page 1, line 8, after the word "years", to insert "(or on January 1 of such marketing year in the case of Maryland tobacco)", and in line 11, after the word "year", to strike out "then current, except that in the case of Maryland tobacco it shall be the quantity of such tobacco on hand in the United States on January 1 of such marketing year, and" and insert "in which such marketing year begins."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PRINTING OF SUPREME COURT DECISION IN STEEL SEIZURE CASE AS A SENATE DOCUMENT (S. DOC. NO. 141)

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Supreme Court has rendered its decision in the so-called steel seizure case. It is my information that the supply of copies of the opinions of the Justices of the Supreme Court in the case has been exhausted. I ask unanimous consent that the opinions written by the Justices of the Supreme Court, of which I have a copy, be printed as a Senate document so that they may be readily available to everyone interested in the Court's decision.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the opinions have already been inserted in the RECORD at the request of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand that but I was requesting that the opinions be printed as a Senate document so that copies may be readily available.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think it would be highly advisable to do so because the opinions could be obtained much quicker in the form of a Senate document than otherwise.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct. They would be in documentary form.

Mr. FERGUSON. They could be obtained much quicker as a Senate document than in the Supreme Court Reports.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am making the request only because people have been telephoning to Senators with reference to the Defense Production Act in connection with the opinions written by the distinguished Justices of the Supreme Court.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is about to leave the floor. I suggest that if the opinions of the Supreme Court are to be printed as a Senate document it would be unnecessary to have them printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I wonder if the Senator from Washington would be willing to withdraw his request that they be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. MAYBANK. I think it would be better if they were printed as a Senate document, because I understand the Supreme Court has no more copies of the opinions available.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. How many copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are printed?

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not know the exact number, but I think it is approximately 43,000. I believe I receive a hundred copies, which are sent to certain persons in South Carolina who are on the list. Many of them probably would not be particularly interested in the opinion of the Supreme Court, although some of them of course would be interested. I dare say that many people are much more interested in reading about agriculture, civil functions, and rivers and harbors.

I am not suggesting that my good friend the Senator from Washington withdraw his request to have the opinions printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I think that in the interest of the lawyers of the country and for the benefit of the people who have been telephoning about the opinions it would be better to have the opinions printed as a Senate document. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is a former judge. He is better qualified to give us an opinion on the matter.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder how long it would take to have a Senate document printed?

Mr. MAYBANK. Probably overnight, if the Senate asked for priority to be given to the printing of the Senate document.

Mr. FERGUSON. If we had the opinions printed as a Senate document they would be all in one place. It would be much easier to distribute them in the form of a Senate document than if the opinions were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We get only a certain number of copies of the RECORD, whereas we can get a greater number of a Senate document.

Mr. MAYBANK. Not only would we get a greater number, but it would not be necessary to read what a Senator said about a House bill or some other subject.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. It seems to me that the best way to get distribution would be through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The same type that is used in printing the opinions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD could be used in printing the document. More than 20,000 copies of the RECORD are regularly distributed to the libraries of the United States.

Mr. MAYBANK. I will say that I have no interest in the matter.

Mr. WATKINS. The opinions can be printed both in the RECORD and as a document.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was asked to make the request by Senators who wanted the opinions in documentary form, so that persons connected with the courts and lawyers could read the opinions.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think it is important that the decision receive the greatest possible distribution because it is of vital interest to the people of the United States.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Michigan is correct. The Senator knows my stand on the matter. The question is whether we should have the opinions printed in documentary form.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have no objection to their being printed as a Senate document. Probably more space would be taken up in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in discussing the subject than would be taken up by printing the opinions. For that reason I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from South Carolina that the opinions be printed as a Senate document?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question of my friend, the Senator from South Carolina. His request, as I understand it, is not predicated on my withdrawing my request that the decision of the Supreme Court be printed in the body of the RECORD. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. MAYBANK. I never made such a request or suggestion.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to suggest that in view of the importance——

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order has been called for.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order has been called for, and the Chair will submit the request: Is there objection to the request for the printing of the opinions as a Senate document? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The next bill on the calendar will be stated.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 7340) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355) as amended and supplemented to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I rise to object, and to ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill is passed over.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY STUDENTS FROM BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I shall not object, I desire to call attention to the fact that in the early days of the State of Utah, a great educational institution was founded by Brigham Young, and is known to the world as the Brigham Young University. It draws students from all over the world.

Today a group of students from that university, and in addition to two young men from Weber College, Ogden, Utah, under the direction of two of the professors of modern languages at the university, and accompanied by chaperons, are visiting the Senate of the United States. They are on their way to Europe, for a 90-day tour. Their tour will not be an ordinary tourists' tour of Europe; it will actually be a course of study in modern languages and in European history and culture.

They will have lectures and study periods regularly while they are traveling; and when the tour is finished, they will receive college credit for the work they have done.

I desire to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to this fact today, because this group is now in the Senate gallery watching the proceedings of the Senate. Their educational tour is also for the purpose of becoming acquainted with their own Government; and then they will go to Europe to meet the people and to meet students at the universities and colleges there, and in that manner to cultivate better relationships between our country and the peoples of Europe.

Some 35 of the students are now in the Senate gallery to the left of where

I am standing. They are accompanied by Dr. Max Rogers, of the faculty of the university and, let me say with some pride, by my son, Dr. Arthur R. Watkins, also of the faculty of the College of Modern Languages of Brigham Young University. The chaperones are Mrs. George H. Hansen, wife of Dr. George H. Hansen, of the department of geology, and Mrs. Dora McDonald, principal of one of Utah's public schools.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS TO FLORIDA FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, have we completed the calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Several measures were ordered placed at the foot of the calendar. Until they have been disposed of, we shall not have completed our action on the calendar.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, let me call the attention of the Chair to the fact that by unanimous consent the measures in which the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], is interested, have not yet been called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Those measures were also placed at the foot of the calendar.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, what is before the Senate at the moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER The bills which earlier today were ordered placed at the foot of the calendar are now to be called. There are four of them, and they will be stated in order. The first bill in that category will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 556), calendar 1419, authorizing the transfer of certain lands in Putnam County, Fla., to the State Board of Education of Florida for the use of the University of Florida for educational purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On a previous day this bill was considered, the committee amendments were adopted, and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed. On the same day a motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The bill is now before the Senate. Is there objection to its present consideration?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, when the bill was reached earlier today, it was suggested that it be placed at the foot of the calendar, for discussion. I believe that at this time there is no objection to the final passage of the bill.

Mr. Adams, legislative assistant to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and Mr. Shelley, my administrative assistant, jointly called Mr. Donald Chaney, who is general counsel of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, to ask him whether any facts were available as to the present market value of the 55 acres of land involved in this bill.

Mr. Chaney told these gentlemen that the entire fair market value was between $500 and $600, with $600 the top.

Under those circumstances, and also in view of the fact that Mr. Chaney said that an appraisal would cost $200, which was because of the remote location of the land, I suggest—and I understand that the settlement I have suggested is acceptable to the Senator from Oregon—that a fixed $300 consideration be provided for, along with the reservations and reversionary clauses, which are to be left in the bill, in accordance with the action previously taken, as those amendments were reported by the committee and as the amendments were adopted by the Senate on a previous day.

I hope that disposition of the matter will be acceptable to the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would ask the Senator from Florida whether he is prepared to offer an amendment to that effect.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am, if that course is acceptable.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, in view of the explanation which has been made, I suggest that that settlement will be satisfactory. If the amendment suggested by the Senator from Florida is adopted, I shall not object on behalf of the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 556?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I now offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, in line 4, after the word 'convey", it is proposed to insert "for the payment of $300."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey, for the payment of $300, subject to other applicable provisions of this act, to the State Board of Education of the State of Florida, for the use and benefit of the University of Florida for educational purposes primarily concerned with conservation of natural resources, land utilization, forestry, biology, botany, and natural history, such portions of the area known as the Welaka Fish Hatchery, Putnam County, Fla., aggregating approximately 55 acres, as he may determine to be excess to the needs of the Department of the Interior, and available for the aforesaid purposes.

SEC. 2. The property to be conveyed shall include both the land and the improvements thereon: *Provided*, That the United States reserves the right to remove, at any time within a period of 2 years from the date of approval of this act, any of said improvements constructed by it or financed out of its funds.

SEC. 3. The use of said property shall be subject to all easements, rights-of-way, licenses, leases, and outstanding interests in, upon, across, or through said property which have heretofore been granted or reserved by the United States or its predecessors in title.

SEC. 4. The United States reserves the rights to all minerals upon or in said property, together with the usual mining rights, powers, and privileges, including the right of access to and use of such portions of the surface of said property as may be necessary for mining and removing said minerals.

SEC. 5. Title to or control over the lands conveyed under the authority of this act may not be transferred by the grantee or its successor, except with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior. The grantee or its successor may not change the use of the lands from the educational purposes specified in section 1 of this act to another or additional use, except with the consent of the Secretary. If at any time after the lands are conveyed under this act, the grantee or its successor attempts to transfer title to or control over these lands to another or the lands are devoted to a use other than the educational purposes specified in section 1, without the consent of the Secretary, title to the lands shall revert to the United States. Such reversion shall be considered effective and established upon the mailing of notice thereof to the State Board of Education of Florida, or its successor, by the Secretary.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE STATE OF TENNESSEE—BILL PASSED OVER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next bill ordered placed at the foot of the calendar will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2959) authorizing the transfer to the State of Tennessee of certain lands in the Veterans' Administration Center, Mountain Home, Tenn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, according to the instructions which I have, I must object to consideration of the bill. However, I wish to ask unanimous consent, because of the importance of this bill—even though objection is made to its consideration at this time—that the bill be included in the next regular call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILL PASSED OVER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next bill ordered to the foot of the calendar will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1331) to further implement the full faith and credit clause of the Constitution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I think an explanation should be made of the bill. I understand that request has been made to have the bill go over. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over, but be included in the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCREASE IN SECURITIES ISSUED BY MOTOR CARRIERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next bill previously ordered placed at the foot of the calendar will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2360) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to

increase the amounts of securities issued by motor carriers without requiring approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

DEATH OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE SAMUEL F. HOBBS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I rise at this time to address the Senate for several minutes.

It is with deep regret that I announce that on last Saturday evening a former colleague in the House of Representatives, Judge Samuel F. Hobbs, died at his home at Selma, Ala.

Members of the Senate will remember Judge Hobbs as one of the most industrious and one of the ablest Members of the House of Representatives. During his 16 years in the House of Representatives, until he was forced to retire voluntarily, because of ill health, Judge Hobbs was outstanding in his work and his leadership, and he made many fine and lasting contributions to our Government and to the welfare of our people. As a member of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, he rendered exceptionally brilliant and devoted service. Alabama was indeed proud of Judge Samuel F. Hobbs.

Mr. President, a year ago, shortly after Judge Hobbs' voluntary retirement from the House of Representatives, many people of Alabama assembled in a meeting in his home town of Selma and paid him impressive tribute. On that occasion I wrote a letter to Judge Hobbs' successor in the House of Representatives, Hon. KENNETH A. ROBERTS. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C.,
May 15, 1951.

Hon. KENNETH ROBERTS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR KENNETH: We are happy that you are going to Alabama to join in tribute to Judge Hobbs on Saturday evening. We only wish it were possible for us to go with you.

We want you and the judge to know that we will be with you in spirit.

Please tell the judge how much we miss him, his good and generous comradeship, and the fine example of courage, of untiring industry, and of deep devotion to Alabama and her people which he set for us. Please tell him how proudly we proclaim his services to the Nation.

Please convey to him—great Alabamian and great American—our warmest and most affectionate salutations and our heartiest congratulations.

Sincerely.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks the Senator from Alabama has made about Sam Hobbs. I knew him well and favorably. A magnificent American and a great statesman he rendered valuable service to his country. His family have assurances of my sympathy.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to join in the remarks just made by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama and the distinguished majority leader, with reference to former Representative Judge Sam Hobbs. He was one of the finest gentlemen whom I have ever had the pleasure of meeting, and, as I thought, one of the ablest Members of the Congress. We all remember how greatly we have missed him since his retirement but a few years ago. I am distressed to hear that he was not allowed to enjoy the years of relaxation and rest which he had so well earned by his efficient labors here. I join in the expressions of sympathy and condolence, to his familiy, to his State, and to his colleagues.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I desire to join in the words of condolence to the family of Judge Sam Hobbs which have been expressed by the majority leader, the senior Senator from Alabama, and the senior Senator from Florida. I first knew Judge Sam Hobbs when I was a freshman Member of the House of Representatives. I shall never forget the kindly way in which he treated me and all other freshmen. Whenever there arose any complicated matter of law or of parliamentary procedure, we always went over to talk with Judge Sam Hobbs. He would give to us generously the benefit of his great experience and of his excellent advice. With all others who knew him, I lament his passing.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I, too, wish to express my deep sorrow because of the death of Judge Sam Hobbs. He and I became Members of the House of Representatives at the same session of the Congress. We served together on certain committees. I came to know him intimately. He was an outstanding statesman, a fine gentleman, at all times a man of honor. Certainly it was a pleasure to work with him. During his service in the Congress, Alabama had an able Representative. The Nation has now lost a great citizen.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I learned with great regret of the passing of the late former Representative Samuel L. Hobbs, of Alabama, who, to my mind, was one of the most valuable Members of Congress in our generation. Representative Hobbs was a man of profound learning in the law. He was an accomplished jurist. He was highly trained in his profession, and he adhered to the ethics of that profession to the very highest degree. He possessed great learning in constitutional law. His advice was sought for many miles around when he was a judge and practicing lawyer in Alabama. When he came to Congress, he was soon recognized as a great constitutional lawyer, a man of very fine attainments, and of very high loyalty to the principles of our Government.

He voluntarily retired within the past 2 years after a very distinguished and constructive career. This Nation will long benefit from his very fine service. We mourn the passing of this truly great man.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to endorse all that has been said by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi concerning Mr. Hobbs. I had known him practically all my life. We came from the some county in Alabama. He was a grand man, and I deeply regret his passing as do all who knew him.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep regret on the untimely death of a very beloved former colleague in the House. I knew Sam Hobbs well. He was a very able lawyer and a wonderfully fine Christian gentleman. I regret sincerely his passing.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I say this for Sam Hobbs: A man. That covers everything. He was that kind of gentleman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). The present occupant of the chair desires to join in the remarks of Senators regarding the public service of Hon. Sam Hobbs. He was a profound constitutional lawyer, a leader in the House Judiciary Committee, a terrific force for wise, progressive legislation, which he so greatly helped to build up for the entire United States, and particularly for the section of the United States which he so ably served. His service terminated voluntarily in the Eighty-first Congress. He has been missed by all who had been associated with him during his many years in the legislative halls.

INCREASE IN AMOUNTS OF SECURITIES ISSUED BY MOTOR CARRIERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 2360, which has been announced as next in order?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2360) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to increase the amounts of securities issued by motor carriers without requiring approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments, in line 6, after the word "figure", to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$1,000,000", and in line 8, after the word "figure", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$200,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 214 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by (1) striking out the figure "$500,000" in the first proviso and inserting the figure "$1,000,000" in lieu thereof, and (2) striking out the figure "$100,000" in the first proviso and inserting the figure "$200,000" in lieu thereof.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That concludes the call of the calendar, with the exception of the bills reported by the Judiciary Committee, which were passed over.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to consider the bills reported by the Judiciary Committee, with the understanding that bills on which explanations are requested, will go over until the next call of the calendar, unless the Senator from Nevada comes into the Senate Chamber in the meantime.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call all the bills reported by the committee which were passed over.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 76) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was considered and agreed to.

(For text of above concurrent resolution, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 12, 1952, pp. 5011 to 5013.)

DR. GUY RAIOLA

The bill (S. 1086) for the relief of Dr. Guy Raiola was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Doctor Guy Raiola shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

RUZENA STRANSKY

The bill (S. 1130) for the relief of Ruzena Stransky was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Ruzena Stransky shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

AUGUSTA BLEYS

The bill (S. 1336) for the relief of Augusta Bleys, also known as Augustina Bleys, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Augusta Bleys, also known as Augustina Bleys, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ADELE FRATTINI

The bill (S. 1479) for the relief of Adele Frattini was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Adele Frattini shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

THORVALD NIN

The bill (S. 1513) for the relief of Thorvald Nin was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 404 of the Nationality Act of 1940, Thorvald Nin shall be held and considered to have retained his United States citizenship regardless of any period of residence outside the United States prior to the date of enactment of this act.

SILVERIO SALVATORE CONTE

The bill (S. 1719) for the relief of Silverio Salvatore Conte was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Silverio Salvatore Conte, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, may be naturalized by taking prior to 1 year after the effective date of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 301 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335 of the said act. From and after naturalization under this act the said Silverio Salvatore Conte shall have the same citizenship status which existed immediately prior to its loss.

ELINA BRANLUND

The bill (S. 1724) for the relief of Elina Branlund was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Elina Branlund shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ALTOON SAPRICHIAN

The bill (S. 1743) for the relief of Altoon Saprichian was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Altoon Saprichian shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

DR. ALBERT HAAS

The bill (S. 1744) for the relief of Dr. Albert Haas was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Albert Haas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

SOCORRO GERONA DE CASTRO

The bill (S. 2308) for the relief of Socorro Gerona de Castro was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Socorro Gerona de Castro shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

JIMMY LEE DAVIS

The bill (S. 3007) for the relief of Jimmy Lee Davis was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Jimmy Lee Davis, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. and Mrs. Billie Davis, citizens of the United States, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the said Jimmy Lee Davis may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

KAREN CHRISTENE EISEN MURDOCK

The bill (S. 3008) for the relief of Karen Christene Eisen Murdock was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Karen Christene Eisen Murdock, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Master Sgt. and Mrs. David L. Murdock, citizens of the United States.

MIRKO M. BJELOPETROVICH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1315) for the relief of Mirko M. Bjelopetrovich, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mirko M. Bjelopetrovich shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TOM TATEKI IRIYE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1740) for the relief of Tom Tateki Iriye, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Tom Tateki Iriye may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence provided he is otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARIA WEILAND

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2067) for the relief of Maria Weiland, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Maria Weiland, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of First Lt. and Mrs. John P. Fowler, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PETER PENOVIC ET AL.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2123) for the relief of Peter Penovic, Milos Grahovac, and Nikola Maljkovic, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 11, after the word "deduct," to strike out "one number" and insert "three numbers", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Peter Penovic, Milos Grahovac, and Nikola Maljkovic shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE B. HENLY CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1707) for the relief of George B. Henly Construction Co., Inc., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have an amendment which I shall offer to the second committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would advise the distinguished Senator from Kansas that, as soon as the committee amendment is reached he may submit his amendment to it. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 6, after the word "Company", it is proposed to strike out "Incorporated,". The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same line, after the word "of", to strike out $43,286.05" and insert "$30,000."

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment to the amendment.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 1, line 7, in lieu of "$30,000", proposed to be inserted by the committee, it is proposed to insert "$22,929.69."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, this would reduce the payment to the construction company from $30,000 to $22,929.69. I may say that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], who is interested in this measure, has agreed with me that this would limit the payment to actual out-of-pocket costs, which I think would make the bill far more equitable. The amendment makes no allowance for interest or profits as had originally been requested and which I felt was an objectionable feature. I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Kansas to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the George B. Henly Construction Co., Boise, Idaho, the sum of $22,929.69. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the George B. Henly Construction Co., Inc., against the United States for additional compensation under the contract dated February 16, 1948 (No. 12r-17891), between the United States and such company for the construction of earthwork and structures, Locket Gulch wasteway, according to specifications No. 1252 of the Mitchell Butte division, Owyhee project, Oregon-Idaho. Such claims are based on additional expenses incurred by such company as a result of conditions not set forth in the specifications and plans for such construction and which could not reasonably have been anticipated: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the George B. Henly Construction Co."

IVO CERNE

The bill (H. R. 654) for the relief of Ivo Cerne was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SARAH A. DAVIES

The bill (H. R. 975) for the relief of Sarah A. Davies was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF COBB NICHOLS

The bill (H. R. 1099) for the relief of the estate of Cobb Nichols was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KAIKO SUGIMOTE (KAY FAIR) AND HER MINOR CHILDREN

The bill (H. R. 1162) for the relief of Kaiko Sugimote (Kay Fair) and her minor children was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAUDE FORANDA

The bill (H. R. 1428) for the relief of Claude Foranda was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ERIKA NICOLO AND MINOR CHILD

The bill (H. R. 1960) for the relief of Erika Nicolo and her minor child was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SISTERS MARIA SALERNO ET AL.

The bill (H. R. 2303) for the relief of Sisters Maria Salerno, Eufrasisa Binotto, Maria Ballatore, and Giovanna Buziol

was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JEAN (JOHN) PLEWNIAK ET AL.

The bill (H. R. 2307) for the relief of Jean (John) Plewniak and Anna Piotrowska Plewniak was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ODETTE LOUISE TIRMAN

The bill (H. R. 2346) for the relief of Odette Louise Tirman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. JEANNETTE THORN PEASE

The bill (H. R. 2587) for the relief of Mrs. Jeannette Thorn Pease was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE H. SOFFEL CO.

The bill (H. R. 2628) for the relief of the George H. Soffel Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FUMIKO HIGA

The bill (H. R. 2784) for the relief of Fumiko Higa was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

YAI WING LEE

The bill (H. R. 2841) for the relief of Yai Wing Lee was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS E. BELL

The bill (H. R. 2902) for the relief of Thomas E. Bell was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MIMI FONG ET AL.

The bill (H. R. 2903) for the relief of Mimi Fong and her children, Sing Lee and Lily, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRISCILLA OGDEN DICKERSON GILLSON DE LA FREGONNIERE

The bill (H. R. 2920) for the relief of Priscilla Ogden Dickerson Gillson de la Fregonniere was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GIOVANNI RINALDO BOTTINI

The bill (H. R. 3070) for the relief of Giovanni Rinaldo Bottini was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MEHMET SALIH TOPCUOGLU

The bill (H. R. 3124) for the relief of Mehmet Salih Topcuoglu was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SISTER APOLONIA GERARDA SOKOLOWSKA

The bill (H. R. 3132) for the relief of Sister Apolonia Gerarda Sokolowska was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. SETSUYO SUMIDA

The bill (H. R. 3152) for the relief of Mrs. Setsuyo Sumida was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY OSADCHY

The bill (H. R. 3561) for the relief of Mary Osadchy was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

YING CHEE JUNG

The bill (H. R. 3572) for the relief of Ying Chee Jung was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STEPHAN JOSEPH HORVATH AND LUCAS ALBERT HORVATH

The bill (H. R. 3732) for the relief of Stephan Joseph Horvath and Lucas Albert Horvath was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHAN TOY HAR

The bill (H. R. 3953) for the relief of Chan Toy Har was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANN TOBAK AND JOHN TOBAK

The bill (H. R. 4152) for the relief of Ann Tobak and John Tobak was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NORMA J. ROBERTS

The bill (H. R. 4492) for the relief of the legal guardian of Norma J. Roberts, a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HELGA RICHTER

The bill (H. R. 4790) for the relief of Helga Richter was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FELIX NAVEDO-MERCED AND CARMEN RAMOS-BAEZ

The bill (H. R. 5121) for the relief of Felix Navedo-Merced and Carmen Ramos-Baez was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TSUTAKO KUROKI MASUDA

The bill (H. R. 5145) for the relief of Tsutako Kuroki Masuda was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BERNARD J. KEOGH

The bill (H. R. 5753) for the relief of Bernard J. Keogh was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATRICIA LAURETTA PRAY

The bill (H. R. 5805) for the relief of Patricia Lauretta Pray was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INGEBORG AND ANNA LUKAS

The bill (H. R. 5956) for the relief of Ingeborg and Anna Lukas was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAULINE W. GOODYEAR

The bill (H. R. 5958) for the relief of Pauline W. Goodyear was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MICHIKO NAKASHIMA

The bill (H. R. 5976) for the relief of Michiko Nakashima was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JIMMY DOGUTA

The bill (H. R. 5984) for the relief of Jimmy Doguta (also known as Jimmy Blagg) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARIAN DIANE DELPHINE SACHS

The bill (H. R. 6265) for the relief of Marian Diane Delphine Sachs was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KIKO OSHIRO

The bill (H. R. 6314) for the relief of Kiko Oshiro was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SHARON ELAINE FRANKOVICH

The bill (H. R. 6848) for the relief of Sharon Elaine Frankovich was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELLIS E. GABBERT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1826) for the relief of Ellis E. Gabbert which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "$438.87" and insert "$309.92."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EDWARD CHARLES CLEVERLY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1114) for the relief of Edward Charles Cleverly, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 6, after the name "Charles", to strike out "Cleverly" and insert "Cleverley."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of Edward Charles Cleverley."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). That completes the call of the calendar.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I was just going to suggest what the distinguished Presiding Officer has indicated, that the call of the calendar has been completed. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

CONFIRMATION OF MIDSHIPMEN MITCHELL DANIEL CHARNESKI AND PAUL S. MACLAFFERTY

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be temporarily rescinded in order that I may submit a report from the Committee on Armed Services with respect to the commissioning of two officers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

MR. HUNT. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent to report, from the Committee on Armed Services, two nominations in the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and the nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, would there be any objection to the immediate consideration of these nominations?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may make his request.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, inasmuch as these two young men will graduate from Annapolis tomorrow I ask unanimous consent that the nominations may now be considered as in executive session. Midshipmen are always commissioned at the time they are graduated. These two names were held up in the Committee on Armed Services by the distinguished Senator from Iowa, who now withdraws all objection. My request is made so that these men may receive their commissions tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I certainly shall not object. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I know about this situation, and I endorse with wholehearted approval what the Senator from Wyoming has said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nominations.

The Chief Clerk read the nominations of Mitchell Daniel Charneski to be second lieutenant in the Regular Air Force and Paul S. Maclafferty to be ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, and as in executive session, the nominations are confirmed, and the President will be immediately notified.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, has the call of the calendar been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The call of the calendar has been completed, and a quorum call was temporarily rescinded.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I renew my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now take up——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Temporarily the call for a quorum has been rescinded, for the purpose of allowing the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] to secure action on two nominations. They have been disposed of, and the Senator from Kansas has renewed his suggestion of the absence of a quorum, which the Chair now sustains.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in the interest of orderly procedure, what is the question pending before the Senate at the present time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no question now pending before the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. May I inform the Senator from Massachusetts——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum, in order to permit this discussion?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I shall be glad to withhold my suggestion.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I had intended to say that if the Senate was through with the call of the calendar, it was my purpose to ask that it consider S. 2437, which is the Federal-aid road bill, and to see if we could dispose of it this afternoon. The bill was reported a week or 10 days ago by the Committee on Public Works. As soon as the Senate finished the consideration of whatever was pending, I had intended to call up that bill.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. HUNT. I desired to ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico if he would be agreeable to our completing Senate bill 3019 on which we had started on Thursday afternoon, and which extends for a period of 10 months provision for equalizing the pay of physicians and dentists in the armed services.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I would have no objection whatsoever if I could obtain consent that immediately after we finished with that bill, we would take up Senate bill 2437.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The only opportunity the Chair has to act is when a motion or a request is made.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that immediately following the roll call the Senate resume the consideration of the Senate bill 3019.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I may say that I had suggested the absence of a quorum because I rather suspected that there would be some question about the order in which these measures should be considered. I respectfully suggest, if it is in order, that the quorum call be now completed, and that immediately thereafter the requests of Senators to consider bills be acted on. It might save some time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas renew his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Byrd	Holland	Nixon
Cain	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Ives	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Connally	Kerr	Schoeppel
Cordon	Lodge	Smathers
Dirksen	Long	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Maybank	Smith, N. J.
Dworkshak	McCarran	Stennis
Ferguson	McCarthy	Thye
Flanders	McClellan	Tobey
George	McFarland	Watkins
Gillette	Millikin	Wiley
Hayden	Monroney	Young
Hill	Mundt	

Mr. McFARLAND. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. PASTORE], the Senators from North Carolna [Mr. HOEY and Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr.

BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. SEATON, Mr. TAFT, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. WILLIAMS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5990) to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BYRD. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HUNT, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. LONG, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. FLANDERS conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 29, 1952, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 148. An act for the relief of Gerdina Josephina Van Delft;

S. 420. An act for the relief of Gloria Wilson;

S. 603. An act for the relief of Wanda Charwat and her daughter, Wanda Aino Charwat;

S. 695. An act for the relief of William Greville Birkett;

S. 794. An act for the relief of Mrs. Shu-Ting Liu Hsia and her daughter, Lucia;

S. 869. An act for the relief of Marie Cafcalaki;

S. 992. An act for the relief of Daniel Wolkonsky and his wife, Xenia Wolkonsky;

S. 1189. An act for the relief of Anthony Lombardo;

S. 1192. An act for the relief of Demetrius Alexander Jordan;

S. 1420. An act for the relief of Pinfang Hsia;

S. 1494. An act for the relief of George Georgacopoulos;

S. 1565. An act for the relief of Andy Duzsik;

S. 1766. An act for the relief of Frederic James Mercado;

S. 1879. An act for the relief of Ernest Nanpei Ihrig;

S. 2033. An act for the relief of Giuseppa S. Boyd;

S. 2034. An act for the relief of Charlotte Elizabeth Cason;

S. 2051. An act for the relief of Naomi Saito;

S. 2145. An act for the relief of certain displaced persons;

S. 2220. An act for the relief of Theresa Hatcher;

S. 2588. An act for the relief of Dulcie Ann Steinhardt Sherlock; and

S. 2770. An act for the relief of Matheos Alafouzes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive W, Eighty-first Congress, second session, a Highway Convention with the Republic of Panama (Ex. Rept. No. 10).

CONVENTION AND PROTOCOL ON RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES, UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN, AND FRANCE, AND FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, AND SO FORTH—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive Q, Eighty-second Congress, second session, a convention on relations between the United States, the United Kingdom of Great Britain, and France and the Federal Republic of Germany, signed at Bonn, Germany, on May 26, 1952, and Executive R, Eighty-second Congress, second session, a protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty covering security guaranties to the members of the European Defense Community by the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty signed at Paris on May 27, 1952.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy is removed from the convention and protocol, and the convention and protocol, together with the President's message of transmittal, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD.

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Senate a copy of the Convention on Relations between the Three Powers and the Federal Republic of Germany, signed by the United Kingdom, the French Republic, the United States, and the Federal Republic of Germany at Bonn on May 26, 1952, to which is annexed the Charter of the Arbitration Tribunal. I also transmit a copy of a protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty covering security guaranties to the members of the European Defense Community by the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty, signed at Paris on May 27, 1952. I request the advice and consent of the Senate to the ratification of these two documents.

In addition, I transmit for the information of the Senate a number of related documents, including a report made to me by the Secretary of State; three additional conventions with the Federal Republic of Germany related to the main Convention; the Treaty Constituting the European Defense Community; a declaration made by the United States, the United Kingdom, and the French Governments at the time of the signing of this treaty; and the Treaty Constituting the European Coal-and-Steel Community.

Together these documents constitute a great forward stride toward strengthening peace and freedom in the world. They are all concerned directly with Europe, but they have world-wide significance.

Three main purposes will be accomplished by these documents:

First, they will restore the Federal Republic of Germany to a status which will enable it to play a full and honorable part in the family of nations.

Second, they will create a common defense organization for six European countries, including the Federal Republic of Germany, and associate that common defense organization with the North Atlantic Treaty. This will greatly strengthen the defense of Europe and the free world against any aggression.

Third, they will constitute additional major steps toward unity among the countries of Western Europe—which is so important for peace and progress in that area.

These purposes are all interrelated, and they all serve the common objective of the free nations to create conditions of peace, based on freedom and justice, in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

It has been a major objective of the United States to help bring about an independent, democratic, and united Germany, and to conclude a treaty of peace

with such a Germany. That is still our policy, and will continue to be. Unfortunately, as all the world knows, the Soviet Union, while professing a desire for German unification, has by its actions and policies prevented unification and the creation of a free all-German Government with which a treaty of peace could be negotiated.

Under these circumstances, the United States, France, and Great Britain 4 years ago gave the people in Western Germany the chance to create their own democratic government. They worked out their own constitution, and since September 1949 the Federal Republic of Germany has taken an increasing responsibility for governing the three-fourths of the German people who are free from Soviet control. During this time the German Government has demonstrated that it is democratic and responsive to the will of the free people of Germany, and that it is able and ready to take its place in the community of free nations and to do its share toward building peaceful and cooperative relationships with other free countries.

Over the last 3 years there has been a continuing process of relaxing occupation controls on the one hand and increasing the scope of the German Federal Government's responsibilities on the other. Last October the United States and many other countries concerned ended the technical state of war which had existed with Germany. In these ways we have gradually been moving away from the original relationship of conqueror and conquered, and moving toward the relationship of equality which we expect to find among freemen everywhere.

Now we are taking another major step in this direction. By the convention on relations between the Federal Republic and the United States, France, and Great Britain, we are restoring to the free German people control over their domestic and external affairs, subject only to certain limited exceptions made necessary by the present international situation. These exceptions relate to the stationing and security of allied forces in Germany, to Berlin, and to questions of unification, a peace settlement, and other matters concerning Germany as a whole. When the new convention goes into effect, the occupation statute will be repealed, the Allied High Commission will be abolished, and relations between the Federal Republic and other countries will be placed on the customary diplomatic basis.

But the Convention on Relations was not, and could not be, prepared as an isolated document, because it does not meet the full problem confronting the free people of Germany and those of other free countries. In order to provide for the security of the Federal Republic, and to insure against any revival of militarism, arrangements were worked out under which the Federal Republic is joining in establishing the European Defense Community—the common defense organization of six continental European countries. As a member of this community, the Federal Republic will be able to make a vital contribution to the common defense of Western Europe without the creation of a national German military establishment. The European Defense Community, with a common budget and common procurement of military equipment, common uniforms and common training, is a very remarkable advance, representing as it does a voluntary merging of national power into a common structure of defense.

As an additional vital safeguard for peace and freedom in Europe, the German Federal Republic, as a member of the European Defense Community, is joining in reciprocal commitments between the members of that community and the members of the North Atlantic Treaty organization. The protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty extends the application of the guaranty of mutual assistance expressed in article 5 of the treaty by providing that an attack on the territory of any member of the European Defense Community, including the German Federal Republic, or on the community's forces, shall be considered an attack against all the parties to the treaty. A reciprocal guaranty is extended to the North Atlantic Treaty partners by the members of the community in a protocol to the Treaty Constituting the European Defense Community.

Thus, these various documents constitute an integrated whole. The United States is a party only to the Convention on Relations—and the related conventions—and to the protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty, but the Treaty Constituting the European Defense Community is an essential factor in the new relationship which the conventions establish. It is expressly provided that the conventions with the Federal Republic, the Treaty Constituting the European Defense Community, and the protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty will come into force simultaneously, thus assuring the complete interrelationship of all of them. The participation of the Federal Republic in the European Coal-and-Steel Community (the Schuman plan) and the European Defense Community, and the resultant transfer to European agencies of authority over the basic industries of the participating countries and over military activities are the strongest safeguards for the future security of Western Europe. The successful creation of these European institutions makes possible the removal of special restraints which have heretofore been imposed on the Federal Republic and thereby enables the latter to participate in western defense on a basis of equality.

Thus, while not a party, the United States has a direct and abiding interest in the success and effectiveness of the Treaty Constituting the European Defense Community and in the continuing existence of this community as constituted. By virtue of the North Atlantic Treaty and the Convention on Relations between the Three Powers and the Federal Republic of Germany, the United States has demonstrated its lasting interest and binding ties with the Atlantic and European communities of nations. By its adherence to the Treaty Constituting the European Defense Community and the Convention on Relations, the Federal Republic has linked its future with that of the community and of the participating countries. It is therefore evident that the United States has acquired a very great stake in the maintenance of the institutions and relationships thus established and would consider any act which would affect their integrity or existence as a matter of fundamental concern to its own interests and security. I stress this point in order to make clear the relationship between the conventions, the Treaty Constituting the European Defense Community, and the North Atlantic Treaty, and between the parties to these various agreements.

The documents I am transmitting to the Senate today are real and significant steps toward peace and security in Europe and the whole free world. These actions threaten no one; their only targets are fear and poverty. They will allow almost 50,000,000 free German people to take a further great stride toward independence and self-government, and to join with their neighbors in self-defense. These moves are clearly in the direction of a just and lasting peace; only those with aggressive intent could have any objection to them.

The actions represented by these documents will not, of course, wipe out the basic conflicts of policies which underlie the current tense international situation. But they will, when ratified by the various countries concerned, bring about a fundamental change in the relationships between the free people of Germany and their friends in the free countries of the world. Under this new relationship we will all be able to work together more fully and more effectively to combine our strength, not only to deter aggression but also to bring about the economic and social progress and the more harmonious and friendly international relations to which all free men aspire.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Convention on Relations and to the protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty transmitted herewith, and give its advice and consent to their ratification in order that this great contribution to the strength and unity of the free world can become a reality.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 2, 1952.*

CONVENTION FOR HIGH SEAS FISHERIES OF NORTH PACIFIC OCEAN BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES, CANADA, AND JAPAN—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I also ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the convention for the high seas fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean, together with a protocol relating thereto, Executive S, Eighty-second Congress, second session, signed at Tokyo on May 9, 1952, which was sent to the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy is removed from the convention and protocol, and the convention and protocol, together with the President's message of transmittal, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the

President's message will be printed in the RECORD.

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith an international convention for the high seas fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean, together with a protocol relating thereto, signed at Tokyo May 9, 1952 on behalf of the United States, Canada, and Japan.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Acting Secretary of State with respect to the convention.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 2, 1952.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Acting Secretary of State. (2) International convention for the high seas fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean, with protocol, signed at Tokyo May 9, 1952.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2721) to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5990) to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VINSON, Mr. DURHAM, and Mr. SHORT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 454) making additional appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

AMENDMENT TO DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, we shall be voting soon on a amendment to Senate bill 2594, extending the Defense Production Act. I am a sponsor of that amendment, together with my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The purpose of my amendment is to strike from the bill the two amendments to the Walsh-Healey Act proposed by the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and approved by the Banking and Currency Committee.

As I read and understand the amendments proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], their purpose is to weaken the Walsh-Healey Act, first by making that statute inapplicable to materials and supplies purchased ordinarily in the open market, regardless of how the Government buys them; and secondly, by making the decisions of the Secretary of Labor subject to review under the Administrative Procedure Act.

I am utterly and vigorously opposed to this attempted emasculation of the Walsh-Healey Act. The amendment making Walsh-Healey inapplicable to contractors selling so-called standard items in the open market would, of course, reduce the Act's coverage so drastically as to make it a hollow shell. For example, I am advised by the President of the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers that this would exempt practically all textiles. It would further cripple the act by causing frequent delays, since obviously there will be many borderline categories of goods where reasonable doubt exists as to whether they fall into the "standard" or "open market" class or not. Decisions would have to be reached in each of these individual cases. In the meantime, the conscientious businessman is uncertain as to whether or not he is covered by the act, while his less scrupulous competitor is given an alibi to ignore the act.

Bringing the Administrative Procedure Act into the picture would further cripple the Walsh-Healey Act. Once you give every contractor, employee, or labor union the right to file appeals against decisions of the Secretary of Labor, you inevitably invite dilatory, and possibly frivolous, appeals to the courts by those who dislike the Walsh-Healey Act. This would render the act impotent in and of itself.

I am one who believes that the Walsh-Healey Act is, on the whole, a good law. The Supreme Court, in my judgment, aptly characterized it as a measure necessary "to obviate the possibility that any part of tremendous national expenditures would go to forces tending to depress wages and purchasing power and offend fair social standards of employment." If the amendments proposed by the junior Senator from Arkansas were to become law, we would then be using the power of "tremendous national expenditures" to depress wages, purchasing power, and to offend fair social standards of employment. The net effect of the amendment would be to reward plants paying low wages with Government orders and to penalize plants which pay higher wages. In other words, Congress is here being asked to reverse a long-standing policy of doing everything possible to encourage high wages and to adopt a policy of encouraging low wages. This is not a policy which will have my support.

This amendment would be bad for labor and bad for management. Companies presently paying higher wages would be forced to cut wages or forego any Government business. The alternative would be for the high-wage company to transfer its plant to a low wage area in order to meet competition for Government orders. This would, in turn, result in a disastrous dislocation to the entire economic pattern of the country, affecting all industry, whether covered by Walsh-Healey or not. The corner grocer would suffer as much as the textile factory. In this sense, crippling the Walsh-Healey Act would be bad for the whole community which has a greater interest in the maintenance of healthy industry than even labor or management.

Earlier this year I appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency to urge a legislative requirement that distressed areas receive priority in channeling of Government orders. As a general proposition, high wages prevail in these areas of abnormal unemployment. The committee voted against incorporating this proposal into the Defense Production Act; now it is urged that affirmative action be taken in the opposite direction to make the situation in these distressed areas just about as bad as humanly possible. I cannot, as one who represents in part a State where many key industries are struggling for their very existence, remain silent in the face of legislative action which would mean economic disaster to many of the people of that State.

I hope, therefore, that our amendment will prevail and that the Senate will not go on record in favor of depressed wages and lower standards of employment.

SPECIAL-INDUCEMENT PAY TO DOCTORS AND DENTISTS IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of Senate bill 3019, Calendar No. 1430.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3019) to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to extend the application of the special-inducement pay provided thereby to doctors and dentists, and for other purposes.

Mr. FERGUSON rose.

Mr. HUNT. How much time does the Senator from Michigan desire?

Mr. FERGUSON. I desire to obtain the floor. It would require me about 10 or 15 minutes.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I regret that I am unable to yield to the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I think we must proceed with the consideration of the pending bill, which, it will be remembered, we began but were unable to conclude on last Thursday evening. I rather reluctantly take the time of the Senate again to explain this bill. I did so on Thursday, I thought, at some length, and that explanation is in the RECORD. But I am quite sure all Senators have not read the RECORD; therefore, I feel compelled again to explain the contents of the bill.

Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to extend for 10 months the so-called equalizing pay of physicians and dentists. It would extend it from September 2, 1952, to July 1, 1953, and it pro-

poses to do so by amending the Career Compensation Act of 1949, which reenacted the provisions, with respect to special pay of physicians and dentists, which had been contained in the Procurement Act of 1947. It will be noted that the special pay applied only to personnel serving as commissioned officers on a voluntary basis, and that the authority to establish eligibility for this special pay existed only for a period of 5 years, terminating September 1, 1952; hence the pending bill.

Mr. President, the bill is requested by the Department of Defense. Appearing as witnesses in favor of the bill were Major General Armstrong, Surgeon General of the United States Army, and Admiral Pugh, Surgeon General of the United States Navy; for the American Medical Association, trustee member, Dr. Walter B. Martin, of Norfolk, Va., and for the American Dental Association, Dr. J. C. Earnest, of Monroe, La. Other witnesses appeared against the bill. However, I think it should be noted that in hearings held earlier in the day with reference to an incentive and with reference to various overseas pay, the Senator from Illinois appeared in opposition. I feel that his position was also applicable to this bill.

Mr. President, from January 1, 1945, to the time of the passage of the Procurement Act of 1947, physicians and dentists were leaving the military services in great numbers. I am advised that there were 956 resignations from the Navy and 142 resignations from the Army, or a total of 1,100 resignations within a 2-year period.

Recognizing that some emergency measure was required in order to stop this trend in the matter of resignations, if the medical and dental services were to be maintained at a high standard, or in fact were to be maintained at all, the Medical Officers Procurement Act of 1947 was passed by the Congress.

Secretary Robert Patterson, in the course of testimony given before the committee presented the argument in behalf of the Defense Establishment. To give some idea of the effect of this bill, I may say that, from the passage of the 1947 act, to date, during the 5-year period there have been but 314 resignations from the Navy, and 347 from the Army, as contrasted to the 2-year record prior to the enactment of that law, of 1,100, in the armed services. During the year before the act was passed, the Public Health Service recruited 166 physicians, though it lost about 501. In the year following its passage the Public Health Service was able to recruit 274 physicians, whereas it lost but 141. Thus, under the Procurement Act of 1947, we find that in 1 year there was a gain of 133 physicians in the Public Health Service.

Mr. President, the referred to act provided equalizing pay to medical and dental officers of $100 a month, over and above that of officers in the other branches of the services, and accomplished just what the act was designed to accomplish. As I have previously stated, the number of resignations immediately declined to an annual average of 80.

The Surgeon General, Major General Armstrong, speaking for the various services, stated to the committee that the sizable decline in resignations, as well as the definite increase in procurement, strongly indicate that the special pay authorized for physicians and surgeons is the most effective method not only of retaining experienced career officers in the service, but of increasing the number willing to accept commissions.

At the outset, it should be pointed out that the $100 a month received by physicians and dentists over and above the amount paid other officers of the same rank, should not be considered merely an incentive pay. It should not be considered extra pay, for it is, in every sense of the word, an equalizing pay, as I shall attempt to point out to the Members of the Senate.

The medical services following World War II found themselves unable to maintain, on a voluntary basis, a Medical and Dental Corps competent to administer even a minimum standard of medical and dental services to our Armed Forces.

Procurement of medical officers was at a standstill. In great part, this was due to the wide disparity between the income of physicians and dentists in civilian life as compared with that of physicians and dentists in the military services.

In the Army, after the war, the officer needs of all the branches of the Department of Defense were on a voluntary basis, and there were five applications for every commission excepting in the Medical and Dental Corps, where there was but one application for every three commissions.

Extensive hearings were had to explore ways and means of meeting this critical situation and making military services more attractive to these professional people.

During the course of the hearings it became very evident that entirely apart from the question of disparity of earnings between medical officers on the one hand and civilian physicians and dentists on the other hand, a basic inequity in pay structure of the Armed Forces existed wherein medical and dental officers were at a considerable disadvantage in terms of total earnings in comparison with that of other officers.

A comparison, Mr. President, between a line officer and a medical officer over the normal 30-year period of service establishes the fact that a career medical officer is at a disadvantage of, roughly, $40,000.

A line officer at the age of 22, having graduated from college, meets the educational requirements for an appointment as a second lieutenant or as an ensign, gets a commission, and his service pay begins.

In contrast, a medical or dental student, after completing 4 years of college, must, in order to attain a degree in medicine, spend 4 years in a medical school and 1 year as an intern. Some dentists also spend 4 years in college in order to qualify for a commission, and some schools require 1 year of internship. They are then qualified for commissions in the armed services; but it is 5 years later, and they are 5 years older than the line officers. The average age they have reached is 27 years, as compared with the line officer, who is but 22 years of age.

During these 5 years after the line officer receives his commission and before the medical officer can receive his commission, the line officer has earned an income of approximately $21,000, while during the same 5-year period the medical officer, requiring the most expensive of all educations, has an expenditure, conservatively estimated, of $10,000. I may say that I know it is far in excess of that amount, Mr. President. Therefore, before the medical officer receives his commission, there is a disparity of more than $30,000 as between the two officers.

Except in the case of West Point and Annapolis graduates, where the disparity equals another conservatively estimated amount of $22,000, the pay of cadets in the Academies is, roughly, $7,100, and the cost to the Government is approximately $22,000 to educate each of the cadets.

Therefore, there is a tremendous additional disadvantage to the M. D. and the D. D. S.

Throughout the 30 years' service, the line officer's income is approximately $212,000. The medical officer's income, without the equalizing pay, is $170,000, or $40,000 to the advantage of the line officer. With the equalizing pay, the medical officer will earn a total in the 30-year period of his service of $202,000, so that with the equalizing pay the medical officer has still approximately $10,000 less total income than has the line officer.

Should an interest charge on the differential be taken into account, the advantage of the line officer is still greater.

But with reference to the disparity of income as between the line officer, who, let us say, is an engineer, and the medical officer, we have additional financial disadvantages to consider:

First. Since the line officer enters the service at 22 years of age, he is subject to retirement after 30 years of service at the age of 52, or a full 5 years before the medical officer entering the service at 27 years of age may retire at the age of 57 years.

Second. If the line officer is in good health at the time of retirement and is an engineer, he will, the Office of Education advises me, earn, estimated on the year 1949, approximately $6,000 a year for the 5-year period, while the medical officer is still in the service, or another $30,000 over and above the amount received by the medical officer.

I might say, too, Mr. President, that during the 5 years of retirement, the line officer is receiving his retirement pay which is still in addition to that which the medical officer would be receiving during that time.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUNT. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Washington.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA LIBRARIES

Mr. CAIN. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming appears to be suggesting that over a normal 30-year period of service the medical or dental officer who benefits from equalizing or incentive pay will still, at the end of his service period, or just prior to retirement, have received a total sum considerably less than the average line officer would receive who serves without so-called incentive pay.

Is the Senator from Washington approximately correct in his interpretation?

Mr. HUNT. The medical officer would receive at the end of 30 years' service approximately $40,000 less than the line officer would have received. That is not quite a correct statement. There would be a differential of $40,000, taking into consideration the 5 years' additional cost of education which the medical officer had to meet while the line officer was receiving an income from his commission in the service.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. HUNT. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it true that when young doctors have finished their medical training and have received their degrees from medical college, they can then go into the service without a prior period of internship, and that their initial period in the military service is thereafter taken as a form of internship?

Mr. HUNT. I am inclined to think that may be possible, but I do not believe that that is what is considered as a good, complete, full medical education.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that a great many young medical officers go into the service right after medical school without having had a prior period of internship in a hospital? That is, they go in with the grades of lieutenant, junior grade, and first lieutenant, and therefore, in practice, have not had a period of internship before going into the service and becoming eligible for the extra $100 a month?

Mr. HUNT. I do not have any information to that effect, but I may say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that that is one thing the armed services very much desire to prevent, for the reason that they feel that a medical officer going into the service immediately upon graduation is not capable of affording to the armed services the type of medical service he would have been able to render if he had had some experience.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not even under the attention of a senior medical officer with experience?

Mr. HUNT. That is what I am told. I am also told by the armed services that going in immediately from school, military officers are not competent to assume command in staff positions which require a great number of career officers, and that they have seriously handicapped the services.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Medical officers could be assigned to base hospitals as interns and also to medical battalions with the younger doctors working under the direction of senior doctors, and thus receiving the equivalent of an internship.

Mr. HUNT. I do not think that is at all possible. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Illinois understands that the medical services afforded within the armed services are very often performed under very great difficulties, and not in the best hospitals, and not in the best conditions for rounding out the type of medical education a doctor or dentist likes to have.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There are a great many other people who go into the armed services who do not receive in the armed services the rounded-out education they would like to receive as businessmen, lawyers, engineers.

Mr. HUNT. I think the Senator is quite right, but I would say those people are not dealing with the health of men in the services; they are dealing entirely with other aspects of military life.

If the line officer is in good health at the time of his retirement as an engineer, he will, in addition to receiving a salary from whatever occupation he assumes, receive his retirement pay.

But there are still some other financial disadvantages to the medical officer. The medical officer in civilian life, computed on the basis of 1949, would be having a net income of $11,000 a year, while the average line officer would, in the same period of time, assuming he is an engineer, have a net income of about $6,000 a year, and in 30 years would be sacrificing an income of approximately $5,000 a year compared with the other line officer.

I think it is entirely unnecessary to elaborate further on the financial disadvantage to which a medical officer is subjected by serving his country in the Military Establishment, but one further point should be emphasized, namely, that the Department of Defense is receiving services from the medical officer which cannot be measured in dollars and cents.

Senate bill 3019, which is now before the Senate, extends for a period of 10 months to July 1, 1953, the $100 a month equalizing pay for physicians and dentists.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming if there is any great change in this bill from the bills considered in 1947 and 1949.

Mr. HUNT. No; except that the 1947 bill and the 1949 bill did not cover a very few officers who were retired at the time those bills were passed, but now are being called back to active duty. They would be covered by the pending bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. What I mean is that there is no great money change. How much would it cost?

Mr. HUNT. For the 10 months, it would cost $382,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. What does it cost now?

Mr. HUNT. I cannot tell the distinguished Senator what it costs now, because we must charge off those going out against those coming in, and we are going to have 6,000 resignations, or 6,000 leaving the service, between now and July 1, 1953.

Mr. MAYBANK. As I understand, the purpose of this bill is to retain those in the service under the present existing pay, except for some small number. Is that correct?

Mr. HUNT. I think the Senator's statement is quite correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. As the Senator from Wyoming knows, I was on the committee in 1947 when such a bill was first written. Again, in 1949, I supported similar legislation. But several people have asked me the question, "Is this another big windfall of money for certain beneficiaries?"

I have made the statement—perhaps unjustifiably, and I want the Senator from Wyoming to correct me if I am wrong, because I am no longer on the committee—that it is the present pay, the pay which the officers now receive, which is being extended.

Mr. HUNT. That is exactly so. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina that this bill has absolutely no effect on any medical or dental officer who goes into the service prior to September 2, 1952. It affects only those going in after that date.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator, because I wanted my statement to be correct. When people have said this is more or less the same as the law which was passed in 1948, and renewed in 1949, I have replied that this bill does not raise the present pay above what they are being paid today. Again, is that statement correct?

Mr. HUNT. That is quite correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I merely wish to say to the Senator from Wyoming that I am a member of the Committee on Armed Services and voted in favor of reporting this bill, because, as I understand, it simply extends for 10 months the privilege of those entering the service between September 1 this year and July 1 of the coming year to get an extra $100, and puts them in the same category or on the same basis with physicians who entered voluntarily after 1947, or who were kept in the service by reason of the selective service law after a later date, after 1949.

Am I not correct in saying that this whole subject will be reviewed on July 1, 1953?

Mr. HUNT. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So the pending bill will merely take care of officers who enter the service between September 1, 1952, and July 1, 1953, and will leave everybody else just as he is now, will it not?

Mr. HUNT. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the whole bill?

Mr. HUNT. That is the whole bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is why our committee unanimously reported it favorably, is it not?

Mr. HUNT. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief question?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Is it not a fact that the authority of the Military Establishment to order Reserve officers to duty involuntarily, or against their will, will expire on July 1, 1953?

Mr. HUNT. No, I do not believe that to be the fact. I do not believe the Physicians and Dentists Procurement Act of 1951, which the Senator will remember, by which physicians and dentists up to the age of 50 were drafted, has a 5-year limitation.

Mr. CAIN. I may say to the Senator that my understanding is that that authority does terminate, and if that understanding is correct, it makes even more valid the Senator's bill, which would extend for a period of only 10 months the time during which an officer ordered to active duty involuntarily or against his will could qualify for the incentive or equalizing pay which the Senator's bill would provide.

Mr. HUNT. I think the Senator is quite correct.

Mr. President, I am very anxious, if it is at all possible, to have a yea-and-nay vote on this bill. While I should like to present a considerable additional amount of evidence on behalf of the bill, realizing that it would be very difficult later in the evening to get a yea-and-nay vote, I shall conclude my remarks simply by saying to the Senate that I believe this proposed legislation is almost a "must" if we wish to continue to maintain the type of medical and dental services to which every serviceman is entitled.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. HUNT. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does not the bill present really a question of fairness? Does it not merely provide fair treatment for those who enter the service up until July 1, 1953?

Mr. HUNT. The degree of fairness, I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts, rests in this consideration; those now in the service and those who will come into the service up to September 2, 1952, will continue to get $100 a month until they are parted from the service, even though they may serve out their 30 years' career service.

If we do not pass this bill any physician or dentist coming in after September 2, 1952, will not receive the additional $100 a month. He will be working side by side with another physician, perhaps from the same school, perhaps from the same class, doing the same type of work, and receiving $100 a month more than the one coming in after September 2, 1952.

DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT IN THE STEEL SEIZURE CASE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, during the call of the calendar I used 5 minutes to discuss the opinion of the Supreme Court in the steel-seizure case.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to continue those remarks at the present time. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall have to preface my question to my friend from Michigan by saying that earlier in the day the Senate ordered the decisions and opinions in the steel-seizure case to be printed as a Senate document. The copies which I have of the Supreme Court decision—and the same is true of the copies which the Senator from Michigan has—are proof copies, subject to correction.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. There may have been a period left out here, or a comma there, or a word may have been misspelled. There may be a number of minor corrections to be made in the proofs.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is true.

Mr. MAYBANK. Inasmuch as the Justices of the Supreme Court are to look over the proofs, and since the Supreme Court itself is to have the opinions printed, it has been suggested that perhaps if the printing of the Senate document is delayed for a day or two, we can use the same type which the Supreme Court uses, with a possible saving of perhaps $13 a page, or $1,300 for the complete copies.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is true.

Mr. MAYBANK. I know the Senator from Michigan feels as I do. The opinions will be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with perhaps a few minor errors. However, when it comes to printing them as a Senate document, I think it is preferable to wait until the Justices check the proofs and the corrections are made. As I say, there may be changes in punctuation, or in spelling of words.

Mr. FERGUSON. Or even other changes. I agree with the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. That process will require 2 or 3 days. The course which I have suggested will result in a saving of thousands of dollars. The proofs can be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for today, and subsequently any errors will be corrected.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator for making that point.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wished to have that point understood.

Mr. FERGUSON. There will be a few days' delay in making use of the same type. Anyone who reads the RECORD may discover that there will be a few alterations, after the Justices shall have searched the proofs.

Mr. MAYBANK. They will be corrections of technical errors, but I do not anticipate any change in substance.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not anticipate that there will be any substantive changes either.

Mr. President, these opinions are so important to the Nation and to the Congress that we should have them before us. I think it is well to have them made a Senate document, as well as to have them printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I read from the opinion of the Supreme Court:

> It is clear that if the President had authority to issue the order he did, it must be found in some provisions of the Constitution. And it is not claimed that express constitutional language grants this power to the President. The contention is that Presidential power should be implied from the aggregate of his powers under article II of the Constitution. Particular reliance is placed on the provisions which say that "the Executive power shall be vested in a President * * *" that "he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed"; and that he "shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States."

Speaking in relation to that part of Constitution the court, describing and discussing his position as Commander in Chief in this case, said:

> This is a job for the Nation's lawmakers, not for its military authorities.

The Court continued:

> Nor can the seizure order be sustained because of the several constitutional provisions that grant Executive power to the President. In the framework of our Constitution, the President's power to see that the laws are faithfully executed refutes the idea that he is to be a lawmaker.

That is very significant. The Court invites our attention to the fact that when the President drew his order he was acting as a lawmaker. He was making a law. We in America do not believe that the Chief Executives can make law by decree. If one will read the order, which is attached to the opinion, he will discover that it lays down a policy, instead of carrying out what Congress had directed. It lays down a certain policy, and then proceeds to carry out the policy as laid down by the President.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. That policy has been cited in the Defense Production Act.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Since 12 o'clock today the staff of the Committee on Banking and Currency has been helping me prepare a memorandum showing how the Defense Production Act is affected by Justice Black's decision for the majority of the Court. The staff has been engaged for 4 hours or more in a study of that question. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my memorandum may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM BY SENATOR MAYBANK

The majority decision of the United States Supreme Court today in the steel dispute, *Youngstown Company* v. *Sawyer*, clearly decides the President has no inherent power to seize the steel mills in the manner he used. The Court, speaking through Justice Black, our former colleague, notes that the Constitution places all legislative power in the Congress and that the President is to execute laws faithfully, not to make them. Justice Black for the Court rejected the President's acts in this case as presidential policy executed in a manner prescribed by the President, not congressional policy executed in a manner prescribed by the Congress. Mr. Justice Black accepted the Government's contention it did not act under the authority of any statute, but rather under what it called inherent powers, Justice Black pointed out Congress refused in

1947 to give the President seizure authority when it considered the Taft-Hartley Act. The Court decision rejects the claim the President was authorized to act as he did as Commander in Chief, even though the "theater of war" is an expanding concept. "Taking possession of private property to keep labor disputes from stopping production is a job for the Congress, not for the Nation's military authorities," he said. Mr. Justice Black for the Court also rejects the idea the President's acts were justified because he is the Chief Executive. Here it was said the legislative power is in the Congress, not in the Presidency.

The Court therefore affirmed the decision of the district court holding the seizure unlawful.

I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that while a majority of the Supreme Court found the President lacked inherent power to seize the steel mills, the same majority and the minority stated that the President has ample statutory authority under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, to take by condemnation a temporary use of these mills upon depositing in Court an amount estimated to be just compensation. Having done so when a declaration of taking is filed, the Government may obtain immediate possession of the property.

The majority of the Court also cite the Selective Service Act of 1948 as authority for the President to take property under the conditions spelled out in that act. In his concurring opinion, Justice Clark points out the Government may move swiftly under that statute to take over property when producers fail to deliver under defense orders.

From the several opinions issued in this decision, it also seems apparent the President may still invoke the Taft-Hartley Act if he cares to do so.

In short, it seems there are laws now on the books the President can use to help solve this crisis. I urge the President to make use of the tools the Congress has already given him to solve this problem, and quickly. I invite particular attention to the fact that the Defense Production Act gives the President authority to keep production going by lawful, statutory means.

If the Congress wishes to resurvey the field of lawful settlement of labor disputes, that is its prerogative. But the times are serious, Mr. President, and our Nation must not let down its guard through inaction. The Congress has given the President adequate tools. I urge him to use them promptly. Under today's decision of the Supreme Court, we remain a Government of laws and not a Government of men.

Mr. FERGUSON. In the last Defense Production Act there was a provision that if it should become necessary to condemn property for defense purposes, the President could take certain steps and follow certain prescribed procedures. But the Solicitor General, in arguing before the Supreme Court, said to the Court, "That law is much too cumbersome. We did not want to use it because it was not what the President thought we ought to have."

That is the question which the Supreme Court discusses in the opinion. The Court says that the President had no such authority. As Justice Holmes once said, Congress lays down the law, Congress, and not the President, is to make the policy. The President has no authority to determine that any law is too cumbersome. He must use it in the best way he can.

Coming back to the opinion:

The Constitution limits his functions in the law-making process to the recommending of laws he thinks wise and the vetoing of laws he thinks bad.

That is his only power in the lawmaking field. He recommends laws which he believes the country should have, and if he is not satisfied with a law which Congress enacts, he has the veto power. Congress can then again exert its power and override the veto.

Continuing with the opinion:

And the Constitution is neither silent nor equivocal about who shall make laws which the President is to execute. The first section of the first article says that—

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States."

After granting many powers to the Congress, article I goes on to provide that Congress may "make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Consitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

The President's order does not direct that a congressional policy be executed in a manner prescribed by Congress—it directs that a presidential policy be executed in a manner prescribed by the President.

In other words, he took over the lawmaking power of the Congress when he issued the order.

The preamble of the order itself, like that of many statutes, sets out reasons why the President believes certain policies should be adopted, proclaims these policies as rules of conduct to be followed, and again, like a statute, authorizes a Government official to promulgate additional rules and regulations consistent with the policy proclaimed and needed to carry that policy into execution. The power of Congress to adopt such public policies as those proclaimed by the order is beyond question. It can authorize the taking of private property for public use. It can make laws regulating the relationships between employers and employees, prescribing rules designed to settle labor disputes, and fixing wages and working conditions in certain fields of our economy. The Constitution did not subject this law-making power of Congress to presidential or military supervision or control.

It is true, Mr. President, that the military did not see fit to take any action by way of an order or a decree; but I believe it is well that the statement is included in the Supreme Court's opinion, because it was argued before the Court that the military advised that it was necessary to enter the order, and that the President under his implied powers had entered the order.

So once and for all we get this very clear opinion from the Court:

The Constitution did not subject this lawmaking power of Congress to Presidential or military supervision or control.

It is said that other Presidents without congressional authority have taken possesion of private business enterprises in order to settle labor disputes.

Some time ago I put into the RECORD a statement of the number of times Presidents have seized properties for various reasons.

The Court continues:

But even if this be true, Congress has not thereby lost its exclusive—

Note the word "exclusive"—

constitutional authority to make laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers vested by the Constitution "in the Government of the United States, or any department or officer thereof."

The next lines in the opinion are very significant and very important. Congress and the people should always remember these lines:

The founders of this Nation entrusted the law-making power to the Congress alone in both good and bad times.

Mr. President, what makes America the great bulwark of liberty is the fact that the Constitution is binding upon the President of the United States and on every citizen of the country and on Congress.

The founders of this Nation entrusted the law-making power to the Congress alone in both good and bad times.

Mr. President, one of the Justices sets forth in his opinion a statement of what happened to the German Republic. It is a well-known fact that the German constitution contained a provision to the effect that in case of an emergency the President of Germany could set aside the constitution. Hundreds of times the President of the German Republic set aside certain constitutional rights. Finally Hitler came into power and he absolutely set aside everything but his own power, under that provision which allowed the setting aside of the constitution in emergencies.

Mr. President, this expression of the Court should be read again and again:

The founders of this Nation entrusted the lawmaking power to the Congress alone in both good and bad times.

Six opinions were written by the justices who affirmed the judgment of the district court in finding that the act of the President was unconstitutional. It is very significant that Mr. Justice Black in his concurring opinion found reason to believe that there was inherent power. He recalled the case of Little against Barreme, decided in 1804. The case involved the seizure of a vessel leaving a French port. The Court stated that it was clear that the President had no power to seize the vessel because the vessel was leaving a French port and not sailing to the French port. Justice Clark goes on to say that in the Steel case the Taft-Hartley law was applicable. He continues:

The limits of presidential power are obscure. However, article II, no less than article I, is part of "a constitution intended to endure for ages to come, and, consequently, to be adapted to the various crises of human affairs."

In again citing Little against Barreme, he concludes that in his opinion, Congress having laid down specific procedures, the President was not authorized to act.

With all deference to the Justices of the Supreme Court, we must say that if the President has inherent power to perform an act, Congress cannot take away that inherent power by legislative act. It would be necessary for Congress to propose a constitutional amendment and to have it ratified. If the President had the power, unless that power was coequal with that of Congress, he would

have the power to act if Congress had not acted.

The distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] introduced a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment, and the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee unanimously reported it to the full committee. The full committee has unanimously reported it to the Senate and it is now on the calendar. I have been granted unanimous consent that it remain on the calendar and that it be considered on the next call of the calendar, because the proposed constitutional amendment should be studied in the light of these opinions, to determine whether under certain circumstances there would be a finding by the Court that there existed such inherent power. I do not find the statement in the opinions, but I think we ought to make a search of the opinions in that regard, and the Committee on the Judiciary should perform that task. That is why I was eager to have the joint resolution remain on the calendar and have it come up on the next call of the calendar, because it is very important that we fully understand what we do.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Along with the Senator from Michigan I have read the opinions somewhat hastily. Do I not express the Senator's feelings, as well as my own, when I say that Mr. Justice Jackson in one sentence sums up the whole situation? He says:

> I cannot be brought to believe that this country will suffer if the Court refuses further to aggrandize the presidential office, already so potent and so relatively immune from judicial review, at the expense of Congress.

Does not that sum up the case?

Mr. FERGUSON. It certainly does.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Michigan intends to speak much longer. The Senate desires to get a vote on the pending measure. It is almost 5 o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall not take much more time. I must attend a committee meeting.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. In view of the fact that the Senator from Michigan has made reference to a joint resolution providing for a constitutional amendment which is now on the calendar, I should like to say that I was in the Supreme Court this morning during all of the presentation made by the Court. I listened to the opinions being read by the respective Justices.

I was never so convinced as I was after listening to the Supreme Court that the joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment should be immediately enacted. While the opinion of Mr. Justice Black was clear, concise, well-rounded, and to the point, the concurring opinions of the other Justices—not the dissenting opinions but the concurring opinions—took something from the cogency of the Black opinion. Although they agreed with the conclusion, they seemed to be in doubt as to certain phases of it. I thought then and I think now that no argument could be offered which would be more convincing for the enactment of the joint resolution that is pending than the decision of the Supreme Court as it was presented this morning.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada for his remarks. In reading the opinions I noticed that Justice Burton referred to "under the circumstances" and so forth of this particular order. There is also mention made of "irreparable damage" and the issuance of an injunction.

For just a few moments more I wish to call attention to some of the other opinions in the case.

Mr. Justice Douglas in his concurring opinion says some very important things about the power of the President, particularly in times of emergency. His opinion declares:

> But the emergency did not create power: it merely marked an occasion when power should be exercised.

That is an important concept, namely, that no emergency creates power under the terms of the Constitution.

In his decision Justice Douglas discusses the Executive power in these terms:

> All executive power—from the reign of ancient kings to the rule of modern dictators—has the outward appearance of efficiency.
>
> Legislative power, by contrast, is slower to exercise. There must be delay while the ponderous machinery of committees, hearings, and debates is put into motion. That takes time; and while the Congress slowly moves into action, the emergency may take its toll in wages, consumer goods, war production, the standard of living of the people, and perhaps even lives. Legislative action may indeed often be cumbersome, time-consuming, and apparently inefficient. But as Mr. Justice Brandeis stated in his dissent in *Myers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52, 293):
>
> "The doctrine of the separation of powers was adopted by the Convention of 1787, not to promote efficiency but to preclude the exercise of arbitrary power. The purpose was, not to avoid friction, but, by means of the inevitable friction incident to the distribution of the governmental powers among three departments, to save the people from autocracy."
>
> We therefore cannot decide this case by determining which branch of government can deal most expeditiously with the present crisis. The answer must depend on the allocation of powers under the Constitution. That in turn requires an analysis of the conditions giving rise to the seizure and of the seizure itself.

Although only temporary seizure was intended, yet if such a right existed, permanent seizure power could be claimed. This was realized by Mr. Justice Douglas when he said:

> A permanent taking would amount to the nationalization of the industry. A temporary taking falls short of that goal. But though seizure is only for a week or a month, the condemnation is complete and the United States must pay compensation for the temporary possession. *United States* v. *General Motors Corp.* (323 U. S. 373); *United States* v. *Pewee Coal Co.*, supra.

Let us consider for a moment the opinion of Mr. Justice Jackson. Attention was called to a statement in that opinion by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. Justice Jackson went on to say:

> The essence of our free Government is "leave to live by no man's leave, underneath the law"—to be governed by those impersonal forces which we call law. Our Government is fashioned to fulfill this concept so far as humanly possible. The Executive, except for recommendation and veto, has no legislative power.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have the entire opinion of Mr. Justice Jackson printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(For Justice Jackson's opinion see pp. 6304–6308 of today's RECORD.)

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I believe that every Senator should carefully examine these opinions, should search them in the light of our constitutional liberties, and should determine whether we should proceed with a constitutional amendment.

Such a constitutional amendment, I believe, should probably go further than is contemplated by the proposed constitutional amendment now on the calendar. I believe that there should be proposed a constitutional amendment relating to "inherent powers," so that there could be no question about that matter. The proposed constitutional amendment now on the calendar relates only to the seizure of property. Of course the seizure of property covers a very wide field. That is why Mr. Justice Douglas said, toward the end of his opinion:

> Yet tomorrow another President might use the same power to prevent a wage increase, to curb trade unionists, to regiment labor as oppressively as industry thinks it has been regimented by this seizure.

So, Mr. President, when we consider industry we consider, of course, labor, as specifically stated in the opinion. That is why it is most important that we study it. We should have in mind more than property, of course, although property involves personal liberty and rights. We should also examine the question of inherent powers, because some day they may even relate to the holding of an election, if a President thought that an emergency which arose required that a national election not be held. Not only property rights but also human rights should be studied in the light of these opinions.

Mr. President, today, June 2, is a great day for constitutional government, a great day for the liberty of the American people, a great day which the people of the United States will long, long remember as one of the guideposts to personal liberty and constitutional government—a government of law, not a government of men.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, when the steel-seizure case was under consideration by the Supreme Court, I refrained from making any statement,

other than to answer my private correspondence. In perhaps more than 1,000 letters I used the following sentence:

> Whatever the Supreme Court of the United States finally decides in this case, the universal judgment of informed mankind will sustain the opinion of Judge Pine, of the district court, who rendered the initial decision in this case.

Beyond that statement, I did not think it proper to make any comment on the issue before the Supreme Court.

I do not intend now to make any extended comments or statement regarding the opinions rendered in this case, because I have not had time to read more than the opinion of Mr. Justice Black and two or three of the concurring opinions.

I must say now that Mr. Justice Black's opinion, in my judgment, is logical, is sound, and is conclusive upon the points with which he dealt in this case. I can very well understand how some Associate Justices might not wish to follow all of his logic to an extreme conclusion. But I wish to commend Mr. Justice Black and I wish to say that I am very proud to have served in this body with a man who has made so distinguished a record upon the Supreme Court of the United States. He has done it in the face of some adverse criticism; but he has done it by hard work, industry, continued study, and devotion to first principles.

Mr. President, I never doubted what would be the opinion of Mr. Justice Frankfurter in this case, because he is entirely too good a lawyer to have reached a decision contrary to the decision he reached today. I never doubted that some of the other opinions which have been announced today would be reached. I did have some doubts about some of the contrary opinions which have been delivered in this case. I say it with all kindness, because those members of the Court happen to be among my most intimate personal friends upon that Court.

However, Mr. President, as nearly as I can arrive at their conclusion it is that the President decided that the country was in "a hell of a fix" and that therefore the President had a right to resort to anything he thought would get the country out of "a hell of a fix." Actually, that is what their dissenting opinions come down to. It will not be a great honor to the Supreme Court of the United States, either this year or 50 years hence, to read the dissenting opinions in this case.

Mr. President, I wish to make a general observation. I regret to make this statement, because, as I have already said, the Justices who have seen fit to dissent happen to be the only Justices on the Supreme Court, with two exceptions, with whom I am on speaking terms and whom I regard most kindly.

The statement I wish to make is this: Who was it who said that "God reigns, and the Government at Washington still stands?" The statement was made after a President had been shot. I am sure that some of our colleagues who are scholars will remember that statement. I am sure that my friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], remembers it.

I wish to repeat another statement. Once there was in the United States a great lawyer who lived in Massachusetts as I recall. I have tried to find his name, because I should like to give him exact credit for making a prophetic statement. He did not hold public office, so far as I know; at least, he was not a Senator or a Vice President or even a President of the United States. So far as I know, he held no public office. However, he made this statement in one of his addresses. As nearly as I can recall, his name was William Evarts. I cannot quote the exact words he used, although I wish I could. I even asked the librarians, a few days ago, to find the quotation for me, but they could not find it.

In substance, what he said was that the final stress and strains upon our free institutions would fall, not upon the President, because he might be a weak man, he might be a vacillating man, he might be subject to pressures by minority groups or by what he erroneously supposed to be the majority group at the moment. He might even be corrupt, said this great American lawyer, but the final stress and strains on our free institutions would not rest upon him. Nor, added he, would it rest upon the Congress of the United States, as honorable as the Members of the Congress were at the moment or might be at any moment in our history. But, they, themselves, might become weak, they might yield to popular clamor; they might yield to public opinions either of a minority or of an imagined majority. They might become even corrupt and venal. So, said this lawyer, the final stress and strain of our free institutions would not rest upon the Congress of the United States. But, said he, the final stress and strain would rest upon an upright, a courageous, a fearless judiciary that would dare uphold the Constitution of the United States and all that is represented by the Constitution.

So, Mr. President, I thank God that again, under quite different circumstances, I can say, "God be praised, the Government at Washington still stands"; and so long as there is a judiciary with the courage and the fortitude and the integrity to stand for the fundamentals of our American institutions, those institutions will prevail.

Unfortunately the decision today in this important case, Mr. President, was not by a unanimous court, though it was by a decisive majority of a full court of nine. I repeat what I said, though not on this floor, when I heard the contention made in the Senate about inherent powers and about a reservoir of powers in the Executive—I repeat what I said in many, many letters, that whatever the decision by the Court across the way might be, the judgment of informed Americans would sustain the opinion of that single courageous man on the bench here in Washington, where official privilege and official power take the backbone out of most men who would dare write what is the simple, plain law of this case. There never was anything mysterious about it. There never was anything involved about it. It takes courts to make things mysterious and involved.

I recall, Mr. President, what another distinguished American lawyer said of a great English case, which had been on trial in London. In referring to the circumstances of that case and the details of the issue involved, which did affect the liberties of Englishmen, he said that when the English jury brought in its verdict, the simultaneous shout of more than 200 Englishmen rose from the waterfront clear across London, or as he put it, "The simultaneous shout of freemen for the triumph of liberty and of justice."

Upon our courts depends the final survival of this free republic we have loved and tried to serve for so long a time. How careless we have been—and I take a full measure of the blame upon myself—in the confirmation of men to high posts in the judiciary, men who had by no possibility the proper qualifications for a high office of that sort. But today at least a court composed of stalwart men who went against the Chief Justice, a court which undoubtedly would have been unanimous with his concurrence, has sustained what all Americans who are without undue prejudice recognize to have been the correct decision in this case.

SPECIAL-INDUCEMENT PAY TO DOCTORS AND DENTISTS IN THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3019) to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to extend the application of the special-inducement pay provided thereby to doctors and dentists, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is with a sense of anticlimax that I follow a discussion of the decision of the Supreme Court with a continuation of the discussion of the bill pending before the Senate, namely, the bonus bill for doctors. In order to indicate some of the issues which are at stake, I send to the desk an amendment which I am proposing to the bill, with a request that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, beginning with line 23, it is proposed to strike out, to and through line 4, on page 4, and insert the following:

> (b) amending subsection 203 (b), (1) by striking out "$100" wherever it appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "$5", and (2) by deleting the second proviso thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "*Provided further*, That the commissioned officers described in subsection (a) (4) of this section who are called or ordered to active duty without their consent shall not be entitled to receive the pay provided by this subsection for any period prior to September 9, 1950."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, all my amendment proposes to accomplish is to reduce the present bonus, which the committee calls an equalizing payment, for doctors from $100 a month to $5 a month. In other words, the amend-

ment is intended to strike at the institution of the medical bonus itself.

I may say that my good friend from Wyoming, the eminent junior Senator from that State [Mr. HUNT], refers to the $100 bonus as an equalizing payment. Apparently, it was first conceived of as an equalizing payment in order that doctors in the military service might receive the same approximate average income which they would presumably have received had they remained in civilian life. That was the purpose; so that there would be no appreciable financial sacrifice involved by the doctors if they entered the military service.

In passing, Mr. President, I should like to say that if we approve this principle in this instance it will lead to very extraordinary conclusions, namely, that if we do this for doctors, how can we refuse to do it for lawyers, for engineers, for businessmen, for skilled artisans, for all the wide variety of men with skills who are needed in the miiltary service and who sacrifice earning power when they go into the military service either willingly or unwillingly?

If we are going to say that no one shall incur a financial sacrifice by going into the military service, then, believe me, Mr. President, the pay in our armed services will be extremely high. So there is a principle involved.

The second basis on which it is said that the bill is equalizing is a complicated process which I confess I cannot fully understand, but which contemplates that medical officers should receive for a time more than line officers in order that over their period of life they will receive as much as will the line officers.

I suppose the chief justification is the 3-year training period which a doctor has to have and which a line officer is presumed not to have. But if we accept that principle, what are we going to do about lawyers who go into the service and become judge advocates? What are we going to do about engineers who go into the service and enter the Engineer Corps? They are not all drawn from West Point. What are we going to do about all the specialists who have spent extra years in training? What are we going to do about businessmen who enter the miiltary service? Or, on lower levels, what are we going to do for skilled workmen, for professional men, and others, who serve in the ranks of the enlisted men? Are we to say that their pay is to be equalized over the course of a lifetime?

So, I think, Mr. President, we are on very dangerous ground, and there are large sums of money involved.

The eminent Senator from Wyoming last Thursday declared that there were some 13,000 doctors and dentists already in the Defense Department. The budget submitted by the Defense Department for next year contemplates a little more than 20,000 physicians and dentists. Since the bonus payments amount to $1,200 a year——

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. I think that what I referred to was the number of physicians and dentists taken in under the existing act. I did not mean the total number in the service.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand. If we take the eminent Senator's figures, we would have 13,000 at $1,200 a year, or an extra amount of $15,600,000 a year. If we take 20,000 as our figure, there would be $24,000,000 a year involved in extra costs caused by the medical bonus, with 1,200 as the multiplier in each case.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. HUNT. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that the number that will be taken in under this bill will draw $4,630,600 in the ensuing 10 months.

Those who will be discharged will take from the roll $4,248,100, leaving the actual cost, under the bill less than $400,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Evidently, the Senator from Wyoming and I are talking about different things. He is speaking of the added cost over the present system. I am speaking of the cost of the whole bonus system to the Government as applied to the number of physicians and dentists who are in the military service, not merely the added numbers who will be brought in.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. HUNT. I am sure the Senator understands that the pending bill has no bearing whatsoever on those who have been taken or who will be taken into the Medical Department prior to September 2, 1952.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, their bonus will continue?

Mr. HUNT. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Wyoming made that clear in his statement on Thursday, but the amendment which the senior Senator from Illinois has proposed aims virtually to eliminate the $100 bonus not merely for the additional doctors and dentists to be brought into the service, but for all those who are already in the service.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. I am sure the Senator understands that should his amendment prevail, the situation would be such that every physician and every dentist taken into the service by September 2, 1952, would receive $100 a month extra, while those taken in after September 2, 1952, would not receive $100 a month, but would receive $5 a month extra. So we would have two men, possibly from the same school, with exactly the same education, working side by side in the operating room, one receiving $95 a month more than the other receives.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator from Wyoming will look at the amendment, a copy of which I have placed on his desk, he will see that it affects everyone.

Mr. HUNT. That is what I understand.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would mean that instead of everyone getting a bonus of $100, they would get a bonus of $5.

Mr. President, certain things need to be borne in mind. One is that the assumption that all doctors must have 5 years of training before they can go into the military service is, as I think the colloquy developed, only partially true. It is quite possible for doctors to go into the military service after leaving medical school to work in base hospitals as internes or to occupy junior positions in medical battalions and medical units under the supervision of some skilled workers, without a prior period of hospital internship. Therefore, instead of having 5 years prior preparation, a practice of only approximately 3 years will be required in a large percentage of cases.

The second point, which was not mentioned in the discussion of the junior Senator from Wyoming, is that when a doctor does enter the military service he enters at one grade above that at which line officers are expected to enter. A young line officer enters as a second lieutenant or as an ensign and serves a period of time as a second lieutenant or an ensign. When doctors and dentists enter, they come in at one grade above, as first lieutenant or as lieutenant junior grade. Is not that true?

Mr. HUNT. That is true to a certain extent, but it is not always true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not 99.44 percent true?

Mr. HUNT. I should like to draw the Senator's attention to the other end of the line, when they are finishing or about to finish their careers.

The opportunity for a medical officer to become a general or an admiral at the other end of his service is decidedly out of proportion to the opportunity afforded to a line officer. In other words, according to the table of organization, a line officer has 0.75 percent opportunity to become an admiral or a major general, whereas a medical officer has only 0.5 percent opportunity. Thus, the advantage is 3 to 2 in favor of the line officer becoming an admiral or a major general, as compared with a line officer. So I should think that would far more than equal any advantage a medical officer who enters as a first lieutenant may have for a short period of time, over the line officer who enters as a second lieutenant.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I understand the Senator from Wyoming to say that 7½ percent of all men who enter as second lieutenants end by having two stars?

Mr. HUNT. No. According to the table of organization, it is possible for 0.75 percent of all line officers——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Three-quarters of one percent?

Mr. HUNT. To become admirals or major generals; while in the case of medical officers, it is only 0.5 percent, or a ratio of 3 to 2.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator mean that in every 100 second lieutenants or every 100 line officers there will be only three-quarters of one man—if we could divide him—who will be a 2-star officer, whereas in the medical branch it will be only half of a man? I would not say that the difference between being half of 2-stars and three-quarters of two stars is a great detriment to the medical profession. That extra one-quarter percent of a star would not, I

think, deter people from entering the medical profession in the armed services. One would not say, "If I go into the medical service, one-half of me will be an admiral, but three-quarters of a line officer will be an admiral or a major-general. Therefore, I shall not go into the service." I do not believe a rationalistic calculist works in such minute proportions as that.

Mr. HUNT. Far be it from me to attempt on the floor of the Senate to debate mathematics or economics with the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is just simple arithmetic.

Mr. HUNT. The Senator from Illinois knows, as does everyone else on the Senate floor, that we are dealing with the Army, not with the individual.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As I have said, I do not think the difference between a half percent and three-quarters percent is very important, whereas the fact is that the doctors come in as first lieutenants, and line officers come in as second lieutenants. That is a big difference.

Mr. HUNT. Taking a military establishment of 3,000,000 men, it means there are a very great number of line officers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this exchange has established the fact that medical officers enter one grade above line officers—and as they are promoted up through captain, major, and lieutenant colonel, they tend to be promoted more rapidly—and I think perhaps the fact that one-quarter of a man does not stand as much chance to become a two-star general as if he were a line officer. But that is outweighed by the advantages which the medical staff has had along the way.

We should also remember that there were during the war many thousands of doctors trained under the V-12 program, who were exempted from combat duty, whose education was simply limited to preparing them for medicine. I am not criticizing them at all. They go into the military service. I notice that quite a few of them have not gone as yet. After their education has been paid for by the Government, they then get $100 a month more than the men who pay for their own education.

Mr. President, what we are doing here is to pay bonuses to specialists who will experience far less danger and hardship than the combat soldiers. A second lieutenant who leads a rifle platoon, whose casualty rate is the highest, receives no bonus. It sometimes seems as though the bonuses for some grades are paid in inverse ratio to danger, upon the basis of supposed earning power in civilian life, rather than on the basis of contribution to the military service itself.

It seems to me we are setting a very dangerous example in the military service when we pay bonuses to doctors and dentists—and I say that with all justice to them—who do not experience the dangers which the average rifleman experiences.

The eminent Senator from Wyoming mentioned the fact that the first casualty in Korea was that of a dentist. That is true, and all honor to him. But it is also true that the average casualty rate of doctors and dentists is relatively low, and the casualty rate of riflemen in the rifle companies is extremely high. No extra compensation is paid to them.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall yield for a question in a moment.

It is the disparity between sacrifice and reward which I think is repugnant to the idea of fairness.

I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Would the Senator agree, then, that if it is correct to take care of a dentist or a doctor now, we should do something for those whose lives are actually put in danger?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator from New Mexico will remember, the junior Senator from Louisiana, the junior Senator from Michigan, and I jointly sponsored an amendment to provide a bonus for combat soldiers. If we give bonuses at all, then the combat soldiers should certainly get them. But I think we should remove some of the unnecessary, and what I regard as unfair and improper bonuses, lest the infection spread through the entire military system, at great cost to the taxpayers and to the destruction of the morale of the Armed Forces.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe that I could agree with the Senator from Illinois that there should be no generalization. I believe all should be treated alike, but certainly consideration should be given to the one who is sticking his stomach in front of a Communist bayonet. There can be no question about that.

But let me tell the Senator from Illinois of the case of a young man I know, whom I brought to Washington. He worked on one of our elevators, and while doing so he received a certificate from one of our fine dental schools here. Then I saw him receive his commission in the Navy. He was called to the colors, and he answered the call and did his duty. Eventually, he returned to civil life to start in his profession. But, like the average American, he joined the Reserves, and now although he has a family, as he is proceeding to make headway in his profession, and he is going to make good, I am positive—he is called to serve again. Is there any reason why an extra bonus should not be paid to that young man, who is asked to serve his country, perhaps in this instance as a dentist only, but who is leaving his all, his future, his everything?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say to my good friend from New Mexico that the hardship of which he speaks, which the individual dentist suffers, is the same type of hardship suffered by reserves in all other occupations. After the war, the reservists reestablished themselves in civilian life, but they were called back. That is true not only of doctors and dentists, but it is true of lawyers, businessmen, engineers, accountants, clerks, laborers, and farmers. It is true of the whole society. If we are to say that doctors and dentists are to be compensated for that reason, the conclusion is that everyone should receive a bonus. If that is done, two things will happen. The country will go bankrupt, and the armed services will be in great difficulty.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not want to make an exception of dentists and doctors. Personally I believe that the boys who suffered that kind of hardship should be compensated. We are compensating business. We tell businessmen, "You will be granted certain tax relief if you start to manufacture bullets, which may kill someone, or produce bombs to destroy people or cities." We do not worry about the taxpayers' money in that case. But if we are paying a poor dentist or a poor soldier, then, of course, the country is going bankrupt.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say to my good friend from New Mexico that if my amendment to eliminate bonuses for doctors and dentists is rejected, I have a satirical amendment which I intend to offer, extending the same bonus to those who studied for 3 years in law school and have an LL. B., to those who studied in an engineering school and have engineering degrees, to those who have received high school diplomas and have been employed for 7 years prior to the date upon which they enter upon active duty, and to those whose salaries for the month immediately preceding the date of their entry into the armed services were greater than the pay which they received in the armed services. If we are to adopt a policy that there shall be no financial loss, by reason of induction into the armed services in the case of doctors, then, of course, we ought to make the same provision for everyone else. But that would bankrupt the country. I serve notice that while I shall offer such an amendment, it will be for satirical purposes only.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question? He has been very patient.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I feel differently than does my friend from Illinois. I do not look upon the teacher of history as being the only one who is honest, loyal, and patriotic in Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is that an implication that I regard myself as being the only person who is loyal, honest, and patriotic?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it or is it not such an implication?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is not.

Mr DOUGLAS. That is fine. I was about to say that if the Senator wished to make such an implication, I did not teach history. In order to make the illustration precise, I should tell the Senator the subject which I taught.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have too much respect for my friend from Illinois to make that kind of implication.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad of that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. To me an American is an American, whether he teaches history or dentistry, or whether he is in the front lines in Korea.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the Senator's point?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The point is that all should be treated alike.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am inclined to agree with the Senator. I believe that the way to do it is to remove the bonuses. But if we cannot remove the bonuses, then, as I say, for satirical purposes, I shall propose that everyone get a bonus.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I could possibly agree with the Senator from Illinois in removing the bonus, so long as it is removed with respect to all. But there is no particular reason why we should punish a dentist any more than we should punish a professor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Professors as such get no bonuses in the armed services. Today we can cut the bonus for doctors and dentists. Later we shall include the chair corps in the Air Corps. Incidentally, while I am on that point——

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the trouble——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That brings me to a very interesting anomaly. On Thursday the eminent Senator from Wyoming placed in the RECORD the fact that slightly less than a thousand doctors and dentists are not only drawing the medical bonus, but drawing the flight bonus in addition.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I wish to conclude.

Mr. HUNT. Every flight officer draws that bonus. It is not a special thing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certain men are drawing two bonuses. They are drawing a bonus of $100 a month as doctors or dentists, and they are drawing $100 to $210 as flight officers.

Mr. HUNT. Only 7 percent of them draw such a bonus.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well. I read from page 6249 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 29, where the eminent Senator from Wyoming said:

> There are 13,181 physicians in the Department of Defense. Nine-hundred and seventy-five, or 7 percent, of these officers receive flight pay.

Mr. HUNT. There are 20,000 physicians and dentists in the service. Seven percent of them, including two dentists are receiving flight pay. That includes submarine pay.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is all the Senator from Illinois said. He said that slightly less than a thousand receive not only the doctors' bonus, but the flight bonus in addition.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if I may be allowed to finish a paragraph without interruption——

Mr. HUNT. Let me say to my good friend from Illinois that I shall not interrupt him again. However, I have often heard the Senator from Illinois interrupt other Senators.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am delighted to be interrupted, but I desire to conclude the argument.

I had always understood that the flight bonus was paid in order to develop proficient flight officers. But we find doctors who are apparently also pilots, as well as doctors. Apparently they are not only skilled in medicine, but they can take up a fighter plane, a bomber, or one of the new jet planes. In order that they may be trained for flight work, they must receive not only their bonus as doctors, but also a flight bonus of $100 a month for a second lieutenant up to $210 a month for a colonel. If the man happens to be a colonel in the medical corps, he receives a flight bonus of $210, as a flight officer, in addition to a bonus of $100 for being a doctor.

I hardly think it is necessary to make flight officers of these doctors. Thousands of them are receiving both bonuses. It is very difficult to defend or justify their receiving either bonus, but certainly they should not receive both. After my first two amendments are offered, I have a third amendment, which would eliminate the anomaly to which I have referred.

There are large sums of money involved, and great questions of equity are involved. It is a tragic thing that the men in the armed services who take the greatest risks, who receive the wounds and who suffer the most physically, and who as a class suffer the most deaths, receive the lowest pay. The bonuses go to the specialists, those who have prestige on the outside. I think it is wrong.

It has been said that it is necessary to follow such a policy in order to induce doctors to volunteer. I make two comments in that connection. The first is that probably the tables of organization of both the Military and Naval Establishments provide a greater complement of doctors than are actually needed in the Armed Forces. We have established the fact that there are 20,000 physicians and dentists in the services at the present time. We do not have more than 3,700,000 men under arms, if we have that many. That means an approxmiate ratio of 1 doctor to every 185 persons. Among the civilian population we have roughly 1 doctor to every 1,000 population. We are providing six times as much medical care for the same number of persons in the armed services as in civilian life. They are employed to take care of young men in the healthiest period of their lives. It is true that when a division or an army goes into combat, there is great need for the medical service. But not all divisions are in combat at the same time; and there are pooled reserves of doctors lying idle, even while a whole army is engaged in battle.

Persons who have been in the service know fairly well that there is an excess complement of doctors and that it is not necessary to maintain 1 doctor for every 185 persons in the uniformed service. Therefore, we could have some shrinkage in the medical service without any real loss of military effectiveness.

The second point I should like to make is that, according to the figures put in the RECORD on Thursday by the eminent Senator from Wyoming, 11,174 medical officers received training under the Navy's V–12 program, and of that number 8,926 have been on active duty. That leaves 2,200 who have been educated at Government expense and who have not been on active duty. Certainly they should be asked to go on active duty if there is need for medical attention, without getting a $100 bonus a month.

Mr. President, the hour is late, and I do not wish to delay the Senate; I should like to ask for a vote on my amendment, which in effect reduces the entire medical bonus from $100 a month to $5 a month.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Illinois constantly refers to the payment to medical officers as a bonus and as something undeserved. In all the discussions in committee on the bill in 1947 and in 1949 I saw no reference at any time to the word "bonus."

The distinguished Senator from Illinois spoke of the attempt to equalize the pay of physicians and dentists in the military service with the pay of physicians and dentists not in the service. That would be an absolute impossibility. I have some knowledge of what the net income of physicians and dentists is as of today. The bill would equalize the pay of dentists and physicians with the pay of their running mates, or line officers.

The Senator spoke of doing the same thing for lawyers and for engineers, as well as for other technically trained men. I should like to say that personally perhaps I would have no objection to it, but the situation is that such men are not in demand. There is no difficulty at all in getting lawyers and engineers into the service. They are in ample supply. Exactly the opposite is true with reference to physicians and dentists. They are in very great demand in practically every community in the United States.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois said that many doctors and dentists got their education at the expense of the Federal Government. Only a very few of those in the armed services were educated at the expense of the Government, and all have been in service except perhaps 3,000. The reason for that is physical disability. There is a sort of selective service board in every community which passes on the availability of dentists and physicians. Many of the physicians and dentists are declared essential in their local communities and are not allowed to go into the armed services.

I may say also, with reference to line officers, outside of the two service Academies, that practically every line officer who enters as a Reserve officer goes through OCS, which, of course, is supported by the Government.

However, this is the most important point, Mr. President, with reference to the Senator's amendment. In 1947 and again in 1949 the Armed Services Committees of the House and the Senate approved, and the House and the Senate passed similar bills, and now again in 1951 the Armed Services Committee approved this bill.

Let me say that a firm contract—an honest agreement and understanding—has been entered into with the men who are now in the service to receive $100 a month. I should hate to be one Member of the Senate who would break faith with a solemn obligation of the United States Government, brought about by the action of Congress, and take the $100 a month away from men who went into the service under that agreement, with certainly no expectation that the Senate would ever repudiate an honest agreement, entered into in good faith.

The Senator spoke of flight pay. There are a few medical officers who get flight pay; but, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that those who get flight pay are actually rendering flight service with injured men and with patients, which makes it necessary to go into the air and spend time in planes. I am not saying that is true in every case; but I am advised that it is true in nearly all cases.

Mr. President, I do not think the amendment has any place in the bill. It would break faith with those in the service. It would greatly lower the morale of the physicians and dentists in the service, and I think it would even affect the type of service our men in the armed services are now receiving.

I am hopeful that the Senate will reject the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I hope we can get a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment. Therefore, I trust that the Members of the Senate who are in the Chamber will be willing to hold up their hands to second my request for a yea-and-nay vote. If we are not able to have such a vote, I shall be compelled to suggest the absence of a quorum. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS (when his name was called). Mr. President, has any Senator voted thus far?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No Senator has yet voted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I privileged to make a clarifying remark, then?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I merely wish to explain that this amendment would reduce from $100 a month to $5 a month the bonuses now being paid to all doctors and dentists in the Armed Forces. Such a provision is submitted as an amendment, so that the bill will apply not only to those who are entering the armed services, as the original bill would do, but also to those who already are in the armed services.

Now that the vote is under way, I answer "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I most respectfully say that I object to that procedure, because I was going to ask a question of the Senator from Illinois; but when he concluded his remarks, he voted "yea." However, if the yeas and nays are now to be called, after the Senator from Illinois has made an explanatory statement, we must begin again with the first name on the roll.

In other words, Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry, namely, at this time is it not necessary to have the yeas and nays commenced again, beginning with the first name on the roll?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, the Chair rules that the roll call has been voided, and the clerk will start again the call of the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. At this time, Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Illinois: If the incentive pay of doctors and dentists is to be reduced from $100 a month to $5 a month, would it be better to reduce it to nothing? I ask that question because it seems to me that it would be an unfair gesture to cut the incentive pay from $100 to $5.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In view of the fact that on two other occasions I have been told that the pending bill would merely extend the $100 payment to other groups who have not previously been covered by such a measure, it is obvious that merely to reject such a bill would not be very important. Therefore I have offered my amendment, so that by means of it we can reduce the bonuses going to the doctors and dentists who already are in the armed services. That is the parliamentary way by which we can strike at the bonus itself.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say that in 1947 I was a member of the committee when a bill similar to this was before us. I had some doubts about the bill at the time. I voted for the bill for the reason that, first, substantial numbers of men in the Armed Forces were without the services of a doctor, which indicated that more doctors were needed. My second reason was that a doctor must have four more years of training than the average person in the Armed Forces is required to have. My third reason was that I understand that doctors and dentists can be compelled to enter the armed services against their will, ahead of those in the other professions.

Of course, some of the doctors and dentists who have entered the armed services have done so because they wished to make that service a career. So it seems to me that it would be very unfair, after those professional men have entered the Armed Forces for the purpose of making military service a career, now to take away from them a portion of their pay.

I wish to say to my friend, the Senator from Illinois, for whom I have the utmost respect, that the entire question of incentive pay is a very difficult one, and I think it should be restudied. However, to act in the arbitrary way now proposed I think would be most unfair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In addition to the arguments which have been advanced by the Senator from Massachusetts, is it not also true that the medical officers are advanced in rank more slowly than almost any other group of commissioned officers in the armed services, for the reason that the officer in charge of a hospital is a colonel, and thus it is required that the officers serving under him must be of lower rank?

I know that when I was a member of the Armed Services Committee, we went into this matter, and we found that medical officers were not advanced as rapidly in rank as are other commissioned officers, for the reason that they must have lower rank than that of the head of the hospital, who is always a colonel. Such an arrangement works a hardship on the officers who serve under an officer who is the head of a hospital.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to the Senator from Colorado that I cannot answer his question factually, but I believe that the senior officer in charge of a hospital is a colonel in rank, and that therefore all doctors serving under him must have lower rank.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot state that as a fact.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that I am sure all of us realize that many outstanding surgeons serve in Army hospitals, but all of them must be under the command of a colonel, for they must not outrank him. That fact may not constitute the only reason for the rather slow advance in rank of medical officers. However, it has always seemed to me that the rank of medical officers who serve in various branches of the armed services appears to be too low.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I speak with some knowledge of the situation, for in World War I my own father was a colonel. He entered the service as a colonel, and he left it as a colonel. He could not rise to a higher rank, because he was in charge of a hospital.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield for either a question or an observation.

Mr. CORDON. I prefer to ask a question. I wish to inquire whether the advance in rank of the commissioned personnel in the Medical Corps is slower than that of other commissioned personnel? If that be so, then in this case are we to compound one error with another error?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. To the best of my memory, that point was not discussed when the hearings on this bill were held.

The main point stressed was the scarcity of doctors in comparison with the number of men in the Armed Forces. Other points discussed were the additional training a doctor must have before he can qualify and the added difficulty in inducing doctors—inasmuch as generally they are somewhat older, by the time they are qualified, than are those who serve in other professions—to enter the armed services as a career.

I do not think the proposed reduction in pay should be made after doctors have entered the armed services on the basis of the inducements which have been offered. I would prefer to vote against any incentive pay at all, rather than to vote for the proposed reduction to $5, because I say most respectfully to my friend, the Senator from Illinois, that if the amendment to reduce the incentive pay to $5 were agreed to, it would constitute almost a slap in the face.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield on this point?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is my colleague serious when he says he would prefer to vote for an amendment which would directly eliminate the bonus pay? In other words, is he making an offer in that connection? If so, I have drafted an amendment on that point.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Illinois realizes from what I have tried to say that I have not made an offer. I shall vote against his amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Massachusetts vote against an amendment to do away with all incentive pay?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would at this time. I am a member of a subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], that is studying the entire question of such pay, and I believe that matter should be further studied.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield for a question or I yield the floor.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Massachusetts has stated that he believes the entire matter of incentive pay should be restudied. I agree 100 percent with him.

What assurance, if any, can the Senator from Massachusetts give the Senate that the question will be restudied? Is there any hope, even, that presently we shall have before us for consideration a well-studied recommendation, upon which we can act?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not wish to anticipate the decisions which will be reached by the Armed Services Committee. All I can say to the Senator from Oregon is that under the leadership of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], there is a subcommittee which expects to make a report very soon. The members of that subcommittee include the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], myself, and several other Senators, including the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. We shall report on the question of incentive pay.

The Armed Services Committee as a whole will have to pass on our report, of course. However, I know that some of us believe the subject should be studied very carefully. I hope the report the subcommittee makes will be accepted.

Mr. CORDON. Then, am I to understand from the Senator from Massachusetts that at this time a subcommittee is making an over-all study of the over-all question of incentive pay?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The study was primarily directed to flying pay, submarine pay, and parachute pay, but certainly medical officers' pay could well be included, and I think it should be.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will my good friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether it is true that when the military pay bill was before the Senate, and when I questioned the bonuses in connection with that measure, it was said that that matter was being studied by a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee? I think that is true, and it led to the rejection of some of the amendments I offered.

Now, 2 months later, we have—not at the initiative of the Senator from Illinois, but at the initiative of the Armed Services Committee—another bill, one which would extend the bonus system or equalizing payments or disequalizing payments or a lop-sided system to still other groups; and yet when we try to strike at all provision for that system, in an attempt virtually to abolish it, it is said that the study of it should be continued. The Senate must act upon it at some time. I think we have had sufficient discussion on this amendment so that the Senate is ready to act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays having been ordered——

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. PASTORE], the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY and Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Georgia, [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 4, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—4

Douglas	Robertson	Smathers
Hennings		

NAYS—50

Aiken	Johnson, Colo.	Mundt
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Nixon
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Kerr	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Lodge	Seaton
Duff	Long	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Malone	Smith, N. J.
Ferguson	Martin	Stennis
Fulbright	Maybank	Taft
Hayden	McCarran	Thye
Hickenlooper	McCarthy	Watkins
Hill	McClellan	Welker
Holland	McFarland	Wiley
Hunt	McKellar	Williams
Ives	Millikin	Young
Jenner	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—42

Anderson	Ecton	Lehman
Bennett	Ellender	Magnuson
Benton	Flanders	McMahon
Brewster	Frear	Moody
Bricker	George	Morse
Bridges	Gillette	Murray
Butler, Md.	Green	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Hendrickson	O'Conor
Byrd	Hoey	Pastore
Capehart	Humphrey	Russell
Carlson	Kefauver	Smith, N. C.
Case	Kem	Sparkman
Chavez	Knowland	Tobey
Eastland	Langer	Underwood

So, Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment, which I should like to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, beginning with line 23, it is proposed to strike out through line 4, page 4, and insert the following:

(b) amending subsection 203 (b) to read as follows:

"(b) In addition to any pay, allowances, or special pay that they are otherwise entitled to receive, commissioned officers as defined in subsection (a) of this section shall be entitled to receive special pay at the rate of $100 per month for each month of active service: *Provided*, That such sums shall not be included in computing the amount of increase in pay authorized by any other provision of this act or in computing retired pay, disability retirement pay, or any severance pay: *Provided further*, That the commissioned officers described in subsection (a) (4) of this section who are called or ordered to active duty without their consent shall not be entitled to receive the pay provided by this subsection for any period prior to September 9, 1950: *Provided further*, That no commissioned officer as described in subsection (a) of this section shall (1) while he is serving as a medical or dental interne or (2) while he is receiving incentive pay pursuant to the provisions of section 204 of this act be entitled to receive the special pay of $100 per month as is provided in this subsection: *And provided further*, That no commissioned officer as described in subsection (a) shall be entitled to receive the special pay of $100 per month provided for in this subsection unless the primary duty to which he is assigned during such month requires the performance of services in which professional medical or dental training is necessary."

Mr. DOUGLAS. My head is bloody but unbowed from the previous vote. I had intended to offer a satirical amendment, and then withdraw it, the idea being that if the Senate believed this bonus was necessary for doctors because of their special training, it should also be extended to engineers, lawyers, and those who have high earnings in business and industry, and to those who have been out of school for a given period of time. However, because of the lateness of the hour, I shall not offer that amendment. I hope, however, the committee will accept the pending amendment, because what it primarily aims to do is to prevent a doctor or a dentist from getting both a medical bonus and a flight bonus at the same time.

I should like to emphasize that approximately 1,000 officers—975, to be precise—who are receiving double bonuses, really cannot be said to be aviators. They are not aviators. If they are doctors, they will receive the medical bonus. Well and good. I do not believe they should get even that, but if the Senate believes that they should receive a medical bonus, very well. But why should they get a flight bonus on top of that? The two bonuses together will come to an average of about $275 a month, or roughly $3,500 a year, over and above what other men in the same grades would receive.

Here is a chance to remove the worst case of injustice and, in the process, to save $1,500,000. I hope the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I find myself unable to accept this amendment. There are 20,000 medical officers in the services. Only 7 percent of them are receiving flight pay. I say to the Senate that while I am not positive of the exact number, they are really in the air, flying with patients, carrying on their duties directly with the flying service. There are less than 1,000 of the 20,000 who fall into that category, and certainly a good many of the 975 are actually in the air, flying. They do not need to be flying planes, but they are in the air and are subject to the same hazards as though they were pilots.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Are they pilots?

Mr. HUNT. No: they are physicians.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Are they merely riding in planes?

Mr. HUNT. No; they are administering to patients in planes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understand, but in doing that they are not in greater danger than is the patient in the plane, are they?

Mr. HUNT. No; but I think the Senator from Arkansas will understand, as to flight pay that is received by the Air Corps, that many receive flight pay simply for being in a plane. The reference is not to pilots.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That may be so, but I do not agree with it. The point I am making is about giving a doctor two bonuses. I voted against the other amendment; but to give a doctor two bonuses because he rides in a plane, just as all our boys ride in planes when they are being shipped somewhere, does not seem right to me.

Mr. HUNT. Even with the $100 equalizing pay, a medical officer still comes out, after his 30 years' career service, nearly $10,000 behind a line officer.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It may be true that some adjustment is needed, but after giving certain officers, doctors, a bonus or incentive pay for being doctors, because they are professional men and because they have expended their own resources to qualify for higher duty, would it not be setting an unwise precedent then to give them extra pay simply because they perform their duty sitting in a plane, when we are putting privates in planes and are shipping them all around the country?

Mr. HUNT. Does the Senator from Arkansas understand that the flight pay to doctors and dentists is no different from that given to other officers?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not understand that flight pay is granted to other officers if they merely happen to ride in a plane. I understand we pay them as pilots, if they pilot a plane for so many hours a month.

Mr. HUNT. When doctors are up in a plane and are administering medical service, they are certainly endangering their lives.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Certainly; and so is everyone else in the plane.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, with reference to the second part of the amendment, which provides that equalizing pay shall be paid only to those who are actually administering medical services——

Mr. DOUGLAS. The phrase is:

Unless the primary duty to which he is assigned during such month requires the performance of services in which professional medical or dental training is necessary.

He does not have to be performing medical services but medical or dental training must be required before he can get the bonus. This means that an administrative officer running a hospital, even though he does not actually take care of patients, would still be qualified.

Mr. HUNT. To the best of my knowledge, this amendment would apply to one individual in the Military Establishment, and that individual is rendering technical dental services to the Selective Service. Certainly he is not operating at the chair, but he is acting in the capacity of adviser on medical matters. If I am correct, the amendment applies to only one individual.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know of one individual—I do not wish to mention his name, because I do not want to single him out—who has a position in the Selective Service which, I am told, has almost nothing to do with dental service. But I am informed that this person is drawing what my friend from Wyoming calls equalization payment, but what I call disequalizing pay, or a lopsided bonus.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for a division.

The Senate proceeded to divide.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Kilgore
Cain	Hennings	Lodge
Chavez	Hickenlooper	Long
Clements	Hill	Malone
Connally	Holland	Martin
Cordon	Hunt	Maybank
Dirksen	Ives	McCarran
Douglas	Jenner	McCarthy
Duff	Johnson, Colo.	McClellan
Dworshak	Johnson, Tex.	McFarland
Ferguson	Johnston, S. C.	McKellar
Fulbright	Kerr	Millikin

Monroney	Seaton	Watkins
Mundt	Smathers	Welker
Nixon	Smith, Maine	Wiley
O'Mahoney	Smith, N. J.	Williams
Robertson	Stennis	Young
Saltonstall	Taft	
Schoeppel	Thye	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 3019) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended by—

(a) Amending subsection 203 (a) to read as follows:

"(a) The term 'commissioned officers,' as used in this section, shall be interpreted to mean only (1) those commissioned officers in the Medical and Dental Corps of, or designated as medical or dental officers in, the Regular Army, Navy, and Air Force and commissioned medical and dental officers of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service who were on active duty on September 1, 1947; (2) those commissioned officers in the Medical and Dental Corps of, or designated as medical or dental officers in, the Regular Army, Navy, and Air Force and commissioned medical and dental officers of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, who were retired prior to September 1, 1947, and who thereafter but prior to July 1, 1953, have been or may be assigned to active duty; (3) those officers who, heretofore but subsequent to September 1, 1947, have been or who, prior to July 1, 1953, may be commissioned in the Medical and Dental Corps of, or designated as medical or dental officers in, the Regular Army, Navy, and Air Force or as medical and dental officers of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service; (4) such officers who on September 1, 1947, were or who thereafter have been or may be commissioned in the Medical and Dental Corps of, or designated as medical or dental officers in, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the United States Air Force Reserve, the Naval Reserve, the National Guard, the National Guard of the United States, the Air National Guard, the Air National Guard of the United States, the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, or as medical and dental officers of the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service and who heretofore, but subsequent to September 1, 1947, have been called or ordered to extended active duty of 1 year or longer, or who may, prior to July 1, 1953, be called or ordered to extended active duty of 1 year or longer; (5) general officers appointed from the Medical and Dental Corps of, or previously designated as medical or dental officers in, the Regular Army, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, the National Guard of the United States, the Army of the United States, the Regular Air Force, the United States Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard, the Air National Guard of the United States, and the Air Force of the United States who were on active duty on September 1, 1947; and (6) general officers who, subsequent to September 1, 1947, have been or who may be appointed from those officers of the Medical and Dental Corps of, or from those officers designated as medical or dental officers in, the Regular Army, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, the National Guard of the United States, the Army of the United States, the Regular Air Force, the United States Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard, the Air National Guard of the United States, and the Air Force of the United States who are included in parts (1), (2), (3), or (4), of this subsection."

(b) Deleting the second proviso of subsection 203 (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided further*, That the commissioned officers described in subsection (a) (4) of this section who are called or ordered to active duty without their consent shall not be entitled to receive the pay provided by this subsection for any period prior to September 9, 1950."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 828, ch. 939), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. Section 1 of this act shall be effective as of October 1, 1949. Appropriations currently available for pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services shall be available for retroactive payments authorized under this act.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to extend the application of the special-inducement pay provided thereby to physicians and dentists, and for other purposes."

CONTINUANCE OF CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS—AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT, 1916

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1526, Senate bill 2437.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2437) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments, on page 2, line 14, after "(58 Stat. 838)", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That not more than 25 percent of the amount apportioned to any State in any year for expenditure on the Federal-aid highway system or on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, respectively, may be transferred from the Federal-aid highway system for expenditure on the Federal-aid secondary highway system or from the Federal-aid secondary highway system for expenditure on the Federal-aid highway system when such transfer is requested and certified as being in the public interest by the State highway department and is approved by the Commissioner of Public Roads."

On page 3, after line 11, to insert:

SEC. 2. For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate highways, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law for the apportionment of Federal-aid primary funds: *Provided*, That the Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be determined in the same manner as now provided by law for projects on said Federal-aid primary system.

On page 4, line 4, to change the section number from "2" to "3"; in line 7, after the word "of", to strike out "$32,000,000" and insert "$25,000,000"; in line 11, after the word "of", to strike out "$28,000,000" and insert "$22,500,000"; in line 18, to change the section number from "3" to "4"; in line 19, after the word "improvement", to strike out the comma and "and maintenance."

On page 5, line 1, after the word "of", to strike out "$16,000,000" and insert "$10,000,000"; in line 8, after the word "of", to strike out "$17,000,000" and insert "$10,000,000"; in line 24, to change the section number from "4" to "5"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "Section" and insert "for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section."

On page 6, line 4, after "(55 Stat. 869)," to strike out "is hereby amended to read as follows:" and insert "as amended by section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785)"; in line 7, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "There" and insert "there"; in line 16, after the word "and" where it occurs the second time, to insert "completion of"; in line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "one-third"; at the beginning of line 25, to strike out "The expenditures authorized by this section shall be made in accordance with all provisions and limitations in section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950."

On page 7, line 3, to change the section number from "5" to "6"; in line 21, after the word "width", to insert "where practicable."

On page 8, line 13, after "December", to strike out "14" and insert "15"; in line 14, after the word "parties", to insert "or any other treaty or international convention establishing similar reciprocal recognition;"; in line 23, after the name "Rama", to insert "and for a survey but not for the construction of a road from Rama to El Bluff."

On page 9, after line 4, to strike out:

SEC. 6. Not to exceed $15,000,000 of any money heretofore or hereafter appropriated for expenditure in accordance with the provision of the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, shall be available for expenditure by the Commissioner

of Public Roads in accordance with the provision of section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785) as an emergency relief fund.

After line 11, to insert:

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized an emergency fund in the amount of $15,000,000 for expenditure by the Commissioner of Public Roads, in accordance with the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, after receipt of an application therefor from the highway department of any State, in the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges on the Federal-aid highway systems, which he shall find have suffered serious damage as the result of disaster over a wide area, such as by floods, hurricanes, tidal waves, earthquakes, severe storms, landslides, or other catastrophes in any part of the United States. The appropriation of such moneys as may be necessary for the initial establishment of this fund and for its replenishment on an annual basis is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That, pending the appropriation of said sum, or its replenishment, the Commissioner of Public Roads may expend, from existing Federal-aid highway appropriations, such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriations herein authorized when made: *Provided further*, That no expenditures shall be made hereunder with respect to any such catastrophe in any State unless an emergency has been declared by the Governor of such State and concurred in by the Secretary of Commerce: *And provided further*, That the Federal share payable on account of any repair or reconstruction project provided for by funds made available under this section shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost thereof.

On page 10, line 15, to change the section number from "7" to "8"; in line 21, after the word "of", to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$2,500,000"; in line 24 to change the section number from "8" to "9."

On page 11, after line 5, to strike out:

SEC. 9. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765), as amended, and section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $150,000,000 to remain available until expended.

After line 11, to insert:

SEC. 10. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765), as amended, and section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $50,000,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That whenever any project for the construction or improvement of a circumferential highway around a city or of a radial intracity route thereto submitted by any State, is certified by the Secretary of Defense, or such other official as the President may designate, as being important for civilian or military defense, such project may be constructed under the authorization in this section and in accordance with the conditions contained therein.

At the top of page 12, to insert:

SEC. 11. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838); the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1105); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950, not inconsistent with this act, shall remain in full force and effect.

In line 7, to change the section number from "10" to "12"; in line 13, to change the section number from "11" to "13"; and in line 16, to change the section number from "12" to "14", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

(a) $270,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid highway system.

(b) $180,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system.

(c) $150,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid highway system in urban areas.

The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year, respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838).

Any sums apportioned to any State under the provision of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 18 months after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Commissioner of Public Roads for the improvement of specific projects as provided by this act.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate highways, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law for the apportionment of Federal-aid primary funds: *Provided*, That the Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be determined in the same manner as now provided by law for projects on said Federal-aid primary system.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of $22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: *Provided*, That the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in accordance with the provision of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

SEC. 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

(b) For the construction, reconstruction, improvement, and maintenance of parkways, authorized by acts of Congress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

(c) For the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: *Provided*, That the location, type, and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved by the Commissioner of Public Roads before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be under the general supervisions of the Commissioner of Public Roads.

SEC. 5. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide for cooperation with Central American Republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway," approved December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860), as amended by section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the sums heretofore authorized, the sum of $8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and a like sum for each fiscal year thereafter up to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, to be available until expended, to enable the United States to cooperate with the governments of the American Republics situated in Central America—that is, with the governments of the Republics of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama—in the survey and completion of construction of the Inter-American Highway within the borders of the aforesaid Republics, respectively. Not to exceed one-third of the appropriation authorized for each fiscal year may be expended without requiring the country or countries in which such sums may be expended to match any part thereof, if the Secretary of State shall find that the cost of constructing said highway in such country or countries will be beyond their reasonable capacity to bear.

SEC. 6. Recognizing the mutual benefits that will accrue to the Republic of Nicaragua and to the United States from the completion of the road from San Benito to Rama in said Republic of Nicaragua, the construction of which road was begun and partially completed pursuant to an agreement between said Republic and the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $8,000,000 for completing the construction of such road, to be available until expended. No expenditure shall be made hereunder for the construction of said road until a request therefor shall have been received by the Secretary of State from the Government of the Republic of Nicaragua nor until an agreement shall have been entered into by said Republic with the Secretary of State which shall provide, in part, that said Republic—

(1) will provide, without participation of funds herein authorized, all necessary right-of-way for the construction of said highway, which right-of-way shall be of a minimum width where practicable of 100 meters in rural areas and 50 meters in municipalities

and shall forever be held inviolate as a part of the highway for public use;

(2) will not impose any highway toll, or permit any such toll to be charged, for the use of said highway by vehicles or persons;

(3) will not levy or assess, directly or indirectly, any fee, tax, or other charge for the use of said road by vehicles or persons from the United States that does not apply equally to vehicles or persons of such Republic;

(4) will continue to grant reciprocal recognition of vehicle registration and drivers' licenses in accordance with the provision of the Convention for the Regulation of Inter-American Automotive Traffic, which was opened for signature at the Pan American Union in Washington on December 15, 1943, and to which such Republic and the United States are parties or any other treaty or international convention establishing similar reciprocal recognition; and

(5) will maintain said road after its completion in proper condition adequately to serve the needs of present and future traffic.

(b) The funds appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall be available for expenditure in accordance with the terms of this act for the survey and construction of the said road from San Benito to Rama, and for a survey but not for the construction of a road from Rama to El Bluff in the Republic of Nicaragua without being matched by said Republic, and all expenditures made under the provisions of this act for materials, equipment, and supplies, shall, whenever practicable, be made for products of the United States or of the Republic of Nicaragua.

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized an emergency fund in the amount of $15,000,000 for expenditure by the Commissioner of Public Roads, in accordance with the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, after receipt of an application therefor from the highway department of any State, in the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges on the Federal-aid highway systems, which he shall find have suffered serious damage as the result of disaster over a wide area, such as by floods, hurricanes, tidal waves, earthquakes, severe storms, landslides, or other catastrophes in any part of the United States. The appropriation of such moneys as may be necessary for the initial establishment of this fund and for its replenishment on an annual basis is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That, pending the appropriation of said sum, or its replenishment, the Commissioner of Public Roads may expend, from existing Federal-aid highway appropriations, such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made: *Provided further*, That no expenditures shall be made hereunder with respect to any such catastrophe in any State unless an emergency has been declared by the Governor of such State and concurred in by the Secretary of Commerce: *And provided further*, That the Federal share payable on account of any repair or reconstruction project provided for by funds made available under this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost thereof.

SEC. 8. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations the sum of $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 9. The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized and directed to assist in carrying out the action program of the President's Highway Safety Conference and to cooperate with the State highway departments and other agencies in this program to advance the cause of safety on the streets and highways: *Provided*, That not to exceed $100,000 shall be expended annually for the purposes of this section.

SEC. 10. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765), as amended, and section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $50,000,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That whenever any project for the construction or improvement of a circumferential highway around a city or of a radial intracity route thereto submitted by any State, is certified by the Secretary of Defense, or such other official as the President may designate, as being important for civilian or military defense, such project may be constructed under the authorization in this section and in accordance with the conditions contained therein.

SEC. 11. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838); the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, as approved June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1105); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950, not inconsistent with this act, shall remain in full force and effect.

SEC. 12. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 13. That all acts or parts of acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed, and this act shall take effect on its passage.

SEC. 14. This act may be cited as the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not know how much progress we can make this evening. I appreciate the fact that Senators have remained in the Chamber. I did not give notice of a night session tonight. The Senate will meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. We have two bills to pass, the pending bill and the independent offices appropriation bill, so, unless we can complete consideration of those two bills before evening, we shall have a night session. We are going to make more progress than we have made today. We have spent altogether too much time waiting for quorum calls.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say the Senate will meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; the Senate will meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, we have wasted so much time during the afternoon that perhaps some people would find it difficult to appreciate what we are doing. I would ask Senators who are in the Chamber, kindly Senators and serious Senators, who want to enact constructive legislation, to remember that the Committee on Public Works of the Senate is not a political committee. We deal with constructive work.

We are now considering Senate bill 2437. All I am asking of Senators is to be patient for a few minutes at least, and that instead of discussing who is going to be President next year, or this, that, or the other subject, we do something for the United States.

The bill I am presenting provides for what? It provides for continuing into a fiscal years 1954 and 1955 the policy of Federal aid in the construction and improvement of the Nation's highways. Is that important? I ask every Senator on both sides of the aisle whether it is important. This is continuing legislation. It is not new legislation. It is not new legislation in the sense of establishing new programs or commitments of new policy. It merely continues the policy and programs of Federal aid to highway improvements which were first adopted by Congress—when? In 1916—and which have been continued in force ever since.

The bill provides the necessary authorizations for another 2-year period to maintain the guiding hand of Federal aid, which has estimated development of the greatest system in the world.

There can be no question about the need for highway development. The principal question involved is how much or how little money we shall invest in the program. It is a question of whether we provide only enough to maintain our existing roads or whether we provide enough to improve and extend the roads. We find very few people who are willing to let our highways deteriorate.

The records show that we have done very little to improve our highways during the past 10 years. During World War II we stopped all highway construction except defense roads, and since the end of the war we have not yet been able to make up entirely for the battering which the wartime traffic gave our highways.

In other words, this is what happened: All our highways, whether they be in Massachusetts, Michigan, Kansas, Washington, or elsewhere, were designed to take care of 2-ton trucks. Today the trucks are much larger and the roads are still feeling the effects of the wartime traffic. I want Senators to please believe that our committee does not give a continental about what anyone's politics are. We are trying to do constructive work for roads. We may have come to wrong conclusions about dollars and cents, but we know that we need roads, whether they cost 50 cents or 60 cents.

As I have said, the records show that we have done very little to improve our highways during the past 10 years, and during World War II we stopped all highway construction except defense roads. Since the end of the war we have not yet been able to entirely make up for the battering which the wartime traffic gave our highways. Yet in the past 10-year period the traffic on the highways has increased from 34,000,000 vehicles to 52,000,000 vehicles in 1952. In other words, there has been an increase of 18,000,000 vehicles during the past 10 year period. There are now 52,000,000 vehicles on our roads. Is the bill

important? Is it as important as whether dentists shall get $100 a month more in pay? I am asking, in all seriousness and without any idea of politics of the Senators who are so kind as to be present, to do something for Uncle Sam and for Uncle Sam's people. I repeat, in the past 10 years the traffic on the highways has increased from 34,000,000 vehicles to 52,000,000 vehicles. The number of miles traveled on the highways per year now amounts to 600,000,000,000 miles, or approximately double the miles of highway travel 10 years ago. Today there is an average of one car for every three people in the Nation. Every source of factual research—and I am referring to factual research, without inquiring into anyone's politics or whether he was elected by a particular political party—shows that our highway system is not meeting the expansion of highway traffic, and the people who drive the cars and trucks today know it only too well. That is true whether a person drives a car from Arlington, Va., to Washington, or from Washington, D. C., to St. Louis, or between any other two places.

Our highway engineers tell us that we are not even keeping up with obsolescence. The roads are wearing out faster than we can rebuild or replace them.

Senators may think that Europe is important; or they may think that Asia is important. Let me say that only the thing that keeps the United States together is our roads; it is transportation. The constitution uses the expression "United States of America." Do Senators know what united the United States? It was transportation, believe it or not. That is what did it. In the olden days after the Civil War southerners were cursing the Yankees in the North. Yankees were cursing the rebels in the South. Both of them were cursing the wild and woolly westerners. Do Senators know what united the United States? It was the 1916 law. That law made transportation possible. That is all that this bill is trying to do now.

Highway engineers tell us that it would take about $32,000,000,000 to bring the Federal-aid systems up to first-class condition. If we spread the amount over as long a period as 10 years, it would mean that we should double the present annual amount of Federal aid, and bring it up to $1,000,000,000 a year. If we needed to be concerned only with our domestic affairs, that is the amount of highway aid we should be providing today, because it would repay generous dividends. But unfortunately, whether we like it or not, we must face the fact that international uncertainties have forced heavy defense expenditures upon us. So, in highway aid, as in so many other things, we cannot do as much as we should do.

The pending bill, therefore, does little more than give assurance that our highways will not suffer greatly from deterioration in the next 2 years. In comparison with the present authorization, the bill authorizes barely enough to cover the increase in price levels during the past 2 years. This bill is admittedly a stopgap measure, recommended in the hope that 2 years hence conditions will be such that in this field we can provide for the aid needed to get off dead center and begin to move forward.

The committee report on Senate bill 2437 contains as explanation of the bill in detail.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wonder whether the Senator from New Mexico would be willing to have proposed at this time a unanimous-consent agreement providing for a limitation of debate on the bill, to begin at 10 o'clock in the morning?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would not mind a limitation on debate; but there are few times when we can get many Senators here on bills such as this one; but a number of Senators would probably be here if the Senate were considering a bill relating to Indonesia or a bill relating to China or a bill relating to France or a bill relating to Italy, or a similar bill. I wish Senators would pay a little attention to what affects the United States of America.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand the Senator's point. However, if the Senator from New Mexico does not object, I should like to attempt to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement for a limitation of debate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know that my friend, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], would love to continue to listen to my remarks.

Mr. McFARLAND. I realize that, but I wondered whether the Senator from New Mexico would be willing to let me propose a unanimous consent agreement at this time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I prefer to continue with my remarks at this time, Mr. President.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know that Senators believe it is important to consider the decision just reached by the Supreme Court, and it is important. But, Mr. President, believe me, getting the farmer out of the mud is also important. So I wish to discuss this bill. I hope my good friend, the economizer from Michigan, will follow me in these remarks.

This bill will do what has been done since 1916, so far as roads and road bills are concerned. Since 1916, Congress has been passing authorization bills in behalf of the American people—not in behalf of the Republican Party or in behalf of the Democratic Party, but in behalf of the American people. I think that is a fine idea. My good friend, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Roads. I ask him now whether at any time any effort has been made to play politics with this bill or with anything having to do with public roads for the American people. Roads affect all of us, just as floods do. A flood in Republican Kansas may do as much harm as one in Democratic Mississippi.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is not Kansas going Democratic in the next election?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall not get into politics now. I am trying to have the Senate pass a constructive bill in the interest of the American people, namely, the road bill, the one bill which has for its purpose its getting the farmer out of the mud.

Mr. President, the farmers need roads. The farmers do not care under what political auspices the road bills are presented in Congress; the farmers simply wish to have the road bills passed and the roads constructed. The roads are for the use of all, for the use of Republicans, for the use of Democrats. Once a road is built, it is available to everyone; it makes no difference what may be the political faith of the driver of an automobile or truck that rolls down the road.

Two years ago, in 1950, the road authorization bill called for $500,000,000 for the primary, secondary, and urban system. This time the committee, in the best faith, in an attempt to save money, but at the same time in an attempt to maintain the American way of life, recommends an authorization of $600,000,000. That was recommended, not because the committee wished to have $100,000,000 more made available to those who build the roads, but because—regardless of whether we like it or not—$100,000,000 more is needed to do today what we could have done 2 or 3 years ago with $500,000,000. That is the explanation of the situation. So the committee recommends $600,000,000 for the primary, secondary, and urban system.

All of us know what the urban system is. In Illinois it is United States Route 66; in my State it is United States Route 85; in Maryland it is United States Route No. 1, and so forth.

This bill also relates to secondary roads and to the farm-to-market roads. Is any Member of the Senate opposed to the building of such roads? If so, let him rise now and say so.

Mr. President, I say God bless the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. When it comes to roads, as well as other subjects, he thinks—and he thinks correctly—not as a Democrat from Arizona, but as an American citizen who is trying to help every State in the Union. The urban system has to do with places such as Baltimore, Washington, Chicago, Detroit; the urban system relates to them more than it does to the Western States, from which come most of the members of the committee.

Then we come to the interstate highway system. The roads in that system are related to the national defense; they are the roads which will connect Baltimore with San Francisco.

Then we come to the forest highways. Let me say that I am sorry that at this time so few Senators are in the Chamber. Neither the American people as a whole nor the Senate itself realize at this moment the tremendous assets we have in the State of my good friend, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. Many of those assets belong to the American people. In the State of the Senator from Washington, 150,000 board-feet of lumber can be obtained from 1 acre of land. The people are not aware of those assets and their importance. We are try-

ing to provide for forest highways which will connect the interstate highways with the national system of roads through the forests.

Then we come to the forest access roads. They make available millions and millions of acres of the finest timberland which belongs to the American people. Is is necessary that highways be built so that timber can be reached?

Mr. President, this bill is not brought forward in self-interest; this bill actually relates to economics.

Then there are the roads in the national parks and parkways and the Indian reservation roads. Many of us are constantly worried about the Indians, and we sympathize very greatly with them. Mr. President, my colleagues should not merely feel sorry for the Indians; my colleagues should let the Indians help themselves. What the Indians need are roads to enable them to have contacts with others. After all, this bill calls for only a small sum—$10,000,000—for that purpose. As a matter of fact, the Indians have been robbed of more than that amount.

Then there are the roads through the public lands. As is known by my friend, the Senator from Washington, who is ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Roads, in the West we have many public lands. In my State, 63 percent of the area belongs to the Federal Government. Thirty-seven percent of my State pays for the cost of the State government. In Arizona the proportion is about the same. In Nevada approximately 88 percent of the land belongs to the Federal Government.

So this bill calls for a little—but only a very little—to take care of the road system for the public lands. For instance, the bill calls for $600,000,000—$100,000,000 more than was called for 2 years ago, for the reason that today $600,000,000 is needed to do what could have been done for $500,000,000 2 years ago.

For the interstate highway system we are asking for $50,000,000.

For the forest highway system we are asking for $25,000,000.

For the forest access roads we are asking for $22,500,000.

For the national parks roads we are asking for $10,000,000.

For the parkways roads we are asking for $10,000,000.

For the Indian reservation roads we are asking for $10,000,000.

For the public lands roads we are asking for $2,500,000.

That has been reduced from $5,000,000.

We then have a lump-sum appropriation. Indeed, many people might object to that; but we are still in the society of nations, we are still in the United States of America.

Mr. President, there are many things I do not like. I might object strenuously to the appropriation of billions of dollars to be sent to Europe or Asia, but I nevertheless love my country, and I want to go along with what is best for my country. They are commitments which are logically and honestly brought about, and I want to see that my country continues them.

We need further development of strategic defense roads and a uniform development of interstate routes vital to defense; there can be no question about that. We also know that highway usage is far ahead of highway improvement. When we commence to lay out additional roads, are we still talking about 2-ton trucks. Are there not 30- and 40-ton trucks today?

We ask for an inter-American highway. Mr. President, were it not for the possible and probable beneficial results to our own country, I would not vote to appropriate one penny to any foreign country. The money we are now spending on roads in Latin America is money contributed with a view to enabling them to buy more from us. When those highways are completed, what automobiles will roll over them? They will be automobiles from Detroit, Cleveland, and Chicago. Where will the people of Latin America buy their machinery? They will buy it in Chicago, Cleveland, and Toledo. That is the reason. Apart from the element of good will, it is not altogether a one-way matter.

I do not want to make myself believe that I am optimistic about Europe or Asia, because I am not. The people of those countries have been plowing their poor land for about 2,000 years. We love the American way of life. There is but one way to keep that way of life, and that is through the creation of wealth. In this country we have but one way by which to create that way of life. Hudson Bay and Patagonia and such places have not been developed. With American skill plus the endeavors of people south of the American border, the Latin-American countries could produce 10 times the amount of wealth they are now producing. When they did so, where would they buy? They would buy from Uncle Sam. For that reason, I think the State Department was correct in recommending the inter-American highway. That is the economic aspect of it. I am interested in that, deeply interested. But, besides that, during World War II, the Germans were powerful enough to go into the Caribbean. Some people, possibly, do not know where the Caribbean is. Drake and Morgan knew about it. Knowledge of it on the part of the world started about 400 years ago. They knew about America. They knew about other places.

So while this bill possibly does not represent the best of judgment, nevertheless I may say it represents the considered judgment of a nonpartisan committee. I ask my good friend from the State of Washington whether it is not true that it comes from a nonpartisan committee.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be read for amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND and Mr. CAIN addressed the Chair.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield first to the majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Washington is about to suggest the absence of a quorum, if we are to vote on amendments. I do not believe we could obtain a quorum at this time and expect Senators to remain during the consideration of this bill tonight.

I ask unanimous consent that, beginning tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, there be a limitation of 40 minutes on each amendment, 20 minutes to the side, and 1 hour on the bill, the time upon the amendments to be controlled, respectively, by the proponent of the amendment and the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, unless the latter should happen to favor the amendment, in which case the time would be controlled by the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I like my good friend from Arizona, but I should like to say to him that I think this bill is so good for the American people. There has not been before the Senate a bill which would do more for the American people than the road bill. I say that irrespective of headlines in the Washington papers.

Mr. McFARLAND. I certainly agree with the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If my memory serves me correctly, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] introduced the original highway bill. I would not be averse to entering into an agreement, but I ask, why can we not vote upon certain of the amendments now?

Mr. McFARLAND. We could do that, but for the fact that many Senators are absent. Even if the absence of a quorum were suggested, I doubt that we would be able to obtain a quorum at this time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is suggested that we might not be able to obtain a quorum. But suppose we did. Suppose we trust Senators to do the right thing, for the moment at least.

Mr. McFARLAND. If it is desired to proceed further without a quorum call, and if the distinguished acting minority leader does not intend to suggest the absence of a quorum, I am willing to proceed. But I do not want to have the Senate put in an embarrassing position.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to have an expression of opinion from the acting minority leader, since he is also the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to say to the majority leader that it is my view, with reference to this side of the aisle, that it would not be possible to obtain a quorum at this late hour. Nor do I believe that action ought to be taken on any of the important amendments which are to be considered, without a quorum being present.

I share completely the view advanced by the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee, that the bill he has discussed is of real importance to the entire Nation, and that a majority of Senators on both sides of the aisle ought to be present and taking an interest when action is called for on any amendment to be presented, or upon the bill itself.

Mr. McFARLAND. Then, under those circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that, beginning at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, there be a limitation of debate of 40 minutes on each amendment, as well as on motions and appeals, the time

to be equally divided, and to be controlled, respectively, by the proponents of the amendment, and, by the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico; that all amendments must be germane, and that the general debate on the passage of the bill be limited to 1 hour, the time to be controlled respectively by the distinguished senor Senator from New Mexico and the minority leader, or by any Senator whom he may designate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I would love to agree with the majority leader, but I do not believe in limitations on debate. This bill is in my opinion, so important to the American people that I am willing to let the Senate discuss it as much as may be desired. I think it is most important. No doubt there will be limitations on debate in connection with the consideration of some bill which proposes to appropriate $8,000,000,000 for use elsewhere.

Mr. McFARLAND. Of course, if the Senator does not want to agree——

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not consent.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from New Mexico desires to object, does he?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I object.

Mr. McFARLAND. I regret that very much, Mr. President, because it may mean that this bill will not be finished tomorrow.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I shall send to the desk in a moment an amendment to the bill, S. 2437, which is under consideration. My amendment would reduce the total authorization by $200,000,000 each year. It would do so by reducing the authorization for the Federal-aid road system from $600,000,000 to $400,000,000. The reduction would be distributed in somewhat larger proportionate cuts among secondary roads and urban roads than in the primary highway systems.

Of course, the system of public roads is extremely important, but we also need to remember that they are subordinate to our preparedness program.

As students of the bill know, the original recommendation of the Budget Bureau for the Federal-aid road system was for an authorization for those items of $400,000,000 a year for 2 years. The House of Representatives increased the figure to $550,000,000. The Senate committee then increased the sum to $600,000,000 a year, and also added two other $50,000,000 appropriations, one for interstate highways and the other for circumferential highways. In fact, therefore the total committee increase over the administration's request has been at least $300,000,000.

We very frequently criticize, and I think, properly, the governmental agencies for sending excessive figures in requests for appropriations and authorizations, which are not covered by the tax bills which are likely to be passed. Here is a case where the House of Representatives and the Senate Public Works Committee, I am sure, with the best of motives, have greatly increased the figure above that requested by the administration. In my judgment, in view of the financial situation with which we are faced, we should go back to the Budget estimate on this item and save $200,000,000 a year.

Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be separately printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to express my appreciation and admiration for the character and substance of the presentation which has just been offered to the Senate by the chairman of the Public Works Committee, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. When he advises the Senate, which is to say, when he advises the Nation, that his intention is to help the United States of America, he is speaking, from my own knowledge, nothing but a complete truth. The Senator from New Mexico has on several occasions this afternoon made reference to the junior Senator from Washington and inquired if it were not a fact that there are few political considerations within the Committee on Public Works. I always enjoy agreeing with my colleague from New Mexico, when that is possible, and it very often is possible.

The only function of the Public Works Committee, as I understand, is to render political free service, the most splendid service, to all the States of the Union, regardless of politics which may exist within those States or within the Nation as a whole.

I relish this opportunity to express my deep regard for the intentions which always underlie the work of a very sincere and honest American—the senior Senator from New Mexico.

RECESS TO 10 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 3, 1952, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 2, 1952:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment to the positions indicated under the provisions of section 504, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be generals

Lt. Gen. Lauris Norstad, 25A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commander in chief, United States Air Forces in Europe, with rank of general.

Lt. Gen. Otto Paul Weyland, 63A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commanding general, Far East Air Forces, with rank of general.

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Charles Pearre Cabell, 70A, Regular Air Force, to be director, the joint staff, Joint Chiefs of Staff, with rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Laurence Carbee Craigie, 61A, Regular Air Force, to be deputy chief of staff, development, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Leon William Johnson, 68A, Regular Air Force, to be commanding general, Continental Air Command, with rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Charles Trovilla Myers, 37A, Regular Air Force, to be commander in chief, United States Northeast Command, with rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Joseph Smith, 84A, Regular Air Force, to be commander, Military Air Transport Service, with rank of lieutenant general.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 2, 1952:

REGULAR AIR FORCE

Midshipman Mitchell Daniel Charneski, United States Naval Academy, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 3, 1952, upon his graduation, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947). Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

IN THE NAVY

Midshipman Paul S. MacLafferty (Naval Academy) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps in the Navy, subject to physical qualification and approval by the Secretary of the Navy.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 2, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Franklin M. Zentz, Court Street Methodist Church, Rockford, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, who art the source of all light and truth, we thank Thee for the heritage which is ours.

We thank Thee supremely for this great Nation of ours, steeped in liberty and dedicated to noble ends.

Make us worthy of the position of world leadership we have attained.

May we ever give of our influence and means that the cause of justice, fair play, and human brotherhood may be advanced.

May the Members of the House of Representatives be guided by Thy truth and eternal purposes.

Give them wisdom and insight.

Give them dedication to noble purpose so that they may be instruments in the building of a better nation and world, where men may live together in peace and plenty. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 29, 1952, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 454. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings entitled "Institute of Pacific Relations";

S. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution accepting the statues of Dr. John McLoughlin and Rev. Jason Lee from the State of Oregon for placement in the Capitol; and

S. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution authorizing temporary placement in the rotunda of the Capitol of the statues of Dr. John McLoughlin and Rev. Jason Lee, of Oregon, and the holding of ceremonies.

THE LATE HONORABLE SAM HOBBS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty this morning of announcing to the Members of the House the death of Hon. Sam Hobbs. The Judge, as he was affectionately known here and throughout the South, died suddenly Saturday evening at the Vaughn Memorial Hospital in Selma, Ala. It was known that he was not in good health but his death at this time was not expected.

Judge Hobbs was born October 5, 1887, in Selma, Ala. He attended Marion Military Institute and Vanderbilt University, and was graduated from the University of Alabama, receiving a law degree from that university in 1908. In 1949 the university conferred a degree of LL. D. on Judge Hobbs in honor of his distinguished service to his State and to the Nation.

Judge Hobbs practiced law in his home town of Selma from 1908 to 1921 when he was elected judge of the Fourth Judicial Circuit of Alabama, serving until 1926 when he resigned to resume his law practice. In 1934 he was elected to the Seventy-fourth Congress and served continuously through the Eighty-first Congress, representing the Fourth District of Alabama.

We all know of his many accomplishments while serving in Congress. He was a man of the highest character and of strong convictions, yet he respected the views of those who disagreed with him politically or otherwise, and was always most cordial at all times. Early in his connection in Congress he established himself as an outstanding constitutional lawyer. He was a distinguished Member of this body and one who had the love and respect of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

When I came to Congress in January 1951, as a new Member, Judge offered his services in guiding and advising me about many problems. I realized that it would be hard to fill his place here, and my life has been enriched for having known him. He was a wise and sympathetic friend, and I shall always be indebted to him.

Judge Hobbs was a lifelong member of the Presbyterian Church and active in church work in Selma and here in Washington.

Sam Hobbs was not only a great man in his political life but a devoted family man, a great father and a wonderful husband. He is survived by his wife, Sarah Ellen Hobbs, a daughter, Mrs. John Joyce, of Birmingham, and two sons, Sam Earle and Truman McGill Hobbs, who are members of his law firm, Hobbs, Hobbs & Hobbs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would be indifferent to my feelings if I failed to express my profound grief over the passing of our beloved former Member from Alabama, Sam Hobbs.

When I came to Congress Sam Hobbs was the dean of our Alabama delegation. In this capacity of elder statesman, I soon became well acquainted with him, for it was he who received my many, many personal problems. From this close association I became aware of his patience, his intellect, and the fidelity and ability which characterized his actions.

His service in the House was distinguished and successful. He acquired a Nation-wide reputation for his capability as a constitutional lawyer and for his honesty in the performance of his duties.

No man in this body ever enjoyed the affection and esteem of its Members more than he. His character, his devotion to duty, and the warmth of humanity endeared him to us all. His passing is a grievous loss not only to those of us who acknowledge his distinguished services here, but to his home community, the State of Alabama, and the Nation. A great American statesman, Sam Hobbs, is at rest.

I join his successor, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS], who has just spoken, in expressing my deep sorrow and profound sympathy for the Hobbs family.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to have this opportunity to say a few words on behalf of former Representative Sam Hobbs. It was my privilege to serve with him on the Judiciary Committee for many years, and his cooperative spirit, warm friendship, and unfailing effort were a constant source of comfort and aid, not only to me but, I am sure, to all the members of our committee. It was with a great sense of regret that we had to accept the fact of his illness, which caused him to retire from congressional activities at the end of the Eighty-first Congress.

Anyone who knew Sam Hobbs could not help but remember his wealth of personal kindness and friendship. Sam's smile was always there even in the days when the pain on his face showed the strain of his illness so plainly. Such courage and control was greatly to be admired and I know that all of his friends felt admiration for his fine inner strength.

Only time will help to ease the grief of his family but I hope that the memory of his good name will help to lessen their very sad days ahead.

He was a tower of strength to our committee.

A great constitutional lawyer, scholarly, erudite, an indefatigable and careful worker, he brought the lamp of learning to shed light on many subjects shrouded in darkness and mystery.

Alabama can well be proud of the achievements of her son and also sad—sad that he has gone to that undiscovered country from whose bosom no traveler returns. His name is deeply engraved on the tablets of our memory, a gentleman ever kind, gentle, self-effacing, modest withal of intellectual honesty and moral integrity, ever in the forefront of good causes.

He exemplified a fierce interest in the protection of our heritage of constitutional liberties. He knew our Constitution well and could cite in a thrice scores of decisions to support his views.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I join my colleagues in paying tribute and respect to our former colleague, Sam Hobbs. He was affectionately called "Judge" by all who knew him—a title that remained with him since he graced the bench of the Fourth Judicial Circuit of Alabama.

As a Member of the House, Judge Hobbs was always ready to render a helping hand to those of his colleagues who sought his advice and counsel. I shall never forget his consideration and courtesy to me when I was a new Member.

Judge Hobbs rendered distinguished service as a citizen, as a member of the bar, as Circuit Judge, and as a Member of this body. Last year after an honorable service of 16 years in the House of Representatives, he retired to take a well earned rest; however, he did not seem to know what the word "rest" meant. He jumped back to his first love—the practice of law.

The sympathy of this entire body is extended to his life's companion and helpmate, Mrs. Sam Hobbs, and to his fine children .

Judge Hobbs was a noble character—one who loved his God, and his fellow man. We will ever cherish his memory.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN].

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I hardly know what to say; I just heard this sad news about our beloved Sam Hobbs going to his reward.

I have never met a bad man in this body, but I do believe that Sam Hobbs was one of the best that ever served his fellowmen here or anywhere else on earth; and he has now gone to his reward. I was with Sam Hobbs just last week up in the little country town of Camden, Ala. We had a wonderful visit. He asked about you all—individually or collectively—and he found so much pleasure in hearing of your every accomplishment.

Mr. Speaker, he told me that he was coming back to see you all pretty soon. Anway, I have just sent a telegram of condolence to Mrs. Sam Hobbs, which I believe I shall read because it kind of expresses just the way I feel about his passing. Words fail me in properly saying the things I would like to say about

my friend because I have never known a better man on this earth and never expect to know a better one. What follows is the message I today dispatched to Mrs. Sam Hobbs and family:

Ocllo and I arrived this morning and were told of the passing of your beloved husband and our dear friend. The Hobbs and Boykins have been friends all our lives and our friendship will continue not only in this world but the world to come. Every man and woman who represents this Nation in the Congress will regret the passing of this great American statesman who represented his Nation so ably in the Congress for so many years. In the passing of Sam Hobbs, you have lost a wonderful husband and the city of Selma, the State of Alabama, and this Nation have lost one of their greatest statesmen. God bless and keep you and give you strength to carry on. Speaker RAYBURN, the entire Congress, and especially the Alabama delegation join us in love and sympathy. Let us know when and how we can help.

Devotedly,

FRANK AND OCLLO BOYKIN.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to realize that Judge Hobbs is no longer with mortal men. When I came to Congress on January 3, 1949, he was a tower of strength in this House. By virtue of his long and faithful service here he was dean of the Alabama delegation in the House and occupied a high position on the House Committee on the Judiciary.

Judge Hobbs loved the law; he loved the Constitution of the United States; he gave their study the full measure of his devotion, and for many years was recognized as one of the outstanding constitutional lawyers in the entire Congress.

Our country has lost a valuable citizen, Alabama has lost one of its great leaders. I join with my colleagues in extending to Mrs. Hobbs and their fine family my sincere sympathy.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the death of Sam Hobbs came as a great shock to me. I have a deep feeling of grief and personal loss. From the first days of my service here, he immediately appealed to me as a man of great breadth of vision and wisdom, and I am sure he impressed every one with whom he came in contact with his tolerance and kindliness.

The Congress has never had a man who fought with greater courage and resolution for the things in which he believed than Sam Hobbs. Yet there was in him a kindliness and understanding that won the hearts even of those who disagreed with him on some piece of legislation. No one ever doubted Sam Hobbs' sincerity. Every one respected his ability. All loved him for his personal attributes.

Sam Hobbs loved the House of Representatives and the House of Representatives loved him. His name always will be enshrined high on the list of those who, as lawmakers, have served their country with fearlessness and fidelity.

With all the burdens imposed upon him as one of the ranking members of the Judiciary Committee and the constant demands that were made upon him, he was always anxious and willing to be of help to his colleagues who had problems which Sam could be helpful in solving. I am personally indebted to him for his kindness to me in this regard.

With his gentleness and his understanding, he was a wonderful husband. My deepest sympathy goes to his beloved wife and his family in their hour of great sadness.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED.]

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Speaker, I did not learn until just a few moments ago of the passing of Judge Hobbs; but even though I had no opportunity to prepare a statement, I could not refrain from coming to the House Chamber and speaking from my heart my feelings about this great Alabamian and this great American.

I have known Judge Hobbs for many years. He was not a resident of our congressional district but of the adjoining district. At one time he was judge of a circuit in Alabama that comprised several counties in our congressional district. I have tried a good many cases under Judge Hobbs when he was circuit judge down in Alabama. At one time I recall that he was sent to Tuscaloosa as the circuit judge to hold court there at a time when I was prosecuting attorney for that circuit. I remember how ably he served during that week of court. I remember the distinguished and able judge he was during the time he served in Alabama.

I followed his record after he came to Congress and I have always admired the record he made here as a Congressman. The people of Alabama knew Judge Hobbs, they loved him, they admired him, they respected him. They truly regarded Judge Hobbs as not only an able man but as a man of character and integrity; a man who stood for the things that he really believed in regardless of any political effect at the time. When I think of Judge Hobbs I think of him as a Christian, Southern gentleman of the old school. I never knew a finer character. I have never known a more courteous individual. You colleagues who served with him over a period of years in the House know that as well as I.

Judge Hobbs was a man who would leave a sick bed, if possible, to come to the floor of this House and vote on an issue if he considered it important. I recall during probably the last year that he served here the FEPC bill was up for consideration on the floor of the House. I knew how much Judge Hobbs had been interested in seeing that bill defeated, and I knew that he was sick. I knew that he was not well at home, but that morning I looked back there and right back of the rail in the rear of the Chamber, my colleague, your colleague, and our friend, was seated, as I recall, in a wheel chair. There he was, responding to the call of duty to be here. You could look at him; you could talk with him, and you were conscious of the fact that really his physical condition was such that he should not have been here. But, he was here, responding, as I say, to the call of duty. Duty was always uppermost in his mind. I had hoped when he retired and went back to Alabama that he might take things easy and not be too active, but all the information that I have received since he left Washington has been to the effect that he has been very actively engaged in the practice of law and in the trial of cases since he returned to Alabama. He was a man who could not be idle; he could not be idle even in retirement.

Mr. Speaker, it was a severe shock to me this morning when I learned of his passing, and I can only hope that time will ultimately heal, in some degree, the great sorrow of his family and his friends. We have lost a great man, a very useful man, in the passing of Judge Hobbs.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, this morning, when I entered the committee room of the Committee on the Judiciary, the clerk said to me, "Mr. GRAHAM, did you know that Judge Hobbs passed away?" You cannot understand the shock that came to me. I looked over to where he sat for 12 years while I have been a member of that committee, but the living presence was gone. He was a fine, gentle, Christian gentleman. The first time I ever entered that committee room he came over to me, and he said, "Buddy, you and I are going to know each other and like each other," and nothing truer was ever said. Sam Hobbs and I became very close friends, although many times we disagreed on legal views and political views, but he was always a gentleman and a scholar, an erudite gentleman, and earnest, sincere, honest man.

I remember one day he asked me to come over and speak to the group that meets Thursday morning. I simply gave a sort of recounting of my experiences and the thoughts I had had, particularly dealing with crime, such as murders. When I finished, he raised his head from the table, and he was crying like a child. I said, "Judge, is something wrong with you?" He said, "Something, I don't know, about what you have been telling here affected me." His heart was full of sympathy.

On the last day he was here he came to my side and said, "I want to tell you how much your friendship has meant to me." I said, "I can say the same thing, it has meant much to me." He said, "Good-by, Buddy," and I said "Good-by," and now he has passed on to be with his Maker. Farewell, my friend.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, some of the greatest pleasures of life are the friendships we make through-

out the years. In our home communities they just naturally grow and multiply. They flourish particularly in our contacts with schoolmates, with neighbors, and with coworkers, business or professional associates. We enjoy their company and life would indeed be dull and uninteresting without them. But when, with their assistance and good wishes, we were privileged to serve in the Congress of the United States as Representatives, we found it necessary to depart from our home communities and our close friends, and come to Washington. We found the Capital City and the body to which we were elected, a mass of strangers. It was with these strangers that we were destined to work and associate for the greater part of each year that we served. It doesn't take Members long to become acquainted. Nor does it require many days to cultivate friendships. It may be months or even years, however, before one really knows one's colleague whom he regards as his friend and whom he sees almost every day.

Sam Hobbs and I were two of the 107 new Members who came to Washington with the advent of the Seventy-fourth Congress. Fifteen of us are still here. While Sam and I became acquainted soon after our arrival, it was not until 2 years later, in 1937 when I was elected to the Committee on the Judiciary that we began to cultivate a close friendship. From the Seventy-fifth to and including the Eighty-first Congresses, we both served continuously on the Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Corporate Reorganizations, of which subcommittee, each of us ultimately became chairman. He was a brilliant lawyer with a judicial intellect. He had unlimited energy and a keen sense of humor. He was fair and courteous. Moreover, he was possessed of persuasive eloquence that many times enabled him, in debate, to successfully maintain his position against great odds. Above all, he was sincere. He had been an acquaintance and later, a friend. He was the kind of a friend that I knew. I greatly respected and admired him.

I regretted the necessity for his decision, 2 years ago, not to seek reelection, but felt that his judgment was sound. His sudden and untimely death on Saturday evening is a grievous shock to his many friends in this House, and our sympathy extends to his widow and bereaved family.

Beautiful life is that whose span
Is spent in duty to God and man,
Beautiful calm when the course is run,
Beautiful twilight at set of sun,
Beautiful death with a life well done.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER].

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I was sitting in the Chamber this morning, and I heard the news that the honorable and most distinguished Sam Hobbs, of Alabama, had passed on to the other side. I covet the opportunity of having the privilege of saying a few words in memory of that great American. There are many members of the House Committee on the Judiciary who are senior to me and who knew Judge Hobbs better than I did. But, I would not forego the opportunity, which is mine at this time, because of the fact that Judge Hobbs came from a neighboring State. Georgia and Alabama are side by side. We are not only neighbors, we are friends and we have the same heartbeats and the same heartthrobs. No one knows how much pleasure I have because of the fact that Judge Hobbs of Selma, Ala., was permitted to come into this body, the greatest deliberative body on earth, and to write not only his name in the imperishable pages of history, but as I conceive of his service, he has made it a little easier for other boys down there in that section to merit the confidence of the people of the entire United States. One of the finest compensations I have ever had as a lawyer, and I am sure that every lawyer will say the same thing, has been the opportunity afforded me to sit at the feet of great men and jurists. Undoubtedly, the honorable Sam Hobbs was one of the finest constitutional lawyers who has ever served in this body. He wore the robes of the bench most worthily. But, he was not only a lawyer. He demonstrated his greatness by the humility which was always his. I came here in 1950, shortly after my nomination, as a matter of fact, I had not yet taken office, when Hon. Sam Hobbs came to me. Some friend had spoken to him about me, and he looked me up and offered me in a most humble way, in a way which I will never forget, it was done in such gentlemanly fashion, the counsel and advice that he might be able to give me by reason of his rich and long experience. That will always be remembered in my heart. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Sam Hobbs reflected great credit upon my section, and not only upon my section, but upon the United States. Judge Hobbs was just as southern as ham and eggs or hominy grits.

On the other hand, he was just as American as Old Glory itself. I am proud to say that he was a southern gentleman. I want to remark here and now that when we use that phrase, "southern gentleman," that is not restricted to the South at all. I have met many Members of this House that I am delighted to say I think are southern gentlemen, because they have pride in their section, they have pride in their country, they believe in family, they believe in law, they believe in this country, and they believe in God. This House has suddenly lost a most valuable friend. This country has lost a great citizen. But he has not only left an imperishable record here, he has built up a record that will stand him in good stead on the other shore; and, after all, that is the test of a real man.

He so lived that he can be a guiding light to you and to me and to all the people everywhere. His life has been such that I think I should say to you, as was said in Thanatopsis, that his life says to the people of America:

So live that when thy summons comes to join
The innumerable caravan, which moves
To that mysterious realm where each shall take
His chamber in the silent halls of death,
Thou go not like the quarry slave at night,
Scourged to his dungeon, but sustained and soothed
By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave
Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch
About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GOLDEN].

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, like every other Member of this body, I was shocked and grieved a few moments ago when I received the sad news of the passing of Judge Sam Hobbs.

Nearly 4 years ago Judge Hobbs was the first man I met when I came to Washington, after having been elected to Congress. It just so happens that he had a number of relatives in my home town of Pineville, Ky. They were kind enough to write to Judge Hobbs and through their letters to introduce me to him. When I first met him I did not fully appreciate the great and good man that I later learned him to be. I had frequent conversations with him about his relatives in my home town. He has a sister-in-law, Mrs. Wood, living in Kentucky, of course, she and her children loved him very dearly, are steeped in grief as this sad news reaches them.

During the last 4 years I have talked with him privately on many occasions, and I have heard him discuss national issues on the floor of the Congress. I began slowly to realize that he was one of the great statesmen of modern times. I gained great respect for all Members of Congress because of what I learned from Sam Hobbs. I think it can be truly stated that he was an outstanding statesman. I think he searched for the truth on every issue. He was dominated by a deep desire to do what was right. He had great love for his country. He was endowed with real natural ability. I did not know him in his earlier life, of course, but he must have been a profound student, because he brought to this body as large a fund of knowledge of national affairs as anyone I have been acquainted with.

Sometimes, when we undertake to answer some of the eternal questions of life, I wonder how any great loss, such as the State of Alabama and the United States has suffered in the passing of Judge Hobbs, can be compensated for. Any right man, a man of profound knowledge, of great love for his country suddenly being stricken down by death. It is horrible to think of his talents and virtues as being lost. We all believe in a just God. It is my belief that in the life to come his great talents, his genuine goodness, his love for humanity, and his respect for all of these things that live on in a future world, that they are not completely lost. We comfort ourselves when these tragedies strike among our friends that they are not lost, that man's

virtues do live after them. The only way that we can suffer and endure these terrible blows is to have faith in God, to believe the Bible, and to know that if we conduct ourselves rightly here on earth we may be able to meet such men as Judge Hobbs who have gone to their reward.

I extend to his friends in Kentucky and his family in Alabama my greatest sympathy.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I could not fail to embrace this opportunity to raise my voice in brief but very sincere tribute to the life, character and public service of our most distinguished former colleague, Hon. Sam Hobbs, of Alabama.

He served with great credit and outstanding distinction as a Member of the House of Representatives for 16 years. He and I occupied offices close to each other during most of his period of service here, and we visited with each other frequently. I always enjoyed his companionship and always profited by his wise counsel and sound advice. He possessed the highest attributes of Christian character and all of the sterling qualities of manhood. He was a man of outstanding and recognized ability and demonstrated devotion to public service.

I join with my other colleagues in conveying to the members of his family my heartfelt sympathy in the time of their bereavement; and I share with them the great loss they have sustained.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this occasion go by without saying just a few words about this fine and distinguished gentleman, Judge Hobbs, whom I knew for only the 6 years I have been in Congress, since early in the Eightieth Congress.

Judge Hobbs was a profound lawyer, a deep student of the law; he was a great and a good man. I noticed one particular thing that he did which I am sure endeared him to every witness who ever appeared before the subcommittee on which I had the honor to serve and of which he was the chairman; he was the most kindly, most gentlemanly in his treatment of all witnesses whether he agreed with their theory and testimony or whether he disagreed. He was a Chesterfield in handling the committee; he was gentle on every occasion.

I am sure when Judge Hobbs retired from this House it was with great reluctance and only at the insistence of his physician. I came to know him and to love him for the fine qualities he possessed and for the fine service he rendered to this great country. We have all suffered a severe loss in the passing of Judge Sam Hobbs.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, it was with a profound feeling of regret and sadness that I learned this morning of the death of my old friend, Sam Hobbs. For the first 2 years I served in the Seventy-seventh Congress it was as a member of the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, of which Mr. Hobbs was chairman. That in itself was a delightful experience, not only from the standpoint of the courtesy and the kindness with which he presided, as the gentleman from Texas has just said, but the fact that you knew Sam Hobbs was going to proceed with thoroughness and care in a legislative hearing.

As I review the past 12 years, certainly there is no more delightful friend that I have made than Sam Hobbs. He has left, in my opinion, upon the statutes of the United States much legislation during that time. Legislation which was always, in Mr. Hobbs' judgment, necessary and in the best interests of the United States.

I was sorry when I learned that Sam had decided to retire upon the advice of his physician. Since that time I have occasionally corresponded with him.

All of us lost a great friend and a good friend, the Nation lost a great American when he retired from the Congress. I join with my colleagues from Alabama and the House in expressing to his family my very deepest sympathy in their loss.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and character of the late Sam Hobbs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grieved to learn of the passing of Sam Hobbs. He was a fine gentleman, a good legislator, and an outstanding and patriotic citizen. To his family I convey my deepest sympathy.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the news of the death of Sam Hobbs saddens the hearts of all of those who served with him in this House. Soon after I came to Congress 16 years ago, I met Judge Hobbs and he and I became close friends and that friendship continued throughout the years. During my entire time here I always looked upon him as one of the most able men who served in this House. He was not only an able man, a great constitutional lawyer, a great legislator, but he was a man of sterling qualities, with deep moral convictions and with love for his fellow man. His death comes as a great loss to the entire State of Alabama and to the Nation. His great period of personal usefulness to his day and time has been closed in death, but surely the wholesome influence of a life like his will live on and on. Mr. Speaker, I mourn his passing and extend to his family and his loved ones my deep personal sympathy.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, as I came into the Chamber this morning shortly after the assembly hour, having been delayed by a visit to the hospital, I heard the name of our distinguished colleague, Sam Hobbs, being mentioned in eulogy. Not having previously known of the death of Judge Hobbs, it was difficult for me to realize that he had gone to his reward. As I join others in this informal extemporaneous fashion, adequate words fail me.

Upon coming to Congress a decade and a half ago, I soon learned of the sterling character, affable friendliness, and great judicial knowledge of Judge Hobbs. We had many things in common. His constituency, like mine, was engaged in tilling the soil, producing chiefly cotton which ultimately was spun and woven in the local textile plants for world consumption. From the very beginning, I sought and won the confidence and friendship of this distinguished gentleman so devoted to his tasks.

The judge, as he was affectionately called, was a natural-born student of the law. He observed the oft-quoted axiom that "the law is a jealous mistress." He seemed never happier than when engaged in drafting needed, helpful legislation and in arguing for the true interpretation of the laws written by those of the past. Any student of the law was fortunate in having the opportunity to associate with one so devoted to his profession.

It is significant that, upon voluntarily retiring from Congress two short years ago, Judge Hobbs resumed his practice at the bar with his two distingushed sons, under the firm name of Hobbs, Hobbs & Hobbs.

I trust that I shall not soon forget the lessons I learned from my colleague and that by precept and example I may transmit these great truths and fundamental principles to my own son at the bar.

Our country at large, and particularly the beloved southland, has lost one of its greatest advocates. During these sad moments of regret, let us resolve more definitely to emulate the example set for us by this scholarly gentleman whose constant desire was to make this a better and a happier world in which to live.

No greater heritage could be left for the faithful widow and fine children who are permitted to carry the name Hobbs on to generations yet unborn. It is a distinction and a great privilege to have known Judge Hobbs, to have served with him in this great legislative body, and be permitted to utter these humble words in tribute to his passing.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, with a heart full of sadness, I acknowledge a great personal loss in the passing of Judge Sam Hobbs. It was my pleasure to know Judge Hobbs intimately, and, on many occasions, to seek his sage counsel and advice on personal and legislative matters. I always found him to be equal to the occasion, and feel that his many courtesies to me enabled me to better serve the people whom I represent.

Judge Hobbs was a man of abiding convictions, with both the courage and ability to maintain them. His influence will long be felt in this House, and his opinions on constitutional questions, in particular, will be cited for years to come.

With heavy hearts, we say farewell to our friend, Judge Hobbs, comforted in the knowledge that he is reaping the heavenly reward which he so justly deserved.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed shocked this morning when I heard the sad news of the passing of my good friend and our former colleague Congressman Sam F. Hobbs, of Alabama, who was first elected to the House in 1934 and served continuously until last year when he voluntarily retired.

I consider myself extremely fortunate in having gained his warm friendship shortly after I was elected to Congress and I shall always recall with profound appreciation his wise counsel and gentle character. He was a fine Christian gentleman of the old school, an able lawyer and an accomplished orator. His distinguished record in the House of Representatives and in the great House Committee on the Judiciary will long live after him.

Judge Hobbs, as he was affectionately known to most of us on both sides of the aisle, had not been in good health for several years prior to his retirement and I am sure that the constant strain of his arduous tasks seriously affected his health and was instrumental in shortening his life.

The people of his community and the State of Alabama have lost a conscientious and able statesman. I have lost a real friend. I shall always remember how kind and thoughtful he was during those years that ripened into a friendship that I shall forever cherish.

To his good wife and sons I extend my deepest sympathy. I am sure that a kind Providence will comfort them in their great sorrow.

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, last year when I entered Congress for the first term, I became acquainted with Judge Sam Hobbs. I met him almost as soon as I took my seat in the House. He had been an undergraduate student at Vanderbilt University where I later studied law. Mutual friends advised me to meet him. I had known of his ability as a lawyer, a judge, and of the outstanding record he had made for 16 years in Congress, so I eagerly accepted their suggestion. However, it was with some temerity I introduced myself to him. That fortunate act enriched my life by giving me the opportunity to know and enjoy the friendship of one of the finest gentlemen I ever met, even for so short a time.

As he finished the legislative phase of his life and returned to Alabama with plans to take up again the practice of law, I could not help but think of the words of Mr. Justice Holmes, spoken on his ninetieth birthday:

> The riders in a race do not stop short when they reach the goal.
>
> There is a little finishing canter before coming to a standstill.
>
> There is time to hear the kind voices of friends and to say to one's self: "The work is done."
>
> But, just as one says that, the answer comes: "The race is over but the work never is done while the power to work remains."
>
> The canter that brings you to a standstill need not be only coming to rest.
>
> It cannot be while you still live. For to live is to function. That is all there is in living.
>
> And so I end with a line from a Latin poet who uttered the message more than 1,500 years ago: "Death plucks my ear and says, live—I am coming."

That was the way Judge Hobbs ended his fine congressional experience. He had determined not to be a candidate again. I suspect that he knew his health would not stand the strain of another term. But he was looking forward eagerly to going back to Alabama to enter the practice of law with his sons. His membership in Congress and his experience here had been a vital part of his life for 16 years. That was over but he could not stop short and say, "The work is done."

He stayed in Washington for 2 months in order that he might gracefully bid his old friends farewell and lose no chance of making new ones among the Members who were entering Congress for the first time. His advice and encouragement meant much to me as it did to other new Congressmen. It was easily apparent that Sam Hobbs was truly a fine Christian gentleman who loved his fellowman.

I extend my sincerest sympathy to his family. Their loss is very great. May they find comfort in the largeness and goodness of his life and in his firm belief in an even better life beyond the setting sun.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, news of the death of Sam Hobbs brings a sense of deep personal sorrow. It was my privilege to know him for many years, even before my election to the Congress. Our colleagues from Alabama have spoken sincerely and eloquently of his many virtues, and I wish to join in these tributes to our beloved friend.

He was firm in his convictions but alway gracious to those with whom he differed. He was courageous but warmhearted and kind. His boundless energies were given to promoting many good causes, including those of his church which he served with such devotion. We who served with him in the Congress and a multitude who knew him outside official circles mourn the passing of a great and good man.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was not until my colleagues were paying their respective tributes to Hon. Samuel Francis Hobbs, of Alabama, that I learned of his death. Few men have served in the House of Representatives during my time for whom I have entertained a higher esteem and affection. I find as I grow older that the passing of friends occurs with greater frequency. Their loss would be almost unbearable were it not for a firm belief in immortality, and an unshaken faith that we shall meet again.

The tributes paid today to Judge Hobbs raise the question, How did he, in his public life, attain to his great influence in the House of Representatives and on the bench? It was not by rank, or wealth, or talents, or eloquence, or ability alone, but rather by integrity of character. This immortal substance our departed friend possessed in the fullest measure. Thus, as we review the public life of Judge Hobbs, how true it is, as has been said: That character is the invulnerable armor which will withstand every assault and march triumphant to the highest positions of honor and trust within the gift of a grateful people. Our departed colleague has met the challenge that appears above the Speaker's chair:

> Let us develop the resources of our land—call forth its powers—build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

Judge Hobbs met this challenge to perform something worthy to be remembered, by this and future generations.

I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Hobbs and the members of the family in this time of a great bereavement.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sad heart that I pay my respects at this time to my former colleague and very dear friend, Judge Sam F. Hobbs, of Selma, Ala.

Judge Hobbs represented the Fourth District of Alabama in Congress for 16 years. His contribution to Alabama and to the United States stands on its own merits. Every Member of Congress sitting in this Chamber who knew Judge Hobbs, and that includes everyone except the newly elected Members, admired and respected him.

I remember that as a new Member of the House of Representatives he was always a great source of strength for me. I knew that I could always get his sincere, conscientious, and sound advice on the crucial issues of the day in the interest of our country. He was a gentleman, a scholar, and a Christian leader.

My family was honored on several occasions when Judge and Mrs. Hobbs visited in our home. We feel a personal loss that cannot be adequately expressed, and extend to Sarah Ellen and the family our warmest sympathy and love.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the sadness that always attends the passing of a close friend has been mine since I have had the distressing news of the death of our former colleague, Sam Hobbs, than whom this House has never had a finer Christian gentleman on its rolls.

As one who still sits in rapt attention before those who hold places of trust and influence in this House I deferred on all occasions to his mature judgment and acquired much from his learned dissertations on matters which came before us. And the fact that we were of different political parties did not lessen my respect for the soundness of his opinions or my appreciation of his unfailing graciousness in delivering them.

It was also my great privilege to meet with him and other House Members each week for prayerful mediation around the breakfast table. There I came to respect and admire his dedication to the

service of the Master and came to appreciate better his unswerving devotion to Christian principles. This House, his host of admiring friends, and, in fact, all who believe in government under law have lost a stalwart champion and we are united in our sympathy for those who are left to mourn and for whom his untimely passing will leave an unfathomable void. May God keep them and sustain them in this grievous hour.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, one of the ablest, one of the cleanest, and one of the finest men with whom I have served was Sam Hobbs, of Alabama. I am one of the many who benefited from his gentle leadership and his kindly counsel. In all my lifetime, there are few whose friendship I have valued more highly.

We shall miss him in our thoughts, even as we miss his wonderful leadership in the House of Representatives. His work and his memory will endure for many years.

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5990) to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. VINSON, DURHAM, and SHORT.

TIDELAND OIL LANDS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LUCAS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from California, Mr. HINSHAW, may be granted leave of absence for the week of June 2, due to personal and family business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SUPREME COURT DECISION ON THE STEEL SEIZURE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has just decided that the steel mills be turned back to the owning companies, in practical effect, in the steel seizure case by a vote of 6 to 3. Congress now has the responsibility to act. It appears, from such part of the opinion as is already reported, that the Court is putting the problem right in the lap of the Congress, where it has always belonged and where it does belong now. The Court cleared the atmosphere now and made the point, I think, very clearly, that the responsibility is upon the Congress to see that industry, operates, when necessary for national defense, and where injunctions and receiverships and all these other techniques will not operate to make production take place.

I hope that now the Congress will, at long last, realize their responsibility which many of us have been saying the Congress has had for some years—mine goes back to the debate on the Taft-Hartley Act where I pointed out this default—and take up promptly this matter of what should be done in the event of a national paralysis labor-management dispute when we simply must have the production in the national interest.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PRESERVING HISTORIC PROPERTIES, OBJECTS, AND BUILDINGS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 254) to provide for investigating the feasibility of establishing a coordinated local, State, and Federal program in the city of Boston, Mass., and general vicinity thereof, for the purpose of preserving the historic properties, objects, and buildings in that area.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

RESERVE CERTAIN LAND ON PUBLIC DOMAIN IN NEVADA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4285) to reserve certain land on the public domain in Nevada for addition to the Summit Lake Indian Reservation.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR WATER RESEARCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6578) to provide for research into and demonstration of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in view of the acute shortage of water in the arid areas of the Nation and elsewhere and the excessive use of underground waters throughout the Nation, it is the policy of the Congress to provide for the development of economically feasible means of producing from sea water, or other saline waters, water of quality suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses. To this end, the Secretary of the Interior, acting through such agencies of the Department of the Interior as he may deem appropriate, is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate facilities (including not more than one demonstration plant) to determine and to demonstrate the feasibility of producing water as aforesaid; for purifying and storing the water and byproducts derived from the operation of such facilities. Facilities constructed and operations undertaken pursuant to this act shall be on a scale sufficient to determine the feasibility of the development of such production on a large scale basis, for the purpose of conserving and increasing the water resources of the Nation.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purpose of this act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized—

(a) to conduct development work, which shall be limited to that work directly connected with the operation of a demonstration plant by the Interior Department and appurtenant facilities, to ascertain the lowest investment and operation costs, and to determine the best plant designs and conditions of operation;

(b) to engage, by contract, chemists, physicists, engineers, and such other personnel as may be deemed necessary, and any educational institution, scientific organization, or industrial or engineering firm deemed suitable to do any part of the research or other work; to coordinate the study of methods for the recovery and marketing of byproducts resulting from and incident to the production of water as herein provided for the purpose of ascertaining the possibilities of offsetting the cost of water production in any area by the commercial utilization of such products;

(c) to acquire, by purchase, license, lease, or donation, technical data, inventions, patent applications, patents, licenses, land and any interest in land (including water rights, easements, and leasehold interests), plants and facilities, and other property or rights: *Provided*, That the land or other property acquired hereunder shall not exceed that necessary to carry on the experiments and demonstrations for the purposes herein provided;

(d) to cooperate with any other Federal, State, or municipal department, agency, or instrumentality, and with any private person, firm, educational institution, or other organization in effectuating the purpose of this act;

(e) to request other Federal departments, agencies, and instrumentalities to provide assistance in carrying out his functions under this act, which assistance such departments, agencies, and instrumentalities are hereby authorized to render, and to advance to them funds required to render such assistance or to reimburse them for costs incurred in so doing.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to dispose of all water and other products produced as a result of its operations under this act pursuant to regulations to be prescribed by him: *Provided*, No patent acquired by the United States under this act shall prevent any citizen of the United States, or corporation created under the laws of the United States or any State thereof, from using any invention, discovery, or process covered by such patent, or re-

strict such use by any such citizen or corporation, or be the basis of any claim against any such person or corporation on account of such use.

SEC. 4. All moneys received for products of the plants and for royalties and licenses under this act shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior shall make reports to the President and the Congress at the beginning of each regular session of the action taken or instituted by him under the provisions of this act. The reports shall include suitable recommendations for further legislation.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior may issue rules and regulations to effectuate the purposes of this act.

SEC. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated, from any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums, not to exceed $20,000,000, as the Congress may from time to time deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That in view of the acute shortage of water in the arid areas of the Nation and elsewhere and the excessive use of underground waters throughout the Nation, it is the policy of the Congress to provide for the development of economically feasible means of producing from sea water, or other saline waters, water of quality suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses. To this end, the Secretary of the Interior, acting through such agencies of the Department of the Interior as he may deem appropriate, is authorized—

"(a) to supervise and direct the correlation and coordination of research and development work, which shall be limited to that work directly necessary to the development of one or more practical processes, to ascertain the lowest investment and operation costs, and to determine the best plant designs and conditions of operation;

"(b) to engage by contract, for the purposes outlined in subsection (a), chemists, physicists, engineers, and such other personnel as may be deemed necessary, and any educational institution, scientific organization, or industrial or engineering firm deemed suitable to do any part of the research or other work; to correlate and coordinate, to the extent appropriate, the research and development work in this field being made by such educational institution, scientific organization, or industrial or engineering firm;

"(c) to acquire, by purchase, license, lease, or donation, technical data, inventions, patent applications, patents and licenses, to be made available to such chemists, physicists, engineers, educational institution, scientific organization or industrial or engineering firm engaged in any part of the research or other work;

"(d) to cooperate with any other Federal, State, or municipal department, agency, or instrumentality, and with any private person, firm, educational institution, or other organization in effectuating the purpose of this act; and

"(e) to request other Federal departments, agencies, and instrumentalities to provide assistance in carrying out his functions under this act, which assistance such departments, agencies, and instrumentalities are hereby authorized to render, and to advance to them funds required to render such assistance or to reimburse them for costs incurred in so doing.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to dispose of all water and other products produced as a result of its operations under this act pursuant to regulations to be prescribed by him: *Provided*, That no patent acquired by the United States under this act shall prevent any citizen of the United States, or corporation created under the laws of the United States or any State thereof, from using any invention, discovery, or process covered by such patent, or restrict such use by any such citizen or corporation, or be the basis of any claim against any such person or corporation on account of such use.

"SEC. 3. All moneys received for products of the plants and for royalties and licenses under this act shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior shall make reports to the President and the Congress at the beginning of each regular session of the action taken or instituted by him under the provisions of this act. The reports shall include suitable recommendations for further legislation.

"SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior may issue rules and regulations to effectuate the purposes of this act.

"SEC. 6. There are authorized to be appropriated, from any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums, not to exceed $1,000,000, for a 5-year period, to carry out the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That departmental expenses for the correlation and coordination of information over said 5-year period shall not exceed the sum of $250,000: *Provided further*, That departmental costs shall be scheduled in equal amounts over that period insofar as practicable."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for correlation and coordination of research into practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFER JURISDICTION UPON UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4241) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any provision of law to the contrary, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of employees and former employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, for compensation for the time they were required to work, in violation of the Saturday half-holiday law of March 3, 1931, during the period beginning March 3, 1931, and ending May 1, 1943, in excess of 4 hours on Saturday without being allowed compensatory leave on some other workday. Any suit hereunder shall be instituted within 2 years after the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, after the colon insert "*Provided, however*, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States Government."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING STUDY OF TRIBES, BANDS, AND GROUPS OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 8) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the respective tribes, bands, and groups of Indians under his jurisdiction to determine their qualifications to manage their own affairs without supervision and control by the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. POULSON, Mr. DAGUE, and Mr. SAYLOR objected.

CIVIL-SERVICE STATUS TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 216) to amend section 631b of title 5, United States Code, by adding a new subsection to be cited as subsection (c).

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS AT MILL ROCK ISLAND, N. Y.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6129) to provide for the transfer of certain lands and interests in lands at Mill Rock Island, in the East River, N. Y.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the General Services Administrator, notwithstanding any provisions of existing law, is hereby authorized and directed to convey to the city of New York for park purposes only all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any real estate at Mill Rock Island in the East River, formerly used by the United States Corps of Engineers and at present held as surplus under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administrator.

(b) The conveyance authorized by subsection (a) shall be made only on condition and with the provision that in the event such property is not used for park purposes it shall revert to the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out section (b) and insert:

"(b) The conveyance authorized by subsection (a) shall reserve title in the United States to the two navigational light structures and to plots of land 25 feet square surrounding each such structure, together with rights of ingress and egress as may be necessary for maintenance of such lights, and shall be made only on condition and with the provision that in the event such property conveyed is not used for park purposes or the Secretary of Defense shall determine that such property is necessary for national defense during war or national emergency, it shall revert to the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARION COUNTY, IND.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7573) to provide for the conveyance to the State of Indiana of certain surplus real property situated in Marion County, Ind.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey to the State of Indiana, upon the terms and conditions and for the consideration set forth in section 2, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land (hereinafter referred to as Federal land) situated in Marion County, Ind., together with all fixtures and improvements thereon. Such land, which is surplus to the requirements of the United States, comprises part of the north half of the northwest quarter of section 20, township 15 north, range 3 east, Marion County, Ind., known as Tent City, and is more particularly described as follows:

(1) Beginning at the southwest intersection of Wade Avenue with Main Street as shown on plat of Thurston Place Addition, said point being the northeast corner of the tract of land herein described, thence running south along the western right-of-way line of Main Street a distance of four hundred and fifty-seven feet to a point in the northern right-of-way line of Bradbury Avenue; thence running in a westerly direction along the northern right-of-way line of Bradbury Avenue, a distance of four hundred fifty-five and twenty-three one-hundredths feet to a point in the east right-of-way line of a fifteen-foot alley; thence running north along said east right-of-way line of said fifteen-foot alley a distance of four hundred and fifty-seven feet to a point in the south right-of-way line of Wade Avenue; thence along said south right-of-way line of Wade Avenue a distance of four hundred fifty-five and twenty-three one-hundredths feet to a place of beginning and containing four and seventy-eight one-hundredths acres of land more or less (tract 1);

(2) Beginning at the southeast intersection of Wade Avenue with Main Street as shown on plat of Thurston Place Addition, said point being the northeast corner of the tract of land herein described; thence running south along the eastern right-of-way line of Main Street a distance of four hundred and fifty-seven feet to a point in the northern right-of-way line of Bradbury Avenue; thence running east along the northern right-of-way line of Bradbury Avenue, a distance of nine hundred twenty-five and forty-six one-hundredths feet to a point in the west right-of-way line of Holt Road, thence running north along the west right-of-way line of Holt Road a distance of four hundred and fifty-seven feet to a point in the south right-of-way of Wade Avenue, thence running west along the south right-of-way line of Wade Avenue a distance of nine hundred twenty-five and forty-six one-hundredths feet to the place of beginning and containing nine and seventy-three one-hundredths acres of land more or less (tract 2); and

(3) All the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all streets, highways, alleys, ways, and rights-of-way which may or do adjoin or abut the said land—the land described in this section is the same land that was acquired by the United States by deed dated December 7, 1942, recorded in the land records of Marion County, Ind., in volume 1103 at page 599, and shown as tracts 1 and 2 on the military real estate map of Stout Field, numbered 1627, approved July 6, 1945, on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers.

SEC. 2. The conveyance of the Federal land provided for in the first section shall be made upon the terms and conditions and for the consideration set forth as follows:

(1) In time of war or of national emergency heretofore or hereafter declared by the President or the Congress, and upon the request of the Secretary of Defense to the State of Indiana, the United States shall have the right to the exclusive or nonexclusive use of all or any part of the Federal land for the full period of such war or national emergency without cost to the United States. Upon the expiration of such war or national emergency the use of the Federal land shall cease in favor of the State of Indiana.

(2) In consideration of the conveyance of the Federal land, the State of Indiana shall agree not to sell, convey, or otherwise dispose of all or any part of certain land or improvements thereon (herein after referred to as State land) comprising Stout Field, situated in sections 17, 18, 19, and 20, township 15 north, range 3 east, second principal meridian, Marion County, Ind., and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point at the center of section 17, township 15 north, range 3 east, second principal meridian, said point being the intersection of the center line of Minnesota Avenue and Holt Road; thence south along the north-south center line of section 17 and the center line of Holt Road three thousand four hundred ninety-three and fifty-nine one-hundredths feet to a point, said point being the intersection of the center line of Holt Road and Wade Street; thence in a westerly direction along the center line of Wade Street extended three thousand four hundred forty-five and eighty-nine one-hundredths feet to a point; thence in a northerly direction nine hundred thirty-two and thirteen one-hundredths feet to a point on the north line of Raymond Street extended, said point being two hundred nineteen and seventy-eight one-hundredths feet east of the east line of Denniston Street; thence in a westerly direction along the north line of Raymond Street extended two hundred nineteen and seventy-eight one-hundredths feet to a point in the east line of Denniston Street; thence north along the east line of Denniston Street one thousand one hundred sixty-five and twenty-one one-hundredths feet to a point; thence in an easterly direction along a line parallel to Lagrand Avenue eight hundred fifty-nine and thirty-one one-hundredths feet to a point on the east line of Roena Avenue; thence north along the east line of Roena Avenue one thousand four hundred ninety-three and seventy-nine one-hundredths feet to a point on the east-west center line of section 18; thence in an easterly direction along the east-west center line of sections 18 and 17, and the center of Minnesota Avenue two thousand seven hundred ninety-one and eight-tenths feet to a point of beginning; containing two hundred fifty-eight and ten one-hundredths acres, more or less; and being the same land under lease to the United States from 1942 to December 31, 1946, covered by lease contract numbered W2215–ENG–69, between the State of Indiana and the United States, executed April 7, 1942; shown as tract 4 on the military real-estate map of Stout Field, numbered 1627, approved July 6, 1945, on file in the office, Chief of Engineers.

(3) In time of war or of national emergency heretofore or hereafter declared by the President or the Congress, and upon the request of the Secretary of Defense to the State of Indiana, the United States shall have the right to the exclusive or nonexclusive use of all or any part of the State land for the full period of such war or national emergency without cost to the United States. Upon the expiration of such war or national emergency the use of the State land shall cease in favor of the State of Indiana.

(4) In the event that the State of Indiana shall at any time sell, convey, or otherwise dispose of, or shall attempt to sell, convey, or otherwise dispose of, all or any part of the State or Federal land without the consent of the Secretary of Defense, all of the right, title, and interest in and to the Federal land shall revert to the United States without cost.

SEC. 3. Nothing herein contained shall prevent the State of Indiana from granting leases of said lands and rights and easements therein and thereon without the consent of the Secretary of Defense providing any such leases, rights, and easements are made subject to the right of use thereof by the United States during war or national emergency.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHEYENNE-ARAPAHO TRIBES OF INDIANS OF OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1631) to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma, formerly a part of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Reservation and known as the Fort Reno Military Reservation, for the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MUTUAL MILITARY AID COMPACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 968) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to mutual military aid in an emergency.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

CLAIMS OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1508) conferring jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine and render judgment upon certain claims of the State of California.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

IMPROVEMENT OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER-GULF OUTLET

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5218) for improvement of the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet and the Mobile to New Orleans Intracoastal Waterway.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following improvement is hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans in the report hereinafter designated; Mississippi River-Gulf outlet and the Mobile to New Orleans Intracoastal Waterway, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report submitted in House Document No. —, Eighty-second Congress, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

SEC. 2. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $1,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purpose of preparation of detailed plans and specifications.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, after "Numbered", insert "245."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVING INEQUITIES IN COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7641) to provide benefits for certain Federal employees of Japanese ancestry who lost certain rights with respect to grade, time in grade, and rate of compensation by reason of any policy or program of the Federal Government with respect to persons of Japanese ancestry during World War II.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That each officer and each regular or substitute employee of Japanese ancestry in the postal field service on the effective date of this act, and each officer and employee of Japanese ancestry holding a position subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, on such effective date, as the case may be—

(1) who, at any time during the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending September 3, 1945, solely by reason of any policy or program of the Federal Government with respect to persons of Japanese ancestry in the interests of the national security during such period, (A) was separated from his position in the postal field service or classified civil service, as the case may be, (B) lost opportunity for or was denied probational appointment from a civil-service register of eligibles to any such position, or (C) was denied reinstatement to any such position; or

(2) who, after having been separated from his position in the postal field service or classified civil service, as the case may be, at any time during such period, in order to enter the Armed Forces of the United States, either lost opportunity for or was denied probational appointment from a civil-service register of eligibles to any such position or was denied reinstatement to any such position, solely by reason of any such policy or program of the Federal Government, shall have the grade, time in grade, and rate of compensation in the postal field service or the time in grade and rate of compensation in the classified civil service, as the case may be, which he would have attained automatically if such policy or program of the Federal Government had not been in effect: *Provided*, That in the case of loss of opportunity for or denial of probational appointment from a civil-service register of eligibles, the date of loss of opportunity for or denial of probational appointment shall be held to be the earliest date on which an eligible standing lower on the same register received a probational appointment therefrom.

SEC. 2. This act shall not affect the status of any person in the postal field service as a regular or substitute employee.

SEC. 3. No person shall be entitled, by reason of the enactment of this act, to compensation for any period prior to the effective date of this act.

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7202) to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress," approved June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 25; 13 U. S. C. 216).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 16 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress," approved June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 25; 13 U. S. C. 216), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 16. That there shall be taken, beginning in the month of October 1954, and in the same month of every tenth year thereafter, a census of agriculture. The census herein provided for shall include each State, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico; and it shall also include such other areas or territory over which the United States exercises sovereignty or jurisdiction as the Secretary of Commerce shall determine. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to collect such preliminary or supplementary statistics, either in advance of or after the taking of such census, as are necessary to the initiation, taking, or completion thereof. The inquiries, and the number, form and subdivisions thereof for the census provided for in this section shall be determined by the Secretary of Commerce. Employees of the Department of Commerce and other departments and independent offices of the Government may, with the consent of the head of the respective department or office, be employed and compensated for field work in connection with each census provided for by this section."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 5, strike out "or jurisdiction."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNLOADING OF MAIL FROM VESSELS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7877) to amend section 1699 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the unloading of mail from vessels.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

There was no objection.

STATUS OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES AT POST EXCHANGES, ETC.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1828) to confirm the status of certain civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities under the Armed Forces with respect to laws administered by the Civil Service Commission, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That civilian employees, compensated from nonappropriated funds, of the Army and Air Force Exchange Service, Army and Air Force Motion Picture Service, Navy exchanges, Marine Corps exchanges, Coast Guard exchanges, and other instrumentalities of the United States under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces conducted for the comfort, pleasure, contentment, and mental and physical improvement of personnel of the Armed Forces, shall not be held and considered as employees of the United States for the purpose of any laws administered by the Civil Service Commission or the provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (39 Stat. 742), as amended (5 U. S. C. '51 and the following): *Provided*, That the status of these nonappropriated fund activities as Federal instrumentalities shall not be affected.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after "service," insert "Navy's ship stores ashore."

Page 2, following line 8, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 2. The nonappropriated fund instrumentalities described in the first section of this act shall provide their civilian employees, by insurance or otherwise, with compensation for death or disability incurred in the course of employment. In the case of employees employed in the continental United States (except Alaska), compensation shall be not less than that provided by the laws of the State (or the District of Columbia) in which the employing activity of any such instrumentality is located. In the case of employees employed outside the continental limits of the United States and in Alaska, compensation shall be not less than that provided in sections 7, 8, and 9 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (44 Stat. 1427-1430), as amended, except that in the case of such employees who are not citizens of the United States compensation shall be in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Treasury, as the case may be. This section shall take effect 60 days after the date of enactment of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MODERNIZATION OF MAIL EQUIPMENT SHOPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7471) to authorize the modernization and enlargement of the Mail Equipment Shops in Washington, D. C., and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed to have prepared the necessary plans and specifications, and to enter into a contract or contracts, for the remodeling, modernization, and enlargement of the Mail Equipmen Shops in Washington, D. C., and to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a parcel of land recorded in the office of the Surveyor for the District of Columbia in Liber Governor Shepherd, folio 41, as parcel 131/99, a parcel of land thirty feet wide and approximately five hundred and sixty feet long lying between and adjacent to the two parcels of land now owned by the United States Government upon which the Mail Equipment Shops' facilities are now situated. Title to the land authorized to be acquired by this section shall be approved by the Attorney General, and any proceedings in court to acquire such land or any interest therein shall be conducted by the Attorney General.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Post Office Department, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amount as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 8, strike out beginning with the word "a" down to but not including the period on page 2, line 5, and insert the following: "the tracts of land located in the District of Columbia and known for the purposes of assessment and taxation as parcel 131/99, and lot 805 in square 3620, comprising a parcel of land thirty feet wide and approximately six hundred feet long lying adjacent to the lands owned by the United States Government upon which the Mail Equipment Shops' facilities are now situated."

On page 2, line 12, after the word "amount", insert the following: "not exceeding $500,000."

On page 2, line 13, before the period insert a comma and the following: "and such amount may be available until expended."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FUNERALS FOR DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7806) to authorize the participation by certain Federal employees, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the Armed Forces returned to the United States from abroad for burial.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to grant time to employees in the executive branch of the Government to participate, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the Armed Forces returned to the United States for burial," approved August 16, 1949, is amended to read as follows:

"That employees in the executive branch of the Government who are veterans of any war, campaign, or expedition (for which a campaign badge has been authorized), or members of honors or ceremonial groups of organizations of such veterans may be excused from duty, without loss of pay or deduction from their annual leave, for such time as may be necessary, but not in excess of 4 hours in any 1 day, to enable them to participate as active pallbearers or as members of firing squads or guards of honor in funeral ceremonies for members of the Armed Forces of the United States whose remains are returned from abroad for final interment in the United States."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSPORTATION ON CANADIAN VESSELS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2721) to provide transportation on Canadian vessels from Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, until June 30, 1953, notwithstanding the provisions of law of the United States restricting to vessels of the United States the transportation of passengers and merchandise directly or indirectly from any port in the United States to another port of the United States, passengers may be transported on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation: *Provided*, That such Canadian vessels may transport merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and other ports and points herein enumerated.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SEA LAMPREYS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6500) to amend the joint resolution of August 8, 1946, as amended, with respect to appropriations authorized for the conduct of investigations and studies thereunder.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of the first paragraph of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to investigate and eradicate the predatory sea lampreys of the Great Lakes," approved August 8, 1946, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "The cost of the investigations and studies authorized in this section shall not exceed $359,000 for the first year; $216,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951; $500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952; and $446,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. VANNEVAR BUSH

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 449) to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Vannevar Bush as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the author of the bill just why this action is necessary? Is it not a little unusual that we should be called upon to act in this capacity?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks this is done every 6 years. There may be a mistake about that, but the Chair rather thinks that is the intent.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I think that is true because this comes out of the Committee on House Administration, and this is a routine renewal of the appointment.

Mr. FORD. There is nothing in the report, and it is most vague as to why we are acting. I certainly have no objection to the action, but I was just curious as to why it should come before us in this manner.

I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, which will occur by the expiration of the term of Dr. Vannevar Bush, of Washington, D. C., on May 2, 1952, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for the statutory term of 6 years.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6856) to extend the duration of the Water Pollution Control Act, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I would like to ask the gentleman some questions about the operation and administration

of the Water Pollution Act. Can the gentleman give us any idea when the Department intends to start acting under the authority of this act, and when it is going to be our policy to eliminate pollution in the rivers and streams? I ask this question because I have been trying to get legislation through which would attempt to encourage the erection and maintenance of waste-treatment plants. The Department in reporting on the legislation simply says that they are unable to approve anything of this nature at this time because the matter is under study. When are they going to get through studying and actually do something to eliminate stream pollution?

Mr. LARCADE. In reply to the gentleman's query, I wish to say that this bill is only an extension of existing law for a period of 3 years.

With respect to the question as to the progress being made, appropriations, of course, depend entirely upon the Committee on Appropriations and the legislatures of the various States of the United States. Every effort is being made by the Department to go ahead with this program, especially in those places where the situation is so critical. But, in the first instance, we had to get legislation passed by the various States of the Union, and in some instances we have to have matching funds. But, the rapidity of the progress of the program is based entirely on the extent to which appropriations are made by the Congress for that purpose.

Mr. BYRNES. In this instance, of course, appropriations have nothing to do with it. It seems to me that they simply cannot make up their minds as to what they want to do so far as the encouragement of the building of waste-treatment plants is concerned. I cannot understand why they are moving so slowly in operating under this authority, and why they have not been able to decide that we certainly have to do everything possible to encourage the communities and industries and anybody that we can encourage to stop dumping waste, and particularly industrial waste, into the streams and rivers of the country.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I concur in the inquiry made by the gentleman from Wisconsin, and also the statement made by the gentleman from Louisiana. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin brought out a very good point. It was brought out in committee, namely that it is time that we started action on this stream-pollution program. As the gentleman from Louisiana said, this is simply an extension of the enabling legislation. But, the time has certainly arrived where we have to have some action. I might add this bill came out of our committee by a unanimous vote after quite a bit of discussion.

Mr. BYRNES. As I suggested, Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to object, but I did want to bring this matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the words "each of the five fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1953" where they occur in section 7 and subsections (a), (c), (d), and (e) of section 8 of the Water Pollution Control Act (Public Law 845, 80th Cong.), are hereby amended to read "each of the eight fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1956."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JACKSON of Washington (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Thursday next, following the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

AMENDING UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 7714) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 21 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, is further amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"The President may retain the unit organizations and the equipment thereof, exclusive of the individual members thereof, in the active Federal service for a total period of five consecutive years, and upon being relieved by the appropriate Secretary from active Federal service, National Guard, or Air National Guard units, shall, insofar as practicable, be returned to their National Guard or Air National Guard status in their respective States, Territories, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, with pertinent records, colors, histories, trophies, and other historical impedimenta."

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force, as appropriate, may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, provide for the organization within any State, Territory, the District of Columbia, or Puerto Rico, of units of the National Guard and Air National Guard whenever unit organizations thereof are retained in the Federal service pursuant to the amendatory provisions of the first section hereof. Each unit so organized shall be comparable in organization structure to that of the unit organization retained in the Federal service, and the strength of any such organized unit shall be as prescribed by the appropriate Secretary and may be changed from time to time, depending upon the availability of manpower: *Provided*, That such units, organized as herein provided, and the members thereof shall be integrated into the respective corresponding unit organizations of the National Guard and Air National Guard retained in the Federal service within a reasonable time after the date of the release of such retained units to State control: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force, as appropriate, under such regulations as he may prescribe shall provide for the arming and equipping of such units in such manner and without regard to apportionment, from available Army, or Air Force stocks, as appropriate, or otherwise, as he may deem necessary. Such arms and equipment shall be provided initially on a reduced basis and changed from time to time depending upon their availability.

SEC. 3. Pursuant to regulations prescribed by the appropriate Secretary, the units authorized in section 2 hereof shall consist of persons eligible for enlistment and appointment in the National Guard or Air National Guard of the respective State, Territory, the District of Columbia, or Puerto Rico, in accordance with the provisions of the National Defense Act, as amended, and of members of the National Guard or Air National Guard who are released from the active military service of the United States or have nonterminated enlistments or appointments in the National Guard or Air National Guard of the respective State, Territory, the District of Columbia, or Puerto Rico, and the members thereof shall be entitled to the same benefits, rights, privileges, and emoluments and be subject to the same laws and regulations, as other members of the National Guard or Air National Guard of such State, Territory, the District of Columbia, or Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House would authorize the President to retain the unit organizations and the equipment thereof of the National Guard, Air National Guard, and other Reserve components in the active Federal service for a total period of five consecutive years.

At the outset I want to make it clear that this bill in no way extends the period of military service required of individuals under present law. It only pertains to the retention of unit designations and the units' records, colors, trophies, and other historical impedimenta. Under the terms of the bill, at the end of the 5-year period, or sooner if possible, the unit designations, together with pertinent records, colors, histories, trophies, and so forth, will be returned to the States.

I would like to explain why this legislation is necessary. Under section 21 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, the President is authorized to order into active military or naval service of the United States for a period not to exceed 24 months any or all members or units of any or all Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States. There is no authority in that statute to retain units longer than the 24-month period specified in the act. Therefore, in the absence of this or other legislation, all units of the Reserve components ordered into Federal service must be released within a period not exceeding 24 months. Consequently, it will be necessary to designate or create new units to take the place of those being released to inactive duty under the provisions of present law.

This bill would allow the military services to retain the unit designations

in the active service for a period not exceeding 5 years and also provides that when a unit is ordered into active Federal service from any State, a duplicate unit will be formed in that State to take the place of the unit ordered into the Federal service.

The unit to be formed at home will be a cadre-type unit and will bear the identical designation as its parent unit in the Federal service. The only difference will be that following the numerical designation of the unit the letters NGUS will be added.

I believe I can best explain to the Members how this bill will work by using a hypothetical example. My colleagues all know that the Forty-fifth Division of Oklahoma has been in the Federal service for almost 2 years. Not only is it in the Federal service but it is adding to the glorious history of the State of Oklahoma by its actions on the front in Korea. Under the provisions of present law, the Forty-fifth Division is due to be released to inactive duty in the not-too-far-distant future. Consequently, a new division will be required to take the place of the Forty-fifth Division when it is released from the Federal service. Now, this can be done in several ways. A new division can be ordered to active duty or, as the bill provides, the numerical designation of the Forty-fifth Division can be retained in the Federal service when the individual members thereof are returned to their homes.

When the Forty-fifth Division—or, for that matter, any other National Guard division—was ordered to active duty it was at about 50 percent strength. Following its entrance into the Federal service, it was filled up with draftees who, in nearly all instances, came from other States than Oklahoma. In addition, these draftees have different terms of service than the terms of service of the members of the Oklahoma division who were mustered into the service when the division was activated. It is easy to see, then, that if you take the Forty-fifth Division out of the Federal service, some place must be found for approximately 9,000 members of that division who will not be released when the division is deactivated.

The most painless method of accomplishing this, and by far the least expensive, is to retain the numerical designation of the Forty-fifth Division in the active military service and create a duplicate unit back in Oklahoma where the returning members of the Forty-fifth Division can be assigned.

Stop and think what is necessary if a new numerical division is created in the active service. It means the relettering and restenciling of all records and equipment. Each individual member's file must be changed so as to conform with the new division's numerical designation. Even mailing addresses must be changed and the administrative burden placed upon the military services is something which should be prevented.

As a matter of fact, this is a very simple bill. There is nothing complicated about it. There is nothing hidden. It does not harm the National Guard or the Reserve components. The Department of Defense is requesting the legislation and the National Guard Association and the Reserve Officers Association heartily endorse it.

Before my committee began hearings on this bill, I asked the president of the National Guard Association to poll each State in the Union and ask for its comments on the legislation. The results of the poll can be read in the printed subcommittee hearings, but I can tell you that the overwhelming majority of the States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico endorse this bill. The poll showed that 42 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico voted in favor of this legislation and six States opposed it. It is significant to note that of the six States opposing, only two had any units of their National Guard in the Federal service. On the other hand, those States whose National Guard units are almost entirely federalized and serving overseas endorsed the bill and requested its enactment.

I would like to say one word about cost. If we pass this bill, there will be realized a saving of no less than approximately $6,000,000 per division for each National Guard division federalized, in the normal costs of operation. I invite your attention to page 5 of the committee's report which sets forth the cost data of this legislation. We will save many millions in eliminating the call of duplicate guard divisions.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close my remarks by saying that this bill is urgently needed and it is needed now because those National Guard divisions and Reserve units which were mustered into the Federal service shortly following the outbreak of hostilities in Korea are due to be released and returned to their homes. We must provide other units both at home and in the field. This bill accomplishes just that.

The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

VETERANS' EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1952

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 7656) to provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date, as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I—SHORT TITLE AND STATEMENT OF POLICY

Short title

SEC. 101. This act may be cited as the "Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952."

Statement of policy

SEC. 102. The Congress of the United States hereby declares that the veterans' education and training program created by this act is for the purpose of providing vocational readjustment and restoring lost educational opportunities to those service men and women whose educational or vocational ambitions have been interrupted or impeded by reason of active service in the Armed Forces during a period of national emergency and for the purpose of aiding such persons in attaining the educational and training status which they might normally have aspired to and obtained had they not served their country; and that the home, farm, and business-loan benefits, the old-age and survivors insurance credit, the mustering-out payments, and the employment assistance provided for by this act are for the purpose of assisting in the readjustment of such persons from military to civilian life.

TITLE II—EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL ASSISTANCE

PART I—DEFINITIONS

SEC. 201. For the purposes of this title—

(1) the term "basic service period" means the period beginning on June 27, 1950, and ending on such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress;

(2) the term "eligible veteran" means any person who is not in the active service in the Armed Forces and who—

(A) has served in the active service in the Armed Forces at any time during the basic service period,

(B) has been discharged or released from such active service under conditions other than dishonorable, and

(C) has served in the active service in the Armed Forces for 90 days or more (exclusive of any period he was assigned by the Armed Forces to a civilian institution for a course of education or training which was substantially the same as established courses offered to civilians, or as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies), or has been discharged or released from active service by reason of an actual service-incurred injury or disability;

(3) the term "program of education or training" means any single unit course or subject, any curriculum, or any combination of unit courses or subjects, which is generally accepted as necessary to fulfill requirements for the attainment of a predetermined and identified educational, professional, or vocational objective;

(4) the term "course" means an organized unit of subject matter in which instruction is offered within a given period of time or which covers a specific amount of related subject matter for which credit toward graduation or certification is usually given;

(5) the term "dependent" means—

(A) a child (as defined in par. VI of Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended) of an eligible veteran,

(B) a parent (as defined in par. VII of Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended) of an eligible veteran, if the parent is in fact, dependent upon the veteran, and

(C) the wife of an eligible veteran, or, in the case of an eligible veteran who is a woman, her husband if he is in fact dependent upon the veteran;

(6) the term "educational institution" means any public or private elementary school, secondary school, vocational school, correspondence school, business school, junior college, teachers college, college, normal school, professional school, university, scientific or technical institution, or other institution furnishing education for adults;

(7) the term "training establishment" means any business or other establishment providing apprentice or other training on the job, including those under the supervision of a college or university or any State department of education, or any State apprenticeship agency, or any State board of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

vocational education, or any apprentice council, or the Bureau of Apprenticeship established in accordance with Public Law 308, Seventy-fifth Congress, or any agency of the Federal Government authorized to supervise such training;

(8) the term "Armed Forces" means the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard of the United States;

(9) the term "State" means the several States, the Territories and possessions of the United States, and the District of Columbia;

(10) the term "Administrator" means the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; and

(11) the term "Commissioner" means the United States Commissioner of Education.

PART II—ELIGIBILITY

Entitlement to educaion or training generally

SEC. 211. Each eligible veteran shall, subject to the provisions of this title, be entitled to the education or training provided under this title.

Commencement; time limitations

SEC. 212. (a) No eligible veteran shall be entitled to initiate a program of education or training under this title after September 1, 1954, or after two years after his discharge or release from active service, whichever is later.

(b) The program of education and training of an eligible veteran under this title shall, on and after the delimiting date for the veteran to initiate his program, be pursued continuously until completion except that an eligible veteran may suspend the pursuit of his program for periods of not more than 12 consecutive months, and may suspend the pursuit of such program for longer periods if the Administrator finds that the suspension for each such period was due to conditions beyond the control of the eligible veteran.

(c) In the event an eligible veteran returns to active service in the Armed Forces during the basic service period, his date of discharge or release shall, for the purposes of this section and section 213, be the date of his discharge or release from his last period of active service which began during the basic service period.

Expiration of all education and training

SEC. 213. No education or training shall be afforded an eligible veteran under this title beyond seven years after either his discharge or release from active service or the end of the basic service period, whichever is earlier.

Duration of veteran's education or training

SEC. 214. (a) Each eligible veteran shall be entitled to education or training under this title for a period equal to one and a half times the duration of his active service in the Armed Forces during the basic service period (or to the equivalent thereof in part-time training), except that—

(1) in computing the duration of his active service in the Armed Forces, there shall be excluded a period equal to any period he was assigned by the Armed Forces to a civilian institution for a course of education or training which was substantially the same as established courses offered to civilians or as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies;

(2) the period of education or training to which an eligible veteran shall be entitled under this title shall not, except as provided in subsection (b), exceed 36 months; and

(3) the period of education or training to which an eligible veteran shall be entitled under this title together with education or training received under part VII (Public Law 16, 78th Cong., as amended, and Public Law 894, 81st Cong., as amended), or part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, shall not, except as provided in subsection (b), exceed 48 months in the aggregate.

(b) Whenever the period of entitlement to education or training under this title of an eligible veteran who is enrolled in an educational institution regularly operated on the quarter or semester system ends during a quarter or semester and after a major part of such semester or quarter has expired, such period shall be extended to the termination of such unexpired quarter or semester. In all other courses offered by educational institutions, whenever the period of eligibility ends after a major portion of the course is completed such period may be extended to the end of the course or for 9 weeks, whichever is the lesser period.

(c) In the case of any eligible veteran who is pursuing any program of education or training exclusively by correspondence, one-fourth of the elapsed time in following such program of education or training shall be charged against the veteran's period of entitlement.

PART III—ENROLLMENT

Selection of program

SEC. 221. Subject to the provisions of this title, each eligible veteran may select a program of education or training to assist him in attaining an educational, professional, or vocational objective at any educational institution or training establishment selected by him, whether or not located in the State in which he resides, which will accept and retain him as a student or trainee in any field or branch of knowledge which such institution or establishment finds him qualified to undertake or pursue. In no event, however, may an eligible veteran pursue a program of education or training under this title at an educational institution or training establishment which is not located in a State, except that the Administrator may approve the pursuit of a program of education or training in the Republic of the Philippines at an approved educational institution or training establishment.

Applications; approval

SEC. 222. Any eligible veteran who desires to initiate a program of education or training under this title shall submit an application to the Administrator which shall be in such form, and contain such information, as the Administrator shall prescribe. The Administrator shall approve such application unless he finds that such veteran is not eligible for or entitled to the education or training applied for or that his program of education or training fails to meet any of the requirements of this title, or that the eligible veteran is already qualified, by reason of previous education and training, for the educational, professional, or vocational objective for which the courses of the program of education or training are offered. The Administrator shall notify the eligible veteran of the approval or disapproval of his application.

Change of program

SEC. 223. (a) Subject to the provisions of section 222, each eligible veteran may, at any time prior to the end of the period during which he is entitled to initiate a program of education or training under this title, make not more than one change of program of education or training.

(b) Each eligible veteran, who has not made a change of program of education or training before the expiration of the period during which he is entitled to initiate a program of education or training under this title, may make not more than one change of program of education or training with the approval of the Administrator. The Administrator shall approve such a change if he finds that—

(1) the eligible veteran is not making satisfactory progress in his present program and that the failure is not due to his own misconduct, his own neglect, or his own lack of application, and if the program to which the eligible veteran desires to change is more in keeping with his aptitude or previous education and training; or

(2) the program to which the eligible veteran desires to change, while not a part of the program currently pursued by him, is a normal progression from such program.

Avocational and recreational courses

SEC. 224. (a) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran in any bartending course, dancing course, or personality development course.

(b) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran—

(1) in any photography course, entertainment course, or any flight training course pursued as a hobby or which the Administrator finds to be avocational or recreational in character, or

(2) in any music course—instrumental or vocal—public speaking course, or course in sports or athletics such as horseback riding, swimming, fishing, skiing, golf, baseball, tennis, bowling, sports officiating, or other sport or athletic courses, except courses of applied music, physical education, or public speaking which are offered by institutions of higher learning for credit as an integral part of a program leading to an educational objective, or

(3) in any other type of course which the Administrator finds to be avocational or recreational in character;

unless the eligible veteran submits justification showing that the course will be of bona fide use in the pursuit of his present or contemplated business or occupation.

Discontinuance for unsatisfactory progress

SEC. 225. The Administrator shall discontinue the education and training allowance of an eligible veteran if, at any time, he finds that, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the educational institution or training establishment, the conduct or progress of such veteran is unsatisfactory.

Minimum number of nonveteran students required

SEC. 226. The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of any eligible veteran, not already enrolled, in any nonaccredited course below the college level offered by a proprietary profit or proprietary nonprofit educational institution for any period during which the Administrator finds that more than three-fourths of the students enrolled in the course are having all or any part of their tuition, fees, or other charges paid to or fo. them by the educational institution or the Veterans' Administration under part VII or part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) or this title.

Period of operation for approval

SEC. 227. (a) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran in any course offered by an educational institution when such course has been in operation for less than 2 years.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to—

(1) any course to be pursued in a public or other tax-supported educational institution;

(2) any course which is offered by an educational institution which has been in operation for more than 2 years, if such course is similar in character to the instruction previously given by such institution; or

(3) any course which has been offered by an institution for a period of more than 2 years, notwithstanding the institution has moved to another location within the same general locality.

Institutions listed by Attorney General

SEC. 228. The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of, or payment of an education and training allowance to, any eligible veteran in any course in an educational institution or training establishment while it is listed by the Attorney General under section 3 of part III of Executive Order 9835, as amended.

PART IV—PAYMENTS TO VETERANS

Education and training allowance

SEC. 231. (a) The Administrator shall pay to each eligible veteran who is pursuing a program of education or training under this title, and who applies therefor, an education and training allowance to meet in part the expenses of his subsistence, tuition, fees, supplies, books, and equipment.

(b) The education and training allowance for an eligible veteran shall be paid, as provided in section 232, only for the period of the veteran's enrollment as approved by the Administrator, but no allowance shall be paid—

(1) to any veteran enrolled in a course approved under section 253 or a course of institutional on-farm training for any period when the veteran is not pursuing his course in accordance with the regularly established policies and regulations of the institution and the requirements of this title.

(2) to any veteran enrolled in a course approved under section 254 or in a course of apprentice or other training on the job for any day of absence in excess of 30 days in a 12-month period, not counting as absences week ends or legal holidays established by Federal or State law during which the institution or establishment is not regularly in session or operation, or

(3) to any veteran pursuing his program of education exclusively by correspondence for any period during which no lessons were serviced by the institution.

(c) No education and training allowance shall be paid to an eligible veteran for any period until the Administrator shall have received—

(1) from the eligible veteran (A) in the case of an eligible veteran enrolled in a course approved under section 253 or a course of institutional on-farm training, a certification that he was actually enrolled in and pursuing the course as approved by the Administrator, or (B) in the case of an eligible veteran enrolled in a course approved under section 254 or a course of apprentice or other training on the job, a certification as to actual attendance during such period, or (C) in the case of an eligible veteran enrolled in a program of education or training by correspondence, a certification as to the number of lessons actually completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution, and

(2) from the educational institution or training establishment, a certification or an endorsement on the veteran's certificate, that such veteran was enrolled in and pursuing a course of education or training during such period, and, in the case of an institution furnishing education or training to a veteran exclusively by correspondence, a certification, or an endorsement on the veteran's certificate, as to the number of lessons completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution.

Education and training allowances shall, insofar as practicable, be paid within 20 days after receipt by the Administrator of the certifications required by this subsection.

Computation of education and training allowances

SEC. 232. (a) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran who is pursuing a program of education or training in an educational institution and is not entitled to receive an education and training allowance under subsection (b), (c), (d), (e), or (f) shall be computed as follows:

(1) If such program is pursued on a full-time basis, such allowance shall be computed at the rate of $110 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or at the rate of $150 per month, if he has one or more dependents.

(2) If such program is pursued on a three-quarters time basis, such allowance shall be computed at the rate of $80 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or at the rate of $110 per month, if he has one or more dependents.

(3) If such program is pursued on a half-time basis, such allowance shall be computed at the rate of $50 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or at the rate of $70 per month, if he has one or more dependents.

(b) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran who is pursuing a full-time program of education and training which consists of institutional courses and on-the-job training, with the on-the-job training portion of the program being strictly supplemental to the institutional portion, shall be computed at the rate of (1) $90 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) $120 per month, if he has one or more dependents.

(c) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran pursuing apprentice or other training on the job shall be computed at the rate of (1) $70 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) $95 per month, if he has one or more dependents; except that his education and training allowance shall be reduced at the end of each 4-month period as his program progresses by an amount which bears the same ratio to the basic education and training allowance as 4 months bears to the total duration of his apprentice or other training on the job; but in no case shall the Administrator pay an education and training allowance under this subsection in an amount which, when added to the compensation to be paid to the veteran, in accordance with his approved training program, for productive labor performed as a part of his course, would exceed the rate of (1) $225 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) $300 per month, if he has one or more dependents. For the purpose of computing allowances under this subsection, the duration of the training of an eligible veteran shall be the period specified in the approved application as the period during which he may receive an education and training allowance for such training, plus such additional period, if any, as is necessary to make the number of months of such training a multiple of four.

(d) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran pursuing institutional on-farm training shall be computed at the rate of (1) $95 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) $120 per month, if he has one or more dependents; except that his education and training allowance shall be reduced at the end of each 4-month period as his program progresses by an amount which bears the same ratio to $65 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or $90 per month, if he has one or more dependents, as 4 months bears to the total duration of such veteran's institutional on-farm training. For the purpose of computing allowances under this subsection, the duration of the training of an eligible veteran shall be the period specified in the approved application as the period during which he may receive an education and training allowance for such training, plus such additional period, if any, as is necessary to make the number of such months of such training a multiple of four.

(e) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran pursuing a program of education or training exclusively by correspondence shall be computed on the basis of the established charge which the institution requires nonveterans to pay for the course or courses pursued by the eligible veteran. Such allowance shall be paid quarterly on a pro-rata basis for the lessons completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution, as certified by the institution.

(f) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran who is pursuing a program of education or training under this title in an educational institution of a less-than-half-time basis shall be computed at the rate of (1) the established charges for tuition and fees which the institution requires similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same course to pay, or (2) $110 per month for a full-time course, whichever is the lesser.

(g) Each eligible veteran who is pursuing an approved course of flight training shall be paid an education and training allowance to be computed at the rate of 75 percent of the established charge which similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same flight course are required to pay for tuition for the course. If such veteran's program of education or training consists exclusively of flight training, he shall not be paid an education and training allowance under one of the preceding subsections of this section; if his program of education or training consists of flight training and other education or training, the allowance payable under this subsection shall be in addition to any education and training allowance payable to him under one of the preceding subsections of this section for education or training other than flight training. Such allowance shall be paid monthly upon receipt of certification from the eligible veteran and the institution as to the actual flight training received by the veteran. In each such case the eligible veteran's period of entitlement shall be charged (in addition to any charge made against his entitlement by reason of education or training other than flight training) with 1 day for each $1.25 which is paid to the veteran as an education and training allowance for such course.

(h) No eligible veteran shall be paid an education and training allowance under this title for any period during which (1) he is enrolled in and pursuing a course of education or training paid for by the United States under any provision of law other than this title, where the payment of such allowance would constitute a duplication of benefits paid to the veteran from the Federal Treasury, or (2) he is pursuing a course of apprentice or other training on the job, a course of institutional on-farm training, or a course of education and training described in subsection (b), on a less than full-time basis.

Full-time courses

SEC. 233. (a) For the purposes of this title, (1) an institutional trade or technical course offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level involving shop practice as an integral part thereof, shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of 30 hours per week of attendance is required with not more than 2½ hours of rest periods per week allowed, (2) an institutional course offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level in which theoretical or class room instruction predominates shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of 25 hours per week net of instruction is required, and (3) an institutional undergraduate course offered by a college or university on a quarter or semester-hour basis for which credit is granted toward a standard college

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

degree shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of 14 semester hours or its equivalent is required.

(b) The Administrator shall define full-time training in the case of all types of courses of education or training other than institutional on-farm training and the types of courses referred to in subsection (a).

Overcharges by educational institutions

SEC. 234. The Administrator shall, if he finds that an institution has charged or received for any eligible veteran any amount in excess of the established charges for tuition and fees which the institution requires similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same course to pay, disapprove such educational institution for the enrollment of any veteran not already enrolled therein, except that, in the case of a tax-supported public educational institution which does not have established charges for tuition and fees which it requires nonveteran residents to pay, such institution may charge and receive from each eligible veteran who is a resident an amount equal to the estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction attributable to such veteran, but in no event to exceed the rate of $31 per month for a full-time course.

PART V—STATE APPROVING AGENCIES

Designation

SEC. 241. (a) The chief executive of each State is requested to create or designate a State department or agency as the "State approving agency" for his State for the purposes of this title.

(b) (1) In the event the chief executive of any State fails or declines to create or designate a State approving agency, the provisions of this title which refer to the State approving agency shall, with respect to such State, be deemed to refer to the Commissioner.

(2) In the case of courses subject to approval by the Commissioner under section 242, the provisions of this title which refer to a State approving agency shall be deemed to refer to the Commissioner.

Approval of courses

SEC. 242. (a) An eligible veteran shall receive the benefits of this title while enrolled in a course of education or training offered by an educational institution or training establishment only if such course is approved by the State approving agency for the State where such educational institution or training establishment is situated or by the Commissioner. Approval of courses by State approving agencies shall be in accordance with the provisions of this title and such other regulations and policies as the State approving agency may adopt. Each State approving agency shall furnish the Administrator with a current list of educational institutions and training establishments, specifying courses which it has approved, and, in addition to such list, it shall furnish such other information to the Administrator as it and the Administrator may determine to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title. Each State approving agency shall notify the Administrator of the disapproval of any course previously approved and shall set forth the reasons for such disapproval.

(b) The Commissioner shall be responsible for the approval of courses of education or training offered by any agency of the Federal Government authorized under other laws to supervise such education or training. The Commissioner may approve any course in any other educational institution or training establishment in accordance with the provisions of this title.

Cooperation

SEC. 243. (a) The Administrator and each State approving agency shall take cognizance of the fact that definite duties, functions, and responsibilities are conferred upon the Administrator and each State approving agency under the veterans' educational programs. To assure that such programs are effectively and efficiently administered, the cooperation of the Administrator and the State approving agencies is essential. It is necessary to establish an exchange of information pertaining to activities of educational institutions and training establishments, and particular attention should be given to the enforcement of approval standards, enforcement of wage and income limitations, enforcement of enrollment restrictions, and fraudulent and other criminal activities on the part of persons connected with educational institutions and training establishments in which veterans are enrolled under this title.

(b) The Administrator will furnish the State approving agencies with copies of such Veterans' Administration informational material as may aid them in carrying out this title.

Use of Office of Education and other Federal agencies

SEC. 244. (a) In carrying out his functions under this title, the Administrator may utilize the facilities and services of any other Federal department or agency. The Administrator shall utilize the services of the Office of Education in developing cooperative agreements between the Administrator and State and local agencies relating to the approval of courses of education or training as provided for in section 245, in reviewing the plan of operations of State approving agencies under such agreements, and in rendering technical assistance to such State and local agencies in developing and improving policies, standards, and legislation in connection with their duties under this title.

(b) Any such utilization shall be pursuant to proper agreement with the Federal department or agency concerned; and payment to cover the cost thereof shall (except in the case of the Office of Education) be made either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be provided in such agreement. Funds necessary to enable the Office of Education to carry out its functions under this title are authorized to be appropriated directly to such Office.

Reimbursement of expenses

SEC. 245. The Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts or agreements with State and local agencies to pay such State and local agencies for reasonable and necessary expenses of salary and travel incurred by employees of such agencies in (1) rendering necessary services in ascertaining the qualifications of educational institutions and training establishments for furnishing courses of education or training to eligible veterans under this title, and in the supervision of such educational institutions and training establishments, and (2) furnishing, at the request of the Administrator, any other services in connection with this title. Each such contract or agreement shall be conditioned upon compliance with the standards and provisions of this title.

PART VI—APPROVAL OF COURSES OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Apprentice or other training on the job

SEC. 251. (a) Apprentice or other training on the job shall consist of courses offered by training establishments whenever such courses of training are furnished in accordance with the provisions of this section. Any training establishment desiring to furnish a course of apprentice or other training on the job shall submit to the appropriate State approving agency a written application setting forth the course of training for each job for which an eligible veteran is to be trained. The written application covering the course of training shall include the following:

(1) Title and description of the specific job objective for which the eligible veteran is to be trained;

(2) The length of the training period;

(3) A schedule listing various operations for major kinds of work or tasks to be learned and showing for each, job operations or work, tasks to be performed, and the approximate length of time to be spent on each operation or task;

(4) The wage or salary to be paid at the beginning of the course of training, at each successive step in the course, and at the completion of training;

(5) The entrance wage or salary paid by the establishment to employees already trained in the kind of work for which the veteran is to be trained; and

(6) The number of hours of supplemental related instruction required.

(b) The appropriate State approving agency may approve a course of apprentice or other training on the job specified in an application submitted by a training establishment in accordance with subsection (a) if such training establishment is found upon investigation to have met the following criteria:

(1) The training content of the course is adequate to qualify the eligible veteran for appointment to the job for which he is to be trained.

(2) There is reasonable certainty that the job for which the eligible veteran is to be trained will be available to him at the end of the training period.

(3) The job is one in which progression and appointment to the next higher classification are based upon skills learned through organized training on the job and not on such factors as length of service and normal turn-over.

(4) The wages to be paid the eligible veteran for each successive period of training are not less than those customarily paid in the training establishment and in the community to a learner in the same job who is not a veteran.

(5) The job customarily requires a period of training of not less than 3 months and not more than 2 years of full-time training, except that this provision shall not apply to apprentice training.

(6) The length of the training period is no longer than that customarily required by the training establishment and other training establishments in the community to provide an eligible veteran with the required skills, arrange for the acquiring of job knowledge, technical information, and other facts which the eligible veteran will need to learn in order to become competent on the job for which he is being trained.

(7) Provision is made for related instruction for the individual eligible veteran who may need it.

(8) There is in the training establishment adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructor personnel to provide satisfactory training on the job.

(9) Adequate records are kept to show the progress made by each eligible veteran toward his job objective.

(10) Appropriate credit is given the eligible veteran for previous training and job experience, whether in the military service or elsewhere, his beginning wage adjusted to the level to which such credit advances him and his training period shortened accordingly and provision is made for certification by the training establishment that

tendance and progress or grades, and satisfactory standards relating to attendance, progress, and conduct are enforced.

(8) The institution complies with all local, city, county, municipal, State, and Federal regulations, such as fire codes, building and sanitation codes. The State approving agency may require such evidence of compliance as is deemed necessary.

(9) The institution is financially sound and capable of fulfilling its commitments for training.

(10) The institution does not utilize advertising of any type which is erroneous or misleading, either by actual statement, omission, or intimation. The institution shall not be deemed to have met this requirement until the State approving agency (1) has ascertained from the Federal Trade Commission whether the Commission has issued an order to the institution to cease and desist from any act or practice, and (2) has, if such an order has been issued, given due weight to that fact.

(11) The institution does not exceed its enrollment limitations as established by the State approving agency.

(12) The institution's administrators, directors, owners, and instructors are of good reputation and character.

(13) The institution has and maintains a policy for the refund of the unused portion of tuition, fees, and other charges in the event the student fails to enter the course or withdraws or is discontinued therefrom at any time prior to completion and such policy must provide that the amount charged to the student for tuition, fees, and other charges for a portion of the course shall not exceed the approximate pro rata portion of the total charges for tuition, fees, and other charges that the length of the completed portion of the course bears to its total length.

(14) Such additional criteria as may be deemed necessary by the State approving agency.

Notice of approval of courses

SEC. 255. The State approving agency, upon determining that an educational institution has complied with all the requirements of this title, will issue a letter to such institution setting forth the courses which have been approved for the purposes of this title, and will furnish an official copy of such letter and any subsequent amendments to the Administrator. The letter of approval shall be accompanied by a copy of the catalog or bulletin of the institution, as approved by the State approving agency, and shall contain the following information:

(1) date of letter and effective date of approval of courses;

(2) proper address and name of each educational institution or training establishment;

(3) authority for approval and conditions of approval, referring specifically to the approved catalog or bulletin published by the educational institution;

(4) name of each course approved;

(5) where applicable, enrollment limitations such as maximum numbers authorized and student-teacher ratio;

(6) signature of responsible official of State approving agency; and

(7) such other fair and reasonable provisions as are considered necessary by the appropriate State approving agency.

Disapproval of courses and discontinuance of allowances

SEC. 256. (a) Any course approved for the purposes of this title which fails to meet any of the requirements of this title shall be immediately disapproved by the appropriate State approving agency. An educational institution or training establishment which has its courses disapproved by a State approving agency will be notified of such disapproval by a registered letter of notification and a return receipt secured.

(b) The Administrator may discontinue the education and training allowance of any eligible veteran if he finds that the course of education or training in which such veteran is enrolled fails to meet any of the requirements of this title or if he finds that the educational institution or training establishment offering such course has violated any provision of this title or fails to meet any of its requirements.

(c) Each State approving agency shall notify the Administrator of each course which it has disapproved under this section. The Administrator shall notify the State approving agency of his disapproval of any educational institution or training establishment under part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended.

PART VII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Authority and duties of Administrator

SEC. 261. (a) The Administrator is authorized to prescribe, promulgate, and publish such rules and regulations as are consistent with the provisions of this title and necessary to carry out it purposes. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 11 of the act of October 17, 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1193), payments under this title shall be subject to audit and review by the General Accounting Office as provided by the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended, and the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950.

(b) The Administrator is authorized to accept uncompensated services and to enter into contracts or agreements with private or public agencies, or persons, for necessary services, incident to the administration of this title, including personal services, as he may deem practicable.

(c) The Administrator may arrange for educational and vocational guidance to persons eligible for education and training under this title and, if the Administrator requires such educational and vocational guidance, he is authorized, in his discretion, to defray, or reimburse the veteran for his traveling expenses to and from the place of advisement. At such intervals as he deems necessary, he shall make available information respecting the need for general education and for trained personnel in the various crafts, trades, and professions: *Provided*, That facilities of other Federal agencies collecting such information shall be utilized to the extent he deems practicable.

Advisory committee

SEC. 262. The Administrator shall form an advisory committee which shall be composed of persons who are eminent in the field of education and are representative of the various types of institutions and establishments furnishing education and training to veterans enrolled under this title. The Commissioer shall be an ex officio member of the advisory committee. The Administrator shall advise and consult with the committee from time to time with respect to the adminstration of this title and the committee may make such reports and recommendations as it deems desirable to the Administrator and to the Congress.

Control by agencies of United States

SEC. 263. No department, agency, or officer of the United States, in carrying out this title, shall exercise any supervision or control, whatsoever, over any State approving agency, State educational agency, or State apprenticeship agency, or any educational institution or training establishment: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be deemed to prevent any department, agency, or officer of the United States from exercising any supervision or control which such department, agency, or officer is authorized, by existing provisions of law, to exercise over any Federal educational institution or training establishment, or to prevent the furnishing of education or training under this title in any institution or establishment over which supervision or control is exercised by such other department, agency, or officer under authority of existing provisions of law.

Conflicting interests

SEC. 264. (a) Every officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration or of the Office of Education, who has, while such an officer or employee, owned any interest in, or received any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, any educational institution operated for profit in which an eligible veteran was pursuing a course of education or training under this title shall be immediately dismissed from his office or employment.

(b) If the Administrator finds that any person who is an officer or employee of a State approving agency has, while he was such an officer or employee, owned any interest in, or received any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, an educational institution operated for profit in which an eligible veteran was pursuing a course of education or training under this title, he shall discontinue making payments under section 245 to such State approving agency unless such agency shall, without delay, take such steps as may be necessary to terminate the employment of such person and such payments shall not be resumed while such person is an officer or employee of the State approving agency, or State Department of Veterans Affairs or State Department of Education.

(c) A State approving agency shall not approve any course offered by an educational institution operated for profit and, if any such course has been approved, shall disapprove each such course, if its finds that any officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration, the Office of Education, or the State approving agency owns an interest in, or receives any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, such institution.

Reports by institutions

SEC. 265. Educational institutions and training establishments shall, without delay, report to the Administrator in the form prescribed by him, the enrollment, interruption, and termination of the education or training of each eligible veteran enrolled therein under this title.

Overpayments to veterans

SEC. 266. In any case where it is found by the Administrator that an overpayment has been made to a veteran as the result of (1) the willful or negligent failure of the educational institution or training establishment to report, as required by this title and applicable regulations, to the Veterans' Administration excessive absences from a course, or discontinuance or interruption of a course by the veteran or (2) false certification by the educational institution or training establishment, the amount of such overpayment shall constitute a liability of such institution or establishment, and may be recovered in the same manner as any other debt due the United States: *Provided*, That any amount so collected shall be reimbursed if the overpayment is recovered from the veteran. This provision shall not preclude the imposition of any civil or criminal action under this or any other statute.

Examination of records

SEC. 267. The records and accounts of educational institutions and training establishments pertaining to eligible veterans who

such credit has been granted and the beginning wage adjusted accordingly. No course of training will be considered bona fide if given to an eligible veteran who is already qualified by training and experience for the job objective.

(11) A signed copy of the training agreement for each eligible veteran, including the training program and wage scale as approved by the State approving agency, is provided to the veteran and to the Administrator and the State approving agency by the employer.

(12) Upon completion of the course of training furnished by the training establishment the eligible veteran is given a certificate by the employer indicating the length and type of training provided and that the eligible veteran has completed the course of training on the job satisfactorily.

(13) That the course meets such other criteria as may be established by the State approving agency.

Institutional on-farm training

SEC. 252. (a) An eligible veteran shall be entitled to the benefits of this title while enrolled in a course of full-time institutional on-farm training which has been approved by the appropriate State approving agency in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(b) The State approving agency may approve a course of institutional on-farm training when it satisfies the following requirements.

(1) The course combines organized group instruction in agricultural and related subjects of at least 200 hours per year (and of at least 8 hours each month) at an educational institution, with supervised work experience on a farm or other agricultural establishment.

(2) The eligible veteran will perform a part of such course on a farm or other agricultural establishment under his control.

(3) The course is developed with due consideration to the size and character of the farm or other agricultural establishment on which the eligible veteran will receive his supervised work experience and to the need of such eligible veteran, in the type of farming for which he is training, for proficiency in planning, producing, marketing, farm mechanics, conservation of resources, food conservation, farm financing, farming management, and the keeping of farm and home accounts.

(4) The eligible veteran will receive not less than 100 hours of individual instruction per year, not less than 50 hours of which shall be on such farm or other agricultural establishment (with at least two visits by the instructor to such farm each month). Such individual instruction shall be given by the instructor responsible for the veteran's institutional instruction and shall include instruction and home-study assignments in the preparation of budgets, inventories, and statements showing the production, use on the farm, and sale of crops, livestock, and livestock products.

(5) The eligible veteran will be assured of control of such farm or other agricultural establishment (whether by ownership, lease, management agreement, or other tenure arrangement) until the completion of his course.

(6) Such farm or other agricultural establishment shall be of a size and character which (A) will, together with the group-instruction part of the course, occupy the full time of the eligible veteran, (B) will permit instruction in all aspects of the management of the farm or other agricultural establishment of the type for which the eligible veteran is being trained, and will provide the eligible veteran an opportunity to apply to the operation of his farm or other agricultural establishment the major portion of the farm practices taught in the group instruction part of the course, and (C) will assure him a satisfactory income for a reasonable living under normal conditions at least by the end of his course.

(7) Provision shall be made for certification by the institution and the veteran that the training offered does not repeat or duplicate training previously received by the veteran.

(8) The institutional on-farm training meets such other fair and reasonable standards as may be established by the State approving agency.

Approval of accredited courses

SEC. 253. (a) A State approving agency may approve the courses offered by an educational institution when—

(1) such courses have been accredited and approved by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association;

(2) credit for such course is approved by the State department of education for credit toward a high-school diploma;

(3) such courses are conducted under the act of February 23, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 927), or the Vocational Education Act of 1946; or

(4) such courses are accepted by the State department of education for credit for a teacher's certificate or a teacher's degree.

For the purposes of this title the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies and associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered by an educational institution and the State approving agencies may, upon concurrence, utilize the accreditation of such accrediting associations or agencies for approval of the courses specifically accredited and approved by such accrediting association or agency. In making application for approval, the institution shall transmit to the State approving agency copies of its catalog or bulletin.

(b) As a condition to approval under this section, the State approving agency must find that adequate records are kept by the educational institution to show the progress of each eligible veteran. The State approving agency must also find that the educational institution maintains a written record of the previous education and training of the veteran and clearly indicates that appropriate credit has been given by the institution for previous education and training, with the training period shortened proportionately and the veteran and the Administrator so notified.

Approval of nonaccredited courses

SEC. 254. (a) No course of education or training (other than a course of institutional on-farm training) which has not been approved by a State approving agency pursuant to section 253, which is offered by a public or private, profit or nonprofit, educational institution shall be approved for the purposes of this title unless the educational institution offering such course submits to the appropriate State approving agency a written application for approval of such course in accordance with the provisions of this title.

(b) Such application shall be accompanied by not less than two copies of the current catalog or bulletin which is certified as true and correct in content and policy by an authorized owner or official and includes the following:

(1) Identifying data, such as volume number and date of publication;

(2) Names of the institution and its governing body, officials and faculty;

(3) A calendar of the institution showing legal holidays, beginning and ending date of each quarter, term, or semester, and other important dates;

(4) Institution policy and regulations on enrollment with respect to enrollment dates and specific entrance requirements for each course;

(5) Institution policy and regulations relative to leave, absences, class cuts, make-up work, tardiness and interruptions for unsatisfactory attendance;

(6) Institution policy and regulations relative to standards or progress required of the student by the institution (this policy will define the grading system of the institution, the minimum grades considered satisfactory, conditions for interruption for unsatisfactory grades or progress and a description of the probationary period, if any, allowed by the institution, and conditions of reentrance for those students dismissed for unsatisfactory progress. A statement will be made regarding progress records kept by the institution and furnished the student);

(7) Institution policy and regulations relating to student conduct and conditions for dismissal for unsatisfactory conduct;

(8) Detailed schedule of fees, charges for tuition, books, supplies, tools, student activities, laboratory fees, service charges, rentals, deposits, and all other charges;

(9) Policy and regulations of the institution relative to the refund of the unused portion of tuition, fees, and other charges in the event the student does not enter the course or withdraws or is discontinued therefrom;

(10) A description of the available space, facilities, and equipment;

(11) A course outline for each course for which approval is requested, showing subjects or units in the course, type of work or skill to be learned, and approximate time and clock hours to be spent on each subject or unit; and

(12) Policy and regulations of the institution relative to granting credit for previous educational training.

(c) The appropriate State approving agency may approve the application of such institution when the institution and its nonaccredited courses are found upon investigation to have met the following criteria:

(1) The courses, curriculum, and instruction are consistent in quality, content, and length with similar courses in public schools and other private schools in the State, with recognized accepted standards.

(2) There is in the institution adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructor personnel to provide training of good quality.

(3) Educational and experience qualifications of directors, administrators, and instructors are adequate.

(4) The institution maintains a written record of the previous education and training of the veteran and clearly indicates that appropriate credit has been given by the institution for previous education and training, with the training period shortened proportionately and the veteran and the Administrator so notified.

(5) A copy of the course outline, schedule of tuition, fees, and other charges, regulations pertaining to absences, grading policy, and rules of operation and conduct will be furnished the veteran upon enrollment.

(6) Upon completion of training, the veteran is given a certificate by the institution indicating the approved course and indicating that training was satisfactorily completed.

(7) Adequate records as prescribed by the State approving agency are kept to show at-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

istrator shall not refuse to pay a guarantee on loans theretofore entered into in good faith between the veteran and the lending institution."

TITLE IV—OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS' INSURANCE

Wage credits for veterans of Korean conflict

SEC. 401. (a) Section 217 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) (1) For purposes of determining entitlement to and the amount of any monthly benefit or lump-sum death payment payable under this title on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of any veteran of active military or naval service on or after June 27, 1950, such veteran shall be deemed to have been paid wages (in addition to the wages, if any, actually paid to him) of $160 in each month during any part of which he served in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress. This subsection shall not be applicable in the case of any monthly benefit or lump-sum death payment if—

"(A) a larger such benefit or payment, as the case may be, would be payable without its application; or

"(B) a benefit (other than a benefit payable in a lump sum unless it is a commutation of, or a substitute for, periodic payments) which is based, in whole or in part, upon the active military or naval service of such veteran on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be determined by Presidential procalamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, is determined by any agency or wholly owned instrumentality of the United States (other than the Veterans' Administration) to be payable by it under any other law of the United States or under a system established by such agency or instrumentality.

The provisions of clause (B) shall not be applicable in the case of any monthly benefit or lump-sum death payment under this title if its application would reduce the primary insurance amount (as computed under section 215 prior to any recomputation thereof pursuant to subsection (f) of such section) of the individual on whose wages and self-employment income such benefit or payment is based by $0.50 or less.

"(2) Upon application for benefits or a lump-sum death payment on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of any veteran of active military or naval service on or after June 27, 1950, the Federal Security Administrator shall make a decision without regard to clause (B) of paragraph (1) of this subsection unless he has been notified by some other agency or instrumentality of the United States that, on the basis of the military or naval service of such veteran on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, a benefit described in clause (B) of paragraph (1) has been determined by such agency or instrumentality to be payable by it. If he has not been so notified, the Federal Security Administrator shall then ascertain whether some other agency or wholly owned instrumentality of the United States has decided that a benefit described in clause (B) of paragraph (1) is payable by it. If any such agency or instrumentality has decided, or thereafter decides, that such a benefit is payable by it, it shall so notify the Federal Security Administrator, and the Administrator shall certify no further benefits for payment or shall recompute the amount of any further benefits payable, as may be required by paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(3) Any agency or wholly owned instrumentality of the United States which is authorized by any law of the United States to pay benefits, or has a system of benefits which are based, in whole or in part on military or naval service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, shall, at the request of the Federal Security Administrator, certify to him, with respect to any veteran of active military or naval service on or after June 27, 1950, such information as the Administrator deems necessary to carry out his functions under paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"(4) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Trust Fund from time to time, as benefits which include service to which this subsection is applicable become payable under this title, such sums as the Administrator estimates to be necessary to meet the additional costs, resulting from this subsection, of such benefits (including lump-sum death payments). Such estimates shall be arrived at through the use of appropriate accounting, statistical, sampling, or other methods.

"(5) For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'veteran' means any individual who served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, and who, if discharged or released therefrom, was so discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable after active service of 90 days or more or by reason of a disability or injury incurred or aggravated in service in line of duty; but such term shall not include any individual who died while in the active military or naval service of the United States if his death was inflicted (other than by an enemy of the United States) as lawful punishment for a military or naval offense."

(b) Section 205 (o) of such act is amended by striking out "section 217 (a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (a) or (e) of section 217."

(c) (1) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall be applicable only with respect to monthly benefits under section 202 of the Social Security Act for months after, and with respect to lump-sum death payments in the case of deaths occurring after, the month following the month in which this act is enacted, except that, in the case of any individual who is entitled, on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of any individual to whom section 217 (e) of the Social Security Act applies, to monthly benefits under such section 202 for the month following the month in which this act is enacted, such amendments shall be applicable (A) only if an application for recomputation by reason of the amendments is filed by such individual, or any other individual, entitled to benefits under such section 202 on the basis of such wages and self-employment income, and (B) only with respect to such benefits for months after whichever of the following is the later: the first month following the month in which this act is enacted or the seventh month before the month in which such application was filed. Recomputations of benefits as required to carry out the provisions of this paragraph shall be made notwithstanding the provisions of section 215 (f) (1) of the Social Security Act; but no such recomputation shall be regarded as a recomputation for purposes of section 215 (f) of the Social Security Act.

(2) In the case of any veteran (as defined in section 217 (e) (5) of the Social Security Act) who died prior to the enactment of this act, the time within which proof of support may be filed under subsection (f) or (h) of section 202 of the Social Security Act shall be 2 years after the date of enactment of this act.

Lump-sum death payments for reinterment of deceased veterans

SEC. 402. (a) Section 101 (d) of the Social Security Act amendments of 1950 is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding: "and except that in the case of any individual who died outside the 48 States and the District of Columbia on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to September 1950, whose death occurred while he was in the active military or naval service of the United States, and who is returned to any of such States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands for interment or reinterment, the last sentence of section 202 (g) of the Social Security Act as in effect prior to the enactment of this act shall not prevent payment to any person under the second sentence thereof if application for a lump-sum death payment under such section with respect to such deceased individual is filed by or on behalf of such person (whether or not legally competent) prior to the expiration of 2 years after the date of such interment or reinterment."

(b) In the case of any individual who died outside the 48 States and the District of Columbia after August 1950 and prior to such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, whose death occurred while he was in the active military or naval service of the United States, and who is returned to any of such States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands for interment or reinterment, the last sentence of section 202 (i) of the Social Security Act shall not prevent payment to any person under the second sentence thereof if application for a lump-sum death payment with respect to such deceased individual is filed under such section by or on behalf of such person (whether or not legally competent) prior to the expiration of 2 years after the date of such interment or reinterment.

TITLE V—MUSTERING-OUT PAYMENTS

Eligibility for payments

SEC. 501. Mustering-out pay as provided in this title is designed to be in lieu of any provision for unemployment insurance or readjustment (unemployment) allowances except that it is not the purpose to impair any rights to unemployment insurance which may be afforded under existing laws.

SEC. 502. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, each member of the Armed Forces who shall have been engaged in active service on or after June 27 1950, and prior to such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, and who is discharged or relieved from active service under honorable conditions, shall be eligible to receive mustering-out payment.

(b) No mustering-out payment shall be made to—

(1) any member of the Armed Forces who, at the time of discharge or relief from active service, is in a pay grade higher than O-3;

(2) any member of the Armed Forces who is retired or separated therefrom under provisions of law other than title IV of the Career Compensation Act of 1949;

(3) any member of the Armed Forces for any active service performed prior to the

received education or training under this title shall be available for examination by duly authorized representatives of the Government.

False or misleading statements

SEC. 268. The Administrator shall not make any payments under this title to any person found by him to have willfully submitted any false or misleading claims. In each case where the Administrator finds that an educational institution or training establishment has willfully submitted a false or misleading claim, or where a veteran, with the complicity of an educational institution or training establishment, has submitted such a claim, he shall make a complete report of the facts of the case to the appropriate State approving agency and where deemed advisable to the Attorney General of the United States for appropriate action.

Criminal penalties and forfeitures

SEC. 269. Whoever knowingly and willfully—

(1) makes or presents any false, fictitious, or fraudulent affidavit, declaration, certificate, voucher, endorsement, or paper or writing purporting to be such, concerning any claim for payment under this title, or pertaining to any matter arising under this title,

(2) makes or presents any paper required under this title on which paper a date other than the date upon which it was actually signed or acknowledged by the claimant has been willfully inserted,

(3) certifies falsely that the declarant, affiant, or witness named in such affidavit, declaration, voucher, endorsement, or other paper or writing personally appeared before him and was sworn thereto, or acknowledged the execution thereof, or

(4) accepts and converts to his own use payments for any period during which he was not actually pursuing a course of education or training under this title for which period payment was made,

shall forfeit all rights, claims, and benefits under this title and under Public Law 2, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both. Any person not subject to the forfeiture provisions of this section who violates this section shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

Application of other laws

SEC. 270. The provisions of Public Law No. 262, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 607), as amended, and the provisions of titles II and III of Public Law No. 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 29, 1936, as amended, shall be for application under this title.

Waiver of recovery of overpayments

SEC. 271. There shall be no recovery of payments of education and training allowance made under this title from any person who, in the judgment of the Administrator, is without fault on his part and where, in the judgment of the Administrator, such recovery would defeat the purpose of benefits otherwise authorized or would be against equity and good conscience. No disbursing officer or certifying officer shall be held liable for any amount paid to any person where the recovery of such amount is waived under this section.

Information furnished by Federal Trade Commission

SEC. 272. The Federal Trade Commission shall keep all State approving agencies advised of any information coming to its attention which would be of assistance to such agencies in carrying out their duties under this title.

Effective date

SEC. 273. This title shall take effect on the date of its enactment, except that no education and training allowance shall be paid for any period prior to September 1, 1952.

TITLE III—LOANS

Persons eligible for loans

SEC. 310. Subsection (a) of section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended—

(1) by inserting after "war" in the first sentence the following: ", or at any time on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress,";

(2) by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: ": *Provided*, That any person who is eligible for the benefits of this title by virtue of active service prior to June 27, 1950, or is the owner of property acquired through benefits accruing for prior service, shall not be eligible for additional benefits under this title by reason of active service on or after June 27, 1950: *Provided further*, That any guaranty entitlement used prior to reentry into service as to which the Administrator has incurred no loss and is no longer subject to contingent liability shall be restored to any veteran separated from the service after June 27, 1950"; and

(3) by inserting after "war" in the third sentence the following: ", and any loan to a veteran eligible by virtue of active service on or after June 27, 1950, if made within 10 years after such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress,".

Power of Administrator to examine loans

SEC. 302. Section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended, by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Notwithstanding the provisions in this title respecting automatically guaranteed loans, the Administrator may at any time upon 30 days' notice require loans to be made by any lender or class of lenders to be submitted for prior approval, and no guaranty or insurance liability shall exist in respect to such loans unless evidence of guaranty or insurance is issued by the Administrator."

Additional requirement for guaranteed loans

SEC. 303. Section 501 (a) (2) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by inserting after "expenses" the following: ", and the veteran is a satisfactory credit risk".

Standards of planning and construction; warranties; substantial deficiencies in housing

SEC. 304. Section 504 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by striking out subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) No loan for the purchase or construction of residential property on which construction is begun subsequent to 60 days from the date the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 becomes effective shall be financed through the assistance of the provisions of this title unless the property meets or exceeds minimum requirements for planning, construction, and general acceptability prescribed by the Administrator: *Provided*, That subsection 504 (b) as originally enacted shall continue to be applicable to construction begun prior to the end of such 60-day period: *Provided further*, That this subsection shall not apply to a loan for the purchase of residential property the construction of which was completed more than 1 year prior to the making of such loan.

"(c) The seller of a newly constructed dwelling unit which is sold for initial occupancy to any person who meets the eligibility requirements of section 500 (a) or section 1506 of this act, as amended, with the aid of financing guaranteed or insured by an agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government, and such other person as may be required by such agency or instrumentality to become warrantor, shall be deemed to have expressly warranted to such purchaser that the dwelling is constructed in substantial conformity with the plans and specifications on which such agency or instrumentality based its valuation of the unit or its commitment to guarantee or insure a loan to finance the construction or purchase of such unit. Such warranty shall apply only with respect to failures of performances as to which the purchaser has given written notice to the warrantor within 1 year from the date of initial occupancy.

"(d) The Administrator shall have the right to refuse to appraise any dwelling or housing project owned, sponsored, or to be constructed by any person identified with housing previously sold to veterans under this title as to which substantial deficiencies have been discovered, or as to which there has been a failure or indicated inability to discharge contractual liabilities to veterans, or as to which it is ascertained that the type of contract of sale or the methods or practices pursued in relation to the marketing of such properties were unfair or unduly prejudicial to veteran purchasers."

Eligibility for loans to refinance existing liability

SEC. 305. Section 507 (1) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: "or, in the case of a veteran eligible by virtue of active service on or after June 27, 1950, not later than 10 years after such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress."

Expiration of authority to make direct loans

SEC. 306. Section 512 (b) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by striking out "(D)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(C)" and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", except that if a commitment to make such a loan was issued by the Administrator prior to that date the loan may be completed subsequent to such date."

Refusal to guarantee or insure loans in certain cases

SEC. 307. Title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 514. Whenever the Administrator finds with respect to loans guaranteed or insured under this title that any lender or holder has failed to maintain adequate loan accounting records, or to demonstrate proper ability to service loans adequately or to exercise proper credit judgment or has willfully or negligently engaged in practices otherwise detrimental to the interest of veterans or of the Government, he may refuse either temporarily or permanently to guarantee or insure any loans made by such lender or holder or bar such lender or holder from acquiring loans guaranteed or insured under this title: *Provided*, That the Admin-

date of his discharge or relief from active service on his own initiative to accept employment or, in the case of any member so relieved from active service, for any active service performed prior to the date of his discharge while in such inactive status, unless he has served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska;

(4) any member of the Armed Forces whose total period of service has been as a student assigned by the Armed Forces to a civilian institution for a course of education or training which was substantially the same as established courses offered to civilians;

(5) any member of the Armed Forces for any active service performed prior to the date of his discharge from such forces for the purpose of entering the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, or the United States Coast Guard Academy;

(6) any member of the Armed Forces whose sole service has been as a cadet at the United States Military Academy or the United States Coast Guard Academy, or as a midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, or in a preparatory school after nomination as a principal, alternate, or candidate for admission to any of said academies; and

(7) any commissioned officer unless he is discharged or relieved from active service within 3 years after such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress.

Determination of payments

SEC. 503. (a) Mustering-out payment for persons eligible under section 502 shall be in sums as follows:

(1) $300 for persons who, having performed active service for 60 days or more, have served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska.

(2) $200 for persons who, having performed active service for 60 days or more, have served no part thereof outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska.

(3) $100 for persons who have performed active service for less than 60 days.

(b) Each person eligible to receive mustering-out payment under subsection (a) (1) shall receive one-third of the stipulated amount at the time of final discharge or ultimate relief from active service, or at the option of the person so eligible, at the time of discharge or release for the purpose of enlistment, reenlistment, or appointment in a regular component of the Armed Forces; and the remaining amount of such payment shall be paid in two equal installments—1 month and 2 months, respectively, from the date of the original payment. Each person eligible to receive mustering-out payment under subsection (a) (2) shall receive one-half of the stipulated amount at the time of final discharge or ultimate relief from active service or, at the option of the person so eligible, at the time of discharge or release for the purpose of enlistment, reenlistment, or appointment in a regular component of the Armed Forces; and the remaining amount of such payment shall be paid 1 month from the date of the original payment. Each person eligible to receive mustering-out payment under subsection (a) (3) shall receive the stipulated amount at the time of such discharge or relief from active service or, at the option of the person so eligible, at the time of discharge or release for the purpose of enlistment, reenlistment, or appointment in a regular component of the Armed Forces. A person entitled to receive the first installment of the mustering-out payment at the time of discharge or release for the purpose of enlistment, reenlistment, or appointment in a regular component of the Armed Forces shall, at his election, receive the whole of such payment in one lump sum, rather than in installments.

Time limitations

SEC. 504. Any member of the Armed Forces entitled to mustering-out payment who shall have been discharged or relieved from active service under honorable conditions before the effective date of this title shall, if application therefor is made within 2 years after the date of enactment of this title, be paid such mustering-out payment by the Department of the Army, Navy, or Air Force, or the Treasury Department, as the case may be, beginning within 1 month after application has been received and approved by such department. No member of the Armed Forces shall receive mustering-out payment under this title more than once, and such payment shall accrue and the amount thereof shall be computed as of the time of discharge for the purpose of effecting a permanent separation from the service or of ultimate relief from active service or, at the option of such member, for the purpose of enlistment, reenlistment, or appointment in a regular component of the Armed Forces.

Deceased members

SEC. 505 If any member of the Armed Forces, after his discharge or relief from active service, shall die before receiving any portion of or the full amount of his mustering-out payment, the balance of the amount due him shall be payable, on appropriate application therefor, to his surviving spouse, if any; and if he shall leave no surviving spouse, then in equal shares to his child or children, if any; and if he shall leave no surviving spouse or child or children, then in equal shares to his surviving parents, if any. No payments under this title shall be made to any other person.

Administration of title

SEC. 506. (a) Mustering-out payments due or to become due under this title shall not be assignable and any payments made to or on account of a veteran hereunder shall be exempt from taxation, shall be exempt from the claims of creditors, including any claim of the United States, and shall not be subject to attachment, levy, or seizure by or under any legal or equitable process whatever either before or after receipt by the payee.

(b) The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Treasury shall make such regulations not inconsistent with this title as may be necessary effectively to carry out the provisions thereof, and their decisions shall be final and not subject to review by any court or other Government official.

(c) The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Treasury, or such subordinate officers as they may designate, are authorized to make direct payment to survivors over 17 years of age, and to select a proper person or persons to whom mustering-out payments may be made for the use and benefit of former active members of the Armed Forces, or survivors thereof, as defined by section 505 hereof, without the necessity of appointment by judicial proceedings of a legal representative of any such former member or such survivors when, in the opinion of the respective Secretaries or their designees, the interests of persons under 17 years of age so justify, or where the former active member or his survivors is suffering from a mental disability sufficient to make direct payment not in the best interests of such person or persons. Payments made under the provisions of this subsection shall constitute a complete discharge of the obligation of the United States as provided in this title; and the selection of a proper person or persons, as provided herein, and the correctness of the amount due and paid to such person or persons shall have the same finality as that accorded decisions made pursuant to subsection (b). The provisions of this subsection shall not apply where a legal guardian or committee has been judicially appointed, except as to any payments made hereunder prior to the receipt of notice of appointment.

Definitions

SEC. 507. As used in this title—

(a) The term "spouse" means a lawful wife or husband.

(b) The term "child" includes (1) a legitimate child; (2) a child legally adopted; and (3) a stepchild, if, at the time of death of the member of the Armed Forces, such stepchild was a member of the deceased's household.

(c) The term "parent" includes father and mother, stepfather and stepmother, and father and mother through adoption.

(d) The term "Armed Forces" means the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard of the United States.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

Job counseling and employment placement

SEC. 601. Section 607 of title IV, Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended (38 U. S. C. 695f), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC 607. The term 'veteran' as used in this title shall mean a person who served in the active service of the Armed Forces during a period of war in which the United States has been, or is, engaged, or during the period on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as may be thereafter determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, and who has been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable."

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 602. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD an explanation of the bill as reported by the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

(The statement is as follows:)

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
JOHN E. RANKIN, *Chairman*.

KOREAN CONFLICT SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT, H. R. 7656

Title: To provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities

to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date, as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress.

Mr. TEAGUE. Introduced and referred April 30, 1952.

ANALYSIS

Title I—Statement of policy

Declares as congressional policy that the veterans' education and training program created by this act is for the purpose of providing vocational readjustment and restoring lost educational opportunities to those whose educational or vocational ambitions were interrupted or impeded by reason of active service in the Armed Forces during the emergency period.

Title II—Education

1. Grants 1½ days of education or training for each day of service on or after June 27, 1950, regardless of where service was performed, up to a closing date to be determined by the President or the Congress—maximum period limited to 36 calendar months which would result in a 4-year academic college course. Person eligible under World War II program may take training under both World War II and Korean programs not to exceed 48 months.

2. The program of education or training must be initiated within 2 years after discharge and completed within 7 years after discharge.

3. Veteran may make one change in program and only one change.

4. Avocational and recreational courses may be taken if evidence is submitted that they will be of bona fide use in pursuit of his present or contemplated business or occupation.

5. With specified exceptions, courses must have been in existence for 2 years prior to enrollment of the veteran and in the case of proprietary profit schools offering nonaccredited courses (except farm training) enrollments must include at least one-fourth nonveteran students in each course.

6. Education and training allowance is set at $110 for a veteran enrolled in a full-time institutional course without dependent and $150 if he has a dependent or dependents; for a three-fourths time basis, the rates are $80 and $110, respectively; for a half-time basis, $50 and $70. From this allowance the veteran must pay his tuition, books, and subsistence and meet all other costs incident to his training. These rates based on World War II average rates.

Where there is a full-time program of institutional courses and supplemental on-the-job training, the rates are $90 and $120 for the classes listed above.

For apprenticeship or other on-the-job training under the bill the rates are $70 and $95 which are subject to reduction as the course progresses plus an over-all monthly ceiling on earnings and allowances of $225 and $300, respectively.

For institutional on-the-farm training, the rates are $95 and $120 which are subject to reduction as the course progresses.

Special provisions are included as to correspondence courses, flight courses, and courses of less than half-time training.

7. Bars taking of courses by person on active duty in one of the branches of the Armed Forces.

8. Authorizes use of the Office of Education where no State approval agency is functioning, and in developing cooperative agreements with State and local agencies.

9. Bars participation in the program of Veterans' Administration employees, Office of Education, and State approval agency employees who have pecuniary interests in schools or other educational institutions which conflict with the interest of the Government.

10. Waives finality of the decisions of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

11. Provides specific criminal penalties for violations of the act.

12. Creates stricter standards for approval of below college level nonaccredited courses.

Title III—Housing

Authorizes the same housing benefits for the veterans serving on or after June 27, 1950, as presently enjoyed by World War II veterans—guaranty of home loans up to 60 percent with the maximum guaranty of $7,500 (veterans and widows of veterans with service-connected deaths); business-loan guaranty of $2,000; and direct loans in nonmetropolitan areas where private financing is not available up to $10,000; interest rate in all cases not to exceed 4 percent. In addition, sales of property may not be financed through the assistance of this title within a 1-year period following construction, unless the property meets or exceeds the minimum requirements for planning construction and general acceptability. Statutory warranty would be deemed to apply in favor of the veteran purchaser who is the initial occupant that the house is constructed in substantial conformity with the plans and specifications on which the Federal agency based its valuation in guaranty of the loan.

Title IV—Social Security Act amendments

Continues the $160 per month wage credit for Korean conflict veterans, previously granted World War II veterans for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits.

Title V—Mustering-out payments

In lieu of unemployment compensation or readjustment benefits, mustering-out payments are provided: $100 for less than 60 days of service, $200 for more than 60 days' service, $300 for more than 60 days' service and service overseas. (Includes all those up to and including the rank of captain in the Army and Air Force and lieutenant senior grade in the Navy.)

Title VI—Employment of veterans

Provides employment assistance to veterans of this conflict on same basis as World War II.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 90]

Aandahl	Bender	Chatham
Abbitt	Blackney	Chelf
Addonizio	Blatnik	Chudoff
Albert	Bow	Clemente
Allen, Calif.	Bramblett	Cole, Kans.
Allen, La.	Bray	Cole, N. Y.
Anfuso	Brehm	Cooley
Arends	Buchanan	Corbett
Armstrong	Buckley	Cotton
Ayres	Burdick	Coudert
Bakewell	Burton	Crumpacker
Barden	Bush	Curtis, Mo.
Barrett	Butler	Davis, Ga.
Bates, Ky.	Canfield	Davis, Tenn.
Beall	Carlyle	Dawson
Beamer	Carrigg	Denny
Beckworth	Case	Denton
Dingell	Jackson, Wash.	Philbin
Dollinger	James	Phillips
Dolliver	Jenison	Polk
Dondero	Johnson	Potter
Donohue	Jonas	Powell
Donovan	Jones,	Price
Doughton	Hamilton C.	Prouty
Doyle	Jones,	Redden
Durham	Woodrow W.	Rees, Kans.
Eberharter	Judd	Ribicoff
Evins	Kean	Richards
Fallon	Kearns	Riley
Fenton	Kelley, Pa.	Robeson
Fine	Kelly, N. Y.	Rodino
Fogarty	Kennedy	Rogers, Colo.
Forand	Keogh	Roosevelt
Frazier	Kilburn	Ross
Fugate	King, Calif.	Sabath
Fulton	King, Pa.	Sadlak
Furcolo	Kirwan	Sasscer
Gamble	Klein	Schenck
Garmatz	Kluczynski	Scott, Hardie
Gary	Lane	Scott,
Gavin	Lanham	Hugh D., Jr.
Goodwin	Latham	Scudder
Gordon	Lesinski	Shafer
Gore	Lovre	Sheehan
Granahan	Lyle	Sheppard
Green	McCarthy	Short
Gregory	McConnell	Sieminski
Gwinn	McCormack	Simpson, Pa.
Hall, Edwin	McGuire	Smith, Va.
Arthur	McKinnon	Smith, Wis.
Hall,	McMullen	Spence
Leonard W.	McVey	Stanley
Halleck	Machrowicz	Stigler
Hardy	Mack, Ill.	Stockman
Hart	Meader	Sutton
Havenner	Merrow	Tackett
Hays, Ohio	Miller, Calif.	Talle
Heffernan	Miller, Md.	Taylor
Heller	Miller, N. Y.	Thomas
Herter	Morano	Thompson, Tex.
Hess	Morgan	Vail
Hillings	Morris	Weichel
Hinshaw	Morrison	Welch
Hoeven	Morton	Werdel
Hoffman, Ill.	Moulder	Wharton
Hoffman, Mich.	Multer	Wheeler
Holifield	Mumma	Widnall
Holmes	Murphy	Wier
Hope	O'Brien, N. Y.	Willis
Horan	Osmers	Wilson, Ind.
Howell	Ostertag	Wolcott
Hunter	Passman	Yates
Jackson, Calif.	Patterson	Zablocki

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House take a recess until tomorrow morning at 12 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. That motion is not in order.

The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called Mr. RAYBURN's name.

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 218 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

VETERANS' EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1952

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the bill as reported to the House is a combination of a bill which I introduced, H. R. 7642, and one sponsored by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], H. R. 7656.

So that the RECORD may be complete, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point a comparison of the two bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

(The comparison is as follows:)

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
JOHN E. RANKIN, *Chairman.*

Comparison of H. R. 7642 and H. R. 7656, Korean Conflict Servicemen's Readjustment Act

	H. R. 7642 (Mr. RANKIN)	H. R. 7656 (Mr. TEAGUE)
Title	"Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952"	"Veterans' Educational Assistance Act of 1952."
Coverage	Provides for education and training, home, farm, and business loan benefits, old age and survivors ins. credits, unemployment ins. coverage, and employment assistance.	Provides educational and training benefits only.
EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS		
Definitions:		
(1) Basic service period	Period beginning June 27, 1950, and ending by Presidential proclamation or Congressional resolution.	Same provision.
(2) Eligible veteran	Active service during basic service period; discharge or release other than dishonorable; 90 days' active service or disability discharge. *Veteran ineligible for education and training while in active service, under both bills.*	Do.
(3) Program of education or training	Single or plural courses or subjects leading to predetermined objective.	Do.
(4) Course	Organized unit of subject matter	Do.
(5) Dependent	Child, dependent parent, wife, dependent husband	Do.
(6) Educational institution	All categories of schools, colleges, universities, etc	Do.
(7) Training establishment	Business or other establishment providing apprentice or other training on-job.	Do.
(8) Armed Forces	Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard	Do.
(9) State	All States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia	Do.
(10) Administrator	Administrator of Veterans' Affairs	Do.
(11) Commissioner	United States Commissioner of Education	Do.
Time limits	Initiation by Sept. 1, 1954, or 2 years after discharge, whichever later; completion 7 years after discharge or end of "emergency." Requires continuous pursuit of program on and after last date for initiation subject to right of suspension for periods not exceeding 12 consecutive months, or longer, if approved by Administrator.	Same limitations on initiation and completion of program, but no requirement of continuous training.
Entitlement	1½ days for each day of service up to 36 months. Entitlement ending after major part of semester or quarter is extended to termination thereof.	Same provisions.
Selection, application, and approval of programs.	Veteran may select program leading toward predetermined objective at institution of choice. Must apply to Administrator who shall approve unless he finds veteran does not meet requirements of bill or is already qualified.	Do.
Change of program	One change prior to initiation limit; one change after initiation limit if no prior change and subject to approval.	Do.
Avocational and recreational courses	Bartending, dancing, and personality development courses prohibited. Other listed courses and additional ones found to be recreational or avocational by Administrator may be pursued only on submission of justification.	Similar but no outright prohibition of any particular course.
Minimum nonveteran enrollment	At least ½ required with certain exceptions	At least ¼ required with certain exceptions.
Period of operation for approval	Course not approvable unless in operation for 3 years of more, subject to certain exceptions.	Similar provision except that the required basic period is 1 year. (Note: 2 of the exceptions refer to a 3-year period of operation.)
Institutions listed by Attorney General under Executive Order 9835.	Enrollment or payment of allowance for any course in such an institution is barred.	Same provision.
Education and training allowance	Administrator would pay veteran a "package" allowance covering his tuition, subsistence, and supplies, except that in certain cases only amount covering tuition and fees to be payable. No payments direct by the Government to institution.	Same basic plan though different rate schedule.
Schedule of rates:		
Full-time instruction	$90, no dependent; $110, one dependent; $135, more than one dependent.	$110, no dependent; $150, one or more dependents.
¾-time instruction	$65, no dependent; $80, one dependent; $100, more than one dependent.	$80, no dependent; $110, one or more dependents.
½-time instruction	$45, no dependent; $55, one dependent; $65, more than one dependent.	$50, no dependent; $70, one or more dependents.
Full-time instruction and supplemental on-job training.	$75; no dependent; $90, one dependent; $110, more than one dependent.	$90, no dependent; $120, one or more dependents.
Apprenticeship or other on-job training	$60, no dependent; $70, one dependent; $85, more than one dependent.	$70, no dependent, $95, one or more dependents.
Institutional on-farm training	$90, no dependent; $100, one dependent; $115, more than one dependent.	$95, no dependent; $120, one or more dependents.
Correspondence courses, flight training and courses of less than ½ time training.	Special provisions apply	Same provisions, except higher allowance rate for less than ½ time training.
4 months' reduction formula	Allowances for apprentice and other on-job training and institutional on-farm training subject to reduction for each 4 months as course progresses in accordance with mathematical formula.	Similar provisions.
Income ceilings	On-job allowances subject to reduction when the allowances plus compensation paid to veteran for productive labor performed as part of course exceed $225 per month if no dependent, $275 per month if one dependent, or $300 if more than one dependent. *No income ceiling for institutional training.*	Same provisions, except that only two ceilings are provided: $225 per month if no dependent, or $300 per month if one or more dependents.
Full time courses	Below college trade courses with shop practice requiring 30 hours per week minimum; below college course in which theoretical or classroom instruction predominates requires a minimum of 25 hours per week; undergraduate college course requires minimum of 14 semester hours or equivalent; other full-time training to be defined by Administrator.	Same provisions.
Overcharges by institution	Administrator to discontinue allowance to veteran if institution charges or receives in excess of established charges for nonveterans.	Same, except that tax-supported public institution having no established charges for nonveteran residents may charge veteran resident amount equal to established cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction, not to exceed $31 per month for a full-time course.
Approval of courses	Approval by State approving agencies and in certain instances by Commissioner of Education.	Same provisions.
Use of Federal agencies	Administrator may use services of other Federal agencies. Bill directs utilization of service of Office of Education in certain particulars.	Similar provisions.
Payment for certain State expenses	Administrator authorized to contract for payment to State and local agencies for necessary salary and travel expenses in ascertaining qualifications of institution and supervising same and furnishing other requested services.	Do.
Standards for approving courses	Provides detailed standards for on-the-job, on-farm, and all institutional courses (accreditation procedure employable in lieu of standards for certain established courses).	Do.
Disapproval of course and discontinuance of allowance.	State agency to disapprove course which fails to meet requirements. Administrator authorized to discontinue allowance to veteran if course fails to meet requirements or if institution has violated any provision.	Similar provisions. Provision for Administrator to discontinue allowance refers only to a situation where the course fails to meet the statutory requirements.
Regulations and review of payments by GAO	Administrator authorized to issue necessary regulations. No review by GAO provided.	Similar authority to issue regulations, but finality of decision provisions of act of Oct. 17, 1940, made inapplicable to decisions of Administrator as to payments under this program.

Comparison of H. R. 7642 and H. R. 7656, Korean Conflict Servicemen's Readjustment Act—Continued

EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS—continued

	H. R. 7642 (Mr. RANKIN)	H. R. 7656 (Mr. TEAGUE)
Educational and vocational guidance	Administrator authorized to provide such service and reimburse veteran for traveling expenses incident thereto where advisement is required by Administrator.	Same provisions.
Advisory Committee	Administrator authorized to form Advisory Committee composed of educators and including Commissioner of Education, ex officio.	No specific requirement for Advisory Committee.
Control by Federal agencies prohibited	Standard provision precluding Federal supervision or control of State agencies and institutions.	Same provisions.
Conflicts of interests	Employees of VA, Office of Education, or State agency having pecuniary interest in institution to be dismissed, courses disapproved by State if conflicting interests develop. Administrator may waive these provisions where no detriment indicated.	Do.
Recovery of overpayments	Provides for recovery from institution of overpayment of allowance to veteran resulting from (1) willful or negligent failure of institution to report excessive absence, etc., or (2) false certification by institution.	Do.
False or misleading statements	Administrator not to make payments to any person who has willfully submitted false or misleading claims.	Do.
Crimina penalties and forfeitures	Person who knowingly and willfully makes false statement or commits certain other defined acts to forfeit all rights and benefits under the program and under Public No. 2, 73d Cong., as amended, and upon conviction could be fined up to $1,000 or imprisoned up to 1 year, or both. Person violating such provisions who is not affected by forfeiture could be fined up to $10,000 or imprisoned up to 5 years, or both.	Do.
Waiver of overpayments	Contains standard provision for waiving recovery of overpayments of training allowance where Administrator finds that the person is not at fault and recovery would defeat purpose of benefits otherwise authorized or would be against equity and good conscience.	Do.
Federal Trade Commission	Required to keep State agencies advised of information available to FTC which might be of assistance to State agencies in carrying out their duties.	Do.
Effective date of educations. and training provisions.	Effective on enactment but no education and training allowances payable for period prior to Sept. 1, 1952.	Do.
LOAN ASSISTANCE		
Service group and nature of benefit	Extends title III of SRA (guaranty and insurance of home, farm, and business loans, and direct home loans in certain cases) to veterans of service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to a date to be determined.	No provision.
Additional amendments to present law	Makes certain other amendments to title III of SRA, including (1) specific authority to require advance approval of certain loans notwithstanding automatic guaranty provision; (2) requirement that new home construction meet minimum standards for planning and general acceptability, as well as construction standards; (3) construction warranty to veteran purchaser for initial occupancy; (4) authority to refuse appraisal of housing handled by person of poor record as to dealings with veteran purchasers; and (5) authority to exclude from future loan guaranties lenders with record of dealings detrimental to veterans or Government.	Do.
OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE		
General nature of benefit and service covered	Provides OASI wage credits of $160 per month based on service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to a date to be determined. *Identical in purpose to coverage given World War II veterans.*	No provision.
UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION		
General nature and service group	Payments under State unemployment compensation laws to unemployed veterans of service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to a date to be determined, on basis of military wage credits of $160 per month. Secretary of Labor would administer Federal aspects through agreements with States and payments to States for additional cost incurred.	No provision.
JOB ASSISTANCE		
Nature of benefit and group covered	Extends title IV of SRA to veterans of service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to a date to be determined. This involves assistance in securing employment. Administered by Department of Labor. *Identical to provision for World War II.*	No provision.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a telegram from Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, legislative director, Veterans of Foreign Wars, which I desire to read in my time:

Sincerely hope House will approve Korean veteran benefit bill as reported by Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Bill is designed to provide Federal educational aid to veterans rather than Federal aid to education. Would be a mistake to amend bill by returning to old system and abuses which existed under World War II law.

Signed, "Omar B. Ketchum, Veterans of Foreign Wars, legislative director."

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. Is it not a fact that every veterans' group, every educational group which appeared before our committee, testified in behalf of this bill except the American Legion? The Legion testified they would rather extend the old bill, but every other group that came before the committee testified in behalf of this bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. It is my recollection that the legislative representative of the Legion merely stated that, because they had no such directive from the national convention, they could not commit the Legion to this measure.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is it not also a fact that the telegram which the gentleman from Mississippi just read designating this bill as a Korean GI bill is a misnomer? It applies to all men in the service who enlisted after June 27, 1950?

Mr. RANKIN. That is right. The gentleman from New York is correct.

I have a letter from the national service director of the AMVETS also supporting this bill, which I am also inserting as a part of my remarks:

AMVETS,
Washington, D. C., May 29, 1952.

The Honorable JOHN E. RANKIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: AMVETS respectfully request that the House of Representatives give immediate consideration to the passage of H. R. 7656, the Korean GI bill of rights. Thousands of individuals already have been discharged from active duty after having served in the Korean conflict. We believe there is a national obligation to provide to these individuals readjustment benefits and educational opportunities.

H. R. 7656 received extensive study by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and was specifically advocated by the House Select Committee To Investigate the GI Bill. It is very meritorious legislation and AMVETS therefore urge its enactment without amendment.

H. R. 7656 is coming up before the House of Representatives during the early part of next week. We understand that at that time an amendment will be offered by Mr. SPRINGER, of Illinois, which will, in effect, destroy its intent by changing the philosophy of direct payments to veterans back to the World War II philosophy of direct payments to schools. AMVETS are primarily interested in a GI bill of rights for Korean veterans rather than being interested in Federal aid to educational institutions. It appears to us that the philosophy inherent in H. R. 7656 is correct and proper and should be adopted by the House of Representatives. We therefore urge the defeat of the Springer amendment. It would appear to us that a bill of this nature, which is predicated on individual self-discipline, individual integrity, and individual initiative is far superior to the World War II practice of placing these three fundamental human traits in the hands of educational institutions.

AMVETS respectfully urge expedited consideration by every Member of Congress on the Korean GI bill of rights and we trust that final action will be taken in order that the bill might be placed into law prior to congressional adjournment.

Very sincerely yours,

RUFUS H. WILSON,
National Service Director.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point certain excerpts from the House Report No. 1943 on the bill H. R. 7656 and certain material pertinent to this discussion, notwithstanding the rule that material so inserted shall not exceed two pages.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The material referred to follows:

[Excerpts from H. Rept. No. 1943]

HISTORY OF THE LEGISLATION

Within approximately 2 weeks after the start of the Korean conflict on June 27, 1950 (the date the American forces were ordered into action), the chairman of the committee addressed communications to the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, AMVETS, Federal Security Administrator, Bureau of the Budget, Veterans' Administrator, National Education Association, and the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities asking for their comments concerning the extension of the benefits provided by the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to the veterans of the Korean conflict.

Many valuable replies and suggestions were received which helped set the pattern of this legislation.

The committee had before it House Committee Print No. 210 of the Eighty-first Congress, containing some 200 pages of investigation on the operations of the education and training provisions of the so-called GI bill of rights—a report prepared by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. This report showed that numerous abuses had existed in connection with the present law and that any new legislation should be carefully considered with a viewpoint of blocking loopholes which have been shown to exist.

A short time later a message was received from the President which subsequently became House Document No. 466 of the Eighty-first Congress, also citing abuses in connection with this program and giving certain suggestions for standards for profit schools and other features of the program. Many of these suggestions, with modifications, were incorporated in Public Law 610 of the Eighty-first Congress.

On July 20, 1951, the Acting Comptroller General submitted to the chairman of the committee a review by the General Accounting Office of the veterans' education and training program. This was designated House Committee Print No. 160 and contains nearly 200 pages of findings by that agency of the Congress and points up numerous abuses which have grown up under the present program.

In the second session of the Eighty-first Congress a special committee was created by the House Resolution 474 to investigate the education and training program of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, headed by the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE. The committee was continued by the Eighty-second Congress by House Resolution 93 and broadened to include the loan-guaranty program of the act. This special committee conducted numerous hearings and performed a real service in pointing out the deficiencies of the present act. In addition to the hearings, the committee filed a full and complete report on the education and training aspects in the form of House Report No. 1375 of the Eighty-second Congress, citing not only the experience under the present law but laying down certain standards which this special committee believed should be followed in the extension of similar benefits to men serving on and after June 27, 1950.

The above record clearly shows that the legislation herewith presented has been the subject of considerable study and investigation.

In regard to this specific proposal, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has held hearings over a 6-week period in which an opportunity was presented all interested parties to present their views. These hearings resulted in the printing of some 945 pages of testimony and generally covered the period from February 6, 1952, through March 11, 1952. By the conclusion of the hearings, 39 bills had been introduced and presented to the committee, seeking in one way or another to extend education and other benefits to persons who served in the Korean conflict.

Prior to the hearings each Member of Congress was invited to present his or her views to the committee, and a number of Members availed themselves of the opportunity. In addition to the Veterans' Administration, testimony was received from representatives of the Department of Defense, Office of Education, General Accounting Office, Bureau of the Budget, American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, AMVETS, American Council on Education, American Association of Junior Colleges, Association of Land Grant Colleges, American Vocational Association, National Association of State Approval Agencies, and the representatives of certain associations of private schools. In addition to this testimony, several organizations filed statements and suggestions for changes in the administration of this act which were incorporated in the hearings.

Following the completion of the hearings the staff of the committee was directed to proceed with informal conferences with representatives of all interested Government agencies in an effort to draft legislation which would reflect suggestions made during the hearings. To that end the staff conducted a series of round-table conferences with officials of the Veterans' Administration, Bureau of the Budget, General Accounting Office, Office of Education, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Internal Revenue Bureau, Social Security Administration, Treasury Department, Department of Labor, and the Federal Trade Commission. These staff conferences were held on March 12, 13, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 26, and 27, and April 2, 3, 4, 16, 17, 21, and 24, 1952.

GENERAL COMMENTS

The committee wishes to emphasize that the bill which is reported is a "one-package deal" which would provide benefits which have not yet been enacted for the Korean veterans in the same general fields in which comparable benefits have previously been granted to veterans of World War II. Thus, besides education and training benefits, the bill provides home, farm, and business loan credit assistance, old-age and survivors insurance credits, mustering-out payments, and employment assistance.

It should be emphasized that it is the view of the committee that this bill, as indicated in the statement of policy, is an effort and attempt on the part of the committee to provide readjustment assistance for those men who have had their normal civilian life interrupted by reason of their service since the outbreak of fighting in Korea. Under the terms of the bill, any man who served at least 2 years after the date of June 27, 1950, would be entitled to 36 months or three calendar years of education, which means a full 4-year academic period.

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 provides 1 day of eligibility for each day of service plus 12 months. This formula is highly favorable to the veteran with a short period of service who in fact had little or no material disruption in his civilian life. A veteran with 91 days' service during World War II was entitled to 15 months of training. This legislation proposes to shift the emphasis on service to the extent that the individuals with longer periods of service and more material disruption of civilian pursuit will be favored. Under the formula provided in this legislation a veteran receives 1½ days of eligibility for education or training for each day of service. Therefore, a person with a relatively short period of service receives a short period of education or training, with the advantage going to the person with longer periods of service. It is emphasized that the bill proposes to restore lost educational opportunity and make it possible for a veteran to obtain education or training which he might normally have obtained had he not served his country during an emergency period.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the educational title of the bill is a program for the benefit of the veterans. The committee is aware of the fact that, of the more than $3,617,000,000 spent for Federal education programs during the fiscal year 1950, nearly $3,000,000,000 of it was administered by the Veterans' Administration (vol. 2, pt. 3, Federal Educational Activities and Educational Issue Before Congress, Committee on Education and Labor).

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

This committee and the Congress in this program is mainly concerned with the veteran and not with any benefit which might flow to schools or others as a result of the enactment of this legislation.

Under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act provision was made for payments of subsistence allowance directly to veterans and for payments by the Federal Government to institutions in behalf of veterans, such payments to cover the costs of tuition, fees, books, supplies, and so forth. This resulted in the Federal Government assuming a contractual relationship with the institutions and entering into direct negotiations with them concerning the charges made in individual cases. Furthermore, the veteran, having no responsibility for the prudent expenditure of such funds, stood in a relationship that was different from other students pursuing the same courses. On the other hand, educational institutions found that additional administrative responsibilities were imposed upon them through the necessity of establishing with the Federal Government the amount that could reasonably be charged for the services to be performed and in vouchering for and receiving payments for such services, in addition to the burden placed upon the Veterans' Administration in the negotiation and settlement of accounts with the institutions. It is obvious that any such system was subject to sharp practices and abuses, and resulted in many cases of benefits flowing to the institution rather than to the veteran.

After thoroughly considering these problems, the committee has decided that the best way to meet them is to provide that no payment shall be made directly to schools, but that, instead, all payments shall be made to the veteran directly, thereby enabling him to deal with the school on the same basis as any other student. The principle of direct payment to the veteran met almost universal approval in the testimony.

It was for that reason that the principle of making direct veteran payments was adopted. This would, in effect, establish a scholarship grant between the veteran and the Federal Government and relieve educational institutions of an agency responsibility which at the best has been time consuming and expensive both for the Government and for individual institutions. It is much better from the standpoint of the veteran, as well as institutions and the Government, that educational institutions devote every available resource of material and energy and time to the improvement of the educational program of the veteran.

The initiative and responsibility factors also influenced greatly the setting of the rates of the educational allowance because it is believed that if the individual has a stake in his own training, it is much more likely that better results will flow from the individual's own desire to see that he receives a dollar's worth of education for each dollar that he spends. In this connection, a recent study made by the Office of Education found that publicly controlled junior colleges and teacher colleges draw the highest proportion of their students from State residents (96.9 and 94.1, respectively). The publicly controlled universities draw 85.3 of their students from State residents (Residence and Migration of College Students, 1949–50). This would seem to indicate that the veteran would go to a school reasonably close to his home and thus would probably benefit through the decreased living costs, as well as special consideration by reason of being a resident of the State in which the school he sought to attend is located. This legislation provides normally 36 months of eligibility for the 2-year period of service and would result in financial benefits of $4,000 to $5,400 to the veteran for such service during that period. The tables on page 27 give the latest information on the subject on catalog rates of State universities and land-grant colleges. It is noted that the table shows the average resident student rate (tuition and fees) is $195 per academic year.

The committee in fixing the rates of allowances has considered, among other things, statistics which disclosed that the average age of veterans who will participate in this program will be considerably less than that of veterans participating in the program following World War II, with the result that a good percentage of these men will return to their homes and will have a considerably lesser degree of financial responsibility. The committee believes that the fact that more than one-half of college students earn a part of their own expenses (and a recent study indicates it may run as high as 7 out of 10), lends further support to the allowances provided.

The committee emphasizes that it is not the intention of this legislation to establish a program which completely subsidizes the cost of a veteran's education or training program, as well as his living costs. This legislation is designed as an aid program and it is expected that in many cases the veteran will be required to make a contribution to the cost of his own education and training program. It is believed that the veteran will maintain a greater interest in the use made of the funds provided by this bill if he is required to make a contribution from his own resources.

Moreover, it is emphasized that the purpose of the committee is not to equalize educational opportunities for the veteran population, but rather to provide assistance which would help a veteran to follow the educational plan that he might have adopted had he never entered the Armed Forces.

This legislation furthermore insures that the Nation shall be able to utilize the highest skills and abilities of the veterans who benefit from it. This is especially important since at this time the number of young men available to fill the essential technical and professional posts is the lowest in ratio to our total population which we have had or will have for a decade to come. It is doubly essential that we make the fullest use of the skills of the young men who are available.

It was brought out in the hearings that during the administration of the present law no formal relationship existed between the Office of Education and the Veterans' Administration for the administration of this large educational undertaking. Several witnesses stressed the importance of utilization of the services of the Office of Education. The committee did consider this point and has included in the bill a plan by which the Office of Education will cooperate with the Veterans' Administration. However, responsibility for administration remains in the Veterans' Administration.

Resident and nonresident tuition and fees per student in land-grant colleges and State universities, 1951–52

Institution	Resident student	Nonresident student
All institutions listed	$195	$382
Alabama Polytechnic Institute [1]	140	230
University of Alabama	197	447
University of Arizona [1]	106	306

[1] Land-grant institution.

Resident and nonresident tuition and fees per student in land-grant colleges and State universities, 1951–52—Continued

Institution	Resident student	Nonresident student
University of Arkansas [1]	$170	$370
University of California [1]	101	461
Colorado A. & M. College [1]	180	360
University of Colorado	204	430
University of Connecticut [1]	205	455
University of Delaware [1]	250	320
University of Florida [1]	100	470
University of Georgia [1]	160	260
University of Idaho [1]	169	279
University of Illinois [1]	165	325
Indiana University	121	336
Purdue University (Indiana) [1]	110	310
Iowa State College [1]	138	308
Iowa State University	186	296
Kansas State College [1]	143	343
University of Kansas	173	283
University of Kentucky [1]	134	224
Louisiana State University [1]	141	341
University of Maine [1]	320	480
University of Maryland [1]	306	431
Massachusetts Institute of Technology [1]	$18	[2] $18
University of Massachusetts [1]	138	438
Michigan State College [1]	164	389
University of Michigan	167	417
University of Minnesota [1]	197	372
Mississippi State College [1]	142	342
University of Mississippi	206	406
University of Missouri [1]	163	313
Montana State College [1]	125	215
Montana University	132	282
University of Nebraska [1]	207	267
University of Nevada [1]	128	328
University of New Hampshire [1]	277	514
Rutgers University (New Jersey) [1]	297	472
New Mexico A. & M. College [1]	164	264
University of New Mexico	185	385
Cornell University (New York) [1]	500	600
North Carolina State College [1]	277	487
University of North Carolina	310	520
North Dakota Agricultural College [1]	113	203
University of North Dakota	231	310
Ohio State University [1]	227	477
Oklahoma A. & M. College [1]	135	255
University of Oklahoma	165	405
Oregon State College [1]	186	336
University of Oregon	286	386
Pennsylvania State College [1]	241	401
University of Rhode Island [1]	228	278
Clemson Agricultural College (South Carolina) [1]	166	276
University of South Carolina	186	376
South Dakota State College [1]	174	269
University of South Dakota	183	333
University of Tennessee [1]	211	436
A. & M. College of Texas [1]	119	269
University of Texas	134	381
University of Utah	185	395
Utah State Agricultural College [1]	110	215
University of Vermont [1]	404	554
University of Virginia	283	673
Virginia Polytechnic Institute [1]	180	330
State College of Washington [1]	162	322
University of Washington	226	526
West Virginia University [1]	136	286
University of Wisconsin [1]	173	473
University of Wyoming [1]	176	386

[1] Land-grant institution.
[2] No distinction between resident and nonresident.

Source: Catalogs of institutions (Office of Education).

Office of Education—Average income per student from tuition and fees, 1949–50

All institutions	$263.98
Publicly controlled	169.30
Privately controlled	362.38
All students	263.98
Nonveteran students	219.49
Veteran students	360.28
Public universities, colleges, or professional schools	187.68
Private universities, colleges, or professional schools	360.42
Public teachers colleges	153.31
Private teachers colleges	318.42
Public junior colleges	92.48
Private junior colleges	415.65

[Excerpts from H. Rept. 1943]

Comparison of H. R. 7656, 82d Cong., with titles II and III of Public Law 346, 78th Cong., as amended (GI bill of rights)

Title	H. R. 7656 [1] "Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952"	Public Law 346, 78th Cong., as amended Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.
EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS		
Definitions:		NOTE.—No general definitions as such, equivalent statutory provisions are listed.
(1) Basic service period	Period beginning June 27, 1950, and ending by Presidential proclamation or congressional concurrent resolution.	Sept. 16, 1940, to the termination of World War II (July 25, 1947, for all persons except certain enlistees under the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945).
(2) Eligible veteran [2]	Active service during basic service period; discharge or release other than dishonorable; 90 days active service or disability discharge.[3]	Similar, except for differences in dates.[4]
(3) Program of education or training	Single or plural courses or subjects leading to predetermined objective.	Not a key term of SRA. The act refers to "course."
(4) Course	Organized unit of subject matter	No statutory definition.
(5) Dependent	Child, dependent parent, wife, dependent husband	Term "dependents" undefined, but implementing regulations restrict it to wife, child, dependent parent.
(6) Educational institution	All categories of schools, colleges, universities, etc.	Similar.
(7) Training establishment	Business or other establishment providing apprentice or other training-on-job.	Similar.
(8) Armed Forces	Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard	Not a key term of SRA, the act relates to "military or naval service."
(9) State	All States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia	Similar provision applicable to SRA.
(10) Administrator	Administrator of Veterans' Affairs	Same provision applicable to SRA.
(11) Commissioner	United States Commissioner of Education	Not specifically involved in SRA.
Time limits	Initiation by Sept. 1, 1954, or 2 years after discharge, whichever later; completion 7 years after discharge or end of "emergency". Requires continuous pursuit of program on and after last date for initiation subject to right of suspension for periods not exceeding 12 consecutive months, or longer, if approved by Administrator.	Initiation within 4 years of date of discharge, or termination of World War II, whichever is the later. No education or training may be afforded beyond 9 years after the termination of World War II. Continuity of training after initiation date (subject to excusable interruption) required by implementing regulation.
Entitlement	1½ days for each day of service [1] up to 36 months. Entitlement ending after major part of semester or quarter is extended to termination thereof.	1 year plus the time spent in active military service [2] up to 48 months. Similar to H. R. 7656 with respect to extension of entitlement to end of semester.
Selection, application, and approval of program	Veteran may select program leading toward predetermined objective at institution of choice, except no education furnished in foreign schools other than in the Philippines. Must apply to Administrator who shall approve unless he finds veteran does not meet requirements of bill or is already qualified.	Veteran may elect any course (not avocational or recreational) under the program, either full-time or equivalent part time, at any approved institution which will accept him. No statutory requirements as to initial approval procedure.
Change of program	1 change prior to initiation limit; 1 change after initiation limit if no prior change and subject to approval.	Changes of course authorized for reasons satisfactory to Administrator. Veteran who has completed or discontinued a course (for reasons other than unsatisfactory conduct or progress) may apply for additional courses, subject to authority of Administrator to apply regulatory restrictions (1) after the initiation date, or (2) after the veteran has already made one change from one "general field" of education or training to another field and desires to make additional changes to a different field.
Avocational and recreational courses	Certain courses prohibited. Other listed courses and additional ones found to be recreational or avocational by Administrator may be pursued only on submission of justification.	Similar to H. R. 7642, except no outright prohibition of any particular course and establishes a procedure of justification by affidavits in certain cases.
Minimum nonveteran enrollment	At least ¾ required with certain exceptions	No mandatory requirement, but provides that schools operated for profit must meet prescribed standards during any period such schools have fewer than 25 students or ¼ of the students enrolled (whichever is larger) paying their own tuition.
Period of operation for approval	Course not approvable unless in operation for 2 years or more, subject to certain exceptions.	Contains 1-year-operation requirement, with certain exceptions.
Institutions listed by Attorney General under Executive Order 9835.	Enrollment or payment of allowance for any course in such an institution is barred.	No specific provision.
Education and training allowance	Administrator would pay veteran a "package" allowance covering his tuition, subsistence, and supplies, except that in certain cases only amount covering tuition and fees to be payable. No payments direct by the Government to institution.	No package allowance. Provides for payment of subsistence allowance to veterans, with tuition, fees, and other listed charges paid to the schools up to a maximum of $500 for an ordinary school year, subject to right of veteran to elect to have charges paid in excess of $500 limitation with acceleration of entitlement.
Schedule of rates:		(Rates indicated are for subsistence only.)
Full-time instruction	$110, no dependents, $130, with dependents	$75, no dependents, $105, 1 dependent $120, 1 or more dependents.
¾-time instruction	$80, no dependents, $110, with dependents	Pro rata of full-time rates from ¼- to ¾-time training.
½-time instruction	$50, no dependents, $70, with dependents	
Full-time instruction and supplemental on-job training.	$90, no dependents, $120, with dependents	Combination of institutional and on-job rates.
Apprenticeship or other on-job training	$70, no dependents, $95, with dependents	$65 per month, no dependents, $90, per month, 1 or more dependents.
Institutional on-farm training	$95, no dependents, $120, with dependents	$65, no dependents, $90, 1 or more dependents.
Correspondence courses, flight training, and courses of less than ½-time training.	Special provisions apply, gearing educational and training allowance to institutional charges only.	No subsistence for courses exclusively by correspondence; no special allowances for flight training. No subsistence for less than ¼-time training (by regulation).
4 months' reduction formula	Allowances for apprentice and other on-job training and institutional on-farm training subject to reduction for each 4 months as course progresses in accordance with mathematical formula.	No predetermined reduction. Administrator authorized to pay such lesser sums as he may determine, in part-time cases and cases of persons receiving "compensation from productive labor."
Income ceilings	On-job allowances subject to reduction when the allowances plus compensation paid to veteran for productive labor performed as part of course exceed $225 per month if no dependents, $300, with dependents.	Ceiling limitation on rate of allowance plus compensation received from productive labor based on the standard workweek, established at the following rates: No dependents, $210 per month; 1 dependent, $270 per month; 2 or more dependents, $290 per month. Not limited to on-job cases and not limited to income received from productive labor as part of course.
Full-time courses	Below college trade courses with shop practice requires 30 hours per week minimum; below college course in which theoretical or classroom instruction predominates requires a minimum of 25 hours per week; undergraduate college course requires minimum of 14 semester hours or equivalent; other full-time training to be defined by Administrator.	Same provisions, except no statutory definition of undergraduate college course (defined generally by regulation as 12 semester hours).

[1] The other titles of H. R. 7656 would provide old-age and survivors insurance credits, mustering-out payments, and employment assistance.

[2] Veteran ineligible for education and training while in active service. Under SRA, veteran reentering service may receive the benefit, not including subsistence.

[3] Any period during which assigned to a civilian institution for a course of education or training which is substantially the same as established courses offered to civilians or as a cadet or midshipman is excluded.

[4] By sec. 1507, SRA of 1944, as amended, the benefits of pt. VIII are available to persons, otherwise eligible, while on terminal leave or while hospitalized pending final discharge. Period while assigned for training under the ASTP or the Navy college training program or as a cadet or midshipman is excluded, if course is continuation of civilian education and pursued to completion.

Comparison of H. R. 7656, 82d Cong., with titles II and III of Public Law 346, 78th Cong., as amended (GI bill of rights)—Continued

EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS—continued

	H. R. 7656[1]	Public Law 346, 78th Cong., as amended
Overcharges by institution	Administrator to disapprove institution if institution charges or receives in excess of established charges for nonveterans. Authorizes up to $31 for full-time courses for certain tax-supported schools not having nonveteran resident fees.	No provision. VA pays customary or contractual charge direct to institution. Tuition pay to school.
Approval of courses	Approval by State approving agencies and in certain instances by Commissioner of Education.	Basically similar to H. R. 7656, except for supplemental approvals to be made by Administrator, rather than Commissioner.
Use of Federal agencies	Administrator may use services of other Federal agencies. Bill directs utilization of service of Office of Education in certain particulars.	Administrator may use services of other Federal agencies. No mandatory requirements with respect to any specific agency.
Payment for certain State expenses	Administrator authorized to contract for payment to State and local agencies for necessary salary and travel expenses in ascertaining qualifications of institution and supervising same and furnishing other requested services.	Administrator authorized to reimburse State and local agencies for reasonable expenses incurred in ascertaining qualifications and supervision of industrial establishments and proprietary institutions, and furnishing other requested services.
Standards for approving courses	Provides detailed standards for on-the-job, on-farm, and all institutional courses (accreditation procedure employable in lieu of standards for certain established courses).	Contains standards for on-the-job and on-farm training which are similar to those in H. R. 7656, with the addition of standards for training on farm of another. Detailed standards for institutional courses are confined to proprietary profit schools, under certain conditions.
Disapproval of course and discontinuance of allowance.	State agency to disapprove course which fails to meet requirements. Administrator authorized to discontinue allowance to veteran if he finds that course fails to meet requirements or if institution has violated any provision.	Authority to Administrator to withhold benefits in on-job training and on-farm cases, when he finds they fail to meet standards. Administrator may withhold benefits in institutional cases only after finding by State approving agencies of failure to meet standards.
Regulations and review of payments by GAO	Administrator authorized to issue necessary regulations. Review by GAO provided.	Administrator authorized to issue necessary regulations, subject to certain limitations added by Public Law 610, 81st Cong. Finality provisions of sec. 5, Public No. 2, 73d Cong., and sec. 11, of act of Oct. 17, 1940, are applicable.
Educational and vocational guidance	Administrator authorized to provide such service and reimburse veteran for traveling expenses incident thereto where advisement is required by Administrator.	Administrator authorized to provide such service, but no authorization to reimburse veteran for traveling expenses.
Advisory committee	Administrator directed to form advisory committee composed of educators and including Commissioner of Education, ex officio.	No specific requirement for advisory committee, but such a committee functions under general authority.
Control by Federal agency prohibited	Standard provision precluding Federal supervision or control of State agencies and institutions.	Same provisions.
Conflicts of interests	Employees of VA, Office of Education or State agency having pecuniary interest in profit institutions to be dismissed, courses disapproved by State if conflicting interests develop.	No specific provisions.
Recovery of overpayments	Provides for recovery from institution of overpayment of allowance to vet resulting from (1) willful or negligent failure of institution to report excessive absence, etc., or (2) false certification by institution.	Similar provisions.
False or misleading statements	Administrator not to make payments to any person who has willfully submitted false or misleading claims.	No specific provisions in act.
Criminal penalties and forfeitures	Person who knowingly and willfully makes false statement or commits certain other defined acts to forfeit all rights and benefits under the program and under Public Law 2, 73d Cong., as amended, and upon conviction could be fined up to $500 or imprisoned up to 6 months or both. Person violating such provisions who is not affected by forfeiture could be fined up to $5,000 or imprisoned up to 3 years or both.	The criminal penalties generally applicable to other veterans' benefit programs apply. The forfeiture provisions of Public Law 2, 73d Cong., as amended, are made applicable and the over-all effect is somewhat broader than under either of the bills.
Waiver of overpayments	Contains standard provision for waiving recovery of overpayments of training allowance where Administrator finds that the person is not at fault and recovery would defeat purpose of benefits otherwise authorized or would be against equity and good conscience.	The same provision is applicable by reference to Public Law 2, system of which present program is a part.
Federal Trade Commission	Required to keep State agencies advised of information available to FTC which might be of assistance to State agencies in carrying out their duties.	No provision.
Veterans' Education Appeals Board	No provisions, as payments to institutions not involved under the bill.	Authorized to hear appeals from institutions dissatisfied by decisions of the Administrator as to customary cost of tuition and other actions taken under Veterans' Education and Training Amendments of 1950.
Effective date of educational and training provisions.	Effective on enactment but no education and training allowances payable for period prior to Sept. 1, 1952.	June 22, 1944.

LOAN ASSISTANCE

Service group and nature of benefit	Extends title III of SRA (guaranty and insurance of home, farm, and business loans, and direct home loans in certain cases) to veterans of service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to a date to be determined.	Same, but applicable to World War II group. These title III loan-assistance benefits are now provided for those who served on or after Sept. 16, 1940, and prior to July 26, 1947.
Additional amendments to present law	Makes certain other amendments to title III of SRA, including (1) specific authority to require advance approval of certain loans notwithstanding automatic guaranty provision; (2) requirements that new home construction meet minimum standards for planning and general acceptability as well as construction standards; (3) construction warranty to veteran purchaser for initial occupancy; (4) authority to refuse appraisal of housing handled by persons with poor record as to dealings with veteran purchaser; and (5) authority to exclude from future loan guaranties lenders with record of dealings detrimental to veteran or Government.	As indicated proposed amendments in H. R. 7656 would amend existing title III of Servicemen's Readjustment Act and would apply prospectively to the World War II group as well as the new service group.

SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS

Old-age and survivors insurance	Gives $160 credit for each month spent in the service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to a date to be determined.	Same as applicable to World War II group. (Not provided in Public Law 346, 78th Cong.)

[1] The other titles of H. R. 7656 would provide old-age and survivors insurance credits, mustering-out payments, and employment assistance.

Comparison of H. R. 7656, 82d Cong., with titles II and III of Public Law 346, 78th Cong., as amended (GI bill of rights)—Continued

MUSTERING-OUT PAYMENTS

	H. R. 7656 [1]	Public Law 346, 78th Cong., as amended
Mustering-out payments	Grants $100 for veterans serving less than 60 days, $200 for veterans serving more than 60 days, and $300 for veterans serving more than 60 days and with service overseas. Includes up to and including the rank of captain in the Army and Air Force and lieutenant, senior grade, in the Navy.	Identical to World War II coverage. (Not provided in Public Law 346, 78th Cong.)

JOB ASSISTANCE

Employment benefits	Grants preference in employment based on service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to a date to be determined.	Identical to World War II coverage.

[1] The other titles of H. R. 7656 would provide old-age and survivors insurance credits, mustering-out payments, and employment assistance.

[Excerpts from hearings on H. R. 7656]

VA home loans closed, FNMA purchases, and estimated private originations

	Number of loans (thousands)				Loan amount (millions)			
	VA home loans closed	FNMA (or RFC [1]) purchases		Estimated private originations	VA home loans closed	FNMA (or RFC [1]) purchases		Estimated private originations
		Number	Percent of VA			Amount	Percent of VA	
ALL HOME LOANS								
1945–46	453.3	[1] 0.4	0.08	454.9	2,494.5	[1] 2.2	0.08	2,492.3
1947	541.9	[1] 21.8	4.0	520.1	3,282.5	[1] 129.2	3.9	3,153.3
1948	349.9	[1] 5.3	1.5	344.6	1,881.0	[1] 28.2	1.5	1,852.8
1949	276.8	65.5	23.7	211.3	1,423.6	419.5	29.5	1,004.1
1950 total	497.6	133.1	26.7	364.5	3,073.3	995.1	32.4	2,078.2
First half	221.9	70.0	31.5	151.9	1,273.2	510.9	40.1	762.3
Second half	275.7	63.1	22.9	212.6	1,800.1	484.2	26.9	1,315.9
1951 total	447.4	77.1	17.2	370.3	3,614.5	602.7	16.7	3,011.8
First half	241.0	43.6	18.1	197.4	1,833.6	340.6	18.6	1,493.0
Second half	206.4	33.5	16.2	172.9	1,780.9	262.1	14.7	1,518.8
PRIMARY (SEC. 501) HOME LOANS								
1945–46	440.3	[1] 1.4	.09	439.9	2,477.7	[1] 2.2	.08	2,475.5
1947	494.4	[1] 21.8	4.4	472.6	3,228.1	[1] 129.2	4.0	3,098.9
1948	256.3	[1] 4.1	1.2	252.2	1,743.1	[1] 26.7	1.5	1,716.4
1949	177.9	53.4	30.0	124.5	1,275.9	404.3	31.7	871.6
1950 total	373.9	129.1	34.5	244.8	2,903.2	989.9	34.1	1,913.3
First half	156.8	66.7	42.5	90.1	1,182.3	506.5	42.8	675.8
Second half	217.1	62.4	28.7	154.7	1,720.9	483.4	28.1	1,237.5
1951 total	413.9	76.0	18.4	395.6	3,569.1	600.9	16.8	2,968.2
First half	212.8	42.9	20.2	116.6	1,795.9	339.7	18.9	1,456.2
Second half	201.1	33.1	16.5	221.4	1,773.2	261.2	14.7	1,512.0

[1] All purchases in 1945 to 1947, and part of 1948, represent purchases by the RFC Mortgage Company.

Status of FNMA home financing, Dec. 31, 1951

Gross authorization		$2,750,000,000
Less:		
Mortgage portfolio	$1,849,534,000	
Undisbursed commitments	239,109,000	
Total available for use		661,357,000
Less set asides:		
Defense and military housing	$396,255,000	
Disaster housing	16,249,000	
Available for purchase of other mortgages		248,853,000
COMPOSITION OF MORTGAGE PORTFOLIO		
VA loans, total		$1,645,800,000
Sec. 501	$1,638,000,000	
Sec. 502	1,500,000	
Sec. 505 (a)	6,800,000	
FHA loans, total		203,700,000
Sec. 203	$52,800,000	
Sec. 603	95,800,000	
Sec. 207	31,500,000	
Sec. 608	22,500,000	
Other	1,100,000	
Total portfolio		1,849,534,000

"SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT BY MR. T. B. KING, DIRECTOR, LOAN GUARANTY SERVICE IN OFFICE OF FINANCE, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

"At the conclusion of the round-table conference on housing finance held before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on February 6, 7, and 8, 1952, the participants were extended the opportunity to submit supplemental comments or statements pertinent to any of the subjects discussed. I am pleased to avail myself of that opportunity and hope that the following comments to be included in the record of the conference will prove helpful in furthering the committee's objective of obtaining a more comprehensive understanding of the major problems presently of concern in the residential financing field.

"From the viewpoint of the Veterans' Administration certainly the major problem discussed at the conference concerned the present 4 percent maximum interest rate permissible for VA guaranteed home loans. It came as no surprise that the bulk of the testimony given at the conference favored an increase in the GI-loan maximum interest rate as a primary solvent to the current shortage of mortgage funds now evident in many parts of the country. That is quite natural, and no one can question the sincerity of the assertions of the industry spokesman as an expression of a valid point of view. While there was substantial testimony supporting a contrary view, I believe that the committee may find helpful a discussion of the primary factors which support the Veterans' Administration's position that the present maximum 4 percent interest rate is adequate, and that an increase in that rate is not warranted either in light of the present situation or the situation anticipated in the year ahead.

"Most of the criticism by lender participants centered upon the net yield obtainable from GI 4-percent loans in relation to other investment yields. It was pointed out that from the gross 4-percent yield a one-half of 1 percent factor must be deducted in considering the net yield of the typical secondary market investor, since that is the figure commonly paid to the servicing agent. A further deduction must be made for home-office expenses which according to the best available data amount to approximately three-tenths of 1 percent of the loan amount. Thus an investor purchasing mortgages from an originating mortgage company receives a net yield which falls in the neighborhood of 3.2 percent. It should be recognized that the actual net yield figure experienced undoubtedly varies by individual lender depending upon such factors as size of portfolio, efficiency of operation, and total servicing costs. It might be pointed out also that many institutions which originate loans locally for retention in their own portfolios, such as savings and loan associations and many banks, probably enjoy a higher net yield since the functions of origination and servicing are integrated in a single operation. Likewise secondary investors who pay their services less than the customary one-half of 1 percent servicing charge enjoy a correspondingly higher yield.

"Moreover, it must be counted to the advantage of all holders of GI loans that the guaranty contract is so liberal and pervading that added elements of expense either in origination or liquidation are well covered, so that no dilution of the 3.20 factor because of unsecured expenses or outlay is likely, nor need any appreciable fund be set aside as a reserve for such contingent outlay or to cover principal loss.

"In general, we take no exception to the net-yield figures presented by the various industry spokesmen. We do, however, believe that insufficient emphasis was given to the proper measuring stick which should be used in assessing the relative investment attraction of VA-guaranteed 4-percent loans. Thus, the approximate 3.2 percent net-yield factor quoted as characteristic for GI-loan portfolios was repeatedly compared with the net yields obtainable on corporate bonds, ranging from triple A corporate bonds to Baa-rated securities. It was pointed out that the highest grade corporate bonds may now be purchased to yield from 3 to 3.10 percent. One spokesman attached even greater significance to the yield obtainable on Baa bonds which may now be purchased in the market to yield approximately 3.6 percent. The availability of even higher yields was stressed where the securities are acquired through private negotiations for the purchase of new corporate issues.

"It is not our intention to deprecate the investment worth of the corporate securities which are included in the various yield series discussed. It is recognized that such securities represent the obligations of some of our strongest corporate enterprises. Many of

them are blue-chip investments and their relatively low yield in terms of bonds of lesser security reflect that high quality.

"THE GI 4-PERCENT RATE IS STILL COMPETITIVE

"What we do contend is that the only fair basis of comparison in judging the investment attraction of the GI 4-percent loan is to relate its net yield to the yield obtainable on Government bonds. Since the GI loan is guaranteed by the Government for the top 60 percent of the loan, it must be regarded for all practicable purposes as a riskless security, which, like Government bonds, is backed by the full credit and resources of the Government. When compared with Government bonds, the relative investment position of the VA-guaranteed 4-percent loan shows up in a much more favorable light than in the comparisons made by other participants with corporate securities. Presently the average yield on long-term Government bonds is approximately 2.70. That figure is a full one-half of 1 percent below the net yield of 3.20 cited above as typical for those institutional investors which pay a one-half percent servicing fee. Admittedly that one-half of 1 percent spread has been narrowed from what it was prior to the upward shift in the structure of money yields which followed upon the monetary actions taken in the spring of 1951. Nonetheless the differential is there, and remains substantial even at the low point currently reached by the Government bond market. Moreover, an even more proper basis of comparison is with Government bonds of intermediate maturity since the average mortgage portfolio has a high turn-over rate which reduces its average life to approximately 8 years, more or less. Government bonds of intermediate maturity now outstanding may be purchased to yield approximately 2.65 percent.

"The contention that the GI 4-percent rate is no longer competitive is, moreover, not borne out by the facts. Even in the present mortgage market the Veterans' Administration continues to receive from 25,000 to 30,000 GI home-loan applications from lenders each month. While admittedly below peak-activity rates of the boom building year 1950, this rate of application volume is substantial and does not compare unfavorably with other past periods in the relatively brief history of the GI loan program. This experience is more impressive when allowance is made for the fact that the GI loan program has been proceeding for some time under credit controls which constitute a substantial deterrent to prospective veteran home buyers.

"But to be accurate a qualification should be noted in discussing the current rate of GI loan activity. Although the bulk of current GI loans are being made by private capital, the over-the-counter mortgage-purchase program of the Federal National Mortgage Association is still supplying a substantial support in helping to make GI loans available in many areas of the country. Thus, in the last half of 1951 approximately 16 percent of the total of GI loans made stemmed from Government funds supplied via the FNMA Government secondary market. At the same time, considering this source of support solely from the aspect of appraising the present rate of volume against past experience, it may be observed that FNMA was called upon in prior years to supply a higher rate of support. For example, in 1950 we estimate that FNMA capital supplied approximately one-third of the total of GI first-mortgage 4-percent loans made to veterans in that year.

"FNMA SUPPORT TO GI LOANS

"At this point it would appear appropriate to comment on the future role of the FNMA market in affording support for GI loans and to indicate our concern over the inability of FNMA to continue that support in the year ahead. In 1948 the very important need for Government secondary market support to the GI 4-percent loan in many communities was recognized by the Congress in the passage of legislation which made GI loans eligible for FNMA purchase. Further evidence of the desire of Congress to improve secondary market support for the GI loan by FNMA was shown by an amendment to the law in 1949 which permitted lenders to sell GI loans on an unrestricted basis to FNMA if they were unable to find a private buyer. For other loans eligible for purchase by FNMA, such as FHA title II loans, the lender could sell no more than 50 percent of his eligible loan originations (a limitation which has remained in full effect except for military housing loans insured under title VIII of the National Housing Act). Thus the primary purpose of the FNMA market was altered and shaped legislatively to supply broad secondary market support to FHA-insured loans, and to VA-guaranteed 4-percent loans particularly.

"The present FNMA holding of GI loans is ample evidence that that legislative purpose was achieved and that a considerable support has been supplied by FNMA in the past. Currently FNMA holds approximately 230,000 GI first-mortgage loans with an outstanding loan balance of approximately $1,700,000,000. But the true measure of the support function of FNMA is much broader than those statistical totals would indicate. Because lenders could rely upon the existence of the FNMA market in the event they could find no buyers in the private secondary market, the indirect support effects, so long as a substantial and reassuring unexpended balance was on hand in FNMA, afforded widespread encouragement to lenders to originate 4-percent loans to veterans.

"But on the other hand, historically, in a pattern currently being repeated, at the point where the balances available in FNMA become depleted, the assurance and with it the support vanish, and a 'devil take the hindmost' rush take heavy toll of the remainder.

"Currently FNMA holds an estimated $1,900,000,000 to $2,000,000,000 in mortgages as against its total authorization under the law of $2,750,000,000. Unfortunately, however, the difference is not all available as a support to the GI loan. The reason is that FNMA has undergone a complete reorientation over the past year or more so that its major objective under prevailing policy is to give financing support to defense and military housing. The Defense Housing Act of 1951, effective last September 1, authorized FNMA to use $200,000,000 of its remaining resources for advance commitments to purchase programed defense housing in defense areas, military housing loans, and loans in disaster areas. In addition, FNMA has earmarked another $400,000,000 or more which is available only for the financing of programed defense housing and military housing. It is recognized that a portion of these funds will undoubtedly provide GI financing for defense workers in defense areas who are eligible World War II veterans, although the incidence of GI financing in such areas will be restricted in view of the fact that approximately 70 percent of the defense housing now being programed is to be built as rental housing.

"As the situation now stands, there is less than $150,000,000 still available for general over-the-counter purchases which has not been earmarked or committed by FNMA. It might be pointed out also that that limited fund is available for the purchase of FHA loans as well as GI 4-percent loans. Moreover, at the present rate of sales of mortgages to FNMA, it seems a foregone conclusion that very shortly FNMA will have no more funds to buy GI loans other than those which may stem from programed sales housing in defense areas.

"I am not questioning the desirability of using FNMA resources to supplement private capital in the financing of whatever quantity of defense housing is needed. Nonetheless, the fact cannot be escaped that the use of FNMA funds for that purpose has virtually eliminated the efficacy of that market as a broad secondary market support for the GI 4-percent loan. An even more pressing concern is whether, in the current state of the mortgage market, private capital will be able to step into the breach to supply the 5,000 to 6,000 GI loans a month which FNMA capital has been supplying (actually in January FNMA purchased about 8,000 GI loans).

"It is no part of my purpose to take issue with the use of FNMA to support defense housing needs. Nor is it part of my purpose to argue for new and larger appropriations to FNMA for GI-loan support. My sole purpose is to bring to the attention of the committee the significance of FNMA's current role in relation to the GI-loan program, so that the committee may have the viewpoint of one charged with the administration of that law before it when it considers its action on these and related matters during the present session.

"MORTGAGE CAPITAL UNEVENLY DISTRIBUTED

"Getting away from the subject of FNMA, I would like to comment on the significance attached by Mr. W. A. Clark to a remark by me that the present supply of GI loans is 'spotty and sparse.' It is indeed true that the present supply of mortgage capital for GI loans is not distributed evenly throughout the United States. Our statistics show that available GI loans are largely concentrated in the northeastern section of the United States and in a relatively few large urban centers in other parts of the country. It does not follow, however, as Mr. Clark contends, that an interest rate increase for GI loans would achieve an even flow of mortgage capital for GI loans into all areas. The uneven distribution of funds available for long-term mortgage investment has always existed and is by no means a unique characteristic of the GI 4-percent loan. As you know, there are some areas of our country where savings capital has been concentrated and where consequently mortgage money has been available in ample supply on liberal terms and at relatively low cost. There are many other areas, however, where the converse has been true, i. e., where the demand for mortgage capital has far outstripped the local supply. In capital-tight areas of the latter description quite often the only prospect for obtaining the needed mortgage capital has been through the medium of interstate investment from the centers of relatively heavy concentrations of savings capital. Concededly, in partial agreement with Mr. Clark's statement, a higher interest rate would improve the geographical distribution to a limited degree. But it is more likely his proposed increase would stimulate an oversupply in the areas least needing an added supply, with the result that premiums would once again prevail in those areas.

"The limited direct loan program of the Veterans' Administration first authorized by the Housing Act of 1950 and later extended by the Defense Housing Act of 1951, was enacted in clear recognition of the fact that World War II veterans living in smaller towns and communities were generally unable to obtain long-term mortgage loans on the liberal terms and at the low interest

rate offered by VA-guaranteed loans. In addition to the limited aid made available by a special purpose program such as VA's direct loan program, however, I believe great hope for improvement lies in the direction of creating a central mortgage bank along the lines suggested by Senator SPARKMAN and other participants as a means of achieving a mere fluid mobility of mortgage capital from areas of ample supply to those where local capital is insufficient. It is to be hoped that such a meritorious proposal will receive intensified study by your committee and by the industry groups who have the resources out of which the tremendous aggregate of capital necessary to effectuate the objectives of such a market must be derived.

"IMPROVED INVESTMENT CALIBER OF GI LOANS

"In reflecting on the stress which several participants laid upon the lack of flexibility in the maximum interest rates for Government-supported mortgage loans, in contrast to the marked changes which have taken place in the money market over the past year, I believe some qualifying comment is in order.

"Quite apart from the question of relative yields, while it is true that the GI-loan interest rate maximum has been maintained unchanged at 4 percent, it is not true that the GI loan itself, in terms of investment caliber or net yield, has remained static. To the contrary, the intrinsic advantages of the GI loan to the investor have been greatly improved over the past several years in a number of important respects. For example, the Housing Act of 1950 increased the guaranty protection to the lender by a considerable margin. Where previously the maximum guaranty on a VA home loan was 50 percent with a maximum guaranty of $4,000, the lender is now protected for the top 60 percent of the loan, and the maximum guaranty amount has been raised to $7,500. In November of 1949, VA regulations were amended to permit the lender to charge a 1-percent origination fee to the veteran borrower. While that 1 percent fee did not increase the lender's income by the full amount of the charge, since it was permitted only in lieu of certain other origination expenses of the lender, it nonetheless did serve to sweeten the investment attraction of the GI 4-percent loan by providing an offset to origination costs. At that time it was generally agreed that for most lenders the 1-percent charge offered an additional profit incentive, probably averaging about one-half of 1 percent of the loan amount.

"In December 1948, VA regulations governing the conveyance of property were liberalized substantially from the lender's standpoint. The present rules governing liquidation provide a number of important advantages, for example, the Veterans' Administration will take the property upon foreclosure subject to redemption rights and without regard to whether the property is adversely occupied. Also the VA will accept title which is generally acceptable in the locality and does not insist upon a marketable title; VA will assume custody of the property and risk of loss due to property damage immediately after foreclosure even though the title has not yet been conveyed to the VA. These are by no means all of the advantageous aspects of VA's rules governing property conveyance when foreclosure occurs, but they serve to illustrate that the lender is afforded strong inducements to invest in GI loans quite apart from the permissible interest rate itself.

"In 1948, Congress added an incontestable clause to title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act which provided a strong measure of protection previously lacking by enabling the lender to have confidence that the validity of the VA guaranty would not be questioned in the future because of mistake or misunderstanding on the part of either the lender or the VA field office.

"Other changes over the past several years have seen the establishment of minimum construction requirements, by the introduction of compliance inspections to guard against defective construction, and by a tightening of the VA appraisal and credit underwriting functions. Now, under credit controls, all GI loans require down payments. The investment attraction of the GI loan has also been bolstered by the wider acceptability now accorded to the GI loan among all types of lending institutions, including secondary market investors who supply mortgage capital on an interstate basis, in contrast to the earlier days of the VA loan guaranty program when the GI loan was regarded by many as a new and untried investment instrument. Last but not least is the outstanding record demonstrated by veterans in repaying their GI loan obligations and the warm respect which that attested record has generated among lenders. In contrast to the fears expressed in the earlier years of the program, many lenders now point with pride to their GI loans and regard their veteran borrowers as their soundest credit risks.

"It is admittedly impossible to assign a fixed numerical weight to all of the above-discussed advantages from the investor's standpoint. But it cannot be denied that they all have contributed to a substantial enhancement of the investment appeal of the GI 4-percent loan and show clearly that the GI loan as an investment package has not stood still while everything else around it has changed.

"THE MORTGAGE MARKET SHOULD IMPROVE

"As stated earlier, we are not prepared to concede that the GI 4-percent rate has lost its competitive ability even in the present mortgage market. But we believe that the case against an increase in the maximum interest rate for GI loans is even stronger in view of the prospective improvement now beginning to take shape in the mortgage market. It is our belief that most of the deterring influences to mortgage investment are now beginning to diminish in importance and that the basic trends now evident portend an easing in the mortgage supply situation, including the supply of funds available for investment in GI 4-percent loans. Briefly, the factors which underlie that belief may well be restated here in summary as follows:

"(a) The very large volume of mortgage commitments made by lenders in the latter part of 1950 and the early part of 1951 are now being worked out. This was clearly brought out in the statistics presented at the conference showing the sharp decline over recent months in the outstanding loan commitments of life insurance companies. With the reduction in outstanding commitments to more normal levels now in sight, the pressure upon lenders to find new mortgage investments to keep their dollars employed will increase.

"(b) The extremely high rate of peacetime savings out of current national income is being reflected in the record amounts of new money flowing as deposits into mortgage financing institutions. That trend, plus very large principal repayments on outstanding loans, is also steadily increasing the pressure to find available investment outlets.

"(c) The opportunities to invest in mortgages are gradually contracting as the credit controls and limitations on materials bite deeper, so that the swelling amount of investment money will be forced to compete for a dwindling supply of new mortgages.

"(d) One deterrent to mortgage investment has been the greatly expanded investment opportunity in corporate securities which has arisen in connection with expanding capital outlays by business for defense-plant expansion and other defense-production purposes. Corporate borrowing is still proceeding at extremely high levels, but it is expected that the volume of such financing will soon begin to decline in rate as the initial tooling-up phases of the defense-production effort are completed. The probability of such a decline in the rate of corporate borrowing from present peak levels is strengthened in view of present defense budget policy which contemplates an easing in the impact of defense expenditures upon the civilian economy by spreading the defense-production program over a longer period.

"(e) While lenders may be expected to have increasing difficulty in finding conventional and FHA borrowers who can meet the very substantial down-payment terms required for such loans, their potential customers among World War II veterans will be very large because of the preference which GI loans are given under the credit-control laws. For example, on a $12,000 house a nonveteran must put in $2,400 as a down payment with an FHA or conventional loan. With a GI loan the down payment required of the veteran is less than $1,000 ($960) in the same case.

"These we believe to be the major influences in the picture which point toward an increasing improvement in the mortgage-supply situation, including an increased willingness on the part of lenders to invest in VA-guaranteed 4-percent loans. These various influences are reflected currently in VA's most recent statistics. New appraisal requests for proposed construction, the first and most sensitive indicator of GI-loan volume, reached a low point of 7,700 units in July 1951. Since that date the monthly total has moved almost steadily upward, reaching a monthly average of 15,000 in the last quarter of 1951, and a peak of 21,600 in January 1952, the highest number of units requested in any month since the October 1950 curbs were imposed.

"Some of this accelerated appraisal activity may well be arising from financing arrangements which reflect discounts, or the absorption of discounts, which are set up to avoid or skirt the prohibitions of maximum-fee schedules established pursuant to section 504 of the Housing Act of 1950. If these recourses are to be proscribed, such a prohibition could be accomplished only by substantially broadening and strengthening the present law. But such a step is not urged since no flagrant abuses such as compelled the Congress to enact the original section 504 have been noted. It is thought also that such arrangements may serve to compensate for and bridge over to some extent the consequences of temporary voids or maladjustments in the regular flow of mortgage money such as underlay the market during 1951.

"POSSIBLE INFLATIONARY EFFECTS OF AN INTEREST RATE INCREASE

"Another subject discussed was the possible inflationary effects of an increase in the maximum interest rate for Government guaranteed or insured loans. At one point during the discussion Mr. Martin, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, indicated that an increase in the rate would not be inflationary. As you probably noted, that indication was later capitalized upon by Mr. Clark as a favorable factor in presenting his arguments for a higher rate.

"It is deemed probable that the Federal Reserve Board's expression is based upon the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

assumption that the 800,000 figure for new housing starts in 1952 must be regarded as an absolute maximum and that whatever steps are necessary to achieve that goal will be undertaken by the Government. Viewed in that light, it is conceivable that an increase in the maximum interest rate for GI loans might be regarded as noninflationary, since the result would be to shift a substantial portion of conventional financing into FHA and GI loans with no additional increase in the net amount of the new mortgage indebtedness required to finance that level of starts.

"It is my belief, however, that the stimulation of an increased GI loan interest rate would greatly increase the difficulties which the Government would encounter in keeping maximum housing production within the desired goal, and that further, it might very well incline or force the Government to take other restrictive steps to keep within that goal. Also in the existing housing sector, I do not think there is any doubt that an increase in the GI-loan interest rate would tend to inflate the expansion of mortgage credit in connection with the sale of existing homes. In the case of existing homes, there is no numerical goal to be controlled and a higher interest rate would greatly increase the effective demand of veterans in the housing market. It should not be inferred, of course, that we do not want to see a larger share of the housing supply go to veterans with the advantageous terms of GI financing. We want to see that trend very much but we would prefer to witness its accomplishment at the same low interest costs which have always been in effect for GI loans. We believe also that a gradual improvement in the availability of GI financing—now in prospect even with the 4 percent maximum rate maintained—will contribute far more to stability in the housing market than would a precipitous improvement caused by an increased interest rate, with the attendant inflationary dangers and the higher financing costs which veteran borrowers would have to bear.

"As the committee proceeds further with its consideration and study of the various points and problems related to the foregoing, it may be sure that the Veterans' Administration will be glad to supply it promptly with any further analysis or statistics which may serve to assist the committee."

Loans approved for guaranty or insurance number, principal amount, and amount of guaranty or insurance cumulative through Dec. 25, 1951

Regional office	All loans			Home loans			Farm loans			Business loans		
	Number	Principal amount	Guaranty or insurance	Number	Principal amount	Guaranty or insurance	Number	Principal amount	Guaranty or insurance	Number	Principal amount	Guaranty or insurance
Total	2,875,097	$17,117,080,443	$8,801,047,365	2,643,261	$16,402,628,814	$8,537,107,839	62,447	$241,453,569	$108,247,852	169,389	$472,998,060	$155,691,674
Alabama: Montgomery	38,861	209,593,020	113,432,158	35,179	199,453,396	108,562,448	2,647	6,386,674	3,167,504	1,035	3,752,950	1,702,206
Alaska: Juneau	250	1,167,324	569,712	166	829,102	443,678	0	0	0	84	338,222	126,034
Arizona: Phoenix	10,021	42,993,884	22,301,260	8,502	38,695,216	21,232,957	280	972,381	296,992	1,239	3,326,287	771,311
Arkansas: Little Rock	19,792	71,245,678	38,719,819	16,491	62,807,416	35,209,068	1,604	3,760,482	1,759,448	1,697	4,677,780	1,751,303
California:												
Los Angeles	198,133	1,432,057,763	764,159,604	192,585	1,412,792,838	760,160,570	153	1,095,370	415,964	5,395	18,169,555	3,583,070
San Diego	15,918	111,552,414	62,020,427	15,341	109,900,004	61,615,202	8	60,925	26,250	569	1,591,485	378,975
San Francisco	147,559	993,031,242	484,099,195	140,352	875,958,728	476,509,678	1,073	7,031,228	2,831,071	6,134	20,041,286	4,758,446
Colorado: Denver	28,922	154,919,061	80,871,783	24,991	140,964,842	77,288,798	1,791	7,413,334	1,332,247	2,140	6,540,885	2,250,738
Connecticut: Hartford	39,504	295,842,607	144,514,642	37,032	289,354,101	142,551,672	38	310,202	127,456	2,434	6,178,304	1,835,514
Delaware: Wilmington	8,970	62,839,349	33,022,634	8,690	61,619,772	32,448,266	123	628,538	315,448	157	591,039	258,920
District of Columbia: Washington	42,851	381,272,414	189,953,740	40,780	376,193,291	188,368,795	5	36,000	17,000	2,066	5,043,123	1,576,945
Florida:												
Miami	26,842	173,717,879	95,830,999	26,468	172,387,966	95,350,806	10	68,215	26,370	364	1,261,698	453,823
Pass-A-Grille	34,656	183,863,019	103,226,679	33,701	180,434,316	101,835,166	53	164,750	76,968	902	3,263,953	1,314,545
Georgia: Atlanta	54,556	322,422,931	168,493,501	50,136	309,090,032	162,338,574	2,321	6,809,760	3,367,125	2,099	6,523,139	2,787,802
Hawaii: Honolulu	3,608	32,500,180	15,705,381	3,438	32,026,096	15,488,703	1	3,900	1,950	169	470,184	211,728
Idaho: Boise	8,811	39,746,913	22,294,255	7,870	36,148,475	20,652,132	488	1,920,885	882,760	453	1,677,553	759,363
Illinois: Chicago	116,882	707,344,169	349,609,748	109,185	683,733,133	339,960,421	1,831	6,888,193	3,102,867	5,866	16,722,843	6,546,460
Indiana: Indianapolis	61,615	285,152,730	148,981,808	56,988	269,199,925	141,674,629	2,150	8,763,908	4,114,989	2,477	7,188,897	3,192,190
Iowa: Des Moines	41,646	205,390,092	105,178,479	33,646	178,542,376	93,299,471	4,681	16,378,381	7,327,599	3,319	10,469,335	4,554,409
Kansas: Wichita	30,529	145,522,523	72,908,929	26,786	133,787,313	67,971,608	1,486	5,556,401	2,584,069	2,257	6,178,809	2,353,252
Kentucky: Louisville	25,680	129,235,232	65,923,392	22,363	115,799,473	59,954,870	1,827	8,673,158	4,175,968	1,490	4,762,601	1,792,554
Louisiana:												
New Orleans	23,991	135,084,026	74,278,457	23,069	132,682,707	73,424,954	143	373,889	174,782	779	2,027,430	678,721
Shreveport	11,369	51,960,931	29,700,605	10,669	49,891,711	28,761,609	412	1,042,939	497,236	288	1,026,281	441,760
Maine: Togus	15,244	63,230,635	34,367,188	13,166	57,118,809	31,538,975	446	1,580,598	734,490	1,632	4,531,228	2,093,723
Maryland: Baltimore	41,563	258,002,662	132,623,094	39,720	252,480,582	130,606,749	235	1,390,542	636,103	1,608	4,131,538	1,380,242
Massachusetts: Boston	120,127	813,175,307	374,808,894	114,206	795,190,568	367,682,312	146	946,506	420,942	5,775	17,038,233	6,723,640
Michigan: Detroit	127,165	838,622,921	437,997,961	122,146	822,457,047	431,490,592	950	3,891,001	1,851,205	4,069	12,274,873	4,656,164
Minnesota: St. Paul	53,778	333,511,064	168,319,402	45,638	307,292,805	157,695,800	3,209	12,554,481	5,491,329	4,931	13,663,778	5,132,273
Mississippi: Jackson	16,618	74,293,730	41,926,700	14,075	67,010,824	38,378,824	2,059	5,595,097	2,751,160	484	1,687,809	796,716
Missouri:												
Kansas City	40,251	203,188,310	109,875,537	34,591	184,024,887	101,625,669	2,859	11,956,442	5,528,231	2,801	7,206,981	2,721,637
St. Louis	28,996	180,690,971	89,852,439	25,351	169,542,895	84,980,561	1,623	5,608,602	2,607,633	2,022	5,539,474	2,264,245
Montana: Fort Harrison	6,419	30,934,235	16,196,182	4,984	26,006,466	14,041,436	473	1,698,830	761,612	962	3,228,939	1,393,134
Nebraska: Lincoln	17,361	78,287,210	40,943,513	14,668	70,597,562	37,429,583	1,478	4,170,108	1,965,853	1,215	3,519,480	1,548,077
Nevada: Reno	2,132	10,101,225	5,642,181	1,886	9,170,079	5,272,200	72	310,111	139,984	174	621,035	229,997
New Hampshire: Manchester	16,711	79,774,313	38,681,370	14,841	72,995,021	35,909,516	230	1,079,936	497,627	1,640	5,699,356	2,274,227
New Jersey: Newark	131,089	876,957,322	446,772,456	120,222	853,759,353	442,297,964	104	721,075	327,209	10,763	22,476,894	4,147,193
New Mexico: Albuquerque	11,577	50,891,009	29,390,624	10,564	47,166,009	27,870,425	332	1,189,637	428,984	681	2,535,363	1,091,215
New York:												
Albany	31,231	173,788,291	87,195,966	27,667	161,904,867	82,366,259	753	3,514,243	1,561,351	2,811	8,369,181	3,268,356
Buffalo	85,421	367,469,350	184,611,012	52,701	356,431,936	179,935,934	704	3,101,945	1,439,679	2,016	7,935,469	3,235,399
New York	185,171	1,179,697,618	550,110,837	143,695	1,090,868,707	534,594,106	60	428,454	171,525	41,416	88,400,457	15,345,206
Syracuse	36,091	206,896,859	104,330,694	32,000	192,577,169	98,450,062	1,138	5,034,653	2,258,870	2,953	9,285,037	3,621,762
North Carolina: Winston-Salem	38,605	199,483,876	102,437,588	37,111	193,441,831	99,709,820	478	2,328,909	1,109,615	1,016	3,713,136	1,618,153
North Dakota: Fargo	8,147	34,307,414	17,105,835	4,761	24,778,391	12,579,208	2,051	5,508,573	2,680,098	1,335	4,020,450	1,846,529
Ohio:												
Cincinnati	54,620	322,191,672	157,595,247	51,908	310,779,579	152,416,665	1,364	6,553,050	2,990,221	1,348	4,859,043	2,188,361
Cleveland	92,224	591,863,992	302,654,630	90,070	582,488,971	298,664,897	738	4,327,327	1,969,072	1,416	5,047,694	2,020,661
Oklahoma:												
Muskogee	17,655	71,541,367	40,875,193	16,074	67,154,496	38,841,861	970	2,453,240	1,146,206	611	1,933,631	887,126
Oklahoma City	41,941	224,652,909	124,834,844	40,161	217,749,028	121,807,818	905	3,816,001	1,654,668	875	3,087,880	1,372,358
Oregon: Portland	19,400	103,440,407	53,530,110	15,866	92,648,531	50,090,032	725	2,980,393	1,213,560	2,809	7,811,483	2,217,518
Pennsylvania:												
Philadelphia	97,487	569,278,268	293,349,302	95,423	563,203,670	291,042,968	114	731,204	310,088	1,950	5,343,394	1,966,246
Pittsburgh	73,550	405,856,591	207,019,689	68,692	389,583,305	200,676,396	996	4,643,902	2,212,851	3,862	11,629,384	4,130,442
Wilkes-Barre	45,765	217,106,988	110,703,058	41,674	200,534,823	103,216,331	1,297	6,249,021	2,935,416	2,794	10,323,144	4,551,311
Puerto Rico: San Juan	4,229	4,046,793	3,542,275	3,927	3,201,380	3,141,075	2	4,300	4,300	300	841,113	396,900
Rhode Island: Providence	21,132	135,175,096	67,472,750	20,134	131,651,560	66,009,974	11	85,100	33,300	987	3,438,436	1,429,476
South Carolina: Columbia	23,591	123,977,743	64,936,727	21,964	118,804,093	62,610,764	488	1,477,277	694,219	1,139	3,696,373	1,631,744
South Dakota: Sioux Falls	7,157	27,157,559	13,892,419	4,249	19,230,973	10,484,737	1,713	4,419,787	1,931,198	1,195	3,506,799	1,476,484
Tennessee: Nashville	48,523	241,671,230	133,264,039	46,669	233,911,824	129,860,000	1,046	4,961,090	2,311,545	808	2,798,316	1,092,494
Texas:												
Dallas	50,423	254,592,033	133,499,742	46,639	242,236,164	127,793,250	1,500	5,478,134	2,567,677	2,284	6,877,735	3,138,815
Houston	48,705	295,932,938	161,480,156	47,696	292,285,890	159,961,453	334	1,194,617	499,447	675	2,452,431	1,019,256
Lubbock	24,202	141,814,505	77,427,468	22,612	135,332,416	74,523,745	806	4,105,847	1,822,291	694	2,376,242	1,081,432
San Antonio	28,177	174,196,711	94,415,904	26,980	169,261,873	92,330,874	380	1,495,197	682,445	817	3,439,641	1,402,585
Waco	15,771	88,714,893	47,174,700	13,883	80,107,867	43,422,407	1,254	6,080,485	2,758,783	634	2,526,541	993,510
Utah: Salt Lake City	11,652	54,067,271	29,612,010	10,777	51,227,300	28,475,273	189	760,188	334,758	686	2,079,783	801,977
Vermont: White River Junction	8,330	38,259,229	18,468,058	6,964	32,848,950	16,272,575	693	3,063,968	1,269,018	653	2,346,305	926,465

Loans approved for guaranty or insurance number, principal amount, and amount of guaranty or insurance cumulative through Dec. 25, 1951—Continued

Regional office	All loans			Home loans			Farm loans			Business loans		
	Number	Principal amount	Guaranty or insurance	Number	Principal amount	Guaranty or insurance	Number	Principal amount	Guaranty or insurance	Number	Principal amount	Guaranty or insurance
Virginia: Roanoke	38,504	$202,120,989	$105,389,606	36,169	$193,308,715	$101,414,912	807	$3,827,889	$1,794,880	1,528	$4,984,405	$2,179,814
Washington: Seattle	65,706	354,384,119	187,195,264	62,039	343,242,117	183,244,575	403	2,212,696	932,570	3,266	8,929,306	3,018,119
West Virginia: Huntington	15,461	72,157,335	38,694,567	14,461	68,601,969	37,021,582	390	1,311,362	646,062	610	2,244,004	1,026,923
Wisconsin: Milwaukee	41,959	248,868,832	122,855,064	36,003	225,756,603	112,847,630	2,556	11,559,765	5,255,716	3,400	11,552,464	4,751,728
Wyoming: Cheyenne	4,208	22,251,270	12,177,863	3,786	20,368,674	11,366,983	151	712,433	309,888	331	1,170,163	500,992

Number and amount of direct loans fully disbursed by the Veterans' Administration from initiation of program (July 1950) through Dec. 15, 1951

Regional office	Number of loans (by purpose)			Initial principal amount			Regional office	Number of loans (by purpose)			Initial principal amount		
	Purchase of completed home	Construction of home	Construction or improvement of farmhouse	Total, all types	Total	Average amount		Purchase of completed home	Construction of home	Construction or improvement of farmhouse	Total, all types	Total	Average amount
Total, all regions	15,449	766	33	16,248	$104,111,639	$6,408	New Hampshire: Manchester				None		
Alabama: Montgomery	915	10	7	932	6,196,273	6,648	New Jersey: Newark				None		
Alaska: Juneau	307	4	0	311	2,681,200	8,396	New Mexico: Albuquerque	344	2	2	348	$2,598,985	$7,468
Arizona: Phoenix	7	8	0	15	93,610	6,241	New York:						
Arkansas: Little Rock	168	6	1	175	1,001,965	5,726	Albany	5	0	0	5	21,247	4,249
California:							Buffalo	20	1	0	21	123,185	5,866
Los Angeles	23	0	0	23	169,075	7,351	New York City				None		
San Diego	59	18	0	77	582,973	7,571	Syracuse	10	2	0	12	68,950	5,746
San Francisco	118	5	0	123	987,816	8,031	North Carolina: Winston-Salem	330	14	0	344	2,126,667	6,182
Colorado: Denver	291	10	0	301	2,019,907	6,711	North Dakota: Fargo	259	24	1	284	1,842,650	5,843
Connecticut: Hartford				None			Ohio:						
Delaware: Wilmington				None			Cincinnati	128	0	0	128	680,471	5,316
District of Columbia: Washington				None			Cleveland	264	13	0	277	1,866,700	6,739
Florida:							Oklahoma:						
Miami	13	0	0	13	88,004	6,770	Muskogee	87	12	0	99	545,750	5,513
Jacksonville	311	27	0	338	2,399,250	7,098	Oklahoma City	61	0	0	61	350,150	5,740
Georgia: Atlanta	755	1	3	759	4,646,250	6,122	Oregon: Portland	73	0	0	73	424,926	5,821
Idaho: Boise	51	8	0	59	382,038	6,475	Pennsylvania:						
Illinois: Chicago	306	8	0	314	2,039,477	6,495	Philadelphia				None		
Indiana: Indianapolis	768	42	0	810	4,407,950	5,442	Pittsburgh	263	7	0	270	1,630,982	6,004
Iowa: Des Moines	305	3	0	308	1,808,700	5,872	Wilkes-Barre	367	2	0	369	2,302,844	6,241
Kansas: Wichita	103	0	0	103	618,425	6,004	Puerto Rico: San Juan	56	16	1	73	865,600	7,748
Kentucky: Louisville	1,562	68	8	1,638	10,276,075	6,274	Rhode Island: Providence				None		
Louisiana:							South Carolina: Columbia	257	13	0	270	1,691,850	6,266
New Orleans	288	81	2	371	2,377,400	6,947	South Dakota: Sioux Falls	332	25	0	357	2,384,978	6,681
Shreveport	213	67	2	282	1,851,414	6,565	Tennessee: Nashville	447	1	0	448	2,685,200	5,994
Maine: Togus	149	0	0	149	744,009	4,993	Texas:						
Maryland: Baltimore	180	4	1	185	1,275,334	6,894	Dallas	62	4	0	66	417,677	6,328
Massachusetts: Boston				None			Houston	246	0	0	246	1,646,335	6,692
Michigan: Detroit	56	0	0	56	315,305	5,630	Lubbock	266	0	1	267	1,746,850	6,543
Minnesota: St. Paul	149	4	0	153	908,419	5,937	San Antonio	32	0	0	32	220,360	6,886
Mississippi: Jackson	661	2	2	665	4,493,650	6,757	Waco	183	0	0	183	1,133,898	6,196
Missouri:							Utah: Salt Lake City	107	7	0	114	695,468	6,101
Kansas City	205	0	0	205	1,298,454	6,139	Vermont: White River Junction	9	0	0	9	34,430	3,826
St. Louis	326	10	1	337	2,075,900	6,160	Virginia: Roanoke	879	101	0	980	6,520,490	6,654
Montana: Ft. Harrison	487	28	1	516	3,510,009	6,802	Washington: Seattle	63	1	0	64	414,300	6,473
Nebraska: Lincoln	209	32	0	241	1,571,398	6,520	West Virginia: Huntington	684	25	0	709	4,118,170	5,808
Nevada: Reno	88	4	0	92	652,159	7,089	Wisconsin: Milwaukee	483	36	0	519	3,310,858	6,379
							Wyoming: Cheyenne	79	10	0	89	619,105	6,956

[No. 283]

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, D. C., May 16, 1952.

Re H. R. 7656, Eighty-second Congress.
Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RANKIN: This is in response to your telephone request of May 15, for the views of this Agency on title III of H. R. 7656, the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, as set forth in the committee print of the bill dated May 15.

Title III of this bill is similar to title IX of H. R. 6895, Eighty-second Congress, on which this Agency furnished a report to your committee on March 14. Title III of H. R. 7656 contains amendments to title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 relating to loans to veterans for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property. These amendments would, among other things, extend the benefits of title II of the act to veterans who served during the period of the Korean conflict.

The comments contained in our report on title IX of H. R. 6895 are also applicable to title III of H. R. 7656, except with respect to the builders' warranty provisions. This Agency has no objection to such provisions in section 304 of H. R. 7656.

In view of your request for an immediate report, this Agency has not had sufficient time to obtain the views of the Bureau of the Budget on this letter. As soon as we have obtained these views, we shall advise you further. As you know, the Bureau of the Budget advised us that there was no objection to the submission of our report on title IX of H. R. 6895. As stated in that report:

"The Bureau of the Budget also advises that enactment of the provisions of the bill extending the present housing loan guaranty program to Korean veterans would not be in accord with the program of the President, unless responsibility for administration of such program, in the event such an extension is felt to be necessary, is vested in the Housing and Home Finance Agency."

If we can be of further assistance on this proposed legislation, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND M. FOLEY,
Administrator.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] and members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs have done a monumental job. I hope this bill is approved.

In common with other Members, I am also the author of a bill to give the Korean GI's the same benefits as those in World War II.

My purpose in asking for this time is to emphasize that we not only give benefits to our veterans but we give them dignity. It is something that all ought to think about and I hope there will not

be many who will not when this Korean action became necessary. I think the history which we had in Manchuria in 1931 and in the Rhineland in 1934, when we let Japan and Germany, respectively, get away with armed aggression which brought on World War II, demonstrates that even though we have allies, some of whom find it impossible to help as much as we feel they should due to their internal situation, and some of whom are busy in other places, the essential job had to be done. History will prove that if world war III is prevented, which we are trying to do, it will have been prevented because we took this first step to stop armed aggression when it threatened us in this important area of the world.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] such time as he may desire.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, there is no need for me to go into the provisions of this bill today under consideration to extend benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to veterans of the Korean conflict. I know that the Membership is familiar with the provisions of the measure which the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has unanimously reported and, I sincerely trust, that we all are in agreement as to the great necessity to act without delay in this matter.

I do want to say briefly however, that it is my belief that the measure which is before the House today represents a great and vast improvement over the original bill which the Congress enacted in behalf of the veterans of World War II. The reasons for this are clear. The original bill itself was improved through amendment and otherwise over the months following its enactment and as this great program of veterans benefits has been in operation. The new bill thus profits through experience gained in the amendment and administration and operation of the original program.

Further—and of the greatest importance—the new bill for the benefit of our Korean veterans is also based upon what was learned by the thorough and complete investigation of the GI educational and training program conducted by a special committee of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. The bill before the House today incorporates experience thus gained and the knowledge thus gained and is an improved piece of legislation and will, I feel sure, result in greater benefits to the veterans themselves as well as in great economies in the administration of the program.

It is entirely safe to say that abuses and irregularities which plagued the original program and which resulted in much waste to the taxpayers will not be possible under the operation of the new GI bill.

The committee has written into the new measure safeguards which would prevent such abuses as have been disclosed to have existed in certain instances and the preying upon the veterans by operators of educational and training institutions who were more concerned with profits than with the welfare of the veterans. It assures benefits of college training; of vocational and trade training; of on-the-farm training and, at the same time, protects these rights for our Korean veterans through certain safeguards which experience has taught us are necessary.

Nearly 8,000,000 veterans—or approximately one half of all veterans of World War II entitled—participated in the GI educational and training program originally enacted.

It was a gigantic undertaking on the part of a grateful Nation—but it was a program almost universally approved by the Nation. Its benefits have been untold and it has proved the greatest gesture of gratitude that any Nation in history has ever extended to those who saw service in wartime—this despite incidences of abuses.

We are now confronted with the fact that there have already been some 800,000 Korean war veterans discharged. But, so far, no provision for GI benefits of education and training and otherwise has been made for them.

It is most imperative, therefore, that the Congress act with all speed to enact a new GI bill. Nearly 2 years have passed since the start of the Korean conflict—we cannot afford to delay in this matter longer. I sincerely trust and strongly urge that the House act today to safeguard the Korean veterans and provide the benefits to them which a grateful Nation provided for the veterans of World War II.

These 800,000 servicemen already discharged are entitled to these benefits and, in all fairness to them and to the hundreds who are daily following them back into civilian life, we should not delay enactment of this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is before the Congress under a suspension of the rules. This procedure prohibits amending the bill and limits debate to a very short time. However, it should be made clearly to appear that the intent of Congress is that these veterans, who are furnished with money to make up for their loss of educational opportunities while they are in the Armed Forces and in combat, may use this money if they prefer to attend private college, universities, and schools when these schools are established and meet the standards required.

In my opinion, it would be a great disservice to the veterans themselves, to the American people, and to the very large group of privately maintained schools if any limitation whatsoever should be placed in this bill that would prevent a free and equal opportunity to the veterans to attend private schools if the veteran should choose to do so.

From a domestic standpoint, there is nothing that is more important to the future progress, development, and welfare of the American people than to maintain, expand, and improve our educational institutions. The private schools of this Nation from the beginning of the Republic have made a distinct contribution to the education of our people. Tax supported schools and universities have likewise performed a good service for the youth of our country in educating them, but we have many universities, colleges, and schools that do not call upon the taxpayers for any support that furnish to our young people as good an education as can be obtained in any of the tax supported universities and colleges.

In addition to this, all of us are familiar with many schools and universities that are privately supported that give to our young people here in America not only a first class education, but they contribute invaluable spiritual and cultural opportunities that round out the development of the young people of America and build them into more useful and better equipped men and women and add materially to the standards of their moral character.

I think it should be pointed out that in many instances private schools, church schools, endowed schools that are not tax-supported make possibly a larger contribution to the spiritual development and culture of our young people than any other institutions in our land. In addition to this, two other factors should be made to appear. One is that many of these private colleges and universities are located throughout the country close to the homes of many of our Korean veterans, and if this bill is intended to give to our veterans an equal and unhampered opportunity to attend these private schools they can do so at much less expense than if they were required to travel long distances from their homes to go to school in a tax-supported university or college.

Another thing is most of our great tax-supported universities are and will continue to be crowded with students, they do not have sufficient buildings or equipment to accommodate all the students that wish to attend them, and if the Korean veterans have the clear right to attend these private schools it will take a great load and surplus off of the public schools.

It is admitted by all that the money allowance to the veterans of the Korean conflict will most probably not be sufficient to meet all of the expenses incurred by these veterans in pursuing further their education. If they are allowed freedom in going to the private schools, colleges, and universities many veterans will be permitted to accept the benefits of this bill and go to some of these very fine private schools that are close to their homes, and thus we will be able to afford more veterans the opportunities of participating in this very beneficial legislation of Congress.

When the act is being administered by the authorities after it becomes a law, the intent of Congress should be made clearly to appear that these authorities that do administer the act have clear and complete authority to extend all of the benefits under the act to any Korean veteran in America that wishes to attend these private schools, and I most sincerely hope that the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle will agree that this is the true intent of the Congress and that when the act does become law that the administrators of these funds may have no hesitancy or doubt that they can give all of the assistance provided in this act to each and every veteran that wishes to attend our private schools when these schools meet the standards required.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the legislation before us is a fair and equitable bill. I listened with a great deal of interest as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, to almost all of the testimony that was presented at the hearings before us. This worthy legislation has the approval and endorsement of all the veterans' organizations which appeared before us. Parenthetically, I should point out that the American Legion, because of a convention mandate, went on record as favoring an extension of benefits to the Korean war veterans identical with those given to the veterans of World War II, but the American Legion did not and does not oppose the bill before us. One of the most important features of the legislation reported by our committee is that it eliminates much of the waste and abuse which occurred under the original GI bill, and substantially reduces the cost of the veterans' educational program.

Many veterans involved in the Korean conflict are being discharged at the present time. Thousands more will continue to be separated from the service. Many will resume education and training which were interrupted by their period of service. This bill will give them an opportunity to enroll in school or in on-the-job training this September. Like the original GI bill, it is a just and deserving benefit, humbly offered by a grateful nation to those who sacrificed and gave when called upon. Regardless of minor criticisms that can be leveled against this legislation, it should be passed with unanimous approval by this House. Let us not delay. The bill is a good one. Let us, with speedy legislative justice, discharge our responsibility. I sincerely trust, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation will have the unanimous approval of this House.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, on May 12, 1944, the House of Representatives considered and passed the Servicemen's Readjustment Act for the benefit of Veterans of World War II. The bill was generally referred to as the GI bill of rights and was sponsored by the American Legion. At that time, Mr. Speaker I was in my first term as a Member of this body and was serving as a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation which reported the bill. It was the most comprehensive piece of veterans legislation ever to pass this body and I am glad to have had a part in its preparation and final enactment.

Mr. Speaker, within eight short years we find ourselves considering similar legislation for the benefit of another group of veterans of another war. Does this not compel us to pause and wonder whether or not every generation of America's sons is going to have to participate in the mass slaughter, the suffering and heartache that goes with war? Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Congress will find itself considering similar legislation for another group of veterans 8 or 10 years hence—for the benefit of little boys who are now 8 or 9 or 10 years of age? May God grant, Mr. Speaker, that the leaders of all nations may soon come together in a spirit of brotherly love and bring peace to this sore and bleeding world. Veterans' benefits are fine and I am for them and for this bill. But the greatest benefit that can be brought to America's youth is the privilege and opportunity of living in a world at peace. May God speed the day.

Mr. Speaker, I am for this bill. It grants benefits similar to those which we provided for veterans of World War II. It grants benefits to a group of young men who have participated in the most cruel conflict of all time, the Korean war which has so often been most improperly referred to as a "police action." America's dead and wounded and the tortures which have beset our living sons in Korea testify to the ruggedness and bitterness of this 2-year struggle.

I welcome the opportunity to vote for this bill, Mr. Speaker. I hope that it passes without a dissenting vote.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I feel that this bill should be passed at the earliest possible moment to assure time for consideration by the other body and perhaps for reconciling differences in conference in the versions of the two Houses and so that there will be no difficulty in getting the bill in final form and approved before recess or adjournment. Personally I favor the Springer amendment or something similar that will enable veterans to attend the colleges and universities of their choice without being penalized. Of necessity, most privately supported and endowed institutions have to charge a higher rate of tuition than tax-supported universities and they are performing a service that can hardly be estimated. Also, the State schools cannot possibly take care of all the young folks who desire to attend college.

Neither do I like any provision that authorizes a school to charge a veteran a higher rate of tuition than is regularly charged to students who have not been in the armed services or have exhausted their GI benefits. Otherwise I believe the bill is a good one and must be passed without delay.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it would be tragic if this House failed to do its duty and failed to pass this legislation now. It has been overdue for a long time. Many Korean war veterans have already returned home; and the benefits of this bill come very late for them.

I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to say that there is another tardily handled piece of legislation concerning this war. I refer to the combat infantry pay bill. It makes me ashamed of myself that I have not been able to secure hearings on that legislation; and I sincerely hope that the immediate passage of the GI bill now before us will act as a stimulus for favorable committee and congressional action on a combat infantry pay bill.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have this opportunity to speak for the passage of the bill, H. R. 7656, a GI bill of rights for veterans of the Korean war. This legislation has been too long delayed already. Shortly after the Korean conflict began on June 27, 1950, I endorsed the principle of providing educational and training benefits for those who were in the service at the time, and for all those called in subsequently, and introduced one of the first bills to provide such benefits. I am glad that the bill is now before us, and though there may be some minor provisions of the bill that all of us cannot agree upon, I believe that we should go ahead and pass this bill immediately, and as was true of the Servicemen's Adjustment Act of 1944, we can amend the law from time to time as conditions develop which make its amendment desirable.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR KOREAN VETERANS

I hold to the view that one of the soundest investments this Government can make for the sake of our future is the provision of opportunity for education and training for veterans of our military, naval, and air service since June 27, 1950.

Those who have served in this time of emergency have lost the privilege and opportunity of continuing their education; their vocations have been interrupted or impeded. A program of education and training will provide vocational readjustment of unmeasured value both to the veteran who takes advantage of the opportunity afforded, and to the future well-being and security of this Nation. The education and training program will pay direct dividends for a period of 50 years or more, and the indirect benefits throughout the future are unmeasurable.

This bill provides 1½ days of education or training for each day of active service since June 27, 1950, with a maximum of 36 calendar months, which is sufficient for a 4-year academic college course. For those who take education or training on a full-time basis, an allowance is paid of $110 per month directly to the veteran. If the veteran has dependents, the allowance is $150 per month. It will be observed that these payments are considerably higher than were the similar payments to veterans of World War II. The difference is that under the system set up by this bill the veteran will pay his own tuition rather than having it paid directly to the college by the Veterans' Administration, as was true following World War II.

The argument has been made that the system set up by this law will encourage the veteran to go to a State-supported institution where tuition costs are generally much less than in private schools. The answer to this contention, it seems to me, is that this bill provides benefits

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

for the veteran, and leaves up to him the decision of where he will go to school. Recent correspondence coming to my office indicates that this system of direct payments to the veteran and leaving with him the responsibility of paying tuition will make no appreciable difference in the number who would otherwise attend private schools. Many veterans will undoubtedly want to attend private schools, and will use the direct monthly benefit provided by this bill as an aid in doing so. The primary emphasis in this bill is on the veteran. It leaves him a free choice as to where he will go to school. I think the bill is stronger by virtue of the fact that the veteran has the responsibility for the expenditure of the money allotted to him by this bill.

HOUSING

This bill provides the same housing aids and benefits now provided for veterans of World War II, including the privilege of participating in the direct-loan program for those veterans who live in rural areas where financing through private institutions is not available.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Each veteran of service since June 27, 1950, will be given an automatic wage credit of $160 per month for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits.

MUSTERING-OUT PAYMENTS

Mustering-out payments provided by this bill are in the amounts of $100 for less than 60 days of service; $200 for more than 60 days of service; and $300 for service overseas.

INSTITUTIONAL ON-THE-FARM TRAINING

This bill continues institutional on-the-farm training, and thus allows this great program which has done so much for World War II veterans to go forward now for Korean veterans. The payments to the trainee under this program are $95 for the veteran without dependents, and $120 for the veteran with dependents. These payments are subject to some reduction as the course of training progresses.

Mr. Speaker, this is just legislation. It should be passed today. Veterans of Korean service are being discharged in great numbers today. The sooner this program gets under way the better it will be for them, and for the country.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECREST].

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, the committee has worked many, many weeks on this bill, heard testimony for weeks on end, and I think we have a very good bill reported to this House. It provides in substance for the same educational benefits to all veterans who have been in the service since June 27, 1950, or who will be in the service until Congress or the President acts to declare the present emergency over.

The bill also gives housing benefits to the veterans of this present war equal to those and identical with those given to the veterans of World War II. It goes even further than the benefits given to the veterans of World War II, because it guarantees that the veteran of the Korean war when he buys a house will get exactly what the plans and specifications call for, and the housing is warranted.

It further gives social-security benefits to every veteran in the service of $160 each month that he serves. It gives mustering-out pay of $100 to the veteran with less than 60 days' service; $200 to a veteran with more than 60 days; and $300 to a veteran with service overseas.

The bill also insures these veterans of unemployment rights when they return the same as was given the veterans of World War II.

This in my opinion is an excellent bill and one that is deserved by the veterans who are now serving in this period which we rightfully call the Korean war.

There is one difference in our committee and that is with respect to the payment of tuition to colleges and universities. There are those who feel, and I am inclined to agree, that there will be a better break possibly for the independent colleges that might otherwise be if tuition were paid direct to the college. This bill provides direct payment to the veteran. But I want to point out that these five major benefits that are guaranteed under this bill affect several million veterans right now, and already from the Korean conflict thousands of veterans have been returned home. Walter Reed and other hospitals in this country are discharging these veterans. They may want to go to college; they may want on-the-job training; they may want to go back home and have farm training, yet at the present time all these things are denied to them. Those veterans today are in the same state of uncertainty that the boys in the 18–19 age group are with respect to an education and planning for their life activity.

I do not think we ought to deny these benefits to these veterans, and even though the bill comes up under suspension and although I would favor normally the Springer amendment, I want to urge the Members of this House to pass this bill today so that the Senate will have time to act on it and it can become effective before this Congress adjourns.

There is no question in my mind that the veterans of the Korean war deserve exactly the same treatment as was given to the veterans of World War II, and today is the day to begin giving it to them.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts, ranking minority member of the committee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this bill we have before us, H. R. 7656, is the result of a great deal of study and consideration by our Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Shortly after the start of the Korean conflict, I introduced a bill in the Eighty-first Congress, H. R. 9468, which would extend to personnel of the Armed Forces engaged in operations against the forces of North Korea certain benefits provided by law for veterans of World War II. The date of this bill was August 17, 1950.

Our Committee on Veterans' Affairs took no action upon the proposal in the Eighty-first Congress. When the Eighty-second Congress convened, I reintroduced the bill, which was numbered H. R. 353.

Many Members of the House spoke to me in this interval, urging that something be done to take care of the men and women who would soon be coming back to civilian life after their Korean service.

While the committee recognized the great need for the legislation, there was a feeling that legislative action should be deferred until a report had been made by the special committee created by House Resolution 474 to investigate the education and training program of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. This committee was headed by the very able Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE, of Texas, and it held numerous public hearings not only here in Washington but out in the field. Its report was a comprehensive one and it pointed out conclusively many of the deficiencies in the old GI bill of rights. It also made certain recommendations which the special committee believed should be followed in the extension of similar benefits to men serving on or after June 27, 1950.

The Eighty-first Congress, had through the enactment of Public Law No. 894, dated December 28, 1950, taken care of the vocational rehabilitation of the combat wounded men by extending to them the privileges of Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress.

I did not agree, but it was felt that this legislation would suffice for the immediate present by caring for the large number of veterans who were being discharged from the hospitals after treatment for their combat-incurred disabilities. It was felt also, but I did not agree, that there would not be a great demand for the benefits of Public Law No. 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, until enlistment periods had expired or rotation of troops had progressed to a point where a great number of Korean conflict men were returning to civilian status. Legislation to give the men GI benefits should have been made available immediately on their discharge.

That, to some extent, explains the long delay in presenting this proposal to Congress. As soon as the so-called Teague report was printed, Chairman RANKIN scheduled public hearings upon all of the Korean veteran-benefit bills that had been referred to our committee. There were 39 of these measures. That, to my mind, is most indicative of the great interest in this legislation. From the period of February 6, 1952, through March 11, 1952, these public hearings were held. There were 14 of these hearings. Prior to the hearings every Member of Congress was invited to testify, and a number of them availed themselves of the opportunity.

After prolonged testimony by the officials of the Veterans' Administration, detailed evidence was heard by representatives of the Department of Defense, Office of Education, General Accounting Office, Bureau of the Budget, American

Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, AMVETS, American Council on Education, American Association of Junior Colleges, Association of Land Grant Colleges, American Vocational Association, National Association of State Approval Agencies, and representatives of certain associations of private schools. There were a number of statements and suggestions for changes in the administration of the act filed with the Committee and these were incorporated in the hearings. The printed hearings comprised a volume of 945 pages of testimony and statements.

I mention this to emphasize the thoroughness with which the committee considered the proposal. Throughout the testimony and during the questioning of the witnesses it was apparent that the primary interest of all of the committee members was the protection of the veterans' interests. It was equally apparent that every effort would be made to correct the deficiencies that existed in the original GI bill of rights. The Teague committee investigation had spotlighted many of these, and great care was used to plug these loopholes.

Immediately after the completion of the public hearings, the staff of the committee met in round-table conferences with representatives of the Veterans' Administration, Bureau of the Budget, General Accounting Office, Office of Education, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Internal Revenue Bureau, Social Security Administration, Treasury Department, Department of Labor, and the Federal Trade Commission. There were 16 of these conferences, at which the bill was gone over, word for word, and a clean bill was prepared for submission to the committee.

On May 14, 1952, this clean bill was considered by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in executive session, and after the deletion of certain parts and the addition of others it was voted unanimously to report to the House the measure you have before you today.

I do not say that it is a perfect bill. I do not feel it is. The subject is a broad one, and it is exceedingly difficult to obtain unanimity between 24 Members of Congress on so broad a proposal as this encompasses. I had hoped that the committee would accept the recommendations made by the American Legion and provide for readjustment allowances, as was afforded veterans of World War II. However, the majority of the members of the committee did not go along with this viewpoint and my amendment to effect it was voted down.

The proposal in this bill to pay all necessary funds directly to the veteran instead of paying them subsistence allowance only and having the Federal Government reimburse the institutions for tuition fees, books, supplies, and so forth, was one in which I do not fully concur. I am wondering whether or not it will be in the best interests of the veteran and his educational future. A careful reading of the Teague Report shows that there were many abuses and sharp practices under the old method. However, I am not sure that paying the money direct to the veteran is the cure for the objectionable conditions. Under this measure as you have it before you today all payments are made to the veteran directly, the theory being that it will enable him to deal with the school on the same basis as any other student. Here again it was emphasized that the committee was mainly concerned with the veteran and not with any benefit that might flow to schools or others as a result of the enactment of this legislation. I sincerely hope that it will work out this way. The Committee points out in its report upon the bill that the direct payment to the veteran would, in effect, establish a scholarship grant between the veteran and the Federal Government and relieve educational institutions of an agency responsibility that has been time consuming and expensive both for the Government and for the individual institutions.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. Will the gentlewoman tell the House in what way she is dissatisfied with the bill?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. As the gentleman knows, I introduced a bill which would provide for reenactment of the old World War II Veterans Readjustment Act. That would give unemployment insurance, the boys could get mustering-out pay through another committee, the Armed Services Committee; also I think the men should be permitted to go to the colleges they want to. As is provided in this bill, I think too many colleges will be unable to take care of the number of men who will apply.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS.]

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is very important and speed is essential. There are some objections I have to the bill. One is the requirement that veterans may be required to pay $31 a month to tax-maintained institutions. I do not think that is right and I hope the Senate takes that out. Should the Senate fail to do so, I intend to introduce separate legislation to correct that situation.

But I am going to vote for the bill under suspension of the rules because we have delayed long enough in taking care of these veterans of Korea. Our duty is to the veterans and the payments should be made directly to them so that they can attend to their own business and the school of their choice. This bill was not designed as a Federal-aid-to-education bill, but as means of partially meeting our obligations to these courageous men who have given so much and asked so little. Let us exhibit the same faith in the ability of these men to handle their own affairs as we have in their ability to meet and stop the enemy. Time is of the essence and we must not delay longer. Let us measure up to our responsibility.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Has not a rule been granted providing 2 hours general debate on this bill?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I do not know.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Will the chairman give us that information?

Mr. RANKIN. It has been before the Rules Committee but there is some controversy about leaving it open to all kinds of amendments.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The truth ought to be stated on the floor as regards the action taken by the Rules Committee. The Rules Committee granted a rule on this bill but made the request that the Springer amendment be permitted to be offered on the floor.

Mr. RANKIN. The rule that the Rules Committee proposed to grant would have thrown the bill open to all kinds of amendments.

Mr. COX. It would not do any such thing.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; it would. The House Parliamentarian says it would.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Representing the minority on the Rules Committee, may I say that the rule contemplated, which has not been reported—we were not given the opportunity to report it—would have made it open to only one amendment and would not have opened the bill for all sorts of amendments. At least that is my understanding.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield further and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, in response to the question asked by the gentleman from Maryland I desire to say that the committee overlooked the fact that this entire bill is an amendment, and the rule that was proposed or that was offered would have thrown it open to all sorts of amendments. The request we had and the rule we asked for provided that amendments be limited to committee amendments. That was eliminated by the Rules Committee, which in my opinion—and I think I know the rules of the House as well as any man in here—would have thrown the entire bill open to amendments. I say that with all deference to the Rules Committee. For that reason I asked permission, which was granted, to take the bill up under suspension of the rules.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, this bill is the result of a very thorough study that has been made by a subcommittee of the Committee on Veterans Affairs of the House. The most important thing to remember about this bill is that it eliminates the abuses we found to exist

under the GI bill of rights which we passed for the veterans of World War II. For instance, this bill eliminates what we commonly call the 50–20 Club. We found that as the result of the bill which was passed during World War II there were altogether too many abuses of the so-called 50–20 Club.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SECREST. I might point out on the question of unemployment benefits that a subcommittee is to be appointed by the Committee on Veterans Affairs to study that whole question. We left it out of this bill because of the controversy.

Mr. O'KONSKI. That is right. Furthermore, under the old bill it was possible, for instance, for a veteran to study the mixing of cocktails and get benefits under the GI bill of rights; it was possible for him to get a course in golf or some other pleasure. This bill cuts out all of those frills. We can, in good conscience, vote for this bill because it eliminates all of the abuses of the GI bill of World War II.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX].

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Speaker, apparently there seems to be a great deal of misunderstanding as to the rule. As a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs my understanding was that a closed rule had been granted, that 2 hours of debate would be allowed, and that committee amendments would be permitted to be presented. The next thing, we turn around and find that they are coming in with a suspension of the rules. My personal opinion is when such great sums of money are involved, where the provisions of this bill have no termination date, that we should stop and think about it and discuss it a little bit more; at least, by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the people who have studied this situation.

I will say in support of the bill that by and large it is an excellent bill and has eliminated many of the deficiencies that were in the original GI bill. However, when we have these controversial matters which would have been pointed out to you had we had time for debate, I believe they would have been changed. I refer to two things that have not been touched on so far. We provide $110 a month allowance for an unmarried veteran, or GI without any dependents at all, and should he acquire one dependent his benefits then increase to $150 a month. Of course, some of you people may agree with that: personally I do not. I think that you will find with the GI with a wife and no children, the wife being able to go out and work and supplement their income, living next door with the wife with one, two or three children, that there should be a differential. More, it will save a great deal of money.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I just want to compliment the gentleman on his statement about bringing a bill of this magnitude up under suspension of the rules. I will not discuss the merits of the particular rule, but there seems to be a growing tendency here to bring up bills of great magnitude like this where we only have 20 minutes on a side for discussion. I think the gentleman is eminently correct.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I thank the gentleman.

Here is another point I invite your attention to. By and large the provisions of this bill are Federal aid to the GI and not Federal aid to education. However, we make one exception. As to any tuition-free schools, we then permit that school to charge the GI $31 a month out of his allowance. Now, it does not make any difference if the money is coming from the Federal Government, that GI, in going to school, will have to reach down into his pocket and pay out $31 a month for his education, whereas the young man next door, who did not serve one single day in the service, will go to that school absolutely free.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Does the gentleman mean to say that this bill discriminates against the veterans that want to go to school?

Mr. DEVEREUX. In that particular exception, it does.

Mr. LECOMPTE. In other words, the school can charge the veteran more than it can a private citizen?

Mr. DEVEREUX. In this particular exception, when the school does not charge any tuition whatsoever, we make in this bill a provision so that they can charge the GI.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Why would they not charge anyone else the same as they charge the GI?

Mr. DEVEREUX. That is the general provision of the bill, but it does make this one exception.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. Let me say this to those who live in New York City. Take CCNY or Hunter College, you can go to those schools, as I understand; to tax-free institutions. Any student can go there. If a GI comes out of Korea and comes back to New York City in order to attend Hunter College or City College of New York, he has to pay $31 a month out of his allowance. If that is a fair proposition to any veteran, I will eat your hat.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I arise at this time to protest this method of considering such an important measure as H. R. 7656.

My colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Representative TEAGUE, has done a fine job of helping to ferret out abuses in the old law and we are all indebted to him for his good work in this regard and for his proposals for improvements. I not only congratulate him for these accomplishments but I would also like to extend my congratulations to the other members of the committee.

I know that the gentleman from Texas, Representative TEAGUE, like each of us here today, wants to act as expeditiously as possible in the interest of our veterans and our country. However, Mr. Speaker, I have some questions about some of these proposals which I think are important so I am sorry that it is not possible for us to have full debate under the rules and have the opportunity to amend this important bill. It is my understanding that some of the proponents of this legislation say that the Springer amendment is actually a proposal to provide extra Federal aid to a favored group of private schools and that H. R. 7656 provides equal treatment to all veterans and furthermore it was written as a veteran aid bill and not a Federal aid to education bill designed to subsidize certain categories of schools. This statement standing alone about private schools is not enough to convince me on this particular point which shows the need for debate and substantiating evidence. Also, I do not concede that equal treatment is being given to all veterans under the proposed legislation.

Another serious question that I have in mind, Mr. Speaker, involves a situation that is especially acute in the South. The fact is that in certain specialized types of training we have not had adequate facilities in the past. Therefore in instances where no schools existed prior to the original GI bill of rights and adequate facilities do not exist today the feature of the proposed legislation requiring one-fourth of the students to be non-GI's would eliminate certain types of training facilities from being established or reestablished in our area. Consequently, there can be no such thing as equal treatment of our veterans compared to those in areas where such schools are already established.

The fact of the matter is that all of us here today want to eliminate the evils and abuses and make sure insofar as possible that our deserving veterans get the best educational advantages possible. We are also in agreement, I am sure, in our desire to see that the tax dollar is expended in the wisest and most efficient system that can be devised but the fact remains that all of these points have not been clarified and that under the existing rules they cannot be clarified because there is not sufficient time for debate and amendments are not in order.

It is my intention, Mr. Speaker, to support the principles of this legislation and I am hopeful that the House will be given an opportunity to debate this measure in full so that we can come out with the best possible legislation in the interest of our veterans and our country.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, this is timely legislation for which, in my opinion, there is not only a need but a positive requirement. The men who have

fought in the Korean war have fought in the meanest war in which this country has engaged in our times. This bill pays a deserved tribute to them. I commend and congratulate the committee most highly on bringing this legislation to the floor. It should pass unanimously.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, we are here to consider a bill giving rights to Korean veterans similar to those rights which were extended to veterans of World War II by Public Law 346, of the 78th Congress, commonly referred to as the GI bill of rights. Let me make it clear at the outset that I believe our national policy of providing educational and other benefits to our war veterans is firmly established, and should be continued. The only question then before us today is as to implementation of that policy. Let me make it further very clear that I favor an extension of benefits to veterans of the Korean fighting. We must extend them substantially the same benefits as were given to veterans of World War II, being guided, however, in writing this new legislation by the experiences which were gained from the former.

In the very limited time available to me, I shall address myself principally to the question of suspending the rules to pass the bill as now written. It seems to me that in a matter of this magnitude, we should have full and free discussion upon the floor of the House. Forty minutes of debate without opportunity for amendment of the bill is certainly not enough and is not giving to the veterans and the people generally the time which this important legislation should have. From the announced program, it is apparent that we are not so busy in the House but that we could take more time for debate and have opportunities to offer amendments.

Let me point out, briefly, some of the reasons why I think that fuller discussion should be had:

First. This bill represents a new approach to the method of handling payments to veterans of the Korean fighting. All payments hereunder for tuition and fees, books, and supplies, as well as subsistence, would go to the veteran in one lump sum, unless separated as proposed by the Springer amendment. There is much to be said on both sides of that question and the Members of the House ought to have an opportunity to express their views so that we may be as certain as possible that our eventual decision is the best.

Second. The second point concerns the proposed payment schedule. As now set up, it is $110 for a veteran without dependents and $150 for veterans with one or more dependents. There is a considerable body of thought to the effect that instead of two categories of payments there should be three, making a distinction between those veterans with one dependent and those with more than one dependent. Certainly, it is entirely obvious that at today's price levels, each additional dependent involves a considerable increase in cost. This may be particularly true where the first dependent of a veteran is a wife and the second a child as would usually be the case. If there is just the veteran and his wife, she might possibly seek employment and supplement the family income, but where a child is added to the family not only does that ordinarily prevent the wife seeking employment, but it increases very considerably the cost of the family living.

Third. There are certain provisions calling for a warranty of new home construction. This warranty would exist for a period of 1 year. As this is a new feature in the legislation and involves relationships between the Veterans' Administration, the veteran, and the builders, it should be carefully studied.

Fourth. As it now stands, the bill provides mustering-out pay "in lieu of any provision for unemployment insurance or readjustment"—unemployment—"allowances." There was a great deal of criticism after World War II of the so-called 52–20 Club, and I think much of that criticism was justified. At the same time, we must certainly recognize the fact that many people, particularly those called back into the service who had to interrupt their civilian activities begun after World War II, have suffered great financial loss. We want to be fair to these people and, to the degree possible, be sure that they are reasonably compensated.

Fifth. Finally, there has been considerable discussion to the effect that by making the payments directly to the veteran, it is fair to him and to all educational institutions involved. It is further contended that no educational institutions, whether they be private schools or otherwise, should be afforded special treatment. If that be true, I say that the bill contains an inconsistency when it provides on page 68:

> Except that, in the case of a tax-supported public educational institution which does not have established charges for tuition and fees which it requires nonveteran residents to pay, such institution may charge and receive from each eligible veteran who is a resident an amount equal to the estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction attributable to such veteran, but in no event to exceed the rate of $31 per month for a full-time course.

It seems to me that by that language, we are saying to this certain group of tax-supported institutions that they may charge a veteran up to $31 a month for his education, but the nonveteran may have exactly the same education without direct payment. If we contend that this bill is written primarily for the veteran and not to favor any classification of schools, I do not see how we can leave language of that sort in the bill.

This is no small question. It is estimated that the social security—old-age and survivors insurance benefits of the bill will cost about a million and a half dollars per year; the mustering-out payment $200,000,000 or more per year; and that the educational provisions would begin at about $315,000,000 and level off at about $800,000,000 per year. Therefore, it is apparent that we are speaking of expenditures which will exceed $1,000,000,000 per year in the very near future. Even in these days of terrifically high budgets, that is a figure which must give us pause to be sure that both the veteran and the American taxpayer receive the greatest return for a dollar spent. Of even more importance, however, is the fact that hundreds of thousands—perhaps millions—of the lives of our service people will be touched and influenced by what we do here.

Briefly, I have attempted to point out some of the reasons why I feel that this bill should have full debate. The Veterans' Affairs Committee held extended hearings and did much work on this bill and now the entire membership of the House should have opportunity to consider it in some detail.

As I stated at the outset, I believe that we should have legislation to take care of the Korean veterans and that in writing this legislation we must have their interests first in mind. Other benefits which may flow from such laws, and there are such benefits, but they must of necessity be secondary. There is no reason why we cannot take the time for the House to enact a bill which will be as good as it is humanly possible to make it.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a small bill. It will eventually involve a billion dollars a year, and more importantly affect the lives of hundreds of thousands and even millions of people. We should consider it thoroughly.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, under ordinary circumstance, with a bill of this magnitude, I would be inclined to vote against the suspension of the rules. But, I was informed during the past week end that unless the bill came before the House in this manner, it would be at least 2 weeks before the bill could be brought to the floor of the House, under a rule, and there was a question even then as to whether the House would be able then to debate and pass this legislation prior to any recess. The committee has worked hard and diligently on this bill for many, many weeks. As one who was on the committee when the original GI bill for World War II was written, I know of the many months we spent in hearing witnesses and holding hearings in executive session, trying to bring out a bill which would be a just bill. In this particular bill, we have tried to skip the pitfalls of the GI bill of World War II, and I think in a great measure we have. I introduced a companion bill to the bill under discussion, but I want the House to know, as far as I am concerned, most of the credit should go to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. He has worked many, many months and worked hard to bring to the floor of the house a bill, which would be justified in all respects. I think he has done so.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I received a telegram from a man by the name of E. H. Retski, president of the National Federation of Private Schools Association, in which he definitely and strongly urges the House to vote against the so-called Springer amendment. It seems to me that not only private schools, but all public institutions should realize that this bill is a bill for the veteran, and not for the financial enhancement of any

institution, whether they be private or public.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNEY. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I know I am a very new Member of this very great body, but will the gentleman from New York explain to me why it has taken us so long to get this bill before the House, and after a rule has been granted, why it should take us 2 weeks more to bring it out so that the House can work its will upon it?

Mr. KEARNEY. The gentleman from Maryland will have to ask others. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, in analyzing H. R. 7656, let me again reiterate what I have already said, that the popular opinion concerning the name of this bill, namely the Korean Conflict Servicemen's Readjustment Act, is not in keeping with the facts.

This bill is for the benefit of all who entered the armed services after June 27, 1950 and includes members of the Armed Forces, wherever stationed. We, in this bill, declare as congressional policy, under title I of the bill, that the veterans' educational and training program created by this act is for the purpose of providing vocational readjustment and restoring lost educational opportunities to individuals who entered the active service during the emergency period.

Title II—education—in substance, grants 1½ days of education or training for each day of service on or after the date above specified, regardless of where such service was performed, the closing date to be determined by the President or the Congress. Persons eligible under World War II program may take training under both World War II and this, the program under H. R. 7656, not to exceed 48 months. This program of education or training must be initiated within 2 years after the discharge of the individual and completed within 7 years after discharge and the veteran may make one change in program and only one change.

In view of the thorough coverage of this title by other members, I will refrain from enumerating them again.

Title III—housing—authorizes the same housing benefits for veterans under the provisions of this bill as presently enjoyed by World War II veterans.

Title IV continues the $160 per month wage credit for veterans previously granted World War II veterans for the purpose of old age and survivors insurance benefits.

Title V—mustering out payments—provides that in lieu of unemployment compensation or readjustment benefits, mustering out payments are provided, up to certain amounts and includes those up to and including the rank of captain in the Army and Air Force and lieutenant senior grade in the Navy.

Title VI—unemployment of veterans—provides employment assistance to veterans under this bill on the same basis as veterans of World War II.

Much has been said on the floor today concerning the so-called Springer amendment. It was believed that such an amendment would work a detriment to the whole principle of H. R. 7656 and was also opposed by public schools and associations representing institutions of higher learning as well as the National Federation of Private School Associations, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and the AMVETS. The President of the National Federation of Private Schools Associations opposed the Springer amendment on the theory that this bill proposes to establish direct scholarship payment to veterans enrolled in training and education.

It is my humble belief that much red tape will be dispensed with and the cost of administering the provisions of the bill will be materially decreased by the adoption of the bill as written.

I was disturbed to read the statements of my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] in the House on May 29, 1952, speaking on his proposed amendment to H. R. 7656. At that time the gentleman spoke of the President of the American Council on Education as being dishonest and not reflecting the sentiment of all the people of his association, who submitted the matters in the bill to a poll. He stated that the gentleman did not represent anywhere near the majority of opinion of the members of the American Council on Education and that they voted overwhelmingly the other way. As I read the answers to the poll, I must disagree with my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois.

In the first place, the gentleman to whom he referred was not the president of the American Council on Education but was a member of the American Council on Education Committee on Relationships of Higher Education to the Federal Government. This gentleman, by name Carter Davidson, is president of Union College, Schenectady, N. Y. He is one of the foremost educators in the country today and the statement that he presented in person to the committee on March 4, 1952, was one which heartily endorsed the provisions of the so-called Teague bill and was made by him after a thorough study of the provisions of that bill. The statement made by Mr. Davidson on that date was one of the finest and most comprehensive made to the committee during its entire hearings. Not only myself but other members of the committee were deeply grateful for that statement.

It must be remembered that in measures of this magnitude, there is always controversy over various provisions of the bill and disagreement among educators and operators of on-the-job training schools and the heads of private schools. What we have tried to do is to bring into general agreement the thoughts of all, that this bill is written for the veterans and the taxpayers of the country who, after all, are paying the bill. Naturally there are groups who have motives which I will not go into but I realize that they are thinking more of themselves financially than they are of the veteran. We saw that after the Veterans Readjustment Act of 1944 became a law and some of the rackets as exposed by our special committee of the House, headed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] were brought to light. It was a crying shame and an everlasting disgrace that such things were allowed to exist.

I understand that in several instances the facts have been laid before the United States attorneys of the several localities where these rackets existed looking toward indictment if found guilty. We have tried to steer clear of the pitfalls of the first GI bill but only time will tell. I was very happy to be a cosponsor of this legislation and, as I said in my opening remarks, while generally opposed to bringing the bill to the floor of the House under a suspension of the rules, I was convinced in my own mind that unless we did so in that manner that it might not be possible to enact this legislation into law prior to any contemplated recess of the Congress this summer.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in the first place, I want to say that being chairman of the Veterans' Committee is not a very pleasant job. I have struggled on that committee to take care of the disabled veterans, trying to do justice to these men that have been sent abroad to fight wars all over the world. They did not kick up these wars, but they have done the fighting and the suffering, and the dying. It has been my effort to try to take care of them in the best possible way.

I want to say to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] that we took up this question of the rule with the House Parliamentarian, and he advised us that if that rule had been adopted in the form in which it was proposed, as submitted by the Committee on Rules, it would have thrown the bill open for amendments from one end to the other. I hope he will take that proposition up with the House Parliamentarian before he goes too far.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the amendments that was criticized on the other side a while ago was offered by the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX]. Members of the committee have done the best they could. The mere fact that this bill is coming up under suspension of the rules is no different from bringing it up under a close rule, except that it take a two-third vote to pass it. What we are trying to do is to get this bill passed to take care of these veterans who have gone to this Korean conflict and offered up their lives on foreign soil.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I am sure the gentleman does not mean to infer that the gentleman from Maryland in any way wants to delay the benefits for any of our veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. No. I will say the gentleman from Maryland does not want to delay the benefits to these veterans. I hope the gentleman did not misunderstand me.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I think it is extremely important to get this bill to the Senate. I have every confidence that the Senate will add certain amendments to it.

I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, during the past several days there has been a great deal of heat generated about the Korean GI bill and the Springer amendment. In these few minutes which I am allowed I will try to cast as much light as I can upon this controversial point in this bill.

Those who oppose the Springer amendment have attempted to say that the overwhelming weight of the educational opinion in this country supports H. R. 7656 upon the particular question of payment of tuition. I have said this before but I think it is very important to reemphasize. The American Council on Education in a poll of both private and public schools throughout the country on the principle of the Springer amendment found that 967 favored the principle of the Springer amendment. Of that figure 380 public schools and 577 private schools favored the principle of direct tuition to the university. Let me reemphasize that 380 public schools voted for this principle. At that time over 93 percent of all of the colleges and universities in this country, both private and public, voted for the principle of the Springer amendment. In order to bring this matter up to date a poll has been taken on this matter within the past 10 days. The Emergency Committee for the Amendment of the Korean GI Bill has received replies from over 425 schools throughout the country thus far. Less than a dozen support the position of the present bill with over 400 supporting the Springer amendment. That gives you a clear picture as to where the colleges and universities in this country stand on the Springer amendment. For your information I have asked the Emergency Committee to compile the universities and colleges by States which support this amendment. I am placing this list on the table for your inspection in order that you may know which in your particular State support the Springer amendment. I might say that the poll is not yet complete. As you know such a poll could not be completed in the 10 days that it has been under consideration. This committee is receiving replies each day.

The large payment here is the question of tuition. You can take your own pencil and paper and follow this explanation of my position on the tuition and figure it just as easily as I can why there is discrimination in the bill as now written. Members of the committee will realize we figured out that the ordinary veteran should receive $80 per month for subsistence including board, room, books and other expenses of living. We decided on the figure of $30 per month as the amount that should be allotted to the veteran as his expenses for tuition. If you will multiply $30 by 12, it is easy to see that would give you $360 as the amount that is allotted under the present bill for tuition to the single veteran.

If that veteran goes to a tax-supported institution he can go for about $120 per year. Subtract that $120 from $360 and it can easily be seen that he is making a profit of $240 a year on tuition which he can put in his own pocket. If that same veteran goes to a private school where his tuition will be about $400 to $500 per year, that veteran will have used all of his $360. The veteran will receive in his lump-sum allowance 12 times 80, which is $960. Add to that $240—that will give the veteran who goes to the tax-supported institution the sum of $1,100 per year to live on as against the student who goes to the private university only $960 per year for living and subsistence. This I am sure is a pure matter of arithmetic which anyone can do with his own pencil and paper. In other words the student who goes to the tax-supported institution is getting a break over the student who goes to the private institution of exactly 25 percent. You can arrive at this figure by taking the sum of $240 and dividing it by $960. It will give you exactly 25 per cent that the student who goes to a public institution gets over the student who goes to the private institution. In other words the bill as now written is a 25 percent discrimination against the student who attends a private school. If that is not a discrimination I do not know of anything that is.

In the first place no GI should be allowed to make a profit on tuition allowance by going to a cheaper school.

I think you can see from these figures that the range of selection of an ordinary student is going to be greatly narrowed by just the financial consideration alone of this bill. I come now to the question that I believe is of importance at this time which has nothing to do with the bill itself but which I think is of importance to this House of Representatives. That question is whether or not you are going to suspend the rules and pass this bill with only 40 minutes of debate and without any opportunity to offer amendments to the bill. This committee considered this bill for over a period of approximately 60 days with hours and days devoted to these hearings. A week ago last Friday all of those who were interested in this bill appeared before the Rules Committee and gave their views with reference to this bill. The Rules Committee indicated at that time that it was ready to grant a rule. The rule as I understand it would let this bill open for amendment. It is at that point that those who oppose the Springer amendment sought to bring this bill up under a suspension of the rules today in order to prevent the amendment from being offered. There is a place in the rules for times when the rules should be suspended and bills passed. I presume those are in emergency situations where there is no time near the end of sessions to hear bills completely.

This is not the time to suspend the rules. We have all the rest of this week that is open and this bill could be heard and every opportunity given to those who wish to amend the bill and to debate particular provisions of the bill. I do not know what you would call it. That kind of legislation to me is gag legislation and I call it gag advisedly because the very purpose of this suspension is to gag anyone from offering an amendment to this bill. In my opinion it would be unwise to pass this bill without further debate and an opportunity to amend the bill as the Members of this House wish. I am perfectly willing to trust your judgment as to whether or not my amendment has merit.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in August of 1950, the House Select Committee To Investigate Abuses of the GI Bill was created. The first time I appeared before the Committee on House Administration and asked for money its members insisted that we begin work to correct the abuses that had taken place. At that time we began to contact every veterans' group and every educational group and told them generally of our plans and requested their advice. Our first thought was that this is not a Federal-aid bill of any kind, form, or fashion; this bill was designed for two groups of people: First, the veteran; and second, the taxpayers who were paying for it.

The next question we had to settle was how much are you going to pay these men? What amount of money will go to them? We adopted a scholarship plan which was not intended to pay the full cost of the education; we planned merely to give the men a certain amount of money and say: Go to school of your choice.

In reference to the question of discrimination against private schools, may I say that this bill does not discriminate against any group of schools. There has always been a price differential between tax-supported and private schools. All we do when we pay the veteran a scholarship allowance is to add to the money the veteran has now and state: You go to school of your choice, private school or public school.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. Just for one question; that is all.

Mr. GOLDEN. If it is possible, I would like for the committee to assure Members of Congress who are interested in providing schools that these veterans can go to private schools, and whether or not this bill provides for that?

Mr. TEAGUE. In answer to the gentleman's question, we say to the veteran: "Here is a certain amount of money because you were in the service; you may go to the school of your choice. If you want to go to Harvard and pay a large tuition, go ahead. If you want to go to some other school, do the same thing."

We contacted every educational group for over a year. Gradually every one of the groups came to agree with us. They appeared before our committee. There are 900 pages of testimony and every single group that came before the commit-

tee testified in behalf of and in favor of this policy of direct payment to the veteran.

The gentleman from Illinois has mentioned a questionnaire over and over again. The American Council of Education has a group of 15 college presidents who act as a committee on relationship of higher education to the Federal Government. We met with that committee. We asked them to help us decide what was the right thing to do. They set up this questionnaire asking a great number of questions. Those questions had nothing to do with the Springer amendment in any way, form, or fashion. The questionnaires came back. I have a copy of the questionnaire which I shall include as a part of my remarks.

Last week the gentleman from Illinois did the American Council of Education, in my opinion, a great disservice when he said that the president of the American Council of Education was dishonest.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. I am glad that the gentleman from Texas brought that question up. The gentleman he is referring to now is president of the Union College at Schenectady, New York, Mr. Carter Davidson, who is chairman of the legislative committee of this group. He is also president of my Alma Mater. There is no more honest, upright and forward educator in the country than Mr. Carter Davidson.

Mr. TEAGUE. He is also president of a private college; is he not?

Mr. KEARNEY. Yes.

Mr. TEAGUE. I am sure if the gentleman from Illinois will restudy this whole thing he will retract those statements he made that the president of the American Council of Education was dishonest, because he was not.

This council of 15 men constituted the group that decided on what they would recommend to our committee.

Appearing below is a list of the American Council Committee on Relationships of Higher Education with the Federal Government:

J. L. Morrill, chairman, president, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

Leonard Carmichael, president, Tufts College, Medford, Mass.

Carter Davidson, president, Union College Schenectady, N. Y.

Virgil M. Hancher, president, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

John A. Hannah, president, Michigan State College, East Lansing, Mich.

Henry T. Heald, chancelor, New York University, New York, N. Y.

Althea K. Hottel, dean of women, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Charles S. Johnson, president, Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn.

Deane W. Malott, president, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

Hugh G. Price, dean, Montgomery Junior College, Takoma Park, Md.

Edward B. Rooney, S. J., executive director, Jesuit Educational Association, 49 East Eighty-fourth Street, New York, N.Y.

Richard H. Shyrock, director, Institute of the History of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Raymond Walters, president, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Roscoe L. West, president, State Teachers College, Trenton, N. J.

Goodrich C. White, president, Emory University, Emory University, Ga.

Mr. Speaker, that is the group that represented the thinking of the American Council and recommended this principle of direct payment to the veterans. These gentlemen of the American Council did a tremendous amount of work on developing this legislation and we are indebted to them for their aid and help.

After the hearings were all over and about the time we were going into executive session to write the bill, a member of a private school came to me and asked if I would introduce this amendment, which is nearly three pages long, an amendment that would completely change the whole concept of the bill before the committee. I took the amendment to the committee and so far as I know the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] never saw it until I offered it in committee. The amendment was offered and it was defeated. It is the very heart of our bill. Nobody came and testified before our committee. Why do they not offer it over in the Senate and try to get it in over there, if they want it in, instead of waiting until the last minute and trying to get it in here?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. There were only six votes in the committee for that amendment. I did not vote. I am chairman of the committee, and there had been so much said about the chairman trying to run it that I withheld my vote, although I had the proxies of two other members.

Mr. TEAGUE. Soon after it became apparent the bill was coming up for a vote, the president of the University of Southern California, Mr. Fred D. Fagg, sent out a letter to every private school in the United States in which it was stated:

> However, the provision for a monthly all-inclusive allowance to be paid to the veteran is seriously detrimental to at least one-half of the veterans and also to all private colleges and universities.
>
> Not only will this payment device remove from the veteran freedom of choice of institutions as enjoyed under the current GI bill (Public Law 346, amended), but will also tend, through economic compulsion, to discriminate against the Korean GI veteran who chooses to attend a privately controlled institution of higher learning.

Since that was written, Mr. Case, president of Colgate, and Mr. McGrath both said that that was absolutely not enough.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Would these direct payments that are now suggested eliminate any amount of red tape?

Mr. TEAGUE. I wish that we had time to present on this floor the amount of red tape that Mr. Lunden, of the University of Minnesota, testified would be cut out. If you want a bill for schools, vote against this thing and let it go back to the committee. I do not think the Springer committee could ever get in. If anybody wants to put in the amendment that the Legislative Reference Service said would completely ruin the bill, put it in there.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FURCOLO. Did the gentleman say most of the educators who appeared before the committee testified in favor of his bill?

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes; all of them.

Gentlemen, in view of the unwarranted attack made on the floor of the House on May 29, 1952 by the Honorable WILLIAM SPRINGER against the integrity and honesty of the officers of the American Council on Education, I feel compelled to apprise the House of certain facts related to the American council and the so-called Springer amendment.

After 18 months of investigation by the Select Committee To Investigate the GI Bill, the Veterans' Affairs Committee held hearings on the subject of benefits for Korean veterans. At that time there were 40 pending bills before the committee including the bill prepared by the select committee which was later reported by the Veterans' Affairs Committee. During the early part of 1951, the select committee requested the American Council on Education to cooperate in obtaining certain information for use in preparing an education program for Korean veterans. On July 2, 1951, the American Council on Education sent out a questionnaire to its membership requesting their opinion on certain matters pertaining to veterans' education. The questionnaire was sent to approximately 950 colleges and universities and included the following questions and response:

Question: If legislation is to be enacted providing educational benefits to honorably discharged veterans who have served on active duty since June 27, 1950, would you prefer that financial payments be (check one):

Public	229
Private	374
(a) On essentially the same basis as in the educational program provided by the present GI bill; i. e., payment of tuition and fees and the cost of books, supplies, and equipment to the institution and a monthly subsistence allowance to the veteran	627
Public	87
Private	133
(b) For tuition and fees to the institution and a monthly subsistence allowance to the veterans, such allowance to include an allotment of books, supplies, and equipment	228
Public	34
Private	70
(c) For tuition and fees only to the institution	112
Public	27
Private	12
(d) A flat-rate monthly payment directly to the veteran which he apply on the total cost of his education. If so, how much per month?	44
Public	2
Private	3
Uncertain	6

It is pointed out that this poll was a sampling of approximately 1,000 schools, of the 13,000 schools which are participating in the veterans' educational program. The answer to the poll has no bearing on the Springer amendment since the Springer proposal differs from any of the methods described in the poll.

On February 6, 1952, several members of my select committee and myself introduced bills incorporating the recommendations of our committee. Shortly thereafter, Mr. RANKIN, chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, announced that hearings would begin on the Korean GI bill. The American Council on Education was asked to testify and their Committee on Relationships of Higher Education With the Federal Government met to prepare the policy and testimony of the American Council. Dr. Carter Davidson, president of Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., is chairman of the subcommittee on veterans' educational benefits. The committee is composed as follows, and Dr. Davidson spoke in behalf of the committee:

J. L. Morrill, chairman, president, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

Leonard Carmichael, president, Tufts College, Medford, Mass.

Carter Davidson, president, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.

Virgil M. Hancher, president, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

John A. Hannah, president, Michigan State College, East Lansing, Mich.

Henry T. Heald, chancelor, New York University, New York, N. Y.

Althea K. Hottel, dean of women, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Charles S. Johnson, president, Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn.

Deane W. Malott, president, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

Hugh G. Price, dean, Montgomery Junior College, Takoma Park, Md.

Edward B. Rooney, S. J., executive director, Jesuit Educational Association, 49 East Eighty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.

Richard H. Shyrock, director, Institute of the History of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Raymond Walters, president, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Roscoe L. West, president, State Teachers College, Trenton, N. J.

Goodrich C. White, president, Emory University, Emory University, Ga.

I urge the House to note that this committee is a group of the outstanding college presidents and educators of the Nation. It is also important to note that of the 15 members the committee has a majority or 8 members from private colleges. In reviewing the 40 bills pending before the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the American Council committee decided that H. R. 6425—later reported as H. R. 7656—offered the most promise of correcting the many inadequacies and weaknesses of existing legislation. The American Council committee apparently gave consideration to the poll which had been taken 6 months prior to the introduction of H. R. 6425, but realized that it could not reflect the opinion of the membership with regard to H. R. 6425—H. R. 7656.

In testimony before the Veterans' Affairs Committee, Dr. Carter Davidson, spokesman for the American Council, made the following statements in favor of H. R. 6425 and the principle of a lump-sum payment direct to the veteran:

After careful study of all of the bills now under consideration, our committee endorses the general principles and philosophy of H. R. 6425, introduced by Mr. TEAGUE February 5, 1952, and referred to your committee. * * * In commenting on major principles, our committee approves the broad policy of H. R. 6425 by which, if this bill were adopted, all payments would be made directly to the veteran student or trainee. We endorse a policy which would establish a scholarship grant or aid contract between the veteran and the Federal Government and relieve education institutions of an agency responsibility which in the past has been time consuming and expensive for the Government and institutions alike.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee held hearings for a period of 6 weeks and met 14 days. The committee took 855 pages of testimony and heard every major veterans' service organization, governmental agency, and educational group in the Nation. These groups testified overwhelmingly in favor of H. R. 6425—H. R. 7656—and the principle of direct payment to the veterans. I wish to quote pertinent portions of the testimony from these groups:

AMVETS: "We support granting an educational allowance to participants in this new program, this to be in lieu of the present subsistence and tuition and supplies payments."

Veterans of Foreign Wars: "I think of course there will probably be some other headaches that will pop up on the direct payment to veterans, but I think in the long run you have eliminated the possibility of the big headache in all the contracts with the schools."

General Accounting Office: "Under these bills, H. R. 6425 and H. R. 7656, an amount, designed to cover the cost of tuition, books and supplies, and subsistence would be paid to the veteran leaving the determination as to the school and all financial arrangements as a matter to be handled solely by the veteran. * * * The General Accounting Office views the program proposed by H. R. 6425, H. R. 7656, and related bills as a more realistic approach to granting educational assistance to veterans than the existing program."

United States Office of Education: "The basis of the program is justice to the veteran—restoration of his educational opportunity. Therefore the relationships to be established in the first instance should be between the individual veteran and the Federal Government, without any intermediaries. The veteran should have his entitlement certified directly to him and draw his benefits directly."

Bureau of the Budget: "The size and complexity of the program, together with the lack of normal competitive checks and balances, frequently produced a situation which actually encouraged exploitation of the veteran and of the Government. A new program designed in such a way as to minimize the possibilities of such exploitation would have distinct advantages over the existing program."

American Council on Education (an educational organization composed of 146 national and regional educational associations and 982 institutional members, comprising universities, colleges, teachers' colleges, State departments of education, city school systems, and special educational institutions:) "We endorse a policy which would establish a scholarship grant or aid contract between the veteran and the Federal Government and relieve educational institutions of an agency responsibility which in the past has been time consuming and expensive for the Government and institutions alike."

American Association of Junior Colleges (an educational organization composed of 450 institutional members in 46 States and indirectly representing 150 additional colleges with a combined student enrollment of more than 500,000): "Third, we favor H. R. 6425, H. R. 7656, because it extends these benefits and provides for a better working arrangement between the Veterans' Administration and the colleges and technical schools. Apparently its provisions are aimed at the elimination, as far as possible, of excessive paper work and clerical work which became a burden to many colleges in recent years under the GI bill of rights. * * * We believe that the methods and amounts of payments are in keeping with the findings of experience with the past GI bill of rights and that such method of payment should be approved."

Joint Committee of Business Officers of the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities and the National Association of State Universities: "Rather than involving an institution of higher learning in any way other than a certification of enrollment I would prefer to have an outright scholarship bill with a flat sum, the amount to be determined by dependency status and payable to the veteran with complete freedom of choice given to him as to where he will enroll."

Association of Land Grant Colleges (an association composed of 53 colleges and universities located in all of the States and Territories; their combined enrollment is about one-fifth of the total enrollment in 4-year colleges and universities in this country): "Another important principle of H. R. 6425, H. R. 7656, provides that the Federal Government shall make all payments directly to the veteran and that the veteran shall pay his own bills for tuition, fees, books and supplies. Our association believes this is a sound principle."

National Association of State Approving Agencies (an organization composed of the State approving agencies of the 48 States and Territories): "We believe that it would be desirable and workable from an administrative standpoint, to pay to each participating veteran a prescribed amount each month, from which amount he should pay all expenses incurred including tuition, fees, books, and supplies."

National Education Association of the United States: "We are particularly pleased with section IV of the bill, which provides for payments directly to the veteran rather than to the educational institution. We are convinced that this is one of the most important principles in H. R. 7656."

American Vocational Association, Inc.: "We are particularly anxious to see that section of the bill that proposes to pay all subsistence and tuition funds directly to veterans, retained in the bill."

National Council of Chief State School Officers (an organization of State commissioners and State superintendents of education in the 48 States and Territories): "Payments should be made to the veterans on an individual basis rather than to an educational institution as such and should be the same in the case of any veteran regardless of what institution he may select for attendance."

Private school associations, including the National Association and Council of Business Schools, National Council of Technical Schools, National Home Study Council and National Association of Mortuary Schools with an enrollment of approximately 1,750,-

000 students: "Our committees have carefully studied all of the bills now under consideration with reference to the GI training programs. They are in agreement with and endorse the general principles and philosophy contained in H. R. 6425. We strongly endorse the principle of direct payment to the veteran."

In discussing the principle of a lump-sum payment paid directly to the veteran, Mr. SPRINGER voiced his approval of the principle as follows:

Mr. SPRINGER. Dr. McGrath, one question. I was a little disturbed and I might have misinterpreted your meaning. That is the advocacy of the payments directly to the veteran himself. Now, we already do pay him his monthly allowance. But the thing that bothers me a little bit in this picture is this. We had a situation last year when we agreed to give the veterans who had their legs off $1,600 for a car. We found that in many of those instances it was meritorious. They used it for the purpose of rehabilitation and getting a job as was intended. We found other instances where they sold the automobile almost simultaneously.

Now the question I am trying to get clear in my mind, are you going to pay him the $600 to enter Harvard or Yale or Illinois or Stanford? You are going to give that to him in a lump-sum instead of paying it to the university.

Dr. MCGRATH. Yes, sir; but not until Harvard or Yale certifies to the Veterans' Administration that he is acceptable to them as a student in residence.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is he going to have to advance the $600 himself?

Dr. MCGRATH. No; you can work that out so he will have the money as soon as he is accepted.

Mr. SPRINGER. He will have the money as soon as he is accepted. Suppose he does not do that. That is the thing I am bothered about.

Dr. MCGRATH. You mean if he does not get the money?

Mr. SPRINGER. If he does not spend the money.

Dr. MCGRATH. As I understand it, in the two bills I am thinking of 5040 and Mr. TEAGUE's bill, there is a provision that the institution has to certify periodically that the student is there. If he is not there, automatically the Veterans' Administration, through the Treasurer of the United States, cuts off his money.

Mr. SPRINGER. If those safeguards are there, I will accept it."

Gentlemen, it is apparent from the testimony of these witnesses that every major educational group in the Nation favored H. R. 6425—H. R. 7656—and the principle of direct payment to the veteran. The educational organizations which I have quoted above represent 13,000 educational institutions, both public and private, including universities, colleges, teachers colleges, junior colleges, public and private vocational schools and business schools, State departments of education and State approving agencies.

No educational group appearing before the Veterans' Affairs Committee opposed H. R. 6425—H. R. 7656—or the principle of direct payment to the veteran. No representatives of private colleges registered opposition before the committee.

After the Veterans' Affairs Committee hearings were over and 1 day before the committee was to report out the bill a representative of a private college came to me with a proposed amendment which would change H. R. 7656 entirely and asked that I support it. Of course, I could not agree with such an amendment but in an effort to be fair to all groups I promised to introduce the amendment. I introduced the amendment and opposed it and it was beaten in the committee. That amendment has now come to be known as the Springer amendment.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee reported H. R. 7656 unanimously; however just before the bill was to come to the floor of the House a group of private colleges that had been unable to influence the leadership and the majority of their own organizations bolted their own organization, formed a temporary organization called the Emergency Committee To Amend the Korean GI Bill and launched a pressure campaign to force inclusion of the Springer amendment which had been beaten in the committee. This group circulated a letter to all private colleges alleging that H. R. 7656 would discriminate against the private college and urged that each private college write or wire its Congressman. Apparently the private colleges were not furnished with a copy of the bill and the proposed amendment. The circular letter alleged that the Springer amendment was a substantial extension of the method of payment used under the present act, Public Law 346. I am inserting the circular letter which went to all private colleges in order that you may read its entire text:

EMERGENCY COMMITTEE FOR
AMENDMENT OF KOREAN GI BILL,
Los Angeles, May 20, 1952.

DEAR SIR: H. R. 7656, introduced by Congressman TEAGUE and titled "Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952" will be brought to the floor of the House of Representatives for vote probably next Tuesday or Wednesday, May 27 or 28.

This bill in general is excellent. However, the provision for a monthly all-inclusive allowance to be paid to the veteran is seriously detrimental to at least one-half of the veterans and also to all private colleges and universities.

Not only will this payment device remove from the veteran freedom of choice of institutions as enjoyed under the current GI bill (Public Law 346, amended), but will also tend, through economic compulsion, to discriminate against the Korean GI veteran who chooses to attend a privately controlled institution of higher learning.

In practical terms, the bill as written could divert as many as one-third of your potential veteran-students to public institutions (assumption from statistics of U. S. Office of Education).

This situation can be corrected if the House of Representatives adopts the Springer amendment which will be offered next Tuesday or Wednesday when the bill is brought to the floor. Essentially, the Springer amendment divides the proposed all-inclusive allowance into two parts: A tuition allowance, and a subsistence allowance. In this sense, it follows the formula of the GI bill but reduces total benefits in accordance with the over-all reduction in H. R. 7656.

Please join us in supporting the Springer amendment by doing the following:

1. Write special delivery—or better yet, telegraph—your Congressman and your two Senators. Because this bill will probably be acted upon by a voice vote, it is imperative that in your communication to your Congressman, you request him to be on the floor and vote next Tuesday and Wednesday.

2. Have the president of your board of trustees and the president of your alumni association do the same, and by Friday, May 23, if it is to be effective.

3. Check and mail the enclosed postcard immediately, so that it may be received in time to be assembled into a list which will be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Monday, May 26.

Sincerely,

FRED D. FAGG, Jr.
Chairman pro tempore, President, University of Southern California.

P. S.—If you belong to the ACE, you will note that their questionnaire to you dated May 16, 1952, is seeking information along the lines indicated here, but the return date of May 30, will be too late to be effective.

Emergency committee: Boston University, Denver University, James Millikin University, New York University, Ripon College, Stanford University, Syracuse University, Texas Christian University, Tulane University, University of Southern California, Willamette University.

The alleged discrimination is, of course, entirely untrue. As a result, many schools have been duped into a letter-writing campaign to support the Springer amendment.

Gentleman, I have given you this background in order that you may understand the unfairness of the charges made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] against the officers of the American Council on Education.

On May 29, 1952, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] took the floor of the House to argue for his amendment and he was confronted with the fact that his amendment had no support whatsoever from any recognized educational group and that the American Council which represents private colleges as well as many other institutions had endorsed the very principle of the bill which his amendment was seeking to eliminate. In order to imply that his amendment did have support, he apparently found it necessary to attempt to refute the integrity of the officers of the American Council and the Committee on Relationships of Higher Education to the Federal Government.

I quote from the RECORD Mr. SPRINGER's statements:

Mr. SPRINGER. If you want to talk about being dishonest and of doing a thing that is not true, the president of the American Council on Education testified that they reflected the sentiment of all the people of this association who submitted the matter to a poll. But the gentleman did not represent anywhere near the majority opinion of the members of the American Council on Education, which makes up about 1,100 colleges and universities. They voted overwhelmingly the other way.

Mr. TEAGUE. Of course, my answer to the method of the American Council on Education——

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is asking me why they did not appear.

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. The president was supposed to represent them and he did not do it.

This statement does a great injustice to Dr. Arthur S. Adams, president of the American Council on Education. Dr. Adams did not testify on the bill and is not a member of the committee on relationships which is responsible for formulating policy on legislation.

The statement is equally unwarranted in its implication that Dr. J. L. Morrill, chairman of the committee, or Dr. Carter Davidson, chairman of the subcommittee on veterans' legislation, have been dishonest in representing their organization.

As difficult as it is to imagine the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] is refuting the integrity of this outstanding group of college presidents and educators and gives as his reason reference to a poll conducted by the American Council 6 months before the specific legislation under consideration was introduced. Is this duly appointed committee of college presidents, predominantly from private colleges, to be accepted as spokesmen for the American Council or are they to be discredited and their policy refuted by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], based on his interpretation of an old poll?

Gentlemen, I wish to dwell briefly on another aspect of this problem, the merits of the Springer amendment. From his remarks before the House on May 29, 1952, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] would have you believe that the answers to a poll currently being conducted by the American Council implies support for his amendment. The current poll asked three questions:

First. Do you favor an extension of Public Law 346?

Second. Do you favor the plan of H. R. 5040?

Third. Do you favor H. R. 7656?

These questions have nothing whatever to do with the Springer amendment, which is an entirely different proposal from the three included in the poll. If there is any doubt whatever on this point in the mind of any Member, it can be readily resolved by contacting the American Council on Education.

The only supporters of the amendment are a small group of private colleges out of the 13,000 schools which would be affected. These few schools see in the Springer proposal a chance to obtain a favored position for themselves. The amendment is designed to reduce the normal price differential between public and private colleges for the purpose of giving the private college an advantage in recruiting veterans that they do not enjoy in recruiting nonveterans.

I wish to emphasize that this self-serving plan is not advocated by a majority of private colleges, but is receiving its support from a small group who found they could not influence majority opinion, and have therefore bolted their organization to work on their own.

I hope every Member will clearly understand that the bill reported by the Veterans' Affairs Committee does not discriminate against any type of school. The bill is primarily a veteran bill. All veterans will receive the same allowance and will be free to attend the school of their choice. Schools will compete for veterans on identically the same basis they compete for nonveterans. It is not the purpose of the bill to use Federal funds to place a special category of schools in an advantageous position in recruiting veterans which they do not enjoy in recruiting nonveterans. The Springer amendment is class legislation for a special group of schools and is not veteran legislation and should not be considered as such.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 7656) go over until Thursday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts.. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, under the agreement made last week, owing to the fact that there were primaries today in Iowa and tomorrow in California, it was the unanimous understanding that any roll call would be deferred until Thursday. I sincerely hope that the request of the gentleman from Tennessee will be granted and that the vote will go over until Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1952

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 6947) providing supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 7005) entitled "An act to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HORAN (at the request of Mr. MACK of Washington), on account of official business.

JEFFERSON DAVIS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, 35 years ago, as a soldier in World War I, I was sent to Camp Pike, Ark., a short distance from Little Rock.

A good share of my fellow soldiers came from homes in the Southern States. War was our trade in those days, and we "talked shop" among ourselves. They had many heroes, these young, alert, land-loving Americans. Yet, out of our talks one hero emerged—a soldier's soldier, a man's man. This archhero was Jefferson Davis.

During the years between those Camp Pike days and now I have learned the reasons behind this veneration of Jefferson Davis. I have been more than repaid for the time I have given to studying his life and reading about him. It has been a lasting pleasure to become acquainted with a truly great American through the medium of books. By knowing him I have come nearer to the minds of those who revere his memory.

Nine States have set aside his birthday—June 3—as a State holiday. Communities in other States than these nine make June 3 an occasion to honor him.

Jefferson Davis was born in what is now a part of Todd County, Ky., near the Tennessee border. He was the youngest of a family of 10 children.

Kentucky might well claim him for he was born in that State, and he received his early schooling there.

But, then, so might New York claim him—for no single period of his life exerted greater influence over him than his 4 years at West Point. When he was an old man and had begun to dictate his memoirs, he said, "I shall tell a great deal of West Point, and I seem to remember more every day."

And so might Wisconsin claim him—for, as a young lieutenant at Fort Crawford, he first met Sarah Knox Taylor, daughter of his commanding officer, Col. Zachary Taylor. For her, he left the Army. They were married. Less than a year later, she died of malarial fever. It was at the end of his Wisconsin tour of duty that we hear the first sound character sketch of the young officer in the words of his captive, Black Hawk: "We started to Jefferson Barracks in a steamboat, under the charge of a young war chief"—Lieutenant Davis—"who treated us with much kindness. He is a good and brave young chief, with whose conduct I was much pleased."

Alabama might claim him—for Montgomery was where he came to accept the presidency of the Confederacy.

Virginia might claim him—for, in Richmond, this man, young-at-heart, grew old.

Louisiana might claim him—for he died in New Orleans.

His full life touched the people of every region where he served. Illinois, Arkansas, Maine, Missouri, Mississippi—these States knew him and thousands of their citizens honored him and respected him.

What my buddies in World War I Camp Pike told me, convinced me that Jefferson Davis was a man of many facets. He was a rare diamond amid a galaxy of semiprecious stones. He was no "diamond in the rough". His character had been cut on the harsh wheel of adversity. It is true that he was dignified to the point of austerity in public;

a quality which alienated some prominent men of the period. But, it is also true that his qualities of sincere dedication to his cause won him the undying admiration of great masses of people.

One of the finest tributes to the character of Jefferson Davis is the loyalty and devotion of his second wife, Varina Howell Davis of Natchez, whom he married in 1845. She was a bulwark of courage for him through his short term of office as a Member of the House of Representatives, through his trying Mexican War service, through his brilliant career as a United States Senator and as Secretary of War, through the ordeal of the War Between the States, and through the quiet after years of self-chosen obscurity.

Jefferson Davis had innumerable interests. Yet, his life was shaped by his few, but well-defined, goals. He demanded a strict interpretation of the Constitution. He sought the manifest destiny of this Republic through the expansion of its territory. He insisted that all rights, with the exception of those specifically given to the Federal Government by the Constitution, should repose with the governments of the several sovereign States. Whatever else he did throughout his crowded years, these three pillars of purpose remained always uppermost in his thoughts.

Yes. Jefferson Davis was a man of many occupations. At his plantation, Brierfield, he raised roses, as well as cotton. He helped to found the Smithsonian Institution. He was one of the earliest and strongest proponents of a sea-to-sea canal across Nicaragua. He started the building of the Cabin John viaduct which was to supply the District of Columbia with clear water. He antagonized Gen. Winfield Scott by demanding that American troops in the Mexican War be supplied with something other than Revolutionary War muskets. He instituted the 4-year change-of-post rule in the Army during his service as Secretary of War under President Pierce.

And, with this recital, I have only scratched the surface of the thousand-and-one concerns of this brilliant and able man.

He left the House of Representatives after a little more than 6 months of his term had expired so that he might command his fellow Mississippians in the Mexican War. After he left the House of Representatives, a great deal was said and written about Jefferson Davis. He, himself, wrote and said a great deal.

Not long after he went to Mexico, Mexican General Ampudia, an opposing officer at Saltillo described the sound made by the Davis-led southerners as "a cry which began with a growl and rose to a falsetto scream." This was the account of the birth of the rebel yell.

Davis' father-in-law, Gen. Zachary Taylor, wrote in a dispatch from the field under date of March 6, 1847:

> The Mississippi Riflemen, under Colonel Davis, were highly conspicuous for gallantry and steadfastness, and sustained throughout the engagement the reputation of veteran troops. Brought into action against an immensely superior force, they maintained themselves for a long time unsupported, and with heavy loss, and held an important part of the field until reinforced.
>
> Colonel Davis, though severely wounded, remained in the saddle until the close of action. His distinguished coolness and gallantry, and the heavy loss of his regiment on this day, entitle him to the particular notice of the Government.

On his return to Brierfield, Jefferson Davis received a letter from the Governor of Mississippi offering him the appointment to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Jesse Speight. This was his reply to the governor:

> The approbation which you convey of my services in the Twenty-ninth Congress is especially pleasing because therein was manifested my fixed opinion on the taxing and spending powers of the Federal Government, my uniformly entertained and often avowed creed of strict construction of the Constitution of our Union.

He had not changed his mind when, after leaving the Senate to become Secretary of War, he said at Wilmington, Del., in 1851:

> A strict observance of this Constitution is the highest duty of an American citizen. He is not worthy the blessing our fathers left us who would not claim all the rights of that Constitution, and he is no freeman who would attempt to usurp privileges not conferred by it.

Jefferson Davis was not one to change, nor was he one to compromise. Yet, as late as January 9, 1861, we find him—sick in body as well as sick at heart—making a final appeal to President Buchanan to send Maj. Robert Anderson back to Fort Moultrie from Fort Sumter. His plea futile, he arose on the Senate floor to announce his retirement from that body. This is a part of what he said then:

> I go hence unencumbered by the remembrance of any injury received, and by having discharged the duty of making the only reparation in my power for any injury offered * * * it only remains for me bid you final adieu.

In these words, he permitted all posterity to briefly glimpse the serenity of soul, the gentle dignity of the inner man. It was this nobility that had caused President Franklin Pierce to write to Mr. Davis as a member of the Cabinet—the only Cabinet which remained unchanged throughout the entire administration in all our history:

> It has concededly been a period of general prosperity; defalcation on the part of Federal officers has been almost entirely unknown; the Public Treasury, with more than $20,000,000 constantly on hand, has been free from the touch of fraud or peculation; foreign questions have been amicably and advantageously adjusted; valuable additions have been made to our already vast domain; and peace has been made with all the earth and without compromise of right or stain upon our national honor. Whatever of credit pertains to the Federal Executive in the accomplishment of these results, is attributable in great measure to the fidelity, laborious habits and ability of the heads of the different departments.
>
> FRANKLIN PIERCE.

In January 1861 Jefferson Davis was a United States Senator.

In February 1861 Jefferson Davis was President of the Confederacy.

In February of 1862 he was to say:

> Obstacles may retard, but they cannot long prevent, the progress of a movement sanctified by its justice and sustained by a virtuous people. Reverently let us invoke the God of our fathers to guide and protect us in our efforts to perpetuate the principles which by His blessing they were able to vindicate, establish and transmit to their posterity. With the continuance of His favor ever gratefully acknowledged, we may hopefully look forward to success, to peace, and to prosperity.

The tide of success moved back and forth during the long days of war. Peace was distant by years. Prosperity was distant by decades.

The press of the North was, of course, against him. A large, important and vocal portion of the Confederate press was scarcely less bitter against his policies and his person. Yet, not once did he attack the freedom of the press. His most biting words were reserved for those foreign interests who reaped the greatest profits from the perilous blockade running of cotton; but who refused to recognize his government. It was in this fighting mood that he told the Mississippi State Legislature in December 1862:

> Put not your faith in princes; and rest not your hopes on foreign nations.

I find in these words a thundering echo of the thoughts of our first President, George Washington.

Gettysburg stabbed him deep.

Vicksburg battered him to his knees.

The wilderness left him hollow-eyed, incapable of tears.

If this were not enough, he was stricken by the death of his young son, Joe, who fell from the balcony of the executive mansion in Richmond.

But, in February 1865, his head erect, he faced his people in the African Church at Richmond and said:

> Let us unite our hands and our hearts, lock our shields together, and we may well believe that before another summer solstice falls upon us, it will be the enemy who will be asking for conferences and occasions in which to make known our demands.

A few weeks later, the Confederacy was forced to evacuate Richmond. His public message, issued on April 5, 1865, stated:

> Let us not despond, my countrymen, but, relying on God, meet the foe with fresh defiance and with unconquered and unconquerable hearts.

"Unconquerable heart." With these two words, Jefferson Davis had described himself.

Ten days after Davis had penned this message, young Lieutenant Wise presented dispatches to him at Danville, Va., telling him that Lee had surrendered.

What transpired after that is history. His progress through North and South Carolina into Georgia followed. I intentionally say progress, because it definitely was just that—and not a flight. Jefferson Davis could no more run away from an enemy than he could run away from himself. He was intent on gathering the remnants around him; determined to regroup his forces to fight

again; perhaps, to establish a new Confederacy west of the Mississippi. When he was taken by troops of the Fourth Michigan Cavalry, he was ordered first to halt and gave a defiant answer to the man who had so ordered him. He was taken to Fortress Monroe where, for a time, he was shackled to the wall. He was released in May 1867. He never accepted amnesty. He never accepted pardon. He lived. He spoke. He wrote. Unchanged. Unbowed.

Just a year before he died—on December 6, 1889—he spoke at Mississippi City. This is what he said:

Mr. Chairman and fellow citizens, ah, pardon me, the laws of the United States no longer permit me to designate you as fellow citizens, but I am thankful I may address you as my friends. I feel no regret that I stand before you this afternoon a man without a country, for my ambition lies buried in the grave of the Confederacy.

There has been consigned not only my ambition but the dogmas on which that Government was based. The faces I see before me are those of young men: had I not known this I would not have appeared before you. Men in whose hands the destinies of our Southland lie, for love of her I break my silence to speak to you a few words of respectful admonition. The past is dead; let it bury its dead, its hopes, its aspirations; before you lies the future—a future full of golden promise; a future of expanding national glory, before which all the world shall stand amazed. Let me beseech you to lay aside all rancor, all bitter, sectional feeling, and to make your place in the ranks of those who will bring about "a consummation devoutly to be wished"—a reunited country.

Mr. Speaker, Jefferson Davis did many things, wrote many things, spoke many things. But in a single phrase he wrote his own biography and explained to me why my World War I buddies of Camp Pike were such fine soldiers and such true patriots. They, like the Jefferson Davis they loved, like many of my tried and trusted friends of this Congress, are southerners who proudly possess "unconquered and unconquerable hearts."

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT CONTRACTS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I again wish to protest what I consider the very unfair awarding of contracts, particularly to the new district areas, by the Defense Department. There is something radically wrong. It is unfair to penalize the business people in those areas so much that they are afraid to fight. In many instances I know they took their complaints, because they did not receive the orders when they were the low bidders, to the Office of the Comptroller General. But there is a fear in business today. They do not dare to complain to the Office of the Comptroller General in such cases for fear they will be penalized further. There is something very radically wrong, Mr. Speaker.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LANTAFF and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include an article by Ernest K. Lindley.

Mr. BRYSON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RHODES and to include two editorials.

Mr. MADDEN and to include a speech he made at Memorial Day exercises in Atlantic City, N. J., last Friday.

Mr. MAGEE.

Mr. GATHINGS.

Mr. ANGELL and to include a letter.

Mr. MCDONOUGH in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCMULLEN (at the request of Mr. LANTAFF) and to include an article.

Mr. BUFFETT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARVEY and to include an editorial.

Mr. TOLLEFSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHELLEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. HARDEN and to include an article appearing in the American Legion magazine.

Mr. SADLAK (at the request of Mr. KEATING) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANHAM (at the request of Mr. TRIMBLE) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MITCHELL and to include an address by Walter Reuther, despite the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $252.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings entitled "Institute of Pacific Relations"; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution accepting the statues of Dr. John McLoughlin and Rev. Jason Lee from the State of Oregon for placement in the Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution authorizing temporary placement in the rotunda of the Capitol of the statues of Dr. John McLoughlin and Rev. Jason Lee, of Oregon, and the holding of ceremonies; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 454. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 3, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1537. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of April 23, 1930, relating to a uniform retirement date for authorized retirements of Federal personnel, and for other purposes," was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4305. A bill to authorize the use of the Sackets Harbor Military Cemetery for the burial of war and peacetime veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2012). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6581. A bill authorizing the President to exercise certain powers conferred upon him by the Hawaiian Organic Act in respect of certain property ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii, notwithstanding the acts of August 5, 1939, and June 16, 1949, or other acts of Congress; with amendment (Rept. No. 2013). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REGAN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5788. A bill to extend certain 10-year oil and gas leases; with amendment (Rept. No. 2014). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7393. A bill to revise the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2015). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REDDEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5327. A bill to amend the act of July 26, 1946 (Public Law 551, 79th Cong.), relating to the issuance of general obligation bonds by the city of Anchorage, Alaska; with amendment (Rept. No. 2016). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1258. An act to authorize and direct the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Mississippi to Louie H. Emfinger; with amendment (Rept. No. 2010). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McMULLEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7302. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2011). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 8066. A bill amending the Tariff Acts as related to bauxite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 8067. A bill to protect striped bass; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (by request):

H. R. 8068. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Fort Belknap Indian community of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to transmitting copies of civil-defense compacts as entered into between the State of Washington and the States of Oregon, Montana, and Idaho, pursuant to subsection 201 (g) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 8069. A bill for the relief of Dr. Syed Abdul Qadir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

H. R. 8070. A bill for the relief of Kinu (Kenuko) Shiina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 8071. A bill for the relief of Nachum Samuel Leitner and his wife, Anna Leitner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 8072. A bill for the relief of Michael Demcheshen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

749. Mrs. ST. GEORGE presented a petition in opposition to the advertisement of alcoholic liquors on the air and in magazines going into the homes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 3, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, June 2, 1952)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of justice and righteousness, we would constantly search our own hearts, even as we mobilize our national might to keep pagan powers of darkness from strangling our liberties and from accomplishing their evil design of enslaving the whole world. Fervently we pray that we may see clearly that this godless growth of tyranny with its false promises feeds upon hunger and misery and exploitation. Give us to understand that its ominous spread has been made possible partly by the low spiritual vitality of democracy, by the relaxing of loyalty to the Christian principles and verities on which freedom's very breath depends. With the anxious world listening as we here talk about defense and plan for more and more arms to stay aggression, help us never to be unmindful—lest we forget that the real and ultimate battle must be fought deep in the hearts of men, where burn the fires of faith. Facing boldly the causes of seething discontent of moral decay and mental confusion, may we march into the new world that is to be to fulfill the fair promises to humanity which slave systems make but to break. So may we keep the faith. We ask it in the name of that One who is the truth. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 2, 1952, was dispensed with.

CONTINUANCE OF CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS—AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT, 1916

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, Senate bill 2437.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2437) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, when the session was concluded yesterday, I was giving to the Senate information about S. 2437, which now appears in the RECORD yesterday. I only wish to add that the road bill which was reported to the Senate was certainly given all necessary consideration by the Committee on Public Works and the Subcommittee on Roads. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is chairman of the subcommittee. He spent many long days listening to testimony about the need for continuing this laudable program.

Mr. President, I know the Senate is well acquainted with the history of road building in this country, and the need for road construction. The committee has not done anything except to recommend continuation of a program which was started in 1916.

The only difference between the bill of 1950 and the one of 1952 is in the amount recommended for the primary system. The bill which was passed 2 years ago authorized an appropriation of $500,000,000. The pending bill authorizes an appropriation of $600,000,000 for primary, secondary, and urban systems. The primary system is the transcontinental, or interstate, system.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from New Mexico stated the Federal-aid road system was started in 1916. The other day I happened to be looking at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of those days and found that I introduced a Federal-aid road bill in the House of Representatives on November 26, 1911, 4 days after I was sworn in as a Member of the House. As I recall, Mr. Shackelford, of Kansas, was chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads of the House at that time. A number of Federal-aid road bills had been introduced, and later we finally agreed on a bill which became known as the Shackelford bill. However, it was a composite of the principal features of all the bills which had been introduced, and it took Mr. Shackelford's name because he was chairman of the committee.

There was a tremendous fight in getting the bill through in both the House and the Senate, it being strongly argued by many that it was unconstitutional.

After the bill had passed both Houses, and had gone to President Wilson, we learned that he was thinking of vetoing it on the ground that it was unconstitutional. Senator John H. Bankhead, Sr., and I went to see the President about it, and got him to change his mind because the contemplated roads could be used to promote the national defense.

The Senator from New Mexico is correct in saying that we did not get the system started until 1916. It did not actually go into effect until sometime in the 1920's, after the conclusion of the First World War. Since then we have built up one of the grandest systems of roads on earth.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that the people of the country will ever be grateful to him and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who were the originators of and actually pioneered the way for a road system in this country.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What we are trying to do now, as successors to those good gentlemen, is to carry on the same program without any changes whatsoever. But, as the Senator well knows, it costs more to build a road now than it did in 1916.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the only reason why the committee is recommending $600,000,000 instead of $500,000,000.

For forest highways, we are recommending $25,000,000. The original recommendation for forest highways in S. 2437 was $32,000,000. The House companion bill to the Senate bill recommended $22,000,000. The Senate committee is recommending a reduction from $32,000,000 to $25,000,000.

With reference to forest roads and trails, I feel certain the Senate will agree with me as to the importance of properly protecting our forest properties. I do not know whether the American people realize the vast resources which they have in their forest reserves and their value. I believe that one of the greatest contributions made by any President of the United States was made by President Theodore Roosevelt when he decided that the forest reserves should be protected, and appointed the late Governor Pinchot, of Pennsylvania, as the first forester.

There are many millions of acres of virgin timber land. How is that property affected by the provisions of the pending bill? Forest highways and forest access roads are provided for. Several years ago I visited a number of forests in the State of California. As far as the eye could reach there was a field of green, formed by the most beautiful trees man ever gazed upon.

Forest trails are provided for in the bill, so that in case of fire or in case it is desired to harvest some of the timber, there will be access roads into the virgin timber. That policy is in keeping with what we have done heretofore. Formerly the Agriculture Department constructed such roads and had jurisdiction over them. The same principle applies to the Indian reservation roads and the parkway roads. However, several years ago Congress decided that the road builder should be the Bureau of Public Roads. Notwithstanding the fact that construction funds are authorized in various bills, the construction and supervision of such roads are carried on by the Bureau of Public Roads. The bill as a whole is in keeping with present demands for roads.

Imagine what would have happened in the First World War and in the Second World War if we had not kept transportation rolling all over the country. Roads are just as necessary to the national defense as are guns. Guns and supplies must be transported across the land. One of the things that have saved this country is the fact that many years ago Congress decided that the United States should have a road system.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico one or two questions about the bill. As I read the bill, I note that no provision is made for access highways, which are very important to the present military defense program. Many of our States have incurred special obligations because of new highways which are necessary around large cities, around cantonments, and around air bases. I wonder if the Senator can advise the Senate as to what suggestions might be in order in connection with that type of approach. What can we expect?

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator will turn to page 11 of the bill, he will note that section 10 reads as follows:

> SEC. 10. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765), as amended, and section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $50,000,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That whenever any project for the construction or improvement of a circumferential highway around a city or of a radial intracity route thereto submitted by any State, is certified by the Secretary of Defense, or such other official as the President may designate, as being important for civilian or military defense, such project may be constructed under the authorization in this section and in accordance with the conditions contained therein.

Let me say to the Senator from Kansas that the proviso in that section was inserted at the request and suggestion of the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who is a member of the subcommittee. It provides for two things. The proviso takes care of the circumferential or radial roads. The authorization of $50,000,000 is to take care of the access roads. We decided that possibly $50,000,000 was not sufficient. Originally I thought $150,000,000 should have been provided. The reason I thought so was that when the previous highway bill was pending, the committee recomended $25,000,000. On the day the bill was considered by the Senate, in the old Supreme Court Chamber, a letter came to the chairman of the committee suggesting that the amount be reduced to $10,000,000.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Let me ask whether the fund of $50,000,000 is to be matched by the States, or whether it is a fund which can be used directly by the Department of Defense, in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads, for access highways.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Under the authorization it can be used up to 100 percent without matching, but, of course, any matching is available to add to the total provided by the Federal Government.

Mr. CARLSON. As the chairman of the committee well knows, there is a great need for assistance to some States in areas where there has been a large increase of traffic on highways which were constructed to carry normal traffic.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is why I thought, and as a matter of fact the committee thought, that probably $50,000,000 might not be sufficient, but, in deference to the suggestion made by some members of the committee, we reported $50,000,000. The proviso applying to these funds came as I have said, as a suggestion from the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I suggest to the distinguished chairman of the committee that this is a very important amendment. I think it will be very helpful. As to whether the amount is sufficient will have to be determined by the program.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to call the attention of the distinguished chairman of the committee to section 7, which I understand is a new approach to the authorization of highway funds when it comes to dealing with the construction of highways, and the reconstruction of highways which have been damaged by floods, hurricanes, and other acts of God. May I ask the distinguished chairman if this is new legislation?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; it is continuing legislation, except that a revolving fund is created to take care of emergencies such as occurred in the Senator's State last year, and in Nebraska, Iowa, and the Dakotas during this year's floods. As the Senator from Kansas well knows, at Omaha, Council Bluffs, and other cities, some of the interstate roads were completely wiped out. Of necessity something should be done about it. Section 7 would create a revolving fund of $15,000,000 to take care of emergencies of that nature.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to state to the distinguished chairman, if he will permit me to do so, that this is a very important section. Every year in various States of the Union losses of this type are suffered. It seems to me that a fund should be available for the reconstruction of highways which have been destroyed by floods or hurricanes, or have been damaged by similar causes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is what the committee had in mind.

Mr. CARLSON. I note that once the authorization is granted the bill provides, in line 23, page 9:

> The appropriation of such moneys as may be necessary for the initial establishment of this fund and for its replenishment on an annual basis is hereby authorized.

Therefore, once the section is approved the authorization continues, and there will be no need for further legislation on this subject.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the understanding of the committee.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to commend the chairman for the fine work he has done in preparing and reporting the highway bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say that the chairman of the subcommittee and every member of the full committee devoted a great deal of time to this important piece of legislation. In my opinion it is in the interest of the welfare of the country.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. With reference to section 7, I note the following language on page 10, lines 11 to 14:

> The Federal share payable on account of any repair or reconstruction project provided for by funds made available under the section shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost thereof.

Does that language contemplate that the States shall match the funds to the extent of the other 50 percent?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the present law. The language in the bill continues the present law.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. In other words, we should not be led to believe that the Federal Government——

Mr. CHAVEZ. Would hand out $50,000,000, for example.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Yes. There is an obligation and a responsibility upon the States to match the Federal funds.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. The Federal Government provides 50 percent, which can be matched if an emergency arises in any area.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). The amendment of the Senator from Illinois will not be in order until the committee amendments have been disposed of.

The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Public Works was, on page 2, line 14, after "(58 Stat. 838)", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That not more than 25 percent of the amount apportioned to any State in any year for expenditure on the Federal-aid highway system or on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, respectively, may be transferred from the Federal-aid highway system for expenditure on the Federal-aid secondary highway system or from the Federal-aid secondary highway system for expenditure on the Federal-aid highway system when such transfer is requested and certified as being in the public interest by the State highway department and is approved by the Commissioner of Public Roads."

THE CASE OF JACOB (JACK) UDELL

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on February 28, 1952, I made a statement, as appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 1579, regarding the manner in which Jacob (Jack) Udell, address: New York City; Frankfort, Del.; and Miami Beach, Fla., after employing Joseph D. Nunan, former Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as one of his attorneys had been successful in having his $792,094 tax case pigeonholed in the files of the Department of Justice.

Prosecution of Jack Udell's case was dropped after both the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department had decided that for reasons of his bad health, which was described as extreme anxiety, he should not be prosecuted for income-tax invasion.

Significantly this decision was made within a few weeks after the employment of Joseph D. Nunan, November 17, 1948.

Since last February this additional information has been called to my attention.

In late 1948, during the same period in which both the Treasury Department and the Department of Justice were dropping their tax case against Jack Udell for reasons outlined above, another Government agency, the Veterans' Administration, was negotiating a contract with him for the establishment of a veterans' school in Miami, Fla.

This veterans' school was organized, and operations were begun in November under the name of the National Meat and Food Institute. Jack Udell was the president; Lawrence Udell, his son, the vice president; and his wife, Leah, secretary. The school was operated supposedly for the purpose of teaching veterans how to cut up poultry and other meats.

In the 40-month period between November 1948, and March 20, 1952, Jack Udell, through the operations of this school, collected from the Veterans' Administration $451,559.30. This does not include the amount the Veterans' Administration paid direct to the veterans as students.

In July 1951, certain alleged irregularities in the operations of this so-called veterans school were reported to the Veterans' Administration, and an investigation was authorized.

In September 1951 this investigation was completed. The report submitted called particular attention to the fact that there were erroneous billings made to the Veterans' Administration for instructions supposedly given to veterans who actually were not in attendance at the school.

I quote from that report:

An attendance roll book showing practically 100 percent attendance at the National Meat and Food Institute for the period October 1949 through October 1950 was submitted to the Identification and Detection Division, Inspection-Investigation Service, for examination to determine the authenticity of the entries.

The report revealed some 395 erasures and alterations had been made to show students present. However, more recent attendance records and checks at the school do show a fairly large percentage of absentees being recorded. The contract with the school allows each student to be absent three times per month, which is well known by the students who generally utilize in full the permitted absences.

One veteran stated under oath that he had been absent while employed (thereafter verified by a check of his employer's records) on July 18, 19, 20, 26, 28, 1950, and August 2, 3, 1950. An examination of the attendance roll book submitted to the Identification and Detection Division showed him as being marked present on those dates after alterations and erasures were made therein.

During the investigation the owner, Jacob Udell, refused to discuss with the examining agents the activities of the school and arranged for a meeting at his attorney's office.

At this meeting Attorney Albert S. Dubbin advised his clients, Mr. Jack Udell and Mr. Evilio (Jake) Ramirez, registrar and bookkeeper for the school, to make no statements, nor to answer any questions.

As evidence that the Treasury Department was likewise put on notice regarding this operation, I quote further from the report:

When the auditors reported the school had lost many financial and attendance records necessary to determine cost data for the hourly rate under the contract, the investigators and auditors contacted and notified the Intelligence Unit of the Miami office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue of the allegations about which the investigation was being conducted and the facts concerning loss of the records. The agent in charge, Mr. Brown, advised that Mr. Udell had an income-tax suit pending against him.

There is no indication that the Treasury Department paid any attention to this notice. The same lack of concern exists here as was found in his income-tax case.

Many other damaging statements questioning the activities of this school are contained in this report of September 1951 by the Veterans' Administration.

Summarizing Jack Udell's case as discussed last February and again today, we find that:

First. He failed to file any income tax returns in 1945;

Second. The proposed outstanding tax assessments against him, including interest and penalties, total $792,094;

Third. He was successful in having criminal prosecution in his tax case dropped 6 weeks after Mr. Nunan filed as his attorney; and

Fourth. While still owing three-fourths million dollars in delinquent taxes, he was able to contract with and collect from another Government agency nearly one-half million dollars for operating a veterans' school.

Jack Udell came to this country as an immigrant, and was granted American citizenship.

During the World War II, while American boys were dying fighting for his adopted country, he made substantial profits, yet paid practically no income taxes, even failing to file a return for the year 1945.

The major portion of these large profits were made from farmers in my own area.

Rather than pay taxes, he employed Joseph D. Nunan, former Commissioner of Internal Revenue, who today refuses to talk about his activities for "fear of incriminating himself."

Since the war, and while still owing the Federal Government over three-fourths million dollars in back taxes, Jack Udell capitalized on a program which had been set up by Congress for the worthy purpose of assisting veterans in preparing themselves for a postwar trade.

Through padded bookkeeping and other devious methods, he collected from the Government substantial amounts which were charged against this program.

From Mr. Udell's record it appears that he does not appreciate the many advantages of our great country, and apparently is not willing to accept as an adopted American citizen his proportionate part of the responsibility of supporting this Government.

It was not until after the tax case of Mr. Udell had been exposed in the Senate on February 28, 1952, that the Department took any action toward securing an indictment. Even now, as far as I can find out, they have never mentioned this phase of his operations.

CONTINUANCE OF CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS—AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT, 1916

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2437) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended, and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I regret that I was not able to be in the Chamber earlier today, during the previous consideration of Senate bill 2437 and during the preliminary remarks on it.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee, who is handling this measure, a question about section 10 of the bill.

Section 10 provides, among other things, an authorization for an appropriation of an additional sum of $50,000,000, "to remain available until expended."

I read from section 10: "for the construction or improvement of a circumferential highway around a city or of a radial intracity route thereto submitted by any State" if it is "certified by the Secretary of Defense, or such other official as the President may designate, as being important for civilian or military defense."

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee whether any yardsticks are provided by the bill for the determination of how that amount of money shall be allociated; or is it proposed to leave that question to the determination of the Department of Defense; and does the provision apply at least theoretically, even though the name is not given, to the city of Washington, D. C.?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The city of Washington could participate in the fund if a proper showing were made. It was not intended that the fund should apply only to the city of Washington; the intent was that the fund would be general in its application.

The committee had considerable information concerning the needs for defense in respect to access roads.

If the Senator from Kansas will turn to page 5 of the report——

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Yes; I have it before me.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I now read from page 5 of the report:

DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS

The committee studied extensive information concerning authorization needs for defense and access roads. It found considerable variation in the views of different executive agencies on this subject. It considered also two proposed amendments relating to this subject which would provide authorization for circumferential and radial roads generally in the interest of civil defense. One view received from an executive agency was to the effect that this matter could better be considered in separate legislation after further data on the needs of the program are obtained. Other views indicated that additional needs do now exist and various estimates were mentioned, including a sizable program of timber access roads as well as roads for access to mineral sources, industrial plants, and other defense installations.

When the committee brought up the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 for consideration in the Senate, it was prevailed upon by the executive department to reduce the modest authorization which it had recommended in the bill for defense access roads.

Two years ago the committee recommended to the Senate an authorization of $25,000,000 for access roads. At the suggestion of the executive department, the authorization was reduced on the floor of the Senate to $10,000,000. It was only a few months afterward, when the Korean situation developed, that the executive department came to Congress and begged for additional funds for access roads.

In this instance, in the pending bill, the committee, after having considered all those matters, decided that an authorization of $50,000,000 would be a very modest one to meet what the committee considered to be the needs of the moment.

It is true that in this instance the money, when appropriated, could be used for a circumferential road around Washington, D. C.; or Detroit, Mich.; or Albuquerque, N. Mex.; or Portland, Oreg.; or other cities.

On the other hand, inasmuch as the matter must be handled through the Bureau of Public Roads, we feel confident that there will not be any abuse of the discretion which must be exercised by someone, and we feel confident that the funds will be spent properly. Of course, the main purpose is to provide access roads.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I know the discretion is to be left to the Department of Defense. I also know there is some controversy and some difference of opinion regarding the extent to which these millions and millions of dollars should be spent within the vicinity of the city of Washington, D. C., to the exclusion of some of the cities which have great industrial activities.

According to the bill, apparently the decision is to be left to the Department of Defense; as such.

I should like to know whether the military authorities or the civil defense authorities have indicated where they would likely use the funds if this authorization bill is passed in the amount now proposed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The request must be submitted by a State and must be certified by the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Yes; I know that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We have in mind actual access roads for defense.

I read further from the bill, in regard to the certification: "or such other official as the President may designate."

I believe those provisions of the bill will take care of the problems which appear to be in the mind of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I wish to be sure that the various States will have opportunity, upon reasonable, equitable, honest showing, to use these funds, when need can be shown. I can well envision that not $50,000,000 but $100,000,000 or $150,000,000 might be spent in the area around Washington, D. C. That would be a substantial addition for things other than strictly defense measures or defense activities. I wish to be sure that some safeguards against that are provided.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am glad the Senator from Kansas has called my attention to this particular matter, because I wish to assure him that the chairman of the committee and, I believe, the committee as a whole wish to make certain that there will be no abuse of the authority granted to any agency of the Federal Government in connection with the distribution and use of the funds authorized by this bill for a particular purpose.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Under section 10, I assume there is no adherence to any formula or pattern for the allocation of any of the $50,000,000 which would be authorized under that section. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The entire discretionary power would rest, would it not, in the Secretary of Defense or other official, who would determine the priority rights of the various projects for which applications would be submitted?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is what they are doing now for actual access roads.

Mr. DWORSHAK. That is a diversion from the regular program which is followed in the allocation of highway funds under the matching program, is it not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Under the present matching program, all 48 States and the Territories share equitably in the allocation of the Federal funds, do they not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. At this point I should like to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, who is in charge of the pending bill, that it is not always true that allocations of funds made available upon a priority basis are allocated impartially among all the applicants.

I should like to point out that, on page 252 of the hearings on this bill, there appears a statement in regard to atomic energy plant access roads, which reads:

These projects are:

In South Carolina, we have five projects serving our Savannah River plant, at an estimated cost of $4,511,000.

In the State of Kentucky, there are three road projects serving our Paducah area plant, at an estimated cost of $746,700.

Is it true that those allocations have been made without any matching of funds by the States in which those projects are located?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I could not answer as to those particular States, but if the Senator will proceed a little further, he will note that, in the States of Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, and Utah, 24 road projects are today serving the raw-materials programs for atomic projects, at an estimated cost of $3,730,800. I know that the State of New Mexico, through its highway department, has contributed some money.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am quite sure that other access roads which penetrate raw-materials areas are not essentially the same as those affecting the projects in South Carolina and Kentucky, to which I referred, which provide access to atomic-energy plants. I am particularly interested in knowing whether there has been any State matching of funds in those particular cases.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Having in mind projects such as those in South Carolina, I may say the matching of funds by States generally occurs when the roads serve the general public. If in the instance of South Carolina the project itself does not serve the public as a whole but is only designed for the benefit of the installation in South Carolina, I should not be surprised if the fact were that matching funds could not be obtained.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I presume that that distinction is correct. However, I wanted to point out that in Idaho at the Arco atomic reacter plant considerable difficulty has been encountered in obtaining any assistance in the rebuilding of highways which have been worn out by the use of trucks hauling supplies to the atomic energy plant. Within the past year we have been unable to get any assistance for that particular project, and the State of Idaho was compelled to utilize its regular highway funds to match Federal aid, in order to reconstruct that highway. It was apparent that the highway would not have required rebuilding had it not been for the stress and strain resulting from the use of the highway by atomic energy plant trucks. In this instance, I feel that our State was not treated as equitably as were the States of South Carolina and Kentucky, when they received funds under the priority system for the reconstruction of roads leading to atomic energy installations.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As a general rule, very few access roads are built to atomic energy installations with money from this fund. It generally applies to military installations, and in this instance it does, as outlined by the committee. In the West there are many mineral resources. I presume that is true of the State of Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In those States a little extra money was desired in order to reach those mineral areas, in connection with the stockpiling program.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I certainly hope that in giving discretionary power to the Secretary of Defense or to other Federal officials to make allocations on the basis of priority, notice will be served upon those officials that they should not consider in any way the political aspects of those priorities, and that the States, regardless of the political character of the State administrations, will be entitled to equitable treatment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As chairman of the committee, I am sure that I am in full accord with the statement of the Senator from Idaho. The roads are not made for political parties. Roads are made for the benefit of the American people. Roads are needed in Republican Pennsylvania as much as in Democratic Mississippi. We are trying to carry out that idea. I may say to the Senator that I have had little difficulty in the matter of the location of access roads where I thought they were necessary. No question was raised because of the fact that I belonged to the opposite political party.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the chairman of the committee for that statement. I share his views in that respect. But I believe that the Public Works Committee of the Senate, as well as comparable committees in the House of Representatives, should make an effort to require the submission of information and data from the executive agencies which control the allocation of these funds, so that we may know and may have assurance that, while they have no pattern and no specific formula to follow in the allocation of funds, all the States which have atomic energy installations, or which needs access roads for the transportation of raw materials or for some other projects, will receive the kind of treatment to which they are entitled.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think the Senator from Idaho is correct. I want to assure him that, in my opinion, the one agency of the Federal Government which has the respect of the Congress and of the American people is the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. DWORSHAK. But is it not true that the Bureau of Public Roads does not determine the allocation of these particular funds? I refer to the $50,000,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Those funds might be designated by the President, because of the proviso contained in section 10, which reads:

> *Provided*, That whenever any project for the construction or improvement of a circumferential highway around a city or of a radial intracity route thereto submitted by any State, is certified by the Secretary of Defense, or such other official as the President may designate—

We had that in mind, as well as the fact that, when it comes to the question of civilian access roads, the Bureau of Public Roads would control.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I have complete confidence in Commissioner MacDonald, of the Bureau of Public Roads, in the matter of the allocation of available highway funds. But in this instance I emphasize that Commissioner MacDonald does not have supervision; that in reality the Secretary of Defense, or such other official as the President may designate, may supersede the officials of the Bureau of Public Roads, and thus may have much greater authority in making the allocations than possibly they should have.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think we can watch any agency of the Federal Government, because I am sure the committee completely agrees with the idea which the Senator from Idaho has in mind regarding proper distribution of the taxpayers' funds for public purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to call up my amendment, identified as "6-2-52—F," and ask that it be read and be made the pending order of business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Illinois that the Senate has not yet completed action upon the committee amendments. When the committee amendments shall have been acted upon, the Senate will then take up the consideration of individual amendments. The question before the Senate at the present time is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Millikin
Anderson	Hendrickson	Monroney
Bridges	Hennings	Moody
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Morse
Byrd	Hill	Mundt
Cain	Hoey	Nixon
Capehart	Holland	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Hunt	Pastore
Chavez	Ives	Robertson
Clements	Jenner	Saltonstall
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Seaton
Dirksen	Kerr	Smathers
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Duff	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Lodge	Stennis
Eastland	Long	Taft
Ellender	Martin	Thye
Ferguson	Maybank	Tobey
Flanders	McCarran	Underwood
Fulbright	McCarthy	Welker
George	McClellan	Wiley
Gillette	McFarland	Williams
Green	McKellar	Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 14, after "(58 Stat. 838)", it is proposed to strike out the colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That not more than 25 percent of the amount apportioned to any State in any year for expenditure on the Federal-aid highway system or on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, respectively, may be transferred from the Federal-aid highway system for expenditure on the Federal-aid secondary highway system or from the Federal-aid secondary highway system for expenditure on the Federal-aid highway system when such transfer is requested and certified as being in the public interest by the State highway department and is approved by the Commissioner of Public Roads."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the remaining committee amendments.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, after line 11, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 2. For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate highways, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law for the apportionment of Federal-aid primary funds: *Provided,* That the Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be determined in the same manner as now provided by law for projects on said Federal-aid primary system.

On page 4, line 4, to change the section number from "2" to "3"; in line 7, after the word "of", to strike out "$32,000,000" and insert "$25,000,000"; in line 11, after the word "of", to strike out "$28,000,000" and insert "$22,500,000"; in line 18, to change the section number from "3" to "4"; in line 19, after the word "improvement", to strike out the comma and "and maintenance."

On page 5, line 1, after the word "of", to strike out "$16,000,000" and insert "$10,000,000"; in line 8, after the word "of", to strike out "$17,000,000" and insert "$10,000,000"; in line 24, to change the section number from "4" to "5"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "section" and insert "for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section."

On page 6, line 4, after "(55 Stat. 860)", to strike out "is hereby amended to read as follows:" and insert "as amended by section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785)"; in line 7, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "There" and insert "there"; in line 16, after the word "and" where it occurs the second time, to insert "completion of"; in line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "one-third"; at the beginning of line 25, to strike out "The expenditures authorized by this section shall be made in accordance with all provisions and limitations in section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950."

On page 7, line 3, to change the section number from "5" to "6"; in line 21, after the word "width", to insert "where practicable."

On page 8, line 13, after "December", to strike out "14" and insert "15"; in line 14, after the word "parties", to insert "or any other treaty or international convention establishing similar reciprocal recognition;"; in line 23, after the name "Rama", to insert "and for a survey but not for the construction of a road from Rama to El Bluff."

On page 9, after line 4, to strike out:

SEC. 6. Not to exceed $15,000,000 of any money heretofore or hereafter appropriated for expenditure in accordance with the provision of the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, shall be available for expenditure by the Commissioner of Public Roads in accordance with the provision of section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785) as an emergency relief fund.

After line 11, to insert:

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized an emergency fund in the amount of $15,000,000 for expenditure by the Commissioner of Public Roads, in accordance with the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, after receipt of an application therefor from the highway department of any State, in the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges on the Federal-aid highway systems, which he shall find have suffered serious damage as the result of disaster over a wide area, such as by floods, hurricanes, tidal waves, earthquakes, severe storms, landslides, or other catastrophies in any part of the United States. The appropriation of such moneys as may be necessary for the initial establishment of this fund and for its replenishment on an annual basis is hereby authorized: *Provided,* That, pending the appropriation of said sum, or its replenishment, the Commissioner of Public Roads may expend, from existing Federal-aid highway appropriations, such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriations herein authorized when made: *Provided further,* That no expenditures shall be made hereunder with respect to any such catastrophe in any State unless an emergency has been declared by the Governor of such State and concurred in by the Secretary of Commerce: *And provided further,* That the Federal share payable on acount of any repair or reconstruction project provided for by funds made available under this section shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost thereof.

On page 10, line 15, to change the section number from "7" to "8"; in line 21, after the word "of", to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$2,500,000"; in line 24 to change the section number from "8" to "9."

On page 11, after line 5, to strike out:

SEC. 9. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765), as amended, and section 12 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $150,000,000 to remain available until expended.

After line 11, to insert:

SEC. 10. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765), as amended, and section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $50,000,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That whenever any project for the construction of improvement of a circumferential highway around a city or of a radial intracity route thereto submitted by any State, is certified by the Secretary of Defense, or such other official as the President may designate, as being important for civilian or military defense, such project may be constructed under the authorization in this section and in accordance with the conditions contained therein.

At the top of page 12, to insert:

SEC. 11. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838); the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1105); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950, not inconsistent with this act, shall remain in full force and effect.

In line 7, to change the section number from "10" to "12"; in line 13, to change the section number from "11" to "13"; and in line 16, to change the section number from "12" to "14."

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "$600,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$400,000,000."

On page 2, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "$270,000,000 and insert in lieu thereof "$190,000,000."

On page 2, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "$180,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$115,000,000."

On page 2, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "$150,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$95,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in 7 years since 1946 the Congress has authorized and the Federal Government will have spent approximately $3,500,000,000 for Federal aid to the States for the construction of highways and roads. The details of these authorizations and appropriations are given on the chart inserted between pages 36 and 37 of the Senate committee hearings.

TWENTY BILLION DOLLARS SPENT FOR ROADS SINCE WORLD WAR II

It will be remembered that this is, of course, merely the Federal share of a joint program. The State and county governments will add at least an equal sum to the Federal appropriation, so the Federal aid appropriations carry with them at least a total of $7,000,000,000 of appropriations for the construction and improvement of the Federal-aid roads of the country. In addition, there have been appropriations by States and local authorities for nonfederally aided highways. There have also been Federal appropriations for various types of

roads which were not a part of the Federal aid system. So I think we can start with the clear knowledge that the United States Government and the State and local governments have spent enormous sums of money for the construction and improvement of the Nation's roads since the conclusion of war. Since World War II the Federal share of the highway funds have amounted to between 10 and 20 percent of all funds spent for roads. Thus, since the war, the country has spent at least $20,000,000,000 for roads.

CONGRESS TREATS HIGHWAY AUTHORIZATIONS THE SAME AS APPROPRIATIONS

In the second place, the debates of this year and of preceding years have made it clear that, so far as the Senate and the House are concerned, Congress will treat authorizations as the equivalent of appropriations. This bill is ostensibly an authorization bill and not an appropriation bill. I do not believe that an authorization constitutes any legally binding obligation upon the Federal Government to appropriate the sums of money so authorized. We hold to this point of view with respect to all other bills except, I believe, this particular type of bill involving highway construction.

As indicated by past votes, this body and the other body are clearly of the opinion that once the authorization is made by Congress and once, indeed, the allocations are fixed by the Bureau of Public Roads for the various States—the Federal Government is then morally committed to appropriate the sums stated. I believe this to be a mistaken point of view and I refer to the Supreme Court decisions in the Charles River Bridge case and Stone against Mississippi to bear me out, but it is the point of view of the Senate and of the House. This point of view is held even though no contracts have been let by the States, and even thought the authorization is merely a letter from the Bureau of Public Roads stating that certain sums will be allocated if satisfactory contracts are made. So make no mistake about it: According to past decisions of the Senate, when we pass an authorization bill for Federal highways and for State-aid systems, we are in effect appropriating the money.

TOTAL AUTHORIZATIONS OF OVER THREE-QUARTERS OF A BILLION DOLLARS A YEAR

The pending bill contains total authorizations of $810,000,000 a year for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, namely, the fiscal year 1953–54 and the fiscal year 1954–55. In some cases, the authorizations are for even longer periods of time. The major share of this $810,000,000 consists of $600,000,000 each year for Federal-aid roads, $50,000,000 each year for interstate highways, and $50,000,000 for circumferential roads. At least $600,000,000 of this will have to be met by the States and localities with equal sums. So in effect we are providing for appropriations of at least $1,400,000,000 a year for roads for each of 2 years.

As I have intimated, in the seven preceding years for which authorizations have been granted, the maximum authorization each year has been $500,000,000. For two of the years, 1950 and 1951, respectively, the authorizations were $450,000,000. So the authorization contained in this bill, on the basis of purely Federal-aid roads, is $100,000,000 a year in excess of the highest authorization provided in the past; and if we include the two added appropriations of $50,000,000 each for interstate highways and for circumferential roads, making a total of $700,000,000, it is about $200,000,000 in excess of the highest appropriations or authorizations of past years—and I shall call them appropriations, because that is what they really are.

This increase is made at a time when the financial situation of the Government is probably at its most desperate point. We need always to remember that the budget submitted by the President called for expenditures of $85,500,000,000, as against anticipated revenues of only $71,000,000,000, producing an administrative deficit of at least $14,000,000,000 for the coming fiscal year. We do not have any real hope that the situation will be any better in 1953–54, or in 1954–55.

CONGRESS SHOULD PRACTICE WHAT IT PREACHES

We criticize the administration from time to time on the excessive amounts of appropriations which they request. I have joined in that criticism. I believe that on the whole the executive departments have not exhibited the degree of prudence in relation to resources which they should observe.

But, Mr. President, in this particular case all that the Bureau of the Budget and the President of the United States asked for, in behalf of the general system of national highways, was $400,000,000. They did ask for $81,000,000 more for forest highways, forest development roads, national park roads, parkway roads, Indian reservation roads, the Inter-American Highway, and the Rama Road. But for the Federal-aid road program they requested only $400,000,000. The committee has reported a bill which increases the figure from $400,000,000 to $700,000,000—$600,000,000 for the Federal-aid system, $50,000,000 for interstate highways, and $50,000,000 for circumferential highways.

That is an increase of $300,000,000 a year, for each of 2 years. If Members of the Senate, who seem to be startled by my statement will turn to the table submitted by the Bureau of the Budget, which is printed at page 179 of the hearings, they will find confirmation of my statement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert, at this point in my remarks, a table comparing the individual requests by the executive agencies with those included in the pending bill, S. 2437.

There being no objection, the table was ordered printed, as follows:

Summary of recommended new highway authorizations, compared with provisions of 1950 Highway Act and S. 2437, by program

[In millions of dollars]

Program	Recommended new level	1950 Highway Act	S. 2437
Annual authorizations:			
Federal-aid highways:			
(a) Primary system	200.0	225.0	270.0
(b) Secondary system	100.0	150.0	180.0
(c) Urban system	100.0	125.0	150.0
Total, Federal-aid highways	400.0	500.0	600.0
Forest highways	17.5	20.0	25.0
Forest development roads and trails	17.5	17.5	22.5
National park roads and trails	10.0	10.0	10.0
Parkways	10.0	13.0	10.0
Indian reservation roads	10.0	6.0	10.0
Public lands highways		5.0	2.5
Interstate highways		(1)	50.0
Authorizations not on an annual basis:			
Inter-American Highway (for completion)	56.0	(2)	[2] 56.0
Rama Road (for completion)	8.0		8.0
Emergency relief fund		5.0	15.0
Access roads	(3)	[4] 10.0	50.0
Total	529.0	586.5	858.0

[1] Interstate system authorized, but funds were to come from funds allocated to primary and urban systems.
[2] Authorization for Inter-American Highway was provided in 1950 Highway Act for 2 years, at annual level of $4,000,000. S. 2437 would provide authorization of $8,000,000 annually for 7 years, thus providing the same total future authorization as is herein recommended.
[3] Request of different agencies varied. Bureau of Public Roads made no request.
[4] Increased to $45 million by Public Law 177, 82d Cong.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to make an observation, in the belief that the Senator from Illinois would wish to have his statement meticulously correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe the Senator from Illinois made one mistake in his statement with reference to the $700,000,000 figure. His statement apparently referred to the $50,000,000 authorized in section 10 of the committee bill as coming within the purview of regular road-construction program and as being available in each of the fiscal years. To the contrary, that $50,000,000 is all for defense highway construction. It is not for each of the fiscal years, but is made available only until expended. Such road construction does not serve as a part of the regular Federal highway system. So I believe the total figure should have been stated as $650,000,000 instead of $700,000,000, unless I misunderstood the Senator's statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator for the emendation. What he says is technically correct. Yet it is also true that there is an added authorization of

$50,000,000, a lump sum, for circumferential highways, which certainly could be woven into the national highway system, and other sums will be requested for the same purpose. Therefore, I should say that it is perhaps a minor correction, but certainly not a major correction.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield again?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. While it is true that a part of the $50,000,000 might be made available eventually for circumferential highways, it is in reality a defense highway appropriation, and not in any of the years to be used for circumferential highways. It is merely a permissive provision, which would permit a portion of the fund, if needed for circumferential highways, to be so used. The primary purpose of the $50,000,000, however, is for defense and access road construction. The hearing showed that more than that sum will be needed during the time covered by the report for strictly defense and access construction purposes, without reference to circumferential highways.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the eminent Senator from Florida whether the administration requested the $50,000,000 under another request or whether this addition was made by the committee?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that the administration, through various agencies, took different positions. The Department of Defense requested $150,000,000. That amount, the Senator will find, was originally included in the bill by the distinguished chairman of the committee in the original section 9, which was stricken by the committee. Other agencies of the administration requested different amounts. The Bureau of the Budget took what the Senator from Florida thought was a very proper position, namely, that this item should be covered by a separate bill. However, we became so pressed for time, and the bill came up so late, that the committee finally agreed to provide only $50,000,000, with full knowledge of the fact that the actual requirements for defense and access highway construction will exceed that amount. The figures were not substantiated in the way the committee felt they should have been before an actual authorization was made.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, if we authorize this additional $50,000,000 for the purposes indicated in section 10, we can be quite certain that there will be further requests made by the departments affected.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The same is true with reference to the Department of Defense. The Commission made it clear that its requests, which I believe aggregated about $18,000,000, would be approximately $40,000,000 before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not wish to debate the point, but would not the Senator from Florida say, therefore, that the Senator from Illinois did not go very far off the beam when he said we would be committed to extra expenditures probably of at least $100,000,000, not $50,000,000?

Mr. HOLLAND. No; the Senator is not correct. The amount is needed for defense and access highways. I am sure that the Senator from Illinois will agree that eventually any amount needed will have to be appropriated. The purpose of the committee in providing this amount was to make sure that there would be no holding up of the construction of needed projects in the field of defense and of access highways while the matter was being further studied. The committee was of the opinion that the final sum would be well in excess of $50,000,000. The Senator is correct in that conclusion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Florida. I should like to point out that my amendment does not propose to reduce the sums provided for circumferential highways; that I did not object when the committee amendment was adopted, and that my amendment is addressed to the Federal-aid system. I was merely trying to give an over-all picture of the sums the Federal Government is being called upon to appropriate at this time.

Mr. President, how can we properly criticize the executive agencies for asking for excessive sums of money when Congress itself proceeds to spend $250,000,000 more a year, for each of 2 years, than the administration itself has asked for? Will not our protests with regard to economy fall upon rather deaf ears if on the items which are so popular with Members of the Senate we increase the administration figures by a quarter of a billion dollars each year for 2 years, or by a total of a half billion dollars? We must be consistent in these matters. If we mean economy, we should practice it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe the Senator from Illinois could be mistaken to this extent. No one wants to waste any money, or spend any more money than is necessary. The general public does not pay the tax which provides the funds in question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my good friend from New Mexico, Mr. President, that we both have gone over that question again and again. It is understood that the revenues derived from the Federal gasoline tax go into the general funds of the Treasury, and are not allocated, either legally or morally, to the specific purpose of road construction. They are a part of the general revenues of the country. They are not earmarked for road construction, any more than the tax on alcoholic liquors is used for the reform of drunkards or to build more beautiful taverns.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The money is specially provided by the road users for the purpose of road construction.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is provided by the road users for the general purposes of the United States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; for roads. I do not agree with the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The parliamentary record and the constitutional record is perfectly clear that such revenues are not earmarked, but go into the general funds of the Treasury.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator will be patient with me, I should like to proceed a little further.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe the Senator is completely wrong, not in trying to save money, but in trying to cut down on something that should be done. The Federal Government collects approximately $2,000,000,000 from automobile users; but now some persons say that there is involved a waste of money, in spite of the fact that it is proposed that Congress, in order to continue a necessary road system, reduce the authorization to one-quarter of the $2,000,000,000, or to $500,000,000 or $600,000,000.

The Federal Government uses in the General Treasury the remainder of the money which is paid by the automobile users; and that money does not come from a general tax.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am not a constitutional lawyer; but if my good friend, the Senator from New Mexico, will examine the Butler case, in which the Supreme Court rendered an opinion in 1935, as I recall, he will find that in that case the Supreme Court ruled that the original Agricultural Adjustment Administration was unconstitutional because the tax money collected under it was earmarked. The decision was on that specific point, and I think the opinion in the Butler case is controlling and decisive on that issue.

The revenues collected from gasoline are no more earmarked for the highways than the tax revenues collected from liquor are earmarked for the reform of drunkards, or the tax revenues collected on tobacco are earmarked to be used to cure people of the tobacco habit.

I see my good friend, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] rising, no doubt to ask a question. Of course, he is known not to be addicted to the use of either liquor or tobacco; and, accordingly, he does not need to be cured of those habits. Therefore, I am glad to yield to him.

Mr. KERR. I suppose my good friend, the Senator from Illinois, realizes that the past week end saw the largest number of traffic fatalities that have occurred in any week end during the history of the Nation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was on the roads at that time, and I believe the statement the Senator from Oklahoma has made is a correct one.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator from Illinois aware that in view of the terrific increase in the number of automotive units on the highways and the fact that we are not building highways as rapidly as they are being worn out or becoming obsolete, the traffic conditions on our highways cannot fail to result in still greater fatalities, unless we not only improve the safety factors on our highways, but also enlarge the highways, so they will be adequate for the great volume of traffic they have to carry?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In reply, let me inquire whether my good friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, is aware of the

fact that since the war the Federal Government has appropriated $3,500,000,000 for Federal-aid highways, which amount, when added to the State and local appropriations, represents a minimum of $7,000,000,000, and that total expenditures for this purpose have been about $20,000,000,000? The poor highways are not being starved. Is my friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, aware of that fact?

Mr. KERR. I am aware of it, but——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am delighted that the Senator from Oklahoma is aware of that fact.

Mr. KERR. But I am also aware of the well-established fact that even so, we do not have today a highway system sufficient for the traffic it carries. Indeed, it is insufficient by a very substantial percentage; and in proportion to the traffic it bears, it is not comparable to the highway system we had prior to World War II.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the eminent Senator from Oklahoma aware of the fact that the budget, as submitted for the current year, will cause a deficit of $14,000,000,000, and that in order to meet that budget, the Government will have to float bonds, with a resultant increase in bank credit and inflation? Does the Senator from Oklahoma think those facts have any place in this discussion?

Mr. KERR. Yes; I am perfectly aware of the point the Senator from Illinois has made, namely, that there will be a deficit in the budget of the Federal Government for the coming fiscal year.

However, I wish to ask my friend, the Senator from Illinois, this question: As between a slightly greater financial deficit, on the one hand, and a greater deficit in human lives, on the other hand, which would the Senator from Illinois choose?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me ask my eminent friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, whether he read the road article which appeared in last Sunday's issue of the magazine, This Week. In that article it is stated—and it is stated on good authority, I believe—that the new superhighways in many cases are more dangerous than the older ones were. The article states:

> Critics of the superroads label the turnpike "speedways to death." The fact remains that our superhighways, built to eliminate most driving hazards, have created others of their own.

Some of the new hazards listed were inducements to greater speed, "high-speed hypnosis," and "outside factors." Has the Senator from Oklahoma read this article?

Mr. KERR. I did not read the article.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I advise the Senator from Oklahoma to read the article. He will find it very informative.

Mr. KERR. I wish to say to my friend, the Senator from Illinois, that I do not care who says better highways increase traffic fatalities on the roads; anyone who makes that statement is mistaken. I know that not only from the studies I made as Governor of my State, but also from the studies I have made as a member of the Committee on Public Works. I must say that common sense would compel us to realize that better roads and safer roads would decrease traffic fatalities, rather than increase them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed, at the conclusion of my remarks, the article on roads which appeared in last Sunday's issue of the magazine This Week. I make this request in order that both the Senator from Oklahoma and I may study the article.

Mr. KERR. I thank my friend for the opportuinty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of Mr. DOUGLAS' remarks.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Are we to understand that the Senator from Illinois is arguing that we should not have better highways?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, not at all. I am simply prcposing that we should not overtax the United States in connection with our spending for highways.

Mr. LONG. Of course the Senator from Illinois knows that the amount we pay for gasoline taxes, according to the statement I have heard here, is more than the amount that we are spending for highways. I believe the public would like to feel that the money it is paying in gasoline taxes will be used for highway construction.

I know that in my State the members of the public pay a high gasoline tax. Obviously they would be somewhat more receptive to that tax if they felt they were getting highways for it, rather than to have the tax money used for other purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my good friend, the Senator from Louisiana, that I think probably he was not in the Chamber a few minutes ago when I had a colloquy on this point with the Senator from New Mexico.

It is clearly established, particularly by the Butler decision on the Agricultural Adjustment Administration Act in 1935, that under our constitutional system, taxes cannot be earmarked for expenditure on specific projects or for specific purposes. All taxes must move into the General Treasury, and the appropriating function is then separated from the taxing function. That is clear.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator from Illinois will find that if the Government decides to do so, it can dedicate funds.

If I correctly recall—and I say frankly that I have not read the case for a long time—the Butler case merely involved a standing to sue, in a case in which a taxpayer was arguing that he had a right to sue against a program under which the funds were dedicated to use in an unconstitutional purpose.

Nevertheless, I believe the Senator from Illinois will find that if the Government desires to earmark funds for a particular purpose, so long as that purpose is authorized and is within the constitutional power of the Government, that can be done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As I have said, I am not a constitutional lawyer, and I certainly do not wish to pretend that my opinions are authoritative; but, as I remember that case, the revenues derived from the processing tax established by the original Triple A Act were to be used for the specific purpose of paying bonuses to farmers who restricted output. The Court held that such an earmarking of funds was in itself unconstitutional. So I think there is a very clear decision on that point.

I believe the point to which the Senator from Louisiana had reference was first raised in the Federal-aid suit which was begun in the State of Massachusetts and which was decided in the case of Frothingham against Mellon, a case in which the Supreme Court, by unanimous opinion, declared that a suit of an individual taxpayer to restrain enforcement of an act of Congress authorizing appropriations of public money, upon the ground that the act is invalid, cannot be entertained in equity—Two Hundred and Sixty-second United States Statutes, page 448.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly; I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. Certainly within many States and, I know, within my own State, there is the principle of dedication of funds. In many States, funds are dedicated to roads.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; that is true on the State level; but I believe the Senator from Louisiana will find that on the Federal level that is constitutionally impossible. On the Federal level, the revenues, when collected, have to be mixed with the general revenues, rather than be siphoned off for specific purposes.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. CAIN. I have only one question at this point.

Will the Senator from Illinois estimate the dollar amount which would be required thoroughly to modernize the Nation's highway system, if our assumption is that we have available to be spent all the money we want to spend on important national projects?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I doubt if experts could ever agree on such a question. I would say to the Senator from Washington that if we take each of the amounts which it is said is absolutely essential in order to develop essential projects, and if we combine all those figures, we arrive at a total figure infinitely greater than the resources of the United States.

I believe I heard the Senator from New Mexico state that a total of $32,000,000,000 would be required for the highways of the country. I have heard similar statements. In connection with flood control it was said that $60,000,000,000 would be needed. I have heard statements to the effect that in order to

provide adequate irrigation systems $40,000,000,000 or $50,000,000,000 would be needed, and that in order to provide other improvements of one kind or another, $30,000,000,000 or $40,000,000,000 more would be required.

The point is that each group pushes its demands to perfection, to the point where there must be an absolutely perfect system. My contention is that the resources of the United States are not unlimited, that a point is reached where the returns in productivity from a given unit of investment decline, and that we cannot push everything to perfection. We cannot have in any near future a perfect highway system, a perfect irrigation system, a perfect rivers-and-harbor system, a perfect navigation system; everything perfect. We become guilty of the great fault which is common in the Army of thinking that each piece of equipment must be prepared for every emergency, and that the tables of organization must provide for all emergencies happening simultaneously. There is in that idea a startling logical fallacy.

Mr. CAIN. The distinguished Senator, however, appears to be stating that he has given no particular personal study to the present status of the Nation's highway system.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ride over the highways, I read books about the highways. I do not pretend to be an expert or an authority upon the subject of highways, but I do know something about the general financial situation of the country. I am trying as best I can, undoubtedly imperfectly, to fit this request for highway appropriations into the general financial picture of the country.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator for his answer.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The junior Senator from Virginia desires first to comment on the suggestion of his colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. CAIN], which is that, in view of the fact that we now have approximately 50,000,000 motor vehicles, including automobiles, trucks, and so forth, our highway system is by no means adequate.

The junior Senator from Virginia wholly endorses the statement of the distinguished Senator from Illinois that the resources of the United States are not inexhaustible. We have a direct national debt of $260,000,000,000. We have an indirect debt ranging from $50,000,000,000 to $100,000,000,000. We have accumulated pension demands estimated by some to be as high as $250,000,000,000. We have a contemplated expenditure within the coming fiscal year of $80,000,000,000. We have a contemplated deficit in the coming fiscal year of $11,800,000,000. I wholly agree with the distinguished Senator from Illinois that, until we can get past the highly inflationary effect of deficit spending, on top of back-breaking debts and taxation, we should prudently curtail wherever possible all domestic expenditures.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I can tell this distinguished body that when we authorize funds for State aid to highways we have to appropriate those funds, because we of the Appropriations Committee are not in a position to cut them down after the authorizations come to us. The Bureau of Public Roads says, "We have allocated these funds to the States, they have let their contracts, they have started work, and the Federal Government must pay what has been allocated." They allocate it before Congress ever appropriates.

As I understand, the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Illinois would reduce the total of Federal highway aid. The Senator from Virginia frankly admits that the improvement of our highways is one of the most valuable works to which the Federal Government contributes. We receive value from it, because it is under the jurisdiction of the States, and they put up 50 percent of the money and are therefore cautious with their own money. We need the roads. But the Senator from Virginia understands that the Senator from Illinois seeks to reduce the total aid for primary roads to the budget estimate of $200,000,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It amounts to an appropriation of the total figure recommended by the budget of $200,000,000 for each of the next 2 years for primary roads.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then the Senator from Virginia understands that the Senator from Illinois has slightly modified the allocation of the budget, which was to be $200,000,000 for arterial highways, $100,000,000 for the farm-to-market roads, and $100,000,000 for urban development.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that my allocation is a little more favorable to the rural roads than to the urban. Coming from an urban area myself, I leaned over backwards to be fair to the rural areas.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then the reports which the junior Senator from Virginia received, that the Senator was leaning over backward in favor of the big cities was in error, and I am very happy to join with him in being a little more liberal to the rural areas and in assistance to our farmers, if I correctly understand that to be the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then do I correctly understand that the amendment would take $10,000,000 from the so-called arterial or tourist roads, and add $10,000,000 to the farm-to-market roads, and not to the urban roads? Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator from Virginia will look at the hearings, on page 179—I presume there is a copy of the hearings on his desk—he will find the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget, called for $200,000,000 for the primary system, $100,000,000 for the secondary system, and $100,000,000, for the urban roads.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Unfortunately, the Senator from Virginia does not have before him a copy of the hearings. The Senator from Illinois can tell me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The recommended new level for the urban system was $100,000,000. In other words, the percentages were 50, 25, and 25.

I changed that to provide $190,000,000 for the primary system instead of $200,000,000 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget; $115,000,000 for the secondary or rural roads, instead of $100,000,000, and $95,000,000 for the urban roads, instead of $100,000,000. In other words, I gave a break to the secondary roads, although we proposed to cut both secondary and urban roads in a somewhat greater proportion than the primary system. I think there are dubious grounds, for going into this system of secondary roads, but I did not want to raise that issue in this connection, and I leaned over backward as a matter of fact to be fair. excessively fair, to the rural areas.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The junior Senator from Virginia was a cosponsor of the bill which created the State highway department in Virginia, of a bill to create a State highway system, and he was a member of the commission which laid out that highway system. He has followed the development of roads in Virginia with great interest ever since. At the present time we have approximately 50,000 miles of highways in Virginia, and with all due modesty, the Senator from Virginia believes that the Virginia system compares favorably with that of any other State. We do not have a dollar of road debt or of any other debt. In fact, the revenue was so much above receipts that we refunded 20 percent of the income taxes last year.

Of course, I wish the Federal Government were in as good condition as that. In Virginia we have about 4 miles of rural roads for each mile of arterial roads, and I can frankly say that the increased percentage for rural roads proposed by the Senator from Illinois would be quite popular in Virginia.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Virginia. I appreciate the statesmanship of the Senator from Virginia in supporting the proposed reduction of $200,000,000 or back to the budget total. I should like to make two comments about the matter, namely, that generally, in my judgment, the Bureau of the Budget and the executive agencies are commonly too liberal in recommending appropriations, but here is a case where Congress exceeds the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget by $250,000,000 a year for each of 2 years, or a 60-percent increase above the figures of the Bureau of the Budget. I think in this bill we should go back to the Bureau's figures.

The second point I should like to make is that one of the great organizations of this country is the American Farm Bureau Federation. It is composed, in the main, of successful farmers who use the roads perhaps more than do any other single group. It would be thought, therefore, if they consulted their own interests, that they would be in favor of very large appropriations for roads, but the American Farm Bureau in the past 2 years has taken the most statesmanlike attitude as to public expenditures of any organized group in the Nation. They have subordinated their class interests in appropriations to the general desire for national solvency. We shall find some of their suggestions coming

up when we consider the agricultural appropriation bill at a later date.

The American Farm Bureau has taken a stand. It filed a statement with two congressional committees, recommending that the authorization be held at the $400,000,000 level recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for each of the next 2 years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the American Farm Bureau be printed at this point in my remarks, but I should like to read certain passages from it for the benefit of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FB ASKS $200,000,000 CUT IN FEDERAL-AID ROAD FUNDS—CONGRESS TOLD BALANCED BUDGET MORE ESSENTIAL

The American Farm Bureau Federation, in a statement filed with two congressional committees, has recommended that the Federal-aid authorization for Federal-aid highway systems be held at the $400,000,000 level for each of the next 2 years.

That would be $100,000,000, or a 20-percent cut, under the authorization for each of the past 2 years.

The statement was filed with the House and Senate Public Works Committees which recently concluded hearings on Federal-aid road bills.

AFBF said that, while adequate rural roads are essential to satisfactory farm living standards, "we must, without fail, reduce the Federal budget so that we can pay the bill."

"The construction and maintenance of highways requires great sums of money annually," the statement said. "The Federal Government is faced with a heavy financial burden to prepare our Nation for defense. It becomes necessary, therefore, to make a choice between having all roads in the highest state of utility which we would like, and which we believe are ultimately necessary, and expenditures deemed necessary to prepare our Nation to defend itself."

The farm bureau said it is convinced that State governments are able to maintain the standards of construction and maintenance of highways "for which they have long had the major share of financial and administrative responsibility—a responsibility which we believe should be continued and strengthened."

As for the division of Federal highway aid between primary, secondary, and roads for urban areas, AFBF recommended that it be made on the same basis as provided in the 1950 act. That act authorized 45 percent of the total authorization for primary systems, 30 percent for the secondary system including rural roads, and 25 percent for roads in urban areas.

The AFBF suggested that "as the defense effort diminishes that Congress should promptly take cognizance of the conditions of the highways and begin preparation for a more adequate program of maintenance, improvement, and construction."

Mr. DOUGLAS. I now read a paragraph from the statement, as follows:

The construction and maintenance of highways require great sums of money annually. The Federal Government is faced with a heavy financial burden to prepare our Nation for defense. It becomes necessary, therefore, to make a choice between having all roads in the highest state of utility which we would like, and which we believe are ultimately necessary, and expenditures deemed necessary to prepare our Nation to defend itself.

The recommendation of this great organization is that the appropriation—and I call it an appropriation because it is such; it is not merely an authorization; it is not legally an appropriation, but in practice it is an appropriation—be reduced by $200,000,000.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to invite the Senator's attention to the provision of his amendment, ignoring for the moment the total amount, which makes a division of the funds as between the primary system, the secondary system, and the urban system of roads. The Senator from Illinois will recall that the historic formula agreed on by the Congress for a number of years was based on testimony and trial and error. It provides that 45 percent shall be allotted to the primary system, 30 percent to the secondary system, and 25 percent to the urban system, which is the primary system in the cities. The Senator changes that distribution——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very slightly.

Mr. STENNIS. In the case of the primary system from 45 to 47 percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. In the case of the secondary system from 30 to 29 percent, and in the case of the urban system from 25 to 24 percent. The Senator has not given a reason for this change as yet.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The change is a very minute one. It is really designed as a compromise between the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget and the recommendations in the pending bill. The Bureau recommended a division on the basis of 50 percent for primary roads, 25 percent for secondary or feeder roads, and 25 percent for urban roads. My proposal is half way in between—47½ percent for primary roads instead of the 45 percent and the 50 percent recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, and 29 percent for rural roads instead of the present 30 and 24 percent for urban highways instead of 25 percent.

I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Mississippi to the fact that, again, the Senator from Illinois has been more generous in the reductions he has proposed toward the rural areas than toward the urban areas, as compared with the proposal of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. STENNIS. As a matter of fact, the Senator, more or less by a stroke of the pen, is changing the historic formula which has worked well over the years, and he is doing it without any scientific basis or any hearings or facts on which to base the change. Is not that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the Senator from Mississippi will forgive me if I say that if he opposes the amendment on that ground, he is straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. What I am really proposing is that we get back to the total figures of the Bureau of the Budget, namely, $400,000,000, giving the rural roads a little more than the Bureau of the Budget gave them——

Mr. STENNIS. What reason does the Bureau give and what reason does the Senator give for making this change? First, what reason did the Bureau of the Budget give?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Mississippi and I had a colloquy, I believe, 2 years ago on this very point. It is very difficult to establish a case where secondary roads are of equal importance with primary roads. Feeder roads should primarily be the responsibility of the States and localities. If we do not believe in the Federal Government interfering in local affairs, why should the Federal Government build feeder roads from towns off the main highways? I know this is a somewhat unwary statement of mine, because my present proposal has nothing to do with that issue. I merely think that in the long run the Senator from Mississippi—I know he has done it in perfect good faith—has suggested a precedent which is dangerous to the distribution of responsibility between the Federal Government and the State governments, and, without meaning to do so, he has been advocating a big Federal Government at the expense of localities. But I waive that point. My primary purpose is to get a reduction of $200,000,000, while at the same time decreasing the percentage for rural roads from 30 to 29 percent and urban roads from 25 to 24 percent.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator takes from the secondary system a part of the fund and allots it to the primary system. We recognized the increased need of the primary system when we provided initially a $50,000,000 fund for the so-called interstate system. Does not the Senator think that whatever problem there is in connection with the primary roads can well be handled by establishing the interstate system and designating so much money as the Congress may see fit to provide to take care of the increased burden without disturbing the time-proved formula?

Mr. DOUGLAS. What I am trying to effect is a reduction of one-third in the total appropriation——

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me state what I am trying to effect, please. Would not the Senator from Mississippi support this proposal if we made a flat reduction of one-third in the items, which would mean reducing the sum for primary highways from $270,000,000 to $180,000,000; reducing the amount for the secondary system from $180,000,000 to $120,000,000 instead of $115,000,000; and reducing the sum for urban roads from $150,000,000 to $95,000,000?

Would the Senator from Mississippi, under those conditions, support my amendment? I am ready to present it if I can get his support.

Mr. STENNIS. The top figure is a debatable matter to be decided in the wisdom of the individual Members after hearing the facts. I voted in recognition of the increased traffic on our highways. That is a matter to be decided. I do not argue it particularly, but I want to preserve the formula. I submit that even though the Senator can rightly favor a decreased figure, he is not justified in disturbing the formula.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would say that the Senator from Mississippi is really straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. He is straining at a 1-percent reduction in the formula, but is swallowing a $200,000,000 added authorization. I say that with pain, because there is no Member of the Senate for whom I have greater respect than the Senator from Mississippi, who is always courteous, fairminded, generous, and kindly. I say that sincerely.

Mr. STENNIS. The $200,000,000 is certainly based upon a very strong array of undisputed facts which justify that amount.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is really an increase of $250,000,000, as the Senator knows.

Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If I understood the Senator from Illinois correctly, he was objecting very strenuously to having the Federal Government control some of the roads contemplated. Nevertheless, he is willing to trust the Bureau of the Budget, but not a committee of this body. The difficulty with the Senator from Illinois is that at times he tries to give the impression that he is the only one who is trying to be honest in these days.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, from time to time the Senator from New Mexico has implied that that was the effort of the senior Senator from Illinois. There was an indirect reference made to the same effect yesterday by the Senator from New Mexico. There have been previous references of that kind, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show.

I may say that it is not pleasant for the Senator from Illinois to stand on the floor of the Senate and propose reductions. I know perfectly well that when I do, I am stepping on the toes of Members of the Senate who are interested, and honestly interested, in the program under discussion.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. First I wish to complete my reply to the Senator from New Mexico, who has made a direct implication that I believe I am the only Member of the Senate who tries to be honest or economical. I may say that that is not my purpose, intention, or idea at all. I think that I am conscious of my own faults. I do not pretend that I am right all the time. I know I am wrong some of the time, though I cannot pick out the individual occasions when I am wrong. But I have had to assume an ungrateful task—and I know how ungrateful it is. I know the natural tendency of Senators is to accept committee reports, lest we hurt the feelings of the chairmen and members of the committees. The result is that unless some Senator rises on the floor of the Senate and at least questions the reports of committees, bills go through with great speed.

In the pending bill, and in other bills which have come before the Senate, it seems to me that, on the whole, committees have been recommending the appropriation of larger sums of money than the financial situation of the country justifies. Believe me, I had to summon up my courage this morning when I rose to offer this amendment. Unpleasant as it is to me, without any idea at all that I am superior to any other Member of the Senate, because I know I am not, I have to move in a direction which, on the whole, seems to me to be in the public interest.

I wish the Senator from New Mexico, who is a very fine gentleman, would not constantly imply that because I desire to effect economy, I therefore believe I have a monopoly on virtue, and that I think I am always right. I only ask that to the degree to which my arguments have merit, and only to that degree, they be considered by Senators. I am sure they will not be considered by them with any prejudice in my favor. I simply ask that they be considered with as little prejudice against me as the arguments may warrant.

Does the Senator from New Mexico wish to make any reply? I shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. THYE. I followed very carefully the explanation of the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I personally wish to commend him for his efforts to economize, not only on this particular item, but on other items of appropriations. Had I not studied the problems of various State highway departments as thoroughly as it was necessary for me to study them some years ago, when I had the responsibilities of State government, and as I have studied them in later years, I would not have found that there is a great demand upon all States of the Union, as well as the Federal Government, to improve highways because of the tremendous traffic demands upon them. We see our roads destroyed faster than we are able to build or maintain them. There is not one of us who could not drive into our States and find highways which have been literally pounded to pieces in the past 6 months by the heavy traffic to which they have been subjected.

Within the past 6 weeks it was necessary for me to drive practically the full length of the State of Minnesota. Highways which I had personally observed constructed in the past 10 years were literally going to pieces on grades and in the cuts of hills, where the so-called bottom or support of the concrete slab was not sufficient to keep the concrete from breaking and cracking up.

Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Illinois for allowing me the opportunity to make these few comments. I know I am trespassing on his time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no.

Mr. THYE. I appreciate his courtesy. There is no person for whom I have greater admiration, not only because of his courage, but also his understanding of government, than the senior Senator from Illinois.

Reverting to the highway question, any of us who stand here and oppose a $200,000,000 economy move are immediately going to be attacked by the taxpayers, because they will think us spendthrifts. They will think we have no common sense left within us. I take that chance by speaking in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The senior Senator from Illinois will never say or think that the Senator from Minnesota is a spendthrift or devoid of common sense. We can have honest differences of opinion on these matters without labeling each other as tax wasters or as undue penny pinchers.

Mr. THYE. Every single month additional fleets of semitrailer trucks go out on the highways. They pay a tax, it is true. They not only pay a user's tax, but they pay taxes on oil, gasoline, tires, and accessories. All that is revenue for the Federal Government which aids in defraying the expenses of government, and certainly it is a form of revenue which was supported at the time of the first enactment of the legislation by the great users of the highways, for the reason that if the tax were imposed and revenue was derived there would be an improvement made in the arterial highway system of this land.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No such contract was ever made, either implicitly or explicitly.

Mr. THYE. I will grant that there was no such contract written into the statute.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There was no such understanding.

Mr. THYE. But in the public hearings there was moral support for the legislation when it was before the committee, and when the proposed additional tax was being advocated in legislative measures, the users of highways oftentimes supported such measures. Only in that way could such a bill gather the support necessary to make it possible of enactment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have just read into the RECORD a statement by the group representing the largest users of the highways, the American Farm Bureau. Much as they want highways, they believe that the financial condition of the country is so critical that we should authorize not $600,000,000, but instead $400,000,000, as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and by the senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I fully appreciate the importance of that very fine farm organization. I have been affiliated with it during all the years of my adult life. I fully appreciate the splendid public service it always renders. I wish to support it in every instance in which I can do so. If I had not seen the highway conditions in some of the Northwest States, as I have had the privilege of witnessing them in the past year, and had I not seen what I thought was a perfect pavement 10 years ago pounded to pieces in the past 2 or 3 years because of excessive traffic on the highways and the excess tonnage to which the highways are subjected, I would be inclined to say that I would follow the recommendations of the farm organization and of the senior Senator from Illinois.

If I had not seen with my own eyes that the State highway departments and the county highway organizations, as well as the supervisors in charge of the township roads, are unable to maintain

them and keep pace with the ever-increasing traffic on the highways; and if I had not witnessed these things as one who had the responsibility of State government for several years, I would not stand here and oppose the recommendation of the fine farm organization to which reference has been made, nor would I be so bold as to oppose the very able and studious Senator from Illinois. But I am compelled by my own convictions and my own observations to try to give aid to the State highway commissioners, who are unable to meet the demands made upon them in the construction and maintenance of highways for which they have responsibility.

If in the event of a great emergency our transportation system should fail, we would be criticized as a legislative body for having neglected to aid the highway departments in the States to meet the demands upon them in the construction and maintenance of highways adequate to carry the load of today, and the anticipated load of tomorrow. The revenue from gasoline and lubricating oil alone is $694,000,000. The tax on automobiles, trucks, accessories, and tires amounts to a total of $1,005,000,000. In the present fiscal year the revenue is bound to be increased by reason of increased taxes written into the tax measure of a year ago.

That is the reason why I feel that in the pending bill the committee was entirely justified in recommending $600,000,000 for Federal aid for highways in the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I had really finished my remarks when the Senator from Minnesota began. I now yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

HOW TO STAY ALIVE ON SUPERHIGHWAYS

(By Norman Carlisle and Leonard Paris)

A new era of high-speed automobile travel is forcing us all to adjust our sights. Within the next 2 years it should be possible to drive all the way from Portland, Maine, to Chicago without a traffic light. On superhighways cutting wide swaths across the Nation, we're unsnarling traffic tangles that have plagued us for years.

But we are also killing ourselves and each other on these same dream roads. For despite every precaution highway police could take, more people were killed on the parkways and superhighways last year than ever before. The skyrocketing rate of traffic strongly indicates that 1952 will set new and grimmer records.

Critics of the superroads label the turnpikes "speedways to death." Fair charge or not, the fact remains that our superhighways, built to eliminate most driving hazards, have created others of their own.

Chief among these hazards is speed. It is still the No. 1 killer on all roads. It is an even greater menace on the superhighways. Without traffic lights, crossroads, sharp curves, or steep grades, the motorist can zip along at a rate he's never dared before. His chances of an accident caused by speed are therefore much greater.

A second danger on the superhighways is something called "high-speed hypnosis"—a trance-like state induced by mile after mile of effortless driving. In its acute stage it may become actual dozing. In its more insidious form it is a temporary loss of alertness.

The third hazard of the superhighways is one which no driver and no safety engineer can control. It is the danger of accidents caused by outside factors—the weather, mechanical failures, and what the other fellow may do. This danger, too, is common to all roads, but it is doubly terrifying on the superhighways because of speed.

Let's look at these dangers, one by one, and see what you, as a driver, can do about them. First, speed.

The matter of safe speed is, of course, relative. It's not just a figure on a signpost; it's the rate at which you still have your car in control. On a bumpy, winding road, that may be 35. On a superhighway, it could be twice that fast. It depends on you, the driver.

What may be a safe speed for someone else may not be for you. You can go 70 miles an hour on the Pennsylvania Turnpike. That's the legal limit. And many a driver who's never been over 50 before will cut loose on that broad white band of concrete. Why not? What can happen?

Plenty, say the experts. Particularly if you're not used to doing 70. "Most of us," says Burton W. Marsh, director of the Traffic Safety Department of the AAA, "simply aren't so constructed that we can come from months of driving experience at speeds of from 25 to 55 miles per hour, and suddenly drive upwards of 70 without greatly increasing the danger of accidents."

RULES FOR TURNPIKERS

The Pennsylvania Turnpike's police coordinator, Joe Vent, suggests that every driver's license ought to carry the top rate at which the particular driver can safely travel. So rule No. 1 for superhighway drivers is: Drive only at your safe speed. If you're used to driving no more than 60, don't go above it.

So many accidents on the turnpikes just needn't have happened. Just before Christmas last year, only 43 days after New Jersey's new 118-mile turnpike was opened to traffic, five United States marines were killed on the road when their car struck the rear end of a truck. The giant vehicle was pulling back onto the right-hand lane after stopping on the shoulder, when the homeward-bound marines crashed into it. Tragic as this accident was, and needless as it seems in view of the wide passing areas and ample shoulders, it was a common variety of turnpike wreck.

Time after time on the superhighways, speeding automobiles have crashed into the rear of others traveling slower. Attempting to pass a slow-moving vehicle, they have misgaged their distances and failed to turn out soon enough. Some motorists, turning into roadside service stations, have plunged headlong into parked cars. Apparently they did not realize how long it would take them to stop at such a high rate of speed.

Thus we come to rule No. 2: Remember that speed can stretch your reaction time. It will take you many times as much space to turn out or stop when you're traveling at top speed.

A corollary of this rule, prompted by the large number of smash-ups resulting when a passing car cuts in front too soon, has been stated by G. B. Gilbert, the Pennsylvania Turnpike's assistant chairman:

Rule No. 3: Perfect your technique of passing at high speeds. You've been used to getting back into your lane as fast as possible. Turnpike experts warn, "Take your time."

WHEN YOU FORGET SPEED

Another thing about speed. After miles of driving with your foot to the floor, you get used to it. You're doing 70, but you feel and act as if it were 40. The experts call it "velocitization." Whatever its name, it can play tricks on you and your ability to act in an emergency. Unless you're aware all the time of how fast you're going, you may try to stop on a dime as you would in city traffic.

Rule No. 4, therefore, is: Remember that speed grows on you. A long superhighway can become so familiar that you forget how fast you're going. If you drive at night, keep a dashboard light on the speedometer to remind you.

In high-speed driving, the penalties for any mistakes are terribly high. A brief moment's inattention can mean the difference between life and death.

In an accident on the Pennsylvania Turnpike, a young driver simply took one hand from the wheel to adjust the seat. He was traveling so fast that he lost control and crashed into a bridge abutment. No safety engineer could have prevented the death of the three persons in that car.

Rule No. 5: Make driving your only business on the road. If you want to light a cigarette, fiddle with the radio, or reach into the glove compartment, pull off onto the shoulder.

So far, our rules about speed do not vary a great deal from the common sense we've been hearing for years. But some drivers seem to feel that common sense can be forgotten on the superhighways. "After all," they point out, "these roads were built for speed and safety."

That's true. The superroads under construction today are engineered for as much safety as the experts can put in them. Lessons learned every day on the turnpikes are being translated into new safety measures. Passing zones are being widened. Opposing lanes of traffic are being separated by broader strips, often with inside shoulders. Flashing traffic signals to warn of danger are being installed.

But no matter how good the engineering, you as a driver can be hurt by the new and unaccustomed speed you're allowed. As the National Safety Council puts it: "The faster you go, the less time there is to get out of a jam."

That is a good thing to remember about the first—and greatest—hazard of the superhighways: speed.

The second big danger on the turnpikes is "high-speed hypnosis." Whether it is a by-product of speed or of monotony and other factors, nobody knows for sure. The way the AAA experts figure it, the steady hum of the tires, the unbroken purr of the engine, the effortless driving somehow create a spell that turns the driver into a robot without conscious control of his car. Psychologists of the driving laboratory at Iowa State College are studying the phenomenon, but it is too early for final results.

HYPNOTIZED DRIVERS

Dr. A. R. Lauer, director of the driving laboratory, points out that almost all hypnotic techniques involve concentration on some specific object for a period of time, with as few distractions as possible. These conditions are met on the highway by driving steadily behind another vehicle for mile after mile, without distractions.

For instance, a car may travel along a superhighway at about the same speed as a truck, rolling along behind it evenly. Then the truck slows, pulls off onto the shoulder. As if drawn by an invisible tow-line, the car behind turns off too, but fails to slow down and crashes into the rear of the truck.

Fantastic? Perhaps, but it has happened more than once. How else can we explain those weird rear-end collisions where there are no skidmarks on the pavement, indicating that the driver didn't even try to stop? It's as though he hadn't seen the car ahead at all.

No one knows how many accidents are caused by highway hypnosis. There is no way to find out. You can't question a dead driver. Those who walk away from wrecks will seldom admit that they've wool-gathered at the wheel.

But most motorists will admit that highway hypnosis does exist. They've experienced it themselves. On ordinary highways

they are jolted out of it by the rigors of the road—lights, turns, crossroads, opposing traffic. But on superhighways they can drive in a semidaze for miles, unable to collect their wits when a crisis arises. And since they're going so fast, if anything does happen, it's likely to be fatal.

DEATH FOR SLEEPERS

The hazard is increased with every mile of distance. On a road like the Pennsylvania Turnpike, which sweeps along for 327 miles (with more being added), highway hypnosis becomes something to look out for. Without a grade over 3 percent, without a pedestrian, a red light, or a town, any driver may succumb to hypnosis.

Some motorists actually do go to sleep at the wheel. It can happen to you, if you start out feeling tired. On the turnpike your drowsiness can be aggravated by speed, monotony, and the absence of driving challenges. But you can do one big thing to fight it:

Rule No. 6: Get plenty of rest before you start a long drive on a superhighway. Don't drive if you're feeling tired.

Engineers recognize the danger of hypnosis. To combat it on the newer superhighways, they have been ingenious. On the New Jersey Turnpike, for instance, long straight tangents have been purposely avoided, with the thought that occasional gentle curves will serve to keep drivers alert. Ohio is considering using alternate strips of concrete and bituminous pavement on its new turnpike, to give drivers a frequent change in driving conditions. The distance between opposite-bound lanes of travel may also be varied, and the levels of the lanes in relation to each other, as on the Taconic State Parkway in New York.

But engineering alone cannot solve the problem. You can help to protect yourself from highway hypnosis by following rule No. 7: When momentary diversions fail to keep you alert, pull off the road and rest a while before proceeding.

The third and final menace of the superhighways comes from outside factors: weather, mechanical failures, and the other fellow.

Fog, rain, snow, sleet, and ice are responsible for thousands of traffic accidents every year. Yet there are many drivers who seem to feel that the laws of nature are suspended on the superhighways. Most of the turnpikes have maintenance crews which erect warning signals at strategic points when the weather is hazardous. But the driver must use his own good judgment as well.

Rule No. 8: In bad weather, the superhighway becomes almost as hazardous as an old-fashioned road. Drive accordingly. Cut your speed at least in half.

The posted limit may be 70 miles an hour, but with death lurking in treacherous spots on the road, you'd be crazy to drive at that speed.

A BLOWOUT AT 70

Another outside factor which causes accidents is mechanical failure. A blowout can happen anywhere. If it happens on a superhighway when you're doing 70, your chances of a crack-up are much greater. The same is true of any failure of the brakes or the steering mechanism. Anything that goes wrong will be twice as bad on the turnpikes, because of speed.

Therefore, rule No. 9: Have your car checked thoroughly before you start. Remember that high-speed travel may actually cause mechanical trouble, particularly if your car isn't used to being driven fast.

Finally we come to the other fellow. Turnpikes are designed to allow you plenty of room to pass or be passed, and maximum protection from oncoming and crosstraffic. But this very sense of security may breed overconfidence. You can still be endangered by someone else's mistake.

So our tenth and final rule for safety on the superhighways goes like this: Remember that turnpike driving is no cinch. It requires skill, experience, and the ability to deal with emergencies.

In each of these 10 rules, the emphasis is on you, the driver. Engineers and safety experts have already done their part to make the turnpikes safe.

THE SHORTER, THE SAFER

This can be demonstrated on the shorter expressways, where the driver has less chance to build up steady speed and a false sense of security. The Detroit Industrial Expressway, for instance, had an accident rate for 1 year about a seventh as high as that of a parallel, old-fashioned highway. But both roads were only about 15 miles long.

In California, the Arroyo Seco Parkway kept its accident rate for one 7-year period five to six times lower than that of a comparable, but conventional, thoroughfare, Wilshire Boulevard. But again, the distance was only about 5 miles.

Connecticut's Merritt Parkway shows a fatality rate about one-third that of the Boston Post Road, which parallels it for some 37 miles. The Maine and New Hampshire Turnpikes both report extremely low fatality rates, but they are short roads—36 and 15 miles—and their volume of traffic is not nearly so heavy as that of the Pennsylvania and New Jersey Turnpikes.

These figures seem to add up to one fact: the driver's hazards on superhighways are increased by speed and distance.

This is something to remember as New York State begins construction on the longest turnpike of all: 536 miles from New York City to Buffalo through Albany; as Ohio and Indiana map plans for new superhighways, and as the whole Nation prepares to get behind the push for better roads.

It need not distress us, however. Instead, we can prepare to enjoy trouble-free travel on the best roads in the world, if we know the dangers and how to cope with them. These 10 rules can make the turnpikes highways to safety instead of speedways to death.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, while we are talking about uneven highways, we might talk a little about the tortuous and rough fiscal road which this Government must travel in the days ahead.

If there is anything wrong with the amendment of my friend and colleague from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], it lies in the fact that the cut proposed is not deep enough. If it were left for me to do, I would probably lay the ax a great deal deeper. I do not apologize to anyone for being an economizer. At the moment I am greatly interested in the solvency and the fiscal solidarity of this Government in the years ahead, when the unobligated and unexpended balances shall have been exhausted. Then will come this additional charge upon the Federal Treasury. With a softening of business, that can only mean that the deficit in succeeding fiscal years will be larger than the estimated deficit in the fiscal year 1953.

I think the Senate ought to be advised as to what is authorized by the bill. First of all, it authorizes $600,000,000 for the fiscal year 1954–55. It makes $50,000,000 available for bridges and tunnels in each of 2 years. It makes $25,000,000 available for forest highways in each of 2 fiscal years. It makes available $22,500,000 for each of two fiscal years for forest development roads. Then it includes $10,000,000 for those 2 years for national park roads. It contains $10,000,000 for parkways on United States-owned land, for each of 2 years. It contains $10,000,000 more for roads on Indian reservations, for both fiscal years. It contains $8,000,000 for every fiscal year from 1953 to 1959, inclusive, for the Inter-American Highway. It contains another $6,000,000 for Nicaragua, and $15,000,000 for the emergency fund. It includes $2,500,000 for surveys on unreserved and Indian lands for each of 2 years; and finally, $50,000,000 for defense highways.

So, in sum, what is in the bill is $73,000,000 for the fiscal year 1953, $738,000,000 for the fiscal year 1954, a like amount for the fiscal year 1955, and another $8,000,000 for each of the four succeeding fiscal years. So what we are authorizing here today is $1,581,000,000 from the fiscal year 1953 to and inclusive of the fiscal year 1959.

Mr. President, when I was a Member of the other body I served on the Independent Offices Subcommittee, which dealt with the subject of public roads. Appropriations for forest highways and development roads were formerly considered in connection with the agricultural appropriation bill. So this argument is not new to me. I have been living with it for a great many years.

I make the point that this road program is progressive. It cannot be completed in a single year or in a number of years. Highways are never going to be wide enough, especially when there is a "nut" behind the wheel who may have a certain content of alcohol in him. They are never going to be smooth enough for some people. So it is a progressive job which must go on and on and on. The question now is, How much should we authorize for any given fiscal year, in view of the present state of the budget?

I wish to emphasize as best I can that when all the unexpended and unobligated balances which are reported from time to time in connection with first one appropriation bill and then another are finally exhausted, it will become necessary for Congress to deal with these authorizations in the years ahead. Appropriations are likely to be larger and larger. Revenues may not keep pace. Then we shall be confronted with a very substantial budget deficit indeed, which may impair the confidence of the country.

I will not commit myself to that kind of program. If there is so much uncertainty and so much fever in the air as has been recited on the floor of the Senate from time to time, then it is incumbent upon the Congress to be rather restrained and inhibited in the extent of the commitments it makes for the years ahead.

So because of the uncertainty, and because of the charge upon the public purse which is involved, I shall go along with the amendment. My only regret is that the cut is not more substantial. The amount should be cut back to an even greater degree.

Not so many years ago we were appropriating for roads only $150,000,000 a year, and there was constantly the same argument. The interesting thing with regard to the safety factor, which is frequently discussed, is that the more stop-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and-go lights, the more divided highways, the more traffic officers, and the more safety devices, the larger is the weekend and holiday toll. I suppose it is one of those inescapable things, but it does mean, of course, that constantly we must work toward the elimination of the factors which take a toll upon the highways and city streets, and constitute such a shame and scandal to a civilization which boasts of so much enlightenment. Probably some of it is inescapable, particularly so when we consider that the greatest safety factor is not the stop-and-go signs, but the alertness and mentality of the person who is behind the wheel. I have said over and over again that perhaps it is in the field of discipline, which must encompass the discipline of man, woman, and child, whether it be an aged person peering over bifocals walking across the street, or whether it be an impetuous child running into the street to retrieve a baseball, that we will finally get results and cut down this astonishing and cruel toll.

But here we have quite another thing, Mr. President. I think as never before—and I share this sentiment with my colleague—we simply cannot constantly go forth on the hustings and make political speeches and direct the attention of our people to the fact that there must be economy in government, and we cannot give constant assurances to people who are inveighing against Congress and rebuking it on both sides of the Capitol for its failure to balance the budget, without making at least a constructive endeavor in that field.

I do not wish to be found wanting in whatever modest endeavor I can make. Therefore, I shall support the amendment offered by my colleague from Illinois, and I once more confess my disappointment that the proposed cut is not larger.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am astounded at my own moderation.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, according to the facts stated by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and as shown on page 3 of the report, the Federal Government had, in round figures, an income of $700,000,000 a year from the gasoline tax during fiscal 1951, and an income of an additional $1,000,000,000, in round figures, from Federal taxes on automobiles, tires, and parts. For fiscal 1952, the gasoline tax has been increased by one-third. Therefore, henceforth the annual figure, instead of being $1,700,000,000, will be close to $2,000,000,000.

That fact and one additional fact are very significant. They are what convince me that we would be playing the part of the ostrich if we ran from the necessities of our highways at the present time. More than 50,000,000 motor vehicles are using our highways. The testimony shows that the highways are wearing out. With respect to primary highways and superhighways they are not keeping up with the demand of current use and abuse and the wear-out rate. Those circumstances, as I see the matter, compel us to set the figures at some point near the demand of traffic, especially in view of the fact that this is an item which pays its way by more than 2 to 1 under the new figures.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not unmindful of the revenues which are derived from the sources mentioned and of the desire to put them back into the highways. However, I do not subscribe to the theory that there is even a moral obligation to do so, for if we take that approach, then the tax on furs should be put into more minks, and so forth.

Mr. STENNIS. I do not lay that down as a formula.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand. The other point is that from now until doomsday highways will never be wide enough and they will never be smooth enough, in the judgment of many people, to take care of the traffic needs. They will crumble under heavy loads. If we carry out that argument logically, then we should authorize not $1,500,000,000 for respective fiscal years, but $5,000,000,000; or let us make it $10,000,000,000. Let us be unmindful of the needs of the budget, and do the job according to the estimates which have been set forth on the Senate floor.

Why stop with $600,000,000 in fiscal 1954 for highways? Let us make it three or four times as much. That will mean so many more jobs, and so many more miles of highways. I am thinking in terms of the charge that is put upon the Treasury, which is money that must be extracted from the pockets of the people who are already overburdened with taxes.

Mr. STENNIS. It is not merely a matter of logic; it is a matter of the demands of the highways of the Nation. Our economy moves on wheels. A great number of those wheels are automobile wheels which use the highways day and night. We must meet the absolute demands of that traffic.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention also to the proposed change in the formula of distribution, as proposed by the Senator from Illinois in his amendment. I have been among those who have tried to keep up with the needs of and, in part, to look out for the secondary highway system. But I have willingly yielded to the facts and the demands of the times, and have gone along cheerfully with the program for interstate highways, which are superprimary highways. That system is needed. The traffic demands it. The money must be forthcoming. Frankly I think that $50,000,000 is merely a start.

However, I strongly protest—and find no basis for it whatever in the facts—changing the formula of distribution among primary, secondary, and urban highways. The primary highways get 45 percent of the funds, and the urban highways get 25 percent. Therefore, 70 percent of the total amount goes to what we may call primary highways throughout.

In addition, a new formula is proposed for the secondary highways. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois would make an inroad into the historic formula with respect to the small amount that goes to secondary highways. They cannot be classed as feeder roads, as local roads, or even as rural roads. They are highways which are carrying an increasing proportion of the Nation's traffic, because many of the trucks and automobiles have already started going by what is called the back way, in order to keep off the primary highways.

This amendment strikes at a very vital factor in our highway legislation. It affects a formula which is based on testimony and on practical experience. Every time that formula has been before either House of Congress it has been affirmed. I submit in all seriousness that we should not strike down the formula by an amendment offered to the bill after the bill reaches the floor of the Senate, or vote a material change in the formula. I think it would be, as a practical matter, the beginning of a serious inroad into the so-called secondary-road formula, most of which applies to roads that could be classified as primary roads.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I gladly yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I have noticed with interest the Senator's suggestion that the bill now pending was constructed from what the committee thought was competent and informed testimony.

Mr. STENNIS. Very much so.

Mr. CAIN. Given by very practical highway people. My question, sir, is: Is it not a fact that the Public Works Committee studied the considered testimony offered to the committee by the American Association of State Highway Officials?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CAIN. In other words, those gentlemen came from several States of the Union to appear before the committee and to offer their best advice as to the character of the bill which should be considered by the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

There is a further fact in regard to this formula. The bill as introduced contained a provision for the switching of funds as between the primary, secondary, and urban roads. The subcommittee expressly considered that provision. I am not a member of the subcommittee; but I know that, after consideration, the subcommittee recommended striking from the bill the provision which would permit any switching of the funds, and the full committee affirmed the recommendation of the subcommittee regarding that matter.

This morning the Senate already has adopted an amendment which strikes from the bill the provision in regard to the switching of these funds. If at this time we were to adopt an amendment which would be contradictory of that formula, we would be reversing the action the Senate took only a short time ago.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENNINGS in the chair). Does the Senator

from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. Along the line of the remarks of the Senator from Washington, who spoke of the State Highway Officials Association, I ask the Senator from Mississippi, is it not true, that last year, in order to obtain the grass-roots thinking in regard to the amount of money which should be appropriated for highways, a letter was addressed to the Governor of every State of the Union, and in that letter the opinion of each Governor was requested on the subject of whether there should be a decrease in appropriations for highways? Every Governor responded to the letter; and every Governor said, in effect, "It is absolutely the minimum amount that should be appropriated." Approximately half the Governors requested that the amount be increased. So we have from the grass-roots, from the highway officials of each State, and from the Governors of each State, statements to the effect that they do need the amount of money which has been requested, in order properly to maintain their highways.

Mr. STENNIS. I certainly appreciate the contribution the Senator has made to the facts, for the facts are what the Senate is interested in.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi permit me to add an observation to what the Senator from Wyoming has just said?

Mr. STENNIS. Certainly.

Mr. CAIN. I do not seek to embarrass the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], of course, nor do I question his sincerity in any respect whatsoever. On the other hand, with reference to the formula we are now discussing, is it not a fact that the State highway officials of the State of Illinois appeared either in person or submitted statements in writing, before the Public Works Committee, and strongly encouraged the adoption of the formula which the Senator from Illinois now seeks to have the Senate change? I would very much appreciate having the Senator indicate whether that is a fact, as my recollection tells me it is.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Mexico, the chairman of the committee, may answer the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, these are the facts: Representatives of the American Association of State Highway Officials—only highway officials, not other types of officials—appeared before the committee. I know that highway officials from the State of Illinois and from every other State of the Union belong to the Association of State Highway Officials. The officers who represented that association represented officially the highway officials of every State of the Union.

Mr. CAIN. In order that I may be absolutely clear in my own mind, I have one more question: Did the Senate Committee on Public Works at any time receive any testimony from any State highway official of the State of Illinois or from any other official within the State of Illinois who said that he wished to disregard or change or eliminate the formula which the Public Works Committee adopted?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not only did they not insist that the formula be changed, but they recommended that the amount of the authorization be increased. As a matter of fact, they recommended a larger authorization than the committee reported.

Mr. CAIN. Then, it is fair to say, is it not, that the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] may be correct; but if he is, he is the only one who is correct, and the rest of us are wrong?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me for a further moment?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. On page 77 of the committee hearings there appears a "National Policy Statement of the American Association of State Highway Officials Relating to New Federal-Aid Legislation for Highways, As Approved at a Meeting of the Chief Administrative Officers of the Association, Convening at Chicago, Ill., on November 27, 1951." They did not recommend changing the formula, but they did recommend the following:

Interstate, $210,000,000.
Primary, $270,000,000.
Secondary, $180,000,000.
Urban, $150,000,000.

Or a total of $810,000,000, which is $210,000,000 more than the recommendation made by the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement made by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, after making one more point, I shall yield the floor.

I have no criticism of the Senator from Illinois; I think he renders a very fine service. But it should be pointed out that whatever he states in regard to the top figure is a statement of opinion by him, and by him only. So I wish to warn the Senate that it would be taking a wrong and a dangerous step if it adopted the figure the author of this amendment took from the budget estimates, and then split the difference between that figure and the amount already carried in the law.

If the Senator from Illinois wishes to follow the Bureau of the Budget, he can offer an amendment to strike out the item of $75,000,000 for the interstate highways. That will be a good test, because the Budget Bureau did not make any recommendation on that item.

But it is a most serious matter to alter the formula, unless the alteration is based upon facts and an analysis of the facts which reach into the real ramifications of the problem.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Would not the adoption of the amendment against which the distinguished Senator has just spoken be a very heavy blow to farm-to-market roads?

Mr. STENNIS. It certainly would, and it would also be a very heavy blow to secondary roads and highways.

Mr. KERR. Including all federally aided farm-to-market roads?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct—including the farm-to-market roads, and also including the secondary highways which carry a great part of the burden of the traffic in the United States.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Moody
Anderson	Hennings	Morse
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Hill	Nixon
Byrd	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Cain	Holland	Pastore
Capehart	Hunt	Robertson
Carlson	Ives	Saltonstall
Chavez	Jenner	Schoeppel
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Seaton
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Lehman	Stennis
Dworshak	Long	Taft
Eastland	Martin	Thye
Ellender	Maybank	Tobey
Ferguson	McCarran	Underwood
Flanders	McCarthy	Welker
Fulbright	McClellan	Wiley
George	McFarland	Williams
Gillette	McKellar	Young
Green	Millikin	
Hayden	Monroney	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nebraska

[Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS and other Senators demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

I announce also that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would each vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. If present and voting the Senator from Maine would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay," and the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—33

Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Schoeppel
Byrd	Ives	Seaton
Capehart	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Carlson	Martin	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	McCarthy	Taft
Douglas	Moody	Tobey
Dworshak	Morse	Welker
Ferguson	Mundt	Wiley
Flanders	Nixon	Williams
Hendrickson	Robertson	Young

NAYS—37

Aiken	Hayden	McClellan
Anderson	Hennings	McFarland
Cain	Hill	McKellar
Chavez	Holland	Millikin
Clements	Hunt	Monroney
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Eastland	Kerr	Smathers
Ellender	Kilgore	Stennis
Fulbright	Lehman	Thye
George	Long	Underwood
Gillette	Maybank	
Green	McCarran	

NOT VOTING—26

Bennett	Humphrey	McMahon
Benton	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Brewster	Kefauver	Neely
Bricker	Kem	O'Conor
Butler, Nebr.	Knowland	Russell
Case	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Lodge	Sparkman
Ecton	Magnuson	Watkins
Frear	Malone	

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that that motion be laid on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, June 3, 1952, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1342. An act to amend acts relating to garagekeepers' and liverymen's liens and the enforcement thereof in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 2786. An act to amend section 106 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1855. An act for the relief of Joachim Volk, also known as Steven Craig Delano;

S. 1953. An act for the relief of Midori Sugimoto;

S. 2089. An act for the relief of Debra Elaine Evans;

S. 2462. An act for the relief of Teruo Uechi;

S. 2554. An act for the relief of Eugene Richard Sushko;

S. 2571. An act for the relief of Ernest Daniel Davis, Jr.;

S. 2593. An act for the relief of Jean Hamamoto, also known as Sharon Lea Brooks;

S. 2643. An act for the relief of Kathleen Cowley;

S. 2768. An act for the relief of Barbara Ann Sheppard; and

S. 2805. An act for the relief of Susan Jeanne Kerr.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1828) to confirm the status of certain civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities under the Armed Forces with respect to laws administered by the Civil Service Commission, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4241. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice;

H. R. 5218. An act for improvement of the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet and the Mobile to New Orleans Intracoastal Waterway;

H. R. 6129. An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands and interests in lands at Mill Rock Island in the East River, N. Y.;

H. R. 6500. An act to amend the joint resolution of August 8, 1946, as amended, with respect to appropriations authorized for the conduct of investigations and studies thereunder;

H. R. 6578. An act to provide for correlation and coordination of research into practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6856. An act to extend the duration of the Water Pollution Control Act;

H. R. 7202. An act to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress," approved June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 25; 13 U. S. C. 216);

H. R. 7471. An act to authorize the modernization and enlargement of the mail equipment shops in Washington, D. C., and for other purposes;

H. R. 7573. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Indiana of certain surplus real property situated in Marion County, Ind.;

H. R. 7641. An act to provide benefits for certain Federal employees of Japanese ancestry who lost certain rights with respect to grade, time in grade, and rate of compensation by reason of any policy or program of the Federal Government with respect to persons of Japanese ancestry during World War II;

H. R. 7714. An act to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7806. An act to authorize the participation by certain Federal employees,

without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the Armed Forces returned to the United States from abroad for burial; and

H. J. Res. 449. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Vannevar Bush as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

REPORT OF GOVERNOR OF PANAMA CANAL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the annual report of the Governor of the Panama Canal for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 3, 1952.*

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

INCOME TAX AND REFORESTATION—RESOLUTION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by by the Kentucky-Tennessee section of the Society of American Foresters, suggesting one of the several steps needed to accelerate the present rate of reforestation.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas reforestation in the area of the Kentucky-Tennessee section is proceeding at a pace under which it will take many decades to complete the needed reforestation; and

Whereas, as a consequence, large acreages of land capable of producing timber and national wealth now lie idle and unproductive; and

Whereas it is believed good Government policy to place such land in forest production at a more rapid rate; and

Whereas it is believed that this may be partially accomplished by adjustments in income tax procedures in a manner which should prove beneficial to long term income tax returns to the Federal Government: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That (1) the Kentucky-Tennessee section in meeting assembled requests the council of the SAF to seriously consider proposing legislation to the Eighty-second Congress looking toward the adjustment of the income tax regulations, to provide that costs of tree planting may be treated either as a capital expense to be added to the depletion base or as an operating expense at the option of the taxpayer. (2) Copies of this resolution be forwarded to each Senator and Congressman representing the area covered by the Kentucky-Tennessee section for their information.

OVERPOPULATION OF EUROPEAN COUNTRIES—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution which was adopted at a meeting of 13 nationality, social, fraternal, and religious groups in my State of Wisconsin.

The subject of the resolution is the pending legislation dealing with the possible relief of European overpopulation.

We, on the Senate Judiciary Committee, have urged that there be a thorough study of this vital issue.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Representatives of 13 nationality, social, fraternal, and religious groups in Milwaukee, Wis., met to discuss current legislation on special migration, and resolved to support House bill 7376 in principle, as an indication of American interest in the overpopulated areas in Europe, and also to continue the precedent of American foresight for concern of the needy and oppressed in Europe.

The desire was expreseed by this group that if possible, priorities for immigration should be given to refugees from any Communist-dominated area of Europe.

Therefore, in conclusion, we as individuals active in 13 nationality, social, fraternal, and religious groups in Milwaukee, wholeheartedly approve of House bill 7376, move and urge for the passage of this bill.

REV. GEORGE THOMAS,
JOSEPH MIKULA,
PETER SHANE,
JAMES T. HELIOS,
WILLETTE C. PIERCE,
Resolutions Committee.

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—LETTERS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senate will shortly consider, I trust, the long delayed issue of the final vote on Senate Joint Resolution 27, for the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway.

At this time, I send to the desk an excellent letter received this morning from the legislative counsel of the National Grange. I particularly invite the attention of my colleagues to J. T. Sanders' able comments on the self-liquidation amendment which we have cosponsored to the bill in order to reduce to a minimum any possible burden on the Federal Treasury, even on a temporary basis.

It has also been my pleasure to correspond with the distinguished president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Allan B. Kline, on the subject of the self-liquidation amendment. We of Wisconsin are proud of our Wisconsin Federation, and of the great support which it and other farm bureaus all over the Nation have always given to the seaway. Mr. Kline has kindly and as usual, promptly acknowledged my note and has indicated that a detailed reply will be forthcoming. At this time, I send to the desk the letter from Mr. Sanders, and the letter which I in turn conveyed to Mr. Kline. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., June 2, 1952.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The St. Lawrence seaway and power project will soon come before you for a favorable or adverse decision. For nearly a quarter of a century, 23 years to be exact, the National Grange has been in favor of developing this great project. Throughout this period of support, I believe, an accurate analysis of why we have been continuously in favor would doubtless reveal three reasons, as follows: (a) That its completion would decidedly promote the national welfare; (b) that it is economically sound and, as a corollary, more recently is set up as a self-liquidating, self-financing project; (c) that even its opponents who are motivated by imaginary self-interest, we believe, will ultimately receive net gains from the project.

Besides these long-time more basic reasons in favor of this project, we believe there are some recent situations that constitute strong reasons why delay in this project is pointless and unjustified, as follows:

(1) Canada, impatient at our unjustified delay, now proposes to go ahead and build the project without us, but Canada will not develop the project to give expanded service west of Toledo, Ohio.

(2) If Canada builds the project alone, she necessarily can and will charge American shippers and users for all services we get from it—we, in the end, will lose all control and probably pay a far bigger bill.

(3) The proposed Aiken-Douglas-Taft amendment, even overcomes the groundless excuse that expanded Federal expenditures at this time should be avoided. This amendment will provide for use of private capital and puts this project clearly in the investment category. It also does away with the unbalanced budget inflationary claims of opponents.

With this array of logic before the Senate, it is indeed difficult for us to see how the Senate can now fail to approve this project for the earliest possible construction.

We sincerely hope you will agree with us and will use all your influence for earliest favorable action.

Very sincerely yours,
J. T. SANDERS,
Legislative Counsel.

MAY 21, LETTER FROM SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY, REPUBLICAN, OF WISCONSIN, COSPONSOR OF SEAWAY BILL AND OF SELF-FINANCING AMENDMENT, TO ALLAN KLINE, PRESIDENT OF AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, TO URGE NO MAJOR CHANGES IN SELF-LIQUIDATION PROPOSAL

DEAR MR. KLINE: I am writing to you in order to present a few reactions to the letter of April 10th which you sent to Chairman CONNALLY of the Foreign Relations Committee and which he subsequently reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 1.

Having worked closely with the Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation and other fine groups on behalf of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence objective down through the years, I know that you will understand why I, for one, would like to submit various comments to you—and on a frank and friendly basis—in this letter.

I know that you are interested in getting the candid judgment of those of us legislators

who have earnestly put our heart and soul into this effort in the interest of the Nation's agriculture, industry, national defense and well-being. We feel this issue keenly because we know how keenly our constituents feel it, too.

I am sure that the Farm Bureau wants to be continually helpful in connection with the seaway. And so, I trust that if you will reconsider the various recommendations made below, you and your distinguished board of directors may agree that the self-financing amendment which I have co-sponsored along with Senators AIKEN, DOUGLAS, TAFT, KEFAUVER, and others—is the best possible approach toward achieving this objective on a truly self-liquidating basis.

CHANGES AT THIS LATE STAGE COULD BE HARMFUL

At this late stage, I am inclined to feel that any efforts—however well intentioned as I know your efforts are—to effect major changes in our Senate seaway proposal could prove harmful to the over-all seaway cause. And while I welcome constructive criticisms of our proposal, as I am sure my colleagues do, I would not want to see our ranks unnecessarily divided on matters on which I feel we should remain united.

We all realize that we who favor the seaway still face an uphill fight, and that is why we are anxious that there be a maximum of unity and cooperation among us. We are well aware that the opposition will exploit every situation to its own selfish advantage.

I am sure that the American Farm Bureau Federation with its deep devotion to the interest of American farmers would not want this great objective to be delayed or harmed in the slightest.

Now may I comment seriatim on the various suggestions in your letter. Please be assured that I would welcome hearing from you on every single one of these and other points, and shall be happy to examine such differences as we may further have, although I trust that they will be at a minimum.

1. Your sugestion to amend Section 3 (a) of Senate Joint Resolution 27, calling for a "fund agreement" with Canada "prior to construction," will, I feel, have the effect of delaying construction over a considerable period of time. I do not frankly know what you mean by "fund agreement" and, in any event, the level of tolls and revenues cannot be determined until construction is fairly advanced and the two Governments know the cost items that must be taken into account in the toll rates, which would determine the gross revenues.

2. You recommend the deletion of section 3 (b), giving the President a discretionary power to create a St. Lawrence Commission to negotiate a toll agreement. I agree with this if the proposed amendment to create a St. Lawrence Development Corporation is adopted, because then the corporation could be the instrumentality of the United States Government to negotiate the toll agreements.

NEW YORK CONTRACT CAN BE NEGOTIATED IN DUE TIME

3. You recommend also that section 5 be amended so that the contract with the State of New York be negotiated again "prior to contruction." I see no necessity for this, because the 4 or 5 years that it will take to construct the project will be sufficient time to iron out problems between the Federal Government and the State of New York. The purpose that you have in mind—namely, allocation of costs between power and navigation—is already taken care of by section 5.

4. You recommend deletion of section 206 (b) from the amendment, providing Government guarantee of the bonds of the St. Lawrence Development Corporation. You recommend instead revenue bonds. Your grounds for this recommendation are that the Farm Bureau is in no position to arrive at any conclusions concerning the cost estimates and traffic potential and the economic feasibility of the project.

ONE HUNDRED PERCENT GUARANTEED BONDS UNCALLED FOR

These grounds surprise me somewhat, because the Farm Bureau has been splendidly supporting the project for many years as desirable and economically feasible. However, my concern about the recommendation of substituting revenue bonds for guaranteed bonds is based on the following grounds:

(a) What you propose, in effect, calls for bonding 100 percent of the capital requirements of the St. Lawrence project at the International Rapids section. This is going very considerably beyond the practices of private enterprise, because no business would be rash enough to capitalize 100 percent of its assets or investments in bonds without any equity capital to take the risks. If you were to recommend making the project a profit-making project with up to 50 percent in stock equity, which would absorb the risks and enjoy the benefits from the profits, and, say, 50 percent in bonds, then I think you would be consistent and there would be no difficulty in financing it. But, to operate this project at cost and to capitalize the assets 100 percent in bonds is an unusual proposal implying that the bondholders must take all the risks. This would create very serious difficulties in the marketing of the bonds and would cause prolonged and unnecessary delay in the initiation of the project.

FARMERS WOULD SUFFER FROM HIGHER TOLLS

(b) Even if such bonds were saleable, the interest rate on them might be prohibitive, because they would carry a risk element and there would be a continuing excess charge upon the users of the power and navigation facilities, the consumers, including the farmers. A difference of interest rate between 2 percent and 4 percent, for instance, would increase the annual charge by $10,000,000. I find no justification for supporting a suggestion which will create this additional burden on the users of electricity and the navigation facilities. It would surely mean a higher toll rate on grain shipments than would otherwise be necessary.

(c) Those of us who have studied this project are convinced that there will be more than enough revenues to pay the interest on the bonds as proposed in our amendment and, therefore, the financing would in no way put a burden upon the credit of the Government. The Government will not be called upon, in other words, to make good on the guaranty, any more that it has had to make good on the guaranty on billions of dollars of guaranteed bonds and loans issued by the Federal Land Banks, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and housing loans.

Although the project is economically sound and self-supporting, the legal requirements of bond issues will necessitate firm understanding with both New York and Canada, which would take time to accomplish. It is so imperative to start work on this project at the earliest possible moment that the proponents should not be responsible by proposing limitations and conditions which will create difficulties in the sale of bonds. In other words, because this is a public undertaking, because there are other important Government entities involved, such as New York and Canada, we cannot expect to button up all of the details in such a way as to present to the bonding house a complete "meat package" in a very short time. We can do this only at the expense of devoting a considerable period of time to negotiating the necessary undertakings.

I have no doubt that these agreements can and will be worked out but the question is: Do we have to wait until this is done before we turn a spade in the construction of the project which is attested to be economically feasible and necessary for national defense?

EASTERN BANKS HOSTILE TO SEAWAY

(d) I think perhaps the most serious objection to your proposal is that it will put us, to all intents and purposes, in the hands of the investment bankers and insurance companies in New York. This being a very large financing program, involving $485,000,000, it could be expected to get in the hands of some of the principal eastern investment banking houses. The history of this project is that these banking houses, having important economic relationship in many instances with the eastern railroads and utilities, are not going to approach the seaway project with unalloyed sympathy. I say this in all candor and with no disrespect or impugning of any firm's motives. I present it as a fact with which few impartial observers would disagree.

If we have so much difficulty in getting this project through congressional committees, presumably impartial and disinterested because of the pressures of selfish lobbies, one can imagine what our difficulties will be before a committee of New York bankers, where the power and influence of these same interests can often be far greater than in congressional committees in Washington.

In summary, those of us who are interested in the construction of the project have two choices. We either let Canada build it, and they are anxious to proceed immediately, by the issuance of Canadian Government-guaranteed bonds; or we participate in the construction without delay, which means, of course, financing at the earliest practicable moment through the issuance of Government-guaranteed bonds. If the American alternative will lead to interminable arguments with investment bankers in New York over a period of years, I am afraid that many proponents would prefer sure progress under the Canadian plan.

I look forward to hearing from you and from your able associates whenever the spirit moves you.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2354. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by requiring the Interstate Commerce Commission to consider, in stock modification plans, the assents of controlled or controlling stockholders; with amendments (Rept. No. 1627).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. CASE):

S. 3271. A bill to provide that certain costs and expenses incurred in connection with repayment contracts with the Deaver, Wildwood, and Belle Fourche irrigation districts shall be nonreimbursable; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 3272. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chester A. Beaver; to the Committee on Finance

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 3273. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the late George Herman (Babe) Ruth; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 3274. A bill for the relief of John Mroczek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 3275. A bill for the relief of Anthony Zahareas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 3276. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to assist Federal prisoners in their rehabilitation"; which was passed.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCARRAN when he introduced the above bill and it was passed.)

By Mr. McCARRAN (by request):

S. 3277. A bill for the relief of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. MOODY):

S. J. Res. 161. Joint resolution to create a Commission on Labor-Management Relations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 141, RELATING TO SUPREME COURT DECISION IN STEEL SEIZURE CASE

During the delivery of Mr. DOUGLAS' speech,

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me on a matter involving a saving of several hundred dollars?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The text of the opinion of the Supreme Court and of the concurring and dissenting opinions has been sent to the Government Printing Office by the Court. If at the time the material goes to press the heading is changed so as to make it a Senate document, 4,000 copies can be obtained for $1,200.

Therefore, I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 327) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed, for the use of the Senate document room, 4,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 141, Eighty-second Congress, relating to power of the President to take possession of steel mills, being the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States and the concurring and dissenting opinions in the case of the Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co., et al., petitioner, against Charles Sawyer, and Charles Sawyer, petitioner, against the Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co., et al.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am happy to yield. I congratulate the Senator from Arizona for saving money.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LEHMAN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2594) to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 2594, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. MOODY, Mr. BENTON, and Mr. LEHMAN) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 2594, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. BENTON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MOODY, and Mr. LEHMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 2594, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HILL, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. BENTON, and Mr. MOODY) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 2594, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. NIXON (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT RELATING TO EFFECTIVE DATES OF CERTAIN AGREEMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. McFARLAND (for himself, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. HILL, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ECTON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. YOUNG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 6291) to amend section 218 (f) of the Social Security Act with respect to effective dates of agreements entered into with States before January 1, 1954, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following new sections:

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 3 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 3. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for old-age assistance, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1952, (1) in the case of any State other than Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as old-age assistance, equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as old-age assistance under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $55—

"'(A) four-fifths of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $25 multiplied by the total number of such individuals who received old-age assistance for such month; plus

"'(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A);

and (2) in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as old-age assistance, equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as old-age assistance under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $30, and (3) in the case of any State, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Administrator for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, which amount shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for old-age assistance, or both, and for no other purpose.'

"(b) Section 403 (a) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 403. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid to dependent children, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1952, (1) in the case of any State other than Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to dependent children, equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to dependent children under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any dependent child for any month as exceeds $30, or if there is more than one dependent child in the same home, as exceeds $30 with respect to one such dependent child and $21 with respect to each of the other dependent children, and not counting so much of such expenditure for any month with respect to a relative with whom any dependent child is living as exceeds $30—

"'(A) four-fifths of such expenditures, not counting so much of the expenditures with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $15 multiplied by the total number of dependent children and other individuals with respect to whom aid to dependent children is paid for such month, plus

"'(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A);

and (2) in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be

used exclusively as aid to dependent children, equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as aid to dependent children under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any dependent child for any month as exceeds $18, or if there is more than one dependent child in the same home, as exceeds $18 with respect to one such dependent child and $12 with respect to each of the other dependent children; and (3) in the case of any State, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Administrator for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, which amount shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for aid to dependent children, or both, and for no other purpose.'

"(c) Section 1003 (a) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 1003. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid to the blind, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1952, (1) in the case of any State other than Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to the blind, equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to the blind under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $55—

"'(A) four-fifths of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $25 multiplied by the total number of such individuals who received aid to the blind for such month, plus

"'(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A);

and (2) in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to the blind, equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as aid to the blind under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $30; and (3) in the case of any State, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter a found necessary by the Administrator for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, which amount shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for aid to the blind, or both, and for no other purpose.'

"(d) Section 1403 (a) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 1403. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid to the permanently and totally disabled, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1952, (1) in the case of any State other than Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to the permanently and totally disabled, equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to the permanently and totally disabled under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $55—

"'(A) four-fifths of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $25 multiplied by the total number of such individuals who received aid to the permanently and totally disabled for such month, plus

"'(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A);

and (2) in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to the permanently and totally disabled, equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as aid to the permanently and totally disabled under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $30; and (3) in the case of any State, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Administrator for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, which amount shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for aid to the permanently and totally disabled, or both, and for no other purpose.'

"(e) The amendments made by this section shall become effective October 1, 1952.

"SEC. 3. (a) Title XI of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 1108 the following new section:

"'MINIMUM STATE PUBLIC ASSISTANCE EXPENDITURES

"'SEC. 1109. (a) If during any calendar year the total State expenditures (as defined in subsection (b)) for any State under titles I, IV, X, and XIV are less than the total State expenditures for such State under such titles during the base period, the total amount payable to such State for such year under such titles shall not exceed the total amount payable during the base period.

"'(b) As used in subsection (a), the term "total State expenditures" means the difference between (1) the sum of the expenditures under State plans approved under titles I, IV, X, or XIV of this act with respect to which amounts are payable to the State under section 3 (a), 403 (a), 1003 (a), and 1403 (a), respectively, and (2) the sum of the amounts so payable to the State; and the term "base period," with respect to any calendar year, means the calendar year preceding such year.'

"(b) The amendment made by this section shall be effective only with respect to payments to States under sections 3, 403, 1003, and 1403 of the Social Security Act for the period beginning January 1, 1953, and ending with the close of December 31, 1954.

"SEC. 4. For a period of 1 year commencing October 1, 1952, notwithstanding provisions of title I of the Social Security Act, as amended (relating to grants to States for old-age assistance), and of appropriations for payments thereunder, in any case in which any State pays old-age assistance to any individual at a rate not more than $5 in excess of the rate of old-age assistance paid to such individual during the month of September 1952, any failure to take into consideration any income and resources of such individual not in excess of $50 per month arising from agricultural labor performed by him as an employee, or from labor otherwise performed by him in connection with the raising or harvesting of agricultural commodities, or income and resources from performance of service as a nurse as an employee, or in connection with the care of sick or confined persons as an employee, shall not be the basis of excluding payments made to such indivdual in computing payments made to States under section 3 of such title, of refusing to approve a State plan under section 2 of such title, or of withholding certification pursuant to section 4 of such title."

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 4241. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5213. An act for improvement of the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet and the Mobile to New Orleans Intracoastal Waterway; and

H. R. 6856. An act to extend the duration of the Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6129. An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands and interests in lands at Mill Rock Island in the East River, New York, and

H. R. 7573. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Indiana of certain surplus real property situated in Marion County, Ind.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 6500. An act to amend the joint resolution of August 8, 1946, as amended, with respect to appropriations authorized for the conduct of investigations and studies thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 6578. An act to provide for correlation and coordination of research into practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

H. R. 7202. An act to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress," approved June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 25; 13 U. S. C. 216);

H. R. 7471. An act to authorize the modernization and enlargement of the Mail Equipment Shops in Washington, D. C., and for other purposes;

H. R. 7641. An act to provide benefits for certain Federal employees of Japanese ancestry who lost certain rights with respect to grade, time in grade, and rate of compensation by reason of any policy or program of the Federal Government with respect to persons of Japanese ancestry during World War II; and

H. R. 7806. An act to authorize the participation by certain Federal employees, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the Armed Forces returned to the United States from abroad for burial; to the committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7714. An act to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. J. Res. 449. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Vannevar Bush as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting

sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. BRICKER:

Radio broadcast by Senator TAFT over NBC network on Sunday, June 1, 1952.

By Mr. MOODY:

Memorial Day address delivered by Senator KEFAUVER at Inglewood, Calif.

By Mr. NIXON:

Statement prepared by him entitled "Analysis of Tidelands Veto Errors."

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Address entitled "At the Water's Edge," delivered on May 21, 1952, by Wilson Compton, head of the International Information Administration of the State Department, having to do with a nonpartisan approach to world affairs.

Letter from John J. Ruñ, relating to exchange of students and professors.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

Memorial Day address delivered at Woodbury, N. J., by Hon. Hugh L. Mehorter, former speaker of New Jersey House of Assembly.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Address entitled "The National Status of Research Today," delivered by Dr. Paul R. Beall before the Conference on Research for Small Industry at Pennsylvania State College on May 27, 1952.

By Mr. WILEY:

Article entitled "Thirty-second Division Rides Its Road" and article entitled "From the Argonne Through Buna," published in the Milwaukee Journal.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Article entitled "Roper Study Indicates Role of Groups in Swaying Voters," published in the New York Herald Tribune of May 19, 1952.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MCCLELLAN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

THE AMERICA WE LOST

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to make one or two observations regarding an article which was offered for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD yesterday by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. The article is entitled "The America We Lost." It was written by Dr. Mario A. Pei and published in the Saturday Evening Post of May 31, 1952. I believe that this article should be given wide distribution, because it covers one of the subjects in which Members of the Senate are so greatly interested, namely, the constant expansion of government. The article begins as follows:

When I first came to America, 44 years ago, I learned a new meaning of the word "liberty"—freedom from government.

I did not learn a new meaning for "democracy." The European country from which I came, Italy, was at that time as "democratic" as America.

From that statement I think we can all take a lesson. It emphasizes the meaning of liberty, and points out the way in which our liberties can be taken away from us by a big government. Over-extension of activities of government can take away a man's liberty just as effectively as though he were to lose a part of his parliamentary rights.

This article is extremely well written. When we think of the decision of the Supreme Court, in the steel-mill seizure case, holding that the legislative power of the United States is in the Congress, we must realize that it is the duty of Congress to see to it that the Government is not built too large, with too many functions. Such a government, as Dr. Pei says, tends to take away the liberties of the people, even though a shell of democracy, if we may call it such, may remain.

EXCERPT FROM ADDRESS BY GEORGE KIYOSHI TOGASAKI BEFORE COMMONWEALTH CLUB OF SAN FRANCISCO

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, on May 23 the president and publisher of the Nippon Times, of Tokyo, Japan, made a fine speech before the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco. One paragraph in that speech, particularly, referred to the immigration and naturalization omnibus bill which the Senate recently passed, and which is now pending in conference. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this particular paragraph, which is short, may be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Excerpt from speech of George Kiyoshi Togasaki, president and publisher of the Nippon Times, of Tokyo, Japan, before the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco, Calif., on May 23, 1952:

"Before proceeding further, I wish to comment upon the action of the United States Senate which yesterday passed the immigration and naturalization omnibus bill, which confers upon the Japanese and other Asiatics equality for the first time. The significance and importance of the passage of the bill may mean merely codification of the laws and bringing them up to date to most of you. However, the teeming millions in Asia who are being swayed by the propagandists of antidemocratic forces, will be impressed with the sincerity of the American people to practice what they hold dear to themselves."

ATTEMPTS TO INFLUENCE ACTION OF THE PRESIDENT ON OMNIBUS NATURALIZATION BILL

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I learned today that a Communist unit in New York City has circularized foreign-born voters in that city urging that each send a letter or telegram to the President demanding that he veto the new immigration bill.

The circular, of which I have a copy, not only viciously falsifies with regard to the terms of the measure but it appeals directly to race prejudice in attempting to influence the President of the United States.

It would seem to me that a campaign of this kind, originating with those who have pledged themselves to support a foreign government which openly plots the destruction of our Government by force and violence, should throw suspicion on all the protests against the new bill.

I cannot believe that the President will be guided by traitors in his action on the measure and I hope he will not be misled by those others who have become confused by the specious arguments against it.

The circular bears the name of "The Village LaGuardia Club, American Labor Party" as the sender. This is not the true name of any official component of the American Labor Party, so far as I can discover. Its address is given as 166 Thompson Street, New York 12, N. Y. This is the address of the first and second district American Labor Party Club whose officers and many of whose members have Communist or Communist-affiliated records.

It seems obvious that an effort has been made to utilize the prestige of the LaGuardia name in this heavily Italian-populated New York neighborhood.

The circular is printed in both English and Italian but, for the purposes of the RECORD, I think the English version is enough. I ask that it be so printed in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the circular was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MCCARRAN THREATENS YOU

Thursday midnight, May 22, the United States Senate passed the vicious McCarran immigration law.

This law is a menace to 14,000,000 foreign-born in the United States, especially Italian-Americans.

This law threatens all of us, our family, our relatives and friends and most of our neighbors. We know how dangerous this threat is because Senator MCCARRAN, the author of this law, is the same enemy of the Italian people who just a few months ago said that 90 percent of the people living in the Italian community of downtown New York could be deported.

DISCRIMINATION CONTINUED

This law continues the discrimination in the low quota of Italian immigrants. Only 5,000 Italians a year will be admitted, compared to a quota of 90,000 immigrants from Great Britain and Germany.

CITIZENS ALSO IN DANGER

This law attacks citizens as well as noncitizens. Whether you are a citizen or not, the Immigration Department has the power to hold you in jail without bail. All that an Immigration official has to do is to state that you are "believed to be an alien," and that your political beliefs or trade-union activities or desire for peace represent a danger and make you a subversive.

If the Immigration Department orders you deported and you fail to show up they can send you to jail for 10 years.

CITIZENSHIP CAN BE TAKEN AWAY

Years after you have received your second papers your citizenship can be taken away and you can be deported. All they have to do is to say that you did not admit certain beliefs and ideas at that time, which only today they choose to call subversive.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

LET'S STOP IT

President can stop this vicious law by a veto.

The time is short.

Write or telegraph the White House immediately, telling the President you want this law stopped.

VILLAGE LAGUARDIA CLUB,
AMERICAN LABOR PARTY.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

CONTINUATION OF CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS—AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT, 1916

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2437) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (3 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk my amendment F, and ask that it be read and made the pending question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "$600,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$500,000,000."

On page 2, line 3, strike out "$270,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$225,000,000"

On page 2, line 5, strike out "$180,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$150,000,000."

On page 2, line 7, strike out "$150,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$125,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I can state in 1 minute what this amendment is. The previous amendment proposed a cut of $200,000,000. The pending amendment proposes a cut of only $100,000,000, from $600,000,000 to $500,000,000. Furthermore, it does not alter the existing ratio of disribution provided by the Federal-aid statute, retaining the formula of 45 percent, 30 percent, and 25 percent, respectively.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to ask the Senator a question in order to clarify the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator wish me to yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does not the amendment propose to continue the present authorization of the 1950 act?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh yes. It merely affects the authorizations for 1953–54 and 1954–55. It does not alter the previous authorization.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It keeps the authorization as it was in the 1950 act.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct—$500,000,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I favor the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, and I wish to make a brief statement with reference to it.

First, the pending amendment does not make any change in the basis of distribution between primary aid, secondary aid, and urban assistance, and to that extent does not bring into the bill any of the implications which were involved in the previous amendment.

Second, this amendment is based not upon the budget, but upon a continuation of the present level of authorizations which have been followed under the current law, and which have been found by the States to be usable, though in some instances insufficient to meet the needs of the States.

I should be entirely willing to go along with the full amount covered by the bill, but for the necessity for economy, which I think, except in conditions which directly affect the defense situation, makes it unwise for us to increase expenditures under present conditions.

This amendment would follow both the basis of distribution and the amount of authorization contained in the present law. I do not want to leave that statement by itself, because it might create the impression that the total amount carried by the bill was the same as the amount under the present law, whereas that is not the case. The bill has an additional item of $50,000,000 for the interstate system.

If Senators will read the report of the hearings they will find that the Defense Department made a very strong case for hurrying the work on the interstate system of highways, and made it very clear that the interstate system had to do directly with the defensive strength of our Nation. That subject is covered in some detail on page 33 of the committee hearings. It will be found also in various other places—and I refer to pages 10 and 11 and page 26 of the committee hearings—that not only the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army, but also the Bureau of Public Roads, made it quite clear that in their judgment the Nation was following an unwise course in not accentuating the early completion of the interstate system.

The interstate system comprises a mileage of not to exceed 40,000 miles of critical highways embraced within the primary aid system and the connecting urban links through the cities. The interstate highway system has not been completed. The worst bottlenecks to traffic are in the uncompleted portions of the interstate system.

So I feel that the Senate is justified, as I felt the committee was thoroughly justified, in placing in the bill a special item of $50,000,000 for hastening the completion of the interstate system.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

If the amendment now pending is adopted, it will continue the present levels of construction with respect to primary, secondary, and urban assistance, as enlarged by the $50,000,000 which is in another section of the bill, and which has already been approved by the Senate. The total increase involved in the bill for the Federal-aid system to the interstate highway in general is $50,000,000 a year for each of the 2 years covered by the program. I dislike to see any increase, but I believe that in view of all the testimony before the subcommittee, which testimony was discussed in the full committee, it is quite clear that the Nation is defensively weak by reason of the present state of incompletion of the interstate system of highways. For that reason I think the committee is wholly justified in recommending the increase.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi did not understand clearly. As I understand, this amendment does not affect the $50,000,000 which is provided by the bill expressly for the superprimary system.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The only reason the Senator from Florida mentioned that item is that, whereas he has just said that the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois would continue the present level of authorizations and expenditures, he wanted to make it clear that the other amendment in the bill, relating to the interstate system, in the amount of $50,000,000 a year, is above the level of the present authorizations and expenditures. The Senator from Florida thinks that is justified, and he wished so to state on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Florida was chairman of the subcommittee which considered the bill and conducted the hearings. The full committee decided to make the amount $600,000,000, because the full committee felt that, because of the high cost of materials nowadays, at least $100,000,000 more would be required than would have been required 2 years ago for the construction of roads. It was not with the idea of merely appropriating an additional $100,000,000. There is no question that the Senator from Illinois is well acquainted with what deevloped at the hearings. I will accept his amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, have not the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

I think we should proceed with the yeas and nays.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Illinois, notwithstanding the fact that State-highway officials are not with him. I shall vote for his amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I had not quite completed my remarks. One further statement and I shall be through.

This amendment would leave the entire amount of the bill for each year for the regular subjects, the primary, secondary, urban, and interstate systems, at exactly the same amount as the $550,000,000 included in House bill 7340, which is on the desks of Senators. In other words, very little would be left for consideration in the conference. Such action would indicate an expression by the

Senate very close to the expression already made by the House of Representatives.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, to make the figure $450,000,000 instead of $500,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. The yeas and nays have already been ordered on the original amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Are we now voting on the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the original amendment of the Senator from Illinois?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have. This vote is on the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

I announce also that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would each vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. If present and voting the Senator from Maine would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR]. If present and voting the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay," and the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—33

Bridges	Hoey	Robertson
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Saltonstall
Byrd	Ives	Schoeppel
Capehart	Jenner	Seaton
Dirksen	Martin	Smith, Maine
Douglas	McCarthy	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Moody	Taft
Ferguson	Morse	Welker
Flanders	Mundt	Wiley
Hendrickson	Nixon	Williams
Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney	Young

NAYS—36

Aiken	Green	McCarran
Anderson	Hayden	McClellan
Cain	Hennings	McFarland
Chavez	Hill	McKellar
Clements	Holland	Millikin
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Monroney
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Eastland	Kerr	Smathers
Ellender	Kilgore	Stennis
Fulbright	Lehman	Thye
George	Long	Tobey
Gillette	Maybank	Underwood

NOT VOTING—27

Bennett	Frear	Malone
Benton	Humphrey	McMahon
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Bricker	Kefauver	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Kem	O'Conor
Carlson	Knowland	Russell
Case	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Lodge	Sparkman
Ecton	Magnuson	Watkins

So Mr. BRIDGES' amendment to Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in order to save time, why can not we dispense with a yea-and-nay vote?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a number of Senators who have voted against previous cuts have expressed to me their desire to vote for a cut of $100,000,000. I think they should be given an opportunity to go on record. I must insist on a yea-and-nay vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

I announce also that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the

Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would each vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. If present and voting the Senator from Maine would vote "yea" and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR]. If present and voting the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay" and the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 14, as follows:

YEAS—54

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Anderson	Hoey	Nixon
Bridges	Holland	O'Mahoney
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Robertson
Byrd	Ives	Saltonstall
Capehart	Jenner	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Seaton
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Long	Stennis
Ferguson	Martin	Taft
Flanders	Maybank	Thye
Fulbright	McCarthy	Tobey
George	McClellan	Welker
Gillette	Millikin	Wiley
Hendrickson	Moody	Williams
Hennings	Morse	Young

NAYS—14

Cain	Hayden	McKellar
Chavez	Hill	Monroney
Clements	Kerr	Pastore
Ellender	McCarran	Underwood
Green	McFarland	

NOT VOTING—28

Bennett	Frear	McMahon
Benton	Humphrey	Murray
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Bricker	Kefauver	O'Conor
Butler, Nebr.	Kem	Russell
Carlson	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Case	Langer	Sparkman
Connally	Lodge	Watkins
Duff	Magnuson	
Ecton	Malone	

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read by the clerk, for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, in line 13, following the colon, it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided*, That with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction; and be it further."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, this amendment has been discussed with and accepted by the chairman of the Committee on Public Works.

The amendment speaks for itself. It merely makes certain that an appropriate Federal agency shall not construct or reconstruct timber-access roads unless it has available the considered views of the responsible persons who live in the area where the road is to be constructed.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES obtained the floor.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me, to permit me to submit an amendment identical to the one just agreed to? The amendment to which I now refer properly belongs in another place in the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well; I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I now offer the amendment and send it to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment heretofore agreed to on page 11, in line 25, it is proposed to strike out the period, and to insert the following: "*And be it further provided*, That with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber access road under the authority contained in this section, advisory public hearings shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, for the reasons previously stated, I urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. DWORSHAK. It has been my experience that in attempting to obtain allocations of funds under the Federal highway program for timber-access roads, for which the Department of Agriculture has the responsibility of asking for priorities, invariably there has been a delay which has resulted in the exhaustion of all the funds prior to obtaining any allocation for specific timber-access-road projects.

I wonder whether the proceedings contemplated by the amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington may not cause delay to such an extent that all the funds will be completely exhausted before the Bureau of Public Roads will be able to take any action on a specific timber-access-road project?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Idaho is wrong, because of the fact that the bill provides that not less than $5,000,000 shall be used for the construction and reconstruction of timber-access roads. The amendment which has just been adopted will permit both the large and the small timber operators to present their views as responsible persons to the appropriate and responsible Federal agencies.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield further to me?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly, sir.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am fully aware of that fact, because I suggested that particular amendment in the Public Works Committee, and it was graciously accepted by the chairman and the other members.

However, the amendment just offered by the Senator from Washington, on page 11, deals specifically with the access-road fund, and has nothing to do with the forest roads and trails fund, which is supervised by the Forest Service. Can the Senator from Washington explain that situation?

Mr. CAIN. I think so. My answer to the Senator's question is, I believe that caution, care, patience, and intelligence should be exercised before any timber-access road, long or short, wide or narrow, should be constructed or reconstructed. If a reluctance on the part of the Federal agency to conduct the public hearings as provided by the amendment just offered by the Senator from Washington were to develop, I take it to be obvious that the Public Works Committee in its next bill would recommend an appropriate and adequate remedy to overcome such reluctance.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. If the $50,000,000 fund provided on page 11, in section 10, were to be completely exhausted before any reports could be made or hearings held relative to a timber-access road, would not the Senator's amendment prove ineffective by virtue of the fact that no funds would be available at that time?

Mr. CAIN. I hardly believe the Senator's fear would materialize. But, by way of argument, I shall continue to believe most sincerely that no timber-access road, or, in fact, any other road of any character, should be constructed or reconstructed without every effort being made to learn the full facts as to what was to be done, before undertaking the project. I think this amendment would afford a maximum of insurance and guaranty in that matter.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Is it the Senator's position that his amendment would make it easier, or that it would make it more difficult to provide adequate fire-protection roads and other roads through the forests?

Mr. CAIN. It should make it neither more difficult nor easier to get a particular road constructed. It should make certain that a road to be constructed would be strategically, economically, and advantageously located.

Mr. MUNDT. Is the Senator entirely satisfied that it would not create circumstances of red tape and confusion which would delay the construction of desirable roads?

Mr. CAIN. I think in a good many instances it would speed up construction, because the public hearing would result

in a more rapid decision. The public hearing would dissipate uncertainty, dissension, and argument. The probability is—and we hope it will be the case—that the public hearing will result in a complete and total agreement on the part of all parties concerned, and that the public interest will be better conserved, as a result.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator. I merely did not want to see added to the bill a provision which might create endless delay in the construction of roads which are very essential.

Mr. CAIN. It is my considered view that such a sad result would not ensue. I say to my friend, the Senator from South Dakota, that if there should be any such result—and it would naturally be brought to the attention of the Senator from Washington—I would most glady go to the Public Works Committee, first, to point out that a mistake had been made, and I would follow that by asking the Senate to repeal the amendment. However, I think there is no likelihood of the happening of such a contingency as that which the Senator from South Dakota has pointed out.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. As a result of his experience, does the Senator from Washington believe that public hearings sometimes develop more heat than light?

Mr. CAIN. Occasionally they do, but generally speaking, I believe that much better and more constructive results are obtained when members of the general public are permitted to present their views, than is the case otherwise.

Mr. TOBEY. That is the hope, in accordance with the maxim, "Vox populi, vox Dei," is it not?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, we are spending money which belongs to the taxpayers of the United States, and, in my view, the taxpayers should be permitted an opportunity to discuss the situation.

Mr. TOBEY. "Vox populi, vox Dei."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment on page 11, in section 10, was agreed to, is reconsidered. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move to amend the bill, on page 11, line 12, by striking out section 10. The amendment would provide a saving of approximately $50,000,000, in the amount authorized by the bill, a saving on an item which is not now imperative.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, inasmuch as section 10 has already been adopted as a committee amendment, is the Senator from New Hampshire in order at this time in submitting his amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment having been agreed to, an amendment to it is not in order unless it is reconsidered, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the point of order having been made, it is obvious that unanimous consent could not be obtained. Therefore I desire to make another motion. I move that on page 11, section 10 of the bill, in lines 16 and 17, the numerals "$50,000,000" be stricken out and "$10,000,000" inserted.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the committee amendment is not again open to amendment at this stage. The Chair must therefore rule the Senator from New Hampshire out of order.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, may I inquire the basis upon which the Chair rules me out of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After an amendment, as amended, has been agreed to, a further amendment is not in order unless the previous vote has been reconsidered. There was a previous motion to reconsider the vote agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Chair has referred to a previous motion. May I inquire what that motion was?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that a motion to reconsider the committee amendment, as amended, is in order. The previous motion was to consider the vote agreeing only to the committee amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then, Mr. President, I submit that my amendment is in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be necessary first to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to, as a preliminary to the submission of the Senator's second amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. The second amendment would be in order, would it not, if its sole purpose were to affect a figure in the amendment which has now become a part of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that it would be in order, if a motion to reconsider the committee amendment, as amended, were agreed to, which would require a majority vote.

Mr. BRIDGES. I assume the correctness of the ruling of the distinguished occupant of the chair, by and with the advice of the Parliamentarian, but I did not realize that when the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to, we would be precluded from changing a figure in the amendment so adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that in order to get this question before the Senate, it will be necessary for the distinguished minority floor leader to move to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. I so move.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I hope the distinguished Senator will reexamine this matter and not insist upon his motion. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator that, serving as chairman of the subcommittee, I felt it would have been wise to have an entirely separate bill with reference to the defense access highway authorization, but so much time elapsed between the time of the hearing in February and the time when the bill was ready to be considered by the full committee, that it was quite obvious we might have no access highway authorization at all. We were told by the Department of Defense and by the Atomic Energy Commission and others who were in charge of the defense program that the $45,000,000, which was the total amount authorized last year, had been exhausted and that the construction of certain projects was so completely necessary that, instead of not having any legislation at all, the committee should consider some amount, even though it was insufficient, to see the matter through the whole year.

I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that in the beginning the Defense Department asked for $150,000,000, and the committee, considering the testimony before it, felt it was quite clear that more than $50,000,000 would be required in the course of the fiscal year, and therefore put into the bill an amendment containing the $50,000,000 figure. I was very sure that amount would prove to be inadequate for the defense access highway construction which would be needed during the year.

The bill covers a great multitude of roads, such as access roads to new atomic energy bases, with some 24 access roads in one State to and from uranium mines. There are other roads to submarginal mining operations which are very necessary in the defense effort.

I hope the Senator will feel that he is justified in not pressing his motion, because I shall certainly have to oppose it very vigorously. I believe the $50,000,000 is considerably less than the amount which will be needed.

I make that statement at this time for the information of the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I, too, should like to tell the Senator from New Hampshire that the testimony which was adduced by the committee is to the effect that, as a matter of fact, three or four times the amount the committee allowed could be used. The committee has had experience with access road funds on several occasions. Two years ago, when the Senate was meeting in the old Supreme Court Chamber and the road bill was under consideration, the committee recommended $25,000,000 for access roads. A letter came from the executive branch of the Government suggesting cutting the amount to $10,000,000. It was not 40 days until the Korean situation developed, and then Congress had again to authorize the appropriation. Money will be needed in case of emer-

gency. As to most of it, suggestions were made by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, I should like to refer him to page 11 of the committee hearing, and to a portion of the report on this very subject, which the Department of the Army submitted to our committee. In that report the Senator will find that at the time of the report, on February 19, the items already certified by the Secretary of Defense to the Secretary of Commerce amounted to $18,000,000, and that by June 30, 1952, it was believed the amount would be $40,000,000. Of course the Defense Department does not have jurisdiction of such matters as forest-access roads, atomic-energy roads, and other roads of that kind.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the last paragraph on page 11 of the hearings, which is an excerpt taken from the report of the Department of Defense, addressed to Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ, chairman of the Committee on Public Works of the Senate, under date of February 19, 1952.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The estimated cost of access road projects which have been certified to the Secretary of Commerce by the Secretary of Defense is approximately $18,000,000. More projects have not been acted upon only because of the difficulties in obtaining qualified personnel and making the necessary administrative adjustments for handling the increased workload connected with this access-road program and other highways for national defense and highway utilization problems which have arisen since the enactment of Public Law 177, Eighty-second Congress on October 16, 1951. It is believed that these difficulties have now been overcome in large part. Accordingly, it is estimated that the Department of Defense certifications to the Secretary of Commerce will be current by June 30, 1952, and that all projects certified by that date will cost approximately 40,000,000. While there is no known way to determine accurately the amount of funds that will be required for access roads, it is believed that the appropriation of $150,000,000 authorized by section 9 of the bill will adequately provide for this requirement in the foreseeable future. Subject to the amendment indicated above the Department of Defense favors section 9.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I desire at this time to supply some background for a proposed amendment by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and myself to the Defense Production Act, S. 2594, relating to section 104 of the present act. The situation I am about to describe has had very little attention heretofore and deserves, in my opinion, very careful consideration.

First of all, the present Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, contains section 104 which provided import-control authority for fats and oils, including oil-bearing material, fatty acids, soap and soap powder, peanuts, butter, cheese, and other dairy products, and rice and rice products.

It will be recalled that there has been considerable discussion of provisions of that amendment. I note that the Committee on Banking and Currency, in reporting out S. 2594, a bill to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, has seen fit to rewrite section 104 and that its new section 101 eliminates the mandatory provisions of section 104 with respect to action by the Secretary of Agriculture and the President in imposing quotas.

My distinguished colleague from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has proposed an amendment to continue section 104 in effect. He has agreed with me to the addition of four commodities seriously affected by developments in recent years. These commodities are rye, barley, oats, and feed wheat which are being brought into this country in increasing quantities. It is background with respect to these four that I wish to supply at this time.

My present purpose is not to discuss the relative merits of the old section 104 compared with the proposed new section 101 but to outline why the same kind of treatment should be given to oats, barley, rye, and feed wheat which was provided for dairy products, rice, peanuts, and fats and oils.

RYE

In the case of rye production, producers in the United States have become very discouraged.

I ask unanimous consent at this time to have placed in the RECORD with my remarks a table marked "Exhibit F," showing the harvested acreage of rye in the United States from 1931 through 1951 and the official Government estimate of the estimated acreage for harvest in 1952.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

EXHIBIT F

Harvested acreage of rye, United States, 1931–52 [1] [2]

Year:	*Acreage (thousand acres)*
1931	3,153
1932	3,350
1933	2,405
1934	1,921
1935	4,066
1936	2,694
1937	3,825
1938	4,087
1939	3,822
1940	3,204
1941	3,573
1942	3,792
1943	2,652
1944	2,132
1945	1,856
1946	1,607
1947	2,010
1948	2,096
1949	1,560
1950	1,730
1951	[3] 1,733
Estimated acreage for harvest:	
1952	[3] 1,381

[1] Source: Crop Production, 1951 Annual Summary, Crop Reporting Board, U. S. Department of Agriculture, December 1951, p. 36.

[2] The 1950 acreage is revised on the basis of the 1950 Census of Agriculture and other check data.

[3] Source: May 9 Crop Report, U. S. Department of Agriculture, p. 1.

Mr. YOUNG. This table shows that in the 1930's, despite two serious droughts, United States farmers harvested an average of around 3,500,000 acres of rye annually. This fell off in the 1940's to something below 2,500,000 acres annually. The reduction has been rather consistent; and now for 1952, based on the May 9 crop report showing conditions on American farms as of May 1, we find this year the lowest prospective harvested acreage for more than 20 years. This year the May report estimates harvested acreage of rye at 1,381,000 acres.

Mr. President, I think that proves conclusively that as a result of vast imports of more cheaply produced rye, we are fast liquidating the rye industry of the United States.

It is possible that there will be further abandonment of acres because weather conditions have been somewhat adverse, particularly in my own State of North Dakota, and in South Dakota and Minnesota, which are important rye producing States.

Why has rye production fallen off? The answer is that imports, primarily from Canada, have increased substantially. These imports, while they are less than our domestic production, effectively determine the price of rye for our domestic producers.

Whereas in the 1922 and 1930 tariff acts there was an import duty on rye of 15 cents per 56-pound bushel, this has been reduced by negotiations carried on by the State Department to a point where the duty on rye is now only 6 cents a bushel. Taking into account the lower production costs and lower transportation costs in Canada, this 6-cent tariff is at present no impediment to the importation of rye, and the decline in our domestic production indicates that producers, unless appropriate steps are taken, are being forced to surrender the opportunity of supplying our domestic needs.

It does not seem to me that it is practical, desirable, or consistent with the program of expanded production proposed by the United States Department of Agriculture and supported by Congress to ask farmers to increase their production of rye while at the same time permitting their prices to be determined largely by imports.

Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended many times and as recently as 1948 and 1949, the clear legislative intent of Congress was to establish parity as the goal for farmers. However, parity will be increasingly unobtainable by farmers in the case of rye as long as very substantial imports come into this country. Indeed, the parity price for rye has been reduced 5 percent this year under transitional parity.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if the Senator from North Dakota would tell the Senate whether, in his opinion, he agrees with the Senator from South Dakota that in permitting this kind of competition from Canadian rye, we are actually operating in direct opposition to the program relating to parity prices adopted by the Senate Committee on Agriculture, the

House Committee on Agriculture, and the Congress, because it is impossible to maintain parity prices for American rye when, as rye goes up in the United States, there are expanding importations coming down from Canada.

Mr. YOUNG. I agree completely with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. By permitting excessive imports of any given commodity, we destroy not only the price of the commodity, but also the whole intent of the agricultural adjustment program.

Mr. MUNDT. Is it not true also that, following such a ruinous tariff agricultural program in the instant case of rye, the only way we are going to be able to stimulate domestic rye production, the only way we are going to be able to give the farmer a parity price for rye, will be to provide a parity-price-support floor whereby the Government and the taxpayer would have to pay the American farmer for his rye? Not only that, but, under those circumstances, with rye coming in from Canada, we would also be putting a floor under the price of rye for the Canadian farmer as well as the American farmer.

Mr. YOUNG. That is exactly what we are doing at the present time. We are not only supporting the price of rye on behalf of farmers in the United States but, in effect, are supporting the price not only in Canada but also in other places in the world.

I might point out to the Senator from South Dakota that only a year or two ago, when we had potatoes running out of our ears, we were importing sizable quantities of potatoes from Canada. Those imports were largely responsible for the depressed price of potatoes and the heavy cost to the Government of the United States. Now, when we need those potatoes they have few to sell us. I think it is imperative that at all times we protect our own industry in the United States to insure future supplies, if nothing else.

Mr. MUNDT. Not only should we protect it, but if we do not we are driving a knife into the back of the whole agricultural program. What broke down the potato program was the importation of foreign potatoes, and we should learn something from that experience before we adopt a similar course in the field of rye, oats, and other grains.

Mr. YOUNG. I had intended to touch on the importation of oats a little later, but I think now is a good time to bring up a few figures on oats imports, since the Senator from South Dakota has mentioned oats.

Mr. MUNDT. I hope the Senator will bring out the fact that the price of oats is very seriously depressed in the Northwest today.

Mr. YOUNG. I certainly shall do so. According to the May 15 report of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, the average price for oats in North Dakota was 59 cents a bushel. The support price for the 1951 program, under which those oats were produced, was 65 cents a bushel. In other words, the price of oats is 6 cents a bushel lower than the price support level, which means that the Department of Agriculture will unnecessarily have to spend millions of dollars in support of oats, when all they would have to do to hold the price up to support levels, would be to shut off a part of the imports from Canada.

Mr. MUNDT. Under the provisions of our amendment, that will become mandatory, and the Department can do that.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct. I should point out, further, that the announced support price for oats in our area this year is 70 cents a bushel. That will make a spread of 11 cents a bushel between the support level and the cash price of oats, which means that the Government of the United States will be spending unnecessarily millions of dollars on the support price of oats. Such support would be unnecessary in this case if only we would cut off some of the imports.

Rye is not a basic commodity, but a price support and purchase agreement program has been offered by the United States Department of Agriculture at about 80 percent of transitional parity. It is now felt that a great deal of the rye produced even from our greatly reduced acreage of rye will this year find its way into the price-support program because the market prices are dominated by the imports of rye. This year these imports will amount to three million to four million bushels. They have been higher still in other recent years. Many of us feel these imports are bound to be higher in the next several years because Canada is tending to expand its production of rye because of market opportunities here.

The United States Department of Agriculture and the President could, of course, invoke Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended. This section has as its purpose to complement and assist the Agricultural Adjustment Act by the imposition of quotas when necessary.

No step has been taken, to my knowledge, to investigate the effect and influence of imports on the production of rye or on the extent to which imports interfere with the Government's rye production programs, and there is presently in prospect no action by the Administration of which I am aware. Thus, the purpose of section 22 has been ignored despite its clear intent to protect and support our farm programs.

It is recalled that the first sentence of section 22, the import section of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, stated:

> Whenever the President has reason to believe that any one or more articles are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in sufficient quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective or materially interfere with any program or operation undertaken, or to reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any commodity subject to and with respect to which any program is in operation, under this title or the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or section 32, Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission, which shall give precedence to investigations under this section to determine such facts.

Ordinarily, one would think the Secretary of Agriculture or the President of the United States would take action under present circumstances. But, as I pointed out, the President very rarely has used section 22, and it is for that reason I believe we must have mandatory provisions, such as are contained in section 104.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. If I recall correctly, section 22 has not been used since 1939 or 1940, for the purpose for which Congress intended it.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. It has been used to reduce tariffs, but it has never been used to protect the American market or the American support program.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his statement.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from North Dakota also realize it is barely possible that, if through outright failure to apply the law as intended by Congress, sufficient imports can be induced to come into this country, the price to the American farmer may be reduced to such a point that he would be willing to accept a Government check to help him support his family? That would be the ultimate result—either that or the elimination of the program, as in the case of potatoes.

Mr. YOUNG. I think the Senator from Vermont is absolutely correct. That would be the inevitable result.

In view of the inactivity which we have witnessed incident to utilizing section 22 and until such time as Congress can, through appropriate committees, ascertain very fully the facts incident to the influence of imports on rye—the influence of these imports on our production, on our prices, on the program of Congress to see parity for producers, and on the program of the Department to expand production as a part of the defense effort—until such time, I believe rye deserves to have treatment similar to that which is proposed for fats and oils, dairy products, peanuts, and rice—at least for a period of 1 year.

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE CASE OF BARLEY

Developments in the case of barley are somewhat similar with respect to reduced acreage by American farmers and increased imports from Canada which are having the effect of discouraging production in the United States.

A table marked "Exhibit A" shows barley imports over the years, with the estimated imports for the year ending June 30 of 18,000,000 bushels being the highest for any year since the war years when the Government followed a program of buying Canadian barley to stimulate our livestock production as an emergency measure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table marked "Exhibit A" printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT A.—*Barley imports*

[In thousands of bushels]

Year beginning July 1—	From Canada	From all others	Total imports
1933	3	27	30
1934	9,499	1,479	10,978
1935	642	6	648
1936	16,061	1,090	17,151
1937	1,289	1	1,290
1938	322	(1)	322
1939	715	1	716
1940	1,214	20	1,234
1941	1,690	0	1,690
1942	26,456	41	26,497
1943	39,757	858	40,615
1944	36,961	854	37,815
1945	5,647	0	5,647
1946	4,063	0	4,063
1947	973	12	985
1948	10,366	9	10,375
1949	15,321	272	15,593
1950	11,119	(1)	11,119
1951	[2] 18,000		

[1] Less than 500 bushels.
[2] Preliminary estimate.

Source: Data for years 1933 through 1950 from the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, U. S. Department of Agriculture. Compiled from official records, Bureau of the Census and of the U. S. Tariff Commission.

Mr. YOUNG. The March "Intentions to Plant" report of the United States Department of Agriculture indicated that farmers intended to reduce barley plantings by 10 percent under last year's acreage. This meant that the acreage would be 24 percent below the goal of barley production set up by the United States Department of Agriculture this year.

The present tariff on barley is 7½ cents per bushel compared with 20 cents in the 1922 and 1930 Tariff Acts.

The reduced acreage comes in the face of a small increase in the support price announced by the Department of Agriculture. Whereas it supported barley through a loan and purchase agreement program last year at about 75 percent of parity, its announced price support for this year is about 80 percent of parity. Actually this is not much of an increase because parity prices for barley have been reduced by transitional parity.

But of course, with the high and increasing level of imports, there is absolutely no chance of farmers reaching the congressional goal of parity in the case of barley.

Thus, once more, until Congress has an opportunity to study this subject in some detail, I believe that we are amply justified, for a period of a year, in directing the Administration to take appropriate steps to arrest these imports in view of the fact that apparently section 22 will not be invoked.

OATS

In the case of oats, imports from Canada will run a minimum of 50,000,000 bushels and perhaps may reach 60,000,000 bushels this year. The tariff on oats is now only 4 cents a bushel compared with 15 cents under the 1922 Tariff Act and 16 cents under the 1930 Tariff Act. The table marked "Exhibit B" shows the imports of oats by years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table marked "Exhibit B" printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT B—*Oats imports*

[In thousands of bushels]

Year beginning July 1—	From Canada	From all others	Total imports
1933	131	12	143
1934	1,635	13,979	15,614
1935	66	32	98
1936	65	91	156
1937	4	7	11
1938	973	36	1,009
1939	10,117	425	10,542
1940	9,973	240	10,213
1941	969	1,366	1,305
1942	58,725	99	58,824
1943	26,235	22	26,257
1944	67,948	0	67,948
1945	21,478	0	21,478
1946	923	1	924
1947	1,270	389	1,659
1948	19,261	1	19,262
1949	18,341	1,393	19,734
1950	28,012	1,997	30,009
1951	[1] 50,000		

[1] Preliminary estimate.

Source: Data for years 1933 through 1950 from the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, U. S. Department of Agriculture. Compiled from official records, Bureau of the Census and of the U. S. Tariff Commission.

Mr. YOUNG. In addition, in the case of oats, as is also true of barley and rye, transitional parity has come into force and effect, under which parity is now 5 percent lower than it was in terms of the indexes of prices paid and received by farmers a year ago. This is because, for oats, barley, and rye, a new parity formula is now gradually coming into effect rather than reliance on the old formula based on 1909–14 price relationships.

The imports of oats are very substantial at the present time, and the price of oats is depressed. As of May 15, 1952, it was reported by the Department of Agriculture on May 29 that the average price received by farmers for oats was 82 cents a bushel, compared with an effective parity price even under transitional parity which reduced parity by 5 percent, or 94 cents a bushel on the same date. The price support announced for this year is about 80 percent of transitional parity.

As I pointed out a while ago, the present cash price of oats is 6 cents below the support levels in my home State of North Dakota; and, based upon the announced program for 1952, they will be 11 cents a bushel below. The price announced for this year is about 80 percent of transitional parity.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator say that the market price of oats is 6 cents below the present support level?

Mr. YOUNG. That is true in my area. In some other areas the cash price is about even with the support level.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator maintain that that is due wholly to the fact that imported oats can be bought cheaper than domestically produced oats?

Mr. YOUNG. I think that is largely the answer. The price of oats has dropped more than 25 cents a bushel in the past 3 months, under the impact of heavy imports.

Mr. AIKEN. Is that because the dealers and mill men of that area buy Canadian oats with which to fill their orders instead of using American oats?

Mr. YOUNG. I think the Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I addressed to Secretary of Agriculture Brannan asking for an investigation of certain practices which the able Senator from Vermont has just mentioned.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 2, 1952.

Hon. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
The Secretary of Agriculture,
The Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Continued heavy importations of Canadian oats, barley, rye, and feed wheat are not only jeopardizing our entire price-support program for feed grains, but they are also forcing our producers to switch from these crops to others which are more profitable, and at a time when you are asking for increased production of feed grains.

I am certain that the Congress never contemplated that the price-support program would be used, in effect, to bolster prices to Canadian producers, but that has been happening for years, with the result that our domestic acreage of oats, barley, and rye has been declining, while Canadian output, especially of oats, has been on the increase. These heavy imports result in an additional and unnecessary cost of commodity-price support operations.

As you know, United States rye production this year will be the smallest since the disastrous drought of 1934, principally because of a greatly reduced acreage. American farmers have learned that they could expect the bulk of the Canadian rye exports to move into the United States year after year, depressing prices and making it uneconomic for them to continue producing rye on land which was equally adaptable to wheat.

Our barley acreage this year, based upon farmers' intentions to plant, will apparently be about 24 percent below the Department of Agriculture's goal. Here, again, I think Canadian competition is largely responsible.

The heavy importations of Canadian oats this year and last raises some even more serious implications. There appears to be some evidence that much of these oats have been brought in not for marketing through regular commercial channels but solely for delivery against futures contracts, principally in Chicago. Between December 1951 and May 1952 the May oats futures on the Chicago Board of Trade declined from $1.01 per bushel to 74½ cents. This sharp break in oats prices cost American farmers millions of dollars. I think you must agree that the present price of oats, strictly from the standpoint of feed value, is far out of line with the price of corn.

I have reason to believe that at least some of these oats were brought into the United States at a time when the price relationship between Canada and this country was such as to make the transactions unprofitable. The only possible explanation would seem to be that the importers expected to make a profit by delivering these oats against futures contracts and forcing domestic prices down.

It appears that Cargill, Inc., has been the principal importer of Canadian oats and that virtually all of the heavy deliveries in Chicago against the May futures contract originated with this company. I was not impressed by some of the practices of this organization as revealed in the recent hearings before the Senate Agriculture Committee, and I think it is a matter of record that they were suspended from all trading privileges as

far back as 1937 when they engineered a corner of the corn market. Apparently they now manage to trade in Chicago through member commission houses, although it would seem to me that this would defeat the purpose of their suspension.

I believe there is enough evidence to warrant a thorough investigation of Cargill's activities in the oats futures markets, and I urgently request that you direct Mr. J. M. Mehl, Administrator of the Commodity Exchange Authority, to institute such an investigation.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senator.

Mr. YOUNG. One commission firm, Cargill & Co., it appears, had been importing oats at a time when perhaps it was not even profitable so far as cash sales were concerned, but it appears that they may have been importing oats and delivering them against futures contracts, making a profit on the futures market rather than on cash oats transactions.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not sure but that the Senator should ask Congress, rather than the Secretary of Agriculture, to investigate a situation of which the Secretary of Agriculture must have full knowledge, and which he is permitting to continue. If the situation continues, it means either that the United States must undertake to support the prices of these commodities wherever produced in the world, or that we shall have to give up the farm-support-price programs.

It is my understanding that section 22 was enacted by Congress for the express purpose of controlling a situation such as this. It is obvious that if we are to maintain support prices in this country at a level sufficiently high to encourage the American farmer to produce commodities, we are bound to have to regulate the amount of such commodities which can be imported.

Mr. YOUNG. I agree with the Senator entirely. Let me say to the Senator that if I do not get results from my request of the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the situation, I plan to ask the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and its investigating staff to go into the subject thoroughly.

Mr. AIKEN. I think, however, there is this to be said for the Canadian position: Western Canada has become a great producer of grain. Next to the United States, I believe Canada is the greatest grain-producing country in the world. Canada must export about 90 percent of her wheat, and I presume a considerable percentage of other agricultural commodities, although perhaps not so much as in the case of wheat. The grain is produced largely in the western provinces. It must be shipped from Atlantic coast ports. Canada does not have facilities for transporting all that grain to the ports of export, whence it can go into the world markets. That is why there is an added incentive to dump this tremendous grain crop on the central west markets of the United States. We could relieve that situation to a considerable extent if Congress would stop dragging its feet and authorize construction of the St. Lawrence seaway, which would enable Canada to put her grain on the world markets instead of dumping it all on Chicago, Duluth, Minneapolis, and other American markets.

Mr. YOUNG. I agree with the Senator entirely. The construction of the St. Lawrence seaway would be a great contribution to the economy of the whole Nation.

Mr. AIKEN. Western Canadian farmers could save probably in the neighborhood of 10 cents a bushel on wheat and rye, which is about the amount which they make by unloading it onto us, under our support price program.

Mr. YOUNG. There is another factor entering into the question. As the Senator from Vermont knows, the railways in Canada are nationalized. They have not had nearly as many rate increases as have railroads in the United States. I think there have been as many as 12 rate increases in the United States, affecting farm commodities.

Mr. AIKEN. To that extent the St. Lawrence seaway would affect the fortunes of the North Dakota farmer by enabling him to put his wheat, oats, and rye on the market at 10 or 15 cents a bushel lower transportation costs than he must pay today.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. The able and distinguished Senators from North Dakota and South Dakota have submitted an amendment to what we know as section 104. The amendment is absolutely sound, and should be favorably considered. There is no reason why the price of oats or barley should be at the present low figure, except for the imports which are coming into the United States.

Our feed crop particularly feed corn, was short last fall. Normally, with a short corn crop there would be an increase in the price of oats and in the price of barley, because both of them are supplements to the corn crop at a fair value. In spite of the shortage of feed corn we note the price on oats going down to the low level at which it is today. The same applies to barley and rye.

Mr. President, either we are going to stand by and watch our support program completely discredited or put in jeopardy by these imports, or we shall have to adopt an amendment such as the Senator from North Dakota is now discussing.

The support program was initiated to give assurance to agricultural producers that there would be a floor under their commodities. If the support program must carry all the imports that may come in from all areas of the world, whether the products be dairy products or other agricultural products, it will be found eventually that the same situation will obtain with respect to these products as has obtained with respect to potatoes for the past 18 months. Thus the program will be discredited and attacked by the taxpayers, the press, and everyone else. Ultimately it will go out of existence.

Not only will the farmer suffer, but the consumer will suffer also, as the consumer is now suffering for lack of potatoes and from the inflationary price of potatoes. The producer of potatoes could not take the chance of increasing his acreage and going to the tremendous expense of producing a large crop when he did not know what the harvest would be or what price would prevail at harvesttime. Therefore, the producer reduced his over-all acreage in order to be on the safe side. Then, due to climatic conditions, over which the farmer had no control, a short crop in potatoes resulted. The consumer therefore must pay unreasonably high prices in order to obtain potatoes. Oftentimes it is impossible to find potatoes in the markets. The same situation will be true with respect to other agricultural products which are under the support program, if we are to bear the burden of supporting all commodities and products which are shipped in under reduced tariffs, such as oats, rye, barley, and other commodities which could be mentioned.

The Senator from North Dakota has submitted a chart which shows specifically what the tariff was in 1922 on oats, barley, and rye, and what the reduction in that tariff has been during the past 30 years since 1922. The reduction has been constant, down to 4 cents a bushel. The farm program has had to carry the burden of this reduced tariff rate.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator from Minnesota is absolutely correct. Price supports for many agricultural products would be impossible or at least tremendously costly, perhaps to the extent that they would be prohibitive, if we do not have a little protection against more cheaply produced products which come in from other countries.

I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota. He has not only made a great study of the whole subject of agriculture but is a very great friend of agriculture, as is the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

We do not know definitely at this time what the acreage of oats will be this year, but there is very considerable evidence that farmers have reduced acreage except in situations where they had no choice in their rotation programs.

There is a considerable quantity of surplus oats still remaining in Canada with a result that it is possible that even a lower acreage of oats this year with a lower total production will result in very considerable quantities going under the loan program at 80 percent of parity.

It seems to me that, in view of the congressional goal of parity for these commodities, Congress will be failing in its duty if it does not take appropriate action on the amendment which is proposed in the case of oats, as well as in the case of the other commodities I have mentioned.

FEED WHEAT

Feed wheat, or wheat unfit for human consumption, is coming into this country in greatly increased quantities. For the year ending June 30, it is now estimated that our imports from Canada will be more than 40,000,000 bushels, the high-

est by far in modern agricultural history, if not for all time.

At least, the table, exhibit D, which I offer at this time, being imports of wheat unfit for human consumption, indicates that this is by far the highest figure for the period covered beginning with the year 1933.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT D

Imports: Wheat unfit for human consumption

[In thousands of bushels]

Year beginning July 1—	From Canada	From all others	Total imports
1933	6	0	6
1934	8,128	18	8,140
1935	9,163	42	9,205
1936	4,040	17	4,057
1937	4	0	4
1938	187	21	208
1939	11	75	86
1940	3,180	57	3,237
1941	1,770	16	1,786
1942	150	0	150
1943	187	2	189
1944	15,919	0	15,919
1945	719	7	726
1946	28	0	28
1947	118	0	118
1948	10	1	11
1949	1,097	(1)	1,097
1950	11,647	0	11,647
1951	[2] 40,000		

[1] Less than 500 bushels.
[2] Preliminary estimate.

Source: Data for years 1933 through 1950 from the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, U. S. Department of Agriculture. Compiled from official records, Bureau of the Census and of the U. S. Tariff Commission.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, it happens that there has been a considerable increase in Canadian feed wheat production in recent years. Transportation costs for moving wheat from the surplus producing areas of the country to the far eastern and far western consuming areas have gone up more rapidly than transportation rates in Canada. Production costs have also increased faster here, including farm wage rates. The result is that these imports have reduced considerably the demand for wheat in the United States of feeding quality. Normally there are considerable quantities of such wheat because of adverse harvest conditions and problems of infestation in storage. In the case of one variety of wheat, red durum, which is grown in substantial quantities in South Dakota, much of it is normally consumed as feed wheat.

The Feed Situation, issued on April 11 by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, states in the last paragraph on page 8, in a review of wheat feeding in 1952–53:

> The total tonnage of wheat to be fed in 1952–53 probably will be at least as large as during the current season. During the current October to September feeding season, about 150,000,000 bushels are expected to be fed, including low quality wheat from Canada. If the domestic feed supply situation should turn less favorable in 1952–53, increasing quantities of low quality wheat and feed grains could be supplied by Canada, since substantial quantities of these grains will be carried over into 1952–53.

In other words, the Department is reporting that very substantial quantities of surplus grains are available in Canada which serve to depress prices here, making very certain that unless steps are taken in connection with restoring section 104 and adding to it the commodities rye, barley, oats, and feed wheat or wheat unfit for human consumption, the congressional goal of parity for these commodities is simply a hollow and empty promise.

It was never intended that the price-support programs, established to insure orderly marketing, a fair share of income for farmers, and ample production to meet the Nation's needs, would be utilized as a magnet to attract in the same products from outside the Nation's borders.

Instead, it was intended, through the enactment of section 22 and its subsequent amendments, that the price-support program to the farmers and the Government's investment in it would be protected and that prompt administrative steps would be taken by Executive order by the President.

A step in that kind was taken in 1941 by President Roosevelt in the case of wheat for milling purposes, or wheat for human consumption, following an investigation and a report to the President, dated May 19, 1941, by the United States Tariff Commission. An Executive order was issued which established an annual quota of 800,000 bushels of wheat and 4,000,000 pounds of flour which might be brought into the United States annually. In the case of wheat, most of this quota was assigned to Canada. Cotton producers were similarly provided assistance by Executive order.

In the case of wheat, however, there is no limitation on the quantities of feed wheat which may be brought into the country, and the tariff which was long 10 percent ad valorem at ports of entry in the case of feed wheat have been reduced by negotiations carried on by the State Department to 5 percent ad valorem at ports of entry.

This duty, in view of lower production and transportation costs in Canada, affords no protection to American producers. Indeed, the chief reason why we have not been flooded with cheaper feed grains from Canada is the difficulties encountered in the Canadian transportation situation. Canadian railroads frequently have to borrow freight cars from American carriers, and our own transportation situation has not permitted unlimited loans of these cars.

CANADIAN PRODUCTION PATTERN AFFECTED

There is an additional point not to be overlooked. That is that in the absence of any quotas to protect American producers, Canadian production patterns are undergoing some change. For instance, the three prairie provinces which supply most of the surplus oats apparently stabilized production somewhere in the magnitude of 225,000,000 bushels a year for a considerable period. This production has now moved upward as a result of the influence of the American market opened through tariff reductions, and most crop estimators now expect Canadian production of oats in the same provinces to average around 325,000,000 bushels annually.

The prospect of a continued rise in Canadian imports, plus the trend of our own acreage in the face of increased production asked by the United States Department of Agriculture, which goals are not being met, is not pleasant to contemplate. Our producers need encouragement. The table marked "Exhibit E" shows the downward trend of our feed-grain acreage.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have that table printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT E

Harvested acreage of crops, United States, 1931–51 [1] [2]

[In thousands of acres]

Year	Corn, all	Oats	Barley	Sorghum grain	Feed grains
1931	106,866	40,193	11,181	4,443	162,683
1932	110,577	41,700	13,206	4,400	169,883
1933	105,918	36,528	9,641	4,354	156,441
1934	92,193	29,455	6,577	2,396	130,621
1935	95,974	40,109	12,436	4,597	153,116
1936	93,154	33,654	8,329	2,793	137,930
1937	93,930	35,542	9,969	4,915	144,356
1938	92,140	36,042	10,610	4,699	143,511
1939	88,279	33,460	12,739	4,760	139,238
1940	86,429	35,431	13,525	6,374	141,759
1941	85,357	38,161	14,276	6,015	143,809
1942	87,367	38,197	16,958	5,991	148,513
1943	92,060	38,914	14,900	6,889	152,763
1944	94,014	39,672	12,301	9,385	155,372
1945	88,079	41,933	10,465	6,408	146,885
1946	88,489	43,205	10,411	6,773	148,878
1947	83,932	38,451	11,014	5,629	139,026
1948	86,067	40,198	11,987	7,296	145,548
1949	87,029	40,440	9,857	6,612	143,938
1950	81,817	40,733	11,153	10,335	144,038
1951	81,306	36,454	9,391	8,449	135,600

[1] Crop Production, 1951 Annual Summary, Crop Reporting Board, U. S. Department of Agriculture, December 1951, p. 36.
[2] The 1950 acreages are revised on the basis of the 1950 Census of Agriculture and other check data.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I believe United States interests can be temporarily protected by the suggested amendment, without doing serious injury to any group.

The Government's interest from the standpoint of the Treasury is not the least interest that we should take into account. It is unthinkable that the Government should acquire considerable quantities of these feed grains through commodity credit programs, then encourage their export at prices below the acquisition costs of the Government or give them away under foreign-aid programs, while at the same time meeting a substantial portion of our domestic needs by imports for which we pay cash.

To a considerable extent this is the policy we have been following. I think it is high time that there should be a moratorium on this conflict in policy, a halt until a full examination of the subject can be made by Congress. This is the course of action which I propose, a course of action I hope that the Senate will adopt.

CONTINUANCE OF CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS—AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT, 1916

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2437) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended, and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I withdraw my previous motion to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment, as amended, beginning on page 11, in line 6, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the motion is withdrawn.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, no other committee amendments are pending. Why cannot we proceed now to vote on the question of the final passage of the bill?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I seek the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], I move to strike out section 6, as amended, beginning on page 7, in line 3, down to and including line 4, on page 9 of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion submitted by the Senator from Michigan, for himself and the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, section 6 provides for the expenditure by the United States Government of $8,000,000 for completing the construction of a road in the Republic of Nicaragua. The road is known as the Rama Road.

A few years ago the Senate of the United States was interested in an investigation of the construction of the Inter-American Highway. At that time I was a member of the so-called Truman committee, which decided to make an investigation of that highway. The Truman committee then sent a subcommittee to various Latin-American Republics, to examine into the building of the highway, because its construction was costing so much more than ever had been anticipated.

The members of the subcommittee discovered that the military authorities had gone there first and had spent many millions of dollars for the building of the highway, and then the Bureau of Public Roads decided that the road which had been laid out and built by the military authorities was, at least in part, not in accordance with what the Bureau of Public Roads desired the road to be; so that Bureau discarded the portion of the highway which had been built by the military engineers, and began to build its own highway.

We have spent many millions of dollars and much time on building the highway known as the Inter-American Highway. This particular item of $8,000,000, however, does not relate to the building of the Inter-American Highway.

When I traveled over the road which was built, I went by jeep, automobile, airplane, or donkey. When I reached Nicaragua, I discovered that a road had been built to the east. I asked the persons who were taking me over the section just north of Managua where that particular highway went. I was advised that it had nothing to do with the Inter-American Highway, and that therefore I would not be interested in that part of the highway. I asked whether any money provided by the United States Government was to be used in the building of the highway. At first there was an evasive answer, but finally the statement was made that no appropriated money had been spent from the funds for the Inter-American Highway.

After I drove some 35 kilometers on the highway, I discovered that the United States Government had spent $4,000,000 for construction of the highway east to Bluefields, which is on the Atlantic coast. I was advised that the reason why the Congress would not be concerned with that highway was that it was a personal matter with the President of the United States and the President of Nicaragua.

When I returned to the United States, I discovered that the $4,000,000 which had been spent on the Rama Road had been obtained from the President's so-called private or secret funds. The President had advanced, for the building of that highway, $4,000,000 of the money of the taxpayers of the United States; and at that time more money was being requested for that purpose.

Mr. President, that highway was not the only one built outside the Inter-American Highway on which we were spending millions of dollars. I discovered that another million dollars had been spent for the building of a highway around a lake. Ferryboats had been operating across the lake for many, many years; but when the war came it was decided that a highway should be built around the lake.

Mr. President, I wonder what we are really preparing for. For what purpose is the American taxpayer spending his money? Is it for preparedness? Is it for preparedness against what we call the common enemy, namely, communism or Russia or her satellites; or is it because of a desire of the United States to try to purchase good will all over the world?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is this road being constructed, or has it been constructed, by American contractors?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would say that a portion of it was built by American contractors and another portion was built by local labor; but the United States was paying for it. The United States spent money there to the tune of $4,000,000.

Mr. AIKEN. Is equipment with which the work on the road may be continued now there?

Mr. FERGUSON. Oh, no; all the equipment has been removed. I was there in 1948.

Mr. AIKEN. What are the specific benefits which will accrue to the United States from further work on that road?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not find that there will be any benefits.

Mr. AIKEN. I note the statement in the report that there would be benefits to the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have made some notations on page 372 of the hearings from which I should like to read, to show the Senator that there would be no benefits.

Mr. AIKEN. Is there American-owned property within the area traversed by the road?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. AIKEN. None at all?

Mr. FERGUSON. None at all. I shall endeavor to state the reasons for the claim that we should agree to build this highway. Many years ago there was talk about an agreement covering the acquisition of land upon which to build a canal across that section of Nicaragua; so, in order to satisfy Nicaragua, the President of the United States, without advising the Congress at all and without having obtained any kind of authority from the Congress, agreed that he would build the highway for the Nicaraguan Government.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the United States own a right-of-way for a canal?

Mr. FERGUSON. There is a perpetual treaty giving the United States a right-of-way for a canal. But this highway has nothing to do with the canal, it is no part of the canal.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the treaty provide that the United States shall pay for the canal zone, in the event the canal is built? I realize that I am going back into ancient history somewhat, but I should like to know.

Mr. FERGUSON. The United States has a treaty with Nicaragua giving our country a perpetual and exclusive right to build a canal through Nicaragua. In 1914, we cemented the agreement by paying $3,000,000 to Nicaragua. So I assume that the $3,000,000 was the purchase price of a permanent and perpetual right-of-way for the canal. I find nothing which indicates that we owe any further money for the right to build the canal.

But, Mr. President, we have put $4,000,000 into this particular highway. As we moved north on the Inter-American Highway I discovered another blacktop road leading off the highway. I asked where that highway led. I was told that it was not a part of the Inter-American Highway. When I asked who built it, I was told that the United States had built it. Why did the United States build this spur road? The reason given was that the President of Nicaragua had a farm about 16 or 18 miles off the highway, so the United States used the money of American taxpayers for the purpose of building a highway to the farm of the President of Nicaragua.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. How does that distinguish Nicaragua from certain areas in the United States?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not know that it does. But I say there is less rhyme and less reason for building a road to the residence of the President of Nicaragua through the use of the American taxpayers' money, than there would be if we were building a similar road in the United States. I suppose it is a question of degree.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I know the Senator from Michigan wants to be fair.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is a correct statement.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am sure he wants to be fair even with respect to the President or the king of some foreign country.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; the Senator from Michigan desires to be fair to everyone.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the fact is that the road in question goes through a part of the property of the President of Nicaragua——

Mr. FERGUSON. It goes toward it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; that is correct. In that case, I submit there is no more significance in that than there is with respect to Highway 66, which passes the Governor's mansion at Springfield, Ill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Wait a moment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know the history of the road referred to.

Mr. FERGUSON. The spur road had nothing to do with the contract covering the construction of the Inter-American Highway. It was a spur leading off the Inter-American Highway to the President's farm, 16 or 18 miles from the highway.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Perhaps the natives were becoming Americanized, and had learned to do it that way. That happens in the United States, too, as the Senator knows.

Mr. FERGUSON. If that is the way by which we are to Americanize other people, I say to the Senator that we are not going to keep them Americanized very long. The Nicaraguans are one of the peoples of America.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. They ought to be interested in the things which interest us.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Why not tell the people of the United States the history of the Rama Road?

Mr. FERGUSON. I intend to tell them.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The people of the United States ought to know. I have been in the country to which reference is being made. I am not prejudiced.

Mr. FERGUSON. I intend to tell the people of the United States about the Rama Road. At this critical time, when we have such a huge deficit, we should not be sending $8,000,000 to Nicaragua to be used in the construction of a highway which we have no obligation to build, and which would be of no value to the taxpayers of the United States so far as defense purposes are concerned at this time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Did the Senator from Michigan vote for the last ECA bill?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think so, after certain deductions had been made.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Did the Senator know that that bill contained an appropriation of $27,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money for the benefit of Great Britain, to enable her to fulfill her obligation to Guatemala? The Senator voted for that bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I did not know that such an appropriation was contained in that bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the statement of the United States Ambassador to Nicaragua, beginning on page 370 of the hearings on the pending bill, is revealing.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is very revealing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is revealing, for in a statement which appears on page 373 of the hearings, the Ambassador says:

> The position taken by some Members of the Congress that no such commitment should be made or is valid until the Congress provides the money is a proper one for debate in Washington, but it confuses Nicaraguans.

Mr. President, I should not be a bit surprised if secret commitments and commitments which are in contravention of law or for which there is no authority, should result in confusing people. How long can the State Department and the President capriciously and arbitrarily commit this country and the Public Treasury, and then endeavor to make it appear that it confuses people? I suppose we ought to confuse some folk a little more.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am not for this authorization merely because it confuses people. I am for it because I feel that, inasmuch as Uncle Sam is so powerful and so great, he should keep his promises. If the Senator from Michigan will bear with me for a moment——

Mr. FERGUSON. Indeed, I am glad to listen to what the Senator from New Mexico has to say. If necessary, I would ask unanimous consent that he might continue.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If Senators will be patient with me, I will tell them the history of this authorization. In 1914 we thought it might be necessary to build the Nicaraguan canal. So Mr. Bryan and the diplomatic representatives of Nicaragua got together. As a result, Nicaragua gave the United States the right, in perpetuity, to build the Nicaraguan canal. Of course, the people of Nicaragua felt that through the building of the canal certain benefits would accrue to them. The fact is that the authorization is now for the amount of $8,000,000, and even if it were increased above that by $4,000,000, the amount would be far less than it would have cost Uncle Sam to build the Nicaraguan canal. Uncle Sam never did build it. I think it was a pretty good business proposition, even if we had given $12,000,000.

I do not believe the President had any right to make any commitment. Only Congress had such right; but Congress had accepted and ratified a so-called sacred treaty, all the benefits of which were on our side. That is the only justification I can see for the building of the Rama Road.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Where is the obligation that comes from the treaty? We were notified in 1942 that the canal was not economically feasible and it had no relationship whatsoever to the 165 miles of east-west highway. An effort was made to justify it on the ground that it had defensive value, but when General Eisenhower was serving as Chief of Staff he said, as will be noted in the hearings, that it could have hemispheric value. He did not say it had such value. Had we gone there to build a canal, whether it was a barge canal or a blue-water canal, we would have put up all the money and Nicaragua would have derived a very substantial part of the benefits. But what has that to do with an east-west road?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It has this to do with an east-west road: Evidently, from the testimony of Mr. Miller, the Assistant Secretary of State, and that of Ambassador Waynick, if we did not build the canal it would be only fitting and proper that we should build them a road for $8,000,000. We still have a perpetual right, but we are not doing anything about it.

That is the only justification I can see. There is no idea of confusing any one; that does not appeal to me at all; but I feel that if we asked for the right to build a canal and were given the right to build it, we obligated ourselves to build it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. We paid $3,000,000 for the right in 1914. We paid for the perpetual right. Where is the consideration for the $4,000,000, and now the $8,000,000—$12,000,000 in all?

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is a saving to Uncle Sam of $800,000,000. It would have cost $800,000,000 to build that canal.

Mr. FERGUSON. We were not under any obligation to build it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We talk about fair play, Mr. President. The difficulty with some persons is that they see only the power of might and not the power of justice, decency, and dignity.

Mr. FERGUSON. What I am trying to figure out today is how to accord fair play to the American taxpayers. We are talking about fair play for everyone else, but when we suggest that there should be fair play for the American taxpayers, we are criticized for it.

Let us see whether this project is of military value. Is there any opinion now to the effect that it is of military value? When was Dwight Eisenhower Chief of Staff? It was back in 1946 and 1947, 5 years ago. Is there any member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff today who will say that from a military standpoint we should spend $8,000,000 on the Rama road? I should like to hear one of them come before the committee and advocate

that it is a military necessity, if the war which we are preparing to fight should come, and that we should spend that large sum of money.

Mr. President, has not the time come when we should be considerate of the taxpayers' money? If there ever was an item not essential, not necessary, and not even desirable, it is this Rama road item.

I read from the hearings:

It seems clear, however, that President Roosevelt and the Department did not contemplate that the matter would require at any time a special congressional appropriation, believing that the allocation from the emergency fund would suffice.

Mr. President, they thought they could take $4,000,000 of the taxpayers' money out of a secret fund to build a highway—I am referring to the State Department, because the President would not know anything except what he was told at the time—and we would never know anything about it as Members of the Senate. The taxpayers would not know anything about it, and the road would be built in a foreign nation. It was thought that $4,000,000 would complete the road. I read further:

Furthermore, I do not represent the road as having present military or other value to the United States.

There is the key to the situation. The State Department will not certify today that the road has any military or other value to the United States.

I read further:

But I am firmly of the opinion that this commitment to Nicaragua should be honored and the road completed for the following considerations.

Mr. President, we had a treaty with Nicaragua. The President of the United States has no inherent right to cancel that treaty without the consent of the Congress which had ratified it in 1914. If there were a waterway constructed across the country, it might become a very valuable asset. Not all the people in Nicaragua believe that highways are good things. I remember when we were driving along one of the highways, not at this particular place, a farmer was coming down the hill driving some little pigs to market. We stopped and asked him, through the interpreter, how he liked the new highway. He said he did not like it at all. When asked why, he said it was too hard on the pigs' feet, that he could not very well drive them to market. He then showed me shoes which he had put on his pigs' feet. He had cut out leather shoes and tied them on the feet of the little pigs so that he could take them to market.

We are not making friends of all those people, not by a long shot.

Mr. President, I desire to show some of the facts about this highway. I read further from the hearings, from the testimony of the United States Ambassador to Nicaragua, who was a member of the State Department's official family. This statement is filed as a part of the State Department's information:

While I do not attempt to justify the building of the Rama Road for direct benefit of the United States, I do believe that a system of roads including the Inter-American Highway and lateral branches in the Latin-American Republics can be of great substantial value to the United States as they pave the way to better communication, and the consequent development of commerce with populations now nearly equal in the aggregate to our own.

Then he goes on to say:

I do not suggest this amendment of the contract places us under any additional obligation with respect to the Rama Road. It does represent, however, a cooperative spirit in Nicaragua worthy of respect. And it does cut the cost of the Inter-American Highway and the Rama job to about what we had planned to spend on the former.

Mr. Miller, who represented the State Department, seems to be in some doubt that the sum mentioned would complete the highway. He said:

Since it is part of the agreement and this $8,000,000 is estimated not only as the amount to complete the road as far as we are committed to build it, but to complete this survey, so as not, in any way, changing the amount of the authorization, but simply to conform the purposes of the authorization to the agreement.

Mr. President, surely Congress is not going to authorize the expenditure of $8,000,000 for this purpose.

In this record there is no showing by the military authorities that it is of any value. The only showing which was made that the road could have hemispheric defense value was back in 1947, when General Eisenhower was Chief of Staff.

Mr. President, when is the time coming that we will spend the taxpayers' dollars for the defense of America and in places where we have reason to believe there may be an attack? We know something about the prospect we are facing. We in Congress know something about what we are defending, or are preparing to defend. We know of the millions and billions of dollars which have been spent. But certainly the Rama Road is not a project on which the taxpayers should put their money.

Mr. President, in the pending bill the Senate eliminated $100,000,000 from the appropriation for highways because we believed the time had come when there should be some economy and less should be spent on our own highways. We have heard today about the condition of highways in America and the amount needed to be spent on them. Just a few minutes ago, by a vote of 47 to 14, as I recall, we took $100,000,000 from the appropriation for the highways of the American people. Yet we find this authorization before us. We have been able to keep this $8,000,000 item out of the bill so far. No request for this authorization was made until it was discovered by the State Department that the Committee on Appropriations did not want to appropriate money on the basis of a flimsy executive agreement, without consideration, without any rhyme or reason. But now we find that it is to be authorized.

I say that if the Senate votes for the authorization of an appropriation for a nonmilitary project the money will be appropriated for it, and the first thing we know the people will pay $8,000,000 for the construction of this highway.

It is not the Inter-American Highway; it does not have anything to do with the Inter-American Highway. It is an east-west highway extending approximately 160 miles, on which we have already spent $4,000,000. But that was 4 or 5 years ago, not now. The road-building machinery is not there. We have no obligation to continue the construction of the road, and certainly we should not authorize $8,000,000, because it will be taken from the taxpayers' money, and the taxpayers need the money for their own highways and military expenditures, rather than for this nonessential item.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it the Senator's suggestion that the $8,000,000 allocation provided by the bill should be transferred to some other part of the bill, to be spent here at home?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; but I think the Senator from Oklahoma has made a good suggestion.

Mr. KERR. I was asking a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I had not advocated that.

Mr. KERR. Very well.

Mr. FERGUSON. But I think the Senator from Oklahoma has made a good suggestion, namely, that the $8,000,000 had much better be added to the funds for the highways of America than utilized for this nonmilitary, unnecessary project.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, at the outset I wish to say that this is a matter upon which our committee, a completely nonpolitical committee, agreed by unanimous decision of all members of the committee, from both sides of the aisle, that the United States was so committed, and its good faith so involved, that there was no course which we could properly take, no course which we believed the Government of the Uinted States or the people of the United States would want to take, except to move ahead with this project and complete it at the estimated cost of $8,000,000, provided in the bill.

The whole matter is set forth very fully in the printed hearing record, which is on the table of every Member of the Senate. I wish to call attention particularly to pages 367 to 376, inclusive, of the hearing record. Obviously, it is too much to read at this time. I believe the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has very accurately stated the beginning of this situation.

There was a contract earlier entered into between our Nation and Nicaragua, by which we were to have the right to construct a second canal across Central America through Nicaragua. Interpretation of that contract was not identical when seen through the eyes of the United States and the eyes of Nicaragua. The United States felt that all we had was an option to build a second canal if and when we wanted to build it. Nicaragua understood, and stoutly maintained, that we were obligated to build that canal. The committee felt that that was much too far behind us, coming, as it had, more than 10 years ago, for us to attempt to go back that far to determine who was right and who was wrong in that contention.

We did have the statement of an Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Edward G. Miller, Jr., who appeared before us at great length and stated the facts. We had before us the written statement of the former Ambassador to Nicaragua, now Ambassador to Colombia, Hon. Capus M. Waynick, of North Carolina, who incidentally at one time was, I believe, a member of the highway department of the State of North Carolina, and knew considerable about the values and the construction problems involved in connection with this road.

We had before us other testimony, which rather clearly showed what happened shortly after the time of the outbreak of World War II. At that time certain conversations were held between the then President of the United States, President Roosevelt, and the head of the Republic of Nicaragua, President Somoza. The Senate will find in the third paragraph of page 368 of the hearings a statement which I think is the crux of the whole situation. It reads as follows:

Accordingly, on April 8, 1942, this Government in an official note stated that it would be willing to construct a highway between San Benito and Rama and to survey and recommend a route from Rama to El Bluff.

Mr. President, there are no "ifs" or "ands" about that. That was an official note from this Government to the government of Nicaragua more than 10 years ago, in which the committee felt, without exception, the good faith of the United States of America was involved, and in which our credit was pledged to that extent.

It appeared that after that note had been delivered, the President of the United States went ahead, under emergency powers and an emergency appropriation which he then had, to commence the construction of the road. As I understand, nearly half the road has been constructed. The maps filed with our committee are available here, and any Member of the Senate who is present can see them.

In the meantime, costs have risen, and it was very difficult during the war to press the construction of the road. By the time the war was over, after $4,000,000 had been spent upon it, the road was not half completed. It then became necessary for the matter to be revived from time to time, and at this time, as I say, the committee went exhaustively into the situation and felt that too long already had the decision been left in abeyance, and that we should act to redeem the very solemn promise of the United States, made in writing, and followed up by the expenditure of $4,000,000, which the President had unquestioned authority to expend, at a time when he had authority to expend it, and upon a project which he had committed the United States to build.

I wish to make it perfectly clear that not only was there a consideration moving to the United States, in that Nicaragua abandoned her contention to the effect that we were obligated to build the second canal, but likewise there was another consideration, growing out of the fact that Nicaragua made available to us, for the conduct of the war, certain ports on the Pacific side of Nicaragua.

At this time I ask Senators to refer to page 369, beginning with the statement by Mr. Miller, which I shall read:

Mr. MILLER. That is correct. I might point out in that connection that during World War II we received very valuable cooperation from Nicaragua, which was agreed upon just about that time, in connection with the use of certain ports on the Pacific coast in which we, in effect, got base rights.

Senator HOLLAND. And did the granting of those base rights and the cooperation of Nicaragua, falling at that same time, constitute a part of the over-all objective which the President of the United States Government had in view?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir; very much so.

Senator HOLLAND. And are you stating for the record that the advantage received by the United States to which you have just referred with regard to these matters was regarded as being highly helpful in the furtherance and pursuance of the war effort?

Mr. MILLER. That is correct, Senator HOLLAND.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Was Nicaragua in the war with us, as one of our allies?

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe the record shows that she declared war the very day after we did.

Mr. FERGUSON. And she was one of our allies throughout the war?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Here we have a statement from the official of our State Department who handles public business not only with Nicaragua, but other Latin-American nations, describing the relationship and the agreement entered into at that time, an agreement which we, as a committee, unanimously felt had been only partially performed.

The amount involved is not large. I agree with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], who would be glad to see this amount—and other amounts, if we had them—devoted to the construction of domestic projects.

I am one Senator who believes that we should be just in carrying out our commitments as we do things which are eminently more pleasant to us, that is, building roads for ourselves and our own people. I feel that if members of the committee from the other side of the aisle were present—I notice that one of them is now present—each of them would state what I have stated. This was a hard decision for the committee to make, but one which was made unanimously. Incidentally, we had the advantage of the observations made on the ground only last year by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and by two members of the committee from the other side of the aisle. As I recall, they were the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. All were of the same opinion, that this was something that our Nation should do.

I hope there will be no disposition on the part of the Senate not to follow the committee in this matter, because I believe that the committee was acting to redeem a very solemn commitment by our Government, made in time of great stress, and partly carried out, now needing only this appropriation and the work authorized herein to fulfill the commitment of our Nation made through our wartime President. Regardless of how we may feel about that President—and I am one who frequently found myself in disagreement with him—he very actively handled the conduct of the war. In a matter of this kind, in which he acted for our entire Nation, when the contract is only partly carried out, I believe that we should all stand together behind that commitment and wind it up. Certainly that is the position of each member of the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Florida to yield before he yields the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thought I was yielding to the Senator from Michigan for a question. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that our country has the option at this time, under an agreement previously made with Nicaragua, to build a second canal across Nicaragua if we should feel impelled by necessity to do so?

Mr. HOLLAND. It was my understanding, and the understanding of the committee, that that agreement, that formal contract before World War II, is still in effect, and that we still have that right. The thing with respect to which the two governments were on different sides in their interpretation was this: The United States Government contended that we had an option to build it, but were not obligated to do so, whereas the Government of Nicaragua contended that we had an obligation to build, and not a mere option to do so.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for that statement. I was eliciting that information in order to lead up to the next question.

Is it the understanding of the Senator from Florida, and was it the understanding of the committee, that the provision for the building of this road was not only for the purpose that there might be transportation facilities between the two oceans, but also, in a way, to reaffirm and attach validity to the continuing option which we have to build the canal in the event we should need or desire to do so in the future?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct, with the further understanding that by this arrangement the situation was changed, so that the agreement between the two countries was thereafter recognized by both as merely an option, without involving a positive obligation upon the part of the United States to build, as had been claimed prior to that time by the Republic of Nicaragua.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Does not the Senator also feel not only that the building of this road would make a substantial contribution to our national defense, but also that preservation of the validity of the option

would be a valuable consideration in the future defense of our country?

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course that is true. The Senator from Florida is not sure that the continuing validity of the option is dependent upon our performing this construction. On that point he would not be completely positive.

Mr. KERR. But that question is involved in the consideration of the provision in the bill and in the discussions between the representatives of the two governments, is it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. The composition of all differences in point of view with reference to the entire situation includes this authorization.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, just a few words in reply.

I do not find in the record anything to show that the building of the road is a consideration for the cancellation of the formal treaty with respect to construction of the canal. I am wondering now whether it is the contention of the committee that by building this road we are canceling the right to build the canal, and forfeiting the $3,000,000 which we paid in 1914. I believe that if this proposal involves a cancellation of that treaty——

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KERR. Did not the Senator from Michigan just hear the Senator from Florida say that it did not cancel the option, but that in his opinion it firmed up the validity and continuance of the option?

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to have pointed out to me anything in the record which would show that to be a fact. I am trying to find out whether this is a new agreement or a cancellation of the treaty, or a determination by the Congress to modify or cancel the treaty. The facts on that point are not in the RECORD.

I should like to read to the Senate what Mr. Miller said, to the effect that this was not a binding agreement so far as the Congress was concerned. As the Supreme Court of the United States said in yesterday's opinion, only Congress can appropriate money; only Congress can authorize the payment of money. I read from page 368 of the printed hearings. In speaking of the State Department, Mr. Miller said:

> The Department realizes fully that such an agreement cannot bind the Congress later to appropriate funds for its fulfillment. In this case, however, funds, which were properly available to the Executive for such an agreement and which were considered adequate when it was made, were exhausted when the agreement was only partially honored.

Mr. President, we thought that $4,000,000 would be sufficient to build the highway. The President of the United States provided $4,000,000 with which to build the highway. Then it was discovered that the $4,000,000 would be sufficient to build less than half the highway and that the other half would cost $8,000,000 to construct, instead of $4,000,000.

Mr. President, whence do these estimates come? Will $8,000,000 be sufficient to build the rest of the highway? Will the administration not return next year for another appropriation?

Let me turn to page 372.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator from Michigan read the paragraph which immediately follows the statement which he has read from the testimony of Mr. Miller?

Mr. FERGUSON. On page 368?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Miller continues:

> Nicaragua, understandably, looks upon the agreement as a formal and binding commitment of the United States Government, regardless of the relations between the executive and legislative branches. It confidently expects that the Congress of the United States will honor this agreement by providing funds for its fulfillment. The Bureau of Public Roads estimates that the $8,000,000 authorized in this bill would be sufficient for this purpose. Nicaragua is a country whose government and people are particularly friendly to the United States and who offer consistent and valuable support for United States policy in international matters of the greatest importance. The Department believes it would be most unfortunate if Nicaragua's confidence in the fulfillment of an agreement made in good faith with the United States were to be frustrated.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, must not other peoples who make commitments with anyone in the State Department remember that our officials must follow the law? Must we always conform to what other nations think the United States Constitution says? Must it always be that way? I think not. Let us find out on what the estimate is based.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Not at this point. The estimate which is found on page 372, is based on the resident engineer's figures of November 1948, and it breaks down as follows: The grand total is $8,000,000.

Mr. President, where in this record is there any evidence that $8,000,000 will be sufficient to do the work which was estimated by the resident engineer in 1948 to cost $8,000,000? Will $8,000,000 be sufficient? If the estimate increased from $4,000,000 to $12,000,000 from the time they started the road until 1948—and they started it in 1943 or 1944—how do we know that it will be possible to complete the construction of the highway for an additional $8,000,000?

However, Mr. President, that is not the point. The point is whether or not we should not screen every item of appropriation and authorization to determine where we can reduce the deficit spending of the United States, because the $8,000,000 will eventually have to be a part of the $14,000,000,000 of deficit spending. In other words, this great country must borrow the money by bond issues and pay interest on it in order to build this highway in Nicaragua. Yet the Senate today has eliminated from this bill—and I think rightly so—$100,000,000 which we felt should not be spent on the highways of America. Ordinarily that amount of money would have been appropriated for highways in America. But now every Senator realizes that the time has come when we must look everywhere for items which can be properly cut without interfering with the national defense.

Mr. President, there is not a scintilla of evidence in this record after 1947 or 1948, when the Chief of Staff said that the road could have some hemispheric value, to show that it has any value so far as military purposes are concerned. Even the Ambassador does not make that claim.

Mr. President, we must save our raw materials. We know that in the last year we have not been able to get sufficient material with which to build highways in America. Steel is so short that highways in the State of Michigan, as is true in other States as well, cannot be built. Yet we are asked to authorize an expenditure of $8,000,000, which would take steel and machinery and many other items in short supply in America, in order to build a highway which we have no legal or constitutional obligation to build.

I certainly hope that the Senate will strike this committee amendment from the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the road is finished, irrespective of whether the conclusions of the Senator from Michigan are correct or whether the conclusions of the committee are correct, does the Senator know the kind of cars that will be rolling on that road?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They will probably come from Detroit.

Mr. FERGUSON. Probably some of them will come from Detroit. Nevertheless, the time has come when Senators must consider not only what will be beneficial to their own cities and their own States, but what will be best for the Nation. A much bigger issue confronts us than merely providing benefits for the people back home in our respective States. The issue is bigger than all that. It is a question of doing without things that America, not Michigan or Detroit, can do without and not cause harm to the whole Nation. We cannot be selfish and look merely to our own bailiwicks. We must look at the broader national picture when we are trying to save money and keep within the budget. It makes no difference to the Senator from Michigan that construction of the road would sell a few more cars. That is not the point. We must do what is right from the standpoint of the taxpayers of America; not on behalf of Michigan taxpayers only, but on behalf of all the taxpayers of this great Nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I fully agree with the Senator from Michigan that the position of all of us should be based upon what we think is the right thing to do

and to the best interest of our own Nation. I know he is taking his position on that ground. I should like to have him think that all Members of the committee felt they were taking their position on similarly high ground.

Mr. FERGUSON. I certainly agree to that.

Mr. HOLLAND. It was and is the opinion of the committee, having in mind the specific fact—and there is no question about the fact—that on April 8, 1942, this Government, in an official note, stated that it would be willing to construct a highway between San Benito and Rama, and to survey and recommend a route from Rama to El Bluff; and having in mind the fact that the road is only half completed and that at the time the agreement was made the President of the United States had full right to make the agreement and had funds in hand with which it could have been done, which funds were entrusted to him alone for spending, which, however, did not suffice in getting the work completed before the war came to an end, it was our view that there was nothing that we in this Nation could do but to see that agreement to its completion.

I close by reminding the Senator from Michigan that at the time the agreement was entered into, in April 1942, Nicaragua, with its frontage of many hundreds of miles both on the Caribbean Sea and on the Pacific Ocean, was subjected, just as was my own State at that time, to submarine attack. We had submarines on both coasts. It was no small matter that that little Republic of Nicaragua was willing to stand by us and make available bases to us. Speaking as one Senator it seems to me that here was a real consideration moving to the United States and that the President of the United States recognized that consideration when he gave Nicaragua the assurance, by written commitment of our Government, that this work would be done. I feel that we should now observe that commitment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in regard to the item of $8,000,000, I should like to call attention to the 1948 estimate.

The State Department now claims that the promise we made was not a promise to spend $8,000,000; the State Department claims that our pledge to Nicaragua was not to provide a specific sum of money for the building of the Rama Road, but that our pledge was to build the road.

Thus, Mr. President, under that theory, if we now authorize the expenditure of $8,000,000 for that road, we shall not be fulfilling our agreement; and if the $8,000,000 were sufficient to complete the construction of only half the road, we would be requested to provide additional funds, in order to complete the road, for it would be claimed that we would be bound to appropriate all the money needed to complete construction of the road.

Thus, Mr. President, the time for us to stop is now. Now is the time to say that the construction of this road was not authorized by Congress, that when the President thought he could have the entire road built for $4,000,000, and proceeded to make the $4,000,000 available, he was acting without congressional authority. The $4,000,000 which has been spent is water over the dam, that money is gone; but certainly we should not proceed now on the basis of a 1948 estimate of $4,000,000, and at this time authorize the expenditure of an additional $8,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], for himself and the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	McKellar
Anderson	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bennett	Hennings	Monroney
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Moody
Bridges	Hill	Morse
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Nixon
Cain	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Ives	Pastore
Chavez	Jenner	Robertson
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Dirksen	Kem	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kilgore	Taft
Dworshak	Lehman	Thye
Ellender	Long	Underwood
Ferguson	Martin	Welker
Flanders	Maybank	Wiley
Fulbright	McCarran	Williams
George	McCarthy	Young
Gillette	McClellan	
Green	McFarland	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, briefly I should like to explain the purpose of this motion. It is to strike out section 6 of the bill, beginning with line 3, on page 7, and continuing through line 4, on page 9.

This section of the bill would authorize an appropriation of $8,000,000 for the purpose of building a highway in Nicaragua in Central America. It is not at all part or parcel of the Inter-American Highway. The Inter-American Highway has not been completed. The original estimate of the cost of this road was $2,000,000 to complete the project. During the war, the President expended out of his private funds $4,000,000. In 1948, according to an estimate which we have, it was thought that $8,000,000 would be required in order to complete the highway.

Mr. President, there is no legal obligation whatever upon the United States to build this highway. The Department of State said it was fully realized that the agreement it entered into could not bind the Congress to appropriate funds later for the purpose of fulfilling the agreement.

Mr. President, since we have stricken from the bill $100,000,000 which was to have been used in our own country, because it was felt that we could not afford it, why at this time should we go into Central America and build this highway when we have deficit spending and must borrow the money with which to build the highway and must pay interest on the money?

The record shows that in 1947, when General Eisenhower was Chief of Staff, he stated that the building of this highway could have some hemispheric value; but there is nothing in the record to show that it would have any military value. In fact, there is evidence to the contrary.

Mr. President, I submit that we must spend our dollars for purposes which will aid the operations of our Government, contribute to the building of our roads and highways, and promote the defense effort. I submit that our allies should not expect us to waste money in this manner, outside the realm of our defense, at the present time.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. When the Senator from Michigan stated that the President had spent $4,000,000, I take it he meant that the President spent public funds, representing the taxpayers' money, which had been earmarked for use in Nicaragua.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. But during the war the President had a large fund, provided by the taxpayers, for which he did not have to account.

Mr. MUNDT. The theory was that it was to be spent on defense projects, some of which might be secret in nature. Is that not a fact?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; and this road was said to be one of such projects.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I dislike to take the time of the Senate, but since a number of Senators are now in the Chamber who were not present when the matter was discussed, I merely want to call attention to the fact that on April 8, 1942, the Government of the United States, in an official note, stated it would be willing to construct a highway between San Benito and Rama and to survey a recommended road from Rama to El Bluff. That was an official expression in black and white by our President in time of war to one of our allies in the war at a very critical time in 1942. Under that commitment there were spent $4,000,000 of public funds, emergency funds entrusted to the President. The only reason the project was not completed was that it could not be completed during the war years. There seemed to be no question in the mind of any member of the committee that our Nation was committed, and that it was our duty to see this project through.

Before I conclude, I may say, since it has not been mentioned before, that the House has recognized this obligation, and placed in the House bill an authorization of $2,000,000 for each of the 2 years covered by the period of the House bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator from Florida claim that this cancels the treaty we have with Nicaragua under which we could build a canal there, or would it permit us, if we desired to do so, to build a canal across Nicaragua?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not so claim, but I claim that this obligation was undertaken by President Roosevelt to cause an abandonment on the part of Nicaragua of its claim that we were obligated to dig the second canal, rather than being merely permitted to do so, as we contended.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has the Senator from Florida examined the treaty?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have not.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does he claim that the treaty bound us to build the canal?

Mr. HOLLAND. No. All I claim is that it was very clearly shown by all the testimony before the committee, both that of the gentleman who was our Ambassador to Nicaragua, but is now our Ambassador to Colombia, and by the Secretary of State, and by the Assistant Secretary of State who handles Latin-American affairs, that the obligation had been made, and that the obligation still persists. We have the right to dig the canal if we wish to do it. Under the settlement made, our interpretation, rather than that of Nicaragua, prevails. We are not obligated to dig the canal, but we have the right to do so if we so elect.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], for himself and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to strike out all of section 6. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senators from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND and Mr. STENNIS] are unavoidably detained on official business at one of the Government departments.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] would each vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—45

Aiken	Hoey	Morse
Bennett	Ives	Mundt
Bricker	Jenner	Nixon
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Butler, Md.	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kem	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Martin	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Maybank	Smith, N. J.
Duff	McCarran	Taft
Dworshak	McCarthy	Thye
Ferguson	McClellan	Underwood
Fulbright	Millikin	Welker
Hendrickson	Monroney	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Moody	Williams

NAYS—25

Anderson	Gillette	Lehman
Cain	Green	Long
Chavez	Hayden	McFarland
Clements	Hennings	McKellar
Connally	Hill	Robertson
Cordon	Holland	Smathers
Ellender	Humphrey	Young
Flanders	Kerr	
George	Kilgore	

NOT VOTING—26

Benton	Kefauver	O'Conor
Brewster	Knowland	Russell
Byrd	Langer	Seaton
Carlson	Lodge	Smith, N. C.
Case	Magnuson	Sparkman
Eastland	Malone	Stennis
Ecton	McMahon	Tobey
Frear	Murray	Watkins
Hunt	Neely	

So the motion of Mr. FERGUSON, for himself and Mr. BRIDGES, was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 1549, House bill 7340.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7340) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355) as amended and supplemented to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and inserting in lieu thereof the provisions of Senate bill 2437, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 7340) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. KERR, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. CASE conferees on the part of the Senate.

REHABILITATION OF FEDERAL PRISONERS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

Out of order, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill, and I am going to ask for its immediate consideration. Its consideration should take less than 5 minutes.

On May 15 the President signed an act which would authorize the Attorney General to make small loans to deserving Federal prisoners at the time of their release from prison. The act also provided that the Attorney General might accept gifts or bequests of money for credit to the "Commissary funds, Federal prisoners," which could be deducted from income for certain tax purposes.

The Joint Committee on Taxation has called my attention to the fact that this particular section, through a clerical error, contains the word "state" instead of "estate" with reference to a type of tax. The bill I am introducing would simply correct that error, and substitute the word "estate" for "state" in the original enactment.

The senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] the chairman of the Finance Committee, has been advised of this error, and the amendment is perfectly agreeable to him.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if what the Senator from Nevada desires may be done by unanimous consent, I have no objection.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I do not intend to object to the request of the Senator from Nevada, but I should like to ascertain what effect it will have on House bill 7072, the independent offices appropriation bill. I have been here since 10 o'clock this morning, and we had hoped that that bill would be considered. It was expected that we would finish with the road bill last evening, but it is now 4 o'clock this afternoon, and I do not believe we should bring up this very important appropriation bill unless we are to have a night session and get somewhere with it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall make an announcement as to that in a moment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send the bill to the desk and ask unanimous consent that the rule be suspended so that it may be immediately considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3276) to amend the act entitled "An act to assist Federal prisoners in their rehabilitation," was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of May 15, 1952 (Public Law 342, 82d Cong.), relating to the rehabilitation of Federal prisoners, is hereby amended by striking out the words "Federal income, State, and gift taxes" and inserting in lieu thereof "Federal income, estate, and gift taxes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 7072, the independent offices appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I made an announcement yesterday evening that in order to finish the road bill and the appropriation bill the Senate would have a night session, if necessary. So there will be a night session, and we will proceed with consideration of H. R. 7072. I hope we can finish it; if we do not, we will go as far as we can.

Mr. MAYBANK. That was exactly my understanding. We have been here all day accomplishing what could have been accomplished last evening in probably an hour or so.

I wish to make a unanimous-consent request, if it is agreeable to the majority leader and the minority leader. I should like to have the attention also of both leaders.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate first consider committee amendments to which there is no objection. I understand the amendment as to the TVA steam plants is quite controversial, and I understand there is quite a controversial issue as to the amount of public housing to be constructed. I have not heard that there is much controversy with respect to other amendments although there may be. There are some slight amendments proposed with respect to the Selective Service System and the Battle Monuments Commission. I do not think there is any issue of consequence about them.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the amendments as I have suggested, so that we may really get under way. So far as I am concerned, I do not intend to make a speech. I do remind the Senate that the bill provides $1,800,000,000 less than the amount appropriated last year, and approximately three-quarters of a billion dollars less than the President requested. So I shall talk only about amendments that are objected to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hope the procedure outlined by the Senator from South Carolina will be followed. Then we will know what the debate will cover, and what we shall have to discuss. At least a part of the bill will be out of the way. I hope that procedure will be followed.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to inquire if we could agree by unanimous consent to limit debate upon this bill. I should like to see debate limited to 1 hour on the housing amendments, and 1 hour on the other amendment the Senator from South Carolina mentioned.

Mr. MAYBANK. The amendment affecting the TVA steam plants.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to see debate limited to 1 hour on that amendment. That would be 30 minutes to a side. Then I would propose a limitation of 30 minutes on all other amendments.

Mr. MAYBANK. I would have no objection to that, because I understand the mind of every member of the committee is pretty well made up. However, I would not suggest what the Senate should do.

Further, as the TVA amendment, I understood from the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—and if I am wrong, I hope the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] will correct me—that the members of his legislative committee first thought the appropriation should be $800,000. The Appropriations Committee made it $600,000, and I understood that that was acceptable, certainly to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That was acceptable, except that one member of our committee did not join us in our request.

Mr. MAYBANK. Why not limit the debate on housing amendments to 1 hour to each side?

Mr. McFARLAND. I had suggested 30 minutes to a side.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, am I to understand that the debate on housing amendments will be limited to 1 hour to each side?

Mr. McFARLAND. If that is what everyone wants, then I shall have no objection.

Mr. MAYBANK. I think, in view of the tremendous pressure there is upon all Senators, it should be an hour to each side.

Mr. McFARLAND. How much time is desired on the TVA amendment?

Mr. MAYBANK. Whatever the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee suggests. I intend to turn over to the Senator from Tennessee whatever time I do not use.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well. I ask unanimous consent that on the pending bill there be a limitation of debate of 1 hour to a side upon any amendment involving housing, the time to be controlled by the proponents of the amendments and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], in the event he is opposed to the amendment, and in the event he is in favor of the amendment, then the time to be controlled by the distinguished minority leader.

On the TVA amendment, I ask unanimous consent that there be a limitation of debate of 1 hour, 30 minutes to each side, the time to be controlled.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. McFARLAND. I see we are going to be here until 1 or 2 o'clock in the morning. If that is the wish of the Senate, we can do it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Oh, no; I think we can work this out harmoniously. Let us have an hour to each side. So far as the TVA is concerned, I intend to turn the time over to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. McFARLAND. I will make it 1 hour to each side, but that will run into a long time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will request the Senator from Arizona to restate the agreement he requests.

Mr. McFARLAND. If I can get the floor, I will endeavor to restate the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I shall now endeavor to restate the unanimous-consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that there be a limitation on the debate on the pending bill as follows: Two hours on any amendment in the housing portion of the bill, to be divided equally between the proponent of the amendment and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] in the event he is opposed to the amendment; and in the event he favors the amendment, then by the minority leader, or any Senator he may designate.

Two hours upon the TVA amendment, if one is offered, the time to be divided equally between the proponent of the amendment and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina in the event he is opposed to the amendment; and if he is in favor of the amendment, then by the minority leader or any Senator he may designate.

On all other amendments, 30 minutes, to be divided equally between the proponent of the amendment and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Let me finish the unanimous-consent request.

I also ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on the bill be limited to 1 hour, to be controlled equally by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina and the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona ask that all amendments be germane?

Mr. McFARLAND. I include in the request that all amendments must be germane.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am not quite clear what disposition the Senator proposes to make with regard to amendments offered from the floor. Is the time to be half an hour, 15 minutes to a side, or some other length of time?

Mr. McFARLAND. With respect to amendments offered to the housing portion of the bill, there will be an hour to each side. With respect to the TVA amendment, there will be an hour to each side. On all other amendments there will be 15 minutes to a side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Chair to understand that the majority leader wishes to include motions and appeals?

Mr. McFARLAND. On all motions or appeals, 15 minutes to a side.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to make clear what is meant by an amendment to the TVA portion of the bill. Would a proposal to strike out a provision already in the bill be considered an amendment? In other words, when the Senator from Arizona uses the word "amendment" in connection with the TVA provision, does that mean that the limitation would apply to the debate which might arise in connection with a proposal to strike out a provision already in the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. That would be an amendment, as I understand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to submit a resolution which I think is of great importance, in the light of the Supreme Court decision in the Steel case. I wonder whether or not the proposed unanimous-consent agreement would preclude me from having that opportunity. I do not wish to submit it tomorrow. I wish to submit it today.

Mr. MAYBANK. How much time would the Senator require?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think I can finish in 15 minutes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am agreeable to the Senator from Minnesota having 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if I may have the opportunity to place two or three small items in the RECORD, I shall not object to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. McFARLAND. I expect to yield to Senators before the request is submitted. Perhaps we can dispose of the Senator from Nevada in a few minutes.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall be glad to yield in just a moment.

I now yield to the Senator from Nevada.

(At this point Mr. McFARLAND yielded to Mr. McCARRAN, who submitted several matters for printing in the RECORD, which will be found under appropriate headings elsewhere in the RECORD.)

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. In a moment. As a part of the unanimous-consent request which I am submitting, I am about to ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President——

Mr. McFARLAND. If the Senator will give me an opportunity, I should like to have the unanimous-consent request disposed of while there is a good attendance of Senators in the Chamber.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask one question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington expects to raise a point of order against a particular paragraph in the bill. He will need very little time. How much time will he be entitled to use to explain and defend his point of order?

Mr. McFARLAND. How much time does the Senator desire? I think the limitation of 15 minutes to a side would apply.

Mr. CAIN. That is entirely satisfactory to me. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. Also, there would be a limitation of 15 minutes to a side on all amendments to amendments.

I also include in the unanimous-consent request the provision that immediately following the agreement of the Senate to the unanimous-consent request, Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD, and, if they have brief statements, that they be allowed not to exceed 5 minutes to make them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE CURRENT STEEL DISPUTE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution and to speak on it for not exceeding 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is this the 15-minute period which the Senator from Minnesota mentioned previously?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I would rather take the time now than when the Senate is considering the appropriation bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection, but I hope that the Senator will take 10 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to discuss for a few brief moments the pending steel strike and the responsibility of the Congress in connection with that strike.

On April 8 the President of the United States sent a message to the Congress in which he announced that he had seized the steel plants by Executive order, and in which he asked the Congress to legislate in the event the Congress had other solutions to the problem of this grave labor dispute affecting our national interest. The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States yesterday further placed the responsibility for Government action to resolve serious labor-management disputes on the Congress.

Members of the Senate are aware that since April 15 the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee has held hearings on a number of legislative proposals dealing with plant seizure and with the whole problem of national emergency strikes. The Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations, of which I am chairman, has been delegated the responsibility for recommending legislative solution to the Congress. I would be less than frank if I did not say that this is one of the most perplexing, complicated, and controversial subjects which it has been my responsibility as a Member of Congress to deliberate upon. Men of good will and long experience have different opinions on what can be done legislatively.

We face two legislative problems. First, we must seek a solution to the immediate steel strike which now threatens our national safety. Secondly, we must come forward with legislative proposals providing a more permanent and lasting solution to the problem of national defense labor disputes.

It is my intention to convene a meeting of the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations as soon as possible to come to some decisive meeting of the minds on both of these urgent problems. It is my hope that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will be able to report a bill to the Senate floor within the next few days. I appreciate as much as any Member of the Senate, the urgency that our Nation faces and the fact that time is of the essence.

Finally, Mr. President, I want to bring the attention of the Senate and the attention of the country to one incontrovertible fact. It is that the only possible and lasting solution to the pending steel strike is collective-bargaining agreement between labor and management freely arrived at. The Supreme Court of the United States cannot settle the disputes, the President of the United States cannot settle the disputes, and try as we will, the Congress of the United States cannot settle the disputes.

I, therefore, propose the enactment of a resolution by the Senate, voicing the hope and sentiment of the American people that both labor and management in the steel industry will set aside the bitterness of the past and come to an agreement on terms and working conditions of employment in that industry so that production can be resumed immediately. The resolution which I submit reads as follows:

Whereas the United States of America has undertaken and is exercising leadership in a global struggle for the preservation of democratic institutions;

Whereas this Nation has made and is making great sacrifices to arm against and repel totalitarian aggression;

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Whereas the Armed Forces of the United States are deployed throughout the world to discourage aggression by totalitarian forces;

Whereas many of our fighting men in Korea have sacrificed their lives and our forces there are face to face with a totalitarian enemy;

Whereas the forces of the United States and the United Nations countries associated with it in Korea and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization are dependent upon the industrial production of this Nation for arms and supplies;

Whereas continued production of arms and material are vital to the security of the United States and the free nations associated with it; and

Whereas the continued production of steel and steel products is essential to the adequate production of arms and material required by the Armed Forces of the United States and the democratic nations dedicated to the preservation of freedom: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States calls upon the parties to the current steel dispute (1) to resume collective-bargaining negotiations immediately (2) to agree upon interim conditions which will make possible the immediate resumption of production pending settlement of the issues in dispute, and (3) to make every effort in the interest of the national welfare and security to speedily resolve the dispute. The Senate also calls upon the President of the United States to make available to the parties to this dispute the services of any Government agency which the parties to the dispute may request as an aid to collective bargaining thereby to facilitate the resumption of production and the resolution of the dispute.

Mr. President, I hope that this resolution will have the effect of communicating to the union and the managements the profound sense of urgency with which we in the Congress face the crisis.

I know that no resolution will resolve a dispute. I feel, however, that the climate of opinion in America must be crystallized so that there will be an immediate demand upon the participants in the dispute to come to an agreement voluntarily, in behalf of the public interest and the national security.

In my opinion, too many harsh words have been spoken. The dispute cannot be settled in a spirit of acrimony and bitterness. It can be settled only in a spirit of national welfare, national security, and national need. I believe that the Senate should take the leadership in expressing to the union and to the management involved in the dispute that we want immediate collective bargaining; that we want an interim agreement to get production under way; and that we want a speedy solution of the issue which divides them, so that full production may be resumed in behalf of the welfare of our country and the free world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered at this time. I send the resolution to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent agreement under which the Senate is now proceeding does not include the procedure requested by the Senator from Minnesota. Does the Senator from Minnesota make another unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, we cannot legislate in this manner. I would certainly have to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The resolution is not legislation. It is an expression of attitude on the part of the Senate. I believe it is constructive. I believe it is forward-looking. I believe it is needed. I believe we must say that we want this dispute settled; that we want it settled now; and that we will not further delay a settlement of it with any harsh words or acrimony.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not say that I am not in favor of the resolution. It is a matter of grave importance to the country, but I do not think that we should adopt resolutions by unanimous consent in 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that the Senate is operating under a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand. It is for that reason that I asked unanimous consent to proceed in the manner I suggested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has been heard.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand. I heard the objection.

The resolution (S. Res. 328), submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. MOODY), was ordered to lie over under the rule.

PROPOSED CREATION OF A COMMISSION ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], I send to the desk a joint resolution to create a Commission on Labor-Management Relations.

Mr. President, in view of the limitation upon my time, I ask that a statement which I prepared for delivery in connection with the introduction of the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

I am also introducing a bill creating a Commission on Labor-Management Relations to meet a need which has become increasingly urgent and pressing since the beginning of World War II. The composition of the Commission is comparable to the Temporary National Economic Committee of 1939 and the Hoover Commission, except, of course, that it will deal with labor-management relations. The increasing complexity of our industrial economy, with the added burden of the tensions of a grave international situation, make it imperative that the production of goods continue without serious interruption. The welfare of our people and the security of the Nation are threatened when the flow of goods is halted by disagreements between employers and their employees. Congress has discussed a number of proposals and has enacted several laws to cope with this problem. The inadequacy of these laws has been amply demonstrated by the current dispute in the steel industry.

At the present time there are pending in both Houses of Congress new proposals for meeting this situation. In the Senate, the Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations is currently studying a proposal authorizing Government seizure of certain types of industries when their production is halted because of a labor dispute. I understand that there are two measures proposed in the House which, in effect, will prohibit industry-wide bargaining. I will not express judgment on any of these proposals at this time. However, in the light of experience, I do not hesitate to say there are no perfect cures, we will not find the universal panacea. Any solution sought, and any legislation enacted must be consistent with the democratic principles on which our Nation was founded and under which it has become the greatest symbol of freedom in the world.

Forty years ago, in the year 1912, the Congress of the United States created a Commission on Industrial Relations. This Commission was directed to inquire into "existing relations between employers and employees; into the effect of industrial conditions on public welfare and into the rights and powers of the community to deal therewith." The report of this Commission was submitted to Congress on August 23, 1915, and it has been since recognized as one of the greatest documents for establishing public policy in the history of our Government.

In submitting the Commission's report, the chairman, Mr. Frank P. Walsh stated the following:

"For the perhaps the first time in the history of our Government, the facts in relation to conditions in the industries examined and the relations inquired into are placed beyond the realm of controversy and established upon the solid and scientific basis of ascertained and indisputable fact."

I might add that almost every major recommendation of the Commission on Industrial Relations of 1912 was enacted into law by a succession of Congresses. Foremost among these recommendations was the encouragement of collective bargaining. The encouragement of collective bargaining was first established as a national policy by section 7 (a) of the National Industrial Recovery Act. When that act was invalidated (on other grounds) by the Supreme Court, the Congress passed the Wagner Act which guaranteed employees the right to organize for purposes of collective bargaining without interference from employers. Though this act was modified in 1947 by the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act, public policy continued to approve this principle. I am sure that there are very few Americans who would wish to reverse it.

With this growth of labor organization a new series of problems have arisen. As I mentioned earlier, Congress has sought legislative solutions to some of them, but with little success. For this reason I propose that a commission, removed from the day-to-day tensions of the legislative process be created, to study objectively the whole field of labor-management relations. It is important that the problem be examined in its whole in order to determine, first, the major objectives of public policy; second, the rights and responsibilities of the interested parties; and third, the proper role of government.

The commission will be composed of representatives of both Houses of Congress, representatives of interested agencies of the Government, and six public members not directly involved in labor-management problems. This commission will operate in many ways along the lines established by the very successful Hoover Commission on the Reorganization of Government. In part, the organization of the commission will be along the lines of the Temporary National Economic Committee which investigated the concentration of economic power in the

United States. This Committee under the distinguished and able chairmanship of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] performed an invaluable service for the Nation. I am sure that a commission on labor-management relations will be able to perform with equal distinction and service in supplying Congress with the vital facts on this problem. Until such a commission is given an opportunity to determine the facts I seriously doubt that Congress will be able to legislate with wisdom and foresight on this problem. Labor-management relations are so closely woven in the fabric of our National Government and democratic institutions that it cannot be dealt with hastily. I believe that the proposed commission offers, at least, a partial solution. It can and should, as a result of comprehensive impartial study, give the Congress a body of findings and recommendations out of which we can prepare basic legislative policy and direction.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish only to review briefly the purpose of the proposed Commission. It is set forth quite concisely in the preamble. There is established a Commission on Labor-Management Relations, to be composed of 17 members. The joint resolution provides that the Commission shall conduct a full and complete study and investigation to, first, ascertain the effect of collective bargaining in labor-management relations upon the national economy; second, determine the proper role of the Federal Government in industrial relations, including a particular reference to emergency proposals for the settlement of labor-management disputes; and, third, appraise existing and proposed legislative remedies in the field of labor-management relations, and transmit to the President and the Congress a preliminary report of its findings upon the convening of the Eighty-third Congress, or as soon thereafter as may be practicable, interim reports upon their completion, and a final report of its findings and conclusions, including specific legislative and administrative proposals.

Mr. President, the new Commission will follow the outlines of the now famous Hoover Commission and the Temporary National Economic Commission. The new Commission will include three Members of the Senate, one of whom will be the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and no more than two of the Senate Members may be members of the same political party. They are to be appointed by the President of the Senate. The Commission will also include three Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, one of whom shall be chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and no more than two of the House Members shall be members of the same political party.

The Commission will also include one member from each of the following departments and agencies, to be designated by the respective heads or chairmen thereof: The Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, the National Labor Relations Board, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, and the National Mediation Board.

Finally, Mr. President, the Commission will include as members six distinguished citizens who are not engaged in labor-management relations in behalf of either labor or management. They are to be appointed by the President of the United States.

The Commission is to elect its own Chairman and Vice Chairman.

Mr. President, let me say that the proposal I now offer to the Senate is not something which has just been pulled out of thin air. It is the result of more than 3 years of hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in its study of labor-management law and labor-management relations. At those hearings some of the outstanding authorities in American life have suggested to the committee that such a Commission should be established—in other words, that there should be created an impartial body to make legislative and administrative recommendations in the light of existing economic conditions, as they are reflected in labor-management disputes and negotiations.

Mr. President, I believe that this is one of the most constructive undertakings ever suggested for a Government commission. Surely, if we need to reorganize the executive branch of the Government, the time has come for us to do some thinking about improving the handling of labor-management relations in the United States, and to give serious consideration to the need to remove the cause of the fear which arises because of the difficulties in connection with labor-management relations and lock-outs.

On behalf of myself, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], I now introduce the joint resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 161) to create a Commission on Labor-Management Relations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. MOODY), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me conclude by saying that I hope that following the Senate's action on the independent offices appropriation bill and on various measures pertaining to the Defense Production Act, the Senate will give judicious consideration to the first resolution I have submitted, expressing the sense of this body to management and to labor. Surely the full weight of public opinion must be used to settle this dispute.

I remind this body that if this dispute persists too long, the security of the United States may be seriously jeopardized. It is the responsibility of the Senate to express the desire of the people of the United States that justice be done, that the dispute be settled, and that it be settled in the way that free men settle disputes and difficulties, namely, through free and voluntary collective bargaining.

I warn this body that action which leads to seizure or that leads to enforceable judicial instruments, such as injunctions, does not really settle disputes. All too frequently such action merely aggravates the situation.

I say to the leaders of the steel companies, "If you want to preserve free enterprise, then make the free instrument of collective bargaining work."

I say to the leaders of the CIO steel workers, "If you want to have free trade unionism in the United States, keep free trade unionism responsible and make it work at the bargaining table."

Mr. President, the time is at hand for these two great participants, labor and industry, to sit down and bargain and give the American people an example of what the free citizens of a free country can do to preserve human freedom.

I, for one, appeal to them, as I have done on other occasions, to work as free men and to give fair play to the American people, so that by means of the instruments available to a society of free people, this tragic situation which threatens our security may be handled properly, in the interest of our Nation as a whole and all its free people.

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The first committee amendment will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Executive Office of the President—Emergency fund for the President—National defense," on page 3, line 4, after the word "year", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "the unexpended balance in this fund on June 30, 1952, is hereby continued available during the fiscal year 1953."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of the Budget," on page 4, line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$54,000" and insert "$64,500"; and at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "$3,314,400" and insert "$3,608,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Council of Economic Advisers," on page 4, line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,200" and insert "$2,750"; and in line 16, after "(not exceeding $300)", to strike out "$208,900" and insert "$225,000, to remain available until March 31, 1953."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent offices—American Battle Monuments Commission," on page 5, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$10,300" and insert "$12,865."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Atomic Energy Commission," on page 6, line 6, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "purchase of not to exceed 225 passenger motor vehicles, of which 165 shall be for replacement only; purchase, maintenance, and operation of aircraft;" and insert "maintenance and operation of aircraft;"; in line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,230,500" and insert "$2,788,200"; and in line 16, after the word "services", to strike

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

out "not to exceed $7,290,800 for program direction and administration personnel in the District of Columbia and extensions; and not to exceed $16,273,475 for program direction and administration personnel outside the District of Columbia;" and insert "and not to exceed $23,564,275 for program direction and administration personnel."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 5, after the word "the", to insert "purchase and"; and in line 8, after the numerals "1946", to strike out "including purchase of land and interests in land" and insert "including purchase of land and interests in land; purchase of aircraft; and purchase of not to exceed 225 passenger motor vehicles, of which 165 shall be for replacement only; $371,741,000: *Provided*, That there shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation that portion of the unexpended balances of prior year appropriations included under the appropriation for Operating Expenses which is applicable to Plant and Equipment, and amounts so transferred together with the foregoing appropriation shall remain available until expended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 9, after the word "Commission", to insert "except contracts with any foreign government or any agency thereof and contracts for source material with foreign producers."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 22, to insert:

Any appropriation available under this act or heretofore made to the Atomic Energy Commission may initially be used to finance the procurement of materials, services, or other costs which are a part of work or activities for which funds have been provided in any other appropriation available to the Commission: *Provided*, That appropriate transfers or adjustments between such appropriations shall subsequently be made for such costs on the basis of actual application determined in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 8, to insert:

Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation under this head may be transferred to any other such appropriation but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 5 percent by any such transfers.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Civil Service Commission," on page 11, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$426,000" and insert "$532,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 12, after "(5 U. S. C. ch. 14)", to strike out "$321,000,000" and insert "$321,900,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Communications Commission," on page 15, line 6, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$6,108,460" and insert "$6,708,460"; and in line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$78,700" and insert "$98,350."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Power Commission," on page 15, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$180,000" and insert "$225,000"; and in line 15, after the word "newspapers", to strike out "$3,935,700" and insert "$4,235,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Trade Commission," on page 15, line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$126,470" and insert "$158,000"; and in line 25, after the word "travel", to strike out "$3,978,800" and insert "$4,128,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General Accounting Office," on page 16, line 7, after the word "services", to strike out "$28,600,000" and insert "$30,100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,125,000"; and in line 11, after the word "travel", to strike out "$1,835,000" and insert "$2,085,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the heading "General Services Administration," on page 16, after line 22, to strike out:

Executive direction and staff operations: For necessary expenses in the performance of executive direction and staff operations for activities under the control of the General Services Administration; including not to exceed $86,565 for expenses of travel; not to exceed $250 for purchase of newspapers and periodicals; and processing and determining net renegotiation rebates; $4,029,750.

Public Buildings Service: For necessary expenses of real-property management and related activities as provided by law; including the salary of the Commissioner of Public Buildings at the rate of $16,500 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; repair and improvement of public buildings and grounds (including furnishings and equipment) under the control of the General Services Administration; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises; moving Government agencies in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of building space; demolition of buildings; acquisition by purchase or otherwise and disposal by sale or otherwise of real estate and interests therein; purchase of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and not to exceed $157,630 for expenses of travel; $98,346,030: *Provided*, That for the foregoing appropriation shall not be available to effect the moving of Government agencies from the District of Columbia into buildings acquired to accomplish the dispersal of departmental functions of the executive establishment into areas outside of but accessible to the District of Columbia.

Federal Supply Service: For necessary expenses of personal-property management and related activities as provided by law; including not to exceed $250 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals; not to exceed $69,000 for expenses of travel; and the purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; $2,094,100.

National Archives and Records Service: For necessary expenses in connection with Federal-records management and related activities as provided by law; including preparation of guides and other finding aids to records of the Second World War; purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; and not to exceed $20,750 for expenses of travel; $4,739,200.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Operating expenses: For necessary expenses of the General Services Administration not otherwise provided for, including: Repair and improvement of public buildings and grounds (including furnishings and equipment) under the control of the General Services Administration; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises; moving Government agencies in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of building space; demolition of buildings; acquisition by purchase or otherwise and disposal by sale or otherwise of real estate and interests therein; not to exceed $417,370 for expenses of travel; not to exceed $800 for purchase of newspapers and periodicals; processing and determining net renegotiation rebates; and preparation of guides and other finding aids to records of the Second World War; $115,206,060.

The foregoing appropriation shall not be available to effect the moving of Government agencies from the District of Columbia into buildings acquired to accomplish the dispersal of departmental functions of the executive establishment into areas outside of but accessible to the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$21,600" and insert "$27,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 11, after "(Public Law 105)", to strike out "$4,500,000" and insert "$5,000,000"; and in line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$53,400" and insert "$41,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 24, after the word "Administration", to strike out "$9,000,000" and insert "$9,500,000"; and on page 23, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$66,000" and insert "$83,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 16, after the word "fund", to insert "including contractual services incident to receiving, handling, and shipping warehouse items, and"; in line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$119,000" and insert "$148,800"; in the same line, after the word "travel", to strike out "$13,998,000" and insert "$15,075,000"; and in line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "five" and insert "twelve."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$142,600" and insert "$178,250"; and in the same line, after the word "travel", to strike out "and the purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Housing and Home Finance Agency—Office of the Administrator," on page 25, line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$210,000" and insert "$265,000"; in line 16, after the numerals "1949", to strike out "$3,606,000" and insert "$5,606,000"; and on page 26, line 7, after the word "made", to strike

out the comma and "but such nonadministrative expenses shall not exceed $374,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 8, to insert:

Defense community facilities and services: During the current fiscal year not to exceed $225,000 of the appropriation granted under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, shall be available for administrative expenses in connection with the construction of facilities under such appropriation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Housing Administration," on page 27, line 12, after the word "amended", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the Public Housing Administration shall not, with respect to projects initiated after March 1, 1949, (1) authorize during the fiscal year 1953 the commencement of construction of in excess of 5,000 dwelling units, or (2) after the date of approval of this act, enter into any agreement, contract, or other arrangement which will bind the Public Housing Administration with respect to loans, annual contributions, or authorizations for commencement of construction, for dwelling units aggregating in excess of 5,000 to be authorized for commencement of construction during any one fiscal year subsequent to the fiscal year 1953, unless a greater number of units is hereafter authorized by the Congress" and in lieu thereof to insert the following: "*Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the Public Housing Administration shall not, with respect to projects initiated after March 1, 1949, authorize during the fiscal year 1953 the commencement of construction of in excess of 45,000 dwelling units."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, is this the housing amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. LEHMAN. I object to this amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, let me say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from New York, that at this time we are merely adopting the committee amendments, which in many cases propose increases in items in which the House of Representatives already has voted to make decreases.

Mr. LEHMAN. I realize that. However, the distinguished Presiding Officer asked whether there was objection to the amendment; and I did not want it to appear that there was no objection to it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I understand that. I have understood that there were two debatable committee amendments, one relating to the TVA and one relating to housing.

I understand that at this time we are approving the other committee amendments, with the understanding that thereafter we shall take up the so-called TVA and the so-called housing amendments.

There are some small committee amendments with regard to Selective Service, to which I have called attention, and also some committee amendments with respect to the Federal Trade Commission and the Maritime Administration.

Mr. LEHMAN. I fully understand, and I am grateful to the Senator from South Carolina for the explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Public Housing Administration amendments beginning on page 27 will be passed over. Is that in line with the request of the chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct—and also to pass over the TVA amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, let me ask, so I shall not have to interrupt again, that the National Science Foundation committee amendment also be passed over, because I have an amendment which I wish to offer to that amendment, and perhaps other Senators will have amendments to offer to it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I intended to ask that that committee amendment be passed over.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments referred to are to be passed over until what time?

Mr. MAYBANK. They are to be passed over until all the other committee amendments have been agreed to.

Of course, it is to be understood that each Senator is privileged to be present and to object to any amendment. In other words, the unanimous-consent agreement was simply that we would proceed first to consider the committee amendments; but any Senator has a right to object to any of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that it is understood that when all the other committee amendments are disposed of, the Senate will return to the ones which have been passed over at this time.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well.

The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Indian Claims Commission," on page 29, line 4, after the word "Commission", to strike out "$89,300" and insert "$93,500", and in line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$2,550."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Interstate Commerce Commission," on page 29, line 15, after the word "exceed" to strike out "$205,000" and insert "$256,300", and in line 17, after the word "only", to strike out "$8,935,000" and insert "$9,704,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$145,000" and insert "$181,100", and in the same line, after the word "travel", to strike out "$907,000" and insert "$1,042,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$125,240", and in line 20, after the word "travel", to strike out "$664,000" and insert "$755,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado subsequently said: Mr. President, I had a little difficulty in finding an amendment in which I was interested. It occurs on page 29, under the subtitle "Interstate Commerce Commission." I shall have certain amendments to propose with respect to the amounts of the appropriation at that point in the bill. I ask that we may revert to that amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I may say, with appreciation for the distinguished chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate, that we have tried to go along as best we could. I believe that if we were to proceed under the unanimous-consent agreement, first, and then return to the Senator's amendments, it would possibly be better.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is satisfactory to me. I merely did not want final action to be taken on the amendments which appear on pages 29 and 30, under the heading "Interstate Commerce Commission."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the votes whereby those amendments were agreed to are reconsidered, and the amendments will be passed over for the present. Is that agreeable to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Chair. That is agreeable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics," on page 31, line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$213,400" and insert "$266,700", and in line 18, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$46,522,200" and insert "$50,650,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Capital Park and Planning Commission," on page 33, line 1, after the word "exceeding" to strike out "$22,375" and insert "$27,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Science Foundation," on page 33, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$95,000" and insert "$142,500", and in line 14, after the word "services", to strike out "$3,500,000" and insert "$5,000,000."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I ask that the amendment be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, that amendment will be passed over, to take its regular turn when the other amendments shall have been disposed of.

The Clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Renegotiation Board—Salaries and expenses," on page 33, line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$180,000" and insert "$291,000", and on page 34, line 2, after the word "Columbia", to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

strike out "$4,907,800" and insert "$5,907,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Securities and Exchange Commission," on page 34, line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$90,000" and insert "$112,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Selective Service System—Salaries and expenses," on page 34, line 17, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "not to exceed $69,500 for expenses of travel, national administration, planning, training, and records management; not to exceed $363,500 for expenses of travel, State administration, planning, training, and records servicing; $92,500 for the National Selective Service Appeal Board, of which not to exceed $3,500 shall be available for expenses of travel; and $215,200 for the National Advisory Committee on the Selection of Doctors, Dentists, and Allied Specialists, of which not to exceed $40,000 shall be available for expenses of travel;" and insert "not to exceed $779,300 for expenses of administrative travel; $36,772,000."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] has an amendment to offer to this amendment which I am willing to accept. I ask the distinguished minority leader whether he will agree to it. It seems that a mistake was made in the estimates, and I think it would be well in order to accommodate the Armed Services Committee, which the Senator from Wyoming represents, to take to conference the amendment he desires to propose.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does this item relate to Selective Service?

Mr. MAYBANK. It does.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Very well.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment to the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 35, in line 2, it is proposed to strike out the "$779,300" and insert "$963,250."

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, this amendment is necessary, in order to correct a technical error in the bill, which occurred through an oversight.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I shall be pleased to take the amendment to conference, where I hope an agreement concerning it can be reached. I believe the distinguished minority leader feels the same way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 7, to insert:

Appropriations for the Selective Service System may be used for the destruction of records accumulated under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, which are hereby authorized to be destroyed by the Director of Selective Service after compliance with the procedures for the destruction of records prescribed pursuant to the Records Disposal Act of 1943, as amended (44 U. S. C. 366–380): *Provided*, That no records may be transferred to any other agency without the approval of the Director of Selective Service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Smithsonian Institution", on page 36, line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$9,100" and insert "$11,350", and in line 20, after the word "publication", to strike out "$2,274,000" and insert "$2,565,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,600" and insert "$2,000", and in line 25, after the word "proper", to strike out "$1,181,100" and insert "$1,300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Subversive Activities Control Board," on page 38, line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$4,000" and insert "$7,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Tariff Commission," on page 38, line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$12,000" and insert "$15,000", and in line 17, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$1,194,750" and insert "$1,388,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The first amendment under the heading "Tennessee Valley Authority" was, on page 39, line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "one hundred and ten" and insert "two hundred and twenty, of which one hundred and fifty shall be"; in line 8 after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$171,270,000" and insert "$186,027,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Veterans' Administration," on page 41, line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$3,138,400" and insert "$3,923,000", and in line 10, after the word "equipment", to strike out "$809,382,260" and insert "$877,382,260."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 7, after the word "expended", to strike out "$153,600,000" and insert "$66,316,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 8, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "$9,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "War Claims Commission—Administrative expenses," on page 47, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$8,000" and insert "$10,000", and in line 5, after the word "Commission", to strike out "$683,000" and insert "$786,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, after line 8, to insert:

REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION

The unobligated balance of the funds available for necessary expenses of the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission, as authorized by the acts of July 18, 1947 (Public Law 203), and May 31, 1949 (Public Law 78), is hereby rescinded effective July 1, 1952, except for necessary liquidating expenses, and such sum shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent offices—General provisions," on page 50, line 19, after the word "training", to strike out "committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Department of Commerce—Maritime activities—Operating-differential subsidies," on page 52, line 19, after the word "excess," to strike out "of sixteen hundred, of which one hundred shall be for new operators, and which number shall include the number of voyages under contracts hereafter awarded" and insert "of sixteen hundred, which number shall include the number of voyages under contracts hereafter awarded and of which one hundred shall be for operators who have not held contracts prior to July 1, 1951."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 4, after the word "Administration", to strike out "$14,375,700" and insert "$16,860,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$130,700" and insert "$160,350"; in line 14, after the word "models", to strike out "$8,099,700" and insert "$9,212,000", and in line 22, after the words "excess of", to strike out "three hundred" and insert "five hundred."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,200" and insert "$2,775," and in line 3, after the word "travel", to strike out "$1,764,000" and insert "$2,078,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 3, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$4,512,000" and insert "$5,570,000", and in line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$6,650" and insert "$8,325."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,881,600" and insert "$2,474,100."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I send to the desk a correcting amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 54, line 15, after the word "services", it is proposed to insert "exclusive of pay of cadet midshipmen."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question first on agreeing to the committee amendment, in line 14, changing the numeral. Without objection, that amendment is agreed to.

Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina is agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished acting minority leader if it is not a fact

that it was not the intention to take the money away from the Maritime Commission.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, for the purpose of clarification, I see on page 54, line 10, the words "Maritime training." I have in my hand a memorandum which reads, in part, as follows:

For the fiscal year 1952 there was appropriated for the maritime training program of the Maritime Administration $3,724,500. In his budget message the President recommended that for this program there be appropriated for the fiscal year 1953, $3,865,000, a slight increase over 1952. Presumably this recommendation of the President was based upon the belief generally held in the maritime industry, in the fall of 1951, that because of the Mutual Security Program and the Korean situation, the maritime industry would be confronted with a manpower shortage. There was some ground for this belief. In order to carry out the Marshall plan, the Maritime Administration had been obliged to take out of reserve approximately 550 merchant ships to carry goods to countries participating in the plan. Coming suddenly after the shipping depression which followed the termination of World War II, this swift expansion of our merchant fleet was accompanied by recruitment difficulties, and some delays were encountered in manning ships. It was therefore probably sound policy for the Administration to look to the future and to develop a training program.

The point is that, because of the fact that thousands of maritime employees are now out of work, it is necessary, at least at the moment, to extend the training program. I wonder if the chairman of the subcommittee can advise me as to that.

Mr. MAYBANK. My information is that the men who are trained in the schools are placed in the Naval Reserves. That is my understanding of the testimony which was given before the committee. The schools were discontinued last year, much to the regret of many Senators, and the Kings Point Academy was the last Federal school to be operated. The Senator from New Hampshire can correct me if I am wrong.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, another statement made by the person who called this matter to my attention is this:

In brief, instead of a manpower shortage, the American maritime industry is now faced with a growing surplus of qualified seamen and increasing unemployment. To continue, and especially to enlarge the training program of the Maritime Administration, under these circumstances, would simply be to increase unemployment, and thus to intensify the depression which afflicts the maritime industry.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is a Federal school at Kings Point. There are State schools, mainly supported by the Federal Government, in California, New York, Massachusetts, and Maine. Those schools train men to be officers in the merchant marine. As a whole, the graduates are being employed. I believe they all become Reserve officers in the Navy. The evidence before the committee would indicate that the demand for the graduates is still great.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Massachusetts to mean that at Kings Point, Sheepshead Bay, Alameda, Calif., and the United States Maritime Service Institute they are still training boys to be Reserve officers in the Navy, or are they training them for the merchant marine?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In addition to the schools which I mentioned, there are two other schools, one in California, and one at Sheepshead Bay, where men are being trained for the maritime service. In other words, a man will receive instructions so that he can up his grade in the noncommissioned class.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It appears rather serious to me that there are thousands of maritime employees out of work. I think it would not be sound policy to continue to train others when there are so many unemployed.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not think many are unemployed. I was distressed about certain things that happened in the old Maritime Commission, but this is not the time or the place to bring them up. The American Legion and various other organizations in the country support this amendment. I know nothing about it except what they tell me.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am not complaining about the training if it is necessary, but I think they must have some justification for asking that the program be continued inasmuch as thousands of men in this line of work are unemployed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire memorandum submitted to me be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

MEMORANDUM

Subject: Maritime training program, independent offices appropriation bill, 1953.

For fiscal year 1952 there was appropriated for the maritime-training program of the Maritime Administration $3,724,500. In his budget message, the President recommended that for this program there be appropriated for the fiscal year 1953 $3,865,000, a slight increase over 1952. Presumably this recommendation of the President was based upon the belief generally held in the maritime industry in the fall of 1951 that, because of the Mutual Security Program and the Korean situation, the maritime industry would be confronted with a manpower shortage. There was some ground for this belief. In order to carry out the Marshall plan, the Maritime Administration had been obliged to take out of reserve approximately 550 merchant ships to carry goods to countries participating in the plan. Coming suddenly after the shipping depression which followed the termination of World War II, this swift expansion of our merchant fleet was accompanied by recruitment difficulties, and some delays were encountered in manning ships. It was therefore probably sound policy for the Administration to look to the future and develop a training program.

However, the threatened maritime manpower shortage failed to develop. Early in 1952, with the rapid decline of the ECA program, the Maritime Administration commenced to return merchant ships to reserve. Since that time approximately 400 Government-owned ships, which had been operated under General Agency contracts, have been withdrawn from service and returned to reserve. Estimating conservatively, the average of these ships carried a crew of approximately 45, which means that since February 1952 approximately 16,000 seamen have become unemployed as a result of the withdrawal of General Agency ships. During this same period private shipping companies have reduced their fleets, with the result that there are many unemployed seamen in every port.

When this union was first informed by the Maritime Administration of the possibility of a manpower shortage, it endeavored to meet the situation by establishing training schools for seamen. Thus, while we were in fact entering a period of increasing unemployment, the union has been engaged in recruiting and training additional seamen, who now find themselves well-trained, qualified and unemployed. An examination of the record will disclose that a much higher percentage of SIU-trained seamen pass the Coast Guard examinations than of those trained by the Maritime Administration.

In brief, instead of a manpower shortage, the American maritime industry is now faced with a growing surplus of qualified seamen and increasing unemployment. To continue, and especially to enlarge the training program of the Maritime Administration under these circumstances, would simply be to increase unemployment, and thus intensify the depression which afflicts the maritime industry.

In the opinion of SIU members, the House Committee on Appropriations (see Rept. No. 1517 on H. R. 7072) acted wisely and in the best interests of the maritime industry when it recommended a reduction in the appropriation of maritime training from $3,865,000 recommended by the President, to $2,795,200. This reduced amount for maritime training is $929,300 less than the appropriation for 1952, and $1,069,800 less than the estimate for 1953. Certainly Congress should not appropriate money to increase unemployment. Certainly Congress should not appropriate money to further depress the American maritime industry. Indeed, this union firmly believes that the appropriation for maritime training at this time could be still further reduced with salutory effects upon the merchant marine.

Respectfully.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, in line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,500" and insert "$2,500"; in line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$20,500" and insert "$30,750"; in line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$55,680" and insert "$72,500"; on page 55, line 1, after the word "Administration", to strike out "$2,795,200" and insert "$3,990,000", and in line 2, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "including uniforms and textbooks for cadet midshipmen, to be provided in kind at an average yearly cost of not to exceed $200 per cadet: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be used for compensation or allowances for trainees or cadets" and insert "including the pay of cadet midshipmen."

The amendment was agreed to.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 17, after the word "schools", to strike out "and $300,400 for allowances for uniforms, textbooks, and subsistence of cadets at State marine schools, to be paid in accordance with regulations established pursuant to law (46 U. S. C. 1126 (b)); $643,400" and insert "and $749,050 for the pay of seven hundred and ten cadet midshipmen at $65 per month and $275 per annum for the subsistence of each cadet midshipman; $1,092,050."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—Corporations—Housing and Home Finance Agency," on page 58, line 16, after the word "exceed" to strike out "$3,371,425" and insert "$3,647,600"; on page 59, line 11, after the word "exceed" to strike out "$122,760" and insert "$153,450", and in line 12, after the word "travel", to strike out the colon and *"Provided further,* That administrative expenses not under limitation for the purposes set forth in the budget schedules for the fiscal year 1953 shall not exceed $150,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$6,000" and insert "$7,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$25,000", and in line 17, after "(12 U. S. C. 1421–1449)", to strike out the colon and *"Provided further,* That the nonadministrative expenses for the examination of Federal and State chartered institutions shall not exceed $1,664,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$3,700" and insert "$4,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$130,000" and insert "$162,250", and in line 15, after the figures "$500" to strike out the colon and *"Provided further,* That expenditures for nonadministrative expenses classified by section 2 of Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, shall not exceed $25,175,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$10,455,000" and insert "$12,613,000"; in line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$620,000" and insert "$775,000"; in line 19, after the word "projects", to strike out the colon and *"Provided further,* That all expenses of the Public Housing Administration not specifically limited in this act, in carrying out its duties imposed by or pursuant to law shall not exceed $31,690,000", and in line 22, after the word "That", to strike out "not to exceed $50,000 of."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I think this amendment should go over, inasmuch as it relates to public housing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be temporarily passed over.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Inland Waterways Corporation," on page 65, line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$467,330" and insert "$481,200"; in line 8, after the word "exceed" to strike out "$9,560" and insert "$11,950", and in line 13, after the numerals "1947", to insert a semicolon and "and funds available for operating expenses shall be available for purchase (not to exceed two, for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—General provisions," on page 66, after line 21, to strike out:

SEC. 401. Hereafter no part of the funds of, or available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this or any other act, including the government of the District of Columbia, shall be available to pay for annual leave accumulated by any civilian officer or employee during any calendar year and unused at the close of business on June 30 of the succeeding calendar year: *Provided,* That the head of any such corporation or agency shall afford an opportunity for officers or employees to use the annual leave accumulated under this section prior to June 30 of such succeeding calendar year: *Provided further,* That this section shall not apply to officers and employees whose post of duty is outside the continental United States: *Provided further,* That this section shall not apply with respect to the payment of compensation for accumulated annual leave in the case of officers or employees who leave their civilian positions for the purpose of entering upon active military or naval service in the Armed Forces of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 16, to change the section number from "402" to "401."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, after line 23, to strike out:

SEC. 403. In no event shall the number of passenger-carrying vehicles which may be operated during the current fiscal year at the seat of government under any appropriation or authorization in this act exceed 50 percent of the number in use as of June 30, 1951.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 4, to change the section number from "404" to "402."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 9, to change the section number from "405" to "403," and in line 18, after the word "States," to insert "or whose place of duty is in a foreign country."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, after line 18, to strike out:

SEC. 406. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1952: *Provided,* That this inhibition shall not apply

(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

(b) to positions filled from within a department, independent executive bureau, board, commission, corporation, agency or office, provided for in this act;

(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

(d) to all employees in veterans' medical facilities, exclusive of medical departmental personnel in the District of Columbia;

(e) to employees in grades CPC 1, 2, and 3;

(f) to employees of the General Accounting Office;

(g) to employees of the Tax Court of the United States;

(h) to American Battle Monuments Commission: *Provided further,* That when any department, independent executive bureau, board, commission, corporation, agency or office, contained in this act shall, as the result of the operation of this amendment reduce its personnel to a number not exceeding 90 per centum of the total number provided for in this act, such amendment may cease to apply and said 90 per centum shall become a ceiling for employment during the fiscal year 1953, and if exceeded at any time during fiscal year 1953 this amendment shall again become operative.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 404. (a) No part of any appropriation made by this act for any purpose shall be used for the payment of personal services in excess of an amount equal to 90 percent of the amount requested for personal services for such purpose in budget estimates heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1953; and the total amount of each appropriation, any part of which is available for the payment of personal services for any purpose, is hereby reduced by an amount equal to 10 percent of the amount requested in such budget estimates for personal services for such purpose less an amount representing the reduction, if any, between the amount requested for personal services in the budget estimates and the amount appropriated herein for such services.

(b) This section shall not apply to—

1. Offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

2. Employees of the White House Office.

3. Employees engaged in the care, maintenance, and so forth, of the Executive Mansion and Grounds.

4. Employees in medical facilities, exclusive of administrative medical personnel in the District of Columbia.

5. Employees of the General Accounting Office.

6. Employees of the Smithsonian Institution, including the National Gallery of Art.

7. Employees of the Tax Court of the United States.

8. Employees in foreign countries of the American Battle Monuments Commission.

9. Employees of the Atomic Energy Commission.

10. Employees of the Selective Service System.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, after line 9, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 405. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or any funds made available for expenditure by this act, shall be used for the purpose of acquiring, seizing, or operating any plant, facility, or other property, unless the acquisition, seizure, or operation of such plant, facility, or other property is authorized by act of Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, after line 15, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 406. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year, in accordance with section 16 of the act of August 2, 1946

(5 U. S. C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor vehicle (exclusive of busses, ambulances, and station wagons), is hereby fixed at $1,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, after line 21, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 407. (a) No part of the money appropriated by this act to any department, agency, or corporation, or made available for expenditure by any department, agency, or corporation which is in excess of 75 percent of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1953 contemplated would be employed by such department, agency, or corporation during such fiscal year in the performance of—

(1) functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press-relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material.

shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2).

(b) This section shall not apply: To persons employed by the General Services Administration in the performance of functions or related assisting or supporting functions in connection with the publication of the Federal Register, or to persons engaged in functions of the Civil Service Commission related to (1) the preparation and issuance of materials relating to the recruitment of personnel for the Federal service, and (2) the compilation of the Official Register of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, line 4, to change the section number from "407" to "408."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. The committee amendment inserting section 405 should be rejected. Since the Supreme Court has rendered its decision in the steel case, section 405 should not be in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that amendment is rejected.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which, in my judgment, is legislation on an appropriation bill, but it is an amendment which was unanimously approved by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, most respectfully, I should like to ask for a reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment inserting section 405 was rejected, in order that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who is very much interested in it, may be in the Chamber. Therefore, I should like to ask to reconsider that vote and to let section 405 go over for the time being.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is perfectly agreeable. My only thought was that the section is no longer necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote whereby section 405 was rejected is reconsidered, and the amendment wil be passed over for the present.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, with respect to section 404, known as the Ferguson amendment, I should like to know whether there has been any action taken to exclude employees of the Tariff Commission from the operation of that section. I ask the question because the Tariff Commission, as the result of additional work which has been placed upon it by reason of recent legislation, requiring special activity on the part of the Commission, has reached a point where the peril point problem is involved.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Oregon is correct.

Mr. CORDON. There is probably need for more employees than the total requested by the Bureau of the Budget, so I wish to know whether there has been any action taken to exclude the Tariff Commission from the operation of this section.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Michigan, who was the author of the amendment, advised today that he intended to exempt the Tariff Commission in the free conference. But if the Senator from Oregon wishes to bring up the matter at this point, I think it would be perfectly agreeable to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. CORDON. If the Senator from Michigan is going to return to the floor, I prefer to wait until he arrives.

Mr. MAYBANK. The appropriation for the Tariff Commission is less than it was in 1940, if we consider the number of employees working for them. They surely should be exempt.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with what the Senator from Oregon has said. We restored the full amount of the estimate for the Tariff Commission, as the Senator will remember realizing that with the additional work the amount appropriated was barely sufficient. If the appropriation is reduced under the Ferguson amendment, we will be depriving ourselves of what we need from the Commission.

Mr. MAYBANK. They will never get the business done which Congress asked them to perform.

Mr. CORDON. Has action been taken yet with respect to section 404 from a parliamentary standpoint? May we still amend the section?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The amendment was agreed to, but the Senator can ask unanimous consent to take further action.

Mr. CORDON. In that event, I shall await the return of the Senator from Michigan, and then take it up.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let us have an understanding now, because if we open the door wide, we could make a mistake. Does the Senator from Oregon ask unanimous consent to amend the Ferguson amendment to exclude the Tariff Commission?

Mr. CORDON. I would prefer to withhold my request until the Senator from Michigan returns to the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish the Senator from Oregon to know that I thoroughly agree with him, and I feel certain the Senator from Michigan does also.

Mr. CORDON. I appreciate that.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I send to the desk the amendment to which I referred, which is really legislation on an appropriation bill. This amendment would provide for the use of counterpart funds. I should like to have the attention of the distinguished minority leader and of the Senator from Oregon, who worked so hard on this amendment. It is proposed to take from "Counterpart funds" in order to enable the American Battle Monuments Commission to pay their employees overseas, to place headstones on tombs, and to keep cemeteries in good order, such amount as may not be required for purposes of either mutual security or the State Department.

So, instead of asking for the appropriation of money, I send to the desk an amendment and ask the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who has been over this matter with me, if he will agree to a certain change.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will agree to both the Senator's amendments. They carry out the principle upon which we agreed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask that my first amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 4, it is proposed to strike out "$619,550" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$400,000, and in addition, the Commission is authorized to utilize for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation, without dollar reimbursement from this or any other appropriation, foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States in an amount not exceeding $219,550, and the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to make such foreign currencies or credits available to the Commission in the amount stated."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 21, it is proposed to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$500,000, to remain available until expended, and, in addition, the Commission is authorized to utilize for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation, without dollar reimbursement from this or any other appropriation, foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States in an amount not exceeding $4,500,000, and the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to make such foreign currencies or credits

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

available to the Commission in the amount stated."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, if it is proper, at this time I rise to make a point of order against the paragraph in title II, beginning on page 56, line 19, ending on page 57, line 5. I wonder if it would suit the convenience of the Chair to have the clerk read the paragraph in question.

Mr. MAYBANK. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Washington to state the paragraph again? Does he refer to page 55, line 25, War Shipping Administration liquidation?

Mr. CAIN. The page number is 56, beginning with line 19 and running through line 5, on page 57.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that, except by unanimous consent, an amendment at this point is not in order until committee amendments have been acted on.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, for the reason that it will take but a few minutes, I think I shall ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to raise the point of order at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as I understand, the language to which the Senator's request refers is not subject to a point of order. It is a part of the bill as it came from the House.

Mr. CAIN. I did not understand the Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. I said that since the language was in the bill as it came from the House, it is not subject to a point of order, if he raises the question.

Mr. CAIN. I may say to the Senator from South Carolina that I believe it would be of benefit to the Senate if the paragraph on which the Chair would rule were read to determine whether a point of order can validly be registered against it.

Mr. MAYBANK. My understanding was that individual amendments were not in order until we had finished the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Except by unanimous consent.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have no objection to the Senator's raising the point now.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington had asked for unanimous consent, and it was granted. I sought only to dispose of this item as rapidly as possible.

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the language to which the Senator from Washington refers.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

No money made available to the Department of Commerce, for maritime activities, by this or any other act shall be used in payment for a vessel the title to which is acquired by the Government either by requisition or purchase, or the use of which is taken either by requisition or agreement, or which is insured by the Government and lost while so insured, unless the price or hire to be paid therefor (except in cases where section 802 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is applicable) is computed in accordance with subsection 902 (a) of said act, as that subsection is interpreted by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina to this observation——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if the Senator will bear with me, I appreciate his desire. The Senator can make a motion to strike out the provision, and we can take the question to conference; but no point of order can be raised with respect to the language, because it came to the Senate in the House bill. I understood the distinguished Presiding Officer to rule not with respect to a point of order, but that nothing further was in order until the committee amendments had been disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Except by unanimous consent.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington may, if he chooses, move to strike this paragraph from the bill.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, in order to be completely fair to all Members of the Senate, I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry. The Senator from Washington is thoroughly aware of the fact that a point of order cannot be raised against language which has come to the Senate from the House.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CAIN. But with respect to this language, which came to the Senate from the House had the Senate committee itself written the language, could a point of order legitimately be raised against such language?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that it could not, inasmuch as the Senate committee has not touched this particular wording.

Mr. CAIN. I understand that. I am asking, by way of argument, whether or not, if the language were before us as having been written by the appropriate Senate committee, a point of order could be raised against it. My feeling is that though a point of order cannot be raised against it because the language has come to the Senate from the House, it is legislation on an appropriation bill, and properly should be eliminated from the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands from the Parliamentarian that if the language had been written into the bill as a committee amendment, a point of order would lie.

Mr. CAIN. For that reason I should like to move that this paragraph be stricken from the bill so that further consideration of the question of whether or not it is actually legislation on an appropriation bill may be had in the conference.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have no objection to taking to conference such an amendment as the Senator from Washington proposes, with the distinct understanding that the House placed the language in the bill, and if it is restored in conference, the Senator will understand that I am undertaking only to take it to conference.

Mr. CAIN. I shall be satisfied with any decision which is reached in the conference. But if the Senator from South Carolina agrees to strike out the language, the question will be subject to discussion in conference.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is the only ground on which I would agree to the amendment. I am willing to take it to conference in order that the question may be discussed more fully than I have heard it discussed. The question involved in the point of order which the Senator suggested was never fully considered in the committee.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The language in question first came into an appropriation bill in a conference, as a result of a difference in views between the two Houses. I thought perhaps the Senator might be interested in a brief statement with respect to the history of the language in question.

Mr. CAIN. Personally, I should be most grateful for such an explanation, and I know that other Members of the Senate share my interest and concern in this subject.

Mr. CORDON. As a result of the auditing by the General Accounting Office, of the War Shipping Board and the Maritime Commission which followed it, and a highly critical report by the General Acounting Office, a question arose as to whether the procedure adopted by the then Maritime Commission was in accord with a proper interpretation of the Ship Sales Act. The General Accounting Office took a different view than did counsel for the Commission. In the discussion in conference, the conferees agreed to accept the interpretation of the General Accounting Office as to the meaning of the law; and upon an agreement at that time this language was placed in the bill in lieu of either the language of the House or the language of the Senate, the only difference being that as it appears here, it will become general law, whereas at that time it applied only to the bill then under consideration.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I appreciate the fullness of the response of the Senator from Oregon. I take it he does not resist the desire on the part of the Senator from Washington that this question be further explored in the conference.

Mr. CORDON. I can see no reason in the world why that should not be done. I am quite sure what the result will be.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, what is the status of the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] to strike from the bill the language beginning with line 19, on page 56, and continuing through line 5, on page 57.

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall be glad to take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, since the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has returned to the Chamber, I should like to take up at this time the proposed exemption of the Tariff Commission from the so-called Ferguson amendment. The Senator from Michigan has been working arduously all day long. I may say that a question arose as to exempting the Tariff Commission from the so-called Ferguson amendment. I had understood that the Senator from Michigan had no objection.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, because of the extra burden which has been placed upon the Tariff Commission, and the number of employees necessary to carry on its work, I am willing to make an exception of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is my understanding that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] raised that question.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to section 404, beginning at the top of page 71 of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to be reconsidered, and that section 404 be amended by adding, on page 72, after line 9, the following:

11. Employees of the Tariff Commission.

That amendment would exclude the employees of the Tariff Commission from the effect of the section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment in section 404 was agreed to is reconsidered. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon to the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to offer a further amendment to the committee amendment. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Unfortunately through some error the Inland Waterways Corporation, which was exempted last year because of its personnel being scattered up and down the rivers, was not included in the list of exemptions this year. I wonder if the Senator would object to including it?

Mr. FERGUSON. It was exempted last year, and I am agreeable to an amendment exempting it.

Mr. MAYBANK. I offer an amendment, on page 72, after line 9, following the previous amendment to the committee amendment, to insert the following:

12. Employees of the Inland Waterways Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina to the committee amendment on page 72, in section 404.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, if it is in order, I should like to ask a question of the able Senator from South Carolina, who is in charge of the bill, with reference to the Veterans' Administration amendments which have already been adopted. Do I understand that that section of the bill, with the increases provided, practically restores to the measure all the cuts which were made by the House?

Mr. MAYBANK. I am very glad that my distinguished colleague and member of veterans' organizations, as I am, has asked the question. I can only say that we did the best we could to restore to the veterans, insofar as health benefits and care were concerned, $37,000,000. The Ferguson amendment also applied to doctors and nurses who were aiding the sick veterans. The Veterans' Administration had $12,500,000 of unexpended funds on hand, and we authorized them to use that amount, together with $73,000,000, making a total of $85,000,000. They have an ample amount of money on hand so far as running their present hospitals is concerned.

However, we cut out $85,000,000 for new construction; the construction of new veterans' hospitals, many of which perhaps will be needed. We did not see how many new hospitals could be constructed, as provided in the House version, and at the same time not pay the doctors, nurses, dieticians, and those who decided the eligibility of persons to enter such hospitals. So we took the money allotted to the construction of new hospitals and used it to staff the present hospitals so that they could operate, according to the testimony of General Gray, at 100 percent efficiency.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I appreciate the explanation of the Senator from South Carolina. That is what I was concerned about.

Mr. MAYBANK. We did not authorize any more money.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Will the increases now in the bill accomplish and permit and provide for the staffing of the present hospitals with an adequate number of doctors and other personnel to take care of the veterans?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is my very definite understanding.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. They asked for a total amount in new money of $73,000,000. We gave them $68,000,000. In other words, in view of the enormous increases involved, we gave them almost all they asked for, within a small amount, on the theory that they could get along and would get along on that amount.

Mr. MAYBANK. We provided the full amount asked for by the members of the research board for prosthetics, and so forth.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator. I wanted to be sure about that.

Mr. MAYBANK. What is the use of having new hospitals when the ones we have cannot be properly operated? That was our thought. I know many people will be disappointed when they hear that we cut out the appropriation for the construction of new hospitals.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Kansas with respect to the money cut from the fund with which to build new hospitals, that the bids had not been let; therefore, there should be no appreciable loss to the Federal Government. What the House did was to provide a sum for construction of new hospitals, and cut out money for the operation of the present hospitals.

What we did was to put back the operating money and cut out the new construction.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I think the committee acted with wisdom in handling the matter in that way. We certainly want to care adequately for the present needs of our veterans and to provide for the future.

Mr. MAYBANK. There is no use in building new hospitals when we do not have sufficient money to operate efficiently the ones we have.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the Federal Trade Commission provision on page 15 of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, line 25, it is proposed to strike out "$4,128,800" and to insert in lieu thereof "$4,428,800."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment having been agreeed to, the vote by which the Senate agreed to the committee amendment will have to be reconsidered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to a question of parliamentary procedure. It was my understanding that after we went through the bill we would go back first to the amendments to the bill which were passed over and that after we had completed action on those amendments, we would then take up individual amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee is in order, inasmuch as it is an amendment to a committee amendment which has been adopted.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I understand correctly that the Senator from Tennessee must first move to reconsider the vote by which the Senate agreed to the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Tennessee discussed his amendment with me. It relates to the Federal Trade

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Commission. Some years ago a similar amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee was accepted. The situation this year is that the Federal Trade Commission had a deficiency appropriation of approximately $300,000. I am not in a position to accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee. I ask the Senator from Tennessee if he would mind letting us proceed with the committee amendments with reference to TVA and the housing program.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would it not be much better to have the committee study the matter under the so-called deficiency appropriation?

Mr. MAYBANK. That was my attitude, because I believe in handling matters correctly. As I understand, the Federal Trade Commission received $300,000 in a deficiency appropriation bill. Therefore, as I told the Senator from Tennessee, I would not vote for any more money for the Federal Trade Commission. I will not vote for the Senator's amendment, although I appreciate the integrity with which he proposes it. I have also spoken to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] about the amendment. I spoke to him about it yesterday.

Mr. FERGUSON. The figures in the amendment are also above the budget estimate; are they not?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. They are not above the budget estimate. I should like to have an opportunity to explain the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advised the Senator from Tennessee that the question is first on the reconsideration of the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to. That question must be disposed of first. Is there objection to the reconsideration of the vote by which the committee amendment on page 15, line 25, with reference to the Federal Trade Commission, was agreed to?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] expects to leave the Senate Chamber at 7 o'clock this evening. I do not know whether I am correct in that statement, but he has been here and he wanted to get along with the committee amendments. I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that I shall have to object unless the Senator from New Hampshire does not intend to leave. Does the Senator from New Hampshire intend to leave at 7 o'clock?

Mr. TOBEY. Yes; I do.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If I could offer my amendment tomorrow I should be glad to withdraw it at this time. I understood, however, that it was in order to offer amendments to committee amendments.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, who has been waging a great campaign, which all of us have followed, that beginning at 10 o'clock tomorrow we start consideration of the Defense Production Act, which will probably occupy the remainder of the week. Therefore, no amendment on this bill could be offered tomorrow.

Mr. KEFAUVER. After the other amendments are out of the way I could offer my amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly. Let me ask the distinguished acting minority leader if it would be agreeable to permit the Senator from Tennessee to take up the amendment at this time. I believe it would not take more than 5 minutes to do so.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Not more than 5 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection at all. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the time for debate on this amendment, as on all other amendments, except on the housing and TVA amendments, is limited to 15 minutes to a side.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct. The Senator from Tennessee believes it would not take more than 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment on page 15, line 25, was agreed to, is reconsidered, and the clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, line 25, it is proposed to strike out "$4,128,800" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,428,800."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in 1950 Congress passed the most important antitrust law since 1914, the antimerger bill. This law plugged up the loophole in section 7 of the Clayton Act, which permitted corporations to evade the intent of Congress by purchasing the assets rather than the stock of their competitors. As a result of the enactment of the antimerger bill, the law now applies equally to both asset and stock acquisitions.

Although the great importance of the new law is generally recognized, the Federal Trade Commission has thus far had little success in obtaining funds for enforcement of the new law. To date what has happened is that Congress has passed an ordinance but has discharged the policemen. Now with this recommendation of the Appropriations Committee, Congress will have docked the policeman's back pay.

Mr. President, under the antimerger law, it is necessary for the Federal Trade Commission to determine in each case whether the effect of the merger is to substantially lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce in any section of the country. In order to reach that determination it is necessary for the Commission to make a detailed inspection and analysis of the condition of competition in the particular section where the merger occurs. This takes money.

The Federal Trade Commission believes that approximately $1,000,000 a year will be required for the enforcement of the new law. The Bureau of the Budget thinks it can be enforced with only half a million dollars; and in the last fiscal year, 1952, Congress provided less than $200,000—$198,000, to be exact. The President on May 8 submitted to the Congress a supplemental request of $300,000, which, when added to the $198,000 the Commission has already received, would provide, roughly, half a million dollars for the enforcement of this law. If granted, this would provide the Commission with an appropriation of $4,667,000 for the coming fiscal year, 1953.

However, the House of Representatives has approved only $3,979,000, and the Senate Appropriations Committee only $4,129,000. The latter figure is $539,000 below the President's request and $159,000 below what the Commission already has for the current fiscal year, 1952.

Thus, even if the Senate Appropriations Committee figure were approved by the conferees, the Commission would have only $40,000 more than it had before the antimerger bill was passed.

If the President's supplementary request of $300,000 were added to the Senate Appropriations Committee figure, it would yield a total of $4,428,000, which would be $239,000 below the President's total request for this agency, and only $141,000 above what the Commission already has for the present year.

Apparently it is a known fact in industry that the Commission has not as yet been provided with adequate funds for the enforcement of the new law. This is indicated by the fact that the rate of mergers has nearly tripled since the act has been in effect. The number of industrial mergers has risen from an annual rate of around 200 prior to the passage of the bill in 1950 to a current rate of approximately 750 a year. At the present time mergers are taking place at a more rapid rate than at any time since the late 1920's. Moreover, with each passing month the number of important mergers involving large firms is increasing very rapidly.

Mr. President, I have before me a chart which shows the current merger trend. Since the passage of the antimerger bill, mergers have increased rapidly, rising from a rate of about 30 a year in 1950 to approximately 200 a year in 1952.

The new law is unlike the other antitrust law, in that the pressure on the part of the respondents is all for speed, rather than delay, in its administration. The parties to a merger wish to know as quickly as possible whether their plans will run afoul of the law. The less the funds available to the Commission, the greater the delay in making these determinations, and thus the greater the inconvenience to industry.

Mr. President, since the Commission last year received $198,000 for the enforcement of the antimerger law, and since the amount recommended by the Appropriations Committee is $158,000

below what the Commission already has, it follows that if the amount now provided in the Senate version of the bill is finally approved and enacted into law, the Commission will have only $40,000 for the enforcement of the most important antitrust act since 1914.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a list of mergers taking place since the Antimerger Act was passed.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Acquiring company	Company acquired	Source	Date	Page
1. Adolphus Rice Mills	Walton Rice Mill, Inc	WSJ	Feb. 16, 1951	5
2. Allied Stores Corp	Newcastle Dry Goods Co	SCR	Feb. 5, 1951	6207
	Stern Bros	Moody's	Apr. 4, 1951	1264
	Kemp & Herbert	SCR	Aug. 10, 1951	4339
3. American Machine & Foundry Co	Cleveland Welding Co	Moody's	Mar. 28, 1951	1337
	Junior Toy Corp	do	Apr. 7, 1951	1224
	Sterling Engineering Co., Inc	SCR	Sept. 10, 1951	4121
	Monarch Woodworking Machinery line of American Sawmill Machinery Co.	SCR	Oct. 9, 1951	3913
	Leland Electric Co	SCR	Feb. 13, 1952	9617
	Thompson-Bremer & Co	Moody's	Mar. 5, 1952	3576
	Float-Lock Corp	A. M. and F. Co. Ann. Rept., 1951	Oct. 1, 1951	12
4. American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp	Acme Metal Products Corp	SCR	Aug. 23, 1951	4229
5. Archer-Daniels-Midland Co	W. J. Small Co., Inc	SCR	Aug. 27, 1952	4209
6. Atlas Plywood Corp	Plywood, Inc	SCR	Oct. 9, 1951	3913
7. Aveo Manufacturing Corp	Horn Manufacturing Co	Moody's	Apr. 21, 1951	1113
8. Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton	Austin-Western Co	do	Mar. 13, 1951	1511
9. Borden Co	Datson Dairies	SCR	Aug. 17, 1951	4277
	John W. Harms milk distributing business	SCR	Feb. 5, 1952	9080
	Bassett Dairies, Inc	SCR	Feb. 13, 1952	9618
	Washington Better Foods	Food Field Reporter	Apr. 24, 1952	44
10. Burlington Mills Corp	Arthur Bone, Inc	SCR	Jan. 4, 1951	6567
	Worth Bros., Inc	WSJ	June 28, 1951	4
	National Mallison Fabrics	SCR	Mar. 21, 1952	9139
	Sarfert Hosiery Mills	SCR	Apr. 1, 1952	8813
11. Burroughs Adding Machine Co	Control Instrument Co	SCR	July 11, 1951	4656
12. Byron-Jackson Co	Dempsey Pump Co	SCR	Aug. 10, 1951	4341
	International Cementers, Inc	NYT	Oct. 6, 1951	35
	A. D. Cook, Inc	SCR	Dec. 12, 1951	2310
13. Cargill, Inc. (Nutrena Mills, Inc.)	Royal Feed & Milling Co	WSJ	June 4, 1951	6
14. Carpenter Steel Co	Webb Wire Works	Moody's	Aug. 18, 1951	2510
15. Caterpillar Tractor Co	Trackson Co	SCR	Dec. 20, 1951	3256
16. City Stores	Lansburgh & Bro	Moody's	July 7, 1951	2737
17. Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp	Worth Steel Co	do	Feb. 7, 1951	1709
18. Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp	E. & G. Brooke Iron Co	SCR	Oct. 17, 1951	3860
19. Cone Mills Corp	Dwight Manufacturing Co	Moody's	Feb. 3, 1951	1715
	Union Bleachery, subsidiary of Aspinook Corp	WSJ	Feb. 25, 1952	5
20. Congoleum-Nairn, Inc	Delaware Floor Products Co	SCR	May 15, 1951	5084
21. Consolidated Grocers Corp	United States Products Corp., Ltd	Moody's	Jan. 27, 1951	1749
	Gentry, Inc	do	Apr. 18, 1951	1150
	Union Sugar Co	Comm. & Fin. Chr	Sept. 24, 1951	2
	Fred M. Drew Co	Moody's	Sept. 22, 1951	2358
22. Copperweld Steel Co	Flexo Wire Co., Inc	SCR	Oct. 1, 1951	3969
23. Crane Co	Hydro-Aire Co	SCR	Dec. 3, 1951	3382
24. Curtis Companies, Inc	American Plywood Corp	SCR	Dec. 24, 1951	3241
25. Diamond Alkali Co	Kolker Chemical Works, Inc	NYT	Aug. 7, 1951	39
26. Ely & Walker Dry Goods Co	Rockwood Mills, Inc	J of C	Aug. 21, 1951	8
		SCR	Aug. 20, 1951	4264
27. Food Machinery & Chemical Corp	Ohio-Apex, Inc	Moody's	Jan. 31, 1951	1734
	Simplex Packaging Machinery, Inc	SCR	Nov. 19, 1951	3514
	Buffalo Electro-Chemical Co	SCR	Dec. 4, 1951	3369
	Oakes Manufacturing Co., Inc	SCR	Dec. 21, 1951	3250
28. Foremost Dairies, Inc	University City Dairy	J of C	Aug. 22, 1951	5
	Sunshine Dairy	do	do	5
	Royal Dairy Products	do	do	5
	Central Dairies	do	do	5
	Dairy at Sherman, Tex	do	do	5
	Diamond Dairy, Inc	Comm. & Fin. Chr	Feb. 25, 1952	3
		NYT	Feb. 16, 1952	16
	Blue Seal Dairy, Inc	Comm. & Fin. Chr	Feb. 25, 1952	3
		NYT	Feb. 16, 1952	16
	Gunn Ice Cream Co	Comm. & Fin. Chr	Feb. 25, 1952	3
		NYT	Feb. 16, 1952	16
	International Dairy Supply Co	Comm. & Fin. Chr	Feb. 25, 1952	3
		NYT	Feb. 16, 1952	16
	International Dairy Engineering Co	Comm. & Fin. Chr	Feb. 25, 1952	4
		NYT	Feb. 16, 1952	
	Superior Dairies, Inc	SCR	Mar. 3, 1952	9412
	Acf-Brill Motors Co	NYT	May 6, 1952	41
		WSJ	do	1-2
29. General Shoe Corp	Nisley Shoe Co	Moody's	Feb. 17, 1951	1656
	Johnston & Murphy Shoe Corp	SCR	Aug. 3, 1951	4414
	Innes Shoe Co	SCR	Dec. 21, 1951	3250
30. Ideal Cement Co	Pacific Portland Cement Co	SCR	Sept. 12, 1951	4105
31. International Milling Co	Eagle Roller Mill Co	Moody's	Oct. 20, 1951	2251
32. International Minerals & Chemical Corp	Innis Speiden & Co	do	May 26, 1951	2898
	Thomson Phosphate Co	SCR	June 27, 1951	4749
	Hoover & Mason Phosphate Co	SCR	Oct. 24, 1951	3800
	Eastern Clay Products, Inc	SCR	Dec. 19, 1951	3267
33. Kimberly-Clark Corp	Munising Paper Co	Comm. & Fin. Chr	Dec. 17, 1951	5
34. Koppers Co., Inc	Continuous Metalcast Co., Inc	SCR	July 27, 1951	4508
	Coreco Oil, Inc	SCR	Sept. 24, 1951	4025
	Franki Foundation Co	SCR	Feb. 1, 1952	9720
35. Mathieson Chemical Corp	American Potash Chemical Co	SCR	Oct. 10, 1951	3909
36. McGraw Electric	Tropic Aire, Inc	SCR	May 8, 1951	5157
	Pennsylvania Transformer Co	SCR	Feb. 8, 1952	9650
	Stinson Industries, Inc	SCR	Dec. 5, 1951	3359
37. Michaels Stern & Co., Inc	Levy Bros. & Adler	WSJ	July 9, 1951	8
38. G. C. Murphy Co	Morris Stores, Inc	SCR	Sept. 10, 1951	4125
39. Merck & Co	Marine Magnesium Co	Moody's	Jan. 27, 1951	1754
40. Mid-Continent Petroleum Corp	Edsell Oil Co	National Petroleum News	June 6, 1951	48
41. Minneapolis-Moline Co	B. F. Avery & Sons Co	SCR	Feb. 28, 1951	6082
42. Munsingwear, Inc	Vassar Co	Moody's	Feb. 3, 1951	1720
43. National Distillers Products Corp	U. S. Industrial Chemicals Co	SCR	Apr. 5, 1951	
44. National Tea Co	21 supermarkets of Gamble-Skogmo, Inc	Moody's, 1951 Ann		218
	C. F. Smith Stores Co	SCR	Apr. 17, 1952	8760
	6 food stores of Northwest Piggly Wiggly Co	WSJ	Apr. 28, 1952	5
45. New York Air Brake Co	Aurora Pump Co	SCR	Oct. 26, 1951	3774
	Hydraulic Equipment Co	SCR	do	3774
	Dudco Products Co	WSJ	Dec. 31, 1951	5
46. Ohio Oil Co	Staebler-Kempf Oil Co	SCR	Dec. 14, 1951	3300
47. Olin Industries, Inc	Frost Lumber Industries, Inc	SCR	Dec. 31, 1951	3388

Acquiring company	Company acquired	Source	Date	Page
48. Oliver Corp	A. B. Farquhar Co	SCR	Oct. 24, 1951	3801
49. Pennsylvania Salt Manufacturing Co	Sharples Chemicals, Inc	SCR	Nov. 8, 1951	3621
50. Phillips Petroleum Co	Penn-O-Tex Oil Corp	SCR	June 7, 1951	4883
51. Pillsbury Mills, Inc	Ballard & Ballard Co., Inc	Moody's	Mar. 28, 1951	1357
	Pool Elevator at Buffalo, N. Y	WSJ	Jan. 31, 1952	5
	Duff's Baking Mix Division, American Home Products Corp.	SCR	Mar. 11, 1952	9301
52. H. K. Porter Co	Buffalo Steel Co	SCR	Oct. 25, 1951	4019
53. Pullman, Inc	Trailmobile Co	WSJ	May 29, 1951	11
54. Pure Oil Co	Power Oil Co	SCR	Dec. 11, 1951	3324
55. Quaker Oats Co	Coast Fishing Co	Moody's	Mar. 3, 1951	1581
	Farm Industries, Inc	SCR	Mar. 19, 1951	5835
56. Ralston Purina Co	Merit Mills, Inc	Moody's	Feb. 3, 1951	1722
	Valley Mills—subsidiary of The Merchants Co	do	May 9, 1951	1007
57. Rockwell Manufacturing Co	Shellabarger Mills, Inc	WSJ	Feb. 25, 1952	5
	Ohlen-Bishop Manufacturing Co	SCR	May 22, 1951	5021
58. Robertshaw-Fulton Controls Co	Deluxe Saw & Tool Co	SCR	Feb. 14, 1952	9814
59. Russell-Miller Milling Co	Fielden Instrument Corp	SCR	Dec. 18, 1951	3280
60. Scott Radio Laboratories	Feed business of Northrup King & Co	Moody's	May 5, 1951	1033
61. Scott Paper Co	John Meek Industries, Inc	SCR	Oct. 2, 1951	3863
	Falls Paper & Power Co	Moody's	Feb. 14, 1951	1679
	Soundview Pulp Co	SCR	Sept. 21, 1951	4041
62. Sinclair Oil Corp	Crown Oil Co	Comm. & Fin. Chr	Dec. 24, 1951	7
	Stoll Oil & Refining Co	SCR	Dec. 20, 1951	3261
	Dunn Oil Co	WSJ	Mar. 8, 1952	8
63. Standard Milling Co	Valley Grain Co	SCR	Sept. 4, 1951	4163
64. J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc	Utica & Mohawk Cotton Mills, Inc	WSJ	Dec. 26, 1951	8
65. Suburban Propane Gas Corp	Barnesville Development Co	Moody's	Jan. 10, 1951	1821
	Elmer T. Hurst	do	Apr. 7, 1951	1253
	Vapyre Corp	do	Apr. 11, 1951	1216
	Suburban Gas Co	do	do	1216
	Abbott's Gas Service	SCR	Oct. 4, 1951	3947
	Rulane Gas Co	Comm. & Fin. Chr	Nov. 26, 1951	11
	Country Home Gas Service, Inc	SCR	Jan. 18, 1952	9857
66. Swanson & Sons (C. A.)	F. K. Floden & Co	WSJ	Sept. 25, 1951	10
67. Thatcher Glass Mfg. Co	McKee Glass Co	Comm. & Fin. Chr	Oct. 22, 1951	9
68. Ward Baking Co	Kern's & Associated Bakeries	SCR	Mar. 25, 1952	9104
69. Wayne Pump Co	Martin & Schwartz, Inc	SCR	Sept. 27, 1951	4000
70. Warner-Hudnut, Inc	Maltine Co	SCR	Oct. 11, 1951	3804
71. White Motor Co	Sterling Motor Truck Co., Inc	Moody's	May 23, 1951	924
72. National Gypsum Co	Wesco Waterpaints, Inc	SCR	Mar. 17, 1952	9219
	National Mortar & Supply Co	Moody's	Mar. 10, 1951	1525

The sources are as follows:
WSJ—Wall Street Journal.
SCR—Standard Corporation Records, Daily News Section.
NYT—New York Times.
Comm. & Fin. Chr.—Commercial & Financial Chronicle.
Moody's—Moody's Industrials, b-weekly edition, section I.
J of C—Journal of Commerce.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, this list shows that since the act was passed, many companies have bought up several other companies, often with the result of lessening competition. Many of these mergers are big ones, important ones.

Among the principal ones are those by the American Machine & Foundry Co., Foremost Dairies, Inc., the Food Machinery & Chemical Corp., the Burlington Mills Corp., the Consolidated Grocers Corp., the General Shoe Corp., the International Minerals & Chemical Corp., and the National Tea Co. In short, large firms have been buying out their competitors right and left. It is impossible even to look into such mergers if only $40,000 a year is available.

My amendment to the committee amendment would add to the amount included in the bill the $300,000 which was requested by the President on May 8. But the total amount thus provided would still be approximately $200,000 less than the amount which has been requested by the President and by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to say that the Senator from Tennessee is correct. In connection with this matter, a mistake was made, either by me or by someone else, when it was said that the amount proposed was less than the amount of the budget estimate.

A $300,000 supplement estimate is now in conference, I believe. That is for the Federal Trade Commission. Am I correct about that? When the $300,000 supplemental item is approved by the conferees, and if the conference report on that item is agreed to, that such additional money will be available to the Commission.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The $300,000 is covered by a message which was sent to the Congress on May 8. That amount has not been included in any bill, and it is not before any conference, so far as I understand.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand the situation, it is that these funds were requested for the antimonopoly work. The $300,000 item included in the 1952 supplemental appropriation bill was not acted upon; the Commission was supposed to absorb the additional work required of it, by making use of funds already made available to it.

When the 1953 budget came along, nothing was included in it for the antimonopoly administration or work.

The President's message has come to the Senate. Nothing relating to this matter has been before the House of Representatives.

So our committee felt that inasmuch as this matter had not been before the House of Representatives, it would be better for us to omit it, and to let the President submit it in a supplemental message, as a part of the 1953 supplemental appropriation bill, and thus let the House of Representatives consider the item in the regular way.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Massachusetts has stated, more clearly than I did, what the situation is. I point out that, as the Senator from Tennessee knows, the Senate committee voted to increase by $150,000 the amount voted for this purpose by the House of Representatives.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct. However, even after the figure voted by the House of Representatives was increased in that way, the increased figure was still $158,000 below what the Commission now has, and $538,000 below the budget estimate. In other words, even after the amount voted by the House of Representatives is increased in the way now proposed, the amount available to the Commission will be only $40,000 above the amount which it had before the antimerger bill was passed. As a result, the Commission will not have an opportunity to investigate hundreds of mergers which now are occurring.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have page 2 of the President's message of May 8 printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., May 8, 1952.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1953, in the amount of $300,000, for the Federal

Trade Commission, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year, as follows:

Independent Offices—Federal Trade Commission

Budget page	Heading	Original estimate	Change to—	Increase
128	Salaries and expenses	$4,367,000	$4,667,000	$300,000

This proposed supplemental appropriation is necessary to provide more nearly adequate staff for the effective enforcement of Public Law 899, approved December 29, 1950. The purpose of Public Law 899 is to prevent the concentration of economic power by prohibiting business mergers which lessen or eliminate competition and promote monopoly.

In addition to the information available at the time the budget was processed last fall, experience during the past several months shows an increase in the number of both the acquiring and acquired companies with assets of over $5,000,000. There has also been an increasing trend in the number of mergers of firms in which the acquiring and acquired firms produced the same type of product, which eliminates direct competition.

A great amount of work is required in the collection and analysis of information before final action on these cases can be taken. Timing is important if the action is to be effective. If a merger is permitted to continue for a considerable length of time before it is analyzed, it becomes increasingly difficult to effect an equitable dissolution where such action is necessary. More important, however, is that any undue delay tends to make the antimerger prohibition meaningless because competition has been lessened or eliminated.

I recommend that the foregoing proposed supplemental appropriation be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

F. J. LAWTON,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, let me call particular attention to a paragraph of the President's message. At that point in the message, a letter from Mr. F. J. Lawton, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, is quoted. I read now from that letter:

> In addition to the information available at the time the budget was processed last fall, experience during the past several months shows an increase in the number of both the acquiring and acquired companies with assets of over $5,000,000. There has also been an increasing trend in the number of mergers of firms in which the acquiring and acquired firms produced the same type of product, which eliminates direct competition.

The Bureau of the Budget recommends very strongly that the $300,000 additional be added to the present appropriation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say to the Senator from Tennessee that, inasmuch as the House of Representatives did not act on this matter in connection with the 1952 supplemental appropriation bill, the members of the committee felt that it would be much wiser, since this item was not submitted to the House of Representatives in connection with the 1953 regular budget, and since it had not been acted on in connection with the 1952 budget, to have the item submitted as a part of the supplemental appropriation bill, and that we should allow the House of Representatives to consider it first, and thus avoid having a difference of opinion in regard to the matter, since it involves a question about which the House of Representatives is so sensitive, for it takes the position that appropriations should first come before it.

So we felt that was the better part of wisdom. We did not pass judgment on whether the money was needed or was not needed for the antimonopoly work. We felt it was wiser to have the matter handled in the way I have suggested.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In answer, Mr. President, let me call attention to the fact that when the antimerger bill was passed by the Senate, it was passed by a vote of 55 to 22. Certainly the Senate must have intended that the Federal Trade Commission should have more money in order to be able to execute the law which the Congress had passed.

If the Senator will examine the chart on merger activity and if he will also examine the list of mergers which have occurred in the last year, he will note an alarming trend. Economic concentration is steadily rising as a result of mergers. The horse will soon be out of the stable unless some action is taken very quickly.

The Commission needs the additional funds now, in order to be able to begin to investigate mergers, so that it can ascertain whether some of them should be stopped.

So, Mr. President, in the name of carrying out the provisions of the bill which the Senate passed by a vote of 55 to 22, and which is now the law, I think at least the $300,000 should be added to the appropriation now carried in the pending bill, in order to enable the Federal Trade Commission to proceed with its necessary investigations.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Louisiana, as chairman of a subcommittee of the Small Business Committee, has had occasion to make some study of the monopoly problem. While we have not gone deeply into the subject, the information given to us indicates that something should be done about the merger problem. The Congress, by law, has indicated that it desired to have action to curb mergers.

Some of the mergers are interesting. For example, one of the six largest manufacturers of agricultural implements is the Minneapolis-Moline Co. That company is acquiring B. F. Avery & Sons Co., which has been one of the principal competitors. Because of lawful competition the farmers have benefited, generally speaking, by being enabled to buy at lower prices.

Likewise, we have had occasion to notice a trend on the part of the Borden Co. and the large dairies generally to acquire their competitors in the dairy field. Of course, the test would be whether by acquiring competitors they are eliminating competition in a particular area, or seriously injuring competition. Merely as an example the Foremost Dairies, Inc., acquired the University City Dairy, Sunshine Dairy, Royal Dairy Products, Central Dairies, Dairy at Sherman, Tex., Diamond Dairy, Inc., Blue Seal Dairy, Inc., Gunn Ice Cream Co., International Dairy Supply Co., International Dairy Engineering Co., Superior Dairies, Inc., and so forth. Then it is noted that the Borden Co. is acquiring a large number of dairies, many of which are chain dairies, in themselves. A study is needed to determine whether such mergers are in violation of the act.

I certainly hope that Congress will provide sufficient funds. Perhaps the suggestion made by the Senator from Massachusetts that the necessary funds be provided in a supplemental bill might be the best way to proceed, but, in any event, I hope the Congress will find it possible to provide for the adequate enforcement of the Antimerger Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. My time has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has the time expired on both sides?

Mr. MAYBANK. No. I think there is time on the other side.

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely wanted to ask certain questions.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the committee has increased the House figure for this item. The supplemental appropriation bill carries $300,000 for the Federal Trade Commission. I do not see how the committee can be expected to increase the appropriation in this bill when supplemental or deficiency appropriations will be made.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree with the Senator. That is what I wanted to ask, whether we should not make a full study of this question when the supplemental appropriation bill comes to the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course we should.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I hope we shall follow the unanimous-consent agreement. We departed from it in order to consider other amendments. I understand that the first amendments passed over relate to housing. I believe the Senator from New York has an amendment to the housing item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments to the housing provision will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 27, line 12, after the word "amended", it is proposed to strike out "*Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the Public Housing Administration shall not, with respect to projects initiated after March 1, 1949 (1) authorize during the fiscal year 1953 the commencement of construction of in ex-

cess of 5,000 dwelling units, or (2) after the date of approval of this act, enter into any agreement, contract, or other arrangement which will bind the Public Housing Administration with respect to loans, annual contributions, or authorizations for commencement of construction, for dwelling units aggregating in excess of 5,000 to be authorized for commencement of construction during any 1 fiscal year subsequent to the fiscal year 1953, unless a greater number of units is hereafter authorized by the Congress" and insert *"Provided further,* That notwithstanding the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the Public Housing Administration shall not, with respect to projects initiated after March 1, 1949, authorize during the fiscal year 1953 the commencement of construction of in excess of 45,000 dwelling units."

On page 28, line 14, after the word "expressed", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further,* That no part of any appropriation contained in this section shall be used to pay annual contributions on any housing unit of a project assisted under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, which is occupied by a person who is a member of an organization designated as subversive by the Attorney General."

And on page 28, line 22, after the word "Administration", to strike out "$7,000,000" and insert "$9,000,000."

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I desire to call up an amendment which I sent to the desk earlier in the day, and I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 28, line 6, it is proposed to strike the "forty-five thousand" and insert "seventy-five thousand."

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the pending question is not only a question of appropriations, it is also a question of good faith toward hundreds of thousands of people of our country in the low-income brackets—people for whom the problem of housing is among the most urgent and pressing of any that they confront.

In our commendable desire to economize and to cut and trim appropriations, we cannot forget these people. When we cut down on the number of public housing units that can be built we are cutting down on the chance that these people have to get adequate housing at prices they can afford.

To these people there is no more important issue than housing. It is the central problem of their daily lives. When we cut the figure below the authorized level of 135,000 units we are calling on the underprivileged and ill-housed portion of our population to make what amounts to a far greater sacrifice than most of the rest of us are bearing.

Of course, I realize that the Appropriations Committee made a great improvement in the housing features of the pending bill. Funds have been restored for the continuance of slum clearance, urban development, and the basic research programs. And on public housing, the committee has, of course, recommended a ceiling of 45,000 units for the coming fiscal year. The House, most unwisely and unreasonably, provided a meaningless total of 5,000 units and went to the length of providing a similar ceiling for all future years. This was a not-so-subtle way of killing the entire public housing program.

Mr. President, the people who need housing in this country would not be fooled by this symbolic limit of 5,000 public housing units. The purpose of this House-approved provision was to gut the program—to destroy it, and to frustrate forever the will of the Congress and of the country, as expressed in the Housing Act of 1949.

The Senate committee has understood this fact. The Senate committee added 41,000 units to those permitted by the House.

In my judgment, Mr. President, 45,000 units is still inadequate. I think 75,000 units would be a reasonable figure, taking into consideration the authorized limitation of 135,000 and the fact that shortages of materials and the requirements of the defense effort call for some reduction in the authorized program.

I think that even with 75,000 units we are exacting a disproportionate sacrifice from those whom we should ask for the least sacrifice instead of the most. Those who need this housing are the same individuals and families who need most to be reassured that their health, welfare, and housing conditions are a matter of great concern to the Government and to the people of the United States.

We must also bear in mind that no matter what figure the Senate adopts, we face the likelihood of a compromise in conference. I would, therefore, urge as strongly as I may that the Senate vote a figure higher than 45,000. Seventy-five thousand units is, as I said, a reasonable figure and I would hope that the conference committee would not recede very far from that figure.

It is because of my feeling with regard to the complete inadequacy of the President's proposed program that I have offered my amendment calling for 75,000 units instead of the 45,000 units provided for in the committee amendment to the bill.

If we do this, it will be a token of good faith that we do intend to carry out the pledge we made in the Housing Act of 1949, within the restrictions that are necessary as a result of defense requirements.

The President, in his budget message, recommended 75,000 public housing units for this year, which was in line with the general forecast that 750,000 to 800,000 units would be privately constructed in the coming year. Seventy five thousand public housing units would have been 10 percent of that figure and would be consistent with the general formula we adopted in the Housing Act of 1949.

Now, however, it seems apparent that private housing construction will doubtless exceed 1,000,000 new units. If we permit only 45,000 public units, we will be reducing the ratio to less than 5 percent. We would fall far behind the goal of meeting the current needs of low-income families. We would not even begin to catch up on the great backlog of need created during the war years.

The 1950 census shows that more than 11,000,000 nonfarm dwellings are dilapidated or lack adequate indoor plumbing facilities. This is substandard housing. This housing should be replaced.

I know that private enterprise—the private home construction industry—is going to do its job in this field within the limits of material shortages. We have passed adequate legislation to help the private building construction industry play its vital part in this picture. But we must keep up the public housing end of this program. We must not slough it off carelessly, and certainly should not scuttle it deliberately.

In view of the forecast of 1,000,000 privately constructed housing units, we should be talking about 100,000 low-rent public-housing units. That would be a fair minimum ratio. That would be in the spirit of the Housing Act of 1949.

We can be very certain that if Congress adopts a public-housing program of less than 100,000 or less than 75,000, many American families will be frustrated in their hope for new and decent housing at costs they can afford.

Mr. President, in my own State many public-housing projects now in the planning stage are doomed to be shelved unless the Senate takes remedial action and insists on a fair and reasonable figure for the public-housing provisions of the pending bill. Thus, for example, there is a fine housing project planned for the city of Buffalo. I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Buffalo Courier Express, dealing with this situation be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LONG DELAY FACING COMMODORE PERRY HOUSING EXTENSION—LACK OF FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION SEEN IF SENATE BACKS HOUSE LIMIT OF 5,000 UNITS IN NEXT FISCAL YEAR

(By Lucian C. Warren)

WASHINGTON, March 25.—Buffalo's largest Federal housing project, a 464-unit extension of the Commodore Perry development in the South Park-Chicago-Louisiana area, is doomed to indefinite delay if recent action by the House of Representatives is sustained by the Senate.

In approving a $6,200,000,000 appropriation bill for independent offices, the House last week adopted an amendment which would limit to 5,000 the number of Federal public housing units which could be constructed in the fiscal year beginning July 1. President Truman had asked for authority to build 75,000 units. This was pared to 25,000 units by the House appropriations committee and later cut again by the House.

All six Buffalo area GOP Congressmen supported the Fisher amendment, stipulating a 5,000 unit limitation. This passed the House last Thursday, 192 to 168.

BUTLER STILL ON FENCE

Representatives EDMUND P. RADWAN, of Buffalo; WILLIAM E. MILLER, of Lockport; HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, of Attica; W. STERLING COLE, of Bath, and DANIEL A. REED, of Dunkirk, were on hand personally to cast their votes for the amendment as a Republican-supported economy measure. Representative JOHN C. BUTLER was recorded as paired in favor of the amendment.

BUTLER, in whose district the housing project lies, said today that he has made no final decision on the merits of the Fisher amendment, and that he probably will have another chance to vote for or against the limitation when the bill comes back from the Senate for adjustment of differences.

Both RADWAN and MILLER stressed the need for governmental economy as a primary cause for their votes. In addition, they pointed out that a New York State referendum favoring public housing developments failed to carry Erie County, indicating to them that a majority of the constituents in their area are opposed to such projects.

Chairman Arthur B. Victor of the Buffalo Municipal Housing Authority is of the opinion that the Commodore Perry project would have little chance of receiving funds for construction if the 5,000-limitation is allowed to stand.

Under the ration worked out by Federal housing officials, New York State gets no more than 10 percent of Federal housing funds, which would mean that in the coming fiscal year no more than 500 low-rent units could be built in the entire State. Competition for the funds would sharply reduce or eliminate Buffalo's chances, for the Perry development, Victor believes.

Buffalo's other two new Federal housing projects, a 233-unit development in Ontario Street north of Laird Avenue and a 210-unit section in Lawn Avenue near Hertel Avenue, would not be affected by the current legislation. Work already has started on the Lawn Avenue project, while the Ontario Street development is scheduled to get a green light from Washington within the next few weeks.

It is understood that funds for the latter development have been provided in Federal housing funds for the current fiscal year and are not subject to further congressional action.

The huge Commodore Perry project, to cost an estimated $6,184,355, has been surveyed and plans drawn up, but advertising and awarding of bids is not scheduled to take place until after the new fiscal year begins July 1.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD a telegram I have received from Mayor Vincent Impellitteri of New York. Mayor Impellitteri wired me that the provisions of the bill as approved by the House would impose serious hardship on the people of New York City. I ask unanimous consent to insert this telegram from Mayor Impellitteri at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, *March 18, 1952.*

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

If the proposed cut-back on public housing in the independent offices appropriation bill now before the House of Representatives is adopted it would impose serious hardships on the people of New York City. It would delay four-fifths of the federally aided public housing construction program for the coming year, reducing the scheduled start of 10,581 apartments to little more than 2,000. Projects in the Bronx, Manhattan, Brooklyn and Queens would be affected. It would hold down planning. Site acquisition and clearance to the rate of 11/2 projects, 200 apartments, each year, with the result that the last project in the presently authorized program reservation of 24,000 apartments could not be planned for 12 years. Delays in building the proposed middle income projects under title I on the United States Housing Act of 1949 would be certain since new public-housing projects are a part of the plan for relocating the site residents. Unemployment in the building trades, already serious, would increase. Low-income veterans who have lived since their return to civilian life in squalid quarters awaiting a chance to rent a decent home would meet again with frustration. Since the National Production Authority exercises controls to relate housing construction to national defense, any program smaller than 75,000 apartments for the country is completely unrealistic. I urge your consideration of the serious consequences of the appropriations committee proposal.

VINCENT R. IMPELLITTERI,
Mayor of the City of New York.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be glad to yield, but I should like to conclude my remarks. I have only a few paragraphs remaining.

Mr. President, let us not cut the heart out of the public housing program. In so doing we would weaken our greatest weapon for defense—the creation and maintenance of decent and healthful surroundings for the families of American citizens.

I hope that the Senate will see fit to increase the ceiling to 75,000 units for the coming fiscal year, and I hope that this number will be insisted upon in conference. We cannot and must not compromise when the essential welfare of large groups of the American people is involved and threatened.

Mr. President, I believe it would be an unfortunate step, a step which would frustrate the hopes and the justified expectations of a great portion of our low-income families, if we provide this year a number of public housing units less than the number I have mentioned and which is covered by my amendment, namely, 75,000.

I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. How many of the 75,000 units does the Senator think should go to New York?

Mr. LEHMAN. I assume New York would get its fair share. I have no doubt that New York has a great many applications presented; but I am asking nothing for New York that I would not ask for the great States of Michigan, Pennsylvania, California, Illinois, and every other State.

Mr. FERGUSON. My question was prompted by the fact that the Senator read the mayor's telegram. I wondered what the demand was and what the requirement was in New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not believe it has been determined as yet.

New York has plans, of course, to take care of its people, so far as its means and its ability permit.

Mr. FERGUSON. Are there any military establishments where it is necessary to house people coming into the locality?

Mr. LEHMAN. New York City, of course, has not been favored with as many defense plants as have Detroit, and other cities, but New York has 8,000,000 American citizens.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is true.

Mr. LEHMAN. The suggestion that New York should receive less fair treatment than other cities does not make sense to me. It is true that New York does not have great automobile, tractor, and truck companies; it does not have great steel companies, but it is still the greatest center of population, of commerce, of banking, and of trading in the country. Certainly its people are entitled to equal treatment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator feel that if we were to provide housing only for the new industrial or military plants we would be fulfilling our obligation?

Mr. LEHMAN. I certainly do not. This is not a defense building program. It is the continuation of a program which was adopted many years ago to help the low-income and very poor people of our country. I emphasize with all the strength at my command that New York is asking for no more than its fair share of housing. It does not expect or request more than its fair share.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in the slum-clearance and public-housing act of 1949 there is specific provision that, regardless of need, no State is to receive more than 10 percent of the total appropriation, so that there is no danger that New York State or New York City will walk off with the lion's share of these funds?

Regardless of the fact that the need of New York City or the need of Chicago might be more than 10 percent of the total, the State of Illinois or the State of New York cannot have more than 10 percent of the total. That restriction was written into the law. So I think the Senator from New York is completely correct in pointing out that there is no danger that the great industrial centers are going to get more than their fair share.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Illinois. He is absolutely correct. I have tried to make it very clear to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that New York is not asking for more, does not expect more, and does not want more.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan was trying to get the facts as to what was anticipated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say to the Senator from New York that the matter of defense housing in areas where there are defense plants is a separate matter. What we are talking about is low-cost housing for people with low incomes, groups who are in need of public assistance or in need of public housing. We should not in any way confuse the issue by talking about a housing program for people who are working in rather well-paying jobs. We are talking about families having incomes under $2,000 or $2,500 a year, people who cannot afford to pay rentals obviously necessary for individually or privately constructed homes, homes built for the purposes of private rental. This is a separate and distinct feature. I may say the State of Minnesota is likewise interested in this program, as are other States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I gladly yield.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Last year the President asked for 75,000 houses, the House cut that number away down, the Senate then increased the number to 50,000 houses. Finally the number of 50,000 houses was adopted.

This year the President requested 75,000 houses. The House committee cut the figure to 25,000. The Senate committee, by a divided vote, increased the number to 45,000 houses, which we felt, under all the circumstances, was probably the most practical solution we could adopt.

I come from an area which wants this type of housing just as does the section represented by the Senator from New York. I have always believed in it. I voted for 45,000 units this year, and 50,000 last year, because I felt that was the most practical figure to adopt.

I may say to the Senator from New York that that was about the situation within the committee. The Senator is, of course, entirely within his rights in moving to increase the number to 75,000 houses, but the committee thought 45,000 was the most practical number to adopt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the distinguished acting minority leader that I appreciate very much the great efforts that have been put into framing this provision by the committee. As I stated in my remarks a few minutes ago, the bill, so far as it refers to housing, is a great improvement, a vast improvement, over what the House passed, but I still believe it should provide for 75,000 houses. However, I wish to make it clear that I am not in the slightest degree critical of the committee, which I know has worked industriously, conscientiously, and intelligently on this matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to endorse all the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I have a little more time, in order to yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say to the Senator from New York that when this matter was before the committee, the committee was very much divided. Like the Senator from New York, I feel a great interest in the public housing question. Getting the figure up as high as we made it was more than we expected when we started out. So far as concerns the housing figure inserted by the Senate committee, considering the testimony and discussions before the committee, I think we were exceedingly lucky to get 45,000 units. I hope that the compromise arrangement made in the committee, by which we finally reached that point, will not be interfered with. I think it would be unwise to do so.

To a smaller degree, I am confronted with the same sort of problem the Senator from New York has before him in connection with housing. I want to be perfectly fair, but I think the only thing we can do at this stage is to uphold the committee, and not undertake to make the figure larger.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to yield 1 minute more to the opposition. I say opposition, because I thoroughly agree with the Senator from New York that the law provides for 135,000. The President cut the number to 75,000. The committee itself approved 45,000. I must agree with the distinguished chairman of my committee that it took hard work and a long time to agree on 45,000. I only hope we can maintain that figure.

I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I simply wish to express again my very deep appreciation for all the committee has sought to do. I know they have worked on this matter with great devotion and with great industry. I realize the difficulties, but I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, who is chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that I would not feel true to my own conscience if I did not express my feeling that we should provide for at least 75,000 units, and I believe a great many of my colleagues feel as I do. But I do thank the distinguished Senator for his great cooperation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I may say to the Senator from New York that no question was raised about the number of units that should go to one city or another city, or anything of that nature.

Mr. MAYBANK. Not at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. Nothing was mentioned about any city. New York was not mentioned; Memphis was not mentioned; in fact, I do not recall a single city being mentioned.

Mr. MAYBANK. The only thing that was mentioned was 150,000,000 Americans.

Mr. McKELLAR. We were trying to make the best of the situation as we saw it. We worked faithfully on the bill. To my mind, knowing the feeling of the Senator from New York, with the knowledge I have of the situation, I think the best thing to do is to stand by the committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. I hope to stand by the committee.

Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire desires to address the Senate, but I shall yield first to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Some of us who have studied this question feel that the committee has come forward with a reasonable recommendation.

Mr. MAYBANK. The best it could do.

Mr. LONG. Certainly I believe that if we were to accept the House figure, we would be more honest and forthright with ourselves than if we simply went ahead and killed the public-housing program.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to say that rather than accept the House figure, I hope the Senate will stand by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. LONG. If the junior Senator from Louisiana should vote to sustain the committee, he would want to vote for 45,000 units, rather than 25,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Louisiana knows the bill will go to conference, I do not believe we will get 45,000 in conference; but I will do the best I can. I will stand by whatever instructions the Senate gives its conferees, but I believe there will have to be some compromise.

Mr. LONG. If the 45,000 figure remains in the bill in the Senate, I hope we will at least end with that number, or something near it.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from South Carolina also hopes we will. I trust the Senate will adopt the 45,000 figure.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I am glad to be here tonight representing men and women who year in and year out have been working and fighting to bring the blessings of our democratic America into the homelife of all our people.

Housing is not a big enough word for what we seek. We seek a decent home in a decent living environment for every American family. That is the goal we set for ourselves by the solemn and considered action of the Congress in its historic declaration of our national housing policy in the Housing Act of 1949. I fought for its enactment, and I will continue to fight for its preservation and fulfillment.

We seek homes for families of moderate means, as well as for those who are relatively well-to-do—homes that are worthy to provide the spiritual soil for the future greatness of this country and for a strong-hearted, straight-thinking citizenship.

We are here tonight to reassert our determination to reach that goal and to reaffirm our faith in the rightness of our quest, and in the overwhelming support of the American people in its accomplishment.

We know that the full achievement of our goal still lies ahead. We have had to fight long and relentlessly just to get on the right road and headed in the right direction.

We know by now, if any of us ever fooled ourselves about it before, that the way ahead is not an easy one. The same forces who fought us every inch of the way to prevent our progress toward better homes are still on the job. They are lying in ambush along the way, planting booby traps and devising new schemes and strategems to block our advance.

Most of all, they seek to discourage and dishearten us. But, as the Gospel says, "Be not weary in well doing."

Once again this year we are confronted with the famous "operation scuttle" on public housing that was tried and that failed last year. Once again a House floor action has been jammed through that would whittle public housing down to a mere 5,000 units. This is not limited just to the coming fiscal year. This limit would remain on indefinitely. In the words of the song, it

would mean only 5,000 units "not for just a day, not for just a year, but always."

That would mean virtually a total eclipse of the hope we lighted in the Housing Act of 1949, 3 years ago, for millions of slum dwellers when we set up a 6-year program to provide some 800,000 decent homes to families which had no other hope of getting them in the reasonable future.

What would these 5,000 units a year do? With that number to carry to completion the 1949 program would take about 125 years—the balance of this century and half of the next. Most of the children of today who need these homes would be dead and gone before they could be built. Even their children would be grandfathers and great-grandfathers by the time what was authorized to be done in 6 years was finally completed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for a question?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In view of the fact that the original act provided for an average rate of construction of 135,000 units a year for each of 6 years, subject to a minimum of 75,000 a year, if a limitation of 5,000 is imposed in an appropriation bill; does not that, in effect constitute legislation on an appropriation bill?

Mr. TOBEY. I would so construe it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is absolutely correct. Such a provision would do away with the law which was passed, providing for 135,000 units. The number was reduced by the Bureau of the Budget to 75,000, and has now been reduced to 5,000.

I beg the Senator's pardon for interrupting him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In effect, such a provision would be legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. It would.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. When language is placed in a bill in the House, it is not subject to a point of order in the Senate. But if Congress makes up its mind that there should be a reduction, this is a good place to effect it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is true that technically such a provision would escape the point of order; but, in effect, it would be legislation on an appropriation bill. We would be going back upon the position which the American Congress solemnly took three years ago, which act has not been repealed.

Mr. TOBEY. It is a covenant.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator understands, does he not, that one Congress cannot bind another?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no solemn obligation, such as the Senator speaks of.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator from Michigan wishes to repeal the act, why does he not introduce a repealer?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not intend to support the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], because the Appropriations Committee decided on 45,000 units. Perhaps there may be amendments to reduce the number. I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that yesterday the Supreme Court said that the Congress was still powerful. The Congress enacted a law providing for 135,000 units.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan .

Mr. FERGUSON. The House is a part of the Congress. The Senate committee, being a part of the Senate, has decided that the figures in the law previously enacted should not now be used. Even the Budget Director reduced the number to 75,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say to my distinguished friend from Michigan that he knows we must compromise with the House on this item.

Mr. FERGUSON. I hope so.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the action to cut to 5,000 units a year is not a public-housing program in any sense of the word. It is a program of slums for the many and crumbs for a few.

We are not dealing here with merely a housing issue, nor with only an economic issue. This is an issue of our moral responsibility as a Nation to the people of this country.

It has taken us a good many years to recognize and accept that responsibility. We accepted it in the Housing Act of 1949, when we recognized that our advances in providing better housing for the many still fell short of providing decent homes for all our people. We established what we hoped would be a comprehensive program to provide a decent home for every American family as an essential objective of our democracy.

Now the House action would rewrite that objective to say a decent home for every American family "except"—and to eliminate from its benefits hundreds of thousands of American families for whom no other prospect for decent housing exists.

We cannot write exceptions into democracy. We cannot draw a dollar line and say that below this line people must live in slums. We cannot do that any more than we can draw such a line and say that below it no one shall eat meat, or ride in an automobile, or wear decent clothes, or get an education.

The excuse given this time is that since we must make some sacrifices in housing, we cannot continue to provide decent housing for low-income families—at least, not at more than a mere nominal rate.

But let us look at the record, as Al Smith used to say. We hear much about how homebuilding is being cut back. In 1949, the year the public-housing program was passed, we passed the million mark in housing starts for the first time in our history. The following year we hit the phenomenal mark of 1,400,000 units. In 1951, despite defense cutbacks, we started 1,100,000 units, the second highest year on record. And thus far this year our rate of housing starts exceeds even last year's.

When the Housing Act of 1949 became law it authorized 135,000 new low-rent units a year. Before that rate could be attained, the Korean outbreak occurred, and the President cut the rate back to 75,000 as part of an anticipated general cut-back in housing production. This fiscal year the Congress has moved the limit down to 50,000. And now, under the House action, the program would be all but wiped out with a 5,000-unit limit.

While our housing production proceeds at a rate that is second only to the 1,400,000 boom year of 1951, we propose to cut the housing that is needed for those in most urgent need to one twenty-seventh of its contemplated level.

This simply does not square with our American way of life or our American conscience. This is a question of justice and national morality. This slash in public housing is not equality of sacrifice. It represents the grossest inequity and injustice toward a segment of our people who are least able to speak in their own behalf.

I go back to the Gospel——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Only last week we passed an authorization of $900,000,000 for FNMA.

Mr. TOBEY. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. And, of course, $400,000,000 for FHA, for private enterprise.

I am for private enterprise, as is the Senator. But private enterprise is not going to clean up the slums. This is only slum clearance. Is not that correct?

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator is correct.

I now turn to the Gospel as my justification for this housing legislation:

> Bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfill the law of Christ. We then that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak.

That is the essence of the teaching of Jesus.

Over many years we have built up with extensive Government help an expanding and prosperous housing industry. We have provided reserves and investment insurance in savings and loan institutions with resources totaling $17,500,000,000 and serving 12,000,000 individual borrowers and investors. We have underwritten through the FHA more than 15,000,000 housing loans for more than $25,000,000,000 and enabled more families to own their homes and builders and lenders to greatly expand their businesses. We have guaranteed 2,500,000 home loans to veterans totaling more than $15,000,000,000. We have provided $2,750,000,000 for Government mortgage purchases.

Add that up and we get more than $70,000,000,000 of housing business that has received Government support, which has gone to expand and strengthen our private lending and homebuilding operations.

All this has done good. It has meant more homes to more people, more home-building and lending, and a level of prosperity and profits to the housing industry that it has never had before.

Yet we hear that the billion and a half authorized for loans for public housing in the Housing Act of 1949 for public low-rent housing to serve those whom private enterprise cannot serve and never has served, and the $300,000,000 a year in subsidy to make decent housing possible for those families, is too much.

We are asked to adopt in place of our national housing goal of a decent home for every American family, the slogan, "Billions for private business, but a paltry 5,000 units, less than one two-hundredth of our housing production, to provide decent homes in place of the misery of the slums."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes more.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, have I any time left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Hampshire be permitted to continue for 5 minutes.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 4 minutes more time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOBEY. Here we come to a paradox. Those who have prospered most in home building with Government aids are the ones who finance and spearhead the very lobby which seeks to kill off any kind of housing help to the families that cannot pay their price. The arguments they put forth today about cut-backs, materials, or anything else are simply today's arguments against something they have fought all the time. I say to the real-estate lobby, 'Get off the track. You cannot stop progress in America."

The simple fact is that the members of the real-estate lobby are opposed to public housing anywhere, at any time, under any conditions. They do not want anyone to do a housing job even if they cannot do it themselves. They fought public housing before it was born, and now they are drawing freely from their large housing profits to kill it off in its infancy.

These pro-slum lobbyists tell us that public housing costs money. Slums cost money, too, and they cost people as well. We can take our choice—pay a subsidy for decent housing which gives people a chance, or pay a subsidy to support the high profits of our slums.

I think there can be only one answer by the people of this country. We are dealing not with houses, but with people. We are dealing with immortal souls. They are families of veterans, of men in the service, many of them fighting in Korea, of wage earners who just cannot keep up with the high price of housing, or minorities who often cannot find decent housing even though they can afford it.

As Senators know, in recent months I have learned a great deal about crime in this country. Crime in its various forms is one of our great national problems, and one that calls for full understanding and action by the people of this country. It has many causes. One thing I know: People who must live in the congestion and misery of our urban slums are the ready-made victims of the racketeers, the gamblers, the dope peddlers, and the corrupt politicians who offer them the hope of easy money and easy escape from their predicament.

This country must offer the people in its slums a better way out of their misery, a chance for a decent American life. God help us if we extinguish the light of hope for decent homes for these families.

When we passed the Housing Act of 1949, we designed the fundamental framework for a broad and comprehensive housing policy. We provided that it should be carried out through an effective coordination of housing operations in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. We set up a broad research program to develop means for producing better homes at lower cost in order to extend the market of private enterprise. We established a large-scale program of Federal assistance to communities to clear and redevelop their slum areas.

All of these were vital and significant milestones in our housing progress. But they will not get very far if the Congress does not permit them to work. In addition to its deathblow to public housing, the House took another drastic and unconsidered act when it slashed a neat million dollars from the HHFA appropriation to the Administrator to carry on these other programs, plus the administration of our emergency defense housing programs. And this slash was on top of an already heavily cut budget estimate.

We need to move forward with public housing, with slum clearance, with research, with defense housing, with a comprehensive housing program. Hard looks and hard actions are necessary today, beyond a doubt, to keep our expenditures down. But it is folly to throw away dollars in order to save pennies. I hope the Senate will stand firm for adequate funds to enable all these programs to proceed within reasonable limits.

As we continue to fight and edge our way ahead on our broad housing programs toward our ultimate objective, we continue also to have our emergency housing situations that require attention.

My distinguished colleague and friend, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], has introduced a housing measure in the Senate to make better provision for some of our emergency requirements in the defense situation and to supplement our action last fall in enacting the Defense Housing and Community Facilities Act. In addition to increasing the authorizations for FHA and for defense housing and community facilities aid, the bill, S. 3066, would increase by $1,300,000,000 the authorization of the Federal National Mortgage Association to be available for advance commitments for the purchase of mortgages exclusively on defense and disaster housing.

In closing I desire to say that the greatest and most fundamental need in America today is adequate housing for our people. It is our duty to bear the infirmities of the less fortunate, as I understand the Gospel of Christ. We must stand together and covenant together tonight to help enact provisions which will provide adequate housing for people who cannot help themselves. That is what America stands for.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I join the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire in what he has said. He has again, with his characteristic sense of integrity and charity for those who are less fortunate, raised his voice in behalf of people who need someone to be their friend. He has given us the kind of message that ought to motivate Congress in considering questions such as this. The Senator from New Hampshire has again stated the spirit that should propel us in the consideration of this legislation. I join him and I salute him.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). All time for debate has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For what purpose does the Senator from New York rise?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I believe, as I stated before——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate on the amendment has expired.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I send to the desk, an amendment to amend the amendment offered by the Senator from New York by striking out "seventy-five" and substituting in lieu thereof "seventy."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will, state the amendment. to the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] it is proposed to strike out "seventy-five" and to insert in lieu thereof "seventy."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from South Carolina controls the time in behalf of his amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall not take any time on the amendment. I offered the amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York, so that the Senator from New York could speak.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, as I stated before, I believe with all my heart, mind, and conscience that a minimum of 75,000 public-housing units should be provided this year, instead of the 45,000 which are provided in the bill reported by the committee. At the same time I deeply appreciate the splendid work and

the great devotion and great effectiveness which has been shown by the subcommittee under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. Last year the House included 5,000 units in its bill, and the Senate raised the number to 50,000 units by an amendment to the bill. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from South Carolina, took the amendment to conference, and fought tooth and nail for the full number of 50,000 units.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate the very kind remarks of my good friend from New York, but I want to say that I am not worthy of them. I wish to assure the Senator from New York that I will stand by what the committee did. While I hate to vote against the amendment to make the number 75,000 units, if the bill goes to conference with 45,000 units, I shall do the best I can in conference.

Mr. LEHMAN. Knowing the record of the Senator from South Carolina——

Mr. MAYBANK. However, I cannot vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from New York. I cannot vote to increase the number of units recommended by the committee. I hope the Senator from New York will withdraw his amendment. If he will withdraw it, I will stand by the committee amendment, provided the committee amendment is adopted by the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina a question. If the Senator from New York withdraws his amendment——

Mr. MAYBANK. If the Senate adopts the figure of 45,000, I shall stand by that figure. I do not know what the Senate will do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senate will follow the vigorous leadership of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and the chairman will fight for the 45,000 units.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate the compliment of the Senator from Minnesota. However, I do not know what the Senate will do. I know that the committee reported the bill with 45,000 units. If the Senate agrees to the 45,000 figure, I will stand by the action of the Senate. I cannot vote to increase the figure to 75,000.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, knowing the record of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, and having his assurance that he is going to stand steadfast behind the action of the Senate, if it votes to raise the number to 45,000, which is the minimum which should be provided, I am very glad to accede to his request, and withdraw my amendment to raise the number to 75,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York withdraws his amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate the action of the Senator from New York. I can only follow the judgment of the Senate in connection with what the committee has recommended. I will stand by the recommendation, as I have always stood by my colleagues and friends in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has offered an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

Mr. MAYBANK. I withdraw the amendment to the amendment. I offered it merely to give the Senator from New York an opportunity to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time remaining for debate on the amendment which I had offered be allotted to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the extent of 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that 2 minutes be allowed to the Senator from Illinois. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that during my stay in the Senate it has been my privilege to serve under the Senator from South Carolina as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. No man could be fairer, possess greater integrity, or fight harder than the Senator from South Carolina. It is a marvelous thing to see the talents of the Senator from South Carolina marshaled in this case. I am very happy to serve under him.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the two amendments have now been withdrawn. Therefore it means that the amendments on pages 27 and 28 and also the amendment on page 64 are adopted in the committee language.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum, so that I may make a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. MAYBANK. Several Senators have asked me with reference to the parliamentary situation. They understood that there would be an hour's debate on an amendment, the time to be equally divided, and that then we would vote on the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to my friend from South Carolina that I have no desire to have a quorum call. I do believe, however, that the question is of such importance that there should be a yea-and-nay vote on it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I apprehend from the number of Senators on the floor that it would be difficult to get a sufficient show of hands to second a request for a yea-and-nay vote.

Several Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would inquire of the Senator from South Carolina whether he wishes the Senate to vote on the three amendments en bloc or separately?

Mr. MAYBANK. It is my judgment that we should have a vote on the three amendments en bloc, because they are all tied together. So I ask unanimous consent to have the amendments considered en bloc. I think the acting minority leader will agree to that request.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand that the amendments to be considered en bloc will include the committee amendments on page 64.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Is there any further debate? If not, the question is——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I imagine there will be further debate.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not think there will be.

Mr. MAYBANK. Then, Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, the vote can be taken.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to inquire of the chairman of the subcommittee whether the consideration of these committee amendments en bloc will prevent me from subsequently offering an amendment on the same subject, namely, an amendment relating to the removal of the cut-off of projects previously authorized. The amendment relates to this section and also to other parts of the bill. I wish to be sure that I shall not be prevented from offering the amendment subsequently.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that an amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan to the text of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives would be in order.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, that is my understanding, although I am opposed to such an amendment, and I am going along with the committee.

Mr. MOODY. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments en bloc.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll; and Mr. BRICKER voted "nay" when his name was called.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. The pending question is on agreeing to the committee amendments, including the committee's recommendation of 45,000 dwelling units; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And the other amendments relating thereto.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; insofar as the funds required to operate them are concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Am I correct in assuming that a vote "yea" on this question would be a vote for 45,000 units and that a vote "nay" would be a vote for 5,000 units?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that a vote "yea" would be a vote for 45,000 units and that a vote "nay"——

Mr. FERGUSON. A vote "nay" would be a vote in favor of restoring the House provision for 5,000 units. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Chair's understanding of the effect of a vote "nay" on this question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is it too late for an amendment in the nature of a substitute to be offered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not hear the Senator's parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Can a substitute amendment be offered at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that that cannot be done, inasmuch as the roll call has already been started.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But the roll call has not yet been started.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; the roll call has been started.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll call has been started, and the clerk will proceed with it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is it in order at this time for a motion to be made to include at this point in the bill, as a substitute for the committee amendment, a figure less than 45,000?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that such a motion is not now in order, because the roll call has already begun.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the committee amendment calling for 45,000 units is rejected, then will this part of the bill still be subject to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands.

The roll call has already been begun, and the clerk will proceed with the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. CAIN (when his name was called). Mr. President, may I be permitted to vote last, sir? The question appears to be in reasonable doubt to me.

Mr. KILGORE (when Mr. NEELY's name was called). My colleague, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

I announce also that if present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would each vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay."

In all frankness, Mr. President, I seek to accommodate the wish of a personal friend, the Senator from Alabama; but I take it for granted that the Senator from Alabama would not have a pair determine the result of this vote. Nevertheless, my pair will stand.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President I inquire how I am recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask how I am recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

The vote was recapitulated.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I inquire how I am recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—37

Aiken	Hunt	McKellar
Anderson	Ives	Monroney
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Moody
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Kefauver	Pastore
Ellender	Kerr	Saltonstall
Green	Kilgore	Smathers
Hayden	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Hendrickson	Lodge	Thye
Hennings	Long	Underwood
Hill	Maybank	
Humphrey	McFarland	

NAYS—31

Bennett	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Bricker	Hoey	Schoeppel
Bridges	Holland	Smith, Maine
Butler, Nebr.	Jenner	Smith, N. C.
Capehart	Kem	Stennis
Cordon	Martin	Welker
Dirksen	McCarthy	Wiley
Dworshak	McClellan	Williams
Eastland	Millikin	Young
Ferguson	Mundt	
George	Nixon	

NOT VOTING—28

Benton	Frear	Neely
Brewster	Fulbright	O'Conor
Butler, Md.	Gillette	Russell
Byrd	Knowland	Seaton
Cain	Langer	Sparkman
Carlson	Magnuson	Taft
Case	Malone	Tobey
Duff	McCarran	Watkins
Ecton	McMahon	
Flanders	Murray	

So the committee amendments on housing were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendments which have just been considered en bloc were agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendments considered en bloc were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois to lay on the table the motion to reconsider. [Putting the question.]

The "ayes" seem to have it.

Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CAPEHART, and other Senators requested a division.

On a division, the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. MAYBANK. Am I correct in my understanding that the next amendments to be considered are those appearing under the heading "Tennessee Valley Authority," on page 39?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The Chair understands from the Parliamentarian that the next amendment to be considered appears under the headline "Interstate Commerce Commission," beginning on page 29. Certain amendments were reconsidered, upon request of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Colorado. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the amendments in the TVA section of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments in the ICC section will be further passed over, and the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the Tennessee Valley Authority amendments, that subject beginning at page 39.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. FERGUSON. What is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands, it is the Tennessee Valley Authority provision, beginning on page 39. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 39, line 6, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to strike out "one hundred and ten" and insert "two hundred and twenty, of which one hundred and fifty shall be."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 8, to strike out "$171,270,000" and insert "$186,027,000."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment to the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 39, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "$186,027,000" and insert "$140,270,000."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, when this question was before the House, Representative GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, chairman of the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee which considers TVA appropriations, stated:

> The high quality power potential of the Tennessee River is virtually exploited.

Representative GORE, one of the most vocal advocates of TVA, has, in effect, announced what TVA officials have hesitated to admit in appropriations hearings. Since the precedent for steam generation was set in the passage of the New Johnsonville steam plant appropriation, TVA has struck out to become essentially a power-producing Government agency, with major emphasis on costlier steam capacity.

Three items in the budgetary requests of TVA for fiscal 1953 underline this steady trend toward a high percentage of steam capacity in the TVA system. These three items, amounting to some $62,000,000 in the $200,000,000 budget request, are perhaps the most important to TVA if it is to continue its self-asserted public-utility function in the Tennessee Valley.

The first of these items is an appropriation request for $15,000,000 to install steam units 5 and 6 in the Kingston steam plant near Kingston, Tenn. When completed, the total cost of the Kingston installation is estimated to be $51,000,000, with a 540,000-kilowatt capacity.

The second item calls for an appropriation of $28,000,000 to start installation of steam units 5, 6, 7, and 8 in the Shawnee steam-plant operation near Paducah, Ky. When completed, this operation is estimated to cost $80,000,000, with a 540,000-kilowatt capacity.

The third item covers the installation of steam plant units 3 and 4 at the Colbert steam plant near Wilson Lake, in northern Alabama. Budgetary requests ask for $16,000,000 to start the last of four units in the plant, which is estimated to cost $51,500,000 at completion.

During the hearings on these TVA appropriations in the current session of Congress, G. O. Wessenauer, manager of power for the TVA system, told the committee that the TVA requests for additional capacity in 1953 will bring a total power capacity in the system to approximately 8,000,000 kilowatts by 1954. Upon questioning as to the division between water power and steam capacity in developing this 8,000,000 kilowatts, Mr. Wessenauer replied that the ratio would be one-half steam, one-half hydro.

When the New Johnsonville plant was authorized a few years ago it was asserted that the real purpose of the plant was to firm up water power. We now discover that it is to be one-half steam and one-half hydroelectric power.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. As the Senator from Michigan knows, dams have been built on the Cumberland River since the Tennessee Valley plants have been virtually finished, and they must have steam plants in order to firm up the power. The Senator will remember that the budget provided $28,000,000 for four steam units. We cut the amount in half and adopted an amendment providing for only $14,000,000. The House eliminated the item out altogether.

I hope very much, Mr. President, that the Senator from Michigan can see fit to let the question go to the conference, at all events.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am unable to do that, because I believe that when we reach the point of having one-half steam and one-half hydroelectric power——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. How much time does the Senator have in which to discuss his amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. What does the Chair rule as to how much time I have in which to discuss my amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that there is 30 minutes time on each amendment, 15 minutes to a side.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator was interrupted. So far as my opposition to the amendment is concerned, I desire that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] have whatever time he needs and that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] have whatever time he needs in which to discuss the amendment, to be charged to my time.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that. The Senator from Michigan does need a little time on the amendment; it is very important.

Mr. President, at the Senate hearings last year, Gordon R. Clapp, Chairman of the TVA, told the Senate committee that of the 6,500,000 kilowatts that TVA was shooting for at that time, 3,500,000 would be hydro and 3,000,000 steam.

Because of the dwindling possibilities for developing hydro sites, some observers have predicted that the time is not far distant when the TVA system will generate a major part of its power by the use of steam plants. Clapp agreed with a member of the Senate committee last year that the trend in TVA operations was shifting from one of hydro firmed up with steam to steam firmed up with hydro.

That is what we are coming to. Instead of firming the hydroelectric power with steam, we are going to firm up the steam with hydroelectric power.

Since the TVA system had its genesis in the "cheap power" idea of hydro development, it is conceivable that this increased steam capacity will eventually necessitate the raising of power rates.

TVA has assumed the public utility responsibility in its area. Through a combination of apparently inexpensive hydro operations and the obvious benefits of Government tax exempt operation, TVA has managed to offer relatively low cost residential and industrial power. The fact that the cost of steam generated power cannot be arbitrarily written down by juggled allocations to flood control, navigation, and other benefits, must confront TVA with no alternative but to raise its rates. In this sense the "yardstick" would have to be stretched without any alternative benefit of tax-free hydro operations.

A summary of the steam plant operations of TVA, completed and contemplated, follows:

Project and location	Units	Capacity (kilowatts)
Johnsonville (Kentucky Lake, west Tennessee)	6	675,000
Widows Creek (Stevenson, Ala.)	6	675,000
Kingston (Kingston, Tenn.)	2	540,000
Shawnee (Paducah, Ky.)	4	540,000
Colbert (Wilson Lake, northern Alabama)	2	360,000

Mr. President, at Shawnee and Paducah there are four units having a capacity in kilowatts of 540,000. At Colbert, Wilson Lake, northern Alabama,

there are two units having 360,000 kilowatts capacity.

The amendment of the Senator from Michigan would make a reduction of $31,000,000 below the House figure. It would eliminate six units of steam plants.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the Senator's amendment would cause eight units to be eliminated. Four Shawnee steam units were cut out by the House; that is the House figure.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What the Senator's amendment does is to cut out two units at Kingston, $15,000,000, and two steam units at Colbert, $16,000,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. I wish to correct the figure now and say there are eight units.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Altogether eight units would be stricken. The House struck out four, and the Senator's amendment would strike out four more.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe the Senator has already mentioned it, but I wish to call his attention to the fact that in addition to these units, which are all for new construction, not for continuing construction——

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is $140,000,000 in the supplemental appropriations for atomic energy, for the TVA.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understood that was to be $150,000,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Possibly it is $150,000,000. I do not know whether that is for steam or for hydroelectric plants.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understood it was for steam plants.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So if all the estimates stand there will be started this year new construction of $140,000,000 in the new appropriation for TVA, and there will be approximately $59,000,000 eliminated either by the House or by the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct, but I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that there are still provided for and being constructed 20 steam units, at a cost of $105,520,000.

The Senator from Massachusetts corrects the Senator from Michigan and says that there are 29 instead of 20 units. Some of them are hydro. So I am sure there are 20 steam units, and 29 units in all, but there is appropriated $105,520,000.

Mr. President, in its attempt to justify reinstatement in the fiscal year 1953 appropriation of the four Shawnee steam plant units, TVA lays great stress on general load growth throughout TVA power-service area. It states that 1,200,000 homes, farms, stores, and factories rely on TVA for their increasing power requirements. In other words the plea for additional steam capacity is not based primarily on Atomic Energy Commission requirements, although that is mentioned. The plea is emphatically based on future load growth in the TVA service area.

Because of the fact that TVA has made available to an area now referred to as its "service area" a source of Federally subsidized electric energy is no reason for the Government to assume an obligation of all future supply for that area. The municipalities, REA's, and so forth, have received already a great helping hand from the Government by getting this subsidized power.

Mr. President, at Paducah, where an atomic-energy plant was installed, there was a combination of privately owned plants that were established and were able to get one-half of the capacity. The Government, having contracts to let, allowed private companies, in effect, to bid upon one-half of the power which was necessary for the great atomic-energy plant.

I am satisfied, after conversation with those who know, that if the Government had allowed private plants to go ahead, private industry could have furnished power for the great plant at Paducah, Ky.

The same thing will be true in other areas. If private industry is allowed to function, and the Government does not establish a monopoly, we will find that private industry can furnish power at even lower rates than at present, when we consider the income tax that is paid to the Government.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Did not the private power plants which moved in go in and make construction under the tax-deferment program of the Government?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am unable to advise the Senator from Vermont, but that would not make a particle of difference, because when one takes deferment, it means that he takes it at the present time, and as the years go on, he has to pay every bit of the amortization cost. One does not save any money.

Mr. AIKEN. If the private companies were not saving a lot of money, they would not be so anxious to get tax-deferment certificates. They now have received nearly $2,500,000,000 in certificates.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is a reason why one takes tax-deferment certificates. One takes them at the present time.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. If tax rates go up and up—and everybody expects them to go up—in the future more taxes will have to be paid by virtue of having taken amortization earlier.

Mr. AIKEN. They are taking tax deferments when taxes are sky high, we might say.

Mr. FERGUSON. If we keep going as we have, they will not only go sky high; they will puncture the sky.

Mr. AIKEN. The Government has now issued tax-deferment certificates for close to $20,000,000,000 worth of construction in this country. When those people who have tax-deferment certificates deduct 20 percent of a certain part of the cost in a year, instead of the normal 3 percent, it means that somebody else has to pay taxes for them for a 5-year period. At the end of the 5-year period, if the surtax is removed—and certainly within 5 years taxes will either be lowered, or else the country will be in bad shape—then they have actually made a decided saving through the tax-deferment program.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not also true that the rate will then be determined by the local authorities?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator asks if it is not true that rates would be determined by local authorities, meaning, I suppose, State public service commissions.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I would change that to say that rates should be determined by State public service commissions, but the commissions cannot keep within sight of the utility companies and their rate increases.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator think that in Kentucky and Tennessee the rates would be regulated by the public service commissions?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have been notified to that effect, and I wish to yield whatever additional time the Senator from Michigan may need.

Mr. McKELLAR. I could use a little time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator from South Carolina let me finish?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as I understand, on this amendment I have 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAYBANK. On the next amendment we will have an hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is a question the Chair is unable to answer, because the present occupant of the chair was not present at the time the agreement was reached.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask unanimous consent to consolidate the time, if that would be agreeable to everyone.

Mr. FERGUSON. May I have 5 minutes, then?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield me 5 minutes? I probably shall not need all of it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me inquire how much time I have.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thought we had 1 hour on the TVA amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. We do on the committee amendment, but this is a special amendment of the Senator from Michigan to strike out.

Mr. FERGUSON. May I have 3 minutes?

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course the Senator may have 3 minutes, but I should like to have the Parliamentarian through the Chair explain to the Senate the exact situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands, it was agreed that there should be 2 hours on the TVA amendments. There are three of those

amendments. The question is as to how the time is to be divided among the three amendments.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am wondering if there could not be consent by the minority leader to agree to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I desire only a few minutes to explain my amendment. May I have 5 minutes of the time?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is welcome to it. I understand I have an hour, which I can yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HILL. Can the Senator from South Carolina, under the agreement, now yield to the Senator from Michigan, let the Senator from Michigan take whatever time he desires, and then yield the remainder of the hour allotted to the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as I understand, I have an hour and 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, we have been supplying money in the Tennessee Valley. We have been feeding the calf. The question now is whether or not we have come to the time when the calf should be weaned and compelled to go on its own. There comes a time when a calf must be weaned—and it would appear that it is about time to wean this calf and let these various power-distributing agencies now dependent upon TVA for their source of power begin to make their own arrangements for future power supply, especially so since the hydroelectric potential of the area has been substantially developed and steam power is now having to be employed to care for future load growth.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will not the Senator admit that the calf of which he speaks is one of the most valuable properties in the country? It is actually paying dividends into the Treasury of the United States. It is one of the most successful calves of its kind that has ever been raised in this country.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan has not seen the dividends. We are asked to provide an appropriation of $171,270,000 to be paid out by the Government to the TVA, instead of dividends coming to the Government in the manner in which dividends are paid by private industry.

One of the basic reasons why TVA is today the sole supplier of power in what it calls its service area is the fact that a standard clause in its contracts with municipalities and other public agencies is the provision that the purchaser may buy from no other source; nor may it generate its own power. It will not permit municipalities to generate their own power to help this program along.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a moment?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator understands, does he not, that there is an agreement, not only with the municipalities but with the private power companies themselves? That agreement has been entered into. We have a lower rate for power in the Tennessee Valley than in almost any other part of the country. The Tennessee Valley Authority is paying money into the Treasury every year.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no doubt that there is a cheap rate for power, but it is obtained at the expense of all the people of the United States. We are asked to provide an appropriation of $171,270,000 tax dollars this year. The Senator from Michigan has asked only that $31,000,000 be taken off. That is a small amount. We are allowing 20 steam plants to go along, at a cost of $105,000,000. If we could eliminate the monopoly clause, the situation might be different. I see evil in monopoly, whether it be a monopoly by Government or by private enterprise. The elimination of that clause would free the cities of Chattanooga, Memphis, Knoxville, Nashville, and other large power consumers, so that they might supplement TVA power from their own sources.

The other day I examined certain figures relating to the number of United States Government telephones listed for the State of Tennessee, and the number listed in certain cities. In Memphis 140 United States Government telephones were listed in the telephone directory. For the remainder of the State of Tennessee there were 25. That shows what has happened in Tennessee. The situation is almost equally bad in my own city. The figures there were 240 and 127. We know that the Federal Government is moving into those places and taking over business.

Tax-free revenue bonds could be issued at 2½ percent to 3 percent interest. They would have a ready sale in the bond market. The obligation to serve the entire area is one which has been created by TVA in order to render certain cities wholly dependent upon the Federal agency. They have been called TVA's captive cities.

A wise step at this point in the TVA appropriation bill, instead of restoring the four steam plants, might well be for Congress to declare invalid TVA's "exclusive supplier" provisions in its sales contracts. We are not asking for that at the present time. We are only asking that the appropriation be reduced by $31,000,000.

In a similar situation, where private interests developed the hydroelectric resources of the Susquehanna River and attempted to enter into exclusive supply contracts, the courts held that the contracts were invalid on the ground that they violated the provisions of the Sherman antitrust law. These decisions involved the Pennsylvania Water & Power Co. and the Safe Harbor Water Power Corp. cases in the fourth circuit. In other words, the Tennessee Valley Authority is exempt from the Sherman antitrust law.

The Senator from Michigan realizes that this is an important question. TVA is always an important question on the floor of the Senate. The question is whether or not we should slow it down, and not make of it a steam industry, furnishing power to be firmed up by hydroelectric power. We started with the philosophy that some steam was needed to firm up hydroelectric power. Now the water power has been used up, and the TVA is going ahead full speed with steam plants.

I hope the Senate will agree to the proposed reduction.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator's amendment would eliminate $31,000,000 for new plants.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct—not plants which have been started. We are letting those go ahead.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The House has eliminated four new plants.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct. This proposal would cut out four more.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The President's message of May 28 asking for $3,341,000,000 more for atomic development in the Tennessee Valley provides for $150,000,000 worth of steam electrical generating plants, transmission lines, and other facilities. In the bill which we are considering, all new projects for atomic energy development have been eliminated, awaiting consideration of the message from the President with respect to new construction.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. We have received certain figures with respect to atomic energy, and we are waiting on the supplemental bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. With $150,000,000 of new construction in the latest message, it seems to me that it would be perfectly proper to defer the other new steam generating plants, so that we could consider them all with relation to the atomic energy development.

Mr. FERGUSON. As was developed from some of the testimony of the Atomic Energy Commission, it was admitted that in the Paducah case private industry had been allowed to come in. If private industry were allowed to enter into the program in connection with part of the $150,000,000, some of the plants could be constructed by private industry. Therefore it is correct to say, as the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts suggests, that in view of the fact that there will be a request for $150,000,000 in the next supplemental bill, we should again look into the question and see whether or not such construction is essential.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this is the 26th year of the fight on TVA. I have been actively engaged in it from the time I first introduced the Muscle Shoals bill in 1926.

Let me say to my good friend from Michigan that if there is a single human being in the TVA who is friendly to me, I could not name him to save my life. I hope there may be some, but I do not know of any.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The subject of patronage has been brought up——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no. The Senator did not bring it up. The Senator was very careful about that. However, I saw an article in the press the other day on the subject of patronage.

So far as I know, not a single solitary person connected with TVA is friendly to me. I am not making this fight for any other reason than to do what I think is best for my State and the States surrounding it—Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, Kentucky—I notice the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] shaking his head.

Mr. McCLELLAN. We furnish private power to the TVA from Arkansas.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is fine.

Mr. President, the Tennessee Valley Authority is one institution owned by the Federal Government which has been a success. It has been a success from almost the very beginning. It has worked so well that time after time I have voted to build similar systems on other rivers such as the Missouri and the Columbia, as I voted for the New York proposal the other day. It means cheaper power for the people of the country.

The Senator from Michigan has referred to the farmers. I desire to speak of farmers, too. When the Muscle Shoals plant was completed in 1930 or 1931, it had the effect of reducing the cost of power to everyone. The very fact that it was established, and the very fact that power could be made cheaper than it could be made by private power companies, brought the price of power down.

The private power companies in Tennessee, the municipalities, and the TVA made an agreement by which TVA was to let the power go to the municipalities, and the private power companies were to take over the wires and the distributing plant of the TVA.

It is a peculiar situation, Mr. President. Someone wrote an article it was stated, that a person connected with the TVA had made the statement that they wanted to have steam power equal to water power.

Mr. FERGUSON. That they would be equal?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; and I am just as much opposed to that proposition as he is. Since the Tennessee Valley Administration has been such a success, I should like to say to the Senator from Michigan, if we are to talk about farmers, that only 7 percent of the farmers of Tennessee had electricity in their homes when the first dam was built on the Tennessee River. How many farmers does the Senator from Michigan think have electricity in their homes now?

Mr. FERGUSON. I hope all of them have electricity in their homes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Eighty-seven percent of the farmers have electricity in their homes. That shows what this project has accomplished. Industry has been benefited by the cheaper rate. The whole State and the whole area have been benefited.

My friend, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], will agree with me that TVA has been of the greatest benefit to his State and to every other State in the Tennessee Valley. I have introduced bill after bill to build dams on the Cumberland River, which flows through a valley just north of the Tennessee. It rises in the mountains of Kentucky, flows through Tennessee, and then into the Ohio. The building of those units must be authorized in order to provide what we call firm power, and in order to be able to let contracts for firm power. It is necessary to have steam power to firm up the electric power. That is all that is involved here. The bill would authorize two units. Several units have been built, one of them last year.

I have grown up with this great development. I hope the Senate will pass the bill authorizing two units to be built next year. I hope the Senate will stand by a project which has been a success. No one can say that it has not been a success. I have not always agreed with some of its policies. Perhaps that is why there is what is known as a McKellar man in my State who is employed by the Authority. I am not speaking of it from the standpoint of the personal equation or from the standpoint of the political equation. I speak for the building up of my own State and of the surrounding States. TVA has been of wonderful benefit to the country.

I should like to illustrate what I have in mind. President Roosevelt at one time was very much in favor of TVA. The bill had been agreed upon, but at his insistence it was changed so as to provide for the appointment of a commission. After the commission was appointed, an amendment was offered on the floor—and I believe it was offered on behalf of private power companies—to limit the number of dams that could be built on the Tennessee River.

The Muscle Shoals Dam had been built and was in operation when Mr. Roosevelt came into office in 1933. He then got the bill passed. I say he got it passed. Actually it was passed by the Senate and by the House, and he approved it. He appointed a commission. The commission made a recommendation to Mr. Roosevelt that we proceed with the Muscle Shoals Dam, now called Wilson Dam, and then finish the Wheeler Dam, which was about two-thirds completed at the time, as I remember. The third recommendation was that the Chickamauga Dam at Chattanooga be completed—and it was a little less than one-half completed at the time—as an experiment. There never was such a fight in the Appropriations Committee or in the Senate as the fight that developed as to whether the private power companies should limit the number of dams to be built on the Tennessee River. The question was finally resolved, after a tie vote in committee, by putting on the stand a man by the name of Smith, who I am informed is still connected with the private power companies. I asked him what salary he received. He said $65,000 a year. He was the chief lobbyist for the power companies. That testimony changed one Senator's vote in committee, and the bill was reported to the Senate. We defeated the amendment.

Since that time 39 other dams have been built on that river and tributaries. Under those circumstances, the project having been such a success, why should we change what the committee has reported?

I want to say to my friends on both sides of the aisle that I do not know how they feel about public power, but I know it has been one of the greatest blessings we have ever had in the area in which I live, especially in the Tennessee Valley and also the Cumberland Valley.

I believe it is of the utmost necessity that the plants be provided for at this time. I hope that the Senate will adopt the amendment reported by the committee. The amount of money has been cut in half, or nearly in half. The original appropriation was for $38,000,000. We cut it down to $14,000,000, to provide for only two units. I think that is fair.

I ask Senators to look at what has resulted from the success of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I ask Senators on both sides of the aisle who have similar establishments in their States or in their vicinity to consider what they have gained and what is being done, and to remember how the price of power has gone down.

There has been no scandal at all about this matter. I wish to say for the Tennessee Valley Authority that although I did not always agree with it and although I still do not agree with some of those connected with it, nevertheless I think the men in charge of it are honest and are trying to do an honest job. Certainly they are doing a successful job.

I shall not take more time now, because the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is ready to speak further on this question. I merely wish to say that nothing would give me greater satisfaction than to be able to restore a part of the cut the House of Representatives has made in the item for this great institution.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the amendment of the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment is agreed to, the Tennessee Valley Authority will be seriously crippled and will be denied even an opportunity to meet the needs and the demands for power in the Tennessee Valley area. Furthermore, if the amendment of the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment is agreed to, it will seriously jeopardize the national defense program.

As the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has said, it is absolutely necessary that this amendment to the committee amendment be rejected, if the TVA is to measure up to its responsibilities in meeting the needs and the demands for power in the Tennessee Valley and the national defense requirements of the Nation.

Let me say to the Senate that the appropriation recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee at this point in the bill does not provide for the building of a single new steam plant; it does not provide one penny for the inauguration or establishment of a new steam plant. All it does is provide funds for additional generating units in steam plants now in existence.

So far as the Shawnee steam plant in Kentucky is concerned, I wish to say that that plant was built by the Tennessee Valley Authority, not upon its own initiative, not because the Tennessee Valley Authority wished to build that plant, but because the Atomic Energy Commission requested the Tennessee Valley Authority to build that plant in the name of the national defense effort, we might say, in order to supply power for the great atomic energy plant in the State of Kentucky.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let me inquire of the distinguished Senator from Alabama whether these additional facilities are necessary to supply the atomic energy plant.

Mr. HILL. Not all of them are necessary to supply the atomic energy plant.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is any part of them necessary for that purpose?

Mr. HILL. Some of this power will go not only to the great atomic energy plant in Kentucky, but also to the atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn. Some of the other power will go to other defense plants in the Tennessee Valley, and also to other industrial and manufacturing plants there and to municipalities, for Rural Electrification Administration uses, and to approximately 1,200,000 homes, farms, and other consumers in the Tennesee Valley.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield further to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to have the RECORD clear. Surely any power that is produced and generated either from steam plants or from hydroelectric plants will be used for some purpose. I ask whether this additional facility is necessary for the Atomic Energy plant to which the Senator from Alabama has referred as the one which initially called for the building of the additional plant.

Mr. HILL. I may say that two additional generating units to be installed at the Shawnee plant are the units from which some power will go to the Atomic Energy Commission's plant, and some of the power may go back into the Tennessee Valley system, to serve other industries and other plants in the Tennessee Valley.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I appreciate that; but the power will obviously go somewhere. So I ask the pointed question: Is it necessary for the Atomic Energy plant, or is the Atomic Energy plant used just as a springboard, in order to obtain more power?

Mr. HILL. Oh, no.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. HILL. Oh, no; the Atomic Energy plant is not used as a springboard. As I said in the first instance to my good friend, the Senator from Arkansas, the plant there was built because the Atomic Energy Commission went to the Tennessee Valley Authority with an urgent request for the building of the plant, in order to supply power to the Atomic Energy Commission's installation in the State of Kentucky.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield at this point?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I appreciate the fact that the time available to the Senator from Alabama is limited, and I do not wish to use all of it.

Mr. HILL. Of course.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Nevertheless, I wish to make clear my position on this matter.

Under the circumstances relating to the Tennessee Valley area, I am willing to vote for appropriations to construct steam-generating plants to the extent that it is necessary to firm up hydroelectric power, for there is no other remedy; but by my vote on this matter, I am not willing to set a precedent for having other steam plants built at any place where there may be a desire to have them built and at any place where there is a desire to have more power generated, and to have the Federal Government finance them. We must draw the line somewhere.

On the other hand, whenever hydroelectric power which is available needs firming up, if private companies are not available to firm it up, I am willing to vote for appropriations for the construction of steam plants to firm up the hydroelectric power, because there will be a definite loss in potential values unless that is done.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say to the Senator from Arkansas that, as he recalls, the Cumberland Valley is being provided with dams, just as the Tennessee Valley has been. That development requires the construction of additional steam plants. That situation constitutes another reason for the adoption of this committee amendment. Hydroelectric power is now being generated on the Cumberland River; and in order to firm it up, we are obliged to have two more plants.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is a question which I wish to have determined. I wish the RECORD to be made clear on that point. I am willing to vote for appropriations in that area, to firm up hydroelectric power; but by that vote I do not commit myself to vote promiscuously for the construction of steam plants all over the country, to firm up power.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the Senator from Arkansas will examine page 413 of the hearings I believe he will find there a direct answer to his question.

As I understand the situation, it is that if the four additional units had been authorized for the Shawnee steam plant the TVA would have had the minimum safety amount of 7 percent over the requirement, that is, over the present amounts which would be allocated to the atomic-energy plants and other plants. In other words, as a result of that situation, if all four of these units had been authorized, the TVA would have had a 7-percent surplus, which is the minimum safety allowance.

The House of Representatives cut out the item for the four units, and the result of that action will be to bring the available power below the danger point.

The Senate committee has voted to restore the appropriation items for two units, and that is the question which is now in controversy here.

In order really to have sufficient capacity to take care of the Atomic Energy plants and other defense plants, the Congress should make available these four additional units, instead of only the two additional units provided for in the bill. The hearings make clear that this is necessary in order to permit the Atomic Energy plant in Kentucky to carry on its operations.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Tennessee is correct. The four additional units should be made available, although the committee amendment provides for only two of the additional units.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me point out that that was all we could obtain; it was the result of a compromise, after quite a fight in the committee.

Mr. HILL. That is correct; but for the fight the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] made, we would not have gotten from the committee the amendment providing for the two additional units. I wish to make that point clear.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In order to make the record clear, I believe it should be pointed out that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] wishes to strike from the bill all provision for the two plants there, plus the two at Kingston, Tenn., plus the two at Colbert, Ala.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the funds for those plants are stricken from the bill, the TVA will be very hard hit to meet its defense needs, if it has only the two additional units in the Shawnee steam plant. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. But I may say there was a terrific battle in the committee to get the appropriation as recommended by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I do not want to complain of the committee. I thought the committee treated me fine all the way along. I have no complaint whatever.

Mr. HILL. It was the tireless efforts and fine leadership of the Senator from Tennessee and the great esteem and appreciation in which the committee holds the Senator from Tennessee that moved the committee to adopt the amendment providing the additional units for the Shawnee steam plant. I say to the Senator from Tennessee that once more he won victory for TVA.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was interested in the statement made by the Senator from

Arkansas, and I have been particularly interested in the statement that has been made here about the use of this power for atomic energy. There is another feature which comes to my mind, which I have not heard mentioned, and it is something which is equally essential. It is already in the Tennessee Valley. It is not the case of another industrial plant coming into the area. It is already there. I refer to the manufacture of aluminum.

Mr. HILL. I may say to my friend from Alabama that he has not heard me mention it, because I have not been able to come to it. I was getting to that subject as rapidly as possible, but I had been unable to do so, since there have been many interruptions. I am glad the Senator has raised that question. We can hardly pick up a newspaper nowadays, whether in the morning or in the afternoon, but what we see that someone is advocating the cause of air power; and I, myself, am one of the apostles of air power. But we cannot have air power unless we have the airplanes with which to carry on the functions of air power. Aluminum is essential in order to make airplanes. In the Tennessee Valley today, as my colleague from Alabama knows, there is located the great plant of the Aluminum Co. of America, the largest producer of aluminum in the country. Their very great plant for this production is at Alcoa, Tenn., in the heart of the Tennessee Valley. Also located in that area is the Reynolds Metal Co., which is another large producer of aluminum. As we know, the greater part of the aluminum used in connection with air power in winning World War II was made with TVA power developed in the Tennessee Valley.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my colleague, the junior Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true that at this particular time the Government of the United States is discussing with the Aluminum Co. of Canada a proposal to buy vast quantities of aluminum? My colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama, the Senator from Arkansas, and other Senators have protested against buying aluminum from Canada. We have been met with the answer that there simply is not available in this country sufficient power with which to produce the necessary supply of aluminum.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct. The Government came within an inch of signing that contract with the Canadian Aluminum Co.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And the Government is waiting even now.

Mr. HILL. That is correct. I do not hesitate at all to say that if the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan were adopted, the Government would have to sign that contract. It would have to sign a contract with the Canadian company in order to obtain the aluminum which we must have for our airplanes and our airpower, because sufficient power would not be available in the Tennessee Valley and at other places within the United States with which to produce the necessary aluminum.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I merely wanted to observe that the Senator is endeavoring to emphasize the point that, because the Nation may need airplanes or may need aluminum, the Federal Government ought to build a plant in order to obtain it. I do not agree with that thesis at all. I am willing to firm up hydroelectric power in this particular area. It is an Authority area. But when we consider the broad aspect of it and say, merely because the Government needs guns or planes, that the Government should build factories, and because the Government needs power, it should build power plants, I wholly disagree with that contention. However, if the project can be tied into the need within that particular valley, then I would be willing to go along with it.

Mr. HILL. That is exactly what the Senator from Alabama was seeking to emphasize when he referred to the fact that in the valley today there is the greatest aluminum plant in the United States, the plant of the Aluminum Co. of America.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is operating, is it not?

Mr. HILL. It is.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It has the necessary power with which to operate, does it not?

Mr. HILL. Yes. It is operating, but the Senator from Arkansas, because there is a fine aluminum plant in his State, knows that it is a kind of operation which requires much time. For example, aluminum is obtained from raw bauxite.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to ask my friend from Alabama whether he has any evidence, or whether he has ever observed any evidence, that aluminum can be produced economically by means of steam power?

Mr. HILL. It is my understanding that it certainly can be so produced, but it depends on several factors. When the Senator speaks of steam power, a great deal depends upon where the coal is, whether it is necessary to pay a high cost for transporting the coal, or whether the coal is right at the steam plant. Within my own State of Alabama, certainly the Alabama Power Co., serving most of the counties of Alabama, is not developing additional hydroelectric power; it is developing coal power. It is going right to the coal mines, so to speak, placing their plant at the coal mine, and thus developing cheap power.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, if he will yield, I should further like to ask my friend from Alabama whether, when the private aluminum industry undertakes to find the very cheapest spot in which to make aluminum, it does not invariably go to the place where hydroelectric power can be developed most cheaply?

Mr. HILL. Of course, the Senator knows that there are some rivers which develop hydroelectric power, which is the cheapest power we have. I think the cheapest power in the entire United States is to be found at Bonneville on the west coast. The Senator from Vermont knows as a businessman, that in the operation of a business a number of factors are involved. There is not only the factor of cheap power, but there is also the factor of how far the plant may be located from the consumer, and of how much transportation must be paid in order to get the product to the consumer. So there are numerous factors which enter into the selection of the site for a plant.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to add that if the amendment offered by the committee were adopted, it would not at all affect the price. We would still have the cheap power we now have. It would merely make it a businesslike operation. That would be the only effect of it. I do not really see how anyone could argue to the contrary concerning this matter.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator from Tennessee so well emphasized, we are not proposing to build new plants.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not at all.

Mr. HILL. We are putting some additional generating units into existing plants.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Should it not be pointed out for the benefit of the Senator from Vermont that the Aluminum Co. at Alcoa, to which the Senator from Alabama referred, was not built in that location by the Government. It was in existence and using hydroelectric power there long, long before the TVA came into being. So there is involved only the expansion or the larger use of an already existing facility.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Furthermore, the Aluminum Co. was operating for many years, even before Wilson Dam was started, in 1926.

Mr. HILL. The Senator knows better about it than I do, but, as I recall, that plant was perhaps the original plant of the Aluminum Co. of America.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is one of the original plants of the Aluminum Co. of America, and it has developed as the Tennessee Valley Authority has developed. We are familiar with what the West has accomplished by following in the footsteps of TVA.

Mr. FLANDERS and Mr. McCLELLAN addressed the Chair.

Mr. HILL. I yield first to my friend from Vermont, and following that I shall yield to my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. FLANDERS. I do not want to prolong my questioning unduly, but I should like to ask whether I am really presumptuous in worrying, when the argument seems to take the line that

additional steam power should be used for the sake of aluminum production, when I know of no important aluminum plant that has ever been located on the basis of steam power available for its use.

The Aluminum Co. of America went clear up the Saguenay River, miles away from any consumer, miles away from its source, although there was water transportation. Why? For the sake of cheap electric power. Aluminum has never been made by steam power.

Mr. HILL. I do not think there is any cheaper power on the North American continent than is the power of the Saguenay River. The company went there to get the cheapest power it could find.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am willing to go along with the proposal to build steam plants in the Tennessee Valley area to the extent that it is necessary to firm up the hydroelectric power, but there must be some line of demarcation as to where the taxpayers are to spend their money for steam plants. If we go beyond that point, simply because power is needed in that area, we may cover the whole map, anywhere that power is needed, and the Government will have to make appropriations to build steam plants. Power is needed all over the Nation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree entirely with the Senator from Arkansas. The only purpose of this appropriation is to firm up power.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am willing to go along with the Senator on that, but we want to keep the record clear. When we have done that, we have discharged our responsibility.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I intend to support the committee amendment because of the assurance which I have now received from the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Tennessee. There is a question of firming up hydroelectric power. I have always been, as the Senator knows, a firm believer in the development of hydroelectric power, whether it be at Bonneville, Grand Coulee, Niagara, or the St. Lawrence River. But I agree with the Senator from Arkansas that there must be a dividing line between steam power and hydroelectric power. I shall support the amendment.

Mr. HILL. I desire to be perfectly frank with the Senator from New York. All the power will not be used for firming-up purposes. Take, for instance, the Shawnee steam plant. The power there is developed by coal, and it is going to the atomic-energy plant.

Mr. LEHMAN. It is firming up hydroelectric power in the manufacture of defense material.

Mr. HILL. It produces power for the atomic-energy plant.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator point out any place in the record showing that the money is to be used to construct steam plants to firm up hydroelectric power?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, my time is limited. I do not want to cut the Senator off. Mr. Clapp said that the four additional units proposed were not specifically for the purpose of new loads at the atomic-energy plant, but were to help to meet the general load in the entire TVA area, not merely for the purpose of firming up power. The Senator would not want to exclude farmers from this cheap power, would he?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is what would happen if the power is not firmed up.

Mr. FERGUSON. We are not going to get cheap power for the farmers from coal plants. We get cheap power from hydroelectric plants, just as was said by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

This is not a firming-up proposal; it is a new philosophy. That is the reason I want private industry to come in.

Mr. McKELLAR. That would have to come up on a legislative bill, not on an appropriation bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. We can take the item out of the appropriation bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, how much time have I consumed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). There are only 25 minutes left of the hour.

Mr. HILL. I do not want to consume all the time.

I have spoken of aluminum plants. There are many other defense plants, electro-metallurgical plants, and chemical plants. On several military reservations, as the distinguished Senator from Tennessee so well knows, there are great chemical-warfare installations and large ordnance installations. There are phosphate plants, plants manufacturing rubber, and plants engaged in the fabrication of metals. Many plants contribute to the strength and to the defense of our Nation.

In this connection, Mr. President, let me invite the Senate's attention to a report prepared by the Electric Power Advisory Committee, appointed by Mr. Fleischmann, who is the Administrator of the Defense Production Administration. In that report it is stated that the national power expansion program, over the next 3 years, 1952 to 1954, is 30,000,000 kilowatts, which is too small. Only recently the Defense Administration announced an increase in the electric power expansion program to provide 32,000,000 kilowatts of new capacity.

The distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] who is chairman of the Joint Committee on Defense Production——

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator understands that the appropriation was originally $28,000,000, but the committee reduced it.

Mr. HILL. We cut off two of the plants. We cut the number in half.

The Joint Committee on Defense, of which the distinguished Senator from South Carolina is chairman, a committee composed of members of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House and the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, made a study from which I should like to read:

> Embarking on a policy of increasing the productive capacity of American industry during the present emergency, care must be taken to see that all necessary elements required for that increase are given due consideration and provided. Obviously one of these elements is electric power. Your committee cannot emphasize too strongly the need for realizing the long lead time required to increase the output of electric power. In the face of past and current predictions by men competent in this field that the Nation faces a power shortage, especially in the Southeast and the Northwest, our policy makers both in Government and in industry must give full recognition to the lead-time factor.

The committee is referring to the fact that it takes 3 or 4 years to order, to purchase, and to get delivery on the units of power. We cannot get these things by Saturday night; we cannot get them in a year's time or 2 year's time; it takes 3 or 4 years to get them.

The committee goes on to say:

> It must also be remembered that DEPA's estimates for power requirements are based upon present military requirements. Any increase in these requirements—which is entirely possible—will cause an increase in requirements for electric power capacity.
>
> In view of these considerations, there is more danger of underestimating than of overestimating electric power requirements—yet this Nation cannot afford to underestimate those requirements.

I repeat—"yet this Nation cannot afford to underestimate those requirements."

As I have said, Mr. President, the committee by its amendment cut the appropriation about $4,000,000 under the budget estimate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator that we were conservative in the committee. We cut $1,800,000,000 from the amount carried in last year's appropriation bill and $750,000,000 from the present budget estimates.

Mr. HILL. I was referring about the generating units.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand. I appreciate what the Senator says.

Mr. HILL. The Senator's subcommittee was very conservative, and the full committee stood squarely behind the subcommittee in its conservatism.

Mr. MAYBANK. And we cut the amount in the President's budget almost in half.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. The committee did cut in half the amount for the generating units at the Shawnee plant.

Mr. President, a little earlier in the evening, my good friend the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]—and he is my good friend, although I do not always agree with him—made an impassioned speech on the floor of the Senate against an appropriation of any money for a road in Nicaragua.

Mr. FERGUSON. I meant it, too.

Mr. HILL. Unless we provide the money which the committee recommends in this committee amendment, we shall be forced to go to Canada and other places to get aluminum and other

materials needed for the defense of our country. As I said in the beginning, this amendment would not only seriously cripple the Tennessee Valley Authority, but it would jeopardize the national defense and the freedom of our country.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair may advise that the Senator from South Carolina has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the Chair will notify me when I have consumed 10 minutes, I will appreciate it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The hearings, at page 413, clearly state the case here involved. After reciting the findings of the Maybank committee as to the necessity for planning ahead in order to have sufficient electric power available for the defense establishment——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to say that when the committee report was filed by the joint committee, there was no opposition. I received communications from power and private interests to the effect that the report was factually correct. I merely wish that to be shown in the RECORD. I appreciate what the Senator has to say.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator.

I believe everybody connected with public and private power, as well as everyone else, agrees that the findings of the joint committee were correct and fully substantiated.

The committee, after reaching the conclusion that it was necessary to plan 4 years ahead for the production of the power which will be required, urged that full consideration be given, in connection with the defense effort, to having an ample power supply, and that plans should be made for it now.

The testimony shows that with the four Shawnee units in the steam plant, the TVA would have barely enough surplus to take care of a possible emergency or of an additional military establishment, even after the atomic-energy plant at Paducah, Ky., had been constructed. It was considered—and so stated—that there should be a minimum of 7 percent above estimated requirements as a margin of safety and that with the four units which the President recommended, and which the TVA requested, the TVA would have just 7 percent to take care of an emergency or an additional demand.

The testimony shows that if those four units were eliminated, there would be absolutely no margin of safety, and it would be doubtful whether TVA would have sufficient power to supply even minimum defense needs. So, even with the two units restored to the bill, which was done by the Senate committee, there still will not be a margin of safety, such as has been recommended by the Maybank subcommittee.

Instead of eliminating the two units already in the bill for the Shawnee steam plant, the two at Kingston, and the two at Goldsboro, Ala., in order to meet the defense requirements of the Nation, and provide a sufficient margin of safety, the Senate ought to restore the four units for the Shawnee power plant, instead of only two.

I know the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] and the members of the Committee on Appropriations interested in this project have done the very best that could be done under the circumstances.

This power should be supplied by the Tennessee Valley Authority for these reasons: If a time comes when an additional amount of power might be used over and above what was calculated for the atomic-energy plant at Paducah, if it is connected with the TVA system, that power can be taken from somewhere else. If the time should come when the atomic-energy plant at Paducah would not have to be operated full time, in the event of a bettering of world conditions, then the testimony shows, as stated by Mr. Clapp, that the power from this steam plant, operating in the TVA system, could be utilized so that there would not be any waste to the Government.

Mr. President, it should be kept in mind also that if this facility were built by a private company specifically for the atomic-energy plant at Paducah, Ky., it would be, as the testimony shows, a captive of the atomic-energy plant. If the atomic-energy plant should close, the power plant would have no customers. If power were shut off in that area, it would be in the interest of economy and good management to have the power available so that it could be used elsewhere in the system in the event the atomic-energy plant should not have to be operated.

Mr. President, it should be kept in mind also, I think, that the TVA is under an obligation to the United States Congress to amortize and pay off its investments charged to electric power within 40 years of the time any investment is made. A bill for amortization in a period of 40 years was passed about 4 or 5 years ago, and a large or substantial part of the investment made in TVA has already been paid back or has been reappropriated for additional items authorized by the Congress.

Considering the testimony as to the margin of safety which is so urgently necessary, I feel that the Senate would neglect its obligation to the Nation and the safety of the country if it did not at least provide for these two steam plant units to furnish the very minimum amount of power necessary for the atomic energy plant.

I certainly wish to join as strongly as I can in support of the position of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] against the Ferguson amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 12 minutes remaining on the side of the proponents of the amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to reach an agreement as to the time, because I do not desire to use the 12 minutes myself. If the Senator from Michigan wishes to use it, that is agreeable to me.

Mr. FERGUSON. A very few minutes would be agreeable to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, some moments ago I asked that the amendments on page 29, referring to the Interstate Commerce Commission, be passed over. At this time I wish to withdraw that request, and have that paragraph open for consideration. I wish to offer an amendment, by unanimous consent, to section 404, on page 72. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment inserting section 404, beginning on page 71, was agreed to, be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Now, Mr. President, following two amendments which have already been agreed to in the committee amendment on page 72, I wish to offer an amendment after line 9, in subdivision (b), to read as follows:

13. Employees of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I hope the Senate will agree to this amendment to the committee amendment. I have spoken to the Senator from Colorado about it. His amendment to the committee amendment is in the nature of an exemption from the so-called Ferguson amendment, for the benefit of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is a small agency. Therefore, the Senator from Michigan has no objection.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Senator from Colorado does not ask for any increases in salary, does he?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Not at all.

Mr. MAYBANK. He asks only that that agency be treated as other agencies have been treated?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I see no objection in the world to the amendment. I think the agency should be exempted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the amendment which he proposes to the committee amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Colorado to the committee amendment on page 72, after line 9, is agreed to; and, without objection, the amendment as amended, is agreed to.

The question now recurs on the TVA amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as I understand, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] desires 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have 12 minutes remaining. I ask that 2 minutes in

rebuttal be reserved for the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this is an important matter. It involves the entire question of what we are to do about the Government developing power. The Senator from Michigan is not objecting to hydroelectric power. That has been developed. The question of firming up hydroelectric power is not involved here. The question is whether or not the United States Government is going into the power business. The distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] made it clear that it is desired to use these steam plants not for firming up hydroelectric power, but for the purpose of providing power for plants which are to manufacture aluminum. I say that that was never the purpose of the TVA.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. The purpose of TVA was only to develop hydroelectric power. Then the TVA said that it wanted to firm up that hydroelectric power. What is meant by firming up hydroelectric power? It means that over a period of time there is a certain amount of hydroelectric power developed when there is plenty of water. During the drought periods there is less water and less hydroelectric power. Therefore the hydroelectric power needs to be firmed up to a point represented by the normal flow of the water.

There is no objection here today on that score at all. It is a question of providing new power for new business coming into the Tennessee Valley. Let me say to Senators who say that they represent four States in this area that we should represent 48 States, not 4.

The whole question is, Is the United States going into the business of furnishing power? If we are to build power plants in this area with the dollars of the American taxpayer, there will be no other area in the United States where any plant can manufacture war goods. If the operators of a plant in Kansas wish to build a new plant, they must furnish their own power or obtain private power. If a company in Michigan wishes to build, it must furnish its own power or obtain private power.

It is said that the Tennessee Valley Authority wishes to take the money of the taxpayers for the purpose of developing power in the Tennessee Valley, and say to all the manufacturers in America, "Come to the Tennessee Valley. We will furnish you power, and we will furnish it at a low rate. We are not paying any income tax. We get the money from the Federal Government at a low interest rate. We have hydroelectric power. We have a monopoly." There will no longer be a yardstick to show at what cost power can be furnished.

The record does not show that any of the plants proposed would be used to firm up power. Therefore, we should vote to cut the amount by $31,000,000, and let the subject be reexamined when the atomic energy supplemental bill comes before us. A request is being made for $150,000,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority, including the purchase of not to exceed 75 additional passenger motor vehicles.

What was done at Paducah? That project was not for the purpose of firming up power. It was a new plant. Private industry was not allowed to furnish all the power. The five firms which had created a plant there were informed that they would be allowed to furnish half the power.

Here we have a monopoly. The Government of the United States, all powerful, with the taxing power behind it, is saying to the people of the Tennessee Valley, "Everyone else stay out. It is no longer a question of firming up power. It is a question of providing power for a growth which we believe we can obtain at the expense of the rest of the Nation."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not think the Senator quite states the situation as it was stated by the Chairman of the TVA.

Mr. FERGUSON. I hope I did.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In response to a question about firming up power, Mr. Clapp said:

> But if I might explain more fully, much of the steam capacity the TVA is building today is being built for the specific purpose of supplying national defense loads and high load factor loads. If you segregate those amounts from the normal loads of the TVA, and relate the remaining steam to the hydro system, we still have need for steam capacity that can be used to firm up the hydro capacity in the river.

Mr. FERGUSON. Where does the record show the amount which is necessary for firming up power?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Of course, when the plants are built the entire system is used not only for furnishing power to Paducah, but power for the Alcoa plant at Maryville and plants at other places.

Mr. FERGUSON. But Alcoa is not being furnished power by the Federal Government unless it is hydroelectric power. That is not the purpose of this project. If hydroelectric power is furnished, only hydroelectric power can be firmed up. If Alcoa built a manufacturing plant anywhere else, it would either have to build its own power plant or be furnished power by some private firm. If Alcoa had an aluminum plant in Michigan, it would not build a steam plant, because then it would be in competition.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does not the Senator agree that in order to have a margin of safety it is necessary to have 7 percent more than is planned for? The entire TVA system, with these 4 generating plants, would have a margin of 7 percent. However, the testimony shows that if 4 plants were taken away, no margin whatsoever would be left for the entire system.

Mr. FERGUSON. But it is not a question of firming up power.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Thus the national defense effort would be endangered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Clapp said:

> The four additional units which we proposed at Shawnee and for which the House struck the money were not specifically for the purpose of meeting new loads at the atomic-energy plant, but were to help meet our general load growth in the entire TVA service area.

The only words I have been able to find relating to this item are as follows:

> If you segregate those amounts from the normal loads of the TVA, and relate the remaining steam to the hydro system, we still have need for steam capacity that can be used to firm up the hydro capacity in the river.

Mr. Clapp talks about supplying the national defense load. All industry in Detroit is more or less engaged in national defense.

> If you segregate those amounts from the normal loads of the TVA, and relate the remaining steam to the hydro system, we still have need for steam capacity that can be used to firm up the hydro capacity in the river.

TVA has no right to use it in other places and then firm up the power merely because they have a lack of it at that place.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is made clear at the top of the page that the whole TVA system, in order to furnish power necessary for the atomic energy plant, had to have the four units at Shawnee.

Mr. FERGUSON. On page 422 it is stated that the four plants are not involved.

Mr. KEFAUVER. TVA does not separate the power from this steam plant and from the other steam plant specifically. It is all put into the system. That is the way it should be done. If the power from one plant is not used at one place, it can be used at some other place. It is made clear at the top of the page, that if the four units are not provided the defense effort will be endangered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, based on the evidence in the record, the Senate should not vote for the appropriation on the theory that it is to be used for the purpose of firming up power. It is new power, and it has nothing to do with firming up power.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment on page 39, line 9.

Several Senators requested the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Chair direct the clerk to state the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the pending amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 39, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "$186,027,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$140,270,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to the committee amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is the Senator from Michigan correct in his understanding that the adoption of the amendment would mean a reduction of $31,000,000, and that therefore a "yea" vote would be a vote in favor of the reduction, and

a "nay" vote would be in favor of the amount stated in the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan will have to interpret his amendment according to his own understanding. The Senator's amendment would reduce the committee recommendation in the bill from $186,027,000 to $140,270,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Therefore a "yea" vote would be a vote for the reduction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Chair's interpretation.

Mr. McKELLAR. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would a "yea" vote for the Ferguson amendment be a vote against what the committee has reported?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that it is his understanding that a "yea" vote would be a vote to reduce the amount that the committee has recommended.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. A "yea" vote would reduce the amount from the House figure of $171,270,000 to $140,270,000. In other words, it would be a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is a substitute for the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the committee amendment to the bill provides for $186,027,000 in lieu of $171,270,000, as stated in the House bill. The pending amendment would reduce the amount in the committee amendment from $186,027,000 to $140,270,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Therefore it would reduce the House figure by $31,000,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is equally true that the committee amendment reduces the budget estimate by $14,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not have the budget before him.

Mr. MAYBANK. The estimate was sent to the committee. This is very important, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask if what I stated is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not have the budget before him. He cannot answer the Senator's question.

Mr. MAYBANK. It ought to be in the RECORD.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Chair should state that a "yea" vote is a vote in favor of the Ferguson amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. And a "nay" vote is a vote for the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has so stated. A "yea" vote is in favor of the Ferguson amendment, or a vote to reduce the amount of the committee's recommendation.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virgina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay."

I announce also that on this vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN and Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—31

Bennett	Ives	Smathers
Bricker	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Bridges	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Dirksen	Lodge	Taft
Dworshak	McCarthy	Thye
Ferguson	Millikin	Welker
Flanders	Nixon	Wiley
Hendrickson	Robertson	Williams
Hoey	Saltonstall	
Holland	Schoeppel	

NAYS—36

Aiken	Humphrey	McKellar
Anderson	Hunt	Monroney
Butler, Nebr.	Johnson, Colo.	Moody
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Mundt
Douglas	Kefauver	Neely
Eastland	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Lehman	Pastore
Green	Long	Sparkman
Hayden	Maybank	Stennis
Hennings	McClellan	Underwood
Hill	McFarland	Young

NOT VOTING—29

Benton	Ecton	Martin
Brewster	Frear	McCarran
Butler, Md.	Fulbright	McMahon
Byrd	George	Murray
Carlson	Gillette	O'Conor
Case	Hickenlooper	Russell
Chavez	Knowland	Seaton
Connally	Langer	Tobey
Cordon	Magnuson	Watkins
Duff	Malone	

So Mr. FERGUSON's amendment to the committee amendment on page 39, in line 8 was rejected.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 39, in line 8.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I hope we may have a yea-and-nay vote on this committee amendment, so we shall know whether the Senate desires to go along with the amount voted by the House of Representatives or the amount voted by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

The argument which was applicable to the cut proposed by me is also applicable in this case.

The pending question is whether we shall appropriate $171,270,000, the amount voted by the House of Representatives, or $186,027,000, the amount recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, could we vote on all three amendments en bloc?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I think this one committee amendment should be

voted on separately, so that we may ascertain what the Senate wishes to do.

Mr. President, the question comes down to this: These plants are not for the purpose of firming up hydroelectric power. They are for the purpose of developing power for industries in this area, not to firm up hydroelectric power. If any plant now moves into this neighborhood, it will be able to obtain this power from the Federal Government.

The question is whether we wish to use funds of the Federal Government only for the purpose of firming up hydroelectric power or whether we wish to use Federal Government funds for the purpose of building steam plants, so that industry will move into this neighborhood, and thus be taken away from other States. That is the simple problem confronting us; that is the issue now before the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the vote we are about to cast will be a vote on the question of whether we shall approve the amendment reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee, that amendment calling for an increase of approximately $14,000,000 in the amount of this item.

It was my understanding throughout the hearings that the reason why the TVA built units to provide 50 percent of the power and the reason why the private power companies built units to provide 50 percent of the power was that a year ago the private power companies refused to build facilities sufficient to provide 100 percent of the power. If I am in error, I ask the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] to correct me.

I voted for this item only after I learned that the private power companies refused to provide 100 percent of the power and only after I learned that this committee amendment, if adopted, will result in decreasing the item included in the President's budget.

Mr. President, I have nothing further to say on this amendment. I yield now to the Senator from Alabama, but I wish to have my position made clear and to have the RECORD clear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield the floor?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, so far as the Shawnee steam plant is concerned, the TVA built that plant at the request of the Atomic Energy Commission. If private power companies had been willing to provide and if they had been in a position to provide 100 percent of the power the Atomic Energy Commission wanted, the TVA would never have built the Shawnee plant.

The Atomic Energy Commission preferred to do business with the private power companies, and that certainly would have been all right with the TVA. The TVA did not go to the Atomic Energy Commission; the Atomic Energy Commission went to the TVA, and said, "We must have this power, and we want you to supply half of it. The private power companies are not in a position to supply more than half of it and do not wish to supply more than half of it."

Mr. MAYBANK. That was my understanding.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I think a basic problem is involved here, namely, whether we are to have——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Indiana suspend for a moment, please?

Let the Chair announce that there is a limitation of time; and the time available is under the control of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the minority leader or the acting minority leader.

Approximately 40 minutes remain on the side of the opponents of the committee amendment, and approximately 10 minutes remain on the side of the proponents of the committee amendment.

To whom does either of those Senators yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In this instance is it not true that I am representing the opponents of the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. Previously, on the question of agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment, the Senator from Massachusetts represented the proponents of that amendment to the committee amendment.

However, at this time the Senate is considering the committee amendment itself; and in this instance the Senator from Massachusetts has control of the time for the opponents of the committee amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Chair.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So at the present time 40 minutes remain to my side; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, on the original two amendments.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I think a basic problem is involved here in connection with the question of having the Federal Government build steam plants. I have no objection to the Federal Government's developing hydroelectric power from rivers where navigation and irrigation and flood-control are involved. But in this instance it is proposed to build steam plants. If we could justify a steam plant within 50 miles of a river, or within 10 miles, or on the banks of a river, it would be possible to justify one 1,000 miles away. So I think a basic principle is involved.

If we are to vote for the Federal Government to take over the production of power in America, let us do so; let us turn over the natural resources to the Government; let us turn over to the Government the tidelands oil. Let us give the Government everything. As I sit here watching the votes of Senators, I notice that those who are opposed to the development by the Federal Government of the oil resources of the tidelands—which is power, nothing more than power, just as much so as hydroelectric power—vote one way on the one question, and a different way on the other question. I am opposed to the Federal Government's developing power other than that which can be developed from the rivers in connection with flood control and navigation and irrigation. If we are to permit the Federal Government to build steam plants, even though it be on the bank of a river, or 10 miles away, or 50 miles away—if the Government can build such a plant 50 miles away, it can build one 1,000 miles or 2,000 miles away—we at least ought to be consistent. I for one am becoming tired of seeing the Senate run up the hill and then run down the hill, applying one principle and one standard in one case, and to one sort of power, and the opposite in another case. Let us at least be consistent.

I want it known—and I want the statement to go on record—that I am opposed to the Federal Government's going into any kind of business which private industry can handle, and should handle—and private industry can handle the power in the country. I am in favor of the Federal Government's developing power on rivers in connection with navigation and irrigation and flood control, but I dislike to see Senators and the Senate go up the hill and then come down the hill, applying one standard to one thing and the opposite standard to another.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

I announce also that on this vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. If present and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN and Mr. DUFF] are detained on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—39

Aiken	Hill	McFarland
Anderson	Humphrey	McKellar
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Monroney
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Moody
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Mundt
Cordon	Kefauver	Neely
Douglas	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Kilgore	Pastore
Ellender	Lehman	Sparkman
Green	Long	Stennis
Hayden	Maybank	Underwood
Hennings	McClellan	Young

NAYS—30

Bennett	Holland	Schoeppel
Bricker	Ives	Smathers
Bridges	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Lodge	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	McCarthy	Taft
Ferguson	Millikin	Thye
Flanders	Nixon	Welker
Hendrickson	Robertson	Wiley
Hoey	Saltonstall	Williams

NOT VOTING—27

Benton	Frear	Martin
Brewster	Fulbright	McCarran
Butler, Md.	George	McMahon
Byrd	Gillette	Murray
Carlson	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Case	Knowland	Russell
Connally	Langer	Seaton
Duff	Magnuson	Tobey
Ecton	Malone	Watkins

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 29, line 15, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to strike out "$205,000" and insert "$256,300"; and in line 17, after the word "only", to strike out "$8,935,000" and insert "$9,704,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$145,000" and insert "$181,100"; and in the same line, after the word "travel", to strike out "$907,000" and insert "$1,042,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$125,240"; and in line 20, after the word "travel", to strike out "$664,000" and insert "$755,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics," on page 31, line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$213,400" and insert "$266,700"; and in line 18, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$46,522,200" and insert "$50,650,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Capital Park and Planning Commission," on page 33, line 1, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "$22,375" and insert "$27,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Science Foundation," on page 33, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$95,000" and insert "$142,500"; and in line 14, after the word "services", to strike out "$3,500,000" and insert "$5,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 33, line 14, it is proposed to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$10,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that on the amendment of the Senator from New York debate is limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to a side.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator from New York how long he expects to take, because I am an opponent of his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York will control the time in favor of the amendment and the Senator from South Carolina will control the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Senator from New York is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I support the amendment to increase the appropriation for the National Science Foundation. When it was first contemplated it was heralded as a great step forward in the development of scientific knowledge and information and it was enthusiastically agreed to by the Congress. The Foundation was created with 24 of the leading scientists and educators of this country, taken from all parts of the Nation, representing the various sciences and coming from many of our great educational institutions. It was believed that the National Science Foundation would develop research in many different branches of scientific knowledge and also aid in the training of teachers and research workers. The original amount that was included, at least, in the debate and in the proposed legislation, was placed at a maximum of $15,000,000, and it was believed that that amount, after the first year or two, would be made available.

The recommendation was made that the $15,000,000 contemplated would be made available to the National Science Foundation this year. Instead of that, the House cut the amount to $3,500,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to say that I am very much interested in the National Science Foundation. I was one of those who worked for it. In the subcommittee we discussed an appropriation of $6,500,000. That figure was recommended to the full committee. The full committee, in its judgment, cut the appropriation to $5,000,000. The House provided only $3,500,000. I talked tonight with several members of the committee who are anxious to make the appropriation $5,000,000. I voted for the higher amount. Those who were in favor of the $5,000,000 agreed tonight to take to the conference a recommendation of $6,000,000 in the hope that it can be retained in conference. I ask the Senator from New York, while he wants $10,000,000 and I myself should like to see a larger appropriation than $5,000,000, if he would agree to $6,000,000, with the understanding that an effort will be made to hold it in the conference.

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that I believe $10,000,000 is inadequate; I believe that $15,000,000 is inadequate, but I realize the parliamentary and legislative situation in which we find ourselves. I should be perfectly willing to agree to withhold my amendment, providing it be agreed that the figure of $7,500,000 be taken to conference. I realize that even that would not be binding. It would be a matter of discussion between the conferees, but I hope that at least the figure of $7,500,000 in support of this tremendously important undertaking will be taken to the conference.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. We worked diligently and hard upon this item. We heard the different scientists who came before the committee. I may say that the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] brought them before the committee. After the committee had voted, we finally agreed to raise the House figure to $5,000,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The subcommittee voted to raise the amount to $7,500,000, but the full committee voted $5,000,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am going to stand by the full committee, unless, after discussion, a figure is arrived at between the full committee and the subcommittee which I should feel free to vote for, because I told the Minority Leader at that time that I would vote to do away with the whole thing.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not want the Senator to misunderstand me. If we can agree upon a figure between $5,500,000 and $7,500,000, say around $6,000,000, I shall be glad to take it to conference.

I have heard about great scientists educating themselves. They did not need the Federal Government to send them to the University of North Carolina, the University of South Carolina, or the University of Alabama. I have heard about the Oppenheimers. I admire and respect them, just as I respect the great scientists educated at Princeton, the university of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. But I have never heard of the Federal Government sending people to universities to be educated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I say frankly to the Senator from South Carolina that I am perfectly in sympathy with what the Senator from New York is trying to do. I would very much prefer to have $10,000,000, rather than $5,500,000, $6,000,000, or $7,000,000. As one member of the committee I may say I tried to get the committee to agree to $7,500,000, but I did not succeed. I am being perfectly frank. I think those who are most vocal on this subject in any way would agree to $6,000,000 and would do their best to hold to $6,000,000 in conference. Personally, I should like to see the figure higher.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have on the table an amendment which I had intended to call up in the event the Senator from New York was not able to have his amendment providing for $10,000,000 adopted. My amendment calls for $7,500,000.

I am one of those who feel very much depressed over the whole National Science Foundation budget. I have been working for 5 years on the floor of the Senate to get the appropriations needed to get the Foundation's program fully under way. The Foundation has working for it the finest group of scientists in the United States of America, including Dr. Conant, of Harvard, and Dr. Chester Barnard, of New Jersey, who is president of the Foundation.

I am mentioning this because I want my colleagues to have the necessary background. The original temptation was to place that scientific research—that basic research—in the military departments.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want the Senator to remember that already $7,300,000 has been transferred from the military agencies to do what the Senator is talking about. That is an additional appropriation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I understand that the military have given up some of their research funds so that they could be transferred to the National Science Foundation. I think that is a very important matter to be considered.

To continue what I was saying, I discussed this matter in detail with Dr. Vannevar Bush, who was the originator of the whole program. When he wrote his report he contemplated that we would have an annual research fund of between $15,000,000 and $25,000,000 to start with, and substantially more after that. We tried in the beginning of this work to start with a budget of $15,000,000. Last year we had a final appropriation of $3,500,000.

This year the Foundation again asked for $15,000,000, and finally the amount was cut to $5,000,000 in the Senate, and to $3,500,000 in the House.

I feel very much depressed over the development of this program, but I realize what our parliamentary situation is, I think that, under the circumstances, the wisest thing we can do—if the Members here who are willing to take $6,000,000 and stand by it in conference, would be, if I may say so to my colleague, the junior Senator from New York, for us to accept the $6,000,000, go to conference, and hope it will hold in conference.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to correct the statement I made. $7,300,000 was deducted from the military request, but has not yet been appropriated.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is just the point. If we do not appropriate it for the National Science Foundation, it will not be available to that agency.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I feel very strongly on this subject. I am very much appreciative of the very frank statement made by the chairman of the subcommittee. It is a fact that $7,300,000 was taken out of the budget of the Defense Department agencies in the expectation that the work they had previously done would be carried on by the National Science Foundation.

As a matter of fact, not only was the foundation charged with carrying on the duties originally assigned to them, but they were charged, by reason of the cut in the defense appropriation, with the great amount of additional work which is directly connected and associated with the defense effort.

I believe it is a serious mistake not to give this organization the funds necessary to enable it to carry on its work. We are going to pay for it. Indeed, we are paying for it every day. The backbone of the country and its defense effort is in the know-how of our people, in their scientific knowledge. Where would our country be if we had not had scientific development? We would not have any one of a hundred different things which we are enjoying today, and which have brought about security, prosperity, and well-being in this country. I shall not labor the point.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I only wish to confirm what the acting minority leader said, that the Senator from New York will agree to $6,000,000, and if increasing the appropriation to that amount is acceptable to the Senate, I shall be glad to take it to conference, and will be as firm as I can.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I recall very distinctly the discussion in committee on this item. It was my conviction that an appropriation of more than $5,000,000 was needed for the National Science Foundation. If we are to make progress and to make advances scientifically, as we need to do to keep ourselves ahead in the world struggle, we shall have to rely on those who are qualified in the scientific field and in the field of research.

It was my feeling that while appropriations for military and defense purposes were running into many billions of dollars, the appropriation for scientific research was a very small sum, and yet it might give a greater return than appropriations of large sums for military defense.

I personally felt that the committee should have recommended more than $5,000,000 — indeed, even $10,000,000. But there was some discussion about whether we would have scientists who could serve even in the event we made the figure a higher sum, and that was one of the final discussions that brought us to the decision to fix the amount at $5,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to announce that the Senator from New York has only 1 minute of his time remaining.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield me 5 minutes more?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I do not retreat from my position one inch. I believe we are making a mistake. I believe nothing is more important in the development of our country and in securing peace than science, unless it be good will. However, when my good friend and colleague, the Senator from South Carolina, who has been most helpful and most generous to me in many ways, tells me that when he goes to the conference committee he will not be able to support more than $6,000,000 in conference, I realize that my words are fruitless and futile, and—yes—unnecessarily taxing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be very glad indeed to yield to the Senator from Minnesota in a moment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from New York.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA LIBRARIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The remaining time on the amendment is yielded to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to continue with my statement.

When my very good friend and colleague from South Carolina who has been so helpful not only to me, but to Members of the Senate generally, and who is one of the outstanding Members of the Senate, tells us on the floor that, as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, and therefore the senior Member representing the Senate at the conference, he cannot support an amount larger than $6,000,000, I realize how perfectly futile any further discussion would be. However, I wish to make it clear that I believe that the few millions of dollars which we are trying to save would bring in a return of one-hundredfold in our defense efforts, in our effort to conquer disease, and in our effort to bring about a better living standard for our people. I believe that to cut down the appropriations of this great organization, which has unlimited possibility, is shortsighted. I believe that we shall regret our action.

I am faced with a reality. I am faced with a situation in which I know that further argument is useless. So, with the understanding that the figure of $6,000,000 will be taken to conference and supported by the members of the conference on the part of the Senate——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I assure the distinguished Senator from New York and the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] that, as the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has said, we shall do the best we can with the figure of $6,000,000. As a matter of fact, the subcommittee reported a figure of $7,500,000.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, my head is bloody but unbowed. I shall continue to fight for this great organization. I know that we cannot get more than $6,000,000 today. It would make no difference if the Senate were to vote for $10,000,000. The item would still have to go to conference; and if we could not obtain support for more than $6,000,000, we would not get anywhere under those circumstances.

Mr. MAYBANK. I will say to the Senator from New York that I shall do the best I can.

Mr. LEHMAN. With the understanding that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, chairman of the appropriations subcommittee, will take the figure of $6,000,000 to conference, and with the understanding that that course is agreeable to my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who has an amendment providing for an appropriation of $7,500,000, I am willing to modify my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may modify his amendment accordingly.

Mr. LEHMAN. I modify my amendment so as to read "$6,000,000" instead of "$10,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from New York to the committee amendment on page 3, line 14.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as a cosponsor, with the Senator from New York, of the original amendment, I reluctantly concur in his judgment.

I want the Senate to know that as a result of this reduction we are going to cut down very severely our graduate fellowship program. In order that the RECORD may be perfectly clear, let me say that the National Science Foundation is the supporting organization for primary and basic scientific research, in connection with a national contribution to research of more than $2,500,000,000. The ratio which will be established will be $6,000,000 in primary research, plus graduate fellowships to support a national governmental research program of $2,500,000,000.

I submit that that ratio is inappropriate and inadequate. Let the RECORD be perfectly clear, that even though we are to have an opportunity to obtain at least $6,000,000, what we have done is to fail to take into consideration the warnings which the scientists and technologists have given the Congress. They have been here to tell us that we shall severely cripple the basic research program of the United States unless we put up the money which they requested, and which they desperately need. We are doing only a partial job by doing what we are doing here; but we had better do something than do nothing.

I submit that we shall come back at a later date and wish that we had placed in the budget the amount of the appropriation which was needed, and for which the Senator from New York asked as a token of what was truly needed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] to the committee amendment on page 3, line 14.

The modified amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

There is one further committee amendment still on the table, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 72, line 10, it is proposed to insert a new section 405, as follows:

SEC. 405. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or any funds made available for expenditure by this act, shall be used for the purpose of acquiring, seizing, or operating any plant, facility, or other property, unless the acquisition, seizure, or operation of such plant, facility, or other property is authorized by act of Congress.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. Since the Supreme Court made its decision yesterday, I thought it would be useless to bring up the so-called steel amendment in connection with this bill. I hope the Congress will agree with me, because I joined the Senator from Michigan in placing that amendment in other appropriation bills. It was passed over because of the absence of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Under the circumstances, the Supreme Court having ruled that the seizure of the steel plants was illegal, and the President having returned the plants to the owners, at the present time I do not see that the amendment is necessary in this bill. If another seizure should occur, the Congress could act to prohibit the use of any funds for that purpose.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am afraid the Congress will have to act. However, it does not have to act in connection with this bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the method which should be used. We were within four votes of placing the amendment in a previous appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 72, after line 9.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk in the name of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and myself, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan on behalf of himself and other Senators will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 28, line 7, after the colon, it is proposed to insert the following: *"Provided further*, That the Public Housing Administrator is authorized to proceed with the construction of all units previously allocated in areas declared by the Secretary of Labor to be areas having a substantial labor surplus."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to set myself straight. First of all, the figure of 45,000 public housing units was agreed upon. The next question is, Was the appropriation agreed upon? I understand that it was, but I wish to make certain for the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The appropriations in the committee amendment were agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. The question which occurs to me is this: The Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] has an amendment. Several other Senators have amendments. I do not know whether or not they are subject to a point of order. I shall not make the point of order, but other Senators have told me that they intend to make a point of order against those amendments. I wish the Senator from Michigan to be informed on that score.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I have conferred regarding this amendment with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. MOODY. I understood him to say that he would agree to this amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thoroughly agree with the Senator.

Mr. MOODY. I thank the chairman. Before yielding to my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], I should like to state very briefly that a certain number of units of housing was previously approved by the Congress. Later their construction was stopped. In some areas there is large unemployment in the

building trades. This amendment merely provides that in such areas, in addition to what the bill already provides, the stop order shall be lifted.

I now yield to my colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question. Is it not true that in most of the areas where there is a surplus of labor which has been brought about by the transfer from civilian to defense economy, the Government itself has a responsibility?

Mr. MOODY. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. A good deal of money could be saved if these people could find employment in building public housing projects instead of drawing unemployment compensation from the United States Government.

Mr. MOODY. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it not also correct to say that the projects would be financed by long-term bonds and eventually would be built anyway? Therefore, the Government would at least be furnishing some employment or allowing people to have some employment when they are entitled to it and when they are not able to get it because of some Government activity.

Mr. MOODY. Not only will employment be furnished but improvements will be achieved without ultimate substantial cost to the Government. Mr. President, the hour is late. The chairman of the committee has indicated that he would accept the amendment and take it to conference. I do not want to take any more time of the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Michigan. I believe that a point of order should be made. As I told the Senator from California, I intend to do the same with the amendment to be offered by him. I do not intend to be abrupt, Mr. President, but I was speaking to the Senator from Michigan, and I certainly did not intend to stop the Senator from California from offering his amendment. But I told him what my feeling was.

Mr. McFARLAND. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. As I understand the parliamentary situation, a point of order, if made, would raise the question of the germaneness of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. No time would be gained by voting on the germaneness of the amendment. Therefore, we may as well vote on the amendment itself. Personally, I feel that the amendment should not be offered, and I hope the Senator will withdraw it. It is a matter that should be submitted to a legislative committee. It should not be submitted on an appropriation bill.

Mr. MOODY. I do not know whether the majority leader was in the Chamber earlier this afternoon when I asked the chairman of the committee whether it would be acceptable if I held it up until the committee amendments had been disposed of.

Mr. McFARLAND. If we can have an immediate vote on the amendment, I will not raise the point of order.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I want to be clearly understood. The distinguished junior Senator from Michigan came to me after we had held hearings for many long weeks. I said it would not be appropriate to offer the amendment until we had approved the public-housing title on page 64 of the bill. I did not say it would be germane or not germane. I suggested at that time that he should offer it after the housing title was disposed of. I think the Senator has a good amendment. I sympathize with it. However, no hearings have been held on it, and no study has been made of it. I do not want to deprive the Senator from doing what he wants to do.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment of the Senator from Michigan is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A point of order has been made against the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan. Under the rule, all questions of relevancy of amendments, when raised, shall be submitted to the Senate and be decided without debate. The question is on the germaneness of the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY]. [Putting the question.] The "noes" have it, and the amendment is held not to be germane.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I do not think that we understood what the Senate was voting on. May we have a reconsideration of the vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would suggest that the Senator ask for unanimous consent to reconsider the vote.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was declared to be not germane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote is reconsidered. The question is, Is the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] germane?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KERR. I understood the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to make the point of order that the amendment was legislation on an appropriation bill. I did not understand that he raised the question of germaneness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That point of order indirectly raises the question of the germaneness of the amendment, inasmuch as the Senate is considering an appropriation bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, no one is more sympathetic about taking care of the laboring people than is the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. McFARLAND. The question is not debatable.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is what it would do. It is supposed to take care of unemployment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. The point of order is not debatable. My distinguished friend and colleague from New Mexico has made the point of order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I still insist on the point of order that the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] on behalf of himself and other Senators is legislation on an appropriation bill.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] germane? The question must be decided without debate. Senators who believe that the amendment is germane to the pending bill will vote "aye"; Senators who believe that the amendment is not germane will vote "no." [Putting the question.] The "noes" have it, and the amendment is held to be not germane.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 74, after line 3, it is proposed to insert a new section:

SEC. 407 (a) No appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be available to pay—

(1) for personal services of civilian personnel above basic rates, or

(2) for transportation of things (other than mail)

more than 90 percent of the amount which the budget estimates heretofore submitted in connection with such appropriations or authorization contemplated would be expended therefrom for such purposes, respectively; and the total amount of each appropriation, any part of which is available for such purpose, is hereby reduced by an amount equal to 10 percent of the amount requested in such budget estimates for such purpose less an amount representing the reduction, if any, between the amount requested for such purpose in the budget estimates and the amount appropriated herein for such purpose.

(b) This section shall not apply to—

(1) Atomic Energy Commission.

(2) American Battle Monuments Commission, Construction of memorials and cemeteries.

(3) Veterans' Administration funds for expenses incident to burial and cemetery activities.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I want to say that the Senate has considered this amendment on the other appropriations bills. The Senator from Michigan can very ably explain what the amendment proposes. The question has been raised with respect to TVA, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Battle Monuments Commission, and the Veterans' Administration. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] properly raised the question in the subcommittee. The Senator from

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Michigan explained the matter to my satisfaction, and I am in favor of the amendment.

I wish the Senator from Michigan would make the RECORD clear that we have worked together on this proposition. I understand that it does not affect the Atomic Energy Commission, the Battle Monuments Commission, or the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. The reason why it does not affect the Battle Monuments Commission is that I have excepted it from the amendment. It does not affect the TVA because there are no budget estimates for the items mentioned in the amendment so far as TVA is concerned. I have searched the record, and I am satisfied that that is an accurate statement.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. HILL. In other words, in the present budget, as submitted by the President, there is no item under TVA for transportation that would in any way be affected by this amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. The amendment does not in any way affect TVA?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Michigan, who excepted the Veterans' Administration from the so-called Ferguson amendment does not apply the proposed amendment to the Veterans' Administration in the cases where hospitals must be constructed for which steel must be transported in the cases of ambulances and so forth.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. President, in order that a vote may be taken promptly on this amendment, I ask that a statement I have prepared regarding it be printed at this point in the RECORD. The statement includes an itemized list.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FERGUSON

This amendment is the same limitation which has been applied to other appropriation bills, and applies a 10-percent reduction on funds for overtime pay and for transportation of things.

The maximum savings under this amendment would amount to $597,535. (The limitation of transportation of things would not apply to the Tennessee Valley Authority, since the budget estimate for TVA does not list an item for transportation of things.)

Transportation of things (as contained in 1953 budget estimate)

Executive Office of the President:	
(a) Compensation of the President	----------
(b) White House Office	----------
(c) Executive Mansion and Grounds	----------
(d) Bureau of the Budget	$15,000
(e) Council of Economic Advisers	----------
(f) Emergency fund for the President	----------
American Battle Monuments Commission:	
(a) Salaries and expenses	5,040
(b) Construction of memorials and cemeteries	12,165
Atomic Energy Commission	1,407,499
Civil Service:	
(a) Salaries and expenses	$75,000
(b) Annuities under special acts	----------
(c) Retirement and disability fund	----------
Federal Communications Commission	25,000
Federal Power Commission	3,000
Federal Trade Commission	1,500
General Accounting Office:	
(a) Salaries and expenses	----------
(b) Miscellaneous expenses	75,000
General Services Administration:	
(a) Operating expenses	281,730
(b) Emergency operating expenses	----------
(c) Renovation and improvements (outside District of Columbia)	1,000
(d) Repair, preservation, and equipment (outside District of Columbia)	15,000
(e) Expenses, general supply fund	75,059
(f) Strategic and critical materials	6,606
Housing and Home Finance Agency:	
(a) Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator	10,000
(b) Administrative expenses, Public Housing Administration	25,000
(c) Annual contributions, Public Housing Administration	----------
Indian Claims Commission	----------
Interstate Commerce Commission:	
(a) General expenses	9,624
(b) Railroad safety	200
(c) Locomotive inspection	50
Interstate Commission on Potomac River Basin	----------
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics:	
(a) Salaries and expenses	140,000
(b) Construction and equipment	----------
National Capitol Housing Authority	----------
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	----------
National Science Foundation	3,000
Renegotiation Board	40,000
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,600
Selective Service System	118,100
Smithsonian Institution:	
(a) Salaries and expenses	46,300
(b) Salaries and expenses (National Art Gallery)	600
Subversive Activities Control Board	300
Tariff Commission	100
TVA	----------
Tax Court of the United States	900
Veterans' Administration:	
(a) Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services (of this item, $172,100 is for shipping bodies)	4,839,841
(b) Compensation and pensions	----------
(c) Readjustment benefits	----------
(d) Military and naval insurance	----------
(e) Hospital and domiciliary facilities	280,000
(f) Major alterations, improvements, and repairs	10,000
(g) National service life insurance	----------
(h) Servicemen's indemnities	----------
(i) Veterans' miscellaneous benefits	----------
(j) Grants to Republic of Philippines	----------
(k) Automobiles, etc., for disabled veterans	----------
War Claims Commission	$4,000
Maritime activities:	
(a) Ship construction	----------
(b) Operating-differential subsidies	----------
(c) Salaries and expenses	29,400
(d) Maritime training	8,500
(e) State marine schools	1,000
Total appropriations	7,567,114

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield the floor?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield the floor.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, I have an amendment to offer.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, we have not yet voted on the pending amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the amendment of the Senator from Michigan is now pending.

Does the Senator from California wish to submit his amendment to the pending amendment of the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. NIXON. No, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan on page 74, after line 3, inserting a new section.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 28, it is proposed to strike out the proviso beginning in line 7 and extending through line 14, and to insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided, further*, That the Public Housing Administration shall not, after the date of approval of this act, authorize or proceed with the construction of any projects initiated before or after March 1, 1949, in any locality in which such projects have been or may hereafter, at any time prior to such authorization or construction, be rejected or previous approval rescinded by the governing body of the locality through resolution or otherwise or by public vote, nor shall any part of the appropriation contained in this section be used to pay annual contributions on any housing unit of any project so rejected or with respect to which the governing body of the locality votes by resolution or otherwise, or the locality by public vote, to rescind its approval at any time prior to actual commencement of construction, unless in either case such projects have been subsequently approved by the same procedure through which such rejection was expressed."

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, I have already discussed the amendment with the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and he has indicated that he will have to make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes the addition of legislation to an appropriation bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I can appreciate the situation in Los Angeles.

I have read the newspaper accounts and the decision of the California Supreme Court. I have received numerous communications regarding this matter and I have replied to many of them.

I now make the point of order that the amendment submitted by the Senator from California proposes the addition of legislation to the appropriation bill.

Of course, Mr. President, in making the point of order, I wish to say that we appreciate what the Senator from California is trying to do.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the chairman of the subcommittee withhold the point of order for a moment?

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly, so that the Senator from California can explain the situation in Los Angeles, about which I have received telegrams, letters, and so forth, practically every day. I have replied to many of them.

Mr. NIXON. The explanation of the amendment, which I have submitted on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], is as follows:

The provision of the bill which we seek to amend by means of this amendment reads in this way: "*Provided further*, That the Public Housing Administration shall not, after the date of approval of this act, authorize the construction of any projects initiated before or after March 1, 1949, in any locality in which such projects have been or may hereafter be rejected by the governing body of the locality or by public vote, unless such projects have been subsequently approved by the same procedure through which such rejection was expressed."

Mr. President, last year when the independent offices appropriation bill was before the Senate, the chairman of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] was questioned concerning the effect of this particular provision. He made the following statement:

> If a community desires, through its governing body, to vote not to have housing projects, it may do so; and * * * they may, if they wish—and I desire to make this perfectly clear, so that there will be no misunderstanding—cancel a contract which has been made for public housing. But, of course, they will be responsible for any money which the Government has put into the project.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Senator from California is absolutely correct, in that what he has read is what I said.

However, as I understand the situation—and I know the Senator from California will correct me if I am in error—this matter has been to the supreme court——

Mr. NIXON. The Supreme Court of the State of California.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is what I meant.

Mr. NIXON. The point which should be made is that apparently the Supreme Court of California did not read the legislative history and the statement of the chairman of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], because the California Supreme Court held that where action is taken——

Mr. MAYBANK. If the Supreme Court of the United States and the Supreme Court of the State of California do not agree, I am not responsible for that situation.

I appreciate having the Senator from California read the statement I made last year on this point; and he has correctly quoted—at least in part—the statement I made then. However, it is obvious that I did not mean to infer that a contract which had been entered into could be canceled without the agreement of all the parties concerned.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, at this point I read from the decision of the Supreme Court of the State of California in the case of housing authority of the city of Los Angeles, Calif., against city of Los Angeles, a municipal corporation:

> It is quite apparent that the local rejection referred to is that by which the city might withhold approval of the project. It deals with future action of the agency. It does not contemplate a case where, as here, the city has approved the project and the Federal agency has authorized the construction.

As will be noted from the colloquy which occurred during the debate last year on the independent offices appropriation bill, the chairman of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from South Carolina, indicated that this provision was to apply not only to action taken prior to the making of the public housing contract, but also to action taken subsequently.

I wanted to have the RECORD at this point perfectly straight, so that it will be clear that that is still the interpretation of the chairman of the subcommittee, regarding this provision of the bill, as it reads presently, namely, that both subsequent and prior action is to be recognized by the courts. Is that correct?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from California is correct. I have nothing to do with what the court says. The reason why I made the point of order is that I do not think the Senate should take up at this time an amendment to the public housing section of the independent offices appropriation bill, when that amendment takes exception, I may say, and I think the Senator from California will agree with me, to what the Supreme Court of California did.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina, permit me to ask him a question? Does the Senator from South Carolina continue to believe what he supported in 1951, in maintaining that a local community without question had a right to cancel a public-housing administration contract, once that contract had been entered into, and before construction had been undertaken?

Mr. MAYBANK. I would never suggest that any community, any individual, or anyone else ever had a right to cancel a contract, whether it be made in the courts or whether it be made with the Government or whether it be made with a State. I do not think any community has a right to ask the Federal Government for aid—to enter into a solemn contract and, for instance, take the Government's money to buy land, and then turn around and say, "We will get out of this."

Mr. CAIN. I know the Senator from South Carolina appreciates the seriousness with which these questions are asked.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do.

Mr. CAIN. It was only in August 1951 that the Senator from South Carolina in the most plain and clear language made the following statement:

> If a community desires, through its governing body, to vote not to have housing projects, it may do so——

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly.

Mr. CAIN. And then the Senator from South Carolina went on to say:

> I desire to make this perfectly clear, so that there will be no misunderstanding—

In other words, that a local community, if it wishes to do so, can—

> cancel a contract which has been made for public housing. But, of course, they will be responsible for any money which the Government has put into the project.

Mr. MAYBANK. And responsible for the money the Federal Government put into it.

Mr. CAIN. Indeed so.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say to my good friend, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], that when we get into the liability clauses under contracts for public housing, that is not exactly the kind of a cancellation about which I first understood the Senator from Washington to ask his question of me.

Mr. CAIN. I understand.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. What is the regular order? I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 51, in line 6, it is proposed to strike out "$140,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$125,000,000."

On page 51, in line 17, it is proposed to strike out "$20,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$10,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in view of the lateness of the hour, I am offering only two amendments to items which otherwise would not come within the jurisdiction of the committee of conference. These items affect funds for ship construction and ship-operating subsidies. I am offering these amendments for consideration en bloc.

The first amendment is on page 51, in line 6. It would reduce the funds for ship construction from $140,000,000 to $125,000,000. This item is designed to pay for contracts for work completed

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

during the fiscal year 1952–53. A reduction of $15,000,000 in this item would require a slight slow-down in the rate of construction, which consists primarily of work on cargo ships of the merchant class.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, let me say that it is now 20 minutes of 10. I have been sitting at this desk since 10 o'clock this morning, and other Senators have done likewise. We have been willing to do so.

Many other Senators have many amendments which have never been submitted to the committee, with the result that the committee has never heard about them or has never seen them. Those amendments have never been sent to the desk, to lie on the table.

I think it is about time for us to determine what to do or what not to do. I am willing to remain here until 2 o'clock in the morning to debate amendments.

Now the Senator from Illinois has submitted an amendment. If the Senator differs with me, I can only say that I have had a chance to read his amendment only casually.

I understand that the Senator from Illinois has two more amendments to submit.

All that the pending amendment would do would be to defer the payments to the Maritime Administration. Of course, a deferment of the payments would make no real difference, for the Federal Government would owe the money. If Congress wishes to have the money paid this year, then let the Congress provide for paying it. If Congress does not wish to have the money paid this year, then let Congress provide for deferring the payment.

I am perfectly willing to take to conference the amendment submitted by the senior Senator from Illinois, but I want it distinctly understood that the Government owes the money and that the Government cannot get out of paying the money, as the Senator knows.

The Senator from Massachusetts knows that if the operating subsidies have to be paid, they have to be paid, and that in some instances we are 2 and 3 years behind time. Is that not correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In the case of the $140,000,000 appropriation for ship construction, nothing can be done. If we should fail to provide the money obligated under contract, it would have to be provided later in a supplemental bill. In the case of an operating subsidy payments can be slowed down.

So far as I am concerned, if the chairman of the subcommittee would agree, I would be willing to accept the operating subsidy amendment. I think we should vote down the other amendment, because we really would gain nothing by adopting it.

Mr. MAYBANK. We would not gain anything, either way, for eventually we have to pay our debts.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the Senator's amendment propose to do something about the charges made by the Comptroller General that the Government has obligated itself to pay money in excess of the legally authorized construction differentials to the company which has purchased a certain ship from the Government?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Like the Senator from Idaho, and like many others, I have been very suspicious of the subsidy paid on that big ship. When Mr. McKeough was vice chairman of the Maritime Commission he handed down some dissenting opinions, stating that the payments which the Maritime Commission had agreed to were excessive.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller General, previously made a report saying the subsidies were excessive. Then a House committee, headed by a distinguished Representative from the State of Virginia by the name of HARDY, made a report saying the payments were excessive. It is now proposed to go through with the $70,000,000 payment, although Lindsay Warren has served notice that in his judgment it is illegal and excessive.

I should be very glad to have this amendment accepted, and, as a matter of fact, I had hoped that a part of this reduction might be counted as one of the economies I am proposing; but it may be that that will have to be handled in a separate amendment.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the Senator's amendment place any restriction on the use of the funds, at least insofar as the differential costs are concerned?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; it does not. It does not place any restrictions on that.

Mr. DWORSHAK. How would the Senator deal with that specific problem?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I had hoped, frankly, by a reduction of funds, we might put some pressure on the Secretary of Commerce to heed the warnings of Comptroller General Warren.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me read but one sentence regarding the construction contracts. This is from the hearings on the independent offices appropriations, 1953, at page 591:

> Senator SALTONSTALL. The recent contracts call for a total of $71,600,000 to be paid for out of the 1954 budget or succeeding budgets.
>
> Admiral COCHRANE. That is correct.
>
> Senator SALTONSTALL. You need $140,000,000 this year plus $71,000,000 in future years to complete the contracts?
>
> Admiral COCHRANE. To complete the contracts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would say we can slow down the rate of construction, but I also think the Secretary of Commerce should consider very carefully whether he should go ahead with payments which Comptroller General Warren declares to be illegal and excessive. Do I correctly understand that the chairman of the committee is willing to accept this amendment?

Mr. MAYBANK. I said I was willing to take the amendment in connection with the voyages to conference, provided it is not objected to, although I say again to my distinguished friend from Illinois that if we should lose in conference, that would be the end of it. If the ships lose money on their voyages, we shall have to appropriate the money with which to pay the loss. Until the substantive law is changed it would be impossible to get around the 1,660 voyages that are authorized by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. As I understand, this amendment was not submitted to the committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. It was not.

Mr. McFARLAND. And the committee was not given an opportunity to consider the questions involved?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. If we are to consider this amendment on the floor of the Senate, and consider other amendments which may be proposed to the bill, we might be here all night.

Mr. MAYBANK. I think the subject belongs to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. McFARLAND. Such amendments should be submitted beforehand so they could be considered without unduly delaying the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 63, line 4, it is proposed to strike out "$4,885,000" and insert "$5,400,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the hour is late. I shall endeavor to complete my statement in about 3 minutes. This amendment would add to the appropriation for the FHA the sum of $515,000. The budget estimate of $5,631,000 was cut to $4,885,000 by the House. My amendment would restore the appropriation to $5,400,000, which would still be $231,000 below the budget estimate, and only slightly higher than the amount appropriated last year.

If this amendment is not adopted, the staff of 1,050 workers which the FHA had in 1951, which has been reduced to 900 at the present time, will have to be cut another 100 or 125 workers in the Washington headquarters office.

The work load on FHA is increasing. It is expected that more than 1,000,000 homes will be built this year, most of

them under the FHA insurance program. We recognize the fact that, the larger the insurance mortgage load at the local level, the more money is required to process the loans. The impact of handling the work load caused by so many more mortgages will require an additional staff in Washington, or at least a continuance of the present staff. We can ill afford to deprive the FHA of another 100 or 125 personnel. If the Senate agrees to the cut made by the House, it will impair the soundness of a mortgage insurance program which has underwritten more than $14,000,000,000 in home mortgages, and which by next year will have underwritten about $17,000,000,000 or $18,000,000,000. Unless there is adequate control, adequate inspection, and adequate standards of uniformity and soundness of construction, the risks against the Federal Government are bound to be increased.

It may be interesting to note with respect to this item that none of the money comes out of the taxpayers' pocket. The FHA have made in premium income from the one-half of 1 percent override on the interest rate that homeowners buying their homes must pay, $120,000,000 for the current year, and a part of this money is used for operating expenses. I do not believe it wise at this time, when we are trying our dead-level best to have constructed lower-priced houses so the low-income groups can afford to own their homes instead of having to live in public housing, that we should cripple this program by forcing a reduction of more than 100 people off the present payroll. I believe we would be pennywise and pound foolish to assume additional insurance risks without proper inspection, investigation, and checking to assure the soundness of the program. It is essential to check the new devices, the new construction methods which are being developed all the time by construction contractors and builders, because those are the things that must be fed into private home construction if we are going to help the low-income group.

I hope the chairman of the committee will agree to take this amendment to conference. It merely restores a little of what the House has cut out. It does not come near representing the amount that was budgeted for this program.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I appreciate what the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has said. He is correct with respect to the curtailment in various agencies. I could not accept the amendment, although I appreciate what the Senator wants to have done. If we accept one amendment, we must accept another one for FNMA. No agency is satisfied. I cannot accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. FERGUSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

ELIMINATION OF THE LEAVE RIDER FROM THE INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the committee saw fit to eliminate the Thomas leave rider from the appropriation bill, I should like to have a statement printed in the RECORD. It is too late for me to read the statement, so I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

It is of utmost importance that our Federal working force be fully utilized during this critical emergency period. If we are to achieve this goal we must maintain employee morale at the highest possible level. It is with this purpose in mind that I call upon you to oppose vigorously any attempt to reinsert the provisions of the Thomas leave rider back into the independent offices appropriation bill. It is my considered opinion, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Federal Manpower Policies, that this provision will not only cost the Federal Government millions of dollars in overtime payments, but will strike a devastating blow at employees' morale at a time when our defense needs demand maximum operating efficiency.

I want to praise the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee who so wisely voted to strike out this ban on accumulation of leave provision from the independent offices appropriation bill. During the first session of this Congress, a similar proposal was considered and rejected by the House and Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committees. The leave bill that passed, Public Law 233, limited the right of accumulation to 60 days, and restricted the accumulation of annual leave to a minimum of 13 days and a maximum of 26 days per year, depending on length of service. One important reason for granting this accumulation right was that Federal employees receive no unemployment compensation nor severance pay as given in industry, and it was deemed advisable to offer some means to the employee whereby he, through his foresight and diligence, could provide himself with a financial bulwark against separation from the Federal service.

There are a number of other forceful reasons why such a ban on leave accumulation should not be enacted into law at this time. Many of the defense agencies are working at top speed with limited staffs, and are forced into putting in many hours of overtime each week to meet their workload demands. If agency heads were compelled to give their employees all their accumulated leave each fiscal year rather than leaving them discretion as to when their people could be spared best, not only would the overtime payroll skyrocket, but the quality of the work would suffer considerably. On May 27, 1952, the local office of the Office of Price Stabilization reported to me that their overtime payments from January 1 through March 29 of this year amounted to over $46,000. During that same period their 2,600 local employees used less than half the leave they accumulated during that same period. They further informed me that if their employees felt that they were going to lose this leave balance, they would have taken it all, with the result being that the overtime payments would have been around $100,000, rather than the amount indicated.

When we realize that these 2,600 employees represent only one-tenth of 1 percent of the total Federal payroll, we can fully appreciate the dire consequences of passing any legislation which might cause such results.

Further, many of our military installations, such as naval shipyards, gun factories, and arsenals, have found it extremely difficult to recruit skilled workers, because industry is offering them considerably better incentives. Therefore, on production line work of this type, where there are three shifts working around the clock, the only way these installations could let their employees off would be to let their vital defense work lag behind, because replacements are just not available.

A report from the National Production Authority, also dated May 27, points out that 2,800 employees in 5 of its leading bureaus used less than one-eleventh of their leave during the 3-month period from February through April 1952, while putting in over 5,700 hours of overtime work during that same period. While perhaps the overtime would not jump in the same proportion to the leave taken, I was informed that the overtime would have been at least five or six times as great, or around 30,000 hours, at an average cost of $2 per hour, had these employees been forced to use all this remaining leave.

As I have previously indicated, it has been extremely difficult for Government recruiting teams to attract qualified personnel in the Federal service. One of the main reasons is that industry can offer them much higher pay and other benefits. One feature that has proved of great value in attracting qualified personnel into Government has been the granting of accumulated leave rights. Not only did this right help us obtain good people to do the job but it offered them an incentive to remain with Government while they were needed, notwithstanding the fact that they could make considerably more money performing the same work out in industry. Therefore, it is my sincere conviction that we owe these people a moral obligation to protect this leave right which we granted them.

Many of our new employees in Government have come to Washington from the west coast and other distant parts of the country. It would be virtually impossible for them to take a vacation back home within the 13 days' leave they would be entitled to. However, if they can continue to accumulate leave, it would be possible for them to make such a journey every 2 years, and, further, they would have the opportunity of selecting a time that would be both satisfactory to their personal desires and suitable to the workload of the agency; thus, neither the morale of the individual nor the operating efficiency of the agency would be impaired.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI LIBRARIES

The Subcommittee on Federal Manpower Policies was established for the express purpose of striving for maximum utilization of our Federal working force during this emergency. I mention this at this time only to emphasize the fact that we are extending every effort to improve Government operations, revise obsolete, cumbersome procedures, and formulate recommendations that will result in greater economy. Therefore, if this ban on accumulation of leave provision was a true economy measure, I would be among the first to champion it. However, as I have just indicated, the extensive study which has been made into this proposal by the Subcommittee on Federal Manpower Policies has conclusively shown that it will cost millions in overtime payments, that it will seriously hamper defense-production work in many of our military installations, and, lastly, that it will result in immeasurable injury to employees' morale at a time when it is imperative to the defense effort and the welfare of our country that they continue working to the extent of their ability.

The Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 (Public Law 233, 82d Cong.), approved October 30, 1951, authorizes employees to accumulate up to 60 days' annual leave for use in succeeding years.

The act provides further that in the event an employee had an accumulation in excess of 60 days he might continue to carry forward not to exceed 90 days until such time as the excess amount was reduced to the 60-day level. Thus, under the act employees have individual ceilings ranging from 60 to 90 days. The administration of leave requires that these ceilings be recorded, audited, and otherwise complied with on an individual employee basis.

The Thomas rider requires that leave earned during any calendar year must be used before June 30 of the succeeding year or it is lost to the employee. This requirement creates a second set of records which complicates considerably leave processes of the departments and agencies. Let me give you a specific example of how involved it becomes.

John Doe had 50 days' leave to his credit at the beginning of 1952. Under the 1951 leave act, he could accumulate not over 10 additional days during 1952. In other words, he could go into 1953 with not more than 60 days to his credit. This would be noted on his record; and he would be required to use all but 10 days of the leave he would earn during 1952 or it would be lost to him at the end of the year. Under the Thomas rider, he could still add 10 days out of his 1952 leave to the 50-day accumulation he had at the beginning of the year and go into 1953 with a total accumulation of 60 days; however, it would have to be recorded on his record that 10 days of this total accumulation would have to be used by June 30 or forfeited.

A study has been made of these additional computations; and it has been determined that even on the basis of a conservative estimate, it will require one additional hour per year to maintain the leave account of each Federal employee. On the basis of 2,500,000 leave records in the Federal service, the extra work occasioned by the Thomas rider will amount to 2,500,000 hours. On the basis of 2,080 hours constituting the work-year, it is clear that the rider will require 1,154 additional man-years of work. On an average salary basis of $4,500 per year, additional bookkeeping cost alone amounts to just under $5,000,000. This additional cost does not include any estimate for additional work in payroll, disbursing, and auditing activities; but it is confined entirely to the record-keeping functions.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of Senators in remaining and completing our work for the day. I now move that the Senate adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 4, 1952, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 3 (legislative day of June 2), 1952:

The following-named (Naval Reserve aviators) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Paul Allison	Robert T. Lemon
James H. Bergstrom	Sidney R. Mason
Frank S. Coleman	Daniel N. Mealy
Thomas R. Cuthbert, Jr.	Robert L. Nelson
	Theodore E. Newark
Ralph W. Foster, Jr.	Stephen R. Odrobina
Richard W Green	Lyle R. Peters
Russell L. Harber	Thomas B. Ray
David L. Hardin	Cecil J. Ross, Jr.
Martin H. Henry	Keith K. Stroupe
Carl C. Hilscher	Herbert A. Sudhoff
Robert J. Kaps	Alan D. Tibbetts

Floyd E. Wanamaker (Naval Reserve Officer's Training Corps) to be ensign in the Navy.

Richard W. Marble and Charles L. Elliott (Naval Reserve Officer's Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy in lieu of ensigns in the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct name.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officer's Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy in lieu of ensigns in the Supply Corps in the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed:

Randall K. Barron	John W. Pancoast, Jr.
Gordon C. Lofquist	Cloyd S. Sweigert

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officer's Training Corps) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps:

Howard L. Cook
Robert E. McCamey II
Richard O. Wilson

Robert W. Gibson (civilian college graduate) to be lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Corps in the Navy.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grade indicated in the Dental Corps in the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

William J. Clauss
William J. Rogers, Jr.
Edward W. Smith

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps in the Navy:

Agnes F. Acerra
Doris R. Aldhizer

The following-named (civilian college graduates) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Rawley M. Gregory
Lucian C. Whitaker, Jr.

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Supply Corps in the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

James M. Baumgardner	Bobby L. Hatch
	James D. Hereford, Jr.
James E. M. Coughlin	Leif A. Houkom
Harold Crain	Francis Roche
Forrest H. Doucette	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 3, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of all grace, may we be inspired with indomitable courage and an invincible faith in the ultimate triumph of moral and spiritual forces as we face arduous tasks and heavy responsibilities.

We pray that we may not allow ourselves to become the victims of any cynical attitudes and feelings that present-day situations and conditions are so hopelessly wrong that all our efforts to change and put them right are useless and will only end in failure.

Show us how we may conquer our moods of discouragement and depression and cultivate a stronger and more dynamic confidence in Thy divine wisdom, for Thou art too wise to err and too kind to injure.

May the Members of the Congress daily give clear and convincing testimony that they are men and women of lofty vision, of fine insight, and of unconquerable hope as they seek to build a better world and a finer social order.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 23, 1952:

H. R. 4387. An act to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to certain veterans and their dependents;

H. R. 4394. An act to provide certain increases in the monthly rates of compensation and pension payable to veterans and their dependents, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4551. An act to provide for the acquisition of a site for the new Federal building in Newnan, Ga., adjoining the existing Federal building there as an economy measure before land value has increased as a result of land improvement; and

H. R. 7230. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code, so as to make nontaxable certain stock transfers made by insurance companies to secure the performance of obligations.

On May 26, 1952:

H. R. 4949. An act to amend the act of February 10, 1920, so as to provide for free blank ammunition for veterans' organizations for use in connection with the funeral ceremonies of deceased veterans and for other ceremonial purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that

the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 156. An act to repeal the Alaska railroads tax;

H. R. 654. An act for the relief of Ivo Cerne;

H. R. 696. An act to authorize the President of the United States to present the Distinguished Flying Cross to Col. Roscoe Turner;

H. R. 975. An act for the relief of Sarah A. Davies;

H. R. 1099. An act for the relief of the estate of Cobb Nichols;

H. R. 1162. An act for the relief of Kaiko Sugimote (Kay Fair) and her minor children;

H. R. 1428. An act for the relief of Claude Foranda;

H. R. 1960. An act for the relief of Erika Nicolo and her minor child;

H. R. 2303. An act for the relief of Sisters Maria Salerno, Eufrasisa Binotto, Maria Ballatore, and Giovanna Buziol;

H. R. 2307. An act for the relief of Jean (John) Plewniak and Anna Piotrowska Plewniak;

H. R. 2346. An act for the relief of Odette Louise Tirman;

H. R. 2587. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jeannette Thorn Pease;

H. R. 2628. An act for the relief of the George H. Soffel Co.;

H. R. 2764. An act for the relief of Fumiko Higa;

H. R. 2841. An act for the relief of Yai Wing Lee;

H. R. 2902. An act for the relief of Thomas E. Bell;

H. R. 2903. An act for the relief of Mimi Fong and her children, Sing Lee and Lily;

H. R. 2920. An act for the relief of Priscilla Ogden Dickerson Gillson de la Fregonniere;

H. R. 3070. An act for the relief of Giovanni Rinaldo Bottini;

H. R. 3124. An act for the relief of Mehmet Salih Topcuoglu;

H. R. 3132. An act for the relief of Sister Apolonia Gerarda Sokolowska;

H. R. 3152. An act for the relief of Mrs. Setsuyo Sumida;

H. R. 3561. An act for the relief of Mary Osadchy;

H. R. 3572. An act for the relief of Ying Chee Jung;

H. R. 3732. An act for the relief of Stephan Joseph Horvath and Lucas Elbert Horvath;

H. R. 3953. An act for the relief of Chan Toy Har;

H. R. 4152. An act for the relief of Ann Tobak and John Tobak;

H. R. 4492. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Norma J. Roberts, a minor;

H. R. 4790. An act for the relief of Helga Richter;

H. R. 4801. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the board of supervisors of the city and county of Honolulu to issue certain bonds for flood-control purposes;

H. R. 4802. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the board of supervisors of the city and county of Honolulu to issue certain public improvement bonds;

H. R. 4923. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the board of supervisors of the city and county of Honolulu to issue certain bonds for the construction of the Kalihi tunnel and its approach roads;

H. R. 5071. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the county of Maui, T. H., to issue public improvement bonds for the construction of flood-control projects on Iao stream;

H. R. 5072. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the county of Maui, T. H., to issue public improvement bonds for the construction of new public-school buildings;

H. R. 5121. An act for the relief of Felix Navedo-Merced and Carmen Ramos-Baez;

H. R. 5145. An act for the relief of Tsutako Kuroki Masuda;

H. R. 5386. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation of the Territory of Hawaii, to issue bonds for acquisition of real property for public-school purposes and for construction and replacement of buildings for public-school purposes;

H. R. 5753. An act for the relief of Bernard J. Keogh;

H. R. 5805. An act for the relief of Patricia Lauretta Pray;

H. R. 5956. An act for the relief of Ingeborg and Anna Lukas;

H. R. 5958. An act for the relief of Pauline W. Goodyear;

H. R. 5976. An act for the relief of Michiko Nakashima;

H. R. 5984. An act for the relief of Jimmy Doguta (also known as Jimmy Blagg);

H. R. 6265. An act for the relief of Marian Diane Delphine Sachs;

H. R. 6314. An act for the relief of Kiko Oshiro;

H. R. 6675. An act to authorize the conveyance of lands in the Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation to the State of California or to the Hoopa unified school district for use for school purposes;

H. R. 6848. An act for the relief of Sharon Elaine Frankovich;

H. R. 6922. An act to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, so as to extend the benefits of such section to certain colleges in the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 7188. An act to provide that the additional tax imposed by section 2470 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code shall not apply in respect of coconut oil produced in, or produced from materials grown in, the territory of the Pacific Islands; and

H. R. 7593. An act to amend paragraph 1774, section 201, title II, of the Tariff Act of 1930.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 643. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vivian M. Graham and Herbert H. Graham;

H. R. 646. An act for the relief of Mrs. Inez B. Copp and George T. Copp;

H. R. 1114. An act for the relief of Edward Charles Cleverly;

H. R. 1826. An act for the relief of Ellis E. Gabbert;

H. R. 1842. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ann Morrison;

H. R. 3554. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 5633. An act to approve a contract negotiated with the irrigation districts on the Owyhee Federal project, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6133. An act to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 6336. An act to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research;

H. R. 6661. An act to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926; and

H. R. 7345. An act to exclude from gross income the proceeds of certain sports programs conducted for the benefit of the American National Red Cross.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 556. An act authorizing the transfer of certain lands in Putnam County, Fla., to the State Board of Education of Florida for the use of the University of Florida for educational purposes;

S. 1086. An act for the relief of Dr. Guy Raiola;

S. 1130. An act for the relief of Ruzena Stransky;

S. 1315. An act for the relief of Mirko M. Bjelopetrovich;

S. 1336. An act for the relief of Augusta Bleys, also known as Augustina Bleys;

S. 1479. An act for the relief of Adele Frattini;

S. 1513. An act for the relief of Thorvald Nin;

S. 1707. An act for the relief of the George B. Henly Construction Co.;

S. 1719. An act for the relief of Salvatore Conte;

S. 1724. An act for the relief of Elina Branlund;

S. 1740. An act for the relief of Tom Tateki Iriye;

S. 1743. An act for the relief of Altoon Saprichian;

S. 1744. An act for the relief of Dr. Albert Haas;

S. 2067. An act for the relief of Maria Welland;

S. 2084. An act for the relief of Mathilde Kohar Halebian;

S. 2123. An act for the relief of Peter Penovic, Milos Grahovac, and Nikola Maljkovic;

S. 2229. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire, construct, operate, and maintain public airports in certain areas, and for other purposes;

S. 2308. An act for the relief of Socorro Gerona de Castro;

S. 2357. An act to provide that horticultural commodities shall be included within the term "agricultural commodities" for the purpose of the agricultural exemption for motor carriers of the Interstate Commerce Act;

S. 2360. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to increase the amounts of securities issued by motor carriers without requiring approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission;

S. 2603. An act to authorize the transfer of certain lands to the State of Oregon;

S. 2610. An act providing that excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to certain lands that will receive a supplemental or regulated water supply from the San Luis Valley project, Colorado;

S. 2621. An act to provide for national cemeteries in the State of Arizona;

S. 2646. An act to cancel irrigation maintenance and operation charges on the Shoshone Indian Mission School lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation;

S. 3001. An act for the relief of Jimmy Lee Davis;

S. 3008. An act for the relief of Karen Christene Eisen Murdock;

S. 3019. An act to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to extend the application of special-inducement pay provided thereby to physicians and dentists, and for other purposes;

S. 3195. An act granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims; and

S. Con. Res. 76. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1822. An act to amend the act creating a juvenile court for the District of Columbia, approved March 19, 1906, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5990) entitled "An act to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HUNT, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. LONG, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. FLANDERS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EISENHOWER PROMOTERS IN TEXAS

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, every American who believes in the preservation of the two-party system should be aroused over certain tactics of the Eisenhower promoters in Texas.

I have in my hand a reprint of an ad published by the Eisenhower for President Club of Dallas County, Tex.

This ad contains a cunning invitation for Democrats to overpower and pervert the Republican Party in Texas.

The Eisenhower crowd makes this brazenly dishonest proposal to Texas Democrats:

> You are not pledged to support the nominee of the Republican Party, nor does it prohibit you from voting in the July Democratic primary.

In plain English, the Eisenhower gang was saying: "Come in Democrats, take over the Republican convention by force of your superior numbers—and then go on to your own Democratic primary in July and pick your own Democratic candidate."

I think General Eisenhower should promptly tell the American people if he approves of this sleazy appeal to Democrats carried in the Dallas Morning News of Saturday, May 3.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative business and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday next, following the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS].

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE GOVERNOR OF THE PANAMA CANAL, 1951—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the annual report of the Governor of the Panama Canal for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 3, 1952.*

THE STEEL STRIKE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the people of America this morning have unbounded praise for the Supreme Court.

Now, if power drunk Phil Murray does not call off this his third strike against the best interest of the people of the United States and against the defense of our country thereby jeopardizing the lives of our fighting men in Korea, he will receive the universal condemnation of all the people.

President Truman who has sowed to the wind in his political coalition with Phil Murray is now reaping for the American people the whirlwind which will speedily weaken the economic structure and the defense of our Nation to the great delight of the Kremlin. If the President had firmly told Phil Murray that he would enforce the Taft-Hartley Act to prevent a work stoppage, a reasonable settlement would doubtless have been made without the necessity of seizure or work stoppages.

Since the President is largely responsible through his failure to promptly act months ago to prevent this strike, he should now immediately invoke the Taft-Hartley Act which would resume production and give the Congress time to pass whatever additional legislation is necessary.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Calendar.

COL. JULIA O. FLIKKE AND COL. FLORENCE A. BLANCHFIELD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2256) for the relief of Col. Julia O. Flikke and Col. Florence A. Blanchfield.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

TRUST ASSOCIATION OF H. KEMPNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2181) for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over, without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

FOOD SERVICE OF EVANSVILLE, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2405) for the relief of Food Service of Evansville, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $11,317.27 to Food Service of Evansville, Inc., of Evansville, Ind., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses sustained as the result of an agreement with officers at Camp Breckinridge, Ky., to furnish equipment and supplies in the post exchanges at Camp Breckinridge, Ky.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALMA COOPERATIVE EQUITY EXCHANGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3211) for the relief of the Alma Cooperative Equity Exchange, Alma, Nebr., and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Alma Cooperative Equity Exchange, Alma, Nebr.; Floyd Snider, Republican City, Nebr.; and Ernest F. Lueking and Andy Haas doing business as Tri-County Oil Co., Republican City, Nebr., respectively, the fair value in each case, as determined by the Secretary of the Army, of those grain elevators owned by each of the above-named (located on the right-of-way of the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad) which were rendered useless by the United States in connection with the construction of the Harlan County Dam and Reservoir project, and for which compensation may not be made under existing law.

SEC. 2. No part of the sum appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this payment. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in a sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any

money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Alma Cooperative Equity Exchange, Alma, Nebr., for a grain elevator, office building and scales, coal shed and appurtenances; Floyd Snyder, Republican City, Nebr., for a grain elevator and appurtenances; Ernest F. Lueking and Andy Haas, doing business as Tri-County Oil Co., Republican City, Nebr., for a filling station bulk plant, and the Farmers Cooperative Equity Exchange, Republican City, Nebr., for a grain elevator, respectively, for fair value in each case, as determined by the Secretary of the Army, of the property owned by each of the above named (located on the right-of-way of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad) which were rendered useless by the United States in connection with the construction of the Harlan County Dam and Reservoir project, and for which compensation may not be made under existing law. *Provided*, That payment in each case shall be limited to the fair value of the improvements, or the cost of moving such improvements, whichever is less, as determined by the Secretary of the Army: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated shall not be expended for the payment of business losses or other losses incident to the acquisition of lands for this project.

"SEC. 2. No part of the sum appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this payment. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in a sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROFESSIONAL ARTS BUILDING CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3727) for the relief of the Professional Arts Building Corp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $7,497.47 to Professional Arts Building Corp., of Atlantic City, N. J., in full settlement of all claims against the United States by reason of damages suffered by the said corporation resulting from the reconstruction of the Professional Arts Building in Atlantic City, at the direction of the Veterans' Administration of the United States, and from loss of occupancy in such building, all occasioned by the failure of the Veterans' Administration to enter into a lease with the said corporation after requiring such reconstruction and the removal of tenants from the building: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$7,497.47" and insert in lieu thereof "$6,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TERMINAL WAREHOUSE CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5004) for the relief of Terminal Warehouse Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Terminal Warehouse Co., Philadelphia, Pa., the sum of $3,287.34. Such sum represents the value of storage space occupied by certain merchandise said corporation was required to keep in its bonded warehouse, pending payment of customs duties by the consignee. Upon failure of said consignee to pay such customs duties, the collector of customs seized the merchandise and, after many months' delay, sold it to satisfy the Government's claim. The sum of $3,287.34 due the said corporation for storage during the interval remains unpaid. The Bureau of Customs acknowledges the validity of the claim but has no authority to pay it out of existing Customs Bureau funds.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "certain" strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof "imported merchandise which was voluntarily abandoned to the Government by the consignee under the provisions of section 563 (b), Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and which was subsequently stored by the said corporation in its bonded warehouse at Philadelphia, for account of the Government, pending its disposition by the Government: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GALLAGHER'S WAREHOUSES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5006) for the relief of Gallagher's Warehouses, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Gallagher's Warehouses, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa., the sum of $4,411.56. Such sum represents the value of storage space occupied by certain merchandise said corporation was required to keep in its bonded warehouse, pending payment of customs duties by the consignee. Upon failure of said consignee to pay such customs duties, the collector of customs seized the merchandise and, after many months' delay, sold it to satisfy the Government's claim. The sum of $4,411.56 due the said corporation for storage during the interval remains unpaid. The Bureau of Customs acknowledges the validity of the claim but has no authority to pay it out of existing Customs Bureau funds.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out line 8 and the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof "imported merchandise which was voluntarily abandoned to the Government by the consignee under the provisions of section 563 (b), Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and which was subsequently stored by the said corporation in its bonded warehouse at Philadelphia, for account of the Government, pending its disposition by the Government: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF EDWARD B. FORMANEK, DECEASED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5095) for the relief of Mrs. Edward B. Formanek.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Mrs. Edward B. Formanek, the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Edward B. Formanek against the United States on account of the death of her husband, Edward B. Formanek, who lost his life on May 14, 1943, when the airplane which he was piloting was struck by a United States Army bomber on the runway at the Birmingham Municipal Airport, Birmingham, Ala., such airport at that time being under the control and management of the Government:

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Mrs. Edward B. Formanek" and insert "to the estate of Edward B. Formanek, deceased."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "of the said Mrs. Edward B. Formanek."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "her husband."

At the end of bill add: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI LIBRARIES

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Edward B. Formanek, deceased."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN H. VOGEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5515) for the relief of John H. Vogel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John H. Vogel, Takoma Park, Md., the sum of $245.20. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said John H. Vogel against the United States for reimbursement of the cost of transporting his household effects from Milwaukee, Wis., to his home in Takoma Park, Md., following his release from active duty in the Army on December 14, 1945. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per centum therof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$245.20" and insert in lieu thereof "$221.41."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM KIPF AND DAROLD D. SELK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6761) for the relief of William Kipf and Darold D. Selk.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to William Kipf, Lincoln, Nebr., a sum (not to exceed $195.96) sufficient to satisfy the judgment and court costs recovered by him against Darold D. Selk, Lincoln, Nebr., on October 24, 1951, in the United States District Court at Lincoln, Nebr., and (2) to the said Darold D. Selk, a sum equal to $195.96 less the amount paid by the Secretary of the Treasury under clause (1), but in no case to exceed the total amount which may have been paid by the said Darold D. Selk in partial or full satisfaction of such judgment and court costs. The payment of the sum specified in clause (1) shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said William Kipf against the United States and the said Darold D. Selk arising out of an accident which occurred in Lincoln, Nebr., on January 27, 1950, and which involved a mail truck being operated by the said Darold D. Selk as an employee of the United States Postal Service. The payment of the sum specified in clause (2) shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Darold D. Selk against the United States for indemnification for losses he suffered by reason of the judgment and court costs recovered against him as a result of such accident. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7241) to authorize payment to the Empire District Electric Co. for reasonable costs of protecting its Ozark Beach power plant from the backwater of Bull Shoals Dam.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Chief of Engineers be, and he is hereby authorized to make such payment to the Empire District Electric Co. as in his judgment will cover the reasonable cost of protective works to prevent physical damage to the said company's Ozark Beach Dam and power plant by backwater from the Bull Shoals Dam.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "payment", insert "not to exceed $700,000."

Page 1, line 5, after the word "Company", insert "of Joplin, Mo."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "plant", insert "and appurtenant facilities."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOACHIM VOLK, ALSO KNOWN AS STEVEN CRAIG DELANO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1855) for the relief of Joachim Volk, also known as Steven Craig Delano.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, solely for the purposes of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, Joachim Volk, also known as Steven Craig Delano, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Warrant Officer Junior Grade and Mrs. Norman Delano, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIDORI SUGIMOTO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1953) for the relief of Midori Sugimoto.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of that act, the minor child, Midori Sugimoto, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Lt. and Mrs. Thomas H. Malim, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEBRA ELAINE EVANS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2089) for the relief of Debra Elaine Evans.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Debra Elaine Evans, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Tech. Sgt. and Mrs. Charles E. Evans, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TERUO UECHI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2462) for the relief of Teruo Uechi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, Teruo Uechi shall, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Corp. Leroy F. Canty, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EUGENE RICHARD SUSHKO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2554) for the relief of Eugene Richard Sushko.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Eugene Richard Sushko shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of First Lt. and Mrs. Albert R. Sushko, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERNEST DANIEL DAVIS, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2571) for the relief of Ernest Daniel Davis, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Ernest Daniel Davis, Jr., shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Capt. and Mrs. Ernest Daniel Davis, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

JEAN HAMAMOTO, ALSO KNOWN AS SHARON LEA BROOKS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2593) for the relief of Jean Hamamoto, also known as Sharon Lea Brooks.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, solely for the purpose of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Jean Hamamoto, also known as Sharon Lea Brooks, a minor half-Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Capt. and Mrs. Robert N. Brooks, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KATHLEEN COWLEY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2643) for the relief of Kathleen Cowley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provision of law excluding aliens inadmissible to the United States because of race, the minor child, Kathleen Cowley, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Capt. and Mrs. James E. Cowley, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BARBARA ANN SHEPPARD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2768) for the relief of Barbara Ann Sheppard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Barbara Ann Sheppard, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Master Sgt. and Mrs. Gordon B. Sheppard, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSAN JEANNE KERR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2805) for the relief of Susan Jeanne Kerr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, Susan Jeanne Kerr shall be considered to be the alien natural-born daughter of her adoptive parents, Capt. and Mrs. John K. Kerr, United States citizens.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MERCEDES HERNANDEZ SAGUAR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1092) for the relief of Mrs. Mercedes Hernandez Saguar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of the second category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Mrs. Mercedes Hernandez Saguar may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the colon, insert "*Provided*, That there be given a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States and to all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof holding the United States and all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof harmless against Mrs. Mercedes Hernandez Saguar becoming a public charge."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRYK KRAMARSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1490) for the relief of Henryk Kramarski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Henryk Kramarski, Camden, N. J., who arrived in the United States on the Steamship *Coral Sea* at Philadelphia, Pa., on December 3, 1947, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted, as of such date, to the United States for permanent residence upon payment of visa fee and head tax. Any bond outstanding in his case shall be canceled. Upon such payment, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Poland for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after "Kramarski", strike out down to and including "available" on page 2, line 2, and insert "shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the bill for the relief of Henryk Kramarski, now before the House, has been favorably reported by the Judiciary Committee of the House.

This bill is exceedingly meritorious and should be passed. It provides that, for the purposes of immigration and naturalization laws, Henryk Kramarski shall be considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

The necessity for this legislation arises from the fact that Henryk Kramarski on December 3, 1947, when a lad 17 years old, entered this country as a stowaway on the steamship *Coral Sea* at Philadelphia, Pa.

Back of his entrance into this country there is a story of tragic circumstances growing out of the war that awakens the heartfelt sympathy of everyone who is familiar with the story. I confess there has never been during my long service in the House a case that has so stirred my emotions, or created a greater desire to be helpful, than the case of this Polish boy.

Henryk Kramarski was born November 16, 1930, in Batanowicze, Poland. His mother died when he was 8 years of age. In 1942, at the age of 11, the German invaders of Poland separated Henryk from his father and two older sisters, and sent him to slave labor in Germany. The tortures he was subjected to have left their marks on his body to this day. For a time he was confined at Buchenwald Concentration Camp. Unable to stand the atrocities heaped upon him, he escaped and attached himself to the United States Army at Coblenz, performing the duties of an orderly, errand boy, and kitchen boy. His likable disposition endeared him to the men of our Army with whom he came in contact. They have given him some of the finest of recommendations which have been made a part of the hearings in this case together with equally splendid recommendations that had been given to him since his arrival in this country.

In 1947 he was returned from Germany to his native Poland. He sought his father and his two sisters. He was unable to find them and later learned they had all been killed or died. This left him without any known living relatives. In this state of dejection he found his way to the port city of Gdynia. He worked around the docks for a while, but this was not sufficient to sustain him. He then, inspired by the friendship that had been shown him by American GI's and a desire to have the liberty and freedom that would be his in America, hid himself aboard the steamship *Coral Sea* and arrived in Philadelphia on December 3, 1947. He was detected by immigration officials and sent to Ellis Island. He was confined there for upwards of a year, during which time he gained the friendship of all with whom he came in contact. Finally, through the interest taken in him by the International Institute of Philadelphia, a most worth-while charitable agency that cares for distress cases among foreign immigrants at the port of Philadelphia, his case was brought to the attention of Msgr. Arthur B. Strenski, pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Camden, N. J.

Monsignor Strenski was immediately touched by the plight of the boy and with his characteristic diligence and zeal, procured for him a home with Mr. and

Mrs. John Okulicz. It was fortunate, indeed, for the boy that a family such as that of John and Helen Okulicz should open the door of their home to him. It is one of the finest Polish homes in the city of Camden. They have given to Henryk the care and attention they have given to their own children. They have by precept and example shown him the advantages of right living. The result is that the boy has progressed marvelously in his education at the Wilson High School, has taken a great interest in the duties of his church, and, altogether has made a reputation for fine manly conduct. He is a credit to all who have taken an interest in him.

It is not strange that it is his greatest ambition to be a citizen of the United States. I shall never forget the look upon the face of this lad when I took him into the gallery of the House of Representatives on the day he appeared before the Judiciary Committee in the hearing on the bill I had introduced for his relief. His face fairly shown with pleasure. He showed an appreciation of seeing Congress in session that left no doubt in my mind that here was a boy who would make a good citizen. His every word and act indicated he looked forward to being a citizen of this great country of ours. There is no doubt he would make a loyal and worthy citizen. It is necessary for this bill to be passed to enable him to become such. It would be cruel and inhuman to send him back to Poland. To do so would in all probability mean death to him, because of the fact that he is an escapee and as a Catholic is under a ban of the communistic regime that rules Poland.

I beg the membership of the House to do our part in giving this boy the opportunity to breathe with us the free air of liberty. You know, as I also know, the Polish people have always been through centuries of time the exponents of liberty and freedom. I appeal to Congress to give favorable action to the bill for the relief of Henryk Kramarski and with the hope that, after our favorable action, the President will give his approval.

As part of my remarks and as an indication of the very great interest taken in this case of Henryk Kramarski, I enclose a copy of the resolution adopted by the Polish American Citizens Club, of Camden, N. J. It reads as follows:

Whereas it has come to the attention of this club that Henryk Kramarski, who resides at 1510 Mount Ephraim Avenue, Camden 4, N. J., and is a native and subject of Poland, arrived in the United States at the port of Philadelphia, Pa., aboard the steamship *Coral Sea* on December 3, 1947, from Gdynia, Poland. He was born on November 16, 1930, in Batanowicze, Poland. His mother died when he was 8 years old. In 1942, at the age of 10, German invaders separated Henryk from his family and sent him to slave labor in Germany. He worked on a German farm, and after escaping from same he was caught and placed in Buchenwald concentration camp for a period of 9 months, where he endured strain beyond his physical strength, and his hands bear permanent scars from slave labor in Germany and from ill treatment received in the camp; and

Whereas Henryk Kramarski's relatives cannot be found, and he has been informed that his father and two sisters were killed; and

Whereas Henryk Kramarski's application for an immigration visa was found excludable on the immigration laws by the Board of Appeals on March 18, 1948. They noted in their opinion, "we have, on rare occasions, permitted stowaways who are minors to enter on parole for future adjustment of their immigration status. However, this has been done only where there is an absolute showing that some responsible person or agency has accepted the obligations of parole, both financial and otherwise"; and

Whereas on November 22, 1948, Henryk Kramarski was paroled on a bond of $500 to Mr. and Mrs. John Okulicz, of 1510 Mount Ephraim Avenue, Camden 4, N. J., where he now resides. His conduct has won him many friends and has endeared himself to his foster parents. He attends classes at the Woodrow Wilson High School, and he also takes accordion lessons and spends a couple of hours a day practicing. He is well liked by his classmates and has progressed satisfactorily and considerably beyond other recent arrivals from foreign countries; and

Whereas he has attached himself with the United States Army at the time of its arrival in Germany, and has become a civilian employee, and for which he possesses several letters of recommendation from officers of the United States Army; and

Whereas he has a very fine record during his stay at Ellis Island; and

Whereas Henryk Kramarski has no family or other ties in Poland, and he is virtually a refugee of World War II, a displaced boy whose only memory of human kindness experienced since his forced removal from his father's home and care at the age of 10 was with the United States Army and his subsequent experience with officials and citizens of the United States; and

Whereas to send him back to his native village, which is now occupied by the Russians, would compel him to be subjected to ill treatment and possible death for his offense against the state for running away from a children's Communist indoctrination camp to which he was slated to be taken: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Polish American Citizens Club at its monthly meeting at its community home, 1038 Lowell Street, Camden 4, N. J., this 6th day of February 1951, That this club go on record praying that the Members of Congress of the United States support favorably the bill introduced by Congressman CHARLES A. WOLVERTON under bill H. R. 1490, and that a copy of this resolution be mailed to Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, chairman, Judiciary Committee, and a copy to the Camden Courier-Post newspaper.

POLISH AMERICAN CITIZENS CLUB,
By STANLEY CIECHANOWSKI, *President.*
Attest:
JOSEPH A. DYNAKOWSKI,
Recording Secretary.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SISTER ANITA (VINCENZINA DI FRANCO)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2166) for the relief of Sister Anita (Vincenzina Di Franco).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister Anita (Vincenzina Di Franco) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIO FARABULLINI AND ALLA FARABULLINI, HIS WIFE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2661) for the relief of Mario Farabullini and Alla Farabullini, his wife.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, the aliens, Mario Farabullini and Mrs. Alla Farabullini, who arrived in New York, N. Y., on October 29, 1947, for temporary stay, shall be held and considered to be lawfully admitted as of such date to the United States for permanent residence.

Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Italy and one number from the quota for Russia for the first year that such quota numbers are available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mario Farabullini and Alla Farabullini, his wife, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LIANE LIEU AND HER SON, PETER LIEU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3154) for the relief of Mrs. Liane Lieu and her son, Peter Lieu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Liane Lieu and her son, Peter Lieu, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out beginning with line 8 down to and including the word "available" page 2, line 1, and insert "fees and head taxes: *Provided*, That there be given a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States and to all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof holding the United States and all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts, hereof harmless against Mrs. Liane Lieu becoming a public charge. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUMIKO YAMAMOTO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1151) for the relief of Sumiko Yamamoto.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That provisions of the immigration laws excluding from the United States aliens inadmissible because of race shall not apply to Sumiko Yamamoto, Japanese fiancée of Renaldo A. Barbaro, of Newark, N. J., a United States citizen serving in the United States Armed Forces. The said Sumiko Yamamoto shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months if the appropriate administrative authorities find that she is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of marrying the said Renaldo A. Barbaro and that she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. If such marriage does not occur within 3 months after her entry, the said Sumiko Yamamoto shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported under sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C., secs. 155 and 156). If such marriage does occur within such period, the Attorney General shall record the lawful admission of the said Sumiko Yamamoto to the United States for permanent residence, as of the date of her entry therein, upon payment by her of required fees and head tax.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 11, strike out "her entry therein, upon" and insert "the."

Page 2, line 12, strike out "required fees and head tax" and insert "the required visa fee and head tax."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. EMI YASUDA AND HER MINOR SON, KEICHIRO YASUDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3280) for the relief of Mrs. Emi Yasuda and her minor son, Keichiro Yasuda.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 231 (c)), which excludes from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Emi Yasuda, an American-born person of Japanese ancestry who lost her United States citizenship through voting in a Japanese election, and to her minor son, Keichiro Yasuda, and that the said Mrs. Emi Yasuda and Keichiro Yasuda may be permitted to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IVO MARKULIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3989) for the relief of Ivo Markulin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien, Ivo Markulin, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon the payment of the visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Ivo Markulin shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL FRKOVIC

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3990) for the relief of Paul Frkovic.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien, Paul Frkovic, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon the payment of the visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Paul Frkovic shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SANDRA E. DENNETT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4002) for the relief of Sandra E. Dennett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Sandra E. Dennett may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUBEN GEORGE VARGA AND MRS. ILONA VARGA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4250) for the relief of Ruben George Varga and Mrs. Ilona Varga.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Ruben George Varga and Mrs. Ilona Varga shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fees and head tax.

SEC. 2. Upon the granting of permanent residence to these aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Israeli quota and one number from the Hungarian quota for the first year that such quotas are available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Ruben George Varga and Mrs. Ilona Varga shall be held and considered to have

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA LIBRARIES

been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent resident as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIAS PAPADOPOULOS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4396) for the relief of Elias Papadopoulos.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Elias Papadopoulos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUZANNE MARIE SCHARTZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4503) for the relief of Suzanne Marie Schartz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Suzanne Marie Schartz, in religion Mother Mary Angela of the Holy Cross, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YUSUF (UASH) LAZAR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5581) for the relief of Yusuf (Uash) Lazar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Yusuf (Uash) Lazar shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. DONALD D. DUNN

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 214) to commend Mr. and Mrs. Donald D. Dunn, from the State of Washington, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Whereas the Congress and the President of the United States recognized the importance of water-resources development by enacting into the law the Reclamation Act of 1902; and

Whereas this and subsequent legislation has been the means of placing more than 6,000,000 acres of land under irrigation and installing more than 4,000,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric power on our rivers and streams; and

Whereas people everywhere in the West are joining this year in celebrating this Golden Jubilee of Reclamation; and

Whereas a principal celebration is being sponsored by the people of the Columbia Basin reclamation project and the State of Washington as a part of the golden jubilee celebration and also in honor of the first integrated operation of the great Columbia Basin reclamation project; and

Whereas Mr. Donald D. Dunn, judged the most worthy war veteran to be found in the United States, is to receive a farm fully developed and equipped, which has been provided by the people of the project as a part of the celebration; and

Whereas Mr. and Mrs. Dunn and family, displaying an earnest resolution not to let misfortune deter them from winning a stake in the land for which he fought, are typical of the strength of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That this Congress congratulate Mr. and Mrs. Dunn on the record of heroism and fortitude in the face of misfortune which has won for them this first family farm to receive irrigation water from the great pumps at Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BENCH LAKE IRRIGATION CO., HURRICANE, UTAH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7305) to authorize the sale of certain land in Utah to the Bench Lake Irrigation Co., of Hurricane, Utah.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Bench Lake Irrigation Co., of Hurricane, Utah, is hereby authorized for a period of 1 year from and after the effective date of this act to apply for the purchase of, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to convey to the irrigation company for irrigation purposes, the following-described public lands situated in Utah: West half southeast quarter of section 24, township 42 south, range 13 west, Sevier Lake meridian, embracing approximately 80 acres.

SEC. 2. That the conveyance shall be made upon the payment by the said irrigation company for the land at its reasonable appraised price of not less than $1.25 per acre, to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the conveyance hereby authorized shall not include any land covered by a valid existing right initiated under the public-land laws or found by the Secretary of the Interior to be needed for public purposes: *Provided further*, That the coal and other mineral deposits in the land shall be reserved to the United States, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under applicable laws and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "Sevier" and include "Salt."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "of" and insert "but."

Page 2, line 8, after "public", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert "purposes."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIE H. EMFINGER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1258) to authorize and direct the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Mississippi to Louie H. Emfinger.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue a patent to Louie H. Emfinger, of Meadville, Miss., subject to the conditions provided for in section 2 of this act, conveying all right, title, and interest of the United States, including mineral rights in and to the following-described tract of land situated in the State of Mississippi: The southwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 18, township 7 north, range 4 east, Washington meridian of Franklin County.

SEC. 2. The tract of land authorized to be transferred by the first section of this Act shall be conveyed upon the payment by the said Louie H. Emfinger of the appraised value of the lands, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior if payment is made within 1 year after the Secretary has notified the said Louis H. Emfinger of the appraised price of the lands. The appraised price shall not include any increased value resulting from the development or improvement of the lands by the applicant or his predecessors in interest. The patent shall contain express conditions that the oil and gas lease entered into on April 1, 1948, between the United States of America by Thomas C. Havell, Assistant Director of Bureau of Land Management, and Harry E. Koch, recorded in lease book 11, pages 139 to 145, located in the office of the chancery clerk of Franklin County, Miss., on April 27, 1948, shall continue in effect, subject to compliance with the terms and conditions set forth in such lease until terminated in accordance with the provisions thereof.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2 line 10 strike out "interest" and insert "interest, but the Secretary shall consider and give full effect to all of the equities of the applicant."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

This bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BLACKFEET INDIAN RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7302) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to the following-named persons patents in fee to certain lands allotted to them on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont.:

Fred Gerard, Jr., northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 4, township 35 north, range 12 west, Montana principal meridian, containing 40 acres.

Hazel Gerard Powers, southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 34, township 36 north, range 12 west, Montana principal meridian, containing 40 acres.

Lyda Rose Gerard Shelton, southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 4, township 35 north, range 12 west, Montana principal meridian, containing 40 acres.

James Gerard, west half of the west half of the northeast quarter of section 10, township 35 north, range 12 west, Montana principal meridian, containing 40 acres.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois.

Mr. CAMP and to include a composition by a school pupil.

Mr. MORRISON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Alabama and to include an address by Hon. Richard J. McCormick, regional adjudicator, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.

Mr. DORN.

Mr. VAN PELT and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. JENKINS (at the request of Mr. McGREGOR) to extend his own remarks on the bill H. R. 7656.

Mr. DONDERO and to include an editorial.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include an editorial.

Mrs. BOLTON and to include an address she gave on Memorial Day.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN.

Mr. WICKERSHAM and to include a statement with reference to H. R. 658.

Mr. FERNANDEZ and to include testimony he gave before the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 556. An act authorizing the transfer of certain lands in Putnam County, Fla., to the State Board of Education of Florida for the use of the University of Florida for educational purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 1086. An act for the relief of Dr. Guy Raiola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1130. An act for the relief of Ruzena Stransky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1315. An act for the relief of Mirko M. Bjelopetrovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1336. An act for the relief of Augusta Bleys, also known as Augustina Bleys; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1479. An act for the relief of Adele Frattini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1513. An act for the relief of Thorvald Nin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1707. An act for the relief of the George B. Henly Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1719. An act for the relief of Salvatore Conte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1724. An act for the relief of Elina Branlund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1740. An act for the relief of Tom Tateki Iriye; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1743. An act for the relief of Altoon Saprichian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1744. An act for the relief of Dr. Albert Haas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2067. An act for the relief of Maria Weiland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2084. An act for the relief of Mathilde Kohar Halebian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2123. An act for the relief of Peter Penovic, Milos Grahovac, and Nikola Maljkovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2229. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire, construct, operate, and maintain public airports in certain areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2308. An act for the relief of Socorro Gerona de Castro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2357. An act to provide that horticultural commodities shall be included within the term "agricultural commodities" for the purpose of the agricultural exemption for motor carriers of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2360. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to increase the amounts of securities issued by motor carriers without requiring approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2603. An act to authorize the transfer of certain lands to the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2610. An act providing that excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to certain lands that will receive a supplemental or regulated water supply from the San Luis Valley project, Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2621. An act to provide for national cemeteries in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2646. An act to cancel irrigation maintenance and operation charges on the Shoshone Indian Mission School lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3007. An act for the relief of Jimmy Lee Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3008. An act for the relief of Karen Christene Eisen Murdock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3019. An act to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to extend the application of special-inducement pay provided thereby to physicians and dentists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3195. An act granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 76. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MORANO (at the request of Mr. SEELY-BROWN), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

1952 COTTON PARITY STANDARD

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 658 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5713) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide that Low Middling seven-eighths inch cotton shall be the standard grade for the purposes of determining parity and price support for the 1952 cotton crop. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adpoted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and now yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, which you have just heard the Clerk read, provides for 2 hours of general debate on the bill, H. R. 5713, a bill introduced originally by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], one of the ablest authorities on agriculture in the Congress. The bill was reported out by the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives. I shall not take a great deal of time in discussing the merits of the bill. That will be done by members of the committee. I do, however, want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture, due to the world situation and the turmoil that exists, and the economic conditions of the world, has called upon the farmers of America to redouble their efforts in this time of stress to produce more than they have heretofore produced. Among other things, the Secretary has called upon the farmers of America to increase sharply their production of cotton, a material that is one of the bulwarks of our economy and one of the great necessities in the economy of the entire world. In other words, in this time of world stress we have called upon the cotton

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LIBRARIES

producing farmers of the Nation to produce in excess of the production heretofore in this country.

There is, as the membership knows, a support price for cotton under the agricultural program. This price is based upon middling seven-eighths-inch cotton as the standard for the purposes of parity and price support.

This bill does simply one thing: it would change the standards from middling seven-eighths to low middling seven-eighths for the purpose of parity support.

The purpose of the bill, in brief, is to accentuate that production that the Secretary of Agriculture has said is necessary to give the farmer not only the incentive but some protection in this larger production. It is a well-known fact in the cotton-growing regions that when the normal crop is produced under the normal condition of labor supply and harvesting this cotton can be harvested in a normal and business-like manner. However, when larger production is called for and is produced it requires more labor and a longer time to harvest. It is also a recognized fact in the production of cotton that the longer the cotton remains in the field after maturing, subject to the hazards of weather conditions, the lower the grade of cotton which is finally harvested. Therefore the farmers of America who produce cotton are confronted with a situation where they are called upon to produce several million bales more of cotton than they have heretofore produced and notwithstanding the fact we are faced with a shortage of labor. They must have some assurance that if they make this larger production in response to the demands of national defense and in line with the Secretary's request, they will not be called upon alone to bear the risk. We know as a matter of fact that in all of the defense programs when contracts are entered into with industrial organizations those contracts are written so that the industrial producer is protected. This bill would do the same thing for the cotton farmer; it would require the Government to share the risk with the farmer as it now does in the case of industrial production.

There is one important feature of this matter I would like to mention before I conclude and that is that this bill does not go into effect and cannot become effective until the Secretary of Agriculture after crop reports are in determines that the goal may be reached; in other words, it would not be effective unless the Secretary of Agriculture came to the conclusion from a survey of the cotton crops that the quota was going to be made. This is a bill that does simple justice to the cotton farmer in the light of the request of the Secretary of Agriculture to meet this situation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I shall be glad to yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. TABER. The report itself shows that the cotton crop was estimated last year at 17,000,000 bales and that it actually turned out to be 15,000,000. Under those circumstances if we pass this bill we are trusting the Secretary of Agriculture to do something that he overdid very decidedly last year, and it sounds like a very peculiar approach.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman from New York realizes, of course, as do I and every other Member of Congress, that in the enactment of any legislation of this type there must be certain duties and discretion left to the administrative officer who in this case is the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I would like to say that the gentleman from New York has pointed out one of the objectives of this particular legislation. It was the position of members of the Committee on Agriculture from the cotton-growing areas that the crop-reporting board could have avoided the mistake they made in the large estimate if they had made an earnest effort so to do. This legislation will absolutely require him to do it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. COLMER. Does the gentleman wish me to yield to him for a question?

Mr. TABER. No; I think we ought to have a quorum present.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his point of order to permit me to present a conference report?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I withhold the point of order.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. CANNON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6947) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 7005) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

CONSENT TO INSERT STATEMENT

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to insert in the RECORD of today at the point where the bill H. R. 1490 was considered on the Private Calendar remarks with reference to the purpose of the bill and to include a resolution of the Polish-American Citizenship Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I insist on my point of order.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, June 4, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON: Committee of conference. H. R. 6947. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2017). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 8073. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the establishment of the Herald Tribune Fresh Air Fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOOD of Georgia:

H. R. 8074. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in order to protect the national health and safety against the consequences of certain labor-management disputes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. J. Res. 472. Joint resolution to assist the Polycultural Institution of America in expanding further its program and activities for the purpose of promoting universal understanding, justice, and permanent peace, to assist such institution in providing for its permanent plant and equipment in the Nation's Capital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD of Georgia:

H. J. Res. 473. Joint resolution to advise the President of the United States concerning the will of Congress respecting the labor dispute in the basic steel manufacturing industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 8075. A bill for the relief of Hannelore Mayerl Fulbright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 8076. A bill for the relief of Kazimierz Budzynski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 8077. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Topol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 8078. A bill for the relief of Ichiro Iida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1, of rule XXII,

750. Mrs. ST. GEORGE presented a petition in opposition to the advertisement of alcoholic beverages on the highways, in the press, and on the radio and television, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 4, 1952

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in the beauty of the world we find Thy footprints leading on to hilltops of vision; in the goodness of human hearts, like fragrant lilies, midst the murky swamps of evil, Thy holiness breathes upon us; in truth, though crushed to earth for an hour, yet ever rising triumphantly over falsehood and pretense, Thou dost put into our hands the keys for every prison house of the spirit. May all the factors of destiny be weaving in us the tapestry of a great character strong enough to stand the strain of these testing days. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 3, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1258) to authorize and direct the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Mississippi to Louie H. Emfinger, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7340) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FALLON, Mr. TRIMBLE, Mr. DEMPSEY, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. DONDERO, Mr. MCGREGOR, and Mr. ANGELL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1092. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mercedes Hernandez Saguar;

H. R. 1151. An act for the relief of Sumiko Yamamoto;

H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of Henryk Kramarski;

H. R. 2166. An act for the relief of Sister Anita (Vincenzina Di Franco);

H. R. 2405. An act for the relief of Food Service of Evansville, Inc.;

H. R. 2661. An act for the relief of Mario Farabullini and Alia Farabullini, his wife;

H. R. 3154. An act for the relief of Mrs. Liane Lieu and her son, Peter Lieu;

H. R. 3211. An act for the relief of the Alma Cooperative Equity Exchange, Alma, Nebr., and others;

H. R. 3280. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emi Yasuda and her minor son, Keichiro Yasuda;

H. R. 3727. An act for the relief of the Professional Arts Building Corp.;

H. R. 3989. An act for the relief of Ivo Markulin;

H. R. 3990. An act for the relief of Paul Frkovic;

H. R. 4002. An act for the relief of Sandra E. Dennett;

H. R. 4250. An act for the relief of Ruben George Varga and Mrs. Ilona Varga;

H. R. 4396. An act for the relief of Elias Papadopoulos;

H. R. 4503. An act for the relief of Suzanne Marie Schartz;

H. R. 5004. An act for the relief of Terminal Warehouse Co.;

H. R. 5006. An act for the relief of Gallagher's Warehouses, Inc.;

H. R. 5095. An act for the relief of the estate of Edward B. Formanek, deceased;

H. R. 5515. An act for the relief of John H. Vogel;

H. R. 5581. An act for the relief of Yusuf (Uash) Lazar;

H. R. 6761. An act for the relief of William Kipf and Darold D. Selk;

H. R. 7241. An act to authorize payment to the Empire District Electric Co. for reasonable costs of protecting its Ozark Beach power plant from the backwater of Bull Shoals Dam;

H. R. 7302. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation; and

H. R. 7305. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Utah to the Bench Lake Irrigation Co., of Hurricane, Utah.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 214) to commend Mr. and Mrs. Donald D. Dunn, from the State of Washington, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1822. An act to amend the act creating a juvenile court for the District of Columbia, approved March 19, 1906, as amended;

S. 2721. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation;

H. R. 156. An act to repeal the Alaska railroads tax;

H. R. 654. An act for the relief of Ivo Cerne;

H. R. 696. An act to authorize the President of the United States to present the Distinguished Flying Cross to Col. Roscoe Turner;

H. R. 975. An act for the relief of Sarah A Davies;

H. R. 1099. An act for the relief of the estate of Cobb Nichols;

H. R. 1162. An act for the relief of Kaiko Sugimote (Kay Fair) and her minor children;

H. R. 1428. An act for the relief of Claude Foranda;

H. R. 1960. An act for the relief of Erika Nicolo and her minor child;

H. R. 2303. An act for the relief of Sisters Maria Salerno, Eufrasisa Binotto, Maria Ballatore, and Giovanna Buziol;

H. R. 2307. An act for the relief of Jean (John) Plewniak and Anna Piotrowska Plewniak;

H. R. 2346. An act for the relief of Odette Louise Tirman;

H. R. 2587. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jeannette Thorn Pease;

H. R. 2628. An act for the relief of the George H. Soffel Co.;

H. R. 2784. An act for the relief of Fumiko Higa;

H. R. 2841. An act for the relief of Yai Wing Lee;

H. R. 2902. An act for the relief of Thomas E. Bell;

H. R. 2903. An act for the relief of Mimi Fong and her children, Sing Lee and Lily;

H. R. 2920. An act for the relief of Priscilla Ogden Dickerson Gilison de la Fregonniere;

H. R. 3070. An act for the relief of Giovanni Rinaldo Bottini;

H. R. 3124. An act for the relief of Mehmet Salih Topcuoglu;

H. R. 3132. An act for the relief of Sister Apolonia Gerarda Sokolowska;

H. R. 3152. An act for the relief of Mrs. Setsuyo Sumida;

H. R. 3561. An act for the relief of Mary Osadchy;

H. R. 3572. An act for the relief of Ying Chee Jung;

H. R. 3732. An act for the relief of Stephan Joseph Horvath and Lucas Albert Horvath;

H. R. 3953. An act for the relief of Chan Toy Har;

H. R. 4152. An act for the relief of Ann Tobak and John Tobak;

H. R. 4492. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Norma J. Roberts, a minor;

H. R. 4790. An act for the relief of Helga Richter;

H. R. 4801. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue certain bonds for flood-control purposes;

H. R. 4802. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue certain public improvement bonds;

H. R. 4923. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue certain bonds for the construction of the Kalihi tunnel and its approach roads;

H. R. 5071. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the county of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, to issue public improvement bonds for the construction of flood-control projects on Iao stream;

H. R. 5072. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the county of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, to issue public improvement bonds for the construction of new public-school buildings;

H. R. 5121. An act for the relief of Felix Navedo-Merced and Carmen Ramos-Baez;

H. R. 5145. An act for the relief of Tsutake Kuroki Masuda;

H. R. 5386. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation of the Territory of Hawaii, to issue bonds for acquisition of real property for public-school purposes and for construction and replacement of buildings for public-school purposes;

H. R. 5753. An act for the relief of Bernard J. Keogh;

H. R. 5805. An act for the relief of Patricia Lauretta Pray;

H. R. 5956. An act for the relief of Ingeborg and Anna Lukas;

H. R. 5958. An act for the relief of Pauline W. Goodyear;

H. R. 5976. An act for the relief of Michiko Nakashima;

H. R. 5984. An act for the relief of Jimmy Doguta (also known as Jimmy Blagg);

H. R. 6265. An act for the relief of Marian Diane Delphine Sachs;

H. R. 6314. An act for the relief of Kiko Oshiro;

H. R. 6675. An act to authorize the conveyance of lands in the Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation to the State of California or to the Hoopa Unified School District for use for school purposes;

H. R. 6848. An act for the relief of Sharon Elaine Frankovich;

H. R. 6922. An act to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, so as to extend the benefits of such section to certain colleges in the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 7188. An act to provide that the additional tax imposed by section 2470 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code shall not apply in respect of coconut oil produced in, or produced from materials grown in, the Territory of the Pacific Islands; and

H. R. 7593. An act to amend paragraph 1774, section 201, title II, of the Tariff Act of 1930.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (S. DOC. NO. 142)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations, in the amount of $469,687,000, for the Department of Defense, fiscal year 1953, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1268. A bill for the relief of Panaiotis Nicurezos (Rept. No. 1628);

S. 1454. A bill for the relief of Walter Koels (Rept. No. 1629);

S. 1946. A bill for the relief of Erich Anton Helfert (Rept. No. 1630);

S. 1947. A bill for the relief of Felix Kortschak (Rept. No. 1631);

S. 2249. A bill for the relief of Biancamaria Cori (Rept. No. 1632);

S. 2277. A bill for the relief of Nicholas J. and Elizabeth Miura (Rept. No. 1633);

S. 2289. A bill for the relief of Michiko Okuda (Rept. No. 1634);

S. 2313. A bill for the relief of Hsieh Ta-Chuan or Der Ott-Kuan (Rept. No. 1635);

S. 2528. A bill for the relief of George Tus (Rept. No. 1636);

S. 2630. A bill for the relief of Mary Fox (Rept. No. 1637);

S. 2637. A bill for the relief of Peter Rousetos, also known as Panagiotis Roussetos, also known as Panagiotis Roussetos Metritikas (Rept. No. 1638);

S. 3032. A bill for the relief of Bonnie Jean MacLean (Rept. No. 1639);

S. 3056. A bill for the relief of William R. Jackson (Rept. No. 1640);

S. 3132. A bill for the relief of Jun Miyata (Rept. No. 1641);

H. R. 812. A bill for the relief of Karel Vaclav Malinovsky (Rept. No. 1642);

H. R. 885. A bill for the relief of Heinrich von Biel, Margarethe von Biel, and Doris Schumann (Rept. No. 1643);

H. R. 966. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Solveig Normanson (Rept. No. 1644);

H. R. 1690. A bill for the relief of Carl M. Campbell, James R. White, and Frederick J. Powers (Rept. No. 1645);

H. R. 2296. A bill for the relief of Mother Anna Fasulo (Rept. No. 1646);

H. R. 2413. A bill for the relief of the Kloman Instrument Co., Inc. (Rept. No. 1647);

H. R. 2510. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Beverly Brunell Roth (Rept. No. 1648);

H. R. 3155. A bill for the relief of Sebastiano Bello, Dino Bianchi, Pierino Ciccarese, Vincenzo Dall' Alda, Vittorio De Gasperi, Salvatore Puggioni, Giovanni Battista Volpato, and Leone Montini (Rept. No. 1649);

H. R. 3534. A bill for the relief of Gabriella Rubido Zichy (Rept. No. 1650);

H. R. 3616. A bill for the relief of the Pacific Fruit Express Co. (Rept. No. 1651);

H. R. 4067. A bill for the relief of Samuel Thomas Wong (Rept. No. 1652);

H. R. 4070. A bill for the relief of Isabelle F. Story (Rept. No. 1653);

H. R. 5208. A bill for the relief of Sor Eufrasia Gomez Gallego, Sor Francisca Gil Martinez, and Sor Rosalia De La Maza (Rept. No. 1654);

H. R. 5479. A bill for the relief of the estate of Floyd L. Greenwood (Rept. No. 1655);

H. R. 5759. A bill for the relief of Chizuko Nakagami (Rept. No. 1656);

H. R. 5957. A bill for the relief of Veronica Merita Ritson (Rept. No. 1657);

H. R. 6023. A bill for the relief of Fred Augustus Snead, Jr. (Rept. No. 1658);

H. R. 6231. A bill for the relief of Gordon Uglow (Rept. No. 1659);

H. R. 6259. A bill to authorize the admission of Wong Ng Chin Chun to the United States (Rept. No. 1660); and

H. R. 6264. A bill for the relief of Louis R. Chadbourne (Rept. No. 1661).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 732. A bill for the relief of certain Basque aliens (Rept. No. 1662);

S. 808. A bill for the relief of Sisters Adelaide Canelas and Maria Isabel Franco (Rept. No. 1663);

S. 1577. A bill for the relief of Constantinous Tzortzis (Rept. No. 1664);

S. 2074. A bill for the relief of Robert Lee William (Rept. No. 1665);

H. R. 3600. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alexander Symeonidis (Rept. No. 1666); and

H. R. 5687. A bill for the relief of Peter Mihaly Berend (Rept. No. 1667).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 709. A bill for the relief of Stephen A. Spilios (Rept. No. 1668);

S. 1127. A bill for the relief of William T. Kreh, Sr. (Rept. No. 1669); and

S. 2487. A bill to permit judicial review of decisions of Government contracting officers involving questions of fact arising under Government contracts in cases other than those in which fraud is alleged (Rept. No. 1670).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 326. Resolution to investigate problems connected with emigration of refugees from Western European nations; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1671); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration; and

H. Con. Res. 191. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; with amendments (Rept. No. 1672).

By Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2115. A bill to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1674).

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution, and I submit a report (No. 1673) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 81) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-6196857, Ho, Kwo Mo.

A-6382891, Ho, Yu Hu.

A-6382892, Ho, Mai-Li.

A-6382893, Ho, Min-We.

A-6097798, Kaneko, Kakuaki.

A-6143970, Kaneko, Otari.

A-7251808, Kapsouris, Nikolas Giorgios.

A-5891900, Barone, Alfonso.

A-6552336, Johanson, Mary Ann or Christine Mary Johanson or Mary Ann Lander or Mary Ann Blythe or Mary Ann Levy.

A-1712752, Koumlikis, George or Georgios or George Koukis.

A-6041640, Lozano-Luna, Maximiano.

A-7145267, Ramos de Garcia, Rosa, formerly Rosa Ramos de Villalobos and Rosa Ramos.

A-4099428, Bertonasco, Delfina Virginia.

A-4572678, Casademont, Enrique or Enrique Deulonder Xasademont or Henry Casademont.

A-3430025, Dentamaro, Antonio.

A-6026525, Feng, Tsuan Hua.

A-1678372, Fredriksson, Lajha Lydia or Lajha Frederickson or Fredriksson.

A-6550914, Friedman, Pesle Babinovieicz.

A-6341322, Friedman, Vilem Kahn.

A-7476108, Godinez, Francisco Lopez.

A-6771337, Honigsfeld, Jacob (Jacub or Jakub) or Honingsfeld.

A-6771340, Honigsfeld, Sala (nee Grupsmith).

A-6851700, Jui, Oong or John Jue.

A-7197805, Jui, Shu Yi (nee Shy Yi Chang).

A-6343406, Ling, Charles Cho-Sung.

A-6848586, Ling, Ruth Jin-Heng Kao.

A-7269595, Liu, Charlotte Chih-Hwa Tsui.
A-6849835, Liu, Oscar Chun.
A-6556385, Chien, I-Nien.
A-6848064, Chien, Yen-Lin Liu.
A-4669706, Cia, Elisa Andrea.
A-7423209, Coy, Jung, alias Barrie Snow.
A-6851498, Dai, Victor Shenyu.
A-5484248, Ford, Joshua N., also known as Joshua Ford and Charles Ford.
A-5447993, Gliesche, Willy.
A-5407264, Goebel, Walter Ernest August.
A-2288509, Juhar, Louis Frank.
A-7596073, Kovacs, Jeanette.
A-1991429, Lamela, Joseph Formosa or Jose Formoso Lamela, alias Manuel P. La Mela.
A-5053864, Maahs, Emil.
A-3362967, Martinez, Antonio Maria Lopez or Antonio Lopez.
A-3440298, Moy, Chang Sue.
A-4223769, Muza, Elizabeth or Elizabeth Coyle or Elibieta Muza.
A-1267361, Satas, Anthony.
A-4635329, Singh, Ram or Munsy.
A-4689213, Siwy, William Wenas or Amad Bin Hussein.
A-7132841, Ternullo, Sarina (nee Sarina Albano).
A-2868900, Tseo, Josepha Shu Hwa.
A-4674788, Venieris, Demetrios Alexandros or James Venieris.
A-1384799, Zapata de Duran, Faviana.
A-4763258, Alabacis, Antonio or Andon Alabacoff.
A-4183648, Beato, Edward or Eduardo or Eduardo Pedro Beato or Eduardo P. Bernal.
A-7967823, Beato, Esther Flora (nee Hernandez-Valdes).
A-3402784, De Silva, David Gomes or Mancel or Manuel Augusto Ferreira Malaquias.
A-4483910, Dezsofi, Sylvia Solal or Sylvia Dessy (nee Sylvia Camille Solal).
A-3117380, Fazel, Mongu or Mongu Khan or Mongu (Mongoo) Kahn and Kahn Mongu.
A-5601788, Gutaj, Wladyslaw or Walter Guttofsky or Henry Borecki or Henry Guttofsky or Henry Gutaj or Henry Walter Guttofsky or Wladyslaw Butak.
A-2460825, Hernandez-Marquez Felipe.
A-7607791, Hikind, Frida.
A-6707432, Hikind, Majer.
A-6924608, Hoffman, Aron.
A-6017669, Hu, Ho Sheng.
A-6083911, Hu, Jui Chen (nee Hsu).
A-4180044, Jee, Wong Ding, Wong Ting Chi, Wong Kit, Wong Long Hip, Wong Gock Git, Wong Dock Mong, Gook Git, Wong Lai Hip.
A-2111328, Jelenco, Katherine or Jelenko.
A-7174612, Lee, Hoy Chen or Shue Mon Lee or Hoy Lee or Shew Mang.
A-6954786, Lightenstein, Eva (nee Lightenstein).
A-6794748, Lightenstein, Juda.
A-7539779, Ling, Julia Kuo-Fang alias Julia Agnes Ling-Ling Kuo Fang.
A-6730663, Liu, Yen Chueh or Josephine Liu Yen (nee Liu Chueh).
A-4575992, McGowan, John Joseph.
A-4206663, Moser, Daniel Edwin.
A-3780185, Ni, Ernest In-Hsin or In-Hain Ni, alias Ying Hein Ni or Ni Ni Hsing.
A-7632240, Ni, Katherine Kao or Katherine Chun Chun Kao.
A-6635618, Oliveras, Edita or Crisologo.
A-4237553, Ozawa, Tsuneo or Tuneo Ozawa.
A-5887193, Panouskis, John Demou.
A-2634579, Plohs, Erich Ernst or Erich Ernst Ploss.
A-7064180, Reiss, Gertrude.
A-5799529, Scott, Thomas Walker.
A-4373329, Von Mathe, Johannes.
A-2694988, Badali, Clifford James Dunlop.
A-3021157, Badali, Joseph Chamberlain.
A-5177121, Bain, Peter, also known as Peter Beneaz or Panagiotis Beneaz.
A-1875416, Bauernfeind, Josefa.
A-3966816, Camponeschi, Antonina Colapaoli or Antonina Pittori or Angela Colapaoli Pittori or Angela C. Colapaoli.
A-6848475, Chang, Mei-Yum (Rose Fei).
A-6428100, Chen, Ching-Hsiang.
A-6428101, Chen, Yu-Yung Li.
A-4031450, Danzo, Sally Mello.
A-4973660, Draht, Emil.
A-1228392, Fang, Chao Ying.
A-1228389, Fang, Lien Che-Tu.
A-2100147, Gee, Myra Pui-Lan Chan or Myra Pui-Lan Chan.
A-6471817, Giocarinis, Kinon Theodore.
A-5223655, Gomes, Manuel Pereira.
A-3642362, Grinoff, Zachari.
A-4477781, Harding, Thomas Sargent.
A-7049762, Hines, Mabel Angelina Gordon.
A-7202557, Hoffman, Ruzena.
A-6497649, Langer, Zmira.
A-6667187, Langer, Moses Isaak.
A-7809301, Lee, Da-Tsien Tsu.
A-5275376, Lee, Tsung Chi.
A-2075626, Loh, Cheng Shan.
A-6306141, Nunno, Angelo.
A-5515615, Pennanen, Rose Anne (nee Carpentier) or Cecile Brown.
A-6401861, Sakellariadis, Christos Sypeos.
A-4010952, Schultz, Willy Carl.
A-3350274, Tsang, Sin.
A-3293391, Zettl, George Stefan.
A-3293409, Zettl, Marie Tresa.
A-2370115, Baharas, Maralambos or Harry Barras.
A-4163586, Burt, Morris or Moishe Berterinsky.
A-5815116, Bunger, Herman.
A-6825309, Casareo, Giuseppe.
A-7975634, Chang, Shue Wem Yeh.
A-7096061, Dengiz, Fikret.
A-7197554, Fodor, Elizabeth (nee Mitterbach).
A-7197555, Fodor, Stephen or Istvan Etienne Fodor.
A-7002683, Galisky, Albert or Albert Joseph Galisky.
A-1218184, Healy, Patrick.
A-7050467, Hernandez, Francisco.
A-4506846, Inouye, Tasaburo.
A-4813778, Levitt, Mortimer or Max Levitt or Morty Levitt.
A-7130218, Martinez, Irene.
A-7130216, Martinez, Juana.
A-7130217, Martinez, Severiano.
A-7130987, Martinez-Martinez, Arturo.
A-6964605, Ming, Fu En or En Ming Fu or Fu En Ming Cheng.
A-3800541, Sagi, Mihajlo or Mihaly Sagi or Mihailo Sagi.
A-5515787, Schwartz, Fred Hellmuth (Fritz Hellmuth Schwartz).
A-7841636, Sfikas, Panagiotis or Pfikos or Sfigas.
A-5746267, Smith, Rennie.
A-5950762, Sourvanos, Spvridos or Spyridos Sourvandos or Spryiday Sourvayos or Speros Sourvanos.
A-3124841, Spithogiannis, Elias or George Livanos or Elias Spethogiannis.
A-3199325, Tauber, Irene or Irene Rosenberg or Irene Link or Irene Chumbley.
A-5925688, Temelcovich, George Stoyan, also known as George Stevens and Joseph Anthony.
A-3552409, Tim, Joe or Tom.
A-4738293, Venier, Victor Volvero.
A-7032653, Welsch, Elizabeth (nee Dinger).
A-4386026, Welsch, Nikolaus.
A-4673268, Jager, Elizabeth (nee Welsch).
A-7512689, Yang, Yin Chang.
A-3887584, Yuen, Loy or Yuen Loy or Yen Loy.
A-2817827, Zung, Fong Yu Sun.
A-7016074, Zung, Tse Kwai Thomas.
A-6554479, Andrianopoulos, Apostolos Konstantine.
A-4535422, Barbaresos, Stefanos Constantinos.
A-7463934, Bonilla, Rafael Gavilanes.
A-2602878, Brindle, Doreen or Dora Brindle.
A-3514333, Cadiente-Cabarloc, Gaspar or Gaspar Cabarloc Cadiente.
A-7222533, Cheng, Tom or Tom Emile Cheng.
A-6151562, Cochrane, James or Hamish.
A-6647069, Damon, Dorothy Emily, formerly Tibbetts (nee Drew).
A-6647070, Damon, Dexter Grant.
A-6647071, Damon, Ronald John.
A-7240670, Esparza-Olisaba, Ebaristo.
A-4522822, Ferguson, Sarah Hirt.
A-7240382, Georgoulopoulos, Jean Ant. or John Anthony Georgoulopoulos.
A-7375876, Hernandez, Jose.
A-6805610, Lichtig, Chawa (nee Chawa Gotlib).
A-6805614, Lichtig, Owi Majer.
A-7290163, Maris, Demetrios Konstantinos also known as James Marie.
A-7828966, Matiatos, Zacharias.
A-7576490, Matsukata, Mari.
A-6703629, Poggi, Andrew Dennis.
A-5524452, Sideris, Sideris Dimitrious.
A-2884417, Simon, Martin.
A-6704055, Ancheta, Fred Siazon.
A-7560721, Chao, Lo Hui or Nelson Hui Chao Lo.
A-6622743, Chronopoulos, Peter John.
A-7560596, Chow, Wen Mou.
A-6591973, Diamantopoulos, Socrates Athanasiou.
A-4914119, Hyndman, Richard Louis.
A-7809534, Jimenez-Ponce, Refugio.
A-9764775, Meah, Sona.
A-6880819, Papaelias, Emmanuel Louis.
A-7095000, Samonas, Evangelos.
A-7140300, Yan, Ng, Ng Tut, Ng Sam, Ng Dat Sam, Dar Sam.
A-6243922, Zwierzchowski, Alexander Antoine.
A-3135560, Beltran De Trujillo, Elena or Maneula Martinez.
A-7058995, Brooks, Eric Vincent.
A-5731311, Chang, Mildred Yuhua.
A-7423200, Clark, Ruth Viola or Ruth Viola Kiesow.
A-7583911, Fung, Fung Yuen.
A-7050419, Gasparis, Stanley or Efstratios Gasparis.
A-4760208, Marlun, Charles Hamilton or Charles Hamilton or Mar Lun or Lun Mar.
A-7483662, Pires, Eduardo or Eddie Pires.
A-9134073, Tak, Lum.
A-6501673, Bider, Fanny or Fanny Niederhoffer.
A-1437617, Bouche, Edward Adolf.
A-6383747, Calyvopoulos, Alexander Demetre.
A-9670886, Chapero, Americo or Americo Chapero y Escribano.
A-7841592, Chapman, James Austin or Chappie alias Croney.
A-7934945, Courtois, Cyril.
A-7476842, Creque, Leo Adelbert.
A-5778137, Cunning, Helena (nee McCampfield).
A-4614561, Cunningham, Mary Gladys (nee Mary Gladys Lahey).
A-4614562, Cunningham, Richard John.
A-5765012, Delangy, Joseph Philip or Alfred Parent.
A-6726830, De Organista, Baltazar Benita or Benita Baltazar de Romo.
A-4332736, De Valenzuela, Maria Felix or Maria Felix De Garcia.
A-7130699, Equihua-Gallego, Jose.
A-1369494, Escobedo-Carrillo or Jose E. Carrillo.
A-4875957, Ferenci, Rose.
A-5702749, Ferraro, Modesto Nicola.
A-6838830, Flores, Antonio Martinez.
A-6878621, Generalis, Savas.
A-5152035, Goldstein, Leib or Leb or Louis Goldstein or Benny Greenberg.
A-6686157, Gonzalez-Lopez, Ismael.
A-5418058, Gonzalez-Ybarba, Roberto.
A-2258286, Green, Lloyd or Lloyd Seburn.
A-5363172, Guerra, Ramon.
A-5881095, Gumbs, David Wilson.
A-7866943, Harrison, Mary Louise (nee Midford).
A-5470742, Hodge, Lillian Agatha or Lillian Agatha Todman.
A-7127881, Jaramillo, Manuel or Manuel Jaramillo-Alvarez.
A-7127882, Jaramillo, Carlos Manuel.
A-7127883, Jaramillo, Carlota.
A-7127884, Jaramillo, Tranquilino.
A-7130219, Lerma, Agustin.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

A-7130207, Lerma, Manuel or Manuel Linna-Elias.
A-7130205, Lerma-Guerrero, Valepte.
A-7083364, Lujan, Pedro.
A-2084132, Maravilla, Jose Luis or Jose Luis Maravilla-Mendez.
A-4416088, Montelongo-Valdez, Antonio or Antonio V. Montelongo.
A-7050963, Nunez, Herlinda.
A-7050962, Nunez, Trinidad or Trinidad Nunez-Sanchez.
A-6935829, Perez, Vicente.
A-6639079, Pulido-Heredia, Manuel.
A-9777264, Quoy, Lee or Lee Quey or Quoy Lee or Quey Lee.
A-5657087, Rosales-Morones, Tomas.
A-6031803, Salazar-Balli, Fidencio.
A-7203576, Tritsarolis, Dimitrios.
A-7809285, Vourvoulas, Evangelos or Evangelos Bourboulois.
A-9125432, Anthanasidias, Nicolaos.
A-9799631, Carvounnis, John.
A-4203501, Cederholm, Axel Hugo.
A-7240213, Freire, Ildefonso Henrique, Jr.
A-9825161, Garcia, Antonio or Antonio Garcia Vasquez.
A-9825373, Glykis, Dionysios or Dennis Glykis.
A-4289793, Kutsay, Ali Umit.
A-6626121, Ling, Wen Sze-Yung alias Sze Yung Wen.
A-7144642, Lopez-Becerra, Jesus.
A-7118314, Martinez-Moreno, Jose.
A-7140261, Ortiz, Carlos or Carlos Ortiz Martinez.
A-6904342, Outor, Carolino Dos Santos.
A-7415959, Robinson, Vincent.
A-7140260, Robledo, Jesus or Jesus Robledo-Rosas.
A-5168538, Brett, Alfred George.
A-7483112, Canelopoulos, Philippe or Philip or Kanellos or Kanel Lopoulos.
A-1333078, Carreon, Miguel.
A-5691467, Daly, Catherine Mary (nee Buttress) or Catherine Mary Wirth.
A-5471818, Daly, Florence Marie.
A-5648204, Daly, Maurice D.
A-7035975, Daly, Raymond John.
A-6880219, Da Rosa, Alberto Machado.
A-6840085, Favela, Roberto.
A-7249845, Lobato, Margarita.
A-7070747, Lobato, Pablo or Pablo Lobato Holguin.
A-6079330, Rendon-Gomez, Celestino.
A-6781221, Rendon, Josefina Tejeda De.
A-1368040, Rissanen, Juho Vilho.
A-6067724, Rodrigues-Jaramillo, Juan.
A-7203062, Saenz, Raul, Jr.
A-7203064, Saenz, Raul or Raul Saenz-Reyes.
A-7203063, Saenz, Maria Elena.
A-1019172, Sanci, Francesco Antonio.
A-9765067, Scarimbolo, Antonio.
A-9825338, Statas, Stephen or Efstathios Svaliotis.
A-6961078, Tabares, Pedro.
A-6009882, Taylor, Dorothy Lenor or Dorothy Lenor Nelson.
A-6815645, Tellez-Bautista, Magdaleno or Antonio Ponce Bautista.
A-6101593, Valdez-Serla, Pedro or Pedro Serla Valdez.
A-6743352, Villa-Zaragoza, Florentino.
A-7189313, Adractas, John Spiridon or Ioannis Spiridons Adrahtas.
A-7127875, Aguilar-Miramontes, Gabriel Aguilar Gabriel.
A-7363328, Aleman-Jurado, Carlos.
A-6100780, Avila-Rodriguez, Venustiano.
A-5938356, Esquivel, Raul or Raul Esquivel Maria Valencia or Maria Valencia Raul Esquivel.
A-7188720, Fernandez, Enrique Nunez or Enrique Nunez.
A-7188721, Nunez, Ester.
A-7188722, Nunez, Rogelio.
A-7398968, Gruber, Fitz Albert, also known as Herman Woods.
A-7203609, Hernandez, Calisto.
A-7203608, Hernandez, Francisco or Francisco Hernandez-Villa.
A-6590595, Kanalos, William Z. or Vassillios Zacharias Kaneliopoulos.
A-8015825, Koutsis, Kosmas.
A-7070050, Lerma, Dario or Dario Lerma-Elias.
A-7398908, Melendez-Cano, Davis.
A-7127892, Pena-Quintero, Jose or Joe Pena.
A-7079668, Perros, Constantinos.
A-7728277, Rodriguez, Soledad (nee Murga-Yanez) or Soledad Murga De Munez.
A-7728278, Murga, Leticia Virginia.
A-6630043, Roman, Juan Haro.
A-8001110, Rubio-Soto, Marcela.
A-7390672, Sapien-Zendejas, Jose.
A-7189636, Silva, Carlos Ramirez or Enrique Romo.
A-7367098, Stratis, Ioannis A. or John Anthony Stratis.
A-7421515, Tagonui, Sarah Vitalis (nee Vitalis).
A-7127897, Valles, Virginia, or Valles De Garica Virginia.
A-7130526, Zapien, Gabriel Morales.
A-7415450, Arvizu-Gutierrez, Cesar.
A-7050079, Balandran-Aguirre, Pablo.
A-6015255, Bertot, Antonio Eduardo y Barcelo or Antonio Bertot or Antonio Bertot E. or Antonio Edwardo y Barcelo.
A-6763048, De Bogarin, Maria Cecilia or Maria Cecilia Gomez.
A-6763049, Bogarin-Gomez, Jesus.
A-6763051, Bogarin-Gomez, Alejandrina.
A-6856292, De Joux, Solange.
A-6763050, Bogarin-Gomez, Aurora.
A-9553437, Dos Santos, Christovan Bispo.
A-5971686, George, Constantia Adina.
A-7048901, Golabek, Michel.
A-7203095, Gonzalez, Ruperto.
A-1392411, Gulabovich, Christo Naumoff or Gulabovic or Christ Nick.
A-7140080, Gurrola, Maria Elena.
A-7140081, Gurrola, Lorenzo.
A-6764906, Hernadi, Ernest or Erno Herskovits.
A-6241051, Hsiung, Chuan-Chih.
A-6403553, Hsiung, Wen-Chin.
A-6027122, Hsu, Hsien Liang also known as Harry Liang Hsu.
A-4075039, Karaiskos, Evangelos Michael.
A-7140423, Krojnik, Andrej.
A-7140424, Krojnik, Nina (nee Mandel).
A-2747074, Kusalo, Ivo Pero or John Peter Kusalo.
A-6773650, Lesieutre, Leontine Edith (nee Courtin).
A-6773651, Lesieutre, Colette Regine.
A-6736262, Lesieutre, Jean Marcel.
A-6736263, Lesieutre, George Pierre.
A-6736264, Lesieutre, Gisele Edith.
A-6736261, Lesieutre, Rene Charles.
A-6982867, Liao, Hsiano Peng.
A-6555831, Liu, Daisy Da-Si.
A-6702177, Liu, Yong-Chi or Robert Chi Liu.
A-6305775, Martinez-Esquivel, Santos or Martin Carrion-Garcia.
A-7371888, Menendez, Jose Lopez.
A-7371889, Menendez, Rosalia Lopez.
A-6048010, Munoz, Manuel.
A-71401177, Munoz, Virginia.
A-6985634, Noriega, Santos or Ramon Orona or Santos Ortiz Noriega.
A-5995490, Ortiz, Baltazar.
A-5266296, Ortizian, Christos Nicholas.
A-6153182, Ozaki, Kuniaki.
A-6153184, Ozaki, Motoichi.
A-6154183, Ozaki, Tamiye.
A-6634383, Racioppi, Francesco.
A-6771408, Racioppi, Liliana (nee De Nubbis).
A-7222474, Sandoval-Pinon, Andres.
A-9732170, Sing Tai.
A-9626742, Sotelo, Manuel Mayorga or Manuel-Mayorga.
A-6606306, Staley, Galina or Gala Zebero.
A-9097697, Tuominen, Anna.
A-6258445, Urdal, Jan.
A-7858040, Valadez-Villalobos, Raymundo or Raymundo Valadez-Miradores.
A-7222277, Valdez, Maria Ester, de la Vega or Ester Valdez-Munoz.
A-7222750, Valenzuela, Maria Encarnacion Aranda de.
A-7222751, Valenzuela-Aranda, Nicholas.
A-6750582, Valles-Rosales, Ysidro.
A-7491367, Varela, Jesus Tena.
A-7243059, Velona, Anna Violi Bonavolonta (nee Violi).
A-6642381, Villescaz, Severiano.
A-6642382, Villescaz, Guadalupe.
A-6903666, Wagschal, Samuel.
A-6381683, Wahab, Abdul.
A-6567004, Wan, Yee Tit.
A-6320155, Wang, Margaret Chan.
A-6321477, Wang, Paul I.
A-7703244, Woodman, Elizabeth Hide (nee Takagi).
A-7083362, Wosner, Helena (nee Helena Federweiss).
A-6855579, Wosner, Pavol or Paul Wosner.
A-6567005, Yee, Lulu Tue or Tu Lily or Tu Yee.
A-6999327, Adamson, Norman McKenzie.
A-1828498, Ascencio, Porfirio or Pete Ascencio.
A-3913095, Barraza, Apolinar.
A-7073986, Biasco, Giuseppa.
A-3722890, Bombelli, Josephine Anette Carmela Concetta (nee Corso) alias McCarthy alias Pringle.
A-5966253, Caines, Charles Ebenezer or James.
A-6723895, Godinez-Arana, Jose.
A-6865943, Gomez-Castro, Gil Alberto.
A-6614766, Govostis, Dimetrios Alexander.
A-9620383, Koutsoutos, George or George Koutsoutis or Koutsontas.
A-7457793, Medina-Ortiz, Armando.
A-7419726, Li, Chen Pien.
A-4660444, Man, Ko Kam or Ko Kam Man Goo.
A-7476455, Pesce, Francesco.
A-7427542, Polino, Amleto Claudio Armando.
A-6758243, Rotberg, Fela (nee Gutman).
A-6755582, Rotberg, Szlama or Samuel.
A-7389914, Rubino, Angelo Bruno.
A-6082661, Salgado-Bustillos, Reymundo.
A-7117728, Sawicki, Zenon Simon or Zenon Sikiewicz or Simon Sawicki.
A-7264394, Schumaker, Finn Mannu.
A-7450633, Shu-Chi, Chang.
A-6317599, Stylianides, Stephen John.
A-7383160, Sustr, Jaroslav.
A-7383161, Sustr, Vera.
A-7483311, Tang, Han Chih.
A-6027107, Teng, Chi-Yu.
A-6683186, Berg, Elise Marianne.
A-6683187, Berg, Evelyn.
A-4909120, Broniewicz, Zygmunt.
A-6484086, Buchanan, John Hilton.
A-6711108, Chan, Chit Kin.
A-6206595, Chan, Ping Hwa Shu.
A-6965276, Chavarria, Eliseo.
A-7355401, Chu, Tsun Hwei also known as Tsun Hwei Chu Li.
A-3365379, Dalty, De Louise Williams.
A-7020256, Dalty, Michelene.
A-4241272, Dalty, Tarres, Leon.
A-7241656, Dominguez-Carrillo, Julio or Ruben Rodriguez.
A-7849962, Giapapas, Theodore Antoniou or Theodore Giapapas.
A-7450204, Gomez-Galindo, Manuel.
A-7137744, Gonzales, Maria Jesus or Maria Jesus de Gonzalez or Maria Jessie Gonzalez or Marie Jesus Lopez.
A-6854477, Gruetzmann, Mary Clara.
A-6854476, Gruetzmann, Lillian Gudrun.
A-7188730, Gutierrez, Agustina Valenzuela de or Agustina Valenzuela or Augustina Valenzuela De Gutierrez.
A-7145855, Gutierrez, Felix or Felix N. Gutierrez.
A-7250765, Li, Ting Yi.
A-7379731, Lomeli, Salvador G. or Salvador Lomeli-Gonzalez or Salvador Lomeli-Gomez.
A-6142743, Ma, Ju Luan.
A-6848608, Ma, Margaret Feng-Ya Chang (nee Feng-Ya Chang).
A-7145693, Manuel-Sepulveda, Sanchez.

A-6972124, Martinez, Pedro or Pedro Martinez-Flores.
A-7809270, Panagiotidis, Fotis B.
A-4604786, Pien, Chung Ling.
A-7755811, Pien, Nung Chung (nee Lee).
A-6113969, Quiroz-Morales, Roberto.
A-6555338, Rozenberg, Motel or Rosenberg.
A-6555339, Rozenberg, Irena Rolider or Irena Rozenberg (nee Bolides).
A-7140255, Saucedo, Jose Manuel or Jose Manuel Saucedo Hidrogo.
A-7463512, Testamark, Florence Mildred (nee Hodge).
A-7130999, Acosta, Guadalupe.
A-7130892, Ortega, Maria De Jesus.
A-6698228, Alfaro-Quiroz, Enrique.
A-7359551, Alvarado, Jose or Jose Alvarado-Chavez.
A-7130810, Alvarado, Antonia.
A-6165096, Alvis, Albertha Princess formerly Collymore (nee Verbeke).
A-2570320, Armendariz, Sostenes or Sostenes Armendariz-Crosco or Alfredo Aguirre.
A-6079554, Bobadilla, Rosario Sepulcer.
A-7841596, Briseno, Vidrio, Felipe.
A-5983642, Cavazos-Gonzalez, Benito or Benito Cantu-Gonzalez.
A-7755830, Chen, Jo-Yun Tung.
A-1466909, Chin, Pao-Hsiung.
A-7560739, Chin, Ping-Sheng (nee Yen).
A-9533008, Ching, Yip.
A-7222294, De Chavez, Soledad Ledesma.
A-7222295, Chavez, Angelina.
A-7962095, De Lopez, Reynalda Lopez.
A-6562366, De Rico, Amalia Fuentes (nee Amalia Fuentes) or Amalia Fuentes Vega.
A-3479484, Ferro, Domenico Antonio or Domenic Ferro or Domenico Ferro.
A-7145856, Guerra-Gonzalez, Valentin.
A-7873620, Kiourtsis, Panagiotis or Peter Kurtis.
A-7417085, Lomeli-Ramirez, Margarito or Charley Lomeli.
A-7203752, Lopez-Lino, Enrique alias Enrique Hernandez-Lopez alias Enrique Lopez.
A-6611441, Metaxas, Emmanuel Stylianos.
A-7178309, Ortega, Eleuterio or Eleuterio Ortega-Hernandez.
A-1616469, Paul, Donald or Donald Cornelius Paul.
A-3335305, Pompeo, Guiseppe.
A-7828740, Rabsatt, Era Florene.
A-5470951, Rabsatt, Esther Cerena.
A-6561106, Rendon, Juan Rico or Juan Rico.
A-9825408, Rosende, Pedro.
A-4774079, Sandoval, Roberto or Roberto Robinson-Sandoval.
A-6842496, Shiang, Flora Wang or Flora Fusheng (Fu-Sun) Shiang.
A-6083714, Shiang, Si Ta.
A-5147027, Shusterman, Esther also known as Esther Sterman.
A-7267320, Vessenes, Dionisios Katopodis.
A-8021435, Wagschal, Frida (nee Walsh).
A-5982146, Watanabe, Habukichi.
A-6154812, Watanabe, Oyobu.
A-4651337, Weiner, Louis.
A-4712339, Weisz, Arnold.
A-6988908, Accardo, Antonio.
A-7171763, Alanis-Trevino, Bonifacio.
A-2661429, Alfheim, Asbjorn or Asbjorn Alfredsen Alfheim.
A-6340939, Baron, Alejandra Garcia alias Modesta Quiocho Cadacas.
A-6069960, Crow, Ciem Raymond.
A-6069961, Crow, Carl Joseph.
A-7189494, Cruz, Maria Francisca.
A-7387467, De Del Rio, Leonor Estrada (nee Leonor Estrada-Beltran).
A-6811163, Deer, George Oswald.
A-7995831, De Vasquez, Dolores Torres.
A-6730359, Dos Vais, Manuel Vieira.
A-6591132, Franco, Pedro.
A-7092828, Franco, Socorro.
A-6849877, Gabris, Tibor.
A-6476262, Garza-Garza, Pablo.
A-7118458, Garza-Pena, Jesus.
A-6597869, Gumrukcu, Hasan Erol.
A-5024775, Hattori, Saburo.
A-6881750, Huang, Yu-Ying Tsing formerly Yu-Ying Tsing.
A-8015436, Jackson, Sydney Welesley alias Charles Scott.
A-7130505, Jergerian, Kevork (nee Pilibossian).
A-7073708, Jergerian, Siranoush (nee Bohjelian) formerly Pilibossian.
A-6590310, Kamakas, Nicholas Constantine.
A-5394176, Kosakowski, John Joseph alias John Kosky.
A-8031195, Koutchoyan, Ichran.
A-7821097, Lee, Kin Ping.
A-7366106, Lee, Tien Ho.
A-7273976, Lerman, Jakob Chaim.
A-6015840, Li, Chung Yuan.
A-6434202, Macia, Maria Laura.
A-5831796, Malone, Indiana (nee Todman).
A-6706814, Mastalos, Vasilios or Vasilios Mastalis or Vasilies Mastalos or Basile Mastalos.
A-9770922, Min, Chow Sian or Tjroe Sian Min.
A-7983190, Morejon, America Nicolasa Ferro y or America Nicolasa Kelso de Montigny.
A-5906147, Peremenis, Kyriakos or Charles K. Peremenis.
A-7682570, Peremenis, Sarah Novena (nee Sawyer).
A-7682571, Peremenis, Katerina.
A-7682572, Peremenis, Marina.
A-7682573, Peremenis, Virginia.
A-6409723, Ravasini, Guido.
A-7069284, Ray, Efthalia Kyriakicou or Efthalia Kyriakidou.
A-6732397, Redik, Heinrich.
A-6732398, Redik, Elfrida.
A-1928642, Rinaldo, Giovanni Filippo or James Philip Rinaldo.
A-7127143, Rodriguez, Juan Collazo.
A-7264804, Rubalcaba, Ines.
A-7264803, Rubalcaba, Raul.
A-7706878, Schilling, Mildred Helen (nee Pearson).
A-6006882, Sepulveda-Fimbres, Ernesto or Ernesto Fimbrys-Sepulveda or Ramon Sepulveda, Jr., or Ramon Sepulveda or Ramon Sepulveda-Valencia.
A-3541552, Smith, Charles Henry.
A-5881902, Smith, Mildred Augusta.
A-7118018, Solano-Ramirez, Miguel.
A-2967575, Stubbs, Mervin Gardiner alias Albert George Woods.
A-7863139, Tanzi, Vincenzo.
A-8021434, Wan, Chan Hing also known as Hing Wan Chan.
A-5838603, Xydis, Stephen George.
A-7463248, Alonzo-Vega, Manuel.
A-7398319, Canales, Juana Antonio.
A-7984817, Carranza-Alvarez, Jose.
A-7756418, Chang, Hsiang-Tung.
A-7457003, Chantre, Felipe Pedro.
A-6830524, Dajany, Paud Sharif.
A-7469399, De Barjaran, Juana Saenz or Juana Saenz.
A-7196299, Kahl, June Margaret (nee Reid).
A-6203569, Moran, Carlos Lisinio.
A-6628325, Nagymajtenyi, Helen, also known as Helen Kropel or Kropyl.
A-6550701, Nagymajtenyi, Marton.
A-8001560, Penn, Amy Alma (nee Amy Alma Burrows).
A-7188175, Rodriguez, Jose.
A-7394640, Titley, Veronica Venovia.
A-6624891, Tsou, Hsieh-An Ivan.
A-7809053, Yao, Lucy Tsui-Hwa.
A-7127601, Alvarado, Jose Saldana.
A-7188869, De Lara, Narcisa Cisneros Vda.
A-6320364, Delfino, Aurora Villanueva.
A-7945412, De Ruiz, Dolores Herrera.
A-7118456, Garza-Lerma, Guadalupe.
A-9537604, Goncalves, Manuel.
A-6153066, Miyahira, Sumiko.
A-6153067, Miyahira, Koso.
A-8039348, Monaldi, Olindo.
A-7247945, Murillo-Sanchez, Jose or Jose Abran Murillo-Sanchez or Abraham Jose Murillo-Sanchez.
A-6440824, Rubin, Abraham Samuel.
A-7945414, Ruiz, Maria Paula.
A-7945415, Ruiz, Aurelio.
A-1556398, Testolin, Antonio or Tony Testolin.
A-7203621, Uranga, Aurora.
A-7203620, Uranga, Maria de La Luz.
A-5987520, Uranga-Vaca, Mardonio or Mardonio Uranga or Mardonio Uranga Baca.
A-5950026, Vuurens, Cornelia.
A-1873529, White, Malaki.
A-6709308, Yao, Ting-Chang.
A-6144740, Achram-Chen, Peter Hugh Bernard or Peter Chen or Peter H. Chen.
A-7064135, Bretan, Patria Guion also known as Patria Siatona Guion.
A-8065655, Chavez, Teodosia Cantu.
A-8082292, Cheng, Henry (Chu-Hwa).
A-6851579, Cheng, Lydia (Lu Chin).
A-3438377, Chu, Chauncey Cheng-Shui.
A-6298259, Chu, Margaret Chen-Ying Li.
A-4342227, Clairmont, George or Solomon B. Caufman or Solomon Caufman.
A-5953151, De La O, Marcela Fernandez also known as Marcela Ibarra or Isabella Deras or Marcella Magallanes or Ibarra or Hazel Deras.
A-8065876, Daskalakis, William Michael.
A-7841695, De Arellano-Lopez, Angel Sanz.
A-7358662, De Munoz, Zenaida Solorzano.
A-5656336, De Rivera, Rita Lopez or Rita Lopez-Arce or Maria Perez.
A-6725649, Erbsland, Albertine.
A-4583397, Fritsch, Heinrich Edward or Heinrich Eduard Fritsch.
A-6701989, Garcia-Alvear, Elena.
A-6701990, Garcia-Alvear, Hortencia.
A-6678458, Garcia-Olivio, Juan.
A-8039081, Jack, Mary Veronica.
A-8039082, Jack, Ronald Clive.
A-7483341, Kardoulias, Theodosia (nee Koukouva).
A-6787394, Maynard, Christalia Augusta.
A-6961748, Rosales-Melendez, Jose also known as Francisco Jacobo-Aguelira.
A-5971693, Saddler, Joseph.
A-6606818, Tsai, Tun Hou.
A-6847919, Tsai, Ching-Hsian Wei also known as Ching Hsian Wei.
A-7140137, Urquiza, Cayetano or Cayetano Urquiza-Hernandez.
A-8031108, Villa, Jose Paz.
A-8031691, Villa, Soledad Canales.
A-7398898, Villagomez-Bocanegra, Nicolas.
A-6921481, Viola, Eligio.
A-6190235, Wong, Frank Eugene.
A-6190236, Wong, Esther Chu.
A-8082291, Wu, Bao Cheng Lee.
A-7080337, Wu, Te-Leng.
A-6283264, Aguilar-Gomez, Eliodoro.
A-7983288, Alfonso, Agapito Alcid.
A-7358015, Arce-Thomaty, Enrique Guilermo or Enrique Arce-Tomaty or Enrique Arce.
A-7983837, Castellanos, Roberto also known as Roberto Salas-Castellanos.
A-6047918, Claxton, Elsa Eudora.
A-7983430, De Vargas, Lucia Castellanos.
A-7873892, Estrada, Teodora.
A-7957297, Evans, Edwin Ernest.
A-7957296, Evans, Vancy Irena.
A-6267939, Favela, Sijifredo.
A-7192720, Gumbs, Daisy Viola.
A-9795384, Hoff, Bastoaan Van't.
A-5475472, Koide, Kiyoichi also known as Kiyoichi Tashiro.
A-7203963, Ku, Angela or Angela Hsiao-Jao Chow.
A-6877757, Ku, William Yung-Kang or Ky Yung-Kang.
A-7730653, Lo, Hsu.
A-6142738, Lo, Kiahsuang Shen
A-8021503, Loh, Wen-Hu.
A-8021504, Loh, Hua Jo Lee.
A-6064876, Martinez-Valencia, Rodolfo.
A-7809109, Montiel, Alfonso.
A-7363009, De Montiel, Dolores Robles.
A-7398516, Nurse, Prince Edmond or Prince Edmund Nurse or George Brown.
A-7984785, Palos, Reyes also known as Reyes Castellanos also known as Reyes Palos-Castellanos.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

A-7197798, Ramirez-Torres, Genaro or Jesus Ramirez-Torres.
A-8015466, Stephens, Winifred Mary Wakeford.
A-9701380, Szalaj, Josef Tomasz.
A-1920842, Szatanek, Wladyslaw or Walter Szatanek.
A-7821934, Tiberi, Duilio.
A-7476674, Wong, Veda Leonie Chen See.
A-6710565, Baras, Leja.
A-6737777, Baras, Josef.
A-7903758, De Veaux, Norma Delfina (nee Robinson).
A-7189153, Gamboa, Esteban or Esteban Gamboa-Ramirez.
A-6143060, Lin, Man-Ming Wang (nee Man-Ming Wang).
A-6545348, Liu, Tung Sheng.
A-7178886, Palazzo, Salvatore.
A-9825406, Pisani, Giacomo.
A-7755827, Sun, Jung Yi Tung.
A-7962023, Garbalosa-Bernal, Heliodoro Roberto or Robert G. Bernal.
A-6592950, Logar, Branko Francis or Logan.
A-6851277, Mateos, Tomas Alberto or Thomas Alberto Mateos.
A-6852997, Mateos, Adelia Sierra or Adelia Purification Sierra Mateos (nee Suarez).
A-6068197, Morales-Avila, Artemio.
A-3459283, Friedman, Geczel Geza or Gerczel G. Friedman.
A-6486112, Olivari, Antonio Eugenio.
A-7863659, Stark, Sarah Teura, formerly Pahi Teura John Stark.
A-6731255, Montano, Severino Medina.
A-8001080, Loy, Betty (nee Cooper).
A-2053125, Villani, Frank.
A-7991491, Vitlin, John.
A-6253102, Vitlin, Mina.
A-6884672, Tang, Tsong Ming alias Anthony M. Tang.
A-6242281, Ganeshan, Ganapathi Vydianatha.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 4, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1822. An act to amend the act creating a juvenile court for the District of Columbia, approved March 19, 1906, as amended; and

S. 2721. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 3278. A bill for the relief of Julia Ann Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEM:

S. 3279. A bill for the relief of Dr. J. Donald McIntyre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 3280. A bill for the relief of Sadie Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar and George Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar; and

S. 3281. A bill for the relief of Chiu But Yue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 3282. A bill for the relief of Ivan Grbin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 3283. A bill for the relief of Luigi Mascitti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG:

S. 3284. A bill for the relief of Beverly Jane Ruffin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 3285. A bill for the relief of Kosta Milisav Bulatovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 329), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate the sum of $60,000 for the purpose of discharging obligations incurred by it prior to June 30, 1953, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by Senate Resolution 58, Eighty-first Congress. Such sum shall be in addition to any other moneys available to the committee for such purpose, and shall be disbursed upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 4 OF 1952, RELATING TO DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 330), disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 4, of 1952, relating to the Department of Justice, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 4 transmitted to Congress by the President on April 10, 1952.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. ANDERSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7314) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MAYBANK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2594) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MONRONEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 2594, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. O'CONOR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 2594, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MOODY (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 2594, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CASE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 2594, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 1092. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mercedes Hernandez Saguar;

H. R. 1151. An act for the relief of Sumiko Yamamoto;

H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of Henryk Kramarski;

H. R. 2166. An act for the relief of Sister Anita (Vincenzina Di Franco);

H. R. 2405. An act for the relief of Food Service of Evansville, Inc.;

H. R. 2661. An act for the relief of Mario Farabullini and Alla Farabullini, his wife;

H. R. 3154. An act for the relief of Mrs. Liane Lieu and her son, Peter Lieu;

H. R. 3211. An act for the relief of the Alma Cooperative Equity Exchange, Alma, Nebr., and others;

H. R. 3260. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emi Yasuda and her minor son, Keichiro Yasuda;

H. R. 3727. An act for the relief of the Professional Arts Building Corp.;

H. R. 3989. An act for the relief of Ivo Markulin;

H. R. 3990. An act for the relief of Paul Frkovic;

H. R. 4002. An act for the relief of Sandra E. Dennett;

H. R. 4260. An act for the relief of Ruben George Varga and Mrs. Ilona Varga;

H. R. 4396. An act for the relief of Elias Papadopoulos;

H. R. 4503. An act for the relief of Suzanne Marie Schartz;

H. R. 5004. An act for the relief of Terminal Warehouse Co.;

H. R. 5006. An act for the relief of Gallagher's Warehouses, Inc.;

H. R. 5095. An act for the relief of the estate of Edward B. Formanek, deceased;

H. R. 5515. An act for the relief of John H. Vogel;

H. R. 5581. An act for the relief of Yusuf (Uash) Lazar; and

H. R. 6761. An act for the relief of William Kipf and Darold D. Selk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7241. An act to authorize payment to the Empire District Electric Co. for reasonable costs of protecting its Ozark Beach power plant from the backwater of Bull Shoals Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7302. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation; and

H. R. 7305. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Utah to the French Lake Irrigation Co., of Hurricane, Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 214) to commend Mr. and Mrs. Donald D. Dunn, from the State of Washington, and for other purposes, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

Citation awarded Senator WILLIAMS by Wesley Junior College, Dover, Del.

Article entitled "The Thin Blue Line Fades but Veterans March On," written by John M. Cummings and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 30, 1952.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

Editorial entitled "Tidelands Oil Is a National Resource," published in the Des Moines (Iowa) Register of May 31, 1952.

By Mr. WILEY:

Article on the Children's Fund and an editorial from the Anniston (Ala.) Star.

By Mr. MORSE:

Statement entitled "The Faith and Hope of an American," written by former Senator Frank P. Graham.

By Mr. CAIN:

Article entitled "All Around the Town," written by Fred C. Koch and published in a recent issue of the Wenatchee (Wash.) Journal.

PUBLIC HOUSING—LETTER FROM MAYOR OF LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, yesterday in the discussion of the bill which was then before the Senate there was discussion about the situation in California. I am in receipt of a letter dated May 7, 1952, from Hon. Fletcher Bowron, mayor of the city of Los Angeles, Calif., on the subject of public housing. Personally I do not know of the exact political situation and other situations which exist in Los Angeles. In order to make clear the RECORD of yeseterday, which is somewhat ambiguous, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the mayor's letter to me and my reply to him under date of May 15, 1952, which makes more clear my views on the matter which was discussed last night on the floor.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Los Angeles, Calif., May 7, 1952.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: At the State primary election on June 3 the electors of the city of Los Angeles will have an opportunity to express themselves on the subject of public housing. The result will have no legal effect other than a preferential vote, but much public interest is being manifested. In the campaign considerable reference is made to certain statements made by you on August 15, 1951, and recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, relating to a proviso of the Officers Appropriation Act of 1952 to the effect that public-housing administration shall not authorize construction of public-housing projects where such projects are rejected by the voters or the governing body of the localities in which they are to be built.

I am aware that you clarified this statement in a letter dated December 5, 1951, addressed to Charles Navarro, a councilman of the city of Los Angeles. However, Mr. Navarro, a newly elected councilman who is opposed in principle to public housing, did not make your letter public. I would appreciate a letter from you that may be used to correct erroneous or deliberate misstatements being made locally.

Among other things I would appreciate it if you would express yourself with reference to an opinion that the Supreme Court of California handed down only a week ago holding that the Federal act has no application to the situation in which the city of Los Angeles now finds itself, having made application under the Housing Act of 1949 pursuant to Federal and State laws and having been allocated 10,000 units, the property rights of numerous persons having been affected in securing sites, the selection of which were formally approved by the city council, and over $12,000,000 having been expended, representing obligations guaranteed by the United States Government.

Referring to the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1952, Eighty-second Congress, first session, chapter 376, approved August 31, 1951, the opinion concurred in unanimously by the justices of the California Supreme Court reads in part as follows:

"That proviso, after the date of its approval, prohibits authorization of the construction of projects initiated before or after March 1, 1949, in any locality in which such projects have been or may thereafter be rejected by the governing body of the locality or by the public vote, unless the projects have been subsequently approved by the same procedure through which the rejection was expressed. This proviso does not purport to grant a power to the city. It was dealing with the authority of the Federal agency.

"As material here the proviso prohibits that agency's authorization of construction where the city had validly disapproved the project pursuant to State law. It does not purport to validate action of the city council which is invalid under State law. It is quite apparent that the local rejection referred to is that by which the city might withhold approval of the project. It deals with future action of the agency. It does not contemplate a case where, as here, the city has approved the project and the Federal agency has authorized the construction. It does not give the agency power to rescind prior authorization of construction or repudiate the obligations incurred thereunder. This view is in accord with the opinion of the acting general counsel for the Public Housing Administration in a circular issued February 8, 1952."

Notwithstanding this construction of the law by our State Supreme Court, a statement of the opponents of public housing quoted in the public press of this date reads as follows:

"The action of the city council canceling the housing agreement clearly conforms to Public Law 137 passed August 31, 1951, authorizing such cancelation. The council has declared its intention to carry the case to the Supreme Court of the United States, if necessary, to establish this fact.

"In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 16, 1951, is this statement by Senator MAYBANK regarding the intent of Public Law 137: 'If a community desires, through its governing body, to vote not to have housing projects, it may do so, and provided further, that they may, if they wish, (and I desire to make this perfectly clear), cancel a contract which has been made for public housing. But of course they will have to be responsible for any money which the Government has put into the project.'

"In the light of this plain language it would seem that imposition is being made on the local rights of Los Angeles. The issue in proposition B has become, primarily, 'Do the people of Los Angeles have the right to rule themselves in local matters?'"

In an editorial appearing in this day's issue of the Los Angeles Times, the statement you made in Congress relating to Public Housing Law 137 is quoted and with the editorial declaration that the Federal Public Housing Authority "ought to act according to the will of Congress."

I would appreciate a statement from you that may correct the misinterpretation and misuse of your verbal statement in Congress on October 18, 1951, in an exchange with Senator Wherry. In order that effective use may be made of it, I would appreciate a reply at your earliest convenience.

Very truly yours,

FLETCHER BOWRON,
Mayor.

MAY 15, 1952.

Hon. FLETCHER BOWRON,
Mayor, City Hall,
Los Angeles, Calif.

MY DEAR MAYOR BOWRON: This will acknowledge and thank you for your letter of May 7 in which you inquire about the proviso included in the authorizing language for the Public Housing Administration in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, which reads as follows:

"Provided further, That the Public Housing Adminstration shall not, after the date of approval of this act, authorize the construction of any projects initiated before or after March 1, 1949, in any locality in which such projects have been or may hereafter be rejected by the governing body of the locality or by public vote, unless such projects have been subsequently approved by the same procedure through which such rejection was expressed."

I believe that, first of all, I should indicate the background of this proviso. It will be recalled that, when the Senate Committee on Appropriations reported the bill to the Senate, this proviso, which originally had been inserted by the House, was stricken from the bill. When the bill was considered on the floor of the Senate, an amendment was offered to restore this proviso, but it was defeated. Subsequently, however, as a result of the conference between the two Houses, the language of this proviso was included in the Independent Offices Appropriations Act, 1952, as finally passed by the Congress. Of course, the Senate Appropriations Committee had felt that the inclusion of this proviso could create some serious legal difficulties, and it was for that reason that the committee had stricken it from the bill, and the Senate itself had refused to restore it. As a matter of fact, I had sought to point this out in a colloquy with the late Senator Wherry at the time the Senate was considering the conference report on the bill.

After the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, became law, I received an inquiry from Councilman Charles Navarro of the Los Angeles City Council, referring to my colloquy with the late Senator Wherry concerning the language of this proviso. In reply to Councilman Navarro's inquiry, I indicated very clearly that I had not intended to imply that the language of the proviso would permit a community, without liability, to cancel its contract for a low-rent public housing project after work had begun on the project or expenditures had been made in reliance on the contract. I indicated further that where, as in the case of the city of Los Angeles, large sums of money had been obtained from the Federal Government and expended for work on low-rent public housing projects on the basis of a cooperation agreement, duly approved, authorized, and executed by the city, the cancellation of such a contract by the city would naturally result in substantial damages and also would seriously involve the matter of an impairment of the obligation of contract contrary to the constitutional prohibitions. I also indicated that I had sought to point this out during the Senate consideration of the conference report in

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the course of my discussion of the matter with the late Senator Wherry.

In its recent decision with respect to the cooperation contract between the city of Los Angeles and the Housing Authority, the Supreme Court of California, in its determination of the effect and meaning of the proviso said:

"The city also looks to a proviso in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952 (supra, Public Law 137, 82d Cong., 1st sess., ch. 376, approved August 31, 1951). * * * This proviso does not purport to grant a power to the city. It was dealing with the authority of the Federal agency. * * * It deals with future action of the agency. It does not contemplate a case where, as here, the city has approved the project and the Federal agency has authorized the construction. It does not give the agency power to rescind prior authorization of construction or repudiate the obligations incurred thereunder."

In my opinion, the decision of the Supreme Court of California correctly interprets the effect of this proviso as being inapplicable to existing contracts—that it can only apply to future contracts and to future actions by the Federal agency responsible for the administration of the law, namely, the Public Housing Administration. I have always understood the law to prohibit any actions which would impair the obligation of a valid contract, and that legislative action which would impair the obligation of valid contracts may not be taken. Once a contract is validly entered into, I do not understand that it may be terminated by the unilateral action of only one of the parties to the contract and without the consent of the other. A valid contract between a city and a local housing authority cannot be terminated and canceled by the unilateral action of the city, and without the consent of the other party to the contract, any more than a valid contract between a local housing authority and the Public Housing Administration could be terminated or canceled by the unilateral action of the Public Housing Administration and without the consent of the other party to the contract. Unless there is mutual consent of both parties to a termination, then both parties must abide fully by the terms of their contract. That is what I understand the law to be, and that is what the Supreme Court of California has said in this case.

As you know, I have always been a strong advocate of the fundamental right of the States and the local communities to make their own determinations as to State and local matters. My feelings in such matters are clearly expressed in the report which I filed in the Senate of the United States when the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency favorably reported the Housing Act of 1949 which authorized the present low-rent public housing program. Under the heading "Philosophy of the bill," the report of the of the committee (S. Rept. 84, 81st Cong., 1st sess.) states:

"The bill now being favorably reported by your committee is based upon the firm foundation that, although the housing problem is obviously national in scope, it is fundamentally a local problem, and that first responsibility for its solution therefore rests with the local community. This bill leaves that primary responsibility with the local communities where it belongs. It recognizes that the need for any kind of housing action should be determined locally. * * * It therefore provides that Federal assistance for low-rent public housing shall be available only for projects where there has been a local determination, by the governing body of the community, that such housing is required * * *."

Two specific provisions were included in the law authorizing the present low-rent public housing program in order to carry out this basic philosophy. First of all, we provided that the Public Housing Administration could not make any contract for preliminary loans with a local housing authority "unless the governing body of the locality involved has by resolution approved the application of the Public Housing Administration for such preliminary loan." In the case of Los Angeles, the governing body of the locality—whose members are the elected representatives of the people—did adopt a resolution specifically approving the application of the Los Angeles Housing Authority for a preliminary loan to finance the present program of 10,000 units.

In the second place, we specifically provided in the law that the Public Housing Administration should not make any contracts for annual contributions "unless the governing body of the locality involved has entered into an agreement with the Public Housing Administration providing for the local cooperation required by the authority pursuant to this act." In the case of Los Angeles, the governing body of the locality—whose members are the elected representatives of the people—did enter into the required agreement with the local housing authority providing for the local cooperation in connection with the present 10,000-unit program.

It is perfectly true that, if before the governing body took these valid actions, all of which are authorized by law, the governing body had decided to first hold a referendum for the purpose of ascertaining specifically the wishes of the people in this matter, all parties would then have been entirely free to abide by the vote of the people whatever the results happened to be. However, in this case, the governing body—whose members are the elected representatives of the people—did not hold any referendum before it took the actions (which, by law, they were fully authorized to take) which resulted in valid contractual commitments with respect to the present 10,000-unit program of low-rent public housing. I point this out simply to make it clear that the provisions of the Federal legislation did not in any way prevent or militate against a governing body of a locality which desired to ascertain the wishes of the people on such matters before taking any authorized actions to enter into valid contracts with respect to a local program of low-rent public housing.

Sincerely yours,

BURNET R. MAYBANK.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2594) to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendment is open to amendment.

The Secretary will read the unanimous-consent agreement.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That beginning at the hour of 10 o'clock a. m. on Wednesday, June 4, 1952, debate upon the bill (S. 2594) to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, be limited as follows:

1. One hour on any amendment proposed to the so-called Walsh-Healey or the Stabilization Board provisions of the bill, and 30 minutes upon any other amendment or motion (including appeals): *Provided*, That no vote shall be taken before 12 o'clock noon on said day on any amendment or motion to the Walsh-Healey provisions: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received;

2. That the time on any amendment or motion (including appeals) shall be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and Mr. MAYBANK, in the event he is opposed to such amendment or motion; otherwise by the minority leader or someone designated by him; and

3. One hour on the question of the final passage of the bill, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. BRIDGES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee substitute is open to amendment.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, while Senators are waiting to find out what amendments are to be offered, I should like to offer one, with respect to which I am sure there will be no controversy. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, after line 11, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. . Section 403 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) It shall be the express duty, obligation, and function of the present Economic Stabilization Agency or any successor agency, to stabilize and to coordinate the relationship between prices and wages."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment. As I told the distinguished Senator from New York, I am glad to accept it, because I think it represents the intention of the committee. However, I wish the Senator would enlarge upon it for the record, so that there will be no misunderstanding as to the intention.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I believe it was the understanding of every member of the Banking and Currency Committee, and presumably of Members of the Senate who voted in favor of the Defense Production Act initially and in favor of its extension last year, that the function of the Economic Stabilization Agency was to coordinate all the activities which come under it. In other words, wage control and price control, which are the chief functions in which the Agency is engaged should be coordinated in such a way as to avoid the confusion and sometimes the seeming contradictions which have existed.

As a matter of fact, at the time the Committee on Banking and Currency was holding its hearings on the subjects of price control and wage controls, it became very obvious, as the result of the testimony before the committee, particularly by former Governor Arnall, that there had been no effort made whatever to coordinate the price structure and the wage structure. That was not the intent of those who framed the act, as I recall the discussions and debate at the time. Therefore, Mr. President, the sole purpose of the amendment is to express specifically in the act what presumably is the intention of the act.

I believe that explanation covers the situation.

Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. CAPEHART addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield; if so, to whom?

Mr. IVES. I yield first to my colleague.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask the senior Senator from New York to yield to me so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum. The only reason I ask it is that I am not completely familiar with everything that has happened.

Mr. IVES. We just had a quorum call.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am not familiar with everything that has happened in the committee. I believe that the amendments are so important that there should be a substantial representation on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to yield for the suggestion of the absence of a quorum if I do not lose any of the time allotted to me and if I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from New York would lose all of his time if he yielded for that purpose.

Mr. IVES. Then I decline to yield. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I see nothing wrong with the amendment. I think it is a good amendment. I believe, however, it should be modified, and I would modify the amendment so as to read:

> It shall be the express duty, obligation, and function of the present Economic Stabilization Agency, or any successor agency, to stabilize and to coordinate the relationship between prices and wages, and to stabilize prices and wages.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to accept the modification if it expresses more clearly what I have in mind.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York can modify his own amendment.

Mr. IVES. I so modify my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. As many as favor the amendment will say "aye." Opposed——

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask——

The VICE PRESIDENT. No Senator can be recognized unless he is yielded time by a Senator who is in control of time.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield to the junior Senator from New York. I understand he wants to suggest the absence of a quorum. I understand that the amendment offered by the senior Senator from New York has been adopted. It may be a good idea to have a quorum call at this time. There are a good many amendments which have not yet been returned by the Printing Office. I understand that they are running a little behind. The amendments should be here shortly. I am informed they have not yet been received in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In order to enforce the unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair would like to suggest to all Senators that no Senator is entitled to recognition unless he is yielded time by one of the Senators who is in control of time. Any time yielded for the purpose of having a quorum call will be charged to the Senator who yields the time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. There is no amendment pending at this time, as I understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is pending.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thought the amendment had been adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was in the act of putting the question, but the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] asked recognition.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield me 3 minutes? He has plenty of time remaining.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield 3 minutes to the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The junior Senator from New York is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York cannot suggest the absence of a quorum. A quorum cannot be developed in 3 minutes. All the time taken for the purpose of calling a quorum would be charged to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. McFARLAND. Evidently Senators desire to have a quorum call. I ask the Senator from South Carolina to yield to me.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that a quorum call may be had and that the time be charged to neither side.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is: Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. CAPEHART. I object.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Reserving the right to object——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana objects.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana has already objected. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. The junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is recognized for 3 minutes, if he wishes to use the time.

Mr. LEHMAN. The only reason I asked that some time be yielded to me was so that I could suggest the absence of a quorum. Many amendments are before us. Many others were sent to the desk yesterday, but they have not yet been printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There are a great many amendments lying on the desk. Twenty-two amendments have been printed. Any of those amendments could be called up.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on a bill of this importance I believe we should have a quorum call.

Mr. CAPEHART. We just had a quorum call.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the pending amendment, but I ask that when the next amendment is offered I be yielded sufficient time to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It seems difficult for Senators to understand that under the unanimous consent agreement entered into no Senator can be recognized to suggest the absence of a quorum without the time consumed in calling a quorum being charged to the Senator who yields time for that purpose, unless by unanimous consent one of the Senators in control of time obtains unanimous consent of the Senate that the time be not charged to either side.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am in control of a half hour on each amendment, as I understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A half hour for debate is allowed on this amendment; 15 minutes to each side.

Mr. MAYBANK. Fifteen minutes?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it would be strange, indeed, if before a vote is taken on an amendment, no Senator would have the right to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is not responsible for the agreement.

Mr. McFARLAND. The agreement does not provide for any such thing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It provides that no Senator can be recognized without time being yielded to him.

Mr. McFARLAND. Time has been yielded to the junior Senator from New York on this amendment, and the Senate was about to vote on the amendment. We have a right to have a quorum call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York has not yielded any of his time; neither has the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield the remainder of his time for the purpose of having a quorum call?

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say on my own time that I will yield my 15 minutes when the next amendment is called up.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not think that it should be necessary to yield time for the purpose of having a quorum call. We have a right to have a quorum call when a vote is to be taken, regardless of whether any time is left. The Senate was about to vote on an amendment, and we have a right to have a quorum call.

Mr. MAYBANK. I agree with the Senator from Arizona, but I am not going to yield time to have a quorum call which will take an hour to complete, when I have only 15 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair insists, after consulting with the Parliamentarian, who concurs in the Chair's insistence, that while all the time is not exhausted on the pending amendment the Senator from Arizona is not entitled to recognition, unless one of the Senators in control of time yields to him.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Chair on my own time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the senior Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. IVES. I was going to ask a parliamentary question myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well. The Senator from New York should be permitted to ask his question first.

Mr. IVES. I should like to ask the Chair whether it would not be advisable to adopt the pending amendment, which is virtually noncontroversial, and then obtain unanimous consent for a quorum call. Under such circumstances, I cannot understand how anyone could object to a unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's inquiry is not a parliamentary inquiry, but the Chair thinks it is a good suggestion.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I cannot understand the ruling of the Chair. If the ruling of the Chair is to the effect that two Senators who control time can prevent a quorum call and thus control the affairs of the Senate, I cannot believe that that is the rule of the Senate, and I must therefore appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask for recognition.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have no intention of trying to control the action of the Senate on the 15 minutes allotted to me on this amendment or on the half hour or hour allotted to me on other amendments. I do not believe that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] has any such intention either. He can speak for himself, but I am willing to ask unanimous consent, when this amendment is adopted, that there be a quorum call.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I seek recognition in my own right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair cannot recognize the Senator from Indiana unless time is yielded to him by either of the Senators who have charge of the time.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, how much time remains to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have charge of the time on this side.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry? I should like to have the parliamentary situation straightened out because it is important, not so much in regard to this debate, but as a general proposition. If the time available under the agreement has not expired, I wish to know whether the Senate can be compelled to vote upon an amendment or other pending questions and can be compelled to do so without having a quorum call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona and all other Senators understand that whenever a unanimous-consent agreement is entered into for control of the time in regard to the consideration of amendments, the Chair has no right to recognize any other Senator except the two Senators in charge of the time, while the time under the unanimous-consent agreement is being used, unless such other Senator is yielded to by either of the two Senators then controlling the time. Frequently unanimous consent is requested in order that a quorum call may be had, without having the time required for the quorum call charged to either side. That is done so often that it is a part of the practice of the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, does the Chair rule that under such circumstances the two Senators having charge of the time under the unanimous-consent agreement could compel the taking of a vote simply because they had charge of the time, even though all the time had not expired, and could thus compel the taking of a vote, regardless of the number of Senators then on the floor; and that the two Senators controlling the time could prevent a Senator from suggesting the absence of a quorum prior to the taking of the vote? I do not believe that is the Chair's ruling. If it is the Chair's ruling, I must appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Chair has made no such ruling.

The Chair has held, and the Chair believes he is correct, that if the time is controlled under a unanimous-consent agreement and if all the time available has not been exhausted, unless the Senators controlling the time yield it back, there cannot be a quorum call unless time is yielded for that purpose.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I have not yielded any time yet. How much time have I left?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York has approximately 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. IVES. Very well; then I yield 2 or 3 minutes, or whatever time he wishes to have, to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a quorum call may be had at this time, without having the time required for it charged to either side.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to propound another parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, is all this being charged to my time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; it is being charged to the time available to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. Then I object.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina will have to yield time to himself, or else obtain time from the other side.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, how much time remains to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Approximately 9 minutes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield 9 minutes——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just a minute; the Senator from Indiana has been yielded to by the Senator from New York.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry. I wish to know whether the situation is now such that a vote can be compelled and a quorum call cannot be had simply because only 1 minute is left under the unanimous-consent agreement and the Senators in charge of the time are not inclined to yield it. Would not such a decision by the Chair be subject to appeal?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senators having charge of the time under the unanimous-consent agreement have any time left, and if they do not wish to use it before a vote is had on an amendment, the Chair will recognize——

Mr. McFARLAND. But suppose the Senator having charge of the remaining time does not yield time, but simply wishes to have a vote taken at that point. Can that Senator compel a vote to be taken then, or can the absence of a quorum be suggested?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has just said that if two Senators have charge of the time, under a unanimous-consent agreement, and if neither side in charge of the time uses all the time available to it, and if unanimous consent is obtained for the call of a quorum at that point, without having the time required for the quorum call charged to either side, by unanimous consent that may be done and the quorum call may be had.

However, if a Senator who is in charge of the time in such a situation does not use all the time available to him and if the absence of a quorum is suggested, a quorum call can be had.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is a different situation than the one stated a moment ago, because just a few minutes ago the vote on the amendment was being taken, and the "ayes" had responded; and before the "noes" could respond, the absence of a quorum was suggested.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That occurred before the result of the vote was announced.

Mr. McFARLAND. But the absence of a quorum was suggested at that point; and the ruling of the Chair at that time

was different from the ruling which had just been made by the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The RECORD will speak for itself.

The VICE PRESIDENT subsequently said: The Chair would like to clarify a ruling he made a while ago in connection with the flare-up on the point of no quorum.

It seems to the Chair that the situation is a very simple one. When the Senate makes an agreement providing for a limitation on debate, and Senators are designated to control the time, they have a right to control the time until it is exhausted. If a Senator in control of the time should yield 2 minutes to another Senator, and that Senator, while he is occupying those 2 minutes, should be entitled to make a point of no quorum, of course it is obvious that a quorum could not be obtained in 2 minutes. Sometimes it takes longer than 15 minutes, sometimes longer than a half hour, and all the time to which the Senator who had yielded 2 minutes was entitled would be exhausted.

When debate is exhausted and all the time has been used, of course, any Senator then, before a vote, has a right to suggest the absence of a quorum; or if the time is not so exhausted, and those in control of the time announce there is no further debate, before a vote any Senator would have a right to make a point of no quorum.

The Chair does not think a Senator who has control of time has a right to sit on it and not use it, or to prevent any Senator from being recognized to make a point of no quorum. The Chair feels that he has a right to ask any Senator in control of time whether there is to be any further debate, and if the announcement is made that there is to be no further debate, then the Chair would assume that the same situation had been reached as if all the time had been exhausted. In that case, before a vote, a Senator would have a right to make a point of no quorum.

The Chair has no desire, of course, to prevent the Senate from having a quorum developed when there is to be a vote. Obviously, under the procedure when there is a limitation on debate, a limitation of 15 minutes to a side, or any other amount of time to a side, if a Senator controlling the time yielded to another Senator ostensibly to debate the question at issue, and then that Senator had the right to make it a point of no quorum, and did make it, all the time allotted to the Senator in control of time might be exhausted.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have no criticism of the ruling of the Chair. I think it was a correct one. The situation was that the Senator from New York was on the floor. I do not think the Chair understood that the Senate had already taken a vote on one side of the question, and the Senator from New York rose for the sole purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum. Then the Chair would not recognize him, because the Senator did not have any time. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] then yielded time to the Senator from New York, in order that the Senator from New York might be recognized. If the Chair does not recognize a Senator when he rises, and there is to be a vote, there could never be the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate was in the process of taking a viva voce vote. The vote was not completed, and it could not become official until completed. The Chair did not put the question on the other side, because the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] yielded 3 minutes to the Senator from New York. Obviously if the time for debate had about expired, and the Senator attempted to yield time for a quorum call, it could not be developed in 3 minutes.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator had not yielded that time until the Chair refused to recognize the Senator from New York for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair sees no reason for any great controversy over the procedure.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the only reason why I understood the Chair did not recognize the Senator from New York was that my time had not been exhausted, and the time had been limited between myself and the Senator from New York, whose amendment was being considered. That is what I understood.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a quorum call may be had at this time, without having the time required for that purpose charged to either side on this amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Monroney
Anderson	Hendrickson	Moody
Bennett	Hennings	Morse
Benton	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Brewster	Hill	Neely
Bricker	Hoey	Nixon
Bridges	Holland	O'Conor
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Pastore
Byrd	Ives	Robertson
Cain	Jenner	Saltonstall
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Seaton
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Clements	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Dirksen	Kilgore	Sparkman
Douglas	Lehman	Stennis
Dworshak	Lodge	Taft
Eastland	Long	Thye
Ellender	Martin	Tobey
Ferguson	Maybank	Underwood
Flanders	McCarran	Watkins
Frear	McCarthy	Welker
Fulbright	McClellan	Wiley
George	McFarland	Williams
Gillette	McKellar	Young
Green	Millikin	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The junior Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the amendment proposed by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New York, is not clear to me. As I interpret it—and I may be in error—it would appear that if an increase in wages of 10 or 20 or 25 cents an hour or in any other amount were given, it would be necessary for the Stabilization Board to take that into account in fixing the price of the finished product.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. IVES. That could be done, of course, if coordination were required, but it would not necessarily have to be done. Coordination as I understand it means the recognition of a relationship between the wage authority and the price authority to the extent that they pay attention to one another.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, if that be the case, it would seem to me that this amendment is not a good one, because I can readily conceive that a product may already be selling at so high a price that the manufacturer could very easily afford to pay an increase in wages without increasing his price. Yet, under the amendment proposed by my colleague, the senior Senator from New York, it would be necessary to maintain the relationship existing at the time of giving the wage increase, between the price of labor and the price of the finished article. If that be the case, it seems to me the amendment is not a good one.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I prefer not to yield, but rather that my colleague offer his remarks in his own time.

Mr. IVES. Very well; I shall do so in my own time.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, it seems to me we have never considered that one agency should take into account both price-fixing and wages. After all, wages are stabilized by one agency, prices are fixed by an entirely different agency.

To compel the Wage Stabilization Board—which I assume is the agency now under discussion—both to fix the wage of labor and the price of the finished article offered to the public or to the Government would seem to me to be poor policy.

Therefore, Mr. President, unless my distinguished colleague has some explanation to offer, I shall vote against the amendment. He may have an explanation; and, if so, I should welcome it now.

Mr. IVES. Is the Senator through?

Mr. LEHMAN. Temporarily I am.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. IVES. I thank the Chair.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAYBANK. Since I have agreed to accept the amendment, I have no further use for my time. I understand the Senator's point. I yield the remainder of my time to the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator. I shall use the remainder of the time later.

Mr. IVES. Does my colleague, the junior Senator from New York, desire to continue?

Mr. LEHMAN. Not at this time.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I think it would be hard to deny that there is a relationship between wages and prices. From the standpoint of economics, I have never known of that theory having been questioned. We all know that wages have a strong and direct bearing on prices. Therefore, there is a relationship between wages and prices and that relationship, it seems to me, should be recognized in any measure pertaining to wage control and price control. That is the sole purpose of this amendment; that is, to have the Wage Stabilization Board and the OPS so related in their activities that one will know what the other is doing. At the moment, one of them at least apparently pays no attention to what the other is doing. Anyone who thinks that an agency may set a price in utter disregard of the wages which may be determined and paid is, from an economic standpoint, completely in error. The sole purpose of this amendment is to stabilize wages and prices so that their relationship will be recognized and so that the results of the efforts to preserve that relationship will be satisfactory.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has 6 minutes. The Senator from South Carolina had that much time and he yielded it to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield the 6 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I realize, of course, that there is a relationship between the cost of labor and the selling price of an article, and we now have agencies that would give consideration to that relationship. But to make it mandatory upon the Economic Stabilization Agency to take into account both the price of labor and the price of the article, it seems to me, would lead to difficulty.

At the hearings of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, at which both the Chairman of the Wage Stabilization Board and Governor Arnall appeared, it was testified that, whereas the Wage Stabilization Board recommended a certain increase in wages, the steel companies refused to accept it, and demanded that the price of steel be increased by $12 a ton. That has since been denied by the steel companies, but I think the record pretty clearly shows it to be the case.

It would not seem to me that the Wage Stabilization Board should be charged with the responsibility of fixing both the cost of labor and the price of an article when there are separate agencies for that purpose. Undoubtedly Governor Arnall's agency would take into account the cost of labor in fixing the price of products of the steel companies. Even if the increase in pay which was recommended by the Wage Stabilization Board were granted, it would not affect the price of steel more than $4 or $5 a ton, at the most, whereas the steel companies demanded $12 a ton. Governor Arnall is the man who is responsible for fixing prices in order to hold the line against inflation.

The function of the Wage Stabilization Board is twofold, to recommend wages and also make a determination with regard to such other matters as may have been voluntarily referred to the Board by contesting parties.

I yield the floor.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, once more, on my own time, I merely wish to point out that the amendment does not do what my distinguished colleague seems to think it does. It does not provide that the Wage Stabilization Board is to fix wages and prices. It does provide, however, that the Economic Stabilization Agency, which is the overall and top agency of which both the Wage Stabilization Board and the OPS are operating units, shall in and of itself coordinate the activities of the subordinate agencies, so that the relationship between wages and prices shall be taken into consideration.

I think everyone knows that, in some cases, wages constitute practically 80 percent of the cost of production. So the purpose of the amendment is to provide that this relationship shall be recognized and that as a result we shall not have prices which utterly disregard the wage scale and the wage factor and we shall not have a wage scale utterly disregarding whatever price may finally be fixed. It is a question of coordination.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will my distinguished colleague yield for a question?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I might say to my distinguished colleague that as I read his amendment it would imply, at least, that the differential between the cost of labor and the cost of the finished article which exists at the time the determination is made by the agency would be maintained. That is what I object to.

I realize, of course, that there is a relationship and there should be a relationship. No one wants industry to produce at a loss or to fail to make a reasonable profit. But, considering the way the amendment is worded, I think it would leave grave doubt as to whether the existing differential would not have to be maintained, in the event there was an increase in the price of labor.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I can only reply that that is not the intention of the author of the amendment. If anyone can improve the wording of the amendment so that it will not be subject to such an interpretation, that will be perfectly agreeable to me. I very much doubt that it can be so worded. The best we can do is to indicate on the floor of the Senate what the intention behind it is, and I have tried to do that in the remarks which I have already made.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. IVES. Certainly.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is what I wanted to establish. I wanted the RECORD to show it. As I understand, it is not the intention of the proposer of the amendment or the intent of the amendment itself to preserve a fixed differential.

Mr. IVES. No; that is not the purpose.

Mr. LEHMAN. In other words, while the Senator wishes to make certain that all the factors are taken into account in the fixing of prices, he does not mean to imply that if an increase has been given to labor it would necessarily mean a proportionate or any increase in the price of the finished product.

Mr. IVES. That is correct. What I do intend is to make sure that the OPS and the Wage Stabilization Board shall pay attention to one another, so that when one takes action in connection with a product the other will take action in connection with wages, which are a part of the product.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Now that we have this explanation and a definite record, I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. IVES. I thank my colleague.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wished to have a clear understanding of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to, as follows:

SEC. . Section 403 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) It shall be the express duty, obligation, and function of the present Economic Stabilization Agency, or any successor agency, to coordinate the relationship between prices and wages and to stabilize prices and wages."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I should like to have the clerk read for the information of the Senate. It may have to be changed in some places, but

I should like to have it before the Senate at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, after line 16, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 108. Title IV of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"NATIONAL EMERGENCY PRICE AND WAGE BOARD

"SEC. 412. (a) Whenever the President finds that a threatened or actual work stoppage or lockout affecting an entire industry or a substantial part thereof will, if permitted to occur or to continue, imperil the national defense or defeat the purposes of this act, he may refer such dispute to the Board created in subsection (b) to inquire into the issues involved in the dispute and to make a written report to him within 113 days after such dispute has been referred to it. Such report shall include a statement of the facts with respect to the dispute, including each party's statement of its position, and shall contain the Board's recommendations with respect to wage and price stabilization as well as other matters involved in such dispute. The President shall make the contents of such report available to the public.

"(b) There is hereby established the National Emergency Price and Wage Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") which shall be composed of a chairman and six other members to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall have power to sit and act at any place within the United States and to conduct such hearings either in public or private, as it may deem necessary or proper, to ascertain the facts with respect to the causes and circumstances of the dispute. Each member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 for each day actually spent by him in the work of the Board, together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses.

"(c) The provisions of sections 9 and 10 relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended (15 U. S. C. 49 and 50), shall be applicable with respect to any hearing or inquiry conducted by the Board under this section.

"(d) The President shall make such provision for stenographic, clerical, and other assistants and for facilities, services, and supplies, as may be necessary to enable the Board to perform its functions.

"(e) Whenever a dispute is referred to the Board the President shall immediately notify the parties to the dispute that the dispute has been so referred and until the Board makes a report to the President and for 7 days thereafter it shall be unlawful for the parties to engage in any work stoppage or lockout. The provisions of section 706 of this act shall apply in the case of any violation of this section.

"(f) Within 7 days after the Board has reported its findings and recommendations to the President, the parties to the dispute shall advise the President in writing whether or not they are willing to accept the recommendations of the Board for settlement of the dispute.

"(g) If all parties to the dispute agree to accept the recommendations of the Board for settlement of the dispute, the President shall take such action under this title as may be necessary to effectuate the recommendations of the Board.

"(h) If any party to the dispute refuses within the period specified in subsection (f) to accept the recommendations of the Board and as a result thereof a work stoppage or a lockout is threatened, the President shall take immediate possession of and operate all plants, mines, or facilities involved in the dispute subject to payment of just compensation therefor as required by the Constitution of the United States. During such period of operation the terms and conditions of employment which were in effect at the time possession of such plant, mine, or facility was taken by the President shall remain in effect.

"(i) Whenever any plant, mine, or facility is in the possession of the United States, it shall be unlawful for any person (1) to coerce, instigate, induce, conspire with, or encourage any person to interfere, by lockout, work stoppage, slow-down, or other interruption, with the operation of such plant, mine, or facility, or (2) to aid any such lockout, work stoppage, slow-down, or other interruption interfering with the operation of such plant, mine, or facility by giving direction or guidance in the conduct of such interruption or by providing funds for the conduct or direction thereof or for the payment of work-stoppage, unemployment, or other benefits to those participating therein.

"(j) At any time after the referral of the dispute to the Board or during the operation by the Government of any plant, mine, or facility the parties to the dispute may reach an agreement by means of collective bargaining. Such agreement must be within the framework of the stabilization policies then in effect.

"(k) Upon settlement of any dispute so referred to the Board, the President shall immediately return possession of the mine, plant, or facility involved to the owners thereof in the event possession of such mine, plant, or facility has been taken by the President pursuant to the provisions of this section.

"(l) While this section is in effect, the provisions of sections 206 to 210, inclusive, of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, shall not apply in the case of any dispute referred to the National Emergency Wage and Price Board. In such case the provisions of the act of March 23, 1932, entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes,' shall not be applicable."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has just had read an amendment which he says he may offer a little later. I strongly urge that the amendment be referred to the committee for hearing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is proceeding under an agreement limiting debate, and there is no amendment pending. If there is an amendment to be offered, debate would be appropriate on it. But the Chair doubts whether this is a question which could be acted on at this time.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I submitted the amendment——

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, may I speak for 2 minutes on the proposed amendment?

Mr. MAYBANK. I submitted the amendment as a United States Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so understands.

Mr. MAYBANK. The committee has never had a hearing on the amendment. The committee has not had time to hold a hearing on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is not pending. It was read only for the information of the Senate. Unless it is offered, there can be no debate on it.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 2 minutes on the proposed amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Indiana may proceed.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I do not wish to speak about the merits or demerits of the proposed amendment. It may well be a good amendment; I do not know. However, I strongly urge that the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency offer this as an amendment to the bill and have it referred to the committee for a quick hearing, so that all principals may be heard in respect to it. The amendment is far reaching. Possibly it has some very meritorious features; again, it may not have. Personally, as a Senator, I should not like to pass upon it without having had time to study it. I should not like to pass upon it without having heard from some of those who would be affected by it.

For example, with respect to one feature of the amendment, if the President should take over and seize a facility, he could operate it indefinitely, and wages would be frozen; there would be no opportunity for an increase or a decrease in wages.

I would not wish to say the amendment was not a good amendment; I would not wish to say it was. I urge the chairman of the committee to hold immediate hearings upon his proposal, because it may well have considerable merit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's 2 minutes have expired.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes on the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from South Carolina may proceed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I did not submit this amendment as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I submitted it in my own right as a United States Senator. I submitted it for the reason that since the bill came before the Senate the Supreme Court has handed down its decision in the steel mill seizure case. It has ruled that the Congress is responsible for legislation. The Supreme Court has cited certain acts written by the Banking and Currency Committee, the Selective Service Act, and the Taft-Hartley Act as being available to the President in place of seizure.

Senators know that the bill before us is not permanent legislation. I submitted the amendment in connection with this bill because by its terms the proposed act will expire on March 1, so it is temporary legislation. I submitted the amendment in connection with the pending bill for the reason that every Senator knows that at any time, by concurrent resolution, without the necessity of going to the President, this provision can be done away with, just as

any other section of the Defense Production Act can be done away with.

Another reason why I submitted the amendment is that there is no use in having a Defense Production Act when the main product to be produced is steel, and when hundreds of thousands of workers in steel factories are out of work. I do not blame management, and I do not blame the workers. The workers are entitled to certain cost-of-living increase in wages, and management is entitled to certain price increases.

I felt that it was our duty to do something, following the Supreme Court ruling. The Senate is now operating under a unanimous-consent agreement for the limitation of debate. I know that management will not like my amendment. I know that labor will not like it. However, after the Supreme Court ruled that Congress had the power to legislate, I felt that it was up to Congress to do something. The amendment which I have submitted represents an attempt to satisfy my own conscience, and to do something.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Can an amendment such as this be adequately considered under a unanimous-consent agreement limiting debate to 30 minutes?

Mr. MAYBANK. When I submitted the amendment my intention was to seek to have the unanimous-consent agreement suspended with respect to it.

Mr. FERGUSON. There ought to be unlimited debate on an amendment of this nature.

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly. I do not believe that 15 minutes would afford opportunity adequately to discuss such an amendment. That is one reason why I asked to have it read for the information of the Senate.

The selective service is taking the young men of the country. Whose young men are they? They are the sons of miners, the sons of manufacturers, the sons of farmers. There is now a stoppage in production. I do not blame either side. I think it is about time for the parties to the dispute to get together, in the interest of the young men who are being drafted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Carolina be permitted to proceed for 5 minutes more.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it so ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. My only purpose is to fulfill my obligation. What is the use of passing a Defense Production Act if we are not going to produce steel?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I commend the Senator for suggesting legislation on the important question to which the amendment relates. I do not know whether or not this is the correct approach. There is no time for extended hearings. The steel mills of the country are closed. Our boys are fighting in Korea. It is time for Congress to act. We should act, and not hold long hearings.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Supreme Court affirmed what Congress had done in the Taft-Hartley law, in the Selective Service Act, and in the Defense Production Act. We are considering amendments to the Defense Production Act. What is the purpose of the Defense Production Act? It is for the benefit of the armed services, for the defense of this country. The main item of production is shut down. I do not blame management, and I do not blame labor. I have submitted this amendment only in order that we may have something before us. Management will probably be disappointed with it, and labor will probably be disappointed with it. I do not care whether they are or not under the conditions which now exist. My conscience is clear in offering an amendment such as this to safeguard the defense of the United States.

I have been asked if I have talked with the President. Of course I have not. I have never discussed this question with him. I have acted on my own responsibility.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Personally I do not understand in what respect the proposed amendment is different from the Taft-Hartley law so far as the next 80 days are concerned. Am I not correct in supposing that under the terms of the proposed amendment the President would appoint a board which would sit for 121 days instead of 80 days?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct in general. The Board could have 113 days to reach a decision, but it could also act faster than that if it wishes. After the Board acts, parties to the dispute would have 7 more days to accept or reject the Board's recommendations.

Mr. TAFT. During that time it would be illegal to strike, or to change any of the terms of employment. It would mean that the Government could obtain an injunction, just as it can do under the Taft-Hartley law. Under the terms of the proposed amendment there could be no seizure until after 121 days. So what possible change in the legal situation would be brought about during the next 80 days if the proposed amendment were substituted for the Taft-Hartley Act?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator well knows that I supported the Taft-Hartley law. As the Senator knows, I was one of those Senators who voted to override the President's veto. If it had not been for the support of those of us who voted to override the President's veto, there would have been no Taft-Hartley law.

The proposed amendment would extend the waiting period in the Taft-Hartley law from 80 days to a possible 120 days. The proposed board, which would be subject to confirmation by the Senate, would have the right to make recommendations and to have them accepted. That is not true of the board under the Taft-Hartley law. It has only the right to make findings without recommendations.

Mr. TAFT. During the next 80 days, under the proposed amendment, as under the Taft-Hartley law, the President could obtain an injunction and compel the men to work for 80 days against their will, under exactly the same procedure that is provided in the Taft-Hartley law, except that the waiting period is extended 40 days. The proposed amendment would be infinitely more tough on labor than is the Taft-Hartley law. It would add an indefinite seizure feature. While the property remained under seizure, the Government could not change wages by 1 cent. A seizure might continue indefinitely, as was the case with the railroads.

Mr. MAYBANK. The law would expire, at the latest, on February 28. By concurrent resolution of Congress it could be done away with in 24 hours.

I do not wish to argue with the Senator from Ohio, or to ask him why the President did not use the Taft-Hartley law. I only ask that my proposed amendment be given consideration.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Am I to understand that the Senator from South Carolina has in mind asking unanimous consent that the time limitation be suspended with reference to this particular amendment, and that if he does not obtain such consent he will not offer the amendment?

Mr. MAYBANK. I have never said that. I said that I expected to ask that the time be extended. The amendment has been read. There are probably errors in it. I know that labor may not like it. I know that management may not like it. But let us get together and amend it so that they will like it, once they recognize their responsibilities to the Nation in the defense effort.

We are working on the pending bill for only one reason, and that is that 1,000,000 of our boys are in military service in Korea and other parts of the world.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the Senator is right when he says that we ought to proceed to take some action. However, if we are to have no more than 30 minutes' debate on the amendment, how can we adequately consider it and amend it so that it may satisfy both management and labor?

Mr. MAYBANK. I will say to the Senator that that could never be done. I have never been able to do it; but I will do the best I can.

Mr. FERGUSON. At least they are entitled to know what is in the amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is why I had it read.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senate is operating under a limitation of debate. It seems likely that we may complete consideration of the bill today.

Mr. MAYBANK. I stated that I expected to ask for a suspension of the unanimous-consent agreement so that my amendment could be properly considered. Of course we could not complete adequate consideration of it today.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to commend the Senator from South Carolina for having the courage to try to get something done. Like him I voted for the Taft-Hartley Act. I have never apologized for it. I think it is a good act. But the proposed amendment seems to me to also have merit, and I think there is ample time to study it. I suggest to the Senator that it be taken up as the last part of the discussion. Then if we cannot obtain unanimous consent for an extension of time for debate, we can offer amendments to make minor changes in the wording, without changing the substance, in order to provide sufficient time to discuss the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I suggest to the Senator from Florida that he ask for 5 minutes, so that I may have a couple of minutes in which to ask him some questions.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to amend my request and ask for 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Florida may proceed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in the first place I call attention to the fact that there is no time limit for the continuance of a seizure except for the ability of Congress to act by concurrent resolution, and except for the further fact that the act itself, to which the amendment would be attached, has a definite time limit.

I call attention to the further fact that there is no granting to either industry or labor of a clean slate to do anything they want to do. Under the terms of the amendment, there is the express condition that there shall be no change in wages, which would mean that the demands of labor in the Steel case, which the Wage Stabilization Board had intended to grant, could not be granted during a seizure.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

So far as industry is concerned, just compensation as allowed under condemnation proceedings and as required by our Constitution are afforded to industry.

Without attempting to give final and conclusive approval to the proposed amendment, it seems to me that it has the earmarks of a just approach. I again commend the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency for trying to get something done in an affirmative way. I believe that before we are through our friends on the other side of the aisle will be joining in some such approach.

I now yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I, too, commend the able Senator from South Carolina for taking some action looking to a solution of a serious problem. I said a moment ago that I do not know whether the amendment is meritorious. I like some parts of it. My position is that it ought to be studied at least for 1 day by the committee. We should hear from the interested parties. I am hopeful that the author of the amendment will take the same position. I must say that if he tries to tack it onto this bill I shall be forced to make a motion to recommit the entire bill to the committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, let me say to the able Senator from Indiana that I have no intention of tacking the amendment onto the bill without opportunity for fair discussion of it. I submitted the amendment this morning. I started to work on it with legislative counsel and the committee staff yesterday morning at 8:30. This morning I telephoned to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] at 9 o'clock, stating that I would ask for a unanimous consent agreement in connection with it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment. Is there any amendment to be proposed to the bill?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, identified as 5-29-52-C. I offer it at this time, but because of its length I ask that it be not read by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will not be read, but will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment offered by Mr. IVES is as follows:

On page 6, beginning with line 10, strike out through line 11 on page 8 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) (1) There is hereby created, in the present Economic Stabilization Agency, or any successor agency, a Wage Stabilization Board (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the 'Board'), which shall be composed, in equal numbers, of members representative of the general public, members representative of labor, and members representative of business and industry. The number of offices on the Board shall be established by Executive order.

"(2) The members representative of the general public shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The members representative of labor, and the members representative of business and industry, shall be appointed by the President. The President shall designate a Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board from among the members representative of the general public.

"(3) The term of office of the members of the Board shall terminate on March 1, 1953. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

"(4) Each member representative of the general public shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 a year, and while a member of the Board shall engage in no other business, vocation, or employment. Each member representative of labor, and each member representative of business and industry shall receive $50 for each day he is actually engaged in the performance of his duties as a member of the Board, and in addition he shall be paid his actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949 while so engaged away from his home or regular place of business. The members representative of labor, and the members representative of business and industry, shall, in respect of their functions on the Board, be exempt from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

"(5) The Board shall, under supervision and direction of the Economic Stabilization Administrator—

"(A) formulate, and recommend to such Administrator for promulgation, general policies and general regulations relating to the stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation; and

"(B) upon the request of (i) any person substantially affected thereby, or (ii) any Federal department or agency whose functions, as provided by law, may be affected thereby or may have an effect thereon, advise as to the interpretation, or the application to particular circumstances, of policies and regulations promulgated by such Administrator which relate to the stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation. For the purposes of this act, stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation means prescribing maximum limits thereon. Labor disputes, and labor matters in dispute, which do not involve the interpretation or application of such regulations or policies shall be dealt with, if at all, insofar as the Federal Government is concerned, under the conciliation, mediation, emergency, or other provisions of laws heretofore or hereafter enacted by the Congress, and not otherwise: *Provided, however*, That the Board may undertake to mediate and/or arbitrate labor disputes involving wages, salaries, and other compensation, if the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service certifies to the Administrator of the Economic Stabilization Agency that all remedies available to the Service have been exhausted, and (i) the parties themselves request the Board to mediate and/or arbitrate, or (ii) the President requests the Board to mediate and/or arbitrate the dispute and the parties consent: *Provided further*, That in any effort to mediate and/or arbitrate a labor dispute referred to the Board pursuant to the terms of the foregoing proviso, a panel of the Board, the membership of which is constituted in the same proportion as is the Board itself, may act on behalf of the Board.

"(6) Paragraph (5) of this subsection shall take effect 30 days after the date on which this subsection is enacted. The Wage Stabilization Board created by Executive Order No. 10161, and reconstituted by Executive Order No. 10233, as amended by Executive Order No. 10301, is hereby abolished, effective at the close of the twenty-ninth day following the date on which this subsection is enacted."

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, how much time am I allowed on this amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. IVES. I shall try to keep within the 15 minutes.

Mr. President, in line with the discussion which we have just had I am offering an amendment to section 10(c). I believe that by making the change proposed by my amendment we can go a long way in resolving labor disputes which may endanger the national safety.

In spite of protests to the contrary, the present Wage Stabilization Board is not soundly constituted with respect to both membership selection and scope of function. More than anything else, the critical controversy in the steel industry has demonstrated a fundamental weakness in the Economic Stabilization Agency, for which the operation of the Wage Stabilization Board has been in part responsible. It is significant, in this connection, that this Board is not a statutory agency.

The provision in the Defense Production Act, by which the creation of the Wage Stabilization Board has been construed to be authorized, is broad and indefinite. As we know, the Board itself was established by Executive order and the specific functions assigned to it were authorized by Executive order.

Mr. President, may we have order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order. The Chair would suggest to the Senator from New York, after examining his amendment, that it seems to come within the purview of the unanimous-consent agreement allowing 1 hour of debate on amendments affecting the Wage Stabilization Board. Therefore the Senator from New York is entitled to speak for 30 minutes.

Mr. IVES. That is why the Senator from New York inquired previously. I thank the Chair.

Because of its importance in our economic structure, however, this Board does possess the power to do much good—or much harm—to our economy. Recommendations it apparently is allowed to make are, to be sure, without the force of law, but they can and do have a far-reaching effect through their influence upon the thinking and action of all with whom they may be concerned.

Especially has this influence been noticeable when the Board's recommendations have not been confined to matters pertaining to wages, salaries, and other compensation.

I do not question the authority or the propriety of action by an appropriate governmental agency in dealing generally with questions and issues and controversies arising in the course of collective-bargaining negotiations. Permanent agencies of this type and for this purpose already exist.

But I do question seriously the general and unrestrained invasion of the field of labor-management relations by a governmental agency whose sole function presumably should be to set, or at least recommend, wage, salary, and other compensation ceilings, and otherwise to act in an effort to stabilize wages, salaries, and other compensation. I believe firmly that such an agency should not become involved in extraneous controversies arising during the course of the consideration of wage cases, which, of course, fall naturally and properly within the agency's jurisdiction.

However, to the extent that agency action may occasion a dispute between labor and management over wages, salaries, or other compensation, it seems to me most essential that the agency involved should be granted sufficient power to seek to effect a reconciliation between the parties in dispute, but only after the regular and permanent governmental agencies, which have been established to aid in resolving labor disputes, have exhausted unsuccessfully their own efforts to settle the dispute. In other words, before a Wage Stabilization Board should be permitted to attempt to mediate or arbitrate a labor dispute pertaining to wages, salaries, or other compensation, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service should have been fully utilized and its Director should certify that its efforts have been futile.

Therefore, I have prepared the amendment I have just offered, which amounts in effect to a substitute for section 106 of the pending bill—S. 2594. This amendment, it will be noted, not only specifies functions of the Wage Stabilization Board in line with the recommendation I have just made; it also changes the nature of selection of the Board's membership.

It seems to me, in truth, that, although the existing provision in the law under which the Wage Stabilization Board has been created may have lent and may lend itself to unwise interpretation and even abuse, the pending bill's provisions, to which I am referring, would tend to stir up and increase, rather than reduce, labor-management controversy and strife. When I make this statement, in no way do I cast a reflection upon the purpose or motive of the authors and sponsors of section 106. Indeed, I join in their feeling that the Board in question is so vital to the country's welfare that it should have statutory status, with definite functions assigned to it, and not be the product solely of executive whim and fiat.

Nevertheless, I cannot, in the present critical circumstances, accept the idea that a Wage Stabilization Board, consisting only of public members—regardless of how able and fair-minded they may be—but deprived of the cooperation and support of either labor or management, can possibly accomplish as much or act as efficaciously as can a Board that is equitably tripartite in character and structure and favored with the wholehearted backing of both labor and management. After all, the present emergency does not require the application of any ideal theory—no matter how beautifully and perfectly conceived. Rather it calls for a plan which can bring about the greatest possible cooperation among labor, management, and government in an effort to stabilize the economy and in the interest of all the American people.

It would appear that, under prevailing conditions, there is need for the formal and specific representation of both labor and management on any board dealing with wages, salaries, and other compensation. It seems to me immaterial whether or not the public members constitute a majority of the total membership. In any case and under any condition of real controversy between labor and management, the ultimate decision would have to be made by the representatives of the general public. If direct representation on such a board by labor and management will induce greater cooperation by either of them, then, by all means, both of them should be thus represented. If an equal division of representation among labor, management, and the general public will induce still further cooperation on the part of either labor or management, then most certainly such equality in representation should be provided.

So it is that under the terms of my amendment, a tripartite Wage Stabilization Board would be established, and its members would be representative equally of the general public, labor, and management. All the members would be appointed by the President, and the appointment of the members representing the general public would require confirmation by the Senate.

In this connection it should be noted that both in section 106 of the bill and in my amendment, the requirements pertaining to the compensation and qualifications of members representing the general public are the same. Under my amendment, however, the members representing labor and management would receive $50 a day while engaged in the performance of their duties, together with their actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses.

In both section 106 of the bill and in my amendment the chief functions of the Board are substantially the same, with the exception of my amendment's mediation and arbitration provisions, which conform to recommendations previously stated in these remarks.

These provisions would permit the Board to act as a mediation or arbitration agency in labor disputes involving wages, salaries, or other compensation, if the parties to the dispute should desire or agree to that kind of arrangement. In both section 106 of the bill and in my amendment the Board's jurisdiction is confined wholly to this type of case.

I believe the terms of my amendment would remove the danger inherent in section 106, as now written into the bill. I believe my amendment is workable and wholly practicable, and I urge my colleagues in the Senate to consider it favorably.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a question?

Mr. IVES. Certainly.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me for a question?

Mr. IVES. I yield first to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Assuming that the amendment of the Senator from New York were adopted, what would happen to the case load now before the present Board? Would it be transferred?

Mr. IVES. It would have to be transferred; that would happen automatically, no matter what was done with the particular bill now before the Senate. The same would apply if section 106 as now written were adopted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me state what troubles me in connection with the matter: There is to be a brand new Board——

Mr. IVES. It would be a brand-new Board in status, but presumably not in membership.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Presumably in membership, too.

Mr. IVES. I would doubt that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Under the present provision or the amendment submittted by the Senator from New York, what would happen to the great mass of cases which have developed during the existence of the present Board?

Mr. IVES. Earlier in these proceedings we have adopted an amendment which calls for coordination between the two subdivisions of the Economic Stabilization Agency. That being the situation, if there is proper coordination, which there must be if the entire set-up is to work satisfactorily and effectively, the whole case load will be taken care of adequately.

I would assume that for the sake of that very objective, the appointing officer, who would be the President of the United States, would name to the Board the same persons who now are on the existing Wage Stabilization Board. That should automatically take care of the present case load. They could take care of it as they saw fit; it would be a question of administration only.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Do I correctly understand that the proposed representatives of the general public, to have a salary of $15,000 annually, would be permanent members?

Mr. IVES. They would be permanent until March 1, which would be the termination date of the act.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Whereas the labor and management members would be ad hoc members who would be appointed as special occasion arose. Is that correct?

Mr. IVES. They would not be appointed for a length of time greater than the length of duration of the act.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Why is it proposed that the compensation differ, then?

Mr. IVES. For the reason that the members representing the general public, as named in my amendment, and also as proposed in section 106 of the bill, could do no other kind of work, but would have to confine their activities exclusively to the work of the Board, whereas the labor and management representatives, time permitting, would be able to carry on their regular work elsewhere. All the members would be full-time members, insofar as the requirements of the Board are concerned; but the public members could do nothing else.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I assume from the long experience the Senator from New York has had in this field that he is familiar with the operations of tripartite boards.

Mr. IVES. I have never favored, as a matter of principle, the idea of tripartite boards. They are not a satisfactory way of handling controversial questions which arise in cases in which labor and management are concerned, although not merely cases of this particular nature. After all, the National Labor Relations Board is not tripartite or anything like it. Neither is the Mediation Board tripartite. Although their functions are not identical to those of the Board here proposed, they correspond in a general way.

In this case I am trying to do something which will gain the cooperation of the parties in interest. What is the point of setting up a public group if it is not to receive the cooperation of one of the great parties in interest in this case, namely, labor? And I understand that labor will not go along with a Board which is constituted entirely of public members.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is the purpose of my question.

Mr. IVES. I am trying to bring peace in industrial relations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I understand from the answer given to my previous question that the Senator from New York does not generally favor tripartite boards.

Mr. IVES. Not as a general practice.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. But I also understand that in this instance the Senator from New York favors a tripartite board because he desires to obtain peace in this situation.

Mr. IVES. I certainly would favor anything else if I thought it would better secure the desired result.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. One of the things which have troubled many persons, both those in Congress and those outside of Congress, has been the way in which labor questions not relating to wage stabilization or price stabilization have been taken up by the present Board and have been ruled upon by it.

In reading the amendment submitted by the Senator from New York, beginning on page 3, in line 20, and continuing to page 4, line 17, it would seem that the amendment would confine the activities of the Board to questions relating to wages and other remuneration. On the other hand, in line 6 it appears that the amendment provides that when the Mediation and Conciliation Service certifies that all remedies and other means available to the Service have been exhausted and (i) the parties themselves request the Board to mediate and/or arbitrate on these other matters or (ii) the President requests the Board to mediate and/or arbitrate the dispute and the parties consent.

That means that nothing except remuneration could be considered, unless both parties consented. Is that correct?

Mr. IVES. That is correct. The only matters in dispute which they could consider would be matters dealing with wages, salaries, and other compensation, as defined in the act.

Mr. FLANDERS. I wished to have that point stated clearly in the RECORD.

Mr. IVES. I do not think it is proper to have a Wage Stabilization Board, whose primary function presumably is to deal with the wage structure, given authority to expand its operations and to deal with everything under the sun.

Mr. FLANDERS. Does the Senator from New York feel that in going outside that field, the present Board exceeded the law; or does the Senator from New York feel that in the present law there is authorization for the Board to go outside?

Mr. IVES. The present law is a little vague in that respect. The amendment already adopted this morning will do a great deal to clarify that situation.

I do not think it was the intent of the Congress to have the wage agency deal with every kind of labor dispute under the canopy of heaven. I do not believe that was the congressional intent, and I am sure it was not the intent of those who drafted the law itself.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me ask the eminent Senator from New York, following the questions which have been asked by the Senator from Vermont, the precise meaning of the language on page 4, lines 5 to 12. Do I correctly understand the Senator from New York to say that this Board could not deal with nonwage matters?

Mr. IVES. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. How would nonwage matters in dispute, such as union shop, seniority, and other matters be handled?

Mr. IVES. Those would have to be handled by the machinery we have at present, or by additional machinery to be provided by this particular act.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may call the attention of my good friend from New York to the language at the bottom of page 3, beginning on line 22, continuing on page 4, which seems not to confine itself to wage matters but to include all wage disputes.

Mr. IVES. That is exactly what the language does.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It reads:

> Labor disputes, and labor matters in dispute, which do not involve the interpretation or application of such regulations or policies shall be dealt with, if at all, insofar as the Federal Government is concerned, under the conciliation, mediation, emergency, or other provisions of laws heretofore or hereafter enacted by the Congress, and not otherwise.

I call the attention of the Senator from New York to the three concluding words, "and not otherwise." Would that mean that if a great national dispute were to arise involving seniority or the union shop, all the President could do in effect would be to use the conciliation services, and that he could not establish a special board to deal with those disputes?

Mr. IVES. It is not the intention of the Senator from New York to have it mean that, because it would be a grave mistake to prohibit the President from establishing a temporary board which he might select for the purpose of endeavoring to resolve a special situation of a critical nature. I can understand how that might be fundamental and necessary, vitally necessary. It is not the purpose of my proposal to prevent that being done. However, if it will straighten the matter out so that the senior Senator from Illinois would favor this amendment, I am perfectly willing to drop the three words "and not otherwise." The others are quite sufficient, since they indicate that as a first course of action the actually existing services provided by the Government must be

utilized. That is the intent of the language. But if they are not sufficient, the President should then be empowered to appoint such board of a voluntary type as he might see fit.

Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. AIKEN rose.

Mr. IVES. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Under what laws would the President have power to create independent boards to deal with nonwage matters?

Mr. IVES. Any laws that are now in existence, under which he would have such power.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Preceding the words "and not otherwise," appear the words "or other provisions of laws." In other words, the President can only move in such matters as the result of a congressional delegation of power, and by implication he cannot move under the executive powers of the President. I should like to ask the Senator from New York whether he means to foreclose the President from acting under his Executive powers.

Mr. IVES. No; whatever his Executive powers may be. I think they have been pretty well defined within the past 2 or 3 days by the Supreme Court of the United States. I think we now know much better what Executive powers are, and perhaps what inherent powers are.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The amendment refers to provisions of existing laws. Specifically, I should like to ask the Senator from New York this question: What are the powers of the President, granted to him by specific laws, to deal with nonwage matters which may be in dispute between the two sets of parties?

Mr. IVES. They are the laws which now exist, under which he could act.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What are they?

Mr. IVES. I do not know. Does the Senator mean to tell me that the President is going to proceed in such matters without legal authority?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; but I am saying that the President should be free to move under Executive authority. It seems to me that the Senator from New York, for whom I have the greatest respect and who is a magnificent Member of this body, is depending upon a black cat—which is not there—in a dark room.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. In view of the colloquy between the Senator from New York and the Senator from Illinois, I suggest that it seems to me that what this amendment does is simply to say that in respect to questions, which may be exceedingly important, outside the area of wages and salaries and other compensation, this particular Board shall not be used. That is what this says.

Mr. IVES. That is correct. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. FLANDERS. It is, therefore, negative in that respect.

Mr. IVES. That is correct.

Mr. FLANDERS. The particular Board may not be used for those purposes. In that respect I think it a wise provision.

Mr. HUMPHREY rose.

Mr. IVES. I yield first to the senior Senator from Vermont, since he has been standing for some time.

Mr. AIKEN. I may possibly reiterate questions which have already been asked, though perhaps I shall change them somewhat in form. The Senator from New York proposes that labor disputes be handled under the provisions of laws heretofore or hereafter enacted by the Congress, and not otherwise. He uses those words advisedly.

Mr. IVES. I understand what the Senator means.

Mr. AIKEN. That would successfully preclude the Wage Stabilization Board from concerning itself with such matters as jurisdictional disputes, grievances other than grievances over wages, union shop, and other matters which do not directly concern the wage level which the Board is set up to determine.

Mr. IVES. That is the purpose of the amendment, namely, that those matters in and of themselves, should be dealt with in accordance with the provisions of acts to which the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois has referred.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from New York. I would not have asked the question, but I have seen many laws deliberately misinterpreted by executive agencies, who always fall back on the excuse that it was not specifically stated in the record by anyone that they should or should not do certain things.

Mr. IVES. That is the sole purpose of this particular amendment. That is the sole purpose of section 106, anyway. I think the senior Senator from Illinois will attest to that fact.

Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. IVES. I yield first to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator for purposes of clarification a few questions with reference to the difference between his proposed amendment and the present situation as outlined under Executive Order 10233. As I understand, the Executive order establishes the present Wage Stabilization Board to which, in case of a dispute, the parties may go, if they agree to do so, and if they also agree to accept the recommendations of the board. That is No. 1. Is that correct?

Mr. IVES. I believe that relates to any type of dispute. I am trying to get away from that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. 2: Under that Executive order, the President of the United States may certify to the Board a particular case.

Mr. IVES. On any subject, on any question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No—whenever he believes that a labor dispute would vitally affect production.

Mr. IVES. Yes. The President of the United States, by interpretation of the present act, has greatly broadened the function of the Wage Stabilization Board in the handling of actual wage cases.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, under the Executive order, the President may refer to the Wage Stabilization Board a case which in fact may not involve wages, but which might involve working conditions.

Mr. IVES. That is what I have been talking about. Hours and working conditions, under certain circumstances, are inextricably tied in with wages, and to that extent and under certain circumstances they could be construed as appropriate matters to come before a board of this type, when they are tightly tied together.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator that, as I understand, his amendment would empower the Board to mediate and/or arbitrate labor disputes involving wages, salaries, and other compensation, such as, I suppose, fringe benefits.

Mr. IVES. That is the law as it now stands.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. But it would not permit the Wage Stabilization Board to handle, let us say, a case involving seniority.

Mr. IVES. Seniority, where wages would be involved, might come under it, but I cannot see where wages and seniority are tied together in that manner.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has one more minute remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Under title IV of the Defense Production Act, section 401, there are set forth what are said to be the intentions of the Congress under the law, one of which is to prevent economic disturbances, labor disputes, interference with the effective——

Mr. IVES. But it does not say it shall be done by the Wage Stabilization Board.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not arguing with the Senator about that. If there were a labor dispute which involved something besides wages, salaries, and other compensation, would anything in the Senator's amendment prevent the President of the United States from setting up an ad hoc board?

Mr. IVES. I know of nothing in the amendment which would prevent him from doing so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, it is the view of the Senator from New York that the President's power to establish ad hoc boards to make recommendations and findings on other matters than wages, salaries, and compensation would in no way be impaired by his amendment?

Mr. IVES. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New York has expired. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is entitled to 30 minutes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not intend to use 30 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. For how many minutes?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Time enough to ask the Senator from New York one question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield 5 minutes for that purpose.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New

York this question: Do I correctly understand that his amendment is offered primarily because he believes that the complexion of the Board as proposed by the committee will simply not be accepted, and, therefore, the provision is of no value?

Mr. IVES. I think section 106 as presently written will not be acceptable to all parties in interest, and will be not only useless but, perhaps, worse than useless. As I expressed it in my prepared remarks, I am sure it would create greater labor strife than would otherwise exist, and I look upon it with grave apprehension. I believe my amendment is so fair to all parties concerned that no one can direct a legitimate, reasonable criticism at it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Under the terms of the amendment, does the Board take jurisdiction when the Director——

Mr. IVES. The Board will take jurisdiction if the parties desire it and agree to it. Otherwise, the Board cannot take jurisdiction. There is no point in a governmental agency entering into a dispute when one of the parties objects strenuously to it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So the Senator believes that his amendment is more practicable than is section 106 of the bill?

Mr. IVES. I do not think that section will be workable. I think my amendment is workable.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has 27 minutes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and the remainder to the Senator from——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can yield to only one Senator at a time.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield, first, to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the substitute offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] leaves me in something of a dilemma. We have to go back and pick up the stitches a little, I think, in order to get a good perspective of what is before us.

Long before the steel dispute, as a matter of fact, when the Defense Production Act of 1951 was pending, there was some doubt about possible bias on the part of the public members of the Board. In those days there was under discussion in the House of Representatives a type of proposal that would clarify the authority of the Wage Stabilization Board under the disputes section of the Defense Production Act.

After considering the matter, I offered an amendment which preserved the tripartite character of the Wage Stabilization Board, which gave it statutory authority, which provided, among other things, that the number of public members should not exceed, in the aggregate, the number of industry and labor members, and called for Senate confirmation of the public members of the Board.

The theory was that the public interest ought to be accented, for one thing, and, second, the matter was of such importance that the public members should be confirmed by the Senate, so that we might examine into the background of those who would pass upon questions so delicate and so explosive as might come before the Board.

It was in that form that the bill was offered for consideration to the Banking and Currency Committee. When the bill was under discussion and was finally being marked up, the suggestion was made by a number of members of the committee that, perhaps, instead of preserving the tripartite character of the Board, all members should be public members.

I may say to my friend, the senior Senator from New York, that in our discussion of the matter in the Banking and Currency Committee—and I trust I do him no injustice, for I would not do so for the world—his notion at the time was that perhaps the members of the Board ought to be all public members. I know that was only informal discussion.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. My colleague from Illinois will remember that I voted against an all-public-member board in the committee, and I pointed out, exactly as I pointed out to my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] what my theory was. While, generally speaking, I am in favor of public members on a board of this type, in this particular instance I do not think that would work.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I make the point merely in order to indicate the transformation that took place in the amendment in the Banking and Currency Committee. Subsequently an amendment was offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and that amendment prevailed.

Mr. IVES. That was the one against which I voted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I said at the outset that I was left in a bit of a dilemma, because the amendment suggested by my friend from New York is substantially the same as the one which I originally offered. But I did go along with the proposal to provide that all members of the Board be public members to accent the public interest, and to require their confirmation by the Senate.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I should like to point out that the amendment, so far as the complexion of the board was concerned, is exactly as the distinguished Senator from Illinois had it in his original draft, except that it is now truly tripartite. However, I have found upon checking that that is not going to work, either.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know that any of us can be sure whether or not it will work. I can understand some of the virtues and benefits that may accrue from a tripartite board. On the other hand, we have a tripartite board at the present time. They failed in the steel controversy—quite aside from the reasons for which they failed. So I am disposed toward taking a chance with a board composed of all public members, to be confirmed by the Senate, in the belief that it might as nearly work out satisfactorily as the system we have at the present time.

After all, there are only two issues before the Senate in this matter. The first is the composition of the board. Shall it be composed of public members, or shall the tripartite character of the board, with labor, industry, and the public being represented, be preserved? Secondly, how far should the authority go? Shall we prescribe maximum limits beyond which the board may not go? Or shall we project ourselves into the same difficulty we are in at the present time, because, in connection with the steel controversy, involving something over 100 separate and distinct issues, the board undertook finally to pass upon all of them, and certainly in contravention of what I thought the authority of the board actually was? The controversy involved the union shop, geographical differentials, and a host of other things. I thought they were matters that should remain within the province and jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board, because, after all, that Board is responsible to Congress. When Mr. Herzog, Chairman of the Board, testified before the House Committee on Education and Labor, the hearings filled between 200 and 300 pages of testimony. There he asserted and reasserted his belief that nothing in the wage dispute section of the Defense Production Act in any way modified the character, authority, or jurisdiction which the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board possessed.

So I simply emphasize that the two issues are: What shall the composition of the Board be in case a dispute of similar dimensions comes before it? Secondly, how far shall we go in conferring authority upon such a board?

Because of the strange transformation of the amendment I originally offered, I am content to go along with the provision presently in the bill under consideration.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois if he does not appreciate the fact that there is a vast difference between the authority which would be granted to the Board where mediation and arbitration are concerned, and the authority given to and exercised by the National Labor Relations Board? The functions of the two boards are wholly different.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suppose the Senator from New York is referring to the language on page 4.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from Illinois mentioned the National Labor Relations Board. I am pointing out that there is no relationship whatsoever between the functions of the National Labor Relations Board and the functions which would be given the Wage Stabilization Board by my amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I believe everyone knows that this whole controversy was precipitated by the union shop issue. That is a matter that has been heretofore resolved, under the jurisdiction of the Taft-Hartley Act, by the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. The Senator realizes that the union shop issue as such could not be handled by the National Labor Relations Board, under my amendment, any more than it could be handled by the Wage Stabilization Board under his provision in section 6.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am quite mindful of that, and I allude to it only to indicate that it was the rock upon which the matter finally split and brought the controversy before the Senate, necessitating remedial legislation in order to meet it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have received a letter from Philip Murray in regard to the bill. I should like to ask unanimous consent that the clerk be permitted to read it, without having the time charged to the Senator, because the Senator may wish to comment on it, if that could be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has only one more minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator indulge me for just a moment, in order that I may conclude?

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In view of the fact that a majority in the committee took the position indicated by the amendment, and the amendment was initiated at my instance, I feel disposed to go along with the language reported to the Senate today by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, before the Senator from Arizona makes his unanimous-consent request, which I am certain all of us desire to have granted, so that we may hear the letter, I desire to allot the 5 minutes following to the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], to whom I have previously promised time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield time to the Senator from Arizona, so that the letter referred to by him may be read?

Mr. MAYBANK. I allot the next 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator from South Carolina yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be read, the time to be charged to neither side. I am sure that all Senators, whether they agree with the letter or not, would like to hear it and comment on it.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, whom is the letter from?

Mr. McFARLAND. Philip Murray.

Mr. WATKINS. To whom is it addressed?

Mr. McFARLAND. To myself.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, if the letter is to be read in the Senate, is it to become a matter for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. McFARLAND. If I read the letter in my own time, I will have to put it in the RECORD. I should have put it in the RECORD yesterday, so that Senators would have had an opportunity to see it.

Mr. BRICKER. I think that would have been far better. Does the Senator sponsor the letter?

Mr. McFARLAND. I am not going to say at this time, Mr. President. I am merely having the letter read for what it is worth.

Mr. BRICKER. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., May 28, 1952.

Hon. ERNEST W. McFARLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR McFARLAND: I want to take this occasion to inform you of the views of the Congress of Industrial Organizations with respect to the so-called Dirksen amendment to S. 2645, amending and extending the Defense Production Act of 1950.

This amendment, in the form reported by the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, would abolish the existing Wage Stabilization Board and substitute a new Board with different composition and responsibilities. It would drastically change not only the mechanics but also the substance of our national wage stabilization policy.

Before discussing the amendment in detail, I want to make it clear that the CIO feels that this amendment has only one basic purpose: To discredit the President of the United States and the existing Wage Stabilization Board and to undermine the recommendations of that Board in the current steel dispute, which have been endorsed by the President.

In the last session of Congress an amendment similar to the present Dirksen proposal was introduced in the House. That proposal—the Lucas amendment (H. R. 4552)—was defeated by more than a 2-to-1 vote. A similar amendment introduced in the Senate by Senator TAFT was withdrawn.

What has happened since that time? Up until March 20 of this year there was no dissatisfaction with the Wage Stabilization Board and its policies. Even our former Defense Production Administrator, Mr. Charles E. Wilson, has testified before the House Labor Committee that the Board performed its duties faithfully and well up until March 20. The companies in the steel industry responded with alacrity when the President asked them to submit their dispute with the steelworkers to the Wage Stabilization Board. They cooperated in the Board's proceedings and publicly announced their concurrence in the view that the Board had jurisdiction to issue recommendations on all issues in dispute between the companies and the union. They specifically agreed, in hearings before the Board's panel, that the Board had jurisdiction to issue a recommendation for the union shop.

Suddenly, on March 20, 1952, all this changed. Having willingly, and even anxiously, submitted their case to the Board, the steel companies and their allies suddenly discovered, after the Board's decision was made on March 20, 1952, that the Board was illegal, that it was improperly constituted, and that it should be abolished. They all cried, "Kill the umpire."

The Dirksen amendment which will come before the Senate this week is the direct expression of this cry. Those who support it are simply carrying out the wishes of the reactionary segments of big business which insist upon maintenance of profits far in excess of normal, as defined by this very Congress, while the living standards of their employees continue to decline because of the increase in the cost of living.

The Dirksen amendment as reported by the Banking and Currency Committee would do these things, among others:

(1) It would destroy the benefits of tripartitism and thus insure labor's hostility and noncooperation with the stablization program. It must be remembered that the principal function of the Wage Stabilization Board is not to settle disputes but to determine whether wage increases which employers have agreed to pay can be put into effect consistently with our stabilization policy. Such a program is difficult for labor to swallow at any time. It will be virtually impossible for unions to cooperate in such a program if they are to be denied any voice in the discussion and decision of stabilizaiton issues. Even the industry members of the present Wage Stabilization Board have recognized, in a public statement issued on June 27, 1951, that a tripartite system is a highly desirable system of administering wage stabilization.

(2) The amendment prevents effective handling of emergency disputes. The current steel controversy has beclouded the fact that the Wage Stabilization Board has been remarkably successful in avoiding strikes in plants in which a stoppage of work would seriously threaten the progress of the national defense. The recommendations of the Board in the steel case did not succeed in settling the steel dispute only because of the adamant refusal of the industry to budge one inch from its predetermined position that its present excess profits be maintained intact., I think it would be most regrettable if the Congress of the United States were to become a willing party to the industry's deliberate attempt to wreck our stabilization machinery because it dislikes the results in the steel case.

The amendment goes even further than taking away the Wage Stabilization Board's disputes function. It appears to establish a blanket prohibition against any effort by the Federal Government to settle disputes other than through the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, the Taft-Hartley Act, and the Railway Labor Act. In a period of emergency, I think it is highly dubious for the Congress to place arbitrary limits upon the President's efforts to obtain uninterrupted production of materials necessary for the national defense.

(3) The amendment contains language which appears to limit the new wage stabilization board to the prescription of maximum limits on wages and salaries. While the purpose of this language is unclear, it would appear that the intention is to require the imposition of rigid and inflexible ceilings, without any possibility of adjustment to take care of hardships and inequities. If this is the purpose of the amendment it would completely undermine the existing wage stabilization structure.

The present Wage Stabilization Board has issued regulations which are not supposed to constitute absolute ceilings but rather to separate the cases in which wage increases can be put into effect without Board examination of the facts and cases in which Board examination is necessary to determine whether the increase can be placed into effect. Such increases as the 4 cents annual improvement factors negotiated by the United Auto Workers (CIO) and other unions have been approved by the Board on a case by case basis, rather than by overall regulations. If the effect of the bill will

be to transform the Board's regulations into rigid ceilings rather than a dividing line between the cases which do not require approval and the cases which must be examined further, then either a tremendous injustice will be worked in thousands of cases or the Board's regulations will have to be revised upward to take care of matters which have been previously handled on a case by case approval.

(4) Finally, the effect of the amendment would be to disrupt completely the existing Board procedures and thus manifoldly increase the delays which even today are an unfortunate part of the stabilization process. Wage increases which eventually prove to be allowable under present regulations are often delayed for many, many months because of the tremendous backlog of undecided cases which the present Board has. Many workers are thus denied the benefits which their employers have agreed to give them and which are permissible under the law. If the present Board is to be scrapped entirely and an entirely new Board established, we may certainly expect that additional delay of at least several months will certainly be created. By the creation of additional delay, the legitimate rights of the employees of this country will be tremendously prejudiced.

SUMMARY

The amendment to the Defense Production Act of 1950 recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency is a backhanded effort by the steel industry to use the Congress of the United States for its own purposes. It would substantially wreck our wage-stabilization program. It would destroy the tripartite system which served so effectively throughout World War I and World War II and which had continued to serve effectively in the present mobilization period up until the moment when the steel industry sought to destroy it. It would establish a method of wage stabilization administration which would be both impractical and unjust. Finally, it would remold our entire stabilization program into an antilabor, proindustry program. Certainly neither the CIO nor any other respectable labor organization will willingly submit to or cooperate with a stabilization program so designed.

On behalf of the CIO and all of its affiliated unions, I urge most strongly that this unwholesome and undesirable legislation be defeated.

Sincerely,

PHILIP MURRAY,
President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from New York on his major purpose in this amendment, which is to limit and restrict the authority of the so-called Wage Stabilization Board within its proper province, and to do away with duplication as between that Board and any other board which might be established under the law.

The day before the steel seizure took place, and before a strike had been called, I stated that it was the practice of ranging in the field where there was no jurisdiction on the part of the Wage Stabilization Board which was directly responsible for the strike. I still believe that to be true. Had the orderly processes of law been used, there would have been no steel strike; it would have been settled by negotiation between the parties.

I believe that the board recommended by the committee is in the public interest. Union labor is a minority interest so far as the public is concerned. The steel companies are a minority interest so far as the public is concerned. But we in the Senate have a paramount duty to represent the over-all public interest. That may or may not be identical with the position taken by organized labor. It may or may not be identical with the position taken by industry, or by the steel companies.

First of all, the public interest is today represented by those who are fighting around the world, and who need continued production for their full support. I shall not vote on the floor of the Senate under promise of favor or under intimidation or threat of reprisal. As I see it, the only reason the Senator from New York advocates the tripartite board, which has proved its inefficiency and ineffectiveness, is that one segment has refused to accept it and has publicly asserted that it will not go along, but will wreck the program.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Does not the distinguished Senator from Ohio feel that one of our chief purposes, if not our chief purpose, should be to do something to bring about peace and avoid controversy and conflict between management and labor?

Mr. BRICKER. I certainly agree with that purpose. However, the board proposed to be established under the terms of the amendment of the Senator from New York, a board of a tripartite nature, would give the power to labor or to industry to break down the operation of the board, just as labor broke down the operation of the first nonstatutory board created by the President, by walking out. If industry had not agreed with the Board, it could have done the same thing. I feel that the paramount and over-all public interest of the United States should be represented, but it cannot be done by a tripartite board which has a special minority segment.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York would like to inquire of his distinguished colleague from Ohio if he does not think that a public board, a board consisting entirely of public members, which would not be recognized, which would not be utilized, which would be absolutely ignored or boycotted by either labor or management, could not possibly be more effective than a tripartite board, even though one of the parties should refuse to cooperate.

Mr. BRICKER. I feel that if the public interest is properly represented by the vote of the Senate, no minority interest will have the power, the right, or the authority to break down the operation of law. When that is done, the very foundation of the Republic and the representative system of government is destroyed. That I shall endeavor to prevent.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Does not the Senator feel that a board dealing primarily with two elements in society, management and labor, is, generally speaking, representing society as a whole, in view of the fact that it is dealing with questions which are of grave concern to society as a whole, but in which those two great bodies of society are primarily involved? How can the Senator intimate for one moment that if one side to a dispute refuses to cooperate and to work with the other side, a minority is attempting to sabotage the operation of the law, when it is a great body which has to do with the total defense effort of the country?

Mr. BRICKER. I recognize the great interest of labor and of industry in the operation of this Board and in the effect of the law. However, I say that no minority interest and no combination of minority interests should determine the over-all public policy, which ought to be the paramount consideration before the Congress.

The amendment of the Senator from New York places in the hands of a minority interest the power to say, "We will not go along." If we create a public board, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, it will represent the paramount power of the Republic, expressed through its representatives in the Congress.

No segment or minority can try to defy the operation of law in this country for a great length of time because of public opinion and public support. I say again I shall not vote under threat. I shall not vote under promise. I represent no minority or segment of society, but I speak for the great public interest of the people of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has 11 minutes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield 3 minutes to the senior Senator from Illinois.

TRIPARTITE COMPOSITION IS DESIRABLE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] has made a very laudable attempt to reach a compromise between the present system under which the Wage Stabilization Board operates, under Executive order, and the so-called Lucas amendment, which was defeated in the House of Representatives last year, by a vote of 113 to 217. On the one hand, he retains the tripartite character of the present Board instead of the purely public body proposed by the Dirksen-Bricker amendment. He also retains equal representation for labor, industry, and the public. In this I think he is extremely wise.

It is necessary in a democracy to get the consent and understanding of the parties concerned; but it is impossible to get their understanding or their consent unless they have representation. That is the price which must be paid in a democracy for understanding and consent. The parties to the dispute must feel that they are in on the hearing of cases and on the decision of the cases,

and, although at times the parties break up in apparent disagreement and conditions appear to get no better as a result of the conferences, there are also a great many other times when, through a mutual discussion of issues, the parties come closer together and reach an understanding. The record of the Wage Stabilization Board substantiates this. On two specific cases, for example, the parties reached an agreement after the case had been referred to the Board, but without the necessity of formal Board recommendations, although they had not been able to reach an agreement before the case went to the Board. Frequently, moreover, they reach an understanding with each other although for a time they may be unwilling to declare that understanding to the public.

So, the tripartite character of the Board enables a better set of facts to be considered and enables a reconciling process to take place. In this respect the present composition of the Board is superior, in my judgment, to that provided by the so-called Dirksen-Bricker amendment, and I commend the Senator from New York for including that principle.

SENATE CONFIRMATION ADVANTAGEOUS

The Senator from New York, moreover, in my judgment, makes an improvement upon the present composition of the Board when he requires senatorial confirmation of the public members. This, I believe, is advantageous. It would help to eliminate manifestly improper appointments on the part of the President and it would give to the office of a public member a solemnity and dignity which mere Presidential appointment without senatorial confirmation would lack. Up to this point I shall agree with the Senator from New York.

Now I come to two very important paragraphs in the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MAYBANK. I still have some time remaining. If the Senator will permit me——

Mr. DOUGLAS. In order not to trespass upon the Senator's time, I should like to call my amendment 6–3–5–H. I offer it on behalf of myself and on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] in the form of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that I desire to allow the remainder of my 8 minutes under the pending amendment to the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am perfectly willing to yield now, or at the preference of the Senator from Ohio if he wishes to take 5 minutes now, to have this amendment in the form of a substitute considered.

Mr. TAFT. Perhaps I may as well proceed now.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to make only a brief statement.

There are two questions involved with respect to the Wage Stabilization Board. One is as to the jurisdiction of the Board: Shall they merely have power to fix wages, that is, the maximum figure to which wages can go without violating the stabilization program, or shall they have power to settle disputes referred to them by the Mediation Service or otherwise?

The other question is whether the Board shall be made up of representatives of the public, management, and labor, or whether all the members shall be public members.

On the first question, as I see it, both the committee amendment and the amendment offered by the Senator from New York propose to eliminate the power of the Board to pass on labor disputes and confine it to the stabilization or wage-fixing function, except that the amendment of the Senator from New York would permit them to settle disputes if both parties agreed to the submission of a dispute to them. The real question at issue between the two amendments, therefore, is the question of the method by which the Board shall be made up.

It seems to me clear that the fixing of wages and the maintenance of the stabilization program is the function of the Government, just exactly as price fixing is a function of the Government. Those who do it ought to be representatives of the Government only, and should have a responsibility as Government officials. It seems to me, therefore, that they should all be public members of the Board.

The interest of labor and the interest of management may be to increase wages as the easiest solution, regardless of the inflationary effect on the general public.

The only argument made by the Senator from New York seems to be that an all-public board will not work because labor will not agree to abide by its decisions. The Senator from New York is saying, in effect, that there is no way in which the Government can enforce the fixing of wages.

I agree that that is a difficult task; but if we admit the premise that Government cannot fix wages without the consent of labor, we had better strike out all of the price-fixing and wage-fixing provisions of the bill, because I do not see how we can fix prices unless we can fix wages.

Questions in dispute ought to be determined on a scientific basis. It seems to me that is the one substantial difference between the committee amendment and the amendment offered by the Senator from New York, and the Senate should support the committee amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is in charge of the two remaining minutes of time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President in behalf of the Senator from South Carolina, I yield the 2 minutes to any Senator who desires the time, the Senator from Illinois if he wishes to occupy the time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of submitting an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he submits the amendment? The Senator from New York would like to modify his amendment, if that is possible, and I assume it is, by striking out at the top of page 4, in line 2, the comma after the word "Congress", and the words "and not otherwise." I so modify my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has a right to modify his amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield the balance of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Illinois, if he desires to offer his amendment, and he will have 30 minutes on the amendment after he offers it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). The Senator from South Carolina had 2 minutes, a considerable portion of which has elapsed.

Does the Senator from Illinois desire to be recognized?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I desire to be recognized in order to submit an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such an amendment is in order if the Senator from Illinois wishes to submit it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "6–3–52—H." It is a printed amendment. The amendment is submitted by me, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], as an amendment to the amendment of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. At this time let me request that the opening two lines of my amendment be changed, so as to read as follows, in connection with the amendment of the Senator from New York:

> In the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], on page 1, beginning with line 3, strike out through line 25, on page 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following—

And then the text of my amendment, as printed, follows.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois wish to have his amendment to the amendment of the Senator from New York read?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, Mr. President; it lies on the desks of all Members of the Senate, and I think we can save time by not reading the amendment which I am submitting to the amendment of the Senator from New York. I shall ask, however, that it be printed

in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well. The amendment to the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS, for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HILL, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. BENTON, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. MOODY, to the amendment of Mr. IVES, is as follows:

On page 1 of Mr. Ives' amendment, beginning with line 3, strike out through line 25, on page 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) (1) There is hereby created, in the Economic Stabilization Agency, a Wage Stabilization Board (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the 'Board'), which shall be composed, in equal numbers, of members representative of the general public, members representative of labor, and members representative of business and industry. The number of officers on the Board shall be established by Executive order.

"(2) The members representative of the general public shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The members representative of labor, and the members representative of business and industry, shall be appointed by the President. The President shall designate a Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board from among the members representative of the general public.

"(3) The term of office of the members of the Board shall terminate on March 1, 1953. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

"(4) Each member representative of the general public shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 a year when actually engaged in the performance of his duties as a member of the Board. Each member representative of labor, and each member representative of business and industry, shall receive $50 for each day he is actually engaged in the performance of his duties as a member of the Board, and in addition he shall be paid his actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949 while so engaged away from his home or regular place of business. The members representative of labor, and the members representative of business and industry, shall, in respect of their functions on the Board, be exempt from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

"(5) The Board shall, pursuant to the provisions of this act, stabilize wages, salaries, and other compensation. The coordination of wage stabilization policies with other stabilization policies shall be the responsibility of the Economic Stabilizaton Administrator.

"(6) The Board shall, upon (i) the joint request of the parties to the dispute, or (ii) the request of the President, assume jurisdiction of any labor dispute, which is not resolved by collective bargaining or by the prior full use of conciliation and mediation facilities, and which threatens an interruption of production affecting the national defense. In such cases the Board shall investigate and inquire into the issues in dispute, and shall advise the parties of its recommendations for fair and equitable terms of settlement. In any case where the parties to the dispute jointly agree to be bound by the decision of the Board, the Board shall render a decision on the issues in dispute, which decision shall be binding on the parties. Any wage action taken by the Board in any disputes case shall be fully consistent with the wage stabilization policies promulgated under paragraph (5) of this subsection.

"(7) Paragraphs (5) and (6) of this subsection shall take effect 30 days after the date on which this subsection is enacted. The Wage Stabilization Board created by Executive Order No. 10161, and reconstituted by Executive Order No. 10233, as amended by Executive Order No. 10301, is hereby abolished, effective at the close of the 29th day following the date on which this subsection is enacted."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as I have said, I think the forequarters of the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] are very good. They provide for a tripartite board, instead of an exclusively public board, and that will aid in securing the cooperation of both parties and in helping them to understand each other.

It may be asked, Why should labor be represented on a board which deals with wages or why should industry be represented on such a board. It is said that this should be exclusively the concern of the public.

PRICE AGENCY NOT EXCLUSIVELY MADE UP OF PUBLIC MEMBERS

Let me point out that the Price Stabilization Agency, which fixes the prices and wages, is not composed exclusively of public representatives, but it also includes industry advisory members, who assist the Administrator. There were 263 such advisory committees set up during the first 6 months of OPS. In other words, in that case it is judged to be all right to call in the employers to help fix prices, but apparently it is judged to be wrong to call in labor to help, along with the employers, to fix wages. I do not think we should draw that distinction. Since cooperation from both parties is needed, I believe they should be included in both cases—in the case of wages as well as in the case of prices.

DEFECTS IN DISPUTES SECTION OF THE AMENDMENT

So the forequarters of the Ives amendment are very good, but the hindquarters are not so good. The defects in the hindquarters are these: In the first place, the Board would be limited strictly to wage matters, and it could not deal with nonwage matters.

The second defect is that if a labor dispute breaks out, the President can refer the dispute to the Board, even in the case of wage matters, only if both parties to the dispute consent. The President cannot operate on his own, so to speak, in regard to such matters.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield on this point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from Illinois understands, does he not, that that provision refers exclusively to disputes over wages, salaries, or other compensation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. IVES. I am sure the Senator from Illinois would agree with me that it would be perfectly futile to refer to the Wage Stabilization Board, for mediation or voluntary arbitration, any dispute to which one or the other of the parties to the dispute absolutely was in disagreement about the reference and absolutely refused to have the Board undertake such an assignment, and absolutely refused to cooperate with the Board in such a matter. There would be no purpose in that.

DISPUTES OFTEN INVOLVE NONECONOMIC ISSUES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say to my good friend, the Senator from New York, that labor disputes commonly are not confined solely to wages. They involve, in addition to wages and hours, questions of seniority, questions of union shops, and questions involving a wide series of variations of the union shop and many other issues as well. They involve a wide variety of strictly noneconomic questions; yet these are also parts of the disputes.

The proposal of the Senator from New York would mean that the President could send wage issues to the Wage Stabilization Board if both parties consented, but the Board could not deal with nonwage or nonremuneration aspects of the dispute, which would have to be settled in some other way.

I am afraid my good friend, the Senator from New York, is in earnest in the way in which Solomon behaved when he was not in earnest. My colleagues will remember that a child was brought to Solomon after two women claimed to be its mother. Solomon made the award by holding up the child and saying, "I will cut this child in two, at the waist; and I will give the top half to one mother and the bottom half to the other mother."

Mr. President, that is not a very good way to deal with such a question. Solomon did that, I may say, as my good friend, the Senator from New York, who studied at a Presbyterian college knows, in order to test and to determine which mother would show the most concern, and therefore to determine which one of the women was really the mother of the child.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield at that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask my friend to wait a minute; I wish to finish the analogy. Let us not allow the Senator from New York to spoil a beautiful analogy.

The Senator from New York is proposing that the method he suggests should be used in earnest, namely, that labor disputes should be cut off at the middle; that a wage dispute should be awarded to the Wage Stabilization Board, and that nonwage aspects of the dispute should be confided to some other board. Precisely what other board it would be, we cannot tell, because in the colloquy we had recently the Senator from New York was extremely vague as to the powers by means of which the President of the United States could proceed in such cases.

So one group would be dealing with wages, and another group would be dealing with disputes other than wage disputes; and yet the two would have to be considered as integral parts of the whole dispute.

So I suggest to the Senator from New York that the hindquarters of his amendment are not so good as the forequarters, and that the hindquarters are subject to the fallacy of Solomon.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me at this point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Speaking of the hindquarters of my amendment, to which the Senator from Illinois has alluded in his reference to the question of determining the maternity of a child——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, the analogy was a little mixed, but I tried to keep the two in separate paragraphs. [Laughter.]

Mr. IVES. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Illinois whether he really thinks a Wage Stabilization Board could have a legitimate offspring which would have nothing to do with wages, salaries, or other compensation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that in the defense-production bill of 1950, as the Senator from New York will see if he will examine title V of that act, we tried to provide a method not for settling wage disputes but for settling labor disputes. What we want is some machinery by means of which to obtain uninterrupted production in a period of national emergency, with justice to both sides and with the cooperation of both sides. I do not see how the Senator from New York can obtain that result by setting up a dual machine, with one part having to deal with wages and another part having to deal with nonwage economic matters or issues.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from New York really serious in making this proposal?

Mr. IVES. Yes; I am very serious about it. I should like to inform my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Illinois, that I am not trying to set up a dual piece of machinery. I am only trying to set up one thing, namely, the exact jurisdiction and function for the Wage Stabilization Board.

The other matters to which the Senator from Illinois is referring should be handled by some other agency. I did not see fit to include the other agency in section 106.

I should like to point out that there is implicit in the proposal made by the Senator from New York that either the noneconomic issues will not be settled at all or, if they are settled, they will have to be adjusted by some other board. In that way there would be a dualism which would wreck the structure.

Mr. President, at this time I yield 10 minutes to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to support the pending substitute, of which I am cosponsor, and to express my total disagreement with the substance and purpose of section 106 of the committee bill, the section commonly referred to as the Dirksen amendment, affecting the Wage Stabilization Board.

This is a matter of great interest to me as a member of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. I think I can refer to it with some authority because the Labor Committee held many hearings on this subject and, in fact, issued a report, Senate Report No. 1037, on the disputes functions of the Wage Stabilization Board. I commend this report to the attention of every Senator interested in this provision of the pending bill.

The Dirksen amendment, section 106 of the committee bill, is very obvious in its motivation. It is intended to strip the Board of the functions it exercised in the recent Steel case.

Mr. President, it is an old legal maxim that hard cases make bad law. The present attempt to pass a bill reflecting an adverse judgment on a particular decision of the Wage Stabilization Board is, as I see it, very poor legislative practice. Fundamentally, it is a kind of bill of attainder. It is an attempt to punish the present Board by abolishing it and by putting in its place a new kind of board—a board made up entirely of public members.

The easiest thing to say about section 106 as it now stands is that it would not work. It could not work. It is, in a sense, like organizing a ball game and then taking out all the players and putting in umpires in their places. If wage stabilization is to be effective the parties at issue—both labor and management—must participate in the decisions. This is so elementary a principle that I cannot see how we can overlook it in this instance.

A tripartite board may be somewhat cumbersome and sometimes arrive at decisions which are not wholly satisfactory to any one group, but they arrive at decisions which the parties at issue will honor and abide by. What the Dirksen amendment proposes is that we have wage stabilization by fiat—by executive dictation rather than by consultation, discussion, and compromise. At this point in my remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert an article from the American Federation of Labor News Reporter which reflects the attitude of that great organization toward the Wage Stabilization Board and toward the legislation now under consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFL WARNS CONGRESS LABOR WON'T TOLERATE WEAKER WSB

BOSTON.—The AFL executive council warned Congress that organized labor will refuse to play ball in the stabilization program if Congress "changes the rules in the middle of the game to give employers unfair and unjustified advantages."

In blunt and forceful language, the AFL leaders attacked two pending moves in Congress to rescue big business by (1) destroying the tripartite nature of the Wage Stabilization Board and (2) limiting the jurisdiction of the Board to wage issues only.

On the first point, the executive council told Congress that "organized labor cannot and will not participate in any wage stabilization program unless the Wage Stabilization Board is set up on a tripartite basis, as at present."

On the second point, the council served notice that if Congress "yields to the dictates of big business it will be impossible for organized labor to participate in stabilization policies."

RECALLS EARLY MOVE

Observers recalled that the entire labor movement withdrew from the defense program administrative set-up early in 1951 on similar grounds and returned only when President Truman corrected the objectionable conditions.

In its statement on the new crisis, the executive council said:

"Two moves are under way in Congress to destroy the basic structure of the wage-stabilization program.

"(1) The Senate Banking and Currency Committee, in voting to extend the Defense Production Act for another year, approved a 'ripper' amendment providing that the Wage Stabilization Board shall be comprised of 'public' members exclusively.

"(2) Various proposals have been introduced in both the Senate and the House of Representatives limiting the jurisdiction of the Wage Stabilization Board to the consideration of wage issues only.

"The executive council condemns both of these moves as hostile to the public interest in a period of national emergency. They are intended to rescue big business interests from the effects of decisions unacceptable to them. But the inevitable result of such unwise, unpractical, and unjust changes in the law will be to wreck the entire stabilization program and expose the Nation's economy to the disaster of uncontrolled inflation.

DEMAND SELF-GOVERNMENT

"We wish to inform the Congress as clearly and as bluntly as possible that organized labor cannot and will not participate in any wage stabilization program unless the Wage Stabilization Board is set up on a tripartite basis, as at present.

"The workers of this country are willing to submit to wage controls because they realize the paramount importance of the success of the national defense program, but they will not consent to the regulation of their livelihood by a system of compulsory arbitration. They insist on self-government, in the American tradition. They want a direct voice in the regulation of their wages and salaries through a tripartite board on which labor, business, and the public are equally represented.

"No group of 'public' members can know enough about the intimate details of collective bargaining and wage setting under the diverse conditions of all American industries to handle these problems on a practical basis. An all-public board would result in compulsory arbitration by theorists and bureaucrats whose decisions ultimately would become as insupportable to industry as to labor.

CANNOT BE HEDGED

"Likewise, the executive council wishes to impress upon Congress that the jurisdiction of the Wage Stabilization Board in consideration of labor-management disputes cannot be hedged or confined without destroying its entire usefulness. This is not a new controversy.

"The Labor-Management Conference called by President Roosevelt shortly after Pearl Harbor agreed upon all points except whether the War Labor Board should have the authority to consider union security issues. President Roosevelt decided that since the primary objective was to assure full, uninterrupted production in the war emergency, obviously all disputes that might result in strikes or lockouts would have to be considered by the Board.

"Again, the same issue came up a year ago when President Truman undertook the reconstitution of the Wage Stabilization Board. The business organizations urged that the WSB be confined to money matters only. The AFL pointed out that the purposes of any wage program in a national emergency are both to stabilize the economy and to reduce industrial strife to a minimum.

Such a program, organized labor insisted, must obviously include broad and flexible provisions for the settlement of all disputes arising during the emergency period.

"President Truman recognized the clear logic of this position and established the present Wage Stabilization Board with full jurisdiction to deal with disputes.

"Because of its broad jurisdiction, the Wage Stabilization Board has been successful in keeping industrial strife to a minimum. Its record compares well with that of the War Labor Board, even though there has not been a no-strike pledge and the Government has not asked for one during the current emergency.

"In effect, Congress is now being asked to veto this policy because the leaders of one industry are unwilling to comply with recommendations of the Wage Stabilization Board with regard to negotiating union-shop agreements.

"The executive counsel serves notice on Congress that if it yields to the dictates of big business on this crucial matter and changes the rules of the stabilization program in the middle of the game to give employers unfair and unjustified advantage it will be impossible for organized labor to participate in stabilization policies."

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the committee proposal and also the Ives amendment would also divest the Wage Stabilization Board of a critical phase of its substantial authority. Under the terms of these proposals the Wage Stabilization Board would have absolute power to impose wage ceilings, but no power to settle disputes between management and labor arising from, among other things, differences as to wages.

Mr. President, unless we are ready to pass legislation depriving labor of the right to strike we should not pass legislation weakening the functions of the Wage Stabilization Board in facilitating the settlement of disputes.

And I want to say at this point, Mr. President, that you cannot divorce economic issues in a labor dispute from certain other issues. It is unrealistic. It is impossible. We must recognize that during an emergency period such as this, when the national interest and the national security require that wages be stabilized and that there be a minimum of interference with production arising from labor disputes, the organ of Government which is given the responsibility to stabilize wages should also be given the authority to step in, where needed, to help settle disputes centered around wages. And, necessarily, Mr. President, the settlement of such disputes must include the settlement of other subjects at issue. You cannot mediate part of a dispute in the Wage Stabilization Board and the rest of the dispute elsewhere.

These are abnormal times, Mr. President. In the Defense Production Act we have provisions granting tax-amortization privileges to certain businesses. We provide for allocation of raw materials. There is no argument about the necessity for these powers. They are emergency controls. But the emergency also requires other extraordinary steps that we would not contemplate in ordinary times. The vesting of authority for wage stabilization is one side of the coin. The vesting of authority to help settle labor disputes is the other side.

If we are going to establish a Wage Stabilization Board without the participation of labor and management, and if we are going to strip such a board of any significant authority, we may as well eliminate the entire board and save the taxpayers what such a board would cost. It would be sheer waste.

Our substitute amendment, Mr. President, would meet this situation. It would establish a statutory board; it would clothe the board with authority given it by Congress; it would define the jurisdiction of that board; it would make members of the board subject to confirmation by the Senate.

The only sensible and realistic thing to do is to adopt this substitute and to strike the unrealistic, unreasonable, and impractical section 106 from the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise, of course, to support the substitute amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], on behalf of himself and certain of his colleagues. The issue which is now under discussion is not a new one to those of us who have given some thought to the substitute proposal; and, of course, it is not new to the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], who likewise has offered an amendment. Extensive hearings have been conducted on the whole subject of the Wage Stabilization Board and its program. Mr. President, I have in my hand a volume containing the hearings, consisting of 225 pages. The hearings were before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the subject of the hearings was the question as to the powers of the Wage Stabilization Board in labor-management disputes. It was very much because of those hearings that the Lucas amendment in the House of Representatives a year ago was defeated, and it is because of those hearings that a similar amendment was not brought up in the Senate of the United States.

We are not talking merely about terminology or emotional words when we refer to the public interest and when we refer to the continuance of production through the use of a Government agency or with the assistance of a Government agency. We are talking about something we know about. Let us examine the present Board to see how it got to where it is.

First of all, every Member of the Congress knows that the entire wage-stabilization machine of the Federal Government was at dead center about a year and a half ago. As a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, it was my privilege, at the direction of that committee, to consult with almost every top official of the Government in reference to how we could properly adjust the difficulty among labor and management and the Government, and to get the Wage Stabilization Board on its feet as an operating agency. I discussed the question with Mr. Charles Wilson, who was then the head of the Defense Production Administration and with Mr. Arthur Flemming, the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. I discussed it with Mr. Eric Johnston, the former Economic Stabilizer, and with his associates. I want the record to show that, to a man, they agreed that the Board should be tripartite, and they agreed that it should have not only wage functions, but also dispute functions. This is a matter of public record.

The men with whom I discussed this problem were not labor union officials. Mr. Eric Johnston is the former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Charles Wilson is president of General Electric Corp., and Mr. Flemming is an outstanding man in the field of public decision of manpower problems.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe he comes from Ohio and is an eminent Republican. Is that not true?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have not investigated his political pedigree, but even with that on his record, I still respect his judgment. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, in their testimony before the committee the witnesses to whom I have referred, who were working for our Government, made their position perfectly clear. They felt that the jurisdiction of this board should include not only matters of wages, salaries, and other compensation, but also the disputes function. It is because of that evidence that we come forward with our substitute.

Mr. President, I ask those who oppose section 106, "What evidence do you have that the Wage Stabilization Board has not been effective? Upon what evidence can you base your case?" There have been 34 primary cases referred to the Wage Stabilization Board, cases affecting the national interest, within 13 months, which is less than 3 a month. There was no flood of important cases affecting production in defense industries. Of the 34 cases, 22 were voluntarily submitted by the parties. In other words, industry and labor had sufficient confidence in the Board in 22 vitally important cases to submit their problems to the Board for final adjudication, and in 22 cases the final adjudication of the Board was accepted voluntarily.

Mr. President, there have been 12 cases which the President of the United States has had to certify to the Wage Stabilization Board because of the national interest and the national security, and those 12 cases have all been resolved except the Steel case. Those cases involved plants, such as Douglas Aircraft, so vital to the defense industry of this country; the packing industry of the United States; farm-machinery production; and I would remind the Senate that only recently the Wage Stabilization Board ruled upon the Oil case. Where is the hue and cry in the Senate about the Oil case? There was a strike, but the oil companies apparently were not so well organized as were the steel companies. As a matter of fact, the Wage Stabilization Board, at the direction of the President, ruled in the Oil case that the wages

would be 3 cents an hour less than the parties themselves had already agreed upon, in some instances. In the Oil case the Wage Stabilization Board frankly admitted that its recommendations pierced the ceiling of the stabilization formula, and yet not a word of protest has been heard. They sent their recommendations to the Economic Stabilizer, under a special section, rule 13, regulation 13, which permits the Economic Stabilizer to take into consideration exceptional cases.

The Economic Stabilizer said the Steel case was not an exception.

All this hue and cry in the Senate about the Wage Stabilization Board not using good judgment in the Steel case is just so much pure, unadulterated politics. It has been made a hot political issue.

The Wage Stabilization Board has worked in 34 cases. The fact that the Steel case has not been properly settled is because it has been a hot political issue. The Wage Stabilization Board's record is better than that of most Senators. There are few Senators who have the reputation of being up to bat 34 times and having only one pending decision. What better public record do we want for an agency of the Government which has preserved production in aircraft, in electronics, in farm machinery, in oil, and has settled many disputes affecting the national security and defense?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator say that the batting average of the Board was better than that of Ted Williams or Joe DiMaggio?

Mr. HUMPHREY. In the big leagues, if a man bats .350 he is a hero, but the Stabilization Board has to be purer than Ivory soap, and Senators want it to float more than half the time. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, the burden of proof is not upon those of us who are opposing the substitute, because the record speaks for itself. The record of the Wage Stabilization Board is an enviable one. It is a record of continuous flow of production. I submit that there is not one eminent authority in America who will testify in behalf of a board such as is proposed by the Dirksen amendment.

Mr. Cole, an eminent member of the Mediation Board in New Jersey; a man of great renown in the field of labor relations, Dr. George Taylor, former Chairman of the War Labor Board; Dr. William Leiserson, Mr. William Davis, all of whom have testified before the committee, are men who have served their country with vigor and competence. They are in favor of a tripartite board.

Mr. President, we may lose this vote. But we shall not lose it on the basis of fact, but on the basis of partisan privilege, because the facts are on our side.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 7 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield the remainder of my time to the junior Senator from Oregon.

I ask unanimous consent that the portions of my remarks interrupted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] be combined in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall speak very briefly at this time and shall later offer an amendment which will give me more time to discuss what I think is about as serious a problem as any before the Senate at the present time.

I think we should face the fact that we are attempting on the floor of the Senate this afternoon to pass what amounts to a labor bill for the settlement of labor disputes in defense industries during a period of time when no union and no group of workers, union or nonunion, have any moral right to strike in a defense plant and no employer has a moral right to lock out in a defense plant.

It seems to me that point should not be lost sight of as we consider this question, because, as the great Baruch said a few days ago, the over-all issue which confronts the American people is the issue of peril. Are we in peril or are we not in peril? If we are not in peril we should not pass this bill at all; we should simply proceed with so-called normal procedures for the handling of economic problems and labor problems as well. If we are in peril—and I believe we are—then it is of the utmost importance, from the standpoint of the security of the country, that there be a continuous flow of products necessary to build up our defense.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. How much time has the Senator from Illinois?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has 5 minutes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield the Senator from Illinois 15 minutes more.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we are dependent upon the generosity of the Senator from South Carolina. At the end of the speech of the Senator from Oregon we shall proceed on our own time.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is not generosity on my part. I merely wanted to make certain of the time so as to know at what time we should speak, which will be at approximately 23 minutes from now.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I have said, if we are in peril—and I fear we are—it is of the utmost importance, from the standpoint of the national security, that there be a continuous flow, uninterrupted by work stoppages, of the products necessary to build up our defenses in the shortest period of time.

I desire to emphasize the advice which we have received from our military leaders. All our military intelligence seems to indicate that 1954 appears to be the potential target date of the Soviet Union of Russia in case it contemplates proceeding with an all-out war. At least, Mr. President, the military intelligence seems clearly to indicate to me, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, that we cannot afford to take a chance. If our military intelligence is correct in advising, yes, in warning us, that 1954 is the critical year which we must face so far as a potential threat of war on the part of Russia is concerned, then on the home front we had better close ranks and do those things which are necessary to create a continuous strengthening of the sinews of war.

If that be true—and I submit it as an assumption we cannot risk disregarding—then I move to my second premise, namely, that we should take away from employers and labor any moral right to strike or lock-out during this period. If we say to them, as we have a right to say, as a government, that their right to resort to economic action is only a relative right, and does not really exist in fact when its exercise jeopardizes the security of the Nation, then I think it is as clear as clearness can be that we must provide a procedure for the settlement of disputes in their totality. We cannot do this on a segment basis. We cannot divide labor disputes into different issue segments and send a part of a dispute to one board and a part to another. We cannot, for example, take up separately the question of grievance machinery from the other issues in a dispute.

One of the greatest causes of unrest in American industry today is that there are still many employers, such, for example, as a large number within the steel industry, who are far behind the times when it comes to adopting reasonable procedures for the settlement of grievances. We cannot take those issues involved in a given dispute and separate them from the other issues which have carried an emergency dispute. They must all be handled by the same tribunal at the same time.

Mr. President, whether we like it or not, if it be true that we are in great national peril, if it is sound to say to labor, "You cannot strike," and to employers, "You cannot lock-out," then we ought to measure up to the clear problem before us, and recognize that we must adopt a procedure and provide an organization for the settlement of labor disputes in their totality. I say that is not done even under the existing Wage Stabilization Board procedure and, with the utmost respect for the point of view of the senior Senator from New York, of course it would not be done under his amendment.

Mr. President, I therefore suggest that we ought to come to grips for the duration of the emergency with the task of setting up a tribunal for the settlement of labor disputes that arise in defense plants, recognizing that if we fall back upon existing procedures, such as those which exist under the Taft-Hartley law, the time factor will be causative of labor unrest, rather than causative of industrial peace, during the period of emergency.

I close with the statement that what we ought to have is a labor law for emergency disputes, one that will settle disputes before one tribunal on the basis of the totality of issues involved in each dispute. In other words, we might just

as well face the fact that we need a defense period labor board for the settlement of disputes arising in defense plants. Until we come to grips with that reality, it seems to me we are going through a lot of false motions and gestures on the floor of the Senate which will be causative of labor unrest, rather than performing our job of establishing procedures that will bring about industrial peace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has control of one-half hour.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from New York, or the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest that if the Senator from South Carolina desires to yield time, he yield it to the opponents. We have an amendment in the nature of a substitute, so I suggest that they be permitted to speak now.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois, whose amendment is now being considered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it the junior Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MAYBANK. The junior Senator from Illinois. As chairman of the committee, I may say that I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is all I have to say. I am opposed because I do not think the amendment is a proper provision. I am opposed to it, and I hope the Senate will reject it. But I yield 7 minutes to the junior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that the junior Senator from Illinois is junior by a matter of only a few months.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not like to be in between the two Senators from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is not necessary to labor this matter, so I am going to make only a few comments. First, I shall comment upon the message which came this morning from Philip Murray. I believe Mr. Murray would have been in better grace, and I think perhaps he would enjoy a greater confidence on Capitol Hill, if he had confined himself to argument on facts, and had eliminated the portion of his statement that relates to motives of other people. Our motives are just as good as his in trying to find a solution for a problem that has precipitated a constitutional crisis in the country.

Secondly, I would comment very briefly upon what was said by my righteous friend, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], concerning the record of the Board. I wish it had been possible for him to attend the off-record sessions of the Committee on Banking and Currency when Mr. Wilson testified. I am not at liberty to disclose what Mr. Wilson said, but I think I may say that it was quite at variance with what was stated by the Senator from Minnesota.

In connection with my old friend, Eric Johnston, I remember some private conversations which do not square with the statement that was made upon the floor today.

With respect to the record and efficacy of the Board, I wish only to say, Mr. President, that when the Board goes beyond the agreed demands in a labor dispute, how can a dispute be settled? I remember that the general manager of one of the largest companies in this country manufacturing military aircraft said to me that after they had agreed upon the substance of what was involved in the dispute, the matter was finally submitted to the Board, and the Board went away beyond what had been agreed upon. Of course, that was a violation of every conception of justice I know anything about, and every concept of equity, and it was probably on that account that the steel controversy reached such national dimensions as finally to become a constitutional crisis.

I hope the Senate will reject the amendment sponsored by my colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], to the amendment of the Senator from New York, and that it will then vote down the amendment offered by my compatriot on the Committee on Banking and Currency, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and finally approve the amendment reported by the committee.

As I read the language of the Douglas amendment, it restores the tripartite character of the Board, but the real issue involved in that amendment is the authority of the Board, and it will go so far as to put us right back into the same difficulty.

I think often of the motorist who got stuck in the Georgia mud. A farmer and his boy pulled him out. When he paid his fee, he said, "Do you always pull people out at night?"

The farmer said, "No, sir. At night we fill that hole with water again."

This amendment proposes to fill the mudhole with water again, because in subsection 6, page 3, of the Douglas amendment, we read:

> The Board shall, upon joint request of the parties to the dispute, or request of the President, assume jurisdiction of any labor dispute.

It is that language which gives concern, because it is language which was written into title V of the Defense Production Act. There has not been agreement, certainly not in proportion as has been represented on the floor, as to how far that provision goes. That is the nub of the controversy here.

I submit to the Senate that there are two issues involved. The first is as to the character of the Board. Shall all the members be representatives of the public, or shall the tripartite character of the Board be preserved? Second, how far shall the Wage Stabilization Board go? It has failed. I do not say it has not done good work. It would be astonishing, indeed, that a board of 18 members could serve for a long period of time without their having done some good in behalf of the defense effort; but when the real crisis came, they failed.

I suggest that there be a careful and more leisurely reading, not only of the report which was finally rendered by the Board in the Steel case, but also of some of the ancillary comments made by both the labor and industry members.

It was represented to the committee that some of the members did not know, until an hour before the wage schedule was submitted, what it was going to be. That certainly is no judicial attitude. I think the time has come to deal with this question in the manner which has been suggested by a majority vote of the committee.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to make a few brief comments.

Mr. MORSE rose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Oregon wish to speak at this time?

Mr. MORSE. If there is any time left after the Senator has concluded, I should like to use it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to make this comment about what the Senator from Illinois said with respect to the position of the tripartite board. It is easy to talk about a public board, as though it represented the public interest. But in matters which pertain to a labor dispute, more is involved in defining the public interest.

Actually, a board such as the Wage Stabilization Board must engage in the process of conciliation and mediation, and act as a liaison agency in the process of collective bargaining.

It is perfectly true that this is a skilled operation. I submit that there are only a few Members of this body who would be truly good arbitrators or mediators in a labor dispute of any complexity. It so happens that we are fortunate to have in this body a former member of the War Labor Board who will testify as to the intricate nature of the dispute. I refer to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Let it be clearly stated that collective bargaining, conciliation, mediation, and arriving at recommendations in order to adjudicate or settle a dispute are parts of a skilled operation. They call for labor-management experience.

Let me say a word as to the purpose of a tripartite board in a wage stabilization function. The recommendations of such a board affect the parties involved. They affect the industry. They affect the working people, and they affect the public in general. Therefore we must have a balanced operation. We must have an equal number of industry, labor, and public members. To be sure, the public members are frequently the balance of power, representing the public interest. I submit that the public members should be persons of competence and of background and experience.

One other word about Senator DIRKSEN's comments in order to keep the record straight. When I spoke of Mr. Eric Johnston favoring a tripartite board, I did not grasp that statement out of thin air. Eric Johnston's testimony is to be found at page 35 of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, held on May 17, 22, 29, and 31, and June 1, 6, and 7, 1951. Mr. Johnston is on record.

I ask the Senate to take my word for it that in a lengthy private conversation in 1951 with Mr. Charles E. Wilson in my office, which conversation I reported to the Senate committee, Mr. Wilson

concurred in the tripartite arrangement.

Furthermore, the membership of the National Defense Advisory Council, which the President established, representing agriculture, industry, labor, and the public, unanimously concurred in the establishment of a tripartite board. I submit that there was no dissent on the part of either the Economic Stabilizer or the Defense Production Administrator. But whether Mr. Johnston or Mr. Wilson likes such an arrangement has really very little to do with it.

The fact of the matter is that the old War Labor Board, which did an admirable job, was a tripartite board. The most successful boards which have been used for purposes of adjudication, or for handling labor disputes, have been tripartite boards.

A further fact is that men who are skilled and experienced, and who have a valuable background in this field, men who can stand the test of critical cross-examination, testify as to the validity of a tripartite board.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. I commend the Senator from Minnesota for his very brilliant exposition of this subject. It seems to me to be perfectly clear that if the function of the Board is to get the two sides of a dispute together, it is elementary that both sides must be represented, along with neutrals who will help to nail the issue down.

I ask my colleague from Minnesota whether he has ever heard of any impartial leading expert in this field who took any other position than that the tripartite board was the wisest plan if what was desired was results and real collective bargaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I answer the Senator from Michigan by saying that the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], who has had great experience in the labor-management relations field, has in his own amendment proposed a tripartite board. I take my hat off to the Senator from New York. I have great admiration for his judgment and decision. I happen to be somewhat in disagreement with him as to whether or not he has properly outlined the functions of the Board. I presume the Senator from New York will send me another quarter. [Laughter.]

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York has just sent a quarter to his distinguished friend, the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This token gift from the Senator from New York of 25 cents merely proves that the stabilization program has worked well, because even in the good old days the price of a compliment was still 25 cents, and the price remains the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield 2 minutes more to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield the remainder of the time to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. How much more time have I?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixteen minutes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, continuing my remarks of a few minutes ago, I wish to say that in my judgment the Wage Stabilization Board did not fail in the Steel case. The Congress failed. To date Congress has failed to place on the statute books a law which would be effective in the settlement of emergency disputes in defense plants during this period of emergency.

The reason I am pleading here today that we vote for the status quo in the form of the Douglas amendment and then proceed to vote on a bill for the handling of labor disputes in defense plants during the period of the emergency in their totality, is that I believe that until we enact such legislation, we shall continue to fail, as a Congress, in our obligation in respect to this issue.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] seeks by his substitute only to continue the status quo, by retaining the present law on the books. I shall vote for his substitute only for the purpose of seeking to give the Senate the time which I think it needs to consider a bill directed to the entire question of labor disputes in defense plants during the period of the emergency. The only reason I will vote for the Douglas substitute is because it is our obligation to consider all phases of this issue, and not take the unrealistic attitude of thinking that one can separate the issue of wages from the rest of the issues involved in a labor dispute. In almost all of the major labor disputes which arise in defense plants many issues are involved. In the Steel case, as has been pointed out in debate, there were approximately 100 issues involved. What is to be done so far as procedure is concerned in those cases? If only the wage issue is considered, what will be done about the rest of the issues? What will be done to prevent a stoppage of work so far as the rest of the issues are concerned?

Mr. President, sometimes a grievance in a department of a plant will be more provocative of labor unrest in that plant than the issue of wages.

If we are to take away from labor the right to use economic force and from employers the right to use economic force in these plants, the production of which is so vital to the security of our country, and if we are to meet the peril, which I assume we generally recognize is ours for the immediate future, what procedure is there in the Dirksen amendment or in the Ives amendment or in the Douglas substitute for coming to grips with the real problem? I say none. Why do I say that, Mr. President? I say it because if we take away the power of economic force from the party litigants, the only thing that they can fall back on is existing legislation, such as the Taft-Hartley law.

From the standpoint of the time factor alone, Mr. President, in my judgment, it is not a successful solution to the problem. I would that it were. However, I say that what we ought to do before the week is over, as soon as we pass the pending bill, which should maintain the status quo for the time being as to the Wage Stabilization Board, with respect to its powers, jurisdiction, and prerogatives, is to pass a labor bill for handling all of the issues that arise in a dispute that threatens national security. Before the week is over we should pass a bill for the handling of emergency disputes in their totality, and not make the grievous mistake today of thinking that it is possible to departmentalize cases, issue by issue. It just will not work that way, human beings being what they are.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I find myself in a rather weak position on this whole matter, in that I can appreciate the arguments made on the part of each Senator who has spoken. I should like to say that I am not particularly stiffnecked about this matter at all. First of all, it was the intention of the framers of the Defense Production Act to establish a board with flexible powers to control prices and wages, and to permit the President, of course, to create a price board, which was to establish fair and equitable prices. The intention was to establish a labor board, consisting of a group of men, which, in determining wages, would arrive at a formula which would be fair and equitable, in coordination with prices.

We have the Price Stabilization Board, now headed by Mr. Arnall, formerly headed by Mr. DiSalle. We have the Wage Stabilization Board. It was certainly the intention of the original legislation that both Boards would sit and listen to qualified witnesses from labor and management. It was the intention that the members should listen to the facts, and that the members would be disinterested parties. It was the intention that on the basis of the facts they would come to their conclusions. I do not believe that it was ever the intention of Congress—perhaps it should have been, as the able Senator from Oregon has stated—that the Labor Board should deal with anything other than what is necessary to arrive at maximum wages, in order to arrive at maximum prices.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I have heard the argument made that the Board did not fail in the Steel case. I shall not say whether it did or did not fail. The members of the Board arrived at their conclusion by using a certain formula. I think they pierced their own formula.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I believe that the Senator from Indiana will agree, however, that it was not our fault at the time the legislation was formulated that a board which might be established to deal with

wages should consist wholly of public members.

Mr. CAPEHART. I was coming to that point. I do not think that the framers of the legislation or the committee cared particularly who was on the board; whether it was a tripartite board consisting of six labor members, six industry members, and six public members. I do not think we cared then and I do not think we care today particularly. In my opinion, what we want is 18 men who are unprejudiced and unbiased, who will sit and ascertain the facts, and whose decision will be based 100 percent on the facts as presented to them. I believe that is what we wanted. That is what we want today. I am one Senator who does not believe that merely because 18 men representing the public are appointed the result will not be that 6 of them will get into one corner, 6 of them into another corner, and the other 6 in still another corner; or that 5 of them will not get into one corner, 3 of them into another corner, and the others into still another corner. I do not believe it is possible to find 18 men who will think alike. I do not think that we ought to have 18 men who think alike.

I do not have any particular fixed ideas on this subject. I voted for the committee amendment, and I shall support it. I will vote for it on the floor, as I did in committee, because I do not think that we are going to change human nature. I do not think that we are going to improve the situation particularly by appointing 18 public members.

I do not think we would go particularly wrong in having six members appointed from labor, six from industry, and six generally representing the public. I believe that what we ought to do is to create a board on the basis that we will have 18 honest, unprejudiced, and unbiased men who will deal 100 percent with the facts and then deal only with matters that have to do with wages, and permit industry and labor to solve their problems themselves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six minutes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Before I use any more of the time I would say that this is a very important amendment. It is my purpose to suggest the absence of a quorum. However, before doing so, I should like to ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment. I hope other Senators will agree with me that we should have the yeas and nays.

Several Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, is the substitute which is offered by the Senator from Illinois subject to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is an amendment in the second degree and therefore is not subject to amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have nothing more to add to the discussion. As chairman of the committee I intend to stand by the committee amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; but first I should like to complete my statement. I feel that the Ives amendment is a compromise between the committee amendment and the substitute amendment.

I have nothing further to say except that the remainder of my time is now——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MAYBANK. I was going to yield, but in the first place I was trying to ascertain how much time remains to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAYBANK. I now yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say that I think that if we make any change at this time in the present law, in connection with the handling of labor disputes, particularly in view of the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, such action on our part would be most unfair to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. That committee has been meeting now for a great many days, taking testimony on various bills which have for their purpose the settling of emergency labor disputes. In all probability I think we shall report a bill from the committee this week.

My attitude has been the open-minded one of being willing to accept any amendment to the so-called Morse bill or to any other bill before the committee that would be designed to give us a really effective and fair method of settling emergency disputes.

But, Mr. President, just as surely as we sit here today, if we adopt, as a part of the pending bill, the proposed section dealing with disputes, the argument then will be made, "We have already adopted something, so let us see how it works before we proceed to adopt anything else."

Under the Supreme Court's decision, I think a clear obligation rests upon us to provide a legislative blueprint for the handling of emergency disputes, including all the issues in them, not just the wage issue.

In this instance we have a committee which has jurisdiction over labor disputes, and which has been working faithfully and conscientiously in an endeavor to reconcile the differences over this matter. The committee will be ready in the next few days to bring a bill on that subject before the Senate.

In view of that situation, I think the status quo should be allowed to continue; in other words, I think we should adopt the Douglas amendment to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], inasmuch as the Douglas amendment to that amendment simply provides for a continuation of the present powers of the Wage Stabilization Board. Thereafter, later this week, let us take up a bill which deals with the over-all problem of handling emergency disputes. In that way I think we shall do our duty.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I now yield 1 minute to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, simply for the purpose of clarification in connection with the pending question, I wish to refer to the Defense Production Act of 1950, and in particular to title V of that act. I point out that it says nothing about a tripartite board. The language at that point of the act is as follows:

> The President may designate such persons or agencies as he may deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title.

I do not know whether that matter was discussed in the conference, but certainly the act is silent on that point.

In the second place, I point out that there is nothing in any of these amendments that would call for the appointment of an 18-man board. The board could be composed of 5 members, 10 members, 20 members, or 50 members, because the appointing power would remain in the hands of the President of the United States. So the size of the board is not involved in this instance.

I merely repeat at this time what I have said before, Mr. President, namely, that in my judgment the amendment submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] would put us right back into the same hole in which we find ourselves at the present time.

I can see nothing wrong with an all-public-member board, for the very reason that a strike exists at the present time and the present Board has failed in a very critical hour and situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Flanders	Long
Anderson	Frear	Martin
Bennett	Fulbright	Maybank
Benton	George	McCarran
Brewster	Gillette	McCarthy
Bricker	Green	McClellan
Bridges	Hayden	McFarland
Butler, Md.	Hendrickson	McKellar
Butler, Nebr.	Hennings	Millikin
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Cain	Hill	Moody
Capehart	Hoey	Morse
Case	Holland	Mundt
Chavez	Humphrey	Neely
Clements	Hunt	Nixon
Connally	Ives	O'Conor
Cordon	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Dirksen	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Dworshak	Kem	Saltonstall
Eastland	Kerr	Schoeppel
Ellender	Lehman	Smathers
Ferguson	Lodge	Smith, Maine

Smith, N. J.	Thye	Wiley
Smith, N. C.	Tobey	Williams
Sparkman	Underwood	Young
Stennis	Watkins	
Taft	Welker	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], for himself and other Senators, to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is absent on official business at one of the Government departments.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 56, as follows:

YEAS—26

Anderson	Hennings	Monroney
Benton	Hill	Moody
Chavez	Humphrey	Morse
Clements	Hunt	Neely
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Fulbright	Kerr	Pastore
Gillette	Lehman	Sparkman
Green	McFarland	Underwood
Hayden	McKellar	

NAYS—56

Aiken	Dworshak	Kem
Bennett	Eastland	Lodge
Brewster	Ellender	Long
Bricker	Ferguson	Martin
Bridges	Flanders	Maybank
Butler, Md.	Frear	McCarran
Butler, Nebr.	George	McCarthy
Byrd	Hendrickson	McClellan
Cain	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Capehart	Hoey	Mundt
Case	Holland	Nixon
Connally	Ives	O'Conor
Cordon	Jenner	Robertson
Dirksen	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Schoeppel	Stennis	Welker
Smathers	Taft	Wiley
Smith, Maine	Thye	Williams
Smith, N. J.	Tobey	Young
Smith, N. C.	Watkins	

NOT VOTING—14

Carlson	Kilgore	McMahon
Duff	Knowland	Murray
Ecton	Langer	Russell
Johnson, Colo.	Magnuson	Seaton
Kefauver	Malone	

So the amendment of Mr. DOUGLAS, in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of Mr. IVES, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Ives amendment subject to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. MORSE. I send to the desk an amendment to the Ives amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, lines 2 and 3 of the Ives amendment, it is proposed to strike out the words "by and with the consent of the Senate."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. How many minutes do I have on this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 30 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I intend to continue with the remarks I started earlier this morning in setting forth my views as to the legislative problem which I think confronts the Senate.

For the purpose of a brief summary, so that there will be some continuity and logical development of my thesis in the RECORD, I want to summarize my previous remarks by pointing out that it seems to me we are confronted in the Senate with the overriding issue as to whether this Nation stands in great peril so far as our national posture is concerned. If that be true, Mr. President, and I believe it is, then we must take the steps necessary so to mobilize the defense forces of the Government in such a show of strength that by 1954, which our military advisers tell us is the expected target date so far as a possible attack by Russia is concerned, that we shall be able to absorb the first shock of that attack and proceed quickly to knock Russia out of the war.

That means, Mr. President, that the American people, I think, have to come to grips with reality more than they have up to this time in regard to the crisis confronting us.

My second premise is that if we are in peril, then we must make clear to American employers and American workers that in defense plants producing those goods which are essential to the protection of the security of this country, they must live up to their moral obligation to keep production flowing without stoppage of work on the part of either or both. In other words, their right to resort to economic action has become a very relative right and must be denied to them for the duration of the emergency.

My third premise is that if we take the position that economic action must be denied employers and workers for the period of the emergency, the Congress has an obligation to place on the statute books a law which will provide a fair procedure for the quick settlement of labor disputes which arise in defense plants.

I think that means, Mr. President, that we have to be objective about it and recognize that the laws on the books will not provide and do not provide for a quick settlement of labor disputes arising in defense plants.

It is one thing, Mr. President, to have the type of legislation which we have on the books, although I think it needs to be materially amended, in fairness to all parties concerned, leaving to the parties the right to use economic action against each other in order to bring about an agreement between the parties as to a collective bargaining agreement, which is, of course, the purpose of economic action in a labor dispute, but it is quite a different thing, Mr. President, to say to the parties to the dispute, "You will have to wait for whatever period of time it takes the law presently on the books to operate in its tedious way in the settlement of the dispute."

I think it is perfectly clear, on the basis of the testimony before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Mr. President, that if our only means of settlement of labor disputes is to be the existing legislation, it will be a matter of many months in most cases for the law to run its course. We then place a tremendous tax of credulity on human nature if we make the assumption—and I think it would be a very false assumption—that even in the time of emergency, human beings being what they are, the provocations which develop within a defense plant that lead to emotional reactions, will not result in stoppages of work. Unless we have a procedure handy and ready for a quick disposition of such cases I am convinced there will be many work stoppages. We can say all we want to say about what men should do under those circumstances, and I have never condoned, under those circumstances, workers or employers resorting to direct action interfering with the production of necessary goods for the protection of our country or the successful prosecution of a war; but that does not stop them from taking economic action. I think that economic action was kept to a remarkable minimum during World War II and during World War I but that was because there existed a tribunal for settling all of the issues in emergency disputes. In both those wars, Mr. President, with American men dying in defense of their country, there were some stoppages of work, but they were not of long duration.

I think it is remarkable, Mr. President, that during World War I, under the War Labor Board, headed by the

cochairmanship of William Howard Taft and Mr. Walsh, the strikes which occurred were of very short duration. During World War II, Mr. President, under a tripartite War Labor Board, there were relatively few strikes in proportion to the many hundreds of cases we handled, but not a single one of those strikes was of what could be called long duration. The reason why they were not of long duration was because the tripartite board went into action the moment there was a threat of a work stoppage.

Mr. President, my testimony, for what it may be worth, is that for more than 18 months some of us on the War Labor Board worked the clock around, 24 hours of the day and night, on the average of once every 11 days, because we knew how important it was for speedy action in a major case, in order to prevent stoppage of work.

A case that comes first to my mind is the International Harvester case, which I remember so very clearly. In that case we did not cease work for some 30 hours, until we finished writing the decision for submission to the board. It was a historic case, but it was an example of the type of energy and work we devoted to our labors, because we knew the importance of a quick decision in the handling of a major labor dispute. Time is of the essence in any labor dispute, but particularly so when an emergency situation is involved, in which the parties have been denied the use of economic action under a no-strike, no-lockout agreement, such as prevailed during World War II.

So, whether we like it or not, we shall not fulfill our obligations as a Congress if we do not immediately proceed to the adoption of a labor law for the emergency period, restricted in its jurisdiction and application to so-called defense plants, as determined by the President of the United States upon the basis of reports made to him by appropriate departments of the Government, to the effect that a labor dispute existing in one plant or segment of industry is jeopardizing the security and safety of the Nation. It is necessary to start with that premise.

My objection to the Ives amendment and the Dirksen amendment primarily is based upon the fact that neither amendment imposes upon any tribunal the breadth of jurisdiction it must have in order to settle labor disputes. Adopting those amendments would be running a risk that would be bound to result in serious disaster to individual cases, if it is assumed that a work stoppage can be terminated, when tempers are high and emotions are running amuck, by waving the flag or speaking patriotic phrases. It makes a nice case on paper, but it has never worked, and it will not work now.

So my plea, for whatever it is worth, is that we come forward with a labor law for the defense period, to be applied to emergency disputes, disputes decreed by the President of the United States to be such as to threaten the security of the Nation. There should be a law that will give to someone, some tribunal, or some board, jurisdiction to do what, Mr. President? To render a decision.

Oh, yes. The parties do not like that little provision. Of course, one defect of the present Wage Stabilization Board law is that it does not provide the Board with power to render a decision. It may only make recommendations, which to all intents and purposes are looked upon by the victorious party to a particular issue as, in effect, a decision. But believe me, Mr. President, one gets an entirely different reaction from the parties when there is a procedure that vests jurisdiction in a body, and empowers that body not only to recommend to the parties, but also to make clear to them what the decision will be a very short time after the recommendation is handed down, if they, by collective-bargaining negotiations forthwith, do not reach a voluntary agreement for settlement of the dispute between themselves.

Oh, certainly, I know that when this suggestion is made, there will be thrown back the charge that, in the last analysis, what is proposed is compulsory arbitration. What I am proposing is that in the last analysis, after the gates of voluntarism have been kept wide open to the parties for the settlement of disputes between themselves through collective bargaining, based upon the aids that flow from conciliation and mediation services of an appropriate body of the Federal Government, and finally from a list of recommendations based upon facts approved by a Government tribunal through appropriate hearing, there be a final step, which says to the parties, "Having had all this time and opportunity, the benefit of Government aids that have been rendered to you by way of mediation and conciliation, and now recommendations based on a hearing, we tell you, party litigants to this dispute, that in the interest of the all-important public interest, your Government now tells you that, in order to protect the security of the country for the period of this emergency, the decision on wages and every other issue of your dispute shall be as follows."

When we reach that state of facts, Mr. President, I shall not worry about compulsory arbitration. When we get to that state of facts, I say here, as I said last month in the great labor temple in the city of Portland, Oreg., "There is not a labor leader on the floor of this convention who can stand up and justify an argument that, at the point of crisis where the choice is either to let you go out on strike, to the detriment of the security of this country, or to have the Government enforce a decision which it has found through judicial processes, found to be a fair and equitable decision, labor should have the right to strike."

Every labor leader in the convention knew I was right, and many of them came to me afterward and said, "Although we cannot argue with you about it, because we know you are right, we hope you will stand firm on that position."

Why do many labor leaders take that position? I will state why. I think I know something about labor leaders, and something about the psychology of employers, too. They will do a lot of "beefing," as we say in the field of labor relations. They will squawk loud and gesture vehemently, but in an emergency dispute they frequently want a decision enforced because that provides them with a face saver. Oh, I am not primarily interested in providing labor or employers with a face saver. Just in passing, I make note of the fact that face savers are important in settling labor disputes. It happens to be one of the rather important elements of a possible settlement of a labor dispute. I am stressing the fact that unless there is a procedure that keeps the gates of voluntarism open as long as possible, so that the parties will have ample opportunity by collective bargaining to settle their dispute, and then finally have the power of decision vested in some board, the defense effort will be jeopardized, because a time will come when there must be enforcement of a fair settlement of a dispute.

In spite of all the criticism we hear from labor and management under such circumstances, Mr. President, there would be relatively few cases which would ever reach the point of decision if we should adopt the procedure which I have been suggesting in connection with the Morse bill. Of course, it is difficult to prove, but I am willing to venture the prophecy that if we have that kind of procedure for the settlement of disputes in defense plants for the period of this emergency, 95 percent of them will be settled by the time the point of recommendation is reached. Not more than 5 percent of them will ever go through to what I call enforceable decision. But I want that gun behind the door, to protect the security of my Nation, if necessary, in a major labor dispute.

The next point I wish to make is that the Taft-Hartley law is not the answer. The adoption of the Ives amendment or the Dirksen amendment and reliance on the Taft-Hartley law for settlement of issues other than the wage issue is not the answer. It is not the answer in any case. It is particularly not the answer in such a case as the steel case. Why? Because there is not a line in the Taft-Hartley law which is aimed at preventing the stoppage in the first place. The procedure of the law itself is time-consuming, and the time which is consumed in the operation of the procedure of the Taft-Hartley law itself permits a stoppage of work to continue for days, the number of days being dependent upon the complexity of the case.

In the steel case, for example, it would unquestionably mean many days. I do not know how long a board of inquiry in the steel case would require to make the findings necessary to report to the President of the United States; but we know the kind of record which was made in the steel case before the Wage Stabilization Board. I assume that if a board of inquiry were appointed under the Taft-Hartley law procedure, it would make a conscientious study of the facts of the case. It would not send a report to the President before it had completed its study. There is not a chance of obtaining an injunction under the Taft-Hartley law until the report is before the President, and the President sends his recommendation to the Attorney Gen-

eral, the Attorney General lays his case before a judge, and the judge takes the case under advisement and subsequently decides whether or not to issue an injunction.

It is very difficult to bring about a public understanding of the ineffectiveness of the procedure of the Taft-Hartley law in emergency disputes; but I say that we have an obligation to do something about it. Moreover, it seems to me that under the Ives amendment or the Dirksen amendment there would be a great many disputes which would have a serious effect on the defense program and which would be a long time in reaching the point of litigation.

Let me stress at this point another phase of the problem. It is easy, particularly for lawyers, to assume that the human problems involved in labor disputes can be settled by legalistic formulas. That procedure does not work. Why? Because in the main we are dealing with matters which are not legal in nature. They are economic; they are social; they are psychological. I find nothing in the Ives amendment which is broad enough to take care of all the issues which I think must be settled in a labor dispute in a defense plant, if we are to carry out what should be our objective; namely, to make this country strong enough fast enough so that it can meet any crisis which may arise during the target year of 1954. If we do it fast enough, I think the possible dangers of that target year will never come to pass. But we cannot do it unless we have dispute-settlement machinery for the continuous flow of production into the military pipelines necessary to provide the defense with which to meet the crisis.

That leads me to the next point which I wish to make. Let us assume for the sake of argument that we adopt either the Ives amendment or the Dirksen amendment. What do Senators suppose would be the reaction in the Senate if, before the end of the week, or at the first of next week, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare should report a labor bill aimed at handling emergency disputes in defense plants. Unless my colleagues in the Senate completely change their patterns of normal reaction between now and then, I will tell the Senate what we would hear. We would hear Senators saying, "We have just finished making a complete change in the procedure of the Wage Stabilization Board. The President has not yet even appointed the members of the Board. Now the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare brings forth a new bill which would seek to change what we have already changed by our action of last Wednesday."

Of course, we cannot bring forth a labor bill which will really do the job which needs to be done, that of encompassing all the issues in a labor dispute, without changing in many particulars what would be done if we were to adopt either the Ives amendment or the Dirksen amendment. With the defeat of the Douglas amendment, which was the one proposal which permitted a continuation of the status quo until we could pass an all-encompassing defense labor bill, what I fear is that we shall get nowhere in the Senate with a bill which seeks to come to grips with disputes involving all the issues in emergency cases. If we do not, I respectfully submit that in my judgment the Senate, particularly in view of the Supreme Court decision in the Steel case, will have walked out on its obligation.

I wish to close with a few references to what I think are the implications of the decision in the Steel case with respect to our obligation to enact legislation relating to emergency disputes.

It is well known in this body that my views, so far as the powers of the President of the United States are concerned, coincide much more nearly with the dissenting opinion in that case than with the majority opinions. The other day I stated that if I were reversed I would not feel the slightest embarrassment in admitting that I had been reversed. I have been reversed.

But, Mr. President, in my judgment, the majority opinion in that case leaves no room for doubt as to the clear obligation of this Congress, under the separation-of-powers doctrine, to enact legislation which will not leave the President in a position in which he cannot exert his executive authority to protect the security of the United States until the Congress first acts. I say that under that Supreme Court decision it is now more than ever the clear duty of the Congress to enact legislation which will lay down a blueprint to govern any President of the United States as to what he shall do under article II of the Constitution in handling, under legislative mandate, an emergency dispute which threatens the security of the country. It was my view that the President had the power to act subject to the immediate checking by Congress of his actions. Now, as I read the decision of the majority of the Supreme Court, which majority opinion I consider to be a very static interpretation of the Constitution of the United States, it is the constitutional duty of Congress to get on the statute books legislation which will guide a President in the meeting of these emergencies before the fact, rather than after the fact. The security of our country demands it. The security of our country calls for the ending of what I think is the most serious and costly strike in the country, namely, the strike of the Congress of the United States against carrying out what I think is its clear duty in this hour of emergency. Its clear duty is the passing of legislation for the handling of all the issues involved in an emergency dispute which threatens the security of our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty minutes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not intend to take more than a few minutes. I should like to say a few words before I yield the remainder of the time to the Senator from New York. I wish again to make clear what I have proposed to do. I hope the Senate will understand that what I propose to do is in substance what the Senator from Oregon suggests. I agree that it is the sons of the union leaders who are fighting the war; it is the sons of the union workmen who are fighting the war; it is the sons of the owners of the steel mills who are fighting the war; and it is the farmers' sons, and others who are fighting the war. Therefore my amendment, which was read earlier today which is in keeping with what the Senator from Oregon says that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare should do. We are not dealing with permanent legislation. Insofar as title IV and title V are concerned, they expire on the first day of March. If the pending bill were to take effect, next week by concurrent resolution, and without approval by the President of the United States, entire sections of the bill could be wiped out.

I repeat that the amendment which I submitted this morning—and it will be the last amendment to be called up, and will be considered under unlimited debate—provides only for a temporary handling of the situation. Again I ask: What is the use of having a National Production Act when the workers, whose sons are fighting in Korea, and the owners, whose sons are fighting in Korea, cannot produce the tools with which to fight the war?

I congratulate the Senator from Oregon on his statement with reference to permanent legislation. However, these amendments have nothing to do with permanent legislation. The amendments are tied to sections of the Defense Production Act which, except those dealing with allocations, expire on March 1. By concurrent resolution Congress can repeal any of the sections.

Mr. President, I desire to make the RECORD clear that I believe the amendment offered by the Senator from New York is a better amendment than the one which was offered on this side of the aisle by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and other Senators. Again I wish to say that I do not intend at this time to propose permanent labor legislation. Such legislation should be considered first by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I am glad the distinguished Senator from Arkansas worked out with the Secretary of Labor certain amendments which we had before us. Again let me say that unless something is done now the steel strike will continue, and steel production will decline. Who will suffer? The American people will suffer. As a result, the sons of those who work in the steel factories and the sons of those who own the stocks in the companies will suffer.

The Senator from New York attempts to correct the Dirksen amendment for which I voted in committee. Naturally I shall stand by the committee, but I believe that the amendment of the Senator from New York is far better than the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

My main purpose in speaking again is that tomorrow, as the Senator from Oregon has said, may be too late, for, Mr. President, we cannot allow management

and labor to continue to tie up production in the steel industry. Beyond national defense there is also involved the production of bridges and roads, for which steel is needed. I believe it is about time that Congress should take some constructive action in the light of the fact that the Supreme Court has stated Congress alone has legislative power. In other words, Congress can enact legislation this week, such as this bill, place in it any provision it desires, and next week repeal the law.

I hope that the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon to delete the provision requiring confirmation by the Senate of the appointments of members of the Board will not be adopted.

I again express my appreciation of what the Senator from Oregon has said. It is our duty to legislate. The Supreme Court has so declared. I never felt that the President should seize the steel plants. I never raised my voice against the CIO or those who are on strike. They are entitled to a cost-of-living wage, and the steel companies are entitled to a certain commensurate raise in prices to take care of the stockholders. What that figure is, I do not know. But the time for Congress to act, following the Supreme Court's decision, is now.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I want to be sure that the RECORD does not indicate that we are walking on a one-way street. I am always willing to assume my responsibility as a Member of this body under any circumstances. But the chairman of the subcommittee, my good friend the affable, the honorable, and the very fair Senator from South Carolina, knows that in the long testimony which Mr. Wilson gave before our committee it was made clear that this body has no responsibility for the difficulty in which we find ourselves.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; and the Supreme Court has so declared. The Supreme Court said we passed the Selective Service Act. It said we passed section 230. The Supreme Court said we passed the Taft-Hartley law. I am one who voted for the Taft-Hartley law, and I am not ashamed of it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The President had the responsibility of appointing the members of the Board. He could have ascertained the fact that three of the public members of the Board, when the Taft-Hartley veto message was sent to the Congress in June of 1947, expressed themselves in no uncertain language to the effect that the law was unworkable, and had other discrediting things to say about it.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am not here to condemn the President of the United States for what he does or does not do. I only express my own opinion. Someone asked me if I had talked to the White House about my amendment. I said I had not and that is true. I assume my own responsibility. The President of the United States assumes his responsibility. The President may make mistakes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I conclude by saying that the difficulty and dilemma in which we find ourselves was not initiated by any action or lack of action on the part of Congress.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct. The Supreme Court has said so. What I wish to bring out again is that I think that in the Defense Production Act we are not legislating against labor and we are not legislating for management. We are not legislating for either one of them. We are passing a law which is to be effective only temporarily until March 1, and until permanent legislation can be passed, after it has been reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Everyone knows that we cannot enact permanent legislation on this subject now. Perhaps I should not say everyone, but certainly many will agree with me that we cannot get permanent legislation from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and have the Senate adopt it before July 1, when Senators are all set to go to Chicago, first to the convention of the Republican Party and then to the convention of the Democratic Party. I think most of the Members of the Senate will be absent from Washington during the time of the conventions. I am not a candidate for office, so I might be in Washington then.

However, frankly, Mr. President, until some action is taken by us in regards to this emergency situation, we should not leave Washington. It may be that what I favor doing is the wrong thing to do. If so, I hope some Senator who has in mind the correct solution will offer it, so that it can be approved.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield now to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has been consistently and methodically at its business of holding hearings on the bill introduced by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate that that is so, Mr. President.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Furthermore, Mr. President, the measure dealing with this subject is highly complex and affects the rights of both individuals and groups.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course it does.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I have said, I would not favor proceeding in haste.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct, for that measure will, when enacted, constitute permanent legislation.

In the present case, however, we are dealing with a temporary measure to protect the rights of both management and labor, and also to provide that in the interim, steel can be produced for the war effort. After all, what is the use of having a Defense Production Act if steel is not produced?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Our committee has completed the hearings on the so-called Morse bill, and we have had three drafts of that bill. The committee is now prepared to go into executive session to mark up the bill. I hope we shall be given an opportunity by the Senate to perform our duty conscientiously, to the best of our ability.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I would never criticize the committee. I simply say that the pending bill proposes a continuation of the Defense Production Act; and the purpose of that Act is to enable us to have steel, copper, and aluminum produced. After all, the present war situation involves the production of heavy materials. If the steel mills are closed, how can steel be obtained?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thoroughly agree as to the necessity of settling the dispute. On yesterday I offered, as an expression of the sense of the Senate, a resolution which would put the Senate on record as saying to both the steel companies and the steel workers that the Senate expects them to settle the dispute.

I recognize that the adoption of that resolution in itself would not settle the dispute, but the resolution would at least give an opportunity for an official, public expression on the part of the Senate.

I hope that in the course of the debate on the pending bill we shall be able to act on that resolution.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if I correctly understand the situation, the public of the United States wants one thing done, namely, they want their children protected. The steel workers, the owners of steel stock, and the management are the fathers and the mothers of those children.

I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 17 minutes.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I would respectfully remind the Senate that, after all, the amendment which now is proposed to be amended by the amendment of the Senator from Oregon is mine; and I should like to speak briefly on that point.

Before doing so, I wish to comment concerning the discussion which has just occurred in respect to emergency action. I subscribe 100 percent to the ideas expressed by the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to the effect that we need to have action taken now.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes, now.

Mr. IVES. However, I might differ in part with both Senators in that I think the action we take now should be of a temporary nature. I do not believe that we should give to the Chief Executive of the United States broad powers to meet emergencies, and then put those powers on a permanent basis. To do so would be a mistake, I believe.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I agree with the Senator from New York. As he knows, I voted to limit to March 1 the emergency powers, even though a 2-year extension was requested in the committee.

Mr. IVES. That is the point to which I was coming. Of course, Mr. President,

on that basis we would have a choice as between an amendment to be adopted to the Defense Production Act and an amendment or measure of a similar nature which would be in effect only during the life of the emergency. Personally, I think the measure we enact should go no further than that. Furthermore, I would have the measure we pass confined to the emergency existing in the steel industry itself and the controversy existing in connection with that situation.

In 1949, as may be recalled, I submitted an amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act, in an effort to meet such a situation.

In respect to the amendment now before the Senate, let me say that I think all of us agree that at least the public members of the Board, as proposed in my amendment, should be confirmed by the Senate. I believe it would be a serious mistake to take away from the Senate the power of confirmation.

Question has arisen, in connection with my amendment, in regard to the so-called fringe benefits and the amount of territory the amendment covers.

I read now subsection (e) of section 702 of the Defense Production Act, which is very brief, and defines the term "wages, salaries, and other compensation":

(e) The words "wages, salaries, and other compensation" shall include all forms of remuneration to employees by their employers for personal services, including, but not limited to, vacation and holiday payments, night shift and other bonuses, incentive payments year-end bonuses, employer contributions to or payments of insurance or welfare benefits, employer contributions to a pension fund or annuity, payments in kind, and premium overtime payments.

That is the end of that particular subsection.

I think everyone who has been listening to the reading of that subsection will agree that it covers a great deal of territory, and that a large part of all the disputes which might arise would have some bearing insofar as that particular subsection is concerned.

As a consequence, I firmly believe that the dispute powers which, under my amendment, would be given to the Wage Stabilization Board are sufficiently broad. I do not believe we should extend them beyond that point. They would, in my opinion, enable the Wage Stabilization Board to resolve a great many questions which might be in dispute, in relation to wages, salaries, and other compensation—questions which it is most necessary that the Wage Stabilization Board be permitted to resolve.

In submitting an amendment of this particular type, I wish to say that the provision for the particular function here provided was derived from our experience in New York State in connection with the New York State Labor Relations Board. At one time or another so many disputes arose over questions involving collective bargaining, which could have been mediated by the New York State Labor Relations Board, but which under the law could not be mediated under that process, that finally we amended the law, so as to permit more or less this same type of function on the part of the New York State Labor Relations Board. As a result of that change, which proved to be salutary, many controversies which otherwise might have arisen, never developed.

So the amendment is submitted for the purpose of confining the activity to the Wage Stabilization Board, and not to permit of a broad undertaking with respect to disputes generally.

If, as I suggest, such an undertaking is to be made, we should have for that purpose a strictly emergency type of set-up; but that endeavor should not be undertaken by the Wage Stabilization Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has control of the time.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, how much time remains to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield 1 minute to me for a parliamentary purpose?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the submission of my amendment having given sufficient time to discuss the points involved in this controversy which I wished to discuss for the RECORD, I now withdraw my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is withdrawn.

The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

The Senator from South Carolina has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I desire to request the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have already been ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. Then, Mr. President, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum. However, first let me inquire how much time remains to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it in order to offer at this time an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from New York?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is, inasmuch as the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to the amendment of the Senator from New York has been withdrawn.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], I offer the following amendment to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]: On page 1, strike out lines 6 through 8 inclusive, and insert the following: "shall be composed of equal numbers of members representative of labor and members representative of business and industry, together with an odd number of representatives of the general public, which shall exceed in number that of either labor or business and industry, but which shall be less than the aggregate numbers of representatives of labor and business and industry."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I do not desire to use the 30 minutes, because this is merely a change of the formula, and it is very easily explained, I believe. It seems to the junior Senator from Louisiana that if the Ives amendment were adopted, the representatives of the general public should exceed in number both the representatives on the part of labor and the representatives on the part of management. For example, if there were two for industry and two for labor, it would seem fair that there should be a number exceeding that—three, for example—to represent the general public. That would prevent the Board's being deadlocked in tight votes. On the other hand, it would mean that when labor would take one view and management would seem to take anther view, a majority of the members representing the general public would have the balance of power to decide the outcome, in the event there should be a close division between the representatives of labor on the one hand and the representatives of industry on the other.

It would also make it possible, as it is now, that in the event the representatives of management and the representatives of labor all agreed on a particular solution, they would have more votes than the representatives of the general public as a whole. Of course, if labor and management should agree in the first instance, usually there would be no labor dispute.

This seems to me to be a reasonable and fair modification of the amendment offered by the senior Senator from New York. I very much hope that the author of the Ives amendment will accept this modification.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Under the amendment as proposed, could there not be a situation in which, for example, two members represented industry, two represented labor, and three represented the general public?

Mr. LONG. That is true. On the other hand, there could be three representing management, three representing labor, and five, in that instance, representing the general public.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is not the difference between the amendment which the Senator from Louisiana has offered and the committee amendment that the Senator from Louisiana recognizes that this board would be meaningless unless there were cooperation on the part of labor and industry? This is a method of getting labor and industry representation on the board, but at the same time it is recognition of the interest of the general

public, which after all is more important than the interest of any one of its parts, such as labor or industry. It is a recognition of the fact that the whole is more important than the parts. For that reason, the Senator from Louisiana proposes an amendment providing that the representatives of the general public shall always outnumber the representatives either of labor or of industry. Is not that correct?

Mr. LONG. That is correct. It seems to the junior Senator from Louisiana that this is a fair compromise between the one point of view, according to which there would be no representatives of either labor or industry, as such, and on the other hand, the point of view that each group should be represented equally.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I understand, it is a mandatory provision; that is to say, it is mandatory upon the President to name more public members than are named on behalf of either of the two other interested groups. Is not that correct?

Mr. LONG. That is the intention of the junior Senator from Louisiana in offering the amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would the members appointed to represent the public be subject to confirmation by the Senate, as under the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from South Carolina opposed to the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Louisiana to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]?

Mr. MAYBANK. I favor the amendment to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from South Carolina is not opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana, under the unanimous-consent agreement the minority leader will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, as acting minority leader, may I say that I think there is no one on our side, or, in fact, on either side, who wishes to speak.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana is being proposed as an amendment to my amendment, and therefore I should like to have something to say about it, though I shall not say very much.

Mr. CAPEHART. How much time does the Senator from New York desire?

Mr. IVES. I do not want very much time—not over 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator would be entitled to 30 minutes. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, who has offered the amendment. I appreciate very thoroughly the attitude he has expressed, and his argument has merit. But I point out that the very reason for making a tripartite arrangement with equal representation on behalf of labor, management, and the public, is that there should be a continuance of the general idea which now exists, namely, that labor should have representation equal to the representation of the general public, on the one hand, and of management or industry, whatever it may be called in the bill, on the other hand.

I doubt very much whether the proposal of the Senator from Louisiana would provide a satisfactory arrangement in the final analysis, and therefore I personally, shall have to vote against his amendment. I can see its merits, though I can also see its demerits. I think it would be a great deal better than to have equal representation on the part of labor and management with a representation on the part of the public greater in the aggregate than the number of representatives of both labor and industry combined. Certainly I would not agree to anything of that kind.

Mr. LONG. Of course, under the amendment of the Senator from New York, unless my amendment to it were adopted, there might be tie votes; one representative of the general public might side with industry while another representative of the public might side with labor, and thus the vote would be at an impasse, because of an equal number on both sides.

Mr. IVES. I agree with the Senator as to that. I agree that his amendment would prevent a tie of any kind in any controversy in which the representatives of labor and the representatives of industry were divided.

Mr. LONG. Of course it might seem to the Senator that it would be a fair proposal, in the event of a tie, with the management group on one side and the labor group on the other, that the proper person to break the tie would be a representative of the general public.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). The time of the Senator from New York is expired. The Senator from Indiana has control of the time.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, how much time do I have under my control?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 25 minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. I will yield 25 minutes to anyone who wants it, or 5 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New York whether he would accept an amendment to his amendment, when it may be in order to offer it, on page 2, line 5, by adding the words "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate"—in other words, to make all members of the Board subject to confirmation by the Senate, and not merely those representing the general public?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, how much time have I for reply?

Mr. CAPEHART. As much time as the Senator desires, and not exceeding 23 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, in my amendment I deliberately omitted a provision that members representative of labor and the members representative of business and industry should be confirmed by the Senate. My reason for that was a very simple one, namely, that I have no doubt that any President who may appoint members representing those groups would go out of his way to make sure that the appointments he made were approved by those groups. I doubt very much whether he would fail to do that. Certainly if he wanted to have peace in the Wage Stabilization Board, he would not fail to do it. I thought it much simpler not to have them confirmed. At the same time, I thought that the general public should be represented by members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

After all, the members representing the general public do nothing else. They can get no other remuneration of any kind from any other source, in return for which they devote their time to the work of the Board. In consequence of their occupying a slightly different roll and being in a slightly different status, I thought it advisable to have them confirmed. If, however, the Senate feels that it is desirable to have all the representatives confirmed, I have no objection.

I admit that, so far as labor and management are concerned, if they were to be confirmed by the Senate their own representatives would thereby have greater dignity in the positions they held than they would otherwise possess; there can be no doubt about that.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I should like to take 2 minutes myself. I have enjoyed every word that has been said on this subject, but I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that it is now about 10 minutes of 3 o'clock, and the act upon which we are working is due to expire, in the event we follow the advice of the committee, on February 28, 1953. So by the time that the President concluded the task of appointing all these members, whether the number be 18 or 15, and by the time the Senate confirmed them, the law would have expired.

Furthermore, we are completely forgetting, it seems to me, that the President appoints them. He may appoint anyone he cares to appoint. He can designate a man as a representative of business, or as a representative of the public, or of someone else. It seems to me we are wasting a great deal of time on something that does not amount to too much, because the law will expire on February 28, 1953. By the time 18 or even 15 men have been appointed and confirmed by the Senate, the law will have expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment of Mr. LONG to the amendment of Mr. IVES was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The earlier amendment disposed of was the Douglas amendment as a substitute for the Ives amendment. As I understand, the yeas and nays are ordered on the Ives amendment which is an amendment in lieu of the committee amendment or the committee language.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then there will be a vote upon the committee language?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the Ives amendment, on page 2, line 5, after the word "President", where it appears the first time in that line, to insert the words "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire time to discuss his amendment?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. All I want to say, Mr. President, is that it simply adds words to provide that the members representing the general public, the members representing labor, and the members representing business are to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, not simply the public members, as provided for in the original Ives amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], as amended, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as I understand, we are now about to vote on the Ives amendment. In case the amendment should not be adopted, will we then vote upon the section of the bill known as section 106? In other words, will there be another vote after this vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that there will not be.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, the only way in which we can again vote on the specific section is in connection with further amendments to the section if the Ives amendment is rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct, as the Chair understands.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would it be improper to offer an amendment to strike section 106?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be in order.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Would it be proper to offer an amendment similar to those which have been voted on—an amendment to the Dirksen amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If a substantial change or changes were in the amendment previously offered and rejected, it would be in order; otherwise, it would not be.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], as amended. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is detained on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—41

Aiken	Hoey	Monroney
Anderson	Holland	Moody
Benton	Humphrey	Neely
Clements	Hunt	Nixon
Connally	Ives	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Flanders	Kefauver	Smathers
Gillette	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Green	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Hayden	Lehman	Sparkman
Hendrickson	Long	Thye
Hennings	McFarland	Underwood
Hill	McKellar	

NAYS—40

Bennett	Ferguson	Mundt
Brewster	Frear	O'Conor
Bricker	Fulbright	Robertson
Bridges	George	Schoeppel
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Smith, N. C.
Butler, Nebr.	Jenner	Stennis
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Cain	Kem	Watkins
Capehart	Martin	Welker
Case	McCarran	Wiley
Dirksen	McCarthy	Williams
Dworshak	McClellan	Young
Eastland	Millikin	
Ellender	Morse	

NOT VOTING—15

Carlson	Langer	McMahon
Chavez	Lodge	Murray
Duff	Magnuson	Russell
Ecton	Malone	Seaton
Knowland	Maybank	Tobey

So Mr. IVES' amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. AIKEN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from New York.

Mr. TAFT. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair cannot interrupt the yea-and-nay vote for a parliamentary inquiry. The Senator will submit his parliamentary inquiry later.

The roll call was resumed and concluded.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. For what purpose does the Senator from South Carolina rise?

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. During the progress of the last vote, before the motion was made to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] to reconsider, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] came over to ask me about a certain question which he intended to propound. I was talking with the clerk, seeking to obtain the information requested. I spoke to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], about bringing up his so-called compromise amendments later. I spoke to the Chair. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] was presiding at that time. When my name was called I was speaking with the Chair. I distinctly said "No." I think the Senator from North Carolina heard me. I feel certain that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] heard me, and other Senators heard me. Afterward I was called to the door by a representative of the Mutual Broadcasting System, and I went out to talk with him. So, amid all that confusion, my vote was not recorded. The present distinguished Presiding Officer was not present at that time. I wish merely to relate the facts as to how I voted. I had stated that I intended to

vote "nay." I so voted, but my vote was not recorded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina state, upon his responsibility as a Member of the Senate, that he vote "nay" on the previous roll call?

Mr. MAYBANK. I do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. And that the vote was not recorded?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Carolina be given permission to vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not necessary to obtain unanimous consent. The vote of the Senator from South Carolina will be recorded.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, of course that will result in a tie vote. Regardless of that fact, these votes should be accurately recorded.

Under the circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that all subsequent proceedings be set aside, in order that the vote of the Senate may be accurately recorded.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. THYE, and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina has stated that he voted in the negative on the previous yea-and-nay vote, and that because of the confusion in the Chamber his vote was not recorded.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is true. I had stated that I intended to vote in the negative, and I so voted. The distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] was in the chair at the time. I asked for order, because there was so much confusion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator states that he voted—and the Chair does not doubt the Senator's word about it—he is entitled to have his vote accurately recorded.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona that all subsequent proceedings be vacated? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. For what purpose does the Senator from New York rise?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I do not wish in any way to prevent my distinguished colleague the Senator from South Carolina from having his vote properly recorded. But what will happen to the amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The result is that the vote is a tie vote. It will be up to the Chair, and the Chair will vote when the time comes.

Mr. IVES. I thank the Chair.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JENNER. On the yea-and-nay vote I did not vote. If all the proceedings are to be set aside, will it be necessary for me to vote?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; it is not necessary for the Senator to vote. It would be set aside anyway.

The vote of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] will be recorded in the negative, and the clerk will report the revised result to the Chair.

The result of the vote—yeas 41, nays 41—was reported to the Chair by the legislative clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The vote being 41 to 41, a tie, the Chair, in the exercise of his constitutional authority, votes in the affirmative, and the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is agreed to.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I now renew my motion to reconsider the vote by which my amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] to reconsider the vote by which the Ives amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT, Mr. IVES, Mr. AIKEN, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests to Members of the Senate that the inaccurate recording of votes is not the fault of the staff. If Senators would keep better order, so that they could hear their names called and hear the recapitulation, they would not be in such a state of confusion as that through which the Senate has just passed. Therefore, the Chair insists that the Senate be in order. If any Senator thinks he must converse, he will please retire.

The roll call was resumed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The calling of the roll will cease until the Senate is in order. The clerks at the desk cannot hear the responses of the Senators. All other persons in the Chamber, in the galleries, or on the floor, will observe the same rule.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business, and, if present, would each vote "yea."

Also, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—42

Aiken	Hennings	McFarland
Anderson	Hill	McKellar
Benton	Hoey	Monroney
Chavez	Holland	Moody
Clements	Humphrey	Neely
Connally	Hunt	Nixon
Cordon	Ives	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Flanders	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Frear	Kefauver	Smathers
Fulbright	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Green	Kilgore	Sparkman
Hayden	Lehman	Thye
Hendrickson	Long	Underwood

NAYS—39

Bennett	Ellender	Morse
Brewster	Ferguson	Mundt
Bricker	George	O'Conor
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Schoeppel
Butler, Nebr.	Johnson, Colo	Smith, N. C.
Byrd	Kem	Stennis
Cain	Martin	Taft
Capehart	Maybank	Watkins
Case	McCarran	Welker
Dirksen	McCarthy	Wiley
Dworshak	McClellan	Williams
Eastland	Millikin	Young

NOT VOTING—15

Carlson	Langer	Murray
Duff	Lodge	Russell
Ecton	Magnuson	Seaton
Gillette	Malone	Smith, N. J.
Knowland	McMahon	Tobey

So Mr. AIKEN's motion to lay on the table the motion of Mr. IVES to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "6-3-52-B" and ask that it be stated.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for an announcement, without the time being taken from his time and without his losing the floor?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With that understanding I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have been asked whether we would have a night session. I believe that we should continue in session until late tonight. How late will depend on whether we can conclude consideration of the bill. We made good progress yesterday in disposing of two bills. I have had a number of requests from Senators that we go ahead and try to dispose of the pending bill today, if possible, if it is agreeable to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to say that there are now left 32 amendments. My belief is that the controversial amendments on which extensive time for debate was allotted have already been disposed of, except for the amendment

which I submitted this morning. It will be the last amendment to be offered, with ample time allowed for its consideration. We now have before us the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], which is an amendment of the Walsh-Healey Act. According to what the Secretary of Labor has told me—and I shall not go into it in detail, except that Senators know we have had long conferences with him—the situation has been worked out satisfactorily to the best interests of all concerned.

My thought is that if we could dispose of the 32 amendments that remain, and carry my last amendment over until tomorrow, under a unanimous-consent agreement limiting debate to perhaps 1 hour to each side, I believe it would serve the best interest of the Senate to do so. I know that the 32 amendments are very important to many Senators. But the national issues involved have been settled, with the exception of the amendment dealing with the Walsh-Healey Act, which is now before the Senate, and the amendment submitted by me.

Mr. McFARLAND. It will take us until quite a late hour to finish consideration of all the amendments even without the amendment which the Senator from South Carolina has mentioned.

Mr. MAYBANK. I believe we can finish by 8 o'clock.

Mr. McFARLAND. If we can finish by 8 o'clock, we will be lucky.

Mr. MAYBANK. We can finish with all the amendments by 8 o'clock, I believe, with the exception of the amendment I submitted this morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 30 minutes. Senators opposed to the amendment are entitled to the same time.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the amendment submitted by Mr. FULBRIGHT.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, because I intend to explain the amendment, which is technical in nature.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the further reading of the amendment will be dispensed with, and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment offered by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

On page 11, beginning with line 9, strike out all through line 16, on page 12, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 301. The act entitled 'An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes', approved June 30, 1936 (41 U. S. C. 35–45), is amended (1) by redesignating sections 10 and 11 as sections 11 and 12, respectively, and (2) by inserting immediately following section 9 a new section 10 as follows:

"'SEC. 10. (a) Notwithstanding any provision of section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act, such act shall be applicable in the administration of sections 1 to 5 and 7 to 9 of this act.

"'(b) All wage determinations under section 1 (b) of this act shall be made on the record after opportunity for a hearing. Review of any such wage determination, or of the applicability of any such wage determination, may be had within 90 days after such determination is made in the manner provided in section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act by any person adversely affected or aggrieved thereby, who shall be deemed to include any manufacturer of, or regular dealer in, materials, supplies, articles or equipment purchased or to be purchased by the Government from any source, who is in any industry to which such wage determination is applicable.

"'(c) Notwithstanding the inclusion of any stipulations required by any provision of this act in any contract subject to this act, any interested person shall have the right of judicial review of any legal question which might otherwise be raised, including, but not limited to, wage determinations and the interpretation of the terms "locality," "regular dealer," "manufacturer", and "open market".'"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Only if the time required for that purpose is not charged to the time available to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has no control of that situation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In any event, Mr. President, I yield for 1 minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Vice President whether it is possible at this time to offer an amendment to the amendment submitted by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], which amendment was adopted just a few minutes ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; that is not possible, for that amendment has been disposed of.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement, 1 hour is available for debate on amendments to this section of the bill, as has been announced by the Chair.

However, I intend to take only a few minutes, because I think the Members of the Senate who are interested in this amendment have reached a point of agreement, so that consideration of the amendment will not take much time.

This amendment would strike out title III of the bill as reported by the committee. That title contains the amendments which I offered to the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act, which were adopted by the committee.

The first of these amendments dealt with the so-called open-market exemption of the Walsh-Healey Act, to require that it be interpreted in the manner which I and a majority of the committee believed to be in accordance with the intention of Congress when it passed the Walsh-Healey Act.

The second portion of the committee amendment would require the Walsh-Healey Act to come under the procedural and judicial review provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, in order that those affected by the act might have an opportunity to challenge the interpretations the Secretary of Labor has made of the provisions of the Walsh-Healey Act.

The amendment I now have called up is a substitute for both those amendments, and is in the nature of a compromise. It also provides for the procedural and judicial review safeguards of the Administrative Procedure Act, insofar as they can properly be applied to the Walsh-Healey Act. In my opinion and in the opinion of counsel for the committee, this amendment will afford protection against arbitrary misinterpretation or misapplication of that act.

In offering this amendment, I do so with the understanding that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] will withdraw their amendment, which proposes to strike out the entire committee amendment. I also understand that they will support the amendment I have offered.

Furthermore, I understand that the Secretary of Labor will support this amendment, if any question arises as to its acceptance by the House conferees.

In other words, Mr. President, it is my understanding, after conferences yesterday and today, that the persons who had evinced some opposition to the amendment as it is carried in the bill, have agreed to support this amendment.

This amendment accomplishes the major objective of affording judicial review of interpretations of the Walsh-Healey Act by the Secretary of Labor.

It is my view that the Secretary of Labor has misapplied the Walsh-Healey Act in such a way as to erect artificial obstructions to the development of industry in the small communities throughout the country. Of course, that is especially prejudicial to the West and to the South, and also to small towns in the East and Northeast. Obviously, the West and the South are not as highly industrialized or as highly urbanized as are the eastern and northeastern sections of the country. However, I believe that the misapplication of the act by the Secretary of Labor has been as prejudicial to communities in the Northeast as it has been to communities in the South or in the West.

The long-time effect of the mistaken interpretation made by the Secretary of Labor is, in my opinion, to tend to freeze the industrial status quo. It is an effort on the part of the great industrial urban centers to obtain, through Government action, protection from competition. That effort is very similar to the effort made in the early days when England sought to prevent the American Colonies from developing industries.

However, I do not think that was the purpose of Congress in enacting this measure. I believe the purpose was primarily to prevent sweatshops from obtaining a large part or a considerable part of the Government business.

On the other hand, I am perfectly willing to leave the interpretation of this measure to the courts.

Under the existing law it has not been possible to obtain a review by the courts of the question of the proper interpretation of the terms of this act. Therefore, in view of the willingness of Senators to go along on this matter, and the willingness on the part of the other members of the committee to leave to the courts the decision as to what is the proper interpretation to be made of the act, I offer this amendment, which, simply stated, provides for judicial review and compliance with the Administrative

Procedures Act in the interpretation and administration of the Walsh-Healey Act.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Arkansas had an amendment to the original act, and his amendment comprises the two parts he has just described. He now proposes an amendment which will change the administrative procedure only, as I understand.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me clarify that point. Those two amendments are now in the committee bill. They were adopted by the committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. My amendment is a substitute for them. My amendment would strike out those two amendments and would substitute a single provision relating only to judicial review and the Administrative Procedures Act.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. I hope the amendment will be an improvement of the administrative procedure in connection with the Walsh-Healey Act. It will be in effect for 9 months, the duration of the bill. Thereafter we can change it again, if that is necessary.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; it would not be in effect for only 9 months. This amendment is offered to the Walsh-Healey Act, and it is not limited to 9 months.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. However, it is an amendment to the administrative procedure in connection with the Walsh-Healey Act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct; the amendment has that effect. It applies the Administrative Procedure Act to the Walsh-Healey Act, but not only for 9 months; it applies permanently.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. Under those circumstances, the amendment which was to be proposed by myself and my colleagues, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], will not be submitted.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is my understanding.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe this amendment will correct the situation. Personally, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas will be adopted.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I simply wish to reiterate the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Massachusetts as to his understanding of the situation.

I would say, in addition, that I hope the amendment now proposed will meet the problem the Senator from Arkansas has stated, and at the same time will protect the parties in interest, whom the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from New Hampshire are attempting to protect.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the statement made by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. President, I believe that everyone who has been interested in this matter could well accept the amendment, as it does not constitute any change whatever in the substantive law. In view of the long history of the Walsh-Healey Act—in other words, it has been on the statute books since 1936—I realize that there will be some resistance, no matter whether I am correct with respect to my interpretation of the original intent of Congress.

Nevertheless, I am perfectly willing to allow the courts to determine the correctness of the interpretation of the act, as made by the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. After reading the amendment, I should like to ask a question about a part of it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Which part?

Mr. PASTORE. I refer to section 10, subsection (b), on page 2 of the amendment; and the part I have in mind is about four lines following the beginning of the subsection. I read the part to which I refer: "may be had within 90 days after such determination is made in the manner provided in section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act by any person adversely affected or aggrieved thereby, who shall be deemed to include any manufacturer of, or regular dealer in," and so forth. Does the Senator from Arkansas understand that to mean that "any person adversely affected or aggrieved thereby" might include a union which feels that it might be aggrieved by an order which was being issued in another locality, insofar as its welfare might be concerned in another part of the country? Do I make my question clear?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the question is clear, but I cannot conceive that those circumstances would cause a union to be aggrieved. However, if it was, I see no reason why it could not challenge the ruling. In other words, certainly nothing is intended to prevent a union from taking advantage of this provision.

The court would have to say they are aggrieved. If the court says they are aggrieved—and there might be circumstances in which they could be aggrieved, and if so, I see no reason why they should not take advantage of the review provisions to have the determination challenged.

Mr. PASTORE. To give a more specific case, let us assume that a union in a textile plant in Rhode Island felt that an interpretation was to be made of a contract to be granted, let us say, in some Western State. The Rhode Island union is not directly aggrieved by that particular decision, but indirectly it might feel that its standard of living was being lowered, or the standard of working conditions in its own State of Rhode Island. Could that union in Rhode Island consider itself an "aggrieved person," and thus bring the case to a judicial review on a matter that is being decided with reference to a Western State? Do I make myself clear in this question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator's question is clear, but I think the answer has to be within the discretion of the judge, as to whether the union is to be considered to be an aggrieved person. I think it is a little far fetched to think the members of the union would be aggrieved—upon the facts, I mean—and as to how they would be able to show to a reasonable person that they had been aggrieved, because a contract has been let in California. I realize the position of all the New England States has been that any contract let outside of New England is an insult to them. Apparently they have a God-given right to all industry in this country. I think that is a matter the judge would have to decide. I do not think they would be aggrieved, but I am perfectly willing that the court should determine that.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is the framer of this particular amendment, and I should like to know what is in the Senator's mind as constituting an aggrieved person, because it may well be that the court, in establishing jurisdiction over a matter upon review, would have to determine what was meant by the Congress of the United States when it employed the term "an aggrieved person." I assumed the case of a Rhode Island union only as an example, not because I felt that we in Rhode Island have any God-given rights that are superior to those of any other Americans.

If the Senator desires to do so, he may reverse the situation and suppose it to be a union in his own State, feeling aggrieved as to a contract that had been made in Rhode Island. But I am trying to find out what the intention of the Senator, as the framer of this amendment, is so that his statement may appear in the RECORD as indicative of the intention of the Congress as to who shall be considered to be an aggrieved person.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let us see whether this would answer the question. The Senator's example is difficult for me to follow. Perhaps this might be simpler. Let us suppose that a wage determination were made, and that the union felt that on the clear facts in the matter the wage should have been set at $1.50, but that, as the result of ignoring certain facts or in some other unjustified manner, the Secretary should say, "No, it should be only $1.25." Can they in such a case come in to challenge it upon the ground that it is an arbitrary and capricious judgment? They would be affected in such a situation, because it applies to them. I can see no reason why they could not make out a case. I am unable to see how a contract made in Rhode Island would affect people in the State of Arkansas. The effect of it would be too remote for them to be able to show any injury. It would be necessary for them to have a case, in other words.

Mr. PASTORE. If I read correctly subsection (c) of the Senator's amendment, the court of review is to pass upon interpretations made by the Secretary of Labor with reference to the terms "locality," "regular dealer," "manufacturer," and "open market." With reference to the case which was given by the able Senator, the question might arise as to whether it should be $1.25 or $1.50. I can well see where the

connection might be too far removed. But under the interpretation of "locality," "regular dealer," "manufacturer," or "open market," it might be a question vitally concerning a union or workers in another State, because, after all, what is meant by "locality" under the Walsh-Healey Act, and what is meant by an "open market," under the Walsh-Healey Act has been the bone of contention throughout this entire controversy. It occurs to me that if we are to standardize working conditions throughout the entire country—and that was the original purpose of the Walsh-Healey Act—it might be of vital concern to certain people in one locality as to what interpretation is made of a provision of the particular law.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has stated that that was the original purpose, of course, I deny that that was the original purpose. The Senator has raised one of the points of controversy, namely, the question as to what is the meaning of the word "locality" in the act under the compromise that very question to be decided by a court, it being contended that we should not decide it, that we cannot decide it properly on judicial grounds. The act has been passed. The Secretary of Labor has decided that the law means a certain thing. I say he is in error about it. He say he is right. All that I am endeavoring to do, and all that it is intended to do is to afford a means whereby that question can be decided by the court.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, it is to be a decision by the court in the same manner as that provided by the Administrative Procedure Act, whereas the present Walsh-Healey Act is an exception to the Administrative Procedure Act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. There has been no reasonable means by which interpretations might be challenged. It was tried in the Lukens steel case, in which it was held that the parties seeking to challenge the interpretation had no standing in court to do so. It is our purpose, by this amendment, to overturn that decision.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So, the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, we hope, will provide a fairer procedure than the procedure now in effect.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. That is the intention. It is simply intended to give a judicial review of the questions referred to by the Senator from Rhode Island, and others which may arise.

The application of the provision in question to the specific set of circumstances outlined by the Senator from Rhode Island is something to be decided by the court, in the light of the facts. Whether there has been an injury or not would depend, I suppose, upon the facts of the particular case.

Mr. PASTORE. I was hoping that the author of this amendment would really give a liberal construction as to what might be meant by "an aggrieved person." I think I understand the Senator correctly, that anyone who feels himself aggrieved, even though he may not be directly connected with the particular case, might go to court and have the question determined by the court upon review.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator gets into a very technical question, there, as to whether there is a controversy involved, under the Constitution. I do not think I could shed much light upon that. But that matter would be submitted to the court for decision as to whether there was a sufficient set of circumstances to support a case.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas, either for a question or, if he wishes time, for any remarks he may desire to make. I may say the Senator from Kansas has been very much interested in these questions and has followed them very closely. He deserves much credit for that. I yield to the Senator. Does the Senator wish me to yield for a question?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to take a few moments.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield the Senator whatever time he desires.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I appreciate the explanation by the able Senator from Arkansas, who has in my judgment presented this matter most fully to our committee. I happen to be one of the members of the committee who supported the position taken by the Senator from Arkansas when the matter was first brought to the attention of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I felt then, and I still feel, that certain practices have been indulged in by the Labor Department which go beyond what I think was the intendment of the act.

I note the changes the distinguished Senator from Arkansas has made in his proposal, limiting it to a court review, and providing procedure whereby an interpretation of the act may be obtained by means of a court decision. While I should have preferred to go along with the original approach made by the Senator from Arkansas, I am entirely willing to accept the situation and the circumstances which have developed.

I am happy to support the amendment as it is presently offered by the Senator from Arkansas, because I think it is a very vital and important step in correcting some of the practices which I developed. I hope the amendment will be adopted and sustained in conference.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I appreciate the attitude of the Senator from Kansas. We should all like to have our own way, but any other approach, it seems to me, would have involved a long difficult and uncertain controversy, which might not have been successful. But when this approach was suggested, it seemed to me wiser to follow it. After it has had an opportunity to work, if the courts do not interpret it in the way Congress thinks they should, we of course, would have an opportunity to change the basic law. I hope also, that it will serve as some restraint upon the Secretary of Labor.

I agree entirely with the Senator from Kansas with reference to the interpretations of the Secretary of Labor. I think the Secretary of Labor has misinterpreted the concept of "locality" set out in the original act. I think he has gone entirely contrary to the legislative intent as shown by the legislative history of the act. I think the same is true as to section 9 of the original act with regard to standard articles purchased in the open market. However, I trust the judgment of the courts. I think my case is so strong that the courts cannot help but interpret it in the proper manner; at least, that is the way I feel.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I appreciate the Senator's statement, and I thoroughly agree with him. I feel that the interpretations made by the Labor Department with reference to eliminating the locality consideration with reference to wages have inured to the detriment of small business. That was the thing about which I was most fearful.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the worst effect has been in preventing the operation of ordinary economic forces enabling the smaller communities, non-industrialized areas, to develop industry, freezing the existing economic pattern.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, several Senators have asked me with respect to the amendment. As I told the distinguished minority leader, I have no intention of speaking on it. I voted for the amendment in the committee, but I am wondering whether the Senate wants to show by a vote exactly what it feels about the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think anyone opposes it.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wanted to make clear that practically every Senator is in favor of the amendment.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. If the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas is not adopted, what agency can determine such questions as were recently raised by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If it is not adopted, the Secretary of Labor will determine them.

Mr. CAIN. It is the wish of the Senator from Arkansas, is it not, that there should be a judicial rather than an administrative review in the future?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. A judicial review of administrative action.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina wish to use any of his time?

Mr. MAYBANK. No; I do not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "June 30, 1953," and insert "February 28, 1953."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall take just a minute. Price control terminates on February 28. Rent control terminates on June 30. I see no reason why the terminations should not fall on the same date. That is all the amendment provides for, and that is all the time I wish to use.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, this is a very important amendment. It has to do with rent control. Rent control has been turned over to States and municipalities. Some of the larger communities will be in a serious situation if the amendment shall take effect. The able Senator from Illinois says his amendment puts rent control on the same basis as price control. Wages and prices are not determined by sovereign States or localities under ordinances passed by city councils. The rent-control provision of the bill merely continues the present rent controls, leaving the termination to communities or States to decide by action of the legislature or by action of the city council. There was a motion made in the committee to do away with rent control——

Mr. DIRKSEN. That was the motion which I originally offered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not quite understand the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is to terminate rent control on a certain date.

I think there should be a full discussion of the amendment. I shall insist upon the yeas and nays, because the amendment would affect situations in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and so forth. While we do not have rent control in South Carolina, except in critical areas as defined by either the Secretary of Defense or the Stabilization Director himself after public hearings and after a showing that it is necessary, I think that in the large cities which cannot have the States pass laws for them, with the exception of New York State, this amendment would cause a great deal of trouble, having in mind Detroit, Wilmington, Del., and other cities.

So, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is agreeable with me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is obviously a sufficient number seconding the request, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

Mr. CAPEHART. The able Senator from South Carolina makes the best argument in the world for changing the date and having rent control expire when price and wage controls expire. He says rent control is going to be handled by the States and cities. Of course it is. Every State and every city has the right to impose rent control upon its citizens if it so desires, and many of them have done so.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana declined to yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The State of New York has its own rent control law. If Illinois wishes to control rents, that is its business. If North Carolina wants to impose rent control, that is its business, and it has a right to do it.

The big question mark in my mind is whether the Federal Government has a right to control rents, inasmuch as that subject is certainly not a form of interstate commerce. The States can control their own rents, if they desire to control them. Why should we extend Federal control of rents any longer than we extend the control of prices and wages? By what reasoning can it be justified? I wish someone would give me one good reason why we should single out rents and say, "We are going to control rents longer than we will control prices and wages." Give me one reason why we should do it.

Furthermore, when the States have a right to control their own rents, I think they ought to control them, if circumstances warrant. Evidently the State of New York believes that circumstances warrant rent control, because it has it. I think Illinois ought to control rents if the people of that State believe rents should be controlled. But, for the life of me, I cannot see the reasoning for having price and wage controls expire at one time, and rent controls expire 3 months later.

The cities, towns, and States control their own rents. For example, the State of New York does not care at all what we do here. New York has its own law. Indiana could pass a law tomorrow if it so desired. Illinois could pass a law tomorrow if it wished to do so—and it ought to do it if, in its own personal opinion, it believed rents should be controlled. If there is anything which ought to be considered as a local matter, it seems to me it is rent control. I never knew of houses being moved from day to day from one State to another. It is not an interstate matter at all; it is 100 percent a local matter.

I think possibly there should be rent control as long as price and wage controls are continued. But I do not know why we should continue rent control any longer than we do price and wage controls. Under this bill, as written, price and wage controls will expire on February 28. Why should not rent control expire on the same date? If at that time the Senate wishes to extend price and wage controls for another year, they might then extend rent control for another year. But why single out rent control and say that it must continue 3 months longer than price and wage controls? I do not understand that. I do not know why we should not be consistent.

Why should we single out property owners of America and treat them differently from the way we treat those who operate grocery stores or drugstores? We say to merchants, "We are going to control your businesses; but we are going to let you off the hook on February 28." But here we are proposing that the fellow who owns a little house be kept on the hook 3 months longer than February 28.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I seem to recall that 1 year ago the Committee on Banking and Currency said to the Senate for the first time that it was putting wage, price, and rent controls together because it wanted all of them to expire at the same time, when they did expire. Does the Senator from Indiana recall that?

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator is 100 percent correct. I am not arguing whether we should or should not have rent control. All I am saying is that we ought to treat property owners the same as we do the owners of any other property.

Mr. CAIN. I remember that a year ago every assurance was given to the Senate that that was going to be done.

Mr. CAPEHART. Again the Senator is 100 percent correct. Formerly we had a separate rent-control bill, and it was incorporated into the Defense Production Act on the promise to property owners of America that when price and wage controls were eliminated, rent controls would also be eliminated. We made that promise.

Mr. CAIN. Will the Senator from Indiana then please suggest to those of us who are not members of the Committee on Banking and Currency what reasons were advanced within the committee to separate price and wage controls from rent control?

Mr. CAPEHART. Frankly, my memory is poor about that. I do not believe we gave any consideration to it. Perhaps it was just one of those things as to which, if it had been considered, we might have applied the same date. I may be wrong about that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield one additional minute to the Senator.

If the Senator from Indiana will yield, I may simply say that actually the issue was never discussed. The bill contained divergent dates, and we merely let it run as such, without trying to correct it.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think that is a proper interpretation of the situation. Perhaps I am wrong. If I am, will somebody correct me?

Mr. MAYBANK. I must say to the Senator that when the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] called up his amendment—and the Senator from Virginia is not here to bear me out—the matter was discussed, and the Senator from Indiana knows that we put on allocations and priorities along with the extension of rent control.

The Senator from Indiana says this is a local matter. It is not a local matter in the Savannah Valley, when the Federal Government sends 62,000 peo-

ple there to work. It is not a local matter in Gary, Ind., when steel plants are going to be expanded. The only places where rent controls can be applied by the Federal Government are in national critical defense areas.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is just the point.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Indiana says that South Carolina should pass a rent-control law. I shall not quarrel with the Senator about that. But certainly the legislatures of Indiana and South Carolina, when they meet next January, cannot put such a law into effect by the end of December.

The matter was discussed at length last year, and those who rent property were given a 20-percent increase. However, I do not wish to discuss that question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield me additional time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Indiana three more minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. We are not asking to have rent control eliminated; we are asking that it carry the same expiration date as do price and wage controls.

The able Senator from South Caroline speaks about atomic plants and says that 62,000 people are going to be sent to them. Of course, the State of South Carolina has a right to pass a law controlling rents in that State, and it ought to do it, in my personal opinion, because it is a local matter. Perhaps in Mississippi rent control is not needed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Perhaps Indiana should do the same thing, but it has not done it. Why should the workers there suffer?

Mr. CAPEHART. They are not suffering.

Mr. President, we are not arguing whether we ought to have rent control; we are arguing whether rent control should carry the same expiration date as price and wage controls. Rent control is in the bill and we are for keeping it in the bill. But why have one date for price and wage controls and another date for rent control?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I will tell the Senator why I believe we should have one date for one and another date for another. It is because it takes a little longer to build a house than it does to produce a can of tomatoes.

Mr. MAYBANK. We have to put prices on commodities from the Belgian Congo before they get here.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As the Senator knows, the reason for rent control is that there is a shortage of housing facilities in certain areas. The fact of the matter is that the shortage cannot be overcome overnight. Furthermore, if rent control were taken off as a Federal enactment, it would be at times when many State legislatures were not in session. It would be at a time when it would impair the whole stabilization program, because a part of the stabilization program is rent control.

I wish to say to the Senator from South Carolina that I think the recommendations of his committee are entirely proper and should be supported.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me repeat what I have already said, that rent controls are applied only in national critical defense areas.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. If local people take over defense plants, they cannot be recontrolled until public hearings have been held.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Insofar as public interest is concerned, there is plenty of opportunity in defense areas for local rent control. The Senator from South Carolina is proposing only that where critical areas are affected, and where there is critical defense production or construction, rent control be continued. I think he should be supported.

Mr. FREAR. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether it is true or not true that even under the present act, whether the extension be 8 or 12 months, anything now under control can be decontrolled by action of local government?

Mr. MAYBANK. The city council could meet tonight and decontrol by action of the council, approved by the mayor.

Mr. FREAR. I should like to say that the distinguished Senator in his remarks mentioned the fine city of Wilmington, Del.

Mr. MAYBANK. I only knew of the problem that the distinguished Senator from Delaware was confronted with, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, and of how that great industrial city and its workers would be affected.

Mr. FREAR. I very much appreciate the Senator's statement. The city of Wilmington, Del., although it has had the prerogative of decontrolling, has never seen fit to do so in all this time.

Mr. MAYBANK. It can be done under local self-government, in which the Senator believes, I am sure.

Mr. FREAR. That is true.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the Senator from Delaware has covered a part of my question. As I understand, rent control covers only such areas as are considered to be critical.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. And with respect to which local government has not taken action to decontrol.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct. The great State of New York has its own law. However, in that State there are many persons who are interested in other parts of the country, and who are trying to protect the economy of the entire country.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is quite true. In my State of New York many of the localities have not decontrolled. They feel very definitely that further control is essential to the welfare of the people.

Is it not a fact that even though New York and certain other States have rent-control laws of their own——

Mr. MAYBANK. I may be mistaken. If so, I am subject to correction. However, I believe that New York is the only State which has a rent-control law. That is my understanding.

Mr. LEHMAN. I was not sure about that. I understood the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] to refer to some sort of rent-control law in his State. Probably I misunderstood him.

Mr. MAYBANK. New York is the only State which has such a law.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very glad, of course, that we have it, because it has certainly protected the people and will continue to protect the people for a long time. But is it not a fact that even though a legislature has the right to enact such legislation, as the Legislature of the State of New York has done, in a great many States—possibly in the majority of the States of the Union—the legislatures meet only biennially, or the sessions really begin to operate at such a late date that they could not possibly take action by February 28, regardless of the urgency of the situation?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] stated that many of the States have been negligent in not taking action. I do not intend to defend such inaction.

Mr. LEHMAN. Perhaps they have been negligent——

Mr. MAYBANK. Two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. LEHMAN. Perhaps the politicians have been negligent. I have frequently found that to be the case. But there is no reason to make the people of a State or community suffer because the politicians have been negligent or self-interested. I think the proposal contained in the committee bill is sound, and I shall certainly support it. I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold for a moment his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly. I merely wish to make certain that Senators have an opportunity to vote on this question.

Mr. CAIN. I understood the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency to say that any community in the Union which is presently under Federal rent control can decontrol itself through an appropriate legal act of the local government.

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not say that. I said that the action must be approved by the Governor of the State.

Mr. CAIN. Following affirmative action at the local level.

Mr. MAYBANK. No; it does not require approval by the Governor of the State. It is accomplished by local action, such as a vote of the city council. I will say to the Senator that there are some complications in the case of city and county governments, as well as local subdivisions. However, the decontrol is accomplished by the local law of the community.

Mr. CAIN. But it is true that a local determination can be made to decontrol American counties, cities, and States.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. Is there any way in which such States and municipalities can prevent their being recontrolled? If they

have the authority to decontrol themselves they have the authority to keep themselves from being recontrolled by the Federal Government?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; they have the authority. Under the so-called Robertson amendment the Administrator must hold public hearings and there must be a finding of facts before recontrol can be put into operation. I am sorry the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is not present. He insisted upon this provision. I read from section 202 of the bill:

(p) Except in the case of action taken after full compliance with subsection (k) of this section, the President shall not reestablish maximum rents in any defense-rental area which has previously been decontrolled under this act until a public hearing, after 30 days' notice, has been held in such area.

There must be findings of fact.

Mr. CAIN. That does not mean that a public hearing in itself represents any authority on the part of the local community to keep itself from being recontrolled if the Federal office of the Rent Expediter wishes to recontrol it.

Mr. MAYBANK. The law does not say that he may not; but the substance of the law, and the substance of the intention of the committee, has been that recontrol cannot be made effective until after a public hearing and a finding of fact. If there should be an erroneous finding of fact, I assume that we would hear about it.

Mr. CAIN. Apparently, then, the Senator feels strongly that no American community should be recontrolled over its considered resistance.

Mr. MAYBANK. Under no conditions, except upon a finding of the fact, for example, that thousands of people have been moved into a community to work in defense industries, and not for some other reason.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the debate concluded?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we have some time left, but I do not object to a quorum call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I had suggested the absence of a quorum, but I believe the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] desires to speak for a few minutes. How much time have I left?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has 2 minutes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield the remainder of my time to my friend from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I shall make only two points. The first is that the new Congress which will assemble, in all probability under a new administration, will be very busy. To heap upon the new Congress in the first month in which it meets the question of the change of both price control and rent control may well overload the Congress with work. Therefore, I favor the extension of rent control until the 1st of July.

The second point is this. A longer time is required to build houses than to produce commodities. Therefore there is justification for a longer period of rent control, during which we hope the construction of houses will overcome the shortage. In that field more time is needed than in the production of commodities.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Monroney
Anderson	Hendrickson	Moody
Bennett	Hennings	Morse
Benton	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Brewster	Hill	Neely
Bricker	Hoey	Nixon
Butler, Md.	Holland	O'Conor
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Hunt	Pastore
Cain	Ives	Saltonstall
Capehart	Jenner	Schoeppel
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Kefauver	Smith, N. C.
Cordon	Kem	Sparkman
Dirksen	Kerr	Stennis
Douglas	Kilgore	Taft
Dworshak	Lehman	Thye
Eastland	Long	Tobey
Ellender	Martin	Underwood
Ferguson	Maybank	Watkins
Flanders	McCarran	Welker
Frear	McCarthy	Wiley
Fulbright	McClellan	Williams
George	McFarland	Young
Gillette	McKellar	
Green	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I believe I have some time remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. For the information of the Senate, I should like to say that the pending amendment does nothing more than to provide that price control and rent control shall end on the same day. The bill before the Senate, as reported by the committee, ends rent control on June 30, and price control on February 28. Not one reason, valid or persuasive in nature, has been assigned as to why the two controls should not end at the same time.

It has been said, in what I think is a most delightful and whimsical argument, and without foundation, that it takes longer to build a house than to can a can of tomatoes, and, therefore, there ought to be a difference. It has been said that a new Congress will come into office next year. I confidently hope that that will be true—and that it will be a Republican Congress—and that we would throw an undue burden on the new Congress.

Mr. President, the same Congress is going to deal with price control on or before February 28, and it can deal with rent control at the same time. That shows the kind of specious argument that has been advanced against the amendment. No valid reason has been assigned as to why both controls should not terminate on the same day.

Mr. WILEY. What is the date?

Mr. DIRKSEN. February 28, 1953.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce that on this vote the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

I announce also that if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]. If present and voting the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—48

Aiken	Flanders	O'Conor
Bennett	George	Saltonstall
Brewster	Hendrickson	Schoeppel
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Smathers
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Smith, Maine
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Ives	Smith, N. C.
Cain	Jenner	Stennis
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Case	Kem	Thye
Cordon	Martin	Tobey
Dirksen	McCarthy	Watkins
Dworshak	Millikin	Welker
Eastland	Morse	Wiley
Ellender	Mundt	Williams
Ferguson	Nixon	Young

NAYS—34

Anderson	Hill	McClellan
Benton	Humphrey	McFarland
Chavez	Hunt	McKellar
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Monroney
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Moody
Douglas	Kefauver	Neely
Frear	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Fulbright	Kilgore	Pastore
Gillette	Lehman	Sparkman
Green	Long	Underwood
Hayden	Maybank	
Hennings	McCarran	

NOT VOTING—14

Bridges	Langer	Murray
Carlson	Lodge	Robertson
Duff	Magnuson	Russell
Ecton	Malone	Seaton
Knowland	McMahon	

So Mr. DIRKSEN's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I desire to call up my amendment dated May 29, 1952, and lettered "A."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, between lines 8 and 9, it is proposed to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 101. Section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "If the domestic production of any commodity is in excess of the amount necessary to meet allocations for defense, stockpiling, and military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress, then no restriction or other limitation shall be imposed under this title upon the right of any person to purchase such commodity in any foreign country and to import and use the same in the United States. No restriction or other limitation shall be imposed under this title if the domestic production of any commodity is sufficient to meet all civilian domestic requirements and the requirements for defense, stockpiling, and military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress."

Renumber succeeding sections accordingly.

On page 5, line 24, strike out "a new subsection (l)", and insert in lieu thereof "two new subsections."

On page 6, line 5, strike out the quotation marks.

On page 6, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

(m) No rule, regulation, or order issued under this title shall apply to purchases by any person of any material outside of the United States or its Territories and possessions for importation into the United States for his own use or for fabrication by him into other products for resale.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on previous occasions I have attempted to acquaint the Senate with the reasons I believe make it imperative that we amend the Defense Production Act so its provisions cannot be used to implement the decisions of the International Materials Conference, the IMC.

Mr. Fleischmann, in his appearance before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, said that the IMC "assures the Nations of the free world engaged in the mobilization effort an equitable part of the materials. By equitable I mean loaded in favor of the mobilization effort." Those are Mr. Fleischmann's words. Mr. President, that is one of the main reasons we are told that we should not interfere with the International Materials Conference. So let us see how "loaded" for defense the IMC really is. The Banking and Currency Committee was also told that in 1950 this country consumed 47.3 percent of the free world's copper and that today IMC is allocating the United States 49.1 percent of the free world's copper, an apparent increase. Unfortunately, the information given the committee on which their decision was based, does not agree with the information published by the IMC itself. The IMC, in its report on operations for 1951 and 1952, on page 67, show that in 1950 the United States consumed 1,304,700 metric tons out of world total of 2,640,400 metric tons. This gives 49.4 and not 47.3 as the committee was told.

The IMC's published report of their 1952 allocations does agree with the information given the committee so that actually the "loading in favor of the mobilization effort," to which Mr. Fleischmann referred, means that we really get a smaller share of the world's copper today than we got in 1950.

Mr. President, let me put this whole thing in another way. If the United States gets about what it did in 1950, and, if the share going to the other countries is about what they got, and, we have the largest defense program of other countries in the non-Communist world, then our civilian economy has been reduced more than that of any other country. This is the nub of the problem.

Mr. President, that is the situation in which we find ourselves. We are engaged in the greatest war effort on the part of any country, and yet more material is being allotted to other countries than is being allotted to this country.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator state the materials we are allotting to other countries? I understood the Senator to say that we were allotting more materials to other countries than we were allotting to this country. Does the Senator refer to scarce materials?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is that all this applies to?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator name the scarce materials?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I name copper.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator believe that we have sufficient copper without Chilean copper?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am saying that under this international cartel 49.1 percent of the copper is allotted to the United States of America, whereas in 1950 we were using 49.4 percent. So, with the increase in production within this country, we are now getting less copper under this cartel than we did before.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, this amendment affects the critical materials of the United States. I know the large corporations of this country desire to purchase wherever they can, and I have no complaint about that. But when it comes to copper, of course, as the Senator knows, copper allocations have been seriously curtailed as a result of the shipment of Chilean copper. As a result of the conferences which have been conducted by the Secretary of Commerce, I understand from Secretary Sawyer that the copper representatives of this country, were to meet with the President on Monday. I do not know whether they did or not. I know little about it, in fact, I know nothing about it except what I have been told. So far as I know, the figures presented by the Senator from Michigan are correct. Of course, he would not present figures that were incorrect.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I am getting accurate figures. I am getting the figures from the report.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator implies that there is a threat on the part of Chile to take over in the matter of copper. The Senator knows about the increases in the price of copper. With respect to at least 20 percent of the Chilean copper, the Senator knows that it had not been allocated here.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; but we allowed 20 percent to be reserved, and we furnished to foreign countries money to enable them to go into the market and purchase copper for as much as 60 cents a pound, when our country was only allowed to pay 27½ cents a pound, and when American corporations and individuals—and this is not a question of large corporations—are not allowed a similar privilege.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, can that go on. Would the Senator's amendment make it any better? Consider the way money is being spent in Europe and how the people are allowed to spend our money. I was in accord with the cut of $1,000,000,000, made in the mutual security bill, but when it comes to the importation of Chilean copper, and the question of what we are allocated, that is a different situation.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to explain the situation, and I think the Senator will agree with me.

I am also concerned with the fact that although Congress has passed Public Law 520, Seventy-ninth Congress, which provides for strategic stockpiling—and this is very important—the International Materials Conference has virtually suspended our stockpiling program. The report on operations by that conference, to which I have already referred, makes this statement:

In the case of commodities where the shortage was more acute (nickel, tungsten, and molybdenum), the committees were unable to recommend any special allowance for stockpiling. In the allocation plans for the first quarter of 1952, the Copper-Zinc-Lead and the Manganese-Nickel-Cobalt Committees found it inadvisable to provide any special allowance for stockpile purposes.

In other words, they would not give us material for stockpiling.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. Is it not true that we drew on our stockpile for approximately 200,000 tons?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. Not only did we not add to the stockpile,

but we had to withdraw a part of it because of this international cartel.

Mr. FREAR. Is it not also true that during that period we exported 131,000 tons of copper?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is also correct. Even though we were producing more copper under the agreement, we were shipping it out, taking it out of the stockpile. It is not only a matter of the large corporations, but everyone who uses any copper finds himself in such a position that he cannot get tickets for copper nor go into the world market and buy copper, while we have been allotting it to other people.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I have great respect for the wishes and desires of the chairman of the committee——

Mr. MAYBANK. I have no wishes and desires in connection with it. I have seen representatives of large corporations as well as small-business people. As I said, representatives of the Banking and Currency Committee went to see Mr. Fowler yesterday afternoon and asked him questions. I intend to read his answers.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina if the matter was presented to the committee?

Mr. MAYBANK. It was.

Mr. McFARLAND. How would it affect the Defense Board? We know that more copper is needed for automobiles, but how would it affect countries that want copper for defense purposes?

Mr. MAYBANK. I have statements I could read all evening about that.

Mr. FREAR. I think the Senator ought to read them.

Mr. MAYBANK. I will say to my distinguished friend that I have no interest except in what I think is right for the American people. I think there has been a great deal of misunderstanding. I sent representatives to see Mr. Fowler and obtain his answers to the major issues raised by the industry people who have talked with me. Mr. Fowler has forwarded a three-page letter replying to each of these objections.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I want to reply to the distinguished Majority Leader. He wants to know how it will affect the defense program. The amendment does not even apply to it. The amendment reads, in part, as follows:

> If the domestic production of any commodity is in excess of the amount necessary to meet allocations for defense, stockpiling, and military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress—

It is only then that—

> no restriction or other limitation shall be imposed under this title upon the right of any person to purchase such commodity in any foreign country and to import and use the same in the United States.

What is wrong with that? In other words, when we have sufficient material for the defense program, why should people not be able to go into the world market and buy copper? Why should it be taken away from the industry of America?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I was not referring to our own demands for copper for defense purposes; I was referring to the demands of our allies. I will say to my good friend that I think there probably should be something done about copper, but I doubt that it should be done in this bill. I do not think it is right for the people of the United States to produce copper and get 24½ cents a pound for it in competition with copper produced with low-cost labor. I think we should be careful about that. It is not only the manufacturers of automobiles who are affected.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is not merely a matter of automobiles.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is my understanding from Mr. Fowler that he is equally interested in seeing that the American people should have the right referred to by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, whenever conditions permit. I have not suggested that they should not have that right. But the International Materials Conference is not a proper thing to legislate on by means of this bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. We are not legislating on it. All we are saying is that the people of America ought to be able to compete with other people in the world to buy materials. What is wrong with that?

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. I should like to ask the chairman of our committee, because he says it should not be put into this bill——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 13 minutes.

Mr. MAYBANK. If it is agreeable to the Senator from Michigan, I will read the letter from Mr. Fowler.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield for that purpose?

Mr. FERGUSON. I will yield to the Senator from South Carolina for that purpose.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield first to me for a moment?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Michigan is contributing something to the welfare of the country, and I ask unanimous consent that at the end of his remarks there be printed in the body of the RECORD an article appearing in yesterday's Washington Daily News, entitled "That's the Way It Looks to Our Latin-American Friends—Our Good-Neighbor Policy Seems on a One-Way Street." It has reference to copper.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I want to say in reply to the majority leader that the authority to carry on the program is derived from the Defense Production Act, and both Mr. Wilson and Mr. Fleischmann so testified in the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the next part of the amendment relates not to copper. It provides as follows:

> No restriction or other limitation shall be imposed under this title if the domestic production of any commodity is sufficient to meet all civilian domestic requirements and the requirements for defense, stockpiling, and military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress.

In other words, if we produce an article, such as sulfur, in sufficient quantity to supply all American needs, including the defense program, why should there be restrictions placed upon it?

The last part of the amendment provides that—

> No rule, regulation, or order issued under this title shall apply to purchases by any person of any material outside of the United States or its Territories and possessions for importation into the United States for his own use or for fabrication by him into other products for resale.

Why should we control the price of labor if the manufacturer of the Honeywell heat control device wants to buy some copper in Chile? Why should he pay only a certain price in Chile when it is for his own use or for fabrication by him into other products for resale? If he is a manufacturer, why should he not be able to go into the open market and compete with other countries?

The ony reason given is that we want to increase the prices for other countries, that we want to furnish material which people in other countries can use, rather than the people here at home. Do we not want a free economy? Do we not want a free economy in the world? What is wanted apparently is control of prices, regulations of all kinds.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to inquire as to my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask that the remainder of my remarks be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remainder of Mr. FERGUSON's remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The only way that this country can obtain materials necessary to operate its economy is to remove IMC restrictions implemented by DPA. My amendment will accomplish that.

Mr. President, the second reason advanced by the DPA for maintaining the IMC has been that it stabilized the world markets. The IMC, in its report on operations, discussed the price of metals as follows:

"The United States established a domestic ceiling price of 27.50 cents on imported copper and copper produced from imported concentrates in July 1951 and marked the price of domestically produced copper at 24.50 cents. The prices for lead and zinc of 17

and 17.50 cents, respectively, were maintained until October 1951, as a result, first of voluntary price stabilization and, later, the fixing of price ceilings. On October 2, 1951, the price of zinc was increased from 17.50 to 19.50 cents and of lead from 17 to 19 cents and a prohibition was placed on the importation of these metals above these prices.

"The prices quoted above cannot be considered as representing a world price for any of these metals. Prices of 55 to 60 cents for copper, 45 cents for zinc, and 25 cents for lead were paid for a part of the supplies sold internationally."

Mr. President, last week the Senate in adopting my amendment to the Mutual Security Act to furnish the goods rather than dollars where materials are under allocation in this country will do more to stabilize prices than anything which the IMC could hope to do. Up to now we have been giving recipient nations dollars with which to bid against us and against each other in the markets of the world. If my amendment prevails in conference we will be able to control the dollars and do the buying and that will stabilize these markets.

Mr. President, copper has been used in these discussions as an illustration. The IMC deals with many other commodities and our share in each case has not reflected our mobilization contribution. It is significant that the commodities selected for handling by IMC are those in which we have something to lose. IMC has never included commodities such as tantalum, natural rubber, tin and vanadium, and countless others, which we must import and where the IMC possibly could have been loaded in favor of our mobilization effort. I am confident that eliminating the IMC, through this amendment, will in no way interfere with the defense effort but that it will make it possible for us to maintain a healthy and vigorous economy to support our defense effort.

Furthermore, Mr. President, my amendments are also in keeping with our basic foreign policy in that they promote the maximum trade between countries with no restrictions by governments.

I wish to address a few remarks to the Senate today about the International Materials Conference, an autonomous body, of which the United States is a member. You will recall that I discussed this subject in some detail a few months ago, putting particular stress on the activities of the International Materials Conference as they affected the employment situation in Detroit and other areas of the country.

I have been continuing my studies into this international cartel in which our Government participates and now wish to bring your attention to some phases of this conference which are extremely interesting, particularly as they affect the conduct of our foreign policy and the powers of the President of the United States.

The State Department and the Defense Production Administration, which direct this country's participation in this socialistic cartel have said that their activities are based on the President's power to conduct our foreign policy, the power to wage war (this despite the fact that the President says we are not at war) and the specified power granted in the Defense Production Act.

The actual facts in the matter clearly show that the present international emergency offered an excuse for putting into action these plans for intergovernmental commodity agreements and allocations, which the State Department has been developing and sponsoring ever since the end of World War II. The State Department used the Korean war and the present defense emergency as the excuse for fastening these socialistic plans on the American economy.

I would like to develop these facts in somewhat greater detail at this time. The first public appearance of the State Department activity in developing these international commodity agreements took place in 1947 before the Senate Committee on Finance, which held lengthy hearings on the proposed International Trade Organization Charter. The junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] was the chairman of the committee at that time.

First I will read the provisions of article 46 of the proposed International Trade Organization Charter and the official statement of the objective of the article which relates to international commodity arrangements:

"The members recognize that the relationship between production and consumption of some primary commodities may present special difficulties. These special difficulties are different in character from those which manufactured goods present generally. They arise out of such conditions as the disequilibrium between production and consumption, the accumulation of burdensome stocks and pronounced fluctuations in prices. They may have serious adverse effects on the interests of producers and consumers, as well as widespread repercussions jeopardizing general policies of economic expansion.

"OBJECTIVES OF INTERNATIONAL COMMODITY ARRANGEMENTS

"Intergovernmental commodity arrangements may be employed to enable countries to overcome the special difficulties referred to in article 46 without resorting to action inconsistent with the purposes of this Charter, by achieving the following objectives:

"(a) to prevent or alleviate the serious economic problems which may arise when production adjustments cannot be effected by the free play of market forces as rapidly as the circumstances require;

"(b) to provide, during the period which may be necessary a framework for the consideration and development of measures which will have as their purpose economic adjustments designed to promote the expansion of consumption or a shift of resources and manpower out of over-expanded industries into new and productive occupations;

"(c) to moderate pronounced fluctuations in the price of a primary commodity above and below the level which expresses the long-term equilibrium between the forces of supply and demand (in order to achieve a reasonable degree of stability on the basis of remunerative prices to efficient producers without unfairness to consumers);

"(d) to maintain and develop the natural resources of the world and protect them from unnecessary exhaustion; and

"(e) to provide for expansion in the production of a primary commodity which is in such short supply as seriously to prejudice the interests of consumers."

These words describe the International Materials Conference. The program outlined in this article is identical to the program of the International Materials Conference in almost every detail.

The chairman, Senator MILLIKIN, then asked the witness, who was the Acting Chief of the International Resources Division of the State Department, if there was not a fundamental conflict between these provisions and the provisions of the ITO Charter.

Here is the answer: "Yes, sir; there is, in this sense. The activities which might be included in an intergovernmental commodity arrangement, which would be under governmental auspices, might require, in fact very probably would require, the imposition of export quotas, perhaps a two price system—a domestic price and a world price—and other types of restrictions which the whole charter attempts to do away with."

Today, this is an accomplished fact. The United States, in furtherance of the program of the International Materials Conference, has established price ceilings on nonferrous metals and on sulfur below the world price * * * bringing about this same two-price system.

The chairman of the Finance Committee further pinned down this program by his questioning, which I quote:

"The CHAIRMAN. As we go along in the chapter, we will study the various provisions, with that especially in mind.

"Now, am I correct in saying that the plan here is to make an exclusive governmental monopoly by intergovernmental agreements in a field which heretofore has been handled by private arrangements?"

"Mr. PHILLIPS. In one sense of the word, sir, you are correct. Whether or not it would be an exclusive governmental monopoly would depend pretty much upon the particular agreement. In most cases I would think that quotas would be established, and perhaps a price range would be established within which private trade would operate."

Senator MILLIKIN also inquired as to the origin and nature of these international commodity agreements, which are now paraded under the name of the International Materials Conference. Here is the passage from the testimony:

"The CHAIRMAN. Has that theory become a part of the philosophy of this country?

"I assume, however, that that has all been thought out, and that this is a definite part of State Department policy; am I correct?

"Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes, sir. It is not only the Department's policy, but, as you know, it has been approved by the other Government agencies that were engaged in compiling it, getting it together, thinking it out. It has gradually merged over a period of years. This particular chapter first appeared in the proposals; then in the United States suggested Charter; then in the London draft; and more recently in the New York draft—with, I think the important provisions unchanged, or relatively unchanged."

Even at that time, the question of congressional approval of these international activities was important and Senator MILLIKIN requested reassurance on that point from the State Department.

The reply, a letter signed by the present Secretary of State, who was then acting secretary, contains the following statement:

"Insofar as such commodity agreements impose any obligations on the United States requiring legislative implementation in any way, it is the intention of the Department that they should be submitted to the Congress."

So, on April 15, 1947, the date of this letter, the now-Secretary of State assures Congress that international commodity agreements would come up for congressional approval. The International Materials Conference has actually been making international commodity agreements for almost 18 months * * * but not one word has been submitted by the State Department to Congress on the subject.

No legislation was ever reported to the Senate in consequence to these hearings, despite the more than 650 pages of testimony.

The next open move in the development of this widespread program was the participation of the United States delegation at the international meetings in Habana which prepared the final draft of the ITO Charter. This draft was submitted to the House Foreign Affairs Committee in 1950 as House Joint Resolution 236.

The House committee held hearings, compiled more than 800 pages of testimony and declined to report the measure which still contained the blueprint for intergovernmental commodity agreements—the International Materials Conference.

In other words, the United States Senate Committee on Finance in 1947 and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in May 1950 refused to recommend approval of the

principles and practices of these commodity agreements.

Despite this two-fold denial, and despite the written assurances of the Secretary of State that no action would be taken without congressional sanction, the working basis for the International Materials Conference was established in December 1950, during the visit of Prime Minister Attlee.

Our State Department has been contending, in response to my earlier speeches, that the International Materials Conference is a temporary, emergency agency. But here are the facts, as I have just established. Two congressional committees refused to O. K. the idea. The Secretary of State formally declared that no such activity would be undertaken without congressional approval. Yet the administration went ahead anyway.

But this is only part of the story. Our State Department wasn't the only group engaged in this type of socialistic planning. The United Nations, in 1947, when the International Trade Organization Charter was being considered, proceeded on the apparent assumption that the United States would approve the ITO charter and established an Interim Coordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements, which we might know as the ICC for ICA.

This Interim Committee, established in 1947, was designed to set the stage for the formal development which would follow the adoption of the ITO charter. Ever since then, this Interim Committee has been plugging away at its mission and has issued annual reports.

So there will be no doubt about the fact that this Interim Committee, too, is a cartel, I wish to quote from its 1951 report, in relation to tea. "The present tea agreement covers the four producing countries of Ceylon, India, Indonesia, and Pakistan. The agreement regulates the acreage to be devoted to tea and prohibits the export of tea planting material to countries not party to the agreement."

In other words, this international agreement prevents anyone outside of these countries from getting the necessary tea-growing stock. It is as restrictive a monopoly as can be conceived.

This interim coordinating committee for international commodity agreements was in effect given permanent status by a 1950 resolution of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations which put into effect the provisions of the ITO Charter of this subject. In other words, the cartel provisions of the International Trade Organization came in the back door of the U. N. and into the front parlor of the United States by means of this action despite the unwillingness of two congressional committees to report the matter.

The 1951 report of this U. N. interim coordinating committee for international commodity agreements welcomes the organization of the International Materials Conference and welcomes it into the fold with open arms. The report makes frequent reference to the allocation programs of the various IMC committees and makes the merger of the International Materials Conference with this ICC and ICA quite apparent.

Now, I want to swing to another phase of this entire operation. Our State Department and the Defense Production Administration have repeatedly referred to the International Materials Conference as a temporary expedient. But the socialistic planners just don't see it that way.

An article in the magazine Freedom and Union, edited by Clarence Streit, strongly defends the International Materials Conference, describes its operations. The article points out that the International Materials Conference sulfur committee announced allocations on a 6-month basis, instead of a quarterly basis previously used, and then goes on to say, "Similar plans are to be adopted by other committees and it is even hoped that planning for a much longer period—4 years—may soon become possible." In other words, this temporary agency is starting to plan 4 years in advance, and 4 years doesn't seem to me like a temporary period.

The real tip-off is found in a 1951 United Nations publication entitled "Measures for International Economic Stability," a report by a group of experts appointed by the Secretary General. The conclusions of the report are significant and interesting:

"85. We suggest that governments should reconsider the case for a series of commodity arrangements of various types as a means of keeping short-run movements of primary product prices, both upward and downward, within reasonable bounds, and of helping to stabilize the international flow of currencies. To this end, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development might indicate that it is willing in principle to consider participating in the financing of commodity arrangements that involve buffer stocks. Progress in these directions would make an important contribution to the stability of industrial as well as primary producing economies.

"86. We do not believe that any new international agency to administer a comprehensive scheme for a range of different commodities is necessary or practicable. The arrangements needed differ from commodity to commodity, and must be worked out and put into effect by the countries mainly concerned in each case. Coordination of general structure and policy amongst the various schemes is important, but international bodies—such as the Interim Coordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements and the International Materials Conference—already exist and can be used for this purpose.

"87. The present shortage of many commodities does not reduce the urgency of the problem. We have already emphasized that detailed agreements take a long time to negotiate and that assurances to producers are required now, both to encourage production necessary to prevent continuing shortage and as a quid pro quo for the import allocations now being made. The possibility should be considered of converting these emergency schemes into permanent stabilization arrangements. It might also be possible at some future date to use for stabilization purposes the stockpiles acquired for strategic reasons."

EXHIBIT 1

OUR GOOD-NEIGHBOR POLICY SEEMS ON A ONE-WAY STREET—THAT'S THE WAY IT LOOKS TO OUR LATIN-AMERICAN FRIENDS

(By Edward Tomlinson)

There's gloom in Latin-American diplomatic circles here. It is hard for most envoys to hide their concern over the rapid decline in inter-American relations and the rising tide of anti-United States sentiment in the nations to the south.

Most of them readily admit that this is due in some measure to the same upsurge of nationalism, intensified by Communist propaganda, that is found elsewhere in the world. But some of them blame it on our confusing hemisphere policies, not to say the wide disparity between our declared policies and our actual application of them.

As a high Foreign Office official from one of the leading South American capitals, recently in this country, put it, "to many of our people it appears that the good-neighbor policy is becoming a one-way street, leading only in your direction."

THE TARIFF QUESTION

It is difficult, according to this official, for the Latins to understand why we denounce price fixing, quota systems, and tariffs imposed by other countries, while at the same time practicing all these things ourselves. As they see it, we not only insist upon selling them our products, but upon buying theirs on our own terms. In times of emergency we call upon them to produce more copper, tin, sugar, wool, and other strategic necessities. When the emergency is over, we often impose quotas, tariffs, and other restrictions on these very same commodities.

We have a policy of reciprocal-trade agreements by which we ask various countries to sit down and agree on mutual tariff concessions. But often after the documents are signed we arbitrarily impose tariffs on certain of their products which were exempted in the agreements.

We have made much of President Truman's point 4 program. In fact, the Congress has voted the administration millions to administer this program, which is designed to train technicians and to help promote new industries and diversify production in the Latin-American as well as other countries. At the same time, we place prohibitive tariffs and even refuse to buy the products of such new enterprises.

MORE INCONSISTENCIES

We acknowledge that inflation is rampant here. But we shut our eyes to the fact that prices and wages are skyrocketing also in Chile, Bolivia, and Brazil, and practically all the other countries of the hemisphere. We maintain the most rigid restrictions and sometimes complete embargoes on export of critical manufactures and machinery which they need and wish to buy from us.

Recently a company in Santiago wanted to buy $4,500 worth of arc-welding machinery necessary for repairs on Chilean naval vessels, and the operation of the new steel works which the Export-Import Bank has helped to finance. Although we have negotiated a mutual defense pact with Chile and have agreed to help revamp and reequip its military establishment, the Office of International Trade refused to give any priority for the export of this machinery to the South American country. At the very same time it authorized a priority for a large shipment of arc-welding equipment to far off Indonesia.

We acknowledge that the cost of mining Bolivian tin is higher than in British Malaya and other far eastern countries. We have built a special refinery at Texas City, Tex., the only one in the world capable of handling Bolivian ore. Yet we have refused to pay any more for the Bolivian than for the far eastern product.

Following World War II we urged, even helped to finance development of a tuna fishing industry along the shores of Ecuador and Peru, thus enabling our sister republics to take over an enterprise which had been previously controlled by the Japanese. Now that the industry has grown to be a new source of income and employment for these countries, Congress has voted to place a tariff on tuna fish imports into the United States.

We are insisting upon cutting imports of wool products from Uruguay, the little nation which has stood solidly with us in two world conflicts, and has recently resisted strong pressure from Argentina to desert us and cooperate with the anti-United States Peron government.

Our neighbors also feel that the State Department no longer determines our foreign policy in Latin America. Lately it has not been able to stand up against the pressure groups who make organized demands on their Congressmen to limit or exclude various imports from Latin America.

The Department advised that the ceiling price on Chilean copper imports be increased by 8½ cents a pound which would help to offset the increase in production costs. But Ellis Arnall, of the Price Administration, as well as Economic Stabilizer Putnam, opposed any such increase.

REPUDIATES OUR PROGRAM

The Department has taken the stand that imposition of the tariff on Ecuadoran and Peruvian tuna fish is in reality a repudiation of our point 4 program, but Congress (at least the House of Representatives) refuses to listen.

All of which has contributed to, even if it may not justify the increasing criticism of this country emanating from the nations below the Rio Grande.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, in order that there may be no misunderstanding about this amendment by anyone who believes in private industry, provided he stays within reason, I wish to read to the Senate the letter which Mr. Fowler wrote to me today, at my request as chairman of the committee. I have had inquiries from big business and from small business and from the military, so I asked Mr. Fowler for information. I sent the representatives of the committee to Mr. Fowler with the request that he let me have his comments to the questions. I now read from the letter:

This has reference to the amendment to the Defense Production Act proposed by Senator FERGUSON which, I understand, may be offered on the floor of the Senate, your committee having declined to report it.

The committee declined to report it, but in our deep appreciation of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], we invited him to the executive meeting when Mr. Fowler was with the committee, and we were happy to have him there.

I read further from the letter:

Your staff has advised us that representatives of private industry have raised with you a series of questions which they conceived to be arguments in favor of the amendment and I am taking the liberty of addressing to you some comments concerning those questions.

I asked for the facts to which Mr. Fleischmann had testified in executive hearings before he resigned. There was no public hearing. I asked for the facts about which people had been talking, which the newspapers or no one else knew anything about, to my knowledge, unless members of the committee talked about them, and I do not believe they did.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Was not the main point Mr. Fleischmann made that if we did not participate in these voluntary negotiations and any country could back out when it wanted to, the effect would be to increase the cost of purchases of vital materials?

Mr. MAYBANK. To increase the cost.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Merely because it might have benefited one or two companies, such as General Motors, which did not get as much copper as it wanted, and thus run the risk of increasing the total cost of the rearmament program, because it would probably have increased the cost of some critical materials, all of which have to be bought.

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not say that, but that was what was meant.

The obvious purpose of this provision is to prevent the preemption of civilian supply by those large corporations best able to pay and best equipped to fight for it. If a piece of costume jewelry selling at $10 or an automobile selling at $3,000 contains a fraction of an ounce or a few pounds of copper, the manufacturer might well afford to pay 2, 3, or 10 times the normal price for that copper. Other uses in the construction of housing, hospitals, and schools and in the manufacture of electrical equipment could not compete with such high-price demand. So the Congress wisely provided that the Government which took a substantial part of the supply for defense was also obligated to see to it that the balance of the supply was fairly distributed. This protection to essential industry and to small business would be discarded by operation of the proposed amendment.

A second question is: Why should not CMP tickets be issued as a matter of course to any domestic consumer who purchases material abroad?

The answer to this question is entirely contained within the answer to the first question. Whenever allocation is necessary it is because our total supply, including imports, is inadequate to meet all demands. In such a case the Government cannot afford to preempt domestic supply—

And the stockpile has been drawn on, sad to say—

for defense uses and leave the control of imported supplies to the wealthy and powerful. It is no answer to the small-business man to suggest that he establish overseas purchasing agents with ready funds to outbid his bigger neighbor and the rest of the world.

Mr. President, we know that is not a fact.

A final question was as follows: Why are not larger allocations for the United States recommended by the International Materials Conference?

The substance of this complaint is that international discussion of the requirements of the free peoples of the world have produced agreement on a share for the United States that is only one-half or three-fifths or sometimes three-quarters of the total world supply.

It is argued that in many cases we consumed as much before the defense buildup began. Of course, the considerations pertinent to a division of supply of any particular material are tremendously complicated but it is immediately obvious that the demand for all materials has risen throughout the world in the last few years. The reemergence of Germany, Japan, Italy, and Austria as manufacturing countries and the recovery of the United Kingdom and Western Europe from the ravages of World War II have substantially altered the ratio of material requirements on a world wide basis. The fact that this country's share of strategic materials continues to be out of all proportion to its population is clear evidence of the recognition voluntarily given by our allies first to our preeminent position in defense production and second to the highly industrialized nature of our economy.

I do not have very much time. I merely wish to say that I have received a great many letters on this subject.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. I should like to ask the chairman if it is not a fact that we entered into a bilateral agreement with Chile for 80 percent of their copper, at a price of 27½ cents a pound, and that the other 20 percent was earmarked for other countries; and if it is not also a fact that the 20 percent that was to go to other countries, is not being utilized, and that at the present time the stockpile of 20 percent in Chile is increasing.

Mr. MAYBANK. My answer to the question is that in an executive session of the committee the Chilean situation was brought up, and it was said that Chile had a stockpile of copper and was hoping America would pay more for it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They have already made a free market in the copper, and it is now being purchased at from 32 to 35 cents.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator, of course, I presume, refers to the meeting we had.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That was the situation, though, prior to that time; and only yesterday or the day before the press carried an account of what has been done with respect to copper.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, at the time we had the meeting the fact is that negotiations were going on with the State Department, Mr. Fleischmann, and others, and we could not talk about what was going to happen in that meeting.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

The point is that these voluntary negotiations have had the effect of maintaining a stable market in those commodities, and of avoiding unlimited bidding against one and another, driving prices up, and creating an unfair allocation of metals, which we were not always getting. It happened that copper was the most critical item. They have now taken action on that, and that action was in accord with the views of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They have taken off that regulation, and producers are buying copper.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to remind the Senator that before those satisfactory agreements were made—that have occurred since we had our executive hearing—Chile was not going to make very large shipments of copper to America.

If I have said something wrong, I hope to stand corrected. We have worked out the matter of shipments and also an increase in purchase price for the Chilean and other foreign copper while the negotiations have been pending.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that if the amendment should be adopted, there would be absolutely uncontrolled competition for materials in scarce supply, which might drive up prices beyond any limits whatsoever? And would not that, in turn, increase the cost of war preparations, and the building of hospitals, schools, roads, automobiles, and everything else? Costs might be tremendous.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want to answer the question, but I shall leave it to the Senator from Arkansas, who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and who has been all through that matter, just as much as I, as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from New York has stated the situation. What has been forgotten is the over-all effect

upon the cost of all the other materials, of which we are the greatest consumer in the world. I should say we have had more benefit from controls than has any other nation, so far as the over-all cost of strategic materials is concerned. We have obtained our fair share of the world supply, and at a much more reasonable price than we could possibly have obtained by unrestrained national competition.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to make no mistake. I have discussed this subject with small-business men, military officials, and others.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in full in the RECORD the letter to which I have referred, from Mr. Fowler, who has taken Mr. Fleischmann's place, about CMP certificates.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, June 4, 1952.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MAYBANK: This has reference to the amendment to the Defense Production Act proposed by Senator FERGUSON which, I understand, may be offered on the floor of the Senate, your committee having declined to report it. Your staff has advised us that representatives of private industry have raised with you a series of questions which they conceived to be arguments in favor of the amendment and I am taking the liberty of addressing to you some comments concerning those questions.

Preliminarily, I think it should be noted that there is nothing new to you or to the committee in the issues raised by the questions discussed hereafter. They were considered in an orderly manner during the hearings before the committee and were answered carefully and thoughtfully by responsible witnesses. The committee's failure to report the amendment after full consideration and discussion should be given great weight on the Senate floor, particularly since the problems raised by the proposed amendment are not simple and easy but complicated and important. Any genuine interest in the merits of the problem justifies reference to the report of the hearings.

Probably the most important question asked is as follows: If the supply of a material is sufficient to meet needs for defense, stockpiling, and authorized military assistance programs, why is it necessary to allocate the balance of supply among civilian uses?

The question might more succinctly be worded: Why worry about the little fellow? The present law specifically provides that whenever allocations result in a significant dislocation of normal distribution in the civilian market the available civilian supply shall be so distributed as to give a fair share to all. The obvious purpose of this provision is to prevent the preemption of civilian supply by those large corporations best able to pay and best equipped to fight for it. If a piece of costume jewelry selling at $10 or an automobile selling at $3,000 contains a fraction of an ounce or a few pounds of copper, the manufacturer might well afford to pay 2, 3, or 10 times the normal price for that copper. Other uses in the construction of housing, hospitals, and schools, and in the manufacture of electrical equipment could not compete with such high-price demand. So the Congress wisely provided that the Government which took a substantial part of the supply for defense was also obligated to see to it that the balance of the supply was fairly distributed. This protection to essential industry and to small business would be discarded by operation of the proposed amendment.

A second question is: Why should not CMP tickets be issued as a matter of course to any domestic consumer who purchases material abroad?

The answer to this question is entirely contained within the answer to the first question. Whenever allocation is necessary it is because our total supply, including imports, is inadequate to meet all demands. In such a case the Government cannot afford to preempt domestic supply for defense uses and leave the control of imported supplies to the wealthy and powerful. It is no answer to the small-business man to suggest that he establish overseas purchasing agents with ready funds to outbid his bigger neighbor and the rest of the world.

The third question asked is: If our domestic supply of a material is adequate to our total domestic needs, why should any controls be put upon the material?

This question is, of course, aimed at the use of materials controls to assure some supply for export to our allies in the free world. The idea behind it is that our first obligation is to our own industry, and that any secondary obligation may properly and safely be ignored. The question presupposes an unreadiness on the part of the questioner to consider other nations of the free world as proper claimants upon our materials supplies. It is probably best answered, therefore, in terms of complete self-interest.

The fact is that this Nation is not self-sufficient in materials essential to its own defense. If we are to secure from other nations the materials we need we must be prepared to share our supplies of what they need. My rake and my neighbor's lawn mower will take care of both our yards until I decide that my rake is for me alone. On that date I had better order a lawn mower.

A final question was as follows: Why are not larger allocations for the United States recommended by the International Materials Conference?

The substance of this complaint is that international discussion of the requirements of the free peoples of the world have produced agreement on a share for the United States that is only one-half or three-fifths or sometimes three-quarters of the total world supply.

It is argued that in many cases we consumed as much before the defense build-up began. Of course, the considerations pertinent to a division of supply of any particular material are tremendously complicated but it is immediately obvious that the demand for all materials has risen throughout the world in the last few years. The reemergence of Germany, Japan, Italy, and Austria as manufacturing countries and the recovery of the United Kingdom and Western Europe from the ravages of World War II have substantially altered the ratio of material requirements on a world-wide basis. The fact that this country's share of strategic materials continues to be out of all proportion to its population is clear evidence of the recognition voluntarily given by our allies first to our preeminent position in defense production and second to the highly industrialized nature of our economy.

All of the argument on the International Materials Conference comes down to this: That the Government of the United States should not consult with foreign governments or consider the needs of foreign governments for materials over which it has or might by any means gain control. If we were self-sufficient in the needs of national defense we might perhaps afford to consider such a withdrawal from the rest of the world. Since we are not self-sufficient, our own interest allows us no choice.

I have not touched upon difficulties inherent in the Ferguson amendment not raised by manufacturers who called upon you. I feel I should mention, however, that even some segments of big business would suffer from its operation. Consider, for example, the effect of limiting materials controls to domestic supply and the needs of the defense program. This would result in leaving civilian consumers to make the best arrangements they could with foreign suppliers. When the defense program tapered off domestic producers would find themselves faced with the necessity of winning back their normal civilian customers. Such a Government-imposed exposure of the United States market to foreign suppliers would not be in keeping with the very self-interest which the amendment is supposed to serve.

I shall try to make available to you whatever further information you may request in this or any other connection.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. FOWLER,
Administrator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to correct the statement of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. He stated that the copper situation had been entirely released. All that was done was to permit the copper fabricators whose entire product was copper—for example, the manufacturers of copper wire—to go into the open market. However, that same privilege was not extended to fabricators who were not primary copper fabricators. They were not permitted to go out into the market. Those who were freed from the restrictions were told—and that was the joker—"If you go out and pay more in the open market of the world, we will recognize only 80 percent of that price. We will not recognize the other 20 percent."

So the copper situation was not entirely freed. On the surface, some relief appeared to have been granted, but not to the extent to which this amendment would require relief.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not understand that that is the effect at all. If our companies are able to purchase copper, they use whatever they can get at 35 cents or 32 cents, and that relieves the pressure.

Mr. FERGUSON. Only primary manufacturers of copper are allowed to go into the market. The fabricator who uses only a small amount of copper is not allowed to go into the market. So production is being kept down.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, this amendment goes far beyond copper.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. It covers all materials.

Mr. MAYBANK. For example, it covers platinum. I have received the following memorandum from the armed services:

Platinum, a basic strategic metal for defense, is not available except by importation. Platinum now being acquired in adequate quantities at $93 per troy ounce. World spot market price now $135. If import ceiling price for this metal is banned world market price would increase substantially. This would increase defense costs.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no doubt that the amendment goes further than copper.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has an additional minute.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] may have 5 minutes additional, and that I may have 5 minutes additional. This is a very important amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is very important.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this is a very important subject. I realize that many years ago the Department of State decided on a policy of creating an international cartel for the control of all raw material. The Defense Production Act is now being used to reduce the amount of material which America can acquire, even though today America is performing the great task of trying to arm the free world.

Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan has no desire to interfere with the Defense Department. The first part of the amendment is to take effect only when there is an excess over the amount necessary to meet the allocations for defense, for stockpiling, and for military assistance to any foreign nation. We allow raw materials to go to those to whom we are giving military assistance, as authorized by an act of Congress. Only then—

No other restriction or other limitation shall be imposed under this title upon the right of any person to purchase such commodity in any foreign country and to import and use the same in the United States.

That applies not only to the fabricators of material whose product consists almost entirely of such material, but it gives the right to any person to purchase such commodity in any foreign country and to import and use it in the United States.

The next feature has to do with price control. If there is plenty of the commodity for America, in preparation for defense, then there shall be no price control. If there is plenty of a certain material for every need in America, there shall be no price control, because it may be desirable to sell it in foreign markets. The time has come when we need just a little free enterprise.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator refers to price controls on copper. I am sure that he is aware of the fact that we have a dual system of prices on copper. The copper price is 24½ cents for domestic production, while the sky is the limit so far as foreign production is concerned and its availability in the world markets.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. For example, the copper market in America was 24 cents, whereas 20 percent of all the copper purchased in Chile was sold at prices as high as 60 cents a pound. The fact was that we furnished most of the money to pay the price of 60 cents.

Mr. President, I hope this amendment may be adopted and made a part of the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to place in the RECORD, without detaining the Senate to read it, the list of materials found on pages 1503, 1504, 1505, 1506, 1507, and 1508, showing the distribution plans as recommended in the IMC. These commodities include copper, zinc, molybdenum, cobalt, nickel, sulfur and tungsten. I shall not take the time to read the entire list.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COBALT

Cobalt is of prime importance in the defense-mobilization program and ranks high in the list of strategic and critical materials. While its principal uses are in alloy steels, it has vital nonferrous applications and special military uses. Cobalt is used in jet-engine alloys, as a binder in making tungsten carbide for tools and armor-piercing shot cores, radar magnets, etc., through a long list of military items.

United States consumption prior to IMC allocations

[In short tons]

	Total free world supply	United States consumption	United States consumption in percent of total supply
Quarterly average, 1949	1,447.9	587.8	40.6
Quarterly average, 1950	1,790.0	1,019.0	56.9
Quarterly average, 1951[1]	2,125.2	1,245.6	58.6

[1] Production data for fourth quarter not available.

Distribution plans as recommended in the IMC and subsequently agreed to by all member governments have been in effect beginning with the fourth quarter of 1951. Results to date follow:

	Total free world supply	United States share	United States percent of total
Fourth quarter, 1951	2,159.4	1,280.8	59.3
First quarter, 1952	2,420.6	1,501.3	62.0

Important efforts are being made to increase world production. For example, large investments are being made in the Belgian Congo (now providing two-thirds of the world supply) in mining operations and the improvement of transportation and facilities. Expansion of output is under way in northern Rhodesia and production is rising in French Morocco. In the United States a refinery of the Calera Mining Co. is expected to be completed near Salt Lake City in April or May which will produce cobalt metal at an annual rate of 3,300,000 pounds.

COPPER

Copper is a widely used metal both in the defense-mobilization program and in essential civilian production. It is one of the strategic and critical metals in tightest supply.

Distribution plans as recommended in the IMC and subsequently agreed to in whole or in substantial part by all member governments have been in effect beginning with the fourth quarter of 1951.

The method back of the IMC distribution plan was a priority for direct defense requirements, provision for minimum strategic stockpiles, and the distribution of the remaining supply for civilian requirements on the basis of consumption in 1950. In the first quarter of 1952, owing to the acute shortage, no specific provision was made for stockpiling.

United States consumption prior to IMC operations

[In short tons]

	Total free world supply	United States consumption	United States consumption in percent of total supply
Quarterly average, 1949	622,250	296,250	47.6
Quarterly average, 1950	749,150	354,250	47.3
Quarterly average, 1951	727,300	338,330	46.5

Results of the IMC recommendations as they affect the United States

	Total free world supply	United States share	United States percent of total
Fourth quarter, 1951	740,100	367,900	49.1
First quarter, 1952	820,800	403,400	49.1

MOLYBDENUM

An additive alloy, used generally in the hardening of steel. It is, in many cases, interchangeable with tungsten and it is well to review figures on molybdenum and tungsten together.

Because of its tight supply position and its peculiar importance to the defense mobilization and defense-supporting programs, molybdenum was recommended by the IMC for allocation, beginning with the third quarter, 1951. The recommendation was accepted by all member governments. Basis for the recommendation was both the historical use levels and the stated requirements with special weight given to defense requirements.

United States consumption prior to IMC allocations

[In short tons]

	Total free world supply	United States consumption	United States consumption in percent of total supply
Quarterly average, 1949	3,169.1	2,417.5	76.0
Quarterly average, 1950	3,802.8	3,144.4	82.7
Average first 2 quarters, 1951	5,486.5	4,063.3	73.5

Results of the IMC recommendations as they affect the United States

[In short tons]

	Total free world supply	United States share	United States percent of total
Third quarter, 1951	4,850.0	3,769.5	77.7
Fourth quarter, 1951	5,379.0	4,007.0	[1]74.5
First quarter, 1952	5,280.0	3,883.0	[1]73.5

[1] Net, i. e., after export of primary products.

NICKEL

Nickel ranks near the top in any list of strategic and critical materials in short supply throughout the free world. It is of basic importance in the defense production program. For example, military items such as

jet engines, armor plating and gun steels use considerable nickel. While principal usage is in alloy steels, nickel has important nonferrous uses.

United States consumption prior to IMC operations

[In short tons]

	Total free world supply	United States consumption	United States consumption in percent of total supply
Quarterly average, 1949	28,182.5	17,087.5	60.6
Quarterly average, 1950	36,387.9	24,787.5	68.1
Average first 3 quarters, 1951	34,158.6	20,483.3	60.0

Beginning with the fourth quarter of 1951, the International Materials Conference recommended plans for distributing nickel among the free nations which were accepted by all the member governments. The total distribution of forms of nickel covered by the recommendations and the United States share are as follows:

	Total free world supply	United States share	United States percent of total
Fourth quarter, 1951	37,531.3	24,108.8	64.2
First quarter, 1952	37,018.9	25,299.2	68.3

The free world supply of nickel is expected to show considerable increase beginning in the second quarter, principally because of the yield of the Nicaro (Cuba) project financed by the United States, and French production from New Caledonian ores. Other projects are being contemplated or developed for future production by various nations, including the United States.

SULFUR

Sulfur is among the important raw materials because it is basic to a wide variety of industries, urban and agricultural, and cuts across the economies of all nations, be they highly developed or underdeveloped. It is vital in the production of steel and other metals which produce guns, ships, tanks, and planes. It is necessary in the production of agricultural fertilizers and insecticides, textiles, pulp and paper, rubber, petroleum products, chemicals, and many other essential items.

Because of increased demands for sulfur as such, world production has been unable to satisfy these requirements, and the sulfur shortage has developed. The shortage was in the magnitude of 1,200,000 long tons in 1951, and is estimated at 1,500,000 long tons for 1952. In March 1951 the Sulfur Committee of the International Materials Conference was established to consider the world shortage and to make recommendations to governments to alleviate the shortage, and to recommend effective distribution of available supplies. The committee has recommended three plans of distribution covering the third quarter of 1951, fourth quarter of 1951, and the first 6 months of 1952. These recommendations have been accepted by governments.

The following table shows the United States production, consumption, and exports compared with the total free-world production:

Crude sulfur (native and recovered)

[Thousand long tons]

	1948	1949	1950	First half 1951	Second half 1951	Estimated first 6 months 1952
Free world production	5,344	5,280	5,914	2,988	3,123	3,017
United States production	4,913	4,802	5,334	2,694	2,783	2,655
United States allocation					2,003	2,054
					[1] (64.1)	[1] (69.1)
United States consumption	3,700	3,500	4,000	2,150	2,070	2,062
	[1] (69.2)	[1] (66.3)	[1] (67.6)	[1] (71.9)	[1] (66.3)	[1] (68.3)
United States exports (crude)	1,262	1,443	1,440	544	705	637
Canada	318	253	354	139	194	172
Others [2]	944	1,190	1,086	405	511	465

[1] Percent.
[2] Actual exports do not correspond to export quotas due to export licenses being issued in one period, with shipments being made in a subsequent period.

TUNGSTEN

An additive alloy, used generally in the hardening of steel. It is, in many cases, interchangeable with molybdenum and it is well to review figures on tungsten and molybdenum together.

Considering its scarcity and its peculiar importance to the defense mobilization and defense-supporting programs, the IMC recommended to governments a distribution pattern for tungsten in the third quarter, 1951. Basis for this distribution was, in part, the historical use levels and, in part, the stated requirements, with special weight given to defense requirements. Recommended also by IMC was a price ceiling and floor for spot purchases. Both recommendations were accepted by member governments.

Agreement in IMC was again reached on a distribution plan in the fourth quarter and the first quarter, 1952. In these two quarters agreement was not reached on tungsten price.

United States consumption prior to IMC recommended distribution

[In short tons]

	Total free world supply	United States consumption	United States consumption in percent of total supply
Quarterly average, 1949	3,389.5	619.8	18.3
Quarterly average, 1950	3,582.4	943.3	26.3
Average first 2 quarters, 1951	2,920.5	1,582	[1] 54.2

Results of the IMC recommended distributions as they affect the United States

	Total free world supply	United States share	United States percent of total
Third quarter, 1951	3,086.4	1,383.3	44.8
Fourth quarter, 1951	3,576.9	1,708.5	47.8
First quarter, 1952	4,078.5	1,926.8	47.2

ZINC

Zinc is a metal of importance both in the defense-mobilization program and in essential civilian production. It has been in extremely short supply.

Zinc has been considered in the Copper-Lead-Zinc Committee, IMC, and treated in a similar manner to copper in reaching a recommendation to governments for distribution.

United States consumption prior to IMC operations

[In short tons]

	Total free world supply	United States consumption	United States consumption in percent of total supply
Quarterly average, 1949	458,500	177,950	38.8
Quarterly average, 1950	491,375	236,875	48.2
Average first 3 quarters, 1951	479,166	220,966	46.1

Distribution plans within the IMC on zinc have been in effect beginning with the fourth quarter, 1951. The results of the IMC distribution plan as it affects the United States are as follows:

	Total free world supply	United States share	United States percent of total
Fourth quarter, 1951	517,700	251,800	48.6
First quarter, 1952	537,500	252,400	46.9

PULP AND PAPER

Early in 1951, the Pulp and Paper Committee, IMC, surveyed the position of wood products, principally newsprint, kraft pulp, and dissolving pulp. The survey indicated that the free world shortages of kraft pulp were insignificant and that the shortages of dissolving pulp, while more serious, were insufficient to justify an allocation program. These commodities have been kept under review.

In the case of newsprint, it was decided that emergency allocations were necessary to aid a number of countries in which supplies were critically low. These allocations were made possible by the Governments of Canada and the United States with the cooperation of their producers and publishers. Increased production accounted for most of the allotments. The newsprint supplied by the United States and Canada was in the approximate ratio of 5 parts from Canada to 1 part from the United States.

Less than three-tenths of 1 percent of the free world's annual supply of newsprint comprised these emergency allocations and were distributed among the countries as follows:

	Short tons
Brazil	1,322.8
Chile	1,102.3
Dominican Republic	551.1
Ecuador	551.1
France	[1] 5,180.8
Germany, Federal Republic of	7,716.1
Greece	[1] 1,587.3
India	2,480.2
Indonesia	1,653.4
Israel	440.9
Malaya and Singapore	694.4
Nicaragua	440.9
Pakistan	496.0
Philippines	[1] 2,579.4
Spain	1,929.0
Turkey	[1] 557.1
Uruguay	1,322.8
Yugoslavia	[1] 6,492.5
Total	37,092.1

[1] Allocations to France, Greece, the Philippines, Turkey, and Yugoslavia were financed in whole or in part by ECA (MSA) funds.

Expanding production and a softening in demand has recently relieved the critical supply problem. The committee, therefore, is now working on a program to stimulate the resumption of normal trade through commercial channels.

I call your particular attention to the fact that in making our comparison for the year 1949, we are using consumption figures, which figures are public information, in order to avoid divulging of classified material that might show the exact status of our stockpile.

It occurred to me that you might be interested in knowing just how we came out in our allocation in the fourth quarter of 1951 and the first quarter of 1952, on copper.

After the difficulties of obtaining acceptable statistics on consumption and supply by country, we had the problem of implementation and of getting accurate information promptly enough to determine whether or not we were receiving our allocation in the fourth quarter. While our total allocation including about 17,000 tons for the stockpile was 366,000, we have now determined that we were about 12,500 tons short of receiving our allocation.

In the first quarter it now appears that we may be as much as 50,000 tons short of receiving our allocation of 403,000 tons, partly due to failure of domestic production to reach expectations. Possibly we could have made up a part of the deficiency through increasing imports by the abandonment of our price ceiling. I submit that such a move would amount to burning down the house to get rid of the termites.

Recommendations have already been made for allocations for the second quarter and in all cases these figures compare favorably with the tonnages allocated to the United States for the fourth quarter.

In the case of copper the amount allocated to the United States will be slightly less than the amount allocated to us for the first quarter, but the supply figures used are more realistic so that the United States should come closer to obtaining its allocation and the effect should be a larger supply of copper to the United States in the second quarter than was actually obtained in the first quarter.

This whole arrangement has appeared to me to be a sensible business deal to assure our receiving a proper proportion of the world supply at a reasonable price. Without such an arrangement I do not believe that we would have received as great a proportion of the world supply as we have under IMC unless we were prepared to pay any price for the material. Even then there is some doubt as to how much of the material we would have received and certainly such an attempt would have resulted in terrific inflationary pressures within the United States and the loss of cooperation of our friends in the world.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. MAYBANK. How much time have I, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has 4 minutes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if that is not sufficient, I will yield some of my time.

Mr. FREAR. In reply to what the distinguished chairman has said regarding the allocation of copper, I think he was referring to page 1504 of the hearings, which shows that in 1950 the United States consumption, in terms of percentage of the total supply, was 47.3 percent.

Those are the figures of the IMC.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I understand that the IMC figures are approximately correct. I asked certain staff members to investigate and check the figures.

I am not here to defend the operations or management of the IMC. I am here only to show the effect of price control, or IMC control, upon the military.

Mr. FREAR. As I recall, Mr. Fleischmann, in his testimony before the Committee on Banking and Currency, said that the authority under which he acted in the IMC came from the Defense Production Act. If he has any authority, I agree that that is where he got it.

I should like to read from the Report on Operations by the International Materials Conference. I read from page 2:

The distribution plans developed by most of the committees recognize the needs for defense, and essential civilian, consumption, and take into account the principle of strategic stockpiling. Governments which agree to a distribution plan undertake to see that the plan is implemented, as far as their countries are concerned. Committee recommendations covering the allocations request participating governments to establish the necessary mechanisms for implementing the allocations.

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas said that of course it was purely a voluntary agreement. However, when our Government agrees to the distribution I think it becomes more than a voluntary agreement. I believe it becomes something that we are morally obligated to abide by.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What I meant by voluntary was that it was an agreement which our Government made with other governments, not a voluntary agreement on the part of the consumer. Mr. Fleischmann and his associates protected our interests insofar as the price is concerned. It was made on a voluntary basis. Certainly they did not have to make it.

Mr. FREAR. They did not have to agree to what our representatives on the committee did. But once our representatives on the committee agreed, I believe that we had a moral obligation and are bound by it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With respect to any agreement which is made voluntarily, if it is made by responsible people, they are bound by it.

Mr. FREAR. I do not say that we were forced to agree to it. Once we did agree, we were morally bound.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. The Senator admits that we did agree to it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. Our committee agreed to it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; and I think we should have agreed to it. I think it has saved us millions of dollars in our defense effort by having such an agreement. I do not think it has benefited especially the General Motors Corp.

Mr. FREAR. If we are to talk about General Motors——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have 1 minute left. I will yield the minute to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask the Senator whether we may have the yeas and nays ordered at this time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, on page 2 of the amendment, to strike out lines 11 to 16, inclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the so-called Ferguson amendment it is proposed, on page 2, to strike out lines 11 to 16, inclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I think this is one of the most dangerous amendments that has been offered to the bill. The amendment was offered before the committee, and the committee held a special hearing on it. We voted on the amendment in committee and rejected it. It is much too complicated to make a real explanation of it on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not at this time. The amendment involves more than copper. Some of the rare metals, such as tin, nickel, and cobalt, of which we have practically none, and rubber, are also involved in the allocations. We should not prohibit our representatives from coming to an agreement as to reasonable allocations. The testimony was very clear that in these agreements in every case we had obtained our traditional and historical shares of the total amounts. It seems to me we have peculiarly benefited from the agreements. There are only a few of the elements, such as sulfur, of which we have an excess and an exportable surplus. We doled it out. We had to do it if we expected to get from Great Britain, for example, tin, rubber, cobalt, or manganese, or the rare earths which come from India; and so on. There is a long list of them. Some of them are not involved in the direct allocations, but certainly they are involved in the negotiations by which the countries which produce these metals were willing to allocate to us our traditional share.

Apparently copper has caused all of this furor. There has been a little complaint about the other metals, but the main complaint has been with reference to copper. If we knock out the agreement with respect to copper it will amount to less than one-half of 1 percent of the total amount involved. It will enable a few of the large companies, who have a market for Cadillacs and similar articles, to benefit. They do not care whether the price is 30 cents or $1, because copper is such a small amount in the over-all production that the price can be absorbed. However, it will affect very materially the cost of our defense effort. It will add an incalculable amount to the cost of the materials our Government is manufacturing which contain these metals.

Mr. President, it is much too serious for the Senate to overturn the considered judgment of the committee on this item. I had felt, in view of the hearings before the committee, that there would not be a serious effort made on the floor to attach this amendment to the bill. I regret very much that the effort has been made.

I hope the Senate will not act hastily on this subject. If we do, and the amendment should be adopted, it will cause repercussions far beyond any which could be caused by the other items which have been discussed on the floor. I can only refer Senators again to the committee hearings, which were very extensive and exhaustive. Too much is involved to treat the subject in 15 minutes on the floor of the Senate, but I want to impress on Senators the seriousness of such a step, which I believe would disrupt very seriously the whole defense effort.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that while copper may be the most spectacular commodity involved, there are also involved many other commodities of which the United States is the chief consumer and therefore gets the main benefit from the agreements?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. Of the world supply of copper, about 50 percent is consumed by the United States. In the case of molybdenum the United States consumes 80 percent of the entire world supply. In the case of nickel, the United States consumes nearly 70 percent of the world supply. In the case of tungsten the United States uses nearly 40 percent, and in the case of zinc it is using nearly 50 percent. It would seem to me that the United States is the main beneficiary under this arrangement. If it were not for this arrangement the various countries would be bidding against each other in every market of the world and there would be no limit to the price to which these commodities might soar, and the United States would be harmed, not only in the defense effort, but in every other effort.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask whether it is true that about the only specific complaint the Senator from Michigan has advanced is that the American allocation for copper was three-tenths of 1 percent less now than the proportion we had formerly obtained.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is exactly correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So, on the basis of three-tenths of 1 percent of the supply of copper the Senator from Michigan would throw overboard a system which protects the American consumers from having prices skyrocket. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. It is not only protecting the American consumers, but on the materials involved it is protecting the prices as well. Assuming that we would get the same amount, it would cost much more if we turned the market open to unrestricted competition among the various countries.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield now to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, as I understand, some time ago the people of the United States were complaining that they were being compelled to pay extremely high prices for tin and rubber, much of which was being purchased from British possessions. Pressures were brought and measures were undertaken by the Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, headed by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], to obtain a reduction in the world price which we had to pay for critical and strategic materials for stockpiling purposes.

I wish to inquire whether this amendment would make it possible for a few large American corporations in addition to the price they established for purchases in the United States, in connection with their operations in this country, to establish a world price which would be sky high, so far as our allies would be concerned, and thus would have a most harmful effect? In short, the effect on our allies then would be similar to the effect about which we ourselves formerly complained.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is exactly what the situation might be. For instance, controls have now been relaxed partially, as the Senator has indicated. Of course, the controls have not been relaxed altogether. At the present time the price of copper is from 32 cents to 35 cents a pound, whereas a month ago the price of copper was 27½ cents a pound. If all controls were discarded, I think it would be found that the price of scarce materials, many of which we purchase, would go out of sight.

I have before me a memorandum in regard to platinum, which is very important in the defense effort, as the Senator from Louisiana knows. I now read from the memorandum:

> Platinum, a basic strategic metal for defense, is not available except by importation. Platinum is now being acquired in adequate quantities at $93 a troy ounce. The world spot-market price now is $135.

The situation in respect to platinum is somewhat comparable to the situation which formerly existed in respect to copper, under the previous agreement. It is true that if the platinum market were opened to everyone, we would be paying $135 a troy ounce; in that respect the situation would be comparable to that existing when the supply of copper was limited.

Mr. President, how much time remains available to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to reserve a little of my time. If it is agreeable, I should like to have the Senator from Michigan speak now. Therefore, I yield the floor at this time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in the case of platinum, about which the Senator from Arkansas has spoken, the first part of the amendment does not apply to platinum, because platinum is not produced in the United States.

I now read from the first part of the amendment, which proposes that a new section be inserted in the Defense Production Act:

> If the domestic production of any commodity is in excess of the amount necessary to meet allocations for defense, stockpiling—

And so forth. So platinum would not be covered by that part of the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me at this point?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator has sulfur in mind in that connection. It is very clear that if we are going to do as we please in the case of the scarce materials we have, we cannot make arrangements beneficial to ourselves in regard to scarce materials of which we have none.

Mr. FERGUSON. But this amendment does not apply to platinum. The amendment reads in part as follows:

> No restriction or other limitation shall be imposed under this title if the domestic production of any commodity is sufficient to meet all civilian domestic requirements and the requirements for defense, stockpiling, and military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, let me inquire about the provision, on page 2 of the amendment, that—

> No rule, regulation, or order issued under this title shall apply to purchases by any person of any material outside of the United States or its Territories and possessions for importation into the United States for his own use or for fabrication by him into other products for resale.

That provision directly relates to imports.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the third part of the amendment, and it applies to price control.

Why should we say to an American manufacturer that he cannot go into the open market to buy platinum. The amendment does not provide that he shall be given any price relief. The price he pays can be fixed at any level; but he should be able to purchase the platinum.

That is why the amendment is limited to manufactured articles.

All we are asking is that our manufacturers be allowed to make purchases in the free market; in other words, that they be allowed to make purchases where manufacturers of other countries can make purchases. We would not open the market any more than the other countries would. We wish to place ourselves and our own manufacturers in the same position, in respect to purchasing materials in the world market, that France and Great Britain and their manufacturers are placed in. Is there anything wrong with that, Mr. President?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Under these agreements we subject ourselves to exactly the same restrictions the other countries do.

Mr. FERGUSON. Oh, no.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The agreement is a mutual one, and we have the same freedom the other countries have.

Mr. FERGUSON. No, we do not have the same freedom. During all the time when France and Britain were using American dollars to purchase copper for 55 or 60 cents a pound in the open market, we were restricting the United States to a price of 24 cents a pound for copper in the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That was before the International Materials Conference. After we subscribed to the International Materials Conference, that situation was ended. In fact, that was the entire purpose of the International Materials Conference. It came into being to stop that of which the Senator from Michigan is complaining.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask any Senator upon this floor how he can favor anything which would not result in putting our people on an equal basis with the people of France or the people of England or with the people of the other countries who are permitted to make purchases in the open market. How important it is that our people have an equal opportunity, inasmuch as we are carrying the great burden of arming the rest of the world for its own defense. All we are asking is that our people have an opportunity equal to that of the people of other countries.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator from Michigan realizes the present situation.

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe I do.

Mr. LEHMAN. Since the formation of the International Materials Conference, Britain and the other countries of the world are bound by exactly the same rules by which we are bound.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; they are not.

Mr. LEHMAN. I beg the Senator's pardon; they are.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from New York does not know that they were permitted to purchase copper in the open market at 60 cents a pound or at any other price.

Mr. LEHMAN. They have not been permitted to do so since the formation of the International Materials Conference.

Mr. FERGUSON. No, Mr. President; the Senator from New York is in error.

Mr. LEHMAN. A certain amount of the materials was allocated to those countries at a certain price.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; 20 percent of the copper coming from Chile was available on the free market to anyone except the United States.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think the Senator from New York is mistaken, because recently the Administrator issued an order to the effect that now the people of the United States could buy all the copper they wished to buy.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; but that order related only to copper.

Mr. CAPEHART. The order was to the effect that our people could buy all the copper they wished to buy, at any price which they might care to pay for it. Therefore, I am certain that the Senator from New York is mistaken.

Mr. LEHMAN. But I believe what has not been brought out is the fact that the United States has been the purchaser of from 50 to 80 percent of all the scarce materials which are so badly needed not only for our own defense but for the defense of other countries.

Mr. FERGUSON. No, Mr. President; the Senator from New York is mistaken.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have just read the figure which is pertinent in that connection, and I shall be glad to read it again for the benefit of the Senator from Michigan. I refer to all the materials which are so badly needed, not only for ourselves but for our allies, for armaments and also for civilian life—in other words, for the construction of homes and schools and for the manufacture of silverware, automobiles, and many hundreds of other articles which make up our civilian life.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, would the Senator from Michigan regard me as badgering him if I were to ask him a question at this time?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; the Senator from Illinois never could do that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would never try to; that would never be my disposition.

Could we correctly summarize the attitude of the Senator from Michigan by saying that he would substitute inequality in unrestraint for equality in restraint?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be glad to answer that. I realize that there are those who sincerely believe that the United States should prepare for the defense of the rest of the world which is outside the iron curtain; and there are those who believe that it is more important to maintain employment in other countries than it is to do so in the United States. Those persons sincerely believe that; it is a part of their philosophy.

There are other persons who believe that world controls should be complete, that there should be "one world," that all materials should be controlled by government action, and that free enterprise should disappear. That was the Marxist philosophy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was not that the proposal advanced by the Republican candidate for the Presidency in 1940?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I do not yield at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan declines to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, of course those who believe in the philosophy to which I have just referred have a right to do so.

On the other hand, I believe the time has come when the people of the United States should expect that if their manufacturers, in order to afford the maximum of employment to the people of the United States, wish to make purchases in the free market, they should have the same right in that connection as a Frenchman or as a Britisher or as anyone else in the world has, and that we should not establish controls to apply to the United States only, and to have the effect of destroying the United States, when we might not apply those controls elsewhere or might lift them so far as other countries are concerned.

I say sincerely that if this world is to survive, the United States of America must lead the way. If the United States fails economically or politically, there will be no leadership, and the entire idea of a world cartel or of "one world" will do the people no good.

Mr. President, this amendment is a serious one. Anyone who reads the amendment will find that it applies only in certain cases. The first case will be when there are sufficient materials for all the defense purposes of ourselves and our allies. Then the amendment will apply. If our people wish to go into the free market, to make purchases in the same way that the people of other countries make purchases, why should our people be restricted? Prices may be controlled here in the United States. Furthermore, in connection with the purchase of such articles, our manufacturers may need only a few ounces of them in order to be able to produce tons of manufactured articles.

However, we say, "Oh, no; we shall have global control," and then we control the reins.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, first let me inquire how much time the Senator from Illinois wishes to have?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Approximately 5 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, how much time remains available to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then at this time I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and thereafter I shall yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I never saw a better illustration of the need of care in using language in writing legislation than in the situation here presented. What I regard as the most tenuous and dubious authority in the Defense Production Act, the instrument of price control, is used in order to control the allocation of critical materials on a world-wide basis. First, by using import controls; and secondly, by preventing the payment of a price which is necessary in the world market, we have an instrument for putting a ceiling upon what American industry can obtain.

The other danger—and it has not been alluded to, Mr. President—is this: There are seven committees functioning now, representing seven countries, and they are under the direction of the materials branch of the State Department. A member of the State Department went to New York to address the Mining Congress. He said that, if it works, they can extend it to other materials. Then,

on top of everything else, a subcommittee of the United Nations publishes a monograph in which it says that, if it works, they will make it permanent. So the price-control mechanism is being used to control critical materials for the industry of America.

The Ferguson amendment is designed to remedy that. It is simple. The first part says that when there is sufficient production for domestic and foreign purposes so far as defense is concerned, the right of a citizen of the United States shall not be restricted. That is the first part. The last part says that there shall be no rule or regulation by the Office of Price Stabilization which will put a squeeze on and prevent American citizens from buying somewhere else in the world. That is what it says, and I object, Mr. President, on principle. I cannot imagine either that the Price Control Act was designed for the purpose or that those who fashioned it contemplated that it would be used as an instrument for the world-wide control of critical materials.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I have time. Mr. President, I object on principle. If those in charge of such matters want to do it, let them come to Congress and get full statutory authority, and let the Congress look at it with its eyes open and give those who are affected a chance to be heard upon the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I want but 1 second. The present arrangement now permits Russia to go into the markets outside the United States to buy matériel. We cannot even compete with them. We do not allow our people to go into those markets to make purchases.

I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for a minute and a half.

INTERNATIONAL MATERIALS CONFERENCE BASIC POINTS

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I desire to begin my remarks by calling attention to two things:

First. Global control of production and prices, and allocations, of primary raw materials, is basically objectionable as the very opposite of free enterprise, and free markets.

It is in fact a more or less complete reversal of one of the main promises in the Atlantic Charter of August 14, 1941, that all nations should have "access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world."

Second. The International Materials Conference is a supernational body exercising power over economic activity and trade, without responsibility, and so far as this Government's participation is concerned, without any congressional sanction.

The International Materials Conference is really part VI of the Habana Charter for an international trade organization, which was signed at Habana on March 24, 1948.

A year later, when presented to Congress, it was pigeonholed by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and regarded by the Senate with a very jaundiced eye—hearings on House Joint Resolution 236, Eighty-first Congress, second session, April 19 to May 12, 1950; hearings on International Trade Organization, Senate Committee on Finance, Eightieth Congress, first session, March 20 to April 3, 1947.

The Department of State has not only acted without the approval of Congress, but given commitments of a sort which a Democratic Congress disapproved in withholding action on the Habana Charter.

Third. Even if these objections in principle are passed over, the practical results of our Government's participation are injurious to our interests.

Possessing the resources to purchase what we need or want in the markets of the world, the net effect of our participation in IMC allocations is to dissipate this advantage for a variety of political motives. In the case of several important metals (copper for example), this country is not even getting the proportion of world supplies which it would get on a historical basis. We have been short-changed to the extent that we have not only not built up our stockpile of copper, but have had to dig into it for over 200,000 tons.

Fourth. As to most raw materials, world supplies are no longer critically scarce and prices are softening. There is no real need for global allocations on the ground of scarcity, actual or threatened.

But if the IMC is in being, there will be a demand that it move over from allocating materials onto supporting world prices at unrealistic and arbitrary levels. Nothing could be more dangerous to our free economy as consumers, or in fact to the economies of producing areas, than such a scheme of world price controls, administered by a group of world planners responsible to no one.

Historical comparison: It is not commonly recognized as such, but the imposition of controls upon trade and materials, by an agency dominated by political considerations, is to fasten upon international commerce just those same restrictions which were the most vicious and economically unsound, of the so-called colonial system. If the underdeveloped areas look for someone to blame for price recessions and their resulting deflationary effects, they will surely accuse this country of having dominated the IMC, and used it for imperialistic purposes. But, if free markets are allowed to function, we cannot be accused of this.

Alternatives: The alternative is simple. Our private consumers, and our Government should buy in the world market what they need for civilian and military purposes. There is nothing so effective as high prices to increase total production. The critical element in world production of most raw materials today is this country's capacity to buy for consumption. Any arbitrary reduction of our capacity to buy has definitely greater negative effect than a corresponding increase in some other country's entitlement if, for want of resources, the other country does not buy its quota. There are indications that that is just what is happening, at this juncture, specifically in the case of copper.

Mr. President, I think that the International Materials Conference considers it is to be a permanent organization. In the report of the International Materials Conference, on page 3, in the last paragraph, it is said:

> The need for longer-range plans will depend upon the committee's evaluation of the supply situation and on member governments' decisions regarding the nature of international action that may be required for future developments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Delaware has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there are one or two points so far as the question of authority to act is concerned. I think the Senator from Illinois should look at section 101 of the act, which I think specifically gives the power to allocate. I read from section 101:

> To allocate materials and facilities in such manner, upon such facts, and to such extent as he shall deem necessary and proper to promote the national defense.

There is no question of the authority to allocate or control strategic materials in short supply. There is, of course, a legitimate question about the wisdom of doing it, and I think also the Senator from Michigan might raise the question that our representatives have not done it exactly as it should have been done in some specific instances. That is always possible, but as to the broad power or purpose of it there should be no doubt.

We did exactly this during the last war, with precisely the same kind of operation. Everybody agreed then that it was to our advantage, since our country is the largest importer and consumer of these materials. I do not see how the Senator from Michigan can get around that fact. There is no doubt that what is contemplated by this International Materials Conference, is to try to prevent unrestricted competition among these countries, putting the price of these materials clear out of reason.

There is one other question as to the point made by the Senator from Michigan, as to whether these countries have any restrictions. I have in my hand a letter signed by Mr. Frederick Winant, Director of the International Activities Division of the Defense Production Administration. This letter happened to be addressed to Mr. GEORGE MEADER, a Member of Congress from Michigan. Mr. Winant sets out in this letter—and I shall be glad to make it a part of the RECORD—the countries which have restrictions on their use of these various materials—France, for example. He says:

> Regulations are in effect in France restricting the use of copper, nickel, and tungsten. In addition, supplies of cotton, newsprint, and sulfur are allocated according to an administrative plan arranged by the Government.

The sound objective and the purpose of the IMC seem to me to be beyond any question at all, and I cannot believe that the Senate wishes to prevent our

administrators, our own Government, from participating in this kind of an arrangement, designed as it is to minimize the cost of these materials, which are absolutely necessary for our defense effort.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, the letter by Frederick Winant, Director of International Activities Division, of the Defense Production Administration, dated May 20, 1952.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, May 20, 1952.

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MEADER: This will acknowledge your letter of May 2 expressing interest in such preliminary information as may be available regarding the materials controls in effect in countries, other than the United States, which are members of the International Materials Conference.

Although a copy of the recent Report on Operations of the International Materials Conference was sent to you at the time of publication, another copy is forwarded herewith. The report provides information on the organization and operation of the Conference, the problems dealt with, the nature of the difficulties encountered, the accomplishments of the Conference, and furnishes some indication of the work which remains to be done. In particular, your attention is invited to the sections of the report which are devoted to the question of conservation and end-use controls within the member countries, and the recommendations of the commodity committees.

Your attention is also invited to the Preliminary Statement on End-Use Control in Certain Countries Which Participate in the International Materials Conference, which was presented on March 21, 1952, at the hearings before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952. This statement appears on page 1488 of the record of the hearings.

Pending the completion of the broader study now being prepared by the International Materials Conference, I am enclosing an interim summary of the types of controls in effect in the member countries. This summary is subject to revision based upon more complete and up-to-date information, which should be forthcoming as a result of the current International Materials Conference study.

As soon as further information is available, it will be forwarded to you.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK WINANT,
Director, International Activities Division.

PRELIMINARY CONDENSED SUMMARY OF MATERIALS CONTROL MEASURES IN CERTAIN COUNTRIES PARTICIPATING IN THE INTERNATIONAL MATERIALS CONFERENCE

(NOTE.—This summary is based on preliminary and incomplete information. Therefore the omission of reference to certain controls does not necessarily indicate that they are nonexistent.)

AUSTRIA

In Austria, a general act of Parliament authorizes the control and directs the trade and use of industrial materials and semifabricated products. Based on this general authorization, restrictions are imposed on the use of copper, nickel, molybdenum, tungsten and cobalt. In addition, sulfur is under strict import control whereby the uses for which licenses are granted are specified.

BELGIUM-LUXEMBURG

In Belgium, restrictions are presently in effect on the use of copper, nickel, molybdenum, and sulfur.

FRANCE

Regulations are in effect in France restricting the use of copper, nickel and tungsten. In addition, supplies of cotton, newsprint and sulfur are allocated according to an administrative plan arranged by the government.

GERMANY

Germany has a general regulation concerning the manufacture, delivery, acceptance, storage and statistical classification of nonferrous materials. In addition to this regulation, end-use restrictions are in effect for copper, nickel, zinc, cobalt and molybdenum. Use of sulfur is controlled by means of an administrative allocation.

ITALY

Regulations are in effect governing the use of copper, nickel, zinc and sulfur. In addition, special import and export restrictions are in effect on cobalt, tungsten, molybdenum, sulfur, pulp, and paper, cotton and wool.

NETHERLANDS

Regulations are in effect controlling the use of copper, zinc and nickel. The other commodities under IMC allocation are channeled into essential end-use production by means of an effective import control system.

NORWAY

Regulations are in effect controlling the use of copper and newsprint. Nickel and zinc are subject to a system of internal allocation restricting their consumption to essential purposes, and the use of tungsten, molybdenum, cobalt, and sulfur is limited in amount to the extent IMC allocations permit current essential production.

PORTUGAL

In Portugal, control of the utilization of materials is implicit at all times under the corporate state, under which all the various aspects of industry and trade are controlled.

SPAIN

The Spanish Government exercises control over all production, distribution, prices, imports, and exports, under the national syndical system.

SWEDEN

A regulation restricting the use of copper is in effect. The use of nickel, molybdenum, tungsten, and cobalt in alloy steels (which are produced largely for export) is carefully scrutinized as to specifications in order to apply conservation and substitution measures.

SWITZERLAND

Regulations are in effect which restrict the use of copper and nickel and which control and allocate sulfur.

TURKEY

The use of scarce materials for other than direct defense purposes is extremely limited by means of the Turkish Government's strongly centralized control over all economic activities.

UNITED KINGDOM

Regulations are in effect governing the use of copper, zinc, and nickel, and the import and export of sulfur and sulfur-bearing materials are under strict control.

CANADA

Regulations are in effect controlling the distribution of copper, zinc, nickel, lead, and sulfur. In accordance with the Emergency Powers Act and the Defense Production Act, the Canadian Government can institute additional controls over essential materials whenever necessary. In addition to these specific controls, materials and other resources may be diverted by means of indirect Government controls (i e., fiscal monetary, and credit).

AUSTRALIA

Although no direct end-use control regulations are in force, there are strict import, export, and foreign-exchange controls which result in fairly rigid control of distribution and a practical prohibition of reexports.

INDIA

Legislation is in force enabling the Central Government to regulate the production and distribution of goods including nonferrous metals and sulfur.

JAPAN

Regulations are in effect restricting the use of nickel and cobalt. Import, export, and foreign-exchange controls are also in effect.

NEW ZEALAND

Export, import and foreign-exchange control restrictions are strictly applied.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

Strict export, import, and foreign-exchange controls are in effect under which scarce materials are allocated on the basis of requirements for essential use.

ARGENTINA

In Argentina, an inventory-control system of scarce materials is in effect which is intended to form the basis of a plan to regulate the use of scarce materials. A strict system of export, import, and foreign-exchange controls is also in force.

URUGUAY

In Uruguay, a central authority has been established, the specific responsibility of which is the control of the use, distribution, and prices of commodities.

OTHER LATIN-AMERICAN COUNTRIES

In Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, and Peru foreign exchange and export and import controls are in effect.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I cannot overemphasize the seriousness of our preventing agreements of this kind, and that is what this amendment would do. The report on the original bill, regarding section 101, expresses the opinion of the committee that the Government should engage in this very type of negotiation with these other countries, in order to reach some equitable distribution of the strategic and scarce materials, as far as we are concerned.

So I cannot imagine why the Senate would wish to tie the hands of our administrators, which I think would inevitably increase the cost of our defense effort. And particularly, it seems to me, since the amendment comes without much understanding, I believe, from those who have on other occasions, when appropriation bills were being considered, evidenced great interest in economy. This kind of an amendment would make our efforts at economy absolutely impossible. It could increase the cost of the defense effort much more than would any of the efforts the Senator from Michigan has ever made to reduce appropriation bills.

Mr. FERGUSON. It does not apply to defense materials.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator think that copper is not a defense material? I know what the Senator's point is; that this is for private consumption; but the Senator well knows it is the total amount available that counts, and when

it comes to actual distribution, our own administrators have always felt the necessity of making some reasonable provision for domestic civilian production, such as Cadillac automobiles. I would probably have an interest, too, if they were made in my State, and I would be very proud of it. But we must make some choice——

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I only want to remind the Senator from Michigan that that is what was done in the last war, and I do not recall anyone complaining about it being wasteful or unnecessary in that war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan on this question. The yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should like to offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], as follows:

After "(m)" add the words "If the domestic production of any commodity is in excess of the amount necessary to meet allocations for defense, stockpiling, and military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress, no."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will send his amendment to the desk, the clerk will state it.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 12, after "(m)" it is proposed to insert the following:

If the domestic production of any commodity is in excess of the amount necessary to meet allocations for defense, stockpiling, and military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress, no.

Mr. LONG. The reason I offer the amendment, Mr. President, is that the section occurs in a different place in the bill, and without the amendment it seems to me the Government would be in no position to fix price controls on materials which are strategic and essential for defense.

I ask the Senator from Michigan if he intends by his amendment to fix the price which American purchasers should pay for those commodities?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator's amendment provides that if production is not sufficient——

Mr. LONG. Yes—taking the language which the Senator from Michigan used. He said there would be no quota or any limitation on purchases by American concerns on the foreign market and no limitation on the price they could pay, if those materials were not needed for stockpiling or for the defense of this Nation. Would he be willing to apply the same principle to section (m) to control the price Americans could pay on the foreign market? It seems to me that to acquire rubber or tin or copper people should not be required to bid against General Motors on their own market. I do not believe the Senator intended that by his amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. I certainly do not intend to increase the price. That is why I left it open, so that if a person wanted to pay more in the open market his price could be controlled on the article he got. That is why I applied it to the fabrication of products which are to be sold.

Mr. LONG. What I have in mind is that in the case of a material, which this Nation needs for its own defense, it would seem that the Government should be able to control the price American purchasers pay in competition.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the material is not sufficient for military purposes in the United States.

Mr. LONG. Yes. That language is not contained in section (m) of the Senator's amendment, while it is contained in the previous part of the Senator's amendment. I simply ask if the Senator would be willing to accept the same principle on page 2 that he himself placed on page 1.

Mr. FERGUSON. I would accept it. I would modify my amendment to that extent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan modifies his amendment.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan, as modified. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan. The question recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, as modified. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted "yea" when his name was called.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, is it possible to propound a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator cannot interrupt the roll call for a parliamentary inquiry. The vote is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. The clerk will continue with the roll call.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

I announce also that if present and voting, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

On this vote the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—43

Aiken	Frear	Saltonstall
Bennett	Gillette	Schoeppel
Brewster	Hendrickson	Smith, Maine
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Smith, N. J.
Bridges	Ives	Smith, N. C.
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Taft
Butler, Nebr.	Johnson, Colo.	Thye
Cain	Kem	Tobey
Capehart	Martin	Watkins
Case	McCarran	Welker
Cordon	McCarthy	Wiley
Dirksen	Millikin	Williams
Dworshak	Morse	Young
Ferguson	Mundt	
Flanders	Nixon	

NAYS—40

Anderson	Hoey	McKellar
Benton	Holland	Monroney
Chavez	Humphrey	Moody
Clements	Hunt	Neely
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Kefauver	Pastore
Ellender	Kerr	Robertson
Fulbright	Kilgore	Smathers
George	Lehman	Sparkman
Green	Long	Stennis
Hayden	Maybank	Underwood
Hennings	McClellan	
Hill	McFarland	

NOT VOTING—13

Byrd	Langer	Murray
Carlson	Lodge	Russell
Duff	Magnuson	Seaton
Ecton	Malone	
Knowland	McMahon	

So Mr. FERGUSON's amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana will be stated.

Mr. CAPEHART. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. CAPEHART'S amendment is as follows:

On page 8, begining with line 16, strike out through line 16, on page 9, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SUSPENSION OF CONTROLS

"SEC. 411. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, all wage and price controls heretofore imposed under this title shall terminate as of the date of enactment of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952, and such controls shall not be reimposed unless (1) the index figure shown by the last published 'Consumers' Price Index for Moderate-Income Families in Large Cities—All Items', published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, is higher than , or (2) a state of war shall have been declared by the Congress. Wage and price controls reimposed under clause (1) of this subsection, shall be terminated whenever such index figure is or less.

"(b) In the event price and wage controls are reimposed under this section, and subject to the provisions of subsection (a), it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the President shall use the price, wage, and other powers conferred by this act, as amended, to promote the earliest practicable balance between production and the demand therefor of materials and services, and that the general control of wages and prices shall be terminated as rapidly as possible consistent with the policies and purposes set forth in this act; and that pending such termination, in order to avoid burdensome and unnecessary reporting and record-keeping which retard rather than assist in the achievement of the purposes of this act, price or wage regulations and orders, or ooth, shall be suspended in the case of any material or service or type of employment where such factors as condition of supply, existence of below ceiling prices, historical volatility of prices, wage pressures and wage relationships, or relative importance in relation to business costs or living costs will permit, and to the extent that such action will be consistent with the avoidance of a cumulative eand dangerous unstabilizing effect. It is further the policy of the Congress that when the President finds that the termination of the suspension and the restoration of ceilings on the sales or charges for such material or service, or the further stabilization of such wages, salaries, and other compensation, or both, is necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, he shall by regulation or order terminate the suspension."

On page 9, beginning with line 23, strike out through line 3, on page 10, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) Subject to the provisions of section 411, this act and all authority conferred thereunder shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1953."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the amendment which I have just offered was discussed by me at considerable length on last Thursday. There are two schools of thought in America and two schools of thought in the United States Senate. One is that we ought not to extend price and wage controls, and the other is that we ought to extend them. I have supported price and wage controls up to this time. I have always been in favor—and still am—of the policy that any time the Nation goes to war we ought automatically to freeze prices and wages.

The amendment which I have sent to the desk would suspend price and wage controls unless Congress should declare war or the consumer index, which is used in escalator clauses, labor contracts, and legislation, rises 3 points. The consumer index has risen about 11 points since Korea, 8 points prior to the time the President put wage and price controls into effect in January 1951, and a little less than 3 points since that time.

The advantage of this amendment is that it would enable us to go back to private enterprise, to a free economy, and at the same time guarantee to the American people that there will be no run-away inflation, because the minute the consumer index went up three points the President then would do what I think ought to be done any time we go to war. He would freeze all prices and wages at that point.

This amendment proposes to do with respect to wage and price controls what the Administrator is doing piecemeal at the present time. For example, at the moment the Price Administrator has already decontrolled or suspended the controls with respect to many items. He intends to suspend controls with respect to many other items in the near future. I do not believe that is the way to do it. I think we ought either to control all items as to prices and wages, or we ought not to control any. I do not believe that the system will work if we remove controls from one item and retain them on another.

I am just as much interested in stopping run-away inflation as is anyone else. This amendment would accomplish that purpose. It would guarantee to the American people that if the consumer index went up 3 points, we would go into 100 percent price and wage controls. Today in America almost every item in America is selling below ceiling. Warehouses are filled with consumer goods. I do not know of a single item in America today with respect to which there is a shortage, unless it be nickel, and perhaps one or two other strategic materials which are not produced in America.

There is no shortage of foodstuffs, and there is no shortage of agricultural products, except a temporary shortage of potatoes. They are a perishable product, and we are likely to have a shortage of a perishable item at any time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator has stated that he knew of no item with respect to which there was a shortage. He might consider the shortage of administrative judgment. I think there is a little shortage in that respect.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall not undertake to argue that point. There might well be. However, I am thinking in terms of things which the people buy. There are few shortages.

Another advantage of this amendment is that if this kind of price and wage controls were adopted, if it were necessary to continue for a year, 2 years, 3 years, 4 years, or 5 years with a big armament expansion, then on February 28, when the law expires, it could be extended for another year, because there would be a piece of legislation which would insure to the American people that they would not have run-away inflation, and yet we would have a free economy in America.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not equally true that when the Congress meets in January, or perhaps in December, if we have a special session, by concurrent resolution, Congress can do away with all controls?

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree with that statement; but why saddle on the American people and the wage earners wage and price controls if they are not needed? What is the use of doing it?

In my opinion we would have less production if we were to retain the price and wage controls than if we were to remove them.

Let me make another statement, which I make as a businessman of many years' experience. Under existing conditions, if we retain wage and price controls, we shall have higher prices than we would have if we were to remove controls. There are conditions under which I could not make that statement, but under existing conditions, in my opinion, we would have higher prices with price control.

If we do not intend to do something such as I am suggesting, when are we going to remove price and wage controls? I challenge any Senator to rise in his place and give me the standard or the gage, or tell me what, in his opinion, will happen in America which will enable him to vote to remove price and wage controls. What is the yardstick?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, did the Senator challenge some Senator to stand up and answer?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I will stand up and say that whenever I believe the economy is so adjusted that prices will not continue to rise, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics index and other measurements, I will vote for a concurrent resolution to do away with controls, no matter who may be the next President. I might vote to do away with them in December. The Senator challenged any Senator to stand up and answer. I will not remain seated and be challenged without making my statement.

Mr. CAPEHART. Any Senator could rise and make the same statement which the Senator from South Carolina has made. He is willing to remove controls whenever, in his opinion, the economy is properly adjusted.

Mr. MAYBANK. I would not be much of a Senator if I did not have a mind of my own.

Mr. CAPEHART. I want the Senator to tell me to what point our production must rise before controls are removed? What is the yardstick to be? Are we to keep the controls until we have 10,000,000 people unemployed? Are we to keep

them in effect until we have a depression? I thought that what we wanted in America was to have all our people employed at high wages. Are we admitting that we cannot have prosperity in America and have all our people employed without having price and wage controls? Have we admitted that the private-enterprise system has failed, and that every time all our people are employed and we have prosperity we must have price and wage controls? That is about what we are saying. We are using less than 15 percent of our production today in the manufacture of war materials. I do not know how much longer that situation will continue to exist. However, I am saying that we can remove price and wage controls today under the terms of this amendment just as well as we can do it a year from now. I am willing to gamble that when next March 1 rolls around, if we extend the act, the same arguments can be made for retaining price and wage controls as are now being made. If such arguments cannot be made next March, will that mean that we are to have unemployment? Will it mean that we are to have a recession in business, or a depression? Why not remove price and wage controls and say to the wage earners and the people of America that we are going back to a free economy in America, a private-enterprise system; that we are going to produce some flexibility in the economy under which prices and wages can go up and under which prices can go up not to exceed 3 points.

We are also saying to the American people that if prices go up more than 3 points, according to the consumer index, price and wage controls will be put into effect. Under such circumstances we ought to put them into effect. They ought to apply to everyone, and they ought to apply to every item. Either we ought to have controls, or we ought not to have them.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I agree with what the Senator has said about the desirability of the Congress having instituted a stabilization program immediately when the Korean invasion came. But did I correctly understand the Senator to say that today nearly all items are selling at prices substantially below ceiling prices?

Mr. CAPEHART. I said that they were selling at below the ceiling, not substantially below.

Mr. MOODY. If the Senator from Indiana will look at the committee report——

Mr. CAPEHART. I will not yield for the purpose of having the Senator make a speech. I know the chart he is about to use. It was put into the RECORD, and every Senator has seen it.

Mr. MOODY. I was not going to use a chart.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is one of those little blue books. I said that substantially all of the items in America today—and I know that it is true of agricultural products and it is true of perishable goods, with the exception of potatoes—are below the OPS ceiling.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CAPEHART. No. I shall yield the floor. How much time do I have remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Five minutes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

The VICE PRESIDENT. How much time does the Senator yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Rhode Island has a very important resolution which he would like to read into the RECORD. I yield him as much time as he needs to read it into the RECORD.

Mr. PASTORE. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a resolution which was adopted by the United Veterans Council of Rhode Island at its annual convention, held at Providence, R. I., on May 27, 1952. It is entitled "Resolution re: Veterans and the Price Stabilization Program."

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS AND THE PRICE STABILIZATION PROGRAM

Inflation is the sharp rise in prices that takes place when people have more money to spend than there are things to buy—and people bid against each other for things they want.

Uncontrolled inflation can and will undermine our economy. If that happens, all segments of the American economy will suffer—business, labor, and consumers.

American World War I and II veterans are members of all these groups. Collectively, they comprise the largest single productive group in the Nation today. If our economy remains stable, they will enjoy the full fruits of the way of life they fought to protect.

Stabilization of prices safeguards our economic system. It is a check against disastrous losses in purchasing power. It is a curb against hoarding and speculation in defense materials. It is the Government's assurance that it can purchase the maximum amount of tanks, guns, and ships for the money made available to strengthen our defenses against communism.

Military strength and economic stability go hand in hand. Veterans, more than any other group in America, know of the vital need for implementing both these weapons of defense; Therefore be it

Resolved at this annual convention assembled at Providence, R. I., on May 27, 1952, That the United Veterans Council of Rhode Island urges Congress to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 until such time when the dangers of uncontrolled inflation and Communist aggression subside; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution immediately be forwarded to the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees in Washington, D. C., and to the members of the Rhode Island congressional delegation, national OPS Price Stabilizer Ellis G. Arnall, Rhode Island OPS Director T. Morton Curry, and Rhode Island press and radio media.

WILLIAM J. TRACY,
President.

MAY 27, 1952.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield time to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I wish to correct a misapprehension on the part of the Senator from Indiana. He said that nearly all commodities in the United States are selling below ceiling prices. They are not. The facts brought out before the committee clearly demonstrate that they are not.

Many commodities in the country are indeed selling below ceiling prices.

There is under way a progressive program of removing controls from commodities which are selling at substantially below ceilings. That is taken care of in the statement of policy in another section of the bill. If the Senator from Indiana will look at page 13 of the committee report he will find that as of March 15, 1952, items sold at peak accounted for 50 percent of the Consumers' Price Index, items within 2 percent of peak for 71 percent, and items within 5 percent of peak for 85 percent of the Consumers' Price Index.

Therefore, it is a mistake to believe that merely because some items are down today there is no danger of a general price rise if we lift controls now. I should like to point out that any automatic rise of 3 points in the price index, which I believe would occur if the amendment were adopted, would result in further demands for wage and price increases and further disputes such as we have now in the steel industry between labor and management. The purpose of this bill, imperfect instrument that it is, is to protect the consuming public and the national economy against inflation. This amendment runs directly counter to that purpose.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] to yield to me briefly. I have yielded him some time, and I shall yield further time to him.

Mr. President, this is such an important amendment that I ask for the yeas and nays at this time.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield time to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. MOODY. I should like to complete my statement.

Mr. CASE. I wish to ask a question of the chairman of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield for that purpose?

Mr. MOODY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CASE. I merely wish to ask the chairman of the committee if he could confirm the understanding I have with the clerk of the committee, or staff member of the committee, that the matter of fixing rates for abstracting fees, to which I called the chairman's attention, which is intended to be handled by an OPS regulation, is improperly a matter of regulation where a State law fixes the fee, and whether or not it is his understanding, as it is now my understanding, that that matter will be taken care of by an amendment to the regulations, so that the State law can be operative without being overruled by an OPS regulation.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is my understanding from Mr. Herbert Maletz, the general counsel of OPS. It is my understanding that the situation to which the Senator refers is to be taken care of. OPS agrees with what he has said.

Mr. CASE. And that they will issue a modification?

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand that the staff members whom I asked to talk with the general counsel have been informed that OPS would issue a modified regulation.

Mr. CASE. Within the next few days?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is my understanding.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to emphasize that what this bill is supposed to do is to check inflation. Some of the amendments which have been agreed to do not go in that direction. However, I do not see any reason for now tearing the bill apart merely because it has been loosened a bit.

The Senator from Indiana would remove controls unless there was a rise of 3 points in the index. Let me read what happened between June and August 15, 1950, when the Consumers' Price Index rose a little more than 3 points, or 1.9 percent. Foodstuffs rose 11 percent; hides, 17 percent; shellac, 21 percent; tin, 35 percent; silk, 48 percent; natural rubber, 61 percent.

Competent authorities submitted that a 3-point rise in the index would cost the American consumers $6,000,000,000. So, Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Indiana would cost the consumers of America $6,000,000,000. I see no reason in the world why the Senate should vote here this afternoon for $6,000,000,000 of inflation.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOODY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. When the Senator says $6,000,000,000, he is going on the basis that the index will go up 3 points. If it does not go up 3 points, but instead goes down 3 points, it will save the American people $6,000,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. MOODY. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, if prices went down 3 points it would save the American people $6,000,000,000.

Mr. MOODY. As my friend from Indiana well knows, there is nothing now to prevent prices from going down.

Mr. CAPEHART. The items which the Senator has just named do not enter into the Consumers' Price Index.

Mr. MOODY. Does the Senator mean to say that the cost of raw materials does not enter into the price of goods?

Mr. CAPEHART. The items which the Senator has named do not, except possibly indirectly, enter into the Consumers' Price Index, which is issued by the Department of Labor.

Mr. MOODY. They do indirectly.

Mr. CAPEHART. They are not items which are used in computing the Consumers' Price Index.

Mr. MOODY. The point I attempted to make when my friend from Indiana declined to yield to me was that while it is true that there are some prices considerably below ceiling—and they are being decontrolled—50 percent or more of the prices are pressing hard against the ceilings and there is evidence that if the amendment is adopted prices will go up, and therefore there will be a $6,000,000,000 increase.

Mr. CAPEHART. Some would go up, and some would go down. That is always true in America. Prices go up or down, according to the index. We are talking about the Consumers' Price Index, which is used as a cost-of-living index in America. That is what we are interested in. We are interested in the cost of living. That is the index we are using.

Mr. MOODY. Perhaps the Senator would agree that if we should allow a 3-point rise we would have an inflationary demand all along the line, which would deteriorate the value of the dollar.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOODY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not understand the argument being made by the Senator from Indiana. The prices of a certain number of goods have gone down and they have been decontrolled. An effort is being made to decontrol them just as promptly and just as completely as circumstances will permit. Certainly as prices go down it makes very little difference whether there is or is not a control law in effect. In that event prices will decrease, and such commodities will be decontrolled. Even if they are not decontrolled, they will be offered to the public at the lower prices.

I believe there will be a scarcity of certain goods, for certainly we cannot possibly foresee the future. Already there has been an increase in the price of certain commodities, certain goods, and certain foodstuffs. If a scarcity should exist and if at that time we were without controls, that situation might cost countless billions of dollars to the American people.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say we would not then be without controls, because if the Consumers' Price Index rose three points controls would automatically go into effect.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that the entire control machinery would then have been dismantled, and it would take months to establish the controls again?

Mr. CAPEHART. Well, Mr. President——

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I have yielded to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. I did not yield for a colloquy between my distinguished friends. I would be glad to hear their colloquy; but the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] wishes to speak on this amendment, and I believe we have only about 5 minutes left.

Therefore, I hope the Senator from New York will conclude his remarks rather quickly.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that there was complaint, which possibly was justified, that it took very long to get the control machinery going again. If we dismantle the machinery, it will take a long time to get it functioning again.

Mr. CAPEHART. But my amendment would not result in dismantling the machinery.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I do not believe that the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished ranking minority member of our committee, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], should be adopted. I believe it should be rejected, for the reason that it would, if adopted, completely stop the control machinery. Thereafter, if it were necessary to reimpose controls, it would be necessary to go through the entire process of setting up the controls again.

Furthermore, in the respect that the application of the amendment would depend on the across-the-board Consumers' Index, let me say that the amendment does not take into account the point that the prices of some commodities, some of which are most essential in computing the cost of living, might be far ahead of the general Consumers' Index, or those prices might be far above the ceiling prices.

I believe all of us realize that at the present time we are in a fairly good state of equilibrium, and therefore we do not feel the need for controls. We feel that probably in a number of instances controls could be suspended at this time. On the other hand, we do not know what will happen next month or 3 months from now.

The bill as reported by the committee takes notice of that situation, and provides for a suspension of controls. However, contrary to what the Senator from Indiana is attempting to do by means of his amendment, in the committee bill we call for the suspension of controls on individual commodities, instead of a suspension across the board, and we allow for flexibility in the reimposition of controls.

I simply do not believe it would be wise for us at this particular time to provide for the removal of controls all the way across the board.

We should also lay stress on the point that the Consumers' Index, on which the amendment of the Senator from Indiana would be pegged, has a lag of approximately 40 days. In other words, a price prevailing today would not be conveyed to the country for more than a month, and probably not until 6 weeks from now. So there is always a lag. The result is that we could not possibly tell how high prices might go before controls would be reimposed, because increased prices are not reflected in the Consumers' Index until from 30 to 40 days after the price increases or price fluctuations have occurred.

Furthermore, the arrangement proposed in the amendment of the Senator from Indiana would not take into account a spot-price increase which might occur in the case of an individual commodity, inasmuch as that price would be lumped with many other prices, in arriving at the Consumers' Index.

Therefore, I believe the amendment of the Senator from Indiana would break down the system of controls which we are trying to have. First, the amendment would break down the selective controls; and, in the second place, the amendment would destroy the degree of flexibility which we direct the Administrator to maintain in connection with

the suspension of controls when the existing situation warrants such a step.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield at this point, let me say that such action would not be mandatory on the part of the Administrator; the provision simply amounts to a lot of pious words.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I agree that it is not mandatory.

Furthermore, the Senator from Indiana knows that Mr. Arnall, the Director of Price Stabilization, assured us that he would carry out that arrangement; and the distinguished Senator also knows that already the Price Stabilizer has actually suspended controls on a number of items. I hope those suspensions may increase steadily as we proceed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll; and Mr. AIKEN voted "yea," when his name was called.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, has the roll call commenced?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it now too late to suggest the absence of a quorum?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is, after one Senator has voted, following the order for the call of the roll. In that case the absence of a quorum cannot be suggested.

The clerk will proceed with the call of the roll.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SELTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 57, as follows:

YEAS—23

Bennett	Dworshak	Schoeppel
Bricker	Ferguson	Taft
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Watkins
Butler, Nebr.	Jenner	Welker
Cain	Martin	Wiley
Capehart	McCarran	Williams
Case	Millikin	Young
Dirksen	Mundt	

NAYS—57

Aiken	Hennings	Monroney
Anderson	Hill	Moody
Benton	Hoey	Morse
Brewster	Holland	Neely
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Nixon
Byrd	Hunt	O'Conor
Clements	Ives	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Douglas	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Eastland	Kem	Smathers
Ellender	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Frear	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Fulbright	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
George	Long	Sparkman
Gillette	Maybank	Stennis
Green	McClellan	Thye
Hayden	McFarland	Tobey
Hendrickson	McKellar	Underwood

NOT VOTING—16

Carlson	Knowland	McMahon
Chavez	Langer	Murray
Duff	Lodge	Russell
Ecton	Magnuson	Seaton
Flanders	Malone	
Johnson, Colo.	McCarthy	

So Mr. CAPEHART'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC 103. Subsection (d) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) After the enactment of this paragraph, no ceiling price shall be established or maintained on any agricultural or fish commodity during any calendar month which begins more than 30 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph unless such commodity is certified to the President under this paragraph as being in short supply. On the first day of the first calendar month which begins more than 30 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify to the President each agricultural commodity, and the Secretary of Interior shall certify to the President each fish commodity, which such Secretary determines to be in short supply. Thereafter, on the first day of each succeeding calendar month, each Secretary shall certify modifications of such certification by adding other agricultural or fish commodities which have become in short supply and by removing from such certification such commodities which he determines are no longer in short supply. Within 15 days of the receipt of any such certification or modification of such certification, the President shall suspend and may reactivate the price ceilings applicable to particular agricultural or fish commodities as required or permitted by such certification. For the purposes of this paragraph (i) an agricultural commodity or fish commodity shall be deemed to be in short supply unless the supply of such commodity equals or exceeds the requirements for such commodity for the current marketing season; (ii) the term 'agricultural commodity' shall be deemed to mean any agricultural commodity and any food or feed product processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity; (iii) the term 'fish commodity' shall be deemed to mean any fish or seafood and any food or feed product processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any fish or seafood."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield so that I may make an announcement?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, several Senators have asked me how long the Senate will remain in session tonight. I have given notice of a night session. I thought we would remain in session not later than 10 o'clock. If it should look as if we could not finish an amendment by 10 o'clock we might quit a little earlier. I do not think we would be justified in quitting before that time. I think the Senate should be prepared to sit until somewhere in the neighborhood of 10 o'clock.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, insofar as I am concerned, I should be glad to stay here as long as the majority leader and the Democratic whip believe we should stay. But there are some 27 amendments printed and lying on the desk. I think every Senator's mind is made up as to the different amendments, which have been talked about and passed around for 3 or 4 months. I think the majority leader could expedite the proceedings so that we can perhaps finish by 10 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate very long. I am reluctant to speak after the last vote on suspension of controls. My amendment provides that controls shall be suspended on agricultural and fish commodities on a month-to-month basis so long as there is no finding by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture that a commodity is in short supply.

The amendment is designed mainly to bring some relief to the processors of the country. I think the amendment should be adopted for several reasons. The first is that, according to the figures adduced before the Banking and Currency Committee, 80 percent of all the fruit and vegetable pack is now selling under ceiling, and approximately one-third of the pack is selling at least 10 percent under ceiling.

Second, the production of fruits and vegetables has been the highest in our history. From 1943 to 1946 251,000,000 cases were packed. In 1951 the pack went up to 310,000,000 cases. The stocks of fruits and vegetables are higher today

than they ever were before. The figures submitted to the committee indicate that there are 101,000,000 cases in stock, which is more than 20,000,000 cases over the number in 1948.

I cite as an additional reason why the amendment ought to be adopted the fact that there is the singular situation of the Department of Agriculture reducing planting goals by more than 1,000,000 acres, and at the same time OPS is insisting that a very tight price control be kept upon these products.

My amendment would have little or no effect upon the prices of canned vegetables, because if Senators will look at the Bureau of Labor Statistics index they will find that fruits and vegetables are below the index price.

It seems to me, if I properly evaluate the vote which has just been taken, there is a disposition to keep the country in a strait-jacket and impose upon the processors and canners the burden of constantly filling out reports. I think some of the flexibility has gone out of price controls, and the time has come when Congress ought to deal very realistically with the question.

So I submit the amendment to the tender mercies of the Senate without laboring the point any further.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator if there is any definition of an agricultural commodity.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think it has been defined and redefined. There is a splendid definition in the basic production act itself.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will some Senator yield me some time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall be glad to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have given a great deal of study to the prices of agricultural commodities, whether they be vegetables, or citrus fruits, and most of the prices, if not all of them, have been below the established ceiling prices set by OPS. With the high production of citrus fruits, vegetables, and all other agricultural commodities, there can be no justification for continuation of the OPS with reference to agricultural commodities.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. As chairman of the committee, I shall be glad to accept the amendment, because the instructions to OPS from the Congress are to suspend controls on those items.

Mr. THYE. If OPS would suspend controls whenever the prices of such products go below the established ceiling prices, there would not be as much opposition to the control measure on the statute books.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate that statement. I feel the same as does the Senator from Minnesota, and I accept the amendment.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! vote!

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois yielded to me, and the amendment is his amendment. Therefore, I shall not comment further one way or the other. I am very appreciative of the fact that the chairman of the committee is willing to accept the amendment.

I now yield the floor. I know the sponsor of the amendment will speak for himself.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was temporarily engaged at the desk. May I ask the distinguished chairman of the committee if he will accept the amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes, as to those commodities which are below ceiling prices.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I very much hope that the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee will not accept the amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. I said I would, if the agricultural products referred to, and fish—I do not know what kind of fish—are below ceiling prices. If they are below ceiling prices, the OPS should do away with the ceiling prices.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The distinguished chairman of the committee asked me to expedite the consideration of the bill. I know that all of us would like to get some article exempted from price control.

If we start to exempt certain articles from price control for some favored industry or for some farm products, we shall have to do away with the whole bill. Maybe it would be better to exempt commodities by localities. The Senator has asked me to expedite consideration of the bill, but, of course, all we can do is to vote the amendment down. So let us vote it down, and proceed with the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Dirksen	Hill
Anderson	Douglas	Hoey
Bennett	Dworshak	Holland
Benton	Eastland	Humphrey
Brewster	Ellender	Hunt
Bricker	Ferguson	Ives
Bridges	Frear	Jenner
Butler, Md.	Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.
Butler, Nebr.	George	Johnson, Tex.
Cain	Gillette	Johnston, S. C.
Capehart	Green	Kefauver
Case	Hayden	Kem
Clements	Hendrickson	Kerr
Connally	Hennings	Kilgore
Cordon	Hickenlooper	Lehman
Long	Neely	Stennis
Martin	Nixon	Taft
Maybank	O'Conor	Thye
McClellan	O'Mahoney	Tobey
McFarland	Pastore	Underwood
McKellar	Robertson	Watkins
Millikin	Saltonstall	Welker
Monroney	Smathers	Wiley
Moody	Smith, Maine	Williams
Morse	Smith, N. C.	Young
Mundt	Sparkman	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are detained on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—33

Bennett	Dworshak	Nixon
Brewster	Eastland	O'Conor
Bricker	Ferguson	Saltonstall
Bridges	Gillette	Stennis
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Taft
Butler, Nebr.	Jenner	Thye
Cain	Kem	Watkins
Capehart	Martin	Welker
Case	McClellan	Wiley
Cordon	Millikin	Williams
Dirksen	Mundt	Young

NAYS—44

Aiken	Hoey	McKellar
Anderson	Holland	Monroney
Benton	Humphrey	Moody
Clements	Hunt	Morse
Connally	Ives	Neely
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Frear	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Fulbright	Kefauver	Smathers
George	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Green	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Hayden	Lehman	Sparkman
Hendrickson	Long	Tobey
Hennings	Maybank	Underwood
Hill	McFarland	

NOT VOTING—19

Byrd	Langer	Murray
Carlson	Lodge	Russell
Chavez	Magnuson	Schoeppel
Duff	Malone	Seaton
Ecton	McCarran	Smith, N. J.
Flanders	McCarthy	
Knowland	McMahon	

So Mr. DIRKSEN's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, beginning with line 11, it is proposed to strike out through line 5 on page 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 104. Import controls of fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, and soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products and coconuts and coconut products), peanuts, butter, cheese, and other dairy products, oats, rye, barley, wheat other than for human consumption, and rice and rice products are necessary for the protection of the essential security interests and economy of the United States in the existing emergency in international relations, and no imports of any such commodity or product shall be admitted to the United States until after June 30, 1953, which the Secretary of Agriculture determines would (a) impair or reduce the domestic production of any such commodity or product below present production levels, or below such higher levels as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary in view of domestic and international conditions, or (b) interfere with the orderly domestic storing and marketing of any such commodity or product, or (c) result in an unnecessary burden or expenditures under any Government price-support program. The President shall exercise the authority and powers conferred by this section.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Senators will recognize this amendment because it seeks to reenact into law the present section 104, which is operative at the present time in the Defense Production Act. That act is about to expire and section 104 will expire with it. Unless we reenact section 104 it means that the producers, consumers, and taxpayers of America will suffer very serious injury because of a flood of importation of certain products into this country.

The only change which would be brought about in section 104 as it now operates by the enactment of my amendment would be to add to the products listed in section 104, such as rice, peanuts, and dairy products, the additional products of oats, rye, barley, and wheat other than for human consumption.

Those products are presently in distress and in danger of having their price levels forced down even further, just as is the case with peanuts, rice, and dairy products. All of these products are headed for lower prices and increased foreign competition unless my amendment prevails.

Mr. President, I also point out to the Senate that this amendment is necessary from the standpoint of the producers of America, who find themselves utterly unable to produce in this country in competition with severe foreign competition, which dumps products upon the American farmer and the American producer. It means that if we are going to set up and maintain a farm program which will be effective and continuing, we must have some kind of protection for the American producer of supplies which must compete in our own market with great shiploads of material coming in from abroad. The American farmer needs the Mundt-Young amendment if he is not to confront cheap foreign imports which will keep his farm produce from rising with the other products made in America and by Americans.

In the second place, the legislation is necessary from the standpoint of the consumer. I may point out that the consumer in the city today is paying an all-time high price for fluid milk, and that in spite of that fact the consumption of fluid milk is seriously decreasing in this country. We find that it is a tremendously difficult situation today for families in cities to procure the milk needed for the youngsters in their family, because of paying the terribly high prices they must pay for it.

In spite of that fact, we have had a decrease of more than 4,000,000 cows in the dairy herds of this country, principally because of the inability of American dairymen to compete with the importation of dairy products from abroad.

If our consumers are to be protected we must reenact section 104, which is operating at the present time.

Another illustration of why this amendment is important from the standpoint of the consumer is with respect to the health of the consumer. We have been importing, prior to this situation, a considerable quantity of Italian cheese. Unlike American cheese which is made in creameries and in cheese factories in which inspections are regularly made, the Italian cheese is subjected to only spot inspections. Only spot loads of Italian cheese are inspected.

In such spot loads which were inspected the last time that we had importations of Italian cheese we found that it was so filthy and so unhealthful and so injurious to human consumption that 77 loads out of 1,600 loads had to be rejected altogether.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Briefly for a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, does not the Senator from South Dakota believe, if that is true, which I seriously doubt, that the matter ought to be handled under the Pure Food Act and not be the subject of an embargo?

Mr. MUNDT. First of all, the Senator from Arkansas has no reason to doubt the figures unless he wants to quarrel with the Bureau of the Census.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I recall a similar statement being made at the time the Senate considered the oleomargarine bill. It was stated that margarine was filthy and unhealthful. I seriously doubt it. It is being made by the same people, as I recall.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Arkansas has more familiarity with the present administration than I have. If he chooses to doubt the reliability of the Bureau of the Census he can put it in the same category as the Bureau of Internal Revenue. I am willing to accept the findings.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator will agree that this is the first time the deleterious nature of such importations has ever been raised. Before our committee no one, not even the people who are in opposition to my position and who support the Senator's position, ever mentioned the fact that the importations should be kept out on the ground cited by the Senator.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, we will mention it now, crediting the authority to the administrator of the Bureau of the Census, which is a part of the present administration. I am inclined to accept the figures, unless it is demonstrated that corruption has also penetrated that fine statistical bureau. I hope that is not the case. I hope that the Bureau is dependable. I believe the figures are accurate.

I may also point out that the figures from the Bureau of the Census indicated that had they been able to make a complete inspection, which is impossible for them to make——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I suggest that that is the fault of Congress for not appropriating a sufficient amount of money for the Bureau of the Census. Perhaps if they had made a complete investigation they would not have written what they have written to the Senator.

Mr. MUNDT. If they had made a full investigation and if Congress had appropriated sufficient money to employ enough investigators to inspect every pound of imported cheese, this is what they would have found. If the same pro rata degree of filth had been found in all the imported cheese, they would have found over 2,225,000 pounds of imported Italian cheese so filthy that it would have been denied entry, if it had been inspected. Yet it came in and was sold to unsuspecting American consumers.

Mr. President, I believe that the American consumer should be protected. They deserve a better break than to be forced to pay high prices for fluid milk and to buy this filth embedded in foreign cheese in competition with the splendid cheeses which are being produced domestically in Wisconsin and in Ohio, of which we had the privilege of eating some samples at lunch today. There is no reason why the splendid nutritious cheese of the new and struggling cheese industry of Wyoming must compete with the filthy cheese which is being imported from Italy. It would not have to compete if we reenacted section 104. Section 104 is now in the law, and

all we are asking is that it be reenacted at this time. This legislation should be supported by every friend of the farmer and by every Senator representing a State producing substantial quantities of the products mentioned in our amendment.

Now a word about the taxpayer: Unless we adopt this amendment, Mr. President, the American taxpayer will be confronted with the necessity of shelling out additional money each year in order to maintain price supports, to maintain price levels as against the importations of foreign commodities which are driving farm prices down on the American markets. In such a situation, those price supports must be maintained in order to keep the American farmer from going bankrupt and thus precipitating another national depression.

So the necessity for the maintenance of price support confronts our people, in such a situation. I do not believe that either my good friend, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], or many other persons will argue that the American taxpayer has such an inexhaustible supply of money that he can afford to underwrite price supports for all the agricultural products of the world.

We have a real job to do if we are to maintain price supports for the American peanut producer, the rice producer, the American rye producer, and the American farmer who produces small grains.

I do not believe we can possibly print enough money to be able to maintain price supports for all our agricultural products, if we permit unlimited importations of these same products. Therefore we must either provide for a decreased amount of imports of competitive agricultural commodities from foreign markets or we must provide increased amounts of money for price supports here at home.

In the past, Congress enacted section 104, and I believe Congress should now reenact it, expanded in the way we provide, so that the American farmer will obtain the protection to which he is entitled.

I point out that section 104 would become operative and would function only under certain stipulated conditions—for instance, only when the importations entered the American market in such quantities that they forced down the prices of our agricultural products or interfered with the storage program or had the effect of compelling the American taxpayer to underwrite price supports for our products which otherwise, in the open market, would sell at the full parity price to which the farmer is entitled.

Mr. President, I do not wish to consume any more time at this point, because my associate on this amendment, my good friend and distinguished colleague on the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, one of the most able and energetic advocates of justice to the American farmer, in the United States Senate, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], will speak at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the able Senator from South Dakota has covered very well the field insofar as dairy commodities, rice, and other products are concerned. At this time I should like to speak with respect to oats, barley, and rye.

Last December, oats were selling on the Chicago market at $1.01 a bushel. Under the impact of terrific imports of oats, the price on the Chicago market has now dropped to approximately 75 cents, or approximately 25 cents a bushel.

At the present time, in my own State of North Dakota, cash oats are 6 cents a bushel less than the support level. The average price of oats there now is 59 cents a bushel. That is the relationship with respect to the 1951 price-support program.

When the new oats start coming into the market in a month or 6 weeks, the cash price will be approximately 11 cents below the new and higher announced support levels.

Mr. President, does it make sense for the United States Government to pay out perhaps hundreds of millions of dollars to support the price of oats, when we could have a fair price on oats if we cut off even a part of the foreign imports?

In 1949 and 1950, large quantities of rye were imported. They forced prices to below the support levels, and forced the Government to spend millions of dollars to support the price.

Ten years ago an average of 3,500,000 acres of rye were harvested in the United States. Because of the imports, and depressed prices, the acreage of rye has steadily decreased. This year the harvested acreage of rye is expected to be approximately 1,380,000; in other words, the rye industry has almost been liquidated.

Barley is the next one on the list. According to the Department of Agriculture, barley planting this year will be 24 percent lower than it was a year ago. Again, that situation is almost entirely due to the heavy imports of barley at a time when we are asking the farmers of the United States to increase feed production.

Certainly it does not make sense to me to have increased imports which depress prices below the level price-support programs and when we have unnecessary losses, under those price-support programs, for oats, barley, and rye.

All we would have to do would be to make some reduction in the imports in the case of oats or rye, and then the price would be above the support level, thus making unnecessary any price-support programs for those commodities at this time.

Mr. President, I believe adoption of this amendment is very necessary. It would be in effect for only 1 year. I think the consumers of the United States and the taxpayers and the farmers of the United States are entitled to have this amendment adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from North Dakota has expired.

The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senate is quite familiar with this issue. This matter was before us twice before, I believe. A bill on the same subject was before the Senate only a few months ago.

I should like to explain the situation, although unfortunately not many Members of the Senate are present at this time. As a result, I do not know that I am justified in taking the time of the Senate to discuss this matter now, because practically all Members of the Senate who now are on the floor are interested in this subject, I believe, and are quite familiar with it.

As I said, hearings were held on this matter. No one has ever before raised the question about the lack of healthfulness of imported cheese. Furthermore, at no time in the recent hearings on this bill or on the previous bill did anyone, so far as I recall, bring up the question of feed grains. Apparently that is a new subject, which is injected at this time in an effort to attract more support for the present proposal.

The extension of this proposal into the feed-grains field would merely have the effect of increasing the price of feed grains and thus of increasing the price of milk in the States affected. So the proposal is a two-sided one from the point of view of the farmers of some of the Eastern States where it is necessary for the dairy farmers to purchase feed grains.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that it is claimed that some of the blue cheese now being imported is unhealthful?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understand that claim has been made.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, such cheese is some of the best that I eat, and I never have been sick. So apparently that cheese is all right.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Virginia evidently has been eating Wisconsin blue cheese.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I take no stock whatever in the allegation as to the unhealthfulness of such imported cheese. I state categorically that no one was willing to present any such evidence or any such claim to the committee which was considering these proposals. So I believe that fact in itself is sufficient to discredit the allegation and to show clearly its inaccuracy.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question, but not for a speech.

Mr. MUNDT. I do not ask the Senator from Arkansas to yield for a speech.

First of all, I think the Senator from Arkansas will agree that the Senator from Virginia is not a typical citizen who could properly be used as a laboratory for a demonstration of what the effect may be as a result of eating Italian cheese. The Senator from Virginia is a great, unusually robust, Herculean type of person and he could withstand an almost untold amount of stress and strain. [Laughter.]

Furthermore, let me point out that on May 15, 1952, Charles W. Holman,

secretary of the National Milk Producers of America, appeared before the House committee and, as appears at page 32 of the hearings, presented a large number of statistics and facts and figures about the cheese situation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Holman is standing right outside the door at this time; I saw him there a moment ago. All of us understand the position he takes. He takes the same stand in regard to this matter that he did in the case of the oleomargarine fight. Mr. Holman made a similar statement in connection with the fight on oleomargarine. Many of us found that the claims he presented at that time were without significance. I do not believe the statistics he presents at this time are any better than the ones he presented in that case.

Mr. President, I realize that the argument I am making at this time will not convert any Senator; Senators' minds already are made up. However, at least I shall go through the motions of presenting our arguments against the pending proposal, for certainly it is a faulty one.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not believe the Senator from Virginia has eaten the Italian cheese which has been referred to in the last few minutes, but I understand that one of the largest factories in Virginia is dependent upon the importation of a certain type of cheese which cannot be produced in the United States. If I am in error on that point, I hope the Senator from Virginia will correct me.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The statement the Senator from South Carolina has made is correct; in Virginia a certain type of cheese cracker is produced and in that connection a blue mold cheese is used. The production of the article has been seriously hampered by the inability to obtain an adequate supply of that cheese.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the statement the Senator from Virginia has made. He is a splendid example of what cheese will do for anyone. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, this is about the tenth time this provision has been challenged because of the cheese situation. It seems to me that the situation in that respect is really very clear.

The proposal to add oats, barley, rye, and feed wheat to the list of commodities now included in section 104 is, in my judgment, unnecessary for three reasons: First, the quantity of imports of feed grains which we are currently receiving in relation to our domestic production and requirements is very small; second, for the country as a whole, price returns to farmers for these feed grains have been above support levels; and, third, if action to control imports of these commodities becomes necessary in the future, appropriate action can be taken under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act as has been done in the cases of wheat and cotton.

In crop year 1951–52 it is estimated that imports of oats, barley, rye, and feed wheat will represent only about 2 percent of total feed grain used in the United States during the year. Despite these imports of feed grains, which we receive primarily from Canada, our carry-over stock of feed grains is being reduced about one-third in the current year—a reduction from 28,000,000 to 19,000,000 tons. This means that at the end of the current crop year feed-grain stocks will be at an undesirably low level considering the continuing requirements to meet high-level livestock production.

I am sure you all know that the primary objective of the Department of Agriculture's production-goal program in 1952 is to increase the production of feed grains. This drive is based on the fact that, unless we can increase feed-grain production substantially above the levels of the past years, a reduction in the level of production of livestock and livestock products will of necessity follow. Such a situation with respect to these products which are so important to everyone would have extremely harmful effects to our population in this mobilization period. The feed-grain goal for 1952 has been set 12 percent above last year's level. This is a very high goal and we will have to be blessed with favorable weather to reach it.

During the entire 1951–52 season which is now drawing to a close, the United States average prices of oats, barley, and rye have been above support levels. Support levels for all these crops have been increased in 1952 as compared with 1951 in order to stimulate increased population. As of May 15, 1952, United States average prices for these commodities were above the higher 1952 support levels.

Supplies of these commodities is important to the well-being of farmers and consumers. I am confident that if future developments would result in imports in such volume that the interest of our farmers were seriously threatened, remedial action should be taken under section 22.

I should like to call to your attention that restrictions on these grains would primarily affect exports from Canada. Canada is one of our largest markets for agricultural products, and any hindrances made between the two countries would have harmful effects on this mutually beneficial trade.

The committee's conclusion, set forth on pages 22 and 23 of the committee's report, was that the present provision, in its restrictive and inflexible form, might result in injury to the American export trade, and to American producers dependent on the export trade. This conclusion was based on the testimony presented by the National Cotton Council, the American Farm Bureau, the Boston and Philadelphia Chambers of Commerce, the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, and other associations, including a number of agricultural people.

In the last debate on this subject, I presented the figures with regard to agriculture, itself, and the situation is very clear. I put into the RECORD statements by the Farm Bureau Federation, backing them up with statistics from the Department of Agriculture, that we export roughly about two and one-half times as much in the way of agricultural commodities as we import. What the sponsors of this amendment are trying to do is to sacrifice the agricultural interests to one small segment of our economy, and largely I think because they were fortunate enough to acquire the services of the most astute lobbyist, in my opinion, that Washington has ever seen. I think we are all willing to agree that Mr. Holman knows his way around better than any other lobbyist. He is persistent. I give him credit for that. He is at this moment standing in a room nearby to see whether there are any questions he might be called upon to answer or to note any contributions I may make to this debate.

Mr. MUNDT. And he is reliable.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I give him credit for that. But this particular amendment involves a great deal more than the items to which it refers. What is being done is to recreate the same atmosphere that existed in connection with the enactment of the Smoot-Hawley tariff, following World War I. This amendment is much worse, I think, even than a high tariff. Section 104 sets a limit on the importation of certain commodities, cheese in particular, which has been the article which has caused all this trouble. The level of the importation of cheese is substantially less than it was some time ago. I think importations are about 20 percent less than they were in 1939, although in the meantime the consumption of domestic cheese has increased very greatly. It is well over a billion pounds now. The total amount of all imported cheese is less than 5 percent of the American consumption.

Mr. MOODY, Mr. THYE, Mr. MAYBANK, and Mr. LEHMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, does not the distinguished Senator from Arkansas desire to point out that related to this amendment is feed grain, so that the cost of production of meat and other products, including milk and other dairy products, themselves would be increased by this amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Very definitely it would. It would be bound to increase; in fact, its purpose is to increase the cost of feed grains. It was made clear in the statement of the Senator from North Dakota that the purpose was to keep the price of feed grains up. So, all the dairy farmers in the New England States would have to pay "through the nose" if this amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. MOODY. Is it not also true that more dairy products are exported than are imported into the United States?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. The importation of dairy products is not large.

Mr. MOODY. Is it not therefore logical that this amendment would actually decrease the markets of the farmers of the United States, rather than increase them?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There can be no question of that. The Farm Bureau Federation has offered extensive testimony on that subject. I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have long been interested in the dairy industry in my State and in the dairy industry of the Nation. I may say that no man had more to do with working out the Federal-State accord, which has made the prices of dairy products as high today as they have ever been in the history of the industry. But for the life of me, I am unable to see that there could possibly be any advantage to the dairy industry in putting an embargo on feed for cattle, such as oats, rye, barley, and wheat. It would seem to me that it would be very much to their detriment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is already a shortage of those grains.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. This is simply for the RECORD. I have been asked to get this on the RECORD. On page 22 of the report from the Committee on Banking and Currency accompanying Senate bill 2594 there appears the following statement:

> Items which are not directly competitive with one another should not be barred from import merely because their importation might have an indirect but remote effect upon other articles of commerce covered by the criteria for import controls set forth in this section.

It is my understanding, based upon the hearings before the committee, that this statement was intended to exempt from import controls certain noncompetitive varieties or types of a commodity, such as certain varieties or types of cheese, although other varieties or types of the same commodity may be competitive with similar domestic varieties or types and thereby subject to import control.

Would you be kind enough to advise me whether my understanding of that phase of the report is correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite right. The testimony in the hearings was quite clear, that the amount of cheese, particularly the cheese referred to by the Senator from South Dakota, is not competitive with sheep's-milk cheese, and it is quite different in quality, price, and in every other way.

Imported Swiss cheese averages from 50 percent to 100 percent more in price than the domestic article. It is quite a luxury item. The only item which could possibly give any concern in the beginning was blue cheese from Denmark, which is competitive in price. Imports of it amount to approximately 3,500,000 pounds, as against well over a billion pounds of our domestic production of cheese. I would say the competitive feature is so infinitesimal that no one should be concerned. In my opinion, no one is seriously concerned except a few, I think 20, blue-cheese manufacturers; but they are able to generate all this interest, primarily through Mr. Holman and his associates.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. MAYBANK. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three minutes to the proponents, one minute to the opponents.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I understand an amendment is going to be offered to this amendment, on which the Senator from Illinois desires to speak for 5 minutes, and, if agreeable to the Senator from Arkansas, it is agreeable so far as I am concerned that 5 minutes be allowed to each side. If agreeable to the Senator, I shall ask unanimous consent that we vote at one time on both amendments, rather than have another debate for about 15 minutes, about nothing but sheep and goats.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have been endeavoring to obtain recognition. If only 5 minutes more were allowed for debate on each side, that would preclude me from making a remark or two on the pending question. So, if a unanimous-consent request were made, perhaps it should be a request that 10 minutes be allowed to each side, in order that I might be permitted to speak for at least 2 or 3 minutes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota. I have watched people milk goats and sheep.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency that I have never had any experience in milking goats or sheep, and I do not want to be so classified, but I know that there is an absolute need to safeguard the American producer against the influx of imports we can expect because of the support-price program which is on the statute books, and which maintains agricultural prices at a certain level. Monetary values in the United States are higher than those in foreign nations. Therefore, the foreigner can pay the small duty required to ship to this country and can realize more for his product, even though he pays the tariff and the freight, than he could realize in other world markets. Without an embargo, there will be imports of cheese and other dairy products, such as powdered milk, canned milk, and butter.

With reference to pork prices, I have a report from the Central Livestock Association of South St. Paul, Minn. In January hogs weighing 180 to 240 pounds sold at from $17.50 to $17.60. It was only 4 years ago that farmers received $28 a hundred for the same type of pork. The farmer was then buying a tractor for $1,700, and today he is paying $3,000 for the same type of tractor.

Imports of fats and oils cause detriment to our farmers. If we lift embargoes and levy meager tariffs against foreign products, we are going to see the American farmer destroyed. If the Democratic Party is so generous with the foreigner that it is going to destroy the American farmer, it is high time the American farmer found out about it.

Here is the price report on hogs in April 1952, showing that hogs weighing 190 to 200 pounds sold for $16.75 to $17.

How long is the farmer going to produce pork at such prices? Not only Danish hams, but Polish hams, are being imported into this country. There are imports of cheese——

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. Would the Senator feel that luxury cheeses which are sold at prices higher than American cheeses would imperil the American market?

Mr. THYE. Any cheese that comes in will imperil the American market, because it displaces domestic cheese.

Mr. FLANDERS. It may be that the person who wants luxury cheese will not buy American cheese.

Mr. THYE. I can only answer my very dear friend from Vermont by saying that there is no type of imported cheese that is any better than the cheese produced in this country. The American cheese is just as good in quality, just as good in texture, and just as edible, if not more so, than imported cheese. It is only a matter of habit. Invariably the foreign product can be bought more cheaply than the domestic product.

The producers of dairy products in Minnesota who produce for the fluid milk markets of Minneapolis and St. Paul on May 9, 1952, sold base grade A milk for $4.36 a hundred pounds, with 3½ percent butterfat, comparable to the grade A milk on the Washington market. The producer received 8.7 cents a quart for the milk, or less than 9 cents a quart. He must divert some of it to the manufacture of cheese in the Midwest area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. FLANDERS. Then, Mr. President, may I ask a question in thin air?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] had some time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 5 minutes.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, may I have 15 seconds of the Senator's time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. FLANDERS. I desire to raise the question whether it is not a new idea in the protection of American producers to protect them against imported products which sell for a higher price than domestic products?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not want to dissipate the time by answering the Senator's question.

There are eight or nine countries which are under license and which are importing goods into this country. They have a very facile and sumptuary way of devaluing their money, and the advantage is on their side. We cannot compete with them.

It has been said that there is protection for farmers under section 22 of the Triple A Act, and under section 7 of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

If we take a look at section 22 we find that the damage has to be done before we can get any remedy, as a matter of fact. Then it is a long-drawn-out process.

When it comes to section 7 of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, there

first has to be an interminable investigation by the Tariff Commission before any relief can be had. In the meantime, the damage can be done.

Mr. President, I am interested in the dairy industry—and may I say to my friend from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] that it is not Mr. Charlie Holman who is waiting for me. I think the Senator's statement was rather unbecoming, and I think it should be taken from the RECORD.

Mr. WILEY. So do I.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have known Charlie Holman for over 20 years; there are home folk who are interested in dairying in Illinois, Wisconsin, and elsewhere, and I think it is not in accordance with good conduct to attempt to make it appear that there is a lobbyist standing outside the door——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I cannot yield. The Senator mentioned Mr. Holman, and I did not think it was in good taste.

The number of milk cows has decreased by 4,300,000. How long will it be before the industry is liquidated? The number of milk cows was up to 27,700,000. I do not blame the farmer for liquidating his dairy herd. If the policy of the country is against him, how is he going to make out? If I were a farmer under those difficulties, I would sell my milk cows and go out of business.

We go through the business of taking surpluses from the market. From 1949 to 1951 we took 240,000,000 pounds of butter off the market. Under our surplus program we took 235,000,000 pounds of cheddar cheese off the market from 1949 to 1951. The Government started buying a large quantity of cheese last September when we were discussing this very question in the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. President, I think there is enough Americanism in me to want to make sure that we are not going to liquidate a great industry that is indispensable to the health of this Nation. Some folk become awfully sensitive and think that perhaps we are subservient to Communist propaganda if we put a limit on importations. I think the time has now come to stand up a little for an industry that will not be entirely liquidated. I am not being extreme about it, but at least it is going to be damaged, and I do not want to see it damaged in a country where there is a rising population and a diminishing dairy herd.

Mr. President, those are the arguments I can commend to the Senate. I hope there will be a favorable vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]. If present and voting the Senator from Washington would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—36

Aiken	Dirksen	Millikin
Bennett	Dworshak	Morse
Brewster	Ellender	Mundt
Bricker	Ferguson	Nixon
Bridges	Frear	Schoeppel
Butler, Md.	Hendrickson	Taft
Butler, Nebr.	Hickenlooper	Thye
Byrd	Ives	Watkins
Cain	Jenner	Welker
Capehart	Kem	Wiley
Case	Martin	Williams
Cordon	McCarthy	Young

NAYS—46

Anderson	Hunt	Neely
Benton	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Douglas	Kefauver	Robertson
Eastland	Kerr	Saltonstall
Flanders	Kilgore	Smathers
Fulbright	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Gillette	Long	Smith, N. J.
Green	Maybank	Smith, N. C.
Hayden	McCarran	Sparkman
Hennings	McClellan	Stennis
Hill	McFarland	Tobey
Hoey	McKellar	Underwood
Holland	Monroney	
Humphrey	Moody	

NOT VOTING—14

Carlson	Knowland	McMahon
Chavez	Langer	Murray
Duff	Lodge	Russell
Ecton	Magnuson	Seaton
George	Malone	

So Mr. MUNDT's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with. It is on the desks of all Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be read.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. The Senator from Tennessee asks that the amendment be read.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Is it long?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Not too long. I have no objection to having it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill, it is proposed to insert the following:

That section 402 (d) (3) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (act of September 8, 1950, ch. 932, title IV, sec. 402, 64 Stat. 803, as amended by the act of July 31, 1951, ch. 275, title I, 65 Stat. 134), is further amended by striking the proviso at the end of the second sentence and substituting, in lieu thereof, the following: "*Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of this title, in establishing, maintaining, and adjusting ceilings on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock and livestock products, or on the distribution thereof, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing and distributing of such products; and equitable treatment shall be accorded to all such processors and distributors. For the purposes of this paragraph a margin shall not be deemed to be fair and equitable for a processor if it is below the highest margin received by him between January 1, 1950, and June 24, 1950, or, in the case of a group of processors, below the highest average margin received by a representative number of the members of the group during such period, adjusted in either case, for increase or decrease in all costs (other than prices paid for the agricultural commodities) occurring subsequent to the date on which such margin was received and prior to the effective date of the rule, regulation, or order, establishing such adjusted margin; and a margin shall not be deemed to be fair and equitable for a distributor if it reflects a percentage margin over the price or cost of the processed commodity lower than the percentage margin which he received during the period May 24, 1950, to June 24, 1950, or such other nearest representative date determined under section 402 (c), or, for a group of distributors, if it reflects a percentage margin over the price or cost of the processed commodity lower than the average percentage margin received by a representative number of the members of the group during the period May 24, 1950, to June 24, 1950, or such other nearest representative date, determined under section 402 (c)."

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, this amendment has just one essential purpose, and that is to define in direct fashion and clear terms just what we in Congress mean by the words "fair and equitable." These terms are used in several places in the Defense Production Act, but they are broad words, and thus subject to a wide range of interpretation. Two years of operating experience under the act have proven conclusively that we must define these words more specifically, if we are to insure fair treatment under the act to those regulated by it. This is especially necessary for the thousands upon thousands of small-business men who are processors and distributors of farm and food products, many of

whom are farmers themselves marketing their own produce, who have been mistreated by OPS and subjected to unwarranted cost squeezes through the delaying tactics and the misinterpretations which have been perpetrated under the act as it now stands.

The first sentence of section 402 (d) (3) of the act is a long one, setting forth the minimum level at which ceilings may be placed on prices at the farm level. The second sentence now states that any ceilings on products processed from farm commodities must be high enough to reflect these minimum farm prices and provides also that the margins allowed for the processing of such processed products must be fair and equitable for the processors. Presumably, the purpose here is twofold: First, to avoid a cost squeeze on processors of farm products which will jeopardize their ability to actually pay the minimum prices to farmers; and, second, to provide broad insurance that OPS will set ceiling prices which allow fair margins.

The proposed amendment is designed to make the second sentence of section 402 (d) (3) a little broader and much more specific, so that there can be no misunderstanding as to congressional mandate and intent. It is no part of the purpose of this amendment to bring about any fundamental change in congressional intent, or to weaken price-control authority in any respect. On the contrary, the changes which are herewith proposed for this second sentence rest on three or four of the basic purposes or intents of Congress, as I understand them, which we have tried again and again to express in the Defense Production Act. In brief, these purposes or intents are, first, we do not want ceilings at the farm level below certain specified points and we want to remove any obstacles which prevent farm prices from rising freely up to these points; second, we expect price ceilings on finished products to reflect fair and equitable margins; third, we feel, as witness the Capehart amendment—section 402 (d) (4)—that pre-Korea margins for manufacturers or processors, adjusted for dollars and cents cost changes since pre-Korea are fair and equitable; fourth, we feel that immediate pre-Korea percentage margins for wholesale and retail distributors are a sound guide to fairness and equity, as witness the Herlong amendment—section 402 (k); and, fifth, we are deeply concerned, as witness section 701 of the act, that we do not impose undue burdens on small-business enterprises.

The experiences of the processors and distributors operating under OPS price ceiling regulations, which have been brought to my attention time and time again, have convinced me that we need to make the language of the act more specific in order to be sure that we carry out these basic purposes. And that is all and it is exactly what this amendment is designed to do.

The first change which this amendment creates is the addition of distributors at wholesale and retail to the proviso regarding fair and equitable margins. The justification for this should be obvious. I will say quite frankly that there has been much difficulty encountered by people in the dairy industry, in production and the processing of dairy products. The distributing function must be performed in order to get our farm and food products to market. It is just as essential and often more costly than the processing job. In many cases the same business concern performs both processing and distribution. In any event, a margin squeeze on distributors represents just as serious a threat that farmers will not actually receive the full price which we in Congress want them to have as does a margin squeeze on processors. Also, Congress should be, and I am sure it is, just as concerned that distributing margins be fair and equitable as it is that processing margins be fair and equitable.

Certainly I know of no special bias that we should have toward processors, and no reason why we should knowingly discriminate against distributors or deny to them this degree of protection. The amendment proposes to say, therefore, processing and distribution, rather than just processing alone.

The second change is really not a change at all, but simply a transposition of the essence of the Capehart amendment—section 402 (d) (4)—and of the Herlong amendment—section 402 (k)—to this sentence for the sole purpose of making it clear right at this point what we mean by the words "fair and equitable." The effect of the change is simply to state right at this point that when we say "fair and equitable" margins for processors, we mean margins at least equal to those which the Capehart amendment specifies, namely pre-Korea adjusted for actual cost changes. Similarly, when we say "fair and equitable" margins for wholesale or retail distributors, we mean margins at least equal to those which the Herlong amendment specifies, namely the same percentage margins as pre-Korea.

I would be among the first to agree with anyone who argued that such a change or amendment as this should not be necessary. I would also be among the first to argue, however, that such an amendment is in fact very necessary in order to guarantee that congressional mandate is carried out. There is abundant evidence, in the absence of any specific definition of "fair and equitable" that these terms get defined automatically by OPS in terms of 85 percent of earnings before taxes in the three best of the four pre-Korean years 1946–49. At today's tax rates on corporate income, this means that "fair and equitable" means about 56 percent of the net income enjoyed in the three best of the four pre-Korean years. In other words, "fair and equitable" means a 44-percent profit squeeze unless the terms are defined.

If this type of profit control and margin squeeze is what we in Congress meant by the terms "fair and equitable" then why did we amend the act in 1951 to incorporate the Capehart and the Herlong amendments? The answer is simply that we did not mean or intend that the terms "fair and equitable" should be defined or interpreted to mean profit control. The Senate Banking and Currency Committee in its report has made it even clearer than before that pre-Korea margins plus cost increases since pre-Korea is fair treatment for processors, and that pre-Korea percentage margins represent fair treatment for distributors. That is all this amendment says. But, it says it right at this point where we specify that margins shall be fair and equitable.

There was an excellent illustration only last week of the need for the type of clear language which this amendment represents. The office of one of our northern New England Senators was asked by the representative of a farmers' cooperative which happens also to be engaged in fluid-milk processing and distribution to find out whether its operations came under the Capehart amendment or the Herlong amendment. Both seemed to apply, yet the cooperative had not been able to obtain any ceiling or margin adjustment on either basis. The Senator's office was told, in a tone of greatest sincerity that this was a very complex problem. The legal staff of OPS, so the Senator was told, had been studying and pondering since August 1, 1951, whether milk dealers came under Capehart or Herlong. As of today, they still have been unable to resolve this question. The net result is that they have given the milk industry the benefits of neither amendment. As of today, the margin adjustment policy for milk is to deny pre-Korea percentage mark-ups and to allow margin adjustments on a dollars-and-cents basis, not for all cost changes as the Capehart amendment specifies, but only for cost increases for labor and containers. I want Senators to note this point particularly. This means that cost increases since pre-Korea must be absorbed by milk dealers to the extent that such increases represent higher costs for tires, trucks, gasoline, depreciation, rent, local taxes, repairs, advertising, selling, transportation, heat, light, power, rent, interest, or a hundred other cost categories.

I submit that when we voted last summer to extend the price control authority for another year, we expressed at that time our clear intention that we were not delegating to OPS the authority to squeeze margins and to control profits. We enacted an emergency excess profits tax for the latter purpose and it is a very high tax. Certainly, we do not need to buttress it with other regulatory powers to keep profits down. We voted instead a 1-year extension of price control authority, stating that price controls should be used only when necessary, and that specific standards of fairness should be observed in the exercise of this authority. Our experience has shown that we did not set forth in the act adequate safeguards that this control authority should confine itself to these specified limits. This amendment represents an attempt to redefine those limits—but not to change them. It represents a simple attempt to define "fair and equitable" by relating those words specifically to the essential meaning of the Capehart and Herlong amendments.

Mr. Arnall in his letter of May 19, 1952, to the chairman of the Senate Banking

and Currency Committee on the proposed amendment regarding State minimum price laws, for example, implied very clearly that the Herlong amendment specifying pre-Korean percentage margins is applicable to retail and wholesale distributors. Yet we are told by the lawyers in OPS that after 10 months' study they still are unable to resolve this complex problem of whether Herlong or Capehart applies. They have compromised by not applying either one. Fluid milk handlers in several of our New England areas presented petitions to OPS last September, using July 1951 cost data for comparison with pre-Korean cost data. When they finally got their margin adjustments, one market as late as May 1952, the adjusted margins covered only their cost increases for labor and containers, and not their other costs, as the Capehart admendment requires up through July 1951.

In a business which is as freely competitive as local food processing and distribution, with thousands of local independent businesses including proprietorships, partnerships, cooperatives, and corporations, it is almost impossible to obtain detailed cost and price data from every single business unit in the industry. Some have gone out of business since pre-Korea and other new ones have come in. Many such businesses balance their books only once a year, are too small to have a regular accountant on their payroll, and generally keep books only for income-tax purposes.

If price or margin relief for an industry in a local area is delayed until unit cost and price data are filed with OPS from every single concern in the industry, it will mean a delay up to a year's time in many cases or it will mean that there will be no relief. In many cases in the openly competitive local markets, no business concern can increase its prices, or margins unless the general market level moves up. If one or more concerns is not permitted to raise its prices, therefore, this may very well prevent any concern from doing so. This provides another very effective sabotage, therefore, of the clear intent of Congress, unless we make it clear beyond question that adjustments for the entire industry shall be granted when information is available from a majority of those in the industry and such information indicates that such an adjustment is warranted under the provisions of the act.

An example of what has been done by OPS under the act as it now stands is furnished by General Overriding Regulation 21, issued December 5, 1951, and designed to carry out the Capehart amendment. It is worth noting first that it took from August 1, 1951, to December 5, 1951, just to work out the procedure, which is delay with a vengeance. Under this regulation 21, each individual concern has to file and apply for relief. Those with over 1,000,000 sales apply to Washington, those under 1,000,000, apply locally. Five and one-half Federal Register pages are required to print this regulation and to spell out all the detailed cost and earnings data required to accompany each firm's application. The "statement of considerations" accompanying the regulation takes another two pages, admits that the regulation is complex, imposes a heavy administrative burden, and may well yield different results for different sellers.

Mr. Arnall, in his May 19 letter to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], deplores the situation where, under State minimum-price laws, the highest cost seller sets a market pattern, but at the same time this regulation 21 makes the lowest cost seller set the market pattern; neither actually happens in actual business practice, generally speaking, and one extreme would be as bad as the other. This amendment would use the average of a majority of the market.

I hope the Senate will accept the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I heard the amendment being read. Does it apply to the average margin in the periods of time set forth or to the highest margin?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. It applies to the average. It should be neither the highest nor the lowest. It applies to the average, as I understand and as it has been represented to me.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thought the amendment referred to the highest.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. On page 2, line 6, the term "highest margin" is used. I wondered about that. In line 9 the term "highest average margin" is used. I wonder why it should be the highest.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. It should be the highest margin.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. How can it be the highest?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. It should not be the lowest, certainly.

Mr. FERGUSON. Should it not be the average?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I would have no objection to making it the average margin between those dates.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is what it ought to be, apparently.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Yes. I understand your position.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the Senator willing to amend his amendment by inserting the word "average" in place of the word "highest"?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I would accept that modification of my amendment if it is not below the average margin between January 1, 1950, and June 24, 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The Senator from Kansas modifies his amendment accordingly.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to understand what the distinguished Senator from Kansas is accepting. Does he modify the amendment to read the average price in February 1950, or in February 1951?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I will say to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina——

Mr. MAYBANK. It has not been mentioned, but it should be remembered that the agricultural laws apply to milk and milk products, and also that parity is involved.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I may say that even in section 3 of the act those express dates are used for other commodities. Therefore I wonder why it would not be necessary to do so likewise for the dairy industry.

Mr. MAYBANK. My information is that milk has not reached parity. The Government is not buying milk. Certain prices are mentioned in the control law. I have asked that question because I do not know the answer until I find out. Under what conditions is the average price to be applied? I understood the Senator from New Hampshire or the Senator from Massachusetts to suggest the use of the average price. I should like to know what date for the average price is to be used insofar as milk is concerned and how it would relate to the parity price.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. In the section of the act, as I read it——

Mr. MAYBANK. If the Senator will bear with me, I should like to ask him what section he is referring to.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have before me the original act. I am reading from page 8, which reads:

> No ceiling shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity below the highest of the following prices.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I continue to read:

> The parity price for such commodity, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture—

And so forth. Certainly I will say to the distinguished Senator that it will be the responsibility of someone to determine it.

Mr. MAYBANK. We have several copies of the act before us. I have before me the 1950 act, as amended. Would the Senator from Kansas tell me which section he has in mind? We had a long argument about it, as the Senator will remember, and I accepted some amendments from the dairy interests which at the time I thought would protect them.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. It is Public Law 774, Eighty-first Congress, chapter 932, second session. I was reading from page 8. I do not understand you.

Mr. MAYBANK. Unfortunately, we have various revisions of the act.

I have section 402 before me. Is that the one?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I believe it is if it is the same document that I have referred to. I thought it was important enough to bring the matter to the attention of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Kansas indicate how he wishes to modify his amendment?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. The change would be made in the second paragraph of section 3——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Kansas will yield to me,

I wish again to call his attention to the fact that this is what the law says:

No ceiling shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity below the highest of the following prices.

With that I agree.

The parity price for such commodity, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the Agricultural Adjustment Act—

And so forth. I would never be willing to agree to what the Senator from Massachusetts or the Senator from New Hampshire suggested, namely, the average price, because the law says that it must be the highest price, and that is what it should be in my judgment.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. That may happen to be the view of the Senator from South Carolina; section 402 (d) (3) of the Defense Production Act is the one that is sought to be amended.

Mr. MAYBANK. But if the Senator from Kansas will go further to subsection (1), under subsection (d), and subsection (3), under subsection (d), and if the Senator will bear with me on subsection (3), under subsection (d), I should like to read part of the provision to be found at that point. It is as follows:

No ceiling shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity below the highest of the following prices: (i) The parity price for such commodity, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture—

And so forth, and so on—

or (ii) the highest price received by producers during the period May 24, 1950, to June 24, 1950, inclusive—

And so forth. I am not going to vote to change any agricultural law for the dairy industry or for anyone else. This law applies to every agricultural commodity in the United States.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. It is not my intention to have such a change made.

Mr. MAYBANK. But I understood some Senator to say that the "average price" was to be substituted. I do not say the Senator from Kansas said that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kansas has expired.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, may the Senator from Kansas have the time which remains in opposition to the amendment, because we wish to have this matter discussed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas desire further time?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. No, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas desire to modify the amendment?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I modify it by inserting the word "average."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is that word to be inserted in lines 6 and 9, on page 2?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. It is to be inserted on page 2, in line 6, and also in line 9, where the word "highest" appears.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Kansas. [Putting the question.]

The amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further amendments to be proposed?

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further amendments to be proposed, the question is agreeing to the committee amendment as amended. [Putting the question.]

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida will state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. What is pending at this moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment as amended.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, let me say that when the question was just put on that proposition, I voted "no," because I understood that the Senator from Florida wished to submit an amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I submit, and ask immediate consideration for, an amendment which is proposed by me in behalf of myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and the Senators from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK and Mr. WELKER]. It is an amendment to section 102.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Florida, for himself and other Senators, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, between lines 6 and 7, it is proposed to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 102. Paragraph (3) of subsection (d) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "No ceiling shall be established or maintained under this title for fresh fruits or vegetables."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, this amendment would simply provide that no ceilings could be made applicable under this bill to fresh fruits and vegetables. Of course, the words "fresh fruits and vegetables" would cover all the ordinary fresh fruits when marketed in a fresh condition, and also all the ordinary fresh vegetables. I shall briefly discuss the Irish-potato problem, because that particular fresh vegetable has caused the most trouble in recent weeks.

However, I call attention to the fact that this amendment relates to fresh fruits and vegetables in general, whose production is a very hazardous undertaking; this whole field of production is a highly hazardous one. All these products are highly perishable, and they are not storable. These products have never had Government price supports, with the exception of one of the commodities—namely, Irish potatoes—which is in the very unusual position of having had the former support price removed at the request of those who produce the crop. That action was taken because the potato growers were willing to "go it alone" and were willing to attempt to meet a situation which they knew was difficult, but which they did not know would become additionally difficult as a result of having a ceiling imposed by their Government which they were relieving of the burden of heavy price-support payments.

Under the conditions which have prevailed in the last few weeks, we have seen potatoes become so scarce in the market that the situation has become almost a tragedy for many persons. Certainly it has become a Nation-wide fiasco. We have seen the potato industry itself badly hurt because the producers found it necessary in many cases not to plant potatoes because they could not absorb the losses they would have encountered in the event they had to meet ceiling prices.

Mr. President, I remind the Senate that most of the vegetable producers grow more than one vegetable. If they take a loss on one crop which is not under a ceiling, they certainly cannot recoup any of that loss from the other crop they grow, if that crop is under a ceiling. The result is that they abandon the crop which is under the ceiling, and they concentrate all their production in the crops which are not under ceilings.

I hold in my hand affidavits from six different vegetable producers in the Okeechobee Lake area. These affidavits show the abandonment just this spring of 980 acres of land which were prepared for the production of potatoes, but were planted in another crop because those producers found they already had a loss on their fall crop, and they knew they could not recoup that loss if they planted potatoes and produced them under a ceiling. Therefore they simply had to abandon their production of potatoes and go to other crops.

Aside from the fact that the growers have been badly hurt, and aside from the fact that potatoes have disappeared from the market, I call attention to the fact that black-market conditions of the worst kind have already made themselves evident. It is so easy for such a situation to develop by means of tie-in sales and other means of avoiding the production controls. In fact, the situation has deteriorated to such an extent that the Washington office tells us that 450 cases of violations have already been reported, and 105 of those cases are already being prosecuted in court.

Mr. President, there is just no sense in creating a situation of that sort, and there is no sense in driving good people out of the production of crops on which there were support prices up to 2 years ago, but on which the producers elected to "go it alone" in the effort to be fair to their Government and to agricultural producers in general.

So hazardous in nature is this business and so completely nonstorable is the product and so completely necessary is it for the product to be moved quickly and competitively—and I remind the Senate that crops of this kind are produced in nearly every State of the Union, and there is keen competition between

areas, as well as between the individuals in each area—that it is simply unreasonable to continue the handicaps arising from the possibility of price ceilings on all fruits and vegetables, when price ceilings on them have not been brought into actuality, except in the case of one vegetable. In that case, the price ceiling has brought into existence such bad conditions that the entire Nation is ashamed of the situation which has been created by a bad law, badly enforced.

Mr. President, I now yield 7½ minutes to my distinguished colleague the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], who will allot the time among our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are joined with us in sponsoring or supporting this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Florida. I do not need to say anything about the OPS or what it has done to the production of potatoes in Idaho; I think everyone knows that situation. Suffice it to say that in many places in America one cannot buy a potato today.

Let me say that the OPS by its order has reduced the size of a No. 1 potato from 2 inches to 1½ inches, with the result that the producers of potatoes in Idaho were permitted to ship 2,000 carloads of culls to the consuming public in the East. As a consequence, poor potatoes were sold to persons who were paying the price which should have been paid for No. 1 Idaho potatoes.

What happened to the No. 1 potatoes, Mr. President? It is reported to me that all over our country the black marketeers are receiving from $300 to $800 a carload for potatoes which should be sold on the open market subject to the law of supply and demand and not controlled by OPS and its impossible restrictions.

Mr. President, like the Senator from Florida, who knows this subject well, I say that certainly these short-cycle crops must be decontrolled. The grower of fruits, vegetables, and potatoes takes a terrific gamble. If his crop fails because of weather or for another reason there is practically no chance for him to recover his loss. As I say, they must be removed from control by the Office of Price Stabilization, because no producer can take the gamble that is required of one who grows a short-cycle crop when it is subject to price controls.

For instance, my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] and I went to see Mr. DiSalle months and months ago before these controls went into effect. We told him exactly what would happen if the OPS price was placed upon potatoes in our country. We told him that the year before many Idaho growers had lost hundreds of thousands of dollars in trying to sell potatoes from our State. However, this arbitrary price was imposed. As a result, potatoes by the carload are being shipped to Canada, where there is no price ceiling, and the American people cannot buy one of the great products, Idaho produces.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

Mr. WELKER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not true that potatoes are practically a continuous crop during every month of the year, and that if controls had not been imposed, the problem of the potato shortage would have been solved long since, with a minimum of dislocation?

Mr. WELKER. That is correct. I may say that a crop of potatoes is harvested every 120 days.

Under the OPS plan, the State of Maine shipped to the Pacific coast more than 1,000 carloads of potatoes, and received for them, on the Pacific coast, a higher price than the Idaho growers could get even on potatoes sold in the State of Idaho or on the Pacific coast. OPS has destroyed our Idaho potato market and has seriously hurt our industry. This amendment should be adopted. We have no support prices for fruits, vegetables, and potatoes. Let us return to the formula of supply and demand.

Mr. President, in Idaho the Office of Price Stabilization has a payroll of better than $322,000 per year for office help alone. At the same time one of Idaho's greatest assets, namely, the potato industry, has been seriously injured. If we take away these controls the potato grower will produce a larger and better supply of potatoes. Prices will be stabilized and the black market which has taken potatoes off of the open market, will be done away with. I hope the Senate will pass this amendment, not only for the potato growers but for the fruit and vegetable industry, which is a large industry in the State of Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to support this amendment, because I think it is the best possible solution to the perishable-products problem. If we do not adopt this amendment, then there will be other amendments on specific perishable products, such as potatoes. I I think it better to have this blanket amendment on all perishable agricultural products than to have a series of amendments on individual perishable agricultural commodities.

It is a matter of regret, Mr. President, that I have to say what I now say in regard to the treatment that some of us have received from the Department of Agriculture and from OPS in regard to perishable products. However, the sad fact is, Mr. President, that we have run into nothing but incompetency and arbitrary action both in the Department of Agriculture and in the OPS in handling of perishable commodities. They have demonstrated to me time and time again that they cannot be relied upon to adopt a fair policy of controls for perishable products. They have been working great injustices on the farmers in connection with perishable products.

Mr. President, over the months I have endeavored to work cooperatively with the Department of Agriculture and OPS in connection with the problem which exists in Idaho, Washington, and Oregon in connection with premium potatoes.

I ran into a situation early this year in which I discovered that they had not even brought in a single producer for advice with regard to the potato problem which confronts us in the Pacific Northwest. I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that such incompetency and arbitrary action in the handling of perishable products now makes it desirable, and I think imperative that we proceed to take these perishable products out from under the control of the Department of Agriculture and OPS. In doing it, Mr. President, in my judgment we shall do a favor to the consumers of perishable products as well as to the producers. No harm will be done to the inflation-control program by the adoption of this amendment, because the very perishable nature of these products is in and of itself a natural control against the possibility of excessive prices. Where the crop is very good the price is bound to be relatively low because the farmer must sell these products quickly. Under those circumstances his prices cannot be inflationary. When the crop is poor he must get a relatively high price to meet expenses and a reasonable profit. The OPS officials have never seemed to comprehend the law of nature which controls the price of perishable products. We, therefore, should pass the amendment.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I now yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, one of the objectives of the Defense Production Act was to insure maximum production in order to curb inflationary trends. Last December, when the OPS announced the probability of placing price ceilings on potatoes, those of us who represent the potato-producing States pointed out that the inevitable result would be to force potatoes from normal marketing channels into the black market. Everyone knows that is exactly what happened.

One may pick up almost any daily paper and find headlines such as these: "Potato strike starts at Detroit with job truckers"; another one, "Federal grand jury investigates Detroit potato black market." Similar developments are reported from other cities.

Mr. President, one of the reasons for the potato industry having been completely demoralized—with the result that consumers have had available few potatoes even at high blackmarket prices—is that in 1950 we produced the last crop under the price support program. In 1951, this industry operated without price supports. Potato industry representatives in my State had advocated elimination of supports for a long time. I contend that so long as we have no price supports or floors for potatoes it is not economically sound to adopt price ceilings which make it impossible for the producers of potatoes to make an average profit. If he loses money in one year, certainly he cannot recoup losses in another year, when there are price ceilings which prevent such profit.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DWORSHAK. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho has but 1 minute remaining.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I am not only concerned about the producer because I believe the consumer of potatoes is entitled to an adequate supply at reasonable prices.

However, the OPS, under the price ceiling issued on January 19 of this year, set up artificial obstacles and road blocks which have so disrupted the potato industry that, while we have faced shortages during the past few months, the likelihood is that we shall face even greater shortages when the current year's crop is harvested.

Mr. President, I believe that we can render a real service not only to the producer but to the consumers of potatoes, and not force them to eat substitutes, if we can encourage a maximum production, and thereby insure adequate supplies at reasonable prices. The OPS has forced most of the Idaho potatoes into the black market, and for several weeks the average consumer has not been able to get potatoes at any price. That has been the net result of the OPS's bungling and meddling with the potato industry.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I now yield the remaining time to the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I desire to subscribe to those remarks which have already been made by those Members who are joining with Senators HOLLAND and me in sponsoring this amendment. I may say particularly that I endorse the remarks of the last speaker, the Senator from Idaho. Three weeks ago I was in Hastings, Fla., which is in one of our State's largest areas for producing potatoes.

I talked at that time with at least 15 or 20 farmers. I went out on their fields, where they pointed out to me their potato field. They said to me, "We are not going to dig potatoes at the OPS price; if we did, we would add to the loss which we have already suffered in planting, fertilizer, and cultivation." Those farmers also said they and many other farmers who they knew would not, under present conditions, ever think of planting a potato crop again. So far as the fruits and vegetables are concerned, they are a very small item in the total food consumption of this Nation. As a matter of fact, potatoes, which are the largest item under this list of fresh fruits and vegetables, constitute only about 6 percent of the total food consumption. We know that it is a very hazardous business which these farmers have. It is stated down in our State over and over again that a farmer expects to lose his crop about 3 years in a row, but, in the fourth year, if he is lucky, if the weather is good, if he does not suffer a hurricane, if he does not have some plant disease or insect sweep over his fields, then he may make a crop and be able to make enough money in that fourth year to pay for his losses in the preceding 3 years. Farming is a very hazardous business, particularly if the farmer grows crops classified as perishables. He cannot store them, he cannot hold them, he must dispose of them, he must sell at the price which is then offered. He has no price support, so he is the victim of the market. Now, if a Government agency puts a ceiling on the price a farmer can get for his perishables, then the farmer can be ruined, as has been the case of potato growers in our State. He is at the mercy of the bureaucrat, and if the bureaucrat does not understand the farmer's plight, then the farmer is ruined. Perishables are not proper items of controls. To continue to control them guarantees us a continuance of shortages, for the farmer cannot risk further uncertainties to those he already has.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], for himself and other Senators.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am wondering if the author of the amendment would accept a modification—to insert after the word "vegetables" the words "or any agricultural products"? I have in mind an example in Indiana. We grow corn, soybeans, wheat, and many other agricultural products. I am wondering if the Senator from Florida would so modify the amendment?

Mr. HOLLAND. I could not agree to it for two reasons. The first reason is that those crops are subject to price supports and the men who produce them do not undergo the risk that is undergone by those who produce fruits and vegetables.

The second reason is that they do not have to be moved in a few hours or a few days as perishable commodities have to be moved.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why should we decontrol vegetables and fruits and not decontrol other agricultural commodities?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The answer is because they are perishable. They cannot be stored as can most agricultural commodities. Therefore, they are in a particular classification. Fresh fruits and vegetables cannot be stored.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place, it is proposed to insert the following:

Section 102. Paragraph (3) of subsection (d) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "No ceiling shall be established or maintained under this title for fresh fruits and vegetables or other agricultural products."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I understand that a similar amendment was defeated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment to strike fruits and vegetables and limit the amendment to agricultural products.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read the amendment as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment as modified.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 102. Paragraph (3) of subsection (d) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "No ceiling shall be established or maintained under this title for agricultural products."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I would have to object to that, and would have to request a roll-call vote. We have defeated several similar amendments. The price of cotton is dependent on the Commodity Credit Corporation. The price of tobacco is dependent upon acreage. We cannot remove all ceiling prices on all agricultural products and at the same time have the Government deciding what acreages shall be planted. In all fairness, how can we take ceilings off agricultural products which are supported by law, when the acreage is limited by law?

I hope the Senator from Illinois will not press his amendment, in justice to the Commodity Credit Corporation and in justice to the former Secretary of Agriculture who is a Member of the Senate. I do not believe he would approve it. We are asked to take off ceilings on the one hand and to support prices on the other hand. That is a pretty big order. There is no better friend of the farmer than I am. I have voted for parity; I have voted for funds for the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am sorry I was not present a few days ago to vote in favor of the elimination of title IV from the bill. It seems to me the time has come to take off all price controls except possibly as to certain products which go directly into the defense program. I shall vote for the amendment, because I think it moves in the proper direction. Here is an administration deliberately stimulating prices, taking off all credit controls, spending Federal money to build up prices and hold up prices, and at the same time——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. What administration is holding up prices on agricultural products? Did the Senator from Ohio oppose price supports when the law was passed?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think the system of price supports has anything whatever

to do with price controls. Price supports are justified.

Mr. MAYBANK. I asked the Senator a question——

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has the floor.

Mr. TAFT. What was the Senator's question?

Mr. MAYBANK. What are we supporting today that the Senator thinks we should not support with reference to agricultural products?

Mr. TAFT. I am in favor of the price-support program. I think it is justified. It is justified in time of peace as well as in time of war. But it has no connection with the general price-fixing system itself. It is only a proposal to prevent agricultural prices falling to a point where agricultural purchasing power is destroyed and a serious depression may be precipitated.

Certainly the prevention of a depression is perhaps the most important economic problem we have to face. I do not think the question of price controls has anything to do with a general price-support system, fixing maximum prices.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is asked that the ceilings be removed from agricultural products. I agree with the Senator's theory of government, but, nevertheless, we cannot very well take ceilings off commodities we are supporting while we attempt to stabilize our economy through the use of controls. That is all I want to say to the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. I cannot yield any more time. We adopted a price-support system in the Aiken bill, in the Eightieth Congress. It was amended and carried on into the Eighty-first Congress. That has nothing whatever to do with the question of general price control.

Mr. Truman wanted prices controlled in time of peace, and we turned him down. Finally we granted it to him because there was a great emergency, a tremendous military program that was going to raise prices and create inflation. Apparently that emergency has passed, because prices are falling rather than rising. The administration itself is trying to stimulate prices by removing credit controls. It has removed credit controls from automobiles and other products, in order that consumer credit might operate to build up prices. It is utterly inconsistent to continue a price-control system when, as a matter of fact, the administration's policy is to try to stimulate prices, not to hold them down.

The inconsistency of this administration, it seems to me, is obvious. It seems to me perfectly clear that the general purpose is to send prices up so that we may have the greatest prosperity in November 1952 we have ever had. So long as the administration is pursuing that program, we do not need price controls, and I shall vote to take price controls off agricultural commodities.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I have been told that there is a larger amount of agricultural commodities in this country than has been reported by the Department of Agriculture. I believe the Department only yesterday or today increased its estimate of the carry-over of corn to some 50,000,000 bushels. Yet the grain trade reports that it is far below the actual amount which we have in this country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me illustrate to the Senate exactly what the Senator from Ohio has stated. Let us take one commodity for instance, eggs. Testimony before the committee was that as of February 15, the parity price of eggs was 78 percent of parity. A year ago it was 90 percent. Eggs are 11 cents a dozen lower than they were a year ago. The price of eggs has never been up to the ceiling. What has happened? The ceiling price on eggs is still maintained.

I have here information which comes from the Chicago Mercantile Exchange. On the 10th of April the Department announced it was going to buy 500,000 cases of eggs, to remove a temporary surplus. They refused to tell what price they paid for the eggs, and they are disrupting the egg market. Men from the Mercantile Exchange in Chicago have been here for the last 3 days, trying to get some satisfaction out of OPS, but it has been impossible to get any kind of definite action.

So, with money taken from the Treasury, 500,000 cases are removed from temporary surplus, while another agency fixes a ceiling price on eggs, and makes producers and others go through the harassment of maintaining all kinds of records.

Let us look at turkeys. It was testified before the committee that the price of turkeys was never up to the ceiling, and they are 4.2 cents below ceiling at the present time, and present production is higher than it ever was.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator remember one operator who testified that he and three of his employees had to spend one-third of their time making reports to the OPS, under the regulations?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do. Let us look at ducks. Ducks constitute one-half of 1 percent of all poultry that is sold. Yet a duck order was issued that was unworkable. It had to be withdrawn and changed three times. One firm lost $150,000 in that kind of deal. The same thing is true of turkeys; the same thing is true of chickens and eggs.

In my judgment, this matter has become rather farcical, and I think the time has arrived when controls should be taken off farm commodities, because controls are nothing but a nuisance. The American Farm Bureau Federation has been pleading year after year, not selfishly, but in the interest of uninterrupted, undisrupted agricultural production, that ceilings might be taken off.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The Senator will recall that when we were discussing the potato amendment, much was made of the fact that in the large production cycles price controls were particularly oppressive. But is it not truer to a greater extent that price controls in longer cycles are even more oppressive in any phase of the livestock industry? In the longer cycle, the risk is perhaps greater, and the oppression of price controls is correspondingly greater.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The logic applies to everything. Look at how farcical this thing has become. The president of Admiral Radio wrote me that, on their general model, the ceiling price is $304.95. However, Admiral sells it for $229.95. They sell it for $75 below ceiling. They would like to have the ceiling taken off. So the president of the company wrote to the Price Stabilizer. What kind of letter did he receive in return? This is what Mr. Arnall said to him on April 29:

> Your letter of April 25, advocating suspension of price controls on television, and so forth, has been referred to the OPS Study Committee on the Relaxation of Controls.

If Admiral charged the ceiling on that model, they would charge $75 more than they get for it in the retail market at the present time.

So, whether it be agriculture or anything else, the time has arrived when we should come to grips with this straitjacket that is on the economy of America. Everywhere in the country today markets are getting soft. Ask any banker who is on textile paper, furniture paper, or appliance paper. He is getting a little worried about it, and the Federal examiners are beginning to look at such bank paper with a rather baleful eye. We have done a lot of cheese paring here. We took the ceiling off fruits and vegetables. Let us go whole hog and do away with this type of regulation that has become an incubus on farmers.

Mr. YOUNG. Is it not true that practically all grains, oats, wheat, flax, barley, and rye, are not only below ceilings but below support levels?

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. What will be done with all the job holders making $9,600 a year?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have some concern in my heart for those merchants of the country who have been up against this harassment and nuisance so long. I am thinking also a little about the taxpayers. There were 11,460 employees on the rolls as of January. It was expected that there would be 12,500 on the rolls as of June 30, and it is costing the taxpayers $71,000,000 a year.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to remind my distinguished friends, the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Illinois, that most of the jobholders, so far as I know, are members of the Republican Party. I do not know to what party Mr. Charlie Wilson belonged; I am not sure. But I can assure Senators that as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency I have never been consulted as to who was to be appointed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not know what is the political persuasion of those who administer the affairs of OPS. I do know, however, that OPS is getting to be a real burden upon the country. Sooner or later this thing must be removed. We might just as well do it now as any other time, in the face of a constantly softening economy.

It was rather interesting to note the other day that Leon Keyserling, Chairman of the Board of Economic Advisers, indicated—and I hope I do him no disservice when I draw upon my memory as to what he said—that he thought probably some controls could be lifted, in view of the fact that the economy is beginning to soften up in various places.

I suggest that tonight, before we recess this session, we think about Mr. Keyserling. I suggest we reflect on the Federal Reserve Board. Already they have suspended regulation W on installment paper, and there is an amendment in contemplation to suspend regulation X relating to housing credit.

This is the responsibility of Congress, not the responsibility of a lot of appointed people, who set themselves up as economic emperors and economic czars in America. I have lifted my voice against this from the time I landed on the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I intend to continue to do so for those who are faint-hearted about it.

I may say that in the last month I have traveled from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the Dominion to the Gulf. Wherever I have mentioned this matter before very substantial audiences of American people, they have greeted the idea with gusto and with real enthusiasm. So let us have some spunk, let us take heart, and let us do this job. We are not doing it for Republicans; we are doing it for productive America. This is the time; this is the place.

Mr. MAYBANK. I cannot help appreciating the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, but I must oppose his amendment, and I hope he will not press for a vote on it.

I yield to the distinguished majority leader whatever time he may need.

I wish to remind Senators that this is a matter to which the Committee on Agriculture should attend, if we are to take off support prices. That is the business of the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from North Carolina. There is nothing in this amendment which has to do, for instance, with what the Senator from South Dakota has said about cattle, and I have great regard for him.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am sure the Senator does not want the RECORD to show that he said support prices. The Senator does not mean that this amendment or any other amendment has anything to do with support prices.

Mr. MAYBANK. Oh, yes, I do, because agricultural commodities which are protected by support prices, in my judgment, should have ceiling prices, when we have general price control.

Mr. CAPEHART. But what does the ceiling price have to do with the support price under the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. MAYBANK. That would be a long story. I could stand here and explain it. As the Senator from Indiana understands, I know something about farming, and I could go back to the support price on potatoes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Has any Senator on the floor today suggested that support prices be discontinued?

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not suggest that, but I understood that the senior Senator from Ohio suggested something about support prices the Eightieth Congress had imposed, when, as a matter of fact, we had such a law when Roosevelt was President. There was such a law on the books before I came to the Senate. There was a law I helped write when my distinguished colleague was in the Senate, and when the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] was in the House of Representatives.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have always found the able Senator from South Carolina to be very fair.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not want to be unfair.

Mr. CAPEHART. In this instance I think he is being unfair, because he is trying to leave the inference that some Senator suggested on the floor of the United States Senate that support prices ought to be eliminated. I do not believe it happened. I think the RECORD ought to show that it did not happen.

Mr. MAYBANK. If I made such a statement, I was only drawing an inference from what the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], for whom I have great admiration, said. He said that all agricultural price controls should be removed, in accordance with the amendment which was offered. I stated that I hoped the amendment would not be pressed.

Mr. CAPEHART. What he said was that he was in favor of taking price ceilings off agricultural prices, but he said nothing about eliminating support prices.

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not say that he said it. I said that all ceilings on agricultural products, many of which have support prices, cannot be removed when we have general price control.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, the Senator from South Carolina is the one who suggested it.

Mr. MAYBANK. I never suggested any such thing. The Senator knows better than that.

Mr. CAPEHART. I merely wish to keep the record straight. I know that the Senator from South Carolina does not favor the elimination of support prices. No Senator has so indicated on the floor of the Senate today.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I have tried to point out that the two things have nothing to do with each other. Support prices are justified and have been justified. They were in effect when there was no price control whatever. Their justification has nothing to do with price ceilings. This amendment has nothing to do with removing price supports. I never have advocated the removal of price supports.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me make it plain that I have never suggested that the distinguished Senator from Ohio, for whom I have great respect, as he well knows, advocated such a thing. However, I did believe, and I still believe, despite what the Senator from Ohio believes, that support prices and ceiling prices are rather tied together in the intricate economy of the present time.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am astonished to listen to a statement——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MAYBANK. I presumed that the Senator from Minnesota, who comes from an agricultural community, would ask me a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The question which I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from South Carolina is this: Am I to understand that he is endeavoring to tell us that the price-support program with respect to agricultural commodities has any relationship to the ceiling prices which have been established by OPS? In the past year agricultural commodities have been——

Mr. MAYBANK. The amendment which was recently adopted with respect to fresh fruits and vegetables concerns products which have no price supports, and are also products which cannot be stored. Commodities which have support prices and are capable of storage must be subject to price control if we are to have economic stabilization. Commodities which do not have price support are in a different category from agricultural products which have prices that are cushioned and supported.

Mr. THYE. I am sure the distinguished Senator from South Carolina was not trying to associate ceiling prices with support prices, because the two have no relationship.

Mr. MAYBANK. They certainly are related during a period when we have wage and price control. As the Senator from Florida so well stated, and as the Senator from Idaho so ably stated, there are certain hazards involved in planting potatoes or fresh fruits and vegetables. They are in a different category from a commodity with floor prices.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield about a minute to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. No; I promised to yield first to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND]. After that I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, the Senate does not want to march up the hill and then march down again. The Senate voted on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and rejected it.

What would it mean if we were to exempt agricultural products? I come from an agricultural State. I should like to please my people, if possible, and to help them if I can. But I do not think I could go back to Arizona and tell them that I voted to take the ceiling off agricultural products without taking it off livestock. And if we take it off livestock and take it off agriculture, I do not believe that other Senators can go back to their home States and tell their people, "We have left price ceilings on manufactured products and other things."

Mr. President, we must use some common sense. If we are to remove price ceilings from one product, we must remove them from other products. I can appreciate what the Senator from Illinois wants to do. He wants to kill the entire program. He so stated. He said that it ought to be killed. If that is the way Senators believe, they should vote accordingly, and remove price ceilings from all agricultural products.

What would that mean to the people? What would it mean to the agricultural population? If the prices of agricultural products should go up, prices of farm implements, which the farmers must buy, would also go up. Prices of labor would go up, and the spiral would continue to climb. No program is any good if it is not a complete program.

That is all there is to it. If we do not remove price ceilings from copper, how can I go back to Arizona and say, "We removed price ceilings on agricultural products, but we did not do the same with respect to copper." Of course, those who buy copper, those who manufacture automobiles and other products, would not want to see the miners of Arizona receive more money for copper because it would mean that they would have to pay a higher price for copper, and they would have to pay a higher price for practically everything else.

Mr. President, it should be an easy thing to vote down this amendment. I should like to help the farmers of my State, if possible. It would not help them to vote half a bill. I submit that this amendment should be defeated overwhelmingly.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President——

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me for 2 minutes?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I do not think there is anything that requires price ceilings and price controls more than does food. People can get along without automobiles. They can get along without even the comfort of washing machines, and without many other things which go to make up the comforts of life. But there are two things which the people cannot get along without. They are food and shelter.

I voted against the amendment to change the date on which rent control should end, because I felt that rents were very important. But even rent is no more important than foodstuffs. I need not remind my colleagues that foodstuffs go into every home. They are the most important factor in the life of every family in the country, and particularly families of low or medium incomes.

As the distinguished majority leader has pointed out, I do not believe that I could possibly go home to my State and say, "Yes; we are continuing controls on manufactured articles, such as automobiles, but we are not continuing them on foodstuffs." So I hope this amendment may be roundly beaten.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

The Senator from South Carolina has 2 minutes remaining, and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has 1 minute remaining.

Several Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. My purpose in suggetting the absence of a quorum was that I had promised some Senators that I would suggest the absence of a quorum when another yea-and-nay vote was had.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—29

Aiken	Dworshak	Millikin
Bennett	Eastland	Mundt
Brewster	Ferguson	Schoeppel
Bricker	Gillette	Taft
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Thye
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Watkins
Cain	Jenner	Welker
Capehart	Kem	Wiley
Case	McCarran	Young
Dirksen	McCarthy	

NAYS—49

Anderson	Humphrey	Neely
Benton	Hunt	Nixon
Butler, Md.	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Douglas	Kerr	Robertson
Ellender	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Frear	Lehman	Smathers
Fulbright	Long	Smith, Maine
George	Martin	Smith, N. J.
Green	Maybank	Smith, N. C.
Hayden	McClellan	Sparkman
Hendrickson	McFarland	Stennis
Hennings	McKellar	Underwood
Hill	Monroney	Williams
Hoey	Moody	
Holland	Morse	

NOT VOTING—18

Byrd	Flanders	Malone
Carlson	Kefauver	McMahon
Chavez	Knowland	Murray
Cordon	Langer	Russell
Duff	Lodge	Seaton
Ecton	Magnuson	Tobey

So Mr. DIRKSEN's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I wonder how many more amendments remain to be acted upon. It is very evident that we cannot conclude action on the bill tonight.

Earlier I told various Senators that the Senate would remain in session until approximately 10 o'clock. Of course, under the unanimous-consent agreement it takes half an hour to debate an amendment, and then 15 or 20 minutes are required for the vote on the amendment, if the yeas and nays are ordered.

We could dispose of a short amendment in a few minutes, and I would not mind having a short one taken up at this time, if an amendment of that sort is now available.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. MCFARLAND. Does the Senator from Vermont have a short amendment to present?

Mr. AIKEN. Probably the amendment will not require more than half an hour's time, although I do not know how much discussion there will be in regard to it.

Mr. MCFARLAND. What is the amendment?

Mr. AIKEN. It is a proposal for a modified version of section 104.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the amendment relate to fats and oils?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; it is a revised version of the fats and oils amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, I have the utmost confidence in the Vice President and in the majority leader, and I wish to say that I hope very much that any amendment which is submitted will at least be germane and will not be one which in substance has already been voted upon. Four amendments which have been voted on have, under my interpretation, been substantially the same.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has already opposed the milk amendment; but if we are to vote on all sorts of amendments which are similar in substance, we shall be on this bill for another month.

If there is a general desire to have the Senate take a recess at this time, such a course will be agreeable to me; but I hope that on tomorrow amendments which, in substance, already have been voted upon will not be called up again, because in my humble judgment we have voted on substantially the same amendments at least three different times.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, my only thought is that we should not remain in session too late.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the amendment referred to would be one in the so-called 15-minute category; in other words, 15 minutes would be available to each side for debate on the amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. President, I hope Senators will not require us to go over and over the same subject by submitting substantially identical amendments.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I now submit the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not ask that the amendment be read. This amendment was intended to be proposed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. The amendment is numbered "5-19-52—A," at the bottom of the page. It is on the desks of the Senators. The amendment is a modified and more workable version of section 104, which was in the Defense Production Act last year.

The amendment offered by Mr. AIKEN is as follows:

On page 2, strike out lines 17 and 18 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: 'Import controls of fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, and soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products and coconuts and coconut products), peanuts, butter, cheese and other dairy products, and rice and rice products are necessary for the protection of the essential security interests and economy of the United States in the existing emergency in international relations and imports into the United States of any such commodity or product, by types or varieties, shall be limited to such quantities as the Secretary of Agriculture finds would not (a) impair or reduce the domestic production of any such commodity or product below present production levels, or below such higher levels as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary in view of domestic and international conditions, or (b) interfere with the orderly domestic storing and marketing of any such commodity or product, or (c) result in any unnecessary burden or expenditures under any Government price support program: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary of Agriculture after establishing import limitations, may permit additional imports of each type and variety of the commodities specified in this section, not to exceed 10 percent of the import limitation with respect to each type and variety which he may deem necessary, taking into consideration the broad effects upon international relationships and trade. The President shall exercise the authority and powers conferred by this section.'"

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it will be recalled that section 104 came into being because the United States, in order to obtain enough milk and other dairy products for our cities, established a price-support program, and that program was so attractive to producers in foreign countries that they began to ship dairy products into the United States by the tens of millions of pounds. I believe 10,000,000 pounds were included in the first shipment which arrived. That shipment was placed on the market, and dairy products produced in the United States then began to go into storage.

As a result, Congress enacted section 104, which required the Secretary of Agriculture to place quotas on certain imported commodities including dairy products when he found such imports were breaking down the support-price programs existing in the United States.

I am sorry to say that the Secretary of Agriculture did not apply this section as was anticipated by this body. The commodity for which he found it necessary to establish quotas happened to be cheese. The trouble originally arose from excessive imports of Cheddar cheese. However, the Secretary of Agriculture established across-the-board quotas on all kinds of cheese. He gave Italy a quota which was not used; he gave Switzerland a quota which was used before Christmas. But the Secretary of Agriculture did not see fit to allow Switzerland to import more cheese, even though Italy did not take advantage of the quota which was given to her.

This amendment provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall impose "import controls of fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, and soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products and coconuts and coconut products), peanuts, butter, cheese and other dairy products, and rice and rice products," as such quotas may be necessary to protect the price-support programs in the United States.

It is obvious that if we establish support prices in order to induce farmers to produce sufficient of certain commodities in the United States, we shall simply defeat the purpose if we permit the United States to become the world's dumping ground for imported commodities of those sorts.

However, the Secretary of Agriculture adhered so rigidly to across-the-board quotas for all types of cheeses last year—which was not in accordance with the intent of Congress; at least I am sure it certainly was not my intent, and I supported the amendment—he could have been more tolerant toward the producers of high-priced cheese coming from European countries—that certain difficulties arose and certain countries felt they were not treated fairly. Certainly cheese costing $1.50 a pound does not break down the price-support program for cheese that sells for 40 or 50 cents a pound; but the Secretary of Agriculture did not see fit to be more tolerant in that respect.

So the amendment provides for this year—

That the Secretary of Agriculture, after establishing import limitations, may permit additional imports of each type and variety of the commodities specified in this section, not to exceed 10 percent of the import limitation with respect to each type and variety which he may deem necessary, taking into consideration the broad effects upon international relationships and trade.

I still think the Secretary of Agriculture did not apply the cheese-import limitation as was intended by Congress last year, and I think he could under the amendment now proposed vary the amounts of the different types of cheeses allowed to be imported.

However, this amendment permits a tolerance of 10 percent, so that if a country finds itself in the position that Switzerland found herself last year, when her quota had been exhausted by Christmastime, the quota could be increased.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This amendment will vary from section 104 by placing in the Secretary of Agriculture discretionary power to the extent of 10 percent of the import limitations: and, in the second place, the amendment differs from the Mundt amendment which was submitted some time ago, in that this amendment does not include oats, grain, and several other items.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct; the amendment now pending does not cover those items, which included several types of grain. Neither is the pending amendment so rigid as was the Mundt-Young amendment. However, the amendment will allow the Secretary of Agriculture to increase import quotas 10 percent on any variety of cheese.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair ask the Senator from Vermont about the amendment he is offering. The clerk at the desk has called the attention of the Chair to the fact that the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont as amendment "A" is not the same amendment "A" that is on the desks of Senators. Wherein does it differ?

Mr. AIKEN. I obtained my copy of the amendment from the Secretary. The amendments were printed as intended to be introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has offered an amendment heretofore intended to be proposed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The reference is to an amendment to another bill.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not identical with amendment A, which has been on the desk of the staff.

Mr. AIKEN. I have five copies, which are all alike, and this is the one I want to offer.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, this amendment has been voted upon. I do not desire to take any time in opposition to it. I wish the Senate would vote. We have been voting on section 104 for a year, and every time we find another amendment. That is what I desire to call to the attention of the distinguished occupant of the chair. So let us get through. Let us stay here until 12 o'clock and get through with it.

When the Senator from Vermont concludes, I shall desire no time. I only ask that the Senate vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has the Senator from Vermont yielded to the Senator from South Carolina? [Laughter.]

Mr. AIKEN. No; I did not yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, in order that this may be charged to my time?

Mr. AIKEN. No.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont has the floor. He has a little bit of his own time remaining. All the Chair was endeavoring to do was to clarify the situation as to what amendment we were considering.

Mr. AIKEN. I identify this amendment as "5–19–52—A." Mr. President, I was about to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts. I now yield to him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I correctly understand that, whereas the present section 104 keeps out imports of oil, fats, and so forth, this amendment would allow discretion to the Secretary of Agriculture to let in some oil and fats, up to 10 percent, provided it would not effect our production or create an excessive surplus?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. The Senator from Massachusetts is entirely correct that this allows the Secretary of Agriculture to increase import quotas of any one variety up to 10 percent. I do not know that anything more need be said on this amendment. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina desire to use any time?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I do not desire to use my time. I hope we shall have a vote for the last time on section 104, which has been voted on to the best of my knowledge for over a year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. Senators favoring the amendment will vote "yea," those opposed will vote "nay." The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—38

Aiken	Ferguson	Saltonstall
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Brewster	Hoey	Smith, Maine
Bricker	Humphrey	Smith, N. C.
Bridges	Ives	Taft
Butler, Nebr.	Jenner	Thye
Byrd	Kem	Underwood
Cain	Martin	Watkins
Capehart	McCarthy	Welker
Case	Millikin	Wiley
Dirksen	Morse	Williams
Dworshak	Mundt	Young
Ellender	Nixon	

NAYS—38

Anderson	Hill	McKellar
Benton	Holland	Monroney
Clements	Hunt	Moody
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Flanders	Kerr	Pastore
Frear	Kilgore	Robertson
Fulbright	Lehman	Smathers
Green	Long	Smith, N. J.
Hayden	Maybank	Sparkman
Hendrickson	McClellan	Stennis
Hennings	McFarland	

NOT VOTING—20

Butler, Md.	Gillette	McCarran
Carlson	Kefauver	McMahon
Chavez	Knowland	Murray
Cordon	Langer	Russell
Duff	Lodge	Seaton
Ecton	Magnuson	Tobey
George	Malone	

So Mr. AIKEN's amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 4, it is proposed to strike "declaratory of existing law."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the texture of legislation is frequently vulgar. It is only because one such issue happens to be involved in the amendment submitted by the committee that I bring up the issue now, and not for the purpose of bringing comic relief at this hour of the night or presenting smoking room stories. But I ask the Members of the Senate to read page 4, of the committee bill, at lines 12 and 13, with some care, and I think they will find that there are exempted from price regulation "charges for the use of washroom and toilet facilities in terminal stations."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I decline to yield, temporarily.

Mr. President, it is quite within the power of this body to exempt such facilities from price control, but I invite attention to the fact that in line 4, on page 4, it is stated that this is "declaratory of existing law." It is that language, "declaratory of existing law," which I should like to have stricken.

The history of this particular situation is as follows:

In January of 1951, the Pennsylvania Railroad and the Grand Central Station increased the charges for pay toilets from 5 cents to 10 cents, and in washrooms with comb and toilet service from 10 cents to 25 cents. OPS advised the railroad and the Grand Central Station that they were violating the general price freeze which OPS had instituted, on January 19, 1951. The Grand Central Station which, incidentally, had raised its prices only the day before the price freeze was instituted, reverted to its previous charges of 5 and 10 cents, but the Pennsylvania Railroad which raised its prices some weeks after the price freeze insisted on maintaining the price of 10 cents and 25 cents, claiming exemption as a common carrier. OPS finally denied the exemption, brought suit, and the case went into the courts.

On the 28th of April a hearing was held, but judgment has not been rendered, so that the matter is now in litigation.

The amendment of the committee, adopted, I am sure, in an inadvertent moment, not only freed comfort stations and toilets from future price regulation, which is quite within our power, but it also committed the very grave constitutional dereliction of declaring that these changes were freed from regulation in

the past. In effect, what it may well do is to wipe out and eliminate the grounds for suit on the part of the Government against the Pennsylvania Railroad——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I shall not yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as I have said, the texture of legislation is frequently vulgar, but we have to deal with these issues. I think there is a very grave constitutional principle which is involved in this matter. [Laughter.]

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I shall not yield.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I shall not yield.

Mr. President, the fact that what we are now doing is to try to interpret language which was introduced in 1950 and to rule out of court existing suits amounting to $385,000, started by OPS against the Pennsylvania Railroad. I submit it is a matter for the courts of the country to decide what the law of 1950 is. I have searched the debates of that time, and I find no reference whatsoever to comfort stations or toilet facilities. This matter should be left to the courts, and we should not intrude upon judicial functions. It is the function of this body to pass laws for the future, but it is the function of courts to interpret laws once passed.

I am really concerned about the suit which has been instituted against the Pennsylvania Railroad seeking damages of $385,000, which might be ruled out of court completely if the phrase "declaratory of existing law" is retained. I believe we should respect the judiciary in these matters, and let them decide what the law of 1950 actually was.

Some notable jurists have commented on this very question. Chief Justice Marshall, in *Wayman* v. *Southard* (10 Wheat. 1, 46, 6 L. ed. 253, 263), said:

> The difference between the departments undoubtedly is that the legislature makes, the executive executes, and the judiciary construes the laws.

No less a jurist than Mr. Justice Holmes commented in *Prentis* v. *Atlantic Coast Line Co.* (211 U. S. 210, 53 L. ed. 150, 29 S. Ct. 67):

> A judicial inquiry investigates, declares, and enforces liabilities as they stand on present or past facts and under laws supposed already to exist. That is its purpose and its end. Legislation, on the other hand, looks to the future and changes existing conditions by making a new rule to be applied thereafter to all or some parts of those subject to its power.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. Is not the point at issue in the Senator's amendment the question of legislating at this time a direction to the Court to find a verdict upon an existing question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be adopted and that the words "declaratory of existing law" will be stricken out.

I yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator from South Carolina wishes to oppose the amendment——

Mr. MAYBANK. I understood the Senator from Illinois desired to strike out certain language about agricultural commodities.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator from South Carolina does not oppose the amendment——

Mr. MAYBANK. I do oppose the amendment, but I understood the Senator desired to eliminate all reference to agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator from South Carolina does not oppose the amendment, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is entitled to control the time in opposition.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the able Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, the proposed amendment to subsection (b) of section 103 of the bill before the Senate is merely a clarification of language in the present law which has within the last year been interpreted by the OPS in a manner not intended by the Congress.

I call attention to the report of the Committee on Banking and Currency, No. 2250, Defense Production Act of 1950, page 37, subsection 402 (f). This subsection exempts from price and wage control under this title certain categories of items. Number 5 under that subsection includes rates charged by any common carrier, indicating that it was surely the intent of Congress that those rates would not be controlled by OPS.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I shall yield when I finish my statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware declines to yield at the present time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will not the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield at the present time.

Mr. FREAR. The language of the present law exempts "rates charged by any common carrier or other public utility." Taken at its face, this exemption would seem to exempt all charges made by a common carrier in its capacity as a common carrier. The agency, however—and by "the agency" I mean the OPS—has taken the position that this exemption applies only to rates that are approved by a regulatory commission. Since the amendment was first agreed to by the committee, the agency has exempted by regulation the per diem charge for cars of one railroad used by another, the charges for heating and refrigeration service, and some few other charges which do not require the approval of regulatory agencies. So, we find that the agency has to that extent already conceded that some charges not having approval of a regulatory body properly come under the language of the exemption in the present law. However, there has been one lawsuit filed in Philadelphia against a common carrier to require that carrier to roll back its prices and to pay the amount of the increased charges for pay toilets and washroom facilities into the agency. This suit was filed before my amendment was offered and accepted by the committee. It seemed, at that time, to me and to a majority of the committee, that the suit should not have been filed and this clarifying language has been adopted in order to make that point clear. This policy of the OPS has been followed since the adoption of the amendment by the committee by the filing of a similar suit in Washington, D. C., against another common carrier, and other suits may be expected to be filed at many other places throughout the country unless the agency is given this clear-cut direction by the Congress.

The utter foolishness of applying price control to pay toilets in railroad stations is demonstrated best by reminding the Members of the Senate that in all stations that have pay toilets we likewise find free toilets, so there is no gouging of the public by the slight 5-cent increase because if a person feels that that's too much to pay for the toilet facility, he finds toilets adjoining that he may use at no charge whatever.

The agency has insisted that the railroads are not acting as common carriers in the furnishing of toilets, yet we find that in almost every State of the Union, railroads are required by law, or regulation having the force of law, to furnish toilet facilities for the use of the traveling public. In many States, railroads are the only persons required to furnish toilets. In one State—Indiana—the law reads as follows:

> All railroad companies operating lines through cities and towns of 100 population or more shall provide and maintain suitable waiting rooms, together with separate water-closets for men and women, for the convenience of the traveling public, and shall keep such rooms open for the period of not less than 1 hour next preceding the arrival of all passenger trains that are allowed by schedule or flagging to stop at all stations (Acts, 1895, ch. 51, sec. 1, p. 99).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Delaware has expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Delaware three more minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 3 minutes more.

Mr. FREAR. From the wording of this statute and others in effect throughout the country, it can easily be seen that they are required to furnish such facilities only because they are railroads and, consequently, the charges for the facilities should come under the exemption in the act.

I have heard some opposition expressed to the amendment on the grounds that charges made by a hotel which is owned by a railroad company would also come under the terms of the exemption of the clarifying language which is contained in my amendment. Such is not the case, and I think is not at all implied, but in order to satisfy any Members of the Senate who have such fears, let me say that I shall be happy to agree, and will ask the Senate to agree, to an amendment, if any Senator cares to propose it, which would add to the language of my amendment the qualification that the exemption shall apply to rates and charges of any common carrier "which

rates and charges are made in connection with or incidental to the performance of transportation service." I sincerely trust that the Senate will adopt the clarifying language of the amendment already approved by a majority of the committee.

Mr. President, I also wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that should this amendment prevail the port authority or the public utilities controlling the ports under the Knowland amendment would also be affected.

I call attention also to the fact that the Kennedy amendment of 1951, covering the same subject as does the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, was not accepted by the Congress.

I believe that OPS has declared inherent powers with respect to the telephone companies, although the Congress has denied it that right.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will not adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, how much time remains?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, how much time have I?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Four minutes remain to each side.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the able Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. BRIDGES] wished to have in the RECORD certain clarifications with respect to a number of points which have nothing to do with the pending amendment. He intended to ask me a few questions. I have obtained the advice of counsel, and have had the law checked. I desire to place the answers in the RECORD so that there may be no misunderstanding.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator from Indiana yielding 3 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire to ask the questions which he wishes to ask for the RECORD. I shall insert the answers in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator from South Carolina yielding back to the Senator from Indiana the time yielded to him?

Mr. MAYBANK. No. I am holding my time so that I may clarify the RECORD, in order that the minority leader may understand exactly how the Herlong and Capehart amendments apply.

Mr. CAPEHART. I withdraw the time which I yielded to the Senator from South Carolina and yield it to the able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 3 minutes. The Senator from Indiana has 4 minutes in his own right.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I address these questions to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency in order to clarify some phraseology in the act, particularly as applied to the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL].

The first question I wish to ask is as follows:

Is the so-called Capehart amendment supposed to apply to all processors, such as processors of food products?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; it does, in the opinion of the legal counsel whom I have consulted.

Mr. BRIDGES. Secondly, what about a processor who does his own wholesale and retail distribution? Does he come under the so-called Capehart amendment or the Herlong amendment?

Mr. MAYBANK. The best legal advice I can obtain coincides with my own judgment. It is to the effect that part of his business would come under the Capehart amendment and part under the Herlong amendment, assuming that processor could allocate his business according to whether, and to what extent, it constituted processing, and the extent to which it was wholesale or retail.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is it the intention to let the Capehart and Herlong amendments be the congressional standards of fairness and equity?

Mr. MAYBANK. I will say to the Senator that it is not my belief, nor the belief of the committee, in my judgment, that such is the case. I have been advised that the general provision with respect to fairness and equity is found in section 402 (c) of the law. That is in addition, of course, to the amendment which we have discussed.

Mr. BRIDGES. So far as the so-called Schoeppel amendment is concerned, the clarification given may to a certain extent take the place of the Schoeppel amendment, if the clarification becomes a part of the legislative history.

Mr. MAYBANK. If I understand the question——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield one additional minute to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall use some of my own time.

The Schoeppel amendment would change the cut-off date in the Capehart amendment for agricultural processors, as I tried to make clear when the distinguished Senator from Kansas offered his amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank my distinguished friend.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, how much time have I?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has 4 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we come back to the 1950 act, which exempted the rates charged by common carriers and other public utilities. Those rates were exempted because they were presumed to be regulated by State or other Federal authority. The Senate committee report on the 1950 act so states. However, prices charged in dining cars were not regulated by State or other Federal authorities, and they are under OPS, or at least may be subject to OPS control. The same thing applies to rates charged for the use of toilets in stations. Such rates were not under State or other Federal regulation and therefore were subject to regulation by OPS.

Consider the situation of the Grand Central Station, which is not a common carrier. Its rates for comfort stations will be subject to regulation by OPS. That will not apply to the institutions owned by the Pennsylvania Railroad, if we approve the language suggested by the committee. So, Mr. President, I think it would be much better to strike out this declaratory language with respect to existing law, and let the courts decide what the act of 1950 means.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A division is requested. Those who favor the amendment will rise and remain standing until counted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been asked for and declined. The demand for the yeas and nays was not sufficiently seconded. A division is now in progress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask for the yeas and nays the second time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Those opposed——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is in the midst of a division.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, no business has been transacted since the last quorum call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is in the midst of a division, and the suggestion of the absence of a quorum cannot be entertained.

Those opposed to the amendment will please rise and remain standing until counted.

The amendment is rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois withhold his suggestion for a moment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair had not recognized the Senator from Illinois. Therefore, he could not make the point of no quorum.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not see that anything would be gained by suggesting the absence of a quorum, when there is plainly a quorum present. I voted with the distinguished Senator from Illinois, but he did not have the

votes necessary to adopt his amendment. If there had been a yea-and-nay vote, he would not have had the votes.

Mr. President, I should like to ascertain how many amendments remain. This afternoon I made the statement that we would try to quit around 10 o'clock. I feel obligated to live up to my statement.

The present situation is an illustration of the difficult position in which a majority leader often finds himself. Along about this time of night certain Senators come to him and say, "Let us finish; let us continue until 12 o'clock." Others say, "Let us go home." So the majority leader is torn by the desire to please all Senators, which cannot be done.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Why do we not do what the Senator said we would do? The Senator from Arizona said we would adjourn at 10 o'clock.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not think that I should be reminded of anything like that. I resent the question of the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I apologize.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not yield at this time. I am trying to find out whether we can expedite the consideration of the pending bill. I should like to know how many amendments will be offered in addition to the so-called seizure amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for one moment?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to say to the majority leader that he is doing all right. We are getting legislative questions disposed of, and that is perfectly all right; and I am sure none of us will complain if we keep on grinding them out as we have done in the last few hours.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator very kindly. I should like to know how many amendments are still to be offered. I am advised there are approximately four. I should like to inquire whether the Senate would be willing to have the Senators proposing those amendments send them to the desk at this time, with an understanding that tomorrow the Senate will consider only those amendments, the seizure amendment, and amendments to the amendments. Otherwise, we would be considering amendments indefinitely.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona has made no request.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I shall make a request in a moment. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota for a question.

Mr. CASE. There is one other amendment which I had previously discussed with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. He may or may not offer it. At least I should like to reserve my rights in that connection.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that Senators may send to the desk the amendments which they desire to offer tomorrow, and that only those amendments and the seizure amendment, and amendments to the amendments, be considered tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I certainly think we need time to look over what I consider to be some of the great damage that has been done to the bill today, to ascertain what sort of repair work we may have to do tomorrow by way of amendments which may come to us between now and the time we complete our study of the bill. I do not believe that we would save any time by the adoption of the suggestion made by the majority leader. I do not think that we should prevent the Members of the Senate from taking a survey of what the bill looks like and determining what action must be taken. Therefore I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The attention of the Chair has been called to the fact that some Senators did not understand that the Chair had announced that the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] had been rejected. The Chair did announce the result of the vote. The amendment was not agreed to. If there is any doubt about it, the Chair announces again that the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] was rejected. The RECORD will show the announcement.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, June 5, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 4, 1952:

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

John E. Hushing, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the district of the Canal Zone. He is now serving in this office.

Benjamin F. Ellis, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Alabama. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 28, 1952.

Raymond E. Thomason, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Alabama. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 3, 1952.

Julius J. Wichser, of Indiana, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Indiana. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired April 26, 1952.

Rupert Hugo Newcomb, of Mississippi, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Mississippi. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 28, 1952.

Frank Golden, of Nebraska, to be United States marshal for the district of Nebraska. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired April 26, 1952.

William T. Brady, of New Jersey, to be United States marshal for the district of New Jersey, vice Hubert J. Harrington, term expired.

Gerald K. Nellis, of New York, to be United States marshal for the northern district of New York. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 6, 1952.

Clemens P. Michalski, of Wisconsin, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Wisconsin, vice Anton J. Lukaszewicz, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 4, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou infinite and eternal God, we rejoice that Thou art able and willing to give us the wisdom and strength which we need for the duties and responsibilities of each new-born day.

Humbly and reverently we are waiting upon Thee as we again hold counsel together in this Chamber. May we honestly seek to know Thy will and apply it to all our problems.

Grant that in spite of the contradictions and confusion of life and its fears and frustrations we may continue to trust that Thou art God over all, transcendent and triumphant.

Help us to place our confidence in Thy promises that Thou wilt never forsake the righteous and wilt always keep them in perfect peace whose minds and hearts are stayed on Thee.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7072. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. FERGUSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3276. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to assist Federal prisoners in their rehabilitation."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7340. An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and

supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requested a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. KERR, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. CASE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7340) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. FALLON, TRIMBLE, DEMPSEY, JONES of Alabama, DONDERO, MCGREGOR, and ANGELL.

THE TIDELANDS ISSUE

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post this morning carried a column by Mr. Marquis Childs which is representative of a total lack of knowledge or a gross misrepresentation of the tidelands issue. The article borders on propaganda tending to confuse the issues and to lend unqualified support to the Federal Government in an unconscionable theft of State property. I particularly call attention to the second and third paragraphs of this article. In speaking of the tidelands question, Mr. Childs refers to "vast oil wealth under coastal waters off California, Texas, and Louisiana." In treating this misrepresented subject he says, and I quote:

> Powerful interests pushed through a bill giving this wealth beyond the tidal line to the States off whose shores it lies.

Anyone having the faintest conception of the tidelands question knows that this is at best a half-truth and could easily be misconstrued and misunderstood. Mr. Childs does not attempt to name the powerful interests to which he refers. As a Texan and a stanch supporter of the legislation to correct the grievous wrong worked upon the several States by the unwarranted decision of the Supreme Court that undertook to underwrite this Federal grab, I say that the Federal Government never owned the tidelands off Texas' coast, does not own them now, and never asserted any claim to them until some power-seeking greed-conscious politicians thought they detected the smell of oil and gas in some of those lands. I further add that reference to powerful interests having anything to do with this legislation is a reflection on the Members of this Congress and an attempt to hide the true issues involved behind a smoke screen of unfounded insinuations. And if there are special or powerful interests involved, it is the duty of those who know the identity of these so-called interests to divulge their names and their activities to the American people. Let them come forward with the same kind of truth that the people of Texas have presented in this controversial issue. Mr. Childs' column reflects the same lack of knowledge or misrepresentation of the issues as the President's veto message.

TIDELANDS OIL BILL

Mr VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Texas, and to point out that the St. Louis Post-Dispatch quoted me in an editorial as not voting, and criticized other Members from Illinois for voting for the tidelands bill. I want the Post-Dispatch to know that I did vote on May 15 and am so recorded, for the tidelands bill. I have voted for all tidelands bills of the past, and I am proud of it.

Further, when they talk about taking away oil lands from the Federal Government the facts are the bill does not take anything away from the Federal Government. The bill only attempts to prevent the Federal Government from taking the submerged and tidelands away from the States, which they have owned for over 50 years. We in this Congress are only trying to prevent the Federal Government, that now owns one-fourth of the land of the United States, from going further in this encroachment against the States.

May I point out that General Eisenhower, General MacArthur, Senator Taft, and two-thirds of the Members of this Congress, who favor this legislation, do not think it will hurt national defense. Nearly all the governors of the States, and 46 of the attorneys general of the States, have favored previous legislation and the present bill.

And the United States Chamber of Commerce, who are a rather able group of citizens, favor this legislation and this week have written all Members of the House urging we vote to override the President's veto of this legislation.

MUTUAL SECURITY BILL

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House in conference on the mutual security bill may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, several years ago the Congress passed a so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act which allowed the State Department to change the duties upon articles coming into the United States.

The State Department has made a practice of operating these changes without giving any notice to the producers in this country, and without letting the producers know that their markets are being aimed at.

The Cuban Government, a couple of months ago, notified our State Department that they planned to negotiate a new treaty with Chile. All details were disclosed during the month of February. It was proposed to establish a quota on colored dried beans which would give Chile a large share of the American market in Cuba. It was not until April that the State Department sought the advice of the Department of Agriculture and at no time did they consult the farmers.

Our foreign policy should be lined up so that the United States will not participate in these operations against the interest of the farmers without any notice to them. The agreement was signed and nothing was known to the farmers until after it was all done.

How much longer are the people of the United States going to stand for this way of doing business undercover to destroy American agriculture?

ARE WE GIVING AWAY MORE OF OUR IMPORTANT FOREIGN FARM MARKETS?

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper clipping.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, recently in a news item in the National Dried Bean Council, Washington report, I noticed that a three-way trade agreement has

been proposed wherein a quota of about 398,200 bags of colored beans would be shipped into Cuba; the United States to supply 51 percent, while Chile would supply 48 percent, and the rest of the world 1 percent. Therefore, proportioning the bean shipments to Cuba. And under this agreement a new duty of 3.25 pesos will apply for the whole quantity; when a country's quota is filled the duty reverts to the old rate. Red kidneys, small reds, pinks, and possibly pintos would be affected by this trade agreement.

This is but another example of the short-sighted policy of the give-away foreign-aid program. It seems they are not satisfied with placing an unwieldy mortgage on the country, but are now attempting to build up surplus stocks in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation to be given away later in exchange for token payments.

It is reported that at the present time the Commodity Credit Corporation owns over 4,500,000 bags of dried beans, and the question arises as to why we should be a party to a trade agreement that would give Chile the opportunity of shipping in 48 percent of the quota of beans necessary for the Cuban market.

We should take a careful look at both sides of this trade agreement. Remember, recently the Chileans ceased shipping us copper and only after the market was jacked up were we able to resume the shipments of Chilean copper.

What benefit will Cuba receive from the purchase of dried beans from Chile even though Chile did promise to buy sugar from Cuba?

The result of this behind the scene operating of our trade agreements will eventually end in the United States temporarily bailing out surplus crops of the American farmers and furnishing free food to other countries.

It seems to me that the American people are entitled to know exactly what provisions are placed into these trade agreements and to have the facts immediately. Furthermore, the producers of farm crops should be consulted, through their trade organizations when trade agreements are being contemplated, with the organizations given an opportunity to be heard on the provisions of the trade agreement.

Mr. Speaker, we need more light and information on all our foreign trade agreements.

I enclose a news release in the Washington News of June 2, 1952:

OFFICIAL SECRECY

A "spirit of secrecy" abroad in every level of government is "eroding" away the American "right to know," J. R. Wiggins, managing editor of the Washington Post, said today.

Mr. Wiggins listed three factors which have led to the "erosion." The expansion of the executive branch of the Government, military secrecy, and arbitrary official obstruction.

In a speech prepared for delivery before the National Conference of Farm Bureau Editors, Mr. Wiggins pointed out that the changing makeup of the Federal Government has transferred legislative and judicial functions from the courts and Congress, "where the right to know was safeguarded by specific enactment and long-standing custom," to independent and executive agencies, where "no such protection prevails."

"Press conferences by cabinet officials, once a weekly institution, have become a rarity," he said. "Months go by without a single correspondent having direct access, in an open press conference, to a Department head. Public relations policies of Federal agencies more and more restrict the direct access of reporters to most officials."

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, and to cancel her special order for Monday next.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and any other special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6947) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this bill carries funds for payment of postal and other salaries and we had hoped to dispose of it at the earliest possible moment but in view of the circumstances, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request at this time.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the motion.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST NEW ENGLAND

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak about the discrimination by our Defense Departments against New England in giving out Government orders and Government assistance for national defense. That is what I am going to speak about today, and that is what I am going to speak about tomorrow. It is the most unjust discrimination I have ever known in national defense orders. I have watched the wheels go around in Washington since 1913, and the New England area has very just cause for complaint, and I feel almost enough cause for revolt. We have sent many of our men to fight. Many of our men have not been properly equipped. Now there seems to be an effort to prevent our section of the country from manufacturing the very things that are badly needed today in winning the war. There is something radically wrong going on, and I intend to have it thoroughly investigated.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE STRIKE SITUATION

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the President has been advising us as to the necessity of keeping the steel mills operating. We also are aware that a strike is on. Some 650,000 men are not working and undoubtedly if the strike follows in the usual course, picket lines will be thrown about the entrances to the plants, and men who have sons and brothers in the armed services and who are denied the opportunity to work are not permitted to work we will not have steel production. To at least help in solving this situation, I have introduced a resolution today,[1] which I hope

[1] [82d Cong., 2d sess., in the House of Representatives, Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on ————]

House Joint Resolution ——

Joint resolution advising the President of his duty to aid in the national-defense program and the preservation of civil rights

Resolved, etc.—

Whereas a labor dispute and a strike involving not less than 600,000 men in the steel industry and other threatened disputes and strikes, if continued, will not only seriously and adversely affect our domestic economy but make it impossible to adequately supply and maintain the men who have volunteered or been conscripted to fight in a war brought on by the activities of the United Nations; and

Whereas the President seized certain industrial plants engaged in the production of steel, without which men in the Armed Forces in Korea and wherever else they might be engaged in active fighting will needlessly die; and

Whereas such seizure has, by the Supreme Court, been declared illegal; and

Whereas the President has failed to use Federal legislation, especially the Taft-Hartley Act, in an effort to solve the labor dispute and prevent the strike in the steel industry; and

Whereas the President is, by section 2 of article III of the Constitution, Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and of the

will be helpful. By it, the attention of the President is called to a section of the Federal law, section 5299 of the Revised Statutes, or section 203 of title 50 of the Code. Permit an excerpt:

That if domestic violence or unlawful combinations in any State obstructs or hinders the execution of the laws of the State or of the United States so as to deprive any portion or class of the people of the State of any of

---

militia of the sovereign States when called into actual service of the United States; and

Whereas by section 8, article I, of the Constitution, the Congress has authority for the calling forth of the militia to execute the laws of the Union and to suppress insurrections; and

Whereas the Congress has provided by section 5299 of the Revised Statutes, the same being section 203 of title 50 of the United States Code, that:

"Whenever insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combinations, or conspiracies in any State so obstructs or hinders the execution of the laws thereof, and of the United States, as to deprive any portion or class of the people of such State of any of the rights, privileges, or immunities, or protection, named in the Constitution and secured by the laws for the protection of such rights, privileges, or immunities, and the constituted authorities of such State are unable to protect, or, from any cause, fail in or refuse protection of the people in such rights, such facts shall be deemed a denial by such State of the equal protection of the laws to which they are entitled under the Constitution of the United States; and in all such cases, or whenever any such insurrection, violence, unlawful combination, or conspiracy, opposes or obstructs the laws of the United States, or the due execution thereof, or impedes or obstructs the due course of justice under the same, it shall be lawful for the President, and it shall be his duty to take such measures, by the employment of the militia or the land and naval forces of the United States, or of either, or by other means, as he may deem necessary, for the suppression of such insurrection, domestic violence, or combinations"; and

Whereas it has been, and is, a common practice during strikes for pickets to, by force, violence, and by threat of force and violence and by the use of profane and obscene language, prevent workers from going peaceably to their places of employment; and

Whereas such acts are in many States violations of State law and a denial of civil rights guaranteed by the Federal Constitution and Federal laws; and

Whereas the President of the United States has failed to take measures either by the use "of the militia or the land and naval forces of the United States, or of either, or by other means" to suppress domestic violence or to secure to the people of the States the "equal protection of laws": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress that the President use and employ the Taft-Hartley Act, section 203 of title 50 of the United States Code, and any other applicable Federal legislation, or authority, to amicably, or otherwise, end existing labor disputes and strikes which injuriously affect the public health, welfare, or safety or the equipment of the Armed Forces; and be it further

Resolved, That the President be advised that it is the sense of the Congress that he maintain through the use of the Armed Forces of the United States and of the States, law and order in the States wherever force, violence, or rioting or the threat of force, violence, or rioting prevents the operation of any industrial plant, or results in the denial of civil rights.

the rights or privileges or immunities named in the Constitution or secured by the States—

Of course, one of those is the right to work, and some employees in the steel mills want to work at this time in order to support the Armed Forces—

Then—

And note this language please—

it shall be lawful for the President and it shall be his duty—

And I emphasize the word "duty"—

to take such measures by the employment of the militia or the land and naval forces of the United States, or of either, or of other means as he may deem necessary for the suppression of violence.

If the President instead of playing "footsie" with labor politicians will enforce the laws of the Nation and make it possible for citizens to enjoy the civil rights about which he talks so often and at such length, undoubtedly the steel strike will be solved and the men will go back to work.

PROGRAM FOR THURSDAY

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order that I may ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question as to which conference report will come first tomorrow, the third supplemental appropriation bill, the mutual security bill, or something else?

Mr. PRIEST. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that the first order of business tomorrow will be the conference report on the third supplemental appropriation bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. When does the gentleman expect the vote to come on the so-called GI bill of rights?

Mr. PRIEST. The vote on that bill will come as soon as we can get to it. Several things have had to go over until tomorrow.

The first order of business tomorrow will be consideration of the conference report on the third supplemental appropriation bill, and immediately following the conference report the vote will be had on the GI bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman give us any information about the program for Friday?

Mr. PRIEST. I cannot at this time, but as soon as possible I will do so.

INCREASE IN POSTAL RATES

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to amend Public Law 233 which was recently enacted by the Congress in order to bring about a much-needed increase in the postal rates. The amendment which I offer is designed to correct what appears to have been an oversight in that Public Law 233 failed to repeat a part of the old postal law relating to the privilege of using bulk or pound rates when mailing second-class matters—a privilege which has been available to publishers of second-class matter since 1879. It has come to my attention that as a result of failing to retain this provision of the old law, certain nonprofit service organizations must now pay 2 cents per copy to mail a substantial portion of their magazines as compared with 1½ cents per pound which they paid under the old law. To these organizations, this change in their second-class mailing privilege means a rate increase of over 1000 percent on the portion of their circulation affected, and a rate increase of 500 percent in their over-all postal bill.

Now, I do not believe that when the Members of the House voted for Public Law 233 they ever intended to increase anybody's postal bill by 500 percent. I listened carefully to the testimony before the Post Office Committee on the postal rate revision bill and I heard not one word about changing the basic law with respect to the privileges of publishers using the second-class mail. The committee report and the report of the conference committee on the bill which later became Public Law 233 listed no such change; indeed, they stated that this law merely provided certain general uniform increases in the rates and did not disturb the basic postal law. And in stating the position of the Post Office Department on this bill, Postmaster General Donaldson appeared also to be of this view, for he flatly said:

I feel most strongly that there should be an increase in the rates for all publications of the second-class and that no preferences or special consideration should be given to any groups of publications other than as covered by existing law.

And yet, when the bill was finally passed it did, by its omission, wipe out certain privileges covered by existing law.

To sum the matter up, Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that when we considered Public Law 233 we all recognized that the second-class postal rates were too low and had to be increased. But we intended to and thought we were accomplishing this increase in a fair and equitable way by a uniform general increase in the rates of all users of the privilege. It now appears we did not entirely succeed in this and as a result some people have been subjected to immediate increases of 500 percent and more in their rates. I believe that there is a principle of fairness here which we cannot escape and an oversight which we must correct as quickly as we can.

My amendment does not create any new class of free riders. Nor does it deprive the Post Office of any revenue to which it was entitled under the old law, because the persons affected here will

still have to pay the same uniform general increase in their second-class bulk rates that every other publisher does. My amendment merely restores the protection which these privileges have always enjoyed under the postal laws and, under the circumstances, I believe we must do just that.

ESTABLISHMENT OF UNITED STATES SCIENTIFIC ACADEMY

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, recent developments in the scientific field have led me to again bring to the attention of the House two proposals I have made in the last 4 years.

One was my proposal to establish a United States Scientific Academy along lines similar to those of West Point and Annapolis except in a scientific field.

Another proposal that I made back in January of 1949 was the Federal scholarship plan that I had discussed with Members many times. Under it, the Government would make it possible for qualified students to go on to higher education even when they themselves were in financial need and unable to pay for it. Under the Federal scholarship plan I suggested, that could be done without any cost at all to the Federal Government.

The reason for my talk today is that there has been a growing manpower shortage in scientific fields. That shortage is going to continue and is going to be increased.

On March 25, 1952, Dr. Edgar C. Britton, president of the American Chemical Society, spoke about the manpower shortage in chemistry at the one hundred and twenty-first national meeting of the society.

After pointing out that the manpower shortage in chemistry is growing so acute that it may well undermine both the Nation's defense program and the civilian economy, Dr. Britton said:

> The situation has grown particularly acute within the past year. It will soon become critical unless the Nation takes drastic action to build up and maintain an adequate supply of chemists and chemical engineers.

Another statement that should alarm us is that of Atomic Energy Commission Chairman Gordon Dean. Pointing out that the Commission would need 7,000 extra scientists and engineers to carry out a proposed expansion of America's atomic program he said it could cause one of the greatest shortages of technicians the United States ever suffered.

There is a great deal more evidence, of course, of the acute situation but I cite the above facts as illustrations of what is facing this country. It is also interesting to note that Russia is using every possible means to increase the number of scientists in that country. The Congress should recognize the peril and take action to meet it at the earliest opportunity.

I want to again urge this nation to give serious consideration to the two suggestions I have made:

First, the establishment of a United States Scientific Academy.

Second, enactment of the Federal scholarship plan.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. TRIMBLE.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas and to include excerpts of an address he delivered in the House on February 2, 1949.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas and to include a manuscript entitled "Natural Gas of Texas," notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $189.

Mr. O'NEILL and to include an address, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $210.

Mr. WIER and to include an article.

Mr. CLEMENTE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALBERT (at the request of Mr. STEED) and to include an editorial.

Mr. RADWAN.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE and to include an article.

Mr. JENSEN and to include three letters.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3276. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to assist Federal prisoners in their rehabilitation"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 156. An act to repeal the Alaska railroads tax;

H. R. 654. An act for the relief of Ivo Cerne;

H. R. 696. An act to authorize the President of the United States to present the Distinguished Flying Cross to Col. Roscoe Turner;

H. R. 975. An act for the relief of Sarah A. Davies;

H. R. 1099. An act for the relief of the estate of Cobb Nichols;

H. R. 1162. An act for the relief of Kaiko Sugimote (Kay Fair) and her minor children;

H. R. 1428. An act for the relief of Claude Forunda;

H. R. 1960. An act for the relief of Erika Nicolo and her minor child;

H. R. 2303. An act for the relief of Sisters Maria Salerno, Eufrasisa Binotto, Maria Ballatore, and Giovanna Buziol;

H. R. 2307. An act for the relief of Jean (John) Plewniak and Anna Piotrowska Plewniak;

H. R. 2346. An act for the relief of Odette Louise Tirman;

H. R. 2587. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jeannette Thorn Pease;

H. R. 2628. An act for the relief of the George H. Soffel Co.;

H. R. 2784. An act for the relief of Fumiko Higa;

H. R. 2841. An act for the relief of Yai Wing Lee;

H. R. 2902. An act for the relief of Thomas E. Bell;

H. R. 2903. An act for the relief of Mimi Fong and her children, Sing Lee and Lily;

H. R. 2920. An act for the relief of Priscilla Ogden Dickerson Gillson de la Fregonniere;

H. R. 3070. An act for the relief of Giovanni Rinaldo Bottini;

H. R. 3124. An act for the relief of Mehmet Salih Topcuoglu;

H. R. 3132. An act for the relief of Sister Apolonia Gerarda Sokolowska;

H. R. 3152. An act for the relief of Mrs. Setsuyo Sumida;

H. R. 3561. An act for the relief of Mary Osadchy;

H. R. 3572. An act for the relief of Ying Chee Jung;

H. R. 3732. An act for the relief of Stephan Joseph Horvath and Lucas Albert Horvath;

H. R. 3953. An act for the relief of Chan Toy Har;

H. R. 4152. An act for the relief of Ann Tobak and John Tobak;

H. R. 4492. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Norma J. Roberts, a minor;

H. R. 4790. An act for the relief of Helga Richter;

H. R. 4801. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue certain bonds for flood-control purposes;

H. R. 4802. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue certain public improvement bonds;

H. R. 4923. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue certain bonds for the construction of the Kalihi tunnel and its approach roads;

H. R. 5071. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the county of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, to issue public improvement bonds for the construction of flood-control projects on Iao stream;

H. R. 5072. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the county of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, to issue public improvement bonds for the construction of new public-school buildings;

H. R. 5121. An act for the relief of Felix Navedo-Merced and Carmen Ramos-Baez;

H. R. 5145. An act for the relief of Tsutako Kuroki Masuda;

H. R. 5386. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the City and County of Honolulu, a municipal corporation of the Territory of Hawaii, to issue bonds for acquisition of real property for public-school purposes and for construction and replacement of buildings for public-school purposes;

H. R. 5753. An act for the relief of Bernard J. Keogh;

H. R. 5805. An act for the relief of Patricia Lauretta Pray;

H. R. 5956. An act for the relief of Ingeborg and Anna Lukas;

H. R. 5958. An act for the relief of Pauline W. Goodyear;

H. R. 5976. An act for the relief of Michiko Nakashima;

H. R. 5984. An act for the relief of Jimmy Doguta (also known as Jimmy Blagg);

H. R. 6265. An act for the relief of Marian Diane Delphine Sachs;

H. R. 6922. An act to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, so as to extend the benefits of such section to certain colleges in the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 6314. An act for the relief of Kiko Oshiro;

H. R. 6675. An act to authorize the conveyance of lands in the Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation to the State of California or to the Hoopa unified school district for use for school purposes;

H. R. 6848. An act for the relief of Sharon Elaine Frankovich;

H. R. 7188. An act to provide that the additional tax imposed by section 2470 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code shall not apply in respect of coconut oil produced in, or produced from materials grown in, the territory of the Pacific islands; and

H. R. 7593. An act to amend paragraph 1774, section 201, title II, of the Tariff Act of 1930.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1822. An act to amend the act creating a juvenile court for the District of Columbia, approved March 19, 1906, as amended; and

S. 2721. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 2, 1952, present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 454. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 5, 1952, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1538. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1953 in the amount of $2,990,487,740 for the Department of Defense (H. Doc. No. 485); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1539. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1953 in the amount of $6,625,000 for the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 486); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1540. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1953 in the amount of $961,000 for the Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency (H. Doc. No. 487); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1541. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1953 in the amount of $3,380,700 for the Department of Defense (H. Doc. No. 488); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1542. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the Ninth Quarterly Report on the Administration of the Advance Planning Program authorized under Public Law 352, Eighty-first Congress, approved October 13, 1949, pursuant to section 6 of that law; to the Committee on Public Works.

1543. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to establish an additional office of Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and an office of Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1544. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the quarterly report of property acquisitions for the quarter ending March 31, 1952, pursuant to subsection 201 (h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1545. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the quarterly report of contributions for the quarter ending March 31, 1952, pursuant to subsection 201 (i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1546. A letter from the executive secretary, American Chemical Society, transmitting the annual report of the American Chemical Society for the calendar year 1951, pursuant to section 8 of Public Law 358, Seventy-fifth Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1547. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, approved July 1, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FINE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1539. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide extra compensation for overtime service performed by immigrant inspectors and other employees of the Immigration Service," approved March 2, 1931; with amendment (Rept. No. 2030). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee of conference. H. R. 7005. An act to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2031). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FINE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1360. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, adjudicate, and render judgment on the claim of John J. Snoke; without amendment (Rept. No. 2018). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FINE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2696. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Cuban-American Sugar Co., against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2019). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2278. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katherine L. Sewell; with amendment (Rept. No. 2020). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3705. A bill for the relief of William Mooney; with amendment (Rept. No. 2021). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FINE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3983. A bill for the relief of the Clemmer Construction Co., Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2022). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4163. A bill for the relief of Francis C. Dennis and Marvin Spires, of Eastover, S. C.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2023). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4502. A bill for the relief of Santos Sanabria Alvarez; with amendment (Rept. No. 2024). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5126. A bill for the relief of Lucian Roach, doing business as the Riverside Lumber Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2025). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5127. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleanora O. Gibson; with amendment (Rept. No. 2026). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5481. A bill for the relief of Norman E. Dole, Jr., William F. Smith, John G. Harris, and James E. Chamberlain; without amendment (Rept. No. 2027). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7711. A bill for the relief of Henry C. Bush and other Foreign Service officers; without amendment (Rept. No. 2028). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7859. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Corrina Arena; without amendment (Rept. No. 2029). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 8079. A bill relating to the rate of postage on certain publications entered as second-class matter prior to June 28, 1932; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. J. Res. 474. Joint resolution to assist the Polycultural Institution of America in expanding further its program and activities for the purpose of promoting universal understanding, justice, and permanent peace, to assist such institution in providing for its permanent plant and equipment in the Nation's Capital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 475. Joint resolution advising the President of his duty to aid in the national defense program and the preservation of civil rights; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 8080. A bill for the relief of Cecil Wilson Hinkson, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8081. A bill for the relief of Georgie Sugita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 8082. A bill for the relief of William Foster Denney, administrator of the estate of William Myre Denney, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 8083. A bill for the relief of Dr. Frantisek Lysy and Mrs. Edita Ondrejicka Lysy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8084. A bill for the relief of John A. Sbarounis, Mrs. Georgette A. Sbarounis, and Anthony Athanase Sbarounis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 8085. A bill for the relief of Emanuel Maltese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. J. Res. 476. Joint resolution to provide for the conveyance to the Texas Hill Country Development Foundation of certain surplus land situated in Kerr County, Tex.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 5, 1952

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, we turn to Thee sorely perplexed with our own thoughts, often confused and confounded by the very vastness of the human problems confronting us. Save us, we beseech Thee, from the despair of a defeating cynicism which denies that there is any road to the fair city of our dreams. We confess that our lives are so cluttered with the trivial and the trifling that too often mistaken magnitudes keep us from fixing our minds on the great issues that at last prove to be the factors of our destiny. We ask but for light enough for the next step ahead and for the faith and fortitude to take it boldly. Send us forth on our way attended by the vision splendid, grateful even for night skies that bring out the clear stars of faith, for hard tasks that develop the sinews of strength, and for futile quests which drive us back unfilled to Thee. We ask it in the Name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 4, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 4, 1952, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1533. An act to designate a Floyd B. Olson Memorial Triangle in the District of Columbia, and to authorize the erection of a memorial plaque in such triangle; and

S. 2735. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940, as amended.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 643. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vivian M. Graham and Herbert H. Graham;

H. R. 646. An act for the relief of Mrs. Inez B. Copp and George T. Copp;

H. R. 1826. An act for the relief of Ellis E. Gabbert; and

H. R. 1842. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ann Morrison.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6787) to extend the Rubber Act of 1948 (Public Law 469, 80th Cong.), as amended, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VINSON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. KILDAY, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. SHAFER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6854) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. GARY, Mr. FERNANDEZ, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. SIKES, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CANFIELD, Mr. WILSON of Indiana, Mr. JAMES, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. THOMAS, Mr. GORE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. YATES, Mr. CANNON, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. COUDERT, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7151) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FOGARTY, Mr. HENDRICK, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. DENTON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. BUSBEY, Mr. MILLER of Maryland, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6947) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 5, 22, and 45 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 25, and 47 to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1855. An act for the relief of Joachim Volk, also known as Steven Craig Delano;

S. 1953. An act for the relief of Midori Sugimoto;

S. 2089. An act for the relief of Debra Elaine Evans;

S. 2462. An act for the relief of Teruo Uechi;

S. 2554. An act for the relief of Eugene Richard Sushko;

S. 2571. An act for the relief of Ernest Daniel Davis, Jr.;

S. 2593. An act for the relief of Jean Hamamoto, also known as Sharon Lea Brooks;

S. 2643. An act for the relief of Kathleen Cowley;

S. 2768. An act for the relief of Barbara Ann Sheppard; and

S. 2805. An act for the relief of Susan Jeanne Kerr.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. YOUNG was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until June 22, 1952.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MCCARTHY was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate after 6 o'clock this evening, until Monday next, because I am the permanent chairman of our Indiana Republican Convention, which meets tomorrow and will be in session Friday and Saturday. I shall have to be absent from the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana asks unanimous consent that he be excused until Monday, on official business. [Laughter.] Without objection, leave is granted.

MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS IN ITALY—RESOLUTION OF MASSACHUSETTS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Massachusetts, requesting Congress to congratulate Premier Alcide de Gasperi and the Italian people for their impressive showing over the forces of communism in the recent municipal elections in Italy.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to congratulate Premier Alcide de Gasperi and the Italian people for their impressive showing over the forces of communism in the recent municipal elections in Italy

Resolved, That the house of representatives memorialize Congress to congratulate Premier Alcide de Gasperi and the Italian people on their impressive showing over the forces of communism in the recent municipal elections in Italy; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

GENOCIDE CONVENTION—RESOLUTION OF JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF METROPOLITAN BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Boston, Mass., favoring the early ratification of the Genocide Convention.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL,
Boston, Mass., June 3, 1952.

The Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: The Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Boston at its annual meeting last evening adopted by unanimous vote the following resolution:

"Nearly 40 nations have ratified the Genocide Convention, condemning the murder of whole populations because of race, religion, or ethnic origin; but the United States Senate has not yet placed its approval upon this proposal to marshal the sentiment of free peoples against any possible repetition of the ghastly crime conceived by the Nazis. We earnestly petition our Senators to renew their efforts for early ratification by the United States Senate of the Genocide Convention, a pronouncement consonant with America's reputation for dedication to the cause of justice."

We are hopeful that you will act upon this petition favorably especially in view of your interest in the Genocide Convention in the past.

Yours sincerely,
ROBERT E. SEGAL,
Executive Director.

PENSIONS FOR VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I—RESOLUTION AND QUOTATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received from Harry I. Andersen, secretary of the Three Hundred and Tenth Engineers Unit of the Eighty-fifth Division, a resolution which had been adopted at a Detroit reunion of the comrades of World War I. The group calls itself the Three Hundred and Tenth Engineers Last Man's Club. The resolution concerns an appeal for World War pension legislation, irrespective of disability or financial status.

Appended to the resolution were a series of quotations on the affirmative side of the much-debated question: "Should there be a pension for World War I vets?"

As an indication of that group's position, I send the resolution and quotations to the desk and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution and quotations were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas moneys saved by World War I veterans in the form of insurance, annuities, pensions, and old-age security for their retirement in old age have lost their dollar value and therefore today do not provide adequately for a proper standard of living; and

Whereas the average age of World War I veterans is 58 years and therefore he is in need of financial assistance due to changing circumstances of today; and

Whereas veterans of previous wars and their widows received adequate pensions, said pensions being granted at the age of 50 years and regardless of one's physical or financial status; and

Whereas due to previous pension policy it appears that World War I veterans are now discriminated against; and

Whereas the present Veterans' Administration regulations are being misinterpreted as a pension law, said regulations grant compensation to a veteran upon proof of physical disability and financial embarrassment in the amount of $60 per month to the age of 65 years with an increase to $72 per month if the veteran is 65 years or older and only if his income does not exceed $1,000 per year if single or $2,500 if he is married; and

Whereas the above declaration request makes this regulation purely a procedure of the Veterans' Administration in order to compensate a veteran for physical disability and financial embarrassment within the limitation of the order; and

Whereas the above regulations govern the payment of compensation (pensions) to widows of World War I veterans; and

Whereas the above facts prove that World War I veterans and their widows do not have a pension law that adequately provides for their security in old age: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be requested to enact a pension law granting a pension to World War I veterans, their widows and dependents, comparable to pensions granted veterans of previous wars, their widows and dependents; and such pensions be payable at the age of 50 years and upon proof of honorable service in the Armed Forces of the United States, regardless of one's physical or financial status; and be it further

Resolved, That pensions to World War I veterans or their widows be at the rate of $125 per month for the year 1952, and that the rate per month of pensions be adjusted on January 1 and July 1 of the succeeding years to meet the change in the cost-of-living standard, thereby guaranteeing the veteran or his widow or dependents an adequate pension to maintain a proper standard of living.

WHY A PENSION FOR WORLD WAR I VETS?

Admissions of—

AMERICAN LEGION

National magazine, March 1952, page 55:

"Dollars saved in the form of insurance, pensions, annuities, and savings bonds have lost their dollar value today; therefore World War I veterans at the average age of 58 years are in need of aid in the form of a pension."

Wisconsin Badger Legionnaire, March 1952, page 7, James Burns:

"Why does the Legion not back a pension bill to pension veterans at the age of 65? Jim says we do have a pension bill in the act of the Eightieth Congress whereby a veteran who declares himself permanently, totally disabled and who has an income within a certain limitation is entitled to $60 at the age of 60 years and $72 at the age of 65 years. Widows of World War I veterans are also entitled to a pension governed by the same income limitations. This, therefore, is not a pension law but a disability grant with a so-called pauper clause—a compensation grant."

Forty and Eighter, national magazine, February 1952, page 2:

"A bill to adjust compensations and pensions. Bill presented by Representative RANKIN, chairman, House Veterans' Affairs Committee, bill H. R. 5895, which would increase the income limitations of the present compensation and pension grant by $300 and $500, respectively; still requires a veteran to declare himself permanently and totally disabled plus financially embarrassed per limitations. Again, the regulation is purely one of compensation and not pension."

News and Views, Milwaukee Post, No. 1, American Legion, March 1952, page 4.

"Operations victory—H. R. 2420—an economy act similar to the act of 1933 whereby veterans will lose many benefits to which they are now entitled. To create a new department—Department of Health—with Cabinet status, in which will go Veterans' Administration medical and surgical services, etc. This bureau would pass upon a veteran's physical disability before he can be declared eligible for a pension.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Wisconsin Veteran, VFW, March 1952, page 7, MacDonald:

"We do not have a pension bill for World War I veterans because a veteran must be disabled to qualify and must also come within income limitations."

Ability to pay pensions

Wisconsin Veteran, March 1952, page 5. "Pension Costs":

Pension Costs:	
1890	$10,701,000,000
1900	$15,364,000,000
1951	$278,000,000,000
"Military pensions:	
1890	$106,000,000
1900	$138,000,000
1951	$2,000,000,000
"Percent:	
1890	0.72
1900	0.89
1951	0.72

"There has been a decline of 43 percent in military pension payments since 1947. All this notwithstanding.

"1890, veteran population was 2.3 percent of total; paid 0.99 of 1 percent.

"1900, veteran population was 2.1 percent of total; paid 0.89 of 1 percent.

"1951, veteran population was 13.2 percent of total; paid 0.72 of 1 percent.

"Veterans were pensioned at the age of 50 years, upon proof of honorable service in the Armed Forces of the United States regardless of their physical or financial status; World War I veterans therefore are discriminated against under the present ruling. Social security is not adequate and too many veterans are not covered by social security."

Hon. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, House of Representatives, March 29, 1946:

"We should pay World War I veterans the same pension and under the same regulations as we now pay Spanish-American War veterans. This is long overdue."

REVISION OF LAWS RELATING TO IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND NATIONALITY—RESOLUTION

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, adopted at that organization's eighteenth biennial convention, May 12 to 16, 1952. The resolution deals with the subject of immigration and expresses the opposition of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers to the so-called McCarran bill and its support of the principles of the so-called Humphrey-Lehman bill.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMMIGRATION

SUBSTITUTE RESOLUTION FOR RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE DETROIT JOINT BOARD

The Senate is now considering so-called omnibus immigration legislation which would affect the entire fabric of our immigration policies. This legislation would involve the status of all aliens in the United States, the status of hundreds of thousands of naturalized American citizens and the whole structure of civil liberties in this country.

A bill by Senator MCCARRAN is now pending which would limit immigration to a trickle, would provide new and arbitrary grounds for exclusion and deportation and make radical distinctions between naturalized and native-born American citizens. It would also deepen present racial and national discrimination in our immigration laws and create new barriers against orientals.

Pigeonholed in Senator MCCARRAN'S Judiciary Committee is a sound and forward-looking omnibus immigration bill (the Humphrey-Lehman bill) which moves in the direction of liberalizing our immigration policies, protecting the rights and liberties of all, and of making a positive contribution to American leadership in world affairs.

One of the chief problems besetting the free world today, is the presence in Europe of thousands of refugees from tyranny.

At the same time more than half of our basic immigration quotas which are going unused are wasted. The Humphrey-Lehman bill would use our unused quotas and open our doors to a limited number of immigrants, reuniting divided families and providing here a haven for refugees from the totalitarian terror as well as surplus peoples.

Resolved, That the Eighteenth biennial convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America urges the United States Senate:

1. To defeat or recommit to committee the dangerous and un-American McCarran bill.

2. Enact into law the Humphrey-Lehman bill with its humane and practical provisions for screening out totalitarians and other subversives while letting in the victims of totalitarianism and tyranny.

PAYMENT OF TAXES TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT ON FEDERAL-OWNED PROPERTY—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the City Council of Minneapolis, Minn., at its meeting on May 9 of this year, be printed in the RECORD at this point, and appropriately referred. The council goes on record in support of my bill (S. 2268) providing for payment to a local government in lieu of taxes of federally owned property.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORDINANCES AND LEGISLATION

Your committee recommends that the city council go on record as being in favor of S. 2268, a bill pending in the present session of Congress providing for payments to local governments in lieu of taxes on federally owned property.

Your committee further recommends that a copy of this action be transmitted forthwith by the city clerk to the Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the State of Minnesota, and to Carl H. Chatters, executive director of the American Municipal Association.

GEORGE W. MARTENS,
EINER CHRISTIANSEN,
W. GLEN WALLACE,
STEPHEN PALMER,
Committee.

EXTENSION OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of a resolution adopted by the faculty of Weber College, of Ogden, Utah, expressing support for my bill (S. 3122) to authorize the extension of Federal old-age and survivors insurance to employees of institutions of higher education who are covered by State or local government retirement systems.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the present Utah State teacher retirement system allowances are inadequate for retirement from service with a minimum subsistence income; and

Whereas present fixed incomes are becoming progressively less adequate in inflationary times; and

Whereas the limited income from the profession of college instruction makes it virtually impossible to accumulate savings or establish annuities of any kind in addition to maintaining a standard of living commensurate with the standards demanded by our profession; and

Whereas the services of college teachers are devoted almost entirely to social service and research into problems concerning health and welfare of the Nation without the primary motive of economical gain: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Weber College Faculty Association support and encourage the passage of Senate bill 3122 of the Eighty-second Congress, second session, provided such bill does not in any way endanger continuance of the Utah State retirement benefits for all professional educators, and provided that the resolution in no way indicates a desire on the part of the Weber College faculty to eliminate or discard the present Utah State retirement system; be it further

Resolved, That passage of such a bill should presuppose inclusion of all public-school teachers, administrators, and employees under some other similar legislation; be it further

Resolved, That an expression of thanks be conveyed to Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT for supplying information about the bill along with a copy of the bill for our consideration.

BASIL H. HANSEN,
President.
SHELDON B. HAYES,
Secretary.

FARM CREDIT ACT OF 1952—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have recently received a copy of a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Fergus Falls Production Credit Association in connection with the Farm Credit Act of 1952. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the board of directors of the Fergus Falls Production Credit Association believing that the provisions of the Farm Credit Act of 1952 drawn by the joint farm-credit committee would be of great benefit to all production credit associations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the secretary-treasurer of this association be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to the House and Senate Agricultural Committees, voicing our approval of the following:

1. A 12-man Farm Credit Board, with 1 man from each farm-credit district, is to be set up in complete authority over the Farm Credit Administration. The Governor will take orders from this Board, and the positions of the commissioners will be eliminated. Each member of the Board is to be appointed by the President of the United States, with the approval of the Senate, from three nominees selected by each district farm-credit board. Each member of the Board is to serve a term of 6 years and cannot serve more than two terms. The board is to operate on a per diem basis and to be paid $50 per day and expenses. (We expect to set an upper limit of 75 days per diem for any 1 year.)

2. NFLA's, PCA's, and co-ops owning stock in the bank for cooperatives will each elect an additional member on the district farm-credit board as follows:

(a) The NFLA's in a district will elect an additional man when the farmers own two-thirds of the capital, surplus, and reserves of the Federal land bank. (All land banks are now fully owned by farmers.)

(b) Production credit associations in a district will elect an additional man when members own as much as two-thirds of the total capital, surplus, and reserves of all the associations in a district. (Farmers own more than two-thirds of the capital, surplus, and reserves now in every one of the districts.)

(c) The cooperative associations owning stock in the bank for cooperatives will elect an additional man when they own as much as two-thirds of the capital, surplus, and reserves of the bank for cooperatives in a district. (The co-ops own a very small percentage at this time.)

So, just as soon as current terms of two of the appointed directors are up, the national farm-loan associations and production credit associations will each elect an additional member to all the boards in the country. The seventh man on each farm-credit board will be appointed by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, with the approval of the Federal Farm Credit Board.

3. The bill authorizes production credit associations to issue class C stock, which will be preferred over all other stock. As it stands now, this stock may be sold to production credit corporations "and other investors." We hope to eliminate the "other investors" so that it may be sold only to production credit corporations. This provision is designed to assist an association which gets in such a tight spot that it is necessary to look to the Government for assistance. Even in this case, however, it calls for payment to the Government for the use of such capital, and it is expected that the use of such capital will be only temporary. Such stock may be issued to a production credit corporation only with the approval of stockholders owning at least two-thirds of the total amount of stock (A and B) in the association, the president of the production credit corporation and the Governor. The provision for approval of stockholders seems logical because this stock would be preferred ahead of all of the A and B stock in the association. Stockholders naturally should have some say in a case like this.

4. The bill provides that the Federal land banks, Federal intermediate credit banks, production corporations, and banks for cooperatives pay to the Government a franchise tax of 25 percent of their annual net earnings, after setting aside certain reserves, or pay for the use of the Government capital an amount of interest equal to the cost of the direct obligations to the Government, whichever is less. This seems to mean that in most cases they would pay the franchise tax. The Federal intermediate credit bank has paid a franchise tax all along, and this simply fixed it so the other institutions will do likewise.

5. In addition, this association recommends that the bill authorize production credit associations to pay dividends on A stock without paying dividends on B stock.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. 3061. A bill to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise; with amendments (Rept. No. 1675).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2213. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, so as to authorize the imposition of civil penalties in certain cases; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1679).

S. 3161. A bill to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for filing of equipment trust agreements and other documents evidencing or relating to the lease, mortgage, conditional sale, or bailment of railroad equipment; without amendment (Rept. No. 1676).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

H. R. 1732. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act with respect to the apportionment of funds to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands; with amendments (Rept. No. 1677).

By Mr. HUNT, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 7714. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1678).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 5, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1855. An act for the relief of Joachim Volk, also known as Steven Craig Delano;

S. 1953. An act for the relief of Midori Sugimoto;

S. 2089. An act for the relief of Debra Elaine Evans;

S. 2462. An act for the relief of Teruo Uechi;

S. 2554. An act for the relief of Eugene Richard Sushko;

S. 2571. An act for the relief of Ernest Daniel Davis, Jr.;

S. 2593. An act for the relief of Jean Hamamoto, also known as Sharon Lea Brooks;

S. 2643. An act for the relief of Kathleen Cowley;

S. 2768. An act for the relief of Barbara Ann Sheppard; and

S. 2805. An act for the relief of Susan Jeanne Kerr.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 3286. A bill for the relief of Crisanto Castillo Underwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 3287. A bill for the relief of James N. Milionis; and

S. 3288. A bill for the relief of Francisca Egurrola; to the Comittee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES (for Mr. ECTON):

S. 3289. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Louis W. Milliken;

S. 3290. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Frederick P. Knows Gun;

S. 3291. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Grace Kills A Boy; and

S. 3292. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Marceline Jane Johnson; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 3293. A bill for the relief of Eftychios Mourginakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 3294. A bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to authorize the appropriation of additional funds to cover reductions, occurring as a result of the 1950 United States census, in Federal funds apportioned for expenditure in the States and Territories; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 3295. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide for insurance on mortgages executed in connection with the sale of permanent emergency housing projects, constructed by or on behalf of a State or municipality, or an agency, instrumentality, or body politic of either, for occupancy by veterans of World War II and others; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENDRICKSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 3296. A bill to provide for a commission to regulate the public transportation of passengers by motor vehicle and street railroad within the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for Mr. MURRAY):

S. 3297. A bill to provide for the issuance of a patent in fee to Olive Old Bull Comes In A Day; and

S. 3298. A bill to provide for the issuance of a patent in fee to Amy Old Bull; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a memorial to Dr. J. Finley Wilson, in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BENTON (for himself and Mr. O'CONOR):

S. J. Res. 163. Joint resolution for the establishment of the Second Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. BENTON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT RELATING TO HOUSING FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the National Housing Act. I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief statement in relation to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from New Jersey may proceed.

The bill (S. 3295) to amend the National Housing Act to provide for insurance on mortgages executed in connection with the sale of permanent emergency housing projects constructed by or on behalf of a State or municipality, or an agency, instrumentality, or body politic of either, for occupancy by veterans of World War II and others, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the bill is designed to make FHA mortgage insurance under section 610 of the National Housing Act available to help in financing the sale of permanent emergency housing built by the State of New Jersey and several other States and their municipalities for occupancy by veterans and their families.

The bill would make such financing available in connection with the sale of veterans' State housing on a basis sub-

stantially similar to that now available for the sale of federally constructed war housing.

The bill, which is supported by veterans' organizations, would enable veterans and their families to obtain ownership of housing projects on a cooperative basis and would also enable projects to be sold to limited dividend corporations and other investors who would continue to rent the dwelling units with appropriate preferences to veterans.

It would facilitate private ownership and private financing of veterans' emergency housing which was built as good, sound, permanent housing. The measure does not concern temporary housing.

The bill, Mr. President, is a substitute for S. 2032, which I introduced during August of the last session, the basic purpose of which I explained in some detail in my remarks appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 21, 1951.

REPUBLIC OF INDIA AND THE DOMINION OF PAKISTAN

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, for myself, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], I send to the desk a concurrent resolution, and ask unanimous consent that I may speak for not to exceed 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The concurrent resolution has been prepared by Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, and one identical with that presented by me will be submitted in the House today. It is concerned with the nation of India and our relations with that country. It reads as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress expresses the interest of the American people in the well-being and success in nationhood of the peoples of the great Indian subcontinent and, based on need as a critical element in the well-being of the whole subcontinent, favors assistance to the Republic of India and the Dominion of Pakistan from public and private sources, consistent with the financial capability of the United States, to enable the people of India and the Dominion of Pakistan to plan with continuity and assurance for the economic development and improvement of the country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 82) expressing friendly interest in the welfare of the Republic of India, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, at the conclusion of my remarks, which will be brief, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the sponsors of the resolution in the Senate and the House, and released to the press in connection with the submission of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The purpose of the concurrent resolution is simply to express to our friends in India our great interest in India as a new and young Republic. India has already demonstrated its vitality as a great democracy in its recent elections, when a record number of voters participated.

Just as America needed help from Europe, in the form of sympathetic interest, and in some cases loans, when we started on our career as an independent Republic, India today must depend upon other nations to obtain technical assistance in order to get its programs under way. India is showing determined ability and great courage in meeting its economic problems.

The first purpose of the concurrent resolution is to assure the people of the Indian subcontinent—and I use that term particularly because we are including the area of Pakistan as well as India—of the continued interest of the American people in their welfare. Such expression on our part can give important psychological support to leaders in the Indian Government who are leading the fight there against poverty. It will help them to feel that they can plan with some assurance of continued American support for the success of their program.

The concurrent resolution is offered in connection with the program which India is trying to work out for her economic rehabilitation, and is simply an expression of interest on our part, and a willingness on our part sympathetically to have our ears open to a request from them for aid.

I now ask unanimous consent that there be published in the RECORD the statement issued by a group of Members of the Senate and the House in connection with the submission of the concurrent resolution.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT

A bipartisan group will today (Thursday) introduce in the House and Senate a resolution to the following effect:

"Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress expresses the interest of the American people in the well-being and success in nationhood of the peoples of the great Indian subcontinent and, based on need as a critical element in the well-being of the whole subcontinent, favors assistance to the Republic of India from public and private sources, consistent with the financial capability of the United States, to enable the people of India to plan with continuity and assurance for the economic development and improvement of their country."

Sponsors of this bill are: Senators RALPH E. FLANDERS, Republican, Vermont; BRIEN MCMAHON, Democrat, Connecticut; WAYNE MORSE, Republican, Oregon; H. ALEXANDER SMITH, Republican, New Jersey; JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democrat, Alabama; CHARLES W. TOBEY, Republican, New Hampshire; and ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, Wisconsin; and Representatives FRANCES P. BOLTON, Republican, Ohio; JAMES O. FULTON, Republican, Pennsylvania; JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican-Liberal, New York; CHESTER E. MERROW, Republican, New Hampshire; EDNA F. KELLY, Democrat, New York; FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, Jr., Democrat-Liberal, New York, and CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Democrat, Wisconsin.

This action is taken in view of the need to assure the people of the whole subcontinent, and particularly the people of India, of backing in the fundamental struggle against very low standards of living and underdevelopment which the sponsors of the resolution believe to have a vital bearing upon the kind of society and government which will be found in the subcontinent and in India. A resolution of this kind is the only way under the constitutional processes of the United States in which the American people can express to the people of India a continuing interest in their 5-year plan for economic development which will give the people of India some added assurance in addition to their own self-help that they may proceed with this plan with confidence in the sympathetic consideration of their needs by the people of the United States.

India is a vital element in the free world's security in an area of the world in which it is being the most directly and aggressively threatened by the Soviet Union and its satellites. Open aggressive warfare by the Communist bloc is now being waged in Korea, Indochina and Malaya and a campaign of threats and intimidation is also going on by the Communist bloc against Burma, Thailand, and Indonesia and the countries of the subcontinent. The people of the subcontinent have taken careful note of the fact that Communist China has already swallowed up Tibet.

India's 5-year investment plan calls for a total investment of $3,765,000,000. India has already received assistance from the United States of $283,100,000, the largest part of which is the $190,000,000 United States wheat loan. The net requirement for foreign assistance is $1,128,000,000. The United Kingdom has agreed to release sterling balances at the rate of £35,000,000 per annum to India but that part of the money is not part of the money available for the 5-year development plan as this blocked sterling has been earmarked to finance the needs of private industry in India. It is expected that Australia, New Zealand and Canada will help India and that the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which has already loaned $62,500,000 for economic development of India, will increase its lending operations, but it is estimated that all of these aids will still leave a gap of $1,000,000,000 in round figures. Private industry in India and in cooperation with overseas capital can help greatly with the 5-year plan and with India's problem of underdevelopment. Foreign capital is being invited to India on very easy terms. The Government of India is fully aware that foreign capital, before it comes into the country in any substantial quantity, must be assured of prospects of a fair return, equality of treatment, and facilities for transfer of profits. The measures already taken give that assurance. The agreements signed recently with the Standard Vacuum Oil Co. of America and the Burma-Shell group for the erection of oil refineries in India are evidence of the large concessions accorded to foreign investors.

India's 5-year development plan is fundamental. It deals almost exclusively with making India self-sufficient in food. The target is to produce 7,200,000 tons of additional food, 2,100,000 bales of jute, 1,200,000 bales of cotton, 370,000 tons of oilseeds, and 690,000 tons of sugar. The plan covers the period from April 1951 to March 1956. As more than two-thirds of the population of India is dependent on the land, development and irrigation will take first priority. Of the total outlay of the different sectors of the Indian economy, agriculture and the allied

activities under irrigation and power will receive 43 percent. India has ample supply of water but at present is using about 6 percent of the flow of its rivers. Although in India the area under irrigation is nearly 48,000,000 acres—more than twice as large as in any other country of the world—it constitutes only one-fifth of the total area under cultivation. Agriculture, therefore, is largely a gamble in rains. The area which is to be brought under irrigation under the plan is 8,800,000 acres by 1955–56 and when full facilities for these projects are developed, 16,500,000 acres. Other parts of the plan include improvements of transport (26.1 percent), development of certain vital industries (6.7 percent) and extension of social services, such as housing, education and medical relief (17 percent).

The plan consists of two parts. The first part, which is designed to restore the standards of consumption prevalent in India before the war (1939) taking into account the expected increase in population over the period and which the Government of India is committed to execute is expected to cost $3,135,000,000. The second part of this plan in terms of priority which is intended to insure a somewhat higher rate of development over the period is expected to cost $630,000,000.

The sponsors of the resolution consider the essence of self-help and mutual cooperation in respect of India's economic problems to require an expression of a continuity of interest by the United States in the progress of India's 5-year plan for economic development. This plan to be consistent with the capabilities of the people of India necessarily calls for more than the year or two for which United States constitutional processes permit appropriation. Private enterprise should be the mainstay of India's economic development and this is apparently its Government's intention. This resolution is intended to express sympathetic interest in what will be required of the public sector.

OPPOSITION TO ADOPTION OF CERTAIN CONVENTIONS BY INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution opposing adoption of certain conventions by the International Labor Organization. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 83), submitted by Mr. BRICKER, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Whereas the delegates appointed to represent the Government of the United States at Conferences of the International Labor Organization have from time to time voted for the adoption of Conventions which may prejudice the Federal-State character of our constitutional government; and

Whereas such delegates have also voted for conventions designed to promote a collectivist state and a controlled economy in place of our system of free competitive enterprise; and

Whereas certain conventions which are supported by the United States Government delegates are inconsistent with legislation enacted by the Congress and by the several States, or are in conflict with clear legislative intent evidenced by rejection of proposals of the kind contained in such conventions, and

Whereas there is a convention to be voted on in June 1952 designed to impose binding international standards for programs affecting the purely domestic affairs of our citizens, including old-age and survivors' benefits; old-age assistance; workmen's compensation; unemployment compensation; employment services; medical care and sickness benefits; maternity benefits; and family allowances, some of which Congress has specifically provided for, some of which Congress has recognized as appropriate only for determination by individual States, and some of which Congress and State legislatures have determined as appropriate for private rather than public action; and

Whereas this convention is prejudicial to our present voluntary social-security programs such as hospital-service programs, prepaid surgical and health-insurance programs, and all other voluntary free-enterprise approaches to health insurance and health services despite their effective operation and widespread acceptance by our citizens; and

Whereas Senate ratification of such convention would require Congress to abdicate vital responsibilities in the field of social security, and lead to the adoption of programs contained in the convention which would vest Government control over the personal lives and liberties of American citizens incompatible with American freedom: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

First, delegates of the United States Government to the Thirty-fifth Conference of the International Labor Organization should oppose the International Labor Organization Convention on Minimum Standards of Social Security and all other conventions or treaties of a similar character; and

Second, such delegates should not vote in favor of any proposals—whether in the form of recommendations or conventions (1) which may prejudice the Federal-State character of our constitutional Government, or (2) which are incompatible with our basic constitutional principles, or (3) which tend to replace our competitive free-enterprise system with a Government-controlled economy.

The statement by Mr. BRICKER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRICKER

The concurrent resolution is intended to express to delegates representing the Government of the United States at the Conference of the International Labor Organization now meeting in Geneva the sense of the Congress with respect to a very important treaty on the conference agenda. The proposed treaty is known as the ILO Convention on Minimum Standards of Social Security.

The proposed social security convention cannot be implemented by any government within the framework of a free enterprise system. This ILO Convention embodies the socialist dream of cradle-to-the-grave security. The hostility which is displayed toward private and voluntary insurance is shocking. In fact, in the broad area encompassed by this social security convention, private insurance systems are outlawed unless subsidized by the government. Article VI of the proposed ILO Convention on Minimum Standards of Social Security reads as follows:

"Where the insurance against the contingency concerned is voluntary, the public authorities shall subsidize such insurance to the extent of at least one quarter of the expected cost of benefits and administration."

In considering the compulsory subsidization of private insurance companies, it is well to recall what the Supreme Court has held:

"It is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes." (*Wickard* v. *Filburn*, 317 U. S. 111, 131 (1942).)

The proposed social security convention of the ILO is another example of the use of the treaty-making power as an instrument of domestic legislation. The social security legislation of the United States and the several States involves matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction. The health and general welfare of the American people are not legitimate objects of international definition, regulation, and control.

My proposed constitutional amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 130, attempts to prevent abuse of the treaty-making power. Hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 130 are being conducted by a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. The concurrent resolution which I have just introduced does not solve the basic problem. That can be done only by amending the Constitution. Pending the adoption of an appropriate constitutional amendment, I believe that it is proper for the Congress to express its opinion with respect to a proposed treaty which, if adopted, would make socialism inevitable.

I am not unaware that the President and his representatives constitute the sole voice of the United States in negotiations with other nations. Nevertheless, delegates of the Government of the United States should not consider themselves as representatives of the executive branch alone. For example, the proposed ILO Convention calls for socialized medicine. Representatives of the United States could vote for that in complete good faith if they spoke only for the executive branch. Socialized medicine has been repudiated by the American people and by their representatives in Congress. Those who speak for the United States abroad should not mislead other nations by voting for the adoption of conventions which are clearly contrary to policies of the United States which have been endorsed by its citizens. The concurrent resolution is intended to remind delegates of the United States Government at the present ILO Conference that they speak for America and not for just one branch of the Federal Government.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3 OF 1952, RELATING TO BUREAU OF CUSTOMS, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I submit for reference to the Committee on Government Operations, a resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1952, relating to the Bureau of Customs, Department of the Treasury, in order that that committee may give it consideration.

By submitting the resolution, I do not intend to convey the thought that I am necessarily opposed to Reorganization Plan No. 3, but I believe the committee itself should be able to inform the Senate whether judicial review in the Bureau of Customs is preserved. There is involved a rather serious question as to how far judicial review is preserved. I am therefore submitting the resolution so that the committee may be able to submit a report to the Senate, rather than to indicate my own viewpoint on the question at this time. Frankly, I have not had time to consider the subject since it has been presented to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received, and referred, as requested by the Senator from Georgia.

The resolution (S. Res. 331), submitted by Mr. GEORGE, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1952 transmitted to Congress by the President on April 10, 1952.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 7314) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. McKELLAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7314, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. FREAR, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, and Mr. O'CONOR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2594) to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CASE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 2594, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 7314) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 61, after line 5, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 414. Section 32 of the act entitled 'An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes,' approved August 24, 1935, is amended—

"(a) by striking out, in the first sentence of the first paragraph thereof, 'There is appropriated for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'There is authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953';

"(b) by striking out, in the second sentence of the first paragraph thereof, 'Such sums' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'Sums appropriated under authority of this section'; and

"(c) by striking out, in the second paragraph thereof each place it appears therein, 'sums appropriated under this section' and inserting in lieu thereof: 'sums appropriated under authority of this section.'"

On page 37, after line 5, insert the following:

"REMOVAL OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

"To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612c), an amount equal to 30 percent of the gross receipts from duties collected under the custom laws during the period January 1, 1951, to December 31, 1951, both inclusive."

Mr. DOUGLAS also submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7314, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Maj. Gen. Willard Gordon Wyman, United States Army, for appointment as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Williston Birkhimer, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. George Henry Decker, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army), for appointment as Comptroller of the Army, with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Samuel Ernest Vandiver, Jr., Georgia Air National Guard, adjutant general, State of Georgia, for appointment as major general in the Air National Guard of the United States, United States Air Force;

Maj. Gen. Glenn Oscar Barcus, Regular Air Force, to be commanding general, Fifth Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general;

Charles Anthony Dever, and sundry other officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force;

Admiral Robert B. Carney, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of an admiral while serving as commander in chief, Allied Forces, southern Europe;

Vice Adm. Jerault Wright, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander in chief, United States Naval Forces, Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean; and

Rosemarie S. Armstrong, and sundry other women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line; and

Debbie P. Belka, and sundry other women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Address delivered by Senator GILLETTE before the Democratic State Convention, Des Moines, Iowa, on May 28, 1952.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

Article entitled "The Court and the Steel Case," written by Walter Lippmann and published in the Washington Post of June 5, 1952.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

Article entitled "Explorations of the Year," written by Commander Wendell Philips Dodge and published in the Book of Knowledge Annual for 1952.

By Mr. FREAR:

Statement and tabulations entitled "Federal Tax Burdens Per Capita, by States, Calendar Year 1951."

By Mr. BENTON:

Article entitled "Immigration Bill Discriminatory, Say Fairfield University Forum Speakers."

Summarization of rules on limitation of debate in State legislatures.

Summary of American press opinion with reference to the success with which former Gov. Chester Bowles is performing his duties as Ambassador to India.

By Mr. WILEY:

Article entitled "Business Tops Donors to Health and Welfare," published in the Milwaukee Journal of May 30, 1952.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "White Elephant," published in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of June 3, 1952, relating to the St. Lawrence seaway.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

An address delivered by him at a final campaign rally in Oakland, Calif., on June 2, 1952.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

Article entitled "A Way To Spend Wisely," written by Roland Sawyer, and published in the Christian Science Monitor on June 4, 1952.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article entitled "The Need and the Chance for Equality," by Malcolm Ross, published in the New York Times Magazine on May 25, 1952.

REVISION OF LAWS RELATING TO IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND NATIONALITY—EDITORIALS

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have in my hand two editorials urging veto of the McCarran immigration bill. One is from the magazine the Reconstructionist and is entitled "Kill the McCarran Immigration Bill." The other is from the Chicago Sun-Times of May 26 and is entitled "Veto the Immigration Bill." I ask unanimous consent that these two editorials be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Reconstructionist of May 29, 1952]

KILL THE MCCARRAN IMMIGRATION BILL

The Halls of Congress are a long way from Ellis Island and other points of entry where

immigrants to the United States undergo the formalities of health inspection and certification. They are even farther away from the many United States consular offices scattered throughout the world, at which thousands of wretched human beings make their desperate bid for the available visas to the land of freedom and plenty. Perhaps this distance from contact with real people enables the members of Congress to disregard the suffering resulting from the immigration bills which are brought up for consideration from time to time.

The plight of refugees from behind the Iron Curtain and of those Orientals who are attracted by the American way of life has apparently failed to touch some of our legislators. But if they lack compassion, our Congressmen ought, at least, take into account the basic traditions of democracy in formulating the quotas under which immigrants are to be admitted into our country.

These remarks are prompted by the possibility that the McCarran Immigration bill now before the Senate, may be passed. The corresponding House measure sponsored by Congressman Walter has already been passed. If this happens to the Senate bill, grave injustices will be perpetrated on innocent men and women, and American democracy will suffer a severe blow.

Contrary to the American tradition of hospitality, the bills seem destined to discourage rather than to welcome immigration to these shores. They prevent the admission of the total annual quota of immigrants by failing to make provision for the transfer of unfulfilled quotas. Thus, for example, if immigrants from England are below the annual quota, the remaining allotment cannot be used by refugees from Poland.

Supporters of the bills have made much of the allotment of quotas to orientals as abolishing racial discrimination in respect to immigration. But the fact is that, to all intents and purposes, the discrimination continues. The quotas assigned are too small to be significant. Colonial regions are limited to 100 immigrants, even though the mother country's quota is not filled, thus discriminating indirectly against immigration from such places as Jamaica, Trinidad and other colonies in the West Indies, most of whose inhabitants are Negroes. Moreover, ancestry rather than place of origin determine eligibility for admission.

Such legislation obviously renders ineffective, among the colored races, our foreign policy declarations about the value of democracy. What it does to our own spiritual development is self-evident.

Another evil feature of the bill makes naturalized citizens subject to deportation if, within 5 years of their naturalization, they have joined an organization listed as subversive by the Attorney General. There is no appeal from the immigration authorities to the courts.

Frequently we are faced with no alternative in regard to legislation but to accept or reject the measure proposed. In this case, however, defeat of the McCarran-Walter proposals does not mean that necessary changes in our immigration laws need be delayed. The Senate Judiciary Committee is now sitting on a bill sponsored by Senators HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and HERBERT H. LEHMAN which forms the basis of a humane and sensible approach to immigration. Congressman FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR., has introduced a similar bill in the House.

What the McCarran-Walter bills deny about humanity and democracy, the Humphrey-Lehman-Roosevelt bills affirm. Where the former deny the ability of our country to absorb new racial, religious and national strains into our culture, the latter affirm it. Where McCARRAN and WALTER apparently believe in the inequality of men, on the basis of their origins, HUMPHREY, LEHMAN and ROOSEVELT remain true to the democratic tradition of equality. Where the former would force all naturalized citizens to live under the constant threat of deportation by an arbitrary administrator, the latter would offer them full protection of the law.

There can be no greater test of the caliber and strength of American society than our immigration laws. If we follow the path of McCARRAN-WALTER, we shall soon constitute ourselves a closed society. There is no surer way to lose whatever spiritual authority we have left among freedom-loving people throughout the world. There is no surer way to lose all that has made America great. The McCarran bill, therefore, must be defeated and an adequate hearing must be given to the Humphrey-Lehman-Roosevelt bills.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times of May 26, 1952]

VETO THE IMMIGRATION BILL

The so-called McCarran-Walter bill to regulate the immigration, naturalization and deportation of aliens will soon reach President Truman's desk. He should veto the legislation in the interest of fair play—and we have every reason to believe he will do so.

As we have pointed out before, the chief merit of the legislation is that it wraps up all of our scattered immigration statutes into one package. But the bad features of the McCarran-Walter measure far outweigh any good that could come from merely having the legalistic advantage of a single immigration code.

Constant misrepresentation has created the false impression that the bill effects long-overdue reforms in American immigration laws.

Actually, as its opponents have charged, the legislation establishes at least 13 new grounds for keeping out immigrants on at least 20 new grounds for deporting recent immigrants. More importantly, naturalized Americans would become, in effect, second-class citizens, for the legislation sets up innumerable new grounds for revoking their citizenship. In many instances the new provisions violate the spirit, if not the letter of the Bill of Rights.

While much is made of the fact that the bill lifts, for the first time in American history, restrictions prohibiting Japanese and certain other Asians from becoming United States citizens, there is a catch to that, too. The new immigration quotas that would be established for oriental nations are so small as to make the citizenship victory a very hollow one, indeed.

It is unfortunate that some Japanese-American groups have been forced to conclude that it is better to accept this grudgingly given crumb than nothing at all. In the long run we believe that their cause and the cause of all Asians, and all Americans of Asian descent, will be better served if the McCarran-Walter bill does not become law.

The recodification of our immigration laws is not so urgent that the matter cannot be studied for another year or two—in the interest of enacting legislation that is less hypocritical and more in keeping with our best traditions than is the McCarran-Walter bill.

NOTICE OF SPEECH BY SENATOR WILEY TOMORROW

Mr. WILEY. If we finish the consideration of the pending bill today, I understand there will be a session tomorrow. I give notice that I shall use some time tomorrow to speak on the question of the Bonn contract and on my reactions during my recent trip to Europe to the European situation.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2594) to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is designated "5-27-52-D."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, after line 18, it is proposed to insert the following new subsection:

(d) Subsection (e) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(ix) Annual or semiannual payments in the nature of compensation made to employees or officers of a business or enterprise which constitutes a distribution of a portion or percentage of its profits according to a profit-sharing plan or practice which was established and in effect on or before January 15, 1950. If the determination of any amount or part of the plan or practice involves the exercise of the discretion of managers of the business or enterprise, such plan or practices may be continued and payments made thereunder so long as the discretion is exercised according to the same policy standards and principles which were applicable and in effect on or before January 15, 1950."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to address myself particularly to the chairman of the committee, Mr. MAYBANK. I do not know whether or not he has had an opportunity to examine the amendment, but I should like to tell him briefly what is involved.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois has 15 minutes, and I have 15 minutes. I intend to be very frank with the Senator. When the Senator has completed his remarks, to which I shall listen with great interest, I should like to read into the RECORD a statement which I have prepared in connection with the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is quite all right. I merely wished to take a moment to say to the chairman of the committee that there are a number of firms in the country which have developed profit-sharing plans with their employees. They have done so on a contract basis. As I understand, when an employee goes on the rolls he automatically becomes one of the beneficiaries of the profit-sharing plan.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does not the Senator believe that if this amendment were agreed to the result would be an increase in the number of such profit-sharing plans which would be subject to the amendment, and therefore exempted from certain provisions of law? I am fearful that the situation might become like a running sore.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The profit-sharing plan must have been in effect on or before January 15, 1950. The amendment has no relation to new profit-sharing plans.

Mr. MAYBANK. If the Senator does not mind, I should like to read this brief

statement from a memorandum which I have prepared.

More important, the operation of this amendment would constitute special tax legislation for a preferred group. It would necessarily turn into spendable dollars a great many millions of dollars which are now available only as profits after taxes. The flow of these additional spendable dollars into our economy would add one more very serious pressure.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to urge the chairman of the committee to accept the amendment and take it to conference, so that there will be an opportunity to study it, with no obligation connected with it.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should be glad to accept the amendment if it could be distinctly understood, as the Senator from Indiana has said, there would be no obligation in connection therewith, in order that we might have an opportunity to study it. I wish to be perfectly frank with my friend from Indiana and other Senators. If the amendment affects the tax structure, I am opposed to it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That course is agreeable to me. If I may make this additional observation, what is actually involved in cases of this kind is the right of contract between the employers and the employees.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am not suggesting that the Senator is not correct; but if this amendment affects the tax laws, as I understand it does, I am opposed to it. I shall be glad, however, to take it to conference.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is involved is wage stabilization. The company certainly has its hands tied. It cannot perform its share of the contract with the new employees who come into its employment. The company is placed in the difficult position of either being in violation of a stabilization policy on the one hand or, on the other hand, in violation of a contract which it has made, which automatically inures to the benefit of the employees. So I trust the chairman will take this amendment to conference and give it consideration. There are probably not many firms which are in this difficulty, but it is a legal difficulty which confronts them.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield me a minute of his time—or it can be charged to my time—I was in error when I said that the amendment would increase the number, because such profit-sharing plans must have been in existence prior to January 15, 1950. However, it has been called to my attention that an important by-product of all this would be the opportunity for companies who happened to have a bonus form of compensation prior to January 15, 1950, to offer substantial financial inducements to the employees of companies which did not have such a plan.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This amendment would apply only in cases in which a profit-sharing contract had been in existence prior to January 15, 1950. It would not open the door to any new contracts or to any possible abuses.

Mr. MAYBANK. Again I say to the Senator that I shall be glad to take the amendment to conference, with the understanding that I am not to be bound.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is designated "5–27–52–A."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, after line 21, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 105. Section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(j) On and after September 1, 1952, no ceiling shall be applicable with respect to a material or service unless the President makes a specific finding of fact, and sets forth the basis for the finding, in the rule, regulation, order, amendment or supplement thereto imposing such ceiling that (i) such material or service is in such short supply as to threaten to cause the price of such material or service to rise unreasonably, and (ii) such material or service is important in relation to business costs or living costs. Thereafter, the President shall review such findings of fact and all rules, regulations, and orders issued thereunder, and add to or remove from such individual services or materials such ceilings in accordance with the afore-mentioned standards; but no ceiling on any material or service shall be reimposed or maintained below the ceiling price on such material or service in effect on the date the ceiling on such service or material was suspended."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on yesterday the Senate passed on the question of the suspension of controls. It came in the form of an amendment which was submitted by the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. It approached the matter of suspension in a slightly different manner than the amendment which I have offered.

The pending amendment provides a definite date and states that no ceiling shall be applicable after that date, except in the case of a contingency, the contingency being that if there were a finding, as a result of a survey, which showed that a material or service was in such short supply as to threaten to cause the price of such material or service to rise unreasonably, and coupled therewith there was no inflationary threat, then and only then could controls be reimposed.

The point has been made, in connection with the effort to strike out titles IV and V of the act, that to do so would not permit the existence of any machinery which would be available in case a threatening situation developed.

The pending amendment is a suspension amendment, as distinct from a decontrol amendment. It provides for the suspension of price controls, but it leaves the machinery intact so that it is usable at any time. It picks out a definite date and makes it possible for the President to reimpose controls, after a review and a finding that a material or service is in short supply and threatening to our economy.

Therefore, Mr. President, for all practical purposes the pending amendment would suspend the controls as of September 1, 1952. The date is not particularly arbitrary. It is sufficiently beyond July 1, 1952, to make possible a reordering of whatever is necessary in the administrative machinery.

I felt that the Senate should have an opportunity to pass on the question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina wish to take any time?

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the amendment prohibits the maintenance of price control over any material after September 1, 1952, unless, first, the material is in such supply that the price threatens to rise unreasonably and, second, the material is important to business costs or living costs.

This amendment would kill price controls.

There are many materials, such as milk, oil, cigarettes, which are not scarce, but prices are pressing ceilings and producers are asking higher prices. With prices of these materials going up, the pressure on other prices and on wages would start another spiral of price-wage increases.

Right after Korea prices went up sharply, even though there were few shortages, and even though the budget was balanced and defense spending had not started. Scare buying, and the resulting price increases, can and did take place, without any shortages.

Defense spending is still increasing, the budget is unbalanced, and the actual inflationary pressures are greater than just after Korea.

We cannot afford to gamble on the chance that there will be no international incident which will start off a new round of scare buying.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Until all time for debate on both sides has been exhausted the possibility exists that the time available to both sides will be consumed in the development of a quorum. The Chair therefore suggests, until all debate has been concluded, that the suggestion of the absence of a quorum be withheld.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I believe that Senators will want to know what they are voting on. I ask unanimous consent that we may have a quorum call and that the time be not charged to either side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Monroney
Anderson	Green	Moody
Bennett	Hayden	Morse
Benton	Hendrickson	Mundt
Brewster	Hennings	Neely
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Nixon
Bridges	Hill	O'Conor
Butler, Md.	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Pastore
Byrd	Humphrey	Robertson
Cain	Hunt	Russell
Capehart	Ives	Saltonstall
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Clements	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Dirksen	Knowland	Sparkman
Douglas	Lehman	Stennis
Duff	Long	Thye
Dworshak	Martin	Tobey
Eastland	Maybank	Underwood
Ellender	McCarran	Watkins
Ferguson	McCarthy	Welker
Flanders	McClellan	Wiley
Frear	McFarland	Williams
Fulbright	McKellar	Young
George	Millikin	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield whatever time he may desire to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], who has an amendment substantially similar to the one now pending.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to inquire how much time remains?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has 7 minutes; the Senator from South Carolina has 14.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois. As he has explained, I had submitted to the committee an amendment somewhat similar to this, which would relieve from price control all material selling for a 60-day period at a price below the ceiling. It would permit the President to reestablish controls if, for a period of 30 days, after the removal of the controls, any goods should go above the ceiling price. I like this amendment because of the fact that it would relieve businessmen generally from the perpetual paper work which is essential in order to comply with wage regulations, rules, orders, and edicts of OPS, which are being issued with amendments, qualifications, and exceptions so fast that businessmen cannot keep track of them.

I have in my hand one volume about 3 inches thick, which involves but one segment of the retail business in our country. It is impossible to keep up with these rules and regulations, and when one undertakes to read them, he finds it impossible at times to understand them. They have been written and prepared by men who are technically expert, possibly, but who certainly use language calculated to confuse their thought rather than to clarify it.

In the hearing before our committee it was testified by certain representatives of various segments of business, that it took about a third of their time to prepare reports for the Government. We likewise had testimony to the effect that, for every employee of OPS, it takes about 10 employees throughout the country, in order to comply with their rules and regulations. We have had personal contact, of course, with a great many business people, who have confirmed the testimony presented to our committee.

This amendment would place the responsibility upon the administration, upon the President, and through him, upon OPS, to establish positively and affirmatively whether a regulation should be in effect after the first day of September of this year. That clearly brings the question into the realm of need. At the present time many goods are in adequate supply, and many in surplus supply throughout the country. The market is soft in many industries, and prices have been declining in many fields. It is absurd for the Federal Government to maintain control through ceiling prices on materials and goods which are selling far below ceiling prices.

There have been several instances of the OPS having attempted to lower prices and roll them back. I particularly remember one, that in the case of fats and oils, where there was a rollback order. Within only 2 or 3 months under the rollback order, which was issued with tremendous fanfare and publicity in order to influence people to think that OPS was acting in their interest, the product was selling at one-half the ceiling price. On the other hand, where ceiling prices were fixed by the OPS, as in the case of scrap iron, the steel companies were forced to go a great distance for scrap. Ceiling prices were placed on scrap, and scrap went into hiding. Scrap of inferior quality was necessarily bought, and extra work was required in order to make it available and useful in the production of steel. So, generally, confusion has resulted from the orders of OPS and their interference with the orderly conduct of business.

Mr. President, I grant you that price control might have been necessary in the case of commodities which were in short supply. Some of them may be in short supply yet, such as minerals and metals which are essential to the defense program, with respect to which we shall have to continue controls. But this amendment makes that responsibility the responsibility of the Federal administration, the President of the United States, operating through OPS. It would relieve business generally except in the few instances where there is a short supply of articles needed in connection with the Federal Government's defense-production program. It would relieve businessmen of the country from the additional cost, from the confusion, from the burden of making interminable reports, and from keeping track of the rules and regulations and orders and amendments and supplements thereto issued by OPS.

Mr. President, the time has come in our economy when production is rapidly catching up in all fields. It was testified before our committee that even in the case of steel, by the end of this year, barring an extensive strike, the steel industry would be producing at about 90 percent of its capacity.

The copper situation is such that last week authority was granted to American companies to buy outside our country or offshore and to carry through the cost to 80 percent, of course, of the amount paid, in addition to the ceiling price. Yet, domestically, the ceiling price that is maintained is causing utter confusion in the copper market and is further limiting the supply.

So, in my judgment, Mr. President, the time has arrived when we ought to look forward to an early date when all price and wage regulations can be removed. This amendment is a step in the right direction, removing them only where they are no longer necessary, and relieving business generally of the business of reporting and keeping track of the regulations and orders issued by OPS.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. Granting that there is considerable provocation for the type of amendment with respect to prices which the Senator is in this instance supporting, I should like to inquire of my able colleague from Ohio what plan he has with respect to wages in those industries where price controls would thus be removed.

Mr. BRICKER. There is no plan at all in this amendment in regard to wages.

Mr. IVES. They would still remain controlled, would they?

Mr. BRICKER. They would still remain under stabilization.

Mr. IVES. That is, virtually controlled.

Mr. BRICKER. That is the import of the amendment. The amendment is submitted, not by the Senator from Ohio, but by the Senator from Illinois. The stabilization program, as the Senator from New York well knows, is operated under an entirely different formula and in an entirely different way from that in which the price control program is operated. One has been more or less in the nature of a freeze, the other has been operated in the nature of adjustments. Most of the adjustments have been upward, and the

pressure has been upward. The pressure on prices has been downward, until at the present time I would say in a great majority of the fields, prices are below the ceilings fixed by OPS.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York would like to ask his colleague from Ohio whether he does not feel that, if controls over prices in any particular industry in any particular area should be removed, controls of any type and of every type over wages, to the extent that the controls over prices are affected by such an order, should also be removed?

Mr. BRICKER. I agree with the Senator from New York. As he well knows, I am in favor of taking them all off now so far as that is concerned.

Mr. IVES. I do not think we should remove controls over prices without removing controls over wages, where they are involved.

Mr. BRICKER. That involves an entirely different situation. Where prices are low, there would of course be no demand for an increase of wages in those fields. The fields which would be exempt from price control are fields wherein there is not a great element of labor. In those fields there is not going to be much pressure for an increase of wages, and in some places they may decline. As the Senator from New York well knows, where there is at the present time a suppressed market and a softening of prices there have even been some decreases in wages. So, I do not think the effect which the Senator from New York fears might result because of not removing wages from controls is very important.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senate were to show a disposition to deal with this matter in conformity with this amendment, it could then deal with the other matter.

Mr. BRICKER. The question of controls could easily be dealt with, and I would join in and heartily support an amendment having such an objective.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield in order that I may address a question to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BRICKER. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from New York for that purpose, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. IVES. Would it not be far better to have the two questions combined in a single amendment, so that we might know what we were doing?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Illinois combined them in a proposal for joint action on titles IV and V, but in that particular case he was not very successful.

Mr. IVES. Surely, if we turned down the earlier effort in connection with titles IV and V, we should not now be abolishing one or the other.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If it is not done "whole hog," then it will be necessary to take two bites of the cherry. I do not think that would work in this particular instance. We are dealing with but one segment of the problem at the present time. I do not know how it would be possible to combine them.

Mr. BRICKER. I assure the Senator from New York that if an amendment were submitted along the line of his suggestion, I would give it my full support.

I point out, Mr. President, that at the present time OPS is increasing its staff——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired. All time of the proponents of the amendment has expired. The Senator from South Carolina has some time on the amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, this amendment would terminate price control on September 30, 1952, except for materials which are in such short supply as to threaten an unreasonable price rise, and are important in relation to business costs or living costs.

In order to permit control of these materials, a formal finding would have to be made and its basis set forth. That is the important thing. We have voted to do away with rent control at the end of February. I supported the action, as chairman of the committee. But, Mr. President, please remember that a formal finding of facts will have to be made to ascertain what is to be discontinued and what is not to be discontinued. The finding of facts is subject to court review. The courts will have to review the finding before September.

Furthermore, the amendment attempts to insulate individual commodities in an entirely unrealistic manner, instead of recognizing the danger of general inflationary pressure against which we must protect the consumer, the farmer, and the entire Nation.

I repeat, Mr. President, that this amendment could not be administered and would, in effect, achieve the same purpose of eliminating price controls which the earlier amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] sought to achieve more directly. If we want to do away with price controls, let us do away with them by adopting a concurrent resolution.

My good friend from Illinois knows that there must be findings of fact as to the materials which are to be released from controls. How can we have findings of fact and court decisions between now and September, when almost everyone is going either to the Republican convention in early July, or to the Democratic convention later in July?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. After a finding of facts the situation might change in 2 weeks.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct. And the courts have to review the facts.

Mr. McFARLAND. I agree with the Senator. Instead of merely knifing it, let us do away with it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. It would be too bad if the administration had to find the facts.

Mr. MAYBANK. I think Governor Arnall has found many facts in connection with wool. Certainly, the distinguished Senator from Indiana was interested, as I was, in tallow, hides, and pork products. Governor Arnall removed controls from those commodities.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The point was made that there must be a court review. There is nothing in the amendment about a court review.

Mr. MAYBANK. The law provides that there must be court review.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There must be an inflationary threat before controls could be restored.

Mr. MAYBANK. Title 7 has not yet been eliminated from the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The amendment is a suspension amendment, and, in my opinion, it meets every point which has been made.

Mr. MAYBANK. If the Senator wants to do away with price controls by concurrent resolution, that is one thing, but what about the findings of fact which have to be made?

Mr. McFARLAND. The amendment states that "such material or service is important in relation to business costs or living costs." There is no standard established.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. Arnall will have to find the facts, and the courts will have to review them. If the Senator from Illinois thinks that can be done by next September, he is very much mistaken.

Mr. McFARLAND. What about children's shoes? I used to go barefooted when I was a child. Maybe Governor Arnall went barefooted, and might think that shoes are not very important, but some people think children ought to wear shoes. There is no standard at all.

Mr. MAYBANK. There must be a finding of facts, with a court review.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. OPS does not need any criteria now to check their own good judgment. They took antiques and squash seed off the list as having no bearing on the cost of living. I think the Senator's argument is wholly irrelevant.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am sorry the Senator disagrees with me.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. BRIDGES. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 54, as follows:

YEAS—27

Bennett	Cordon	McCarthy
Brewster	Dirksen	Millikin
Bricker	Dworshak	Mundt
Bridges	Ferguson	Schoeppel
Butler, Md.	Flanders	Thye
Butler, Nebr.	Hickenlooper	Welker
Cain	Kem	Wiley
Capehart	Knowland	Williams
Case	Martin	Young

NAYS—54

Aiken	Hennings	Monroney
Anderson	Hill	Moody
Benton	Hoey	Morse
Byrd	Holland	Neely
Chavez	Humphrey	Nixon
Clements	Hunt	O'Conor
Connally	Ives	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Duff	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Eastland	Kefauver	Russell
Ellender	Kilgore	Smathers
Frear	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Fulbright	Long	Smith, N. J.
George	Maybank	Smith, N. C.
Gillette	McCarran	Sparkman
Green	McClellan	Stennis
Hayden	McFarland	Underwood
Hendrickson	McKellar	Watkins

NOT VOTING—15

Carlson	Langer	Murray
Ecton	Lodge	Saltonstall
Jenner	Magnuson	Seaton
Johnson, Colo.	Malone	Taft
Kerr	McMahon	Tobey

So Mr. DIRKSEN's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, beginning with line 17, it is proposed to strike out subsection (p), and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

(p) Except in the case of action taken after full compliance with subsection (k) of this section, the President shall not reestablish maximum rents in any locality which has previously been decontrolled under this act until a public hearing, after 30 days' notice, has been held in such locality, and the governing body of said locality has by resolution, adopted in accordance with applicable local law, found that the conditions set forth in subsection (1) exist in said locality.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, Senators know that at present the Government can, without public hearings of any kind, reimpose Federal rent control, in localities in critical defense housing areas which have previously been decontrolled, provided the President has certified that there exist in each such locality (a) new or expanded military or defense installations, (b) a substantial immigration of military or defense personnel, (c) a substantial housing shortage or (d) an excessive increase of rents or the threats of excessive increases in rents.

Senators know that a locality can remove Federal rent controls through affirmative action taken by its local governing body.

Senators know that the pending bill, S. 2594, includes an amendment by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], which provides that the Government shall not reimpose Federal rent controls on a locality which has previously been decontrolled until a public hearing, after 30 days' notice, has been held in such area.

The amendment which I have offered is merely a logical addition to the Robertson amendment. My amendment requires that the Government shall not reimpose Federal rent controls on a locality which has previously been decontrolled unless the local governing body, after a public hearing, has by resolution found that the four conditions to which I have made reference do exist.

It seems obvious to me that, following a public hearing to determine the facts, a locality is better equipped and qualified to determine the need for reimposing Federal rent controls than is the Federal Government. Without the adoption of my amendment, there are likely to be cases where the Government will insist on reimposing Federal rent controls only to have the local governing body immediately take steps to remove the controls.

Such a circumstance is as unnecessary as it would be costly and confusing.

Yesterday the Senate agreed that price, wage, and rent controls shall terminate at the close of February 28, 1953. Every caution should therefore be taken to prevent reimposing Federal rent controls on localities previously decontrolled unless the reasons for doing so are impelling and accepted as being valid by the locality affected. It would be improper and, in my opinion, unwise for us to assume that any American locality is less patriotic or intelligent than is the Federal Government. If a public hearing proves conclusively that rents in any locality are excessive and that a housing shortage exists because of the substantial in-migration of defense or military personnel, I take it to be true that the governing body of such a locality would resolve that Federal rent controls should be reimposed.

What my amendment recommends is based on logic. In having previously provided by law that a locality can rid itself of Federal rent controls, we ought now to provide that localities shall be the agency to determine if Federal rent controls ought to be reimposed. Should my amendment be adopted, we shall acknowledge our respect for American localities and our confidence in their ability and readiness to take proper action in accordance with facts which are developed in the public hearings which will be required by the amendment of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. As I understand the amendment, it differs from the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Virginia.

If there were a public hearing and the Federal Government believed that rent control was necessary in a community which today has 5,000 people, but which, we will say for the sake of argument, in December may have 100,000 people because of the construction of an atomic energy plant or a military installation, the city council which was in existence when the community consisted of 5,000 people would have the power to veto the action of the Government, whatever the Government might claim with respect to the area being a critical defense area. The amendment of the Senator from Virginia provides for a public hearing with respect to larger communities.

I asked the hypothetical question because that was the way I understood the amendment would apply. I am not against landlords, as the Senator well knows. I have never said anything against them, and I am not opposed to them. But I have sense enough to know that there are certain communities in America which are very small today, and which may be very large tomorrow if present plans are carried out. The President has asked for $3,000,000,000 additional for the construction of atomic plants. There might be in existence today a community of 5,000 people with a council form of government, which could veto the decision of the Federal Government.

For example, take Oak Ridge, Tenn. I believe the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is very much interested in trying to prevent a similar situation arising anywhere else in America. At the site of the new atomic plants there may be very few people today. There may be many thousands tomorrow. I am not sure about the wisdom of allowing a few local people to veto a finding of fact with respect to a critical defense area.

Last night I opposed shortening the limitation on rent control from 12 months to 8 months. That made no serious difference. We have no rent control in my State, except where atomic energy plants or military installations are located or to be located.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Washington are by no means far apart. I believe that within the next few minutes that fact will be established.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the time consumed in this colloquy may be charged to my time.

Mr. CAIN. I am very grateful to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield, gladly.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia was successful in persuading the committee to adopt the amendment to which reference has been made. We thought that when an area had been decontrolled there should be some definite expression, through a public hearing, of the necessity for recontrol before it was imposed. In a community such as Hampton Roads, which is in a critical defense area, or in the nearby counties of Arlington and Fairfax, which I believe are critical defense areas, I can see no particular objection to the additional safeguard which the Senator from Washington proposes. However, I can see that in some areas there might be difficulties. I have visited the atomic energy plant at Savannah Valley. There are about 65,000 new workers at that site, compared with 1,000 or 2,000 local people in the community. The Government must furnish the houses. The Government cannot bring workers in there unless it can provide housing at a reasonable price. Rents must be controlled, at least temporarily, in areas of that kind. As the Senator from South Carolina has pointed out, we run into certain difficulties in connection with the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments made by the Senator from Virginia. Let me say to the Senator from South Carolina—I think he did not hear it—that among other things the Senator from Virginia indicated that he saw no objection to the adoption of my amendment, but he raised several questions in connection with it, which I wish now to answer.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I do not intend to raise objections to the Senator's amendment before the Senator has explained it. I only asked a hypothetical question, as to whether or not his amendment would apply to an area which had been declared to be a critical defense area, and where there might be two or three thousand people today, and many thousand tomorrow. There may be such areas in Arizona, New Mexico, Virginia, or South Carolina. Tomorrow there may be 100,000 people in such a community because of expenditures by the Federal Government either for the armed services or in connection with the atomic energy program.

Mr. CAIN. I ask the Senator from South Carolina to bear with me for about 2 minutes.

The present law provides that there shall be a finding of fact by the Federal Government before Federal rent controls can be reimposed on a community which had previously been decontrolled. Secondly, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] has provided in his amendment that there shall be a public hearing.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. To be of assistance in the finding of fact.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Virginia will bear me out in the statement that I supported his amendment throughout in the committee.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. In the third place, the Senator from Washington is suggesting in his amendment that the finding of fact as to the need for recontrolling an American municipality shall be where he believes it belongs, with the American municipality or locality.

Mr. MAYBANK. How large would the new municipality be?

Mr. CAIN. From the smallest up to the highest population figure for any city in the United States.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, a community of 10,000 would be a comparatively small place. In the case of Savannah Valley, the population jumped to 50,000. I am considering what my own people are up against. The same thing would be true in Paducah, Ky., where the distinguished Vice President comes from.

Mr. CAIN. I feel quite certain that the Senator from South Carolina will agree with me that if it is apparent in any American local area that there is a housing shortage, that there is substantial in-migration of defense and other workers, and that there is or threatens to be an excessive increase in rents, the community's local government will be as responsive to the needs of their community, and more so, than the Federal Government can ever be.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Washington would be absolutely correct so far as the city of Norfolk or the city of Memphis, for example, would be concerned. It is the mushroom cities—and I say that respectfully—where atomic plants and new defense installations are being constructed, which give me concern, because they have old-line governments. Sometimes they were unincorporated communities even a year ago.

Mr. CAIN. We have in such circumstances, in nearly every State in the United States, a Board of County Commissioners. The only difference between the law as it is now written and what I am suggesting is that the power of determination ought, by way of compliment and out of respect, to be vested in the American local government, as opposed to the dead-hand government of a Federal agency which is often located as much as 3,000 miles away.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me suggest—and I say this knowingly—that there are communities in my State, and there are communities in Kentucky, if I may say so, as there are communities in New Mexico, in which the local people do not know, to the best of my knowledge, what the extent of the in-migration will be. For example, in my State it is said there is going to be a certain amount of in-migration. I know better than that from what officials of the Federal Government have told me. I am not going to talk about what the Atomic Energy Commission has told me, or about the $3,000,000,000 in additional appropriations the President has requested, but the Federal officials know factually about the in-migration of workers long before the local people know about it. That is what gives me concern.

Mr. CAIN. I will allay the Senator's concern. The Senator from Virginia in his amendment makes certain that there is to be a public hearing in which the facts will be developed, as a result of which the local authorities, whatever the situation may be, will be as fully conscious of the facts as the Federal Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. CAIN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. We have a situation in Tennessee which I wish to call to the attention of the Senate, particularly the Senator from Washington, which is very unusual. At Oak Ridge, Tenn., which I think is now the fifth largest city in the State—and it has been made so by the atomic energy plant which has been built there—there is no civic government at all. Every foot of ground is owned by a foreign corporation. It is not a local corporation at all. They increased the rents last year by 26 percent. In January of this year they gave notice that they were going to increase the rents 26 percent more. I was appealed to. I was asked to prevent the additional increase, if possible. We did prevent it.

I would like to know how the Senator's amendment would affect that particular city. It ought to be protected against a further increase in rents.

Mr. CAIN. Indeed, sir. I see no problem whatever in that situation because the foreign corporation to which the Senator from Tennessee makes reference are in fact agents of the United States Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. If it be so that one agency of the Government cannot cooperate with and understand the intentions of another agency of the Federal Government, there can be no help or solution for a problem of that character.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator's amendment does not apply to that situation in any way?

Mr. CAIN. Oh, no.

Mr. McKELLAR. What ought to be done? We ought to adopt an amendment to take care of it. Probably I shall offer an amendment. The Government should take steps to find out what the people in that community want. It should find out whether they want their rents increased. Even though the Government owns all the land, the foreign corporations let out the business places, such as restaurants. But everything is

owned by the Government. It is an impossible condition; it is an undemocratic condition; it is a communistic condition that exists there today. They have raised the rents on the poor people who work for the Government.

Mr. CAIN. I would encourage the Senator from Tennessee to offer such an amendment. Certainly the Senator from Washington would support it. What the Senator from Washington seeks to accomplish is to make unnecessary and to make impossible the existence of conditions in American municipalities which the Senator from Tennessee suggests with cause exist in a Federal city in a sovereign State. I am only suggesting and urging the adoption of the pending amendment in order that the local communities may have a full and complete chance to express their own will. I know that the Senator from South Carolina basically believes as I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have always been on the side of my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in connection with the Manhattan Project ever since 1941, when it was established. The people in the communities have no right to vote, even. They have no government.

Mr. McKELLAR. They cannot vote. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. They have no government.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from South Carolina was absent from the floor when I answered that question precisely. In Oak Ridge, Tenn., there is a Federal city.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. It is a ward of a Federal agency.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. My amendment has no relationship to the relationship between different Federal agencies. That will continue to be their own responsibility.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is a very bad responsibility. It is bad for the people of Tennessee, as the Senator from Tennessee has so often said on the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from South Carolina accept an amendment providing that localities which have no city government, but which are cities just the same, should have the right to pass on an increase in rents?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee has asked me whether I would accept an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Washington. I cannot accept it as an amendment to the pending amendment. I shall be glad to consider it as a separate amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will prepare one and submit it later.

Mr. CAIN. I would suggest that as soon as a vote is had on my amendment I should like to join with the Senator from Tennessee in urging the adoption of such an amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I think I have stated substantially and fundamentally the essence of the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Washington. All I seek to accomplish is that a finding of fact concerning the need for reimposing Federal rent controls on an American municipality in a critical defense housing area shall be determined by the local governing body of that municipality, rather than by the Federal agency concerned.

In all sincerity I urge the adoption of the amendment out of my respect for the self-reliance, for the patriotism, and for the intelligence of the average normal American community and locality.

Mr. President, I request the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I do not desire to labor the point, but under the circumstances I shall suggest the absence of a quorum. We may as well dispose of the amendment in order to determine whether—no, not to determine whether one is for the Federal Government or for the cities. I merely wish to provide an opportunity for Senators to support the amendment who wish to do so.

Mr. MAYBANK. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. President, a quorum call has been requested; but before the absence of a quorum is actually suggested, I merely wish to say that when I vote against the amendment of my good friend, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], I shall not be voting for the Federal Government, as against local government. I shall vote against this amendment because I simply do not believe it is workable in communities in which today the Federal Government is expending huge sums of money—for instance, communities in the State of Kentucky or communities in my own State. I do not believe it would be workable to permit the government of a small town which last year was unincorporated, but which has 10,000 inhabitants today, to determine what in-migrant workers will have to pay for rent and what rent charges will be made, at a time when labor is so scarce.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina is not unmindful, I am sure, that we are speaking only of communities in the United States which previously have been under Federal rent control, but which by local action have decontrolled themselves. The Senator from South Carolina has no doubt of what the facts in this case are, I trust.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have no doubt as to what the facts are or as to what the Senator from Washington is attempting to do. He and I are really trying to do the same thing, in substance, although we may differ as to the method.

I thought the Senator from Virginia covered the point well in his amendment.

Mr. CAIN. He took a positive step in that respect.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; and I supported the amendment of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. CAIN. So, Mr. President, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). The Chair wishes to inquire whether the Senator from South Carolina yields back the time which remains to him or whether he wishes the time required for the call of the roll, following the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, to be charged to his time.

Mr. MAYBANK. No, Mr. President, for the call of the roll might take even as long as an hour. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the time required for the call of the roll not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	McFarland
Anderson	Green	McKellar
Bennett	Hayden	Millikin
Benton	Hendrickson	Monroney
Brewster	Hennings	Moody
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bridges	Hill	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Nixon
Byrd	Humphrey	O'Conor
Cain	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Ives	Pastore
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Clements	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Knowland	Sparkman
Duff	Lehman	Stennis
Dworshak	Long	Thye
Eastland	Martin	Underwood
Ellender	Maybank	Watkins
Ferguson	McCarran	Welker
Frear	McCarthy	Wiley
Fulbright	McClellan	Williams

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

Mr. CAIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. BRIDGES. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota

[Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

If present and voting the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—29

Bennett	Cordon	McCarthy
Brewster	Dirksen	Millikin
Bricker	Duff	Mundt
Bridges	Dworshak	Nixon
Butler, Md.	Ferguson	Thye
Butler, Nebr.	Hickenlooper	Watkins
Byrd	Kem	Welker
Cain	Knowland	Wiley
Capehart	Martin	Williams
Case	McCarran	

NAYS—46

Aiken	Hoey	Moody
Anderson	Holland	Morse
Benton	Humphrey	Neely
Chavez	Hunt	O'Conor
Clements	Ives	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Ellender	Kefauver	Smathers
Frear	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Fulbright	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Gillette	Long	Smith, N. C.
Green	Maybank	Sparkman
Hayden	McClellan	Stennis
Hendrickson	McFarland	Underwood
Hennings	McKellar	
Hill	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—21

Carlson	Kerr	Russell
Connally	Langer	Saltonstall
Ecton	Lodge	Schoeppel
Flanders	Magnuson	Seaton
George	Malone	Taft
Jenner	McMahon	Tobey
Johnson, Colo.	Murray	Young

So Mr. CAIN's amendment was rejected.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS 1952—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6947) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 3, 1952, pp. 6627–6629).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6947, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 5, 1952.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 5, 22, and 45, to the bill (H. R. 6947) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"For payment to Barbara Y. Schwabe, widow of George B. Schwabe, late a Representative from the State of Oklahoma, $12,500.

"For payment to Lyla H. Murray, widow of Reid F. Murray, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin, $12,500.

"For payment to Anna M. Byrne, and Elizabeth B. Turkenkoph, sisters of William T. Byrne, late a Representative from the State of New York, one-half to each, $12,500."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

After the words "Public Law", in line 5 of said amendment, insert "298, Eighty-second Congress," and, in line 7 of said amendment, change "$6,500,000" to "$4,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"CHAPTER XII

"CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS

"For payment of claims for damages as settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law, audited claims certified to be due by the General Accounting Office, and judgments rendered against the United States by United States district courts and the United States Court of Claims, as set forth in House Document No. 471, Eighty-second Congress, and Senate Document No. 108, Eighty-second Congress, $6,490,662, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall have become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That, unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than 30 days after the date of approval of this act."

Mr. McKELLAR. Amendment No. 7 provided an appropriation to the widow of George B. Schwabe. The House has added the beneficiaries of Representatives Byrne and Murray.

Amendment No. 25 provided an appropriation of $6,500,000 for investigations by the Civil Service Commission. The House insisted on the appropriation being reduced to $4,000,000.

Amendment No. 47 provided an appropriation to pay judgments and authorized claims. The House added additional judgments which were submitted in House Document No. 471.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 25, and 47.

The motion was agreed to.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2594) to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, line 22, after the word "area", it is proposed to insert the words "including any community owned and operated by the Federal Government."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object——

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator from South Carolina intend to accept the amendment and take it to conference?

Mr. MAYBANK. I intend to do that after certain things are done.

Mr. CAPEHART. I understand.

Mr. MAYBANK. As I understand the amendment, it grants the people of Oak Ridge the right to vote, as people in other Federal communities have the right, and they should have that right.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator for his statement.

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall be more than pleased to take the amendment to conference, with the hope that the conferees will agree to it.

The Senator from Connecticut has asked me if I would yield him a few minutes so that he could introduce a joint resolution. He could not introduce it without being yielded to for that purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me just a moment?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. At Oak Ridge, which is a community where there is an atomic energy plant, the Government owns all the property. Sometime last fall, I believe in November, the rents charged the people who lived on that project were raised. Those people have no right to vote. They have no city government, they have no municipal government of any kind. They are controlled by a corporation that is domiciled outside of the State of Tennessee. As I have said, the people there have no right to vote. But their rents were raised 18 percent, and later notice was given them that the rents were to be raised an additional 28 percent.

The Senate agreed with me when the notice of rent increase was given, and prohibited that action, but I want the people to be put on the same basis with

those in other communities in our country where citizens have a right to vote. That is all there is to this amendment.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee permit a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. BRICKER. What is the total amount of the land on which the Government has increased the rental on its own property in Oak Ridge?

Mr. McKELLAR. The rental has been raised only 16 percent up to this date, but those in control desire to increase it 28 percent more. The Senator will probably recall that I offered an amendment to prohibit that, and it was agreed to.

Mr. BRICKER. It was agreed to by the conferees.

Mr. MAYBANK. The increase was prohibited last year under the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. We prohibited it last year, and our desire is to give the people the same right those in other communities have.

SECOND COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining on the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has 12 minutes left.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON]. However, I wish to say to the Senator that I cannot yield him any more time than that.

Mr. BENTON. I am grateful to the Senator from South Carolina. Eight minutes will be sufficient, but it will prevent me from yielding for questions.

Mr. President, for myself and the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] I send to the desk for appropriate reference a joint resolution for the establishment of the Second Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 163) for the establishment of the Second Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, introduced by Mr. BENTON (for himself and Mr. O'CONOR) was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I am much pleased to see so many Senators on the floor as I give this brief explanation.

Perhaps many of my colleagues noticed a newspaper story published yesterday morning, reporting on a letter from former President Hoover to the Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of the House of Representatives. I wish there were time to read the whole letter, Mr. President, but the first part of it which I commend to the Congress is the two sentences, which I should now like to read. President Hoover gives these as general comment on the 29 separate legislative measures, calling for various kinds of reorganizations, now before the House committee. He states:

> You will, as in all the enactments you have already made, be confronted with opposition. They will have the familiar form "reorganize everybody but me" or "don't touch that agency, it's sacred."

Mr. Hoover ends his letter with a paragraph which carries number 9, as follows:

> To reestablish the Commission on Organization, 13 bills. While many commission recommendations have been adopted during the past 3 years, there are important reorganizations of the Post Office, Treasury, Interior, Agriculture Department, the Veterans Administration and the Federal Security Agency which are not fully dealt with in the 29 bills before your committee. We must also recognize the enormous increase in Federal activities since the Commission's recommendations. I suggest, therefore, that these proposals to reestablish the Commission go over to the next Congress. It would be desirable that they should appoint a new Commission to examine these uncompleted tasks and to make recommendations on them. Moreover, the increase in the Federal Budget from about $40,000,000,000 annually to about $90,000,000,000 creates new problems of organization which should be studied.

Mr. President, I was most actively interested in this whole subject during my first year and a half in the Senate, when I had the privilege of serving on the Committee on Government Operations. During the year 1950, I was the only Member of the Senate who spoke on the floor with respect to some of the Hoover proposals. It may be recalled that during that year, 34 proposals came to the Senate, based on recommendations of the Hoover Commission, and 27 were approved.

In the Eighty-second Congress, only six plans have been submitted by the President. One pertaining to the RFC was approved last year. One relating to the Bureau of Internal Revenue has been approved this year. Three plans are pending—namely, for the Post Office Department, collectors of customs, and United States marshals—and they will go into effect on June 21, unless disapproved. The fifth and final plan with reference to the District of Columbia, will go into effect, unless disapproved, on July 1.

Mr. President, it does not seem to me that the Congress should delay in accepting this recommendation and suggestion of former President Hoover, who calls for the establishment of a second Commission on Organization. Let us start on this at once. The total cost to the taxpayers of the first Commission was, as I recall, roughly $2,000,000. I suppose that the American people have had a greater return from that $2,000,000, in increased efficiency and savings in the operation of the Federal Government, than from any other money spent in this generation. Why wait a year for the follow-up which former President Hoover recommends. Starting at once, instead of next year, may save hundreds of millions of dollars. There is one saving alone, not yet acted on, which President Hoover estimated to me, when I visited with him in his apartment in New York 2 years ago, at the vast sum of $400,000,000 annually. This one project alone warrants a second Commission.

My resolution is modeled exactly after the prior resolution in 1947 which established the first Commission on Organization. The proposed Commission would be entirely nonpartisan and nonpolitical; appointed in exactly the same manner as the Commission of which ex-President Hoover was chairman. The only difference is that, instead of giving to the second Commission as its duty and responsibility the examination of the entire Federal Government, with the injunction to review and report on the entire Federal operation, my resolution sets up as the duty and responsibility of the Commission the examination of those areas with respect to which reorganization legislation has not yet been enacted, and such other areas of the Federal Government as may seem appropriate to the Commission, due to the great increase in the budget, or for any other reason.

If we establish this Commission at once, we shall be a year ahead, and we may save hundreds of millions of dollars. What are the counter arguments? I do not know them.

I do not wish to suggest that I personally approve every recommendation of the first Commission on Organization. As an illustration, there are some facets of the proposals affecting the Veterans' Administration with which I disagree. But I do suggest that any recommendation by a Commission so responsibly established should be studied and reviewed by the Congress. That is why I sponsored, along with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], every one of the proposals coming before the Senate this year growing out of the Hoover Commission recommendations. They warrant careful consideration by appropriate committees.

It was not that I approved of each bill in detail. It was not that I would not, as a member of a committee reviewing any one of the bills, have advocated changes in the Hoover proposals. It was only that I thought every single one of them should be carefully studied. None should be ignored.

I earnestly hope that the Committee on Government Organization will move ahead rapidly in the consideration of my resolution, and that the resolution may be favorably acted upon by the Senate before Congress adjourns.

In conclusion, I have before me a sheet called A Legislative Box Score, which has been made up by the Citizens' Committee in support of the proposals of the Hoover Commission. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point this so-called legislative box score of 1951, which reviews the background and status of each of the unenacted recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Below is a box score on the 20 bills prepared by the Citizens' Committee in 1951 incorporating all the unenacted recommendations of the Hoover Commission. The

bills were introduced in the Senate on March 15, 1951; in the House in March and April 1951. In addition, the committee suggested 51 reorganization plans to the President on May 8, 1951. On April 30, 1951, the plan to reorganize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was approved. Further, the Bureau of Internal Revenue was reorganized, effective March 15, 1952.

Subject and bill Nos.	Purpose of bills	Status
Agriculture: S. 1149; H. R. 3684, H. R. 3308	Provide better services to farmers at lower cost to all citizens.	In Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the House Committee on Agriculture. Hearings held by Senate Committee from Aug. 28 to Sept. 18, 1951. No definitive action taken by Oct. 1.
Commerce: S. 1141; H. R. 3682, H. R. 3310	Give Commerce Department many governmental functions related to its mission but now located in other agencies.	In Senate and House Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. No hearings held.
Displaced Persons Commission and War Claims Commission: S. 1147; H. R. 3690, H. R. 3319.	Consolidate these agencies in State Department	Referred to Senate Judiciary Committee and House Foreign Affairs Committee. No hearings held.
Federal-State relations: S. 1146; H. R. 3683, H. R. 3308.	Study relationships of Federal, State, and municipal governments.	In Senate and House Committees on Expenditures in Executive Department. Reported favorably and passed the Senate July 23, 1951. Motion made by Senator Ellender and carried to recall bill. No further action in either House.
Foreign affairs: S. Con. Res. No. 19; H. Con. Res. Nos. 92 and 78.	Combine Foreign Service and domestic employees of State Department into single career service.	In Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs Committees. Hearings not held but State Department submitted alternate proposal designed to accomplish same end; however, falls short of Hoover Commission plan.
General management: S. 1134; H. R. 3304, H. R. 3674.	Provide President with necessary staff assistance and better departmental organization.	In Senate and House Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. No hearings held.
General Services: S. 1136; H. R. 3676, H. R. 3314	Centralize several "fringe" organizations in the General Services Administration.	In Senate District of Columbia Committee and House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. No hearings held.
Interior:		
S. 1143; H. R. 3680, H. R. 3309	Consolidate duplicating public works development programs into 1 agency.	In Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. No hearings held.
S. 1144; H. R. 3318, H. R. 3679	Eliminate interdepartmental competition for public works projects by establishing Board of Impartial Analysis.	In Senate and House Committees on Public Works. No hearings held.
Labor: S. 1142; H. R. 3681, H. R. 3315	Revitalize and expand responsibilities of Labor Department.	In Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and House Committee on Education and Labor. No hearings held.
Medical activities: S 1140; H. R. 3688, H. R. 3305	Coordinate all Federal medical services to avoid present waste of medical manpower and facilities.	In Senate and House Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. No hearings held.
Overseas administration: S. 1166; H. R. 3697, H R 3406.	Study overseas programs so Congress will have sound basis for considering appropriations.	In Senate and House Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Reported favorably and passed by Senate on July 23, 1951. Motion made by Senator Ellender and carried to recall bill. No further action in Senate. House committee completed hearings, favorable report expected soon.
Personnel: S. 1135	Decentralize civil service recruiting and improve Government career service.	Passed by Senate in October 1951; now before House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.
Post Office:		
S. 1137; H. R. 3675, H. R. 3320	Bring hidden air subsidies into the open	Assigned to Senate and House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees. Hearings held by Senate committee from June 21 to July 30, 1951. A bill incorporating the major recommendations (S. 436) passed the Senate on September 19, 1951. No action has been taken by House.
S. 1148; H. R. 3691, H. R. 3312	Take Post Office out of politics, decentralize postal service and reset rates on certain special services.	In Senate and House Committees on Post Office and Civil Service. Both Houses passed rate bills (S. 1046, H. R. 2982) making penny postcards and special services self-supporting. Bills now in Senate-House conference. Senate committee held hearings September 5, 1951 and House committee in February 1951, on remaining Hoover proposals.
Regulatory Agencies: S. 1139; H. R. 3307, H. R. 3678.	Strengthen organization and assure bipartisan control of regulatory agencies.	In Senate and House Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Senate Committee redrafting bill.
Social security and education: S. 1145; H. R. 3689, H. R. 3306.	Create new Department of Social Security and Education combining all functions of Federal Security Agency except Public Health.	In Senate and House Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. No hearings held.
Treasury: S. 1138; H. R. 3685, H. R. 3313	Realine Treasury Department and give it control of all fiscal programs.	In Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the House Ways and Means Committee. No hearings held.
Veterans affairs:		
S. 1151; H. R. 3686, H. R. 3316	Eliminate wasteful methods in VA operation and provide better services for all veterans and dependents.	In Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and House Committee on Veterans Affairs. No hearings held.
S. 1139; H. R. 3317, H. R. 3677	Set up an insurance corporation within VA	In Senate Finance Committee and the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. No hearings held.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. BENTON. I am very grateful to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] for having yielded time to me.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2594) to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It was submitted yesterday by me, on behalf of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and myself. It is designated "6-4-52-E."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan will be stated.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment offered by Mr. MOODY (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY) is as follows:

On page 3, line 13, substitute the following for all of section 103:

"(c) Section 402 (e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is further amended by adding after the words 'by an attorney or firm of attorneys engaged in the practice of his or their profession' in paragraph (ii) thereof the words '; wages, salaries, and other compensation paid to professional architects licensed to practice as such employed in a professional capacity by a professional architect or firm of professional architects engaged in the practice of his or their profession; and wages, salaries, and other compensation paid to certified public accountants licensed to practice as such employed in a professional capacity by a certified public accountant or firm of certified public accountants engaged in the practice of his or their profession'."

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, the Committee on Banking and Currency inserted in the pending bill an amendment which would exempt certain classes of professional people from salary stabilization. That amendment was adopted by the committee with a few or no dissenting votes. At a later time facts were presented which led some of us on the committee to the conviction that a part of the amendment should be reconsidered.

There is an acute shortage of engineers in the country. The Atomic Energy Commission and a number of corporations working on defense work have represented to me and to other Senators that if engineers are removed from the classification of persons whose salaries

are stabilized under the law, a system of pirating will spread and continue, which will seriously jeopardize the production situation.

I should like to read briefly from an article in Fortune magazine for September 1951:

> Aircraft engineers were so scarce that the situation led to the rise of "flesh-peddling" agencies, deplored by both industry and the profession. Dummy engineering companies hired batches of engineers outright on contract, then hired them out to aircraft and other companies at advanced salaries, pocketing the difference.

What is happening, apparently, is that a $15,000 engineer is hired away from an aircraft company or some other company working on defense work or private work by one of the new "flesh-peddling agencies," as the article terms them, and paid a somewhat higher salary. His services are then sold back to the corporation for $40,000 or $50,000 a year. This practice not only disrupts the production schedules, but also costs the Government money, and results in higher costs of defense materials.

My amendment merely restates the previous amendment, but leaves the engineers out of the exemption. I have discussed this amendment with the Office of Salary Stabilization. That agency is very anxious that it be adopted. I have also discussed it with other members of the committee. I believe that most of them, although not all of them, agree that the amendment is desirable.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOODY. I yield.

Mr. BENTON. I congratulate the Senator from Michigan for offering this amendment. There are involved millions of dollars in costs to the Federal Government. I do not feel that it is just to set aside engineers as a group, for the special privileges proposed to be accorded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from South Carolina opposed to the amendment?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield whatever time I have on this amendment to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. I voted for the amendment in the committee.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, the reason the amendment appearing in the bill as section 103 was submitted to the committee and adopted by the committee is the fact that private engineering firms are not under any restrictions, limitations, or ceilings, so far as their fees are concerned. However, the situation is such that they cannot increase the pay of the engineers whom they employ. The result is exactly the reverse of what was suggested by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY]. Industrial concerns have been raiding private engineering corporations. In my home town two men went out with a surveying party to work on the road. The representative of a big company came along and said to them, "I do not know what you are paid or what you are doing, but if you are graduate engineers we will pay you $2,000 a year more than you are now receiving." The men quit their jobs in the middle of the day and accepted the new jobs.

Private engineering firms are laboring under a handicap which they are trying to have removed. The committee amendment would not cost the Federal Government one cent.

Mr. President, there are three or four fundamental issues involved in the committee amendment which should be retained, and in the amendment of the Senator from Michigan which should not be adopted.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan takes engineers entirely out of the exemption. Lawyers are exempted, doctors are exempted, and accountants are exempted at the present time.

There has been no conflict with business whatsoever. Engineers are professional people, just as lawyers, doctors, and accountants. It is very difficult to regulate the salaries of professional people.

Engineers must be specially trained. They require 4 or 5 years of college work before they can qualify as registered engineers. Most of the States regulate the profession and require engineers to have certain educational qualifications before they can practice their profession.

As a result of that situation, the committee saw fit to exempt engineers and put them in the same class as lawyers, doctors, and accountants.

Mr. President, let me refer to the testimony in the hearings. This is all the testimony that was given on the subject, as I remember. It is the testimony of Mr. Paul H. Robbins, executive director of the National Society of Professional Engineers. He said:

> We submit that such an amendment would strengthen the defense economy, and, in addition, that it would be equitable, just, and proper for the individuals concerned, for their employers, and for the public.
>
> In brief, what we propose is that the employed professional engineer—one who is in circumstances comparable to the already exempt physician and attorney—be treated by the law exactly as they are treated.

On the next page he said:

> The usefulness of many consulting firms, however, and in some cases even their continued existence, is threatened by the controls imposed by the Defense Production Act. As matters now stand, consulting firms are limited in what they may pay their professional engineer employees. This despite the fact that increased effort and work on the part of the consulting firm has brought with it increased work and increased activity to professional employees.

Reading further:

> The consulting firm, able and willing to share the profits which have accrued to the firm because of the skilled work of its professional employees, is now face to face with the prohibitions of the Defense Production Act. Consulting firms are generally convinced that their professional fees, exempt from controls under the Defense Production Act, result from the unified teamwork of all their professional employees. The fee in reality represents payment for the unstinting effort of all these professional men. It seems clear that it is only fair that these men should be properly recognized and rewarded.

Continuing to read on page 530:

> On the other hand, the adoption of this amendment would permit the continued existence of many consulting engineering firms which are at present faced either with extinction or with a drastic curtailment of the services which they can render. If the activity of these firms is curtailed or if they are forced out of business the country will not have available to its defense production efforts the proved and well-tested services which have thus far contributed so much to our defense activity. A general loss of the services these firms can, and do, provide could be of serious consequence to our general economy.

Mr. President, there is another point involved in this very serious situation, and that is that the engineering schools of the country are low in the number of graduating students. They are 40 percent lower this year in graduates than the normal requirements. Industry has been competing for the services of the graduates of engineering schools. They are very much in demand, and there is a shortage of engineers. They are being offered all kinds of high salaries.

Of course, graduated scales are established by OPS, but what happens as a rule is that the firms that engage the graduate engineers do not employ the engineers under the first classification, but under the second, third, or fourth classification. In other words, the classification is raised in order to give them a higher salary. The result is that boys coming out of engineering schools are getting four or five hundred dollars a month to begin with. I know of one graduate student, with only a master's degree, who was paid $9,000 a year by one large industrial concern. The result is that there is a complete dislocation within the industry between the new employees and the engineers who have been employed for a number of years.

It is to permit an adjustment within the industry, a proper relationship between employer and employee in the engineering consulting firms, and a better relationship between the industry and the outside independent engineering concerns, that the amendment was adopted by the committee and reported to the Senate.

Furthermore, the committee amendment will encourage boys to go into engineering schools this fall, because they will know that if they obtain a good education and properly prepare themselves they will get their just rewards either in industry or in private engineering firms.

That is the fundamental interest I have in the subject. I have some relationship with the engineering college at Ohio State University. I have talked with the dean of the engineering college and I have talked with the head of the Atomic Energy Commission, as well as with the president of Case Institute, who is one of the members of the Commission and one of its most able members. They are all deeply concerned about the loss of students in the graduate schools, as well as in the baccalaureate work of the engineering schools.

Mr. President, the committee amendment would have the combined effect of encouraging boys to go into engineering work, which is the basic work upon which the industrial progress of our Nation depends and upon which the war effort actually depends.

Not only would it help fill up our engineering schools, but it would likewise put engineers on an equal basis with doctors, lawyers, and accountants.

Not only would it do that, but it would equalize the opportunity of industry and private engineering concerns to get the best men that they can possibly get from the universities and engineering schools. Furthermore, there would not be the raiding that there has been up to the present time on the part of industry as against private concerns.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] fears that the private engineering concerns will raid the engineering personnel of the big industrial concerns. I have no fear of that, because if engineers wanted to leave their employ they could leave and form a partnership. There is no control whatever over the fees they could charge the same concern in which they were previously engaged as employees. So the danger which the Senator from Michigan anticipates is a rather imaginative one, I believe.

Mr. President, I have talked with many leaders in the engineering field, including some of those with whom the Senator from Michigan has spoken, and they say that they anticipate that there might be some trouble. I doubt whether that is any difficulty. A great deal of the present raiding that is going on against private engineering concerns is brought about by the fact that they cannot pay their employees a just and fair wage, regardless of the fees being paid to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I find myself in charge of time in opposition to the amendment. I am in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan. The opposition has used 5 minutes. I should like to have 3 minutes allotted to me by the able Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. I shall be glad to yield time to the Senator from Indiana. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana has 5 minutes remaining. The Senator from Michigan has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. MOODY. I shall be glad to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I find myself in disagreement with my good friend the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. I do not believe that it would be wise to exempt engineers from wage controls, because thereby such a situation would be created that thousands of engineers working for hundreds of concerns in the United States who would like to pay their engineers more money would be prohibited from doing so, and under the law would lose their engineers to private engineering firms, who, under the committee amendment, would be permitted to pay any wage they cared to pay.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I would rather join with the Senator from Indiana in exempting everyone in the engineering field so that there would be equality of opportunity in bidding for the services of engineers. I would prefer to have an amendment submitted which would take all of them out entirely. Otherwise independent engineers would be at a tremendous disadvantage, in view of the raiding that has been going on for some time.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course, both the able Senator from Ohio and myself would like to eliminate price and wage controls under a formula included in an amendment which I submitted yesterday, but that seems to be impossible. Until we do eliminate price and wage controls, I think to eliminate wage controls in the case of engineering firms, with the result that they would thus be put in the position of being able to offer virtually any wage to engineers working for various manufacturing and other concerns, would work a hardship.

I do not know whether an engineering firm in Indianapolis, my home town, for example, would pay an unlimited wage; but if a manufacturing concern in that area was limited in the wages it could pay, an engineering firm might see fit to offer higher pay to the engineers working for that manufacturer, and those engineers might accept employment from the engineering firm which could pay them additional amounts of $100 or $200 or $300 a month. I do not understand how such an arrangement could work equitably.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Reference was made a moment ago to the possibility that an organization such as the Atomic Energy Commission might have difficulty in obtaining the services of a sufficient number of engineers, in view of the fact that, so it was stated, a private firm might offer the engineers of the Commission increased salaries, with the result that the engineers would leave the Atomic Energy Commission and would go to work for the private firm. As a matter of fact, in private industry the reverse has been true up to the present time. Consider the case I mentioned a moment ago, in which two men were working on a job, and the representative of a great industrial firm said to them, "If you are graduate engineers we will pay you $2,000 a year more than you are getting now, regardless of the work you do."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have had considerable experience with engineering firms, and up to this time I have never found many of them to be very modest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I should like to comment on several statements which have been made by the Senator from Ohio.

I did not quite understand his point when he said, on the one hand, that recent college graduates are being paid large salaries, but, on the other, that salaries are not sufficiently high to attract men to study engineering. There is a clear disparity in that remark.

In the second place, I should like to correct the impression that this situation is entirely an anticipated one. That is not a fact; this situation has existed for some time.

I am not sure whether the Senator from Ohio was in the Chamber when I read an article from Fortune magazine for last September. In the article it was stated that there have been so-called "flesh-peddling firms" which have been hiring engineers away from defense-production firms, and have been adding a large fee or "take" to the salaries of those engineers, in addition to the salaries paid for the actual work the engineers do. They have been "selling" those engineers back to the other firms.

The original complaint regarding this situation came from organizations such as the Atomic Energy Commission, which are concerned about the pirating of engineers from their organizations.

Nearly all of us are under salary stabilization. It may be that we would be justified in removing from salary stabilization some professional persons. But persons who are working on a salaried basis should have their salaries stabilized equally.

I should like to point out to the Senator from Ohio that some of the persons to whom both he and I spoke yesterday did not say this situation was an anticipated one only; at least, they did not say so to me. They are afraid of what the future situation might be if the other amendment which has been mentioned by the Senator from Ohio were adopted, for that amendment would remove all engineers from salary controls. Then there would be trouble in the organizations employing engineers, we are informed, because to remove them from salary controls while leaving others controlled would disrupt the general wage structure of those organizations.

The fact is that the pirating of engineers who are working for defense production organizations and for essential civilian firms is already occurring, and the defense production firms and other essential firms are most apprehensive of what will be the cost to the Government and what will be the effect on defense production in general if this situation is allowed to continue.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. MOODY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. How is an engineer in a position different from that of a skilled laborer, if skilled labor is in short supply?

Mr. MOODY. That is exactly the point.

Mr. McFARLAND. Why should the engineer be given a preferential right to get any salary he can, whereas a man doing ordinary labor cannot do that?

Mr. MOODY. That is exactly the point, and I am very glad the distinguished majority leader emphasized it. Of course any group of people would be glad to receive increased salaries if they could.

Mr. McFARLAND. Could it happen to be that the engineer is a somewhat

better lobbyist than is the ordinary laboring man?

Mr. MOODY. I would not know, but perhaps that could be so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. MOODY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Michigan would not say, would he, that an engineer should receive an exemption merely because he is a better lobbyist?

Mr. MOODY. I certainly would not.

I should like to point out that the amendment of the Senator from Ohio was adopted by the committee without extensive consideration. The consideration of it was very brief. Subsequently a number of additional facts were brought out.

At that time there had been in the committee an agreement that no reconsideration would be had of votes finally taken. When additional facts were presented it was suggested that the matter had better be brought up on the floor. I thought it was of sufficient importance to be brought up on the floor. I hope the Senate will adopt this amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, how much time remains to my side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana has 5 minutes remaining, and the Senator from Michigan has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, when the Senator from Michigan said that this matter has not had adequate consideration, he is entirely mistaken, so far as I am concerned. This problem has been in my mind and under consideration for many years, since the days when the engineering field began to be depressed and salaries began to decline and the student bodies in the engineering colleges and universities began to grow smaller and smaller. The problem is a serious one, for the country needs more engineers. At the present time the supply of engineers is 40 percent short.

I agree that there is competition for the services of engineers, but I also wish to have full enrollments at engineering schools which offer an adequate opportunity for an excellent education in the engineering field. If engineers are made subject to wage stabilization, I think engineering students will be discouraged. The present situation already has had a deadening effect upon the engineering schools and colleges.

The amendment reported by the committee would put the engineers, who are just as much professional people as are the lawyers or the accountants, into the same classification with the lawyers and accountants. The committee amendment will have very little impact upon the cost of the bill to the Government or to anyone else.

Reference has been made to the Atomic Energy Commission. I have talked to representatives of that Commission as much as has any other Senator. That Commission is having difficulty in obtaining engineers. On the other hand, the engineering students find it difficult to remain in engineering schools until they receive their doctorates, because of the difficult conditions now existing.

So the question is one of freeing them from controls and putting them on a basis of equal opportunity with the engineers who work for private engineering firms. Such an arrangement would provide equality of opportunity in obtaining the services of engineers, and it would stop the raiding by large industrial concerns which at the present time are able to pay unlimited salaries, and even can charge the high salaries to the Government, in connection with Government contracts, whereas the private engineering firms cannot do that.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I did not mean that the Senator from Ohio had not given sufficient attention to this matter. Of course he has given it personal attention. We simply do not happen to agree about it.

I think he will agree with me, however, that when this matter came before the committee, all the facts which now are available to the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Michigan and other Members of the Senate were not available to the committee at the time when the initial vote was taken in the committee. That is all I meant when I said that sufficient consideration was not had. I did not intend to reflect on the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator from Michigan is entirely mistaken. There is testimony in the RECORD. Either the Senator from Michigan was not at the hearings or he has not read that testimony, for in the hearings there are four full pages of testimony which was given by the executive director of the National Society of Professional Engineers.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. Is the Senator from Ohio saying that additional information did not come to the committee after the taking of the testimony, and after the vote had been taken?

Mr. BRICKER. Additional information may have come to the individual members of the committee, but there was no further testimony on it.

Mr. MOODY. One subsequent morning when the Senator from Ohio was absent, and when no vote was taken up in the committee by reason of the absence of the Senator from Ohio, this matter was discussed in the committee. New information was submitted. The record will show that to be so.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. BRICKER. Is an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan in order at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is an amendment to the committee bill; therefore, another amendment is in order.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, or as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, to strike out, in the committee amendment, on page 3 of the bill, from lines 18 and 19, the words "by an engineer or firm of engineers engaged in the practice of his or their profession."

I hope the Senator from Michigan will accept that amendment. It would obviate any difficulties of the kind the Senator fears might arise in connection with the industrial companies which might be in competition with private engineering firms.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. I am concerned not only with the industrial companies, but also with the general situation, particularly in regard to atomic energy and other matters. Would the Senator mind repeating the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to state that the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio is an amendment to the bill, itself; that is, it is an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. BRICKER. It is in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a perfecting amendment to the bill itself, and therefore takes precedence over the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. In a moment. Let me say further that the Atomic Energy Commission, as the Senator from Michigan well knows—and I know a little bit about their engineering problems—the Atomic Energy Commission, except as to the production program, which is handled by independent companies, is not in competition with the general engineering field. It is a highly specialized service.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to indicate to the Senator from Ohio that he has used all his original time. However, since he has offered another amendment, the Senator is entitled to 15 minutes on that amendment, and he is now speaking in that time.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Chair. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, this may be charged to my time. I should like to say that all this confusion came about at a joint committee hearing, at which time the Senator from Ohio brought up the situation in regard to engineering students at the universities of this country. Am I not correct?

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. At that time, with the approval of the chairman of the joint committee and with the approval of the joint committee, it was decided to have the head of the staff of the Banking and Currency Committee, the administrative assistant, and other members of the staff interview Mr. Di Salle,

to see whether something could not be worked out which would protect the interest of engineering schools and colleges of the United States, particularly because of the tremendous shortage of engineers. Knowing all that and having done nothing, the Senator from Michigan opposed in committee an amendment to exempt engineers. It is the story of an unfortunate situation, because it was not followed up by action in accordance with what the entire joint committee had done, in approving the action of the chairman and having instructed the chairman to act accordingly. That included members from the House as well as from the Senate.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator is entirely correct, and had they acted as they assured us they would act, this amendment would not be at all necessary.

Mr. MAYBANK. I received information as to what was going to be done, through the chief of the staff. Nothing was done. So the Senator from Ohio has proposed the original amendment, and since he proposed it, and since I voted with the Senator, though not because I thought the joint committee had done wrong, if the Senator insists upon his original amendment, I shall support it because, as the Senator knows, I do not vote one way today and another way tomorrow.

Mr. BRICKER. I appreciate that fact.

Mr. MAYBANK. Like the Senator from Michigan, I have received letters from large corporations and from the Atomic Energy Commission, of which the Senator from Ohio is a member. So he knows who has the contracts, and he knows what the effect would be on the contractors as well as on some small business people. If the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio, which as I understand is in the nature of a substitute, would not interfere with small business, and would not hamper the work of the Atomic Energy Commission, I would vote for it.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. I want to be sure we understand the meaning of the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. As I understand, he would strike out the words "by an engineer or firm of engineers engaged in the practice of his or their profession." The elimination of those words would have the effect, would it not, of exempting all engineers from control?

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. MOODY. If the Senator will yield further, does not that pose the question raised a few moments ago as to whether we want to exempt one class of salaried employees—and these people are salaried employees—without exempting other salaried employees in the same way. We all agreed there is a shortage of engineers. There is also a shortage of certain kinds of highly skilled craftsmen, tool makers, for example. There are other professions and skills that are in short supply. Those people are not exempted. I should merely like to point out to the Senator from Ohio that, while his amendment would take care of the pirating feature of this matter——

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct.

Mr. MOODY. While it would take care of that, it would not take care of the situation which might exist, let us say, inside an aircraft company, or perhaps inside a Government commission, such as the Atomic Energy Commission, in which there would have to be a breaking through of the stabilization lines in behalf of one group of employees as against other groups of employees.

Mr. BRICKER. I think the Senator's fears in that regard are not well founded.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a correction of my remarks?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In whatever time I may have, I desire to make this correction. I stated that we had sent the staff to the OPS.

Mr. BRICKER. They were present at the hearing.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was in error. The OPS was not responsible. It was the Salary Stabilization Board which refused to do anything. I merely did not want to leave my previous statement in the RECORD uncorrected, since I talked to Mr. McMurray, chief of staff, who went with the Senators.

Mr. BRICKER. Neither does the Senator from Ohio want an erroneous statement in the RECORD. But the OPS or its representatives were at the committee meeting.

Mr. MAYBANK. But it was the Salary Stabilization Board that refused to do anything about it.

Mr. BRICKER. I think the maladjustment about which the Senator from Michigan speaks is a very insignificant matter, because there is no company that could not work the matter out to the satisfaction of its engineers and to the satisfaction of others who might be interested.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to say a word about the peculiar characteristics of the engineer as compared with the best technical worker in the shop. The professional engineer does not simply perform a routine duty, no matter how well it must be done. He is a creative person, and we cannot apply salary controls to such a man.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator from Vermont. The amendment of the Senator from Michigan would leave restrictions on men employed in their professional capacities. I agree exactly with the Senator. I believe the work of the engineer is creative. It is essential to progress. The Senator knows of the shortage in the number of students desiring to enter the engineering profession following the war. I hope this amendment will be an encouragement to them.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, that I may propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield, provided it is not taken out of our time.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. It would be taken out of the Senator's time.

Mr. BRICKER. I shall be through in a moment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I do not intend to discuss this amendment. I told the Senator from Ohio that I would support his amendment after the joint committee tried to do something about educating engineers in the colleges and giving them some incentive. The joint committee authorized me to send the staff down. I shall stand by the committee amendment and I shall vote for it.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator from Ohio will withdraw his amendment if the Senator from Michigan will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to have a vote on my amendment. I still believe that the outline which is set out in my amendment is the proper thing. I should appreciate it if the Senator from Ohio would reconsider and accept my amendment.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator from Ohio cannot in any way accept the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

I shall have to insist upon my amendment being considered first.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, as amended. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BRICKER. On what did the Senate vote just now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the substitute of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BRICKER. It was my substitute which was adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment was a perfecting amendment.

Mr. BRICKER. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio then becomes the law——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It becomes a part of the bill.

Mr. BRICKER. That is what I mean. The committee amendment, with my amendment, is now a part of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It depends upon what action the Senate takes.

Mr. BRICKER. But my amendment is now in the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAPEHART. We must now vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. We are in the process of voting. The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BRICKER. What is the status of the section of the bill in regard to engineers?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests that the Senator from Ohio withhold his parliamentary inquiry while the roll is being called.

Mr. BRICKER. What is the purpose of the roll call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a quorum call.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I will withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BRICKER. My amendment is in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, and it was adopted.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, what I said to the Senator from Ohio I shall stand by. I am for the amendment which the Senator from Ohio put in the bill. I hope the Senator from Ohio will insist upon the committee amendment. I have talked to other members of the committee, and they feel the same way I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian, who was present all through the session of the Senate——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Chair would suggest to the Senator from South Carolina that he assist in obtaining order.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] offered a substitute for section 103. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] offered a perfecting amendment to the committee amendment which was agreed to. Now the question is on the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Michigan to withdraw his amendment. He has made an excellent statement and an excellent record. The committee is on record as having voted for the original committee amendment as suggested by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I have just been conferring with the chairman of the committee. The bill has yet to go to conference, of course, and the chairman of the committee and the other members will be well informed. I have called the situation to their attention, and I am sure they will take proper action.

I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, what is now pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Did we adopt the committee amendment, or is the amendment of the Senator from Ohio still before the Senate?

Mr. BRICKER. My amendment was adopted.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, it was an amendment to my amendment, and I withdrew my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the amendment of the Senator from Ohio is now a part of the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. What amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The perfecting amendment which was part of the committee amendment.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, as I understood, the Senator from Ohio offered his amendment as a perfecting amendment to my amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that it was an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. MOODY. I understood the Senator from Ohio to say he was offering a perfecting amendment to my amendment, and I have withdrawn my amendment. Am I in error?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was not in the Chamber at the time the amendment was offered, but the Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the Senator from Michigan is in error.

Mr. MOODY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed that at the proper place in the bill there be inserted the following:

Title V of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by adding a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 504. *Resolved*, That, by reason of the work stoppage now existing in the steel industry, the national safety is imperiled, and the Congress requests the President to immediately invoke the national emergency provisions (secs. 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, for the purpose of terminating such work stoppage."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the amendment is offered to title V.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. How is the time divided on this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] will be in control of the first 15 minutes, and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] will be in control of the remaining 15 minutes, if he is opposed to the amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course I am not opposed to the amendment, because it states what is the law now, and nothing is being done about it. I merely wondered if this was to be the final legislation in connection with the steel strike dispute. So far as I am concerned, I have no objection. I am glad the Senator from Virginia has offered his amendment. But 15 minutes would not be sufficient time in which to consider proposed labor legislation to be attached to a bill such as the one under consideration. I do not know whether the unanimous-consent agreement can be changed, but if so, I should like to propose that the time be extended so that the Senator from Virginia would have more time, as would also the opposition, because I do not believe an issue of this importance can be settled in 15 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I have no objection to increasing the allotted time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, may I inquire if all amendments are now disposed except those which pertain to the steel strike?

Mr. MAYBANK. They are not. I had hoped we would finish with all the other amendments—not that I am objecting to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. McFARLAND. Would the Senator from Virginia be willing to withhold his amendment until the other amendments are acted on, with the understanding that he will have a prior right to offer his amendment?

Mr. BYRD. No. We might as well settle this question now. The present crisis is one of the most important subjects the Senate could consider.

Mr. McFARLAND. Then I cannot agree to an extension of time.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to make it clear that I shall offer my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia because what his amendment invokes is the law now.

I repeat what I said, it would be my policy to bring up my amendment last, after all other amendments had been disposed of. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] have amendments to offer. I agree with the Senator from Virginia that his amendment presents a most important question; but if that amendment is to be taken up, all the other amendments should be taken up. I had intended to bring up my amendment last. I happen to be the one who offered the first amendment on the subject covered by the amendment of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. My amendment is now before the Senate. I do not care when the others come up. I wish to discuss my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the time of the opponents of the amendment will be controlled by the minority leader or someone whom he will designate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am certain many Members of the Senate did not hear the text of the proposal by the Senator from Virginia. For the information of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be stated again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will restate the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed that the following be inserted at the proper place in the bill:

Title V of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by adding a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 504. *Resolved*, That, by reason of the work stoppage now existing in the steel industry, the national safety is imperiled, and the Congress requests the President to immediately invoke the national-emergency provisions (secs. 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, for the purpose of terminating such work stoppage."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina says there is no use adopting this amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from South Carolina did not suggest that. Let us get the matter straight, because I voted for the Taft-Hartley Act, as did the Senator from Virginia. But I have been asking for a long time——

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I assume the Senator's remarks are being made in his own time.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let them be charged to my time.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia would merely request the President to act. Of course, I join with the Senator in requesting the President to act. The only trouble is that this amendment could not become law until the bill was passed. The President already has available the Taft-Hartley Act. I say the President should invoke it.

Mr. BYRD. My amendment is intended to get the President to do so. I do not believe the President would ignore the will of Congress in a matter of this kind.

Mr. MAYBANK. This is a matter of request. The President should have acted before this. If the method suggested were adopted it would take 3 weeks to get action.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from South Carolina knows we cannot direct the President to do it; all we can do is to request him to do it. If the President of the United States is willing to ignore the sentiment of the Congress of the United States in a matter affecting the very safety and security of the country, then it is time for the people of the Nation to know it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, again in my time——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to advise the Senator from South Carolina that he is not in control of any time. The time of the opposition is controlled by the minority leader.

Mr. MAYBANK. I hope the minority leader will grant me some time.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the able Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to make one thing perfectly clear. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Virginia that the President long ago should have invoked the Taft-Hartley Act, but the President has not done so. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Virginia that we should request the President to do so, but that will not have the effect of law. We can only request, and I join the Senator from Virginia in his request.

Mr. BYRD. If that be the case, there should not be much difficulty in adopting the amendment. If the Senator from South Carolina will vote for it, I am sure, there will be a majority for it.

Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment to the bill. I propose to amend title V so that it will be germane to the subject of title V; which has to do with the settlement of labor disputes. That is what the amendment attempts to do. It requests the President of the United States to invoke immediately the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, whereby the present steel strike can be suspended for at least 80 days. It was to meet just such a situation that Congress passed the Taft-Hartley Act. When it passed the act, Congress intended that if a crisis such as now confronts us should occur, the President should invoke its provisions to stop the strike—a great national strike in this instance—for a period of 80 days.

Mr. President, we are now losing in steel production in the neighborhood of 300,000 tons a day. If such a condition continues for 80 days, we will lose 25,000,000 tons. That is nearly one-quarter of the entire steel production of this country. Everybody knows that steel is the very basis of our preparedness program. Without steel, we could not fight the war. Without steel, we could not build airplanes, tanks, or battleships. What Russia fears more than anything else is the mass-production capacity of this country. At last reports we were producing four times as much steel as Russia and twice as much steel as the world was producing. We cannot maintain this supremacy unless our plants are kept in operation.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator change his amendment so as to make it retroactive?

Mr. BYRD. We have lost the advantage of the production of nearly 1,000,000 tons of steel in the past 3 days, since the strike has been in effect. The President should have invoked the Taft-Hartley Act the very day, the very hour, the decision of the Supreme Court was rendered, and thereby he could have perhaps stopped the walkout that has occurred in the steel plants. I do not know why he did not invoke the Taft-Hartley law. He has made no explanation. It was certainly the clear intent of Congress that in an emergency of this kind the President should invoke the Taft-Hartley Act, in order to allow an 80-day breathing spell.

I was a Member of the Senate when the Taft-Hartley Act was passed. The particular provision to which I have just adverted was discussed for hours, and it was clearly the desire of Congress to have in the bill such a provision as would give power to the President to stop a great national strike like the present one in the steel industry, for at least 80 days.

Mr. President, I submit that we are facing a very perilous threat. We cannot permit anyone to sabotage our efforts. We must go forward with our production. We must keep steel plants running in order to reach the production of 110,000,000 tons of steel, which is our program. To me it seems unthinkable that any President would not utilize every tool at his command to keep this country in full production of materials essential to our very security.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to my colleague 3 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The distinguished chairman of our committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], has said he plans to offer his so-called seizure amendment as an amendment to the amendment of the senior Senator from Virginia. In my opinion, that would not be proper procedure. These are two different approaches. I think that if Congress should adopt the seizure amendment proposed by the Senator from South Carolina, two necessities would confront us. First, the bill would have to be passed by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President. Second, the board proposed to be created under the Maybank amendment would have to be selected by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

It is to be assumed that, even if we were to take that approach deliberately, we would not wait for another month to do anything about the steel strike. In any event, it seems to me that we would have to act first under the Taft-Hartley law to enjoin the strike and get operations going again. Then we would set up the machinery either of the Taft-Hartley law or of any other law which might be passed with respect to seizure.

The junior Senator from Virginia will vote with his senior colleague for this request to the President to use what appears at the moment to be the only practical remedy to restore production in a work stoppage which imperils the national safety. The junior Senator from Virginia does not like seizure any more than do any of his colleagues. Under seizure wages are frozen, and that is objectionable. Under seizure we allow the industry no profit unless the Government operation produces a profit; and the chances are that it will not produce a profit. So under seizure the plant owner can recoup only his actual losses.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have only 3 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator yield for an observation at that point?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Not for an observation, but for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that in the Pee Wee Coal Co. case, which was brought to the attention of the court in the early 1940's, the company was operating at a loss prior to seizure, and that when the court adjudicated compensation after seizure it allowed the company a profit based on its net worth and investment, even though the history of the

company had been that of a losing enterprise? In the Pee Wee Coal Co. case a profit was awarded to the company despite months and years of losses.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The junior Senator from Virginia is not familiar with that case. He is not in a position to dispute the statement which the Senator from Minnesota has made. However, under the Taft-Hartley Act there have been nine seizures. In eight of those cases there was a settlement before the end of the 80-day period. In six of them the companies claimed serious losses, and in all of them they claimed that they did not get what was coming to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask for one more minute.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield one more minute to my colleague.

Mr. ROBERTSON. During the last war, under the Smith-Connally Act, two coal companies were seized. What happened? Both times John L. Lewis came out of the seizure with all he asked for.

I recognize the fact that seizure is a very harsh remedy, and that no one prefers it. However, in this emergency, if I have no opportunity to vote for anything except seizure, to show that I propose to place the welfare of our boys in Korea first, I will vote for seizure. In the meantime, I will vote for the pending amendment.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BYRD. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator that he has only 1 minute remaining.

Mr. BYRD. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I am in entire accord with the proposal of the senior Senator from Virginia. On May 23 I proposed such a joint resolution, which has been pending in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare since that time.

Mr. President, it is foolhardy for us to consider a stabilization program without giving recognition to the fact that the most important segment is now in idleness, due to the fact that the President of the United States has not utilized the existing legal provisions. The Supreme Court has said that it is up to Congress to act. Congress has acted. The Chief Executive has not utilized the provisions of existing law.

Until and unless he does, he cannot expect one of the two contending parties to change its present attitude and resume the production of supplies needed by our boys who are fighting today in Korea.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I think there must be some mistake.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will some Senator yield to me so that I may make a unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in the first place, it seems that Senators who favor the amendment have full control of the time. I think the time should be extended. It was our intention to extend the time. I believe that in connection with the steel amendments there should be possibly an hour to each side, or an hour in total.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that the time for each side be extended 15 minutes, making 30 minutes to a side on this amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does that mean that we are to extend the time on this amendment only, to 30 minutes to a side.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. The proponents have already used 15 minutes.

Mr. McFARLAND. The proponents have already used 15 minutes. My suggestion would give them 15 minutes more.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not know whether or not the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is opposing the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. May I complete my inquiry?

Mr. CAPEHART. I think I can answer the Senator's question.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, in case the proposer of an amendment and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], chairman of the committee, are both for the amendment, the minority leader is in control of the time in opposition. The unanimous-consent agreement specifically provides that in that event the minority leader shall control the time in opposition. That means to me, as acting minority leader, that I am obligated to give 30 minutes to those opposed to the amendment, and I shall do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Indiana to yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, may I have action on my unanimous-consent request? I ask that each side be granted an additional 15 minutes on this amendment.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, what is the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is to extend the time 15 minutes on each side. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on December 22, 1951, at the time the President referred the Steel case to the Wage Stabilization Board, the contract between the United Steelworkers and the steel companies was to expire on the 31st of December. It was obviously impossible for the two parties to get together and reach an agreement. A Nationwide steel strike was threatened. The President then had a choice of one of two methods. Either he could invoke the Taft-Hartley law at that time, or he could proceed under the Executive powers of the President to appoint a special board to try to mediate the situation or refer it for the same purposes to the Wage Stabilization Board which he had set up last year.

It may be argued that in December he should have chosen the Taft-Hartley method. After due consideration, however, he chose to utilize a special board, and designated the Wage Stabilization Board as the Presidential Board. That was a perfectly legal use of his Executive power.

That Board conducted its inquiry and made its recommendations It tried to get the two parties together, and succeeded in postponing the strike from the first of January until the 8th of April, or a total of 99 days. The maximum delay which could have been obtained under the Taft-Hartley law was 80 days. At the end of the 80-day period under the Taft-Hartley law, the two parties would have ben entirely free to act.

The result was that even though it may be said that in December the President made a wrong choice—and I am not saying it—even if one were to say that he made a wrong choice in not invoking the Taft-Hartley law at that time, he was successful in postponing the strike for 19 days more than he would have been able to postpone it had he invoked the Taft-Hartley law with its injunction powers.

A strike was then threatened at midnight, April 8. At 10 o'clock p. m. the President announced the seizure. Since then a further delay of 56 days has ensued. It is now 155 days after the first of January; and during that time, except for 3 days, there has been no strike. For at least 152 days there was no strike.

During that time the wages and hours and working conditions were not altered. During that time the union voluntarily abstained from any stoppage, and did, in fact, forego improvements which it probably could have obtained had it gone on strike on the first of January.

Are we going to say that on top of all that we are now going to superimpose the Taft-Hartley law, which provides for an injunction and a further delay of 60 days, during which working conditions, wages, and hours cannot be altered?

It seems to me that the choice which existed between the Taft-Hartley law and these other methods was one which existed in January, but which does not exist in all equity in June, because, having taken the alternative route, it is unfair to superimpose a further delay of 80 days on top of the 152 days which have already occurred.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield the floor.

Mr. IVES. Will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Gladly.

Mr. IVES. Is it the Senator's understanding that there was an agreement between the President of the United States and the steelworkers that if the arrangement which was not followed last winter had been in effect and accepted, the Taft-Hartley law would not be imposed?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know of no such agreement. I was not in the confidence of either party on this matter, and I know nothing about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the amendment which is before the Senate is in substance the joint resolution which the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] introduced on May 23, I believe. It was given some consideration by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee at its meeting this morning, in line with the resolution which the junior Senator from Minnesota submitted. It has been the feeling of members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that at least we ought to give this subject matter our very best consideration, and not act in terms of what might upset proposals which are now under way.

Mr. President, I have in my hand today's issue of the Washington Evening Star. The headline reads: "Steel pact talks open at White House."

The subheads read: "Industry, union leaders renew truce efforts; United States aides seek end to crippling strike."

Mr. President, what is the purpose of the Taft-Hartley injunction? The purpose of the Taft-Hartley injunction is to keep production under way. The objective of the Taft-Hartley injunction during the 80-day period while it is in effect is a method of reconciliation in a dispute. The fact of the matter is that during the 80-day period, according to all the objective testimony which the Members of the Senate have been able to receive, conciliation and bargaining is not encouraged or fostered, but retarded and delayed.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has painted the picture and told the story of what has transpired since the 18th day of December. There is no doubt that there is a very serious strike and that it must come to an end.

I submit that an injunction applied at this particular hour, at a time when the parties have gathered together and, according to the news story——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not at this point. The news story states:

> Officials said the meeting would not have been called if leaders of both groups had not given assurance they were ready to engage in real collective bargaining.

Mr. President, there has been little or no collective bargaining up to this hour. I believe that every member of the committee who heard the testimony will agree with that statement. At long last, there is some bargaining.

I repeat that the objective of the Taft-Hartley injunction is to impede and impair collective bargaining.

If the Senate wanted the strike settled—and injunction will not settle it—we should have placed the force and power and official policy of the Senate behind the resolution which was submitted the other day, to call upon the parties to bargain collectively and to bargain in all sincerity.

I am not saying that the President may not have used the Taft-Hartley injunction. But I know that when the parties are at this very minute meeting in the office of the White House, and that they are for the first time engaged in real collective bargaining, all that the Senate is doing is irritating the situation and antagonizing the participants in the collective-bargaining conferences. This amendment would amount to a refusal to believe in the good faith of the parties who are now gathered in the White House in conference. What the Senate should do is adopt a resolution calling upon the parties to bargain to a conclusion and to agree upon some interim conditions immediately, to go back to work, and to finally resolve this dispute in the way it ought to be resolved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield one more minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for an additional minute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the Byrd amendment, and I ask that the clerk state it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the Byrd amendment it is proposed to insert the following:

> *Resolved*, That the Senate of the United States call upon the parties to the current steel dispute (1) to resume collective-bargaining negotiations immediately, (2) to agree upon interim conditions which will make possible the immediate resumption of production pending settlement of the issues in dispute, and (3) to make every effort in the interest of the national welfare and security to speedily resolve the dispute.
>
> The Senate also calls upon the President of the United States to make available to the parties to this dispute the services of any Government agency which the parties to the dispute may request as an aid to collective bargaining thereby to facilitate the resumption of production and the resolution of the dispute.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it. First let the Chair make an observation to the Senator from South Carolina, which may answer his inquiry. The Senator from Minnesota has 15 minutes allotted to him, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has 15 minutes allotted to him in opposition.

Mr. MAYBANK. My parliamentary inquiry is this: If the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota should be adopted, would that be the end of it, or could I offer my amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate would then be on the Byrd amendment, as amended.

Mr. MAYBANK. How would I have an opportunity then of offering the amendment I said I intended to offer?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Byrd amendment would not be open to further amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am certain that the Senator from Minnesota did not intend to preclude me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There would be no reason why the Senator from South Carolina could not offer his amendment to another section of the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. If the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], as amended by the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], were adopted, I could not offer my amendment. I assured the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] on that point before this came up. We have been fighting and trying to pass a control law for a long time. If the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota is agreed to, Senators who have been here day and night will have no opportunity on the floor to offer their amendments. I think that is very unjust. I do not believe that the Senator from Minnesota intends to do it, because I assured him that I would offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield any of his time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, momentarily I withdraw my amendment so that there will be no misunderstanding about my objective. We will continue with the debate on the Byrd amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota is withdrawn.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BYRD. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia will state it.

Mr. BYRD. How much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia has 15 minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. How much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have only 3 minutes, and I cannot yield to any Senators at this time.

The whole case has not been stated by the Senator from Minnesota or by the Senator from Illinois. Under the Taft-Hartley Act, the President appoints a public board. No one can say that the Wage Stabilization Board is a public board within the contemplation of the National Labor Relations Act. That Board must report. After it reports, the

President can ask the Attorney General to seek an injunction. That has not been done. That procedure is subject to review by the courts, if there is any difficulty about it. It is the duty of the parties to the dispute to settle and adjust. The President then can reconvene the Board, and at the end of 60 days the Board can report to the President. Then at the end of the next 15 days a secret ballot is to be taken. That has not been done, Mr. President. Thereafter the President of the United States can report and can make recommendations to the Congress. That has not been done.

It seems to me that in approaching equity, the rule is that one should first exhaust all his legal remedies. No such remedies have been exhausted. There they are, as plain as print, in the National Labor Relations Act; and the President of the United States, notwithstanding the time factor that has been alluded to, should have utilized what is upon the law books.

Perhaps an additional 57 days or 100 days have gone by; but in every case we are dealing with a tripartite board, and there have been allegations of bias, regardless of whether they are well founded.

Under the National Labor Relations Act, a board is provided for. It is to be established by the President; and, as I read the act, it is a public board. Mr. President, the things which should have been done have not been done.

That is why I propose to support the amendment of the Senator from Virginia, which would be an additional section to title V of the Defense Production Act, which says that it is the intent of Congress, and so forth, to see that there is uninterrupted production. When that is done, it seems to me it will be unnecessary for us to consider further the proposal which was advanced yesterday by the Chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will my good friend, my colleague from Illinois, yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; if I have time, I shall be delighted to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. My colleague's argument is that the President has had only one choice since December—Hobson's choice—namely, that all he could have done would have been to invoke the Taft-Hartley law.

Does not the junior Senator from Illinois realize that the President could also have proceeded under his own executive powers, which existed before the Taft-Hartley law was enacted, and have been invoked on countless occasions; and in that way the President could have set up a separate board to deal with the emergency—which is what he did.

Mr. DIRKSEN. All I know is that at the time when testimony was being given to the House committee by Mr. Herzog, chairman of the National Labor Relation Board, at the time of the creation of the Wage Stabilization Board, when that Board and its functions were under consideration, he testified that he did not conceive that that Board was being divested of any of its functions, notwithstanding the contentions which were made in behalf of the Wage Stabilization Board.

There is an instrumentality upon the law books, and it has not been used. These remedies have not been explored. It seems to me that it is high time for the President of the United States to use a law which has been handed to a board which is the trustee of the congressional intent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield 5 minutes to the able Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, all of us want to have the steelworkers return to work and have steel produced. There is no question at all that the President in his wisdom—although not all of us may agree with him——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question at this point. Will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. If I do not lose time thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If a Senator speaks at this time, he must be yielded time by one of the Senators who is in charge of the time.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield 2 minutes more?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield 2 minutes more to the Senator from New York, giving him 7 minutes in all.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator. I now yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Virginia. Suppose I agree at this time to accept the amendment of the Senator from Virginia. Would the Senator from Virginia be agreeable?

Mr. BYRD. Agreeable to what?

Mr. MAYBANK. Agreeable to having me accept the amendment of the Senator from Virginia, which requests the President to proceed by way of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator from South Carolina mean to ask me whether I would be agreeable to having the Senator from South Carolina ag ee to accept my own amendment?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Of course I would.

Mr. MAYBANK. Then, Mr. President, I move that the amendment of the Senator from Virginia be accepted.

Mr. BYRD. However, Mr. President, I wish to have a yea-and-nay vote on the question of agreeing to my amendment, for this matter is important.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I desire to make myself perfectly clear. I intend to offer my amendment.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from South Carolina has a right to do so, of course.

Mr. MAYBANK. But I do not know what the situation then would be as between the amendment of the Senator from Virginia and my amendment; for if both amendments are included in the bill and are enacted into law, my amendment would actually be law; but the amendment of the Senator from Virginia would not be law, since it begins with the word "Resolved." So I do not know what position I would be in, in that event.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield, to permit me to propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I regret that I cannot yield at the moment.

As I was stating before I was interrupted, the principal object of this effort is to have the steelworkers return to work and produce steel. Although not all Members of the Senate are in agreement with the President, the President persuaded the steelworkers and the steel mills to postpone the threatened strike. In that way they were persuaded to postpone the strike for nearly 100 days, or for 19 days more than the period of time required by the Taft-Hartley Act. The President hoped until the last moment that a settlement would be reached; and he made a personal appeal over the radio and the television to get the country to back him up.

The Senator from Virginia has referred to the Taft-Hartley Act. Apparently, he thought seizure was permitted by that act. Of course, as we know, seizure is not authorized under the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. Therefore, if the Taft-Hartley Act had been invoked, the Government would not have been in control of the mills and steel would not have been produced.

Today we have before us an amendment requesting the President to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act. Of course, we could only request him to do so; certainly, we could not direct him to do so. I believe that at the present state of the negotiations—and the negotiations are going on today between the management of the steel companies and the steel company workers—nothing could do more harm to the possibility, yea, the probability, of an adjustment of those differences than to have the Taft-Hartley Act invoked.

I am convinced that representatives of the two parties to the dispute are meeting today in good faith in a desire to compose their differences and to reach a real meeting of the minds and an agreement which will permit the steel mills to resume operation.

On the other hand, to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act at this time, with its cumbersome machinery which calls for the setting up of an emergency board, which would have to be set up while the strike was going on, and then to have the courts asked to issue an injunction—which process would, at the very least, consume a week or 10 days—would merely result in delay, and would not

settle anything, because at the conclusion of the period of 80 days which would be superimposed on the period of 100 days, the only effect would be to cause resentment and distrust, and still nothing would have been settled in regard to the relationships between the employers and the workers.

Mr. President, I also wish to refer to the resolution which was submitted the other day by my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], on behalf of himself and myself. That resolution requests the Senate to express to both the employers and the workers its hope that their differences will be composed and that the work will be resumed in the interest of the national defense and in the interest of a stable national economy. I believe that is the way to go about it for the time being. We shall have opportunity in the future to draft and pass permanent legislation to take care of similar situations in the future, legislation which will give the President the authority necessary to care for emergency situations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I do not know the merits of the controversy between the steel industry and labor, but, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I am familiar with the schedule of needed airplanes, needed guns, needed arms, trucks, automobiles, and other items requiring steel; and the demand is now. I think the Congress and the President would be grossly derelict in the performance of their duty and responsibility to the Nation and particularly to the men who are carrying the fighting burden in Korea, did they not exhaust every remedy of whatever nature to bring about satisfactory results. Instead of arguing about what happened in January, or in 9 days, or arguing about the merits of the Taft-Hartley Act, we ought to move as promptly as possible to get results. I therefore enthusiastically support this amendment. But I do not think that even it would afford a remedy that would meet all the conditions and all the requirements of the situation.

I think it is a congressional matter, and that it is incumbent upon us to pass a law which will meet this situation. We took the position that the President did not have authority to seize the steel mills. The Supreme Court upheld that position, and I think the burden is now on the President to proceed under the Taft-Hartley Act. I think the burden is on the Congress to proceed to the enactment of legislation which would fully meet such an occasion. I do not think it can be done overnight. I want to hear the argument on the Maybank amendment, but I doubt that it would meet the needs of the occasion. I think it is going to require that the best lawyers, the best industrialists, and the best labor specialists get together and spend days in cooperation with the Congress in order to draft a law which would meet a situation of this kind effectively. But in the meantime, we need steel, and I think the President should proceed under the law that we have on the books. Therefore, Mr. President, I support this amendment enthusiastically.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the amendment now before the Senate merely expresses the opinion that, the Congress having acted and having passed a law, that law should be executed by the Chief Executive of this Nation. Last Monday the Supreme Court decided that the President had no authority to pass laws, that his duty under his oath was to execute the laws which had been passed by the Congress. In 1947, the Congress, over the veto of the President, passed a law. We decided that it should apply in an emergency. It is not necessary for the Congress today to go into the merits of the pending dispute in the steel industry. A strike is on, and steel is not being produced. It is a case of the kind that the Taft-Hartley and the Labor Relations Acts apply to.

At this time it is merely the request of the Senator from Virginia that the Congress express its opinion, reciting the fact that Congress has already acted, that the President has a law under which he can act, and asking that the President carry out his oath of office. I think that is a duty of the Congress under the circumstances. The President having sent two messages to the Congress, the Supreme Court having acted upon this matter and having said that the Congress has a right to say what the policy of the Government shall be, and Mr. Justice Holmes having said in a famous opinion in the Supreme Court that it is not for the Executive to determine whether a law is right, it is now the duty of Congress to declare what the law is and what the policy should be. The oath of office of the President then requires that the President shall faithfully execute that law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield 1 minute to the able chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I merely want to say that I thoroughly agree with what the Senator from Michigan has said. The Supreme Court called attention to the Taft-Hartley Act, the Defense Production Act, and the selective service law; but the Supreme Court did not express the opinion that the Congress should tell the President what to do. The Supreme Court did not say the Congress should pass resolutions calling upon the President to proceed under a particular act.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Did not the President send a message to the Congress, asking that it make suggestions, in case it cared to do so?

Mr. MAYBANK. I have that suggestion.

Mr. CAPEHART. One of the suggestions the Congress is making, I presume, is the present one.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana has 9 minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have 9 minutes to allocate to anyone who may desire to oppose this amendment. How much time does the Senator from Arizona desire?

Mr. McFARLAND. Four or five minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield 5 minutes to the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I shall try not to use the entire 5 minutes. These are times when we should act conscientiously and carefully. It does no good to become excited. The circumstances are such as to call for action. These are times when we should weigh very, very carefully everything we do. The Congress of the United States has a duty, and the administration has a duty. I have found that about all I could expect to do was to try to discharge my own duties in the Congress without trying to run the administrative end of the Government. When the Executive tries to step over into our field, we all become very angry and very critical of him. But now, when all interested parties are trying to arrive at a just settlement, we are trying to tell them that they should not do this or that, but should invoke the Taft-Hartley Act. An effort is being made to settle the strike; and I contend that an opportunity should be afforded to settle it in that way. I think labor and management should get together and, in good faith, through the processes of collective bargaining, compose their differences and that they should be able to settle the strike within 24 hours.

If the Byrd amendment embodied a resolution of that tenor it would, in my opinion, be within our jurisdiction. But, Mr. President, when we try to run the affairs of the Executive we go outside our field. We have no business doing that, regardless of what our feelings may be. We may feel that this or that should be done, but we have no business dictating what should be done. Let us provide the laws we think are needed.

Of course, there is the Taft-Hartley Act, and we may have our opinion that it should be used; but, Mr. President, we are treading upon dangerous ground when we try to take over the executive powers of the Government.

Mr. President, I want you to know, and I want the Senate to know that because I believe in the Constitution and because I believe in the separate powers of the executive, the legislative, and the judicial as provided by the Constitution, I am firmly persuaded that the judiciary was the proper branch of the Government to pass upon this question; upon the issues involved in the steel case; and it has done so.

I think Congress has all it can do to perform the duties which are within its jurisdiction, without adopting a resolution prescribing a course of action.

Each of us may have a different opinion. I think a majority of the Members of the Congress feel that the strike cannot be settled by the methods now resorted to. Something more must be done. But I want to say that we have all we can do to take care of our own business without encroaching on the business of the executive branch of the United States Government.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. If I correctly understand the meaning of the Supreme Court's decision in the Steel case, it was that the Executive should stay out of the legislative field. What the distintinguished majority leader is saying is that we should stay out of the Executive field; that we cannot run the Executive department from Capitol Hill, and we do not believe the Executive department should try to run the business of the Congress.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is exactly my position. I think it is as bad for us to inject ourselves into executive business as for the Executive to inject himself into legislative business.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. Is it not a fact that the President has requested Congress to make an expression, and has invited Congress to advise him as to what should be done? What more direct expression of opinion could be given than for the Congress to reassert the conclusion already reached?

Mr. McFARLAND. The President has asked for additional legislation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I read the President's message, as the courts read it, and as the arguments before the court indicated, the President did not ask for a law; he asked for suggestions as to whether we were satisfied as to what he was doing.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am not going to become involved in an argument on that point.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is not that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not yield any further. I am not going to try to run the office of the President. I have all I can do to run my own. He said that if we wanted him to act, we should pass such legislation.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Three or four years ago Congress passed a law which some Members of Congress still think will solve the problem. That law is on the books, but evidently the Executive does not think it goes to the heart of the question. I personally feel that when collective bargaining breaks down and a strike occurs, Congress is on the spot and should devise a method to keep the industrial facilities operating. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] represents a State which keeps its utilities operating.

Mr. McFARLAND. In order that my position may be very clear, I desire to say that if I were in the President's place I would have seriously considered trying the Taft-Hartley law. But that does not mean that I shall vote for the Byrd amendment. It is not the province of Congress to usurp the functions of the Executive department.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very happy to hear the distinguished majority leader say that the Senate should use its good offices in every way possible to bring about a settlement under collective bargaining between the employers and the workers in the steel mills. I think that is the important thing. If that is not done, there will not be any lasting peace in industry. The resolution which was submitted by my distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and myself would invoke wholehearted collective bargaining and bring about peace. I think that would be the greatest step forward we could possibly take.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield one more minute to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I desire to sum up my position in this matter. Being a lawyer by profession and believing in the Constitution and in acting under the Constitution, I could not for a moment support an amendment that would attempt to tell the Executive how to conduct his office. As I previously stated, if I were in the position of the President, knowing what I do—I have not all the facts at hand—I would have seriously considered invoking the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law. But I do not think it is our duty to try to force the President to act in a manner he thinks is unwise. If the Senate of the United States will follow that policy, it will be following a safe policy. Any time any lawyer thinks to the contrary, he is getting on dangerous ground.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I hold in my hand the message of the President of April 9, which seems to be entirely clear as to what he desires of the Congress. He said:

> The effects of such a shutdown would have been so immediate and damaging with respect to our efforts to support our Armed Forces and to protect our national security that it made this alternative unthinkable.

He goes on as follows:

> It may be that the Congress will deem some other course to be wiser. It may be that the Congress will feel we should give in to the demands of the steel industry for an exorbitant price increase and take the consequences so far as resulting inflation is concerned. * * *
>
> It may even be that the Congress will feel that we should permit a shutdown of the steel industry, although that would immediately endanger the safety of our fighting forces abroad and weaken the whole structure of our national security.
>
> I do not believe the Congress will favor any of these courses of action, but that is a matter for the Congress to determine.

We are not dependent, however, on whether the President asked us for our opinion. I happen to represent in part a State which has various defense programs existing within it which are vitally dependent on the production of steel. Within the next 3 weeks the development of our defense will begin to experience a strangling. The Constitution of the United States provides that the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for redress of grievances shall not be denied. Who will deny the right of this body, with the responsibility resting upon it, with the invitation from the President as to what we think about it, to tell the President that we have provided an alternative.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENNINGS in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield two more minutes to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it is plain and clear that Congress has enacted a law which provides for 80 days within which Congress may determine what further action, if any, is required. The Taft-Hartley Act provides for this very emergency. Why the President, when he has nine times used that act to meet a similar crisis, now refuses to use it, is certainly difficult to understand.

Under the Supreme Court decision, the President is to execute the laws. A course which he says is unthinkable he is permitting to be pursued day by day, and certainly the accomplishment of any further action by Congress is utterly impracticable in the face of this crisis, when the plain, clear path is before the President.

I am happy to be able to state, from this side of the aisle, that according to a statement by a recent recruit to our ranks, General Eisenhower, he has announced that he himself considers the Taft-Hartley Act to be one of those things that he, as well, I think, as every other Republican, favors and which most Democrats are now inclined to favor.

I hope that the unanimous opinion on one side, and the very strong opinion on the other, will persuade our friends no longer to seek to delay action which is

vital to enable the American economy to produce what is necessary to protect our boys on the battle front.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I send to the desk the substitute amendment I spoke of yesterday. I wish to make it perfectly clear that if the substitute is voted upon and is defeated, I shall join with the Senator from Virginia in his expression of hope that the President will use the Taft-Hartley Act. That has been my hope for many months.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read, for information only, under the ruling of the Vice President yesterday.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, after line 16, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 108. Title IV of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"NATIONAL EMERGENCY PRICE AND WAGE BOARD

"SEC. 412. (a) Whenever the President finds that a threatened or actual work stoppage or lock-out affecting an entire industry or a substantial part thereof will, if permitted to occur or to continue, imperil the national defense or defeat the purposes of this act, he may refer such dispute to the Board created in subsection (b) to inquire into the issues involved in the dispute and to make a written report to him within 113 days after such dispute has been referred to it. Such report shall include a statement of the facts with respect to the dispute, including each party's statement of its position, and shall contain the Board's recommendation with respect to wage and price stabilization as well as other matters involved in such dispute. The President shall make the contents of such report available to the public.

"(b) There is hereby established the National Emergency Price and Wage Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") which shall be composed of a chairman and six other members to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall have power to sit and act at any place within the United States and to conduct such hearings either in public or private, as it may deem necessary or proper, to ascertain the facts with respect to the causes and circumstances of the dispute. Each member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 for each day actually spent by him in the work of the Board, together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses.

"(c) The provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended (15 U. S. C. 49 and 50), shall be applicable with respect to any hearing or inquiry conducted by the Board under this section.

"(d) The President shall make such provision for stenographic, clerical, and other assistants, and for facilities, services, and supplies, as may be necessary to enable the Board to perform its functions.

"(e) Whenever a dispute is referred to the Board the President shall immediately notify the parties to the dispute that the dispute has been so referred and until the Board makes its report to the President and for 7 days thereafter it shall be unlawful for the parties to engage in any work stoppage or lock-out. The provisions of section 706 of this act shall apply in the case of any violation of this section.

"(f) Within 7 days after the Board has reported its findings and recommendations to the President, the parties to the dispute shall advise the President in writing whether or not they are willing to accept the recommendations of the Board for settlement of the dispute.

"(g) If all parties to the dispute agree to accept the recommendations of the Board for settlement of the dispute, the President shall take such action under this title as may be necessary to effectuate the recommendations of the Board.

"(h) If any party to the dispute refuses within the period specified in subsection (f) to accept the recommendations of the Board and as a result thereof a work stoppage or a lock-out is threatened, the President shall take immediate possession of and operate all plants, mines, or facilities involved in the dispute subject to payment of just compensation therefor as required by the Constitution of the United States. During such period of operation the terms and conditions of employment which were in effect at the time possession of such plant, mine, or facility was taken by the President shall remain in effect.

"(i) Whenever any plant, mine, or facility is in the possession of the United States it shall be unlawful for any person (1) to coerce, instigate, induce, conspire with, or encourage any person to interfere, by lock-out, work stoppage, slowdown, or other interruption, with the operation of such plant, mine, or facility, or (2) to aid any such lock-out, work stoppage, slowdown, or other interruption interfering with the operation of such plant, mine, or facility by giving direction or guidance in the conduct of such interruption or by providing funds for the conduct or direction thereof or for the payment of work-stoppage, unemployment, or other benefits to those participating therein.

"(j) At any time after the referral of the dispute to the Board or during the operation by the Government of any plant, mine, or facility, the parties to the dispute may reach an agreement by means of collective bargaining. Such agreement must be within the framework of the stabilization policies then in effect.

"(k) Upon settlement of any dispute so referred to the Board the President shall immediately return possession of the mine, plant, or facility involved to the owners thereof in the event possession of such mine, plant or facility has been taken by the President pursuant to the provisions of this section.

"(l) While this section is in effect the provisions of sections 206 to 210, inclusive, of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, shall not apply in the case of any dispute referred to the National Emergency Wage and Price Board. In any such case the provisions of the act of March 23, 1932, entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes,' shall not be applicable."

Renumber succeeding sections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that there can be no further debate on the Byrd amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The substitute amendment of the Senator from South Carolina is now in order.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. How will the time for debate on the substitute amendment be divided?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule; 15 minutes.

Mr. MAYBANK. There were 13 minutes remaining on the previous amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make a unanimous-consent request. The matter is very important. The substitute is of some length. I know Senators desire to have it explained and to have an opportunity for discussion. In order that that may be done, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on the substitute amendment be 1 hour to each side.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, in the first place I do not think the amendment should be offered. I think it should be referred to the committee, and that hearings should be held upon it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Indiana suggested that course to me, and I was advised that under the unanimous-consent agreement an amendment which had been offered to the pending bill could not be referred to the committee.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am not saying——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would not be in order to refer to the committee an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. If it had been, I would have asked yesterday that that be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has made a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair is advised that it is not in order to refer to the committee an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement.

I am opposed to extending the time for debate on this amendment or to devoting any more time to debate on this amendment than was devoted to the Byrd amendment, which was 30 minutes to a side.

Mr. McFARLAND. It was 35 minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. I feel very strongly that if we are to enact legislation so far reaching as the amendment just read, I shall be forced to make a motion to recommit the entire bill to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency for further study and for hearings. I do not believe that we should enact legislation so far reaching as that which has been proposed without giving labor, management, and the American people an opportunity to be heard on the subject.

Furthermore, we are dealing entirely with matters which ought to be considered by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and not by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator is going to object to any more time than was given to the Byrd amendment, I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended to 35 minutes

to a side. That was the time allocated in connection with the Byrd amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I hope the Senator from Indiana will not insist upon his objection to a limitation of 35 minutes to a side in connection with an amendment so important as the amendment of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. CAPEHART. I stated that I would not object to granting the same amount of time as was devoted to the Byrd amendment, which was 35 minutes to a side. I have no objection whatever to that.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is not sufficient time.

Mr. McFARLAND. I had hoped that we could agree upon an hour to a side.

Mr. FERGUSON. An hour to a side should be the very minimum.

Mr. McFARLAND. I would have requested an hour to a side on the Byrd amendment, except that certain Senators indicated that they would object. I do not believe that the Senate ought to act hurriedly. I believe that Senators should have an opportunity to have their say.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I do not believe that we ought to debate this question at all at this time. I think it ought to be studied, and that public hearings should be held.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I make the request for 35 minutes to a side.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have no objection to that request.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I amend my request, so as to make it an hour to a side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is demanded. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona, as modified?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it seems to me that the procedure which we have entered upon is entirely out of order. The so-called Byrd amendment is in the form of a resolution. It is now sought to substitute for that amendment a piece of basic legislation. It was my hope that we might dispose of the Byrd resolution by an affirmation on the part of the Senate. The seizure proposal of the Senator from South Carolina is a very serious piece of legislation. I am not saying that we ought not to discuss it or debate it or act upon it. To be very candid about it, an hour on a measure so intricate and complex as the seizure amendment is merely to skim the surface.

Very frankly, we cannot debate that subject in an hour. If the majority leader wishes to make a request for four or five hours to a side, perhaps we shall have an opportunity to discuss the amendment. We have held 3 weeks of hearings on seizure legislation. We have not had half enough time. Any Member of this body who thinks we can debate and dispose of a seizure amendment in an hour is not thinking through the problem.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish to obtain whatever time we can, and then see what we can do later.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to add a word to what the Senator from Minnesota has said. I appeared before the subcommittee which deals with the problems of strikes in essential industries. The Senator from Minnesota very courteously accorded me an hour there. There was quite a discussion. In my opinion it would be a mistake to try to dispose of legislation of this character under the limitations provided in the unanimous-consent agreement. Personally I should like to see all the amendments dealing with seizure withheld, unless there can be a general modification of the unanimous-consent agreement so that we may go into the subject, broad as it is, with the time that it deserves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND]?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As I understand the parliamentary situation, it is this: The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has offered an amendment to the pending bill. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] has offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the Byrd amendment. Does that mean that an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina would not be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Alabama repeat his parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The query part of it is simply this: Under the present parliamentary situation, would an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair is advised that it would not be in order, because it would be an amendment in the third degree.

Mr. McFARLAND and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina should prevail, could an amendment to the Byrd amendment be offered later?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that no amendment to the Byrd amendment or to any other amendment heretofore agreed to would be in order.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Further reserving the right to object, I am very eager to have the parliamentary situation cleared up.

Mr. McFARLAND. I want to clear it up for the Senator if I can.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, because the proposed Maybank substitute amendment stands out, in a way, as independent legislation, it being a proposed amendment to existing law, I add to my unanimous request the provision that the substitute be permitted to be amended as though it were an original bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona as modified?

Mr. BYRD. That would involve a change in the rule.

Mr. McFARLAND. It does not require a change in the rule. We have done it frequently.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I certainly am not in favor of changing the rules of the Senate for one particular bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. We have already done it in connection with the pending bill.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from South Carolina says that he is in favor of the Byrd amendment. He can accept the Byrd amendment and then offer his amendment. That would simplify the procedure.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if I wait to accept the Byrd amendment——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the majority leader?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico wishes to submit a parliamentary inquiry. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What is the question? I understand that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] has made a unanimous-consent request based upon the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. I happened to be in conference on the road bill, and I was not present in the Chamber at that time. What is the amendment of the Senator from Virginia, and what is the unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will restate the Byrd amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

Title V of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by adding a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 504. *Resolved*, That, by reason of the work stoppage now existing in the steel industry the national safety is imperiled, and the Congress requests the President to immediately invoke the national emergency provisions (sections 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, for the purpose of terminating such work stoppage."

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is on that amendment, as I understand, that the Senator from Arizona, the majority leader is now

asking unanimous consent to limit debate.

Mr. McFARLAND. No. A substitute amendment has been offered by the Senator from South Carolina. I am asking that debate on the substitute amendment be limited to 1 hour to a side, instead of 15 minutes to a side, because it is a very important amendment and it is also very important that Senators be permitted to offer amendments to the substitute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, we may as well discuss the subject now, if I am permitted to do so in connection with my unanimous-consent request. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has been working on this subject. They have a bill which they would like to offer. As I understand from the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Oklahoma has a bill which he desires to offer. We will have to thrash out the matter sooner or later. There is a strike in the steel industry, and steel is not being produced. That is the only reason why the matter is brought up in this manner. I hope there will be no objection to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I demand the regular order. I am not interested in whether we talk an hour or 2 hours. I am interested in settling the steel strike.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is: Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. CASE. Does the proposed unanimous-consent agreement include a request that the Maybank substitute be considered as an original amendment, so that it will be open to amendment?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the Senator from South Dakota has correctly stated the parliamentary situation, and that the limitation of 1 hour's debate to a side is encompassed in the request.

Mr. CASE. What would be the situation with respect to an amendment to the Maybank amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Maybank amendment would be open to amendment in two degrees.

Mr. CASE. How much time would be accorded to an amendment to the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair is advised that 15 minutes would be allotted to a side under the unanimous-consent agreement, unless modified.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to remind Senators of what we are doing. The majority leader has asked unanimous consent that the substitute for the Byrd amendment be open to amendment, adding the statement that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has a substitute and a great many amendments to offer, and that the committee has been studying the subject for 3 weeks. That means that debate could go on for days and days on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. No. I refuse to yield at this time. I want to finish my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana declines to yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. We would go on for days and days debating and discussing on the floor of the Senate strictly 100 percent labor legislation. If Senators insist upon doing that, I shall make a motion that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Mr. President, I do make the motion that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency for further study.

Mr. McFARLAND and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the motion of the Senator from Indiana is in order, and the question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, my unanimous-consent request has not been acted on.

Mr. CAPEHART. I object to the unanimous-consent request. I have already made my motion that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency for further study. I make the motion if we are to proceed to take up days and days in debate on labor legislation.

Mr. MAYBANK. A unanimous-consent agreement is in effect now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes of debate is allowed to each side on the motion of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is equally divided, and controlled by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the motion is agreed to, and the defense production bill is recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency, would it be recommitted without the Byrd amendment, or would the Byrd amendment be pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that if the motion to recommit is agreed to, all amendments adopted by the Senate will be nullified.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does that mean that all amendments which the Senate has adopted up to this time as a part of the bill would be dropped and the bill would go back to the committee in its original form?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has correctly stated the parliamentary situation.

Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. MAYBANK, and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move as a substitute to the Capehart motion that that bill and all amendments adopted to it be recommitted, and that the committee be instructed to report back by next Tuesday morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute motion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Under the motion made by the majority leader, would the committee be bound by the amendments which have been attached to the bill in the Senate and that the committee could not bring the bill back in the form in which the committee reported it originally, or in some other form?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the bill would go back to the committee with the amendments adopted by the Senate as they stand.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And no other amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And such other amendments as the committee may report.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There could not be any change made in the amendments which were adopted by the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that that could not be done under the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to appeal to the Senator from South Carolina to withdraw his substitute amendment. He says he is in favor of the amendment offered by me.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course the Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD. Let us act on my amendment. After we act on it——

Mr. MAYBANK. In my appreciation of the Senator from Virginia, I must say that his amendment is only a request that the President use the Taft-Hartley law, which both the Senator from Virginia and I voted for, as we voted also to override the President's veto. We know that the President is not going to do it. I am trying to have the strike settled.

Mr. BYRD. I do not believe that the President is going to ignore the request of the Senate of the United States. I do not believe that we have reached that point in a free government. I ask the Senator to withdraw his amendment. Mr. President, may we have order?

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina has stated that he favors the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do.

Mr. BYRD. Let us vote on it. Then Senators may offer other amendments.

Why complicate it by having the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina offered at this time?

Mr. MAYBANK. It is not a complication. The amendment of the Senator from Virginia is merely a request that the President of the United States do something. It asks him to do something that I asked him to do 3 weeks ago, and that most Members of Congress have asked him to do.

Mr. BYRD. Did not the Senator from South Carolina state that he favored my amendment?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; and I voted for the Taft-Hartley law, and also to override the President's veto.

Mr. BYRD. Why not vote on my amendment now? What is the objection to voting on it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona, as a substitute, to recommit the bill to the committee, that all the amendments that have been agreed to shall remain in effect, and that the committee report back by next Tuesday.

Mr. MORSE. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Is the McFarland motion debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into, all motions are subject to a limitation of debate of 15 minutes to each side, to be controlled—as agreed to—by the mover of the amendment and the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, respectively, if the latter is opposed to the amendment; or, if not, by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. It has been stated on the floor that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has pending a bill which will be offered later this afternoon as a substitute. I think that impression should be corrected as I propound my parliamentary inquiry in regard to the so-called Committee on Labor and Public Welfare bill.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as such, has no bill pending. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare met this morning, and the members of the committee made a good many suggestions for perfecting that bill. A subcommittee was appointed to perfect the bill, and now has done so. The bill as perfected is now being typed; and later this afternoon it will be offered, at some point in the proceedings, as a substitute, if the bill now before the Senate is not recommitted.

My question is this: If the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] is agreed to, will the bill which the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare had before it this morning, but which bill has not yet been voted on by the committee, be subject to reference to the Banking and Currency Committee, or will it then have to wait for consideration until the Banking and Currency Committee reports back to the Senate, next Tuesday, the bill which now is before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the motion of the Senator from Arizona prevails, the result will be that the bill now pending will be recommitted to the Banking and Currency Committee, with instructions to report it to the Senate by next Tuesday, with all the amendments thus far agreed to by the Senate preserved intact. When the bill comes back to the Senate, it will be subject to amendment, just as it is now subject to amendment.

The fact that another bill is pending in another committee would have no effect whatever—regardless of whether that committee had acted on that bill or had not acted on it—on the parliamentary situation in regard to having recommitted to the Banking and Currency Committee the bill now pending in the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. If I should send to the desk and offer the bill to which I have referred, before debate closes on the pending motion, that bill would automatically go to the Banking and Currency Committee, for its consideration and action, would it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from Arizona was in part, that the amendments which have been agreed to would remain intact in the bill which now is pending. Of course, the committee itself could suggest any amendments it might see fit to suggest.

When the bill returns to the Senate, regardless of whether the committee does or does not propose amendments to it, the bill would then be subject to further amendment.

At this point let the Chair state that all the debate occurring at this time is out of order unless it occurs in time which is yielded for that purpose by the Senator who has made the motion or the Senator who has control of the time on the opposite side.

The present situation is that the Senator from Arizona has 15 minutes on his motion, and the Senator from South Carolina has 15 minutes against the motion, if he is against it; or if he is not, the Senator from Indiana will have 15 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia will state it.

Mr. BYRD. How much time do I have? Apparently I have been cut off entirely.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A motion to recommit takes precedence over all other motions or all pending amendments.

Mr. BYRD. But I have 9 minutes left, and I wish to say something about this matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the motion to recommit the bill is rejected, the Senator from Virginia will still have 9 minutes; but if the motion to recommit is adopted, all nine of those minutes will go out the window. [Laughter.]

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am entitled to the floor at this time.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry: I simply wish to make certain that the Senator from Arizona understands that I am opposed to the motion to recommit; therefore, I shall have 15 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina has announced that he will oppose the motion.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona is recognized at this time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President I wish to explain briefly why I moved to modify the motion of the acting minority leader, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. He moved that the bill be recommitted. Under the circumstances, I thought that was reasonable, because all of us are tired, and the arguments being made this afternoon are rather heated. If ever there was a time when conditions in the country required cool and deliberate thinking upon an important question, that time is now, Mr. President.

I had another object in mind in making my request that the bill be left intact, as it now stands. I did not want us to lose the benefit of all the action which the Senate has taken thus far on the bill, even though some of the amendments which have been adopted were adopted over my protest and without my vote. Nevertheless, I did not want us to lose the benefit of all the work we have done thus far on the bill, and probably have to go over the same ground again.

On the other hand, under the circumstances, I feel that a little more time is important.

One of the principal reasons for my motion is that I thought that if this bill goes back to the committee a settlement might be reached between now and next Tuesday. Then further discussion, such as we have had today, could be eliminated, and we could proceed without all the turmoil which we have had this afternoon and pass the bill.

So, Mr. President, under the circumstances, I am joining with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] on his motion, except I do not think that either he or anyone else would want us to lose the benefit of all the work the Senate has done thus far on the bill.

If we begin to amend the bill from the point of view of seizure, of course, one amendment may be adopted, but another one may be offered at another place in the bill to strike out some other part of the bill.

So I think it would be well for the bill to be recommitted, since so much confusion has developed.

Much as I would like to see rapid progress made—and I should have liked very much to have seen the bill passed today, for no one regrets more than I do having the Senate lose any time, inasmuch as we are trying to reach a goal—nevertheless, I feel that we shall save time and shall be acting more judiciously and more wisely if we recommit the bill at this time, and thus give everyone an opportunity to study the situation.

So I hope that with the modification I have proposed, all Senators will go along with the motion, because no one can be hurt by having it adopted. Adoption of the motion will simply mean that the bill as it now stands will be recom-

mitted, and then the committee will be able to make such recommendations as it may see fit to make in regard to amendments to the bill, although in any event we shall have to pass on them when the bill comes back to the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Do I correctly understand that the present proposal is that the positive action the Senate has taken up to this point on the bill will remain in effect—in short, that amendments already agreed to will remain in the bill, and that it will be reported back by the committee in that condition?

Mr. McFARLAND. Of ccurse, the committee may make additional recommendations, but the bill will be reported to the Senate again, as it now stands, together with any additional recommendations.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator from Virginia wish to speak in behalf of this motion?

Mr. BYRD. No.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator from Virginia wish to support the motion?

Mr. BYRD. I do not.

Mr. McFARLAND. Then I do not yield time to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to make my position perfectly clear, before I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Very well. The Senator from South Carolina now has the floor. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield, so that I may make an inquiry of the majority leader?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader whether I correctly understand that his basic purpose in making the motion is to have the bill returned to the committee, in order that the committee may give consideration to the issues involved in the Byrd amendment and in the Maybank substitute?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I hope the question and the answer to it will not take too long.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All time being required in that connection is being taken from the time of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Then, Mr. President, I refuse to yield further.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may I have an answer to my question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina refuses to yield any further for the moment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina will proceed, or his time will soon have run out. [Laughter.]

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I do not need much time. I merely wish to say that on yesterday morning I submitted the amendment. When I submitted it, I distinctly said that probably it was not perfect, and perhaps it should be amended; but, at any rate, I submitted something positive, not an amendment requesting the President to do something which I knew he would not do. Inasmuch as the Supreme Court has said that the President should do what the Congress says should be done, I have offered a bill which provides positive action for the President to take.

Of course, I said yesterday the manufacturers' associations would condemn me. I said yesterday that certain labor groups would not be very happy. So I picked up the Wall Street Journal, a publication I have read for a long time, and noted that it goes into the matter of the seizure bill, and in substance, says, "We believe that a Government power of this sort is both unnecessary and dangerous, under the Maybank bill."

Mr. President, there never was such a bill introduced by me. The only thing I introduced was temporary legislation, to be terminated not later than March 1. The only thing I introduced was a bill to change the Taft-Hartley law, because I am not running for any office, Mr. President. I was conceited enough to think that perhaps attention might be paid to a contribution I might be able to make, in some small way, by providing for about 120 days that a board appointed by the President, subject to confirmation by the Senate, could make recommendations which would have to be carried out. Both labor and management agreed. I want to make the record clear as to what I tried to do yesterday. I tried to do it for one purpose, and for one purpose only. It was not an attempt to interfere with labor or with the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. This morning I told the Senator who was working on a temporary measure, that I would, of course, amend my proposal, if that was thought advisable. It was only a temporary measure for one purpose, and for one purpose only, namely, in connection with the extension of the National Production Act, to bring about the normal production of steel, for as I said yesterday, if the strike continues and steel is not produced we might as well not have any law.

Mr. President, I know there are people who do not want a law on this subject, and that is the reason for certain things being done around here, but I made it prefectly clear that what I was trying to do was in connection with the extension of the National Production Act to March 1. Now, apparently, the bill is to be recommitted to the committee. I regret that, but I shall not vote against the motion. The majority leader wants the bill to be recommitted. If that is done, I shall do the best I can to report a bill to the Senate, for one purpose. I am not interested in the subject from the standpoint of politics, and I care not who may be President. My first thought is of the working people of America and their children in the armed services, and also of management, and their children.

I want the record to show that what I did was in the exercise of my own honest judgment, and that the distinguished legislative counsel, who is sitting beside me, Mr. Boots, and myself drew the amendment. I never talked to anybody about it. We worked for 2 days only in the interest of America and of the American people.

I regret that I have to vote to recommit the bill, but in view of the confusion prevailing here, I am going to vote that way, because I know this bill has had the ground cut from under it. There were weeks of hearings. For 6 weeks we heard everyone who cared to testify, including those who thought no controls were needed. They were sincere, just as sincere as the Wall Street Journal, which says the Maybank seizure bill is unnecessary and dangerous, which is nonsense.

When the bill goes back to the committee, I shall be there, and I shall be back on the floor on Tuesday, when I hope we can do something to maintain a high rate of production, and to help—and I am in favor of helping—whoever may be the next President, so he may make a good President. I am sure he will be, if he is a certain gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BYRD rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina controls the time. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. MAYBANK. I told the Senator from Virginia I would yield. I yield 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia has been in the United States Senate for 19 years. He has never seen a situation develop in the Senate such as exists at this time. Here we have the majority leader willing to defeat a very important bill simply in order that the Senate shall not have an opportunity to say to the President of the United States that it requests him to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act, in a desperate effort.

It is a desperate effort to keep steel in production in an emergency. In the meantime, what are we doing? We are losing 300,000 tons of steel every day for our own defense work, which will mean, if continued for the next 80 days, 25,000,000 tons.

Yet, on the floor of the Senate, we hear time and time again, "We must have steel production, we must support the boys who are fighting and dying in Korea." Yet this political maneuver—and that is all it is—on the part of the majority leader, who has joined in the effort to recommit the bill to committee, is aimed at one single objective, and that is to defeat the Byrd amendment. All the Byrd amendment proposes is that the Senate request the President of the United States to use the authority he already has to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act in order to stop the steel strike. I merely want to say, in all deference——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I decline to yield now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia declines to yield.

Mr. BYRD. I think my time is about up. I merely want to say, with all deference to the distinguished majority leader, for whom I have the greatest admiration, that this is the most unusual procedure I have ever known in my entire service in the Senate of the United States. Why is it that he wants to kill this amendment? All I ask is that the Senate have a record vote on the simple proposition, that the President should use the authority already existing to stop the steel strike, which is causing the loss of 300,000 tons of steel a day. That is all this amendment would do.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, how much time have I?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia has not concluded.

Mr. BYRD. I ask the majority leader not to take up my time. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not much. [Laughter.]

Mr. BYRD. I merely want to say, Mr. President, that the situation must be desperate, if it is necessary to resort to such tactics as this, merely to keep this amendment from coming to a vote, and I want to say that those behind this movement are not going to succeed in it, even if they succeed in this particular maneuver—and that is what it is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia has two more minutes.

Mr. BYRD. They are not going to succeed ultimately, even if they succeed in this political maneuver now to kill their own bill.

Here is a bill of vast importance. We have been studying it and debating it for 2 or 3 days. Is the Senator willing to forego all of that? Is he willing to obliterate everything that has been done, in order to prevent the Senate of the United States from going on record in this day of great trial and great peril, as requesting the President to use the power he already has to stop the steel strike?

I may say to the Senator from Arizona that he is not going to succeed. If it is bypassed today, I am going to offer this amendment to every bill that comes up before the Senate. I shall have the right to do it, and I shall do it. So this maneuver to prevent a vote on this important question will not prevail.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ten minutes.

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield myself 4 minutes, or such time as I may want to use.

Mr. President, I am surprised and disappointed at the statement of the Senator from Virginia. I am surprised that he would resort to such language as he has used in regard to me. I would not for one moment charge him with political maneuvering on this occasion. I am sure that politics has nothing at all to do with what he is doing, and with what he is trying to do. [Laughter.] I am really disappointed in him. Not for one moment, not for anything in the world, would I chastise the Senator from Virginia as he has chastised me. What have I done that I should be chastised? I am supporting the motion of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] to recommit the bill in order to save the work the Senate has already done on it.

I am greatly disappointed in the Senator from Virginia. I am disappointed because he accused me of political maneuvering. Mr. President, I do not take off my hat to the Senator from Virginia when it comes to patriotism, and it ill behooves him to stand on the Senate floor and make the charges he has made against me. They are unfair. I am surprised that he would resort to such tactics.

A motion has been made to recommit the bill. I want to save the work the Senate has done on it during the past 2 days. I want the bill to come back intact and come back quickly.

I should now like to answer the question of my distinguished friend from New Jersey as to what I expect to be done.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, would the Senator like me to repeat the question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I think I remember it. The Senator wants to know if I expect the Banking and Currency Committee to consider these amendments——

Mr. HENDRICKSON. No, Mr. President—to consider the issues involved in the Byrd amendment and the Maybank substitute.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct. I want labor and management to consider them over the week end. I hope they will get together and settle the question.

Mr. President, it does not do anyone any good for a Senator to chastise another Senator and resort to the tactics to which the Senator from Virginia has resorted today.

I yield to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] if he is on the floor.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me for a moment?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The distinguished majority leader is troubled because he was chastised by the Senator from Virginia. I should like to quote from the Scripture for his benefit:

> Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exorcised thereby.

Possibly that will fit the Senator's case and be a comfort to him.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I want to save some time for the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina has 3 minutes left.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. I will divide my time with the minority leader.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I think the amendment should be considered and hearings should be held on it. It is a far-reaching amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, let me again remind my good friend that this is not permanent legislation——

Mr. CAPEHART. That is why I made the motion when the majority leader said that he was going to ask that the Maybank amendment be thrown open to all sorts of amendments and substitutes, which simply meant, to me, that we might be here for hours and days and days.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is why I suggested, under those circumstances, that we should take care of it in the committee and not on the floor. I understand that that is not what is going to happen, and, therefore, I withdraw my motion to recommit the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana has withdrawn his motion to recommit, and that carries with it the substitute. So there is nothing pending before the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I resubmit my amendment as a substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia has 9 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I inquire what is the pending question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. How much time have I?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia has 9 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, it seems to me that a careful consideration of the language of the so-called Byrd amendment would indicate that there is no occasion for so much excitement as has been manifested about it. I read the amendment:

> *Resolved*, That by reason of the work stoppage now existing in the steel industry, the national safety is imperiled—

I think everyone will have to agree to that—

> and the Congress requests the President to immediately invoke the national emergency provisions (secs. 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 for the purpose of terminating such work stoppage.

What can be wrong with that? The law is on the books. The President knows it is there, and we know it is there. Who should say that the law is not to be observed?

I must confess that about the best thing I have seen come out of this acrimonious debate has been the colloquy between the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], wherein it was disclosed beyond all peradventure that the Senator from Virginia has greater confidence in the President of the United States than has the Senator from South Carolina. I do not think we should impute to the President that he will not do what we ask to have done. I think we should adopt the language of this amendment and suggest again to the President that the course the amendment outlines be followed. I can see no reason why it should be the subject of such an acrimonious debate.

Mr. President, it seems to me we have spent a great deal of time on this bill. It should not go back to the committee. If we can get a vote on the Byrd amendment and then on the Maybank amend-

ment the bill can be promptly passed. I am not concerned about anything except the public interest; I am not interested in the history given by apologists for either labor or management; I am interested in what the public thinks about the situation and what is for the country's welfare. I think the Nation needs steel production, and why we should hold our hands while the committee debates the question all over again is beyond my comprehension.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from North Carolina has expired.

The Senator from Virginia has 4 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it is gratifying if we have made, in this atmosphere, what the opponents suggest is a meaningless gesture, but which to many of us seems like a very worth-while gesture. Without disparagement of the methods or the ideas of the President, it is evident that the course he has taken in the past few months has not been well calculated to serve the interests of the country. It has finally culminated in the Supreme Court being compelled to find that his action was outside his executive power. It was his duty to execute the laws, not to make them.

With the messages we have before us, and with the crisis which we face, is it not clear that as simple and as clear an amendment as that which the Senator from Virginia proposes may well be a respectful suggestion within the well-defined constitutional limits of the right of petition for grievances, if the 150,000,000 people whom we represent request that the President shall immediately take the one clear legal course that is open to him to get the mills back into operation and to resume production?

He has said in his message that to consider permitting steel mills to close down is unthinkable. Certainly it is time the Senate should say, in this respectful fashion, that the President should invoke the methods of the Taft-Hartley law, which he can do within 3 days, to get mills back in operation, and then to give Congress time to deal with what is one of the most tragic crises it has ever faced.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia has 3 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to reserve the 3 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota cannot be recognized for that at the moment.

Does the Senator in control of time wish to use the time or yield it back to the Senate?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is the use of the time. Does the Senator wish to use the time?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will recognize the Senator from South Carolina in a moment, but he wishes to get the matter of time straightened out.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was going to reoffer my substitute amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands there is no further time on the Byrd amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Am I not correct in believing that the minority leader, to whom has been given the allocation of time, is morally bound to allot that time to those who oppose the amendment?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly, and I am glad to do so.

Mr. LEHMAN. I believe the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] had asked to be recognized.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's statement is not necessarily a parliamentary inquiry. However, if the Senator from New Hampshire wishes to yield his time to Senators on either side, he has a right to do so. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield any time?

Mr. BRIDGES. If the Senator from Minnesota desires to rise in opposition to the amendment, then I am very glad to yield him 2 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I understand, the substitute amendment of the Senator from South Carolina has been withdrawn.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not been offered; it has merely been read for the information of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Very well. Therefore, I offer an amendment to the Byrd amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot offer a substitute at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Why not, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Because the debate on the Byrd amendment has not been concluded. Until that debate is concluded, the Senator cannot offer an amendment or a substitute amendment, because the time is under the control of two Senators for debate, and not for the offering of a substitute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry, in my time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand a Senator may offer an amendment at any time he wishes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is afraid the Senator misunderstands the situation. Under the limitation of 15 minutes on a side, the time is controlled by two Senators. When the time has been exhausted, or when either side or both sides announce they have no further debate to present, then an amendment or substitute may be in order. But during the 15 minutes of debate it is not in order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may I ask, then, if the situation in reference to the Maybank amendment is that it had merely been read, but had not been brought up for action? Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not actually been technically and parliamentarily offered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then I shall yield the floor, because it is my desire to offer, at the appropriate moment, an amendment to the Byrd amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to state, in fairness to all, that the Senator from South Carolina has advised the Chair that he intends to offer a substitute, and the Chair feels that the Senator, as chairman of the committee, is entitled to recognition for that purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say that prior to the time the present occupant of the chair had come into the Chamber to act as Presiding Officer, the junior Senator from Minnesota had offered his amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was not in order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was prior to the action of the Senator from South Carolina. At the request of several Senators, I withheld action on it, so that we could proceed to utilize the time which was prescribed for the Byrd amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not think that that gives the Senator's amendment any priority.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Very well. I merely wished to make my point clear.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia wish to use any more time?

Mr. BYRD. I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the junior Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, yesterday the chairman of our committee offered an amendment to title 2, which is the seizure part of the Defense Production Act. But that could only authorize a partial seizure of what the Government actually needs for the military program. It does not authorize seizure of an entire industry which is shut down, industry-wide, by reason of a labor dispute.

The Maybank amendment authorizes an extension of the power so that a whole industry may be seized and it creates a fact-finding board to recommend settlement. It also freezes wages and, in effect, freezes profits, too, until settlement is reached.

Title V of the act provides a special remedy to settle disputes, and the last sentence of section 503 provides that such action shall be in conformity with the Labor Management Relations Act—the so-called Taft-Hartley Act—the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, or other applicable laws.

The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has today offered an amendment to title V, which merely provides, following the language providing that the settlement of labor disputes shall be under the Taft-Hartley Act, "We request the

President to act under the Taft-Hartley Act."

Earlier today I indicated that, while I do not believe the Maybank amendment is a perfect amendment—as a matter of fact, I do not expect the Senate to adopt it—I intended to vote for it, since it is the only proposal before me to vote for to indicate my belief that we must give our veterans abroad priority over inconveniences or hardships upon labor or industry, or both, which are nowhere comparable to those our servicemen are suffering and to the sacrifices they are making, even if they do not get killed. I did not promise, however, to vote for the Maybank amendment as a substitute for the Byrd amendment. I indicated previously today that even if the Senate adopted the Maybank amendment, no action could be taken under it until the whole bill became law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Four minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield 1 minute to the able Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have sent to the desk a perfecting amendment. I should like to have the Senate consider the perfecting amendment in connection with the Byrd amendment before considering any substitute. My only question is: Would I be in order at this time in offering my perfecting amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator's amendment were a perfecting amendment to the Byrd amendment, it would take precedence, in voting, over any substitute offered for the Byrd amendment. Does the Senator offer his perfecting amendment now, or does he propose to offer it later?

Mr. MORSE. I offer it now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. We are not acting quite in order, because all the time on the Byrd amendment has not yet been consumed.

Mr. MORSE. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair feels that he must now recognize the Senator from South Carolina, if the perfecting amendment is to be voted upon first, before the substitute.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Three minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Unless some Senator wishes to use 3 minutes, I suggest that a vote be taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has all time for debate on the Byrd amendment been consumed?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Has any substitute amendment been offered?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No, not yet. The Senator from South Carolina is on his feet for that purpose.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I offer my substitute, which has been read. I ask that it be not read again.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold offering his amendment for just a moment?

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me make a brief statement.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish to use 1 or 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All time is exhausted.

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. President, let me say that I do not wish to be a party to causing confusion. At the same time, yesterday I told Senators who were present that all amendments having to do with labor would be placed at the bottom of the ladder and would not be taken up until we had finished the other amendments. I spoke as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, and I thought that my fellow Senators who were present would stand by me.

Many important amendments have not yet been voted upon. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] offered an amendment. He probably was not present yesterday when I made my statement. His amendment tells the President that he should use the Taft-Hartley law. The President knows that the Taft-Hartley law is available to him, because the Senator from Virginia and I and others have told him so. He knows that he can use it if he so desires.

My purpose is not to permit any amendment to be adopted if I can prevent it until we first complete the business which we agreed yesterday to complete, namely, the other amendments to the bill, with the labor amendments being placed at the end. If my statement needs correction, I ask any Senator to rise and correct it.

I gave such assurances to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and other Senators. I told the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], not only yesterday, but again today, that this would be the order of business if I had anything to say about it.

I stand on my statement. I favor the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], but I favor it at the proper time, after we conclude the other amendments to the bill on which the Banking and Currency Committee has held hearings for weeks. The bill has been before the Senate since 10 o'clock yesterday morning. We remained in session until 10:30 p. m. yesterday. The bill has been before the Senate today since 12 o'clock noon. Prior to that the measure was under consideration in committee meetings with various agencies of the Government, labor, industry, the farmers, various businessmen, and representatives of the public.

I want my action in offering the substitute to be distinctly understood. If the Senate wishes to take a recess and meet tomorrow and take up the other amendments which we have not yet considered, I have no objection. I do not believe that the bill should be recommitted to the committee.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, may I have a few minutes, please?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has no way of saying whether the Senator from Minnesota may have time or not.

Mr. THYE. Will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me for 3 minutes?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, how much time have I?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has 15 minutes.

Mr. THYE. I merely wished to speak to the question of the substitute, and the question of labor legislation.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am glad to yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota, but first I wish to make an explanation.

Yesterday I assured the Senate, as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency—if I am not mistaken, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] also spoke to me on the subject—that no legislation of this kind would be taken up, and no amendments of this kind would be taken up, until we had finished the committee amendments and other amendments. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has some most important amendments.

In the middle of the afternoon I am caught in this situation. I may be charged with blocking something. I am not blocking anything. I am only keeping my word, as I always do, with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. I assured them that an amendment of this nature would be the last thing considered. That is the responsibility which I feel lies on my shoulders.

I now yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am very much concerned over the effort that is being made here to write vital and complex labor legislation on the floor of the Senate. It seems to me that we should give thought to the effect on both labor and management of the procedure we are proposing to follow, which does not afford ample opportunity for hearings and consideration through the appropriate legislative channels in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

There is reason to view with some alarm not only this procedure but the proposals which would provide for an entirely new system of dealing with labor disputes aside from the established conciliation and mediation service of the Government. It would appear to me that adoption of such measures, without the due consideration and public hearings which they ought to have, would be an open invitation to both labor and management to take either course in connection with any dispute. It would certainly tend to weaken the present authorized conciliation services and would add confusion to the whole picture of labor-management relations.

The critical situation which has grown out of the dispute in the steel industry is

directly traceable in my opinion to the fact that instead of utilizing the labor conciliation service of the Government, for which some $4,000,000 is appropriated annually and in which there are several hundred trained experts in the field of conciliation, the matter was placed in the hands of temporary stabilization agencies. The plain fact is that they muffed the handling of this entire matter while the conciliation and mediation service has stood idly by.

I sincerely believe, Mr. President, that we should be most careful in considering changes in the pattern of our Government policy in the settlement of labor-management disputes. If we adopt measures here, on the spur of the moment, we run a great risk of adding to the confusion which already exists and making more difficult the task of conciliation. That is my concern.

We are endeavoring, in the process of extending the Defense Production Act, to write major labor conciliation legislation into the Defense Production Act. By so doing we do irreparable damage to our entire labor conciliation and labor-management relationship in this Nation. I hope that we shall turn back to the question of extending the Defense Production Act, and then examine the question of labor conciliation legislation on its own merits.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. How much time does the Senator from Indiana intend to take?

Mr. CAPEHART. I allot myself 2 minutes.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an amendment which, in reality, is a bill. It is a far-reaching document. It is a proposal which the Senate is asked to pass under a unanimous consent agreement allowing 30 minutes' debate, 15 minutes on a side. I say that that is a mistake, and I shall vote against it, unless the vote is to occur tomorrow. I think it would be a mistake. I think we have a perfect right to adopt the Byrd amendment, requesting that the President of the United States use a law which the Congress has already enacted. I shall vote for the Byrd amendment. I shall vote against the so-called Maybank substitute, not on the ground that I do not think it has merit—I do not know whether it has or not—but I simply will not agree to consider such serious legislation under a unanimous-consent agreement providing for only 30 minutes of debate. I think that is the wrong procedure. However, I feel that we have a perfect right to notify the President of the United States that we think he ought to use a law already enacted by Congress.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. No; I decline to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's 2 minutes have expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield myself one additional minute.

Mr. President, if an emergency exists today in the steel industry, it would require at least 3 weeks to enact the Maybank amendment. The Senate would have to pass it, the House would have to pass it, it would have to go to conference, the conference report would have to be agreed to, and then the bill would have to go to the President to be signed. Therefore, it cannot help in the steel situation. If it cannot help in the steel situation why do we not take sufficient time to consider and pass upon it?

I yield 8 minutes to the able Senator from Michigan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield so that I may inquire how much time I have remaining?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina yielded 3 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. He has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who is one of the authors of the Taft-Hartley law, were present he would have expressed the views on the pending Maybank substitute which I am about to express. I have the same views on this substitute. Because of the time limitation on debate in effect yesterday it was impossible for the senior Senator from Ohio to express his views on the Maybank amendment.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] by his amendment which is in the nature of a substitute, is requesting the Senate to, in effect, suspend the national emergency section of the Taft-Hartley law and write into the Defense Production Act a substitute measure for the handling of national emergency strikes. Such action would bypass consideration by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and write into the law without hearings a new national emergency strike procedure. Such action could never be justified except in a period of extreme emergency which requires the Congress to act immediately. The amendment is obviously designed to meet the current steel strike. The amendment should, therefore, be considered along with the existing provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

In order to determine which may more effectively be used to bring about an end to the steel strike, giving it the benefit of all possible accelerated action, it would be 2 weeks before the Maybank amendment would be available for the use of the President. It must be passed by two Houses of the Congress; it would undoubtedly have to be considered by the conference committee of the two Houses; then revoted on by both Houses and signed by the President. Compared to this 2 weeks, the President has available the Taft-Hartley law under which he can secure an injunction against this strike in 3 days if he cares to use it. The Taft-Hartley Act has been applied in the past to secure an injunction within a period of 4 days. In the current dispute the facts have already been pretty well established and I can see no reason why an injunction could not be secured in 3 days.

Both the Maybank amendment and the Taft-Hartley law provide for an injunction in the initial stages. The present law permits the injunction in 3 days; the amendment would require a minimum of 2 weeks.

Under the Taft-Hartley Act the President may obtain an injunction which lasts for a period of 80 days. Under the Maybank amendment the President may secure an injunction which lasts for at least 120 days, and then may be extended into an indefinite injunction if one of the parties does not agree to settlement proposals and seizure is made by the President. The Maybank amendment does not use the term "injunction" but its section (e) clearly calls for an injunction in making a strike unlawful, and then by reference to section 706 of the act it sets forth the remedies for violations. I cannot see that injunctions are any less unpalatable to organized labor if they should be called something other than injunctions.

Under the Taft-Hartley Act, at the end of the injunctive period a vote is conducted by the National Labor Relations Board on the employer's last offer. The Maybank amendment provides for no such vote. It may be argued that since experience with this last offer ballot in the Atomic Energy and Maritime cases did not establish that the employees would vote against acceptance of the offer and to go on strike, that the last offer ballot is useless. On the other hand, I do not believe that these two cases provided a good test of the last offer ballot. In the Atomic Energy case the employees knew that there was not going to be a strike, and could not be a strike which would shut down the atomic energy operation. In the Maritime case the iron hand of Harry Bridges prevented use of the ballot. I do not believe we should strike out this section of existing law without more consideration than it is possible to give it while considering the Defense Production Act.

The Taft-Hartley Act does not provide seizure. The Maybank amendment provides seizure at the end of the 120 days and the seizure provided is an indefinite one. It could only be brought to an end by an act of Congress on the expiration of the Defense Production Act next March. It is a type of seizure in which no change in the working conditions which existed prior to the President's action may be brought about. It is a seizure very much comparable to that provided in the Railway Labor Act and which was used by President Truman to hold the railroads under seizure and prevent the railway workers from getting any increase for a period of one year and a half. I have always believed that the railroad seizure was unfair to the railway employees. I know that the railway workers disliked it very much.

The Maybank amendment permits the Emergency Board to make definite recommendations for settlement. The Taft-Hartley Act requires only fact finding. It may again be argued that by providing for such recommendation the Maybank amendment does something affirmatively to settle the strike. However, the amendment by providing that

if either party does not wish to accept the recommendations an indefinite seizure is brought about, the recommendations cannot be put into effect. Under these circumstances I can see no advantage over the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law.

There is no merit in doing something just for the sake of doing something. The Maybank substitute gives the President for at least the next 80 days nothing that he does not already have available to him under existing law. It gives him less than existing law in that it would take at least 2 weeks before he would have the amendment available for use.

Mr. President, for these reasons I shall vote against the Maybank substitute.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement in connection with my amendment, which I intended to read. I do not desire to detain the Senate. The statement points out the inaccuracies in the statement made by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Which inaccuracies?

Mr. MAYBANK. To start with the Senator from Michigan stated that the Taft-Hartley Act would be repealed by the amendment or that the Maybank amendment would be a substitute for it. The Maybank amendment is only another remedy which the President could use.

I voted for the Taft-Hartley Act. The President could use it today. He could use it tomorrow. I have been in conference with many members of the Railroad Brotherhood, and I should like to say——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wanted to answer the inaccurate statements of the Senator from Michigan. In substance the Senator from Michigan said to the Senate something which in my judgment was inaccurate. He said that my amendment is a substitute for the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let us read subsection (l).

Mr. MAYBANK. That applies only after the dispute is referred to the Wage Board. The President could put the Taft-Hartley law into effect immediately. He could put it into effect in the morning.

Mr. FERGUSON. May I read this section?

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly.

Mr. FERGUSON. I read:

While this section is in effect the provisions of sections 206 to 210, inclusive, of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947—

That is the Taft-Hartley Act—

shall not apply in the case of any dispute referred to the National Emergency Wage and Price Board. In such case the provisions of the act of March 23, 1932, entitled "An act to amend the judicial code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," shall not be applicable.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have only a few minutes remaining. I cannot yield further. I say to the Senator that the President can use the Taft-Hartley law. That provision would apply only after a case is referred to the Board.

Mr. FERGUSON. The LaGuardia Act is set aside by this section, in addition to the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. MAYBANK. Only after the dispute is referred to the Board.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, nothing can be done until it is referred to the Board.

Mr. MAYBANK. No. I am submitting a statement which shows exactly what the amendment would do. I repeat that the President has on the books now for his use the Taft-Hartley law, the Selective Service Act, and the Defense Production Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD the statement to which I have referred. It has nothing to do with doing away with the Taft-Hartley Act.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAYBANK

I offer for consideration of the Senate an amendment to the Defense Production Act designed to keep in operation industries required for the adequate defense mobilization of our Nation. It applies only to disputes affecting the whole or a substantial part of an industry. Basically it creates a 7-man National Emergency Price and Wage Board of outstanding qualifications subject to Senate confirmation, which can objectively search out the facts in dispute and on that basis make recommendations to the President for settling the dispute, keeping in mind the objectives of the Defense Production Act to stabilize prices and wages. One difficulty of the Wage Stabilization Board in the current steel dispute is that its recommendations did not and could not cover the price aspects of the dispute as distinguished from its wage aspects. It gives the Board the comparatively long time of 113 days to do its work, and bans strikes or lockouts during that period, all the while encouraging the disputing parties to settle their differences by collective bargaining. After the Board recommends a settlement to the President, the disputing parties have 7 days to accept or reject the recommendations. The amendment gives the President full authority to adjust price and wage regulations in order that the Board recommendations may be placed in effect.

However, if any party to the dispute declines to accept the recommendation, continuation of production is assured by having the Government take possession of the plant and operate it under status quo employment conditions until the dispute is settled or until expiration of the Defense Production Act price and wage sections. Just compensation is allowed for the Government's taking of the property. The amendment provides no vote by labor unions because it invites labor and management to settle their disputes any time they want.

I appreciate and regret that neither management nor labor will be pleased with the provisions of this amendment which give the President power to take possession of plants, mines, or facilities.

But I would remind my colleagues and the American people that in times of peril such as these it is imperative that our defense structure not be weakened because of internal disputes, however justified they may be.

This amendment would remain in the law only as part of the Defense Production Act to handle labor-management differences of opinion which imperil national defense or defeat the purposes of that act. Under the committee version of S. 2594, the price-and-wage provision of that act will end February 28, 1953, unless further extended by a later action of the Congress. This brief period will give a fair trial run for the procedure proposed by this amendment. The Congress will have an early opportunity to examine the effectiveness of the suggested procedure. Your Joint Committee on Defense Production will be in a position to follow closely administration of this amendment. Under the provision of section 717 (b) of the Defense Production Act, the Congress may terminate this section by concurrent resolution even before February 28, 1952, if it desires to do so. Thereby the Congress reserves for itself in effect a veto power over the amendment or operation thereunder at any time before its life ends on next February 28. This amendment is not offered as permanent legislation to supersede the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. It is intended as an emergency method of assuring continued defense production despite the existence of labor-management disputes which would otherwise impede that production. The amendment envisions no compulsory arbitration; it encourages voluntary settlement of disputes. But it says that nonsettlement of any such dispute shall not deprive the Nation of material and products needed for defense purposes. It requires immediate return of the plants to their owners as soon as the dispute is settled.

A person subject to the draft cannot deprive the country of his services as a member of the Armed Forces by becoming entangled in a civil legal dispute with another person not involving his draft status, no matter how justifiable that dispute may be.

I fully realize that persons subject to the draft and other members of our Armed Forces come from the ranks of labor and management as well as from the many other segments which make up our population, and this comparison is not meant to reflect adversely on either labor or management. But unarmed men alone do not constitute an adequate defense force. Our system of laws must assure that the men in our Armed Forces receive the equipment they need to defend our Nation adequately. That is all this amendment strives to do. I urge my colleagues to give it serious consideration. It does not say to labor or to management: You may not alter your working relations, but it does say to them: Your difference of opinion cannot be allowed to impede the defense of this Nation.

The President has not chosen to use the statutory tools now on the books to keep defense production rolling despite labor-management differences of opinion, although in my own opinion he might well have used the power given him by section 201 (b) of the Defense Production Act to acquire temporary use of plants whose production is needed for national defense. I have worked hard and sincerely with the full help of the Banking and Currency Committee staff and the very able office of the Senate Legislative Counsel to suggest a method which offers the President one additional tool intended to be of assistance in assuring that defense production will not be hampered by the private quarrels of industry and labor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I now wish to propound a unanimous-consent agreement. I would be perfectly willing to withdraw my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] if he will withdraw his amendment, so that we may proceed with the bill reported by the Banking and Currency Committee, insofar as concerns other amendments which have not yet been acted upon, so that we may

conclude action on that part of the bill this afternoon, and then return to the seizure question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia does not seem to be in the Chamber at the moment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Then I shall wait until he returns. If my proposal is agreed to, we then would take up the amendments intended to be proposed by the Senator from Arkansas and other amendments which have not yet been acted on.

Mr. President, while we are waiting for the Senator from Virginia to return to the Chamber, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I desire to thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina for yielding this time to me.

I have at the desk an amendment which, because of the present parliamentary situation, cannot be offered to the amendment submitted by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

I happen to prefer my own amendment to that of the Senator from South Carolina, because my amendment would give the President the right of seizure, subject to veto by the Congress. It grants to Congress the right to veto a seizure within a period of 15 days after the receipt by Congress of a communication in which the President informs the Congress of his determination to invoke seizure; and the amendment also provides for 80-day automatic termination of seizure unless it is extended by concurrent resolution adopted by the Congress.

Because I feel that it is of vital importance that Congress not "pass the buck" to the President, but, instead, pass a bill which will provide machinery to prevent shut-downs of our most vital and indispensable facilities, I intend to vote for the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina, even though I believe my amendment is preferable, and even though I realize that if I vote for the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina, I shall be precluded from proposing any changes in the program proposed by his amendment.

I believe it is not sufficient for the Senate to express, by means of a stump speech, a pious hope that the President will use a law which already is on the statute books—a law which all of us know the President knows is in existence, a law which provides that the President shall do various things in an effort to try to effect labor peace—and then will do what is called for in the amendment of the Senator from Virginia, without having Congress give substance and meaning to substantive legislation in this field. The Supreme Court has said it is the duty of Congress to enact such legislation if we wish to stop crippling strikes. If we do not do so, we shall be neglecting our duties as United States Senators. If the Members of the minority party choose to hand the people of the United States the suggestion that the President should use the Taft-Hartley Act, and it alone, to settle these crippling strikes, then I think the people will have something to say about that lack of responsibility, come next November.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure they will, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators who wish to speak must first address the Chair.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Virginia, who has now returned to the Chamber, that a moment ago I proposed, as a unanimous-consent agreement, that I would withdraw my amendment if he would withdraw his, and in that way we could then proceed to consider the various amendments which have not yet been acted upon, and thereafter we could return to the subject which we have been considering for some time.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I would not agree to have that done. The Senator from South Carolina has said repeatedly that the Byrd amendment means nothing. If it means nothing, then why all this row?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I do not yield for a speech.

Mr. BYRD. Then, Mr. President, I shall be as short with the Senator from South Carolina as he is short with me; and I say "No."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have been in the Chamber as much as the Senator from Virginia has been, if not more; in fact, I was here until 10 o'clock last night and until 10 o'clock the night before, as well as all during both those days and the preceding days.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator from South Carolina give me one good reason why I should withdraw my amendment?

Mr. MAYBANK. I think the Senator from Virginia should have been courteous enough to me—because I have great respect and admiration for him—at least to have told me that he would bring up this amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, has the time come in the Senate when Senators must consult the chairman of the committee which reports a bill before we may submit amendments to it?

Mr. MAYBANK. That time has never come, so far as I know. However, I spoke on the floor of the Senate to the Senators who then were present.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from California.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, at this time I desire to correct a misapprehension which the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] left in the RECORD. He indicated that the Supreme Court stated in its decision that it was the duty of Congress to pass legislation to deal with the steel seizure and other seizure problems.

Apparently the Senator from Oklahoma has failed to read the Supreme Court's decision and to understand it, because the Supreme Court in its decision specifically stated and recognized that the Taft-Hartley Act is on the statute books at the present time, and that the President had not used it; and the Supreme Court pointed out that the President should not and could not use seizure powers until he used the existing law.

Under the circumstances, if there was any argument for the Byrd amendment, I believe it was made by the Supreme Court in its decision.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I was shocked when the President originally seized the steel mills without any congressional authority, but solely on inferred authority. I said then that I believed the Congress should not take action until the decision of the Supreme Court was rendered.

Now the Supreme Court has ruled that the President's action was unconstitutional. In the opinion it rendered the Supreme Court stated that the President had certain powers which he could use, but that they did not include the power of seizure.

The question now before the Congress is whether we shall enact a law involving seizure. Such a measure cannot properly be worked out on the floor of the Senate.

We have heard from the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] about a bill which is being considered by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. We have also heard about a measure which is being sponsored by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], a measure which is being sponsored by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and a measure which is being sponsored by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

The question involved is of the utmost importance to all the people of the United States—to those who work, to those who manage industry, and to our soldiers who are in the trenches.

It is impossible for the Congress to pass a proper measure on this subject by adopting an amendment to the Defense Production Act, which will continue for only 1 year.

I hope and trust that the Senate will not pass hastily or attempt to work out on the floor of the Senate, in the course of debate, a measure relating to the rights of so many of the citizens of the United States. Such a measure should receive careful consideration by the committee which has jurisdiction over such matters. That committee is the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I hope that committee will report proposed legislation on this subject, if it determines that that should be done.

In the meantime the President should proceed under the laws which already have been passed by the Congress, which laws give him executive authority to act. Personally, I believe the President should do that.

In that spirit, I shall vote for the amendment submitted by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. But, I hope we shall not attempt to enact on the floor of the Senate a measure relating

to matters which involve so many persons and the rights of so many of our citizens, without having the Senate give careful and thoughtful consideration to those problems, particularly in this time of great stress, uncertainty, and insecurity in our country.

For that reason, I shall vote against any of the fundamental measures on this subject submitted by the Senator from South Carolina or any of the other Senators, until they have received sufficient consideration by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The question now is on agreeing to amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have at the desk a perfecting amendment, which I call up at this time. It is submitted to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The perfecting amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the amendment of Mr. BYRD, it is proposed to strike out the word "requests," and to insert the word "recommends"; and also to strike out the word "immediately," and to insert the words "within the next 7 days", so that as thus perfected, the amendment of the Senator from Virginia will read:

SEC. 504. *Resolved*, That, by reason of the work stoppage now existing in the steel industry, the national safety is imperiled, and the Congress recommends the President within the next 7 days to invoke the national emergency provisions (secs. 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, for the purpose of terminating such work stoppage.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly, first, upon what I consider to be the merits of the perfecting amendment, and, second, I wish to make a few observations regarding the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves.

As to the language of the perfecting amendment, I think it more appropriate and in keeping with the protocol which is involved in the separation-of-powers doctrine, to say to the President of the United States that we "recommend" rather than that we "request." After all, there are such things as nicety of language, and it seems to me to be appropriate, if we use the word "recommend" rather than the word "request." Furthermore, I think the word "recommend" is in keeping with the spirit and intent of the letter which the President of the United States sent to the Congress the day after he seized the steel mills.

As to the merits of my suggestion that we recommend that he do this within the next 7 days, I am not too sure of the merits, but I think they outweigh the possible criticisms or objections to it, for this reason: I understand that very active negotiations have been going on for the past several hours in an effort to reach a settlement of the steel dispute by collective-bargaining agreement I hope that the parties reach an agreement, and that it will include both the wage and the price formulas.

I express some fear that strong pressures are being brought to bear upon various Government officials, in the interest of getting this case settled, to break the ceiling authority of the wage formula or of the price formula, or of both. Of course I believe if that should occur it would be very unfortunate, particularly in view of the problems which confront us in the passage of the Defense Production Act.

But, be that as it may, I call the attention of the Senate to what I consider to be a practical and important factor in the picture, namely, that management and labor and Government officials are proceeding now in good-faith negotiations, trying to settle this case. I am inclined to think we ought to give them a reasonable time to settle it before we make the suggestion that the President should proceed forthwith with the procedures of the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MORSE. No; I should like to finish my argument first, if the Senator will permit.

We might just as well face the fact that the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Virginia and the following by the President of the recommendation it contains, if he should decide to accept the recommendation, will not be very conducive to that calm reflection which we would like to see on both sides of the collective-bargaining table, if the parties are expected to reach an agreement. I am willing to take judicial notice, Mr. President, that the adoption of that recommendation on the part of the President will not create an atmosphere of calmness and reflection on the labor side of the table.

Mr. President, if we feel that circumstances are such that it makes no difference whether they proceed with the present negotiations in which they are engaged to the end of reaching an agreement, there apparently being good prospects that they will reach an agreement, let us then go ahead to adopt the proposal of the Senator from Virginia; but if the President follows it, if he will, I think it will not at all conduce to increasing the chances of a settlement of this dispute in the present negotiations which are taking place. That is why I included the provision that it be done within the next 7 days.

Mr. President, let me now speak to the merits of the resolution or amendment of the Senator from Virginia as I see them, because I hold a view, I think, somewhat different from that held by some of my colleagues in the Senate, who also think the passage of the Taft-Hartley bill in the first instance was a mistake. We must face the realities in connection with problems such as this, and I cannot escape the conclusion, as I read the decision of the Supreme Court—and I have not only read it, but I have also studied it, to the best of my ability—that the Supreme Court clearly implied that it was the judgment of the majority that the President should have followed the laws on the books before he resorted to a seizure, and that he should have sought the approval of the Congress in advance of seizing. The Court, to my satisfaction, made clear that it was its view that the kind of operative facts involved in this situation were quite different from the kind of operating facts which would be presented in case of an invasion, for instance, in the case of an all-out, open attack upon the United States. When the comments on the meanings of this decision shall have been finished, Mr. President, I believe we shall find a considerable amount of scholarly opinion to the effect that the Supreme Court has not handed down a decision which says that under no circumstances does the President have inherent power; that while the Supreme Court ruled that any discussion of inherent power in connection with the operative facts of this particular case certainly was not in point and that he had no power to do what he did on the basis of the facts, yet that the Court reserved judgment as to what the President may do under a different set of facts, when there is no law whatever on the books which could be applied to a particular emergency, whatever it may be, which might arise in the future.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. No; I decline to yield until I finish this argument.

So, Mr. President, I think that what the decision means is, in part, that on the basis of the operative facts of this case, in view of the laws on the statute books which it was the constitutional duty of the President faithfully to execute, it was the duty of the President to proceed to handle the case of seizure under those laws.

Mr. President, from that premise I argue that the Supreme Court clearly implied, as I said in the meeting of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee this morning, that whether he liked it or not, or whether he thought it would be as successful as its advocates seemed to think it would be, the President should have resorted to the Taft-Hartley law. Although it is a permissive law, and although the law clearly says that it was the spirit and intent of the Congress at the time it was passed to make it a permissive law and to leave to the discretion of the President whether he would resort to it in the case of an emergency, I nevertheless feel that, in view of the Supreme Court decision, he ought to proceed to use the Taft-Hartley law, if the parties within the very reasonably near future do not reach a collective-bargaining settlement of this dispute.

Therefore, I am not as opposed as are some of my colleagues to the Byrd amendment, from the standpoint of recommending to the President that he ought to resort to this law if, within the reasonably near future this case cannot be settled by a collective bargaining agreement. That is why I propose the period of 7 days, which I think is a pretty reasonable bracket of time in view of the fact that negotiations are proceeding at the present time which seem to offer at least some possibility of success for the settlement of the case.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. No, I decline to yield until I finish my argument.

Mr. President, I think that resorting to the Taft-Hartley law after the lapse of that time will once again bring out in full review what I think are some very serious shortcomings of that law in respect to the emergency-disputes section. But the situation is quite different from what it was at the eleventh hour when the crisis was upon the President and he had been advised by the Secretary of Defense that a show-down with the mills for that period of time would result in the closing of the furnaces, making it impossible for the mills to get back into production for some two or three weeks. The strike has now occurred; the furnaces have now cooled, so that the emergency reason on the part of the President for acting as he did, if the Constitution had permitted him to do so or if the Supreme Court had found it permitted him to do so, is now no longer in point, because the furnaces are down. Therefore, Mr. President, I think he should proceed under the Taft-Hartley law if the negotiations do not settle the controversy.

The operation of the Taft-Hartley law, if the President resorts to it, will provide further experience which will show the need for an early amendment to that law. That leads me to comment on the parliamentary situation in which some of us find ourselves.

I said earlier this afternoon that this morning the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare met for a writeup of the so-called Morse bill. Let me say here, Mr. President, that it is not my bill; it is a bill which has in it a great many suggestions advanced by my colleagues on the committee for I have been willing to accept any amendment or revision of the language of the bill which would gain the objective which I seek, namely, before the fact, to place on the books, legislation that will aid the President in handling an emergency dispute in such a manner as will make it desirable for both parties to settle the case before the Government enters the picture and applies the procedures called for by my bill.

But look at the situation in which we find ourselves. I have before me a very artistic piece of work which has taken the form of a scissors-and-paste job. This is my bill. It is no so badly multilated as it would seem to be. It carries out all the suggestions made in the meeting this morning. It should be printed and be placed on the desk of each Member of the Senate for careful study. It is a bill on which there have been extended hearings. The Maybank substitute and the Monroney proposals did not go to a hearing, but this bill has gone to hearing, and has been considered for days and days. It is out of the record of those hearings that we now come forward with this scissors-and-paste job. But I think it is unfortunate and most unfair to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that there is in connection with the pending bill before the Senate proposed legislation by means of a rider. The Defense Production Act is not an act that has any direct relationship to labor legislation.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. Let me finish my argument, and then I shall be glad to yield.

We are really attaching to the bill a labor-law rider. I do not believe that is a good way to legislate in the Senate of the United States. I think it is a good way to make a great many serious mistakes.

What we should do—and I close with this statement—is not to adopt any amendment to the Defense Production Act which relates to the problem of the handling of emergency disputes; but, because the labor situation is such a serious emergency and because Congress does have an obligation to pass some measure, we should make it the first item of business as soon as we get through with the Defense Production Act, and then determine whether we want to adopt the Morse bill, or some type of amendment to the Taft-Hartley law, or whether we want to reach the conclusion that we already have a law on the books at the present time which is good enough and, therefore, we do not need any additional legislation. We should bring about such a parliamentary situation that we can bring to bear our best thought and consideration to a problem which is of great importance to the American people, and not leave ourselves, as we are this afternoon, in a position of legislating by rider on the defense production bill.

I now yield to the Senator from South Carolina. I am not through, but I yield to him.

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall yield the Senator more time if he wants it.

It is not my thought that it is permanent legislation with regard to labor. The amendment is suggested only as an interim piece of legislation until the bill of the Senator from Oregon can be brought before the Senate. Under no conditions will it go beyond February. I want the Senator from Oregon to understand that I am not trying to propose permanent legislation.

Mr. MORSE. I understand. Everything the Senator has said on the floor today about what he has told others of us in the cloakroom, and so forth, is accurate. But the Senator may get himself into a position where I think the comment of most of our colleagues will be, "We have already passed something; let us wait and see how it works, and after January 1st we will go into the question of other labor legislation."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I shall need about 5 minutes. The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] had a question to ask.

Mr. IVES. I think the Senator has already answered the question. It is merely this: With the Byrd amendment, amended as is proposed by the Senator from Oregon, would the Senator then support the Byrd amendment?

Mr. MORSE. Yes, I would.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. The Senator has been foresighted, I believe, with reference to the question of the need for additional legislation in the field of labor. The Taft-Hartley Act is merely permissive. It provides for a delay of 80 days in a situation such as we now face in the steel industry.

As the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] pointed out this afternoon, there has already been a delay of 120 days. Sooner or later there must be a settlement or a crippling strike. It seems to me the Congress should consider that if it agrees to the Byrd amendment this afternoon, and, as the Senator from Oregon pointed out, goes home as if it had accomplished something, it may be that in approximately 3 months from now, when Congress is in adjournment and it is too late to do anything about it, we may encounter a situation such as that with which the President was faced on the night he issued his seizure order. It seems to me that this amendment, calling on the President to do this and that, is begging the question.

It seems to me that the Senate, if it intends to act before it goes home, should act properly, and not merely delay by putting into effect a measure which could be effective for 80 days only, and no longer. I certainly hope that consideration will be given to some measure; either the measure of the Senator from Oregon or some other measure which will vest in the President authority to take action in a situation of emergency. I ask if it is not true that if the Senate adjourns, merely having adopted the amendment of the Senator from Virginia, it is placing itself and the Nation in such a situation that in August or September, while Congress is in adjournment, we may be faced by a strike which will cripple the Nation.

Mr. MORSE. Let me make my position very clear. It is my position that the adoption of the Byrd amendment, together with the perfecting amendment I have suggested, will not meet the obligation the Congress owes to the people of the country to enact legislation which will effectively meet emergency labor-dispute problems.

Mr. MOODY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. In my judgment we must enact legislation which will amend the Taft-Hartley law in such a manner that it will be effective in preventing strikes in the first place. That is what the Morse bill seeks to do.

Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. MOODY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. MOODY. I yield first to the Senator from New York; then I shall yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEHMAN. I feel very strongly, as does the Senator from Oregon, that we must have effective legislation of a comprehensive kind, carefully considered, it is true, but effective in its long-range provisions. But does not the Senator agree with me that while that is most essential, nothing can be a substitute for it? For the Senate today to take action on the Byrd amendment, which is merely a gesture, which does not mean a thing,

which does not bind the President, and does not even tell him anything that he does not know, to adopt this amendment just at a time when negotiations are being carried on, I believe in good faith, between labor and industry, looking toward a peaceful settlement and composition of the labor dispute, would do more to kick over the apple cart than anything else we could possibly do.

Mr. MORSE. My answer to the Senator from New York is that if the perfecting language I have suggested were adopted, then I do not believe the Byrd amendment would cause the difficulty the Senator mentions, but I think it would serve as a very clear signal to the parties that if they cannot within the next 7 days settle the dispute by negotiation, then the procedures of the Taft-Hartley law will be employed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am going to vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon. But failing adoption of that amendment, does not the Senator think the Byrd amendment would inevitably do harm to efforts to bring about a peaceful settlement? Failing adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, I shall vote against the Byrd amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I wish to say, in addition to what I just stated in the colloquy with the Senator from Oregon, that the time must come when the question with which we are confronted will be settled. There is no law on the statute books today that will stop a crippling strike. It seems to me that the proper action of the Senate, if we are really trying to be helpful in this situation, and are not trying to humbug the country, is to declare it to be the sense of Congress that both steel management and steel labor should look at this situation from the national standpoint and in the public interest, as well as in their own immediate interest, and bring the strike to a close by a settlement which will stick, by a contract between management and labor.

I believe the country ought to be on notice that any action taken this afternoon by the Senate of the United States except action of that sort cannot have any effect; and, of course, action of that sort would merely clarify the issue in the minds of the citizens in my judgment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield some time to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield time to the Senator from Minnesota, but I wish to make a statement before a vote is taken. Regardless of how the vote turns, I shall be sorry in one way, and glad in another way, that I brought this issue before the Senate, realizing the seriousness of the situation. If there are but 10 votes for my amendment, I shall feel that I have done my duty, because in my judgment it is going to take weeks to work out any plan. I know we spent days and days, and hours and hours, on the Taft-Hartley Act, which I supported, and I voted to override the President's veto of the bill.

I brought my amendment before the Senate yesterday only to clarify the minds of the people of the country as to the seriousness of the situation we are facing. Many of my friends have come to me and have expressed their approval of my action. I appreciate from the bottom of my heart what they have done. I have done my duty. I have made such action as I suggest an issue, and we are going to have to face the issue. We shall have to face it in a hard and tough situation unless, as the Senator from Oregon has said, some positive language is adopted by Congress before we leave in July. We must meet this issue now. If consideration of the amendment had taken all of next week, as I had thought it would, it would have been satisfactory to me. But merely to condemn the President for what he does or does not do is not a solution of the problems we are facing.

The Supreme Court has said, in no uncertain terms, that it is up to Congress, as the Senator from Oklahoma, so ably stated, to legislate positively. I brought the amendment before the Senate for the purpose of calling the conditions to the attention of the people of the country and for no other purpose. So I hope the Senate will vote.

I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am sure all Senators recognize that the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has rendered a service by bringing up this matter. I do not say that everyone would agree with every provision of his bill——

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator knows that when I introduced the bill, I expected it to be amended, and I said so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator so stated. At least, he has brought the issue into focus.

I have asked members of our staff to get for us copies of reports and testimony before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I wish to ask the proponents of any amendments whether they have read all the testimony contained in the volumes I hold in my hand. Obviously they have not read it, because we have not had time to get it to the Government Printing Office. We have been taking testimony up to the very last hour. We have worked 3 or 4 days upon it. Men from all over America, responsible officials, have testified to their concept of seizure legislation. It is not any easy subject to handle. Let no one kid himself about it. In considering what should be done, one moves into an area which is very delicate, an area that requires judicious consideration of every single line of proposed legislation.

I only wish to say that I am perfectly willing to legislate on the subject of seizure, but I want enough time to debate it, so that we may know what we are doing. If we do not do that, then we shall be making some serious mistakes, mistakes which may prove to be very tragic.

With reference to the Byrd amendment, I merely wish to ask, What is its purpose? What purpose will it serve? The President of the United States will use the Taft-Hartley law if he wants to use it. He has done so before; he can do so again. Or he may not use it, if he so desires.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. President, that under an injunction, there is little or no collective bargaining. I should like to have someone point out to me when there was real collective bargaining while an injunction was in effect. The history of labor-management negotiations reveals that in such a situation there has been little or no collective bargaining to settle a dispute. Also, the history of injunction proves that frequently, and all too frequently, collective bargaining stops at dead center.

What is it that the proponents of the Byrd amendment desire? Is it their pound of flesh? Apparently it must be, because adoption of the Byrd amendment will not do any good. It only affords a chance to crystallize—what? To crystallize an attitude that they do not like the fact that the President has not used the Taft-Hartley Act. But that will not contribute one iota toward helpfulness in the settlement of this dispute.

What will help toward a settlement of the dispute? What will help will be an expression by the Congress that we call upon the parties to the dispute to recognize their responsibility to the people of the United States, and to its economic system. That is about the only thing we can do here, Mr. President, except to write a new piece of legislation, such as is proposed by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

There are one or two things that we can do in the Senate today, or in the days to come. We can either call upon the parties in the present dispute to settle their differences, which is only to say that we expect them to live up to their responsibilities in time of national emergency, which would be constructive, which would be affirmative, which would be helpful, which would at least point a sense of direction; or we can have the courage to legislate. We must do one or the other. I am willing that we do both. I am willing that we provide in the bill that we shall first call upon the parties to settle their dispute by normal American procedure of collective bargaining; and second, I am willing to have Congress to provide emergency powers for the Government. But I am not willing to do it in 15 minutes.

I am willing to do it when the Morse bill or any other bill can be presented so that we can go over it line by line.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield me an extra minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from

Oregon [Mr. MORSE], to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, has any Senator any time to assign me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is exhausted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. On this question the yeas and nays have been requested. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the order for a call be abandoned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to change the wording of the amendment from "within the next 7 days" to "within 7 days from this date."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the change is made.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon, as modified, to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may the amendment be read?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, has all time for debate expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On all sides.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate postpone the consideration of the pending bill until 12 o'clock noon Monday.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. So far as I am personally concerned, I have made my position in regard to the pending amendment clear. There is nothing to be gained one way or the other, if I may say so without being accused of talking about politics, if the legislative proposal is postponed, certainly nothing that I could gain personally. On the other hand, Mr. President, I have been looking into the situation as best I could to ascertain what is taking place, and I am told——

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President——

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. No Senator has the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has the floor. There are 15 minutes to each side.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has 15 minutes.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator has 15 minutes on the motion. I beg his pardon.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have been checking into the situation, and I find that there is a committee on behalf of industry, and a committee on behalf of labor, discussing a settlement as they have not discussed it for weeks. Whatever we may do here might well mean the difference between the present strike being settled between now and Monday, and its not being settled. I do not say it will be settled; I do not make any prediction one way or the other; but there is little we can lose by doing what I suggest, because everyone will be in the same position on Monday which he now occupies. The amendment of the Senator from Virginia can be voted on.

Sometime ago we promised the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that we would take up the agricultural appropriation bill. We can take that bill up and dispose of it, and I think we might gain a great deal by postponing the consideration of the pending bill until Monday.

As I have said, it might well mean the difference between the strike being settled and its not being settled, because if Congress acts, no matter how it acts, one side or the other, and perhaps both sides, may not like the action. I believe that what the United States wants is to get the steel strike settled, and, as I have said, I am making my motion in the interest of what I think may well mean the difference between the strike being settled and its not being settled.

It makes no difference to me how Senators vote on the amendment of the Senator from Virginia. I have made my position clear in that respect. The amendment would not alter my position, because I do not believe in interfering with or in any way trying to direct the Executive of this great Government as to what he should do, and I do not want him to direct me in what I should do.

We could take up the Agricultural appropriation bill tomorow, and no time would be lost. On the other hand, a great deal could be gained. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BRIDGES. May I ask a question of the distinguished majority leader?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; on the Senator's own time.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the motion of the distinguished majority leader a motion to adjourn or to postpone action?

Mr. McFARLAND. To postpone further consideration of the pending bill until Monday. It would leave everything exactly as it is. It would not jeopardize anyone's right. It would give an opportunity for the strike to be settled between now and Monday.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, taking a moment of my own time, I would say that the motion of the majority leader, to postpone action until Monday, considering all the time we have devoted to the bill, and the good attendance we have in the Senate, will not gain anything for the Senate. Therefore, I believe that we should meet the issue at this time; and I move to lay on the table the Senator's motion to postpone until Monday, consideration of the pending bill. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Monroney
Anderson	Hennings	Moody
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Morse
Benton	Hill	Mundt
Brewster	Hoey	Neely
Bricker	Holland	Nixon
Bridges	Humphrey	O'Conor
Butler, Md.	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Ives	Pastore
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Clements	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Connally	Kem	Smathers
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Lehman	Sparkman
Eastland	Long	Stennis
Ferguson	Malone	Thye
Flanders	Maybank	Tobey
Frear	McCarran	Underwood
Fulbright	McCarthy	Watkins
George	McClellan	Welker
Gillette	McFarland	Williams
Green	McKellar	
Hayden	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] to postpone consideration of the pending bill until Monday.

Several Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN and Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—37

Aiken	Flanders	O'Conor
Bennett	George	Robertson
Brewster	Hendrickson	Saltonstall
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Bridges	Ives	Smith, Maine
Butler, Md.	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Cain	Malone	Thye
Case	McCarran	Watkins
Cordon	McCarthy	Welker
Dirksen	Millikin	Williams
Dworshak	Mundt	
Ferguson	Nixon	

NAYS—42

Anderson	Hoey	McFarland
Benton	Holland	McKellar
Chavez	Humphrey	Monroney
Clements	Hunt	Moody
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Frear	Kefauver	Pastore
Fulbright	Kerr	Russell
Gillette	Kilgore	Smathers
Green	Lehman	Sparkman
Hayden	Long	Stennis
Hennings	Maybank	Tobey
Hill	McClellan	Underwood

NOT VOTING—17

Butler, Nebr.	Jenner	Murray
Capehart	Langer	Seaton
Carlson	Lodge	Taft
Duff	Magnuson	Wiley
Ecton	Martin	Young
Ellender	McMahon	

So the motion to lay Mr. MCFARLAND's motion on the table was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona to postpone until Monday the further consideration of the pending bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on the motion to postpone until Monday, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN and Mr. DUFF] are detained on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—42

Anderson	Hoey	McFarland
Benton	Holland	McKellar
Chavez	Humphrey	Monroney
Clements	Hunt	Moody
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Frear	Kefauver	Pastore
Fulbright	Kerr	Russell
Gillette	Kilgore	Smathers
Green	Lehman	Sparkman
Hayden	Long	Stennis
Hennings	Maybank	Tobey
Hill	McClellan	Underwood

NAYS—38

Aiken	Flanders	O'Conor
Bennett	George	Robertson
Brewster	Hendrickson	Saltonstall
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Bridges	Ives	Smith, Maine
Butler, Md.	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Cain	Malone	Thye
Case	McCarran	Watkins
Cordon	McCarthy	Welker
Dirksen	Millikin	Wiley
Dworshak	Mundt	Williams
Ferguson	Nixon	

NOT VOTING—16

Butler, Nebr.	Jenner	Murray
Capehart	Langer	Seaton
Carlson	Lodge	Taft
Duff	Magnuson	Young
Ecton	Martin	
Ellender	McMahon	

So Mr. MCFARLAND's motion to postpone until Monday the further consideration of the bill was agreed to.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952—AMENDMENT—REPRINT OF BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make two unanimous-consent requests. The first is that the so-called Morse bill, in the form of an amendment to the Defense Production Act, be printed as an amendment to Senate bill 2594; and I also ask to have printed as a new print the so-called Morse bill, Senate bill 2999, so that we shall have both the bill and the amendment before us in a new print on Monday.

I ask that the amendment be printed and to lie on the table. The old bill has already been introduced, but it is so completely revised that I need a new print of the old bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the requests of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7005) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 6947) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

STATUS OF CERTAIN CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1828) to confirm the status of certain civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities under the Armed Forces with respect to laws administered by the Civil Service Commission, and for other purposes," which were, on page 1, line 5, after "Service", insert "Navy Ship's Stores Ashore", and on page 2, after line 7, insert:

SEC. 2. The nonappropriated fund instrumentalities described in the first section of this act shall provide their civilian employees, by insurance or otherwise, with compensation for death or disability incurred in the course of employment. In the case of employees employed in the continental United States (except Alaska), compensation shall be not less than that provided by the laws of the State (or the District of Columbia) in which the employing activity of any such instrumentality is located. In the case of employees employed outside the continental limits of the United States and in Alaska, compensation shall be not less than that provided in sections 7, 8, and 9 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (44 Stat. 1427–1430), as amended, except that in the case of such employees who are not citizens of the United States, compensation shall be in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Treasury, as the case may be. This section shall take effect 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House. It is a clarifying amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7314, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year end-

ing June 30, 1953. It is Calendar No. 1547.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

STATEMENT OF REPUBLICAN PRINCIPLES AND OBJECTIVES—COMMENT BY DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have a matter which I desire to call to the attention of the Senate. While it is of primary concern to Members on this side of the aisle, I hope the Members on the other side will indulge me a moment as I call attention to what may be a rather epoch-making statement made by Mr. Dwight D. Eisenhower. I want to read briefly what he stated, and then ask permission to have printed in the RECORD some further material.

There has been of course, great interest as to Mr. Eisenhower's political philosophy, and, according to the news ticker, he had this to say in a report to the people today:

NEW YORK.—Following is a partial transcript of General Eisenhower's press conference in Abilene as taken from the TV broadcast:

"Ladies and gentlemen, with respect to what a man might call his political philosophy in these bewildering days, I find that in the Republican declaration in February 1950 which was passed or accepted by the Republican Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives and the Republican National Committee I find that so far as principles there were stated I am in general accord.

"In that statement they did go into specific details that appeared to be a little bit different. Certain Senators and Representatives voted against the complete adoption of that statement. As I understand it, their disagreement was again not on principle but on specific application or procedure."

Mr. President, I hold in my hand the statement of Republican Principles and Objectives, as adopted by the Republican Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, and concurred in by the members of the Republican National Committee on February 6, 1950. This is a very complete statement of our position on matters of foreign policy and of domestic policy, and the fact that the most distinguished and perhaps the most recent recruit to our ranks has now joined all the Republican Members of the House and Senate in concurring in this is a happy indication of that harmony which we all seek to achieve, and I hope it will indicate that our friends on the other side may similarly find an opportunity ultimately to concur.

For the information of the Senate and of the country, I ask that the statement of principles and objectives be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, in order that all may be informed. Its origin was in a committee of the Republican policy committee of the Senate and as the Senator from Maine had the distinction of being chairman of the subcommittee, he has a certain pride of authorship. Associated with him were the Senator from Nebraska, the late and lamented Mr. Wherry, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. The statement was prepared under the direction of the policy committee, on the appointment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. So it would appear that the harmony we seek is now perhaps rapidly approaching. I ask that the statement be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF REPUBLICAN PRINCIPLES AND OBJECTIVES

(Adopted by the Republican Members o. the House of Representatives and the Republican Members of the Senate, and concurred in by the members of the Republican National Committee on February 6, 1950)

To win lasting peace, to build a country in which every citizen may make the most of his skill, initiative and enterprise, and to hold aloft the inspiring torch of American freedom, opportunity, and justice, assuring better and happier life for all our people, we dedicate our efforts and issue this statement of principles and objectives supplementing the Republican platform of 1948.

We shall not passively defend the principles stated here, but shall fight for them with all the vigor with which our forefathers fought to establish what we now seek to advance and perpetuate—human liberty and individual dignity.

We pledge that in all we will advocate and in all that we will perform the first test shall be: Does this conduct enlarge and strengthen or does it undermine and lessen human liberty and individual dignity?

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The American people face the hard fact that though they won the war nearly 5 years ago they have not yet won the peace. We offer them leadership in new efforts to achieve this vital end.

We favor a foreign policy in which all Americans, regardless of party, will join to assure peace with justice in a free world while maintaining the independence and the rights of the American people.

We insist upon restoration of our foreign agreements to their proper place inside the Constitution, and we insist that the United States shall not be bound to any course of action unless the spirit and letter of our constitutional procedure are followed.

We oppose secret commitments, and we denounce the refusal of the administration to furnish accurate and adequate information to the Congress.

Under our indispensable two-party system we shall be vigilant in critical exploration of administrative foreign policy. We favor consultation between the Executive and members of both major parties in the legislative branch of Government in the initiation and development of a united American foreign policy; and we deplore the tragic consequences of the administration's failure to pursue these objectives in many fields, particularly in the secret agreements of Yalta, subsequently confirmed at Potsdam, which have created new injustices and new dangers throughout the world.

We favor full support of the United Nations and the improvement of its Charter, so that it may be an effective international organization of independent states prepared to mobilize public opinion and the armed forces of the world against aggression. We favor full support of the inter-American system as an integral part of the international organization, and of our treaty obligations in the North Atlantic Community.

We advocate a strong policy against the spread of communism or fascism at home and abroad, and we insist that America's efforts toward this end be directed by those who have no sympathy either with communism or fascism.

We support aid to those states resisting communism, but such aid should be given only if it is essential to our national security, if it is within the total limits which the American economy can afford, if it will be effective, if it is beyond the ability of the aided nation to supply for itself, and if there is a program for progressive reduction.

The Republican Party has always believed in a strong national defense. We must maintain our Armed Forces at a strength completely adequate for the security of our people.

We favor the promotion of world trade on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and we assert that this can be done within the Republican principle that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to this country on terms which imperil the living standards of the American workman or the American farmer, or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry. A strong American economy is a vital factor for our security.

DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

The major domestic issue today is liberty against socialism—whether we shall remain in this country a free people in constant control of our governments, or whether we shall delegate to an all-powerful Federal Government with unlimited power to tax and spend, the rights to direct and operate our agriculture, industry, labor, and local communities and the daily lives of our citizens. We believe there is no frontier beyond which devotion to the American system may not increase our knowledge, character, and material welfare; but we believe these goals can only be secured in a framework of liberty, equality, and justice, with adequate incentive and rewards to workmen and to industry for ability, knowledge, character, hard work, daring, and genius.

Basic American principles are threatened by the administration's program for a planned economy modeled on the Socialist governments of Europe, including price and wage control, rationing, socialized medicine, regional authorities, and the Brannan plan with its controls, penalties, fines, and jail sentences. This program is dictated by a small but powerful group of persons who believe in socialism, who have no concept of the true foundation of American progress, and whose proposals are wholly out of accord with the true interests and real wishes of the workers, farmers, and businessmen.

As the iron curtain descends on half the globe, and as nation after nation samples the drug of totalitarianism, the Republican Party is the champion of human liberty and the essential dignity of the individual. To it falls the task of offering not only its opposition, but of proposing a program to restore faith in free institutions, and bring about stability, opportunity and progress.

We hold that Government can use its just powers to foster national health, promote real security for the aged, develop sound agricultural and labor-management policies and advance civil rights. These ideas are in keeping with the earliest and finest Republican traditions, and can be achieved without establishing socialism or discipline or dependence. The Democrats have also professed these ideals, but the stark truth is that after 18 years of democratic control and endless talk, they have reduced this whole field to confusion and futility. The administration is seeking to make demagogic appeals rather than enact sound legislation. It seeks to keep glittering goals intact to lure votes in anticipation of favors to come. Such a cynical procedure raises the naked

issue of sincerity, of responsibility, and of achievement.

To achieve our objectives, we offer certain fundamental proposals, and constructive undertakings to rebuild a prosperous and progressive America:

I. The economy

Liberty cannot breathe the air of bankruptcy and live.

Reckless and extravagant spending by the Federal Government, as now advocated by the Democratic administration, with recurring annual deficits or continually increasing taxes, can result only in disaster and ruin for our country. It will further cheapen the dollar, rob the wage earner, impoverish the farmer and destroy the savings, pensions, insurance and investments of millions of people. Therefore we urge:

A. An end of deficit spending and a return to a balanced budget.

B. That Federal spending be materially reduced.

C. Achievement of efficiency and economy in Government especially by adoption of measures along the lines of the Hoover Report.

D. A policy of general tax reduction to be accomplished as rapidly as reduction in Federal expenditures will permit. We favor immediate repeal of oppressive wartime excises and reduction of taxes on small business to stimulate new industry and growth. This will create new jobs, new wealth, and eventually greater tax revenue. It will provide opportunity for youth, furnish incentives for stable employment and retention of older employees and encourage lower prices.

E. Strict enforcement of the laws against monopoly and unfair competition.

F. Establishment of a nonpartisan commission to study and recommend a sensible redistribution of governmental functions and sources of revenue between the Federal, State, and local entities, to secure the sovereignty of the several States with as much decentralization as is compatible with the national welfare.

II. Agriculture

A prosperous agriculture is fundamental to a prosperous America. We join farm organizations in condemning the Brannan plan which would regiment our farmers, cost untold billions of the taxpayers' money, and would mean the ultimate nationalization of agriculture. Its inefficiency and increased costs would adversely affect both the producer and the consumer.

It would place every farmer in a state of complete dependency on Government for a large part of his income from uncertain annual congressional appropriations. We deplore the maladministration for political purposes of the present agricultural law by the Department of Agriculture.

We will continue to work with the farmers, farm organizations, and all friends of agriculture to bring about a sound solution of the many problems confronting the farmers of this country. Such farm policies must be developed in the interest of the farmer, the consumer, and the national economy. Agriculture is a growing and dynamic industry undergoing constant change and improvement. No farm program can succeed which is not in harmony with this concept. Specifically we propose the following:

A. A program to provide a fair price for the farmers' products in the market place aided by a system of price supports and by protection against the dumping of competitive commodities produced by underpaid foreign labor, to the end that the farmer's standard of living will be in line with the contribution he makes to the national economy.

B. Continue and enlarge programs of research and education, both in production and marketing, with particular attention to cheaper and more effective production, a better and more effective marketing system especially for perishable commodities, sound cooperative marketing, and the development and expansion of industrial uses for agricultural products and by-products.

C. Continued development and restoration of our soil and water resources through soil conservation and reclamation.

D. Expansion of animal agriculture as a means of reducing surpluses, rebuilding the soil, and providing a better diet for our people.

E. Special encouragement for the development and ownership of family-sized farms, improvement of rural living conditions, and completion of the rural electrification program.

F. Development of export markets for the surplus crops which can be efficiently produced in this country.

III. Labor-management relations

Industrial harmony and justice are essential to the country's well-being. To that end, government should encourage and promote free collective bargaining. On management and unions falls an equal responsibility to act in good faith toward each other and toward the country. We favor:

A. Continuation of the Taft-Hartley law because it has restored equality between employer and employees, guaranteed the right of collective bargaining, the recognition of unions and the right to strike, while protecting the rights of the public and the union members. Under this law union membership has increased to new highs, wages have risen to record levels, and strikes have decreased.

B. Continuation of our efforts to enact such improvements in the law as have been shown to be necessary to accomplish its purposes more effectively. We deplore the action of the administration in playing politics in this vital area of human relations, thereby blocking the enactment of necessary amendments to the law—many of them proposed by labor organizations.

IV. Civil rights

The right of equal opportunity to work, to vote, to advance in life and to be protected under the law should never be limited in any individual because of race, religion, color, or country of origin. Therefore, we shall continue to sponsor and support legislation to protect the rights of minorities.

V. Social responsibility

The obligation of Government to those in need has long been recognized. Recognizing the inequities and injustices of the present program of social security, we urge:

A. The extension of the coverage of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program, reduction of eligibility requirements and increase of benefits to a more generous level, with due regard to the tax burden on those who labor.

B. A thorough-going study of a program of more nearly universal coverage including the principle of pay-as-you-go.

C. Federal aid, where the need is clearly demonstrated, to States and through States to their subdivisions, to assist them in affording subsistence, shelter, and medical care to their citizens who are unable to provide for themselves. Such aid, including unemployment compensation, must be based on State and local initiative, operation, contribution and responsibility, without Federal bureaucratic interference. It must avoid socialization of the medical profession or of any other activity. Federal aid must be in amounts which do not impose an unreasonable burden of taxation on the American people who pay the bills.

VI. Veterans

A grateful nation demands that those who fought in its defense, their widows and orphans, must never be forgotten. We urge:

A. Continuing and sympathetic consideration of the rights and deserts of the veterans and their dependents.

B. Prompt and efficient handling of claims and other problems of veterans.

VII. Loyalty

Communism is an international conspiracy aiming at world-wide dictatorship and the suppression of religious, political, and economic freedoms throughout the world. It corrupts ideals, corrodes basic religious teachings, destroys the fiber of man, and denies the existence of God. It is imperative that the nations of the world develop new methods to offset this frontal attack on civilization.

We condemn the failure of the administration to recognize the full implications of this threat to our security. We deplore the dangerous degree to which Communists and their fellow travelers have been employed in important Government posts and the fact that information vital to our security has been made available to alien agents and persons of questionable loyalty. We denounce the soft attitude of this administration toward Government employees and officials who hold or support Communist attitudes. We pledge immediate action to bring about:

A. The complete overhaul of the so-called loyalty and security checks of Federal personnel.

B. The prompt elimination of all Communists, fellow travelers, and Communist sympathizers from our Federal payroll.

C. Closer coordination between our intelligence agencies, with full use of the facilities of the FBI for protecting our security.

CONCLUSION

To this program we subscribe, confident that the overwhelming majority of Americans cherish our heritage of freedom and will join us in this crusade to see that it shall not perish from the earth.

Our people must arouse themselves to preserve our precious liberties and freedoms—the right to worship God in our own way; to speak freely our minds without fear; to conduct our lives and our affairs without officious meddling by too powerful government. We must revivify those qualities of diligence, economy, courage, initiative, and patriotism which enabled our forefathers to make this Nation great.

This Republic is the custodian of human liberty. The Republican Party will endeavor to see to it that we are worthy of this guardianship.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CAIN obtained the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a moment? Does the Senator wish to address the Senate?

Mr. CAIN. I should like to address the Senate for approximately 20 minutes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I announced a few moments ago that the Senate would take up the national security bill. We worked very late last night, and I think it is perhaps better not to take it up at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to inquire what will be the order of business tomorrow.

Mr. McFARLAND. The agricultural appropriation bill is the unfinished business, but I am hopeful that we can dispose of both bills tomorrow.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield further?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in order to be sure that the Senate can complete consideration of both the conference report on the agriculture bill and the pending bill, I want to announce that the Senate will meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO MESSAGE WITH REFERENCE TO THE TIDELANDS BILL

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I wish to discuss several of the high lights of the President's veto message on the Holland tidelands bill which was sent to us last Thursday. To my way of thinking the veto message was replete with mistakes, and the President's reasons for rejection of the Holland bill ignore the law, facts, logic, and completely distort the question of State ownership of property.

The President, plainly flouting the majority wishes of Congress, said that under the Constitution only the Supreme Court could settle the legal question of tidelands ownership. He attempts to exclude the right of Congress to determine ownership of Federal property as contained in article IV of the Constitution.

By his veto, the President has denied for the second time to Congress the right to settle this issue in its own way, although Congress has voted twice by substantial majorities to confirm title to States' 3-mile ocean belts.

The President says in his veto message that the issue of submerged lands can be settled to his satisfaction only by enactment of the O'Mahoney-Anderson so-called interim bill and the Hill amendment giving the Federal Government control over tidelands, and devoting the revenues to aid to education. In essence, the President says Congress cannot act constitutionally except in accordance with his wishes.

Mr. President, almost a week before handing down the veto message, the President told the Americans for Democratic Action that the Holland tidelands bill was "robbery in broad daylight and on a colossal scale and makes the Teapot Dome look like small change."

Again and again in the veto message President Truman called the legislation a gift of property to a few States.

Apparently, the President is unable to make up his mind whether the legislation was a gift or a robbery.

In any event, by his favoritism for the O'Mahoney-Anderson bill, with the Hill amendment, the President proposes to rob the States of their rightful property in order to give the Interior Department the power to make leases, and the Federal Security Agency authority to parcel out funds. This blatant inconsistency only underlines the President's full determination to do all of the giving himself for political advantage.

Once again, the President attempts to confuse the public and the Congress as to where ownership actually rests. He says:

> That question (ownership) was settled by the Supreme Court.

Actually, the Supreme Court specifically refused to declare that the Federal Government owns these lands. The American Bar Association, the American Title Association, and many other groups have passed resolutions expressing their beliefs that the States did own and should continue to own these lands.

That ownership had been confirmed for 100 years by 54 prior Supreme Court decisions, 244 State and Federal court decisions, 39 opinions of the Secretaries of Interior, and 49 decisions of the Attorney General.

The President says that the Federal Goverment must have submerged oil properties for national defense, and cites the strong objection of the Defense Department to the Holland bill. This appears to me as only an excuse to grab the property of the States.

After all, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, support the Holland tidelands bill. Those distinguished gentlemen certainly are concerned with national defense. I personally have reason to believe that both are American patriots of the very highest order.

It must be remembered also that Justice Reed, in his dissent in the California case held that sovereignty does not require ownership of resources, that ownership by the State would not interfere in any way with the needs or right of the United States in war or peace. Justice Reed noted that in time of war the power of the United States is "plenary as it is over every river, farm, mine, and factory of the Nation."

The President says that the Federal Government does not own and has no intention of asserting control or ownership over piers, beaches, harbors, seacrops, marine life, police and conservation powers, or the navigable waters of bays, sounds, and inland lakes and rivers. But the record shows Federal intentions are to the contrary. State officials, the National Association of Attorneys General, the Council of State Governments and the governors of most States do not believe this disclaimer of intent to encroach further on States' rights. The reasons for their doubts lie in language of the Supreme Court in the California decision, and in contrary actions by Federal departments.

Mr. Justice Black in the California decision said that States have a "qualified right" to such properties, and furthermore said that the States were not entitled to base their claims to title on representations previously made by members of the Executive Department of the Federal Government.

The President's statement about the Federal Government's recognition of the sanctity of State ownership of bays is factually wrong.

At this very moment, a special master appointed under the Supreme Court's decree in the California case is considering Department of Justice contentions that the State line once settled in San Pedro Bay by a Federal court gave the State of California too much property and jurisdiction in this bay—*U. S.* v. *Carrillo*, Thirteenth Federal Supplement, page 121.

Illustrating how unreliable Federal promises can be, Mr. Justice Clark as Attorney General once promised—as I suppose many of us remember—that Texas would not be sued under the theory of the California case; the late Harold Ickes when Secretary of Interior said that it was the "settled law of the United States" that States owned their submerged lands. Both gentlemen reversed their positions—I have often wondered why—when Mr. Clark sued Texas and Mr. Ickes changed his mind about State ownership.

In the Nation-wide radio broadcast of his Americans for Democratic Action speech, the President charged that the oil lobby supported the quitclaim bill approved by Congress.

How unnecessary that inaccurate statement was. How amazed the average American ought to be when he considers how his President can be so totally inaccurate, on so many occasions. But the President, in his veto message, made no mention whatsoever of the so-called oil lobby.

Apparently the President discovered that the interested oil companies have been asking Congress to pass the very same so-called interim legislation which he seeks in his veto message. This places the President and the alleged oil lobby in the same camp.

However, on the evening, when the President had fun and disturbed the emotions of a great many Americans called Americans for Democratic Action, he did stretch the truth to the breaking point while making political hay, by making statements which any reasonable man, in his right mind, ought to have known were wrong and contradictory before he made them.

It ought to be noted that the President was more conservative in his veto message than he was in the ADA speech in talking about the value of tidelands oil. His inaccuracies indicate how very little he really knows about the question.

For instance, how much is tidelands oil really worth? Is it worth 1,000,000,000 or 100,000,000,000? Opponents of the Holland bill, including the President, have widely exaggerated the value of oil deposits in the submerged lands within the constitutional boundaries of California, Texas, and Louisiana. They have mentioned sums ranging from 40 to 100,000,000,000 of dollars. As I recall the President's Americans For Democratic Action speech, he used the latter figure—about a hundred billion dollars. But on the basis of the figures given by the President in his veto message, the amount of royalties that would accrue to the three States over a probable 40-year period would be less than $1,000,000,000.

Here literally is what the President says about such petroleum deposits in his tidelands veto message:

> The area involved may comprise as much as 16,000,000 acres. The oil fields thus far

discovered in this area contain estimated proven reserves aggregating more than 278,000,000 barrels of oil. Moreover, it is estimated that future exploration may reasonably result in the discovery of additional oil fields containing more than 2,500,000,000 barrels of oil.

Assuming, by way of argument, the President's figures of 2,778,000,000 barrels of oil as being correct, at a value of $2.70 a barrel, which was the figure used in a Senate debate by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the gross value of such deposits would be $7,500,000,000.

An average royalty—12½ percent—would yield from this $7,500,000,000 over a probable period of 40 years the sum of $940,000,000 or an annual sum for 40 years for all three States—California, Louisiana, and Texas—of about $23,000,000.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] in his Nation-wide NBC speech of May 24, replying to President Truman, placed the outside value of all tidelands oil within State boundaries and on the Continental Shelf as well, as just $700,000,000.

There are many other Presidential inconsistencies. For example, the President says that in the interest of national defense the Federal Government must develop and explore submerged lands because "we have become an oil importing Nation." At the same time, he inconsistently says that oil must be conserved for national defense and that "we must not dissipate these resources."

In House Report No. 695 of the Eighty-second Congress on the Walter tidelands quitclaim bill which was passed by the House on July 30, 1951, the House Judiciary Committee says at page 38:

The theory of establishing Government oil reserves (as a conservation measure to aid defense) by setting aside undeveloped areas has been discarded by practically all competent persons who have studied the matter.

The National Military Establishment is now in process of returning to the Interior Department for leasing to private interests, all naval reserve areas, except two which are presently in the process of development.

It is the committee's opinion that the most effective petroleum reserve and the key to our national security is the development of an adequate reserve of productive capacity which can be drawn on immediately in the event of an emergency.

The President implies that there is or may be an oil shortage. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] told the Senate on April 1 that the National Petroleum Council recently said there are adequate oil supplies for the next 3 years. Moreover, the Senator said there is no danger of running out of petroleum at current rates of use for the next 100 years. In conclusion he quoted the President's oil industry advisory committee report—NPC report of January 29, 1952—to the effect that long before this country runs out of oil reserves to tap, there is a high probability that other forms of energy, solar power and nuclear fission, will make oil production and exploration unnecessary.

The President also disregarded the facts when he implied that Federal control of tidelands oil would mean more rapid production of usable reserves. The House Judiciary Committee in its aforementioned report at page 40 gives contrary evidence:

In the five public land States producing oil and gas the Federal Government owns 36⅓ percent of the acreage, but produced only 13 percent of the oil and gas produced in these States. The 1946 production from these lands was approximately 62,000,000 barrels, while the production from State and privately owned lands in the same States was in excess of 380,000,000 barrels.

While assuring the States that there is no further danger of Federal encroachment beyond oil needed for national defense, the President now indicates that the Federal Government has its eye on all other minerals and resources that may exist in and under the marginal seas.

Instead of an "oil grab" alone, now we have a "grab-everything-in-sight grab." Government lawyers are even now claiming "paramount rights" in the waters of the Santa Margarita River in California, and some 14,000 farmers are threatened with a Federal lawsuit, with the suit already filed against over 2,500 of them. The same Justice Department attorneys think they have similar rights to oil shale of the Colorado River, and other forestry and mineral interests in many States.

In many places in his veto message, the President reveals contempt for the legislative process and for the rights of the States. He said many of the States arguments were "irrelevant," and said that they were "too numerous" for him to deal with, and that he was not "persuaded" by them.

In vetoing the Holland bill which Members of Congress and State officials said many times was the very cornerstone they relied upon to prevent further encroachment on State and private property rights, the President showed his determination to ignore those rights.

With tongue in cheek, the President said that he "would not do anything to interfere" with the property interests of the coastal States, when by his very act of vetoing the bill he was striking at all State functions, much of their revenues and taxes.

He said that he could not give to a ·w States the property belonging to 155,000,000 people. That is a tremendously appealing and persuasive argument, I think, to those who are uninformed—and the average American, not having accurate information before him, is uninformed. What are the facts? Actually, the 19 coastal and the 9 Great Lakes States combined have a population of more than 130,000,000 which illustrates the type of propaganda effort being exerted against the sovereign States by America's leading citizen, the President of the United States.

The truth is simply not in those who seek to confiscate what belongs to others.

In view of the legal and historical background of States' ownership, and remembering that when the Federal Government takes over anything, taxes are always increased and never diminished, this argument must be—to the States—their final crown of thorns.

As Senators we shall soon be given an opportunity to vote on the President's veto. I relish that coming opportunity to work with others to override an action by the President which the junior Senator from Washington considers to have been unwise, unreasonable and wholly unwarranted.

Mr. President, I express my appreciation for the indulgence of Senators at this late hour. I yield the floor.

RECESS

Mr. SPARKMAN. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, June 6, 1952, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 5, 1952:

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Ivy W. Duggan, of Mississippi, to be Governor of the Farm Credit Administration for a term of 6 years from June 15, 1952. (Reappointment.)

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Allen Reginald Hawkins, of Hawaii, to be second judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Edward A. Towse, elevated.

Robert Kiyoichi Murakami, of Hawaii, to be third judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice John E. Parks, term expired.

Wilford D. Godbold, of Hawaii, to be seventh judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii, to fill a new position.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

A. Carter Whitehead, of Virginia, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Virginia, vice George R. Humrickhouse, resigned.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

SUPPLY CORPS

Bernard E. Bassing Andrew J Owens
Donald J Loudon James G Tapp

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Theodore J. Larson

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 5, 1952

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who art always seeking to make our hearts the sanctuaries of Thy presence, may we be eager to have Thy spirit fashion and direct our desires and plans in harmony with Thy divine will for in Thy will is our peace.

May our faith in Thee and in Thy love and care never falter when we are in sore straits and, when confronted by the forces of evil, we are groping our way to a more peaceful and joyous kind of life.

Give us the glad assurance that we are not alone in our days of hardship and adversity, for Thou wilt never let us go and allow us to suffer defeat if we aspire and determine to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with the Lord.

Show us how we may release the hidden splendor in the soul of man and bring to fulfillment and fruition that beautiful and glorious something which we were all made to be and meant to be.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7151) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. FOGARTY, HEDRICK, MCGRATH, DENTON, CANNON, STOCKMAN, BUSBEY, MILLER of Maryland, and TABER.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. THOMAS, GORE, ANDREWS, YATES, CANNON, PHILLIPS, COUDERT, COTTON, and TABER.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6854) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. GARY, FERNANDEZ, PASSMAN, SIEMINSKI, CANNON, CANFIELD, WILSON of Indiana, JAMES, and TABER.

EXTENSION OF RUBBER ACT OF 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6787) to extend the Rubber Act of 1948 (Public Law 469, 80th Cong.), as amended, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. VINSON, BROOKS, KILDAY, SHORT, and SHAFER.

ELLIS E. GABBERT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1826) for the relief of Ellis E. Gabbert, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$438.87" and insert "$309.92."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. VIVIAN M. GRAHAM AND HERBERT H. GRAHAM

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 643) for the relief of Mrs. Vivian M. Graham and Herbert H. Graham, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, lines 8 and 9, strike out ". The operator of such Marine Corps truck was not operating within the scope of his employment."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. INEZ B. COPP AND GEORGE T. COPP

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 646) for the relief of Mrs. Inez B. Copp and George T. Copp, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, lines 5 and 6, strike out ". The operator of such vehicle was not operating within the scope of his employment."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ANN MORRISON

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1842) for the relief of Mrs. Ann Morrison, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the national service life insurance in the amount of $10,000 (N-3187200) granted to the late Leonard Morrison, who died on June 25, 1948, shall be held and considered to have been in effect at the time of his death. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall pay such insurance in accordance with the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, except that any payments made as a result of enactment of this act shall be made directly from the national service life insurance appropriation."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

STUDENT NURSES

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today, after weeks of consultation and conference with agencies of the Federal Government and with many splendid national organizations that are interested in nursing education, I have introduced an entirely new emergency bill to provide emergency scholarships for newly enrolled nurse trainees and emergency grants to accredited schools of nursing.

Because the sentiment of the Congress correctly demands that this proposed legislation bear directly on the national

situation as it now confronts us, the provisions of this bill cover a period limited to 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, the best estimate at hand today indicates that we are short some 60,000 nurses. This is an actual shortage of desperately needed services to the sick and applies to vacancies in the public health field. This is a poignant reality that is spelled out in closed hospital wards.

Today more nurses are on active duty than ever before, but the 316,000 civilian nurses actually practicing their profession are 60,000 short of minimum needs. By the most conservative estimate we shall require at least 381,886 civilian nurses in 1954.

As more and more young men have entered the armed services, more and more civilian nurses have also been recruited to give them the skilled care that is necessary. As a consequence, however, we find that civilian needs are left increasingly unfulfilled.

True, it is estimated that approximately 60,000 nurses will have been graduated by the end of 1954, but even if we assume that the armed services will not recruit more nurses—and this is an assumption which, in fact, we cannot make—there will still be a shortage of at least 16,000 student nurses.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is one of closing the gap between what is and what should be.

The country needs 16,000 additional young women each year who will choose the nursing field above all other fields. The positive gains that have been made in wages and salaries in production and the services present a young woman who may be interested in nursing with a difficult choice. We must face the reality that some inducement must be found to make nursing training possible to young women who would gladly seek it were the complete cost of the training not on their shoulders.

Mr. Speaker, in this bill the responsibility for administering this Emergency Act rests on the proper agency of the several State governments. Funds will be allocated to the States for emergency scholarships and grants to accredited schools of nursing will be allocated at the State level in proportion to their share of the national total of newly enrolled nurse trainees. We know that this is the only way that the present nurse school facilities can be fully utilized and necessary numbers of young and qualified women can be recruited for this vital training.

At the same time that we place the administration of these emergency funds in the States, we require that the State submit a State plan to improve and expand nurse training facilities. When a State plan fulfills the criteria specified in this bill it will then be approved by the Surgeon General.

In effect, then, we will not in any manner, shape, or form increase the powers of the Federal Government over the States.

In brief, we recognize that an emergency shortage of trained nurse personnel exists and that this shortage derives in part from the increase of civilian and armed services' demands for nurses and in part from the lack of adequate economic inducement to those who wish to enter nursing; we provide for scholarships and grants to help the States and the present schools of nursing to recruit more qualified persons. The bill is simple and it is clear. I know, Mr. Speaker, that the House will give this measure the serious consideration which it deserves.

VOTE FOR KOREAN GI BILL, BUT HOPE IT WILL BE AMENDED LATER TO IMPROVE THE BILL

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, during the past 3 weeks, both in the hearings before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and on the floor of the House, I have attempted to get the Springer amendment adopted for the GI veterans of the Korean war.

In that effort I have been blocked by the proponents of the present bill who, refusing to bring the bill up in the regular course of business, saw fit to bring the bill forward under a motion to suspend the rule and pass the bill. As the Members of this House know on last Monday total debate on the GI bill was limited to 40 minutes and there was no opportunity to introduce any amendments. I want to reemphasize again that I am against that way of enacting legislation and I take this opportunity to express myself again on that subject.

I have sincerely believed that my amendment would have corrected a serious situation in which some veterans will be discriminated against over other veterans. In addition I believe the present bill will bring some administrative headaches to colleges and universities of this country as well as the GI who is getting ready to start to college.

However, I realize that we do not always get a complete bill that will satisfy all of us and I want to say this bill does not satisfy me as it is presently written. The veterans of the present Korean campaign have been waiting since last July for some bill that would allow them to take advantage of the educational benefits that were granted to the veterans of World War II. The chairman has indicated that we will probably not get another chance to vote a GI bill during this session. For this reason I intend to vote for the bill today.

I am hoping that the other body will consider in its deliberations and make my proposal part of its version of this bill.

I think we will see other possible flaws in the present bill that will have to be remedied from time to time. The bill as presently written is not the final solution to the problems of the educational aspects of the Korean veteran.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

[Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

INDIA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JAVITS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6947) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 91]

Aandahl	Gamble	Morano
Anderson, Calif.	Gore	Morris
Bakewell	Hale	Moulder
Beckworth	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Murphy
Blackney	Havenner	Nelson
Blatnik	Hillings	Potter
Bramblett	Hinshaw	Powell
Brehm	Holifield	Redden
Buckley	Hope	Rees, Kans.
Buffett	Hunter	Regan
Burdick	Jackson, Calif.	Sabath
Carlyle	Jenkins	Sadlak
Case	Johnson	Sheppard
Celler	Keating	Short
Cole, Kans.	Kennedy	Stigler
Cooley	Kerr	Stockman
Crawford	King, Calif.	Sutton
Curtis, Mo.	Lovre	Tackett
Davis, Tenn.	Lyle	Taylor
Dawson	McCormack	Welch
Denton	McGrath	Werdel
Doyle	McKinnon	Wheeler
Eaton	McVey	Wilson, Ind.
Fenton	Martin, Iowa	Wood, Ga.
Frazier	Miller, Calif.	Yorty

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 351 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2017)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6947) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 20, 24, 51 and 54.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 23, 26, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 46, 48, 49, 50, and 53, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 7 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the figures "$700,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$650,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$988,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,746,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "and the limitations under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, on the amount available for expenses of National Administration, Planning, Training, and Records Management is increased from '$1,856,000' to '$2,042,000', and on the amount available for expenses of State Administration, Planning, Training, and Records Servicing is increased from '$6,454,000' to '$7,350,000' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 1303. Amounts made available for pay increases in this Act by appropriation, increase in administrative expense limitation, transfer and otherwise are hereby reduced in the sums hereinafter set forth, and such sums (except corporate funds, trust funds, and funds under the title 'Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases') shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this Act, as follows:

"EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

"National Security Resources Board: 'Salaries and expenses', $3,000;

"INDEPENDENT OFFICES

"Civil Service Commission: 'Salaries and expenses', $40,000;

"Defense Production Administration: 'Salaries and expenses' (transfer) ($130,000);

"Economic Stabilization Agency: 'Salaries and expenses', $2,500,000;

" 'Export-Import Bank of Washington' (administrative expenses) ($7,000);

"Federal Communications Commission: 'Salaries and expenses', $20,000;

"Federal Power Commission: 'Flood-control surveys', $1,400;

"General Accounting Office: 'Salaries', $500,000;

"Interstate Commerce Commission:

" 'General expenses', $24,000;

" 'Railroad safety', $6,000;

" 'Locomotive inspection', $4,500;

"National Capital Housing Authority: 'Maintenance and operation of properties', $160;

"National Labor Relations Board: 'Salaries and expenses', $22,000;

"National Mediation Board: 'Salaries and expenses', $900;

"Railroad Retirement Board: 'Salaries and expenses' (trust fund) ($35,000);

"Selective Service System: 'Salaries and expenses', $100,000;

"Smithsonian Institution: 'Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art', $4,000;

"The Tax Court of the United States: 'Salaries and expenses', $1,000;

"FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

"Food and Drug Administration: 'Salaries and expenses', $17,300;

"Howard University: 'Salaries and expenses', $4,420;

"Howard University: 'Salaries and expenses' (transfer) ($21,610);

"Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: 'Salaries and expenses', $2,000;

"Social Security Administration:

" 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance' (trust fund) ($173,000);

" 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance', $3,900;

" 'Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau', $5,250;

" 'Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner', $250;

" 'Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner' (transfer) ($325);

"Office of the Administrator:

" 'Salaries, Office of the Administrator', $6,275;

" 'Salaries, Office of the Administrator' (transfer) ($2,400);

" 'Salaries and expenses, Division of Service Operations', $975;

" 'Salaries and expenses, Division of Service Operations' (transfer) ($700);

"HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

"Office of the Administrator:

" 'Salaries and expenses', $20,700;

" 'Advance planning of non-Federal public works', $6,350;

" 'Salaries and expenses, defense housing and community facilities and services', $4,470;

" 'Salaries and expenses, defense-production activities', $4,000;

" 'Federal National Mortgage Association' (administrative expense limitation) ($24,400);

" 'Loans for prefabricated housing' (administrative expense limitation) ($1,800);

"Home Loan Bank Board:

" 'Administrative expense limitation' ($6,000);

" 'Nonadministrative expense limitation' ($9,500);

"Federal Housing Administration:

" 'Administrative expense limitation' ($33,400);

" 'Nonadministrative expense limitation' ($117,500);

"Public Housing Administration:

" 'Administrative expenses', $60,100;

" 'Administrative expenses limitation' ($83,300);

" 'Nonadministrative expenses limitation' ($103,100);

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

" 'Research and Marketing Act of 1946', $10,000;

"Bureau of Agricultural Economics: 'Economic investigations', $10,500;

"Agricultural Research Administration:

" 'Research on agricultural problems of Alaska', $2,000;

" 'Research on strategic and critical agricultural materials', $3,200;

"Bureau of Animal Industry: Salaries and expenses:

" 'Animal disease control and eradication', $15,800;

" 'Marketing agreements, hog cholera virus and serum', $200;

"Bureau of Dairy Industry: 'Salaries and expenses', $3,000;

" 'Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry', $25,000;

"Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering: 'Plant, soil, and agricultural engineering research', $30,920;

"Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine: 'Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases' (language) ($4,200);

"Forest Service: 'State and private forestry cooperation', $3,000;

"Production and Marketing Administration: 'Marketing Services', $74,000;

" 'Commodity Exchange Authority', $1,200;

"Rural Electrification Administration: 'Salaries and expenses', $5,000;

"Farmers Home Administration: 'Salaries and expenses', $174,500;

" 'Commodity Credit Corporation' (language) ($108,000);

"Farm Credit Administration:

" 'Salaries and expenses', $3,100;

" 'Office of the Secretary', $10,000;

" 'Office of the Solicitor', $17,000;

"DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

"Office of the Secretary:

" 'Technical and scientific services', $1,000;

" 'Salaries and expenses, Defense production activities', $400,000;

"Civil Aeronautics Administration:

" 'Technical development and evaluation', $7,000;

" 'Maintenance and operation, Washington National Airport', $8,000;

"Civil Aeronautics Board: 'Salaries and expenses', $15,000;

"Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce: 'Export Control', $12,400;

"Maritime activities: 'Maritime training', $2,000;

"Patent Office 'Salaries and expenses', $25,000;

" 'Inland Waterways Corporation' (administrative expenses limitation) ($1,000);

"DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

"Department of the Army—Civil Functions:

" 'Canal Zone Government', $55,000;

" 'Postal service', $5,000;

" 'Panama Canal Company' (administrative expenses limitation) ($1,500);

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

"Office of the Secretary: 'Salaries and expenses, defense production activities', $15,000;

"Bonneville Power Administration:

" 'Operation and Maintenance', $16,000;

" 'Construction', $59,000;

"Bureau of Land Management: 'Management of lands and resources', $15,000;

"Bureau of Indian Affairs: 'Health, education, and welfare services', $75,000;

"Geological Survey: 'Surveys, investigations, and research', $64,900;

"Bureau of Mines: 'Conservation and development of mineral resources', $65,000;

"Fish and Wildlife Service:

" 'Management of resources', $10,000;

" 'Investigations of resources', $5,000;

"Office of Territories: 'Administration of Territories', $16,300;

"Administration, Department of the Interior: 'Salaries and expenses', $4,000;

"DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

"Legal Activities and General Administration:

" 'Salaries and expenses, general legal activities', $40,000;

" 'Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division', $24,500;

"Federal Prison System: 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons', $113,000;

"DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

"Office of the Secretary:

" 'Salaries and expenses', $1,500;

" 'Salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor', $2,200;

" 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Standards', $700;

" 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights', $300;

" 'Salaries and expenses, defense production activities', $3,000;

"Bureau of Apprenticeship: 'Salaries and expenses', $3,500;

"Bureau of Employees' Compensation: 'Salaries and expenses', $2,700;

"Bureau of Employment Security: 'Salaries and expenses', $9,000;

"Bureau of Labor Statistics:

" 'Salaries and expenses', $6,000;

" 'Revision of consumers' price index', $1,600;

"Women's Bureau: 'Salaries and expenses', $200;

"Wage and Hour Division: 'Salaries and expenses', $11,500;

"POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT (OUT OF THE POSTAL REVENUES)

" 'General Administration', $16,750;

" 'Postal operations', $2,414,790;

"DEPARTMENT OF STATE

" 'Salaries and expenses', $250,000;

" 'International information and educational activities', $175,000;

" 'Government in occupied areas', $70,000;

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT

"Bureau of the Public Debt: 'Administering the public debt' (transfer) ($75,000);

"Bureau of Narcotics: 'Salaries and expenses' (transfer) ($13,000);

"Secret Service Division: 'Salaries and expenses, White House Police' (transfer) ($5,000)."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 3, 5, 7, 22, 25, 45 and 47.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN J. ROONEY (except as to so-called Whitten amendment No. 51. Field Service of Post Office Department should be wholly exempted from provisions of sec. 1310 of Public Law 253, 82d Cong.),
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
JOHN TABER (excepting as to amendments 16 and 54),
BEN F. JENSEN (excepting as to amendments 16 and 54),
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
PAT MCCARRAN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
STYLES BRIDGES (excepting 54),
HOMER FERGUSON (except as to amendment No. 54),
GUY CORDON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL (excepting 54),
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6947) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CHAPTER I

Legislative branch

Amendment No. 1: Inserts title, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 3: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 4: Inserts title, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $25,000 for Senate restaurants, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates $35,000 for Appropriations Committee of the House, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 9, 10, 11, and 12: Appropriate $8,000 for expenses of contested election cases of the House, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13: Transfers $300 to the appropriation "Subway transportation, Capitol and Senate Office Buildings", as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Increases to $650,000 the limitation for printing the Federal Register instead of to $700,000, as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER II

Department of Justice

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $12,500,000 for "Salaries and expenses, claims of persons of Japanese ancestry", instead of $14,800,000, as proposed by the House and $9,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $4,000,000 for "Salaries and expenses", Immigration and Naturalization Service, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,610,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $750,000 for "Support of United States prisoners", as proposed by the Senate instead of $575,000, as proposed by the House.

CHAPTER IV

Department of Labor

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $988,000 for "Salaries and expenses", Bureau of Employment Security instead of $892,000, as proposed by the House and $1,059,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19: Increases the personal service limitation for the Bureau of Employment Security to $5,746,000 instead of $5,675,000, as proposed by the House and $5,817,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Security Agency

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $40,000 for Surplus Property Disposal, as proposed by the House, instead of nothing, as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER V

Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $3,250,000 for "Salaries and expenses" for fighting forest fires, instead of $3,000,000, as proposed by the House and $3,500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER VI

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $163,000 for "Administration of Territories", as proposed by the Senate, instead of $463,000, as proposed by the House.

CHAPTER VII

Independent Offices

Amendment No. 24: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $30,000 for the American Battle Monuments Commission.

Amendment No. 25: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $20,000 for the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $100,000 for the Renegotiation Board, instead of $200,000, as proposed by the Senate and nothing, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 28: Increases the limitations on use of Selective Service System's appropriations instead of outright repeal as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER XI

Increased pay costs

Amendments Nos. 29–43 inclusive: Appropriate $938,246 for various Senate purposes as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44: Transfers $750,000 to "Salaries and expenses, Division of Disbursement (Treasury Department)" instead of $400,000, as proposed by the House, and $814,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 46: Strikes out House language reducing funds in Chapter XI, as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER XII

Amendment No. 47: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER XIII

General provisions

Amendments Nos. 48, 49, and 50: Change chapter and section numbers, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to exempt the Field Service of the Post Office Department from the provisions of Public Law 253, 82d Congress.

It is the understanding of the conferees that the existing language of the Whitten amendment provides authority for the Civil Service Commission to authorize permanent appointments in the Post Office Department up to the number of permanent employees on the rolls as of September 1, 1950. The Chairman of the Civil Service Commission has advised by letter, dated May 2, 1952, that "further statutory authority is not required" and that the Commission is proceeding with arrangements to permit permanent appointments.

Amendment No. 52: Reduces certain specific appropriations carried in the bill instead of applying a straight percentage reduction as set forth in the Senate proposal.

Amendment No. 53: Changes a section number.

Amendment No. 54: Strikes out Senate language prohibiting use of funds in connection with Executive Order 10340. The Senate recedes from this amendment in view of the decision of the Supreme Court in the cases of *Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company, et al., petitioner, No. 744* v. *Charles Sawyer and Charles Sawyer, petitioner, No. 745* v. *Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company, et al.*, and the order of the President which has completed the return of the steel plants to their owners.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN J. ROONEY (except as to so-called Whitten amendment No. 51. Field Service of Post Office Department should be wholly exempted from provisions of Sec. 1310 of Public Law 253, 82d Cong.),
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
JOHN TABER (except as to amendment 16 and except as to amendment 54),
BEN F. JENSEN (except as to amendment 16 and except as to amendment 54),
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been unnecessarily delayed. It passed the House on March 13. It was sent to conference April 29. It should have been disposed of before the end of that week. Agreement was reached on all amendments except one having no relation to any item in the bill and which would not have affected the situation it purported to remedy in the slightest.

It is a rule of conference that the House proposing an amendment on which agreement cannot be reached must accept responsibility for failure of the bill.

The House, in order to take every possible step to insure payment of salaries when due, passed a continuing resolution and transmitted it to the other body before the Easter holidays. It was pigeonholed until last week when it was finally returned with the same monkeywrench amendment.

The regrettable feature is that this bill carries provisions for the pay of a vast number of Government workers. Due to this unwarranted delay, hundreds of thousands of Government employees, a large number of them in the lower brackets failed to receive their pay last pay day and will continue without pay until this conference report is agreed to. Many of them have been driven to the loan sharks and all of them have been compelled unexpectedly to readjust their financial routine.

The House managers have made every effort to avoid this situation and are urging prompt action this afternoon.

The situation is accurately reported by Joseph Young in his column The Federal Spotlight in the Washington Star of yesterday, June 4, 1952, in part, as follows:

THE FEDERAL SPOTLIGHT

(By Joseph Young)

The payless pay-day situation involving Government employees could have been avoided easily if Congress had shown some foresight, Federal officials say.

The House is not blamed.

* * * * *

Of course, now that House-Senate conferees have agreed on the third supplemental bill, the threat of payless pay days has vanished. Final enactment by the House and Senate is regarded as a mere formality and should take place either today or tomorrow.

But for the last week or so Federal employees have been subjected to a severe case of jitters regarding their pay.

And more than 500,000 postal workers, most of them in the lower-salary brackets, who live from pay check to pay check, already have missed out on their pay this week. At best, their pay checks will be from 3 to 4 days late.

These postal workers are hard-working and conscientious. To deny them their pay was a shabby way for Congress to show its appreciation of their loyal service to the American public.

Fortunately, most other Federal departments and agencies don't have their pay days until next week. Thus, most Federal workers were spared a payless pay day. Employees in several agencies, among them the Small Defense Plants Administration and the Railroad Retirement Board, were not so fortunate and have missed a pay day.

The entire situation could have been avoided, if the Senate had approved the House-passed emergency resolution that would have permitted regular pay days while the third supplemental bill containing the funds was tied up in conference.

Over a month ago, the House prepared for this contingency by approving the emergency resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, there are some things in this conference report that I do not like, but for my own part I do not believe I shall offer a motion to recommit, although I would support one if it were offered with reference to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which has an increase of $1,400,000 to carry the Mexicans who come into the United States illegally back to Mexico in airplanes. It sounds like a rather gorgeous way to treat these people. Of course they will come back again right away for another airplane ride. It sounds so silly that I cannot imagine any department getting into it. Frankly, I do not see how that outfit could spend $4,000,000 in 1 month, anyway. I do not believe such a thing ought to happen.

There is another item, which the other body put in, amendment No. 54, a limitation with reference to expenditures in connection with the steel seizure. For my own part, I would like to see that carried, but I shall not ask for a roll call, or make any motion with reference to that because there are so many people who feel that now the President has acquiesced in the decision of the Supreme Court, and we will not have any more such operations.

I think that is all I care to say at this time except that these salaries of the employees, which are held up, unquestionably have been held up because of the failure of the other body to pass the continuing resolution, which was sent to them as early as the 9th day of April, and because of the delay in this conference. This bill has been in conference now for practically a month, and that is a much longer time than ordinary circumstances would justify the bill being in conference.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is there any appropriation here for conveyances for certain disabled veterans, and money to pay the widows' and orphans' insurance benefits?

Mr. TABER. I think there is. It was in the bill when it went to the other body; was it not?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. As I understand it, it was in that bill.

Mr. TABER. There were no amendments which related to anything of that kind which were under consideration in the conference, and as I understand it, those things are all in this bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is that correct, may I ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

Mr. CANNON. There is an item of $25,000,000 in the bill for that purpose. This amount was inserted by the House with the cooperation of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And there is also the money to pay the widows' and orphans' insurance benefits?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And that will be paid at once?

Mr. TABER. That is not a question in disagreement so it does not appear in the conference report. The conference report only relates to the amendments adopted in the other body, and those items which were not amended would not be mentioned in the conference report. It is not customary to bring a bill back from conference and mention in the conference report anything except that which is in disagreement between the two Houses.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Furthermore, that was not passed in the continuing resolution.

Mr. CANNON. I might say in response to the inquiry of the gentlewoman that every item requested by the Veterans' Bureau is included in the bill in full. There was no reduction of any kind in any amount of any of the budget estimates submitted to the committee for the Veterans' Bureau.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very glad for that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, at the proper time, I propose to offer a motion to recommit this conference report, with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist upon the disagreement to Senate amendment No. 16, which pertains to an expenditure referred to a moment ago by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. It refers to a nonessential spending item which this House on three different occasions has stricken out when it has had the issue debated and explained. I think you are entitled to know exactly what it is and what you are doing. Of course, I am not unmindful of the difficulty under which we are legislating today. I recognize the pressure that is coming from the fact that the postal employees are overdue in their pay checks. That has been emphasized as one of the reasons for rushing this through. We are all anxious to get those checks to the postal employees.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Why do they have to have 40 automobiles in this item?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. It includes 40 automobiles. They were given a good many automobiles a year ago. There are many other expenditures that are absolutely not essential, including in particular the airlift into Mexico, the most inexcusable part of it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. All the gentleman intends by his motion will be to correct this one item of excessive expenditures, particularly as applying to the airlift, which has proven a very expensive item, and also one which creates difficulties in Mexico, as well as in the United States?

Mr. FISHER. That is correct. I assume that the conferees could agree in 5 minutes on this correction, and that the House could then adopt the report in 5 minutes. There might be involved here a matter of holding up the pay checks possibly 30 minutes.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CROSSER. I have had a number of calls from the lower-income groups, saying that they have been compelled to go to loan agencies, and so on, to get money to keep going.

Mr. FISHER. Yes. I understand that is true. Those people are entitled to be paid promptly.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman yield briefly further?

Mr. FISHER. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. As I understand it, in making your motion to recommit, there will be specific instructions on this point, so that there will be no misunderstanding?

Mr. FISHER. That is correct.

Mr. PHILLIPS. My own opposition is directed to the airlift item, which I think is extravagant and unfortunate.

Mr. FISHER. Certainly it is, and this House has acted on that subject three different times. It is also proposed to increase the number of people on the Federal payroll, to a certain extent, and for the construction of two large concentration camps, one in California and one in Texas, which would replace the system that has been used for a hundred years of contracting the retention of prisoners at local jails, which has worked fairly well and economically. Here it is proposed to appropriate money for the construction of two large detention camps. That would mean a complete administrative set-up at each facility and it would mean administration officers, conveyances, all kinds of utilities; a complete, brand new set-up of administrative procedure, which would be very expensive and which, of course, would go on for a long time. The hearings simply do not justify this expenditure.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman tell us during what period of time the money which is here appropriated is to be spent?

Mr. FISHER. As I understand it, this is for the balance of this fiscal year.

Mr. POAGE. And that ends in about 3 weeks, does it not?

Mr. FISHER. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. In other words, this money must then be intended to pay for alleged services and commodities that were supposed to have been furnished in months past, and this House has heretofore specifically refused to authorize an appropriation for these services and commodities, particularly the airlift?

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman is correct. A reading of the hearings will disclose that part of this money was to have been spent last April and May and this June, for the payment of salaries which the House refused to go along with when the matter was before the House. And it refers to the operation of the airlift during May and June.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. POAGE. It is true, is it not that this House has affirmatively acted upon the question of whether this should be spent for this airlift and it was decided that it should not be?

Mr. FISHER. Yes; the House decided three different times that this should not be done. The bill, of course, does not specify or identify it, but the hearings indicate that the money appropriated was for the purposes to which the gentleman has already referred.

Mr. POAGE. In other words, if this money is appropriated, as is proposed by this conference report, this House will be voting $1,400,000 of public funds that we say we need in order to meet the payroll of the postal employees. We have got to raise the money somewhere to pay those employees. If we pay it out for an airlift we will not have it to pay to the postal employees. To agree to the conference report as it now stands would be to vote $1,400,000 to pay certain bills we specifically said should not be incurred. If we do that how can we continue to make any pretense of economy?

Mr. FISHER. That is exactly correct.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. In just a moment, if the gentlemen will let me proceed.

Let me recall to your minds a little of the history of this. On March 12 the House defeated an identical item before it by a vote of 105 to 48; they said it was nonessential and struck it out. Then in the regular appropriation bill for the next fiscal year we had a $4,000,000 item for the same three purposes in there, and a record vote was taken at that time. That was a month or two ago. At that time the House acted again and by a vote of 193 to 136—that was April 4—the House struck it out.

Then, last August, they had it in the appropriation bill, and the gentleman from Iowa, who is now standing, offered an amendment to strike that $4,000,000 out of the bill, and it was carried overwhelmingly. So, on three different and separate occasions the House has expressed its will on this identical subject and said that this type of nonessential spending should not be incurred by the Federal Government. Here we have it back again this time. Last summer, by the way, after the House struck out the $4,000,000 item, it went over to the other body, and they put in $3,000,000. Then the committee on conference finally reported it at $1,000,000, and the House approved that. Then this time we struck out all of it, and it comes back; they restored the full amount, and it is back here now with the full amount.

What we are doing is to ask that this be recommitted in order that the will of the House may be protected, after having expressed itself three different times, and the conference brought back and approved without this item being in it.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for a question.

Mr. FULTON. May I ask this question: If the gentleman's motion to recommit this bill prevails, will that not send this appropriation bill back to conference? And is it not a fact that this bill has been held in conference through no fault of this House for a period of more than 30 days? So it will not require just a 5-minute delay if the gentleman's motion prevails?

There is a binding obligation on the Government that our employees' pay be paid on time. I know, personally, that failure to pay the postal employees currently results in severe and needless hardship on workers who are doing a fine job, and, in addition, lowers morale and efficiency.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman can figure that out to suit himself. I see no reason why they should take very much time. We are under pressure; and, of course, the conferees would be under pressure, and I know they would act expeditiously. I can see no reason why there would be any quibbling among the conferees when this is called to their attention. This is for the present fiscal year, and the justification for it had to

do with expenditures in April, May, and June.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman realize that the conferees on behalf of the other body were unanimous in insisting upon the restoration of this money to the bill? When the gentleman says it would take only 5 minutes for the conferees to agree on this, the gentleman is not properly informed, in my opinion.

Mr. FISHER. Oh, well, the gentleman is not doing himself justice. I know that. I feel very confident that with his powers of persuasion he could probably get a little concession out of the Senate. I think the Senators would like for this bill to be passed and the conference report adopted. We know that they are hearing from home also, and they also want to pay the postal employees without delay.

Has the gentleman explained to them the fact that they may have misunderstood that they are appropriating money here to do something last April and May?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Texas two additional minutes.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to ask the gentleman if he called the attention of the Senate conferees during conference to the fact this appropriation has to do with items the justification for which called for expenditure last April, May, and this month?

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman is incorrect in his particulars with regard to this item. He has given the House a great deal of misinformation in the last 10 minutes. The gentlemen representing the other body on the conference committee were and are fairly familiar with it. At the time of the action, this item was agreed upon in conference, the House conferees were unanimous, and I say that for the reason there was no objection at that point by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] or the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. It was upon the signing of the conference report almost a month later that the gentleman from New York first brought up any question on amendment in disagreement No. 16.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Both the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and I objected to the item when it was reached.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to suggest to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] that he read the hearings, particularly page 124 of the hearings, with respect to the correctness of what I said a moment ago. I quoted Mr. Mackey. He should know, should he not, because he asked for the money? He is the one who testified and said that it was to be used beginning early in April. He went on to say with regard to the airlift that it was to be used during May and June. Those are his words. I cannot believe that the gentleman would say I misrepresented. I am quoting from what Mr. Mackey said.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, there is no reason on earth why they could not agree on this in 5 minutes and save the taxpayers $1,500,000. We have been doing pretty well this year in attempting to keep the fat out of these appropriation bills. Are we under pressure now going to throw in the sponge?

Let the conferees protect the integrity and the will of this House as expressed on three different occasions. Although I realize the House is prone to go along with the conference report, due to the pressing need to pay the postal employees whose salaries for June are 5 days overdue, I nevertheless feel that we should not forget our obligation to economize when we can. The recommital of this conference should not delay those postal checks for even 1 day.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I suppose I should talk about the Immigration Bureau's special tourist-rate air-coach service to Guadalajara and other oases in southern Mexico. However, I am going to limit my remarks to just one item of this appropriation bill which includes a part of that my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] has covered in his remarks.

I refer to the two prisons or stockades that are going to be built. The United States has had some difficulty and State governments have had some difficulty with their prisons recently. Here we have an item for two prisons or stockades to be built, one of them in my district, at a cost of $250,000, and another also at a cost of $250,000.

Let me give you some facts and figures. This is to contain illegal aliens. I used to be a member of a county government on the border, and I know what we did to help the Federal Government when it made its request to house these Federal prisoners. We spent thousands of dollars enlarging our jails along the border and improving them to meet Federal conditions so that we could house these illegal aliens. We did it at a cost to the Government of from $1 to $1.50 a day. That is what the Federal Government pays to house these illegal aliens in county jails in my district.

Now, after the counties have made this expenditure to improve and enlarge their jails, we see the Immigration Service turning around and saying, "No; we want to take them out of the jails that you have built; we want to put them in Federal prisons we are going to build along the border."

We know that the Federal Government cost averages over $3 a day for the prisoners it houses; that in comparison with $1 to $1.50 a day they are paying the counties at this time. It just does not make sense. Just to choose an arbitrary figure of 2,000 prisoners, which I think would be conservative, this means an additional cost to the taxpayer of well over $3,000 a day, plus the capital investment by the Government for the new prisons.

To show you the contradiction and waste at this time, there is a bill in the Judiciary Committee to allow counties to house their prisoners in Federal jails because in many parts of the country are Federal prisons overbuilt and standing partially vacant. Yet in this time of deficit financing, we find the Border Patrol asking to build new prisons when the situation is now being met in an economical manner by south Texas counties with a saving to the taxpayer.

Not only is the proposed construction uneconomical and expensive to the taxpayer, but it is a prime example of bad faith on the part of the Federal Government after they have encouraged our officers to increase their facilities at great expense to our taxpayers now to remove the prisoners and deny them the small source of revenue that would eventually pay for the improvements. I want to read to you a telegram I have just received from an able law enforcement officer of my district:

> BROWNSVILLE, TEX., June 4, 1952.—Please oppose any move by United States Immigration to construct alien-detention camp in our area. This would be very detrimental to our good neighbor relations with Mexico regardless of what some Mexican officials might say. I have improved our county jail at great expense to our taxpayers at the request of Federal Bureau of Prisons and Immigration and can care for 600 prisoners at present. Our jail is inspected regularly by Federal Bureau of Prisons and has met every standard. I cannot see why more taxpayers' money should be spent to duplicate facilities already being used and adequate.
>
> BOYNTON H. FLEMING,
> *Sheriff, Cameron County, Tex.*

The Immigration Bureau has not received this money yet, and has seen the disapproval of the House of the expenditure of these funds, not just this time, but in times past, and yet they have gone ahead with their plans in utter disregard of the views the majority of this House expressed on this particular amendment when it was voted on some months ago.

The mayor of the city of Brownsville called me yesterday and told me that the Immigration Service said:

> We want 3 acres of the Brownsville Airport on which to build our prison.

The mayor of Brownsville, Mr. Herb Stokely, in answering the inquiry for the site by the Immigration Bureau, said:

> There is not a logical location.
>
> It will be very expensive to build the facilities that will be needed to house these prisoners. You will have to put in complete sewerage facilities, plus many other items necessary for the welfare of the prisoners.

They further advised him that they we submitting plans of the prison, which included 12-foot control towers with searchlights and armament. When he told them he thought the expenditures were excessive, he quoted them as saying, "Don't you worry about that. We will get the money. We will make the expenditures."

It is obvious that a stockade or prison of this type, after the many disturbances we have seen throughout the country and abroad in prison and stockade management, will lead to further bad relations with Mexico, and will complicate the good-neighbor policy that has progressed so well between the citizens of Brownsville and Matamoros, and many other sister cities along the international border.

I have heard no complaints about the way the counties have met their obligations in their contracts with the Federal Government in the housing of these prisoners. They have invested considerable funds in modernization, enlargement, and improvement of their local jails in the area at the behest of the Federal Government, now only to find they are left holding the bag because the Immigration Bureau decides it wants to increase its staff and duties and go into the prison business on a grandiose scale.

Certainly our county jails' administration have not been plagued with riots, have seen no banner of defiance strung across the windows of the jails, nor any general criticism of their administration, nor have the prisoners been able to capture a single sheriff and hold him hostage.

The citizens of my district are interested in law enforcement, and certainly are ready to cooperate in solving the most difficult problem of the illegal alien. Those who attacked our citizenry as being wholesale law violators and slavemasters have been the victims of distorted pictures portrayed by a carefully conducted tour given them by the border patrol, who is trying to their utmost to justify some of the asinine appropriations.

A congressional subcommittee recently visited my district, and stayed something like 24 hours, during which time they were in the hands of the border patrol and were shown what the border patrol wanted them to see. I regret very much that the gentlemen on that committee did not have the time or opportunity to fully study the facts involved in the problem of the illegal alien along the Rio Grande.

They were carefully given the plaintiff side of the case, but were given no opportunity to hear the defendant enter his rebuttal.

I suppose I could seize on isolated instances of lawlessness in Brooklyn, such as the Arnold Shuster incident, and say that because of these examples where men were shot down on the streets because they stood ready to advise the police of the presence of criminals, and say that this represented the attitude of the people of Brooklyn, but such, of course, would be a most unfair analysis, just as to choose isolated instances in my district and to condemn all the people for them would be unfair and unjust.

While the committee was in my district, I heard some stories quoted in the newspaper of ridiculously low wages being paid, and that the committee had been offered evidence of the facts. In the particular incidents that were described, I have tried repeatedly to obtain the names of the employee and the employer in order that we might have the full facts involved. None of this information has been forthcoming. I am confident that a full examination of the particular incidents would show there is much more to the story than has been told, and that the picture, as portrayed, has been vastly distorted to try to influence the members of the subcommittee.

Certainly the vast majority of the citizens in my district would never condone these incidents if they were true.

It is my hope that a committee of Congress will have an opportunity to visit my district again soon, and they will have time to be able to stay and investigate the problem fully—taking time to talk to laborers, border patrolmen, farmers, businessmen, and all representative groups that are interested in the welfare of south Texas—that they will not be subjected again to a tour conducted solely by a bureau who is trying to influence an increase in appropriations.

I think the example of the prisons or stockades that are proposed in the bill is such a clear extravagance and waste that it cannot be refuted.

Today we find the House conferees have accepted the Senate version on this expenditure in its entirety. The House is placed in an exceedingly difficult position, because this expenditure is tied to the pay checks of thousands of Government employees who are in arrears in their pay because of the length of time taken in conference on this bill. Even though I know that many of the Members of the House have not changed their minds on this particular amendment, and agree with me that it is a wasteful expenditure, they are faced with the fact that it is a relatively small item, when taken in comparison with the huge appropriations involved in the over-all bill for a multitude of items. Particularly is this problem posed when we find thousands of Federal employees have had one payless pay day because of the delay in passage of this bill.

I regret the tactics by which this item has been returned to the House, surrounded by the pressure of the other items in the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to clear up a situation that has developed here. The gentleman who proposed to recommit this appropriation bill said the purpose of it was to build concentration camps. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] said it was to pay for expenditures already made. There seems to be a misunderstanding. The fact of the matter is—and I want my colleagues of the House to know—it is an attempt on the part of the people who backed the wetback legislation to prevent the immigration authorities from properly controlling the wetback situation. They do not want them to have money to control that situation; they want to run it so that they can use these wetbacks on their farms while they are in this country illegally. I hesitate to make a direct charge like that, but that is the move back of this proposal to recommit this bill. I sincerely hope that the House will not be fooled by the intentions of the gentlemen who succeeded in getting the wetback legislation passed some months ago.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would be very much afraid to recommit this bill. We know what happened; we know the length of time the Senate took to act upon it before; we know that the Senate refused to act on the continuing resolution, and if it goes back to conference I feel that the veterans and the widows and the postal employees will not receive their just due, and it would be very cruel to them. I do not see how I can vote to recommit the bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sure the gentlewoman would not want this House to pass this legislation without attempting to save $1,400,000, and I am sure that the veterans and the postal workers and the rest of the folks would surely back this Congress up if they knew the facts and knew the story and knew that we were doing it to save $1,400,000.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I doubt very much if you would save $1,400,000. The Senate is not in a yielding mood.

Mr. JENSEN. Out in my country that is not hay, and it is not hay in most States. It may be one of these things that will finally break the camel's back if we do not start saving a million here and there.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I do not think you will save it. The Senate will not yield, and in the meantime the people in these departments and the disabled should have their money.

Mr. JENSEN. I know they will get their money and it will not take more than a few hours at the most.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I believe it would take weeks, and we will be in adjournment before the bill will be passed.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure

Mr. JENSEN. We certainly will not.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

that the Members of this House will keep their attention on the fact that the postal employees had a payless payday on Monday of this week. In communities such as the one which I have the honor to represent, Brooklyn, N. Y., thousands of these low-bracket employees have had to go to finance companies and borrow cash at a premium in order to tide themselves over for a few days, so I trust that we shall not waste too many minutes in regard to the Mexican wetback labor controversy that has arisen. I would rather that the controversy had come at a time when we would each have an hour or two to debate the issue which the gentlemen from Texas have raised, because I can assure you that they have not been presenting an accurate picture. And, I include the gentleman from California.

Less than 2 months ago, during the week of April 14, I had occasion to visit the lower Rio Grande Valley with members of my committee. We were there only 24 hours, but in that short period of 24 hours we learned enough to be able to prove that the opposition to law enforcement along the border in Texas is not as it is represented here to be. I am now going to include with my remarks the names of some of the persons in the lower Rio Grande Valley who have shown their contempt for our Federal immigration laws and at the bottom of

the picture you will find the almighty dollar.

We had a good look at the lower Rio Grande Valley, including an airplane ride at quite low altitude, and we saw these Mexican people, men and women, crossing the Rio Grande River in order to obtain work.

We happened, also, to visit a shed, not a Federal prison as referred to awhile ago, but a shed which our Immigration and Naturalization Service uses as a detention headquarters at McAllen, Tex. In that shed, in my presence, a farm foreman paid a young, dimwitted, ablebodied Mexican five $1 bills for a week's work on a farm picking tomatoes.

While there at dusk on Tuesday, April 15, 1952, I saw another farm foreman, in my presence and in the presence of the members of our group, pay two young women of the age of 20 and 21, who had waded over the Rio Grande the night before, a dollar each to cover the period they picked carrots beginning at 8 o'clock that morning until 4:30 that afternoon, when they were apprehended before the end of their day's work.

Certain employers of alien Mexican labor persist in encouraging illegal aliens to return to the United States after they have been deported by the border patrol. That is the reason you have to fly these aliens a couple of hundred miles south into Mexico, and down to Guadalajara.

Among the most flagrant offenders are the Schuster brothers, Carl and Frank, who have large farms located along the river south of Pharr and San Juan, Tex. These two brothers are among the largest operators in this territory and are both active in civic affairs in their community. They are violently opposed to immigration laws and to the personnel of the border patrol in trying to enforce such laws. They make open threats against individual patrol inspectors and the patrol as a unit and place every obstacle at their command in the way of the patrol in an effort to hamper them in their operations. Hundreds of aliens are apprehended from their farms weekly.

The Kremnueller brothers, Fred and Max, who are close relatives of the Schuster brothers, have adjoining farms to the Schusters and operate in the same manner as the Schuster brothers. Between these two large farming operations, thousands of aliens have been taken over the last year from this area alone. They show a complete lack of respect for all immigration laws. All of these people are prominent farmers in their communities and active in all civic affairs.

Henry Kawahata, a prominent Japanese-American farmer who has large holdings near Hidalgo, has consistently worked illegal aliens and openly states that he will continue to do so. He, too, has thrown every obstacle in the way of the patrol in an effort to impede the apprehension of aliens.

Allen Shivers, Governor of Texas, has large holdings near the Rio Grande and through his employees has consistently worked illegal aliens. He, too, has shown a disregard for the Federal immigration laws. Illegal aliens have been apprehended on his property weekly, and it is impossible to believe that Governor Shivers could be ignorant of these conditions.

Shary Farms, owned by Mrs. John H. Shary, mother-in-law of Allen Shivers, has extensive holdings throughout Hidalgo County, but principally in the vicinity of Mission and McAllen, Tex. Hundreds of aliens are apprehended on these farms and the property of this owner, and they show a flagrant disregard for all immigration laws.

Following are the names of farmers in different sections of the Rio Grande Valley who have consistently disregarded the immigration laws and who have made the enforcement of such laws as difficult as they possibly could for the border patrol:

In the McAllen area is J. K. Bottiger who resides on South Jackson Road and operates a farm adjacent to the Rio Grande, which is about 200 acres in size. He employs aliens exclusively, has locked the entrances to his farms to prevent the apprehension of aliens in his employment, and is most insulting to the officers of the Immigration Service. He makes himself as offensive as possible to the men on each occasion they have to visit his farm to apprehend aliens.

A. F. Buchanan, Alamo, Tex., who farms several hundred acres of land in the floodway and south of the floodway near Alamo, consistently hires aliens, and though he does nothing to impede the Immigration Service in their efforts to apprehend the aliens, shows a complete disregard for all immigration laws.

Joe A. Cunningham, Jr., McAllen, building contractor, works large groups of aliens at various times in his contracting business, and upon every apprehension made of illegal aliens while in his employment, the patrol inspectors have had to endure insults and threats of bodily harm, and upon occasions have even endured such actions that in any other section of the United States the courts would have convicted him of assault upon a Federal officer in the performance of his duty.

In the Edinburg area the following show the most flagrant disregard of our immigration laws:

Bert W. Sheets, Elsa, Tex., who is a retired attorney and operates a small farm of about 100 acres. He consistently challenges the authority of patrol inspectors to enter upon his land to apprehend aliens without warrants and has ordered patrol inspectors off his property each time they find it necessary to go there.

The Gutowsky brothers of McAllen and Edinburg, who have extensive farming holdings in the vicinity of both towns and probably have about 700 or 800 acres of land in cultivation, have numerous wetback camps, and attempt to hide aliens from the patrol at all times. They have on many occasions attempted to interfere with the patrol in the performance of their duties and have always objected strenuously to having their aliens apprehended.

Milton D. Richardson, Monte Alto, Tex., county judge of Hidalgo County, has a large farm in the Monte Alto area northwest of Edinburg. Estimated acreage, about 700, and he consistently challenges the authority of the patrol to apprehend aliens employed by him. He has created ill will between Federal officers and county officers in that he has instructed county officers to give the border patrol no cooperation in any matter.

Joe Holms, Route 1, Edinburg, Tex., operates a farm of some 300 to 400 acres. He employs large numbers of aliens and resists all efforts of the patrolmen to apprehend such aliens. He has been most uncooperative and on occasions has threatened to beat up patrolmen who apprehended aliens while in his employment.

C. R. Parliman, Edinburg, Tex., owns 700 to 800 acres north of Edinburg and consistently employs aliens and resists efforts of patrolmen to apprehend his aliens whenever possible. During the last cotton season he closed roads on his land, placed boards with nails in them extending upward across roads, stretched a chain between two posts in another road, the chain being placed about 12 to 15 inches above the ground. All these booby traps were placed on the roads leading into his property to prevent the border patrol from apprehending his aliens. He installed a siren on the roof of his tractor shed and used it to warn aliens of the approach of the border patrol.

Carroll Vernon, Edinburg, Tex., operates scattered farms in the dry-land area north of Edinburg between Faysville and San Manuel. He consistently employs aliens for all work on his farms, is most disagreeable and uncooperative to the Immigration Service. For example, on one occasion a Government-owned truck broke down near his home and he refused the driver the use of his telephone to call for assistance.

In the Mission area there have been several farmers who have flagrantly shown little respect for our immigration laws. Among them are Thomas Robertson, a prominent farmer and leader in the Mission community who has consistently resisted all efforts of the patrol to apprehend illegal aliens working on his various farms located north and west of Mission. He has openly stated to several patrol inspectors that he intended to work aliens and that if any man came on his farm without his permission that he intended to stop him with whatever means that would be at his hand, and that if it meant killing a patrol inspector, that is the way it would have to be.

The Banworth brothers, Arthur and Harold, who operate a large farm and ranch west of Mission along the river, have consistently resisted the efforts of the border patrol to apprehend their aliens and have openly stated they would use whatever means necessary to prevent their apprehension. They have kept their gates locked to prevent the border patrol from entering and apprehending aliens on their farms. Recently, they have attempted to contract braceros from Mexico. They have made threats against individual patrol inspectors and continuously attempt to lure patrol inspectors into arguments concerning the policy of the Immigration Service.

Jim Carpenter, who has large acreage along the river west of Mission and near

Sullivan City, Tex., has always created much trouble for the patrol, has locked gates to his property and prevented patrol along the Rio Grande, and during the last cotton season his father assaulted three patrolmen with a shotgun and was later no-billed by a grand jury consisting of Rio Grande Valley farmers.

Jim Griffin, ex-Patrol Inspector and now prominent farmer near Mission, has holdings in the vicinity of Rio Grande City, Tex., and uses his knowledge of immigration law to consistently impede the border patrol in its efforts to apprehend aliens illegally in his employment. Mr. Griffin is the head of farm organizations which are constantly attempting to secure a more favorable bracero agreement with Mexico.

In the Harlingen area there are several prominent men who have large farms and businesses and who constantly use illegal aliens. Some of these are Bert Adams, Albert Wolf, Harlingen Compress Co., Valley Compress Co., Niagara Chemical Co. and H. E. Butt Canning Co. These companies and individuals consistently hire illegal aliens and impede the Immigration Service in every manner possible.

The following are the more flagrant offenders in the San Benito area: Billie Sojak, R. G. Smith, H. J. Garret, Frank Russell, John T. Chalick, Campbell Brothers, Robert West, W. D. Todd, Carl Stanford, John DeHaan, Kenneth Shuckman, Lee Joe Woods, Miguel Ramirez, G. W. McCain, George Bishop, Jesus Montalva, Woolam and Yarbrough, Porter and Wince, and Tilton Garrison. All of these men are large farmers or contractors and employ large groups of illegal aliens. The majority of them are prominent leaders in the communities in which they live. Many of them consistently place every obstacle available in the way of the border patrol to prevent them apprehending their aliens.

In the Weslaco area the following-named farmers constantly employ large groups of illegal aliens and resist all efforts of the border patrol in the apprehension of such aliens: J. S. McManus, packing shed and farms; Gulf Distributing Co. and packing shed; Bob Tankersly farm; Tony Taromina farms and canning company; C. W. Tyner farm; Boyce and Botton packing shed and farms; A. C. Fuller farms; G. I. Ripley farms; American Fruit Growers, Inc.; Happy Kitayama; Mummert farms; William and Hubert Drawe farms; McDaniel brothers farms; and E. W. Vertrees farms.

Brownsville area: Larry P. Lightner, owner of Lightner Products Co., Inc., a tremendously wealthy man who owns and operates farms consisting of hundreds of acres and leases, rents, and finances several thousand more acres. He has stated he did not have to legally contract braceros, that he could always get all the wetbacks he wanted by going down to the river and beating on a bucket to signal them across.

J. W. English farms about 400 acres immediately along the bank of the Rio Grande, hires illegal aliens who live immediately across the river from his farm, and states that the border patrolmen had better watch their coming around his place at night, they might get shot and that no jury here would ever convict anyone for shooting a border patrolman.

Paul Gilmore farm, about 300 acres across from Matamoros, Mexico, obtain all their labor from Matamoros and constantly complain about patrolmen abusing aliens. These charges are groundless and made to slow down the operation of the patrol.

E. E. Sadler, deputy United States marshal for the judicial district, was until recently openly using illegal aliens in his farming. He was very critical of the airlift operation and stated that it was illegal and unconstitutional, and that the border patrol should have been airlifted to Mexico rather than the illegal aliens. Aliens have frequently and constantly been apprehended while in his employment.

Frank Russell, Russeltown and Olmito area, the largest and wealthiest farmer in the Brownsville territory. It is hard to determine just how much land he farms and what all his interests are. He farms at least 5,000 acres, has his own water district, his own cotton gin and drier, owns a large packing shed, and is reputed to be owner of oil wells in Oklahoma and large cattle and oil interests in Duval and La Salle Counties of Texas. His bookkeeper and manager is a brother-in-law of George Parr, political leader of south Texas. Frank Russell consistently uses large groups of illegal aliens in his operations and shows a complete disregard and contempt for all immigration laws.

Carlos G. Watson, United States Comsioner for south Texas judicial district, owner of Coronado Farms near Brownsville, prominent attorney and State secretary of the Republican Party of Texas, is next. Mr. Watson's employees quite often refuse to pay aliens who have been apprehended on his property and who have been employed by him, and he consistently challenges the authority of the Immigration Service.

The following are others who are just as contemptuous of the immigration laws as those I have mentioned but do not operate on as large a scale: George McGonigle; S. L. Turner; Mrs. M. R. McCormick; S. D. Ray; Jesse Dennett; W. E. Collins; Dean Porter; Floyd and Lynn Hoel, who have most recently been charged with assaulting two patrol inspectors with deadly weapons; A. B. and A. N. Baker; N. L. Ledbetter; Edward Ginn; J. G. Fernandez, president of First National Bank, Brownsville; Dr. R. F. Breeden; Pan-Am Foods, Inc.; R. M. Mathers & Sons, Frank and Charles; Douglas Risinger; J. H. Ginn II and J. H. Ginn III; C. E. Coffelt; H. H. Pope; Cameron County Water Control District No. 5, W. I. Gilson, manager; E. E. Mackbee; John H. and Earl Hunter; and L. P. Wilkinson.

Most of these people who are engaged in farming activities own or operate farms ranging from 200 acres up to 4,000 and 5,000 acres. Many of them have elaborate alarm systems set up to warn their aliens of approaching border patrolmen, and among these people are those that are and do conduct smear campaigns against the border patrol and the United States Immigration Service.

I am going to insert in the RECORD at this point a report to the chief patrol inspector at McAllen, Tex., made in February last by the patrol inspector in charge, Brownsville, Tex., concerning a conference with one J. H. Ginn, Jr., and his son. Mr. J. H. Ginn, Jr., is county commissioner for Cameron County, Tex., of which Brownsville is the county seat. It reads as follows:

The morning of February 19, 1952, Mr. J. H. Ginn, Jr., and his son J. H. Ginn, 3d, came to the Brownsville patrol office to protest the apprehension of aliens in their employ. Earlier the same morning Patrol Inspectors Donald R. Hansis and Douglas S. Wilson had apprehended a number of aliens at the Ginn home farm. At the time of the apprehension the patrolmen were thoroughly cursed and vilified in a particularly lurid and imaginative manner by J. H. Ginn, 3d.

Mr. Ginn, the father, started the conference by apologizing for his son's behavior toward the patrolmen. Throughout the proceedings the father was very reasonable and pleasant. The basis of his complaint was that the patrolmen drove by his house, on a private road, in order to apprehend the aliens that were congregated around an implement shed approximately 1,000 yards beyond the house. On being questioned, Mr. Ginn stated: He had no objection to the manner in which the patrolmen drove down the road; he was satisfied that we were within our legal rights to enter and that he had no objection to our doing so; he stated we had never disturbed his family by passing the house and had never damaged his property in any way; he had always cooperated with the border patrol and did not object to our picking up his wetbacks, in fact, if we would call him on the phone he would bring the aliens into the office; but he did object to the lack of courtesy shown by not stopping at the house, bidding him good morning and telling him we were after his wetbacks.

I told Mr. Ginn that we always tried to be courteous and to conduct our operations in a manner becoming to officers and gentlemen but that I felt his request was impractical in that the aliens were almost certain to escape if the patrolmen stopped at the house before driving on and also such an act would be misconstrued by others to mean that we had to have permission to enter upon a farm. Mr. Ginn regretted that I felt that way but did not press the point. Instead he attempted to draw me into a discussion of politics in general, the probable actions of Congress in regards to pending immigration bills, the "Bracero" program, and economic conditions here in the Rio Grande Valley. During this discussion he made a blanket statement that he was not going to do any contracting under any labor agreement this year.

Mr. Ginn is a very prominent man. He is county commissioner for Cameron County and has extensive farm holdings as well as other interests and he has in the past consistently employed a great many illegal aliens.

He is very personable and was entirely reasonable throughout the conference but I do not believe he was completely satisfied with the interview and in my opinion there will be incidents whenever the operations of this unit interfere with his farm labor requirements to any appreciable extent. I am not satisfied as to the real purpose of his visit but I do not believe he is actually concerned with the courtesies he requested. I am satisfied, however, that whatever his purpose, if any, would not be compatible with the efficient removal of illegal entrant aliens from this territory.

As stated before Mr. J. H. Ginn, Jr., was very reasonable but Mr. J. H. Ginn III was extremely obnoxious, abusive and completely objectionable throughout the major period

of time they were in the office. The father did most of the talking with the son interjecting uncontrolled outbursts of profanity and unfounded accusations directed against the border patrol. He, Mr. J. H. Ginn III, a young man of about 24 years of age, repeatedly referred to the gestapo and of how they had everyone but him terrified. He stated three times that he was going to get a gun and that then he would like to see any border patrolmen come on his place. He inquired as to our legal rights to enter a house, and upon being informed that we did not enter residences without a warrant, he told us he had a wetback housemaid in his home and dared us to try and get her. The maid had actually been apprehended that morning by Hansis and Wilson and was no longer in his house. This apprehension was made without entering the residence. Just before leaving the office he, too, calmed down enough to apologize for his conduct toward the officers.

You might also find the next report interesting. It was made in the same month to the chief patrol inspector at Del Rio, Tex., by a patrol inspector with regard to illegal aliens apprehended on the Roger Gillis California Ranch. Mr. Gillis is one of the most prominent ranchmen in the Del Rio area, and if I am not mistaken has a member of his family in the Texas legislature. This one reads as follows:

We received information from a reliable source that there were a large number of wetbacks, aliens illegally in the United States, on the Roger Gillis California ranch near Comstock, Tex.

On Monday, February 4, 1952, Inspector ——— and I were sent there to investigate. However, since the gates leading into his ranch are kept locked, it was necessary to proceed afoot.

We walked in about 6 or 7 miles and finally topped out on a hill with the ranch buildings about 300 or 400 yards below. This was about 5: 30 p. m. We stayed there until we believed that all the aliens were in. Just before sunset we left this spot and proceeded under cover around the hill and came out on the road below. We followed this road directly to the ranch houses. We arrived about 5 or 10 minutes after sunset.

Upon approaching the ranch buildings we saw a man, who, upon seeing us, ran into the bunkhouse with us right behind him. After questioning he admitted being in the United States illegally. We asked him where the other "wets" were, in Spanish, and he told us that they were in the next building. Then we encountered a foreman, asked him the same question, and received the same answer. As we were talking to the foreman some of the men came out of the next building, saw us, turned around, and ran back. We followed them in and inside found several more. The foreman also followed us in. We asked him how many of these men were here without proper papers. He looked them over, counted them, 12 in all, and replied all but one. This one man was Juan Cortes, a bracero, whose contract had expired on December 19, 1951. We left this man and took the remaining 11 aliens who were here illegally.

Then Mr. Schiller, the man in charge of the ranch, came into the cookhouse and told us to leave. We said that we would but that the wets were going with us. We waited for the aliens to finish eating and to collect their belongings. Then the foreman took each of their addresses. When this was finished Mr. Schiller tried to get us to wait because, he said, Mr. Gillis was on his way out and wanted to talk to us. We asked him that should we wait, would he give us transportation to the highway where our car was. He did not answer to this after being asked twice. We realized that this was only a delaying action to stall us. We had spent better than a half hour to 45 minutes there. When we started he kept following us down the road to the next gate, which was about a hundred yards away, still trying to persuade us to wait. After a further discussion of some 10 or 15 minutes, we realized that Mr. Schiller was only trying to delay our departure, whereupon we departed on foot with the aliens. Shortly after departure I looked at my watch and it showed 7:20 p. m.

After going about 2½ miles, Messrs. Roger Gillis, Walter Gillis, and Schiller intercepted us and tried to prevent us from taking these men. First they asked if we had a warrant, to which we replied "No." Then they demanded to see our identification, as they said they doubted that we were border patrolmen. Inspector ——— showed his credentials, while I only showed my badge, having left my identification card at home. Mr. Roger Gillis made the remark that badges could be bought in any J. C. Penney store, and continuing, said, "Let's take these men back to the ranch, the sheriff is on his way out; we'll call your boss and straighten this matter out." When we refused, he said, "Then the sheriff will probably take you in." To this we replied that the sheriff probably would not, and that he, Roger Gillis, was interfering with a Federal officer in the performance of his duty. He replied that Federal officers come under the laws too. We agreed with him on that point, and also stated that interfering with a Federal officer in the performance of his duty also comes under the law. He then ordered the aliens to put their belongings in his car, that they were going back to his ranch. "No, they are not," we said, "these men are in our custody and we are taking them to Del Rio headquarters right now." "Well, maybe you will and maybe you won't," he replied, "you don't have to get tough all of a sudden." Then we told the aliens to come on, and left.

The aliens were delivered to border patrol headquarters in Del Rio, Tex.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. BENTSEN. I have heard the comment before about the committee having seen these two particular employees paid these wages, and I would certainly agree that would be slave wages, and I could not condone it in any way if the facts were truthfully represented to the committee and the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I will say to the gentleman that while we were in the automobile in which we were proceeding to Falcon Dam from Brownsville, we stopped three Mexican wetbacks in tattered clothes and practically no shoes who were returning across the border that afternoon because all they were offered, and these were three able-bodied men—was $1.25 for stoop labor, picking tomatoes.

Mr. BENTSEN. But the question I was going to ask the gentleman is that I have tried, since I heard that statement and seen it in the papers in my district, I have tried and citizens of my district have tried to find out the name of the farmer who paid that wage of $5 for a week's work.

Mr. ROONEY. I would imagine that it could easily be obtained.

Mr. BENTSEN. I have not been able to, and I would appreciate the gentleman's help because I would like to get it.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] was present at the time.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I gladly yield.

Mr. BENTSEN. I want to clarify something. I was not questioning the gentleman's statement, or the gentleman from Minnesota, but I am questioning the farmer's statement and the employee's statement. I think it was a put up job to influence the gentleman from New York and the committee.

Mr. ROONEY. It was not a question of anyone making a statement. I was there and I saw the dollar bills which I have referred to, five to the young man and one each to the young women.

Mr. BENTSEN. I tried repeatedly to try to find out who the farmer was.

Mr. ROONEY. What about the case of the two young women who had not worked before that day?

Mr. BENTSEN. I would like to have the facts surrounding this so I could talk to the people and have it investigated, if it did happen. The vast majority of citizens in my district would not condone such a practice if it was true, any more than I believe would the citizens represented by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman will get in touch with the district director of the Immigration and Naturalization Service——

Mr. BENTSEN. That is what I have been doing.

Mr. ROONEY. I should say that if the fine people who are all over the rest of that fine State of Texas knew the situation in the lower Rio Grande Valley, they would not stand for it for a minute because the many Texans I have met by and large are fair people. They would not tolerate this kind of nonsense occasioned only for the sake of making the almighty dollar. The point is, not only that the Mexicans were paid such a low wage—they were satisfied with it—the point is that as the result there is no respect for our law along that border, and I am ashamed, as an American citizen, to see the contempt in which decent, faithful officers of the Federal Government are held. They are being continually threatened and being told that if they enter a property as they have the right to do to legally apprehend an illegal alien, they will be shot.

I yield to the gentleman from California, and may I say I have not gotten to California on this as yet.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We will be glad to see you. This is a point which is not quite clear in our minds. For example, we have a minimum 70-cent wage so that this must be some illegal individual rather than an exceptional case.

Mr. ROONEY. Exceptional?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. Why do not these farmers in this area hire Mexican labor legally? Why do they not sign up for their aliens and vouch for them?

Mr. PHILLIPS. They do.

Mr. ROONEY. Why do they not hire them legally and agree to pay them 45 cents an hour. That is low enough.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Since we pay them 70 cents an hour, I suppose 45 cents an hour would be low.

Mr. ROONEY. Surely the gentleman is acquainted with the fact that the Mexican agreement calls for 45 cents an hour.

Mr. PHILLIPS. But we do not pay that low.

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend and fellow committee member, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, this is a terrific problem, and concerns all of us. As Members of the House, we are attempting to talk about in a short time one of the most critical problems facing that area. It is not a localized problem. I would like to say to some of my good friends that this is not a local problem because these people who come across the border illegally keep right on going. It is not the group who merely comes across the line that we are concerned about, but it is the people who keep right on going. They come from Mexico into the southern part of the United States and they go on up to Michigan. They come clear up into my area.

Mr. ROONEY. Exactly. And the gentleman well knows about the narcotics which have been brought in as a result of this loose condition on the border.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. Some of the farmers in my area are wondering what sort of economy people have in that area, that they need to be subsidized with cheap labor to the extent that some of them are. That is a serious problem with some of our people who had to pay wages in cooperation with the Mexican Government under the labor agreement that they entered into. It is unfair competition.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman for his wholly accurate remarks.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I spoke to the Director of Immigration in the city of Chicago, and he said the most expensive item in their budget is the apprehension of the illegal Mexican entrees who come into this country and wind up in the industrial areas, such as Chicago, where they have to be rounded up and sent back to Mexico. They stop at the farms in the south for a temporary sojourn, and they continue on up to the industrial areas where the wages are much higher.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

In conclusion may I say that I wish we had an hour to discuss this one subject of the Mexican wetbacks. But we have an important conference report pending. As to this particular item the Senate was in full agreement, the Senate conferees; and the House conferees yielded to the Senate on this point. I hope no one will lose sight of the fact that in this bill is contained the pay of our postal workers who have been payless since Monday. Let us not get too involved in this important subject at the moment. Let us defer debate on it until a later date, and I am sure you will agree with the position that my committee has taken in regard to this particular matter. Let us all vote for adoption of the conference report and our postal employees will get their back pay.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I have been greatly disturbed not because of the defense of the Members of the House who come from Texas, in regard to the wetback situation, because I am thoroughly familiar with their position on that, but more important in this legislation, that has been delayed too long now, is more than just the pay of postal and Government employees.

On yesterday I received a long-distance call from Frank Howard, adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans organization in the city of Minneapolis, which represents the organization at Fort Snelling. The Disabled American Veterans and the Veterans of Foreign Wars have now found it necessary to help subsidize the widows of the deceased veterans. These widows and dependents are not able to collect their pensions. It is a meager amount at best. I cannot accept the argument that is advanced that this conference agreement will be done in 5 minutes, as was said by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER]. It has been over 6 weeks in conference now, and on the basis of the position of the Senate on this question, I am not as naive as the gentleman from Iowa, who thinks that this is a mere formality on this question. I want to see the widows and the beneficiaries of these veterans get their checks at Fort Snelling. That is my interest in this bill. I do not want to see any Government employees or postal employees having to go down to the pawn shops or the loan offices and have to subject their needs to that system. I hope this bill will be passed today.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] in the feeling that we should not attempt in a few minutes on the floor to solve a question that is as confused and as confusing as the problem of the Mexican national workers. This also involves other workers usually referred to as wetbacks. That actually represents a separate problem. It would not be right for me to sit here and have statements made on the floor that people are paying pickers a dollar or a few dollars a week. I have no doubt that there are people today evading the law in Texas and California just the same as there are people evading the law in Brooklyn, but we certainly would not judge Brooklyn by the fact that one or two people evaded the law; that would be a matter, according to my mind, for the police department, or in this case for the Department of Justice; and we would support legal action.

I wonder if it did not seem odd to my friend from New York [Mr. ROONEY] that the payment of this illegal amount of money was made exactly at the moment when his subcommittee happened to be on the spot and in a position to observe the payment. The minimum in Texas is 45 cents an hour for farm labor, and higher in California. We do not pay anyone less, on an hour rate, than 70 cents. It is no surprise to me that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] was unable to trace this alleged incident.

I confine my remarks to an area with which I am familiar, my own area. These pickers we are talking about make as high as $8, $10, $14 and $18 a day picking onions and cantaloups. The melon season is on. If there were small checks it could be because the worker elected to work on a piecework basis. When the season is at its height they make as high as $18 a day. I doubt the incident even then. The piecework basis has been in effect for 50 years and has been a satisfactory method.

The wetback is not primarily a problem of the American farmer. He is a problem of Mexican regulations which require $10 for a visa on a crossing card. He can walk across a nonexistent border and work without it. We have tried to cut out the wetbacks; our farms are policed by our own farm associations where I live.

We prefer domestic workers whenever we can get them, but the Mexican has been doing this type of work for 50 years, in California, Arizona and Texas, and the native American does not want to do it, except for those of Spanish origin, or those who live all the time in the area. The Spanish and Mexican workers were in this part of the United States before we English-speaking people got there.

Some of these days I think I shall have to take time to talk at length on this subject. When you hear what these workers make, and the conditions under which they work, your opinions may change from the opinions created by the stories of the window-box farmers from New York and West Virginia, who have not seen the situation for themselves. We would welcome a distinterested and honest investigation of the whole problem. The solution of the problem is closely related to the food supply of the eastern seaboard.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. FISHER. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FISHER moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H. R. 6947 to the committee on conference with instructions to

the managers on the part of the House to insist upon their disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FISHER) there were—ayes 35, noes 149.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 1, line 10, insert:

"For payment to Marjorie C. Wherry, widow of Kenneth S. Wherry, late a Senator from the State of Nebraska, $12,500."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 2, line 1, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Effective April 15, 1952, the appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1952 is made available for the compensation of one camera man, Joint Recording Facility, at the basic rate of $3,600 per annum."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 2, line 9, insert:

"Folding documents: For an additional amount for folding speeches and pamphlets at a gross rate not exceeding $2 per thousand, $10,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 2, line 23, insert:

"For payment to Barbara Y. Schwabe, widow of George B. Schwabe, late a Representative from the State of Oklahoma, $12,500."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

"For payment to Barbara Y. Schwabe, widow of George B. Schwabe, late a Representative from the State of Oklahoma, $12,500.

"For payment to Lyla H. Murray, widow of Reid F. Murray, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin, $12,500.

"For payment to Anna M. Byrne, and Elizabeth B. Turkenkoph, sisters of William T. Byrne, late a Representative from the State of New York, one-half to each, $12,500."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 22: Page 11, line 23, insert: "That the amount made available herein shall be the full cost of the acquisition of land and construction of facilities."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25: Page 15, line 15, insert:

"CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

"Investigations: For the establishment of a revolving fund which shall be available to the Civil Service Commission without fiscal year limitation for financing investigations, the costs of which are required or authorized by Public Law or any other law to be borne by appropriations or funds of other Government departments and agencies, $6,500,000: *Provided*, That said funds shall be reimbursed from available funds of such departments and agencies for investigations made for them at rates estimated by the Commission to be adequate to recover expenses of operation, including provision for accrued annual leave and depreciation of equipment purchased by the fund: *Provided further*, That any surplus accruing to the fund in any fiscal year shall be paid into the general fund of the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts during the ensuing fiscal year: *Provided further*, That any such surplus may be applied first to restore any impairment of the capital of the fund by reason of variations between the rates charged for work or services and the amount subsequently determined by the Commission to be the cost of performing such work or services."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

After the words "Public Law", in line 5 of said amendment, insert "298, Eighty-second Congress,"; and, in line 7 of said amendment, change "$6,500,000" to "$4,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 45: Page 48, line 24, insert ": *Provided further*, That (1) the position of Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Treasury established by Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950, the position of Administrative Assistant Attorney General established by Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1950, the position of Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior established by Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1950, the position of Administrative Assistant Secretary of Commerce established by Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1950, and the position of Administrative Assistant Secretary of Labor established by Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1950, shall be filled without reference to section 1310 of Public Law 253 of the Eighty-second Congress, as amended, shall be subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall be placed in the highest grade set forth in the general schedule of such act without regard to section 505 (b) of such act, as amended, and shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grade under such section, and (2) in the case of any other position for which compensation is expressly established by law at a rate equal to the rate payable prior to the enactment of Public Law 201, Eighty-second Congress, under the highest grade of the Classification Act of 1949, the rate of compensation shall hereafter be equal to the rate payable for such grade under said Public Law 201."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 47: Page 50, line 21, insert:

"CHAPTER XII

"CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS

"For payment of claims for damages as settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law, audited claims certified to be due by the General Accounting Office, and judgments rendered against the United States by United States district courts and the United States Court of Claims, as set forth in Senate Document No. 108, Eighty-second Congress, $4,357,649, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall have become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That, unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than 30 days after the date of approval of this act."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate Numbered 47, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"CHAPTER XII

"CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS

"For payment of claims for damages as settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law, audited claims certified to be due by the General Accounting Office, and judgments rendered against the United States by United States district courts and the United States Court of Claims, as set forth in House Document No. 471, Eighty-second Congress, and Senate Document No. 108, Eighty-second Congress, $6,490,662, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in

such judgments or in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall have become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That, unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than 30 days after the date of approval of this act."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the extension of the emergency powers of the President.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. ARMSTRONG) was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Tuesday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

KOREAN VETERANS BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in a few moments we are going to vote on the passage of H. R. 7656, a bill to take care of our veterans in the Korean war, which President Truman referred to as a "police action." I hope there will not be a vote against it.

I introduced the bill, H. R. 7642, and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs amended it to the satisfaction of practically every Member present. Then a motion was made to strike out all the bill after the enacting clause and insert the provisions in H. R. 7656, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Efforts have been made to force through an amendment for the benefit of private schools instead of legislating, as this bill does, for the benefit of the veterans themselves.

These boys did not stir up these foreign wars, but they are doing the fighting, the suffering, the dying; and it is our duty to see that they and their widows and orphans are properly treated.

At this point I am inserting a telegram I received from Hon. Francis M. Sullivan, national legislative director, Disabled American Veterans. It reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 3, 1952.*

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Disabled American Veterans request your support for passage of H. R. 7656, as reported by Veterans' Affairs Committee. Our organization vitally concerned with provisions of title III, H. R. 7656, which extends loan guaranty benefits to veterans of the Korean conflict. In our judgment title III provides safeguards so that Korean veterans applying for loans will not be victimized as were World War II veterans.

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
National Legislative Director,
Disabled American Veterans.

Mr. Speaker, attempts have been made to build up strength for the so-called Springer amendment, which would mean legislating for the private schools instead of for the veterans. I want to repeat that we owe the veterans our first duty. In this Korean conflict, or police action, we have already lost more men than we lost in four wars—the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the Spanish-American War. We did not suffer as many casualties in all four of those wars combined as we have suffered in this Korean conflict.

In order to let the Members know how the people feel about this legislation, who are in a position to know what it means, I am inserting at this point a letter from the Department of Higher Education, signed by Hon. Francis H. Horn, executive secretary, which reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION,
Washington, D. C., June 3, 1952.

To Members of Congress:

The Department of Higher Education of the National Education Association, an organization of some 18,000 members in 1,600 of the Nation's 1,850 colleges and universities, including administrative officers of all kinds and faculty members of every academic and professional field, urges you to support H. R. 7656, the Teague bill, without amendment, when it comes to a vote in the House.

On March 13 the department's national committee on veterans' affairs, consisting of veterans' counselors from both publicly supported and privately supported institutions, submitted to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee a statement endorsing the proposal to make all educational benefits payable direct to the veteran because such an arrangement will (1) "foster a relationship between the veteran and the educational institution which is the same as that of nonveteran students"; and (2) "it will save money for the Federal Government by eliminating the extensive and expensive operations now required of the Veterans' Administration and educational institutions alike in the administration of the present GI law."

Since that time, as a result of agitation on the part of some colleges and universities for support of the Springer amendment, the department's executive committee of eight members, also representative of both publicly supported and privately supported institutions, has considered the matter and reaffirmed the department's position in support of legislation which would make all educational benefits payable direct to the veteran.

Legislation for the new veterans should be regarded as a program of assistance to the veteran and not as a Federal subsidy of higher education. The interests of individual veterans, of higher education as a whole, and of the Nation will be best served by the legislation proposed in H. R. 7656.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS H. HORN,
Executive Secretary, Department of Higher Education.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

At this point I am inserting a letter I received from Dr. Arthur S. Adams, president of the American Council on Education, supporting this measure as it is now written. His letter reads as follows:

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,
Washington, D. C., June 2, 1952.

The Honorable JOHN E. RANKIN,
Member of Congress from Mississippi,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RANKIN: As offered in previous correspondence, I submit for your information the latest tabulation of replies to the American Council on Education questionnaire concerning bills to provide educational benefits for veterans on active duty since June 27, 1950. It should be clearly understood that these results reflect opinions on at least two major issues—the amount of the subsidy by the Federal Government and the method of payment.

Thus, the majority, 313 colleges and universities, representing 53.5 percent of those replying to date, favor an extension of all provisions of Public Law 346, granting full tuition and fees, up to $600 per academic year, plus academic supplies and subsistence.

Only 48, or 8.2 percent, favor the bills S. 1940, H. R. 5038, and H. R. 5040, which retain the provision of paying tuition and fees directly to the institution, but reduce the amount to one-half of such tuition and fees, or a limit of $300 per academic year. Votes for the Springer amendment have been counted in this category, since the Teague bill, so amended, would approximate these previous bills in effect.

Voting for the Teague bill, without amendment, are 232 institutions, or 39.6 percent of the total reporting.

It seems clear that of the institutions voting for a lower scale of subsidies than those provided in Public Law 346 a large majority favor payment directly to the veteran (232 to 48, or approximately 5 to 1). How those who favor extension of all provisions of Public Law 346 would vote on the issue of paying a lesser amount to the institution or to the veteran is a matter of conjecture, since the questionnaire did not provide for a separate reply on that issue.

It is perhaps unnecessary to state again that the results of this poll supersede the opinions expressed by council members in July 1951 before any of the recommendations of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, including the crucial one of decrease in total educational benefits to veterans, had become known to the public.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. ADAMS.

I am also inserting in the RECORD a memorandum from Dr. Arthur S. Adams bearing on the same subject. It reads as follows:

MEMORANDUM TO MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JUNE 3, 1952

Because of statements made by Congressman SPRINGER, of Illinois, on the floor of the House on May 29 regarding the attitudes and actions of members and representatives of the American Council on Education regarding H. R. 7656, I feel obligated to present the facts in the situation to all House Members. The enclosure is an unrevised copy of the explanatory material and the questionnaire circulated to council members on this legislation last month. It includes a summary of council activities, particularly those of the cognizant standing committee, the Committee on Relationships of Higher Education to the Federal Government.

The last page includes the votes of colleges and universities, as tabulated to noon, June 2, 1952.

ARTHUR S. ADAMS,
President, American Council on Education.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,
Washington, D. C., May 16, 1952.

QUESTIONNAIRE ON VETERANS' EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS

(NOTE.—See last page for questionnaire to be returned to the American Council on Education)

This statement and questionnaire have been prepared to review with the membership of the council, legislation now pending in the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, covering proposed educational benefits for veterans on active duty since June 27, 1950.

BILLS INTRODUCED TO DATE

The legislation that has been drafted in bills resulting from hearings and deliberations to date, may be broken into three major classifications in terms of provisions and administration:

1. H. R. 6377 is the most recent bill providing for an extension of most of the provisions of Public Law 346, the present GI bill. These provisions are familiar to college and university officials from past operating experience and need not be summarized here.

2. The second category of bills, commonly referred to as the administration bills, were introduced during August 1951. S. 1940, H. R. 5038, and H. R. 5040 were discussed in detail in the Council Bulletin, Higher Education and National Affairs, No. 174, dated August 13, 1951. These are identical bills "to provide certain educational and training benefits to veterans who served in the active military, naval, or air service on or after June 27, 1950." These bills are similar in many respects to Public Law 346 as amended, but provide for lower payments to institutions (one-half the tuition up to a maximum total tuition limit of $600). Subsistence payments to the veteran are raised in these bills $5 per month over Public Law 346 provision, to cover books and supplies, which the veteran would purchase. Under these bills veterans in full institutional training would be allowed $80 if without dependents, $110 if with one dependent, and $125 if with more than one dependent. Income from the allowance plus income from productive labor, in these bills, could not exceed a rate of $2,580 for 12 months for a veteran without dependents, $3,300 for a veteran with one dependent, and $3,540 for a veteran with more than one dependent.

3. The third group of bills represents modifications resulting in large part from the report of the House Select Committee To Investigate Educational, Training, and Loan Guaranty Programs under the GI bill (the Teague committee). The bill sponsored by Mr. OLIN TEAGUE, Democrat, Texas, chairman of the select committee, is now numbered H. R. 7656 (replacing H. R. 6425), introduced April 30, 1952, after hearings at which testimony was presented, prepared from study by a special subcommittee of the Council Committee on relationships of higher education to the Federal Government. This bill provides for payment of all benefits directly to the veteran as a partial tuition, books, and subsistence scholarship to be used to obtain education at an institution of the veteran's choice. Amount of the payment would be $110 per month for single veterans with no dependents or $150 per month if the veteran has one or more dependents. Entitlement is for a period of education not to exceed 36 months. (This compares with 48 months under the administration bills and Public Law 346.) Programs must be initiated within 2 years after discharge or the effective date of the act and no education will be offered after 7 years beyond discharge. (This compares with 4 years and 9 years, respectively, under Public Law 346. The 2-year and 7-year limits are included in the administration bills.)

In addition to the Teague bill (H. R. 7656), Mr. RANKIN, Democrat, Mississippi, has introduced an omnibus bill, H. R. 7642, embodying the major provisions of the Teague bill, including payment of all funds to the veteran, but providing for monthly amounts for $90 for veterans with no dependents, $110 per month for one dependent, and a rate of $135 for veterans with more than one dependent. H. R. 7642 includes additional provisions for loans, retirement insurance, and unemployment compensation.

CONSIDERATION OF VETERANS' EDUCATION LEGISLATION BY THE COUNCIL

In June 1951 the American Council on Education submitted a questionnaire to its membership regarding possible extension of educational benefits to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces on and after June 27, 1950. One of the questions referred to the mode of payment: i. e. whether the tuition payment should be made to the institution as under the GI bill or whether a fixed sum should be paid directly to the veteran to cover tuition and other fees, books, and subsistence. Most of the replies from all types of institutions of higher education favored payments on the same basis as those made under the GI bill.

After the results of the questionnaire had been compiled, the council's committee on relationships of higher education to the Federal Government (membership attached) discussed them with appropriate governmental agencies and with representatives of the House Select Committee To Investigate Educational, Training, and Loan Guaranty Programs under GI bill, Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE, chairman. These discussions appeared to make it clear that the Congress was not disposed to extend the GI bill with its liberal benefits. The committee was advised that the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs was interested mainly in legislation based upon three fundamental considerations: (a) the need for a long-range program of educational benefits for veterans; (b) the necessity that this program be geared to the national economy and to the limited amount of continuing Federal funds available for this purpose; and (c) the necessity for a greatly simplified administrative procedure for both the Federal Government and the institution. It was pointed out that the system and amount of payment under the GI bill did not square with these fundamental considerations.

Unfortunately, these statements were made to the committee "off the record" and it was not until February 14, 1952, that the report of the Teague committee was released. At the meeting of the organization members of the council on January 25–26, 1952, an effort was made to procure a consensus but the issues were "referred to the staff for continued study." It was, however, apparent that a substantial proportion of representatives of organizations who were present recognized the advisability of supporting legislation that would make the payment directly to the veteran.

The Committee on Relationships devoted part of the February 11, 1952, meeting to discussion of the issue and in an informal poll of the members and consultants showed preponderant judgment in favor of the Teague bill with its direct payment to veterans. The Teague bill was first introduced on February 5, 1952. The Committee on Relationships appointed a subcommittee under the chairmanship of President Carter Davidson of Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., and authorized it to prepare and present testimony. This was presented on March 4, 1952.

On March 10, the complete transcript of the testimony was sent to all colleges and universities asking for reactions and stating that the council's testimony would be revised in the light of such comments before presentation to the Senate committee. Only eight communications had been received by the council up to the time of the annual meeting on May 2–3, 1952, four in commendation, four suggesting modifications.

The Teague bill has been further revised and was reported out of the committee on May 14, 1952. It is now possible to procure the judgment of the council membership on the bill which will be acted upon in the House and this is the express purpose of this communication.

FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED IN EVALUATING CURRENT LEGISLATION

The Eighty-second Congress faces a situation considerably different from that of 1944, when the GI bill was enacted. Instead of a flood of millions of men (9,000,000 were released between June 1945 and June 1946) returning to civilian life after an extended period of active service in a war of world-wide proportions, (a little more than 8,000,000 veterans took advantage of the GI bill, some 2,500,000 of them attended an institution of higher education) only 20,000 men per month are now being discharged. By the fall of 1952 approximately 500,000 men who have served on active duty since June 1950 will have been released to civilian life. These veterans have an average of 2 years of service in the Armed Forces of currently around 3,500,000 men, mustered for the long-range garrison economy of partial mobilization resulting from the Korean conflict. Since these men will be returning to civil life in relatively small numbers over a long period of time, there is no reason to expect that those who take advantage of educational benefits will overcrowd educational institutions.

Any new program of education and training, provided to recompense veterans for interruption of their normal progress, will probably last much longer than the program conceived in 1944 when Public Law 346 was enacted. The present Selective Service Act runs to 1955, and will undoubtedly be extended unless the world situation improves. Any new veterans' program, then, will mean a more or less permanent and extended outlay of national funds for thousands of veterans for an indefinite period in the future.

Certain benefits given World War II veterans have already been extended to Korean veterans in the application of Public Law 16 for the disabled. The real problem is not whether there should be a new GI bill for veterans other than those physically disabled, but rather what should the new bill provide in the light of new conditions and the present problems arising from military service under partial mobilization.

The present proposed program for veterans' education and training may well serve

to set the policy pattern for any future program of financial aid or scholarship at the Federal level providing education in our colleges and universities.

SUMMARY OF SOME ARGUMENTS WHICH HAVE BEEN ADVANCED FOR AND AGAINST EACH OF THE THREE TYPES OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION IN RELATION TO MODE OF PAYMENT

H. R. 6377, extension of educational benefits of Public Law 346

Arguments For

1. Direct payments to all types of institutions would be made by the Federal Government on the basis of tuition or determined instructional costs as heretofore.

2. Can be defended as sound Government policy, in that payment is based on demonstrable costs.

3. Assures veteran of receiving complete subsidy for his education at any type of institution he chooses.

4. Lessens the pressure toward increase of customary fees for nonveteran students.

5. All veterans would receive the same benefits as those of World War II.

Arguments Against

1. Involves complicated fiscal relationships, including contracting, determination of formulas, auditing, etc., with Federal Government.

2. Is subject to attack as a program of aid to institutions rather than veterans, since usual sources of support for institution would not contribute to educational cost for veteran students.

3. Involves no financial responsibility on the part of the veteran for his own education.

4. Involves substantial administrative costs for the institution and the Federal Government.

5. Over-all cost imposes too great a burden upon the national economy as a long-range policy.

S. 1940, H. R. 5038, H. R. 5040, similar to Public Law 346, but lesser payment

Arguments For

1. Would require the veteran to contribute substantially to the cost of his education.

2. Would reduce cost to the Government by reducing the amount of payment to educational institutions.

3. Would continue in some degree, the principle and procedures enunciated in the original GI bill (Public Law 346).

Arguments Against

1. Would involve dual billing and collection by the institution (once to the Federal Government and once to the veteran), with no increase in revenue to cover extra administrative costs. For institutions with low fees, administrative costs would be a substantial part of tuition income.

2. Would retain direct fiscal relationships between the Veterans' Administration and educational institutions, through which some degree of control could be exercised.

3. For some institutions would raise the question of whether payment of only half the fee would cause veterans to seek low-tuition institutions.

4. Would require considerable administrative and fiscal machinery in the Veterans' Administration.

5. Would exert some pressure toward raising total tuition and fees to $600.

6. Would exert pressure on the institution to remit the half of the tuition not paid by the Federal Government.

H. R. 7656 (Teague) and H. R. 7642 (Rankin), payments only to veteran

Arguments For

1. The veteran student would be in the same relationship to the institution as the nonveteran.

2. The student would be required to assume a part of the financial responsibility for his education.

3. Fiscal relationships between the Veterans' Administration and the institutions would be reduced and hence result in the proportionate reduction of possibility of control through fiscal power over institutions or programs.

4. Costly administrative overhead would be reduced both in institutions and in the Federal Government.

5. Customary sources of support of the institution would resume their normal pre-World War II status, and there would be no tendency to increase fees because federally paid.

6. Distribution of students between types of institutions would remain about the same as in a normal period without a veterans' program, since this plan takes existing financial resources and adds a flat sum to them.

Arguments Against

1. This plan of payment would cause veterans to seek low-cost institutions.

2. Monthly payments to veterans would cause difficulty in the collection of tuition and fees in advance as is now required at most institutions.

3. For institutions with relatively low or no fees, the Federal Government should assume responsibility for a greater share of the educational cost of veterans than is provided by the customary fee.

4. Lack of direct fiscal relationships between the Veterans' Administration and the educational institution leaves the Government without power to correct abuses by withholding payments.

COMMITTEE ON RELATIONSHIPS OF HIGHER EDUCATION TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Members

J. L. Morrill, chairman; president, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

Leonard Carmichael, president, Tufts College, Medford, Mass.

Carter Davidson, president, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.

Virgil M. Hancher, president, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

John A. Hannah, president, Michigan State College, East Lansing, Mich.

Henry T. Heald, chancelor, New York University, New York, N. Y.

Althea K. Hottel, Dean of Women, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Charles S. Johnson, president, Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn.

Deane W. Malott, president, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

Hugh G. Price, dean, Montgomery Junior College, Takoma Park, Md.

Edward B. Rooney, S.J., executive director, Jesuit Educational Association, 49 East Eighty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.

Richard H. Shryock, director, Institute of the History of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Raymond Walters, president, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Roscoe L. West, president, State Teachers College, Trenton, N. J.

Consultants

Jesse P. Bogue, executive secretary, American Association of Junior Colleges, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

Helen D. Bragdon, general director, American Association of University Women, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Robert P. Fischelis, secretary, American Pharmaceutical Association, 2215 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

Ralph E. Himstead, general secretary, American Association of University Professors, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

Frederick G. Hochwalt (Right Reverend Monsignor) secretary general, National Catholic Educational Association, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

Francis H. Horn, executive secretary, Department of Higher Education, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

James McCaskill, director, Division of Legislative & Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C.

Howard A. Meyerhoff, administrative secretary, American Association for Advancement of Science, 1515 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

M. D. Mobley, executive secretary, American Vocational Association, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

Guy E. Snavely, executive director, Association of American Colleges, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

Russell I. Thackrey, executive secretary, Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

M. H. Trytten, director, Office of Scientific Personnel, National Research Council, 2101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

J. Fletcher Wellemeyer, consultant, American Council of Learned Societies, 1219 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Edward H. Litchfield, executive director, American Political Science Association, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

Capt. J. J. O'Donnell, United States Navy, Chief, Education Branch, Armed Forces, I and E Division, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Building T-7, Gravelly Point, Washington, D. C.

Ernest V. Hollis, Division of Higher Education, United States Office of Education, Federal Security Building, Washington, D. C.

Commander W. D. Thompson, United States Navy, Office of Public Information, National Organizations Branch, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Washington, D. C.

QUESTIONNAIRE ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS TO VETERANS

Your judgment is sought as to which of the three alternatives listed below most nearly expresses the action you believe to be sound national policy in providing educational benefits to veterans discharged since June 27, 1950.

Please put a check mark in the box of only the one statement which best reflects your judgment.

(a) Benefits on essentially the same basis as the educational program provided by the present GI bill (Public Law 346); i. e., payment of tuition, fees, cost of books, supplies and equipment to the institution and a monthly subsistence allowance to the veteran? (See par. 1 and arguments re H. R. 6377.) 313.

(b) Payment to the institution of one-half the customary tuition up to a maximum total tuition limit of $600 and a monthly subsistence allowance to the veteran, such allowance to include an allotment for books, supplies, and equipment? (See par. 2 and arguments re S. 1940; H. R. 5038, H. R. 5040.) 48.

(c) A flat-rate monthly scholarship paid directly to the veteran which he can apply on the total cost of his education? (Teague and Rankin bills, see par. 3 and arguments re H. R. 7656 and H. R. 7642.) 232.

Here is a statement from the National Association of State Approval Agencies supporting this measure and opposing the Springer amendment. It reads as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE APPROVAL AGENCIES,
Jefferson City, Mo., June 3, 1952.

To: Members of the House of Representatives of the United States, Eighty-second Congress.

From: P. Larry McKeever, president.

Subject: H. R. 7656, coming before House of Representatives for vote Thursday, June 5, 1952.

For the benefit of the veteran and in the interest of taxpayers, we sincerely urge your favorable consideration when this bill comes

to the floor for vote. Your assistance will enhance legislation for Korean veterans without further delay.

We express unanimous approval of the principle of direct payment to the veteran. We solicit your support to defeat the Springer amendment as we feel it is a selfish attempt by a small group of private schools to receive a larger take in Federal tuition payments and defeat the principle of H. R. 7656 in eliminating certain abuses discovered by Congressman TEAGUE'S House Select Committee to Investigate Education and Training Programs under the GI bill. Your favorable vote on H. R. 7656 in its present form on June 5 will eliminate further consideration of the Springer amendment, which is meant only as Federal aid to a favored group.

As director of veterans' and adult education, State of Missouri, and president of the National Association of State Approval Agencies, we seek your allegiance to the Korean veteran by your favorable vote for H. R. 7656 without further amendment.

Now here is one from the American Vocational Association, Inc., which also expresses strong opposition to the so-called Springer amendment. It reads as follows:

AMERICAN VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Washington, D. C., June 4, 1952.

To: All Members of the House of Representatives.

Subject: Readjustment bill for Korean veterans, H. R. 7656.

The American Vocational Association, composed of teachers, officials, and lay friends of vocational education located in all States and in virtually every community in the Nation, is strongly opposed to the Springer amendment to H. R. 7656. The members of the American Vocational Association are in favor of the principle included in the present bill of paying tuition and subsistence directly to veteran students.

Direct payment of tuition and subsistence to veterans will eliminate troublesome negotiations in making contracts with the officials of the Veterans' Administration and will thus result in less danger of Federal domination and control of both public and private schools. It will also tend to eliminate abuses that occurred under the present GI bill of rights (Public Law 346 as amended).

We hope that you will see fit to vote for the Teague bill (H. R. 7656) on Thursday, June 5, 1952, in order for this proposal to become law at an early date. The Korean veterans are now returning to their homes in sizable numbers. They should be permitted to begin at once to reenter educational institutions and training programs and thus, so far as possible, offset any loss of educational opportunities resulting from their service in the Armed Forces.

Respectfully submitted.

M. D. MOBLEY,
Executive Secretary.

This measure has been prepared by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I am chairman, with a view to taking care of those veterans who are now offering up their lives on foreign soil, and of providing certain benefits for their widows and orphans. As I said, I hope this measure will pass without a dissenting vote, and that the Senate will approve it without delay.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

VETERANS' EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1952

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H. R. 7656) to provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date, as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress, as amended.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the bill now before the House is to provide education and training and other benefits for persons serving in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950. This legislation for the benefit of our Korean GI's is extremely meritorious and should have the support of every Member of this House. It is regrettable that there has been such a long delay in bringing the bill before the House.

The bill will provide benefits which have not yet been enacted for the Korean veterans in the same general fields in which comparable benefits have previously been granted to veterans of World War II. Thus, besides education and training benefits, the bill provides home, farm, and business loan credit assistance, old-age and survivors' insurance credits, mustering-out payments, and employment assistance.

Furthermore, this is an effort and attempt to provide readjustment assistance for those men who have had their normal civilian life interrupted by reason of their service since the outbreak of fighting in Korea.

The care with which the bill has been drawn by the Veterans Committee of the House is commendable. The committee with the help of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, AMVETS, Veterans' Administrator, departments of Government, and other interested parties has done a really good job, although there are some provisions which I think could have been improved if the bill had been permitted to come before the House under a rule that would have permitted amendments.

However, I am pleased at the opportunity that is afforded to vote for this worthwhile legislation. I do so with the hope and expectation that in the event any deficiencies develop during its administration, then, amendments to correct the same can and will be passed by the Congress.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge immediate unanimous House approval of this measure to give our Korean war veterans the full privileges and entitlements they so richly deserve and which have been too long delayed.

I would like to congratulate my former associates on the Veterans' Affairs Committee who have worked long and faithfully to present a bill freed from the abuses and deficiencies experience demonstrated was attached to the operation of previous veterans' education and rehabilitation programs. There is, of course, no such thing as a perfect piece of legislation that will satisfy everyone, and there are perhaps some provisions of this measure that will prove faulty; if so, they can be corrected by future amendment.

In my conviction, the two important parties of primary consideration in legislation of this kind are the veterans and the taxpayers.

The committee has done an excellent job of including provisions designed to remove excessive red-tape operation, encourage more efficient administration, and placed barriers against financial abuses to insure the money of the underwriting taxpayers will not be spent needlessly and indiscriminately.

The veterans are being extended practically every educational and rehabilitation benefit accorded the World War II participants, with the additional dignified feature of making payments directly to the veteran himself. This policy does away with the enormous amount of record keeping and duplicating procedures that was shown to be costly and overlapping in past experience. In making money payments directly to the veteran instead of the educational institution, we are merely affirming the obvious fact that those who discharged their war service responsibilities with such eminent success are certainly capable of handling their own finances and planning their own educational ambitions.

There are, according to authorized figures, about 800,000 Korean war veterans already discharged now waiting to continue pursuit of the personal civilian ambitions and desires they patriotically gave up to defend the honor and security of this Nation; many thousands more will renew their private lives and endeavors in the near future.

It is but simple justice, therefore to speedily enact this measure authorizing their entrance into the rehabilitation and educational opportunities owed to them by a grateful country. They willingly fulfilled their military obligation and this is the hour for us to discharge our debt and responsibility to them.

I earnestly urge immediate approval of this legislation and hope it will be accorded the unanimous vote of the House so that procedure will be initiated to guarantee its enactment into law before any temporary adjournment may occur.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I must be absent from the floor of the House today attending the graduation exercises of my son and his school in Massachusetts. I would like to have the RECORD show that I approve entirely and support H. R. 7656, the veterans' education and training bill, and hope that it will be enacted promptly. Certainly, the veterans who have served in the United Nations army in Korea are just as much entitled to the same benefits as those who served in our Armed Forces in World War II. The fighting is bitter, the terrain

and the weather are tough, and the service has been required of these young men just as it was in World War II.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the Teague bill to extend veteran benefits to the Korean GI's is an excellent bill, and most timely brought up for consideration. It incorporates many of the benefits given the GI of World War II and makes them now available for veterans of Korea. The committee has labored long and carefully in drafting this bill. It has incorporated in the bill many features of great interest to veterans generally, and has sought to take out of the law features objectionable in the operation of the veterans' program.

I note that provision for the unemployment compensation for veterans has been left out of the bill. I understand that this was done in order that a separate study might be given this important subject. I am sure the committee handling this matter will go to work promptly giving this subject its attention and thought.

So important have I felt this measure was that I actively engaged in the handling of the bill when it came to the floor this past Monday. I worked a great deal in explaining some of the provisions of the bill and in supporting it actively on the floor of the House. We were not able to vote at that time on the measure, but the vote was set down especially today. I remained over in Washington for the express reason to vote on this and other important legislation affecting our cotton farmers today.

I want to commend the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for reporting this bill to the House. I would have personally liked some different arrangements regarding private and sectarian schools but I hope this difference of opinion may be ironed out by the Senate before this bill becomes law. The bill will shortly be voted on and I hope it passes the House by a unanimous vote.

Many months ago I stated publicly that I thought veterans' benefits should be extended to the Korean GI. I am especially impressed with the value of educational benefits given those men who bear arms for their nation in times of distress. These benefits go far toward giving the GI the best education of any group of people within the United States, and I hope that time will show that our GI veteran as a group is as well, if not better, educated than other groups in the United States.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 361, nays 1, answered "present" 2, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 92]

YEAS—361

Abbitt	Andresen,	Baker
Abernethy	August H.	Barden
Adair	Andrews	Baring
Addonizio	Anfuso	Barrett
Albert	Angell	Bates, Ky.
Allen, Calif.	Arends	Bates, Mass.
Allen, Ill.	Armstrong	Battle
Allen, La.	Aspinall	Beall
Andersen,	Auchincloss	Beamer
H. Carl	Ayres	Belcher
Anderson, Calif.	Bailey	Bender
Bennett, Fla.	Greenwood	Mumma
Bennett, Mich.	Gregory	Murdock
Bentsen	Gross	Murphy
Berry	Gwinn	Murray
Betts	Hagen	Nelson
Bishop	Hall,	Nicholson
Boggs, Del.	Edwin Arthur	Norblad
Boggs, La.	Hall,	O'Brien, Ill.
Bolling	Leonard W.	O'Brien, Mich.
Bolton	Halleck	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bonner	Hand	O'Hara
Bosone	Harden	O'Konski
Bow	Hardy	O'Neill
Boykin	Harris	Osmers
Bray	Harrison, Nebr.	Ostertag
Brown, Ga.	Harrison, Va.	O'Toole
Brown, Ohio	Harrison, Wyo.	Passman
Brownson	Hart	Patman
Bryson	Harvey	Patten
Buchanan	Hays, Ark.	Patterson
Budge	Hays, Ohio	Perkins
Burleson	Hébert	Philbin
Burnside	Heffernan	Phillips
Burton	Heller	Pickett
Busbey	Herlong	Poage
Bush	Herter	Polk
Butler	Heselton	Poulson
Byrnes	Hess	Preston
Camp	Hill	Price
Canfield	Hoeven	Priest
Cannon	Hoffman, Ill.	Prouty
Carnahan	Hoffman, Mich.	Rabaut
Carrigg	Holmes	Radwan
Case	Horan	Rains
Celler	Howell	Ramsay
Chatham	Hull	Rankin
Chelf	Ikard	Reams
Chenoweth	Irving	Reece, Tenn.
Chiperfield	Jackson, Wash.	Reed, Ill.
Chudoff	James	Reed, N. Y.
Church	Jarman	Rhodes
Clemente	Jenison	Ribicoff
Clevenger	Jensen	Richards
Cole, N. Y.	Jonas	Riehlman
Colmer	Jones, Ala.	Riley
Combs	Jones, Mo.	Rivers
Cooper	Jones,	Roberts
Corbett	Hamilton C.	Robeson
Cotton	Jones,	Rodino
Coudert	Woodrow W.	Rogers, Colo.
Cox	Judd	Rogers, Fla.
Crosser	Karsten, Mo.	Rogers, Mass.
Crumpacker	Kean	Rogers, Tex.
Cunningham	Kearney	Rooney
Curtis, Nebr.	Kearns	Roosevelt
Dague	Kee	Ross
Davis, Ga.	Kelley, Pa.	St. George
Davis, Wis.	Kelly, N. Y.	Sasscer
Deane	Keogh	Saylor
DeGraffenried	Kersten, Wis.	Schenck
Delaney	Kilburn	Scott, Hardie
Dempsey	Kilday	Scott,
Denny	King, Pa.	Hugh D. Jr.
D'Ewart	Kirwan	Scrivner
Dingell	Klein	Scudder
Dollinger	Kluczynski	Secrest
Dolliver	Lane	Seely-Brown
Dondero	Lanham	Shafer
Donohue	Lantaff	Sheehan
Dorn	Larcade	Shelley
Doughton	Latham	Sieminski
Durham	LeCompte	Sikes
Eaton	Lesinski	Simpson, Ill.
Eberharter	Lind	Simpson, Pa.
Elliott	Lucas	Sittler
Ellsworth	McCarthy	Smith, Kans.
Elston	McConnell	Smith, Miss.
Engle	McCulloch	Smith, Va.
Evins	McDonough	Smith, Wis.
Fallon	McGrath	Spence
Feighan	McGregor	Springer
Fernandez	McGuire	Staggers
Fine	McMillan	Stanley
Fisher	McMullen	Steed
Flood	Machrowicz	Stockman
Fogarty	Mack, Ill.	Taber
Forand	Mack, Wash.	Talle
Ford	Madden	Taylor
Forrester	Magee	Teague
Fugate	Mahon	Thomas
Fulton	Mansfield	Thompson,
Furcolo	Marshall	Mich.
Garmatz	Martin, Mass.	Thompson, Tex.
Gary	Mason	Thornberry
Gathings	Meader	Tollefson
Gavin	Merrow	Trimble
George	Miller, Md.	Vail
Golden	Miller, Nebr.	Van Pelt
Goodwin	Miller, N.Y.	Van Zandt
Gordon	Mills	Velde
Gore	Mitchell	Vinson
Graham	Morgan	Vorys
Granahan	Morrison	Vursell
Granger	Morton	Walter
Grant	Moulder	Watts
Green	Multer	Weichel
Wharton	Williams, N. Y.	Wolverton
Whitten	Willis	Wood, Idaho
Wickersham	Wilson, Tex.	Woodruff
Widnall	Winstead	Yates
Wigglesworth	Withrow	Yorty
Williams, Miss.	Wolcott	Zablocki

NAYS—1

Devereux

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Dawson Powell

NOT VOTING—67

Aandahl	Hale	Miller, Calif.
Bakewell	Havenner	Morano
Beckworth	Hedrick	Morris
Blackney	Hillings	Norrell
Blatnik	Hinshaw	Potter
Bramblett	Holifield	Redden
Brehm	Hope	Rees, Kans.
Brooks	Hunter	Regan
Buckley	Jackson, Calif.	Sabath
Buffett	Javits	Sadlak
Burdick	Jenkins	Sheppard
Carlyle	Johnson	Short
Cole, Kans.	Keating	Stigler
Cooley	Kennedy	Sutton
Crawford	Kerr	Tackett
Curtis, Mo.	King, Calif.	Welch
Davis, Tenn.	Lovre	Werdel
Denton	Lyle	Wheeler
Donovan	McCormack	Wier
Doyle	McIntire	Wilson, Ind.
Fenton	McKinnon	Wood, Ga.
Frazier	McVey	
Gamble	Martin, Iowa	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Jenkins with Mr. McCormack.
Mr. Short with Mr. Sabath.
Mr. Gamble with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. McIntire with Mr. Denton.
Mr. Werdel with Mr. Kennedy.
Mr. Hale with Mr. Holifield.
Mr. Keating with Mr. Regan.
Mr. Jackson of California with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. Sadlak with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Hope with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Potter with Mr. Tavenner.
Mr. Brehm with Mr. Kerr.
Mr. Lovre with Mr. McKinnon.
Mr. Bakewell with Mr. Miller of California.
Mr. Johnson with Mr. Morris.
Mr. Blackney with Mr. Frazier.
Mr. Aandahl with Mr. Doyle.
Mr. Hillings with Mr. Donovan.
Mr. Bramblett with Mr. Norrell
Mr. Hinshaw with Mr. Lyle.
Mr. Hunter with Mr. Wier.
Mr. Javits with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Cooley.
Mr. Rees of Kansas with Mr. King of California.
Mr. Fenton with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Morano with Mr. Beckworth.
Mr. Curtis of Missouri with Mr. Brooks.
Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. Carlyle.
Mr. Crawford with Mr. Hedrick.
Mr. McVey with Mr. Sutton.
Mr. Cole of Kansas with Mr. Wheeler.
Mr. Burdick with Mr. Tackett.
Mr. Buffett with Mr. Redden.

Mr. POWELL changed his vote from "yea" to "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

KOREAN VETERANS BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, official business at the Department of Agriculture caused my absence from the Chamber at the time the vote was taken on roll call No. 92 on the bill H. R. 7656. Had I been here my vote would have been "yea." I ask unanimous consent that these remarks follow the roll call vote on H. R. 7656.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, on the roll call on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 7656, the Veterans' Educational Assistance Act of 1952, I was unavoidably detained just ouside the Chamber on the affairs of a constituent and was not informed that the roll call was being concluded. If I had been present I would have voted "yea." I introduced a similar measure myself in this session to give veterans of service after June 27, 1950, the full benefit of the GI bill as given to veterans of World War II. I was present on Monday last, June 2, for the debate on this bill and rose here immediately before the vote to obtain a roll call.

KOREAN VETERANS BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am for this bill 100 percent and think it should be passed now. Any opposition to it seems to me to be out of place in this national crisis, because we are only trying to do for the Korean veterans what has already been done for the veterans of World War II. Oftentimes in traveling about in my district I hear the remarks made, "Too much is being done for the veterans. We are babying them."

What if the enemy was coming down through Canada and another group coming up through Mexico, who would we call on to save the United States of America and our very lives? The serviceman, of course.

Many thousands of our boys have been killed in Korea. Why should we not take care of their widows and families and others who were depending on them for support? Why should we not be willing to sacrifice to give these benefits to those fortunate enough to come back to make up just a little bit for the financial losses they sustained while fighting our cause?

We frequently find the ones doing the loudest complaining are those who did not have to go to the service or who do not have a relative in uniform. This is not always the case, but it is frequently that way.

On the other hand we have to do things within reason but I think this is a fair and reasonable bill; therefore, I think we as Members of this House should vote for it.

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that at long last the Veterans' Committee has brought to the House for action this urgently needed and just legislation to grant to our boys engaged in the Korean conflict benefits similar to those granted the GIs of World War II under Public Law 346 of the Seventy-eighth Congress. I salute the committee for its forthright decision to eliminate the flimsy distinctions between Korean veterans and those of World War II. This bill, of course, is not perfect in all details in that it does not extend all of the benefits, but it is a step in the right direction. Once having passed the basic law it will be comparatively simple to iron out the inequities by amendments. Good common sense dictates prompt approval of the measure before the House.

To our boys in Korea the present conflict in which they are engaged is not police action; it is war. To our people at home, their husbands, sons, and fathers are at war. They have been placed in the uniform of our country and are active members of the armed services of the United States. Guns have been placed in their hands; they have maimed and killed the enemy and in turn have been maimed and killed themselves. They are at war, and let us call it what we will—undeclared war, cold war, or police action—to our boys lying in hospital beds and to their families at home, it is a real war in all its horrible aspects and consequences. As of May 23 last, 19,219 of our American boys have lost their lives. Seventy-nine thousand two hundred and sixty-eight have been wounded, of which 1,791 have died of such wounds. One thousand two hundred and four are listed as prisoners of war and 9,696 are currently missing in action. They are fighting and have fought for the same freedom for which their buddies fought in World War I and World War II. Then why delay in granting to them the rights and privileges accorded said buddies?

I can realize that it was necessary to make some changes and to plug loopholes to correct the abuses arising from the administration of Public Law 346 on which the bill before us is patterned. Now that work is completed let us fulfill our obligations by extending to all veterans of the Korean hostilities who served from the beginning on June 27, 1950, to the end, whenever that may be, every benefit voted for veterans of former wars.

I am particularly interested in having Title III, Housing, put into effect without delay. Korean veterans returning home are confronted with serious housing problems and are resentful when advised that the preferences accorded to veterans of previous wars have not been accorded to them—and rightfully so. They have been called upon to serve in a conflict which has jeopardized their civilian advancement as completely as did those who served in other wars and must not be discriminated against in any way. I am wholeheartedly in favor of this bill and will vote for its passage.

1952 COTTON PARITY STANDARD

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 658 for further consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5713) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide that Low Middling ⅞-inch cotton shall be the standard grade for the purposes of determining parity and price support for the 1952 cotton crop. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi explained this rule the other day. I know of no one on this side who is opposed to the rule, although some are opposed to the bill itself.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5713) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide that Low Middling ⅞-inch cotton shall be the standard grade for the purposes of determining parity and price support for the 1952 cotton crop.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5713, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, before going into the objective and effect of this bill I think I should first give a little background and relate the events and experiences which lead to this legislation.

In January 1952, possibly earlier, the Secretary of Agriculture announced the agricultural production goals for all crops for the year 1952. Among the goals was a proposed cotton crop of 16,000,000 bales.

Mr. Chairman, such a crop is unusually large. Only in 6 years in all the history of cotton production have farmers produced a crop of such magnitude, and only twice in the last 20 years has such a crop been produced. The 1952 goal is approximately 900,000 bales more than was produced in 1951, which crop itself was regarded as unusually large.

Mr. Chairman, in the production of a 16,000,000-bale crop of cotton there are very unusual and dangerous risks involved. Under the present status of our cotton program, farmers are not only called upon by their Government to produce the large crop but they are expected to assume all of the risks even though the crop is to be produced in the interest of national defense. If it should result that our country will not need for the purposes of national defense, for domestic consumption and export, the quantity of cotton included in this goal, then it is quite possible that farmers will again have thrust upon them acreage allotments which they abhor and which all of us abhor.

It is also quite possible that such a large crop will plunge cotton to a price level that will not reflect the actual cost of production. Furthermore, in planting for a 16,000,000-bale crop it is possible to produce, under the most favorable conditions, 17, 17½, or even 18 million bales. Either would be disastrous and the cotton farmer would not only pay the penalty of having to sell his cotton at a disastrously low price, but would in all probability find himself producing cotton under controls for several years. These are the risks which farmers are expected to assume. For whose interest? For their country's interest, for the interest of everyone, in the interest of national defense. Since the appeal is made in the interest of everyone, then I feel that the risks involved should be eliminated and that is what my bill purports to do.

What is the basis for this large goal? I have before me the 1952 Production Goals Handbook, issued by the United States Department of Agriculture. From the foreword of the handbook and over the signature of the secretary I quote the following:

> If plantings are in line with the goals and if yields come up to expectation, our people will have enough food, the pressing requirements of military preparedness will be filled, and we can continue to help the peoples allied with us in defense of freedom.

On page 54 of the handbook under the subject of cotton I find this language:

> The 1952 production goal of 16,000,000 bales of cotton reflects the continuing need for increased production for military, defense, and essential civilian requirements.

Quoting further from another paragraph:

> Therefore, cotton producers are urged to select the most suitable land and make the best possible use of all available resources in 1952 in order that another large cotton crop may be produced efficiently and marketed in an orderly manner.

There, Mr. Chairman, is the appeal by the Department of Agriculture to cotton farmers to produce a crop which has been equaled only six times in all history and for what purpose? I repeat again. In the interest of national defense. For whose benefit? If it is in the interest of national defense then it is for the benefit of every man, woman, and child in America.

After the goal was established, what then took place? Employees in the Department of Agriculture then fixed goals for each State, and thereafter broke the goals down to each county. Information then went down to the county PMA administrative officials whose duty it is to work among farmers and urge them to meet the production goal. This procedure applies to all crops.

They then called in the county committees and the precinct committees, and these committeemen were informed as to the goal. They were then charged with the responsibility of contacting the farm people and informing them of the goal for the community, for the county, the State, and Nation. Farmers were impressed with the fact that the goal was in the interest of national defense. The language which I have just read to you from the Agricultural Handbook was cited and an appeal was made to their patriotism to produce the large crop.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I know very little about cotton, so will the gentleman explain to me what precisely is meant by "middling," and, what is it, "seven-eighths"?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I will get down to that in just a few minutes.

In addition to the pleas, which I have just described, made to farmers to produce this extraordinary crop, every PMA administrative officer in the Cotton Belt received a suggested piece of publicity from the Department of Agriculture, with the request that it be published in the local papers. For what purpose? To further urge farmers to produce this large crop in the interest of national defense. I have before me a clipping taken from one of the county papers in my district. The subject is the "1952 Cotton Goal." This piece of publicity is in the nature of a bleeding appeal to cotton farmers to use their best land and toil hard and long hours to produce this large crop in the interest of national defense.

So, Mr. Chairman, the production of this quantity of cotton is as much a defense measure as is the production of machines and the direct materials of war. It is generally accepted that in order to secure all-out industrial production it is necessary to provide incentives in the form of loans, accelerated tax amortization, cost-plus contracts, bonuses, and higher wages, plus an assurance to the manufacturer that he will not be forced to sustain any loss if the need for his product should not be as great as anticipated, leading to the cancellation of his contract. In the case of cotton needed for defense, however, the accepted theory appears to be that it is only necessary to appeal to the patriotic motives of farmers, tell them how much the Government wants them to produce, and leave them to take all the risk of financial loss if they accidentally produce more than is needed or if the Department of Agriculture has overestimated the need for their product.

Mr. Chairman, I take the position it is wrong for our Government to call upon any segment of our economy to produce a crop, or a machine, or any article in the interest of national defense without giving reasonable protection against a price break to a level below the cost of production. This might well happen to cotton farmers this fall.

The mere anticipation of a large crop was sufficient in 1951 to send cotton down more than 10 cents per pound and virtually to support levels.

Since the spring of 1951, the prices of almost everything that goes into the cost of producing cotton have increased. Wage rates for day labor, for example, have gone up 12 percent; the cost of machinery, fertilizers, insecticides, and other supplies have generally advanced. Mr. Chairman, if farmers are forced to sell their cotton in 1952 at the present support level, many of them will not get back their cost of production.

The quality of cotton is largely determined by the length of time that it remains open in the field before being picked. Unpicked, open cotton is subject to damage from wind, rainfall, and dust. To assure a high quality crop, every farmer attempts to pick his crop as soon as it opens. This requires several pickings for each field. Unfortunately, in years of large crops, it is impossible to pick the cotton as rapidly as it opens. This inevitably results in a lower quality crop.

In 1947, the farmers produced 11,900,000 bales of cotton. In 1949, the crop was 16,100,000, which was an exceptionally large crop, and which incidentally is almost exactly the goal for 1952. For the smaller crop, the 1947 crop, almost three-fourths of it had been harvested and ginned by the first of November, whereas in the case of the large crop, the 1949 crop, less than 60 percent had been harvested and ginned. To further illustrate how a large crop delays picking, the same number of bales were picked and ginned during the month of October for the years 1947 and 1949, whereas in the month of November, the number of bales picked and ginned in 1949 was almost three times the amount in 1947. This clearly shows it was impossible for farmers to pick a larger crop as rapidly as it opened. There is no question but that the quality of the 1947 crop was far superior. For example, the portion of the 1947 crop which graded Middling or better was 94 percent larger than that for the 1949 crop. The whiteness has a tremendous influence on the grade and quality. A further substantiation of the

fact that the larger 1949 crop was much lower in quality is conclusively revealed in that the 1949 crop contained a third more cotton which was spotted and tinged than did the 1947 crop. To show that the delayed picking lowers quality, in 1949 of all the spotted cotton in the crop, 80 percent was picked and ginned after November 1 compared with only 50 percent for the 1947 crop. Comparison of other grade variations and characteristics between these two crops further substantiates the fact that the quality of the cotton crop is directly related to the size of the crop.

On this point a high administrative official of the Department of Agriculture made the following statement before our committee:

> We recognize that with a big crop the longer the crop stays in the field your grades automatically go down.

This naturally results in the farmers receiving a lower price for their crop because of the lower grade. The present standard grade for the purpose of determining parity and price support is 7/8-inch Middling cotton. The purpose of my bill is to lower the standard to 7/8-inch Low Middling, which will have the effect of offsetting at least a part of the anticipated low price which farmers will receive for their crop on meeting the 16,000,000-bale goal. It will have the effect of increasing the support price 3.45 cents per pound, but will not be effective unless and until the Department estimates the crop at or above the goal. Furthermore the bill will have the effect of protecting farmers against a repetition of the unreasonable and unforgivable mistake which the Department made last year in estimating the crop at more than 2,000,000 bales above actual production. This forced cotton down to a very low level and brought heavy losses to farmers—especially small farmers—throughout the Cotton Belt.

There are many grades and staples of cotton. The present standard for the determination of parity and price support is 7/8-inch Middling. On the 15th day of July the Secretary of Agriculture determines the parity price for cotton. He does not determine parity for 7/8-inch Middling or for fifteen-sixteenths or for inch cotton, or for 7/8-inch Low Middling, or for any particular grade or staple, but just for cotton—all cotton. The law then requires him to treat that as the parity price for 7/8-inch Middling—the standard grade for determining parity and price support for all grades and staples. The support price is thereupon calculated for each staple and grade—upward for the better grades and staples and downward for the poorer grades and staples. The support-price spread is related to the generally recognized variations in market prices of the different grades and staples.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In connection with what the gentleman has said about changing the grade, what effect will that have upon support price, or how much does that increase the support price?

Mr. ABERNETHY. The support price will be 3.45 cents per pound higher than the present support price. However, that would be the case only in the event the crop reporting board estimates the crop at 16,000,000 bales or more. In other words, if farmers do not produce the crop, if they do not meet the Department's goal, then the support price will remain unchanged. What could be fairer? We only seek to eliminate the risk attendant to a large crop such as we have been called on to produce in 1952. Such a crop could wreck the price and in turn wreck my farmers. If we produce the crop in answer to our Government's appeal and in the interest of national defense, we only ask our Government to share a part of the risk. Certainly my colleagues will agree this is fair.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And what will that be in dollars and cents?

Mr. ABERNETHY. A guaranteed minimum support price of 35 cents per pound for cotton—not enough to keep us out of the poor house. That is almost exactly parity. It is six one-thousandths of 1 cent per pound above parity. In other words, it will mean that the farmer will receive only the absolute minimum of what he is entitled to as judged by the Government's own standards and laws.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In other words, instead of 7/8-inch Middling, it brings it down to Low Middling?

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is correct, which would be a standard proportionately in keeping with the quality of a 16,000,000-bale crop as compared with the present standard for a normal crop.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. On what day is that estimate made?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think the first estimate is made about the 10th day of August, as of August 1.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the estimate on that day be the one to govern the provisions of this bill?

Mr. ABERNETHY. It will if the crop reporting board estimates the crop at 16,000,000 bales or more.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman advise us as to the estimate of August 1951, on the 1951 crop?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am glad the gentleman asked me that question. That is the one thing the little cotton farmer will never forget as long as he lives. I will tell you what happened. That estimate was 17,266,000 bales. In other words, the Crop Reporting Board overestimated the 1951 crop in August of 1951 by more than 2,000,000 bales. The price was driven down more than 10 cents per pound. When the Board several months later brought its estimate more in line with what was actually produced, it was too late, the little farmer had already sold his cotton. This colossal error cost cotton farmers $150,000,000 and most of the loss was taken by small farmers who could not afford to hold their cotton. They must sell as soon as their cotton moves through the gin. They took a price beating that will never, never, never be forgotten. The net result of the Board's erroneous estimate was that farmers lost more money in 1951 from the action of the Board than they did from the inroads of either insects, floods, or bad weather.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me ask the gentleman this: What date was the second estimate made and what was the effect at that time?

Mr. ABERNETHY. The second estimate was made in September, and it increased the earlier estimate to 17,291,000 bales.

A third estimate was made in October, and they reduced it to 16,991,000 bales, but still quite too high and far above the actual yield.

Then came November and they reduced it by more than a million bales to 15,771,000. That was the largest reduction for a November estimate in all history of the Crop Reporting Board. There is positively no precedent for such. Even then the Board's estimate was over 600,000 bales above the actual yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me ask the gentleman this: Had most of the cotton passed out of the hands of the cotton farmers before the last estimate which brought the production down to around 15,000,000 bales?

Mr. ABERNETHY. No; I would not say that most of it had. There was a strong movement of cotton into the loan as well as a withholding movement. Many sensed there was something wrong and that sooner or later the price would improve, and it did improve. But it was too late for the little fellows—the small growers. They could not hold. They had to sell. They most always have to sell just as soon as their cotton is ginned.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What I am trying to get at, I may say to my very able and distinguished colleague, is this: We are interested, and I know the gentleman is very much interested, in trying to protect the interests of the producer. Had this cotton if it had passed out of the cotton farmer's hand at the time the estimate was around 17,000,000 or 16,900,000, we know the price was depressed because of the higher estimate and the anticipated production; then the lower estimate was made down around 15,000,000 bales. Now, if the cotton farmer had held on to his cotton he would have been better off. I assume a good many did.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Some did; some did not.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The price went up after the lower estimate came in; he would have had the advantage of that increase in price. Is not that correct?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes; that is true. Of course, no one absolutely knows which way the price will go. However, many producers felt that the estimate was considerably out of line and that the price would improve. As a result there was a tremendous movement of cotton into the loan. The price had gradually moved downward to near support price levels as a result of the crop reporting board's reports. Then as it went back up those who could and did use the loan pulled their cotton out and sold it at a fair price.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Can the gentleman tell us if there was any

great activity in the cotton futures market when these high estimates came in and produced the price that these speculators who speculate in cotton could load up on future contracts at a lower price and get the advantage of the price increase?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I do not know whether there was or not, I may say to my friend; but I will say to him that those of us who live in the smaller cotton producing areas like my own—made up of little family-sized farms that produce 5, 6, 7, or 8 bales of cotton—suspected and felt that there was a bug under the chip and that there was considerable speculation. All we actually know is that there was a considerable amount of money made and my farmers were not the ones who made it. Cotton had dropped from 44 cents to 34 cents and when the news finally got around that the board had overestimated the crop by 2,000,000 bales the price climbed back to 41 and 42 cents.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Were there many cotton farmers who reaped the benefit of that 8 or 9 cents a pound raise?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes, those who had held their cotton or had put it in the loan. But I would say that most of the farmers had sold.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The speculators were the ones who got the advantage of the increase in the price of cotton rather than the producer himself?

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. So the gentleman seeks by this bill, as I understand it, to protect the cotton producers before they sell their cotton so that they will get the advantage in the event a higher production is estimated?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes; but only if they respond to the appeal, the patriotic appeal, if you please, of their Government to produce this large crop in the interest of national defense. That is all we ask and we think it is fair. There is not a man in this House who knows anything about cotton but what he will tell you that farmers can make more money this year off thirteen or fourteen million bales of cotton than they can off of 16,000,000 bales.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We have the same problem in other commodities in agriculture.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I do not think there is any question about that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will not go into that now. For instance, I happen to come from a dairy area and we are threatened with unlimited imports of dairy products, peanuts, and things of that kind into this country. The gentleman knows what that will do to our economy.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I certainly do. I know what the gentleman's views are on that and I want to say that I have had the pleasure of supporting the gentleman's views on that point with my vote and I will do it again.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman generally shows very good judgment when it comes to supporting sound legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I am supporting the gentleman's bill. The Federal Government has made through the years the sum of $233,000,000 by its loan program on cotton alone. As a matter of fact, these loans at the beginning should have been made on a standard of Low Middling instead of Middling. In regard to the lowering of the price of cotton from 44 to 34 cents a pound, that was at a time when the tenant, the cropper, and the small farmer could not hold their cotton. They were forced to put it on the market at the lowest price. I think it is only fair and right that the gentleman's bill should pass without a dissenting vote.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, who is one of the real experts in this House on cotton.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. As I understand it, the gentleman said that the support price would move up from 90 percent of parity to 100 percent of parity.

Mr. ABERNETHY. No. In dollars and cents it would, for all purposes, result in that, but only if the farmers meet the Department's defense-production goal.

Mr. JAVITS. According to the data I have the ⅞-inch Low Middling sold on the spot market at roughly 20 cents a pound on May 27, 1952. Under the gentleman's bill the proposed loan rate would have been something like 3 cents in excess of that; is that correct?

Mr. ABERNETHY. My bill will increase the loan rate 3.45 cents per pound if the farmers meet the goal.

Mr. JAVITS. In other words, the support price would be above the present market?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I do not know whether it would be above the present market or not. That will have to be seen at harvest time.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman suggested that the spot market on cotton was down to around 20 cents?

Mr. JAVITS. On this particular ⅞ Low Middling grade, that is the figure I have.

Mr. POAGE. I am sure that is an excessively low figure. There is normally about a 10-percent difference between Middling and Low Middling. Middling cotton sold on May 20, according to the New York paper, on the spot market at 40.40.

Mr. JAVITS. Those are not the figures I have. The figures I have show that the Low Middling is only two-thirds the market price of the ⅞-inch; that is, the Low Middling tinge.

Mr. POAGE. Low middling tinge is an entirely different thing from Low Middling. The word "tinged" means that the cotton is discolored.

Mr. JAVITS. The difference between the ⅞-inch Middling and the ⅞ Low Middling is something in the area of 6 cents a pound; is that correct?

Mr. POAGE. I think it is probably a little less than that; probably about 3 or 4 cents at present prices.

Mr. JAVITS. I am only asking for information. Will the support price which is here sought in this bill result in setting a support price which is higher than the current market price for this low grade?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Let me answer the gentleman. The present parity price is about 35.10 cents per pound; the support price is 90 percent of that. Now under this bill if the farmers meet the goal in response to an appeal from their Government and in the interest of national defense then the support level would move up to 35.16 cents per pound, which is almost exactly parity. In other words, they will be getting almost exactly what their Government says is a fair minimum price for their crop.

Mr. JAVITS. Will that result in increasing the market price?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Certainly not. The market price right now is about 40 cents a pound or almost 5 cents above what the support price would be under my bill. All I am trying to do is to keep my farmers from going broke if they make a big crop in response to the Government's appeal.

Mr. JAVITS. If that is correct, the present price is something like the support price.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The present price is far above the support price.

Mr. JAVITS. There is a 5- or 6-cent differential this year. The spot figures I have shown for this Middling grade, which is apparently the standard now, ⅞-inch Middling grade, is 37.75 cents a pound on May 27, 1952, and for your ⅞-inch Low Middling 31.07 cents a pound on the same date.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman stated it was 20 cents a moment ago which, of course, was wrong.

Mr. JAVITS. No; I was wrong about that, and I made that clear. The figures I am giving now are the figures for those two grades I have been discussing.

Mr. ABERNETHY. And it is what?

Mr. JAVITS. Thirty-seven and seventy-five one-hundredths for the seven-eighths Middling and 31.07 cents for the ⅞-inch Low Middling.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Here is what the gentleman must bear in mind. The major portion of a normal crop would turn out considerably above ⅞-inch Middling. I am speaking of a normal crop in a normal year when the farmers have not planted the fence corners in cotton as the Department of Agriculture has asked them to do this year, they get a much better quality and staple of cotton. If they make the 16,000,000 bales this year and it stands in the field week after week, taking a beating from wind, rain and dust, waiting for pickers to come along and pick it, then, of course, the grade and quality

will be lower. It must be understood that it takes just as much land, just as much fertilizer, just as much seed and just as much sweat to produce one pound of ⅞-inch Low Middling or any other low grade as it does to produce one pound of a higher grade. It is not the farmer's fault that it turns out to be a lower grade. It turns out to be a lower grade because the crop was so large that he just could not get it harvested while the quality was good. So, all we ask is that our Government, upon whose appeal we produce the crop, underwrite us against a loss in quality which results from a large crop.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Mississippi has made one of the best arguments that I have heard in behalf of the cost of production bill which is before his committee and which the committee does not seem to want to consider.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am not completely familiar with the bill. No hearings have been held on it.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will admit, I am sure, that if the farmer were put upon a cost-of-production basis, a formula based on the cost of production, you would not be here now seeking this kind of legislation; it would not be necessary.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think the gentleman has something.

Mr. GROSS. Every argument that the gentleman has made here could be made in behalf of the corn and the oats farmers of the Middle West; is that not true?

Mr. ABERNETHY. And the wheat farmer.

Mr. GROSS. Then why do you not spread the good things of this life around in this bill, if it is a good bill?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am perfectly willing to help the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said that cotton is second only to steel in time of a national emergency such as we experience at this hour. Undoubtedly this must be the case or else our Secretary of Agriculture would not have made the strong appeal which he did make to our farmers to produce such an unusually large crop of cotton.

I should also like to say, Mr. Chairman, that our Government has never lost a dime on the cotton program. On the contrary, the program has been a profitable one, both for the Government and the farmer. The Government shows a net financial gain of $268,000,000 on cotton since the program first started.

Cotton is probably the best storable of all commodities. Should the Government be compelled to take over some cotton as a result of my bill—and I am reasonably confident it will not—then it can be held until the price improves and no losses will be sustained. Since it is a strategic material, it can and should be stockpiled in the interest of national defense.

The price which a farmer receives for his cotton is but a small part of the total cost of a finished item of cotton goods. Last year the price of a business shirt averaged $3.75 to the consumer. Out of this the farmer got only 33 cents. The farmer got only 88 cents out of a pair of overalls costing the consumer $3.85. The farmer received only 81 cents out of a sheet costing the housewife $3.

In other words, the farmer could have given away his cotton and the shirt costing the consumer $3.75 would still have cost him $3.42. The farmer could have given away his cotton and the pair of overalls costing $3.85 would still have cost $2.97. The farmer could have given away his cotton and the sheet costing $3 would still have cost $2.19. The additional security which we seek by my bill will not increase the cost of cotton to the consumer over and above the costs in the finished products I have just mentioned. My bill is not inflationary. It is not designed to raise prices. It is designed to keep farm income from dropping to a dangerously low level and in some instances below the cost of production.

In behalf of the toiling cotton farmers of our land, who are earnestly endeavoring to produce in the interest of national defense and in response to an appeal by their Government, I seek your support of my bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation was considered by our Committee on Agriculture in the nature of emergency legislation, the emergency being that the Department of Agriculture had asked the cotton farmers of this country to increase their cotton production up to at least 16,000,000 bales for the crop year of 1952. It is my understanding that the cotton farmers throughout the Cotton Belt are trying to comply with that request in the interest of national defense. The bill applies only to the 1952 crop.

Several members of our committee, and on the minority side in particular, voted to report this bill with reservations, so that they would have an opportunity to give it further study and then make up their minds what they wanted to do when the bill came on the floor.

If a 16,000,000-bale crop is raised, there is no question about the need for some legislation of this kind. I thought about this bill a great deal since it was reported, and I was one of those who announced that I would vote to report the bill with reservations as to my personal standing on the measure.

I tried to secure some estimates as to what the cotton acreage will be for this year, and also what the production may be, but I have been unable to get that information from the Department of Agriculture, because, as I understand, the first report the Department makes is on August 10, and they are not able to give out any information on the present condition of cotton or the acreage; so we are really at a loss to come to any estimate whatsoever at this time as to either acreage or cotton production.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Is it not true that the Department is forbidden by law to make an estimate at this time as to the yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is true for cotton, but on every other crop estimates are made beginning on May 10 and throughout the entire year. However, cotton has had special treatment throughout the past 25 years. There may be reasons for it. Sometimes, like last year, the estimate they made along in August and September later proved to be an erroneous estimate in the light of the actual production of cotton.

There is one thing that we on the Committee on Agriculture try to do, and that is encourage the farmers of this country to produce an abundant supply of food and fiber. We believe that is our responsibility, in order that the people of this country can have abundant food and fiber at reasonable prices to take care of their personal needs, and for the economy of the entire country.

I am concerned over what happened last year in the case of cotton in particular where the Department of Agriculture estimated that the crop would be over 17,000,000 bales on its first estimate and also on the second estimate made in September, when the amount of the cotton crop they estimated would be produced for cotton was higher than in the month of August. That led the farmers first to believe that they were going to have a big crop. But many of them sold out as soon as they could pick the cotton, especially the small farmers. When the price was driven down 10 cents a pound for cotton, only one group could get into the market, and those were the speculators, either those who carried the commodity as a hedge or to speculate in the future commodities. I had occasion here in the Eightieth Congress to be chairman of a committee investigating commodity speculation, that was with reference to all types of commodities. I found to my surprise that many people in all the countries of the world were speculating on cotton in the United States markets. These speculators sought to come into the market when the price was low. During the production season when the estimates were high, and the price was driven down, they bought futures contracts. That is purely a speculative transaction, and they reaped tremendous profits for their courage in going into the speculative market, and it does take courage for an individual to do that.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. And that is at the expense of the producer who does not have the money to hold it and it is the fellow who produces who suffers because of that; is that not correct?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is the general rule. The producer generally sells out at the bottom, but if he has to buy anything he buys at the top.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman mentioned speculation. I cannot quite understand that it is very much of a speculation

when these men go in and gamble on the market, right after a report has been made saying that cotton production would be over 16 or 16½ million bales. Why is that much of a gamble when he knows, if he has his own private reports coming in from the cotton area, that the cotton report is not correct. I would like the gentleman to discuss something about wheat crop reporting. Do we have the same thing on wheat? A Government report comes. I know a little about this reporting on wheat from my own district, but I do not know anything about the reports on cotton. I go along with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] who is a member of our Committee on Agriculture. If these reports are gathered in for an area, as they are in the western wheat sections where certain individuals are selected and they send in regular crop report conditions and from these the central office tabulates a report. When the area Department of Agriculture reporter gets around to it, he sends them into the Department of Agriculture where all reports are tabulated. But these big industrial operators, who are making money on the market, have their own private sources and when they send a report privately to their company, they knew exactly what the crop condition is. Will you discuss that so a farmer will know something about crop reporting?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I find that the speculator in the market is a rather close observer of production conditions throughout the country, and the world, and the anticipated demand for the supply of cotton or any other commodity. Now a good speculator, if you can differentiate between a good and a bad speculator, is the man who sells short at the high point, when cotton is up to 45 cents a pound, and before the estimate was made, and then buys in again on the long side after cotton goes to 34 cents. He rides up and down with it in the market. There are not very many who do that, but those men who are speculators are quite clever in their operations.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. How does he know when to buy short, if he knows he is not a speculator?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No. He buys these contracts for future delivery.

Mr. HILL. Would he do that if he knew the crop was going down?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No. He would sell on the short side.

Mr. HILL. Then he is not a speculator, if he knows what is going to happen in the future.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me get down to cases. The gentleman may buy 10 kegs of nails at 7 cents a pound——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

They will offer him a carload of nails, which is probably 200 kegs. He buys them on the anticipation that nails will go to 10 cents a pound. That may be speculation. I figure it would be. But if the price goes down he has lost some money; if it goes up he has made some money.

I do not want to get into any argument with my colleague from Colorado, but let me return for a moment to this legislation. I would not support this legislation today if it were not for the fact that it is a temporary proposal, dealing only with the 1952 crop. If we are to revise the grades, support prices and all of those things, then we should have a very thorough investigation of all the commodities that come under the support program, so that we may treat wheat, cotton, tobacco, and all of these other commodities that the American farmer produces in the same manner. So when I said that I will give my support to this bill today, I do so only as an emergency matter, in the event that the cotton farmers raise 16,000,000 bales, or more, in the 1952-crop year.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I simply wanted to comment on what the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] had to say about the crop reporting board, and with regard to the reports on wheat. If anything like what happened to the cotton report last year happened to wheat, then I think we have something coming forth in a few days which might give the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] some satisfaction. That is a report which will be coming from my subcommittee with regard to the activities of the crop reporting board and its manner of gathering statistics and making reports. From that I think the gentleman from Colorado will get a great deal of satisfaction, and I believe that in the end we will get much better reports than we are getting now.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. That is exactly what I wished to emphasize. What I wanted to emphasize I probably missed, and that is this: that the way the whole system of collecting information on crops needs a complete overhauling—I would like to call attention to potatoes. I know that is a hot subject, because we know exactly what happened on potatoes. I said in this House during that period that we were losing money on potatoes. During all that time the Department of Agriculture, through its reports and through its requests and farm suggested crop acreages was asking farmers of this country to increase their potato acreage. In other words, what they asked the farmer to do was to please cut your own throat and bleed yourself to death on the inside.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I know that the potato farmers produced fewer potatoes and reduced their acreage.

Mr. HILL. Of course they did.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And if it were not for governmental interference the crop raised in 1951 would have more than adequately taken care of the needs of the American people.

Mr. HILL. If the gentleman will yield, I had not intended to say anything of a personal nature, but I would like to say that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] is a very valuable member of our committee on agriculture, one of the members of our committee who knows agricultural problems. His specialty, of course, is cotton. I live in a beet and wheat section, and I think I know something about those crops.

If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to make one point. The time has come, Mr. Chairman, when we need a new system, even if it costs us more money, a new system of crop reporting upon which we can rely absolutely.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, let me conclude my remarks by saying that I have the highest respect for the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY]. He is a valuable member of the Committee on Agriculture. His concern about the welfare of cotton producers is exemplified by his authorship of the bill now under consideration. I am supporting the Abernethy bill as an emergency measure. When Congress reconvenes in the new session, I will urge a comprehensive study of all farm commodities with a view of enacting general legislation to protect the integrity of all producers in our effort to secure abundant production for American consumers.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, frankly, I do not know a terrible lot about raising cotton. I have seen it grow and I have seen it picked. But I can tell you something about the prices and the estimates on it when I read them. I do not like to oppose a bill brought in by the gentleman from Mississippi, but let me give you the picture. I think we ought to go back far enough so that we will know what this is all about, what is behind it and what is the cause of this bill being presented.

A year ago now—and I have the figures in front of me—Middling upland cotton was selling on the New York market for 46.06 cents a pound. That is a year ago the 4th day of June. Whether or not the things I will describe resulted from manipulation I will leave it up to you to say, I will not say it; I will simply call your attention to the facts.

As of the 1st day of August the Agriculture Department in a statement released on the 8th of August estimated the cotton crop at 17,266,000 bales, way above what had previously been anticipated and way above the previous year's crop. Then as of the 1st of September they estimated it 25,000 bales more or 17,291,000. On the 1st of October they estimated it down 350,000 bales. On the 1st of November when the crop began to come in it was estimated down further. Their present estimate on that crop is 15,200,000 bales or 2,091,000 bales below their

highest estimate. And, what happened? The price of cotton went down from 46 cents to approximately 32 cents. I have not that exact figure, but that is about it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It went to about 34½.

Mr. TABER. My information is—and I have not the detailed figures—that an enormous quantity of this cotton changed hands on the cotton exchange, and there was a great purchase of that cotton by speculators. They got it in, and then when the first of November came around and they got down into about a 15,000,000 bale estimate, the price went up again.

I have not a very large range of the different grades of cotton, and the prices, but on the 5th of January it got back up to 43½ cents a pound; in other words, it jumped about 10 cents a pound. That gave the speculators a great opportunity to get out. The cotton market was supplied. When it got to the 30th of April it was 39 cents. Then yesterday it got up to about 41 cents a pound, almost 41½ cents. I do not know what you call that, but it looks to me off-hand, and as a fellow sitting on the outside, as if it was manipulation.

What does this bill do? It results in giving the Secretary of Agriculture, when he feels like boosting those estimates up, and reducing the price, the opportunity to manipulate the market. This bill results in insurance to the farmer against being caught, but it does not make any provision to stop that kind of performance that we had last year. Now I do not know whether you want to have that kind of an operation going on any longer. What we ought to be doing is to stop this manipulation on the markets. That is the way we ought to be handling this thing and not try to permit them to continue. This bill does not say that when the crop itself gets up over 16,000,000 a bonus shall be paid. It says when the Secretary of Agriculture estimates it above 16,000,000. That permits all sorts of manipulation, all sorts of ridiculous things to happen to the market, and to my mind it is not only against the interests of the country and the consumer, but it is against the interest of the farmer himself.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. First I want to say that I want to congratulate the gentleman on the point he has raised. I think he and I are actually driving at the same thing. I do not think there is very much, if any, difference between us. I do not know that I will go as far as the gentleman did, but I am not critical of what he says. But, as I understand the gentleman he is suspect of what the crop reporting board was doing last year in regard to estimating the cotton crop. That is the way I understood the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. That is correct, and I am still critical, and I am afraid that what you are doing in this bill is going to produce that same sort of thing right along.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Oh, no.

Mr. TABER. And it is not going to stop it. If you were going to stop it I would vote for the bill, but it is not going to stop it; it is going to promote it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I want to express my thanks to the gentleman. The gentleman concedes that as a result of the estimates of the Crop Reporting Board last year the farmers lost a lot of money?

Mr. TABER. Certainly they did.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Sure they did.

Mr. TABER. That was because the Crop Reporting Board did not do its job right.

Mr. ABERNETHY. If I may go a little further, I think we can get together and help one another.

I have a subcommittee, incidentally, which has been making a study of the very thing the gentleman has referred to. But you cannot force a man by law to correctly estimate a crop. When he makes his estimate it has to be just exactly what it is, an estimate.

Mr. TABER. If he makes it on what he thinks it is and on legitimate reports, that is one thing.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is right.

Mr. TABER. But when you get a picture like this, that turns out the way it did last year, it makes you very suspicious that it was not done right side up.

Mr. ABERNETHY. May I say further to the gentleman that I now hold in my hand a copy of a 68-page report which has already been approved by my subcommittee and referred to the full Committee on Agriculture with regard to the very thing the gentleman is complaining about. We are complaining, too. I do not say there is anything startling about this report but I do say it will be interesting, it will be informative, and I believe it will be helpful insofar as future crop reports are concerned.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In Iowa last year the corn crop was overestimated not by hundreds of thousands of bushels but by millions of bushels. Any blind man could have seen late in August that we were not going to have the corn crop the Federal Government estimated. I just wondered if the gentleman's committee went into the reasons why the corn estimate in Iowa was so high last year.

Mr. ABERNETHY. We did not go completely into each particular commodity but we did do this: We sent invitations to people in the gentleman's State and to many other States to appear before our committee with regard to this very subject. The report we have filed, while it deals specifically with cotton, deals generally with all crops and with particular regard to the manner and means of gathering crop statistics and making crop reports.

Mr. GROSS. What are you going to do if you find that these estimates have been manipulated, slap them on the wrist, and then in another 2 or 3 years have the same thing happen?

Mr. TABER. In the early days when I came here we had trouble with crop estimates. This is not the first time. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] was here. He told you about some of the cotton estimates. I know something of the things that happened with reference to other crops that were up in my territory in the old days. I do not like it. It got so bad that we had to limit them on their operations. I do not know how you are going to do it, but rather than bring out bills to provide insurance to farmers against manipulation by the Secretary of Agriculture, we have to have some kind of legislation that will stop the manipulation. I hope that will be the result.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER].

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to congratulate the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] for a bill, which I think is most fair and equitable. I sincerely hope the Members of the House will recognize its fairness. I happen to come from an agricultural section, and we grow cotton down there. I want to say to you now that cotton is certainly not a big-money crop. You need not be deceived about that. We can grow many crops down there that we can make much more money on. I do not want to threaten you in any way, shape, or form because, if I did, I would not be speaking the truth. The people from my section of the country are loyal people. The Government told our people that we had to have cotton. I am not going to tell you that we are not going to plant cotton, if you do not give us this bill. On the contrary, I am going to tell you that the people in my section of the country are going to plant cotton if they do not get anything for it just so long as the Government says that they have to have cotton because they will do that as patriotic American citizens. But, I do want you to see the situation in which we find ourselves. I recall last year, the cotton census estimate was that they were going to have a little over 17,000,000 bales of cotton. I knew that that was not true. I knew that the people from my section of the country who had responded to a patriotic impulse to grow cotton for their country, and for our national defense, were going to be penalized and were going to have to take a lower price because of a report which was untrue. I had been down through Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, and had talked to Members of Congress from all sections of the United States. Apparently everybody knew that there had been a drought, and they knew that they were not going to make that kind of cotton crop—that is everybody knew with the exception of the Department of Agriculture. All on earth that we are asking you for is to let us assist in our national defense. Let us grow this cotton, and let us be protected against an estimate made this year, which will be fictitious and which will at the same time cause our farmers to lose money. I do not believe that anybody can object to a thing like that. Do you understand

that there has to be an estimate that 16,000,000 bales of cotton are going to be made before this bill will apply? Do you see what I am talking about there. That is all on earth we are asking for—protection—surely, I believe you will feel that the cotton grower is entitled to that kind of protection.

Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this bill. I join with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] in his support of the bill. I sincerely hope that there will not be a dissenting vote.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a very worth-while bill. I commend the gentleman from Mississippi and the committee for bringing in this bill, which may provide an increase of $17.50 per bale to cotton farmers. I was a member of this great committee for 6 years. I represent the largest cotton area in Oklahoma. I originally came from the largest cotton-producing area in the State of Arkansas. If you would only stop for a moment to realize that what you are wearing and what you have to eat comes from the farmers. Even the minerals, also the oil and gas which keeps you warm, and gasoline which keeps your cars running comes from the farms. The national income is always seven times the income of the farmers. It is important not only to the farmers that we produce this additional cotton but to the men who are in the service. I flew back to Washington today because of the importance of this bill and because of the Korean veterans' bill. The men who are fighting at the front not only wear clothing made of cotton but much of their gunpowder is made from cotton. The food that we produce to feed the boys in the service, the food that we produce to feed the people in this country, and the food we are producing for other countries comes from the farmers. If we do not have this food and this clothing, then, lo and behold, the world will go by the wayside.

Another point I wish to stress is that the farmer has many other problems facing him today. He has to spray his cotton. Sometimes in our part of the country he has to spray it as many as 10 times for bollworms, boll weevils, and insects. Labor is difficult to get. Last fall the Secretary of Labor refused the small farmers in Arkansas, east Texas, and Oklahoma who had failed to make a crop to allow their children to go to Oklahoma to pull bolls or snap cotton. When you pay greatly increased costs of harvesting, when you pay much higher costs for implements, then it is essential that our farmers receive a fair price for our cotton.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics last year overestimated our crop by 2,000,000 bales. In our particular area we have many small farmers. This was disastrous to all of them. It will be disastrous in the future unless the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, under the Secretary of Agriculture, makes a more accurate estimate. Naturally, those whom we term the big "city windshield farmers" or "city cliffdweller farmers" and the speculators would make a lot of money, but unless we pass this bill then we will not have the cotton that all of us need for next year.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] such time as he may desire.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is designed to give the cotton farmer simple justice. Our Government has called upon the cotton farmer to produce a record crop, in order to meet the needs of national defense. Is it fair or reasonable to ask the cotton farmer to produce this crop, and at the same time risk bankruptcy for himself?

Under the terms of this bill, if the defense goal for cotton production is met, the support price will be increased approximately 3½ cents per pound. Even this increase in the support price will, in many instances, not provide a large enough return for the cotton farmer to pay for the cost of production, to give him any reward for his heartiest labor, or any return for the depreciation of his land. The increase in support price will, however, to some extent lessen the risk involved to the cotton farmer, as he patriotically fills the request of his Government to supply an ample quantity of this fiber which is so vital to our defense needs.

Cotton is entitled to this special protection, because there is no other way in which the Government can act to benefit the cotton farmer, as is the case with other basic commodities.

In addition to the normal parity support, the producers of other commodities have the advantage of special arrangements, such as the International Wheat Agreement, and opportunities for incentive programs to bring about greater use of corn in raising pork. Cotton is the only commodity which suffers an average loss in grade when the size of the crop is expanded. This is elemental because the longer the cotton remains in the fields the poorer its grade will be.

Under these circumstances, the Congress of the United States will only be acting in simple justice if it passes this bill to change the basis of support for cotton in 1952 from strict middling to low middling.

The industrial plants of our Nation which are also contributing mightily to our defense effort, make this contribution without the risk of bankruptcy which the farmer must undergo. Defense contracts are given to manufacturers under terms which stipulate a fair return and a fair profit. The cotton farmer is asked to produce a crop under a price ceiling which he knows will prevent any great profit on the crop, and with the possibility of attaining a price which will be far below the cost of production.

This Nation spent over $14,000,000,000 helping industry to convert in tax amortizations and things of that kind. The farmer on the other hand has had only the assurance of 90 percent of parity, and that only on the basic commodities. In many cases this is not even cost of production. Nevertheless American agriculture has fed the world. Farmers have grown bigger crops, knowing they would get less net profit for it than on smaller crops.

I feel it is only fair that if they do grow the large cotton crop that has been demanded and thereby reduce the average grade and staple that the least we can do is provide the same support price we have now for that lower grade and staple. Actually the membership should know the Nation has made a profit on the price-support system so far as cotton is concerned. I hope all of you will support this bill which is sponsored by my able colleague from Mississippi, TOM ABERNETHY.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, first I want to say that the commodity which is here involved is one commodity that can be stored almost indefinitely. It is a commodity, the supply of which the surplus that had been built up in the hands of the Government, because it could be stored, saved us in World War II.

I think my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] has done a splendid job in bringing this bill to the Congress under the present conditions. When we get into an emergency and ask for those who can help to meet that emergency to increase their production, we do it through various ways. With regard to industry, the Congress provided that the Government would make loans to business for plant expansion, or we would give them quick amortization, so that they can charge off the cost of such plants. We gave industry a firm contract. We agreed to take the output at cost of production plus a profit. We agreed that if we had to cancel that contract we would pay them any damages that they had sustained, plus a profit. We said we would take the end product at a price where they could make a profit. Through those means, and because we sold, after the recent war, what we had left over at very reduced prices, to meet the last war, World War II, this Government paid out over $14,000,000,000 to industry to meet the wartime needs in expansion of plant facilities.

With regard to the farmer, the best we told them was, "We will support a price at 90 percent of parity with one or two commodities slightly above that. When we promised a percentage of parity what is that? First, what is parity? In the public mind, so frequently parity is thought to be a fair price. There is no connection between parity and fair price, no necessary connection at all; parity is an effort to give the farmer the same comparative purchasing power he had in 1909–14 at a time when the farmer's farm investment was over 70 percent land and it took him 10 years

to lose the land through making no crop, even though he did not make a dime out of the crop; in other words the outlay each year was only one-tenth of his investment in his farm.

Mr. GROSS. And of that 1909–14 price support on a basis of four basic commodities, not a dime of farm labor is figured in, is there?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is true, entirely so in 1909–14 where the farm investment was land. At that time the farmer did not have to buy all these expensive machines and equipment which are so essential to running a farm today. The figures show that a man can lose his farm today in 2.7 years if he does not make anything on it, the cash outlay each year is so great.

Along that line we go out and ask the cotton farmer and other farmers likewise to increase production, and we just give them not a fair price, but we say with regard to the basic commodities: If you will go out and increase such crop or such a production as to meet all our possible needs and add to the surplus for emergencies, we will assure you 90 percent of what your forefathers made on a comparative basis in 1909–14, a time when the farmer had to buy little except salt and a few other things.

But here is something else you need to keep in mind: As long as you just have an adequate supply the law of supply and demand will take care of the situation; but the moment you have 2,000,000 more bales than the market will consume or use, the price for the surplus pulls down the price of the rest of it; so not only does a large crop tend to pull down prices, but any overproduction, and a farmer cannot figure production exactly, any overproduction drags down what the man should make on his crop.

When my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] said that the cotton farmer could make more money out of a 13,000,000-bale crop than he could out of a 16,000,000-bale crop he pointed out a truth.

But we want to meet these needs, we want to have adequate supplies to meet the needs of this country, but as he so well pointed out, when you have a 16,000,000-bale crop of cotton your average grade and quality is lower; it is lower than it would be if you had a smaller crop.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. But you do not come to the farmer's aid as you do the aid of industry and tell him you will give him firm contracts or that you will give him a cost-plus contract to produce; you do not even give him a fair price but say to him, "We will assure you 90 percent of the comparative purchasing power your fathers had in 1909–14, but when you produce a bigger crop you get even less than that," because the quality of the cotton is such that it does not figure 90 percent of the average parity, because the average grade and quality is down low, and then actually your support price is only about 90 percent of the 90 percent of such comparative purchasing power—1909–14.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman has given the committee a program for farm-price supports. Why, however, is the cotton farmer entitled to special consideration in determining price supports as opposed to all farmers as is presented in this bill, is it not?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes. I would not say they were entitled to any special treatment; they have always had individual treatment due to the difference in type of commodity. Certainly cotton can be stored much longer than almost any other commodity. It is the only commodity I know of where you can run the grade and quality down when you increase the crop level as you do now, and it is the one place where we have some chance of making this change. I think, frankly, as has been pointed out, that what has happened in the last 2 years certainly makes a strong case to pass this bill. We should pass it. Then I think we should review the whole situation to see that fair treatment is given all along the line to all similar crops.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact that the support prices we are going to provide and the grades that will be established if we pass this bill—and I wish the gentleman would analyze it for us—is not going to raise prices further?

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman. Here is the situation, what you have done, and I would like for you to follow me in this because I think I am right in it. You want production of cotton. The point which the gentleman makes on its face would appear important, but if you study it, in my judgment at least, the facts do not back it up. It is like the rise in cotton prices on the markets along in the spring. They can tell you how much cotton has gone up and how much the farmer may have made, but the farmers do not have cotton in the spring. In effect you go out and ask cotton producers or the farmers to produce this large crop. Theoretically, he would get a much larger support price for the high qualities, but the thing that is overlooked is you do not have the quality that year. Such high-quality cotton will be short and none will go into the loan. Records show that it will be sold on the market. When the grade and quality goes down because the Government got the farmers to grow a big crop, we say let this bill become operative so that you are giving the farmer the same amount of support. Without this bill, he hurts himself, first, by increasing his costs; then, again, because the grade and quality is lower, he hurts himself again—all voluntarily to help his country.

You would not give him more because those grades and qualities which in theory and on paper would be at a much higher level will not exist.

Mr. JAVITS. We are breaking through the 90-percent support figure and going to 100 percent?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is not correct, though it might be what you would term "six of one and half a dozen of the other." You change the basis for figuring parity. Parity, as I said awhile ago, is the comparative purchasing power in 1909–14. We will just change the base and fix it on the average grade and quality. That is what this present law was claimed to be when it was passed. But when you go to enlarging or increasing the crop, the average grade and quality will come down, as the evidence will show, to the level that is figured in this bill. So in effect you are raising the amount of support for this class of cotton, but the amount of money you are paying into the farmer's hands for the cotton, in my judgment, will not be increased.

I would like to say one other thing, and that is, I hope this bill will be passed because it is getting to the point that you are going to the American farmers and asking them, as the only segment of our population, to meet the needs of a great nation in time of emergency on a basis where it costs them money for growing additional crops, but the additional surpluses wrecks him on the normal amount of his crop.

I hope this bill will be passed.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I congratulate the gentleman on the splendid presentation he has made of this very technical matter. My observation confirms what the gentleman has said. I am for this bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I wish that the proponents of this bill had based their case more on the particular conditions prevailing in the growing and marketing of cotton rather than on some of the arguments which they have made. I refer particularly to the point that was made that industry generally has all manner of supports, assistance, tax benefits, and other advantages which the farmer does not receive. The point should be made that advantages are given only when industry is producing specifically for purposes of defense; however, by far the greatest percentage of our industrial production is for nondefense purposes. These industrial producers do not receive these special favors, but must produce for the market. In the case of cotton, we do support the entire crop, whether it is going to be used for wartime purposes or whether it is going to be used for normal or ordinary nondefense consumption.

We should be considering a revision of the entire farm price-support program. That is our real problem. Producers of corn have problems which in many respects are similar to the problems in the case of cotton. I wish the committee had seen fit—and I think the committee did have time—to consider these problems as they bear upon other crops and other commodities in our present agricultural program.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman recollects that I suggested that our committee should have a study of that made. I would not be supporting this legislation excepting it was just for one thing, as an emergency proposition, and I agree with the gentleman that our committee should begin a study of the entire crop-support program so that all branches of agriculture may have the same treatment.

Mr. McCARTHY. I quite agree with the gentleman.

As I recall, when we debated the Defense Production Act about a year ago, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations of the Committee on Agriculture and ranking members of the Committee on Agriculture disagreed even as to what we actually meant by "parity." If nothing else, we could accurately define "parity" and examine the basis upon which parity itself is determined.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of section 403 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "Middling ⅞-inch cotton shall be the standard grade for purposes of parity and price support, except that, in the case of the 1952 cotton crop, Low Middling ⅞-inch cotton shall be the standard grade for purposes of parity and price support."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "support." and insert "support if at any time during the calendar year 1952 the official reports of cotton condition and progress, issued pursuant to the act of May 3, 1924, as amended (7 U. S. C. 475), indicate an estimated production for 1952 equal to or in excess of 16,000,000 bales."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take 5 minutes on this bill, but I want to speak briefly particularly to the comments made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I want to agree with what he said with reference to the need for legislation regarding the speculator. However, this bill does not touch that, but I think it does do a thing that the gentleman recognizes needs to be done, and that is to protect the producer who is made the victim of the practices of which he speaks.

In my section this last year our farmers were forced to sell the majority of their crop at the lowest figure, causing them immense losses. They knew that the price would go up but they were unable to hold that cotton. They had borrowed the money to make the crop; they had to sell it. This bill, as I see it, will do much to protect the producer, the man that we are interested in, the man who is responsible for this production that the Government is calling upon him to make. At the same time I think it should be emphasized that this bill will not cost anyone one dime. It will not cause any increase in the price of the products that the consumer is going to buy. This cotton is bought by cotton merchants and others and is held, but when the cotton is produced by the farmer he has to sell it at that time. This price support in this bill will not cover the cost of production this year. It will enable the producer to reduce the loss that he took last year on his crop. I think that the only person that is going to be benefited is the producer, but I think that he is the one that is being called upon to take the big gamble, and he should be protected.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I hope that this bill will be passed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is no arguing the fact that cotton is a vital and strategic article of war. Because of the national defense needs for this commodity, the Secretary of Agriculture has appealed to the cotton farmers of America to produce a 16,000,000-bale crop this year.

The Secretary, in requesting all-out production, merely had to rely upon the patriotism of the cotton producers to furnish 16,000,000 bales; he was not clothed with authority to offer any incentives to the farmer, nor could he obligate the Government to assume part of the risk involved.

Other segments of our economy, when requested for all-out production of defense materials, are given economic incentives, such as accelerated tax amortization, subsidies, and low-interest loans. Industry, as such, seldom runs a risk of loss when it manufactures products to be used in the defense effort.

It is for that reason this legislation is before the House today. The cotton farmers of America, in producing a bumper crop, always suffer depressed prices, and it is only fair that they be given protection comparable to that enjoyed by industry, in producing the fiber needed by our Armed Forces and civilian defense efforts.

As has been so ably explained by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] and others who have spoken on this bill, the quality of cotton produced drops in proportion to the increase over average production. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that a 16,000,000 bale crop would not be of the same high grade that would be received, for example, from a 13,000,000 or 14,000,000 bale crop, thus depressing prices to the producer even further.

During the past several years, the American cotton farmer, particularly the small grower, has been penalized many times because of bureaucratic mishandling of his commodity. The Government, by placing restrictions on the exports of cotton in the middle of the 1950 harvest season, cost our farmers untold millions of dollars. This action served only to benefit manufacturers of cotton products because, while the price of cotton went down, the cost of the finished product to the consumer went up.

Irresponsible crop estimates during the last growing season were almost disastrous to the small producers, as was explained by several preceding speakers.

These estimates, which started at around 17,000,000 bales, were later revised downward toward the end of the picking season—which resulted in advancing prices, but only to the large growers who were able to hold their cotton or place it in the Government loan program. The small farmers were caught in the middle and forced, because of their circumstances, to sell their crops as they were picked.

Attempts—later stymied—to place a ceiling price on raw cotton were also exemplary of the high handed and unjust attacks which have been made against the southern cotton producer in the last several years.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the entire price support program should be given study and many revisions made. I am sure that other farm commodities are suffering from the same penalties which have been assessed against the cotton farmer, and I wish it were possible for Congress to pass a one-package bill which would extend similar protection to producers of wheat, corn, and other basic products. If we are to expect America's cotton growers to produce 16,000,000 bales next year, the least that Congress can do is to afford this protection.

It should be borne in mind during the consideration of this legislation that no change in the standard for determining parity and price support will be made if the farmers fail to meet the 16,000,000 bale goal. This bill is temporary emergency legislation, to be applied solely to the 1952 crop. I am sure that the House will take these facts into consideration, recognize the need for this legislation, and enact it without delay.

In conclusion, I cannot let this moment pass without expressing my appreciation to the distinguished author of this legislation, Mr. ABERNETHY, for his untiring efforts in behalf of American agriculture. He has worked hard and diligently on this legislation, and deserves the commendation of all who are interested in the cotton farmer. I congratulate him upon the splendid work which he has done on this bill, and hope that it will pass overwhelmingly.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill, for perhaps a little different reason than a good many other Members of the House.

In our section, the farmers are going into the cattle business. They are going into the cattle business in a big way. Moving from the West to the East, the cotton farmers in north Louisiana are now abandoning the cotton crop and going into the cattle business. Of course, I have no objection to their going into any type of business they want, but I fear they may be changing too rapidly from one industry to another. Perhaps the reason they are doing this is the experience of the last few years. I remember that several years ago we provided regulations to reduce the amount of cotton to be grown by our farmers.

It so happened when we put acreage control into effect and reduced the total acreage and the amount of cotton our farmers could produce in that particular year, we developed not a surplus but a huge shortage that year. As a result, the farmers were in effect misled into not producing what should have been produced.

The next year the reverse situation prevailed, so that the farmer produced all he could of cotton in response to the Government's request due to the shortage. He found that he was facing a declining price market and lost money on the crop. As a result of these mistakes the cotton farmer is losing confidence in his crop.

As a result, now the tendency is to go out of the cotton business and into the cattle business.

This bill will, to some extent at least, reassure that farmer who remains in the business of growing cotton that he will receive a reasonable and an adequate price in the event of enormous overproduction. In that event, at least a portion of our farmers may be persuaded to remain in the cotton-producing business rather than make the transition into the cattle business. I hope very much that this bill goes through without any difficulty, that the farmers may be given this additional reassurance in the face of a possible declining market. This bill will help stabilize both the cotton and the cattle business.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in my considered judgment no fairer piece of legislation has ever been presented to the Congress than that which is under consideration. I believe the Members of this House agree that the farmers of America are just as patriotic as our men in uniform. So far as I know, never in the history of our great country when there was an emergency and the farmers were called upon to produce did they fail us. As urged by the Department of Agriculture in the interest of national defense and security, the farmers of America were called upon to produce 16,000,000 bales of cotton this year. Their patriotism and willingness to cooperate in the present emergency prompted them to do everything possible to meet the goal set by the Department of Agriculture and requested in the interest of national defense and our preparedness program.

The 1952 cotton crop is going to be an expensive one to raise. In that a large percentage, if not a majority, of the cotton farmers are having to plant their cotton for the second time and it is now anticipated that they will experience difficulty in obtaining labor to cultivate and harvest this year's crop. Many of the farmers, recognizing the difficulty they will have in obtaining labor to harvest their crops, are now mortgaging their property to enable them to purchase mechanical cotton pickers. A modern mechanical cotton picker costs from $7,000 to $9,000. The depreciation is tremendous and, too, it must be remembered that mechanical cotton pickers have a tendency to lower the grade of the lint.

Mr. Chairman, as it has been brought out, this bill establishes that Low Middling 7/8-inch cotton shall be the standard grade for purposes of parity and price support. Furthermore, the bill will not be applicable to the 1952 crop unless the official reports of cotton conditions and progress indicate an estimated production equal to or in excess of 16,000,000 bales.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to reiterate that the cotton farmers are attempting to meet the goal set by the Department of Agriculture. The farmers' patriotism prompted them to plant for this yield without any assurance that they would be compensated for the additional expense. They were promised no protection and we all know this does not apply to any other industry that has to do with preparedness or our national security. In my candid opinion it would be a slap in the face to the cotton producer not to afford him this small increase for his cotton, providing the goal fixed by the Department of Agriculture is reached. And, too, we should keep in mind, when voting, that the bill applies only to the 1952 crop.

I hope before the 1953 cotton crop is planned that the proper committees of the Congress will revise the present parity formula, thereby guaranteeing the farmer a minimum of security. If such an approach is not made, diversified farming will replace much of the present cotton acreage.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill.

I favor the passage of H. R. 5713, the bill now before us, which seeks to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide that Low Middling 7/8-inch cotton shall be the standard grade for the purposes of determining parity and price support for the 1952 cotton crop, provided if at any time during the calendar year 1952 the official reports indicate an estimated production for the crop year 1952 equal to or in excess of 16,000,000 bales.

The Secretary of Agriculture has requested the farmers of this Nation to produce 16,000,000 bales of cotton this year in the interest of our national defense. The farmers of this Nation are patriotic people and they will make every effort to comply with this request. I represent a district largely composed of farmers. Census reports from the 1950 census indicate that there are over 34,000 farms in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama. Before I left the district to return here in January of this year a farmer well beyond 70 years of age, who had retired, told me that he had read where the Secretary of Agriculture was asking farmers to produce 16,000,000 bales of cotton this year, and he said he was coming out of retirement and that he would make great effort to produce cotton and other crops in the interest of national defense. I believe his attitude is representative of that of farmers everywhere.

Our cotton farmers must cope with many complex and varied conditions in the production of 16,000,000 bales of cotton. Weather is one of the big factors and one, of course, over which he has absolutely no control. If the weather is favorable during the growing season throughout the Cotton Belt, the crop produced may be 20 to 25 percent above that produced if weather conditions are not so favorable. So, if the cotton farmers of America plant enough cotton to produce under reasonably favorable or normally favorable weather conditions a crop of 16,000,000 bales, then unusually favorable weather conditions may result in the production of 18,000,000 bales or more.

So we find the farmer planting enough cotton to produce 16,000,000 bales, and actually, because of these favorable conditions, producing 18,000,000 bales, and he is then placed in the position of having to pay a heavy penalty in the form of low prices for his cotton. This is not conjecture. This is reality. What happened last fall? In the fall of 1951 the crop-reporting service of the Department of Agriculture came out with an estimate of a 17,000,000-bale cotton crop, and the price of cotton fell 10 cents or more per pound. The farmer took his loss, but the tragic turn of events is that this estimate proved to be grossly incorrect, and when it was discovered to be incorrect, generally speaking, after the cotton farmer had sold his cotton, the price moved back up to about where it had been before. But this, mind you, came after the farmer had sold his cotton. It came too late for him to profit by it in most cases. I don't know who did profit by it—perhaps the speculator in cotton. The Department of Agriculture says that no system can be devised that will work perfectly in the field of cotton estimating. There will always be mistakes made in guessing the number of bales produced until the crop is actually harvested, ginned, and sold. The farmer pays for these mistakes. He should not be required to do so.

The bill before us gives the farmer some aid where mistakes in the reporting system are made. It helps him to absorb the shock. He is entitled to this relief. He is entitled to have parity calculated on a basis, as provided for in this bill, when the estimate of cotton production for 1952 goes over 16,000,000 bales, that will provide him with an increased support price for his cotton of 3½ cents per pound above the levels prevailing during the 1951 marketing season. He is entitled to this consideration for many reasons. One reason is that the parity formula is antiquated and unrealistic. Another is that as a result of the mistakes made in cotton estimates for 1951, he saw $150,000,000 that should have gone to him in the form of higher prices slip away. He has paid a big price for these mistakes. He should not be called on to pay this price again. He will not be called on to do so if we pass the bill before us.

Some have indicated that they thought this might be a "gravy train" bill. Nothing could be further from the truth. The cotton crop for 1952 has already been planted. It was planted before this law was considered. Therefore, no

farmer can overplant with the expectation that this bill will take care of him in the event that a larger crop than 16,000,000 bales is produced.

There are those who would like to have us believe that the farmer is a favored person in our economy. I wonder who they think they are kidding. No group of our population realizes less for his labor, or a less return on his investment than does the southern cotton farmer. In order to stay in business he has consistently subjected himself to acreage reductions and marketing quotas that have left him by and large very little return for his labor. He is now faced with the fact that in order to keep up with changing conditions he must mechanize his farm. He must diversify. He must turn a considerable portion of his acreage to permanent pastures. All of these operations are expensive. Our credit system has not yet adapted itself to these changing conditions. It is hard for a farmer to get the necessary credit to modernize and improve his farm rapidly enough that he may increase his income as it should be increased. In 1950 in Blount County, Ala., I had the pleasure of meeting with a group of farmers to discuss this very subject. They were good farmers. Many of them were highly trained farmers. Some of them had completed courses in better farming under the GI bill. They made the point with me that they knew how to make a better living on the farm, but they needed capital with which to improve their farms so they could do so. By and large they must earn the needed capital. They should not be called upon to take any undue risks at this time. The Government should cushion them against some of the risks, some of the losses, connected with the overproduction in good faith of the amount of cotton—16,000,000 bales—asked for by the Secretary of Agriculture.

It is just that this bill pass. I trust it will pass, and that the Senate will act upon it before Congress adjourns.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, since I am from a district which produces a great deal of cotton, and since I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture, which has studied the bill now under consideration, I am naturally strongly in favor of it.

I have just been in my district and have talked at length with some of my farmers concerning the effects on this year's operations if the bill is passed, and if it is not passed. The people with whom I consulted belong to the Danevang Farmers Cooperative Association of Wharton County in Texas, which, by the way, could be used as a model by any farmers cooperative. It was their opinion that without the bill they might well suffer losses similar to those which were experienced during the past year. As practical farmers, they believe that this bill would protect them.

It is interesting to note that the subject of crop estimates has been thoroughly discussed here today, and that it was also discussed by the Danevang farmers at our meeting. In this connection and in view of the fact that today it has been strongly suggested that there may have been deliberate irregularities in last year's crop reporting, I want to make some observations which I think are timely.

I am a member of the special subcommittee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], which is about to bring in a report concerning crop estimates. We studied the subject with great care and over a period of many weeks. We heard many witnesses—practical farmers, Department of Agriculture officials, cotton merchants, and others. We approached the subject with a full realization that there might have been irregularity somewhere. We looked for it on every hand and we were particularly careful as we checked the operations within the Washington offices of the Department of Agriculture. We found no indication of irregularity of any kind. There were, and there will always be, errors in judgment, and last year these, coupled with weather conditions, scarcity of labor, and various local problems, combined to bring about the wide differences between the estimates and the actual yield. It was my personal conclusion, and I think this will be reflected in our formal report, that the system of crop reporting is as reliable as any which can be devised. Certainly no other method was proposed.

In closing may I again urge that the bill under consideration be passed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I need only a minute or so to state my opposition to this measure.

I have every sympathy for the cotton farmers of the South, particularly those who operate farms of modest acreage, but their economic rights are not attained through this kind of temporary legislation.

Moreover, this is completely sectional legislation and it is discriminatory. If this proposal is sound, and I maintain it is not, it ought to be made applicable to the products of all the Nation's farmers.

What farmers desperately need, whether they be cotton, corn, hog, or livestock producers, is cost of production prices for all their products necessary for domestic consumption. This legislation in addition to being discriminatory by applying to only one product, is an expedient.

It is bad because it may provide the top price for a low quality product and it may be put into effect on the basis of crop estimates that are admitted here this afternoon to be often unreliable.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that on the record that has been presented here, I think there is very grave doubt as to whether the interests of the consumer would be protected under this bill to the extent that I think they should be. I shall therefore vote against the bill.

This bill apparently could raise the price support base on all grades of raw cotton from 90 percent to just over 100 percent of parity and by the increase in the cost of raw cotton to mills which is likely to result and through pyramiding this extra cost in the processing and distribution channels would raise costs of clothing and other cotton goods to consumers. At least consumers should be wary of these results.

Though the estimate of the bill's proponent is somewhat lower it is not appreciably so, and the appended comparison of 1952 with new loan rates under this bill shows the situation likely to occur:

Comparison of 1952 loan rates on specified leading grades of cotton to the new rates proposed by H. R. 5713

Staple and grade	1952 loan rate, cents per pound	Proposed loan rate under H. R. 5713, cents per pound
¾-inch, Low Middling [1]	26.61	30.91
¾-inch, Middling [2]	30.91	36.21
Price support in percentage of parity [3]	90.0	102.5
15/16-inch, Middling	31.96	36.26
1-inch, Middling	32.41	36.71
1 1/32-inch, Middling	32.66	36.96

[1] Proposed base grade.
[2] Base grade in current price support regulations.
[3] Prices of Middling ¾-inch cotton as percentage of parity price of cotton.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, the need for cotton in the preparedness program has been discussed quite a lot here today. Let us see what is meant when we speak of needing cotton in the Armed Forces.

It requires 250 pounds of cotton per man to fully equip the armed services.

Cotton goes into 11,000 separate uses that are directly connected with the military.

In World War II cotton was second only to steel as the most vital war material. The authority for this statement is the Department of Defense itself.

Just about every military item that is produced has some cotton or cotton byproduct in it.

Linters are absolutely essential in the production of ammunition. The number of linters is determined by the number of bales of cotton grown. Cotton is used in the manufacture of parachutes, cords, cases, tents, uniforms, and many other defense uses.

Cotton is as essential to industry as it is to the military—electric insulation, tarpaulin, friction tape, and so forth.

Cotton keeps industry producing full speed which is essential to our defense effort.

I trust that this bill will pass without amendment.

I would like to include some facts and figures on the excessive costs involved in the making of a cotton crop. These figures do not include the cost of picking the crop. It costs about $55 a bale for picking charges alone.

Our farmers suffered great hardships in 1951 due to the wet spring, the drought in the summer, and the heavy infestation of boll weevil.

1951 crop cost

ONE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED ACRES COTTON, BROKEN DOWN ON COST-PER-ACRE BASIS

Tractor fuel	$3,575
Gas	1,566
Motor oil	616
Grease	470
Tractor repair	1,338
Truck repair	571
Implement Truck & Supply Co. (parts)	874
Farmers Tractor & Equipment Co. (parts)	1,183
Car expense	355
Tire expense	172
Shop	295
Lot expense	1,129
Arkansas Power & Light	172
Telephone	841
Freight	108
Insurance (fire)	2,198
Taxes	3,496
Fertilizer	9,022
Poison	9,919
Cultivation	6,500
Chopping	44,263
Salary	4,117
Miscellaneous repair	2,406
Miscellaneous payroll	593
Miscellaneous expense	687
Expense a/c Mexican nationals	2,870
Total	99,341

This is actual cost to September 1. Does not include picking, ginning, nor management for balance of year.

Total production 1,246 bales, an average of 410 pounds lint per acre.

Day crops—480 pounds lint cotton produced per acre

PER ACRE COSTS OF PRODUCING COTTON EXCLUSIVE OF HARVESTING EXPENSE

Farm No. 1, 280.9 acres:	
Tractor work	$11.39
Payroll	2.81
Chopping	43.46
Fertilizer	9.74
Planting seed	3.49
Poison	8.80
Other charges	3.49
Total	83.18
Farm No. 2, 576.4 acres:	
Tractor work	13.39
Payroll	.78
Chopping	46.06
Fertilizer	16.00
Planting seed	5.34
Poison	10.12
Other charges	.80
Total	92.49
Farm No. 3, 207.7 acres:	
Tractor work	8.86
Payroll	2.15
Chopping	25.68
Fertilizer	9.44
Planting seed	------
Poison	8.31
Other charges	.23
Total	55.67
Farm No. 4, 348.9 acres:	
Tractor work	11.18
Payroll	1.20
Chopping	29.26
Fertilizer	7.27
Planting seed	1.51
Poison	6.67
Other charges	3.88
Total	60.97
Farm No. 5, 99.5 acres:	
Tractor work	9.02
Payroll	2.55
Chopping	32.61
Fertilizer	6.26
Planting seed	6.53
Poison	8.46
Other charges	2.86
Total	68.29

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5713) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide that Low Middling ⅞-inch cotton shall be the standard grade for the purposes of determining parity and price support for the 1952 cotton crop, pursuant to House Resolution 658, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, no quorum is present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 93]

Aandahl	Doyle	Martin, Ia.
Anderson, Calif.	Durham	Miller, Calif.
Anfuso	Fallon	Morano
Auchincloss	Fenton	Morris
Bailey	Flood	Moulder
Bakewell	Frazier	Potter
Beckworth	Fugate	Powell
Blackney	Gamble	Rains
Blatnik	Hale	Ramsay
Bosone	Hall, Leonard W.	Reams
Brambletti	Havenner	Redden
Brehm	Hébert	Rees, Kans.
Buckley	Hillings	Regan
Buffett	Hinshaw	Rogers, Mass.
Burdick	Holifield	Sabath
Burleson	Hope	Sadlak
Carlyle	Hunter	Sasscer
Celler	Jackson, Calif.	Shafer
Chelf	Jenkins	Sheppard
Cole, Kans.	Johnson	Short
Cole, N. Y.	Keating	Stigler
Cooley	Kennedy	Stockman
Crawford	Kerr	Sutton
Curtis, Mo.	Kilburn	Tackett
Davis, Tenn.	Kilday	Vinson
Dawson	King, Calif.	Welch
Deane	Lovre	Werdel
Dempsey	Lyle	Wheeler
Denny	McCormack	Wilson, Ind.
Denton	McKinnon	Wood, Ga.
Dingell	McVey	Woodruff
Dondero		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 336 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

1952 COTTON PARITY STANDARD

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 156, noes 62.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and eighteen Members voted on the division; a quorum is present.

So the bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide that Low Middling ⅞-inch cotton shall be the standard grade for the purposes of determining parity and price support for the 1952 cotton crop, under certain conditions."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7005) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No 2031)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7005) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Mutual Security Act of 1952'.

"SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 is amended by inserting '(a)' after the section number and by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(b) The Congress welcomes the recent progress in political federation, military integration, and economic unification in Europe and reaffirms its belief in the necessity of further vigorous efforts toward these

ends as a means of building strength, establishing security, and preserving peace in the North Atlantic area. In order to provide further encouragement to such efforts, the Congress believes it essential that this Act should be so administered as to support concrete measures for political federation, military integration, and economic unification in Europe. Appropriations made pursuant to paragraphs 101 (a) (1), relating to military assistance, and 101 (a) (2), relating to defense support and economic assistance, of this Act may be used, pursuant to the applicable terms and conditions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, and of section 503 of this Act, respectively, to furnish assistance (including, in the case of amounts available pursuant to paragraph 101 (a) (2), transfers of funds) to any of the following organizations: (A) The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, (B) the European Coal and Steel Community, (C) the organization which may evolve from current international discussions concerning a European defense community.'

"SEC. 3. Title I (relating to Europe) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 is amended as follows:

"(a) In paragraph 101 (a) (1), insert ', for Spain,' after 'parties to the North Atlantic Treaty'.

"(b) At the end of section 101 (a) (1), which relates to military assistance for Europe, add the following new sentence: 'There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed $3,415,614,750, for assistance pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1571–1604) to countries eligible for assistance under this paragraph; and in addition unexpended balances of any appropriations heretofore made pursuant to this paragraph are authorized to be continued available for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the appropriation hereby authorized.'

"(c) Amend section 101 (a) (2), which relates to defense support and economic assistance for Europe, to read as follows: 'There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed $1,282,433,000 to provide assistance to any country covered by paragraph (1) of this subsection and to any other country covered by section 503 of this Act in accordance with the provisions of such section; and in addition unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to this paragraph are authorized to be continued available for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the appropriation hereby authorized.'

"(d) At the end of section 101, add the folowing new subsection:

"'(c) Not less than $25,000,000 of the funds made available under authority of subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be used for economic, technical, and military assistance to Spain in accordance with the provisions of this Act. Unexpended balances of appropriations made available for assistance to Spain pursuant to this section by the Act of October 31, 1951 (Public Law 249, Eighty-second Congress), are authorized to be continued available until June 30, 1953.'

"SEC. 4. Title II (relating to the Near East and Africa) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 is amended as follows:

"(a) At the end of section 201, which relates to military assistance for the Near East area, add the following new sentence: 'There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed $560,316,500, to carry out the purposes and provisions of this section; and in addition unexpended balances of any appropriations heretofore made pursuant to this section are authorized to be continued available for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the appropriation hereby authorized.'

"(b) Amend section 203, which relates to economic and technical assistance for the Near East and Africa, to read as follows: 'In order to further the purpose of this Act in Africa and the Near East there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed $50,822,750 to carry out the purposes and provisions of this section; and in addition unexpended balances of any appropriations heretofore made pursuant to this section are authorized to be continued available for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the appropriation hereby authorized. Funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be available under the applicable provisions of section 503 of this Act and the Act for International Development (22 U. S. C. 1557).'

"(c) After section 205 add the following new section:

"'SEC. 206. In addition to the amounts authorized by section 203, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $60,063,250 for carrying out the purposes and provisions of section 204 of this Act, relating to Palestine refugees, during the fiscal year 1953; and not to exceed $70,228,000 for carrying out the purposes and provisions of section 205 of this Act, relating to refugees in Israel, during the fiscal year 1953: *Provided*, That amounts appropriated pursuant to this section which the President finds cannot be effectively expended to carry out the purposes and provisions of sections 204 and 205 may be transferred to and merged with the appropriations authorized by section 203.'

"SEC. 5. Title III (relating to Asia and the Pacific) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 is amended as follows:

"(a) At the end of section 301, which relates to military and other assistance for Asia and the Pacific, add the following new sentence: 'There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed $564,807,500, to carry out the purposes and provisions of this section; and in addition unexpended balances of any appropriations heretofore made pursuant to this section are hereby authorized to be continued available for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the appropriation hereby authorized.'

"(b) In the second sentence of section 302 (a), which relates to economic and technical assistance for Asia and the Pacific, strike out the words 'the applicable provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501–1522), and' and insert in lieu thereof 'the applicable provisions of section 503 of this Act and the applicable provisions' and at the end of such subsection add the following new sentence: 'There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed $202,778,250, to carry out the purposes and provisions of this subsection in accordance with the applicable provisions of section 503 of this Act and not to exceed $118,634,250 to carry out the purposes and provisions of this subsection in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Act for International Development (Public Law 535, Eighty-first Congress); and in addition unexpended balances of any appropriations heretofore made pursuant to this subsection are hereby authorized to be continued available for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the appropriation hereby authorized.

"(c) At the end of section 302 (b), concerning Chinese and Korean students in the United States, add the following new sentence: 'Unexpended balances of allocations heretofore made to the Secretary of State pursuant to that proviso shall be continued available until expended.'

"(d) In the first sentence of section 303 (a), authorizing the appropriation of $45,000,000 for Korean relief, after the words 'to be appropriated to the President' insert the words 'for the fiscal year 1953.'

"(e) In the second sentence of section 303 (a) strike out '1952' and insert '1953'.

"(f) Immediately before the last sentence of section 303 (a) insert the following: 'In addition, the United States Department of the Army is hereby authorized to make available to the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, at the time when that agency assumes full responsibility for relief and rehabilitation in Korea, goods and services of a value not to exceed $67,500,000 which the Department of the Army then has on hand or on order for civilian relief in Korea and which the President determines should be contributed by the United States to the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency for use in its relief and rehabilitation operations in Korea. The value of goods and services made available pursuant to the preceding sentence shall be credited toward the contribution to be made by the United States to the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency.'

"(g) The last sentence of section 303 (b), which provides for reduction in United States contributions to Korean relief by the amounts made available by United States agencies, is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 6. Title IV (relating to Latin America) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 is amended (1) by adding at the end of the center heading 'AND NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES OF THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE', (2) by inserting after 'Republics' in section 402 the words 'and non-self-governing territories of the Western Hemisphere', and (3) by adding at the end of such title the following new section:

"'SEC. 403. In addition to the amounts heretofore authorized and appropriated, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed $57,685,750 to carry out the purposes and provisions of section 401, which relates to military assistance for Latin America, and not to exceed $20,329,000 to carry out the purposes and provisions of section 402, which relates to technical assistance for Latin America. In addition, unexpended balances of the appropriation heretofore made pursuant to each such section are authorized to be continued available for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the applicable appropriation authorized by this section.'

"SEC. 7. Title V (relating to organization) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 is amended as follows:

"(a) Section 522, which requires that at least 10 per centum of the funds for aid pursuant to the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, be in the form of loans, is hereby repealed.

"(b) In paragraph (3) of section 501 (a), insert before the period at the end thereof the following: 'and the supervision, coordination, and evaluation of all reports prepared by agencies of the United States Government in the course of their operations under this Act, in order to prevent duplication of effort and to insure a reduction of reporting requirements to the minimum essential for effective operation'.

"(c) Amend section 503 by inserting '(a)' after '503', by redesignating paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) as (1), (2), and (3), respectively, and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, is repealed.

"'(2) Of the powers, functions, and responsibilities transferred to the Director for Mutual Security by section 502 (b) (2) of this Act, only those which are exercised pursuant to the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, enumerated in paragraph (3) of this subsection and are not in conflict with the other provisions of this Act, as amended, may be exercised after June 30, 1952. Of the powers, functions, and responsibilities conferred on the President or the Secretary of State by the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, only those conferred by the provisions of that Act, as amended, which are referred to in paragraph (3) of this subsection may be exercised after June 30, 1952.

"'(3) The provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, referred to above are the following: Sections 104 (e) and (f); 105 (c); 107; subsections (a), (c), and (d) of section 109; 110 (a) and (b); 111; 112; 113; subsections (d), (h), and (i) of section 114; 115 (a); 115 (b); except the first sentence thereof; subsections (d), (h), and (j) of section 115; section 117 (c); 118, 119; 120; and subsection (a) of section 121. Where any of the above provisions refer to the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, such reference shall be deemed to be to the purpose of this Act, as amended.'

"(d) In section 504 (a), strike out all after 'Senate' and insert in lieu thereof a period and the following sentences: 'The Deputy Director shall receive compensation of $17,500 per annum. The Special Representative in Europe shall receive the same compensation and allowances as a Chief of Mission, class 1, within the meaning of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 999), and have the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary. The Deputy Special Representative in Europe shall be entitled to receive the same compensation and allowances as a Chief of Mission, class 3, within the meaning of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 999), and have the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.'

"(e) In section 504 (c), (1) strike out 'transferred to or employed by the Mutual Security Agency' and insert in lieu thereof 'employed in the United States on programs authorized by this Act' and (2) amend the second sentence of such subsection to read as follows: 'Such positions shall be in addition to those authorized by law to be filled by Presidential appointment and in addition to the number authorized by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.'

"(f) Before the period at the end of section 504 (d), insert the following: ': *Provided further*, That, ninety days after the enactment of the Mutual Security Act of 1952, the number of civilian employees who are United States citizens, receiving compensation or allowances from the administrative expense appropriations authorized by this Act, employed in the United States and overseas by or assigned to the Mutual Security Agency, or employed by or assigned to the Department of State or the Department of Defense for carrying out programs the appropriations for which are authorized by this Act, and the military personnel assigned to such programs, shall be in the aggregate at least 5 per centum less than the number so employed or assigned on June 1, 1952, except for such personnel of the Department of Defense engaged in the manufacturing, repair, rehabilitation, packing, handling, crating, or delivery of matériel: *Provided further*, That after the Director has determined the reduction to be effected in each agency, the determination as to which individual employees shall be retained shall be made by the head of the agency concerned'.

"(g) Amend section 506 (c) to read as follows:

"'(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, beginning with July 1, 1952, the Secretary of Defense may furnish (subject to reimbursement from funds appropriated pursuant to this Act) military assistance out of the materials of war whose production in the United States shall have been authorized for, and appropriated to, the Department of Defense: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this Act shall authorize the furnishing of military items under this subsection in excess of $1,000,000,000 in value. For the purposes of this subsection (1) "value" shall be determined in accordance with section 403 (c) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, and (2) the term "materials of war" means those goods, commonly known as military end items, which are required for the performance of their missions by armed forces of a nation, including weapons, military vehicles, ships of war under fifteen hundred tons, aircraft, military communications equipment, ammunition, maintenance parts and spares, and military hardware.'

"(h) Section 511 is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"'(c) (1) The Congress of the United States finds that mutual security can be realized only to the extent that the countries who receive our aid do their utmost to help themselves and cooperate among themselves and with the United States to the fullest extent in achieving the objectives of the free world. In providing assistance under this Act, the Congress of the United States affirms the desire of the United States to continue to use its leadership and resources for the purpose of uniting the efforts of recipient countries to the end that positive accomplishments toward mutual security may be realized with a maximum of efficiency and a minimum of delay and cost.

"'(2) In addition to the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section, the Director, in administering this Act, shall insure that, where necessary to the mutual security effort, no country shall receive any assistance hereunder unless it take decisive action to marshal its resources collectively, or individually where more suitable, with integration and unification plans in the appropriate area, and participate in programs which promote collective security in that area. The Director shall insure that, where suitable or necessary to the success of the mutual security effort, countries take adequate steps to mobilize their industries for mutual defense and gear their fiscal, budgetary, capital, political, and military resources to the objectives of this Act and take appropriate other steps toward self-help and mutual cooperation.

"'(3) Assistance shall be given on a country-by-country basis to a degree and at a rate commensurate with the rate of progress made in the attainment of the objectives of this Act.'

"(i) In section 513, amend the heading to read 'SPECIAL USE OF FUNDS', insert '(a)' after SEC. 513, and add at the end of such section the following new subsection:

"'(b) Not more than $100,000,000 of the funds made available under the Mutual Security Act of 1952, of which not more than $20,000,000 may be allocated to any one country, may be used or supplied without regard to any conditions as to eligibility contained in this Act, or any other Act for which funds are authorized by this Act, when the President determines that such use is important to the security of the United States. The President shall notify the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives upon making any such determination.'

"(j) Amend section 514 to read as follows:

"'STRATEGIC MATERIALS

"'SEC. 514. In order to reduce the drain on United States resources and to assure the production of adequate supplies of essential raw materials for the collective defense of the free world, the Director for Mutual Security is authorized to initiate projects for, and assist in procuring and stimulating increased production of, materials in which deficiencies or potential deficiencies in supply exist among nations receiving United States assistance.'

"(k) Amend section 516 by inserting '(a)' after 'SEC. 516.' and by adding at the end of such section the following new subsections:

"'(b) To accomplish the purpose of clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section, under the coordination of the Director for Mutual Security, the Mutual Security Agency, cooperating with private business groups and governmental agencies to the fullest extent possible, shall encourage a greater participation by private capital in the guaranty program and shall develop broad criteria to facilitate such participation, including programs consistent with the purposes of the Act for International Development.

"'(c) The Department of Commerce shall, in cooperation with such groups and agencies (including the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development), conduct a thorough study of the legal and other impediments, foreign and local, to private investment abroad, and the methods and means whereby those impediments can be removed or decreased and shall make recommendations thereon to the Director for Mutual Security.

"'(d) The Department of State, in cooperation with other agencies of the Government concerned with private investment abroad, and taking into account the study and recommendations described in subsection (c) of this section, shall accelerate a program of negotiating treaties of commerce and trade, or other temporary arrangements where more suitable or expeditious, which shall include provisions to encourage and facilitate the flow of private investment to countries participating in programs under this Act.

"'(e) The Technical Cooperation Administration, taking into account the study and recommendations described in subsection (c) of this section, shall encourage and facilitate a greater participation by private industrial groups or agencies in private contracts awarded by the Administration, and shall, in cooperation with the Department of Commerce and the Mutual Security Agency, find and draw the attention of private enterprise to opportunities for investment and development in underdeveloped areas.

"'(f) The reports required by section 518 of this Act shall include detailed information on the implementation of this section.'

"(l) In section 519 (a), which permits the limited use of economic and technical assistance funds for the Near East, Africa, Asia, and the Pacific to acquire local currency, immediately after the words 'may be advanced', insert the words 'out of funds made available for assistance under section 503 of this Act'.

"(m) After section 531 add the following new sections:

"'EXEMPTION FROM CONTRACT, ACCOUNTING, AND CERTAIN OTHER LAWS

"'SEC. 532. The provisions of section 119 of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1517), which concern exemption from contract and accounting

laws, shall apply to the performance of functions authorized by this Act.

"'SEC. 533. (a) Notwithstanding section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894 (5 U. S. C. 62), which prohibits certain retired officers from holding certain office, any retired officer of any of the services mentioned in the Career Compensation Act of 1949 may hold any office or appointment under this Act or the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, but the compensation of any such retired officer shall be subject to the provisions of the Act of June 30, 1932 (5 U. S. C. 59a), which does not permit retired pay to be added to the compensation received as a civilian officer.

"'(b) Officers of the United States Public Health Service and officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, who are assigned for duty under this Act outside the continental limits of the United States, may receive the allowances and benefits provided for officers in the Foreign Service Reserve or Staff by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801–1204), and may also receive salary differentials as provided in that Act computed on their basic pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U. S. C. 231–320); and, in addition to any quarters furnished them by the Government, such officers may receive, during the period of their assignment for duty outside the continental limits of the United States, the allowance payable under section 302 (f) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U. S. C. 252 (f)).

"'MOVEMENT OF MIGRANTS

"'SEC. 534. In order to encourage further the movement of migrants from European countries having surplus population, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President $9,240,500 for use in making contributions for the calendar year 1953 to the Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe established at Brussels, Belgium, on December 5, 1951.

"'OCEAN FREIGHT CHARGES ON RELIEF PACKAGES

"'SEC. 535. The authority to pay ocean freight charges on shipments of relief supplies and packages under section 117 (c) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1515 (c)), shall be continued and may be exercised after June 30, 1952, by any department or agency of the Government that the President may designate: *Provided*, That this authority shall hereafter also be applicable to relief shipments by voluntary nonprofit relief agencies registered with and approved by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid to any country eligible for economic or technical assistance under this Act: *And provided further*, That not to exceed $2,587,500 are authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 for use in paying ocean freight charges under section 117 (c) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

"'INFORMATIONAL MEDIA GUARANTIES

"'SEC. 536. The authority to make informational media guaranties under section 111 (b) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, shall be fully continued and may be exercised after June 30, 1952, by any department or agency of the Government that the President may designate.

"'LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR PROPAGANDA

"'SEC. 537. None of the funds herein authorized to be appropriated nor any counterpart funds shall be used to pay for personal services or printing, or for other expenses of the dissemination within the United States of general propaganda in support of the mutual security program, or to pay the travel or other expenses outside the United States of any citizen or group of citizens of the United States for the purpose of publicizing such program within the United States.

"'SMALL BUSINESS

"'SEC. 538. (a) Insofar as practicable and to the maximum extent consistent with the accomplishment of the purposes of this Act, the Director for Mutual Security shall assist American small business to participate equitably in the furnishing of commodities and services financed with funds authorized under this Act (other than funds authorized to carry out the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended) by making available or causing to be made available to suppliers in the United States and particularly to small independent enterprises, information, as far in advance as possible, with respect to purchases proposed to be financed with funds authorized under this Act (other than funds authorized to carry out the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended), by making available or causing to be made available to prospective purchasers in the countries receiving assistance under this Act information as to commodities and services produced by small independent enterprises in the United States, and by offering additional services to give small business better opportunities to participate in the furnishing of commodities and services financed with such funds.

"'(b) There shall be continued in the Mutual Security Agency the Office of Small Business headed by the Special Assistant for Small Business to carry out the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section. Each report transmitted to the Congress under section 518 shall include a report of all activities under this section. The Technical Cooperation Administration shall adopt the procedure of notifying American business, particularly small independent enterprises, of procurement and other information as far in advance as possible through the facilities of the Office of Small Business of the Mutual Security Agency. The Secretary of Defense shall assure that there is made available to suppliers in the United States, and particularly to small independent enterprises, information with respect to purchases made by the Department of Defense pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, such information to be furnished as far in advance as possible.

"'(c) Section 112 (l) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, is hereby repealed.

"'LIMITATION ON USE OF COUNTERPART FUNDS

"'SEC. 539. Except as otherwise specifically authorized by law, all counterpart funds of local currencies created by section 115 (b) (6) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and by Acts supplementary or amendatory thereto shall be expended only on programs to carry out the purposes for which new funds authorized by this Act would themselves be available.'

"SEC. 8. The Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1571–1604), is further amended as follows:

"(a) Before the period at the end of the proviso in the first sentence of section 403 (d), which authorizes the furnishing of $1,000,000,000 worth of excess equipment to foreign nations, insert a comma and the words 'and after June 30, 1952, by an additional $200,000,000'.

"(b) Change section 408 (e), concerning reimbursable aid, to read as follows:

"'(e) (1) The President may, from time to time, in the interest of achieving standardization of military equipment and in order to provide procurement assistance without cost to the United States, transfer, or enter into contracts for the procurement for transfer of, equipment, materials, or services to: (A) nations eligible for assistance under title I, II, III, or IV of the Mutual Security Act of 1951; (B) a nation which has joined with the United States in a collective defense and regional arrangement; (C) any international military organization or headquarters if, in the opinion of the President, such assistance will further the purposes of this Act; or (D) any other nation not eligible to join a collective defense and regional arrangement referred to in clause (B) above, but whose ability to defend itself or to participate in the defense of the area of which it is a part, is important to the security of the United States: *Provided*, That, prior to the transfer of any equipment, materials, or services to a nation under this clause (D), it shall provide the United States with assurance that such equipment, materials, or services are required for and will be used solely to maintain its internal security, its legitimate self-defense, or to permit it to participate in the defense of the area of which it is a part, or in the United Nations collective security arrangements and measures, and that it will not undertake any act of aggression against any other state: *Provided further*, That, in the case of any such transfer, the President shall forthwith notify the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

"'(2) Whenever equipment or material is transferred from the stocks of, or services are rendered by any agency, to any nation or international organization as provided in paragraph (1) above, such nation or international organization shall first make available the fair value, as determined by the President, of such equipment, materials, or services before delivery or, when the President determines it to be in the best interests of the United States, within sixty days thereafter. The fair value for the purpose of this paragraph shall not be less for the various categories of equipment or materials than the value as defined in subsection (c) of section 403: *Provided*, That with respect to excess equipment or materials the fair value may not be determined to be less than the value specified in paragraph (1) of that subsection plus (a) 10 per centum of the original gross cost of such equipment or materials; (b) the scrap value; or (c) the market value, if ascertainable, whichever is the greater. Before a contract is entered into, or rehabilitation work is undertaken, such nation shall (A) provide the United States with a dependable undertaking to pay the full amount of such contract or the cost of such rehabilitation which will assure the United States against any loss on the contract, or rehabilitation work, and (B) shall make funds available in such amounts and at such times as may be necessary to meet the payments required by the contract or the rehabilitation work in advance of the time such payments are due, in addition to the estimated amount of any damages and costs that may accrue from the cancellation of such contract or rehabilitation work: *Provided*, That the total amount of outstanding contracts under this subsection, less the amounts which have been paid the United States by such nations, shall at no time exceed $700,000,000.

"'(3) The provisions of section 409 of this Act shall not apply to equipment, materials, and commodities made available under this subsection.'

"SEC. 9. Section 115 of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, is amended as follows:

"(a) Before the period at the end of paragraph (6) of subsection (b) insert a colon and the following: '*And provided further*, That whenever funds from such special ac-

count are used by a country to make loans all funds received in repayment of such loans shall be redeposited in such special account'.

"(b) In subsection (h) strike out '5 per centum' and insert in lieu thereof '10 per centum'.

"(c) At the end of such section add a new subsection as follows:

"'(k) Of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 101 (a) (2) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, (1) $100,000,000 shall, to the maximum extent practicable consistent with the accomplishment of the policies and purposes of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, be expended in such manner and subject to such agreements as may be necessary to assure that the amounts of local currencies deposited under subsection (b) (6) as a result of such expenditure shall be used exclusively, in accordance with principles developed by the Administrator, to establish revolving funds which shall be available for making loans, and otherwise to carry out programs in furtherance of the objectives of section 516 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, with a view to stimulating free enterprise and the expansion of the economies of those countries with equitable sharing of the benefits of increased production and productivity between consumers, workers, and owners; and (2) the Director for Mutual Security is authorized to transfer not exceeding $2,500,000 to the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, to be used on terms and conditions to be specified by the Director in order to promote the objectives of section 516 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended.'

"SEC. 10. The Act for International Development is amended as follows:

"(a) At the end of section 404 (b), as amended, which relates to contributions of not to exceed $13,000,000 for 1952 to international organizations for technical cooperation programs, add the following proviso: '*Provided further*, That for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed $15,708,750 is authorized to be appropriated to the President for use in making contributions under this subsection.'

"(b) Change section 413 (a) thereof, which concerns the appointment of the Administrator of the Technical Cooperation Administration at a salary of $15,000, to read as follows:

"'(a) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an Administrator for Technical Cooperation, who, under the direction of the President or such other officer as he may designate pursuant to section 412 hereof to exercise the powers conferred upon him by this title, shall be responsible for planning, implementing, and managing the programs authorized in this title. He shall be compensated at a rate fixed by the President without regard to the Classification Act of 1949 but not in excess of $16,000 per annum. The President may also appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a Deputy Administrator for Technical Cooperation who shall perform such functions as the Administrator shall designate, and shall be Acting Administrator for Technical Cooperation during the absence or disability of the Administrator or in the event of a vacancy in the office of the Administrator. The Deputy Administrator shall receive compensation at a rate fixed by the President without regard to the Classification Act of 1949 but not in excess of $15,000 per annum.'

"SEC. 11. Section 32 (b) (2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 App. U. S. C. 1641), is amended by striking out in the first sentence thereof 'acquired as a result of such surplus property disposals,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'held or available for expenditure by the United States or any agency thereof (or deposited pursuant to agreements entered into pursuant to section 115 (b) (6) and 115 (h) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended), and not required by law or agreement with such government to be expended or used for any other purpose,'.

"SEC. 12. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed $16,481,000 to enable him to make contributions to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund until December 31, 1953, in such manner and on such terms and conditions as he may deem to be in the interests of the United States to support international children's welfare work: *Provided*, That the contributions shall be made in such a manner as to give assurance that they will not exceed 33⅓ per centum of contributions from all governments, including contributions made by governments for the benefit of persons located within territories under their control: *Provided further*, That none of the funds authorized shall be used in duplication of the activities of other agencies of the United Nations."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JAS. P. RICHARDS,
MIKE MANSFIELD,
THOMAS E. MORGAN,
R. B. CHIPERFIELD,
JOHN M. VORYS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

TOM CONNALLY,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7005) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The committee of conference has agreed to a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. Except for clarifying, clerical, and necessary conforming changes, the differences are noted below:

THE FUND AUTHORIZATIONS

The total amount authorized in the House bill was $6,174,600,000. The amount authorized by the Senate amendment was $6,720,861,500, or $546,261,500 more than the sum carried in the House bill.

The committee of conference has agreed on a total of $6,447,730,750.

This amount was reached by dividing equally the difference in each authorization between the two Houses. Thus, $273,130,750 was added to the House authorization; an identical sum was subtracted from the Senate authorization.

The agreement provides for all titles a total of $4,598,424,500 for military assistance and a total of $1,805,288,500 for economic and technical assistance. The military assistance authorization is $2,424,500 more than the total in the House bill. The sum authorized for economic and technical assistance in the agreement is $268,488,500 more than the total in the House bill.

Four other items—United Nations technical assistance, emigration of surplus manpower from Europe, ocean freight on relief packages, and the Children's Fund—carry authorizations totaling $41,017,750, a sum which also represents an equal adjustment between the House and the Senate authorizations.

The nonmilitary sums for title II (Near East and Africa) and for title III (Asia and Pacific) are subdivided. The House bill and Senate amendment carried this subdivision for title II; only the House bill had this provision for title III. The Senate adopted the House position in the latter title. Thus, specific sums are allocated for programs to be carried out under the Technical Cooperation Administration and under the Mutual Security Agency.

The House bill provided for the carry-over of unobligated balances. The Senate amendment provided for the carry-over of unexpended balances. In view of the fact that previous acts carried over unexpended balances, it was the opinion of the committee of conference that this was better understood and would cause fewer administrative problems. Hence, the Senate language is retained in the conference agreement.

The following tables show the breakdown of the agreed amounts:

TABLE I.—*Authorization by title*

Title I—*Europe:*	
Military	$3,415,614,750
Defense support	1,282,433,000
Total	4,698,047,750
Title II—*Near East and Africa:*	
Military	560,316,500
Technical assistance	50,822,750
Arab refugees	60,063,250
Israel refugees	70,228,000
Total	741,430,500
Title III—*Asia and Pacific:*	
Military	564,807,500
Economic	202,778,250
Technical assistance	118,634,250
Total	886,220,000
Title IV—*Latin America:*	
Military	57,685,750
Technical assistance	20,329,000
Total	78,014,750
Other:	
United Nations technical assistance	15,708,750
Emigration of surplus manpower from Europe	9,240,500
Ocean freight for relief packages	2,587,500
United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund	16,481,000
Grand total	6,447,730,750

TABLE II.—*Authorization by type*

	Military	Economic	Total
Title I	$3,415,614,750	$1,282,433,000	$4,698,047,750
Title II	560,316,500	181,114,000	741,430,500
Title III	564,807,500	321,412,500	886,220,000
Title IV	57,685,750	20,329,000	78,014,750
	4,598,424,500	1,805,288,500	6,403,713,000
Other:			
United Nations technical assistance			15,708,750
Emigration of surplus manpower from Europe			9,240,500
Ocean freight for relief packages			2,587,500
United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund			16,481,000
			6,447,730,750

TABLE III.—*Authorization by comparison*

	Executive request	House authorization	Percent reduction	Senate authorization	Percent reduction	Difference between House and Senate authorizations		Conference agreement	Percent reduction from Executive request
Europe:									
Military	$4,145,000,000	$3,316,000,000	20.0	$3,515,229,500	15.2	Senate	$199,229,500 more than House	$3,415,614,750	17.6
Defense support	1,819,200,000	1,022,000,000	43.8	1,542,866,000	15.2	Senate	520,866,000 more than House	1,282,433,000	29.5
Near East:									
Military	606,370,000	606,370,000	0	514,263,000	15.2	House	92,107,000 more than Senate	560,316,500	7.6
Technical assistance	55,000,000	55,000,000	0	46,645,500	15.2	House	8,354,500 more than Senate	50,822,750	7.6
Arab refugees	65,000,000	65,000,000	0	55,126,500	15.2	House	9,873,500 more than Senate	60,063,250	7.6
Israeli refugees	76,000,000	76,000,000	0	64,456,000	15.2	House	11,544,000 more than Senate	70,228,000	7.6
	196,000,000	196,000,000	0	166,228,000	15.2	House	29,772,000 more than Senate	181,114,000	7.6
Asia:									
Military	611,230,000	611,230,000	0	518,385,000	15.2	House	92,845,000 more than Senate	564,807,500	7.6
Economic	[1] 258,000,000	208,800,000	19.1					202,778,250	21.4
Technical assistance	150,000,000	[1] 88,000,000	41.3					[1] 118,634,250	20.9
	408,000,000	296,800,000	27.3	346,025,000	15.2	Senate	49,225,000 more than House	321,412,500	21.2
Latin America:									
Military	62,400,000	62,400,000	0	52,971,500	15.2	House	9,428,500 more than Senate	57,685,750	7.6
Technical assistance	22,000,000	22,000,000	0	18,658,000	15.2	House	3,342,000 more than Senate	20,329,000	7.6
U. N. technical assistance	17,000,000	17,000,000	0	14,417,500	15.2	House	2,582,500 more than Senate	15,708,750	7.6
Emigration of surplus manpower from Europe	10,000,000	10,000,000	0	8,841,000	15.2	House	1,519,000 more than Senate	9,240,500	7.6
Ocean freight for relief packages	2,800,000	2,800,000	0	2,375,000	15.2	House	425,000 more than Senate	2,587,500	7.6
Total	7,000,000,000	6,162,600,000	22.0	6,699,899,500	15.2	Senate	537,299,500 more than House	6,431,249,750	18.6
UNICEF		12,000,000		20,962,000		Senate	8,962,000 more than House	16,481,000	
Grand total		6,174,600,000		6,720,861,500				6,447,730,750	

[1] Includes Burma and Indonesia.

REPEAL OF THE ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT—SECTION 7 (C)

The House bill provided for the repeal of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (Public Law 472, 80th Cong.), except for certain enumerated sections which were to be continued to enable the Director for Mutual Security to carry out the duties conferred on him by section 503 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951. The Senate amendment included no such provision.

The conference agreement provides for retaining those sections of the Economic Cooperation Act which are set forth in the House bill and adds certain others to insure that the Director for Mutual Security will not be handicapped in carrying out the program. These additional sections include provision for continuing the present status of Mutual Security Agency missions abroad and for the Director for Mutual Security to terminate assistance when recipient countries do not carry out their agreements with the United States. In addition, a number of conforming amendments are incorporated in the conference agreement which were made necessary by the repeal of the Economic Cooperation Act.

REDUCTION IN PERSONNEL—SECTION 7 (F)

The House bill provided for a 10 percent reduction from the level of January 1, 1952, in personnel engaged in carrying out the United States program. The Senate amendment contained no such provision. The conference agreement changes the date on which the reduction is to be based to June 1, 1952, and provides for a 5 percent reduction.

The committee of conference believes that this action is necessary to insure that adequate personnel will be provided to carry out programs in countries where agreements are just being completed preparatory to beginning operations. It should be noted that the reduction provided for in this section applies to personnel employed by the Departments of State and Defense and the Mutual Security Agency.

Point IV program activities are carried out through participating agencies as well as the Department of State's Technical Cooperation Administration. These agencies maintain substantial staffs in Washington as well as the TCA headquarters. These agencies should take steps to reduce their staffs. It is the intent of the committee of conference that all staffs in Washington concerned with Point IV should be brought to reasonable levels. The committee of conference expects the Administrator of Technical Cooperation to see that this is achieved.

MOVEMENT OF MIGRANTS—SECTION 7 (M) (NEW SEC. 534)

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment contained a provision authorizing a contribution of funds by the United States to the Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe (PICMME). The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation in the alternative to "any successor organization." The House bill contained no such alternative authorization and in addition contained a proviso denying salary or expenses to the Director General of the Committee if a former employee of UNRRA or the IRO. The Senate amendment contained no such proviso.

The conference agreement omits the phrase "or to any successor organization" and the House proviso. The phrase "or to any successor organization" is unnecessary. It is the intent of the committee of conference that the United States participate in and contribute to PICMME whether the word "Provisional" appear in the title of the organization or not. This has already been made amply clear in House Report 1922, at page 59.

The intent contained in the conference report on the Mutual Security Act of 1951 is repeated here that none of the funds made available for the movement of migrants shall be allocated to any international organization "which has in its membership any Communist, Communist-dominated or Communist-controlled country, to any subsidiary thereof or to any agency created by or stemming from such organization."

OCEAN FREIGHT CHARGES ON RELIEF PACKAGES—SECTION 7 (M) (NEW SEC. 535)

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment continued the authority of the Government to pay ocean freight charges on shipments of relief supplies overseas. The Senate amendment, in addition, contained a proviso granting similar authority in the case of shipments by voluntary nonprofit relief agencies (registered with and approved by the Advisory Committee on Foreign Aid) to any country eligible for economic or technical assistance under the Mutual Security Act. The conference agreement retains the language of the Senate amendment.

INFORMATIONAL MEDIA GUARANTIES—SECTION 7 (M) (NEW SEC. 536)

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment authorized continuation of the informational media guaranty program. The House bill also contained a similar provision concerning investment guaranties.

The conference agreement omits the House provision on investment guaranties, since such a program is elsewhere in the conference agreement specifically required to be continued beyond June 30, 1952 (sec. 7 (c)).

OCEAN SHIPPING AND REIMBURSABLE AID—SECTION 8 (B)

The Senate amendment contained a provision making section 409 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, which requires that 50 percent of the equipment and material made available under that act be carried in United States flag vessels, inapplicable to equipment, material, and commodities made available to foreign nations on a reimbursable basis. The House bill contained no such provision.

The committee of conference decided that since, in the case of reimbursable aid, a foreign country is purchasing material with its own funds, it is not proper to require such a country to ship 50 percent of this material on United States flag vessels. The conference agreement retains the Senate language to make clear that the 50-percent requirement is not applicable to material, equipment, and commodities furnished under section 408 (e) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, which deals with reimbursable aid.

INCREASING THE AVAILABILITY OF COUNTERPART FUNDS FOR THE PROCUREMENT OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS—SECTION 9 (B)

The House bill provided that whatever sums were necessary to meet United States expenditures for strategic materials should be made available from the counterpart funds deposited in each country. The Senate amendment contained no such provision. Under subsection 115 (h) of the Economic

Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, not less than 5 percent of the counterpart has been set aside for strategic materials and for other expenses of the United States Government. In general, this 5-percent provision has been made by bilateral agreement a ceiling for the amount available for strategic materials.

LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR PROPAGANDA—SECTION 7 (M) (NEW SEC. 537)

The Senate amendment provided that no funds authorized or counterpart funds could be used to pay for the travel of United States citizens outside the United States for purposes of publicizing the Mutual Security Program in the United States or for other expenses of disseminating in the United States general propaganda in support of the Mutual Security Program. The House bill contained no such provision. The conference agreement includes the language of the Senate amendment.

The committee of conference recognized the desirability of preventing any use of funds for propaganda in support of the Mutual Security Program. At the same time there should not be any interference with the supplying of full information to the Congress and to the public concerning the operations of the Mutual Security Program. The committee of conference believes that it is possible for those responsible for the administration of the Mutual Security Act to maintain a sharp distinction between propaganda and the supplying of information as to the results attained under the program, and that this section of the conference agreement should not interfere with the recognized procedures for keeping the public and the Congress informed.

SMALL BUSINESS—SECTION 7 (M) (NEW SEC. 538)

The Senate amendment provided for amending the Mutual Security Act to establish an Office of Small Business and to give direction to the Director for Mutual Security to insure that small independent enterprises will share equitably in furnishing supplies financed by the Mutual Security Program. Similar provisions were already in the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, and the Director for Mutual Security has been carrying out these provisions as a consequence of his assumption of the powers, functions, and responsibilities of the Administrator for Economic Cooperation, as provided in section 502 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951. No such provision was included in the House bill.

The committee of conference believes that the transfer of provisions spelling out the responsibilities of the Director for Mutual Security for small business from the Economic Cooperation Act to the Mutual Security Act gives desirable assurance of the continuation of operations under these provisions. In addition, language has been included to insure that small business will share equitably in the programs of the Technical Cooperation Administration. The conference agreement contains the provisions of the Senate amendment with certain modifications for purposes of clarification.

LIMITATION ON USE OF COUNTERPART FUNDS—SECTION 7 (M) (NEW SEC. 539)

The Senate amendment provided that "except as otherwise provided by this Act" counterpart funds should be used only for projects of military assistance or defense support for which new funds authorized by the Mutual Security Act of 1952 would be available. No such provision was contained in the House bill.

The committee of conference recognized the desirability of the use of more counterpart funds in the defense effort, but felt that the language of the Senate amendment might prevent the use of counterpart under other acts, and for such purposes as procurement by the United States of strategic materials. All country programs administered by the Mutual Security Agency must conform to the requirements of section 503 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 so that in such countries the Senate amendment would be appropriate, but the committee of conference felt there was the possibility that under the Senate amendment counterpart could not be used in Germany, Austria, and Trieste to carry out programs essential to the security of the United States but not strictly within the Senate limitation.

The conference agreement modified the Senate language so that the use of counterpart is limited to the programs for which new funds authorized in the Mutual Security Act of 1952 would be available, except as other uses of counterpart are specifically authorized by law.

The committee of conference recognized the desirability of increasing the availability of counterpart for the procurement of strategic materials. It was believed, however, that this objective could be better accomplished with less disruption to the normal commercial trade in such materials by amending subsection 115 (h) to increase the percentage set aside for such purposes from 5 to 10 percent, rather than by the provision included in the House bill. The conference agreement includes such a provision. It is intended that the 10 percent should be a minimum, not a maximum.

COUNTERPART TO ENCOURAGE FREE ENTERPRISE—SECTION 9 (C)

The House bill and the Senate amendment contained provisions setting aside counterpart funds (in the value of not less than $100,000,000 in the House bill and $150,000,000 in the Senate amendment) for programs furthering the free enterprise objectives of section 516 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951. The House bill directly earmarked the counterpart. The Senate amendment provided that $150,000,000 of dollar aid shall be furnished under agreements which will assure that the counterpart derived therefrom shall be used for section 516 purposes. The Senate amendment further provided that the counterpart funds shall be used to establish revolving funds in the respective countries, which shall be available for making loans and otherwise to carry out section 516 programs. The Senate amendment further authorized the transfer of not to exceed $2,500,000 to the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) to promote the objectives of section 516.

The conference agreement follows the Senate language, except that the words "in the respective countries" are omitted and the amount is cut down from $150,000,000 to the House figure of $100,000,000. The omission of these words will permit greater flexibility in the use of the revolving fund mechanism. The amount of $100,000,000 should be sufficient to make possible a substantial implementation of the objectives of section 516.

COUNTERPART FUNDS FOR EXCHANGE PROGRAMS UNDER FULBRIGHT ACT—SECTION 11

The Senate amendment contained a section amending the Surplus Property Act of 1944 by making it possible for limited amounts of counterpart funds acquired in connection with the foreign-aid programs to be used for the exchange programs authorized by the Fulbright Act. The House bill contained no such provision. The conference agreement adopts the Senate language.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND—SECTION 13

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment made provision for a contribution by this Government to UNICEF. In making such money available it was recognized that presidential discretion as to specific sums and specific conditions was desirable. The committee of conference agreed, however, that in no case should United States contributions exceed one-third of the contributions from all governments, including contributions made by governments for the benefit of persons located within territories under their control. This was one of the conditions upon which the House approved the provision. To assure the most effective use of the money the committee of conference also agreed to another House proviso that none of the funds could be used in duplication of the activities of other agencies of the United Nations. The conferees recognized the necessity for the closest cooperation between the United Nations agencies connected with health, feeding, and educational activities, all of which might affect children, and that there might be an interchange of activities under special circumstances in a given area, but felt that this was no reason for duplication of activities by the Children's Fund. Since the United Nations operates on a calendar year basis and because the General Assembly will review the whole program in the fall of 1953, the terminal date in the House bill, December 31, 1953, was adopted in the conference agreement.

LIMITING SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT UNDER ACT FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The committee of conference eliminated a House provision limiting dollar expenditures under the Act for International Development for the program in any country in any fiscal year for supplies and equipment to not more than three times the dollar costs for personnel. In dropping this provision the committee of conference considered the reduction in funds for TCA a sufficiently limiting factor for this year. The committee reports of the House and Senate noted with concern the increasing ratio of supplies and equipment to personnel—4 to 1, and both bodies have expressed the view that it is not desirable to go beyond this ratio. But the proper limit cannot be effectively expressed by a mathematical ratio. Fundamentally the technical assistance program is one of teaching and showing; supplies and equipment beyond those necessary for demonstration purposes will convert this into a type of world-wide economic aid program our country cannot afford. This should provide adequate notice to the Administrator as to the legislative intent of this program.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION

The House bill contained a provision permitting the Director for Mutual Security to subscribe up to $100,000,000 to the capital of an International Finance Corporation, should it be created, as an affiliate of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The Senate amendment contained no such provision.

This is omitted in the conference agreement. The committee of conference was of the view that such a provision, while desirable, is premature, since no definitive study has been made of the subject and it is highly doubtful that any funds could be used for such a purpose during fiscal year 1953.

OFFSHORE PROCUREMENT

The House bill provided that not less than $1,000,000,000 of the military assistance funds made available by the bill shall be expended for procurement of military end items from sources outside the United States. The Senate amendment contained no such requirement. The conference agreement omits the provision. Section 401 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, already includes authority for offshore procurement. The committee of conference expects that this authority will be utilized when, and to the extent that, it is to the advantage of the Mutual Security Program to do so.

EXPORTS TO THE SOVIET UNION AND ITS SATELLITES

The Senate amendment included a provision that no economic, financial, or military

assistance should be provided to any country knowingly permitting the export of arms, military matériel, or commodities likely to be used in the manufacture of arms or armament to the Soviet Union or its satellites. This section also provided for the repeal of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (Public Law 213, 82d Cong.—Battle Act). The conferees felt that proper implementation of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act would provide a more workable solution to the problem and did not include this section in the conference agreement.

The committee of conference, however, expressed dissatisfaction with the progress made so far in bringing under control shipments to the Soviet bloc from countries which receive United States assistance. The committee of conference also was concerned that the operation of the control of trade with countries behind the iron curtain was still dispersed among several departments and agencies in Washington and that the centralization of administration which had been anticipated under the Battle Act had not been completely put into effect. The committee of conference examined figures showing substantial reductions in East-West trade in strategic materials since the Battle Act went into effect and found that substantial progress was being made in eliminating this trade. It was recognized that during the short time the Battle Act has been in effect a basis has been laid for reducing the volume of shipments to Russia and the satellites and that the results of preparatory work have not yet had time to become fully apparent.

JAS. P. RICHARDS,
MIKE MANSFIELD,
THOMAS E. MORGAN,
R. B. CHIPERFIELD,
JOHN M. VORYS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. RICHARDS (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House be dispensed with, and the statement be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

WHAT, IF ANY, CONTRIBUTION SHOULD BE MADE BY UNITED STATES FOR FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND MILITARY AID?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, as time goes on it is becoming more and more apparent that the people of our Nation are becoming alarmed. They are deeply concerned as to the ultimate effect on the financial stability of our Nation as a result of our continually appropriating large sums of money for use throughout the world. It would seem that, in too many instances, those who advocate this generosity, upon our part, throughout the world, do not recognize either the necessity of maintaining our own financial standing, or that many necessities of our own people cry out for relief.

There is an undeniable sensitiveness on the part of the people of this Nation for all who are in need. Our hearts respond to every call for help, regardless from whence it originates. This has been particularly apparent during and since the war. Our response as a nation has been quick and generous. It has been gratifying to realize that the help we have extended through many different activities and agencies has produced such beneficial results.

NEED FOR HELP AT CLOSE OF WAR SHOWN BY STUDIES MADE BY CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

As a member on two occasions of congressional committees specially authorized by the Congress to study the economic need of the countries of Europe and the Near East, I have had an opportunity to study in detail the conditions existing in those countries. The first study was made with the so-called Colmer committee, immediately following the cessation of hostilities in Europe. The second study was made as a member of the Herter committee, 2 years later in 1947. The report submitted by the latter committee was the basis for the so-called Marshall plan. It was evident at the time the above-mentioned studies were made that there was a real need existing for such help as could be given by this country. Each of the countries visited was badly demoralized from an economic standpoint as a direct result of the hardships and losses incident to the ravages of war. The morale and spirit of the people were at a low ebb. However, there was evident a spirit to overcome their difficulties if the necessary financial assistance was made available to them. It was under these conditions that help was extended by this country. The amount has run into many billions of dollars.

PRODUCTION IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES RECEIVING UNITED STATES AID HAS REACHED HIGH LEVEL

The aid that was given has resulted in a high degree of recovery in each of the countries to which assistance was given. Today, in each of these countries statistics show that their rate of production has reached a point in excess of what it was before World War II. In many instances it is almost double that of prewar.

Under the degree of recovery above mentioned, it is natural and sensible for us to ask, "Is further help necessary, and, if so, how much?" This is the issue that is presented to the Congress in its consideration of the Conference Report on the Mutual Security Act of 1952. The President asked for a total of $7,900,000,000. The House reduced the requested authorization by 22 percent to $6,174,000,000. The Senate increased the amount to be authorized to $6,720,861,500. The conferees of the House and Senate, after a study of the differing amounts, have recommended $6,447,730,750, as a compromise between the House and Senate. This represents a cut of 18.6 percent from the President's request.

HOW MUCH, IF ANY, SHOULD BE OUR CONTRIBUTION FOR ECONOMIC AND MILITARY AID AT THIS TIME?

In determining the question, How much, if any, additional financial aid should be given by the United States to countries throughout the world, for economic and military assistance, there are two pertinent questions that must be determined.

First. Does the need exist, and, if so, to what extent?

Second. To what extent does our fiscal status and the need in our own country limit the amount, if any, to be given by the United States?

In my opinion it is wise and consequently imperative to answer these fundamental questions. A negative answer, in whole or in part, does not mean that there is a lack of desire to be helpful. It merely recognizes that conditions are such that we must be practical in our desire to help, and reasonable in our response. We owe a duty to our own people as well as to the people of other countries. If our spirit of generosity leads us to give beyond our means, or, beyond what necessity demands, then our action is unwise. We must at all times recognize that there is a limit beyond which we cannot safely go. To do so is to weaken our financial structure and thereby bring disaster to us and the rest of the world. There is no one who will dispute the fact that if there is a financial failure in the United States that it would prove a disaster throughout the world. The chaos that would result, in my humble opinion, is exactly what Russia would like to see. Certainly it would contribute to the aims and purposes of the Soviets to bring the whole world under the domination of communism. Today, our country is a bulwark against the spread of communism. To weaken our Nation by unwise fiscal policies that cause us to expend beyond our means plays directly into the hands of communism. This must be avoided under any and all circumstances.

FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND MILITARY AID EXPENDITURES SINCE 1940, INCLUDING 1953, AMOUNTS TO OVER $130,000,000,000

It is well to pause in our consideration of this subject to realize the extent of our gifts in furtherance of foreign aid, both economic and military. A study of reports relating to the subject reveals that including the present authorization of $6,447,730,750, the total in actual appropriations, authorizations, and surplus property credits for the benefit of foreign governments from the commencement of such program in 1940 amounts to approximately $132,000,000,000.

By comparison when our own country was in the throes of a long depression, in the 7 years starting with fiscal 1934, the actual expenditures for relief, work relief, and all other Federal aid totaled but $20,994,448,806.

These funds here were spent for the operations of the Civilian Conservation Corps, the National Youth Administration, the Works Progress Administration, the Public Works Administration, and many minor projects affecting the economic and social life of the Republic. Some projects admittedly were not so good, however, a lot of discouraged Americans were put on their economic feet by the use of Federal funds, and we did get a goodly number of new public buildings, schools, and the like and in the end every tax dollar spent for all the projects went for relief of our own distressed people.

The American taxpayers are now commencing to wonder just when the Congress will quit appropriating new funds for foreign economic and military aid when our own Treasury is more than $258,000,000,000 in debt. Syphoning off the wealth and resources of the United States is a contributing factor to the inflation depreciating the value of the dollar. This the people are commencing to realize.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FOREIGN AID IN 1953 CREATES HEAVY TAX BURDEN FOR OUR TAXPAYERS

The authorization for the additional appropriation of $6,447,730,750, creates a tax burden of $155 on every family in the United States. And, this authorization coming on top of a defense program currently costing nearly $60,000,000,000 a year, means that practically one-third of the total national income is presently being absorbed by the cost of national defense, foreign military and economic aid, and the other governmental costs, Federal, State, and local which the citizens must bear. It should also be borne in mind that the $130 and more billion dollars appropriated for foreign military and economic aid in peacetime as well as wartime is an amount that equals more than one-half of our present public debt of $258,000,000,000. The mere statement of this fact is sufficient to cause serious thought as to how long we can continue to give away our substance and still remain financially strong.

WHAT SHOULD BE THE FUTURE COURSE OF THE UNITED STATES IN GIVING ADDITIONAL AID, ECONOMIC AND MILITARY, THROUGHOUT THE WORLD?

To show the extent to which our aid under the pending bill, is to be given throughout the world, I refer to the conference report of the conferees. It is as follows:

TABLE I.—*Authorization by title*

Title I—Europe:	
Military	$3,415,614,750
Defense support	1,282,433,000
Total	4,698,047,750
Title II—Near East and Africa:	
Military	560,316,500
Technical assistance	50,822,750
Arab refugees	60,063,250
Israel refugees	70,228,000
Total	741,430,500
Title III—Asia and Pacific:	
Military	564,807,500
Economic	202,778,250
Technical assistance	118,634,250
Total	886,220,000
Title IV—Latin America:	
Military	57,685,750
Technical assistance	20,329,000
Total	78,014,750
Other:	
United Nations technical assistance	15,708,750
Emigration of surplus manpower from Europe	9,240,500
Ocean freight for relief packages	2,587,500
United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund	16,481,000
Grand total	6,447,730,750

TABLE II.—*Authorization by type*

	Military	Economic	Total
Title I	$3,415,614,750	$1,282,433,000	$4,698,047,750
Title II	560,316,500	181,114,000	741,430,500
Title III	564,807,500	321,412,500	886,220,000
Title IV	57,685,750	20,329,000	78,014,750
	4,598,424,500	1,805,288,500	6,403,713,000
Other:			
United Nations technical assistance			15,708,750
Emigration of surplus manpower from Europe			9,240,500
Ocean freight for relief packages			2,587,500
United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund			16,481,000
			6,447,730,750

The above figures show the vast coverage of aid that has been assumed by the United States. When will the time come when it can be discontinued? How long can it be carried on without doing an injustice to our taxpayers, and, those programs within our land that await a lessening of our foreign burden? With each succeeding year the call becomes more insistent to assist our aged, the blind, the mentally deficient and those otherwise handicapped, as well as to promote research and study along lines that will promote the health of our citizenship. These are only a few of the many objectives retarded in our own land because of the tremendous burden we now bear in assisting those outside our Nation, and, maintaining at the same time our own security and defense.

We have come to a time when there must be a reappraisal of the things to be done, a close examination of our national resources and financial ability, as well as the extent to which we can do all that our hearts prompt us to do to relieve need and provide security at home and abroad.

The thoughts that I have expressed are not due to any lack of appreciation upon my part of the need that exists elsewhere, but, merely to awaken us to a realization that we must proceed with caution or we will lose in our own land that which we seek to preserve in other lands. I appeal for a common sense decision in matters such as this, that so vitally affect our future welfare and that of the world.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to vote in favor of accepting this conference report on H. R. 7005 to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951. It is by no means as satisfactory as we would like to have it. Further reductions of appropriation authorization could, in my opinion, reasonably be made under some of the provisions and I hope they will be accomplished after further study and more thorough examination of the operating features of the bill. However, this appears to be the best possible measure we can get under existing circumstances.

No one can doubt that the basic objectives of this Mutual Security Program are in accord with the Christian character and purpose of this generous Nation. To sensibly assist our friendly allies to rebuild their war-torn economy and encourage them to reject communistic overtures is really a most practically wise way of helping ourselves in the long run. Since the end of World War II the American people have willingly and most generously shared of their means and their substance with the distressed peoples all over the globe. The example of personal and national unselfishness contained in that generosity is the brightest Christian light ever to shine from the pages of world history.

However, as I have repeatedly stated on the floor of this House, the time has come to remind ourselves that the wealth and resources of this great country are not inexhaustible. In our generous impulse to aid our foreign friends we must remember to keep our own house in order. We are duty bound to insure that our own national economy does not become unbalanced. We have the obligation of preventing the imposition of unbearable tax burdens and financial hardships upon our own people. We should ever be mindful this Nation is the last bulwark of liberty against the Soviet determination to control the world. The primary responsibility of this Government is to maintain the high spirit and morale of our own American citizens first and that cannot be done if we neglect their interests—charity begins at home.

These are the fundamental thoughts with which we should approach action on this Mutual Security legislation at this time. We should scrutinize closely the effectiveness of the assistance programs already established. We should ask ourselves such questions as—have they shown any signs of accomplishing the purpose; does a further real need exist; how much more can the American economy reasonably afford; are the friendly nations we are trying to help evidencing convincing proof they are exerting every possible effort to help themselves. I believe the authoritative reports available clearly reveal substantial progress in economic rehabilitation achieved by most of our allies. Indeed some of them have reached a point of economic productivity beyond their capacity previous to the war. It can also be demonstrated that by far the greater number have exhibited an earnest desire to worthily use our assistance in becoming self-sustaining. Such observations are gratifying indeed with assurance our generosity has not been wasted.

Under our current national economic and financial situation the more pertinent questions, however, with respect to this proposed program are these. Do our foreign friendly allies need further assistance and how much can we sensibly afford to extend if they do? In my conviction there is little if any reason to grant any additional aid for further economic recovery of these nations. In that regard we have offered all that could be rightfully expected and the objective has been practically fulfilled. It is only defense support for the mutual security of ourselves and the free world that is warranted now. I am decidedly in favor of the real principle involved in such defense aid and that is not to have our American fathers and sons fighting all over the earth under the commitments we have made. I am therefore supporting this program of furnishing arms aid to those allied countries who are willing to fight in the common cause against Communist tyranny.

I am also in favor of the sensible plan, embodied in this bill, of furnishing technical assistance to friendly, undeveloped nations; giving them supplies and equipment and personal instruction for imitation of modern American methods of preserving health, increasing productivity and setting up advanced agriculture and manufacturing techniques. Experience has demonstrated that assistance of that kind has and will cost us less by inspiring smaller nations to prevent collapse of their antiquated systems rather than rendering aid after the catastrophe has occurred. Nevertheless every safeguard should be invoked to guarantee to the American taxpayer that our money and materials for that purpose will not be diverted from their intended uses.

In the over-all consideration of adopting this Mutual Security Act authorization, I am convinced it is a sound American investment provided that the expenditures are reasonably within what our economy can stand and every precaution is taken to negative the idea it is a give-away program. For these reasons I voted for the $600,000,000 reduction of the originally proposed authorization and I would have voted in favor of many other reductions if the opportunity had been presented. There are some provisions in the measure where cuts could be justly made and I shall support every reasonable proposal on that score before final action is taken. This legislation today is, as you know, merely an authorization and I am sure our alert Appropriations Committee members will recommend additional reductions when we come to pass on the actual money appropriations. I earnestly urge my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to clearly keep in mind that the suggested amounts in this measure are high ceilings and are not to be taken as minimum figures of spending. Let it be borne in mind that this is a conference report representing a compromise between the Senate and the House. Although the conference agreement figure here is $1,468,750,250 below what the President asked, I think a deeper cut can be justified upon continuing examination of some of the exorbitant provisions whose essential need has not been satisfactorily explained. The point 4 provision, I am sure, will bring a full return on the investment especially in the Near East where undeniably some very grave trouble zones exist. We should do all we can to stop any eruption in that area which might incite world warfare. Yet we should religiously observe the continuing operation of this program when it starts and immediately cancel any financial and equipment assistance that is being abused by an unappreciative recipient. Our watchword on all appropriation measures, domestic or foreign, should be "the American taxpayer and our own economic stability come first."

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, the bill as reported back by the conference represents what I consider a fair adjustment of the major differences between the two Houses. At the same time, I feel the conferees did a good job of retaining in the conference agreement the basic principles adopted by this House, while incorporating certain Senate provisions which reenforce those principles.

We have come out with a total figure of $6,447,730,750. This is $273,130,750 more than the House authorized, but by the same token it is $273,130,750 less than the amount authorized by the Senate. The figures in the agreement were reached through an equitable formula of dividing equally the difference between the two Houses in each authorization.

The conference agreement retains the Vorys amendment adopted by the House on the repeal of the ECA Act of 1948, with certain perfecting amendments. This will make it clear that the ECA Act is out after June 30, 1952, in keeping with the strong sentiment of this House on that subject. We have kept in the reduction-of-personnel provision, except that the committee of conference changed the percentage to 5 percent. Also included in the conference agreement are several provisions relating to counterpart funds which will increase their efficient use. In section 9 (b) of the conference agreement we have increased from 5 to 10 percent of the percentage of counterpart funds which must be set aside for strategic materials needed by the United States. The 10 percent represents a minimum and not a maximum. In section 9 (c) we have adopted a Senate provision in lieu of a similar House provision, which will permit a more flexible use of the counterpart funds to encourage free enterprise by establishing revolving funds available for making loans and helping to expand the economies and productivity of the countries receiving aid under this program. The third counterpart provision found in the conference agreement is in section 7 (m) and will be a new section 539 of the Mutual Security Act. In adopting this section, the conferees on the part of the House felt that this House would agree with the principle of that provision that counterpart funds should be used primarily for military assistance or defense support purposes wherever possible. Finally, on the subject of counterpart funds, the conference agreement retains a Senate provision which permits the use of these funds for student exchange programs authorized by the Fulbright Act. Another Senate provision adopted in conference, in which I believe this House will concur, is the Dworshak amendment, baning the use of funds for propaganda in the United States in support of the Mutual Security Program.

Several provisions adopted by this House are not retained in the agreement. Perhaps the major one is the offshore procurement section, which provided that not less than $1,000,000,000 must be used to purchase end items outside the United States. The committee of conference felt that such a provision was not needed, especially where authority already exists under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act to make such purchases. But we do expect that authority to be utilized to the extent and when it is to the advantage of the program to do so. Another House provision not found in the agreement is the section which limited dollar expenditure under point 4 for supplies and equipment to not more than three times the dollar costs for technical personnel. It was felt that this provision was too drastic for this year where point 4 funds have been reduced. But in the conference report, on page 21, you will find a strong statement which indicates the legislative intent concerning the program that point 4 should not become a commodity program, contrary to the basic principle laid down by the Congress.

There are other adjustments in the conference agreement, but in the main the more important ones I have already outlined. I believe we now have before us a better bill than either the House or Senate version, better coordinated and better designed to enable the program to move ahead with a maximum of efficiency and a minimum of cost to the American taxpayer.

I want to say just a word about the achievements of the minority members of the House conferees. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] and his colleague [Mr. CHIPERFIELD] fought valiantly and ably for the House money figures and for other provisions put in the bill by the House. They came out with what I think is even more than their share of victory. We often disagree, and did disagree, in conference on this bill, but I respect them and their views.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. When the bill passed the House it carried a mandatory provision that a billion dollars be spent on products of foreign manufacture. Do I understand that provision of the bill is stricken?

Mr. RICHARDS. That provision was stricken from the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, when I offered the amendment in the House to strike it, the amendment was rejected. What was the reason for striking that out?

Mr. RICHARDS. The fact remains that that provision was not accepted by the conferees and it is not in the conference report.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman tell us what happened to the amendment making a limitation in spending on the point 4 program?

Mr. RICHARDS. It was felt by the conferees that 3 to 1 ratio would probably be too restrictive to be contained in the bill and it was deleted. But the report is very critical of the existing 4 to 1 ratio.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That means that they can go ahead and build fertilizer plants, canals, and all these other things that were not envisaged in the original concept, which was an extension service involving nothing more than that?

Mr. RICHARDS. No. I disagree with the gentleman.

The conference report clearly indicates the wishes of both the House and

Senate in that connection. Here is what we say about that—

The committee reports of the House and Senate noted with concern the increasing ratio of supplies and equipment to personnel—4 to 1, and both bodies have expressed the view that it is not desirable to go beyond this ratio. But the proper limit cannot be effectively expressed by a mathematical ratio. Fundamentally the technical assistance program is one of teaching and showing; supplies and equipment beyond those necessary for demonstration purposes will convert this into a type of world-wide economic aid program our country cannot afford. This should provide adequate notice to the Administrator as to the legislative intent of this program.

The gentleman in essence has won a victory from the conference report.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. But that will not stop the boys downtown who have this whole scheme planned on a global basis. They will continue to spend and spend until we restrict them.

Mr. RICHARDS. It was thought better not to put the Administration into a strait-jacket of 3–1.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I want to compliment the conferees on coming up with a very fine bill. It is not what some in the House wanted, but actually on the figure that has been arrived at there is just about 400,000,000 cut more, which is approximately the amount that was unobligated on June 30, 1952.

Mr. RICHARDS. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. All of the conferees were not absolutely satisfied. We met the Senate half way. We split the reduction that the House and Senate had made, and met them on a 50–50 basis.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I signed this conference report and intend to vote for it. I was disappointed over a number of the decisions of the conferees. To be frank about it, I was disappointed earlier over some of the actions here in the House and in our committee on this bill but I realize that in legislation you cannot have it all your own way. Here we practice the art of the possible. This report is about as satisfactory as was possible, under all the circumstances.

When I went into conference I felt mighty lonesome, because except for my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD], and myself, every conferee had voted against every floor cut that had been offered in either body; and the score was, therefore 8 to 2. The other conferees had the votes to cut out everything that the House had done, but it is to their credit they did not go at it that way.

After about half a day of skirmishing and bargaining we got around to this 50–50 formula on amounts, splitting the difference between the House and Senate figures. The Senate operates in broad generalities and they had cut this bill, not with a meat ax but with a buzz saw, cut off a 15.2 percent slab all the way through. In the House we had been selective and cut where we felt cuts ought to be applied. The conferees might have forced an over-all distribution of the 50 percent adjustment along the lines of the Senate bill. Instead they applied the 50–50 formula selectively and split the difference on each item, so that we preserved the selective effect of the cuts that were made by the House.

The conference report makes it clear that ECA, ERP, the Marshall plan is over, finished, through, as per schedule, on June 30, 1952. We accomplished this through the language adopted on this floor and in conference and also through the reduction in nonmilitary aid for Europe of $536,767,000; a 29.5 percent reduction. We have made it clear that economic aid, recovery money, for Europe is out, and only defense support for mutual security is available from now on.

Point 4 has been cut 21 percent. I think, as the conference report states, that this reduction in money will bring point 4 back to its original purpose and keep it from being a world-wide economic-aid proposition.

Let us remember this: We have not appropriated or spent a dime of this yet; this is an authorization bill and the amounts merely provide ceilings under which the Appropriations Committee is permitted to bring in appropriations. I hope they do not consider these maximums as minimums, mistake ceilings for floors.

I am for the principle involved of not having American boys do all the fighting all over the world under the commitments we have made; therefore, I am for the principle involved of furnishing arms aid to countries willing to fight in the common cause.

I am for the principle of furnishing technical assistance to friendly, undeveloped nations; teaching and showing, with supplies and equipment, for demonstrations; but this must not become a world-wide economic-aid program.

The conference report authorizes action based on these principles.

Those of us who voted for the cuts here are going to get another chance to review this. I hope the Appropriations Committee gives us some reductions to vote for. If they do not there may be some floor amendments to bring this to proper size when we finally get to appropriating any money at all for this program.

So in spite of certain disappointments, I feel that the conference report is about as good as we could hope to get.

But lest anything I have said sounds as if the two minority conferees were solely responsible for holding half of the cuts, I would like to remind my colleagues that 2 out of 10 votes do not settle what happens in conference; it required a majority of the House conferees, and I think that the credit or blame for what has been done, cutting this $1,468,750,250 below what the President demanded and what his candidate for President, Mr. Harriman, said was absolutely necessary, I think the credit or blame should be properly assessed. Our chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], is a very genial but very tough man; he was tough in committee; when we came to the floor he supported his committee bill against all comers; when we got to conference the results show that he supported the House position in striking a compromise, in spite of the angry and anguished words of Messrs. Truman and Harriman. These results show that he is loyal to his committee, he is loyal to the House, he is loyal to his President when his President is right, but he is, above all, loyal to his own patriotic but at times somewhat stubborn convictions.

In view of the fact that this authorization is merely the first chapter in the consideration of appropriations for mutual security for next year and that we have put ceilings of nearly a billion and a half below where they started out, I feel that we are justified in approving this conference report.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, is it not a fact, as I see from the report, that the sections designed to bring as much as possible private enterprise into this whole program, especially section 7 (k), have been retained in the bill; and, as I understand it, that it is the intention of our committee to follow through and see that the various Government departments concerned implement those sections and do something about them as a very sure way of seeing that our burdens from the Government side are reduced?

With reference to section 7 (k), is it not also a fact that the agencies mentioned in that section must move ahead with their responsibilities at once and not wait until a Department of Commerce study is made, that they should work closely together and with the Director for Mutual Security, and that in any case the Department of Commerce complete its study by the end of this year?

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE].

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, first I want to express my agreement with the very complimentary reference that the gentleman from Ohio has made with respect to the chairman of our committee. May I ask this question: When the foreign aid bill was up a year ago, the House adopted an amendment prohibiting, I believe, the payment of taxes to any of the participating countries out of the funds appropriated. As I understand, as a result of the work which has been done at the present time no taxes are being paid to foreign nations on the expenditures which we are making under authority of the present legislation?

Mr. RICHARDS. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee that due to the insistence of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, the practice that the gentleman has mentioned of foreign governments charging

taxes on the aid we are giving them has practically ceased and the evidence before the committee shows that. I think the gentleman from Tennessee was perhaps the first one who proposed the step along this line before our committee.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. May I say that the chairman expressed agreement with that and was cooperative in developing the program which is now in effect.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman is correct. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Will the chairman of the committee inform the House as to what action was taken in conference on the matter relative to the transfer of military funds and military equipment and the remuneration therefor?

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman's amendment was retained in the bill.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, am I correctly informed that under the provisions of the Mutual Security Act any amount of money can be spent for the products of foreign manufacturers?

Mr. RICHARDS. No. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG].

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. I want to ask him if in the conference report there is any change made in the amount appropriated for equipping and utilization of the troops in Asia that are not now being utilized? I refer specifically to the loyal Chinese troops which a year ago I inquired about and there was some discussion. I was assured we were making preparation for their utilization to fight for their own freedom and ours. Can the gentleman tell us whether that provision is in there and, if so, what is going to be done about it?

Mr. RICHARDS. There is no provision in there in addition to existing law.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, there are $564,807,500 for military aid in Asia; however, it is secret as to how that is distributed as between Formosa and the other areas.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is correct. I do not think that was the point the gentleman had in mind. Of course, the statement of the gentleman from Ohio is correct.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'TOOLE. It is our sincere hope that there is nothing in this bill as it is now that would cause any further dissension between General Eisenhower and Senator TAFT.

Mr. RICHARDS. I hope not.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 230, nays 115, answered "present" 1, not voting 85, as follows:

[Roll No. 94]

YEAS—230

Abbitt	Gore	Morrison
Addonizio	Granahan	Morton
Allen, Calif.	Granger	Moulder
Angell	Grant	Multer
Armstrong	Green	Murdock
Aspinall	Greenwood	Murphy
Ayres	Gregory	Murray
Baring	Hall,	Norblad
Barrett	Edwin Arthur	O'Brien, Ill.
Bates, Mass.	Halleck	O'Brien, Mich.
Battle	Hardy	O'Brien, N. Y.
Beall	Harris	O'Neill
Bender	Harrison, Va.	Osmers
Bennett, Fla.	Hart	Ostertag
Bentsen	Hays, Ark.	O'Toole
Boggs, Del.	Hays, Ohio	Patman
Boggs, La.	Hébert	Patterson
Bolling	Hedrick	Perkins
Bolton	Heffernan	Philbin
Bonner	Heller	Poage
Bosone	Herlong	Polk
Boykin	Herter	Preston
Brown, Ga.	Heselton	Price
Brownson	Holmes	Priest
Bryson	Howell	Prouty
Buchanan	Irving	Rabaut
Burleson	Jackson, Wash.	Radwan
Burnside	James	Rhodes
Burton	Jarman	Ribicoff
Byrnes	Javits	Richards
Camp	Jones, Ala.	Riehlman
Canfield	Jones, Mo.	Riley
Cannon	Jones,	Rivers
Carnahan	Hamilton C.	Roberts
Carrigg	Judd	Rodino
Case	Karsten, Mo.	Rogers, Colo.
Chatham	Kean	Rogers, Fla.
Chiperfield	Kearney	Rooney
Chudoff	Keating	Roosevelt
Clemente	Kee	Ross
Combs	Kelley, Pa.	Saylor
Cooper	Kelly, N. Y.	Scott, Hardie
Corbett	Keogh	Scott,
Cotton	Kersten, Wis.	Hugh D., Jr.
Coudert	Kilburn	Seely-Brown
Cox	Kilday	Shelley
Crosser	Kirwan	Sieminski
Crumpacker	Klein	Sikes
Cunningham	Kluczynski	Sittler
Dague	Lane	Smith, Miss.
Davis, Ga.	Lanham	Smith, Va.
DeGraffenried	Lantaff	Spence
Delaney	Latham	Springer
Dempsey	LeCompte	Staggers
Devereux	Lesinski	Steed
Dollinger	Lind	Taylor
Donohue	Lucas	Teague
Donovan	McCarthy	Thomas
Durham	McConnell	Thompson, Tex.
Eaton	McDonough	Thornberry
Eberharter	McGrath	Tollefson
Elliott	McGuire	Trimble
Ellsworth	McMillan	Van Zandt
Engle	McMullen	Vinson
Evins	Machrowicz	Vorys
Fallon	Mack, Wash.	Watts
Feighan	Madden	Weichel
Fernandez	Magee	Wickersham
Fine	Mahon	Widnall
Fogarty	Mansfield	Wier
Forand	Marshall	Wigglesworth
Ford	Martin, Mass.	Williams, N. Y.
Forrester	Meader	Willis
Fulton	Merrow	Wolverton
Furcolo	Miller, Md.	Yates
Gary	Miller, N. Y.	Yorty
Gathings	Mitchell	Zablocki
Gordon	Morgan	

NAYS—115

Abernethy	Berry	Davis, Wis.
Adair	Betts	D'Ewart
Allen, Ill.	Bishop	Dolliver
Allen, La.	Bow	Dondero
Andersen,	Bray	Dorn
H. Carl	Brooks	Doughton
Anderson, Calif	Brown, Ohio	Elston
Andresen,	Budge	Fisher
August H.	Busbey	Gavin
Andrews	Bush	George
Arends	Butler	Golden
Baker	Chenoweth	Graham
Barden	Church	Gross
Beamer	Clevenger	Gwinn
Belcher	Colmer	Hagen
Bennett, Mich.	Curtis, Nebr.	Hand
Harden	Mason	Sheehan
Harrison, Nebr.	Miller, Nebr.	Simpson, Ill.
Harrison, Wyo.	Mills	Simpson, Pa.
Harvey	Mumma	Smith, Kans.
Hess	Nelson	Smith, Wis.
Hill	Nicholson	Stanley
Hoeven	Norrell	Stockman
Hoffman, Ill.	O'Hara	Taber
Hoffman, Mich.	Passman	Talle
Horan	Patten	Thompson,
Hull	Phillips	Mich.
Ikard	Pickett	Vail
Jenison	Poulson	Van Pelt
Jensen	Rankin	Velde
Jonas	Reece, Tenn.	Vursell
Jones,	Reed, Ill.	Wharton
Woodrow W.	Reed, N. Y.	Whitten
Kearns	Rogers, Tex.	Williams, Miss.
King, Pa.	St. George	Wilson, Tex.
Larcade	Schenck	Winstead
McCulloch	Scrivner	Withrow
McGregor	Scudder	Wolcott
McIntire	Secrest	Wood, Idaho
Mack, Ill.	Shafer	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

O'Konski

NOT VOTING 85

Aandahl	Doyle	Miller, Calif.
Albert	Fenton	Morano
Anfuso	Flood	Morris
Auchincloss	Frazier	Potter
Bailey	Fugate	Powell
Bakewell	Gamble	Rains
Bates, Ky.	Garmatz	Ramsay
Beckworth	Goodwin	Reams
Blackney	Hale	Redden
Blatnik	Hall,	Rees, Kans.
Bramblett	Leonard W.	Regan
Brehm	Havenner	Robeson
Buckley	Hillings	Rogers, Mass.
Buffett	Hinshaw	Sabath
Burdick	Holifield	Sadlak
Carlyle	Hope	Sasscer
Celler	Hunter	Sheppard
Chelf	Jackson, Calif.	Short
Cole, Kans.	Jenkins	Stigler
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson	Sutton
Cooley	Kennedy	Tackett
Crawford	Kerr	Walter
Curtis, Mo.	King, Calif.	Welch
Davis, Tenn.	Lovre	Werdel
Dawson	Lyle	Wheeler
Deane	McCormack	Wilson, Ind.
Denny	McKinnon	Wood, Ga.
Denton	McVey	Woodruff
Dingell	Martin, Iowa	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Martin of Iowa against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Buffett against.

Mr. Hale for, with Mr. O'Konski against.

Mr. King of California for, with Mr. Werdel against.

Mr. Bakewell for, with Mr. McVey against.

Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Bramblett against.

Mr. McCormack for, with Mr. Burdick against.

Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Brehm against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Jenkins against.

Mr. Denton for, with Mr. Woodruff against.

Mr. Frazier for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Crawford against.

Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Blackney against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Lovre against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Aandahl with Mr. Garmatz.

Mr. Hillings with Mr. Miller of California.

Mr. Hunter with Mr. Doyle.

Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Jackson of California with Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. Cole of Kansas with Mr. Flood.

Mr. Fenton with Mr. Kerr.

Mr. Potter with Mr. Wheeler.

Mr. Sadlak with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Curtis of Missouri with Mr. Tackett.
Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts with Mr. Sutton.
Mr. Johnson with Mr. Anfuso.
Mr. Morano with Mr. Bates of Kentucky.
Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Denny with Mr. Morris.
Mr. Goodwin with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. Rees of Kansas with Mr. Regan.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Maine, Mr. HALE, who if present would vote "aye." Therefore I withdraw my vote of "no" and vote present.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6947) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 25, and 47 to the foregoing bill.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF JUNE 9

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a long minute to inquire of the gentleman from Tennessee the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, in response to the query of the distinguished minority leader, I may say that Monday is District day, and it is planned to call up two bills on the District calendar:

S. 2383, to amend the act entitled "An act to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 17, 1923; and

S. 2605, to amend certain tax laws applicable to the District of Columbia.

Also scheduled for consideration on that day is the bill S. 97 which passed the Senate last fall, dealing with an authorization on the Cumberland River.

On Tuesday and Wednesday we have scheduled the bill H. R. 5012 that amends the Navy rations statute.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If I might interrupt, that is where the so-called oleomargarine battle comes in?

Mr. PRIEST. That is my understanding. On Wednesday, if a rule is granted, we expect to bring up the emergency statutory provisions. That, of course, is based on the assumption that a rule will be granted.

On Thursday, we have the bill S. 658 which amends the Communications Act of 1934.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I have been informed that possibly during the week there will be a conference report on the immigration bill. Of course, any conference reports may be called up at any time, but I think Members would want to know particularly about the possibilities with reference to that bill.

I may say also it is not definite at this time when there might be action in the House, assuming that the Senate might override the President's veto on the tidelands bill. No definite date has been set in the other body, but I can assure the minority leader and Members they will be given 24 hours' notice at least before any action on tidelands, if action comes up in the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman is aware, of course, of the fact that there are millions of poor, aged people who are suffering from inflation and looking to the Congress to give them some relief. Will the gentleman tell us when he is going to schedule that bill for consideration?

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman cannot inform the minority leader at this time. There is no rule on that bill and, of course, we do not schedule consideration of legislation until a rule has been granted. As soon as I am able to inform the gentleman, I will be happy to do so.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman, I am sure, appreciates the situation. We also have his good wishes if it comes to the floor so that these poor people may have relief.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman has my very good wishes at all times.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman give us 24 hours' notice on the immigration conference report?

The SPEAKER. Conference reports have to lie over 24 hours.

Mr. PRIEST. All conference reports, except by unanimous consent, must go over 24 hours.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And 24 hours' notice will also be given on the tidelands veto if the Senate acts, am I not stating the fact correctly?

Mr. PRIEST. That is correct.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. What does the emergency powers bill cover?

Mr. PRIEST. Those are emergency powers of the President that would have expired on June 1 and which we extended for 15 days by resolution. A bill has been reported by the Committee on the Judiciary for extension of those powers and if a rule is granted that bill will be brought up.

Mr. FULTON. That in no way relates to any particular strike situation?

Mr. PRIEST. No; these are the regular powers that have been extended from time to time.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I wonder if the gentleman from Tennessee might not have left an incorrect impression concerning extension of the war powers of the President. It is not, as I understand it, a permanent extension; it is an extension for the emergency and 6 months, but not beyond, I believe, June 30, 1953?

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the gentleman. By "permanent" I meant beyond the 15-day extension we passed a few days ago.

INDUSTRY-WIDE BARGAINING

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, the Allen resolution hearings by the House Committee on Education and Labor have convinced me that the practice of industry-wide bargaining by both management and labor is the basic cause of continuing labor-management controversy.

Unfortunately, past efforts to curb industry-wide bargaining have not been successful. In 1947, the House passed as a part of the Hartley bill—a provision which would have dealt with this problem; it failed in the Senate by a single vote. Had this provision been enacted, no one can fail to realize that none of our recent strikes in basic industries would have been possible; as it is now, we are in the middle of the second steel strike within a month's time, and a serious oil strike has but recently come to an end. Meanwhile, it is common knowledge that the master of all the coal miners is patiently waiting the outcome of the steel strike to go the steel workers one better.

I have just introduced a bill to end industry-wide bargaining. It consists of the industry-wide bargaining provisions of the old Hartley bill. It would:

First. Prevent the NLRB from certifying a common bargaining representative for the employees of competing employers, with a special exemption for small businesses in the same metropolitan area.

Second. Make it an unfair labor practice for employers to engage in monopolistic lockouts or for labor to engage in monopolistic strikes. Both are defined similarly as concerted interference with employment, or an employer's operation in accordance with a common plan of action by two or more competing employers, or by the employees of two or more competing employers, unless there is a certified common bargaining agent.

Third. Enforcement would be left to the NLRB subject to the procedures now in the Taft-Hartley Act for dealing with secondary boycotts.

Fourth. A grace period is provided for both management and labor to adapt themselves to the new law.

The time has come for us to act to restore the rights of the local and independent union.

My bill will do just that.

Remembering what happened to another Lucas bill 1 year ago, I want to warn my colleagues that we may not get widespread support from outside the Congress. While major industrial organizations are on record as being opposed to industry-wide bargaining, there are spokesmen for some industries who have been captured by industry-wide bargaining, and whose jobs depend, to a large extent, on its continuation. For this reason, we can expect opposition from the shipping, pulp and paper, glass, vitreous china, stove, wallpaper and parts of the coal industries. In addition, local employer groups, particularly on the west coast are committed to the practice known as group bargaining, with which my bill will interfere to some extent, so we can expect to hear from them. In addition, I have no doubt that those same short-sighted individuals who opposed the Lucas bill dealing with the Wage Stabilization Board last year will attempt to exert their influence. It is now clear that these particular individuals cannot be trusted to guide congressional policies.

I will welcome suggestions from my colleagues on this proposed bill. I do not contend that it is perfect, but it is aimed at the primary evil of industry-wide bargaining.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

KOREAN VETERANS BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I was necessarily absent from the Chamber during roll call No. 92 covering H. R. 7656. My purpose in rising at this time is to state that had I been here I would have voted "aye." Among other things, this bill incorporates the general principles of a measure which I introduced some time ago, which extends to the Korean GI's and others who have entered the service since World War II similar benefits under social security to those accorded to World War II veterans. For that reason and in other important respects I favor the enactment of the legislation. I am happy that the bill has been so uniformly supported by the Members.

RESOLUTION TO FAVOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVEMENT OF SOUTH ASIAN SUBCONTINENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, a bipartisan group in the House and in the other body has today introduced the following resolution:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress expresses the interest of the American people in the well-being and success in nationhood of the peoples of the great South Asian subcontinent and, based on need as a critical element in the well-being of the whole subcontinent, favors assistance to the Republic of India from public and private sources, consistent with the financial capability of the United States, to enable the people of India to plan with continuity and assurance for the economic development and improvement of their country.

Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of the sponsors of this resolution that this expression of interest on the part of the Congress should apply as well to the great country of Pakistan, which is an important part of that subcontinent. We feel also that this should assure the people both of Pakistan and of India that our interest is not limited by 1 year's consideration of the mutual security program, but that it is a continuing one until they have adequately met their problems of new nationhood.

Sponsors of this bill are Senators RALPH E. FLANDERS, Republican, Vermont; BRIEN MCMAHON, Democrat, Connecticut; WAYNE MORSE, Republican, Oregon; H. ALEXANDER SMITH, Republican, New Jersey; JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democrat, Alabama; CHARLES W. TOBEY, Republican, New Hampshire; ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, Wisconsin; and Representatives FRANCES P. BOLTON, Republican, Ohio; JAMES G. FULTON, Republican, Pennsylvania; JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican-Liberal, New York; CHESTER E. MERROW, Republican, New York; EDNA F. KELLY, Democrat, New York; FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR., Democrat-Liberal, New York; and CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Democrat, Wisconsin.

This action is taken in view of the need to assure the people of the whole subcontinent, and particularly the people of India, of backing in the fundamental struggle against very low standards of living and underdevelopment which the sponsors of the resolution believe to have a vital bearing upon the kind of society and government which will be found in the subcontinent and in India. A resolution of this kind is the only way under the constitutional processes of the United States in which the American people can express to the people of India a continuing interest in their 5-year plan for economic development which will give the people of India some added assurance in addition to their own self-help that they may proceed with this plan with confidence in the sympathetic consideration of their needs by the people of the United States.

India is a vital element in the free world's security in an area of the world in which it is being the most directly and aggressively threatened by the Soviet Union and its satellites. Open aggressive warfare by the Communist bloc is now being waged in Korea, Indochina, and Malaya and a campaign of threats and intimidation is also going on by the Communist bloc against Burma, Thailand and Indonesia and the countries of the subcontinent. The people of the subcontinent have taken careful note of the fact that Communist China has already swallowed up Tibet.

India's 5-year investment plan calls for a total investment of $3,765,000,000. India has already received assistance from the United States of $283,100,000, the largest part of which is the $190,000,000 United States wheat loan. The net requirement for foreign assistance is $1,228,000,000. The United Kingdom has agreed to release sterling balances at the rate of £35,000,000 per annum to India, but that part of the money is not part of the money available for the 5-year development plan as this blocked sterling has been earmarked to finance the needs of private industry in India. It is expected that Australia, New Zealand, and Canada will help India and that the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which has already loaned $52,500,000 for economic development of India, will increase it lending operations, but it is estimated that all of these aids will still leave a gap of $1,000,000,000 in round figures. Private industry in India and in cooperation with oversea capital can help greatly with the 5-year plan and with India's problem of underdevelopment. Foreign capital is being invited to India on very easy terms. The Government of India is fully aware that foreign capital, before it comes into the country in any substantial quantity, must be assured of prospects of a fair return, equality of treatment, and facilities for transfer of profits. The measures already taken give that assurance. The agreements signed recently with the Standard Vacuum Oil Co. of America and the Burmah-Shell group for the erection of oil refineries in India are evidence of the large concessions accorded to foreign investors.

India's 5-year development plan is fundamental. It deals almost exclusively with making India self-sufficient in food. The target is to produce 7,200,000 tons of additional food, 2,100,000 bales of jute, 1,200,000 bales of cotton, 37,000 tons of oil seeds and 69,000 tons of sugar. The plan covers the period from April 1951 to March 1956. As more than two-thirds of the population of India is dependent on the land, development and irrigation will take first priority. Of the total outlay of the different sectors of the Indian economy, agriculture and the allied activities under irrigation and power will receive 43 percent. India has ample supply of water but at present is using about 6 percent of the flow of its

rivers. Although in India the area under irrigation is nearly 48,000,000 acres—more than twice as large as in any other country of the world—it constitutes only one-fifth of the total area under cultivation. Agriculture, therefore, is largely a gamble in rains. The area which is to be brought under irrigation under the plan is 8,800,000 acres by 1955–56 and when full facilities for these projects are developed, 16,500,000 acres. Other parts of the plan include improvement of transport, 26.1 percent; development of certain vital industries, 6.7 percent; and extension of social services, such as housing, education, and medical relief, 17 percent.

The plan consists of two parts. The first part, which is designed to restore the standards of consumption prevalent in India before the war—1939—taking into account the expected increase in population over the period and which the Government of India is committed to execute is expected to cost $3,135,000,000. The second part of this plan in terms of priority which is intended to insure a somewhat higher rate of development over the period is expected to cost $630,000,000.

The sponsors of the resolution consider the essence of self-help and mutual cooperation in respect of India's economic problems to require an expression of a continuity of interest by the United States in the progress of India's 5-year plan for economic development. This plan to be consistent with the capabilities of the people of India necessarily calls for more than the year or two for which United States constitutional processes permit appropriation. Private enterprise should be the mainstay of India's economic development and this is apparently its Government's intention. This resolution is intended to express sympathetic interest in what will be required of the public sector.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 92 I was present. I did not hear my name when it was called. I ask unanimous consent to be recorded in favor of the measure.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman missed the roll call, he cannot have his name recorded on the roll call. However, he can state how he would have voted if he had been here, or, if he was here, he can also state that he did not hear his name called.

Mr. BROOKS. I did not hear my name called, Mr. Speaker, and I ask that the RECORD show that I am in favor of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

THE ATOMIC ENERGY PROGRAM

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, two overriding problems have occupied this House since it reconvened in January—military security and economic solvency for our Nation. For all our growing success in combating tyranny, Stalin's military might remains a massive and present danger. For all our diligence in trimming military spending to the bare bone, our country still groans under the burden of $60,000,000,000 defense budgets.

The Members of this House now have a golden opportunity to vote for a program which, as it goes forward, can give us both greater military security and a smaller annual defense budget.

The President has transmitted to the Congress a request for $3,191,000,000 in supplemental appropriations for our atomic energy program. These moneys will not be spent in 1 year but over a period of 4 or 5 years. Do not be deceived: The outlay per year for atomic progress will be small—quite small—compared with our over-all defense budget. This money will speed the construction of vital new atomic research and production installations—facilities which will dramatically increase our ability to keep Stalin from marching.

This expansion program represents a great victory for every believer in effective preparedness. In particular, it is a tribute to Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, who has been a tower of strength in the fight for peace and in the fight for more atomic weapons, faster—to keep open the future for peace.

Of course I am going to support the appropriation request, just as I hope everyone on this floor will support it. The money needed is vital—absolutely vital—to our security, and weeks count in approving it. We must act with speed.

Let us be clear about one crucial point, however. The program before this House is merely a half-way program. It is a half-way solution to an all-out challenge.

It is not all we can do nor as fast as we can do it—it is just half what we can do and even the half is not to go forward at top speed.

This program falls far short of giving us as many atomic and hydrogen weapons as every expert who has studied the problem frankly admits and concedes we are capable of producing. In the secret files of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy there are documents which demonstrate and prove that I am right in saying this is not an all-out program but literally a half-way program. These documents were prepared by the Nation's finest technical people. Everyone knowing the facts agrees the documents are sound. Everybody knowing the facts concedes that we can actually do more—much more—than in fact we propose to do under the program now before this House.

This program will not nearly transform into fissionable materials all the uranium ores we are capable of acquiring. It will not come near achieving all the savings that are possible by building our defense forces around atomic weapons.

The military have been specifically and formally told that the Atomic Energy Commission can provide them with many, many more weapons than they request under this expansion plan. Knowing this—with all the alternatives before them—the military have still recommended to the President a program which falls miles short of a maximum effort in atomic energy.

In effect, the military have said to the Congress and to the American people: "We in the armed services do not want all the atomic and hydrogen weapons we can have."

Yet these same military men warn the Congress that the time is rapidly nearing when Russia will have the capability of launching a knock-out blow against the cities of America. They tell us that, thanks to atomic and hydrogen weapons, we are in the midst of the greatest arms revolution in history. Again and again, they testify that we must make the transition from conventional weapons to atomic weapons with all possible speed.

The military speak of our remaining—our remaining, I emphasize—superiority in the field of atomic weapons, and they solemnly warn us that Russia's atomic progress in her first 5 years of effort may have been faster than American progress in our own first 5 years.

Having said all this, the military then present a halfway atomic program to the Congress.

I have tremendous respect for the men entrusted with defending our country. Speaking very bluntly, however, I am baffled by their refusal to ask for as many atomic and hydrogen weapons as are offered to them. The military tell us over and over that above all they want atomic strength—and yet they request only about half the atomic strength which the Atomic Energy Commission is capable of giving them.

If security did not deter me, I could go into history—and I could point out concrete examples of short-sightedness in past decisions on military requirements in the atomic field. Against this background—and against the many and repeated and emphatic military assertions that we must excel to the limit of our ability in the field of atomic preparedness—I simply do not understand the halfway nature of the program before us. I want to place myself on record as saying that, although I will vote for this program, I consider it to be far too timid and too little.

In all candor, I must declare that if some day we need more nuclear weapons than will be achieved through this program those men who now settle for half measures will bear a solemn and fearful responsibility.

I do not, of course, recommend that we immediately drop all of our production of conventional armaments. That would be colossal folly. What I do recommend is that, whatever we do with conventional armaments at this time, we place greater emphasis upon atomic weapons. If this can be done in addition to present budgetary commitments for present-day arms, then well and good. However, if this cannot be done, then I recommend a careful examination of our entire armament program with a view toward greater emphasis upon atomic weapons within present armament programs.

For I am firmly convinced that there is no other expenditure of money for defense that will yield a greater return than atomic weapons, and I am certain that greater emphasis can be placed upon them even within our present plans.

I want to assure you that no genuine obstacles stand in the way of an atomic program that is really all-out. Early this year, when the shortage of critical materials was far more acute than now, the Defense Production Administration officially stated in writing that a far larger program than the one now proposed need not be rejected on the grounds that it would run short of critical materials. Today, with the essential materials situation rapidly easing, a really all-out program would be even less of a burden. Neither would a more ambitious construction effort fail for lack of engineers and technicians—the expansion program now before us does not begin to enlist the talents of the specialists potentially willing and able to serve in our atomic plants.

Neither can the dollar burden be called a road block to an all-out effort. It is simply a case of spending more on our cheapest and best weapon and less, far less, upon the costly conventional weapons that are not nearly as good.

How much money would all out require? I estimate that the construction cost would be about $7,000,000,000, again to be spent over a period of several years. It simply makes no sense to pay out each year tens and tens of billions for costly conventional weapons and to stint on the cheapest and best weapon we have got.

Last fall I stood on this spot and called it unthinkable that we should manufacture fewer atomic weapons than we were able to. And now the unthinkable is about to happen. Although I call upon every House Member to support this present expansion program, I can frankly regard it as only a down payment on real atomic security and real atomic economy.

The task of the moment, to be sure, is to give this supplemental appropriation quick and speedy passage. Here is the right way to work for economy, real economy that is not purchased at the price of military weakness. Dollar for dollar, atomic explosives are hundreds of times cheaper and more destructive than ordinary TNT. The time is coming when a single hydrogen weapon used tactically can substitute for hundreds of tanks, when one plane with an atomic payload can be the equal in deterring power of hundreds loaded with blockbusters, when a nuclear-powered submarine can replace several conventional underseas craft, when an atomic depth charge can retire scores of the "ash cans" of World War II.

If the arms race continues, the day is coming, as surely as I am standing here, when Soviet Russia will possess the hydrogen bomb in quantity. When that day comes, we could not defend our homes and factories by shooting down only 3 out of every 10 enemy bombers, or even 9 out of every 10. We will need and we must have total defense to ward off total destruction. That can only mean antiaircraft missiles with atomic warheads.

Here is the only method of achieving an absolute or almost absolute home defense. Here is the only real defense against the "H" bomb. Such a defense, based upon atomic antiaircraft missiles, will plainly require the stuff of which atomic weapons are made in immense quantities. Do you wonder that I protest against the halfway program for atomic production now before this House?

Atomic and hydrogen armaments can never completely replace expensive conventional armaments, nor can they replace them all at once. But a sweeping replacement is in the cards as surely as day follows night. The speed and extent of this substitution is not preordained; it will depend on how much priority we now assign to building our Army and our Navy and our Air Force around atomic and hydrogen firepower.

Neither is the magnitude of possible savings preordained—what we can save on conventional armaments will be in proportion to the sums we now devote to the atom. For every additional dollar we spend on atomic weapons today, we will save four and five dollars on ordinary weapons.

Consider these grim statistics: Even when our rearmament program is completed, we and our NATO allies will have only one man under arms for every five who wear the uniforms of the Red army—to say nothing of the 150 divisions of Red China and the 50 divisions of satellite Europe.

In numbers of men under arms we are weak, but in science and technology we are strong. Why do we not exploit to the utmost our greatest strength?

We say, of course, that the plentiful weapons of the free world's troops make them more than a match for many times their number of poorly equipped and badly led soldiers. So we do not aim to match the armies of the Communist world man for man; we propose instead to far outstrip them in firepower.

This would be a sensible and practical plan—if we were fully carrying it out. But we are not.

Right now, today, the Red army—far from being a rabble-in-arms in contrast to the NATO forces—actually possesses greater total firepower than the armies of the western alliance. A Russian division, though numbering only 11,000 men, is prepared to hurl at our troops almost as much firepower—rockets, shells, mortars, and machine guns—as it receives from one of our divisions numbering 18,000 men. The individual front-line Russian soldier commands one and one-half times as much firepower as one of our own combat troops. With the help of the satellite divisions, Stalin can throw against the defenders of the free world at least 10 times as much conventional firepower as he would receive in answer.

Overcoming this 10 to 1 Communist superiority in conventional firepower—here is the heart problem of preventing world war III. We Americans have wrongly imagined that Stalin's generals rely on bone-crushing manpower, whereas in reality they place supreme emphasis on concentrated and massed firepower. Three things, Stalin himself once said, are needed to win battles—first arms; second, more arms; and third, still more arms.

Hitler launched his attack against Russia with 2,500 tanks. The Soviets, still technically at peace, already had 12 times this many in their arsenal. At Stalingrad, the ebb tide of Russia's military fortunes, the armies defending the city could still outgun their foes. By the time the Kremlin's troops had thrown the Nazis back to the German frontiers, they possessed five times the firepower of the Nazi legions. And during the battle for Berlin, the Reds employed 20,000 pieces of artillery—or more than General Eisenhower's armies used in forcing the Rhine.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that we stop underestimating Communist strength. It was no unarmed horde that bested the military machine of the Nazis. It is not a nation of untutored peasants which produces the MIG fighter—the equal, if not the superior, of our best jets.

Up till now, our preeminence in atomic firepower has canceled out Russia's superiority in conventional firepower and in numbers of men under arms. And never has a nation purchased greater military security for less money. Since VJ-day, we have spent a little more than $3,000,000,000 on our atomic program. Our project has employed less than 100,000 people in the average postwar year.

Except for the deterring power we have purchased with the $3,000,000,000 spent on atoms, I fully believe that we would have been forced to spend an extra $100,000,000,000 upon conventional armaments in order to balance Russian strength. Except for our A-weapons, I estimate we would have been compelled to have five million additional men in our armies.

One worker in a laboratory substituting 50 men in uniform; $1 on atomics the equal of $30 on conventional armaments—this is what the split atom has already meant for the economic solvency and security of America.

But what we can do in atomic energy, Stalin can also do. Let us face it: He intends to overtake us in the atomic armaments race.

At this very moment, the Kremlin has more—far more—people working in its atomic program than we have in ours. You may be certain, Mr. Speaker, that the Kremlin has not adopted a half-way atomic program, I can assure you that the Soviet atomic effort is truly all-out.

It requires no access to top secret intelligence reports to realize that the day is coming when the Communist rulers will have an entire family of atomic weapons of their own—weapons that can be used against our troops in the field, against our ships at sea, against our air bases—and against our cities and factories as well. Stalin, no less than ourselves, has it in his power to build an atomic army, an atomic navy, and an atomic air force.

I will go further: if we are able to achieve the hydrogen bomb, the Kremlin will also achieve it.

In fact, I believe it is possible—though I hope unlikely—that Russia may beat us in the race for hydrogen supremacy. This is a terrifying thought—one which we are tempted to push into the background of our minds. Yet there are no occult secrets in nuclear science. If Stalin attaches higher priority to achieving the hydrogen bomb than we do, if he assigns his program more men and more resources than we are assigning ours, he may conceivably get there first and get there first with more. It is as simple as that.

If the hydrogen bomb is feasible, Russia—given the passage of time—will come to possess not one of these hideous weapons, but hundreds and in time even thousands.

What can be our answer to this dreadful prospect except to manufacture several hydrogen weapons for every one of theirs?

Today Moscow outstrips us in raw manpower and conventional firepower. If we falter, tomorrow will see Moscow outstrip us in atomic and hydrogen firepower as well.

This situation need not be. Here stands America with the greatest factories, the most skilled workers, the finest laboratories, the most productive science the world has ever seen. And there stands Russia, barely one generation into the industrial age, with a national output one-fourth the size of ours, and decades behind us in basic technical skills. And yet, we lag behind them in terms of conventional firepower.

There is nothing the matter with the courage or dedication of our military leaders; they are men of outstanding ability and character. But there is something the matter with our plans for defending the free world. There is something wrong, very wrong, when, despite our industrial and scientific preeminence, we can do little more than try to keep up with Russian military progress. There is something amiss, terribly amiss, when our military says: "No; we do not want nearly as many atomic and hydrogen weapons as the Atomic Energy Commission can give us."

What are we going to do about it?

There are only two real choices. We can go on with our old way of doing things, only a little more so. We can grudgingly acknowledge our inferiority to the Russians in conventional firepower and move, with measured, deliberate steps, to close the gap. We can add more artillery at this point, increase our tanks at that point, cut down on our supply services here, get more fighting men into fighting posts there. We can belatedly concede the unique nature of atomic firepower, and move, again in a mincing fashion, to give atoms greater emphasis in our military planning. We can agree as a matter of abstract principle that it makes sense to substitute cheap and vastly more efficient weapons for their conventional counterparts wherever possible.

Yet, if we aspire merely to narrow the gap with the Soviets in conventional firepower, and if we aim simply to maintain our present lead in the atomic field, let us be blunt and honest about what this decision will cost us in dollars and very possibly in lives. Let us, if we are to be content with this, also be content with a future in which fifty and sixty and seventy billion dollars a year defense budgets are a permanent part of our way of life. Let us also resign ourselves to a national debt that spirals ever higher into the stratosphere, to increasingly total mobilization, to more and more pervasive Government controls. No less will suffice if we aim to compete with Stalin's armies on his own terms.

Let us also acknowledge that merely matching the Communist world in firepower also means matching it casualty for casualty, if war should come. This much is axiomatic in military science—the smaller your firepower, the greater your casualties.

It would be purest folly for us to permit ourselves to be forced into a defensive war of human attrition, when we have at our fingertips the means to gain and maintain a tremendous technological advantage.

I say that it is downright immoral to have our fighting men confront Stalin's troops with a wall of flesh instead of a wall of fire.

The choice is simple—a real all-out atomic program or the half-way program now before this House.

Every American can take justifiable pride in what General Eisenhower has done to rekindle Western Europe's will-to-resist. In all candor, however, I cannot see how, given our present half-way atomic effort we can hope to keep the Red army out of Europe indefinitely.

Reflect upon the lessons of Korea. Here we do not confront directly the tremendous firepower of the Russian Army itself. Here we face meagerly equipped troops, the kind of troops that we wrongly imagine Stalin's to be. Though Communist strength is growing week by week, the invaders from the north still have no air support for their infantry; they have few tanks; their artillery does not remotely match that of the Red army in quantity or quality. And yet, for all the valor and skill of the United Nations forces, we have been so far unable to force a military decision.

I can see only one way out. It consists in making our thinking catch up with the military revolution that has occurred in our atomic laboratories.

It consists in giving less lip service and more real service to atomic preparedness.

It consists in realizing that we can generate the power we need to keep the peace only through atomic and hydrogen firepower. It consists in abandoning the notion that atomic and hydrogen weapons are merely a useful, but highly limited, supplement to conventional arms.

It consists in recognizing that only atomic and hydrogen weapons can give us greater military security at less cost to the taxpayer. It consists in moving heaven and earth to replace obsolescent conventional weapons with modern atomic arms as quickly as possible.

Twenty years after the tank was introduced on the battlefields of Flanders, some men still argued that the tank would never replace the horse. And now, the erstwhile defenders of the horse are to be found depreciating the atom.

But mark my words, Mr. Speaker: The day is coming when our military vocabulary will be reversed, when nuclear weapons will be our primary armaments, and when mortars and machine guns will be thought of as secondary special-purpose weapons. Just as propeller-driven planes are now being retired in favor of jets, so will jet propulsion in turn yield to nuclear-driven flight. I foresee the day when atomic power plants will prevail in our underseas navy. I anticipate the time when atomic fuel will replace Diesel fuel in our battleships and aircraft carriers, just as inevitably as the Diesel replaced the coal boiler.

Only one question remains: Will the inevitable occur 2 or 3 or 4 years from now, or 20 or 30 years from now? Will we supplant conventional arms with modern arms too late to keep the peace, or will this substitution occur in good time? Will we act upon events, or will events act upon us?

If our Armed Forces do not have the firepower they need to keep the peace, we of this Congress will not escape our own heavy share of the responsibility. This being the case, I am now introducing a resolution which would create a temporary joint committee, directed and authorized to launch a thorough investigation on the subject of military firepower. This committee would determine why we have lagged so badly in this field, and what we can now do about it. My resolution asks that the committee report its considered findings to the Congress not later than the beginning of the next session.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken the floor on behalf of this supplemental appropriation because I want peace in the world. Yet, standing by themselves, atomic weapons piled as high as Mount Whitney will not guarantee the peace.

A total program for peace includes the following:

First. A real all-out atomic program and not a halfway program.

Second. A stepped-up program on the part of our Defense Department to readjust to the vast new source of firepower that atomic weapons can provide. This will mean that all our Armed Forces—Army, Navy, and Air Force—must increase their efforts in producing already-known means of delivering atomic materials, and further that they must intensify their research and development programs to find the new and better weapons that our scientists know can be developed. This would require, I feel, greater concentration on the air power, guided missiles, torpedoes, artillery shells, and other weapons that can deliver atomic ammunition. For nuclear weapons cannot be truly effective deterrents against aggression unless they can be delivered to their targets.

Third. A program for strengthening the alliance of the free peoples. Overseas bases—to cite just one example—will continue to be the indispensable foundation of our atomic striking power. Our B–29's and B–50's and B–47's require globe-girdling airfields, and the construction and maintenance of these

require the cooperation of our allies. Unless the effort to keep Stalin in check is a team effort, neither our planes nor our bombers will avail.

Fourth. A program for strengthening the free world's moral strength. The battle for the minds of men is no less important than the battle for military preeminence.

Two struggles are sweeping across the globe—and they are inseparable. One centers around the competition for armed strength; the other centers around the competition for spiritual strength. The prize here is the loyalty of men.

To us in this Chamber, it may seem fantastic that this contest could be in doubt. To us it appears self-evident that Kremlin tyranny carries mankind back to the ages of darkest antiquity. The Soviet dictatorship, it seems obvious to us, is the negation of everything decent—the amalgam of all the evil forces against which men have struggled since the birth of history.

Yet, thanks to the iron curtain and the outpouring of the Moscow propaganda machine, what strikes us as self-evident is by no means evident to millions and millions of people throughout the world. The ordinary Russian people are told day and night that America is bent upon aggression and conquest—many of them have come to believe this. In Asia and Africa, millions of men of good will—thanks again to the iron curtain—are unaware of the ghastly reality of life under the Soviet yoke. They know nothing of forced collectivization—instead they are given the promise of land reform. They know nothing of the grim facts of the forced-labor camps and the ever-widening inequalities of Soviet society. Instead, they are tempted by a millenial vision of a world in which war and injustice are no more.

In Asia freedom is now on the defensive. The Kremlin is parading there as the foe of colonialism and the friend of all peoples seeking national rebirth. It has converted tens of thousands of former idealists into Communist militants ready and willing to die for the cause of Moscow.

It is now our high and inescapable task to confront Moscow's program for a better world with a program of our own—it is now our duty to reassert America's historic role of the exporter of great and compelling ideas.

The world influence of our country was never higher than during the half century following the American Revolution. We did not export guns; we did not export goods. We exported something even more important—a vision of a world in which decent people could live in equality and justice and brotherhood. We exported a vision which fanned into flame the idealistic hopes of people everywhere. It is now our task to rekindle that flame once more.

Our task is no less than making real the brotherhood of man. The community of free nations is in this struggle together—and together we must stand if we are not to fall separately. Let the factories and mines of Western Europe fall to the Soviets and the balance of industry might well tip in favor of Stalin. Let us lose our overseas bases, and we lose the equivalent of thousands and thousands of bombers. Let us lose our overseas bases and a big share of our atomic stockpile is sterilized.

We must count on the community of decent men and the family of peace-loving nations to keep the peace of the world. Someday it may be possible to disband our armies. Never, if the peace is to be kept, can we disband the alliance of free peoples. Never can there be any cut-back on brotherhood.

There is one weapon Stalin fears even more than our atomic stockpile—and that weapon consists of the plain and everyday truth. Godless communism and the Soviet system are based from the beginning to the end upon monstrous falsehoods. Let men come to understand that our free way of life offers them both infinitely more material wealth and infinitely more freedom than the way of the Kremlin—and communism can never win out.

So let us now get about the job of making the truth known, by word and even more by deed. Through the Voice of America, let us give the lie to Moscow's charge of warmongering. Through the point 4 program, let us show the diseased and hungry of the world that we stand ready to help them help themselves. Through refusing to compromise with honor and decency in Korea, let us make it plain that we will never appease. Through the North Atlantic Pact and military-aid program, let us declare that we believe the fight against aggression is a common fight, in which we will carry our fair share of the load.

And let us, above all, make it unmistakably clear that we stand foursquare for peace with justice, and that we stand ready to lay aside our armaments the moment Stalin lets us—the moment he agrees to some foolproof international plan for the control of all weapons.

We must expect the Voice of Moscow to say that this atomic-expansion program is the latest evidence of American imperialism. So we should now be assuring the world, with every means at our disposal, that we build these weapons with measureless reluctance, and that we profoundly want to use the power of the split atom not for destructive but for constructive purposes, as we now could if only Stalin would let us.

It is not yet widely enough known that the atomic bomb atom is also the peaceful atom. Plutonium and uranium-235, the stuffs of which A-weapons are made, are also the fuels needed for atomic reactors, the machines which change atomic energy into power which can be used in turning the wheels of factories and lighting homes. The material in our weapons casings is not lost for the cause of peace. It can easily be converted into forms suitable for running atomic reactors. If we win out to true and lasting peace, our atomic treasures will surpass in value all the gold stored in Fort Knox.

Heretofore, every plan for conquering poverty in Asia and Africa has come to naught because these regions lack cheap fuel—because they have little or no coal or oil or hydroelectric power. But just 1 pound of fissionable material contains far more power than 2,000,000 pounds of coal. In this fact lies the possible material salvation of the underdeveloped areas of the world. Atomic power allows us to hope that the age-old wretchedness of the depressed areas of the globe can at last be conquered.

There is no longer any question but that it is technically possible to generate useful power from the atom. The only question centers around how soon and how much.

In manufacturing atomic weapons, we are therefore not really sacrificing butter to get guns. The more we spend today on atoms, the greater will be our future dividends in peacetime applications of the atom. Doubling the stock of materials used in these weapons also means doubling the amount of atomic fuel we will some day use to light cities and power factories. Accelerating the time required to achieve an atomic submarine means hastening the day when atomic-powered merchant ships will ply the seas. Stepping up our effort to achieve nuclear-powered flight means telescoping the time needed to send commercial transports through the heavens on atomic fuel.

These are, of course, the long-range benefits of an intensive atomic-energy program, and proof that even if not needed for defense, our expeditures in this field will not be wasted.

The shorter-term benefits, I feel, are in the compelling needs for an adequate defense. Our military leaders have said that it is our atomic superiority that has prevented a third world war for the past 6 years. This is a significant statement, and the lesson for us is plain. For it could very well mean that if we lose our atomic superiority, a world war could swiftly come upon us. Thus the compelling logic of an all-out, and not half-way program of atomic energy becomes abundantly clear.

The right way to vote for economy is vote for this supplemental appropriation. The right way to achieve greater economy is to concentrate still more upon atomic weapons. The right way to vote for military security is to vote for this appropriation. The right way to get even greater military security is to demand even more stress upon our best and cheapest weapons—atomic weapons.

For the sake of peace and progress, I urge that we greatly intensify our atomic-energy effort and as a step in that direction that we give this supplemental appropriation bill speedy passage.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have listened with great interest and deep concern to every word of the gentleman's splendid address. I congratulate my friend, the gentleman from the State of Washington, on this splendid presentation. No one among us to my knowledge is more fitted to tell us of the possibilities of nuclear energy than the gentleman from the State of Washington, he having served on the Joint Committee on Atomic

Energy, and having given this subject all the additional study possible on the basis of the inside information to which he has had access. As one of the older generation, I listened to my young friend with concern as to the first part of his remarks. I felt and knew that eventually he would get to the peacetime uses of nuclear energy, as he has so well done. I congratulate you, Congressman JACKSON, and I congratulate your great State. You come as a voice out of the great west of this young Republic. You have informed me and stirred my thinking, and I hope you have equal effect upon our entire membership and upon the Nation.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I appreciate the gentleman's comment very much.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I compliment the gentleman, one of the outstanding members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, for the particularly outstanding address that he has given to us this afternoon. I know that his remarks are based upon experience and that he knows whereof he speaks. I am quite disturbed at the picture he paints of the difference in fire power between our own Armed Forces and the armed forces of the Russians, or the U. S. S. R. and its satellites. It appears to me on the basis of what he has said that the only answer to the defense program which confronts us at the present time is the approval of the request made by the President of the Congress for in excess of $3,000,000,000 of supplemental appropriations for our atomic energy program. I was also pleased to note that the gentleman referred to the possibility of disarmament in his speech, always providing that it would be something the Russians agreed to as well. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the United Nations this past year, a disarmament proposal was offered by this country which seeks to bring about the regulation and inspection of both atomic and regular or conventional weapons of war.

So far the Russians have been willing to sit down, but they do not seem to be seriously willing to discuss the possibility of disarmament. Until such a point is reached, I think it is up to this Congress to follow the recommendations and suggestions made by our colleague from Washington, and get behind a program such as this, in the interest of our own security, if for no other reason. I say "if for no other reason," because the gentleman has also pointed out that a program of this kind is not wasteful, and that if we can achieve peace and if we can achieve disarmament of the atomic and conventional weapons, the materials used in the development of atomic energy can be used for peaceful purposes. The gentleman is to be commended for the magnificent speech he has made today.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I wish to associate myself with the fine comment which the gentleman from Montana has made with reference to the necessity of building up our atomic strength. We all hope and pray that we can bring about complete disarmament, but it would be utter folly for America to agree to atomic disarmament and then leave to the Russians all of their conventional weapons.

I think it may come as a great surprise to our people to find that in the field of conventional fire power we are lagging behind the Russians, man for man. It has always been the idea of the person in the street that while America lacks the ability to match the Russian forces in the field man for man, we could make up for that deficiency by greater fire power. We do not have that conventional fire power at the present time. We do have the atomic fire power at the present time, but that gap is being closed very rapidly. I certainly think the gentleman from Montana has made a very fine presentation of that position.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I did not hear all of the gentleman's remarks, but I was very much interested and I think it is extremely important that some of the atomic energy plants should be placed in different sections of the country. I think Massachusetts could very well have one or two small plants for research. We probably do not have the space for a big plant, but it would be very helpful and very educational if there could be some small plant in Massachusetts.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I would say to the gentlewoman that we have literally hundreds of plants throughout the United States now engaged in working for the Atomic Energy Commission, either directly or through its contractors. We are doing important work in the State of Massachusetts in connection with many of your very fine schools. That contribution has been invaluable in helping to bring forth new ideas which later are implemented in the form of new production facilities and new techniques in the development of the varied and many aspects of this program. I certainly agree that as we extend production facilities in connection with atomic energy, we should disperse them as much as possible.

I would like to invite your attention, however, to the fact that there are two factors that are of great importance. One is the necessity for an abundance of hydroelectric power. Our people may be unaware of it, but the percentage of the total amount of power being produced in America today that is being allocated to atomic energy production facilities is utterly fantastic. Security prevents me from advising on this floor as to how much power is required for a plant like Oak Ridge, for example, but I can assure the gentlewoman that it takes a tremendous amount. That power requirement is heaviest in connection with what we call a gaseous diffusion plant. For a plant like Hanford or the Savannah River, we require power, plus a tremendous amount of water, in order to cool the atomic reactor, so to speak.

So those two factors are very important. I am sure that Massachusetts will be able to meet some of the requirements for atomic facilities when and if further expansion is indicated.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think they are expanding; that is my understanding, at least in the larger plants; is not that correct?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I am advised, and this has been made public, that there will be an additional gaseous diffusion plant, that is, in addition to the plant that is now operating at Oak Ridge and in addition to the one that is being completed at Paducah, Ky.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I may say that my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is very much interested in getting some of this production for his district. His district adjoins mine; they are brother-sister districts.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. We certainly all want to get behind this program and expand it just as rapidly as possible. This is one program that we must push forward. I regret the necessity of being repetitious, but I think we must strive to make the point day after day that these plants we are now building in connection with the atomic energy program are the same identical plants that we will need to refine this material for peacetime uses. So when we build an atomic energy plant we are not only helping fight aggression during this period of crisis in the free world but it is also a plant that can be used to refine this energy for the many peacetime uses that we can make available through a vastly expanded atomic program.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They are fine institutions, very valuable. We have not had any of our share of defense work.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The material that you use in the atomic bomb itself is the same material that you need to fuel and fire a peacetime atomic engine; so we cannot have too much of this material. If we can avoid a world war III, which is the supreme objective of all of us, we will have the greatest stockpile of peacetime energy ever known to mankind.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. I also want to join with my colleagues here on the floor this afternoon in extending our congratulations to the gentleman from Washington for his very fine presentation of this subject matter. It is one of the most important issues that we face. We all should be interested, and I hope the gentleman will see fit that each and every Member of Congress receives a copy of his report to the Congress here today for their own benefit and for the benefit of their people back home.

I assume also that not only will the power situation be important to the construction of these new units in the atomic energy program, not only electric power but also as the gentleman says, water power and water supply; but is it not also a fact that the labor problem enters into it and that we who have surplus labor in New England, we in Massachusetts who now face unemployment in many of our cities and towns should also receive consideration in the establishment of these plants that are subsidiary to the atomic energy plants?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I certainly agree with my friend that every consideration ought to be given to those areas where you have a substantial surplus of manpower and where you have water and electric power available, too.

Mr. LANE. I thank the gentleman and I hope he will see to it that his remarks receive publicity not only among Members of Congress but among his own people in the Northwest who I know are mighty interested in this subject matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE NEW ENGLAND INDUSTRIAL CRISIS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken very steadily and very consistently in behalf of greater consideration for the industries of New England and of the fact that we in Massachusetts and all of New England have not had our share or anything like our share of national defense orders. In World War II we produced an enormous quantity of important war material and did it very successfully.

The thing that is such a farce, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the administration is boasting of how it helps small industries, how committees are created, and groups are instituted in the various departments to help the small industries of the country. Yet these groups are not allowed to help small industry, and more and more the Government work and contracts are being concentrated into large industries with very large capital.

Mr. Speaker, today this Democratic administration stands for greater enlargement and expansion of our already too large industries. The Government work secured only by the large corporations has not been given out in any part to the small industries as it should have been. As a result there has been delay in the national defense, delay in production which hinders our men who are fighting.

Recently I have been working to save small industry in Massachusetts from going out of business. This small industry has been unable to compete with the large industries and needs help from the Government departments in order to continue. Conferences have been held by the industry representatives with the Government representatives. The industry representatives were told by the Government representatives that a large sum of money would have to be secured by the industry to add to the capital of the industry in order to continue with Government contracts, and that a hearing would not be granted.

I told them over the telephone I never had such an experience in my life in Washington, and I have been here since 1913. However, a hearing was granted today at 9 o'clock. What the outcome will be I do not know. But this is a matter that is very important to national defense, and I shall give more details to the House at a later date.

The industry I have been trying to help is well equipped and located in Massachusetts in a distressed area. The Government departments have no excuse for not helping in view of the essentiality of the product manufactured and there is no reason why assistance should not be given and the company allowed to continue with the manufacture of this necessary war product.

I have been here for many years in Washington, I have watched Congress for many years, and I have never seen such destruction of small business due to lack of assistance and such destruction of confidence in the Federal Government due to lack of partialities so far as certain areas in the country are concerned. Partiality is shown areas that are congested or in which industry is congested. There is no dispersal of industry, which was one of the primary objectives so-called in the administration of national defense. Small business has been almost entirely obliterated, as a matter of fact condensed into small areas.

Always an excuse is given for not awarding a contract in New England, even when the New England bidders are lowest. I am sure the Comptroller General would decide to stop payment on some of these awards if the manufacturers in New England were willing to fight. But this is a very serious situation and there is a fear by the manufacturers that has never before existed in this country.

We are in a war, although they call it a police action. This Democratic administration says they are conducting a police action, but they are doing it very differently from what they did the war action. Boys have been mutilated and many have died. It is nothing but a mockery to call it a police action, and worse not to give their families employment. We hear about distressed areas, yet when an area is declared to be distressed it seems as if everybody tries to keep work away from that area. It is the most outrageous situation I have ever seen in the Government and in national defense in my lifetime.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to say to the gentleman that his congressional district too is in a very greatly distressed area. He has done a magnificent piece of work in securing help for that area and I know he deserves success.

Mr. LANE. I would like to join with my colleague from the city of Lowell, Mass., in her remarks made here this afternoon in reference to helping out industries in Massachusetts. I know that she has given much of her time and her effort not only on the floor of the House but on various committees and also outside of the Capitol in order to help and to assist these people in her congressional district and the distressed city of Lowell to obtain some of these defense orders, some of these contracts that should be channeled into such areas. I know she has been most active in the committee I head as chairman appointed by members from Massachusetts, a committee to help relieve unemployment in the textile industry in Massachusetts and, of course, in the whole of New England. She has traveled with the committee here and there throughout the country trying to obtain some of the work for her people back home. May I say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts at this time that, as true enough as she has stated here so ably and well, it is most important now. It has become an emergency back home with us people—so much so that, in respect to that committee on which she has served as a very active member, I called upon the President, with the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], today at the White House, to see if there was not something that he could do. We pleaded with the President and urged him to help us in some way to obtain those defense orders that the gentlewoman has spoken about not only today, but many other days on the floor of the House.

True enough, we should have some of those orders, because we have been labeled as a distress area. We need the work. We need that employment for our people who are now walking the streets and who do not receive any unemployment payments, because they are exhausted. We have the same situation that the gentlewoman has. She is very much interested, I know, and I hope that after the visit that we made to the President today to ask him to delegate somebody to look to it that we obtain some of those orders, if he can possibly direct some of those agencies of Government to force them to give orders to our distressed areas, something good will be accomplished. We need that work and we should have it because, as the gentlewoman has stated many, many times we are a contributing factor to these United States. New England, although we are at the end of the line, should have this aid and assistance.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know the gentleman has worked tirelessly on this question, and I hope the President will listen. There is an invisible something that prevents these areas in New England from even getting as much as they used to get. It looks as if the New England area is being punished in some way by those in power, because we have been fighting for our communities. It is a very unwise thing for national defense. It is a very unwise thing to say to those boys who are flying and dying in Korea, "We will take you, and we will drop you if you are a volunteer, but when it comes to keeping your family at work, we will not do it; in fact, we will take our contracts, where you are the low bidders, where your families work, away from you."

It is the most outrageous thing and the most cruel thing I have ever known. It is the sort of thing that will greatly hurt our country.

Mr. LANE. Of course, the gentlewoman is familiar with our work and the effort to channel those orders into our distressed areas. She knows as I know that that has not worked out as we thought it would. We had some hope and we had some faith that the channeling of these orders into our distressed areas would help. Now, due to the decision of these boards that have listened attentively to our people they have decided otherwise, so consequently we will have to seek help and assistance in some other way.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is pure discrimination. Work that previously has gone to New England has stopped. What the reason for it is, I do not know. What the psychology is by any group in Washington that wants to hurt an area is beyond my comprehension and it is not wise. It must be changed. I know the gentleman is very prominent in his party and has done a great work. He is a very loyal American. I do not know of anyone who works any harder than does my colleague from Massachusetts, my next-door neighbor of Lawrence, Mass.

This afternoon while I was at the Government department trying to help this Massachusetts industry there was a roll call on the conference report on the Mutual Security Bill. If I had been present, I would heve voted for the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

SOCIAL SECURITY PAYS POOR-HOUSE BENEFITS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will they ever permit the old-age and survivors insurance system to put more meat on the skeleton ribs of its so-called beneficiaries?

When our opponents admit that the scale of benefits is undernourished and urge that the work clause be liberalized so that a person can earn more than $50 a month on a part-time job in covered employment without losing his benefits, then the payments must be far below par.

No doubt that many worthy retired recipients now regard this pittance as better than nothing, notwithstanding the frantic claims made back in 1935 that social security would ruin the Nation.

I regret to observe, however, that even though we have an old-age-pension system that pays its own way, it is not growing up in substance.

Benefits are still paid in a fixed number of dollars, according to each claim, but their purchasing power is going down as more water is being pumped into the dollar, diluting its strength.

We no longer have those shameful institutions once known as the poorhouse. We only have old folks living in cheap and lonely rooming houses, trying to make both ends meet on string benefits.

H. R. 7800 proposes a token increase of some $5 per month, and I hesitate to mention that sum because it provides such little help that it falls far short of genuine improvement. Even so, it is having banana peels thrown in its way by those who can afford bananas.

To deny people the small additional benefits that some have already paid for is not playing fair with them.

I want to emphasize that no increase is required in the present social-security taxes to cover the increased benefits we propose. As wages have gone up during the past few years, so has the tax take for this fund. The income is considerably greater than the outgo. The social-security program does not operate on that peculiar basis known as deficit financing. It is self-supporting and will continue to be so. A gradual and limited increase in its tax will open the way to higher benefits in the future beyond the small one now under consideration.

When the history of our times is written, I believe that the Social Security Act of 1935 will stand out as one of the most important pieces of legislation enacted during the first half of the twentieth century.

It was timid in its beginnings, but the long-overdue start was made. From that point on we are committed to increase and extend its benefits until all Americans are covered by an economic insurance that will protect them in disability, in retirement, and will also include certain of their survivors.

The meaning of this is far-reaching.

Floor by floor we shall build supports out of earnings for the aged, the disabled, and the widows with young children who have lost their provider. Coupled with unemployment compensation and a real full-employment policy, we shall have internal strength and stability.

This is necessary for the well-being of our people, and to defend them from the larger economic forces over which they have no control.

And it will be one of our most effective answers to the challenge of communism.

I say "will be" because the shelter is far from completion.

We cannot afford to be too slow in getting on with this construction.

Our people were caught once in a violent storm that stripped them of all they had and left them with no opportunity to earn a living. This Nation was then unprepared to help the people within its own borders, except by politically controlled hand-outs, to survive that storm with purchasing power due them as a return from previous earnings.

The people will not endure such an abandonment again.

By a combination of work, which is self-help, plus social insurance which is group protection, they want to build progress without ambush.

They see the storm clouds of communism gathering abroad.

They are presently giving a sizable part of their own earnings to help people in other lands to build defenses against want and worry so that their world neighbors will not be struck down by economic depression which brings on the whirlwind of communism.

They also need—our folks in the United States—some security for themselves.

This basic return, or that part of earnings deferred until the person is too old to compete in the labor market, or is unable to compete by reason of disability, or because death takes the breadwinner and thus imposes a hardship upon a widow left with minor children—this is protection for the innocent victims of adversity.

It is a policy of putting something aside for a rainy day on a regular, sound, and dependable schedule.

It is a national coverage, patterned after the conservative standards of private insurance companies, and intended to save individuals from their own lack of foresight, from accident or disease which strike suddenly and knock down income as well as health, and from various other hazards beyond their control.

In the past, our defenses against such misfortunes have been absent or weak.

Private charity tries valiantly to help but it cannot cope with the whole problem, and no matter how discreet or kind it is in its methods, it cannot shield the recipients of benevolence from the subtle and crippling effects of humiliation.

Only a delayed yield on previous earnings, held back as a reserve to be paid out in old age, or before then to survivors, or, as the Social Security Act expands to include those who are totally and permanently disabled will provide the individual so entitled to both income and self-respect.

The Social Security Act is almost 17 years of age.

As it approaches maturity, the time has come for it to assume more responsibility.

This year we have an opportunity to improve and strengthen the social security system, and to make it more reliable.

First, by an altogether too small increase in benefits.

Secondly, by raising the ceiling on outside earnings.

Thirdly, to provide wage credits for any time spent in military service from the end of World War II through 1953.

Fourthly, to freeze the worker's rights during periods of permanent and total disability, so that their eventual benefits will not be reduced.

Fifthly, to give State and local government employees with retirement systems of their own the chance to come under the Federal plan if they so wish.

Sixthly, correction of a technical defect regarding earned income of the blind who are receiving public assistance.

We must always bear in mind that many people exhaust their savings for medical care and hospitalization before they reach retirement.

It is not enough to pay them back out of their lifetime contributions to our Nation's material progress with barely enough to keep body and soul together. This Nation has the means to do better than that. The dignity of old age is not honored by a poorhouse dole.

These 1952 amendments will be constructive work done this year to advance the building of the real social-security structure which this country has contracted for in behalf of all its people.

So let us get on with the job.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DEANE, for 2 days, on account of official business.

Mr. RAINS, for 2 days, on account of official committee hearing in Detroit, Mich.

Mr. FENTON (at the request of Mr. MCCONNELL), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

TIDELANDS BILL

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the acting majority leader whether he can at this time give us any more accurate information as to the time next week when the vote to override the veto on the tidelands bill may possibly come before the House.

Mr. PRIEST. I appreciate the question of the distinguished gentleman from New York. I can say this much in answer to his question, that if the Senate should override the veto and it comes back to the House for action, there will be no action in the House on it before Thursday, at least.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman. I think that will be very helpful to the Members.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WALTER and to include a resolution adopted by the American Bar Association.

Mr. WHITTEN and to include a letter from Hon. Robert Ramspeck, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. SIEMINSKI in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KENNEDY (at the request of Mr. CLEMENTE).

Mr. PRICE in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY and to include an article appearing in the Evening Star.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAGUE and to include a magazine article.

Mr. BEAMER and to include an article appearing in the Marion (Ind.) Chronicle.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania in two instances, to include in one an article by the senior research forester of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and in the other an address by Major General Ford.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois and to include an address delivered by Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., before the Illinois Bankers Association.

Mr. POULSON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and to include an address by J. H. Carmichael on the subject America Needs a Strong Air Transport System.

Mr. RIEHLMAN and to include two editorials.

Mr. JAVITS in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CANNON to revise and extend his remarks made on the conference report and to include excerpts appearing in the Washington Star.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, on May 17 I asked unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the advisers of the point 4 program. Subsequently the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] included all or part of that statement in his longer remarks on a different subject. The Printing Office has sent it back because of what they call duplication. It was my desire then and now to have that printed as a separate item and I now renew my request that it may be printed under my name.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL and to include a tribute to Jose Rizal by His Excellency, Carlos Romulo, Philippine Ambassador, along with comments.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) in two instances, to include in one an editorial and in the other a newspaper article.

Mr. DORN and to include an editorial.

Mr. MCGRATH.

Mr. MULTER in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JUDD in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL in five instances.

Mr. VELDE and to include an editorial.

Mr. VAN PELT and to include an editorial.

Mr. MACK of Washington in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOW and to include a letter.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENDER in five instances.

Mr. DURHAM and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MOULDER and to include an article on the Southern Baptist Convention held in Miami on the 14th of May of this year.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. KEATING).

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6947. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1855. An act for the relief of Joachim Volk, also known as Steven Craig Delano;

S. 1953. An act for the relief of Midori Sugimoto;

S. 2089. An act for the relief of Debra Elaine Evans;

S. 2462. An act for the relief of Teruo Uechi;

S. 2554. An act for the relief of Eugene Richard Sushko;

S. 2571. An act for the relief of Ernest Daniel Davis, Jr.;

S. 2593. An act for the relief of Jean Hamamoto, also known as Sharon Lea Brooks;

S. 2643. An act for the relief of Kathleen Cowley;

S. 2768. An act for the relief of Barbara Ann Sheppard; and

S. 2805. An act for the relief of Susan Jeanne Kerr.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 4, 1952:

H. R. 156. An act to repeal the Alaska railroads tax;

H. R. 654. An act for the relief of Ivo Cerne;

H. R. 696. An act to authorize the President of the United States to present the Distinguished Flying Cross to Col. Roscoe Turner;

H. R. 975. An act for the relief of Sarah A. Davies;

H. R. 1099. An act for the relief of the estate of Cobb Nichols;

H. R. 1162. An act for the relief of Kaiko Sugimote (Kay Fair) and her minor children;

H. R. 1428. An act for the relief of Claude Foranda;

H. R. 1960. An act for the relief of Erika Nicolo and her minor child;

H. R. 2303. An act for the relief of Sisters Maria Salerno, Eufrasisa Binotto, Maria Ballatore, and Giovanna Buziol;

H. R. 2307. An act for the relief of Jean (John) Plewniak and Anna Piotrowska Plewniak;

H. R. 2346. An act for the relief of Odette Louise Tirman;

H. R. 2587. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jeannette Thorn Pease;

H. R. 2628. An act for the relief of the George H. Soffel Co.;

H. R. 2784. An act for the relief of Fumiko Higa;

H. R. 2841. An act for the relief of Yai Wing Lee;

H. R. 2902. An act for the relief of Thomas E. Bell;

H. R. 2903. An act for the relief of Mimi Fong and her children, Sing Lee and Lily;

H. R. 2920. An act for the relief of Priscilla Ogden Dickerson Gillson de la Fregonniere;

H. R. 3070. An act for the relief of Giovanni Rinaldo Bottini;

H. R. 3124. An act for the relief of Mehmet Salih Topcuoglu;

H. R. 3132. An act for the relief of Sister Apolonia Gerarda Sokolowska;

H. R. 3152. An act for the relief of Mrs. Setsuyo Sumida;

H. R. 3561. An act for the relief of Mary Osadchy;

H. R. 3572. An act for the relief of Ying Chee Jung;

H. R. 3732. An act for the relief of Stephan Joseph Horvath and Lucas Albert Horvath;

H. R. 3953. An act for the relief of Chan Toy Har;

H. R. 4152. An act for the relief of Ann Tobak and John Tobak;

H. R. 4492. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Norma J. Roberts, a minor;

H. R. 4790. An act for the relief of Helga Richter;

H. R. 4801. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue certain bonds for flood-control purposes;

H. R. 4802. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue certain public improvement bonds;

H. R. 4923. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue certain bonds for the construction of the Kalihi tunnel and its approach roads;

H. R. 5071. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the county of Maui, T. H., to issue public improvement bonds for the construction of flood-control projects on Iao stream;

H. R. 5072. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the county of Maui, T. H., to issue public improvement bonds for the construction of new public-school buildings;

H. R. 5121. An act for the relief of Felix Navedo-Merced and Carmen Ramos-Baez;

H. R. 5145. An act for the relief of Tsutako Kuroki Masuda;

H. R. 5386. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation of the Territory of Hawaii, to issue bonds for acquisition of real property for public-school purposes and for construction and replacement of buildings for public-school purposes;

H. R. 5753. An act for the relief of Bernard J. Keogh;

H. R. 5805. An act for the relief of Patricia Lauretta Pray;

H. R. 5956. An act for the relief of Ingeborg and Anna Lukas;

H. R. 5958. An act for the relief of Pauline W. Goodyear;

H. R. 5976. An act for the relief of Michiko Nakashima;

H. R. 5984. An act for the relief of Jimmy Doguta (also known as Jimmy Blagg);

H. R. 6265. An act for the relief of Marian Diane Delphine Sachs;

H. R. 6314. An act for the relief of Kiko Oshiro;

H. R. 6675. An act to authorize the conveyance of lands in the Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation to the State of California or to the Hoopa United School District for use for school purposes;

H. R. 6848. An act for the relief of Sharon Elaine Frankovich;

H. R. 6922. An act to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, so as to extend the benefits of such section to certain colleges in the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 7188. An act to provide that the additional tax imposed by section 2470 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code shall not apply in respect of coconut oil produced in, or produced from materials grown in, the territory of the Pacific islands; and

H. R. 7593. An act to amend paragraph 1774, section 201, title II, of the Tariff Act of 1930.

On June 5, 1952:

H. R. 6947. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 9, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1548. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting copies of the report of the proceedings of a special meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held at Washington, D. C., March 20 and 21, 1952, pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 331 (H. Doc. No. 490); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1549. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the audit of the financial statements and accounts of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs for the year ended June 30, 1951, pursuant to Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 491); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1550. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1953 in the amount of $50,000 for the Executive Office of the President (H. Doc. No. 492); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1551. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the report on the administration and enforcement of the registration provisions of the Subversive Activities Control Act, pursuant to section 9 (c) of the act, for the period from June 1, 1951, to May 31, 1952; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CELLER: Subcommittee No. 5 (Anti-trust Subcommittee) of the Committee on the Judiciary. Report filed pursuant to House Resolution 95, Eighty-second Congress, first session, authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 505, pt. 3). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REGAN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1032. An act to authorize each of the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Washington to pool royalties derived from lands granted to it for public schools and various State institutions; with amendment (Rept. No. 2036). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMULLEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4683. A bill to provide for distribution of moneys of deceased restricted members of the Five Civilized Tribes not exceeding $500, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2037). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5328. A bill to amend the third paragraph of section 4, chapter 1, title I, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 322; 48 U. S. C., sec. 101), as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2038). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. D'NGELL: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 6241. A bill to provide for the refund or credit of the internal-revenue tax paid on fermented malt liquors lost or rendered unmarketable by reason of the floods of 1951 where such fermented malt liquors were in possession of (1) the original taxpayer, (2) a dealer who sells fermented malt liquors at wholesale, or (3) a dealer who sells fermented malt liquors at retail; without amendment (Rept. No. 2039). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2383. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 17, 1923; without amendment (Rept. 2040). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1558. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to Victory Bible Camp Ground, Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2032). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REDDEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4810. A bill authorizing and directing the commissioner of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii to issue a right of purchase lease to Edward C. Searle; without amendment (Rept. No. 2033). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3494. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to the Catholic Society of Alaska for use as a mission; with amendment (Rept. No. 2034). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6385. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Kenai (Alaska) Troop 653 of the Boy Scouts of America; with amendment (Rept. No. 2035). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 8086. A bill to govern the hospitalization of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 8087. A bill to provide a program of emergency grants and scholarships for education in the field of nursing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 8088. A bill for the relief of the county of Hamilton, Ohio; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FURCOLO (by request):

H. R. 8089. A bill relating to the consideration of petitions and memorials to the

Congress in committees of the Senate and House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H. R. 8090. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of tribal lands within the Wind River Indian Reservation, Wyo.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 8091. A bill to diminish the harmful effects of labor disputes upon the general public and the national defense by encouraging collective bargaining between employers and their own employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 8092. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 8093. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to allow as a deduction from gross income under section 23 (1) the depreciation of property owned and occupied by the taxpayer as his residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 8094. A bill authorizing construction of works to restore to Palo Verde irrigation district, California, a means of gravity diversion of its irrigation water supply from the Colorado River and providing certain benefits to the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Ariz., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 8095. A bill to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 8096. A bill to assist States and cities in fostering civil peace through public agencies set up to improve group relations, to provide for the training of State and local law-enforcement officers in the prevention and control of intergroup conflicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 8097. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 8098. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 8099. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to appoint Rear Adm. Morton Loomis Ring to a civilian position with the Munitions Board, upon retirement, without affecting his military status and perquisites; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 8100. A bill to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 477. Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but not beyond June 30, 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. J. Res. 478. Joint resolution to assist the Polycultural Institution of America in expanding further its program and activities for the purpose of promoting universal understanding, justice, and permanent peace, to assist such institution in providing for its permanent plant and equipment in the Nation's Capital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. Con. Res. 219. Concurrent resolution providing for a temporary bipartisan joint congressional committee to investigate the fire power of our armed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Res. 665. Resolution to provide payment to Florence Wright, daughter of Minnie Wright, late an employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. Res. 666. Resolution to favor the economic development and improvement of the south Asian subcontinent; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Res. 667. Resolution to favor the economic development and improvement of the south Asian subcontinent; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 668. Resolution to favor the economic development and improvement of the south Asian subcontinent; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. Res. 669. Resolution to favor the economic development and reenforcement of the south Asian subcontinent; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. Res. 670. Resolution to favor the economic development and improvement of the south Asian subcontinent; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. Res. 671. Resolution to favor the economic development and improvement of the south Asian subcontinent; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Res. 672. Resolution to favor the economic development and improvement of the south Asian subcontinent; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STANLEY:

H. Res. 673. Resolution for the relief of Francis P. Casey; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature memorializing Congress to congratulate Premier Alcide De Gasperi and the Italian people for their impressive showing over the forces of communism in the recent municipal elections in Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to congratulate Premier Alcide De Gasperi and the Italian people for their impressive showing over the forces of communism in the recent elections in Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, urging congratulations to Premier Alcide De Gasperi and the Italian people for their impressive showing over communism in the recent elections in Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, urging congratulations to Premier Alcide De Gasperi and the Italian people for their impressive showing over communism in the recent elections in Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 8101. A bill for the relief of Jose do Rego Dias Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 8102. A bill for the relief of Evoggelos Mponpotsis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8103. A bill for the relief of Vacellios Koniditsiotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 8104. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to the heirs of William Petzoldt Covers Up; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 8105. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Abel L. Farwell; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 8106. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Jennie Bad Horse; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 8107. A bill for the relief of Panayotis Koutsoyannopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FURCOLO (by request):

H. R. 8108. A bill for the relief of Louis Belkin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8109. A bill for the relief of Adalgisa Carpanelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 8110. A bill for the relief of M. G. Huff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 8111. A bill for the relief of Vytautas Stanislau Bacevicius; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 8112. A bill for the relief of Emanuel and Maria Puleio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 8113. A bill for the relief of Yoko Itabashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 8114. A bill for the relief of Igor Michael Bogolepov (alias Ivar Nyman) and Margaret Johanna Bogolepov (alias Margaret Johanna Nyman); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 8115. A bill for the relief of Antonio Rotondo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H. R. 8116. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mabel Chu Tow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 8117. A bill for the relief of Louis Joseph Rago; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 8118. A bill for the relief of Herman Sharma and Gertrude Sharma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 8119. A bill for the relief of Njdeh Hovhanissian Aslanian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

751. Mr. FORAND presented a petition of Mr. J. H. Foster, Jr., and 46 members of the Rhode Island Congress of Industrial Organizations petitioning the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency to continue rent control in its present form, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 6, 1952

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 5, 1952)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, with the deep desire that all our deliberations on this high hill of the Nation's life should be begun, continued, and ended in Thee, we would enter this forum of the people's hopes through the gateway of prayer. Here may our faulty perspectives be corrected by vast horizons. Kindle on the altar of our hearts a flame of devotion to freedom's cause in all the world, that in its white heat shall be consumed every grosser passion. Serving here in the homeland, make us knights of a holy crusade, worthy to be reckoned with those who on land and sea and in the air are sacrificing their all to roll back the tide of violence from the souls of men. On crimson fields they fight for ordered government, just laws, and the sacredness of human personality. We here remember them and pray that to us strength may be given to follow in their train. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 5, 1952, was dispensed with.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. IVES was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate this afternoon after 3:30 o'clock.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and by unanimous consent, the Postal Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. MILLER, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On June 5, 1952:

S. 2736. An act to amend the Code of Law of the District of Columbia in respect to the recording, in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds, of bills of sale, mortgages, deeds of trust, and conditional sales of personal property, and for other purposes.

On June 6, 1952:

S. 302. An act to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5713. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide that Low Middling ⅞-inch cotton shall be the standard grade for the purposes of determining parity and price support for the 1952 cotton crop, under certain conditions; and

H. R. 7656. An act to provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress, and for other purposes.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

TUBERCULOSIS CONTROL—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN ANTI-TUBERCULOSIS ASSOCIATION, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, which I have just received from C. W. Kammeier, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Anti-Tuberculosis Association, a splendid group of leading physicians and laymen in my State. In this resolution, Mr. Kammeier points out that recent publicity on so-called "wonder drugs" against TB should not lead to exaggerated suppositions that TB has already been conquered. The Association bespeaks, therefore, continued appropriations for necessary research.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE FORTY-FOURTH ANNUAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING OF THE WISCONSIN ANTITUBERCULOSIS ASSOCIATION, MILWAUKEE, WIS., MAY 15, 1952

Whereas the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives has recommended a substantial cut in the appropriation for tuberculosis control of the Public Health Service; and

Whereas in doing so the committee declared that, "it is hoped that recent developments in the field of tuberculosis treatment will permit a very much larger reduction next year"; and

Whereas increasing costs of Government require that the Federal budget be reviewed carefully to avoid any unsound or unnecessary expenditures; and

Whereas current research work on the new isonicotinic drugs indicates, however, that while they appear to be a valuable therapeautic aid, they are unlikely to bring about any revolutionary changes in the general pattern of case-finding, sanatorium care, and rehabilitation, and may in fact result in the need for an even more intensive program of case-finding and rehabilitation: Be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Antituberculosis Association, representing several hundred physicians, public health nurses, social workers, educators, and other public-spirited citizens, recognizes the need on the part of the Congress for careful scrutiny of proposed expenditures of Federal departments and bureaus. We feel it our responsibility, however, to caution Wisconsin representatives in the Senate and House of Representatives against slashes in the Public Health Service budget on the basis of premature reliance on the widely publicized new drugs. The value of these drugs was much exaggerated in early publicity; they are in no sense a cure for tuberculosis, and their use is highly unlikely to materially reduce the cost of tuberculosis control.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 6773. A bill to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1680).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 7783. A bill to increase certain rates of veterans' compensation provided for specific service-incurred disabilities, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1681).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 2582. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey the sand, gravel, and clay deposits in and on a certain tract or parcel of land in Russell County, Ala., to W. T. Heard; with amendments (Rept. No. 1682).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2355. A bill to establish the finality of contracts between the Government and common carriers of passengers and freight subject to the Interstate Commerce Act; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1683); and

S. 2364. A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to revoke or amend, under certain conditions, water-carrier certificates and permits; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1684).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 3299. A bill for the relief of Cecylia Morgenstern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3300. A bill to establish a Federal Committee on Migratory Labor; placed on the calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he reported the above bill from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 3301. A bill to provide additional compensation for certain individuals who were prisoners of war during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAIN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT RELATING TO EFFECTIVE DATES OF CERTAIN AGREEMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6291) to amend section 218 (f) of the Social Security Act with respect to effective dates of agreements entered into with States before January 1, 1954, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 5713. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide that Low Middling ⅞-inch cotton shall be the standard grade for the purposes of determining parity and price support for the 1952 cotton crop, under certain conditions; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 7656. An act to provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of William D. Sudia, to be senior assistant sanitarian in the regular corps of the Public Health Service, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

William L. Jenkins, and Robert F. Suczek, for appointment in the regular corps of the Public Health Service; and

Albert L. Burroughs, and sundry other candidates, for appointment and promotion in the regular corps of the Public Health Service.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Address delivered by Representative CHARLES J. KERSTEN, of Wisconsin, at the Conference of Americans of Slovak Descent, Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C., May 23, 1952.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Editorial entitled "HOPE'S Own Farm Program," published in the Garden City (Kans.) Telegram of May 30, 1952.

By Mr. STENNIS:

Address delivered by Mrs. William Lawrence Fulton, on the occasion of Honors Day at the University of Mississippi, Oxford, Miss., on May 14, 1952.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Article entitled "Early Birds in Business—Distributive Education Students to Get a Fast Start Toward Success" written by Pete Gilpin, and published in the Houston Chronicle Magazine of Sunday, May 18, 1952.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Article entitled "It's Time We Had a Revolt Against Fair Deal Waste," published in the May 3, 1952, issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

By Mr. CAIN:

Article entitled "What's Happening to Our Forests," published in a recent issue of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

Editorial entitled "The Stake Kentuckians Have in Our Foreign Trade," published in the Louisville Courier-Journal of May 25, 1952.

By Mr. BENNETT:

Editorial entitled "Utah's Indians Point the Way," published in the Deseret News of June 2, 1952.

PERSONNEL STRENGTH OF MARINE CORPS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 677) to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to establish the relationship of the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the following is hereby substituted for the first sentence of section 206 (c) of the National Security Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 501):

"(c) The United States Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy as defined in this section, shall include not less than three full-strength combat divisions, three full-strength air wings, and such other land combat, aviation, and other services as may be organic thereto. Hereafter the actual enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Marine Corps shall be not less than 220,000. The total active duty enlisted strength of the Marine Corps shall not be more than 400,000, which number shall constitute the authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Marine Corps: *Provided*, That this limitation shall be suspended during time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress. The actual permanent commissioned strength of the active list of the Regular Marine Corps, exclusive of commissioned warrant officers, shall not be less than 3¼ percent and not more than 7 percent of the authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Marine Corps. 'Actual strength', as used in this subsection, shall be construed to mean the daily average number of personnel in the category concerned during the fiscal year and shall be attained as soon as practicable without impairing the efficiency of the Marine Corps but not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of this amendatory act."

SEC. 2. Section 211 (a) of the National Security Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 505), as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 211. (a) There is hereby established within the Department of Defense the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which shall consist of the chairman, who shall be the presiding officer but who shall have no vote; the Chief of Staff, United States Army; the Chief of Naval Operations; the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force; and the Commandant of the Marine Corps. The Joint Chiefs of Staff shall be the principal military advisers to the President, the National Security Council, and the Secretary of Defense."

SEC. 3. Section 2 (b) of the act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92), is hereby repealed.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, to add the Commandant of the Marine Corps as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and for other purposes."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House; ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. LONG, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. FLANDERS conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF RUBBER ACT OF 1948

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6787) to extend the Rubber Act of 1948 (Public Law 469, 80th Cong.), as amended, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

ALBERT D. LASKER

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, just a week ago today there died in New York City a very great American, Albert D. Lasker. Mr. Lasker was for many years an outstanding leader in the business world. He long devoted himself to public affairs and served under several Presidents, of both parties in highly important posts. During many years he rendered signal service to his country and its people.

He retired from business and public life in 1942, and for the balance of his days devoted himself exclusively, in association with his wife, to the alleviation of human suffering, to the betterment of the lot of his fellow man, to medical research, and to the care and cure of countless thousands of suffering people.

With his wife, Mary Lasker, he founded in 1942 the Lasker Foundation, which made available large sums of money for the purpose of research, for the support of hospitals, and for the training of a great number of men and women in scientific fields.

By general consent he was recognized as one of the most distinguished and best citizens of New York State. I mourn him as a personal friend for whom I had great admiration and affection. But he was a great public figure and, in addition to his family and many friends and associates, the whole community has lost in his passing one of its most useful members.

I wish to read the last paragraph of an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of Saturday, May 31, which refers to Albert Lasker in these words:

He was more than a philanthropist, for he gave not only of his substance, but also of his own experience, ability, and strength for the health and welfare of all people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the complete editorial from which I have read a paragraph and a news article from the same newspaper of the same date.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALBERT LASKER

New York City and the Nation have lost one of their great citizens in the death of Albert Lasker. His biography is like a Horatio Alger story, but it is much more than that. A cub reporter at the age of 15, he rose to be the head of one of America's greatest advertising firms. A combination of imagination, creative ability, and salesmanship, he set new patterns for modern advertising.

Mr. Lasker served his country under both Democratic and Republican administrations, as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in 1917 and as Chairman of the United States Shipping Board in 1921.

Retiring from business at the peak of his career, Mr. Lasker dedicated his life to the service of humanity. His primary interests were medical. Problems of the aging, mental health, cancer, public health, and the problems of social medicine were the areas closest to his heart.

With his wife he established the Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation to honor those who had made outstanding contributions to the public health and other awards for significant contributions in scientific reporting, as well as providing financial support for a variety of research projects.

During his entire life he was active in Jewish affairs. He not only aided in their financing but was sensitive to and sponsored many special projects in agriculture and medicine, and maintained a deep, continuing interest in the multiple problems of Palestine.

He was more than a philanthropist, for he gave not only of his substance but also of his own experience, ability, and strength for the health and welfare of all people.

ALBERT D. LASKER, PHILANTHROPIST, DIES OF MALADY HE HELPED TO FIGHT—ADVERTISING PIONEER, LARGE DONOR TO MEDICAL RESEARCH, SUCCUMBS TO CANCER AT 72

Albert D. Lasker, advertising pioneer and Chairman of the United States Shipping Board after World War I, died at 8 a. m. yesterday in the Harkness Pavilion, Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center, at the age of 72. His home was at 29 Beekman Place.

Mr. Lasker died of cancer. It was ironic that the man who retired at the peak of his business career in 1942 to devote his wealth, his time, and his energies to the promotion of public health through medical research should be struck down by one of the diseases he sought to conquer.

His gifts to medical research and education and his many philanthropies were administered through the Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation, established in 1942 in his name and that of his wife.

One of his chief beneficiaries was the University of Chicago, to which he presented $1,250,000 for study of the diseases of the aging and a $3,000,000 estate at Lake Forest, Ill.

The funeral, which will be private, will be held from the Lasker home at noon tomorrow.

The son of Morris and Nettie Davis Lasker, Albert Davis Lasker was born in Freiburg, Germany, on May 1, 1880. His parents were Americans traveling abroad at the time. Morris Lasker had left Germany after the 1848 revolutionary disturbances in that country and had settled in Texas in the early 1850's.

Brought up in Galveston, Albert Lasker went to work there at the age of 15 as a reporter for the Galveston News. He also worked for the Dallas News before starting his advertising career in 1898 with the firm of Lord & Thomas, which he purchased 12 years later.

In his 44 years in the advertising business, Mr. Lasker built up Lord & Thomas from an annual billing of $800,000 to a peak of $50,000,000. He was regarded as a pioneer of modern advertising. Finding that nineteenth-century advertising lacked the basic element of salesmanship, he helped develop a modern technique of salesmanship in print.

"It takes salesmanship in print," he said, "to weld every element of an advertisement—its ideas, its news, its drama—into a consummate whole and then to make it sing."

Canned milk was one of the products that he helped to popularize with this form of advertising. As he saw it, the result was mass education of the public in values.

Mr. Lasker did much to persuade business and industrial executives of the wisdom of increasing their appropriations for advertising. He urged his clients in 1912 to appropriate 5 to 10 times as much as before. To back up his promises that this would prove effective, he offered to extend a year's credit to advertisers who shared his faith.

He believed in the importance of advertising as a factor in raising American standards of living and preserving American democracy.

"There can be no democratic way of life without freedom of selection and this freedom makes for better goods at lower prices," he said.

Mr. Lasker was a Republican but he served in high office under both Democratic and Republican Presidents. In 1917 he became assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture in the administration of President Wilson.

Later he was Chairman of the United States Shipping Board from 1921 to 1923 while Warren G. Harding was President. In this capacity he directed the liquidation of more than $3,000,000,000 worth of investments held by the Board after the First World War.

He was assistant to the chairman of the Republican National Committee in the 1920 presidential campaign that brought Mr. Harding's election. In 1940 he was a delegate to the Republican National Convention that nominated Wendell Willkie for the Presidency, and served as Mr. Willkie's floor leader for Illinois.

From 1937 to 1942 Mr. Lasker was a trustee of the University of Chicago.

PATRON OF BASEBALL AND GOLF

As a sportsman he turned to baseball and golf. He was among those who helped rescue the national pastime following the 1919 "Black Sox" scandal. In 1915 Mr. Lasker had acquired an interest in the Chicago Cubs baseball club.

When the game's future was threatened by the scandal he energetically defended the sport, putting forth what became known as the Lasker plan for its reorganization and supervision. Out of that came creation of the office of baseball commissioner and the election of Judge Kenesaw Mountain Landis to the post.

In golf Mr. Lasker directed the building in 1919 of the first 18-hole public course with grass greens on the Pacific coast at Pasadena, Calif.

"There were seven courses in southern California at that time," he recalled. "Six years later there were 140, mainly because the game grew in popularity as grass greens made putting more scientific."

Mr. Lasker built his own private course at the Lake Forest country home which he later gave to the University of Chicago. It was described by leading golfers as one of the finest in the country.

TULIP MEMORIAL IN CITY

In 1948 Mr. Lasker and his wife made a gift to New York City's Park Department of 50,000 tulip bulbs, brought from the tulip fields of Holland, in memory of Mrs. Lasker's mother. The Dutch Tulip Growers Association in Holland donated an additional 20,000. The tulips were planted in the traffic islands along Park Avenue between Thirty-fourth and Thirty-ninth Streets and at the Central Park Place at Fifth Avenue and Fifty-ninth Street.

Long active in Jewish affairs, Mr. Lasker was a director of the Jewish Charities of Chicago and a member of the executive committee of the American Jewish Committee. In memory of his father, who was interested in agriculture for Jews, Mr. Lasker and others of his family gave a building to the National Farm School and Junior College in Bucks County, Pa.

When Mr. Lasker dissolved his advertising firm in 1942, it had placed more than $750,000,000 in advertising under his direction. Explaining his retirement he said:

"I simply wish to take an intellectual and mental vacation. I am going to devote my time to matters concerning public welfare."

ANNUAL AWARDS BY FOUNDATION

The Lasker Foundation was perhaps best known to the public through its annual awards in the fields of mental hygiene, public health, planned parenthood and medical journalism. Pioneers in these fields have been among those honored with cash prizes of from $500 to $2,500 each year.

The awards sponsored in public health administration and medical research through the American Public Health Association were started in 1946. Five awards have been made annually in these fields. The awards for mental hygiene were established in 1944 and have been administered by the National Committee for Mental Hygiene.

Mr. Lasker married three times. His first wife was Flora Warner, whom he married in 1902. She died in 1936, leaving three children—Mary (Mrs. Leigh Block), Edward Lasker and Frances (Mrs. Sidney F. Brody). Mr. Lasker married Doris Kenyon, actress, in 1938, but they were divorced the next year. In 1940 he married Mary Woodard Reinhardt.

Mr. Lasker is survived, in addition to his wife and three children, by two sisters, Mrs. Samuel Rosensohn and Miss Loula Lasker, both of New York City, and four grandchildren.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H. R. 7314.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7314) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the hour is early, and I have a statement of about 30 minutes' length which I wish to make in reference to the agricultural appropriation bill. Permit me to suggest, out of consideration for my colleagues, that the call for a quorum be deferred until I have made the statement.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, in deference to my dear friend, the Senator from Georgia, I withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in this troublous period we are compelled to devote more time and money than any of us likes to spend in order to devise means to protect our way of life by military strength. My service as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has brought forcefully to my attention the necessity for equipping ourselves speedily with the best and most effective weapons of defense, to insure that we will have sufficient strength to deter the threat of Communist aggression.

I have supported this principle at every opportunity. I believe everyone will agree that it would be a most happy event if suddenly we should be freed from the necessity of considering such vast appropriations for weapons of destruction.

Unfortunately, that day is not yet ours. But while I cannot offer that happy prospect at this time, I can bring before the Senate a defense measure which does not involve the purpose of destruction, but rather the capacity for bringing to our fellow men and to ourselves better health, better diets, and greater security.

The defense measure to which I refer is the annual appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture. There can be little question that the agricultural appropriation bill, during a period like the present, is a defense measure. The people of the United States have placed greatly increased responsibilities upon the Department of Agriculture, in order to aid farmers in stepping up production of food and fiber—food and fiber which are absolutely essential for the use of our Armed Forces, our civilian population, and those associated with us in the defense of the free world against the threat of Communist aggression.

Mr. President, on one August day in the crucial year of 1940, when the Royal Air Force was almost all that stood between England and a Nazi conquest, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Winston Churchill, said of that Air Force, "Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few."

I do not think I will be taking any credit away from the gallant airmen of England, or from our own superb Air Force, if I say that those same words might well be addressed to the farm people of the United States.

Year by year it becomes more and more evident that the rapidly growing efficiency of American agriculture is the basic foundation upon which rests our economic and military might.

Steel is vital. So are oil, aluminum, coal, rubber, and a multitude of other factors in our economic and defense organization.

But none of them—not even all of them put together—are as basic to our very existence as food and clothing. I am sure we all appreciate this fact as one of the axioms of human existence. I shall not dwell on it further. But there are certain other facts concerning the relation of our agriculture to the economy, to defense, to prosperity, and to our future as a great Nation, which are less apparent. It is some of these facts that I would bring to the attention of the Senate at this time.

Mr. President, we live in an era that has often been called the power age. When men speak of the power age, usually they mean an era in which electricity and mechanical and automotive power have revolutionized the old-time ways of production and of getting work done. When we speak of that kind of power age, we do so proudly.

But today when I speak of the power age, I mean an era in which economic and military power—or force—have unfortunately become dominant in the affairs of men. That is not something to be proud of, but something to fear. We know that in the Far East the forces of communism have some 5,000,000 men under arms. We know that those forces have more than 150 mobilized divisions threatening Europe. We know that those forces have hundreds of submarines, and many hundreds more in the construction and planning stages. We know that those forces have a large and growing air force, and that they are adding to their stockpile of atomic bombs. The existence of this kind of imperialistic power is a grave threat to human freedom everywhere in the world.

How shall we meet it? How shall we assure the survival of freedom in this age of naked military power? How shall we stand against the 800,000,000 persons ruled with an iron hand by the master of the Kremlin?

We, with a population of 156,000,000, are outnumbered more than 5 to 1. Even when we join our manpower to that of free Europe, we are still outnumbered by almost 2 to 1. Our manpower would seem to be dwarfed by the limitless hordes which the enemies of freedom can send into battle.

Were it not for one basic fact, our manpower would be dwarfed by these vast numbers arrayed against us. That one fact is this: Mankind has never found a way to live and work and fight without food. First, man must eat.

It is estimated that in prewar Russia more than half the population was engaged in agriculture. Allowing for some improvement since then, it is probable that it still requires roughly one farm family in Russia to produce food for two families.

In this country today less than 15 percent of our people are on farms—in other words, about one out of seven—and only one person in nine in our civilian labor force is actually engaged in agriculture. Mr. President, that fact is the basis of the industrial, military, and economic strength of this great Nation.

If we, like the Soviet Union or China, had half our people in agriculture—as we did, for example, back in 1880—where would the world look for the industrial power to check the onslaughts of the Communist aggressors? Where would we look for the manpower to build aircraft, ships, tanks, and other weapons, much less to operate them?

The release of manpower from the job of tilling the land is, I think, the first and most basic contribution of American agriculture to the growth of our Nation. Ever-increasing productivity in agriculture has made it possible for eight out of nine persons in our civilian labor force to turn their attention to off-the-farm work. That is one of the basic reasons why we are able to engage in a program which is doubling our output of aluminum, increasing our supply of electric power by 40 percent, and boosting steelmaking capacity by 15 percent. When this program is completed—and it is well along now—we shall be able to produce as much steel as all the rest of the world combined. Already we produce as much total industrial output as the rest of the world put together; and when we add to our industrial output that of the free nations of Europe, the total dwarfs that of the Soviet and its satellites by 3 to 1. All this illustrates why I say that the measure we are now considering is undoubtedly a defense measure.

But there are additional reasons. From American farms and forests come many of the raw materials which are vital to the smooth functioning of our industries, both defense and nondefense. The Members of this body all know that cotton, for example, is used in making gunpowder, photographic film, parachute and plane fabrics, tentage, and clothing. Cotton is only one of a large number of vital raw materials that industry must have.

Altogether, it is estimated that 65 percent of the raw materials which enter into our manufacturing and processing industries are produced on American farms and forest land. Nearly one-third of the total tonnage hauled by class 1 railroads last year consisted of farm commodities.

In view of the vital dependence of our whole economy upon the relatively small segment of our people who are engaged in agriculture, I repeat, Mr. President, that never was so much owed by so many to so few.

American agriculture has met every challenge which the people of this Nation have presented to it. The history of the past 10 years is especially illuminating in this respect. As Senators know, we have had production goals in agriculture every year from 1942 to the present, with the exception of 1950. The manner in which American farmers have met those goals is nothing short of magnificent.

Let me summarize the record. During the heart of World War II—from 1942 through 1945—farmers were asked to maintain production at about 14 percent above the prewar, 1937–41, level. Production actually averaged 17 percent above prewar for the crucial war years from 1942 through 1945.

During the postwar period, 1946 through 1949, at a time when American food and fiber supplies were among the primary aids to world reconstruction, crop goals called for maintaining farm production at 19 percent above prewar. Again the actual production exceeded the goal. It averaged 24 percent above the prewar level.

With the outbreak of the Korean conflict in June of 1950, production goals on important crops were again set up for 1951. They called for more than a 50-percent increase in cotton acreage and for substantial increases in some other crops.

Our agriculture did not quite meet the production goals last year. Production was 28 percent above prewar 1937–41, while the goals called for a 31-percent increase. But I wish to point out that the only reason farmers did not meet the goals was that drought and floods caused them to abandon 26,000,000 acres which they had planted but could not harvest. Even so, Mr. President, I point out that as late as September of last year it appeared that the goals would be exceeded, and it was only the deterioration of both the corn and cotton crops as the season progressed that brought down the actual level of these crops and the total farm output.

We all like to talk about the magnificent production record of American agriculture, but we are not so much inclined to talk about what it has cost farmers to make this record, or about the drain which has been placed on the Nation's soil resources.

Farmers have had to increase their farm output approximately 30 percent above 1937–41, without using much additional acreage. They have had to increase their output with less and less farm labor. Actually farm employment last year was about 14 percent below prewar.

Farmers have had to increase the use of fertilizer, power machinery, and production inputs generally to make the records they have achieved. Last year they used nearly 3 times as much fertilizer as in the prewar period; they used more than twice as much power and machinery.

It costs the farmers money to put all these elements into increased production. The estimated cash expenses associated with farming last year approached $22,500,000,000, which was about 3½ times the prewar, 1937–41, average.

What about the drain on soil resources? Certainly, farmers cannot produce 30 percent more crops and livestock without taking from the land substantially more of the elements—nitrogen, potash, potassium, and various minerals—which go to make up soil fertility.

The plain fact is that farmers are being asked to maintain larger acreages of cotton, corn, and other clean-cultivated, soil-depleting crops in the South, in the Midwest, and in other areas, and much larger acreages of wheat in the Great Plains, than most good farmers, agronomists, or soil conservationists would recommend from the standpoint of good farming or best-adapted soil-conservation rotations. In short, we are deliberately asking farmers to maintain crop acreages or systems of farming which create serious hazards, especially in the case of either drought or excessive rainfall.

We need this production at this time. The goals for the current crop year call for 6 percent more output than last year's near record production.

I am informed that prospects at this time are bright for a new record output in 1952. If the prospects are fulfilled, agricultural production is expected to be sufficient to maintain civilian food consumption per person at least as high as in 1951, and in addition to provide for the requirements of the military and of friendly foreign countries for food and fiber products.

But I point out that the job must be done with fewer farm workers. In the first 4 months of 1952, there were about 200,000 fewer farm workers than in the corresponding period of 1951; and there are almost 2,000,000 fewer workers than in the prewar period. Obviously, farmers will have to intensify their use of other production factors, such as fertilizer, farm machinery, and electric power.

I must point out further, that during the past year the price squeeze has been clearly evident in agriculture. Prices received by farmers are 7 percent below the level of February 1951, but prices paid by farmers, including interest, taxes, and wages, have risen 5 percent in the same period.

Altogether, farm operators this year with increased farm marketings will do well if their realized net income equals the nearly $15,000,000,000 of 1951—and this, it will be recalled, was more than $2,000,000,000 below the income of 1947. And it is expected that the purchasing power of this farm income will be lower than in any year since 1941, with the sole exception of 1950.

The present challenge facing the Nation and its agriculture is great. But we have the responsibility also to consider the requirements of this country in the future. Will we have the food and fiber to feed and clothe a rapidly growing population 25 years from now? Let us think about that a moment.

In 1880 we had something over 50,000,000 people in this country and 188,000,000 acres of cropland. Our population, of course, has tripled since that time. Up to about 1920 we provided the food and fiber for this increasing population largely by bringing in new cropland. Between 1920 and 1930 output for human consumption was increased principally by the release of millions of acres from production of feed for horses and mules. Since 1930 we have also had a large increase in production through improved technology on farms.

In 1950, we had available to produce for human consumption 462,000,000 acres of cropland or its equivalent in grazing land. Looking ahead to 1975, what are our chances for increasing our crop acreage?

It now appears that 45,000,000 acres of additional land may be available from new irrigation, reclamations, and further releases from other uses, to produce food and fiber for domestic human consumption in 1975. Thus, it appears that we may have available in 1975 the equivalent of 507,000,000 acres of cropland for this purpose.

Now, let us look at the other side of the picture. How much cropland will we need to provide for our population in 1975? The Census Bureau estimates that, under moderately favorable conditions, we will have a population of 190,000,000 in 1975—an increase of 25 percent over the 1950 population of 152,000,000.

But here is the significant fact: It will require 530,000,000 acres of cropland equivalent to provide for that population of 190,000,000 at 1935–39 diet levels. That is 68,000,000 acres more than we now have available for that purpose, and it is 23,000,000 more than the 507,000,000 acres we think we may have by 1975.

If we maintain in 1975 the diet levels that we are experiencing now—and I am sure we want to at least hold the current levels—it would require 577,000,000 acres of cropland equivalent. That is 115,000,000 acres more than we now have available, and 70,000,000 acres more than the projected possibility. If we count on improving diet levels among people who do not now have adequate diets, the deficit in productive acreage is even greater.

It is plain that we will not have as large an increase in acreage of cropland as we will have in population by 1975. We must then find alternatives for getting the production we shall need.

We might consider the possibility of increased imports, but in view of our production situation in relation to the situation in other countries, this offers no hope for filling the deficit. We might consider cutting off all of our exports, but this is not a practical or humane solution, and even if we could do so it would release only about 40,000,000 acres which are now being used to produce goods for export.

The fact is that most of the increase in farm output which we must have for our increasing population, will have to come from agricultural improvement, which it seems to me falls into two basic categories:

First. Decreasing waste—cutting losses of all kinds in the utilization of our resources and in the production and marketing of farm products.

Second. Increasing productivity—improving our resources and efficiency to get more output per acre per animal, and per man-hour.

Our agricultural programs are aimed at these objectives. Decreasing waste brings to mind immediately programs such as soil and water conservation, forestry, the school lunch program, insect and disease control, and marketing research and service. These programs also contribute to increased production as do research, rural electrification, and many others.

We are accustomed in these days to dealing with astronomical figures. But I should like to present some cost figures on agricultural and forestry losses, which I think are striking enough to command attention.

The Congress is, of course, concerned about the costs of government and of defense, but it would be a great mistake to think of costs only in terms of appropriations and expenditures. The loss of valuable resources—of timber, of meat, of soil fertility—is just as real a drain on our national wealth as are the appropriations necessary to build military planes and tanks.

Consider such losses as these:

It is conservatively estimated that our total annual loss caused by insects amounts to nearly $4,000,000,000, not including the cost of control measures.

The annual loss from cotton insects alone is $762,000,000, and insects which infest stored grain cost the Nation $600,000,000 a year.

Annual losses from animal diseases and parasites are approximately $875,000,000. Mastitis alone costs us $140,000,000 a year, and brucellosis of cattle another $100,000,000. In addition, poultry diseases cost the Nation about $200,000,000 a year.

In the past 10 years this Nation's timber resources have been used, lost, or wasted to the extent of 15,000,000,000,000 board feet. Only about 38 percent of the timber removed since colonial days has been converted into lumber, poles, and other items of use to mankind. The other 62 percent has been lost through fire, insect, and disease destruction, and through waste in land-clearing and other operations. The loss from insects, fire, and disease during this period of 150 years is estimated at more than $67,000,000,000 on the basis of present prices.

It is impossible to calculate in terms of dollars the loss of soil fertility which this country has suffered. But it is a fact that about 50,000,000 acres of once-productive cropland have been eroded too severely to be used for immediate cultivation. Another 50,000,000 acres of former cropland are in a condition almost as bad. From one-half to all of the original topsoil has been removed from still another 100,000,000 acres. All this erosion has taken place since the country was settled, and most of it in the past 100 to 150 years.

Mr. President, recently we have heard much of the terrible threat to the livestock industry of the United States from foot-and-mouth disease which we have helped to stamp out in Mexico, and which now has appeared in Canada. It is estimated that if the disease should become established in the United States, it could wipe out one-fourth of our production of meat, milk, and other animal products. What this would mean in the way of inflationary pressure on the entire economy—quite apart from the sharp reduction in diet that would inevitably take place—is all too obvious.

Some of us may think that our swine industry is free from the ravages of hog cholera. That is not the case. Discovery of the virus-serum treatment has made it possible for hog producers to live with the disease; but hog cholera still costs farmers from $50,000,000 to $60,000,000 a year in lost productivity.

I cite these figures to show the importance of agricultural research and the vital need that in this period we do nothing to impair its effectiveness. We need more research, not less. We must not be penny wise and pound foolish.

The Congress in 1938 expanded research facilities for agriculture, and authorized the establishment of the four great regional research laboratories in New Orleans, San Francisco, Peoria, and Philadelphia. In 1946, the Congress again expanded research facilities by passage of the Research and Marketing Act. I am proud of my participation in securing enactment of these two important pieces of legislation. Under them, many valuable projects have already been carried out, and appropriations for research are being returned many times over in the form of increased productivity, better and more efficient distribution, and the elimination of waste and losses.

Under the provisions of the Research and Marketing Act, various research advisory committees have been set up, including in their personnel many of the outstanding agricultural and industrial leaders of the country. These committees have an active part in guiding research and in choosing the particular projects to be studied.

Much of the current research in the Department is being directed toward meeting the defense needs of the Armed Forces. There has been special emphasis on such projects as flameproofing for cotton fabrics, which is obviously of major importance as protection against napalm bombs, white phosphorus in bombs, and shells and other flame-producing agents. Studies have also been made to improve dehydrated foods, and to develop commercial production of dextran, a blood plasma substitute.

Mr. President, I should like to cite the details of one or two of these projects.

I mentioned dextran. About a year and a half ago the Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry was urged by the National Research Council and medical units of the Military Establishment to assist them in solving a most acute emergency problem—that of developing a satisfactory substance that could be used in place of blood plasma for combating shock in military and civilian casualties.

With its own funds, the Bureau immediately organized a large team of experienced chemists, fermentologists, and engineers, and began work on the dextrans, which are starchlike substances made by fermentation of sugar, and which had previously been shown to have promise as plasma replacements.

For some months now a bacterium discovered by one of the regional agricultural research laboratories, as well as a fermentation process which it developed, have been used by several commercial companies in pilot-plant production. One of these companies is producing dextran on a semicommercial basis, and is now constructing a full-scale plant.

The first phase of the problem has been solved, but improvements are still needed in the product and in methods of production.

The Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry is spending $375,000 on this research in 1952, and proposes to spend a like amount in 1953. I would point out to the Members of the Senate that this research is a matter of life or death to military personnel and to civilians. It is a great forward step in saving lives.

Yet the $750,000 which the Bureau is spending in these 2 years is only about one-fifth the cost of a B–36 bomber.

Another successful research project is the conforming bandage that has been developed by the agricultural research laboratory at New Orleans. This is a cotton bandage that stretches and adapts itself to movements of the joints, and is especially valuable in treating cases of severe burn. I am informed that it is far superior to the rubberized or elastic bandages previously employed, both from the standpoint of performance and cost.

Recently, the Armed Services Medical Procurement Agency placed an order for 10,000,000 cotton conforming bandages, and several commercial companies are producing them. These bandages cost the Department of Defense about 20 cents each. The rubberized or elastic bandage which they replaced cost 70 cents. The saving to the Department of Defense on this first order of 10,000,000 bandages is about $5,000,000, or roughly two-thirds of the annual appropriation of the entire Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry.

Mr. President, these are examples of the way agricultural research serves the whole Nation. But what is true of research is true also of the other major agricultural programs and services.

These programs are vital to enable agriculture to produce the abundance the Nation requires, now and in the future.

I have mentioned the drain on the Nation's soil resources during recent years. In the Corn Belt States, soils have been cropped heavily to corn and to soybeans during and since the war. In the war years, there was a 50-percent increase in the number of acres on which intertilled crops were repeated for two or more years in succession. Without sufficient intervening crops of legumes and grass, the soil organic matter declines, soil tilth and permeability are impaired, and erosion increases.

In the Great Plains, increased cultivation has caused declines in organic matter and nitrogen. In much of this area, a satisfactory legume crop to grow in rotation has not been found. The problem is one of minimizing losses and protecting against erosion.

In the Southern States, the trend of soil productivity since 1941 has been upward in some areas, due to the increase in close-growing crops and pasture, less

cotton grown on erodible land, and more adequate fertilization and management of the corn crop. But I have already called your attention to the fact that farmers were asked last year, and are asked again this year, to maintain a greatly increased cotton acreage. This raises serious conservation problems over wide areas.

On the whole, farmers are doing a far better job of conservation than they did a decade ago—and immeasurably better than two decades ago. But the salient fact is that they must carry out more conservation practices. Greatly increased quantities of commercial fertilizer and lime must be used if farm production is to be sustained. We must get more of these materials and improved methods of farming into more widespread use in order to stop, and to reverse, the declining trend in soil productivity.

This is not a problem for farmers alone. The American people have asked farmers to increase production, and I can think of no worse calamity that could befall us than a major crop failure or a serious downtrend in farm output. But if the American people are going to ask farmers for this contribution, all of the American people must also be willing to assist the farmers in doing the job.

The agricultural conservation program—as its name implies—is a program working for the conservation of the Nation's agricultural resources. Its objectives are: First, to restore and improve soil fertility; second, to reduce erosion caused by wind and water; and third, to conserve water on the land.

It is a program that deals with the individual farmer and his farm, with the conservation problems on each farm, and with practices that must be carried out to maintain permanently the productive resources on each farm.

As Members of the Senate know, I have worked hard in behalf of this program because it is a program that is working hard in behalf of the American people. It is an essential part of any farm policy designed to safeguard the general welfare. As I have pointed out, the ability of American agriculture to produce adequate supplies of food, feed, and fiber has contributed immensely to the strength of this Nation. Conservation practices must be carried out in volume and to the extent necessary to insure against diminishing fertility and dwindling productivity.

The agricultural conservation program was first established in 1936, and has been continued since that time as one of our most effective farm programs.

In 1950, the number of farmers cooperating under the program totaled 2,816,224. The participating farms included about 64 percent of the Nation's cropland.

Since 1936 the program has resulted in the construction of more than 200,000 dams for erosion control and more than 800,000 storage dams for livestock water. It has helped with the drainage of more than 26,000,000 acres, and the leveling of more than 4,500,000 acres. It has encouraged the seeding of nearly 52,000,000 acres of pasture, and the planting of more than 900,000 acres of trees.

It has helped make possible the application of more than 256,000,000 tons of lime and 24,000,000 tons of superphosphate to the Nation's farm lands. It has encouraged the growing of more than 248,000,000 acres of green manure or cover crops. It has helped with the terracing of more than 18,000,000 acres, and has helped to bring contour farming to more than 132,000,000 acres.

The program embraces the principle of cooperation with the farmers in carrying out needed conservation practices. The average rate of assistance for all practices approximates 50 percent of the cost, exclusive of labor. The farmer bears the balance of the cost, and, in addition, furnishes the labor required to carry out the practices.

The figures I have cited indicate the progress farmers have made in applying conservation practices through this program. Yet the estimated annual need for such practices is far greater than the actual performance. We need to apply about four times as much lime and about five times as much superphosphate as we are now doing. We need about four times as much stripcropping, about five times as much green manure and cover crops, and about 30 times as much contour farming as we are now getting.

Yet again and again we meet the criticism that farmers do not need this program, because they would apply all the practices necessary without it.

I do not understand how that can be so, especially when I know that farmers, even with the encouragement of an organized and Nation-wide conservation effort, are not now applying anywhere near all the practices that are needed.

It is not true that conservation is solely the farmers responsibility, and that they should pay all of its cost.

All of us—farmers and city people alike—live from the land. All of us gain or lose according to whether our basic natural resources are strong or weak.

We can neglect land resources; but the results will inevitably be smaller yields per acre, higher costs of farm production, and higher prices to consumers.

Let us suppose that through such neglect the price housewives pay for milk is increased 1 cent a quart. That would cost consumers $287,000,000 a year, at present rates of consumption—more than the cost of the agricultural conservation program.

Or let us suppose that through neglect of land resources, prices of meat, dairy, and poultry products go up 1 cent a pound. That would cost consumers more than a billion dollars.

Mr. President, again I would repeat that it would be sheer folly to adopt a policy of "penny wise, pound foolish" as regards this great conservation program.

The same applies, in equal measure, with respect to the technical assistance provided by the Soil Conservation Service. This agency aids in bringing about physical adjustments in land use that will conserve soil and water resources, and thereby will establish a permanent and balanced agriculture and will reduce the hazards of floods and sedimentation.

In general, the Soil Conservation Service provides technical and other assistance to conservation districts in developing conservation farm plans and applying planned practices to farm and ranch lands.

The Service was created in 1933, and it is estimated that by the middle of this year there will be included in soil-conservation districts more than 80 percent of the farm land of the entire Nation. It is expected that the number of districts organized will total about 2,415 by July 1 of this year.

More than a million complete farm-conservation plans have been prepared by farmers in districts with the aid of SCS technicians. These plans provide for conservation treatment and use of 275,000,000 acres. More than 140,000,000 acres have already received this combined conservation treatment.

Although immense progress has already been made, it is estimated that perhaps three-fourths of the total conservation job remains to be done. In view of the drain on our soil resources, and the challenge that faces American agriculture in the next quarter century, a reduction in the funds provided in this bill for the conservation program would be false economy, indeed. Not only must we maintain strength in the land; we must rebuild it.

I wish to direct attention to another vital and dramatic conservation agency in the Department. I am sure, Mr. President, everyone today is aware of the splendid work the Forest Service has done in promoting the conservation and wise use of the country's forest and related watershed lands, comprising one-third of the total land area of the United States.

The Forest Service carries on three main lines of work: first, management, protection, and development of the national forests; second, cooperation with the States and with private forest landowners in fire protection and forest management; and third, forest and range research.

The national forests provide about 9 percent of annual United States lumber production; they provide range for some 9,000,000 head of domestic livestock; they protect the water supplies for most western cities, and many in the East, and the irrigation water used on 20,000,000 acres of farm land; and they provide flood protection for cities, communities, and many thousands of acres of rich valley lands.

The national forests will produce an estimated $65,000,000 from timber harvested this fiscal year. The estimated receipts for fiscal 1953 are $70,000,000—more than 10 times the average per year for the first 46 years of the existence of the Forest Service. Approximately 65 percent of this income is deposited in the Federal Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. An estimated 4,600,000,000 board feet will be cut from the national forests this fiscal year, and the cut for the fiscal year 1953 is estimated at 5,000,000,000 board feet.

I have mentioned the astronomical figure of $67,000,000,000 as the loss of timber resources caused by fire, insects, and disease in the past century and a half. We depend primarily on the Forest Service to hold such loss to a minimum now and in the future.

The major development activities of the Forest Service consist of reforestation of denuded and lightly stocked forest lands, revegetation of denuded range lands, and the construction of improvements, principally access roads.

The service cooperates with the States and with private forest land owners to get better fire protection on the 427,000,000 acres of State and privately owned forest lands, to obtain better returns from 345,000,000 acres of commercial forest lands in private ownership, to aid in the distribution of planting stock, and to encourage proper management of State, county, and community forests.

Mr. President, the national mobilization has placed immense pressure on our forests and timber resources. We must meet present needs, but we must also plan for the future long-term benefit of the whole Nation. Timber growing is a long-time enterprise.

We have enough forest land to grow timber for the long-time needs of the United States. But once again, to make sure that we shall have enough timber, we must follow a policy of curtailing waste and building up productivity.

We must therefore intensify our efforts against forest enemies—against fire, insects, disease, and wasteful cutting. We must work unceasingly for good forest management and for reforestation.

We find the same two basic objectives—curtailing waste and increasing efficiency—in the school lunch program. I have always felt an especial interest in this program. In years past, in handling this appropriation bill when efforts were made to eliminate it, I have fought on this floor to see that it was continued.

This program finds constructive use for surplus agricultural foods by making them available for use in well-balanced lunches for school children. Thus, it prevents waste, by broadening the market for agricultural food commodities. It promotes the total efficiency of the Nation by improving the health and well-being of millions of school children.

During this school year over 9,000,000 children—about 30 percent of all children attending school—participated in school lunch programs receiving Federal assistance. Of the billion and one-half meals eaten in school by these children, over 70 percent represented meals designed to provide one-third of the child's daily requirements.

Assistance to school lunch programs began in the mid-1930's. It is now authorized on a permanent basis under the National School Lunch Act of 1946. This assistance has helped to establish high standards for school food services, and has aided thousands of communities to provide for the children the kind of lunches needed to safeguard health and improve food habits.

This year participating schools spent $250,000,000 with local suppliers for foods needed in the program. The Federal Government in cash and donated commodities provided less than 23 cents of each school lunch dollar expended. This, Mr. President, demonstrates the great interest throughout the land, which has resulted in the development of this program from a modest beginning to one which is now largely financed by the States and local communities.

Now, let us turn to a program which has been of great benefit in helping small farmers to help themselves. The Senate has always been keenly aware of the need of small farmers for supervised credit.

In 1946 the Farmers Home Administration Act was passed and a new agency established to take the place of the Farm Security Administration which had administered the rural rehabilitation and farm-tenant loan programs. As a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry at that time, I handled this legislation on the floor of the Senate. The Farm Security Administration makes loans only to farmers who cannot secure additional credit at reasonable rates elsewhere.

The Farmers Home Administration is now authorized to—

First. Make direct farm ownership—farm tenant—loans for the purchase, enlargement, or development of family-size farms.

Second. Insure 40-year farm-ownership loans made by private lenders.

Third. Make production and subsistence loans to farmers and stockmen.

Fourth. Make loans for the construction, repair, or improvement of water facilities in the arid and semiarid areas.

Fifth. Make loans and grants to farm owners for the construction, improvement, alteration, repair, or replacement of dwellings and other farm buildings.

Sixth. Make emergency loans to farmers and stockmen in areas where a production disaster has caused a need for agricultural credit.

Supervisory assistance in planning and carrying out sound farm and home operations is provided all borrowers on the basis of their individual problems and needs. No loans are made to anyone who can secure adequate credit from other sources at reasonable rates.

The Farmers Home Administration has a noteworthy record of repayments on the various loan programs which it administers. It is really remarkable when we consider that these loans are made only to those who are certified by all of the lending agencies in the community in which they live as being unable to secure credit elsewhere. Collections on production and subsistence loans made from appropriated funds since November 1, 1946, equaled 92.1 percent of the amount which had matured as of December 31, 1951. Collections on water-facilities loans equal 99.1 percent of the amount matured as of December 31, 1951. From the inception of the farm-ownership program in 1938, borrowers have repaid 127 percent of the amount due. They have in most instances anticipated payments. Of the 10,300 farm-ownership borrowers with payments due, 97 percent paid the amounts due on December 31, 1951.

Of the disaster loans that had been made as of the end of last year, 86 percent of the principal matured on these loans has been collected. Bear in mind, Mr. President, that those loans are only made to those who have been the victims of floods and of other great catastrophes of nature.

As the Senate is well aware, one of the greatest untapped reservoirs of underemployment at the present time is represented by the approximately 2,000,000 farm families having insufficient resources to permit full employment of the available family labor.

Through the Farmers Home Administration programs, farm families in this economic group are provided the opportunity to enlarge or develop their farms with resources that will make it possible to employ much of this labor reservoir.

This Nation can no more afford waste of manpower in this crucial period than it can afford waste of land, timber, or money.

The records of families who have completed payments on past loans show that supervised credit of this kind helped them achieve production increases of 40 to 60 percent per acre—considerably larger increases than the average for agriculture as a whole during the same period.

Mr. President, we are all in substantial agreement that the family-owned and family-operated farm is one of the great bulwarks of our democracy. I should like to point out to the Senate that in the past 20 years—and partly as the result of just such programs as these Farmers Home Administration programs—the proportion of farms operated by their owners in this country has climbed from less than 58 percent to 75 percent.

Through this and kindred programs we have reversed the trend which was so evident 20 years ago to eliminate the small family-sized farm and to depend upon the corporate farm, so that we now have a higher percentage of family-owned and family-operated farms than we had 20 years ago.

I do not believe I could say anything about these programs that would reflect more credit upon them than the statement which I have just made.

The Senate is so well aware of the need that is served by the Farm Credit Administration, which has the responsibility of supervising and coordinating the Farm Credit System, that I am sure I do not have to go into its operations in detail.

A well coordinated system offering all types of agricultural credit must be maintained if the benefits of the Farm Credit legislation are to be fully realized. The Farm Credit Administration has adapted its programs to the mobilization effort, and these programs are making a substantial contribution to the increased production of agricultural commodities.

Let me turn now to a program which helps farmers protect their investment against total loss.

As you know, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation was created in 1938 to furnish much-needed protection against crop loss from unavoidable causes. All-risk crop insurance provides investment protection to farmers who lose their crop for reasons beyond their control, and who might, as a result of such losses, be forced out of farm production. When a loss from flood, drought, hail, windstorm, disease, or insects does occur, the insured farmer recovers his investment

in the crop and thus is enabled to continue his efforts to produce the Nation's food and fiber.

The floods that did such extensive damage in the Midwest last summer and this spring, drought in several of the major winter wheat areas a year ago, and freeze damage last fall in many corn counties, emphasize the need for crop investment protection and its value in maintaining the farmer's contribution to production capacity when crop disasters strike. But even in the best production years many farmers in every State lose their crop investments due to weather, disease, and insect risks beyond their control.

Adequate electric power is as important to efficient farming today as it is to industry. Here, again, in REA we have a program that is geared to eliminate waste and increase productivity.

Many Senators know as well as I the manner in which electric power has revolutionized the American farm. There are at least four major contributions in agriculture which we can credit to electrification:

It has saved immense quantities of time and labor.

It has lowered unit costs of production for many commodities.

It has eliminated waste and improved the quality of products.

It has made available on the farm modern conveniences which have long been commonplace in city homes.

When I consider that less than 20 years ago practically 9 out of 10 farm homes were using kerosene lamps, coal and wood stoves, were without refrigeration, and had no running water, and when I compare the changes that have been brought about through the extension of electric power to rural areas, I cannot help feeling proud that I have played a considerable part in transforming so many farm houses into farm homes.

Mr. President, I well remember that some 15 years ago, when the committee recommended an increase of $5,000,000 above the budget in the funds to be loaned to the REA cooperatives in order that electric current could be furnished to farms, it provoked a tremendous fight on the floor of the Senate. I think the total amount involved was approximately $32,000,000. Today, as the result of experience, almost 10 times that amount is loaned each year.

When the Rural Electrification Act was passed in 1936, only 11 percent of the Nation's farms had central-station electricity.

Through the REA, cooperative associations formed solely for the purpose of making electricity available in rural areas were able to send power lines fanning out through the entire country. Electric service has now been extended to more than three and one-half million farms and other rural consumers. Eighty-five percent of all farms in the United States are now receiving central-station electric service.

The sound nature of the loans made by the REA is indicated by the fact that payments are running in advance of the amounts due. Payments at the end of 1951 totaled $326,000,000, or more than $41,000,000 more than the total amount due.

Once again I must point out, however, that the job is not finished. As we seek to extend power into fringe areas and isolated communities, we are discovering that difficulties increase. Yet power is too important to agriculture—too important to the Nation—to desist or to curtail the national effort to make power available to those who want it and need it everywhere in the United States.

Similar loans for the expansion of telephone facilities in rural areas were authorized in 1949.

The REA has approved telephone loans totaling $67,000,000, which will provide almost 115,000 prospective new rural subscribers with modern telephone service, and about 95,000 others with modern telephones to replace antiquated and unsatisfactory ones.

The inadequacy of rural telephone service was a distinct handicap to the efficient functioning of agriculture's production and marketing activities during World War II. Less than half of the farms of this country now have any kind of telephone service, and only about half of the farms with telephones have anything like adequate service.

Mr. President, we must always bear in mind that the agriculture of this Nation forms the base upon which has been built, and upon which rests today, the economic and military strength of the United States. It is as true today as it was when the words were said more than a century ago, that "when tillage begins, other arts follow. The farmers, therefore, are the founders of human civilization."

In no nation of the world has this truth been better illustrated than in our own. Our farm population has been decreasing. We have 6,000,000 fewer persons on farms now than we had in 1940, while the national population is 25,000,000 larger than in 1940. Yet fewer people on farms are producing enough so that 25,000,000 more people in the whole population are eating far better on the average than in 1940. Moreover, our Armed Forces are well fed, and we are able to ship much more agricultural tonnage to friendly nations abroad than we did in 1940.

This is a truly great achievement. It is a monument to the skill, the efforts, and the sacrifices of American farmers.

But it is also a monument to the wisdom of the Congress in providing sound and adequate farm programs to aid farmers in cutting down waste and increasing productivity per acre, per animal, per machine, and per man-hour.

No Senator has more respect for the achievements of industry than I. Industry was magnificent in its production achievements during the past decade. But I would point out to the Senate that in the period from 1941 to 1950, gross production per man-hour in industry increased 11 percent, while the comparable figure for agriculture was 35 percent.

The Senate will be making no mistake in continuing to provide agriculture with the program aids farmers need to continue such an amazing increase in productivity.

For the past 2 years I have pointed out that the Department of Agriculture is unique in that its budget and the number of its employees are both smaller today than they were in 1940. I will not repeat the figures, but will simply recall that fact to the mind of the Senate.

I would remind the Senate that since that period the Department of Agriculture appropriations have decreased approximately 32 percent. During the same period the annual budget requirements for the other departments of the Federal establishment, excluding the Defense Department, has increased from approximately $1,200,000,000 to $5,400,000,000, an increase of more than 360 percent, while the expenditures for the Department of Agriculture have decreased approximately 32 percent.

In making this comparison, Mr. President, I am, of course, not passing judgment on the necessity of appropriations for other departments. I have pointed out that the Department of Agriculture alone has shown a decrease in appropriations. In 1940 the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture carried 13.7 percent of the entire Federal budget, exclusive of military expenditures. In the bill now before the Senate there is contained less than 3 percent of the total Federal budget, exclusive of arms expenditures.

We should also bear in mind, Mr. President, that since 1940 a number of new activities have been added to the agricultural program, such as the Research and Marketing Act, the farm housing program, and the rural-telephone program. Moreover, in that period we have increased the salaries of Federal employees in excess of 70 percent, and other costs have doubled.

I would point out further that 20 percent of the total funds recommended for the Department of Agriculture consist of authorizations for loans to be made available by REA and FHA, on an interest-bearing basis, to farmers who have amply demonstrated that they are sound credit risks.

Mr. President, I submit that the agricultural appropriation bill is a sound investment in the prosperity, security, and happiness of the whole Nation.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be read for amendment and that the committee amendments be first considered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Georgia for his splendid presentation of this bill. He has been one of the leaders in keeping the school-lunch program going. It would have been greatly curtailed, if not abolished, had it not been for the efforts of the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

With regard to the soil conservation program, had the Senator from Georgia not made a fight on the floor a few years ago, in my opinion that program would have been abolished.

I congratulate the Senator for his foresight in recognizing the importance of these programs, not only for the farmers of the country, but for the defense of the country. Many do not recognize

the connection between the production of farm products and the defense of the Nation.

The Senator mentioned the small farmer. I wish to say that the small farmer has had no better friend than the distinguished Senator from Georgia. We can see the result of his work when we travel through areas which once had been seriously damaged by soil erosion but where the farms are now being built up. We see better homes which are furnished with electricity. That is important, not only for the economy of the Nation, but for its contribution to the defense of the Nation. We must have a happy population. We need to demonstrate to people all over the world that democracy works and that the results of democracy are manifested, among other things, by better homes, including rural homes, and better conditions everywhere.

Again I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Georgia for the splendid work he has done in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I cannot once emphasize the fact that his good work has contributed to the welfare of the mass of the people. The work of the Senator from Georgia as chairman of the Armed Services Committee has been equally as outstanding. I know of no one who has a better understanding of the defense of our country than the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest and approval to the remarks by the majority leader [Mr. MCFARLAND]. I wish to associate myself with everything he said about the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. There is no man in the Senate—I think I should say no man in government today—who has the confidence and respect of the American people to a greater extent than does the junior Senator from Georgia. He has made a contribution to the farmers of this Nation in the fields of soil conservation and rural electrification, and to the school children of the Nation in connection with the school lunch program. He has endeared himself to the agricultural population, as well as to all the other citizens of America.

I wish to commend him for the bill he has brought before the Senate. I believe it is a good bill, as are all the bills handled by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I, too, wish to commend the Senator from Georgia for the very fine statement he has made on the agricultural appropriation bill. The Senator from Georgia is always very conscientious in everything he undertakes to do, and I have listened with much interest to what he has had to say about the bill.

I heard the Senator's reference to research activities which were considered by the committee, and his views on research matters. I should like to ask the Senator if there is in the measure a provision for additional research affecting animal husbandry and into the diseases of animals which farmers have been encountering. What I have in mind is the extension or enlargement of laboratory research. As we all know, farmers are confronted with new outbreaks of disease, such as the foot-and-mouth disease, and others. Does the bill provide for the development of methods to meet such epidemics, or in the wisdom of the committee was there an approach to this problem?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Kansas is correct in his statement of the great threat posed by the presence of hoof-and-mouth disease in this hemisphere. I referred to that briefly in my remarks.

We know that our sister Republic of Mexico has suffered tremendous losses among its own cattle from an outbreak of hoof-and-mouth disease; and in our own enlightened self-interest, as well as to assist our neighbor, we have sent large numbers of scientists to Mexico, and expended large sums of money there, in an effort to combat and eliminate hoof-and-mouth disease.

Two years ago we authorized the establishment of the great laboratory to which the Senator from Kansas has referred. Very frankly, we had great difficulty in finding any community that would welcome the laboratory. We even considered placing it on an island off the coast, but the adjacent mainland area cattle growers were opposed to its location there. They all wanted the laboratory established, but they wanted someone else to have it at his front door.

Funds for the laboratory are included in the urgent deficiency bill, which the House is about to send to the Senate. The House Committee on Agricultural Appropriations did not include the funds in the pending bill, but I understand that since the bill passed the House an agreement has been reached as to money for the laboratory. The funds are included in the urgent deficiency bill, which will be before the Senate in a few days. In my judgment, the laboratory will be under construction within the next few months.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I certainly appreciate having the information. I wish to say further, if the Senator will permit me, that while I have generally gone along with reductions in appropriations for the various departments, and I may go along with some reductions in this bill, if it can be shown that activities can be sacrificed to the extent proposed in the bill, yet I think we would be guilty of a disservice if we overlooked research work being carried on by the use of funds included in the bill, and if we failed to appropriate sufficient funds to keep enlarging that program.

From a study I have given to the subject I know that not only in my own State and my own area, but elsewhere, this is a most important part of the program. I commend the Senator from Georgia for his views and activities in that regard.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. WELKER. I, too, pay my respects to the distinguished Senator from Georgia. I refer to page 4 of the report and ask him to explain to me why the Forest Service requires nearly half a million dollar increase to strengthen national forest protection and management organization, including $200,000 for the strengthening of fire-control organization and $248,000 for rebuilding inventory of timber areas prepared for sale.

I may say to the distinguished Senator, before he replies, that it is my observation that at this crucial time in America, when we should conserve the taxpayers' funds, the Forest Service need not do any more strengthening of their fire-control organization; indeed, I might inquire, what have they been doing for the past 25 years?

I should also like to make another observation, so the Senator may reply. Why do we need more inventory of timber on the national forests? I come from a State that abounds in great forests. Certainly the Forest Service ought to know with reasonable foresight the inventory as of this time. I invite my distinguished friend's observations.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as to the first item, the Forest Service made a case before the committee, which pointed out that in 1951, which was one of the five worst seasons for fire losses in the history of the Forest Service, more than 4,000 acres were burned over, and more than a billion board feet of timber was lost.

Emergency fire-fighting obligations were in excess of $9,000,000. The reason for the great losses was that the number of smoke chasers and firemen was not large enough to reach all fires within a reasonable length of time. It was insisted that the fire-fighting organization really was not as strong as it was in 1950, because the increased compensation which had been voted by Congress for those Federal employees had actually resulted in a reduction in the number. We had not increased the appropriation to pay the people as rapidly as we had increased the rate of pay that accrued to the individuals. That is a matter that addresses itself to the sincere judgment of every Member of the Senate, as to whether the increase of $200,000 for strengthening the fire-fighting organization of the Forest Service is justified.

As to the item of $248,000, that was included in the bill upon the insistence of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. I wish he were here to explain it, because he made a very persuasive argument in the Appropriations Committee. His argument was that there is a great deal of timber that is down now in the forests, having been felled by storms or by insects, and that it is necessary to conserve the timber and sell it before it further deteriorates. I repeat that I wish the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon were here to justify the item, because it was added to the bill on his motion, but it was represented to the committee that the Forest Service would be able to reduce losses from deterioration of this timber that is down if there were an adequate force to cruise the timber now and to supervise its sale and marketing to those who purchase timber in the national forests.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WELKER. I hope I do not appear facetious when I make the remark, based

upon my observations, that the Forest Service is going to conserve that timber until they wear it out. As I have said, I live among those people, and I think this expenditure could be curtailed. If I am correct, we have raised, or expect to raise, the amount nearly a million dollars more than the House has allowed.

I may say to the Senator from Georgia that I notice, by reference to the top of page 4 of the report, that it is proposed to cut down very largely the amount appropriated for the control of white pine blister rust.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is in error. The Senate has increased that item and we were probably wrong there. We found some little weakness in the item for the forests, and are trying to protect them. We increased the item for white pine blister rust.

Mr. WELKER. We have increased it; but the Forest Service asked for much more than the House allowed, and more than the Senate committee allowed.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true. They asked much more for other items, too.

Mr. WELKER. I am mindful of that. However, unless the white pine blister rust is controlled the largest remaining stand of white pine in the world will be destroyed. I have some personal knowledge of what has been done with respect to the white pine blister rust. Members of my staff have led the fight in Washington and Idaho. My executive secretary is an authority in this field. He worked for the Forest Service for more than 20 years. I say that we are being foolish when we add to the administrative personnel and give the Department and its bureaus more money to expand their organizations, and more money for fire control, while we neglect other items. Certainly the fire-control organization should have been perfected by now. Yet, at the same time we are denying appropriations which I think are urgently needed. We should provide adequate funds to prevent pests from ruining our forests. No one can deny that the white pine blister rust campaign which has been in progress for years has amounted to little more than a sprinkling in an endeavor to kill the infestation. I am sincere in that statement. Unless we are going all out to eradicate the white pine blister rust, we are merely throwing our money away.

Mr. RUSSELL. That may well be. I have some little familiarity with the white pine blister rust campaign. I have supported appropriations for it for a great many years. The pending bill contains $3,650,000 for that purpose. That is not an inconsiderable sum of money. I do not know what the Senator would advocate for that purpose, but that is a very substantial sum of money.

Mr. WELKER. It is $350,000 under the estimate made by the Budget Bureau.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand; but the total amount provided by the bill is $3,650,000 to combat the white pine blister rust disease. That will enable us to initiate protection on some 650,000 acres in northern Idaho, where the disease is now spreading rapidly. I do not think that is an inconsiderable sum of money. We have spent tens of millions of dollars fighting the white pine blister rust. I recall that even back in the days of WPA we allocated large sums, running into many millions of dollars, to fight the white pine blister rust disease. I have stood on this floor in and out of season in an effort to save the natural resources of the Nation, wherever they are located. Last year, I believe, I devoted great efforts toward obtaining an appropriation to fight Engleman's spruce bark beetle in Colorado. I have earnestly sought to see that a campaign was waged against the white pine blister rust in Idaho and in other States in that area. The same is true with respect to other diseases which affect our forest plants.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator one further question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I repeat, $3,650,000 is not an inconsiderable sum of money.

Mr. WELKER. Is it not a fact that for years we have been appropriating approximately that sum for the eradication of the white pine blister rust?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the fund has varied somewhat from year to year. It may average approximately that amount.

Mr. WELKER. I invite my friend's attention to the fact that last year we appropriated $3,300,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. This sum represents as an increase over what was appropriated last year.

Mr. WELKER. In 1951 we appropriated $3,375,610.

Mr. RUSSELL. So there has been an increase in that appropriation from year to year.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. For 30 years or so, or since the white pine blister rust first appeared in the forests of this country, I have lived with the white pine blister rust. When it first appeared, it was thought that it might be extremely destructive to our forests, and that it might wipe them out. We have recently experienced the chestnut blight, which destroyed all the chestnut trees in the eastern area of the United States. I think the apprehension was well grounded. There have been times since then when the Government has undertaken to eradicate the host plants of the white pine blister rust namely, the red currant and the gooseberry.

In the early days the European black currant was the chief offender, producing spores so virile that they would travel 500 miles to reach white pine trees. The spores of the disease which developed on the red currant and the gooseberry were not nearly so virile. I do not know whether anyone ever found out how far they would travel, but they would not travel any great distance.

Back in the WPA days crews were put to work eradicating currants and gooseberries. They successfully eradicated all currants and gooseberries from the gardens. They have been temporarily eradicated in certain areas of the forest. The host plants of the white pine blister rust disease have not been completely eradicated. I venture to say that $100,000,000 would not control the white pine blister rust in this country. But educational work can continue. In areas where there are serious infestations a great deal of control work can be done, but we are not going to eradicate the disease by the expenditure of any amount which the Congress would appropriate. It would require a tremendous sum.

What I was about to say is that the danger did not turn out to be so serious as was feared. The white pine has continued to grow and thrive. I do not know that I have ever seen a white pine tree in my community completely destroyed by the white pine blister rust. We have much more trouble with the bark beetle in our evergreens than we have with the white pine blister rust. It is not a desirable thing to have around, but we have not eradicated it after 30 years, and I do not know how much money would be required to eradicate it. We are not going to eradicate it. We are living with it, and yet are producing quantities of white pine timber.

I am not saying this is an effort to reduce the appropriation or to prevent an increase, because there may be areas in the western white pine forests which are more susceptible than the eastern white pine. I do not know about that. I am simply saying this to allay fears that the white pine in this country might be wiped out. It has not been wiped out. After 30 years I think there is less apprehension than there was during the first 10 years of the existence of the disease in this country.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon. If the Senator will indulge me for one moment, I will yield the floor.

Mr. CORDON. I merely wish to discuss for a moment the white pine blister rust as it affects the pine timber in the West. There are areas in the northern portion of the State of Idaho and in the eastern portion of the State of Oregon, to my personal knowledge—and unquestionably there are other like areas—where one can see mountainsides covered by dead timber, as a result of the white pine blister rust.

The funds are used in places where the disease has progressed to such an extent in a small area that it is not only dangerous to the particular timber in which it is located, but endangers a vast area around it. Crews go in and control the disease in the particular area, and that holds it down.

The Senator from Vermont is correct when he says that we shall never get rid of it all, just as we may never get rid of the common cold or other disabilities. They will probably always be with us, but white pine blister rust can be controlled in those places where it becomes serious to the extent that it spreads and endangers surrounding areas.

Mr. AIKEN. In the worst areas educational campaigns can be of assistance, because there are always more people who are not familiar with it than there are those who know something about it. But it cannot be eradicated. The spruce bark beetle probably is doing several times as much damage as the white pine blister rust.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am glad to have the Senator from Vermont confirm my statement that the WPA carried on a tremendous campaign in eliminating the hosts. Of course, the winds will blow and the birds will fly, and they will bring it back again. It is one of those problems that must depend on education if we are to be successful. I think, however, that the incidence of the disease is less in the East than in the West.

Mr. AIKEN. Perhaps in the East it was killed when it first appeared. I do not know whether the disease is any weaker, but I do know that our forests from Maine to Georgia are full of wild currants and gooseberries, and that it would be virtually impossible to eradicate them all. If we did, the birds would find more hosts, and it would be a continuing job to get them out.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, has unanimous consent been given to reading the bill for amendments, and that the committee amendments be first considered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the practice it is not necessary to make such a request. That is the established practice of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I proceed to the discussion of another subject matter, I wish to say a few words with regard to the statement made to the Senate this morning by the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I commend him for the leadership he has displayed again for another year as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture. Since I have been in the Senate, I have stood with the junior Senator from Georgia shoulder to shoulder on most of the recommendations that have come from his subcommittee in respect to agricultural policy.

Although I reserve judgment now as to any individual amendment, I wish to say that the very fine report that he has brought to the Senate I find again very persuasive and shall be inclined, I am sure, to support him again on most individual items.

I wish to make two comments about the report.

First, I desire to compliment and congratulate the junior Senator from Georgia and his committee for bringing again to the Senate a bill which recognizes the fact that, even in the field of agriculture, savings which can be made in the interest of true economy and in avoiding false economy should be made.

Any committee that brings forth a report on appropriation problems which shows, as this committee report shows, that the committee has cut below the administration's budget recommendations on a great many items, should commend itself to the Senate. Agriculture too must be expected to make what savings can be made in the interest of true economy if we are to protect the economy of the Nation.

The second comment I wish to make deals with a great asset the American people possess, but one which I think too frequently the people by and large do not appreciate. In my judgment, Mr. President, we cannot consider the report of any committee on agricultural problems unless we keep in mind the importance of that asset. That asset is the food surplus potential of the United States. I am sure that most persons do not fully appreciate the value of that asset to them as free men and women. If the time ever comes when we do not have that potential of surplus food in our country, then we shall see the beginning of a declining American civilization.

It is so easy for people, when they consider matters of public policy, to overlook the relationship of the land and its products to the civilization of the people of the entire Nation. So I say that if we do not protect the surplus food potential of the United States, we shall strike a serious blow at the values and standards of our civilization itself. I think that point needs to be kept in mind as our population as a whole considers the fiscal problems which are connected with the maintenance of a surplus food potential in the United States.

The assumption on the part of many persons seems to be that any appropriation related to the surplus food potential is an appropriation for the selfish benefit of the individual farmers of the Nation. I deny that premise. To the contrary, Mr. President, I take the point of view that appropriations which are essential to the maintenance of the surplus food potential are appropriations that benefit all the people of the United States. It is in the interest of all that whatever appropriations are necessary to maintain that surplus food potential be made in the interest of a true economy, and that to deny such appropriations would be to act in the direction of false economy.

That does not mean that we should support any waste in the agricultural economy; that does not mean that we should engage in hand-outs to the farmers which cannot be economically justified; but it means that the people as a whole must recognize that they have the obligation and the duty of paying their proportionate share, on the basis of the entire population, in order to maintain what is one of the great assets of our Nation.

When we apply an intelligent awareness of that asset—a philosophical approach, some persons may believe it to be—to specific issues as they arise in connection with an appropriation bill, we see the importance to each individual Senator of constantly keeping in mind the relationship between the food productive capacity of the Nation and the security of the Nation, its standard of living, its social values, its culture, and—yes—its economic soundness. I care not whether the issue is one of sound soil conservation or one of a support price or one of a fair parity formula or of a necessary subsidy, for, no matter what the issue may be we are dealing with an issue which concerns not alone the farmers, not alone the economic advantage of the farmers, but also the interests and the economic advantage and the welfare of every citizen of our country.

So, Mr. President, those of us who serve in the Senate have before us in connection with those issues, it seems to me, the task of deciding what is a reasonable and proper amount of appropriations to make in order to protect that great asset, namely, the surplus food potential of our country. To the extent that funds are needed to protect that asset in the interest of the national welfare, we should be willing to make appropriations.

Once before, as I recall, I used a vital statistic which I wish to repeat today because I do not think we can consider any agricultural bill without at least giving some heed to this statistic. It is a population statistic, and it indicates what the population trends and changes mean in terms of agricultural policy during the decades ahead. When we keep in mind that in 1750, so our population experts tell us, there were 660,000,000 human beings on the face of the earth; and that 100 years later—in 1850—there were 1,000,000,000 human beings on the face of the earth; and that 100 years later—in 1950—there were 2,200,000,000 human beings on the face of the earth, we get a better idea of the relationship between the maintenance of a surplus food potential in the United States and the security of our country. If the time ever comes when we are not able to maintain that surplus food potential in relation to our population, we shall see, as I said earlier in these remarks, a declining civilization in the United States.

What we do in regard to soil policies, what we do in regard to most of the long-term farm issues which arise in connection with farm bills, will determine whether we keep faith with the future of our Nation, in relation to its ability to support an increasing population.

At this point, Mr. President, I desire to turn to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

ABUSES BY THE PASSPORT DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, IN THE EXERCISE OF DISCRETIONARY POWER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at this time I turn to the subject matter of my principal address. Let me assure the Senate that, figuratively speaking, not only have I counted 10 once, but I have counted 10 several times a day for several days prior to making this speech. But I am still provoked, and I am sufficiently provoked, Mr. President—so that I believe it is important that a record be made today in protest against a growing tyranny in the United States. It is a tyranny for which the Congress has to assume its fair share of responsibility, although that tyranny is not necessary, and it has not been necessary for it to

develop, and it would not have developed, in my judgment, if the State Department had exercised a wise discretion under a law which Congress has given it, a law which permits the State Department to exercise discretion.

I know that the alibi of the State Department—in fact, it is one of the favorite recourses of the State Department when congressional criticism is directed toward it—is to fall back on some discretionary clause in a law which the State Department believes it can use as justification for its exercise of discretion.

However, Mr. President, if we are to protect the liberty and freedom of the people of the United States against arbitrary and capricious discretion exercised by bureaus and departments of our Government, then as a Congress we must constantly exercise vigilance over the manner in which the bureaus and departments exercise the discretion which our laws permit them to exercise. When we find that they are exercising that discretion in a manner which does injury to the American people, as the elected representatives of those people we have the duty of adopting such amendments to existing laws as will check the exercise of arbitrary discretion.

Within the next few days, Mr. President, I shall submit to the Senate a series of amendments to a law which now is on the statute books, which permits the State Department, in its Passport Division, to exercise what has become, in my opinion, tyrannical, arbitrary, and capricious exercise of discretion.

This is not the first experience I have had with the star-chamber proceedings of the Passport Division of the State Department. It has been going on, for a long time. I had hoped that as the cases accumulated in the Department of State, the Secretary of State would have performed what I believe has been his clear duty, but in the performance of which he has failed miserably, namely, to insist on the adoption of procedures within the Passport Division of the State Department which would not support the charge which I make here this morning, namely, that that division is run as a star chamber, contrary to the principles of a full and fair hearing subject to review by third-party minds. Historically we have always opposed star-chamber proceedings in this country from its very beginnings, both in its Declaration of Independence and in its Constitution. Arbitrary discretion unchecked by review is plainly un-American. However, the Congress is partly responsible for the abuse that has developed in the State Department because unthinkingly we have been passing laws which have permitted the exercise of a discretion not subject to review, not subject to the great protection the American people should have of public disclosure.

Mr. President, when we get away from public disclosure, when we adopt a procedure which does not permit the penetrating light of publicity to be brought to bear upon the procedure adopted by Government officials who render decisions, we jeopardize the freedom of our people. Because we have enacted a law which permits of the exercise of discretion, and because a Secretary of State has not kept faith, in my judgment, with one of the basic principles guaranteeing American freedom, namely, the procedure of review, we now have operating in the State Department a Passport Division which is a law unto itself and which is tyrannical in its procedures. All the protests that may be sent to that Division, all the requests which may be made by us as the elected representatives of a free people for the facts on the basis of which they render their decisions result in a polite denial of the information through what has become almost a stereotype reply from the State Department.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, so long as the Secretary of State permits this kind of arbitrary procedure within his Department, he is the last one I want to hear protest charges against the State Department to the effect that they maintain within their personnel undesirable employees. So long as the Secretary of State permits the procedure that operates in the Passport Division of the State Department, I consider him an undesirable employee of the Government, inasmuch as I consider that he has failed as the Secretary of State to insist within a division of his Department upon a procedure that will prevent the kind of injustice which I think is constantly done within the Passport Division of the State Department.

Mr. President, in my opinion, the fact that we, as elected representatives of the people, cannot get at the facts in individual cases, opens the State Department, particularly through its Passport Division, to the charge that it acts in an arbitrary and capricious manner in denying to the American people a full disclosure of the evidence on which it reaches its decisions. Of course, I know that safeguards need to be set up, but, Mr. President, safeguards can be set up without in any way permitting the continuation of a procedure which now prevails in the Passport Division, under which the arbitrary decision apparently of one person prevails on the issue as to whether a passport should be granted to an American citizen.

I believe the freedom of an American citizen to travel in a foreign country is a right—a relative right, not an absolute right, but is a right which should not be denid to him except upon a clear showing of good cause. How is it to be determined that there is good cause unless there is a checking procedure whereby the action of the person rendering the decision in the first instance is subject to review? The amendments I intend to propose to the passport law will guarantee review by an independent reviewing board. It will then be possible to ascertain through an appeal procedure as to whether or not the denial of a passport is based on adequate facts or upon prejudice and unsound judgment.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Would my distinguished friend and colleague from Oregon inform me whether any review whatever is possible? I mean, could an appeal be taken from an administrative or Executive order of the one person denying a passport? Could an appeal be taken to some court on the ground of abuse of discretion?

Mr. MORSE. No.

Mr. WELKER. Then I think the distinguished Senator is certainly making a very fine contribution in regard to this matter.

Mr. MORSE. It is my understanding that there is no possible appeal beyond that little coterie within the State Department, after they have rendered their decision. The State Department reviews itself in these cases. It is judge, witness, prosecutor, jury all molded into one mold of tyranny.

Mr. WELKER. I take it that if an appeal were granted, or could be granted, upon the ground of abuse of discretion on the part of the one individual about whom the Senator speaks, the appeal would be costly and cumbersome, and would probably take a year.

Mr. MORSE. The appeal procedure which I shall offer in one of my amendments will be an administrative appeal procedure handled by a board not made up of State Department officials. It will be expeditious, quick, and fair. It will assure the public that no individual or group of individuals in the State Department will have finality of decision when a citizen believes that an injustice is being done to him in the granting of a passport. In a moment I shall read the alibi they present for the procedure they follow in the State Department. We have, in my judgment, reached the point in this country where, when some bureaucrat wants to justify an exercise of arbitrary and capricious power, the great bogy is raised of the importance of secrecy. In my opinion, this alibi of secrecy, this excuse that the security of the country might be threatened if the facts were disclosed, has in many instances become a rationalization on the part of officials of the Government for the exercising of unchecked powers. In my judgment, we must get back to the old historic principle that we must always oppose government by men; and the way to prevent government by men is to provide checks in the form of the review of decisions of mere men.

I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon has been pointing out a condition which should greatly concern every Member of the Congress. I am not familiar with the particular instance in regard to the State Department to which the Senator is discussing. Personally, I have had very little difficulty with the Passport Division of the State Department; but the Senator is referring to a condition which is altogether too common throughout the executive branch of the Government. Congress has enacted laws which carry a provision to this effect:

> The determination of the Administrator shall be final.

It will be noticed that when the executive branch of the Government feels the need of a new law affecting the Veterans' Administration, or some other agency, it invariably requests that there

be included the provision that the determination of the Administrator shall be final. I am not a lawyer, but I can see that the purpose is to bypass the judicial branch of the Government. We have already given authority to bypass the legislative branch of the Government. We grant rule-making powers which give the executive branch the right to continue legislating after the Congress has passed a law which the executive branch is supposed to apply. Thus, during the past 10 or 15 years, there has been a steady weakening of the balance of power which was intended to exist between the three branches of our Government. We have been strengthening the executive branch by giving it the right to bypass Congress and to continue legislating after Congress has enacted laws.

I would say, Mr. President, that that is one of the most serious problems, if not the most serious, we have to face today in undertaking to maintain our democratic form of government. I again say that I am not familiar with the fault of the particular agency to which the Senator from Oregon adverts, but I know that the same fault permeates our Government today. So I think the Senator is performing a valuable service to the country in speaking as he is doing.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the contribution which the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Idaho have made to my discussion of the subject. I completely agree with them. Among the many bad features of the New Deal, I consider that one of its worst features has been the emphasis upon procedures which increase the arbitrary discretionary power of the administrators of Government agencies. I think one of the reasons why we need a new administration in November is that there should be in power a party which will insist on keeping faith with the principle of the checking provisions of the Constitution of the United States. The decisions of mere men must be reviewed by others than those who recommended the decisions in the first place. That is the fundamental purpose of my protest this morning in regard to the procedure which has developed in the Passport Division of the State Department. The responsibility for it rests clearly on the shoulders of none other than Dean Acheson himself. I intend to keep that responsibility there, because so long as he continues to support that kind of a procedure, I think he is subject to the most severe type of censure, for, in my opinion, he is guilty of doing great injustice to basic procedural safeguards owed to the American people.

Mr. President, on May 23, 1952, I sent a letter to Mr. Acheson in regard to a passport case, as follows:

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the past few days I have received inquiries concerning the alleged refusal of the Department of State to issue a passport to Professor X, of the California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Calif. It is my understanding that Professor X has desired to make a trip to England. If the passport was in fact refused, I would appreciate being advised of the reason for such action. Needless to say, if the information which the State Department has discloses that he is a security risk, I agree that he should not receive a passport. However, in view of the inquiries I have received, I think it might be helpful if a recheck were made in order to insure that an injustice has not occurred.

I want to say two things about that letter, Mr. President. In the first place, I think I made it perfectly clear in the letter that if facts existed which justified the denial of a passport, I did not want a passport issued.

Next, I think I made it perfectly clear in the letter that I thought there should be a review of a decision, if it had been made, as to whether the facts supported the denial of a passport. I am satisfied now, after my experience with this case, that we should adopt an amendment which will provide for a review procedure outside the State Department. I think we ought to have a review procedure based upon an independent check of the Department rendering its decisions in cases where a protest has been filed.

Let me read the reply to that letter, Mr. President, dated June 2, 1952:

JUNE 2, 1952.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Department has received your letter of May 23, 1952, regarding the refusal of passport facilities to Professor X.

In view of the confidential nature of the passport files the Department is not in a position to furnish detailed information concerning the facts which were the basis for its decision in the case of Professor X. It may be said that the refusal of the passport was made after most careful consideration by the officers of the Department who found no other course open to them.

There is enclosed for your information a copy of a press release dated May 24, 1952, setting forth the Department's policy with regard to the refusal of passports in certain categories of cases.

Sincerely yours,

R. B. SHIPLEY,
Chief, Passport Division.

Mr. President, I was glad to have a reply from Mrs. R. B. Shipley, but I should have preferred to have a reply from the Secretary of State to whom I addressed my letter. I should like to know what he thinks of the procedure he is sanctioning in the State Department directly, particularly when my criticism is primarily directed against Mrs. Shipley. I think she is the one who for a long time has been using the arbitrary power which I am protesting. I think she exercises discretion in a manner which is not consonant with the protection of the rights of American citizens. It is her decisions, Mr. President, which I think should be subject to review by an independent board. I think it is a case of one having been in a position to exercise arbitrary power for so long that she has lost sight of the importance of having the elected representatives of the people informed of the facts on which she bases her decisions, so that they can check into the exercise of her judgment. Because I assume that she, like other human beings, is not infallible, I think the attitude of infallibility which seems to have developed within the Passport Division of the State Department should be brought under surveillance.

Mr. President, I do not know whether this particular applicant for a passport has on his record facts which would justify the denial of a passport, but I do know enough of his reputation and of the high standing he enjoys in the academic world and in the field of science to know that the greatest of care should be exercised in seeing that the facts alleged by the State Department can be substantiated. That is why a review-board procedure is so important in cases such as this one.

Let me say, Mr. President, that the attitude of the administrator of any division of the Government changes decidedly when we take away from such administrator the finality of decision and he has to justify his position before impartial minds which make up a third-party board. There is not a Senator who has not seen how Government administrators work time and time again. There is a great difference, Mr. President, between giving to a bureaucrat the finality of decision and giving to him the power of decision subject to review. In the latter case he is an entirely different type of person in his relationship to the elected representatives of the American people. One of the great safeguards the American people have is the power of Congress to step in to protect their rights by checking the exercise of discretion on the part of administrators acting for the Government.

I agree with the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Idaho. We must see to it that in passing legislation we do not give finality of decision to administrative officers of the Government, but that we always keep such control over possible abuse of discretion by requiring a procedure for review of their decisions.

I am disturbed about the decision in this case, the facts of which I cannot get from the State Department because the Department insists that under the law it has a right to deny the facts to us, the elected representatives of the people, if in its discretion it wishes to deny us the facts.

I shall come in a moment to the press release issued May 24 in which the State Department again rationalizes the exercise of arbitrary action based upon a discretionary power of finality. The Secretary of State himself supports and approves the exercise of the arbitrary action of the Passport Division.

I have received the following telegram in regard to Professor X from members of the faculty of Reed College, in my State, dated May 13, 1952:

We are sending the following telegram to Mrs. Shipley, of the State Department:

"X is one of America's most prominent and able scientists, and is so recognized throughout the world with the exception of Soviet Russia. Our Government is placed in a ridiculous and shameful position by refusing to issue him a passport. It is inconceivable that his traveling abroad would be detrimental to the best interests of the United States. We vigorously protest the refusal to issue him a passport and strongly urge that one be issued to him immediately.

"We urge you to use your good offices with the State Department to have denial of passport reversed."

Signed by 49 out of the 59 members of the Reed College faculty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the telegram, with the name of the professor concerned eliminated, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 13, 1952.*

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We are sending the following telegram to Mrs. Shipley, of the Department of State:

"X is one of America's most prominent and able scientists, and is so recognized throughout the world with the exception of Soviet Russia. Our Government is placed in a ridiculous and shameful position by refusing to issue him a passport. It is inconceivable that his traveling abroad would be detrimental to the best interests of the United States. We vigorously protest the refusal to issue him a passport and strongly urge that one be issued to him immediately.

"We urge you to use your good offices with the State Department to have denial of passport reversed."

Signed by 49 out of the 59 members of the Reed College faculty:

Frank Fussner; Roger B. Oake; F. L. Griffin; Ruth G. Collier; William L. Alderson; Owen Ulph; Donald Macrae; Frank W. Jones; Donald L. Layman; Janet Soderberg; Paul H. Yearout; Arthur F. Scott; Arthur H. Livermore; Robert A. Rosenbaum; Frederick A. Courts; James T. Hamilton; Marion Besserman; Fred D. Ayres; Stanley Moore; Maure L. Goldschmidt; Margaret E. Jump; Mark Linenthal, Jr.; C. S. Botsford; Louise J. Rosenbaum; Alan M. Macews; Frank P. Hungate; Arthur Leigh; H. F. Peters; Marianne Littman; Leroy R. Shaw; Herbert B. Gladstone; Verner Anderson; Charles J. Gaupp, Jr.; J. F. Bunnett; Edwin N. Garlan; Howard Jolly; William Griffith; Lloyd B. Williams; Una V. Davies; William L. Parker; Kenneth E. Davis; Lloyd J. Reynolds; Charles McKinley; David French; Richard H. Jones; R. F. Arragon; Dorothy O. Johanson; Ann W. Shepard; Colleen Cook.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am pleased to notice within the free press of the country a growing criticism of the exercise of arbitrary discretion by the Passport Division of the State Department. I am now going to discuss for a few minutes what I think is a great editorial on the subject, published recently in the Washington Post. From time to time in the next few days I shall insert in the RECORD other editorials arriving at my office, including one from a great newspaper in my own State. I think the editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on Thursday, June 5, is so clear and unanswerable on this problem that I intend to read it and discuss it in some detail. It reads:

PASSPORTS

The State Department's recent press release on passport policy makes a strong case for care and discrimination in the issuance of passports. But it presents no convincing justification whatever for exercise of the Department's discretionary authority in this area without any published standards of judgment and without any of the elements of due process. The press release asserts that "the Secretary of State has discretionary authority in the issuance of passports, both as a power inherent in the exercise of the Presidential authority to conduct foreign relations and as a matter of statutory law." Both premises deserve examination.

The assertion of a power inherent in Presidential authority must of itself be considered somewhat less persuasive today than it may have seemed when the State Department made it a fortnight ago. Besides, it stretches the Presidential authority to conduct foreign relations pretty thin to extend it to a denial of passports. A passport is a kind of exit permit from the country. The granting or withholding of it from citizens is much more a matter of internal security than of foreign policy. It involves a quasi-judicial finding which affects an individual citizen much more than it affects international relations.

So far as the statutory basis of the Secretary's discretionary authority is concerned, it rests on an act of Congress which says that the Secretary of State may issue passports in conformity with rules and regulations set forth by the President, and upon an Executive order authorizing him in his discretion to refuse, to restrict, or to cancel passports. There is a substantial question whether so vague a statute does not amount to an invalid delegation of legislative power. A recent study of the subject in the Yale Law Journal observes that "the passport statute seems as clear an example of invalid delegation as is possible to imagine. No standards are set forth, nor can any be implied, from legislative history."

When the State Department denies a passport, it says no more nowadays than that it does not consider the applicant's proposed trip abroad to be "in the best interests of the United States." It gives no grounds for its conclusion; it offers no hearing; it affords no basis for judicial review.

Mr. President, that last sentence in the Washington Post editorial on this subject is such a vital one, in that it goes to the heart of the problem, that I propose to reread it:

It gives no grounds for its conclusion; it offers no hearing; it affords no basis for judicial review.

Mr. President, whenever there exists such procedure as that sanctioned by the Secretary of State, we, the Congress, had better do something about it. We, the Congress, had better pass an amendment to the law upon which the Secretary of State relies, to check the Secretary of State in continued promulgation of a procedure which, as the Washington Post points out, enables him, through the head of the Passport Division, to deny a passport without any grounds for his conclusion, without offering the citizen a hearing, and without being subject to any judicial review of his decision.

Mr. President, denial of a passport is not a minor thing. In my opinion, denial of a passport limits the freedom of a citizen of the United States. Freedom must be limited whenever the facts in a given case justify the limiting of freedom in the public interest, and I would be the first in the Senate to defend that principle to the end. But I am also going to insist that freedom of an American citizen must not be limited by arbitrary, unchecked, capricious discretion of an administrator of the Government, even though he may be Secretary of State.

The editorial continues:

True enough, its press release declares that "the decision not to issue a passport or to withdraw a passport already issued does not represent the judgment of the Passport Division alone but is reached after consultation by responsible officers of the Passport Division with security officers, and political and administrative officers of the Department."

All there is to that alibi of the State Department is that they engage in concerted action to deny, without review by independent third parties, the right of an individual to a passport. I wish to emphasize that in observing the functioning of the departments it has been my experience that if we make the mistake of giving a department such discretionary power as the State Department is allowed to exercise in regard to the issuance of passports, and do not provide for a review outside the department, the tendency is for members of the department to support one another. That is an understandable human trait. However, as a matter of administrative principle, I think we are bound to endanger a fair review of the facts of the case if we do not provide for a review procedure which takes the appeal outside the department to which we have given the power of decision in the first instance.

The editorial continues:

This is about as handsome as an announcement by the Attorney General that a decision summarily to clap a citizen in jail will not be made by the local United States attorney alone but will be reached after consultation with other officers of the Department of Justice.

The denial of a passport involves a substantial deprivation of liberty. It is likely to mean not only an infringement of the right to travel but in addition the infliction of possible financial loss, humiliation, and disgrace, since the denial implies an official suspicion of disloyalty.

That is one of the worst features of this evil. The reputations of people are being assassinated by the Passport Division of the State Department, for which procedure the Secretary of State is responsible. The Secretary of State has indicated on various occasions his opposition to character assassination tactics. He had better look to his own Department. He had better look to the procedures of his own Passport Division, because so long as the Secretary of State supports his procedure in the Passport Division, he, too, is guilty of character assassination, because he is guilty of bringing people into disrepute under circumstances in which they cannot prove their innocence. I do not wish to hear the Secretary of State on the presumption-of-innocence doctrine until the Secretary of State is willing, as he has the power to do, to change the procedures of the Passport Division of the State Department in a manner which will comply with the presumption-of-innocence doctrine. To do that there must be a check into the facts of the exercise of discretion in the State Department, including his own exercise of discretion.

The editorial continues:

Many indubitably loyal and law-abiding citizens may be restrained by fear of a denial from seeking the right to travel when the right can be denied so arbitrarily and when the denial carries such a stigma.

This amounts, in our opinion, to a patently unconstitutional deprivation of liberty without due process of law. The considerations of national security which warrant

care in the granting of passports afford no warrant whatever for so arbitrary and authoritarian a procedure. It is a procedure inconsistent with a government of laws. We think that Congress should define by law the conditions under which passports may be granted to or withheld from citizens of the United States and that the State Department should be held to strict judicial account in its administration of the law.

Mr. President, I think that is one of the most courageous, penetrating, and sound editorials I have read on any subject for a long time. I now ask unanimous consent to have it printed in its entirety at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PASSPORTS

The State Department's recent press release on passport policy makes a strong case for care and discrimination in the issuance of passports. But it presents no convincing justification whatever for exercise of the Department's discretionary authority in this area without any published standards of judgment and without any of the elements of due process. The press release asserts that "the Secretary of State has discretionary authority in the issuance of passports, both as a power inherent in the exercise of the Presidential authority to conduct foreign relations and as a matter of statutory law." Both premises deserve examination.

The assertion of "a power inherent" in Presidential authority must of itself be considered somewhat less persuasive today than it may have seemed when the State Department made it a fortnight ago. Besides, it stretches the Presidential authority to conduct foreign relations pretty thin to extend it to a denial of passports. A passport is a kind of exit permit from the country. The granting or withholding of it from citizens is much more a matter of internal security than of foreign policy. It involves a quasi-judicial finding which affects an individual citizen much more than it affects international relations.

So far as the statutory basis of the Secretary's "discretionary authority" is concerned, it rests on an act of Congress which says that the Secretary of State may issue passports in conformity with rules and regulations set forth by the President, and upon an Executive order authorizing him in his discretion to refuse, to restrict or to cancel passports. There is a substantial question whether so vague a statute does not amount to an invalid delegation of legislative power. A recent study of the subject in the Yale Law Journal observes that the passport statute seems as clear an example of invalid delegation as is possible to imagine. No standards are set forth, nor can any be implied from legislative history.

When the State Department denies a passport, it says no more nowadays than that it does not consider the applicant's proposed trip abroad to be "in the best interests of the United States." It gives no grounds for its conclusion, it offers no hearing, it affords no basis for judicial review. True enough, its press release declares that "the decision not to issue a passport or to withdraw a passport already issued does not represent the judgment of the Passport Division alone but is reached after consultation by responsible officers of the Passport Division with security officers, and political and administrative officers of the Department." This is about as handsome as an announcement by the Attorney General that a decision summarily to clap a citizen in jail will not be made by the local United States attorney alone, but will be reached after consultation with other officers of the Department of Justice.

The denial of a passport involves a substantial deprivation of liberty. It is likely to mean not only an infringement of the right to travel but in addition the infliction of possible financial loss, humiliation and disgrace, since the denial implies an official suspicion of disloyalty. Many indubitably loyal and law-abiding citizens may be restrained by fear of a denial from seeking the right to travel when the right can be denied so arbitrarily and when the denial carries such a stigma.

This amounts, in our opinion, to a patently unconstitutional deprivation of liberty without due process of law. The considerations of national security which warrant care in the granting of passports afford no warrant whatever for so arbitrary and authoritarian a procedure. It is a procedure inconsistent with a government of laws. We think that Congress should define by law the conditions under which passports may be granted to or withheld from citizens of the United States and that the State Department should be held to strict judicial account in its administration of the law.

Mr. MORSE. In closing I wish to say that in the preparation of amendments to the so-called passport law I not only propose to provide for a review of the decisions of the State Department on this very important subject, but I also propose to leave it up to the Review Board to determine whether a given hearing or review should be in executive session. I can understand that there are instances where for security reasons the hearings should be executive, but the citizen involved is entitled to be present and hear and answer the allegations presented against him.

The State Department released on May 24, 1952, its defense of the procedure in the Passport Division against which I have been arguing today. In fairness to the State Department I think its defense should be in the RECORD along with my speech. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have the press release of May 24, 1952, No. 412, printed in the RECORD in full at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Department of State has been asked what authority the Secretary of State has in regard to the issuance of passports and what the Department's policy is in regard to the denial of passports.

The following information is provided in answer to these questions:

1. The Secretary of State has discretionary authority in the issuance of passports, both as a power inherent in the exercise of the Presidential authority to conduct foreign relations and as a matter of statutory law.

2. Various Secretaries of State have exercised the right to refuse passports or withdraw passports already issued. Various courts and attorneys general of the United States have rendered opinions in which the discretionary authority of the Secretary of State in the issuance of passports has been recognized. In an opinion of August 29, 1901, the Attorney General stated:

"Substantial reasons exist for the use by Congress of the word 'may' in connection with authority to issue passports. Circumstances are conceivable which would make it most inexpedient for the public interests for this country to grant a passport to a citizen of the United States. For example, if one of the criminal class, an avowed anarchist for instance, were to make such application, the public interests might require that his application be denied.

"Without expressing any opinion as to whether a passport should be granted to Ng Faun, I advise you that it may, in your discretion, be granted or withheld."

In the case of *Perkins* v. *Elg* (307 U. S. 325 (1939)), the Supreme Court, after holding that the Secretary of State should be included in a decree declaring the plaintiff to be a natural-born citizen of the United States, had the following to say:

"The decree in that sense would in no way interfere with the exercise of the Secretary's discretion with respect to the issue of a passport but would simply preclude the denial of a passport on the ground that Miss Elg had lost her American citizenship."

3. For many years the Department has refused passports to persons for many reasons. For example, passports are denied when evidence in the Department's files shows that the applicant for the passport is a fugitive from justice or mentally ill or likely to become a public charge abroad, etc.

4. For many years the Department has also refused passports to persons when it had in its files clear evidence that they had, on previous trips abroad, engaged in political activities in foreign countries.

5. The Department reexamined its policy respecting the issue of passports to Communists and persons believed to be Communists and subversives after both the judicial and legislative branches of the Government had made certain findings concerning the Communist movement in the United States. The United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, in upholding the conviction of the 11 leading Communists in New York, found that the conspiracy in which they were participants was a "clear and present danger to the United States." The Congress of the United States, in the Internal Security Act of 1950, made these findings: That there exists a world-wide Communist revolutionary movement, the purpose of which is by treachery, deceit, espionage, and sabotage to establish a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in countries throughout the world; that, due to the world-wide scope of the movement, the travel of Communist members, representatives, and agents from country to country is a prerequisite for the carrying on of activities to further the purpose of this revolutionary movement; and that individuals in the United States, by participating in this movement, in effect, repudiate their allegiance to the United States and transfer their allegiance to the foreign country which controls the Communist movement.

It was decided that, in view of the findings by the court and the Congress, it would be inappropriate and inconsistent for the Department to issue a passport to a person if information in its files gave reason to believe that he is knowingly a member of a Communist organization or that his conduct abroad is likely to be contrary to the best interests of the United States. This policy has been followed since February 1951 and, in view of the national emergency proclaimed by President Truman and the conditions existing in various areas of the world, it is believed that it should be closely adhered to.

6. A passport certifies to foreign governments not only the citizenship and identity of the bearer but requests them to permit him safely and freely to pass and, in case of need, to give all lawful aid and protection. Possession of the passport indicates the right of the bearer to receive the protection and good offices of American diplomatic and consular officers abroad. The right to receive the protection of this Government is correlative with the obligation to give undivided allegiance to the United States. A person whose activities, either at home or abroad, promote the interests of a foreign country or a political faction therein to the detriment of the United States or of friendly foreign countries should not be the bearer of an American passport.

7. Passports are refused only on the basis of very clear and definite reports from the investigative and security offices of this Department and of other Government departments and agencies and from foreign governments containing well-authenticated information concerning past and present activities and associations of the applicant. The decision not to issue a passport or to withdraw a passport already issued does not represent the judgment of the Passport Division alone but is reached after consultation by responsible officers of the Passport Division with security officers, and political and administrative officers of the Department. This group varies according to the area or areas in which the applicant desires to travel. The decision is therefore the decision of the Department.

8. Any applicant who has been refused a passport has every right and is given every opportunity to request further consideration of his case and may present any evidence or information which he may wish to have considered. The particularity with which he may be informed of the contents of the reports in the Department's file depends, of course, upon the source and classification of such reports but it is usually possible to inform him in a general way of the nature of the evidence and the information upon which he has been refused a passport. Any new evidence or information which the applicant may submit is referred to the officers who first examined the case for evaluation and expression of opinion as to whether a passport may be issued. The Department cannot violate the confidential character of passport files by making public any information contained therein.

9. The Secretary of State has the authority to establish any administrative procedures respecting passports which he may deem appropriate. These procedures are under constant review and a continuing effort is made to see that they are fair and efficient. There is a board in the Passport Division for questions of loss of nationality. The consultations between officers of the Passport Division and officers of other divisions of the Department and with the Foreign Service abroad, in effect, constitute in a given case a most fair and comprehensive board of review action in the denial of a passport in the interests of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. The first paragraph of the release reads as follows:

The Department of State has been asked what authority the Secretary of State has in regard to the issuance of passports and what the Department's policy is in regard to the denial of passports.

The only comment I wish to make at present—and I shall discuss the release later, when I offer my amendments at a later date—is this: The release reads, in part, as follows, bearing upon the question of what the statute provides, the responsibility for which rests upon the Congress:

The Secretary of State has discretionary authority in the issuance of passports, both as a power inherent in the exercise of the presidential authority to conduct foreign relations and as a matter of statutory law.

Various Secretaries of State have exercised the right to refuse passports or withdraw passports already issued. Various courts and Attorneys General of the United States have rendered opinions in which the discretionary authority of the Secretary of State in the issuance of passports has been recognized. In an opinion of August 29, 1901, the Attorney General stated:

"Substantial reasons exist for the use by Congress of the word 'may' in connection with authority to issue passports. Circumstances are conceivable which would make it most inexpedient for the public interests for this country to grant a passport to a citizen of the United States. For example, if one of the criminal class, an avowed anarchist, for instance, were to make such application, the public interests might require that his application be denied.

"Without expressing any opinion as to whether a passport should be granted to * * * I advise you that it may, in your discretion, be granted or withheld."

Mr. President, I do not deny that the release cites correctly the law as it now exists on the statute books; but I close by making two arguments with respect to that law.

First, that law does not require the Secretary of State to adopt the procedure which he has adopted in carrying out the discretion permitted under the law. He has adopted a type of arbitrary procedure for which I severely criticize him today.

The second point is that, on the basis of the experience we have had with the Passport Division the time has come to amend the law so that the discretion of the Secretary of State also can be checked, so that he may not be given the finality of decision to do the great damage which he is doing at present, in my judgment, to people who, if we had a reviewing board, would be granted passports in some instances where they are now denied. I am convinced that in some instances the Passport Division of the State Department would be reversed by a board of review of its decisions.

Mr. President, I am sorry to have taken as much of the time of the Senate as I have, but I believe that the subject matter is of sufficient importance to justify it.

Within the next few days I shall offer my amendments and speak briefly on them at that time.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7314) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture—Title I—Regular activities—Agricultural Marketing Act (RMA—Title II)," on page 2 line 7 after the word "Department", to strike out "$5,250,000" and insert "$5,260,000."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will it be the procedure now to dispose of all committee amendments before other amendments will be entertained?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; except as to an amendment to a committee amendment.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio will state it.

Mr. BRICKER. Is the Senate proceeding under the terms of a unanimous-consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not at this time.

Mr. BRICKER. There is no restriction?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no restriction; except, of course, that the bill will first be read for amendments. That is the established practice.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I believe there should be a limitation on debate, so that we may dispose of the bill within a reasonable time.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I have done my best to get in touch with all Members on the minority side of the aisle who intend to offer amendments or who are likely to offer amendments. All the Senators with whom I have spoken have indicated that they would appreciate the entry of a unanimous-consent agreement with respect to limiting debate.

Mr. McFARLAND. I appreciate the cooperation of the distinguished acting minority leader.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on all amendments debate be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to a side, to be controlled by the proponent of the amendment and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and in the event the Senator from Georgia favors an amendment the time in opposition to be controlled by the distinguished minority leader or any Senator designated by him; that the same limitation with respect to debate apply to motions and appeals; and that debate on the bill itself be limited 1 hour, 30 minutes to a side, to be controlled by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the minority leader.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to utilize approximately 10 minutes on another subject.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I will add the proviso that the unanimous-consent agreement shall go into effect after the Senator from Ohio has concluded his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona include the usual provision with respect to germaneness of amendments?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is not necessary on an appropriation bill.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I was called out of the Chamber temporarily. I had intended, when the Senate convened, to take a

few minutes to present a certain matter to the Senate. I gave notice that I would do so. I do not know whether a request is being made which would foreclose me from making my remarks.

Mr. McFARLAND. How long does the Senator from Wisconsin intend to speak?

Mr. WILEY. As I have stated to the majority leader, I would probably require 15 minutes, but I could take less time, if necessary, after stating the gist of my remarks.

Mr. McFARLAND. In order not to show any partiality, I ask unanimous consent that the unanimous-consent agreement with respect to the agricultural appropriation bill go into effect after the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] has spoken and after the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has spoken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATIVE TO THE MAKING OF TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I wish to give a little attention at this time to a subject which is now before the Committee on the Judiciary. At the very beginning, in order that my remarks may be better understood, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point two editorials which appeared in the Washington Post. One of the editorials is entitled "BRICKER's Shotgun," and the other editorial is entitled "BRICKER's Folly." A more appropriate title for the latter editorial would be "Washington Post Bull's-Eye." Firing blindly at my proposed constitutional amendment, the Washington Post has supplied, unwittingly, an additional reason for its adoption.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 24, 1952]

BRICKER'S SHOTGUN

Senator BRICKER has been amazingly successful in lining up support for his proposed amendment to the Constitution designed, as he says, to "prohibit the use of the treaty as an instrument of domestic legislation." When hearings on the proposal began the other day, 58 Senators were listed as sponsors. Let no one suppose, however, that the sentiment behind it is becoming unanimous. Prof. Zechariah Chafee, of the Harvard Law School, must have caused some of the sponsors to think twice when he told them that the amendment was a manifestation of no confidence in themselves. The framers, he said, voted down, 8 to 1, a similar proposal. They trusted the Senate's judgment in meeting new problems without trying to build a constitutional wall against them.

Some weeks ago Manley O. Hudson declared in his address to the American Society of International Law that Senator BRICKER's proposal is "so badly drafted that its actual text hardly bears serious study." He was referring to this sentence:

"No treaty or executive agreement shall alter or abridge the laws of the United States or the Constitution or laws of the several States unless, and then only to the extent that, Congress shall so provide by act or joint resolution."

It must be assumed from Senator BRICKER's remarks on the subject that his aim is to prevent the President and the Senate from entering into treaties that might drain the substance out of the Constitution. But if that is his purpose, he has chosen a strange way to express it. As we read it, the above language means that the President could enter into an executive agreement with a foreign power (which requires no approval by the Senate) and it would supersede the Constitution if Congress should so provide by a bare majority vote. The effect might be to give the President and a small majority in Congress carte blanche to amend the basic law.

More worthy of attention, according to Mr. Hudson's view, is the following proposal of the house of delegates of the American Bar Association:

"A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation by Congress which it could enact under its delegated power in the absence of such a treaty."

But this proposal too might dangerously weaken the treaty power. At present treaties become the law of the land as do statutes. The bar's proposal fails to give assurance that treaties would be respected in State laws. Mr. Hudson also pointed out that the powers of Congress do not extend to all fields within reach of the treaty-making power. In these days of essential international cooperation it would be tragically short-sighted to narrow the sphere in which the United States would be able to act by means of treaties. The proposal would impose upon the United States a treaty-making handicap that has given Canada much trouble—a handicap that Canada is now trying to shake off.

If we are going to be realistic, we must view the treaty-making power, as Mr. Hudson suggested, "not solely from a national point of view, but also from the point of view of an international legal order." The United States has now keyed its defense system to an international order. More than ever before it needs flexibility in the making of treaties. To our way of thinking the danger from any weakening of the constitutional system by means of treaties is insignificant compared to the perils of placing the Government in a strait-jacket at a time when closer international relations have become imperative to our safety.

[From the Washington Post of June 2, 1952]

BRICKER'S FOLLY

Senator BRICKER's assault upon the Constitution has encountered some formidable resistance. At first the testimony on the Senator's proposal to put a strait-jacket on the President and the Senate in the exercise of the treaty power seemed to run pretty much with him. He and the American Bar Association's committee on peace and law have succeeded in getting a good many people aroused over an alleged Achilles' heel in the grand old charter of 1787. But their excited cries have stimulated a number of experts to examine the Bricker proposal in the light of facts and history. The result is devastating.

One provision of the Bricker proposal would forbid the President and the Senate to make any treaty or Executive agreement "respecting the rights of citizens of the United States protected by this Constitution." This is aimed, of course, at the human-rights covenants that are taking shape under the auspices of the United Nations. We have taken sharp issue with some of the provisions written into these covenants, but it is not necessary to take a shotgun to kill a fly. Acting Secretary of State David K. Bruce pointed out to the subcommittee that Mr. BRICKER's reckless language would undercut existing treaties which enable American citizens to carry on trade and commercial activities in other countries. Even the International Slavery Convention of 1926 would go down.

Both the Bricker and the bar proposals would reverse the present rule that a treaty becomes the law of the land. Under these changes, a treaty would become domestic law only if Congress should pass a separate act making it so. And Congress could not pass such an act if the subject of the treaty were not within the scope of congressional powers. This sounds complicated, but there is no doubt as to what the consequences would be. The United States could no longer participate in international control of subjects that, in the domestic field, are left to the States. For example, the convention of 1932 for limiting the manufacture and regulating the distribution of narcotic drugs would be outlawed because, domestically, such drugs are under State control.

Sponsors of this bungling proposal have conjured up fears that if it is not passed, our precious heritage of civil rights may be frittered away by means of the treaty power. In the first place, it is absurd to suppose that the Senate would ratify any such treaty by a two-thirds majority even if the President should make such a request. Second, we cannot imagine the Supreme Court upholding such a treaty in preference to the Constitution. It is true that the Constitution does not specifically require that treaties be made in conformity with its provisions, but the Supreme Court has said that the treaty-making power "does not extend so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids."

In part the hysteria on this subject grew out of the Fujii case in which a California court held that the United Nations Charter invalidated the California land law. We pointed out at the time that the court had blundered. Some weeks ago it was set right in an opinion by Chief Justice Gibson of the California Supreme Court. While the Charter represents moral commitments of foremost importance, the court said, it was not intended to supersede existing domestic legislation. That should be sufficient to clear the air on this point.

Mr. Bruce emphasized another part of the proposed amendment that might have the effect of outlawing the Baruch plan for international control of atomic energy. Clark M. Eichelberger, executive director of the American Association for the United Nations, told the subcommittee that if the Bricker amendment had been in effect the United States could not have taken Texas or Hawaii into its family.

The amazing thing is that this assault upon the treaty power comes at a time when the United States must exercise its world leadership or stand helpless before the onslaught of Communist imperialism. It is no exaggeration to say that the Bricker amendment would throw our foreign policy into a tailspin of confusion. We cannot believe that the Senate will follow any such suicidal course. Senator BRICKER has asked his colleagues to confess that they are unfit to exercise the treaty power that the founding fathers gave them. In less tempestuous times such self-humiliation would be inconceivable, and even now we think the Senate can be trusted not to give away its power on the flimsy assumption that ugly world problems will go away if the United States is only deprived of the means of meeting them.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, the Bricker Shotgun editorial concludes that section 3 of Senate Joint Resolution 130 would give the President and a small majority in Congress unlimited power to amend the basic law. Section 3 reads as follows:

No treaty or Executive agreement shall alter or abridge the laws of the United States

or the Constitution or laws of the several States unless, and then only to the extent that, Congress shall so provide by act or joint resolution. Section 3 is given this interpretation in BRICKER's Shotgun: "As we read it, the above language means that the President could enter into an Executive agreement with a foreign power (which requires no approval by the Senate) and it would supersede the Constitution if Congress should so provide by a bare majority vote."

In other words, the Post editorial writer has construed the phrase, "the Constitution or the laws of the several States" as referring to the Constitution of the United States. Let us assume that this interpretation of section 3 of my amendment is correct. I concede that it is not far-fetched. However, the phrase in section 3 of my amendment which terrifies the Washington Post also appears in article VI, paragraph 2, of the Constitution of the United States. This supremacy clause of our Constitution reads in part as follows:

All treaties * * * shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

That is exactly the same language that is used in the joint resolution which I have introduced.

Therefore, if "Constitution" in section 3 of Senate Joint Resolution 130 means "Constitution of the United States," as claimed by the Washington Post, the same process of interpretation leads to the conclusion that article VI makes treaties the supreme law of the land, anything in the Constitution of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding. Quite frankly, this interpretation of article VI, paragraph 2, and the parallel language in section 3 of Senate Joint Resolution 130, had not occurred to me, or to anyone else, up to this time, except the Washington Post. I am, therefore, deeply grateful that the Washington Post's frenetic attacks on my proposed amendment have accidentally disclosed an additional reason for amending the Constitution. Fortunately, any ambiguity in my amendment can be removed by adding the letter "s" to the word "Constitution" in section 3. Only by amending the Constitution, however, can a similar ambiguity in article VI, paragraph 2, be removed.

After reading the editorial, BRICKER's Shotgun, I have the following suggestion for editors of the Washington Post. In commenting editorially on any constitutional amendment, it helps to have the Constitution of the United States available for reference.

The Post editorial of June 2, 1952, appears under the heading "BRICKER's folly." "It is no exaggeration," says this editorial, "to say that the Bricker amendment would throw our foreign policy into a tailspin of confusion."

Mr. President, if my intention were to reverse completely the course of American foreign policy, Senate Joint Resolution 130 might properly be described as "BRICKER's folly." To revolutionize American foreign policy would require in some cases only a majority of both Houses of Congress and in others only my vote plus the votes of one-third of the other Senators present. I would indeed be foolish to seek to revolutionize American foreign policy by the cumbersome process of constitutional amendment, when simpler means are available. The fact is that I do not seek to reverse our whole foreign policy, a goodly portion of which I have voted for.

The BRICKER's Folly editorial alleges that Senate Joint Resolution 130 would prevent our participation in plans for the international control of atomic energy. It implies that we would be unable to participate in a treaty outlawing traffic in slaves and illegal traffic in narcotics. Others have claimed that Senate Joint Resolution 130 would make it impossible for the United States to participate in NATO or the U. N. All such arguments are utterly fantastic, Mr. President. I can only say that I would vote against any constitutional amendment, my own included, if such undesirable consequences were even a remote possibility.

The opening paragraph of the "BRICKER's Folly" editorial reports that the examination of my amendment by a number of experts has been devastating. Who are these experts? First, there are those who represent the majority view in one section of the American Bar Association, the section on international and comparative law. However, the overwhelming majority in the American Bar Association recognizes the need to limit the scope of the treaty power. Secondly, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, in a divided vote, decided to oppose my amendment. To the best of my knowledge, every other State and local bar association which has studied the problem has reached a contrary conclusion and supports the constitutional amendment I propose. Finally, there are those who do not wish to foreclose entry into world or regional government by treaty in case authorization by constitutional amendment becomes impossible to achieve. But even among the proponents of world or regional government, opposition is not unanimous. Former Justice Owen Roberts, a leader of the Atlantic Union movement, said in a debate with me, on the Town Hall radio program, that he supported whole-heartedly the constitutional amendment that is called for in Senate Joint Resolution 130.

Of course, I do not object to criticism of Senate Joint Resolution 130. I welcome it. Much of that criticism has already proved helpful, and will no doubt be reflected in any resolution reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee. As an example of irresponsible and uninformed criticism, however, I should like to quote again from the editorial, "BRICKER's Folly":

Both the Bricker and the bar proposals would reverse the present rule that a treaty becomes the law of the land. Under these changes, a treaty would become domestic law only if Congress should pass a separate act making it so. And Congress could not pass such an act if the subject of the treaty were not within the scope of congressional powers. This sounds complicated, but there is no doubt as to what the consequences would be. The United States could no longer participate in international control of subjects that, in the domestic field, are left to the States. For example, the convention of 1932 for limiting the manufacture and regulating the distribution of narcotic drugs would be outlawed because, domestically, such drugs are under State control.

Mr. President, to whatever extent this criticism is valid, it applies to the suggested amendment of the American Bar Association, but not to Senate Joint Resolution 130. This point was conceded by two opposition witnesses, Professor Chafee, of the Harvard Law School, and Mr. Charles W. Tillett, of North Carolina. Section 3 of my proposed amendment expressly recognizes that some subjects appropriate for a treaty are, in the absence of any treaty, matters within the jurisdiction of the several States, and not within the scope of Congress' power to legislate. If the Washington Post would send a competent reporter to the hearings now being conducted by the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Senate Joint Resolution 130, instead of accepting as gospel the State Department's hand-outs, the Post's editorials on this important issue might bear some relation to reality.

The Washington Post editorial, BRICKER's Folly, urges that we trust the Supreme Court to invalidate any treaty which adversely affects the constitutional rights of the American people. We are reminded of Supreme Court dicta in a case decided in 1890—*Geofroy* v. *Riggs* (133 U. S. 258, 267)—to the effect that the treaty-making power "does not extend so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids." Opposed to this dicta we have: First, the implications of *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416), decided in 1920; second, a famous speech by the late Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes in 1929; and third, the opinion of an overwhelming majority of American lawyers who have considered the problem. In order to demonstrate that this is no imaginary fear conjured up by isolationist lawyers, I need cite only the statement by Mr. John Foster Dulles that "treaty law can override the Constitution" and that a treaty "can cut across the rights given the people by the constitutional Bill of Rights." Those statements are taken from his address before the regional meeting of the American Bar Association at Louisville, Ky., on April 11, 1952.

Both Washington Post editorials point out that Senate Joint Resolution 130 would place limitations on the treaty power similar to those considered and rejected in 1787. While that may be true, constitutional history in this instance is not persuasive. Plans have been made to put the treaty-making power to a revolutionary use never dreamed of by the founding fathers or the lawyers in the early days of our Nation's existence. It is proposed in the draft Covenant on Human Rights and in many other treaties to redefine the relationship between the American people and their own government. A host of State Department officials have conceded that this is a recent and revolutionary development in the field of international law.

Finally, Mr. President, we come to the most potent argument against Senate Joint Resolution 130. The Washington Post, for example, urges that we

trust the President and two-thirds of the Senate not to make any treaty which undermines the rights of the American people. I share the view of the Washington Post that the draft Covenant on Human Rights is a shabby compromise. It has no chance whatever of being approved by the present Senate.

But as I read the history of the founding of this Republic, the people intended to make themselves the exclusive repository of their fundamental rights. In their insistence upon a bill of rights, they specifically denied to the national government all power not expressly delegated. The American people in 1791 never intended that the President and the Senate should have any power to alter their unalienable rights by treaty, either for better or for worse. They excluded those rights from the power of government. If the American people feel the same way today, they will adopt a constitutional amendment limiting the scope of the treaty power. Should they, at some future time, desire to commit the protection of their inherent rights to the President and two-thirds of the Senate, they can say so by a further amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the wording of the dissenting opinion by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, concurred in by two other Justices, wherein he emphasized his dissent from the opinon of the majority of the Supreme Court, and his support of the President of the United States in connection with the President's alleged seizure power, upon the representation of the United States in the United Nations—a treaty. The implication is there very clearly that that strengthens the power of the executive and lessens the power of the people of the United States to protect themselves under the Bill of Rights. I grant you, Mr. President, that there is nc direct finding to that extent, but the emphasis laid upon the United Nations certainly supports and strengthens my position in insisting upon consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 130 and its ultimate enactment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under reservations heretofore made, and before the unanimous-consent agreement becomes effective, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

GERMAN PACTS MUST AND WILL BE PROMPTLY RATIFIED; THEY PROVIDE FURTHER FINE OPPORTUNITY FOR FOREIGN POLICY BIPARTISANSHIP; PRESIDENTIAL POLITICS MUST NOT BE ALLOWED TO INTERFERE WITH UNITED STATES UNITY AT WATER'S EDGE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I shall take the time of the Senate for but a short while today.

I rise to speak on the issue of bipartisan foreign policy, in general, and support of the German peace agreement and military protocol, in particular.

My remarks today supplement the two principal addresses which I have made within the last month and a half on the general challenge in America's foreign policy.

My first such speech was on Saturday, April 19. It was delivered before the convention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. That speech was reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following Monday.

My second such speech was on May 9, 1952, here in the Senate when I rose on behalf of Senate confirmation of the Foreign Relations Committee recommendations on the Mutual Security Act.

My initial address before the newspaper editors had been entitled "A Dynamic Foreign Policy for a Dynamic Age." At that time I stressed the fact that there were a great many elements in our program of international relations, upon which I felt that, as Americans—irrespective of other political party differences—we should be thoroughly unified.

I stated that the Republican Party had unfortunately not been consulted with regard to America's Asiatic program, but that, in respect to Europe, we definitely had been consulted, we definitely had given our support to it, and we definitely intended to continue that support, so that we Americans could be united "at the water's edge."

MUTUAL-AID DEBATE WAS ON SIZE OF PROGRAM, NOT ON PROGRAM ITSELF

Subsequently, on May 9, I spoke on behalf of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee version of the mutual security bill.

I stated my confidence that the Republican Party in the Senate, while no doubt having some strong internal and external differences as to the size of the funds, would vote to continue the bulk of the mutual aid.

My prediction and faith were well founded. That is evidenced by the fact that, although there was spirited debate on proposed slashes of up to a billion dollars, there was never the slightest question but that the mutual-aid bill in its broad outline and principle would be supported.

Yet, to hear some few people loosely talk, one would think that 45 of the 46 Republicans in the Senate had been all set to vote to kill mutual aid entirely. Actually, the entire CONGRESSIONAL RECORD debate shows that the basic differences were as to specific appropriations, specific authorizations and limitations.

The final Senate vote was overwhelming—64 for the bill to 10 against.

I DISCUSSED GERMAN PROBLEM AT FIRST HAND DURING RECENT TRIP

Now, Mr. President, I rise to speak today in order to renew my appeal and renew my personal dedication to bipartisan foreign policy. I base these particular suggestions today on my recent visit to Europe, in the course of which—(a) I conferred with members of the British Parliament in London. (b) I met with representatives of 12 nations in Noorwijk, Holland, where leaders of various denominations attended the International Conference of Christian Leadership. At the sessions both the Queen of Holland and the Queen Mother, Wilhelmina, spoke. (c) I attended the signing of the German Contractual Agreement in Bonn. (d) I had the occasion to speak with various members, including the President, of the German Bundestag and certain leaders of the West German Federal Republic, including Chancelor Adenauer.

I shall confine my remarks principally to the German problem because I think it contains a cross-section of the basic problems of our entire bipartisan foreign policy in Europe.

THERE SHOULD BE NO DILLY-DALLYING IN RATIFICATION

In my judgment, the Senate will and should act with reasonable swiftness in approving the two historic documents which have been laid before us. There must be no dilly-dallying or intentional, unjustified delays.

The first of the documents is the Anglo, French, and American Contractual Peace Agreement with West Germany.

The second is in the form of a protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty. It provides the protection of the mutual defense clause of the NATO alliance to Germany. Under this second agreement, we signify that if attacked from any quarter, all the 14 full-fledged members of the alliance will regard that attack on West Germany as an attack upon themselves.

Both the peace contract and the protocol are directly interrelated with the treaty—a great forward milestone—establishing the European Defense Community. That treaty in turn sets up a 6-nation European army. Such an army is supplemented by United States and British forces on the Continent.

It should be recognized that the ratification problem as faced by the United States is somewhat different from that faced by our allies. Only two of the formal agreements recently signed, require United States approval. France and Germany, on the other hand, must approve five separate pacts. All told, the some 15 governments concerned are involved in 47 separate ratification actions. These will probably take some 6 months.

I mention that fact because it underlines part of the story of the delicate and complex nature of these inter-governmental actions. Taken together, all the actions help to provide a pattern for future European strength and security.

Woe be to any group in any nation which lightly endangers that pattern.

GERMANY IS TEST OF BIPARTISAN POREIGN POLICY

It is my judgment that the German accords and ratification of them are further tests of American foreign policy.

We of the Senate will rise nobly to those tests. The Senate will thereby demonstrate that it recognizes that the battle for control of Europe can be won or lost in Germany.

Two facts are clear:

First. The great ideological battle for Western Europe is not won by a long shot. Communism is still on the march, and there is gradually rising the old specter of fascism in the form of extreme nationalism. Democratically inclined forces are being squeezed in between.

Second. Fortunately, however, neither is the battle for Europe lost by a long shot. We have made notable progress, thanks to our mutual-aid program. We may face the future with resolute faith and confidence.

I have seen Europe on several different occasions and I know how its former depressed spirit has been revitalized. So-called neutralism has diminished.

Now, Mr. President, in the past few weeks and months, there has been considerable debate here at home on foreign policy. Unfortunately, there has been indulgence in a certain amount of abuse and low-level reference to personalities. In my own discussions, I have always tried to keep and debate at the high level of principle, and I shall continue to try to do so.

By pointing up the principles and issues involved, in Germany, I hope to point up the principles and issues of American foreign policy.

REPUBLICAN PARTY HAS ALWAYS RECOGNIZED GERMANY'S SIGNIFICANCE

I believe that the people of America have generally recognized the significance of Germany in the European and world scene.

We of the Midwest who are fortunate to have so many German-American citizens, particularly appreciate, I believe, the importance of the land of their forefathers. We know of the tremendous vitality and energy of this great, industrious people, not to mention its superb contributions to the culture of the world. We know that if the marvelous talents and abilities of this people are channeled along constructive lines, then the world will be infinitely the better for it.

The Republican Party whose strength has always been in the Midwest has perhaps particularly understood the German problem. It is, incidentally, we of the Republican Party who were most critical of the reckless process of dismantling German factories, for example, during the early postwar years. It is little wonder therefore, that I believe that the Republican Party will join hands with the Democrats to vote ratification, as a nonpartisan step.

TALKS WITH GERMAN LEADERS

In the course of my recent trip, as on other trips, I spoke personally, as previously indicated, to leaders of the Western German Republic. I spoke to Chancelor Adenauer, that amazing, clear-sighted elder statesman who has so successfully "walked the tight rope," so to speak. I have spoken to the President of the Federal Republic, Theodore Heuss, and to leaders of the majority party of the German Bundestag. What are the facts, however, today?

First, Chancelor Adenauer, while still controlling the Bundestag, has lost control of the Bundesrat.

Second, the "neutralist" Socialists, under Dr. Schumacher, are making increasing inroads on Adenauer's strength.

Third, the extreme right-wing Nationalists, playing up certain traditional strong sentiments within the German consciousness, are increasing their strength.

Fourth, the Russians, ever the trouble makers, have stepped up their campaign against ratification of the agreements. They have caused serious disturbances in Berlin. They have cut the telephone communications between West and East Berlin. They have interfered with traffic into Berlin. They have caused constant rioting.

Mr. President, why do I bring that up? I bring it up because the battle for Europe is going to be won or lost right here, depending upon whether we are able to win Germany.

SOVIET PROPAGANDA EXCEEDINGLY EFFECTIVE

As usual, the poisonous propaganda masters have unleashed exceedingly effective propaganda. It, as a rule, appears along these lines:

First, "Send the AMIS home. We want no foreigners on German soil." "The German people have a right to be completely free of foreign troops, but the contractual agreement interferes with German sovereignty," they say.

Second, "Unify western and eastern zones." "So long as Germany is split, she will be weak." If she is unified, as the Soviet Union has so consistently propagandized—but has so insincerely sabotaged—then Germany will be strong.

By offering the bait of unification, the Russians have won considerable support among Germans who fail to recognize that the Russians would never permit free elections in the east zone.

Third, "Avoid the tremendous cost of rearmament." "Use our available budget to rebuild further our cities. Why tax ourselves to death just in order to build another huge army to defend the western zone?"

Fourth, again, they say, "let not Germany become a battleground." "Why should we permit ourselves to be smashed to pieces again by the forces of east and west? Let the Americans fight their third world war somewhere else."

These are four of the principal lines of poisonous thinking encouraged by the Russians.

SOMETIMES WE CONTRIBUTE TO RED PROPAGANDA

Now, Mr. President, I am frank to say that sometimes certain of us here in this country are guilty of contributing to and feeding the Russian propaganda mill.

Sometimes so-called American leaders make reckless, ill-considered statements to give the Germans to understand that we are irresponsible, that we do not intend to hold a line at the Elbe. "We will probably just retreat to the Rhine, or perhaps way back to the Pyrenees, and then we will use air power to smash to pieces everything in between," they imply.

They talk as if air power alone would be decisive and as if we didn't mind at all if Western Europe were occupied by an invading army. "Let them occupy it," some of our leaders seem to say. "We can shower down atomic bombs on Western Europe and blow their armies to pieces." The fact, however, that we would be blowing to pieces millions of Europeans does not seem to concern some of these so-called thinkers whose lung power on air power reduces our diplomatic power.

Now, Mr. President, reckless talk such as I have described is not a sound or fair approach either to win or keep allies, or to win and hold Europe. We do need land strength in Europe—strength to hold the line, strength to prevent invasion and occupation. We have made our contribution in the form of six divisions.

There is a limit, of course, to our military land strength—as well as our unfortunately weak air strength. We cannot disperse it all over the world. But we can make, have made, and will make our contribution to the effort to hold the line. The issue now is whether we can bring Germany into line.

OTHER GLOBAL DANGER SPOTS

Now, Mr. President, let me further point out a few further facts on this global scene.

First. In Italy, the Communist Party, dynamic, active, is hatching new plans of treachery. Italy possesses the strongest single Communist Party in all of Europe—with 2,000,000 members.

Second. In the south of Italy, however, there has been a strong recurrence of fascism—with many cities being taken over by Mussolini's old followers. That is a grim commentary on the sacrifices of the Americans who died at Anzio and Salerno trying to liberate Italy from Mussolini's fascism.

Third. In France, the Communist vote hit 5,500,000 and there are over 200,000 Communist Party members. The Renault plant riots demonstrate Red "activism."

Fourth. In England, Mr. Bevan's wing of the Labor Party has been increasingly effective in selling more of the British people on the proposition that Britain is contributing "too much" to the rearmament effort and that she should devote more of her funds for welfare purposes.

These are but a few of the grim realities which we face.

STATESMEN PILLORIED FOR ANY CONCESSIONS TO FOREIGNERS

In my judgment, those far-sighted statesmen of Western Europe who have so ably cooperated with us, men like Foreign Minister Schuman, of France; Dr. Adenauer, of Germany; Premier de Gasperi, of Italy; Prime Minister Churchill, deserve the deepest thanks of our people and the warmest regards of their own and all Allied peoples.

Every one of these outstanding leaders is being pilloried every single day for making concessions at all to the foreigners, to the United States.

Yet, here in this country there are some people who act as if these foreign leaders had made no concessions whatsoever in the common cause of peace. Actually, these men have invariably gone about as far as they felt they could go toward compromising on all significant issues, without compromising basic principles. They must ultimately answer to their own electorate.

They would not and do not intend to become puppets of America; and we would not think for one moment of having them be our puppets. We believe in the independence, the sovereignty, and the integrity of our allies, unlike Soviet Russia, which does want her satellites to be her complete slaves.

I ask my colleagues in the Senate and the American people as a whole to understand this situation. In my opinion, the course history is to take will be determined by the events of the next few weeks. I ask them to "put themselves in the shoes" of these fine leaders and of the great masses of their people who believe in them.

LET US NOT BECOME PEDDLERS OF HATE

I do not ask that we abandon our own firm policies and place any undue reliance on any foreign leader. But I do ask for a maximum of mutual faith among men deserving of such faith. Let us not become peddlers of suspicion, of hatred, of jealousy against the other fellow—simply because he talks a different language from our own or simply because of any other arbitrary factor. Let us live our Christian faith—not just talk it.

The remaining months of 1952, as well as 1953, may be crucial from the standpoint of the security of Western Europe. In 1953, elections are to be held in Western Germany. Certain observers have predicted that Dr. Adenauer's party may lose its slim majority. If the Socialist forces of Doctor Schumacher gain power, then we will really be in for major problems, endangering the entire basis of the western alliance.

The Germans, in trying to play both ends against the middle, could cause violent reactions in already deeply concerned countries like France. We know that France has a deep and almost inborn fear of a possible new aggressive Germany, and that if the supernationalistic spirit should once again come to dominate Germany, the question of France's entire cooperation would be at stake.

We know that France has seen some of her finest blood drained in the jungles of Indochina, that her economy is strained close to the breaking point.

And so, I repeat, if Western Germany is lost to the alliance, whether it be lost by an internal overturn or by external forces, the entire peace of Europe could be out of the window. The problem before us is that of holding the line, of promoting unity and of cementing the bonds among those who have been our allies and who think as we do in regard to economic, political, and religious matters.

ON EUROPEAN UNITY DEPENDS PEACE

It is my earnest hope and prayer that this will not come about. I believe that the fundamental mass of the German people realize that in the direction of unity with France, Italy, and the Benelux nations lies the hope for Germany and for the world.

General Eisenhower, in his recent remarks, has emphasized the necessity for maintaining the fabric of European unity. On the other hand, he has pointed out and affirmed the sound justification for Republican criticism of those United States-Asiatic policies which have brought us to the present Korean impasse.

But he has not permitted his eyes to be blinded to the fact, and I trust we will not permit our eyes to be blinded to the fact—that there has been bipartisan unity and success in Europe, and we intend to keep it so.

MANY DANGER SPOTS IN EUROPE

I have concentrated thus far on the Bonn and Paris agreements, but it is quite clear that there are a great many other danger spots, financial, political, military, in other parts of Europe. We know that the British financial position, for example, is worsening, that the pound sterling has been endangered. We know of the continual problem brought about by the rivalry of Marshal Tito's Yugoslavia and our Italian ally over Trieste, and of other problems.

I could go on adding references to other dilemmas which we face, but they all boil down to this fact: Let us not lose our heads in this political election year or any year. Let us not loosely tamper with steps toward unity which have been dreamed of for centuries and which have been facilitated by the sacrifices in blood, sweat, and tears of the Second World War.

Let us not irresponsibly say anything or do anything which weakens our good friends abroad or which strengthens their enemies. It would be tragic indeed, if anything were said or done here which would cause the downfall of a friendly Allied Government.

We have a grave responsibility on our shoulders.

Never before have communications conveyed so rapidly a single word, a single slur, a single idea which can be misinterpreted in the far corners of the earth.

Talk is cheap, Mr. President, but it can do great harm. This does not mean that we must in the slightest limit our debate or deny any American his right to say what he pleases. It does mean, however, that in the process of saying what he pleases, we have the opportunity of using our highest discretion, our ablest judgment.

I, for one, intend to continue to do my part on behalf of bipartisan foreign policy. I shall urge that my colleagues do likewise.

I appeal to both of the major Republican presidential candidates to recognize the critical challenges of the hour. I have a tremendousiy high respect and admiration for both of them. I trust that neither they nor their ardent supporters will permit the foreign policy issue to become a football, to the resulting detriment of American unity and the cause of world security and peace.

I have previously indicated that I am frankly deeply desirous that the Republican Party win the presidential and congressional elections. However, I want to reiterate with all the power at my command, that I do not want my party or any party mistakenly to presume that it can and should win the election by indulgence in an unjustified attack on programs which we ourselves have previously approved.

LET US NOT WILLFULLY FORGET OUR PREVIOUS SUPPORT

I do not want any Republican, or for that matter, any Democrat to commit what might be called willful amnesia, willful forgetfulness of the past. I want all of us to remember the fact that we Republicans and Democrats have supported European bipartisan foreign policy. We supported the U. N. Charter which passed by a vote of 89 to 2; the North Atlantic Treaty by 82–13, and so on down the line. There are 46 of us Republicans in the Senate. We can be proud of our record of enlightened cooperation on patriotic issues. Let us not forget that record. I believe that it is sound Americanism to be united at the water's edge and that it is good party policy, as well.

I shall urge the platform committee of the Republican National Convention to adopt a strong bipartisan foreign policy plank—one based not upon merely glib generalities or high-sounding phrases, but one based upon sincere, specific support of the basic elements of our European unity program.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7314) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture—Title I—Regular activities—Agricultural Marketing Act (RMA—Title II)," on page 2, line 7, after the word "Department," to strike out "$5,250,000" and insert "$5,260,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Agricultural Economics," on page 3, line 16, after the word "trends", to strike out "$2,320,500" and insert "$2,455,000."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I desire to speak with reference to the amendment, which I understand is on page 3, line 16, which is under the subhead "Bureau of Agricultural Economics"——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is controlled by the minority leader and by the chairman of the committee. Who is yielding time to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. FERGUSON. The minority leader will yield time. He is not present at the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the time being used by the Senator from Michigan will be charged against the minority leader.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the bill provides for conducting investigations and for acquiring and diffusing useful information among the people of the United States, relative to agricultural production, and so forth. The House provided an appropriation of $2,320,500. The Senate has increased it by $134,500.

It is the opinion of the Senator from Michigan that the House figure should be adopted; that is, that the amount should be $2,320,500. The increase in the appropriation for economic investigations by the Bureau of Agricultural

Economics was voted by the committee primarily for the conduct of economic investigations in irrigation areas.

The reason why I rise to speak in opposition to the amendment is because I do not believe the Department of Agriculture should specialize in economic research only in areas of irrigation. The justification supplied by the Department itself contains these words:

> The farm problems to which the Department programs are directed should receive services on a uniform basis, irrespective of whether the farming is carried on with or without irrigation, and irrespective of whether irrigation water is supplied by Federal projects or otherwise.

That statement is directly contradictory of the spirit of the committee amendment.

I share the view of the Department of Agriculture that the farm problems to which the Department programs are directed should receive services on a uniform basis irrespective of whether the farming is carried on with or without irrigation and irrespective of whether irrigation water is supplied by Federal projects or by private projects. If we are going to have research work carried on, it should be performed for all the farmers of the Nation rather than on a specialized basis favoring a few or prejudicing a few.

I hope the Senate will vote for the House figure.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this item is covered by the budget estimate. Members of the committee from irrigation States were very insistent that the House reduction be restored. The argument was made that there are specific economic problems in connection with irrigated areas which do not apply generally throughout the country. It was impressed on the committee that there was a very clear and definite need for economic studies to determine the most profitable size and type of farms under varying conditions in reclaimed areas. The House committtee, in effect, approved the activity and said that the work should be carried on. In its report, however, it stated that it was thought it should be done with funds appropriated to the Department of the Interior.

It developed that the Department of Agriculture, through the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, has always done this work, and that the Department of the Interior had no facilities for doing it. The question whether the work should be done is one that addresses itself to the discretion of the Senate. Members of the committee from irrigated areas were most insistent that it was valuable work, very beneficial to those who are taking up irrigated lands, and would be helpful not only to farmers, but also to the Government, in providing for orderly liquidation of irrigated projects.

I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will treat this farm project as a 48-State project rather than on the basis of favoring those living in a particular section, whether they be engaged in irrigation farming or dry farming. We included in the report an earmarking which provides $134,500 for a specific investigation. I hope the vote on the amendment will be "no," thus allowing the House figure to stand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I do not believe we should legislate with so few Senators on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hayden	Moody
Bridges	Hendrickson	O'Mahoney
Butler, Nebr.	Hill	Robertson
Connally	Hoey	Russell
Cordon	Hunt	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Ives	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kem	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Kilgore	Sparkman
Ellender	Long	Stennis
Ferguson	McClellan	Thye
Flanders	McFarland	Tobey
Frear	McKellar	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CASE, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NIXON, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. PASTORE, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. WELKER entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the amendment which is about to be voted on——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time in opposition has been consumed in the calling of the quorum.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has approximately 14 minutes remaining. I am sure he will yield some time to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I merely wish to explain what the Senate is voting on. The committee amendment is on page 3, line 16. The amendment increases the appropriation for economic investigations for the Bureau of Agricultural Economics by $134,500.

The increase was voted by the committee primarily for the conduct of economic investigations in irrigation areas and I rise to oppose the amendment because I do not believe that the Department of Agriculture should specialize its economic research just in areas of irrigation.

The justification supplied by the Department of Agriculture itself contains these words:

> The farm problems to which the Department's programs are directed should receive service on a uniform basis irrespective of whether the farming is carried on with or without irrigation and irrespective of whether irrigation water is supplied by Federal projects or otherwise.

This statement is directly contradictory to the spirit of this committee amendment which is an increase over the House figure of $134,500. The House allowed a smaller sum. The Senate has earmarked the $134,500 for this work in irrigation areas only, which, as I stated before, is in direct contradiction to what the Department of Agriculture has recommended.

Therefore, I hope that the House figure will be retained and that the figure in the bill will be the figure which the House allowed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arizona, or as much time as he may require.

Mr. HAYDEN. Heretofore the Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior has been doing the work of advising farmers with respect to the cultivation of crops upon new lands being brought under irrigation. Complaint was made that those in irrigation areas were not getting the information from

the Department of Interior, and that the Department of Agriculture could give better instructions with respect to crops, and so forth, it being better qualified than the Department of the Interior in that respect. Therefore to the two Departments entered into an interdepartmental agreement whereby the Interior Department will no longer engage in this kind of work and spend money for the program, and the Department of Agriculture will do the work exclusively. That is satisfactory to everyone concerned.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Has a corresponding reduction been made in the appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation?

Mr. HAYDEN. I cannot say at the moment whether it has been made. But I read what the hearings on the pending bill show, at page 80:

> Pursuant to that understanding with the Department of the Interior, within the past 12 or 18 months we have secured from the Department of the Interior data and information which expressed their opinion as to the need for the Department of Agriculture's activities in connection with their projects.

The Senator from South Dakota will appreciate the fact that special considerations are involved when new land is brought under cultivation and irrigation, particularly with respect to what kind of crops should be planted, and so forth. The Department of Agriculture can be very helpful in that respect.

Mr. CASE. I have always felt that the Department of Agriculture probably could be very helpful in that respect. Such procedure is provided for under the Water Conservation and Utility Act, which provides that the Department of Agriculture shall make the investigations.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the amendment is agreed to, the Department of Agriculture will do the work from now on.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not correct to say that if the specific amount is not earmarked the Department of Agriculture will still have the right to do the work, if they think it ought to be done, out of the $2,320,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; but that covers economic investigations over the entire Nation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; it should cover the whole United States.

Mr. HAYDEN. But where there are involved special problems incident to bringing in new land, which require a special kind of work to be done, it can be done better by the Department of Agriculture than by the Department of the Interior. Therefore we ought to give the Department of Agriculture this sum of money to do that work.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. If we had assurance that the amount of money would be taken away from the bureau in the other Department, there would be much to commend the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall look into the matter when we mark up the appropriation bill for the Interior Department, which is now in process.

Mr. FERGUSON. If I may have the attention of the Senator from South Dakota for a moment, I should like to say that we should not start to earmark funds provided for the Department of Agriculture to conduct investigations of this kind in particular areas. That is the point. The Department of Agriculture can do this work, but we should not earmark an amount for certain areas. As the Department itself says, "The farm problems to which the Department's programs are directed should receive service on a uniform basis irrespective of whether the farming is carried on with or without irrigation and irrespective of whether irrigation water is supplied by Federal projects or otherwise."

Mr. President, we should go along with the House figure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3, line 16.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Experiment Stations," on page 7, line 8, after the name "Alaska", to strike out "$62,500" and insert "$75,000", and in line 12, after the name "Puerto Rico", to strike out "$12,441,208" and insert "$12,453,708."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 5, to insert:

> VIRGIN ISLANDS AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM
>
> For expenses necessary to carry out an agricultural program in the Virgin Islands in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 228, approved October 29, 1951, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle, $100,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. The amendment on page 8 provides funds necessary to carry out an agricultural program in the Virgin Islands, in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 228, approved October 29, 1951, including the purchase of one vehicle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has a Senator in control of time yielded time to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I am very glad to yield sufficient time to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The amendment provides $100,000 for expenses of carrying out an agricultural program in the Virgin Islands.

Since 1932 the Department of the Interior has operated a research station on the islands and this appropriation is apparently designed to affect a transfer of those functions from the Interior to the Department of Agriculture.

It looks to me as if this appropriation is very much in line with the old "if you don't succeed, try, try again" spirit of operation. The Department of the Interior tried for 20 years and then gave up as a bad job. So the Department of Agriculture is ready to try and try again. But I wonder how many trys this country can afford to finance.

Mr. President, in addition to these factors, we find an item in the Department of the Interior budget, which is now under consideration, of $91,000 for the Virgin Islands Corporation revolving fund for this same purpose.

In the appropriation for the Interior Department we find that a further reduction of $14,000 has been made in the program of grants in support of soil- and water-conservation work, the promotion and development of the tourist trade, and agricultural aids.

The amount allowed for these purposes is $130,000, the same appropriation that was allowed by the House for 1952.

Mr. President, we should certainly not allow the $100,000 with which to start a new project at this time in the Virgin Islands. The work should be carried out by the Department of the Interior. I hope the committee amendment will be rejected.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this appropriation is proposed to be made pursuant to Public Law 228, which was approved October 29, 1951. That is a new enactment which transfers all agricultural research work in the Virgin Islands from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture.

I freely concede that the Virgin Islands Corporation did not do a very good job with agriculture in the Virgin Islands. I am not saying that the Department of Agriculture will make agriculture flourish in the Virgin Islands, but at this time the research and experimental work which has been done in agriculture in the Virgin Islands, in an effort to make the islands productive, has been transferred from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture. Therefore, if any research work in agriculture is to be carried on in the Virgin Islands, the Senate should approve this amendment. I believe it is justified.

We have a responsibility to the people of the Virgin Islands, which the United States purchased from Denmark during World War I. Those islands have not been a very productive asset to the United States; we have had to pour out many million dollars for them.

The purpose of the amendment is to make those islands self-sustaining. I think the amendment should be adopted.

The standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has approved this item of the bill, and this amendment has the approval of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the members of which are thoroughly familiar with the conditions existing in the Virgin Islands.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. My understanding is that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] made a trip to the Virgin Islands, and that the legislation to which the Senator from Georgia has just referred was enacted primarily upon the recommendation of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had in mind the trip the Senator from Nebraska made there, and the fact that he and the other

members of the committee thought this appropriation should be made.

I do not see how we can justify making similar appropriations for each of the 48 States, and for Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, and yet refuse an appropriation which is designed to insure the very existence of the Virgin Islands.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Georgia will recall that the Virgin Islands Corporation has been superseded by a completely new organization which was created by a law passed within the past 2 or 3 years.

The new corporation is headed, as chairman of the Board, by the head of the Willys-Overland Automobile Co. The new corporation has opened up a completely new agricultural operation on St. Croix, and is actually doing work on the ground.

The funds provided by this committee amendment for the agricultural experiment station there are needed, for the new organization is entirely separate from the Virgin Islands Corporation. The work was originally under the direction of the Department of the Interior, but under the new arrangement it will be under the direction of the Department of Agriculture. That experimental work is exactly the same in type as the experimental work which is conducted in the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the sentiment I undertook to convey when I said that similar work is carried on by the Federal Government in each of the 48 States and in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, and I do not see how we can in good conscience deny the benefits of that research to the people of the Virgin Islands.

So, Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I am entirely in agreement with the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 8, beginning in line 6.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this amendment would authorize the beginning of work on a new type of project in the Virgin Islands. The Virgin Islands are a possession into which we have poured millions and millions and millions of dollars since we took over the islands.

The Department of the Interior has conducted the work of this type there, and now the work has been transferred to the Department of Agriculture.

I see no reason for beginning a new project under new direction. So I hope the committee amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 8, beginning in line 6.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Animal Industry—Salaries and expenses," on page 10, line 18, after the word "products", to strike out "$13,660,000" and insert "$14,260,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry", on page 11, line 12, after the word "thereof", to strike out "$7,500,000" and insert "$7,550,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering," on page 12, line 5, after the word "airplanes", to strike out "$11,330,000" and insert "$11,590,000, including not to exceed $15,000 for construction of an addition to the United States Cotton Ginning Branch Laboratory at Mesilla Park, N. Mex."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask that this amendment be passed over for the time being, inasmuch as a Senator who is very much interested in this item is temporarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine—Salaries and expenses," on page 16, line 14, after "(7 U. S. C. 147a)", to strike out "$2,700,000" and insert "$2,759,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Control of forest pests," on page 17, line 18, after "(16 U. S. C., Supp. I, 594–1–594–5)", to strike out $3,250,000" and insert "$3,625,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 1, after "(16 U. S. C. 594a)", to strike out "$3,300,000" and insert "$3,650,000"; in line 7, after the word "States", to strike out "$1,750,000" and insert "$1,981,500", and in line 10, after the word "and", to strike out "$1,045,000" and insert "$1,163,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest Service—Salaries and expenses," on page 21, line 17, after the word "forests," to strike out "$29,400,000" and insert "$29,848,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest roads and trails," on page 23, line 2, after the word "administration", to strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$13,000,000."

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I oppose this committee amendment, and I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. FERGUSON. This amendment calls for the appropriation of $13,000,000 for the administration of the forest roads and trails. The amount voted by the House of Representatives was $10,000,000, but the Senate committee has voted to increase it to $13,000,000. I hope the Senate will reject the committee amendment, and will vote for the amount voted by the House of Representatives, namely, $10,000,000.

The additional money is needed, according to the justification, in order to build new timber-access roads, to the extent of $1,300,000. The best information available to me at this time indicates that there is really no pressing need for development roads into this timber area because there is no need for the timber itself.

Furthermore, this appropriation has an unobligated balance, estimated to amount to $3,569,420, according to the Department's justification. It would appear that the appropriation as voted by the House, plus this unobligated balance of more than $3,000,000, would certainly be adequate to provide for the development of these roads and trails.

Mr. President, if we allow the Forest Service to have the use of the unobligated balance, and if we also vote at this time for a further appropriation of $13,000,000 for this purpose, we shall be making available for that purpose a total of $16,569,420.

From the facts in this case it would appear that the $10,000,000 provided by the House, plus the carry-over of the unobligated funds—the two combined amounting to more than $13,000,000—certainly would be all the Forest Service would need for this purpose.

So I hope the Senate will reject the committee amendment, and will vote to make the appropriation for this item $10,000,000. Of course, the unobligated balance will continue to be available for this purpose to the Forest Service.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the committee recommends that the appropriation for this purpose be made in the full amount of the budget item relating to forest development roads and trails.

The purpose of the committee was to provide new roads in the national forests, in order that we might be able to derive the revenue from the sale of timber which now is located in areas that are inaccessible.

The amount called for by the committee amendment does appear to be a large sum of money, at a casual glance; but we must bear in mind that $10,000,000 is scarcely sufficient to provide for the maintenance of the present roads and trails. In the forests there are 107,700 miles of roads and 127,000 miles of trails which are usable during the forest-fire season. A number of States do not have as many miles of highway as that. Therefore, it is obvious that the amount here requested is not an excessive amount for maintenance.

The construction of new roads and trails will increase the revenue to the Treasury. It is anticipated that for the present fiscal year the revenue from the national forests will be in the neighborhood of $65,000,000. That is a considerable sum of money. It is much more than we have ever collected heretofore in any 1 year from the national forests. Through the granting of this appropriation we shall be able, in the fiscal year 1954, to increase greatly the return from the national forests.

It would also be helpful in another way, Mr. President. We have in our national forests at the present time great areas of down timber, timber blown down by wind storms. That timber is deteriorating very rapidly. The construction of these roads and trails would

make it possible to market that timber and prevent it from becoming a complete loss.

This matter is within the discretion of the Senate. The committee thought it a desirable appropriation. When we hear about the large sum that is involved, let us bear in mind that the entire amount practically is consumed on the maintenance of the present system. If we are to extend the system to reach this merchantable timber, timber that is deteriorating in value from year to year, it is necessary to allow the increase suggested by the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. It has been suggested that the amount of money which would be received from the timber sales would help pay this sum, but there is nothing in the law requiring that the amount spent on these roads shall become a factor in determining the value of the timber sales. Would it not therefore be a good idea to allow the contractor, or the purchaser of the timber, to build his own access road for the purpose of getting the timber out in any way he desires?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, as the Senator well knows, that argument has been made for a number of years. The Forest Service insists that there are comparatively few bidders who are able to build the roads, and that when the timber is sold with the provision that the bidder is to build the roads, the result is the loss of a considerable amount of money, because of the lack of competition among those who are able to bid for the timber. When the Forest Service itself builds the roads it can split up the timber into lots, thereby bringing in more bidders and obtaining a higher price. At least, that was the evidence which was adduced before the committee.

The testimony was that the Forest Service has constantly insisted that it is a very extravagant policy to deal with but two or three contractors, or with the small number of contractors who would be able to build the roads. They could form a closed corporation and beat down the price of the timber on the stump, whereas if the road has already been constructed, many more bidders enter the field, and thus much higher prices are received.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not also a fact that we are allowing the Department $10,000,000, when they have a carry-over which is in excess of $3,560,000? Is it not also a fact that we are confronted with deficit spending, and that on this one item we have an opportunity to save $3,000,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. The argument can be made, and it has some appeal, but by opening up these areas revenues will be increased and deficit spending will be decreased, by reason of the fact that large areas of timber not now available will be brought into the market, and would prevent a great deal of waste in the case of this timber. The Senator from Michigan, of course, is entitled to the opinion he expresses, but the majority of the committee thought this would be a wise and prudent investment and that it would pay large returns because of the opportunity which would be afforded to increase the sale and marketing of timber.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I merely want to say a few words with respect to this appropriation. This is one of the few opportunities the Congress of the United States has of taking money from the Treasury in order to bring more money back to the Treasury. To me that is economy. To me it is sound to spend $1 in order to get $3 or $5. The Government has 175,000,000 acres in its national forests. Particularly in the West, there are the last stands of a primeval forest, the really merchantable timber. The Government has title to it. It can translate the price into dollars in the Treasury, or it can leave the trees there and lose them and have nothing for the Treasury.

The money proposed to be provided by this appropriation will build roads to timber, and when the timber is sold, it it will be sold at a price which will return to the Treasury the particular dollars used to build the roads, and, on top of that, it will return the full value of the timber itself, timber which otherwise would not be sold. Somewhere along the road, Mr. President, I hope the Congress of the United States will understand that if it is going to have the Government in business, it must operate it like a business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Acquisition of lands for national forests," on page 23, after line 17, to insert:

WEEKS ACT

For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), $75,000, to be available only for payment toward the purchase price of any lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in connection with such acquisition.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 5, to insert:

SPECIAL ACTS

For the acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior boundaries of the following national forests, in accordance with the provisions of the following acts authorizing annual appropriations of forest receipts for such purposes, and in not to exceed the following amounts from such receipts: Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, Utah, act of August 26, 1935 (Public Law 337), as amended, $39,830; Cache National Forest, Utah, act of May 11, 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, $10,000; San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests, Riverside County, Calif., act of June 15, 1938 (Public Law 634), as amended, $22,000; Nevada and Toiyabo National Forests, Nevada, act of June 25, 1938 (Public Law 748), as amended, $10,000; Angeles National Forest, California, act of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 591), $20,000; Cleveland National Forest, San Diego County, Calif., act of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 589), $5,000; Sequoia National Forest, California, act of June 17, 1940 (Public Law 637), $34,850; in all, $141,680.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Flood prevention," on page 26, line 19, after the word "expended," to strike out "$7,750,000" and insert "$7,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask that this amendment go over temporarily. The Senator from Oklahoma, who is interested in this amendment, is not on the floor at the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Soil Conservation Service—Salaries and expenses," on page 28, line 12, after the word "employees", to strike out "$60,210,000" and insert "$60,610,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WELKER. I object to the committee amendment, and I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on page 3 of the pending bill there is an item very similar to this, which the Senate has adopted. I say it is similar, because it provides for the earmarking of funds for irrigation areas. The Senator from Michigan feels that percentagewise certainly $400,000 is a comparatively small amount. We are dealing in large figures here. The House allowed $60,210,000, which the committee amendment would increase by $400,000. While $400,000 may seem to be a small amount, when we are dealing with $60,000,000, yet there is again a question of the principle involved, namely, the earmarking of this particular money for work in reclamation project areas.

The committee amendment provides for an additional $400,000 for technical assistance. That is somewhat like the point 4 program. It would provide technical assistance in specific areas within this country. Representatives of the Department of Agriculture—and this is the agricultural bill—expressed the opinion that funds in this bill should not be earmarked, but should be used for the benefit of all farmers, regardless of whether they rely upon rainfall or whether they draw water from private wells, their own private irrigation systems, or from a public irrigation project. I think that this is one of the items which the Senate should not include in the appropriation.

If farmers need technical assistance and we give the Department $60,000,000, we should not earmark $400,000 for a particular group of farmers. Whether the farmer gets his water from the Lord or whether he gets it from Uncle Sam, we should be consistent and require the Agriculture Department to provide the assistance from the $60,000,000, wherever it thinks such assistance should be afforded.

I hope the vote will be against the amendment. Certainly, under any circumstances, $400,000 is too much of an increase for this particular item.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield me a minute or two?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the senior Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this matter was very thoroughly gone into by the committee. I read from the justification:

> It was proposed with the remaining $400,000 involved in the House reduction to provide technical assistance to new irrigation farm operators in reclamation project areas. The Service is already providing some assistance to the farmers in the particular areas that are in soil conservation districts. However, the workload is very heavy and additional technicians are needed to speed up planning and lay-out work. The same help is also needed by new settlers in project areas that are not yet included in soil conservation districts. The great need in all these areas is to make technical help available to the farmers at the time they begin irrigation farming so that each can make a start with an irrigation system planned and laid out to fit the particular needs of his land and that will protect it. If it is necessary for the farmer to proceed with developing his farm without technical assistance, the job may have to be done over again at a later date.

That confirms the statement which was made years ago to the effect that it took, so to speak, three crops of settlers finally to develop the country, that the first two would try and fail, and the third would succeed. We are opening up to veterans vast areas of land, particularly in the State of Washington, in the Columbia Basin project. A man who wishes to settle there must be a veteran; he must have had previous farm experience; he must have at least $3,000 in cash in order to be entitled to participate in the drawing. These men come from all parts of the Nation into a perfectly new country. They need help in order that they may firmly establish themselves in an entirely new environment where they face conditions to which they are unaccustomed. That was true of the Yuma Mesa project in Arizona, where the farms were drawn by lot by veterans from all over the Nation. The Department of Agriculture is much better qualified to help them than is the Reclamation Service. A very large area of new land is being made available for agricultural uses throughout the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is there anything in the law today to prohibit the use of the $60,000,000 for this work, instead of earmarking a portion of it? That is what I am objecting to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Of course, it would not be necessary to earmark it if these projects did not happen to be in an arid region of the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. If they did not happen to be located where Uncle Sam is furnishing the wherewithal. What is the difference between a farmer there and a farmer who seeks to go from the city to a farm in some other locality and who must get aid from the $60,000,000? Why should the few irrigation States be singled out and given money that must be used for a particular purpose, whether the Agriculture Department thinks it should be taken out of Federal funds or not?

Mr. HAYDEN. Provision is made in the budget estimate to take care of this special situation. It is to assist primarily new settlers, many of whom have not had irrigation experience. We wish them to stay on the land and not make a lot of mistakes. I think it is money well spent for very worthy persons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.]

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask for a division, Mr. President.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Production and Marketing Administration—Conservation and use of agricultural land resources," on page 30, line 21, after the word "States", to strike out "$250,000,000" and insert "$251,754,142."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 2, after the word "inclusive", to strike out the comma and "of which amount $2,500,000 shall be available for technical assistance in formulating and carrying out agricultural conservation practices and $1,000,000 shall be available for conservation practices related directly to flood prevention work in approved watersheds"; and in line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$26,754,142."

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, was the amendment on page 30, line 22, agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I have been asked to object to the committee amendment appearing in line 22, page 30. The clerk was reading so fast, and I was turning the pages and could not keep up with him.

I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, a year ago when I was going through my first experience with an appropriation bill, I was amazed to discover that the recommendation of a responsible farm organization, taking the very leaderlike position that it was time for the farmers themselves to suggest ways in which the cost of Government could be cut, was completely ignored. They have made a similar recommendation this year, but apparently it has been rejected by the committee. I should be derelict in connection with the farmers of my State if I did not on this occasion inform the Senate that there is a very substantial feeling among Utah farmers that the recommendation should have been accepted, and that this particular organization, at least, actually represents the feeling of its members.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, when we reach page 32, line 12, I intend to offer an amendment to reduce the item $100,000,000. It is in line with the recommendation of the farm organizations. It is not so deep a reduction as some farm organizations have suggested. The only reason it is done for 1953 instead of 1952 is that most farmers have completed the practices which will be paid for out of the item already carried in the bill and authorized last year.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to say that I shall propose an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, reducing the item $50,000,000 more and making it $100,000,000, which is what the Farm Bureau Federation advises it should be.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I do not want to get on my feet again, and since I have a few minutes left, I should like to complete my purpose, which is to tell the Members of the Senate that a survey was made in one of the richest agricultural activities in Utah, among the farmers themselves, who were asked the specific question whether they would be in favor of the reduction of soil conservation payments.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to say that on page 30 of the bill is an item for a purpose in connection with which contracts have already been made. It always places the Appropriations Committee in the very embarrassing position, after having authorized the use of money to be told, as in the case of the highway agency, that the money has already been used. On page 30 the amendment controlling the item to which the Senator from Utah refers has already been agreed to.

The old saying is, "The milk has been spilled," and nothing can be done about it; the water is over the dam. The item on page 32 is milk that is still in the pail. We can do something about it. We can arrange so that we will not spill it, or we can put in a dam to keep the water from running away.

Mr. BENNETT. Apparently, in my eagerness, I am 2 pages ahead, but I should still like the privilege of finishing my statement, which will have equal application to the material on page 32.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the amendment on page 30, line 22 was agreed to is reconsidered.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Senator.

In one community, of the number of farmers asked, 294 farmers favored cutting direct conservation payments to farmers. Only 41 were opposed to it. Twenty-five could not make up their minds.

I personally stirred this matter up because last year I had been told that while the organization stood for one thing, the individual farmers stood for another.

Mr. President, I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as the conclusion of my remarks, an editorial entitled "Who Cares What the Farmers Say" published in the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City, on May 13 last. The editorial contains the figures I have just mentioned and also an expression of the attitude of the people toward the importance of reducing soil-conservation payments.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO CARES WHAT THE FARMERS SAY?

Members of the House who recently approved intact a $250,000,000 budget bill for the Department of Agriculture—after long debate filling 31 closely printed pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—ought to know what people are thinking up in Cache Valley.

Especially Congressman POLK, from Ohio. Mr. POLK took occasion during the grueling argument to say that he had talked with "many" farmers and that not one of them wanted to see the agricultural budget cut, as has been proposed by the National Farm Bureau in the interests of economy in Government. He said he doubted whether the Farm Bureau leaders really represent the wishes of Farm Bureau members—thus parroting a groundless argument of the National Farmers' Union discussed on this page a few days ago.

Certainly Mr. POLK ought to listen to the farmers up in Cache Valley. Up there Farm Bureau officers presented their case for economy in a series of 13 community meetings. This is the way the voting went:

On one question 296 farmers said they were willing to accept a reduction in agricultural appropriations. Fifty-one said they were not willing. Eight were undecided.

More specifically, 294 favored cutting of direct conservation payments to farmers. Forty-one were opposed. Twenty-five could not make up their minds.

That voting record is open—available for public inspection. The Cache folks know each other and they know how their neighbors feel. There is no chance for vote rigging. The record is clear. Cache County farmers want economy in Government. They are more concerned about stopping the socialistic trend of Government than they are about pocketing the subsidy hand-outs the Government is so anxious to give them.

But maybe those Cache farmers don't know what's good for them. That's the idea our own Congressman GRANGER offered as his contribution to the debate.

"It is generous, I admit, on the part of the Farm Bureau to make this gesture of willingness to have the appropriation cut," Mr. Granger admitted, "but I do not concede that they know any more than I do of what the farmers of this country need."

Six out of seven Cache County Farm Bureau members said they do not want handouts. They say they want to do the job themselves. But these men are only farmers. You couldn't expect them to know what is best for their own farms. Needless to say, Congressman GRANGER voted against any cuts in the appropriation.

Aside from the fact that we are at war and that the very economic foundations of our Nation are threatened by Government spending, there is an important reason why farmers should resist this type of direct subsidy. The section outlining conservation payments to farmers also includes the threat of complete Government control. To participate in the program, the farmer must comply with acreage requirements—limitations imposed only on tobacco and peanuts at the present time, but which could be multiplied indefinitely.

It is time for action. As is always the case with Government, the soil conservation program is swelling rapidly, at the expense of the taxpayer. Only 4 years ago, the country was spending less for all soil conservation, including the complete Soil Conservation Service, than it now proposes to spend for the direct subsidy alone.

So far, the House has considered 10 budget bills. It has made substantial slashes in eight. Only the Department of Agriculture and a bill financing flood, river and harbor work of the Army Engineers have escaped the knife. How can this be, in view of the fact that the Nation's strongest farm group asks economy at its own sacrifice?

Maybe the voices of those sturdy and self-reliant Cache Valley farmers will yet be heard when the Senate goes to work on the agricultural appropriation. Let's hope so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, what I propose to do is to strike out the increase and revert to the original figure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will have to get time from the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be glad to yield time to the Senator from Illinois, but, as I understand, under the unanimous consent agreement the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] has already used all the time that was available.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, is it necessary for a Senator to have time in order to propose an amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is operating under a unanimous consent agreement.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from New Mexico has not proposed an amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. He rises to propose an amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thought the Senator said he was opposed to the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; he is proposing an amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I beg the pardon of the Senator from New Mexico. I regret very much that I stirred him so deeply. I misunderstood the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the right to offer an amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not quite certain of the technical form in which I should offer my amendment. I thought perhaps what I should do was to reduce the total amount of $251,000,000. The original provision was for $250,000,000, and I should like to have a parliamentary ruling whether, if I revert to the original amount, it would be regarded as an amendment on my part, or whether it would have to be a different figure from $250,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That question is now before the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would propose, then, that the figure be changed to $251,000,000, instead of $251,754,142; and that similarly, on page 31, the figure $26,754,142 be changed to $25,000,000.

Mr. President, if we analyze the reasons for the increases which the committee made over the House figure, as indicated on page 6 of the report, it becomes obvious that this bill increases the administrative salaries on the county level. I am simply proposing that the increases of salaries be absorbed in the total appropriations to the amount of approximately three-quarters of a million dollars.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asks the Senator to state the amount he proposes to include in his amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. On page 30, a total of $251,000,000; and on page 31, a total of $26,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will have to offer the amendment as to the $26,000,000 item later. The Senate cannot vote on both amendments together.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well. I desire to reduce the amount of $251,754,142, and to absorb the approximately three-quarters of a million dollars increase in salary out of the total appropriation of some $26,000,000 for salaries.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the item with which the Senate is dealing at the present time has to do with the authorization for the conservation program, the ACP program, for the next fiscal year. The amount authorized for the present year was $256,500,000. Whatever action the Senate has taken heretofore on these appropriations—and they have been cut from time to time—the Senate has never yet disturbed any existing agreement. The argument has always been over the program for the next year.

This item, as Senators will observe, is almost $5,000,000 below the budget estimate. The purpose of the $1,700,000, as the Senator from Illinois has said, is to rectify an inequity between the amount of compensation paid those who work in State offices of the Production and Marketing Administration, as compared with the compensation paid other employees of the Federal Government who work in the same offices. There are instances of one typist drawing several dollars a week less than another who works by her side, both working the same number of hours, and doing the same kind of work. That arises from the fact that salaries of people who work with the PMA program are not covered by the Classification Act and the civil service.

It seemed to the committee to be a matter of simple justice that that injustice should be corrected. Certainly it should not be corrected at the expense of farmers, as suggested by the Senator from Illinois. I do not believe it is fair to take from a farmer the payment that is due him under a conservation program which is under way, which payment he is expecting as an act of good faith.

In my opinion, it woud be preferable to defeat the entire amendment rather than to violate the agreement with the

farmer. In my judgment, the farmers in the program are entitled to the money. This amendment proposes to correct an injustice that is known to every Senator who has any familiarity with the farm program in his own State. There is a disparity in pay between the PMA employees and those who are regular employees of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, is it not a fact that this amendment was approved by the unanimous vote of the committee?

Mr. RUSSELL. As I recall, it was approved by unanimous vote of the committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Why would it not be possible to absorb the increase out of funds otherwise devoted to administration, rather than to increase the total?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know what the Senator means by "absorb."

Mr. DOUGLAS. By diminution of personnel.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, that might be done, although we have diminished the personnel considerably. As I recall, appropriations for administrative work under this program were $44,000,000 or $45,000,000 only a few years ago, and the amount has already been reduced, I may say, $10,000,000 below the budget estimate this year, and the committee did not restore the amount. I thought it would delight the heart of the Senator from Illinois when he saw that the amount of the administrative figure was already $10,000,000 below the budget estimate. It seems to me we are asked to cut pretty thin when it is proposed to reduce the amount by $750,000. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we recur to the amendment on page 26, which was passed over in the absence of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will state the amendment on page 26.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 26, line 19, it is proposed to strike out the numeral "$7,750,000", and insert "$7,000,000."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, there is on the clerk's desk an amendment to the committee amendment, which I offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 26, line 19, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "$7,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof, "$10,000,000";

On page 27, lines 7 and 8, it is proposed to strike out "$5,556,540" and insert in lieu thereof, "$8,556,540."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, no unanimous consent was given to turn back to this amendment. Why do we not continue through the bill? It would require unanimous consent to revert to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment was passed over temporarily by unanimous consent.

Mr. BRIDGES. I understood the Senator from Georgia to ask unanimous consent to recur to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. Some time ago the Senator from Georgia asked unanimous consent that the amendment be temporarily passed over.

Mr. RUSSELL. I requested that it be temporarily passed over when it was reached. I am now asking that it be taken up. I asked that it be passed over temporarily by unanimous consent in order to avoid a quorum call. The Senator from New Hampshire was not present. I think we saved about 30 minutes by the method we have pursued.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, my amendment would add $3,000,000 to the flood-prevention item on page 26. This is an effort to obtain a reasonable amount of funds to carry on the upstream flood prevention and agricultural flood-control program.

In all the years that we have been spending money on flood control we have spent more than $4,000,000,000 on "main-stem" dams constructed to hold back the floodwaters after they reach the main rivers of the country.

We have been most niggardly in our efforts to control the floods by holding the water where it falls. The upstream program has received increasing support from the farmers and the people of the country, because they realize that the Army engineers, in spending $4,000,000,000, are literally trying to put all the feet into the same sized shoe. They have only one treatment for floods, and that is the building of costly and gigantic, main-stem dams which inundate hundreds and thousands of acres of our most fertile lands along the main channels of our rivers.

This program is no experiment. Through upstream flood control and flood prevention, the job can be done many times more cheaply in dollar cost to the Government. It can save literally millions of acres of the most fertile bottom land. Through the use of check dams, gully plugs, soil conservation, terracing, and other time-tested methods of holding water where it falls, we can keep the water from rushing into the main steam of the river. By failing to hold it upstream, it necessitates dams costing $50,000,000, $75,000,000 or $100,000,000. At the same time these huge dams cover up, as I have said, millions of acres of irreplacable natural resources, namely, our bottom lands.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish to ask two questions. First, did the Senator present this amendment to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. MONRONEY. This program was presented very thoroughly by its advocates, in support of an appropriation of $3,000,000. The committee was good enough to hear our delegation from Oklahoma, where one of these projects is in operation. Instead of giving us the $3,000,000 for which we asked, the committee cut the amount $750,000 below the figure which the House had allowed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the basin to which the Senator refers the Washita Basin?

Mr. MONRONEY. That was 1 of the 11. I will say to the distinguished minority leader that these funds are en bloc for 11 projects which have previously been authorized by the Congress for development and construction.

Mr. BRIDGES. My second question to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is this: He is asking for $3,000,000, but what would be the ultimate over-all cost? I believe that before Congress enters into a program of this kind we should know the ultimate over-all cost. It would be a very substantial amount, would it not?

Mr. MONRONEY. It will be a substantial amount; but I will say to the Senator that we can do the job on all 11 watersheds, holding the water upstream, where it belongs, at a much lower figure than in building only giant main-stem projects which the Army engineers love to build, down toward the confluence of the rivers.

At the same time, the dollar cost to Uncle Sam would be less through the upstream method. Also, the natural resources of the country, the fertile bottom land, of which we have altogether too little, and which we are covering with main-stem dams at too rapid a rate, will be saved for this Nation.

Further, for each year we delay, millions of dollars' worth of topsoil washes down the rivers to the oceans, to fill up the $4,000,000,000 in dams we have already completed, making them obsolete and useless. So, in our delay in getting about the task, we are costing the Nation a great deal of money.

Let me read for the information of the distinguished Senator a table showing the names of the 11 projects which have been authorized after careful consideration by the Agricultural Committees of both Houses through the years, as well as the number of years it was supposed to require to complete the project, and the number of years which will be required to complete the project under present appropriation rates:

Name of project	Proposed years to complete	Years to complete under present appropriation rate [1]
Buffalo Creek, N. Y.	18	23
Colorado, Middle, Tex.	20	24
Coosa, Ga. and Tenn.	20	22
Little Sioux, Iowa and Minn.	15	12
Little Tallahatchie, Miss.	20	14
Los Angeles, Calif.	10	31
Potomac, Md., Va., Pa., W. Va.	24	13
Santa Ynez, Calif.	10	6
Trinity, Tex.	15	54
Washita, Okla.	15	29
Yazoo, Miss.	20	49

[1] Based on total estimated Federal costs for 1949 and 1952 appropriations figures.

I believe that sooner or later the Congress must come to grips with the question of whether or not we are to say that there is no other remedy for floods except the Army Engineers' program of bigger, higher, and more expensive dams.

I think we must divert at least a little money in our flood-control programing to further the agricultural flood-control program. This program does not withdraw millions of acres of fertile land, but adds to the Nation's wealth millions of acres of land, because the little creeks which now overflow each year become cultivable under the upstream flood-control program, through check dams. These small dams prevent their periodic flooding, and make these valleys usable for agriculture.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I want the Congress and the public to understand that when the Senator speaks about $3,000,000, that represents only the first feeble step. These 11 basins are relatively small basins. They are not like the Missouri River Basin. The present estimates indicate an ultimate over-all cost of $152,000,000. So we are not really talking about the Senator's amendment. We are talking about the start of a $152,000,000 program.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I should like to correct the distinguished Senator. We are not talking about the start of a program. We have been engaged in this program for about 6 years, but we are not doing it at a rate which will complete it within the time estimated. We have already spent $25,000,000,000 on these 11 projects, but we are going about it at a snail's pace. Meanwhile, the top soil washes down to silt up dams which we have already built. I think it is high time to accelerate the program. Delay is costing us millions in top soil as well as flood damage.

What am I to say to the farmers of Oklahoma who know and believe in this program, who have seen, on some of the small tributaries, the operation of the upstream, gully-plug, check-dam, soil-conservation flood prevention program? How can I defend before those people the fact that Congress is spending 170 times as much for main-stem dams as it is spending for agricultural flood prevention?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to add that it is of great importance that these upstream works be constructed before we consider extensive dams across the main streams down the river. When we construct the upstream works we keep the soil up there from washing into the main river and filling the basins which are created by the big dams.

I dare say that some of the large dams which are now built in the name of flood control actually destroy land, the value of which, if put into upstream controls, would far exceed the value of the big dams themselves as control measures.

I believe it is highly essential that before we build great dams across our large rivers—and I know that engineers like to build the big dams—we find some way of keeping the soil on the tributaries from washing into the main stream and filling the reservoirs, so that in 40 or 50 years from now their flood-control value will be practically negligible. In some cases the reservoirs are filling up within 20 years. In other streams it will take 75 years.

Mr. MONRONEY. We could add many years of useful life to our main-stem dams by putting this money into the soil-saving upstream conservation program.

Mr. AIKEN. If it is found that we must have these great dams across the big rivers——

Mr. MONRONEY. Of course, we must have some of them, we all admit, and what I propose is not a substitute for the big dams, of course.

Mr. AIKEN. But, first, we should do all we can to prevent their filling up in a few years with soil that washes down into the big rivers.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not correct to say that the budget estimate is $7,750,000?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Michigan is eminently correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Oklahoma would increase that amount by $2,250,000?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Or $3,000,000 above the amount recommended by the committee?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; or $2,250,000 above the budget estimate or the House figure.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not also correct to say that the Senator's amendment would cut the lead time for the completion of the projects? By how much would the additional $3,000,000 above the proposed amount accelerate the construction?

Mr. MONRONEY. By plain mathematics I would say that it would be accelerated by 33⅓ percent. It would shorten the lead time because we are adding $3,000,000 to $7,000,000. Therefore, by the expenditure of the additional $3,000,000 we should be able to cut down the finish time by at least one-third.

Mr. FERGUSON. The amount needed for the whole project is $152,000,000.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; and we have spent $25,000,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. But the $3,000,000 is in addition to the $152,000,000.

Mr. MONRONEY. We would accelerate the present program by about one-third above its present speed. We would get one-third more of upstream flood control by the expenditure of an additional $3,000,000 than we would have if we accepted the committee's figure.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; it would accelerate it by approximately one-third.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. Is that not worth while?

Mr. FERGUSON. But the total amount necessary to complete the job now is $152,000,000.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct. I believe that is worth while, particularly when Congress is going to vote next week $450,000,000 for main-stream flood-control work. Yet we bicker about $3,000,000 for the purpose of accelerating a program that farmers know makes common sense.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Is it not correct to say that if we do not do this work upstream, the silt will wash down, will be lost to the agricultural land, and will fill up the big dams on the main stream?

Mr. MONRONEY. It fills up the Mississippi River, for example. That requires higher and higher levees. It is not only dams that are involved, but levees also.

Mr. CASE. On Memorial Day I had the privilege of looking at one of the upstream dams which was built on a tributary of the Missouri River. It is a relatively small dam, and was built by the Bureau of Reclamation, but had some flood control value also. I believe it cost approximately $11,000,000. However, the rate of runoff was such and the crest of the flood was such that, had it not been in operation this year, there would have been a foot more of water at the city of Omaha at the time the crest of the flood passed the city. Had that additional foot of water been at Omaha at that time, the city of Omaha would have had a very difficult time of it. It is my opinion that it would have done far more than $11,000,000 worth of damage at Omaha, to say nothing about inundating more rich farm land at Sioux City, Vermilion, and other places.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his very comprehensive and adequate explanation, in proof of what the program can do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wonder whether I may ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee what in his opinion would be the amount that would be required to complete the whole program? I do not mean the particular basins which are mentioned—and there are 11 of them, I believe—but the whole program that is foreseeable under this appropriation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am almost a fanatic on the subject of conservation. I have great sympathy with every proposal to conserve soil or other natural resources of this Nation. I have much sympathy for the position taken by the Senator from Oklahoma in offering the amendment. But I do not think that the Senate can afford to start going above the budget estimate on this item.

As has been stated here, 11 of the Nation's watersheds already have been surveyed and authorized for improvement. I do not recall the exact amount of the estimates. It seems to me that in the neighborhood of $150,000,000 will be required to complete those 11 projects.

I went into the matter very fully with the officials in charge of the work. About 2 years ago the committee conducted very extensive hearings. It developed at that time that it would cost,

if we improved intensively all the watersheds of the Nation, in the neighborhood of $300,000,000,000. Therefore, we are in this item of the bill dealing with very important work, but necessarily at the pilot scale. If we were to go into it comprehensively at this time it would place a burden on the tax budget of the American people which I believe would not be received very warmly by them.

It is a magnificent program. It is magnificent in concept and in its sweep. But it is one of those things that we cannot afford to enlarge at the present time.

Mr. WATKINS, Mr. CASE, and Mr. MOODY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. First I shall yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I assume that the matter under discussion is flood prevention.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. A number of rivers are mentioned in the bill. The bill states:

> For expenses necessary • • • to make preliminary examinations and surveys, and to perform works of improvement, and to plan the agricultural phases of the development—

And so forth. Does it mean that the money is to be used for permanent improvements or for a surveying and planning program?

Mr. RUSSELL. The work is divided into two parts. One part refers to the surveying program, which is not affected by the pending amendment. The other is a construction item, which the Senator from Oklahoma seeks to increase by $3,000,000.

Mr. WATKINS. Under the provisions of the bill, are the appropriations to be used for permanent works of improvement on the rivers named?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. The rivers that are named relate to the surveys. The improvements which are actually under construction at the present time are not named in the bill.

Mr. WATKINS. I notice one river, the Sevier River. That river is in Utah. Would it mean that none of the money here appropriated could be used for a permanent program on that river, but only for a survey?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Is sufficient money being provided in the bill as now written, without the amendment, to take care of the items named in it?

Mr. RUSSELL. So far as the surveys are concerned, there is an adequate sum of money provided. The Senator from Oklahoma is not seeking to increase the survey fund. He is seeking to increase the construction item.

Mr. WATKINS. Is that the only part which is affected now?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the only part that is in controversy now.

Mr. WATKINS. There will be sufficient money with which to make surveys?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. But not to complete the program?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; not to complete the program. It is a long-range program.

Mr. WATKINS. Are not the rivers named in the bill at page 26 the ones which would be taken into the program?

Mr. RUSSELL. It seems to me that the Sevier River was added on the floor of the House. It was not reported by the committee. The report of the Department of Agriculture to the Senate Appropriations Committee indicates that there is not likely to be any general basin investigation of the Sevier River. Probably there will be some surveys, but no general basin investigation.

Mr. WATKINS. It is rather limited, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; but it is authorized.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CASE. What was the committee's thought in voting to strike out $750,000 from the item of $7,750,000? To what would that reduction apply?

Mr. RUSSELL. The reduction voted by the committee relates to the construction program as set forth in the committee report.

Mr. CASE. Let me say to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, who is in charge of the bill, that there are now pending before the Department of Agriculture requests for surveys on the Vermilion and the Big Sioux Rivers, as well as the James River, all of which are tributaries of the Missouri River and are related to the flood problems in the Missouri River Basin. I know the Committee on Public Works has already requested a report on these matters from the Department of Agriculture. I certainly would not wish to interfere with the ability of the Department to prepare its report. By the same token, having in mind the importance of this program, and in view of what the chairman of the subcommittee himself has said about the importance of the work, it is difficult for me to understand why the committee proposes to reduce the amount voted by the House of Representatives in the case of this particular item.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that in connection with this bill, which already has been very drastically reduced in amount, the committee was seeking some item which could be reduced. The committee contemplated that this particular item could be reduced in the amount of $750,000 with less injury than in the case of any other item in the bill, because a reduction in the amount of $750,000 would be so small a reduction in proportion to the total appropriation for construction, namely, approximately $5,000,000, that a reduction of $750,000 would not greatly interfere with that work, although, of course, it would postpone it.

Mr. CASE. But we are dealing here with projects which will cost between $150,000,000 and $155,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. We thought we could safely reduce this item by the amount of $750,000 without doing violence to any project. We did not propose a reduction in the item for preliminary examinations and surveys. That item is $1,724,760, the full amount of the estimate. Neither did we propose any reduction in the item of general basin investigations, which is $450,000, the full amount of the budget estimate. We did vote a reduction in the amount for permanent works of improvement that are in process; we voted to reduce that amount by $750,000.

Mr. CASE. Let me suggest to the Senator from Georgia that my understanding of this type of flood-control work is that it is not necessary to have the entire job completed before some benefits may be derived from it.

Of course, when a dam is built on the main stem of the river, no benefit is obtained until the dam can be closed. However, the spending of $750,000 on upstream work may make the difference between saving several farms or not saving them. The expenditure of $750,000 might not determine whether a great dam would be completed this year or next year; but when we are dealing with the smaller projects and when we are dealing with cases involving half a dozen farms in perhaps one particular area, the expenditure of $750,000 might enable completion of the project to be achieved to an extent sufficient to provide for the protection of a number of farms.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the Senator from South Dakota is correct, and his point is perfectly apparent to anyone.

Not only that, but if the Senate wishes to adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], protection will be afforded to a number of other farms, for these farms are small ones. Furthermore, if the Senate wishes to appropriate $50,000,000, instead of the $10,000,000 suggested by the Senator from Oklahoma, a great many more farms can be protected.

However, the project is so gigantic in its over-all projection, but so minute in its present application, that the committee thought that a reduction in this amount could very well be made.

Of course, any amount of money which the Congress could appropriate could be well spent for this purpose. These projects are distributed all over the United States, and all of them are highly desirable. Every time any part of any one of them is completed, some farm, somewhere, is protected.

If the Senate wishes to embark on this venture on such a scale, it will be performing a great conservation service. If the Senate wishes to embark on it on that scale, it will be contributing greatly to the sum total of conservation in the Nation. But such a program will require the appropriation of utterly fantastic sums of money, in order to make this program really effective all over the United States.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I am not suggesting that we undertake this work this year on the basis of a $150,000,000

appropriation. However, apparently the proposal to spend an additional $750,000 was based upon a program of work.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. There is a vast difference between suggesting that we make an appropriation which will at least be consistent with what has been approved in previous years or with the program of work for this year, and suggesting that we make the appropriation for this item $150,000,000. I think it would be absurd to propose at this time an appropriation of $150,000,000 for this purpose, because no work has been outlined on that scale.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes; there are actual plans for more than $150,000,000 worth of work.

Mr. CASE. But not in detail.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes; in detail.

Mr. FERGUSON. The 1949 figure was $152,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. It occurs to me that one of the old adages is that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. The country has been ravaged this year by floods on a number of rivers, and those floods have caused millions upon millions of dollars' worth of damage.

It seems to me that the Senator from Oklahoma has enunciated a very proper principle when he has said that he believes the place to stop floods is at the source of the rivers, upstream, rather than downstream, where the rivers pile up their waters.

I do not believe, either, that we can put $150,000,000 into this work now; but I think the proposal of the Senator from Oklahoma is a modest one in comparison with other provisions, and should really be considered by the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am glad to have the committee consider the suggestion. Many items in connection with this bill have been bounced around considerably because some Senators have thought the committee approved the appropriation of too much money.

It happens that one of the projects which has been proposed is in my own State. Thus, if the Senator from Michigan wishes to have the total amount approved, there will not be any criticism from me.

However, I still think that inasmuch as this program is a many-year program involving the expenditure of $300,000,000,000, we might well defer it in the amount proposed in this case by the committee.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to point out that more than a decade ago President Roosevelt first announced to Congress his great proposal for the development of the Missouri Valley. If this suggestion had been adopted at that time, the floods of this year in the Missouri River Valley would not have occurred.

So, Mr. President, from the standpoint of economy and from the standpoint of the wealth of the country, I believe that if we fail to properly control floods, we shall be indulging in uneconomic, false economy.

I think the same is true today along the shores of Lake Michigan, Lake Huron, and Lake St. Clair, where there is insufficient flood control. It seems to me that the property values which are wiped out by floods are much greater than any sums of money which might be spent by the Congress in a moderate and sensible program or system of flood control.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have always supported flood-control measures, and I supported this basic legislation. I am entirely in favor of conservation. However, with the gigantic defense program that now confronts us, I do not think it wise to expand this work at this time.

DOMESTIC APPROPRIATION VERSUS AID FOR EUROPE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I have the utmost confidence in the Senator from Georgia, and I know he has done his best to save our taxpayers money.

But did the committee fear that the addition of $3,000,000, as now proposed—a relatively small amount now proposed to be added to the appropriations to help the people of the United States in their flood-control problems—might endanger the plan to give aid in the amount of $6,900,000,000 to Europe?

Mr. RUSSELL. The committee had no such fears, because aside from our own responsibility as individual Senators, the agricultural subcommittee has no responsibility for appropriations for foreign aid.

But with the responsibility that was ours to deal with the agricultural appropriation bill, we did the very best we could.

If the Senate sees fit to vote for an increase in this item in the bill, I can assure each and every Member of the Senate individually that I will bear no rancor to Senators who vote that way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. The Chair calls attention to the fact that the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma includes two items: One, on page 26, in line 19, would increase the amount of the committee amendment from $7,000,000 to $10,000,000. The other, on page 27, in lines 7 and 8, would increase the amount carried at that point in the bill from $5,556,540, to $8,556,540, or an increase of $3,000,000 over the amount carried at that point in the bill.

Without objection, both those items will be considered together.

The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma to the committee amendment and also to the bill itself.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, Mr. MONRONEY's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the committee amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. CASE. The amendment now to be voted on is the proposed reduction of the $7,750,000 appropriation to $7,000,000, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amount proposed by the committee.

Mr. CASE. Is time allowed in opposition to the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The Senator from South Dakota has no time. The acting minority leader may yield time.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, it is not necessary to take 10 minutes, for I think the issues have been gone into pretty well here. I simply wanted to call attention to the fact that last year there was appropriated for this purpose $7,262,976. In other words, if the committee amendment were to prevail, we would be voting $262,000 less than was provided for the current year.

The Senator from Georgia has already stated that the reduction would be applied to the construction phase of this program. I merely repeat what I pointed out earlier, that the construction phase in this type of flood-control work brings immediate results. There need not be any of this money for construction involved in the State of South Dakota, so far as I know. I understand that the projects are not listed here, but that they are in various parts of the country. But I believe this type of work gets results for the money, and it gets results immediately. It is not dependent upon the completion of some huge dam; but immediate protection would be provided. I hope the committee amendment will not prevail in this instance.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will have to obtain time.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am opposed to the committee amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I shall not need that much time, because I should merely like to say that I am terribly disappointed that the Senate has voted not to accelerate the rate of construction in this program, to do what the distinguished Senator from South Dakota said can be done, and that is, to save the soil worth hundreds of millions if not billions of dollars within the next few years by getting on with the work. But I do think that since the Senate in its wisdom has turned down the $3,000,000 dam, the least it could do would be to stay with the Budget, and with the amount the House approved. The House is not noted for being prodigal in appropriations, but after careful consideration, the House adhered to the Budget figure and voted $7,750,000. In the light of the

increased cost, this would just about carry the program along at its present rate.

Mr. President, people are enthusiastic in trying to get on with this job, but now the Senate comes along and, instead of even carrying on at the present rate, we are going to throw a roadblock to stop work that today is being done, and being done altogether too slowly, because of the lack of funds.

Mr. President, let us not be penny wise and pound foolish, and vote to cut this figure by $750,000 by approval of the committee amendment.

Let us take the Budget figure. It was carefully considered. Let us take the House figure, which is $7,750,000 and not try to save a few pennies, or a few of the crumbs that we drop to the agricultural land for flood control.

When the Senate is going to pass $450,000,000 or more for main-stem dams, let us give the farmers one one-hundred-and-seventieth of the amount that we are spending for these gigantic main-stem dams which the Army engineers love to build.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I am in hearty accord with what the Senator from Oklahoma has just said; but I should like to ask him this question. Is it not true that when farmers have in their areas a watershed treatment program, when they know that appropriations are being provided—I know the appropriations are modest, indeed they are too modest—they arrange their plans and develop a schedule?

If we were to cut this one appropriation $50,000, while it would represent a small cut, as appropriations go and as Congress has been throwing money around, it would deprive thousands of acres of land of the benefit they should receive. As the Senator from South Dakota pointed out, the benefits are accruing rapidly in many of the programs. Is it not true that the new thought is that greater consideration should be given to the development of projects upstream, rather than to big-stream dams which inundate thousands upon thousands of acres of the finest land? In my opinion, that program should be encouraged rather than discouraged, and I fear that even rejecting a $3,000,000 program a while ago was a step in that direction.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I desire to suggest to the Senator from Oklahoma one reason why it is difficult to get more than $7,000,000 for upstream work in the farmlands, whereas it is comparatively easy to get $500,000,000 with which to build great dams across rivers, is that the farmers do not have a lobby constantly working for their interests, such as the contractors have?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. But the farmers know that the sound program is the upstream flood-control program.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. And the Senate had better stop trying to kid them into thinking that the Senate believes in flood control, when the Senate can see only one type of control, and that is the main-stem dam.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not blame the contractors for wanting the work, but I say they have a very powerful lobby working for appropriations for great dams across rivers, which I think frequently are of doubtful value.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator has made quite an argument against the large dams, as have other Senators, but I wonder how many of us vote against the large dams.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would say to the Senator from Michigan that I took the floor last year to fight a bill for a dam in my home State, and I will tell the Senator why.

It would have cost $35,000,000 to cover up 93,000 acres upstream, but it would save 95,000 acres downstream. That is what I am talking about in regard to these main-stem dams.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree with the Senator. Is it not true that such a project would cover up 93,000 acres of fertile land upstream——

Mr. MONRONEY. Indeed.

Mr. FERGUSON. In order to protect the 95,000 acres below, for a certain period of time?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would say to the Senator from Michigan that the farmers know it is impractical, and, at long last, they hope that some time the Army engineers will realize that if we hold water where it falls, that that is a practical way to effect flood control.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is not the trouble today that we have just started to look at the problem about which the Senator is talking?

Mr. MONRONEY. Oh, no.

Mr. FERGUSON. The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] said that if we should undertake to complete the program $300,000,000,000 would be required properly to do the job.

Mr. MONRONEY. I understood the Senator to say $300,000,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. It was $300,000,000,000.

Mr. MONRONEY. We are not talking now about trying to work on all the Nation's rivers upstream. I am not trying to make every foot fit the same size shoe. Upstream methods will work on some watersheds; it will not work on others. We should be smart enough to prescribe the best treatment for the watersheds in connection with the problem of upstream versus downstream. We should not be spending $450,000,000 this year on one program and $7,000,000 on another. That is the relative proportion that this bill permits.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator feel that we should take 1 or 2 projects instead of 11? According to the 1949 estimate, $152,000,000 is required. The chairman of the committee said it would require $300,000,000,000. Had we not better start to experiment on several of them?

Mr. MONRONEY. There are 11 watersheds. We are building dozens of main-stem dams. We spend more in surveys on them than we are asking for construction of upstream structures.

I hope the Senate will restore the amount which the House, after hearings, recommended. Let us continue at least with the program at the present rate instead of throwing a road block in the way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 26, line 19. [Putting the question.]

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 2, after the word "inclusive", to strike out the comma and the words "of which amount $2,500,000 shall be available for technical assistance in formulating and carrying out agricultural conservation practices and $1,000,000 shall be available for conservation practices related directly to flood-prevention work in approved watersheds."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$26,754,142."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Marketing services," on page 37, line 1, after the figures "$11,465,000", to strike out the colon and *"Provided,* That hereafter the Commodity Credit Corporation may contract with cooperatives for classing cotton and may pay for such services an amount not in excess of the value of the samples."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to yield 5 minutes to me for some brief remarks.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I shall support the pending bill, just as I have consistently supported adequate agricultural appropriations since the people of Missouri sent me to the Senate.

Our farmers are entitled to a fair share of the national income. The Government has an obligation to help them obtain it.

Our farmers are also entitled to have access to electrical service at a reasonable cost. To that end, the pending bill contains funds for the Rural Electrification Administration, which has done so much to make farm life more attractive.

The idea for an REA originated with the late Senator George Norris, Republican, of Nebraska. In 1935, a 1-year

REA program was authorized by Executive order, and a little later Congress enacted the Rural Electrification Act of 1936.

When REA began, 1 in 10 American farms had the benefit of electricity. Now more than 8 out of every 10 farms have electrical service. Of my State of Missouri's 230,045 farms, more than 185,000, or 80.8 percent, now have electricity.

The REA in Missouri, as in other States, has laid the basis for a better standard of living on the farm through added prosperity, health, and happiness. New industries have moved into electrified areas. Better opportunities for adequate school lighting, for rural health clinics, and improved farm sanitation through pressure water systems have accompanied the power lines.

Electricity makes it possible for everyone on the farm, the older people or the younger people or the children, to do a lot of things they could not do without electricity. This is particularly important at a time when so many young farm boys are being drafted into the Armed Forces.

REA has gone into a field that the electric light and power companies were not interested in. These companies said they could not make a fair return on the investment. I think REA and these companies should operate each in its own field.

It has always been my conviction that where American free enterprise stands ready and willing to do a job that Government ought not to do it. I do not believe in the Government building power lines to parallel lines already in operation by companies who are paying taxes and serving their customers at rates prescribed by the State public service commission. If public money is used for unfair competition, the public will lose in the end.

I believe in REA. I shall support it in the future as I have in the past.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Extension Service—Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico," on page 41, line 18, after the name "Alaska", to strike out "$13,950" and insert $17,300"; in line 22, after the word "act", to strike out "$42,150" and insert "$42,558"; in line 24, after the name "Puerto Rico", to strike out "$31,438" and insert "$32,131"; on page 42, line 5, after the name "Puerto Rico", to strike out "$71,502" and insert "$101,090"; and in line 8, after the name "Puerto Rico", to strike out "$27,135,000" and insert "$27,169,129."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations," on page 44, line 7, after the word "work", strike out "$615,000" and insert "$682,500."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. FERGUSON), I offer to the committee amendment the amendment, which I send to the desk, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 44, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "$682,500" and to insert in lieu thereof "$600,000."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this item is for foreign agricultural relations, and I want the United States to have such relations. The State Department, the point 4 people, the ECA, and all the various agencies of that kind, are carrying on that work. It is for the purpose of collecting certain information.

Let me read from the justification:

> The office has been unable to follow and to analyze the agricultural activities in Central Africa and to appraise the significance of the economic development there and the programs such as the British peanut scheme.

We are contributing to the various socialistic schemes of the world, and we have a surplus of peanuts in the United States. We are spending millions of dollars on the peanut program.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. What is the use of spending money now to find out why Great Britain failed in her socialistic scheme of trying to raise peanuts in Africa? Does not the average person know today why it failed? It was because it was a socialistic scheme developed by planters to plant peanuts where they could not grow.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator from Michigan has stated the point very expertly. To start with, certainly there is no problem about peanuts in the United States. We do not have to seek from the world new methods of increasing peanut production in this country. We have a surplus of peanuts, because of which we have been contributing a large amount of money.

Now what is it proposed that we do? We are not trying to obtain information on how to grow better peanuts or more peanuts in some other part of the world. We are undertaking to appropriate money to learn why certain peanut producers failed, why the British socialistic scheme to produce more peanuts in Africa failed. If Senators can think of a more useless way to spend American money than to collect information about the failure of the socialistic scheme of the British Labor Government to produce peanuts in Africa, I do not know what it is.

On this vote, I believe there should be the yeas and nays. I should like to see how many Senators will vote to spend money of American taxpayers on such a program, when a surplus of peanuts exists in this country. We produce better peanuts than are produced anywhere else in the world. We know all the modern methods. It is unnecessary to acquire information as to why the British failed to produce peanuts in Africa under their socialistic scheme.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia wish to be heard on this question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations does not control the point 4 program in any manner, shape, form, or fashion, however vehemently the charge may be made on the floor. The Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations does represent the United States in agreements made with respect to international farm commodity problems. It has a great deal to do with the export of American agricultural products. It provides for United States representation and for negotiations under the trade agreements program, to protect American farmers.

There has been some criticism to the effect that activities of the Office have been controlled more by the Department of State than by the Department of Agriculture in connection with international agreements, but I had never heard it charged before that the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations controlled the point 4 program.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have not charged that the Office controls the point 4 program.

Mr. RUSSELL. I heard the Senator talking about the point 4 program.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is usually very attentive.

Mr. RUSSELL. I must confess that I was talking to another Senator about another item in the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator was listening with one ear.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; another Senator was talking to me about another item in the bill, but I heard the Senator mention point 4.

Mr. BRIDGES. To inform the Senator correctly, I said the United States has a whole series of programs with respect to foreign agricultural activities. Among them are the State Department program, the ECA program, and the point 4 program. Perhaps there are others.

I then said we had reached in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill an item which is of a little different nature, but still deals with foreign agricultural relations, namely, of collecting for ourselves information on an agricultural product of which we have a surplus, on which we are paying many millions of dollars a year. The item I am discussing provides money to collect information about peanut production under a program of the British Socialistic Labor Government which has failed. I cannot think of anything more asinine than to do that.

Mr. RUSSELL. The program has nothing to do with the British peanut program in South Africa.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to read the justification. I wondered about the Senator approving this item. Let me read from page 313 of the justification, under "British Empire":

> The office has been unable to follow and analyze the agricultural activities in central

Africa to appraise the significance of economic developments there, and the programs for expansion, such as the British peanut scheme.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes, indeed; if the Senator is talking about a study.

Mr. BRIDGES. Why should we undertake a study in central Africa?

Mr. RUSSELL. We study farm production all over the world. We study the production of wheat in Australia and the production of fresh fruits and vegetables in north Africa. Why do we make such studies? So that we will have information available for the farmers of our Nation, to enable them to produce intelligently. We do study production. That is one of the statistical works that is carried on, in order that we may know what the world is producing, and know how to protect the American farmer in the American market.

The Senator from New Hampshire has referred to the point 4 and other programs. They are for the purpose of helping the agriculture of backward countries. That activity may be well and good in its place, but the program now under discussion is designed to assist the American farmer.

I must confess there have been times when I have thought the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations has not quite measured up to its responsibility, but that is no excuse for destroying it or impairing its efficiency. We placed in the committee report an injunction to the agency to operate in behalf of the American farmer, rather than to carry out policies of the Department of State.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, constant studies are being made the world over of agricultural crops, legumes, cereal grains, and feed grains, in order to enable American farmers to improve their methods and crops. The very wheat which was so successfully raised in the great Southwest was brought from Russia, and was developed through studies in experiment stations in the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I believe we would be derelict in our duty if we did not keep abreast of agricultural activities in every part of the world. Such information is most helpful to American farmers.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, is the Senator from Georgia familiar with the fact that the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations made a study of cotton grown in Russia, where experiments were actually being made with a view to producing various colors in the cotton itself? Is not that of some importance to the cotton-producing industry of the United States?

Mr. RUSSELL. I should think it would be of great interest to American cotton producers.

Mr. BRIDGES. To start with, the appropriation is not intended to result in bringing into this country new grains, or anything of the kind. Perhaps the Senator from Minnesota, for whom I have very great respect and admiration, was speaking on that assumption. The amount here provided is for gathering statistics, not for bringing in actual new strains of grains, or anything of that kind. It is for gathering information and statistics.

No one is proposing that the office be abolished, which may be useful along some lines, as the Senator from New Mexico has suggested. I am talking about the need for additional money. One of the matters referred to is the British peanut scheme. If it is proposed to study anything, let us not study a socialistic scheme of the British Empire in Africa, which failed in producing peanuts.

I want to see how each Senator will vote the proposal. That is why I asked for the yeas and nays.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wish to observe that the world is very small. There is nothing that can transpire in the agriculture of Madagascar, Patagonia, Japan, or South America, that does not affect the American farmer toiling in this land.

I wish I could subscribe to theory that we should turn our backs upon the rest of the world and wish it away.

It would be a very comforting solution to our problems if we could delude ourselves with that idea. But we live in a world that is fiercely competitive and completely independent, with strange paradoxes, which are new to us, and with which we have never had to grapple before. It is of the utmost importance that the farmers of the United States know exactly what is transpiring in the way of agricultural activities in every part of the globe. A bushel of wheat cannot be produced in Australia without affecting the price of a bushel of wheat produced on the plains of Montana.

We cannot carry out this program if we do not have trade agreements, or if we have tariff barriers which are higher than the Capitol dome. In the complex civilization of today we must take into consideration the things which are happening in every other part of the world. There is no more important agency to the American farmer than this agency, which gathers statistics as to the agricultural activities of all the other nations on the earth, in order that the American farmer may be informed, before he plants his crop, as to what conditions are going to be all over the world.

Because inquiry was made into some peanut losses in Zambonia, or wherever it was, the Senate can strike down this little item of appropriation, which in my judgment is completely justified. I think we would be doing American agriculture a disservice if we allowed ourselves to be led astray by any such argument as that.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. This item deals with an investigation which is to come, not with one which has been made. As I understand the report, the Senator from Georgia was not pleased with what this agency had been doing.

Mr. RUSSELL. I so stated; but I am not going to kill the patient merely because he is not recovering as fast as I think he should. I am going to try to cure him. I referred to that criticism when I made my opening statement. There is nothing new in it. I stated that criticism had been made in the committee that the State Department had influenced the policies of this agency. We are remonstrating with them in the report, and telling them that their only responsibility is to the American farmer, and to let the State Department take care of the Nation's foreign relations.

Mr. FERGUSON. The following language from the report is important in this connection:

> Information has again come to the committee indicating that this agency is placing undue emphasis upon programs and activities which are the primary responsibility of other agencies and which are designed to assist producers in foreign countries. The committee is greatly disturbed over this trend and is of the opinion that a reorientation in the thinking of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations is necessary so that it will function efficiently with sharp emphasis upon carrying out its primary obligation to American agricultural producers.

In other words, the agency was admonished not to study such programs as have been referred to and which it desired to study.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing in that statement about studying any programs.

Mr. FERGUSON. I did not read it from the statement. I read what was in the statement and then I commented upon it. Why is it that we cannot reduce this amount, so that the agency will not study a program which has been a failure, and which has been disclosed to the American farmer through Life magazine?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know. Perhaps all the farmers of America subscribe to Life magazine.

Mr. FERGUSON. They could have read it in Life magazine.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know whether all the farmers in America subscribe to Life magazine or not, but I say that a study of a program which has been a complete failure somewhere else in the world might be very useful to the American farmer. I will wager that the program which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] have so vitriolically criticized did not require any substantial amount of money in its operation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator refer to the loss which was suffered by the British?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; the loss which was suffered by the British peanut growers in South Africa or central Africa or wherever it was. The Senator does not contend that all this money goes for that purpose, does he?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course not. Only an infinitesimal part of it goes for that purpose.

This program is of benefit to the American farmer, even though it may involve some study of the failure of the peanut program in Africa. The American farmer had better find out why such a program failed in some other country in order to prevent a similar failure in this country.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment to the committee amendment will not

be agreed to, and that the committee amendment will prevail.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that many countries have economic programs relating to their agriculture, including many types of price support and subsidy programs, and so forth, of which this office makes a study, and with respect to which it reports to the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that this agency keeps track of production levels, acreage, and the yield of various kinds of seeds in crop production?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course. That is one of the principal purposes. That information is of exceedingly great value to the farmers of this country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The whole program of reciprocal trade agreements as they pertain to agriculture, and the program of import and export trade, are based upon statistical information which is gathered by this office, are they not?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. Moreover, the information is of benefit to the actual farmer in the field, in planting his crops.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Various kinds of information are gathered as a result of experimentation, and statistical information is given to the farmers of the United States through the Department of Agriculture, so that information from some far corner of the world becomes available to farmers in Georgia, Minnesota, or Michigan.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We are calling upon our farmers to produce more food, and to use new kinds of seed and fertilizer. We are calling upon them to compete with other areas, which are likewise stepping up their food production. What could be worse than to try to cripple or limit the functions of an office of statistical reporting and information?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would be a penny-wise, pound-foolish policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to the committee amendment on page 44, line 7. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "nay," and the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "nay," and the Senator from California would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea," and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—33

Aiken	Frear	Mundt
Bennett	Hendrickson	O'Conor
Bricker	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Ives	Saltonstall
Butler, Nebr.	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Cain	Kem	Smith, Maine
Case	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Malone	Watkins
Douglas	Millikin	Welker
Dworshak	Moody	Wiley
Ferguson	Morse	Williams

NAYS—32

Anderson	Hoey	Monroney
Clements	Holland	Neely
Connally	Humphrey	Pastore
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Ellender	Kilgore	Smith, N. C
Fulbright	Lehman	Sparkman
George	Long	Stennis
Hayden	Maybank	Thye
Hennings	McFarland	Underwood
Hill	McKellar	

NOT VOTING—31

Benton	Green	McClellan
Brewster	Hunt	McMahon
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Murray
Byrd	Kefauver	Nixon
Capehart	Kerr	Seaton
Carlson	Langer	Smathers
Chavez	Lodge	Taft
Duff	Magnuson	Tobey
Ecton	Martin	Young
Flanders	McCarran	
Gillette	McCarthy	

So the amendment offered by Mr. BRIDGES, for himself and Mr. FERGUSON, to the committee amendment on page 44, line 7, was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Several Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would note "nay," and the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "nay," and the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON]. If present and voting the Senator from Florida would vote "nay," and the Senator from California would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea," and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. If present and voting the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

If present and voting the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—27

Aiken	Ferguson	Mundt
Bennett	Frear	O'Conor
Bridges	Hendrickson	Saltonstall
Butler, Nebr.	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Cain	Kem	Smith, Maine
Case	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Malone	Watkins
Douglas	Moody	Welker
Dworshak	Morse	Williams

NAYS—33

Anderson	Hoey	McKellar
Clements	Holland	Monroney
Connally	Humphrey	Neely
Cordon	Hunt	Pastore
Eastland	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Ellender	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Fulbright	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
George	Lehman	Sparkman
Hayden	Long	Stennis
Hennings	Maybank	Thye
Hill	McFarland	Underwood

NOT VOTING—36

Benton	Green	McClellan
Brewster	Hickenlooper	McMahon
Bricker	Ives	Millikin
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Murray
Byrd	Kefauver	Nixon
Capehart	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Langer	Seaton
Chavez	Lodge	Smathers
Duff	Magnuson	Taft
Ecton	Martin	Tobey
Flanders	McCarran	Wiley
Gillette	McCarthy	Young

So the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider the vote on the so-called Bridges-Ferguson amendment. [Putting the question.]

The "ayes" appear to have it. The "ayes" have it, and the motion to reconsider is agreed to.

The question now is on agreeing to the so-called Bridges-Ferguson amendment to the committee amendment on page 44, line 7.

Mr. MORSE, Mr. FERGUSON, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays, and the yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted "yea" when his name was called.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, may we have order? I cannot understand what is being stated at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The question is on agreeing to the so-called Bridges-Ferguson amendment to the committee amendment on page 44, in line 7.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is the vote now being taken on the committee amendment itself?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, the vote now being taken is on the so-called Bridges-Ferguson amendment to the committee amendment on page 44, in line 7.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask that the pending amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 44, in line 7, it is proposed to strike out "$682,500" and insert "$600,000."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, may we please have order? I cannot hear what is being said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order, and Senators will take their seats.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire will state it.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the vote now being taken on the amendment submitted by me to the committee amendment or on the committee amendment itself?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote is being taken on the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire to the committee amendment on page 44, in line 7.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, there is so much confusion that I cannot hear what is being said. I dislike to ask for order, but I am compelled to do so, for I wish to understand what is occurring.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All Senators will take their seats.

The clerk will continue with the call of the roll.

The Chief Clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. MOODY (when his name was called). The junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] received the sad news that the mother of his wife had passed away. He was here for the last roll call. He was forced to leave the Chamber to return to New York. I therefore gave him a pair. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay," and the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

I announce further that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is paired on this vote with the Senator

from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "nay," and the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "nay," and the Senator from California would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea" and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "yea" and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea" and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—30

Aiken	Ferguson	Mundt
Bennett	Frear	O'Conor
Bricker	Hendrickson	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Butler, Nebr.	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Cain	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Case	Knowland	Watkins
Dirksen	Malone	Welker
Douglas	Millikin	Wiley
Dworshak	Morse	Williams

NAYS—32

Anderson	Hoey	Monroney
Clements	Holland	Neely
Connally	Humphrey	Pastore
Cordon	Hunt	Robertson
Eastland	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Ellender	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. C.
Fulbright	Kilgore	Sparkman
George	Long	Stennis
Hayden	Maybank	Thye
Hennings	McFarland	Underwood
Hill	McKellar	

NOT VOTING—34

Benton	Ives	McMahon
Brewster	Jenner	Moody
Butler, Md.	Kefauver	Murray
Byrd	Kerr	Nixon
Capehart	Langer	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Lehman	Seaton
Chavez	Lodge	Smathers
Duff	Magnuson	Taft
Ecton	Martin	Tobey
Flanders	McCarran	Young
Gillette	McCarthy	
Green	McClellan	

So the amendment offered by Mr. BRIDGES, for himself and Mr. FERGUSON, to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the committee amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan will have to be assigned time, if he wants to discuss the amendment.

Mr. WELKER. I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the question now before the Senate is whether we should adopt the committee amendment, which represents an increase of $67,500. A matter of principle is involved in this item. This was an item on which the committee itself was not satisfied. The committee said:

Information has again come to the committee—

Not the first time, but "has again come to the committee"—

indicating that this agency is placing undue emphasis upon programs and activities which are primarily the responsibility of other agencies, and which are designed to assist producers in foreign countries.

The committee is greatly disturbed over the trend and is of the opinion that a reorientation of the thinking of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations is necessary so that it will function efficiently with sharp emphasis on carrying out its primary obligations to American agricultural production.

Mr. President, considering that language in the report, and the fact that, after giving due consideration to this item the House placed the total for this office at $615,000, I believe the Senate of the United States should not increase the appropriation. The committee criticized the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations for doing unnecessary and improper things. One of the things pointed out was that this office proposed next year an investigation of the failure in peanut culture by the British Government in Africa, indicating that they have in mind carrying out a previous suggestion not to increase production in America, but to show the cause of failure in another country.

Mr. President, in view of this criticism in the report, I hope the Senate will go along with the House and will make the amount $615,000 as recommended by the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I should like to have a little time.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I yield my remaining time to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, the brief remarks which I am about to make may not bear directly on this particular item in the bill, but I think they do, in a general way.

Mr. President, on all the amendments, with the exception of one, I have voted on the economy side; that is, I have voted for the lower appropriations which were proposed, and I intend to continue that course with the exception of appropriations proposed with reference to soil conservation and similar practices.

In support of that position, I should like to read a letter from a Nebraska farmer which came to me under date of May 12, addressed to me, and reading as follows:

The city newspapers played up the fact today that the farm bloc in the House shoved to pass the proposed agriculture expense bill without one cent of money being cut from it. City folks will read that and growl about those dog rich farmers also getting a big Government handout.

Now, Senator, I am a farmer—

I may say, Mr. President, that I know the gentleman very well—

I am not dog rich or even puppy rich. As a matter of fact I am a World War II veteran getting a start and I have had a rough time trying to keep costs down and get income up. I appreciate that little PMA check that comes my way yearly. But I think I ought to sacrifice a part of it to promote better relations with the city folks. If all farmers would just give up a little, we could cut 1 or 2 percent off that agriculture bill. Then maybe some economies could be found in the rest of the agriculture bill, the military bill, the labor bill, the various education expense bills, the Interior bill, and all other bills.

I am afraid that unless we all give up something, the people will tax the people to death.

What could we give up? Well, I see an item called crop residue management. That is summer fallow. Like other farmers out here, I summer fallow, because I make more money by summer fallowing, and it is a short time return. What I summer fallow this year, will give me a profit return next year. I do not think I need to be paid to summer fallow, and I should be willing to give it up. There are others like seeding legumes, seeding pastures, drilling new wells, and that increase for small payment which I think could be cut.

I am in hopes that when the agricultural bill comes to the Senate, you can find a way to effect an economy here and there. Somebody must set the pace in giving up something.

Incidentally, I hope nobody cuts from the Soil Conservation Service or the county agents. They are my teachers. If we keep good teachers on the job, I will learn more,

apply better farming methods, and make more production for more profit than a government can ever pass out.

Sincerely,

MILES E. CADWALLADER, Jr.

As he states in his letter, Mr. President, he is a World War II veteran who is trying to get started. I think he represents the sentiment of the people of Nebraska, which is a State more nearly 100-percent agricultural in its make-up than is any other State of the Union.

I am hoping, Mr. President, that the Senate will accept this measly little reduction in the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], because it will be complying with the requests of the farmers themselves who are anxious to build up their public relations so as to bring about a little more favorable attitude on the part of the people who do not live on farms.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I recently voted against the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire, but I propose to support the amendment of the Senator from Michigan to take the House figure.

It is important, in fact, it is highly essential to all our farmers, but especially the farmers in the South who grow crops such as cotton and tobacco for the export market, to know what their markets are and what competing crops are being grown. It is also important to cooperate in the administration of reciprocal trade agreements under which we have an escape clause. It is necessary for us to know, before it is too late, when we need to escape.

It is difficult to know to the exact dollar what is required for any activity abroad, but the House was satisfied that the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations could successfully function with the figure recommended by the House, and it has assumed responsibility for that figure.

As the Senator from Nebraska has pointed out, the dollars add up, and we are in a position in which all the dollars must be considered in every bill.

The junior Senator from Virginia has supported farm legislation during his entire service in the Congress, but he has frequently observed that when farm-purchasing power stops it is a harbinger that the wheels of industry are going to slow down. I know that farm income this year will be lower than it was last year, while the costs of production still rise. But I have been voting to cut the expenses of the Government wherever it could be done, and I have taken the position that Virginia farmers, if Congress will economize in all other directions, are willing to share in the economy program.

So I hope, Mr. President, that the amendment of the Senator from Michigan will be adopted. In committee I voted against an increase in soil-conservation payments, and when we reach that item I intend to vote to reduce it, although frankly admitting that soil conservation was a boon to our farmers during the depression years and is still highly esteemed all over the country.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the subject has been quite thoroughly covered in the discussion.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask for a division on the amendment. I hope the Senate will vote "no" on the committee amendment, which will leave the House figure in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment. Of course, if the committee amendment is rejected, the House figure will stand.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MOODY (when his name was called). Repeating my announcement on the last vote of my pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], I withhold my vote. If the Senator from New York were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

I announce further that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea," and the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are detained on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay," and the Senator from Washington would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "nay," and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay," and the Senator from Florida would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "nay," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would vote "nay."

The vote was recapitulated.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, how is the senior Senator from Michigan recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the negative.

Mr. BRIDGES. How is the senior Senator from New Hampshire recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the negative.

Mr. KNOWLAND. How am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the negative.

Mr. DIRKSEN. How am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the negative.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. How am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the negative.

Mr. MALONE. How am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the negative.

Mr. KEM. How am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the negative.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. How am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the negative.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. How am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the affirmative.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. How am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the negative.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, how is the junior Senator from South Dakota recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the negative.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recorded in the negative.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a point of order. This is obviously a dilatory interruption of the calling of the roll. I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This will soon be over.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it permissible for a Senator to change his vote at this stage of the voting?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. AIKEN. How am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recorded in the negative.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not wish to change my vote.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recorded in the negative.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, what is the result of the vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is about to announce the result.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 30, and the nays are 29.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask for a recapitulation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The result of the vote has been announced.

Mr. BRIDGES. I asked for the recapitulation before the result was announced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There may be a recapitulation, but the vote cannot be changed. The clerk will recapitulate the vote.

The legislative clerk recapitulated the vote—yeas 30, nays 29—as follows:

YEAS—30

Anderson	Hill	McFarland
Clements	Holland	McKellar
Connally	Humphrey	Monroney
Cordon	Hunt	Neely
Eastland	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Ellender	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. C.
Fulbright	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
George	Kilgore	Stennis
Hayden	Long	Thye
Hennings	Maybank	Underwood

NAYS—29

Aiken	Frear	O'Conor
Bennett	Hendrickson	Robertson
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Schoeppel
Cain	Kem	Smith, Maine
Case	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Malone	Welker
Douglas	Millikin	Wiley
Dworshak	Morse	Williams
Ferguson	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—37

Benton	Ives	Moody
Brewster	Jenner	Murray
Bricker	Kefauver	Nixon
Butler, Md.	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Langer	Pastore
Capehart	Lehman	Seaton
Carlson	Lodge	Smathers
Chavez	Magnuson	Taft
Duff	Martin	Tobey
Ecton	McCarran	Watkins
Flanders	McCarthy	Young
Gillette	McClellan	
Green	McMahon	

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Corporations," on page 47, line 6, after the word "hereof", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury by canceling notes issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury in the amount of the capital impairment determined by the appraisal of June 30, 1951 (but not to exceed $109,391,154), pursuant to sections 1 and 4 of the act of March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a–1, 4)."

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I am opposed to this amendment. I yield my time to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to enter my annual protest against this method of concealing expenditures through the procedure of authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to discharge indebtedness owed to the Treasury by other agencies of Government.

During the past 10 years some $10,000,000,000 of Government expenditures have been concealed in this manner. The Treasury borrows the money. Another agency of Government is authorized to spend the money. It borrows from the Treasury. Then the Congress authorizes the Treasury to cancel the notes of the agency which borrowed the money from it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Did the Senator say $10,000,000,000?

Mr. AIKEN. Ten billion dollars in the past 10 years. The Treasury is authorized to cancel the notes of the agency which borrowed the money from it with which to make expenditures.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is not this amendment legislation on an appropriation bill?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I hope the time consumed by this colloquy will not come out of my time. I should like to complete my statement.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to raise a point of order. Mr. President, is not this amendment on an appropriation bill?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I cannot yield for that purpose, if I am to lose the time allotted to me by the acting minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair believes that the amendment is germane, and that it is in order because it relates to a provision in the House bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. The question is, Does it not assign a new duty to the Secretary of the Treasury?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Of course, the Senate should pass on the question of germaneness, under the rule.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does it not assign a new duty to the Secretary of the Treasury, authorizing him to make a cancellation of certain indebtedness?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I did not yield for any purpose. I rose simply to point out that this is a method of concealing expenditures from the people who pay the taxes eventually to meet such expenditures. When the Treasury cancels the note of an agency owing money—and in this case it is more than $100,000,000—then that $100,000,000 does not appear in the appropriation act for that agency of Government. It appears only in the national debt, which is so large that the $100,000,000 becomes lost, and the public never knows that the $100,000,000 has been spent.

I should like to refer to page 52, and point out a similar authorization in regard to the International Wheat Agreement. The United States has lost $182,000,000 plus through the International Wheat Agreement. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to cancel the notes of the Commodity Credit Corporation in that amount. So the cost of the International Wheat Agreement will never appear in any appropriation bill, and in that manner is concealed from the public, unless the public happens to read this bill, authorizing the cancellation of such notes. In the case of the International Wheat Agreement costs, only about one-third of such costs should ever be charged to the Department of Agriculture at all. The other two-thirds should be charged to foreign cooperation, because had the Commodity Credit Corporation put that wheat on the world market it would have received 70 cents a bushel more for it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. What I am protesting is that we ought to do away once and for all with this method of concealing Government expenditures and bring them out into the open. I do not dislike all subsidies. I do dislike concealing them, however, and I think we ought to get away from that practice.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What the Senator means is that we have sold, in connection with these two items, $291,000,000 worth of commodities below their cost price to the Government. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. AIKEN. One hundred and eighty-two million dollars in the case of wheat.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And $109,000,000 in the case now under discussion.

Mr. AIKEN. And $109,000,000 in this instance.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So we have sold $291,000,000 worth of commodities below their market price.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the $109,000,000 is to make good the capital stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I am in favor of paying these bills, but I am in favor of paying them by means of appropriations, and not by this method of concealing them, so that they never come to the notice of the public.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to join the Senator from Vermont in protesting this amendment. I wish to call his attention also to page 51, which shows $11,000,000 transferred, covering notes of the Commodity Credit Corporation under another section.

Mr. AIKEN. So that more than $200,000,000 which should be appropriated to the Department of Agriculture, is not appropriated to it. It is merely added to the national debt, without being made public.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield, if I have the time.

GREAT PUBLIC SERVICE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I believe that the distinguished Senator from Vermont is performing a very great public service to the country in discussing concealed and indirect taxes. Furthermore, in line with the principle, and with direct reference to the amendment presented earlier on the subject of furnishing the money to investigate the peanut episode in the upper Sudan—Egypt—by the English with our money, I should like to say that I visited the English governor of the upper Sudan in 1948 when they were using our money to plant their peanuts. Everyone knew that the peanut project would be a failure.

The real meat of the subject was that we were furnishing the money to the English to take the water out of the upper Nile during low water periods which is the lifeblood of Egypt.

If the people of this Nation could be apprised of the purposes to which their tax money is applied they would rise up in their anger and rebel against the tax collector.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The committee, on page 1 of its report, states that the bill which it is reporting to the Senate is $200,000,000 below the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget. However, on page 14 it claims a credit of $180,000,000 under the international wheat agreement. Therefore, is not the reduction in reality fictitious?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not understand the question of the Senator from Illinois because of the distance between our desks.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The committee claims in its report that it had reduced the appropriations by $182,000,000 so far as the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget are concerned. If the Senator from Vermont will look at page 14 of the committee report he will find that the budget estimate calls for $182,000,000. Therefore the figure is canceled, and the $182,000,000 of alleged savings represent only a transfer of appropriations.

Mr. AIKEN. The effect of the authorization to cancel the notes makes the appropriation to the Department of Agriculture appear to be approximately $300,000,000 less than it actually is.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore the savings by the committee, instead of being $200,000,000 below the budget estimates, are actually only $18,000,000 below the estimates.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Vermont another question?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont cannot hear the Senator from Illinois very well.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First I wish to commend the Senator from Vermont for bringing into the open the hidden appropriations. I should like to ask the Senator whether he would join with me in bringing section 32 into the open, because there we have a transfer of approximately $180,000,000 or $200,000,000, without there being any direct appropriations.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont will join the Senator from Illinois, or any of the other 94 Senators, in bringing all subsidies into the open.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont what the nature of his amendment is. Is he striking the committee amendment and suggesting an appropriation of $109,000,000?

Mr. AIKEN. I have no such amendment written up. If I had one written, I would offer it. I am speaking on the committee amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have such an amendment prepared, and I would be glad to furnish it to the Senator from Vermont, and to support it. The matter is as broad as it is long. It does not involve one dollar's difference to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. I have sufficient confidence in the Senator from Georgia to offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 47, line 6, after the word "hereof:", it is proposed to substitute for the committee amendment the following:

Restoration of capital impairment, Commodity Credit Corporation: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation determined by the appraisal of June 30, 1951, pursuant to section 1 of the act of March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a-1), $109,391,154.

Mr. RUSSELL. I accept the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Should not the Senate first vote to reject the amendment reported by the committee? Otherwise we would have in the bill both an appropriation and a cancellation.

Mr. AIKEN. No. This is a substitute amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understood that the Senator from Vermont was offering the amendment as a substitute for the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a substitute amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I also ask to have appropriate changes made in the bill to make it conform to the amendment. I do not know where the changes will have to be made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I suggest that we incorporate in the amendment the appropriations which would take care of the other note cancellations appearing on pages 51 and 52.

Mr. AIKEN. I think we had better take these amendments one at a time. I know that two-thirds of the wheat agreement should be charged to foreign aid, and the remainder should be charged to the Department of Agriculture, because the Department of Agriculture could have received 70 cents a bushel for the wheat if it had sold it on the open market. I think we should take these matters up one at a time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont, which has been accepted by the Senator from Georgia to the committee amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE. Would not a point of order lie against the amendment if it could not be shown that there was an authorization for making the appropriation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not of that opinion.

Mr. CASE. I should like to observe that if there is no authorization the amendment constitutes legislation, and legislation may not be offered on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the question of germaneness were raised the Chair would have to submit the question to the Senate.

Mr. CASE. It is not only a question of germaneness. It is whether there is an authorization in law for making the appropriation. If there is no authorization in law for making the appropriation the amendment constitutes legislation. As legislation the amendment could not be offered on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The language involved comes to the Senate

in the form of legislation passed by the House.

Mr. CASE. If the Chair will indulge me further I should like to say that the question of germaneness would arise if the language proposed sought to amend the language of the House. Clearly if no authority existed, a proposal to make an appropriation would constitute new legislation and therefore would constitute in effect an amendment to existing law. Therefore, it would be legislation and could not be offered in the form of an amendment to an appropriation bill, except by setting aside the rule of the Senate by a two-thirds vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule of the Senate provides that all questions of relevancy of amendments, when raised, shall be submitted to the Senate and be decided without debate.

If the Senator from South Dakota wishes to appeal to the Senate, the Senate may pass on the question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE. Certainly; if I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois must have time yielded to him.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe that the act of 1938 with respect to the capital structure of the Commodity Credit Corporation authorized the appropriation. Therefore, I believe that the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont is in order.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from Illinois believes that the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont is in order, but he does not believe that the committee amendment as originally proposed would have been in order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

I wish to address one comment to the chairman of the subcommittee. I believe that the hearings were very meager on this point. I think also that for the information of the country and for the Senate there ought to be cumulative tables printed from time to time, running over a period of 10 years, showing actually what our losses are. There are only two references to this subject in the hearings, one at page 540 and the other at page 983. I have no doubt that the House hearings probably covered it in greater detail. But it is difficult to ascertain just what the losses are. Since these are public funds, I believe a little more emphasis should be placed on this matter and a little more information should be furnished.

However, I believe that the amendment submitted by the Senator from Vermont to the committee amendment is very clearly in order, and that there is authority in law for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, which has been accepted by the Senator from Georgia, to the committee amendment on page 47, beginning in line 6.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—Special activities—Research on strategic and critical agricultural materials," on page 49, line 22, after "(50 U. S. C. 98f)", to strike out "$582,000" and insert "$625,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—General provisions," on page 56, after line 7, to strike out:

SEC. 410. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1952: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

(b) to positions filled from within the department;

(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice of the Senate;

(d) to seasonal and casual workers;

(e) to employees engaged in meat inspection and law enforcement;

(f) to field employees of the Soil Conservation Service and Production and Marketing Administration who provide conservation assistance to farmers and ranchers;

(g) to field operating and research employees engaged in work of county offices and other field locations;

(h) to employees of the crop and livestock reporting service;

(i) to the administrative expense limitations fixed by this act for Federal intermediate credit banks and for production credit corporations, or to the appropriation for the Farm Credit Administration, except the portion thereof provided by direct appropriation from the General Fund of the Treasury;

(j) to employees in grades CPC 1, 2, and 3: *Provided further*, That when the total number of personnel subject to this section has been reduced to 90 percent of the total provided for in this act, such limitation may cease to apply and said 90 percent shall become a ceiling for employment during the fiscal year 1953, and if exceeded at any time during fiscal year 1953, this provision shall again become operative.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, after line 18, to insert:

SEC. 410. (a) No part of any appropriation made by this act for any purpose shall be used for the payment of personal services in excess of an amount equal to 90 percent of the amount requested for personal services for such purpose in budget estimates heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1953; and the total amount of each appropriation, any part of which is available for the payment of personal services for any purpose, is hereby reduced by an amount equal to 10 percent of the amount requested in such budget estimates for personal services for such purpose less an amount representing the reduction, if any, between the amount requested for personal services in the budget estimates and the amount appropriated herein for such services.

(b) This section shall not apply to—

1. Field operating and research employees engaged in work of county offices and other field locations

2. Employees of the crop and livestock reporting service.

3. Employees paid from funds for research.

4. The administrative expense limitations for Federal intermediate credit banks and for production credit corporations, or to the appropriation for the Farm Credit Administration except the portion thereof provided by direct appropriation from the general fund of the Treasury.

5. Employees of the market news service.

6. Employees of the Rural Electrification Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is at the desk an amendment which the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] proposes to submit to this committee amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have discussed with the Senator from Texas the amendment he proposes to submit to this committee amendment. The amendment at this point in the bill is known as the Ferguson amendment. An analysis of the figure which has been presented indicates that if the employees of the Rural Electrification Administration are excepted, the employees of the Soil Conservation Service should be excepted, also.

So I would have no objection to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment, because, under the circumstances and in view of the figures which have been presented, I think that would be fair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Michigan very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas desire to call up his amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes, Mr. President; I call up my amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 58, after line 22, it is proposed to insert:

7. Employees of the Soil Conservation Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, have all the committee amendments been acted upon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Several other committee amendments remain to be acted on.

The next committee amendment will be stated.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have an amendment to submit to the committee amendment on page 58. I now send it to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the amendment offered to the committee amendment on page 58?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I offer it to the committee amendment on page 58, in line 22. All of page 58 is a committee

amendment. Therefore, I believe my amendment is in order to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment, as amended, on page 58 was agreed to will be reconsidered, for the purpose of permitting consideration of the amendment which the Senator from Oregon desires to submit to that committee amendment.

That committee amendment, as amended, is now before the Senate; and the amendment submitted to it by the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, as amended, on page 58, after line 22, it is proposed to insert:

8. Employees of the Forest Service.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the amendment which I am submitting would amend the committee amendment, as amended, on page 58, in line 22, The item appearing at this point of the bill relates to appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, including those for the Forest Service.

Combat experience has repeatedly demonstrated that soldiers should not be placed in the line of fire without competent leadership. Failure to observe that rule of warfare almost always results in heavy losses.

The same rule applies to forest-fire fighters. Without competent leadership, losses among combatants of this type are also heavy.

Leadership in other activities of the Forest Service is likewise indispensable. More than 5,000,000,000 board-feet of timber will be cut from the national forests during the coming year. We are also providing large sums of money for the construction of access roads in the forested country. Most of the work of this type will of course be done by field workers. However, to do this work in such a way as not to damage our valuable forests requires skilled leadership. I am, therefore, in my amendment, proposing that the employees of the Forest Service be exempted from section 410 of this bill. Exemption is already provided for the fire fighters and woods workers. My amendment would also exempt the leaders needed to get this work done in a safe and satisfactory manner.

It seems inconsistent to me to grant the Forest Service increases in appropriation to step up the work which will greatly increase returns to the Government, and then on the other hand to make 10-percent reductions in specific levels of the organization.

The Forest Service is a highly decentralized organization with over 1,000 scattered field locations where the work is carried on. Certain centralized offices are operated to provide leadership, guidance, and specialized service to the work on the ground. Many services, such as accounting and purchasing, are handled on a centralized basis because this is the most efficient and economical way to get the job done. Yet these services, under the present system of Government procedure, are absolutely essential to getting the timber sold and cut, out in the forest, and to control the fires which are threatening to destroy a most valuable resource.

Regional offices of the Forest Service need to check on its widely scattered and isolated field work units in order to give leadership and guidance and to see that the field job is being done in the most efficient manner. It is absolutely essential that over-all direction, leadership, supervision, and inspection be conducted as an integral part of getting the job done in the field. If we expect to get the timber cut on the ground and to get the seriously damaging fires under control, we must depend upon the outfit doing the job to see that it is properly organized. To do otherwise is merely to place obstacles in the way of good management, which can only result in less productive work at the ground level.

Here is an organization which will return some $70,000,000 to the Treasury during the fiscal year 1952. Increases which have been provided will insure a greater return to the Treasury in the fiscal year 1953. It is very questionable in my mind that this body should take action which could well reduce receipts, rather than increase them.

Therefore, I submit this amendment, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], to the committee amendment, as amended, on page 58, in line 22.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. How many employees are there in the central office of the Forest Service? All other employees of the Forest Service are field operators or those who are engaged in research and those who are engaged in work at field locations; and all of them are excepted, under the original committee amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I do not have the exact statistics, but I have been advised by the Department that the proposed cut will make it necessary to cut the personnel that will be needed in order to give the leadership that is so essential in the fire-fighting program.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I desire to oppose the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon to the committee amendment. Thirty-three million dollars is in this fund. The field operators, those who are actually engaged in fire-fighting, those who are in the field, are excepted; no cut is proposed as to them.

The committee amendment would do nothing except make a cut of 10 percent in the budget estimate for the Washington office.

In other words, under the committee amendment the Washington office would receive 90 percent of the full amount of the budget estimate. That cut would be made only in the funds proposed for the Washington office.

Under the circumstances, when the Government is operating at a deficit, I think the time has come for us to reduce the overhead in the Washington office. The committee amendment would not make any reduction in the funds to be appropriated for the actual services in the field, but would simply reduce by 10 percent the amount of the budget estimate for the overhead in Washington.

So I hope the Senate will reject the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon, for himself and the Senator from Washington, to the committee amendment as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon, in behalf of himself and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], to the committee amendment, as amended, on page 58, after line 22.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the committee amendment as amended was rejected.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to the committee amendment at the same point.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, if I may be recognized, I should like to state that I understand that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has a short amendment which he wishes to offer.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment which now lies at the desk.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I wish to offer to the committee amendment which has just been under consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further amendments to be proposed to the committee amendment at this point in the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, some committee amendments remain to be acted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from South Dakota desires to offer an amendment to the committee amendment at this point in the bill. The amendment to the committee amendment, as amended, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 58, after line 22, and following the amendment of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas to the committee amendment at that point, it is proposed to insert:

8. Employees engaged in land development on water conservation and utilization projects.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, if this amendment to the committee amendment as amended is clearly understood, I believe the author of the committee amendment will wish to accept it.

On page 30, the bill provides an appropriation of $235,000 for water conservation and utilization projects. That $235,000 is to be used for land-leveling and the preparation of land for irrigation in small water conservation and utilization projects.

The application of the 90-percent provision last year meant that on one project that I know of, it was necessary to discharge some of the persons who were actually doing the work. There were only one or two supervisors or engineers on the project. Such a reduction meant the making of a reduction in the number of persons who were actually doing the work on the project. The result was

that not as much work could be accomplished by means of the expenditure of the same amount of money.

Mr. FERGUSON. I fear the Senator is not familiar with the nature of what is proposed by this amendment. It would not reduce contract items by 10 percent, but would reduce certain other items.

Mr. CASE. That is exactly the point. On some projects the work is done by contract. I say it does not apply at all. On the Angostura project in South Dakota, the work was not done by contract but was done by purchase and hire.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then all the field employees are excepted.

Mr. CASE. They found that they were able to save money for the Government. They were able to prepare the land at a cost of about $37 an acre, as contrasted to the cost of $64 an acre when done by contract. Under the application of this amendment last year they had to reduce some of those in the lower levels, and they did not get the work done. They had the same number of supervisory employees, because they had to have supervision.

Mr. FERGUSON. But, if the Senator will yield, this excepts all field employees. Every supervisor in the field is exempted by this amendment. This is only applicable to the administrative office.

Mr. CASE. If paragraph 1 covers the situation, and if the Senator will state that it does——

Mr. FERGUSON. I am stating it emphatically.

Mr. CASE. Was that in the amendment last year?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. We inserted it this year.

Mr. CASE. Then the first part of the amendment does not apply.

Mr. FERGUSON. It does not apply to field operators.

Mr. CASE. Of course, I do not know whether what I have in mind is an operation. It is not a normal operation. It has to do with the contract phase of the project.

Mr. FERGUSON. We included the language, "field, operating and research employees engaged in the work, county offices, and other field locations."

Mr. CASE. I am perfectly willing to have my amendment considered no further, on the statement of the Senator from Michigan that section 410 (a) can be interpreted so that it does not apply. But I know that last year it did apply, and the result was that there were one or two engineers sitting around at the end of the year without any employees.

Mr. FERGUSON. It does not apply to field operators.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, under the circumstances, and with that understanding, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has withdrawn his amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator from Georgia mind if I offer an amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to complete the committee amendments. It seems to me now that in the light of recent developments the amendment which is designated as section 413 is probably surplusage in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would inquire whether there are any further amendments to be offered to section 410? If not, the question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 58, after line 22, to insert:

SEC. 411. (a) No part of the money appropriated by this act to any department, agency, or corporation which is in excess of 90 percent of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1953 contemplated would be employed by such department, agency, or corporation during such fiscal year in the performance of—

(1) functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press-relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information, publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material,

shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2), and the total amount of each appropriation, any part of which is available for such purpose, is hereby reduced by an amount equal to 10 percent of the amount requested in such budget estimates for such purpose.

(b) This section shall not apply to personnel engaged in the preparation and distribution of technical agricultural publications and farmers bulletins, and the Agriculture Yearbook, the reporting and dissemination of the results of research and investigations, the preparation and broadcasting of the Farm and Home Hour and similar radio programs, and other work required to carry out the duties and responsibilities of the Department imposed by law other than work intended primarily for press, radio and television services, and popular publications.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have an amendment to section 411.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 60, line 3, after the first comma, it is proposed to insert the words "preparation and distribution of information on the protection of natural resources against fire, insects, and disease."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon to the committee amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, most Senators are familiar with the fire-prevention program the Forest Service has carried on for the past 17 years. This campaign is sponsored by the National Advertising Council and in many respects it is comparable to the interest that organization has shown in the Defense bond drives.

Over 95 percent of the cost is financed by industry. When I say "industry," I am not thinking merely of the logging and lumbering firms—I am thinking also of grocery stores, streetcar companies, and many other community-minded organizations that participate.

The fire-prevention campaign has made millions of Americans more conscious of the need for protecting our great timber resources. Some Senators will recall that the Congress recently passed legislation giving the Forest Service a copyright on the use of the name "Smokey Bear," as a character around which many of the radio, television, and other programs are built.

Personally, I think the fire-prevention campaign has paid terrific dividends to the country. As I said earlier, over 95 percent of the cost is borne by industry. The Forest Service, however, must be in position to provide technical information and some assistance in developing suitable skits for this campaign.

I want to be sure that the language of section 411, particularly subsection (b), recognizes this situation and, hence, propose the following amendment:

On page 60, line 3, after the first comma, insert the words "preparation and distribution of information on the protection of natural resources against fire, insects, and disease."

I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether he would be willing to take that amendment to conference.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course the Senator from Oregon realizes, does he not, that this is an attempt to make a 10-percent cut in the so-called propaganda item? Many exceptions are made in connection with what we felt to be legitimate information. Do I correctly understand that there is an appropriation for these so-called fire-prevention notices?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct. What those who are interested in this educational program, sponsored primarily by the National Advertising Council, wish to make certain is that the amendment of the Senator from Michigan would not deny to the Forest Service the right to carry on that program.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator know the amount that is contained in the bill for a program of this kind?

Mr. MORSE. No, I do not.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am not clear as to the reference to the provision regarding fire, insects, and disease. What is that?

Mr. MORSE. It is their educational program, showing the great damage which the insects do to the forests, and what the citizens in the various commu-

nities can do by community cooperation to help check the ravages of insects.

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course, if that is the result of research, then it is excepted.

Mr. MORSE. The purpose of my amendment is to make clear that the committee amendment does not cover a program which has been conducted for some years with very beneficial results, and would not affect it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator know how this amendment was interpreted last year with relation to the items he has mentioned?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon does not know.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should be willing, in view of the explanation by the Senator, to take the amendment to conference. In the meantime, I shall ask the clerk to obtain all possible information from the central office regarding these programs.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I see no objection to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon. I think it consistent with the general policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Oregon is agreed to. Without objection, the committee amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

JOHN CROCKETT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized on a matter of privilege.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask the indulgence of the Senate as I make an announcement which I know will bring sadness to the hearts of all Members of the Senate, at least those whose service dates back 6 or 7 years. The announcement relates to a very famous and colorful fellow citizen of mine from Iowa, who was a valued servant of the Senate for a good many years. At 2:30 this afternoon, as I am informed John Crockett died at Doctors Hospital. Those of us who had known him for a good many years loved and revered him. He was a colorful figure, linking the past with the present in the history of the Senate of the United States. He was a public servant in the Senate whose first interest was the interest of the Members of the Senate whom he served.

I am not prepared to go into a lengthy eulogy of John Crockett this afternoon. He is eulogized in the hearts of everyone who knew him during the 40 or 50 years in which he served this body. I refer Senators at this moment to the eulogies which were pronounced in this body, on the occasion of his birthday, on June 17, 1947. I hope that at the earliest opportunity I can at a little greater length pay my respects to this grand old pioneer and grand servant of this body, a fellow Iowan whose experience in the legislative field reaches far back into our own Iowa Legislature.

I know I can express to his family the heartfelt sympathy of all who knew him and their deep regret at the ending of a great career.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I became a Member of the House of Representatives in November 1911. John Crockett then delivered messages from the Senate to the House. I can recall his wonderful voice, and the delightful manner he had. When I came to the Senate I found him to be a faithful, upright, conscientious, hard-working, splendid employee of this body. I honored and respected him, and I am grieved to hear of his passing. He was a wonderful man, a fine friend, and a faithful and patriotic servant of the Senate of the United States and of the Government.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, at this sad moment I want to say a few words about John Crockett.

When I came to the Senate he was in the employ of the Senate, and he was of great assistance to the Senator from Michigan. He always made the Senator from Michigan feel that he was trying to be of great help and assistance, which was also his attitude with reference to all Senators. He served the Senate for a long time. We missed him when he retired because of age and of illness.

We deeply regret to hear of his passing, for we have lost a great public servant.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7314) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have an amendment on the desk which I wish to call up at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let us first dispose of the committee amendments.

The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 60, after line 8, to insert:

SEC. 412. No appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be available to pay—

(1) for personal services above basic rates of civilian administrative personnel (except field employees);

(2) for transportation of things (other than mail); or

(3) for travel of civilian employees (other than for field operation of action programs), more than 90 percent of the amount which the budget estimates heretofore submitted in connection with appropriation or authorization contemplated would be expended therefrom for such purposes, respectively; and the total amount of each appropriation, any part of which is available for such purpose, is hereby reduced by an amount equal to 10 percent of the amount requested in such budget estimates for such purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, after line 24, to insert:

SEC. 413. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or any funds made available for expenditure by this act, shall be used for the purpose of acquiring, seizing, or operating any plant, facility, or other property, unless the acquisition, seizure, or operation of such plant, facility, or other property is authorized by act of Congress.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, under the circumstances, because of the decision of the Supreme Court and the fact that the President of the United States, in compliance with the decision in the steel seizure case, has returned the property, there is no need for the section. Should a further seizure be made in violation of the Supreme Court decision and of the Constitution, we could take the matter up, but at the present time there is no need for this section being in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment incorporating section 413 in the bill.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any committee amendments which were passed over?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is an amendment on page 12, line 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Under the heading "Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering," on page 12, line 5, after the word "planes", the committee proposes to strike out "$11,330,000" and to insert "$11,590,000, including not to exceed $15,000 for construction of an addition to the United States Cotton Ginning Branch Laboratory at Mesilla Park, N. Mex."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, to the committee amendment I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 12, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "$11,590,000" and insert "$11,600,000."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, my amendment would add $10,000 additional for research in connection with the elimination of the screwworm. As Members of the Senate will recall, last session $20,000 was appropriated for such research.

One of the worst and most deadly pests in the country, particularly among cattle in the Southeast, is the screwworm. I very much hope that the distinguished chairman of the committee will take the amendment to conference.

Mr. RUSSELL. The amendment involves the use of radial energy, a new development in the field, and I think I would be justified in taking it to conference.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Michigan has anything to say in the conference he would have to oppose it.

Mr. HILL. I hope that by the time the amendment gets to conference we shall be able to furnish the Senator all the facts.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be glad to hear all the facts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 22, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "$5,365,000" and insert "$5,415,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in brief—and I want to address my remarks particularly to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]—there is a request to increase the amount by $50,000. I would be rather sheepish about it if it were not for the fact that quite a number of items in the bill have been increased for the purpose of research and investigation. The purpose of the amendment is to make provision to set up a plant for wood utilization in an area in southern Illinois embracing approximately 20 counties which has already been designated as a distressed area by military authorities. Mines have been abandoned, so that much of the income of the people has lapsed and they have to fall back upon their one and only natural resource, which is timber, which they have been converting into boxes, mine props, and so forth.

As the Senator from Georgia remarked today, with reference to a similar item, it would add materially to the revenue and the amount appropriated would come back to the Federal Treasury. It is a modest amount, as compared with what we are doing abroad. One might call it "point 4 at home." We are not asking for anything like the amount that was given to Yugoslavia or to India.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is cast in such an unusual role that I am very much impressed by what he says about his amendment. I happen to have some knowledge of the subject which he has discussed. Some 10 years ago I traveled through sections of Indiana, Illinois, and Pennsylvania where strip mining had been carried on. I was utterly appalled by the devastation which had resulted from the accumulation of slag and other material, rendering the land useless.

When I returned, I recommended, on my own initiative, an appropriation of $40,000. We have not been able to do much with it, because States have been derelict in passing laws which would require putting the topsoil aside, first, and then scattering it over the land.

If no member of the committee objects, I shall be glad to take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be stated. I hope it may be taken to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 33, line 15, after "counties", it is proposed to insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That not to exceed 2½ percent of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program for any State may be utilized in determining the most needed conservation practices on individual farms for which Federal assistance shall be given."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I believe the amendment has been discussed with all members of the subcommittee. It does not involve any increase whatsoever in the appropriation. It takes from the appropriation made available for the soil-conservation program a small amount for an intensive study of soil-conservation practices needed on each farm.

The amount originally requested was 5 percent. After discussing the matter with the Senator from Tennessee, he has modified his amendment to make the amount 2½ percent. Inasmuch as no increase in appropriations is involved, I have no objection to taking the amendment to conference.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Michigan have amendments which bring out the fact that many of the practices under soil conservation which should normally be carried out, should not be paid for by the Federal Government, I do not think any money can be lost by adopting the amendment. It would not increase the appropriation, but would use some of the experimental and research money to determine what programs should be paid for by the Federal Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. That being true, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement I have prepared on the subject covered by the amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McKELLAR

The amendment is for the sole purpose of getting more out of each dollar appropriated for the conservation of our farm land resources. It simply makes it possible for the Department of Agriculture through the PMA, to determine what conservation needs on each farm have the highest priority so that assistance from Federal funds will be given only on those high-priority practices.

This approach is a change-over from the old cafeteria-style program where farmers could select from a list the practices they wanted to carry out with Federal assistance. It involves an actual review of each farm's needs by a farmer-committeeman and the farmer himself and the full use of plans laid out by all other agencies interested in conservation.

It is being tried in one county in each State in 1952. The results are astonishing. Two big changes result from this approach: (1) more permanent-type conservation practices are carried out and less of the assistance is being required to get recurring or "repeat" practices performed and (2) more farmers become interested in conserving their soil, and the same number of dollars of Government funds are spread over many more acres. Latest reports from the trial counties in the 1952 program indicate an average of 70 percent increase in permanent type practices and an average increase of 28 percent in the number of farmers' participation. In some places the increases in both permanent-type practices and in participation exceed 100 percent.

This amendment would set aside 2½ percent of the funds allocated to each State under the law for conservation assistance payments for use in determining the most economical and sound way to make that assistance available. It will produce more of the kind of conservation practices we in the Congress have advocated and which this country must have if our food supplies are to be protected. I urge full support for the amendment.

Increase in permanent type practices, and increase in total participation in 50 trial counties where community committeemen were used to determine most needed conservation practices in which Federal assistance will be given in the 1952 agricultural conservation program; based on reports from State PMA offices, May 26, 1952

State	Permanent practices	Participation
	Percent	*Percent*
Maine	+20	+9
New Hampshire	−10	−10
Vermont	+10	+0
Massachusetts	+10	+8
Rhode Island	+76	+6
Connecticut	+500	+9
New York	+200	−6
New Jersey	+75	+5
Pennsylvania	+40	+0
Ohio	+100	+7
Indiana	+15	+10
Illinois	+77	+35
Michigan	+20	+0
Wisconsin	+80	+4
Minnesota	+400	+12
Iowa:		
Sioux County	+65	+15
Marshall County	+50	+19
Missouri	+20	+12
North Dakota	+14	+30
South Dakota	+15	+12
Nebraska	+35	+6
Kansas	+25	+30
Delaware	+60	+12
Maryland	+11	+124
Virginia	+311	+44
West Virginia	+58	+66
North Carolina	+88	+74
South Carolina	+20	+54
Georgia	+28	+22
Florida	+30	+60
Kentucky	+100	+7
Tennessee	+30	+3
Alabama	+20	+50
Mississippi	+36	+28
Arkansas	[1]	+100
Louisiana	+80	+112
Oklahoma	+19	+20
Texas	−53	+21
Montana	+100	+30
Idaho	+25	+30
Wyoming	+17	+24
Colorado	+26	+19
New Mexico	[1]	+30
Arizona	+0	(·)
Utah	+20	+77
Nevada	+15	+0
Washington	+176	+54
Oregon	+20	+10
California	+185	+10
United States [3]	+70	+28

[1] Not reported.
[2] Small increase.
[3] Simple average, not weighted.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a short statement printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ELLENDER

The agricultural conservation program has been criticized because more of the funds

for the program were not being used in carrying out more of the permanent-type conservation practices. Charges have been made that too much of the program money is being spent on the annual, on recurring, types of practices which farmers can and should carry out without program assistance. We of the Congress have insisted that this program be more along the line of permanent conservation and that the program assistance be given only for practices most needed on the individual farm, and which come in the order of first things first. It was in an effort to strengthen the program along these lines that a new agricultural conservation plan was developed for this year.

Under this plan, the farmers' own elected representative—his PMA community committeeman—will contact him and assist in determining, on the basis of the most-needed practices for the farm, how the limited funds for conservation could best be used to supplement the farmer's personal investment in conservation of his soil. Also, under this plan the community committeeman will help his neighbor farmers work out the means for carrying out the more permanent-type conservation practices needed on the farm. To gain experience on a test basis, the plan was put into operation by the Production and Marketing Administration in one county in each State in 1952. Funds available for administering this plan for 1952 did not permit it being extended to more than one county in each State. The results of these test counties indicate two things:

First, that after consideration of the conservation problems by the farmer and his community committeeman, there is an increase of at least 70 percent in the assistance being used on the more permanent-type conservation measures, such as terracing, installing sod waterways, building erosion control dams, establishing permanent pastures, providing drainage, conserving irrigation water, improving forests, and restoring range lands. Because of the contact by community committeemen, farmers have voluntarily decreased the program funds being used on the types of practices which they are more likely to carry out in their normal farming operations, such as protecting summer fallowed land from wind erosion by cultural methods, fertilizing and liming established protective cover and growing green manure and annual cover crops.

Second, an average of about 28 percent more farmers are participating in the agricultural conservation program in these counties. This means that more acres are getting soil-conserving treatment than heretofore in these counties, with no increase in the amount of money appropriated by the Congress.

The proposed amendment which will make possible the use of this new method of operation in all counties in the program year 1953 is essential, if we are to obtain for the public the maximum return in conservation with the tax dollars we are appropriating for this program.

This amendment does not make available one cent more for salaries of full-time Federal employees or county office employees. These funds are to pay the expenses, or probably something less than that, of the full-time dirt farmers chosen by their neighboring farmers to administer the ACP in that neighborhood. Their expenses in travel and time away from home on this work will far exceed the small pay they will receive but most of them cannot afford the financial sacrifice they would be called on to make without these funds. These farmers have to work for a living and we can't expect them to neglect their own work while rendering a service in the common interests of all farmers and other taxpayers

The following table shows the effect in each State of the trials made to determine permanent practices and participation:

Increase in permanent-type practices, and increase in total participation in 50 trial counties where community committeemen were used to determine most needed conservation practices on which Federal assistance will be given in the 1952 agricultural conservation program; based on reports from State PMA offices, May 26, 1952

State	Permanent practices	Participation
	Percent	*Percent*
Maine	+20	+9
New Hampshire	−10	−10
Vermont	+10	+0
Massachusetts	+10	+8
Rhode Island	+75	+6
Connecticut	+500	+9
New York	+200	−6
New Jersey	+75	+5
Pennsylvania	+20	+0
Ohio	+100	+7
Indiana	+15	+10
Illinois	+77	+35
Michigan	+20	+0
Wisconsin	+80	+4
Minnesota	+400	+12
Iowa:		
Sioux County	+65	+15
Marshall County	+50	+19
Missouri	+20	+12
North Dakota	+14	+50
South Dakota	+15	+12
Nebraska	+35	+6
Kansas	+25	+30
Delaware	+60	+12
Maryland	+11	+124
Virginia	+311	+44
West Virginia	+58	+66
North Carolina	+88	+74
South Carolina	+20	+54
Georgia	+28	+22
Florida	+30	+60
Kentucky	+100	+7
Tennessee	+30	+3
Alabama	+20	+50
Mississippi	+36	+28
Arkansas	(1)	+100
Louisiana	+80	+112
Oklahoma	+19	+20
Texas	−53	+21
Montana	+100	+30
Idaho	+25	+30
Wyoming	+17	+24
Colorado	+26	+19
New Mexico	(1)	+30
Arizona	0	(2)
Utah	+20	+77
Nevada	+15	0
Washington	+176	+54
Oregon	+20	+10
California	+185	+10
United States [3]	+70	+28

[1] Not reported.
[2] Small increase.
[3] Simple average, not weighted.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 25, it is proposed to strike out lines 21 to 23, and on page 26 lines 1 and 2, and insert:

For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forests, as authorized by section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (Public Law 478), $700,000, to remain available until expended; and the unobligated balance of the $700,000 appropriated under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1952 (Public Law 135, 82d Congress) is hereby continued available, but not subject to the provision relating to the use of such appropriation included in such act.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the object of offering the amendment in this form, to strike out and insert, is to get the entire matter into conference. It was the understanding of the committee, and I believe the understanding of the House, that the full amount of $700,000 was to be available for the next year; in other words, that no part of the appropriation made for the present fiscal year had been expended.

I am advised in a telephone communication from the Department of Agriculture that some part of the money has been expended. I could not get a more accurate figure. The item may amount to as much as $200,000. If that be the case, the amount available, as it stands in the bill, would not be the $700,000 agreed upon. As a matter of policy, the money should be expended each year, because it comes from grazing fees collected from users of the range. The law provides that 2 cents a head for sheep, and 10 cents a head for cattle shall be used for range improvements.

So, in order to get the matter to conference, to obtain the facts, and to make sure that there will be actually $700,000, and no more, available, I have offered my amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the amendment add any more money to the appropriation? Would any more be appropriated?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; the amendment does not add any more money. If $700,000 was left over from last year, as the bill reads as it comes from the House and as the committee approved it, the $700,000 would be expended. But if in truth and in fact some part of the $700,000 which was appropriated for this year has been expended, then there will not be $700,000 left for next year. We seek to determine what the difference is.

Mr. FERGUSON. But no more money is appropriated under the Senator's amendment, I understand.

Mr. HAYDEN. No. Seven hundred thousand dollars is provided for the next fiscal year, as was intended. We can determine what will be available when the bill goes to conference.

Mr. FERGUSON. Under the circumstances, so that a study can be made in conference, I have no objection.

Mr. HAYDEN. The facts will be obtained from the Department.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona what is meant by the language:

The $700,000 appropriated under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act for 1952 (Public Law 135, 82d Cong.), is hereby continued available, but not subject to the provision relating to the use of such appropriation included in such act.

Mr. HAYDEN. In last year's bill, there were a number of restrictions which made this activity practically inoperative, except in certain instances. Exactly the number of instances and the amount of money that was expended I have been unable to learn. But to the extent the money has been used under those conditions, which the House has now abandoned, we ought to appropriate the full $700,000, because that is what is

required under the section of the law which provides that a charge of 2 cents a head for sheep, and 10 cents a head for cattle may be used as prescribed.

Mr. MALONE. Can it be used for range improvements as originally intended by such appropriation and assessment.

Mr. HAYDEN. It can be used for range improvements, as was intended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk my amendment designated "6-4-52—A," and askd that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 32, line 12, it is proposed to strike out all after "amended" down to and including "$2,500)" in line 20, and insert: "amounting to $150,000,000 including administration, and formulated on the basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States and counties in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the secretary, except that no payments authorized in this proviso shall be made for soil-building and soil-and-water conserving practices which are a normal and accepted part of farming operations of the county or locality in which the farm is situated, and no participant shall receive more than $2,500)."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] associates himself with me in the sponsorship of the amendment. I am happy to have him join with me, and should like the RECORD so to show.

I read to a group of farm editors a few days ago some portions of a magazine article headed "Farmers Milk Public Treasury." I did not subscribe to a word in that article. I do not believe the farmers of the United States are engaged in milking the Public Treasury, but once in a while there are some bad practices which lead to that belief.

I could not help being struck a few minutes ago when the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] was trying hard to get $750,000 for some work in the headwaters of streams. It appears to be thought we could not afford to make the appropriation, but we can permit each year the payment of $250,000,000 for soil-conservation practices, a great deal of which would have been carried on whether the money was available or not.

When the junior Senator from South Dakota referred to some work in his State, particularly when he mentioned the Vermilion River, beside which I lived as a youngster, with a house on one side and a farm on the other, I realized that throughout all sections of the United States there are farmers who would like to see a real program for controlling headwaters of streams, yet we cannot do it because it will take 50 years to put the program into operation. No; we cannot afford to go through with many desirable projects.

I say the way to accomplish what is desired is to act where we can save money, a hundred million dollars at a time. My amendment proposes to save $150,000,000.

There appeared in a New Mexico newspaper not long ago a paid advertisement inserted by a man who signed himself "Bill Porter," who is manager of a large ranch. He said this to the taxpayers:

THANKS TO THE TAXPAYERS

I wish to take this means of thanking the taxpaying citizens for constructing a lake on my ranch at Watrous, increasing the value of the property and secondarily in increasing the recreational value of this property.

I have just received authorization of payment of $474.10 from the Government, under the PMA program, which sum was received for improving facilities at my ranch—something which I no doubt would have done myself.

Next year, I am informed, I will be entitled to a payment of $2,500 for continued Government-approved practices on my ranch property.

I regard the Government's interest in my ranch as a profitable enterprise.

I would like to remind you taxpayers that this expenditure is necessary, because, the President himself has said that he has cut the budget to the bone, leaving only essential expenditures.

Again, thanks, taxpayers—although you might not realize you are making this windfall possible.

BILL PORTER.

WATROUS, N. MEX.

What is the situation on that land? There is a man who, for years and years and years, has been practicing soil conservation. But when the Agriculture Conservation Program was merged with the Soil Conservation Program, someone went to this man and wanted him to accept money for what he had been willing for a long time to do without pay.

This is why the farm organizations have become interested. The American Farm Bureau Federation and the Grange have recommended a large cut in this appropriation. The cut which I am suggesting does not go so far as the farm organizations would go. The Farm Bureau Federation would cut about $100,000,000. The Grange recommends that the amount be cut out almost entirely. Only a few minutes ago, the Grange sent to me a copy of testimony which was given before a Senate subcommittee by Herschel D. Newsom, the new Master of the Grange, in which he says:

May we remind this committee that we recognize the benefit that has accrued to many farmers and to consumers alike from the "agricultural conservation payments" but we feel that there is little justification for making such payments to the farmers, who would automatically carry out necessary conservation practices at a profit to themselves without incentive payments. The inability of low-income farmers to finance these practices has been used as an argument for direct subsidy payments but we cannot solve basic farm problems by putting farmers on a dole. We recommend elimination of the present system.

The American Farm Bureau Federation, with its 1,420,000 farm families, the Grange, with its 400,000 farm families, and 1,800,000 of the 2,000,000 members belonging to farm organizations, say that these payments should be eliminated.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Did the Senator make clear that his amendment relates to the authorization for setting up the program for succeeding years, and does not relate to the funds to make payments for programs which are now in operation, in the current year?

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator. The big argument against this proposal has always been, "You have made a contract with the farmers. They have planted their crops and used their fertilizer, and they should not be cheated out of their money." Therefore this amendment relates only to the 1953 program. It is the endeavor to limit it to practices which are really worth while and novel.

A short time ago the State of California issued some very interesting literature. It was entitled "Basic California." It was pointed out how the population had grown. It was pointed out that California is now the foremost State in cash farm income by a substantial margin, with $2,500,000,000 in cash income every year going to the State of California.

Do Senators know what percentage of the land in California is represented by participation in the ACP programs and with respect to which payments are made? According to the Department of Agriculture records, issued in December 1951, there is 13.7 percent participation. The remainder of the farms are out. Less than half the farms in the United States participate in this program, and I say that such a program can safely be trimmed down, this time by at least $100,000,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is certain language in the Senator's amendment, beginning in line 7 which reads as follows: "no payments authorized in this proviso shall be made for soil-building and soil-and-water conserving practices which are a normal and accepted part of farming operations of the county or locality in which the farm is situated, and no participant shall receive more than $2,500."

I am wondering if that language pertains to this kind of situation: I notice by the table that in the best counties, where the land is most fertile in our State, payments are larger than in the areas where they are really needed. Is that true in a great many other States?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. This money should be used to help build up farms which really need assistance. In a State bordering on my State the money which seems to be going into payments for certain farm practices is not needed, but the area of the State which badly needs good farming practices does not receive any money. Therefore, I believe that we ought to take a real cut at these payments, and eliminate

$100,000,000 from them. If we do that, I believe that we shall be benefiting ourselves.

I have agreed to yield some time to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I yield 5 minutes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In order that I may be enlightened, in the area where there is the greatest need for soil building or for a soil conservation program, why is not such a program in operation?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it is primarily because the richer farmers, the farmers with greater resources, know more about farm programs, and find it easier to get in to the farm office. Frequently the man who needs assistance most does not know who his county agricultural agent is.

Mr. THYE. Are the PMA and the Soil Conservation Service negligent in their educational programs? Do they fail to reach the man who is residing on the most depleted soil, and who needs this assistance the most? Is there a failure on the part of the Department of Agriculture to carry out the educational program?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not want to say that there is a failure on the part of anyone, particularly under existing circumstances; but I suggest that if we modify the program so that the payments will be limited to payments for practices not customarily used in the area, and require the Government agencies to come up with new types of soil building in areas where the soil really needs to be built, it will not be long before we shall have a far better agricultural program.

I now yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, for what do these payments go? The Department of Agriculture issues a bulletin called "The Agricultural Conservation Program, Statistical Summary, 1950." Page 2 lists the purposes, and the proportion of the total outlays for specific purposes. Thirty-nine percent of the $250,000,000 is spent for inorganic fertilizer, nearly all of it for applying lime and phosphate, investments which are paid back in increased crops, virtually in the same year. It is true that there is some carry-over for succeeding years, but in the main it does not require much foresight to see that lime and phosphate will pay for themselves. So payments for those purposes, in general, do not have to be stimulated by subsidies. In effect, therefore, they are largely bonus payments made to successful farmers for carrying out practices which they would do anyway as a matter of good business.

Thirteen percent is used to put protective and green manure on the land. I do not believe that a payment of this kind—something like $35,000,000—is needed to cause farmers to know that putting green manure on land will increase productivity.

About 4 percent is used for protecting summer fallow.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to complete my statement, if I may. I shall be glad to yield later.

About 4 percent is used for protecting summer fallow, which is an accepted practice in dry farming areas, and which will be done whether bonus payments are made or are not made.

About 2½ percent is for eliminating weeds in pasture, or controlling competitive plants in pasture, which I suppose is a fancy way of describing the same thing.

One percent is for water wells.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a table showing the proportion each practice which is subsidized bears to the total for the country as a whole.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Conservation practices for which payments are made under the agricultural conservation program, United States and Territories

	Portion of total credit
Total inorganic materials for conserving uses	39.00
Liming materials—standard ground limestone equivalent	15.96
Phosphate materials—20 percent superphosphate equivalent	19.06
Potash materials—50 percent muriate equivalent	3.57
Gypsum or sulfur—18 percent sulfur equivalent	.16
Boron—100 percent boron equivalent	.01
Manganese sulphate—oxide equivalent	.05
Copper sulphate—oxide equivalent	.05
Zinc sulphate—oxide equivalent	.02
Magnesium—oxide equivalent	.12
Protective and green manure crops	18.93
Green manure and cover crops	13.29
Permanent cover on steep slopes, waterways, and eroded land	.77
Perennial cover established in orchards	.01
Perennial cover maintained in orchards	(1)
Seeding increased acreages of legumes and grasses	4.86
Mechanical practices primarily for erosion control	14.64
Terraces—standard	2.53
Terraces, ditches and dikes—diversion and spreader	.63
Terraces—individual mulch, around vanilla plants	(1)
Contour farming—intertilled crops	1.12
Contour farming—close-sown crops	.48
Contour farming—strip cropping established	.28
Cross-slope farming—intertilled crops	.03
Cross-slope farming—close-sown crops	.03
Cross-slope farming—strip cropping established	.01
Strip cropping not on the contour	1.41
Contour planting orchards and vineyards	(1)
Sod waterways and terrace outlets established	.50
Sod waterways and terrace outlets established—earth moved	.36
Mechanical protection of outlets and flumes in gullies	.04
Constructing ditches with rock or vegetative barriers	(1)
Mechanical practices primarily for erosion control—Continued	
Constructing protected outlet channels	(1)
Protecting summer fallow	3.91
Subsoiling—regular and rotary	.8
Tillage operations on cropland to prevent erosion	.5
Contour tillage operations on non-crop pasture	.01
Crop residue management—stubble mulch	.68
Crop residue management—leaving stalks or stubble	.18
Dams for erosion control—storage type (new)	.92
Sums for erosion control—storage type (improved)	(1)
Dams for erosion control—checks and drops	.03
Riprap	.10
Vegetative barriers planted to control erosion	(1)
Rock barriers for bench terraces	(1)
Mulching blow land to control wind erosion	.01
Permanent ditches constructed to prevent soil wash	.01
Drainage	3.50
Open farm ditches	2.36
Enclosed drains	1.14
Irrigation	3.57
Irrigation ditches, dikes or laterals (reorganization only)	.27
Dams and reservoirs for irrigation (new)	0.34
Dams and reservoirs for irrigation (improved)	.03
Leveling land for irrigation	1.45
Lining irrigation ditches (reorganization only)	.21
Drops, chutes, etc., for irrigation (reorganization only)	.17
Flumes for irrigation (reorganization only)	.10
Siphons and pipes for irrigation (reorganization only)	1.00
Pasture and range	16.27
Seeding and reseeding pasture—artificial	8.20
Reseeding range—natural, by deferred grazing	.08
Grazing land management	.10
Small pasture management	(1)
Dams and reservoirs for livestock water (new)	3.94
Dams and reservoirs for livestock water (improved)	.26
Springs and seeps developed for livestock water	.04
Wells constructed for livestock water (new)	.89
Wells constructed for livestock water (deepened)	(1)
Pipelines installed for livestock water	.08
Supplemental water storage developed for livestock water	.05
Watersheds for livestock water—artificial	.01
Stock trails constructed	.03
Fireguards constructed or maintained to protect range	.03
Mowing weeds on pasture	1.27
Controlling competitive plants on pasture	1.28
Increasing acreages of legumes and grasses for seed	.01
Forestry	.38
Tree planting	.23
Improving a stand of forest trees	.05
Maintaining a stand of trees in windbreaks	.03
Fireguards or firebreaks constructed to protect woodland	.02

[1] 0.005 or less.

Conservation practices for which payments are made under the agricultural conservation program, United States and Territories—Continued

	Portion of total credit
All other	3.71
Clearing land	1.06
Weed control—tillage or chemicals	1.32
Lining earthen reservoirs	.01
Mulching materials applied to orchards or vineyards	.17
Coffee pulp applied to coffee trees	(1)
Fencing to protect woodland and pasture	.54
Stone wall and hedgerow removal	.08
Applying sugarcane mill refuse	.05
Pineapple plants, shredded, applied to pineapple fields	.01
Applying fertilizer in coffee groves	.22
Local practices	.25
Total	100.00

[1] 0.005 or less.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think that many of these purposes are, in the main, such that they would be carried out by virtually all farmers without the payment of subsidies. The subsidy, therefore, does not in these cases stimulate better agricultural practices. It merely spreads money from the taxpayer to a certain group of people in the population, many of whom are much better off that the average taxpayer.

Reference has been made to the fact that these benefits go to a greater extent to the farmers on better land than to the farmers on poorer land. I have before me some figures for my own State and for the State of Mississippi.

The Twenty-fourth Congressional District in my State is the most hilly section. It has the least fertile soil. It is most in need of soil conservation practices. The average payment per square mile there amounts to $188. The wealthiest farm district in my State is the Seventeenth District, around Bloomington. There the average payments per square mile are $225. In other words, the section of the State which is most fertile, and which needs soil conservation practices probably the least, receives most; and the section of the State which needs soil conservation practices most receives the least.

Let me turn to the State of Mississippi. I note that the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is present in the chamber. I am not acquainted in complete detail with the geography of Mississippi, but from what I can learn from the maps of that State, in the main there is a rather sharp division between the so-called delta counties and the hill counties. The delta counties are extremely fertile. The hill countries are not so rich. In the hill counties, where the soil is poor, and where the need for conservation is greater, the average payment per square mile is $154. In the delta counties the average payment is $216 per square mile. The richer land receives a larger payment per square mile than the poor soil.

Mr. President, I have worked out some tables on these average payments per square mile comparing selected hilly districts with selected flat fertile districts in Illinois and Mississippi. I ask unanimous consent to insert these tables in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Illinois

	Number of square miles	Payments in 1950
TWENTY-FOURTH DISTRICT		
Clinton	498	$112,550
Marion	580	134,587
Clay	464	95,810
Washington	565	142,983
Jefferson	574	134,011
Wayne	715	98,417
Edwards	225	58,600
Gallatin	328	59,635
Hamilton	435	62,829
Hardin	183	23,010
Johnson	345	51,514
Massac	246	38,657
Pope	381	32,430
Saline	384	66,249
White	501	98,417
Total	6,424	1,209,699
Average per square mile	$188	
TWENTIETH DISTRICT		
Adams	866	168,957
Brown	307	59,181
Calhoun	259	37,159
Cass	370	74,795
Greene	543	92,282
Hancock	797	163,180
Jersey	374	80,701
McDonough	582	102,603
Morgan	565	101,723
Pike	829	153,925
Schuyler	434	87,913
Scott	251	47,472
Total	6,177	1,169,891
Average per square mile	$189	
TWENTY-SECOND DISTRICT		
De Witt	399	64,244
Macon	577	126,090
Shelby	772	145,039
Piatt	437	105,036
Moultrie	345	77,783
Champaign	1,000	187,756
Douglas	420	86,946
Coles	507	93,781
Total	4,457	886,675
Average per square mile	$199	
SEVENTEENTH DISTRICT		
Ford	488	114,578
Iroquois	1,112	235,983
Kankakee	680	144,406
Livingston	1,043	242,038
Logan	622	150,165
McLean	1,173	267,510
Woodford	537	118,925
Total	5,655	1,273,605
Average per square mile	$225	

Mississippi

	Land in square miles	Payments
DELTA COUNTIES		
Bolivar	917	$218,501
Coahoma	570	152,495
Humphreys	410	95,168
Issaquena	415	28,002
LeFlore	588	161,021
Quitman	412	107,317
Sharkey	436	38,916
Sunflower	693	235,097
Tunica	458	71,295
Washington	728	140,832
Yazoo	938	169,096
Total (11)	6,565	1,418,430
Average per square mile	$216	

Mississippi—Continued

	Land in square miles	Payments
HILL COUNTIES		
Chickasaw	506	$101,286
Clarke	697	68,204
Jasper	683	96,780
Kemper	757	97,813
Lauderdale	721	89,841
Monroe	769	163,915
Newton	580	110,172
Total	4,713	728,011
Average per square mile	$154	

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, here is a type of payment that we could well reduce, and confine such payments as we made to practices not in common use, the results of which cannot be immediately foreseen and the payment of which would stimulate long-time conservation practices, rather than payments for fertilizer that would be put on anyway.

Mr. President, as a cosponsor of this amendment, I want to make it clear that I am not trying merely to supplant my judgment for that of the committee. In the first place, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who is the main sponsor of the amendment, was former Secretary of Agriculture. But more than that, two of the three great farm organizations favor an even deeper reduction.

Mr. Herschel D. Newsom, national master of the National Grange, stated:

> We recommend elimination of the present system of direct payment made through PMA under the agricultural conservation program (amounting for the year 1952 to the total of $256,500,000).

This can be found in his statement on page 819 of the Senate hearings on the bill before us. He would not only favor a reduction; he favored actual elimination of the whole program. I would not go that far, but at least it points up the support for reducing this program.

The American Farm Bureau Federation was even more specific in listing reasons for its recommended reduction. Mr. Allan Kline, president of the Farm Bureau, which represents 1,450,000 farm families, stated:

> The American Farm Bureau Federation recommends authorization of a program for the 1953 crop year requiring $100,000,000 for compliance with practices related to a real need for conservation. This reduction of $156,500,000 is recommended in carrying out the following resolution for 1952 adopted at the annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation held last December:
>
> The maintenance and improvement of our soil, water, and forest resources through proper use must be an integral part of any permanent farm program. This is of vital importance not only to agriculture, but also to the entire Nation; however, the ultimate responsibility for wise soil management rests with those who farm the land. Farmers everywhere have a growing realization of their responsibility for the protection of our soil and water resources. The encouragement of wise farming practices through education and demonstration is a sound public investment.
>
> As provided in our resolution on economic policies for mobilization, it is our firm conviction that a reduction in Federal expendi-

tures for less essential governmental activities is imperative to prevent inflation and preserve our free-enterprise system. Agriculture should bear its fair share of such reductions. The necessity for maintenance of essential research and service activities makes an across-the-board reduction impractical, and necessitates a relatively heavy reduction in direct payments to farmers.

Appropriated funds for the agricultural conservation program should be allocated on the basis of conservation needs. Payments for practices which have become a normal and accepted part of farming operations of the area in which the farm is located should be discontinued.

Summary information on the agricultural conservation program for 1950 indicates that out of the total farms in America, about 46 percent are participating in the program. These 46 percent, however, have 56 percent of the farm land and 64 percent of the cropland of the Nation. The program, therefore, is being participated in by approximately half of the farmers of the Nation, while the other half apparently prefer to remain outside the program.

The increased need for agricultural production requires a full utilization of available tillable acres. Further study of summaries of activities under the 1950 program indicate that, in the areas where a high percentage of the land is tillable, a large percentage of the expenditures is for inorganic materials including limestone, phosphate, and potash fertilizers. Farmers recognize that the practice of adding fertilizers to tillable acres is a necessary and profitable expenditure for obtaining increased production. In certain areas it is found that substantial sums are paid to farmers in connection with irrigation practices which are regarded as a regular expense of operation. Payments should be discontinued on those practices. Numerous other illustrations can be given to indicate the extent to which agricultural conservation payments have been diverted to payments for practices which have become a normal and accepted part of farming operations.

The $100,000,000 which we recommend be authorized for the period July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1953, should be allocated to areas where the conservation need is greatest. Conservation need must be distinguished from the established practices which are already recognized as necessary for profitable production and as consistent with good land use. It is this distinction which must be made and which will enable the conservation program to give a better dollar of service for each dollar spent.

We recommend that this principle of distinction be written into the appropriation act as a proper basis for the development of practices for conservation payments. The intent of the payments should be an incentive for the development of new methods and not a subsidy because new practices have been adopted.

On comparing the foregoing recommendations with those contained in the budget it will be observed that a number of items have not been referred to. These include the school-lunch program, sugar program, Commodity Exchange Authority, and others. It is recommended that the appropriation items not specifically discussed be provided in amounts not in excess of the budget recommendations.

The American Farm Bureau has taken a statesmanlike position in advocating reductions in this program, but it has not been a mere pious declaration of policy or a simple matter of "going on record." It has actively worked for this reduction; and Mr. Roger Fleming and Mr. Hugh Hall of the Washington office have devoted a great part of their time in working for it.

The Illinois Agricultural Association, which is the Illinois affiliate of the AFBF, has vigorously supported the national organization on this issue. Its exceptionally able president, Mr. Charles B. Shuman, has informed me many times of IAA support for a reduction.

The Farmers Union, the third great farm organization, is not on record as favoring a reduction in the ACP program. However, at least one of its State organizations does. In fact, in Nebraska, all three of the State farm organizations are united in favor of the reduction. This is borne out by a news article by Stanley A. Natzke appearing in the Nebraska State Journal, March 25, 1952.

Furthermore, I have received many letters from individual farmers, who are recipients of the program, who have urged reductions. The following letter is typical:

CARTHAGE, ILL.,
March 16, 1952.

DEAR SIR: I would like to commend your efforts in behalf of economy in the operation of our Federal Government. I hope you may have more success in the future.

As a farmer I believe many of the functions of the Agriculture Department could be eliminated. I do not deny the need for conservation but in the name of it, I have received payments for doing things which I would have done anyway. Having served as a PMA committeeman, I think they are mostly a waste of time and money.

As a veteran of the past World War, I am disgusted by the waste and hand-outs. All I think we deserve is good government, and a decent chance to make our way in the world.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP CLARK.

From news stories, it would appear that participation in receiving ACP money has fallen off so much that PMA employees are afraid of losing their jobs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point a news article date-lined at Gainesville, Fla., March 10, 1952.

There being no objection, the article was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OFFICIAL URGES FARMERS TO SIGN FOR UNITED STATES CASH OR UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES TO LOSE JOBS

(By Milton Plumb)

GAINESVILLE, March 10.—Alarmed over Florida farmers' lack of interest in seeking cash hand-outs from the United States Department of Agriculture, the man in charge of ladling out that "gravy" in Florida has told his employees to hustle out and sign up more farmers.

If they don't hustle, some of those USDA employees will lose their jobs, it was made clear in letters from R. S. Dennis, executive officer for the USDA's Production and Marketing Administration in Florida.

The letters went out to PMA administration officers in virtually all Florida counties; and bluntly pointed out there will be a consolidation of some counties' PMA offices unless they can corral more farmers willing to accept USDA cash.

Consolidation of some offices, naturally, would mean a reduction in the number of PMA jobs available, and a saving to the taxpayers.

Many county agents, experiment station and agricultural college scientists, and even some PMA employees themselves, admit they would welcome such consolidation within the PMA's many-county setup. They do not talk publicly, however, for fear of losing their jobs.

The PMA hand-outs go to those farmers who by liming, fertilizing, ditching, terracing, planting of legumes or other practices improve their own farms.

INTENSIVE CAMPAIGN

The letters from Dennis' office to the PMA administrative officers said:

"If we are equal to last year's sign-up (and the remainder of the sentence is underlined for emphasis), an intensive campaign will have to be put on immediately. Let me urge every county committeeman and employee to make intensive efforts to at least equal last year's record. Frankly, there are several county PMA offices that will have to be consolidated with adjoining counties unless there is a drastic improvement in the sign-up."

County committeemen serve virtually without pay under the PMA program. The administrative officers and clerks are the hired hands.

With most Florida farmers and ranchers prospering, the lack of interest of landowners in enrolling for PMA payments in 1952 might indicate a trend of rural opinion favoring Government control and fewer Government subsidies. Hundreds of thousands of USDA free dollars have been handed out to Florida farmers, some of them owning ranches of 10,000 acres or more, in years past, but this year interest on the part of the landowners has been so slight that in some counties only two or three farmers turned out to elect county committeemen.

MORE RESEARCH POSSIBLE

If the USDA hand-outs were trimmed, or eliminated entirely, many millions of dollars could be diverted to badly needed agricultural research and the Agricultural Extension Service which passes along to the farmers the findings from such research, college professors admit. That is just what American Farm Bureau Federation is trying to do.

Attached to Dennis' letters was a two-page statistical report. It showed that in 57 of the State's 67 counties (those which had reported on 1952 PMA sign-up progress) there are 52,373 farms. For 1951 in those counties 29,694 farmers signed up for the PMA hand-outs; but as of February 23 only 16,251 had signed up to get the USDA cash for 1952.

However, under Dennis' prodding (his letters to the administrative offices were dated February 28), there likely will be a considerable increase in the sign-up before the March 15 deadline.

Meanwhile, the Production and Marketing Administration is under fire, nationally, from the farmers, of the Nation themselves, through American Farm Bureau Federation. The federation has asked that $200,700,000 be pared off the 1953 budget items requested by the USDA; and $156,500,000 of that recommended saving would be made by trimming down PMA's agricultural conservation program.

The agricultural conservation program, says Farm Bureau Federation "has become diverted from the real need of conservation," while research and agricultural extension need and deserve more funds.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the arguments for making this reduction could go on and on. It can easily be made without hurting the substantive soil conservation program.

The reduction will not affect the $60,000,000 we are appropriating in this same bill for the Soil Conservation Service which is performing useful and valuable services by providing technical advice and assistance to farmers who want to improve their soil. It need not affect any of the permanent-type practices such as terracing, farm ponds, and so

forth. The program can continue where it is needed for practices which would probably not otherwise be done.

Here is a chance to save $100,000,000 in a most painless and productive way. I urge the Senate to adopt the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this issue arises before the Senate every year. The so-called soil-conservation program has been highly controversial for a number of years. It is true that the heads of some farm organizations have appeared before the committee and opposed the program. But there can be no doubt that the majority of the farmers of the Nation, whether associated with farm organizations or not associated with them, have no objection to the program. They participate in it in considerable numbers.

I listened with great interest to the very eloquent remarks of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico at one time was a very able Secretary of Agriculture. At the time he was Secretary of Agriculture I handled the agricultural appropriation bill, and I do not recall in those days that he appeared before the committee and said that these funds were being wasted and that they were not being properly utilized. On the contrary, if I recall correctly, he supported to the hilt the full amount of the budget estimates which were submitted to the committee for SCP payments.

The practices in those days were not greatly different from those which obtain today. We know that the program originates in the States. The State committee sets forth the practices which are regarded as proper soil-conservation practices in those States. They are then submitted to the Department of Agriculture in Washington for approval.

Mr. President, if there is any program in this land in which every citizen has a vital interest, it is the soil-conservation program. We talk about farmers who are being carried on the program; but, as a matter of fact, they are contributing over two-thirds of the cost, when the labor cost is included.

Every American citizen, wherever he may live, has a vital stake in the program. We all know that great civilizations have risen, have flourished briefly, and then have fallen into decay because the people who operated the agriculture in those lands did not protect the fertility of the soil. The population of this Nation is increasing at the rate of more than 6,000 every 24 hours. The lands which are available to feed and clothe those people cannot be increased in any such degree. We have now reached the stage where there are only 2¼ acres of land available to feed and clothe each person in the United States.

I suggest, Mr. President, that if each Member of the Senate knew just where his little 2¼ acres were, if they were set aside in lots, we would not have this controversy over soil conservation. Every Member of the Senate would support a bill which would take care of his 2¼ acres, in order that he might be assured of food and clothing during the remainder of his life. Many of them, who have children, would be interested in preserving their land because their children would perhaps not have more than two acres of land each, and their grandchildren would have about an acre and a half of land each.

Mr. President, that makes this program, which is designed to prevent further loss of fertility of the soil, a national issue in which the Nation and all its citizens have a deep interest. The program will increase the fertility of the soil which is now being farmed, so that this great land we love and this great civilization of which we are so proud will not go the way of Iran and other civilizations, which rose for a brief period and today are classed among the backward nations of the earth whom we must help.

Mr. President, if this program was so important in days gone by, it is all the more important today because of the fact that we are making greater demands on the farmers for production than we ever made, even during the period of World War II.

The Senator from New Mexico, having now decided that we can save, he says, $100,000,000, offers this amendment. I invite the attention of every Senator to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico. It will be seen that it will not only save $100,000,000, but that it will save $250,000,000, and thus abolish the whole program, if the amendment is carried out literally. The amendment says:

> No payments authorized in this proviso shall be made for soil-building and soil-and-water conserving practices which are a normal and accepted part of farming operations of the county or locality in which the farm is situated.

Mr. President, that means that if a practice is carried on and is accepted in a community there may not be a payment made for it. I submit that there is not a farming community in this Nation where some part of these conservation practices is not carried on. The effect of the amendment would be to strike down completely the program and abolish it.

Mr. President, sometimes I wonder about the Congress of the United States with respect to this program, which we bring in each year and which it is attempted to cut down. From $500,000,000 a year it has been reduced to where it is now only $250,000,000. The appropriation has taken reduction after reduction, year after year. Although it deals with something that is very vital to the very existence of our land it is now proposed to cut it further, at the same time we are content to cut other appropriations by 10 percent. When we obtain a 10 percent reduction on an appropriation we think it is the exercise of great economy. Here it is proposed to cut the appropriation down to the heart. It will result in the very death of the program.

Mr. President, we have cut this program deeply before. We cut it $250,000,000 in the year 1947. I will not remind Members of the Senate—and I am sure that my colleagues do not want to be reminded—of the lemmings in Norway, which periodically go down to the sea and drown themselves in a mass movement. I hope that in this Presidential year of 1952, following the example of the lemmings in the last Presidential year, we will not strike down this very vital program.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Of course, this year we have different candidates I may remind the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and the American people may not take that choice again.

Mr. RUSSELL. That may well be. There are a number of candidates, some retreads and some new ones, who are offering themselves to the American people in this campaign.

But the vital fact remains that the rank and file of the farmers of the United States do not appreciate Congress undertaking to cripple this program. Let us not be deceived by the Farm Bureau Federation leaders. They led some of our brethren to destruction in 1948. We would do well to profit by their fate and follow a different course in the year 1952. We are dealing with a resource which, once gone, cannot be recreated. It is something we must preserve. It is the very fertility of the soil. Mr. President, we can talk all we wish about subsidies. This is not a subsidy. It is an investment in the future, and it is a very modest investment when we measure it against other types of investment we make.

Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, a year ago I voted for the economy amendment in respect to the soil conservation item which we are now considering.

During the recess last fall I spent much time in the State of Minnesota, checking on the situation of the young men who had just assumed the responsibility of farm management in the various counties of the State.

A young man who assumed the responsibility of managing a farm of 160 acres invariably had an investment of anywhere from $10,000 to $12,000 to $15,000 in farm equipment, farm machinery, and livestock. That young man, who assumed that tremendous financial obligation in connection with the management of his farm, did not have an opportunity to rent the best farm in the county. Invariably he had to rent a farm with dilapidated buildings and depleted soil.

That young man, working that depleted farm, needs the soil-conservation payments in order to be able to make applications of fertilizer, lime, and so forth, in order to make a catch of grass seed, inasmuch as he has invested a large sum of money in grass seed in order to build up his farm.

Speaking of the green fertilizer which has been mentioned by the able Senator from Illinois, let me say that the operator of a depleted farm has to make applica-

tions of lime and fertilizer before he can get a catch of legumes which he can plow under for green fertilizer. If the operator of the farm, or a young tenant farmer, gets a catch of grass which he plows under for green fertilizer, he will not be able to produce a crop on the farm during that year, the year when he plows under the legumes for green fertilizer.

All questions of that type are involved in cases of that sort. I am not now speaking of farmers who have been engaged in operating their farms for 15 or 20 years. After all, they are in a position to take care of themselves. I am referring to the young veterans, who fought for all of us, and who now have returned to the land and have assumed the heavy obligations incident to farm management, after having rented farms of that sort. I am pleading for them. They are the ones who will feel the effect of the destruction of this program, if it is destroyed.

Not only are the payments made to them, but the entire program is carried on by those who administer it; and if the heart is cut out of the incentive payments, we might just as well eliminate the funds——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield me an additional one-half minute?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I yield an additional one-half minute to the Senator from Minnesota; and then I desire to yield the remainder of the time to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if we reduce the funds to the point where there is nothing with which to make incentive payments, we might just as well eliminate the entire appropriation, because otherwise a tremendous sum of money will have to be spent for administration, for office rent, and so forth, even though it will not be possible to spend anything to build up the depleted acreage.

The fact is that the top soil on more than 280,000,000 acres of land in the United States has been depleted, and the top soil is being rapidly removed from any additional acres of land.

So although I feel very strongly that we should economize, nevertheless I believe that a cut in this appropriation would be a cut in the wrong direction, and would not really be economy at all, if the result would be to destroy the soil-conservation program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it is easy for me to decide how to vote on this amendment, because the Vermont Legislature unanimously memorialized the Congress to appropriate the full sum of $285,000,000 for the soil-improvement program.

I cannot vote for the full $285,000,000 as requested; but the nearest I can come to it is to vote for the $250,000,000 which is included in this bill.

Mr. President, the Vermont Legislature is a farmer legislature. It represents very well the farmers of the State of Vermont. Most of the farmers of our State are members of the Grange and of the Farm Bureau Federation.

A month ago I asked the Library of Congress to determine how much the Nation is spending for subsidies this year. I was surprised at the figures the Library of Congress produced for me. Including foreign subsidies, the total amounts to approximately $16,000,000,000. That includes subsidies to airlines and subsidies to shipping interests, including the $45,000,000 which Secretary Sawyer says he is going to give to the United States Lines, even though the Comptroller General says it is illegal to do so; and it includes the mutual-security subsidies to American industry, because most of that appropriation is spent here in the United States. It also includes subsidies to the post office, and other subsidies. Included in that large total amount of subsidies is a proposed subsidy of $250,000,000 for American agriculture, and it is the most important factor in connection with any security program which our country can devise.

So I have no hesitancy in voting for the proposed appropriation in the amount of $250,000,000.

Mr. President, to date our tax deferment program for American industry amounts to almost $20,000,000,000. Approximately 50 percent of that can be deducted by industry from taxes. Approximately $10,000,000,000, in short, has been given to industry during a period of one year and one half, in the form of tax deferment certificates.

Those who oppose any subsidy at all for the farmers, or who advocate the elimination of the program, as would be done by the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], should think a little about eliminating the subsidies for the power companies, the subsidies for the shipping industry, the subsidies for the airlines, and the subsidies for certain other industries in our economy.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, how much time is available to me at this point?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The only time remaining is that available to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] all the time that remains available to me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, my good friend, the Senator from New Mexico, knows my attitude in regard to this matter. He knows what my attitude has been over the years, and he realizes that my attitude would be consistent with a vote by me in favor of making the proposed cut.

Mr. President, I have tried to bring about the making of this cut, as my colleague well knows. In the most friendly and genial spirit, he and I always fuss about this matter, back and forth across the table, either in committee or in conference.

I wish to say that when I was in the House of Representatives and when the Senator from New Mexico was Secretary of Agriculture, certainly some of the present abuses of the program did not exist; certainly some of them crept in after the Senator from New Mexico no longer had the responsibility of serving as Secretary of Agriculture.

For instance, I think of the following situation: A former employee of the Department, who now is in the employ of limestone interests, circularized the farmers and put on pressure. I do not think he is always too careful in the statements he makes. I had to haul him before the committee and extract the truth from him.

If the truth be known, I think there are far more farmers who are interested in the making of the cut than we might suspect. Certainly that is true in my State, although I do not pretend to speak for the farmers of other States. But I know how the leaders of the farmers feel. I have been to farm conventions. I also know what the mails disclose. I believe that the farmers are increasingly interested in having their farms in a solvent country, particularly at a time when the tax burden is so heavy.

The American farmer realizes now that there must be equality of sacrifice. I believe that for the most part the farmers are willing to share in that task and in that responsibility.

So I believe it is necessary to make this cut. As a matter of fact, if I were handling this matter, I would make an even larger cut. On the other hand, if I cannot get a whole loaf, I am willing to take some bread.

Therefore, Mr. President, I support the amendment proposed by my good friend, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time on the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute. I send the amendment to the desk, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Michigan will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. As a substitute for Mr. ANDERSON's amendment, on page 32, in line 12, it is proposed to strike out all after the word "amended", down to and including the numeral in line 20, and to insert in lieu thereof the following: "(amounting to $100,000,000, including administration, and formulated on the basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States and counties in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary, except that no payment authorized by this proviso shall be made for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices which are a normal and accepted part of farming operations of the county or locality in which the farm is situated, and no participant shall receive more than $2,500)."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I yield several minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], for I understand that he was not able to finish the statement he wished to make.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I simply wish to complete my statement.

Another thing which distresses me about this matter is the almost paternal approach. This is not guesswork. I try to go back, now and then, and read the hearings on the House side. When Mr. Geissler, of the Production and Marketing Administration, appeared before the House committee this year, he said:

> The Department of Agriculture has been assigned the responsibility for seeing that each of these millions of individual producers directs his efforts so that they will produce in the aggregate quantities of the commodities most urgently required.

Then he said:

> We know of only one effective way to carry out this responsibility, and that is to advise the producers in each locality and in some instances individually—

As to what they should do.

It seems to me it is not the function of a Federal agency to take every farmer by the hand, because if we should undertake to do that there would not be enough money in the Federal Treasury to do it. I may say to the Senator from Minnesota that this program is applied to 6,000,000 producers, of whom the federation farmers are a proportion, and perhaps a small proportion. But if what he has in mind is carried out, the idea would be to lead them all by the hand.

That is not my idea of the American farmer. I think there is a sense of responsibility in him. I think he knows farming. I think that up to a certain point in the field of research and things of that sort the Government ought to assist him, but ought not to exert what I consider to be a completely paternal influence, because that is the usual and dismal road to the ultimate control of agriculture, and the enlightened farm leaders of the country understand that today. Their interest in the economy is motivated first by a sense of identity with a sovereign country, and also by a feeling that ultimately agriculture will be controlled by the paternalistic governments.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I have time, I will yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I come from a State that is a little more than 100 years old. The men of two generations before me broke the wilderness, developed the first successful irrigation in America, and have given us a substantial agricultural economy. They did it without help of this kind. I have been very much interested to know what the attitude of their grandsons is. I have had the expressions of the Farm Bureau, which is the chief agricultural organization in my State, on the other hand I have heard the expressions of men on this floor and from a few men in Utah, that the American Farm Bureau did not speak for the farmers of Utah. So I queried their local representatives, and I should like to read briefly from a letter from the secretary of the State Farm Bureau Federation. He says:

> Vigorous opposition has developed from several Federal agencies. The agencies are having quite an effect upon the people out in the counties because they have large staffs of workers and are in a position to spend a great deal of time in propaganda work among them. We of course do not have funds nor the personnel to match Federal Government, but we do have one thing definitely in our favor and that is the assurance that our position is right and that the farm people of Utah are realists enough to know that the Government must be run on a sound basis just the same as they expect to run their own farm operations.
>
> Naturally the Federal agencies are raising plenty of questions in some of the people's minds as to whether or not the ACP payments should be expanded or reduced. They are for all-out expansion of these payments and argue that farm people will not carry out desirable soil conservation programs unless they are paid for it by the Federal Government. We, of course, are in disagreement on this point.
>
> It is quite remarkable, however, in the face of all the Government agency experts' propaganda to find as high a percentage of farmers of Utah in favor of the Farm Bureau position.

Earlier this afternoon I quoted certain figures, and I should like to read them into the RECORD again at this point:

> Thirteen community meetings that were held in one of our most prosperous agricultural communities, Cache Valley, in northern Utah, and as a result of those meetings, 294 of the men present favored cutting direct conservation payments to farmers, 41 were opposed, and 25 could not make up their minds.

In the face of that situation in my own State, I cannot escape the feeling that the farmers of Utah of this generation really represent the same principles as those represented by their grandfathers who broke the wilderness; and I for one propose to take the attitude of this organization at its face value and vote to reduce these conservation payments.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may make an observation?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I realize that the question of subsidies is getting somewhat out of hand. I should like to say to the Senator from Utah that if the Congress will abolish all subsidies to the steamship companies and to the airlines, both domestic and overseas, to the power companies and to the railroads, I shall then favorably consider the removal of subsidies in the case of farmers.

Mr. BENNETT. I may say to the Senator from Vermont there must be a point of beginning.

Mr. AIKEN. Well, let us begin with the big boys.

Mr. BENNETT. I am proud that the leadership of the farm organizations has undertaken the first step. I hope their example can be followed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I merely want to say that an unusual thing took place before the Appropriations Committee in connection with this particular question. Patriotic citizens who would be benefited personally, as well as the people whom they represent, came forward and asked to have the amount of this appropriation cut. That was an unusual thing. The Senator from Vermont is correct in saying that $16,000,000,000 has been handed out in the form of subsidies. Would that the day would come when all corporations and all individuals would be as patriotic as the farmers of America, and would ask or even allow the Congress to discontinue some of these subsidies.

But I cannot agree as the distinguished Senator from Vermont suggests, that if we do not cut the others, we should not cut this. The only thing we have before us today is a proposal to cut this item. Let us perform our function.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. In a moment. Herschel D. Newsom, national master of the National Grange, in his testimony given before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate said we could reduce this amount even more than the amount stated by Mr. Kline, who testified for the Farm Bureau Federation. Listen to what Mr. Kline said:

> I have received many letters from farmers who say, "Well, I am one of these fellows that gets the ACP payments, but I shouldn't be getting them."

He further said the record showed that only 46 percent of the farmers of the States cooperated with the program and received ACP payments; which means that 54 percent did not. In other words, the farmers will quite naturally take this subsidy as long as it comes to them. I think the time to cut is now, not at some future time; because if we do not cut this particular item, the amount will be in the budget next year, and we shall have to pay the bill, as we have learned by our experience in connection with other items.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for a question.

PRESERVE THE FINANCIAL INTEGRITY OF THIS NATION

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan whether he is aware of the fact that with our $6,900,000,000 of foreign aid the countries of Europe are building flood-control projects, soil-conservation projects, and all other sorts of projects for farmers in those countries, and that $300,000,000 was spent on a flood-control project in Italy. I shall not take the time of the Senate to enumerate the many projects. The distinguished Senator from Michigan must know them. But in view of all this expenditure for aid to Europe, as an over-all proposition, the junior Senator from Nevada can hardly see why we should start cutting down on our own farmers, although I fully agree with the distinguished Senator from Michigan that we should do so, provided we first did it in respect to foreign farmers.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is saying that we are doing wrong in making these appropriations, and I agree with him. But that does not mean that because we are making such appropriations, we should give more. We shall destroy this country through bankruptcy if we give so much to foreign countries——

Mr. MALONE. I do not believe that $150,000,000 given to our farmers will destroy the country, when we pay $7,000,000,000 to foreign nations.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator has heard of the "last straw," which is the one that breaks the camel's back.

Mr. MALONE. Let us take care of the first straw first which is taking care of our own people, which will preserve the financial integrity of our own Nation.

Mr. FERGUSON. We are putting dollars on the back of the American taxpayer, and the time is coming when the taxpayer's back will break. Then it will be too late. We shall not then be able to save this great Nation this great Republic which we think should survive.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, there are some projects in the State of Nevada. Two of them have been authorized. One involves $14,000,000 and the other $3,000,000. But, no, we must send $7,000,000,000 to Europe and we cannot construct these projects to protect our own farmers. Who is going to break the back of the American taxpayer? I voted for economy by voting against the $7,000,000,000 for Europe. Let us start by taking care of our own people. Let us be for America like the European nations are for their own nations and let us be for the European nations as they are for America.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I desire to say a word with reference to soil conservation. The objective is fine, and it has accomplished some good, but the looseness of the administration is very interesting.

I have in my hand the example of a man who owned no property. He worked for another person on the other person's property. He was not a farmer. There was a lawn, and some scrub trees were growing, but there was very little land, an acre or two which might be available for cultivation. The man called in the local supervisor or agent and explained his proposition. He got lime for distribution on this land which did not belong to him and which was not a farm, but was mostly a lawn. After he got the lime and distributed it, he received, a few weeks later, a check for $50.80, and he does not know yet what the check is for. I have it in my hand.

That shows very clearly the looseness in the administration's operation. All the man did, generally speaking, was to mow the lawn and act as a sort of caretaker. He got lime for the owner's land on a place that was not a farm, and some weeks afterward he received a check for $50.80.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has two more minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield a minute and a half to the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas is recognized for a minute and a half.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I have listened to the discussion, and I want to say that I am in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

Last year, when a similar measure was voted upon, my surprise may be imagined when 2 or 3 weeks afterward, when I went home, I received calls by the dozen, and I received much mail taking me to task because I was not present and voting to reduce this appropriation. I have received requests on the part of individuals by the score to vote to reduce this type of appropriation. The thing they were interested in was economy. They felt they should take a substantial cut in the program along with others, because our Nation is in a strained financial situation, taxes high, and we must be practical and share these necessary reductions which should be made in many departments and programs. The requests I have referred to came from both young and older farmers. I want to say that I think this is a cut which will be accepted gladly by the members of farm organizations in my State, and I shall support it. The leaders of two of our great farm organizations in my State and thousands of their members are sincere in asking for and taking their reductions as their patriotic duty.

Mr. President I can say that it is unusual for a Senator to receive requests to reduce appropriations that affect a group such as farmers have suggested in this case and they are to be commended. Since the cut will not affect the present year's program and we can see what our situation will be next year, I hope the Senate will vote this reduction.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, we proposed the amendment, but we have received no support or requests from the other side of the aisle. Under the circumstances, I ask every Senator on this side of the aisle to join the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] on the $150,000,000 item. I withdraw the amendment to cut it to $100,000,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator withdraw his amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the point of order.

Mr. AIKEN. According to the rule under which we are operating, can a Member of the Senate propose an amendment, use up his full time, and then withdraw the amendment before a statement can be made in reply? I should like the Senator to explain his amendment a little more fully. I should like to ask him some questions.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Vermont be given a minute to ask some questions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Under the amendment which the Senator from New Mexico proposes, cutting the appropriation from $250,000,000 to $150,000,000 for what practices can the $150,000,000 be spent?

Mr. FERGUSON. It can be spent for all practices "except that the proportion allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 15 percent from the distribution for the next preceding program year."

Mr. AIKEN. What other practices would anyone be likely to engage in?

Mr. FERGUSON. Anything that is not the common, ordinary things the farmer is doing——

Mr. AIKEN. What are they? This would eliminate the program.

Mr. FERGUSON. Not entirely. It relates to the common practices which farmers should carry on by themselves.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was in Terrell, Tex., a short time ago, and learned that great areas are being planted in hairy vetch, making good land by the development of the new program. That is the sort of thing I had in mind.

Mr. AIKEN. I planted hairy vetch, and I have not yet got rid of it.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. It proposes to strike out the language which begins with the word "except" in line 7 and ending in line 2, page 2, of the amendment. It would restore the language of the bill except for a change in the per centum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that the amendment would not be in order at this time.

Mr. CASE. What I am trying to do is to strike out a portion of the language used by the Senator from New Mexico in his amendment, and to insert other language in lieu thereof.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator can amend any part of the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CASE. That is exactly what my amendment seeks to do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is that all it seeks to do?

Mr. CASE. That is all. It strikes out a portion of the language and inserts other language in lieu thereof.

Mr. AIKEN. Could the Senator from New Mexico accept the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. CASE. I may say that the amendment strikes out the following words: "except that no payments authorized in this proviso shall be made for soil-building and soil-and-water conserving practices which are a normal and accepted part of farming operations of the county or locality in which the farm is situated."

My amendment would insert the following: "except that the proportion allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 40 percent from the distribution for the next preceding program year."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 7, after the word "secretary", it is proposed

to strike out down to and including the word "situated" on page 2, line 2, and insert the following language: "except that the proportion allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 40 percent from the distribution for the next preceding program year."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the amendment I propose to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico bears exactly on a question raised by the Senator from Vermont, namely, what is the meaning, or what would be the effect, of the language proposed by the Senator from New Mexico which says that no payments shall be made for soil-building and soil-and-water conserving practices which are a normal and accepted part of farming operations of the county or locality in which the farm is situated.

It may be that a case can be cited where there is a clear-cut change as to an individual farmer or an individual county. But what is done in an area in which some farmers have planted hairy vetch, or have used lime or summer fallow, or have planted shelter belts, or have made check dams or spreader dams? Not all farmers have done that to all farms. To whom would those payments be made?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say that farmers in the older Eastern States have practiced all those methods, and the effect of the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico would be to eliminate practically all the easten part of the United States from the program, and would result in the whole amount of the money being used in that part of the country which says it does not need it.

Mr. CASE. It is true there has been an increase in some of the practices in some States. It might be said they are almost new, and a normally accepted part of farming. But the line is very intangible. Where the line would be drawn it is difficult to say.

The language of the bill as it was reported to which the whole amendment pertains is as follows: "except that the proportion allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 15 percent from the distribution for the next preceding program year."

I have used the same language in my substitute amendment, but I have changed "15 per centum" to "40 per centum," because under the language reported in the bill $250,000,000 would be available for a planting program next year. A reduction from $250,000,000 to $150,000,000 is a reduction of 40 percent, so I have merely used the language and made it applicable, so that allocations to the States should conform to the reductions in the total program authorized.

I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont has suggested that the proposal would cut off the eastern part of the United States. If there is anything unfair about it, or if the amendment is not clear, I should be perfectly willing to accept the language offered by the Senator from South Dakota, get a reduction first, and make sure an attempt is made to adopt some of the new practices, by reducing the amount. I think it will be found that a great many new practices will have to be devised. I note that the average amount spent in Texas is $90, that the average amount spent in Minnesota is $60, but that in the Western States it is $766.

I should be willing to accept the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota, and I so modify my amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE. I have yielded to the Senator from New Mexico, and I wish to reply to him briefly.

Of course, I am happy to have the Senator from New Mexico accept the amendment. I think it leaves us with a single clear issue, and avoids confusion over what is normal and accepted practice in other parts of the country. It simply achieves a reduction of 40 percent of the total amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], as modified.

Several Senators asked for the yeas and nays, and the yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay," and the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

I announce further that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "nay," and the Senator from California would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], would vote "nay."

Mr. BRIDGES. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is paired with the

Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—23

Anderson	Dworshak	Millikin
Bennett	Ferguson	Schoeppel
Bridges	Frear	Smith, Maine
Cain	Hendrickson	Smith, N. J.
Case	Hickenlooper	Watkins
Cordon	Holland	Welker
Dirksen	Hunt	Williams
Douglas	Knowland	

NAYS—35

Aiken	Humphrey	Monroney
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Moody
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Mundt
Eastland	Kem	Neely
Ellender	Kilgore	Russell
Fulbright	Long	Smith, N. C.
George	Malone	Sparkman
Hayden	Maybank	Stennis
Hennings	McCarran	Thye
Hill	McFarland	Underwood
Hoey	McKellar	

NOT VOTING—38

Benton	Ives	Nixon
Brewster	Jenner	O'Conor
Bricker	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Butler, Md.	Kerr	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Langer	Robertson
Byrd	Lehman	Saltonstall
Capehart	Lodge	Seaton
Carlson	Magnuson	Smathers
Duff	Martin	Taft
Ecton	McCarthy	Tobey
Flanders	McClellan	Wiley
Gillette	McMahon	Young
Green	Murray	

So Mr. ANDERSON'S amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided*, That of this amount $135,000 shall be available to the Bureau of Animal Industry for poultry husbandry investigations, such allocation to be in addition to other funds now appropriated or allocated to the Bureau for such purpose."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to assist the Bureau of Animal Industry in poultry research, to find a cure for a disease which is now prevalent in the poultry industry in our area. It has wiped out about 20 percent of the poultry industry on the Del-Mar-Va peninsula. It is now reaching over into the States of Georgia and Arkansas. I ask that this amendment be adopted. I think the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is willing to accept it, because it involves a problem which has arisen since the budget figure was submitted.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to support the amendment, because what the Senator has said as applying to his own State applies to my State. This industry has grown tremendously in the past few years, and is contributing a great deal to the resources of the country—more than ever before. I hope the amendment may be accepted.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. FREAR. I understand the senior Senator from Delaware to say that this amendment does not apply merely to the Eastern Shore, Maryland, Delaware, and Virginia, but is applicable to many other States in the Union. It involves a disease in which the Federal Government should be interested, along with the State experimental stations. Is that true?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. The disease originated on the Del-Mar-Va peninsula. It has reached epidemic proportions, and has wiped out about 20 percent of the poultry industry in that area. It is now spreading westward. The epidemic is threatening the poultry industry of the country. Something must be done immediately to check it.

Mr. FREAR. Is it not also true that Dr. Simms, of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture, has stated that it is a disease in which the Department of Agriculture should take an interest? It may not now be prevalent in certain areas of the United States, but it is spreading through other sections of the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. Dr. Simms has already assigned a large percentage of his staff to work in this field. By reason of that fact his funds have been cut short. This problem is something which could not have been planned for at the time the budget was submitted to the Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in view of the statements which have been made as to the serious nature of this disease which is attacking the poultry industry, I have no objection to taking this amendment to conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 7314) was passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. CORDON conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of Senators, I should like to make an announcement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] whether he desires to proceed with the consideration of the conference report on the mutual security bill?

Mr. CONNALLY. It had been my hope—although I did not anticipate it would be realized—that we would take up the conference report today. I am perfectly willing to take it up on Monday, but would request the distinguished majority leader to make it the unfinished business at this time so that we can proceed with its consideration promptly on Monday.

Mr. McFARLAND. Under the circumstances, I am willing to have the Senate go over until Monday. I think the Members of the Senate are to be commended on the hard work they have done this week. However, if we are to go over until Monday, I feel that we should recess until 10 o'clock, instead of 12 o'clock on that day, because the defense production bill is still pending, and I hope we will be able to dispose of the conference report in the 2 hours between 10 o'clock and 12 o'clock noon.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7005) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 5, 1952, pp. 6655–6662.)

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the report.

HEALTH AND SAFETY OF LONGSHOREMEN AND HARBOR WORKERS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report, favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 991) to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1685) thereon.

The bill, which amends the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, was approved and ordered reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on June 5, 1952.

Longshoring and harbor work are among the most hazardous occupations in American industry. Compensation insurance rates in several States are higher for longshoring than for coal mining which is recognized for its highly dangerous character.

However, while coal mining is covered by the safety regulations of the States, a stevedore operator while on board on ship is subject to no safety regulations. State regulations cover operations on the docks but ends at the gangplank. The ship is under Federal jurisdiction and no regulatory authority exists. The Coast Guard functions principally in the field of ship design and construction, and the licensing of ships' officers. It has no authority on board foreign cargo ships except in the handling of explosives and dangerous cargo, nor has it any effective authority on American ships in the handling of general cargo.

S. 991 will remedy this situation by authorizing the Secretary of Labor to issue and enforce safety regulations. It is not a new field to the Labor Department as it has had advisory authority in waterfront safety for a number of years and has had an excellent record in promoting safety through State agencies and employer and employee groups.

The shockingly high accident record in this industry calls for immediate action. Only Congress can supply the remedy. I sincerely hope that S. 991 will be passed by the Senate without delay.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, with the individual views of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

COMMITTEE ON MIGRATORY LABOR—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report an original bill to establish a Federal Committee on Migratory Labor, and I submit a report (No. 1686) thereon.

The subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare held extended hearings on this bill. It comes to you with the unanimous endorsement of the seven members of the subcommittee and without a dissenting vote in the full committee.

It is a modest bill calling for the establishment of a Federal Migratory Labor Committee as recommended in the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, a committee to be made up of representatives from the affected departments and agencies and three public members. No new substantive law is enacted. Its function will be to assist the Federal departments and agencies toward a unified and integrated program for dealing with the extremely difficult problem of migratory agricultural labor and to provide machinery by which Federal and State programs may supplement each other.

Further, we believe that this committee will provide badly needed expert advice to the Congress for legislative action.

The Labor Committee's recommendation for a program of action is to start by establishing this Federal Committee on Migratory Labor. It is the hope of the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that this bill will be promptly enacted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 3300) to establish a Federal Committee on Migratory Labor, reported by Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I wish to make a reasonably unusual unanimous-consent request. Beginning on next Monday I shall begin to benefit from some minor surgery which is to be undertaken on that day. My problem is that the time to be involved is not subject to determination at the moment. I may return to full-time duty in a week's time, or I may be required to remain away until the end of this month.

Because of the uncertainty, Mr. President, I can only ask, as I now do, unanimous consent to be absent from the sessions of the Senate from the close of business today through the 30th of June 1952.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request is granted.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN WORLD WAR II PRISONERS

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide additional compensation for certain individuals who were prisoners of war during World War II.

The bill, in effect, provides that prisoners of war should be entitled to the pay of the next highest grade, if there was a demonstrated ability of fitness for such a higher grade. This is substantially in accordance with the policy which was followed by the Armed Forces at the end of the war. According to the Department of Defense, the exact promotion policy was as follows:

> On March 31, 1945, a joint Army (Air Force)-Navy prisoner-of-war policy agreement was formulated with a view toward obtaining consistency in the policies to be used by both the Army and Navy with respect to the one-grade promotion of deserving enlisted and commissioned personnel who presumably had been deprived of merited advancement because of internment, evading capture, or capture by the enemy. Promotions of this nature were authorized partially to compensate the recovered individual for a promotion he presumably would have received but for his having been lost to military control. This policy also provided that an individual who presumably would have been advanced more than one grade but for the fact of his capture could be recommended for subsequent promotion upon serving 3 months in the performance of duties appropriate to the higher grade. Such promotion was made only when there was conclusive evidence that an individual had fully demonstrated his fitness for the higher grade and that he would unquestionably have attained the higher grade had he not been taken a prisoner of war.

The problem which the Armed Forces faced was that involving colonels and the highest grade of enlisted personnel. Many prisoners of war and the organizations representing them have felt that there has been an unfair discrimination against these two ranks. I hope that the introduction of my bill will initiate a study of this problem by the Congress with a view to determining what the inequity is, and how it can be corrected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3301) to provide additional compensation for certain individuals who were prisoners of war during World War II, introduced by Mr. CAIN, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

THE CHINA LOBBY

I

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, my desire and intention during the next half hour will be that of endeavoring to slay some Chinese dragons and their American counterparts.

Within the past 60 days a series of incidents has provoked fresh discussion of the so-called China lobby. These developments merit close observation.

Incident No. 1: A periodical known as the Reporter, after an elaborate and, no doubt, very expensive advance advertising campaign, devoted almost the whole of two issues—dated April 15 and April 29, 1952—to what it termed an exposure of the China lobby.

Incident No. 2: On April 28, 1952, a Federal grand jury in New York indicted the managing officials of a Chinese Communist newspaper published in New York. The indictment in some 53 counts charged this paper with participating in—New York Times, April 29, 1952—"an international racket entailing murder, extortion, torture and, in general, commerce in human misery." The substance of the charge was that the newspaper sweated money out of Chinese-Americans, threatening to injure relatives in the old country if the blackmail was not paid.

The President of the China Daily News, finding himself indicted as a participant in this gruesome set of crimes, issued a most singular statement. Said he—New York Times, April 29, 1952:

> The indictment climaxes a relentless drive by the combined forces of the Kuomintang clique, the China lobby and certain forces in our Government to destroy the China Daily News, the only Chinese-language newspaper in the United States which has consistently supported peaceful solutions to all outstanding problems in the Far East.

Mr. President, these circumstances are remarkable: Inside of 60 days, at almost one and the same time, an American

periodical and an indicted Communist newspaper issue vehement attacks upon the China lobby.

I propose to examine this peculiar set of circumstances.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles in the Reporter dealing with the China lobby, and other articles in the same periodical advocating the recognition of Communist China, be inserted in the RECORD, together with other documentation concerned, immediately following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit I.)

II

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, almost a year ago, on June 7, 1951, during the hearings on the recall of General MacArthur, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], a member of the Armed Services Committee, raised the question of the so-called China lobby. He made a statement which he said was based upon newspaper accounts, and he asked Secretary Acheson whether these newspaper accounts represented the facts—page 2116ff and following pages, Military Situation in the Far East, Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees' hearings, part 3.

Secretary Acheson said he did not know, but that he would look into the question.

On the next day, June 8, 1951, Mr. Acheson told the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], of the Foreign Relations Committee—MacArthur hearings, opinion cited, page 2206ff and following pages—that he had duly performed this looking into. His reply was somewhat peculiar. It seemed that there was considerable hearsay material about what he called the "use of foreign funds in the United States for the purpose of influencing opinion," but, he went on to say, "the material does not warrant charges."

Still, he said, he had talked to the President about the question, and that the President had told him that the executive agencies would diligently cooperate with any congressional committees investigating the matter.

I confess that I was somewhat startled at the Secretary's reply, remembering full well that both the President and the State Department had been adamant in their refusal to give up the files on those suspected of Communist leanings.

Still, according to the Secretary, the Executive was going to cooperate in this matter at least.

There was a considerable discussion about the so-called China lobby and related matters during this session of the MacArthur hearings.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] strongly urged that the investigation be made. Said he—and I quote him:

> I would like, Mr. Chairman, as Senator MCMAHON and Senator MORSE have done, to respectfully ask the Secretary of State, not only to assemble such material on any influences and pressures that may be brought in behalf of the anti-Communist Nationalist Government of China, headed by Chiang Kai-shek, but also on the influences, people, pressures, and lobby, if there are any, of the Communist government of China, which is now slaughtering American boys by the thousands, until the casualties have run to a sum over 174,000 in this country. (MacArthur hearings, op. cit., p. 2216ff.)

The Senator from New Hampshire took the position that propaganda efforts in this country of all governments and foreign political groups should be thoroughly investigated and all the facts brought out. I ask unanimous consent that the discussion of this problem by the Senator from New Hampshire be printed in full in the proper place at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit II.)

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, because of the volume of the inserts I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, I may say that I have attempted, and I believe I have accomplished, the most documented speech on the question called The China Lobby that has yet been written or spoken on the floor of the United States Senate.

Within a few days after Secretary Acheson made his statement, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on July 6, 1951, introduced, on behalf of himself and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] Senate Resolution 170—the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 6, page 7703.

This resolution authorized the Foreign Relations Committee to investigate what attempts, if any, have been made by individuals or groups of individuals representing the Chinese Nationalist Government, the Chinese Communist Government, or any other foreign government, to influence the foreign policy of the United States since September 2, 1945, and the extent and means, including methods of financing of any such attempts.

So far as I know, Mr. President, silence thereafter rested upon the scene. What the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] thought or did about the resolution, I do not know. Despite Secretary Acheson's voluble assurances that the Executive was going to cooperate eagerly, nothing more was heard.

III

When we reflect upon this resolution, Mr. President, it must occur to us that if a thoroughgoing investigation were carried out according to the all-embracing and rigorous terms drafted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], it might cause profound embarrassment in administration circles.

Let me say here, Mr. President, that I have never, at any time, been opposed to the Morse-McMahon resolution. Upon the contrary, I applaud it. Let us have the truth, come what may.

But, as I say, the resolution seems to have been stillborn. Why?

In the first place, Mr. President, for more than a decade the administration has been pouring out billions of dollars in foreign-aid programs. Many a New Dealer and many a Washington law firm found these programs a magical road to riches. Surely these foreign governments, recipients of the American taxpayer's bounty, needed able representatives with contacts here in our Nation's Capital, in Washington, D. C. Who could do the job better than the New Dealers or, at a pinch, Washington law firms?

I am not accusing these people of dishonesty at all. Like the late George Washington Plunkett, the sage of Tammany Hall, these people "seen their opportunities, and they took 'em." A golden Niagara of money, sweated out of the hides of American citizens, was pouring into the foreign-aid trough, and many a tired New Dealer refreshed himself at this fountain of currency.

If an investigation into this matter were pressed, it might prove embarrassing not only to such persons as Robert Nathan, Oscar Cox, and O. John Rogge. It might even disturb a very attractive person, Mr. Clark Clifford. All these men have drawn juicy fees from this foreign-subsidy business. It would rustle the ghost of Harry White of the Treasury, the erstwhile collaborator of Alger Hiss. White, it will be recalled, was before his death, the paid consultant of the Bank of Mexico. It might conceivably, in some way, embarrass Mr. Acheson's old law firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, O'Brian, & Shorb.

I repeat, I do not charge these persons with dishonesty at all. Mr. Acheson's old firm found that the Governments of Denmark, Greece, Iran, Colombia, Sweden, Pakistan, Finland, and Communist Poland were lush clients indeed. For the names of these and other representatives of foreign governments and groups see the records of the Foreign Agents Registration Division of the Department of Justice.

If what these people did was not dishonest, why should an inquiry into their actions be embarrassing? True, one and all were aboard a gravy train, but none of them had stolen. Why should this matter not be investigated freely?

I suppose, Mr. President, it is because an essential in the career of these men has been the odor of sanctity. The Secretary of State exudes sanctity from every pore. No more moral man than O. John Rogge ever beat his breast in public. To admit that this troupe of dedicated uplifters were pushing and shoving at the public trough would not be seemly.

Second, Mr. President, there was another risk. We know that the administration has done everything in its power to prevent the investigation of Communist infiltration; but who could tell where this inquiry, sponsored so forthrightly by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] might lead? Should the risk be taken?

The resolution, as drafted, called for the investigation of "groups of individuals representing the Chinese Communist Government." Would that mean another resurrection of the Amerasia case? Would it mean another go-around with Frederick Vanderbilt Field, Owen Lattimore, John Stewart Service, John

Carter Vincent, and the rest of that dreary crew? Would it mean more embarrassing questions about the exile of Angus Ward?

With the memory of the Tydings whitewash all too vividly in mind, the Administration must have shuddered at the thought. If the Morse-McMahon resolution were really put in force, if there were a real investigation of the efforts of the Asiatic Communists to influence American policy, would the administration have a chance of getting through undisgraced?

A chance? Not a Chinaman's chance.

Finally, Mr. President, why did the administration hesitate to investigate the efforts of the Chinese Nationalist Government to influence American opinion? The Morse-McMahon Resolution called for investigation of all such efforts after September 2, 1945, and surely the open hatred of the State Department against Chiang Kai-shek was clearly obvious not very long after 1945. So why not investigate?

Well, Mr. President, there is an old phrase that goes "damned clever, these Chinese." If Communists, who happened to be Chinese, had been successful in seducing Frederick Vanderbilt Field, had they managed to bedazzle Owen Lattimore, could it not be that other Chinese, who were not Communists at all but who were bitterly anti-Communist, were also damned clever?

And if these anti-Communist Chinese on the island of Formosa, making a last stand against the Reds, should survey the American landscape, if they should see busy lobbyists running in and out of the back door of the White House, might it not occur to these anti-Communist Chinese, Mr. President, that they needed friends also?

And if such thoughts did occur to the Chinese Nationalists, if they observed New Dealers, Trumanites, Burlings and Shorbs gobbling up fees, commissions and lush perquisites, it just might occur to the minions of Chiang Kai-shek that a little moola doled out in administration circles might do them good.

Oh, Mr. President, would it embarrass the administration if a stern Morse-McMahon investigation were to reveal that numerous noble administration officials or former officials had been hired by the Chinese nationalists? Suppose it revealed that Chinese nationalists had contributed to Mr. Truman's 1948 campaign fund.

It would appear, Mr. President, that just about the last thing on this earth that the administration wants is an investigation of the efforts of foreign governments to influence opinion in this country and, above all, Chinese efforts.

And that, I judge, is the reason why the Morse-McMahon resolution now gathers dust in Senator CONNALLY's capacious pigeonhole.

But if the administration will not come clean on this so-called China lobby, and if Mr. Acheson will not produce anything about it and if Senator CONNALLY is disinclined to take up the matter, I do not feel so hesitant. I shall do the best I can to analyze this question of the China lobby right now.

IV

Mr. President, the substance of the allegations about the China lobby amounts to this:

First. That beginning several years back the Chinese Nationalist Government or subsidiaries of it or individuals in the group around Chiang Kai-shek hired public relations people here in the United States to put out publicity and argue the Chinese Nationalists case. That these public relations people included William J. Goodwin, who was first paid $30,000 per annum and subsequently, when he worked for the Chinese News Service, $25,000. That another public-relations outfit, Allied Syndicates, Inc., headed by David Charnay, was also hired by the Chiang group.

Second. That going back as far as 1941 all through World War II and coming down to the present day, either the Chinese Nationalist Government or subsidiaries of it or Chinese Nationalists in person have hired to represent them various Washington lawyers including Thomas G. Corcoran, William S. Youngman, Jr., Whiting Willauer, and others.

Third. That in Congress Republicans generally have been bitterly opposed to the Chinese Communists, have obdurately fought against recognition of Red China by our Government and the admission of Red China into the U. N. That among the Republicans who have most outspokenly taken this position are Representative WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota, formerly a medical missionary in China, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. And that these Members of Congress have been friendly to the anti-Communist government of Chiang Kai-shek.

Fourth. That Chiang's government has been defended in this country and the Chinese Communists attacked by an assortment of American citizens including Alfred Kohlberg, an importer of Chinese embroidery; Frederick McKee, a Pittsburgh industrialist; Merwin K. Hart, president of the National Economic Council; and a number of others, including Henry Luce, the publisher of Time, and his wife, Clare Boothe Luce.

Fifth. That Chiang Kai-shek and the group about him are a corrupt and decadent lot of people who stand in the way of a beneficent United States policy in China.

Let us look at these charges.

First about the hiring of lawyers, public relations people, and the use of publicity generally. Foreign governments by the score do it here in the United States, the custom is recognized and, by law, all such people must register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. The people who are hot and bothered about the China lobby admit that Mr. Goodwin was so registered. On the releases of the Chinese News Service the following statement is prominently displayed:

> This material is filed with the Department of Justice, where the required registration statement of Chinese News Service under Fifty-sixth Statute, pages 248–258, as an agency of the National Government of China is available for inspection: Registration does not indicate approval or disapproval of this material by the United States Government.

As for Mr. Charnay, I assume that he also was registered as an agent of the Bank of China, and if he was not Senators MORSE and MCMAHON might look into the matter.

As for the sums paid, I am somewhat puzzled about the hue and cry. The most recent figures available for foreign government expenditures on so-called information services show items like the following for 1950:

China News Service	$77,972
Israel Information Office	94,821
Netherlands Information Bureau	210,371
Yugoslavia Information Center	187,582
British Information Services	868,343

Next we turn to the charge that Republicans in Congress generally have been bitterly opposed to the Chinese Communists. This charge is true, I am proud to say.

It is a fact that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and Representative JUDD have fought this battle over the years. It is a fact that Republicans generally have backed them up.

What have these three distinguished Americans got for their pains?

I suppose, Mr. President, that you know Mr. JUDD, as I do, and consider him to be an outstanding, fine, and splendid American. I know the high regard in which the Chair obviously holds the Senators from California and New Hampshire, to whom I have referred. What have they received for their pains in opposing the forces of tyranny and the cancer of communism in the Far East? Through recent years they have been vilified by the administration and by the left-wing press from one end of our Republic to the other. They have been traduced and they have been reviled.

Give me one instance where an official of this administration has come to their defense and acknowledged the services rendered to the Nation by these Members of Congress. Name one. It can not be done.

Recall the position occupied by the United States on the eve of Yalta in February 1945. Advancing steadily across the Pacific, American forces had moved from victory to victory and were poised for the final descent upon Japan. Never was the national prestige higher than it was just before Yalta. Where is that prestige today?

Then the debacle began. Month by month, year by year, the extent of the disaster widens.

It was at Yalta that the promises made at Cairo to Chiang Kai-shek were betrayed. It was at Yalta that the Russians were escorted into the Pacific war.

Let these views be submitted to whatever committee investigates the China lobby.

Did the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] fight the embargo on arms for Chiang Kai-shek?

He did.

Did the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]?

He did.

Did Representative JUDD?

He did.

Did Republicans generally?

They did.

Was this embargo a help to the Chinese Communists?

It was.

Is it true that from Yalta onward Republicans in Congress have done everything in their power to stem the tide of communism in Asia?

Yes, it is true and the record shows it.

Have Republicans been friendly to Chiang Kai-shek?

Yes, they have.

Why?

Because for nearly 20 years Chiang has been the unrelenting foe of the Communists.

It is not because of any treasonous conduct of Chiang Kai-shek that the Republic of China has just about been swallowed up by the Communists.

On March 1, 1945, Franklin Roosevelt addressed the Congress on the subject of the Crimean Conference.

Said he:

I think the Crimean Conference was a successful effort by the three leading nations to find a common ground for peace. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 91, pt. 2, p. 1622.)

Five months later, on August 8, 1945, when Russia's declaration of war against Japan was announced, Congressman JUDD said in a press statement:

There goes the peace. There goes Manchuria, then China, then Asia, then Europe, and then ourselves—unless somewhere along the line we fight—we will not get real peace.

Who was right? Roosevelt or JUDD?

Manchuria is gone. China is gone. The Soviet Union, armed to the teeth and ringed about with its satellites, threatens Indochina, Burma, and Iran.

I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of my remarks, there be inserted parts V and VI of the views of Senators BRIDGES, WILEY, SMITH, HICKENLOOPER, KNOWLAND, CAIN, BREWSTER, and FLANDERS, Republicans all and members of the joint committee that conducted the hearings on the recall of General MacArthur and on the military situation in the Far East.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit III.)

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, we have employed our very best efforts to write a textbook on the China lobby. It is not designed to be too long, but it is designed to withstand anyone's attack. We have been extremely careful through research and inquiry to document this treatise on the so-called China lobby so that no one can destroy either its effectiveness or the truth which it contains.

Was it Republicans who tried to force Chiang into partnership with the Communists?

It was not.

That was the avowed policy of this administration, and the wretched story, half - censored, half - suppressed, is strewn through the white paper.

To sum up, the China policy, which, taken altogether, represents the most appalling catastrophe in American diplomatic history, was conceived and implemented by this administration, and fought tooth and nail by most Republicans.

Now, what about the charge that Alfred Kohlberg, Frederick McKee, and others have defended Chiang and opposed the Chinese Communists?

Shortly after the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] raised the question of a China lobby during the MacArthur hearings, the Congressional Quarterly issued a special supplement on the subject. It contained two columns of material about Mr. Kohlberg, and I supposed that the publication of this material would give additional impetus to the proposed investigation. Since it did not and since the data published is highly germane I ask unanimous consent that the Congressional Quarterly special supplement be printed in its entirety in the RECORD in the proper place at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit IV.)

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, it so happens that I am not acquainted with the Messrs. Kohlberg et al. I have met Mr. Kohlberg socially on two occasions. I found him both attractive and well informed. Beyond those casual and very informal contacts, I have had no conversation of any kind with him or with those who were said to be associated with him. I do not know the scope of their efforts, but I do recall one incident in the career of Mr. Kohlberg.

Some years ago he was a member of the Institute of Pacific Relations. Presently he came to suspect that the management of this group had come under Communist influence. For some time he carried on an attempt to oust Communist elements from the institute. He not only failed in his attempt; he was roundly denounced as an irresponsible troublemaker and blackener of reputations.

What happened finally? Little by little Senator MCCARRAN's Internal Security Committee has proven that Communist infiltration of the Institute of Pacific Relations did occur.

Mr. President, I am advised that Mr. Kohlberg, before the committee headed by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], either has sworn, or is about to swear, to an affidavit concerning the Institute of Pacific Relations. I hope the affidavit will shed additional light on the question of the institute, and will provoke a further determination on the part of those who seek to know more about the China lobby to endeavor aggressively to see that such an investigation is undertaken. Mr. President, time is wasting.

Was Mr. Kohlberg right, or wrong?

Finally, there is the charge that Chiang and the group about him are a corrupt and decadent gang who have never done anything but prey upon the helpless Chinese people. That some individuals in Chiang's government were corrupt may be true. I do not know. I take it to be obvious that there must have been many in Chiang's government who were corrupt and dishonest. In every large gathering there are some who are no good. If the Morse-McMahon resolution leads to a real investigation, perhaps some light may be shed on this charge. I do know, however, that corruption is an evil not indigenous to China. If the Chinese Nationalists have Costellos of their own, Lamar Caudles of their own, Finnegans of their own, and various other counterparts of characters who have appeared on the public stage in America, let us have the facts.

But about that decadence. I know that for almost a decade Chiang fought the Japanese invaders from without and the Communists from within and did it with no foreign allies.

He did not get any help worthy of the name from the United States of America. He got some lip service from certain representatives of our administration, but he got no help. Now the valiant remnants of what was once the Republic of China are living as best they can on the island called Formosa against the hope of some day returning to the mainland of China.

In the end the Chinese Communists almost, but not quite, licked Chiang. To its eternal shame our Government never helped him in the way it should have done. When I refer to Chiang Kai-shek, I include every one of the men, women, and children who made up the Republic of China. No one can deny that the Republicans in Congress did everything they could to assist him, and we are most pleased to have Americans generally judge us and our motives on that record.

It is possible that little or nothing—aside from propaganda editorials in the left wing press—would have been heard about the China lobby, had there not been an internal row in the Chinese Nationalist Government. The head of the Chinese Aeronautical Commission in this country, a purchasing committee, was one Gen. P. T. Mow. General Mow's secretary was Col. V. S. Hsiang. In 1951—New York Times, August 22, 1951—Chiang Kai-shek's government ordered General Mow and Colonel Hsiang back to Formosa. They refused to go.

Chiang's government thereupon, on November 14, 1951—New York Times, November 15, 1951—brought suit against the two officers here in Washington, demanding an accounting of some $7,000,000 of the funds of the Chinese Republic which General Mow had in charge, presumably for purchasing planes and other matériel. The suit also demanded that the two officers turn over sundry documents in their possession.

The officers employed counsel here in Washington. They refused to turn over the money and give up the documents. The case was never resolved. According to reports General Mow fled the country and is now in Mexico. Where the $7,000,000 is, or where it went, I do not know.

About the merits of the quarrel between these two Chinese officers and Chiang's government I am not qualified to judge. But sometime after the quarrel began, rumors were current that a collection of documents was being circulated by someone connected with General Mow. The rumor had it that, in some manner, these documents helped

sustain General Mow in his contentions against Chiang Kai-shek's government.

About all this I have no direct knowledge. As I say, these were rumors. But when the Reporter magazine brought out its much publicized series on the China lobby, there appeared in the first installment, on page 18 of the April 15, 1952, issue, the following passage, which I should like to quote:

The text and translation of the following cable were furnished to the Reporter by a former Chinese official who is willing to identify himself and prove its authenticity to the proper government authorities. The message was sent to Chiang Kai-shek during 1949 by Chen Chih-Mai, Minister Counselor of the Chinese Embassy in Washington. Another cable from Chen to Chiang appears on page 21.

What I have quoted so far is the Reporter magazine introducing the cable. I now quote from the Reporter the cable itself:

September 23, 1949: Last week an article on the front page of the Washington Post attacked the Chinese Government for hiring Goodwin for certain activities, blaming us for influencing Congress to get aid. It was apparently done by our enemies. However, Goodwin * * * acted according to the laws of the United States and registered himself as a lobbyist for a foreign country. So nothing can happen to him anymore, and after this, people will even consider that we are doing things properly.

Here, at last, was a cable, and, according to the Reporter, it was sent to Chiang Kai-shek by Chen Chih-mai, the minister counsellor of the Chinese Embassy in Washington.

Where did the Reporter magazine get it? They did not say. All they said was that the document was furnished by a former Chinese official who was willing to identify himself and prove its authenticity to the proper Government authorities.

Is this former official General Mow or Colonel Hsiang, General Mow's secretary? We do not know.

One would suppose that Secretary Acheson and President Truman would have moved at once, because they disliked the Chinese lobby so. Mr. Acheson said the President was going to cooperate. Here was his chance. Here was a chance for the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. And what about the resolution of Senators MORSE and MCMAHON? Nothing happened.

Still, some of the cables seem to have come into the possession of Senator MORSE for, several days after the appearance of the first Reporter article, the junior Senator from Oregon inserted a series of these cables in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—April 10, 1952, page 3970.

All but two of the cables had affixed to them the name of that same Chen Chih-mai. The two exceptions in the series were: a cable followed by the name T. K. Pee; in the series was one dated September 23, 1949, apparently identical with the cable published in the Reporter which I have already read.

I say "apparently identical" for the substance of the cable was about the same, but either a good deal of editing was being done by somebody or different translators had been at work.

At all events the Messrs. Chen Chih-mai and T. K. Pee of the Chinese Embassy took exception to the versions of the cables published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and on April 11, 1952 wrote Senator MORSE a letter. On April 16, 1952 Senator MORSE inserted this letter in the RECORD, along with a letter from William A. Roberts of the Washington law firm of Roberts and McInnis. These last two gentlemen appear to be the counsel for General Mow and his secretary—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 16, 1952, page 4016.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Roberts and the letter from the two Chinese be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit V.)

Mr. CAIN. I read the letters with great interest, especially this passage in the letter from the Messrs. Chen Chih-mai and T. K. Pee:

The cabled reports you introduced were all from Gen. P. T. Mow to Mr. H. T. Chou, secretary of the office of the President of China, although from time to time General Mow had made use of of information which we had given him, sometimes verbally and sometimes in pencilled notes. * * * We have a full file of these cabled reports, and we would be glad to let you examine them if you so desire in the interest of truth.

The letter goes on to say, and I quote again:

The papers which you introduced in your speech on April 10, 1952, on the floor of the United States Senate are a portion of the documents and papers which the district court had ordered General Mow to turn over to the court-appointed custodian. It is a mystery how these documents should come into your possession and the possession of what you call a reliable and reputable publication.

This letter interested me very much. For a long time there had been intermittent cheeping and muttering in the left-wing press about the China lobby. The question had been raised during the MacArthur hearings and Secretary Acheson had told the joint committee that the President was so eager to cooperate. Then came the Morse-McMahon resolution. Yet nothing, nothing happened.

But now, at last, there was an open offer from somebody. Said the two Chinese gentlemen, "We have a full file of these cabled reports and we would be glad to let you examine them, if you so desire, in the interest of truth."

This, I thought, was quite a handsome gesture. It appeared quite open and aboveboard.

I therefore asked to see this file and got it. I have here what seems to be the entire sequence of the cables.

I do not wish to take up the Senate's time unduly, so I ask unanimous consent that the sequence be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks and not at the conclusion of my address.

There being no objection, the cable sequence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TELEGRAMS

JUNE 22, 1949, TO CHOU HUNG-T'AO, TAIPEI

I got your letter saying that you were worried because of the lack of international information. This has already been discussed, and the result was that [Mao] Pang Ch'u, [Ch'en] Chih-mai and [Pi] Tsung-Kan said that you wanted to plan and work in unity with the group. A summary report will be made once a week. If there is anything urgent, it will be wired as the occasion arises. The subject matter will be mainly reports and analysis of international current events. Hereafter such reports will be encoded and decoded by the Air Force office. It is intended not to sign them by name but to put the word "official" at the end. If you have any instructions about this matter please wire as the occasion arises.

JUNE 22, 1949

1. United States officials seem to be less positive than a short time ago [in their attitude] toward recognition of the Chinese Communists. They are still waiting for Secretary Acheson and Ambassador Stuart to return to the United States before making a decision. The antirecognition feeling of the Congress and the people is rather high. But at the same time they feel that mere nonrecognition is not going to solve the problem; their consideration is that the Central Government [sic] has not yet attained stability and whether or not they can carry out their international obligation.

2. Kan Chieh-hou, accompanied by Ambassador Koo went to see Marshall and Acting Secretary Webb. On the 22d [he] visited President Truman, and had a meeting with Senator MCCARRAN, but has not called in reporters. All quarters feel that his position is not clear.

3. There have been rumors connected with the arrival of [T. V.] Soong in the United States. Pearson, in last Sunday's broadcast, said that it was connected with the matter of the loan of silver to coin silver dollars. This may give rise to misunderstanding.

4. Goodwin wants to go on in a positive manner with the work already begun. Key men in both the Republican and Democratic parties intend to support nonrecognition of the Chinese Communists, and also want to study further aid plans.

5. Signs of economic decline are noticeable in the United States, and there is widespread demand for economy. Spread of this [demand] will have a harmful effect on China aid.

6. There are no signs of a trend toward easier Soviet-American relations, but it will not come to war. The United States policy is still to make every effort to avoid war.

JULY 6, 1949

1. I have just heard that United States Ambassador to the Philippines, Myron Cowan returned to the United States and reported that if the Communists obtained power in China the position of the Philippines is in great danger. The United States authorities intend to send Cowan as a special Ambassador to head a group of civilian and military experts to go to China to investigate. The State Department has also requested Cowan's agreement to succeed to the position of Ambassador to China. Cowan is a prominent lawyer and was a law partner of the present Secretary of Defense Johnson. He contributed greatly to the President's last election campaign.

2. According to the above analysis, the administration, under pressure of the Congress and the military, are seriously reconstructing the United States-China policy. However, they are concerned as to whether

our Government can positively unite and determinedly resist the Communists. Whether or not the white paper will be released is still under consideration by the highest Government authorities. This morning General Marshall met with Secretary of State Acheson to discuss this problem. General Marshall expressed to Acheson that he was still gravely concerned with our future policy toward China. His position is of extreme importance.

3. Butterworth's appointment will probably be confirmed. His attitude has gradually become more moderate and he has stated that your excellency is the only leader in the fight against communism.

4. The United States-Communist espionage case has been vigorously prosecuted, and a conviction has already been secured in the woman spy case. The 12 Communist leaders will also probably be pronounced guilty. However, because the Hiss case involves many important Democrats, the administration is most concerned and is doing its utmost to play it down.

5. The Republicans and southern Democrats defeated the labor bill (which was backed by the President) by a vote of 51 to 42. This was a great defeat for the administration and proves the weakness of the Government's control over the Senate.

6. Since Mao Tse-tung issued his anniversary broadcast on the twenty-eighth anniversary [of the founding of the Chinese Communist Party], the understanding here of the Chinese Communists has increased, as compared with previously, and everybody realizes that there is no possibility of them following in Tito's footsteps. Numerous articles in newspapers have attacked the leftist elements for defending the Chinese Communists. Those who constantly advocated the using of trade as a bait to force the Chinese Communists to adopt a moderate policy also realize that the possibility of this is extremely small.

7. The Herald has strongly attacked the rampant smuggling and piracy in southern China and the corruption and connivance of the customs police. This matter can also furnish the anti-Chinese elements with a pretext to attack. Is it permissible to pass on instructions to those responsible agencies to devise means of control?

JULY 14, 1949

1. Regarding Your Excellency's advocacy of a Pacific anti-Communist alliance during your visit to the Philippines, although United States officials in the Philippines have deliberately avoided [the issue] and allowed a do-nothing [attitude], the subsequent reaction here was good. At present the United States Government is giving no thought to activating a Pacific anti-Communist alliance, but certainly has no intention of opposing its progress. After the event, the State Department expressed sympathy for the present advance of mutual aid cooperation between the Chinese and Philippine peoples. Such an alliance, while it might get much coopera'ion on the positive side, it will at least on the negative side be able to stop the various members of alliance from recognizing the Chinese Communist regime. If in the future the number of member states increases, if the United States cannot be enticed to join and take the leadership, then [at least] they will inevitably have to reconsider their far-eastern policy.

2. All United States papers have published the interview which Your Excellency recently gave to an American correspondent. The reaction of journalists and Congressmen was good, but many papers used the headline "Chiang again asks for United States aid," which cannot but lead many readers to jump to a conclusion about the subject matter. The New York Times and the Herald Tribune have printed no comment on this matter, possibly because of professional jealousy.

3. On the 11th the Senate Appropriations Committee discussed the aid-to Europe bill, and McCARRAN's proposal to give $50,000,000 to Spain was approved. McCARRAN thereupon submitted a proposal for $100,000,000 aid to China, which was defeated by a vote of 8 to 6. This resulted from the fact that three Republican Senators were not present at the time. This was a most unfortunate accident.

4. The United States policy maker, Under Secretary Rusk, is giving much attention to the China problem. He had a talk yesterday with [Ch'en] Chih-mai and repeatedly asked whether our Air Force and armored forces bases were on Taiwan. The implication was that he was interested in whether or not we were determined to put up a firm defense of the mainland.

5. United States private philanthropic bodies will certainly raise (money) for relief of the Yangtze flood and north China drought. We can achieve a great propaganda success if we [approve of] proper use from a humanitarian standpoint.

6. Butterworth's confirmation is still held up. The key to the situation is Vandenberg's disapproval. We ought not to take part [by expressing] any opinion in order to avoid misunderstanding.

7. The white paper is still under consideration, but we have heard that the content is more moderate than the first draft, and there have been many deletions in the criticisms of persons in our Government. One of its chief arguments utilizes the fact of previous Nationalist - Communist - negotiations as evidence that the United States did not press us to a policy of tolerating communism. Regarding this point, we have already compiled a refutation to be held in reserve.

8. The State Department states that whether Ambassador Stuart will visit Canton before returning to the United States is still under consideration. Many Senators say he ought to go to Canton. I have just heard that Stuart will soon return to the United States and that he has agreed to meet Councilor [Clarke?] in Tokyo, so that Stuart is not going to Canton.

JULY 21, 1949

I. Butterworth's appointment will be given to the Senate for confirmation after the completion of debate on the Atlantic Pact. I predict that at that time there will be heated fact-finding discussion on the entire United States China policy. Its subject will not be Butterworth personally or the Republican-Democratic conflict, but the failure of United States policy brought about by the expansion of Chinese Communist power and future countermeasures.

II. After three revisions, the white paper will be published within a month. The first draft emphasized our country's political rottenness, the loss of morale, and the failure to adopt General Marshall's various recommendations. It especially emphasizes the fact that recommendations for military and political improvements were subsequently blocked by various quarters. This standpoint would fit into the Communist plan, and it is now rumored that the subject matter will be changed to emphasize the Soviet's violation of the Sino-Soviet pact and its aids to the Chinese Communists, but it continues to criticize our Army and Government. Various quarters here are preparing [information] on all recent Chinese Communist words and actions, which will do still more to bringing about an awakening here. But the decisive effect will be had by the Chinese Communists sou'hern aggression and our resistance.

III. According to general observation, the problem of recognition of the Chinese Communists will not arise unless there is a complete Communist victory, and the State Department propaganda that the Chinese Communists will follow Tito's path has also died down. Anti-Communist arguments are now emphasizing the following three points.

1. Our Army withdraws without fighting, abandoning large quantities of munitions, and has neither the will nor the power to resist.

2. Our Government lacks unity. Rather than help the central government, it would be better to help the various regions separately.

3. They urge United States aid for the various nations and colonies of Asia, emphasizing point 4 as a pretext for reducing possibility of aid to China. Your Excellency's visit to the Philippines dealt a heavy blow to this doctrine, and the general reaction was very good.

IV. Our activity in the United States should continue to be both in the executive and legislative fields, and we should renew contact with Congress. But we must conform strictly to United States law; then there will be no danger. Hu Shih's proposal that we should not work on Congress seems to be a one-sided view.

V. Since the broadcast of Mao Tse-tung's proclamation, and other such incidents as the insult to the United States vice consul in Shanghai, and the Communists' closing of the USIS offices in Shanghai and Hankow, both Government and nongovernment circles, including the State Department, are unanimously denouncing the Chinese Communists, and consider that there is no longer any possibility of the Chinese Communists following Tito's path. Yesterday Senator KNOWLAND again offered a bill for $200,000,000 of military aid to China. But the anti-Chinese groups continue to oppose on the ground that the National Army cannot defend its territory. Recently our military situation has retrogressed, which should have quite a harmful effect on the passage of the bill.

VI. Recently, the British have asked the United States for the secret of the final stage of atom bomb manufacture, so that England could make its own atom bombs by next year. Last week the President called those concerned in the Government and Congress to consider the matter. According to what we hear, the Government circles are rather in agreement with the British request, but the Congress holds that this cannot be conceded because it has not been approved by the legislative body.

AUGUST 1, 1949

1. The United States State Department has recently organized a group to study United States relationships to countries in the Far East. It is headed by the present delegate to the international conference with rank of Ambassador, Philip Jessup. In addition to two Assistant Secretaries of State, they have brought in two other people from outside the Government to aid them. Jessup is professor of international law and formerly was the chairman of the research department of the Institute of Pacific Relations. Although Jessup's political views are not necessarily pro-Communist, his understanding of China cannot but be influenced by the Lattimore faction. Of the other two people, one is a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation, and the other is dean of a university, neither having had any connection with the Far East problem.

2. A certain American official recently stated that the administration could agree to the allotment of a sum of money for aid to China to be used at the discretion of the President provided that it does not injure the European-aid bill. However, they should include a clause that there be reform within the Government and a suitable guarantee

that arms and ammunition not be permitted to fall into Communist hands.

3. The above two items seem to indicate that the [proponents of] United States China policy, under the criticism of Congress and public opinion, are becoming flustered. If we can offer a reasonable change in their course [of action] we can hope for a gradual shift [in their attitude]. However, in order to clarify the true facts, we must publicize them more widely.

4. The next 2 weeks will be very critical. At present the Democratic leaders fully realize the possible errors by the administration in their [policy] toward the Chinese Communists. The work of Miller and Goodwin has been to promote this realization, paying particular attention to [party] leaders, and at the same time seeking to avoid a party split and [the issuance of] unconsidered and extreme statements.

5. The administration's plan for military aid presented to Congress included Greece, Turkey, the Philippines, and Korea in addition to the 12 member nations in the Atlantic Pact. It was also announced that each country had already submitted requests for military assistance to the United States. Our country at this time should also submit to the United States a concrete plan for military assistance. Ambassador Koo has just called a meeting of [Chinese] military personnel here to consider a half year's program for $200,000,000. Madam [Chiang Kai-shek] also intends to present a plan to General Marshall for thorough discussion to eliminate obstacles. After discussion [it is planned] to amalgamate the two plans into one bill. It will then be presented to General Marshall by Madame [Chiang] for his views, then to your excellency for review. Last, it will be formally presented to the State Department by our Embassy. [I feel that the above] will be comparatively satisfactory. However, the [present] session of the United States Congress will last for only 3 to 4 weeks; the time is very pressing. Therefore, we are quite concerned. It might be more advisable for us to strive to present the bill at an early date within the limited time rather than to have [the plan] completely prepared.

AUGUST 3, 1949

1. Recent United States public opinion is that the CC's should not be recognized even if they establish their regime because of the statements of CC personalities and the outrages against American officials and private persons in C-occupied areas. Ambassador Stuart's attitude at the time of this return to America was helpful to the Communists, but I don't think that people will give too much consideration to it.

2. When General Marshall testified on the military aid to Europe bill before the House on the first, he stated that the Chinese situation was very peculiar and until the situation clears up he agrees with Acheson's idea that military aid to China at this time would be ineffective.

3. It is announced the white paper will be given to the papers on the afternoon of the 4th and officially published on the morning of the 5th. It is 1,100 pages long. I will make a detailed report later.

AUGUST 5, 1949

1. The State Department's white paper was released this morning. I had an opportunity to read it prior to its release. The complete text is 1,054 pages, 400 of which were a [historical summary] and the 600 pages of the paper proper contained 186 items including the complete text of the Wedemeyer report and Acheson's report to the President. The contents of the entire volume can be summed up by saying that the civil war in China is a matter beyond the control of the United States Government. He feels that the people of China will definitely oppose foreign rule, and if the Chinese Communists invade areas outside of China the United States will recognize this as a violation of the U. N. treaties and will, as regards their China policy, maintain their traditional friendship and open-door policy and the principles of independent government and territorial integrity of China.

2. The entire tenor of the document is a defense of past policy, and strongly notes the spread of Chinese communism was caused by our Government incompetence and reaction and that the reason why the Nationalists and Communists could not cooperate is the deep suspicion, distrust, and jealousy on the part of the government and its psychology of relying on United States aid. The selection of documents in the appendix is narrow; however, the general reader will consider it as a complete presentation.

3. The last page of the paper proper quotes directly the letter of May 5, sent to President Truman by Acting President Li. The contents of the third paragraph state that the failure of General Marshall's efforts at conciliation was due to the complete lack of sincerity on the part of both the Nationalist and Communist governments at that time, and that the ineffectiveness of United States aid was due to the inability of the Nationalist Government effectively to utilize (it) and the inability to institute political, economic, and military reforms. The white paper's comment with regard to the above was that this letter was a fair though tragic commentary on United States-China policy and the present-day Chinese national distress. This letter was personally delivered to Ambassador Koo by Kan Chieh Hou. Although Ambassador Koo accompanied Kan on his visit to President Truman, he never had a look, before or after, at the original letter or any copy, nor did he see the aide-memoires which Kan gave to President Truman, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Treasury. The same is true of the China-aid plans which Kan sent to several Senators.

AUGUST 9, 1949

1. On the State Department's white paper, the principal points are the corruption and incompetence of the leaders of our Government, the degeneration of morale and loss of popular support, our nonacceptance of United States advice on many matters, and the neglect of opportunities that inevitably [result in] collapse. The conclusion is that aid to the Nationalist Government is now pointless, that the United States in the past has exerted her greatest efforts in economic, military, and personnel fields, and cannot be held responsible, and that unless the United States sends a large force to fight in China, the situation cannot be restored; but this is a measure which would not be tolerated by the United States Government and its people. At present, the State Department has organized a Far East Foreign Policy Advisory Commission with Ambassador Jessup, who compiled the white paper, as its chairman. Naturally, it will take the white paper as a basis for its discussions. Fortunately, after the release of the white paper, the reaction from all quarters in the United States was unfavorable. The Republican Party determinedly attacked [the paper] with all their force. There were also attackers in the Democratic Party and other Democratic leaders in the administration, such as the chairmen of the Senate and House Foreign Relations Committees, have not yet come out in open support of the State Department's position. The press has also taken an attitude of opposition and skepticism. The severe criticism in the New York Times editorial is especially noteworthy. To sum up, the State Department's explanations have served to arouse a general unfavorable public reaction. It is generally felt that the State Department should not have adopted such a defeatist position on this grave problem in order to cover up its past errors.

2. At present, those friendly to us feel that we must seize the opportunity to counter-attack. At present both Republican and Democratic Congressmen have united to propose a bill allotting $200,000,000 for aid to China. Acheson yesterday testified before the Senate and explained his present withdrawal [from his original position] and stated that if Congress were to allot a small amount of funds for use by the President at his discretion, for aid to China, it would be of some avail. Ambassador Koo, fearing that the opportunity would slip by if he requested instructions from the Foreign Office before issuing a statement, held a special interview which was favorably received. He also proposed to invite various people who had formerly been connected with the conduct of Sino-American affairs such as Hu Shih, Ts'Tang Ting Pu, Pei Tsu-Yi, Ku Hsiang-Ch'un and others to hold press conferences to clarify the shortcomings of the contents of the white paper.

3. At present everyone suggests that we adopt the following steps:

(a) Since the white paper is now receiving everyone's devoted attention, we must take this opportunity to immediately begin our itemized refutations, using the reputable and responsible people available to Your Excellency to publish the important documents not included in the white paper, such as the pressure on us during General Stilwell's time; the suggestions proposed by Currie and Lattimore while they were in China; General Marshall's request that we not occupy Chi'ih Feng and To Lun, and the consistent pressure put on us to make concessions to the Chinese Communists; and the promises made by the United States at the Cairo Conference and its subsequent violations; etc. [We should] bring up one point each week in order to keep the unbroken attention of the Americans. If we miss this opportunity, then the timely effect [of such a program will be lost].

(b) General Wedemeyer and General Chennault advocate the establishment of a Voice of Free China Radio Station to broadcast to the United States in order to prevent intelligence agencies here from hearing only Communist propaganda.

(c) Establish a united news organization to compile and release news from all quarters on a daily basis in order to avoid the use by reporters of news items [based on] false rumors.

4. Today the Canton reporter of the New York Times [Tillman], Durdin, reported that it was apparent that there was no cooperation between Taipeh and Canton, that Your Excellency feels that the mainland of China cannot be held, and that our only hope is to preserve Taiwan and wait for a change in United States policy or a third world war; but acting President Li [Tsung-jen] feels that the mainland must be used as a base in the fight against the Communists, and that retreating to Taiwain is equivalent to flight, but that Li [Tsung-jen] and Ma Hung-K'uei are not able to receive any aid supplies. I am much afraid that this news will be a source of elation to our enemies and moreover have a [bad] effect on our struggle for military assistance. I feel that we should issue a strong refutation.

AUGUST 14, 1949

1. On 8 [August] the United States President submitted a bill for aid to the South Korean Government in amount of $150,000,000. Many Congressmen felt that this is not going to the heart of the far eastern problem, and were very suspicious of it. During the discussion of the proposal, it will probably involve the question of aid to southeast Asia and China.

2. Many Congressmen in both the Senate and House intend jointly to petition the

President and Department of State [as follows]:

(a) Not to recognize any kind of Chinese Communist authority.

(b) To give moral support to our policy of resistance to communism.

(c) Within reasonable limit to give economic aid and military assistance.

They are now in the process of gathering signatures (for the petition). If they succeed, it will be a step forward in realizing a congressional resolution signifying the United States attitude.

3. The letter which General Wedemeyer wrote to Your Excellency early this month has been given to a person to present to you. He [Wedemeyer] also introduced his good friend, the influential anti-Communist writer Taylor [Tyler?], who will come to see you. He is arriving in Formosa the middle of this month and I hope that Your Excellency will receive him.

AUGUST 15, 1949

1. It is learned that before the President of the Philippines came to the United States, the Department of State requested the Philippine Delegate to the U. N., Romulo, to return to the Philippines to explain the United States attitude toward an anti-Communist alliance in the Pacific, which was one of indifference, and to request the President of the Philippines not to discuss this matter on his forthcoming visit to the United States. Although when he speaks before Congress he will emphasize the matter of such an alliance, the United States will exert every effort not to abandon its original position. The Burmese Foreign Minister in his recent trip to the United States also talked to reporters on this matter, and stated that Burma had not yet been invited to participate in such an alliance. When Your Excellency goes through the Philippines, no matter what attitude is adopted by the State Department, it has already aroused deep interest in all quarters.

2. The British Foreign Minister, Bevin, and President Nehru, of India, will both come to the United States next month. Bevin will discuss the far eastern problem and encourage the United States to adopt a less intransigent policy vis-à-vis the Chinese Communists, and emphasize economic assistance in southeast Asia. I believe that Nehru will adopt the same arguments. Based on Acheson's pro-British attitude [I feel he will] express sympathy [with the above views].

3. Ambassador Stuart, on his return to the United States, will participate in the discussions of the Far East advisory group and for the time being will not return to his post, and the United States will not appoint any successor. With regard to [United States] policy, I feel we should concentrate all negotiations at Washington and decrease our contracts with the [United States] chargé in Canton. While the above activity is in progress we can reach the [United States] President, members of the Cabinet, and also can contact Congress to influence public opinion, which should be comparatively the efficacious measure.

4. Since the release of the white paper, the United States State Department has been obliged to hold strongly to its policy of anti-assistance to China. General Marshall, in order to whitewash his personal responsibility, will doubtless agree and support them. But Congress and public opinion will continue to criticize and to call for aid to China.

5. As regards the policy set forth in the white paper, I feel we should immediately issue a supplementary document which would meet any refutations and criticisms [which might arise] point by point. It would be best that the first item deal with the documents deferring to the Japanese request for a peace treaty and intelligence [reports] relating to Japanese aggressive intentions against the United States prior to Pearl Harbor, including all related telegrams dealing with these matters. Every week one document can be drawn up in rough draft and released in Taipeh after due consideration. I fear that the texts [of the documents concerned] sent to the United States by reporters in China were not necessarily complete and the manner of release was also restricted. Therefore, I request that you mail either a written copy or photostat of all documents to the United States. Translations would be more convenient here. Furthermore, prior to release we can arrange with [various] authors to select [suitable] reviews. It is requested that hereafter you select suitable material relating to the problem and mail to us.

This telegram has been discussed with, and has the approval of Ambassador Koo.

AUGUST 24, 1949

1. The Senate is now discussing KNOWLAND's $175,000,000 China-aid bill. The House has voted down LODGE's $200,000,000 bill by a vote of 164 to 93. Our general prediction is that the State Department will be in firm opposition in order to maintain the standpoint of the white paper. But there are quite a large number of proponents of China aid in the Senate. The sum now under discussion is $100,000,000. It is not specified that the money will be given to our Government, but is to be given to the President to use at his discretion. The Senate's standpoint takes into consideration the entire American resistance to communism. It is by no means advocated by the Republican Party alone, but that party is its strongest advocate.

2. The anti-China party is now concentrating its attack on previous United States aid in money and goods being grafted away by our officials. They say that our deposits abroad amount to 1½ to 2 billion dollars, but they give no specific figures. This offensive is evidently inspired.

3. The New York Times has published an item on the abandoning of Foochow [saying that] our four defending armies put up no resistance whatever, except for one regiment of recruits sent from Taiwan after only 3 months' training, who fought fiercely for 3 days. This is causing quite a bad reaction here.

4. Some American friends here say that Marshall, accompanied by his wife, went to his country home for a rest just at the time of the publication of the white paper. This is actually a sort of scheme and pretense. In the past year I have been extremely patient with Marshall, but he hasn't changed his attitude in the slightest. But I feel it is advisable to continue to refrain from attacking him as an individual in order to avoid a direct break with the administration authorities.

AUGUST 25, 1949

1. The Senate is now in heated discussion over the aid-to-China bill. Because the European military aid bill was cut in half by the House, they have become panicky and invited in the pro-China-aid Senators in a plan to restore the entire sum for European aid; making concessions for China aid in exchange. But they insist on using the phrase "Far East" without specifically designating aid to China, and on giving the money a limit of $100,000,000 to the President to use at his discretion. The Republicans still insist on specific designation of China. Whether or not China is specifically designated, it will be the same as the Import-Export Bank loan of 5 years ago. Whether the money can be used, and under what circumstances, will be determined by our country's internal situation and the progress of resistance to communism.

2. New York Times China correspondent Durdin has recently been making a series of reports on the Taiwan situation. He considers the authorities in Taiwan Province to be a miniature reproduction of the National Government, without popular support, that the legal position of Taiwan has not been clarified and it cannot as yet be considered as Chinese territory, and that if it is threatened with the Communists, then an Anglo-American joint trusteeship should be considered. Something is apparently going on which provides background for his statement.

3. A New York Times editorial of the 25th is most respectful to Your Excellency. Dealing with your recent trip to the Philippines and Korea and your inspection tour of Kwantung and Szechwan, they explain that Your Excellency is the only leader who can unite the various anti-Communist groups, and that there is no other man who can furnish the leadership.

4. The Washington Post on the same day, quoting Butterworth's statement and the conclusion of the white paper, firmly opposes military aid to China, on the grounds that there would be no stopping point and that the United States would be drawn into the civil war. It also says that the United States Government should consider the safety of American citizens in the Chinese Communist area.

AUGUST 30, 1949

1. An American periodical in its issue of the 26th states that previous United States loans to China have largely gone into the pockets of those in charge and have taken refuge overseas, and that the money in the United States, Switzerland, and South America amounts to $3,000,000,000. It mentions that the 1942 gold loan and subsequent military and economic aid goods were either sold on the black market or captured by the Chinese Communists. It also cites officials and their relatives by name. MANSFIELD, an important member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, thereupon made a speech advocating an immediate thorough investigation of the activities and sources of funds of our country's official and private persons here. Otherwise there will be no further consideration of aid to China. His language was extremely violent. This was evidently an inspired statement. It has already created an extremely bad impression and there is great cause for anxiety.

2. A New York Times dispatch of the 27th states that the Chinese Communists have set up a small-scale navy and air force, made up of our ships and planes which have gone over to the Communists. The figures on ships and planes are quite detailed, and this report can only serve as powerful ammunition for our opponents.

3. The Senate Foreign Affairs and Military Affairs Committees discuss the military aid to Europe today and tomorrow. It is possible that limited aid to China will be approved at the same time. But the strongest supporters of aid to China have repeatedly and strongly advised that the present situation is unusually bad, and also say that even if Congress designates the money, it will be controlled entirely by the President, and the State Department will also put obstacles in the way of its use, so we should not put any reliance on it.

AUGUST 30, 1949

1. All quarters in the United States are considerably concerned over the Chinese Communist question, and cannot but study as to what concrete course of action can be followed. However, White House and State Department officials adopt the pretext that because our Government is splitting up there will be no one to give aid to, and are using Kan Chieh-Hou's activities here to increase misgivings. In addition to our [issuing an] explanation, Congressman JUDD yesterday suggested that it would be best if leaders of all our factions issue a point statement expressing a spirit of unity in order to rectify the misconceptions here.

2. The United States consul in Formosa, after his return to the United States, had many criticisms of the political situation. Recently a Reuter's news agency dispatch reported that the Formosa Provincial Government intends to adopt the British form of socialism. The feeling here was that our citizens' spirit of obedience to law, growth of democracy, and degree of economic development are not equal to Great Britain's. Moreover, English socialism has $6,000,000,000 in aid, despite which they have fallen into a dangerous economic position. I deeply feel that our country's adopting such strict control measures would be a blundering move and that, on the contrary, it would produce a despotic form of government which would arouse the hostile reaction of the people of Formosa. Anti-Communist elements in America are still skeptical of socialism. Furthermore, Belgium, after the war, practiced a free economy, and restoration was rapid. For this reason it encouraged us not to take too hasty action. This matter also has great bearing on the attempt to obtain United States sympathy.

SEPTEMBER 10, 1949

1. The Senate Foreign Affairs and Military Affairs Committees in joint meeting approved by a vote of 11 to 9 [5 absent] the Democratic Party's bill for $75,000,000 for aid to China and the Far East, to be given to the President for use at his discretion. Although the purpose of this plan was to appease the aid-China group, the Republican Party is against it, as they feel that under this plan our country could not get any real benefit. Therefore the whole bill will be heatedly discussed in Congress and the Republican Party will insist on the original proposal for $175,000,000.

2. The Democratic Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman CONNALLY made a statement on the seventh concerning the aid to China bill denouncing Your Excellency. It is evident that someone has put this into his head out of malicious motives. CONNALLY'S biased attitude created a poor impression, and CONNALLY struck out the phrase "welcome the collapse of the National Government," when the official records were edited. But yesterday he again stated that aid of the National Government was improper, and cited Marshall support.

3. Ambassador Stuart will soon go for a short visit to Marshall's home, and they will reopen discussion on China policy. Supporters of aid to China are urging Marshall to revise his ideas, but I fear there is probably no great hope of this.

4. I [Pi], Tsung Kan, went to see Admiral Badger on the 7th and personally gave him Your Excellency's letter. He said that it was regrettable that we had been unable to defend the Yangtse, and said that the defendability of Taiwan was the same as the defendability of the Yangtse, but all forces must cooperate, must have a will to fight, and capable persons must be put in authority in both army and government. Furthermore, although his statement to the Senate advocated aid to China, he was quite critical of our Government and held an equivocal attitude, evidently intending to ingratiate himself with all parties.

5. The British Foreign Minister and Chancelor of the Exchequer in their conversations in the United States will touch on the Far East. We hear that the British intention is to invite United States aid by offers of British colonial products. If they do not get [United States aid], they will announce their withdrawal from the Far East and force the United States to take over all the responsibility. We also hear that the British intend to urge the United States to trade with the Chinese Communists. But the State Department announced yesterday that the Chinese Communists are unable to discharge their international obligations, and is seeking to cut down on the diplomatic establishments in various parts of China. It would seem that there is no present possibility for the trade proposal.

SEPTEMBER 15, 1949 (TOP SECRET)

1. At present various quarters are continuing to make every effort to defend the United States Government's wait-and-see policy. Some say that the Chinese problem is too great, and that United States strength in men and money is not enough to control it, and that the United States should stay out of it; for example, General Marshall and Mrs. Roosevelt. Some say that the United States should face the facts and that recognition of the Chinese Communists is to be considered if it would be advantageous to the United States; for example [Lapham?]. Some say that the Chinese Communists are divided into Liu Shao Ch'i and Chou En-lai factions, and that the United States should use its economic power to encourage the moderate faction to win out; for example, Leighton-Stuart and others. Recently some people have again been wantonly criticizing the Government under Your Excellency's leadership, saying that it is unworthy of aid; for example, CONNALLY and various newspapers and magazines. Still more people are spreading rumors that Your Excellency and Vice President Li do not work together [which is] deliberate slander. All these attacks can be refuted as the occasion arises by our sympathizers in the Senate and House of Representatives. After Congress closes we will lose this opportunity to have spokesmen for the right, and the opportunity will only be regained in January of next year. During these few months our opponents will be more shameless than ever. Recently Your Excellency while in retirement has not been begrudging any effort to unit the [area], to keep in touch with friendly nations, and to call China and the world to strengthen resistance to communism, and you are greatly respected and thoroughly trusted by the well-informed persons in this country. Given enough time, the Government authorities may change their view of Your Excellency.

2. Yesterday, I, Ch'en Chih-mai, saw Wedemeyer, and he said that the aluminum magnate Reynolds had told him that an important man in our Government intended to give Wedemeyer $5,000,000, asking him to leave the United States Army and to go to China to help us in our resistance to communism. Wedemeyer said that he was most sympathetic with our policy of resisting communism and had great respect for Your Excellency's leadership, and he personally would make every effort to do anything that would be useful, but that it is generally known that he does not agree with the present United States foreign policy, and if he went to China as a private individual he would not be supported by the United States Government and it would be impossible to achieve any success. He further said that he personally had enough money to maintain himself and that if we had a large sum of money, whether public or private, it could be used for welfare work among the people to increase the strength of the struggle against communism. He is scheduled to go west to his new post on the 17th.

The Senate Foreign Relations and Military Affairs Committees in joint meeting yesterday approved the bill to the amount of $75,000,000 to be given to the President for use at his discretion in China and its general area, deleting the words "Far East." This bill is a compromise between the Democratic and Republican Parties, and the proponents of aid to China have expressed disappointment. Because the administration authorities have not changed their policy, our country is unable to get any real benefit, but at most will get only moral support. This bill must still go before Congress for passage. Then it is discussed by both Houses. The House bill for military aid to Europe has no clause for aid to China, but there is a possibility of a Senate resolution, which would be our last chance.

SEPTEMBER 23, 1949

1. Last week's Washington Post had a front-page article about our employing Goodwin, in effect accusing us of influencing Congressmen in order to get American aid. It is evident that someone put them up to it. Mr. Goodwin registered officially with the Justice Department, in accordance with the law and the established practice of other countries, and has made regular reports. After explanation was made, the general reaction was that our attitude was proper and irreproachable.

2. The consultation of the United States, British, and French foreign ministers on the Far East problem will naturally tend toward the State Department's viewpoint.

OCTOBER 6, 1949

A. Recent international developments of concern to China

1. The British Empire bloc, led by India and Australia, are agitating for recognition of the Chinese Communist regime.

2. The major powers have still not expressed their attitudes on our charge against the Soviet in the United States. There is still more cause for anxiety if the discussion is postponed in the beginning of November.

3. The United States has been quite startled by the speed of Soviet recognition of the Chinese Communists. The State Department is holding meetings day after day to discuss the China problem. Opinions are still divergent, but the general opinion is that there is no longer any point to supporting the National Government, because the situation is hopeless unless the United States participates in the Chinese civil war with full force, and they fear that this would bring about a direct Soviet-American clash. The present expressed opinion is to take a wait-and-see attitude toward recognizing the Chinese Communists, and that hasty action is inadvisable.

4. Foreign Minister Bevin will come here in a few days to exchange opinions on China with the Americans. Because the Americans always seek to have a parallel foreign policy with the British, it is quite difficult to be optimistic about the future. But the future military situation in our country, and the Chinese Communists' attitude toward other countries, will be a major factor in deciding whether the United States will recognize the Chinese Communists.

5. The State Department's refusal to let Chief of Staff Collins go to China is a special indication of the strength of Butterworth's opposition.

6. It is to be noted that the people and the Congress almost all respect Your Excellency, but the governmental authorities are holding to an attitude of opposition.

7. The newspapers here have recently carried repeated stories that Your Excellency and Vice President Li do not agree and cannot work together. They also say that Prime Minister Yen is going to resign. United States officials have also stated to Ambassador Koo that China's various representatives in America do not act in coordination, which is an example of the lack of cooperation [in China]. This serves as a talking point against us. We, too, feel that in the present international situation, the more internal strife we have, the more criticism and dissatisfaction with us there will be among outsiders, and the easier it will be for various countries to find a pretext for recognizing the CC. This is an important point.

B. Proposals

1. If by chance Canton is not defended and the mainland is lost, then British and United States recognition of the Chinese Communists is unavoidable. Now the only

thing to do is plan for the worst, hold on to Taiwan and Hainan Islands, and wait for a change in the international situation.

2. We ought to make every effort to satisfy outsiders' criticisms that we cannot work together. The way to do this would be to make a clear division of authority between Your Excellency and Li, to have Your Excellency send representatives to reside regularly in Kwangtung, Kwangsi, Szechwan, and Yunnan to keep in touch frequently with all quarters, to make joint declarations at suitable times, and to cut down on the public and private representatives here from all quarters.

3. It would be advisable to give orders for the Embassy to submit an official plan for use of the $75,000,000 military aid passed by this session of Congress plus last year's unused economic aid of $30,000,000. If you approve, then it would be best to submit it before closing of Congress at the end of this month.

OCTOBER 18, 1949

I Everyone here is talking about Nehru's expression to the State Department of approval of prompt recognition of the spurious Chinese Communist regime, but the United States is still against hasty action. The key to the matter at present is:

(a) Can the Chinese Communists really control Chinese territory or a large part of it?

(b) Is Communist China able or willing to abide by international agreements and fulfill international obligations?

(c) Do the majority of the Chinese people tacitly acknowledge the Chinese Communist regime?

The above three matters will be decided on by observing the future behavior of the Chinese Communists. I fear that we cannot hold on by relying on our past legal position.

II. The U. N. legal adviser says that the demand of the spurious Chinese Communist regime to enter the U. N. is without precedent, and the only thing to do is get a vote from the Assembly and the Security Council. I fear then it will depend entirely on the attitude of the various countries.

III. Congress closes this week. In mid-September, I, Ch'en Chih-mai was appointed chairman of the U. N. delegation to handle the charge against the Soviet Union. I estimate that it can be submitted in mid-November.

IV. Recent Soviet-American relations continue to be tense. The establishment of the East German regime, the lack of progress on the Austrian Treaty, and the impasse on control of atomic energy have all made the gulf between the two countries wider day by day.

V. The Soviet pressure on Yugoslavia is still unsuccessful. Opinion here is that the Soviet must attack Yugoslavia or foment a civil war. One of the two plans must be chosen to overpower Tito, but the latter is more likely.

VI. According to what Leighton Stuart told me, Pi Tsung Kan, the State Department is considering appointing Jessup to be Ambassador at large in the Far East, similar to Harriman in Europe. But no definite decision has been made.

OCTOBER 27, 1949

I. I. [Pi] Tsung-Kan, visited both Mr. Stuart and Mr. Hurley. According to reports, the State Department's China policy is still not firm. Last week the State Department assembled 16 persons in various fields to discuss it. A minority favored immediate recognition of the Chinese Communists but the great majority were opposed and felt that no hasty action should be taken. On the one hand, the United States is supporting an anti-Communist policy in the Far East, and on the other hand wants to get the Chinese Communists if not to abandon a pro-Soviet policy, at least not to be anti-American. But since there has been no success for the present they are holding to a wait-and-see attitude. United States official circles feel that we no longer have a foothold on the mainland and that Taiwan can be a secondary consideration.

II. The President of the United States on October 12 suddenly sent someone to see Hurley and ask him to go to work in China, but Mr. Hurley declined because he did not agree with what the State Department advocates. We are now urging him to take this job.

III. The Soviet atomic explosion; the establishment of the East German Communist Government; the election of Yugoslavia to the Security Council over Soviet opposition, and the indictment of AMTORG personnel for violation of the foreign agent's registration law; have all led to tenser Soviet-American relations. The constant rumors of Soviet forces massing on the Yugoslav border have led the United States and the various Western European countries to consider concrete measures to help Tito. But general predictions are as follows:

(a) The Democratic administration maintaining its political position will continue to take all measures to avoid war. If they help Tito, at the most it will be limited to air transport. The main reason is that the building up of the Atlantic Pact armies, originally scheduled to take 4 years, will at any rate take 2 years.

(b) The United States economy is subject to constant strike troubles, but they do not do much harm to the general economy. Continuation of aid to Europe can maintain the economy for quite a while and be advantageous to America.

(c) The Soviets stated that our country's indictment of the Soviets and the election of Yugoslavia to the Security Council were threats to world peace, but after the fact there was no noticeable special attention, and there was no breaking of (anti-Communist) resolution.

(d) The end of fighting on the Greek border is a stabilizing factor, and proof that the United States policy has a possibility of success.

IV. Regarding United States recognition of the spurious Chinese Communist regime, they are still thinking of postponing the issue, but there is a lot of pressure from England, India, and Australia, etc. I hear that a certain schemer has suggested to Truman that the best plan would be to recognize the Chinese Communists and at the same time return an Ambassador to Spain to block an attack from the pro-China group. This is a malicious suggestion. Our sympathizers are constantly asking us how long we can hold out, and whether we would have any real strength if, by chance, there should be an international crisis; and especially whether anything can be done militarily or politically in Taiwan, to make it worth while for America to take us under this wing. They also urge us to pay attention to these two matters.

V. The United States courts have convicted the 11 American Communist leaders, but the appeal can drag out several months or several years. Some people consider this case as a sign of United States anti-Communist resolution, but the indirect result will be to protect the leftist elements in the government and keep them from being exposed.

VI. United States circles, both in and out of Government, are showing great efforts to win over Nehru, considering him a pillar of strength in East Asia, but Nehru's previous pro-Communist proposals, and his present statements that he does not want to be drawn into any Soviet-American conflict or any struggle between capitalism and communism, have been a great disappointment.

VII. The important content of the Soviet proposal in the U. N. for a 5-power peace treaty is an accusation that the United States and England are making war. The General Assembly will no doubt reject this. We hear that the United States counter-proposal [is as follows]:

1. Accusing the Soviets of aggressive measures.

2. Proposing that so-called indirect aggression, which is to say using Communist parties to create civil war, should also be subject to the attention of the U. N.

If so then our chances against the Soviets will be still more relevant. We have heard that the English are fearful that this will bring about a direct clash, and, in order to change the center of attention, they intend to urge the various countries to recognize the Chinese Communist regime.

VIII. I, Ch'en Chih-mai, have now been assigned to draft our charge against the Soviet Union, to be submitted in mid-November. It will be very lengthy. Please instruct on how to handle the matter in consideration of the time for returning home to report.

NOVEMBER 8, 1949

(1) The American delegates to the United Nations secretly informed the Department of State recently that they can only bring up the principles governing the Nine Power Pact, the Monroe Doctrine, and the respect for territorial integrity in regard to the case drafted by us accusing Soviet Russia. It is very vague and we do not have much hope but they brand Russia for a breach of the treaty and they have decided not to recognize the Chinese Communists. They have also handed to the State Department the first draft of our case relating to the accusation of Soviet Russia. They also explained that we have more evidence than that brought out in the accusation against Eastern Europe by Greece. This case has drawn the attention of the American Government and the people and is a key point related to whether America will recognize the Chinese Communists or not.

(2) The Administrator of the European aid program, Mr. Hoffman, in France has called on the European countries to unite; otherwise American assistance cannot be guaranteed. His attitude was very strong. Great Britain, in order to protect the sterling block, has been very cool. It is learned that if Great Britain does not participate in the program, America will make West Germany the center of the European continent. She will start again to establish a European continental force. The ministers of the United States, Great Britain, and France will hold a meeting in France in a few days and will decide this question; they will also discuss the question of recognition of the Chinese Communists.

(3) I, Tsung-Kang, saw Hu-Shih in New York the day before yesterday. He has had two heart attacks in the last 10 days and is feeling great pain, so he is involved in little outside activity. He wants me to submit two points:

(a) The drafting of soldiers in the Province of Formosa should be carried on in a fair and reasonable way. If they do the same thing they did on the mainland—exempt young men of favored classes from being drafted into the army and create the bad practices of selling the service of able-bodied men and maltreating new soldiers—this will cause a revolt of the people of Formosa and will not be beneficial to our military affairs. You are requested to pay attention to this matter.

(b) As to the question of your [the President of China] desire to serve the Government again, it should be carried out at the sincere request of Li [Tsung-jen] and Pai [Chung-hai]. Otherwise an open difference will be created. You will not get any benefit out of it, but will suffer as a result.

NOVEMBER 15, 1949

(1) The United States, and the United Nations have accorded recognition to Governments of the Eastern European countries

which have been taken over by the Communist Party [Czechoslovakia, for example] because the legal governments of those countries have been taken over by the Communist Party, there is no other but Communist governments in these countries. Such a situation is obviously different from that in our country. If our Government leaders were forced to surrender to the Chinese Communists or to sign a peace treaty, from the legal point of view the Chinese Communists will become the legal Government and those opposing them will be considered a rebel party. In these circumstances foreign countries and the United Nations would naturally give recognition to the [Chinese Communist] Government. Although this is a hypothetical case, the consequences would be very serious, politically we have to adopt the necessary measures to prevent such an occurrence.

(2) The Secretary of State gave a speech to the Pan American Association saying that if a government born of free election is overthrown and is replaced by a dictator government the United States may not give recognition. If America affords recognition, this step does not mean that it is in favor of the recognized government—just the opposite may be the case. America may be fundamentally opposed to the way that they take over power and may consider it in violation of human rights. The reason for recognition lies in the protection of American interests and in maintaining usual diplomatic relations with the objectve of protecting the democratic system. This principle, although it was used in connection with the Central and South American countries, may have some relationship to us.

(3) The Secretary of State gave a speech in West Germany stating that America would help those who helped themselves, and he said that China did not help itself, so it was defeated by the Chinese Communists. The success of the Chinese Communists is the result of the failure of China's politics.

NOVEMBER 22, 1949

(1) The confinement of the American consulate at Mukden by the Chinese Communists has not been verified by the Department of State. On the other hand, it says that it is a local affair and should not be exaggerated, but public opinion is getting excited. When the Secretary of State returned from Europe it was declared that recognition of the Chinese Communists cannot be considered at the moment. Public opinion is not satisfied and all kinds of questions are being asked. It is unfortunate our shelling of the American boat occurred on the same day because it diverted attention. Since this has happened, the only way for us is to maintain a strong attitude and declare that our objective of blockade is to check to the Chinese Communists. To break our blockade is tantamount to assisting the Chinese Communists. Furthermore, from the point of international law, a blockade should be effective so that it will be internationally recognized. There is concrete proof that our blockade is effective and our allies should sympathize with us.

(2) The Foreign Minister of Canada expressed the opinion recently that Canada will recognize the Chinese Communists. As a result of this, Canada's foreign trade with China would only be increased 1 percent of the total amount. This shows evidently that Great Britain instigated the move. In the past Great Britain often has said that the diplomacy of Soviet Russia is fundamentally designed to break up cooperation between America and Great Britain. Now there is a disagreement between America and Great Britain in regard to the question of recognition. British sympathizers here will create an atmosphere around the idea of the necessity for (Anglo-American) cooperation which will be unfavorable to us.

(3) Recently people have been paying attention to the question of Formosa. The editorial in the New York Times dated the 16th made two recommendations: One was to place Formosa under the control of the United Nations, and the other was to utilize American financial help to protect Formosa About our military and political accomplishments in Formosa such as the victory of Chin Men, etc., we hope that responsible circles will send us details by telegram or post. If you can send us documents and clear pictures it would be even more effective.

(4) I, Wei-Ko, saw Representative JUDD, who said that the American Navy is paying particular attention to the protection of Formosa and it is believed that it is one of the defense lines of America in the Far East. If there is any change in the military and political situation, for instance, if Sun Li-jen is placed in charge of military affairs and Wu Ku-chen in charge of administration, it would give General Marshall and others a chance to smooth matters over. Then the implementation of American policy would be carried out more effectively.

NOVEMBER 25, 1949

The forwarded telegram of Shen Ch'ang-huan has been received. Several months ago Ch'ang T'ing-fu started organizing a Free China Party. The chief political principles and organization are similar to those of the British Labor Party. Later the draft principles were carefully revised by Hu Shih so that a socialistic color has been diffused. Originally the plan was to have Dr. Hu take personal lead of this party. The group wants to establish contact with Meng-Chun and Tung Ku-hsien and others in Formosa in order to win the support of the legislative Yuan. Dr. Hu is skeptical about the party and believes association with it is in contrast to the nonparty position which he has held for years. Before the occurrence of this event Chiang talked the matter over with Sung Tse-wen and Mr. Sung said that he would give his best support and that he would be responsible for maintaining contact with the Kuomintang. When this party becomes known to the public, there are foreigners who will give it support because of Dr. Hu's reputation. The official circulars made no comment regarding the editorial in the New York Times. No Chinese in America have so far joined this party.

DISPATCH ON NOVEMBER 28, 1949

(1) The telegram sent by Huang-shou-u from Formosa has been received. The propaganda material regarding the event related in his telegram is as follows: We are sending you a copy for your reference.

1. Li advocates a war on the mainland with the Communists but the Chinese President holds the idea that we should trade time for space, trying to avoid direct conflict with the Communist troops.

2. The Chinese President controls the finances. The soldiers' pay is several months in arrears, so their morale is very bad and they will not fight.

3. The Chinese President is in control of the navy and air force blockading the ports. They will not be used to help the army in the war.

4. The Chinese President believes in the protection of Formosa, but the military and political situation is deteriorating, according to a rumor circulated in Hong Kong recently. It is rumored that Sun-Li-en refuses to fly the national flag and is on unfriendly terms with Chairman Ch'en Ch'eng.

5. The Chinese President is unwilling to shuffle personnel. Those who have failed in the past are still allowed to hold important positions. Li repeatedly wanted to make changes but his efforts were obstructed. All of these points have won sympathy for Li.

6. It is said by Representative JUDD that the Department of State may express to Kan Chieh-ou that if Li can get rid of the old corrupt forces and is in control of both military and political power, America will give him assistance. The idea is to deal a blow to the Chinese President.

7. America is worried over the security of Formosa. For the time being the Communist aggression against Formosa is not serious but the disharmony between the generals and the dissatisfaction of the people with the present situation may precipitate a revolt. The American Department of National Defense believes that we will be able to hold Formosa only 6 months.

DISPATCH SENT ON DECEMBER 5, 1949

(1) After the fall of Canton and Chungking the people here believe that we have lost all our power of resistance and we are incapable of holding Formosa and Tibet for very long. Some Republican Members and a few newspapers proposed the idea that General MacArthur should take control of Formosa. The military headquarters are not in sympathy with this idea. The members of the American consulate in Mukden have been released. The American public forgets very easily and whole incidents will quiet down. The Department of State very much hopes so, so as to avoid attack from all sides.

(2) Official sources declare that Li's visit to America is for medical treatment. If he follows his past methods in telling his case orally to the United States, little interest will be shown but it will be hard for the public to distinguish between right and wrong. If we publish the documents and reports and exchanges of correspondences between him and the Government during his trip in America, we can obstruct his activities and the result will be more satisfactory.

(3) Great Britain, India, and others, perhaps will accord recognition to the Chinese Communists this month. At that time, the Department of State must consult with Congress and the latter and the press must have sufficient reasons for preventing realization of the British-Indian objective. We can very well utilize our documents accusing Soviet Russia. The most important thing is to send the entire documentation to America regarding the Sino-American relations with the beginning of the war of resistance up to now. We will edit and publish them as a last step to prevent American recognition of the Chinese Communists. Awaiting your decision so that we can make use of it when Congress resumes session in January.

(4) The Chairman of the American Atomic Energy Commission was attacked by the right wing and he has resigned. There is a rumor that the Secretary of State will also resign at the beginning of next year. Although there is a change in personnel, American policy toward China will not be fundamentally altered. We can say definitely that there is an increase in economic prosperity in America. The people fear war. The rehabilitation work in Europe is progressing rapidly. The relationship with Soviet Russia will not deteriorate. The United States does not like the idea of the Chinese waiting for another world war in order to restore them to power.

(5) It is widely circulated in America that we are planning to lease Formosa as a condition for obtaining help from America. If so this will increase Chinese Communist propaganda material. We sincerely hope that this rumor is not accurate.

DECEMBER 12, 1949

(1) Secretary of State Acheson declared last week that if the Nationalist Government can hold a position on the mainland, the United States would never accord recognition to the Chinese Communists. If the entire mainland is lost, the United States will have to reconsider its future policy. In order to protect Hong Kong and Indochina, Great Britain and France are trying to be

friendly with Communist China. Recently pressure has been exerted on America to take a uniform attitude. America has been holding conferences trying to delay action. Next month the British Empire will hold a conference in Ceylon. America will also hold a conference in Bangkok, the principal discussion of which will be the China problem. So, from now until the end of next month, will be the time for America, Great Britain and France to reach a decision in deciding their policy toward China. We should improve our internal politics during this period and launch a diplomatic offensive so as to refresh the minds of both the Chinese and the people of foreign countries in order to counter criticism of the United States for managing Formosa incompetently. This will increase the attention of the American authorities toward Formosa and will delay recognition of the Chinese Communist regime.

(2) Our case against Soviet Russia in the United Nations will be handed to the Little Assembly for continued discussion. In the beginning, Britain and America were opposed to this idea. Later when the small countries supported the measure, America changed its attitude, and is now using strong words in attacking Soviet imperialism. The result is very satisfactory. The Little Assembly meeting will start in January. We will present our demands again but the question of nonrecognition of the Chinese Communists is a matter of national sovereignty. The British Empire group will oppose this violently, and it will be hard to be successful in our move.

(3) According to those who are close to the Indian Government, Nehru is still dubious with regard to Britain's suggestion for recognition. He suggested that we should appoint representatives to India to discuss the matter and to adopt a joint policy in dealing with anti-Communist matters. They consider that Pao Chun-chien, the former consul general in Calcutta and now Ambassador to Peru, is a very good friend of Nehru. If we are to have any contact with India, Mr. Pao would be the most suitable person to send there.

DECEMBER 21, 1949

1. The reaction of the American authorities and the popular opinion regarding the renovation recently taking place in Formosa is very favorable. They admire your spirit in the face of danger. In general, the attitude toward us is better than before. The Department of National Defense is very enthusiastic in helping us, but the Department of State has not positively expressed its intention and is still entertaining doubt. Our friends have repeatedly expressed the opinion that we should do our best to save ourselves before we ask for assistance. But the time is too late, and we cannot afford to make any experiment without assurance.

2. Some people in our country expressed the opinion that the position of Formosa is very important and America cannot help but give us assistance. This sort of utterance provokes unfavorable reaction in America and does not help us. In order to ask for American assistance it is better to do as little propaganda work as possible.

3. Mr. Li expressed the opinion to Chinese here in America that the defeat in the past should be attributed to you and your colleagues not helping General Pai to fight. He further says he will ask help from America in defending Hainan. If we make any demand from America it is better to include the island of Hainan, otherwise it would create an awkward situation in that Li occupies Hainan and we occupy Formosa.

4. The American Congress will resume its session next month. It is better for us to start making use of publicity regarding improvements that we have made in Formosa before the end of January in order to change popular opinion here. The American news reporters are still biased regarding the 37½ percent rent reduction and the war in Chin-Men and Chou-Shan. We do not have effective reports about these matters. We should utilize these facts to increase our propaganda work.

5. Mr. Jessup is now on his way to the Far East to study the far eastern situation and the American policy regarding the Far East. Mr. Jessup had a close relation with Lattimore in the past and is very much prejudiced regarding Chinese affairs. Before his departure he went to see Mr. Li [Tsung-jen] in New York, but the contents of their conversation are not known. Whether he will come to Formosa is undecided.

6. The radio report at noontime says that President Truman believes that the activity of Minister of National Defense Johnson seems designed to create a position for the 1952 presidential election campaign, so he has used pressure to force him to resign. Mr. Vinson, Chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, has asked Mr. Johnson whether there is any truth in this. Mr. Johnson answered that he does not know anything about it and he is making preparations to resign. The broadcaster further says that the question will be brought up again when the President sees the reporters tomorrow. This news was known for a long time. But now as it is being broadcast over the radio it seems that it has gone a step farther. Mr. Johnson has always been very friendly to China and is the only important minister who is friendly to China.

7. The case of accusing Soviet Russia has been concluded now. Congress will resume its session next month. Please advise us whether Counselor Chen Chih-mai should return to Formosa to make a report. Awaiting your instructions.

DECEMBER 28, 1949

1. The National Security Council has held recently several meetings regarding policy in the Far East and Formosa. It is learned that a Congressman who returned recently from the Far East declared that General MacArthur believes that before the signing of a peace treaty with Japan it is possible to send American troops to occupy Formosa. But the Departments of State and Army are afraid that this step might provoke a confused reaction in the country as well as in the world. So policy for Formosa is still being studied by the United States. The time is pressing for them to make a decision regarding Formosa policy before February, as well as decisions on American occupation of Formosa and the strengthening the American defenses in the Far East. Judging from the present situation, if America occupies Formosa or Formosa is placed under the control of the United Nations, there will be people here who will try to influence the people of Formosa to declare independence, thus causing Formosa to be removed permanently from the Chinese map. If the base of Formosa is lost how can we recover the mainland? This secret plot may be known to the Chinese President. We should do our best to keep our position in Formosa. We do not allow interference from outside. On the one hand we should make use of capable men. We should improve our government and finance as we did recently. We should show our sincerity in cooperating with America. In view of the complicated nature of military occupation by America and the importance of Formosa to America's far eastern defense, it is possible for both sides to cooperate and help each other.

2. Mao Tse-tung's visit to Soviet Russia has attracted attention here. "Meikoyang," member of the Soviet Political Council, said that Stalin has already made plans with reference to the military strategy of the Chinese Communists. This news has awakened people here. According to the propaganda of certain people here, it is hoped that the relations of the Chinese Communists with Soviet Russia will not involve Formosa. At least there is no fear of Soviet submarines and air bases. Some believe that we have lost the confidence of the people, and hope of defending Formosa is very feeble. Regarding this point please read the World Report, dated December 30, regarding the news from Taipeh.

3. At the end of the year the United States Department of Commerce issued a report that there is economic prosperity in America, that the people's psychology is in favor of maintaining peace. Military preparations and aid to Europe will be reduced.

4. JUDD expressed the opinion that the important reason for our military defeat lies in that we placed too much importance in the quantity rather than the quality of the troops. As a result, training was bad, and the treatment of the soldiers has been poor. They have no fighting power. He recommended that we should correct these mistakes in our defense of Formosa. He believes that if we have 200,000 well-trained soldiers it would be better than to have 400,000 riff-raff soldiers. In this way the financial burden of Formosa will be reduced.

JANUARY 4, 1950

1. The American administration, it is learned, is going to accord recognition to the Chinese Communist Government at some favorable time. Acheson, in a speech, pointed to the fact that Soviet Russia is aggressive and he is trying to encourage Chinese nationalism. He is trying to force the Chinese Communists out of the Soviet sphere in order to produce Titoism. Hereafter, American policy, even though Europe decides not to go along with it is replaced with a new one. The new policy is not total opposition to communism, but only opposition to Communist power under Soviet control. It seeks to encourage Communist power, in all places, to break away from Soviet Russia. In order to achieve this purpose, diplomatic recognition and the dispatching of diplomatic officials have become very useful instruments. Recently, America's Assistant Secretary of State Allen went to Yugoslavia to assist its program of antiaggression because of the changed policy.

2. As long as the National Government still exists in Taiwan, this policy is under a real handicap so the authorities are doing their best to create rumors about the President (Chiang Kai-shek) and are making unreasonable attacks in order to achieve their aim. This makes it more difficult for us to continue to ask for help.

3. The Chinese Communists forcefully occupied the American consulate in Peiping. This is a stumbling block to the above-mentioned policy. The Department of State spreads the idea that Soviet Russia is afraid that America is going to accord recognition to the Chinese Communists, and to accord such recognition is the only way to counter Soviet policy. The Department advances as concrete proof the fact that Tito was formerly anti-American; he attacked American planes; at that time the American people were of the opinion that diplomatic relations with Yugoslavia should be broken. Now Yugoslavia has become an ally.

4. Soviet Russia, in its attempt to secure admission for the Chinese Communists, failed, so the Russians withdrew from the meetings altogether, creating a crisis in the United Nations. America has decided not to participate in direct opposition to admission of the Chinese Communists. If seven countries vote in favor, America will not make use of the veto power in order to avoid being criticized for breaking up the peace organization.

5. The policy toward China of the two parties has split, and we have no way of healing the division. The Republican Party is trying to utilize the failure of Government policy toward China as a principal issue in this year's election. Regarding past measures, they are attacking the Democratic Party.

From now on in the dispute over China policy, the opposition party is obviously in an unfavorable position. Mr. Chang says that the Republican view of dispatching the Navy to Taiwan or sending ground forces to occupy the territory is not in accord with America's psychology of fearing war. If we examine the past, the opposition can be very eloquent, because the failure of American policy toward China has been generally recognized. If this dispute develops, the advocates of the policy of abandoning the Nationalist Government will be attacked from all sides and they will be deterred from going further. Recently, an American author published three articles attacking the failures of Stilwell. He has utilized new material and has aroused the attention of the public. My former request asking you to publish the documents is worthy of reconsideration.

6. Those who are sympathetic with us believe that the real policy of the Department of State is a policy of compromise with the Communist Party. Whether this can be carried out or not in this heated atmosphere is still a question. If we hold to our position steadily, firmly, we can prove the policy is wrong, and there is still a chance to control the situation.

7. The day before yesterday Acheson publicly criticised the Philippine Government, saying that American aid has been misused. The Philippines' President and the Minister of Finance disputed him in strong words on the same day, saying that America is adopting the same policy as it did toward China. It is believed that such accusations are correct. America may abandon the Philippine Islands and then Indochina, Burma, and Taiwan. The foreign policy of the Democratic Party always centers on Europe. [Recently, there was a rumor that American finances are limited and one look at the whole world this is in preparation in dropping off the Far East(?)]

JANUARY 4, 1950

1. Regarding the case of assisting Formosa, the newspapers here report that the American Government maintains unusual silence in regard to Hoover's recommendation. Last week when the National Security Council, in discussing our memorandum, the ideas of the Department of State were favorably received, while those of the Department of National Defense have not been accepted.

2. The Congress was in session yesterday. The case of assisting Formosa drew special attention, and will provoke heated discussion. Those who advocate assistance to China are not well informed regarding the contents of our memorandum of December 23, so there were wild guesses by the press. The utterances of many people indicated that they did not seem to grasp its significance; for instance, they object to sending troops to Formosa, to putting Formosa under the control of General MacArthur. We did not propose these. This has caused confusion, thus reducing our strength.

3. The Department of State does not advocate assistance to China. It is adopting a policy of delay, on the grounds that they have to wait for the report of Ambassador Jessup on his return or that they have to wait for the report of the observations made by the staff organization of the United Nations. Mr. "Chang" is strongly opposed to the first proposal. The Department of State, in answering the news reporters last week, said that the Chinese Government has never asked help from the United States. They have merely made informal contact. After being questioned by KNOWLAND they admitted today that on December 23 we made another demand. They criticized it as being incomplete because there were no detailed figures in the request. In fact, Ambassador Koo has asked Pai Te-hua (Bradley?) personally whether figures should be included, but he said it was unnecessary. This shows that they are not sincere. On December 23, according to newspaper reports, the Department of State has secretly informed the consulates in far-eastern countries that Formosa has no strategic value and that this country should do something about popular opinion. If Formosa falls into the hands of the Chinese Communists, the position of America will not be influenced. The Department of State regards this as a secret document and would not disclose it.

4. From the above fact it is apparent that there are many difficulties to the first proposal. We should not be too optimistic. Even now if that case is established there are still many difficulties to overcome. If we hope for too much from this case and if it is upset by the many difficulties, this will be a severe blow to the psychology of our people.

5. It is learned here that Great Britain will accord recognition to the Chinese Communists on the Seventh. Some American Congressmen advocate reduction of assistance to Europe as a check, but this proposal has no chance of realization. It could not influence the already set policy of Great Britain. Great Britain is doing its best to propagate the idea that there are many advantages in recognizing the Chinese Communists. The British are trying secretly to induce America to do the same. At least Great Britain hopes that America will not continue her assistance to China. The influence of Great Britain in America is very great. This is an obstacle to the first proposal.

JANUARY 5, 1950

The declaration made by President Truman regarding policy toward China and Acheson's talk to the news reporters this afternoon are considered a disappointment to those who advocate assistance to China. The general observations are: (1) We have never asked the American Government to send former military advisors to China. This is certainly the result of misunderstanding. (2) President Truman declares that no military assistance will be given to China but expressed the opinion that China can procure freely military supplies in America. Regarding this point Acheson has made some explanation. (3) In connection with the question of financial assistance Acheson will discuss with Congress the matter of the extension of the time limit. It is learned that this case has become a central topic of heated discussion. There will be some changes in the future. The Embassy does not want to comment on President Truman's declaration. We in the country should maintain silence for the time being.

The case of Formosa faces many difficulties. I have been talking with Congress now successfully in the past few days. The opposition uses the pretext that the leader of the Central Government is not supported by the people of Formosa and that the true desire of the people of Formosa is to break away from China. To counter this, it is suggested that the Provincial Assembly of the Province of Formosa send a telegram immediately to the Senate and House to this effect: That the Provincial Assembly is an organ of the people, representing the people of Formosa; at present, Formosa is being threatened by the dictatorial forces of the Chinese Communists; since it is a principle of the American Government to assist free people to protect their freedom, we hope America will give political and military help to the free people of Formosa; we will welcome responsible officers designated by the United States to supervise the use of this help. The above suggestions would be very helpful in eliminating unfavorable rumors. If Jessup should come to Formosa we will have to do our best to remove the complaints of the people of Formsa toward the Central Government and also their idea of asking for independence.

JANUARY 12, 1950

(1) In the last few days the American Congress and popular opinion are engaged in heated discussions regarding the question of Formosa. The Republican Party will use this as a main issue in this year's political struggle. The Department of State is also launching a severe attack in rebuttal. In the past 3 days Acheson has been interrogated in both the Senate and House. On the 12th he gave a speech to the newspapermen. His principal idea is that Formosa has no value in American national defense. He stated that "the defenses of Japan, the Ryukyus, and the Philippines are very strong, and there is no necessity to assist Formosa, and, furthermore, Formosa is Chinese territory. If America builds military establishments on that island, the Communists will accuse us of aggression." However, Acheson did not cite the opinions of the Defense Department and MacArthur. This should be the focal point of dispute.

(2) The American President is extremely prejudiced regarding the question of Formosa. At the end of last year he expressed an opinion to Congressman MCCORMACK and to Congressman JUDD that the China question cannot be solved. He stated that without 10 divisions of American troops it is impossible to defend Formosa and to send troops to Formosa is absolutely impossible. President Truman was not satisfied with Nehru. The reasons are varied, but the refusal of Nehru to listen to America and his anti-British attitude seem to be the main reasons.

(3) The different instances of American help to China have been brought about by the Republican Party. The Department of State does not assist China in the same manner as it does Europe—through bipartisan policy. It must get approval from Congress in order to assist China, and without the approval of the Congress, therefore, for the necessary help which China needed immediately and badly. When I had a direct talk with the Department of State, at the beginning there seemed to be some points of agreement; but when it was concluded, the effort had proved fruitless. This shows that they are not at all sincere. General Boucher (?) (Pai Chi Erh) and Senator FERGUSON, who recently returned from China, said the decision is to follow what George Marshall advocated.

JANUARY 12, 1950 (SECRET)

(1) As we look at the present situation, it is evident that the American Department of State has already made its plans regarding the question of recognition. When the time materializes they will recognize the Chinese Communists on the pretext of keeping abreast of current developments. Recently the newspapers have been inferring this and the Department of State has never disputed the fact. At the same time, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, CONNALLY, has publicly declared that sooner or later the powers will have to meet actual facts. This proves that there is no hope that the White House, Department of State, and the Democratic Party will consider further assistance to China in order to save the precarious situation. The only way for the Chinese Nationalists is to arouse popular opinion in an effort to make the authorities change their attitude. The Republican Party members are unanimously opposed to the policy of giving up Formosa, and there are some Democratic Party members who are also not satisfied with the policy of the Department of State. In the past few months, the negotiations regarding aid to Formosa and our former demands, have not been made public. Consequently, there has been much speculation which dissipates our energies. At the same time the important people of the American Government waver during the negotiations. It looks as

if they were cheating. These facts are not known to the world.

Acheson and CONNALLY are utilizing an evil and detestable design; that we are asking American troops to occupy Formosa to defend us, or that we are asking American officers and soldiers to take part in actual war. They are probably trying to confuse the issues to achieve their objective.

According to my view, the present situation has reached a showdown. Sino-American diplomatic relations cannot be pursued in the customary way. We have to adopt unusual measure. I propose therefore that the entire documentation regarding our present negotiations be published at once in Washington so that the American people will know about our reasonable demands, and that there is absolutely no design to involve America in war. This will also show the mean negotiating measures and the breach of faith of the American authorities. This will produce a general understanding of the situation. Creation of American public opinion has not been based on reason but on documents. The above points have been carefully considered and discussed. We believe it is the only way to save the present situation. I am humbly submitting these ideas and hope you will forgive my impertinence.

Your instruction will be appreciated.

JANUARY 17, 1950

(1) Last week Acheson issued a statement to Congress and to the newspapers severely criticizing the National Government. He stated that the responsibility for the collapse of the Nationalist Government lies with the Nationalists, and that the American Government has absolutely no responsibility. Acheson adds that the aggression of Soviet Russia on the mainland of China will be opposed by the people of China. The best way is not to involve America in the same way that Russia is involved. Senator CONNALLY and the other Democratic Members are giving full support to such utterances. Popular opinion in America is that Mao Tse-tung's stay in Soviet Russia points to the fact that there is a conflict between Mao and Stalin; that the question of territory and the inability of Soviet Russia to supply industrial equipment will make Mao follow the road of Tito; that Kang Yeh-chin [a Japanese Communist] was criticized by Soviet Russia. The American people are led to believe that this is the beginning of Titoistic thoughts in the Orient. The above points have been unanimously advocated by the State Department and the Democratic Party. They are trying to influence the popular opinion and to propagate these ideas.

(2) After a speech by Acheson, the Republican Party was very much dissatisfied. They criticized Acheson and they also demanded that the Minister of National Defense and the Chiefs of Staff present their opinion at a meeting to be held on January 26.

(3) After the American Consulate was forcibly occupied by the Chinese Communists, American public opinion and the Republican Party were very indignant about it, but the Democratic leaders still are arguing in favor of the Department of State. This is proved by the fact that the Department waited 1 week after the occurrence of the event, to announce it in an effort to cover up the affair. The incident will certainly provoke heated political disputes. At present there is no possibility of making the Chinese Communists change their policy.

FEBRUARY 6, 1950

1. The American economic aid program is only being extended to the end of June this year. The opinions of KNOWLAND and others is that they will fight for aid to China at the time when the Congress discusses the aid to Europe program. We have no absolute confidence in what the result will be. At least the China question will not be dropped into oblivion, some propaganda effect will be produced.

2. Mao Tse-tung's visit to the Soviet capital has aroused interest here. If Mao signs a treacherous treaty with Russia, the Department of State will launch a propaganda attack against Soviet Russia in order to divert the attention of Congress regarding past mistaken policies.

3. America has decided to make hydrogen bombs and a British atomic energy expert has been arrested for stealing atomic secrets. The atmosphere is very tense. General opinion believes that America will try again through the United Nations to place atomic energy under international control, although there would not be any success in this endeavor. The question of the right of our delegate in the United Nations will be affected.

4. Acheson's support of Hiss, a former member of the Department of State who resigned because he stole secret documents for the Russians, was attacked by all sides. Whether he will be forced to resign, it is still too early to say.

5. Burton Crane, a news reporter of the New York Times stationed in Formosa, has successfully reported the progress made in the province of Formosa and has aroused a great deal of attention here. American people who come to our consulate to offer their services amount to over 2,000. All express their dissatisfaction with American policy. Our friends believe that our propaganda hereafter should lay special emphasis on the principle of fighting for the freedom and independence of the Chinese people. It should not be limited to opposing communism. We should not overemphasize world problems because we are not in a position to do anything about them.

6. America is puzzled over the steps taken by Russia in the Far East, for instance, the recognition of Ho Chi-min and the sudden recognition of Indonesia. But friendly circles believe that it is intended to divert the attention of America from Europe. It is predicted that Soviet activities in Europe this spring will increase tremendously.

FEBRUARY 14, 1950

In the American far-eastern policy conference held in Bangkok, called by Jessup and Butrick, the object, according to reports, is to inform all personnel of the Embassies and consulates of the decision of the 3-man Far Eastern Advisory Committee in order to unify the whole of far-eastern policy. We have secured, indirectly, the important points of this report as follows:

(1) In the Far East many places are now launching movements of anticolonialism, antihunger, and antipoverty revolutionary movements. They can trace their origin to Sun Yat-Sen, Gandhi and the great revolution of the United States and France.

(2) This revolution was not originally started by the Communists, therefore, it is not a conflict between the United States and Soviet Russia.

(3) American national policy has been sympathetic to movements of this kind. In the past, the United States has recognized new political powers after revolutions. They cited events after the northern expedition (in China) as an example.

(4) Unfortunately, this revolutionary movement has been utilized by the Communists. Because of America's anti-Communist action, the United States has become the enemy of millions of Chinese people.

(5) The American mistake has been overlooking the desire of the people of Asia. They regard the United States as helping the Chinese Government to continue the civil war and support a political power which has lost the confidence of millions of Chinese people. The white paper has proved that the Nationalist Government has betrayed the revolution and has become a symbol of reaction and moral bankruptcy

(6) The new policy of the United States is to assist the people in Asia to secure freedom and righteousness as well as the enrichment of their livelihood. The United States is to be regarded as the friend and adviser of revolutionary Asia.

(7) The point 4 program of President Truman is the only method to combat communism. We will fail if we rely entirely on military forces.

(8) The people in Asia should find a way to help themselves. The United States and the United Nations can only give them guidance and advice.

(9) The Chinese Communist regime is violently opposing the United States. It is pretty hard to predict what the future will be but the United States can only open a path so that the Chinese people will be friendly to the United States and that they will oppose Soviet aggression.

(10) The struggle in the Far East is a struggle of ideologies and not a struggle of military power. The United States should point out the good elements of the democratic form of government in order to defeat communism.

The entire document obviously is a psychological preparation for the recognition of the Chinese Communists. The State Department has separately invited Members of the Congress to study this project.

FEBRUARY 28, 1950

1. Li has decided to come to Washington on March 2 to accept a luncheon invitation of the President of the United States. Other guests invited are Acheson, Ambassador Koo, and Kan Chieh-ou. The State Department advised the Chinese Embassy to keep the engagement secret but the Chinese organizations in town are prepared to welcome him. The American newspapers have also published the news. It has been reported that Li will return to New York the same evening.

2. The United States Senate recently investigated those Communists who have filtered into the State Department and the Department of Commerce. Most of these people are related to the Chinese problem. The administration has refused to turn over secret material to Congress, therefore, it is pretty hard to get an accurate conclusion of the investigation.

3. In the British election, the Labor Party received only a majority of 7 votes. The position of the Cabinet was unstable. Therefore, the United States is very much disappointed because of its effect on cooperation between the United States and Britain.

4. Conflict between the United States and Soviet Russia is getting more acute. Many nations in Europe have expressed their desire to be neutral. India and Thailand also expressed the same opinion. It will be pretty hard on American diplomacy. During the discussion of economic aid to Europe this spring, this will be the center of dispute.

MARCH 2, 1950

DEAR PRESIDENT CHIANG: In compliance with public opinion you have resumed your presidential duties. When we heard of the news overseas, we felt very fortunate and excited. During this period of combatting communism and restoring our sovereignty, which is in a very difficult stage, all people in China and all anti-Communist forces of the world, have secured a brave and brilliant leader. As we look to the future, we are very happy we are serving now in the United States and will redouble our efforts to serve our country and our party. You are working hard for China. Please take good care of yourself for the sake of the country.

MARCH 3, 1950

(1) Yesterday Li [Tsung-jen] came to Washington to attend a luncheon engagement with President Truman. This was arranged by Kan Chieh-ou through private channels. It was not done according to the regular procedure. According to Ambassador

Koo, during the luncheon, Li did not mention his personal problem. In the first part of their conversation they spoke of the good points of the American Constitution. In the second part of their conversation Li mentioned that Truman's anti-Communist policy succeeded in Europe but did not succeed in the Far East. He hoped that Truman would pay more attention to Asia. Truman replies that he is considering this point. After the luncheon, neither made any statements to the press.

(2) The White House spokesman today declared that the Truman-Li luncheon was purely social in nature. They did not discuss any political problems. This engagement was arranged a long time ago. He did not mention whether at this time Li was acting in the capacity of the acting President. He also indicated that in the guest book was recorded only General Li's name with no title.

(3) On the same day a spokesman of the State Department declared that the United States Government has received the formal declaration on the resumption of duties by you (the Generalissimo). Naturally the the United States Government regards you as the commander in chief of China. The spokesman also said that the Chinese Government has the right to decide who is the leader of China.

(4) When Li arrived here, only Ambassador Koo and an aide and more than 20 representatives of the overseas Li clan went to meet him at the station at 6 o'clock. In the afternoon the Embassy gave a tea party and a feast in the evening. Almost all those Chinese officials who were invited declined the invitation. This indicates their reaction toward Li. When Ambassador Koo heard of Kan Chieh-ou's statement, he flew to New York and advised Li not to go beyond the limit, but after he arrived Li had already issued a statement. Ambassador Koo also advised Li not to mention this problem during the Truman luncheon. He achieved success because Li promised that hereafter he will not issue any similar statements.

(5) According to our observation, Li's statements are not considered important by people here. Hereafter even if he is active it will be hard to attract the attention of the United States. You are very generous in nature and will regard this incident lightly. It is better not to take any action. This will not only show your generosity; it will also deprive Li of a chance to explain himself; otherwise you will be giving him a chance to place adverse views before the public. It is expected that this matter will be forgotten in the near future.

MARCH 11, 1950

(1) On the 7th, Acheson asked Congress to extend the China-aid program until the end of February. On the surface the purpose of aid to Formosa and southeastern Asia looks like help to us, but, in reality, it is a move to pacify Congress in order to promote aid to Europe and Korea. The State Department and the ECA are very strict in limiting our use of the funds. Only about $20,000,000 has been used for aid to China. There is still $1,000,000,000 which can be used. We should work hard to have this amount increased.

(2) Secretary-General Lie of the United Nations, on February 26, sent a memorandum to the Security Council regarding the representation of our country and he has publicly advised the various nations to accept the Chinese Communist representatives. The press has been very critical toward Lie. It regards the present stalemate in the United Nations as having been created by Soviet Russia, and contends that the United States should not be blamed for its refusal to recognize the Chinese Communists. In the Security Council there are 5 nations who have already recognized the Chinese Communists. Only 7 votes are needed for a majority vote. The French delegate has abstained from voting. The United States will follow the majority. The key seems to hinge on Ecuador and Egypt. As to the General Assembly, among the 59 nations there are only 16 nations which recognize the Chinese Communists and this number is far from a majority. But a stalemate in the United Nations has continued for a long time. It hampers discussion of atomic power and other problems and this has been a matter of concern to many parties. Unless the United States exerts some pressure on Ecuador and Egypt, the vote will not be very promising.

(3) In his recent speech to American Businessmen, Acheson said that the United States should exert pressure everywhere to prevent the expansion of Soviet influence. All those nations who can support the United States in reaching this objective, and have the determination and power to do so, should be supported by the United States. In his speech, he praised highly Greece and Turkey for their effort to resist communism. When he spoke of China, he said that the victory of the Chinese Communists is due to the fact that the Chinese people have lost confidence in the Nationalist Government and they do not believe the Nationalist Government can bring them happiness. Acheson said that the United States has no way of preventing the victory of the Chinese Communists because the Chinese people feel that what the United States is supporting is not a government which promotes the welfare of the people. Bullitt regarded the above statements as an excuse for the failure of the United States policy toward China, but generally speaking, it looks like a turning point in American diplomacy. If our anti-Communist strength is increased, it may be possible that the United States will consider a more positive policy toward China.

(4) The foreign ministers of the United States, Britain and France, will open a meeting next month in England. The Chinese Communist problem will be one of the issues to be discussed. This is worthy of your attention.

MARCH 24, 1950

(1) The Foreign Relations Committee of both Houses of the United States passed the foreign aid bill yesterday. It included the extension of aid to China to the end of June 1951. According to estimates the unused fund is close to $1,000,000,000. It is expected the aid to China part will be passed by Congress and approved by President Truman.

(2) This resolution includes words to the effect of "territories" of China, including Formosa, Hai Nan and territories occupied by non-Communists. The Foreign Relations Committee of the lower House is afraid that the administration will divert this fund for use in southeastern Asia. Therefore, in the report they recommended that the President spend at least $50,000,000 in China.

(3) Carrying out the foreign aid program has been repeatedly delayed. The actual amount we get is far below the total amount appropriated by Congress. Since it is not the real intention of the original bill, I have made the above recommendation. Whether the Senate will agree or not is questionable. In my past experience of negotiating for American aid, I have often been obstructed by the ECA office as well as the State Department. For instance, the decision on whether to give us materials for reconstruction is the decision of only Hoffman himself. It does not have any legal basis. It is also contrary to the principles of the southeastern Asia aid program. Conditions in Formosa are now being stabilized. They cannot be compared to conditions existing in Shanghai and Canton last year. Also the ECA is opposed to giving us fertilizers for planting sugarcane and to acquire foreign exchange. This has no legal basis and is contrary to the principles of the foreign-aid program. The principal idea of the Marshall plan is to help increase the production in different countries for export purposes and to secure foreign exchange.

(4) According to secret reports from China and foreign sources, the United States has sent a memorandum to different countries in Central and South America, explaining that the United States has no intention of recognizing the Chinese Communists. It also advises the different countries to take the same position and requests the foreign nations to reply in writing. The different countries were asked not to reveal this news to us. It is inferred that United States public opinion will not consent in extending recognition to the Chinese Communists after the occurrence of the Mukden and Peiping incidents. Britain and the Secretary General of the United Nations, Lie, are very active regarding our right of representation, although they have accomplished nothing.

(5) American Congressmen and public opinion are now attacking Acheson very violently. It is also rumored that he will be compelled to resign. In his recent speeches, Acheson counterattacked his critics. Acheson has been supported by the left wing of the Democratic Party, like Mrs. Roosevelt's Committee for Democratic Action, and the leftist trade unions and cultural organizations, etc. President Truman yesterday announced that he has no intention of dismissing Acheson. This matter will be brought up in the election in November and will be an important issue in the American election campaign in November.

(6) After Li Tsung-jen was received in audience by President Truman he called two press conferences and said that he was going back to China in June to lead the guerrillas on the mainland to overthrow the Chinese Communists, as well as the Central Government in Formosa, but his conversation was not regarded as important. Many papers did not carry the news. Recently Chang Fakuei denied in Hong Kong that he is organizing guerrillas in the province of Kwangtung. This greatly lowers Li's prestige.

APRIL 4, 1950

(1) Your announcement of the 28th has been favorably received. It is felt here that it is filled with the spirit of Jesus Christ. After a careful study, I think that the relief work should be initiated by our own government so as to forestall any move by the United Nations, Red Cross, or similar organizations. We shall not fall into the same mistake which UNRRA made. The materials were taken over by the Communists and the refugees were not benefited. At the moment, the best method is to have former President Hoover initiate the organization. As to method, Formosa will be the base of operation. The American Government will be requested to send us surplus food, gasoline, spare parts for airplanes, and have the food distributed by the airplanes of the Nationalist Government to the famine areas. In this way we do both relief and publicity work.

(2) On the 28th Davis, news commentator of the United States State Department, said that since you took over the government you have blunted the fighting strength of the enemy and you have landed guerrilla troops on the mainland. This proves that your troops are willing to fight and can fight also. This point is contrary to what has been said in the white paper. It is worthy of our attention.

(3) Recently the Secretary of the Defense Department, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of both Houses and Chairman of the Democratic Party attended the Hague Conference, but they did not invite any Republican Members of Congress to participate, therefore, it has aroused the indignation of the Republicans. It has been reported that many

countries in Western Europe are utilizing the pretext of their opposition to American military aid to constantly create trouble and disorder and to oppose the political power of the Government. Therefore, they are not very enthusiastic about receiving American military aid. The general feeling of these countries has been that they are unwilling to participate in the cold war between the United States and Russia. If a third world war should develop, they will take a neutral stand in order that their territories will not be violated. The fundamental United States policies for foreign affairs and national defense will be destroyed. All leaders are startled by this development. Johnson did not invite Republicans to participate in the Hague Conference because he was afraid that the real situation would be revealed to the public, and thus shake the confidence of the people. Britain has been trying her best to persuade the European countries to recognize the Chinese Communists. Its most effective argument is to avoid unnecessary direct conflict with Soviet Russia.

(4) The problem of our representation in the United Nations is getting gradually more difficult. The Secretary-General of the United Nations, Lie, is proud of being the Secretary-General of the United Nations for many terms. Mrs. Roosevelt and the liberal press have jointly given support to him. Britain is trying to influence other countries to recognize the Chinese Communist regime. Its argument is that the Chinese Communists are in actual control of China and naturally reality has to be faced. Futhermore, the United Nations cannot carry out its duty. Whether to place blame on Soviet Russia as an obstacle of peace is questionable. The United States at present does not have any intention of recognizing the Chinese Communists, but it is possible that she will separate recognition from power of representation. This move will merely fall into Mr. Lie's trap. The key to this development hinges on the number of countries recognizing the Chinese Communists, and the three foreign ministers conference on May 8, in London. Final decision will rest with the General Assembly in September. Diplomatic maneuvers from now on will be more and more significant. Now all our diplomatic personnel are not at their posts. Their remaining in the United States is not advisable.

APRIL 6, 1950

(1) According to secret reports, Acheson attended two meetings of the Joint Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and the Senate this week to explain the foreign-aid program. When he reached the part connected with China he said the Chinese Government's recent air attacks and blockade and the attack on the mainland are acts of madness. This will provoke the Chinese Communists into attacking Formosa. For the Chinese Nationalists it will be like digging their own grave. He also said that the acts of the Chinese Government are intended to draw the United States to participate in the Chinese civil war. As a matter of fact, the United States does not want to get involved in any adventure on the Chinese mainland. Jessup supplemented Acheson by saying that in his trip to the Far East he recognized that all nations are not willing to support the Generalissimo—the President of the Philippines and Korea are naturally exceptions. This is hard to understand, and he should be corrected. The Republican Members of Congress, at a meeting, asked many questions and made rebuttals, but Jessup was not moved and insisted that the United States should aid countries other than China to combat communism. They paid special attention to the support of the political power of Paota.

(2) I, Chih Mai, yesterday had a long talk with KNOWLAND and JUDD. They both think that Acheson is much prejudiced and cannot be reasoned with. President Truman is limited in ability and has been influenced by Acheson. Therefore, if Acheson remains there is no possibility of a change of policy toward China, but JUDD feels that in an air attack of cities many people are killed, wounded, and injured. He questioned whether it is a military necessity and this is worth consideration.

(3) KNOWLAND recently wrote to Acheson, asking for food for the relief of refugees. Acheson announced that this request is under consideration, but if the Chinese Government has no method of supervising distribution of food, then the American Government or any other international relief organization can administer it without the Chinese Government. If relief is administered by civil organizations it will be more proper, but how to do it effectively is something to consider. I, Chih Mai, have explained to KNOWLAND and JUDD the advantages and disadvantages of the different ways of administering it. They seem to understand the situation. But the Chinese Government should formulate concrete methods so as to be able to remedy the situation when the American Government decides on a plan.

APRIL 7, 1950

Yesterday Lattimore was present at a subcommittee of the United States Senate to answer charges made by Senator MCCARTHY—that he is a Communist spy. He said that in July 1941, he was appointed by President Roosevelt as the political adviser of Generalissimo Chiang. He returned to the United States in February of 1942. Then he went to Chungking at the end of 1942 to ask to be allowed to resign. He said that the Generalissimo was very kind to him and did not allow him to resign formally but gave him indefinite leave. This shows, according to Lattimore, MCCARTHY's statement that he was unsatisfactory to the Generalissimo and was forced to return to the United States is untrue. He then made public a letter from the Generalissimo to President Roosevelt in 1942. This letter commended him very highly. In 1944 Madam Chiang also wrote him a letter. It was very sincere. She invited him to be her house guest. The MCCARTHY investigation is an internal political struggle. We naturally should not be involved in it. But Lattimore has been very critical of our government in recent years. He is opposed to aid for China and he has been disrespectful to you. Now he has quoted the above two letters in trying to explain himself, a very fantastic procedure. It is questionable whether the facts mentioned are true or not. Last night Representative JUDD intended to call the Madam by telephone and hopes that I can say something so that the American public will not be fooled by Lattimore. He [JUDD] asked us to relate the above to you. Now if we keep silent it will be disadvantageous to us and he asked me to consider the matter.

Lattimore said that the South Korean Government is corrupt and the United States should be held responsible. Therefore the United States should abandon Li Chen Wan [the South Korean President Rhee]. On the same day I issued the rebuttal and am now reporting the above to you.

MAY 3, 1950

(1) In recent weeks Soviet Russia has attacked the American plans and the Soviet Government has asked British and American forces to withdraw and the satellite countries expel diplomatic personnel of America. All these things have the American and Soviet relations worse. Representative MCCORMICK, leader of the Democratic Party in the House advocated that the United States break off relations with Soviet Russia and that Congress increase the budget for national defense. Also according to secret reports the United States strengthen the air defense in Alaska. These things indicate that the American attitude toward Soviet Russia has been strengthened. Also the American Government will watch very closely the youth parade of East Germany in Berlin. They regard that it is possible that conflict might arise, but the United States is on the defensive and Soviet Russia has the initiative. But whether the Soviets' purpose is that in Berlin and whether they will use the Berlin incident to start a new war are open questions. In view of the fact that China and the United States have turned their attention to Southeast Asia during the last few months and since the United States is giving economic and military aid, Soviet Russia may repeat the former blockade of Berlin so as to create another diversionary incident in Europe. Then it will take this opportunity to support the Chinese Communists and the Communists in Southeast Asia in spreading its power and destroying American aid to Southeast Asia and the program of anticommunism.

(2) The attitude of the American Government toward us has not recently improved. The press believes that the Communists will attack Formosa this summer, and are concerned with the safety of the island. Since the spring, the United States has commented very favorably on our improvements in the army and government. Although the loss of Hainan will not affect Formosa very much, it increases the threat of the Communists in Southeast Asia. This is the feeling of many well-informed people. We surrendered Haikow without fighting and are issuing victory reports indiscriminately; these two matters received public criticism, and gave an opportunity to those who attack us. From now on therefore the issuing of war reports and the press conferences of responsible military leaders should be conducted very carefully. Also when the American correspondents visit Formosa they should be conducted to see the training of our armies. They should also be conducted on a tour of Kingmen and Chowshan. These measures will increase their understanding of the fighting power of our armies.

(3) The Sunday New York Times printed an editorial entitled "Spokesmen For China." In it was mentioned Ambassador Koo, Chen Chi-mai, and the Kung and Soong families as being very active. The Lattimore affair has been a tool of political struggle between the two parties in America but Lattimore and the Democratic Party purposely involved us. They think that we are secretly attacking the State Department and Marshall. It is very unfavorable to us. Chen Chih-mai understands this matter very well. Please ask him for details.

(4) Former President Hoover made an open speech advocating the reorganization of the United Nations and the expelling of Soviet Russia and its satellites. All remaining nations would support justice, religion and freedom. The organization would be reorganized to present a united front to combat communism. This subject has received the attention of the public. President Truman also telephoned Hoover to congratulate him. But public opinion has been unwilling to go to the extreme of expelling Soviet Russia from the United Nations. They pay special attention to the second proposal, that is, to solidify the united front and the support of the United States in its policy toward Soviet Russia.

MAY 10, 1950

1. Last week the United States Senate passed a resolution regarding the use of surplus funds from the Economic Aid Program. It designated that from the surplus of $9,500,000,000 [sic] at least $5,000,000,000 [sic] be used in non-Communist territory in China, including Formosa. The amount passed by the House has been for $4,000,000,000 [sic] therefore, the measure will be decided by a joint committee of both Houses. Friends in Congress told us that Acheson reported to Congress on this matter and that the State Department will not interfere.

But this money can be used only after the resolution has passed. As to whether we can get the materials we need, there should be a special agent in the United States to negotiate the matter. The position of representative on economic aid in the United States should not remain vacant.

2. The United States Government had adopted a more positive attitude toward the problem of communism in southeastern Asia. With regard to Indochina, Acheson has recently discussed the matter in Paris, and has consented to send large quantities of military supplies and economic aid. The funds will be largely appropriated from the $7,500,000,000 passed last year for anti-Communist purposes in Asia. But the United States attitude toward us is still cool. Recently Keenan, head of the Planning Board of the State Department, gave a speech saying that the failure of the Kuomintang in the past was largely due to its own corruption, that it does not make good use of American aid and materials and that it does not accept the advice of the Americans. Discipline among the Chinese Communists has been very good and their morale has also been good. That accounts for their victory. That being the case the State Department cannot do anything about it. He also said that unless the United States participates actively in the war there is no way of remedying the situation. From this, his stubborn attitude toward us can be seen.

3. The visit of the Secretary General of the United Nations, Lie, to Europe, has been under his own initiative. His idea has been to draw the United States and Soviet Russia more closely together and to soften the cold war. Before he left, he went to see Truman. Truman did not express his attitude toward Lie's mission or toward the meeting of the Security Council in Geneva. After Lie arrived in Paris, he received a telegram from the Soviet Union permitting him to go there. The Soviet papers expressed the idea that Stalin has no intention of receiving Lie, but that he could see Molotov or Vishinski. Because the attitude of both parties has been cool, Lie will not get satisfactory results during his trip.

4. Senator KNOWLAND and 34 others wrote to Truman at the moment when Secretary-General Lie of the United Nations was going to Russia, asking assurance for continued nonrecognition of the Chinese Communist administration and assurance of opposition to the participation of the Chinese Communists in the United Nations. On the seventh, former President Hoover also expressed the same opinion. He considered that recognizing the Chinese Communists and allowing their participation in the United Nations would be defeat in the cold war. The attitude of the three foreign affairs ministers meeting in Europe will also be effected. But in view of the continuing French war against the Communists in Indochina and the cool reception of the British by the Chinese Communists, it does not seem likely that there will be any unfavorable decision toward us.

5. According to reports from Chinese Communist territory and from Hong Kong, industry and commerce in Shanghai, which are under strict control of the Communist Party, are losing heavily. They are not allowed to close, and are in a dilemma. The Chinese Communists have forced the purchase of bonds, and people cannot afford to buy them. Therefore economic decline and general unemployment has resulted, and the people find it very hard to make a living. This unstable condition in Chinese Communist territory has not been reported in detail by the American and British press. Our publicity personnel in Hong Kong should organize secretly so that the people who arrive in Hong Kong from Tientsin and Shanghai can have more contacts with British and American correspondents and supply them with material for publicity purposes. In this way we can change the attitude of the Americans and British toward the Chinese Communists.

MAY 16, 1950

(1) The joint meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee of both Houses of Congress decided that the surplus, $40,000,000, remaining from the economic aid fund should be used for non-Communist territories. This includes the spending of $8,000,000 for the relief of refugees in Formosa; $6,000,000 for relief of our students in the United States. The rest of the $40,000,000 will be used in Thailand, Indochina, Burma, and other places. This resolution will be brought out in this session of Congress and will be passed within the week.

(2) President Truman recently gave a speech and spoke on the Chinese people and the relief of Chinese refugees. Opinion generally is that this is the same old theme of the white paper, that he was not pleased with the puppet government in Peiping, but was cool toward us.

(3) The American Congress has passed a resolution to spend $8,000,000 for the relief of our refugees. This move is merely a propaganda measure. The New York Times has commented favorably on our sending food by air. It believes that this will win back the support of the people, and suggests that the American Government adopt this same measure.

MAY 24, 1950

(1) Truman yesterday reported to Congress on United States participation in the United Nations for the past year. He said that Soviet Russia, using as a pretext the question of the representation of China, walked out of the United Nations. In doing so it deliberately insulted the United Nations and the Charter. He also said that the United Nations will work as usual. This is the usual attitude. Today the newspapers all commented favorably on this matter. The editorial of the New York Times said that the United States has no intention at the present moment of establishing relations with the Chinese Communists. It also discussed the attitude of the Chinese Communists toward Britain and commented that it is not proper to recognize the Chinese Communists.

(2) The stealing of the documents by Amerasia magazine in 1945 will be reinvestigated. This matter has received the attention of the press because the documents stolen totaled about 1,700. Among them were top-secret reports regarding us; but the administration did not mete out severe punishment to those arrested. If during this present investigation there are any revelations, it will influence greatly the political set-up.

(3) After the return of American correspondents to the United States, they write articles about what they have seen. Television also presents films continuously. Two correspondents were invited to attend the Far Eastern Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate regarding their attitude. Generally what they reported was fair.

(4) American friends think that we should try to get the sympathy of the people in general. They recommended that we make use of the agricultural situation in two points, namely, famine conditions on the mainland and the fact that the Communists refused food relief. These two points should be expanded. The group of correspondents brought pictures showing Madam (Chiang) collecting food and sending it by air. This film has received the attention of the public.

(5) The Americans' attitude toward our withdrawal from Chowshan has been generally favorable. They think that the loss of this sea and air base will naturally affect the blockade of the seaports but that the withdrawal was a good measure, that it reduced the defense requirements and solidified the defense of Formosa. Viewed in this light, the withdrawal has been wise as compared with the loss of Hainan Island. The comments have been entirely different.

MAY 31, 1950

1. After the conference of the foreign ministers of the United States, Britain, and France, relations of the United States and Western Europe have improved. American aid to the French Army in Indochina will be increased. During the parade of youths in East Germany there was no incident. All these are regarded as a victory over the Soviet front in the cold war.

2. Secretary-General Lie of the United Nations yesterday interviewed Truman. According to reports his purpose was to explain the sincerity of Soviet Russia toward peace and the importance of supporting the United Nations. He wanted the consent of the United States to admit the Chinese Communists but according to general opinion here that is impossible. On the other hand, the United States is not willing to apply its veto power to reject the Chinese Communists. The key to this matter is to be found in the attitude of Soviet Russia when it assumes the chairmanship of the Security Council by turn 2 months from now.

3. It has been reported that the American Government is very cold toward Lie's impending trip to Soviet Russia because the United States is now actively giving military support to the North Atlantic Defense Pact countries. It is not willing to receive a blow from Soviet Russia's peace offensive which would weaken its fight against communism. This can be proved by the fact that Truman last week blamed Soviet Russia for walkout of the United Nations.

4. It is reported here that the Department of National Defense has been asking help for Formosa. According to news from Tokyo, Johnson and Bradley will visit the Far East in June and they also intend to visit Formosa. According to reports, regardless of what happens, MacArthur will aid Formosa and will not forsake the island. The above items are from the mouth of General Willoughby and are worthy of our attention.

JUNE 3, 1950

1. On the 31st Acheson reported to Congress on the meeting of the three foreign Ministers. Afterward he answered Representative JUDD's inquiry. He said that the United States would go along with the United Nations in following the majority opinion of admitting the Chinese Communist delegates. It will not adopt the right of veto. That night I, Chih-mai, had a long talk with JUDD. After analysis, he regarded this as a serious matter. The impending visit of the Secretary-General Lie to Soviet Russia may have received their understanding of certain parties in the United States, and also the speech of General Marshall on the 30th emphasizing the importance of the United Nations may have some reason behind it. It is true that the Communist attempt to attack Formosa will not be successful. But, in the event the Chinese Communists are admitted to the United Nations, certain parties in America will use the latter as an excuse for recognition. It has been reported here that Ecuador and Egypt are under pressure from different sides. There are possibilities of their being affected. In August, Soviet Russia will become Chairman of the Security Council by turn. If the Chinese Communists receive a majority vote, it will be like burying China alive. Afterwards, we visited different parties. They feel the same way. Some people say that if the Security Council cannot decide in August then the matter will be decided in the General Assembly in September, if the American attitude remains the same and if pressure from other countries increases, many countries will not vote. What the result is pretty hard to predict. According to the judgment of American friends, American people are

not in favor of recognizing the Chinese Communists. They suggest that we should adopt a very positive counteroffensive in order to concentrate the public opinion. If we can induce a Congress to pass an act to express its determined opposition to recognition, or to go further and request the American representatives in the United Nations to apply their power of veto, the situation can be remedied.

2. I, Pang Chu, visited on the 2d the newly appointed Secretary of the Air Finletter. It was a social visit, but Finletter inquired about conditions in China for over one-half hour, with special emphasis on Russia's control over Communist areas and the morale of our armed forces. I answered his inquiries regarding these two points by facts. I explained that Formosa was like north Africa. The Second World War, the birth of free France gave the French people a new hope for liberation. He was very satisfied with my explanation and considered it a very effective explanation. This proves that the American military authorities are very much worried about defending Formosa.

3. I, Chih-mai, recently visited many parties and have reached a conclusion. Namely, that the key to American aid is tied to General MacArthur's visit to Formosa. Correspondents who returned from Formosa have the same feeling. According to the observations of American friends, the most effective formula would be before signing the Japanese peace treaty we should adopt with General MacArthur's headquarters a joint defense of Formosa. This formula will gain the support of Congress. This is reported for your reference.

JUNE 6, 1950

To HUNG TAO:

Wedemeyer arrived in Washington today. According to reports he is here at the request of the Department of National Defense to answer questions regarding military affairs in the Far East. It is also reported that there is possibility of his being sent to Japan.

JUNE 14, 1950

(1) The problem of our right of representation at the United Nations is becoming more important every day. On the surface the American attitude is still determined but if it becomes a stalemate, the withdrawal of Soviet Russia is not desired by the United States. Opposition to American recognition of the Chinese Communists has been mounting. There are twenty persons who dare to bring the problem out, therefore, additional steps have to be taken. We cannot permit separation of the right of representation from recognition or the rejection of our representatives even though the representatives of the Chinese Communist Party are not accepted. The best way to handle this is to express our determination to use the veto power. It cannot be determined by a majority vote. We should attack Secretary Lie. If the Communists are admitted to the United Nations, the Communist government will be regarded internationally as the legal government. Formosa will have no position internationally. It is very important. I, Chih-mai, day before yesterday interviewed several Senators. They are all willing to use their utmost efforts to help us. But they told us that we should not fall behind in payment of our [United Nations] fees. Otherwise we will lose our right to vote. As to the special agencies of the United Nations, Soviet Russia has not participated in any of them. The satellites are withdrawing gradually. In the World Health Organization, after we withdrew, the Assembly rejected the Chinese Communist bid to participate. The American delegation moved that we be invited to return to this organization. This is something that is worth noting. But we are two years behind in our payment of fees and have lost the right to vote. This is the greatest difficulty.

(2) The problem of communism will be one of the main problems of the election this year. Last month the leftist Senator of the South, Pepper, was not elected. Last year, Senator Hickenlooper, one of the most effective anti-Communist members was elected. This is worthy of our attention.

(3) In our attempt to secure American aid we should consider the following two points. First, we should mention just the importance of Formosa itself and not the unimportance of other places in the Far East so as not to antagonize Britain, France, and the places themselves, thereby increasing opposition. Second, the French attitude is very important. If we can secure military cooperation with the French and organize guerrilla forces in Yun Nan and Kwei Chow to assist the French Army to fight against Ho Chih Minh then the French and the Chinese will have the same objective. Indirectly this move will affect American policy.

(4) We have secured evidence that official American reports from Formosa often distort facts to please certain parties. Correspondents who visit Formosa have the same feeling. They feel that in our propaganda we should supply accurate information to American correspondents in Formosa and to take the initiative. Senator KNOWLAND said that there were sufficient reasons strategically and economically for our withdrawal from Hainan but in our publicity we did not handle this very well. Also on the fifth of May we announced that Chow Shan and Formosa are at present equally important. Subsequently we retreated voluntarily [from Chow Shan]. This seems contradictory. Please pay special attention to this so that our enemies will not take advantage of cases like this.

JUNE 17, 1950 (TOP SECRET)

Recently someone has come to us saying that he could help us on condition that he receives a fee afterward. After careful consideration we declined his offer. Now there is a lawyer who belongs to the Democratic Party by the name of Hanlon who is a member of the same law firm as that of Chairman of the National Democratic Committee Boyle with whom he is on intimate terms and who can reach high officials directly. After recommendation by American friends, he is willing to be our legal adviser at $30,000 a year. After careful consideration we regard that this is a very good opportunity for establishing friendship with the Democratic Party and for securing reports from them and for establishing direct contact with them. But he is asking for an immediate reply. He also hinted that if, during this period, we can discuss matters with the military leaders in Japan we can get quick results. We are conducting preliminary negotiations. If you approve of this idea please reply immediately so that we can make arrangements to consummate the deal. Also, please send us the $30,000 so that we can forward it to him. As to the details of the arrangement we will report to you from time to time. These reports will be brought back to Formosa by reliable messenger in order to keep them secret.

JUNE 23, 1950

(1) News from Tokyo in the last few days enables those who are in sympathy with us to be optimistic. If there is a decision to aid Formosa after the exchange of views the opinion is that, since there is no possibility of any act by Congress, we should lay stress on the following four points:

(a) The balance of $450,000,000 from $750,000,000 granted to China as aid in 1949 could be used for military purposes.

(b) Of the amount $750,000,000 which President Truman recommended for 1950, part should be used for military aid.

(c) For the year 1948 foreign aid was reduced $1,125,000,000 and because of this China's share was proportionately reduced.

(d) Part of economic aid should be used for stabilizing the currency.

(2) Friends on our side consider that at this moment we should not mention the necessity of counter attacking the mainland and that we should not ask for moral support because the former cannot be done right now since it is remote from America's national defense. The latter would require recognition of one's own mistake—not easily done during an election year.

(3) Harriman's new duty is to act as a liaison between the White House and those departments which are concerned with the carrying out of foreign policy. His position is equivalent to that of Hopkins during the Roosevelt period. It is very important. Harriman comes from a wealthy family. He is very cautious and emphasized European problems. However, he is not prejudiced toward the Far East. We have recently interviewed Bullitt. According to him we should get into frequent contact with Harriman and with Rusk, the new chief of the Far Eastern Division and Assistant Secretary of State. We are planning to carry out this suggestion.

(4) Both parties in the United States Congress have many opinions regarding China's delegation to the United Nations. Most Congressmen are opposed to the Chinese Communists' joining the United Nations. Some have suggested that the United States apply the veto. Consequently, the Secretary General of the United Nations, Lie, went to Europe several times. The British Ambassador to the United States is also very active. The British Labor Party has recently come to oppose entry of the Chinese Communists into the United Nations. French Foreign Minister Schumann's plan has been a disappointment to the United States. Cooperation between the United States and Britain has received a blow. Regarding developments on our representation in the U. N. we will have further reports.

(5) The commander of the United States Far Eastern Air Force, Stratemeyer, returned to the United States last week. I, Pang Chu, went to interview him. He feels that the jet plane when flying low consumes a lot of gasoline. If the Communists across the straits uncover, our planes can fly low to attack them. Also, we can use NP incendiary bombs. The Communists will not have a chance to land. He is also willing to send officers of general rank to Formosa to lecture on the methods of using jet planes. He mentioned that when he left Tokyo he had already appointed people to do that, but he has to receive permission from General MacArthur. He also said that he has told Air Force representative in Tokyo, Lei Yen-hun, that we should have jet planes and radar to increase the morale of our soldiers and to strengthen our air defense, but the important point is the decision of Washington. He can only do what he is doing presently. Stratemeyer left Washington on the 21st to return to Tokyo.

(6) Chief of Staff of the Air Force Vandenberg was invited to a feast last night. I inquired of him about possible changes of far-eastern policy. He said that whenever he presented the far-eastern problem at the national defense conferences those who were opposed to aid to China think that our soldiers do not have the will to fight, and that the Chinese people do not support the Government. He says that they have been trying their best to help militarily, but regrets that they haven't done much. He is very much concerned about the security of Formosa, but his hands are tied. It is possible that after the visit of Johnson and Bradley to Tokyo there will be a turning point. It is hoped that we will try our best to improve so that those who want to help us can do so more easily. Vandenberg also expressed the hope that we will go to him to talk in person and report to him on progress we have made.

JUNE 27, 1950

(1) The United States is adopting a positive attitude toward the aggression of South Korea. In addition to adopting a policy of checking the aggression of North Koreans, it has adopted a direct policy of sending sea and air forces to the aid of South Koreans to restore its territory to the thirty-eighth parallel. It has also dispatched the Seventh Fleet to prevent the Communists from attacking Formosa. It will reinforce Indochina and the Philippines. These are the most important steps taken by the United States since the war.

(2) After the invasion of South Korea, the United States was worried that Formosa would be invaded too. Therefore, it decided to send a fleet to defend Formosa. In consideration of its own position, it does not go further on the pretext that the Japanese Peace Treaty has not been signed yet. Whether the United States will take a positive step toward aiding Formosa has not yet been decided. If Formosa has been stabilized, an increase of economic aid may be forthcoming.

(3) According to the announcement of President Truman, our Government has been asked to stop bombing and attacking the mainland. According to reports, the intention is to prevent the Communists using these acts as a pretext. It is our opinion that we should not commit ourselves toward these requests at the moment. We wonder whether it is possible to wait until the situation is clarified and then answer. The following four points are worthy of consideration:

(a) How long will the American fleet remain in the Formosa Straits?

(b) How are we to observe and obstruct the Chinese Communists' preparation on the coast for attacking Formosa?

(c) How are we to make contact and support the guerrillas of the Nationalist Government and those of the mainland?

(d) How are we to exchange intelligence regarding the enemy between the Chinese and the American Governments when the American Fleet is established at the Straits?

JUNE 29, 1950

We have studied President Truman's policy decision on the Far East of the 26th, and report to you as follows:

1. Based on the recommendation of the Defense Department, Chief of Staff, and that of MacArthur regarding the far eastern situation, President Truman made some changes. When the South Korean war situation became acute, Truman adopted the recommendation of the Army and ordered its execution. The State Department maintains a different attitude but because of the way the situation developed it did not insist on its opinion. The failure of American far eastern policy in the past has received the criticism of the press. The new decision was made at a critical time and it won the support of the whole nation. It restored a bipartisan foreign policy.

2. Regarding the South Korean war, the United States sea and air forces are executing the decision of the United Nations and will not give up because to do so would injure the prestige of the United Nations and the United States. As to the Western Europe nations, because the United Nations is not opposing Soviet Russia directly in Europe, they feel lucky and are willing to lend their support. Whether or not the Chinese Communists will send troops to North Korea will be an important point. We shall issue reports in detail in connection with this matter.

3. An analysis regarding the situation in Formosa follows:

(a) The decision made at this time is purely defensive in nature in order to prevent the opposite side from accusing the United States of participating in a Chinese civil war. Therefore, we are asked not to attack the mainland and we readily accepted this proposal. Our spirit of cooperation won the admiration of the American people.

(b) Regarding the future position of Formosa, it looks like compromise to satisfy certain opposition parties in the United States and an attempt to avoid any cleavage on the surface. As for the legal position of Formosa, President Truman has repeatedly explained away the doubtful points.

(c) We should study with the United States concrete methods of supplying and maintaining contact with the guerrillas on the mainland. If the Chinese Communists should send troops to the aid of the North Koreans, the United States would be all the more willing to cooperate. At the present time, we should constantly broadcast to the occupied areas asking the people there not to allow themselves to be used by the Soviet Communists and their tools of aggression. We should publicize these broadcasts in the United States.

(d) A certain important person said, "If the United States fights with the Communists in the Far East, you are the natural leader." The situation will change and the United States may have an accurate understanding of the situation, but in recent years, the subversive propaganda of the leftists has left a deep impression. It is very wrong. Now our problem is how to correct these erroneous opinions so that the highest authorities may be made to understand.

(e) The new decision is a reversal of fundamental postwar policy. In its early stages, the old forces still try to embarrass us. Even the Secretariat of the United Nations spread rumors hurting us, saying that the United States had denied our legal position in Formosa. This is a destructive way of hurting us. They know that if we are brought into conflict with the United States, we will fall into their trap.

4. As to whether we should send troops to help in resisting the enemies in North Korea, there are both advantages and disadvantages. If our Government should decide to send troops, they should be limited to the best troops. Beforehand, we should ask the opinion of General MacArthur.

JULY 7, 1950

I have your telegram of "Tung" [date], and I am replying as follows:

1. The new position of the American Government toward the Far East is now supported by the whole country. Heretofore, criticism toward Chinese policy has been somewhat subdued. The United States State Department's attitude toward South Korea and toward us are similar. For example, in the past they sought to compel South Korea to form a coalition government. In this way they put off military aid. They also attack the South Korean leader. They did not desire to aid Korea at this time, but because of the pressure of circumstances they have consented to do so. It is useless to expect these people to have fundamental changes in their policy toward China. General MacArthur knows us much more deeply. It is, therefore, necessary to maintain liaison with Tokyo so as to influence Washington.

2. The American policy in Korea is to localize the Korean war and not complicate it. In other words to execute the decision of the United Nations. Its purpose is to stop the North Korean aggression and to remind Soviet Russia not to start aggression elsewhere. It is not a blow against Soviet Russia or communism. On the 6th (of this month) the United States Government sent military and diplomatic personnel to inspect the Far East, but they are not going to Formosa. The explanation was that the Seventh Fleet could prevent the invasion of Chinese Communists and there was no necessity of increasing the defense forces. The Formosan situation is regarded as differing from others in the Far East. The United States is afraid of getting involved in the Chinese Civil War so it has asked us not to invade the mainland and has asked us not to send any forces to aid Korea. But according to recent reports, American policy has changed. For instance not passing the thirty-eighth parallel, not using the land forces, not adopting the mobilization act, all these have changed. American policy toward Formosa is also temporary, it can be changed any time according to the situation. Our military and political leaders should not argue with the United States at this time. We should not remind the United States of its past mistakes in order to avoid giving comfort to our enemies. If the situation develops and the war expands or the Chinese Communists participate in the war, then there will be a new recognition of the importance of our position.

3. In recent years the Communists have launched effective offensives. They have accused our Government of waiting for the third world war and of wanting to use the military power of the democratic nations to overthrow the Chinese Communists. The American people are afraid of war and therefore this kind of propaganda is very effective. Acheson himself also expressed the same opinion to Congress. We should, consequently, be very careful of this sort of propaganda and not fall into the trap of the Chinese Communists.

4. The American public does not understand clearly the progress which has been made by our military and administrative leaders. Our American friends think that we should take this opportunity to clean up our Government, to cultivate strength and to conserve foreign exchange for the reconstruction of Formosa to make it a model area and thereby to win the respect of the people on the mainland. Regardless of the future of the Korean situation, this is believed to be the basis for recovering the lost areas.

5. In the United States we are not short of sympathizers and friends. We should intensify our liaison and publicity work. We should pay more attention in our publicity to reconstruction and improvements as well as the oppression of the people by the Chinese Communists operating in conjunction with Soviet Russia.

6. The above points all relate to present situation. Reports on future developments will be made from time to time.

JULY 14, 1950

(1) The United States Army has been unsuccessful in the Korean war—many wounded and killed. Congress and the public realize that the Communists are strong. They know that the other nations can contribute very little and that they are heavily dependent on United States arms; therefore, they are disappointed. The administration is prejudiced. It is hesitant to allow us to send our forces. It has also suggested that our troops are not all reliable. The fundamental idea, of course, is that the administration is not willing to see our international position elevated. It is secondary whether the Chinese Communists participate or not, but war in South Korea will be prolonged. We should be patient at this time. As to whether the war will spread to Asia or Europe, we should refrain from comment and wait for the development of the situation.

(2) The South Korean war is actually war against Soviet communism. The elements in the United States which previously advocated cooperation with Russia are beginning to weaken. They will be replaced by people who know us better. Recently Time and Life magazines commented on United States policy toward Formosa, and suggested that the Chinese-American alliance during the last World War be restored. It has been reported recently that the United States will send an Ambassador to Formosa. This move would be watched.

(3) The administration in the United States is very much afraid that war will spread to Europe. The western nations do not have the will to fight, and if Russia attacks Western Europe, Britain and France will possibly take a neutral attitude. This would be the greatest blow to postwar American diplomacy. The secret negotiations between England and Soviet Russia, and India's suggestion that the United Nations take in the Chinese Communists, point up this tendency. But the public is very much excited and it will not be easy to take an attitude of compromise toward Soviet Russia. At the same time, a part of the American Army believes that if the American-Soviet conflict is confined to peripheral regions, it will be very hard for the United States to cope with the situation. They recommend, therefore, that the newest military weapons be used to strike the core of the Soviets in order to deal a heavy blow. But this proposal has been firmly opposed by political elements and will not be adopted readily.

JULY 21, 1950

1. On the 29th, Truman made recommendations to Congress for dealing with the North Korean aggression. He also asked for $10,000,000,000 for the expansion of the Army and special war powers. The whole Nation will be partially mobilized. Preparation will be made to cope with any expansion of the Korean war. All these policies are warmly supported by the whole Nation and they can be carried out successfully.

2. At the present time, the United States is very much afraid that, before she is sufficiently prepared, there will be incidents elsewhere. One power to expand the conflict, of course, is in the hands of Soviet Russia but the State Department is trying its best to localize the Korean war. The State Department says that in Korea, MacArthur is executing the decisions of the United Nations, but that organization has never endorsed the action of the United States Government regarding Formosa, Indochina, and the Philippines.

3. In the announcement regarding Formosa on the 19th, its tone is obviously to minimize the attacks of the Chinese Communists and give assurance that the United States has no intention of occupying Formosa. The idea is to dissuade the Chinese Communists from joining the Korean war and also to respond favorably to Nehru's proposal. This shallow opinion is astonishing but it shows that preparation was insufficient. In case the Chinese Communists participate in the war, the situation will be greatly changed.

4. Nehru's activities seem to be directed to the peace-loving psychology of the Americans, but the opportunity is past. American military men and public opinions are all against compromise. Although there are still people in the State Department who advocate that the United Nations accept the Chinese Communists and even are sympathetic to the leftist tendency of Nehru, they have rejected his proposals politely.

JULY 28, 1950

(a) According to reports, President Truman recently released an order to the effect that we are to be given special consideration in buying Army supplies. The Military Supplies Division of the State Department this morning invited me in for an interview. I was advised that in buying military supplies on the open market we will be given all kinds of considerations. Supplies of the United States Army may also be made available. Last year we bought ammunition and medicine from the Air Force. United States Army surplus will be supplied to us at the original price, in addition to the one hundred and twenty million on the west coast, ready for packing and shipment. The above seems to be the change of policy toward us since the publication of the white paper.

(b) Today the United States Government decided to appoint a consul general in Hong Kong to be Minister to China with a rank of Ambassador. The Navy commander will be given the rank of admiral. The United States Government has also decided to enlarge the staff of the Army and the air attaché.

(c) Regarding the return of the Soviet delegate to the Security Council, opinion here is as follows:

(1) The Soviet delegate, noting the active mobilization of the United States and considering the incomplete state of his own country's preparation, wanted to accede to the compromise advanced by Great Britain, and India, which involved coming to terms with the United States on a solution of the Korean war.

(2) The motive of Soviet Russia in originally boycotting the United Nations was to threaten and immobilize this international organization. After the outbreak of the Korean war the United States made very effective and active use of the Security Council. The Soviet Union was unable to prevent this and therefore returned to the Security Council. It tried to obstruct the Korean program, and sought to hinder the United States from making use of the Security Council in dealings with similar aggressions in the future. In view of the intensity of American opposition to Soviet Russia and the loss of prestige of the American Army in Korea, unless Soviet Russia will agree to the expected compromise and give assurance that there will be no future aggression, the mediation of Great Britain and India will not be easy to realize.

(3) Senator TAFT, leader of the American Republican Party, is very much concerned with the problem of Formosa. In January this year he advocated sending ships to protect Formosa and take the position that in our total resistance against Russia we are very willing to discuss the matter with General MacArthur, but that Formosa is very weak economically and its armed forces are limited. The Chinese Communists are constantly threatening us. However on the mainland there are many guerrillas. There is no lack of manpower but we need to be provided with guidance and organization. You have had a good record in guiding the people's revolution against aggression. Among the Japanese and Chinese, naturally, you are the leader of Asia and the one to whom the United States looks for cooperation. The above ideas will probably be presented by TAFT in his speeches or he will speak to the administration about them.

(4) It has been reported that the Chinese International Trading Co. is the representative of the Chinese Government in acquiring materials and has been active everywhere; also that it is the agent of American factories in Formosa. American businessmen have inquired at our agencies in the United States about the real situation. I am reporting this for your information.

AUGUST 4, 1950

(a) Yesterday the United States Congress passed the mobilization of military, economic, and manpower act. It is more drastic than what President Truman requested. Congress also decided to reduce administrative expenses by 10 percent. These reflect the reaction of the people and the strengthening of their attitude toward Soviet Russia. When the Soviet delegate returned to the Security Council he frequently accused the United States of starting aggressive wars. The idea seems to be that the Communists are preparing for aggression elsewhere and were seeking to prevent action by the United Nations. The American public is angry at India's taking the side of Soviet Russia. (b) MacArthur visited Formosa. Harriman today was ordered to go to Japan and it is possible that there will be a change in United States policy toward China. The misunderstanding in Chinese-American relations during the past few years may be changed because of the Korean war. We ought to make use of this opportunity to clear up past misunderstandings and work at a better understanding.

I present the following points for your reference:

(1) Highest American authority seems to realize the importance of our country, but some people in the State Department apparently do not agree. Some regard us in the same way as they do Franco or try to apologize for the action of the Chinese Communists. We should not neglect this point; by facts we should prove that the critics and apologists are wrong.

(2) Regarding the United States, we should not take it to task for past mistakes in order to avoid irritation. During the election in the fall, however, United States policy toward China will be an important political issue. At the moment the Republicans seem to be in a favorable position. We should, during this election, try to report on facts, but we should not give so much publicity to the Republican attack on the administration's China policy that the administration will be irritated.

(3) Hereafter American aid will take an active rather than a passive form of cooperation. We should elect our officers carefully in order to avoid friction. We should be frank and sincere. We should not promise lightly, and we should keep our promises.

(4) In the past, when we used American aid only the government knew about it. No publicity was given to such aid and our enemy had an opportunity to hurt us because later it was quite difficult to explain it. From now on we should be very careful to make known the facts and there should be proper publicity in order to correct this mistake.

AUGUST 16, 1950

(1) Republican members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee issued a united declaration attacking postwar far eastern policy. The Republican is actively opposed to that part of far eastern policy which relates to our country. If the Korean war is not brought to a conclusion during this election period, this will be their principal issue. Our country should keep completely out of American internal politics. But the Democratic Party cannot avoid unreasonable attacks on our government and our President. Our neutral American friends advise us to be prepared to dispute such unreasonable attacks with actual facts so as to avoid misunderstanding on the part of the people. If we leave everything to be argued for us by the Republican Party this will not be very satisfactory. If we are to correct misinterpretations, we should make use of people outside the government. This method will be more effective. I am submitting this for your reference.

(2) MacArthur's visit to Taiwan. The Leftists criticized it very much. This has made British public opinion to cry out for an end to the policy of protecting Taiwan. They contend that assistance to Taiwan brings about an adverse reaction among the people of Asia. This is tantamount to assisting the Communists. They also add that to assist Taiwan handicaps the United Nations in its anti-Communist front. Recently there was the rumor that Molotov is trying to force Mao in Peiping to mobilize his forces. Mao is in a state of indecision. If the Chinese Communists actually send troops to help the Koreans then these people will say that this is brought about by the American policy of assisting Taiwan. This proves that our enemies have not ended their intention of attacking us. The above points seem to be pertinent in planning our propaganda work.

(3) Chih-mai saw Ambassador Bullitt yesterday and said, first, he was not optimistic about the Korean military situation. Second, the best policy for assisting Indochina

is to help us to launch an attack against the South China mainland. Third, Harriman is very weak-kneed and is very concerned with his success or failure. Fourth, Nehru's activities are still a matter of concern. Fifth, the sending off of our troops to assist Korea is very sound. Sixth, the general situation is favorable to us. We should have patience but we shouldn't overlook opportunities in our struggle in the United Nations and in our propaganda activities in America.

AUGUST 9, 1950

(1) It was disclosed from official sources that Harriman's visit to Japan stemmed from the fact that the authorities are not satisfied with MacArthur's visit to Taiwan which is regarded as inopportune. British newspaper circles are criticizing MacArthur very heavily. The Leftists here are taking this opportunity to band together with them and secretly pass to the newspapers the idea that there is a tendency on the part of bandit Mao to become a Tito. At present America is unwilling to see the Chinese Communists become involved in the Korean war and to risk exhausting their United States military forces. The Leftists say that if the Chinese Communists join the Korean war then the British-American front will break up and India will break away and this is exactly what the Soviet Union wants. They are therefore actually opposed to the policy of assisting Taiwan. This is in keeping with past Leftist attitudes. We have reached a critical point, while waiting for the situation to clarify we should remain quiet until the time has come to propose our plan for attacking the mainland. America has concrete evidence that the Chinese Communists are going to assist the Koreans. The Security Council delegates have openly criticized the Chinese Communists. They are opposed to the decision of the United Nations regarding Korea. This proves that policy toward China is changing. It is just a question of time.

(2) The Western European countries are not at all interested in war. They need at least 3 years to train their armies so they still hope that the Korean war can be solved locally. Therefore, our position in the United States is still precarious. If the United Nations decided to oust Soviet Russia, according to the Charter, another conference similar to the San Francisco conference will have to be convened. Our position as permanent member of the Security Council will be taken by India. Also, when the United Nations discusses the case of our accusation against Soviet Russia, if the other countries do not decide to check Soviet Russia there will be other complications. We should pay particular attention to this.

AUGUST 23, 1950

1. American diplomacy is in a state of dilemma. The reasons are:

(1) If the Chinese Communists participate in the Korean war, American forces will be insufficient to cope with the situation. This will influence West European defense.

(2) The defense of the Western European countries are weak and their will to resist communism is not strong. They are unable to cooperate with each other.

(3) In the Near East, Iran and other countries do not have any defense to speak of. Because of this, the leftists advocate limiting the scope of defense. They want to give up defending Formosa and assistance to Indochina. Regarding South Korea they are in favor of fulfilling the decision of the United Nations but are not concerned with a fundamental solution of the Korean problem. Until the Korean situation is clarified, there is little possibility of a drastic change in United States policy.

2. To prevent the participation of the Chinese Communists in the Korean war, the United States Department of State is still considering the question of admission of the Chinese Communists into the U. N. Great Britain and India and other countries will try very actively to bring this about. During the session of the United Nations to be held in September, our delegation should pay particular attention to friendly relations with the Middle and South American countries. Ambassador Pao Chien should be appointed as one of the five delegates to the United Nations.

3. The activities of the Soviet delegate in the Security Council are being severely criticized by the people, creating a very intense anti-Soviet atmosphere. Our delegate, Mr. Chang, gave a speech on the 17th criticizing the Soviet imperialistic plot, and also made it clear that the United States has no aggressive designs. His speech was applauded by the public. This should be utilized as a key item in our propaganda during the Korean war. The United States has permitted us to buy military supplies. The Department of State has formally notified us that the congressional appropriation amounting to $750,000,000 is not to be turned over to us for use. It seems that we should propagate the idea that our shortage of American currency is much more serious than that of any of the Western European countries. The foreign currency that we get from export is very limited so it is impossible for us to buy sufficient military supplies. The Western European countries, in order to resist Soviet Russia, demand big quantities of military supplies from America and they have declared that they cannot resist communism independently. America is expected to send big troop detachments to be stationed permanently in Western Europe. We should also propagate very strongly the anti-Communist determination of the Chinese people, and our lack of need for American manpower. The above two points fit in very well with the thinking of the American people. I am humbly offering these opinions for your reference.

AUGUST 29, 1950

1. MacArthur's address to the American veterans has been ordered withdrawn by the White House. The address of Matthews, Secretary of the American Navy, has been disavowed by the White House and the State Department. These two events indicate that there is a difference of opinion between the military and the diplomatic group and this conflict is becoming daily more obvious. MacArthur was unusually sharp in his statement. Popular opinion on the surface is not in sympathy with the proposal of the Secretary of the Navy. But as to MacArthur's statement, after Republican Members read it in Congress, the veterans group decided to support MacArthur. This is a big event in American politics.

2. At present, the White House and the Department of State are maintaining a consistent position. In the past, the military's news, because of the experience of the Korean war, did not receive much consideration in Cabinet sessions. Since the outbreak of the war, however, and their assumption of major responsibility, the military is no longer willing to be consigned to the background.

3. The Republican Party has issued a blue book of 20,000 words giving a detailed background of the Korean war. The declaration made at Yalta will become a "literary guide" in this year's Presidential election. The Democratic Party hopes that the Korean war will turn favorable at the beginning of November and that then the people will forget the past. This year's election will depend on the military situation at the time.

4. American opinion toward Soviet Russia and the Chinese Communists is becoming more outspoken and there is increasing disappointment with the United Nations. The attitude of the veterans is very obvious. Yesterday they decided unanimously to oppose participation of the Chinese Communists in the United Nations. A speech that was to have been given by Lattimore was canceled because of popular protests. A certain actress was attacked by an audience because she participated in Communist activities. This shows the general tendency.

SEPTEMBER 7, 1950

(1) The American Government is being induced by Great Britain to try to localize the Korean war. Great Britain has publicly declared that it is going to favor the Chinese Communists. The British are under the illusion that Soviet Russia and the Chinese Communists will not directly interfere in North Korea so their attitude is most temporate and compromising in regard to friendly relations with Russia and the Chinese Communists' protest regarding the bombardment of Manchuria. Great Britain has done its best to make us a scapegoat. The so-called question of Taiwan will be one of the principal topics for discussion during the conference of the three foreign ministers to be held on the 12th of this month in New York.

(2) The present situation is very unfavorable to us; we must be very active. During this United Nations conference I tried to win over the middle and South American countries and near eastern countries to our side and my attempt was successful. Our American friends suggested that the President (Chiang Kai-shek) broadcast to the mainland that Great Britain and India are trying to create a Munich plot in the Far East and make it known that China will not succumb. Also make it clear that we will not give up Formosa under any circumstances and no foreign country will be allowed to interfere unreasonably.

(3) The anti-Communist sentiment of the people of America continues. President Truman's measures have been criticized. The election campaign is gaining momentum but the tendencies of American politics still depend on the development of the Korean war and they are difficult to judge at the present time. Hsiao Te (?) an American died in Japan. He has been very enthusiastic and sincere with us. We should send a telegram expressing our sympathy to mother.

SEPTEMBER 13, 1950

Johnson was attacked by popular opinion because of the unfavorable development of the Korean war. The difference of opinion regarding far-eastern policy between Johnson and Acheson is well known. A change of the policy has been in the making for some time. Johnson outwardly seems to recommend the appointment of Marshall. In fact, his appointment has already been decided, but has not been announced. This change will produce the following effect: (1) Since he [Marshall] belongs to the Acheson clique it shows a victory of the left wing of the Democratic Party. (2) Acheson and Marshall's policy emphasizes assisting Europe. (3) The reputation of Marshall is high. His appointment is a political victory for the Democratic Party. It is going to affect the election this year. (4) There is a political difference between Marshall and MacArthur and there is a personal conflict between them. (5) Our position in the United Nations has become more difficult day by day, but our fundamental attitude of not humiliating ourselves should be maintained. The Chinese Government is a legal government. We have veto power in the Security Council, but a more important fact is that we are in control of Taiwan. We do not allow outside interference. If the outside world insists on studying the international legal position of Formosa then Ku Yeh Tao (the Kurile Islands) and Ch'ien Tao, occupied by Soviet Russia should be settled at the same time. At present, in addition to the material help from the headquarters of MacArthur, the American Government

also declares that they will continue to strengthen our defense of Formosa. The American Congress will begin its session in the near future. Increased help from the American Government will depend on how the situation develops.

(3) What America fears most is that the Chinese Communists will participate in the Korean war and this development is very possible. For the present we should pay attention to the following two points. First, do not propagate the northward movement of Communist Chinese troops toward Korea, so as to avoid increasing the anxiety of the United States Government and to prevent the American Government from accusing us of creating conflict. Second, in order to satisfy American psychology, we should do our best to arouse the people on the mainland against being utilized by the Chinese Communists and Soviet Russia in the Korean war.

(4) At the United Nations Conference this year we should try to promote friendly relations with Central and South America. This is very important. If Minister Yeh has decided not to come to America then Ambassador Pao Chien should be made one of the delegates in order to facilitate matters.

SEPTEMBER 25, 1950

(3) I, Pan Ch'u, interviewed a certain Congressman. According to this Congressman the American Government has made no definite decision regarding the question of the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea. The day before yesterday, President Truman said that this question should be decided by the United Nations. Troop movements along the thirty-eighth parallel, hereafter, will become an important factor in formulating policy.

(2) The United States proposed placing the question of Taiwan on the agenda of the United Nations. In this proposal there are points contrary to the Cairo and Potsdam declarations and the June 27 declaration of President Truman. Other than specifying that peaceful methods be used, he made no other recommendations. The United States discloses that the discussion of this case will be handled by Dulles, foreign relations adviser of the Republican Party. His idea is to pacify the opposition.

(3) British policy believes that the foundation for maintaining peace in the Far East lies in permitting the Chinese Communists to join the United Nations, but American policy under the influence of the Republican Party and popular opinion is opposed. At present the diplomatic activities of the western countries seem to compromise British-American relations. The proposal brought up by Canada in the United Nations seems to point to this fact.

SEPTEMBER 30, 1950

The war in Korea is going smoothly now and the people are excited over it. The authorities will utilize this opportunity to make political capital during election time. The policy toward Taiwan will be a policy of compromise. Then the opposition party will find it difficult to produce any effective issue. Friends in America believe this is the crisis for us. Policy should not show any weakness. Somebody suggested that three points be covered.

The first point is to ask the President, Chiang Kai-shek to send an open letter to President Truman explaining that Taiwan in Formosa is the fortress of Free China and he will not allow it to be sliced away.

Second point is that we will not forget the anti-Communist forces on the mainland. We will do our best to support them.

Third point is, hereafter our relations with America should be conducted in the open because American authorities have no friendly feelings toward us. Secret negotiations or discussions can be altered at any time, and as a result we suffer.

The above suggestions may seem to be biased but our intentions are very sincere. We are sending this telegram for your reference.

The Korean Ambassador in America, Chang Mien, expressed this idea, the Korean Government has decided to send soldiers over the thirty-eighth parallel in order to complete the unification of Korea. The American authorities also expressed the idea that if it is necessary from the military point of view, they can cross the thirty-eighth parallel. The question of borderline will have to be decided by the United Nations. As we see it, if the American troops go over the thirty-eighth parallel the Chinese Communists will send reinforcements to help the North Koreans. Then our position would become very important. Our friends here believe that we should not make commitments so readily. We should insist that if America wants our cooperation and facilities they should be extended on the basis of reciprocity.

Fourth point: In the United Nations we should help Korea to the best of our ability. Our delegate, Mr. Chang, should propose in the Security Council to invite Korea to join the United Nations. Soviet Russia will oppose this proposal. But the opposition of Soviet Russia will cause a world-wide loss of sympathy. We should not overlook the attitude of the United Nations toward Formosa. Regarding this case we should utilize our veto power. If this veto power does not produce any result then we will have to make a declaration forbidding the investigating body to go to Formosa. Our reasons are, first: We accuse the proposal made by Soviet Russia to the United Nations to send people to the Communist area to make an investigation. There is no result even after a year's investigation. Second reason: In the United Nations there are Communist countries who have recognized Communist China. The Secretary-General is in favor of the Communists. Since the defense work of Taiwan is very important, we cannot allow people of this kind to go there and investigate.

Fifth point: Our American friends believe the guerrillas on the mainland and their connection with us is the most effective material for propaganda and we by all means should disclose this news. Vice President, Mr Sheng, gave a talk the day before yesterday which was received favorably. The local election in Formosa should be publicized among the American news reporters as much as possible. The election of civilian members of the party has produced an aroused interest on the part of the public.

Mr. CAIN. As I say, I shall not read the sequence but the very first cable is of particular interest. I will read it entire. The cable is addressed to Chou Hung-Tao, secretary of the office of the Chinese President. I now quote:

JUNE 22, 1949.

TO CHOU HUNG-TAO, Taipei.

I got your letter saying that you were worried because of the lack of international information. This has already been discussed and the result was that Mao Pang Chu, Chen Chih-Mai and Pi Tsung-Kau said that you wanted to plan to work in unity with the group. A summary report will be made once a week. If there is anything urgent, it will be wired as the occasion arises. The subject matter will be mainly reports and analysis of international current events. Hereafter such reports will be encoded and decoded by the Air Force office. It is intended not to sign them by name but to put the word "official" at the end. If you have any instruction about this matter please wire as the occasion arises.

KUO HUA.

At last we begin to get what seems to be a little daylight on this great mystery.

What does the entire cable sequence amount to? It appears that General Mow, Chen Chih-Mai, Pi Tsung-Kau and other Chinese in this country collaborated in sending a sort of weekly newsletter to the authorities in Formosa. Cable No. 1 states that the messages were sent by the Air Force office—that is, the Chinese Air Force office—in this country.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks a table listing the Chinese names of the participants, the Americanized versions of these names and the official position which each participant occupied.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Names of individuals appearing on cables

Position	Chinese name	Abbreviated American name	Familiar Chinese name
Mow, Chief, Chinese Aeronautical Commission in Washington.	Mao Pang-tsu	P. T. Mow	Pang tsu
Lee, Chinese delegate, Far Eastern Commission	Lee Wei-kuo	W. K. Lee	Wei-kuo.
Yu, Deputy Chinese Director, World Bank (a distant cousin o the Generalissimo).	Yu Kuo-hua	K. H. Yu	Kuo-hua.
Pee, military attaché, Chinese Embassy (brigadier general).	Pee Tsong-Kan	Peter T. K. Pee	Tsong-kan.
Chen, minister-counselor, Chinese Embassy	Chen Chih-mai	C. M. Chen	Chih-mai.
Chou Hung-T'ao, secretary of Gen. Chiang Kai-shek			

Mr. CAIN. Many of the paragraphs in the cables identify the writer of the particular paragraph. The cooperative character of the enterprise is very clear.

I said I would not read the sequence in order to save time. They are in the RECORD now where all may read. I hope that any Senator who wishes to discuss the China lobby question again on the floor of the United States Senate will bother to read the table sequence before he speaks.

All the same, I would like to make a brief comment on the cables. They show, beyond a shadow of doubt, that the Chinese authors were watching events very closely in this country. They show what pro-Communist influence on the China policy was trying to accomplish. They reflect clearly the anxiety in Congress about the progress of the Chinese Reds and the attitude of numerous Members of Congress toward Chiang Kai-shek. They show that Republicans in Congress had been consistently hostile to the Chinese Reds and that numerous Republicans had steadfastly supported Chiang Kai-shek. They show that the Republicans had not been alone in opposing the Communists. Mr. President, I am very pleased to make mention of this fact. These cables show that a

sturdy contingent of Democrats had consistently sided with the Republicans in this opposition to the Reds.

Indeed, I would say that these dispatches show remarkably acute observation on the part of the senders.

The Senate will find nothing secret in the cables; they will find nothing that they did not know before.

What they will find is this: That intelligent, outside observers traced very clearly the devious line of administration China policy that all of us, to our sorrow, know so well.

The Senate will find nothing whatever in these cables that does not reflect everlasting credit on Senator BRIDGES and Senator KNOWLAND, and Representative JUDD. The determined opposition of these men to communism in general and Chinese communism in particular is shown again and again.

With these cables now in hand it is possible to make some deductions about the Reporter magazine's performance.

It would appear that, in some way, the Reporter had got hold of a version of some of these cables and had the brilliant thought that the record of Republican opposition to the Chinese Reds could be tied to the cables and this consolidation, in turn, tied in with the anti-Communist activities of Alfred Kohlberg and others and that the whole concoction would not only compromise the reputation of Senator BRIDGES and Senator KNOWLAND and Representative JUDD, but would also give the impression that the entire Republican delegation in Congress were a group of reactionary die-hards, if not outright Fascists.

As I considered this I wondered just why the Reporter had gone to such extraordinary lengths.

Then a few days ago, I happened to read Whittaker Chambers' autobiographical work called Witness.

On page 498 of Witness, Chambers describes his experiences in the editorial offices of Time magazine when, after he had quit the Communist underground and had broken with Alger Hiss, he was given the assignment of supervising the foreign news section of Time.

Says Chambers:

> I had scarcely edited it (the Foreign News Section) so long when most of Time's European correspondents joined in a round robin protesting my editorial views and demanding my removal. They were seconded by a clap of thunder out of Asia from the Time Bureau in Chungking.
>
> Let me list the signers of the round robin, or those among Time's foreign correspondents or those who supported it, or continued to feed out news written from the viewpoint that the Soviet Union is a benevolent democracy of an aggressive intent, or that the Chinese Communists are "agrarian liberals," for I think that they are enlightening.
>
> Foremost among them were: John Hersey, John Scott (son of my old teacher of the law of social revolution, Scott Nearing), Charles C. Wertenbaker, the late Richard Lauterbach, Theodore White. Those are the top names; there were others. Most of them are no longer with Time.

Mr. President, one of the two authors of The Reporter expose is none other than that same Charles Wertenbaker. A glance at the files of the magazine shows that Theodore White is a tolerably steady contributor.

Having noted this fact, I examined the back issues of The Reporter and came upon the January 3, 1950, number. No fewer than 24 pages of this issue are devoted to editorials and articles which, on the whole, show a very tender regard for the Chinese Communists and urging that the United States recognize Red China.

I would not wish my colleagues to be overly impressed by some of the editorial views expressed by the Reporter magazine. It is always wise, I think, to ask the question, "Who writes what?"

Neither Mr. Wertenbaker nor Mr. White are represented in this earlier issue but some of their conferees, some of the old so-called liberal crowd of journalists and writers that interpreted the Chinese Communist cause in such glowing terms are there. Among them are Jack Belden, Edgar Snow, and John K. Fairbank.

By and large the position taken by these journalists and writers was the familiar one:

First. That the government of Chiang Kai-shek is vicious, corrupt, decadent, and tyrannical.

Second. That the Chinese Communist movement is healthy, vigorous and, in most respects, an admirable effort to attain justice and liberation.

Something of this attitude is echoed by Mr. Ascoli, the editor of the Reporter when in this January 3, 1950, issue he introduces these men editorially. I quote Mr. Ascoli:

> In the case of Red China, the new rulers have won their civil war because they have passionate popular support and because of the ineptitude of the previous rulers, whom unfortunately we have helped.[1]

How often have I heard these sentiments expressed before, sometimes on the floor of the Senate. Again and again, during a whole decade, we have had this group of writers endlessly ringing the changes on the merits of the Chinese Communists.

As I went over this roster, I recalled the address by the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] on a guide book to 10 years of secrecy in our China policy, a speech delivered just a year ago, on June 5, 1951. In this speech the Senator considered in detail the writings of this crowd and then presented two tables showing how, in the Sunday book review sections of the New York Times and Herald Tribune they had managed, over a period of years, to monopolize the reviewing of books on China, how they praised the pro-Communist books and damned those critical of Mao Tse-tung.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address, together with the book review tables, be inserted in the proper place at the close of my address.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 6.)

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I am not accusing these people of being Communists, Mr. President. I don't wish to censor them, purge them, put them to the thumb screw and the rack, inject truth serum or indulge in any other of the well-established Communist practices.

But I do want to identify them.

Whom do they think they are kidding?

But the question, Mr. President, is not which of these men are Communists or whether any of them are Communists. The fact is, as nearly as I can trace it, that the earliest demands for an investigation of the China lobby originated with the Communist Party United States of America.

I ask unanimous consent to include at this juncture of my remarks the rather remarkable letter and its enclosure of March 1, 1949, signed by May Miller, assistant organizing secretary of the Communist Party of New York State. It urges the "Dear Comrades" to mobilize behind the program objectives of the Action Conference on China Policy—a program agreed to on January 29, 1949.

There being no objection, the letter and enclosure were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 26, 1949]

COMMUNIST PARTY OF NEW YORK STATE,
New York, N. Y., March 1, 1949.

To All Sections and Counties:

DEAR COMRADES: Enclosed please find program for action on China policy, as voted upon by a united front action conference on China, held in New York on January 29, 1949.

We are sure that you will find this material not only informative but helpful in planning actions on China in your communities.

A special outline has also been issued by the national education committee on Communist policy in China. This can be secured through orders from our district education department. The outline can be used as the basis for discussion in your sections and branches.

Any inquiries in relations to further activity can be received by writing to the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, at 111 West Forty-second Street, New York City.

Comradely yours,

MAY MILLER,
Assistant Organizing Secretary.

PROGRAM FOR ACTION ON CHINA POLICY AS SUGGESTED BY THE ACTION CONFERENCE ON CHINA POLICY, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 29, 1949

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. Demand a congressional investigation.

A. Of the Chinese lobby in Washington. One of the largest spending foreign influences in our Capital; not registered as foreign agents.

B. Of the billions of dollars of private accumulation deposited in American banks and investments by Chinese officials and individuals.

2. Demand a new China policy.

A. An end to all forms of American intervention in China and of plans to aid any elements and remnants of the Kuomintang.

B. Preparation by our Government to recognize the government which the people of China are now establishing.

C. Planning now by our authorities for genuine and self-respecting cooperation with the people's government in China, including normal and friendly trade relations free of any political conditions.

3. Get the facts and implications of the Government's China policy to the American people.

---

[1] The Reporter, January 3, 1950, p. 2.

IMMEDIATE STEPS FOR CARRYING OUT THE ACTION PROGRAM

1. Get your organization immediately to pass a resolution on China policy (use the enclosed January conference resolution for suggestions). Send copies of your organization's resolution to your Senators and your Congressmen; give it publicity in your organization's publication and elsewhere; send a copy to the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.

2. Make use of the "political ammunition" of facts; the American people, if they know, will act.

A. Make a drive to get readers and subscribers to Far East Spotlight, the committee's monthly magazine. This is the indispensable tool for every fighter for a new and friendly policy toward China. Previous sources of reliable information about China and the Far East now have an NAM slant; only Far East Spotlight gives you the positive and encouraging facts about the Chinese people's great and successful fight against American reaction, and keeps you up to date about Washington's evil plans to go on backing reaction in China and the Far East. Subscription: $2 a year. Introductory offer: $1 for 8 months. Members of the CDFEP get this free.

B. Push the sale and reading of Anna Louise Strong's Tomorrow's China. Paper bound, 65 cents; cloth bound, $2. Organizational orders for 5 or more: 25 percent discount.

C. Have meetings on the China policy issue.

(a) The committee can furnish speakers: In the New York City area: Telephone the speaker's bureau of the committee any afternoon, Bryant 9-6343.

In California, the San Francisco area: Contact Mr. William Kerner, 1841 Ellis Street, San Francisco.

Los Angeles area: Contact Mrs. Jeanette Orel, 362 South Columbia Avenue, Los Angeles.

(b) Send your organization's own speaker to the briefing session on China. First session: Friday night, February 18, 7:30 sharp. Telephone the committee for registration blanks; Bryant 9-6342. No fee.

You can't fight without facts. Far East Spotlight is your basic source of information. Meetings on China will bring facts to hundreds of others * * *.

3. See to it that the President and the Members of Congress hear from hundreds of individuals on China policy right now.

Order prepared postcards from the committee—1 cent each. Write your own messages. Make calls—in person and by telephone—on your Senators and Congressmen.

4. Have your organization make an immediate contribution to the work of the committee or plan to give a regular (monthly, quarterly, or yearly) contribution.

5. Support the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.

A. By becoming members and by getting your friends to join. Membership includes subscriptions to Far East Spotlight.

B. By securing individual contributions for the committee. Your own; your friends; throw a party for the committee.

C. By doing volunteer work at the committee's office, 111 West Forty-second Street, fifth floor—any time, any day.

Every Thursday night the staff is at home to friends who come to help.

The Chinese people are defeating the American reactionaries. So can we.

China policy reveals the over-all character of Washington's foreign policy—it harms the American people.

China policy is directly related to our domestic struggle for homes, for more consumption goods, for lower prices, for increased social security, for healthy international trade, for freedom from depression and militarism.

China shows up the weak spot in our reactionaries' program.

Let's fight on China policy and take advantage of the blow the Chinese people have dealt the American reactionaries.

COMMITTEE FOR A DEMOCRATIC FAR EASTERN POLICY.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, what is the first item on this program for action? Why, it is to demand a congressional investigation of the China lobby.

It is a strange phenomenon. Over and over again, during the past 20 years, we have seen squads of liberal American intellectuals and writers played for suckers by the Communists. They were nothing more than that. Sometimes they get so badly burnt, that they quit. Sometimes they just keep on being suckers.

How many times must there be a clear demonstration of the malignant brutality, the virulent poison of communism before these people see the light?

If these people were simply a cult, a discipleship, I do not think I would care much about what they said or did. But the fact is, Mr. President, that many are skillful writers and the part they have played in deluding Americans and leading them astray is serious.

Apparently liberals of this stripe never learn.

Recall Stalin's bloody purges in the late 1930's and recall how fellow-traveling liberals whitewashed the purge trials until the dreadful truth became so glaring that whitewash was useless.

Recall again how, early in 1939, a few alert newspapers deduced that a Nazi-Soviet pact was a distinct possibility. The similarities between totalitarian dictatorships were discussed.

How did these yearning American so-called liberals react?

They were outraged. They got up a manifesto denouncing such slanders and announced firmly that "The Soviet Union continues as always to be a bulwark against war and aggression and works unceasingly for a peaceful international order." More than 400 persons signed this manifesto which appeared in the Nation, August 26, 1939. All but simultaneously with the appearance of this preposterous document, came the announcement of the Nazi-Soviet pact.

The embarrassment of these liberals, Mr. President, was so great when the train of history went around this particular sharp curve, that a considerable number jumped off.

Still, their yearning was so intense that presently many of them came trooping back to get on the train once more.

Exactly the same thing went on for years in the case of the Chinese Communists.

Now, here they are, these liberal journalists still at it in their attacks on this trumped-up China lobby.

I quoted one of Ascoli's editorials in the Reporter in which he spoke of the "passionate popular support" of the Chinese Communists.

Is the man crazy? Does he read the papers? Does he know about the extortion of money from American Chinese?

The New York Times for May 26, 1952, gives us the story of the "confessions" of Chinese liberal educators who had endorsed the Reds in the early days, and now discover that the "freedom," the "independence of thought," that was to accompany the great Communist liberation is a sham and a delusion.

Day by day we learn of mass purges, mass executions, tortures of all kinds. Is this sort of thing an aspect of what Dr. Ascoli calls "passionate popular support"?

Or will he and Mr. Wertenbaker and all the rest tell us that these news stories are fabrications of a decadent capitalist press, and that the truth is that China today is a land of hope and springtime?

Or is the clamor over the China lobby simply the latest Communist maneuver to consolidate the Red position in Asia?

Dr. JUDD has said:

> The so-called China lobby is the discovery of these Americans who know themselves responsible for the loss of China to the Communists.[1]

At the beginning of my address I said that when the head of the China Daily News in New York was indicted a month ago for his participation in the Communist effort to blackmail American Chinese, he said:

> The indictment climaxes a relentless drive by the combined forces of the Kuomintang clique, the China lobby, and certain forces in our Government to destroy the China Daily News, the only Chinese-language newspaper in the United States which has consistently supported peaceful solutions to all outstanding problems in the Far East.[2]

Mr. President, when a Communist talks about "peaceful solution to all outstanding problems in the Far East," he means surrender to communism all along the line.

Mr. President, I conclude that either of two things happened in the case of the Reporter exposé:

Either Mr. Ascoli, Mr. Wertenbaker, and their associates have been "suckered" by the Communists from start to finish, or they have deliberately participated in a Communist maneuver.

I urge that action be taken without delay on the Morse-McMahon resolution.

We certainly should consider that resolution on the floor of the Senate before this session of the Congress has either been recessed or adjourned. Time goes rapidly, but it seems remarkable that the Morse-McMahon resolution is almost 1 year old. Why not give it a first-rate birthday party by having all of us look at it and talk about it here on the floor of the Senate. Our birthday gift ought to be the passage of the resolution.

Mr. President, I raise the question in gentle fashion: Why have not the sponsors of this meritorious resolution been more diligent in pressing the inquiry? I do not know; but I do know that the problem concerned is vitally serious. If the sponsors of the resolution—the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]—are content to postpone and to forget, at least the junior Senator from

[1] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. A3056.
[2] New York Times, April 29, 1952.

Washington and a number of other Senators on both sides of the aisle have no intention of forgetting; and we will continue to encourage affirmative action on the Morse-McMahon resolution until it has been reported from committee, to be seen by everyone in the light of day.

Mr. President, action on this resolution should be made our first order of business.

EXHIBIT I

[From the Reporter of January 3, 1950]

A PLEA FOR THE RECOGNITION OF THE UNITED STATES

(By MAX ASCOLI)

Here it comes—another great debate on recognition. The last one we had was on Soviet Russia. This one is on Red China: Should we recognize it? Now, as then, the whirlwinds of discussion revolve around a distressing fact: The government of a foreign country has been taken over by men who don't like us, whom we don't like, and whose overthrowal we cannot foresee or bring about.

Several such governments exist, and new ones keep coming into power. We don't like the way the Soviet Union is governed, nor do we care for the rulers of the satellite states in Eastern Europe or of Spain. But all these governments share this overcrowded planet with us and are our neighbors. In the case of Red China, the new rulers have won their civil war because they have passionate popular support and because of the ineptitude of the previous rulers, whom unfortunately we have helped.

OUT OF THE GUEST HOUSE

Until the last war, we could afford to behave like guest members of the community of nations. We were linked to other peoples by a common concern with morality and business, but we still liked to think that we were a world unto ourselves. We did not threaten anybody's independence, and nobody threatened ours. Until the very eve of the Second World War, we stayed out of the League of Nations and played with various experiments in nonrecognition of other governments. Because of our undefined international status and our unpredictable international behavior, we were not fully recognized ourselves nor counted upon as a steady force in the balance of power. For our part, at various times, we used to throw around the weight of our neutrality, and face a wayward government with nonrecognition loaded with moral reprobation.

Now, however, we are no longer house guests but managers in the community of nations. Our Nation has been attacked, and can be attacked again at any time. War is no longer a deplorable thing that happens to others, or that we can enter to end war for all time. War—and the prospect of war—has become part of our lives. When there is no war, we must accept its only alternative, which is peace, no matter how precarious. We cannot keep a stand-offish attitude toward a government we don't like. Either we fight it or we have to be prepared sooner or later to recognize it.

A TWO-WAY PROPOSITION

Recognition, however, is a two-way affair. It implies mutually observed diplomatic rituals and a certain amount of mutual respect. Recognition of Red China implies an exchange of representatives. The Red Chinese diplomats will have no housing problem when they come here, for they will simply take over the Embassy and the consular offices vacated by the Kuomintang diplomats. In return, the United States representatives who go to China should not be expected to lodge in jail. The Red Chinese must recognize the existence of the United States in a more considerate way than by kicking our diplomats in the teeth.

Some of the contributors to this issue of The Reporter describe how the Chinese have developed a taste for public confessions, in which past offenders against the people's interests kneel in shame and beg for forgiveness. In their mystical mood, the Chinese Reds might be inclined to forgive our Government for the help it gave the Kuomintang if Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson or their representatives were willing to kneel and confess. Decent diplomatic relations can be established—when the Red leaders understand that the establishment of these relations can be only on a strict "no nonsense" basis.

The experience we have had with Soviet Russia and the satellite countries should have taught us that the relationship between the representatives of our democracy and the officials of a totalitarian power is likely to be strained and barren. Our representatives in a Communist country seldom, if ever, get to meet private citizens, and, even less often, can exert any influence on them. It is doubtful that the old China hands of our Foreign Service would be persona grata in Red China. Old Latin America or Scandinavia hands might have a better welcome, but, no matter who they are, our representatives in China are going to live somewhat secluded lives in buildings endowed with American plumbing. At least for some time, this kind of life is likely to be shared by our missionaries, businessmen, and reporters.

And yet, as full members and leaders of the community of nations, we have no way out but—in due time and when guaranties are obtained—to recognize the new Chinese Government. It is more than a matter of trade or investments. In fact the American investment in China has always been modest, far smaller than the British. Ours is certainly smaller now than in 1930 when it totaled only about $196,000,000. As a matter of fact, at the moment private Chinese citizens have something like 10 times as much money invested in America as Americans have in China.

The British themselves and some of our other closest friends are pressing us. Britain, because of its Chinese trade and the possession of Hongkong, cannot long delay the recognition of Mao's regime. India is ready to recognize it any time. Other countries are likely to follow. Mao is dealing with non-Communist nations in exactly the same way that John L. Lewis deals with mine owners. The hardest pressed are the first to sign up. It might not hurt Mao's and Stalin's interests if the United States were the last.

If we don't want to delude ourselves, we should avoid putting any great hopes in the immediate results of recognition. Perhaps we could do without another great debate now, and avoid a repetition of what happened before and after we recognized Soviet Russia. We do not need to have another Bill Bullitt go through a sobering experience at public expense.

RECOGNIZING OURSELVES

Like charity, recognition begins at home. The weightiest political fact to be recognized is the power of our own Nation—that is, the power of ideas, wealth, and arms. This power must not be wasted in capricious forays; rather, it must be used as well-managed capital is used—to yield long-term dividends.

During the war, we spent our power with the prodigality that the emergency demanded. We defeated our major enemies and, for a time, ruled the enemy peoples. At present we are not in a shooting war with anybody, and that outworn metaphor "cold war" should not blind us to the difference between political and military conflicts.

In the current political conflict with Soviet Russia, we manage to reward our friends and punish our opponents. Indeed, we, the former arch-neutral and arch-isolationist country, are irritated by isolationist nations that play the mugwump role. But the fact that a government comes over to our side should not mean that we give it unlimited underwriting and, still less, that we endorse its internal policies. It simply implies a business relationship for limited purposes. Our political hostility to Soviet Russia has brought us strange allies and even stranger cobelligerents—like Tito and Franco. These are cases in which the old saying holds true: "May God protect me from my friends; I can take care of my enemies."

As long as the tools of our foreign policy are political and not military, we must be extremely careful in evaluating the assets and liabilities of those who are on our side and those who are against us. For our overriding aim is to gain the friendship of the people everywhere whether or not their rulers have alined them on our side.

In this issue of the Reporter, Jack Belden writes about peasants in a Chinese village who have found in communism relief from age-old exploitation and the first awakening of independence at the same time. There seems to be no cloud in the sky over that village, for the villagers cannot yet see how their radiant, newly acquired freedom may be taken away from them. On the contrary, there are a great many clouds in the skies over a large metropolis like Peking.

The prestige and the power of our Nation are closely related to what will happen to these Chinese villagers. If they should keep their lands and learn how to improve their destinies and to rule their own community, they could develop institutions not too dissimilar from ours. Mao has freed them. But how long will it take Mao—the Moscow pilgrim—to choke off the freedom he has released?

Some day, these villagers will understand why our representatives have gone to Red China to live their grim lives. The remoteness of that day indicates how long the road is and how much there is to do in China, perhaps, but most certainly in the non-Communist countries of the Far East. For we have still a gigantic role to play in the awakening of the peoples of Asia. We can help them reach that kind of freedom which does not turn out to be a mockery—a gimmick of dialectical materialism. If we play this role, we do not have much to fear from Mao.

The recognition of Red China—when we come to it—will by itself be an event of no great significance, for ultimately we can scarcely avoid it. It will mean that we acknowledge the existence of a government with which we can do little business, and we pay our respects to the people of China whom we cannot reach. But if we understand the lesson of the Kuomintang's defeat, and our representatives in China keep their ears close to the ground, the recognition of Mao's regime may prove to be the beginning of a new policy in Asia and a step toward peace.

CLOSE-UP OF REVOLUTIONS PURITANS IN THE CAPITAL

(By James Burke)

When the Chinese Communists occupied Peking last winter, the old imperial capital's 2,000,000 inhabitants had no clear idea what would happen to them. During the 40-day siege, the defending Nationalists had assured them—while exacting exorbitant defense taxes—that they could expect only a ruthless orgy of property-sharing and wife-swapping if the Communists won. The encircling Reds, however, had spiked this propaganda somewhat by supplying electricity to the city after capturing its big power plant in the western suburbs—probably the first time this has occurred in the history of siege warfare.

For more than a week after Peking capitulated, the Communists exercised a sort of invisible control. No troops came in. The former Communist underground merely expanded and became more active. Proclamations appeared on walls, and strangers visited offices to ask questions and leave instructions. The Nationalist garrison was marched out and the city otherwise prepared for its new masters.

Then one morning a Communist mayor, Gen. Yeh Chien-ying, suddenly turned up at the municipal offices, alone and unannounced. He wore the plain cotton-padded uniform of a common soldier. City workers, accustomed to seeing new mayors arrive with brass bands and bombast, were called out into a courtyard for a quiet, informal speech.

"We have just come out of the hills," Mayor Yeh said, "so we know nothing about running big-city administrations. We must learn from you."

This humble approach was as disarming as it doubtless was intended to be. So were the Red Army troops who finally entered the city in a triumphant, day-long parade. They were disciplined and courteous, and lived up to their slogan of not stealing a "needle or a piece of thread from the people"—a welcome contrast to the departed Nationalists.

The Communists obviously wanted to avoid any immediate disruption in the city's life. Since they had neither the men nor the experience to manage this themselves, they had to rely on former Nationalist personnel. The way these stayed on their jobs and genuinely cooperated proved their weak faith in the former government as well as the appeal of the Reds.

The same policemen patrolled the streets; the same postman delivered the mail; the same motormen ran the streetcars. Even a key technical administrator like the American-educated head of the North China Electric Power Corp., remained in his position.

One could hardly say, though, that Peking was not immediately changed. The ancient capital was expected to absorb the Communists as it had obsorbed centuries of other conquerors, but it did not live up to expectations.

Skilled in mass-psychology techniques, the Chinese Reds transformed the easygoing spirit of the old city within a few days. The pattern was a familiar one. "Reactionary" newspapers were closed by "public demand," school children began singing catchy lyrics in praise of Mao Tse-tung, and once-quiet hu-tung (residential lanes) echoed the din of an almost endless succession of parades, street dances, and public confessions.

I watched a public confession near my house one day and found myself comparing it to the camp meetings of our own revivalist sects.

This confessional involved a company of city policemen who had just completed a 12-day period of self-examinatin—a favorite Communist pastime. During the period, according to the local press, they had sat in a group taking notes on their thoughts. The notes were exchanged among themselves for comment, and then revised drafts were discussed. The final drafts were read at the public confession.

Some of the police officers wept as they told how they had beaten ricksha pullers, accepted bribes, and tortured political prisoners. All confessions ended with the same fervid sentence:

"By sunning these poisonous thoughts, I hope to be rid of them forever and henceforth to serve the people wholeheartedly."

At other confessions ward leaders stood up before neighborhood meetings to admit extortions, and various persons wrote letters to newspapers admitting hoarding foodstuffs. No violence was permitted against these penitents. Practically all of them were forgiven, and, if they were public servants, reinstated.

The confessional fervor extended even to Peking's parks, the pleasure gardens of the imperial past, where a casual flower picker, if caught, had to write a confession and post it, with his photograph, at the park entrance.

There were those in Peking who shook their heads and complained softly that all this was undignified. But they were a minority, and the Communists weren't interested.

They skillfully exploited both Chinese traditionalism and nationalism—much more so than had the "reactionary" Nationalists. They arranged their parades and other outdoor demonstrations around the yang-ko, a rhythmic, Conga-like Chinese peasant dance which took instantly with the city masses. They injected propaganda into the old Peking Opera and used traditional entertainers like the Bathhouse Guild's corps of stilt-dancers.

Nationalism was exploited with appeals to the basic Chinese feeling against foreigners. Foreign-language shop signs were denounced. Ridiculous, long-nosed figures representing foreigners appeared in almost every parade. The whole irritating history of foreign imperialism and unequal treaties was dragged out. The United States bore the brunt of all attacks. The Communists adopted a completely frigid attitude toward Peking's several hundred non-Communist foreign residents—an attitude quite opposite from the courteous wooing of the Chinese citizens of the capital.

This reversal of the former Chinese Red policy of warm welcome for all foreigners who showed the slightest sympathy was not immediately realized—especially by correspondents who had been assured by Chinese Communist representatives in Hong Kong only a few weeks before that western newspapermen would be as welcome in Communist Peking as they had been in the old Red cave-city capital at Yenan.

I was one of the first to experience the change, when I tried to arrange a press conference with the new mayor for the Peking Foreign Correspondents Club. I had known General Yeh well in the old days, so I confidently wrote him an informal note. The note came back undelivered. I went to call myself but got no farther than the fur-capped Red sentry at the outer gate of the municipal compound. He raised his bayoneted rifle and said brusquely: "Pu kwan wai-kuo jen" ("We have nothing to do with foreigners").

When I left Peking, months later, I still had not seen General Yeh—or any other responsible Communist leader.

Despite their efforts to ignore foreigners, the Communists showed themselves extremely sensitive to any foreign criticism. When two correspondents (one an Englishman and one an Australian) for American press associations suggested in some of their dispatches that the welcome of the People's Liberation Army in Peking had not been altogether spontaneous, they were attacked virulently for 2 weeks in the press, on the radio, and in schools and factories.

The Communists tacitly suggested through non-Communist Chinese that all might be well if the rest of Peking's 17 foreign correspondents would join in denouncing the two slanderous newsmen and repent their own sinful reporting. When this was not done, authorities banned all further foreign correspondence from north China "because of the military situation." The military situation by then had moved to the Yangtze, more than 500 miles away.

Occasionally the campaign against foreigners ran afoul of endeavors to promote Sino-Soviet harmony. One day a zealous Chinese Red army man discovered a foreigner beside him in a cinema and rose to harangue him.

"Don't you know you imperialists aren't welcome in our theaters any more?" he shouted.

"But I'm not what you think I am," the foreigner protested.

"Of course you are," the soldier said. "Anyone can tell from your high nose that you are a foreigner. What are you? American?"

"No," the foreigner shouted, "I am Soviet Russian."

The soldier hastily retired amidst howls of laughter. News of the incident spread quickly over the city.

The Communists soon began devoting more propaganda to overcoming the historic Chinese antipathy toward Russia. Youth was told to "learn from Russian youth." Workers were told to "learn from Russian workers." Soviet motion pictures were praised as "the only accurate and cultural motion-picture entertainment." Newspapers daily reminded the Chinese that they now belonged to the "anti-imperialistic, democratic peace camp headed by Stalin."

This constant hammering was effective. One day a Chinese friend of mine, whom I had always considered an honestly liberal intellectual, asked me seriously why I did not apply for Soviet citizenship.

The relatively mild behavior of the Communists—outside of their phychological excesses and their foreign bias—during their first weeks in Peking was misinterpreted by some as a sign of weakness, or at least of apathy. No capitalists had been shot, no wives swapped, few political arrests made, and there was little disruption of normal life.

Among those who misunderstood the Communists were the city's 10,000 or so beggars. They interpreted the Communist slogan about "turning over the body of society" as making them a new master class. They began setting a high minimum on alms they would accept and blocking shop entrances with their ear-splitting noisemakers until the minimum was met. Shopkeepers called them "tiger beggars" and began closing up when they came in sight.

The Communists allowed this situation to go on for a time, then the People's Daily News, the Party organ, carried a brief news item:

"The Peking People's Government has adopted a series of specific measures to liquidate begging in the city and to reconstruct beggars into productive members of society."

By the following day there was not a beggar to be seen. They were either in hiding or in "training camps." This was an amazing development in China, where begging is an ancient institution.

Black-market currency dealers also misconstrued the Communist attitude. When the Reds made no move against them in the first days of occupation, they grew even bolder than they had been under the Nationalists. They began operating openly by the hundreds at street corners, clanging silver dollars and waving United States bank notes.

When the time came to liquidate them, the Communists were a great deal more efficient than the Nationalists, who could usually be bought off, had been. First, swarms of plain-clothed police posing as currency buyers made wholesale arrests. Then those black marketeers still operating underground were ferreted out by using the arrested dealers as informers. Each man who would produce two other operators was offered his release. This, of course, produced a number of innocent victims, but currency speculation seemed to lapse.

Another group whom the Reds finally had to curb were the students, many of whom had been ardent Communist supporters long before Peking changed hands. They went on a prolonged holiday spree after the Red victory, but finally were persuaded to remain in classes except when called out for official demonstrations.

Back in school they demanded that certain courses, particularly English, be dropped. Then the party newspaper gave them a general lecture:

"The phenomena of disorderliness and nondiscipline have occurred in not a few schools, obstructing students' studies. Quite a number of students wrongly think that all old courses and systems are undesirable. * * * Extreme democracy and nihilistic tendencies must be opposed and corrected."

Some tenants, too, misinterpreted the aims of the Communists. They stopped paying rent, thinking their landlords, like those in rural areas, would be dispossessed. The Communists advised them to pay rent again, as there was a difference between "city policy" and "country policy."

The Reds went to greater propaganda lengths about this with industrial workers, who were frightening owners into closing plants by demanding immediate sharing of factories.

"Some workmen with a comparatively low degree of awakening," the People's Daily News said, "find it difficult to understand why this cannot be done now. The answer has been given by Party Chairman Mao Tse-tung in his principles of New Democracy, which provides for the continuation of patriotic private capitalism until China has attained the industrial growth necessary for pure Marxian socialism."

This, of course, did not apply to those forms of private enterprise which the Reds judged "not beneficial to the national economy." As the first weeks of mild Communist control in Peking passed, the handicraft industries along Lantern and Flower Streets, famed for cloisonné, costume jewelry, and other elegant Peking arts, closed or took up sock weaving. Curio shops began stocking soaps in place of jade.

Shortly before I left Peking, Mayor Yeh apparently changed his mind somewhat about learning from the old municipal staff. He announced establishment of "a school for reforming the thoughts of city employees."

THE OVERTURNING OF SESAME GARDEN VILLAGE

(By Jack Belden)

Overthrowing a European government by a coup d'etat at the top is perhaps an exact science when done by an efficient party of trained "cadres" with arms in hand. But making a revolution from the bottom up, village by village; as was done in China, is an inexact art that demands a world of patience, an infinity of cunning, and a bellyful of resolution. Such activities, if fumbled at, can become dangerous.

I think I can best illustrate the difficulty of making this type of revolution by telling the story of Sesame Garden a village of 4,000 people located in north Honan Province, between the Peking-Hankow Railway and a range of hills, old and redolent of Chinese legend, that are known as the Taihang Mountains.

As Chinese villages go, Sesame Garden is very large, being inhabited by 950 families. Nearly all of these people live in dwellings that are made simply from the soil of the north China plain, molded into adobe bricks, dried until they cease to shrink. The houses are cold in the winter and hot in the summer: When they become damp they crumble like candy houses in the rain. However, in the northwest corner of the village there are homes of a different sort: a group of imposing stone mansions, with many courtyards and splendid gardens. These, until recently, belonged to Chao Hung-pai, whose name literally translates as "Great Count Chao."

The grandfather of the count was a common farmer. One day a hundred years ago, a passing merchant stopped at his home, mysteriously took ill, and suddenly died. Grandfather Chao slit open the merchant's long-gown, discovered a hoard of silver hidden there, and with the funds thus obtained opened a pawn shop. Within a decade, by means of money lent at high interest rates and by foreclosures against mortgaged farm tools, crops, and land, the elder Chao had managed to bankrupt his neighbors and acquire a large estate.

The count's father and the count himself both added to the family fortunes. Within a period of 50 years Sesame Garden had changed from a village of independent peasant proprietors into a sharecropping community, almost the private preserve of the Chao family.

In order to protect its holdings, the family trained the count for Government service. For 35 years the count followed the trade of bureaucrat, and by the 1930's he was chief secretary of the provincial government. While in office, as was traditional, he increased his wealth further by means of what he smilingly called "gifts from the people." He purchased coal wells in the fields surrounding his native village and bought small department stores in the neighboring towns.

The count lived in Sesame like a feudal lord. He owned more than 40 percent of all the land in the village. Three hundred and sixty of the 950 families were his tenant farmers, and they paid him 50 percent of the grain crops they harvested every year.

To care for the needs of the 39 members of his family, Chao employed 41 hired laborers, numerous watchmen, a troupe of performing gymnasts, including a 60-year-old strong man, 4 butlers, 3 major-domos, 6 grooms, 15 slave girls, 12 old woman-servants, 8 wet nurses, and 15 cooks.

The count had a discriminating but enormous appetite. By the time he was 50 he weighed close to 250 pounds. At 60 he had only two teeth, but still insisted on eating meat at every meal, even in time of famine. At 70 he bought and married a 26-year-old slave girl. When peasants slyly asked him why he married such a young woman, he replied with a disarming smile, "We love each other."

As he grew richer the count drew away from his fellow villagers. They showed their resentment by dubbing him "Moneybags Chao." His half-starving tenants would sometimes remark: "The dogs of the landlord are prouder than we; they eat bread and drink paikar, while we eat husks." An old man living beneath the count's walls put this resentment into a song:

"In a mansion by the spring
Lives a fat and greedy king.
Tables sag with food and wine;
Men may starve, but counts must dine.

"What is sorrow? What is pain?
Empty stomach; lack of grain;
Lonely nights; vacant bed—
Only wealthy men can wed."

The count was a scholarly man, with a kindly bent, and he was so far above the ordinary people that they could never summon up a direct personal enmity toward him. That emotion they reserved for the village loafer, a man named Raingiver Wu, who smoked opium and had so many other bad habits that he was called "Rascal" Wu.

Wu had originally been one of the poorest men in Sesame Garden. In 1938, when the Japanese Army invaded this part of China, the people of Sesame were terrified and refused to come out of their houses. To meet this situation, Count Chao called a meeting of the Committee of Thirty Families—a group of village trustees composed of landlords and rich peasants—and proposed that Wu be made village chief. "Wu is so rascally that only he can deal with the Japanese on their own low level," reasoned the count.

But the count, like the industrialists of Germany who backed Hitler's rise to power, was not able completely to control the village ne'er-do-well. With Japanese aid, Wu quickly became head of a district in charge of many villages. After that he organized a troop of 100 men, armed them with rifles obtained by means of a self-defense tax, and gave himself the title of commander in chief. Then, having both civil authority and armed power, he began to squeeze the people of Sesame.

If the Japanese placed a 100-pound grain levy on the village, Wu would raise it to 150 and keep the surplus. Or, seeing a middle-class farmer at work in the fields, he would say: "My grandfather on his deathbed told me your family owed him this land. You must give me half and pay back your debt." In this manner Wu built up an estate of 50 acres—a very fine holding in landpoor China. To increase his prestige, he built two stone mansions, each two stories high.

Previously, when he was poor, Wu had had a wife and son, but they had left. Now that he was rich, he began searching for another wife, and his eye fell on the most beautiful girl in the village—Silver Blossom, the 23-year-old daughter of a middle-class farmer. Though she was betrothed to another man, though she despised Wu, and though her family did not want her to marry a man of 45 with such an unsavory reputation, Wu quickly overcame all difficulties by arresting her father and imprisoning him.

In order to forestall any future retaliation, shortly after the wedding Wu had his blackshooters (assassins with grease-blackened faces) kidnap his father-in-law and kill him outside the town. In all, 42 villagers, who had first been squeezed dry by "Rascal" Wu, were murdered and their bodies thrown into one of Count Chao's coalpits. The people nursed their resentment by making up secret verses about Wu also:

"With knives in both his hands,
At back of door he stands.
Give me all you've got.
Get away you'll not."

During the Japanese War, under the open attacks of Wu and the traditional overlordship of Chao, every branch of life in Sesame Garden began to collapse. The count, unlike Wu, was a Chinese patriot: He refused to have anything to do with the Japanese. But he was so clever in watching his own interests that he lost little during a war in which millions suffered. Chao's tenants had to pay their grain rents in advance before they could do any planting. As a result, when they brought in the autumn harvest they had to sell it immediately to get ready for the next year's planting. When winter came, the peasants had nothing to eat.

At one time, the Japanese placed a levy of six catties of cotton on each mow of land, but the Thirty Families told the peasants the tax was twelve catties. They then sold the surplus at exorbitant prices to those peasants who did not grow cotton. Some farmers had no money to buy cotton to meet the levy, and Wu and his soldiers raided their homes, tearing the cloth from their quilts and making off with the cotton lining. Some families froze to death in their beds.

In 1945, the Japanese Empire surrendered, but this meant little to the people of Sesame Garden Village. True, they saw the enemy garrison leave, but taxes were still exorbitant, 50 percent of the grain still went into the landlords' hands, and the blackshooters still terrorized the village.

Such was the condition of Sesame Garden Village when four cadres of the Eighth Route Army descended from the Taihang Mountains.

These cadres were not soldiers; they were not armed; they were not members of the Communist Party. They were all students who had but recently fled from Chiang Kai-shek's areas. Though they were sent by the Red army, they were all very inexperienced. Their job was to "overturn" Sesame Garden Village.

"Overturn" has been the biggest slogan of the revolution in rural China. In Communist terminology, it means to turn over the social, political, and economic life in every village, to overturn feudalism and establish democracy, to overturn superstition and establish reason. The first step in the "overturning movement" is to "struggle against" the landlords and divide the land.

When the young cadres first arrived in Sesame Garden they posted proclamations of the "liberated areas" government announcing that every village had the right to elect its own officials, and that land rents and rates of interest should be reduced. The startled landlords consulted their bailiffs. "Just pretend you agree with everything," said the bailiffs. Whereupon they went to the cadres, in the guise of common peasants, and suggested that a farmers' association be organized to struggle against evil elements.

The cadres were completely fooled. Believing they were dealing with "progressive" peasants, they participated in a mass meeting which, unknown to them, had been organized by the henchman of "Rascal" Wu. During this meeting, some of Wu's blackshooters, posing as impoverished farmers, made impassioned speeches against a group of middle-class peasants, accusing them of lending money at high interest rates and of various other crimes. When the rest of the village saw what was happening, they immediately began to hold aloof. But the inexperienced cadres were so impressed that they reported back to the county government that they had been completely successful. When they had gone, the landlords secretly congratulated their bailiffs but told the people: "From ancient times till now, every government has grafted. Don't expect anything else from the Eighth Route Army."

Unknown to the landlords, however, the county government of the Eighth Route Army in the Taihang Mountains decided to make Sesame Garden a model village. Five cadres, more experienced than the first student group, were chosen for the job. The leader of this second group was the son of a bankrupt farmer, named Tang Pi-ling.

When Tang and his workers came down from the mountains and entered Sesame, they were greatly surprised to find the people unfriendly. Whenever a cadre approached a group on the street, it would disperse. When they visited a farmer, he would look at the ground and mumble: "It's dangerous to me if you are here. Please go."

Tang decided not to call any more mass meetings, but to seek out some of the poorer villagers and speak to them.

One day a poor farmer, named Crooked Head, who owned one-third of an acre of land, was carrying manure to the fields and Tang pursued him and helped him spread it.

"You know that the policy of our government is to increase the pay of the workers and get the farmers a better living," said the cadre. "Why then do you run away from us?"

"Let me tell you some words from my heart," said Crooked Head. "Who can speak and who can act? Many people have been killed in our village." He then told Tang the story of Raingiver Wu. "The killings are all by blackshooters. No one knows who they are. But Wu is still here. Who dares speak?"

"Why not?" said Tang. "You have your own farmers' association."

Crooked Head laughed bitterly. "The landlord's dog-legs are running the farmers' association. They are all running in an inner circle. Except for such people, who dares do that kind of work? Before you came the landlords told us if we struggled we would be cheating them."

"Listen," said Tang, "get some of your friends and come to a private meeting tonight."

That night Crooked Head brought four friends to a secret meeting. With farmers brought by the other cadres, there were perhaps 20 men.

"We are going to talk poor-people talk tonight," said Tang, opening the meeting. "Some of us have been poor for several generations. But just look how rich the landlords are. What is the reason for this difference?"

The farmers looked down at the ground and would not answer. One tentatively said: "The reason we are poor is because our fathers left us no inheritance like Moneybags Chao."

"Were our grandfathers bad men?" asked Tang. "Did they smoke opium?"

"No."

"Were they able to cultivate land?"

"Yes, of course."

"Well, look at Wu. His father left him nothing. Why is he rich now?"

"Al. Who doesn't know how Wu got his money? He has a good fate. Our fate is bad."

"Well," said Tang, "suppose we don't work for Wu and Chao, don't give them food, just let them stay there. Can they live? If so, their fate is good. If we have wheat flour and can't eat or digest it, or if we have clothes and can't wear them, then our fate is bad. Otherwise you can't blame fate."

This argument particularly interested the farmers, because some of them were in the habit of burning incense at the temple of the god of fate and because many of them had accepted the idea, instilled by the landlords, that it was their fate to be poor. Now one farmer replied. "You are right. If the landlords received nothing from us, they would all be dead in 7 days."

"Then do you still think the wealth of the landlord comes from his father?"

Faces wrinkled with sudden grins. "No," said the farmers, "for if that is the case, we are all the fathers of Count Chao."

"Then is it true that the settlement is only to cheat the landlords?"

"No, it is only natural that we should settle with the landlords."

"Well, if it's natural, shall we make a settlement?" asked the cadre.

The farmers stared at the ground. Then a peasant with a scraggly beard got to his feet and faced them.

"Look at these wrinkles," he said, "and tell me whether I am old. As long as I can remember, I have been treated like a mule or an ox. But I am not an animal; nor are you. We are men. We must act like men. If we do not struggle when these cadres are here to help us, we shall never be able to struggle."

This speech by one of their own kind excited the gathering. At midnight the 20 farmers reached a conclusion that the time had come for their revenge. They swore a solemn oath: "We will turn over. Even if Chiang Kai-shek's troops come, we will turn over. If only for a day, we will turn over."

Tang clenched his fist. "Now we are together," he said. "But 20 men are not enough. We must mobilize the whole village. Go home and tell your friends and relatives."

Despite oaths of secrecy, the landlords had immediate word of the meeting, and within an hour Count Chao came in person to the cadres.

Since the arrival of the first cadres in the village, the count had been acting strangely. Instead of dressing in expensive silk long gowns, he now went about in cotton pants and jacket, bareheaded, and without his cane. When the cadres asked why he dressed this way, he answered, "To get close to the people." When the villagers put the question to him, he replied, "I dress like this so you won't struggle against me."

Now he stood before the cadres with a curious smile on his face. "I heard the peasants intend to struggle against the landlords," he said. "But I want to tell you I approve of the new government. I agree with Mao Tse-tung that tillers should own the land they cultivate. But I have so much land I don't know quite how to put it into the hands of the people."

The cadres, nonplused, could do nothing but take the count at his word. "The common people," Tang explained, "do not demand land from you. They want to make a settlement of the debts you owe them. We shall leave you land. Do not be afraid."

"All right, let me wait patiently," said the count.

Whether the count had seen the handwriting on the wall and was making a tactical retreat, whether he had undergone a kind of religious conversion, or whether he had just grown too old to play the role of lord of the manor any longer will never be known. In any event, his attitude confused his fellow landlords, destroyed their self-confidence, and in particular frightened "Rascal" Wu.

Wu had never been able to break the count's secret hold on the village, and when he heard of Chao's statement to the cadres, he fled panic-stricken into the night.

After Wu's flight, the poor of Sesame Garden came more boldly into the open. Now 200 met in daylong Speak Bitterness meetings.

Speak Bitterness meetings—where people publicly pour out their grievances to one another—have been one of the chief psychological weapons of the Communist Party. An old saying in this part of north China that "a poor man has no right to talk" was literally true. Often a poor man possessed no name at all, and was merely called by some aspect of his physical features. For such a man to stand up before his fellowmen and pour out his sorrows constituted by its very nature a revolutionary break with the past. In the same moment that he burst through the walls of silence that had enveloped him all his life, the peasant also tore asunder the chains that had bound him to his landlord and to the past.

The effect of such meetings on Sesame Garden was especially intense, because of the abnormal number of tenant sharecroppers and because of the desperate conditions under which they were living. One story of sorrow and cruelty led to another, and scores of grown-up men and women wept publicly. By such methods the poor of Sesame Garden Village began to identify themselves with each other and even to acquire a class consciousness, just as the Communist Party wished.

After these meetings, Sesame Garden was swept by what is perhaps best described as a convulsive mass passion. From the 200 most daring sharecroppers, the revolutionary infection spread rapidly through 700 families. Casting all caution aside, groups of peasants, armed with hoes, clubs, and spears, burst into the courtyards of the landlords, arrested them, and locked them up.

With two-thirds of the village fully mobilized, the cadres advised the local leaders to proceed against the landlords at once. The next day a Struggle Meeting was held in a great field south of the town. Three thousand men and women, carrying food and water with them, gathered on the meeting ground.

Crooked Head stepped before the crowd. "Today is our turn-over meeting," he said. "The sky is clear for us at last. Those who have bitterness, reveal it. Those who want revenge, let them get it."

"Bring the landlords here," a farmer shouted, "Let them get on their knees before us."

A shiver of apprehension raced through the audience as the landlords were led onto the field. They had been divided into two groups: ordinary landlords and sinful landlords. These last were made to kneel in

front of the crowd. The others, among them Count Chao, were allowed to remain standing.

One by one the farmers leveled their accusations. Each plaintiff stated his own name and that of the man he was struggling against. Clerks were present to write down their words. In the course of the morning and the afternoon the crowd accused the landlords of many crimes; betrayal of resistance members to the Japanese, robbing them of grain and cotton, forcing them into labor gangs, starving tenants to death, beatings, and many other things.

After several hours, Count Chao was brought before them. An old woman stood up and yelled: "You have so much land and you are so fat—how is that? It is our flesh you are wearing."

The crowd, inflamed, screamed at him, "Kneel! kneel!"

The count knelt.

The first to confront him was a young widow, the mother of two children, who earned her living by spinning cotton. "Look at me," she said, "I am a woman. I have no man and no land. In 1 year I cannot harvest two catties of cotton. Yet the trustees taxed me five catties. When I could not get it, they forced me to give my children to labor for them. I am a woman, but I have to work like a man. Sometimes I am weak from hunger and I cannot work well and then I am beaten. * * * Is it not bitter for me? Should I not settle with him?"

The crowd shrieked approval. "Settle with him! Settle!"

The accusations continued, and over a period of 2 days 143 people struggled against Landlord Chao. At the end of all the accusations, Chao was asked if he admitted the charges.

"All those things you have said are true." Chao's voice was humble.

"How did you become rich?" asked a tenant.

"I became rich because I ate your blood."

"What is your heart made of?" screamed a woman.

"I have a black heart."

"Do we deceive you when we make a settlement?"

"No, it is only just to settle with me."

Appeased by this self-abasement, the villagers released the count. During the next few days a farmers' committee reckoned that the 30 trustees owed the village 13,000 piculs of grain as payment for their extortions during the previous 5 years. The landlords were also to repay the tenants 25 percent of 1 year's land rent. After that the land was to be divided.

When face to face with the angry masses, the landlords had acknowledged the justice of the debts, but later, when the farmers' committee came to collect payment, the landlords became more daring and said they could not pay what had been ordered.

The tenants were enraged. "You stole so much from us. You are so rich," they said. "Where did it all go?" With hoes on their shoulders, they marched 400 strong into the homes of the landlords and carted off furniture, jewelry, and furs, which they put in a field and then publicly divided.

Among all the landlords, only Count Chao did not seek to hide his wealth. "I am old and cannot live long," he said. "What is the use of keeping these things while others are starving?"

Later, when the village was calm once more, a criticism committee was organized to make a temporary division of the land. There were five categories of farmers. The completely destitute and the poor were given land and grain immediately. Low-middle, middle, and upper-middle farmers divided some of the surplus grain of the landlords and some of the furniture. Originally 400 families in Sesame Garden had no land, but now every one of them received land.

After the settlement was completed, the cadres organized the peasants into mutual-help groups to reclaim wasteland. In 3 days wild grass was cleared from more than 50 acres. The fields left to the landlords were also covered with wild grass, but the farmers refused to form labor cooperatives with them.

For the first time, the cadres opposed the common farmers. "You should know," they said, "that the policy of our government is to give everyone enough to eat. If wild grass grows on the landlords' fields, their crops will be poor. So we must form labor cooperatives with these men also."

After the work was finished a landlord said to the cadres, "I was afraid that the people would struggle against me again and again. But now that they have begun to work with me, my heart is quiet and I can work hard."

Many former tenants, however, were afraid that the landlords might again become rich. Again the cadres delivered a lecture. "You know," said Tang, "we settled with the landlords because they received a surplus from the labor of other men. We do not mean that rich men are bad. If a man gets rich by his own toil that is very good."

Count Chao at first wanted to give up all his land, but the cadres would not allow this. "We do not want anyone to starve," they said: "You are too old to work as a laborer."

Though the other landlords were not left more than two or three mow of land, the villagers let Chao keep 70 mow because of his patriotism in the war.

And now the watchmen, the gymnasts, the slave girls, and the wet nurses have all gone, but the 60-year-old strong man remains. He and the count eat together and joke about their weight.

The count was allowed to keep three shops, a cigarette factory, and a small department store. A portion of one house has been left him. There are four persons with him; his daughter, one personnal servant, the strong man, and the slave girl who became his wife. The count still says: "We love each other."

According to the latest reports Count Chao has an important position in the provincial government.

Mao Tse-tung As I Know Him

(By Edgar Snow)

Mao Tse-tung has been the leader of the Chinese Communist Party for two decades. Today, at 56, he is the president of the world's most populous nation. By multitudes of peasants, he is called the saving star. In the strange, tight, iron brotherhood of his own party and army he is simply the chu hsi, or chairman.

Mao's authority is immense, but it would be a mistake to attribute the cataclysmic events in China to any single leader. Mao is not the creator of the Chinese revolution, but its creation. Because he learned how to control its forces for practical ends, he finds himself today at the apex of a system of power which guides the destiny of half a billion men. He is the first Chinese since the Ming dynasty collapsed to unify his country under a single command. Chiang Kai-shek, to whom this feat was prematurely credited, never managed it. Chiang's armies were never united and his regime at its best never controlled more than half the country. The regional war lords were never wiped out by Chiang. Today the last of them are being obliterated. Occupation of the few remaining war-lord and Nationalist bases, including Hainan and Formosa, is inevitable.

The revolt Mao Tse-tung leads has many precedents in Chinese history, but it has already brought about broader economic and social changes than any other upheaval in the last 2,000 years. He has proved to be a military strategist without peer in China, and as shrewd a revolutionary strategist as any in the world. Lenin "seized" power from a government that collapsed at the center. With Moscow and Petrograd behind it, the Bolshevik revolt spread to other cities, and thence to the rest of the people. In China, the cities could not be "seized" from within. Mao Tse-tung accomplished the far more difficult task of organizing the people on the periphery, arming and training them, and encircling Chiang's capitals.

Ideologically as well as politically, Mao is a figure of international influence. He has written pragmatic interpretations of Marxism that contain lessons of new and unpredictable consequence. He has demonstrated that Communists can secure victory without following the Soviet pattern, and indeed without any "direct support" from Russia. He is the first avowed Communist to prove that the revolution can succeed, in a backward country, with the peasantry as a main force, and without proletarian insurrections, if it wins or even "neutralizes" the majority of the middle class.

These are matters of portent. As a result, Mao and Mao Chu-i (or Maoism) represent quite a new force in the Communist world. For the first time Communists outside Russia have won control of a major power without giving up territorial or administrative independence, and without sacrificing their national interest to the interests of Russian chauvinism.

I first met Mao Tse-tung during the eventful summer of 1936, in the tiny walled village of Pao An, far up in the soft, tawny, loess hills of northern Shensi, near the cradle of Chinese civilization. Chiang hoped to make these hills the burial mound of his Communist opposition. Ever since 1927, he had been fighting a war to "exterminate"—his word—the Communists, and at last triumph seemed near. The Communist bases in south China had all been smashed. The remnants of the once-formidable Red army, chased through 12 provinces on the 6,000-mile retreat called the long march, had crossed the tallest mountains and deepest rivers, rolling down from the marshes of Tibet onto the grasslands of Kansu. They had suffered terrible losses; probably not 20,000 gaunt survivors reached the little Red stronghold in the north. And as they regrouped in those narrow-creviced valleys, Chiang Kai-shek brought up fresh forces and renewed his plans for "final annihilation."

At that point some Chinese friends helped smuggle me through the Nationalist lines and into the Red districts, where I walked 3 days to come to the headquarters of Mao Tse-tung. No correspondent had yet seen him. As we sat on narrow wooden stools in the bare, mud-walled, candle-lit cave in the side of a cliff that was his home, bomb shelter, library, and war office, Mao gave me more than an interview. I received lectures on ancient and modern Chinese history, on revolution, on Chinese Marxism, on the dialects of Mao's own evolution and that of thousands of others—and a remarkable forecast of the Sino-Japanese and the great Pacific wars.

His predictions all showed vast confidence in the future, both for his followers and for China. On the surface, his position looked hopeless. Afterward, I traveled for weeks among peasants, among workers in primitive "factories," and with the Red army at the front, and everywhere I found optimism in the leaders and warm relations between them and the people.

It then seemed to me that Mao had gotten hold of the great unused secret weapon of China: The power of the people mobilized and armed in the conviction that they could better their lives in every way by their own efforts. And I began to think that Mao would never be defeated by anything less than the same weapon. I realized that the Nationalists differed from the Communists

primarily in that the former would always maneuver to exclude the peasants from politics—they never held a democratic election in so much as one county—whereas Mao had to find ways of getting the peasants into politics, and into an active struggle for satisfaction of their immediate, pressing needs.

"Whoever wins the support of the peasants, will win China," said Mao. "Whoever solves the land question will win the peasants."

Land—that was the issue. Chiang Kai-shek dared not tamper with the land system, and unfortunately, it remained the most important political fact in China. The equalization of land ownership and the expropriation of landlords will not in themselves revive China—the Communists have never denied that—but they knew from the beginning that it would swing the balance of political power.

The first time I saw Mao he was walking down the broken little street of Pao An, listening to a peasant who had a tale of woe. By that time he had trudged many thousands of miles across the dusty lanes of rural China. For centuries China has not been ruled by men who know so well the highways, the byways, and the remote corners of the Chinese earth. While Chiang Kai-shek tried to pursue them in American planes, Mao, Chu Teh, and their ragamuffin army of "mud" youths, many still in their midteens, waded in the rice paddies and through the tall wheat, in and out of hundreds of villages and towns, haranguing the peasants in the fields, persuading, listening, slowly learning how to revise doctrine to fit facts, and how to make more allies than enemies. "We are the fish and the people are the water through which we move," said Mao.

Mao himself was born a peasant. He is tall for a Hunanese, about 5 feet 10, a bit bent and round-shouldered now. He moves with an easy, deliberate pace, and there is something vaguely feminine about his gestures. His pale, flat brown face is smooth except for a few hairs straggling from a mole on his chin. His head is rather large, and covered with thick black hair which he often allows to grow long; beneath it are large, expressive eyes that can mask his feelings or light up with sudden laughter. When he told me of his life he made many cogent witticisms about his associates, but he did not spare himself, either.

Some of his story may help explain today's China. Mao divided it for me into the various political periods, or metamorphoses—Buddihist, monarchist, republican, pacifist-idealist, democrat, anarchist, socialist—through which he went before, at the age of 27, he became a Marxist and, in 1921, joined the Chinese Communist Party at its foundation.

Mao's mother was illiterate and his father virtually so. But they owned 3 acres, and were "prosperous" enough to send a gifted son to the village school. The old man was a harsh disciplinarian and frequently beat Mao and his two brothers. They all hated him, and when Tse-tung was 10 he ran away. Hauled back, he continued to resent his father's tyranny. By contrast, Mao remembers his mother as kind and generous. She sided with her sons and was their "ally." She was a devout Buddhist and for some years Mao too was religious. His father was an unbeliever.

When Tse-tung was 14 his father married him off, against his will, to a girl of 20, and tried to make him become a farmer or a rice merchant. But the boy was curious about the world, lacked the slightest interest in his wife, with whom he never lived, and was determined to continue his studies. With his mother's help he got to a relative's home in a nearby town, where he finished lower middle school. From there Mao went to Changsha, the capital of Hunan province, and for 5 years attended the Hunan Normal School. He graduated with honors in social sciences and classical literature. In the same year his mother died and he turned his back on his father's home forever.

Cut off by his father, Mao helped recruit students and workers for the Chinese labor battalions that were sent to France to win the First World War; in that way he got funds to reach Peking. He almost went to France himself. At the last moment he decided that he did not know enough about China. It turned out to be the only chance he ever had to go abroad until his visit to Moscow a few weeks ago.

In Peking Mao was swept into the New Youth and the "cultural renaissance" movements, whose tides soon spread across all China. Lacking money for tuition fees in Peking National University, he worked as an assistant in the library—a job "so low," he says, "that people avoided me." But he read more history and literature, formed lasting friendships, fell in love with the daughter of his favorite professor, and married her. This was Yang K'ai-hui, who also became a Communist. Mao presently became a newspaperman and editor, then an agitator, and finally began his career as a revolutionary.

Yang K'ai-hui was executed in 1930, along with Mao's sister, under Chiang Kai-shek's law providing death for Communists. Mao's younger brother was decapitated in Hunan; his other brother was killed in Sinkiang.

Mao's second wife was a school-teacher, from whom he was divorced in 1937; they had one son, who is now with his mother in Russia. Mao's present wife is a former Shanghai cinema star, who joined the Communists during the war against Japan.

The childhood and early student days of Mao tell much about him and thousands of others like him, who eventually gathered together on the mountaintop of Chingkanshan, to build a new world. His father's tyranny symbolized the feudal authority which the age rejected. Mao learned early, he said, that "when I defended my rights by open rebellion my father relented, but when I remained meek and submissive he only cursed and beat me the more."

Meanwhile, his mother taught Mao the value of indirect attack, which is the Chinese way. He formed a united front (his phrase) with his mother and his brothers, using a combination of rebellion and persuasion to overcome the tyrant father. In the family circle, then, he first learned how to overcome superior force by the art of tactical maneuver.

The rebellious tendency, sharpened by his father's severity, led Mao to read secretly the exciting military chronicles and historical novels of ancient China. These were such books as the San Kuo (Three Kingdoms), the Shui Hu Chuan (All Men Are Brothers), and the Yo Fei Chuan (Yo Fei's biography), forbidden to young people because they supposedly stirred up idle dreams and dangerous thoughts. These books about rebellious warriors and famous heroes contain marvelous descriptions of military stratagems and tactics, as well as ethical dialogs. The same books inspired Chu Teh, Ho Lung, Nieh Jung-chen, and other close associates of Mao, long before any of them read the Communist Manifesto. Mao's speeches are peppered with quotations from these tales, so well known to the people through the story-tellers and the theater.

Mao Tse-tung witnessed several rice riots in Hunan at a tender age. He saw starving peasants loot their landlords' granaries; and he saw peasant leaders beheaded. One suspects that Mao's instinctive sympathy with the rebels derived not so much from his own peasant origin—his father was also a rice merchant—but from his mother's gentle Buddhist teachings. He told me that his reaction at the time was simply that the landlords were morally wrong. Once such riot developed into a local insurrection against Manchu rule, and so Mao began to think of justice and ethics in political terms while he was still in grade school.

Mao's school days coincided with years of wide confusion in China. The Manchu dynasty collapsed from inner rot before Chinese society had anything to replace it. Youths were suddenly called upon to solve problems which had in the past been automatically decided. It was a time of experiment and improvisation, and Mao's intellectual flexibility, his ability to change his mind, his distrust of cant and dogma, go back to this early period. He saw bewildering shifts occur in politics, but he noticed that they were alike in one respect: The rich with arms always defeated the unarmed poor.

As a student, Mao spent his summer holidays (he refused to go home) hiking across rural Hunan. He learned that if he helped the peasants they fed him and sheltered him, talked intelligently to him, and treated him as an equal. He organized a group of students to make long trips with him. They, too, came to feel secure with the people. When Mao became a political leader, years later, it was logical for him to go back to the farmers he had known as a boy. Among them he organized the first peasant unions of China, built up the first Red army units, and began his country's first attempt at a Socialist republic.

In the early days of Chinese communism Mao was almost alone as a believer in the efficacy of peasant partisans. After Chiang Kai-shek expelled the Communists from the Kuomintang, in 1927, and massacred them in the cities, Mao insisted that the urban working class could not be organized again until the peasantry was armed. The central committee of the party wanted proletarian insurrection, and Mao was expelled. He ignored his expulsion and built the rural bases to which the committee itself later fled. Mao led many detachments in battle. Starting with only a few rusty rifles, he and Chu Teh armed thousands of peasants and developed great ingenuity in guerrilla war—the art of "being everywhere and nowhere." In 3 years they had an army which challenged Chiang Kai-shek for control of south China.

Stalin's Comintern at first opposed Mao's leadership. Later it sent advisers to act as superminds. In 1934 the last of these was held responsible for the major military and political disasters which forced the Communist retreat to the northwest. He was court-martialed by the Chinese Politburo, and he went back to Russia. Since 1934, Mao's supremacy in the party has not been seriously disputed.

Many of China's present Red leaders have loyally supported Mao for 20 years, and their ties are extremely close. Schisms, splits, purges, and executions, on the Russian scale, have not occurred under Mao. His ability to outmaneuver or win over opposition within the party, and his readiness to recognize mistakes, accept facts, and change his own views before others change theirs is one explanation. Another is the rare trust and confidence that exists between Mao, as political mentor, and Chu Teh, as commander in chief of the armies. For years many people thought that "Chu-Mao" meant a single person.

If there has been no jealousy between Mao and Chu, it is likely due as much to the latter's humility as it is to Mao's tact. Mao is not the uninhibited extrovert that Chu Teh is. His dignity would not permit him to go along with Chu Teh when the latter played basketball with the troops, or to hop about a dance floor with girl students. Like the commander in chief, however, Mao worked in the fields on his land allotment in Yenan to grow food for his own table.

Mao is not a blusterer; he never shouts; he rarely loses his temper and never acts on

impulse. He has a soft conversational way on the platform and uses few gestures. More often he encircles a subject with sly logic rather than with emotional appeals. He is skilled at coining earthy phrases which stick in men's minds; he is a shrewd judge of an audience, and sizes up individuals quickly and sometimes quite wittily. (It was he who nicknamed General Hurley "the Great Wind.")

Unlike some of his comrades, Mao is interested in other things besides politics. I once spent half an hour talking to him about Charlie Chaplin. He is keenly interested in the theater, which he appreciates both as art and propaganda. He likes to write poetry; there is an odd streak of sentimentality in him.

What is to be expected from Mao? Independence of thinking, solutions worked out with an awareness of the necessity of maintaining mass support and control of the apparatus of internal power, patience, a deep interest in the revival and enrichment of Chinese culture, great faith in the people and a sure sense of their capacities, policies evolved after broad discussion and practical tests, and an aggressive defense of China's status as a great power. Marxism is the core of Mao's thinking; dialectical materialism is his method of understanding social phenomena. But he is not a slave of dogma; he has repeatedly adapted doctrine to fit a new fact.

"There are people," he said, "who think that [Marxism] is a kind of magic truth with which one can easily cure any disease. We should tell them that dogmas are more useless than cow dung. Dung can be used as fertilizer."

It should be noted that Mao never promised his followers an early or easy victory. He did lay down the concrete steps by which it could be won. He openly discussed every stage of relations with the Kuomintang; he never denied that he was seeking power, but he offered alternatives for achieving political change by peaceful means. Even when Chiang Kai-shek rejected his conditions for coalition government and resumed the annihilation campaign in 1946, Mao continued to describe, quite openly, precisely the strategy and tactics by which he would defeat the generalissimo. At the same time he also publicly predicted, with great accuracy, the military and political mistakes which Chiang Kai-shek would commit to bring himself to ruin.

Mao has often varied his tactics, but for many years his over-all program has been consistent. The aims have repeatedly been stated to be: First, to complete the nationalist revolution, to unify China, to get rid of foreign imperialism; second, to complete the overthrow of feudalism, to abolish the social and economic power of the landlord-gentry, to establish a new society based on equalization of land ownership; third, to lead the country in peaceful transition toward socialism after an era of broad development of national resources under government ownership and control, coexisting with cooperative economy and with private trade and middle and small capitalists. He has said that it may be many years before socialism can be introduced. Communism remains the distant goal. President Mao appeals to the majority of the Chinese as a leader of national emancipation and national regeneration.

Mao has never seen a progressive democracy in which social change is achieved by evolution, not revolution. The United States support of Chiang Kai-shek buttressed Mao's long-standing belief that western democracy will always behave according to Marxist concepts of imperialism. He has never studied in Russia either, and because he hasn't perhaps he does not quite understand the nature of his own heresy and the challenge that his leadership of China may eventually present to the Kremlin.

THE NEW GOVERNMENT AND THE OLD ECONOMY

(By Otto B. van der Sprenkel)

Now that the Chinese Communists control almost the whole of their country, they must deal with one of the most intractable sets of economic problems that has ever confronted a new government.

While China's village economy—a honeycomb structure of largely self-sufficient (or sometimes deficient) units—is less liable to break down than the economies of the West, it has been deeply ravaged by the long strain of the Japanese and civil wars.

The industrialized fringe of China that owed its development to western business enterprise in the last century, and grew up under the protection of unequal treaties, was extremely vulnerable, and has been pretty much ruined during the past 15 years.

In the middle 1930's a period of economic progress seemed to have started, but it ended abruptly with the outbreak of war in 1937. The years of the Chungking exile weakened the economic position and political influence of Chinese capitalists in the country and in the Kuomintang; and the printing-press financial policy of the Nationalist Government, then and during the subsequent civil war, sent one currency after another into a tailspin, completing the destruction of such native industry, commerce, and banking as had precariously reestablished itself. To this must be added the destruction of a considerable part of China's unimpressive stock of capital equipment, and the looting of Manchuria by the Soviet Union, as well as a succession of natural disasters, including drought, floods, typhoons, pests, and crop failures.

The new People's Government is inheriting a devastated country and a damaged, disrupted, and bankrupt economy.

Mao Tse-tung's problem is certainly not one of deciding where to begin. China is still a predominantly agricultural country; 85 percent or more of its labor force works on farms. Land policy has played a principal role in the Communists' acquisition of power and will do so in their retention of it. On the other hand, however fundamental the village program may be, the dynamic factors for economic expansion will have to be sought elsewhere.

In the past, reports from Red China have usually had much to say about land redistribution. While there is no denying the vital importance of this program, the great emphasis placed on it was mostly due to the earlier military policy of the Communists (one of securing the countryside and surrounding, but not occupying, the towns) and the almost completely rural character of the original Communist-run area.

The impression may have been created that the Communists themselves regarded land reform as a solution of the agrarian problem. This is far from true. Neither land redistribution, nor reduction of rents and taxes, nor the elimination of the usurer and grain speculator (nor all three) is seen by the new government as the solution to China's land problem.

These reforms, along with the campaigns for organizing village mutual-aid groups, for destroying and ploughing over grave mounds, for well digging, and for popularizing the use of insecticides, are regarded mainly as measures for temporarily easing the tensions in the villages and raising production. There is no doubt that these policies have been enormously successful on all three levels—productive, military, and psychological. Today in many villages in northern China crudely drawn wood cuts of Mao Tse-tung fill the niches formerly reserved for the kitchen god, and many peasants say before meals, "Thank Chairman Mao for our food."

The Communist drive for increased production has resulted in the emergence of a class of so-called new middle peasants who have graduated from the ranks of the poor and hired by their own efforts and who seem just now to be the group most favored by the new government. The Communists are quite ready to admit that in 5 or 10 years they may have a kulak problem, and possibly a new sort of class conflict in the villages. This prospect, however, does not seem to worry them, for they are confident that within a decade, or sooner, they will have solved the agrarian problem, not in the villages, but in the cities, through industrialization.

For the time being, collectivization on the Russian model is not being stressed. A few state collective farms have been set up in Manchuria, as well as a large-scale tractor training station; but the present trend is rather toward fragmentation—the necessary result of a policy of breaking up landlord holdings. More significant for the present are the mutual-aid groups, in which villagers combine their labor not only in certain farming activities but, more importantly, in nonagricultural auxiliary pursuits like making carts, irrigation devices, bricks, paper, baskets, and shoes, and even in transport and local trade. A promising type of small-scale rural industry may well develop out of these cooperative organizations, which are already, by their nature, well integrated with the existing village economy.

One precondition for industrialization is control of the towns in which industries are located. A second is finding out how these urban areas are put together and how they work.

By the end of January 1949, Tsinan, Mukden, Tientsin, and Peking had all been occupied by the People's Liberation Army, and in his report to the party in March, Mao called for an important reorientation of Communist activities—away from the villages and toward urban administration and economics.

This was new territory for the Communists. Few even among the leaders had previous experience to draw upon, and the party's policy during the take-over stage halted and fumbled, proceeding by trial and error, with a good deal of the latter. Attempts to devise foolproof methods of bureaucratic control bogged down in red tape and paper chasing. The main difficulty (and the usual excuse when things went wrong) was lack of adequate personnel—what the Communists call "cadres." The short-run intensive training schemes that were set up, in the main with university students as trainees, proved unsatisfactory, and have now been abandoned in favor of more thorough methods. These will undoubtedly show better results, but cannot and do not solve the immediate problem. A surprising number of officials of the old regime have been retained—watched and guided by Communists who are at the same time learning the jobs themselves.

Immediate salvage work, such as getting public services going again, was briskly and efficiently tackled, largely by the army. Moreover, the cities were occupied by the same authority that controlled the countryside, which made it far easier to feed the town dwellers. Two months before the fall of Tientsin, the Communists were already building up stocks of grain at Tsang-hsien. These, placed on the Tientsin market a few days after the capture of the city, brought food prices swiftly down from their siege levels.

Such urban policies have often enough hit reasonably near the target. However, more esoteric skills, such as mastering the financial mechanisms of trade, still evade the grasp of the conqueror.

A great deal of China's industrial plant and transportation was originally created (and located) to serve the needs of a special Sino-western relationship, developed in the heyday of nineteenth-century imperialism,

and obviously not suited to the requirements of a self-governing economy. Economic scene-shifting—mostly from the coast to the interior—is a major headache for the new regime.

The most striking example is Shanghai. The new authorities are planning drastic reductions in the size and importance of this city, involving the moving of cerain industries closer to their raw-material sources in the interior and the development of closer economic ties between Shanghai and its hinterland, to break down the city's crippling dependence on overseas trade.

Another example is provided by the railways. Replanning of the network, however, can hardly get on today's agenda. The priority job is salvage and construction. The Communists are boasting, "Where the People's Liberation Army goes, the trains run too." This reflects a very different Communist attitude from that of a year ago, when a Communist official cheerfully told me: "We may not be very good at building bridges, but we are quite skillful at blowing them up."

A great deal of reconstruction has already been done, again mainly by the army. After Lin Piao's first-line troops had taken Tientsin and moved south, the second-line holding forces seemed largely to be working on railway repair. Bridges were brought in and double-tracked, and not long after the fall of Shanghai the trains were again running through to Peking. The Yangtze Ferry, out since the Japanese war, was also once more in operation. By mid-July the Communists held 60 percent of China's railway mileage, and three-quarters of it was open to traffic.

Of greater immediate importance, though, than the railways, are the country's inland waterways—its canals and rivers. Junks, sampans, and barges, registered and controlled by regional economic authorities, are now moving an unprecedentedly heavy traffic—principally coal, industrial raw materials, and foodstuffs—and will be the main weapon, for the next 2 or 3 years at least, in the government's fight against local famines.

According to Mao Tse-tung's theory of new democracy, China's economy will function during the present pre-Socialist phase through three channels: government-owned industries, cooperatives, and private enterprise.

The first are already off to a flying start, as all concerns classified as bureaucratic, which means they were owned by high-ranking Nationalists, are automatically taken over by the state. Further developments are: first, the setting up of government monopolies covering certain areas of production; second, the establishment of state trading companies on a regional basis, which direct, through barter agreements, a growing proportion of the country's domestic trade, and which have also opened retail stores in the principal cities, mainly as a price-control device; last, the institution of a government foreign-trade monopoly, somewhat on the Russian model, which in Tientsin already exercises statutory control over bristle exports and an increasing number of other export staples.

Advances by the cooperatives have not been as rapid and spectacular. Remnants of cooperatives that survived the hard frost of the Kuomintang inflation are beginning to expand in a more favorable climate, but producers' cooperation is not yet as widespread as it is supposed to be under the new democracy.

In the area left to private enterprise, the businessman has a hard job balancing his new advantages and his new hindrances. If he is classified as a national capitalist, can show reasonable output figures, and has no major blots on his labor-relations record, he is better off than before. Considerable favors are extended to him, ranging from tax reductions to the granting of interest-free loans by the People's Bank. Even the restrictions are often two-sided. For example, while government control of raw materials may limit his freedom of action, it may also keep down his production costs. And the stress laid down by the authorities on production certainly creates an atmosphere more congenial to the entrepreneur than that which existed under the Kuomintang.

It is easy to draw analogies between the period of "new democracy" in China and the New Economic Policy (NEP) of the early 1920's in the Soviet Union, but this comparison is too facile, and is not warranted by the evidence. The theory that the present is just a honeymoon phase is more reasonable. Mao Tse-tung's economic program, after all, contemplates an eventual transition from "new democracy" to full socialism. The Chinese businessman, however, seems to feel it will be time enough to cross that bridge when he gets to it.

It is important to realize how powerfully the vision of an industrialized China has taken hold of the Communist imagination. Here, at least, there is a profound resemblance to the Russians of the 5-year plans. "Industrialization" is a word of magic power in China today. This is understandable enough, for industrialization alone can create an urban proletariat—doctrinally necessary as the basis of any Communist regime. Industrialization, besides, is indispensable to the solution of the land problem; is necessary if China is to achieve military independence; and is closely associated psychologically with the fervid nationalism that pervades the Chinese revolution.

What has so far been accomplished does not amount to even a first step in transforming agrarian China into an industrial nation. However, the Communists have already achieved certain prerequisites, without which even the first step would be impossible. Almost all of China is now a "rear area" militarily, and its economic involvement with the demands of the fighting front is daily growing less. The inflation has been, if not checked, at least slowed. But to bring industrialization from the blueprint to the building stage, three things are needed: Exploitable raw materials, technical personnel, and capital equipment. The first China already possesses—with certain limitations of kind, and certain difficulties of location. Technicians, certainly at the foreman level, can be supplied by training schemes. Machines and the higher grades of technicians will have to be imported.

Here are some of the pressing questions: Can China develop a rate of domestic capital accumulation sufficient to enable it to underwrite at least a significant part of its industrial program without foreign aid? To what extent will China be able to pay for machines and technicians from abroad with its own exports? With whom can such trade be developed? With the Soviet Union alone? Or with Russia and the non-Communist West as well? Answers will depend on two main variables in the present situation—and on western foreign policy.

The new government may attempt to industrialize, as it were, overnight, to force through a program speeded up to the limits of the country's endurance. Or it may endeavor to construct a small cutting edge of industrial development, and work forward at an initially slow rate, but one which may be expected cumulatively to gather speed. It may plan to industrialize through a series of ambitious large-scale enterprises on the Russian model. Of it may decide to lay the main stress on small-size undertakings, geographically dispersed, and from the beginning integrated as far as possible with the existing village structure. The first alternative would call for foreign assistance on a greater, the second on a lesser, scale. How much foreign aid will China want, and from whom?

One opinion that is often expressed in the United States (and to a lesser extent in Great Britain) is that the Chinese will need aid on a maximum scale; that they won't get it from the Soviet Union for the very simple reason that the Russians have not got it to give; and that therefore—since America is the only alternative source—a policy of hands off will sooner or later (probably sooner) bring the Communists running for American assistance, which can then be given on our own terms. This view is summed up in the claim: "We've got them over a barrel."

But have we? This line of argument, many economists will hold, seriously underestimates the powers of capital accumulation possessed by China's rural economy. The ending of the civil war, and the Communist land policy, will certainly release new resources from the villages, possibly in amounts that will surprise the pessimists. Furthermore, it is at least not inconceivable that Russia will subordinate economic to political reasoning, and provide the Chinese with resources, which, on a strictly economic reckoning, would be retained for Soviet use at home. An American economic policy of hands off would make the going tough for the Chinese Communists, increase pressures toward the police state, and leave a clear field to the Soviet. It would be a policy more likely to lead to China's absorption into the Russian orbit than to bring the Chinese running.

The alternative is to allow existing trade relations to continue and grow. Such a policy would allow the Chinese more room to maneuver. Mao Tse-tung is a Chinese nationalist as well as a Chinese Communist, and if the Soviet Union attempts to satellitize the new China, trade relations between America and China may be of decisive significance in determining the regime's course of action.

THE RED DYNASTS VERSUS CHINESE TRADITION

(By Derk Bodde)

In Peking there is a famous park known as the Pei Hai, or Northern Lake. One of the buildings on its northern shore is an old Buddhist temple, in front of which stand three large bronze incense burners. Passing this spot during a stroll on a lovely morning early in March this year, 6 weeks after the Communists had captured Peking, I noticed that two of the tripod caldrons had been toppled from their marble pedestals to the ground. More work of Kuomintang soldiers, I decided.

A few minutes later I saw 8 or 10 young soldiers of the People's Liberation Army, as the Chinese Communist forces are called, also out for a stroll. One of them—a private like the rest—noticed the overturned incense burners and ran toward them, beckoning to his comrades. In a matter of seconds he and three or four of the others, still carrying their rifles and blanket rolls, were struggling to lift one of the tripods back to its pedestal. The soldiers seemed bound to fail, for the tripod was about three feet high, enormously thick and heavy, and so round and smooth that only two or three men could get a real grip on it.

Then the leader had an inspiration. He and his comrades rolled the burner over the ground until it touched the foot of the pedestal. Then, pressing it with all their strength against the side of the stone, they slowly rolled it up the stone's vertical face and into its place. Having done this, the soldier who had conceived the operation leaped happily inside the incense burner, waved his arm and shouted in triumph. Then he and his comrades ran to the other prostrate burner and within a few minutes had restored it to its original position. Watching, I thought: This is probably the first time in decades—perhaps centuries—that a group of Chinese soldiers, undirected

from above and with no expectation of gain or praise, has spontaneously exercised initiative, effort, ingenuity, and cooperation, simply in order to put to rights a monument belonging to the people.

One of Peking's most famous restaurants is the Tung Hsing Lou. It has a staff of about 70. Near it stands a tiny radio shop with a staff of three. During the last 3 months of Kuomintang rule, I was told, the Tung Hsing Lou paid a city tax of $7.30 in gold yuan, or slightly less than two American dollars at the original rate of exchange. The radio shop had to pay 10 times that amount.

Today this could not happen. Bribery has lost its magic and the black market has largely disappeared. Even the enemies of communism are forced to admit not only that the Communists themselves are absolutely honest, but, even more surprising, that the police and other officials, most of them carryovers from the old regime, have seemingly become honest as well.

What is the secret of this transformation? Fear of punishment on the part of the people? Communist cleverness or efficiency? No doubt both of these, in part. But in large measure the changes rest upon three ideological factors of basic importance; the almost religious faith of the Communists in the rightness of their cause, to which they are willing to subordinate all personal considerations; belief in personal example as a means of influencing others; and belief in the possibility of rehabilitating human nature. The first concept is comparatively rare in Chinese history. The other two are deeply rooted in traditional Chinese thought. The combination of the three has given the Communists their conviction that all men, save a handful of hopeless irreconcilables, can be taught to see the error of their ways and be saved. That is why the new government is willing to rely primarily upon suasion and indoctrination rather than compulsion.

Typical of the new ideology is the reform program of the north China prisons. There, prisoners are no longer called criminals, but penitents; corporal punishment has been abolished; "squeeze" among the wardens has been eliminated; and the prisoners are put upon their honor to observe the regulations. The new slogan is: "The prisons have become schools."

Most important in the prison curriculum are the small daily study groups devoted to self-examination and the study of life. Prisoners participating in the former are encouraged to discuss their faults frankly before their fellows, accept friendly criticism, and express repentence. In the latter they hear lectures upon the evils of the old society, the ways in which it can be reformed, and the hope this holds for their own rehabilitation. Through the use of such techniques, conducted by the Communists not only among criminals, but also among surrendered Kuomintang soldiers, students, workers, and almost any other group they can reach, they generate intense fervor among their converts.

The Communists make strong appeals to group and national pride. To workers, farmers, and the people in general they say: "The factories are your factories. The land is your land. The people's government is your government." These are some of the psychological means—quite aside from political and economic measures—by which they have gained the support of large masses of people to whom Marxism-Leninism as such remains only a name.

For Chinese intellectuals, however, most of whom have become vociferous supporters of the new order, Marxist theory itself exercises a potent additional attraction. This may seem surprising at first, inasmuch as Marxism is diametrically opposed to traditional Chinese thought on many basic points. Chinese philosophy is idealistic, emphasizing the supremacy of mind. It is passive, saying that man should harmonize himself with nature and the individual should accept without question his particular status in society. It is syncretistic, tending to merge the extremes of good and evil into one all-embracing harmony. Marxism, on the other hand, is materialistic, preaching that man's thinking is a product of his social and economic environment. It is dynamic, saying that human progress results from class struggle. It is exclusive, emphasizing that there is only one real truth. The one is the product of a static civilization that has remained essentially agrarian. The other is a manifestation of a changing civilization that has produced science, capitalism, and the industrial age.

Yet the very antithesis between the two is what makes Marxism attractive to many Chinese intellectuals. Events of the past few decades, they argue, show something to have been radically wrong in Chinese society, and therefore in Chinese traditional thinking as well. Marxism explains in logical terms what it is that was wrong and how the wrong can be rectified. This point of view has recently struck many intellectuals with the impact of a sort of "instantaneous enlightenment," to quote an old Buddhist term. It underlies, for example, the open letter, published in a Tientsin newspaper on May 17 of this year, from Ch'en Yuan, president of the Catholic University in Peking, to Hu Shih, former president of Peking National University. Professor Ch'en, a well known historian now in his seventies, a man steeped in Confucian tradition, elected to remain in Peking when the Communists came. Dr. Hu, a westernized scholar famed among his countrymen as the leader of China's literary renaissance two decades ago, and among Americans as China's Ambassador to Washington, fled to Nanking during the siege of Peking, and thence to America.

"Why," Ch'en writes to his friend, in essence, "did you choose to run away? You said there would be no freedom here and cited Kravchenko's I Chose Freedom as illustration. But it is not as you say. Now, for the first time in my life, I have seen what freedom really is. I have been free to read many things I had never heard of before, such books as The Chinese Revolution and Chinese Communist Party, and Mao Tse-tung's The New Democracy and On Coalition Government. You own 40 editions of the Water Classic Commentary (an ancient geographical work on which Dr. Hu has long been doing research). Why is it you never owned a single book by Mao Tse-tung? In reading these works, a new world has opened before me. I realize for the first time that our whole study of history has been subjective, unscientific. Man's mind is determined by his society. We must study that society in order to understand the individual, and can reform the individual only through reforming the society. All culture follows politics and at the same time leads politics. The realization of this fact is the freedom that the new government has brought to me."

It is this feeling of widened mental horizons, bringing with it spiritual exhilaration and hope for the future, that has turned many Chinese intellectuals to Marxism despite the Chinese Communists' use of thought-control techniques which, though nonviolent, are highly effective. Ask Chinese intellectuals how they feel about press controls and other curtailments of the freedoms so prized in the West, and some will reply that they regret, but nevertheless accept, them as the necessary price for China's only salvation. Others say that controls are unimportant in comparison with the real freedoms of economic security and social equality, and still others that they are but temporary wartime measures, to be discarded when the new government is firmly in power. The evolution in thinking through which many intellectuals have passed during the last 3 or 4 years was vividly described in a conversation I had in September 1948 (4 months before the coming of the Communists), with a famous liberal professor—a former member of the Kuomintang.

"We intellectuals," he said in essence, "have gone through three phases. The first one in which most of us supported the Nationalist government, recognizing its many faults, but hoping it would reform. The second was that in which we became increasingly discouraged with reform prospects but saw no feasible alternative. Though the government was bad, we felt that what might take its place would be even worse. Then came the present phase, in which we are so completely convinced of the hopelessness of the existing government that we feel the sooner it is removed the better. The Chinese Communists are obviously the only force capable of making this change."

"But while we Chinese have thus been forced more and more toward the left, we have seen a counter movement at work in America. At one time it apparently wanted a genuinely progressive government in China. During the past two years, however, it has seemed to be interested less and less in liberalism and more and more in anything, no matter how reactionary, that might stand as a bulwark between it and Communism. The result is an American government which constantly talks about democratic rights, yet at the same time continues to aid a Chinese government which increasingly disregards these rights. That is why we Chinese have become anti-American—not anti the American people but anti their Government.

"That we are anti-American, however, doesn't mean we are pro-Russian. Normally we would prefer America to Russia. But today the Communists are China's only hope. Besides, we are not convinced, as are Americans, that they are merely tools of Russia."

Though non-Communist intellectuals thus go far in accepting the Communist indictment of America, they evince greater reluctance toward embracing the counter thesis that Soviet Russia is the paragon of all virtues. Strong interest in Russia on their part is coupled with lingering distrust. At an indoctrination course for students held this summer in Peking, embarrassing questions were raised about Russian policy in China, especially regarding the conduct of Soviet troops in Manchuria at the end of the war, and the workings of the 1945 Sino-Soviet treaty of friendship.

Can the Chinese Communists remake human nature in China? They not only can but are, especially among students, school children, and younger workers. Family ties sometimes suffer in the process. When the Communists issued an appeal this spring for volunteers for their southern campaign, about a fourth of Peking's university students decided to give up their studies in order to join, despite parental objections in many cases. With official approval, young people are refusing to accept marriages arranged by their parents.

Despite the social changes brought about by a new ideology, however, I share the opinion of my professor friend that Communism itself may conceivably be modified in the course of its progress in China. Certain factors lend substance to this belief: The tenacity of Chinese institutions and traditions; its geographical position, vast size and amorphous population; its long commercial and cultural relations with the western countries; its present and future economic needs; and the divergences of the Chinese from orthodox Communist theory and practice.

In Search of a China Policy

(By John K. Fairbank)

When Mr. Acheson told the world last August, in the State Department's white paper on China, that we look forward to a reassertion of "the democratic individualism of China," he was using our best political vocabulary. But his good phrase was unexpectedly seized upon by the propagandists of Communist Peking and turned against us with devastating effect; for "individualism," translated into Chinese, has become a garbage word, meaning everyone-for-himself-and-devil-take-the-hindmost. The Chinese Communists neatly indentified it with the disruptive antisocial selfishness that disgraced the last days of the Kuomintang.

The misunderstanding between Washington and Peking is more than verbal. The plain fact is that Asia is very different from America, socially, culturally, ideologically—in all the institutions and values of everyday life. We speak in different language systems, with only part of our vocabularies translatable with any accuracy. Our legal conceptions were so different a century ago that westerners demanded the right to be tried in China by western law under extraterritoriality, a system only recently ended. It is not surprising that neither Sun Yat-sen nor Chiang Kai-shek was ever able to put up a reasonable resemblance of Anglo-Saxon parliamentary democracy.

So now that a new order has come to China, the American mind is ill equipped to deal with it. As the world's oldest surviving revolutionaries and youngest defenders of the established order, we fail to appreciate the attitudes and feelings of revolutionary Asia. We assume that the American ideals of political freedom and economic development, having been good enough for us, are good enough for the Chinese, Indonesians, Japanese, and Filipinos. With our instinctive horror of the totalitarian police state and the evil deeds of Russian imperialism, we assume that no intelligent Asiatic could really desire communism or, having been duped into it, could avoid eventual disenchantment.

If we approach Asia on these terms we will be defeated. This has just happened in China, where we backed a decadent regime in the effort to secure a strong, united, and democratic China, independent of Russia and friendly to ourselves. Had China been an industrialized democracy of Western Europe, a revivified Kuomintang might be in power today. But China is uniquely different and Asiatic, densely populated but thinly industrialized, intensely self-conscious but noncohesive, one of the oldest civilized states in the world, convulsed by the newest revolution.

In forming a new policy toward China we must face several very tough and unpleasant realities. If we want to maintain any contact with China at all we have to recognize the new Chinese Communist regime. Yet recognition will not necessarily preserve for our 1,000 or more missionaries, our trading firms, our students, professors, and our journalists the position and influence which they have had in modern China heretofore. We have to fit our China policy into a larger over-all policy toward Asia. Yet our effort to put the Japanese economy on its feet (so as to take it off our necks) will continue to provoke the bitter enmity of patriotic Chinese.

In tackling all these problems, our freedom of choice is narrower than we may think. If we do not recognize the Chinese Communist government, Russia will have even greater influence in China. If we do not encourage Japanese trade with China, Japan will become an even greater financial burden and a more dangerous political powder keg. We are the losers and cannot expect to be the choosers as much as we were before. What we have to offer may interest Asia less than we expect. We must assess wherein our real contribution can be—mainly in material goods and technology, or in the realm of ideas and values?

Our first need is therefore to face the truth. No amount of bluster, nor the sending of marines (or even Legionnaires) can keep the Chinese Communists from putting consuls like Angus Ward in jail if they choose to. We may feel certain there are Russian machinations behind the scenes, but we have to deal with China as though it were an independent foreign state. Chinese patriotic sentiment demands this with complete sincerity. If the Chinese people are in reality falling victim to police terror and the Russians, squeeze, we have to let them find it out for themselves.

Meanwhile, as advisers and foreign friends, our influence is at a low ebb. It falls steadily lower as Nationalist planes, gifts of the United States, continue to drop American-made bombs on open Chinese cities. The American public forgets that since VJ-day our aid to Chiang has contributed to the killing and maiming of many thousands of Chinese civilians. More than a thousand bombing casualties have been reported from Shanghai since the Communist take-over—enough to blacken our name and strengthen the Communists' moral position.

The hardest idea for us to accept about China today is the seeming paradox that the new Peking regime is both Communist and popular. It is definitely a Communist regime and in the Russian camp, yet it shows promise, on its record thus far, of being the best government that modern China has had. This proposition is hard to take. In recent years some Americans have preferred to think that the Chinese Communists were mere agrarian reformers, do-gooders in the countryside, and not real Communists committed to the police state and allegiance to Moscow. Many Americans have chosen, on the other hand, to deny altogether the record of Chinese Communist good works and reforms for the peasant masses. Either of these beliefs—that the Communists weren't real Communists, or that they weren't real reformers—was a way out. But now we are up against it. Mao Tse-tung has taken over China with a minimum of slaughter and is making some initial progress in solving China's gigantic problems, while proclaiming his allegiance to Moscow.

Revolutionary Asia seems a paradox to us partly because we don't understand its degrees of social and economic difference from the West. The old order of personal government (landlord rule in the countryside and official corruption in the towns) is so far below our own modern standards that a party dictatorship, which seems a backward tyranny to us, may seem a forward step in Asia. The Chinese people are not yet accustomed to the protection of a legal system which is independent of the government in power, nor do they take the rights of free assembly and political self-expression as matters of course. The mere preservation of order, the lessened fear of arbitrary seizure by the police, have been a relief to Chinese intellectuals after their experiences under the Kuomintang. The fact that the new regime may at any time resort in its turn to arbitrary arrest and coercion makes it no worse than its predecessors. It will be judged by the Chinese masses according to their traditional touchstone—whether there is enough rice to eat.

Our ignorance of China leads to sad miscalculations. We overestimated the Nationalist armies' will to fight and oversupplied them with American arms. We sent them field-artillery pieces, key tools for capturing walled cities. But the Nationalists held the walled cities and the Communists remained dispersed in the countryside, where artillery could not reach them. When the besieged Nationalists grew demoralized, the artillery began to change hands, and soon the cities did, too. Since our armament of Chiang outran his troops' desire to use it, the Communists today have the best-armed forces in Chinese history, American-equipped.

We can make similar mistakes in other parts of Asia. Suppose, for example, that our economic-development plans overlook the social effects of industrialization. Done our way, industrialization will create big cities in Asia, which will draw their cheap labor from the farms of the countryside. But this will disrupt the old family relationships, upset the traditional amenities of the individual's life within his community of kin and neighbors, and make him the more ready to give his allegiance to revolutionary causes. American-style industrialization in the crowded East may increase the material satisfactions of the Indonesian or the Indian, and yet also increase his psychological frustration and spiritual dissatisfaction. All these things are interrelated, and our technological aid cannot help having deep social repercussions. Our well-meant injections of technology into underdeveloped economies under point 4 can be misused to entrench backward regimes in power, and so lead us into a whole series of disasters like the one we have suffered in China.

These unhappy facts suggest that American policy can no longer afford to project American ideals into Asia unless they are translated into Asiatic terms. The freedom of the individual, the democratic process, the good life we seek to defend, seem to most Asiatics to be all right for Americans, but beyond their own reach. They must settle for what they can achieve in their own countries, with the meager resources at hand and the historical traditions they have inherited—through communism, if no better means presents itself. Can America offer an alternative, not in New York or Washington, but in Batangas Province and the paddy fields outside Bangkok?

Our forebears, as traders, missionaries, and educators, began the revolutionary process in Asia. It is high time that we took a hand in helping it along. Containment of communism, to keep it out of countries undergoing social metamorphosis, is like containing a forest fire. It is better to build a backfire.

It is not beyond our capabilities to work closely with the native non-Communist leadership of Asia, once we acquire the will and the vision. Asia is still our farthest west, the final frontier to which our westward expansion has brought us. It is now also our strategic frontier, where American ways and ideals are on trial, a border area of cultural ferment and change where modern science can either remake the ancient East or else enslave it. We will bear some responsibility for the outcome.

Our policy must be cast in a new pattern of relations between the American people and peoples of Asia. Elements of this new pattern may be suggested as a series of operating principles.

First, American private citizens and private agencies must be enlisted and given opportunity to work in Asia: business corporations and private enterprisers, missionary and student workers, teachers, and technicians of all kinds. They should not be dominated by government, but advised and helped. We must avoid our recent error in China, where we funneled enormous amounts of aid into the government channels of China and overloaded them. We should not place our bets on governments but on the long-term interests of peoples, and we should seek to work with the peoples of Asia at all possible levels of planning and technical development. Naturally, the governments of the new Asia will be largely Socialist in their plans for the future, since their countries generally lack a strong middle class.

Second, our new contact with Asia, both private and governmental, must be on a

basis of equality and reciprocity. First of all, Asia's independent sovereignty and freedom of action must be fully acknowledged. This means the full recognition of nationalist aspirations in Indonesia, Viet-Nam, and other areas, even when we know that the new leadership is weak and untried. Colonialism and the old Anglo-Dutch imperium in southeast Asia are finished, and we cannot fill the vacuum with a new American imperialism of our own invention. Our only recourse, as a trading power at a great distance, is to nurture nationalist movements and try to treat them as independent even while they are weak.

Finally, insofar as we can plan our part of this relationship with the new nations of India and southeast Asia, we must seek to keep it balanced and integrated within an over-all program, so that military armament does not outrun social reform, and industrial development does not overshadow the welfare of peasants. Trade among far-eastern countries, for instance, is quite as necessary as trade with us.

If we regard China with these considerations in mind, several principles emerge: First, we must help the various new nations of the Far East to work their way toward political independence and economic development, so that increasingly they form a local international community, a segment of the world order. Japan is an integral part of this community and must trade with it. Such growth must inevitably attract Chinese participation. Yet China is not likely, in our lifetime, to be in a position, economically or strategically, to dominate this community.

Second, our interest is to maintain as best we can our contact with the Chinese people, rather than to push them behind a Russian-type iron curtain. Their new government, having ridden to power on a wave of nationalism, is in no mood to accept Russian dictation and police surveillance in its domestic affairs. It is by no means certain yet that the Chinese Communists want to subordinate themselves fundamentally to Russia, or that they wish to eliminate American contact, or that, if they do, they can succeed soon. No matter what the Chinese Communists want, China is still oriented toward the West in many ways. We should try to keep it so, neither by hostility nor by appeasement, but by standing on solid American principles: National independence, economic welfare, personal freedom. These are positive things we are for, not against, and in our relations with Communist China we should mainly talk about them, rather than about anticommunism.

In this context, diplomatic recognition is only a first step. Since Russian aid to the Chinese Communists during the civil war has been relatively meager, we have little basis for applying the Stimson doctrine. The change of government in China has followed a genuine civil war, not military aggression from outside. Diplomatic relations, so necessary in our dealing with Communist Russia, are equally necessary now that the cold war extends to Communist China.

Recognition is not moral approval, only realism. A Chinese veto in the United Nations can have only a little more nuisance value than the present Russian veto. Meanwhile, persistent nonrecognition would constitute desertion of the century-old American interest in the Chinese people—a denial of American principles of humanitarianism, and friendship for the 400,000,000 of China. Recognition is a necessary first step in our continuing competition with Russian influence in China. To withhold recognition beyond the time when the State Department can work out the details would be defeatist and essentially isolationist. It would be playing into Russia's hands. Our aim must be to follow a middle course, free of the illusory hopes and fears that have dogged our China policy in the past, ready to deal with the Communists in China but under no compulsion to take their terms, without expecting either that their regime could be destroyed by our hostility or that it could be enticed out of the Russian orbit by appeasement.

[From the Reporter of April 15, 1952]

INTRODUCTION—STARTING THE JOB

(By Max Ascoli)

The fall of Czechoslovakia, more than any other single event, rallied the western nations to that defensive partnership against communism—the Mutual Security Pact. The fall of China invigorated an entirely different kind of partnership—a partnership between Chinese and American factions eagerly involved in the internal politics of each other's country. The Chinese partners are the agents of a government that can rule China again only if the United States destroys Mao's forces in an all-out war. The American partners are an ill-assorted lot—honest men deeply concerned with the plight of the Chinese people and of Chiang Kai-shek; fanatics possessed by the nightmare of a Communist conspiracy centering on some of America's highest leaders; and politicians who will stop at nothing in their hunt for power.

This partnership of Chinese-American fear, ambition, and greed is the China lobby—a nondescript tentacular affair that manages to use the craft of professional operators and the good will of well-intentioned amateurs. While what is left of Chiang's army is rusting in Formosa, the lobby's operators are employing all their mental and financial resources in the United States. In the last couple of years, they have had remarkable success. Once more the big lie has proved to be unanswerable and undebatable. Weird, unsavory characters have made their names famous or infamous—they don't seem to care which—in public life. Yet all this is far from being the exclusive accomplishment of the China lobby. No deliberate beclouding of issues, no demagogical trickery could have worked so well if the American people had not been baffled and frightened by the fall of China.

During the war, Franklin Roosevelt decided that China was to be considered a great power. It was said then that if China did not exist, it would have to be invented, for it was the only great Asian power on which we could count after the war was won. Of all the Asian peoples, the Chinese are certainly the most numerous, and their numbers plus the vastnes of their territory were taken as the sure evidence of greatness.

Winston Churchill, an expert on power, could hardly conceal his astonishment when Roosevelt insisted that China had to be one of the wartime Big Four. At the Cairo Conference, where Roosevelt took him to meet Generalissimo and Mme. Chiang, Churchill thought the best thing all four could do was to go and take a look at the Pyramids.

For all his knowledge of our country, the half-American Churchill failed to realize two things. The first is the newly developed American habit of adopting favorite or pet countries—Spain (Republican or Franco), or China, or, for that matter, Britain. The second is the particularly warm spot China held in American hearts. The Chinese were different from us and did not care; their civilization was self-contained and yet friendly; they did not try to imitate our ways of living, as the Japanese did so pedantically. Indeed, the Chinese were the pet foreigners of most antiforeign or isolationist Americans who by patronizing China could pay a safe tribute to the brotherhood of man. China was a sort of Shangri-La, exotic, and, in its essence, unchangeable, yet touristically as well as emotionally accessible. Everything was different in China—even the Communists.

Throughout the war there was a considerable difference between the official notions about China in Washington and the hard facts of life in China—something like the difference between the legal and the black-market value of the Chinese dollar. Such discrepancies invariably lend themselves to the profiteering raids of speculators.

The same fiat that promoted China to the exalted role of a great world power prescribed that it produce, practically overnight, a fairly efficient and honest administration, a reasonably disciplined army, and the checks and balances of western democracy. At the end of the war China was scheduled to become one of the arbiter nations, firmly on the democratic side, with a permanent seat on the Security Council of the United Nations.

The leader of the Chinese Republic, Chiang Kai-shek, had proved his mettle when he kept his nation fighting even after such a disaster as the fall of Canton in 1938. Perhaps this unfortunate man once had the strength to modernize his own government. With enlightened ruthlessness, Kemal Atatürk did this for Turkey. Conceivably, Chiang Kai-shek might have succeeded if his power had not been so personal and raw, if he had let it become institutional, disciplined, and respectful of other people's rights, if after the Japanese surrender he had let Americans run his army and his administration, if we had had the officers and administrators to export to China, if our people—Republicans included—had been willing to send American divisions to keep order in China and stop the Communist advance.

Having listed all these "ifs," one has to conclude that the odds were against Chiang. When China became a battleground in the world-wide conflict between communism and democracy, he could be neither his old self, the toughest of the war lords, nor the popular leader of a fighting democracy. Under the floodlight of publicity, his country lost even the privacy of its centuries-old corruption. One after the other, all the causes of Chinese ruin—misrule, Japanese invasion, American misinformation, Japanese surrender, which put too many weapons in the hands of too many trigger-happy Chinese—all tumbled down on the Chinese people and on Chiang until the day of consummation, when Mao won.

Among the causes of Chiang's fall, we have left out one, which was perhaps the most decisive: the reassurance given him by his agents and zealots in America that he need not mend his ways nor reform anything, for a coming election or a congressional move would open up unlimited, unconditional American support. When China fell, these same people scouted around for culprits among American publicists or State Department officials. They suspected everybody—except themselves.

The extraordinary thing is that Chiang's very defeat won the lobby professionals almost as much influence over American opinion as they had boasted they had while Chiang was still fighting. Chiang's humiliation and the bewilderment of the American people gave them their richest opportunity.

The lobby now set itself a new, grandiose goal: to undo the Communist conquest of the Chinese mainland. If the United States is dragged into all-out war with Red China by a public-relations-forged chain of destiny, we might, of course, find ourselves alone and friendless. But that does not worry the China lobby operators, for in their opinion none of our allies except Chiang is worth much, and Europe is doomed anyway. In their effort to manufacture the inevitable, these operators do all they can to dull the people's alertness to the dangers we are facing all over the world and to play on the people's confusion and fear. They keep bludgeoning that branch of the Executive—the State Department—which is supposed to

seek political or diplomatic alternatives to impending military conflicts.

In fact, even the victory our soldiers have won in Korea is being misrepresented and frustrated. There democratic armies have come to grips with the Communist Chinese forces and have stopped them—something Chiang could never do. But the set-back we have imposed on Mao, the punishment we have given him, cannot be cashed in by our diplomats for even to mention a conditional peace with Mao—the hard peace he deserves—has become evidence of treasonable intentions.

The passion for China seems to have acted like a curse on many outstanding people who were initially prompted by a sincere wish to stem the enemy advance on that forlorn front. The lobby's full-time professionals have been quite clever in using the names and the reputations of all those who have had anything to do with China and want that country free. It would be a great injustice to confuse the many honest men who still have Chiang's cause at heart with the unscrupulous lobby operators.

In this series of articles, which will be concluded in the next issue, the Reporter has tried to give the historical background and a description of what the lobby actually is and does. We had to go into history, for one of the main efforts of the lobby is to rewrite recent American history. As for the exposure of lobby operations, we know that we have done little more than scratch the surface. A publication does not have the power of subpena. But we thought that the job had to be done and that somebody had to make a start.

THE CHINA LOBBY

I—THE LEGACY OF T. V. SOONG

The so-called China lobby—which is much more than a lobby, since it exerts a relentless pressure on United States foreign and domestic policies—was born in 1940, when China stood alone and gallant against Japan. In June of that year, T. V. Soong, a clever and charming member of China's most powerful family, arrived in Washington, with no title, to get more help for the government of his brother-in-law, Chiang Kai-shek. His companion in this venture was a clever and charming Pole named Ludwig Rajchman, who had been a League of Nations health expert and was well acquainted in diplomatic circles. Now, 12 years later, the thoroughly Americanized Soong has withdrawn to a sort of exile in Riverdale, on the Hudson just above Manhattan. Rajchman too is in a sort of exile; far from Poland, he lives in Paris and runs errands for the Communist government of his country.

For several years prior to 1940, the United States had been helping China on a basis that was considered businesslike. Two stabilization credits of $50 million each were granted by the Treasury in 1937 and 1941, and in the interim the Export-Import Bank advanced $120,000,000 against the sale of Chinese products to the United States. But to T. V. Soong, this was a few drops in the bucket of China's needs.

Soong, tall and, for a Chinese, burly, carries himself like a man of consequence. He was educated at Harvard and Columbia and clerked a while in a National City Bank subsidiary before going back to China to make money. His father, a Shanghai printer named Charlie Jones Soong, had somehow saved enough to send his six children to America for their education and thereby had founded a dynasty. His second daughter married Sun Yat-sen, the founder of the Chinese Republic. His eldest daughter married a seventy-fifth descendant of Confucius (Kung Fu-tse), H. H. Kung, a banker's chubby son known as "Daddy," or to his family as "Chauncey." The youngest daughter married Chiang Kai-shek in 1927, and T. V. Soong, who, one of his sisters said, "knows something about money," was named Minister of Finance in 1928.

In 1933, Chiang, whose relations with T. V. are often rancorous, relieved him of his Ministry and of the Acting Presidency of the Executive Yuan, and for the next 7 years Soong devoted himself to the acquisition of a fortune he once estimated at $9,000,000. (A former friend put Soong's holdings in the United States alone at $47,000,000 by 1944.) Soong's successor as Finance Minister was his brother-in-law, H. H. Kung, who also knew something about money. The bitter rivalry between Kung and Soong, in which Chiang usually took Kung's side, has been attributed in part to the fact that Mme. Kung had grown up to think of herself as the leader of the six children and did not easily yield to her impatient, often scornful younger brother. Mme. Chiang inclined to side with her sister rather than with her brother. The result of this family quarrel was that Chiang hated Soong and was contemptuous of Kung, Soong despised both the others, and Kung put up with Chiang's insults when he had to. But Kung and Soong have had one idea in common: to get all they could get from the United States for China, which in their minds meant China's ruling family. There is a story that when a legalistic American official once questioned Soong's authority to sign a document for his country, since he had no title, Soong replied: "I am China."

An American who worked with both Kung and Soong has said of them: "Kung seemed a many-sided character—at once aware of, and capable of dealing in, terms of the highest western standards of public morality and adept at operating in the Chinese milieu of squeeze, graft, family political considerations, pseudo-feudal relationships, and vendetta tactics against opponents. In him, in his days of power, there coexisted the China of the nineteenth century and the nascent modern China that antedated the Communist victory. Soong was more completely western, in the style of the American empire builders of the turn of the century, identifying the potential progress of China with the growth of his own fortunes, contemptuous of his backward countrymen, and buying and drawing to himself Americans of like ambition, greed, drive, and executive ability."

Americans have been impressed by Soong's flair for exotic, expensive gestures. In the spring of 1946 his wife, to whom he is deeply devoted, fell ill. Soong chartered a private plane in Nanking to go to Connecticut to pick up a cargo of dogwood, of which Mme. Soong is particularly fond. The bouquet must have cost between twenty and thirty thousand dollars.

T. V. Soong and Ludwig Rajchman sized up Washington rapidly when they arrived in 1940. Each of them had a highly developed genius for understanding how the disparate parts of a complicated structure like a government bureaucracy fit together. They soon saw that official Washington was a jungle of departments, often with overlapping functions and the usual hostility toward one another. The best way to get something done was to collect influential friends who could circumvent or overwhelm opposition.

Rajchman's coterie

Rajchman was a past master at collecting influential friends. His sophistication, his charm, and his tough-minded sense of history made him particularly popular among the young New Deal reformers who had suddenly found themselves, somewhat uneasily, reforming not only a nation but a world. A talk with Rajchman was the intellectual equivalent of a trip around the globe. He led the young men from fascinating assumptions, like the one that China was a great power, to breathtaking vistas of things to come on a somewhat leftist wave of the future.

The best place for Soong and Rajchman to have friends was, of course, in the White House, whose master also favored the hypothesis that China was, or would soon turn into, a great world power. In December 1940, President Roosevelt made his remarks to the press about what to do with your garden hose if your neighbor's house catches fire, and in March 1941, Congress passed the first Lend-Lease Act. Advised by Rajchman, Soong set up China Defense Supplies, Inc., patterned loosely on the British Purchasing Commission. It was the obvious agency to represent China on lend-lease matters. At the President's own suggestion, Soong retained as head of his agency William S. Youngman, Jr., who had been a general counsel for the Federal Power Commission and had Roosevelt's confidence. Soong and Youngman staffed China Defense Supplies with influential Americans and a few persuasive Chinese. The Chinese were the technical "experts," the Americans the "advisers."

Youngman took with him a young lawyer named Whiting Willauer, who had worked with him in the Government. The counsel for China Defense Supplies was Thomas G. Corcoran, to whom the White House door was always open. Corcoran's brother David also got a job, as did Harry Price, whose brother Frank was an important missionary in China. These men made good salaries and better contacts. Beyond the official personnel of China Defense Supplies, "Lulu" Rajchman drew to himself a sort of graduate seminar made up of bright young officials whom he introduced to some of the bright foreigners who were assembling in Washington. Soong himself made friends with such White House intimates as Henry Morgenthau, Harry Hopkins, Admiral Harry E. Yarnell, and Lauchlin Currie, and improved his acquaintance with such journalists as Henry Luce, Roy Howard, and Joseph Alsop. Soong once boasted to a State Department official: "There is practically nothing that goes on in your Government of which I do not learn within 3 days." Rajchman went him one better. He claimed results in 15 minutes.

Muzzling a reporter

With the way made smooth from top to bottom, Chinese requests for lend-lease items would be endorsed by Currie or Hopkins, "expedited" by China Defense men, and supported in lend-lease, where, as in other departments and agencies, disciples of Rajchman's or friends of Corcoran's were to be found. The zealots cut across lines of authority for what they considered a noble purpose. The Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, was bypassed and scorned in much the same way that Dean Acheson is now bypassed and scorned by the present friends of Nationalist China. Once the principle that the end justifies the means is firmly established, the means have a way of perpetuating themselves even after the end has been changed. The principle is one that the China lobby, through all its metamorphoses, has faithfully observed.

Soon after Pearl Harbor, Chiang Kai-shek, with a keen sense of the new value of his resistance to the Japanese, let it be known that a loan of $1,000,000,000, half from Britain and half from the United States, would be greatly appreciated. The American Ambassador in Chungking, Clarence E. Gauss, wrote home that the figure was much too high and would invite attempts at misuse by banking and government elements, and thereby earned the hostility not only of the banking and government elements in China but also of their friends in the United States.

At about this time, Leland Stowe wrote a series of outraged dispatches for the Chicago Daily News syndicate, only two of which ever saw publication—in the first week of January, 1942. In them he documented the charge that "because the Burma Road has for years been dominated by racketeers and

war profiteers, 10,000 Chinese soldiers have gone without rifles, hand grenades, or munitions." It happened that the owner of the Chicago Daily News, Frank Knox, who was also Secretary of the Navy, had been emphasizing in his speeches that Germany took precedence over Japan as an enemy. The Stowe dispatches put T. V. Soong in a fury. Soong, who had become foreign minister in December 1941, protested vehemently to the White House. For a time, the talk in Washington was that China might quit the war. From a high authority came the order to kill the rest of Stowe's dispatches.

A few weeks later, on February 7, 1942, a bill granting China the half billion dollars Chiang had requested went through Congress in record time. The State Department's chief adviser on Far Eastern affairs, Stanley Hornbeck, did his best to get a clause into the agreement providing for consultation about how the credit was to be used, but Soong and his friends were able to override him, and the money was China's to use as its government chose.

The "good" lobby

To the extent that Soong's wartime pressure group was a lobby, it was, in the eyes of 9 out of 10 of the Americans who helped it, a "good" lobby. The Chinese who pocketed some of the money and the Americans who profited later may have been in it with a degree of cynicism, but to the rest it was a patriotic effort to help a victim of aggression and, after Pearl Harbor, an ally.

Most of the fervor of the early New Deal had been transferred to getting the war won, but it was not uncommon in Washington to hear talk of the postwar New Deal in Britain, in Latin America, in China—even in Russia. Rajchman helped to focus the hopes of those who wanted a New Deal for China on T. V. Soong, although Rajchman must have known that Soong was usually on the outs with the rest of his family, that he had little popular following in China, and that the measure of Chiang's desperation was that he had turned to the brother-in-law he loathed. But Soong was the right man for Washington, and not much news got through from China in those days.

Since the late 1930's China had attracted many of the ardent anti-Fascists who had devoted themselves to the cause of Republican Spain. Journalists, students, and the rootless converged on China from Europe and America; once there, they found themselves of use and importance. Some saw in the Chinese Communists a band more dedicated, more social-minded, and seemingly more patriotic than the Nationalists, and Americans began to read about the long march and the land reforms. Some went to work for the Nationalist Government, at better salaries than they could have commanded at home, and served it as propagandists, although they would not have used that term. Most of them endeavored to be objective reporters, but they were hampered by their admiration for China and by the conditions under which they themselves lived.

It is hard to be objective under bombing, and Chungking was incessantly bombed. It is hard to be objective when censored, and the censorship was strict. It is hard to be objective when the belly is stuffed, and the correspondents were lavishly wined and dined. To the accounts that they were sending home of China's glorious fight were added the reports, going straight to the grass roots, from the missionaries who had been flatteringly entertained by the Christian Generalissimo and his lady.

Happy sailing

The activities of T. V. Soong and his group, therefore, were carried on under the happiest of circumstances. In the White House was a President determined to make China a great power; Soong had nursed his friendship there, particularly with Lauchlin Currie, one of his closest collaborators. The press treated China as a staunch ally. Private relief agencies, such as United China Relief, collected thousands of dollars for China, and the churches where the missionaries spoke collected thousands of pennies. And yet even in those days of idealism and hope, aid to China was being used as a lever to pry loose more aid.

The men in Washington were largely ignorant of the temptations and pitfalls of international power politics. They were impatient, determined to bring about the ends they sought before a change of the political wind could blow them out of power. And so they developed ruthless techniques that later were to be turned against them and against men who had little or nothing to do with the original controversy. A Tydings who couldn't be purged as a reactionary in 1938 was to be purged as a friend of liberals 12 years later.

There is a man who must smile at all this now. Ludwig Rajchman had a hand in making China a great power, but Mao Tse-tung, not Chiang Kai-shek, is master of the Chinese mainland. Not even Ludwig Rajchman could foresee this outcome during his Washington days, but undoubtedly he did his bit to expedite the process of Chinese history. A free-wheeling Marxist all his life, he sees the work he has done in Washington largely vindicated by the unexpected results. In Washington, however, the wave of the future is not going toward the left. In fact, the organization that was established there back in 1940, thanks largely to a marginal leftist, has been seized by the marginal right.

II—THE PATTERN OF ENRICHMENT

"You must know the truth if China is to be saved," wrote the Australian newspaperman W. H. Donald to his friend Mme. Chiang Kai-shek in 1934, "and the truth is rotten officialdom—squeeze, corruption, militarism, overtaxation. * * * Unless you or someone initiates a move to install honesty quickly, China will die. It is dying now."

That same year Demaree Bess, now of the Saturday Evening Post, reported in the Christian Science Monitor that the Kuomintang was discredited and that either the Japanese or the Chinese Communists probably would win control of China. Three years later Japan struck, at the Marco Polo Bridge.

In the 4 years that China alone was at war with Japan, warnings like these were overlooked in this country. After Pearl Harbor, President Roosevelt's policy was that China was a great power or had to be propped up to look like one—as a counterweight to Japan and, if need be, the Soviet Union. This, of course, meant keeping China in the war as an active, if not very effective, belligerent. Since Chiang Kai-shek could say "Yes" or "No" to this, the fundamental weakness and disorganization of his government were ignored or played down.

Vinegar Joe

For a time, little criticism of China's military effort was heard in the United States. But as the war went on, United States military leaders grew more critical. General Marshall picked Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell to go to China and put more life into Chiang's resistance. Stilwell was carefully investigated by Secretary of War Stimson, who then arranged with T. V. Soong for Stilwell to be made chief of staff to Chiang Kai-shek, with virtual control over the Chinese Army. But Soong was afraid to make this clear to Chiang, which was the main reason for the bitter antagonism between Chiang and Stilwell for the next 2½ years, ending in Stilwell's dismissal.

Stilwell's assignment was to create an efficient Chinese Army, trained in the use of American supplies. He soon found that he could not make an army out of hungry, barefoot peasants until they were decently fed and honestly paid; nor could he make leaders out of inefficient, grafting officers. In Burma, where Stilwell had the power to pick his generals, the Chinese divisions fought bravely and well.

The feud between Stilwell and Gen. Claire Chennault—whose grandiose plan for developing China as an air theater appealed to the President—was corollary to the Chiang-Stilwell enmity. These quarrels soon involved diplomats, journalists, and the traveling representatives of everybody from the President to the aid societies. It was discovered—and vehemently denied—that Nationalist China was still as inefficient and corrupt as Donald and Bess had reported in 1934.

The conflict in China was reflected in Washington, and Soong's smooth-running machine began to break down. Lauchlin Currie made a trip to China in the summer of 1942, his second; he came back less enthusiastic than he had started out. Soong began to bypass Currie and deal directly with Harry Hopkins or the President. Yet for a time Currie remained sufficiently deferential to Soong to support the appointment of Whiting Willauer—direct from Soong's own employ—to a Foreign Economic Administration post that gave him supervision over both lend-lease to China and purchases from China.

Joseph Alsop, another intimate of both T. V. Soong and Rajchman, went to China on a lend-lease mission, with a pipeline to the White House. He stayed to join Chennault and become a bitter critic of Stilwell and of the State Department men who believed in military collaboration with the Communists. Yet these men have had no more gallant defender than Joseph Alsop against the charges that they were Communists.

By 1944 T. V. Soong had returned to China, gone through one of the Generalissimo's celebrated teacup-smashing tantrums, devoted himself for a time to the Chinese classics, and had once again been restored to power as premier. With Soong up, Kung went down and out as Minister of Finance.

Soong must have been well aware of some of the uses to which American aid was put in China. Under the 11-year ministry of Dr. Kung, those on good terms with the Minister of Finance had taken their cut of this aid—nothing unusual in a country where government-by-family had become a habit. The $500,000,000 stabilization fund of 1942, on which the United States Treasury had pinned so much hope, was used to the hilt; Madame Kung, for one, would buy Chinese dollars on the Shanghai exchange just before new credits to the fund were publicly announced, then sell when the announcement sent the currency up temporarily—thereby, of course, helping to send it back down.

The 20-to-1 fixed rate of exchange between the Chinese and the United States dollar that the Treasury had pressed for before Pearl Harbor enabled the Chinese Government to sell currency to the United States Army at many times its open-market value and to help its friends by buying their Chinese currency with United States dollars at the fixed rate. About $220,000,000 of the $500,000,000 that Soong got in Washington in 1942 was used to buy gold from the United States, ostensibly to stabilize the currency. Much of it was put on sale in China under circumstances that allowed insiders to make big killings in a single evening. One of the largest purchasers was Jeannette Kung, the minister's second daughter.

Two hundred million of the $500,000,000 loan was put aside to be used for eventual redemption of United States dollar bonds and savings certificates issued by the Chinese Government. The bonds were never redeemed, but the well-informed were able to unload before the redemption clause was publicly revoked. The savings certificates were quickly taken up by those who knew—as the general public did not know—that

they, unlike the bonds, would in fact be redeemed. T. V. Soong, it has been reported, invested 5,000,000 United States dollars in these securities as a patriotic duty. The Kung family, by the same report, was 14 times as patriotic; its members invested $70,000,000. "It is most unfortunate," Henry Morgenthau wrote to T. V. Soong in 1945, "that the impression has arisen in the United States that the $200,000,000 of United States dollar certificates and bonds and the gold sold to China have gone into relatively few hands with resultant large individual profits, and have failed to be of real assistance to the Chinese economy."

One day in 1945, after Dr. Kung had left the Ministry, his luggage was opened during a flight over the "hump" into China and was found to contain a million dollars in cash. He said at the time that $9,000,000 more was in New York awaiting shipment to him, and that the million he was carrying was insured in the United States for safe transit. In short, Dr. Kung really didn't much care. The air-force officials, who were forbidden to carry such cargo, made a hasty compromise. Chauncey and his baggage stayed on the plane, but the other nine millions stayed in New York.

As Premier, T. V. Soong got rid of Kung, but not of the government's old financial habits. T. V.'s brother T. L. ran the export-import office. Another brother, T. A., ran the salt-tax bureau. When UNRRA aid began flowing into China in 1945, T. V. Soong tried to bring its distribution under his control. This gave rise to bitterness, confusion, and inefficiency, as a result of which UNRRA fired its chief of mission and director of operations—the latter over the strong protest of Premier Soong. Chinese attacks on UNRRA began.

The reorganized staff stood by its guns and soon discovered that relief supplies were being mishandled. There were reports, for instance, that blood plasma was being sold on the black market. Congestion in the port of Shanghai and delays in landing essential supplies in favor of black-marketable material got so bad that UNRRA's Director General, Fiorello La Guardia, imposed a temporary embargo on most shipments.

Feeding the CAT

Among those Americans with whom Soong had grown friendly in Washington were Whiting Willauer and General Chennault. In 1948 Soong helped Chennault and Willauer become owners of a highly profitable airline. Civil Air Transport, or CAT, grew into China Air Transport, and now operates in the Philippines, Korea, Formosa, and Japan—the largest privately owned airline in the Far East. This was probably one of the neatest examples of the use to which American relief was put.

Arguing the prospect of a serious famine in the interior in 1946, Chennault and Willauer, who was then practicing law in Shanghai, enlisted the support of T. V. Soong and Madam Chiang for a proposal that UNRRA provide the equipment for an airline to fly relief supplies to remote provinces. Chennault was to run the airline. Since China already had two airlines, the proposition was opposed as wasteful by all responsible UNRRA officials, and was turned down by La Guardia. Chennault and his old friend Tommy Corcoran, however, continue to high-pressure La Guardia; and shortly before he resigned as director he was called in for consultation by the State Department and told that both Soong and Madame Chiang had insisted on the need for the airline. LaGuardia reversed himself.

UNRRA earmarked $1,675,000 for planes and equipment and bought 22 United States Army Air Force surplus transports for a total cost of $425,000, or less than $20,000 per plane, about one-tenth of their original value. Another 25 planes were supplied at $5,000 per plane, with the stipulation that they be cannibalized for spare parts; later, on the payment of an additional $7,000, some of the 25 were released for flying. Under their agreement with the Chinese, Chennault and Willauer were to put up $1,000,000 in operating capital. They had to put up nothing to buy planes and equipment; they were allowed to buy them out of the profits of the airline, which carried relief supplies to the interior at a fixed rate, but came back loaded with commercial cargo at whatever rates the traffic would bear.

Although China was pressed for dollars, Chennault and Willauer, as good friends of the government, were able to exchange their Chinese dollar profits for United States dollars at the fixed rate of exchange. The open-market rate, which determined the prices CAT charged, was many times the legal rate. And so the planes, which cost the American taxpayer about $200,000 apiece, became the airline's property for a small fraction of that.

"Talking to" Senators

Thus, in part, was the membership of the expanding China lobby enlisted and rewarded. General Chennault has been one of the most persistent lobbyists for the cause of Nationalist China, and his counsel, Tommy Corcoran, has continued to do favors for T. V. Soong. Chennault testified for China aid in 1948, when an application to operate his enlarged airline commercially was under consideration by the Chinese Government, and still later said he had "talked to" 85 of the 96 Senators about legislation to give aid to the Nationalists. He has signed a score of articles for magazines and newspapers, ghost-written for the most part by Scripps-Howard's Clyde Farnsworth and a former Time correspondent, Edward B. Lockett.

A minor foreign-exchange scandal and a major quarrel with Chiang over control of China's economy (by this time heavily dominated by the military) forced T. V. Soong to resign as Premier in 1947. With Soong down, Kung went up, or at least regained control of the Bank of China. Shortly after that, Kung moved to the United States, transferring his office to the New York agency of the bank. Soong, after a sojourn in Europe, also came to this country, and the Government was left in the hands of Chiang Kai-shek and the Chinese Communists clique of the brothers Chen.

How much of the American money sent to China has returned to this country for one purpose or another—pump priming for further assistance or just for personal enrichment—will probably never be known; Government agencies cannot even agree on how much money has gone to China. Estimates of the latter, confused by different methods of computing material aid, vary from $5,000,000,000 down to $3,500,000,000. Overseas holdings of private Chinese have been estimated at as much as $3,000,000,000, and seldom at less than $1,000,000,000. Some of this money has been used for speculation. Some has been used to persuade the United States to be even more open-handed.

Tin to Tientsin

A few weeks before the outbreak of the Korean war, a group of prominent Chinese bought 6,986,000 bushels of soybeans on the Chicago Board of Trade at $2.34 a bushel. Five days after the Communist invasion of South Korea the price went to $3.45. In August and September 1949, the Yangtze Trading Corp. illegally shipped tinplate to Communist-held Tientsin. For this, the corporation was barred from licensing for trade with any country for 3 years. The largest stockholder in the Yangtze Trading Corp. is H. H. Kung's son David.

Early in 1950, Alfred Kohlberg, a once obscure textile importer who by this time had come to have a profound interest in the fortunes of Nationalist China, wrote a joint letter to Drs. Kung and Soong, which was inserted with their replies in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND. Mr. Kohlberg quoted an item in Newsweek's "Periscope," which had said: "The Administration has an ace up its sleeve in case criticism of its Formosa and China policy becomes too hot. It is ready to disclose how Chinese Nationalist officials sold out their country by transferring personal funds and assets to the United States. The Treasury has the names and figures at its fingertips." Mr. Kohlberg suggested that Drs. Kung and Soong authorize the Treasury to publish the figures after their names, "as statements such as the above are a gross exaggeration."

Dr. Soong replied that he "did not choose to dignify the untruthful attacks by pro-Communists in the American press by any notice"—thereby becoming the first person to call Newsweek pro-Communist—but later he authorized publication of the figures. Dr. Kung, who knew better than Newsweek how little the Treasury knew, wrote under the letterhead of the New York Agency of the Bank of China that he was "perfectly agreeable" to the publication of his "personal" accounts, and added: "Owing to the Communist troubles, I have lost all my businesses and properties in China. What I was able to salvage was barely enough for the maintenance of myself and family for the time being."

III—VOICES IN THE WILDERNESS

For a time after T. V. Soong left Washington, late in 1943, there was no effective pressure group for China at work in this country, except for the devotees Soong and Rajchman had left behind. For a time, there was no need for high-powered Chinese in Washington, since high-powered Americans had acquired the habit of going to Chungking—people like Wendell Willkie, Vice President Wallace, and men whom Franklin Roosevelt wanted to get out of the way with a vague assignment. By and large, with the help of the American pilgrims, Chiang got what he wanted—even on so controversial a matter as the firing of General Stilwell.

The administration and the people who later became its harshest critics seemed to agree on most points. There was then what may be called a bipartisan foreign policy—even about relations with the Red Chinese. Ambassador Patrick J. Hurley, who first had gone to Chungking as the President's envoy, flew to Mao Tse-tung's humble headquarters in Yenan, where he amiably shouted "Yahoo!" while performing an Indian war dance at a Communist banquet, and then settled down to discuss terms for a coalition government. In the spring of 1945, General Hurley went to Moscow to talk over the Nationalist-Communist controversy with Generalissimo Stalin, and later reported that he and the Russians saw eye to eye on the whole problem.

Later the concessions that the United States had made to Russia at Yalta, at China's expense, were to put the administration permanently on the wrong side of the China enthusiasts. But when the Chinese-Soviet treaty, in which China agreed openly to what Roosevelt and Churchill had promised secretly, was signed on the day of the Japanese surrender, it was hailed exuberantly by most of the American partisans of Chiang. To cheer up his friend, T. V. Soong, who feared that he had signed away too much in Moscow, Henry R. Luce ran an editorial in Life lauding the treaty, and in the November China Monthly Alfred Kohlberg praised President Truman for inducing the Russians to be so reasonable at Potsdam.

On VJ-day, Manchuria was occupied by Soviet troops. North China, where there were nearly three million Japanese soldiers and civilians to be evacuated, was occupied by the Chinese Communists. This posed a problem totally unlike any in Europe. Secretary Acheson stated it 6 years later at the MacArthur hearings: "They were people who had a defined area, with a large

population subject to their control, 116,000,000. They had a government of their own; they had an army of their own; and in effect they had a separate country within China, and the task was to put these two things together so that there would be one country and one government."

In the fall of 1945, practically everybody in Washington would have agreed. The late James V. Forrestal, one of the few who were already worrying about our relations with Russia, wrote: "The most important military element in the Far East favorable to the United States is a unified China, including Manchuria, friendly to the United States." The way to get a unified China was either by waging war against the Chinese Communists and the Soviet forces in Manchuria or by trying again to reconcile the Nationalists and the Communists. No one was crying for war. In a cable of December 7, 1945, Generals MacArthur and Wedemeyer and Admiral Spruance suggested that "United States assistance to China * * * be made available as a basis for negotiation by the American Ambassador to bring together and effect a compromise between the major opposing groups in order to promote a united democratic China." Nor was the idea of negotiation and eventual coalition a forcible import into China from the West. Off and on, the Kuomintang and the Chinese Communists entertained the possibility of burying the hatchet. Occasionally they did bury it.

The early worriers

For all this superficial harmony, the elements of a new pressure group were already in being; after VJ-day they rapidly began shaping themselves into a loose coagulation. This group would eventually include the "realists" who saw the dangers of a Communist victory in China, the opportunists concerned either with their own enrichment or the aggrandizement of the extreme right, and the evangelists—incorruptible themselves and refusing to believe that a government led by Chiang could be corrupt beyond redemption. In the latter stages of the war, all these voices had begun to be heard. One of them belonged to a Congressman from Minnesota, Dr. WALTER JUDD.

Dr. JUDD had begun his public career as a crusader against the exploitation of China by foreigners, including his countrymen. He had gone to China in 1925 as a medical missionary and had run a hospital in Shaowu, Fukien Province, a region infested with malaria and bandits, for 5 years, until 46 attacks of malaria forced him to return to the United States. After 2 years he had gone back to head a hospital in Fenchow that became a haven for both Nationalists and Communists fleeing before the conquering Japanese armies. After the capture of Fenchow, in February 1938, Dr. JUDD had stayed on for 5 months, observing the Japanese at first hand. Then he went home and conducted a slimly financed speaking tour that lasted 2 years and covered 46 States.

Dr. JUDD spoke before mission boards, in churches, in the open air—anywhere he could get an audience. He spoke about the danger of Japanese expansion and the need of justice for China. At that time he had good things to say about the Chinese Communists. In Pittsburgh one Sunday in 1938, he spoke five times under the auspices of the Committee for Boycott Against Japan, which had been organized by a local businessman named Frederick C. McKee. This was the beginning of a long association.

The idea that Dr. JUDD run for Congress came from the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, owned by the Cowles brothers. Dr. JUDD is reported to have laughed it off at first, but the newspaper got his campaign going, and he won the Republican nomination and the election. That was in the fall of 1942.

In Congress, Dr. JUDD remained a liberal and a missionary. He was quoted in the Nation as saying: "I want to do all I can for China. Two very practical things can be done: To end the poll tax and the Immigration Exclusion Act. Both of them rankle in the mind of the Orient. We may win the war without getting rid of them, but we won't be able to prevent another one." He was largely responsible for the passage, in 1943, of the Magnuson bill repealing the Chinese Exclusion Act. In November 1943 he said that the United States must "make clear its own intentions in the Orient in view of Prime Minister Churchill's declared intention to reestablish the British Empire in the Far East."

Up to 1944, Dr. JUDD had little, if anything to say against Franklin Roosevelt's policies in the Far East. But in that summer he charged that China was getting only enough military supplies to enable the country to hang on. After a trip to China he campaigned vigorously for Governor Dewey. In March 1945 Dr. JUDD, no longer a friend of China's Communists, made a major speech in Congress on China, in which he pleaded for patience with a government that had been fighting a losing war for 7 years. "In a sense, if one wants to be cynical," said Dr. JUDD, "Chiang Kai-shek has made only two major mistakes. One was that he did not give up at the end of the first 3 months of the war. * * * The second mistake * * * is that he did not completely clean out Communists in 1938 and 1939, when some of his generals wanted him to."

This, in the early days, was the voice of Dr. JUDD, then as now a selfless, altogether dedicated man who had seen China suffer and had suffered with it. There were other such voices, among them Henry Luce's.

The pattern is embroidered

A shrillier voice was that of the aforementioned importer of Chinese embroidery, Alfred Kohlberg, against whom in 1943 the Federal Trade Commission issued a cease-and-desist order for selling Chinese-made lace under fancy European names. About the same time, Mr. Kohlberg began to show active dissatisfaction with American policy in China and started his long hunt, which is still in progress, for the culprits.

His first major target was the Institute of Pacific Relations, an international organization devoted to far-eastern studies, which has been a target of the McCarran subcommittee since last summer. Though Mr. Kohlberg had been an obscure member of the institute for many years, it was not until the war that he became critical of its activities. He was also at the time a director of the American Bureau of Medical Aid to China, and thus in a position to expand his contacts with important Nationalists. He came to know H. H. Kung, Archbishop Paul Yupin, various Nationalist generals, and eventually the Generalissimo himself. Mr. Kohlberg soon became convinced that our Embassy in Chungking was the center of a plot to discredit the Nationalist Government. This, in turn, reinforced his suspicions about the occasional criticism of Chiang and his regime to be found in IPR publications. The institute, as a research agency, was in frequent contact with the State Department, particularly with its China hands.

This was all that Mr. Kohlberg needed to go on. In the fall of 1944 he started a one-man campaign within the institute to "clear it of Communists." The fight was to last for 2 years before Mr. Kohlberg's defeat by a vote of the membership, but Henry Luce thought there was enough in the charges to withdraw his subscription and that of Time, Inc.—a position that was to be reversed in 1951, when the subscriptions were restored.

The first public hints of trouble to come were provided by two famous episodes in 1945. The first of these was the Amerasia case, which broke in the press in June; the second was General Hurley's resignation as Ambassador to China in November.

The Amerasia case

The Amerasia affair, originally played by the press as a case of espionage in the State Department, involved six people who were charged before a grand jury not with treason but with "conspiracy to embezzle and remove official documents without permission." Of the six, three were Government employees: John Stewart Service, a young State Department career man who had been attached to General Stilwell's staff in China as a political adviser; Andrew Roth, a reserve lieutenant in the office of Naval Intelligence; and Emmanuel Larsen, a wartime employee of the State Department. The other three were Philip Jaffe and Kate Mitchell, editors of Amerasia, a left-wing magazine on far eastern affairs; and a free-lance writer named Mark Gayn. The documents seized in the Amerasia office were classified reports from the Office of Naval Intelligence, the State Department, the Office of War Information, and other agencies.

After sitting for several weeks the grand jury concluded that there was no proof that any of the documents had been stolen, though there were indications that some had been loaned out. It also concluded there was no evidence of treasonable intention in connection with the documents, and very few of them could be considered as seriously involving the national defense. In the end the grand jury refused to indict Miss Mitchell, Mr. Gayn, and Mr. Service. The latter was forthwith assigned to the staff of General MacArthur in Tokyo. Of the three indicted, Mr. Jaffe pleaded guilty and was fined $2,500; Mr. Larsen pleaded nolo contendere and got off with a fine of $500; and the Justice Department decided not to prosecute Lieutenant Roth for lack of evidence. Since then the Amerasia affair has been reviewed by a committee of the House in 1946, by a special grand jury in New York in 1950, and by the Tydings committee in 1950. None of these had any serious disagreement with the original disposition of the case.

Hurley's farewell

In late November 1945, General Hurley abruptly resigned as Ambassador to China, publicly charging that a considerable section of our State Department is endeavoring to support communism generally as well as specifically in China. Had it not been for the gravity of the charges, the subsequent hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee would have come near being high political farce.

The irascible and talkative general displayed a marked gift for bewildering his audience. He identified the Chinese Communists with the imperialist bloc of nations that was trying to keep China divided. He said: "Russia is not supporting the Communist Party in China. Russia does not want dissensions or civil war in China."

By early summer of 1949, Alfred Kohlberg, Frederick McKee, and all the other pro-Chiang volunteers had not succeeded in capturing the public's imagination. Alfred Kohlberg, the busiest of them all, had for years been denouncing the "Communist conspiracy in the State Department" to a growing but still parochial audience.

Around the time Mr. Kohlberg wrote his letter to Robert S. Allen, the first trial of Alger Hiss came to an end with a hung jury. The 8 to 4 verdict on Hiss's guilt just about represented the tormented indecisiveness of an extremely large number of people who for months had been debating among themselves, and many within themselves, whether Alger Hiss was guilty and whether, if he was, his lapse represented an accident in the life

of one brilliant young man or a pattern of treason within the administration.

This national ordeal of mutual suspicion and mulling over things past had started just after the war and reached a climax in the summer of 1948 with the outburst of confessions and accusations from Elizabeth Bentley, Whittaker Chambers, and Louis Budenz. These people, who became suddenly famous by reconstructing their pasts in public, released a wave of fear in a deeply disturbed Nation: the fear above all that the new enemy the United States was facing—far more dangerous than the ones that had just been defeated—could have received and might still be receiving assistance from men in high places.

On January 21, 1950, after his second trial, Alger Hiss was convicted on two counts of perjury and Dean Acheson said he would not turn his back on him. Three weeks later a man came up with "guts enough and dumb enough," as Mr. Kohlberg was later to phrase it, to accuse the makers of foreign policy of being traitors.

McCarthy discovers China

The man, of course, was JOSEPH MCCARTHY. On February 9, the junior Senator from Wisconsin made his now-famous speech in Wheeling, W. Va., announcing that he held in his hands the names of 205 Communists in the State Department. He had based his charges on a jumble of material, some of which was derived from a 2-year-old congressional investigation, some from Mr. Kohlberg's own letters and articles, some from William Goodwin. What is surprising is that in this first broadside he made only a few passing references to China.

In February, soon after MCCARTHY's first outburst, Mr. Kohlberg met the Senator for the first time. They needed each other. MCCARTHY had the headlines and wanted ammunition; Mr. Kohlberg had never made the headlines but had a whole arsenal. Over dinner Mr. Kohlberg expounded his thesis that the IPR was the instrument of Communist infiltration into the State Department. The Senator soon was furnished a collection of Mr. Kohlberg's favorite articles and releases, including "The State Department Espionage Case," by Emmanuel S. Larsen, which Mr. Kohlberg had printed in 1946 in Plain Talk.

At his first appearances before the Tydings committee in mid-March, MCCARTHY quoted at length from both the Larsen article and an article by a Father Kearney, who later admitted that all his material had come from Mr. Kohlberg. Three days later MCCARTHY sent for Emmanuel Larsen and introduced him to his assistant, Don Surine. According to Larsen's later testimony, Surine explained that the Senator wanted Larsen's help. "If you string along with us," he added, "then it will go much easier with you." When Larsen insisted he had no evidence of espionage or pro-Communists in the State Department, Surine dismissed him.

As the Tydings Committee hearings to investigate MCCARTHY's charges got under way, most Republicans were cautious; the party's policy committee officially disassociated itself from the McCarthy charges, although Senator TAFT, its ranking member, personally urged his junior colleague to press them. But as the hearings went along more and more Republicans stood up to accuse Senator Tydings of conducting a "whitewash" and to demand Acheson's resignation. Senator TAFT moved steadily closer to MCCARTHY.

To right-wingers of all shades all over the country, China suddenly became, under Senator MCCARTHY's impetus, the magic issue that might finally provide the road to power. Many of the fringe groups had until then never shown any particular interest in China. Take Dr. Edward Rumely's Committee for Constitutional Government, which ever since 1937 had been reviling the administration on domestic issues. Its favorite author, John T. Flynn, had published in October 1949, The Road Ahead, which the committee campaigned to put in every fifth American home. This book never mentions China.

But in November 1951, Flynn published another book, While You Slept, entirely devoted to "our tragedy in Asia." Not the slightest responsibility for this tragedy is ascribed to Chiang. As Flynn has it, "the plan was laid in Russia" and "carried out in the United States by Americans, and by only a handful of Americans." The chief villains of the piece are Marshall, Acheson, and, of course, Roosevelt, who in Flynn's account once tried to induce Stalin to join a world government that would have made Roosevelt "President of the World."

The chorus

Like Dr. Rumely, most of the professional rightists joined in. Merwin K. Hart, president of the National Economic Council, who is fanatical against what he calls political Zionism, had already exchanged congratulatory letters with Kohlberg on their common ideas. Incidentally, Mr. Hart employs Freda Utley, the ex-Communist whose China Story has become the official history recommended by General MacArthur. Joseph P. Kamp of the Constitutional Educational League has chimed in, his paper Headlines adding its special touches, such as accusing Dean Acheson of trying "to sovietize Japan" and shielding Molotov's brother-in-law. Gerald L. K. Smith, in his the Cross and the Flag, quoted Senator JENNER's statement that General Marshall "is a living lie." Smith also suggested that Marshall had protected Acheson and Hiss and fostered "the pro-Russian oriental policy of our State Department." Throughout 1950 and 1951 the chorus from the right and even from some sections of the center and left grew shriller and shriller. Kohlberg could well be pleased with his part in preparing the score. "I am proud," he declared, "to have given Senator MCCARTHY a small part of the information he gathered for his fight." A year later he had only one reservation about the Senator. "He doesn't go far enough," Kohlberg remarked. "He's too cautious about using his information."

People from the most disparate groups, Catholics and Klansmen, Jews and anti-Semites, labor men and "economic royalists," all were united in interlocking committees or interlocking ideas, all backing Chiang. This was not only the lobby's doing, of course, but the lobby gave the inspiration. In the clamor, more and more scruples came to be dropped. A man in whom rugged integrity and loyalty to Chiang had been struggling for years, Congressman JUDD, is reported to have begged MCCARTHY early in the game not to call [them] Communists. But as the tide rose, WALTER JUDD too was swept along.

In the bustle, pushing and being pushed, was Frederick McKee, always active, eager to do the right thing. His slight, nervous figure, loosely clad in a salt-and-pepper suit, could be seen frequently leaving Chen Chih-mai's office, carrying a brief case laden with literature. He trotted down to the National Airport and took a plane out to Ohio, to get the story of Brig. Gen. David Brink, who had been second in command to General Barr in China and didn't agree with his superior about the hopelessness of the Nationalists' situation; back to Washington he flew, to tell Congress about it. He trotted over to the State Department to present Under Secretary Webb with a set of figures compiled by his Chinese friend to refute the Department's figures on aid to China. He trotted here, there, and everywhere.

And yet, even when he was working so zealously for what seemed to be the winning side, Mr. McKee seemed to have retained his passion for liberal causes. In 1950, he had, with all his usual ardor, collected—and given—money for the defeat of Senator PAT MCCARRAN in the Nevada primaries and in the elections. But McKee and MCCARRAN are both in the front rank of the Formosa parade.

He said he had agreed fully with the United States policy of getting the Communist and Nationalist armies to collaborate against the Japanese. He attacked the foreign-service officers who had made contact with Communist leaders toward that end. He said that he and the Russians agreed that the Chinese Communists were not real Communists at all. "The Communist Party of China," he stated, "is supporting exactly the same principles as those promulgated by the Nationalist Government of China." At a National Press Club luncheon the very day after he had made his "pro-Communist" charges against the State Department, the General said: "The only real difference between Chinese Communists and Oklahoma Republicans is that the Oklahoma Republicans are not armed."

In the end it remained for Secretary Byrnes to testify that two of the foreign-service officers General Hurley had tagged as pro-Communists were Mr. Service and George Atcheson, Jr., that there was nothing to the charges, and that the United States needed free and honest reporting by its foreign-service officers. The hearings petered out.

About the time of the hearings, Archbishop Paul Yu-pin, one of the Generalissimo's closest advisers, whom Hurley had come to know well in China, was making one of his visits to the United States. In the midst of the Amerasia affair, he had begun circulating stories about the "pro-Communists" in the American Embassy at Chungking. He also reported that the same men were responsible for rupturing the close friendship (which had never existed) between General Stilwell and Chiang Kai-shek; and that John Service had once gone to Moscow expressly to help the Chinese Reds. (Actually, he has never been there.) On September 19, 1945, Chiang himself wrote General Hurley repeating the "pro-Communist" charges against John Service and George Atcheson.

At the time General Hurley was considering his resignation, one of the Chinese representatives at the U. N. came down to Washington "to warn me again," in the General's words, "that * * * the idea was to get me over there and find some pretext for public discharge." Just before his resignation, General Hurley had been assured by both the President and Secretary Byrnes that he would have their full support on his return to Chungking. Apparently he thought more highly of the word of his Chinese friends.

Plain Talk's accusations

For Alfred Kohlberg, the Amerasia and Hurley episodes, coming in the midst of his campaign against the IPR, were a windfall. Taken together, they enabled Mr. Kohlberg to associate John Service—and through him other officers of the State Department—with what had once been called a case of espionage. What was missing from the Service case could be supplied from the Hurley charges, and vice versa.

In October 1946 Mr. Kohlberg brought out the first issue of his magazine, Plain Talk, edited by Isaac Don Levine. The lead article was The State Department Espionage Case, signed by Emmanuel S. Larsen, one of the defendants in the Amerasia affair. This was heralded as "the story of a highly organized campaign to switch American policy in the Far East * * * to the Soviet line." The article said that there was a pro-Soviet group in the China section of the State Department, and went on to implicate Mr. Kohlberg's favorite targets, including John Service, John Davies, John

Carter Vincent, General Marshall, Owen Lattimore, General Stilwell, and Henry Wallace. For almost 4 years the article was accepted as a truthful confession. Then in 1950 at the hearings of the Tydings committee, Mr. Larsen pulled a surprise: He produced the original manuscript of his article, entitled "They Called Me a Spy."

After 4 years of silence, Mr. Larsen told the Tydings committee the story behind the story. This was it:

Two former FBI agents named Theodore C. Kirkpatrick and William Higgins, Jr., who were hired in 1946 by Mr. Kohlberg, went to see him in Florida and persuaded him to come to New York. After a pleasant evening with Mr. Kohlberg, Mr. Larsen holed up in the Hotel New Yorker to write an article. A few days later Mr. Levine read it and said: "This is a hell of a mess." Mr. Larsen had not described John Service's reports as being Communist-inspired; he had failed to pin the pro-Soviet label on the State Department or its Foreign Service officers ("I do not believe and I did not believe then," Mr. Larsen told the Tydings committee, "that there was a pro-Soviet group in the State Department"); he had not attacked General Stilwell ("I did not mention Stilwell, yet Stilwell was violently attacked in there"); nor did he declare that General Marshall's mission was designed to promote Soviet expansion on our Asiatic frontier.

Mr. Larsen protested strongly against calling his story "The State Department Espionage Case" when he had seen no evidence of espionage. "Levine kept on telling me that it would defeat the whole purpose of the article if we did not call it the Espionage Case," Mr Larsen told the Tydings committee. Mr. Kohlberg had said that he and his editor had in their files a great mass of material that would substantiate their viewpoint and their contention that there was a far-reaching plot within the State Department to pervert the policy of the United States in favor of the Chinese Communists. They had showed Larsen a steel filing cabinet full of material, including extracts from official dispatches, photostats, and documents on the Amerasia case, which presumably had been available only to the grand jury and the Hobbs committee. It was enough, in any event, to persuade Mr. Larsen to allow his employers to rewrite the article.

"If true," summed up the Tydings report, "the action of Levine and his associates in connection with the Plain Talk article is one of the most despicable instances of a deliberate effort to deceive and hoodwink the American people in our history."

1946—Year of indecision

Yet, at that time, 1946, Mr. Kohlberg and his men were the members of a small sect with no great prestige—voices in the wilderness.

The newspapers of 1946, the year of the Marshall mission, were full of editorials reflecting the people's concern that America might become involved in civil war in China. That was the year the American people became most disturbed over the Nationalists' behavior. Back in March 1945 WALTER JUDD had made his speech pleading for patience; now patience had worn out. Correspondents, relieved of wartime censorship, were reporting that corruption was worse than ever.

Nineteen forty-six was the year that UNRRA shipments to China were stopped because of black marketing and other abuses, the year Chennault and Willauer, with help from T. V. Soong, set up their airline with UNRRA-bought planes. That was the year that capital fled from China as never before. It was the year that even Mr. Luce's patience ran out; Time published a three-column documented indictment of "the corrupt inefficiency of the National Government" by its Shanghai correspondent, William Gray. Mr. Gray reported that the Kuomintang's "better-enders" were smugly asking themselves: "What can the Americans do but continue to support the Central Government, in view of the ideological tie between China's Communists and Soviet Russia?" But the strength of that tie was not clearly seen by most Americans in 1946.

The Marshall mission

And so General Marshall was sent to try the only policy that everybody agreed on—to bring about peace between two untrustworthy antagonists, each confident he could destroy the other. While General Marshall tried to bring about a coalition government, Chiang and his bitter-enders were itching to go after the Communists. And the Communists by their actions showed an equal readiness.

When General Marshall returned home at the beginning of 1947, having failed in his mission, little if any criticism of his efforts was heard; his appointment as Secretary of State in January was a popular one; no Senator voted against confirming it. Not until later was it to be charged against him that he had asked Chiang to disband many of his divisions (as William Bullitt was also to ask, in the interest of efficiency) and that he had cut off military supplies to the Nationalists for several months (as he had done to maintain his good faith as negotiator).

At the end of 1946, when full-scale civil war in China broke out again, there were present in America all the disparate elements that would come closer and closer together as the so-called China lobby, and all the conditions for its consolidation and power. Three factors operated to hasten the process. One was the change of political climate in the United States. Another was the transfer of power in Washington from the White House back to Congress. The third was disaster in China.

IV—YEARS OF DISASTER

In March 1947 the Chinese Nationalists captured the Communist capital, Yenan, and Chiang Kai-shek told the American Ambassador, J. Leighton Stuart, that he would have the civil war won by the end of the summer. Instead, within a few months Chiang had lost his chance of mounting an all-out offensive that could destroy the Communist armies. Something had gone wrong.

By VJ-day, Chiang Kai-shek commanded the finest Chinese Army in modern times. With American military advice and American lend-lease totaling more than $600,000,000 in the 10 months after the Japanese surrender, the Nationalists could confront Mao with 6 first-class (by any standard) divisions, 33 divisions which had some United States training and equipment and were excellent by Asian standards, and 200 or so more of inferior equipment and quality. In the fall of 1945, United States LST's and planes ferried Chiang's troops into previously Japanese-held cities in north China and Manchuria to give them strong footholds in areas where in many cases the countryside had been long dominated by the Communists. Fifty thousand American marines arrived to garrison Peiping, Tientsin, and Tsing-tao. The United States was doing a great deal for Chiang—as much as or more than the get-the-boys-home temper of Congress and the people would permit.

Then came the truce negotiations, which stretched out wearily and inconclusively for a year. At the full-scale resumption of the civil war early in 1947, Nationalist forces outnumbered the Communists by 2,600,000 to 1,100,000, and seemed to have the initiative in most of China. From the United States it looked, as it did to Chiang, as if victory was in sight.

Real-estate strategy

The trouble was that the Nationalists were more interested in real estate, in announcing the capture of towns and cities, than in seeking out and defeating the Communist armies in the field. The Communist strategy was precisely the reverse. The loss of Yenan, for instance, meant little to Mao militarily; his government had abandoned it a few weeks before, leaving only a small force, which withdrew without a fight. While the Nationalists spread out thinner and thinner over north China and Manchuria, the Communists struck first in one area and then in another, whittling away Chiang's scattered forces with small loss to themselves.

The strategy of waging positional warfare from widely separated towns meant that the Nationalists had to secure the railroads between. In the course of 1947 it became plain that they couldn't. If they cleared a line 1 week, the Communists seized a lightly held section of it the next. By the end of 1947, the Communists had captured or destroyed most of the rail lines the Nationalists had held a year before.

To sum up, there is no evidence that Chiang ever tried to bring the Communist armies to battle; it is certain that he never succeeded in doing so.

Then there was the problem of graft and corruption in the Nationalist Army and Government—the underfeeding of soldiers, the thievery by officers, the abandonment and even selling of United States-made arms to the enemy. Evidence of this comes from men who otherwise have had the highest opinion of Chiang.

Bullitt and Wedemeyer

Two important visitors to China in the summer of 1947, the season of Chiang's predicted victory, saw that the situation was nowhere near so rosy. They were William C. Bullitt and Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer. Bullitt, who traveled for Life, came back with a $1,300,000,000 plan for saving China in 3 years, claiming that Russia had been arming the Chinese Reds while the United States had been disgracefully withholding weapons, ammunition, and funds from Chiang. The Generalissimo himself was quoted in the New York Times of September 11, 1947, as telling a Kuomintang conference that he still had enough supplies for two more years of civil war. Chiang added that Nationalist losses had been entirely due to the negligence of high commanding officers and to miscalculations of their own.

For all Bullitt's shifting of the blame to the late President Roosevelt, his own 18-point program of military and government reform included such measures as retiring half the Nationalist generals, jailing rich men who would not turn over funds in foreign currency to the Government, and cutting the army in half by removing nonexistent troops from the rolls and disbanding units of the lowest quality.

In a report not released until August 5, 1949, General Wedemeyer, who traveled for the President, urged a 5-year program of aid to the Nationalists, a 5-power guardianship for Manchuria with Russia as one guardian, or a U. N. trusteeship, and immediate drastic, far-reaching political and economic reforms by the Nationalist Government. "Promises will no longer suffice," said the General. "Performance is absolutely necessary. It should be accepted that military force in itself will not eliminate communism."

The real issue on which the administration and the gathering forces of the China lobby split was whether Chiang could or would carry out the reforms that everybody considered indispensable. Bullitt, who wrote: "In the pages of history Chiang bulks larger than any living American," said he could. The administration, for a while, appeared to risk insisting on reform as the price for continued aid.

As it happened, the situation in China was so serious and the pressure from Congress

so severe by the end of 1947 that the administration proposed more aid than Bullitt had asked—$570,000,000 for 15 months (his program for that period came to $562,500,000)—and far more than the modest $250,000,000 a year Governor Dewey was urging. What the administration tried to avoid was all-out entanglement in a civil war which could imperil our program of resisting communism in Europe. In October, Chiang had told a visiting congressional committee that "the predicament in Manchuria was an American responsibility," and the emphasis put on military aid by Chiang's supporters during the hearings on the bill made it seem that the word "military" was as important to China as the appropriation itself.

Discrediting Marshall

In January 1948, when the bill was about to be submitted, the Chinese Premier, General Chang Chun, announced his intention to reform the government. Before the hearings began, a technical mission of Chinese arrived in Washington, headed by Pei Tsu-yi, general manager of the Bank of China, and during the hearings its members were frequently seen around the rooms of Senator STYLES BRIDGES' Appropriations Committee. The presence of this mission, its connections with some of the Americans who testified at the hearings, and certain other coincidences suggest that the Chinese Government began at this time to try exerting extremely direct influence on pending United States legislation.

Both Wedemeyer and Bullitt testified in favor of the China-aid bill, as did General Chennault, whose application to keep operating his airline was then before the Chinese Government. Chennault's proposals were the most ambitious; sending 20,000 United States officers and men to China, he said, could turn the tide within 6 months.

Another witness was Norwood F. Allman, who described himself as a representative of "many of the American firms doing business in China as well as a number of Chinese industrial and business firms," but whose expenses were paid by the Bank of China. From Washington, Mr. Allman, who is known to his friends as "Judge" because of his service with the Shanghai International Mixed Court, wrote to the governor of the bank substantially as follows: That he had been working hard on the Senators to counteract Marshall's opposition to any large aid program; that he had taken the line that Marshall, while in China on his Presidential mission, had tried to order Chiang Kai-shek around like one of his second lieutenants, and when Chiang refused to accept such treatment Marshall was piqued; and all this was having a good effect. Judge Allman was the first China lobbyist to admit trying to discredit General Marshall.

Treason

In March, while the hearings were still going on, an old Christian Fronter named William J. Goodwin, who in 1941 had threatened that there would be civil war if America aided Britain, was hired by the National Resources Commission of China as an adviser on public relations, or paid lobbyist. Mr. Goodwin's fee was $30,000 a year, of which he later said he paid out $22,857 in expenses, largely for entertainment at such establishments as the Metropolitan Club in Washington and the Wee Tappee Tavern in New York. The following year he switched to the Chinese News Service, at a reduction in fee to $25,000 and in expenses to $9,783. Mr. Goodwin says he volunteered his services as a part of his "lifelong fight against communism." When Goodwin was hired, he lunched with Ambassador Koo, and was interviewed by a genial Chinese named Chen Chih-mai. Chen Chih-mai first came to the United States in 1944 to take charge of propaganda and is now Minister Counselor of the Embassy.

Goodwin began giving dinners at the Mayflower for Congressmen at which they could hear the opinions of Ambassador Koo and Counselor Chen. In an interview with Edward R. Harris of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch some 2 years later, Goodwin estimated that he had entertained about 100 Congressmen a year, had converted at least 50 of them to support of more aid for Nationalist China, and had helped materially to lay the groundwork for Senator MCCARTHY'S attacks on the State Department. Among the guests at his dinners were Senators Bridges, Knowland, Wherry, and McCarran.

Early in April 1948 President Truman signed the foreign-aid bill providing $463,000,000 for China (about the 12-month equivalent of the $570,000,000 originally proposed for 15 months), but Congress—this was the Republican Eightieth Congress—did not pass the actual appropriation until June, and it cut the figure for China to $400,000,000. On April 22 the Nationalists in Yenan surrendered almost without a fight.

In the June issue of the China Monthly, Alfred Kohlberg, after a trip to the Far East, quoted a man he identified only as "the greatest living American" as having said that America's troubles came from "stupidity at the top—treason just below." This was the first time Kohlberg had been able to quote anybody of the stature of General MacArthur on treason in the Government.

Enter Chen

In the summer of 1948, when Governor Dewey's campaign was at its height, the vice president of the Legislative Yuan, Chen Li-fu, made an extended visit to the United States. Chen Li-fu and his brother, Chen Kuo-fu, were the leaders of the powerful Chinese Communist clique, which had organized thought control, the secret police, and a network of banks and industries. During the dark months of 1948 when Nationalist defections to the Communists were increasing at an alarming rate and when the Kungs and Soongs had moved to their homes and bank accounts in America, the brothers Chen became more powerful than ever. Chen Li-fu came here, he said, to attend a moral rearmament conference and to study American democratic institutions, which apparently he had neglected while studying for his master of science at the University of Pittsburgh in 1924. Possibly another reason for his trip was his interest in Chinese students in this country, of whom article 14 of the rules and regulations for Chinese students abroad has this to say:

"All the thoughts and deeds of the self-supporting students residing abroad must absolutely be subject to the direction and control of the superintendent of students and the Embassy. If their words are found to be contrary to the San Min Chu I [the three political principles of the Kuomintang] or their actions are irregular, they shall be * * * summarily recalled to China."

Chen Li-fu, a handsome man with a smooth, ascetic face, is a philosopher who has quite seriously compared himself with Jesus Christ. As a favorite of the Generalissimo, who was befriended in his early obscurity by Chen's warlord family, he presented a letter of introduction from Chiang Kai-shek to Governor Dewey. Then Chen returned to Shanghai and gave an unusual interview to the newspaper Sin Wen Tien Ti:

"It seems absolutely certain that Governor Dewey will be elected President of the United States," announced Sin Wen Tien Ti in its November 1 issue, and continued: "According to Vice President Chen Li-fu, should Dewey be elected, extraordinary measures will be taken toward giving military aid to China."

The Clark report

That Chen Li-fu was doing more than whistling in the dark is suggested by the coincidence of his visit here and a mission undertaken by former Senator D. Worth Clark of Idaho. Since his defeat for reelection in 1944, Mr. Clark had been practicing law in Washington in association with Thomas G. Corcoran and William Youngman, two experienced hands at getting things for China. In September 1948, Senator BRIDGES, as Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, asked his old colleague, a Democrat, to go to China and make a report on financial, economic, and military conditions. According to ex-Senator Clark's later recollection, the idea popped up at a cocktail party at the Chinese embassy. Clark took with him, as financial and economic adviser, Russell Smith, executive vice president of the Bank of America, a depository of substantial Chinese funds. To write his report he also took along Edward B. Lockett. Part of the expenses for the party were paid by the Nationalist Government.

The Clark report did not overlook the widespread corruption in the Nationalist Government and army. But it recommended, as the only program to rescue China from communism, immediate and extensive direct military aid to the Nationalists, combat advisory aid, financial aid for the military operation, financial aid to stabilize the currency and American supervision of expenditures. The report ended: "The question whether such a comprehensive program will unjustifiably involve the United States in a foreign conflict is NOT [capitals his] one on which your consultant is called to pass."

Two disasters

In August 1948, the Nationalist Government at last announced a program of what sounded like drastic economic reforms. It was too late. In November, Chiang's demoralized Mukden garrison surrendered the well-fortified city to the Communist Armies. This was the beginning of the end—the end that was to come so swiftly.

In November, too, the Chinese Nationalists suffered another major reverse—thousands of miles away: Thomas E. Dewey was defeated for the Presidency of the United States.

The days after President Truman's victory were dark and dramatic for the Chinese in America. In December Mme. Chiang made her desperate trip to Washington, had tea at the White House, and found the President unwilling to commit himself to the all-out effort that would be needed to save her husband.

Too late again

That this period was indeed the low tide of Kuomintang morale was borne out by a remarkable series of concessions to the United States that were offered in succeeding weeks. Chiang offered to appoint United States officers to command Chinese units (under the guise of advisers) and to accept a high-ranking United States officer as his own military adviser. On January 8, 1949, Chinese Foreign Minister Wu handed a note to Ambassador Stuart requesting renewal of the mediation between Nationalists and Communists that had been given up in 1946—when Chiang had considered his power invincible. The Kuomintang's conception of "respect for Chinese sovereignty" had changed to the extent that United States assumption of direct leadership of Chinese armed forces seemed a necessity. This, too, was too late. On January 21 Chiang announced his "retirement" from the Presidency.

Eleven more months were to pass before the Generalissimo's flight to Formosa, and a year before Madame's famous "Farewell, America" speech, but in the winter of 1948–49 a fateful decision was taken by the China lobby. Until then the Chinese, although they had overtly and covertly hired men to plead their cause, had mainly relied on legitimate, if exaggerated, argument. When the voters failed them, the Chinese and the Americans they used—and were used by—turned to demagogery, slander, intimidation,

and the most direct intervention in American domestic politics.

V—THE UBIQUITOUS MAJOR

Early in the evening of October 8, 1950, the telephone rang in the Manhattan apartment of a public-relations man named Leo Casey. Mr. Casey had done some publicity for the Republican Party in the late 1930's and had been an adviser in Wendell Willkie's Presidential campaign. More recently he had been hired by David B. Charnay, founder and head of a public-relations firm called Allied Syndicates, Inc. When the phone rang Mr. Casey was having a quiet dinner with his wife.

Mr. Charnay, his boss, was on the wire in Beverly Hills, Calif. He ordered Mr. Casey to take a plane for Los Angeles to work on the senatorial campaign of Representative RICHARD M. NIXON against Representative Helen Gahagan Douglas. Mr. Casey says he picked up $400 in expense money from an associate, Arthur Happenie, and caught a midnight plane.

In Los Angeles, according to Mr. Casey, his boss explained that the Nixon campaign would help to "open some doors" for Allied Syndicates, which was setting up a west coast office. Mr. Casey and Mr. Charnay had a meeting with Mr. NIXON at the Hotel Ambassador. In the lobby of the hotel, Mr. Casey noticed, with Laurence Witten, secretary of the firm, a Chinese gentleman whom he had frequently seen going in and out of Mr. Charnay's New York office, and who was referred to by others in the office as "the major" or "the little fellow."

Mr. Casey organized an "independent voters committee for NIXON." He worked hard, he says, to attract the Negro vote, on which Mrs. Douglas, a liberal, was counting heavily. Since Mrs. Douglas had been a sharp critic of the House Un-American Activities Committee, he also played up Mr. NIXON'S part in the investigation leading to the conviction of Alger Hiss. His job well-done and Mr. NIXON elected, Mr. Casey went back to New York.

He was warmly congratulated by Mr. Charnay and Mr. Happenie, who at that time, according to Mr. Casey, was Mr. Charnay's right-hand man. Then, as Mr. Casey recalls it, Mr. Happenie suggested that he go to Washington and "deliver NIXON to the major." Mr. Casey says he was puzzled by this, and Mr. Happenie explained: "You're not so naive as to suppose you were out in California opening doors. You were working for the China account."

Mr. Casey knew, of course, that the firm was retained by the Bank of China, but he says he was shocked by Mr. Happenie's remark and told Mr. Charnay that he wouldn't think of "delivering" a Senator to a foreign agent. Soon afterward Mr. Casey left the firm, went to Washington, and told his story to Senator NIXON, who thanked him for the information.

David Charnay is a stocky, energetic ex-reporter for the tabloids, with a breezy, agreeable manner and iron-gray hair that stands up in Teddy-bear fashion. He founded his firm in 1947 and soon managed to "pitch," as he would put it, some valuable accounts, including Ballantine's Beer, Eversharpe, and the United Mine Workers. Thus Mr. Charnay became good friends with John L. Lewis, whose autographed photograph (with appreciation and good wishes) hangs on his office wall, and later with Mr. Lewis's friend and former $35,000-a-year cotrustee of the UMW's welfare fund, Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire. Like all able publicity men, Mr. Charnay improved his contacts in high places. Among them: Presidential Counsel Clark Clifford, who was engaged by the firm as Washington counsel for 7 or 8 months in 1950 after he left the White House; Assistant Secretary of Defense Paul Griffith, who after leaving that post served as a consultant to Mr. Charnay for a brief time; and former Secretary of the Navy John L. Sullivan, whose firm was retained by Mr. Charnay to advise the Bank of China on the disposition of its funds. Mr. Charnay also got to be friends with Assistant to the President John R. Steelman.

In the summer of 1949—shortly after the Chinese had made their fateful decision to go after political power in the United States, and coincident with the publication of the State Department's white paper on China—Mr. Charnay's firm was retained by the Bank of China at a fee of $60,000 a year, plus $17,500 for Mr. Sullivan's law partnership, Sullivan, Bernard, & Shea. When he was asked recently how he happened to get the account, Mr. Charnay replied: "We pitched it." His job, as he explained it, was to prevent the recognition of the Chinese Communist Government and the consequent freezing, for that government's benefit, of the Bank of China's assets in this country. Mr. Charnay states that he was never told how much those assets amounted to, but he has heard them estimated as between one and three hundred million.

Mr. Charnay says that he did a "straight publicity job," getting editors and reporters interested in the mistreatment of Americans by the Chinese Communists, particularly in the cases of captured marines and Consul Angus Ward. Mr. Charnay set up the broadcast of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek's dramatic farewell to America in 1950 and was one of those who recommended Chiang's offer of Nationalist troops for Korea. Mr. Charnay also had a part in the production of a documentary propaganda film, Death of a Dream, which before its general release was shown to gatherings of Nationalist China enthusiasts, congressional and otherwise. He says that, though the picture had nothing to do with his work for the Bank of China, he acted as "a sort of catalyst" in getting it financed and made, and he denies, "as far as I know," the printed report that $20,000 of Chinese funds went into it. "They were private funds," says Mr. Charnay. He will concede, of course, that private funds from Americans might have been originally furnished by Chinese.

Mr. Charnay's account of the NIXON campaign, and particularly of the part played by Mr. Happenie, differs from that of Mr. Casey and of other former associates; the difference suggests a way in which the Chinese may work through an American firm but keep the boss free of responsibility for, or even knowledge of, its doings. Mr. Charnay says he went to see Hedda Hopper on another matter and she asked him to take over the direction of a committee she had organized for Mr. NIXON. He told her he could not do it personally, but got Mr. Casey for the job, and after seeing the campaign off to a start went back to New York. As for the Chinese major, "he may have been on the west coast." As for his payment, "it all came from the committee." As for Mr. Happenie's being his "right-hand man," says Mr. Charnay: "He wasn't even in the firm."

Happenie's connection: two versions

Mr. Charnay admits, however, that Mr. Happenie did come to some sort of arrangement with Allied Syndicates late in 1949—a connection, as Mr. Charnay describes it, in which Mr. Happenie was given an office on the understanding that he would bring in new business. In his year with the firm, Mr. Charnay adds, Mr. Happenie brought in no new business and was not paid. Mr. Happenie had previously worked for the Rhode Island Insurance Co., earning about $4,000 a year in commissions. He was living in a $70-a-month apartment in Bronxville when he took his job, or connection, with Mr. Charnay.

Soon after Mr. Happenie started with Allied Syndicates, he and his wife bought and moved into a richly decorated penthouse apartment with a gold-leaf ceiling at 1115 Fifth Avenue, which had once belonged to E. R. Squibb. About this time Mr. Happenie told a close friend that he had been placed in the firm by H. H. Kung to look after Dr. Kung's interests, which he suggested went beyond the public-relations job done for the Bank of China. For this he said he received $25,000 a year. When Mr. Charnay was asked if Mr. Happenie was paid by the Chinese, he replied thoughtfully: "I wouldn't know."

Other former and present Allied Syndicates employees were under the impression that Mr. Happenie was a vice president of the firm, one adding "in charge of finances." Harry Guinivan, who is now chief of Mr. Charnay's Washington office, said recently that he knew little about Mr. Happenie except that he was a vice president, had originally come from around Boston, and was "a colorful character."

The files of New York and Charleston, S. C., newspapers show that this last was, if anything, an understatement. In 1937, Mr. Happenie was sentenced to prison for 5 years by a Federal court in Charleston for his part in defrauding a retired manufacturer of $30,000 by promising to make him executive director of a projected British armament syndicate operating in the United States. Mr. Happenie had been associated in this deal with one Samuel Allen and with a man named Charles Robinson, who had been introduced to the victim as "Sir Mark Webster Jenkins, financial comptroller of Vickers, Ltd." Happenie himself had been presented, according to the testimony, as "Huntington, a spokesman for the syndicate."

Mr. Charnay says that late in 1950, about the time Mr. Happenie's unremunerated year with Allied was up, he found out about the Charleston incident and got rid of Mr. Happenie. Soon after, Mr. Charnay's contract with the Bank of China ran out and was not renewed.

Mr. Charnay says he has had no further business dealings with the Chinese, but he will do them a favor if asked. Before the Mr. Guinivan quoted above went to work for Allied in the spring of 1950, he helped Chen Chih-mai, the Minister Counselor of the Chinese Embassy, organize a press junket to Formosa and went along as press agent. Last spring Mr. Charnay donated Mr. Guinivan's services to Erle Cocke, Jr., then National Commander of the American Legion and then as now a good friend of Mr. Guinivan's, for the first leg of a round-the-world trip. After visiting Formosa in Mr. Guinivan's company and being dined by the Generalissimo and Mme. Chiang, Mr. Cocke said the United States should, among other things, turn the Nationalists Army loose on the Communists even if it meant "the calculated risk of world war III."

Fantastic?

Mr. Charnay says he has never met H. H. Kung. He does concede that "the major" or "the little fellow," is Louis Kung, who was a major in the Chinese Nationalist Army (he is now a colonel) and is the second son of H. H. Kung. Mr. Charnay also concedes that Louis Kung is still a "very good friend." His former associates recall that Major Kung was in and out of the Charnay office a great deal during the 1950 campaign and predicted that the Republicans would pick up six seats in the Senate (they picked up five). Incidentally, one of Mr. Charnay's former employees has told Government authorities a curious story of Louis Kung's activities on the eve of the election. According to this informant, Kung turned up at the Charnay office with $60,000 or $70,000 in cash, which was then taken by Mr. Happenie and a third allied man over to a suite at the Savoy-Plaza, where it was supposed to be distributed to interested parties. When told this story, Mr. Charnay remarked: "Fantastic."

Louis Kung and his older brother David are favorites of their aunt the childless Mme. Chiang Kai-shek. Their father, it will be

remembered was China's Minister of Finance while their mother and sisters were speculators in American aid—which could be why Dr. Kung has no objection to letting the Treasury reveal his own personal accounts. The parents now live quietly near Riverdale, New York City, and David has become the financier of the family. His father had him made joint managing director of the Central Trust Co. in China 10 years ago when he was only 22. Among his present commercial activities, he is the largest stockholder of the Yangtze Trading Corp., which was barred last June from licensing for foreign trade after it had illegally shipped tin to Communist China.

Largesse

Louis Kung is 29. He attended Sandhurst, the British West Point, where his English acquired a clipped soldierly accent. He is nominally attached to the Chinese Military Staff Committee at the United Nations and is technical adviser to the Chinese Air Force in Washington, although he has never set foot in the office. He keeps houses in both New York and Washington. His Washington house is on Reservoir Road, and in it are several unlisted telephones. The Major is fond of calling up his friends and associates and identifying himself as Lee or Smith. His friends include Senator STYLES BRIDGES, who, according to Mr. Charnay's former employees, occasionally ran into the major at the Allied office during the 1950 election campaign. Once when the Senator went off to rest up in a western hideaway, Louis Kung was one of the people to whom he confided his phone number.

The Kung boys have been handling financial favors from Chinese to Americans for a good many years. On December 28, 1943, David wrote the following letter to Owen Lattimore, who had several years before served as an official adviser to Chiang Kai-shek and was then Deputy Director of Pacific Operations for the OWI:

DEAR MR. LATTIMORE: I have just received a message from Chungking asking me to send you the sum of $5,000 from the Generalissimo and Madame and therefore write to inquire in what form would you wish me to send the funds to you."

To this, and to a more urgent letter that followed, Mr. Lattimore replied that it would be "impossible" for him to accept such a gift. Mr. Lattimore informed the White House of the offer and then wrote a warm letter to the Generalissimo, thanking him for his "thoughtfulness" but stating that the White House had approved his decision not to accept the gift.

Crisp lettuce

"Major" Kung keeps himself in spending money through drafts on a bank in Tangier, by way of the Irving Trust Company of New York. The major spends his money freely, usually in the form of bills of a hundred dollars or larger. For a short while in 1948, after his return from Formosa with D. Worth Clark, Edward Lockett worked for Louis Kung as an "information officer"—having specified that he would do no lobbying. After Mme. Chiang's dramatic visit to the White House, Mr. Lockett had to inform his employer that her mission had been unsuccessful. The major got excited, declared he knew better, and paid off Mr. Lockett with ten crisp hundred-dollar bills.

Louis Kung has been able to do his work in this country without being hampered by his nominal duties. When the major got his appointment to the U. N. delegation, which carried diplomatic status, the recently deposed deputy chief of staff of the Chinese Air Force office in Washington, Gen. P. T. Mow, thought Kung would no longer need his Air Force position for immunity and took steps to have him dropped from the Air Force staff. The general was soon visited by one K. H. Yu, a deputy delegate to the International Bank, a relative of Chiang's first wife, and agent for Chiang in many high financial matters. Mr. Yu presented General Mow with a letter in Chiang's handwriting, requesting that Major Kung be retained, and sent the General a check for $5,000, drawn on the Riggs National Bank, as a "special reward."

Since then, General Mow and his executive officer, Col. V. S. Hsiang, have gotten into trouble for charging the Formosa government with what they claim to be irregularities in the procurement of military equipment for Chiang's army. Last August Formosa ordered the two officers home and then, when they refused to oblige, answered their accusations of corruption with a suit in an American court to recover some $7,000,000 of unexpended funds which they would not give up.

Louis Kung has a friend named J. Z. Huang, who is with him so constantly as to suggest that he is a sort of bodyguard. Mr. Huang used to work in the Chinese Embassy but now has no official position. He once boasted that he had played poker with President Truman. He has a brother, J. L. Huang, who is a general and an aide to Chiang Kai-shek; like the Kung boys, the Huang brothers are favorites of Mme. Chiang.

It was Jen Zen Huang who, 3 days after General Mow was suspended, telephoned one of General Mow's underlings and asked him to meet him in front of a Connecticut Avenue drugstore. There, in his parked car, Mr. Huang explained that although he had had a misunderstanding with General Mow and did not want to approach him directly, he was still the general's good friend and worried about the general's difficulties with Formosa.

Mr. Huang went on to say that if General Mow and Colonel Hsiang would cease their accusations of corruption against the Nationalist government, they could be assured that no effort would be made to extradite them and they might also get "maybe two or three hundred thousand dollars." Mr. Huang suggested that the money could be held out when General Mow turned over the Nationalist funds in his possession to his successor. The man from General Mow's office went back and reported the offer, and when Mr. Huang next got in touch with him, 4 days later, he rejected it on behalf of the general.

Louis Kung, the ubiquitous major, is far from the key figure in the Chinese division of the China lobby; although important enough to be kept with diplomatic immunity while doing no diplomatic work, he is not much more than a courier or paymaster. And Allied Syndicates, Inc., is only one of the American firms or organizations that have been used by the Nationalist Chinese.

VI—THE INNER CIRCLE

In the spring and summer of 1949, with the Chinese Communists swarming over the mainland, some of the most eminent of the dispossessed Nationalists set off for the United States. Here, too, they had recently suffered a major setback—in the Presidential election of 1948. But America was now the only place where they could find fresh hope for their nearly lost cause; as their army was driven to the China Sea and thence to Formosa, the only battlefield where they stood a chance of operating effectively was United States politics. They still had powerful friends in both parties, though they felt closer to the GOP. To spearhead the new campaign, the Nationalists counted on a few high Chinese officials who had spent the war years in Washington and knew the ropes.

Yet the prospect was dismal. One by one, the big cities and ports—Nanking, Hankow, Shanghai, Tsingtao—were falling to the enemy. The State Department, which had appointed a special committee to review United States policy in China, was about to publish its white paper, and it was an open secret that the white paper would slam the door on further aid to the Nationalists. For Chiang's agents in the United States, the darkest event of all had come at the beginning of that inauspicious year. On January 21, Chiang had stepped down from the Presidency of China and retired to Fenghwa, where he said he would devote his time to "sweeping the tombs of my ancestors."

Madame General

Madame Chiang, who had arrived in Washington on December 1, 1948, took on the assignment of reorganizing Chiang's forces in this country. Until she left, on January 8, 1950, to rejoin her husband on Formosa, her task was to marshal the most skillful Chinese in the United States and to consolidate all the American support she could.

Much of Mme. Chiang's work was done in the pleasant Riverdale section of the Bronx, New York City. There in the home of her brother-in-law, H. H. Kung, she held weekly strategy meetings with various groups of Chinese who, by virtue of their past or present official positions or their private wealth, could accomplish most in the bumpy arena of American politics. The men who attended these sessions fell into two main groups. One, to which H. H. Kung and her brother, T. V. Soong, belonged, operated in and from New York and included men of means rather than Government officials; the other, which worked in Washington, was composed of Chiang's most trusted chiefs of mission.

Loose groups

There was never much real cooperation between or even within the groups. To curry favor with Chiang, each man tried to outdo the others, and Chiang himself, as he always has, encouraged lively competition among his subordinates, even if it meant ignoring the formal chain of command. Operations proposed through one channel would be approved and put into effect through another. As long as Mme. Chiang was here, she, of course, handled most of the communications with her husband. Many of the agents had individual codes for reporting to the Generalissimo. But despite their differences, jealousies, and intrigues, the men who met with Mme. Chiang were united on their large strategy: to mesh the Nationalist cause with the interest of the most effective among the power-hungry American politicians.

This was no ordinary group of political refugees. The Formosa regime was something more than a standard twentieth-century government-in-exile and something a good deal less than a real national government. It had found shelter on the island of Formosa, but it didn't want and couldn't hope to stay there forever. It had to go back to China or out of existence. The Kuomintang was eager to resume the fight, and its only hope was United States assistance on a gigantic scale.

Slowly, out of the Riverdale meetings emerged the line of action that the rebuilt China lobby would follow. According to former Nationalist officials, it has never been a hard-and-fast program. But, by and large, it has kept the same general direction through the years since the fateful summer of 1949.

Weaving the web

One top-priority objective was the removal of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State. Chiang's agents could not tell their master that they had been mistaken when they had advised him not to worry because unlimited military aid was coming. Somebody had to be the scapegoat. So they agreed on Acheson, who, they said, was besieged by Communists and fellow travelers in and out of the State Department and who was under the spell of Chiang's "arch enemy," Gen. George Marshall.

Probably none of these Chinese could have dreamed how wildly successful their piece of self-justification, expressly tailored for Chiang, would later on be with the American

public. But at every opportunity, talking among themselves and with American friends, they hopefully spread word that the administration was to blame for the Communist conquest of China.

Peace, for them, was unendurable and unthinkable; at all costs, America too had to be made to see that a third world war was inevitable.

The cast of characters

The Washington group of Chinese who attended Mme. Chiang's briefings usually included K. H. Yu, delegate to the International Bank; W. K. Li, representative to the Far Eastern Commission; Gen. Peter T. K. Pee, military attaché of the Embassy; Gen. P. T. Mow, head of the procurement office of the Chinese Air Force, who has since gotten into difficulties with the Formosa Government; the Chen Chih-mai, Minister Counselor of the Embassy.

The New York group, by all odds the more colorful, had on its roster several of the most experienced and most mutually distrustful specialists in the lobbying business. This time they were to operate less flamboyantly than they had before. First and foremost came those ancient antagonists, T. V. Soong, who returned to the United States in June 1949, and H. H. Kung. Then there were Chen Li-fu, leader of the CC clique (which had organized "through control," the secret police, and a network of banks and industries), who had returned to this country by 1950, and Dr. T. F. Tsiang, the U. N. delegate.

Of the New York group, according to an ex-Nationalist official, only Dr. Tsiang received and spent Nationalist Government funds. The others had to draw upon their own vast resources as circumstances and opportunity required. Chen Li-fu, for instance, reportedly pledged $2,000,000 from the funds of the CC clique, some of which, incidentally, went and still goes to subsidize most of the Nationalist Chinese newspapers in the United States. His pet project has always been to blacken the character and motives of General Marshall, who back in 1946 had lashed out at the CC clique.

H. H. Kung kept in touch with a wide range of Chiang enthusiasts, from Henry Luce to Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, and Alfred Kohlberg, the New York importer. His son Louis, the "ubiquitous major" of the preceding installment, was recruited by Mme. Chiang as a courier, paymaster, and trouble shooter—a man-about-America.

As for T. V. Soong, his return to the United States was like a homecoming. He quickly set about making new friends and revisiting old ones—among them his wartime associates Tommy Corcoran, Gen. Claire Chennault, and Whiting Willauer, Chennault's partner in the profitable China Air Transport.

One sign of the changing times was Soong's approach to Alfred Kohlberg. It was something of a comedown for the man who had once asserted, "I am China" to seek out the vociferous importer of Chinese embroidery. This was no Ludwig Rajchman, the political expediter and philosopher-at-large, who had helped Soong set up the wartime China lobby. But 1949 was a far cry from 1940, and Mr. Kohlberg looked promising. Through his China Policy Association and his magazine, Plain Talk (later the Freeman), through his friends and fellow enthusiasts in Congress—Senators BRIDGES, MUNDT, and KNOWLAND, Representatives JUDD and NIXON (the latter now a Senator)—through his network of ex-Communists, ex-FBI men, and fanatics of the extreme right, Alfred Kohlberg was rapidly becoming a principal peddler of pro-Nationalist propaganda. Above all, he was spreading, even though to a limited audience, his uninhibited version of the State Department "conspiracy." And so in the winter of 1949–50, not long before Senator MCCARTHY's first barrage, T. V. Soong sought out Mr. Kohlberg.

The hard core of the New York group is joined from time to time by several other Chinese such as James Yu, once consul general in New York and now Ambassador to Italy, a lavish entertainer and distributor of presents; Liu Chieh, Ambassador to Canada, who like Mr. Yu manages to spend a lot of time in the United States; Archbishop Paul Yu-pin, honorary chairman of the former China Monthly; and former Ambassador to the United States Hu Shih, a philosopher and historian with a reputation for political savvy.

Money on the move

Ever since 1949 the official financing of the lobby has centered largely in Washington, where Ambassador Wellington Koo presides uncomfortably and with little real power over the same group of men who used to attend Madam Chiang's weekly meetings in Riverdale.

The first lump sum in support of the lobby's work, according to former Nationalist officials then in a position to know, did not follow the customary route. In the summer of that year $800,000 was transferred from Wang Shih-chieh, Chiang's chief secretary on Formosa, to Dr. Tsiang openly via the Bank of China in New York. This came to the attention of various Nationalist Government employees, who at first believed it was intended to cover their salary payments, which as usual were 2 or 3 months in arrears. That, as it happens, was not what the money was intended for.

Before Mme. Chiang left the United States early in 1950, she arranged for a fund of more than a million dollars, then under control of the Chinese National Resources Commission, to be put at the disposal of Counselor of Embassy Chen Chih-mai. General Pee, the military attaché, who reports directly to Chiang Kai-shek, also draws on large funds independently of the Embassy.

An accountant's nightmare

The man most familiar with the users of "official" Chinese money in this country and abroad is probably K. H. Yu, the deputy delegate to the International Bank. Mr. Yu maintains three accounts. He has an official account, which provides for his office and living expenses; a private account, which provides for lobbying and related expenses; and an official cosignature account, which gives him control, where desirable, over disbursements of other offices. He also maintains control of disbursements from numerous private accounts containing government funds that are frequently used for lobbying activities.

Mr. Yu would seem to be one of Chiang's most trusted and powerful agents in this country. He is a relative of the Generalissimo and also one of his personal secretaries. He receives money and directions from Chiang independently and frequently without the knowledge of Ambassador Koo or anyone else at the Embassy.

The ways of lobby finance, like the finances of the regime itself, would drive any American CPA to distraction. No one, including the Nationalist Government, knows precisely what its assets amount to at home or abroad. In the incessant movement of nationalist money, official and private accounts have become intertwined. In part, the reason is perfectly understandable. In 1949 a good deal of nationalist money was put in private and numbered accounts for fear that the United States would recognize Mao Tse-tung's Communist government and freeze nationalist assets over here. But this was not the only explanation. Of the enormous sums of government money that Chiang has parceled out to relatives and friends in this country and in Europe and South America since 1949, a substantial amount is known to have been allocated to the molding of American opinion.

On one occasion a Nationalist official begged this reporter to help him devise some means of safely destroying several million dollars of Nationalist funds. The money had been deposited in his personal account in the United States by order of the Formosa Government at the time when it was feared the United States might recognize the Communist regime. Later the official broke with the Formosa Government. "I would rather die than return that money to Chiang Kai-shek," he declared. "Would it not be possible," he asked, "to invite United States Treasury officials to audit the account, certify that the millions held in trust were still intact, and then witness their destruction?"

One thing is certain. Money is the most important and fascinating of the many fascinating characters in the China lobby—a character capable of endless disguises. It is everywhere. In a massive stream it flowed from the United States to China. It has returned in large amounts to the United States via numberless channels to create more millions, more propaganda, more aid, more private corruption, and more public confusion.

VII—THE SMILING COUNSELOR

Probably not even the United States Government could trace the expenditure of the lobby's money in the United States. But this magazine has been able to get the details of certain operations and frustrated operations in which the Chinese have been ready to put up anything from the price of a few cocktails to $5,000,000. A case study of how Chinese money and persuasion are used is provided by the Washington career of Chen Chih-mai, the smiling counselor.

Chen Chih-mai, who has been with the Chinese Embassy since 1944, knows a good many people in Washington. He had taken a Ph. D. at Columbia and taught at the National Tsing Hua University from 1933 to 1937. In 1938 he became Counselor to the Executive Yuan, a position he held for 6 years before coming to Washington. His connections with the Nationalist Government, and particularly with the CC Clique, give him power and responsibility considerably beyond his rank. It may be recalled that when William J. Goodwin and Ambassador Koo first discussed Mr. Goodwin's lobbying job, the ambassador had Mr. Chen interview Mr. Goodwin (The Reporter, April 15, page 17). Mr. Goodwin's fee for the first year—$30,000—was paid by the Chinese National Resources Commission.

In a cable of June 22, 1949, Chen Chih-mai reported to Chiang:

"Goodwin has commenced with his work already, which he pushes ahead feverishly. The leaders of both parties * * * are all supporting him. * * *"

On August 1, 1949, Chen cabled again:

"Goodwin * * * [is] working in an effort to disillusion the leaders of the Democratic Party about the Chinese Communists. We are being very careful to avoid a partisan conflict and emotional attacks."

Pipelines of influence

At one of Mr. Goodwin's dinners for Congressmen, a high Embassy official briefed a group of Senators on the reasons why W. Walton Butterworth, former U. S. Counselor of Embassy in Nanking, should not be confirmed as Assistant Secretary of State. Mr. Goodwin (who is now acting as one of Senator TAFT's campaign strategists in New York) gave another of his dinners at the Mayflower just after the white paper was published, in August 1949, at which Chen Chih-mai offered a vehement and detailed criticism of the white paper. His talk provided ammunition for a 3-day barrage by Senators Bridges, Knowland, Wherry, and McCarran.

Chen Chih-mai was greatly helped in his work by the frequent receipt of "information" on Americans from the Chinese secret police. Senator McCarthy has admitted using information from secret police, though he hasn't specified of what nationality, and Mr. Goodwin has stated that he "helped materially" to lay the groundwork for McCarthy's charges. Later the Senator was briefed by Alfred Kohlberg, who also had access to Chinese files. Mr. Chen also brought derogatory information on Americans from American sources; once, for example, he paid $300 for a report on Michael Lee, a Far Eastern expert in the Department of Commerce who was forced to resign in the fall of 1950 largely as a result of unproven charges that he had withheld aviation gas from Chiang.

Chen Chih-mai oversees the operations of the Chinese News Service headquarters in New York, to whose payroll Mr. Goodwin was switched in July 1949. In the same month, the Chinese News Service employed a man named Norman Paige as a "press and radio consultant" at a reported salary of $30,000 a year. Mr. Paige, who changed his name from James Black de Puy for writing purposes, is a tall, heavy-set man of 45, with a thick black mustache. He had been a radio correspondent in the Far East, and after the war had become one-fifth owner of the Philippines Broadcasting Corporation until 1949, when he sold out and went to work for the Chinese. His regular duties have been to call on and win over publishers, editors, and radio broadcasters. He also gives cocktail parties and makes speeches.

The following excerpts from his confidential report to the Chinese News Service of January 29, 1952, show how Mr. Paige operates:

"American public opinion, so long swayed by the successful Red smear campaign, is today far over to the realization that Generalissimo Chiang was sold down the river. People are beginning to realize that the position of the Nationalist Government is today stronger than at any time since Marshall went to China and it is increasing daily. My campaign of realistic and honest approach, particularly with the press, is finding its right reward.

"The Mow-Hsiang case (defections) continues to hold amazingly little interest to the American newspapers and consequently to the mass of people. It received relatively little copy space over the Nation at the time it was most prominently played in New York and Washington; it came at a time when the wires and columns were loaded with domestic scandals; silence by the State Department or other Government agencies helped our cause. I have, accordingly, remained chary about bringing up the subject.

"It is natural that Presidential nominations become the topic of conversations from any angle. * * * There is widespread denunciation—that America's Asiatic policy has been one of fumbling, failure and downright treachery. It gives an easy opening to the suggestions of future policies and actions.

"My recent contacts include:

"------, owner of the ------, is a Republican leader throughout the West. He can be considered an addition to our pipeline. He will not only influence his own newspapers, but also others.

"------, owner and publisher of the ------ ------. He too is a welcome addition to the main pipeline.

"------ ------, feature writer—an old Asia hand and one who goes to any lengths to write or plant stories desirable." (The names above are left blank because we have only this statement that the journalists referred to are parts of a pipeline.)

Cabal against Li

All in all, Chen Chih-mai had a busy summer in 1949, what with riding herd on Messrs. Goodwin and Paige and entertaining Congressmen and other influential Americans. A complication arose from Chiang's resignation. Although General Li Tsung-jen had become acting president in January 1949. Chen Chih-mai and his colleagues continued to report to the Generalissimo, who was busy sweeping the tombs of his ancestors, as if he had never retired.

Life at the Embassy became more devious than ever. Since Ambassador Koo was considered unreliable, all cables dealing with lobby activities were dispatched to Chiang not through the Embassy but through channels controlled by Chiang's trusted agents. As the cables indicate, Chen Chih-mai, aided by General Pee, started intriguing against Acting President Li. On November 28, 1949, Pee cabled to Chiang as follows:

"Congressman Judd gave us information by saying that the State Department may give Kan Chich-hou (President Li's personal representative in the United States) the following promise. If Li were capable of getting rid of the old feudal system of evil forces and could succeed in obtaining military and political power, then aid from the American Government will be forwarded immediately. The intention of the United States Government is to deal a blow at you."

Offered: $5,000,000

One of the most ambitious schemes of the lobby appears in Chen's cable of September 15:

"Yesterday, my humble self, Chen Chih-mai, met Gen. Albert Wedemeyer. General told me than an aluminum magnate (J. Louis Reynolds of the Reynolds Metals Co.) relayed a message to him that the Chinese Government intended to hire him at $5,000,000 if he would give up his military career in the United States Government to go to China to assist us in the anti-Communist activities.

"General Wedemeyer said he always has great sympathy toward our anti-Communist policy, and especially holds you in great esteem as a leader. He is willing to try his best, if he finds himself in a position to be of service to you as an individual.

"However, his opposition to the present United States foreign policy is a well-known fact. Therefore, if he comes to China as a private citizen in a private capacity, it will be certain that he would not be supported by the United States Government. So nothing can be accomplished. He also said he could get by financially. If we have such a large sum of money, private or public, it should be used for the welfare of the people in order to enhance the force against the Communists."

According to Drew Pearson, General Wedemeyer has confirmed both the offer and his rejection of it.

According to former Nationalist officials, the idea of hiring General Wedemeyer originated with T. V. Soong, who, together with Ambassador Koo, was desperately seeking a means of reversing the policy advanced by the white paper and paving the way for further United States aid. The scheme was that if a United States general like Wedemeyer were once established on Formosa, his unofficial mission could easily turn into an official one for the United States.

Hiring an admiral

Though Chen Chih-mai had little to do with the Wedemeyer project, he may well take some credit for the departure for Formosa in the winter of 1949–50 of Admiral Charles M. Cooke, Jr., who had commanded the Seventh Fleet in 1947 and 1948. In the latter year Admiral Cooke had retired and returned to the United States to become an ardent and vocal supporter of the Nationalists.

Aside from numerous speaking engagements, Admiral Cooke worked mostly on the problem of obtaining official clearance for a mission of retired United States officers to be hired directly by the Nationalist Government, a step that would have required Presidential sanction. According to Admiral Cooke, his 1949 trip to Formosa was made as a correspondent for the International News Service. Although the admiral says he was not paid by INS, several articles by him have appeared in the Hearst press.

Once arrived in Formosa, Admiral Cooke quickly found a way to realize his project without Presidential sanction. In the spring of 1950 he entered the employment of Commerce International-China, an American firm that was under contract to the Nationalist Government as its official purchasing and sales agent. Shortly after it hired Admiral Cooke, CIC added 16 former United States officers to its payroll in Formosa.

In the absence of any official United States military mission to Formosa at that time, these officers were called the American Technical and Military Advisory Group. According to one report, CIC received a service fee of $750,000 from the Nationalist Government, part of which went to cover the expenses of maintaining the advisory group.

Envoy to MacArthur

Admiral Cooke's chief function was liaison with SCAP headquarters in Tokyo, and his job, first and last, was to bring General MacArthur into the Nationalist camp. However, as late as the beginning of 1950, General Chu Shih-ming, Chiang's chief of mission in Tokyo, was still reporting SCAP's cool indifference.

A few weeks after the Korean war broke out, Admiral Cooke succeeded in persuading the MacArthur headquarters to release to the Nationalists 22,000 rounds of 3-inch Navy shells at a price of $3 each, plus 40,000 rounds of 20-millimeter and 40-millimeter shells. On July 31, 1950, General MacArthur paid his first postwar visit to Formosa—and a successful visit too.

Admiral Cooke's latest gesture for the Nationalist cause was an appearance before the McCarran subcommittee last fall, following a dramatic flight from Formosa, to testify against John Carter Vincent, Walton Butterworth, and Philip Jessup.

Admiral Cooke has now reportedly severed his connections with CIC, but the firm itself continues to be as active as ever. On last June 26, it finally registered with the Department of Justice as a paid agent of the Republic of China.

Thus Chen Chih-mai's private diplomacy was to bring to Formosa, pending the time the United States Army itself would arrive, a small private army of American officers. United States generals and admirals, retired or not, were encouraged to make private alliances, which Chen Chih-mai hoped and prayed the United States Government would later on ratify.

VIII—CHINA REDISCOVERED

The smiling counselor was lobbying with a vengeance all through 1949. Perhaps he overstepped the boundaries of conventional diplomacy, but his government was in a very unconventional, indeed, tragic, spot. Chen Chih-mai served his leader, for all we know, faithfully and well.

During the same year there were quite a few American citizens who, on their own initiative and with their own means, were moving in the same direction as the lobbyists controlled by Chen Chih-mai. The counselor and his inner group saw to it that the volunteers were well stocked with informa- and sometimes with directives—but delicately. Each group and each leader needed special treatment. Volunteers are harder to keep in line than paid workers. Yet no foreign lobby in our country will ever succeed unless it can organize the spontaneous cooperation of well-meaning Americans.

A notable volunteer

Among China's most energetic volunteers in 1949, a notable one was Frederick C. McKee, a Pittsburgh industrialist, who has for years contributed zeal, time, and funds to causes he has believed in.

Since the fall of 1939 there have been in our country a number of organizations dedicated to a single foreign-policy issue. They cross political, economic, and religious lines, and, when their goal is reached, they are disbanded. In the most liberal of these organizations Frederick McKee was always to be found—an internationally minded fervent political do-gooder. In 1949 he appeared again and founded, with the aid of a few old friends, veterans of the William Allen White committee, the Committee To Defend America by Aiding Anti-Communist China.

Strange bedfellows

On the board of directors of McKee's committee were three AFL leaders: Matthew Woll, David Dubinsky, and Jay Lovestone, the ex-Communist Party chieftain who had become top foreign adviser to the AFL. Overtures were made to the CIO, evidently without success. The AFL, however, had its own foreign-affairs branch—the Free Trade Union Committee, headed by Mr. Woll as president with Mr. Lovestone as moving spirit. In July the FTUC came out for immediate aid to the Nationalist regime, "under careful supervision of American military and economic authorities," and soon started distributing pro-Nationalist propaganda and writing letters to Congressmen, urging more aid for the Nationalists. In a policy statement last May, the AFL demanded continued military and economic aid to the Formosa government.

According to persons who know him, Mr. McKee is not overfond of Alfred Kohlberg. But they have a cause in common. Last June, 10 of the 51 directors of Mr. McKee's committee were also directors of the American China Policy Association, which Mr. Kohlberg says he did not organize but "took * * * in hand" early in its career. The association is a small group—it was deliberately kept so in the early stages, Mr. Kohlberg says, "because we didn't want anyone * * * who didn't agree with us"—but it includes citizens of fairly diverse views and reputation. Until last summer its president was Clare Boothe Luce. She was succeeded by William Loeb, the publisher of the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader, a Republican who loves GOP Senator STYLES BRIDGES but loathes GOP Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, whom he once called dangerous to the future safety of the United States. Republican Senators GEORGE AIKEN and RALPH FLANDERS he has described as "those two disgraces to the State of Vermont."

One of the directors of the China Policy Association is the Reverend Dr. James W. Fifield, a Congregationalist minister and head of Spiritual Mobilization, who has been widely criticized in Los Angeles for the anti-Semitic overtones of his radio speeches. In a talk in 1948, Dr. Fifield singled out Mr. Kohlberg as "one of the five most vigorous, helpful, and constructive individuals in the anti-Communist forces [who] happen to be Jews." Recently, when asked whether there was a China lobby in the United States, Dr. Fifield said: "Yes, there is. Its head is Alfred Kohlberg, one of my dearest friends."

The impact of Hiss

Early in 1949, when Mme. Chiang was briefing the Chinese inner circle at the home of Mr. Kohlberg's friend H. H. Kung, Mr. Kohlberg suddenly renewed his attacks on the Institute of Pacific Relations after 2 years of comparative silence on the subject. In June he took off on a visit to Formosa. On his return he called on his friend Senator BRIDGES, wrote a report on China, and before long had his first meeting with T. V. Soong.

At about the same time, he was seeking what he called "the inside dope" on Ambassador-at-large Philip C. Jessup, under whose direction the white paper had been prepared. Mr. Kohlberg wanted to find out, as he himself put it in an open letter to the columnist Robert S. Allen published in the China Monthly, whether Jessup "is just a confused liberal who has been used by more sinister subversives like Henry Wallace."

IX—KOREA AND BEYOND

At the Chinese Embassy in Washington all the tumult and the shouting brought on by the Tydings hearings were looked on as a great triumph. William Goodwin, Chen Chih-mai's No. 1 lobbyist, said in an interview with Ed Harris of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch: "We'll have a new China policy as a result of all this by the end of summer. * * * And as for Secretary Dean Acheson, I can tell you that he's already fired by President Truman. It just hasn't been announced. He has to get rid of him because of all the pressure."

The Tydings hearings presented Counselor Chen and his colleagues with problems as well as opportunities. One particularly troublesome case was that of Owen Lattimore, who in 1941 and 1942 had been Chiang Kai-shek's chief American adviser and who now stood accused by Senator MCCARTHY of having been the Soviet architect of United States policy in China. On April 7, 1950, this cable was dispatched to Chiang:

"Lattimore is being questioned at a congressional hearing, and he produced two letters—one from you addressed to President Roosevelt, and one from Mme. Chiang addressed to Lattimore, wherein you both commended him highly. As a matter of fact, Lattimore in recent years has attacked our government viciously, and has opposed any aid for us. He especially despises you very much. Now, he has used the above-mentioned two letters for his own defense. But we are in quite a bit of doubt about the existence of these two letters. Last night Congressman JUDD intended to call Mme. Chiang by long distance in order to debunk Lattimore. After a discussion, the Congressman preferred that the report be relayed to you by a cable from us instead."

On May 3, General Pee, the military attaché who had once described himself as having been "patient and tolerant to the extremity with General Marshall," sent the following message:

"Last Sunday the New York Times editorialized about the China lobbyists, and Ambassador Koo, Chen Chih-mai, H. H. Kung, and T. V. Soong were mentioned. The Lattimore case was created as a political weapon in a conflict between the two parties. But Lattimore and the Democratic Party intentionally pulled us into the case and accused us of a sneak attack on the State Department and General Marshall. We are really in a very bad spot. For details, ask Chen Chih-mai in person."

Gunning for Acheson

Meanwhile, of course, the lobby kept up the classic pressures of all lobbyists, as Counselor Chen had indicated in a cable to Chiang back in July 21, 1949:

"As far as our activities in the United States are concerned, it seems that we should cover the administration, as well as the legislative branch, we should especially strive for a closer relationship with the latter. There is no danger at all if our procedure, strictly follows the laws of the United States, but Dr. Hu Shih is opposed to getting in touch with the legislative branch. His opinion is off the beam."

By April 6, 1950, Chen Chih-mai was more than ever applying his tactics of working on the Legislature. That day he cabled Chiang that he had had * * * "a long talk with KNOWLAND and JUDD. They both said Mr. Acheson was strongly prejudiced against China to a most unreasonable degree, President Truman's ability is limited, and he is influenced by Acheson all of the time. Therefore, there is no chance for a change of China policy as long as Acheson is in power. However, Congressman JUDD felt that our continuous air raids on the cities only killed many innocent people—he asked us to reconsider the military necessity of such action."

Two months later, on the eve of the war in Korea, Counselor Chen reported:

"Your subordinate Chen Chih-mai had a long talk with Congressman JUDD after he had shot a series of questions at Acheson today. After talking it over with others, the following conclusions were drawn: United States aid for China mainly depends on the outcome of General MacArthur's visit to Formosa. The most convenient formula for us to apply is to use the Japanese Peace Treaty, which is not signed as yet, as an excuse to work out with General MacArthur a so-called Formosa defense bill. Congress will support such a bill."

June 25, 1950

Three weeks later, war broke out in Korea, and Chen Chih-mai no longer had to press for a "Formosa defense bill." The North Koreans took care of that—and more. President Truman sent the Seventh Fleet to neutralize and, if necessary, protect the island. Thanks to the Communists, Chiang was safe—at least for the duration.

Actually, at the very beginning, the lobby came to realize that June 25 had brought it one step forward and one step back. The war in which American soldiers finally debarked on the mainland of Asia was only a limited one. In America, lobby operators could not launch a campaign for total war, particularly in the early stages when our soldiers were fighting so bravely and with so little of everything. To this day, the China lobby has been unable to make up its mind whether the Korean war is a blessing or a curse—the beginning of the end of Chiang's tribulations, or the "Truman war."

To a diplomatic activist like Chen Chih-mai, the ally status that the United States Government once more granted Chiang was a harbinger of better things. Gently and firmly, he set himself to speeding up the tempo of their coming. A key man to keep in touch with was, of course, Mr. Republican, who might head tomorrow's administration. Chen managed to have a good talk with the Senator. A cable of July 28, 1950:

"Senator TAFT was immensely interested in the problems of Formosa. He at one time even advocated last January to send the United States fleet to defend Formosa. Your humble subordinate, Chen Chih-mai, gave TAFT the following idea: We Chinese are willing to share the responsibilities along with General MacArthur in a fight against Russia and communism; however, the economic strength in Formosa is weak and the source of manpower is limited—whereas, the mainland of China is teeming with guerrillas and a practically inexhaustible source of recruits. What they need is a proper leader and a proper organization. Your career in the racial revolutionary campaign, anti-aggression, anti-Japan, and anticommunism, is brilliantly recorded in history, and you are the most natural leader of Asia and the best partner of the United States as well.

"The above idea will be used by TAFT in his speech which will in turn sell the same idea to the United States authorities."

A few weeks before his conversation with TAFT, Chen Chih-mai had sought the counsel of a rebellious Democrat, former Ambassador to the U. S. S. R. William C. Bullitt, who, although fighting against the administration, still knew who carried weight at the White House and the State Department.

Mr. Bullitt had, said a cable:

"Recommended that we should get in touch—close and often—with Harriman and with the newly appointed Chief of the Far Eastern Division and Assistant Secretary of the State Department—Dean Rusk."

In the Embassy's opinion there was one great difficulty:

"Harriman is a rich man's son, and also he is very scrupulous."

Chen Chih-mai had another thing to hope for: Would Red China enter the Korean war? On September 13, 1950, he reported:

"• • • What Americans fear the most is the forthcoming participation of the Chinese Communists in the Korean war. This development bears a very high possibility, of course, but at the present stage, our policy should be:

"a. Do not make any publicity about the northward moves of the Chinese Communist troops because such publicity will arouse the suspicions and fears of the Americans and would give the Americans an excuse that we are yearning for such a conflict.

"b. Instead, we should yell at the top of our lungs in an effort to persuade the Chinese people on the mainland not to be fooled by the Russians and Chinese Communists to participate in the Korean war. Then it would match perfectly with American psychology."

As far as the Formosa régime was concerned, events in Korea never lost their ambivalent quality, no matter how the war was going for the U. N. Chen Chih-mai saw the Inchon landing as an ominous portent of peace. On September 30, he cabled Chiang:

"The American people are quite excited over the recent victory in Korea. The American authorities will use this as political capital during the election year. The United States policy toward Formosa will have a tendency of a compromise. The attack from the Republicans will no longer be effective. American friends cautioned us that we were facing a most critical and dangerous situation. Our countermeasure is not to show our discouragement."

Chiang has been exposed to the danger of our making peace with Red China since the day when Red China entered the war, and the danger became particularly real when the war practically ended in a stalemate. As late as March 28, 1952, Chiang warned the U. N. against a truce.

All in all, the Korean war has granted Chiang a desperately needed reprieve, and at the same time afflicted him with tantalizing prospects. Up to now, these prospects have remained largely beyond reach. Even his most active American friends seem now to be agitating for verbal or psychological rather than real war. The American people have become acquainted with the nature of war on the Asian mainland, and many leaders, Republicans or Democrats, are looking for short cuts to victory. The American strategy for Asia seems to be based on sea and air power. This is not what Chiang needs. Yet even Alfred Kohlberg's magazine came out with this disconcerting statement in an editorial on May 7, 1951: "We are not called upon to put Chiang's troops ashore on the east Asian mainland. All that we are called upon to do is to see that Chiang has the right to buy ships, the right to good advice, the right to enlist volunteers of the caliber of General Chennault and his Flying Tigers. (He might even be permitted to hire MacArthur as his chief of staff.)"

MacArthur's return was hailed as the beginning of a new era. Perhaps it was the moment when Chiang's hopes soared highest. So did the hopes of the lobby and of its friends. On April 23, 1951, Life wrote: "General MacArthur has a great role—a role of greatness—to play in this country now." But after the Senate hearings the same magazine (May 14, 1951) complained that he "chose to duck some other points in a fashion which at times seemed very weak and unconvincing."

Unquestionably, the China Lobby seems to be more effective in fighting the Communist conspiracy, real or fancied, at home than in rousing the people for a holy war against Red China.

When it comes to measures for the defeat of communism and Chiang's reconquest of China, these indomitable home-front warriors have little more to suggest than the battle for the minds of men, or, at the utmost, some assistance to the Chinese guerrillas. Perhaps Chiang has never felt further away from the Chinese mainland than he does today.

Sometimes Chen Chih-mai, a man who knows how to appraise men and things, must wonder who is using whom, and what his grueling labors and tribulations are for, after all.

X—OUR ASIAN POLICY: THE JAMMED RUDDER

Our policy toward Chiang, since Franklin Roosevelt decided that we should have one, has been torn by the conflict between what our national interest requires of China and what the Kuomintang demands of us. The Kuomintang wants unconditional, unlimited assistance, both economic and military; the American national interest requires a strong, independent, and decently governed China. But no compromise has ever been possible between the American and the Kuomintang notions of strength, independence, and decency.

If Chiang Kai-shek were now the ruler of China, he would be cultivating good relations with Russia, just as, for all his internal anti-communism, he always did as long as he held power on the mainland. Today the Formosa-bound Chinese ruler cannot play the balance-of-power game between the United States and Russia. He cannot threaten to turn against us. He has however, through lobbyists and zealots in the United States, turned against our State Department, one agency of our Government that has—or has had—the temerity to defend United States interests against the insatiable demands of the Kuomintang regime.

This operation against the American State Department, its policies, and its men may very well go down in history as a classic. By skill and by luck, the China lobby has managed to jam the rudder of our far eastern foreign policy. Luck helped toward the end of 1949, when the Chinese Communists began ruthlessly mistreating American consular officials; on June 25, 1950, when North Korea started the war; and finally in November 1950 when Red China went to the rescue of North Korea. Such domestic events as the trial of Alger Hiss also helped. The lobby succeeded in exploiting all these advantages with such brashness and skill that even to admit having considered the recognition of Communist China has become anathema to the leaders of our foreign policy.

Those State Department officials who in the line of duty were attached to Mao's headquarters during the war against Japan, those who then and later thought there was a chance, and a chance well worth taking, to keep the Chinese Communists from falling into the hands of the Kremlin—these men are now branded as traitors. The lobbyists have succeeded in making retroactive the present state of war between our country and Red China so that they can exercise "thought control" over thoughts that men had in the past. They have called everybody they dislike Communists. The course of our foreign policy in Asia has been set: We can only help Chiang. What the other Asian powers and our European allies may think about this is immaterial.

The robot policy

The lobby's tactics have been to attack State Department personnel, to threaten boycott of the Marshall plan program for Europe, and to blame the administration for whatever advances communism has made anywhere in the world. Under this crossfire the administration has fallen back on the defensive. To ransom its European-aid program and to avoid giving the Republicans further ammunition for the electoral campaigns of 1950 and 1952, the administration has had to fight a delaying action.

The lobby's campaign has been just as successful against men as against policies. Most Americans were shocked when Senator McCARTHY all but called General Marshall a traitor on the floor of the Senate. But General Marshall was probably not surprised at all. The first time he had been called a traitor was in a Kuomintang newspaper in 1948. Both in the United States and in China—particularly in China—he has had a unique opportunity to study the lobby in action. His big obstacle as a mediator, apart from the bad faith of both sides, was the reassurance Chiang was getting from his friends in America. They told him that he didn't have to yield, so, of course, Chiang did his best to stall the negotiations that he had originally wanted. General Marshall had ample opportunity to learn that the lobby's influence has been as nefarious in Chinese as in American politics.

Even before Red China showed its hostility toward us, the lobby's campaign of intimidation produced results. In September 1949, the No. 2 Communist leader, Chou En-lai, invited the United States Ambassador to China, Leighton Stuart, to visit Yenching University in Peking, of which Dr. Stuart had been president. The State Department, still hoping to drive a wedge between Mao and Stalin, favored the visit, but President Truman, fearful that he might be accused of selling out Chiang at another Yalta vetoed the trip.

In January 1950, when the question of expelling the Nationalist Chinese delegate came up in the Security Council, the American representative said that his Government viewed the matter as a procedural one and would abide by the decision of a majority vote. In June 1951, during the MacArthur hearings, Secretary Acheson said that it was not clear whether representation in the United Nations was a purely procedural matter. If it were a matter of substance—a point that only the World Court could decide—the United States could deliver a veto in the Security Council. And finally, when the Senate was considering the confirmation of American delegates to the latest General Assembly in Paris, one Senator asked all 10 to declare their views on the recognition of Mao. Through this gradual stifling process the robotization of our China policy has been achieved. The State Department has had to accept it in order to keep some freedom of action in Europe and the Middle East.

One of the lobby's favorite targets after General Marshall has been John Carter Vincent, Counselor of Embassy in China in 1942 and later chief of the Division of Chinese Affairs at the State Department. Mr. Vincent has now reached the point in his career when he might normally expect to become an ambassador, if only he could pass the test of Senate confirmation. Instead, the Department assigned him to Switzerland as minister, and still later, under continuing pressure, to a less sensitive post at Tangier. Last spring Fulton Lewis, Jr., gave his public a glimpse of how the attacks on Mr. Vincent had originated. He announced that he had got hold of a report by Chiang's secret police, one of several dozen that were being circulated in and around Washington. In his column he reported with relish how Chiang's footpads had tailed United States representatives all over China, rifled their files, and eavesdropped on their official and unofficial talks.

To judge from Mr. Lewis's examples, the secret-police reports were not very impressive. Mr. Lewis patched them together to make a picture of fellow-traveling career men conspiring to sell out Chiang to the Communists. He described Mr. Vincent, accurately enough, as "another of the State Department officials who went through the Nationalist Chinese Intelligence wringer."

According to Mr. Lewis, one of the secret-police reports "relates details on how Pat Hurley * * * had Vincent recalled to the United States from China." (Mr. Vincent left China more than a year before Mr. Hurley was appointed ambassador.)

The same document reported that John Stewart Service "rode in Army car No. 2070 * * * to the office of the Communist leader at No. 50 Tseng-Chia-Yen" and that he later "went in person to Yenan to see Communist Mao Tse-tung." Mr. Lewis did not explain that Mr. Service was the official liaison man between the United States Army Headquarters and the Communist Eighteenth Army Group, or that his visit to Yenan lasted for almost a year, since he was a member of the official United States Army Observer Group that was dispatched to Yenan with the approval of Chiang Kai-shek. Or that Pat Hurley, too, "went in person to Yenan to see Communist Mao Tse-tung."

The end of the China Service

The attack on these individuals spread into an attack on the entire "China Service" which the State Department had created after the First World War. Because Chinese dialects, history, and customs are so difficult to master, the Department picked young men of particular aptitude and sent them to school in China for 2 years—and an optional third—of full-time study.

These men formed a sort of elite in the Foreign Service, but not on the basis of social snobbery. The "China Service" was a rugged, unglamorous, challenging assignment. Its men came mostly from families of modest means, frequently from missionary families, and many of them had spoken Chinese since childhood. So much did they steep themselves in the language and in the thinking habits of the Chinese people that they became the most envied corps of diplomatic experts in the Orient. Neither the British nor the Russians had anything to compare with our China Service; not until 1942 did the Russians copy our methods to build a service that could match it.

Today this corps has been disbanded. Of the 22 officers who belonged to it before the Second World War and who are still with the Department, only 2 continue to work in the Division of Chinese Affairs. Both had the luck not to be in China during the war. The other 20 are scattered about the world. One, born of missionary parents and with 25 years' duty in China, is at Palermo. Another, with 18 years, is in Ecuador. Twenty-nine years of experience in China of two men are now being utilized by the Department. The 285 years of the other 20 are being thrown away.

The State Department's attempt to protect its men by sending them off to posts remote from China did not help much. Even when they are scattered around the world, the lobby knows how to reach them. Eleven of the 22 have been attacked in China lobby literature or in congressional investigations. One, Oliver Edmund Clubb, after 7 months' suspension for loyalty hearings and after Dean Acheson had overruled the verdict against him, has resigned. Another, John Paton Davies, who was recently cleared after a long suspension, has been assigned to a post in Germany. John Carter Vincent, who returned on leave from Tangier to demand a hearing before the McCarran subcommittee, was "completely cleared" by the Department's loyalty board and returned to Tangier. It will be surprising if he is not recalled again and again to face the same old charges.

The State Department no longer offers an attractive career for young men. In 1949, 1,128 candidates took the foreign-service examinations; in 1950, 807; in 1951, only 760. At the present time just one is enrolled in the once-famous training program of the China Service.

Officers who once wrote candid reports, expecting them to be read only by their superiors, have come to consider how each word they write would look when excerpted before some committee and then reexcerpted in the newspapers. A good foreign-service officer, like a good detective or reporter, used to get all the information he could and keep a close watch on troublemakers. But now foreign-service officers have to restrict their acquaintanceship to people who will not seem objectionable. Our foreign service is becoming more and more like Soviet Russia's, which confines itself to telling its masters only what they want to hear.

Today many career diplomats tend to keep their mouths shut or to hedge. This is particularly true at meetings with representatives of other Government agencies. Under such circumstances, correct policy decisions are accidental.

Besmirched

Yet the need for correct decisions has never been greater. The July 1951 issue of the American Foreign Service Journal put it this way: "* * * such has been the effect of happenings of the last years that, at the very moment in history when the Foreign Service should be at the peak of its capabilities, when it should be best prepared to meet the terrible responsibilities of a period of decision between war and peace, it should itself become besmirched before the eyes of the American people, its confidence, courage, and very belief in its own principles and precepts, seriously if not irreparably damaged."

XI—THE WORLD OF ALFRED KOHLBERG

Mr. Alfred Kohlberg, the importer of Chinese embroidery and self-educated expert on Communist conspiracy, lives in a world of absolutes. He rigorously divides nearly everything that comes under his scrutiny into two general classifications—patriotic truth and treasonable conspiracy. "I'm a businessman," says Mr. Kohlberg. "I judge things by results."

Mr. Kohlberg himself usually gets results. For example, it has been substantiated by the record and by Mr. Kohlberg's own statements that he furnished much of Senator McCarthy's "case" against Owen Lattimore. But after Mr. Lattimore defended himself successfully against the McCarthy charges before the Tydings committee, Mr. Kohlberg made a speech to the Larchmont Men's Club in which he stated:

"I am not trying to prove that Owen Lattimore is, or was, either a Communist or an espionage agent, because I do not have that proof."

Like Senator McCarthy, Mr. Kohlberg has a way of increasing the emotional effectiveness of his accusations by denying that he has made any accusations. Not long ago he told a student of Chinese affairs that Communists have filled the Government with their agents and that Dean Acheson is the leader of the State Department ring. Mr. Kohlberg repeated that there was no doubt that Mr. Acheson was a Communist but added that he could not print the statement because he was unable to document it. But when this reporter asked whether he thought the Secretary of State was a Communist, Mr. Kohlberg replied as follows: "I don't believe he is a Communist or sincerely pro-Communist. He is a very able, very clever, very shallow man—not the kind of man who becomes a Communist. He's like my lawyer."

Mr. Kohlberg himself is an able, clever, complex man, and if he believes one thing at one time and something else at another time, he nevertheless says everything with utter conviction.

A study in scarlet

Mr. Kohlberg is a rotund little man in a neat business suit with what he has brand-named a "Kohlerchief" sticking out of the breast pocket; he has a smooth, chubby face, a shiny bald head, and an agile smile. There is no warmth or mirth in the smile.

He has been writing long and importunate letters to newspapers and Congressmen for many of his sixty-odd years, and has written scores of articles and letters to editors. He is a voluble public speaker, and will talk readily to anybody who pays him a call.

"In January 1945," he told this reporter, "I wrote a dream of the Communist conquest of the world. After I wrote it, an ex-Communist newspaperman dropped in on me and said I must have based it on the program of the Communist International."

"Who was the ex-Communist newspaperman?" he was asked.

"I won't tell you. I got the program at a second-hand book store. I had to pay $2.50 for one 10-cent document." Mr. Kohlberg handed over a pamphlet entitled "Theses and Resolution of the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International," dated December 12, 1928. He also referred to the program of the Communist International dated September 1, 1928.

"These documents and others are available to the State Department. But the State Department didn't seem to know about them. James Byrnes didn't know about them. Marshall didn't know about them. Acheson didn't know about them. Acheson wrote to Senator George that he hadn't read them. That was in April 1947." (Mr. Kohlberg never has to fumble for a date.) "What motivates Acheson is ambition. He realized that if he went along with the pro-Communist group he would serve his own advancement. There was a pro-Communist group in the White House and he went along."

Mr. Kohlberg paused to listen to another question: "Who do you consider were the pro-Communists in the White House?"

"I'm not going to name them for you. There has been sworn testimony by Elizabeth Bentley, by Whittaker Chambers, and in the Tydings hearings. Between the fall of 1944 and August 1946 in the State Department all five heads of the Far East end were relieved or removed. There was Joseph Grew, Stanley Hornbeck, Joseph Ballentine, Eugene Dooman—I said five; leave it at four. Who forced them out? Well, now, let's see who were the Secretaries of State. Stettinius, Byrnes, and Marshall, all in those years. [Marshall actually became Secretary of State in January 1947.] They didn't know enough to make that mistake. They did it on the advice of people below who knew. No; I'm not going to name them, either.

"After 1946 there was almost no one in Washington who didn't have sympathy for communism, and there were some pro-Communists."

"Exactly what do you mean by a pro-Communist?"

"I mean by a pro-Communist a person whose sympathies in the Far East were with the Communist forces. I can't go into the mental processes. He might not be a pro-Communist in Europe. Philip Jessup, for instance, is probably not pro-Communist in Europe. I don't know whether he is or not. But in the Far East he is pro-Communist."

Belfast and Swatow

Mr. Kohlberg is reluctant to talk about his personal life and his business. He prefers his crusade against communism as a topic of conversation. However, it is known that he was born and brought up in San Francisco, that his father was in the wholesale food business and, according to San Franciscans, was well off. Alfred graduated from Lowell High School in 1904 and from the University of California in 1908. After college, according to his own account, he was "sales repre-

sentative in San Francisco for some New York firms."

At the Panama-Pacific International Exposition in San Francisco in 1915 he saw some Chinese silks and laces, became enamored of them, and made a trip to China the next year. He set himself up in business there and opened offices in England and Switzerland and, in 1917, in New York. His business prospered; Mr. Kohlberg has estimated his gross at $1,500,000 in an average year before the Second World War. "I imported laces, silks, and other items from China," he said. "After 1922 I had my own establishment in Swatow. I bought linen in Belfast, shipped it to Swatow, had it finished, and then brought it here."

By 1937 Mr. Kohlberg had a hundred thousand Chinese women, working under contractors, embroidering his linens for export. It has been widely reported that his profits were derived largely from cheap labor and child labor, that a skilled Chinese girl working 12 hours a day earned 25 Chinese dollars a month. It is a pleasure to record another aspect of the picture as reported by Irene Corbally Kuhn in the June 1951 issue of the Sign, a monthly magazine:

"His enlightened business methods have made his firm an outstanding one and have paid off in unusual human dividends," wrote Mrs. Kuhn. "At the time of Pearl Harbor, Kohlberg's firm had 3,500,000 pieces of work in China. When the Japanese struck, he simply wrote off that shipment as a complete loss. Early in 1946, however, he discovered that his workers had managed to store away nearly 70 percent. Some of the Chinese had gone to great lengths, often at great personal expense, to hold up what they considered their end of the bargain. As a matter of course, Kohlberg took over all living expenses for his employees in China for the 4 years of the war. 'They risked their lives to fulfill their contract and save my goods,' he says, matter-of-factly. 'I just put them back in business.'

"That reputation for fair dealing which paid off so handsomely in China is as much a part of Kohlberg as his skin," Mrs. Kuhn concluded fulsomely.

In her article there was no mention of two cease-and-desist orders issued by the Federal Trade Commission to Alfred Kohlberg, Inc. The first, dated November 19, 1928, complained that although the firm's lace was wound on cards inscribed "Made in China," it carried such names as "Irish Crochet Lace," "Chinese Irish Lace," and "Swatow Irish Picot." The second order, issued on January 26, 1943, reported that "Made in China" tags or stickers had been loosely attached to Kohlberg merchandise bearing such names as "Tuscany," "Cluny Venise," "Valenciennes," etc. The order stated: "That the unqualified use by the respondent of names signifying the lace-producing sections of Europe * * * [has] the tendency and capacity to mislead and deceive a substantial portion of the purchasing public."

Mr. Kohlberg himself was put back in business after the war by the Nationalist government, which promptly granted him export licenses. In the 4 years that the government stayed on the mainland after VE-day, he was able to accumulate a pretty good inventory in New York. "If business stays bad, the way it is now," he says, "it will last for quite a while." The Nationalist government also granted him two decorations, the higher of which is called the Order of the Auspicious Star. Both hang in frames in Mr. Kohlberg's modest first-floor office at 1 West Thirty-seventh Street, New York.

World of ideas

The conversion of Mr. Kohlberg from prosperous merchant to zealot took place suddenly in 1943. "I never took communism seriously until then," he said. "Some people act according to ideas, but the businessman always looks at results. I went to Russia in 1926, 1932, and 1935. I looked at what they were doing there, and I decided we didn't have to worry about Russia; they don't deliver the goods. I wasn't at home in the world of ideas. I didn't realize that people could be moved by ideas and not by results."

After 25 years of business dealings in China, during which he had made some 35 trips to that country; Mr. Kohlberg had become known by the time of the Second World War as a man who could be counted on for help to the Chinese cause. He was an active member and supporter of the Institute of Pacific Relations, and in 1943 he made another trip to China as chairman of the executive committee of the American Bureau for Medical Aid to China. "I saw funny things happen. I heard lies put out by the [United States] Embassy. I believed the lies myself until I went out in the field and heard the truth."

Specifically, Mr. Kolberg heard that Chiang Kai-shek was stockpiling lend-lease tanks and guns for future use against the Communists instead of using them against the Japanese. He reported this to Brig. Gen. Thomas S. Arms, who was in charge of General Stilwell's infantry school at Kunming, and was told that munitions from the United States were delivered to Stilwell, not to Chiang Kai-shek. "That was in August 1943."

It should be noted that this was the time of one of the periodic crises between General Stilwell and Generalissimo Chiang. Stilwell was training a Chinese army at Kunming with inadequate supplies flown over the Hump. Chiang was objecting to Stilwell's plan to attack the Japanese in Burma; he was arguing for arms for his own forces and insisting that he would know how and where to use them. Stilwell was pressing Washington for more supplies while the Chinese, Chennault's air force, and even his own forces accused him of niggardliness in distributing the supplies on hand. At the same time, Stilwell was complaining in his diary of Chiang's failure to supply him with promised reinforcements, of delays in getting promised mortars from Chiang, of the thefts of army payrolls by Chinese unit commanders. In this atmosphere of complaint and countercomplaint, no doubt there were exaggerations. What Mr. Kohlberg saw was a Communist plot. Perhaps the Chinese helped him see it.

Narrow militancy

"When I came back to see Cordell Hull, he sent me to Stanley Hornbeck, who was chief of the Far Eastern Division of the State Department. Hornbeck said that when he saw the people the Department was sending to China he shook in his shoes." [Hornbeck's version is less colorful. He says that he was indeed distressed by the many Americans with no knowledge of China whom the Government was at the time using to staff its multiple agencies in China. Among so many people, he added, undoubtedly there were a few Communists or Communist sympathizers.]

"I soon saw that the center of the conspiracy was the Institute of Pacific Relations, to which I had contributed time and money. The IPR people had infiltrated the State Department, the OWI, Commerce, the Treasury, and the intelligence services of the Armed Forces. There were between a hundred and two hundred IPR people in the far eastern divisions of Government departments. I also found out that their so-called scholarly studies coincided with the Communist line. I spent 6 months of 1944, 4 hours a day and some Saturdays and Sundays, at the public library, studying the IPR publications for the last 7 years. So I tried to clean out the IPR. Instead they cleaned me out."

Mr. Kohlberg's efforts to clean out the IPR went on from 1944 to 1947. They began in 1944 with an 88-page pamphlet designed to show the parallels between the Communist line and the writings in the IPR publications, and culminated in March 1947 with his proposal to the institute's trustees of a resolution that the IPR's entire treatment of China be investigated. The institute probably made a mistake in not taking Mr. Kohlberg seriously enough at first. When it got around to answering his charges in detail, it was able to show omissions and distortions in his quotations and to point to many instances in which it had presented two or more sides of a controversial subject. Mr. Kohlberg, according to "a long-time friend" quoted by Irene Kuhn in her article in the Sign, "doesn't make the mistake of being a liberal who dilutes his views. He has a kind of narrow militancy about them that strengthens them beyond measure."

"There were pro-Communists not only on the staff level," Mr. Kohlberg went on, "but on the board of trustees and the executive committee of the board of trustees. In the vote on my resolution in April 1947 no trustees voted for my investigation." Who were the pro-Communists on the board of trustees? Mr. Kohlberg thereupon proceeded to associate the following names: "Lauchlin Currie, Frederick Vanderbilt Field, Mortimer Graves, Edward C. Carter, Harriet Lucy Moore, Len deCaux (he was kicked out of the CIO when they cleaned out the Communists), Owen Lattimore, Ben C. Kizer, Maxwell Stewart—maybe there were some others, but that's all I can think of right now. They got rid of Field later and they got rid of Carter in part later, although he's still a trustee. Oh, yes; another pro-Communist was Philip C. Jessup."

Neither Mr. Jessup nor two of the others named by Mr. Kohlberg were on the board of trustees of the IPR in April 1947. Of the 57-member board, that left 50 non-pro-Communist trustees who saw no sense in Mr. Kohlberg's resolution.

Having gotten nowhere with the trustees of the IPR or with its members, who subsequently gave him 66 proxies against 1,163 in a vote on whether or not to conduct the investigation he had proposed, Mr. Kohlberg resigned from the IPR and went to work with his own organization, the American China Policy Association. Its mailing pieces are printed in the basement of his importing house and go through his firm's mailing machines. "To that extent, I guess you'd say I support it."

For 4 years he also supported the small, shrill magazine Plain Talk, whose editor was Isaac Don Levine. Plain Talk was discontinued in 1950, shortly before the appearance of the Freeman. Mr. Kohlberg has described himself as "one of the supporters" of the Freeman.

"You know, Lattimore wrote a book called Ordeal by Slander" Mr. Kohlberg remarked. "I'm slandered all the time and I don't find it any ordeal. Maybe I'm not publicity-minded. I'm surprised I get so much attention. All I did was to write a few letters to the press, to Congressmen, and to people on my mailing list."

The reporter asked Kohlberg what he thought of Senator McCarthy. "McCarthy's a great guy. Practically everything he said will be proven. What I gave McCarthy was what I'd been sending to the newspapers over the years." He was asked about his statement that McCarthy was the only man "with guts enough and dumb enough" to do what he did. "By dumb enough, I meant that there were others who knew more but were too smart politically to put themselves out on a limb. But maybe McCarthy was not so politically dumb after all. I said that back last April."

Seeing red

Mr. Kohlberg never betrays a glimmer of doubt as to the righteousness of his campaign, which is against not only communism, or even chiefly against communism, but against those Americans who in his personal opinion have aided the Communists in one way or another. His thesis, a simple one, he has summed up substantially as follows, to the student previously quoted:

There is a great conspiracy aimed at the destruction of the United States. Its method is to say "Europe first" in order to throw away Asia, then to do something about Asia only after it is too late, thus throwing away Europe as well. (Kohlberg does not appear to consider that the "Asia Firsters" could, with equal justice, be accused of the same strategy in reverse.) Recruiting for the great conspiracy has been going on for years. Its main tools are Communist ideology and heavy bribes; $20,000,000 a year is spent on buying members and operating the ring, says Mr. Kohlberg with conviction. During the Second World War the great conspiracy worked to deliver Asia to Russia. The personnel selected for Government agencies in the Far East was picked from a roster of "experts" made up by the Council of Learned Societies under the direction of Mortimer Graves.

Mr. Kohlberg, of course, has a foreign policy of his own and has sent it to Congress. It calls for:

1. Congressional declaration of a state of war with Communist China.

2. Limiting unrestricted trade relations to those nations which agree to a mutual armed-aid pact against Communist nations.

3. The granting of armed assistance to all nations that join in such an agreement ("no question of the form of government of nations entering such an alliance, whether free-enterprise, democratic, monarchial, dictatorial, Socialist, or otherwise").

4. Immediate breaking of diplomatic relations with all Communist nations.

Korea explained

Mr. Kohlberg would also like to bring the "reliable men" back into the State Department and make "some good man like WALTER JUDD" Secretary of State. He offers a simple solution for rescuing China: "What Russia did, we could do in reverse, and we could do it in shorter time."

"Question. How would Chiang Kai-shek get the men?"

"Answer. How do you get men in China? You take 'em. I doubt if a private ever enlisted in China. You get 'em by conscription. That's the way they've always been taken, by the war lords, by the Nationalists, and by the Communists. Chiang has got more troops now than we've armed. We can reverse the process of Russia and do it faster because we can make the things to do it with faster than they can. Then there won't be any world war III because Soviet Russia won't be big enough. They'd never risk a war with a hostile China on their frontier.

"It's all right to call things mistakes, but if a mistake causes 100,000 casualties it becomes expensive. If we hadn't let China go Communist, we could have written the ticket out there, and then there wouldn't have been a war in Korea. I don't know why they started the Korean war—it wasn't on Stalin's program—unless it was cooked up."

"Cooked up with whom?"

"Cooked up with us," said Mr. Kohlberg, eyeing his interviewer suspiciously. "The Russians were out of the U. N. at that time, and they had to have some way to get back in."

IN CONCLUSION

It is strange, but it is a fact. In this day and age there still seems to be something indecent about the mere presence of foreign lobbies in our country. Our Government has power of life and death over practically every country in the non-Communist world; not only cabinets but constitutions may survive or fall depending on the amount of economic and military aid that Washington grants. Any foreign government is derelict in its duty if it does not state its case as convincingly as it can to the peoples of the United States—particularly, in these times of congressional supremacy, to the men who make the laws.

Just as every government that expects something from us has its lobby over here, we have a lobby in every country where our interests are at stake. Effective lobbying is aimed where the power lies—sometimes at the executive, sometimes at the legislature, sometimes before a crucial election at the people themselves. A few weeks ago an American ambassador lectured Greek politicians on the advantages of the two-party system; whenever there are Italian elections—and they are invariably crucial—American citizens of Italian descent are asked to write their relatives and tell them how to vote. The destinies of nations have become so intermeshed that the conduct of foreign affairs can no longer be monopolized, though it must be controlled, by foreign offices of departments of state. This means lobbying, official and unofficial.

Congress, which should know everything there is to know about foreign lobbies, got around to recognizing their existence some years ago when, following its fashion of dealing with unsavory things, it ordered all lobbyists to register. A few years later it dealt with Communists the same way. Congress as a whole is still sour on all foreign lobbies, but quite a few Congressmen make generous exceptions in favor of some lobbyists.

With all the lobbying that is being done by foreigners here and ourselves abroad, there seems to be no reason why people should be squeamish about admitting that such a thing as a China lobby exists—squeamish to the point that most publications still bracket the phrase chastely in quotation marks. If the Kuomintang didn't have a lobby here, there would be something radically wrong with it. As a matter of fact, there is something radically wrong with the Chinese Nationalist Government—not that it carries on lobbying, but that it is little but a lobby.

Since the beginning of the war, the weakness of the Kuomintang on its home grounds has been offset only by the strength it has built up in Washington. It has always lived on credit with no collateral. Its leaders, lacking a real constituency among their own people, have been able to count mostly on their American constituency. This has put the China lobby in a category all by itself, for it has always represented not a great nation but a regime playing at being a great power.

Nothing short of war

Since the China lobby was reassembled here after Mao's victory, it has had to exert pressure on Congress, on the Executive, on public opinion, to get dollars and weapons in almost unlimited quantity. Yet not even billions or arsenals can satisfy it. Actually, nothing can, short of total war—a total war against international communism that the United States has to start in the shortest possible time, for Chiang's position on Formosa is tragic, and his shrunken army has to reconquer a nation of nearly five hundred million people.

Never has there been a government that has asked so much of another. Yet the China lobby has a formidable weapon in its hands: Since the alternative to Chiang is Mao, anybody in America—State Department official or private citizen—who is not for Chiang's restoration can be called a Red. Of course the China lobby has money—a lot of it—and, particularly in the case of its Chinese agents, the resourcefulness that comes with despair. But what has helped most is the Red issue, which was first raised when the American people had grown aware of the Communist danger and were being overwhelmed with exposés on how the Communists had worked in America a few years before.

There are men possessed by a craving to detect conspiracies, hunt down suspects, and then wring confessions from those they have suspected. Almost invariably, these self-appointed vigilantes are those ex-Communists whose anticommunism has become an obsession and a profession. Sometimes they find sponsors or employers whose anti-communism comes from the urge to find a single cause for all the ills of the world. The professional ex-Communists serve their new masters as they did their old—with the same frenzied devotion, the scheming mental processes of the Communist mind. There is no other way they can think or, for that matter, live. They can't help suspecting everybody, planning purges, demanding confessions. They have confessed: Why doesn't everybody else?

The uprooted

These poor displaced people who, having gone through communism, have lost their taste for a free society, cannot be at peace with themselves and cannot leave their fellow citizens in peace. Some of them have tried vainly to find a home and an occupation. The China lobby offers them both.

The China lobby asks every American to choose, and choose quickly, between Chiang and Mao and then to act accordingly, forgetting all else—what is happening in other parts of the world and what might happen to our own country should we plunge into all-out war against Red China. The Communists are masters of the black-and-white, either-or technique, and the professional former Communists have not lost that skill. Their fanaticism, which became aimless when they left the party, can, thanks to the China lobby, help accelerate a train of events. Marxists always like to move in the van of history, like men who feverishly run up the steps of an escalator. Since the Chinese disaster, the invasion of North Korea, and the intervention of Red China, the train of events has seemed unmistakable. It leads to war; but to make the inevitable come sooner, the lobby operators will stop at nothing.

There are men in America who know how to do the job—by no means all former Communists. But the refugees from communism provide the techniques and the brains. Now, under the most respectable auspices, they can practice the subversion they could never successfully apply as Communists. They can work their way into some legal institutions—like congressional committees—and pound at civil rights or stretch the statute of limitations with seeming respect for due process of law.

Actually, now for the first time America has been poisoned by communism, and the men who unknowingly administer the poison are those very men who, under the glare of publicity, denounce it. They make the China lobby—so different from all other foreign lobbies—the nearest thing to an effective Communist Party our country has ever had. There is no other outfit to which the China lobby can be compared, with its hard core of fanatical, full-time operators, its underground, its legion of naïve, misled fellow travelers, its front organizations, and its foreign officials, in Washington with diplomatic immunity, who dutifully report to central headquarters. On a larger scale, the China lobby is very much like the American Communist Party of the 1930's. Of course, people whose idealism or naïveté has been exploited by the lobby or its fronts should not be blamed for the lobby's misdeeds—unless one follows the prevailing theory of guilt by association.

What has to be said

In our country, all conflicts of ideas and interests reach a high pitch every 4 years. Our way of electing a President, for all its circus features, is an exceptionally healthy thing. It is a sort of mock civil war, in which the citizens exercise their political militancy and then politics quiets down.

During the last 2 years the life of the Nation has been deeply disturbed by subversion and corruption. No cause of disturbance has been greater than the China lobby. These have been weird years, years when things have happened that we must remember for a long time and never let happen again. There have been moments when this alliance of fanatic conservatives and incurable revolutionists, united under the auspices of Nationalist China, seemed rather close to remolding the politics of our country on a Chinese pattern—with war lords on parade and thought control on the rampage.

One of the most astonishing things about the China lobby is that, as far as one can find out, it has no leaders, only mouthpieces. Yet they have been strong enough to cramp our national leadership. From now till election, can our Nation get all the poison it has absorbed out of its system?

The answer is, of course, up to the people. But the men who have advanced their claims to leadership must show their mettle well before election day. This applies, of course, particularly to Eisenhower. Will he say, when the time comes, that he recognizes subversion when he sees it, Communist or anti-Communist, and will have no truck with the mouthpieces of the China lobby—even if they happen to be United States Senators?

EXHIBIT II

Senator BRIDGES' request for an investigation of the so-called China lobby and of propaganda of all sorts in the United States conducted on behalf of foreign governments and foreign political groups. MacArthur hearings (military situation in the Far East) before the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, June 1–13, 1951, part 3, pages 2213–2219:

"Senator BRIDGES. Mr. Secretary, yesterday there were some rather violent but vague statements made here with regard to the so-called China lobby, and you, this morning have reported that you have taken this up with the President and given us an outline of the situation as you see it.

"Now, will you identify or define what is meant by the China lobby?

"Secretary ACHESON. I think Senator MORSE defined what he asked me to look into, and I think that appears in the record.

"Senator BRIDGES. Well, does that mean to include anyone who has consistently advocated support for the anti-Communist National Government of China?

"Secretary ACHESON. Well, I think we can find what Senator MORSE asked me by looking back in the record. I think it was the first time Senator MORSE spoke on that.

"Senator BRIDGES. Would it help, Mr. Secretary, if Senator MORSE were to find that?

"Senator MORSE. The answer to your question would, of course, be no, I don't mean to imply that anyone who has consistently advocated the support of the Nationalist Government in China is necessarily a member of the China lobby.

"What I sought to raise was the question as to the means that had been used by some, alleged to be illegal means, that constitute the reprehensible acts on the part of some who have sought to influence American foreign policy with respect to Chiang's regime.

"Senator BRIDGES. Mr. Secretary, you have stated that the United States has given some $2,000,000,000 worth of aid to this anti-Communist Nationalist Government of China, in addition to some intangible military advice, is that correct?

"Secretary ACHESON. I think that was since VJ-day, Senator.

"Senator BRIDGES. Are we today sending to the anti-Communist Nationalist Government of China some military and economic aid?

"Secretary ACHESON. Yes, sir.

"Senator BRIDGES. Do we support the anti-Communist National Government of China today?

"Secretary ACHESON. Yes, sir.

"Senator BRIDGES. When Mr. Rusk stated that the anti-Communist National Government of China is more representative of the Chinese people than the Communist government of China. Was he correct?

"Secretary ACHESON. It won that recognition and we recognize it for the reason——

"Senator BRIDGES. And Mr. Rusk, in voicing that policy, is he speaking for the administration?

"Secretary ACHESON. He was voicing the policy which the administration has consistently followed.

"Senator BRIDGES. Then if we do have a China lobby in this country, which I know nothing about, in reality it is supporting the policy of the Government of the United States, is it not?

"Secretary ACHESON. If that is what it was doing it would be supporting the policy, yes.

"Senator BRIDGES. And we recognize that the anti-Communist Nationalist Government headed by Chiang Kai-shek is strongly anti-Communist, do we not?

"Secretary ACHESON. Yes, sir."

CHINESE COMMUNIST SYMPATHIZERS

"Senator BRIDGES. And we recognize that the so-called People's Government of China is strongly pro-Communist, and is killing Americans, and is our foremost enemy in a limited war today?

"Secretary ACHESON. Yes, sir.

"Senator BRIDGES. Now, would it be true that anyone who attacked the anti-Communist Nationalist Government headed by Chiang Kai-shek today, whose support is our firm, consistent policy, and in turn supported or advocated the pro-Communist Chinese Government, would be advocating and supporting a policy entirely different from a policy of the United States of America today?

"Secretary ACHESON. I don't know what you mean by 'attacked.' It depends upon what you mean by 'attacking' them. If they were advocating that we should support the Communist Government, and not support the Nationalist Government, they would be advocating policies which are contrary to those of the Government.

"Senator BRIDGES. And if we have a lobby today, in this country, or a group of individuals who are doing that, they could be readily called the Communist China lobby, could they not?

"Secretary ACHESON. They can be called a great many things, Senator.

"That might be a description.

"Senator BRIDGES. And if we find that there are members of the China Communist lobby in this country who have been using their various powers and operations, and if we find some of them are within the American Government, inasmuch as we fired General MacArthur, or General MacArthur was fired because he differed with the policy of the American Government, should they not be fired immediately?

"Secretary ACHESON. I presume that would be the proper action."

OTHER NATIONS ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE AMERICAN PUBLIC OPINION

"Senator BRIDGES. Now, there are many other friendly governments in the world today with which we have association who are interested in United States aid, United States help in one form or another, such as Great Britain, such as France, such as the Republic of India, such as Greece, such as Sweden, such as Finland, such as Denmark, such as Colombia, and so on.

"If they are over here attempting to persuade or influence American policy, either for the purpose of getting aid in any form, whether it be in loans, grants or otherwise, or influence legislation, directly or indirectly, they are lobbyists, and they should be investigated, should they not?

"Secretary ACHESON. Well, I don't know whether they should be investigated or not, Senator. I presume that every government that wants something from the United States is trying to influence the Government of the United States.

"There are many proper ways and there are many improper ways. If there is any reason that anyone believes that they are doing improper things, then surely that ought to be investigated.

"Senator BRIDGES. And if there are governments which are unfriendly to the United States of America, which are Communist governments today, or pro-Communist, such as Russia or any of her satellites, including Poland, they particularly should be investigated, because they are our enemies today. Is that not correct?

"Secretary ACHESON. Well, I think—I don't want to respond to the phraseology of the question.

"Senator BRIDGES. I will change that and ask that "enemies" be declassified, and then say that they are in opposition to our policies and our objectives.

"Secretary ACHESON. If there is the expenditure of Communist funds—which we have very little doubt is going on—that not only should be investigated, but I presume is continually investigated.

"Senator BRIDGES. And which would you say it was more important to do, to investigate, if there are lobbies of influences working for friendly governments, on the one hand, which are anti-Communist, or the investigation of pro-Communist or Communist governments that are attempting to bring influences here, which would be the most important to bring to light, in your judgment?

"Secretary ACHESON. I should think that there is continuous and highly desirable investigation of all Communist activities in this country.

"Senator BRIDGES. And which would you think, Mr. Secretary, would be the most important to expose and bring to light, the influences, the pressures, the lobby, if we might call it, of our friends and allies, who are anti-Communist, or the same type of operations—the lobby, the pressures, the influence, of the pro-Communists and the Communist peoples and nations who are fighting everything that we believe in and some of them slaughtering American boys today?

"Secretary ACHESON. I should think the Government does put its emphasis on the investigation of Communist activities.

"Senator BRIDGES. I would like, Mr. Chairman, as Senator MCMAHON and Senator MORSE have done, to respectfully ask the Secretary of State, not only to assembly such material on any influences and pressures that may be brought in behalf of the anti-Communist Nationalist Government of China, headed by Chiang Kai-shek, but also on the influences, people, pressures, and lobby, if there be any, of the Communist Government of China, which is now slaughtering American boys by the thousands, until the casualties have run to a sum over 174,000 in this country."

INVESTIGATION OF ALL FOREIGN LOBBIES

"I would respectfully make that request. I would respectfully ask that the pressures and lobbies and influences of nations first that are friendly to us such as Great Britain, such as France, such as Belgium, such as Holland, and such as Colombia, such as Finland, such as Denmark, such as Greece, such

as Sweden, such as Iran be included in that group.

"I would then again most respectfully ask for the assembling of data on the influences, the people, the lobby if there be any operating in behalf of the great international oil interests in this country which would include one of the hot spots of the world today here in this country.

"I would respectfully ask that we then assemble material on the influences, the pressures and the lobby if any that have been brought in the past and are today brought for the country of Poland which is pro-Communist or Communist country, and for other countries of similar nature which are going on here.

"I respectfully ask that an investigation be made of those individuals within the American Government, if there are such individuals, who have in the past, who are in the present espousing the cause directly and indirectly of communism against our better interests and the policy of the United States, and ask that appropriate action of firing them or prosecuting them be taken.

"I think, Mr. Chairman, that if the subject is to be investigated then we ought to go all the way. I would like to see not only our friends and allies investigated, but our enemies.

"I want to say that when we start to investigate our friends and allies, that we should investigate all our friends and allies. I want to see our enemies investigated and the pro-Communist influences in this country brought to light.

"Now it is terrifying if we in this country allow to operate groups which are jeopardizing the very life and security of America. To me the investigation of these groups is more important than the investigation of an ally to whom we are furnishing aid and assistance today. But if we are going to investigate those friends, then I want these other countries that have been so successful in getting billions of dollars of American aid brought into the open.

"I just want to say, Mr. Chairman, and most respectfully to the Secretary, that unless we do that, the whole probe will be a farce. There is plenty of information, as most of you gentlemen know, and I am sure the Secretary knows information on the activities of some of these countries and their representatives and the influence they bring to bear here.

"I think it is most essential if we go into this matter, that all phases of it be revealed. I would like to know how those individuals are paid. I would like to know whom they employ. I would like to know of the former individuals in the American Government who resigned, severed their connections who are now found to be representing foreign governments and foreign interests.

"This would be a very interesting list. The names will ring a bell pretty well throughout this country. I would like to see the names of the legal firms representing these countries or their various interests in this country brought to light.

"I would like to know all these details, and if we are going to have an investigation, I agree with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], that it should be full and comprehensive. I think it will produce some very startling results. But any investigation limited to a particular group of people who happen to be our allies at the moment and have been in the past, whom we have been supporting, and not embracing in its scope a probe of our enemies and our other allies who have been so successful in obtaining help from this country to the tune of billions of dollars, in my judgment would be a farce and a travesty on justice.

"There are a great many people who would be glad to cooperate to that end. Now, I would like to have you conduct a full, honest, and sincere investigation of the whole problem, Mr. Secretary, just as you were requested to investigate the so-called China lobby. I make that request to you in all sincerity and very respectfully on this issue. I realize that I have included quite a number of problems in this request. There are many more problems besides those I have included. But if we are going to go into this subject certainly we should go into the whole phase and the whole situation.

"I hope you will feel, as I do, that it is essential that if we look into the one, we certainly should look into the others.

"It is very interesting to me that some of the people in our country seem to think so lightly of the burrowing-under technique visible in America today which is employed by the people who would destroy us, by their representatives and by their agents in our country.

"After all, when the chips are down—and they may be down here in the weeks, the months, the years ahead—I think all this information would be most interesting, most useful, most enlightening to have on record.

"We can well expect that situation within the lifetime of those of us around these tables. I hope it will not come and I hope as a result of our action, our attitude, our policy, that we can avoid an outright showdown. But it may come and if it does, let's have the record straight, complete on all details as to whom we have in this country bringing influence for assistance.

"I would like to see you, if you are going to investigate this matter, go back to the UNRRA program and find out which citizens or officials failed to take the precautions to see that Russia and the Russian Communist satellites did not use that program for their own ends. Certainly, there is basis for such an investigation. Anyone in the American Government who had his eyes open and didn't see to that should be named. Certainly, if they didn't know of that danger then, they know of it today. That condition has vitally affected our whole foreign situation."

INVESTIGATING BOTH ALLIES AND ENEMIES

"So, Mr. Secretary, if we are going to do this, let's see the whole picture. Let's take as our prime object our enemies and the people who are responsible for the influences which have placed America in our present condition of a war economy draining the taxpayers of this country. Let's aim at the people who are responsible for killing and wounding thousands of American boys until the total today is greater than all the casualties we suffered in the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the Spanish-American War, combined, a fact which was begrudgingly admitted here by one of the previous witnesses. We had almost 172,000 and now there are 175,000.

"Let's get a little attention on our enemies.

"However, if we are to start investigating our friends and we find they have done anything improper, I certainly fee, they should be exposed. I am for that, of course. But I want the investigation to include all of these countries and all of the people who are playing it up.

"You will find some very startling facts, because you will find that people who have been very highly placed in the American Government and who have since disassociated themselves with their official posts are some of the people who are representing the nations you are investigating.

"You will be amazed at some of the legal firms who are representing these nations and getting huge fees for their services. I think these facts should be brought to the attention of the American people.

"I don't know of any China lobby, but if there is one, and if it is doing anything illegal, certainly it should be exposed. But, if the members of this so-called lobby are not doing anything illegal, they are certainly helping to promote the policy of the United States of America today. On the other hand, the attention of the Nation should be directed toward the people who call the Chinese Communists merely agrarian reformers, who have done everything in their power directly and indirectly to give America a false sense of security as far as the Chinese Communists are concerned.

"Now, if the time comes when bombs start dropping on this country from some enemy—and we now see American boys being slaughtered—if the time comes when we get civilians and cities being destroyed here, then I would like to see the record straight as to who exerted influence in the formation of a policy which left us defenseless. The record should show those who played a part in producing any such situation.

"I tell you that the passion for justice at that time will be terrifying to behold.

"If you gentlemen want to know the intense repulsion existing in this Nation today against any form of betrayal of our land, I would like to have any of you take a trip with me. You cannot help but feel this emotion. You let the show-down come—let some of our industrial cities and industrial potential be destroyed and you will see how quickly some people, some officials will face charges for treason in our country. If these people are not up for treason, they will be up for accessories or aides to treasonable persons. And if there is anything lower than treason in our country—I do not know, I cannot imagine what that may be.

"We who are sitting around these tables now, if we live out a normal life expectancy, may see that come to pass. So let us get the record straight all along the line.

"I submit to you in the same manner as made by Senator MCMAHON, of Connecticut, and Senator MORSE, a request for this action; that is, that you obtain and reveal all this information on all phases of this issue, and, insofar as they have requested it, about the Red China lobby, so-called, or about any illegal activity I think it should be exposed. But I want all people and all information exposed at the same time. That is all, sir."

EXHIBIT III

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES AND FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE RELATING TO HEARINGS HELD ON THE DISMISSAL OF GENERAL MACARTHUR AND THE MILITARY SITUATION IN THE FAR EAST, MAY 3–JUNE 27, 1951

(Parts V and VI)

PART V. AREAS OF DISAGREEMENT

Those significant facts which were proved to the satisfaction of the signers of this report

Introduction

In the previous section of this report there were enumerated a series of areas of agreement in which the members of the joint committee showed a remarkable unanimity.

We now come to matters of a different character, events in which the administration was most intimately and directly concerned. The responsibility for the policies controlling these events we believe to be plain and inescapable. We believe that any citizen, reading the transcripts of the hearings and giving serious consideration to the evidence offered, would be forced to concur in the following opinions:

1. Yalta is a great tragedy of American diplomacy:

The turning point of American foreign policy in the Far East was the Yalta agreement of February 1945. The Secretary of State has vigorously defended the agreements made at Yalta as being essential to achieve the participation of Russia in the war against Japan. According to witnesses who defended the Yalta agreement, the Japanese forces were then capable of terrific resistance. It was claimed that it would cost a million American casualties to invade

the Japanese Islands. It was stated by the Secretary of State that, at the time of Yalta, we did not know whether or not we had an atomic bomb and, therefore, Russian military participation was essential.

The evidence of Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, Ambassador to China at this time, however, contradicts this "explanation" of Yalta. In the opinion of General Hurley: "The surrender of the principles and objectives by the State Department at Yalta created the confusion, the crisis which confronts our Nation today." [1]

General MacArthur referred to Yalta as a great tragedy, stating that "one of the gravest mistakes that was ever made was to permit the Soviet to come down into China at Port Arthur, Dairen, and other places of that sort." [2]

Under questioning, it was established that at the time of Yalta the Japanese Navy was at the bottom of the ocean and American air power had destroyed the Japanese industrial potential. Furthermore, with the economy of Japan dependent on imports, there was absolutely no doubt, from a military point of view, that the Japanese home army would wither on the vine.

The testimony of Admiral Leahy in I Was There was to the effect that it was not the intention of President Roosevelt to invade the Japanese islands, but rather to bring to bear the might of American naval and air power. Admiral Leahy states that he believed that Russia should not be asked to participate in the Japanese war, but that the military desired Russian participation and the President accepted their view.[3]

Testimony has been introduced into the record by Senator Bridges that there was prepared by 50 specialists in the Military Intelligence Division, G–2, the War Department, a study evaluating the desirability of Russian participation in the Japanese war and concluding that such participation should be prevented. (When asked to produce this paper, the Defense Department replied that it has not been able to find the document in question.)

The final and overwhelming evidence is that Secretary of War Stimson and Gen. Leslie R. Groves, head of the Manhattan Engineer District (wartime atom bomb agency) before Yalta, went to President Roosevelt and told him that the atom bomb was a certainty and would be ready for use by midsummer of 1945.[4] (Further, a Colonel Consodine of the Manhattan Engineer District flew to the island of Malta where he met with Secretary of State Stettinius and briefed him immediately prior to Yalta on the certainty of the atom bomb.)[5]

This myth, that the Russian participation in the Japanese war was a military necessity has been refuted adequately. History will record that at Yalta the United States repudiated some of its solemn obligations, yielded to Russian imperialism, and gave way to appeasement which will be regretted for decades and all for mythical reasons. The true reason for Yalta remains an inscrutable mystery. The result of Yalta remains a triumph for Communist diplomacy.

From John Hay to Cordell Hull, America maintained the "open door" in China. At Yalta America slammed the "open door."

[1] Ibid., p. 2839.
[2] Ibid., p. 128.
[3] I Was There, Leahy, McGraw Hill Book Co., 1950, p. 318. Further evidence on this point was given by Admiral Ernest King, former Chief of Naval Operations, in a letter dated June 21, 1951, in which he said "It was the belief of the Navy that Japan could and should be defeated without an invasion of the home islands." Hearings, p. 3055.
[4] Ibid., p. 3119.
[5] Ibid., p. 3120.

2. The victory won by our Armed Forces in the Pacific has been squandered by our diplomats:

In the year 1945 the United States was the dominant military power in the Far Pacific. With the assistance of our allies, excluding Russia, we had crushed the military might of the Japanese Empire. Our military position was unchallenged. Our diplomats were in a most excellent position for negotiation to maintain peace and stability in the area.

Our Chinese allies on the mainland in 1946 had begun to hammer at the Communist forces in the civil war within their land. They were making considerable headway late in 1946 in defeating this armed revolutionary movement.

However, our diplomats gave away our victory in secret agreements, so that in the year 1951, our foreign policy in the Far East stands revealed as a complete failure. China is in the hands of the Reds; communism has swept through Asia; and we are involved in a war. Only Japan has been kept in the camp of the Western Powers, and the explanation for that may largely be found in the fact that our State Department exercised little authority in that area.

While Secretary Acheson's policies and those of his predecessors were largely instrumental in making 450 million of our former Chinese allies into enemies, General MacArthur's policies were largely instrumental in making 80 million former Japanese enemies into our friends.

It is doubtful if the annals of history reveal any similar instance wherein the fruits of victory, gained at such terrific cost in lives and treasure, have been so recklessly thrown away.

3. It has been impossible to determine who wrote the instructions for General Marshall on his mission to China:

On November 27, 1945, the President accepted the resignation of Ambassador Patrick Hurley and announced the same day the appointment of General of the Army George C. Marshall to serve as his special representative in China. In the instructions issued to General Marshall, the President directed that he bring to bear the influence of the United States to the end that the "unification of China by peaceful, democratic methods" [6] might be achieved and concurrently to endeavor to effect a termination of the civil war between the Nationalists and the Communists.

This, of course, had to do with the efforts to bring about a coalition government in which the Communists were to participate alongside of the bitterly anti-Communist Nationalists Government headed by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The Communists themselves have told all the world that their intention in participating in democratic processes of government is only to be considered as a stepping stone toward the ultimate creation of a Marxist Communist state.

Who wrote the instructions for the Marshall mission still remains a mystery despite repeated attempts on the part of the members of this committee to ascertain this fact. Secretary Marshall stated that he did not write the instructions in the Presidential directive to him. The Secretary of State states that Secretary Marshall sat down and wrote his own instructions.

Senator Smith (Republican, New Jersey) referred to a communication from which a correspondent gave some personal views on the MacArthur situation. The final paragraph of the letter reads as follows:

"General Marshall was appointed and on December 11, 1945, sat down with Dean Acheson to write out the instructions President Truman was to give him." [7]

[6] China white paper, p. 132.
[7] Hearings, p. 467.

Senator Smith continued to read this letter. It contained reference to a report General MacArthur made in 1945 in which he evaluated the armed forces in China.

Having listened to the reading of the letter, General Marshall stated:

"In the first place I have not a recollection of that report of General MacArthur's, but I have a very decided recollection of the reference in there that I sat down in the State Department and drew up this policy. I did not." [7]

Senator Smith had previously asked:

Do you recall who had a hand in the preparation of the directives that sent you to China? [7]

To which Secretary Marshall replied:

"At that time, Senator, Mr. Byrnes was Secretary of State, and I presume he had a hand in it; Mr. Acheson was Under Secretary of State, and I presume he had a hand in it; John Carter Vincent was the head of the China group in the State Department, certainly he had a hand in it. I do not know what others did.

"On my part, General Hull, who is now on duty in the Army headquarters, and was the head of the Operations Division during the war for me, he represented my interest so far as I was concerned in that, together with a man from Time magazine forces, who had helped me briefly in the latter part of the war in the preparation of my final report, and who the directorship of Time loaned me to take to China with me because he had been there throughout a good period of the war." [8]

When Secretary Acheson testified on this subject, he supplied the Senators with his version of the Marshall instructions, which is shown in the transcript as follows:

Secretary Acheson said:

"At the end of November 1945, Secretary Byrnes and General Marshall met. This was after General Marshall had been asked to go to China.

"Secretary Byrnes read him a memorandum suggesting the outline of instructions for him. General Marshall did not approve it.

"General Marshall said that he would wish to try his own hand, assisted by some of his associates, in drafting the instructions.

"This he did; and a draft was prepared by him in conjunction with four generals who were working very closely with General Marshall. This was submitted to Secretary Byrnes.

"On the 8th of December Secretary Byrnes made his suggestions to General Marshall, that is, suggestions of changes or alterations or additions to the draft prepared by General Marshall.

"General Marshall's draft, with Secretary Byrnes' suggestions, was discussed at a meeting in Secretary Byrnes' office on Sunday morning, December 9, 1945, by Secretary Byrnes, General Marshall, Mr. John Carter Vincent, General Hull, and myself. I was then Under Secretary of State.

"Those of us went over the instructions. General Marshall approved the suggestion made by Secretary Byrnes and we then had a completely agreed draft." [9]

The testimony from these two Cabinet officers is obviously contradictory. It is impossible to determine who actually wrote the instructions for General Marshall which contained the coalition policy which cost us our Chinese allies.

4. Some United States officials were so opposed to Chiang Kai-shek that they were automatically on the side of the "Red regime":

Evidence has been presented to the committee that some of the American officials

[7] Hearings, p. 467.
[8] Ibid., p. 459.
[9] Ibid., p. 1848.

assigned to assist the Nationalist Government of the Republic of China were so much opposed to Chiang and his government so as to be automatically on the side of the Chinese Communists.[10]

This committee did not attempt to explore fully the important and widespread ramifications of this situation. However, the sworn testimony presented to this committee cannot be ignored. If the personal feelings of American diplomats operate to thwart the policy of their Government, there is a situation created which demands a complete and thorough inquiry.

It appears unlikely to us that the executive branch will undertake to expose this situation to the light of day. The situation strongly suggests that an appropriate committee of Congress endeavor to investigate this question and recommend remedial legislation.

5. It has not been the consistent policy of the United States to support the Republic of China:

The Secretary of State testified it is the "firm and continuing" policy of the United States to support the Nationalist Government of the Republic of China. He stated this policy has been pursued by our Nation from the outbreak of World War II down to this very day.[11]

The evidence before the committee indicates that this policy has been neither firm nor continuous. On the contrary, the policy has been obscured by constant conflict within the State Department, in the press, and in public debate. There has not been and even today there is no unanimity of opinion in the Government on the subject of aid to the Republic of China.

A policy of supporting the Republic of China should have been the firm and continuing policy of the United States. President Chiang Kai-shek was and is the outstanding anti-Communist leader in Asia. Our enemy in Asia and throughout the world has been identified as Russian communism.

The administration cannot straddle the fence on this issue. It claims to have followed a policy of supporting Chiang. The China white paper is a blunt denial of Secretary Acheson's statement. We have not been convinced that Chiang lost China for any other reason than that he did not receive sufficient support, both moral and material, from the United States.

The importance of moral support in any conflict in Asia was emphasized by General Wedemeyer. He testified that lack of moral support was the key to the downfall of the Government of the Republic of China.[12]

Evidence of the continuing lack of moral support can be found in the quixotic attacks leveled by administration stalwarts, both in and out of the Government, against President Chiang and all those who want to support him in his 25 years of struggle against communism and aggression.

The record is replete with the evidence of the lack of material support. Such military equipment as China Nationalists received in the critical days of the war against the Communist regime has been described as moldy, broken, lacking parts, etc. One shipment of automatic weapons arrived without magazines, in such shape the guns were of no more value than broomsticks.[13]

Official Government reports show that since VJ-day our former enemies, Japan, Germany, and Italy, have each received more United States aid and assistance than our wartime ally and historic friend, the Republic of China.

The contention that the administration consistently and firmly supported the Chinese Republic is simply not true.

Further evidence that the administration did not support the Government of the Republic of China is shown in the orientation fact sheet Army Talk. This was an official War Department publication used in World War II to indoctrinate our soldiers. The issue, dated April 7, 1945, was entitled "Our Ally China" and the role of the Communists was discussed.[14]

Throughout the article Communist was in quotation marks and it was pointed out that "when we speak of the Chinese Communist, we should remember that many competent observers say that they stand for something very different from what we ordinarily intend when we use the word "Communist." In the first place, unlike Communists of the orthodox type, they believe in the rights of private property and private enterprise. Their chief interest at present is to improve the economic position of Chinese farmers, many of whom own but little land themselves but rent their land in part or in whole from wealthy landlords. In the second place, the Chinese Communists are not like those in America, merely a small minority. With the sole exception of Kuomintang itself, they are easily China's most important single political group. They exercise almost independent control over many parts of north China, where they have been responsible for much of the continuing guerrilla activity against the Japanese."

This astonishing orientation sheet continues to say:

"The situation is so complex and has such an involved history, that it is very difficult for any outsider to say definitely who is right and who is wrong. Probably some degree of right and wrong attaches to both sides. The Communists say that they are trying to carry out certain economic and political reforms that the Kuomintang has up to now been unable or unwilling to make. Some American and other observers who have visited the Communists agree that their program is a moderate one and that the things they have been doing in their areas are quite in accord with what we think of as a liberal democracy."

Concluding the orientation is a brief discussion of our basic concern which contains the statement that "the issue in China is not so much the tension that exists between the Nationalist Government and the Chinese Communists as it is between those elements within each camp who place their personal prestige, ideas, and ambitions ahead of winning the war."

American soldiers desiring to obtain more facts in regard to the problem of our Chinese ally were given a reference for further reading. That reference was the Making of Modern China by Owen Lattimore.

6. If the republic of China had received effective military aid from the United States they might have defeated the Communists.

Early in 1948 there were three high American officials in China, who felt the need for immediate action if China was to continue free of Communist domination. These officials, Ambassador Leighton Stuart, ECA Mission Chief Roger Lapham, and Vice Adm. Oscar Badger, journeyed to the north of China to see for themselves what could be done to stall the Communist advance and place the initiative in the hands of the Nationalist forces. They were impressed with the appearance, actions, and spirit of the armies of General Fu Tsu Yi as well as the military stature of General Fu.

At the time of this visit General Fu told the United States officials "that he could do little more than to keep the Communists out of the area with his equipped armies and that he was constantly employing them on a defensive basis to meet Communist thrusts from various directions."[15] However, the general went on to say "that if he could obtain equipment for the four additional trained armies he would then be able to set up an offensive to the northeast stabilizing the Chinhuangtao Hulutal corridor and for the eventual relief of Mukden."

He explained: "That in relieving Mukden he could reopen a channel of supply for about 300,000 of the best troops in China (many of them American trained and equipped) which were cut off there and were very lacking in American munitions."[16]

Immediately after this conference with Gen. Fu Tsu Yi a recommendation was sent to the JCS specifically listing the equipment required, and which was estimated at a total value of $16,000,000. It was approved in July 1948 but no specific action was taken to implement the decision.

In November 1948, Admiral Badger received word that a ship was about to enter Tiensin with about 10 percent of the recommended equipment on board. He said: "Well, that's pretty bad. It's too bad that it isn't the full business, but maybe it will still have a morale effect."[16]

After the cargo was unloaded, Admiral Badger received a communication from General Fu reporting the deficiencies of the weapons. Of the total number, 480 of the machine guns lacked spare parts, tripod mounts, etc.; Thompson submachine guns had no magazines or clips, no loading machines for the loading of ammunition belts, only a thousand of the light machine guns with mounts, and only a thousand clips for the 2,280 light machine guns. General Fu's commentary on this deplorable situation was according to Admiral Badger along the following lines:

"The above-mentioned weapons are not in good condition and, for the most part, cannot be used. I do not know how or why these weapons were forwarded in an incomplete state."[17]

As a result of the arrival of this long anticipated shipment of arms in such an unusable condition, General Fu's plans for an offensive collapsed. The troops were completely demoralized and in Admiral Badger's judgment this action "was the straw that broke the camel's back."[18]

The myth that the Republic of China fell because the Chinese troops refused to fight is again refuted by sworn testimony.

7. The propaganda campaign against the Republic of China was vicious:

We have been greatly disturbed by the evidence which shows the terrific impact of the propaganda campaign against the Chinese Nationalist Government, originated by forces both within and without the United States. The constant attacks upon the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek and the repeated assaults upon the alleged corruption and graft of his associates softened the fiber of Nationalist resistance, especially since many of these attacks originated within a nation which claimed to be aiding and supporting the Republic of China.

It is clear that the defection of a friend is more destructive of morale than the victory of an enemy.

8. The administration believed that the Chinese Communists would work in harmony with the Nationalists in a coalition government:

The habit of administration witnesses to contradict themselves during the course of this investigation did little to allay misgivings as to the conduct of our foreign affairs. Nowhere were these misgivings more pronounced than in discussions of the China policy when the Secretary of State was asked: "Was there ever any chance in your opinion of actually bringing the two Chinese groups to work together in harmony?" He replied,

[10] See testimony of Gen. Patrick Hurley and white paper.
[11] Op. cit., p. 1738 supra.
[12] Ibid., p. 2317.
[13] Ibid., p. 2747.
[14] See appendix IV.
[15] Ibid., p. 2746.
[16] Ibid., p. 2746.
[17] Ibid., p. 2747.
[18] Ibid., p. 2748.

"Yes, sir." [19] He then went on to say: "It was the view of all our military people that it was possible, and it was the only way to get real Chinese fighting against the Japanese." In direct contradiction to this statement is the statement of Lieutenant General Wedemeyer, who certainly can qualify as a military expert in the Far East, that "I told him [General Marshall] very frankly that in my judgment he could not accomplish that mission. His mission was one that I thought was just like mixing oil and water." [20]

Later on the Secretary was asked if it was not the "objective" of the Communists in every government in which they had a part to take over that government, "lock, stock, and barrel." The Secretary admitted that it was, and that just such "captures" had occurred in Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Poland.[21]

Yet the administration persisted in pushing for a coalition policy for years after the Japanese had surrendered. The contention was made that the United States desired a "unified" China. The effort to achieve such unification was to insist upon an alliance of the Nationalists with the forces committed to their destruction, the Chinese Communists.

The admission that a policy could not be successful and, at the same time, adherence to that same policy, is a self-indictment.

9. The administration has been unduly preoccupied with the defense of America in Europe to the neglect of the defense of America in Asia:

Since the days of Pearl Harbor, the American people have become used to the terms "global strategy," "global responsibilities," etc., and yet it is apparent to the signers of this report that the administration and the State Department have considered the globe to be much larger in its European aspects than in its Asiatic aspects.

While granting the importance of Europe and while recognizing the military and economic potential of that continent, we cannot help but feel that there has been a myopia approaching blindness whenever we have dealt with matters of the Pacific.

There has never been the same amount of effort expended on behalf of Asiatic matters by the State Department as there has been toward those of Europe. It is unfortunate, but true, that the State Department has been affected by a group who have interpreted Asiatic problems to the advantage of Russia rather than that of the United States.

In the present day, Asia is as important to the United States as Europe.

The situation in southeastern Asia is generally recognized as very menacing. Our temporizing in Korea might encourage the Chinese Reds to move in this area.

We can't attract and maintain the respect and friendship of the people of the Far East unless we demonstrate a sympathetic understanding toward their emerging nationalism.

10. The administration has sole responsibility for the failure of our far eastern policy:

The abject failure of our far eastern policy, aimed at maintaining a friendly China and establishing a free and united Korea, is the sole responsibility of the State Department. No other department of our Government has, in fact or in theory, had responsibility for this failure. China is under the domination of a Communist regime and Korea, far from being free and united, is devastated by war and remains divided by an artificial boundary.

The administration failed to devise a policy to keep China free. It likewise failed to devise a technique to guarantee our victory by creating a free and unified Korea. While the Secretary of State claims it is administration policy to back a free government in China and to unify and free Korea, the facts belie his claims.

There have been desperate efforts to becloud this elementary failure. The administration and its apologists have sought to create the impression that the failure was achieved under bipartisan sponsorship, and that all must share the responsibility for the failure.

The record refutes this claim.

During the last 6 years, members of both political parties as well as interested citizens have voiced strong protests against the trends in Asia.

Many Members of Congress are on record as consistently opposing any concessions to the Asiatic Communists. As a result of these hearings the administration has shifted and has shown some signs of stiffening their attitude toward the Asiatic Communists.

The argument for bipartisan responsibility is completely devastated by the statement of the late, great Senator from Michigan, Mr. Vandenberg, who on April 16, 1947, stated on the floor of the United States Senate:

"What the policy of the State Department is, I am unable to testify. There is a considerable amount of misunderstanding about the so-called bipartisan foreign policy in this country. I have tried to make that plain on several occasions. It is very narrowly channeled within very specific things, namely, the minor peace treaties in Europe and the activities of the United Nations. I have never been consulted about the Chinese policy or the pan-American policy or many other policies, and I am not in a position to be an expert witness for the Senator from Nebraska. My information probably is a little more intimate than that of other Senators, but speaking generally, the facts are as I have indicated." [22]

11. The risk of precipitating world war III through adoption of a positive program for victory in Korea is no greater now than it was before:

Administration witnesses have contended that we dare not press to victory in Korea lest we precipitate world war III. But the evidence shows that this risk was considered and debated when our troops were originally ordered to Korea.[23] The risk of another world war is no greater now than it was before.

Moreover, the decision to fight aggression in Korea was taken in the face of Soviet warnings that implementation of the Atlantic Pact for the defense of Western Europe would be interpreted as "provocative" by the Soviets and their satellites. This theme was repeated recently in the so-called "peace offer" of Mr. Malik.

This Nation has not hesitated to implement the Atlantic Pact, both with troops and supplies.

It is utterly inconsistent for the administration to take the calculated risk of provoking Russia in Europe and to cower at taking a similar risk in Asia. This is only another contradiction in American postwar diplomacy which confuses our own people and the free people throughout the world.

It appears of infinitely greater importance that the United States—with full U. N. backing—go ahead and crush the aggression in Korea where the Communists began it.[24]

12. The Korean conflict is improperly labeled a police action:

The administration's attempts to label this bloody war as a "police action is distinctly misleading." The statistics of the conflict prove it is a war of major importance by any historical yardstick.

Total casualties on both sides exceeded 1,000,000 in the first year of the war. American casualties, even using the accounting method by which we differentiate between battle and nonbattle casualties, are close to 200,000 in the first year of the war. The Korean campaign has been the fourth largest war in our Nation's history. The casualties in the first 12 months were greater than the combined total of the four wars of the Revolution, 1812, Mexican, and Spanish-American.

It is acknowledged that the joint act of the United Nations in resisting aggression in Korea is unprecedented in modern times. Perhaps new terminology will have to be devised, but nevertheless, as Secretary Acheson was ultimately forced to state, "* * * in the usual sense of the word, there is a war." [25]

In addition to the suffering, sacrifices, and loss of life, this war, computed on the basis of increased Federal spending in the United States has cost $10,000,000,000.[26]

13. Political considerations have prevented full exploitation of American air and naval superiority in the Korean war: We lay no claim to being military experts. However, it appears a matter of common sense that in any kind of warfare, one seeks to bring his maximum power to bear against his enemies' weaknesses.

In Korea, we find an almost exactly contrary strategy has prevailed. Our enemy had the advantage over us in manpower. Our advantage was in the air and on the sea. Yet in this situation our air power was shackled by a political decision against strategic strikes in Manchuria while our sea power was denied, through other political considerations, the opportunity of exploiting its superiority through the imposition of a blockade against the coast of Red China.

As Maj. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell stated in this "bizarre war * * * we can learn a lot of bad habits." [27]

Further: "The U. N. decision to restrict us to areas south of the Yalu definitely puts us under wraps and made us work against an inordinate disadvantage." [28]

14. The immoral policy of killing more Chinese Communists is unlikely to produce victory in Korea or to enhance the stature of the United States in the family of nations:

The policy of the United States in Korea, as outlined in the testimony of the Secretary

---

[19] Ibid., p. 1986.

[20] Ibid., p. 2305.

[21] Ibid., pp. 2125–2126.

[22] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, pt. 3, p. 3474.

[23] The secret agreement between the Soviet and Red China is contrary to the U. N. Charter and in theory could outlaw Soviet Union. In addition, the provisions of article 103 of the U. N. Charter state: "In the event of a conflict between the obligations of the members of the United Nations under the present Charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present Charter shall prevail."

To admit that any action that the United Nations takes might provoke Russia to attack the forces of the United Nations is tantamount to admitting that the United Nations, as such, has ceased to be an effective political instrument.

The arguments that our actions will precipitate world war III are not accepted even by Secretary Acheson. He stated before the Foreign Relations Committee upon his return from the Brussels conference that if a third war came either in Europe or the Far East it would be started by the Russians. Nothing we could do, he added, would in any way alter the Russian timetable.

[24] Former Secretary of Defense Johnson said: "* * * The whole world looked to the majestry of strength of the United States to see what we were going to do about this picture" (hearings, p. 2585).

[25] Ibid., p. 2014.

[26] Assistant Defense Secretary W. J. McNeil under pressure admitted that the present cost might total this amount (Washington Post, July 8, 1951).

[27] Op. cit., p. 3066.

[28] Ibid, p. 3091.

of State and the Secretary of Defense and others is that of destroying the effective core of the Communist Chinese armies by killing that government's trained soldiers, in the hope that someone will negotiate.[30] We hold that such a policy is essentially immoral, not likely to produce either victory in Korea or an end to aggression. At the same time such a policy tends to destroy the moral stature of the United States as a leader in the family of nations.

War in any form is abhorrent. War means other humane ways of settling disputes have failed. Only a nation without regard for the sanctity of human life could be committed to a policy of prolonged war with no intent at winning a victory. American policy in every war in which this Nation has engaged, has been designed to win the conflict at the earliest possible moment with the least possible loss of human life—especially American life, but also the lives of those who oppose us.

15. It is difficult to secure information from an administration which is determined to keep the facts from the Congress and the people.

In the course of these hearings, numerous important questions about the conduct of our Far East policy were put to witnesses. Repeatedly the witnesses sought to evade the questions, taking refuge in such phrases as, "I can't remember," "I don't recall," or "I will have to look it up."

The American people are aware of the administration's attitude in the past when efforts have been made to secure evidence of dishonesty or subversive activity in our Government.[30]

One of the worst evasions is the story of the "anonymous telegram."

Appearing in the transcript [31] is an utterly fantastic tale. Chairman RUSSELL states:

"Mr. Secretary [Acheson], I at one time was one of the most enthusiastic advocates of this Government doing everything they possibly could to assist the Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek in his struggle with the Chinese Communists. The thing that discouraged me more in that position than any other single thing was a telegram from the United States Chamber of Commerce in one of the largest cities of China."

The chairman continued to say that it was presented in executive session the previous year before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and also to the Armed Services Committee.

Secretary Acheson then testified as follows:

"This is a telegram which was sent to us, received by us on the 16th of March 1949, sent through our establishment, from the chamber of commerce of a city in China. I have asked that the name of the city not be used because I am advised that we are not sure that the people involved in this are all in a safe place." [32]

The Secretary clearly states: "This is from the chairman of the American Chamber of Commerce," [33] and then read the long telegram into the record. It was a bitter indictment of the Nationalist regime, containing such statements as:

"Through our support of a decadent and ineffectual Nationalist Government, we have, not without a measure of truth, been accused of being party to the rape and eventual abandonment of the large part of China, and the people therein, to communism." [34]

Senator KNOWLAND immediately raised objection to the reading of an anonymous telegram into the record and requested that the signatures be presented.[35]

Senator WILEY asked whether the signatures were Englishmen, Americans, or Chinese, to which Secretary Acheson replied, "This was sent from the American Chamber of Commerce in a city," but continued to say, "I do not know whether individuals' names were on it." Yet, when Senator KNOWLAND pursued by asking, "Then it is an anonymous telegram?" the Secretary replied, "Well, no, this is a telegram from the consul saying that the American Chamber of Commerce asked him. * * *" To this, Senator BREWSTER replied, "You mean there is no name at all?" and the Secretary responded, "I do not know." [36]

Senator KNOWLAND pointed out that the telegram might have been sent by a fellow traveler or even a Communist, and it was later disclosed that the city from which the telegram originated was, at the time the telegram was sent, in Communist hands.[37]

When asked by Chairman RUSSELL the present location of the consul, the Secretary responded, "I will have to find that out, sir." [37]

Senator SMITH of New Jersey inquired if the source of the telegram was investigated by the State Department in order to establish the reliability of the individuals or the group, and Secretary Acheson replied: "Well, I cannot tell you whether the investigation was made in China."

These rather embarrassing developments led Senator RUSSELL to again explain that the State Department had presented the telegram in executive session of the Armed Services Committee a year or a year and a half ago; that it had "quite an impact on me at the time * * * and it made a very vivid impression on me." [38]

Now, we have here the State Department of the United States submitting a telegram which they claim came from the chairman of an American chamber of commerce in an undisclosed city which bitterly attacks our ally, Chiang Kai-shek.

Without knowing whether the communication is signed or whether indeed it had originated from any chamber of commerce and without conducting any investigation to determine the reliability of the informant, the Secretary of State, of his own volition, at the time when our ally needed our support, introduced this anonymous communication into the executive testimony, creating such an impact that, as Chairman RUSSELL stated: "The thing that discouraged me more in that position [support of Chiang Kai-shek] than any other single thing was a telegram from the United States Chamber of Commerce in one of the largest cities of China."

The only conclusion that we can draw from this story is that the Secretary of State abandoned the use of his critical faculties and judgment when it came to evaluating any evidence which supported the Communist viewpoint.

16. The problem of Communist infiltration in our Government is still unresolved:

It is common knowledge that efforts toward Communist infiltration of the State Department have been persistent over the years. This is no idle charge. After long continued congressional pressure, some few convictions have been secured. Today Carl Marzani is serving a penitentiary sentence for concealing the fact that he had been a Communist organizer. The confessions of Julian Wadleigh were made under oath. Alger Hiss, one of President Roosevelt's confidential advisers, was convicted of perjury, involving his contacts with a Communist espionage ring operating within the Federal Government, and is now in prison.

This Communist infiltration has been a critical problem since 1933. At some stage, not yet clear to this committee, Communist influence began to affect our Far East policy. We have had the policy under review during these hearings. Witnesses discussed the activities of the State Department group who favored the Chinese Communists. We are satisfied that the truth about the pro-Communist State Department group has not yet been revealed. It should be noted that since the conclusion of these hearings the State Department has reluctantly admitted that it has numerous major loyalty cases under review.

The Executive has done nothing to assist Congress in its efforts to get at the truth about this infiltration. His consistent tactic is to refuse access to the full records when Congress asks for it. His consistent rejoinder to charges is the phrase "red herring."

There can be no confidence, no unity of purpose until this administration makes available to the public the facts; until the Executive demonstrates the desire to remove from our national institutions those who seek to destroy America. In the light of the continuous disclosures as to the substantial number of security risks discharged by the State Department, it is obvious that a serious situation of Communist infiltration has existed and still endangers our national security.[39]

17. The advice and information of our ablest and most experienced officials has been ignored:

The inquiry revealed that it has become the habitual practice of the Executive to make decisions without thorough consultation with the ablest and most competent officials on the scene of action.

The testimony is replete with examples of this practice. A few are cited:

(a) The failure to consult MacArthur relative to the Yalta Conference.[40]

(b) The failure to inform Ambassador Hurley about the Yalta agreement at the time when he was actively representing this Government in China.[41]

(c) The granting of the Polish loan to the Communist satellite government over the vigorous protests of Arthur Bliss Lane, our Ambassador to Poland at the time.

(d) Failure to consult MacArthur before decision to fight in Korea.

(e) Failure of Marshall, on his way to China, to consult MacArthur on the Far East situation.

(f) Failure to adopt General Wedemeyer's recommendations on China and Korea as well as the suppression of his report.[42]

(g) Failure to follow Admiral Leahy's advice regarding the necessity for Russian entry into the Pacific war.

(h) Failure to follow the recommendations of Angus Ward and his subsequent exile to an obscure post in Africa.

(i) Failure to accept the advice of Admiral Badger relative to military assistance to the Republic of China.

---

[30] "From the military point of view we hope that by inflicting severe casualties on the enemy and proving to them that 'they are not invincible, that they cannot gain anything by aggressive action, that it is too costly a matter that they have been let down by Russia in getting in it, that they will be willing to negotiate a peace with the U. N.'" (Gen. Omar Bradley, hearings, p. 937.)

[31] See item 16 following.

[32] Hearings; p. 1971.

[33] Ibid., p. 1971.

[34] Ibid., p. 1972.

[35] Ibid., p. 1973.

[36] Ibid., p. 1973.

[37] Ibid., p. 1974.

[38] Ibid., p. 1974.

[39] Ibid., p. 1975.

[39] To support this contention, it must be noted that on July 9, 1951, Senator MCCARRAN (Democrat, Nevada), chairman of the recently created Senate Committee on Internal Security, announced after an executive session that "Facts have been developed which show definite Communist slanting of the Voice of America broadcasts, publications, and moving pictures sent abroad which are supposed to give the American viewpoint in the fight against communism."

[40] Op. cit., p. 128.

[41] Ibid., p. 2836.

[42] Ibid., p. 2293 supra.

This method of operation by our State Department has had devastating effects upon our Foreign Service officers. It has apparently resulted in a frustration and inertia, which has reacted unfavorably to our national security. The confidence and harmonious operation of our foreign relations demands that this tendency be reversed and that those who are entrusted with the responsibility of representing our Government abroad be kept informed and allowed to exercise their authority in conformance with our democratic traditions.

18. The Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress has the sole power to declare war:

Although these hearings commenced as an inquiry into the circumstances surrounding the recall of the General of the Army, Douglas MacArthur, it was soon apparent that there was an underlying question of great constitutional significance; namely, the right of the Executive to involve this Nation in a war without consent of the Congress of the United States. In buttressing the position of the administration, citations have been made in the public record of over 150 instances where the Executive, utilizing his authority as Commander in Chief, has used the Armed Forces of the United States without the consent of Congress.[42]

House Document No. 127 shows that whenever the President has used the Armed Forces without the consent of Congress he has done it "as a result of direct aggression upon those forces or in protection of American lives or property."

In the Korean case, the Executive authorized large-scale military operations without the consent of the Congress. Since the President could make a personal decision of this character again, the constitutional question must be resolved.

The use of military forces to the extent of the Korean conflict falls squarely within the constitutional provisions of the war-making power of Congress, therefore, the action on the part of the Executive to intervene without the prior consent of Congress or immediate subsequent approval was ill-advised and should not be allowed to remain as a precedent in our constitutional history.

PART VI. CONCLUSIONS

An inquiry of the type of the MacArthur hearings would accomplish little for the public good unless those who participated arrived at some firm conclusions the implementation of which will strengthen our country.

We have examined all of the facts and in good faith submit to the public the following conclusions:

1. The inquiry was in the public interest:

The inquiry into the military situation in the Far East and the facts surrounding the relief of General MacArthur has been very productive. As a result of the extensive testimony the public and the Members of Congress have for the first time in a decade been informed as to our policies in the Far East.

The hearings have revealed glaring mistakes, evasions, contradictions, and significant admissions which will enable the American people to more properly evaluate our future course of action.

We are satisfied that this investigation was in the public interest.

2. The removal of General MacArthur was within the constitutional power of the President, but the circumstances were a shock to the national pride:

Without debating the right of the President to remove any military leader it must be pointed out that the reasons assigned for the removal of General MacArthur were utterly inadequate to justify the act.

The "justification" for his removal seems to have been built up after the removal rather than before.

The removal came 8 months after the victorious landing at Inchon—a military operation of an extremely hazardous character so brilliantly carried out as to rouse the outspoken admiration of all professional soldiers and our people generally.

Far more serious were the effects in the Far East of his curt and precipitate dismissal. There, perhaps more than anywhere else in the world, prestige is associated with dignity and a due regard for decorum. General MacArthur was our senior general, a former Chief of Staff, and a distinguished commander in two World Wars.

His position in the Far East was unparalleled. He not only held the highest United States command but he was also the general of the United States forces in Korea and supreme commander of the combined forces of the United Nations. He held these positions while still in command of and responsible for occupied Japan. As the executive, in carrying out the reconstruction of that defeated empire, he had acted with extraordinary success. His energetic, intrepid, and vigorous prosecution of the conflict in Korea had deepened the regard in which he was justly held. That such an officer should be discarded overnight, as though he was merely a disgruntled subordinate, is deplorable. The unseeming haste of the dismissal further compromised the position of the United States—a position already badly shaken as a result of the unhappy events of the past 6 years.

Furthermore, there were still other serious repercussions. General MacArthur, testifying before the joint committee, said that—

"I have never known it in the American Army, and I know of no precedents any place. Being summarily relieved in that way made it impossible to carry out directives that I was working on at that moment. I had to turn them over to my successor, an admirable officer in every respect, General Ridgway, who was 350 miles away on the Korean front. I don't think there is any question that the interest of the United States was jeopardized in such a summary mode of turning over great responsibilities which involve the security of the country."[44]

3. There was no serious disagreement between General MacArthur and the Joint Chiefs of Staff as to military strategy in Korea:

The military played no part in initiating or recommending the recall of General MacArthur. The record reveals direct testimony from Secretary Marshall, General Bradley, General Collins, General Vandenberg, and Admiral Sherman on this question. These witnesses testified clearly and unequivocally that the military no more than concurred in a previously made decision to recall General MacArthur.

At the outset, General Bradley refused to divulge conversations with the President, or to enumerate persons whom the President consulted relative to General MacArthur's recall. Under examination by Senator WILEY, General Bradley indicated that President Truman had not, however, requested General Bradley to maintain such matters confidential. Thus, General Bradley on his own initiative refused to give the details and would only give the conclusions of the talks.

When Senator WILEY made a motion to require General Bradley to divulge the actual conversations the chairman ruled against him and the committee upheld General Bradley's refusal to talk. Subsequent witnesses also refused to give the details of what went on in the White House conferences.

In any event, no evidence was presented to prove that any of the military had been responsible for initiating the action for General MacArthur's dismissal. Lastly, it should be noted that the committee still remains in the dark as to precisely what civilian influences were instrumental in the ouster of General MacArthur.[45]

4. Our Armed Forces have acquitted themselves with gallantry:

In the midst of the sober reflections provoked by much that the inquiry has brought forth, we do not forget that in one respect the national honor has been nobly upheld: Our Armed Forces—land, sea, and air—have acquitted themselves with a gallantry unsurpassed in our history. If the recent conduct of our foreign affairs has been disheartening, the same cannot be said of the behavior of the heroic men and women who were given all but impossible tasks to carry out.

The forces first ordered into Korea were largely green troops. Assigned to stem as best they could the advance of an enemy overwhelming in numbers and battle experience, these soldiers distinguished themselves by their fortitude. They were stubborn in retreat, suffering, as they had to do, reverses most punishing to morale.

Later, in the landings at Inchon, the superb coordination in action of all branches of the services roused universal admiration.

Above all, as the fighting has ebbed and flowed with no clear goal of victory to hearten and sustain them our forces have faithfully performed as the command directed.

The traditions of Lexington, Gettysburg, the Argonne, the Bulge, and Coral Sea, and Iwo Jima, have been upheld. In a world and time when stamina is being challenged on every hand, we may recall a surgeon's statement of the conditions under which the First Marine Division conducted their retreat from Hungham in December 1950:

"Thirty degrees below zero weather with no fires or warming tents, frozen C rations for food, snow for water, and the hills lined with screaming Chinese for 16 bloody miles * * *. Men arrived in Hajarn with a shell of ice around their feet inside their boots. Fifteen hundred were evacuated * * * by air, the remaining either being minor or the men refused to turn in, despite the pain and danger of permanent injury, in their desire to fight their way out with their comrades."

Such valor in the battle line deserves something better than indecision, irresolution, and equivocation in the ultimate center of command.

5. The administration's Far East policy has been a catastrophic failure:

A candid survey of the position which the United States now occupies in the Orient leads to the conclusion that the administration's management of affairs in the Far East represents the most desolate failure in the history of our foreign policy. This management has been heedless in its neglect of our interests; the upshot has been catastrophe. The single exception in the record is provided by Japan, where the reputation of the United States for firmness, generosity, and fair dealing has been nobly upheld. The irony provided by this exception lies in the fact that the person most responsible for our success in Japan—Gen. Douglas MacArthur—is the man whose dismissal provoked the investigation in which we have been engaged.

Let us briefly recall the historical background against which this catastrophe was played out:

For many years the Far East was a region of ancient and enfeebled kingdoms, intermittently subjected to the impositions and rapacity of predatory colonial powers. In these long-continued aggressions the United States had never participated. On the contrary, the United States had been scrupulous in carrying out agreements freely negotiated

[42] Op. cit., H. Rept. No. 127 as quoted in detail under item 12, Agreements.

[44] Hearings, p. 26.

[45] Ibid., p. 763 supra.

and had attained an enviable position in the esteem of oriental peoples.

Toward the close of the nineteenth century, the rivalry of the colonial powers in China had become so intense, the encroachments of Russia on the southern boundary of Siberia so threatening, that an international war seemed unavoidable.

In this situation the United States stated in the most categorical terms the position it had assumed in respect to China; it insisted upon the integrity of that country. Thereafter, over a period of years, this position was reaffirmed.

(Examples: The Open Door Note, 1899; the Boxer Rebellion Circular, 1900; the Nine Power Treaty, 1922; Secretary Hull's demands on the Japanese Ambassadors, 1941.)

In effect, the United States in its relations with China had adopted a self-denying ordinance, and so swift was the growth of American domestic wealth and strength that the power of its example was a persuasive argument against aggression by others.

In 1941, Japan directly challenged the position of the United States, and war followed. War in Europe, for other reasons, was an immediate concomitant and the preoccupation with the European war meant that minimum resources of men and matériel could be devoted to the Pacific conflict. With this minimum, the Armed Forces of the United States—land, sea, and air—raised the far-eastern prestige of America to a height never before attained. Forswearing all idea of conquest, with the promise of Philippine independence fulfilled, Americans could justly say that the reputation of their country in the Far East was at its zenith.

Then, with an appalling swiftness, the position of the United States was undermined, compromised, and finally shattered. For this ruinous collapse, the administration in general and the State Department in particular has a direct and dreadful responsibility.

For years, the Russian Communists had plainly stated that international revolution was their aim. An international conspiratorial apparatus was under their control and in this apparatus the Chinese Communists had important places. Their hope of capturing the whole of China was freely acknowledged, their umbilical connection with Moscow well understood. The most intransigent enemy of the Chinese Communists was Chiang Kai-shek, and, for years before Pearl Harbor he had carried on a war both against the invading Japanese and the Chinese Communists.

In 1943, at Cairo, the United States had made the most solemn undertaking that Korea should be set free and that territories previously wrested from the Chinese Republic should be restored. At the time of President Roosevelt's death on April 12, 1945, these commitments were presumably still in force. The secret agreements at Yalta were then unknown, not a single Russian soldier was engaged in the Far East, and the forces of the United States were within striking distance of the very heart of Japan.

On August 8, 1945, the Russians entered Manchuria, and, after a few days of skirmishing, the Japanese resistance on the Asiatic mainland was over. There followed the movement of the Chinese Communists into the vacuum which the Russians conveniently provided. Later in the year (December 15, 1945), a formal demand by President Truman was served upon the Chinese calling for a cessation of hostilities between the Nationalists and the Communists and insisting that a "national conference of representatives of major political elements in the country agree upon arrangements which would give those elements a fair and effective representation in the Chinese National Government."

In this manner the fatal coalition policy was imposed upon our ally.

President Truman has had four Secretaries of State:

Edward Stettinius (1945)
James F. Byrnes (1945–47)
George C. Marshall (1947–49)
Dean G. Acheson (1949 to present writing)

The first of these four men held office for only a few months and was little more than a temporary place holder.

The second, though he was present at Yalta, knew nothing of the secret agreements made there.[46] He has said that he learned of them as a result of a Moscow press statement, and that only diligent search unearthed the relevant documents in a White House safe.

The third, George C. Marshall, undertook the imposition of the coalition policy while acting as the President's special representative in China. After his appointment as Secretary of State in January 1947, he continued for almost 6 months the embargo on arms shipments to the Chinese Nationalists. While declaring that "intervention by any foreign government in these matters would be inappropriate,"[47] the administration in a most practical sense did so interfere and indirectly aided the ultimate Communist triumph in China.

The fourth, Dean G. Acheson, is associated with a long series of vacillations and equivocations, the net result of which has been to encourage Communist aggression. His statement that the policy was to "wait until the dust settles" is an example of this. His speech at the National Press Club on January 12, 1950, is another. In that speech, while drawing the Nation's "defensive perimeter" from the Aleutians to the Philippines, he pointedly omitted both South Korea and Formosa, thus implying that the United States would make no effort to repel a Communist invasion of either territory. Still another illustration of Secretary Acheson's indirect encouragement of the Communists was his statement on May 31, 1950, to Members of Congress in the Library auditorium that the United States would not use the veto to prevent the seating of Communist China in the United Nations.

One of the most singular aspects of the administration's far-eastern policy is illustrated by its acknowledgment of the dynamic character of revolution. As Secretary Acheson has pointed out on so many occasions, international communism is a movement which plans to overthrow existing governments by force and violence if necessary. While holding this point of view our State Department has continually acted as though, if appeasement went far enough, the Russians and their satellites would consent to dwell peacefully side by side with the "free world."

It does not require prolonged reflection upon the disastrous results of the administration's far-eastern policy to draw some conclusions as to what the United States must do. Fear of Russia is no basis for a foreign policy; what we must have is a positive program based upon confidence in our abilities and resources.

6. The foreign policy of the United States since the middle 1940's has been based on expediency rather than the principles of liberty and justice:

It has been extremely difficult to determine the full extent of the secret commitments which the administration has made. These commitments are the basis for a large part of our present foreign policy. The agreements made at Cairo, Tehran, Yalta, Quebec, Potsdam, and elsewhere[48] were largely international executive arrangements drawn without consideration of the treaty-making power of the United States Senate.

In the past the confirmation and implementation of international commitments has required the advice and consent of the Senate. Treaties were public documents, open to the inspection of any citizen.

Ten years of secrecy changed all this. Negotiations were affected by the precarious health of some who represented us; decisions were made by irresponsible people. Practices of this character confused our people and left them in ignorance of what had been undertaken in their name. These hearings broke through this wall of secrecy. For the first time in years a congressional committee has been able to force out enough information to piece together a coherent picture of a foreign situation, discouraging though the picture was.

7. The United States should never again become involved in war without the consent of the Congress:

Despite the legalistic administration arguments to the contrary, the fact remains that for the first time in the history of our Nation the constitutional authority of Congress to declare war has been bypassed.

Recognizing the unique nature of the collective security action of the United Nations, it is nevertheless our opinion that the Korean war should not be allowed to establish a precedent.

It is true that there was popular approval for the intervention of United States forces in Korea. It is also true, however, that this approval was, in measure, based upon the logical assumption that proper military plans and estimates were in existence. It was further assumed by most people that we were in a state of readiness to carry out whatever military objectives were assigned to our Armed Forces by our administration leaders.

Consultation after commitment, as was the case in the Korean intervention, is not in accordance with American constitutional procedures.

8. Cessation of hostilities, based upon restoration of the status quo at the thirty-eighth parallel, will be a victory for aggression:

If a truce is negotiated, based upon the restoration of the status quo at the thirty-eighth parallel, the Communists will remain in control of the northern half of the country and the objectives of the United Nations will not have been fulfilled.[49] We should be on our guard against any Munich-like respites which are only surrenders in disguise and which make the ultimate reckoning infinitely more costly.

The aggressor, of course, has suffered grave losses, but, for that matter, so has the victim of the attack. Indeed, all of Korea is the loser; the land and its people have suffered irreparable harm.

Any peace short of the liberation and unification of Korea is a delusion. Any settlement at the thirty-eighth parallel is a Chinese Communist victory.

General MacArthur had driven the North Koreans to the Yalu and had victory within his grasp when this new and formidable enemy entered the field. To make a settlement south of the Yalu therefore is to admit the success of the Chinese aggressors.

The United States will be confronted with a staggering bill for relief and rehabilitation in Korea; the taxpayer will be paying for generations for the cost of the conflict; and our troops will be pinned down in South Korea indefinitely.

On the other hand, the North Koreans will be able to resume their aggression on any flimsy pretext at any convenient opportunity, and the Russians having utilized the

[46] Byrnes, Speaking Frankly, p. 43.

[47] China white paper, p. 609.

[48] See A Decade of American Foreign Policy, Basic Documents, 1941–49, 81st Cong., 1st sess., Washington 1950.

[49] See Shameful Chapter in History, by David Lawrence, Washington Star, July 10, 1951.

entire conflict as a proving ground similar to Finland and Spain can precipitate war somewhere else in the world.

Signed by: STYLES BRIDGES.
ALEXANDER WILEY.
H. ALEXANDER SMITH.
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER.
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.
HARRY P. CAIN.
OWEN BREWSTER.
RALPH E. FLANDERS.

AUGUST 17, 1951.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Investigation Into Far East Policy, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Without endorsing all the statements in the compilation of views to which this letter is appended, I agree with its criticism of the way in which General MacArthur's dismissal was handled and communism was given a "green light" in China and Korea. I concur in its tribute to the valor of our troops.

I shall very soon submit my own views on the other issues raised by the investigation.

Sincerely yours,
HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
United States Senator.

EXHIBIT No. IV

[From Weekly Report of June 29, 1951]

THE CHINA LOBBY: A CASE STUDY—TEN AGENTS REGISTERED FOR NATIONALISTS, TWO FOR COMMUNISTS—BIG NAMES LISTED—CHINA AID SINCE 1940 EXCEEDS $3,000,000,000

WHAT IS CHINA LOBBY?

With a congressional investigation into the China lobby called for, and new charges and countercharges appearing daily, Congressional Quarterly has brought together the facts behind the names and groups most often mentioned in connection with the so-called China lobby.

It is found a variety of meanings attached to the term "China lobby" and a wide assortment of interests—commercial, military, political, ideological, religious—coming into the picture on one side or the other.

CQ's roundup covers: (1) Agents registered for Chinese organizations; (2) lobby act registrations; (3) the leading groups and individuals vocal on China policy; (4) Congressmen figuring most prominently in this issue; and (5) the Government's figures on the amount of United States dollar aid to China.

Probably the most variously interpreted term now in the news, the phrase "China lobby" has recently been used to embrace the Nationalist China supporters, the Nationalist opponents, and both.

Here are the shades of meaning:

Pro-Chiang Kai-shek: (1) Collectively, all the pro-Chiang backers urging and working for the adoption of the United States foreign policy they favor; this is generally meant to include both Americans and Chinese in this country; (2) just the Americans active in the pro-Chiang cause; (3) just the Chinese agents in this country advocating support for the Nationalist Government.

Anti-Chiang: (1) Collectively, all opponents of the Nationalist regime; (2) Chinese in the United States who are Communist sympathizers; (3) Americans advocating policies ranging from opposition to the Nationalist Government to endorsement of the Communist Government.

PREVAILING DEFINITION

At the present, China lobby usually is used to refer to pro-Nationalist backers. This is the meaning given to the term by Senator WAYNE MORSE (Republican, Oregon), and the administration when it announced it would investigate the China lobby.

WHAT THEY SAY

Morse statement

Senator WAYNE MORSE (Republican, Oregon), in a June 8 statement at the MacArthur hearings said, "behind the sincere differences of opinion in this country over the proper course of the United States to follow in China there has existed the more or less clandestine struggle between two extremist groups, each representing not America's interests, but the interests of the two principal contenders for power in the Chinese civil war.

"While American Communists and their fellow travelers have ardently backed the Chinese Communists and sought to turn American public and official opinion in favor of Communist ends in China, it was alleged that there has been operating at the other extreme a propaganda and pressure group working for the Nationalist Chinese, Kuomintang, Chiang Kai-shek interests. This latter group is generally referred to in the American press as the China lobby.

"Although the vicious operations of the Communists have been widely exposed, to some extent but I believe still not fully * * * there has never been, however, a thorough public investigation of the so-called China lobby."

Violent Campaign Alleged

MORSE further stated, "It is widely alleged that the China lobby, or pro-Chiang group, in the United States has for several years been conducting a violent campaign against American policies in China, chiefly by charging that the State Department, and especially its far eastern division, is a nest of Reds, controlled by Communists and fellow travelers. * * *

"In addition, it is believed by many that the China lobby has been especially active in pressuring Congress for financial, economic, and military aid for the Chiang regime."

MORSE also said "it is believed by many" that the Soong family relatives have "immense" sums of money cached in various parts of the world and that Mme. Chiang Kai-shek's brother, T. V. Soong, has "many millions of dollars on deposit in the United States."

Bridges says influence minor

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, New Hampshire, said June 9 at the hearing that he thought the so-called China lobby influence "is a very minor thing compared to the whole." BRIDGES suggested investigating "those individuals within the American Government, if there are such" espousing the cause of communism. He also proposed that any China lobby probe should cover the pressures of other nations as well.

Senator BRIDGES denied June 16 that he had been influenced by the so-called China lobby in his support of the Chinese Nationalists. In this he refuted a charge made by the Democratic National Committee's weekly publication.

Kohlberg, Loeb

Alfred Kohlberg, American importer of Chinese textiles and chairman of the American China Policy Association, denied he is a lobbyist for the Chinese Nationalists, and said he did not believe the administration would conduct an investigation of the so-called China lobby, "because they will find the real 'China lobby' is a pro-Communist lobby within the State Department."

William Loeb, president of the American China Policy Association and publisher of the Manchester Union-Leader and the New Hampshire Sunday News, said "Acheson's dark and veiled hints about a sinister China lobby would be just plain silly if they were not also viciously aimed at discrediting a fine group of patriotic Americans who have foiled his frightful plan."

Chinese officials comment

The Associated Press reported that two Chinese Nationalist officials at a news conference in New York "said they were mystified by references to a China lobby. If there is such a thing, they said, the Chinese Nationalist Government has nothing to do with it." The two interviewed were Dr. T. F. Tsiang, chief Chinese delegate to the United Nations, and Dr. C. M. Chin, Chinese Nationalist minister. They said that money spent by the American China Policy Association comes from American sources.

The New York Times reported that Tsiang said he had sought vainly for an accurate that replies to his questions always had mentioned McKee and Kohlberg. He said neither definition of the term "China lobby," and man had asked or received any money for backing the Nationalist cause.

McKee statement

Frederick C. McKee, Pittsburgh manufacturer and leader in several past and present foreign policy and China policy groups, denied June 14 that he was connected with any China lobby. The term is of Communist origin, said McKee. The Committee To Defend America by Aiding Anti-Communist China, which McKee heads, has never received money, directly or indirectly, from the Nationalist government, from any Chinese, or from any Americans of Chinese descent, he declared.

Representative Busbey charges anti-Chiang lobbying

Representative FRED E. BUSBEY, Republican, Illinois, said June 11 that two Federal agencies should be included in any probe of the China lobby. He named them in a House speech as the Commerce Department's Office of International Trade and the State Department's Far Eastern Division.

He also listed these organizations and individuals whom he said should be checked if an investigation is made:

Organizations: China Aid Council, American Friends of the Chinese People, American Committee in Aid to Chinese Industrial Cooperation, Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, Institute of Pacific Relations, and American Council of Institute of Pacific Relations.

Individuals: Owen Lattimore, John Carter Vincent, John Stewart Service, Philip Jessup, and Michael Lee.

Louis Johnson disavowal

During questioning at the MacArthur hearings, former Defense Secretary Louis A. Johnson said June 14 that if there is a China lobby, he knows nothing about it and has never had anything to do with it. Johnson said he was aware of a statement that he had been the personal attorney for Dr. H. H. Kung, and answered it by saying that he is not and never had been.

Johnson also stated his law firm has "never lobbied on the Hill for anybody on any subject.

Goodwin describes Chiang backers

William J. Goodwin, a former registered agent for the Nationalist government, asked by Congressional Quarterly about the composition of forces working for aid to the Chiang government, listed "independent businessmen such as the sterling patriot, Alfred Kohlberg, religious organizations whose missionaries have suffered terribly at the hands of the Chinese Communists, and Congressmen and Senators who know there is something terribly foul happening in the State Department."

TWENTY FILED AS RED OR CHIANG AGENTS, TWELVE NOW ACTIVE

Nationalist and Communist China have had a total of 20 agents in America at one time or another since 1942. Primarily these are organizations employing staffs of varying

sizes. Just now, the Nationalists have 10 agents in this country and the Communists have 2. Eight others have terminated their connections.

This is a statistical summation of the China lobby revealed by accumulated information filed with the Justice Department by these agents in compliance with the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

This act—first passed in 1938—requires public disclosure of all persons engaged in political propaganda and other activities on behalf of foreign governments, foreign political parties and other foreign principals. It was first administered by the State Department but the law has been handled since 1942 by the Department of Justice, which maintains the registrants' filings open at all times for public inspection.

Total spending not reported

Their records fail to disclose a precise account of the money spent to propagandize the two China governments in this country. Some China agents report only salaries, others commissions, fees, and expenses. Still others account for income and expenditures, and in the case of a corporate agent, assets and liabilities are reported. This variety of accounting methods—apparently permissible under the Registration Act—precludes a full view of the official China lobby's spending.

Prominent among the listings was the registration of Allied Syndicates, Inc., a New York publicity agency, which registered last year as an agent of the Bank of China in New York City.

Agent for China bank

This branch of the bank, which in China has been taken over by the Communist government, represents Nationalist interests in this country. Allied Syndicates terminated its connection in early 1951. For a variety of activities—the registration said they covered the "entire gamut of the public relations field"—the organization received $50,000 in fees and $10,000 for expenses. David B. Charney was listed as president of the firm, and Charles N. Maybruck, John M. Gray, Robert D. Mockler and Barnett Bildersee were listed as members.

Also paid out by the China bank interests through Allied Syndicates, the organization's registration showed, was a $17,500 fee to Sullivan, Bernard & Shea, a Washington law firm. This was in addition to the Syndicate's remuneration. The law firm was called in by Allied Syndicates in connection with deposits of Bank of China funds in American banks. The Communist government has sought the control of these funds since it took over the bank's home office in Shanghai.

Sullivan, Bernard & Shea reports for 1950 filed under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act show fees placing the firm among top-paid agents reporting for that year. John L. Sullivan of the firm is an ex-Navy secretary.

ECA adviser is China agent

One of the newest registrants is Lester Knox Little, an American, who filed in 1950 as a special adviser to C. K. Yen, Minister of Finance in the Nationalist Chinese Government. According to his registration, Little was Nationalist Inspector General of Chinese Customs from July 1943, until the time he became Yen's adviser. Little, in his registration, listed his business address as 190 Exchange Street, Pawtucket, R. I., and said he also is on the ECA Advisory Committee on Underdeveloped Areas.

A long-standing registrant under the law has been the American headquarters of the Kuomintang, the Nationalist political party headed by Chiang Kai-shek. The latest report of that organization contains the statement that there are approximately 3,825 party members in the United States and several millions in China.

Field represents Communists

Communist China's principal representative in this country is Frederick Vanderbilt Field. He has registered twice as an agent of a variety of governmental and business concerns. Field's first filing listed him as the agent of three corporations of the Chinese Communist state, including the Bank of China, and also a Hong Kong bank. He is now listed as President and Director of the American-Chinese Export Corp., a trading agency dealing with 10 other corporations which handle a variety of Chinese products and commodities.

Helen Black also is a registrant. Her China Photo Agency is the exclusive distributor of photographs from Communist China and her clients, she reported include Associated Press and Acme News Photos. Miss Black also has registered as a distributor of photos from Soviet Russia and Eastern European countries.

SOONG, KUNG BACKGROUND

Two personalities frequently linked up with the so-called China lobby in America are T. V. Soong and H. H. Kung, both brothers-in-law of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. However, their present affiliation with the Nationalist China cause is somewhat obscure.

Both are living in New York. And both have reportedly broken with the Chinese Nationalist Party, the Kuomintang. Furthermore, both have been ousted by official Kuomintang action from the Bank of China on Formosa, but have reportedly retained high positions with the Bank of China in New York City.

H. H. Kung held a series of industrial and financial positions in China until he finally became Minister of Finance of the Republic of China in 1933 and Governor of the Central Bank of China in 1938. He is married to Ai-ling Soong, the eldest of the Soong sisters. Madame Chiang Kai-shek is the youngest.

T. V. Soong, also held a series of important financial and diplomatic positions with Nationalist China. A brother of Madame Chiang, he founded the Bank of China and took over its leadership in 1936. He served as foreign minister for Chiang Kai-shek in American during World War II. His last political position in the Nationalist government was that of Premier until February 1947.

LIST OF CHINA AGENTS

Here is the complete list of active and terminated agents for both Nationalist and Communist China, as revealed by Department of Justice records:

Nationalist China

Active: Universal Trading Corp., trade promotion agency; Lester Knox Little, special adviser to the Chinese Nationalists' Minister of Finance; Kuomintang's American headquarters; Chinese News Service, official Nationalist information agency; Central News Agency, the news gathering arm of the Nationalist government; China Institute of America, Inc., principal educational organ for Nationalist China in America, which is headed by Henry R. Luce, owner of Time, Life, and Fortune magazines; Paul Guillumette, Inc., a photograph sales agency dealing in Nationalist Chinese pictures; Transocean Commerce, Inc., film distributors; Dr. Shou-Ch'un Mong, head of the Chinese American World Publishing Co., who listed himself as an agent of General Ying-Chin Ho and Dr. Chen Lifu, members of the Nationalist Chinese cabinet; and the Committee on Planning and Advising Chinese Students in United States.

Terminated: Allied Syndicates, Inc., represented the Bank of China; Chinese Petroleum Corp., headed by John William Fleming, who listed himself as an export adviser and economic analyst; two Chinese language newspapers, Chinese Nationalist Daily and the Young China; William Goodwin, who had been attached to the Chinese News Service, and the San Francisco bureau of the CNS; and the National Lecture Management, which had listed David Lu, of the Central News Agency in China, as one of its foreign principals.

Communist China

Active: American-Chinese Export Corp. (headed by Frederick V. Field) a trading agency dealing with 10 other corporations which handle a variety of Chinese products and commodities; Helen Black, owner of a photo distributing agency.

Terminated: Frederick V. Field, representing three Chinese Government concerns, the Bank of China, the China National Aviation Corporation, and the Directorate General of Postal Remittances and Savings Bank of Peiping. He also represented the Chinese Postal Remittances and Savings Bank of Hong Kong.

BACKGROUND ON LAW

The Foreign Agents Registration Act was passed in 1938 and revised in 1942 primarily to bring Nazi propagandists and other German agents into the open; but it requires the registration of many more than strictly politically propagandists.

At first administered by the State Department, the Registration Act has been handled by the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice since 1942. The law requires public disclosure of all persons engaged in political propaganda and other activities on behalf of foreign governments, foreign political parties, and other foreign principals.

The registrations are publicized by the Department through several methods:

1. Foreign agents files are kept open for public inspection in the Foreign Agents Registration Section of the Justice Department.

2. The Attorney General reports periodically to Congress on the administration of the act. According to the Registration Section, such a report on 1950 activities is to be released within 2 weeks. Two such reports have already been made since the Justice Department took over the administration of the law.

EXEMPTIONS

The law clearly exempts accredited diplomatic and consular representatives to the United States, as well as persons engaged in welfare or medical-aid activities for the foreign principal. A special section exempting persons working for mutual defense purposes was declared by President Roosevelt during World War II as applicable to agents of the Allied governments.

Another exemption, that of persons engaging in "private, nonpolitical financial mercantile or other activities in furthering bona fide trade or commercial," was named in the last Attorney General's report released in 1950 as one of the principal problems in the administration of the act. The report said this so-called commercial exemption was complicated through the increasing activities in the United States of agents for firms which are wholly or partially subsidized by foreign governments. The Justice Department examines the activities of such a person and decides on the applicability of the law.

WHAT AGENTS HAVE TO REPORT

Every person or group which qualifies as a foreign agent must file an original registration with the Justice Department, with supplementary reports at 6 month's intervals.

Registration statements include:

1. Name, address, and status of agent and comparable information on the foreign principal.

2. Totals of money received and spent in the agent capacity, with detailed statements as to the sources of financing and how such money contributions were used.

3. Details on citizenship, other business connections and social affiliations of the agent.

4. Copies of each written statement, agreement made between the foreign agent and principal.

5. Samples of political propaganda submitted not only to the Justice Department but to the Library of Congress for public inspection there.

When his foreign agent connection is ended, the agent must file a so-called termination statement. An agent is considered still "active" as long as he fails to notify the Justice Department of a termination.

Penalties

Violations of the registration act are punishable by a fine of not over $10,000 or by imprisonment up to 5 years, or both.

ACT UPHELD IN 1951

The constitutionality of the act has been tested in only one case, and was upheld May 9, 1951, by United States District Judge Alexander Holtzoff in Washington, D. C., in connection with the Peace Information Center's failure to register with the Justice Department as foreign agents.

Organized in New York during April 1950, to distribute copies of the Stockholm Peace Appeal, the Peace Information Center was indicted by a Federal grand jury in February 1951, for failure to register. Also indicted were five officers, including Dr. William E. DuBois, Negro anthropologist and American Labor Party candidate for Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN'S seat in the 1950 New York senatorial campaign, and Mrs. Elisabeth Moos. The center has disbanded rather than register.

Attorneys of the five asked Judge Holtzoff to dismiss the indictment on ground that the 13-year-old registration law is unconstitutional. They attacked the registration section as a violation of free speech and the privilege against self-incrimination.

FOREIGN AGENT REGISTRATIONS

Registrations, which have been on the Justice Department's files as agents for China since 1942, are arranged in the following lists according to the function of the foreign principal. The Chinese Nationalist registrations, active and terminated, fall into five categories: Finance, trade, political party, information, and education.

The three Chinese Communist registrations are listed separately.

Chinese Nationalist

Finance

Foreign principal, Bank of China:

Agent, Allied Syndicates, Inc.

Allied Syndicates, Inc., a New York publicity agency, registered in 1950 under the Foreign Agents Registrations Act, as an agent of the New York City branch of the Bank of China, which represents Nationalist Chinese interests. The organization, headed by David B. Charney, who listed his salary as $800 per week, said its activities covered the entire gamut of the public relations field. It terminated its connections in early 1951.

For its activities, the firm received $50,000 in fees and $10,000 for expenses such as staff payroll, hotel bills, etc.

These payments were in addition to a $17,500 legal fee paid the Washington law firm of Sullivan, Bernard & Shea, who were called in by Allied Syndicates at the request of the Bank of China to provide legal counsel on certain problems. Among the latter was listed the question of Bank of China funds held in American banks. Communist China, as new occupier of the bank's home office in Shanghai, is seeking to control these funds. Ex Secretary of the Navy John L. Sullivan heads the firm. Clark Clifford, former special assistant to President Truman, was listed by a Syndicates brochure early this year as legal counsel to Allied Syndicates.

Conversation key method: Allied Syndicates, among facts reported in its registration, said one of its key methods of combating Communist propaganda was through 'conversations' with representatives of all forms of information media as well as civic organization executives. In addition, it said American Government officials were polled as to views on American policy and intervention in China, American public opinion in relation to China was analyzed and information on the Chinese situation was gathered through the public press and radio.

Expenses of the organization—paid out of the $10,000 allotment from the Bank of China for this purpose—included $3,703 in bills from the Mayflower, Statler, and Carlton Hotels of Washington, D. C., $1,308 for travel via American Airlines, and $554 for long distance calls.

Salaries $125 to $600 weekly: Besides Charney, the firm's president, these were listed as members: Charles N. Maybruck, whose salary is $600 a week; John M. Gray, $213 a week; Robert D. Mockler, $150 a week; and Barnett Bildersee, $125 a week.

The firm also listed a Washington branch at 1431 I Street NW., and Justin C. McCarthy as Washington representative. Among activities handled by the Washington office is the United Mine Workers' News Bureau. In New York, the firm said its business included public relations counseling for industry, labor and manufacturing accounts.

Foreign principal: Minister of Finance.

Agent: Lester Knox Little.

One of the newest registrants is Lester Knox Little, an American, who filed for the first time in 1950 as a special adviser to C. K. Yen, Minister of Finance in the Nationalist Chinese Government. Little's report says he joined the Chinese Customs Service in 1914; served as its inspector general from 1943 until the time he became Yen's adviser in July 1950. He is now paid $1,000 monthly for his advisory work with Nationalist attorneys on customs accounts immobilized in the United States by Chinese Communist action.

In his registration Little listed his business address as 190 Exchange Street, Pawtucket, R. I., and said he also was on the Economic Cooperation Administration's Advisory Committee on Underdeveloped Areas.

Little's registration also showed that from July to September 1950 he was Chief of Customs Mission for the Allied Military Governmen in Japan and in February 1951 he was ECA consultant in the Philippines. He did not state whether these missions were undertaken on leave from his jobs with the Nationalist Government.

Trade

Foreign principal: Chinese Nationalist Government.

Agent: Universal Trading Corp.

The Universal Trading Corp., registered as a foreign agent since 1947, seeks to promote trade between America and Nationalist China. It was first organized in 1938 and is a wholly owned instrumentality and agency of the Nationalist Government of China. Trade fostered by the agency since 1949 has been confined to exchanges between Formosa and the United States, the corporation's registration shows.

The 1949 financial report, which is the most recent filed by UTC with the Justice Department, lists the corporation's assets at $21,674,751 and its liabilities at $17,424,167.

Officers include Archie Lochhead, president and treasurer, S. D. Ren, Bank How and Chen-Tung Liang, vice presidents.

Directors include Lawrence Morris, Alfred B. Jones, both of New York, and P. H. Lo, of Washington, D. C. Morris, a member of the Hawkins, Delafield, and Wood law firm, also serves as general counsel and director of the trading concern. Jones said he was, in addition to his UTC job, a consultant with B. F. Goodrich, Akron, Ohio, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and Botany Worsted Mills, Passaic, N. J., and the director of various real estate companies in New Jersey. Lochhead is a director of the Bank of Montclair, N. J.

Foreign principal: Chinese Oil Corp.

Agent: John William Fleming.

An economic analyst, John William Fleming of Washington, D. C., registered as an agent in an advisory capacity on procurement and export with the Chinese Oil Corp. The Chinese Nationalist Government-owned corporation is located at 11 Broadway, New York City and headed by Dr. C. D. Shiah.

Fleming, who is also vice president of Tradeways, Inc., business consultants, 1016 Investment Building, Washington, D. C., received $666.66 monthly salary from the Chinese corporation between July and December 1948. He also reported a $500 fee from Rockal International Corp., an affiliate of the oil firm.

A termination statement was filed by Mr. Fleming in January 1950.

Political Parties

Foreign principal: Chinese Nationalist Government.

Agent: Kuomintang.

A long-standing registrant under the foreign-agents law has been the American headquarters of the Kuomintang, the Nationalist political party which Chiang Kai-shek has headed since 1938.

The main headquarters of the group are at 844 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif. Other branch headquarters are maintained in New York; San Antonio, Tex.; Chicago, Ill.; and Portland, Oreg. The latest report of the organization on file with the Justice Department—from February 1951—states that there are approximately 3,825 party members in the United States and over several millions in China.

Purpose of party:

Its task in America, said the Kuomintang report, is "to secure and maintain interest of Chinese residents of the United States to aid and further the aims of the central executive committee of the Kuomintang."

The party itself, according to the report, is dedicated to uphold and materialize for the benefit of the Chinese people Dr. Sun Yat-sen's principles and to maintain for the people's welfare a democratic form of government for China.

Source of funds:

No financial support is received from the home headquarters of the political party. Income is principally derived from property rental, membership dues, and loans. The main expenses are the operation of a language school and headquarters office. Income and expenditures each amounted to about $18,000 during 1950.

In 1943–44, income and expenditures averaged about $3,000 annually. Receipts for 1950 amounted to $18,517 from property rentals and an unnamed contribution.

Activities of the Kuomintang's main branch in San Francisco during 1950 varied from social to political and included participation in an anti-Communist League sponsored by Six Companies, which is a Chinese community organization in San Francisco. Also sponsored was a movement for support of the United Nations action against Communist aggression in Korea.

Foreign principal: Kuomintang.

Agents: Chinese Nationalist Daily and the Young China.

Two Chinese-language newspapers, both partially subsidized by the Kuomintang, Chinese Nationalist political party, terminated their registrations in 1949 when their foreign subsidization ceased. The two papers, published in San Francisco, are the Chinese Nationalist Daily (Kuo Min Yat Po) and the Young China. According to their registration statements, both serve as outlets for the Chinese Nationalist point of view.

The Young China is published by the Young China Publishing Co., Inc., at 811 Clay Street, San Francisco. Established in

1910, the paper's stated purpose is "to educate overseas Chinese in the belief of San Min Chu I" (Sun Yat-sen's three principles).

Officers include Bill Fong, president; Stephen Fong, manager; Mock Yen, secretary; Mon S. Owyang, treasurer; and Peh-Fei Huang, editor.

The Young China lists contributions of $4,830 from the Kuomintang during 1946 and 1947. Income from subscriptions and advertising from March 1947 to February 1948 totaled $71,473. Expenditures for the same period totaled $69,936.

The other Chinese-language paper, the Chinese Nationalist Daily, stated that it was engaged as an official organ of the Kuomintang to answer all criticism of the Chinese Nationalist Government by newspaper editorials and articles and for other functions.

The Nationalist Party contributed $10,530 from 1944 to April 1948.

Information

Foreign principal: Chinese Nationalist Government.

Agent: Chinese News Service.

The Chinese News Service is the official information office of Nationalist China. Originally incorporated in 1941, it was established as a news service in 1945. Its main headquarters are in New York City at 30 Rockefeller Plaza. Branch offices were also established in San Francisco, Chicago and Washington, but only the New York and Washington offices are now in operation.

The News Service's functions include "dissemination of news and information through press releases, including This Week in Free China, and a fortnightly reference survey, American Press Opinion." The service also maintains a library and an information and visual section. It is operated in this country directly under the Ministry of Information, Executive Yuan, Nationalist Government of China.

The present director of the New York office is N. C. Nyi, who came from China in 1947 to head the agency. Other members of the present editorial staff in New York include Frank Tao, Fabian Chow and C. Y. Tan, editors. Joseph Chiang, of 101 Woodridge Road, Silver Spring, Md., is liaison staff member in Washington. William J. Goodwin joined the staff as press relations consultant in July 1949, but severed his relations in March 1950. Goodwin registered with the Justice Department in his own name for his work with the Chinese News Service as well as his activities for the National Resources Commission of China. (See p. 955.) The press relations consultant is now Norman Paige, of 16 Cedar Lawn, Galveston, Tex.

Expenditures of the Chinese News Service since 1945 total $1,114,355. The figures have steadily decreased since the peak figure of $279,681 in 1946 to $78,134 in 1950.

Foreign principal: Chinese Nationalist Government.

Agent: Central News Agency.

Distinguished from the Chinese News Service is another registered agent, the Central News Agency, which is the Nationalist Chinese news gathering service. Wholly owned by the Nationalist Chinese Government, it has two offices one in New York and the other in Washington.

The New York bureau opened in December 1943, for the sole purpose of collecting and transmitting news in America to China. The report said the agency sells no service in this country and that it is not a revenue-producing bureau. It is financed by appropriations from the Minister of Finance of Nationalist China.

The present staff includes two members in New York, three in Washington and approximately seventy-five outside the United States. The registration statement in 1946 listed seven staff members in New York.

Teh-Chen T'ang, 425 Riverside Drive, is chief of the New York bureau, Chiang-kwang Li is the other New York staff member. The three in the Washington bureau are Richard L. Jen, chief, and Ira Lee and Chien-Saw Lee staff correspondents. The Washington bureau, according to the report, received $25,000 a month to run the service and the New York bureau $6,000 a month, from November 1946, to March 1949. No fresh funds have come from the head office since the beginning of 1949. The office is now drawing on reserves at the rate of $2,500 monthly.

Foreign principal: Chinese Film Corp.

Agent: Transocean Commerce, Inc.

Transocean Commerce, Inc., an export-import firm of chemical products, registered as a distributor and purchaser and purchaser of American films for the Chinese Film Corp., of Shanghai, China. Supplementary reports have not been filed since the March 1949 report which stated that the firm's foreign principal no longer recognizes it as the "exclusive agent" in the United States. This statement apparently indicates a change from Nationalist to Chinese Communist control of the film corporation. Since no termination form was filed, the registration is still carried as "active" by the Justice Department.

The agent, Transocean Commerce, gives its address as 165 Broadway, New York City. Officers include Franz Martin Joseph, director; Eugene Blum, treasurer; and Henry M. Steinfeld, vice president. All natives of Germany, according to the registration statements, Joseph was naturalized as a United States citizen in 1943. Blum and Steinfeld indicated in their original statements they had taken out their first papers for United States citizenship.

Foreign principal: Chinese News Service.

Agent: Paul Guillumette, Inc.

Paul Guillumette, Inc., photo sales agency in New York City, is registered as the distributor of Chinese films in the United States for Nationalist China. The agency, located at 475 Fifth Avenue, works through the Chinese News Service in the sale of photographs and films on China to American newspapers and other publications. Charles Rado is listed as a member of the agency.

Copies of the original contract filed with the report indicate that the sales commission is split between the photo agency and the news service on a 50-percent basis. Guillumette, Inc., listed a total of $3,207 as its 4-year share of the commission from the sale of Chinese photographs. The period covered is 1946 to 1950. No expenditures were listed.

Foreign principal: Chinese News Service.

Agent: National Lecture Management.

The National Lecture Management, of 9003 Sudbury Road, Silver Spring, Md., listed David Lu, of the Chinese Central News Agency, as one of its foreign principals. The concern has also filed for other foreign citizens lecturing under its management. For the one lecture which Mr. Lu gave in the United States (July 1947) the management firm received $50 of his $60 fee. John C. and Violet Metcalfe were listed as manager and associate manager of the group. Their termination statement in July 1950 stated that no lectures had been sponsored since May 1949.

Education

Foreign principal: Chinese Nationalist Government.

Agent: China Institute of America, Inc.

Another registered agent is the China Institute of America, Inc., an educational foundation aimed at promoting culture between the United States and China, whose board of directors is headed this year by Henry R. Luce, owner of Time-Life-Fortune.

Administrative officers include Chih Meng, in charge of the institute, and Joseph L. Mandell, director of public relations. Trustees include Dr. H. H. Kung, brother-in-law of Chiang Kai-shek, and Hu Shih, Chinese educator and former ambassador to the United States.

Created in 1926, the institute was incorporated under the University of the State of New York in 1930. Membership was listed in the original 1942 registration as about 100. Its stated purpose is to administer scholarship funds and to supervise and counsel students and obtain college admission for students sent to the United States by the Chinese Ministry of Education.

The financiers of the institute, and their contributions as listed in the 1942 registration, are: National Tsing Hua University in Kunming, China, $397 a month; Yunnan Provincial Committee for Scholarship Students in the United States, $100 per month; and the China Foundation for Promotion of Education and Culture, $10,000 for 1950. The Nationalist Government of China granted $100,000, of which $50,000 applied to work done in the institute in 1948 and $50,000 in 1945.

Enrollment of Chinese students in American colleges and universities in the academic year, 1949–50, said the institute's registration report for 1949–50, totaled 3,924. These students, according to the report, were in need of financial help and some did not want to return home. In May 1950, Congress earmarked $6,000,000 out of unexpended China funds of the Economic Cooperation Administration for further aid of these stranded Chinese students.

Foreign principal: Chinese Nationalist Government.

Agent: Committee on Student Planning.

The Committee on Planning and Advising Chinese Students in the United States is an affiliate of the China Institute, but it registered with the Department of Justice under its own name in 1947. Its last report, in 1950, said it had been inactive in the past year.

The committee's "foreign principal," the Executive Yuan of the Nationalist Government of China, granted it $257,000 for the fiscal year 1945–46. The committee reported that it spent $218,199 during the same period and has been paying for student allowances and tuition during the subsequent years out of the balance. Since the group no longer has a payroll, it carried on as a member of the China Institute.

Foreign principal: Chinese Nationalist Government.

Agent: Dr. Shou-Ch'un Mong.

Dr. Shou-Ch'un Mong, an inspector of educational facilities in the United States for the Chinese Nationalist Government, has been carried on the Justice agent lists since 1945. In his most recent supplementary report of May 1951 he lists as his foreign principals, Gen. Yin-Chin Ho and Dr. Chen Lifu, cabinet members of the Nationalist Government.

Dr. Mong makes periodic visits to American educational institutions to study research and educational systems. He then submits recommendations to the Chinese Government of suitable methods for Chinese education.

Dr. Mong's salary, paid by the Military Education Commission of Nationalist China's Defense Department, was listed as $500 monthly from March 1945 to August 1946. It was reduced at that time to $300 per month. He is also director of the Chinese American World Publishing Co., newspaper publishers. Dr. Mong gave his address as 790 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Chinese Communist

Foreign principal: Three Communist China firms and one other.

Agent: Frederick V. Field.

Communist China's principal representative in America is Frederick Vanderbilt Field, a New York millionaire who was cited for contempt of Congress in 1950 for refusing

to tell the Senate Foreign Relations Committee whether or not he was a member of the Communist Party. Field, later indicted by a Federal grand jury in Washington, was acquitted in March 1951, after he had pleaded his refusal to testify was a defense against self-incrimination.

Field was registered, individually, as an agent for three separate Communist China corporations, and also a Hong Kong concern. Again he is listed as president in the registration of the American-Chinese Export Corp., a trading agency dealing with 10 other corporations which handle a variety of Chinese products and commodities.

In his individual registration which terminated April 1951, Field said he was the agent for the Bank of China, China National Aviation Corp., and the directorate general of Postal Remittances and Savings Bank, all of Peiping, and the Chinese Postal Remittances and Savings Bank of Hong Kong. He acted as "attorney-in-fact" for the four concerns with "authority to manage and conduct their affairs" in the United States.

Foreign principal: Eight Communist China firms; two others.

Agent: American-Chinese Export Corp.

The American-Chinese Export Corp., which Field heads, is located at 51 Pine Street, New York City. It acts as an agent for China National Native Produce Corp., China National Egg Products Corp., China National Furs and Wools Corp., China National Bristle Corp., China National Import Corp., China National Oil and Fats Corp., and North China Petroleum Corp., all of Tientsin; China National Tea Corp., of Peiping; Leighton Trading Co., Shanghai; and Nam Sun Trading Co., Hong Kong.

The field agency's registration stated that the trading corporation has no knowledge as to the character of the Leighton and Nam Sun trading companies but that the others are, "according to our information, government corporations acting under the supervision of the Ministry of Trade of the People's Republic of China."

Refuses To Answer to Some Points

In both registration statements, Field also refused to answer several of the questions on the registration form "in the exercise of my privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution." These questions concerned:

1. Whether he had ever used another name.

2. If he is subject to the supervision and control of any individual or organization other than those named in his registration paper.

3. Membership in clubs, organizations, business, occupations, and public activities.

Lists Other Activities

He did list himself as director of Trade Union Service, Inc., owner of a building at 23 West Twenty-sixth Street, vice president of 8 and 10 West Thirty-seventh Street Corp., as well as owner of substantial stock holdings in 38 large American industrial corporations. He said he is secretary and director of Soviet Russia Today Publications, Inc. He listed his affiliations with the Harvard Club, the Century Association, the Foreign Policy Association, the American Institute of Pacific Relations, and several economic and scientific associations.

American-Chinese Export Corp. listed David Drucker as vice president. He stated he is a member of the National Lawyers Guild, but refused to answer other questions on incrimination grounds. The registration statements also showed that Victor Perlo was hired as an independent contractor to collect trade and statistical material relating to bristles, egg products, etc. The House Un-American Activities Committee reported Perlo among persons it said were linked to the Communist underground apparatus or leaders.

Income was itemized in certain cases, but not totaled. For the period, June-August 1950, it was reported, the export firm received $13,815 plus $971 commission on the sale of wool from the China National Furs and Wools Corp. and $440 as commission on the sale of bristles from the China National Bristle Corp.

Foreign principal: Chinese Photo Service.

Agent: Helen Black.

Helen Black, who has a photo-distributing firm at 15 West Fourty-fourth Street, New York, registered as distributor of photos from Communist China. She also is registered as photo-distributing agent for the Soviet Union and eastern European countries.

Miss Black said the Associated Press and Acme are among her clients for Chinese, as well as Russian and European photographs and films. She said she works through the China Photo Service in Peking, China. Her registration contained the statement that the China Photo Service is not supervised by the Chinese Communist Government, but is run in strict accordance with the People's Republic of China. Miss Black retains a 60-percent commission. She reported earnings in 1950 from all foreign photo sales of $12,413 and total expenses of $6,905.

LOBBY ACT REGISTRATION

The only Chinese groups, besides those employing William J. Goodwin (see p. 955), to be represented in lobby law reports were the Kwangtung, Kwangsi and Hunan provincial governments of China.

Registering in 1948 for those provinces was W. Bruce Pirnie, who gave his salary as 12,000 CN yearly from each province. This, he said, was less than 10 cents at the 1948 rate of exchange. Pirnie acted as a negotiating agent for reconstruction.

AMERICAN CHINA POLICY GROUPS

A large number of groups with stands on public issues naturally take a strong interest in America's China policy. Among such are veterans, women's, patriotic, religious, business, and labor groups. However, the accompanying round-up of American groups and individuals is confined to those most active in advancing their China policy views.

Outstanding Nationalist China backers are Alfred Kohlberg, who heads the American China Policy Association, and Frederick C. McKee, who heads a group whose sole purpose is getting aid for Nationalist China. McKee also heads or is an officer of several other groups which take strong pro-Nationalist stands.

Another Chiang Kai-shek backer is William J. Goodwin, bitter State Department critic, who formerly was a foreign agent for China.

Especially vocal among labor groups has been the Free Trade Union Committee (AFL), supporting Nationalist China.

On the anti-Chiang Kai-shek side is the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, which Kohlberg and McKee said had Communist affiliations.

Other groups covered in Congressional Quarterly's round-up, on one side or the other of the China issue, include: Institute of Pacific Relations, which figured in last year's McCarthy-Lattimore controversy, and the Committee for Constitutional Government, which has been active on China policy as well as a wide range of other public issues.

KOHLBERG ORGANIZATION

The American China Policy Association and its chairman, Alfred Kohlberg, have directed a steady stream of literature to Congressmen and others urging aid to Nationalist China.

A Kohlberg statement in 1949 said, "Today we do not have a friend among all the parties and governments of east Asia * * * everywhere we have aided our enemies and double-crossed our friends * * *"

An association statement in 1949 called the State Department white paper on China a "propaganda document designed to obscure our total military and political disaster in the Pacific." In November 1949 association announced it was producing Army intelligence reports on the Chinese Communists. "These are the secret documents that Congressman WALTER JUDD, Republican, Minnesota, stated should have been included in the white paper."

In January 1950 association petitioned Congress for a joint resolution to give greater authority to MacArthur and to grant the funds necessary to arm Formosa, Hainan, and counterrevolutionary elements on the China mainland. A May 28, 1951, release told the story of the late Agnes Smedley, an American traitor, and blamed her for part of the confusion in the press and in the public mind over the China question.

The American China Policy Association president is William Loeb, publisher of the Manchester New Hampshire Morning Union. Vice presidents include Kohlberg, who also is chairman of the board of directors.

Board of directors includes Representative Walter H. Judd (Republican, Minnesota) a former missionary; Representative J. Leroy Johnson (Republican, California); Max Eastman, author and roving editor of Reader's Digest; Loeb; ex-Representative Clare Boothe Luce (Republican, Connecticut); A. Philip Randolph, president, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters (AFL); Freda Utley, author who testified against Owen Lattimore at last year's hearings on the McCarthy charges; and William Henry Chamberlin, former Russian correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, associate editor of the New Leader, and contributor to the Wall Street Journal since 1945.

Two other directors are George Creel, chairman of the Committee on Public Information during World War I, and Roscoe Pound, a formed dean of the Harvard Law School (1916–36) who was named adviser to the Chinese Nationalist Government's Ministry of Finance in 1946.

M'KEE ORGANIZATIONS

China emergency group

The China Emergency Committee was organized early in March 1949, and registered soon thereafter under the lobby act. It became inactive later in the same year. It gave its purpose as moral support and economic and military aid to non-Communist China.

It had clerical support and included on its National Advisory Council Representative Walter H. Judd (Republican, Minnesota); Representative B. Carroll Reece (Republican, Tennessee), ex-GOP national chairman; and Irene Kuhn of the American China Policy Association. The group was organized largely through the efforts of Frederick C. McKee, its chairman.

As it swung into action, the committee joined the American China Policy Association in labeling the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy as having Communist affiliations. It stated its program as: Loan to Nationalist China as soon as possible; sending military equipment immediately; strong declaration that the United States would deny de facto recognition to any Communist-dominated government in China.

The committee spent $5,838 during the first half of 1949, according to its lobby-act report. The contributions came to the same total. Of this, McKee gave $3,242 and Carmon D'Agostion, Silver Spring, Md., gave $2,140.

Defend America Committee

The Committee To Defend America by Aiding Anti-Communist China became active in the latter part of 1949 and issued a quantity of literature urging China aid.

Chairman pro tempore of the committee is Frederick C. McKee. Other officers in the organization include:

Gen. William J. Donovan, head of the wartime OSS; Charles Edison, former Governor of New Jersey and ex-Navy Secretary; and Herbert Welch, New York Episcopal Bishop, vice chairman; and James G. Blaine, former director of United China Relief, Inc., treasurer.

Farley on Board

On the committee's board of directors are Arthur H. Burling, of the law firm of Covington and Burling, in which Secretary of State Dean Acheson formerly was a partner; ex-Ambassador Arthur Bliss Lane; David Dubinsky, president, International Ladies Garment Workers Union (AFL); Matthew Woll, vice president, the International Photoengravers' Union of North America (AFL) and second vice president of AFL, who has been active previously on China issues, and is president of AFL's Free Trade Union Committee; James A. Farley, now chairman of the board of the Coca Cola Export Corp., formerly chairman of the Democratic National Committee and Postmaster General.

Also, Jay Lovestone, New York labor leader and one-time general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States of America; Peter Grimm, New York businessman, who has served on various public commissions; Arthur J. Goldsmith, New York lawyer and 1948 Stassen campaigner; ex-Representative Clare Boothe Luce, Republican, of Connecticut, former president of the American-China Policy Association; Mrs. Wendell Willkie; and Dr. George A. Fitch, YMCA secretary and ex-deputy director of UNRRA in China.

Literature Issued

Activity of the committee included sending letters to all Congressmen on December 23, 1949, urging legislative action to avert "Defeat by Default." The letters charged the State Department "has quibbled while Asia burned in the red flame of communism," that military equipment appropriated in April 1948, was not shipped until October, that the Chinese were charged much more than other countries given military aid, and that Secretary of State Dean Acheson's "Wait Until the Dust Settles" policy is leading to a third world war.

Other literature issued by the committee in 1949–50 included a letter by Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican, of California, to the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce arguing against the chamber's policy statement in favor of recognizing Communist China and resolutions of the Texas and Mississippi Legislatures condemning Acheson. The group's literature was published in amounts ranging from 499 to 5,000 copies each.

A recent letter to Congressmen from the committee went out April 23, 1951, with an open letter to the President urging support for Nationalist China. Also included was the committee's foreign policy statement. The open letter was signed by 11 persons, including seven missionaries.

Lobby Report

In its lobby act financial report for 1950, the committee said it spent $4,403.23 and received $3,829. The receipts came mostly from three persons: Frederick C. McKee, $1,565; Dr. Frederick J. Tooker, Summit, N. J., $900; and ex-Governor and ex-Secretary of Navy Charles Edison, West Orange, N. J., $650. Expenditures included money for public relations and printing.

National affairs group

Committee on national affairs: Another group headed by Frederick C. McKee—has included China policy statements in its output. In 1949 it sent Congressmen reprints of an article, "An Aid Plan for Asia," by Harold E. Stassen calling for $1,000,000,000 a year "MacArthur plan" for Asia to oppose China Communists. The Stassen article opposed backing any large central governments, and would extend aid on a project basis.

The committee also circulated in 1949 a letter from AFL President William Green stating, "We have always approved the extension of aid to China and will gladly continue to do so to the extent of our ability."

The committee seeks action to strengthen national and international organization for security, freedom, and justice. Its 1951 release covered subversion and fair play, and commutation of sentences of Nazi war criminals.

List of officers

The committee's officers included McKee, chairman; Arthur J. Goldsmith, secretary, and these executive committeemen: George Fielding Eliot, military analyst; Cord Meyer, Jr., ex-president United World Federalists, now chairman of its national executive committee; and Dr. L. M. Birkhead, founder and national director of Friends of Democracy, Inc., New York.

Friends of Democracy in October 1949 termed "ironic" and "tragic" the appointment of William J. Goodwin as public relations counsel for the Chinese Nationalists, asserting that Goodwin "has a long record of championing extreme rightist causes."

GROUPS SPAN BROAD ALLIANCE

The pro-Chiang Kai-shek China policy groups form a loose and broad alliance of individuals having little in common except their opposition to the Chinese Communists.

A number of the board of directors listed on the letterheads of American China Policy Association and the Committee To Defend America by Aiding Anti-Communist China are people who have worked in China as religious or medical missionaries or in other such capacities.

Roscoe Pound, an ACPA director, was advisor to China's Nationalist Minister of Justice. Several directors of the two groups have been decorated by the Chinese Nationalist Government. One director of ACPA, Dr. Maurice William, identified himself as the only non-Chinese to be made a life member of the Kuomintang Party. He is a dentist and author of anti-Marxist books.

Former Communist leaders

Several of the listed directors are former Communist leaders who broke with Stalinism: Jay Lovestone, of the Committee To Defend America, was once secretary general of the Communist Party in the United States; Freda Utley of ACPA was a British Communist. (Benjamin Gitlow, director of Kohlberg's American Jewish League Against Communism, Inc., was once a top official of the American Communist Party.) Other listed directors of these organizations have had similar affiliations or sympathies in the past. Several ACPA directors are contributors to the weekly magazine, the New Leader, an anti-Communist publication.

LABOR SUPPORT

Still others listed in the Kohlberg and McKee groups are leaders of AFL unions, with long records of fighting against the Communists. The International Ladies Garment Workers Union (AFL), for example, expelled the Communists in it after a long struggle years ago, under the leadership of its president, David Dubinsky, a director of the Committee To Defend America.

Dubinsky is also vice president of the Free Trade Union Committee, which has taken a strong anti-Communist stand on China policy. Matthew Woll, president of the Free Trade Union Committee and also a vice president of the AFL, is another director of the McKee committee, as is Lovestone.

A. Philip Randolph, president, and Ashley L. Totten, secretary-treasurer, of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters (AFL), Frank R. Crosswaith, who has been ILGWU general organizer and before that was a Sleeping Car Porter special organizer, and labor lawyer Louis Waldman are listed as ACPA directors. Labor columnist Victor Riesel is listed as director of the McKee China group.

The Free Trade Union Committee (AFL) also has been active in urging aid to non-Communist China and sending letters to Congressmen to that effect. Its officers are William Green, honorary president, Matthew Woll, president, David Dubinsky, vice president, George Meany, honorary secretary, and Jay Lovestone, executive secretary.

The American Federation of Labor itself in an executive council policy statement May 17, 1951, called for continued military and economic aid to the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa.

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

The Committee for Constitutional Government recently added the name of Alfred Kohlberg, Chiang sympathizer, to the list of advisory board members printed on its letterhead, also has recently poured out China policy statements in its own right.

Included in recent CCG mailings on China policy were statements signed by Rev. William R. Johnson, attacking the administration's Far East policy and urging support for the Nationalist Government. Johnson, according to CCG literature, represented the Methodist Church in China for 35 years.

Johnson is on the board of both the American China Policy Association and the Committee To Defend America by Aiding Anti-Communist China.

The CCG urged readers to help in furtherance of Johnson's recommendations by distributing literature on the Far East to "opinion-molding individuals." Other action suggested was a protest to President Truman calling for support of MacArthur's policies and the Nationalist Government. Readers were urged to send literature to their Congressmen, expressing their convictions.

The regular circulation of CCG literature is large. In 1950, names on the various CCG mailing lists totaled around 350,000, and CCG literature sent out on special issues has run into the millions of pieces. CCG literature covers many national policy topics, mostly on domestic questions.

SPLIT ON POLITICS

But not all pro-Chiang groups and individuals see other issues the same way. They range from those who endorsed the Roosevelt and Truman administrations on most counts through to those who, like the Committee for Constitutional Government, opposed them on virtually all issues. They include labor leaders and anti-union forces. They include leading Republicans like Gen. William J. Donovan, and Representative B. CARROLL REECE, Republican, of Tennessee, leading Democrats like James A. Farley, Charles Edison (all on the McKee committee), and ex-Gov. George H. Earle, of Pennsylvania; ex-Socialist Louis Waldman and ex-Communists like Lovestone and Utley.

The loose alliance includes men who lined up differently in New Hampshire senatorial campaigns. Kohlberg gave pro-Chiang Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire, $1,000 in 1947, according to BRIDGES' 1948 political contributions statement. Kohlberg gave BRIDGES' former aide J. Wesley Powell, $100 in Powell's 1950 primary fight against incumbent Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, Republican, of New Hampshire, while McKee's Committee on National Affairs gave TOBEY $200.

Ten on both groups

A measure of the degree of coherence in the pro-Nationalist forces may be the presence of 10 persons on both the American China Policy Association's 58-man board of directors and the Committee to Defend America's 51-member board.

Another measure may be the circulation to Congressmen, of ACPA Director Freda Utley's articles by the Committee for Con-

stitutional Government and the National Economic Council and the membership of David Dubinsky on the Committee to Defend America's directorate while ILGWU's vice president, Charles Kreindler, is a director of American Jewish League Against Communism, of which Kohlberg is chairman.

ANTI-CHIANG GROUP

The Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, which McKee and Kohlberg groups said was under Communist influence, urged a hands-off policy in China. In literature sent Congressmen in 1949, its "Action Conference on China Policy" called for, among other things:

1. A congressional investigation into the Chinese lobby and private wealth which Chinese officials and individuals "have stowed away in American banks and investments."

2. Immediate end to all United States intervention in China and no dealing with any remnant of the Kuomintang.

Membership of the Action Conference was described by the committee as including delegates from 19 labor unions, 20 ALP chapters, and 4 Communist groups, in addition to fraternal, youth, professional, church, women's and community organizations.

In 1950, the committee circulated Facts on the Korean Crisis criticizing the "unprecedented haste" of the United States in persuading the U. N. to censure North Korea.

In October 1950 the committee sent Congressmen copies of a resolution adopted at a New York City mass meeting, held under its auspices. It urged the United States to: Recognize the Communist Chinese government, help it get into the U. N., and recognize that Formosa belongs to China; stop giving military aid and advice to Asian regimes and to European powers for use in Asia; end the Japanese occupation soon, and negotiate a peace treaty with Japan in cooperation with other nations that had fought the Japanese; and withdraw from Korea.

Among those listed on the committee's board of directors on the October 1950 letterhead were:

Paul Robeson, concert singer, actor, onetime all-American football end, and cochairman of the Progressive Party during the Wallace campaign in 1948.

Ex-Representative Hugh De Lacy (Democrat, Washington), who served in the Seventy-ninth Congress and before that was a Seattle City Council member and executive officer of the Washington (State) Commonwealth Federation.

Eugene Connolly, former New York City Council member; high official in the American Labor Party in New York; unsuccessful candidate for Congress.

Arthur Schutzer, State executive officer of the American Labor Party in New York.

Prof. E. Franklin Frazier, head of the Howard University sociology department and author of leading books on the role of the Negro in the United States.

John T. Bernard, who was registered under the lobbying law as representing the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill and the United Electrical Workers (independent).

Martin Popper, former executive secretary of the National Lawyers Guild, who registered under the lobbying law in November 1947 as representing ex-California Attorney General Robert W. Kenny in connection with the defense of the Hollywood film folk who were cited for contempt of Congress.

Also on the letterhead were the following top officers of unions which were thrown out of the CIO last year:

Hugh Bryson, president, National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards;

James Durkin, president, United Office and Professional Workers of America (now merged into the Distributive, Processing and Office Workers of America);

Ben Gold, president, International Fur and Leather Workers Union of the United States and Canada (Gold told a congressional committee he is a Communist);

Ewart Guinier, secretary-treasurer, United Public Workers of America;

Donald Henderson, ex-president, Food, Tobacco, Agricultural and Allied Workers Union of America (now merged into the Distributive Union).

Another union leader listed was Kenneth Sherbell, of a wholesale and warehouse local in New York, who has been a State Senator.

PACIFIC RELATIONS INSTITUTE

The Institute of Pacific Relations came under heavy attack last year, during the hearings on Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY'S (Republican, Wisconsin) charges of Communist influence in the State Department. It has long studied Far East policy.

William L. Holland, IPR secretary, last year denied as utterly false the McCarthy Communist-front charge. He described the institute as "a reputable nonpartisan international research organization whose studies of far eastern and Pacific countries long have been valued and acclaimed by leading scholars and public figures."

MCCARTHY'S charges came in connection with his attacks on Owen Lattimore, who conducted research in Peiping for the institute in the early 1930's and was editor of its magazine, Pacific Affairs, from 1934 to 1941. Holland asserted the charges mainly were a repetition of unsubstantiated allegations made earlier against the institute's American national council by Alfred Kohlberg.

In the early 1940's, as a member of the Institute of Pacific Relations—Kohlberg attacked IPR for allegedly harboring Communists and permitting its publications to undercut the Chiang Kai-shek government by giving circulation to the Communist line. His charges were rejected in 1947 by vote of the IPR trustees.

IPR also protested to Senator PAT MCCARRAN, Democrat, Nevada, against the seizure of its files in February 1951, at a farm in Lee, Mass., by agents of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee. IPR's Holland said the documents were taken illegally from their place of storage at the country home of Edward C. Carter, a former secretary general of the institute.

Backers of IPR

The IPR is governed by an executive committee headed by Gerard Swope, honorary president of General Electric Co. Vice chairmen are Dr. Robert B. Sproul, president of the University of California, and Heaton L. Wrenn, a Honolulu attorney. Clifford B. Marshall, of the Standard-Vacuum Oil Co., is treasurer.

Trustees include former Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles; Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall; Paul C. Smith, editor of the San Francisco Chronicle; W. W. Waymack, formerly of the Des Moines Register Tribune; Gordon R. Clapp, ex-head of the Atomic Energy Commission; author, John Hersey; J. Wallace Sterling, president of Stanford University; and Owen Lattimore.

Frederick V. Field, a registered agent for Red China, lists himself as a member of the institute and his contributions to it were aired at congressional hearings.

To fight charges

Swope, at an institute meeting in March 1951 said the organization is taking vigorous measures to refute the misleading allegations recently made against it.

OPR officers protested against the action this year of the House Un-American Activities Committee in including IPR in its Guide To Subversive Organizations. They said the listing was based on the California Tenney committee listing of 1948. In 1949, said OPR officers, the Tenney committee omitted the IPR

CHINA POLICY LEADERS

Alfred Kohlberg

Alfred Kohlberg is an importer of Chinese textiles—silks, laces, linens, handkerchiefs and gloves—with offices listed in New York, London and Swatow, Shanghai and Chefoo, China.

ACPA headquarters are at Kohlberg's New York address, and he also foots part of the organization's other expenses.

Kohlberg is a founder and leader of the American China Policy Association and signs most of the steady stream of ACPA press releases and open letters to Congressmen. In addition, he sends out a certain amount of China policy literature on the letterhead of his firm—including the release of the Navy Lieut. (jg) William H. Evans, Jr. letter praising Kohlberg and attacking the State Department policies, Secretary Acheson, and Congress.

Gave McCarthy Data

Kohlberg told reporters last year that he had furnished Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Wisconsin Republican, with some of the data MCCARTHY used in his heavy attacks on the State Department and its personnel, notably against Ambassador at Large Philip C. Jessup, and Prof. Owen J. Lattimore whom MCCARTHY described as pro-Communist, an architect of our far-eastern policy, and the top espionage agent (of Russia) in the United States." (CQ Almanac, 1950, Vol. VI, pp. 445–7, 449, 455–6.)

Kohlberg is also national chairman of the American Jewish League Against Communism, Inc., and on the advisory board of the Committee for Constitutional Government. He is treasurer of the magazine, the Freeman, and was publisher of its predecessor, Plain Talk.

Kohlberg's other activities include donating money to various political campaigns.

Report to Buchanan

Kohlberg and his organizations had not filed financial reports under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act prior to March 1951. But a fractional view of his legislative activities may be gained from the reports he did file on behalf of his textile firm in answer to the request of the late Representative Frank Buchanan, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities in the Eighty-first Congress.

According to the Buchanan committee's report of the expenditures figures submitted by most of 173 corporations it queried, Alfred Kohlberg, Inc., spent a grand total of $10,498.82 to influence legislation and for certain other purposes from January 1947 to May 1950.

This included $4,948.53 for 37 trips by Kohlberg to Washington for informational purposes, $343.98 for 3 trips to testify before Senate hearings, $1,879.31 for printing and distributing literature, and $3,327 to 6 New York organizations: Handkerchief Industry Association ($1,363), Linen Trade Association ($910), National Council of American Importers ($364.50), Far East-America Council ($314.50), New York Credit Men's Association ($225), and Commerce and Industry Association of New York ($150).

The same report submitted by the Kohlberg textile firm said the firm had no Washington office and no expenditures for advertising services.

What Kohlberg Wants

Alfred Kohlberg's foreign policy was outlined in two communications: His December 20, 1950, letter to President Truman and his June 10, 1948, testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Copies of both were sent with a covering letter to Members of Congress on January 5, 1951. Kohlberg's policy aims at "the destruction and overthrow of the Communist

dictatorship that now enslaves one-third of mankind." Actions it calls for include:

1. "Congressional declaration of a state of war with Communist China." This point was in his December 20, 1950, letter as the only addition to his 1948 policy.

2. Allowing unrestricted trade relations only with nations agreeing to a mutual armed aid pact against Communist nations.

3. Granting of American armed aid to nations joining in the agreement. "No question of the form of government of nations entering such an alliance, whether free enterprise, democratic, monarchical, dictatorial, socialistic, or otherwise shall be given consideration."

4. Immediate breaking of diplomatic relations with Communist nations.

Frederick C. McKee

Frederick C. McKee, chairman pro tempore of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding Anti-Communist China, is a Pittsburgh industrialist and philanthropist, who has been active in international movements and in domestic politics.

He was on the executive committee of the American Committee for Non-Participation in Japanese Aggression (organized by the late Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson in 1938 to secure an embargo on scrap iron and oil shipments to Japan). He helped organize the Non-partisan Committee for Revision of the Neutrality Act which William Allen White headed in 1939. He was national treasurer of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies in May 1940, and of the League of Nations Association (which changed to the American Association for the United Nations after the Dumbarton Oaks conference).

He was national chairman of the Citizens for Victory in 1942–43, one of the organizers and an executive committee member of the Committee for the Marshall Plan, and member of the Council on Foreign Relations and of Free World, Inc. He has been chairman of the Committee on National Affairs (formerly the Committee on Public Affairs) which has taken stands on various issues including German policy and has contributed campaign funds for various candidates for Congress.

McKee filed campaign expenditure reports showing personal campaign contributions to the Stassen campaign for the Republican Presidential nomination in 1948. For other McKee campaign contributions, see page 956.

Organizes China Group

In March of 1949 the China Emergency Committee, was organized, largely through the efforts of McKee, its chairman. It was dissolved in May, according to reports filed under the lobbying law.

The Committee to Defend America by Aiding Anti-Communist China has continued its activity. McKee has also been sending Congressmen statements on American world-wide policy, including China policy, this year. He also signed a joint statement on foreign and domestic anti-Communist policy sent to President Truman December 12, 1950, by the Citizens' Committee on Foreign Policy, of which he was vice chairman. McKee is a sponsor of the United States Committee for a United Nations Genocide Convention.

He has been treasurer of the National Casket Co. and an official of the Winfield Railroad Co., Windfield Sand Co., Winfield Mineral Co., Winfield Limestone Co., Morris Lime & Limestone Co., West Penn Cement Co., and Washington Trust Co., Pennsylvania firms.

McKee's Views

In a 1949 letter to Congressmen, McKee said he had supported the administration foreign policy for 10 years but differed sharply with the white paper issued by the State Department. He criticized the State Department for following "diametrically opposite policies * * * toward Communist aggression in Europe and Asia."

McKee in an April 24, 1951, news letter took the MacArthur side in that controversy and hoped that President Truman's friends "may be able to persuade him to free himself from his greatest handicap, Secretary Acheson, before it is too late."

William J. Goodwin

Goodwin has been in and out of politics since the thirties. For years he was a Wall Street operator, but presently is in public relations and sales consultant work.

Goodwin says his night studies at Fordham University inspired his devotion to the fight against communism and led him to go into politics, as a district Democratic leader in the early 1930's. He ran for Congress in 1936 and was supported by Father Charles E. Coughlin's Social Justice movement. In 1941 he ran for mayor of New York on the American Rock Party ticket. He fought President Roosevelt's third-term bid in 1940 and was active that year in both Democratic and Republican conventions.

Goodwin became treasurer of the American Democratic National Committee in 1944. This group, which he helped form, opposed Roosevelt's fourth-term candidacy. Goodwin claimed credit for helping bring about the Republican congressional election victory of 1946 and said he was retained then by Republican State committees in five western States as "political consultant."

At present Goodwin states he is sales consultant to the Fox Metal Products Corp., Denver, of which he is a director and acts as public relations consultant to other clients, including the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad.

Goodwin as Foreign Agent

Goodwin has registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act for two agencies of the Chinese Nationalist Government.

1. He registered for the National Resources Commission of China on April 9, 1948. The employment terminated in March 31, 1949. The contract called for a salary of $30,000 for 1 year. Goodwin reported expenses of $16,596 in his first 6-month report and $6,261 in the second half, for a total of $22,857.

2. Goodwin registered for the Government of the Republic of China through the Chinese News Service in July 11, 1949. The arrangement, terminated March 31, 1950, included a salary of $25,000 a year. Goodwin reported he was actually paid $9,000 before filing his report and $16,000 after. He reported his expenses as $7,970 for the first half of his employment and $1,806 for the second half, for a total of $9,776.

In his registration for the Natural Resources Commission of China, Goodwin stated he had "arranged meetings between Chinese Government representatives and businessmen, bankers, newspaper men, legislators and other leading citizens with a view to increasing their interest in the need for developing China as a future market for American business and also with a view to getting help from the United States for the Chinese Nationalist Government to establish stability. * * *"

In his report on his Chinese News Service job, Goodwin said his activities were "directed toward presenting to the American public the viewpoint of Nationalist China, including a rebuttal of Communist propaganda which gained credence through constant repetition wittingly or unwittingly by newspapers and some Government representatives. To this end I arranged meetings between Chinese Government representatives and newspapermen and Members of Congress. Also I published letters—gave out interviews—and made a few speeches."

Goodwin Lobby Act Registrations

Under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, Goodwin registered in 1948 for the National Resources Commission, at $30,000 for 1 year. J. Paull Marshall also registered for the Commission as an employee of Goodwin at $7,500. Marshall is a Washington, D. C., lawyer.

In 1949, Goodwin registered under the lobby act as employed for 1 year at $25,000 by the Government of the Republic of China. Marshall also registered as a Goodwin employee at a $5,000 salary.

Goodwin said June 12 that since last year he has had no connection with the Chinese Government. He left its employ during the Tydings investigation in 1950 to be a "free agent" and to answer charges made against him by Owen Lattimore. Goodwin claims he "laid the groundwork" for Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY'S (Republican, Wisconsin) charges of Communist infiltration in the State Department.

Robert M. Harriss

The name of Robert M. Harriss of the New York commodity brokerage firm of Harriss and Vose came into the 1950 controversy over the State Department personnel and the accompanying talk about the China lobby. One piece of literature which was sent to Congressmen in 1949 by the Institute of Chinese Culture was dedicated "to Robert M. Harriss, a trustee of the Institute of Chinese Culture and a staunch friend of China."

Harriss, according to newspaper reports of Wisconsin political contribution statements in Wisconsin, gave $1,000 to the MacArthur campaign for President in 1948. He is a one-time financial adviser of Father Coughlin.

Harriss, along with three other individuals and two organizations, was indicted for alleged violation of the lobbying act. The charges were in connection with alleged attempts to influence legislation affecting farm commodity prices. The indictment was dismissed and an information was lodged in its place against the same individuals and one of the organizations, a farm council. The case has not been decided.

Freda Utley

A member of the board of directors of American China Policy Association, Freda Utley, former British Communist, has figured in several statements issued by China policy groups. She is an author and lecturer.

An ACPA release of June 10, 1951, said Senator OWEN BREWSTER, Republican, Maine, used her recent book The China Story as the basis of his grilling of Acheson at the MacArthur hearings. Utley's book sharply criticizes administration foreign policy.

Utley writings on China policy this year were circulated by the Committee for Constitutional Government. The titles included "How We Lost Four Hundred Million Allies" and "Umbrella Statesmanship." Other foreign policy statements of Miss Utley were circulated by the National Economic Council.

Chennault Active in 1949

Gen. Claire Chennault who headed the Flying Tigers during World War II and is president of a Chinese airline, was especially active in Washington in 1949 working for China aid legislation. In the summer of 1949 he said he had talked to 85 Senators regarding the legislation. He also testified before congressional committees.

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Data on political gifts from persons prominent in China policy groups to contestants in national elections follows. The information comes from reports filed in accordance with Federal law.

Frederick C. McKee, according to his reports for the 1948 election, gave $250 to the unsuccessful race of John Stack, Republican, Twenty-ninth District of Pennsylvania; $100 to the Harold E. Stassen campaign for President; and $450 to Representative JAMES G. FULTON'S, Republican, Pennsylvania, campaign.

The Committee on National Affairs, which McKee heads, made contributions to the cam-

paigns of Senators PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, Illinois, ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, Tennessee, JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, Montana, and MATTHEW M. NEELY, Democrat, West Virginia, in 1948. In 1950 the group listed $200 to the campaign of Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, Republican, New Hampshire, and $300 to that of Senator WAYNE MORSE, Republican, Oregon.

Alfred Kohlberg gave $1,000 to the 1948 campaign of Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, New Hampshire, and $100 to the 1950 campaign of Representative RALPH W. GWINN, Republican, New York, and $500 to the 1950 campaign of Senator JOHN M. BUTLER, Republican, Maryland.

Kohlberg also was reported in New Hampshire as having given $100 to J. Wesley Powell, who nearly defeated Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, Republican, New Hampshire, for the Republican senatorial nomination in 1950. William Loeb, New Hampshire publisher and president of Kohlberg's American China Policy Association, was a leading Powell supporter in that contest. Powell had been administrative assistant of another New Hampshirite, Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican.

CONGRESSIONAL STANDS

A number of Senators and Representatives have persistently fought for certain policies relative to China, and are well known for their stands.

Those in the forefront demanding aid for Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and his Nationalist forces are Senators OWEN BREWSTER, Republican, of Maine; STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire; HARRY P. CAIN, Republican, of Washington; HOMER FERGUSON, Republican of Michigan; BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Republican, of Iowa; WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican, of California; PAT MCCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada; and H. ALEXANDER SMITH, Republican, of New Jersey; and Representatives O. K. ARMSTRONG, Republican of Missouri; WALTER H. JUDD, Republican, of Minnesota; JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Republican, of Massachusetts; LAWRENCE H. SMITH, Republican, of Wisconsin; and JOHN M. VORYS, Republican, of Ohio.

In addition, several Congressmen have demanded the use of Nationalist forces in China or Korea, including Senators PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois; JAMES EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi; JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin; and ROBERT A. TAFT, Republican, of Ohio; and Representatives GERALD R. FORD, JR., Republican, of Michigan; CHARLES E. POTTER, Republican, of Michigan; and HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr., Republican, of Pennsylvania.

Those sponsoring legislation favoring strict economic sanctions against the Communist Reds include Senators Harry F. Byrd, Democrat, of Virginia; Spessard L. Holland, Democrat, of Florida; James P. Kem, Republican, of Missouri; John L. McClellan, Democrat, of Arkansas; George W. Malone, Republican, of Nevada; and Kenneth S. Wherry, Republican, of Nebraska; and Representatives Laurie C. Battle, Democrat, of Alabama; and Dwight L. Rogers, Democrat, of Florida.

Critical of Chiang

Among those who are highly critical of both the Chiang regime and the Chinese Communists are Senators TOM CONNALLY, Democrat, of Texas; ROBERT S. KERR, Democrat, of Oklahoma; BRIEN MCMAHON, Democrat, of Connecticut; and WAYNE MORSE, Republican, of Oregon; and Representatives JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts; MELVIN PRICE, Democrat, of Illinois; and ADOLPH J. SABATH, Democrat, of Illinois.

CHINA GROUP MEMBERS

Some present and former Congressmen have backed movements pressing for a particular China policy. Representative WALTER H. JUDD and Representative B. CARROLL REECE, Republican, of Tennessee, were members of the National Advisory Council of the China Emergency Committee, active in 1949. JUDD is a director of the American China Policy Association.

Ex-Representative Claire Boothe Luce, Republican, of Connecticut, formerly was president of the American China Policy Association and is a director of ACPA and of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding Anti-Communist China. Representative J. LEROY JOHNSON, Republican, of California, is also listed as ACPA director.

1949 LOBBY PROBE SOUGHT

Representative MIKE MANSFIELD (Democrat, Montana), in 1949 urged an investigation of whether some of the American money "illicitly diverted to private use * * * is actually being used to promote new legislation for aid to China by which more money would be made available." The investigation, which he said should be handled by the House Select Committee on Lobbying, was not made.

SENATE REPORT, 1948

When the Eightieth Congress was considering aid to China the Senate Foreign Relations Committee made a report critical of the Kuomintang. While approving the bill (S. 2393) to give military and economic aid to China the committee's original report of March 25, 1948, noted that "Ineptitude in military leadership and corruption among army commanders has contributed largely to the lowered morale of the Chinese Government troops."

The report created such controversy that two days later Senator Vandenberg, then chairman of the committee, withdrew it. The amended report stated that "the Nationalist Government * * * represents our common contest against threats of international peace and security and against Communist aggression, and deserves support within our resources as proposed in this act."

UNITED STATES AID TO CHINA SINCE 1940 EXCEEDS $3,000,000,000

China has received a total of almost $3,200,000,000 in gifts and loans from the United States since July 1, 1940, according to Department of Commerce figures compiled by Congressional Quarterly.

Most of the money was in the form of grants—outright gifts. The rest, some $310,000,000, was in credits—to be repaid at some future date in money, goods, or the return of loaned ships, etc.

More than half of the aid—$1,863,000,000—was sent to China after the war. The rest, mostly lend-lease, was wartime aid.

China has returned some of the money and goods sent her. Her repayments have totaled $182,000,000.

Current aid

Administration proposals for China aid during the coming year are contained in a huge omnibus foreign aid bill now being studied in House and Senate committees. Nationalist China (Formosa) would share in $555,000,000 in military aid and $265,500,000 in economic aid for the "general area of China." (Congressional Quarterly weekly report, p. 801.)

Last year China was voted aid in several bills:

Seventy-five million dollars in military assistance. It became law July 26, 1950.

About $100,000,000 in hitherto appropriated but unused economic aid. Signed by the President June 5, 1950.

Sixty-seven million five hundred thousand dollars in economic aid (a sum specified as 3 percent of all ECA money). It became law January 6, 1951.

Figures vary

Estimates of China aid actually received have varied widely. The Clearing Office for Foreign Transactions, in the Commerce Department, is the only Government agency which keeps a running count of all foreign aid. The Clearing Office gets its figures from the various agencies that have given the money or goods.

The State Department has used slightly different bookkeeping methods and comes up with a different total for China aid. In the Far East white paper of August 1949, and again in the Senate MacArthur hearings June 19, the State Department set China aid at about $3,500,000,000 since 1941.

A Clearing Office study of the State Department figures showed that most differences arose when the State Department counted aid as it entered the pipeline, while the Clearing Office was waiting to count the aid when it arrived in China.

The Clearing Office is willing to vouch for its over-all figures, but points out that difficulties in assigning value to surplus property, for instance, make it impossible to figure China aid down to the last dollar.

Outright gifts to China

Here are the programs through which China has received gifts from the United States, as compiled by the Clearance Office and CQ:

The American Red Cross spent $6,000,000 of Government money in China.

The China aid provision in the Economic Cooperation Administration Acts of 1948, 1949, and 1950 has sent $187,000,000 to China and Formosa. This has been economic aid.

A complicated system of payments for ECA materials sold to Chinese citizens has made another $3,000,000 available to China. These are called counterpart funds.

A relief program authorized by Congress in 1947 to replace the expired United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration sent $44,000,000 to China.

A military-aid program authorized by Congress in 1948 sent $121,000,000 to China in cash, goods, and services.

Chinese students in the United States have been given $4,000,000 in aid under a program voted in 1949.

The United States share in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration totaled $363,000,000 in China during the immediate postwar years.

Congress voted to advance China $500,000,000 in 1942 to help China stabilize its currency and fight Japan. As no agreement has been reached on repayment of this money, it is treated as a gift.

Wartime lend-lease aid to China totaled $1,637,000,000. As agreements have been reached to repay some $50,000,000 of this, that amount will soon be dropped from the gift side of the Government ledger.

Loans to China from United States

Here are the programs through which China has received loans from the United States:

The Maritime Administration holds mortgages totaling $16,000,000 on merchant ships purchased by China after the war.

The Army has estimated that surplus military property turned over to China after the war was worth $20,000,000. China has not signed notes for all of this money.

The Export-Import Bank has made direct loans to China totaling $153,000,000.

Agents (private banks) of the Export-Import Bank have advanced another $10,000,000.

Some $50,000,000 in lend-lease aid has been changed from a gift to a loan through postwar agreements with China. This money is now carried on both the loan and gift sides of the Government ledgers.

Some of the civilian surplus property transferred to China after the war is subject to collection by the Treasury Department. This totals $59,000,000.

China aid breakdown

[Figures in millions of dollars]

	Total	1945-51 [1]	1940-45 [1]
GIFTS			
American Red Cross	6	2	4
Far East aid	187	187	----
Counterpart funds	3	3	----
Post UNRRA relief	44	44	----
Military aid	121	121	----
Aid to students	4	4	----
UNRRA	363	363	----
Currency stabilization	500	120	380
Lend-lease	1,637	791	846
Total gifts	2,865	1,634	1,231
LOANS			
Merchant ships	16	16	----
Army surplus property	20	20	----
Export-Import Bank (direct)	153	73	80
Export-Import Bank (agents)	10	10	----
Gifts changed to loans	50	50	----
Surplus property	59	59	----
Total loans	310	229	80
NET AID			
Total gifts and loans	3,175	1,863	1,311
Less: Returns	182	118	64
Equals: Net China aid	2,993	1,745	1,247

[1] Fiscal years from July 1, 1940, to Mar. 31, 1951.

Source: Commerce Department.

NOTE.—All figures have been rounded out to the closest million. For that reason all totals will not check exactly with smaller figures.

EXHIBIT V

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 16, 1952]

CHINESE EMBASSY,
OFFICE OF THE MILITARY ATTACHÉ,
Washington, D. C., April 11, 1952.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are writing in connection with your speech in the Senate on April 10, 1952, introducing a total of some 22 documents attributed to either one of us in the form of alleged cabled reports supposedly addressed to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek.

We note, however, that in the presentation of these so-called documents you did not reveal how you came in possession of these alleged cabled reports. We wish to point out that, whoever supplied them to you, he has kept from you the vital information that all these cabled reports, and many more, were sent by Gen. P. T. Mow, when he was in charge of the Chinese Aeronautical Commission in Washington. The cabled reports you introduced were all from Gen. P. T. Mow to Mr. H. T. Chou, secretary of the office of the President of China, although from time to time General Mow had made use of information which we had given him, sometimes verbally and sometimes in penciled notes. We wish also to point out that these cabled reports were all signed by General Mow himself before they were dispatched, as the unexpurgated copies of the originals will undoubtedly show. With regard to the cable of June 17, 1950, concerning Hanlon, we wish to state that General Mow's recommendation to employ Hanlon's legal services was promptly rejected by Taipei. We have a full file of these cabled reports, and we would be glad to let you examine them if you so desire in the interest of truth.

In view of the above, we are obliged to point out that the person or persons who so gratuitously supplied you with the materials, have sought to mislead you regarding the authorship of these cabled reports. They have absolutely nothing to do with the Chinese Embassy, which possesses established channels of communication of its own, without having to make use of the facilities of the Chinese Air Force under General Mow, which was independent of the Chinese Embassy altogether.

We are sure that you are aware that the Republic of China brought suit against Gen. P. T. Mow and his executive secretary, Col. V. S. Hsiang, for failure to account for some $7,000,000 of public funds placed under their custody, and for their refusal to turn over to the proper authorities the documents and papers belonging to the Chinese Government. The district court has already handed down a judgment by default against the defendant, General Mow, who had reportedly escaped to Mexico. The family of Col. V. S. Hsiang had reportedly gone back to Communist China. The district court had also issued an order compelling General Mow and Colonel Hsiang to turn over the documents and papers to the court-appointed custodian pending the outcome of the lawsuit.

The papers which you introduced in your speech on April 10, 1952, on the floor of the United States Senate are a portion of the documents and papers which the district court had ordered General Mow to turn over to the court-appointed custodian. It is a mystery how these documents should come into your possession and the possession of what you call "a reliable and reputable publication."

Since your speech was reported in the newspapers and picked up by the wire services, we are making this letter available to them as soon as sufficient time is allowed for its delivery to you.

Sincerely yours,

CHEN CHIH-MAI.
PETER T. K. PEE.

ROBERTS & MCINNIS,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1952.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In a communication dated April 11, 1952, Chen Chih-mai and Peter T. K. Pee, political and military personnel of Chiang Kai-shek connected with the Chinese Embassy in Washington, have written you concerning the documents which you placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 10, 1952. Certain of the statements in the letter are false, and others are misleading.

The statement that all of the cabled reports were sent by Gen. P. T. Mow when he was in charge of the Chinese Aeronautical Commission in Washington, is a deliberate and apparent lie. Not only do the original cables relate to matters wholly outside of the functions of the Chinese Aeronautical Commission, but they bear the signatures and are in the writing of Chen Chih-mai and of General Pee, were in part upon the stationery of the Chinese Embassy, and in their contents show that the information originated with Chen Chih-mai and includes his recommendations. The servile tones employed make it clear that these are communications addressed to Chiang Kai-shek and the nature of the contents shows that they couldn't conceivably have been correspondence by Lt. Gen. P. T. Mow to a secretary in the office of Chiang Kai-shek.

The suggestion on page 2 of the letter that the district court had issued an order compelling General Mow and Colonel Hsiang to turn over the documents and papers to the court-appointed custodian pending the outcome of a civil lawsuit is most revealing as to the true purposes of this lawsuit. It is quite true that such a suit was commenced against General Mow and Colonel Hsiang after they had brought to the attention of the Department of State and other congressional and administrative officials of the United States conclusive evidence of fraud and of double-dealing relating to the military and other aid which the United States had advanced to the Chinese Nationalist Government through Chiang Kai-shek. Under the guise of this accounting for the funds under the control of General Mow for the procurement of military equipment for Nationalist China, a special mission sent by Chiang Kai-shek from Formosa to discredit Mow and Hsiang procured, through American lawyers by false representations made in chambers and without opportunity for defense, an order which compelled Mow and Hsiang to turn over to a United States citizen for the benefit and use of Chiang Kai-shek's commission all documents related to the operations of the Chinese Air Force office in the United States.

This injunction, which is presently awaiting determination on appeal, was extremely wide and was intended to divest Mow and Hsiang not only of the proofs of their stewardship, but also of all the evidence which they desired and intended to place before congressional committees in support of their charges. The order did not, and could not, relate to espionage reports of confidential agents of Chiang Kai-shek covering propaganda and subversive activities in the United States. Absolutely no information as to the existence of these secret coded reports made by Chen Chih-mai, Peter T. K. Pee, and other Chinese representatives of Chiang Kai-shek, was disclosed to the court, nor did it have any relationship with the legitimate and approved activities conducted by General Mow and Colonel Hsiang in the Chinese National Air Force Office.

Contrary to the voluminous and expensive propaganda which has been issued by the China lobby and inspired by the secret representatives of Chiang Kai-shek, General Mow has disclaimed in writing, any personal interest in any of the funds well known by the Chinese Embassy to have been held and expended for the actual benefit of the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa. The court record contains direct and specific military orders to General Mow from the constitutional President of Nationalist China, General Li Tsung-jen, requiring him to withhold from illegal diversion to private hands, these sums of money. He has denied the jurisdiction of the United States District Court in a suit between an unlawful and discredited alien regime and an alien military officer relating to the propriety of the military duties of that officer, and both General Mow and Colonel Hsiang have consistently and for many months, held themselves available without limitation or qualification, to full cooperation with the Department of State and any designated congressional committee to supply in full information as to the propriety and good faith of their actions.

The steps initiated by Chen Chih-mai, Peter T. K. Pee, the Chiang Kai-shek delegation and their associates and affiliates, by the use of physical force and threats against General Mow and Colonel Hsiang and their relatives and by legalistic strategy to conceal and smother this information of vital importance to the interests of the United States, has resulted in General Mow leaving the jurisdiction of this cause and in a threat of a default judgment whenever the Chiang Kai-shek forces can prove the truth of their affirmative allegations. Col. V. S. Hsiang has never left the jurisdiction of the court and has constantly been available, and is now available in Washington, to implement prior charges and prove the truth of his allegation. He has submitted to exhaustive depositions before counsel for Chiang Kai-shek. Numerous quantities of accounting and other information, and the entire contents of the Chinese Air Force Office in Washington, as well as possession of those premises, have been turned over to the court-designated custodian and made available for the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek.

In their letter, these Chinese say: "We have a full file of these cabled reports, and we would be glad to let you examine them if you so desire in the interest of truth." It should also be apparent that the signers of the letter have access to the code replies

from Chiang Kai-shek and his instructions and his directions to his agents in the United States with respect to his propaganda strategy. We are advised that Mackay Radio handled this code correspondence, and I strongly recommend that you procure immediately, by resolution of the Senate pending the grant of power of subpena to a congressional investigating committee, an instruction to that company to safeguard and prepare for the production to Congress of the entire correspondence. By similar action, assurance should be had that neither Chen Chih-mai, Peter T. K. Pee or any others of the Chiang Kai-shek agents escape from this country with documents vital to our national defense. Already, one of the Chinese delegation has evaded service of subpena and returned to Formosa.

It is my sincere belief that when the full truth is disclosed to Congress, there will be such a revulsion of congressional opinion over the financial and propaganda activities of the China lobby that it will be possible to develop a plan of cooperative action with the honest and capable Chinese Nationalists who are determined in their effort to restore China to democratic government. Under such a plan, adequate provision can be made for the care, training, and education of the legitimate refugees on Formosa, and by official cooperation with the United Nations, the looting of the United States Treasury for private purposes in the name of the fight against communism can be terminated. At that time you may get your reward in public understanding and appreciation for your courageous position.

ROBERTS & MCINNIS,
By WILLIAM A. ROBERTS,

A GUIDEBOOK TO 10 YEARS OF SECRECY IN OUR CHINA POLICY

(Speech of Hon. OWEN BREWSTER of Maine)

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I want to put the Senate on its guard.

Yesterday, June 4, 1951, was the third day of Secretary Acheson's appearance as a witness before the joint committee investigation of the circumstances of General MacArthur's recall.

During this third day's appearance Secretary Acheson presented what he called a somewhat extended statement on United States policy in regard to China.

This statement must be regarded as one of the most remarkable State Department documents to be issued during the 175 years of our history. It is a miracle of contrived confusion.

There are two things in it which I wish to call to the Senate's instant attention.

The first concerns the Secretary's extraordinary remarks about the Wedemeyer report.

The second concerns Mr. Acheson's denial that any State Department Foreign Service officer believed that Chinese Communists were simply agrarian reformers.

First, about the Wedemeyer report. This passage of Secretary Acheson's remarks will be found on page 4369 of the transcript of the hearings for June 4, 1951. I will read it verbatim:

"General Wedemeyer went to China and returned. He made recommendations, which are printed in the white paper, in which he recommended assistance of economic and military equipment for a 5-year period, which would require congressional authorization.

"Although his actual recommendations do not call for a grant of military aid, it is possible to read that in. He does talk about the desirability of that.

"However, General Wedemeyer recognized the desirability and importance of avoiding direct United States involvement in the civil war in China by stating:

"'Although advice indicated above'—that is, technical military advice—'does provide advice indirectly to tactical force, it should be carried on outside operational areas to prevent the criticism that American personnel are actively engaged in fratricidal warfare.'"

"There are other recommendations in the Wedemeyer report which I shall not dwell upon at the present time. We are now directing our attention to the aid part of it'."

Mr. President, the key sentences in this astounding statement of Secretary Acheson's are these:

"Although his actual recommendations do not call for military aid, it is possible to read that in. He does talk about the desirability of that."

Do not call for military aid, Mr. President. A more bare-faced distortion I have never read.

I shall now read a passage from General Wedemeyer's report, his exact words, taken from page 814 of the white paper. I commence reading at that point in the conclusions where General Wedemeyer states what must be done to prevent defeat at the hands of the Communists. He says:

"In order to preclude defeat by Communist forces, it is necessary to give the National Government sufficient and prompt military assistance under the supervision of American advisers in specified military fields.

"American military aid to China should be moral, material, and advisory. It should be an itegrated element of our world-wide policy of military assistance to certain nations. China should take the initial step of inviting the United States to provide such aid.

"American military aid to China, ground, sea, and air, would, if appropriately supervised, contribute to gradual development of stability in the Far East and lessen the possibility of a Communist-dominated China."

If this passage which I have read does not mean military aid, I would be interested to know what it does mean, Mr. President.

Then for what possible purpose did the Secretary make this distortion?

Now for the agrarian reformers.

On pages 4921 and 4922 of the transcript of hearings for June 4, 1951, Senator SMITH of New Jersey made this statement:

"Senator SMITH. But as I read the white paper, just about the time General Marshall went out there, and when all these things were developing, some of our own representatives in China, representing the State Department there, were arguing, in favor of the Chinese Communists, it was an agrarian revolution."

On page 4923 of the transcript, Secretary Acheson replies to Senator SMITH:

"So far as this agrarian revolution is concerned—to state a negative is a very difficult thing to do—I do not know of any State Department people, in the sense of our Foreign Service officers or departmental officers who thought that the Communists were merely agrarian reformers. They understood they were Communists, and in these reports that you have referred to you will see several times that they refer to their MOSCOW training and their Marxist rigidity."

Mr. President, this is a very remarkable statement. I do not see how it can be construed in but one or another of two ways. It is either outright prevarication or else the Secretary is ignorant of what State Department Foreign Service officers were doing and saying in those years.

There is now in the State Department Foreign Service a man named Raymond Paul Ludden. From 1938 on he held numerous Foreign Service positions in China. He was a language officer at Peiping, a vice consul at Canton, second secretary at Chungking, and so forth, until in 1948 he was consul general at Canton. Mr. Ludden's peculiar part in our China policy finally roused outside attention and discretion has now seen fit to move him out of the limelight and into the shadow of Brussels where he is now counselor of our Embassy there.

In the Philadelphia Inquirer for March 23, 1945, we find an interview with Mr. Ludden, written by Alexander Kendrick. The interview took place in Washington just after Mr. Ludden had returned from a 7-month trip into Red China.

I quote from the interview:

"The slogan of the Chinese peasants in the Communist area is, 'A full belly, a warm back, and no one kicking us around,' but the so-called Communists are agrarian reformers of a mild democratic stripe more than anything else, the American observer asserted."

Does this interview, Mr. President, with Mr. Ludden refresh Mr. Acheson's twilight memory?

Many Members of the Senate were startled 3 weeks ago when the Assistant Secretary of State, in charge of far eastern affairs, Dean Rusk, in a speech made at the China Institute dinner in New York City, seemed to imply a change of United States policy toward China—Department of State press release No. 460, May 17, 1951, Dean Rusk speech, Chinese-American Friendship, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, May 18, 1951.

I say, "seemed to imply," Mr. President, for I have carefully examined the text of this address and I can find no categorical statement in it that the United States will exercise all its powers and influence against the admission of Communist China into the United Nations. The speech seems to denounce the Chinese Communists. The speech seems to say that we will stand by the National Government now established in Formosa.

Less than a year ago, on June 14, 1950, Dean Rusk told the World Affairs Council Conference at the University of Pennsylvania that the Chinese revolution "does not aim at dictatorship"—The China Story, page 121; see also Senator MCCARTHY, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 12, page 4265.

Three weeks ago he told the China Institute that—

"The freedoms of the Chinese people are disappearing. Trial by mob, mass slaughter, banishment as forced labor to Manchuria, Siberia or Sinkiang, the arbitrary seizure of property, the destruction of loyalties within the family, the suppression of free speech—these are the facts behind the parades and celebrations and the empty promises."

Does the quotation I have just read sound like dictatorship? It certainly does. Yet a year ago Mr. Rusk said there was no aim at dictatorship. The most charitable explanation is that these gentelmen have been getting educated. But are they to be considered more worthy of trust today than they were during the 6 years last past when constantly they have been misapprehending the tendencies and the ideology of the so-called Chinese Communist "agrarian reformers?"

Does this seeming change of mind on the part of Mr. Rusk, a State Department official speaking officially, really mean a change of policy on the part of the administration?

Mr. President, I have already said that I have searched his speech from end to end, and despite all the adjectives Mr. Rusk used to decorate his statement, I do not find a firm and solid sentence anywhere in it.

In effect, Mr. President, the speech bears all the marks of a statement colored to give an impression, an appearance, that the administration is beginning to bow to the storm of public opinion. Yet there is no evidence that the admnistration has really shifted ground at all. The Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, apparently would be warranted in his very definite and positive statement that this speech by Mr. Rusk indicates no change in policy at all. Yet every newspaper in the country, so far as my knowledge goes, editorially and otherwise interpreted the speech as a radical change of policy. What cunning use of language, that they should be able, apparently, to deceive the entire press of the United States when Dean Rusk made his statement, and yet Mr. Acheson could blandly assure us that the speech indicated no change at all.

Mr. Rusk refers sourly to the empty promises of the Chinese Communists. Certainly, as a State Department official, he must be able to recognize an empty promise when he sees one.

Mr. President, if Secretary Acheson or Mr. Rusk want to know why confidence in them has disappeared, if they want to know why the country believes the administration morally and intellectually bankrupt, this Rusk speech will help to explain.

It appears, Mr. President, that no one in the State Department is willing to speak simply, directly, and truthfully. They will not come clean.

Mr. President, just a few days ago the American Society of Newspaper Editors held their annual meeting here in Washington. At that meeting, on April 21, 1951, the society's committee on freedom of information brought in a report. Said the committee:

"We editors have been assuming that no one would dispute this premise: That when the people rule, they have a right to know all their Government does. This committee finds appalling evidence that the guiding credo in Washington is just the opposite; that it is dangerous and unwise to let information about Government leak out in any unprocessed form."

Mr. President, what the American Society of Newspaper Editors is now reporting officially, the Congress has been learning through bitter experience over a period of more than a decade.

The congressional power to investigate, which is the last-ditch authority of the national legislature, has been repeatedly defied by the Executive. Subpenas have been ignored. Files have been withheld. Examples will occur to all. I need not recall them.

The Senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], on the floor of the Senate, made an elaborate analysis of Executive secrecy and censorship in a study of the iron curtain at home, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 8, page 10190, and following.

Mr. President, the fundamental issue of our time is whether this Nation shall go Communist or whether we shall struggle through with our individual freedom, both intellectual and economic, battered perhaps, but still intact.

Underneath the surface of our daily lives this grim battle is going on night and day. Sometimes the battle is spectacular—as in the Berlin airlift. Sometimes it is an obscure struggle in the local of a labor union. Sometimes it is silent smothering and strangulation done by a Government information officer.

Mr. President, the suspicion of Communist infiltration and influence in our Government first arose long ago. I need not recall the incidents which first aroused and then deepened this suspicion to conviction. Such incidents are legion.

Similarly, Mr. President, the tendency toward secrecy in the operation of the executive branch began years ago. I need not recall examples of this, either. They are bitterly familiar to us all.

There were numerous reasons for this effort toward secrecy. I do not say that Communist influence and activity were the only reasons. But they were important ones.

Some of all this has now been proven in the courts, but much yet remains shrouded, half-concealed, and not clear.

For some years now the President and his subordinates have been speaking harsh words about communism and the Soviet Union. But the people remain unconvinced.

Why?

Because, Mr. President, the administration has never yet come forward and revealed honestly and fully the truth about Communist influences and infiltration in our Government and in our foreign policy.

In no phase has the determination to operate secretly been more pronounced than in the China policy, and it is in respect to the China policy that the suspicions of our people are most deeply seated.

We have reached a pass, Mr. President, where the administration simply is not believed, no matter what it says about the Far East.

There is not a Member of the Congress who does not know how devious the conduct of the China policy has been. Everyone knows how often the anxious inquiries of Representatives and Senators of both parties have been short-changed, evaded, and flouted.

Mr. President, we had an amazing spectacle within the present week, when a document in the nature of a directive issued by the State Department to 450 officials all over the world was sought to be kept from public view on the simple plea that it did not tell the truth. That was the plea of avoidance made by the Secretary of State—namely, that a document duly processed through the State Department and issued as a directive for instruction to all those officials should not become known to the public because it was a deliberate falsehood from beginning to end.

Mr. President, Socrates a long time ago was asked what was the penalty of being a liar. To the young man who made that inquiry, Socrates replied, "Not to be believed when you tell the truth." That is the tragic situation in which the State Department now finds itself, Mr. President. When it is attempting through the Voice of America to tell the people of the world the truth about the American way of life and America rallying to defeat the Communist attempt to destroy our liberties, the State Department is suspected of indulging in deliberate misrepresentations and untruths. How can they expect to establish confidence with a record of that character written into their own administration of the Department?

I want to pay tribute also to those Senators on both sides who decided that it was time that the people were entitled to know the facts and who voted to make the document public, over the very severe opposition of the Secretary of State.

Sometimes, Mr. President, events may turn on a book. Occasionally we learn the truth when some publication helps to make further concealment and suppression impossible.

Recall the persecution of Alfred Dreyfus. To conceal a piece of treachery in the French army, suspicion was unjustly cast upon Captain Dreyfus, and an anti-Semitic crusade was trumped up to make the false charges stick. Over a period of months and years suspicions accumulated that a monstrous piece of injustice had been done, but it was not until Zola's I Accuse was published in Clemenceau's newspaper that a real beginning was made to get at the truth.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is making a very impressive speech, and I congratulate him upon the public service he is performing in helping to put together at one place this strange evolvement of the so-called Chinese policy. I was particularly impressed by his last few remarks about the importance of avoiding any unnecessary secrecy in our foreign affairs, certainly from the standpoint of keeping Congress and the people informed about them. I wonder whether the Senator would agree with me that, in these days when the Communists are so very obviously using every conceivable tactic and technique to infiltrate the State Department as well as other departments and agencies of the Government, the very fact that secrecy is employed serves the purpose of the Communists, whether or not they have any part in shaping the patterns of secrecy; because, by concealing what is going on, it is then possible for Communists, when they get into positions within the State Department, as they have done in the past, to divert and direct the policies without having the great patriotic pressure of the Congress and the people brought to bear to refute their fallacious policies?

Mr. BREWSTER. It is certainly true that in a great Republic such as ours the only protection of our liberties and our future must be the fullest publicity consistent with what may be determined, in certain very limited instances, to require that confidence be observed. I think it is profoundly gratifying that the two committees, sitting jointly, have indicated so clearly their determination to bring into the light of day everything possible, unless there is a clear showing that the public interests would be very seriously and adversely affected. I pay tribute to the Senators on both sides of the aisle who have rallied to that standard in seeking the service of their country and of the world.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I should like to associate myself, in the paying of that tribute, because, across the party lines, in the matter of disclosing to the American people what was in the so-called Formosa papers, there was an overwhelming vote in the direction of making it public, and every step by which we curtail information unnecessarily creates a new opportunity for espionage agents and Communists in Government to carry out their nefarious practices.

Mr. BREWSTER. There is no question about it, and I appreciate the Senator's observation.

Three weeks ago a book was published that may, by chance, be of as great assistance in dragging forth the truth about the China policy as Zola's article was in the exposure of the persecutors of Dreyfus.

The book to which I refer is called the China Story. It was written by Freda Utley, an English journalist who is now an American citizen.

This book is an analysis of Communist influence on the far-eastern foreign policy of the United States. That is, it analyses Communist influence on our Foreign Service officers, on our journalists, on our State Department, and on the administration generally in respect to our China policy.

It is interesting, I think, to note that in the 3 weeks which have elapsed since its publication it has, in its field, already become one of the best sellers, apparently indicating a very profound desire of the American people to find out more about the motivation of our foreign policy, particularly with regard to the Orient.

If this book does not contain the whole story, it contains the most complete account to date and should be required reading for every voter in this country. But there is a strange story within a story involved here, and it is that story which I wish to call to the attention of the Senate. This book, as a documentation of our policy in China I think may well be read along with the address delivered yesterday by the Secretary of State before the two committees, sitting jointly, in order that there may be explored some of the points which were possibly overlooked by those who briefed the Secretary of State regarding his address. He is necessarily dependent upon his staff officers, and may not be too severely criticised for not being completely briefed on many things which occurred, as indicated in some of the questions which have already been asked him.

By accident, Miss Utley is one of the pivots on which this story turns. To make the story clear it will be necessary to identify the author a little more fully.

She is an Englishwoman, educated at London University and the London School of Economics. In 1927 she became a member of the British Communist Party. A year later

she married a Russian and subsequently went to Moscow. There she and her husband lived for some 6 years until, one night, the secret police arrested her husband and took him away. He was never seen again.

I shall not pursue this lady's biography much further except to say that by the time she managed to get out of the Soviet Union with her child in 1936 she had learned that Communist Russia was not the hope of mankind.

Miss Utley was admitted to this country by private law 372 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, approved September 27, 1944. She had to wait 5 years after immigrating to become a citizen. This private bill was neccessitated because she stated frankly when she came in that she had been a member of the British Communist Party from 1928 to 1931. Last August she became an American citizen.

Having to earn a living, she found employment with the London News-Chronicle and went out to the Far East in 1938 to report the Japanese-Chinese War, then in its second year.

It was at Hankow in 1938 that this disillusioned woman first collided with a group of individuals who were then almost unknown in the United States but who subsequently became famous far and wide as pleaders, rationalizers, and apologists for the Chinese Communist cause.

If the lady's education in communism had not been achieved by the process of going through the wringer in Moscow, it was certainly completed in China at the hands of this heterogeneous band of zealots.

Who were they?

Col. Joseph Stilwell, military attaché, was one of them. He was unaware that events would presently make him a general and Chief of Staff to Chiang Kai-shek.

Still another was Agnes Smedley, who believed that communism was the salvation of the world and who had long been singing the praises of the Chinese Communists in the American left-wing press.

It is interesting to note that Miss Smedley has just been deified by the Communists in Peking within the past month as one of the saints of their cause.

Still another was John Davies, then United States consul at Hankow, later to rise to high position in the State Department and to achieve great influence over the Chinese policy.

Still another was Edgar Snow, not yet but soon to be celebrated as a sort of left-wing Richard Harding Davis.

There were numerous others in this group—and the number grew as time went on. The common interest of all was a fascination for the Chinese Communists and a growing hatred for the Government of Chiang Kai-shek.

At that moment, in 1938, very few people in the United States were aware of the existence of this group in China. Here in Washington attention was absorbed in the persistence of unemployment, in the fact that deficit spending was becoming a permanent policy, and that Hitler was turning Europe upside down. China was getting a minimum of attention.

Suddenly, in 1933, a rocket shot up in the shape of a book by Edgar Snow. It was called Red Star Over China and was an exultant account of life among the Chinese guerrillas and the exploits of the Communist Eighth Route Army.

This book, acclaimed as a best seller, may be said to have been the opening gun in what subsequently became a tremendous effort to impress the general American public—as apart from the left wing—with the virtue, courage, bravery, and humanity of the Chinese Communists.

Today as the reports of purges, mass executions, and tortures come pouring in from China, we see that communism in China is like communism everywhere: cruel, merciless, malignant, and deadly.

I have said that by accident Miss Utley is one of the pivots on which this story turns.

Why is this?

It is because, 13 years ago, she began to report the truth about the Chinese Communists. Because she did, she was thoroughly browbeaten and vilified for her pains. She went out and back to China several times and not only worked as a journalist but wrote books about what she had seen in China. With what result? While American writers who were sympathetic with the Chinese Communists were being applauded in the press, Miss Utley was sniped at and treated with contempt. She came from the wrong side of the tracks and she was told to go back to the intellectual shanty town where she belonged.

In other times, in other circumstances, Mr. President, all this might have been like a dozen other literary teapot tempests that make life interesting in the publishing business, but to which the general public pays small concern.

But in this instance there is a difference. For years the administration preoccupied with Europe, had given minor attention to the Far East.

Chiang Kai-shek had been fighting the Japanese intermittently since 1931 and after 1937 in a full-scale war. Most of the time he was simultaneously waging a civil war against the Chinese Communists. Very little was done about it.

Then came Pearl Harbor and overnight Chiang Kai-shek became an essential ally. He must be aided with arms, money, and advice to help carry the war with Japan to victory.

Who was sent out as General and Chief of Staff but Joseph Stilwell, the former military attaché? Who become General Stilwell's political advisers? John Davies, John Service, Raymond Ludden, and John Emerson. Who became counselor of our Embassy at Chungking? John Carter Vincent.

So the diplomatic positions were occupied.

A little later who began to command space in American print? Not only such scholars as Owen Lattimore. Not only such Communist war horses as Agnes Smedley and Anna Louise Strong. Not only such journalistic heroes as Edgar Snow. There were many others, including Guenther Stein, Harrison Forman, Jack Belden, Richard Lauterbach, Mark Gayn, and Theodore White.

Here on the one side were the Foreign Service officers and, on the other, their friends, the scholars and the journalists.

Here in this heterogeneous group the germ of the fatal coalition idea which subsequently became the basis of United States China policy was cultivated and promoted.

We know, from the Stilwell Papers, edited by Theodore White, how intense General Stilwell's feelings were. Stilwell was an honest, brave and highly competent soldier in the field. His willingness to share hardships with his men won their devoted loyalty. But politically Stilwell was a naive and trusting soul, easily persuaded. He became convinced that the Chinese Communists were wonderful people and that Chiang Kai-shek was unmitigated evil. This put Stilwell in a position where, notwithstanding his bravery and his generosity, he could make political decisions that had dreadful consequences.

It was my fortune as a member of the Truman committee to be sent by the then Senator Truman on a trip around the world which brought us, under the chairmanship of the present distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], to Kunming where I first met General Stilwell, who flew down from Chungking to meet us. The tragic relationship between General Stilwell and General Chennault was a matter that was incredible to believe if we had not actually observed it. His feeling, not only against Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, but also toward General Chennault was very difficult to understand. We were surprised when we went from the airfield where we had landed to find General Stilwell's chair vacant, because when we got back to the airport we found him sitting in his Ford car on the airfield refusing even to sit down and break bread with his brother officer in Kunming because of the bitterness of feeling. What the rights of that situation were, I am not able to say, but the tragic consequences of it, in the absolute lack of confidence between the Generalissimo, General Stilwell, and General Chennault, was a tragic illustration of the things which subsequently ensued.

We know now that Chiang's demand for Stilwell's recall was the Generalissimo's last desperate throw of the dice. We know now that General Wedemeyer's brief term as Chief of Staff in succession to Stilwell was the last time that there was a realistic effort made to deal with Chiang's plight in respect to the Communist threat. We know now that the promises made to Chiang at Cairo in 1943 were betrayed at Yalta in 1945. We know now that the coalition policy which General Marshall was sent out to impose in 1945 was the policy which, by indirection, could do nothing else than aid the Chinese Communist cause.

Mr. President, I have said that the administration has taken every possible opportunity to suppress the whole truth about what they were doing in China.

Because total suppression is difficult we have been able to deduce the outlines of what they were up to. A thousand details we do not yet know, but the broad outlines since 1945 are clearly visible and many of those outlines Miss Utley has been able, in her book The China Story, to fill in.

What was and is the main effort? To do everything possible to back out of our commitments to Chiang Kai-shek. The administration simply did not dare to break with him openly and completely so they had to do it piecemeal. They welshed on the promises made at Cairo, they demanded that Chiang take Communists into his government, they embargoed the shipment of arms to him. The crown of the work was the statement of Secretary Acheson on May 31, 1950, that we would not use the veto to prevent the seating of Red China in the United Nations—Washington Star, June 1, 1950; see also pages 3 and 4 of the mimeograph transcript of Acheson's address to Members of Congress in the Library of Congress Auditorium, May 31, 1950. Acheson made the statement in reply to a question by Representative JUDD.

This diplomatic game of now-you-see-it-now-you-do-not has been going on full blast since 1945.

Mr. President, I have said that the administration has taken every possible opportunity to suppress the whole truth about what it was doing in China.

In full stride with the diplomatic campaign came an outpouring of books and magazine articles from the group that got their start in Hankow in 1938, the group that so thoroughly disagreed with Miss Utley, the group that gained new recruits as the years went by, the group that by 1945 were in a position to make a terrific impact on United States opinion.

As Owen Lattimore put it in the New York Times on June 22, 1947:

"From Edgar Snow's Red Star to Theodore White and Annalee Jacoby's Thunder Out of China the list of names is distinguished. It is noteworthy that the recent and current trend of good books about China, well documented and well written, has been well to the left of center."

Mr. Lattimore was quite right. The list was more than noteworthy.

In general, though not in every detail, these books assumed a common pattern arguing two fundamental points:

First. The government of Chiang Kai-shek is vicious, corrupt, decadent, and tyrannical.

Second. The Chinese Communist movement is healthy, vigorous and, in most respects, an admirable effort to attain justice and liberation.

In some way or other—I do not pretend to know how it was done—the authors of these books managed to endorse each other's wares with remarkable success. Often they reviewed one another's books. It was all very skillful. The praise was glowing, but a spoonful of criticism was often put in to give the right tint of impartiality. A master propagandist could not have done a better job.

And where this crowd really went to town was when they swung the hatchet on the few authors and journalists who tried to warn Americans of the Communist peril.

Mr. President, to show that this charge is not idle and irresponsible, I have prepared two tables. These tables list the bulk of the nonfiction books on China, published in the United States from 1945 through 1950, as they were reviewed in two of the most influential book-review mediums in this country—the New York Times weekly book review and the New York Herald Tribune weekly book review. Novels are excluded from the list, along with poetry, children's books, and technical works. What we have here are the principal nonfiction works on China as they have been reviewed during the past 6 years.

The tables give the title of the book, the author, the reviewer, and the date of publication of the review.

I recommend to the social historian who has claims to impartiality a close inspection of these tables and of the reviews themselves. He will find them a revelation.

Mr. President, I do not wish to take up th Senate's time unduly, so I ask unanimous consent that the two tables be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Nonfiction books on China published in the United States and reviewed in the New York Times Book Review and the New York Herald Tribune Book Review, 1945–1950, inclusive

NEW YORK TIMES BOOK REVIEW

Book	Author	Reviewer	Date
Solution in Asia	Owen Lattimore	Edgar Snow	Feb. 25, 1945
Report from Red China	Harrison Forman	do	Mar. 11, 1945
China Among the Powers	David N. Rowe	do	May 20, 1945
China's Crisis	Laurence K. Rosinger	T. A. Bisson	July 29, 1945
The Challenge of Red China	Gunther Stein	Nathaniel Peffer	Oct. 28, 1945
My Twenty-Five Years in China	J. B. Powell	Annalee Jacoby	Dec. 16, 1945
Thunder Out of China	Theodore White and Annalee Jacoby	John K. Fairbank	Oct. 27, 1946
China's Destiny	Chiang Kai-shek	do	Feb. 9, 1947
Look South to the Polar Star	Holger Cahill	Annalee Jacoby	Do.
No Peace for Asia	Harold Isaacs	do	May 18, 1947
The Unfinished Revolution in China	Israel Epstein	Owen Lattimore	June 22, 1947
The Revolt of Asia	Robert Payne	Robert Shaplen	Sept. 28, 1947
China Awake	do	John K. Fairbank	Oct. 19, 1947
Last Chance in China	Freda Utley	Harold Isaacs	Nov. 23, 1947
The Stilwell Papers	Edited by Theodore White.	Ira Wolfert	May 22, 1948
The United States and China	John K. Fairbank	Annalee Jacoby	July 11, 1948
Changing China	Harrison Forman	do	Nov. 14, 1948
China the Land and the People	Gerald F. Winfield	John K. Fairbank	Dec. 12, 1948
Way of a Fighter	General Chennault	Annalee Jacoby	Jan. 30, 1949
Russia's Race for Asia	George Creel	Nathaniel Peffer	Mar. 13, 1949
The Situation in Asia	Owen Lattimore	Stuart Lillico	Apr. 10, 1949
China Shakes the World	Jack Belden	Nathaniel Peffer	Oct. 23, 1949
The Chinese Conquer China	Anna Louise Strong	Henry R. Lieberman	Nov. 13, 1949
Pivot of Asia	Owen Lattimore	Stuart Lillico	Mar. 26, 1950
Dateline: China	Hollington K. Tong	Robert A. Smith	Apr. 23, 1950
Ordeal by Slander	Owen Lattimore	R. L. Duffus	July 30, 1950
Peking Diary	Derk Bodde	Nathaniel Peffer	Oct. 29, 1950
Mao Tse Tung	Robert Payne	do	Do.
Two Kinds of Time	Graham Peck	do	Nov. 5, 1950
China and the Soviet Union	A. K. Wu	Robert Payne	Dec. 3, 1950
Blunder in Asia	Harrison Forman	Stuart Lillico	Dec. 10, 1950

NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE BOOK REVIEW

China Among the Powers	David N. Rowe	Eleanor Lattimore	Feb. 18, 1945
Solution in Asia	Owen Lattimore	A. T. Steele	Feb. 25, 1945
China After Seven Years of War	(Various authors)	Gunther Stein	Mar. 4, 1945
Report From Red China	Harrison Forman	Floyd Taylor	Mar. 18, 1945
The Chinese Labor Movement	Nym Wales (Mrs. Edgar Snow)	Eleanor Lattimore	Apr. 8, 1945
China's Crisis	Laurence K. Rosinger	Owen Lattimore	July 15, 1945
The Challenge of Red China	Gunther Stein	do	Oct. 14, 1945
My Twenty Five years in China	John B. Powell	do	Nov. 11, 1945
Earthbound China	Hsiao-Tung Fei and Chih-I-Chang	Eleanor Lattimore	Nov. 25, 1945
China in the Sun	Randall Gould	Richard Watts, Jr.	Jan. 27, 1946
Chungking Listening Post	Mark Tennien	Eleanor Lattimore	Mar. 10, 1946
Our Neighbors, the Chinese	Vaughan White	do	May 5, 1946
China and America	Foster Rhea Dulles	Owen Lattimore	June 2, 1946
Sun Yat-Sen	Stephen Chen and Robert Payne	Richard Watts, Jr.	July 14, 1946
Messages of Chiang Kai-shek	Chiang Kai-shek	Owen Lattimore	Oct. 20, 1946
Thunder Out of China	Theodore White and Annalee Jacoby	Richard Watts, Jr.	Oct. 27, 1946
China's Destiny and Chinese Economic Theory	Chiang Kai-shek	Owen Lattimore	Feb. 16, 1947
The Big Yankee (Carlson)	Michael Blankfort	Richard Watts, Jr.	Mar. 2, 1947
Stalin Must Have Peace	Edgar Snow	Joseph Barnes	May 18, 1947
No Peace for Asia	Harold Isaacs	Owen Lattimore	June 22, 1947
The Revolt of Asia	Robert Payne	A. T. Steele	Sept. 28, 1947
Danger From the East	Richard Lauterbach	Owen Lattimore	Nov. 23, 1947
Last Chance in China	Freda Utley	do	Nov. 30, 1947
Donald of China	E. A. Selle	do	Feb. 8, 1948
The Stilwell Papers	Edited by Theodore White.	Harold R. Isaacs	May 30, 1948
The United States and China	John K. Fairbank	do	July 11, 1948
Two Years With the Chinese Communists	Claire and William Band.	Owen Lattimore	Do.
Way of a Fighter	General Chennault	Harold R. Isaacs	Jan. 30, 1949
The Situation in Asia	Owen Lattimore	Edgar Snow	Apr. 10, 1949
Russia's Race for Asia	George Creel	Christopher Rand	May 8, 1949
China Shakes the World	Jack Belden	Owen Lattimore	Oct. 23, 1949
The Chinese Conquer China	Anna Louise Strong	John K. Fairbank	Nov. 13, 1949
Pivot of Asia	Owen Lattimore	do	Mar. 19, 1950
Dateline: China	Hollington K. Tong	A. T Steele	May 7, 1950
Ordeal by Slander	Owen Lattimore	John K. Fairbank	July 30, 1950
Two Kinds of Time	Graham Peck	Harold R. Isaacs	Oct. 29, 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, last year when Owen Lattimore came to write his book called Ordeal by Slander in which he gave his version of his activities and his connection with the Tydings investigation, he said that when he first learned of the charges made against him he recognized them at once as accusations which had been made for years by one Alfred Kohlberg, whom he described as "a millionaire fanatic who for years had spent a lot of money trying to work up pressure for all-out aid to Chiang Kai-shek." Mr. Lattimore described Mr. Kohlberg's activities as chief member of what he called the China lobby. Mr. Lattimore discussed the dubious propaganda organizations with which this so-called China lobby was connected.

Mr. President, I know very little about Mr. Kohlberg and his doings, but I must say that, when compared with what the left wing could do in flooding the market with pro-Chinese Communist material, Mr. Kohlberg is a babe in the woods. These tables prove it.

The tables demonstrate the remarkable success of this effort to explain in glowing terms the Chinese Communist cause.

We find in the New York Herald Tribune that when Mrs. Edgar Snow writes a book, Mrs. Owen Lattimore reviews it in highly favorable terms. Later the favor is returned when Mr. Snow favorably reviews a book by Mr. Lattimore—the Chinese Labor Movement, by Nym Wales—Mrs. Edgar Snow—was reviewed April 8, 1945, by Eleanor—Mrs. Owen—Lattimore. The Situation in Asia, by Owen Lattimore was reviewed by Edgar Snow April 10, 1949. Both reviews appeared in the New York Herald Tribune weekly book review.

Sometimes the connections are not quite so intimate, but when the sentiment of the book is right, the endorsement is forthcoming.

Listen to Owen Lattimore in the Herald Tribune for July 11, 1948, reviewing a book called Two Years With the Chinese Communists, by Claire and William Band.

"This book," says Mr. Lattimore, "is of primary importance to Americans whose tax money is being spent on economic subsidy to the Kuomintang and, as Secretary Marshall has admitted in a devastating phrase, military aid 'far beyond previous congressional knowledge'."

Where and when, Mr. President, did Secretary Marshall say that military aid was being furnished the Kuomintang "far beyond previous congressional knowledge"? If there is any subject that Members of Congress have struggled to get full and complete information about it is military aid to China. And no line of questioning has brought more congressional frustration.

So much for the reviews in the Herald Tribune. Let us turn for a moment to some of the reviews in the New York Times.

Here we have Nathaniel Peffer on October 28, 1945, reviewing Guenther Stein's The Challenge of Red China. Says Mr. Peffer: "There is something in Communist China that captures the imagination of all sorts and conditions of men * * * it must be emphasized that Mr. Stein is a competent reporter and that he documents his facts."

Mr. President, let us recall the later revelations of the competent Guenther Stein. In February 1949, the Army published a report prepared by General MacArthur's staff, stating that they had come upon the records of the Soviet spy, Richard Sorge, who was tried by the Japanese during the war. The Japanese had discovered, according to the records, that Sorge, Agnes Smedley, and Guenther Stein had been members of a Russian Communist spy ring in Asia.

Let us recall further, Mr. President, some of the strange things that happened after this report from MacArthur's staff was published.

In the first place, Guenther Stein, who was in the United States at the time, fled the country within 24 hours. Flight is usually considered a confession of guilt.

Miss Smedley, the old Communist warhorse, from the Hankow days of 1938, took a different tack. She wrote to President Truman and asked him to force MacArthur to apologize or waive immunity so that she could sue for libel.

What happened then, Mr. President, was very mysterious. So far as is publicly known, General MacArthur never apologized nor waived immunity, but the Army here in Washington did a strange thing. It issued what, in effect, was a retraction and said it had no proof to back up the charges that Agnes Smedley had been a member of the alleged spy ring. This whole episode is another chapter in our China policy that is still buried in darkness. For full details of the MacArthur report, the flight of Stein, and the "retraction" made by Miss Smedley, see the New York Times as follows: February 11, 1949, page 1; February 12, 1949, page 4; February 19, 1949, page 1.

It is not to be supposed, Mr. President, that this trusty band could hit the bull's eye every time. A score of 100 percent was perfection not quite to be achieved.

For example, in the course of 6 years in the Herald Tribune Weekly Book Review, two volumes on China are reviewed by the reliable Arch Steele, the far eastern correspondent. Similarly in the New York Times we discern some skepticism in three reviews by Stuart Lillico. Other examples might be given.

But by and large, Mr. President, the boys and girls who, in the old-time phrase, were determined to carry the message to Garcia, scored a triumph. On the whole, it was as successful a selling job for communism as has ever been done here.

But what, Mr. President, happened to the few scattered reporters who were determined, like Miss Utley, to report the facts? Never, Mr. President, was hatchet work better done.

Listen to Owen Lattimore in the Herald Tribune 4 years ago—November 30, 1947—reviewing an earlier book of Miss Utley's called Last Chance in China. Says Mr. Lattimore:

"As for the Chinese themselves, Miss Utley's wide ranging personal references spread through the whole book an atmosphere of tale-bearing about dirty linen."

Here we have the tomahawk smash at the author's skull. Again says Mr. Lattimore, and I quote him again:

"Miss Utley recklessly described the late General Stilwell as having 'surrounded himself with Communist sympathizers'."

Was that so reckless a charge, Mr. President? Let him answer who knows the truth and the whole truth about John Service and the Amerasia case.

I shall not explore these book review tables further, Mr. President. He who wishes to examine them will find ample confirmation of what I say. Nathaniel Peffer applauds Jack Belden and damns George Creel. The Lattimores beat the drum for their favorities and use the knife on anti-Communists. Richard Watts sings the praise of Thedore White and Annalee Jacoby's Thunder Out of China, and, when finally Owen Lattimore writes his Ordeal by Slander, his friend John K. Fairbank, of the Harvard faculty, manages to write a front-page review in which he conceals the fact that he was one of the participants in organizing the Lattimore defense publicity campaign. To such depths has academic integrity declined.

But now, and at last, Mr. President, one of the journalists who went out to China years ago has written a book to open the eyes of her countrymen. Here in Miss Utley's The China Story is piled up a mountain of evidence about how the most appalling tragedy in the history of our foreign policy was engineered.

The bitterest phrase in our language today is this: "The Chinese Communists are just agrarian reformers." We know who put it over. And Miss Utley tells us how it was done.

Ten years ago Edgar Snow wrote a book called The Battle for Asia. In this book there is a passage in which Mr. Snow permitted himself to speak more frankly than later he did. And this passage, oddly enough, deals with Miss Utley. I have said that by accident she was one of the pivots on which this strange and terrible story of journalism and diplomacy turned. I think this passage proves it. Let me quote it in conclusion—pages 289–291, The Battle for Asia, by Edgar Snow, New York, 1951.

Mr. Snow describes how Miss Utley came out to Hankow in 1938 and how he met her. She was, said Mr. Snow, "a sheep strayed from the Comintern fold, of which she had been a follower for some years before the intervention of a personal catastrophe destroyed her enthusiasm. She had a keen political mind, and her recent release from her obligations to Moscow had left her in a back swing of cynicism which gave to her remarks and judgment a highly pungent quality."

Then, said Mr. Snow:

"In her search for a faith she had fallen back upon resurging dreams of a new liberating force in western capitalism."

Is that so much a dream, Mr. President? Confronted by the black and bloody tyranny of a totalitarian world, what other dream is there than that western ideas of individual liberty may develop a new and liberating force?

But let me finish with Mr. Snow's strangely frank passage:

"My personal feeling in the matter is that liberals who build up hopes that the Communists of China are 'different' and 'only reformers' and have abandoned revolutionary methods to achieve their program, are doomed to ultimate disillusionment. These men (that is, the Chinese Communists) are Nationalists because they are in a Nationalist united-front phase of revolution, but their religion remains international socialism, and if conditions change they may adopt whatever methods they believe necessary in order 'to stay on the locomotive of history'."

Mr. President, that the Chinese Communists were out to promote international socialism is what the author of The China Story has been trying to tell Americans for 10 years. It is what our State Department chose not to believe. Will The China Story do for us what Zola's I Accuse did for Dreyfus?

Mr. President, it is my earnest hope that in some measure this book may serve to balance American thinking and information upon the most profound issues with which our generation—or perhaps any generation of Americans—has thus far been faced.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until Monday next, at 10 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, June 9, 1952, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 6 (legislative day of June 5), 1952:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Hon. Jon Wiig, of Hawaii, to be United States district judge for the district of Hawaii, vice Hon. Delbert E. Metzger, term expired.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

The following-named persons to be members of the Subversive Activities Control Board for terms of 3 years expiring August 9, 1955 (reappointments):

David J. Coddaire, of Massachusetts.
Kathryn McHale, of Indiana.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidate for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be assistant sanitarian, effective date of acceptance

William D. Sudia

WITHDRAWAL

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

William D. Sudia, senior assistant sanitarian, in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 9, 1952

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 5, 1952)

The Senate met at 10 a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord of all being, whose glory flames from sun and star and on the good earth: We bring to Thee our parched souls that they may be restored by the riches of Thy grace. As we come to this oasis of prayer set down in the midst of demanding days, lead us beside the still waters and to green pastures of spiritual apprehension.

O Thou from whom in vain we try to flee, grant us now, in a violent world, a saving sense of inner quiet and serenity. The futile years have taught us, sometimes with bitter lessons, that the things for which we greedily grasp, the bauble of fame, the glitter of gold, the allurements of sense and the bread of pleasure are but vanity and vexation of spirit. And now, this morning hour, with the unsatisfied desires of our seeking hearts we turn in contrition to Thee. Like flowers in June gardens uplifted to the sun, like tranquil lakes that mirror the eternal stars, so would we lift our yearning souls to Thee, our light, our life, our help, and our hope. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 6, 1952, was dispensed with.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. RUSSELL was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate this week.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KEFAUVER was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate this week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. AIKEN was excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate during the remainder of this week, in order to keep engagements to speak at several high-school commencement exercises.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Judiciary Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. FREAR, and by unanimous consent, the Judiciary Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. CASE, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet tomorrow afternoon during the session of the Senate, for a brief executive session.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bennett	Hendrickson	McFarland
Butler, Md.	Hill	McKellar
Byrd	Ives	Monroney
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Mundt
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Dirksen	Kem	O'Mahoney
Ferguson	Knowland	Schoeppel
George	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Gillette	Martin	Sparkman
Green	Maybank	Stennis
Hayden	McClellan	Thye

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference.

Mr. FERGUSON. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senators from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE and Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is not present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FREAR, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NIXON, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TAFT, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. WILLIAMS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEELY in the chair). A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business and make insertions in the RECORD, without debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF SPECIAL MEETING OF JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the proceedings of a Special Meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held at Washington, D. C., March 20–21, 1952 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF REGISTRATION PROVISIONS OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration and enforcement of the registration provisions of the Subversive Activities Control Act, for the period June 1, 1951, to May 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE AND AN OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish an additional office of Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and an Office of Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CONSUMPTION OF FUEL FOR THE PRODUCTION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY, 1950

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of its publication entitled "Consumption of Fuel for the Production of Electric Energy, 1950" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AUDIT REPORT ON INSTITUTE OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON CIVIL DEFENSE CONTRIBUTIONS

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, reporting, pursuant to law, on contributions to the States and Territories pursuant to subsection 201 (i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, for the quarter ended March 31, 1952 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS, FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions by the Administration, for the quarter ended March 31, 1952; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON ADVANCE PLANNING PROGRAM

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration of the advance planning program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Massachusetts, requesting Congress to congratulate Premier Alcide de Gasperi and the Italian people for their impressive showing over the forces of communism in the recent municipal elections in

Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE) on June 5, 1952, p. 6578, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A letter from the State director of civil defense, State of Washington, Olympia, Wash., transmitting a copy of an interstate civil-defense compact entered into between the State of Washington and the States of Oregon, Montana, and Idaho (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Associated Cooperage Industries of America, Inc., at St. Louis, Mo., favoring the enactment of legislation to extend the withdrawal period on distilled spirits; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Iowa State Conference for Congregational-Christian Churches, at Mason City, Iowa, favoring the inclusion of ministers and religious workers in the provisions of the Social Security Law; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Iowa State Conference for Congregational-Christian Churches, at Mason City, Iowa, favoring the establishment of a World Federal Government; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Political Action Committee of the Philadelphia Youth Council of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Philadelphia, Pa., signed by John Parker, president, relating to the policies of Dr. Daniel Malan in South Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Door County (Wis.) Chamber of Commerce, Sturgeon Bay, Wis., favoring the enactment of legislation to complete the St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Florida Junior Chamber of Commerce, at St. Petersburg, Fla., relating to the decision of Judge Pine in the recent steel plant seizure case; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition signed by sundry citizens of San Juan, Puerto Rico, praying for the prompt approval of the Puerto Rican Constitution; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A cablegram in the nature of a petition from the executive committee, Fourth of July Celebration in Puerto Rico, San Juan, P. R., signed by Roberto H. Todd, Jr., relating to the approval of the Puerto Rican constitution; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF CITY OF ALGOMA, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution which I have received from the city of Algoma, Wis., on behalf of speedy final action on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 27, now pending before the Senate.

We had earnestly hoped that this issue could have been brought to the Senate floor several weeks ago and for that matter several months ago. However, the intervention of other important issues has delayed us thus far. We trust that there will be no further delays in view of the fact that "the sands are running out" on this session of the Congress and our good friends, the Canadians, have already waited far too long for us Americans to catch up and take constructive action.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT

Whereas this community, in the knowledge that realization of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project would be of the greatest economic and defense value to this Nation and inure to betterment of the Middle West as well as this State and municipality, has repeatedly gone on record favoring promotion of such facility; and

Whereas minority interests have been able to delay necessary approval and appropriations in the Congress of the United States despite an obvious economic justification for the waterway; and

Whereas the Canadian government's announcement that it is considering going ahead on the development regardless of participation by the United States, foreshadows the possibility of this Nation defaulting on an issue going to the progress and stability of the entire country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Mayor and Common Council of the City of Algoma, Wis., That by and through the adoption of this resolution, this body representing the citizens of our community, again repeats the hope that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway will find realization in fact that this city stands ready to do what it can to assist in promoting such development. be it further

Resolved, That, representatives of the citizens of this community, we memorialize the Congress of the United States to seek early action on House Joint Resolution 337 and Senate Joint Resolution 27, relating to the seaway, which are resting in committees; and, be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk is hereby directed to send certified copies hereof to the President and Vice-President of the United States, to our representatives in the Congress of the United States, the Governor of the State of Wisconsin and to Mr. H. C. Broeckel, Milwaukee, Wis., chairman of the special committee to represent the State as to this project, and to Mr. C. D. Brower, Jr., Sturgeon Bay, Wis., citizen member of this committee.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2393. A bill for the relief of the State of New Hampshire and the town of New Boston, N. H. (Rept. No. 1687);

S. 2555. A bill for the relief of Deborah Jayne Engelman (Rept. No. 1688);

S. 2733. A bill for the relief of Donald Lee Ferguson, Jr. (Rept. No. 1689);

S. 2922. A bill to amend subsection (d) of section 12 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 (Rept. No. 1690);

H. R. 404. A bill to amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 (Rept. No. 1691);

H. R. 699. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Blanche Richards, owner of the Bozarth Nursing Home, Toppenish, Wash. (Rept. No. 1692);

H. R. 1267. A bill to reimburse the Stamey Construction Co. and/or the Oklahoma Paving Co., as their interests appear (Rept. No. 1693);

H. R. 1583. A bill for the relief of Francis A. Gunn (Rept. No. 1694);

H. R. 2629. A bill for the relief of Dr. Leonidas M. Peppas (Rept. No. 1695);

H. R. 2810. A bill for the relief of James Nels Ekberg (Rept. No. 1696);

H. R. 2832. A bill for the relief of Leszek Kazimierz Pawlowicz (Rept. No. 1697);

H. R. 3220. A bill for the relief of Joseph Wynn Steel and William Peter Kruse (Rept. No. 1698);

H. R. 4182. A bill for the relief of Clarence Sudbeck (Rept. No. 1699);

H. R. 4543. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Priscilla Crowley (Rept. No. 1700);

H. R. 5301. A bill for the relief of Leonard Jesse Richards (Michio Inoue) (Rept. No. 1701);

H. R. 5349. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edith P. Powell (Rept. No. 1702);

H. R. 5526. A bill for the relief of Dr. J. Ernest Ayre (Rept. No. 1703);

H. R. 5661. A bill for the relief of Ayako Waki (Rept. No. 1794);

H. R. 5755. A bill for the relief of Chong So Yong (Rept. No. 1705);

H. R. 6010. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lennie G. Clarkson and William E. Clarkson (Rept. No. 1706);

H. R. 6117. A bill for the relief of Deliana Meulenkamp (Rept. No. 1707); and

H. R. 6152. A bill for the relief of Lucille Hujima (Rept. No. 1708).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1095. A bill to extend the time for filing claims on behalf of certain persons, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1709);

S. 1867. A bill for the relief of Margherita Gentile (Rept. No. 1710); and

H. R. 4277. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a claim of the Bunker Hill Development Corp. (Rept. No. 1711).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 2609. A bill for the relief of Iwanna Pryma and Roma Pryma (Rept. No. 1712);

H. R. 401. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (Rept. No. 1713);

H. R. 4109. A bill to amend section 73 of the act of January 12, 1895, as amended, relating to the printing, binding, and distribution of the Statutes at Large, and sections 411, 412, and 413 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the printing, binding, and distribution of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1714);

H. R. 4455. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Buchanan (Rept. No. 1715); and

H. Con. Res. 206. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permament residence to certain aliens (Rept. No. 1716).

By Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 3143. A bill to amend section 3182 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to authorize the use of an information filed by a public prosecuting officer for making demands for fugitives from justice, with amendments (Rept. No. 1717).

STUDY OF ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 332), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make an investigation and study of the organization and operations of the Interstate Commerce Commission for the pur-

pose of determining what changes should be made in order to promote maximum efficiency in such organization and operations.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 3302. A bill to grant former owners a preference with respect to the purchase of certain real property acquired under the reclamation laws and no longer needed for the purpose for which it was acquired; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SMITH of North Carolina:

S. 3303. A bill to incorporate the National Conference on Citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 3304. A bill to grant an exemption from the admissions tax to certain national folk festivals; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 3305. A bill for the relief of Paolo Longo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. ANDERSON):

S. 3306. A bill to provide for the development of the oil and gas reserves of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the shores of the United States, to protect certain equities therein, to confirm the titles of the several States to lands underlying inland navigable waters within State boundaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. O'MAHONEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 3307. A bill to amend section 506 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONRONEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

HANDLING OF EMERGENCY DISPUTES—REPRINT OF SEIZURE BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to say that my bill, S. 2999, the so-called seizure bill, for the handling of emergency disputes, has been corrected in a few minor particulars. I ask to have an additional committee reprint made, so that Senators will have on their desks corrected copies of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OBJECTIVES OF THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION PROGRAM" (S. DOC. NO. 143)

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, some time ago, as chairman of a subcommittee having in charge the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriations, I submitted to the State Department certain questions with reference to the United States information program which I sought to have fully answered. Those questions were submitted, were fully answered, and have been printed in a pamphlet entitled "The Objectives of the United States Information Program."

I have conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Printing, and I ask unanimous consent that this pamphlet may be printed as a Senate document, the reason being that there are many requests for it, principally coming to the State Department through the Office of the United States Information and Education program. They send the pamphlet to their representatives in this country and abroad.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JON WIIG, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, June 16, 1952, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Jon Wiig, of Hawaii, to be United States district judge for the district of Hawaii, vice Hon. Delbert E. Metzger, term expired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman; the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. FREAR:

Address delivered by Senator KERR before National Press Club of Washington on June 5, 1952.

By Mr. TOBEY:

Address delivered by George H. Duncan, president, New Hampshire Electric Cooperative, Inc., at its annual meeting, June 3, 1952.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

Editorial entitled "Economy Experts" published in the Washington Post, of June 9, 1952.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

Letter dated May 29, 1952, on the subject of consumer credit addressed to him by Hon. Francis J. Myers.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Two editorials, one entitled "Church Forces Continue To Fight McCarran Bill," and second entitled "The Senate Passes the McCarran Bill," published on May 28, 1952, and on June 4, 1952, respectively, in the Christian Century.

Editorial entitled "The Immigration Bill Hits Harsh Note," published in the New Orleans Item, May 26, 1952; with statement and resolution adopted by the Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Commission on World Peace, relative to the McCarran bill.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

Article entitled "Who Owns the Water?" written by Paul Friggens and published in the Farm Journal for June 1952.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Editorial entitled "Kansas Wheat Crop To Be Total Loss," published in Wichita magazine of the Wichita Chamber of Commerce for May 29, 1952.

LETTER FROM JAMES A WECHSLER

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a very interesting letter from Mr. James A. Wechsler, editor of the New York Post, giving the facts in regard to certain statements recently made in the Senate. This letter will, I believe, be of interest to every Member of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK POST,
New York, N. Y., June 4, 1952.

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: On page 5961 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, dated May 26, 1952, Senator McCARTHY has a brief discussion of me in which, among other things, he says:

"This is the same Wechsler, incidentally, who is now editor of the New York Post, and who admits that he was a Communist until some time in the late 1930's. He claims to have reformed since then, but has never, so far as we know, shown any indication of his reformation."

This is not the first occasion on which Senator McCARTHY has made this point. On October 2, 1951, he said substantially the same thing before the Committee on Foreign Relations. At that time I wired the following statement to Senator SPARKMAN:

"In connection with Senator McCARTHY's attack on the New York Post and myself, I would deeply appreciate the insertion of the following statement in the record of your committee's hearings:

"'The New York Post recently published a documented series of 17 articles on Senator McCARTHY. These articles critically evaluated his record both before and after his election to the Senate. Nearly 2 weeks have passed since the publication of those articles and Senator McCARTHY has not taken issue with a single fact published in them. A newspaper, as you know, has no immunity; it assumes full responsibility for anything it publishes.

"'Instead of challenging the articles Senator McCARTHY has chosen to make a personal attack on the editor of the Post and to imply that only a subversive newspaper could have published this series.

"'I'm sure that Senator McCARTHY knows that the Post is a militantly anti-Communist newspaper. I am sure he knows that the Communist Daily Worker has frequently denounced both the Post and its editor. I am sure that he knows that the Post and its editor warmly support the efforts of the United States Government to resist Communist aggression through military action in Korea, through the organization of the North Atlantic defense forces, and through economic aid to nations menaced by Communist imperialism. Naturally these are all matters of public record, as are the editorial denunciations of the Post which appear almost daily in the Communist press. Nevertheless Senator McCARTHY chose to tell your committee that "Their (the Post) editorials

parallel the Daily Worker's editorials." He has further attempted to discredit factual material published in the Post about him by questioning the loyalty of the Post's editor.

"'I have never made any secret of my youthful Communist associations. They were ended in 1937 when I was 22 years old; may I add that I ended those associations long before Whittaker Chambers, Elizabeth Bentley, and Louis Budenz did so. I have actively and publicly opposed Communist totalitarianism since that time. It is a matter of public record that in 1946 I resigned from the newspaper PM with a public statement explaining that I felt compelled to leave because the newspaper was Communist dominated. Prior to that time I was known to be one of those engaged in a long effort to eliminate Communist influence on the paper and in the American Newspaper Guild. In 1948 I was one of the founders of Americans for Democratic Action which, as you know, is an actively anti-Communist liberal organization and specifically excludes Communists as well as other totalitarians from membership. I am a member of the national executive committee of ADA.

"'Since Senator McCARTHY has also seen fit to attack my wife, may I add that she resigned from the Young Communist League in 1937 at the age of 21 and has similarly engaged in public anti-Communist activity since that time.

"'I regret the necessity for this extended statement but I believe it will be of interest to the members of your committee in view of Senator McCARTHY's suggestion that the New York Post's exposure of him was a party line attack. I would, of course, be delighted to make these statements under oath if the committee so desired'."

At the time that I transmitted this statement to Senator SPARKMAN I offered to present it under oath, but he informed me that it was the view of the subcommittee that that would not be necessary. I am, of course, willing at any time to do so. But, in fact, as I noted in my statement, much of my answer to Senator McCARTHY is on the public record—both in my own writings and public statements and the attacks which the Communists have leveled against me for more than a decade. I might add that any professed expert on communism—such as Senator McCARTHY—ought to know that the Communist Daily Worker's attacks on the Post and myself have grown even more intense in recent months because of the Post's continued support of the effort of the free nations to resist the Communist aggression.

I find it hard to believe that all this material has eluded Senator McCARTHY. However, in view of the fact that his newest attack on me has been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wonder if it would be possible for you to insert this letter into the RECORD for the benefit of members of Congress who have read the McCARTHY charge. Since many of them do not see the New York Post, I feel it is important to bring these facts before them.

I realize that I am only one of many anti-Communist newspaper editors whom Senator McCARTHY has denounced because they refused to condone his methods. I am sure that most Members of Congress will agree that editors so attacked in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should have an opportunity to reply in the same publication. I will be very grateful if you can see fit to introduce this into the RECORD.

Sincerely,

JIMMY WECHSLER.

EFFECT OF POLITICAL ACTIVITIES ON AGRICULTURE IN 1948

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, several days ago I prepared a statement showing how the farm price program had been used for illegal purposes in the fall of 1948, but, because of the limitation on debate, I have been unable to obtain time in which to deliver the statement to the Senate. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to have the statement prepared by me printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR AIKEN

The story I shall tell today is not a nice one. It will not inspire confidence in those who run our Government.

It is the story of how ambitious men operating under the cloak of a great political party brought distress and discouragement to hundreds of thousands of American farmers in the fall of 1948 in an effort to increase and perpetuate their own political controls over the Nation.

All of us vividly recall the collapse of farm prices in the fall of 1948 during those weeks immediately preceding the November national election.

We recall the venom with which administration spokesmen sought to poison the minds of the people into believing that the Congress was responsible for the falling prices of that period.

We recall how they spread even to the community level, the false report that storage space was not available for the grain crop that year and that farmers could not get Government support for grain prices because of this lack of this storage.

They told the farmers that Congress was to blame for this lack of storage.

They did not tell the truth.

What I propose to do now is to tell the Senate what actually happened in that year 1948, when American agriculture was sold down the river by power-seeking politicans.

The Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act of 1948, passed by the Congress late in the evening of June 19, gave the corporation for the first time permanent status under a Federal charter. Had action not been taken by the Eightieth Congress, the Commodity Credit Corporation would have passed out of existence on June 30 of that year.

As S. 1322 passed the Senate, it gave the Commodity Credit Corporation authority to acquire by lease or purchase any storage facilities considered necessary to the conduct of its business. The House took a different position, maintaining that it was unnecessary to give this broad grant of power to the CCC. They pointed out that the Corporation never had owned or leased an elevator in conducting its business. Land had been leased, however, as sites for temporary grain bins. The House conferees took the position that private industry could provide what warehouse facilities might be needed, and would not agree to the provision in the Senate bill authorizing the CCC to acquire such facilities. The House position finally prevailed.

It was also agreed by the conference committee of the House and Senate that nothing in the bill was intended to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from providing farmers with storage facilities with which to store grain on the farm. It was agreed that the best interests of all would be served by an expanded farm storage program.

In other words, while the CCC was prohibited from leasing the land on which to place bins for the storage of the farmer's crop, it was not intended that the CCC should be limited in any way in cooperating with the farmer to provide his own facilities.

The House conferees made no report on S. 1322. It was understood that the Senate conferees would make an analysis of the bill.

The late hour at which a conference report was agreed to by both Houses precluded making any report that night. Before the Senate adjourned for the summer, in the early hours of the morning, I received permission to submit the report on S. 1322 after the adjournment of the Congress. This report was later printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 12, pages A4408–A4409.

In preparing this report, I enlisted the aid of the Solicitor's Office of the Department of Agriculture.

I was especially concerned that this report be written in such a manner that there never could be any question as to the authority of the CCC to assist farmers in providing grain-storage facilities on the farm, although section 5 (b) of the Charter Act specifically authorized the Corporation to "make available materials and facilities required in connection with the production and marketing of agricultural commodities." I wanted to make sure that section 4 (m) could not possibly be construed so as to limit this authority contained in section 5 (b), and asked the Solicitor's Office to write the analysis of this authority so that it could not possibly be misinterpreted by anyone.

The result was this paragraph which appears in the analysis that went into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"The powers conferred by section 4 (m) include the power to, in any manner, acquire, hold, and dispose of personal property or any interest therein, as the Corporation deems necessary in the conduct of its business."

I agreed with the Solicitor's Office that this wording should leave no question as to the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to acquire and provide the farmer with grain bins either by sale or loan.

The Secretary of Agriculture has recently attempted to explain the failure to carry out this program of farm storage by saying that the CCC had no authority to take a mortgage on grain bins once they were set up on the farmer's land. This excuse does not hold water, for the CCC had full authority to sell to the farmer for cash or to take a mortgage on any personal property which he might possess or to make a loan of temporary grain bins so long as they did not permanently become a part of the real estate. As a matter of fact, the CCC could have made unsecured loans on farm-grain bins, on an emergency basis, and the loss, if any, would not have compared with some of the loose deals the CCC made in 1949 and later years.

While the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act of 1948 did prohibit the CCC from owning or leasing elevators, there was nothing whatsoever in the law that affected in the slightest the Corporation's responsibility for providing full support prices to the farmers that year. The Corporation made virtually no effort to cooperate in a farm-storage program other than selling off a few grain bins which it had on hand. It acquired no new bins whatsoever and, in fact, did not place orders for any during that year. A more lamentable failure, with more disastrous results, is hardly imaginable.

The determination of the administration to make political capital by denying farmers support for their grain and putting the blame on the Eightieth Congress evidently was not arrived at for some weeks following the adjournment of Congress on June 19.

On June 30, a night letter from William McArthur, Acting Director of the Grain Branch, PMA, to 10 State directors read as follows:

"In view of new CCC charter provision you are instructed not to lease any new land for grain bins. Leases in effect June 29, 1948, may be renewed for not more than the land under lease June 29. Notify counties immediately. Further instructions will be issued later."

At this time, the CCC took cognizance of the provision in the new law authorizing it to renew all leases which were in effect at that time.

Later in the summer, high officials of Government, including the President himself, stated that no leases for facilities were permissible under the law.

In his tirade against Congress, under date of July 3, 1948, President Truman made this statement:

"S. 1322 * * * prohibits the Commodity Credit Corporation from continuing its long standing policy of leasing or acquiring land where necessary for storing commodities as close to the farm as possible. This restriction will mean that the Corporation will have to ship grain for livestock feeding, for example, from farms to distant points for storage, and then later to ship it back again to farm areas. This will obviously increase costs for carrying grain reserves."

The President gave no intimation at that time that the administration would fail to support the price of grain. He simply tried to make the point that the procedure would be more costly.

The first intimation that the administration intended to knock down the price of grain is found in a release by the Secretary of Agriculture under date of July 26, 1948. I quote from that release:

"Already, the country elevators, terminal warehouses, and the transportation system are being overloaded."

This was a statement so terribly false that I cannot find language to adequately characterize it.

The records of the Department of Agriculture itself show that ample space was available. This was readily admitted on April 28 of this year by Mr. G. D. Bradley, Director of the Chicago Regional Office of the PMA. In testifying before the Senate Agriculture Committee, the following colloquy, which will be found on page 1739 of the transcribed hearings, took place:

"Senator AIKEN. * * * I believe that fall in 1948 that the warehouses as it turned out, they were 60 percent filled, something like that.

"Mr. BRADLEY. Not more than that, I am pretty sure, in 1948."

The reason for the Secretary's deliberate misstatement about storage space being overloaded appears later in the same release where he says:

"The new CCC charter, which was just passed by Congress, prohibits the Corporation from acquiring or leasing additional storage facilities."

The idea of knocking down farm prices and blaming the Congress for it gained momentum rapidly after that.

On August 6, the Secretary of Agriculture issued another release conveying the same false impression initiated in his release of July 26. The Secretary stated:

"Two weeks ago I stressed the need for farmers to take prompt steps to put their farm storage facilities in shape, so that they could hold more grain on the farm and thus relieve the strain on inadequate commercial storage facilities."

As I have pointed out, commercial facilities were not inadequate at that time. In fact, all through that year, commercial storage was in such adequate supply that the CCC found it necessary to license only 791 facilities to care for grain under the support price program. A year later they had licensed 3,875 facilities, nearly all of which were in existence during that period when they only licensed 791. In this release of August 6, the Secretary for the first time suggests that farmers might well be thinking of selling their grain for less than the support level. I quote from his statement:

"Today, with farm prices for wheat frequently below the established loan level, it is even more evident that our farmers should take immediate steps to increase their farm storage facilities. In the absence of such facilities, farmers may have to sell their wheat immediately, even if prices are below the support level and even if such current sales help to jam the already overflowing market channels."

Reading further on in this release of August 6, we find this:

"And the new CCC charter, passed by the last session of Congress, prohibits the Corporation from buying or leasing additional storage facilities."

By this time, the administration was completely ignoring the fact that the law gave the Commodity Credit Corporation the fullest authority to assist in providing farm storage.

These fallacious references to a shortage of storage and a hint that farmers might as well sell their grain for less than the support price were disseminated to the 95,000 local committeemen of the PMA. These committeemen had no reason to suspect the motives of the Washington officials at that time. In good faith, they spread the word that storage space was not available and that the Eightieth Congress had prohibited the Commodity Credit Corporation from meeting the emergency. I have never blamed the PMA committeemen of the grain States for spreading false propaganda because, in most cases, they had no way of knowing that what they passed on to the farmers of their community was untrue.

The game worked beautifully and the administration forces played it to the limit. Farmers were told over and over again that they could not get a loan on their crop unless it was properly stored and at the same time were told that storage was not available to them. Speculators moved in and soon more farmers began to sell at less than the market price, even at less than the support level. It was now time for the big guns to get into action.

On August 28, Under Secretary of Agriculture, Albert J. Loveland, speaking on the National Farm and Home Hour stated:

"At one time the CCC had steel and wooden bins that would store about 300,000,000 bushels of grain. It now has bins to store about 50,000,000 bushels, and the new CCC charter prohibits it from expanding its storage facilities."

There was plenty of empty space in the country when Mr. Loveland made this statement. In fact, the elevators were so empty that the CCC was having to buy new crop wheat right out of the fields to meet the insistent foreign commitments.

On September 10, Secretary Brannan, speaking at Osceola, Iowa, is reported by the New York Times to have said; in speaking of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act:

"This prevents the Corporation * * * from aiding farmers without storage space for grain crops. Farmers will lose millions of dollars because they will be forced to put their corn on the market instead of selling it under Government loans."

Not a word of encouragement did the Secretary give those farmers whom he was authorized to help in constructing storage on their farms—not a bit of discouragement did he give the speculators who all this time were moving in more and more, taking advantage of the farmers whom the administration did not choose to help.

With the price of grain continually dropping, and the speculators moving in to take advantage of it, the stage was now set for the coup de grace of the campaign.

On Saturday, September 18, President Truman addressed an immense crowd of farmers at Dexter, Iowa. His speech was demagogic and inflammatory. He sought to arouse the farmers against the Congress. Let me quote from it:

"* * * And they brought into power a Republican Congress—the notorious 'do nothing' Republican Eightieth Congress.

"Let us look at the results of that change. This Republican Congress has already stuck a pitchfork in the farmer's back."

The President was speaking of the Congress that had saved the farmers of America from the 52 percent support program of the administration.

He was speaking of the Congress that had authorized more loans to the REA cooperatives than all the seven preceding Congresses put together.

He was speaking of the Congress that for the first time in history had given the Commodity Credit Corporation a permanent charter.

He was speaking of the Congress that had for the first time put the crop insurance program on a sound basis.

He was speaking of the Congress which for nearly 2 years had maintained the highest degree of prosperity the American farmer has ever known.

Yes, the pitchfork went into the farmer's back that day, driven in with all the force which the administration could command, but the President went on:

"They have already done their best to keep price supports from working. Many growers have sold wheat this summer at less than the support price, because they could not find proper storage.

"When the Democratic administration had to face this problem in the past, the Government set up grain bins all over the Wheat and Corn Belts to provide storage.

"Now the farmers need such bins again. But when the Republican Congress rewrote the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation this year, there were certain lobbyists in Washington representing the speculative grain trade.

"These big-business lobbyists and speculators persuaded the Congress not to provide storage bins for the farmers. They tied the hands of the administration. They are preventing us from setting up the storage bins that you will need in order to get the support price for your grain.

"When farmers have to sell their wheat below the support price because they have no place to store it, they can thank this same Republican Congress—the Congress that gave the speculative grain trade a rake-off at your expense."

This pitchfork-in-the-back speech of Saturday, September 18, had immediate effect.

On Monday morning, September 20, the price of corn dropped 4 cents a bushel. The price of other farm commodities was soon on the skids. The prosperity of American farmers was being sold for a mess of political pottage.

At Tipton, Ind., on October 15, President Truman made this statement:

"In 1948, the Republican Eightieth Congress refused to grant funds for the Commodity Credit Corporation, to provide storage space for grains. This means that farmers will have to sell their grain at dump prices or let it rot in improper storage. It has already forced many farmers to sell their grain at prices lower than the support price. It will mean smaller supplies of grain in the future."

And, after this speech, the price continued to go down and the speculators continued to profit and half the commercial storage space of the Nation continued to be empty.

On October 12, at Springfield, Ill., the President said:

"If the farmers can't find storage facilities, they can't get the support prices.

"And if you have to sell your corn for less than the support price for lack of storage, you will know that the blame lies on the Republican Party."

Mr. President, under section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1948—

"The Secretary through the Commodity Credit Corporation * * * is authorized

to support prices of agricultural commodities to producers through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations."

Did the Secretary of Agriculture undertake to utilize the full authority of this law? The answer is definitely "No."

As the President said at Springfield, "If the farmers can't find storage facilities, they can't get the support prices."

The vast machinery of the United States Department of Agriculture was not made available to farmers. If as individuals they could not find the warehouse to take their crop to, they couldn't get a loan and that's all there was to it.

The administration officials knew there was ample storage space in the country at that time.

They knew they had full authority to cooperate in a farm storage program.

They knew, too, that if many farmers lost money or crops and they could get away with blaming Congress for it, they would make political capital.

That the President fully recognized the situation is made clear by his speech at Danville, Ill., on October 12, the same day he spoke at Springfield. At Danville he said—

"Farmers all over the country are being forced to dump their grain as 'distress grain,' or let it rot on the ground, because the Commodity Credit Corporation no longer has the power to provide emergency storage space for bumper crops. That is the Republican program, pure and simple. The farmers cannot get the Government support price, because their crops are not in storage."

And yet the next year after President Truman had been reelected, the Commodity Credit Corporation actually made loans on grain piled on the ground. It had the same authority to make this type of loan in 1948.

Even our genial Vice President is reported by the New York Times of October 3, 1948 to have said:

"Because of restrictions placed on the Commodity Credit Corporation by the Republican Congress * * * thousands of farmers have had to sell grain this year 'at distress prices and thousands more will take heavy losses as the crops come in.'"

Evidently, he did not know that the Department of Agriculture was fully authorized by law to promote and assist in a farm storage program or that the elevators of the Nation were only half full at the time he made that statement.

As a matter of fact, I was advised in September 1948 by owners of large storage space in Minnesota that they had tried in vain to get both Government officials and private industry to utilize their facilities.

How much actual loss the farmers of America incurred on their 1948 grain crop will never be exactly known.

The widespread misrepresentations by the President, the Secretary of Agriculture and their front organizations as well as by tens of thousands of unsuspecting persons who were unwittingly used for the purpose had their effect.

What could you expect the farmers to do when the President of the United States told them they would have to dump their grain on the speculative market or on the ground? What could you expect the farmers to do when the Secretary of Agriculture told them that they couldn't get a loan on their grain unless it was properly stored and there was no storage for them?

They did, Mr. President, just what anyone else would have done—they did dump their grain for whatever price they could get.

One farmer in Illinois told me that he took a loss of $1.65 per bag on 1500 bags of soybeans because they told him there was no storage available.

The big loss to American agriculture, however, was not incurred as a result of 10,000 farmers dumping their grain at ruinous prices. It was incurred because such dumping brought down the price level for all farmers, including those who had adequate storage.

From July 15, 1948 to October 15 the average farm price of corn dropped from $2.02 a bushel to $1.38 or 64 cents a bushel. Wheat, because of empty elevators and huge foreign demand, dropped only from $2.03 to $1.98 or 5 cents a bushel.

Oats dropped from 86.6 cents to 69.9 cents, or 16.7 cents a bushel. Barley dropped from $1.42 to $1.10 or 32 cents a bushel and rye from $1.72 to $1.43 or 29 cents a bushel. And there was still a further drop in these prices between October 15 and election day.

It would be a conservative statement to say that the price of all grain dropped at least 15 cents a bushel because of the political manipulations of the Administration. At this rate the farmers of America contributed a billion dollars to the President's campaign of 1948.

American agriculture has never fully recovered from this decline of late summer and fall of 1948. This is evidenced by the fact that from that time on the debt of the farmer has steadily increased until today it is nearly double what it was 5 years ago and is still increasing.

I am telling this story, today, Mr. President, because there are already many signs that the Administration intends to again drive down farm prices in this election year of 1952.

The encouragement given to the importation of huge quantities of grain is one of these signs.

The failure of the Secretary to support the price of certain farm commodities as authorized and intended by the Agricultural Acts of 1948 and 1949 is another.

Mr. President, if we value the concepts of those who bravely and wisely established a government of three well defined branches, we must see that no one of these branches obtains domination over the others.

The continuing campaign of the last few years on the part of the executive branch to discredit and weaken the Congress must be stopped.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may place certain material in the RECORD and may make a statement, which will not exceed 5 minutes. The reason for making this request is that the Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member is now marking up a bill, and I shall have to be there during the remainder of the morning. I assure the acting majority leader that the statement will not exceed 5 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as the Senator knows, we are to resume consideration of the Defense Production Act of 1950 at 12 o'clock. That would mean that, if we had a quorum call, we should begin on that at 11:30. The majority leader and the acting majority leader have talked to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and we have no desire to cut off debate on the conference report on the Mutual Security Act of 1951. Certainly I do not want to object to the request of the Senator from California, but I wonder whether we could at this time obtain a unanimous-consent agreement to complete consideration of the conference report on House bill 7005, the Mutual Security Act of 1951, which may take longer than 12 o'clock. I am not informed as to how many Senators may want to speak on the conference report. Following action on the conference report, we could proceed to the consideration of the Defense Production Act of 1950, Senate bill 2594. If we could do that, then 5 minutes time that might be requested by individual Members would not concern us.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have no idea to what extent other Senators desire to discuss the conference report. I have been informed that several Senators desire to address the Senate on that subject. It does not seem to me that it is in order to forestall discussion of this subject. I, therefore, find myself compelled to object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the purpose of my request is not to place a limitation upon the Senator, but to give him such time as he and other Senators may desire in order to complete consideration of the conference report. Unless my unanimous-consent request were agreed to, or unless a motion were agreed to, then the Senator would be cut off at 12 o'clock.

Mr. KEM. I should have no objection to that, so long as it is clearly understood that there will be no limitation of debate on the conference report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is the plan of the acting majority leader.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on House bill 7005, an act to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes, and, that upon completion of the consideration of that report, the Senate immediately resume the consideration of Senate bill 2594, a bill to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the House and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does that mean it is possible we might continue consideration of the conference report all day, and take up the Defense Production Act tomorrow?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not think so, but the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] has a speech on the conference report, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] also has a speech on it, and there may be one or two other Senators who will want to speak on it, as to whose plans I am not advised. But I am sure they cannot finish before 12 o'clock. I talked to the acting minority leader and the Senator from Missouri, and we have no desire to see them cut off at 11:30.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as I understand, it is proposed that the Senate continue the consideration of the conference report until completed. There is no limitation of debate whatever on the conference report at the present time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it is the plan of the junior Senator from Nevada to be absent from the floor tomorrow, and it is important to him that he be here when the bill extending the Defense Production Act of 1950 again comes before the Senate. If the unanimous-consent agreement proposed would mean that all of today would be consumed on the conference report and the consideration of the Defense Production Act of 1950 would be continued tomorrow, I should be compelled to object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We have no plan to consume 1 minute longer than the time which the Senator from Missouri and other Senators desiring to speak may consume. As soon as they conclude, we shall proceed with the Defense Production Act of 1950.

Mr. MALONE. Then, why would it not be well to go ahead, and if we could not finish with the conference report on the Mutual Security Act of 1951, take it up again tomorrow, and go ahead with the program, in order that Senators might be able to make future plans? It is impossible to make plans, the way we are proceeding at the present time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the conference report on the Mutual Security Act of 1951 is privileged and therefore I do not think I could agree to the suggestion of the Senator from Nevada. I have no disposition to cut off debate on the conference report. The Senator from Nevada may have all the time he wants.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Texas has pointed out that it is unnecessary to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement, at all, that the conference report is a privileged matter, and that we may take advantage of the privilege.

If that is true, then it is unnecessary to have a unanimous-consent agreement. Am I not correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the junior Senator from Texas?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. MALONE. Is it necessary to have a unanimous-consent agreement in order to continue with the conference report after noon today, since it is a privileged matter?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am informed that the Senator from Missouri and other Senators desiring to speak do not have extended speeches but they do not think they could finish by 12 o'clock. At least, they do not want to agree to finish by 12 o'clock. At that hour, under the order of the Senate, we shall have to proceed to the consideration of the Defense Production Act of 1950; so, in effect, we would be placing a limitation on these Senators.

I do not think they would require more than an hour or so. But if we could enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to complete the consideration of the conference report on the Mutual Security Act of 1951, while it is before the Senate, and then could take up the Defense Production Act of 1950, I think that would be appropriate.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. If the distinguished senior Senator from Texas is correct, that the conference report is a privileged matter, what difference would a unanimous consent make, in view of the previous agreement?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not intend to get into a discussion with the senior Senator from Texas, but the Parliamentarian has informed that if we do not enter into a unanimous-consent agreement, and if the Senate does not act by motion, the situation will be that, under the motion made last week and agreed to, when 12 o'clock is reached, the Chair will lay before the Senate the Defense Production Act of 1950.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, that is exactly what the junior Senator from Nevada is objecting to, namely, taking all day on the conference report, so that there would be no opportunity to debate the defense production bill today. The junior Senator from Nevada has previously stated that he has made arrangements to be absent from the Senate at least for a few hours tomorrow. That is the reason for my objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nevada will permit the unanimous-consent agreement to be read, I think we could go ahead and get the conference report out of the way and immediately resume consideration of the defense production bill.

Mr. MALONE. Why not proceed until noon, and let us then see where we stand?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Junior Senator from Texas?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I object.

Mr. MALONE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to the request of the Senator from California—and I have no objection to his putting a statement in the RECORD, or to his having whatever time he may desire——

Mr. KNOWLAND. It will not exceed 5 minutes, I assure the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from California may proceed.

THE POLITICAL CRISIS IN KOREA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am concerned by reports of the political crisis in Korea and the action of this Government and some of the powers associated with us.

More concerned am I, however, by what may develop in the months immediately ahead.

No doubt President Syngman Rhee of the Republic of Korea has some faults but he has some great virtues also. He is a Korean patriot of the first order. Some of us remember him fighting the battle for a free Korea here in Washington before the Republic of Korea came into being.

He is an uncompromising foe of international communism and of its Chinese and Korean offspring.

He and President Chiang Kai-shek of the Republic of China have been the principal targets of the Communists abroad and those in the United States as well.

President Rhee is a man of personal integrity and courage. Let me tell you the story of his visit to the former Communist capital of Korea, Pyongyang, directly after it had been taken over from the enemy.

After addressing a large throng of people from the front of one of the public buildings the Korean military and police officials responsible for the safety of the President urged him to leave by a side entrance in order to avoid personal danger, for they feared an attempt upon his life from Communist fanatics who might be in the huge crowd. The recommendation of the Republic of Korea officials was joined in by some of the responsible American military officials who were there at the time. One of them personally related this story to me.

President Rhee's reply was typical of the courage of the man and his love for his country and its people. His answer was substantially as follows: "If I am unable to mingle with the people of my country, including those so recently freed from the Communist terror, I do not want to be president or for that matter to live." With that he walked down off the platform into the heart of the crowd where he was given another tremendous ovation.

As long as Rhee is president there will be no far eastern Munich that will have the approval of the Republic of Korea.

On numerous occasions he has been attacked by Owen Lattimore and other so-called far eastern experts who suggested Korea be allowed to fall without our having the appearance of having pushed it.

This frontal pressure on the president of Korea by this Government, by others that have recognized the Chinese Communists, and by Trygve Lie, Secretary-General of the United Nations, who openly favored the admission of Communist China into the United Nations should warn the Senate and the Nation that there may be another side to the one-sided diet of adverse material being put out against him here and abroad. I suggest we withhold judgment until all the facts are in.

President Rhee wants the president to be elected by popular vote of the people of the Republic of Korea. He refuses to be treated or permit his people to be treated as colonials. He should be applauded not condemned on both counts.

What do his opponents fear from letting the people elect their president rather than the parliament?

I would be more impressed by the notes being sent if we had made the same demands on Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania where all the promises made to our naive Government have been reneged on and freedom has been destroyed. No free press exists there to report on those people, living and dead, whose fate was sealed at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

Is it essential for Rhee to be eliminated for another catastrophic and sickening coalition with Communists to be worked out as part of the peace-at-any-price policy some of the United Nations members favor? I hope such is not the case.

If there is no substance in this, why should not United Nations influence be on the side of the principle of letting the people of Korea decide for themselves who their president should be? Or would this be too dangerous a precedent for the nations now behind the iron curtain?

We must not take sides in who they elect, for that is the business of Koreans and not outsiders.

But let us not be mislead in Korea by those who were calling the Chinese Communists agrarian reformers a few short years ago. Let us not lay down conditions to our friends that we lacked the intestinal fortitude to lay down to our enemies.

At the same time I am sure that President Rhee will recognize the importance of following constitutional processes even if there be some here who believe in inherent powers in the presidency. Being a close student of our history he may have seen American precedent in some of his actions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks a statement which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 4, pages 4983–4985, approximately 3 months prior to the outbreak of the Korean war; also an article which appeared in the New York Times this morning; and an article from the current issue of the U. S. News & World Report, all of them dealing with the Korean question.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN POLICY IN KOREA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on April 7 the text of the note handed to the Korean ambassador by Secretary of State Dean Acheson on April 3 was published in the American press. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, the text of the note handed by the Secretary of State to the Korean ambassador.

There being no objection, the note was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"TEXT OF UNITED STATES NOTE TO KOREA

"The Secretary of State wishes to take this opportunity to express to His Excellency the Ambassador of the Republic of Korea, prior to the latter's return to Seoul, the deep concern of this Government over the mounting inflation in Korea. The Secretary of State wishes His Excellency to convey to the President of the Republic of Korea the view of this Government that the communication of March 4, 1950, from the Korean Prime Minister to the chief of the Economic Cooperation Mission in Korea, in which the view was expressed that there is no serious problem of inflation in Korea, but rather a threat of deflation, indicates a lack of comprehension on the part of the Korean Government of the seriousness of the problem and an unwillingness to take the drastic measures required to curb the growing inflation.

"It is the judgment of this Government that the financial situation in Korea has already reached critical proportions, and that unless this progressive inflation is curbed in the none-too-distant future, it cannot but seriously impair Korea's ability to acquire effectively the economic assistance provided by the Economic Cooperation Administration.

"Budget limits ignored

"Government expenditures have been vastly expanded by bank overdrafts without reference to limits set by an approved budget. Tax collections have not been increased, aid goods have been underpriced, and governmental subsidies have been expanded. The dangerous practice of voluntary contributions has been used as an inefficient substitute for a sound taxation system. These uneconomic practices have in turn served to expand the currency in circulation, unbalance the Korean national budget, and cause a sharp rise in wholesale and retail prices, thereby strengthening the growing forces of inflation.

"The Secretary of State must inform His Excellency that unless the Korean Government is able to take satisfactory and effective measures to counter these inflationary forces, it will be necessary to reexamine, and perhaps to make adjustments in, the Economic Cooperation Administration's assistance program in Korea.

"The Secretary of State wishes to inform His Excellency in this connection that the American Ambassador in Seoul is being recalled for consultation within the next few days regarding the critical problems arising out of the growing inflation in Korea.

"Election move noted

"Of equal concern to this Government are the reported intentions of the Korean Government, as proposed by the President of the Republic of Korea in a message to the National Assembly on March 31, to postpone the general elections from the coming May until some time in November, to draw to His Excellency's attention the fact that United States aid, both military and economic, to the Republic of Korea has been predicated upon the existence and growth of democratic institutions within the republic. Free, popular elections, in accordance with the constitution and other basic laws of the republic, are the foundation of those democratic institutions.

"The holding of the elections as scheduled and provided for by the basic laws of the republic appear to this Government as equally urgent with the taking of necessary measures for the countering of the inflationary forces already discussed."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, with the general objectives of encouraging the strengthening of free institutions, building the Nation's economy, and maintaining a solvent government, there should be no difference of opinion here or in Korea. As one of the few constitutional republics in that area of the world, Korea has a great responsibility to demonstrate that freedom and constitutional government are not incompatible with the situation in Asia despite the views of some far-eastern experts, official or unofficial.

The timing of the release of the note to the Korean Ambassador is unfortunate, coming as it did on the heels of the April 3 publication of the memorandum prepared by Owen Lattimore pursuant to the State Department request of August 18, 1949, in which, with reference to Korea, the memorandum states:

"4. South Korea is more of a liability than an asset to the interest and policy of the United States. It is doubtful how long the present regime in South Korea can be kept alive, and the mere effort to keep it alive is a bad advertisement, which continually draws attention to a band of little and inferior Chiang Kai-sheks who are the scorn of the Communists and have lost the respect of democratic and would-be democratic groups and movements throughout Asia."

His memorandum ends up with the following paragraph:

"6. The United States should disembarrass itself as quickly as possible of its entanglements in South Korea."

In my remarks on the floor of the Senate relative to Owen Lattimore and American policy in the Far East, to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 4, beginning at page 4804, the following colloquy on page 4830, between the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] took place:

"Mr. ANDERSON. I was interested in the question with reference to Korea, Japan, and China, so far as the attitude toward the United Nations is concerned. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that he did not believe that we were following Lattimore's line with reference to Korea, Japan, and the United Nations?

"Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, I said in my speech—and I do not know whether the Senator was present during that time——

"Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, I was. Having made that statement, I ask the Senator whether he would regard Lattimore as the architect of our far-eastern policy?

"Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say that Mr. Lattimore has had a considerable influence on our policy on the continent of Asia, with particular reference to China. I do not believe—and I say I think it is very fortunate—that to date the Department has followed his advice insofar as the Republic of Korea is concerned, insofar as Japan is concerned, or insofar as American recognition of the Communist regime or their entrance into the United Nations, is concerned."

Up to this moment I believe that the release of the Korean note was a mere coincidence having no relation to the Lattimore recommendations, however, in view of the fact that the note has been released the Congress and the American public are entitled to have some additional background information.

The United States is partly responsible for the serious economic condition Korea finds herself in at the present time due to the fact that we consented to the unnatural division of the country at the thirty-eighth parallel. This has made more difficult the economy of the country due to the fact that much of the hydroelectric power and a considerable amount of other resources are north of that line.

As members of the United Nations we bear a responsibility for the creation of the Republic of Korea. The United Nations Commission supervised the election and the press of the world was present. It is generally agreed that the government elected represented the will of the people in the area of Korea free from Communist domination.

The Government of Korea has been constantly faced with the overt acts of aggression across the thirty-eighth parallel by Communist irregulars from north of the line. At the time I was in Korea last November there had already been 360 violations of the thirty-eighth parallel by Communist groups from North Korea ranging in size from a squad to a battalion. Many additional violations of the border have taken place since last November, the latest being

a few days ago. President Syngman Rhee recently pointed out that there had been substantial casualties on the part of the forces of the Republic of Korea, and there have been considerably greater casualties on the part of the invading forces. Needless to say in that part of the world the cold war is quite warm.

There are a number of responsible people in the Republic of Korea who believe that once the Chinese Communists have liquidated the remaining resistance by the forces of the Republic of China to their regime that they will then move both Communist troops and equipment back into Manchuria and make them available to the North Korean Communists for an invasion against the Republic of Korea. For that reason these Koreans have taken a realistic view of the situation and have urged that the Republic of Korea move against the illegal Communist regime of North Korea and unify their country before all of Asiatic communism can unite to destroy the last vestiges of freedom in Asia.

This Government along with more moderate Koreans have constantly urged that no such action be taken because it might appear in the eyes of the world to be an act of aggression even though the North Korean regime has no standing except in the eyes of the Soviet Union and her satellites. It is difficult to be asked to stand and wait when every responsible Korean knows that should communism overwhelm the Republic of Korea wholesale liquidations would take place.

Due to the fact that we bear responsibility for permitting the country to be divided, that we as a member of the United Nations participated in the formation of the Republic of Korea by a free election, and that we have vigorously urged that no police action be taken against the Communist regime north of the thirty-eighth parallel, the Government of the Republic has been faced with the problem of maintaining a military establishment far larger than the size of the country or its economy can properly support. Our own military expenditures approximate about 34 percent of our budget. The expenditures of the Republic of Korea for its external and internal security forces approximates between 22 and 30 percent of their budget which equals or exceeds the expenditures for defense of most of the North Atlantic Pact nations who have the added advantage of being a part of a pact wherein we recognize that an aggression against one is an aggression against all the signatories. Korea to date has no such assurance.

In addition to this fact, in his speech before the National Press Club of January 12, 1950, as reported in the Washington Star on January 13, Secretary of State Dean Acheson made clear that Korea was outside of our defense perimeter. He does it in the following language:

"First of all, let's deal with the question of military security. I deal with it first because it is important, and because, having stated our policy in that regard, we must clearly understand that the military menace is not the most immediate.

"What is the situation in regard to the military security of the Pacific area, and what is our policy in regard to it?

"In the first place the defeat and the disarmament of Japan had placed upon the United States the necessity of assuming the military defense of Japan so long as that is required, both in interest of our security and in the interests of the security of the entire Pacific area, and in all honor, in the interest of Japanese security. We have American, and there are Australian troops in Japan. I am not in a position to speak for the Australians, but I can assure you that there is no intention of any sort of abandoning or weakening the defense of Japan, and that whatever arrangements are to be made either through permanent settlement or otherwise—that defense must and shall be maintained.

"This defensive perimeter runs along the Aleutians to Japan and then goes to the Ryukyus. We hold important defense positions in the Ryukyus Islands, and those we will continue to hold. In the interest of the population of the Ryukyus Islands, we will, at an appropriate time, offer to hold these islands under trusteeship of the United Nations. But they are essential parts of the defensive perimeter of the Pacific, and they must and will be held.

"The defensive perimeter runs from the Ryukyus to the Philippine Islands. Our relations, our defensive relations with the Philippines, are contained in agreements between us. Those agreements are being loyally carried out. Both peoples have learned by bitter experience the vital connections between our mutual-defense requirements. We are in no doubt about that and it is hardly necessary for me to say an attack on the Philippines could not and would not be tolerated by the United States. But I hasten to add that no one perceives the imminence of any such attack.

"So far as the military security of other areas in the Pacific is concerned, it must be clear that no person can guarantee these areas against military attack. But it must also be clear that such a guaranty is hardly sensible or necessary within the real of practical relationship."

Now, Mr. President, what do you think your reaction would be if you were a citizen of the Republic of Korea or a responsible government official there, your country had been divided in an unnatural sort of a way with the consent of the United States; your Republic had been created by free elections held under the auspices of the United Nations, strong representations had been made not to take police action against the illegal Communist regime in the north that was constantly endangering the security of the Republic and necessitating the maintenance of a much larger army and police force than the size of the country and its economy would normally warrant, the Secretary of State on January 12 of this year serves public notice that your country is outside the defense responsibilities of the United States; and then the people of Korea and the people of the United States are informed on April 7 that they must stop operating on an unbalanced budget, and immediately must put their economic house in order? This, of course, would mean that a substantial reduction would have to be made in both the Army and the national police force.

As in the case of most public questions, there are two sides to this one also. First, we are urging the Republic of Korea to do what we say, not to do what we do. For 14 out of the last 16 years, this Government has operated on an unbalanced budget. It is true that part of this was due to the "hot" war in which we were engaged for part of that time. The Koreans are engaged in at least a "warm" war, which is neither all "hot" nor all "cold."

Nor would I raise this issue if, as a matter of national policy, we are going to take the same attitude to the same extent with all the ECA and North Atlantic Pact countries. If anything, we should be more considerate of Korea because she does not have, to date, the guaranties which are possessed by the North Atlantic Pact countries. I want it to be clearly understood that I fully support the recommendations of the State Department that the elections be held in May, as originally contemplated. I think Korea can do much to bolster a belief in constitutional government and to offset the undermining of her system of government which has been going on in this country by certain of the Communist press and among those who consciously or unconsciously follow or parallel the Communist Party line. I fully support the urgent recommendations of the State Department that Korea make every effort to put her economic house in order by the enactment of a sound tax structure and the elimination of nonessential expenses. This is good advice for any government to follow, including our own.

However, Mr. President, the American people are entitled to have more of the facts relative to our foreign policy than it has been our policy many times in the past to give them. I am convinced that it will be difficult to develop public support for a foreign policy unless the people are taken more into the confidence of their Government in Washington. Under our constitutional system, that job cannot be left to the Executive alone. The Congress, in general, and the Senate, in particular, have a responsibility, under the Constitution, which they cannot and should not abdicate to anyone.

[From the New York Times]

RHEE MAKES OFFER ON PRESIDENT VOTE—KOREAN HEAD SAYS POPULAR ELECTION IS PRICE FOR ENDING HIS FEUD WITH ASSEMBLY

PUSAN, South Korea, Monday, June 9.—President Syngman Rhee declared yesterday that presidential elections by popular vote were his price for ending the feud between the South Korean National Assembly and his administration.

The 77-year-old President said in an official statement that the assembly "may vote for whom it chooses as the next President" provided that it approves of measures to establish presidential elections by popular vote and split the single house into a two-chamber legislature. The assembly voted down both these amendments to the constitution earlier this year.

Dr. Rhee declared himself determined to see the constitution amended before he left office, saying that a secret and powerful group in the assembly was planning to seize control of the young Republic. He said he would be ready to step down if the amendments were passed, "regardless of who may be chosen as my successor."

Opposition leaders said that Dr. Rhee's statement contradicted itself. They declared that if the assembly amended the constitution as demanded, it would lose its power to choose a President this year.

THOUSANDS GATHER IN PUSAN

A Government spokesman replied, however, that Dr. Rhee's statement referred only to future elections and not the one scheduled for this month although the statement did not specifically state that.

Dr. Rhee's statement said that martial law was recently proclaimed to head off clashes between those favoring the amendments and the assemblymen who refused to pass them. Thousands are gathering in Pusan to "settle the dispute with their representatives," it added.

Dr. Rhee's term expires next month. Under the present constitution, a presidential election must be held by the assembly before June 23. Assemblymen are pessimistic about the chances of such an election's being held.

At present 52 pro-Rhee legislators are boycotting assembly sessions, 11 assemblymen are under arrest for alleged conspiracy and another is facing trial for murder.

An assembly official said that the opposition as well as the Government had submitted bills on the question of dividing the legislature into two chambers. He said that the opposition bill would leave the President a figurehead and make the Cabinet responsible to Parliament.

[From the U. S. News & World Report]

IN KOREA: POLITICS AMID WAR—CIVILIANS SQUABBLE, BUT TROOPS WILL FIGHT ON

PUSAN, KOREA.—In the strange war in Korea, politics is replacing military problems as the matter of most concern to United States officials.

American generals, trained and ready to fight a war, find a new political problem everywhere they turn. They can hardly make a move without running into a hornet's nest of politics that has to be cleared away before they can get on with the job.

In a year of truce negotiations, they have been harried by skilled Communist politicians. Other politicians, operating inside prisoner-of-war camps, are stirring up a type of trouble no field general ever expected. Even on the side of the allies, political problems have become so important in Korea that the British are sending two top political experts—rather than top generals—to check up on the United States handling of the war.

Now, along with everything else, a political crisis among Koreans is developing in South Korea. Generals Mark Clark and James Van Fleet—on hand to fight a war—have had to take time out to deal with local politics. They are forced to run down reports of a "Communist plot" against the government. They have to worry over a possibility that South Korea might pull out of its own war. It is a strange and bewildering situation for military.

In South Korea, Americans sometimes forget, are about 20,000,000 Korean civilians—all of them touched by war, millions of them homeless and hungry. They live under a government headed by Syngman Rhee, 77, as president. Rhee is the George Washington of Korea, a man who has spent a lifetime striving for Korean independence and who is serving as first president of the new republic.

Trouble has flared, however, between President Rhee and his political opponents who control the parliament or assembly. Rhee suspects a "Communist conspiracy" to throw him out of office. He jailed some assemblymen, put the capital city of Pusan under martial law and threatened to dissolve the assembly. His opponents claim the whole thing is a smoke screen behind which he is plotting a "military dictatorship."

Back of the political crisis is the fact that in Korea the assembly—not the public—elects the President. Rhee was chosen overwhelmingly in 1948. Two years later, however, his opponents won control of the assembly and since then—throughout the war—he has been governing with a parliament against him.

What brings things to a head right now is the fact that a new president is to be elected this month. Rhee and his supporters do not have a chance with the present assembly. But recent local elections showed Rhee has overwhelming popular support. So he is demanding that the President be elected by popular vote. The assembly kills his suggestion every time it comes up.

One thing is clear: The only way Rhee supporters can be absolutely sure of retaining power is to take things into their own hands and ignore the assembly—using the army if necessary to back Rhee up. Just a hint of that was enough to send American officials and generals hurrying to Pusan. Taking Republic of Korea troops out of the battle line to fight a political war at home would seriously weaken the U. N. forces now.

Today's Korean army bears no resemblance to the army that broke in panic under the first attack by Communists from the north. During the last year, United States commanders have put the Koreans through intensive training. Top officers have been schooled in the United States and returned to take command of their own troops—who now outnumber U. N. forces on several segments of the front.

Morale of the Koreans is high, and they are respected by United States veterans of the fighting. GI's who once called the local troops "Gooks" now call them "Rocks"—short for Republic of Korea soldiers and a compliment to their toughness.

While the army is devotedly loyal to President Rhee, its officers are determined to avoid getting tangled in Pusan's political rows. Rhee has promised that the army will not be involved.

Actually, most people are convinced there will be no military change, whatever happens in Pusan. There is no disagreement on war policy between Rhee and most of his critics. John M. Chang, opposing the Rhee faction, is considered to be strongly pro-American. He is a former Premier and former Ambassador to the United States. He not only supports the war against the Communists, but shares Rhee's opposition to any compromise settlement with the North Koreans.

Crisis in Korea appears to be a row over local politics more than anything else. It is clear that the South Koreans are in the war to stay, whatever happens at Pusan. The whole affair is one more example of how political problems—big and small—keep bobbing up to harass the generals who are trying to turn the military end of the strange war in Korea.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I understand the unfinished business is the conference report in connection with the Mutual Security Act of 1952.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. I very much hope that we can complete the consideration of the conference report without any interruption by other matters.

Mr. President, the committee of conference on the Mutual Security Act of 1952 met all day last Tuesday to resolve the differences between the House and Senate versions of that bill. There were a number of differences between the two Houses, all of which were resolved after a careful examination of the issues. Before asking for approval of the conference report, I want to tell the Senate of the more important issues we faced and the way in which they were met.

First. Amounts authorized: The House bill authorized a total appropriation of $6,174,600,000. The Senate bill authorized an appropriation of $6,720,861,500—or $546,261,500 more than was authorized by the House.

The difference between the two Houses was settled by adding $273,130,750 to the House bill and subtracting the identical amount from the Senate bill. Thus the final over-all figure in the bill now before us is $6,447,730,750.

Mr. President, that amount was arrived at by a formula which the conference committee adopted of splitting the difference between the House and Senate bills.

The new total figure is distributed as among the various titles of the bill by dividing equally the difference between the two Houses on each authorization. The final figures for each title appear on page 15 of the conference report.

Second. Limitation of funds for propaganda: It will be recalled that the Senate adopted an amendment offered by the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] preventing the use of funds for general propaganda in the United States in support of the Mutual Security Program and for the payment of the expenses of citizens traveling outside the United States for the purpose of publicizing the program in the United States.

The House conferees accepted this amendment. The conferees recognized, however, that there must be a distinction between the use of funds for propaganda purposes, which is prohibited, and their use for supplying legitimate information of the type normally made public by the executive agencies in the form of press releases, statistics, and so forth.

Mr. President, in my opinion it ought not to be improper to advise the American people as to what is proposed in the Mutual Security Act. The people of the United States ought to be made to understand what our purposes are and to see the necessity of extending mutual-security assistance to Western Europe in order to build up strength against the invasion of Western Europe by totalitarian hordes.

Third. Encouragement to small business: The House accepted the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] which was designed to insure that small business will share equitably in furnishing supplies financed by the Mutual Security Program. There was no difficulty about that; the amendment was agreed to.

Fourth. Reduction in personnel: The House version of the bill provided for a 10-percent reduction in the number of United States citizens employed pursuant to the appropriations authorized by this legislation as of January 1, 1952. The Senate conferees agreed that some reduction of personnel was desirable, but felt that there should not be a sharp reduction in personnel at a time when deliveries of military end items are beginning to arrive in Europe in increasing quantities and when the Technical Cooperation Program is just getting started in some countries.

As a compromise, therefore, we agreed to the House provision reducing personnel in these programs but changed the reduction figure to 5 percent of the number of employees on the payroll as of June 1, 1952. We adopted that date for its effectiveness, rather than a future date, in order to prevent the building up prior to the date of a large number of employees which we did not regard as necessary.

Fifth. Offshore procurement: The House bill provided that not less than $1,000,000,000 should be used to purchase military end items outside the United States for use in the Mutual Security Program. This provision occasioned a great deal of debate among the conferees because on the one hand it was recognized that some offshore procurement would be advantageous to the United States by helping our allies to build up their defense production, by requiring them to use their own strategic materials in the manufacture of military equipment, and by relieving to some extent their dollar shortage. On the other hand, a group of the conferees felt that

such a provision would result in price increases for such purchases and that offshore procurement might have a tendency to discourage some countries from producing military equipment under their own steam. We did not want to have that sort of situation arise.

It was finally agreed to eliminate entirely the statutory requirement that a specific sum be used for offshore procurement but at the time time make it clear in the conference report that existing authority for offshore procurement should be utilized to the greatest extent possible when such purchases would be advantageous to the total program. We made it a matter of advantage to the United States rather than arbitrarily to require the expenditure of $1,000,000,000 in offshore procurement, when the advantages, terms, and conditions might not be advantageous to the United States.

Sixth. Use of counterpart to encourage free enterprise: This refers to the so-called Moody amendment. The junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] offered an amendment providing that not less than $150,000,000 should be used for the acquisition of counterpart funds which in turn would be used to encourage the free enterprise objectives of section 516 of the Mutual Security Act. This amendment was accepted by the House, subject to a reduction in the amount from $150,000,000 to $100,000,000.

Seventh. Use of counterpart for defense purposes: This refers to the so-called Case amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I have noted with interest the fact that the amendment which I offered with respect to the use of counterpart funds was retained in substance by the conference committee. I think the slight change as made is an improvement, because where I expected things otherwise specifically authorized by the act, the conference report makes an exception as to those things otherwise specifically exempted by law, which constitutes an improvement.

I express my appreciation to the chairman for the consideration accorded my amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. I hope he will support the adoption of the conference report, since he has had such an important interest in it and played such an important part in bringing about its adoption.

The junior Senator from South Dakota offered an amendment to make it clear that counterpart funds generated in the future out of funds authorized under this legislation should be used for projects for military assistance or defense support. This proposal was acceptable to the House conferees subject to an amendment to make it clear that in those cases in the law where counterpart funds are specifically authorized for other purposes, the use of those funds could still be continued. Thus, the Case amendment does not interfere with the use of counterpart funds for such purposes as those set forth in the Moody amendment relating to the encouragement of free enterprise, the Fulbright amendment relating to uses for the exchange program, and other amendments relative to the use of counterpart funds for the purchase of strategic materials.

I understand the Senator from South Dakota is entirely satisfied with the action of the conference committee with respect to his amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I am satisfied, as a matter of fact, I think the strategic materials program should be continued. It certainly was not intended to curtail it in any way.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I note in the conference report a provision that some counterpart funds are not to be used for the building of power plants and reclamation projects in Italy, and also in France. Does the amendment mean that no more counterpart funds can be used for projects under way?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not think so.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator believe the provision prevents their use?

Mr. CONNALLY. No, I do not think it does. The Senator is speaking of the completion of those projects.

Mr. WATKINS. I understand some are already under way. There are a large number of projects.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not think the amendment interferes with those projects.

Mr. WATKINS. That is what I desired to ascertain.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. It would seem to me with reference to projects which were not started, that funds have undoubtedly been allotted to them; and it is generally understood that if a project is under way and commitments have been made, the commitments should be carried out. These funds would have been obligated prior to the enactment of the bill.

Mr. WATKINS. I might call attention to the fact, if the Senator will yield further, that I had the Library of Congress prepare a statement on reclamation and power projects which have been undertaken in Europe through the use of counterpart funds. They are generated by our funds and are outright grants under this program.

I believe the estimate came to nearly $2,000,000,000. Obviously, that money has not all been spent yet. What I was trying to determine was if, as a matter of fact, the money can still be used for any of the projects under way. Probably not so much of it will be used for defense.

Mr. CASE. If the chairman of the committee will indulge me a moment——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to admonish Senators that the only proper way to interrupt a Senator in debate is to address the Chair and obtain permission for the interruption.

Mr. WATKINS. I apologize to the Chair.

Mr. CASE. It seems to me that the answer will be found in whether commitments of funds have already been made. If a project has been started and a commitment has been made for the project, it could be completed. But as to starting new projects, they would be forbidden unless the act itself made it possible for projects to be undertaken as a measure of future security for mutual defense assistance.

The purpose of the amendment was to make counterpart funds yield dividends directly for the same purposes for which we are appropriating funds here. It was to prevent the use of counterpart funds for the retirement of the national debt of those countries, and other similar purposes, for which counterpart funds have been used in prior years.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is correct.

Eighth. Use of counterpart for strategic materials: The House bill provided that additional counterpart funds should be made available for United States purchases of strategic materials. The Senate bill had no similar provision. Recognizing the desirability of increasing the sums of counterpart available for this purpose, the conferees agreed to increase from 5 percent to 10 percent the amount of counterpart that can be made available for United States use in the acquisition of strategic materials and for other expenses of the United States Government.

Ninth. The Children's Fund: After resolving differences between the House and Senate bills relative to the amounts to be provided for contributions to the International Children's Emergency Fund, the Senate accepted two House provisos applicable to the contribution of $16,481,000. Those provisos state that United States contributions to the fund—which carry through until December 1953—shall not exceed 33⅓ percent of the contributions from all governments and that the funds are not to be used in duplication of the activities of other United Nations agencies. The conferees were clear that the Children's Fund should not use American funds in duplicating the activities of other agencies, but recognized that the fund to be most effective must closely coordinate its activities with other agencies such as the World Health Organization.

Tenth. Exports to Russia and satellites: This relates to the so-called Kem amendment, with which the Congress has dealt heretofore. The Kem amendment was adopted by the Congress in May 1951 and was superseded after a few months of very indifferent operation and very unsuccessful application. It was superseded on October 26, 1951, when the Battle bill became the law. I hope Senators will listen to the discussion on the Battle Act by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who will address the Senate at a later time. He points out the success attending the operations of that act and the fact that it has been in operation for only a short time and has not yet had an opportunity to demonstrate its full usefulness in operation.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] will also discuss that question. He is well advised on it. He is thoroughly informed, and he has very fine ideas, not alone with respect to that particular matter but with respect to all other matters covered by the conference report.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the distinguished Senator for his kind remarks

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have already yielded, and the Senator from New Jersey has already spoken.

I will say that the Senator from New Jersey richly deserves the slight compliment which the Senator from Texas has seen fit to pay him.

The conferees gave a great deal of attention to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] which would, in effect, completely cut off trade with the Soviet bloc. The House conferees strongly opposed the amendment, which was not in the House bill. It was argued that adoption of the amendment at this time might well result in throwing some of our friends in Western Europe into Communist arms.

Last year both Houses of Congress gave long and careful study to the Kem amendment and decided to replace it with the Battle Act. That act centralized in one person authority and responsibility for seeing that trade with Russia is stopped insofar as that trade may endanger the security of the United States.

The Battle Act has now been in operation for 7 months. Confidential statistics studied by the conferees showed that shipments of primary strategic items decreased from approximately $7,500,000 in 1951 to less than $400,000 in the first 5 months of 1952. That is what the Senator from Missouri ought to want. The shipments are dwindling. They are being cut down. The reduction referred to is a reduction of nearly five-sixths in the shipments of these materials from Western Europe to the Soviet bloc in the few months that the Battle Act has been in effect. Shipments of lesser strategic materials have decreased from about $80,000,000 in 1950 to an average of about $30,000,000 in 1952.

These figures convinced the conferees that we are moving in the right direction and it was agreed to eliminate the Kem amendment in the bill this year.

The conferees felt that we need careful, calculating, cold-blooded guidance in handling the problems of East-West trade. We need some things from the Soviet bloc such as manganese, ball-bearing steel, railroad cars, chemicals, and similar strategic materials. We are getting these things by careful handling of East-West trade. We can get those things which our soldiers need without trading vital materials to the Soviet Union if we use our heads. But we can also do ourselves great damage if we adopt this amendment which might force some of our friends to forego assistance which will build up their forces for our total defense.

Mr. President, in conclusion let me tell the Senate that we labored long and hard on this report. It represents not only the usual give and take that must be part of conferences between the two Houses, but it represents a great deal of hard, painstaking labor by conferees who have spent the past 3 months in almost exclusive study of the Mutual Security Act. If the report is rejected, the bill will be dead. There will be no Mutual Security Act. The Congress and the country do not want that to occur. Mr. President, this measure is of vital importance to our defense and to our security.

Let no one talk to me about the Mutual Aid Act representing gifts or grants to foreign nations. The gifts or so-called grants are in our own interest, to build up the defense of the United States, and the security of the United States. That is why the conferees are supporting the bill. That is why the Senator from Texas is in favor of a measure of that kind. It is in the interest of saving the lives of American soldiers and saving the industry and civilization of the United States, of the nations of Western Europe, and of the free peoples of the world.

I very much hope that the conference report will be adopted.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. During the course of the debates on May 28, 1952, the following question was asked by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]:

> I invite the attention of the chairman of the committee to a provision on page 20, section 408 (e), of the act, in which there is a change in the provision which formerly was in effect. It is covered in the committee report on page 57. I am concerned about the amendment to section 408 (e) of the act, that the provisions of section 409, the 50 percent shipping provision, shall not apply to equipment, materials, and commodities made available under this subsection.
>
> The committee report says that the amendment applies only to such materials as are furnished to a foreign nation without cost to the United States, and with the foreign nation's free funds.
>
> However, the report also says that such materials may be supplied on a reimbursable basis, and I desire to state it as my understanding that through no financial transaction of refunding or reimbursement can the 50 percent shipping provision be circumvented as to such materials made available under the act at the expense of the United States.

The RECORD shows that the chairman was in agreement with the foregoing statement. The question I should like to ask is whether there were any developments in the conference which would in any manner change the views of the distinguished chairman with respect to this matter.

Mr. CONNALLY. None at all. We are in agreement with the statement which the Senator has just read. Only those shipments are exempted which are paid for by foreign governments in their own funds, and without any obligation or commitment on the part of the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I hope the conference report will be adopted. It is signed by every Member of the Senate conferees, and by every member of the conferees on the part of the House. Does the Senate want to turn down the unanimous decision of the conferees? Members of both Houses have been intimately associated with the bill and have studied it, not for a day, not for a week, but for months. We come to the Senate and say, "This is our considered report. This is what we think the Senate ought to do."

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, as has been stated by the senior Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senate conferees on the foreign aid bill, in reaching an agreement with the House, have deleted the amendment previously adopted by the Senate providing that no economic, financial, or military assistance shall be provided to any country which is knowingly permitting the export of arms, military material, or any commodity which is likely to be used in the manufacture of arms or armaments to the Soviet Union or its satellites.

Mr. President, the time has come for a show-down. Either Congress is going to give unlimited support to our men fighting in Korea, or it is not going to give unlimited support to them. We cannot evade the issue. We must stand up and be counted.

THE BATTLE BILL HAS PROVEN INEFFECTIVE

When I offered the amendment to the foreign-aid proposal cutting off American assistance to those of our allies who continue to provide critical material to the forces of world communism (which amendment was adopted in the Senate) my distinguished colleague from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] suggested that we wait and give the Battle Act a chance to work. The same argument has been made by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, we have had ample opportunity to see the Battle Act in action. The Battle Act became a law on October 26, 1951. It has failed miserably to halt this disgraceful trading with the enemy. The Senate has weighed it in the balance. On May 28, last, the Senate found it wanting. The record of the O'Conor subcommittee is full of specific instances of the shipment and transshipment of critical goods in large quantities behind the iron curtain. The plain truth is, Mr. President, the Battle Act, contains loopholes through which a 20-mule team can be driven, and the Reds are being allowed to enjoy the full benefit of the situation.

Mr. President, mere assertion is nugatory.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. This is not a foreign aid bill. It is a mutual security bill.

Mr. KEM. These foreign aid bills have been brought up under various names. We started with UNRRA, then we had the British loan, the Marshall Plan, which was supposed to be the plan to end all plans, ECA, and now we have the same old rigamarole under a different name. These bills are all part of the foreign give-away program.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEM. I think that the Senator from Texas, realist that he is, will agree that this is a foreign-aid bill and that that is an accurate description of it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the reason I called the Senator's attention to the bill that we are discussing is that I did not want him to be mistaken as to what he was talking about. The Kem amendment has been on our doorstep for a long, long time.

Mr. KEM. I know the Senator's views about the Kem amendment quite well.

Mr. CONNALLY. It has been rejected by Congress after it was tried. It was weighed in the balance and it was found wanting.

Now the Senator from Missouri wants to revive it. He wants to bring it out of its tomb, wants to pull off its shroud, and bring it back and make it appear that it is something that has blood in its veins and arteries and breath in its lungs. But it is dead, and it ought to stay dead.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, it is interesting to note that the Senator from Texas is intrigued with nomenclature. I think he attaches more importance to it than does the country. The country is not fooled by fancy titles. The country knows that this is a grant or gift to the countries of Western Europe of a tremendous sum of money. It is a part of a long series of similar gifts. Certainly the Senator from Missouri is not inaccurate when he refers to the bill as a foreign aid bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was merely going to observe that the Kem amendment may be found wanting at the White House, but I do not believe it would be found wanting in the hearts of our people next November.

Mr. KEM. I agree with the Senator from Illinois. His is a very true observation indeed. I should like to say to the Senator from Texas with respect to the Kem amendment being weighed and found wanting, that the Senate has weighed the amendment several times, and the last time it did so, it was not found wanting, in other words, it was adopted by the Senate

According to the conference report on the foreign-aid bill:

> The committee of conference examined figures showing substantial reductions in east-west trade in strategic materials since the Battle Act went into effect and found that substantial progress was being made in eliminating this trade.

Why doesn't the conference report set out those figures. The report contains several extensive tables of figures. Why should these particular figures be suppressed, apparently, they did not want the country to know the facts.

Mr. President, I have examined the figures made available to the Conference Committee by the Administration. I find them incomplete and wholly unconvincing. They are labeled "Confidential—security information," although I fail to see anything particularly enlightening in the presentation. I, too, have compiled some figures and the information I have obtained from official sources is shocking. Apparently the conferees did not have these figures before them.

There is scarcely any material more vital in warfare than rubber. Tanks, guns, trucks and planes all require rubber. During the first 3 months of 1952 Great Britain sold to Russia 43,371 tons of rubber as compared to only 3,200 tons during the first 3 months of 1951.

Mr. President, let us keep the chronology in mind. During the first 3 months of 1951 Great Britain sent to Russia 3,200 tons of rubber. On October 26, 1951, the Battle Act went into effect. During the first 3 months of 1952 Great Britain sent to Russia and her satellites 43,371 tons of rubber.

In April 1952, the last month for which figures are available, Britain sold to Russia 8,179 tons of rubber, as compared with only 861 tons in April 1951.

Again it is worth while to keep in mind the chronology. In April 1951 Great Britain sent to Russia 861 tons of rubber. On October 26, 1951, the Battle Act went into effect. In April 1952 Great Britain sent to Russia 8,179 tons of rubber.

In view of the plain figures which are official figures obtained from the Department of Commerce, how can it be argued that the Battle Act is doing the job? These shipments make it possible for the artillery which fires on our forces in Korea to be equipped with British rubber. Mobile troop carriers used by the Reds to transport troops to the fighting front may likewise move on British rubber.

On August 15, 1951, just a few days before the Battle Act was passed, and while it was pending in the Congress, Sir Hartley Shawcross, president of the British Board of Trade, announced that Britain had reached a new trade agreement with the Kremlin. At that time Sir Hartley left no doubt that the British intend to continue to furnish rubber to Russia and to the satellites.

Mr. President, is there any evidence that this agreement has been canceled? The plain fact is that the British are entering into further and additional trade agreements with Russia and the satellites.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Is it not a fact that during the past few months an international trade conference was held in Moscow, and that since that time all reports have agreed that the businessmen of Europe, and particularly those of Britain, have made trade agreements of their own to send to Russia manufactured and processed materials which could be used to equip an army or other military forces?

Mr. KEM. Of course, the Senator from Nevada is quite correct. Those agreements were mentioned when this question was being debated in the Senate on the last occasion. There was no denial then that such agreements were being entered into, nor is there any denial today.

Mr. President, I challenge the Senator from Texas to deny that those agreements are in effect and that additional and further agreements have recently been entered into between the Government of Great Britain and the Government of Russia.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield further to me?

Mr. KEM. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. MALONE. Is it not a fact that the specific difference between the amendment to the Mutual Security Act, known as the Kem amendment——

Mr. KEM. Let me say that the amendment should have been called the Malone-Byrd-Kem amendment, because it was proposed jointly by the able Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the able Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and myself.

Mr. MALONE. The amendment has been offered so many times that everyone is familiar with its purport.

I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Missouri state the difference between the Kem amendment or the Byrd-Kem-Malone amendment—by whatever name it should be known—and the Battle Act. My understanding is that the Kem amendment expressly forbids such shipments, whereas the Battle Act gives discretion to the Secretary of State or to the President of the United States or to some other executive official to determine what may be shipped to the satellite countries and to Russia.

Mr. KEM. Yes. I shall reach that point a little later in the debate, if the Senator from Nevada will bear with me.

Mr. MALONE. Very well.

Mr. KEM. However, the Senator from Nevada has stated the difference between the Kem amendment and the Battle Act. The Kem amendment is mandatory; the Battle Act is discretionary. The discretion is vested in the President.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator from Missouri intend to give us any figures in regard to the possible trade between our allies and Red China?

Mr. KEM. Yes, I do; I shall present some interesting and challenging figures in that connection.

Mr. WATKINS. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Missouri to the fact that it has been reported on reliable authority that commerce between Red China and even other Communist satellites of Russia is constantly occurring, and that ships from Poland, for instance, loaded with strategic materials, pass between Formosa and the mainland of China in the view of our own fleet and in view of the Nationalist Chinese fleet—fleets which could stop that traffic; and yet the traffic continues day after day, and ship after ship goes into Red China, right through that area.

Mr. KEM. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. As I understand, those ships go between Formosa and the

mainland of China; and we have forbidden the Chinese Nationalist Navy—whatever navy the Nationalist Chinese have; and they have some ships which could be used—to interfere with that particular traffic.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield at that point, I should appreciate it, because a statement which was made a moment ago would seem to warrant an inference which I am sure the Senator would not wish to have made.

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator from Utah is saying that the trade that is going on there moves in the channel between Formosa and the mainland of China, and that if the Nationalist Chinese Navy were in a position to stop it, as they formerly did, they would.

However, when the Senator from Utah referred to traffic between Formosa and the mainland of China, some persons might infer that trade in materials of war was going from Formosa to the mainland of China. I do not believe that is the case. I believe that ships from Poland, Hong Kong, and other places are traversing the Formosa channel, going to Shanghai and other places in Red China. I do not believe that any trade in substantial quantities is moving from the Island of Formosa to the mainland of China.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator from California for calling that point to my attention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. NEELY in the chair]. The Chair asks the indulgence of Senators long enough to permit the Chair to call attention to rule XIX, paragraph 1, which provides in part as follows:

> When a Senator desires to speak, he shall rise and address the Presiding Officer, and shall not proceed until he is recognized.

That rule will be enforced. A dozen speeches have been made today in the time of the Senator who had the floor, and that has occurred in violation of rule XIX. From now on, it will be enforced.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I apologize to the Chair for not abiding strictly by the rule; but, let me say, in explanation, that the procedure referred to by the Chair has become more or less of a custom, and has been indulged in a dozen times this morning in the case of other Senators, and the Chair did not then call attention to the rule. However, I am not objecting on that ground.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Custom cannot justify a flagrant violation of the rule.

Mr. WATKINS. I shall follow the rule.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will yield further to me, I should like to continue the statement I was making.

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I appreciate having the Senator from California clear up the point to which he referred.

In making the statement to the Senator from Missouri, I had intended to state that the traffic was moving up the channel between Formosa and the mainland, and that the Chinese Nationalist Navy—and the Nationalist Chinese do have a navy, although it is not a large one—could interfere completely with that traffic, if permitted to do so; but the United States Navy keeps the Chinese Nationalist Navy from interfering with that traffic. In fact, that traffic is now being protected, in effect, by the United States Navy.

I wonder whether the Senator from Missouri has any additional information in regard to that matter and in regard to the condition which exists in that area.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Utah has called attention to that point. When this question has previously been discussed in the Senate, there has been a tendency on the part of the opponents of this and similar legislative proposals to poohpooh the extent of the trade between Great Britain and China; they have said it is an inconsequential matter, and is merely some grain sifting through cracks in the barn floor.

Recently, in the last few weeks, it was announced that Britain was withdrawing from trade in China, and that the great British trading houses in China were going to be closed. In order to explain the extent to which Britain would suffer as a result of the closing of those houses the facts were disclosed—for the first time, so far as I know; and the enormous extent of that trade was made public.

Mr. President, that trade has been continuing right along since the outbreak of the Korean war. I know of no way of estimating how many American boys have lost their lives or have been wounded for life as a result of having been shot down by military weapons manufactured from goods supplied by our allies. That is the situation before the Senate today. We cannot evade it. We cannot escape it. We must deal with it as a practical matter.

Mr. President, rubber is only one of the many vital items being sold to the Reds at the present time—at this very moment—by the countries of Western Europe. During the first 3 months of 1952, Great Britain sold to Russia $1,541,280 worth of machine tools. We are told that machine tools constitute a bottleneck in our own effort to build our Air Force. Would that some of these machine tools which are being sold by Great Britain to Russia could find their way into the United States. Then we are told that during the first 3 months of 1952 nearly $1,000,000 worth of electrical and other machinery was sold to Russia by Great Britain.

Mr. President, Italy is still sending large quantities of ball and roller bearings to the Soviet bloc. Five hundred and eighty-two thousand dollars worth went to the Reds during the first 2 months of 1952.

Mr. President, I now desire to read in that connection from a report of the O'Conor committee, which technically is a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This is from the second part of the report issued under date of February 18, 1952, about 5 months after the Battle Act became effective.

The report is discussing the information which the subcommittee had been able to obtain as to the effect of the efforts which had been made to prevent important strategic materials from filtering into the countries behind the iron curtain. The report admits that these efforts have not been too successful, but they have obtained valuable and interesting testimony as to the effect, when the pinch is felt. I read:

> Many of the statements concerning shortages, industrial breakdowns, and economic scars have come from individuals who fled from behind the iron curtain. Some of these individuals were directly in positions of responsibility, and speak at first hand of the effect of these shortages. Others, speaking also at first hand, were in physical contact with the situation.

(At this point, Mr. KEM yielded to Mr. MCFARLAND, who proposed a unanimous-consent agreement, and debate ensued, all of which appears at the conclusion of Mr. KEM's remarks.)

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I was quoting from the O'Conor report of February 18, 1952, and reading statements contained in that report based on testimony coming from behind the iron curtain relative to shortages existing there. I read again:

> Many of these statements concerning shortages, industrial breakdowns, and economic scars have come from individuals who fled from behind the iron curtain. Some of these individuals were directly in positions of responsibility, and speak at first hand of the effect of these shortages. Others, speaking also at first hand, were in physical contact with the situation described, as in the case of mechanics describing the difficulties in vehicle maintenance brought about by a shortage of spare parts.
>
> Many of the shortages described are not directly related to the current Soviet armament program, but indicate that there are basic industrial shortages which are being, or eventually will be felt, in the armament program. Notable among the shortages are ball bearings and certain nonferrous metals essential to so many aspects of war production.
>
> The situation has become so grave that in Czechoslovakia attempts have been made to manufacture substitute types of ball bearings from plastics which pulverize in a brief period of use. The few good ball bearings that are available often go into manufactured products shipped to Russia. (It is interesting to note that Russia will not accept machinery if Czech ball bearings are incorporated in it.) Roller bearings also are in short supply and this affects machinery and, particularly, railroad rolling stock.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. KEM. In just a moment. I should like to complete the reading of these items. It will not take very long.

> A former employee of the Kovo Co. ball-bearing division, Prague, reported that as of mid-1951, ball bearings were being imported from France by air mail. According to this source, the illegal shipments of these ball bearings are referred to as "Action B." Ball bearings are alleged to have been obtained not only from France, but also from Switzerland, England, and Finland. The source stated that the best supplier of ball bearings

for Czechoslovakia was a firm located in Italy, which has been engaged in other questionable transactions. (The names of these firms and such details of the transactions as are available have been turned over to the appropriate agencies of the United States Government for action in the event the allegations as to deliveries are found to be correct.)

In one instance the firm MEZ (the Moravian Electrotechnical Works) delivered electric motors for the power plant at Auschwitz. Two weeks later the bearings had burned out and the electrical engineers were summoned from Czechoslovakia for repairs. The Czech bearings had to be removed and Swedish bearings substituted.

Mr. President, that shows that it is not simply an academic question with which we are dealing. The question is whether we are going to supply these essential war materials through our allies to Russia, the satellites, and the Reds in China.

I now yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to a statement made by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that one of the things which our allies have been receiving is ball bearings. How can the Senator reconcile what he has just read with the statement of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. KEM. I cannot reconcile it.

It seems to me, if we are going to discuss the matter intelligently, the figures on which the conferees say they relied ought to be set forth in the RECORD so that Members of the Senate can examine them and the public can know what the figures are.

Mr. WATKINS. What was the source of the information which the Senator just gave us?

Mr. KEM. It was the report of the O'Conor subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce pursuant to Senate Resolution 365 of the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the report give the source of the information?

Mr. KEM. The information which I read was obtained from statements made by individuals who were directly in positions of responsibility and could speak of what has gone on behind the iron curtain. I take it they are individuals who have become refugees and are now in some of the western European countries.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. If the source of our information is correct, would it not be very helpful to the morale of our troops in Korea if the information were given to them that the industrial side of Russia and its satellites is breaking down because they do not have the proper supplies, such as ball bearings and things of that character?

Mr. KEM. I think it would be helpful, and I believe that in fairness our troops should know that our allies in Western Europe are continuing the shipment of essential materials to Russia, her satellites, and Communist China. That is vital information to which they are entitled.

Mr. President, a great metropolitan newspaper has at its masthead the legend "All the news that is fit to print." On the day the so-called Kem amendment was adopted in the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote of 40 to 32, as I recall, that newspaper contained an extensive report on the proceedings in the Senate of that day. The article referred to other amendments which were adopted, but no mention was made of the war-goods amendment. I read that great newspaper frequently, and I have seen no mention of the amendment since. It may be said that the adoption of the amendment came too late to be incorporated into the report, but the fact is that the roll call on final passage of the bill was reported in the article.

Mr. MARTIN. To refresh my own memory, what was the vote on the amendment?

Mr. KEM. As I recall, it was 40 to 32. I will ask the clerk to correct me, if I am wrong.

Mr. MARTIN. And I think it would be well also to have the date appear in the RECORD.

Is it not true that there is much information going out over the Nation at the present time to the effect that we are deficient in air power and other mechanical instruments of warfare in Korea, which is very detrimental to the morale of our troops who are fighting one of the most difficult wars in the history of American warfare?

Mr. KEM. I think that is a fair statement. Those troops are entitled to know the facts. They are entitled to know exactly what Congress is doing to back them up. I believe they are also entitled to know just what Congress is not doing to back them up. If the Senate today declines to send back the conference report with instructions to insist on our amendment, I believe every man in the front line in Korea is entitled to know it.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. As the distinguished Senator from Missouri so well knows, our casualties in Korea are about as heavy as they have been in any other war in which we have been engaged. Furthermore, our men in Korea are so far removed from their homes that anything which could be given them to help boost their morale would certainly be a patriotic thing for America and its allies to do. Does not the Senator agree with that view?

Mr. KEM. Yes; and the statement comes with authority from the Senator from Pennsylvania, who himself is a distinguished soldier and knows what it means to be in battle.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I am past the age for service, but I have been following the work of our men in Korea with not only great personal interest, but with great American interest. Those men face adverse conditions such as few other troops in the history of the world have ever been confronted with. So it seems to me it is the duty of Congress and of the American people to do everything possible to aid our fighting men, particularly from the standpoint of morale. Does not the Senator agree with me?

Mr. KEM. I agree. I am heartened by the fact that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania should have made the statement, because he knows whereof he speaks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk informs the Chair that the vote on May 28, about which the Senator inquired a moment ago, was: yeas 40, nays 32.

Mr. KEM. I thank the distinguished Presiding Officer. My recollection of the vote was that it was 40 to 32.

Mr. President, what we are being asked to do today is to withdraw from the patriotic position we took on May 28, and to accede to the views of the other branch of Congress.

In that connection, I was very much intrigued by the statement of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] that if the Senate takes a firm stand on this matter, the foreign-aid bill will be dead. Mr. President, why should we accede any longer to the views of the House? Why should we not stand up manfully for the position we ourselves have taken. Since when has it become necessary for the Senate to accept, without quibble or question, a view taken by the House on an important public question. Surely the vote of 40 to 32 is entitled to some consideration. I am sure the Senator from Texas was correct when he said the report had been signed by all members of the committee on conference, but I believe he would also verify the fact that during deliberations of the committee on conference two Members of the Senate voted for the position the Senate had taken. So it cannot fairly be said that the report is anything more than a compromise. It cannot fairly be said that it represents the views of all the members of the conference, since in the deliberations of the conference two Senators objected to it.

Mr. President, Western Germany has sent, and is continuing to send, large quantities of iron and steel, including scrap, steel-mill products, castings, and machinery, vehicles, and nonferrous metals, as well, to China and other Soviet bloc countries. In 1951 Western Germany sold to Soviet bloc countries $17,244,000 worth of iron and steel, $16,142,000 worth of machinery, $3,625,000 worth of vehicles, including trucks, and $81,000 worth of nonferrous metals.

During the first 2 months of 1952 Western Germany sold $900,000 worth of iron and steel to Czechoslovakia; $200,000 worth of vehicles to Poland, and $770,000 worth of machinery to Hungary.

One could go on almost indefinitely, citing example after example.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that in 1947, when we were furnishing materials to Great Britain, Great Britain furnished about 36 jet engines to Russia, that Russia has perfected those engines somewhat, and that they are now the engines in the

MIG's that are being used by the North Koreans and the Communists in North Korea against American flyers and American troops?

Mr. KEM. I recall that. I also recall that when the Battle Act was under discussion in the Senate I mentioned in debate that a MIG had recently been shot down in Korea, that its engine had been examined, and it was found to be a Rolls Royce engine of British manufacture.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. Yes; but first I wish to finish my statement.

The British Embassy in Washington immediately issued a denial of the truth of the statement. My authority was Time magazine. I sent the statement of the British Embassy to the editor of Time, and in due course I received a letter saying that Time magazine had investigated the matter carefully, but was not in a position to give the source of its information. However, the editor said that he stood by the statement and had every reason to believe it was correct.

I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Missouri would have no reason to believe, would he, that the engine could not have been one of the original engines furnished under a trade agreement, and by trade between Great Britain and Russia?

Mr. KEM. It could well have been. As was said in debate one day by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who himself is a machine-tool manufacturer, machine tools are the only inanimate objects that have a capacity to reproduce themselves. It could be said of a MIG engine, that it can be used as a model for the production of untold numbers of similar engines.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. On February 21, 1952, I placed in the RECORD a letter sent to me by a firm in Michigan, which had received it from a firm in Holland, indicating that the United States Government was prohibiting the importation of ink into Hong Kong and Communist China, thereby refusing to give a permit to an exporter to ship ink from Detroit, and from Michigan, to Communist China. I agreed with that philosophy, because it is a well-known fact that the Chinese would have used the ink for propaganda purposes and, therefore, it would have come within the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Missouri. But it is not only Great Britain which is trading with the enemy; it is also some of our larger allies. Again, I should like to call the matter to the attention of the Senator from Missouri, and ask him whether ink would not be prohibited under his amendment? The letter to which I referred was from a Dutch firm to a Michigan firm, and reads as follows:

> One of our business friends in Hong Kong informed us that he is much interested in buying your printing inks. However, as the United States authorities are forbidding the direct export to Hong Kong of this article, we shall be pleased to learn from you at your earliest convenience whether you would be willing to forward the goods to us for payment in United States dollars. The Dutch authorities are willing to grant us a transit license for these goods, so that we could ship the inks from here to Hong Kong.

In other words, the Dutch firm would take American dollars and buy the ink from the Michigan firm, and then the Dutch authorities would permit the ink to be sent directly to Hong Kong. From there it could get into Communist China. Is not that the kind of procedure which the distinguished Senator from Missouri has in mind when he wants at least to try to stop trading with the enemy?

Mr. KEM. That is one kind of business I have in mind. The transshipments are just as important as the direct shipments. What seems to be going on, to a large extent, is that strategic war materials are sent to the so-called free ports in Europe, consigned to some consignee in one of those ports, and then they are transshipped to a consignee behind the iron curtain.

Mr. FERGUSON. This letter would indicate that that is the method of doing business.

Mr. KEM. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. American dollars were used to have the goods shipped to a Holland firm, and then they were immediately transshipped, whereas our own authorities and our own business firms—and I think rightly so—would not be able to ship directly. However, they are doing by indirect action what should be stopped. Is not that correct?

Mr. KEM. Exactly. I shall reach this phase of the matter latter. The authorities in this country are doing a pretty good job in enforcing a law which forbids the shipment of strategic war materials from ports in the United States to countries behind the iron curtain. We have imposed that discipline on ourselves. We have carried it out pretty well. At least, my investigation so indicates. The purpose of this amendment is simply to ask that our friends and allies in Western Europe subject themselves to the same discipline which we are imposing on ourselves. Could anything be fairer than that?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I had in mind one further question, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is claimed that the reason we should not strike down this trade between European countries and our allies on the one hand, and the iron-curtain countries and the Communist countries on the other, is that it permits European countries and our allies to build up their business and to obtain certain articles from the iron-curtain countries.

Mr. KEM. That argument was made today by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the ink situation to which I called attention show that they carry on such trade not to build up their own industries and their own economic systems, but simply to carry on trade? They are willing even to take American-made articles, such as the ink to which I referred, pay American dollars for it, and ship it directly into a Communist country. Therefore, to that extent they are not actually building up their own industries. Is not that correct?

Mr. KEM. Exactly.

Mr. FERGUSON. So it cannot be true that all they desire to do is to have some trade to build up their own industries, and that they cannot live without building up such industries. The example which I have cited shows that they are willing to buy American-made goods with American dollars and send them behind the iron curtain.

Mr. KEM. The worst of it is that the countries in Western Europe are in some cases selling to Russia and the satellite countries war materials identical with those which we are giving to our allies. I do not mean that I have any evidence that the same goods have been sold, but there is ample evidence that identical items—for example, ball bearings and machine tools, which are being given by us to the countries of Western Europe—are in turn being sold by those very countries to Russia and her satellites.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

ENGLAND'S JET ENGINES TO RUSSIA

Mr. MALONE. Does the distinguished Senator from Missouri remember that early in March, when the first Marshall plan was before the Senate, the junior Senator from Nevada made the accusation that jet engines had been sold to Russia by Britain, late in 1947 and early in 1948?

Mr. KEM. I remember that the Senator from Nevada advised the Senate to that effect.

Mr. MALONE. Those shipments were violently denied by our then National Defense Secretary, but within a few months the sale was confirmed by press reports, and it was later confirmed in the manner the distinguished Senator from Missouri has outlined, he having traced it through the report by Time magazine—and further by the similarity of the Russian and English planes.

Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

ENGLAND'S TRADE TREATY WITH RUSSIA

Mr. MALONE. Also on March 4 or 5, 1948, the junior Senator from Nevada inserted in the RECORD a trade treaty between England and Russia, including schedules 1 and 2 of equipment for delivery by the United Kingdom to the U. S. S. R.

Without reading all the items in detail, I merely mention steam power turbine stations, 500-kilowatt; 50-kilowatt mobile Diesel-electric generators; scientific and laboratory apparatus; ball mills for copper-ore grinding; ball mills for grinding apatite; railway steam cranes; 154-kilovolt voltage transformers; complete distributing sets (13.8 kilovolts); 100-kilowatt electric motors, and so forth.

There is a long list. That list was taken from only one out of 86 known trade treaties which had been made by the European Marshall-plan countries

with Russia and the iron-curtain countries.

THE BYRD-KEM-MALONE AMENDMENT

I remember that the distinguished Senator from Missouri debated the question before the Senate at that time. Upon those facts was predicated what has since become known as the Kem amendment, originally the Byrd-Kem-Malone amendment, or whatever it may be called.

The distinguished Senator from Missouri and the junior Senator from Washington have continually debated the question as to why nations which were obtaining monetary assistance and industrial machinery free from the taxpayers of America should not conform to the same trade rules and regulations to which American citizens were forced to conform.

BALL BEARINGS-MANGANESE NOT NEEDED FROM RUSSIA

I point out further that while ball bearings have been shipped from Marshall-plan countries to Russia and the iron-curtain countries, the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] mentioned ball bearings as something we must obtain from Russia. Of course nothing could be further from the truth.

Manganese has been built up by the State Department as being one of the things which it is necessary for the United States to obtain from Russia. Again nothing could be further from the truth. We let our own manganese deposits in this country lie dormant. There is more manganese in Brazil and India than all three nations could use in the next 100 years. Yet we utterly ignore Brazil and send 100,000,000 tons of wheat to India with no requirement of the materials which India could easily produce.

TIMBER AND FOODSTUFFS

It is also said that Europe must obtain timber and foodstuffs from Russia. We have available for shipment to Europe plenty of timber and foodstuffs in the United States to more than equal all the purchases made from Russia by Europe. So that argument simply does not hold water. It is just another excuse to furnish Russia the war materials they need to fight us.

I wish to compliment the Senator from Missouri. If he will allow me, I shall again place in the RECORD articles V and VI of a treaty signed by Anthony Eden and V. Molotov in 1942. It could be called a military and mutual-defense pact. Article VI reads as follows:

ENGLAND AND FRANCE HAVE MILITARY AND ECONOMIC PACT WITH RUSSIA

The high contracting parties agree to render one another all possible economic assistance after the war.

Article VII says:

Each high contracting party undertakes not to conclude any alliance and not to take part in any coalition directed against the other high contracting party.

In a treaty made by France in 1944, and signed by Mr. Bidault and Mr. Molotov—Mr. Molotov is very active in these matters—there is to be found a significant provision.

Article V says:

The high contracting parties undertake not to conclude any alliance and not to take part in any coalition directed against either of the high contracting parties.

Article VI says:

The high contracting parties agree to render each other every possible economic assistance after the war, with a view to facilitating and accelerating the reconstruction of both countries, in order to contribute to the cause of world prosperity.

Mr. President, I should like to ask the senior Senator from Missouri if it would not appear that both countries have agreed to do the same thing with the United States under the Atlantic Pact—NATO—and whether it would not appear that they are carrying out to the letter the two treaties to which I have referred?

Mr. KEM. That is my information.

Mr. President, as I understand, when we discussed the subject previously in the Senate the position of the opponents of the amendment now under discussion was that the trade was inconsequential, and that it was not sufficient to justify our taking the drastic action that was proposed. Now I understand them to say, "We admit that there was very considerable trade prior to October 26, 1951, but our position is that the Battle Act has cut it off, and the situation complained of no longer exists."

So, Mr. President, in addressing the Senate today, I am confining my observations to what we know has transpired since October 26, 1951, the date the Battle Act went into effect. In other words, I am accepting the issue laid down by those who are urging the adoption of the conference report and saying that the Battle Act is doing the job. What I am pointing out is the extent of the shipments since that date.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield further?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

ENGLAND SHIPPED MOLYBDENUM TO RUSSIA

Mr. MALONE. The senior Senator from Missouri has made it very clear that that was the argument, namely, that the shipments were inconsequential and that they were very small in tonnage. I am certain that the senior Senator from Missouri will remember that England made a shipment of a shipload of molybdenum to Russia.

Molybdenum in its use is very much like soda in biscuits, in that a very small amount is used in the manufacture of high quality steel.

The shipload of molybdenum was sent by England to Russia.

I ask the senior Senator from Missouri whether he is familiar with the fact that the two treaties to which I invited his attention, made separately with Russia by France and England, have 12 to 14 years yet to run. In other words, the treaties run for 20 years.

Mr. KEM. That is my understanding. It is my understanding that the treaties have never been denounced by either of the contracting parties and that they are now in full force and effect.

Mr. MALONE. That is correct. If the Senator from Missouri will yield further I should like to say that not only have the treaties not been denounced, but it has been denied that they have any bearing on treaties since signed with us by the same nations—England and France—to do the same thing—namely to assist us an an ally.

They are signed up with both sides—it is hard to see how they can lose. I suppose the same will be said with reference to the Bonn agreement which Secretary Acheson has signed recently, and as to which promises were made that American soldiers would stay in Germany as long as necessary.

So that the treaties between Britain and Soviet Russia are not only in full force and effect, with no denial to the contrary, but they are laughed off with the statement that they really have no bearing on our treaties.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator from Nevada for his contribution.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. A few moments age the Senator from Missouri said, so far as trade from the United States was concerned with Russia or any of her satellites, that that condition had improved, and that shipments were not actually being made from this country.

Mr. KEM. That is my information. I made an effort to check on it. I think a very good check is being made.

Mr. WATKINS. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that that was not the case at the time the senior Senator from Missouri proposed his amendment.

Mr. KEM. Oh, no.

Mr. WATKINS. United States business houses were trading with the satellites, sending strategic materials to them. It was only the full force and effect of the Kem amendment, and the fight that was made at that time, that stopped, by reason of the public sentiment that was aroused in the country, the trade between this country and the Communists.

Mr. KEM. I believe that to be correct. A hue and cry arose to the effect that history was repeating itself. People recalled that we had sent great quantities of scrap iron and other materials to Japan just prior to Pearl Harbor, and that we had seen those war materials blasted back to kill and wound our own boys in the Pacific. Such a strong sentiment was generated against that sort of thing that the authorities were compelled to enforce the law. I think that is being done so far as direct shipments from the United States are concerned.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to say in that connection that I think the Senator from Missouri has rendered a distinct service to the United States. Even though the Congress later abandoned the so-called Kem amendment, the work the Senator from Missouri did in bringing the matter to the attention of the country was of great service. If that fight had not been made, we would not have had the Battle Act, which gives

the President, as he sees fit, discretion to permit trade or to forbid it. But action has come about largely by reason of the fight which was made against that traffic. The Senator from Texas is incorrect when he says the Kem amendment has been weighed in the balance and found wanting. It has been of great service, and has largely forced whatever action has been taken.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator from Utah. I was intrigued by the fact that the Senator from Texas referred to the operation of the Kem amendment after its passage by Congress as an indifferent operation. That was a euphonious term. What happened was that the President thought he found a loophole in the Kem amendment—based on language that was inserted in conference, and he suspended the entire operation of the law. He said, "I am not going to put the law into effect, because," he said, "I think there is a loophole in it."

I differ with the President as to the validity of the loophole. That is why the operation of the Kem amendment was indifferent. The operation was indifferent because it was not enforced. Of course, the law could not be blamed for not doing the job when the President flatly, on the advice of the Secretary of State, declined to put it into operation.

The fact of the matter was that the amendment said that the President, on the advice of the National Security Council, would be entitled to make an exception in certain cases if he saw fit to do so. What the President did, on the advice of the National Security Council, was to suspend the operation of the whole law. It was a strange construction of the word "exception" as used in an act of Congress.

To return to the shipments from Western Germany to Russia, and its satellites, I believe I spoke of the shipments which were being made in 1951 of machinery and vehicles, including trucks and nonferrous metals. During the first 2 months of 1952 Germany sold $900,000 worth of iron and steel to Czechoslovakia, $200,000 worth of vehicles to Poland, and $770,000 worth of machinery to Hungary. In other words, those were shipments that were continuing when the Battle Act—this weak and discretionary Battle Act—was in full force and effect.

How can it be said that the Battle Act is doing the job under the circumstances?

I could go on indefinitely in citing example after example of shipments of strategic materials from our allies to the Reds.

The Battle Act has been in effect for more than 7 months, and the shipments continue.

Let me remind those who ask us to wait longer for the Battle Act to become effective, that while we wait, the casualty lists in Korea grow and grow. While we wait, more American husbands, more American fathers, and more American sons go down under Communist fire.

THE O'CONOR COMMITTEE HAS GIVEN US THE FACTS

Mr. President, the American people are indebted to the efforts of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] in helping bring to light the facts about these shipments.

On January 20, 1952, several months after the effective date of the Battle Act the Senator from Maryland revealed that—

> Strategic products urgently needed by Communist forces are still flowing to the iron-curtain countries through European free ports.

An on-the-spot investigation made by the Subcommittee on Export Controls and Policies revealed a decided reluctance on the part of Western European countries to stop this very profitable trade.

Mr. President, why did we appoint a special committee to investigate this life or death matter? Why did we spend the taxpayers' money to carry on the on-the-spot investigation that was made by the committee headed by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. Was it just as an academic investigation, for scientific purposes; or did we make it because we meant either to stop those shipments or to stop our aid to the countries that were making those shipments? I take it that if any Senator who voted for the appropriations for the O'Conor committee had been asked at that time what we were going to do, if it developed that the countries of Western Europe were continuing to make shipments of strategic war materials to Russia and the satellite countries, he would have said, "Why, we intend to cut off our aid, if that is going on."

The O'Conor committee has made its report; it has laid the information on our table; now it is up to us to act. The question is, What are we going to do, now that we have the facts?

Mr. President, this question weighs heavily on the hearts and consciences of our fellow countrymen. This is shown by my mail. As a typical instance, I think the Senate will be interested in a letter which I have received from Mr. William F. Acorn, of CIO, Local 450, International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, Jamaica, N. Y.

Mr. Acorn writes, in part:

> I have noted the closeness of the recent vote on your amendment to H. R. 7005, and cannot understand the opposition to it. Could you send at least one copy of the proposed amendment to me that the political action committee of this local may see for ourselves what was contained within this bill?
>
> We of the CIO are naturally opposed to any American products or aid giving any support or comfort to the Communists, and we will welcome any help that we can find in sincerely combating the menace of communism.

Mr. President, it is too late to take any more chances with the lifeblood of our people. We must act, and act promptly, to save the live of our fighting men—men who, as the Senator from Pennsylvania has so well said, are waging a bitter war against tremendous odds. We must give our men every chance within our power to return home with life and limb intact. We must insist that every measure be taken to prevent the flow of vital goods from the free world to the slave world. We must make it impossible for our allies to continue to collect dollars that are stained with American blood.

THE BATTLE ACT IN OPERATION

At this time, Mr. President, I wish to address myself briefly to the Battle Act in operation.

The Battle Act prohibits the sending of American assistance to a country which permits shipments of arms, ammunition, implements of war, and atomic-energy materials to countries of the Soviet bloc. Very limited quantities, if any, of these items are being sold by Western Europe to the Reds, so far as can be determined from reported export statistics. So far so good.

The Battle Act forbids aid to countries that are sending arms or ammunition or implements of war to Russia and the satellite countries. There was no hesitation about that. Mr. President, if it is considered fair and proper to forbid such shipments; if it is proper to forbid them, why is it not proper to extend the same interdiction to the shipment of strategic war materials, as well?

Mr. President, I have no criticism of this provision of the Battle Act. The rub comes in the case of the shipment of petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. Under the Battle Act, the President may use the so-called escape clause, and may direct the continuance of aid to countries selling such items to the Reds. This is where the difficulty arises. The decision is entirely for the President to make; it is up to him. It is "Papa knows best" legislation at its very worst.

Early this year, the President made use of the escape clause in the Battle Act to permit the Government of the Netherlands to ship some $200,000 worth of oil-drilling equipment to Communist Poland and still be eligible to receive aid from the United States.

It is reported in the press that—

> The President made his decision to ignore the Dutch action on recommendation of W. Averell Harriman, Mutual Security Administrator.

We are also told that—

> This is the first of a series of exceptions that the President is expected to make under his right through the escape clause.

In other words, Mr. President, we learn from the press that the President intends to go right along making exceptions which will permit the shipment to Russia or the satellite countries of strategic materials. It does not take any imagination to see the direct connection between such equipment and the war effort of the Reds. If additional oil wells are brought in in Poland, additional gasoline and Diesel fuel will be available for Korea.

There are further reports that the administration is now considering utilizing the "escape clause" of the battle to permit Italy to sell quantities of highly strategic ball bearings and roller bearings to the Reds.

On March 25, 1952, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] raised the question as to why, since rubber is an item of vital strategic importance, the President has permitted aid to continue to Britain while she is engaged in selling rubber to Russia.

The Senator from Maryland said:

> One important fact in this connection should be kept in mind. That is, that raw rubber would seem to be an item "of primary strategic significance" as laid down in title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, under the heading of "War materials."
>
> However, while title I specifically includes petroleum and transportation materials of strategic value as items that cannot be sent by countries sharing in the financial aid from this country, rubber has not been included in the list. Under what consideration it could have been omitted, when it seems to be so absolutely essential to the movement of all types of mechanized armaments, is difficult to understand.
>
> Members who will recall the discussions on the floor of the Senate last year in the Congress will remember the paragraph in the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 which provides, and I quote:
>
> "It is further declared to be the policy of the United States that no military, economic, or financial assistance shall be supplied to any nation unless it applies an embargo on such shipments to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination."

Then the Senator from Maryland continued:

> It would certainly seem to circumvent the directly expressed purpose of the congressional act if the responsible authorities of our country continue to regard rubber as of so little strategic significance as to neglect now to include it in the prohibited list of items that may not be shipped to our Communist enemies.
>
> Every mother and father, every wife and child whose close relatives are serving in Korea will disagree with any official dictum which would permit continuing shipments of vitally needed rubber to our Communist foes to be used against our own men and their companions in arms from other countries. It is a matter that warrants the thorough interest of every Member of Congress, and demands immediate reconsideration by those who are responsible for designation of strategic materials which may not be shipped to our enemies.

Mr. President, that is not my language; it is the language of the chairman of a responsible committee of the Senate, a committee to which we furnished funds to investigate this matter for us. Are we now to say to him, "We are glad to have that information, but, now that we have it, we do not propose to do anything about it?"

Mr. President, a few days ago I made inquiry of administration officials as to why Britain was being permitted to sell increasingly large quantities of rubber to Russia, and still be eligible to receive aid from the United States. I was informed very graciously that the administration does not consider rubber to be of primary strategic significance. I was further informed that the shipments of thousands of tons of rubber from Britain to Russia are not of material benefit to her armament program. Mr. President, how can that be said? I want to say, here and now, that for my part I thoroughly and heartily disagree with this dictum of the administration. I think that most other Americans will disagree. I believe that most of us will agree with my friend from Maryland that since rubber is essential to the movement of all types of mechanized armaments, it should be treated as an item of primary strategic importance.

THE EAST-WEST TRADE ARGUMENT

Mr. President, we come to the East-West trade argument. We are told that it is necessary that the countries of Western Europe trade with the countries of Eastern Europe. We are told that this is necessary for the economic well-being of our friends and allies in Western Europe.

The argument is usually compressed by saying that East-West trade between the countries of Europe is a "two-way street."

Mr. President, the road to a lonely grave with a white wooden cross is a one-way street. Thousands of American mothers, fathers, wives, and children of our boys in Korea will so testify.

We are told our allies must send war materials to Russia and its satellites in order that they may get from Russia and its satellites useful goods in exchange.

The "two-way street" argument is equally applicable to cooperation between friendly nations. If we give war materials to our friends, we have every right to expect that they will not in turn sell the same items to our common enemy. Let me make this crystal clear: No proponent of the so-called Kem amendment wishes to abolish East-West trade. We do ask that East-West trade in strategic war materials be abolished. All we ask is that our allies apply to themselves the same discipline we apply to ourselves. We have regulations that we are enforcing at every port in the United States. Why is it unfair? Why is it unreasonable? Why is it unjust to ask that the beneficiaries of our aid do something about a shameful situation?

In the event that administration officials consider it necessary and desirable to have exceptions made to the provisions of the mandatory amendment they may come to Congress and request that they be written into the law itself. Our committee can consider them and we can debate them here on the floor.

The argument is sometimes made that enforcement of the Kem amendment would increase the burden of American taxpayers.

I have always tried to cut nondefense spending to the bone. I shall continue to do so. But never have I been willing to urge economies involving the blood of the young men of America. I am concerned about the spending of American money, of course I am, we all are. But not in the same way or to the same extent that we are concerned about the expenditure of American lives.

If it costs us some money to prevent our young men from being killed and maimed by weapons provided in whole or in part by ourselves through our allies, I believe most of us are willing to pay the price.

Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson are concerned with European trade. The Congress—and they have shown that every time this matter has been under consideration here—is concerned with American blood. Mr. Truman says he is not going to present his name again to the people, and Mr. Acheson, so far as we know, has never been elected to a public office. I wonder how Mr. Acheson would fare if he were to decide to present his name to a typical American electorate. Our Government has already placed a ban on the export of strategic war materials from the United States to Russia and her satellites. Congress is asking that our allies in Western Europe exercise the same restraint. If they do not do so, then no further aid should be forthcoming from this country. The President may consider the exchange of British rubber for American blood to be in the security interests of the United States. Surely the representatives of the people in Congress do not. Mr. Acheson may consider this a fair trade. Certainly the American people do not.

The report of the conferees is unacceptable to me. I believe it to be unacceptable to most of my colleagues who supported the war-goods amendment. I believe it will be unacceptable to the American people when they learn the facts. So, Mr. President, I move that the conference report be sent back to the committee of conference and that the conferees be instructed to resume deliberations with the House conferees and to insist that the war-goods amendment be retained in the conference report.

The Senator from Texas has told us that if that be done the bill will be dead. I think it would be interesting, Mr. President, if we worked that out a bit further and explained why we have to accept the views of the House without any question and why we must withdraw from the position taken by the Senate after due consideration by a vote of 40 to 32.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In light of the fact that the House has adopted the conference report, is it possible to send the report back to conference for a further consideration of the matter?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the opinion of the Chair that that action is not now in order. The House has already acted on the report, and it would not now be in order.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. An amendment to the Battle Act, an act which is on the books today, would cover the point so well brought out by the distinguished Senator from Missouri. I may say that after the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has spoken I shall have something to suggest to the Senator. I ask the question now whether it would not be better to offer an amendment to the Battle Act?

Mr. KEM. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from New Jersey that he will address me, but I suggest that he should address the Senate and the American people.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Of course, the Senator realizes that I meant I was going to address the Senate to reply to some of the points the Senator has made and as to how we can approach this matter in a more effective way.

Mr. KEM. I am also interested in the suggestion of my friend, the able Senator from New Jersey, that the Battle Act should be amended, because, as I understand the previous position of the opponents of the Kem amendment has been that the Battle Act was in the nature of an immaculate conception: that there should be no change of any kind or character made in it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As I understand the situation, it is almost necessary to vote down the conference report in order to save the Kem amendment. Unless that is done, the Senator from Missouri, with the fine proposition which he has advanced not only on this occasion, but previously, will be out of court for a year before he can have another chance.

Mr. KEM. I think that is correct; and there is no telling how many American lives will be lost because of strategic war materials being sent to our allies to be further sent to the Russians. Of course, we have to conform to procedure. If the House has acted on the conference report, which I now understand that it has, then our only recourse is to vote down the conference report. So I ask leave to withdraw my motion, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair should add that in the event the conference report is rejected, such a motion would be in order. That would, of course, call for a recognition of the validity of the vote in the House and the appointment of conferees.

Mr. KEM. I appreciate the benefit of the suggestion of the Chair. It seems to me that the question before the Senate is simple. It is whether we are going to give our fighting men the support they so richly deserve, or are we going to forsake them at this decisive point in the conflict in Korea. It cannot be too often said, "Which shall Congress place first—trade and profits, or the safety and welfare of our own Nation?

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

During the delivery of Mr. KEM's speech,

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. For what purpose?

Mr. McFARLAND. In order that I may propound a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate continue the consideration of the conference report on House bill 7005, an act to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes, now under consideration, until it is finished, and that the Senate resume tomorrow the consideration of Senate bill 2594, to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I did not catch the last part of the request.

Mr. McFARLAND. That the Senate resume the consideration of the Defense Production Act of 1950 tomorrow. Some Senators did not want to go ahead with it until tomorrow.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator mean by that that consideration of the Defense Production Act of 1950 will not be resumed today?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct. But in any event we shall continue consideration of the conference report on House bill 7005, an act to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes, until it is finished.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as I understand, the unanimous-consent agreement heretofore entered into would be in operation at 12:01 o'clock today, at which time we would have to resume temporarily the consideration of the Defense Production Act of 1950.

The conference report is a privileged matter, and consideration of it could proceed.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Therefore, why should we not proceed with its consideration in this manner?

Mr. McFARLAND. I was asking unanimous consent that the consideration of the conference report be continued until concluded, but the consideration of the Defense Production Act of 1950 be not resumed before tomorrow.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. CASE. Would we be resuming consideration of the Defense Production Act of 1950 under a unanimous-consent agreement, or was not an order made last week on motion of the majority leader?

Mr. McFARLAND. There was a motion made, which resulted in the order.

The Senator from Michigan has correctly stated the procedure. Certain Senators, who could not very well be here this afternoon, but intended to be here tomorrow wanted to be sure that the consideration of the Defense Production Act would not be resumed before tomorrow. We have no intention of holding a night session.

Mr. CASE. I have no personal interest in the matter, one way or other. I am going to be here, regardless of when the Defense Production measure comes up. But in the event there had been an order of the Senate, on motion, as I thought, and possibly by a yea-and-nay vote, while of course it could be set aside by unanimous consent, I wonder whether there might be some Senators not on the floor now who might be relying on that order, and who perhaps should have been protected by the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, followed by a quorum call.

Mr. FERGUSON. There was a quorum call when this matter came up. The Senator from Nevada was the one who objected when unanimous consent was requested to bring up the conference report. The distinguished Senator from Texas would be able to do that, of course, on the ground of its privileged character.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota is aware of the fact that the conference report is a privileged matter, but whether an order of the Senate may be set aside without notice, I am not so sure. I was present when the other matter came up, when the Senator from Nevada raised his objection. He may be protected, now, but I do not know whether other Senators are protected.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from Nevada was the only one who objected, following a quorum call.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada had made certain arrangements of long standing to be away from the Senate floor a short time tomorrow since the Production Act was to come before the Senate today. But, in view of the decision not to resume consideration of the Defense Production Act of 1950 today, and in view of the fact that the majority leader has said the Senate will continue on the conference report, and that there will be no night session either tonight or tomorrow night, I think it is generally understood or considered that it will take more than tomorrow afternoon to dispose of the Defense Production Act of 1950. The junior Senator from Nevada is merely anxious that he be on the floor of the Senate before the Defense Production Act of 1950 is finally voted upon. With that understanding, I shall offer no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. My reason for not having a night session is that if we desire to expedite the work of the Senate, it is necessary to afford the Appropriations Committee an opportunity to act on and report the appropriation bills. Really, the work on the floor is up with the committee work. So we are trying to slow down a little bit in order to give the Committee on Appropriations an opportunity to get their work out.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, had been elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

The message announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2383) to amend the act entitled "An act to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 17, 1923.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 661) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926.

The message further announced that the House had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 677) to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to establish the relationship of the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VINSON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. DURHAM, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. ARENDS had been appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6133) to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1828. An act to confirm the status of certain civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities under the Armed Forces with respect to laws administered by the Civil Service Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 643. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vivian M. Graham and Herbert H. Graham;

H. R. 646. An act for the relief of Mrs. Inez B. Copp and George T. Copp;

H. R. 1826. An act for the relief of Ellis E. Gabbert; and

H. R. 1842. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ann Morrison.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 9, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1828) to confirm the status of certain civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities under the Armed Forces with respect to laws administered by the Civil Service Commission, and for other purposes.

REVISION OF LAWS RELATING TO IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND NATIONALITY — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, today the managers on the part of the House filed a conference report in the House of Representatives on the bill (H. R. 5678) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes. The report will be taken up in the House in all probability tomorrow. I submit a copy of the report and as soon as the report has been considered and agreed to in the House and messaged over to the Senate, I shall move to take it up in the Senate in its proper order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and will lie on the table.

(For conference report, see House proceedings in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

EFFECT OF INTERNATIONAL MATERIALS CONFERENCE AMENDMENT TO DEFENSE PRODUCTION BILL

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, last Wednesday the Senate adopted an amendment to the Defense Production Act, which, in effect, removes the implementation of the Defense Production Act from decisions of the International Materials Conference, a body which has no legal standing and which has never been authorized by any act of Congress.

Since this action was taken, the press has carried stories emanating from the Defense Production Administration which completely misrepresent the facts by indicating that this country is on the verge of a disaster because of the action taken by the Senate last Wednesday.

An example was the headline in the New York Herald Tribune of Saturday, June 7, which read: "Fowler warns of disaster in DPA change; says clause would cripple mobilization."

Mr. President, I want to say that that is not a fact. I cite Mr. Fleischmann, who was asked in the committee whether the International Materials Conference was necessary for our defense effort, and his reply was:

The mobilization effort will not collapse if we get rid of it.

Mr. President, Mr. Fowler and others in the Defense Production authority are not only violating the law which prohibits money being spent for propaganda purposes, but they are misrepresenting the facts as to what the amendment would accomplish.

Mr. Fleischmann never once said that there would be a disaster or that the mobilization effort would collapse if the IMC—and when I use those initials I mean the International Materials Conference—went out of existence. Mr. Fowler's dire prediction was in conflict with Mr. Fleischmann's testimony. The press carried numerous accounts which would indicate that a few large companies, particularly automobile companies, under the amendment adopted, would be in a position to buy whatever they needed to make an unlimited number of automobiles.

Mr. President, there is nothing further from the truth. When the Defense Production Agency uses the press of America they ought to tell people the actual truth and the actual facts, and not distort the facts and the truth about what the amendment would do. There is not an iota or a scintilla of suggestion in the amendment that it would allow automobile companies to manufacture one more automobile than the Production Authority wanted produced.

Mr. President, when the agency says that if the amendment goes into effect the automobile companies can manufacture all the automobiles they want to manufacture and charge any price they desire for an automobile, that is an absolute untruth.

I say the time has come when we must correct these mistakes and errors.

The circulation of inferences and statements by defense production authorities and bureaucrats in Washington to the effect that under this amendment the automobile manufacturers could manufacture any number of automobiles and sell them at any price they desire is, of course, utter nonsense, as the allowable production of automobiles is determined by DPA ceilings imposed on each company limiting the total number of units which may be produced. The amendment the Senate adopted does nothing whatsoever to alter such unit ceilings or price regulations. I am told by the Industry Advisory Committee that the automobile industry requested permission to build 2,500,000 automobiles in the last 6 months of 1952. The National Production Authority has established quotas of 2,200,000, or 300,000 fewer units than the industry believed the American people needed and were willing to buy. The amendment in no way alters these or any other limits or the authority to establish them.

Under the Defense Production Act the Office of Defense Mobilization has a right to ban production of any article, as well as to set limits on the total number of any end items which may be produced during any period. For example, construction of theaters and amusement parks was prohibited by the Defense Production Act.

Certainly, I have no desire to obstruct the operations of the controlled material plan, insofar as it channels materials into uses which will best support our mobilization effort and civilian economy. However, I am anxious to have maximum freedom of enterprise to obtain materials, which might not otherwise be available, so as to keep the United States economy strong. I do not blame other nations in the world for wanting to keep themselves economically strong, but I ask also that America be allowed to keep herself economically strong.

Charges have been made through the press that the amendment would increase the price of automobiles and other goods containing imported material. I wish to remind the Senate that the amendment specifically gives permission to purchase commodities in the world market and to import them into the United States, but expressly excludes any provision permitting manufacturers to pass on such costs to their purchasers. I wish to underscore and emphasize that statement. It expressly excludes any provision permitting manufacturers to pass on these costs. There is no way in which the price of automobiles or any other commodity could be increased thereby. Any possible price increase in imported materials, such as copper, would not alter the industry position un-

der the earnings standard which guides OPS in its price determination, because the amendment specifically provides for that.

Following Mr. Fowler's news conference last Friday, Mr. William C. Truppner, Chief of the CMP, told reporters that it is the theory of the defense mobilization agencies that if foreign copper could not be allocated to the brass and wire mills, CMP would automatically fall of its own weight.

The fact of the matter is that most of the foreign copper which enters this country comes from Chile and is produced by two American firms, Anaconda and Kennecott. Those firms process most of this copper in their own brass and wire mills, and the mills of their nonintegrated, historic customers, before they sell copper to others. As soon as copper enters a brass or wire mill and is fabricated into a product for resale, it is then subject to all the allocation rules provided by CMP. So most of the imported copper will be channeled through CMP mechanism, as it always has been. Where in this procedure is the national disaster which the bureaucrats threaten so ominously?

This amendment deals only with free copper, which is available in world markets at world prices to nationals of other countries who have been free to buy it. The real problem at the present time lies in the fact that the price policies of OPS make it impossible for independent wire and brass mills to make large purchases of imported material, since they cannot recover their costs in their ceiling prices. To the extent that independent mills are unable to bring in copper, this country's copper consumption in total will fall. This is the problem facing CMP, regardless of the amendment we adopted. Insofar as the amendment makes it possible for anyone to import copper, it increases the amount of copper in the country, it reduces price pressures within the country, and makes it possible for that much more copper to be allocated to small-business users, schools, and hospitals, under the CMP plan.

I know what the Defense Production Administration has done. It has used the full power of its bureaucracy to arouse the small-business men of America into believing that the amendment would destroy them. Mr. President, nothing is further from the truth. Let me read to the Senate a telegram which I received this morning from a small-business man. It was addressed to me, at the Senate Office Building:

JERSEY CITY, N. J., *June 7, 1952.*

Hon. HOMER FERGUSON,
United State Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We are small business and wholeheartedly approve amendment to Defense Production Act proposed by Senator FERGUSON as per Wall Street Journal item of June 7. Present regulations have prevented American economy from competing with Russian economy in acquiring foreign metals. We would rather fail in a free contest than fail under unrealistic strangulating relations. This amendment gives us opportunity to fight our own battles. Fowler's statement legalistic obstructionism. Earnestly solicit your support for amendment.

Not long ago I received in the mail from Michigan, and also over the telephone, information that a small manufacturer of window sashes in Detroit saw an advertisement in the Canadian press that aluminum was for sale. He saw nothing wrong with the fact that there was aluminum for sale in Canada. He needed aluminum to make his product, so he thought he would go to Canada, buy aluminum, and bring it back to the United States and use it.

But, Mr. President, when it was discovered that this manufacturer had gone into the world market in Canada to buy aluminum, what happened? Under the International Materials Conference plan, under the cartel, under the entitlement for consumption, as it is called, he was prosecuted for violation of the Defense Production Act.

Last February the Detroit manufacturers of automobiles were given an allotment of 1,050,000 automobiles, but they were allowed only enough copper to make 900,000 automobiles. They had the capacity to make the allotted number of automobiles, and they could have bought copper in the open market. However, they were told that under the International Materials Conference plan they were not allowed to bring copper into the country. They were not allowed to compete with other countries in the world, including the iron-curtain countries, by buying copper in the open market.

This amendment would allow American manufacturers to go into the open market and buy only the copper which they are permitted to use in this country under the allotment plan. The Detroit automobile manufacturers were given an allotment of 1,050,000 automobiles, but they were allowed to obtain copper for only 900,000, even though the amount of copper which they required could have been obtained in the world market. That is the sort of situation to which we are objecting.

As I have said, the limitation imposed on production would prevent big business from using more than a specified amount of copper. The contention is made that any copper which might be brought in would adversely affect other users. Contrary to that contention, it would, in reality, benefit all users by increasing the total supply available. Instead of the calamity which the bureaucrats threaten, we have here a sound and workable mechanism for giving American enterprise an opportunity to compete in the international markets on equal terms with producers of other countries, and to protect our standard of living.

This privilege could be exercised only after full provision had been made for defense stockpiling and military assistance to foreign nations. That was clearly the intention of the Senate in adopting the amendment.

What actually happened? I prophesied last February that it would happen. When Michigan automobile manufacturers were not allowed to have copper to manufacture the allotted number of automobiles, I said that sooner or later copper would be permitted to come in. However, instead of the automobile manufacturers being allowed to buy copper in the open market, the world market, the copper was taken out of the stockpile, indicating that the bureaucrats would rather sacrifice the defense of America and the free world than to allow Americans to go into the open market and compete with the producers of other countries on even terms. American automobile manufacturers would not have been able to obtain a price increase by reason of such purchases.

If the international cartel is not stopped, it will turn the world into a socialistic economy, in which only nations can buy and sell, and individuals or corporations cannot deal at all. The world is being socialized. If socialization takes place on an international scale, we shall never be able to avoid national socialism in the respective countries.

It does not make any difference to the American people whether the monopoly be that of big business, or of government. In the past history of the world I have never known of anyone who advocated monopoly, whether by corporations or individuals, who did not say to the public, "This is the best for you." But "the best for you" means that a few individuals wish to create a monopoly and place the heel of monopoly on the people.

The same thing happened in Britain. There were no antitrust laws in Britain. The monopolists said to the Government, "Every time we are in a hard spot, allow us to monopolize, to fix prices, and fix quotas. That is the only way in which we can operate."

After prices and quotas are fixed and limitations are established on the amount which can be consumed, and the amount which can be sold to the public, what happens? A monopoly is created, and the people are never able to get rid of the monopoly, whether it be a monopoly of business or of government.

The British people were told that such a system was good for them. It brought on nationalization. Such a policy will bring on nationalization in this country. Therefore, the amendment which we have been discussing is a good one, because it preserves some semblance of free enterprise. Unless the controlled materials plan permits free access to the world market for the commodities which may be used for production under our applicable DPA and NPA orders, Congress will have abdicated its control over the domestic economy to an unauthorized group of representatives of other countries who have established themselves as the arbiters of world distribution of commodities. International socialism will take place unless something is done about it.

A year ago this was seen by the Swiss Review of World Affairs, which published an article entitled "France's Economy Shows the Effect of Rearmament." The article was written by Samuel Wolff, of Paris. The article stated:

The new divisions now in the making will be equipped with arms supplied by the United States for the most part, and expenses like soldiers' pay and maintenance will, up to a percentage, also be covered by an American contribution. In other words, the

French economy is not for the present required to undergo a drastic change from peace to all-out preparedness conditions. In fact, it can continue to devote itself largely to normal civilian production.

That is what took place. That is what is taking place today. That is not true in America, because we are limiting the amount that we can buy in the world market to make civilian goods.

The article continues:

The obstacle which would have to be overcome is not so much a shortage of labor as a shortage of raw materials.

The article further says:

For in this last respect, France is very dependent on foreign sources, and it is due to this fact that the French Government has already begun to urge an international regulation of the distribution of raw materials.

The producers of France, England, and other countries were not prevented by their governments from purchasing in the free markets of the world materials with which to make civilian goods.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

RECIPROCAL TRADE—MARSHALL PLAN—ITO DISTRIBUTION OF UNITED STATES WEALTH

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan a question. Does not the International Materials Conference conform very closely to the description by the State Department of what the originally proposed International Trade Organization was supposed to do?

It was to be the third point in an international distribution-of-wealth program.

The first was free trade, which is currently masquerading under the cognomen of reciprocal trade.

The trade-balance deficits would be made up by the lend-lease going far beyond assisting an ally in the war—UNRRA—$3,750,000,000 to England, the Marshall plan, ECA, point 4, and now mutual security, including the Bretton Woods World Bank and Import and Export banks.

The idea was to make up the trade balance deficits of foreign nations each year in cash until such time as the markets of this country could be divided among the nations of the world to the point that theoretically there would be no trade-balance deficits. These deficits amounted to from $7,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000 annually.

WORLD MARKETS AND PRODUCTION EQUALLY DIVIDED

The International Trade Organization, recommended by the State Department, was to make such division permanent. Under the International Trade Organization the markets and the production of the world would be allocated on the basis of need—this division to be supervised by an international committee approved by Congress through ITO.

The end result of that program would be a complete redistribution of wealth, and the leveling of the living standards of this country with those of other nations of the world, thus removing the last vestige of protection of the standard of living of the workers and investors of this Nation.

STATE DEPARTMENT CONCEDED DEFEAT

The advocates of this program were finally forced to concede that the International Trade Organization plan could not be passed on the floor of the Senate. I think the Senator from Michigan will remember that the junior Senator from Nevada debated the question at considerable length several times each year from the time the plan was first proposed in 1948.

Finally, when they conceded defeat in the Senate Committee on Finance, they said that if the committee brought out an extension of their reciprocal trade agreements for 2 years—we finally cut the time from the proposed extension of the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act to 3 years—they would not bring the International Trade Organization before the committee again, but would handle the matter in another way.

INTERNATIONAL MATERIALS COMMITTEE SAME AS ITO

I ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan if he detects any similarity between the IMC and the formerly proposed ITO. In other words, is not the International Materials Conference trying to do the same thing without the sanction of Congress that was intended to be done by the International Trade Organization which was proposed that the Congress approve.

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe it is going further.

Mr. MALONE. It could not go further.

Mr. FERGUSON. At least it is an attempt on the part of the State Department which for a number of years has been attempting to control all the world's goods, both as to the amount that can be manufactured by an industry, or in a country, and the prices that can be charged or paid for them.

DIVIDE MARKETS AND PRODUCTION

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator from Michigan will further yield, the way they would divide the markets of the world would be under the so-called Reciprocal Trade program, by allowing the Secretary of State, who has had no experience or seeming interest in the industry of this country, to trade any industry to foreign nations through lowering the tariff, in agreements with foreign countries, and then through the proposed International Trade Organization, which has now been superseded by the International Materials Conference, limit raw materials to American industries and to allocate such raw materials to foreign countries, and in that way divide the production, without the sanction of Congress. Is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. Going back to my quotation from the Swiss newspaper, it will be recalled that France was one of the sponsoring nations of the IMC. From the foregoing it is obvious that it was primarily concerned, not with defense, but with its "normal civilian production."

There is no complaint with respect to that. They wanted to produce civilian goods. They wanted to get ahead. The complaint is that America has been ordered to keep up civilian production at the same time that it is asked to help supply the free world with armaments.

An example of how the United States gives but does not get under the IMC is contained in an article in the London Economist last December. The article concludes with this statement:

In the IMC, member countries are in fact put on their honor. They cannot say they wish to cooperate and then do nothing. The organization is so slender that it can work only if member countries want it to work. Finally, the major powers, and in particular the United States, set the example by making the first contribution. Britain's record in this body is unfortunately not untarnished, because the materials like tin and rubber, which the sterling area produces and the United States consumes, were not brought into the orbit of the conference.

That quotation comes from an English newspaper.

The amendment which we adopted is not designed to produce the disaster that Mr. Fowler threatens in our domestic allocations program, and will not do so unless the Administration deliberately attempts to creat chaos in order to confuse the issue. It is designed purely and simply to permit American civilian producers to enjoy equal opportunity with foreign competitors in the markets of the world after all defense needs have been met. Any statement to the contrary does not square with the facts.

Mr. President, I wish to summarize what I have had to say, because I believe it is very important. I shall put it in this language.

Whenever any rule or regulation adopted by our Government has the effect of handicapping American businessmen and hence harms their employees, I shall protest to the best of my ability. The situation which the automobile companies have faced is no different from the one faced by thousands of other businessmen and their employees. After the needs of defense are adequately taken care of all American businessmen are entitled to an even break with foreign economic interests in competing for the free supply of any material. If being on the side of maximum employment in my State and in the United States is wrong, then I am wrong.

The effect of this amendment which I propose and which the Senate adopted is being completely and deliberately misrepresented by its opponents. It was originally proposed by the automobile companies publicly as an amendment to the NPA regulation. Under it, not one single automobile could be made in excess of the total number permitted by the NPA. No company could produce more than its quota as fixed by NPA. All the amendment would do is to say that if NPA sets quotas at say 1,000,000 per quarter but only allocates copper for 900,000 and surplus copper is available in the free world market to any bidder, it could be bought to help build the allowable total. However, the difference between the world price and the domestic price would have to be absorbed by the companies.

The issue is now at least in the open. It is whether the administration is to continue to take tax money from the pockets of American workmen and give it to other nations where it can be used to increase their output of consumer goods, while the production of the same

goods is being curtailed at home without the review and approval of Congress.

Mr. President, I wanted to make my statement today, because we will be voting on the Defense Production Act tomorrow. I think the information I have given is very material because of the fact that the production authority has caused editors and columnists to use such expressions as "Hatchet Men." For instance, I find the Washington Post parroting the remarks of the Production Board in an editorial this morning: "FERGUSON'S hatchet."

The editorial goes on to say:

> The amendment approved by the Senate last week is one of those curious special-interest grabs that utterly ignore the national interest and the interests of the nations allied with us in the rearmament program.

Mr. President, there is no special interest, unless the United States of America and the employess and citizens of the United States of America can be considered a special interest, in their endeavor to be placed on the same plane and in the same position as the subjects and citizens of other free nations of the world, in going into the open market and buying goods produced under the free-enterprise system.

Mr. President, what are we facing these days? Are we in the United States of America to be free? Are we really trying to stop aggression by communism and by totalitarianism? Do we here in the United States of America believe in freedom and liberty? Do we actually believe in the free enterprise system or the individual enterprise system? Are we willing to sacrifice it, as many other peoples in the world have done, when we come to a hard spot in life; or are we willing to solve those problems under our consitutional system? Are we going to surrender it, never to return to free individual enterprise?

Mr. President, that is the test which we in the United States of America face. Here, at least, we should put on the brakes.

We have said to those who would make our Nation totalitarian, insofar as international relations are concerned, "You cannot do that. In America we have a system that benefits all the people of our country, and that system should be defended. Our system is not one of special privilege or special benefit to any particular group or small segment of our society."

Mr. President, I am satisfied that in the end the people of the United States will be grateful to the Congress for carrying out, in its true spirit, this principle, and for refusing to surrender these fundamental rights. After all, once they are surrendered, either in the United States of America or in the world, there will be no return to them.

All of us know that hard cases make poor law. Therefore we should try to overcome these obstacles under the procedures established by the document which outlines the course of our national life, namely, the Constitution of the United States. We should proceed by means of the Constitution, rather than by means of surrendering to bureaucracy and allowing bureaucracy to become the dictators of the policies of America. Under the Constitution, the people of the United States are sovereign, and they determine our policies.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Under the Senate rules, the Chair is required to admonish the occupants of the galleries that no indications of either approval or disapproval are allowed.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I think the distinguished Senator from Michigan is doing a great service to the United States of America by calling attention to the wording and the effect of the State Department or administration policy. The administration first tried to get Congress to approve that policy, but found that that was impossible because the Senate would not approve it.

Now the administration is attempting to sidetrack entirely the Congress. At this time premiums are being paid by our Government for minerals or other materials produced in foreign countries; our Government pays for such materials a premium price, as compared with the price paid to domestic producers of such minerals or materials. Thereafter, through the International Materials Conference, those materials are distributed throughout the world. In other words, we are giving the other nations the money with which to outbid us in the market. We are purchasing this material—for instance, several thousand tons of copper were given by us to France, after we had purchased the copper—and then we are distributing it in accordance with what the International Materials Conference says is the need of the nations.

Therefore, Mr. President, in reality the result is to hold down wages and prices in the United States, in connection with the production of such materials. For instance, in the United States the wages of the workers who produce the materials are perhaps two or three times the wages which are paid in foreign countries to the workers who produce such materials there. However, under the International Materials Conference procedure, the price of the commodity is held to a lower price—for instance, the price of copper is held down to 24½ cents a pound—when, as a matter of fact, it is well known that copper which either has been given by us to these foreign countries or has been sold by us to them at a low price, has been resold by them at a price of from 50 to 60 cents a pound.

So I think the distinguished Senator from Michigan is entirely correct when he says that we must decide, on the basis of principle, how our country will be run in the future. We must decide whether there is to be one economic world—the sort of world to which the State Department has attempted to point the way, by means of the three moves it has made. As a matter of fact, the Secretary of State and his assistants have testified on many occasions that their efforts toward one economic world were dependent on those three moves. The first was free trade; the second was the subsidy; the third was an International Trade Organization to make those policies effective and permanent. However, when the administration failed to obtain the enactment of permanent legislation along that line, the International Materials Conference was created. Its purpose was to accomplish the same thing—in other words, to allocate the raw materials to other countries, so that American industries would be held down, and therefore unemployment would exist in many parts of the United States.

So I ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan whether he is aware that there is now a definite move to transfer the work of the International Materials Conference to the United Nations, where that work would be administered to the benefit of each foreign nation, although our money would be used; and there would be no differential to cover the difference between the wages paid to American workmen and the wages paid to the workmen of other countries; but the United Nations would then take over the work, and simply would distribute the raw materials and other needed commodities to all nations alike, on the basis of need.

Is the Senator from Michigan aware that that move is under way?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am aware of that fact, and I called the attention of the Senate only last Friday to the fact that in the United Nations such a move is under way.

Mr. President, I believe America can best serve the rest of the free world by perfecting the system under which our country has become great and strong—that is to say, the system under which the United States of America is a republic, with a Congress which establishes the policies and has the right to make the laws and to determine the future of the country.

If we are to surrender to bureaucracy, if we are to become totalitarian merely by a surrender to the Executive, then the United States of America we have known, the United States of America which has become great under our constitutional system, will become weaker and weaker. If we in the United States of America surrender our constitutional system, we shall not be giving to the rest of the free world the leadership it deserves. We shall not help the rest of the free world by destroying our American system. If we are to become internationalists in the true sense of the word, we must offer to lead and to demonstrate that our Republic can produce sufficient goods and can defend the other nations of the free world from totalitarianism.

So, we must ask the other peoples of the free world to permit all of us to have an equal chance in the free markets of the world. We must not attempt to go totalitarian in international relations, when we are trying to defend ourselves from that very thing.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. I wonder whether the Senator from Michigan has seen a release issued by Mr. Henry Fowler, Administrator of the National Production Administration—I do not know the date of the release—regarding the so-called Ferguson amendment. I have particularly in mind the last paragraph of the release.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have not seen it, and I shall be glad to have the Senator from Delaware read the paragraph to which he has referred.

Mr. FREAR. That part of the release reads as follows, in referring to the Ferguson amendment:

> The inevitable result of this amendment is a national disaster this July 1 which would produce either chaos in our civilian economy or a stab in the back to our defense program. Who would profit? A few large manufacturers of automobiles who are unwilling to share equitably in the national supply of copper. Who would suffer? Everyone in the domestic economy, or everyone who has a stake in our defense program.

Will the Senator from Michigan comment on that paragraph?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, I shall be glad to do so. I have previously commented on certain remarks regarding it.

Mr. President, my comment on that paragraph of the release is that nothing could be further from the truth. How could the automobile companies benefit, except that if they are given a quota of 1,050,000 automobiles, and if they are able to obtain only sufficient copper to manufacture 900,000 automobiles, they could then go into the open world market and could buy sufficient copper to permit them to manufacture a total of 1,050,000 automobiles. Then they could return to Michigan and could allow the workingmen there to manufacture 1,050,000 automobiles. If there is only enough material for a certain number of cars, say to make 900,000 cars, and the National Production Authority wants to act fairly, they ought to say, "That is all you can make." But they are afraid of the political consequences of such an honest thing; so instead of saying 900,000 cars, they lead the public to believe that the automobile manufacturers can make 1,050,000 cars, and then not allow them sufficient material to make the 1,050,000 cars, and prohibit them from going out into the open markets of the world and obtaining the necessary copper.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. Who would suffer, if the 1,050,000 cars were not made, but, instead, 900,000 cars were made?

Mr. FERGUSON. The working people would be the ones to suffer, whether it be in the automobile industry or in any other industry. The people in Connecticut would suffer. A similar amendment has been offered in the House by a distinguished Representative from the State of Connecticut, where copper and brass goods are manufactured, and where copper and brass are used in the making of many products. The only people who can be harmed are the American people. No special interests would be harmed, unless it be the special interests of the American people.

Mr. FREAR. Does the Senator from Michigan really think that Mr. Fowler knew exactly what he was saying in this last paragraph?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am going to give him the benefit of doubt by assuming that he was misled by someone, and that he did not know what the facts were. He did not understand the amendment, because, had he understood it, he could not honestly have said what he did in that paragraph, for it is absolutely untrue. It is not what would be caused by the amendment at all.

Mr. FREAR. Numerous other questions could be asked, based on this release Mr. Fowler made, but I shall not take the time to ask them.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be very glad to go over them.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan whether in his opinion it would be possible to maintain the controlled-materials plan under the Ferguson amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. There is nothing which would conflict with it. Under the Ferguson amendment, the controlled-materials plan may provide that so much material may be used in the manufacture of automobiles, and that so many cars may be built. If the manufactures were allowed to make the cars, but were not given sufficient material, they could buy the material in the open market of the world—not in this country, but in the open market of the world—in competition with the other free countries of the world.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is true, is it not, to use the example which has been used more frequently than any other, that there is not a sufficient supply of copper in this country to take care of our needs?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe the statistics show that we lack about one-third of the copper required in the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is about the figure.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Ferguson amendment should become effective, then so far as one-third of the copper is required, that would certainly be out from under our control.

Mr. FERGUSON. No, it would not be.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Why would it not be, if it were simply released and everyone was allowed to enter the market and buy it?

Mr. FERGUSON. That could be controlled, so far as units and prices are concerned, because they do not allow, and would not have to allow, an increase in price for any goods for anyone who went into the free market to buy. The Senator is talking about articles in which only a small amount of copper is used, such as in the manufacture of automobiles. The automobile manufacturers could have obtained what they were allotted, had they been able to purchase 3,000 tons in the open market. Fifty thousand people were thrown out of work in Detroit and in the State of Michigan, because they were not allowed to have 3,000 tons of copper when there was more than that in the open market of the world which they could have purchased and brought into the United States, thus allowing the workers to remain at work. Should they not be allowed to get that copper in a free, open market, when the other countries are not being restricted one iota in the matter of going into the open market to buy commodities, particularly copper, with which they wanted to make civilian goods? Why should we alone be restricted?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, I do not suppose I am in a position to answer the Senator's questions, since he is in control of the time.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to have the Senator answer.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There are answers to them. I think the question implies something which does not actually exist; that is, that we would be the only country to be restricted.

Mr. FERGUSON. We were the only one.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We might be in the particular case to which the Senator has just referred. But there are many other things for which we are dependent upon other countries to a much higher degree than in the case of copper. Certainly it seems to me that the underlying philosophy of the Ferguson amendment is faulty in this respect, that it regards the situation as if the United States had complete control of the situation throughout the world with respect to——

Mr. FERGUSON. It does no such thing.

Mr. SPARKMAN. All the different metals and critical and strategic materials, when such is not true. As a matter of fact, there is in this country a great deficiency in a great many of the strategic and critical materials.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not have the floor. We are dependent on other countries for them. What we have tried to do in connection with the International Materials Conference is to try to solve this problem in a spirit of cooperation. It seems to me the defeat of the Ferguson amendment is that it breaks down the idea of cooperative action and proceeds on the assumption that the United States may write its ticket for whatever it wants.

Mr. FERGUSON. It assumes no such thing.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is the way it seems to me.

Mr. FERGUSON. But the United States does object to a world monopoly. I have referred to other countries. For example, Britain objects to putting tin and rubber into this cartel. Why? Because Britain produces tin and rubber. Are we getting a fair deal in the International Materials Conference? Why are not all products included? Because they want to control the commodities they produce. America is willing to cooperate, but is America's free-enterprise system to be told that, even though given

a quota in regard to so many articles, Americans cannot go into the world market to obtain certain raw materials with which to make those products which they have been allotted?

As I said before, if the Defense Production Administration wants to be honest about it, let it say that so many articles may be made, provided the material may be obtained in this country. The people would then know the truth about what is going on, and the people, I am satisfied, would do exactly what is proposed to be done under the Ferguson amendment.

Small business would be benefited by this amendment, not harmed. I have read the story of an American small-business man, who says he is unable to go into the free markets of the world to buy material which Russia is able to buy. For example, when wool was being sold in Australia, Russia was going into the market there, yet we were being restricted in the purchase of wool. Russia had the right to make any purchase of wool she desired. Is that the way we want to treat the American people?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to ask the Senator a further question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder what chance the Senator thinks the little jewelry maker in New England, for instance, would have in the free open market of which he speaks, as contrasted to General Motors, for example. It is easy to stand here and deal in platitudes and generalities about a free, open market; but when we get down to the realities of the situation, we simply know that little business, such as I mentioned—the jewelry maker in Providence, R. I., let us say, or the little instrument maker in Arkansas, or anywhere else—does not have the ghost of a chance in trying to compete in this wonderful, free, open market of which the Senator speaks, in competition with General Motors or Ford or Chrysler or any of the other large users of these products.

I believe the record will bear me out in the statement that it was the Senate Small Business Committee that made the first recommendation to the Office of Defense Production to the effect that it set up a controlled-materials office. That was the very first recommendation the committee ever made, if I recall correctly, and it was done because we saw the pinch was coming, because we heard a great deal about the death sentence against the makers of less essential goods throughout the country, and that literally thousands of fabricators of aluminum products were on the verge of being forced out of business because they could not get aluminum. We asked the Office of Defense Production to set up a controlled-materials plan so that there might be an orderly distribution of whatever was left over after the defense plants had been supplied.

Such a plan was put into effect, and I think it has functioned fairly well. I believe they responded pretty well when the Senator from Michigan protested against the drastic cut-back in automobiles. They responded with reference to pleas of small business concerns. Regardless of what the able Senator from Michigan says—and I have a high regard for him and for his opinion—I simply do not believe that under the Ferguson amendment it will be either practicable or profitable to maintain a controlled-materials plan. The result, I think, is inevitable, that small businesses all over the country will feel the pinch and those who are depending upon these critical materials will be forced out of business.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wholly disagree with the Senator from Alabama. He is of the opinion that bigness is an evil.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; not at all. No; I do not believe it is an evil.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator asked me a question——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; but I do not want the Senator to put words into my mouth or to say things that I do not believe, because I do not subscribe to the idea that bigness is an evil. I think it is something wonderful. The great productive capacity of the United States could not have been brought about if it were not for the wonderful manner in which we have built up big business and little business together. I do not in any degree subscribe to the idea that bigness is evil.

Mr. FERGUSON. Very well. I shall answer the question, then, Mr. President, in the way in which the Senator put it. He wants to know how it is possible for a small manufacturer, who wants some material that a company like General Motors wants, to be able to procure it. He asks how it is going to be possible for a little company to compete with a big company. What he is saying is that the only way they can compete is for Government to control the lives and conduct of these two businesses, and put them on an equal basis. Therefore we are going to have the Government dictate the policy as to what shall be done.

A small-business man in Michigan thought he had the means of getting aluminum, because he saw an advertisement in a newspaper in Canada. He went over the line and bought the material in Canada and brought it back to the United States. When he was prosecuted he found big business was not in as bad shape as he was because he tried to obtain material in the free market.

I have a telegram from a friend in New York saying that a firm in which he is interested needs a thousand tons of copper. Everyone knows that in America there are jobbers, wholesalers, and so forth, and that the small-business man can go out into the world and buy from the big man unless Government throttles by its control the lives of business people. Who is to be throttled first—the big-business man or the little-business man? Which will die first in case of control? Of course it will be the little-business man.

Ever since I have been in Congress I have heard about the lip service which is given to the small-business man. Every time we put on a control or a regulation, the man who feels it the most is the small-business man, the person who cannot afford to combat the evils of controls, regulations, and so forth.

That is what has happened in America. If small business is to survive we must help small business.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I think the Senator from Michigan is rendering great service to the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. The whole principle of free trade as enunciated and carried out under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is to lower the differential established by the Tariff Commission between the standard of living here and abroad. The primary purpose was to maintain the differential, and that has been the policy of this country for the past 75 years, until this administration came into office.

We hear talk about protecting new business and we are told that that is not necessary now and that the workers are the ones who need protection. They receive $10 to $15 a day against $2.50 paid to labor in other nations. So it is necessary to have short amortization periods in connection with enlarging assets.

A guaranteed unit price is applied to copper, lead, zinc, and other materials which must be mined and processed, so that the taxpayer of America who is putting his money into this business, instead of the private people in America, is protected.

As the distinguished Senator from Michigan has pointed out, we are not only controlling materials in this country to the point of causing unemployment, but we are also continually furnishing money to foreign countries to the extent of between seven and ten billion dollars a year to enable them to outbid us in the market.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. Foreign countries usually buy materials at low prices and resell them at very high prices.

Mr. President, we are also protecting the system that makes possible the very thing the distinguished Senator was pointing out, and ruins us in whole materials control program. There is no tin or rubber control, and foreign production is controlled largely by England. But who guarantees the integrity of the colonial system? The United States of America, through the great Atlantic Pact, so that wherever Great Britain is in trouble, we are in trouble. Thus we are protecting the British colonial system in Africa, where much manganese is located; we are protecting it in the Far East, where rubber and tin are located.

I wish to point out again that none of these things can be considered alone. This is a control program. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan if he agrees with me that we must take all these bureaucratic controls into consideration in order to arrive at an answer.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. It is necessary to consider the whole plan which is being put into effect.

Mr. MALONE. In other words, the international materials program is merely one factor.

Mr. FERGUSON. One phase.

Mr. MALONE. The furnishing of money to foreign nations, to enable them to outbid us in the foreign market, is another factor.

Mr. FERGUSON. I tried to cure that in the act we are now debating, by not allowing foreign countries to go out and compete with our money.

Mr. MALONE. A prominent Nevada engineer wrote me from Reno, quoting another engineer, as follows:

> A prominent and well-known engineer here this summer and now in the Orient had just returned from Europe and said that when he was in Belgium and Holland, he was informed that the United States was selling copper to the governments of those countries for 24½ cents a pound and the governments in turn were selling to their people 50 cents a pound up, putting the profit in their pockets.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is true that copper was being sold in this market at low prices, some of it being taken out of the country and sold for more money.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, all those things go on under our noses, and when there is taken up on the floor of the Senate a great plan to create a new bureau to regulate something, we consider it as an isolated instance. We do not consider all the other factors of which it is merely a part.

In the beginning, as the Secretary of State has said, and during the 4 or 5 years that I have served on the Senate floor, there was the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934, which made it possible to control and depress tariffs below the differential of cost, made up principally of the difference between the wage standard of living here and abroad. That was the first point. The second was the making up of the trade balance deficits, by whatever name the program was called, whether UNRRA, the loan to England, the Marshall plan, ECA, or some other designation. The designation is unimportant. The program called for the amount of money necessary to make up trade balance deficits, until, through free trade, the markets of this country could be divided, so that every nation would live alike—in other words, averaging the living standards of the nations of the world.

Then there was the International Trade Organization, which I would not like the Senate to forget was pressed for 4 years, until finally we were able, on the Senate floor, to convince its proponents that there was no chance to get it through. The International Materials Conference simply takes the place of the International Trade Organization, and is being pressed to do exactly the same thing, without the sanction of Congress, for which the sanction of Congress was formerly asked; namely, to control the division of markets and the division of production among nations of the world, on the basis of need, and to level all wages and living standards simply by controlling raw materials, and to allocate raw materials to the nations, as it was claimed, on the basis of need. Under the International Trade Organization, production could have been directly allocated. Under the International Materials Conference production is controlled by withholding the raw materials that are needed.

So those three things are leading us into the chute, and it should now be plain to the people of the United States that we are headed for one economic world, one political world, and a federation of nations, each with one vote, or each with two Senators, or perhaps one Representative, in accordance with population, so that they can vote taxes upon the American people without the present slight embarrassment of having to come to Congress.

Again, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan if all the long-range plans of the administration do not lead to one thing, namely, the leveling and division of production of the countries of the world, and a division of markets among countries of the world, on a basis of need, as it is said, which would mean on an even basis. Is not that what the plans would lead to?

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe those who advocate one world—one economic, political, and social world—and there are those who claim honestly that they believe in it—will lead exactly to what the Senator describes.

Mr. MALONE. The rest of them are unwittingly following.

Mr. FERGUSON. Well, they are unthinkingly following.

Mr. MALONE. Unwittingly following.

Mr. KEM. May I ask the Senator from Michigan if some countries which are important producers of raw materials are withholding their production from the International Materials Conference?

Mr. FERGUSON. For some time Chile has been withholding her copper production from that organization. She has never placed her entire production in it, but always reserved 20 percent, or a certain amount, and sold that in a free, open market, which included even iron-curtain countries.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

GOLD HOLDINGS OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The Chair, in his capacity as senior Senator from California, asks unanimous consent to have placed in the body of the RECORD a letter which he addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury under date of April 14, 1952, raising certain questions relative to the gold holdings of the United States and purchases at home and abroad, together with a copy of the reply thereto, under date of June 5, from the Secretary of the Treasury, enclosing a compilation in answer to questions submitted by the Senator from California.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 14, 1952.

Hon. JOHN W. SNYDER,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I would appreciate it very much if you would supply me with information concerning the purchase and sale of gold by the United States Government for each year from January 1, 1933, through December 31, 1951.

1. I would like this broken down as to purchase of gold from newly mined sources in the United States and from new production, if any, from other countries of the world.

2. Purchases and sales from and to other governments.

3. Sales during that period of time to industrial establishments for manufacturing purposes.

4. The amount of gold turned in each year by United States citizens and/or other residents including gold coin and/or gold bullion other than newly mined as indicated in paragraph 1 above.

5. Whether or not the Treasury has paid in any case more than $35 per ounce for any of the gold mentioned above, or has sold any gold at a higher price.

6. What information does this Government have as to the price of gold on the foreign market in Europe and Asia for each of the years requested? This information to include the quoted price per ounce (high and low for the year) in American dollars.

7. Does this Government have any information relative to the sales of gold by foreign countries at a price higher than $35 an ounce and, if so, are such sales still being made?

8. Under what conditions sales of gold are made by the Treasury to foreign governments and what agreements or understandings exist relative to the resale of such gold stocks and the reporting of such transactions to the Treasury? Is it possible for a foreign government to purchase gold at $35 an ounce from this Government and have such gold stocks held by the Treasury or the Federal Reserve bank and then have them to dispose of an equivalent or lesser amount on the free market at the prevailing world price?

I would appreciate it very much if this information could be furnished me at your earliest convenience.

With best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, June 6, 1952.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is in further reply to your letter of April 14, 1952, asking for a number of tabulations of information regarding gold.

As the enclosed material will indicate, an extensive effort has been made to compile as complete answers as possible from Treasury records now available in Washington.

To your question No. 5, asking whether or not the Treasury has paid in any case more than $35 per ounce for any gold, or has sold any gold at a higher price, the answer is, first, that the Treasury has not paid more than $35 per ounce for any gold, and, secondly, the Treasury has not sold any gold at prices higher than $35 per fine ounce plus one-quarter of 1 percent where payment was made in dollars.

Gold was sold during World War II to a total of 2,485,200 ounces of fine gold (worth $86,982,000 at $35 per fine troy ounce) in India, Iran, and Egypt, at open market prices and for local currencies in order to obtain such currencies for United States military expenditures there. These operations were conducted jointly with the Bank of England, with that bank acting as agent. In addition, some of the gold sold in the United Kingdom and France during the years 1934–39 against payment in pounds sterling and francs, may have been at prices which, when calculated at the exchange rates then prevailing, were a few cents above $35 per fine ounce.

In case the enclosed material does not fully meet the purposes of your inquiry, please do not hesitate to call upon us further.

Sincerely,

A. N. OVERBY,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

MATERIAL IN REPLY TO QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR KNOWLAND

The questions in Senator KNOWLAND's letter and an explanation of the material submitted herewith in reply to each are as follows:

General question. Information concerning the purchase and sale of gold by the United States Government for each year from January 1, 1933, through December 31, 1951.

Question 1. I would like this broken down as to purchase of gold from newly mined sources in the United States and from new production, if any, from other countries of the world.

Answer. Treasury receipts of newly mined domestic gold by fiscal years, 1940–51, totaled 26,700,000 ounces, with a monetary value, at $35 per fine ounce, of $936,700,000, as follows:

	Treasury receipts of newly mined domestic gold
Fiscal year—	
1940	$207,239,480
1941	197,963,110
1942	173,319,895
1943	66,675,000
1944	17,182,620
1945	10,626,070
1946	23,398,065
1947	44,807,560
1948	47,428,885
1949	46,264,610
1950	50,399,375
1951	51,469,320

The above figures were obtained, beginning with the fiscal year 1940, by adopting special reporting procedures to identify newly mined domestic gold from other domestic gold received by the Treasury from smelters and refiners. However, the Treasury's net domestic receipts—combining receipts of newly mined domestic gold, scrap, other secondary gold, United States coin, etc., less sales to domestic industry—are available yearly, 1934–51, as presented in table I under question 2. No breakdown is available of receipts by the Treasury separating newly mined foreign gold from other foreign gold.

Question 2. Purchases and sales from and to other governments.

Answer. In table I below the columns headed "Foreign—United States purchases—United States sales" give the Treasury's purchases of gold from foreigners and sales of gold to foreigners, by calendar years 1934–51. For the years through 1944 the figures on purchases of foreign gold, it should be noted, include both receipts from foreign governments and receipts from foreign private holders, whether mines, refiners, or others. The data on sales include some sales made to nongovernmental buyers in the gold markets of the United Kingdom and France in the years 1934–39.

From January 1, 1933, to January 31, 1934 (the date of the revaluation), the gold holdings of the Treasury and Federal Reserve banks changed by only $11,000,000, downwards, valued at $20.67 per fine ounce.

TABLE I.—*U. S. Treasury gold transactions, 1934–51*

[In millions of dollars at $35 per ounce]

Calendar year—	Total gold stock (end of year)[1]	Foreign		Other transactions and accounting adjustments[2]	Domestic net receipts[3]	Increase in gold stock
		United States purchases	United States sales			
1934	8,239	1,147	24	.....	[4] 118	[5] 1,241
1935	10,124	1,854	125	.....	[4] 136	1,865
1936	11,423	1,150	14	.....	[4] 163	1,299
1937	12,790	1,601	427	.....	193	1,367
1938	14,592	1,752	140	.....	189	1,802
1939	17,800	3,267	263	.....	205	3,208
1940	22,042	4,156	144	.....	231	4,242
1941	22,761	986	463	.....	196	719
1942	22,739	346	486	.....	117	−23
1943	21,980	32	795	.....	5	−758
1944	20,631	50	1,373	.....	−26	−1,349
1945	20,083	396	857	−21	−66	−548
1946	20,706	901	180	−11	−87	623
1947	22,868	2,982	98	[6] −715	12	2,162
1948	24,308	1,602	182	24	−3	1,530
1949	24,563	754	541	12	−40	165
1950	22,819	72	1,797	14	−32	−1,743
1951	22,873	1,250	1,175	3	−26	53
Total..	.....	24,348	9,084	−694	1,285	15,855

[1] Includes gold in the exchange stabilization fund.
[2] Not separated from foreign transactions prior to 1945.
[3] Receipts of newly mined domestic gold, domestic coin, secondary gold, etc., less sales to domestic industry.
[4] Increase in gold stock during 1934 is measured from Feb. 1, following revaluation on Jan. 31; i. e., transactions in January 1934 which were at various prices below $35, are excluded from all columns of this table.
[5] Estimated.
[6] Includes $687.5 million transferred to the International Monetary Fund as United States subscription payment.

Question 3. Sales during that period of time to industrial establishments for manufacturing purposes.

Answer. Treasury sales of gold for industrial, professional, and artistic uses were as shown below. In addition, however, licensed buyers could and did buy gold for licensed industrial use directly from licensed holders (including refiners and dealers).

TABLE II.—*Treasury sales of gold for industrial, professional, and artistic uses at $35 per ounce*

Fiscal year:	
1933	[1]
1934	[1]
1935	[1]
1936	$568,728.40
1937	677,299.22
1938	313,368.15
1939	244,604.29
1940	335,665.41
1941	307,134.36
1942	1,871,068.75
1943	16,601,298.68
1944	24,977,240.48
1945	65,290,843.72
1946	113,097,557.25
1947	66,113,172.65
1948	50,371,331.98
1949	44,010,560.86
1950	82,724,085.89
1951	86,345,449.53
Total, 1936–51	553,849,409.62

[1] Breakdown not available.

Question 4. The amount of gold turned in each year by United States citizens and/or other residents including gold coin and/or gold bullion other than newly mined as indicated in paragraph 1 above.

Answer. Table III below shows the value of gold received by the Treasury for which settlement was made at $20.67 per fine ounce during each fiscal year, 1934–51. Gold turned in in response to the Executive orders of April 5 and August 28, 1933, and the order of the Secretary of the Treasury of December 28, 1933, as amended and supplemented, was purchased at the price of $20.67 per fine ounce. The figure for 1934 includes gold of the banking system transferred in accordance with the provisions of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 which was also purchased at the $20.67 price. This table is the nearest approximation to an answer to question 4 which is readily available from tabulations maintained by the Treasury Department.

TABLE III.—*Treasury receipts of gold coin and bullion*

Fiscal year:	*Treasury receipts at $20.67 per ounce*
1934	$2,401,958,131
1935	111,091
1936	24,566
1937	239,551
1938	25,075
1939	8,309
1940	81,818
1941	164,466
1942	8,716
1943	2,553
1944	10,763
1945	8,242
1946	3,195
1947	2,775
1948	4,828
1949	11,330
1950	2,434
1951	1,623

Question 5. Whether or not the Treasury has paid in any case more than $35 per ounce for any of the gold mentioned above, or has sold any gold at a higher price.

Answer. This question is answered in the negative in the accompanying letter.

Question 6. What information does this Government have as to the price of gold on the foreign market in Europe and Asia for each of the years requested? This information to include the quoted price per ounce (high and low for the year) in American dollars.

Answer. The official buying prices for gold in foreign countries are in terms of foreign currencies and have been virtually without exception very close to the equivalent, at the prevailing official exchange rate, of $35 per fine ounce. There have also been many unofficial private markets for gold in Europe and Asia. Broadly it may be stated that up to the outbreak of World War II, the price of gold in unrestricted markets, which generally prevailed in most foreign countries, was very close to the $35 per ounce buying price of the United States Treasury at the then-prevailing exchange rates. While more substantial premiums were obtained in unofficial markets during various periods since the beginning of the war, the price has currently dropped to a range between $37 and $38 per ounce in terms of dollars in certain primary markets. Quotations of prices for gold in such markets are not derived from official sources and the Treasury has no way of determining the amount of gold sold at the prices reported. Of even more doubtful reliability are the prices quoted for various intermediate markets throughout the world in which the gold is subsequently resold one or more times for various currencies. Many of such sales are made in terms of local currencies in situations involving complex exchange controls, overvalued official exchange rates, costs of transportation and insurance from sources, expenses of smuggling into illegal markets, and so forth. Consequently, it is virtually impossible in most cases to convert the price received in local

currency into a dollar price which would have any significance.

Question 7. Does this government have any information relative to the sales of gold by foreign countries at a price higher than $35 an ounce and, if so, are such sales still being made?

Answer. According to information received by the Treasury, most foreign governments have refrained from selling gold at prices in excess of $35 per ounce and most exceptions have been domestic sales for local currencies. The largest indicated volume of such sales was by the Nationalist Government of China from 1942 to 1949, for Chinese currency.

For some time the Bank of Mexico has maintained a standing offer to sell Mexican gold coins for pesos at a price which has exceeded $35 an ounce at the current exchange rate. In 1947 and before, the Swiss National Bank also sold gold to Swiss buyers for Swiss francs slightly in excess of $35. The Bank of France, it has been reported, has done a relatively small volume of trading in gold on the Paris market, usually by selling French gold coins (for francs) and buying gold bars. The Bank of Greece has sold as well as bought gold coin of foreign mintage in Greece, for drachmas. Saudi Arabia has for many years used the British gold sovereign as one of its national moneys, and in recent years sovereigns have sold there at prices above the equivalent of $35 per ounce. However, many of the sovereigns which the Government formerly received were disbursed in ways that would more accurately be described as paying out sovereigns as local money rather than selling them at a profit. Such receipts, furthermore, have ceased. In recent years, also, a portion of the newly minted gold of a number of countries has been sold in unofficial, private markets abroad.

Question 8. Under what conditions sales of gold are made by the Treasury to foreign governments and what agreements or understandings exist relative to the resale of such gold stocks and the reporting of such transaction to the Treasury. Is it possible for a foreign government to purchase gold at $35 an ounce from this Government and have such gold stocks held by the Treasury or the Federal Reserve Bank and then have them to dispose of an equivalent or lesser amount on the free market at the prevailing world price?

Answer. The Treasury does not impose upon foreign governments conditions relating to sales of gold, although it does endeavor to make sure that the proposed foreign purchases of gold from the United States are either for legitimate monetary purposes or for bona fide use in industry. While the possibility raised in the second sentence of this question exists, the fact that the total gold holdings of governments, central banks, and international financial institutions increase each year, indicates that gold is being added to official reserves rather than diverted from them on a net basis. Furthermore, the diversion to the free market of gold bought from (or replaced by gold bought from) the United States Treasury is believed to have been of very minor proportions, with the exception of some of the countries mentioned in the answer to question 7 above. In all these countries the gold sold by the local authorities was intended, at least in the first instance, for domestic holding rather than export, although various proportions were later exported.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7005) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey obtained the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is my purpose to make some comments on the conference report in connection with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

At the beginning of my remarks I ask unanimous consent that two insertions be made. First I should like to have the text of the so-called Kem amendment, which was approved by the Senate on Wednesday, May 28, by a vote of 40 to 32, printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. The Kem amendment is the subject of the present debate. It went to conference, and in conference it was stricken by the conference committee.

The distinguished Senator from Missouri has asked that the conference report be rejected because the Kem amendment was not included in it. He first asked that the conference report be recommitted to the conferees with instructions, but it was discovered that, from a parliamentary standpoint, this could not be done, inasmuch as the House had already agreed to the conference report. Therefore the only course which can be taken by the Senate is to vote the conference report either up or down.

In addition to printing the full text of the Kem amendment in the RECORD at this point, I ask unanimous consent that there be published the full text of the so-called Battle Act, which is known as the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as it was passed by the Eighty-second Congress and approved on October 26, 1951.

I wish to emphasize the date, because it is important in connection with the present debate. Shortly after the act was approved the organization set up under the act began operations, and we have now had a period of 6 or 7 months, all told, to determine the effect of the operation. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two insertions be made in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the text of the Kem amendment and the text of the Battle Act were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEM AMENDMENT

SEC. 13. (a) No economic, financial, or military assistance shall be provided out of any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated to carry out the purposes of any act to provide economic, financial, or military assistance to foreign countries, to any country which exports or knowingly permits the exportation of, to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including Communist China and Communist North Korea), arms, armament, or military matériel, or articles or commodities (1) which the Secretary of Defense shall have certified to the head of the agency administering the program under which such assistance is extended are likely to be used in the manufacture of arms, armament, or military matériel, or (2) shipment of which to the Soviet bloc is embargoed, or would be refused export licenses, by the United States in the interest of national security; and the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized and directed to make such certification with respect to any article or commodity of the nature or class described.

(b) After the forty-fifth day following the date of enactment of this act no country shall be eligible for economic, financial, or military assistance under any act providing economic, financial, or military assistance to foreign countries unless within 30 days prior to the date on which such assistance is to be provided such country shall have certified to the United States that it has not, subsequent to the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this act, exported, or knowingly permitted the exportation of, arms, armament, military matériel, articles, or commodities, which are subject to the provisions of subsection (a) to any of the countries referred to in such provisions: *Provided*, That such certification shall not relieve the Director for Mutual Security or any other officer of the United States Government of responsibility for enforcing the foregoing provisions of this section.

(c) The Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 is repealed effective on the forty-fifth day following the date of enactment of this act.

[Public Law 213, 82d Cong., 1st sess.]

H. R. 4550

An act to provide for the control by the United States and cooperating foreign nations of exports to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951."

TITLE I—WAR MATERIALS

SEC. 101. The Congress of the United States, recognizing that in a world threatened by aggression the United States can best preserve and maintain peace by developing maximum national strength and by utilizing all of its resources in cooperation with other free nations, hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to apply an embargo on the shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, in order to (1) increase the national strength of the United States and of the cooperating nations; (2) impede the ability of nations threatening the security of the United States to conduct military operations; and (3) to assist the people of the nations under the domination of foreign aggressors to reestablish their freedom.

It is further declared to be the policy of the United States that no military, economic, or financial assistance shall be supplied to any nation unless it applies an embargo on such shipments to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination.

This act shall be administered in such a way as to bring about the fullest support for any resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations, supported by the United States, to prevent the shipment of certain commodities to areas under the control of governments engaged in hostilities in defiance of the United Nations.

SEC. 102. Responsibility for giving effect to the purposes of this act shall be vested in the person occupying the senior position authorized by subsection (e) of section 406 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, or in any person who may hereafter be charged with principal responsibility for the administration of the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949. Such person is hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator."

SEC. 103. (a) The Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to determine within 30 days after enactment of this act after full and complete consideration of the views of the Departments of State, Defense, and Commerce; the Economic Cooperation Administration; and any other appropriate agencies, and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, which items are, for the purpose of this act, arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and those items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war which should be embargoed to effectuate the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That such determinations shall be continuously adjusted to current conditions on the basis of investigation and consultation, and that all nations receiving United States military, economic, or financial assistance shall be kept informed of such determinations.

(b) All military, economic, or financial assistance to any nation shall, upon the recommendation of the Administrator, be terminated forthwith if such nation after 60 days from the date of a determination under section 103 (a) knowingly permits the shipment to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, of any item which he has determined under section 103 (a) after a full and complete investigation to be included in any of the following categories: Arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war: *Provided*, That the President after receiving the advice of the Administrator and after taking into account the contribution of such country to the mutual security of the free world, the importance of such assistance to the security of the United States, the strategic importance of imports received from countries of the Soviet bloc, and the adequacy of such country's controls over the export to the Soviet bloc of items of strategic importance, may direct the continuance of such assistance to a country which permits shipments of items other than arms, ammunition, implements of war, and atomic energy materials when unusual circumstances indicate that the cessation of aid would clearly be detrimental to the security of the United States: *Provided further*, That the President shall immediately report any determination made pursuant to the first proviso of this section with reasons therefor to the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the President shall at least once each quarter review all determinations made previously and shall report his conclusions to the foregoing committees of the House and Senate, which reports shall contain an analysis of the trade with the Soviet bloc of countries for which determinations have been made.

SEC. 104. Whenever military, economic, or financial assistance has been terminated as provided in this act, such assistance can be resumed only upon determination by the President that adequate measures have been taken by the nation concerned to assure full compliance with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 105. For the purposes of this act the term "assistance" does not include activities carried on for the purpose of facilitating the procurement of materials in which the United States is deficient.

TITLE II—OTHER MATERIALS

SEC. 201. The Congress of the United States further declares it to be the policy of the United States to regulate the export of commodities other than those specified in title I of this act to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, in order to strengthen the United States and other cooperating nations of the free world and to oppose and offset by nonmilitary action acts which threaten the security of the United States and the peace of the world.

SEC. 202. The United States shall negotiate with any country receiving military, economic, or financial assistance arrangements for the recipient country to undertake a program for controlling exports of items not subject to embargo under title I of this act, but which in the judgment of the Administrator should be controlled to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination.

SEC. 203. All military, economic, and financial assistance shall be terminated when the President determines that the recipient country (1) is not effectively cooperating with the United States pursuant to this title, or (2) is failing to furnish to the United States information sufficient for the President to determine that the recipient country is effectively cooperating with the United States.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. All other nations (those not receiving United States military, economic, or financial assistance) shall be invited by the President to cooperate jointly in a group or groups or on an individual basis in controlling the export of the commodities referred to in title I and title II of this act to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination.

SEC. 302. The Administrator with regard to all titles of this act shall—

(a) coordinate those activities of the various United States departments and agencies which are concerned with security controls over exports from other countries;

(b) makes a continuing study of the administration of export control measures undertaken by foreign governments in accordance with the provisions of this act, and shall report to the Congress from time to time but not less than once every 6 months recommending action where appropriate; and

(c) make available technical advice and assistance on export control procedures to any nation desiring such cooperation.

SEC. 303. The provisions of subsection (a) of section 403, of section 404, and of subsections (c) and (d) of section 406 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 (Public Law 329, 81st Cong.), as amended, insofar as they are consistent with this act, shall be applicable to this act. Funds made available for the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, shall be available for carrying out this act in such amounts as the President shall direct.

SEC. 304. In every recipient country where local currency is made available for local currency expenses of the United States in connection with assistance furnished by the United States, the local currency administrative and operating expenses incurred in the administration of this act shall be charged to such local currency funds to the extent available.

SEC. 305. Subsection (d) of section 117 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 (Public Law 472, 80th Cong.), as amended, and subsection (a) of section 1302 of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1951 (Public Law 45, 82d Cong.), are repealed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, before I begin my discussion, I wish to pay a tribute to the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. If I am not mistaken, he was the first one to draw the attention of the Senate to the whole problem of strategic war materials sifting through some of our allies into the hands of our enemies, especially to the Chinese Communists. I wish to state that it was the action of the Senator from Missouri in bringing the subject to our attention that aroused my grave concern over this whole subject. I must say for the RECORD that I would go even further than he goes with his amendment, because I feel that we should have agreed with our allies, especially with Britain, to completely blockade the Communist Chinese coast, particularly as long as the Communist Chinese were defying us and defying the United Nations by keeping their troops in Korea. I could never tolerate the thought that we were being defied and that at the same time that—as the Senator from Missouri so ably stated—our boys were being killed in Korea, trade was permitted to go on with a country that was defying the western civilized world. I would have been glad to go further, if we could have gotten an agreement with Britain to go along with us, and completely blockade the Communist Chinese.

I want to give credit to the Senator from Missouri for bringing the matter to our attention, and I give credit also to the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], whose committee has made such an able investigation and has called the attention of the Senate to the kind of strategic materials that have sifted through into the hands of the Communists, and which could be conceivably used against our boys battling in Korea. I may say that earlier today the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] called attention and gave credit to the Senator from Missouri for having brought this matter to our attention.

Therefore, in taking a position against the Kem amendment, which I shall do, and in supporting the so-called Battle Act, I want to make it clear that Senator KEM is the Member in this body who made the Battle Act possible.

I was very much concerned with this whole matter last year, because prior to the passage of the Battle Act, in May of 1951, the Kem amendment was passed and attached to the third supplemental appropriation bill. That appropriation

bill went into effect, according to a memorandum I have before me, on June 2, 1951.

It so happened that I was 1 of 9 members of the Committee on Foreign Relations who went abroad last July in connection with appropriations being considered at that time for the NATO countries. We visited the North Atlantic Treaty area. We visited France, England, Spain, Greece, Turkey, and Germany. On the trip we ran into situations where some of the people who were administering the actual defense act of the previous year felt that there were certain difficulties involved in the administration of the Kem amendment of June, 1951; and they raised the question of whether it would not be possible to put through legislation which would protect all of the important objectives of the Kem amendment but at the same time give reasonable flexibility, so that the embarrassments that might come about in dealing with some of the European countries could be overcome.

These embarrassments resulted from the fact that the East-West trade which had been developed between the countries that were allied with us and those within the Soviet orbit was in materials necessary to our allies. In some cases it was vitally necessary, such as in the case of coal from Poland, timber, and other items.

I was particularly impressed with what was said by the High Commissioner for Germany, General McCloy, in whom we have the greatest confidence. In the hours we spent with him he pointed out that the terms of the Kem amendment of June 1951 were so severe that it looked as though it would be impossible to carry on the Berlin operation if the Berlin people on both sides of the line could not deal with each other—and the Kem amendment would prevent it—and that therefore it probably would not be possible to carry on the Berlin operation any further. My interest was aroused in the matter and I determined to see what could be done about passing an act which would embody all the strong and important features of the Kem amendment but at the same time would provide a procedure that would remedy the difficult problems involved.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. How can the Senator from New Jersey or Mr. McCloy consider that to ask our friends and allies not to deal with Russia and satellite countries in strategic war materials would cut off trade between the two countries?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is the $64 question which is involved in the whole debate. That is the reason I asked at the start of my remarks in the RECORD the text of the Kem amendment, so that the reader may refer to it. At the same time I asked that the full text of the Battle Act be inserted in the RECORD, in order to establish the fact that we should try to deal with the problem in the form of amendments to the Battle Act rather than in the form of the strict mandatory action called for by the Kem amendment.

If I could postpone the immediate answer to the queston I should like first to develop the differences between us.

I said earlier this morning, when the distinguished Senator from Missouri was bringing up the matter, that it seemed to me that the approach to the matter—and I should be happy to join him in the approach—should be by way of an amendment of definitions to the Battle Act, so that we would be able to know just exactly what materials we want to embargo and what we want to let through. That would be the wiser approach than to attach the Kem amendment to the present Mutual Security Act, because to do so might make it difficult for some of our allies to cooperate with us were they to be cut off completely from any trade with the East in certain materials.

At this point I shall refer to the Battle Act, which I have already had printed in the RECORD.

The Battle Act is divided into three titles. That act is the result of a study which was made by Members of the House, including Mr. BATTLE, who introduced the bill, and for whom the bill is named, and certain other members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, including Mr. JOHN M. VORYS, of Ohio, and Mr. MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana.

I was included in the discussions, along with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who will speak on this subject, and who knows more about the specific features of this measure than I do.

We tried to determine as best we could what legislation should be enacted. First we tried to determine what materials should be allowed to sift through.

At this point let me make a brief statement regarding the organization of the Battle Act. First of all, title I provides a definite embargo on the shipment of war materials.

Section 102 of title I provides for the administration of the act.

Section 103 provides for the determination of the items to be embargoed.

At this point I note that whereas the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], in his amendment calls for a determination by the Secretary of Defense alone, in regard to what the embargoed materials or articles should be, the Battle Act includes, for that purpose, the Administrator of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act, acting with the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, and the Economic Cooperation Administration, which then was in existence, and any other appropriate agencies.

At that point, section 103 provides:

Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, which items are, for the purpose of this act, arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and those items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war which should be embargoed to effectuate the purposes of this act.

I am sure that up to that point the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] would agree that he has no quarrel with this act.

The following paragraph of the act provides, in part, that—

(b) All military, economic, or financial assistance to any nation shall, upon the recommendation of the Administrator, be terminated forthwith if such nation after 60 days from the date of a determination under section 103 (a)—

And certain conditions are established for the termination of such assistance.

Title II relates to "Other materials"—materials other than those strictly classified as war materials. That title provides certain regulations in regard to the "Other materials."

Thereafter, in title III, there are certain "General provisions" relating to the duties of the Administrator, and so forth.

Mr. President, the act is as simple as that. However, it contains one proviso which I believe constitutes the issue between us here. I shall read the proviso, because I believe it is the essence of this debate. First, I read section 103 (b) of the so-called Battle Act:

All military, economic, or financial assistance to any nation shall, upon the recommendation of the Administrator, be terminated forthwith if such nation after 60 days from the date of a determination under section 103 (a)—

Which is the part of the act which provides for the determination of embargoed articles—

knowingly permits the shipment to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, of any item which he has determined under section 103 (a) after a full and complete investigation to be included in any of the following categories: Arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum—

At this point I may add that petroleum itself if not included in the so-called Kem amendment—

transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

Substantially, at least, it may be said—to use a slang phrase—that language "covers the waterfront." However, following it comes the proviso which is the subject of this debate and the present issue:

Provided, That the President after receiving the advice of the Administrator—

Mr. President, I would appreciate the attention, in regard to this particular point, of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], because this point is the key of the debate. In other words, in this debate the primary point we are considering is the proviso allowing the President to exercise discretion in these particular cases—

and after taking into account the contribution of such country to the mutual security of the free world, the importance of such assistance to the security of the United States, the strategic importance of imports received from countries of the Soviet bloc, and the adequacy of such country's controls over the export to the Soviet bloc of items of strategic importance, may direct the continuance of

such assistance to a country which permits shipments of items other than arms, ammunition, implements of war, and atomic energy materials when unusual circumstances indicate that the cessation of aid would clearly be detrimental to the security of the United States.

I believe it is the interpretation of that proviso that has troubled the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and I am perfectly willing to say that it has troubled me, because when the security of the United States is referred to in that connection, this act calls for the striking of a balance insofar as such shipments are concerned, namely, whether the balance in connection with such shipments is or is not in favor of the security of the United States, in connection with the mutual security of the free world.

I believe it is true that all of us resent the shipment of materials which endanger our security or the security of our boys in Korea. On the other hand, under a properly administered law, a determination would be made as to whether the danger resulting from the shipment of item X to the Soviet bloc of nations would be greater, in terms of our security, than the return, in terms of our security, which our country would receive from having item Y shipped to us from the Soviet bloc of countries, following the shipment to them of item X. That is the point at which the difficulty arises. I admit that I am troubled by it, as is the Senator from Missouri.

On the other hand, the way to deal properly with it is not to enact a mandatory law, such as the Kem amendment, but, in my judgment, perhaps to state very definitely just what quantities of what materials may be shipped, to assure that we shall definitely obtain an over-all advantage as a result of such shipments.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Then I understand the Senator from New Jersey to say that there has been an abuse of discretion in connection with this matter.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do not know as to that, because the act has been in effect only 5 or 6 months, and personally I have not received enough data to be convinced that there has been an abuse of discretion in this case.

I am told that in a period of approximately 5 or 6 months—the length of time since the act has been in effect—the shipments of strategic materials from western Europe to the Soviet bloc of nations have fallen from $7,500,000 worth, in 1951, to less than $400,000 worth, during the first five months of 1952. Those figures might indicate that during 1952 the total shipments of such materials to the Soviet bloc will decrease to a total of $1,000,000 worth. Certainly that would indicate an end to some of this business. Whether it is an adequate decrease I am not yet prepared to say.

Mr. WATKINS. Are the figures the Senator from New Jersey has submitted for the entire year, or are they on a monthly basis?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. These figures are for the entire year, for that group of items.

In the case of less important items, such as small electric motors, and so forth, the figures show a decrease in the value of shipments from $80,000,000 worth in 1951 to less than $30,000,000 worth in 1952.

I am citing these figures, which were given to us in a conference, to indicate that there has been a decrease in the shipments during the 7 months the Battle Act has been in effect. These figures show a definite decrease in such exports. That action was taken in the attempt to adjust shipments between the Russian bloc of countries and the countries of Western Europe that are trying to balance their budgets and to handle properly their needs in international trade.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield further to me?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I believe the Battle Act would take care of the situation if it were properly enforced. I do not like the idea of trying to reach a balance, as between imports and exports, in terms of seeing what over-all picture develops, because it seems to me that such an arrangement permits of too much error. The President might say, "We need friends, and so we will do what our friends want, and then they will continue to be our friends."

So it seems to me that it is very difficult for an administrator to enforce properly such an arrangement.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. At this point let me say that of course the Battle Act provides for an administrative organization; and as a result of that arrangement one of the principal men under the Mutual Security Administration program is made part and parcel of the sifting and channeling and screening and scrutinizing of the kinds of material that are permitted to be traded under this program.

Of course, as the Senator from Utah says, there is the danger that mistakes may be made when any human hand is applied to such a situation.

On the other hand, what alternative do we have?

Let us assume that the Kem amendment is adopted: In that event, the countries to whom we give aid would have to sign a paper setting forth the commitments they had made in regard to international trade in such materials. However, one can imagine that "bootlegging" might very easily develop, insofar as international trade in such materials is concerned.

Therefore, I would prefer to have an administrator established, with the result that he would watch this situation very carefully. That is what is done under the Battle Act. It seems to me it is a wiser solution. That is why I favored the Battle bill.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Certainly.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it not a fact that under the terms of the measure, the only time the President can do anything is after the other countries have acted? In other words, if they go ahead and make the shipments, although he may not think they should have done so, they will already have done it, and he would be punishing them for something which has already occurred. He does not have any method or means whatever to determine in advance what they are going to do.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The proviso says—and I shall read it again to the Senator:

Provided, That the President after receiving the advice of the Administrator and after taking into account the contribution of such country to the mutual security of the free world, the importance of such assistance to the security of the United States, the strategic importance of imports received from countries of the Soviet bloc, and the adequacy of such country's controls over the export to the Soviet bloc of items of strategic importance, may direct the continuance of such assistance.

There is an ascertainment he must make before he directs a continuance.

Mr. WATKINS. In other words, he is passing upon something that has already been consummated. He is passing on that situation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. He is passing on the status of trade back and forth which has to be justified by him before we continue our aid. Then, if he finds that the embargo which is provided for in this act is violated, there is the termination provision which appears in section 104. Let me say I did not read the second proviso, which is very important. When the President has made such determination, then country "X" can continue the trade and we can continue the assistance. I read:

Provided further, That the President shall immediately report any determination made pursuant to the first proviso of this section with reasons therefor to the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the President shall at least once each quarter review all determinations made previously and shall report his conclusions to the foregoing committees of the House and Senate, which reports shall contain an analysis of the trade with the Soviet bloc of countries for which determinations have been made.

The next section, section 104, reads:

Whenever military, economic, or financial assistance has been terminated as provided in this act, such assistance can be resumed only upon determination by the President that adequate measures have been taken by the nation concerned to assure full compliance with the provisions of this act.

I am merely reviewing these provisions because I want the Senator to understand the kind of machinery we tried to set up for the purpose of dealing with this problem, and of keeping constant check on the administration of the act. We provided that the information should be detailed and practical, so that the procedure would not simply slide along, as I am afraid it otherwise would. Even under the provisions of the Kem amendment there would be no such check at all. All we would have would be the

statement from the other countries, before they could get any help from us, that they had not, subsequently to the enactment of this act, exported or knowingly permitted the exportation of such goods. I think the Battle Act is tighter than is the Kem amendment.

Mr. WATKINS. I may inquire of the Senator whether the provisions of that act with respect to the quarterly reports to the President have been carried out.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am advised that the reports have been made; and, in fact, before I conclude my remarks, I am going to submit a report which was made to the chairman of our committee in connection with one of the matters which the Senator from Missouri brought to our attention.

Mr. WATKINS. If I may address another question to the Senator, as I understand the parliamentary situation, there is no way that those who favor the over-all program and favor the bill, even though they do not agree with all its provisions and although they voted for amendments which were lost, can express how they feel about this Kem amendment except by voting against the entire conference report. Is not that true?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. At the moment, that is necessary, unless the Senator from Missouri would consider withdrawing his amendment and joining with me and other Senators in attaching a similar amendment, or some kind of amendment, to the Battle Act. I think this question should be handled by tightening up that act, rather than to be handled in the present MSA amendment. That would be my thought.

Mr. WATKINS. Is the Senator from New Jersey in favor of amending the Battle Act, in order to tighten up that situation?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. At the moment I am thinking of merely one item. I do not believe it is tight enough on the subject of rubber. It seems to me the rubber provision is too loose. I really think something should be done in that respect. But I am advised that the reason for the difficulty regarding rubber is the critical situation in Malaya. If rubber cannot be exported from Malaya, or if it is made too tight, so that the other countries cannot take it, or because, by strict limitation, the situation is so tight that Malaya cannot export some of it, Malaya would be in serious economic difficulty. This could well mean a substantial increase in Communist influence in that area. I think that is the reason some of our British friends have been urging that there be not too stringent controls over the rubber situation. I am presently going to read into the RECORD a statement I received from the office of the Administrator of MSA regarding the rubber situation. I shall deal with that in a moment. But I am giving that as an example of the embarrassment we have found in having too rigid an amendment, such as the Kem amendment, which says that no such exports can be made.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator think the administration tried sincerely to enforce the Kem amendment when it was on the books?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do not think it was on the books long enough for us to know much about it in the way of enforcement. The only evidence I had was, I think, in France. I do not want to quote anybody wrongly, but, as I recall, Ambassador Bruce talked to me about it in France, and I know John McCloy did, in Germany. They were embarrassed, and wanted to know whether we could not do something to carry out what the distinguished Senator from Missouri has called to our attention as so important, namely, to put the brakes on the movement of strategic materials, but to set up machinery which would provide sufficient flexibility to enable us to deal with embarrassing situations.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Is it not true that after the passage of the Kem amendment by the Congress, the President suspended its operation by Executive order?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That may be true.

Mr. KEM. It was withheld by Executive order, was it not?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do not know, but I take the Senator's word for it. If that be so, that should not have been done.

Mr. KEM. That is my understanding.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. But it is true, as I said a moment ago, that United States officials in Paris and in other places where our committee was on its trip last July, called our attention to this matter. One of the chief things they asked us to do was to see whether we could not get together when we got back and bring about a satisfactory solution. That led to my interest in the Battle bill and I helped to get that bill passed. It was approved on October 26. I thought I was doing an act which was recognizing the leadership of the Senator from Missouri. I thought I was carrying out the purpose of his amendment.

Mr. KEM. I appreciate the good offices of the Senator from New Jersey, but is it not a fact that, instead of giving the Kem amendment a fair test, the President, merely by Executive order, unlawfully as I thought, suspended the operation of that act? Now it is being said that we ought to give the Battle Act a fair test. They declined and refused to try the Kem amendment in operation, but are now pleading for more than 7 months within which to test the Battle Act.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If I may say so to the distinguished Senator, I very much fear that, had we followed the Kem amendment literally, we would have had to withhold aid from our allies while we were trying to interpret what the Kem amendment meant.

Mr. KEM. Is it unthinkable that our allies would subject themselves to the same discipline that we ourselves have done?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think there is much to be said for that point. I do not want to debate it with the Senator, but I think that probably is a point that we ought to explore further in amending the Battle Act. It is a fact, however, that there are certain areas in Western Europe where they need coal or timber props, or something else for their mines, which they can get only from the satellite countries, and, in order to get those things, they have to trade in some way with such countries. They carry on such trade when it is not in a quantity to be damaging to our security. Our allies do not come as near to being self-sufficient in natural resources as we do in this country.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey further yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Very gladly.

Mr. KEM. Would the Senator join in the argument made by the Honorable Herbert Morrison, when he was in the United States, to the effect that when we want to engage in international trade we have to tell what our customers want to buy, and it so happens that presently Russia and her satellites want to buy strategic war materials, and so we have to sell them to Russia?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No, I would not join him in that statement. But there are many questions involved in these things. I do not think it necessarily means that the advantage will be with the enemy. There might be some cases where it would be well to consider the whole picture and see whether we would be gaining or losing by the proposed trade.

Mr. KEM. Has the Senator from New Jersey heard of any other definition of strategic war materials than that which we are applying to ourselves?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do not think so.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator know of any reason why the same definition should not be required of our allies?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No; and I think that may be a hint that if the Senator will join with me in an amendment to the Battle Act, it might be well——

Mr. KEM. I have great regard for the opinion of the Senator from New Jersey, but I do not quite see why we should undertake at this late hour in the session to introduce new legislation to amend the Battle Act, pilot it through a committee of the Senate and a committee of the House—it may be that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee would not consider it—and then try to pass it during this session, instead of making further aid to our allies contingent on their meeting fair, just, and honorable conditions with reference to selling strategic war materials only to Russia and her satellites.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It is late in the session, of course. It should have come up when we were considering the bill. Here we have an act which is the existing law. It has given evidence of moving in the right direction. But let me read the report of our conferees to show that we are not entirely happy in the matter:

The Senate amendment included a provision that no economic, financial, or military assistance should be provided to any country knowingly permitting the export of

arms, military matériel, or commodities likely to be used in the manufacture of arms or armaments to the Soviet Union or its satellites.

That has reference to the Kem amendment.

This section also provided for the repeal of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (Public Law 213, 82d Cong.—Battle Act). The conferees felt that proper implementation of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act would provide a more workable solution to the problem and did not include this section in the conference agreement.

The committee of conference, however, expressed dissatisfaction with the progress made so far in bringing under control shipments to the Soviet bloc from countries which receive United States assistance. The committee of conference also was concerned that the operation of the control of trade with countries behind the iron curtain was still dispersed among several departments and agencies in Washington and that the centralization of administration which had been anticipated under the Battle Act had not been completely put into effect.

Those were our criticisms up on that point.

The committee of conference examined figures showing substantial reductions in East-West trade in strategic materials since the Battle Act went into effect and found that substantial progress was being made in eliminating this trade. It was recognized that during the short time the Battle Act has been in effect a basis has been laid for reducing the volume of shipments to Russia and the satellites and that the results of prepartory work have not yet had time to become fully apparent.

That is the statement made by the committee in its report, and that is the basis of the view that it was wiser to continue with the statute on the books than to establish the new over-all provisions of the Kem amendment.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I was yielding to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Looking at the matter realistically and objectively, does the Senator feel that if something is not done with reference to the pending bill there is any likelihood that any amendment to the Battle Act may be accomplished during the present session?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is a difficult thing to prognosticate. We are all trying to get through before the conventions begin. I do not think the difference between us is great enough to say——

Mr. KEM. Is it an inconsequential difference when it involves the lives and safety of our men in Korea?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If I thought that, I would agree with the Senator.

Mr. KEM. How many casualties would it take for the Senator to agree?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It is not a question of casualties.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator find fault with the figures which I presented this afternoon to the effect that shipments of strategic war materials to Russia and her satellites have been increasing by tremendous amounts since the Battle Act went into effect?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I have been advised that in rubber they have not increased. One of my aids gave me the figures which I read before, that the shipments of strategic materials have dropped from $7,500,000 in 1951 to less than $400,000 in the first 4 months of 1952.

Mr. KEM. Where did the Senator get those figures?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. From the figures we received from the office administering the Battle Act. I think the Senator has seen some of them. They are filed by countries. Of course, they are confidential information, but the Senator from Missouri or any other Senator may look at them. I did not feel at liberty to read those tables on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. KEM. Why should they be confidential when the safety of our men in Korea is involved?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I could not answer that.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it not true that the statistics show that under the Battle Act, after only 7 months of operation, exportation to the satellite countries has decreased very rapidly?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes. I read that a minute ago.

Mr. CONNALLY. I stated it Friday, in my remarks, I think.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am not entirely satisfied with the figures which I have received, but they show that we are moving in the direction of control and of a reduction of certain items.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey further yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Is it not true, as a general proposition, that if we are to consider the figures, they should be laid on the table here for a critical examination? But the figures are suppressed. Is that the kind of treatment the American people have a right to expect?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do not think it is quite fair for the Senator from Missouri to question me as to the wisdom or unwisdom of our military authorities when they say that certain dealings should not be made public. I think the Senator from Missouri is entitled to study the figures.

Mr. KEM. I have been accorded that privilege, and I appreciate the courtesy. I found some of the figures incomprehensible; I found them incomplete, and I found them far from convincing.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I will say to the Senator that I am very much interested in and very enthusiastic about the work done by the O'Conor subcommittee.

The Senator from Maryland made an important study of the question, but he told me just a day or two ago—I hope I am not quoting him incorrectly—that he has not received any figures for the past 3 or 4 months. His figures were earlier, and he has not received the most recent figures.

These are questions that should be handled by all of us getting together to see where we could tighten this act, without trying to draw the entire curtain down, and preventing anything at all from going through. It should be done in such a way as to avoid embarrassment to our people in their dealings with other countries abroad.

Mr. KEM. I read this morning a public statement made by the Senator from Maryland, as chairman of the committee, to the effect that shipments were continuing in great quantities in January. I read from a report to the same effect——

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. January was the month the Battle Act first began operation.

Mr. KEM. I read to the same effect with reference to February. I have made inquiries at the Department of Commerce and other available agencies, and the latest figures I have been able to get are for April of this year. There is nothing in those figures to indicate that shipments of such important articles as rubber have increased greatly.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That makes it necessary at this point for me to read into the RECORD a statement which I have on the rubber situation. I shall read it at this time.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to explain why I asked about the parliamentary situation, whether or not there was any way we could vote for the Kem amendment, to show our approval of it, without voting against the conference report. I am informed that we cannot do so. Personally I have voted for all so-called foreign aid measures during the years I have been in Congress. I have often disagreed with the amounts authorized in most of the measures for which I voted, but it was always after careful scrutiny. I am one who believes the Senator is doing a great service——

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WATKINS. I am faced now with this situation: I approve the program. It is our program. We have no other program at the moment; and it would seem to me to be folly to withdraw from it, because we have nothing else prepared to take its place.

We are in so far and so deep that we should not change course now. I find myself in a position where I am in conflict between my deep feeling about this amendment, and what is going on overseas, and particularly with reference to what is being done by the administration in keeping the Nationalists on Formosa from interfering with traffic of strategic materials, weapons of war, and almost everything else going into Red China at this time under the very noses of our guns. The Nationalists are prevented by our fleet from interfering with that traffic.

I shall vote for the over-all program as recommended in the report; yet I heartily disagree with the committee's

action on this particular amendment in abandoning it, and not adopting it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. As the Senator probably knows, there were two votes in favor of it. There were two of us, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and myself, who felt in the conference committee that we should try to seek a way to meet the difficulties contained in the Kem amendment. We felt the Kem amendment was too drastic, but that there might be some amendment suggested to the Battle Act to meet the difficulties. I still think that could be done, if we had the will to do it, because the Battle Act has a year to go before it expires. I believe we are making progress.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. Was there any mandate in the conference to bring in an amendment that would meet the Senator's views, to tighten up the Battle Act?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The main reason was that the House had a considered opinion that the Battle Act should be tried further. I do not believe I am misquoting anybody when I say that the House conferees were unanimous in that feeling, and the only ones on our side were the Senator from Wisconsin and myself, who felt possibly some adjustment could be made along the lines of the Kem amendment.

I believe the Battle Act can be used effectively. I think this debate will help the administrator of the Battle Act, and I think it will serve notice on the President as to the way we feel about its administration. I feel the Battle Act is the best approach at the moment, rather than to go back and say that the entire Mutual Security Act should be thrown out because we disagree with the Kem amendment.

Mr. WATKINS. I think the Senator has in mind that the vote in the Senate was 40 to 32 in favor of the Kem amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am very sorry the senior Senator from New Jersey, who is a good, stanch Republican, was the one Republican who did not vote for his colleague's amendment. In fact, the next day I asked to be allowed to change my vote, in recognition of the contribution the Senator from Missouri has made. While I do not agree with him, I still feel the Battle Act is the best approach, rather than to put a straitjacket onto this particular bill.

Mr. WATKINS. I might feel the same way about the Battle Act if we had what I felt was sincere enforcement of it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The administration of any act is always the important thing.

Mr. WATKINS. That is why I believe we ought to have a mandatory act, because we are not getting compliance with the requirements of a discretionary act.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Utah for his courtesy.

In light of the fact that we have been discussing the rubber question, I have here a memorandum from the administration that I should like to read into the RECORD at this point:

CLAIM THAT CRUDE RUBBER SHOULD BE A WAR MATERIAL UNDER TITLE 1 OF BATTLE ACT AND THAT BRITAIN HAS GREATLY INCREASED ITS EXPORTS OF CRUDE RUBBER TO THE SOVIET UNION SINCE PASSAGE OF THE BATTLE ACT

The facts: Crude rubber, like crude steel, is a basic necessity for modern warfare. It is not, however, considered of primary strategic importance because crude rubber, as such, has no direct military application. It must first be treated by the addition of various chemicals and must then be manufactured into strategic items for military use. That is why, under the Battle Act, a long list of rubber-compounding agents, masterbatch, key types of rubber-working machinery, carbon-black manufacturing plants, bullet-proof tires and tubes, and heavy-duty tires in addition to the more important types of synthetic rubber are all rated as primary strategic, and hence require embargo treatment. After careful consideration of the best advice and information available from the United States rubber industry and agencies of the United States Government relating to Soviet bloc stocks, production, and uses of rubber, the Administration has not yet found it possible to determine a precise level beyond which exports would contribute to the Soviet bloc war potential. This level may be as high as 100,000 tons a year.

As I recall, the figures given by the Senator from Missouri this morning showed that the total rubber exports of the Soviet bloc were around 82,000 or 85,000 tons. I do not recall the exact figure, but it was something in that neighborhood.

When the statistics are viewed over-all, Britain has not speeded up the rate at which it has been permitting shipments of crude rubber to the Soviet Union. The very large increase in shipments from the United Kingdom since Korea is accounted for by the fact that whereas Malaya used to ship these quantitites directly to the U. S. S. R., they are now moving largely by way of the United Kingdom. In 1950 approximately 68,000 tons of rubber moved to the U. S. S. R. from Malaya (a British territory), while in 1951 only 17,500 tons moved from that source. In these years, the total imports of rubber into the U. S. S. R. were 82,500 and 67,500 tons respectively. During the first quarter of 1952 shipments from the United Kingdom to the U. S. S. R. amounted to about 42,000 tons. Approximately 18,000 tons of this amount were actually licensed in the latter part of 1951. Because of lack of shipping facilities, this quantity was not exported until 1952. Both Malaya and the United Kindom embargo exports of rubber to China.

Continued exports of crude rubber to the Soviet bloc from the United Kingdom and Malaya are necessary to assure the import into the United Kindom of large amounts of essential timber and coarse grains.

That is the exchange idea which the Battle Act makes possible under that proviso. I continue reading from the memorandum:

A further difficulty in getting sharp reductions in rubber shipments to the U. S. S. R. is in the fact that the price of natural rubber has been declining steadily, leading to reduced wages in rubber producing areas in Malaya and Indonesia which already have difficult internal political problems. As is well known, there is unrest in Malaya now and open Communist depredations against plantation personnel take place daily there. In Indonesia the Communists are making efforts to gain control. Further reductions in exports, attributed rightly or wrongly to United States efforts to get tighter controls to the Soviet bloc, could backfire dangerously especially in underdeveloped areas in the Far East. There has been general dissatisfaction in those areas with United States rubber procurement policy and they feel they must protect their standards of living, already too low, by finding adequate markets for their major income producing product.

Our policy is aimed at embargoing rubber to China, reducing the remaining trade to the lowest level which can be reached considering the grain and timber supply problem and political problems just mentioned and to assuring that rubber which is sent to the bloc produces equivalent or greater strength for the West (by the nature of the quid pro quo) than it produced for the bloc.

We have the question of policy, as to whether it is wise to make these exchanges, carefully screened and carefully watched as to quantities, and the question of the effect on our strategic materials situation, and whether it is wise to have the flexibility provided in the Battle Act, under which the shipments involved are made.

So far as I am concerned, that is the record from the administration on the rubber question.

There was another question raised by the distinguished Senator from Missouri, and that was with reference to petroleum exploration equipment which had been shipped from the Netherlands to Poland. I have inquired about this subject, and I have been handed by the chairman of the committee [Mr. CONNALLY] a letter from the White House, which I am told is not classified, and which I think should be placed in the RECORD at this time, because apparently, under the discretion given by the proviso, section 103 (b), the President felt justified in releasing this petroleum exploration equipment from the Netherlands to Poland.

I shall not read the entire letter, but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 22, 1952.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have been advised that a small quantity of petroleum exploration equipment was shipped from the Netherlands to Poland after the effective date of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (the Battle Act). This oil drilling equipment is an item listed by the Administrator, pursuant to title I of the Battle Act, as one embargoed in order to effectuate the purposes of the act. Any shipment of any such items listed automatically results in all military, economic, and financial assistance to the Netherlands being cut off, unless I determine, in accordance with the powers granted to me by section 103 (b) of the act, that "cessation of aid would clearly be detrimental to the security of the United States." The Administrator of the act has advised me that aid to the Netherlands should be continued. He made this recommendation after consultation with representatives of the Departments of State, Treasury, Defense, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce; the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Mutual Security Agency, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Central Intelligence Agency.

I am informed that the facts are as follows:

The shipment, which took place recently, involved small quantities of oil drilling equipment. Technical experts in this coun-

try believe that this amount of this particular type of equipment would not add significantly to the capacity of the Soviet bloc to explore for, or to produce petroleum.

The shipment is the final one against binding obligations incurred in August 1949. The original contract was entered into in good faith by the Netherlands shipper and the Polish Government enterprise 2 years before the passage of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act and prior to any international understanding that the equipment in question is of primary strategic importance. At the time the original transaction was negotiated, the Dutch shipper had obtained the consent of his government to complete the contract and subsequently had obtained a Dutch export license. By the time the embargo list was established, pursuant to title I of the Battle Act, and became operative on January 24, 1952, the Dutch equipment had been practically paid for by the Polish enterprise. Before the final shipment took place, officers of the United States Government held discussions with the Government of the Netherlands in an effort to find a means of avoiding this shipment. The Netherlands Government considered that this equipment would not significantly contribute to the military potential of the Soviet bloc (a conclusion in which our United States technical experts agree). It also took into account the fact that the shipment had been virtually paid for and represented the final transaction under a binding contract made in good faith more than 2 years previously. The Netherlands Government, therefore, concluded that it would not block the shipment.

Cessation of aid to the Netherlands would materially weaken the whole system of defenses now being built up under the North Atlantic Treaty. Consequently, cessation of aid to the Netherlands would be "detrimental to the security of the United States."

The Netherlands is making a substantial contribution to the mutual security of the free world. The Netherlands has been a participant in the North Atlantic Treaty defense program since its inception and, notwithstanding a most difficult domestic economic situation, has made courageous political and military decisions and has taken positive steps in order to make its participation in the program effective. The Netherlands Government has demonstrated a cooperative spirit, and has displayed a genuine sense of concern and responsibility toward the mutual defense effort.

The Netherlands Government has committed itself to make substantial contributions—industrial, financial, and military—to the North Atlantic Treaty defense program. In this connection, it should be noted that the Netherlands Government is carrying out on its own initiative a strict program of internal financial controls and is reducing the level of civilian consumption in order to provide added resources for defense.

From the standpoint of military strategy, the Netherlands occupies an important position. The Dutch have shown a willingness to cooperate in coordinated planning so as to make possible the maximum use to NATO forces of Holland's strategic location. In addition, the Netherlands Government has specifically committed itself to provide a substantial number of troops, naval vessels, and air units and to be responsible for their maintenance and training. However, the Netherlands' contribution to the security of the free world—and, hence, to the security of the United States—cannot, in the absence of assistance, be carried out as planned.

The Netherlands Government cooperates with the United States and other countries of the free world to prevent or limit drastically export to the Soviet bloc of items that are considered to be strategic. The Netherlands controls are well designed to effectuate understandings arrived at and are efficiently operated.

Therefore, in accordance with the provisions of section 103 (b) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act, I have directed that assistance by the United States to the Netherlands be continued. In reaching this determination, I have acted upon the advice of the Administrator of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act, Mr. W. Averell Harriman, and have taken into account "the contribution of such country to the mutual security of the free world, the importance of such assistance to the security of the United States, the strategic importance of imports received from countries of the Soviet bloc, and the adequacy of such country's controls over the export to the Soviet bloc of items of strategic importance."

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Hon. TOM CONNALLY,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall read one paragraph. I quote from the letter from the President to the chairman of the committee:

> The shipment, which took place recently, involved small quantities of oil-drilling equipment. Technical experts in this country believe that this amount of this particular type of equipment would not add significantly to the capacity of the Soviet bloc to explore for, or to produce petroleum.

That is the official explanation which comes to our committee from the President of the United States.

The letter goes on to say that the Netherlands Government was under contractual obligation, which it entered into long before the question of the embargoes arose, and that this was the last delivery on a contractual obligation undertaken, I believe, in 1948 or 1949. It was decided by our own technical experts that this amount of equipment would not in any significant way add to the capacity of the Soviet bloc to explore for or to produce petroleum.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Has the Senator any comment on the reports in the press to the effect that this waiver or permit given to the Netherlands regarding oil-drilling equipment is considered to be the first of a series of similar waivers which will be issued by the President?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do not know, because all the letter states is that the shipment is the final one, against binding obligations incurred in August 1949. Therefore, so far as this particular transaction is concerned, this is the last of a series for filling a previously incurred obligation. There is nothing I can find in the letter which refers to a continuing series. The President simply takes the position that under section 103 (b) of the Battle Act, he has the flexibility of discretion to allow this shipment to go through.

With respect to the other question which the Senator asks, I could not answer it.

I may say to the Senator from Missouri that I would expect, after this debate and the very able presentation he has made, together with the sincere explanation which I have tried to make, as I understand these two measures, the Kem amendment and the Battle Act, that the President would realize that we have these conditions very much in mind, and that we do not expect further additions to be made, by way of any attempt to get around the spirit of the Battle Act. I do not believe the President would try to do that.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator agree that we are reaching the point where patience is ceasing to be a virtue? We have been told from month to month, and even from year to year, that if Congress would be patient, these shipments would be stopped. Yet when we send out our committee and the committee reports back to us, we find that they have not been stopped, that with respect to some commodities or materials the shipments are increasing instead of decreasing. Still we are again asked to be patient, and told that something will be done about it. In the meantime our boys are being killed and wounded in Korea.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I will say in answer to the Senator that the first time this question was forcibly called to my attention was in the able presentation by the Senator himself last year or the year before. The subject was forcibly brought to my attention as recently as last July. So far as my colleagues and I are concerned, we immediately applied ourselves to the Battle Act legislation. We got that legislation through because we felt that it would carry out the program of the Senator from Missouri. We felt that it provided machinery which would take care of these problems in the course of time.

The Senator from Missouri is perfectly right when he says that our boys are being killed in Korea, and that we should move as rapidly as we can. The question is, How rapidly can we move? I do not believe that we would gain anything by passing a drastic amendment like the Kem amendment, which allows no flexibility to deal with the questions which have a vital part in our entire collective security program.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator whether he thinks the attitude of our friends and allies in Western Europe would be any different if they had 90 percent of the men in Korea and we had 10 percent, and if they were suffering 95 percent of the casualties while we were suffering 5 percent?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I can only say, so far as our French allies are concerned, that we must realize the terrific losses they have taken in French Indochina, both in respect to manpower and the money they have had to spend to try to defend that area for the western free world. We cannot minimize what the French have done there in a most heroic way. They are among those who are in favor of some kind of flexibility in the program. So I do not feel that we can be too critical. In that instance, at least, we have an example of full and wholehearted cooperation which matches even ours in Korea.

Mr. KEM. The O'Conor committee tells us about shipments of badly needed ball bearings shipped from France to Czechoslovakia. Some of them, the

O'Conor committee says, are going by parcel post.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I understand that the steel for the ball bearings comes from Czechoslovakia. Probably some agreement was made for the processing of the steel. I am not sure about that. That subject is also mentioned in the memorandum to which reference has been made.

Mr. KEM. The fact that Czechoslovakia is trying unsuccessfully to get by with plastic ball bearings shows how short they are in supply, and what a body blow it would be to the Russian Communist war effort if we could be successful in cutting off shipments of these strategic materials.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should say that both the United States and our allies would feel that it was most important to do that rapidly as possible. I go further than does the distinguished Senator from Missouri. The Chinese Communists are defying us in Korea, and holding the line in Korea where they have no business, under any possible excuse, to be, except by Russian instigation. I can perhaps understand the North Koreans being there, but the Chinese Communists have no right to be anywhere in Korea. They are defying the United Nations. So far as I am concerned, I would place a tight blockade around the entire country, but we cannot do it unless the British join us in that effort.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I suggested the absence of a quorum in order that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] might be heard. It was my understanding that he wanted to speak on the pending report. He informs me that he does not care to do so. Therefore, I have asked to suspend further proceedings under the quorum call.

Mr. President, I desire to say a few words on the report. I do not desire to take much time, because I believe there has been a very thorough discussion of the subject. I believe that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] very ably presented his viewpoint. I believe that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the chairman of the committee very ably presented the contrary viewpoint. Therefore, I do not believe there is any need for continuing discussion at any great length.

I should like to say, however, that I feel that the Senator from Missouri and I, as well as others who have dealt with the subject, are working toward the same objective. All of us want to curb trade insofar as it is harmful to our defense, to our economy, or in any other way. It becomes a matter, then, of how best to go about it. We tried to proceed under one of the early versions of the Kem amendment, and we saw many difficulties in attempting to carry it out, due, primarily, I believe, to its rigidity.

Then it was that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs decided to study the situation in order to determine whether legislation could be evolved, not to repeal the Kem amendment—that was not the idea at all—but to do what the able Senator from Missouri was trying to do by his amendment, but in a way that would accomplish better results.

The Senator from New Jersey told something about the proceedings under which that legislation was considered. The House committee appointed a subcommittee. The chairman of the subcommittee was Representative BATTLE, from my State of Alabama. It was because of his serving as chairman of the subcommittee and because of his introducing the bill and sponsoring it that it became known as the Battle Act.

My recollection is that the subcommittee, which was a bipartisan subcommittee, unanimously recommended the proposed legislation. It then went to the full committee, which, of course, is a bipartisan committee, and that full committee unanimously recommended the Battle bill to the House of Representatives. As I recall, it was practically unanimously passed by the House. I am not certain, but it seems to me that one vote was cast against it. I may not be correct in that recollection. I know it was passed by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. President, as has been stated, that bill became law on October 26, 1951. It took a little time to set up the machinery, and, because under the form in which we wrote the bill into law it was to be geared into the Mutual Security Program, it took a little time to get it started. But it has been going along very well. I believe there has been sufficent said here today to indicate that it has been working very nicely.

Mr. President, I am not standing here contending that it is working perfectly. I do not suppose anyone would so contend. Certainly the Kem amendment from the time it was on the statute books did not work perfectly. I am not saying that the reason the Kem amendment did not work perfectly was due to the manner in which it was worked or due to the administration or due to any one particular thing. I believe personally that it was entirely too inflexible. I think that is the reason.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, is it not correct to say that the Kem amendment never had a chance, because the President by Executive order suspended its operation, and it was never in effect for even 1 day? How can it be said, therefore, under those circumstances, that it had any test? The President took advantage of what he considered to be a loophole which was put into the amendment in conference, which gave him the right to make exceptions in the application of the law. What he did was not to make any specific exception but to make a general exception, and he suspended the entire operation of the amendment. Certainly under those circumstances it could not be said that the Kem amendment has had a fair test.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am certainly not going to join issue with the Senator from Missouri on his statement, but I do say that at least those who were responsible for it decided it was not workable in the form in which Congress passed it. I do not know whether it was due to the form in which it was written or the form in which it came out of conference, but they decided it could not work. I state again that in my opinion it was due to its inflexibility.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Was that not an exercise of the law-making power by the Executive which was condemned in such strong terms recently by the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not wish to argue the point. I certainly agree with everything the Supreme Court said about the law-making powers. I believe very strongly in the three divisions of Government, and I do not believe that either one should encroach upon the other.

I am not going to argue about that with the Senator from Missouri. I assume there was some kind of loophole, as the Senator from Missouri himself has said, which permitted that particular procedure to be followed.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me at this time?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Was not the so-called loophole simply a provision which was inserted in conference and which enabled the President to make an exception in a particular case?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I assume that is so.

Mr. KEM. But instead of that, the President issued an Executive order suspending the operation of the entire act.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I assume that was the loophole to which the able Senator referred.

Mr. President, I return to the original point, namely, that so far as I am concerned, I believe that the Kem amendment, regardless of how good an objective it had—and I state again that I am in agreement with the objective which was sought to be attained by the Kem amendment—simply was inflexible. I believe that the amendment the Senator from Missouri has offered to this bill, likewise, is inflexible. It simply provides that trade shall be cut off; everything must be either black or white; there can be no gray.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield further to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Is it not true that the proposed amendment is mandatory in the sense that it provides that we shall not send any aid to countries that sell strategic war materials to Russia, the satel-

lite nations, or Red China; the amendment is black or white in that sense, in that it is proposed as a mandatory law. However, it is not black or white in another sense, for it permits east-west trade to continue uninterrupted so long as such nations do not avail themselves of what they consider to be their privilege to sell what their customers want to buy, if what their customers want to buy are materials of war.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, let me say to the able Senator from Missouri that I can visualize some cases to which I do not believe such a mandatory provision should be applied. I am not sure, but I believe the Senator from Missouri referred to a letter, or perhaps read a letter, which the President addressed to the Foreign Relations Committee.

Under the Battle Act, every time a determination is made to permit the shipment of strategic war materials—and I use the same term that the Senator from Missouri has used—the President, under the law, must report that determination to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, as well as to other committees.

A determination of that sort was made in a case relating to the Netherlands. I believe the Senator from Missouri is familiar with that case.

Today, as I recall, the Senator from New Jersey read a letter, in the course of his remarks, or certainly made reference to a letter, dealing with the Netherlands situation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I placed the entire letter in the RECORD, and I referred to a part of the letter.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

The point I make is that that is one instance in which I believe there was justification for the determination which was made. Had the Kem amendment, which was inserted by the Senate in the Mutual Security Act, been in effect, the President would not have been able to make that determination.

That case involved the final shipment of some tools and machinery for the exploration and drilling of oil wells. Certainly such materials are on the forbidden list; they are on the "number one" list under the Battle Act. However, that case related to the final shipment of materials under a contract which was entered into in good faith away back in 1949, and those materials represented a relatively small part of the over-all contract. Before making a determination, the President, or someone acting for him, consulted with the oil industry in the United States, to determine how important that matter was. It was on the basis of the testimony collected from those experts that the determination was made and the report was made to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Senate Appropriations Committee, the House Appropriations Committee, the Senate Armed Services Committee, and the House Armed Services Committee. Never have I heard a single protest from any member of any of those six committees against that determination.

Yet, Mr. President, had the Kem amendment been in effect, that determination could not have been made.

In other words, that is one of the cases which, under the Kem amendment, would have been completely black; there could have been no gray or no white in it.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me at this point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I wish to express the hope that before the Senator from Alabama concludes his very interesting address, he will advise us as to his views regarding the large movement of ball bearings and machine tools and iron and steel from our friends and allies in Western Europe to Russia and the satellite countries.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, before going further, I wish to read into the RECORD at this point an excerpt from the Battle Act. The Senator from New Jersey placed the entire act in the RECORD, along with the Kem amendment. However, for the benefit of Senators who now are on the floor, I wish to read the statement of policy contained in the Battle Act. It states what we really are driving at, and I wish to ask any Senator whether he differs with the policy and the objectives as thus set forth under the following statement of policy:

SEC. 101. The Congress of the United States, recognizing that in a world threatened by aggression the United States can best preserve and maintain peace by developing maximum national strength and by utilizing all of its resources in cooperation with other free nations, hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to apply an embargo on the shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me at this point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does not that provision represent a distinct step forward? In that provision we pick out by name the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It is an unusual thing for one government to denounce and placard the shortcomings of another nation. That shows our purpose.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is true; we name the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and we also refer each time to other "countries under its domination"—in other words, its satellites.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, that is true.

Mr. President, it occurs to me that there could not be a better or more distinct statement of policy than that one.

I submit, as I have said before, that the objective of that act is the same one toward which the Senator from Missouri has been driving in connection with the various and sundry amendments he has offered from time to time.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me at this point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Will the Senator from Alabama permit me to point out this difference in the objective: The Battle Act places a ban on arms and armaments and atomic-energy materials, and provides that we shall not give aid to any country that is furnishing arms, armaments, or atomic-energy materials to Russia or the satellite nations; but the Battle Act goes on to give to the President discretion to furnish aid to countries that are selling other strategic war materials to Russia or the satellite countries.

My position is that from our standpoint—the standpoint of the American taxpayers and the standpoint of the American men in Korea—there is no essential difference between arms and armaments and atomic-energy materials, and other strategic war materials; that we are aiding and abetting the Communist war effort just as much when we send them rubber or machine tools or ball bearings as we do when we send them guns or atomic-energy materials, or other armaments; that there is no essential difference, from their standpoint or from our standpoint between whether they are obtaining the finished product or whether they are obtaining elements essential for manufacture of the finished product. The Battle Act puts a definite ban on the shipment of arms, armament, and atomic-energy materials. As the Senator from New Jersey has very well described it, there is no black and white in the Battle Act with reference to these materials. What I want to do is to extend the same mandatory treatment to other strategic war materials. I do not see how we can stand by and send strategic war materials, which the British say their customers want to buy, to Russia and the satellites, when our boys are dying in Korea.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I, of course, had not gotten to that point, namely, the three different types of materials under the Battle Act. I was making reference solely to the statement of policy, which, as I have said, had the same objective as the Kem amendment.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, I yield; but I should like to get started on my statement, so I can conclude.

Mr. KEM. Will the Senator permit me to make a brief statement at that point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. KEM. I wholly disagree with the statement of policy, the objective, of the Battle Act. The objectives I have in mind are not the same, because the Battle Act is designed to put a definite ban only on arms, armament, and atomic-energy materials, whereas I want to put a definite ban on those areas with respect to strategic war materials.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, Mr. President, I do not agree with the Senator from Missouri as to the limitations he implies to the Battle Act; but, be that as it may, under the Battle Act and under the administration of that act as it is now being enforced, and has been for the past few months, so far as I know, the only actual determination that has been made and reported to our committee is the one I described briefly a few moments ago, the one with respect to the Netherlands. But there are three classes, three categories of strategic items, the export of which to the Soviet bloc is now controlled by the principal Western European countries, in keeping with the Battle Act. Those three are:

First. Primary strategic items such as arms, ammunition, implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, advanced machine tools, and numerous metals, chemicals, transportation, equipment and electronic and chemical plant equipment which are themselves used directly in the warfare or are essential in the production of materials which contribute directly to war potential of the Soviet bloc;

Second. Items of secondary strategic importance in the same general categories as those of primary strategic importance but representing a lower order of strategic value which becomes significant only when exports of such an item reach a substantial level; and

Third. Commodities known to be of strategic importance but for which the importance to the Soviet bloc has not been clearly established; this group includes many commodities of quite general industrial usage where the strategic importance is usually an indirect contribution.

Mr. President, I believe the figures have been supplied already as to the progress which has been made in cutting down the shipments within those various categories. For instance, shipments of primary strategic items were reduced from $7,500,000 in 1951, to $250,000 for the first 4 months of 1952. If that rate is to continue throughout this calendar year, it will mean a 90-percent reduction in the first category.

The shipment of items of secondary strategic importance was reduced from $85,000,000 in 1950 to $50,000,000 in 1951, or a reduction of 40 percent. It is expected that exports for 1952 will not exceed $35,000,000, a reduction of 60 percent, as compared to the 1950 level, and 30 percent, compared to the 1951 level. The latter reduction is expected to result from only partial shipments over the low level of quotas for those items, and the severity of criteria governing shipments of 21 of these items which are not subject to quotas.

Mr. President, I submit that those statistics show very good progress under a system that not only says that this is our objective, that this is what we want to do, but which also sets up the machinery with which to do it; and the Battle Act sets up the machinery.

The Kem amendment simply says, "You shall not do it." The Battle Act provides for an administrator to carry it into effect, and tells him what to do, and it then lends that very essential characteristic which the Kem amendment does not, namely, recognition that sometimes a case may not be all white or all black, but may be in between.

There are instances, Mr. President, when the security of our own country might very well be served by allowing trade and shipments which, if we had complete control of the entire situation all over the world, we would not allow at all. I submit that the Battle Act provides a sensible, flexible means for handling this very vexing problem, and that it is working. It has not had much time to be tried out, only a few months, but during those few months it has shown that it is capable of working, and that it is working.

Mr. President, I shall not take any more time of the Senate. I think this question has been thoroughly discussed. I simply make a last-minute appeal that a chance be given to try out this law, which was written after careful study by two legislative committees in an effort to regulate this trade, which was troublesome and vexatious. Let us give it a chance to prove itself. I believe it will prove itself, but if it does not, I certainly shall join with the Senator from Missouri in trying to work out machinery which will do the thing he wants done, the thing I want done, and the thing I believe the great majority of both Houses of Congress want to see done.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] has performed a great service to the country in bringing to the attention of the Senate and the American people the facts with respect to the threat the Communist countries have offered to the nations of the world, and particularly to those we are aiding under the Mutual Security Program

I voted for the original Kem amendment. I opposed and voted against the so-called Battle bill which killed the Kem amendment.

I voted in favor of the Kem amendment when it was again before the Senate a few days ago. I favor it now. I sincerely regret that the House and Senate conferees did not retain this amendment as part of the Mutual Security Act. It would have served as a warning to our allies that the nefarious trade with the satellite nations in armaments and materials which can be used to build up the war potential of our enemies is in great disfavor in this country, and in the event that it should be carried on in the future, these countries can expect no aid from us.

Mr. President, I also voted for cuts in the total sum of the authorization contained in this measure. I am convinced that the administration came to the Congress with greatly padded requests. I think that is one reason why General Eisenhower felt there would not be too great damage done if the cut did not extent beyond $1,000,000,000. What has happened seems to be that the administration now gets in this bill authorization for the amount it really expected to get in the beginning. I distrust as being insincere the criticisms of the President and others that we are seriously crippling the foreign-aid program by making the reductions that have been made in this bill. The total amount of this authorization, in my opinion, could have been reduced another billion dollars without serious hurt to the joint effort of our allies to prepare themselves for defense.

In this connection, I invite attention to the fact that Mr. Harriman, the Administrator of the program, has now on hand approximately $12,000,000,000 of unexpended funds. There has never been a time when they have been out of money.

I have voted for the various foreign-aid programs with appropriate economies ever since I have been in the Congress, even though I have disagreed with many of the features of these programs and the way they have been carried out. I am convinced that since the Congress has adopted this policy, we must give it support notwithstanding the fact that the measure as reported by the House and Senate conferees is sadly lacking in many respects. Despite these objections I feel that the over-all program must be supported. Therefore, Mr. President, I shall vote for the conferees' report. I find no parliamentary opportunity to disapprove the specific items in the conference report without voting against the entire report. It is because of my approval of the over-all program that I feel that I should vote for it, notwithstanding its many defects.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, there is one little item which I should like to have put into the RECORD. It is under the heading of "Technical cooperation," and I should like to read this very brief statement:

> The House bill contained a provision which would have limited dollar expenditures for supplies and equipment under the act for international development in any country to three times the dollar costs for personnel. This provision was dropped by the committee of conference. While it is essential that the technical cooperation program not be converted into a type of worldwide economic aid program, and that a reasonable ratio of supplies and equipment to personnel be maintained on an over-all basis, the conference committee felt that the TCA Administrator must not be deprived of sufficient flexibility to deal with particular situations in areas of vital importance to the United States.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. KEM. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON and Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would each vote "yea."

Mr. FERGUSON. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senators from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE and Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 11, as follows:

YEAS—59

Anderson	Gillette	Kerr
Butler, Md.	Green	Kilgore
Byrd	Hayden	Knowland
Case	Hendrickson	Lehman
Chavez	Hennings	Long
Clements	Hill	Magnuson
Connally	Hoey	Maybank
Duff	Holland	McCarran
Eastland	Humphrey	McClellan
Ellender	Hunt	McFarland
Ferguson	Ives	McKellar
Frear	Johnson, Colo.	Millikin
George	Johnson, Tex.	Moody
Morse	Robertson	Taft
Mundt	Smathers	Thye
Neely	Smith, Maine	Tobey
Nixon	Smith, N. J.	Underwood
O'Conor	Smith, N. C.	Watkins
O'Mahoney	Sparkman	Wiley
Pastore	Stennis	

NAYS—11

Bennett	Dworshak	Martin
Butler, Nebr.	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kem	Welker
Dirksen	Malone	

NOT VOTING—26

Aiken	Ecton	McMahon
Benton	Flanders	Monroney
Brewster	Fulbright	Murray
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Russell
Bridges	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cain	Kefauver	Seaton
Capehart	Langer	Williams
Carlson	Lodge	Young
Douglas	McCarthy	

So the report was agreed to.

THE CHINA LOBBY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on April 10, 1952, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain excerpts from documents which I believed to be not only pertinent and relevant to Senate Resolution 170, introduced on July 6 last by myself and the senior Senator from Connecticut, but also, in my judgment, indicative of a real need for a reappraisal of our far-eastern policy.

I stated at that time that I was convinced that the translations of the documents which I placed in the RECORD were authentic, and I invited those who might be skeptical about the authenticity of the documents, or who might question the veracity of the sources, to verify the photostatic copies of the originals with the asserted authors.

Later, on April 16, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD without comment a letter to me from the Office of the Military Attaché, Chinese Embassy, dated April 11, 1952, and a letter from William A. Roberts, of the law firm of Roberts & McInnis, in Washington, D. C., dated April 12, commenting on the April 11 letter from the Chinese officials and on the translations which I had earlier put into the RECORD. The letter from the Chinese Embassy was signed by Chen Chih-mai and Peter T. K. Pee. According to my information, these two individuals were the authors of the documents, excerpts from which I had put into the RECORD April 10. In their letter of April 11 these two gentlemen connected with the Chinese Embassy stated that I had been misled regarding the authorship of the documents; and although they did not specifically deny such authorship, they implied such a denial.

Since my statement of April 16 I have received still another communication, dated May 3, from Chen Chih-mai and Peter T. K. Pee, which I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHINESE EMBASSY,
OFFICE OF THE MILITARY ATTACHÉ,
Washington, D. C.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are writing belatedly to thank you for reading our letter of April 11 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 16, 1952. We are indeed pleased that you are approaching the question fairly and without prejudice.

The most serious charge against the so-called China lobby, if such exists, is that American taxpayers' money made available to China through aid programs might have been used to influence American opinion. Such a charge is without foundation at all. On this question we wish to bring to your attention a letter to the editor of the Christian Science Monitor, a copy of which is enclosed. The letter appeared in the May 1, 1952, issue of the Monitor without change.

You must have also noted the series of two articles published recently by the magazine the Reporter. After the completion of the series, the press officer of the Chinese Embassy, on April 18, 1952, issued a brief statement, a copy of which is enclosed. On April 20, 1952, Chen Chih-mai of the Chinese Embassy also issued a statement in Chinese which was published in the Chinese newspapers in New York City on April 22, 1952. The reason why the statement was made only to the Chinese newspapers was that only those papers carried the contents of the two articles of the Reporter. You will please notice that Chen's statement refuted specifically and categorically three allegations made by the magazine concerning him as being without foundation whatsoever. We are enclosing an English translation of the statement for your information.

With further reference to the documents which you included in your Senate speech of April 10, 1952, we wish to point out that no reliable and reputable publication has so far reproduced the photostatic copies of certain originals, as you had predicted on the Senate floor. The only thing approaching such reproduction is found in the May 13 issue of the Reporter, which shows a photostatic copy of some writings in Chinese on the stationery of the Chinese Embassy. You must have noted that, in the photostatic reproduction, the name of the alleged sender, Chen Chih-mai or T. K. Pee, and the name of the alleged receiver, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, do not appear at all. It will be recalled that, when you read the same alleged cable message in the Senate, you had attached the name of Chen Chih-mai at the end. The photostatic reproduction does not bear that name at all.

As you well know, the Reporter articles made considerable use of the documents you included in your Senate speech. But the alleged texts and authorship of them were altered in many instances. As one example, the magazine (issue of April 15, p. 18) announced that another cable from Chen to Chiang appeared on page 21. But there is nothing of the sort on page 21. Instead, there is an alleged cable from Pee to Chiang. A little research shows that, in an earlier edition, that cable was indeed attributed to Chen, but in a later edition it was attributed to Pee.

As another example, when you quoted the alleged cable message of November 28, 1949, beginning with "Congressman Judd gave us secret information," you attributed it to Chen Chih-mai, while the Reporter, quoting the same alleged cable message, dropped the word "secret," and attributed it to T. K. Pee instead. Someone has taken fantastic liberties with our names. These instances only underline our previous statement that these alleged cable messages were not signed by either one of us, and that our names were arbitrarily added by somebody and were fraudulently peddled to you as authored by us.

We do not wish to bother you with further details about so ridiculous a situation. We trust that your interest in the truth will prevail over obvious attempts to mislead you.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is an official document of the highest authority. It is to our own interest, as we presume it is also to yours, to keep its contents truthful.

Faithfully yours,

CHEN CHIH-MAI,
T. K. PEE.

Mr. MORSE. It will be noted that in the May 3 letter, the writers, using rather careful language, now say that, "these alleged cable messages" which I had put into the RECORD "were not signed by either one of us, and that our names were arbitrarily added by somebody and were fraudulently peddled to you as authored by us."

This is indeed a very serious charge. On the face of it, individuals in high position with the Chinese Embassy in Washington are accusing those who made the documents available to me of perpetrating a fraud and a hoax upon me. On the other hand, if my sources are correct, Chen Chih-mai and T. K. Pee as representatives of the Republic of China on Formosa, have deliberately and knowingly lied to a United States Senator.

In these circumstances, I have again checked very carefully with my sources. They have informed me that during the years 1949 and 1950, there existed a group of five officials of the Chiang Kai-shek government who regularly communicated with Chiang Kai-shek himself in secret code under the collective name of "Kung". The five individuals comprising this intelligence group were: K. H. Yu, who I understand is a delegate to the International Bank for the Republic of China; C. M. Chen, who is the same person as Chen Chih-mai; Gen. Peter T. K. Pee, military attaché at the Embassy; W. K. Lee, who is an official of the Far Eastern Commission representing the Republic of China, and Lt. Gen. P. T. Mow, who was deputy commanding general of the Chinese Air Force in charge of the Chinese Air Force office in the United States of America. My informants state that these individuals would pool their intelligence, and usually in the presence of each other would draft in longhand in Chinese a proposed cable to Chiang Kai-shek, care of Chow Hungtai, Chiang's confidential secretary, reflecting their appraisal of the American political and military situation, and their recommendations to Chiang Kai-shek. The great majority of the cables so prepared during 1949 and 1950 were in the handwriting of Chen Chih-mai. A few were in the handwriting of General Pee, General Mow, and Mr. Yu. After the handwritten draft of a cable had been agreed upon, it was then turned over to a cable officer who made his own clear copy and then encoded the document for transmission to Chiang Kai-shek.

I have had photostats of the original drafts in the handwriting of the authors compared with the code officer's copies for encoding, and I am advised by the Foreign Affairs Section of the Legislative Reference Service that the texts are the same, although, of course, the handwriting differs. My sources have prepared for me a master index of approximately 200 pages of cables identifying the actual handwriting of Chen, Mow, Yu and Pee, as it appears on the photostats of the original drafts. In numerous places in the texts of the draft cables there will be the actual name of the author in his own handwriting. My informants tell me there is absolutely no question about the identification of the handwriting of these four gentlemen. They tell me that over the years they have seen hundreds of examples of the authors' handwriting and that it is even more difficult to forge Chinese ideographs than it is to forge our own form of writing.

In view of the contradiction which exists between the statements made to me by Chen Chih-mai and T. K. Pee, and by my own sources, I have asked the State Department to investigate the authenticity of the documents which have been handed to me. If this investigation should establish that Chen Chih-mai and T. K. Pee are telling the truth, I shall be the first to announce it publicly in fairness to them and their positions in the Embassy. If, on the other hand, their authorship of these documents is established, it would seem that our Government should take whatever diplomatic steps are appropriate in order to obtain the recall to Formosa of these individuals as persona non grata to the United States. Obviously, individuals connected with a foreign embassy should not be allowed to mislead and misinform a United States Senator.

Last Friday, June 6, 1952, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] placed in the RECORD some 23 pages of material on this so-called China lobby subject, including translations of cables supplied by Mr. Chen Chih-mai and Gen. Peter T. K. Pee. I do not know who made the translations placed in the RECORD by the junior Senator from Washington, but since he states that he asked for and obtained the file of cables offered by Chen Chih-mai and General Pee in their April 11 letter to me, I would suppose that a fair inference is that the translations were made by them or under their supervision. I did not avail myself of their generous offer, since I thought it advisable to have the Library of Congress give me impartial translations of the photostats of the original Chinese documents, rather than depend on English versions supplied by one side of the controversy. At a later date, I hope to present in parallel columns, for comparative purposes, the translated version as supplied to the junior Senator from Washington and the version given me by the Library of Congress.

In this connection, and with further reference to Senate Resolution 170, I intend at an early date to introduce into the RECORD additional translations of cables which I think will be of considerable interest to the Senate. For example, one of these cables which is represented to be in the handwriting of Chen Chih-mai, and is dated December 5, 1949, after discussing the visit to the United States of Acting President Li of the Republic of China, and rumors regarding the possible resignation of Secretary of State Acheson, says:

Our hope of a world war so as to rehabilitate our country is unpalatable to the [American] people.

Interestingly enough, the comparable portion of the translation of this cable inserted by the junior Senator from Washington, reads as follows—page 6860, bottom of first column:

The United States does not like the idea of the Chinese waiting for another world war in order to restore them to power.

There are a number of other substantial differences between the version inserted by Senator CAIN and that supplied me by the Library of Congress, all of which will become apparent in due time.

Another cable also said to be in the handwriting of Chen Chih-mai and dated September 30, 1950, after the outbreak of the Korean war, reflects a change in attitude by Chiang Kai-shek from the humility of a defeated general to the arrogance of a bitter man seeking to take advantage of a situation embarrassing to his allies. The cable comments that—

Hereafter our negotiations with America should be conducted in an open way, because the American authorities do not have good intentions with us. We will suffer from any secret agreement which can be changed at any time.

The cable writer later says in the same cable:

From our own point of view, if the American troops cross the thirty-eighth parallel and the Chinese Communists send reinforcements to help the North Koreans, then our position will become very important. In that event our friends here think we should not make commitments too easily; that requests for cooperation and facilities from us by America should be based on a quid pro quo basis.

In the context of this seeming desire for a third world war should also be considered cables dated September 1, 1945, and December 6, 1946, from the commanding general of the Chinese Air Force to the Chinese Air Force Office in the United States of America. Copies of these two cables which have been supplied to me indicate that as early as 3 weeks after the Hiroshima explosion of an atomic bomb, Chiang Kai-shek's subordinate, Gen. C. J. Chown, was instructing his officers in Washington, D. C., "to continue search for information in regard to atomic bomb," and later in December of 1946, was instructing them to "collect the information in regard to the report of the results of the Bikini atomic bomb tests in July and send back immediately for our study." I have also seen a translation of a mailgram from this same General Chown sent to the Chinese Air Force personnel in Washington during this year 1948, which contains elaborate instructions for espionage, directing all such personnel in the United States to collect, among other intelligence, "all information with regard to the production method and improvement of atomic bombs," and detailed information on military targets within the United States, such as power plants, aircraft plants, steel plants, and oil refineries.

As I said earlier I have sent a letter to the Secretary of State requesting that the State Department take such steps as may be necessary to establish whether or

not Chen Chi Mai or General Pee authored any of the documents in my possession. If they did, then in view of their denial of authorship I think steps should be taken by the State Department to have them replaced by other representatives of the National Chinese Government.

In closing, Mr. President, let me say that in the course of his remarks the other day the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] expressed the view that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] and the junior Senator from Oregon apparently should have been pressing with greater vigor for action on the resolution which calls for an investigation by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate of all foreign lobbies in the United States.

I am sorry the Senator from Washington apparently has not been following the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains a series of references by the junior Senator from Oregon to the subject since July 6 of last year, urging action by the Foreign Relations Committee. However, the junior Senator from Oregon has no power or authority to require the Foreign Relations Committee to conduct the investigation which the resolution calls for.

After all, Mr. President, when one lays before the Committee on Foreign Relations the record which he believes justifies an investigation, and when one, as I have done on several occasions, publicly on the floor of the Senate calls for an investigation, and when one places in the RECORD, as I have, the cablegrams which are the subject of the discussion on the floor of the Senate in my remarks today, one would think that within the proprieties of the Senate at least one was doing about all he could do to get the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations to proceed to take action on a resolution which apparently is residing with the greatest of comfort in a pigeonhole in the Committee on Foreign Relations and collecting the necessary senatorial dust. I repeat this afternoon, as I have said in times past, that the American people are entitled to know the facts regarding the many allegations concerning a supposed China lobby, as well as the facts concerning other alleged lobbies of foreign governments, which have been alleged to be acting improperly within the United States in an endeavor to direct public opinion into channels which would not be in the national interest of the United States. I intend, politely but firmly, to continue to call this matter to the attention of the Senate and, through the Senate, to the attention of the Foreign Relations Committee, and, through the Senate, to the attention of the American people.

Mr. President, I say today, as I said on July 6, when I submitted Senate Resolution 170, that I do not know what the facts are; but the allegations are of sufficient seriousness, in my judgment, to warrant the making of an investigation. I believe such an investigation would bring out some very interesting information, for I have a suspicion—it is only a suspicion—that there are in the United States Chinese Communist forces who are working underground to the detriment of the United States. We should expose them to the full sunlight of publicity, so that American public opinion can see what is going on within our country, on the part of Chinese Communist lobbies, as well as on the part of Chinese Nationalist lobbies, if the facts show that such activities are occurring, in accordance with the allegations into which one runs so constantly.

Such an investigation, as called for by my resolution, will not result in limiting the exposure to a disclosure of the activities of a Chinese Nationalist lobby or the activities of a Communist Chinese lobby, but will also disclose to what extent other foreign governments or foreign-government agencies are endeavoring improperly to influence American public opinion, with the result that our Nation will suffer thereby.

Of course, Mr. President, the argument often made against the position I take is that every foreign government is at work in the United States, just as we are at work in foreign governments, in an endeavor to collect such information as can be collected, so as to disclose what is going on there. I recognize that; but that is no justification for a position to the effect that we should not exercise vigilance in the matter. That is not sufficient ground for an argument in support of a hands-off policy—a policy which apparently is advocated by many persons who do not wish to have an investigation made of either an alleged Nationalist Chinese lobby or an alleged Communist Chinese lobby or alleged lobbies on the part of other foreign countries or governments.

To the contrary, Mr. President, in view of the unsettled situation of the world at the present time, I believe that both the executive branch of our Government and the legislative branch of our Government should not daily in connection with an investigation such as the one called for by my resolution, Senate Resolution 170.

Let me repeat now what I said at the joint meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee, at the MacArthur hearings: I believe the executive branch of our Government should have been proceeding with this investigation without waiting for the adoption by the Senate of a resolution such as mine.

As I interpret the testimony of the Secretary of State when he appeared at the joint meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee, and when he spoke of what might be available in the files of various of the governmental agencies, if what he said on that occasion is true, then I believe the Secretary of State has been derelict in not proceeding as Secretary of State to exercise what I am satisfied is the power of the executive branch of the Government—if he wishes to exercise that power—namely, the power to ascertain the facts regarding the operations of foreign governments within our country and to report on the same to the appropriate committees of the Congress.

Mr. President, during the MacArthur hearings, when some of us pressed the Secretary of State for a statement in regard to the position of the State Department respecting the allegations which were being made concerning the operation of foreign lobbies within our country, the Secretary of State, as the record will show, said he would take the matter under advisement and would report at a later time to the joint meeting of the two committees. Before he completed his testimony before the joint meeting of the two committees, he did so report; but it is rather interesting to recall—I do not have the record before me now, and I do not propose to quote it verbatim, but I am sure I can now quote with substantial accuracy the substance and meaning of the statement the Secretary of State made at that joint meeting—that the Secretary of State informed those committees, at their joint meeting, that he had consulted with the administration, and that he wished the committees to know that the administration would cooperate in making available to the appropriate committee of the Congress such material as was contained in the files of the various governmental departments, in connection with the activities of foreign lobbies.

At that time I indicated, and I repeat it today, that if the departmental agencies had that information or any information which they believed to be worthy of submission to a congressional investigating committee, they should not wait for the adoption of a resoultion calling for such an investigation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Oregon. However, I wish to invite the attention of the Senator from Oregon to the fact that not only have these investigations not been made by the State Department, but when a Senate committee seeks to obtain from the State Department information which would disclose some of the very things upon which the Senator from Oregon is dwelling, that committee is denied the information and is denied the right to see the files and records.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Nevada that I believe he himself and his committee have been conducting an investigation which provided an ample bottom, as we lawyers say, on which the State Department could have rested its case for volunteering to the Senator's committee information which the Secretary of State said, in effect, when he testified before the joint meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee, the departmental agencies would be glad to furnish to any appropriate committee of the Congress, if it was requested.

I wish to repeat that I believe the Secretary of State has had a responsibility to supply that material, the departmental agencies have such information

or material, and if it is of any merit at all. I assume that if it is not of any merit, insofar as the various allegations which have been made are concerned, the Secretary of State would have said so at the time when he volunteered, on behalf of the administration, his cooperation, as he did when he testified at the joint meeting of the two committees.

Mr. President, in concluding my statement, I wish to say that I am not one who has ever excused, and I do not now excuse, the administration for taking no action in this field, other than to state that it would supply whatever information is in the departmental files, insofar as foreign lobbies are concerned, if and when an appropriate congressional committee, based upon a resolution adopted by either branch of the Congress, called for the information. To the contrary, I take the position that the American people are entitled to have their confusion about such charges ended. In my opinion, one of the worst things in the entire field of American foreign policy today, and one of the reasons which has caused me to believe there is so much confusion in the thinking of the American people, is that for too long a time, information which would clear up the confusion has been kept from the American people by the administration. It has been done under exactly the kind of alibi Dean Acheson gave at the MacArthur hearings. In one sentence, they indicate that they are perfectly willing to cooperate with any congressional committee which requests the information, after appropriate steps have been taken by the committee, but, on the other hand, when there have been congressional committee investigations of subject matters which I believe to be quite relevant to this entire problem—such as the investigation conducted by the Judiciary Committee, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], there has been no volunteering of information by the State Department or other agencies of the executive branch of the Government.

I close, Mr. President, by saying that I think another great advantage which would come from the type of investigation the resolution submitted by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] and myself is that it would necessarily shed some light on the actual conditions which exist in Formosa. My record is perfectly clear on it, Mr. President. I have voted, so far as I can recall, for every suggestion which has been advanced on the floor of the Senate designed to strengthen the hand of the Nationalist government, in the hope that if their forces were properly equipped and properly trained they could become a very powerful factor for the protection of freedom in Asia. In spite of a good many disillusionments I have had about what I understand is going on in Formosa, I am going to continue to give support to any fighting force or potential fighting force in Asia which will carry on combat against Chinese Communists, because, in my judgment, if they are not stopped in what I think is their obvious intention to sweep over Asia, as soon as, if ever, the western nations let down their guard sufficiently enough so the Communists can take over all of Asia, that is exactly what they will try to do. I happen to be one who is convinced that if Asia falls under the heel of communism, be it Chinese communism as a satellitle of Russian communism, or the master of them all, the Kremlin, then freedom in America, in terms of the long spread of history, will be endangered.

That is how serious I believe the threat of communism in Asia to be, and I consider it to be equally serious in Europe. That is why the position of the junior Senator from Oregon, as manifested by his votes in the Senate, and by his statements on the floor, to back up the free forces everywhere in this contest, which I think is going on for many, many years against the enslavement threat of communism, under which personal liberty and freedom are nonexistent. I intend to continue to support the anti-Communist forces around this world; but I do not intend to throw away my thinking cap, Mr. President, and assume that merely because some force represents itself to be the enemy of communism, it is an effective enemy of communism.

In my judgment the time has come when the American people are entitled to know the facts about the present status of the Nationalist forces in Formosa. Are they equipped to fight? Are they trained to fight? Are they ready to fight? Have they the heart to fight?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am very much gratified by the remarks being made by the Senator from Oregon, and I wonder whether he means by what he said just now that he would go along with the position the Senator from New Jersey has taken for the past 3 years, that one of the keystones of our foreign policy should be a free and independent China?

Mr. MORSE. I do not know why the Senator from New Jersey limited his question to whether the Senator from Oregon would go along now. The voting record of the junior Senator from Oregon is that he has never varied from that position.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to have the Senator say that.

Mr. MORSE. A reference to the index of the CONGESSIONAL RECORD will show that on various occasions on the floor of the Senate, the Senator from Oregon has supported the Senator from New Jersey for a free and independent China. I know what an enslaved China would mean, not only to the rights and liberties of the Chinese, but, in the long pull of history, to the rights and liberties of every American citizen. But I insist that we take a look at what our supposed allies are doing, and not make the false assumption that every representation they make is necessarily consistent with fact, and that every request they make is necessarily directed to the end of strengthening our fight for freedom in Asia.

Believe me, Mr. President, if the Generalissimo and his troops are equipped and ready and able to fight, and have the heart to fight, I happen to be one who believes that the policy of the administration in Formosa, of using the United States Navy to prevent them from fighting if they want to fight, is a mistaken policy. That is no "Johnny come lately" opinion of the junior Senator from Oregon; that happens to be the consistent position the junior Senator from Oregon has taken ever since the President announced that the Navy would prevent the Generalissimo from conducting a full-scale operation on the mainland of China, if he wanted to conduct it.

I took the position in the dark hour when the new Formosa policy was adopted that one feature of it was wrong. In the interests of protecting freedom, we at that time had the duty to make very clear to the Chinese Communists, "You cannot attack Formosa; we will use the Navy to see to it that, if you attack it, we will try to stop you." But I never was of the opinion that we were right, either from the standpoint of foreign policy or from the standpoint of our moral obligations to the Generalissimo, in view of the contributions he had made in World War II, and in view of the fact that he was being driven off the mainland of China, in tying his hands and saying, "You cannot try, if you want to, to lead a return engagement against the Chinese Communists." I never was very much concerned about the argument—and I heard it on the floor of the Senate—that, of course, if we did not protect him from attack, and also laid down a rule that he could not in turn attack, there was great danger that his whole regime might collapse. I did not accept that notion, and I do not now. I am perfectly willing, Mr. President, to take the position that if he wants to conduct an attack on the mainland of China, the United States Navy should not be used to stop him. But I want to know the fact about his ability to conduct such an attack. I want to know what is involved in such an attack so far as further commitments on our part are concerned. I want to know the answer to what I say is a very simple question; and I do not see why there should be so much hesitation in answering it, for what it involves is merely a matter of fact. I do not think we ought to be arguing about questions of fact. But we ought to find out what the facts are. I should like to know, not only as a member of the Armed Services Committee, but also as a Member of the Senate, what the present status of the Generalissimo's forces are on Formosa, how many of them are equipped, how many of them have been trained, and how many of them have shoes. Are there 600,000? 500,000? 100,000? or 50,000? We can get all varieties of estimates, Mr. President, from so-called nonofficial sources in regard to those forces. But it ought to be very simple to obtain the correct information.

It ought to be very easy for the Armed Services Committee, of which the present occupant of the chair [Mr. HUNT] is an able and distinguished member, to bring before that committee the officials of the American Military Establishment who could tell us what the facts are. It

has been many, many months since anyone in the Pentagon Building, within my knowledge, at least, has officially sought to give to the Armed Services Committee the facts in regard to the military strength of the Generalissimo's forces on Formosa.

I am sending a letter to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee asking for an early hearing at which there will be called top officials of the Pentagon Building, including top officials of the American Military Commission on Formosa, to clear up, once and for all, the many confused statements as to what the actual military situation is on Formosa.

BELGIAN-AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION

Mr. HOLLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, for about 30 years I have been a member of the executive committee of the Belgian-American Educational Foundation. This foundation was organized after World War I as a follow-up to the work of the Commission for the Relief of Belgium, organized by former President Hoover.

It was financed by the balances left over after the Belgian relief operations. It contemplated aid to the four existing universities in Belgium, the University of Brussels, the University of Louvain, the University of Liege, and the University of Ghent. In addition to these dollar gifts to these institutions, we set up two foundations, one in Belgium and one in the United States, which down through the years since have carried on an exchange of students. A small number of Americans have gone to Belgium each year to study some of the specialties that these Belgian institutions were celebrated for, and 25 to 30 Belgians annually were brought to the United States and studied in our universities throughout the entire country.

Today there are nearly 1,000 living beneficiaries of the foundation's activities, and I am advised that of men in public life in Belgium today more than half are in this group that received American educational aid. Former Prime Minister, and now Foreign Minister, Paul van Zeeland, as an example, was one of our first exchange students. I am proud to add that he took his graduate degree at Princeton University and later, when he became Prime Minister, we conferred on him an honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Mr. President, I am repeating these facts because when I introduced with Senator MUNDT a few years ago the so-called Smith-Mundt bill, I was motivated to support the provisions in that bill providing for the exchange of students between countries because of my experience with Belgium. It is my considered judgment that nothing works more strongly for good will between countries than programs of this kind. One has only to recall the Rhoades scholarships in England, the Guggenheim fellowships, with which our Belgian scholarships were really the originators of this idea of exchanging students.

Within the last 2 weeks the Belgian executive director of the Belgian Foundation has been in the United States. He is Mr. Jean Willems, a friend of mine of many years. He was entertained here by Belgian Ambassador Baron Silvercuys, and I had occasion to have a long conference with him with regard to the progress of this work in Belgium.

Upon his departure he sent me a letter which is so sincere and so representative of the spirit of Belgium toward this contribution by the United States that I should like to read the full letter, which is brief, into the RECORD at this point in my remarks. The letter is as follows:

JUNE 3, 1952.

The Honorable H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: On the eve of my departure for Belgium—after an all too short stay over here—I want to tell you again how very much I enjoyed seeing you in Washington.

You belong to that group of faithful friends of my country who for more than 30 years have not ceased to do their best for the furtherance of intellectual relations between the United States of America and Belgium.

Under the aegis of Mr. Herbert Hoover a most worthy program of action was developed which not only finds a constant echo in our hearts but has led to results whose importance can never be fully evaluated. I am not in a position to say what Belgium gave those of your countrymen who have studied in our institutions of higher learning and research under the auspices of the Belgian American Educational Foundation; but I can testify—and it is a great pleasure for me to do so—to what a generous stay in your great universities and other institutions has meant to a thousand or so Belgian university graduates.

I am inclined to think that my country would not occupy the place it does in the world today if it had not been for the presence in the framework of our scientific, political, industrial and administrative life of that intellectual elite who had the privilege of coming to the United States to become familiar with the most diverse and important theories and techniques under the direction of brilliant and hospitable teachers.

And even though we have long felt our hearts beating in time with yours, even though between our two peoples there is an inner sympathy born of very similar habits of mind and feeling, I am sincerely convinced that the contribution that your colleagues and you yourself have made to the preservation and strengthening of this relationship has been literally all-important.

It would have been difficult for me after our friendly and satisfying talk not to send you this brief message by way of farewell.

With my sincere best wishes,

As ever,

S. J. WILLEMS,
Executive Director,
Foundation Universitaire, Belgium.

I cannot believe that anyone after reading this letter would have any doubts as to the effective possibilities of the international exchange of students. In my judgment it is one of the most, if not the most helpful, road to international understanding and ultimately to lasting peace.

SUBMERGED LANDS BILL

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

(Mr. O'MAHONEY addressed the Senate and introduced a bill (S. 3306) to provide for the development of the oil and gas reserves of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the shores of the United States, to protect certain equities therein, to confirm the titles of the several States to lands underlying inland navigable waters within State boundaries, and for other purposes. On request of Mr. HOLLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. O'MAHONEY's remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD following those of Mr. HOLLAND.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I dislike to take the time of the Senate at this late hour, but I deem it to be my clear duty immediately to call to the attention of the Senate a matter of the very gravest importance relating to the so-called tidelands question.

On last Tuesday, June 3, information reached me from a source which I felt was entirely trustworthy, indicating that the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Oscar Chapman, has been proceeding within the last 2 or 3 weeks with plans for the operation and administration, under Executive orders, of matters relating to oil and gas in the coastal submerged lands, including both submerged lands within the constitutional limits of the States and also submerged lands which lie beyond the constitutional limits of the States and extend to the Continental Shelf. According to my information these plans have been proceeding rapidly and directly in the face of the fact that Congress alone has the constitutional power to dispose of and regulate these lands. According to information given me, the Secretary of the Interior, in preparing these plans for operation by Executive order, has conferred with officials and attorneys of various oil companies which have a direct financial interest in the disposition of these lands.

Immediately upon the receipt on June 3, of the information which I have just mentioned, I took up the matter directly with the Secretary of the Interior, and later in the day with the Attorney General of the United States. In view of the information which I learned from them, I likewise took up the matter with Hon. Jess Larson, Administrator of the General Services Administration. I have been amazed and even shocked by the facts which I have learned from the Secretary of the Interior, the Attorney General, and the Administrator of the General Services Administration which verify in very large measure the information which had reached me, and I feel that I am completely justified in now advising the Senate that the executive branch of the Government has gone very far in its plans to usurp the power of Congress in this matter.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Do I understand correctly from the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Florida that the

executive branch of the Government or any of its departments is proceeding on some doctrine of inherent or other powers without waiting for legislative authority by the Congress of the United States?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. If the Senator will be patient, I think that in a later portion of my remarks I shall indicate rather clearly the particulars of the way in which the Secretary of the Interior intends to ignore Congress, bypass the courts, step upon the rights of the States which are involved, and to go ahead with completely bureaucratic control of the administration of the submerged lands lying offshore in our coastal States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the able Senator that I do not know what full documentation can be made of the situation, but if the statement he has made can be documented, then, speaking as one of the Senators from California, who has just been renominated by both my own party and the Democrats of California, I think it is a shocking revelation the Senator has made. I believe it is a matter which should have the investigation of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. I hope the distinguished Senator from Florida will make such a request, and that the Committee on the Judiciary, or other proper committees of the Senate will adequately investigate the situation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, later in my remarks I expect to make some suggestions very much along that line.

The claim of power upon which the Executive is basing its plans to operate and administer the coastal submerged lands under an Executive decree is based upon what I regard as a strained and distorted construction of section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, which section provides for the disposition and operation of surplus property owned by the Government. The plans of the executive department consist of a program under which the submerged offshore lands extending from low-water mark to the Continental Shelf, as surplus property, shall be or have been delegated by the Administrator of the General Services Administration to the Secretary of the Interior with respect to oil and gas contained in the Continental Shelf of the Gulf of Mexico, with full leasing powers. Under an elaborate program already discussed by the Secretary of the Interior with interested oil companies, outstanding oil leases would be confirmed, leases would be exchanged, and new leases would be granted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thought the Secretary of the Interior and the executive branch of the Government have in the past indicated that they needed legislation from Congress before entering into such an arrangement.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the Senator is correct. Not only have three Secretaries of the Interior so indicated, but the Department of Justice has so indicated. If the Senator will be patient, I think he will find in a later portion of my remarks that that is so. I shall quote directly from testimony given under oath by the Solicitor General of the United States, Mr. Perlman, upon his appearance before the Senate committee on this particular matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not wish to take the time of the Senator unnecessarily, but it is a little difficult to be patient when we hear of such a fantastic proposition as this. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that the Secretary of the Interior is attempting to use the Surplus Property Act, which was passed for the purpose of disposing of surplus goods, to take over submerged lands?

Mr. HOLLAND. The surplus-property provision, which the Secretary of the Interior is planning to use, and has used to a certain degree already, is a section of the act under which the housekeeping services of the United States were assembled in one place, under an administrative officer. The office is now filled by an able man, Col. Jess Larsen.

Under section 203 of that act, this grandiose scheme calls for a finding that the submerged lands constitute surplus property of the Federal Government, and then permit of, and are followed by, a delegation by the Administrator of the General Services Administration to the Secretary of the Interior of the handling of all oil and gas problems on submerged lands, with specific authority to handle them through means of leases for the production of oil and gas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will bear with me, I should first like to yield again to the Senator from Texas, who is on his feet.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to say that within the last few weeks we have seen some unusual things happen. I think the Solicitor General holds the distinction of being one of the outstanding legal explorers in this country for having reached down and come up with the theory of aggregate powers and inherent powers, which required the Supreme Court last week to set him back where he belonged.

But if the Administrator of the Surplus Property Act, Mr. Larson, and the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Chapman, can use the Surplus Property Act to take over submerged lands, then they are entitled to the reputation of being the outstanding discoverers and explorers of this country. I hope Congress will put them in their positions, just as the court put Mr. Perlman in his position.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. If I may make one comment, I do not think the Senator should be severe in his comment about Mr. Larson. My impression, gained through conference with Mr. Larson, was that by no means is he enthusiastic about the scheme. But his directions have perhaps come from a source which he cannot ignore.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. But the Senator's information indicated he is a party to the plan, and he does not necessarily have to be a party to it. If he does not agree to it, he can say so and refuse to exercise the authority given him under the act. Is not that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. It may be that Mr. Larson himself will have something to say along that line.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. By reason of some confusion in the Chamber, I did not hear the latter part of the Senator's statement, to which the Senator from Texas has just referred. It seems to me that the revelation being made by the Senator from Florida gets more outrageous as he goes along. I hope he has hit the target with everything he has. As I understand what the Senator is now saying, it is that after our coastal States, during the entire period since the time of their admission into the Union, had had unquestioned possession of the submerged lands out to the 3-mile limit—in the case of my State of California for a period of almost the full 100 years of our statehood—the Federal Government, having seized that land and taken it away from the States, is now preparing to treat it as surplus property, and, without any authority from the Congress of the United States, is preparing to use a statute never intended for that purpose, as a basis for doing something under a power which it cannot get from the Congress of the United States. I think that is equal to the usurpation of power by the President of the United States in the Steel case. I think it is a clear indication that the Government officials are completely ignoring the rights of the States. I think it is one of the gravest constitutional and legal questions which has been presented to the United States Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. I am glad that he appreciates the enormity of the action. I believe that if he will allow me to continue my remarks he will find that the situation goes even further than I have yet been able to indicate.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am more than surprised. Knowing Mr. Larson as I do, and having the confidence in him that I have, I am not ready to believe that he allowed himself to be a party to that scheme without pressure from some source which must have had control over him, if he yielded to it at all, which I am not ready to believe at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say that I share the same sentiments, and I believe I have already so expressed myself.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is there any question in the Senator's mind as to whether or not the executive authorities have such power?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida believes that they have no such authority. The Senator from Florida

will propose later in his remarks that the best equipped group of Senators, consisting of the chairman and members of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate—best equipped both by training and daily experience, and also by the quality of the staff which they have—make a speedy survey of the situation and report to the Senate, because the Senator from Florida cannot conceive of any Senator taking it lying down, if this situation is as raw as he believes it to be, based upon his own investigation.

Mr. McFARLAND. If they have no such authority, no company would spend any money. The oil companies have good lawyers. No company would spend any money under a lease of that kind, and no company would be interested in a lease of that kind if no such authority existed. So if there is no such authority there is nothing to fear. If there is authority, that is a different question. Then it might be well, from the Senator's point of view, for Congress to act before the surplus property custodian acts. But if there is no authority, it is plain that there is nothing to fear, because they cannot do a thing.

Mr. HOLLAND. I regret that the Senator has jumped so quickly to a conclusion, because I think he will regret that conclusion before this discussion is completed. I call his attention at this time to the fact that the oil companies which have leases, which have producing wells, and which have other wells in the process of drilling in the submerged land belt, are in anything but a good situation when it comes to dealing with the Secretary of the Interior, because it is to him that they must pay the rent for their leases. It is to him that they pay their royalties. It is only at his sufferance that they are remaining under present conditions, except in the State of California, with respect to which there is a stipulation. They are by no means in a position to bargain with him upon a situation of equality.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I decline to yield further at this time. If the Senator will permit me to conclude my point, I shall be very happy to yield further.

A survey of the Supreme Court decision in the California case and of the record of the various hearings which have been held in this important matter indicates clearly that up to the recent development which I have just mentioned no question has been raised as to the fact that Congress has exclusive jurisdiction to dispose of and regulate the submerged lands lying offshore so long as the California decision is the law of the land. In the majority opinion in the California case, the Court stated as follows:

> For article IV, section 3, clause 2, of the Constitution vests in Congress "Power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory or other property belonging to the United States." We have said that the constitutional power of Congress in this respect is without limitation. *United States* v. *San Francisco* (310 U. S. 16, 29–30). Thus neither the courts nor the executive agencies could proceed contrary to an act of Congress in this congressional area of national power.

In the Federal Government's brief in the California case, these words appear:

> The President recognizes that in the event the decision of this Court is favorable to the United States, it will be necessary to have congressional action looking toward the future management of the resources of this area.

The absolute necessity for congressional authorization prior to any affirmative administrative act with respect to the management of these submerged lands has several times been affirmed in sworn testimony before committees of Congress by responsible representatives of the Executive. As recently as March 28, 1951, which was long after the passage of the administrative act to which we have referred, and under which Mr. Larson is serving as Administrator, Honorable Philip B. Perlman, Solicitor General, made the following statement before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

> Well, we are here, Senator, because we recognize, of course, that nothing can be done with respect to those submerged lands without congressional authority, and that is the reason for Senate Joint Resolution 20, and the executive department does not have the authority—Congress has not given it the authority—to proceed to exercise the power which the Supreme Court declared resides in the United States.

For itself Congress has demonstrated clearly that it intends to determine the policies for the disposition and regulation of these submerged lands. It has at least twice refused to approve legislation which was intended to give the Federal executive branch control over these areas, either on a permanent basis as proposed by Senate bill 923, introduced in 1949, or on a so-called interim basis, as proposed under the original terms of Senate Joint Resolution 20 as introduced in 1951 by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. Not only has Congress refused to approve the legislation just mentioned, but it has twice passed by substantial majorities legislation which would restore to the States the ownership and control of submerged lands within the State constitutional boundaries. With respect to the major portion of the Continental Shelf, which lies beyond State constitutional boundaries, Congress has expressly reserved that question for its own determination in the future. This is clear both from the language of Senate Joint Resolution 20, as amended and approved by Congress, and as recently vetoed by the President, and from the language of the conference report of May 7, 1952.

It is difficult for me adequately to express how deeply shocked and depressed I am by the actions of the Secretary of the Interior. My preliminary investigation of the facts as an individual Senator has brought me to certain conclusions which I now bring to the attention of the Senate.

First. The Secretary of the Interior has undoubtedly been developing plans for many months for what amounts to an Executive seizure of these submerged lands on the specious and spurious theory that they constitute "surplus property" of the Federal Government. In pursuance of this scheme the Secretary of the Interior has developed a program for the confirmation of existing leases, the exchange of leases, and the granting of new leases.

That first statement is made as a statement of fact, which I shall be ready to support by the submission of evidence if and when the Committee on the Judiciary, as I believe it will and as I believe it should, takes jurisdiction of the matter for the purpose of checking on these intricate legal questions, which mean so much not only to the coastal States and to all the other States and all the people of those States, but mean so much also to the preservation of our form of government.

Second. In the development of his plans as above stated, the Secretary of the Interior has called into conference officials and legal counsel of interested oil companies and has discussed with them his plans and program. I make that as a statement of fact. I feel that I should digress at this point to say that in my opinion the Secretary of the Interior has the full right to meet and confer with the officers and attorneys for the oil companies who hold leases in the submerged lands by reason of the fact that under the existing situation he is receiving from them payments of lease rentals and lease royalties which fact necessarily and properly brings him into frequent contact with these oil officials and attorneys.

I feel that I should also say that I have not the slightest evidence and I do not charge that the Secretary of the Interior has any personal or pecuniary interest in this matter whatever. From the limited information which I possess the program which he is developing appears to be but another incident in the dangerous trend toward bureaucratic control under which the will of Congress would be bypassed and the Federal Government would be made bigger and more powerful and even further removed from the control of the people and of their chosen representatives.

Third. In pursuance of my investigations I have been specifically denied both by the Secretary of the Interior and the Attorney General the right to see communications by which the Secretary of the Interior requested the opinion of the Justice Department on the program which I have above described, and the Department of Justice replied to such request.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. NIXON. I understood the Senator from Florida to say a few moments ago that he did not feel that Jess Larson, as Surplus Property Administrator, should be held responsible for this action. Did I understand correctly that the Senator's reason for making that statement was that Jess Larson indicated he was not in sympathy with the action that was being taken, or that he had not initiated it, or what was the reason that the Senator gave for that opinion?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Larson stated to me that he had no confidence in this program.

Mr. NIXON. In other words, the Senator from Florida was stating that Jess Larson was not the one who had initiated this kind of procedure.

Mr. HOLLAND. Positively not.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator one further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. NIXON. The Senator from Florida has discussed the matter with Mr. Perlman, the Solicitor General, as I understand?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have not. I have discussed the subject twice with the Attorney General, Mr. McGranery.

Mr. NIXON. May I ask the Senator whether or not Mr. McGranery or Mr. Perlman or anyone else in the Justice Department initiated or suggested the procedure in the first instance? I am trying to ascertain who was responsible for it.

Mr. HOLLAND. The statement to me from the Secretary of the Interior was that he wrote to the Department of Justice submitting this program and asking for its legal opinion; furthermore, that a reply had been received. I asked the Secretary of the Interior for his letter and was refused it. I asked the Attorney General for his letter, and was refused it. The Attorney General did tell me that he would be very glad to turn over the correspondence to me if the Secretary of the Interior would agree that that course be followed. I then saw the Secretary of the Interior and specifically asked him for a release of those two communications. I was later informed by him that he specifically denied my request.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. NIXON. From what the Senator from Florida has stated, is it not possible to draw the conclusion, or at least the inference, that the Justice Department in its opinion might have suggested that there were grave doubts about the legality of this procedure upon which the Department of the Interior has embarked?

Mr. HOLLAND. That would be a possible conclusion, but I should not state it as a fact because I was not able to secure the text of the opinion, letter, or communication from the former Attorney General, Mr. McGrath, to the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. NIXON. But certain opinions or letters have been written, as I understand. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. At least one, and my information from the same source which gave me the original information to which I have referred is that there is still another letter stating an opinion, but I wish to make it perfectly clear that I have no dependable information as to the contents of those letters or opinions, because I have not been permitted to see them. They may not be formal opinions, but communications which fall short of formal opinions. I have no specific information on the subject.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, since the Secretary of the Interior, who initiated this procedure, has declined to disclose this information to the Senator from Florida, it would seem to me that it is imperative that the Committee on the Judiciary in its investigation obtain either this correspondence or obtain the honest opinion of Mr. McGranery or Mr. Perlman, or whoever is assigned the duty of giving an opinion on the subject, whether or not the Department of Justice feels this is a legal and constitutional procedure. Would the Senator from Florida agree that that should be the case?

Mr. HOLLAND. That probably is the case. I may say this, that when I called on Mr. McGranery he told me that this matter was one of first impression with him and that he had no information on it. That is perfectly understandable, because he had occupied his office only a few days, perhaps less than a week, when I called on him last Tuesday or Wednesday, whichever the day was. The files in his office have to do with correspondence between the Secretary of the Interior and the former Attorney General, or perhaps with the former Acting Attorney General, Mr. Perlman, who is the United States Solicitor General.

But, not having seen either the letters from Mr. Chapman or the letters from Attorney General McGrath or Mr. Perlman, I am unable to give specific information as to their contents. That is one of the reasons why I say that I am so anxious—and even insistent—that the Committee on the Judiciary shall take jurisdiction of the matter for the purpose of investigating into this whole situation, because surely they will have the right to insist that the Department of Justice, which is peculiarly under the supervision of the Committee on the Judiciary, shall make known what was the skilled opinion of its best lawyers on this matter which was submitted to it by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. NIXON. If the Senator from Florida will yield once more, I should like to say, since this procedure, which has been at least questioned by Mr. Larson and about which there must be some question apparently in the minds of those in the Justice Department who have been asked to rule on it, that when the Government embarks upon this procedure, or when the Secretary of the Interior does, the Secretary of the Interior will find, in attempting to make contracts for the leasing of these lands, that speculators and others interested in obtaining it are likely to obtain the leases at a much lower price than should be the case, due to the fact that the title would actually be in question.

If Congress had passed the O'Mahoney bill, which would have at least for a period of time resolved the question as to the title, when the Federal Government made leases it would get what the leases were worth so far as the contracts were concerned. But it seems to me that if the Secretary of the Interior is to be allowed to take action under this very novel procedure, which I do not concede, and which I feel others do not concede, is legal or constitutional, certainly if we felt that way those who would be prospective lessees would feel the same way, and the Government would not be able to obtain the favorable leases which it would be able to obtain if the Government would wait until the question of title were decided. Would the Senator agree that that statement is correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree with that statement. In further answer to the question I would say that my source of information unfortunately may not be disclosed, because to disclose the source would jeopardize his position. But that source of information gave me this additional statement, and this is the very point which the Senator has brought out.

He stated that as the Secretary of the Interior brought in officials and attorneys of the various oil companies which now hold leases and are therefore particularly under duress when they are called in by the Secretary of the Interior, because of the peculiar situation which now exists, that at least in several outstanding cases those officials and attorneys called to the specific attention of the Secretary of the Interior the fact that an unstable and questionable setup of the kind which was proposed here would surely result in bidding which would not reflect the actual maximum value of the leases, and would therefore be prejudicial to whoever owned the proprietary interest.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield at this point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. NIXON. I believe that one of the points in controversy in this entire tidelands matter has been the claim, which has been made in some quarters, that one of the reasons why State ownership should be opposed is that the States are unable to obtain or make contracts or leases as attractive, from the standpoint of the people, as those which could be made or obtained by the Federal Government.

Those of us who are familiar with the facts know that in the State of California, for instance, the leases made by the State of California provide for royalties which average approximately 44 percent, whereas if the Secretary of the Interior were to proceed to make leases under the proposed legislation which would have granted that power to him, the average royalty in those cases would have been approximately 12½ percent.

That leads me to the point I wish to make in regard to the matter which now is before us, namely, that if the Secretary of the Interior now proceeds, not under legislation which would leave no doubt as to the title which would be involved, but if he proceeds under the procedure which has been outlined by the Senator from Florida, in the remarks he has made today, we shall find that the people—whether they be the people of a State or the people of the United States, depending upon our point of view regarding the tidelands matter—will receive less under the procedure now advanced than they will receive under any other procedure which has been suggested. Is not that the case?

Mr. HOLLAND. Certainly there is a probability that that is the case. I do not have personal knowledge of such a comparison between the methods of disposing of leases by the Federal Government and the methods of disposing of

leases by the States, because I have not been in a position to observe that situation.

However, I repeat that my informant stated that this point was made categorically to the Secretary of the Interior by several of the officials and attorneys for the oil companies who were summoned to discuss this very matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me at this point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I indicated, a moment ago, that I would yield to the majority leader, for I judged that he wished to interrogate me about some point. Therefore, at this time let me inquire whether the majority leader now wishes to have me yield to him.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I believe that probably the Senator from Florida will develop the point I had in mind, before he concludes. If he does not, I shall ask him about it later on.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be very glad to cover the point to which the Senator from Arizona refers if I can do so. If I do not, I shall be glad to yield to him whenever he wishes to have me yield.

In the meantime, I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida was kind enough to consult me about this matter a day or so ago.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have asked the Senator from Florida to yield to me at this point because I thought I might be able to throw a little light upon one of the questions asked by the Senator from California.

Mr. HOLLAND. Permit me to interject at this point that I consulted the Senator from Wyoming the day after this information reached me, and I have consulted him on several occasions since that time. I have not seen the letter he placed in the RECORD a little while ago; but in conferences with the Senator from Wyoming, he made it very clear to me, throughout, that he completely disapproved the approach being followed by the Secretary of the Interior; and the Senator from Wyoming said to me that he had so advised the Secretary of the Interior some time ago, and believed he had the matter rather stopped at that time.

Now I yield once more to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is quite correct, and I appreciate his courtesy in making the statement he has made.

I believe the Federal Property Act does not apply, and cannot be stretched to apply, to the disposal of the Continental Shelf.

I pointed out to the Secretary of the Interior, in the letter which I dictated to him last Saturday—and I did so for the purpose of having a written record of my position—that the Executive order the President of the United States issued on September 28, 1945, provided that the Secretary of the Interior should have jurisdiction and control over the Continental Shelf, pending the enactment of legislation.

The Federal Property Act, which was enacted in 1949, did not undertake to supersede that Executive order. However, it did in specific terms supersede another Executive order.

Therefore, the position which is suggested here puts the Administrator of General Services in the absurd position of having authority to grant to the Secretary of the Interior power over an area which already has been put into his hands by the President of the United States.

The Senator from California asked what was the attitude of the Department of Justice. Of course, I cannot speak for the present Attorney General. The Senator from Florida has just read testimony given by the Solicitor General before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, from which it is clear that the Solicitor General, speaking for the Department, was definitely and clearly of the opinion that the enactment of legislation by Congress was necessary before anything could be done with these lands.

I have no doubt at all that that was the position of the Department of Justice. The Solicitor General, in testifying before our committee, was not urging the enactment of legislation, and at the same time telling the Secretary of the Interior that there was already on the statute books legislation sufficient to cover the matter.

However, in justice to the Secretary of the Interior—and probably in explanation of the fact that the Senator from Florida has not been able to obtain copies of the correspondence which has passed back and forth—I think it should be pointed out, and I am sure the Senator will agree——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on that point let me say that the Senator from Wyoming heard me make that request of the Secretary of the Interior, but my request was denied.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes; I was there.

However, it was also pointed out by the Secretary of the Interior that no decision had been made. Therefore, it would appear that that correspondence took place while the Secretary of the Interior was trying to determine whether there was any other method of handling the submerged lands.

I am confident that the opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, which I had an opportunity to read last year, does not demonstrate that the Federal Property Act does this; but I believe that to date the record is that the Secretary of the Interior has been trying to explore what the possibilities may be.

I would say again that nothing which has been discovered in the Federal Property Act would, in my opinion, afford a constitutional basis for the issuance of any leases to submerged lands under any provision contained in that act authorizing the Administrator to empower an executive agency to lease surplus property. The only provision affecting leases also gives him power to sell surplus property or to exchange it for other property—with or without warranty.

As I have said, in my opinion there is not the slightest reason to believe that anything can be done along this line; and I am very hopeful that the President of the United States will not make any such decision. In my opinion, such a decision would be a very serious mistake.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am very happy to have the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs make the statement he has just made.

I wonder what influence or power of persuasion would cause Mr. Larson to issue an order or make an order affecting property, which clearly was not within his control.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the question is addressed to me, I shall say to the Senator from Nevada, with the indulgence of the Senator from Florida, that no such order has been issued, according to the information which has been given to me.

An order was drafted, but it was never delivered by Jess Larson to the Secretary of the Interior. Mr. Larson did transmit a copy of the form of an order to be issued if it were determined that an order should be granted. But no order has been granted, no decision has been made. This has been an exploration of a possibility. But I regret that the Secretary of the Interior, in his letter to the Senator from Florida, did not positively and without recourse close the door to this method of procedure. In my opinion, no oil company could hold any lease under the Surplus Property Act with any security at all. I may say my reason for saying that to the Senator from Florida is that I was a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, in 1944, when the Surplus Property Act was drafted. In fact, I think I had a good deal to do with handling it upon the Senate floor when it was considered and passed. I know also that when the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments reported the Federal Property Act in 1949, he recited in his report that practically all the objectives of the Surplus Property Act had been already attained, but that there were probably certain types of property still on the Government's books—the commodities and some real property—and so it was felt necessary to retain portions of the original act. One of the portions retained was a substantial part of the definition of "property," upon which the argument of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior is based. His argument is based upon the contention that, since property is defined as any interest in property, with the exception of the public domain, the national forests, and certain naval vessels like battleships and aircraft carriers, then the right to the submerged lands, declared by the proclamation of the President, was an interest in property.

But to me it is perfectly obvious from a statement made at the time, from the reports of the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in both the House and Senate, and from the fact that the public domain was exempted, and that the national forests were exempted, that the Congress which exempted the public domain and the national forests would not possibly have failed to exempt the submerged lands had they had the slightest belief that submerged lands could be handled in this manner, without specific legislation. Particularly is that true since the President of the United States, in his Executive order, had expressly stated that these lands were reserved and set aside, pending legislation; and therefore, before anything could be done, it would be necessary for the President of the United States himself to modify his own Executive order, the Congress not having done so.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, let me amplify one matter that was covered by the Senator from Wyoming. The Senator from Wyoming correctly stated the relation, to himself and to me, at a joint conference, between ourselves and Mr. Chapman, the Secretary of the Interior, and what was stated to us by Mr. Chapman with reference to this delegation of authority from Mr. Larson. I have since rechecked that matter very cerefully with my source of information, and I am very sure that, upon proper investigation, it will be found that not a copy of the delegation but an original signed delegation came from Mr. Larson to the Secretary of the Interior, and has been upon the desk of the Secretary of the Interior. I am very sure that that fact can be completely shown and proven; and, of course, on that, the statements and the files of the two executive officers will, I am sure, state the facts.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. That brings me back to the thought I expressed a little while ago. There must be something more than what is expressed by the Senator from Wyoming behind this matter, because it would require something more than a mere exploratory attitude on the part of the Secretary to induce Mr. Larson to make that order.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I agree completely with the statement of the distinguished Senator from Nevada; and I shall be very glad, in appearing before his committee, if he grants me that privilege, to go further into what I think is the true explanation of this situation. I would prefer not to do it upon the floor at this time, for reasons which are obvious.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thought probably, because of the Senator's statement a few moments ago, that I ought to make the point clear which I was trying to make. I have not examined the Surplus Property Act; I have not given it study as to what authority might be granted under it in regard to making leases of oil lands. I was merely taking the position that I thought it would be clear, doubtless, that it was not the intent of Congress that lands could be leased for oil purposes by such a procedure as that proposed. I never thought about such authority being granted, and I was assuming that that was the state of the law. Upon that assumption, if it is clear, then, of course, no company would take over or try to exercise any rights under that procedure. On the other hand, of course, if there is question about it, then I could see some reason for alarm.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will permit me to comment, I think, from the study I have made of the matter, which has been considerable, but not by any means conclusive, because I have not had the chance, in the 5 days or 6 since the question first came to my attention, but in my study of the matter it seemed clear to me, first, that any disposition made of leases under such a set-up would be prejudicial to the rights of whoever owned the royalties, whoever owns the equities; but that there is much more of a case, much more probability of trading to some advantage, at least, in leases beyond the State lines, in areas where, at least in the opinion of the Senator from Florida, the Federal title exists; there is much more probability of something like proper results coming from that area of trading, even under this careless and, I think, wholly unsubstantial set-up, than there is in the trading in leases within State lines, in the submerged lands between low-water mark and the constitutional borders of the State.

The Senator from Florida feels that it would be a tragedy of the first degree for an operation to be attempted under this proposed stretched, distorted interpretation of the Surplus Disposal Act.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thought the Senator must have misunderstood me, because I did not for one moment intend to convey the impression that I had any opinion, one way or another, as to what the law might be on the subject. I do know that I did not have that in mind when I voted on the Surplus Property Act. But we sometimes miss points in bills which are passed, and the authority is there, when we do not think it is.

Mr. President, I know that when it comes to the disposition of oil leases, and the making of oil leases, in legislation upon which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has passed, we have been very careful and have scrutinized every bill to see that there were no loopholes by which an injustice could be done to the United States or whereby someone could get property for nothing.

Mr. HOLLAND. Certainly the Senator is correct in his interpretation of what was the intention and attitude of the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives. The question as to whether such a distorted interpretation of this particular section 203 can stand is, of course, a question for able legal authority, and it is for that reason that the Senator from Florida wants that question to go to the able chairman and members of the Judiciary Committee, so that they may speedily advise the Senate and the country upon this very vital question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Florida has rendered the country a great service.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that his opinion is that the Administrator of General Services had already signed an order?

Mr. HOLLAND. According to the information which I have received, he signed the order, and it was actually received by the Secretary of the Interior. My information is—and this is based upon the statement by the Secretary of the Interior—that not only did his Solicitor approve of the course but that the Solicitor of the General Services Administration also approved.

Is that a correct statement?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am heartened by the letter written to the Secretary of the Interior by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I hope every Member of the Senate will read it. I think it is not only a rather strong but a rather sound letter. One paragraph of it is particularly appealing to me, and if the Senator from Florida will indulge me, I should like to read it. The Senator from Wyoming said in the letter:

> Finally, let me say that if the Federal Property Act can by tortured construction be held to apply to the submerged lands, then some future executive could use the same law, not to lease these valuable deposits, but to sell them or even to give them away. The power to lease is only one or the powers to disposal granted by the Federal Property Act. It provides also for sale, exchange, permit or transfer "for cash, credit or other property, with or without warranty." If without specific legislative authority, which the President had in mind in his Executive Order No. 9633 of September 28, 1945, the Administrator of General Services can designate or authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease the submerged lands under executive rules and regulations, then he has equal authority to permit the Secretary or any other executive agency to sell or exchange these lands, and even to transfer them for other property with or without warranty.
>
> It is altogether too unrealistic a concept to be entertained for a moment, particularly in the face of the perfectly proper order of the President reserving and setting aside these lands pending congressional action.

If the Administrator has already determined that he has sufficient authority to designate the Secretary of the Interior as his agent, who can say that he will not determine that he has power to sell or give away or exchange these lands? I think that is a matter in which every Member of the Senate should be interested. If we have reached a period in our national life when an administrator, by taking a pen and signing an administrative order, can transfer property that belongs to the States or to the Federal Government, without coming to

the Congress, it is a sad day for this Nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Texas who has made a real contribution through his own statement and through his reading of the letter of the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], which letter I have not had an opportunity to see.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. In view of the Executive order of the President, would it not be necessary to get approval of the action of the Administrator of General Services?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am inclined to think, in attempting to reply, that it would, but I do not know that that is the case. That would be but another detail as to which the Judiciary Committee could advise the Senate. Suffice it to say that the Secretary of the Interior, in his very interesting conference with the Senator from Wyoming and myself, made it very clear that the Executive order which accomplished this matter—whether it was to be signed by the President or by himself the Senator from Florida is not clear—was drafted and was available, although it was not made available to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HILL. The thought I had in mind was based upon what the Senator from Texas just said. In view of the Executive order of 1945 to which the Senator from Wyoming alluded, before any action could be taken by any of these officials there had to be action by the President of the United States.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator may be correct. Whether he is correct or not, the Senator from Florida will be able to make and will make certain observations on that point when he appears before the Judiciary Committee. He does not feel that this forum is the proper place to do that.

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator from California used the words "reserve" and "reserved power." As I listened to the Senator's statement this afternoon I gathered that any claim of any kind by the Secretary of the Interior or by the Administrator of General Services is tied to and strictly based upon the Federal Property Act. Is not that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe that to be true. But the Secretary made it very clear in his communication to me that inherent power exists in connection with this matter also. In connection with the earlier Executive order he twice used the term "inherent power," which I thought had become quite an unpopular term, but which he apparently thinks it is still proper to use.

Mr. HILL. Is it not a fact that any exploration or investigation of this matter has been based upon the specific statute passed by the Congress, the General Administrative Act of 1949?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is my information.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. NIXON. The Senator from Florida emphasized, and properly so, the fact that the Secretary of the Interior had not made a decision as to what he was going to do in this matter, and that it was still a subject which would be discussed with the Attorney General and the Surplus Property Administrator before decision is rendered. It seems to me that that shows the absolute necessity for the Judiciary Committee to have very early and prompt hearings on the matter, because if we do not have hearings and get the Secretary of the Interior, the Attorney General, and the Surplus Property Administrator on record against this type of procedure, we may find after adjournment the very thing may happen that most of us on the floor today believe should not happen and could not happen under constitutional procedure.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the point raised by my junior colleague from California is a very important one, because we are now moving toward adjournment, which will probably come by the 1st of July, and unless this matter is immediately investigated by the Judiciary Committee we may find when we return, either by reason of a special call by the President of the United States, or when we return in January, that we will be presented with a fait accompli, and certain transactions will have taken place without any authority of law.

I do not believe that the elected representatives of the people in the Senate and the House are entirely helpless in the face of a clear usurpation of authority by the executive branch of the Government. Some time, somewhere along the line the Congress will have to stand up as a coequal branch of the Government and say that we will not permit usurpation of authority under the doctrine of inherent power, or any other theory. After the Committee on the Judiciary calls before it proper representatives of the executive branch of the Government, and makes a full and complete investigation of the subject, which I believe the situation warrants, I hope that if the facts justify it, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, if he deems it proper, will transmit a copy of the hearings to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, because the Congress of the United States, acting through both Houses, still has the power of impeachment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that if there were an attempt to usurp power, the leases would not be any good anyway? If no power exists, the leases are null and void ab initio, are they not? Any attempt at usurpation would avail nothing, because the leases would not be good.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator may be correct. Yet leases might be good outside State boundaries, and not good within them. There might be such a bureaucratic set-up by the time Congress could get around to it that the situation would be entirely different, from the standpoint of the pressure which would be brought to bear on Members of Congress as to what they should do on this question.

I completely agree with the Senator from California that the exigencies of the case call for a quick and early report to the Senate from authoritative sources, the most authoritative we can reach, as to the validity of what is being attempted.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Florida is an eminent attorney. He has had much experience and background in the law. It occurs to me, and I suggest to the Senator from Florida, that in the event such procedures were used, there might be difficulty on the part of anyone getting into court on the basis of whether he had standing to sue because of this illegal usurpation of power.

Mr. HOLLAND. I greatly appreciate the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. It certainly has merit.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina, who is a distinguished former president of the American Bar Association.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I wonder if one of the most dangerous tendencies about the proposition is not the likelihood of administrative bureaucrats continuing to grab or attempt to usurp power, as we have seen in other instances.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe the Senator has put his finger exactly upon the most critical, most crucial principle involved in the whole problem.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. If executive power, by whomever it may be exercised, can grab steel and grab power, as the Secretary of the Interior has attempted to grab hydroelectric power in my State of North Carolina, and can grab the oil of the country, only a few other things need be grabbed before we shall have a socialistic state.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the Senator is correct. This kind of proposal is clearly indicative of a trend toward totalitarianism, which we have observed and are trying to curb. I believe the Senate has not seen a finer illustration of how far the ambition of power-mad bureaucrats can carry us than is presented by the matter in hand.

Mr. President, I ask that Senators listen particularly to my fourth conclusion, because to me the most amazing thing in the whole scheme is that which I shall mention in the fourth conclusion.

I have learned with the greatest distress that under the scheme which I have above outlined it is intended by the Secretary of the Interior to exercise jurisdiction and control.

I hope the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] will give particular attention to this: It is intended by the Secretary of the Interior to exercise jurisdiction and control not only over submerged lands which were the subject matter of litigation in the Louisiana and Texas cases but also over submerged lands which lie off shore of the States of Mississippi, Alabama, and my own State of Florida, including both submerged lands which lie within the State limits, as well as submerged lands which lie from the State limits out to the Continental Shelf.

I may say, aside from the text of my prepared address, that the most amazing development I found in this matter was the very clear indication in the text of the order delegating authority that the offshore areas near Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi were to be treated, and were treated, exactly the same as were the offshore areas near the States of Louisiana and Texas, with respect to which there was at least the authority of action by the Supreme Court of the United States, even though in the Texas case the Court acted by a vote of 4 to 3, meaning that the four who constituted the majority were less than a majority of the full membership of the Court.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. But when the Federal Property Act was passed the Supreme Court had not even acted in the Texas case.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not recall the exact dates, but that is quite possibly the case.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The date of the decision in the Texas and Louisiana cases was June 5, 1950, following enactment of the Federal Property Act.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Wyoming substantiates the point made by the Senator from Texas.

This has been perhaps the most amazing of all of the information which has reached me, in that it would deny to the States of Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida the right to have their cases heard and determined by the United States Supreme Court; and it would propose, by what amounts to Executive seizure, to displace the existing jurisdiction and control of the submerged lands within State boundaries, which is now being exercised by the sovereign States which I have named.

In order to be very sure that my understanding of the situation in Florida was correct, I today called the distinguished attorney general of the State of Florida, and learned from him first-hand that the leases made by the State of Florida on offshore lands lying within the State limits of our State, but between the low-tide mark and the State line, are still being administered by the State of Florida, and that the rents are being paid to and collected by the State. Aside from that, there has been no effort whatever to disturb the much greater, much more valuable jurisdiction of the State of Florida in matters having to do with the control of its fisheries, sponges, and the shrimp industry, its control of the commercial disposition of shell and sand. The State is still in control of the disposition of submerged lands immediately off shore which are susceptible of being filled—and we have a great deal of such land in our State. In those matters and others there has not been the slightest interference with the plenary jurisdiction of the elected officials of the State of Florida and their exercise of powers which the State has enjoyed ever since Florida became a State.

However, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that if bureaucratic power exists, without court procedure to give away, and to bind in control of someone alien to the State of Florida jurisdiction to handle oil and gas leases—and so far as I know, no oil or gas has been discovered in the submerged lands of our State—then there is no question under decisions of the Supreme Court, and also under the proceeding which is being considered here, if it should be upheld, that our State could be despoiled in a much graver way, as I have indicated, by taking away from us rights which mean a great deal more to Florida, with its more than 1,000 miles of coast line, than any value which we can see at present in the question of oil and gas.

Mr. LONG. The Senator undoubtedly knows that if the Federal Government were in a position to own all submerged lands from low-water mark seaward, the Federal Government would be just as well in a position to seize all land that has been reclaimed at great expense by the State of Florida, and to dispose of it as surplus property of the United States Government. If it has a right to seize oil, it has a right to seize all other resources that might be contained within the submerged lands. Certainly that would not be a proper way to dispose of resources which the people themselves have developed along the shore.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is exactly correct in his belief that from the technical standpoint, irrespective of what may be the attitude of the present administration or of any later Federal administration, the right to do the one thing would establish the right to do the other things which the Senator has mentioned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the Senate has been given assurance that minnows are safe. The administration is merely out after whales. It does not care about fish, and does not want them or claim them. But if there is any oil present, the Government claims that it has paramount rights to it. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is so correct. It would appear that so long as the stepchild, the State, had nothing that was very much worthwhile, the Federal Government had no desire to take it. But as soon as oil rights were developed on the submerged lands through the initiative of the States, and those rights were controlled and supervised by regulatory agencies of the States, immediately there was a change in opinion.

After numerous opinions had been given out to the other effect, the grasping hand of the Federal bureaucracy went out to try to take from the States that which they had developed on areas which had been managed, handled, supervised, and controlled—and they thought owned—by them ever since the foundation of our Nation.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. NIXON. The Senator from Florida has made reference to the fact that the Federal Government seems to step in whenever it feels that the properties are of sufficient value to justify it in doing so. In California we have always operated under the happy idea that one of Florida's most valuable assets was its residential property. In California also we have had the idea that much of Florida's most valuable residential properties are built on lands which have been pumped up from the tidelands.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. NIXON. What will keep the Government from taking over many of Florida's finest residential sections if this theory is allowed to prevail?

Mr. HOLLAND. If this theory is allowed to prevail and is upheld, nothing will prevent it, except the grace and good will of the Federal Government, which may exist at one time and not at another, or may exist as to one value and not as to another. We cannot sit idly by and see such a precedent established. I am sure that the Senate will not permit it to be established.

Mr. NIXON. I think the Senator has put his finger on the great problem. In addition to the immediate concern we have over what the Secretary of the Interior is proposing to do, there is the question of the precedent which would be created. In this instance, for example, possibly the claim will be made that only the oil-bearing tidelands affecting two or three States are involved. But here we have a case in which there is a bona fide dispute between the State governments and the Federal Government, over title to the tidelands. At the present time that dispute is being considered in the Congress of the United States. During the period when that dispute is being so considered and debated, the executive department, acting through the Secretary of the Interior, steps in and uses the Surplus Property Act for the purpose of resolving the dispute, at least so far as the Federal Government is concerned, in favor of the Federal Government. Once such a precedent is established if we allow the Surplus Property Act—which all of us, I think, will admit certainly was never intended, under any stretch of the imagination, to be used to cover such a situation as this, as applied to properties of this type—to be used in this instance, to settle this dispute, we shall be allowing a precedent to go on the books which might mean that in the future the executive department could use the Surplus Property Act or some similar or related act for the purpose of resolving disputes not only between the Federal Government and the States, but also disputes be-

tween the Federal Government and private citizens. In other words, if this action is allowed to go unchallenged, it means that a new method of confiscation of rights which are in dispute will have been approved by silence on the part of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is, of course, exactly correct.

To say that this matter has been shocking to me would be a complete understatement. I have had a conference with the Secretary of the Interior, and have received two letters from him on this subject, together with certain documentary material which I shall be glad to produce before the appropriate Senate committee. I have no intention at this time of wearying the Senate by trying to place in the RECORD the mass of material which I have obtained. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] knows perfectly well that I have possession of such letters and documents, because he has copies of them.

Also, I have received, through the good offices of the Senator from Wyoming, a certain message relative to a very important aspect of this matter, which I shall gladly communicate to the commmittee when it passes upon this question. But again I think it relates to a matter which should not be discussed at this time and place.

As already stated, I have not been able to produce from the Secretary of the Interior or from the Attorney General the correspondence between their Departments relating to this subject. Neither have I seen the copy of the Executive order which I understand has been prepared for use in this matter, nor the other documents which have also been prepared. I feel that such material can be obtained only by aggressive action and demand of a Senate committee which has full power to investigate a matter of this kind and importance, in order to bring the full facts before the Senate for its consideration in connection with the fulfillment of its own duties in the enactment of appropriate legislation.

Since the various matters on which the Senate is entitled to the fullest advice are all legal questions, it seems to me that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary should promptly investigate, and I hope that it will promptly investigate, the entire situation and advise the Senate fully with reference thereto.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should like to tell the Senate that I was a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments at the time the Federal Property Act was reported by that committee. Having studied and carefully read that measure as a junior member of the committee, the junior Senator from Louisiana did not have the slightest idea that it could be used as a basis for the Federal Government taking over the submerged lands along the shores of the States. I regret that the distinguished chairman of that committee is not now present in the Chamber. I certainly hope, if this scheme is to be attempted, that he will express himself on that subject. I believe the RECORD will indicate that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], who was chairman of the committee at that time, had not the least idea that such a construction would be placed upon that act. It is amazing to see such property claimed by the Federal Government, in view of the history of this subject.

It seems that the gentlemen who have been Secretary of the Interior in this Government change their minds most frequently. Mr. Ickes was Secretary of the Interior at one time. With all due respect to the late Harold Ickes, he was advised that this was State property. He was an attorney. He was in a position to know something about the law. He advised those who applied for Federal leases that this was State property. Later he said that he had changed his mind, and that the question should be contested in the courts. It is my understanding that when it was contested in the courts the Secretary of the Interior took the position that the Federal Leasing Act did not apply to such land, because it was in a different category from other public lands in the public domain. Later Mr. Ickes came before our committee and urged that the Federal Leasing Act should be applied to it, and that the Federal Government should go ahead and lease, without any authorization by Congress.

Up to this point it has seemed that Secretary Chapman was being consistent in saying that he wanted the Congress to enact legislation to instruct him what to do. If the Senator from Florida is correct, it seems that Secretary Chapman is changing his position in urging that the Federal Government take over this land, declare it to be surplus property, and dispose of it in that fashion. It is certainly most irregular, although some of us suspected that measures of this sort might be attempted.

When the Defense Production Act was before the Senate more than a year ago the Senator from Louisiana asked the chairman of the committee whether some of the general language might be used to permit the Federal Government to take over and operate the submerged lands. The Chairman said, "No," that that was furthest from the intention of those who drafted the legislation. Yet in a press release about 6 months later, we saw that the Interior Department was studying the question to see whether that act could be used.

It seems to me that Congress must be especially careful in connection with future legislation to see that we do not use general language which will be susceptible to twisting and misconstruction.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is exactly correct. With the present trend toward the expansion of bureaucratic powers and bureaucratic government, it is certainly incumbent upon the Senate and the House, and the committees of both bodies, to look with an eagle eye for hidden powers of the type which the Senator has mentioned.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. NIXON. The question of the Senator from Louisiana suggests a very serious problem which the Judiciary Committee should consider as it conducts its hearings. It is that when the Surplus Property Act was being considered by Congress in the first instance no one would have dreamed that it could possibly be stretched to cover this situation. Otherwise, certainly at that time, as there is now, there was a majority of both Houses of Congress which would have written in specific stipulations to the effect that the act could not be used for that purpose. Unless in this instance the Judiciary Committee, through its investigation, is able to get a clear-cut statement on behalf of the Attorney General of the United States, on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior, and on behalf of the Surplus Property Administrator, in which they give up any claim to such power, Congress in the future will have almost an impossible task of attempting to write into legislation very strict restrictions on the Executive. I think it is a task which we would find unable to undertake, in view of the fact that no one would have dreamed when the Surplus Property Act was before us that it could possibly be used for this purpose.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from California for his able observations. I shall hurry along with my conclusions.

Since the various matters upon which the Senate is entitled to the fullest advice are all legal questions, it seems to me that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary should promptly investigate this whole situation and advise the Senate with reference thereto. In particular, the Judiciary Committee would be best qualified to pass upon the following questions:

First. Whether or not there is any substantial legal basis for regarding the submerged lands in question as "surplus property" of the Federal Government and for proceeding thereafter under an Executive order by which the Secretary of the Interior would be delegated the responsibility of operating and administering the submerged lands in question in matters relating to the exploration for and production of oil and gas, including the granting of leases, the confirmation of existing leases, and the exchange of leases and other matters.

Second. Whether or not the Secretary of the Interior is justified in proceeding, without court action, and without legislative authority to exercise jurisdiction over the submerged lands lying offshore from the States of Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida, particularly referring to that portion of said submerged lands which lie within the constitutional boundaries of these three States, over which the several States are now exercising jurisdiction. It seems clear to me that the course of action planned by the Secretary of the Interior is high-handed, arbitrary, and without any legal justification, and that such course of action would deliberately bypass the courts, the Congress, and the affected States.

Third. Likewise the Committee on the Judiciary appears best qualified to secure the production for its examination of the correspondence on this subject between the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice, and also to secure the production of the proposed Executive order or orders and further proposed documents under which the Secretary of the Interior would ostensibly be permitted to administer and operate the submerged lands in the Gulf of Mexico insofar as all questions affecting oil and gas are concerned.

I urgently but respectfully request of the distinguished Senator from Nevada as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and the members of his able committee, that the committee shall take immediate steps in this vital matter to get at the true facts and to render an early opinion on the legal questions involved, to the end that the Senate and the Congress may properly fulfill and discharge the heavy responsibility which rests upon us. I shall gladly present to the Committee on the Judiciary the information which I have secured in the hope that their efforts, if undertaken, may be speedily concluded and the Senate may be fully and accurately advised at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, statements made by the Senator from Florida and the record as made here this afternoon is sufficient in my judgment for congressional alarm. Having listened to the statement of the Senator from Florida this afternoon, and also the statements made by the Senator from Wyoming, it is the purpose of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary to call a special meeting of that committee immediately, so that it may listen first hand and have laid before it everything that it can secure pertaining to the subject.

In this period of the habit of seizure, which seems to be in the air, Congress may well be alarmed at the disclosures which have been made here today by the able Senator from Florida.

He is to be complimented for his decision to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate and to request that the proper committee take jurisdiction and proceed with an investigation of the subject.

Let me say that at that time we shall ask for all papers and documents and instruments bearing on the subject that may have passed between the Department of Justice and the Office of the Solicitor General and other departments and the Secretary of the Interior, in order that we may have a full view of what may be the intendment of the Secretary of the Interior, and in order that we may report to the Congress and may give our views on the subject.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I send forward a bill on behalf of myself and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to provide for the development of the oil and gas reserves of the Continental Shelf. This is the original interim bill, Senate Joint Resolution 20, which was reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs earlier in the session, as modified and perfected upon the floor before the Holland bill was substituted therefor on April 2 this year, by the vote of the Senate. It will be recalled that the Senate approved, on March 25, an amendment to the resolution as reported which would have asserted the title of the States to lands beneath inland navigable rivers, including true tidelands, and to ports and harbors as well as to reclaimed, made, or filled-in lands on the Continental Shelf.

The bill which I am introducing now includes this amendment, which, as I say, was adopted by the Senate as a perfecting amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 20 as reported. In fact, all of the provisions of this new bill have been discussed and debated by the Senate thoroughly.

INAPPLICABILITY OF THE FEDERAL PROPERTY ACT

In connection with the introduction of this bill I should like to ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter which I have written to the Secretary of the Interior with respect to a suggestion which has been made that the Federal Property Act of 1949 which is Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, might be used for the purpose of issuing leases upon the Continental Shelf. I should like to say, as I have already said to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], that, in my opinion, the Federal Property Act has no application whatsoever and that no leases can properly be issued under that measure. The reasons are set forth in my letter to the Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3306) to provide for the development of the oil and gas reserves of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the shores of the United States, to protect certain equities therein, to confirm the titles of the several States to lands underlying inland navigable waters within State boundaries, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. ANDERSON), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS.
June 7, 1952.

Hon. OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR OSCAR: In the light of our conferences this week with respect to the question as to whether the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is applicable to the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, I think it advisable that I should state in writing some of the reasons which impelled me last year to advise you that, in my opinion, this act cannot be held to be applicable to such lands.

The policy of the United States with respect to the natural resources of the Continental Shelf was proclaimed by President Truman on September 28, 1945 (Proclamation No. 2667). The pertinent sentence of this proclamation reads as follows:

"Having concern for the urgency of conserving and prudently utilizing its natural resources, the Government of the United States regards the natural resources of the subsoil and sea bed on the Continental Shelf beneath the high seas but contiguous to the coasts of the United States as appertaining to the United States, subject to its jurisdiction and control."

On the same day President Truman issued an Executive order placing the resources covered by the proclamation under the control and jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior. This order, in its entirety, reads as follows:

"By virtue of and pursuant to the authority vested in me as President of the United States, it is ordered that the natural resources of the subsoil and sea bed of the Continental Shelf beneath the high seas but contiguous to the coasts of the United States declared this day by proclamation to appertain to the United States and to be subject to its jurisdiction and control, be and they are hereby reserved, set aside, and placed under the jurisdiction and control of the Secretary of the Interior for administrative purposes, pending the enactment of legislation in regard thereto. Neither this order nor the aforesaid proclamation shall be deemed to affect the determination by legislation or judicial decree of any issues between the United States and the several States, relating to the ownership or control of the subsoil and sea bed of the Continental Shelf within or outside of the 3-mile limit" (Executive Order No. 9633).

It will be observed that by this order, the submerged lands were reserved and set aside, and that they were placed under the control of the Secretary of the Interior for administrative purposes pending the enactment of legislation in regard thereto.

When the Department of Justice brought suit in the Supreme Court of the United States against the State of California to establish Federal jurisdiction over the submerged lands, the pleadings of the Government asserted fee simple ownership in these lands, or, in the alternate, that the United States was possessed of paramount rights in them. The Supreme Court refused to adopt the contention of ownership, but declared the interest of the Federal Government of the United States is a paramount, rather than a property, right. The California case was decided June 23, 1947. The Louisiana and Texas cases, decided June 5, 1950, reaffirmed the same principle of paramount rather than property rights in the Continental Shelf.

The suggestion which was presented to me a year ago that the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 might be used, in the absence of specific legislation by Congress, to authorize the issuance of leases by the Secretary of the Interior on the submerged lands, was based upon the contention that these lands are property of the United States within the meaning of the act. The Louisiana and the Texas cases were decided more than a year after the enactment of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. To contend that the Act applies, therefore, it is essential first to establish that the paramount right asserted in the Louisiana and Texas cases is an interest in property within the meaning of the 1949 Property Act.

That this is not the fact becomes clear from the Senate committee report on the measure, filed June 8, 1949. The committee, deciding that although the objectives of the 1944 Property Act had been attained in large measure, stated that certain of the disposal provisions of that Act were being retained in the new measure because "the committee believes that, from time to time, there will become surplus to the Government, books, equipment, or other supplies the sale of which would realize little monetary return but which would be usable by and of great benefit to our schools and colleges."

With respect to real property, the committee report stated that, "the committee has retained priorities and preferences with respect to the disposition of surplus real property, including public benefit allowances for education, health, municipal airports, public parks, and recreational purposes." This point of view, which was also inserted in the House report, clearly shows the type of property with which the committee believed the bill was dealing.

If any doubts were left after reading the reports, they would be immediately dispelled by the language of the act itself. Section 203 (c) of the 1949 Property Act purovides:

"Any executive agency designated or authorized by the Administrator to dispose of surplus property may do so by sale, exchange, lease, permit, or transfer, for cash, credit, or other property, with or without warranty, and upon such other terms and conditions as the Administration deems proper."

It will be observed from this provision of the law that no disposal of surplus property may be made by any executive agency until that agency has been designated or authorized by the Administrator of the General Services Administration. But the President of the United States had already, on September 28, 1945, placed the submerged lands under the jurisdiction and control of the Secretary of the Interior, not for disposal as surplus property, but to be held "pending the enactment of legislation in regard thereto." When the President used the phrase "in regard thereto" in his Executive order, he was referring explicitly to the natural resources of the Continental Shelf.

There is no word, sentence, or implication in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 which repeals or supersedes that Executive Order of the President.

If the Congress had intended to supersede the Executive order of September 28, 1945, it would have said so, because in section 502 of the Federal Property Act there is specific reference to Executive Order No. 6166, the first, third, and fifth paragraphs of which are declared to be "hereby superseded." It is clear that the Executive order of September 28, 1945, was not affected in any way by the Federal Property Act of 1949, and the Administrator of the General Services Administration, therefore, has no authority to issue any directive, any order, any authorization turning over to the Secretary of the Interior the custody of the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf which the Secretary already has received from the President of the United States.

The opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of Interior, dated September 10, 1951, arguing that leases may be issued by the Secretary of the Interior to the Continental Shelf, rests firmly upon the premise that there must first be a delegation of authority to the Secretary of the Interior from the Administrator of General Services. This delegation, Solicitor White specifically stated, would constitute the "basic authority needed by this Department for the inauguration of a leasing program respecting such deposits." It follows, therefore, that until there is found in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act some language taking away from the Secretary of the Interior and giving to the Administrator of the General Services Administration the jurisdiction and control given to the Secretary by the President of the United States, the whole argument that the Property Act applies falls like a house of cards.

Solicitor White acknowledges, in his opinion, that the legislative history of the Property Act reveals no evidence that Congress had the submerged lands in mind when enacting the property law. He bases his argument however, upon the contention that the definition of property, contained in the Property Act, was all-inclusive and exempted only the public domain, national forests, national parks, and certain types of naval vessels. But, this definition was taken in general terms from the Surplus Property Act of 1944 and since, as above pointed out, the committees of both houses in their reports on the 1949 Property Act stated their belief that the general objectives of the Surplus Property Act had already been attained, and that very little surplus property was left to be administered, it must be clear that only a strained construction could stretch the act to cover the submerged lands, which the Solicitor himself has stated were clearly not in the mind of Congress. How unreasonable such a construction would be is to be seen from the very fact that the public domain was exempted. It seems to me to be unrealistic to urge that a Congress, although specifically exempting the public domain and national forests in the enactment of the Federal Property Act, nevertheless in some vague way has enabled an executive department to stretch the law to cover an area which the President of the United States has specically placed in the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior "pending the enactment of legislation in regard thereto."

By the Executive order of President Harry S. Truman, these submerged lands were reserved and set aside and placed under your control pending specific legislation by the Congress of the United States. You cannot have it any other way. Officials of every executive branch of the Government that has any interest in the submerged lands, have been testifying for years before my committee in support of the needed legislation which the President had in mind. If the surplus-property law or the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 had any application whatsoever to these lands, then the Secretary of the Interior and the Solicitor General of the United States have been wasting their time when they appeared before my committee urging the enactment of still another law.

Finally, let me say that if the Federal Property Act can by tortured construction be held to apply to the submerged lands, then some future Executive could use the same law, not to lease these valuable deposits, but to sell them or even to give them away. The power to lease is only one of the powers to disposal granted by the Federal Property Act. It provides also for sale, exchange, permit or transfer "for cash, credit, or other property, with or without warranty." If without specific legislative authority, which the President had in mind in his Executive Order No. 9633 of September 28, 1945, the Administrator of General Services can designate or authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease the submerged lands under Executive rules and regulations, then he has equal authority to permit the Secretary or any other executive agency to sell or exchange these lands, and even to transfer them for other property with or without warranty.

It is altogether too unrealistic a concept to be entertained for a moment, particularly in the face of the perfectly proper order of the President reserving and setting aside these lands pending congressional action.

You have labored diligently and efficiently to attain congressional legislation. Let us continue this effort in a perfectly constitutional manner without benefit of strained construction of a law which on its face and in legislative intent as acknowledged in the Solicitor's opinion, was never designed by Congress to deal with the submerged lands.

With every good wish.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks just made by the Senator from Wyoming be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day I introduced in the form in which it had been perfected on the floor of the Senate, a bill to provide for leasing the Continental Shelf, which was originally introduced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and myself. I desire now to ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That (a) the provisions of this section shall apply to all mineral leases covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf issued by any State or political subdivision or grantee thereof (including any extension, renewal, or replacement thereof heretofore granted pursuant to such lease or under the laws of such State): *Provided*—

(1) That such lease, or a true copy thereof, shall have been filed with the Secretary by the lessee or his duly authorized agent within 90 days from the effective date of this act, or within such further period or periods as may be fixed from time to time by the Secretary;

(2) That such lease was issued (i) prior to December 21, 1948, and was on June 5, 1950, in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the law of the State issuing it, or (ii) with the approval of the Secretary and was on the effective date of this act in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the law of the State issuing it;

(3) That within the time specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection, there shall have been filed with the Secretary (i) a certificate issued by the State official or agency having jurisdiction and stating that the lease was in force and effect as required by the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection or (ii) in the absence of such certificate, evidence in the form of affidavits, receipts, canceled checks, or other documents, and the Secretary shall determine whether such lease was so in force and effect;

(4) That except as otherwise provided in section 3 hereof, all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such a lease between June 5, 1950, and the effective date of this act, which have not been paid in accordance with the provisions thereof, and all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such a lease after the effective date of this act shall be paid to the Secretary, who shall deposit them in a special fund in the Treasury to be disposed of as hereinafter provided;

(5) That the holder of such lease certifies that such lease shall continue to be subject to the overriding royalty obligations existing on the effective date of this act;

(6) That such lease was not obtained by fraud or misrepresentation;

(7) That such lease, if issued on or after June 23, 1947, was issued upon the basis of competitive bidding;

(8) That such lease provides for a royalty to the lessor of not less than 12½ percent in amount or value of the production saved, removed, or sold from the lease: *Provided, however*, That if the lease provides for a lesser royalty, the holder thereof may bring it within the provisions of this paragraph by consenting in writing, filed with the Secretary, to the increase of the royalty to the minimum herein specified;

(9) That such lease will terminate within a period of not more than 5 years from the

effective date of this act in the absence of production or operations for drilling: *Provided, however,* That if the lease provides for a longer period, the holder thereof may bring it within the provisions of this paragraph by consenting in writing, filed with the Secretary, to the reduction of such period, so that it will not exceed the maximum period herein specified; and

(10) That the holder of such lease furnishes such surety bond, if any, as the Secretary may require and complies with such other requirements as the Secretary may deem to be reasonable and necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

(b) Any person holding a mineral lease which comes within the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, as determined by the Secretary, may continue to maintain such lease, and may conduct operations thereunder, in accordance with its provisions for the full term thereof and of any extension, renewal or replacement authorized therein or heretofore authorized by the law of the State issuing such lease: *Provided, however,* That if oil or gas was not being produced from such lease on or before December 11, 1950, then for a term from the effective date hereof equal to the term remaining unexpired on December 11, 1950, under the provisions of such lease or any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein, or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, such lease. A negative determination under this subsection may be made by the Secretary only after giving to the holder of the lease notice and an opportunity to be heard.

(c) With respect to any mineral lease that is within the scope of subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall exercise such powers of supervision and control as may be vested in the lessor by law or the terms and provisions of the lease.

(d) The permission granted in subsection (b) of this section shall not be construed to be a waiver of such claims, if any, as the United States may have against the lessor or the lessee or any other person respecting sums payable or paid for or under the lease, or respecting activities conducted under the lease, prior to the effective date of this act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized, with the approval of the Attorney General of the United States and upon the application of any lessor or lessee of a mineral lease issued by or under the authority of a State, its political subdivision or grantee, on tidelands or submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters within the boundaries of such State, to certify that the United States does not claim any proprietary interest in such lands or in the mineral deposits within them. The authority granted in this section shall not apply to rights of the United States in lands (a) which have been lawfully acquired by the United States from any State, either at the time of its admission into the Union or thereafter, or from any person in whom such rights had vested under the law of a State or under a treaty or other arrangement between the United States and a foreign power, or otherwise, or from a grantee or successor in interest of a State or such person; or (b) which were owned by the United States at the time of the admission of a State into the Union and which were expressly retained by the United States; or (c) which the United States lawfully holds under the law of the State in which the lands are situated; or (d) which are held by the United States in trust for the benefit of any person or persons, including any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians.

SEC. 3. In the event of a controversy between the United States and a State as to whether or not lands are submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters, the Secretary is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a) and (c) of section 1 of this act and with the concurrence of the Attorney General of the United States, to negotiate and enter into agreements with the State, its political subdivision or grantee or a lessee thereof, respecting operations under existing mineral leases and payment and impounding of rents, royalties, and other sums payable thereunder, or with the State, its political subdivision or grantee, respecting the issuance or nonissuance of new mineral leases pending the settlement or adjudication of the controversy: *Provided, however,* That the authorization contained in this section shall not be construed to be a limitation upon the authority conferred on the Secretary in other sections of this act. Payments made pursuant to such agreement, or pursuant to any stipulation between the United States and a State, shall be considered as compliance with section 1 (a) (4) hereof. Upon the termination of such agreement or stipulation by reason of the final settlement or adjudication of such controversy, if the lands subject to any mineral lease are determined to be in whole or in part submerged land of the Continental Shelf, the lessee, if he has not already done so, shall comply with the requirements of section 1 (a), and thereupon the provisions of section 1 (b) shall govern such lease. The following stipulations and authorizations are hereby approved and confirmed: (i) The stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the attorney general of California, dated July 26, 1947, relating to certain bays and harbors in the State of California; (ii) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the attorney general of California, dated July 26, 1947, relating to the continuance of oil and gas operations in the submerged lands within the boundaries of the State of California and herein referred to as the operating stipulation; (iii) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the attorney general of California, dated July 28, 1948, extending the term of said operating stipulation; (iv) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the attorney general of California, dated August 2, 1949, further extending the term of said operating stipulation; (v) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the attorney general of California, dated August 21, 1950, further extending and revising said operating stipulation; (vi) the stipulation entered into in the case of the United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the attorney general of California, dated September 24, 1951, further extending and revising said operating stipulation; (vii) the notice concerning "Oil and Gas Operations in the Submerged Coastal Lands of the Gulf of Mexico" issued by the Secretary of the Interior on December 11, 1950 (15 F. R. 8835), as amended by the notice dated January 26, 1951 (16 F. R. 953), and as supplemented by the notice dated February 2, 1951 (16 F. R. 1203), March 5, 1951 (16 F. R. 2195), April 23, 1951 (16 F. R. 3623), June 25, 1951 (16 F. R. 6404), August 22, 1951 (16 F. R. 8720) October 24, 1951 (16 F. R. 10998) and December 21, 1951 (17 F. R. 43), respectively.

SEC. 4. (a) In order to meet the urgent need during the present emergency for further exploration and development of the oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, the Secretary is authorized, pending the enactment of further legislation on the subject, to grant to the qualified persons offering the highest bonuses on a basis of competitive bidding oil and gas leases on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf which are not covered by leases within the scope of subsection (a) of section 1 of this act.

(b) A lease issued by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall cover an area of such size and dimensions as the Secretary may determine, shall be for a period of 5 years and as long thereafter as oil or gas may be produced from the area in paying quantities, or drilling or well reworking operations as approved by the Secretary are conducted thereon, shall require the payment of a royalty of not less than 12½ percent, and shall contain such rental provisions and such other terms and provisions as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe in advance of offering the area for lease.

(c) All moneys paid to the Secretary for or under leases granted pursuant to this section shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury to be disposed of as hereinafter provided.

(d) The issuance of any lease by the Secretary pursuant to this section 4 of this act, or the refusal of the Secretary to certify that the United States does not claim any interest in any submerged lands pursuant to section 2 of this act, shall not prejudice the ultimate settlement or adjudication of the question as to whether or not the area involved is submerged land beneath navigable inland waters.

SEC. 5. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section—

(1) thirty-seven and one-half percent of all moneys received as bonus payments, rents, royalties, and other sums payable with respect to operations in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf lying within the seaward boundary of any State shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to such State within 90 days after the expiration of each fiscal year; and

(2) all other moneys received under the provisions of this act shall be held in a special account in the Treasury pending the enactment of legislation by the Congress concerning the disposition thereof.

(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to moneys received and held pursuant to any stipulation or agreement referred to in section 3 of this act pending the settlement or adjudication of the controversy.

(c) If and whenever the United States shall take and receive in kind all or any part of the royalty under a lease maintained or issued under the provisions of this act and covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf lying within the seaward boundary of any State, the value of such royalty ro taken in kind shall, for the purpose of subsection (a) (1) of this section, be deemed to be the prevailing market price thereof at the time and place of production, and there shall be paid to the State entitled thereto 37½ percent of the value of such royalty.

SEC. 6. (a) The President may, from time to time, withdraw from disposition any of the unleased lands of the Continental Shelf and reserve them for the use of the United States in the interest of national security.

(b) In time of war, or when the President shall so prescribe, the United States shall have the right of first refusal to purchase at the market price all or any portion of the oil and gas produced from the submerged lands covered by this act.

(c) All leases issued under this act, and leases, the maintenance and operation of which are authorized under this act, shall contain or be construed to contain a provision whereby authority is vested in the Secretary, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, during a state of war or national emergency declared by the Congress or the President after the effective date of this act, to suspend operations under, or to terminate any lease; and all such leases shall contain or be construed to contain provisions for the payment of just com-

pensation to the lessee whose operations are thus suspended or whose lease is thus terminated.

SEC. 7. Nothing herein contained shall affect such rights, if any, as may have been acquired under any law of the United States by any person on lands subject to this act and such rights, if any, shall be governed by the law in effect at the time they may have been acquired: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained is intended or shall be construed as a finding, interpretation or construction by the Congress that the law under which such rights may be claimed in fact applies to the lands subject to this act or authorizes or compels the granting of such rights of such lands, and that the determination of the applicability or effect of such law shall be unaffected by anything herein contained.

SEC. 8. The United States consents that the repective States may regulate, manage, and administer the taking, conservation, and development of all fish, shrimp, oysters, clams, crabs, lobsters, sponges, kelp, and other marine animal and plant life within the area of the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf lying within the seaward boundary of any State, in accordance with applicable State law.

SEC. 9. The United States hereby asserts that it has no right, title, or interest in or to the lands beneath navigable inland waters within the boundaries of the respective States, but that all such right, title, and interest are vested in the several States or the persons lawfully entitled thereto under the laws of such States, or the respective lawful grantees, lessees, or possessors in interest thereof under State authority.

SEC. 10. Section 9 of this act shall not apply to rights of the United States in lands (1) which have been lawfully accrued by the United States from any State, either at the time of its admission into the Union or thereafter, or from any person in whom such rights had vested under the law of a State or under a treaty or other arrangement between the United States and a foreign power, or otherwise, or from a grantee or successor in interest of a State or such person; or (2) which were owned by the United States at the time of the admission of a State into the Union and which were expressly retained by the United States; or (3) which the United States lawfully holds under the law of the State in which the lands are situated; or (4) which are held by the United States in trust for the benefit of any person or persons, including any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians. This act shall not apply to water power, or to the use of water for the production of power, or to any right to develop water power which has been or may be expressly reserved by the United States for its own benefit or for the benefit of its licensees or permittees under any law of the United States.

SEC. 11. (a) Any right granted prior to the enactment of this act by any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, agency, or person holding thereunder to construct, maintain, use, or occupy any dock, pier, wharf, jetty, or any other structure in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, or any such right to the surface of filled-in, made, or reclaimed land in such areas, is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States for such term as was granted prior to the enactment of this act.

(b) The right, title, and interest of any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, or public agency holding thereunder to the surface of submerged lands of the Continental Shelf which in the future become filled-in, made, or reclaimed lands as a result of authorized action taken by any such State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, or public agency holding thereunder for recreation or other public purpose is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States.

SEC. 12. Nothing in section 11 of this act shall be construed as confirming or recognizing any right with respect to oil, gas, or other minerals in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf; or as confirming or recognizing any interest in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf other than that essential to the right to construct, maintain, use, and occupy the structures enumerated in that section, or to the use and occupancy of the surface of filled-in or reclaimed land.

SEC. 13. The structures enumerated in section 11, above, shall not be construed as including derricks, wells, or other installations in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf employed in the exploration, development, extraction, and production of oil and gas or other minerals, or as including necessary structures for the development of water power.

SEC. 14. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to repeal, limit, or affect in any way any provision of law relating to the national defense, the control of navigation, or the improvement, protection, and preservation of the navigable waters of the United States; or to repeal, limit, or affect any provision of law heretofore or hereafter enacted pursuant to the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States.

SEC. 15. Any person seeking the authorization of the United States to use or occupy any submerged lands of the Continental Shelf for the construction of, or additions to, installations of the type enumerated in section 11 of this act, shall apply therefor to the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, who shall have authority to issue such authorization, upon such terms and conditions as in his discretion may seem appropriate.

SEC. 16. Within 2 years of the date of the enactment of this act, the Chief of Engineers shall submit to the Congress his recommendations with respect to the use and occupancy of submerged lands of the Continental Shelf for installations of the type enumerated in section 11 of this act.

SEC. 17. The Secretary is authorized to issue such regulations as he may deem to be necessary or advisable in performing his functions under this act.

SEC. 18. When used in this act, (a) the term "tidelands" means lands situated between the lines of mean high tide and mean low tide; (b) the term "navigable" means navigable at the time of the admission of a State into the Union under the laws of the United States; (c) the term "inland waters" includes the waters of lakes (including Lakes Superior, Michigan, Huron, Erie, and Ontario to the extent that they are within the boundaries of a State of the United States), bays, rivers, ports, and harbors which are landward of the ocean; and lands beneath navigable inland waters include filled-in or reclaimed lands which formerly were within that category; (d) the term "submerged lands of the Continental Shelf" means the lands (including the oil, gas, and other minerals therein) underlying the open ocean, situated seaward of the ordinary low water mark on the coast of the United States and outside the inland waters, and extending seaward to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf; (e) the term "seaward boundary of a State" means a line three nautical miles seaward from the points on the coast of a State at which the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf begin; (f) the term "mineral lease" means any form of authorization for the exploration, development, or production of oil, gas, or other minerals; and (g) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

PRESIDENT APPROVES ORIGINAL O'MAHONEY-ANDERSON BILL

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to point out that the President of the United States in his veto message, dated May 29, 1952, of the Holland version of Senate Joint Resolution 20, as it passed the Senate and was agreed to in conference, in several paragraphs throughout the message indicated that the original O'Mahoney-Anderson bill providing legislation to deal with this subject would be satisfactory to him. For example, he said in the second to the last paragraph:

> Third, I believe any legislation dealing with the undersea lands should protect the equitable interests of those now holding State-issued leases on those lands. The Government certainly should not impair bona fide investments which have been made in these undersea lands, and the legislation should make this clear. Here again, Senate Joint Resolution 20, as introduced by Senators O'MAHONEY and ANDERSON, provided a sensible approach.

I have read the paragraph merely to point out that throughout the veto message the President was acting in complete conformity with the Executive order of September 28, 1945, in which he stated expressly that the Continental Shelf was reserved and set aside and given into the jurisdiction and control of the Secretary of the Interior pending legislative action by Congress.

SOLICITOR'S MEMORANDUM OF LAW ON APPLICATION OF PROPERTY ACT

I should like also to ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the memorandum of September 10, 1951, which was sent to me on the 30th of October 1951, by Mr. Mastin G. White, Solicitor of the Department of the Interior. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., September 10, 1951.

To: The Secretary of the Interior.
From: The Solicitor.
Subject: Development of the oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf.

I

It seems reasonable to assume that the Congress will adjourn on or about October 1 without having enacted any legislation providing specifically for the development of the oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, lying seaward of the low watermark along the coast of the United States and situated outside the inland waters of the coastal States. This problem has been of urgent importance during the past several years, and the failure of the Congress to enact legislation dealing specifically with it requires the Department to consider the possibility of dealing administratively with the problem without waiting longer for further legislative guidance.

The importance of this subject arises from the great need of the United States for a rapid and substantial expansion of oil production in the present era of international tension. It is now estimated that the total demand in the United States for oil during the year 1951 will average approximately 7,452,000 barrels per day, but that the total production of oil in the United States during 1951 will average only approximately 6,586,000 barrels per day, or 866,000 barrels per day less than the demand. If, despite all efforts for peace, Communist aggression

should result in a general war, the Nation's demand for oil would increase greatly over the estimated figure given above, and such a conflict might deprive the United States of some of the sources of foreign oil with which the Nation is now bridging the gap between domestic production and consumption of oil.

The submerged lands of the Continental Shelf in the Gulf of Mexico adjacent to the coast of the United States are regarded by the experts in the geological survey as providing an extremely favorable source for a substantial and comparatively rapid expansion in the domestic production of oil. It has been estimated that the oil deposits in these lands may contain a grand total of approximately 13,000,000,000 barrels of oil. The development of the oil deposits in these lands under leases issued by Texas and Louisiana was just gathering momentum when further expansion was brought to a standstill as a result of the litigation between the United States on the one hand, and the States of Louisiana and Texas on the other hand over the power to control such development.

The early resumption of the program for the full-scale development of the oil deposits in the Continental Shelf beneath the Gulf of Mexico seems to be dependent upon the formulation of an administrative plan to that end upon the basis of existing legislation.

II

There are two existing Federal statutes which deal specifically with the issuance of mineral leases on Government-owned lands.

The earlier of these statutes is the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (30 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 181 et seq.), which, as construed by Attorneys General Stone and Jackson, is applicable only to the public lands of the United States (34 Op. Atty. Gen. 171 (1924); 40 Op. Atty. Gen. 9 (1941)). The specific question whether the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 might be utilized for the issuance of oil and gas leases on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf was considered by the undersigned in an opinion dated August 8, 1947 (M-34985), and a negative conclusion was reached for the reason, among others, that the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf are not public lands (see *Mann v. Tacoma Land Co.*, 153 U. S. 273 (1894)). This view was subsequently supported by Attorney General Clark in an opinion dated August 29, 1947 (40 Op. Atty. Gen. 540).

That the Department of Justice is still of the opinion that the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 is inapplicable to submerged lands of the Continental Shelf is indicted by Solicitor General Perlman's testimony to that effect on February 19, 1951, before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs at the hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 20, Eighty-second Congress (p. 29 of printed transcript), and by Attorney General McGrath's statement on June 6, 1951 before the House Judiciary Committee at the hearing on House Joint Resolution 131, Eighty-second Congress, to the effect that the existing statutory provisions for the management of the public domain do not provide authority for the issuance of oil and gas leases on submerged lands on the Continental Shelf (p. 15 of printed transcript).

The more recent of the two existing statutes providing specifically for the issuance of oil and gas leases on Government-owned lands is the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U. S. C., 1946 ed., Supp. III, sec. 351 et seq.). This statute was enacted on August 7, 1947 for the purpose of authorizing the issuance of oil and gas leases on Government-owned lands other than public lands. The Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands specifically excepts certain classes of lands from its provisions, however, and among these are tidelands and submerged lands.

III

In view of the inapplicability of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 and the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands to the problem of the development of the oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands on the Continental Shelf, this office has given consideration to the possibility of utilizing the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U. S. C., 1946 ed., Supp. III, sec. 201 et seq.) for the leasing of such deposits.

This act grants in section 203 broad authority for the disposition of surplus property owned by the Government. Leases are included among the modes of disposition authorized by the section.

The term "surplus property" is used in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 as meaning any interest in property of any kind that is not required for the needs and the discharge of the responsibilities of Federal agencies (see sec. 3 (d), (e), (g) of the act).

The oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the coast of the United States are clearly property of the United States. (See Mr. Justice Douglas' discussion in *United States v. Texas*, 339 U. S. 709 (1950).) Such property is under the control of the Department of the Interior by reason of Executive Order 9633 (10 F. R. 12305).

So far as I am aware, there is no obstacle to the making of a valid, factual determination by the Secretary of the Interior that this Department does not require the oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf for the Department's needs and the discharge of its responsibilities. The Department of the Interior, in the conduct of the governmental programs assigned to it for administration, does not have the authority to drill for and use the deposits of oil and gas (other than helium-bearing gas) contained in Government-owned lands under its control. Instead, the Department is only authorized to grant to private persons, for a consideration, the right to take and utilize the oil and gas in such lands.

With regard to the possible interest of other Government agencies in utilizing the oil or gas deposits contained in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, the Department of Defense might wish to have some of these deposits set aside as naval petroleum reserves for future development and use by the Department of the Navy. It seems likely, however, that it could properly be determined as a fact that the oil and gas deposits in most areas of the Continental Shelf are not required for the needs and the discharge of the responsibilities of Federal agencies and, accordingly, that such deposits are available for development under leases issued pursuant to section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

The conclusion stated above is not affected by the fact that the public domain is expressly excepted by section 3 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 from the provisions of the act. The terms "public domain" and "public lands" are generally used as synonymous expressions (see 34 Op. Atty. Gen. 171 (1924) and 40 Op. Atty. Gen. 9 (1941)). When used in Federal legislation relating to the disposition of property, they do not include lands situated below the line of ordinary high tide along the coast (see *Mann v. Tacoma Land Company*, 153 U. S. 273 (1894)). Consequently, the exception of the public domain from the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 does not affect oil and gas deposits in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, because such deposits are situated below the high watermark along the coast.

The construction of section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 as applicable to the disposition of oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf can be harmonized with the previous interpretations of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 and the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands as inapplicable to the oil and gas deposits contained in such lands. The Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as construed by Attorneys General, is limited to certain kinds of minerals (including oil and gas) in the public lands, and it does not apply to the minerals in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf because these lands are not public lands. The Mineral Leasing Act of Acquired Lands applies to the same kinds of minerals (plus sulfur) in Government-owned lands other than public lands, but it expressly excepts from its provisions various classes of lands, including tidelands and submerged lands. Section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 makes provision for the disposition of any interest in property of any kind that is surplus to the needs of Federal agencies, and this broad language covers oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, theretofore excluded from the provisions of the earlier mineral leasing acts.

The authority contained in section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 for the disposition of property is vested in the Administrator of General Services. The Administrator, however, is expressly authorized by section 205 of the act to delegate his functions to the head of any other Federal agency. Accordingly, a delegation of authority from the Administrator of General Services to the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the disposition by lease under section 203 of oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf can be utilized as providing the basic authority needed by this Department for the inauguration of a leasing program respecting such deposits.

The legislative history of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 does not reveal any evidence that, during the progress of the measure through the Congress, specific consideration was given to the question whether the authority granted in section 203 might be used for the leasing of oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf. That the Congress was well aware, however, of the all-inclusive nature of the provisions of the act relating to the disposition of property is indicated by the fact that it was deemed advisable specifically to except the public domain, national forests, national parks, battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers, and submarines from such provisions (see sec. 3 (d) of the act). The circumstance that the same Congress which enacted section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 did not act upon a request of the executive branch for the enactment of legislation specifically authorizing the leasing of the oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf may warrant speculation as to whether, if the matter of the coverage of such deposits by section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act had been raised during the consideration of this provision, such deposits would have been added to the exceptions mentioned above. However, such speculation would not restrict the power plainly conferred by the broad language of section 203 to dispose by lease of any interest in property of any kind that is not required for the needs and the discharge of the responsibilities of Federal agencies.

Therefore, I believe that it would be legally permissible to undertake pursuant to section 203 of the Federal Property and Administra-

tive Services Act of 1949 a program for the leasing of the oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, if it were regarded as wise from the policy standpoint to take such action without waiting longer for specific legislative guidance in this field.

IV

If the Department should inaugurate under section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 a program for the leasing of the oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, it would be necessary at the outset to make a decision on the question of recognizing the equities of persons who now hold oil and gas leases previously issued by coastal States on such lands.

From the legal standpoint, the Department would not be prohibited by law from recognizing the equities of such persons to the extent of giving them preferential consideration in connection with the issuance of Federal oil and gas leases on the particular areas covered by their respective State leases. There is no statutory requirement that the leasing of property under section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 shall be accomplished by means of competitive bidding, rather than on a negotiated basis.

Therefore, the question whether persons who now hold State-issued oil and gas leases on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf shall receive preferential consideration in connection with the issuance of Federal leases on the same areas is one of policy.

The earliest expression of opinion by a responsible official of the executive branch of the Government respecting the policy question mentioned in the preceding paragraph apparently was made by Secretary of the Interior Ickes before the Senate Judiciary Committee on February 5, 1946, in connection with a hearing on S. J. Res. 48 and H. J. Res. 225, Seventy-ninth Congress. At that time, the first of the so-called submerged-lands cases, *United States* v. *California*, was still pending before the Supreme Court, and it was not known whether the result of the litigation would be favorable to the United States or would confirm the claim of California to the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the California coast. Envisioning the possibility of a Supreme Court decision placing the control of such lands in the United States, and discussing the question of what should be done with respect to the outstanding oil and gas leases issued by the State of California on lands involved in the suit, Secretary Ickes said:

"Leases and contracts for operations on submerged lands outstanding when the present suit was filed in the Supreme Court should be continued in force and effect by the Federal Government, at least as to royalty rate and time limit" (p. 11 of printed transcript).

Later, when Attorney General Clark was arguing the case of *United States* v. *California* before the Supreme Court on March 13, 1947, he made the following statement with respect to the problem of recognizing the equities of California's lessees in the event of a decision favorable to the Federal Government:

"The President advised me that he will recommend to the Congress that legislation be enacted. * * * Such legislation, in the view of the President, should * * * establish equitable standards for the recognition of investments made by private interests and should offer a basis for the continued operation of private establishments wherever consistent with the national interest, and on terms which would be fair and just under all circumstances. There is no desire on the part of the President or of any official of the executive branch to destroy or confiscate any honest and bona fide investment."

The Attorney General's oral statement on this point was subsequently reaffirmed in a supplemental brief (pp. 5–6) filed on behalf of the United States in the case of *United States* v. *California*.

After the Supreme Court rendered on June 23, 1947, its decision favorable to the Federal Government in the case of *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19), representatives of the Department of Justice, the National Military Establishment (now the Department of Defense), and the Department of the Interior collaborated in drafting and in submitting to the Congress on February 6, 1948, a proposed bill to provide for the management of, and the issuance of Federal oil and gas leases on, the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf. This legislative proposal of the executive branch was introduced in the Eightieth Congress as S. 2165 and H. R. 5528. Sections 7 and 8 of the bill prepared by the executive branch of the Government provided for the issuance of oil and gas leases by the Federal Government, on a preferential basis, to those persons who held oil and gas leases issued prior to June 23, 1947, by coastal States on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf within their respective boundaries.

In both written and oral statements to committees of the Congress during the past several years, representatives of the executive branch of the Government have consistently adhered to the position that persons holding oil and gas leases issued prior to June 23, 1947, by coastal States on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf within their boundaries have equities which ought to be recognized by the Federal Government. It is believed that appropriate action to implement this position should be taken in connection with any program that may be inaugurated pursuant to section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 for the leasing of the oil and gas deposits in the Continental Shelf.

In this connection a problem is presented by reason of the fact that between the date (June 23, 1947) of the Supreme Court's decision in the case of *United States* v. *California* and the date (December 21, 1948) when the United States instituted proceedings against the States of Texas and Louisiana over the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf in the Gulf of Mexico adjacent to the coasts of these States both Texas and Louisiana issued a number of oil and gas leases covering such lands.

With regard to the problem of whether persons holding oil and gas leases issued by Texas and Louisiana on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf after June 23, 1947, but prior to December 21, 1948, have equities warranting Federal recognition, it is pertinent to note that the available evidence respecting congressional sentiment on this point, as reflected in the introduction of legislative proposals bearing on the subject, indicates an apparent belief upon the part of Members of Congress that such leaseholders ought to be permitted to retain the benefits accorded them by their respective State-issued leases. For example, legislative proposals introduced in the Eighty-first Congress (S. J. Res. 195) and in the Eighty-second Congress (S. J. Res. 20) by Senator O'MAHONEY, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and perhaps the foremost supporter in Congress of the principle of Federal retention and management of the mineral resources of the Continental Shelf, provided for the recognition by the United States of oil and gas leases issued by Louisiana and Texas prior to December 21, 1948, on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf adjacent to their coasts.

Concerning this point, the Department's report on Senate Joint Resolution 195, Eighty-first Congress, suggested:

"That the privilege of continuing to operate on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf under mineral leases issued by the coastal States should be granted only to those persons whose leases were issued prior to June 23, 1947."

Inasmuch as no congressional support for the Department's position on this question was apparent, the Department changed its position somewhat in reporting on Senate Joint Resolution 20, Eighty-second Congress, and stated as follows with respect to this matter:

"The question of the extent to which the United States, as a matter of grace, should grant Federal recognition with respect to oil and gas leases issued by costal States on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf is, of course, a matter for determination by the Congress. If the Congress should decide, as proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 20, that equitable considerations warrant the granting of such recognition not only as to State leases issued prior to June 23, 1947, but also as to State leases issued between June 23, 1947, and December 21, 1948, this Department would have no objection."

Although I am, as you know, a Texan, perhaps I may be permitted to observe that the Supreme Court's decision on June 23, 1947, in the case of *United States* v. *California* was not a precedent necessarily resolving the question whether the United States or the State of Texas had the power to control the development of the oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf situated within the boundaries of Texas. The State of California was created by the United States, and the basic problem before the Supreme Court in the California case was to ascertain whether the United States, at the time of the creation of the new State, conveyed to it the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf within its boundaries. The Court, in effect, answered this question in the negative. On the other hand, Texas was not created by the United States. It had been an independent Republic prior to its admission to the Union through the process of annexation. Hence, when the controversy arose between the United States and Texas over the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the Texas coast, the point at issue was whether Texas, in connection with its annexation to the Union, conveyed to the United States the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the Texas coast. This question was answered by the Supreme Court in the affirmative.

Although the result reached by the Supreme Court in the case of *United States* v. *Texas* (339 U. S. 707), was similar to the result reached by the Court in the *California* case, the basic questions presented to the Court in the two cases were different. Therefore, prior to the time when the Supreme Court rendered its decision on June 5, 1950, in the *Texas* case, and particularly prior to the time when this suit was instituted against Texas on December 21, 1948, it cannot be said that it was unreasonable for the State of Texas, and for private persons obtaining oil and gas leases from the State, to act under the belief that Texas had the power to grant oil and gas leases on the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf situated within the boundaries of Texas. When the matter is considered in this light, it may well be that the same principle which has led the executive branch of the Government to say that persons holding oil and gas leases issued prior to June 23, 1947, by the State of California on the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf within the boundaries of California have equities warranting Federal recognition is also applicable to persons holding oil

and gas leases issued by the State of Texas after June 23, 1947, but prior to December 21, 1948, on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf within the boundaries of Texas.

Turning now to the matter of the oil and gas leases issued by the State of Louisiana after June 23, 1947, but prior to December 21, 1948, on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, it was clear during that period that Louisiana's claim to the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf within its boundaries was on the same footing as California's claim to similar lands, inasmuch as the State of Louisiana, like the State of California, was created by the United States. Consequently, the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *United States* v. *California* on June 23, 1947, was a precedent which necessarily applied to and governed the decision on Louisiana's similar claim. Hence, it is difficult to understand how anyone obtaining from the State of Louisiana after June 23, 1947, an oil and gas lease on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf could reasonably have believed that the lease had any legal validity.

In this connection, however, there may be some relevancy in the fact that the Supreme Court, after having rendered, on June 5, 1950, a decision favorable to the United States in the case of *United States* v. *Louisiana* (339 U. S. 699) rejected the Government's request that Louisiana be required to account to the United States for the proceeds received by the State from oil and gas operations in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf after June 23, 1947. Instead, the Court merely required an accounting from Louisiana with respect to the period subsequent to the date of the Court's decision in the case against Louisiana (June 5, 1950).[1] It might be argued that if, as the Court's action indicated, the Supreme Court felt that the State of Louisiana had equities which entitled it to retain the proceeds derived from oil and gas operations in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf up to the time when the Supreme Court decided that Louisiana did not own such lands, the persons making such payments to Louisiana likewise have equities meriting consideration.

Whether the Department, in connection with a leasing program under section 208 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 respecting the oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, gives preferential consideration only to those persons holding oil and gas leases issued prior to June 23, 1947, by coastal States on such lands within their respective boundaries, or also extends preferential consideration to persons holding oil and gas leases issued by Texas or Louisiana, or both, after June 23, 1947, but prior to December 21, 1948, on such lands within their respective boundaries, it is believed:

(a) that the preferential consideration should be limited to the specific areas covered by the respective State leases;

(b) that the terms of the Federal leases issued to such persons should only extend over the remainder of the periods covered by their respective State leases; and

(c) that such persons should be required to pay to the United States, under the Federal leases, rentals and royalties at rates equal to those prescribed in the State leases (and, in any event, at rates not less than the minimum rates prescribed in the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 and the Mineral Leasing Act for acquired lands).

V

Except for any Federal leases that may be issued on a preferential basis in recognition of the equities of persons holding State-issued leases, as discussed in part IV of this memorandum, it appears that any leasing or oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf pursuant to section 208 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 should be accomplished by means of competitive bidding. Although this is not required by law, it would seem to be required by the public interest.

MASTIN G. WHITE,
Solicitor.

[1] The Court took a similar action in the case against Texas.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to add that Mr. White sent me this memorandum with the following note, under date of October 30, 1951.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: Secretary Chapman has asked that I send to you the attached copy of my memorandum dated September 10, 1951, on the subject Development of the Oil and Gas Deposits in the Submerged Lands of the Continental Shelf.

The letter was marked "confidential" at the time I received it. This afternoon I obtained permission from the Solicitor to release his opinion. This memorandum not only sets forth clearly the point of view of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, but also recites some of the statements upon which I based the opinion I gave to the Secretary of the Interior last fall to the effect that the Federal Property Act of 1949 does not apply to these submerged lands. The bill as reintroduced now, together with the veto message of the President and the Executive order of the President, all give me every reason to believe, since no action has been taken to apply the Federal Property Act to the submerged lands, that the President of the United States is pursuing the legislative approach.

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was interested in the reference made by the Senator from Nevada to the seizure and the passion for seizure of jurisdiction which he says has been exhibited. Of course, he was referring to the action of the President in the Steel case.

I say to the Senator in the best of good humor that I am sure he did not mean that one committee of the Senate should seize any of the jurisdiction of another committee of the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator from Wyoming imply that the Committee on the Judiciary is exceeding its jurisdiction?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I merely state that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has explicit jurisdiction, granted by the Legislative Reorganization Act, to deal with matters of this kind. It was for that reason that the Presiding Officer of the Senate referred these bills to this committee, I suppose.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think the Senator——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know I have enough to do——

Mr. McCARRAN. It is not a question of what the Senator has to do; it is a question of jurisdiction.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. The question is whether there has been or is to be a violation of the Constitution of the United States—which is a far larger question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to call to the attention not only of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, but also of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the point that this matter not only involves legal research and legal opinions and matters of great importance affecting the legal interpretation of existing law, but also involves a vital matter which we wish to have disclosed.

It would appear that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has known about this matter since October. However, if he has disclosed it in the course of the hearings or the debate, or if there has been any disclosure of any sort to any of us who have been so intimately and vitally affected by this matter and have debated it so long here on the floor of the Senate, I have not heard of it.

We want this matter brought out into the light of day.

It is with that attitude that I have gone as far as I can as an individual Senator, and that I want to have this matter reposed in the jurisdiction where I believe it belongs, namely, the jurisdiction of a committee able and learned in the law and willing and able to go to the bottom of this matter and to disclose it.

Let me say further that I think the Senator from Wyoming is in a peculiarly bad position to head an investigation of this matter because he himself has already taken a positive position in exact conformity with that taken by me, which hardly leaves him in the position of a judicial referee to pass judgment on the question of what are the rights and duties of the Secretary of the Interior under the law which now exists.

So far as I am concerned, I have made no motion, and will make none, to refer the veto message to the Committee on the Judiciary; but I have mentioned what I regard as vital matters requiring the making of speedy and authoritative decisions and the giving of valid advice to the Senate of the United States, in particular, and the Congress as a whole, in general, and I think I have gone to the right place. I am delighted to have the assurance of the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee that he proposes to go speedily into the investigation of these matters.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me, to permit me to reply?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure the Senator from Florida did not intend to imply in his recent statement that I suppressed any information. That this suggestion of Solicitor White was being explored last year was known to many persons, including State officials, oil company attorneys, and many others. The Secretary of the Interior made no effort to keep the fact a secret. The opinion

of Solicitor White, which I have read, and which I have just now inserted in the RECORD, was a detail which, in view of the debate today, I felt I should not put in the RECORD until I had advised the Solicitor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming made it very clear that he received that information in a confidential capacity. In receiving it in a confidential capacity, certainly he was not able to, and did not, communicate to the Senate of the United States anything about the contents or the very compelling issues which were involved.

If he communicated them to his colleagues and associates in the committee, I have never heard of it, because I will have to say that it was to me a matter of shocking first surprise when, last Tuesday morning, the informant came to my office to tell me, under great apprehension for his own job, about these facts, which have been fully demonstrated, so far as I have been able to go, as being the precise truth in regard to the situation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But the Senator from Florida in his main speech about this matter has already stated that I had done what I said I had done, namely, last year advised the Secretary of the Interior that in my opinion this procedure was not a proper one.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Wyoming is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And the Senator from Florida was also kind enough to say that he believed me to have been satisfied that the matter had been dropped.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Wyoming so stated.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Those are exactly the facts.

I was completely satisfied that no attempt would be made to proceed along that line, because throughout this session, and following the conferences which took place during the recess of Congress, both the Secretary of the Interior and the Solicitor General of the Department of Justice appeared before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and urged the enactment of legislation. More than that, during the previous sessions of the Congress the Department of Justice has indicated its support of legislation dealing with this matter.

So I am inclined to believe, although I may be disappointed, that there has been no action of this kind, and that there will be no action of this kind.

Mr. HOLLAND. I certainly hope against hope that such will prove to be the case.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me at this point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I should like to take about 30 seconds to join in congratulations to my colleague for what I think has been a genuine contribution to constitutional local government.

If such high-handed action by the bureaus or other agencies of the executive branch of the Government were permitted to go unchecked, of course the result would be the loss of our freedom.

So I wish to join with all the other Senators in expressing appreciation to my colleague for making a real and definite contribution to the continuation of constitutional government.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me at this point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have not engaged in any of this debate, but I wish to say that it is very healthy to have such debate occur. It seems to me that when the Government of the United States owns property, if it is to be disposed of at all, it should be disposed of in a constitutional, legal way.

I do not think the Federal Government owns this property; I believe the property belongs to the States, and I shall so vote on the question of overriding the veto.

I wish to congratulate the Senator from Florida for his research in connection with this matter, and also I desire to congratulate the Senator from Wyoming in connection with the statement he has made of his viewpoint—with which I do not agree, but I think the Senator from Wyoming has been diligent, conscientious, and sincere in the course he has pursued.

I assume that, under the Legislative Reorganization Act, the Judiciary Committee has sufficient authority to proceed without any further authority.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is my understanding. If we find that we need further authority, we shall ask the Senate for it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I assume that is the case, and I assume that the committee has authority to proceed into these matters under the committee's own motion. I assume, however, that if the committee does not have sufficient authority for that purpose, certainly it will ask the Senate for any further authority it believes to be required.

JURISDICTION OF COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, Mr. President, I recognize that the vote which resulted in the passage of the so-called Holland bill is sufficient in number to make any reference which those who voted in that way may choose to have made in the case of any particular measure or matter.

On the other hand, realizing how diligent many committee chairmen have been in defending the jurisdiction of their respective committees, I do not wish the Members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to feel that their chairman has been lax in this regard, although I doubt whether that committee is any more anxious than I am to launch a new investigation at this time.

Mr. President, it seems to me that it might be well to have printed, at this point in the RECORD, paragraph (k) of section 102 (1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, and also paragraph (m). Paragraph (k) refers to the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee, and paragraph (m) refers to the jurisdiction of the then Committee on Public Lands which subsequently became the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The printing of those paragraphs at this point in the RECORD will make clear to all who may be interested in the specific jurisdiction of the two committees what the Legislative Reorganization Act says upon that point.

So I ask to have these two paragraphs printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paragraphs were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(k) Committee on the Judiciary, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

1. Judicial proceedings, civil and criminal, generally.
2. Constitutional amendments.
3. Federal courts and judges.
4. Local courts in the Territories and possessions.
5. Revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.
6. National penitentiaries.
7. Protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies.
8. Holidays and celebrations.
9. Bankruptcy, mutiny, espionage, and counterfeiting.
10. State and Territorial boundary lines.
11. Meetings of Congress, attendance of Members, and their acceptance of incompatible offices.
12. Civil liberties.
13. Patents, copyrights, and trade-marks.
14. Patent Office.
15. Immigration and naturalization.
16. Apportionment of Representatives.
17. Measures relating to claims against the United States.
18. Interstate compacts generally.

* * * * *

(m) Committee on Public Lands, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

1. Public lands generally, including entry, easements, and grazing thereon.
2. Mineral resources of the public lands.
3. Forfeiture of land grants and alien ownership, including alien ownership of mineral lands.
4. Forest reserves and national parks created from the public domain.
5. Military parks and battlefields, and national cemeteries.
6. Preservation of prehistoric ruins and objects of interest on the public domain.
7. Measures relating generally to Hawaii, Alaska, and the insular possessions of the United States, except those affecting their revenue and appropriations.
8. Irrigation and reclamation, including water supply for reclamation projects, and easements of public lands for irrigation projects.
9. Interstate compacts relating to apportionment of waters for irrigation purposes.
10. Mining interests generally.
11. Mineral land laws and claims and entries thereunder.
12. Geological survey.
13. Mining schools and experimental stations.
14. Petroleum conservation and conservation of the radium supply in the United States.
15. Relations of the United States with the Indians and the Indian tribes.
16. Measures relating to the care, education, and management of Indians, including the care and allotment of Indian lands and general and special measures relating to claims which are paid out of Indian funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in complimenting the distinguished Senator from Florida upon the very fine work he has done. I am hopeful that the Judiciary Committee, or another committee of the Senate having jurisdiction, will look into this matter at once. I think that within the past 6 months we have had entirely too many bureaucrats assuming power which, in my opinion, was not given them by the Congress. It may be that the Congress is providing too much money to pay too many lawyers in order to look into the laws, and to bypass Congress.

Mr. President, I desire now to address myself to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

BAGASSE NEWSPRINT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on Thursday last, several newspapers located in the Louisiana Sugar Bowl—comprising most of the parishes of south central Louisiana—printed their regular editions on newsprint made from bagasse, which is the pulpy substance remaining after the juice has been removed from sugarcane.

The paper was made by a process developed as a result of research begun in 1936 at Valentine Plantation, in Lafourche Parish, La., just a few miles from my home at Houma.

It is indeed heartening to take note of this significant development—one which offers the possibility of another new and vital industry taking root in Louisiana and other sugarcane producing areas. But the long-range effect of this new process will extend much further than Louisiana, for all publishers in this country may eventually be making their press runs on this new paper.

Mr. President, freedom of the press is one of the foundation stones of our American way of life. The press—and its companion mediums of radio and television—is basic to the formation of healthful public opinion. But freedom of the press can extend only to the point where the supply of paper for published matter is adequate to meet the demand. Without an adequate supply of paper—and in this particular instance, newsprint—freedom of the press may become seriously curtailed.

The United States boasts more newspapers and magazines than any other nation in the world. Consequently our use of newsprint is extremely high. During 1951, American publishers consumed nearly 6,000,000 tons of newsprint—of which only some 1,000,000 tons were produced in this country. Basically, our national press is dependent upon imported newsprint for its very existence. Most of these imports, as Senators know, are from Canadian mills. Lately, publishers—particularly small publishers—have been hard hit by increases in per-ton costs of newsprint. From an average of about $72 a ton in 1946, newsprint has increased in cost to nearly $126 a ton today—if the recent price increase announced by Canadian manufacturers last month is added.

This, of course, tends to "squeeze the little man out," and publishers are increasingly fearful that unless a supplementary source of newsprint is opened up, smaller publications will either have to close shop, or merge with larger organizations—organizations that are financially able to pay the asking price of Canadian and other newsprint producers.

The development of a new domestic newsprint industry, using the 950,000 tons of bagasse produced as a byproduct each year by the American sugarcane industry, would be the answer to a publisher's prayer. According to statistics available to me, newsprint made from bagasse is more opaque and takes ink better than a similar product manufactured from wood pulp. In addition, I understand that the delivered cost of bagasse newsprint will run substantially below the present cost of newsprint made from wood pulp.

So here, in this announcement from a sugarcane firm, located in Louisiana's "sugar bowl," we find a development of vital interest to all our people. Besides offering new industries to the South, this scientific achievement promises to stimulate our present free press by offering a basic commodity at a fair price. And while the process is little beyond the pilot-plant stage of development, tests made by the Forest Service laboratory at Madison, Wis.—and proved by press runs made only last week in Louisiana—indicate that the manufacture of newsprint from bagasse is well on its way to becoming an economic reality.

Valentine Sugars and their technicians have given us just one more concrete indication that under our system of competitive free enterprise, our basic freedoms will continue to thrive. For that, and the promise their developments offer to the Nation and particularly the Nation's press, this development deserves great credit.

I desire to compliment the officials of Valentine Corp., and to wish them much success in this new undertaking.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a sheet of paper made from bagasse. I shall leave it at the desk, so that if Senators desire to look at it, they may have the opportunity of doing so.

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944, RELATING TO GI HOUSING

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 506 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, I should like briefly to explain the purpose of this bill. About 5 months ago, I was shocked and amazed to learn of the case of a young aviator, veteran of World War II, who had been recalled to duty on 4 days' notice, who was compelled to sell the home which he had purchased under the GI home program, and who had gone overseas to serve his country. The transfer of the GI mortgage had been made, with the approval of the bank holding the mortgage, which had been approved by the Veterans' Administration. While this man was serving his country overseas, the subsequent purchaser defaulted on two payments. The GI house went to foreclosure. It was sold, without notice to the Air Force veteran of any kind. This young man, who was fighting overseas, flying planes in Europe for this Nation, was called upon to pay back to the Government $600, which they were threatening to take out of the military pay which he was earning at the time.

Mr. President, I was amazed to find that efforts were being made to take out of this military man's pay, after he had been called back into the service, an alleged deficiency of $600 on this house. Furthermore, I was amazed to find that the house, upon which only a few payments had been made, had been sold for a sum more than $600 greater than the mortgage owed by the veteran.

The Veterans' Administration had bid in the house and lot on a foreclosure sale and then sold the property at a profit of approximately $1,000, which, less the cost of repairs, had given them a clear profit of $600 on the transaction. Yet, because the house was bid in low on the foreclosure sale they want to come back on the veteran who was fighting for his country, and they are asking $600 addition from him and trying to collect out of his military pay.

Moreover, Mr. President, I was amazed to find that although the slightest effort on their part could have determined where the veteran was located, so that he could have received notice by mail, they insisted on giving notice by foreclosure.

I should like to recite briefly the publication in the Tulsa Daily Legal News:

> That the defendants have departed from Tulsa County to avoid service of summons and keep themselves concealed in order to avoid the personal service summons upon them.

The affidavit further states:

> That inquiry and search have been made in an effort to locate the presence of the defendants, but such inquiry and search have failed to locate them or either of them.

If they had made the slightest inquiry they could have found out that the captain had been called back into service, but, instead, they just gave notice, and they sold the house at a profit to the Veterans' Administration, and then billed him for a deficiency.

The bill which I have introduced would prohibit the Veterans' Administration from assessing a deficiency judgment in such a situation. In other words, if they sold the house for as much as was the veteran's mortgage, they could not come back on him.

Second. The GI would be treated in this connection in the way which is customary in any such transaction. The veteran could not be held liable to pay out a mortgage which someone else had assumed to pay and whose credit presumably could be proved.

Third. The bill provides that no moneys received from military pay, flight pay, or death benefits can be levied upon by the Veterans' Administration to col-

lect debts that might be owed by a veteran.

Fourth. The bill proposes where there is hardship, if the veteran had to sell his home and transfer it to another purchaser, if he had to move because of his own health or that of a member of his immediate family, or had to move because of any hardship reason, that the veteran will be entitled again to purchase a GI house under the GI housing program.

With that in mind, Mr. President, I have had the bill drafted, and I ask early attention by the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3307) to amend section 506 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM T. BRADY TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL, DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably the nomination of William T. Brady, of New Jersey, to be United States marshal for the district of New Jersey.

I am very happy to endorse Mr. Brady's nomination, and urge its early confirmation by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive R, Eightieth Congress, first session, Convention No. 68 concerning food and catering for crews on board ship; with an understanding (Exec. Rept. No. 11);

Executive S, Eightieth Congress, first session, Convention No. 69 concerning the certification of ships' cooks; with an understanding (Exec. Rept. No. 11);

Executive Y, Eightieth Congress, first session, Convention No. 73 concerning the medical examination of seafarers; with an understanding (Exec. Rept. No. 11); and

Executive Z, Eightieth Congress, first session, Convention No. 74 concerning the certification of able seamen; with understandings (Exec. Rept. No. 11).

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive M, Eighty-second Congress, second session, an agreement between the United States and Canada for the promotion of safety on the Great Lakes by means of radio; without reservation or understanding (Ex. Rept. No. 12).

By Mr. MCCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Ernest A. Tolin, of California, to be United States district judge for the southern district of California;

A. Carter Whitehead, of Virginia, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Virginia, vice George R. Humrickhouse, resigned;

Benjamin F. Ellis, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Alabama;

Raymond E. Thomason, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Alabama;

John E. Hushing, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the District of the Canal Zone;

Julius J. Wichser, of Indiana, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Indiana;

Frank Golden, of Nebraska, to be United States marshal for the district of Nebraska; and

Gerald K. Nellis, of New York, to be United States marshal for the northern district of New York.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Rupert Hugo Newcomb, of Mississippi, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Air Force are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be notified of the action of the Senate in all nominations confirmed today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONRONEY. I move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 10, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 9 (legislative day of June 5), 1952:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment as corps commander, with the rank of lieutenant general, and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Maj. Gen. Willard Gordon Wyman, O12356, Army.

Maj. Gen. Williston Birkhimer Palmer, O12246.

COMPTROLLER OF THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. George Henry Decker, O15950, to be Comptroller of the Army, with the rank of lieutenant general and to be lieutenant general in the Army of the United States.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Glenn Oscar Barcus 87A, Regular Air Force.

To be major general in the Air National Guard of the United States, United States Air Force, to date from April 17, 1952

Maj. Gen. Samuel Ernest Vandiver, Jr., AO770851, Georgia Air National Guard, Adjutant General State of Georgia.

The nominations of Charles Anthony Dever et al., for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and section 306 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 27, 1952, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Charles Anthony Dever, which is shown on page 6036, and ending with the name of Betty Jo Workman, which is shown on page 6037.

IN THE NAVY

Admiral Robert B. Carney, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of an admiral while serving as commander in chief, Allied Forces, Southern Europe.

Vice Adm. Jerauld Wright, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander in chief, United States Naval Forces, Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean.

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and Supply Corps as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Rosemarie S. Armstrong	Mary A. Hawbolt
	Dolores H. Henry
Marion L. Baird	Katherine V. Iams
Emily C. Bittner	Marjorie H. Kaff
Dorothy A. Borbidge	Elizabeth A. McClean
Margaret L. Boyce	Catherine J. Miles
Claire M. Clark	Eleanor A. Ovitt
Betty M. Corredera	Elizabeth A. Read
Dorothy J. Darr	Ada Lou Reed
Barbara J. Dobson	Susan K. Reed
Nancy A. Dutton	Marjorie L. Richardson
Ludean S. Earnest	
Margaret M. Fitzgerald	Jeanne M. Schrumpf
	Virginia D. Smith
Gloria J. Folger	Audrey R. Speckman
Leona J. Fox	Allyn R. Thompson
Jimmie R. Fralic	Alice J. Wardenga
Dorothy M. Funk	Joan E. Zook

SUPPLY CORPS

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Debbie P. Belka	Elizabeth B. McQuiston
Alys G. Dauchess	
Betty J. Emery	Patricia E. Schulze
Ruth D. Forman	

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be senior assistant scientist, effective date of acceptance

William L. Jenkins
Robert F. Suczek

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be senior assistant scientist, effective date of acceptance

Albert L. Burroughs — Richard H. Foote
Clifford O. Berg — Clarence A. Sooter

To be senior assistant surgeon

Harold M. Silver

To be sanitary engineers

Henry J. L. Rechen
Frederick S. Kent

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 9, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCCORMACK.

DESIGNATION OF HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair lays before the House the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
Washington, D. C., June 9, 1952.

I hereby designate Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we are again lifting our minds and hearts unto Thee in our prayers of adoration, confession, thanksgiving, supplication, and intercession.

Thou alone knowest our many needs and how absolutely dependent we are upon Thee for our blessings.

Grant that the day of glorious prediction may soon come when every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that Thou art the God of all mankind.

Inspire us with a sincere and loyal devotion to the lofty ideals and principles of truth and justice and with a courage to proclaim and defend Thee. Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 5, 1952, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7314. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. CORDON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 677) entitled "An act to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to establish the relationship of the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Joint Chiefs of Staff; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. LONG, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. FLANDERS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 6787) entitled "An act to extend the Rubber Act of 1948 (Public Law 469, 80th Cong.), as amended, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1628. An act to confirm the status of certain civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities under the Armed Forces with respect to laws administered by the Civil Service Commission, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 52–22.

ELECTION OF HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

Mr. PRIEST assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 674) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, be, and he is hereby, elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

Resolved, That the President and the Senate be notified by the Clerk of the election of Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK as Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MCCORMACK resumed the chair.

Mr. MCCORMACK was administered the oath of office as Speaker pro tempore by Mr. COOPER.

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 677, an act to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps and to establish the relationship of the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Joint Chiefs of Staff with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Mr. VINSON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. DURHAM, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. ARENDS.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FISHER asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY IN THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. The purpose of congressional investigation is the collection and analysis of facts and the test of its effectiveness lies in the development of adequate legislation to correct deficiencies that are found to exist. In this view I have had drafted a bill amending the National Security Act.

I have today introduced this bill for the promotion of economy and efficiency through integration of supply and service activities within and among the military departments.

The passage of this bill is essential if we are to have economy and efficiency in the military departments.

Extended investigations of the subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman leads to the undeniable conclusion that there is less unity in supply matters in the military set-up than there was in 1945 when our country was so aroused over waste in the Army and Navy. We now have triplication in place of duplication. We must have better management of the business activities of the Department of Defense if we are to have military and economic security. We have only to pause a moment to reflect that the Korean war has now exceeded World War I in length—that is why this legislation is a "surefire" must.

The bill which I am introducing will, first, set up an Under Secretary of Defense for Supply Management; second, abolish the impotent Munitions Board; third, transfer to the Secretary of Defense control over supply matters now vested in many boards, individuals, and so forth; fourth, create an efficient and well-trained supply corps to assist the Under Secretary to perform his duties; and give the Under Secretary proper control over appropriations for supply.

The stakes in this matter are great. I urge that this body insist on action.

I can assure the House that our subcommittee is going to continue to investigate and report on this subject which is so important to our defense and to our economy. We can have defense, adequate defense with economy and national strength when the Department is properly organized and efficiently managed. The bill I am introducing will be a big step in this direction.

WHICH: DOESN'T KNOW OR AFRAID TO TELL?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in his press conference at the Pentagon on Tuesday, June 3, Candidate Eisenhower made three statements that are very difficult for me to understand. In the light of present-day world conditions and world tensions these three statements should cause the American people to "view with alarm" or to have grave doubts about the General as a candidate for President. In that press conference in answer to questions Candidate Eisenhower said:

First. He does not know what our world-wide commitments are.

Second. He does not know what the Pentagon's plans are for our military build-up, nor how much those plans count on British, French, and Italian production.

Third. He is not prepared at this time to state his own convictions as to what a reasonable defense program should be.

Mr. Speaker, these three statements coming from one of our top ranking military men, coming from the one who has had the full responsibility of planning for the European Defense, coming from a candidate who hopes to take over the important position of Commander in Chief of the United States Armed Forces, show either a woeful lack of knowledge on his part of what he has been doing, or a coy reticence to reveal what he hopes and intends to do.

Mr. Speaker, General Eisenhower has spent a lifetime in the military service of his country. He has just returned from one of the top military posts in the world. He has had ready access to the military plans of the United States and of the free nations of Western Europe, including the essential functions of supply, procurement, and war matériel. He, of all people, should know both the facts and the plans involved in his European task. Surely, it was his responsibility to know these things, or not knowing them to find out.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, he now comes to us as Candidate Eisenhower and tells us he is not familiar with our commitments, he doesn't know our military plans, and he can't give us at present his idea of what a reasonable defense program should be. Whatever his reasons for making these three statements, whether a lack of knowledge or a reticence to reveal what he hopes and intends to do, his statements certainly are cause for wonder, for doubt, and for alarm on the part of every American. A candidate for the highest office in the land should know, and be willing to reveal, what his program is for the Nation's future.

REVISION OF LAWS RELATING TO IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND NATIONALITY

Mr. WALTER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5678) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that on the roll call on Thursday, June 5, on the Mutual Security Act of 1952 conference report, H. R. 7005, it was necessary for me to leave the Chamber and I am reported as absent. Had it been possible for me to have answered this roll call, I would have voted aye on the acceptance of this conference report.

FREEDOM

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Westbrook Pegler is again making me a lot of trouble. All too often I hear from the well of the House gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, sometimes from this side, urging that if we are to have a free people, a free world, and ourselves be free as a Nation, we must continue to appropriate more and more billions for other peoples, other nations, as well as for national defense. Well, this morning, as on other occasions when I picked up the paper, there was an article by Westbrook Pegler[1] which says that we are no longer a free people,

[1] [From the Washington Times-Herald of June 9, 1952]

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

Ralph Howard Alsup, the murderous racketeer who still holds the position of vice president of the Nevada State Federation of Labor and president of the Clark County Federation, at last has been locked up in the Nevada State penitentiary at Carson City to serve a term of from 1 to 2 years for shooting a member of the painters' union.

Alsup shot the painter merely because the unfortunate rank-and-filer went to the union hall to present his version of the facts in a simple dispute between a brother painter and the business agent of the local painters' union.

The date of this crime was December 3, 1949, and the victim was hounded out of the State and as far away as Alaska by a cabal of union terrorists because he was the complaining witness against an habitual criminal holding high positions under William Green, president, and the executive council of the American Federation of Labor.

With the usual discount allowed first offenders who indicate a disposition to go straight, Alsup will be eligible for parole about January 1, 1953. He may even be turned loose in time to celebrate Christmas by beating up his wife in line with his marital program to date.

Of course, Alsup is not a first offender, but the power of AFL unions is so great that he may be treated as a wayward boy with an honest heart even though he is an habitual criminal with a long prison career.

Alsup is one of the rogue union bosses whom I had in mind during my discussion of American unionism with the highest authority on the subject of labor, and the Pope's adviser thereon, at the Vatican in March.

Timothy Flynn, regional director of the CIO for the entire west coast by executive appointment of Philip Murray, is another veteran jailbird and criminal with a multiple record who was high in my thoughts as I enlightened this dignitary on important phases of American unionism.

Flynn's specialty was housebreaking. He further qualified for his position of great power over the law-abiding populace and industry of our west coast by two terms in prison. Faithful research in Worcester, Mass., the scene of these interesting activities, failed to disclose the slightest evidence that Flynn had ever put in a day at honest toil.

He is well remembered in Worcester, mostly by the police, but only for evil works without a trace of favorable renown to mitigate his vicious reputation. Repeated efforts to reach him by long-distance phone at the San Francisco headquarters of the CIO all failed.

Ralph Howard Alsup's union is the plumbers' and pipe fitters'.

His criminal career is well known not only to William Green, but to Martin Durkin, the president of the plumbers' union. Green is a lay dignitary of the Baptist Church, given to serious religious preaching. Murray and Durkin are noted for their piety.

Like Flynn, Alsup has authority in more than one State. The Federal Government has been pouring money into Alsup's jurisdiction for new defense projects including the Nevada atom bomb experiments. Some of his subjects have been filching materials to build him a home. Laborers, under easily understood coercion, are donating time and skill to this worthy work.

The fact that Alsup is likely to kill one or more persons unless he is locked away for

that we need at least a little freedom here in America. Now, in view of all this talk about freedom for other people, that is very disturbing to me. I hope others will read, consider, and act on "Pegs" thought. I hope that those who really want to save a little money and perhaps save the lives of a few of our boys will look that article over and insist, for example, our men shall not be sent into war to fight for any country but their own; under any flag other than the Stars and Stripes; nor until the Congress declares war. Before we extend so much help to other countries, have so many killed abroad, it is my hope we will get a little more freedom, a little more constitutional government, a little less political tyranny here at home so that people who want to work to earn a livelihood and enough tax dollars to send money abroad may have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYLE. May I ask the gentleman, whom I admire very much, why the Republican would rather lose with TAFT than win with Eisenhower?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. We do not propose to lose; we intend to win and end this era of corruption and attempted unconstitutional government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

---

life or killed first is obvious on the face of his record. He has served time for an armed stickup and assault with a gun.

In addition to his present shooting job, he was arrested last fall for having a loaded pistol when he got roaring drunk and wrecked an automobile at grave peril to law-abiding motorists on a crowded highway.

This happened when he was out on bail in the shooting case. He also did a prison term in Texas for helping a number of criminals to escape. He never was a worker in any legitimate field. The pious Mr. Durkin lives in Chevy Chase, Md., a select suburb of Washington. He is a dignitary of the American Federation of Labor.

Alsup is under addition sentence of 6 months on a Federal charge of conspiring with dealers in ventilating machinery, plumbing, and so forth, to extort money from the taxpayers. He used his power as a unioneer to withhold union labor from Government works unless the building contractors specified certain metal products.

Alsup was fined $5,000 in addition to his 6-month sentence. Two contractors also got 6 months. One was fined $5,000 and the other $4,000.

A citizen of Las Vegas writes: "Even prior to the sentence there was quite a bit of activity in the local plumbers' union to be sure that Alsup would not have to pay $5,000. The union couldn't legally pay it so a voluntary assessment of a day's pay was levied."

There were approximately 250 members. At $20 each that added up to $5,000. At first it was to be a mandatory assessment but the directors decided that this would be unconstitutional. It was made voluntary which meant that the plumbers could either put up or wait months for the next job because Alsup had control.

They had been paying 1½ percent of their pay to defray the cost of Alsup's other brushes with the law. Several wives of plumbers wanted to protest but were afraid.

Two wives said the assessment meant that they would have to go without oil to heat their homes. Fear goes deep in the hearts of these working people. They may be blacklisted if they protest. When you own your home in a community, it is a tragic prospect.

"Alsup beat his wife so badly on Christmas Eve that she was taken to a hospital and it was necessary for neighbors to care for their two children. This was done by plumbers' wives."

This and the Flynn case will be included in the survey of American labor under criminal unioneers which the Vatican dignitary requested me to prepare for the information of the Holy Father. He said the Pope's regular American sources of information had not reported this phase.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

AMERICAN POLITICS

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman tell me why the Democrats in Texas are supporting Eisenhower?

Mr. LYLE. I will be very happy to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why do you not nominate him as the Democratic candidate?

Mr. LYLE. I think he would make a great President.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You Texas men went into our caucus and supported him.

Mr. LYLE. We are not used to stealing.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not unless you keep the profits of the steal, and I am not talking about tidelands legislation, either, just the nomination of a candidate for the Presidency.

Mr. LYLE. I want to yield to the gentleman now to tell me why the Republicans would rather lose with TAFT than win with Eisenhower?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. We are not going to lose with TAFT and if he is nominated I personally expect to support him.

Mr. LYLE. They do not think they can shoulder the responsibility of national leadership, that is it, and I am not so certain that they are not right because it is difficult to lead in a world like this, it is difficult to know where to go.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I am very glad the gentleman asked that question. I am a RUSSELL man myself.

Mr. LYLE. I am a RAYBURN man.

Mr. COLMER. I am very much interested in getting a reply to the very potent question that the gentleman asked.

Mr. LYLE. Does not the gentleman think it is perhaps because they do not want to shoulder the terrific and terrible responsibility of national leadership? They are frightened, they are very frightened.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I wish you gentlemen would not worry about the Republican prospects. We will take care of that.

Mr. LYLE. I have to worry about them because they are a great national party.

SOUTHERN DEMOCRATS WILL NOT ACCEPT A COMMUNISTIC PLATFORM

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle who seem to be floundering around as to just whom they will nominate for President, did a fairly good job in pointing out the shortcomings of their respective candidates.

While they were on that subject, they might have mentioned the fact that Averell Harriman seems to be running on the Communist platform. He made the statement, and repeated it, that he would wipe out segregation in the public schools here in the District of Columbia. In other words, he would make war on the white children here in the District, catering to that whining, alien element who are complaining about discrimination while joining in this persecution of the white American children here in Washington.

As far as the Democratic candidates are concerned, of course, my choice would be Senator RUSSELL, as between the candidates now in the field; but the chances are that we will be outvoted in the convention, and that these same communistic planks on FEPC, antisegregation, civil rights, genocide, and probably other similar expressions of political insanity, will be inserted in the platform. Of course, we people in the South are not going to accept any such provisions, but we will nominate a candidate of our own on a real American platform, and will carry enough States to throw the election into the House of Representatives. Then our candidate will be elected, for the simple reason that every Republican would rather have him than to have Truman, or any Trumancrat, who favors those communistic provisions, and every Democrat had rather have him than TAFT or Eisenhower.

Then we could get our Government back on the beam and save America for Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

LOS ANGELES VOTERS REJECT FEDERAL PUBLIC HOUSING

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to have them appear in the appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. McDONOUGH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEES

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I can understand why a lot of gentlemen on my right, members of the Democratic Party, and on my left, members of the Republican Party as well, are greatly interested in who is going to be nominated for President on the Republican ticket. I think the American people are more concerned about who is going to be nominated for President on the Republican ticket this time than ever before, because they feel that whoever is nominated on the Republican ticket for President must, and will be elected.

Furthermore, I think that we are fortunate in the fact that we have two great citizens who have demonstrated their worth, one—in the Legislative Halls of our country, and one in the military leadership of our country, who are willing to accept the great responsibility of trying to save freedom and liberty in this country which has been almost lost by 20 years of one reckless administration after the other. And whether it be Eisenhower, who is a great citizen and worthy of the confidence not only of the Republicans, but of the Independents and the Democrats, or whether it be Senator TAFT who has the same confidence, whom I happen to favor with first priority, they will have a tremendous job of cleaning up this wreckage of 20 years under Democrat leadership. With a national debt of $260,000,000,000 hanging over the people, with taxes the highest in our history, with no promise for the future other than continuing crisis, and the danger of the Korean war spreading into wars for possibly a generation, serious Members of this House and the people generally are looking to the election of a Republican President and a Republican Congress. There is nothing to worry about if we entrust the leadership to either TAFT or Eisenhower, unless things have gone so far as that the country cannot be saved.

I think it must be admitted that whoever is nominated for President on the Democrat ticket, with the possible exception of Senator RUSSELL, must and will endorse, and run on the policies of President Truman, as the President has said some weeks ago.

The people want a change. They will not return to power a party, that on its record has forfeited its right to the further confidence of the people. That is why they are so interested in who the Republicans will nominate. They intend to elect whoever is nominated. They want to put an end to the profligate waste and mismanagement of this administration before it is too late.

PRESIDENTIAL CELEBRATIONS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

[Mr. McCARTHY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN W. McCORMACK AND ARCHBISHOP CUSHING

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include two citations for honorary degrees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday Providence College, a Dominican institution in Rhode Island, conferred honorary degrees on two of New England's most distinguished citizens. Archbishop Richard J. Cushing was awarded the degree of doctor of sacred theology and our eminent majority leader, Congressman JOHN W. McCORMACK, who is today sitting as our Acting Speaker, received the degree of doctor of laws.

I know that all of us, here in the House of Representatives, rejoice in the distinction thus paid our majority leader. We know that he justly merits this honor. In conferring it on him and the great Catholic churchman, Archbishop Cushing, Providence College brings additional reflected glory on herself.

Mr. Speaker, I am including the citations for the honorary degrees to which I have referred. We, who know Congressman McCORMACK so well, can take particular pride and pleasure in reading the last sentence of his citation:

> In all things, you have given the last thought to yourself and placed first things first, for your home, your Nation, and your God.

How truly appropriate is this character study of our majority leader.

Mr. Speaker, the citation for honorary degrees to which I have referred are as follows:

CITATIONS FOR HONORARY DEGREES

RICHARD JAMES CUSHING, DOCTOR OF SACRED THEOLOGY

Orator, administrator, churchman. Your more than 30 years in the priesthood have been marked by an ever-deepening zeal in the service of God and your fellow men, and by the ever-widening horizons of the area of your activity, from the duties of a parochial assistant to the labors and dignity of an archiepiscopal see.

The multiple evidence of your administrative vision is acknowledged with respect; your fervent devotion to the highest truth and your vigorous crusading for Christ-like living have brought honor to you and to the Catholic Church; and your unflagging, selfless devotion to God's little ones has earned you the affection of all whom you serve. We recognize, therefore, the inner qualities of mind and of heart that shine through your outward deeds, manifested in your penetrating scholarship, your lucid learning, and your intense love of God and country.

JOHN WILLIAM M'CORMACK, DOCTOR OF LAWS

Eminent statesman, magnanimous humanitarian, and prominent Catholic layman. Through unquenchable zeal and inspiring leadership you have added luster to your dignified office as the first Catholic majority leader in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

In season and out of season, you have given unstintingly of your talents. Your kindness and thoughtfulness have prompted you to see at all times the point of view of other men regardless of race, color, or creed. Your great love for your church and your many beneficent contributions to Catholic life; your Christian patience and courage in facing formidable obstacles; your constant reliance on divine providence and your true Catholic charity have motivated you always to look upon yourself as an humble instrument in the hands of Almighty God. In all things you have given the last thought to yourself and placed first things first, for your home, your Nation, and your God.

RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6133) to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

> Page 2, line 4, after "prescribe" insert ": *Provided*, That such payment shall be made first from any funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Red Lake Band of the Chippewa Indians, of Minnesota, drawing interest at the rate of 5 percent and thereafter from funds drawing 4 percent."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the amendment?

Mr. HAGEN. The amendment provides that this $100 per capita payment shall be made out of the Indians' own money. First it comes from a fund which is now drawing 5-percent interest from the United States Government because the Government has the use of the money, and after the funds from the 5 percent interest-bearing fund are exhausted the funds to pay this $100 per capital payment come from the 4-percent fund.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is money that belongs to the Indians?

Mr. HAGEN. It is their own money in both funds.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 95]

Asandahl	Frazier	Miller, Md.
Abbitt	Fugate	Miller, N. Y.
Abernethy	Fulton	Morano
Adair	Gamble	Morgan
Addonizio	Garmatz	Morris
Albert	Goodwin	Morrison
Bailey	Gore	Morton
Barden	Granahan	Multer
Barrett	Green	Murdock
Bates, Ky.	Gwinn	O'Brien, N. Y.
Beall	Hale	O'Neill
Beckworth	Hall,	Osmers
Belcher	Edwin Arthur	Ostertag
Bender	Hall,	O'Toole
Betts	Leonard W.	Philbin
Blackney	Halleck	Phillips
Blatnik	Hand	Potter
Boggs, Del.	Harden	Powell
Bray	Harrison, Va.	Rabaut
Brehm	Hart	Reece, Tenn.
Brooks	Harvey	Reed, N. Y.
Brown, Ohio	Hays, Ohio	Rhodes
Buckley	Heffernan	Ribicoff
Burdick	Heller	Richards
Burton	Herter	Riehlman
Canfield	Hinshaw	Robeson
Carlyle	Holifield	Rodino
Carnahan	Howell	Rogers, Mass.
Carrigg	Jackson, Calif.	Roosevelt
Case	James	Sabath
Celler	Javits	St. George
Chatham	Jenkins	Sassecer
Chudoff	Johnson	Scott, Hardie
Clemente	Judd	Scott,
Cole, N. Y.	Kean	Hugh D., Jr.
Cooley	Kelley, Pa.	Sheppard
Corbett	Kelly, N. Y.	Short
Cotton	Kennedy	Simpson, Pa.
Coudert	Keogh	Sittler
Crawford	Kerr	Stanley
Davis, Tenn.	King, Calif.	Stigler
Dawson	King, Pa.	Stockman
Deane	Kirwan	Sutton
DeGraffenried	Klein	Tackett
Delaney	Lane	Taylor
Denny	Latham	Thompson, Tex.
Dingell	Lesinski	Vorys
Dollinger	McConnell	Welch
Donohue	McCulloch	Wickersham
Donovan	McGrath	Widnall
Dorn	McKinnon	Williams, Miss.
Elston	Machrowicz	Wilson, Ind.
Fallon	Mack, Wash.	Wolcott
Feighan	Martin, Iowa	Wood, Ga.
Fenton	Merrow	
Fine	Miller, Calif.	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 268 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

STEEL MILLS DECISION

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 675) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the House document room, 3,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 141, Eighty-second Congress, relating to power of the President to take possession of steel mills, being the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States and concurring and dissenting opinions in the case of the *Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company, et al., petitioner*, v. *Charles Sawyer* and *Charles Sawyer, petitioner*, v. *The Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company, et al.*

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special subcommittee of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

BOARD OF ACCOUNTANCY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 2383) to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board of Accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 17, 1923, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the chairman of the committee please explain the bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. The purpose of this bill is to increase the reexamination fees of candidates taking the examination to practice as certified public accountants in the District of Columbia from $10 to $20 for each such examination.

These examinations are held in the District of Columbia in May and November of each year. Approximately 250 to 300 people take the examination each time and the examinations are given in five sessions, which consume 2½ days. It is necessary that the District of Columbia Board of Accountancy meet all of its expenses from the collection of these fees.

The increase would apply only to those candidates who take an examination for the second time. The initial examination fee of $25 would remain unchanged.

At the last examination held in May of this year 244 candidates took the examination as certified public accountants and 180 of these were reexaminations.

The bill has the approval of and was requested by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the third sentence of section 8 of the act entitled "An act to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 17, 1923 (42 Stat. 1263, ch. 94; sec. 2-908 D. C. Code, 1940 edition), is amended by striking therefrom "of $10 for each examination", and inserting in lieu thereof "to be fixed by the Board of Accountancy, not exceeding $20 for each such examination."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERATING HYDROELECTRIC POWER AT CHEATHAM DAM

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 654 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 97) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities for generating hydroelectric power at the Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland River in Tennessee. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and, pending that, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, as the report indicates, is sponsored by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], the distinguished whip on the majority side. It has for its purpose the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities for generating hydroelectric power at the Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland River in Tennessee at an estimated cost of $18,200,000. I am not familiar with the bill and have not read the hearings on it, but that in brief is the purpose of it. However, I am informed that this authorization is necessary if the full benefits of prior expenditures are to be realized.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to construct

and operate a hydroelectric power project. Its estimated cost is about $18,000,000.

I am not going to fight this rule, although I think it probably should be fought, because as you all know, I am against the Government's socializing this Nation.

We know how back in the thirties the Government forced Wendell Willkie to sell his utility companies to the Government. We have seen the attempt of the Government to socialize our farmers through the Brannan agricultural plan. We have seen our Government attempt to socialize and nationalize medicine through socialized medicine. We have seen the Government take over the railroads against private enterprise. We now see the Government attempting to socialize and nationalize the steel industry.

So I say to you Members of this House who favor private enterprise over the socialization and nationalization of the free-enterprise system in the United States that this is just another step of completely taking the Nation's resources and bringing them under governmental control.

I say again, Mr. Speaker, that although I am not going to fight this rule, I hope the Members turn down this additional step, whereby $18,000,000 is to be used to construct and maintain a utility company under Government instead of under private enterprise.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time. Therefore, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 97) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities for generating hydroelectric power at the Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland River in Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 97, with Mr. BURNSIDE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, S. 97, proposes a modification of an existing project, and the installation of a powerhouse and power-generating facilities consisting of three 12,000-kilowatt units. No alteration would be made to the lock and dam authorized under existing legislation.

The existing navigation project below Nashville, with its small locks and inadequate depths, is obsolete for modern traffic, does not meet the needs of existing commerce, and hinders development of extensive new commerce. Present traffic exceeds 1,600,000 tons annually, consisting principally of oil and steel products, and is increasing progressively. The Cheatham lock and dam will be completed in late 1953, and will meet the needs of prospective commerce, eliminate multiple lockages for existing tows, shorten traveling time, and benefit the area generally. Since the close of World War II the total power usage in the Tennessee-Cumberland area has increased 83 percent. A large part of this use is by various municipalities and cooperatives for residential, commercial, and rural consumption. In addition, industries connected with phosphates, chemicals, textiles, electro-metallurgical production of ferro-alloys, and installations directly connected with the current defense effort including ordnance plants, Atomic Energy Commission plants, and other military facilities, use large quantities of power, and the need is increasing. There is a shortage of power in the area, despite the large developments of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Power demands and uses are increasing more rapidly than new power facilities can be installed. The annual value of the power that would be produced is estimated at $1,212,000, and the ratio of annual benefits to costs for the power features is 1.55. That ratio for the navigation project is 3.04.

The committee believes it essential that the power demands in the Tennessee-Cumberland area be met by new developments. Current estimates indicate that power demands will require a total installation of 6,500,000 kilowatts of generating capacity by 1955. The total installed capacity at this time is slightly over 3,000,000 kilowatts. A total potential in excess of 1,000,000 kilowatts is available within the Cumberland River Basin. Since the Cheatham Dam is under construction, it appears that power facilities could be added there without difficulty and completed by late 1954. The power could be absorbed as soon as it could be made available and would make a valuable contribution to the power supply needs of the area.

The committee is of the opinion that the power situation in the area is now so acute that the installation of generating facilities at the Cheatham project is fully justified. Enactment of S. 97 is necessary to provide authority for such installation.

The Department of the Army has advised the committee that studies made by the Corps of Engineers in connection with the design of the navigation facilities at Cheatham show that the benefits from the power which can be developed would be substantially greater than the costs.

The Bureau of the Budget informed the committee that in the light of the potentially critical power shortage in this area, it would seem desirable that the power-generating facilities be authorized at this time.

The Department of the Interior stated that since these facilities are included as a power resource and are a part of the expansion program needed to meet defense loads and essential civilian requirements, prompt enactment of the bill is recommended.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARCADE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Is there any source of power in this area other than this, or is this the only available source of power?

Mr. LARCADE. There are other sources of power available in that area. They are not sufficient to meet the highly expanding economy of that country, and especially with respect to the needs for national defense. This project is located in the Tullahoma-Oak Ridge area, both of which are demanding electricity at a higher peak and are very important in our defense effort.

Mr. KEATING. Are there private power companies in the area which are able to increase their facilities for the manufacture of power?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LARCADE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. With reference to the question just asked by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], I believe I can answer that by stating this: I am sure the gentleman will understand. In 1939, as the gentleman may recall—we will not go into the question of whether that was proper or improper at that time—but the fact remains that in 1939 the Congress approved the sale of Commonwealth Southern Utility interests in that entire area, an area covering 80,000 square miles, to the Tennessee Valley Authority. It developed since then that there is not a private utility capable of supplying the power. As a matter of fact, within most of that area there is no private utility operating. The utility for that entire area is the Tennessee Valley Authority, plus the Army engineer generation at dams under their jurisdiction. There is no private utility capable of supplying that power.

Mr. KEATING. Is the $18,000,000 proposed to be put up by the Federal Government specifically for the construction of a steam plant?

Mr. PRIEST. No. That is for the installation of three hydroelectric generators, 12,000 kilowatts capacity each, at this dam that is about halfway completed as a navigation and flood-control dam. It was originally contemplated by the Army engineers that these generating units would be installed at some time in the future, and plans for the dam were so drawn. They subsequently resurveyed the situation, particularly with reference to the increased demand for power by 1954, when the wind tunnel installation at Tullahoma is in operation, and when the expansion at Oak Ridge and Paducah will be under way, and it was found urgent to proceed now, rather than to wait until some later date to supply that additional power. This is not steam generation. It is hydroelectric generation at this dam that is already under construction as a navigation and flood-control dam.

Mr. KEATING. Is there any reason why this proposed construction contemplated under this bill should not have

been passed upon when the original construction was authorized?

Mr. PRIEST. I am taking the gentleman's time, and I apologize for so doing, but at the time it was originally authorized, in 1946, this great increase in power demand in the area had not appeared. No wind-tunnel installation had been thought about at that time. No authorization for the new atomic-energy plant at Paducah had been contemplated at that time. For that reason there was no urgency demanding this additional block of power. That is why it was not authorized in the beginning.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE] has again expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary for me to state to this House or to the country what my position is on public power. I have heard a great deal on this floor even this morning about low-rent housing, low-cost housing, and now it is low-cost power. All three are misnomers; they are subsidized houses, subsidized rent, and subsidized power; and the RECORD is replete with information even by some people in the public power business that the Government cannot produce electric power any cheaper than private enterprise can do it if private enterprise is relieved of the burden of taxation and not have the Government competing with them.

I recognize the position we are in in this House in regard to this bill. The dam is built, the Government has its money invested in it; it is proposed by this bill to install three generating plants to produce public power. It is claimed, perhaps correctly so, that unless it is done the power that might be generated at this dam and the income therefrom would be lost. I understand fully that it is part of the TVA system. Eighteen million two hundred thousand dollars is involved in it.

As far as I am concerned, I want private enterprise to do this work just as long as private enterprise exists and lasts in this country. When the time comes that private investment and private enterprise cannot invest its capital to produce power, or anything else—when that time comes the Republic of the United States will have vanished and we shall have brought to America a similar system of government which prevails in Russia and which England recently repudiated. I am bitterly opposed to that, and I think any American who understands the basic principles of our country is also opposed to it.

Our country was built, we became a great Nation, we made great progress not under Government ownership and Government control, but under private enterprise and private investment. Then why should we destroy the very principle that has made us so great, and strong, and prosperous?

I recognize, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] stated a minute ago, that this decision of whether or not we should continue to expand public power was made back in 1939, and that that question is settled; we cannot argue that matter here today; so far as the TVA is involved, I recognize that such is the fact, and in view of the further fact that the dam is already built, and that the Federal money would be lost if we did not install these generators. But I want the House to know—I cannot reiterate it too often—exactly what I think about the trend in this country to move away from the basic principles on which the Nation was built and stands. If the Government is to do everything cheaper because it does not have to pay taxes, then who will pay the taxes to run the Government?

As far as I am concerned, I am opposed to this philosophy entirely and shall continue to be so as long as I have a place on this floor.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much what the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] has said on this subject. I may say that insofar as any question of socialization of industry in this country is concerned, I am in thorough agreement with him and will to the very best of my ability now, and all times do my best to guard against any such trend.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I would like to ask my distinguished friend from Tennessee if in his opinion additional money will be required as the bill, S. 97, is written, and I read:

Public Law 525, Seventy-ninth Congress, is hereby amended to include the construction, operation, and maintenance—

And so forth, of the Army engineers. Will an additional amount of money be required for this hydroelectric plant that is authorized under this legislation?

Mr. PRIEST. I appreciate the position of the gentleman in this matter. The amount of money required for this installation is $18,200,000, and that amount, may I say to the gentleman, was computed upward because of increased costs. That contains what we know as the inflation in construction costs. It was originally introduced for about $16,000,000 and the Engineers in their estimates, because of additional costs, thought it would take about $2,000,000 more than the original bill called for.

Mr. McGREGOR. If it will take an additional amount of money, then Public Law 525 does not cover this additional cost; is that correct?

Mr. PRIEST. Public Law 525 is the general authorization?

Mr. McGREGOR. The general authorization for this particular dam.

Mr. PRIEST. I am sure that is right. This figure would not be included in the original bill because actually this is an amendment.

Mr. McGREGOR. The bill, S. 97, will give a blank check because it is stated "is hereby amended to include the construction, operation, and maintenance." When you go to the reference of $18,200,000 it says, "at an estimated additional cost for power facilities." Would the gentleman accept an amendment to the effect that the cost shall not exceed $18,200,000?

Mr. PRIEST. I am taking the estimates of the Engineers and I think our experience with them has convinced us they are very good on their estimates. I feel certain that is all that will be required. Of course, if it went $3 over and we found ourselves quibbling about a few dollars and having to come back to the Congress for additional authorization it might create a construction situation that would reach a sort of impasse.

Mr. McGREGOR. I do not want to get my distinguished friend and his group in that category but, as the bill is written, it is a blank check wide open to whatever the cost might be.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman wishes to say "at a cost not to exceed $18,200,000"? I may say that insofar as the gentleman from Tennessee is concerned, I would have no objection to that. I am not speaking for the committee. I can see no particular objection if you want to pin it down to that figure. That is the best estimate that could be obtained on it at the time. I would have no objection personally to such a limitation.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LARCADE. I do not see how the amount could exceed the amount authorized under the bill. The amount is fixed at $18,200,000.

Mr. PRIEST. That is my understanding.

Mr. McGREGOR. I did not hear the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LARCADE. I do not see why you can offer any argument on the amount. The amount is fixed in the bill.

Mr. McGREGOR. Will the gentleman from Louisiana show me where the amount is fixed in the bill, there is no place in the bill that authorizes $18,200,000 to be spent and no place where it says only that amount can be spent.

Mr. LARCADE. Turn over to page 2.

Mr. McGREGOR. Page 2 says, and I quote, "at an estimated additional cost of $18,200,000." That is an estimated cost. You are not tying it down to $18,000,000, you are not tying it down to anything. It can go to $25,000,000.

Mr. LARCADE. I do not see how any appropriation committee would vote any amount of appropriation in any legislation where the amount is fixed in the bill.

Mr. McGREGOR. This is an estimated cost, putting it at approximately $18,200,000—if you want the cost to stop at 18,200,000 vote for the amendment which I hope to offer at the proper time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman such time as he may require.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I believe already the need for this legislation has been pretty well established. Most of the lock on the Cheatham Dam has been completed. The construction of the dam itself is now under way. As I

stated a few moments ago in colloquy, it was determined in the very beginning that eventually these three units would be added. I think the gentleman from Michigan brought out a point that should be emphasized again, perhaps, and that is that the installation of these three 12,000-kilowatt units provides a source of revenue for the self-liquidation of a project that would not be provided, certainly without it. The determination was made to place some very large power-consuming defense installations in that area, thereby creating a situation that very shortly will lead to a power shortage, one that will grow very critical within a few years, unless something is done.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. Is it not a fact that the Federal Government has already expended several million dollars on dams and locks, and that it takes these power units to begin to get some good out of this project?

Mr. PRIEST. I am sure the gentleman is correct.

Mr. GOLDEN. And is it not also true that there is a great lack of electric power for defense projects, both in Kentucky and Tennessee, that can use the power created by this unit?

Mr. PRIEST. That is quite true.

Mr. Chairman, I have here a telegram from F. C. Sowell, president, Nashville Chamber of Commerce, and he asked me to read this telegram to the House, because he does not want the position of the Nashville Chamber of Commerce misunderstood. That chamber of commerce, through its board of directors, has gone on record as opposing any appropriations now for new construction on the Cumberland River, although it runs right through the area served by this chamber of commerce. They do so on the ground of economy in Government, and that is a laudable position, but he sent me this telegram and he requested me to read it, because it makes clear that this particular Cheatham Dam is not included in the category of new construction:

NASHVILLE, TENN., *June 6, 1952.*

Hon. PERCY PRIEST,
House Office Building:

Since construction of Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland River is already under way and much of the project nearing completion and much of the funds appropriated heretofore by Congress for the construction of the Cheatham Dam would be lost if work is stopped at this time, we strongly urge that funds be appropriated to complete this project as recommended by the Corps of Engineers. The lock for this project is practically complete and the dam is already under contract for construction. This is not at variance with the policy of the Nashville Chamber of Commerce in opposition to new commitments in our own district or new projects on the Cumberland River which can be postponed without endangering the defense effort of interfering with essential services of Government. It will be appreciated if you will have the position of the Nashville Chamber of Commerce with reference to this matter placed before the Members of Congress.

F. C. SOWELL,
President, Nashville Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the wording on line 7 on the first page of the bill. It says: "it is hereby amended to include the construction, operation, and maintenance." This is merely a technical inquiry. Is it not possible that the word "operation" in this authorization, which is essentially for construction, might possibly foreclose the authorization of operational funds in future years, or would the gentleman explain the reason for incorporating that in there? This is purely a technical inquiry.

Mr. PRIEST. Frankly, I will say to the distinguished gentleman, I am not sure of the reason. The plan of operation and distribution of power follows the general pattern: a contract between the Army engineers and the Department of the Interior and in some instances other agencies.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I am sure the gentleman understands that my inquiry was merely in the interest of perfecting language.

Mr. PRIEST. I am sure it is, and if there is some technical reason that the language should be eliminated, I certainly have no objection to its elimination. I believe, however, it is the same language used in all bills of this character.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman from Tennessee have any objection to an amendment to change the wording from "an estimated additional cost of $18,200,000" to "not to exceed $18,200,000"?

Mr. PRIEST. As far as the gentleman from Tennessee is concerned, I would have no objection to such an amendment. I do not speak for the majority side of the committee. I believe, as the gentleman from Louisiana pointed out, that with that amount specifically contained in the bill it needs no further limitations; but I would have no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. It is to carry out the point that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] made in calling attention to that.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I would not agree to that amendment. Take for instance the St. Lawrence Canal, in which the gentleman from Michigan is very much interested. Every time we have a meeting, every time it is brought to the floor of the House, the estimates go up. We do not know how much this inflation is going to increase. We certainly would not want to start, and then stop right in the middle of the construction.

Mr. PRIEST. That, of course, is a chance we take. I simply wanted to make it clear that I did not expect it to go beyond that. However it might be worked out would be satisfactory to me.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR], a member of the committee.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, the colloquy which has taken place is a concrete example that this bill has not had the consideration it should have in order to make good legislation. The fact is that this is a wide-open blank check, and I quote from the bill "at an estimated additional cost of $18,200,000." That amount is an inference that that will be the expenditure but it does not definitely establish the amount that can be spent.

I wonder if my friend from Louisiana will answer this question. The language beginning in line 7, on page 1, reads, "is hereby amended to include the construction, operation, and maintenance."

What period of time will that cover? How long are we going to pay for the operation? How long are we going to pay for the maintenance? I say we should make some definite decision on the construction cost, and then place in the bill a maximum amount. I am asking that it be held to $18,200,000 but, as this bill is written, this project could go on for years and years and years under the words in line 8, "operation and maintenance."

I wonder if my friend from Louisiana will explain those two words, "operation and maintenance." How long does he expect we will pay for the operation, and how long will we pay for the maintenance of the project?

Mr. LARCADE. In all legislation that has come to my attention where an amount is fixed in a bill, that amount cannot be exceeded as it is an authorization for an appropriation.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Will the gentleman show me any place in the bill where there is a ceiling on the construction cost? This language is, and I quote, "at an estimated additional cost of $18,200,000." If it went to $25,000,000, you could say, "our estimate was wrong," and we would have to pay for it.

Mr. LARCADE. I think the bill speaks for itself. That limitation is clearly stated in the bill at $18,200,000 for construction and operation. When that amount is expended, there will be no further funds available.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I cannot see for the life of me where you have any authorization in dollars and cents in the bill. It says, "at an estimated cost." You have not even authorized the expenditure of $18,200,000.

Mr. LARCADE. May I say that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] who is interested in this bill, has gone to the parliamentarian for a ruling on the question raised by the gentleman from Ohio, and we will have a reply in just a few moments.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I appreciate that very much. I wonder if you would ask the parliamentarian what is meant by operation and maintenance. How long are we going to pay for the operation and maintenance of this project. Mr. Chairman, this particular bill has a very interesting history and clearly shows that

it has not been carefully considered by the committee.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. MASON. The point that has just been raised rather amuses me because the statement has been made that when the $18,200,000 is used, there is no more appropriation. But, after you have spent it, I have seen time and time and time again the point raised: Why waste $18,000,000 when $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 or $10,000,000 more is needed to complete the thing? That has been the argument right along.

Mr. McGREGOR. I think the gentleman is correct. May I just refer to the time when this legislation was first presented. I was not a Member of the Congress at that time, and I am not criticizing those who were here then; but in reading the discussion at that time, the word power was not used when they were attempting to pass the authorization for this legislation. They used the term "navigation and flood control." Now they say that they have spent so many millions of dollars on the project and that they have to have power which requires a new authorization as well as additional appropriation.

Here is another concrete example, Mr. Chairman, where they start out in order to get an authorization for a project, they will cover it with just as much sugar and syrup to make it as sweet as possible, and then when the authorization is given and the project started and they need more money, the facts come out as to what was the underlying principle of the whole project at the beginning. I repeat when this enabling legislation was started several years ago, it was about 1946, transportation and flood control were the only things mentioned. Now, they come along and say we have to have power. May I reiterate this legislation is wide open. There is no authorization of the amount that will be expended because it is an estimated $18,200,000. I read again and repeat "construction, operation, and maintenance."

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. At various times in the recent past, when an effort was made to appropriate funds for the construction of steam plants for power in the TVA area, much has been made of the fact that TVA power should not be accelerated or increased.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. LARCADE. In answer to the gentleman's argument, he has been in this House for many years and has had much legislation under study, and has passed on much legislation in our committees. Examining this language, I find it is in conformity with all the language that is usually included in such bills. I think the House is thoroughly protected in the limitation stated in the bill of $18,200,000. I do not see how any amount in excess of that amount as authorized in the bill, could be appropriated for any other purpose except that contained in the bill.

Mr. McGREGOR. May I say to my distinguished friend that he cannot show me any place in this bill where it says that we are authorizing any amount. Referring back to the old law, it says "and other purposes authorized by section 1 of the act of Congress of 1946." But, this bill does not carry any authorization whatsoever for any specific amount—not even $1.

Mr. LARCADE. In line 2 of the bill, it says "estimated additional cost $18,200,000 for power facilities." It is certainly fixed and certainly there is no question about it.

Mr. McGREGOR. It does not say that. It does not say that you are hereby authorizing $18,200,000; does it? Please show me where in the bill you are authorizing to be spent $18,200,000.

Mr. LARCADE. No; it certainly does not. But, I do not see how any agency of the Government can go before a Committee on Appropriations and seek an appropriation for any project where the limitation is clearly indicated in the language of the bill.

Mr. McGREGOR. I disagree with my friend, and say that the limitation is not clearly set forth here. I think you have a wide open blank check. I hope to introduce an amendment setting forth the authorization not to exceed $18,200,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], a member of the committee.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the immediate enactment of S. 97. This bill, and the identical House bill (H. R. 272), seek to amend the comprehensive plan of improvement of the Cumberland River and its tributaries as authorized by Public Law 525 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, so as to include construction, operation, and maintenance under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, and supervision of the Chief of Engineers of hydroelectric-power generator facilities at the Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland River in Tennessee, at an estimated cost of $18,200,000.

Cheatham Dam is presently under construction by the Corps of Engineers for navigation. It is located 42 miles below Nashville, Tenn. This bill would authorize the inclusion, along with the present construction, that is the dam, of the power plant and three generating units of 12,000 kilowatts each, or a total of 36,000 kilowatts. The Cheatham Dam will be completed in about 2 years. The electricity generated by this proposed installation would be included in the transmission and distribution facilities of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Department of the Interior, by contract, would sell this electricity to TVA, and that is the only way the Federal Government would ever have of getting the money back to pay for the dam which will be finished in 1954. This additional electrical energy is urgently needed by defense installations being served by TVA, particularly the so-called wind tunnel at nearby Tullahoma, Tenn. When completed, this wind tunnel alone will use more electricity than the city of Nashville, Tenn., a city of more than 200,000 inhabitants.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LARCADE. In connection with that statement, the two plants at Oak Ridge and Tullahoma, the wind tunnel, together normally would use as much electrical energy as is now required to serve the city of New York?

Mr. BAKER. I so understand. Of course, the gentleman knows the plants at Oak Ridge are in the district I represent.

Since the end of World War II the total power used in the Tennessee area has increased 83 percent. Much of this is due to the tremendous demand for electric power at the atomic energy plants, and plants of the Aluminum Company of America at Alcoa, Tenn., both of which are in the district I have the honor to represent.

There is a critical shortage of power in the area despite the large development of the TVA. Power demands and uses are increasing more rapidly than new power facilities can be installed.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Is it not true that this dam represents one of the few remaining possibilities for the production of hydroelectric power in the Tennessee Valley?

Mr. BAKER. The TVA, I understand, has exhausted hydroelectric locations as far as the TVA is concerned on the Tennessee River. The Cumberland River is not within the jurisdictional territory of the TVA. Of course, the Corps of Engineers is building this dam and it is one of the few remaining hydroelectric sites, there being a few others on the Cumberland River and its tributaries, to furnish electricity.

I feel that it is very important that this pass.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Is there any question in the gentleman's mind whether or not when these turbines are installed that the plant will not be self-sustaining?

Mr. BAKER. There is not whatever, I reply to my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The reason I ask that is that there are two words in the bill that might very well be deleted; that is, that we continue to pay for the operation and maintenance. This would meet the objection of the gentleman from Ohio. If the plan will take care of itself, those two words are not necessary. As I understand, all these turbines are supposed to yield revenue to the Government instead of the Government having to keep on paying money in order to operate them. Is that not just logical and common sense?

Mr. BAKER. Might I make this additional observation on that same point raised by the distinguished ranking

member of the committee: Here is an authorization for the power units alone, you might say; certainly that would pay back many times over, forgetting the cost of the dam; and, of course, if we do not put these power units in there, there is no way in the world for the Government to get any money back.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Government will receive the return of its investment in the turbines in a very short time; and I think eventually the dam will be paid for; but, certainly, the cost of these three power units will be paid back in a very few years.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. I yield.

Mr. GOLDEN. I would like to make the observation that the Wolf Creek Reservoir which is now being completed, one of the large installations of power, all of that power created in Kentucky, is being sold to the Tennessee Valley Authority and is being used in defense installations; there is no power at all left for Kentucky. If we do not complete some of these other power projects we are going to have serious shortages not only in Tennessee but also in Kentucky. I would like for them to go ahead and complete this so we can use some power that we create in Kentucky there in our own State.

Mr. BAKER. I may say in that connection that there is already a serious power shortage in both Tennessee and Kentucky.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Very briefly.

Mr. MAHON. I am supporting the measure but must leave shortly to attend a meeting on military appropriations at the Pentagon. However, I shall seek to pair in favor of the bill. I presume the gentleman is speaking in support of the measure?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly.

Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] that public power is as far from communism as day is from night. No man in or out of Congress has fought communism or taken more abuse from the Communists, their stooges and fellow travelers in this country than I have. But I want to remind you that the power business is a public business. If you are going to brand it as communistic, then begin with Lansing, the capital of Michigan, which has one of the finest public-power systems in America. It is a great pity Lansing could not supply electricity to all the rest of the people in Michigan and save them that overcharge of $138,000,000 a year which they are now paying.

Let me remind the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] that if they had had the wisdom, when they were developing the Ohio River, to have built high dams instead of those low dams you would not only have flood control on the Ohio, which you do not have now, but you would also have been producing 15,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power that is going to waste every year in an area where the coal supply is declining.

They say this project will produce 36,000 kilowatts of electricity. At 8,700 hours per year that would amount to a little more than 300,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year.

I have the report of the TVA before me. The electricity in the TVA area is now being sold wholesale at 4.22 mills per kilowatt-hour. When the gentleman's party was in power, and they had control of it, they were selling power to the private power companies at Muscle Shoals for 1.59 mills per kilowatt-hour, or considerably less than 2 mills a kilowatt-hour and were telling us that it was economically justified, which it was. Today it only costs about six-tenths of a mill a kilowatt-hour to transmit the power the first 100 miles. So this power that is being sold can be sold at this dam for 3 mills a kilowatt-hour and bring in over $1,000,000 a year. In 20 years it will pay for the entire project so far as that is concerned, or the $18,200,000 involved in this bill.

We are now coming to the point where we are going to have to use our water power. That is the reason I am for the St. Lawrence development. You have a barge canal all the way up the St. Lawrence, but, of course, you can run it only 5 or 6 months a year on account of the ice. I support the St. Lawrence project because 12,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power is going to waste yearly in an area where it is badly needed. I know what I am talking about, because in 1950 the people of the State of New York were overcharged $302,000,000 for their electricity alone compared with the Ontario rates. Ontario uses hydroelectric power altogether. They have developed water power in their streams in Ontario—and no man can stand up here and tell me that the people of Ontario are communistic. They are as far from communism as anybody under the British flag.

You hear the same complaint about development of the Missouri Valley project. There are 41,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity going to waste in the Missouri River and its tributaries every year. It could supply the 10 States in the area with more than twice the electricity they are now using. Beside that it would hold back the floodwaters on the Missouri and its tributaries and keep them from synchronizing with the floods on the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers, and save billions of dollars on flood control on the lower Mississippi.

We had better look after our own country, and develop our own resources. If this project were in Israel, or in Italy, or in Switzerland, or in the Alps Mountains, or on the Ganges, you probably would not have any trouble getting an appropriation for it, as was shown the other day by the vote on "foreign aid."

Every precinct in my district is connected with the Tennessee Valley Authority. I was associated with the late Senator Norris in creating the Tennessee Valley, and I never stopped until I got electricity into every precinct in the district I represent. We are not getting it at a loss, either. We are paying the Government a profit. We want the TVA to pay for itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman has confidence that this project will be self-sustaining?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. In view of that, would the gentleman be willing to accept an amendment to strike out "operation and maintenance"?

Mr. RANKIN. No.

Mr. DONDERO. Why not?

Mr. RANKIN. Because that is what it is supposed to do until it gets under way and until the power is distributed. You have to have the funds to carry on. If you strike out "operation and maintenance" you will have to come back and get another authorization. This is merely an authorization.

Mr. DONDERO. If it is self-sustaining and will pay for itself, why have that in there?

Mr. RANKIN. You are not going to pay any profit until the power is sold, and the gentleman ought to know that. If you insert that amendment here you will simply kill the bill, or cripple it, to say the least of it. I am for the passage of this bill.

I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that I am one of the few men from my section of the country who supports the St. Lawrence project, because we are living in an electric age. When I came to Congress I will show you what we were using. We were using only 37,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year in the whole United States. We had the same fight then that we are having now; the same element was opposed to the development of the water-power of the Nation. In 1950, we used over 400,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours; in other words, more than 10 times as much as we used then.

As I said, we are living in an electrical age. If the attitude of the gentleman from Michigan had been followed, we would not have the TVA; we would not have had the power to produce the atomic bombs on the Tennessee River, and we would have no rural electrification. The average farmer would not have had electricity for the next 50 years; and when he did get it, it would have been so high he could not have used it.

The American farmers are living on a standard they never dreamed of a few years ago, and they are now enjoying it as a result of conserving the Nation's resources and providing electricity to the American people at rates they can afford to pay, and that is what is intended in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, pending negotiation on agreeing to an amendment between the parties in interest, I would like to point out to the House that this project is located in a most strategic part of our country and is closely

associated with our national defense effort. The situation with respect to power in that area is critical, and the evidence from the hearings indicates that action should be taken immediately to relieve that situation there. There are located in that area the Oak Ridge atomic energy plant, the Aluminum Company of America, the Reynolds Metals Co., and there is now being built at Paducah, Ky., an atomic-energy plant which is a duplicate of the one at Oak Ridge, as I understand, and that power comes from this same distribution system which covers the entire area. The critical shortage, I think, is imminent unless we start very quickly to make preparations looking to some more power within the next 3 or 4 years. This, I believe is one of the most feasible and one of the most economical ways to bring in a new block of power quickly. The project located on the Cumberland River was originally authorized to provide for the building of this power unit, and I think it would be economical for this Congress to appropriate the funds to do it at this time, because unless it is done now, it will be much more expensive hereafter. I think it would be economical to do that because while the dam is being constructed these hydroelectric power facilities could be added at a much smaller cost than if they wait until after the dam is completed. To proceed now with the powerhouse at a cost of about $18,200,000 would be the most feasible thing to do. In view of the necessity for this power in that area to serve these defense plants I think it is absolutely essential that the Congress take action at this time to authorize these additional facilities to serve our national defense plants for such important installations as are affected and which are in that area.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan if an amendment has been agreed to that would be satisfactory to all parties in interest at this time.

Mr. DONDERO. I have not been advised, I will say to my friend, but I have an amendment which I am sending to the desk to strike the two words "operation" and "maintenance" in view of the argument presented by our able friend from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], who is well versed in electrical matters, who says it will be paid back in 2 years.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I have no other requests for time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the comprehensive plan of improvement of the Cumberland River and tributaries for navigation, flood control, power development, and other purposes authorized by section 1 of the act of Congress of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 525, 79th Cong.), is hereby amended to include the construction, operation, and maintenance under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers of hydroelectric power generating facilities (including step-up switchboard) at the Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland River in Tennessee at an estimated additional cost $18,200,000, for the power facilities.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DONDERO: On page 1, line 8, after "construction," strike out "operation, and maintenance."

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I am just informed that the Army engineers operate these projects. If so, I can well understand, and in view of the argument made by the gentleman from Mississippi, the question of this amendment might not be as important as it might appear at first glance. I certainly in no way want to stop the operation and maintenance of the plant after the Government has put its money into it. I am aware that the dam is already built, and it stands there with the water doing nobody any good. This is the only chance we have for a return of the Federal Government's investment.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I was not certain myself about the effect of that. I have checked with the Army engineers and one or two other sources. It is now my understanding that it is true that the engineers do operate it, and then through contractual negotiations with Interior and other agencies market the power; but the actual operation and maintenance is done by the engineers. I am sure the gentleman did not understand that fully, as I did not myself until I did some checking.

Mr. DONDERO. May I say to my friend from Tennessee that if the money that is returned to the Federal Government from the operation of this project is to be used in the entire TVA area, it does seem rather strange that we should call upon the Federal Government each year to pay for operating and maintaining the project. It should come out of the profits or the money received. Can the gentleman enlighten me on that?

Mr. PRIEST. May I first make this statement, and I think it should be made to clarify that particular relationship This is an Army engineers project. The TVA has no jurisdiction over the Cumberland River whatsoever. It is an Army engineers project just the same as Bonneville or any other project under the Army engineers. The TVA simply comes into the picture because, as I explained earlier in colloquy with the distinguished gentleman, the TVA is the electric distribution utility for that area.

When the Army engineers through contract with the Department of the Interior, and the Interior in turn with TVA, market power from this or any other project on the Cumberland River, the funds are handled just the same as they are for Bonneville or any other Army engineers project. TVA does not enter the picture except that it signs a contract for the distribution of this power over its transmission lines. It is just an Army engineers project the same as any other Army engineers project anywhere in the country.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Then, if I understand my distinguished friend from Tennessee correctly, as soon as the operation is started the operation and maintenance cost is taken from the revenue received from the sale of the power, and it does not come under the category of construction?

Mr. PRIEST. That is correct, may I say to my good friend from Ohio.

Mr. DONDERO. With that understanding, I am perfectly willing to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I was wondering about this: When this original act went through in 1946 it was for the purpose of producing power on the Cumberland River.

Mr. DONDERO. No, there was nothing said about power at that time.

Mr. NICHOLSON. This amends it to put power in there, then?

Mr. DONDERO. That is right.

Mr. NICHOLSON. That is something new?

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct. I understand the reason for that is that they changed the plans. Whether it was contemplated at the time, I do not know.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGREGOR: On page 2, line 2, after the word "Tennessee" strike out the remainder of the sentence and insert "and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $18,200,000 for carrying out the purposes of this act."

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment is self-explanatory.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, the committee has no objection. We accept the amendment.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. BURNSIDE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 97) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities for generating hydroelectric power at the Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland River in Tennessee, pursuant to House Resolution 654, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEARNEY), there were—ayes 53, noes 47.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors. The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 132, nays 120, not voting 179, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

YEAS—132

Andersen, H. Carl	Gordon	O'Brien, Ill.
Andrews	Granger	O'Brien, Mich.
Anfuso	Grant	O'Brien, N. Y.
Angell	Gregory	O'Konski
Aspinall	Hagen	Patman
Baker	Hardy	Patten
Bakewell	Harris	Perkins
Baring	Havenner	Poage
Bennett, Fla.	Hays, Ark.	Polk
Bennett, Mich.	Hedrick	Preston
Bentsen	Herlong	Price
Bolling	Holmes	Priest
Bosone	Horan	Rains
Boykin	Ikard	Ramsay
Brown, Ga.	Irving	Rankin
Bryson	Jackson, Wash.	Reams
Buchanan	Jarman	Regan
Burleson	Jones, Ala.	Riley
Burnside	Jones, Mo.	Rivers
Camp	Karsten, Mo.	Roberts
Chatham	King, Calif.	Rogers, Colo.
Chelf	Kluczynski	Rogers, Fla.
Colmer	Lanham	Rogers, Tex.
Combs	Lantaff	Shelley
Cooper	Larcade	Sieminski
Crosser	Lovre	Smith, Miss.
Davis, Ga.	Lyle	Smith, Va.
Dawson	McCarthy	Spence
Dempsey	McCormack	Staggers
Denton	McGuire	Steed
Dingell	McMillan	Stockman
Doyle	McMullen	Thornberry
Eberharter	Mack, Ill.	Tollefson
Elliott	Mack, Wash.	Trimble
Elsworth	Madden	Watts
Engle	Magee	Whitten
Evins	Mansfield	Wier
Fernandez	Mills	Willis
Fisher	Mitchell	Winstead
Forand	Moulder	Withrow
Forrester	Murdock	Yates
Furcolo	Murphy	Yorty
Gary	Murray	Zablocki
Golden	Norblad	

NAYS—120

Allen, Calif.	D'Ewart	Kearney
Allen, Ill.	Dolliver	Kearns
Allen, La.	Dondero	Keating
Andresen, August H.	Donovan	Kee
Armstrong	Eaton	Kilburn
Auchincloss	Fogarty	LeCompte
Ayres	Ford	Lind
Bates, Mass.	Gavin	Lucas
Battle	George	McDonough
Beamer	Graham	McGregor
Berry	Greenwood	McIntire
Bishop	Gross	McVey
Boggs, La.	Harrison, Nebr.	Martin, Mass.
Bolton	Harrison, Wyo.	Mason
Bramblett	Hébert	Meader
Brownson	Heselton	Mumma
Budge	Hess	Nicholson
Buffett	Hill	Norrell
Busbey	Hillings	O'Hara
Bush	Hinshaw	Passman
Byrnes	Hoeven	Patterson
Chenoweth	Hoffman, Ill.	Pickett
Church	Hoffman, Mich.	Radwan
Clevenger	Hope	Redden
Cole, Kans.	Hunter	Reed, Ill.
Crumpacker	Jenison	Rees, Kans.
Cunningham	Jensen	Ross
Curtis, Mo.	Jonas	Sadlak
Dague	Jones, Hamilton C.	Saylor
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Woodrow W.	Schenck
Devereux	Judd	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner	Springer	Weichel
Scudder	Talle	Werdel
Secrest	Thompson, Mich.	Wharton
Seely-Brown	Vail	Wheeler
Shafer	Van Pelt	Wigglesworth
Sheehan	Van Zandt	Williams, N. Y.
Simpson, Ill.	Velde	Wilson, Tex.
Simpson, Pa.	Vursell	Wood, Idaho
Smith, Kans.	Walter	Woodruff
Smith, Wis.		

NOT VOTING—179

Aandahl	Fenton	Miller, Md.
Abbitt	Fine	Miller, Nebr.
Abernethy	Flood	Miller, N. Y.
Adair	Frazier	Morano
Addonizio	Fugate	Morgan
Albert	Fulton	Morris
Anderson, Calif.	Gamble	Morrison
Arends	Garmatz	Morton
Bailey	Gathings	Multer
Barden	Goodwin	Nelson
Barrett	Gore	O'Neill
Bates, Ky.	Granahan	Osmers
Beall	Green	Ostertag
Beckworth	Gwinn	O'Toole
Belcher	Hale	Philbin
Bender	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Phillips
Betts	Hall, Leonard W.	Potter
Blackney	Halleck	Poulson
Blatnik	Hand	Powell
Boggs, Del.	Harden	Prouty
Bonner	Harrison, Va.	Rabaut
Bow	Hart	Reece, Tenn.
Bray	Harvey	Reed, N. Y.
Brehm	Hays, Ohio	Rhodes
Brooks	Heffernan	Ribicoff
Brown, Ohio	Heller	Richards
Buckley	Herter	Riehlman
Burdick	Holifield	Robeson
Burton	Howell	Rodino
Butler	Jackson, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.
Canfield	James	Rooney
Cannon	Javits	Roosevelt
Carlyle	Jenkins	Sabath
Carnahan	Johnson	St. George
Carrigg	Judd	Sasscer
Case	Kean	Scott, Hardie
Celler	Kelley, Pa.	Sheppard
Chiperfield	Kelly, N. Y.	Short
Chudoff	Kennedy	Sikes
Clemente	Keogh	Sittler
Cole, N. Y.	Kerr	Stanley
Cooley	Kersten, Wis.	Stigler
Corbett	Kilday	Sutton
Cotton	King, Pa.	Taber
Coudert	Kirwan	Tackett
Cox	Klein	Taylor
Crawford	Lane	Teague
Curtis, Nebr.	Latham	Thomas
Davis, Tenn.	Lesinski	Thompson, Tex.
Deane	McConnell	Vinson
DeGraffenried	McCulloch	Vorys
Delaney	McGrath	Welch
Denny	McKinnon	Wickersham
Dollinger	Machrowicz	Widnall
Donohue	Mahon	Williams, Miss.
Dorn	Marshall	Wilson, Ind.
Doughton	Martin, Iowa	Wolcott
Durham	Merrow	Wolverton
Elston	Miller, Calif.	Wood, Ga.
Fallon		
Feighan		

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Mahon for, with Mr. Arends against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Taber against.

Mr. Sabath for, with Mr. Herter against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Coudert against.

Mr. Green for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Morris for, with Mr. James against.

Mr. McKinnon for, with Mr. Fenton against.

Mr. McGrath for, with Mr. King of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Mculloch against.

Mr. O'Toole for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.

Mr. Rabaut for, with Mr. Elston against.

Mr. Dollinger for, with Mr. Bender against.

Mr. Frazier for, with Mr. Jenkins against.

Mr. Abernethy for, with Mr. Brehm against.

Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Bow against.

Mr. Lane for, with Mr. Betts against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. McConnell against.

Mr. Sutton for, with Mr. Martin of Iowa against.

Mr. Chudoff for, with Mr. Morano against.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Osmers against.

Mr. Howell for, with Mr. Widnall against.

Mr. Rodino for, with Mr. Hand against.

Mr. Addonizio for, with Mr. Kean against.

Mr. Heller for, with Mrs. St. George against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Halleck against.

Mr. Clements for, with Mrs. Harden against.

Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Harvey against.

Mr. Fine for, with Mr. Bray against.

Mr. Multer for, with Mr. Ostertag against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.

Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Adair against.

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Vorys against.

Mrs. Kelley of New York for, with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Hart for, with Mr. Wilson of Indiana against.

Mr. Barrett for, with Mr. Carrigg against.

Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. Blackney against.

Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Gamble against.

Mr. Wickersham for, with Mr. Latham against.

Mr. Donohue for, with Mr. Leonard W. Hall against.

Mr. Feighan for, with Mr. Jackson of California against.

Mr. Burdick for, with Mr. Wolcott against.

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Hardie Scott against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Gwinn against.

Mr. Philbin for, with Mr. Crawford against.

Mr. Welch for, with Mr. Goodwin against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Boggs of Delaware.

Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.

Mr. Albert with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Rhodes with Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Ribicoff with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Harrison of Virginia with Mr. Aandahl.

Mr. Richards with Mr. Sittler.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Beall.

Mr. Sasscer with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Deane with Mr. Short.

Mr. Marshall with Mr. Riehlman.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Reed of New York.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Prouty.

Mr. Kerr with Mr. Fulton.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Denny.

Mr. Stigler with Mr. Poulson.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Potter.

Mr. Burton with Mr. Phillips.

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Curtis of Nebraska.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Cotton.

Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Fugate with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Gore with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Flood with Mr. Miller of Maryland.

Mr. Gathings with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Machrowicz with Mr. Miller of Nebraska.

Mr. Klein with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. Kilday with Mr. Case.

Mr. Stanley with Mr. Canfield.

Mr. Robeson with Mr. Wolverton.

Mr. Bailey with Mr. Butler.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6661) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, with an amendment of the

Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "by striking out the last sentence thereof" and insert "by amending the last sentence thereof to read as follows: 'In the case of the buildings and grounds authorized by this act, after the initial alterations, repairs, and furnishing have been completed, subsequent expenditures for such purposes may be made out of the appropriations authorized by this act in amounts authorized by the Congress each fiscal year.'"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman please explain the amendment?

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, the amendment makes it mandatory that future alterations and changes in our foreign buildings will be made out of funds authorized each fiscal year. It ties it down a little tighter. It is a safeguarding amendment, and it puts it in the hands of the Congress to appropriate each fiscal year for this money.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. This amendment was approved by the full committee?

Mr. CHATHAM. It has been passed by the other body, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. And has it been considered by the House committee?

Mr. CHATHAM. It has been considered by the subcommittee, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is it a unanimous report?

Mr. CHATHAM. Yes. It puts it into the hands of the Congress each year to appropriate these funds instead of letting them go ahead year after year.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. In other words, it actually tightens it up?

Mr. CHATHAM. Yes; it gives the Congress a year to year check.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I shall not object. I wish to explain my failure to vote on the last roll call. Together with some five or six other Members, I found myself delayed waiting for an elevator caught between floors. As a result, we missed the roll call by a minute or two. Included in the group was the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. For the information of the Members, I simply want to state that the conference report on the immigration bill has been filed and it is expected to be brought up tomorrow.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it the purpose of the leadership to bring that up first, or will the other bills which are scheduled to be taken up, be taken up first?

Mr. PRIEST. We intend to bring up the conference report first.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

OPS SHOULD NOT BE CONTINUED

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Price Stabilization expires on June 30, and in the interest of producers, consumers, and the American taxpayers it should be discontinued.

MOST PRICES ARE UNDER CEILINGS

The law of supply and demand has already brought most prices well below ceilings set by OPS. The cattle population, hampered by OPS, is nevertheless at an almost record high. The second largest hog crop in history has just been marketed at prices below the cost of production. Since March of 1951 there has been a steady drop in wholesale commodity prices, and farm prices generally have been downward. Between January and March of this year the cost of living dropped about 2 percent, but the drop in cost of food, included in that figure, was more than 5 percent.

OPS COSTS $80,000,000 ANNUALLY

Moreover, there are 12,259 employees on the OPS payroll, and more have been requested for the next year. There are 19 regional offices over the country and there are 91 district offices. The cost of salaries, rents, travel expenses, and so forth amount to more than $80,000,000 annually.

PRODUCTION IS THE ANSWER

It is important to remember that the only real answer to inflation is production, coupled with less deficit spending by the Federal Government. And we know that red tape regulations, controls and regimentation have a deterring effect on production. Therefore, the removal of such controls will have a natural tendency to encourage production to meet supply requirements in the market places.

CONSUMERS AND PRODUCERS SUFFER

In addition to the direct cost of this OPS operation, there are thousands of business concerns, all over the Nation which are spending hundreds of millions of dollars annually for additional clerks, accountants and experts to make out reports and keep records—many of them with respect to items that sell far below OPS ceiling prices. One packing concern keeps 300 people working full time just to comply with the technicalities of the OPS regulations. In one month alone a small army of Armour accountants and clerical workers piled up close to $200,000 in overtime, sorting over old records for OPS. Yet it is reported that 90 percent of all the meat tonnage at Armour's plants is selling well below ceiling prices.

Such costs as these, multiplied thousands of times over the Nation, are in the main either passed on to the consumers or in the case of livestock are more probably charged against the producers, who get just that much less for their livestock.

LAMB PRODUCERS SUFFER

Producers of lamb have in some instances been severly penalized by the method of classifying sheep carcasses. Instead of using the traditional "break joint" method of determining whether a particular animal is a lamb or a mutton, some inspectors have been emphasizing conformation, color of bone, and so forth. This has resulted in many sheep being classified as yearlings or muttons which should have been classed as lambs—and would have been except for OPS. This depresses prices and is unfair to both producers and consumers.

WAGE CONTROLS ABANDONED

It is generally conceded that no price-control system can possibly work that does not control wages because wage raises increase production costs. It is certainly unfair and impractical to seek to regulate prices while wages are permitted or even encouraged to rise.

Title IV of the Defense Production Act covers stabilization of prices and wages. Under that, OPS was created to control prices and WSB—Wage Stabilization Board—was created to do the same for wages. In view of the fact that wage controls have been practically abandoned with the WSB and the President himself using their efforts to push wages for organized labor up—often beyond any semblance of stabilized levels—it is only fair, it seems to me, that the attempt at price stabilization should likewise be abandoned.

WSB FOMENTED STEEL STRIKE

The WSB action in trying to force an inflationary wage increase for steel workers by 26 cents per hour, plus a demand for a union shop, helped to foment the present strike which is costing our economy and preparedness program 2,000,000 tons of steel production each week. It has increased costs to consumers, has created shortages and has set up an inflationary wage rate pattern which if permitted will be felt across the board on wage lines for organized groups which have powerful political backing.

The situation has been aggravated by the illegal action of the President in seizing the steel mills without due process of law. The action of the Supreme Court in holding the President's action unconstitutional renews our faith in constitutional government. It marks the checking of the modern trend toward an indefinite expansion of the President's authority. It reasserts the his-

toric doctrine of limitation of powers under our Constitution.

UNION BOSSES MUST BE CURBED

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of American producers, of consumers, and of justice and fairness, these influences should not be permitted to force more and more inflation upon the American people. The WSB should be abolished or its membership limited to unbiased, fair-minded public members who are not obligated to either the labor bosses or their counterparts in business. Industry-wide bargaining by pyramided organizations of labor unions and corporation heads should, in the public interest, be prohibited. The public interest should come first.

We need more business in our Government and less Government in our business. We must continue our fight against a ruinous tax-and-spend ideology, and return the Government to a sound fiscal policy. Since wage stabilization has been broken by the political power of union bosses and since production in a free economy can meet our requirements, let us abolish both the OPS and the WSB. Let us take this load off of the backs of the American taxpayers. They have carried it long enough.

MORE PRIVILEGES, NOT FEWER, SEEN NEEDED TO BOLSTER AIR FORCE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I addressed this body and in the extension of my remarks included therein an article by Mr. Martin Kivel in which he compared the hazard of flying a jet plane over Korea with that of driving a Greyhound bus or a commercial airliner within the confines of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I bespeak the sentiments of this House when I state that there is no greater living authority on the maintenance and operation of military aircraft than my good and long-time friend, Gen. Carl "Tooey" Spaatz, retired Air Force Chief of Staff.

I do not know whether I first saw "Tooey" Spaatz, then a junior officer, when taking boot training in Texas in World War I, or whether it was in France that I first saw him flying over my outfit into enemy territory. I do know that in the 20 years I have been in this House I have come to regard him as one of America's greatest generals, a great American and a great patriot. When "Tooey" Spaatz speaks on air power, the world listens.

This is the second of three talks I propose making on a series of articles written by Mr. Martin Kivel of the New York Daily News. Mr. Kivel, a distinguished military correspondent, lately made a personal investigation into the problem of obtaining flying personnel for our Air Force. He recites at length General Spaatz' opinions, first, with respect to the problem; and, second, with respect to the remedial measures that should be taken to correct the situation with dispatch:

How do you teach a man to fly—

"Tooey" Spaatz asks—

if he doesn't want to learn? It's impossible. It is hard enough to teach those who want to fly, how to fly without trying to jam it into men who don't want to fly.

Mr. Kivel goes on to say that General Spaatz pointed out that this cannot be blamed on any group of Senators, but, rather, that he is more inclined to drop the blame into the laps of the people who decided on the country's air policy immediately after World War II.

In further quoting General Spaatz, Mr. Kivel writes:

We lost a whole generation of air-minded teenagers after the last war because of a short-sighted air policy.

Most of these kids were eager to step into their older brothers' flying boots—but there was no adequate air training program instituted for these youngsters.

Criticizing the GI training program which was conducted at great expense, General Spaatz also stated:

In most cases, by the time an emergency arose, these aging veterans were too old for aerial combat duty. The Nation and the Air Force would have been better served had the same money been spent on the younger generation.

Mr. Kivel stated that the general pointed out that—

Some of the errors are being corrected by the Civil Air Patrol, which is providing an opportunity for the youth of the country to learn more about airplanes.

Mr. Kivel also stated that this organization has enrolled 45,000 American boys in the 15-to-18-age group, that they are being guided and trained by 12,000 senior CAP members, and that most of them are Air Force Reserve officers, or men and women who own their own planes.

Mr. Kivel then goes on to say:

The Air Force's pet baby, of course, is the Air Force Academy. Such an institution would be to the flier what West Point is to the soldier—and Annapolis is to the sailor.

Of course—

He continued—

If West Point and Annapolis would meet the quotas fixed for them—25 percent of the graduating class—the Air Force readily admits it would not need an academy of its own. But, as pointed out earlier in this naval academy is supplying enough men for series, neither the military academy nor the the flying arm.

Once Congress gives its O. K., the Air Force is ready for the ground-breaking. The site has been carefully chosen, but the location is classified as top secret. The Air Force hopes Congress will give the nod soon, because the construction, equipping, and staffing of the flying academy is figured as a 5-year job, at least.

Mr. Speaker, here again is a wonderfully illuminating article, disclosing factual information of inestimable value, one which I recommend to the considered opinion of every Member of this Congress. It is a comprehensive outline of the course of training necessary to develop competent and efficient airmen, and of the gadgets now used to train them on the ground in simulated flight in order to bring them to a maximum of proficiency with a minimum of cost.

In order that all may avail themselves of this compendium of facts revealed by this, the second of the series written by Martin Kivel, as published in the New York Daily News, I include the same in today's RECORD as part of my remarks.

Mr. Kivel's article reads as follows:

MORE PRIVILEGES, NOT FEWER, SEEN NEEDED TO BOLSTER AIR FORCE

(By Martin Kivel)

An Air Force is only as good as its volunteers. The Russians, the English, and even a small nation like Turkey realize this. All of them have sufficient and efficient air power—without benefit of draft.

The Russians maintain their volunteer status by handing out double pay, special privileges and prestige to their airmen.

"We must do the same," says Gen. Carl Spaatz, retired Air Force Chief of Staff. "That is, unless we want to slip down into being a third-rate air power."

Taking dead aim at some of the Senators who would do away with hazard pay for fliers, the general insisted:

"That kind of talk is a lot of nonsense. It may take a while but those fellows will learn that instead of taking away incentive pay it will have to be raised to get men to volunteer.

"The air services have been volunteer services since they were established. You can't draft men to fly. It simply won't work.

"How do you teach a man to fly who doesn't want to learn? It's impossible. Why, it is hard enough teaching those who want to fly how to fly without trying to jam it into men who don't want to fly," Spaatz said.

But the present plight of the Air Force cannot be blamed on a group of Senators. The general is quick to admit this fact. He is more inclined to drop the blame into the lap of the people who decided on the country's air policy immediately after World War II.

"We lost a whole generation of air-minded teen-agers after the last war because of a short-sighted air policy," Spaatz said.

"Most of these kids were eager to step into their older brothers' flying boots. But there was no adequate air training program instituted for these youngsters. They were brushed off."

Spaatz also criticized the GI training program, which was conducted at great expense.

POINTS TO CAP PROGRAM FOR YOUTH

"In most cases," he said, "by the time an emergency arose, these aging veterans would be too old for aerial combat duty. The Nation and the Air Force would have been better served had the same money been spent on the younger generation."

The general pointed out that some of the errors are being corrected by the Civil Air Patrol, which is providing an opportunity for the youth of the country to learn about airplanes.

This organization has enrolled 45,000 American boys in the 15 to 18 age group. They are being guided and trained by 12,000 senior CAP members, most of them Air Force Reserve officers or men and women who own their own planes.

Spaatz, however, thinks the program should be expanded and aided with Government funds.

Most of the general's ideas and opinions are shared by bigwigs in Washington's huge Pentagon, and at the Air Force bases sprawled around the country. But to put those ideas into effect is another matter—while Congress is keeping a tight hold on the purse strings.

The Air Force's long-range program is comprehensive. It's also expensive. And, as yet, the brass hasn't been able to convince Congress that it should appropriate the necessary funds.

ACADEMIES FAIL TO MEET AIR QUOTA

The Air Force's pet baby, of course, is the Air Force Academy. Such an institution would be to the flyer what West Point is to the soldier and Annapolis to the sailor.

If West Point and Annapolis would meet the quotas fixed for them—25 percent of the graduating class—the Air Force readily admits it would not need an Academy of its own. But, as pointed out earlier in this series, neither the Military nor Naval Academy is supplying enough men for the flying arm.

Once Congress gives its O. K., the Air Force is ready for the ground breaking. The site has been carefully chosen, but the location is classified as top secret. The Air Force hopes Congress will give the nod, because the construction, equipping, and staffing of the flying Academy is figured as a 5-year job, at least.

Another project dear to the Air Force's heart is a detailed program of education centered in the Nation's high schools. This approach to the teen-ager is also stymied by congressional penny-pinching.

The Air Force has printed a 191-page, profusely illustrated book in which it explains to the high-schoolers all the advantages of a flying career with Uncle Sam. The book isn't cheap—$1.25 a copy. And Congress refused to vote funds so that the AF could place several copies in each school in the 48 States.

TELLS YOUTH OF UNITED STATES ABOUT AIR FORCE

The book, titled the "Occupational Handbook of the United States Air Force," answers just about every question a kid wants to know about military flying.

It also lists and describes each of the 42 career fields open to Air Force applicants. Further, the book mentions the educational requirements necessary and what each field will fit a man for in civilian life if and when he leaves the service.

Today's Air Force teaches a man enough about electronics and science in general to virtually guarantee him a job with one of the Nation's leading industrial firms.

But, to get back to an old Air Force theme, to teach him costs money. Take one example:

During World War II it cost about $25,000 to train a pilot in a plane that cost $50,000. Today it costs about $50,000 to train a flier in a plane that costs $500,000.

HERE'S GADGET WITH BOUNCE IN IT

This sharp increase in cost has resulted in the Air Force's using a new training twist. It has brought the possibility of losing two valuable pieces of property—the prospective pilot and the plane—to a minimum by using what it calls a flight simulator.

It's a gadget that resembles in every detail the cockpit of a plane. They say that a man who has never been in an airplane can sit in it and actually learn how to fly. It can simulate every possible plane movement even to bouncing for a bad landing.

The Air Force, however, doesn't use it for that purpose. It is used mostly to convert pilots of conventional planes to jet aircraft.

The Air Force agrees that it does not replace actual flying time, but it does get a man over a psychological hurdle by showing him exactly how a jet plane reacts in different situations.

Another advance in training methods has been instituted by the Air Force at Mather Air Force Base near Sacramento, Calif.

TEACH ONE GUY TO BE ALL THREE

That is where they are turning out the triple and quadruple threats. Instead of a man just being a bombardier or navigator or radar observer, they are teaching one guy to be all three. In some instances, they are all of that and pilot, too.

There are two purposes for this training. Most important is the desire to get a better team up in the air. If a man understands the problems involved in the other jobs he functions smoother and better.

The other reason is that the men can be used interchangeably. Thus, when a man is needed to fill out a crew, he is picked from a pool of the quadruple threats.

The official name for these men is radar observers. The Air Force is looking for a more glamorous monicker. Until they find it, they're dubbed "GDWs"—or gol darn wonders.

DEATH ON THE HIGHWAYS AND RECKLESS DRIVING BY SERVICEMEN

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, I have addressed a letter to the heads of each of the military services in connection with an experience I had, in company with several of my colleagues, on our return from Newport News recently from the trial run of our new liner the steamship *United States*.

We left Newport News about 5 o'clock on a Friday afternoon at a time when our sailor boys were starting home on their week-end passes. We were literally frightened half-to-death by the continual honking of horns and the passing at high speed by our Navy men from that large training area on their way home. They certainly were anxious to get there and, quite naturally, they wanted to do it in the shortest possible time. We noted license tags as far away as New York and Massachusetts.

I do not intend this as a criticism of the boys, but it did bring to our minds the Monday reports in our newspapers of the many deaths and serious injury of servicemen on the highways over the week end. This thought occurred to us, "could not something be done that will automatically take some of the pressure off the road time connected with these week end home goings?"

I know that some service installations have aggressive highway safety training programs but I feel they would appreciate an outsider's viewpoint and constructive suggestions in this connection. While each of us hears only of one crash here and another there, a compilation of these statistics in the Pentagon, I understand, shows that hundreds of our young servicemen lose their lives every year, and thousands more are severely injured in highway accidents. Of course I realize these are largely off the post and the least controllable. The majority of them occur, naturally, in private automobiles.

My letter to the Secretaries, which I quote below, contains some suggestions of my own as to probable ways in which this loss can be minimized without interfering with our military program.

My reason for addressing the House is that possibly some of my colleagues, having this matter brought to their attention, will have some suggestions of their own, which I would ask be mailed direct to the various Secretaries in the Pentagon or given to me for transmittal. Certainly out of 435 Members we ought to have some really helpful suggestions.

Action on this problem by the Department of Defense from the angle of the servicemen's safety will also have a good effect on civilian responsibilities in our general highway safety program.

My letter to the Secretaries of the four services is as follows:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I would like to bring to your attention a situation of which I feel sure you are aware and have no doubt endeavored to improve.

I am appalled too frequently to read in the Monday newspapers of the death or injury to servicemen en route back to their places of military assignment from week-end leaves. These newspaper reports follow a grim pattern: Early morning fatigue, high speed, failure to negotiate a curve, death. Your statistics must show that these fatalities mount up to a really alarming figure. We only hear through the news services of those that are extraordinarily horrible and regrettable.

Apparently these American boys follow the normal desire of enjoying their home stay with friends and relatives until the last possible moment. This, I know, was the situation in my own family during World War II. It necessitates a closely scheduled trip back to camp in order to best the early morning roll call.

It seems imperative that efforts be made to halt this waste of young American manhood. A man's life should not, of course, be evaluated in dollars and cents, yet these accidents must involve great inconvenience and expense in filling the posts left vacant, no matter how minor they may be at the time.

My earnest and urgent suggestion, Mr. Secretary, would be that you make an immediate check-up of any plans you have to correct this situation or that a completely new study of the problem be made. In doing this, may I mention the possibility of a change in week-end pass requirements that would not interfere with the military-training program. One thought which comes to my mind would be to have the boys report Monday noon instead of at reveille time. This might eliminate a lot of this middle of the night driving and throw this traffic on the roads at a time of day when there is more police and road patrolling than in the early morning hours. This extra time could be compensated for their leaving camp at a later hour or in some other manner, such as alternating long and short passes. To do this would remove any excuse to continually drive "to beat the gun."

I know personally of some service installations that have a highway safety program. This is perhaps service wide, but not to my knowledge.

I feel your careful review of this situation could easily result in the saving of lives, which we all must admit is most worthwhile.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER M. MUMMA,
Member of Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted as follows to:

Mr. BOYKIN and to include a speech by Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK and several other prominent gentlemen.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WITHROW.

Mr. SHORT (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include an address by the senior Senator from Missouri, Mr. KEM.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include an editorial from the Boston Post.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts and to include an address by Francis Adams, of the Boston Adams family, made in Florida on Memorial Day.

Mr. DOYLE and to include extraneous material.

Mr. SIEMINSKI in two instances, in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN and to include an editorial from El Mundo, a newspaper of Puerto Rico.

Mr. BOLLING and to include an editorial from the Youngstown Vindicator.

Mr. DOLLIVER and to include an address made by Commissioner Knutson.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in three separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MEADER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCARTHY and to include an editorial.

Mr. SAYLOR in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DINGELL and to include editorial comment contained in Newsweek under date of June 2 and captioned "GOP boner."

Mr. MANSFIELD and to include an article.

Mr. SHEEHAN and to include an editorial.

Mr. EVINS and to include an editorial.

Mr. MACK of Illinois and to include a speech by the Minister to Luxemburg.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri.

Mr. MILLER of New York in three instances and to include two editorials and a resolution.

Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. PRIEST).

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore:

H. R. 643. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vivian M. Graham and Herbert H. Graham;

H. R. 646. An act for the relief of Mrs. Inez B. Copp and George T. Copp;

H. R. 1826. An act for the relief of Ellis E. Gabbert; and

H. R. 1842. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ann Morrison.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1828. An act to confirm the status of certain civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities under the Armed Forces with respect to laws administered by the Civil Service Commission, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RICHARDS (at the request of Mr. BRYSON) for an indefinite period, on account of primary campaigning..

Mr. O'TOOLE (at the request of Mr. ROONEY), for an indefinite period, on account of the death of his mother.

Mr. DENNY (at the request of Mr. DAGUE), until June 12, 1952, on account of illness.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 10, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1552. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1953 in the amount of $177,000 for the Federal Security Agency (H. Doc. No. 495); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1553. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of its publication entitled "Consumption of Fuel for the Production of Electric Energy, 1950"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1554. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Submitted June 6, 1952]

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 477. Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but not beyond June 30, 1953; without amendment (Rept. No. 2041). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted June 9, 1952]

Mr. WALTER: Committee of conference. H. R. 5698. A bill to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization and nationality, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2096). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 5055. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands of the United States situated in Ontonagon County, Mich., for lands within the Ottawa National Forest, Mich., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2098). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Select Committee on Small Business. Report pursuant to House Resolution 33, Eighty-second Congress, entitled "Problems of Small Business Under the Controlled Materials Plan—A Summary Report" (Rept. No. 2099). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2100. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2101. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2102. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 365. An act for the relief of Jean Krueger and Edith Krueger; without amendment (Rept. No. 2042). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 587. An act for the relief of Sotirios Christos Roumanis; without amendment (Rept. No. 2043). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 779. An act for the relief of Ziemowit Z. Karpinski; without amendment (Rept. No. 2044). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1363. An act for the relief of Ceasar J. (Raaum) Syquia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2045). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1527. An act for the relief of Sisters Dolores Ilia Martori, Maria Josefa Dalmau Vallve, and Ramona Cabarrocas Canals; without amendment (Rept. No. 2046). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1555. An act for the relief of Rosarina Garofalo; without amendment (Rept. No. 2047). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1566. An act for the relief of Constantin Alexander Solomonides; without amendment (Rept. No. 2048). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1637. An act for the relief of Doreen Iris Neal; without amendment (Rept. No. 2049). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1676. An act for the relief of Helen Sadako Yamamoto; without amendment (Rept. No. 2050). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1681. An act for the relief of Sister

Maria Seidl and Sister Anna Ambrus; without amendment (Rept. No. 2051). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1715. An act for the relief of Else Neubert and her two children; without amendment (Rept. No. 2052). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1776. An act for the relief of Sister Stanislaus; without amendment (Rept. No. 2053). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1843. An act for the relief of John Kintzig and Tatiana A. Kintzig; without amendment (Rept. No. 2054). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1903. An act for the relief of Toshiko Minowa; without amendment (Rept. No. 2055). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2561. An act for the relief of Susan Patricia Manchester; without amendment (Rept. No. 2056). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2566. An act for the relief of Niccolo Luvisotti; without amendment (Rept. No. 2057). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2635. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller; without amendment (Rept. No. 2058). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2706. An act for the relief of Sister Julie Schuler; without amendment (Rept. No. 2059). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 72, Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 2060). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1793. A bill for the relief of Tokuko Kobayashi and her minor son; without amendment (Rept. No. 2061). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2860. A bill for the relief of Inez Pryer (Sister Mary Carmel); without amendment (Rept. No. 2062). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3071. A bill for the relief of Vito Aiuto; without amendment (Rept. No. 2063). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3134. A bill for the relief of Angela Trinidade; with amendment (Rept. No. 2064). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3140. A bill for the relief of Kazuko Shimamura; without amendment (Rept. No. 2065). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3377, a bill for the relief of Mihai Handrabura; without amendment (Rept. No. 2066). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3389. A bill for the relief of Petrus Van Keer; with amendment (Rept. No. 2067). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3896. A bill for the relief of Frank A. Wefel; without amendment (Rept. No. 2068). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3928. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Mario Mattera; without amendment (Rept. No. 2069). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4385. A bill for the relief of Jack Kamal Samhat; with amendment (Rept. No. 2070). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4630. A bill for the relief of Ayako Kimura; without amendment (Rept. No. 2071). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary, H. R. 5321. A bill for the relief of Connie Marie Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 2072). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5458. A bill for the relief of Joyce Oerlemans Haug; without amendment (Rept. No. 2073). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5499. A bill for the relief of Tamaki Sakasai Cordova; without amendment (Rept. No. 2074). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5539. A bill for the relief of Hiroko Doki and Takako Doki; without amendment (Rept. No. 2075). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5624. A bill for the relief of Tokusaburo Imamura Glasscock; without amendment (Rept. No. 2076). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5918. A bill for the relief of Anastasia Vasiliadu; without amendment (Rept. No. 2077). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5921. A bill for the relief of Keiko Tashiro; with amendment (Rept. No. 2078). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5934. A bill for the relief of Robert Mayotte; without amendment (Rept. No. 2079). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5973. A bill for the relief of Yip Soy Naum and Yip Kug Yow; without amendment (Rept. No. 2080). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6011. A bill for the relief of Tsuyoshi Nagahama; without amendment (Rept. No. 2081). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6070. A bill for the relief of Paul Gust Williams; without amendment (Rept. No. 2082). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6083. A bill for the relief of Amalia Architetto; without amendment (Rept. No. 2083). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6234. A bill for the relief of Junko Kubo; without amendment (Rept. No. 2084). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6260. A bill for the relief of Kazuko Shirai; without amendment (Rept. No. 2085). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6270. A bill for the relief of Jane Loraine Hindman; without amendment (Rept. No. 2086). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6355. A bill for the relief of Francesca Servello; without amendment (Rept. No. 2087). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6415. A bill for the relief of George Rodney Giltner (formerly Joji Wakamiya); with amendment (Rept. No. 2088). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6423. A bill for the relief of Russell William Karbach; without amendment (Rept. No. 2089). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6450. A bill for the relief of Young Yuk Ho and Young Yuk Kue (Young Sue Mei); without amendment (Rept. No. 2090). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6637. A bill for the relief of Gaetana Giambruno Tomasino; without amendment (Rept. No. 2091). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6640. A bill for the relief of Hitomi Matsushita; without amendment (Rept. No. 2092). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6641. A bill for the relief of Leu Wai Ung (Wong Wai Ung) and Leu Wai Chiu (Wong Wai Chiu); without amendment(Rept. No. 2093). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6869. A bill for the relief of Wong Yang Yee and Wong Sue Chee; without amendment (Rept. No. 2094). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7095. A bill for the relief of Ruth Ann Holecek; without amendment (Rept. No. 2095). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ZABLOCKI: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 214. An act for the relief of Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, Mrs. Raul Valle Antelo, Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, Mrs. Otto Resse, and Mrs. Hugo Soria; with amendment (Rept. No. 2097). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 8120. A bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 8121. A bill to increase the income-tax exemptions from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 8122. A bill to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 8123. A bill to establish the finality of contracts between the Government and common carriers of passengers and freight subject to the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 8124. A bill to amend section 2400 of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to ornaments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 8125. A bill to declare the Benton Harbor Canal at and above the west side of

Erie Street, Benton Harbor, Mich., a nonnavigable stream; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. R. 8126. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 8127. A bill to amend the act of June 21, 1940, relating to the alteration of certain bridges over navigable waters so as to include highway bridges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 8128. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide that the tax on the transportation of property shall not apply in the case of certain property exported from the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 8129. A bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to authorize the appropriation of additional funds to cover reductions, occurring as a result of the 1950 United States census, in Federal funds apportioned for expenditure in the States and Territories; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 8130. A bill to promote economy and efficiency through certain reorganizations and the integration of supply and service activities within and among the military departments; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. Res. 676. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to investigate and study the seaward boundaries of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 8131. A bill for the relief of Cheong Chea King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8132. A bill for the relief of Cheong Wai Hing and Cheong Tung Fuin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 8133. A bill for the relief of Franco Gerbino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 8134. A bill for the relief of Emiko Mizaguchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 8135. A bill for the relief of Maria Rozas Espineira de Colchero Arrubarrena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 8136. A bill for the relief of Gregory Leon Baranowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 8137. A bill to overcome an excludible ground of admission into the United States other than race for John Virag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 8138. A bill for the relief of Chew Shee Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 8139. A bill for the relief of Edwin McKenzie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 8140. A bill for the relief of George Akira Yamauchi (Grimsley); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 8141. A bill for the relief of Sang Ryup Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8142. A bill for the relief of Patricia A. Pembroke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 8143. A bill for the relief of Guy H. Davant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

752. By Mr. BYRNES: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. L. Wickman and others urging the passage of bill H. R. 2188, by Mr. Bryson; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

753. By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Petition of Aerie No. 2426, Fraternal Order of Eagles, of Powell, Wyo., urging creation of a governmental commission to study methods for combating floods; to the Committee on Public Works.

754. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition of citizens of Sioux City, Iowa, in support of the President's veto of tidelands legislation and requesting legislation to divert tidelands oil revenue to the Social Security Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 10, 1952

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate pastor, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Thou God of our fathers and our God, we thank Thee that Thou hast created through the minds of our forebears a glorious heritage of liberty and justice for all. We pray that Thou wilt increase among us worthy plans and efforts to continually build the structure of democracy upon the sure foundations which they laid. To this end we pray for guidance this day and every day in the work we have been called to do, that we may know we are contributing to the great stream of creative events that makes history the story of Thy unfolding purpose and will for man. Unite us in one continuous effort that, under Thy guidance, we may make our world a place where fruitful industry, valiant truth, responsible freedom and pure religion flourish and men dwell as sons of God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 9, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 97) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities for generating hydroelectric power at the Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland River in Tennessee, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 220) providing for a joint session of the Congress, on June 10, 1952, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 220, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 10, 1952.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, June 10, 1952, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 220) was considered and agreed to.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and transact other routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, PAYMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS (S. DOC. NO. 144)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments rendered against the United States in the amount of $5,621,462.75, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay indefinite interest and costs and to cover increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED FAIR-TRADE LEGISLATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the Washington Post for Monday, June 9, 1952, there appeared an editorial entitled "What's Fair About It?" a discussion of alleged fair-trade legislation. The editorial points out that the proposed legislation is anything but legislation which seeks to protect the consumers of America by fair-trade practices. I ask unanimous consent that the

editorial be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S FAIR ABOUT IT?

Retailers who have been mesmerized by the protectionist claims of the advocates of "fair trade" legislation had better look sharply at what they are buying. The McGuire bill passed by the House and now before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee not only would bind all retailers in a State to observe minimum prices fixed between one retailer and a manufacturer, it would also bind them to observe stipulated prices. In other words, as Alfred Friendly pointed out in his story the other day, if a manufacturer entered into a contract with a chain of stores stipulating a resale price that would allow only a small retail profit, all other retailers who wished to handle the product would have to sell it at the same price even though the margin might be insufficient to cover their handling costs. This would be regimentation with a vengeance.

It is also interesting to explore some of the claims made by proponents that fair trade results in lower prices to consumers. One such study points out that drug prices under fair trade increased less than the cost of living from January 1948 to December 1950. This study, of course, compares wholesale drug prices with retail costs to consumers. Curiously enough, in January 1947, the wholesale drug index was at the highest point for 20 years, whereas the wholesale index for other commodities lagged 40 points behind. Actually, the big increase in drug prices occurred in 1946, while the increase in other commodities was slower. In 1950 the wholesale drug price index was practically identical with the wholesale index of other commodities. Here is a case in which selected statistics give a very misleading impression; if 1946 had been used as a base date the figures would have been much different.

The minority report of the House Judiciary Committee cites a survey of retail prices on 208 items, showing that in fair-trade States the cost to consumers would be $945.10 compared with $740.86 in non-fair-trade areas. This lends weight to the conclusion voiced by Q. Forrest Walker, economist for Macy's: "The simple truth is that no group fights for price fixing privileges except to make prices higher than they would be under free and open competition." Significantly, some of the largest contributors to the fair-trade treasury have been the drug manufacturers. Economic juggling of the sort attempted in the McGuire bill not only would penalize consumers, it also would constitute a veiled threat to the same small retailers the bill pretends to protect.

VETO OF JOINT RESOLUTION ON SUBMERGED LANDS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Tidelands Veto," published in today's Washington Post. I think the editorial is one of the clearest and most unanswerable statements on the issue I have read.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIDELANDS VETO

The very title of the so-called tidelands oil bill is a fraud. It purports to be a "joint resolution to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters * * *." But the resolution adopted by Congress, and vetoed a fortnight ago by the President, has nothing to do, in point of fact, with lands "within State boundaries." It has nothing whatever to do with "inland waters" or with "tidelands"—a term which is properly applied only to the narrow strip of land lying between high tide and low tide. It deals, rather, with land lying seaward of the tidelands, beyond the inland waters and wholly outside State boundaries—the strip between the low-tide mark and the 3-mile limit properly called the marginal sea.

Now, it is impossible for Congress "to confirm * * * the titles of the States" to these lands for the simple reason that the States, as component parts of the Federal Union, have never had any titles to them. Our authority for this assertion is the Supreme Court of the United States—a body created by the Constitution for the express purpose of settling controversies of this sort. The Supreme Court, although it has held repeatedly that the States do indeed have title to their inland waters, ruled unequivocally in the California case of 1947 that California had no title to the marginal sea and that paramount rights in and full domain over the area rested in the United States as a sovereign Nation. Texas enjoyed such rights and dominion during the decade of her independence but relinquished them upon relinquishing her national sovereignty when she joined the United States.

What Congress attempted to do, therefore, in its tidelands resolution was to give away to three coastal States—California, Texas, and Louisiana—lands and mineral resources which belong to the people of the whole American Union. President Truman sent this resolution back to Congress with a forceful and compelling veto message because, he said, "I do not believe such an action would be in the national interest, and I do not see how any President could fail to oppose it." For our part, we do not see how any Congress acting as a legislature of the United States could fail to sustain a veto on these grounds.

A strange sort of frenzy seems, however, to have taken hold of the officials of a great many interior States of the Union which have nothing to gain and everything to lose from quitclaim legislation. They have allowed themselves to be bamboozled into a belief that somehow or other the Supreme Court's ruling in the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases has cast doubt on the status of lands beneath their navigable inland waters. The fear is, of course, an altogether groundless one. Its groundlessness was made abundantly clear by the President when he declared in his veto message, "If the Congress wishes to enact legislation confirming the States in the ownership of what is already theirs—that is, the lands and resources under navigable inland waters and the tidelands—I shall, of course, be glad to approve it. But such legislation is completely unnecessary, and bears no relation whatever to the question of what should be done with lands which the States do not now own—that is, the lands under an open sea."

Apart from the constitutional issues involved, the President pointed out in his veto message the importance of keeping the oil of the marginal sea under Federal management in order to conserve it for national defense purposes. He pointed out, too, the tremendous benefits that could accrue to the Nation as a whole by devoting the revenue to be derived from exploitation of the marginal sea to a program of Federal aid to education in the manner proposed not long ago by Senator HILL. These ought to be compelling considerations to Members of Congress whose business it is to serve national, not merely local or sectional, interests. The Senate will be tested as a national body when it votes this week on a motion to override the President's veto. We hope that the veto will be sustained.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON COLLEGE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, in these days of doubt and confusion, when strange and alien philosophies are being taught in some of our schools and colleges, it is a sincere pleasure to call the attention of my colleagues to a resolution adopted by the trustees of Washington and Jefferson College.

Washington and Jefferson College is the oldest institution of higher learning west of the Alleghenies. It was founded in 1780 by pioneer ministers and educators who crossed the mountains into the wilderness of western Pennsylvania with the earliest settlers.

Last Friday the members of the board of trustees met in their commencement session in the office of the college president, Dr. Boyd Crumrine Patterson. The resolution they adopted is brief, but most eloquent, in expressing determination to preserve the ancient landmarks of our national faith. It breathes the spirit of American patriotism. It reaffirms adherence to the traditional virtues that are the foundation of the American way of life.

I ask the indulgence of the Senate while I read the text of this important resolution:

We, the trustees of Washington and Jefferson College, a Christian liberal arts college, founded and nurtured by men who believed in the traditional American virtues, do hereby reaffirm this institution's position that a dynamic, enlightened system of free enterprise is the great hope for the future of this country and the world.

We deplore the present tendency toward a materialistic philosophy which we believe contradicts the principles of our American Government.

We are actively opposed to the growth of a socialistic state and pledge that our students will be taught the practical wisdom of the Constitution, which is the defender of our lives, liberty, and property, and is our bulwark against communism and all other alien ideologies which today threaten the American way of life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an editorial entitled "A Forthright Statement," published in the June 7 issue of the Washington (Pa.) Reporter, commenting on the action of the Washington and Jefferson College trustees.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FORTHRIGHT STATEMENT

In these days of living dangerously in a world that is worrisome, to say the least, there is something comforting, something challenging and certainly something based on courage, the whole laced with humbleness in thinking and acting—the mark of the true man—in a resolution introduced and passed by the board of trustees of Washington and Jefferson College in session yesterday.

Read it now and read it again and again. Here it is:

"We, the trustees of Washington and Jefferson College, a Christian liberal arts college, founded and nurtured by men who believed in the traditional American virtues, do hereby reaffirm this institution's position that a dynamic, enlightened system of free enterprise is the great hope for the future of this country and the world.

"We deplore the present tendency toward a materialistic philosophy which we believe contradicts the principles of the American Government.

"We are actively opposed to the growth of a socialistic state and pledge that our students will be taught the practical wisdom of the Constitution, which is the defender of our lives, liberty, and property, and is our bulwark against communism and all other foreign ideologies which today threaten the American way of life."

Thus simply and certainly effectively do we have enunciated for us the basic principles which have brought us to the high station we—as a nation—hold in the world family.

Where else but from leaders of liberal arts colleges—such as Washington and Jefferson—could we expect such an utterance? And we are happy and proud that the board of trustees saw fit to give it publicity through formal action.

As we read it again in our mind's eye we see again certain strong men in the days when these United States were young giving much more than lip service to them, living for them and dying, if necessary, for them.

Similar words were given meaning by the blood prints in the snow at Valley Forge and by Daniel Boone as he stood with ax on his shoulder on the completed wilderness trail.

Abraham Lincoln knew such words and thoughts and how to bring them to life and give them color and he knew, in the first place, that this Nation to be strong must be united.

Therefore it is comforting to learn that the "traditional American virtues" do not lack for supporters. And how logical it is that they come from the minds and hearts of men who know what a bulwark the liberal arts colleges have been over the years.

There are many ideologies—in addition to that of communism—which have been and are advanced in this country. Many of them—on the surface at least—have some reason for being. But too many of them are beamed toward materialistic possessions and are far from the ideals, which, given life, have brought this Nation to its present high estate.

Too often we tend to forget the eternal truths, those which have stood the test of time and have weathered the storms which have beat about them. If they are to be found at all, if they are to be nurtured and brought to man's estate, it is to the liberal arts colleges that we must look and, with the thinking expressed in the words above, we will not look in vain.

Gratefully we learn of the action of the trustees.

They give us courage to hold fast to those things which are true and reject those which are false.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Butler, Md.	Case
Bennett	Butler, Nebr.	Chavez
Bridges	Byrd	Clements
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Nixon
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Kefauver	Pastore
Dworshak	Kem	Robertson
Eastland	Kerr	Russell
Ellender	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Ferguson	Knowland	Schoeppel
Flanders	Lehman	Seaton
Frear	Long	Smathers
Fulbright	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
George	Malone	Smith, N. J.
Gillette	Martin	Smith, N. C.
Green	Maybank	Sparkman
Hayden	McCarran	Stennis
Hendrickson	McCarthy	Taft
Hennings	McClellan	Thye
Hickenlooper	McFarland	Tobey
Hill	McKellar	Underwood
Hoey	Millikin	Watkins
Holland	Monroney	Welker
Humphrey	Moody	Wiley
Hunt	Morse	Williams
Ives	Mundt	
Jenner	Neely	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate reconvenes following the joint session of Congress, the morning hour be completed.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, would that make any change in the existing situation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would not affect the situation at all. The Senate convenes today following an adjournment, and a morning hour would be held in any event.

Mr. BYRD. Why is it necessary to ask unanimous consent to continue the morning hour? I object to any unanimous-consent request.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is all right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia objects.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in accordance with the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 220, I move that the Senate now proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of hearing an address to be delivered by the President of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (Leslie L. Biffle), its Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), the Vice President, and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States may be pleased to make to them.

At 1 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m., the Senate returned to its Chamber, and was called to order by the Vice President.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation? Does the Senate proceed with the morning hour, or does it resume consideration of the unfinished business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is some confusion about that. The Chair was under the impression that when the Senate meets following an adjournment, no matter what agreement may have been previously entered into with reference to debate and a vote, there is a morning hour. The Parliamentarian is under the impression that the unanimous-consent agreement entered into obviates the morning hour, notwithstanding the adjournment on yesterday.

The Chair is inclined in favor of the idea of having a morning hour after adjournment. Therefore, the Chair will act on that theory; and the first order of business is petitions and memorials.

Mr. McFARLAND. Then, the Senate will resume the consideration of the unfinished business at 2 o'clock?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; the Senate will resume the consideration of the unfinished business, or it can be taken up on motion before 2 o'clock, if the morning-hour business is disposed of.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I understand, there has been an adjournment since the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into. My question is, Was the unanimous-consent agreement, which obviously limited the time upon amendments which are before the Senate today, set aside as a consequence of the adjournment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was not. The Senate will resume consideration of the bill under the same conditions that prevailed when it was before the Senate on previous days. The morning business is merely an interlude between the session of the previous day and the resumption of the unfinished business.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understood the Chair to say that the Senate could, by motion, utilize a part of the morning hour for purposes of discussion of the bill. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Perhaps the Chair should state the parliamentary situation as it will be when the Senate resumes consideration of the bill.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] offered an amendment to the bill, to which the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute. Meantime, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] offered an amendment to the Byrd amendment, which would take precedence in the voting. But debate has been exhausted on all three proposals, and no further debate is in order on any of them.

The first vote will be on the Morse amendment to the Byrd amendment, and on that question the yeas and nays have been ordered. If the Morse amendment is either defeated or adopted, further amendment to the Byrd amendment will be in order. But until the Morse amendment is disposed of, no further amendment to the Byrd amendment will be in order, because such an amendment would be an amendment in the third degree.

Furthermore, no amendment is in order to the Maybank substitute, upon which a vote would come before a final vote on the Byrd amendment as it may be perfected, if it is perfected. The Chair has stated the parliamentary situation with respect to the three proposals, but debate has been exhausted on all three of them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it appears to me that the Senate finds itself in a most unfortunate and, I may say, incongruous position, in that it has been called upon to legislate in the field of labor-management relations, and because of a unanimous-consent agreement which was arrived at when the circumstances were different from those existing today, we are incapable, apparently, of altering our rules so that we can debate a proposition which affects the very life of the country.

I submit that we should set aside the rules and should open up the subject for further debate, allowing sufficient time to discuss the subject of the power of seizure as intelligent human beings.

Mr. President, I should like to make a unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks that while the morning hour is in progress, no request or motion regarding any of the three proposals in regard to the extension of the Defense Production Act is in order. After the morning hour is concluded, and these matters come before the Senate, the Chair at that time can entertain any proposal that is in order. However, during the morning hour, that cannot be done.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. As I understand the situation, if the Morse amendment to the Byrd amendment is either adopted or rejected, an amendment to the Byrd amendment will be in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Any perfecting amendment to the Byrd amendment that is in order can be voted on before the vote is taken on the Senator's substitute.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. But while the Morse amendment to the Byrd amendment is pending no other amendment is in order, because such an amendment would be in the nature of an amendment in the third degree.

Mr. MAYBANK. But other amendments can be offered to the Byrd amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Only after the Morse amendment is disposed of.

Mr. MAYBANK. Then we can debate those amendments.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, do I understand the ruling of the Chair to be that promptly at 2 o'clock a roll call will be had on the Morse amendment to my amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. At 2 o'clock, if not sooner.

Mr. BYRD. If not sooner.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and will be had on the Morse amendment to the Byrd amendment.

Mr. BYRD. From that point on, the same restrictions as to debate will continue in effect?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. And on any new amendments which may be offered in the event the Morse amendment should be defeated or approved there would be the same limitation of 15 minutes to each side as provided in the agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Whether the Morse amendment to the Byrd amendment is agreed to or not, further perfecting amendments to different parts of the amendment of the Senator from Virginia would be in order and would be subject to 15 minutes' debate on either side.

Mr. BYRD. Did I understand the Chair to say that the Parliamentarian does not agree with the view of the Presiding Officer?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not wish to go into that question.

Mr. BYRD. I understood the Chair to say that the Parliamentarian had thought there should be no morning hour, in view of the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair discussed the matter with the Parliamentarian, whose idea was that the agreement previously entered into obviated the necessity for a morning hour. The Chair does not agree with the Parliamentarian.

The Chair would like to suggest that the Senate is now in the morning hour. Questions pertaining to the unfinished business will be in order following the conclusion of the morning hour.

In further response to the Senator from Virginia, if the morning hour should be concluded before 2 o'clock, a motion would then be in order to proceed with the unfinished business. At 2 o'clock the Senate will automatically return to the consideration of the unfinished business.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MOODY. After the roll has been called on the Morse amendment to the Byrd amendment, will the proposals of the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Oklahoma, regarding possible operations of steel plants, then be in order as amendments to the Byrd amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would prefer to answer that question when such amendments are offered. Any amendment to that part of the Byrd amendment which is not touched by the Morse amendment would be in order, and would be subject to the limitation of 15 minutes to each side. The amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from South Carolina is already before the Senate.

Mr. MOODY. What about the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That amendment has not been offered. It is not now pending. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, it could not be debated now.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the so-called Byrd amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. They have not been. They have been ordered on the Morse amendment and the Maybank amendment in the nature of a substitute, but not on the Byrd amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. A further parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it now in order to ask for the yeas and nays on the Byrd amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not think it will be in order until the Senate resumes the regular order of business and considers the bill. It will be in order after the morning hour, when the Byrd amendment is before the Senate for a vote.

Mr. FERGUSON. But not at the present time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is now in the morning hour, and the Chair will receive petitions and memorials.

PUNISHMENT FOR ILLEGALLY SELLING NARCOTICS—RESOLUTION

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution unanimously adopted by Calvert Unit No. 85, American Legion Auxiliary, Department of Maryland, emphasizing the need of vigilance to protect the Nation's children against the evil effects of narcotic drugs.

It is a matter upon which informed parents throughout the country are in fullest accord, and to which legislators and law enforcement officials should give

the most earnest consideration and attention.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY,
DEPARTMENT OF MARYLAND,
CALVERT UNIT, No. 85.

Hon. HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'CONOR: At a regular meeting of the American Legion Auxiliary, Unit No. 85, Calvert County, Md., held on February 5, 1952, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the effects of selling dope and narcotics are recognized, and found to be detrimental to the future of our country, our children's health, morale, and safety has to be protected; and

"Whereas this organization urges that more effective laws should be passed to deal with this problem: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the American Legion Auxiliary, Unit No. 85, Calvert County, Md., go on record for the passage of laws which would triple the punishment for the first conviction of peddling dope, and would give life imprisonment or capital punishment for the second conviction; also be it

"*Resolved*, That the evils and effects of dope and narcotics be taught to students. That hospital care for those under the influence be increased, and that it shall be seen that proper care and treatment be given these patients; also

"*Resolved*, That the increased legislation would be applicable to all dope peddlers, regardless of their victims."

The American Legion Auxiliary feels that the future of America, for which our boys are giving their lives, as many have in the past, needs the strongest protection that can be offered.

We, therefore, urge your strongest support of these measures.

Mrs. J. ARTHUR BOWEN,
President.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 1588. A bill to amend the Air Commerce Act of 1926, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1718).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. J. Res. 151. Joint resolution approving the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico on March 3, 1952; with amendments (Rept. No. 1720).

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 2813. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Collbran reclamation project, Colorado, and to provide for disposition of the project upon completion of repayment; with amendments (Rept. No. 1719).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3308. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine and render judgment upon the claims of Lincoln Operating Co., Cameo Amusement Co., Biscayne Beach Theatre, Inc., and Mitchell Wolfson and others doing business as a partnership under the name of "Wometco Circuit"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 3309. A bill to provide for the extension of the terms of office of judges of the Court of Military Appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 3310. A bill for the relief of Hsiao-Min Shuli Ley; and

S. 3311. A bill for the relief of Clara Florentine Peters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 3312. A bill to discontinue the Postal Savings System established by the Act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 814), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. BENNETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 3313. A bill for the relief of Amir Hassan Sepahban; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISCONTINUANCE OF POSTAL SAVINGS SYSTEM

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to discontinue the Postal Savings System established by the act of June 25, 1910, as amended, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3312) to discontinue the Postal Savings System established by the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 814), as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The explanatory statement by Mr. BENNETT is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENNETT CONCERNING BILL TO ABOLISH THE POSTAL SAVINGS SYSTEM

I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to discontinue the Postal Savings System established by the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 814), as amended, and for other purposes.

On March 13, 1952, the Comptroller General transmitted to the Congress a report on a survey of the Postal Savings System. In his recommendations to the Congress, the Comptroller General states: "By and large the main purpose and justification for the Postal Savings System are no longer applicable." In that report the further recommendation is made to the Congress that "It would appear that the Congress should give consideration to the question as to whether under present conditions there is a need for a Postal Savings System."

Every Senator in this body is keenly aware of the unprecedented necessity and public demand for economy in Government. It seems clear to me that the great demand and need for economy cannot be accomplished by a mere percentage reduction in the expenditures for existing Government operations. It is necessary that all nonessential Government programs be eliminated. Under present conditions, the Postal Savings System is a nonessential program.

The conditions justifying the establishment of the Postal Savings System do not exist at the present time. The needs which were met initially by the Government operated savings system are now adequately taken care of by private institutions, at no cost to the Government, and by Government deposit insurance programs.

The Comptroller General's report indicates that the Postal Savings System when established in 1910 was designed to attract the savings of potential small depositors who lacked confidence in the private banking system and to provide savings deposit facilities in communities where no banks existed. The General Accounting Office noted in its report that those objectives are now in substantial part taken care of by functions other than the Postal Savings System. The report states:

"As the result of the formation of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the guaranty and security of savings deposits sought by depositors but previously not obtainable except in postal savings are now afforded nearly all savings deposits up to $10,000. According to the most recent survey, June 30, 1935, by the American Bankers Association, over 78 percent of towns and cities in which there were designated postal savings depositories also had bank savings facilities. A comparison of the number of those facilities, as shown by the 1946 Bankers Directory, with the number of postal savings depositories in each State at June 30, 1950, shows that about 68 percent of the cities and towns had both types of facilities."

The operations of the Postal Savings System are financed from revenues derived from investments of depositors' funds in securities and obligations of the United States and in time deposits with the banks. The 1950 operating deficit was $326,024. In addition, however, the payroll expenses and expenses of other necessary items, such as quarters and overhead costs, are paid out of annual appropriations of the Post Office Department. According to the General Accounting Office report, the allocated part of the Post Office Department expenses for Postal Savings in 1950 was $8,457,033. Of course, all of these expenses would not be terminated if the Postal Savings System were abolished, for example, building costs and overhead in the post offices would continue to accrue for other postal purposes if the savings operation is abolished. However, it reasonably can be anticipated that a large share of the $3,500,000 expenditure could be saved by the abolition of the system.

The postal-savings deposits are decreasing at the present time. In 1950 the postal-savings deposits were valued at $3,097,316,449. The volume of the postal-savings business showed a marked downward trend, with withdrawals exceeding deposits by $15,000,000 and $26,000,000 monthly in fiscal years 1950 and 1951, respectively. The large volume of depositors apparently are residents of rural areas where numerous private and commercial savings institutions are extant. Only a small share of the depositors live in rural areas indicating that farmers are not now extensively using the Postal Savings System as a substitute for private and commercial savings institutions.

When the Postal Savings System was established, the prevailing interest rate paid by private and commercial savings institutions was substantially higher than the legal rate of 2 percent per annum established for the postal savings. Therefore, the Government was not in competition with private institutions. However, according to the General Accounting Office report by 1950 the situation was reversed.

At the present time the general prevailing interest rate paid by private and commercial savings institutions is about the same as the 2-percent rate paid by postal savings. At any rate, it is clear that should the Postal

Savings System be abolished depositors could readily find reliable institutions which would pay a return comparable to that they now receive on their investments.

It may be that some of the citizenry is hesitant to invest in private and commercial institutions because of the depression experiences of some. However, the establishment of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation make that hesitancy, if it exists, a matter for further public education of the Federal deposit insurance and the Federal savings and loan insurance programs, rather than a justification for the continuance of an expensive Government-operated program.

The bill would provide for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System by four steps:

First, it would direct the Board of Trustees in charge of the Postal Savings System to establish a closing date within 1 year after the approval of the law, after which no deposits would be accepted by the Postal Savings System. Provision is made to allow the then existing depositors to surrender and obtain new certificates to accomplish the present practiced process of drawing interest on their deposits, but for a period not to exceed 3 years after the closing date fixed by the trustees.

Second, all depositors of the postal-savings depositories would be notified to withdraw their deposits within 3 years from the closing date and no interest would accrue on deposits remaining after the expiration of the 3 years following the closing date.

Third, after the expiration of 3 years after the closing date, accounts of depositors may be forwarded to one or more central locations to which postmasters would forward for payment all withdrawal demands of depositors. This would authorize a more efficient and less expensive process of administration during the winding-up period.

Fourth, upon the expiration of 5 years from the closing date established by the Board of Trustees, the powers and functions pertaining to the Postal Savings System vested by law in the Board of Trustees and the Postmaster General would terminate and would be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of liquidating the Postal Savings System.

The process would provide an orderly method of liquidating the Postal Savings System. It would give the depositors a reasonable time to reinvest their assets and would provide a reasonable time cushion so that the Government securities and obligations owned by the Postal Savings System as investments of depositors funds would not be placed immediately upon the market in one block. It provides a definite time limit within which the Postal Savings System must be terminated and liquidated.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GILLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 333), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures authorized under Senate Resolution 262, Eighty-second Congress, second session, agreed to January 24, 1952 (authorizing the expenditure of funds and the employment of assistants by the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any authorized subcommittee thereof, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by subsection (o) (1) (D) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate), is hereby increased by $75,000.

STATEMENT OF NAMES AND COMPENSATION OF PERSONS EMPLOYED BY SENATORS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution directing the Secretary of the Senate to prepare a statement showing the names and compensation of persons employed by each Senator.

I serve notice that I shall also offer the text of the resolution as an amendment to an appropriate appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 334) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to prepare, publish, and submit to the Senate on the first day of the first session of the Eighty-third Congress and on the first day of each regular session of the Congress thereafter a statement showing (1) the names of all persons who were employed during the preceding calendar year in the office of each Senator and whose compensation was paid from appropriated funds, and (2) the sums paid by him to each such person by reason of such employment.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952—AMENDMENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2594) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

Text of radio broadcast by him of Program No. 61 in the series entitled "Happenings in Washington."

By Mr. RUSSELL:

Report of Paul Ginsberg, national commander, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, at national executive committee meeting, Washington, D. C., April 5 and 6, 1952.

By Mr. GREEN:

Address delivered by Hon. Perle Mesta, United States Minister to Luxembourg, at forty-eighth annual convention, Advertising Federation of America, at New York City on June 8, 1952.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

National Maritime Day address delivered by Robert W. Williams, member of the Federal Maritime Board, in Baltimore, Md., on May 22, 1952.

Address entitled "Liberty, Authority, and Religion," delivered by Most Rev. Francis P. Keough, archbishop of Baltimore, at the military memorial mass, Arlington Cemetery, on May 25, 1952.

Article from New York Times of May 25, 1952, concerning the late Fulton Oursler.

By Mr. WILEY:

Press release by National Planning Association regarding publication of a new book entitled "The Manual of Corporate Giving," relating to business contributions under the 5-percent-tax-exemption privilege of the Internal Revenue Code.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Editorial from the Washington Evening Star of June 9, 1952, endorsing Senator WILEY's bipartisan foreign policy.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Excerpt from resolution adopted on June 1 by third convention of Polish-American Congress, at Atlantic City, N. J., dealing with pending immigration legislation.

Article from Cleveland Press dealing with omnibus immigration bill.

Correspondence in regard to pending immigration legislation.

By Mr. MORSE:

Editorial entitled "Our Generous House," published in the Oregon Daily Journal of May 17, 1952.

Article entitled "Exiles in New York Mold Leaders for Free China," written by Mary Hornaday, and published in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

Portion of a letter addressed to its clients by the Pioneer Service Co., Inc., of Eugene, Oreg., entitled "Life Is a Pageant."

By Mr. BRIDGES (for Mr. CAIN):

Articles on forestry in the State of Washington and the Pacific Northwest.

Letter addressed by Senator CAIN to Mr. Nathan Cowan, of the CIO.

Letter addressed to Senator CAIN by Mr. Harry Lundberg, president of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Memorandum from the Estonian Relief Committee, Inc., in connection with Celler and Hendrickson bills.

COMMENTS ON STEEL STRIKE BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROBERT A. LOVETT

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, Secretary of Defense Robert A. Lovett commented on Saturday, June 7, regarding the 7-day-old steel strike. Referring to the impact on the defense effort, Secretary Lovett said, "about as serious a blow as you can get."

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD an account of the Secretary's statement on the matter, as published in the Baltimore Sun of June 7, 1952.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOVETT CALLS STRIKE BLOW TO DEFENSE—6,000,000 TONS OF STEEL WILL BE LOST IF WALKOUT LASTS 1 WEEK

WASHINGTON, JUNE 6.—The steel strike already has produced for the defense establishment about as serious a blow as you can get, in the judgment of Robert A. Lovett, Secretary of Defense. He remarked today that even a 1-week stoppage of work in the 400 strike-bound mills would mean a halt of fully 3 weeks in production—largely because of an inescapable delay of a fortnight or more in fully restarting the cooled furnaces.

As American steel production amounts to about 9,000,000 tons a month, this means that even if the strike is terminated next week, as has been optimistically guessed, there will be a total permanent loss of some 6,000,000 tons of steel at a critical time in American rearming.

AFFECTS OTHER INDUSTRIES

The purely military consumption of American steel is figured at only about 15 percent

of the total, to be sure, but so closely is all industrial economy integrated that the strike's injurious effects on transportation, communications, public utilities, and the whole supporting economy of the country, Lovett pointed out, provides a further incalculable injury to arms production.

Moreover, the munitions industry takes varying percentages of the plants' output. Of certain alloys the arms program takes not the 15 percent average but 60 and even 80 percent of the country's total output. The immediate total effect on arms production, therefore, defies any exact estimate, but far exceeds 15 percent of the Nation's total loss.

TAKING TWO COURSES

The defense establishment is pursuing two trails in an effort to reduce its loss in some slight degree. By one system prime contractors have been asked where possible, to shift their orders from a strike-bound plant to a non-strike-bound plant.

This can produce only small results, so wide is the tie-up and so few are the non-strike-bound plants. One of those whose output is sought is a Montana establishment which turns out only 1,300,000 tons a year, a little over 1 percent of the Nation's vast total.

Besides that, contractors for each of the armed services would be likely to turn to the same few refuges, and so would a thousand civilian distress buyers, so that a prime problem is to establish a sort of traffic policeman to control the demand and determine priorities for each of the little plants still operating.

CONTRACT COST HIGH

The financial cost of broken contracts is something else to think about.

There is also in process a study of the possibility of direct orders from the Government agencies, designated as such, to steel plants.

These, under a clause of the Selective Service Act, would be theoretically enforceable, but the actuality is not determined, and the certainty in any case is that the resultant product would be minute, as compared with rearming requirements.

The armed services, it should be observed, do not themselves buy steel, they buy tanks and guns and ships, etc., which have been fabricated from steel by the prime contractors and a host of subcontractors.

THE NEED FOR ECONOMY—THE KEY TO DEFENSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as part of my remarks at this point, an article entitled "Can the Lukewarm War Bankrupt Us?" and an article by the same author entitled "Key to Defense: Seapower Know-How," published in the March 3, 1952, and March 17, 1952, issues of the magazine Fortnight.

In the articles the author presents his answers to the following questions:

Why is Congress so concerned about the lack of sea power representation on the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Can we really get something for nothing in national defense?

How many years of $85,000,000,000 budgets can we survive?

Can our Army and Air Force strike effectively overseas without the latest and best in basic air power—the sea-air team spearheaded by the aircraft carrier for which no substitute has been found?

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Fortnight Magazine of March 3, 1952]

CAN THE LUKEWARM WAR BANKRUPT US?

PART I

If we are to survive we must lead from strength and courage. World conquest is the Kremlin objective, with no strings attached. Strength alone will prevail; yet, ever since World War II we have talked loud and carried a small stick. We need determination as well as physical implements, techniques, dollars and production capacity. We need to accept the leadership that has been thrust upon us, beyond just putting out dollars, and in so doing, be prepared to act with or without allies or fear of the Kremlin. The Soviets have already demonstrated they are not ready. Our potential allies and the United Nations as a whole will fall in behind a leader with guts—no other kind.

Our strength will depend primarily on solvency—our ability to weather the years ahead. The enemy hopes above all to see us go broke. And its wish will be granted if we undertake many more annual budgets of the proposed $85,000,000,000. Consider the fact that over three-fourths of that sum covers the cost of past and present military affairs. Billions of it will be devoted to repairing humans and things that we have needlessly shattered. Sixty percent, or an astronomical $51,000,000,000 is for fiscal 1953 outlay for the armed services.

This latter sum, literally beyond the comprehension of common mortals, should be cut materially. One obvious way is to look squarely at the nature of our military task—at the type of preparedness that will most deter or defeat the enemy with some promise of peace and invest our waning funds where they will produce most for least.

That we are not doing. Rather we have bought the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow—Independent air power, United States Air Force empire building, and the principle of mass destruction. We need an air force and army, but in order to use either except as a home guard—in order to take the scene of action from our own front doorsteps and also gain the extra impact of short-range assault—we must first have the most modern possible carrier-spearheaded sea-air naval force that can bring in raw materials and transport and support our other armed services.

Let's examine some plain facts before going further into this vital subject of improved national security:

Economy is the basis of our ability to survive, yet—

Unification was the paradox of making four armed service departments out of two—to the old War and Navy Departments were added the Departments of Defense and of the Air Force. This was apparently decentralization but actually just the contrary. Along with added costs, we created the new dictatorship, the Defense Department. News suppression and nonexistent superweapons have lulled the people.

Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS, of Vermont, speaks gospel when he says: "For the first time in history, our Government and our people are afraid of a foreign foe. * * * In part, this fear is felt and spread by our National Defense Department at the Pentagon. * * * The reorganization plan has not worked out too well. Our Defense Department is still, to a disturbing degree, disorganized. * * * Our diplomacy has gone on the defensive."

Sabre rattling about such things as the famous 70 targets in Russia and constant reference to intercontinental air delivery of the atom bomb have fed the enemy's propaganda machine. As one result, we have not only impaired our chances of enlisting the sympathy and aid of his nationals but also implanted justifiable dread in the minds of our allies that their women and children may be blasted off the face of the earth by the kind of area bombing of civilians of which we were futilely guilty in World War II. We need soft speech and a big stick.

Interservice bickering. The Army General Staff, brought here from Germany in 1903, is patterned after the German over-all general staff, and not only has sought repeatedly to destroy the Marine Corps but has made legislative advances toward complete military control in times of crisis. We may not know it, but already we have the equivalent of a single chief of staff and are largely controlled by the military.

The Air Force has for years sought to gain control of naval and marine aviation—an objective that has proved disastrous in Italy, Germany, and Japan, and very nearly in Britain. Altogether, it might save American dollars and lives if Army and Air Force confined themselves to helping prepare to deal with the enemy abroad.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff consist of three voting members and one Chairman. All except one are West Point graduates. Thus, if the vote isn't 2 to 1 against the naval service the interpretation carried up the chain of command by the Chairman is certain to give the decision a land-locked tinge, regardless. Yet we are a maritime nation.

The Kremlin Communists have plenty of time. They are not going to seize by forceable means what they can take over without expense of men and materials. They would rather wait. Time is on their side; so is the initiative.

Courage and forthright action accompanied by willingness to "go it alone" if necessary—rather than constant appeasement—will save us by gaining allies and by letting the enemy know we mean business. That implacable enemy is neither to be scared by false strength nor persuaded by negotiations. The sooner we cease worrying about Russian intervention, the cheaper and more effective will be the gains of the free nations.

Air power is a complex of naval and marine aviation, the Air Force, Army, and civilian air and all the techniques, arts, crafts, and facilities that lie behind them. Generally speaking, military aviation constitutes air power when integrated into an over-all scheme of operation, including surface elements. Air Force interdiction is not stopping the flow of enemy men, equipment, and supplies.

Air combat sorties in Korea during 1951 were flown 40 percent to 50 percent by Navy and Marine planes—a fact that is generally unknown to the American public. Under both tactical and publicity control of the Fifth Air Force, Naval and Marine Air have gained slight mention.

The gigantic budget. Our newly independent Air Force has duped a gullible public. It has cornered an ever-increasing portion of the defense budget. For fiscal 1953 it asked for $28,000,000,000, was allotted $18,000,000,000, and finally got Presidential approval of $21,000,000,000, as against $14,000,000,000 for the Army and $13,000,000,000 for the Navy (including Navy and Marine Aviation). Astronomical demands have been Air Force routine. When these are necessarily cut, the "wide blue yonder" hierarchy can loudly proclaim a new alibi. Twenty-one billion dollars isn't much under the total national debt after World War I.

Control of the seas has been taken for granted for generations. But times have changed: Without its own built-in air, including carriers, the naval service cannot do the job required as the indispensable means of bringing our other Armed Forces to bear. These requirements have not been met. A

few enemy submarines would have cut off supplies of U. N. troops and left them stranded.

Thus the Nation needs more and better-rounded sea power experience on the Joint Chiefs of Staff and National Security Council. The Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives of Congress—the group that spends the defense money—has twice lately gone strongly on record in favor of this view. But it cannot act without the support of the people. It and they are seeking the most economical way to do the job of, first, preventing, and then winning a war, if necessary.

And let us not forget that our Navy and Marines have traditionally been dispatched to foreign lands without creating the international incidents that result from the use of other forces.

Moreover, the Army and Air Force will be largely impotent without the primary backing of naval service sea-air power. Yet we have only commenced the 4-year grind of building the heart of the fleet, the first aircraft carrier designed since World War II and thus capitalizing on recent combat experience. Why? Jealousy and personal ambition.

Why? What are the reasons for this sorrowful state of affairs? For one thing, Americans are surfeited with the "good things" of life. We own more and more labor-saving devices and enjoy more leisure. After two decades of Federal paternalism and, finally, inflation, we possess lots of money and lots of rights and all manner of security. Probably the majority of us think we've been getting something for nothing. We have—but it's been loss of self-reliance, self-respect, willingness to face facts and to deal forthrightly and courageously with an arrogant enemy. The result: That enemy has taken over at least a third of the world's population and resources under our very noses.

Kremlin communism will continue this neat set of tricks performed without cost to the Soviet just so long as we quake and announce that we are quaking over the fear of Russian intervention. Witness the sorry spectacle of the cease-fire negotiations. Regardless of Presidential invasion of congressional responsibility for committing troops abroad, the fact is we have been and are in Korea to the tune of hundreds of thousands. We are still acting under the United Nations mandate to unite and stabilize Korea from the Yalu River to the tip of the peninsula—not just that portion below the thirty-eighth parallel, of which ranking leaders in our Government screamed for consideration until the Soviet Russian, Jacob Malik, seized the opportunity for another propaganda coup and suggested peace talks, for which we had already been pleading.

Thus, we went into the cease-fire dealings on our hands and knees—in the eyes of the rest of the world—and we have been cravenly conceding this or that ever since. It is a pitiful sight: the United States of America suing for peace for the first time in its history that it has not clearly dictated the terms.

Meanwhile, we would shudder if we dropped our business and pleasure as usual long enough to contemplate the plight of those thousands of guiltless American youths committed to the most stupidly conceived and operated campaign in our annals—treated as mercenaries, members of some foreign legion instead of the flower of this Nation. They've been slaughtered and maimed to a total well over 100,000, not to mention extra thousands crippled by noncombat causes.

There has never been and isn't yet a governmental plan for ending this war which has already become a longer war than World War I and cost us more casualties than all others combined except two world wars. Our young men are indeed being fed into the meat grinder, waging a thankless struggle because of "having one hand tied behind them."

JCS doings: I hold no particular brief for General MacArthur, though it cannot be gainsaid that he wanted to fight this war in a manner to give our young men a chance, that he was outstanding in his dealings with the Japanese, that he towered above other United States representatives in putting the Russians in their place, and, finally, that he had the courage to speak out, regardless of petty regulations, in a time of gravest crisis.

By sorry contrast, the Joint Chiefs of Staff first displayed a combination of abysmal ignorance and jealousy in the defense hearings of 1949, and subsequently perjured themselves last June before the Joint Foreign Affairs-Armed Services Committee of the Senate when they denied that they, along with virtually every other military officer acquainted with the situation, had agreed with the principle of waging war as war is fought—until the heat was turned on by the White House. Yet their sworn duty was to uphold the Constitution—not the Commander in Chief or Defense or State Departments—and to advise the Congress with honest conviction.

If, shortly after the outset, we had invoked both economic and naval blockades of Red China, permitted our combat pilots to engage in hot pursuit over the Manchurian border of enemy planes that attacked us, and, above all, had energetically supported the Nationalists and other anti-Red elements in China, we might well have stood at the Yalu with the enemy on the defensive and the U. N. in a position to talk cease-fire and armistice terms with condescension instead of pleading.

Let me quote from my open letter to the House Armed Services Committee written August 2, 1950: "This Korean fiasco is undoubtedly one of the worst blood-letting crimes in history, due partly to the limited, one-sided education of those controlling the Defense Establishment, and otherwise to their personal ambition. * * * [They] have literally cut the guts out of sea power. * * * If Joe Stalin should at some moment choose to turn loose his submarines and tactical air, our Pacific lifeline would be broken without ceremony and our entire forces of the Far East left stranded.

"Despite the unmistakable score, what do we do? We talk about atom-bombing a lot of swamps and mountains. We run more and more B-36's * * * through multi-million-dollar modifications to try to give them speed inherently prevented by antiquated design. * * * We appropriate huge sums for the purposes of an airlift which may be able to transport a division at inordinate expense but will leave it to rot while it's awaiting weapons, material, supplies, ammunition and all the heavy stuff that simply can't be air-ferried long distances in quantity in the present state of the art of aeronautical engineering.

"We finally get around to ordering the tactical aircraft that were sidetracked in favor of superbombers. This same United States Air Force was at the outbreak of the Korean hostilities actually breaking up P-51's—junking them. Now what are they doing? They are stealing what are left from the National Guard because they are the only planes that will give them enough range to fly effectively from Japanese bases. They have succumbed to the inevitable in failing to have or to hold bases close in where they need them. * * * Whom do they call on for help? None other than the carriers of the United States Navy. * * * Where * * * is this intercontinental air warfare? And where is it going to be for a long time to come?

"Let me emphasize that because of the handicap of distant bases plus the utter lack of training in close air support, the Air Force has * * * done an almost wholly ineffectual job of stopping the North Koreans. Let's ignore the fact that they've used superbombers and huge bombs at fantastic expense to do tactical jobs of breaking communication lines. * * * But we can't ignore the bitter picture of enemy troops and tanks and supplies continuing to flow south. * * *"

The above was written a year and a half ago—shortly after the start of the "police action." With a word or two changed, it is just as true today.

Facts: The purpose of this column is not to make odious comparisons between the armed services. But we need to get at the facts, and one of them is that a large section of the American public has taken the something-for-nothing bait, hook, line, and sinker—A-bombs, intercontinental bombers and other superweapons—so much so that very few Members of Congress have the courage to vote for cutting defense funds, least of all those affecting the proponents of mass destruction, the big-bomber addicts. Yet we taxpayers are rapidly going broke rebuilding what they tore down with little or no military effect in World War II.

And we shall be stuck with the same for Korea. The man-made works of that unhappy country have already been virtually destroyed but we have added now what Harold Stuart, president of the Air Force Association, terms the new tactical concept of warfare to apply the finishing touches. There is nothing new about it except a cover-up for failure of Air Force planning, procurement and training. It consists of interdiction—air strikes at enemy communications and supply lines and advancing troop reinforcements—while our Army divisions and marines hold a static line and continue the toll of casualties. We are just sitting there losing our young men while the enemy, who hasn't heard about the new concept, is bringing up additional forces, preparing to make it really hot for us unless we capitulate or accept cease-fire terms that should be the shame of every American citizen.

Mr. Stuart bitterly denounces the marine commander for having requested 40 supporting sorties. Those would require just 10 aircraft—a negligible fraction of the lone marine air wing.

Oddly enough, marine air to support the marine division was demanded in Korea by the supreme army commander against the resistance of the Air Force member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg. But that was when the U. N. forces were very much over a barrel on the Pusan perimeter. The significant reason for this predicament was that through the dominating vote on the Joint Chiefs of those who have sought for years to destroy the Corps, it had not only been cut to the bone but for the first time in generations withdrawn from Asia.

In an almost inconceivable short time, a marine regimental combat team (erroneously called a brigade) was thrown together and put into action. Shortly over a month later 23,000 marines, scraped from the bottom of the barrel, made the Inchon landings and turned the tide of Korean battle. They did this with their own air support, just as they did when subsequently they cut to pieces six Chinese Communist divisions, plus parts of four more. That was in the Chosin Reservoir region in the northeast, in the bitter cold of winter. Those marines were advancing after the Eighth Army was in rout. They suffered around 4,000 casualties but lost only a few score as missing in action, and marched out in orderly units bringing more than 90 percent of their equipment, despite instructions from the Army corps commander to escape as best they could. As their commanding general put it, "They came down the mountains, bearded, footsore, and physically exhausted but their spirits were high. They were still a fighting division."

"Esprit": These facts once again make it clear that there is no substitute for tradition. Those who speak so emphatically of this country's inability to support two military organizations with duplicate functions had better pay heed. But above all, the American people may well reflect on the virtue of saving their skins.

Such morale accounts for the amazing fact that the marines have at this writing only 250 missing in action for the entire war. Yet they have constituted generally one-fifth or one-sixth of the American troops committed in Korea. The remainder have, by contrast, some 11,000 missing. The answer is that those marines remain on the field of battle, come hell or high water, until they have removed to burial or hospitalization their dead and wounded. This spirit is not something to be lightly destroyed in the interests of cheap politics.

SOME GRIEVOUS ERRORS THE UNITED STATES HAS MADE

Below are a few of the major faults we have made in the past. Some of them are now incorrectable; others need quick attention.

Perhaps too much of this discussion has seemed to deal with Korea. But the difficulties inherent in that utter mess and an attempt at cleaning it up not only come first but may set the pattern for similar engagements elsewhere. We have made some grievous errors which should lead to answers.

Strategic plan: We had no plan short of general mobilization for meeting an emergency of the Korean dimensions.

MacArthur—pro and con: Due to neglect of occupation troop training in Japan, plus spoon feeding and overequipment, these forces, when they had to be thrown hastily into action, were described by more seasoned officers as a cream-puff army. Let it be said, however, in General MacArthur's defense, that he turned the tide of battle by deciding on the Inchon landings and selecting the right team—Marine-Navy—to do the job. Thereafter he was denied the traditional rights and responsibilities of a theater commander; there was a time when MacArthur might have met the opposing leaders in the field under advantageous circumstances and settled in our favor many of the cease-fire points that have since been ignominiously conceded.

The A-bomb fizzle: The atom bomb, upon which our chief hopes and grand strategy had hinged, would have been of little or no value, even disregarding economy.

We haven't licked enemy tactics: Even with air supremacy, we have been unable to stop movement of troops, supplies and equipment, and destroy manpower concentrations, all reports to the contrary notwithstanding. The enemy is a master at camouflage and moves largely at night when we have been relatively helpless.

Built-in air support needed: The Air Force had neither adequate equipment, training, nor organization adapted to direct support of troops. This was due in part to (a) scorn of such technique, (b) expenditure of billions on strategic instead of tactical air, and (c) complete independence of the Army and other services. The latter has made Air Force aid a matter of pure charity. It is no secret that a large number of ranking officers in the Army are bitter about this situation and would do something to correct it but for fear of reprisal. Gen. Mark Clark, Chief of Army Field Forces, has declared himself publicly for return of tactical aviation to the Army. He couldn't be righter.

Where are those big bombers? Level bombing and mere tonnage dropped by B–29's have proved relatively useless and extremely costly in contrast with the pin-point attacks of Navy and Marine dive bombers. The best that can be said is that we've more or less demolished the mere 18 strategic targets existing in all of North Korea and have generally made a shambles of the peninsula. The B–36, course, has not put in an appearance.

Intercontinental air myth: There is as yet no such phenomenon as intercontinental air warfare. Naval carriers then and now are diverted to transport of Air Force aircraft. Aviation has carried less than 2 percent of personnel and supplies to Korea—and at tremendous cost. Virtually everything has had to be moved by sea. No aircraft designer has yet devised a means of combining long distance and performance.

What if we met submarines? We have seen no enemy submarines; yet that fleet, now reported to approach 400, includes many of the most modern type and constitutes a striking force 7 or 8 times the size of that with which Germany started World War II and very nearly won it. We have been able to afford a maximum of six carriers in Korean waters as against an average of 65 off Okinawa in World War II. We would have been duck soup for enemy submarines and air.

Our moth-balled and outmoded carriers: Two-thirds of our aircraft carriers are of the CVE or escort type and are too slow to outrun the faster subs and to launch fighter bombers with acceptable striking loads unless Mother Nature happens to provide some extra wind over the deck. Only a few of these carriers are worth modernizing for even makeshift use. We should long since have commenced a program of building carriers, large and small. The time required is close to 4 years.

Should have backed Chiang: Our failure to actively support dissident elements in Red China has complicated the task in many ways, including the exposure of our youth to hordes of Chinese military who would otherwise have been occupied in the central and southern regions. And incidentally discouraged from attempting the now threatened attacks on southeast Asia.

Coastal blockade: A number of authorities, including the late Admiral Sherman, have agreed that naval blockade of the China coast to a degree to virtually stall industry, would be relatively easy.

Pursue the attacker: We have lost more planes than the enemy in combat, not to mention our operational losses. One important reason has been our self-imposed injunction against hot pursuit and attack on enemy airfields lining the north banks of the Yalu. This correspondent was twice on combat sorties in that area and it was easy to see how helpless an enemy could have left us after pouring in a burst and dashing across the border, whither we were prohibited from firing a shot. (As this is written a press dispatch reports the official admission that "the United States Fifth Air Force has lost nearly twice as many planes as it has shot down since the beginning of the Korean war.")

Steam rollers and shrinking violets: The world struggle is for men's minds. Soviet propaganda has made us look sick by comparison. True, the Russians hold certain advantages such as control of news sources and disregard for veracity, but their combination of blurb, braggadocio, concentration of physical force at various geographical borders, and other devices has not only greatly impressed the bulk of the world's population but long since scared us into a craven state of impotence. Our salable messages and other aids to foreign underground groups deserve substantially more emphasis. We have been putting out flavorless preachments and grammar-school travelogs.

"Peace in our time": Finally, based on the belief of many sensible Americans that the Kremlin does not want an end to free-of-charge hostilities, we were suckers to have been drawn into the cease-fire negotiations—especially so after having our Secretary of State indicate publicly that a settlement at the thirty-eighth parallel would be acceptable. We have clearly placed ourseves in the position of having committed an amazing set of acts of appeasement. Is this the way to prevent or win a war, or gain a peace? It is not. Its combination, with the passage of time, has greaty aggravated our disadvantage psychologically. It has made much more difficult, if not impossible, solutions that at the right time would have been relatively easy.

[From Fortnight of March 17, 1952]

KEY TO DEFENSE: SEA POWER KNOW-HOW

(By Davis Merwin)

PART II

Last fortnight we suggested premises, noted plain facts too often ignored, listed the more grievous errors of United States military and foreign policy and asked a handful of questions. The keystone was Korea, a "one-handed" yet bloody war that shows little promise of termination—unless we go to bat, duck out, or stultify ourselves by contriving a "truce" based on appeasement and humiliation. Our task of uniting and protecting that hapless shambles, Korea, remains a dismal failure. Moreover, we shall have nothing but mounting casualties, now 110,000, and loss of face to show for our efforts—except the question: "Where's the next hot spot?"

This writer proposed reexamination of our military strategy. It will consume over three-fourths of the back-breaking $85,000,000,000 Presidential budget. So we wondered about military economy and asked why Congress has become concerned about the lack of sea-power representation on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The latter's deliberations, through tricks of fate and connivance, are dominated by "land-locked" thinking. Yet they are charged with resolving favorably the life-and-death struggle of a great maritime nation, the United States of America.

In the congressional hearings of the fall of 1949, Gen. Omar Bradley, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said, "However, by appraising the power of the atomic bomb, I am wondering whether we shall ever have another large-scale amphibious operation. Frankly, the atomic bomb, properly delivered, almost precludes such a possibility." The late sainted Billy Mitchell wrote in 1928, "It is practical to do away entirely * * * with the aircraft carrier," and "Japanese submarines and aircraft would sink the United States fleet long before it came anywhere near this coast." This view, in effect, has been repeated by at least one member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg of the Air Force, who probably has had more to do than any other with limiting the use of our aircraft carriers on hand and the development of new designs. Construction of the flush-deck ("super") carrier, the first to incorporate the lessons of World War II, was belatedly recommenced after Congress took the matter into its own hands.

The record of carrier-based aircraft throughout World War II showed 18 Japanese planes shot down for each American plane lost. This was in comparison with 5 to 1 for the Air Force—a performance three and a half times as effective for closer-to-the-target, high-performance carrier aircraft.

"What if—"

There is little doubt that without the combination of amphibious operations and aircraft carriers, U. N. forces would have been backed into the sea. In any case, literally hundreds of thousands of lives, chiefly American, would have been lost at Inchon and Hungnam, not to mention ports of lesser debarkation and withdrawal. At Inchon, close to 100,000 troops were landed and at Hungnam, as is well known, some 200,000

mortals were evacuated by the same discredited amphibious means, under the protection of carrier-based Navy and Marine aircraft.

Here are at least four essentials:

First. Clean house: toss out the political administration and so-called military experts who have so miserably bungled the life-and-death problems attaching to the gravest crisis in United States history.

Second. Stay solvent and therefore able to survive, by investing primarily in research and development. Plan for production capacity. Cut the budget. Stop being deluded by the sophistry of "strength" from billions of dollars spent on tons and numbers of implements and weapons, including aircraft, that will clog our warehouses and perhaps be obsolete when needed most. Remain flexible in our ability to meet contingencies.

Third. We are a tiny island occupying 2 percent of the globe. Our interests, civil and military, are maritime. Yet we have at least a 4- or 5-to-1 domination of the top planning councils by so-called experts unfamiliar with the ways of the sea. Three of them are the Army and Air Force members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who have consistently voted down aircraft carriers, Navy and Marine groups and squadrons. Their land-locked experience, along with that of most other top members of the Defense Department, not to mention the Commander in Chief, is balanced by a single sea-power voice.

As a gesture toward correcting this imbalance, Members of both Houses of Congress have repeatedly introduced legislation designed primarily to add as a full-fledged member to the Joint Chiefs of Staff the Comnandant of the Marine Corps. Currently pending in the House is Senate bill S. 677 as amended by the House Armed Services Committee. This deserves the studious consideration of every thoughtful American.

The initiative in this proposal has come strictly from Members of Congress. It is generally unknown that the Commandant's qualifications are unique in that he is the only officer concerned who has served years with both Navy and Army, as well as other departments, and in amphibious and combined arms operations. To use the words of the House Armed Services Committee: "The United States Marine Corps is and has always been since its inception a separate service, distinct and apart from the United States Army, United States Navy and United States Air Force." And "it was the committee's unanimous view in March 1950 that the interests of national security demand that the deliberations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff be founded upon a broader base. * * * The committee believes, as it did in early 1950, that this can best be accomplished by seating the Commandant of the Marine Corps as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff [which] will have the wholly salutary effect of enhancing, broadening and balancing the deliberations of that body."

Fourth. Having augmented the thinking of our military experts in the maritime field with which we are vitally concerned, we shall be better prepared to plan and spend toward real defense at least cost. Currently we are devoting billions to air bases overseas—bases that can, as they already have in England and threaten to be in north Africa, be largely disqualified or even inactivated at the political whim of an ally. Also, they are clearly in one identifiable spot and within easy striking distance of the enemy who can make things tough, to say the least, if not impossible. Besides, these bases not only have to be defended but, much more important, they must be supplied, and the naval service will be the only means by which this can be done. There is a rank misconception that with Britain's help we can now lick anything afloat and that mere numbers of ships and tonnage capacity will do our job of bringing in raw materials and transmitting equipment, supplies, material, and even manpower. This is furthest from the truth.

All of us grant that we must control the sea lanes. The question is how. We had best note that we must conjure with the destructive power of enemy submarines many times greater than that of the German Fleet which all but defeated us, of powerful enemy tactical air, and of a number of other elements.

We are too prone to scorn the lessons of the past, especially when the blessings of the future are mostly on paper—such as these much-publicized secret weapons. No substitute has been yet found for the fast carrier task force with its high degree of mobility, flexibility, concentration of force, its precision, and its capacity for surprise. It may move up to 700 miles a day. As a weaving, evasive, altogether fleeting target, it can strike with its aircraft around the enemy periphery and inland, with little or no warning—which means a tremendous gain in forcing enemy dispersion of defenses. It can launch planes capable of almost any performance and bomb load, infinitely superior to those which must fly longer distances.

The investment in this task force is, first in ships that may be used in a variety of other operations, and, second, in a complex that, unlike the fixed land base, can be employed as needed at any number of points over virtually the entire globe.

Remember?

What are the facts in terms of our planning and construction? First let us emphasize that carrier-borne aircraft in World War II turned in a shoot-down record slightly over three times better than that of land-based aviation. Then note the comparison in carrier numbers resulting from the shortsightedness of our advisers. In the last war we operated over 100 carriers. Today 70 of these are relatively useless because of a combination of increased submarine speed and limitations connected with launching aircraft of postwar design.

Of the remaining 28 carriers, we have but 12 in commission and two in reserve. That leaves the other 14 still in mothballs. It ignores economy and the necessity of modernization to partially meet new requirements. Since Korea, some 400 naval craft, including three battleships, have been demothballed. Yet we have not a single addition to those 12 aircraft carriers. Why? Because the Joint Chiefs of Staff won't permit Naval and Marine Aviation to "compete" with the Air Force—which is another way of saying that Air Force General Vandenberg calls the tune and his Army fraternity brothers, Generals Collins and Bradley, sing "amen," while the sole naval service member, Admiral Fechteler, being outvoted, "practices unification."

We have 14 air groups of Naval aviators and planes to man the 12 active carriers—a number wholly inadequate to meet the demands of fatigue and attrition. There should be roughly twice the number.

In the 1953 budget proposal, air groups are to be increased by a mere two, and carriers in commission are to remain static. Navy-Marine pilots require 18 months to train, and carriers up to 6 months to get out of mothballs, let alone some 2 years to put through modernization. Here, while we propose spending billions for new equipment at inflated prices, we permit to rot an investment of hundreds of millions in critical materials which could be put in running order for cut prices and, represent the element of our defense, without which no other can effectively move to meet the enemy beyond our shores. To the thinking American, this situation is suicidal.

There are many points that should be covered: Characteristic of the enemy, crying needs in terms of information and aid to those behind the iron curtain, the tremendous importance to us of the much-neglected Orient, the fallacy of total war and destruction, the sour fruits of one-man secret international settlements, our feeling that we are assuming world leadership by merely dispensing dollars, and the measures that should be taken when the "peace" negotiations fail, as they are bound to, either obviously or subtly.

We cannot, under the burden of our present debt, afford senseless luxuries. It may be sooner than we think that we shall be working for the Kremlin if the people of this country don't wake up and take an active part in urging economy, in that almost inconceivable budget devoted to things military. We must start now finding out how to get the most for our money. The enemy is not deterred by braggadocio. He is smart. Before we proceed beyond the 95 groups authorized for the United States Air Force, we had better build first the sea-air units, without which the Air Force will never contribute its bits to air power. Aircraft independent of surface forces, has convinced painstaking observers of absolutely nothing.

Our basic air power is furnished by Navy and Marines whose aviation is "built-in"—designed and trained for the purpose and commanded by officers with combined air and surface combat experience. It takes its bases with it. It operates close to the target and thus excels in speed, maneuverability and impact. Besides, it costs less. When better overseas bases are built they will be aircraft carriers—if the American public "snaps out of it" and takes the play away from the landlocked "strategic planners."

RESOLUTION TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF TIDELANDS BILL—RESOLUTION COMING OVER FROM PREVIOUS DAY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be stated.

The resolution (S. Res. 247) to discharge the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs from the further consideration of H. R. 4484, the so-called tidelands bill, submitted by Mr. CONNALLY on January 14, 1952, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4484) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the continental shelf lying outside of State boundaries.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be indefinitely postponed, because a bill on this subject has already been reported from the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO SETTLEMENT OF STEEL STRIKE—RESOLUTION COMING OVER FROM PREVIOUS DAY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution com-

ing over from a previous day, which will be stated.

The resolution (S. Res. 328) relative to a settlement of the steel strike and interim resumption of production, submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY on June 3, 1952, was read as follows:

Whereas the United States of America has undertaken and is exercising leadership in a global struggle for the preservation of democratic institutions;

Whereas this Nation has made and is making great sacrifices to arm against and repel totalitarian aggression;

Whereas the Armed Forces of the United States are deployed throughout the world to discourage aggression by totalitarian forces;

Whereas many of our fighting men in Korea have sacrificed their lives and our forces there are face to face with a totalitarian enemy;

Whereas the forces of the United States and the United Nation countries associated with it in Korea and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization are dependent upon the industrial production of this Nation for arms and supplies;

Whereas continued production of arms and material are vital to the security of the United States and the free nations associated with it; and

Whereas the continued production of steel and steel products is essential to the adequate production of arms and material required by the Armed Forces of the United States and the democratic nations dedicated to the preservation of freedom: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States call upon the parties to the current steel dispute (1) to resume collective bargaining negotiations immediately (2) to agree upon interim conditions which will make possible the immediate resumption of production pending settlement of the issues in dispute, and (3) to make every effort in the interest of the national welfare and security to speedily resolve the dispute.

The Senate also calls upon the President of the United States to make available to the parties to this dispute the services of any Government agency which the parties to the dispute may request as an aid to collective bargaining thereby to facilitate the resumption of production and the resolution of the dispute.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I feel that the resolution of the Senator from Minnesota should come up for debate, because there should be some discussion of the situation facing Congress today. This resolution gives us an opportunity to discuss the situation.

First, I wish to make a statement with regard to the situation which confronts the Senate. I am very grateful that my colleagues supported me in obtaining a postponement of the pending bill until Monday, and also supported me in obtaining a postponement until today. I am sure that they, too, are glad that this was done, because it has prevented the Senate from being charged with breaking down the negotiations by passing some form of legislation while the negotiations were in progress.

Even Senators who did not support my position should be doubly grateful, because they, too, cannot now be charged with having prevented a settlement of the strike.

The situation is altogether different today. We have heard the message of the President of the United States. There are several proposed amendments, either pending or lying on the table. Personally I felt last week, before the steel negotiations began, that the Senate should pass some form af seizure law which would result in the resumption of operations in the steel mills. What form of law it should be I am unable to state at this time. I wish to hear the debate. I felt that possibly we should not take a chance on the Taft-Hartley law for the settlement of this dispute. At least it will require some time to settle it. I merely rose to express my gratitude to the Senate. I am very happy that all these questions were postponed until today, because the Senate cannot now be charged with interfering with the negotiations.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I think the Senate should be grateful to its leader for the judgment which he has shown in this matter. I know that the junior Senator from Michigan is grateful to him for that reason.

I should like to ask the majority leader if he would tell us whether, in view of the great importance of the legislation which we shall be considering this afternoon, with regard to the steel plants, he does not feel that it might be a wise course to extend the period of time during which all of the amendments could be debated. As I understand the situation the Maybank amendment; the Morse amendment, which has been considered by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and the Monroney amendment, are all to be considered in connection with the present situation.

I am not sure, under the parliamentary situation, whether they can all be brought before the Senate as amendments to the Byrd amendment. But they should all be discussed thoroughly before any action is taken on any of them, so that the Senate will know what it is doing. I am wondering whether it would not be wise to have more than 15 minutes of debate allowed on each of the amendments because of the importance of the Maybank, Monroney, Morse, and Byrd amendments.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I previously asked unanimous consent in that regard, but objection was heard. Of course there is a method available for obtaining additional time for debate. There is no way to keep the Senate from providing additional time because no doubt amendments will be offered which will provide the additional time to which the Senator from Michigan has referred. Personally I do not want to see votes unduly delayed.

Mr. MOODY. I do not want to see them delayed either.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am perfectly willing to have the Senate pass on all the proposals on this subject which are now before it, because a deadlock has developed in the steel negotiations, and I see no reason why we should delay longer than is absolutely necessary, consistent with a careful consideration of the entire subject.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield again?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I should also like to see the matter settled, and settled this afternoon, if possible, because the steel plants are not now operating and the Nation cannot get along without the production of steel.

It seems to me that any proposals so technical as are the Maybank, Morse, and Monroney amendments should be explained to the Senate. I do not believe that such explanation can be given in 15 minutes on each mendment. That is my only point.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I feel very strongly that seizure legislation should be enacted just as promptly as we can wisely enact it. On the other hand, we are running a very grave risk in passing legislation of a more or less permanent character when no opportunity can be given to the Members of the Senate to know and understand what is contained in the proposals before us or the implications of such proposed legislation.

The majority leader stated that he was anxious to hear the debate. There will be no debate except in a most perfunctory manner. Time has lapsed on all the amendments, as I understand. Even though some perfecting amendments may be offered, 15 minutes of debate on a subject of this importance does not seem to me to be of any account. It does not seem to me to make any sense. I do not know what parliamentary device can be resorted to, but certainly when the Senate has before it legislation of such tremendous importance as that involved in pending proposals careful study should be made of the whole subject. I should like to see the various proposals or bills referred to committee for a short period of study and reported to the Senate. That is the way to find out exactly what is contained in the bills. I do not know whether that could be done.

Mr. McFARLAND. Of course, the Morse bill has been studied by a committee. It has been studied at some length. Although we find ourselves in a position of having to speed things up, these are critical times. I have confidence that the Senate will work out a solution of the problem in some way. Perhaps it will not be resolved entirely to my satisfaction or entirely to the satisfaction of the Senator from New York, but I am certain the Senate will find a solution.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall be glad to yield further, but I do not want to take any more time from the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly I do not expect to be entirely satisfied in every instance with the kind of legislation the Senate may pass, but I think legislation of such vital importance should be entitled to more than 15 minutes, 20 minutes, or a half hour of consideration by the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. I agree with the Senator from New York, but I would prefer to yield the floor now so that the subject may be discussed. We have 35 minutes remaining which can be used for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would announce that at 2 o'clock the unfinished business will be automatically laid before the Senate regardless of whether action on the resolution under consideration is completed at that time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall discuss very briefly the resolution which is now before the Senate. I should like to utilize the time to bring to the attention of the Senate an analysis of some of the amendments relating to seizure which have been proposed to the Defense Production Act. I am confident that the Senate will take some positive action, as it justly should, and for the purpose of understanding what we are about to do I believe it would be well to make a searching analysis of the proposals which are offered as alternative proposals by way of amendments to the Defense Production Act.

It has been my feeling, Mr. President, that the way in which we should legislate on the subject of seizure, is after extensive committee hearings. I have always felt that it would be much more desirable to be able to consider a seizure bill on its own, instead of in the form of an amendment to any other legislation. However, we are not always capable of making a choice. The fact of the matter is that we have before us the Defense Production Act, which relates to the allocation of materials for defense purposes and to the stabilization program with respect to prices and wages. The steel dispute is certainly tied in with the purposes, goals, and objectives of the Defense Production Act. If the steel dispute continues, the operation of the Defense Production Act, for all practical purposes, will be stopped dead, in terms of being able to realize its objective. Therefore, as the President stated so concisely and to the point, the time is at hand for Congress to act.

If we should take action at this time, I wish to reassure the Senate that we would not have a measure to which no prior consideration had been given by Members of this body, for much time has been devoted to the subject matter of seizure legislation. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] at the time of the President's seizure of the steel mills, immediately introduced two bills, one applying to the general principle of seizure and the other specifically applying to the steel dispute.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare took the two bills of the Senator from Oregon under consideration and held hearings on the entire subject matter of the seizure of property during a period of national emergency, considering during the hearings some of the procedures and policies which should be considered by Congress if we are to enact seizure legislation.

A number of witnesses from industry, labor, and the public generally appeared before the committee. It is fair to say that neither the labor witnesses nor the industry witnesses were in favor of seizure legislation, because they know that seizure is a very hard instrumentality and that it surely steps into and interferes with the individual rights of both management or owners of property and those who are the workers.

As a result of the hearings before the subcommittee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the acting chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Safety, referred the Morse bill to the subcommittee of which I am the chairman. We held hearings. The body of the testimony is full and comprehensive. I believe that as a result of those hearings, as a result of several executive sessions, and as a result of a considerable amount of staff work and technical work on the part of our counsel and staff director and his assistants, we have been able in cooperation with the Senator from Oregon to prepare a proposal which should merit the confidence and the support of the Senate, as well as of the House, I hope, and ultimately become law.

As of last week I asked that the committee staff analyze the Maybank amendment, the Monroney amendment, and the Morse amendment to the Defense Production Act. There are some very sharp differences between those proposals.

I may say that the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are closer together than are the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma, or the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina, and the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

For a few minutes, Mr. President, let me review the general objectives and general procedures and policies laid down by the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

First, it is an amendment to the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Does the Senator from Minnesota have an analysis of the amendment submitted by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, I do not.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not understand that it has been referred to in the analysis.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; if I did mention it, I was in error, for I was really referring to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. GEORGE. Another amendment lies at the desk and is before us. I did not know whether it had been included in the analysis.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say that it requires no analysis to determine that the Congress can express its view that the Taft-Hartley Act should be applied; that is a decision which Congress can make at any time, of course.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no; I was speaking of the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR].

Mr. HUMPHREY. The only amendment we have had from the Senator from Maryland is the one asking the Congress to go on record as favoring the use of the Taft-Hartley Act injunctive procedure. I felt sure that a technical study of that amendment would not be required.

The analysis before us is an analysis of the three seizure proposals.

The amendment of the Senator from Oregon would amend title II of the Taft-Hartley Act. It would not supersede it, but would amend it. In other words, the so-called Morse amendment gives the President the sort of choice the President spoke about today in his message to the joint session of Congress. The Morse amendment, if adopted, would be permanent legislation; it would not be of a temporary nature.

In the second place, the Morse bill, or amendment, would be applied in national emergencies which would constitute a threat to the national security, as a result of an actual or threatened strike or lock-out in vital industries or plants. We should remember that the Taft-Hartley Act cannot be used, under the terms of that act, in the case of a specific plant; the use of that act is confined to Nation-wide lock-outs or strikes or lock-outs or strikes affecting the major portion of an industry.

However, it is entirely possible that during a period of defense emergency, a strike or lock-out in merely one plant or one factory or one mill or one mine could seriously cripple the defense effort. That could be true, for example, in the field of electronics or in the field of aircraft production. We need a legislative tool which can be applied when only one plant is shut down because of a labor dispute. The so-called Morse amendment would take care of such a situation.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Would it not be possible for a strike or lock-out in the case of a small union whose members maintained a high-tension line connecting major segments of the Nation's electrical grid to interfere with or cripple the Nation's defense effort?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is true. Under the Taft-Hartley law, in such a case the President would not be permitted to use the injunctive procedures provided by that act, because the entire industry or a major portion thereof would not be affected.

Mr. MONRONEY. Carrying that thought further, let me point out that, of course, the Taft-Hartley Act does not permit the use of an injunction to keep the railroads running. Congress has sat here and has, without taking action, seen the power the Government once had in that situation expire on June 1. Today every railroad can be stopped, and the Government does not have power to prevent a Nation-wide crippling railroad strike or even a railroad strike in a connecting link of the railroad system, such as the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad, which is the major link on the Atlantic seaboard between the North and the South, running from Washington, D. C., to Richmond, Va.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. Once again he has pointed out some of the details and complexities of the problem with which we are confronted and to which we are giving consideration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Before I put my question I should like to say that I think the President of the United States made a very statesmanlike speech today to the joint session of Congress in the interest of defense and of the security of the United States. It took a very courageous man, in view of the terrific criticism to which the President has been subjected, to come before the Congress and not only defend his position on the steel crisis but also set forth what I believe to be a very constructive course of action to be followed, and to put it squarely up to the Congress to take such action as in its wisdom it deems proper.

Of course, that is not a new position for the President to take; he took exactly the same position on April 9, when he sent to Congress, or at least to the Senate, a message pointing out that if the Congress in its wisdom did not approve the emergency action he had taken, Congress should follow whatever course of action it believed proper to follow. In his letter the President indicated very clearly that he would carry out the will and the wishes of the Congress.

I agree with the Senator from Minnesota that under the parliamentary situation which now confronts us, we simply are not going to have sufficient time to do the important job of statesmanship which I believe confronts the Senate today. I am very sad at heart and very blue about that matter, because I believe the action we take this afternoon will have a tremendous impact on American life. Certainly there is great danger that some precious human and political values will be injured this afternoon. Certainly we should pass no measure by way of adding a rider to the pending bill. Of course if there is no chance to pass any legislation on the steel crisis independent of this bill then I shall reluctantly vote for the best rider that is offered. However, I am convinced that the pending rider is not sound.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have already yielded to the Senator from Oregon, and he wishes to complete his statement or question.

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I should like to complete it, please.

Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that I believe that we should pass no measure by way of rider to the pending bill but we may be forced into it by a denial of any other alternative. I believe we should have a gentlemen's understanding that the moment we pass the pending bill, without adding to it a rider dealing with labor issues, we should then proceed immediately to pass independent labor legislation.

I happen to be of the point of view that such legislation should be in the form of a seizure bill, in the sense that it would vest the President with power to seize, subject to some very careful and effective checks upon the President by Congress. That was my position before the seizure of the steel industry; it has been my position since 1950, when I first introduced a seizure bill in the Senate, at the time of the coal dispute in that year. I am of the opinion that we have been derelict in not putting on the statute books permanent legislation, since 1950, when that emergency first arose.

The question I wish to address to the Senator from Minnesota relates to the effect of putting into operation at this time the Taft-Hartley Act. Of course, we can have and we certainly do have sincere differences of opinion among ourselves as to whether the President, in keeping with his constitutional obligations to see to it that the laws of the country are faithfully executed, should in the first instance have sought recourse to the principal piece of labor legislation on the statute books, insofar as congressional sanction is concerned, namely, the Taft-Hartley Act. We can have reasonable differences of opinion as to whether last December, when the first threat of the present strike arose, the President should have said to both parties to the dispute, "Although the Taft-Hartley Act is on the statute books and I believe it is a poor medium for a fair settlement of such disputes in an emergency period, nevertheless until Congress changes the law, I propose to follow it."

Had the President done that last December, probably there would have been a strike, because I am satisfied that the very appointment of a board under the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act would have caused a strike in the steel mills. If that had happened there would have been a period of a number of days during which the steel mills would have been closed. That period no doubt would have been sufficiently long to permit the furnaces to grow cold, which would have meant that a period from 2 to 3 weeks would have been required to return the steel mills to production, even if the men had been willing to return to work within 1 hour after the furnaces became cold.

That was the dilemma which faced the President. I say we can have honest and sincere differences of opinion as to whether at that time he followed a wise course of action, whether at that time he should not have said, "The Taft-Hartley law being on the books, even though I think it an ineffective instrumentality for handling a dispute such as this, nevertheless it is the expression of the wisdom of the Congress, and I am going to follow it." He did not follow it, with the result that, as he pointed out in his address today, there was a voluntary suspension of a strike on the part of the workers for about 99 days. In addition there has been a period of suspension of strike on the part of the workers up until the time of the Supreme Court decision on June 2. However, at long last—and I think it very fortunate, at long last in the history of our country we now have a Supreme Court decision in which the majority have outlined, at least with a considerable degree of specific delineation, the powers of the President under article II of the Constitution.

I have always said, and I repeat it now, that once the Supreme Court of the United States speaks, its decision is the law; and if we are to maintain government by law in this country, we must see to it that a Supreme Court decision is carried out to the *n*th degree. But the President, I think, was quite right today when he pointed out that, if he now, at this late date, follows the course of action of putting the Taft-Hartley law into operation and seeking an injunction, it will take some days before an injunction can be issued. The President will have to appoint an emergency board, which will have to make its report, and then the judge will consider whether he thinks the equities call upon him to issue an injunction. But assuming that he does issue an injunction, we then shall be in the position of sending the steelworkers back into the plants under the mandate of a court injunction for 80 more days, to work for the private profits of an employer, under the terms and conditions and hours of employment which the private employer determines. I think the President was quite right when he made what I think is a very horse-sense observation, that such a procedure would not be fair. It does not happen to be fair, in my judgment, now to put the steelworkers in such a position that they must work under the orders of private industry, in view of all the economic facts which have been presented in this case, facts which show that they are entitled to changes in wages and hours and working conditions. The justification for some increase in wages and for other benefits to the workers is admitted on the record by the steel companies themselves. I say it is not fair to impose the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law under those circumstances. It is not in keeping, at least with my sense of American justice, to say to a group of workers, "Now, you must submit yourselves to the dictates of private employers for a period of 80 days. Try to settle this between yourselves through collective bargaining, and if you do not do that, you go to jail."

It happens to be the view of the junior Senator from Oregon that if any group in this country, I care not how large the number—I have never been the least concerned about the argument, that we may have to put a great many men in jail, if they defy government by law—if any group in this country ever get to the point of thinking they are bigger than the law, and defy a court injunction, they should be put in jail. So, if a Taft-Hartley injunction were issued, and it was defied—as the President indicated this morning, if I interpreted his remarks correctly, even an injunction might not get the workers back into the mill—I would be among the first to say, "Let the law run its course, and let the law defiers be incarcerated for being in contempt of government by law, as well as contempt of court."

But let us assume that hurdle is surmounted, and that the men do go back to work. Of course, those familiar with labor-relations problems know that men can go back to work and still not work very much. Unless there is within their hearts a sense that they have been dealt with fairly by the Government, there can be a dragging of the feet, there can be a loss of spirit, there can be a low working morale on the part of resentful workers. I should be very much surprised, knowing the working people of this country as I think I do, to find that they would go back to work for the 80-day period with very much enthusiasm in view of the way they have cooperated with their Government during these many days of time pending consideration of this dispute. But let us keep in mind the kind of fine which the operation of the Taft-Hartley law would impose upon these workmen. There has been some talk to the effect that an injunction might put the union in such a position that it could be fined if there was the slightest tendency on the part of any segment of the union to violate the injunction. Of course, if there were a violation, I would use the punishment of fines as well as the punishment of jail sentence for contempt of court as a means of enforcing the injunction. As the enforcement officer of the directive orders of the War Labor Board during the war, I made clear at all times to both unions and employers that if ever a union or if ever an employer thought the union or the employer was bigger than the Government and defied a directive order of the Board, which under those circumstances was the law until reversed by the courts, I would recommend the use of all available forces of Government to compel compliance with the order. That would be my position in regard to the enforcement of a Taft-Hartley injunction if the case should reach that point.

But let us not overlook the fact that the very operation of the Taft-Hartley law would impose a tremendous fine, day by day, upon the steel workers, with no corresponding fine upon the steel industry. I cannot vouch for the accuracy of the figure, but I am having it checked and will correct my remarks later this afternoon if the figure I now use is mathematically erroneous, but I understand that under a Taft-Hartley law injunction the fine, which in effect would be placed upon the workers in the industry would be $8,000,000 per week. In other words, requiring the workers to go back for 80 days, to work for the wages the steel industry now pays, when it is admitted that their wages should be higher would amount to a loss to the workers of approximately $8,000,000 per week based upon all the economic benefits allowed in the recommendations of the Wage Stabilization Board. That is why I say that resort to the Taft-Hartley Act, in effect amounts to an imposition upon them of a fine of $8,000,000 a week, despite the fact that now, for well over 100 days, they have sought to cooperate with their Government in trying to reach an amicable collective-bargaining settlement of this case and obtain the economic benefits to which they are already entitled.

Mr. President, if anyone thinks that following such a course of action is going to result in harmonious relations in the steel industry and is going to result in developing a sense on the part of the workers that they have been dealt with fairly by the Government, I respectfully say I simply do not think he knows the psychology of the American worker.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for permitting me to make these few brief remarks, and I want to close by saying that, in view of all the surrounding facts and circumstances which the record of this case shows, the imposition at this late date of a Taft-Hartley law injunction, and requiring the steel workers to return to the mills for 80 days, will be interpreted by tens of thousands of them as an attempt on the part of the Congress of the United States to treat them as second-class citizens. Let me assure you, Mr. President, that they and other workers in this country have no intention of being disfranchised, and they will make very clear in due course of time that they have not been disfranchised, even though we may follow a course of action in the Senate today which seems to treat them as second-class citizens, and which they will recognize as being decidedly unfair to them.

Mr. President, I would much prefer, if we are unwilling to adopt a fair seizure law here today, to follow the second of the three suggestions of the President of the United States, namely, that we merely pass an out-and-out authorization for him to proceed forthwith to get an injunction in the steel case and let the courts pass upon it; because I have tremendous confidence in the fairness of the American judicial process. I may disagree with decisions which the courts reach sometimes, but that does not stop me from supporting the judicial process.

In view of what has developed in the steel industry since the Senate met last Friday, I certainly would not favor today forcing the workers back to the mills under a Taft-Hartley injunction.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his splendid discussion of the merits and demerits of the alternate procedures which are available or which could be available if Congress would take action.

I rose to make a few remarks to get the debate under way so that we could have a better appreciation of the problem before us. I was discussing the Morse bill. I want to make the RECORD perfectly clear that the Morse bill was not written overnight; it was not written by one man; it was not conjured up from a momentary reflection upon the problem. The Morse bill has been rewritten at least four or five times, section by section, line by line, with different members of the committee making their respective contributions.

What does the bill, in substance, do? It amends the Taft-Hartley Act. It applies when there is a strike or a shutdown of operations which would threaten the national security, for a strike may affect a whole industry or a large section of it. It provides that the President may issue a proclamation of emergency, and when he has issued such a proclamation, he can appeal to the parties to the dispute to continue work and operation. Then the President will immediately report to the Congress, with recommendations of procedures to settle and to continue production.

The Morse bill also provides that simultaneously with the issuance of the emergency proclamation, if the President deems it necessary in the public interest and for the national security, he may take immediate action to seize a plant in order to keep the operation of the industry under way.

Under the seizure a particular department of Government will be authorized to operate as the administrative agency, such as the Department of Commerce, the Department of Defense, or whatever department the President may choose.

Where does Congress come in? It has the right, after the President has acted, and after seizure, at any time within 10 days, to enter objection and to stop the seizure. This is similar to the procedure under the present Reorganization Act, under which the President can send to Congress a reorganization plan, and by a resolution, Congress can set it aside. Congress can either confirm or reject it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I want to make it absolutely clear that when I submitted my amendment to the National Defense Production Act I stated in emphatic terms that it was not permanent legislation, that it was an amendment which would terminate by law on March 1, and that any section of the act could be repealed by a concurrent resolution of Congress. I further stated that I did not think the amendment was perfect. I drew it the best I could. I want the RECORD to show, before the voting begins, that I do not think my amendment is perfect. I said it was going to hurt both labor and management, and it will.

I was hopeful that the steel strike might be settled by this time, but it has not been settled. I say this much, to the honor of both parties to the dispute, that they have agreed to certain efforts at production for the boys overseas. My amendment was brought up in the last few minutes of the debate when I had a gentleman's understanding with the gentleman from Masachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] that we would not vote on it on that day. I knew that I cannot amend it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. He has made his position perfectly clear, and I think he has done a great service by bringing

forward his amendment to the Defense Production Act.

I should like now to point out the peculiar and almost ridiculous situation in which we find ourselves. Here is the Maybank substitute for the Byrd amendment. We are helpless to amend an amendment which the author says he wants to amend. We have placed ourselves in a legislative strait-jacket. I do not care what the rules of the Senate may be, the people of the United States will think it is a ridiculous situation, and it is. We should be able to legislate honestly and above board, with all the time we need to make amendments, suggestions, and revisions, if we are going to pass legislation on a subject of this kind.

So I shall vote against these proposals as they come up. The only one I intend to vote for is the Morse proposal, because I have had a chance to know what is contained in it. I think it is most unfortunate, because of the situation under the unanimous-consent agreement, that the Senate of the United States is handcuffed, and we may later handcuff the American economy because of the rules of the Senate. We place a unanimous-consent agreement above the welfare of the American economy. This may be pleasing to people who are parliamentarians, but I think it is legislative nonsense, and I hope that before the day is through we shall do something about it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree with the Senator. The Maybank amendment needs to be changed in several particulars, but I intend to vote for the Maybank amendment and make an effort to amend it so as to provide for a congressional veto of any seizure that may take place after it is adopted. The issue is whether we are going to give the President some real tools with which to keep production flowing during a crisis, or whether we are going to say, "Use an act which is now on the statute books, but which will end up in a few days in a blind alley."

The Taft-Hartley Act has the defect of putting the issue back on the Congress after 80 days.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. What the Senator says is correct. The Supreme Court has stated that Congress is the lawmaking body, that the President has no right to seize a plant except in accordance with a law passed by the Congress. Congress is in a position to return to constitutional government for the first time in many years. That is why I proposed an amendment when I saw the Supreme Court's ruling. The Supreme Court has ruled that Congress is the legislative body, not the President.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have only about 2 minutes remaining, and I should like to conclude.

The Morse bill not only provides that there shall be the issuance of a national emergency proclamation, but it limits the time of seizure to 60 days without a concurrent resolution on the part of both Houses to extend the seizure. It establishes emergency boards. It provides that at the very time the Government may seize the property, there may be some adjustment of the economic issues. It provides that there can be an increase in money wages as the result of a finding of the emergency board. That board is empowered to cover the entire field. The Morse bill also provides that fair compensation shall be allowed to employers, so that both workers and employers are treated with equity.

As the President pointed out today, the measure affords further protection.

Mr. President, on Friday of last week I asked the staff of the Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to prepare a full analysis of the three amendments on the subject of seizure which are before the Senate for consideration, one amendment submitted by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], another by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and a third by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

I have the analysis in printed form, as set forth in the report of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and I ask that a copy of this analysis be placed on the desk of each Senator, so that Senators may become familiar with the respective provisions. I think the analysis will provide a great deal of guidance as we debate these measures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the analysis may be placed on the desks of Senators.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if we are to legislate in this field, I believe that the Senate should carefully examine and analyze all the amendments. I ask that the analysis of the amendments to which I have just referred be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, so that we may have in the RECORD the facts about the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the record as follows:

Committee analysis showing amendments to the Defense Production Act of 1950

	Maybank	Monroney	Morse
(1) Amends	DPA; would expire Mar. 1, 1953, as part of title IV.	Universal Military Training and Selective Service Act of 1948; probably would expire Mar. 1, 1953, as part of title IV of DPA.	Title II of Taft-Hartley; would not expire with title IV; a permanent amendment.
(2) Coverage and conditions of applicability.	Dispute and actual or threatened strike or lock-out in "entire industry or a substantial part thereof"; if strike or lock out would imperil national defense or defeat purposes of DPA. (Problem: dispute in few plants or a single one producing critical defense items.) (Can be used as alternate to present Taft-Hartley provisions.)	Labor dispute in "plants or facilities" so indispensable that cessation of production would endanger national health or security, including military assistance to foreign nations under programs approved by Congress. To be used if Taft-Hartley, Railway Labor Act, or DPA used without success or if President finds no substantial prospect of using them with success.	National emergency from threat to national security from actual or threatened strike or lock-out in vital industry or plant. Mediation or conciliation exhausted without success. Can be used as alternative to present Taft-Hartley provisions. Present Taft-Hartley procedures could be used at any time up to appointment of emergency board. Possible that upon appointment of Board, President could leave to later decision whether it should operate as regular Taft-Hartley board of inquiry (making no recommendations) or emergency board which makes recommendations.
(3) Initial step	President to refer dispute to National Emergency Price and Wage Board.	President to issue proclamation reciting findings. Announces that if no settlement within 7 days or period set by President may seize.	President to issue proclamation of emergency. Appeal to parties to continue work and operations. Immediately report to Congress with recommendations for procedures to settle and continue production. (Implies that Congress must be in session at the outset of procedure.)
(4) Second step and injunction provisions.	Board to inquire and report within 113 days with recommendations, including those on wages and prices. When dispute is referred, strike or lock-out prohibited. Applies injunction provisions of sec. 707 of DPA. Injunction could be against "any person"—quite broad.	If designated period elapses may seize on 2 days' notice to Congress. (Implies that Congress must be in session when seizure effected. (P. 3 11.3-5, make somewhat unclear conditions under which seizure may be made; some inflexibility here.)) No specific injunction provision. Under United Mine Workers case, injunction could be secured after seizure.	May make additional recommendations. These or original recommendations can include seizure. As soon as such recommendation made, may seize. (This can be almost simultaneous with initial step.) When seizure order issued Attorney General can procure injunction against union and officers against strike if necessary.

Committee analysis showing amendments to the Defense Production Act of 1950—Continued

	Maybank	Monroney	Morse
(5) Next step	Within 7 days after Board report, parties to notify President if they will accept. If they do, President to take necessary action to effectuate recommendations. (Résumé indicates this could include revision of price and wage regulations. Language of section possibly inconclusive.) (Structure of bill indicates this latter element limited to this stage.)	See below	See below.
(6)	"If any party" rejects recommendations President "shall" seize "all" plants, etc. (Under language if one of many employers rejects, all facilities of all disputants must be seized.)	See below	See below.
(7) Congressional check on seizure: (a) At outset	None specifically. Sec. 717 (b) of DPA provides for termination, by concurrent resolution, of any "section" of act and all authority thereunder. If this device used probably must scrap complete procedure at one time.	President must notify Congress 2 days in advance. Within 15 days after notice Congress may disapprove. President to terminate on date specified by Congress, or if no date specified, 10 days from concurrent resolution of disapproval.	President must notify when he seizes. Congress may disapprove within 10 days after President issues seizure order. If Congress disapproves must terminate immediately.
(b) After initial period of seizure.	None—seizure can go on indefinitely until settlement of dispute (under language of bill even if emergency abates without settlement). (But see (a) above.)	80-day limit on seizure, unless Congress, by concurrent resolution, extends. (Alternate provision for contingency of Congress being out of session seems unnecessary as seizure cannot take place without notice to Congress.) No limit on extension.	60-day limit, unless Congress, by concurrent resolution, extends. No limit on extension.
(8) Presidential power to terminate seizure before settlement or limit set by Congress.	None	Permits—without conditions	Permits—when President finds seizure no longer necessary under proclamation, which states necessity—e. g., danger to national security.
(9) Wages and working conditions during seizure.	Freezes as of date of seizure. (NOTE.—There is no limitation on changes during initial period when Board is conducting inquiry when strike and lock-out prohibited.)	Permits changes in accordance with Board recommendations (subject to stabilization regulations) for interim conditions based upon increase in cost of living "since the date" of the most recent collective agreement. (NOTE.—(1) The Board is given specific power only to recommend conditions during seizure, although it was probably intended to empower it to make recommendations on all aspects of the dispute except union security (see also below (10)). (2) Not clear whether beginning or ending date of contract intended. Bargaining practices re cost of living would favor former date. (Suggest clarification.))	Government may effect changes in wages and conditions up to limits of Emergency Board recommendations—(see also union security below).
(10) Treatment of union security.	Silent	Board recommendations not to include change in union shop, maintenance of membership, "or similar arrangements * * *." (Last phrase very indefinite. Opinions vary about whether certain subjects, e. g. check-off or seniority, come within subject of union security.)	Board may recommend on union security. Recommendations which go beyond maintenance of membership may not be put into effect during seizure without agreement of parties.
(11) Composition of Board and nature (subpena power, etc., essentially the same for all).	Chairman and 6 members—1 Board for life of title IV. Appointment by President with consent of Senate. Name: National Emergency Price and Wage Board.	Chairman and 6 members—1 Board—1 year terms for members (this may be inconsistent with probable expiration of this amendment on Mar. 1, 1953). Appointment by President with consent of Senate. Name: National Emergency Price and Wage Board. (But no price authority given. See (9) above.)	No set form. Appointment by President. No Senate confirmation. President may use same or new Board for different disputes. Limitation: members may not be officers or employees of disputants.
(12) Time of Board's activity	Board must be used at start of procedure	No time for referral of dispute to Board set. Use of Board apparently not mandatory.	President "may" appoint Board—need not.
(13) Just compensation	Insures "just compensation" under Constitution. No standards.	Same as Maybank	Standards set. Factors: that seizure taken in face of actual or imminent interruption of production; value property would have had without seizure. Insures that any retroactive increase agreed to by parties for period of seizure could be taken from income during seizure—this is protection for employers and removes hazards to retroactive agreement. Procedure: President may appoint a separate Compensation Board. Its decision final unless appealed within 30 days to Court of Claims. If no Compensation Board, standards would be used for negotiation with Government and in court test.

(NOTE.—"Day" defined to exclude Saturdays, Sundays. So, all measuring periods are longer than would first appear. For greater clarity, this definition might be changed.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the resolution under consideration will, under the precedents, be placed on the calendar.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES FOR GENERATING HYDROELECTRIC POWER AT CHEATHAM DAM, TENN.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 97) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities for generating hydroelectric power at the Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland River in Tennessee, which was, on page 2, line 2, to strike out all after "Tennessee" down to and including "facilities" in line 3 and insert "and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $18,200,000 for carrying out the purposes of this act."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the amendment by the House merely changes the language so as to correct an error in the original bill. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagree-

ing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5678) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2383. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board of Accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 17, 1923;

H. R. 6133. An act to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 6661. An act to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926; and

H. R. 7005. An act to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 10, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2383) to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board of Accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 17, 1923.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2594) to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. It was perfectly obvious, when I offered my amendment last Friday, in which I included language striking out the word "immediately" and inserting the words "within 7 days from this date," that the purpose of the language was to allow time for settlement by collective bargaining of the dispute then pending. At that time, as I said on the floor of the Senate, the parties were engaged in negotiations, and it looked as though they would settle the dispute over the week end. I expressed that hope in my comments on the amendment.

Now that the negotiations have broken down, my parliamentary inquiry is, Would I be in order to ask unanimous consent to strike out, on line 2, after the word "recommends", all the language from there to the end of the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the Senator's amendment, but his request may be agreed to by unanimous consent.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia will state it.

Mr. BYRD. Would granting the request of the Senator from Oregon change the amount of time for debate in any way? Would there be any additional debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; no more debate would be allowed. The yeas and nays have been ordered. By unanimous consent the Senator from Oregon may change his amendment, but he would be allowed no additional time for debate.

Mr. MORSE. I may say to the Senator from Virginia that I have asked only the courtesy of being allowed to perfect my amendment by striking out language that is no longer appropriate, because since last Friday the time has elapsed when there was hope of a settlement. The language is not appropriate today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Oregon would restate the perfecting language.

Mr. MORSE. On line 2, after the word "recommends", to strike out the remainder of the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then really the only modification the Senator from Oregon suggests is to substitute the word "recommends" for the word "requests" in the Byrd amendment?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendment of the Senator from Oregon is modified accordingly.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hill	Morse
Bennett	Hoey	Mundt
Bridges	Holland	Neely
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Nixon
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	O'Conor
Byrd	Ives	O'Mahoney
Case	Jenner	Pastore
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kem	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kerr	Seaton
Douglas	Kilgore	Smathers
Dworshak	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Ellender	Long	Smith, N. C.
Ferguson	Magnuson	Sparkman
Flanders	Martin	Stennis
Frear	Maybank	Taft
Fulbright	McCarran	Thye
George	McCarthy	Tobey
Gillette	McClellan	Underwood
Green	McFarland	Watkins
Hayden	McKellar	Welker
Hendrickson	Millikin	Wiley
Hennings	Monroney	Williams
Hickenlooper	Moody	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the so-called perfecting amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to the Byrd amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, under date of June 6, 1952, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must say to the Senator from Nevada that in view of the fact that all time for debate under the unanimous-consent agreement has been exhausted on all the amendments, the Chair cannot recognize the Senator until the vote is taken.

Mr. McCARRAN. May I inquire, who has control of the time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No Senator is in control of the time, because all the time for debate has been exhausted. The Chair will recognize the Senator a little later.

Mr. MORSE. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Would I be in order to ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nevada be allowed to proceed?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time having been exhausted on the Senator's amendment, the Chair does not believe that even the Senator from Oregon has the right to the floor.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would each vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. If present and voting the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea" and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 65, as follows:

YEAS—15

Anderson	Green	Monroney
Case	Hennings	Moody
Chavez	Ives	Morse
Clements	Kilgore	Pastore
Douglas	Long	Tobey

NAYS—65

Bennett	Holland	Nixon
Bridges	Humphrey	O'Conor
Butler, Md.	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Butler, Nebr.	Jenner	Robertson
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kem	Seaton
Dworshak	Kerr	Smathers
Eastland	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Ferguson	Magnuson	Smith, N. C.
Flanders	Martin	Sparkman
Frear	Maybank	Stennis
Fulbright	McCarran	Taft
George	McCarthy	Thye
Gillette	McClellan	Underwood
Hayden	McFarland	Watkins
Hendrickson	McKellar	Welker
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Wiley
Hill	Mundt	Williams
Hoey	Neely	

NOT VOTING—16

Aiken	Carlson	Malone
Benton	Duff	McMahon
Brewster	Ecton	Murray
Bricker	Kefauver	Young
Cain	Langer	
Capehart	Lodge	

So Mr. MORSE's modified amendment to Mr. BYRD's amendment was rejected.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to make a clarifying statement for the benefit of the Senate and of the Chair as well.

Earlier in the day the Chair ruled that when an adjournment is had, under the rule automatically on the following day morning business must come up unless it is dispensed with by unanimous consent or by a direct implication in the request that may be made with reference to the proceedings on that day.

Unfortunately, the Chair was not present yesterday, but he has examined the RECORD, to which he wishes to invite the attention of the Senate for the benefit of the Senate and in order to clarify the situation.

The Chair has always felt, and feels now, that when an adjournment is had until the following day, automatically under the rule the morning business comes up, unless it is dispensed with by unanimous consent or by the strongest implication growing out of the request that is made.

In the proceedings of yesterday the Chair reads as follows, at the time the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] had the floor:

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. For what purpose?

Mr. MCFARLAND. In order that I may propound a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate continue the consideration of the conference report on House bill 7005, an act to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes, now under consideration, until it is finished, and that the Senate resume tomorrow the consideration of Senate bill 2594, to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I did not catch the last part of the request.

Mr. MCFARLAND. That the Senate resume the consideration of the Defense Production Act of 1950 tomorrow. Some Senators did not want to go ahead with it until tomorrow.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator mean by that that consideration of the Defense Production Act of 1950 will not be resumed today?

Mr. MCFARLAND. That is correct.

There is nothing in the colloquy which indicates directly or otherwise that the morning hour after the adjournment would be set aside. No request was made to set aside the morning hour on the following day. There is nothing the Chair can read into the colloquy which sets aside the morning hour. That is why the Chair ruled as he did this morning, that the morning hour must take place, unless specifically it is requested that it be dispensed with, or the plain implication of any request which was made on the previous day does dispense with it. The Chair cannot read into the colloquy any dispensation which would abolish the morning hour today. That is why the Chair ruled as he did.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. For the benefit of the Senate, if the Chair may express an opinion, the Chair believes that it is good practice to have an adjournment occasionally in place of having so many recesses, which carry the same calendar day for a long time. It is good practice to have an adjournment now and then in order to get rid of the old legislative day and to get a new day. Unless there is a specific request that the morning hour be dispensed with on the day following an adjournment, or by plain implication that it is expected to be dispensed with, the Chair does not know how he can hold that the morning hour is dispensed with. That is why he ruled the way he did this morning.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The. VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York will state it.

Mr. LEHMAN. In view of the ruling of the Chair, which seems to me to be eminently correct, I wonder, if a request is made to set aside the unanimous-consent request limiting debate, it would be proper for the Chair to rule, in view of the fact that an adjournment intervened between the time the agreement was reached and today, that the unanimous-consent agreement would be vitiated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair could not make such a ruling, because an adjournment has no effect on any previous agreement as to the limitation of debate on a pending measure. An adjournment means only that the Senate meets on a new day beginning on the following day, that a morning hour will be had until 2 o'clock, during which time morning business may be transacted, and that at 2 o'clock automatically the unfinished business comes up before the Senate, under the same conditions that existed at the time of the adjournment. The Chair could not rule that the unanimous-consent agreement limiting debate on the pending bill is vitiated by an adjournment. The Chair could not rule that way, because it would not be in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2594) to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]

For the information of the Senate the Chair would state that the Byrd amendment is open to amendment if a Senator desires to offer an amendment to it. If so, it would be in the nature of a perfecting amendment, and a vote would be had on it prior to a vote on the substitute amendment.

Is there any further amendment to be proposed to the Byrd amendment?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is there any possible way in which the substitute amendment can be amended?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is not.

Mr. MAYBANK. However, I would not be estopped from offering an amendment to the bill; would I?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator's substitute amendment is adopted by the Senate there is no further opportunity of amending it.

Mr. MAYBANK. But I can amend the general bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina may offer an amendment to any other provision of the bill which is not inconsistent with the substitute amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Would there be any inconsistency in an amendment to the production section, as opposed to the section to which I have proposed an amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from South Carolina propound his question again?

Mr. MAYBANK. I wanted to make certain, if the substitute is agreed to—and I am sorry that it is a substitute, and that it had to be offered as a substitute at the time—whether it would substitute for the so-called Byrd amendment, which has to do with the use of the Taft-Hartley law, in the wage and price section of the bill.

When I submitted the amendment, I said it was a good one, but I said that it was hard on both labor and management.

Since I offered the amendment the negotiations between the management of the steel mills and the workers in those mills have fallen apart, so to speak, and nothing has been accomplished.

Of course, this amendment has accomplished something, in my judgment, in that at least the negotiators for labor and for the management of the steel mills have agreed to make sure that the amount of steel needed for the armed services and for the defensive action in Korea will be produced.

It was my purpose——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and debate is not now in order.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand, but I wish to make it absolutely clear that if this amendment is adopted, I can submit an amendment to the general provisions of this measure, to take care of the changes which have occurred since the steel negotiations broke down.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The adoption of a substitute for the Byrd amendment would not preclude the offering of an amendment to the general provisions of the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Chair, because that would be my intention.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the Maybank amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Such an amendment is not now in order, and cannot be offered at this time.

The yeas and nays have been ordered——

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair asks Senators to wait a moment, please.

The question now is on agreeing to the so-called Maybank substitute for the Byrd amendment. The Maybank substitute itself is an amendment in the second degree, and therefore an amendment to it is not in order.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and debate is not now in order.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York will state it.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to make the following inquiry: In the event that, unhappily, the Byrd amendment should prevail, would it be possible for the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], or other Senators to offer to the bill amendments which, to all intents and purposes, would vitiate the provisions of the Byrd amendment? In other words, in that case will Senators be estopped from submitting other amendments, or will the submission of other amendments be in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair cannot very well pass on an amendment or the ability to offer such an amendment until the amendment is actually offered. The Chair would not like to answer in advance a question as to right to offer an amendment which might have the effect of vitiating or nullifying the Byrd amendment, if the Byrd amendment is adopted.

Mr. LEHMAN. Then I shall amend my parliamentary inquiry: It has been ruled now that in view of the fact that the Maybank amendment is in the form of a substitute, and therefore cannot be amended——

The VICE PRESIDENT. It cannot be amended because under the rules and precedents of the Senate the substitute is itself an amendment, and therefore is in the second degree, and cannot be amended by another amendment, which would be in the third degree.

Mr. LEHMAN. Will it be possible for Senators to submit amendments—I refer particularly to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]; or will such amendments be ruled out of order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon is an amendment to the Byrd amendment. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon to the Byrd amendment has been rejected. Another amendment, similar in form to the Morse amendment to the Byrd amendment, would not now be in order, because the Senate has already passed on the Morse amendment to the Byrd amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Oregon has another amendment——

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not been offered. The Chair understands that the Senator from Oregon has a bill which has been pending before a committee, and the Chair understands that the Senator from Oregon might offer that bill as an amendment. However, the Chair cannot pass on that question until it develops.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio will state it.

Mr. TAFT. I do not wish to question the Chair's ruling; but my understanding is that a substitute is not an amendment. For instance, I understand that in that case there is a clear distinction as to the amendments which are to be voted on first. The Morse amendment was voted on before the Maybank amendment, because the Maybank amendment was a substitute, and the Morse amendment was not. My understanding is that when a substitute is offered it can be perfected, or the original provision can be perfected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is bound to say that under the rules and precedents of the Senate a substitute is regarded as an amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Technically, yes; but it is actually different from an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. We have to pass on the rules technically. A substitute is an amendment. It is offered as an amendment by way of a substitute; and it is an amendment in the second degree, in this case.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to point out to the Chair, however, that there is a distinction which we have just recognized by virtue of the fact that the Morse amendment to the Byrd amendment was voted on before the Maybank amendment to the Byrd amendment was voted on. That was done because the Maybank amendment to the Byrd amendment is an amendment in the form of a substitute. Thus, we already have recognized the fact that there is a difference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Morse amendment to the Byrd amendment was a perfecting amendment to the Byrd amendment, and had precedence in voting over an amendment in the nature of a substitute. Any other perfecting amendment to the Byrd amendment would be in order, provided it was germane.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York will state it.

Mr. IVES. I should like to inquire whether, under the ruling which has been made by the Chair, the Senator who offers an amendment—in this case the Senator from South Carolina—is unable to modify or perfect his substitute in any way, shape, or manner?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not after the yeas and nays have been ordered. The author of the amendment could do so if the yeas and nays had not been ordered; but after the yeas and nays are ordered, the Senator offering such an amendment cannot modify his own amendment.

Mr. IVES. Then, Mr. President, if by unanimous consent the order for the yeas and nays was withdrawn, the Senator from South Carolina might be able to perfect his amendment. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the order for the yeas and nays was withdrawn, by unanimous consent, the substitute would be in the same situation that it was in before the yeas and nays were ordered; and then the Senator from South Carolina could modify his own amendment.

Mr. IVES. Then if the Senator from South Carolina offers an amendment and can modify it, cannot some other Senator modify it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Any Senator who offers an amendment to the Byrd amendment may modify his own amendment, whereas another Senator could not do so, because if such a modification were offered by another Senator, it would be in the form of an amendment in the third degree, whereas if an amendment to the Byrd amendment were modified by its own author, the modification would not be in the form of an amendment in the third degree.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Since the yeas and nays have been ordered and since conditions at this time are entirely changed, as compared with the conditions which existed on Friday afternoon, if it is the desire of the Senator from Ohio or of some other Senator to amend my amendment to the Byrd amendment, I would ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That would not modify the situation. If the order for the yeas and nays were nullified, the result could only be to permit the Senator from South Carolina to modify

his own amendment; but no other Senator could do so.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Could I modify my amendment by means of amendments which other Senators might suggest?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator who offered the amendment could modify his own amendment in any way he might see fit to do.

Mr. MAYBANK. Then I assure other Senators that I shall modify the amendment in that way, for I had no intention of rushing anything through during the late hours of Friday evening.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unanimous consent would be required to nullify the order for the yeas and nays.

Does the Senator from South Carolina make such a request?

Mr. MAYBANK. I do.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia will state it.

Mr. GEORGE. May any Senator modify his own amendment, by unanimous consent?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That could be done in this case by unanimous consent, but not otherwise.

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. CASE. As I understand the situation, the Maybank amendment has been offered as a substitute for the Byrd amendment. Would not it be possible, either if the Maybank amendment were rejected or if it were withdrawn by unanimous consent, for the Byrd amendment to be voted upon, and then for the Maybank amendment later to be offered as an independent amendment, in which case it would then be open to amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina is rejected or withdrawn by unanimous consent—and unanimous consent would be required in order to withdraw the amendment at this time—the Byrd amendment would still be open to amendment so long as such amendment was not in the third degree.

If the Byrd amendment were adopted or were rejected, the bill itself would be open to amendment, thereafter.

Mr. CASE. Thereafter, then, as I understand, the Byrd amendment could be offered as a new section to the bill, standing on its own feet.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Dakota refer to the Byrd amendment or to the Maybank amendment?

Mr. CASE. I meant to say the Maybank amendment—if the Maybank amendment were later offered as an original amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Maybank substitute amendment is voted on and rejected, the question will then arise whether it could be offered thereafter as an independent section of the bill. There would have to be a substantial change in the terms of that amendment in order for it to be proper to be offered under such a situation.

Mr. CASE. Can the Maybank substitute be withdrawn at this time, except by unanimous consent, inasmuch as the yeas and nays have been ordered?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Only by unanimous consent.

Mr. CASE. But if that amendment were rejected, with the result that it would not then be before the Senate, and if the Byrd amendment were then either accepted or rejected, thereafter could not the Maybank amendment, in new form, then be offered as a new amendment or as an original amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; but there would have to be a substantial change in the Maybank amendment in that case.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it proper to have the Maybank substitute read for the information of the Senate, inasmuch as we have had so much discussion since it was originally offered?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the substitute proposed by the Senator from South Carolina will be read.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. NEELY. Would it be in order to ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the transaction of business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Presumably that is what we are doing. The clerk will read the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, after line 16, it is proposed by Mr. MAYBANK to insert the following new section:

SEC. 108. Title IV of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"NATIONAL EMERGENCY PRICE AND WAGE BOARD

"SEC. 412. (a) Whenever the President finds that a threatened or actual work stoppage or lock-out affecting an entire industry or a substantial part thereof will, if permitted to occur or to continue, imperil the national defense or defeat the purposes of this act, he may refer such dispute to the Board created in subsection (b) to inquire into the issues involved in the dispute and to make a written report to him within 113 days after such dispute has been referred to it. Such report shall include a statement of the facts with respect to the dispute, including each party's statement of its position, and shall contain the Board's recommendation with respect to wage and price stabilization as well as other matters involved in such dispute. The President shall make the contents of such report available to the public.

"(b) There is hereby established the National Emergency Price and Wage Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") which shall be composed of a chairman and six other members to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall have power to sit and act at any place within the United States and to conduct such hearings either in public or private, as it may deem necessary or proper, to ascertain the facts with respect to the causes and circumstances of the dispute. Each member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 for each day actually spent by him in the work of the Board, together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses.

"(c) The provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended (15 U. S. C. 49 and 50), shall be applicable with respect to any hearing or inquiry conducted by the Board under this section.

"(d) The President shall make such provision for stenographic, clerical, and other assistants, and for facilities, services, and supplies, as may be necessary to enable the Board to perform its functions.

"(e) Whenever a dispute is referred to the Board the President shall immediately notify the parties to the dispute that the dispute has been so referred and until the Board makes its report to the President and for 7 days thereafter it shall be unlawful for the parties to engage in any work stoppage or lock-out. The provisions of section 706 of this act shall apply in the case of any violation of this section.

"(f) Within 7 days after the Board has reported its findings and recommendations to the President, the parties to the dispute shall advise the President in writing whether or not they are willing to accept the recommendations of the Board for settlement of the dispute.

"(g) If all parties to the dispute agree to accept the recommendations of the Board for settlement of the dispute, the President shall take such action under this title as may be necessary to effectuate the recommendations of the Board.

"(h) If any party to the dispute refuses within the period specified in subsection (f) to accept the recommendations of the Board and as a result thereof a work stoppage or a lock-out is threatened, the President shall take immediate possession of and operate all plants, mines, or facilities involved in the dispute subject to payment of just compensation therefor as required by the Constitution of the United States. During such period of operation the terms and conditions of employment which were in effect at the time possession of such plant, mine, or facility was taken by the President shall remain in effect.

"(i) Whenever any plant, mine, or facility is in the possession of the United States it shall be unlawful for any person (1) to coerce, instigate, induce, conspire with, or encourage any person to interfere, by lock-out, work stoppage, slowdown, or other interruption, with the operation of such plant, mine, or facility, or (2) to aid any such lock-out, work stoppage, slowdown, or other interruption interfering with the operation of such plant, mine, or facility by giving direction or guidance in the conduct of such interruption or by providing funds for the conduct or direction thereof or for the payment of work stoppage, unemployment, or other benefits to those participating therein.

"(j) At any time after the referral of the dispute to the Board or during the operation by the Government of any plant, mine, or facility, the parties to the dispute may reach an agreement by means of collective bargaining. Such agreement must be within the framework of the stabilization policies then in effect.

"(k) Upon settlement of any dispute so referred to the Board the President shall immediately return possession of the mine, plant, or facility involved to the owners thereof in the event possession of such mine, plant, or facility has been taken by the President pursuant to the provisions of this section.

"(1) While this section is in effect the provisions of sections 206 to 210, inclusive, of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, shall not apply in the case of any dispute referred to the National Emergency Wage and Price Board. In any such case the provisions of the act of March 23, 1932 entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes, shall not be applicable."

Renumber succeeding sections.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to amend my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if the request were granted would it extend the debate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would not. The Senator from South Carolina may modify his own amendment, by unanimous consent, and that would not extend the debate. The clerk will state the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina to his amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike the last sentence in section 412 (h), and, at the end of section 412 (j) to insert the following new sentence:

Any such agreement reached after referral of the dispute to the Board shall be retroactive to the date the dispute was deferred to the Board pursuant to subsection (a). The President, upon making a finding that a price increase for the product of such industry is warranted under stabilization policies then in effect, shall take into consideration in fixing the price ceiling of such product under this act the cost of retroactive wages and other benefit paid by the industry under this section.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the modification?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ascertain, if possible, whether this is the amendment which was in the mind of the Senator from Ohio.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not know, since he cannot read the mind of either the Senator from Ohio or the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, would the Senator from South Carolina be willing to answer the question?

Mr. MAYBANK. It is not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I make the point of order that all time for debate has been exhausted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have my answer, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the modification requested by the Senator from South Carolina to his amendment?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think the implications of the question asked by the Senator from Minnesota entitle me to make a statement. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina had nothing whatever to do with anything I had in mind. I had no connection with it in any way.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Ohio. That answers the question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from South Carolina in the nature of a substitute for the Byrd amendment. The yeas and nays having been ordered and all time for debate having been exhausted, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is unavoidably detained in order to keep an engagement at the White House.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 68, as follows:

YEAS—12

Clements	Hayden	McFarland
Connally	Holland	McKellar
Fulbright	Johnson, Tex.	Monroney
Green	Maybank	Smathers

NAYS—68

Anderson	George	Knowland
Bennett	Gillette	Lehman
Bridges	Hendrickson	Long
Butler, Md.	Hennings	Magnuson
Butler, Nebr.	Hickenlooper	Martin
Byrd	Hill	McCarran
Case	Hoey	McCarthy
Chavez	Humphrey	McClellan
Cordon	Hunt	Millikin
Dirksen	Ives	Moody
Douglas	Jenner	Morse
Dworshak	Johnson, Colo.	Mundt
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Ellender	Kefauver	Nixon
Ferguson	Kem	O'Conor
Flanders	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Frear	Kilgore	Pastore
Robertson	Smith, N. C.	Underwood
Saltonstall	Sparkman	Watkins
Schoeppel	Stennis	Welker
Seaton	Taft	Wiley
Smith, Maine	Thye	Williams
Smith, N. J.	Tobey	

NOT VOTING—16

Aiken	Carlson	McMahon
Benton	Duff	Murray
Brewster	Ecton	Russell
Bricker	Langer	Young
Cain	Lodge	
Capehart	Malone	

So Mr. MAYBANK'S amendment, as modified, in the nature of a substitute for Mr. BYRD'S amendment, was rejected.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I should like to call up my amendment to the Byrd amendment, which is on the clerk's desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, may I ask why the amendment is not read?

Mr. MONRONEY. I thought I could save the time of the Senate. I have no objection to its being read.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Is it printed and lying on the desk?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. It is printed and is on the desk. It has been there for approximately a week.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. If the amendment should be read, would the time be taken from the time of the Senator from Oklahoma?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No.

Mr. MAYBANK. I think the amendment should be read, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, after line 16, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 108. Section 18 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act is amended as follows:

(1) Section (18) (g) (1) is amended by adding the following subsection thereto:

"(C) The term 'day' means calendar days exclusive of Saturdays and Sundays."

(2) Section 18 is further amended by adding the following subsection thereto:

"(i) (1) Whenever the President finds that there is an actual or threatened cessation or delay in production, manufacturing, or transportation, arising from a dispute or disputes over terms and conditions of employment and involving plants or facilities so indispensable that such cessation or delay is endangering or will endanger the national health or security, including the interest of the United States in programs authorized and approved by the Congress for the military assistance of other nations; and when he finds that such dispute or disputes have not been resolved despite the utilization of procedures prescribed in the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, as amended, the Railway Labor Act, as amended, or the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, or when he finds that, upon a report of the facts made to him by the Secretary of Labor concerning previous efforts at bargaining, there is no substantial

prospect of a resolution of such dispute or disputes by the utilization of such procedures, he may issue a proclamation reciting such findings and stating, that, unless a settlement of such dispute or disputes occurs within seven days or such longer period as he may prescribe, he may, after appropriate action required by this subsection 18 (1) and upon making the further findings required in subsection 18 (1) (2) of this act, direct that a Government agency designated by him take possession and assume control of the plants or facilities involved in such dispute or disputes.

"(2) At the expiration of such period of 7 days or such longer period as he may have prescribed in his proclamation, the President may, upon further finding that no settlement of such dispute or disputes has occurred and that the cessation or delay referred to in his proclamation is occurring or threatening to occur within 7 days, take possession and assume control on behalf of the United States, through a Government agency designated by him, of such plants or facilities involved in such dispute or disputes: *Provided*, That at least 2 days prior to taking possession and assuming control of such plants or facilities under subsection 18 (1) of this act, the President shall have caused his proclamation concerning such dispute or disputes to be communicated to both Houses of Congress: *Provided further*, That if both Houses of the Congress shall, by concurrent resolution, express disapproval of the taking of possession and assuming of control of any such plants or facilities within 15 days from and after the communication to them of his proclamation, the President, if he has not yet taken such possession and control, shall not take such action; and, if he has previously taken possession and assumed control of such plants or facilities, such possession and control shall terminate on the date specified in the concurrent resolution of the Congress, or, in the absence of such specification, within 10 days from the approval of such concurrent resolution, except that the President may terminate such possession and control at an earlier date. In any event, the possession and control taken of any plants or facilities shall terminate 80 days from and after the taking of such possession and control, except that, if the Congress shall not be in session at that time, such possession and control shall terminate 15 days from and after the day of the next convening of Congress: *Provided, however*, That the Congress, by concurrent resolution, may extend the duration of such possession and control for any greater period, during which period, however, the President may terminate such possession and control at an earlier date. Any taking of possession and assuming of control of plants or facilities under subsection 18 (1) of this act shall be subject to the payment of just compensation therefor as required by the Constitution of the United States.

"(3) It shall be the duty of the President to communicate to the Congress any proclamation issued pursuant to subsection 18 (1) (1) of this act, and any Executive order or other directive or communication by which he may direct the taking of possession and assuming of control of any such plants or facilities pursuant to subsection 18 (1) of this act"——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk has not finished reading the amendment. The Chair cannot recognize the Senator until the reading of the amendment is concluded.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the amendment as follows:

"and to cause any such proclamations, Executive orders, and other directives or communications to be published within 3 days from their issuance in the Federal Register.

"(4) No taking of possession and assuming of control of plants or facilities under subsection 18 (1) of this act shall be construed to relieve any employers or employees, or their representatives, from the duty to bargain concerning such dispute or disputes, or from the obligation of any agreement to arbitrate such dispute or disputes which may have been made prior or subsequent to any taking of possession or assuming of control of such plants or facilities under subsection 18 (1) of this act.

"(5) (a) There is hereby established the National Emergency Price and Wage Board (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board') which shall be composed of a Chairman and six other members to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate for a term of 1 year, and which shall have power to sit and act at any place within the United States and to conduct such hearings either in public or private, as it may deem necessary or proper, to ascertain the facts with respect to the causes and circumstances of the dispute or disputes referred to it by the President, and to make such recommendations as are authorized by subsection 18 (1) of this act. Each member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 for each day actually spent by him in the work of the Board, together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses. The provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended (15 U. S. C. 49 and 50), shall be applicable with respect to any hearing or inquiry conducted by the Board under this subsection. The President shall make such provision for stenographic, clerical, and other assistants and for facilities, services, and supplies as may be necessary to enable the Board to perform its functions.

"(b) During the period when any Government agency has possession and control of any such plants or facilities vested in it by the President under subsection 18 (1) of this act, such Government agency may, in the absence of a resolution of such dispute or disputes by bargaining of the parties, and with the approval of the President, effect such changes in terms and conditions of employment of employees operating or employed in or at such plants or facilities as may be recommended by a majority of the Board. The Board may, after the President refers to it any dispute or disputes over terms and conditions of employment involving plants or facilities of which possession and control are taken under subsection 18 (1) of this act, recommend such changes in terms and conditions of employment of employees operating or employed in or at such plants or facilities as it determines to be fair and equitable on the basis of increases in the living costs of such employees as shall have occurred since the date of the most recent collective-bargaining agreement, which contained provisions concerning such terms and conditions of employment, made by such employees: *Provided, however*, That no such recommendations shall include proposed changes in terms and conditions of employment which would be in violation of stabilization regulations or standards prescribed under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended: *And provided further*, That such recommendations shall not include any proposal for a change in the existing union shop, maintenance of membership, or similar arrangements between employers and employees."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks that the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma would come under the provision of the unanimous-consent agreement allowing debate of 1 hour, 30 minutes to a side on amendments affecting the Wage Stabilization Board. Therefore the Senator from Oklahoma is entitled to 30 minutes, instead of 15 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, first I should like to make a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to state that, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the time is under control of any Senator offering an amendment and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], if he is opposed to it.

At the conclusion of debate the Chair will entertain a point of order, but while debate is in progress, under control, the Chair does not believe he should recognize the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Chair hear me on the question of 1 hour of debate being permitted? The amendment does not change the Wage Stabilization Board; it leaves the Board in full effect, and not modified in any manner. The amendment merely adds another provision which has no relation to the Wage Stabilization Board. It deals only with national emergencies.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment in the nature of a substitute does deal with the question of the Wage Stabilization Board.

Mr. TAFT. Not at all. The amendment does not have anything at all to do with wage stabilization. It is simply in the nature of an amendment to the Taft-Hartley law, deals with national emergency strikes, and provides a special board for that purpose, leaving the Wage Stabilization Board exactly as it is in the bill. I submit that nothing in the amendment would warrant the extension of debate on it to 1 hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, debate on amendments and provisions dealing with the Wage Stabilization Board and provisions dealing with seizure was limited to 1 hour 30 minutes to a side. The amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Oklahoma does deal with those questions, and for that reason the Chair felt the Senator was entitled to an hour instead of 30 minutes.

The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The amendment which I propose to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia attempts to strike a middle-of-the-road policy in order to deal with the difficult and critical situation with which the Nation is today faced.

Today America stands without any protection whatsoever against any kind of crippling, paralyzing strike that might occur in any of our national or indispensable war industries, in our utilities, or in our railroad services, or in any other services on which our security and health as a nation depend.

The impact of the Supreme Court decision wiped away the last vestige of executive power which might have been implied or assumed to deal with the paralyzing situation in which the Nation finds itself as a result of the steel strike. Or the kind of situation in which it might find itself as the result of a utility strike, a railroad strike, or many other types of labor crises.

I believe that the Supreme Court properly called the attention of Congress to the fact that the power should rest in Government, and undoubtedly does rest in Government, to save the country from such situations. But it also held that in making use of such power the Congress is the only branch of the Government which can grant such power; that the Executive cannot legislate, and that the Congress should do so if we expect to prevent such a situation from happening.

I tried my best in this amendment to reach a middle-of-the-road position. I do not believe that the amendment will be popular with either management or labor. In fact, it is designed solely to protect the public of the United States, our military efforts, and our men fighting overseas, without regard to which union they belong to, or whether they belong to the National Association of Manufacturers or the United States Chamber of Commerce.

This is action which I believe is necessary. I believe that the Defense Production Act on which we are working is the last chance Congress will have to speak and legislate during this session.

Briefly, I should like to explain the mechanics of seizure, for which this bill provides, when all collective-bargaining arrangements prove unavailing, when whatever tools the President felt were necessary and could be expeditiously used for the settlement of such a crisis have been used without result. Then, with respect to any defense plants, industries, or utilities which are indispensable—and I ask Senators to bear in mind that qualification—to the Nation's health and security and to our military efforts in behalf of other nations, the President may give 7 days' notice of intent to seize the struck facility or facilities.

The reason for the 7 days' notice is to encourage the every effort at collective bargaining.

The 7 days' notice of intention to seize is a drive forward in a last-minute effort to bring the union and management together to settle their own difficulties before seizure takes place.

If such effort is unavailing, 2 days before seizure the President must notify the Congress, which must be in session. In other words, if he intends to seize a facility which is important enough to our national defense to require seizure, then before it can be seized he must assemble the Congress in session, if it be not then in session.

Within those 2 days the Congress, by concurrent resolution, may prevent the seizure of the facilities. Or, if it does not act within the 2 days, within 15 days thereafter, by concurrent resolution, the Congress can veto, override, and overturn the President's seizure of the facilities and direct that the facilities which have been seized be turned back to their owners.

I believe that that provision safeguards the system of checks and balances in the extraordinary processes of law which we recognize, are necessary for the national good under the conditions which the emergency creates.

Furthermore, this amendment protects both industry and labor. Such seizure as may take place may continue only for a period of 80 days. After 80 days the Congress must extend the period of seizure by concurrent resolution; or, if the Congress be not in session at the expiration of 80 days, then within the first 15 days after the reconvening of Congress the seizure period must be extended by concurrent resolution.

This provision gives an added impetus to genuine collective bargaining because it brings about a period of time within which labor and management can say, "Seizure is terminating after 80 days. Let us get together and decide these issues through collective bargaining."

Subject to all the qualifications and safeguards which have been mentioned, we provide that industry shall receive just compensation under the Constitution for any losses which occur during the period of Government operation. That protects the management side against seizure without due process of law, and awards it just compensation under our Constitution and system of laws.

I do not agree that management should be allowed to neglect bargaining in good faith, thereby forcing into seizure necessary facilities in order that the Government may freeze wages and working conditions of labor over a long period of seizure.

So I provide in this amendment for a special emergency board, whose members are to be confirmed by the United States Senate, whose duty it will be to fix temporary wages for labor under Government seizure. We employ a cost of living index, in comparison with cost-of-living increases since the last collective-bargaining agreement arrived at between industry and labor. That will provide a yardstick to measure any adjustment of wages or working conditions which the emergency board, confirmed by the Senate, may put into effect during Government seizure.

The Board is specifically prohibited from recommending or putting into effect any changes in the union shop conditions of the plant, because we do not believe that during Government seizure any board or Government agency should have the right to change this type of union organization. However, I feel that under the operations of the Wage Board labor has a right to receive increases in wages corresponding to cost-of-living increases during the period of seizure. It is only fair to protect labor in that way.

Mr. President, I should like to invite attention to a small difference between my amendment and the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. They are very similar in many respects, but my amendment amends the Selective Service and Universal Military Training Act.

That makes this provision emergency legislation, so that when an emergency occurs within an emergency—in other words, if the crisis is severe enough to justify drafting the men of America to fight and die in Korea—we should have the right, as a Congress, to expect full production of steel and other goods to supply the men whom we send into combat through selective service.

There is a long list of precedents under the Selective Service Act. I should like to call attention to a few precedents involving seizure to support the Selective Service System.

Government-placed orders must take precedence over all other production schedules. That provision is in the act.

If a person fails to carry out such an order, the President is authorized to take immediate possession of the facility or facilities involved, in order to insure production of the needed article.

Furthermore, it is made the duty of the steel industry under the Selective Service Act to furnish the amounts of steel needed for production of articles ordered, in accordance with previous sections; and provision is made for seizure of steel plants if such production is not carried out.

In enacting the Selective Service Act, Congress decided that the Government could take a portion of industry's production to support Selective Service. But when the entire production of an industry is shut down, are we going to be so cowardly and fearful as to refuse to give the President the tools which every man knows are necessary to put the giant of American steel production back into our war effort?

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. First I should like to say that I think the Senator from Oklahoma has presented the most constructive idea that has yet been presented for a vote in the present situation.

Secondly, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma whether or not it is true that if the Byrd amendment were adopted and Congress took no other action, the country might be left crippled when Congress was out of session? Would that not leave a situation in which the period of 80 days within which the President could, by injunction, keep the steel plants in operation, would expire in September or October? Congress would not be in session, and the Government would be left helpless at that time to get vital steel production going.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Michigan is quite correct. If I read the calendar correctly we would reach a show-down under the Taft-Hartley Act on the 17th of September.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Provided the President uses the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. MONRONEY. Provided that he uses it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, the Senator knows that I offered an amendment in that connection, which was defeated. I offered it only because the Supreme Court by its recent decision has returned to Congress its constitutional powers. As the President so ably stated—and I agree with him—the Supreme Court said that it is the duty of Congress to legislate. If Congress is to legislate what is already on the books, and if the President will not use it, we would not be legislating anything. Does the Senator agree with me?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from South Carolina is eminently correct. The President knows that there is a Taft-Hartley law on the books and that the Taft-Hartley law says the President may—and let us not forget that the act says "may" throughout its provisions—do certain things.

It directs him to use the tools which he believes are best fitted to settle a labor crisis. The Taft-Hartley law does not say that the President "shall" do anything. It is discretionary. It is an alternative process. If the Senate thinks it can get by with the country in this crisis by restating the Taft-Hartley law, it is mistaken.

Mr. MAYBANK. If Congress thinks it can get around the Supreme Court, when the President of the United States could not get around it, they have another thought coming.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. It seems to the junior Senator from Louisiana that the Taft-Hartley law, regardless of its merits, does not provide the answer to the present situation. If the injunction provision were used it would only afford a breathing spell of 80 days. In the meantime Congress would not be in session and there would be no way in which the President could proceed to obtain the necessary steel production. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma has merit in that if a seizure were to take place it would be a seizure by the entire United States Government, namely, by the President and by Congress. Congress could prevent seizure, and would have time to prevent it.

Mr. MONRONEY. We would have preserved the checks-and-balances system. I believe everyone realizes that the situation finally requires determination. When plants go down, when the fires are pulled from under the steel furnaces, when the railroads stop running on the line, or when power is shut off, someone must act. The Supreme Court has limited seizure almost, as I read its opinions, to cases of invasion.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. But the Supreme Court said in substance—and I hope the Senator will correct me if I am wrong—that it was the duty of Congress to legislate, the duty of the President to administer, and the duty of the Court to pass upon laws which Congress passed.

Mr. MONRONEY. As I see it, the Supreme Court practically handed us an engraved invitation, from all of the Justices on both sides of the question, that it was the duty of Congress to act if this is the crisis that we think it was.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is not this the first time the question has been raised before the Supreme Court for generations, and the first time the Supreme Court has clearly stated the situation so far as seizure and emergency are concerned in dealing with the powers of Congress?

Mr. MONRONEY. Because of the Supreme Court decision in the steel case the country stands absolutely naked without vestige of power or authority to stop any kind of crippling strike, whether it originates through the action of a handful of Communists or by the action of great steel organizations.

No matter how critical the situation, we are still without power to prevent a crippling strike.

Mr. MAYBANK. As I stated when I submitted my amendment, labor and big business are not the only ones who are interested. I said I was hopeful that something could be done by Congress which would be on the side of the American people, small business, and the mothers and fathers whose boys are fighting in Korea or whose boys are stationed in Germany. We have suffered greater casualties in this war than in any war except during World War II.

Mr. MONRONEY. The President has asked for the tools with which to do the job and get production rolling. He has asked for bread in behalf of the defense effort and Congress is content to give him a stone.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not always agree with the President on some questions. For example, I did not believe he had the right to seize the steel mills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes of the opposition time to the Senator from Oklahoma, and I yield the remainder of the time to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from South Carolina opposed to the amendment?

Mr. MAYBANK. I advised the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Ohio that I shall not speak in opposition to the amendment, but will yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Ohio, and 10 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from South Carolina, if he is opposed to the amendment, is in control of the time in opposition to it. On the other hand, under the unanimous-consent agreement, if he favors the amendment he does not control the time.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am not opposing the amendment. I assured the Senators on the other side of the aisle that I would not speak against it. I ask unanimous consent that the time I took in colloquy with the Senator from Oklahoma be charged to the opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is in control of the time in opposition to the amendment. The Senator from Oklahoma has yielded himself five additional minutes. He will be recognized for 5 minutes. The Senator from Illinois will have control of the time in opposition.

Mr. MAYBANK. May I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the Senator from South Carolina, being in favor of the amendment, does not control the time in opposition. The time in opposition is controlled by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not say that I was not in favor of the amendment. I said I was not opposing it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into, if the Senator from South Carolina is in favor of an amendment he does not have control of the time in opposition. If he is opposed to an amendment he controls the 30 minutes in opposition.

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall not oppose the amendment. I yield time to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has yielded himself five additional minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the time consumed in the colloquy come out of my time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will not come out of the Senator's time.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As the matter stands, the Senator from Oklahoma will use up his time, and the full 30 minutes will be available to Senators in opposition to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the matter stands the Senator from Oklahoma has consumed 15 minutes. He has yielded himself an additional 5 minutes. Unless he yields himself additional time after he has consumed the 5 minutes, the Senator from Illinois will be recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Thirty minutes will still be available to Senators who wish to speak in opposition to the amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. I may reserve 10 minutes of my time, if I wish. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Michigan for a question.

Mr. MOODY. What we need today is not a promanagement amendment or a prolabor amendment, but a propublic amendment. I ask the Senator from Oklahoma whether he does not feel, since Congress would not be in session when the 80 days under the Taft-Hartley Act would expire, that the President and the

country would be left helpless to protect the national interest? This is a critical situation which must be taken care of before Congress adjourns.

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree with the Senator from Michigan. Mr. President, let me give briefly what I consider to be the defects of the Taft-Hartley Act in this situation.

I voted for the Taft-Hartley Act. I have never apologized for my vote in that connection. I have had to take the consequence of strong labor opposition at times. The controlling reason why I voted for the Taft-Hartley Act was because of the section in the Taft-Hartley Act which endeavors to prevent crippling strikes on a Nation-wide basis.

It was the only choice we had. After watching the act in operation and after analyzing it in the situation in which we find ourselves, I believe it would be following a rather ridiculous procedure for the Senate to direct or request or recommend to the President, as our only solution of this great difficulty, that he take cognizance of the existence of the Taft-Hartley law. In the first place, the Taft-Hartley law, after the cooling-off period and fact-finding period, winds up in a blind alley.

It winds up in a place where nothing can possibly happen if management and labor do not get together. After the 80 days have run, after the last offer of management has been submitted to the workers by the union for a vote, we wind up right where we are today, namely, with the plants not in operation.

I do not know of any arrangement whereby, in any situation that is likely to occur, labor can be kept working for the same wages for which they have worked for 120 days while the President parallels the fact-finding procedure and parallels the cooling-off period. The President already has done everything that he could have done under the Taft-Hartley Act, except to have a vote taken by the workers on the last offer made by management.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield, if the Senator from Ohio will agree to have the time he takes charged to his own time.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; gladly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio does not have any time available.

Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to ask whether under the Senator's amendment at the end of 80 days all the plants would not be returned to their owners?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; unless the Congress by concurrent resolution extended the seizure of the plants.

Mr. President, there is finality to my amendment; but under the procedures of the Taft-Hartley Act, we would wind up in a blind alley.

Mr. TAFT. But under the Taft-Hartley Act, at the end of 80 days the Congress could act by way of concurrent resolution, just as it could under the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. However, in this case the Senator from Ohio is asking the Congress to request the workers to wait another 80 days, after already waiting 120 days under a similar program or arrangement.

Mr. President, that is not the way I like to do business. After all these processes have been gone through, I think it would be rather a shyster operation to say to the workers, "Wait another 80 days."

Mr. President, let us not think that the situation in the case of steel production constitutes the only crisis. On June 1, the only legislation we had to provide for continued operation of the railroads of the United States in the event of a strike expired. The Taft-Hartley Act does not apply to the railroads. So today there can be a strike in any or in all of the railroads, and then the country will be powerless to move a train or to switch an engine or see to the transportation by railroad of indispensable articles of food, drugs, miliary supplies, and so forth, in our Nation.

I am sure that the author of the Taft-Hartley Act, who is in the Chamber at this time, will not deny that at this time we are without any legislative power whatsoever—or without any implied power in the President—to continue the operation of the railroads, in the case of a strike.

That is another defect of the Taft-Hartley Act. We should not simply say, "The operation of the steel plants has been suspended, and we must enact legislation because of that situation." There can be other crippling strikes, and such strikes could have just as great an impact as the steel strike has at this time. Therefore we need to act in such manner to safeguard against all manner of paralyzing strikes—not just that which we face today in steel.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield at this time for a question?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that the steel workers have been prevented for 150 days from having a wage increase to which they were entitled? Have not they already been prevented for 150 days from having that increase?

Mr. MONRONEY. They have voluntarily continued at work at the old pay scale, while negotiations were under way with the fact-finding group.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes. As a matter of fact, the management is willing to grant some pay increase, and has acknowledged that the workers were entitled to it. However, the workers have continued to work at the same old pay for 150 days now, and at this time it is proposed that they work at the same old pay for another 80 days, whereas the management has gained the profits of continuous operation under the old wages.

Under the Taft-Hartley Act, or under any other Act, as a matter of fact, the workers would be entitled to proper compensation. However, in the present situation the management has all the advantage, and the workers are expected to continue working for a total of 230 days without any increase in pay to compensate them for the increase which has occurred in the cost of living.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma has said, in presenting his case, to the Senate, what he has already said in a press release, namely:

> This is strictly emergency legislation. Today the Nation stands without any protection whatsoever against crippling strikes in railroads, utilities, or basic industries vital to the national security.

Of course, that is not a correct statement, for the Taft-Hartley Act is in full effect, and the Nation is protected in the case of situations such as those to which the Senator from Oklahoma has referred.

As a matter of fact, the so-called national emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act were not my proposal. They were worked out by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in 1947. I think all of us felt that the problem was a very difficult one to meet, and that it was not at all easy to meet it properly.

My recollection is that all the members of the committee, including the distinguished Senator from Oregon and the distinguished Senator from New York—although I may be mistaken—thought we should try it, at least; they thought that was as good a measure as we could agree upon.

That law has been in effect ever since. There is no reason at all why the President should not use it. Obviously he does not want to use it, but I do not know what may be the reasons why he does not wish to use it, because he has used it already a dozen times; and often has used it with success. What may be his present reason for not wishing to use it in this case, I do not know. In any case, his reasons as set forth in the message he has sent to Congress are childish.

Only last summer the President used the Taft-Hartley Act in the copper strike, and in that case the men returned to work after the injunction was obtained, and the difficulty was adjusted within 2 weeks.

I do not know that there is any entirely satisfactory solution of the present difficulty. Yet the Taft-Hartley law offers a perfectly reasonable procedure.

Today criticism has been made of the Taft-Hartley Act from the point of view that under the procedures which already have been undertaken by the President, everything which could be done under

the Taft-Hartley Act has already been done, except to seek an injunction and to prolong the situation for 80 days more, during which the status quo would continue while further efforts were made to settle the strike.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that that is infinitely the quickest method of dealing with this matter. I care not what proposed legislation might be passed now by the Senate, in any event it would have to go to the House of Representatives, for the measure now before us is the Defense Production Act. In that case there would be a long dispute about many other provisions of the act, and the chances of passing such a Defense Production Act before the 1st of July are remote.

If the Senate wishes to have quick action taken, the only way to have that done is to use the Taft-Hartley Act; there is no other remedy.

The Taft-Hartley Act provides for an 80-day delay. It is said that the men are suffering or would suffer under that delay. Of course that is not so, Mr. President, because all settlements in cases of this sort are retroactive settlements. The steel companies have been dealing with the men during the past few months on the basis of a retroactive settlement. Undoubtedly the settlement will be retroactive; there can be no question about that. The men are deprived only temporarily of the pay to which they may finally be entitled. So there is no question of the doing of an injustice to the men under that particular provision.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I prefer not to yield at this time.

The Taft-Hartley law provides that after the injunction is obtained, the board shall make a report on the facts, but shall not make an actual recommendation of a settlement. In the opinion of the committee, a recommendation came very closely to the idea of compulsory arbitration, of which we did not approve. Of course, there may be a difference of opinion on that point. I myself supported, last year, I believe, an amendment, which I was willing to have considered, which would have provided for the making of a definite report. That is not a very important difference between the Taft-Hartley Act and other measures which have been suggested.

The Taft-Hartley Act provides, finally, for the taking of a vote by the men on the last and most favorable offer of the employers, at the end of 80 days. I believe the people of the United States feel that it is right that in a national emergency—and the Taft-Hartley Act applies only to national emergencies—there should be a definite and deliberate vote by the workers on the question of whether they intend to strike and to tie up the entire national economy, and that that action should not be taken by their leaders, but should be taken by the action of the men, in the last analysis. That seems to be a wise provision. Such a provision is omitted from all the proposals which now are before the Senate.

That provision may or may not work. I think that point in the procedure has been reached only twice in connection with the various injunctions which have been sought under the Taft-Hartley law. In one case that procedure was sabotaged because Harry Bridges simply ordered all the members of his union to refuse to vote at all. Inasmuch as those men were scattered all over the world, on various ships, it was not very easy to have a vote taken under those circumstances.

I do not think there will be any objection to the taking of such a vote in this case, and I believe that provision should remain in the law.

It is said that at the end of 80 days, the Taft-Hartley law provides nothing further. That is quite correct. But in the measures now proposed provision is made in effect for compulsory arbitration and for the fixing of wages by the Government or by a Government board. I do not think such a provision should be a part of any permanent legislation dealing with labor-management relations. The moment such a provision is placed in such legislation, it kills collective bargaining and destroys freedom of collective bargaining and destroys freedom in the fixing of wages. I do not think we can have a system by which, in effect, the Government will fix wages, without going on to have the Government fix prices and fix every other provision or arrangement or part of our economic life. I do not believe any permanent law should contain a provision for the fixing of wages by the Government. But the measures now before us provide, in effect, for the fixing of wages.

It seems to me that at the end of the 80-day period provided for by the Taft-Hartley Act, if no settlement is thus made, we would have to consider the passage of a special emergency law. If so, it should be confined to this particular steel strike, in my opinion; I believe that in any case it should be confined to the particular strike then existing. Such a special emergency law might include seizure, so far as I am concerned, or other provisions. Such provisions have been made before. As I recall, in the Adamson law, Congress itself fixed the wages of the railroad workers.

There are all sorts of different ways of meeting a particular emergency by drastic legislation, but I do not think it ought to be met by making seizure or by making the fixing of wages by compulsory arbitration a permanent part of the legislation of the United States, because I think that would strike at the freedom of the workman as much as it would at the freedom of all Americans.

Coming to the question of seizure, seizure is not for the benefit of the workmen. Seizure is merely for the socialization of the entire process that is taken over. We have recently noted the seizure of the railroads by the Government. This produced the greatest indignation on the part of railroad workers. Why? Because it has been used to prevent the freedom of strikes; because it has been used to postpone the settlement of the rights of railroad workers; because, for more than a year and a half, the Government continued in control without bringing to a head any of the final settlements. It is all very well for labor, when they have an administration that is 100 percent on their side, as Mr. Truman is on the side of Philip Murray; but if they happen to have Mr. Steelman opposed, in effect, to the railroad unions, then it is a greater imposition upon the men themselves than it is upon an industry.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I prefer not to yield at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio declines to yield.

Mr. TAFT. Seizure is one thing which puts into the hands of the Government the power to prohibit a strike. Over and over again the railroad men started a strike, because they could not get a settlement of their claim; and they were always enjoined. They would like to have the Taft-Hartley law, which puts off their claims for only 80 days. The seizure provision of the railroad law put off their claims for 2 years without any settlement. At the moment of seizure, there is the right to an injunction against any strike of any kind. When anyone talks about being against injunctions under the Taft-Hartley law, he should consider the result of seizure as shown in the United Mine Workers case, which gives the Government an indefinite right of injunction; and if seizure goes on forever, with a Government adverse to the particular union in question, it might easily use it as a tremendous weapon of oppression against labor itself.

I think seizure is fundamentally against the interests of labor, just as it is also against the interests of management. So, Mr. President, I do not see in any of the pending proposals anything better than the Taft-Hartley law. I have no proposal except to say to the President, "You have this right; the Congress enacted the law after great and careful consideration; it is not perfect, try it out. He says that he has postponed a strike many times by persuasion; but the Taft-Hartley law contemplated the whole process of mediation, arbitration, and everything else, first. The injunction was only for use when the point was reached where nothing could be done voluntarily. This is not a substitute for voluntary postponement. Of course, the Government obtained voluntary postponement for a number of months in this case. But the Taft-Hartley law is to be used after all other means of settlement have been exhausted; and so there is no reason at all that the President should not use it today.

The President, I think, is doing himself a great injustice when he says:

> Furthermore, even if an injunction were granted, there is no assurance that it would get the steel mills back in operation. I call the attention of the Congress to the fact that such an injunction did not get the coal mines back in operation in 1950.

Mr. President, that is practically an invitation to the steelworkers to refuse to obey an injunction issued by the court. I think the President himself is asking for sabotage of the Taft-Hartley law in

that connection. In my opinion it is an outrageous thing for him to undertake to suggest to the steelworkers that they should refuse to obey an injunction of a court of the United States, simply because he does not happen to want to use the Taft-Hartley law under present conditions, whether he has promised Mr. Murray that he will not use it or not. I do not know what the reason may be. I can see no other reasonable cause for his refusal to use that law. Of course, the entire message presents no argument whatever against the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. Let me say one thing in conclusion. My feeling is that we should say to him, "You now have a law on the books; try that law out. We see no reason for emergency legislation until that law shall have been tried." In the meantime, I would refer the Monroney bill, the Morse proposal, the proposal of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, and any other proposals to a committee, and let them draft an emergency law, ready to be put into effect, if the Taft-Hartley law provisions do not succeed at the end of 80 days in achieving a settlement of the steel strike. We have not had time to consider all the intricacies of this problem. We cannot, on the floor, consider the details I have suggested and have any reasonable and satisfactory debate on them here. I think the committee should consider them. All that I would say is that there is no provision in any of them that I am very strongly against, if it is confined to an emergency law to deal with this particular strike situation in the steel industry. For that I would be willing to consider, so far as I am concerned, many provisions as emergency legislation which I do not think should be in any case a part of the permanent labor-management relations law of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. MOODY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the President indicated in his message to the joint session of Congress today that he would be required to appoint a board of inquiry under the Taft-Hartley Act. I should like to get the opinion of the Senator from Ohio as to whether that is the case.

Mr. TAFT. Yes, he is required to appoint a board of inquiry, but the board's first report is only on the question as to whether a national emergency exists, and whether the dispute has gone beyond the point where it can be settled by any voluntary means. If the Board reports the President has the right immediately to seek an injunction. In the Maritime case he got an injunction 4 days after he appointed the board, which is certainly by far the quickest action we could possibly hope for under any of the pending proposals.

The amendment of the Senator from South Carolina, of course, did not give any right of seizure for 130 days, or some such time; and the other proposals give a right of seizure within a shorter period; but they could not go into effect today, and not until the Senate has passed the Defense Production Act, the House has passed it, and the conference committee has met and worked out all the differences with respect to price and wage controls. That certainly is going to take 30 days, compared to 4 days under the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Could there be any reason for saying that the President could not use the same board he has used under the Wage Stabilization Act?

Mr. TAFT. No. He could appoint the same board. In fact, I know of no reason for saying, considering all the circumstances which have been brought out here, that the President's board should not report the day after its appointment. I see no particular reason to the contrary. There is no limitation. They could report at once if they want to.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Ohio has generally referred to this amendment as permanent legislation. I again would like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this is temporary and emergency legislation in the nature of an amendment to the Selective Service Act, which everyone knows we are not going to continue unless there is a national emergency.

Furthermore, in case of seizure the amendment provides for a congressional veto and for an 80-day expiration date for the seizure, and requires a continuing resolution of Congress for any extension. Certainly this does not make my amendment in the nature of permanent seizure legislation.

The Senator from Ohio has argued that the slowness of the Congress, because it will not get busy and act, is a reason why we should not act now. That is not the kind of argument I like to hear. The very fact that the wheels of Congress turn so slowly that the President has to use a bad law is sufficient indication that we should give the President real tools with which to work.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio talked about the evil the administration and the President did to the railroads. I wonder if he means that the President should have allowed the railroads to shut down while they went through months of extra collective bargaining.

As I gathered from his statement, the Senator from Ohio objected to seizure of the railroads. I suppose that is one of the reasons why he left railroads out of the Taft-Hartley Act. There is nothing in that act to enable the Government to keep the railroads running after other processes have failed and the railroads stop operating.

The Senator from Ohio enumerated carefully the steps under the Taft-Hartley Act. I ask every Senator who is familiar with the processes invoked in the steel controversy whether most of these steps have not already been taken and whether the Senator from Ohio is now asking that labor go through them all over again.

The first step is that the President shall find there is a national emergency. Does anyone doubt that there is a national emergency, when we are engaged in a cold war and all the steel plants are shut down?

Then there is a cooling-off period of 80 days. I do not think it is going to cool them off after waiting 120 days to wait another 80; I think it is going to heat them up. I could not blame them much, after voluntarily foregoing their strike privileges and pay increases for 120 days if they have to wait now for another 80 days.

There is a fact-finding board which the Senator from Ohio has said is similar to the Wage Stabilization Board. The Board sat on the case for 30 days and is just as familiar with the facts as anyone could be. They made recommendations. Is there anything wrong about that? Because they did find facts, and because they did make recommendations are we going to make the parties wait 30 days more? All three of those processes have have been followed. The only other process under the Taft-Hartley Act is a vote by the employees. I for one, would be very happy to see the President use the portion of the Taft-Hartley law which asks the employees to vote on the last offer of management, if anyone can find out what that offer was.

Finally, the good Senator from Ohio says that when all efforts at collective bargaining under the Taft-Hartley law break down, he might be willing to consider seizure. Evidently he does not consider it so bad if that is the alternative. Maybe there is something else. I do not know what it is. We have been through a waiting and fact-finding period for 125 days and have used three out of the four processes of the Taft-Hartley law. Why the President did not use the fourth process I do not know, but I imagine he thought he could get a little bit more collective bargaining on both sides of the table if the fourth process were not used.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. NIXON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, I should like to use a part of my time by asking the Senator from Oklahoma a question.

What procedures does the Senator's amendment provide for settling a dispute that are not available under the Taft-Hartley Act?

Mr. MONRONEY. The main difference is that my amendment provides that all the processes may be utilized and collective bargaining may go forward while the Government is in ostensible control of the plant.

Mr. NIXON. I think the Senator's answer to my question makes obvious the comment that there is nothing in the Taft-Hartley Act which prohibits collective bargaining to continue during the 80-day period.

Mr. MONRONEY. Would the Senator from California like a little more amplification?

Mr. NIXON. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. The main difference between my amendment and the Taft-Hartley law is that under seizure, if the special wage board provided for finds that because of cost-of-living increases labor is entitled to wage adjustment during seizure, they will have it. Under the Taft-Hartley Act management can reap all the profits possible in the next 80 days, but the wages of labor are frozen.

Mr. NIXON. I recognize that difference, but the Senator has still not indicated why management would be more likely to agree in collective bargaining to wage increases after seizure than it would have been willing to agree before.

I think, Mr. President, we should bear in mind, as we consider the amendment, two very important factors. The first one is that we all recognize the necessity for speed in dealing with the steel strike and in meeting the emergency. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the President have all agreed that an emergency exists, and that something must be done speedily. On that ground I do not think the Senator's proposal can be supported when we compare it with the speed available under the Taft-Hartley Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. NIXON. May I have two additional minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield two additional minutes to the Senator from California.

Mr. NIXON. The Senator from Ohio pointed out that under the Taft-Hartley Act action could be taken in a period of 3 days. Under the proposal of the Senator from Oklahoma, assuming that the Defense Production Act is passed today, goes to conference, and is approved by the President, in a week's time, there will be a period of at least 9 days after the bill passes during which no seizure action can be taken. So, Mr. President, if we want speed, we shall not get it by adopting the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The Senator has also made a great deal of the point he made when he proposed the amendment last Thursday. He said the Nation stands without any protection whatsoever against crippling strikes. So that we may understand exactly what the situation is, I think it is clear from the debate that if the Nation does stand without protection against crippling strikes, responsibility for that lack of protection rests squarely upon the President of the United States for refusing to use a law which we have seen today is the most speedy and effective way of dealing with the crisis—the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, how does the time stand?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 10 minutes left, and the Senator from Oklahoma has 7 minutes left.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the discussion of the proposal of my good friend from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] stirs some recollections of what happened to the Defense Production Act a year ago. I am sure Senators will remember with what volcanic intensity they labored the amendment to license all business in the country, which proposal was offered as an amendment to the Defense Production Act. Had it been adopted in the heat of debate, the President of the United States, as a condition precedent to a company continuing in business, could have revoked a license or could have demanded certain conditions. Fortunately, the amendment was voted down.

I remember also an amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut which would have empowered the President to acquire mines, build plants, and use whatever funds were necessary to equip them. I remember, also, Mr. President, a very logical and persuasive statement made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] in the small hours of the night or in the morning as we discussed that amendment.

I think, therefore, that what happened last year ought to serve as a warning and as a caution when a proposal like that of my friend from Oklahoma is presented.

In the first place, the Senator from Oklahoma does not propose directly to amend the Defense Production Act. What he proposes to do is to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as to which there is no termination date. So the Senator's amendment would become permanent legislation. I think we should be pretty cautious about that.

It seems to me that some progress has been made in the steel controversy. The parties have been hauled to the White House to bargain and negotiate. If I am correctly informed, virtually every substantive issue, with the exception of the union-shop question, has been pretty well determined. No amount of machinery which can be set up by Congress is finally going to dispose of such an explosive issue as that involving the union shop.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I may finish my sentence.

No amount of machinery can be set up that will dispose of that kind of explosive issue, I suppose, short of seizure, if both sides set their heads, and one says "Yes" while the other says "No."

I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. NIXON. As the Senator from Illinois has pointed out, the main stumbling block to settlement at the present time is apparently the issue of the union shop. The amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma, upon which the Senate is to vote in a few minutes, does not meet this problem, because it expressly excludes consideration of the union-shop issue during seizure.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say that the language is most ingenuous. As a matter of fact, there can be bargaining for a change of conditions even while the steel plants are being operated by the Government, but certain things cannot be recommended and must not be done. Those certain things relate to the union shop, maintenance of membership, and so forth. As a matter of fact, it becomes something of a one-way street.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I have been reliably informed that one of the chief matters of disagreement remaining in the steel controversy is the question of the union shop. Certainly the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma does not deal with that at all, so I do not see what would be accomplished by adopting his amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment to be charged to my time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Of course the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma does not deal with the union shop. That is a question which is left for collective bargaining. I do not think the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from California, or the Senator from Ohio would want the Government to put into effect a change of union-shop conditions while the plants are under seizure. That is the issue. That is why that section is in the amendment. Of course, the unions would like to have the Government order that the plants be under a union-shop requirement while they are under Government seizure. But in an effort to be fair to the public and to management, so that there could not be a change in the type of working conditions, the Senator from Oklahoma specifically prohibited a change of union-shop conditions. Of course, the parties could continue collective bargaining—and they would if we would only wait and let them do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the President's statement to the joint session this noon was not in the best of grace. It was a rather strange precedent for the President to use the instrumentality of a joint session for the purpose of telling Congress and the country why he would not employ the Taft-Hartley Act or employ existing law. I think the President would have come in better grace if he had suggested to the country today, "I am going to ask Congress to enact a law that will ignore, in part, the time factors in the Taft-Hartley Act, and to use the provision in section 209 (b) that is constructive and very useful." This is what that section says:

> The National Labor Relations Board, within the succeeding 15 days, shall take a secret ballot of the employees of each employer involved in the dispute on the question of whether they wish to accept the final offer of settlement made by their employer as stated by him and shall certify the results thereof to the Attorney General within 5 days thereafter.

If the time factor is to be emphasized, how much time has already elapsed? Very well. There could be one paragraph to the effect that, notwithstanding any other provision of the Taft-Hartley Act, the President shall direct that the secret ballot shall be employed to vote upon the last offer made by each employer. Then there could be a coming to grips with the issues involved, including the union shop. What more is needed? That would give those who have an abiding interest in the matter a chance to be heard, and not necessarily through their leaders.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not at the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield for the present.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not forgetting that there was a convention in Philadelphia. I am not forgetting that the Secretary of Labor was there and spoke, in my judgment, in rather prejudicial, biased terms. I am not forgetting that the Presiding Officer of this body—and I say it with the utmost of grace and humility—was before that convention in Philadelphia. It seems to me that a little more impartiality, just a little more humility, and just a little more grace, might have served not to fan the fires so much, and might have brought about a conclusion.

So in the act itself there is now an instrument for determining, not from leaders, but from rank and filers in the steel union, whether or not, for each employer, they will accept the last offer of the employer. That includes everything. If this matter is of such high immediacy and such urgency, the President could have done infinitely better today to have come, in a spirit of humility, with that kind of recommendation, rather than to say to the country, in tones that at times seemed a little tinged with arrogance and cynicism, that he will not use existing law.

Mr. President, that is all the more reason why we ought to be guided by two considerations. The first is that we should reaffirm the interest of Congress in the Taft-Hartley Act and adopt the Byrd amendment. Secondly, with respect to substantive legislation dealing with the whole problem of labor-management relations, as it relates to emergency strikes, the matter should be sent back to the committees for reasoned and careful consideration.

When the proposal of my distinguished chairman, the Senator from South Carolina, was first presented, the Senator from Indiana was quite right in saying that perhaps it should be sent back for committee consideration. That would have been a wise and timely thing to do. But I believe we can still cure all our difficulties simply by voting down all the proposals now being urged and reaffirming our interest in the Taft-Hartley Act, as provided in the Byrd amendment, and let the other proposals be carefully considered before we add to the permanent law of the country in a rather hasty, ill-advised fashion.

Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 1 minute left.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has 6 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I do not believe many votes will be changed by what I have to add. I should like to summarize what my amendment proposes to do. It provides that in extraordinary situations, where facilities which are indispensable to national health or security, or to military assistance to our fighting allies, are in peril because of paralyzing strikes the President, upon finding that there is no possibility of settling a labor dispute, may take over the facilities.

The Taft-Hartley Act, generally speaking, whose use is urged, would, after 80 days, be a blind alley so far as ultimate settlement of labor disputes is concerned. Furthermore, the Taft-Hartley Act does not apply to railroads and does not apply to individual bottleneck plants, no matter how necessary they might be to our national defense, national security, or national health.

My amendment would give a congressional veto over any seizure, which would absolutely insure the public interest with respect to the necessity of taking over the plants in the immediate crisis. It is proposed as temporary legislation attached to the Selective Service Act. It is suggested on the theory that if the crisis is great enough to take men and draft them into the Army, it is great enough to compel continued production by the facilities of supply.

Under my amendment seizure can last for only 80 days. If needed to be continued, it must be continued by a concurrent resolution of Congress. My amendment is not designed to please management or labor. It is designed to insure to the public that in a crisis such as the present one, the Government is not going to be absolutely impotent, or unable, with its hands chained behind it, to move in times of peril.

Mr. President, I ask for a vote on the amendment, and I yield the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. TAFT, Mr. MONRONEY, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maine would vote "nay."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] would each vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "nay" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay" and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—28

Anderson	Hill	McFarland
Chavez	Humphrey	McKellar
Clements	Hunt	Monroney
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Moody
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Fulbright	Kefauver	Pastore
Gillette	Kerr	Smathers
Green	Lehman	Sparkman
Hayden	Long	
Hennings	Magnuson	

NAYS—52

Bennett	Byrd	Dworshak
Bridges	Case	Eastland
Butler, Md.	Cordon	Ellender
Butler, Nebr.	Dirksen	Ferguson

Flanders	Maybank	Smith, Maine
Frear	McCarran	Smith, N. J.
George	McCarthy	Smith, N. C.
Hendrickson	McClellan	Stennis
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Taft
Hoey	Morse	Thye
Holland	Mundt	Tobey
Ives	Neely	Underwood
Jenner	Nixon	Watkins
Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor	Welker
Kem	Robertson	Wiley
Kilgore	Saltonstall	Williams
Knowland	Schoeppel	
Martin	Seaton	

NOT VOTING—16

Aiken	Carlson	McMahon
Benton	Duff	Murray
Brewster	Ecton	Russell
Bricker	Langer	Young
Cain	Lodge	
Capehart	Malone	

So Mr. MONRONEY's amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of Mr. BYRD was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, after line 16, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 108. Title IV of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 412. Findings:

"The United States of America has undertaken and is exercising leadership in a global struggle for the preservation of democratic institutions;

"This Nation has made and is making great sacrifices to arm against and repel totalitarian aggression;

"The Armed Forces of the United States are deployed throughout the world to discourage aggression by totalitarian forces;

"The continued production of arms and material is vital to the security of the United States and the free nations associated with it; and

"The continuous production of steel and steel products is essential to the adequate production of arms and material required by the Armed Forces of the United States and the democratic nations dedicated to the preservation of freedom.

"SEC. 413 (a) The President of the United States is empowered to take possession of and operate all enterprises which produce steel and steel products and whose operations are interrupted by the current labor dispute.

"(b) The President shall continue to possess and operate any such enterprise or part thereof until—

"(1) he finds that any such enterprise or part thereof is not essential to the production found necessary in section 412 or

"(2) the labor dispute which disrupted production is settled.

"SEC. 414. The President is empowered to designate an appropriate department or independent agency to operate any enterprise or enterprises of which possession is taken under sections 412 and 413. That department or agency, with the approval of the President, may adjust wages, hours, and working conditions other than union shop in such a manner as to insure fair and equitable treatment of employees of the enterprise or enterprises so operated.

"SEC. 415. The President is empowered to appoint a compensation board which shall determine just compensation to be paid the owners of the enterprises of which possession is taken pursuant to sections 412 and 413. The award of the Compensation Board shall be final and binding, unless within 30 days after the issuance of said award a party moves to have the said award set aside or modified in the United States Court of Claims in accordance with the rules of said court."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to inquire of the Senator from Minnesota if he is offering his amendment as a substitute for the Byrd amendment or as an amendment to the Byrd amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is offered as a substitute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, may I inquire whether the amendment has been printed?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It has been mimeographed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Byrd amendment is to title V, which deals with the settlement of labor disputes. It states that the settlement must be in conformity to the Taft-Hartley law if it relates to the kind of dispute with which we are now dealing in connection with steel.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement with respect to the limitation of time for debate the Senator from Minnesota is entitled to speak in behalf of his amendment, unless he yields for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, do I have the floor on my point of order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not at the moment. The Chair does not believe that the making of a point of order can deprive a Senator of the floor when he offers an amendment and is entitled to speak on it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The amendment is not germane. That is my point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That point of order will have to be made later, the Chair will say to the Senator from Virginia. A Senator cannot take another Senator, who has offered an amendment, off the floor, by making a point of order. That cannot be done under the unanimous-consent agreement, unless a Senator who is in control of time yields for such purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my time is limited. As I understand, I am entitled to 15 minutes on the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair believes that under the unanimous-consent agreement——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just a moment. The Chair believes that under the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement the pending amendment, which deals with the Stabilization Board, entitles the proponents to speak on it for 30 minutes and entitles the opponents to speak on it for 30 minutes. Therefore the Senator from Minnesota is entitled to 30 minutes.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], if he is opposed to the amendment, is entitled to 30 minutes in opposition.

The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 30 minutes.

First, let the Chair state that points of order or amendments to the amendment, or other proceedings relating to it, if in order at all, would be in order following the conclusion of the hour of debate. A Senator offering an amendment cannot be deprived of his time, nor can Senators who are opposed to the amendment be deprived of time, by intervening motions.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota permit me to use some of my time, in opposition to the amendment, to ask the majority leader a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Certainly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield on the Senator's own time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time consumed in this colloquy be not charged to either side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina has yielded himself some of his time. He has half an hour for debate on his side.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understood the majority leader to say yesterday that we would not have a night session today. Debate on the pending amendment will take an hour. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has a very important amendment which he had hoped he would be able to offer after the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] was voted on. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas is not present at the moment. I was wondering whether we could bring up his amendment after we have voted on the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia. I should like to know what I may tell Senators who are members of the committee with respect to how late the Senate will be in session today.

Mr. McFARLAND. I made a definite commitment to a Senator yesterday that there would not be a night session this evening. It would be a night session to the extent it went beyond 6 o'clock, but I hope we can make good progress with the bill this afternoon and that it will be possible for me to live up to the commitment I made, if Senators will stand by me.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this time be charged to neither side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield for that purpose?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the time will not be charged to either side.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota seems to be repetitious of the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. It seems to me that if similar amendments are to be offered one after another, a motion to lay them on the table would be in order. I do not intend to make such a motion in connection with the pending amendment, but unless amendments of this nature are offered, I believe we can finish consideration of the Byrd amendment this evening without difficulty and without a night session.

Mr. McFARLAND. I will say to my friend from Ohio that the commitment which I made was made to a Member on his side of the aisle. When I make a commitment, I like to keep it. The commitment was that we would not have a night session this evening. I like to live up to my commitments.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Do we get time and a half for overtime?

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish we could.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have the floor for the purpose of making an announcement, by unanimous consent. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, after action is had on the Byrd amendment, the junior Senator from Oregon proposes to offer an amendment to the Taft-Hartley law which, I am advised, would be in order because it pertains to carrying out the Byrd amendment, if the Byrd amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have no control over the amendments which will be offered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a few moments ago the Senator from Ohio said this amendment apparently was no different from any other amendments which have been submitted.

I should like to state exactly what this amendment will do, and I should like to show the difference between this amendment and other amendments.

This amendment applies only to the current labor dispute in the steel industry. This amendment applies only for the length of the duration of the Defense Production Act.

In other words, this amendment is an emergency amendment for an emergency situation in a particular case at a particular time, for a particular period of time. In short, this amendment, if adopted, would not be permanent legislation. This amendment does not propose legislation to cover every case which may arise. This amendment is directed specifically and precisely at the dispute which now is before the American people as a serious threat to our defense production program.

I believe this amendment provides a proper way for Congress to legislate in terms of the Defense Production Act, in light of the President's message to the Congress and in light of the dire situation presently facing our country.

Mr. President, this amendment is not a complicated one. In the amendment we do not call for detailed procedure.

As has been pointed out again and again, the Supreme Court has said that the President's so-called emergency powers, whatever they may be, certainly do not apply in the present case. What the Supreme Court's ruling means in cases beyond the present case, no one can tell. The Supreme Court did not rule for posterity or for eternity. It ruled in terms of the present case, as that case was presented to the Supreme Court, and in the light of the particular facts of that case. So, Mr. President, one would be very foolish indeed to attempt to prejudge or predict what future Supreme Courts will do in other cases of this type.

My amendment does not empower the President to seize any industry. My amendment empowers the President to do what every Member of this body knows needs to be done, namely, to have steel produced, although at this time the production of steel has been stopped because of the inability of the parties to this dispute to agree.

My amendment empowers the President to make some adjustments in terms of the compensation to be given employees, and it provides for the establishment of a board which would determine the terms of the compensation to the employers. My amendment provides that the principles of equity and fairness shall be applied to both parties to the dispute.

Mr. President, it will not take me long to explain the amendment.

If all the Senate wants is its pound of flesh with the Taft-Hartley "Ax" then, instead of legislating, we shall simply be taking vindictive action, in proving that we can tell the President what to do.

On the other hand, Mr. President, the Senate can adopt resolution after resolution from now to kingdom come, but the President will not have to do one thing about such resolutions, for resolutions are not law. If the Congress enacts legislation, the President does have to follow that law.

My amendment specifically gives the President the power to seize. My amendment does not give the President advice.

The Byrd amendment provides:

Resolved, That by reason of the work stoppage now existing in the steel industry, the national safety is imperiled, and the Congress requests the President to immediately invoke the national emergency provisions—

"Requests" him to do so, Mr. President. As the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, has said, he did that weeks ago; but the President made perfectly clear, in the speech he made early this afternoon before the joint session of Congress, that without precise legislation from the Congress, he would not follow such a request. He made it clear that he felt that seizure was a much more desirable and equitable method to be used in the present dispute. Of course, Mr. President, I am referring to the present dispute. I do not believe the Senate is of a mind to legislate in the general field of seizure.

I shall support the bill of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], for I believe it is the best measure before us, and I believe that has been proved by the votes taken thus far on the other two measures.

At this time I wish to commend the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] for the valiant fight he made to have his amendment adopted, even though it was defeated by a vote of more than 2 to 1.

Mr. President, the Members of the Senate know that seizure legislation is very serious business. I believe that behind all these votes there is a general desire to have the congressional committees properly process and report a general seizure bill. What we wish to do and what the American people want to have Congress do is to pass a bill giving specific legislative authority, so that at least the President can move forward on a legal basis to protect the national welfare and the national safety. My amendment will do just that.

Mr. President, I am not talking now about general seizure legislation or about conditions which may exist in the days to come. To the contrary, I am speaking of the particular, specific problem which now confronts us.

My amendment does not necessarily preempt the field. Even though my amendment is adopted, the President will still have a right to exercise his judgment in reference to using the injunction process provided by the Taft-Hartley Act.

Of course it is all very well for some Senators to wish to have the Senate adopt a general resolution requesting the President to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act, and it will be all very well for the Senate to take action of that sort, if Senators wish to have that done.

However, this amendment provides for seizure in connection with the present dispute.

There is an honest difference of opinion as to whether any agency of Government should make recommendations and adjudications on the so-called noneconomic issues. I point out to the Senate that we already have adopted an amendment relating to the authority of the Wage Stabilization Board in the field of compensation. The amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] was adopted—it was adopted by a very close vote, to be sure, but it was adopted; and that amendment prevents the Wage Stabilization Board from making recommendations on noneconomic matters. That amendment gives the Wage Stabilization Board the right to make recommendations in regard to matters relating to wages, salaries, and compensation.

This amendment fits right in with the action the Senate has already taken, because in the amendment we preclude governmental imposition of the union

shop in connection with the current dispute.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield at this time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota in section 415 does not refer at all to having Congress give its consent in the case of appointments to the Compensation Board. It occurs to me that the industry involved in this case is a very large one which affects a great number of persons and a large segment of the American public, even if we consider only the stockholders of the steel companies.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The failure to have the amendment provide for confirmation by the Senate of the members of that board was only an inadvertence on my part; I have no strong feeling one way or another on that matter. So I am perfectly willing to modify the amendment so as to provide for Senate confirmation of the members of the Compensation Board. Certainly I have no desire to hamstring the President or in any way to deny the Senate an opportunity to exercise its ordinary functions in connection with this matter. So, Mr. President, I accept such a modification.

Mr. LONG. Would the Senator from Minnesota accept a modification in section 415, after the words "the President is empowered to appoint", by inserting the words "with the consent of the Senate"?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I accept that suggestion, and I modify my amendment accordingly, so as to include provision for confirmation by the Senate of the members of the Compensation Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be modified accordingly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, what do we wish to have done? What is Congress seeking to have done at this moment?

Frankly, Mr. President, I agree with the Senator—I believe it was the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]—who a moment ago said that we have taken several votes on various measures thus far, and that there is no need to prolong this situation.

The simple fact of the matter is that in the present steel dispute there has been a great deal of cooperation and self-sacrifice on the part of the workers in the steel industry. I wish to cite for the RECORD the situation referred to earlier this afternoon by the President of the United States: These working people have not had a salary increase since December 1950. These men and women have children, and they are home owners and land owners, and they are good, loyal citizens. They have worked for their country and for their communities and for their families. These people have been denied, however, an opportunity to have a wage increase, despite the fact that the cost of living has skyrocketed since December 1950. These people have been producing for the steel companies which have made unprecedented profits. Mr. President, let us consider for a moment the millions and millions of dollars which the steel companies have made in recent years. These working people have a right to have fair play and fair treatment.

Earlier this afternoon the Senator from Oregon stated categorically, and I agree, that to have an injunction under the Taft-Hartley Act issued against these workers would be to deny them fair play and equity. Such an injunction would constitute a fine upon these workers; it would mean that they would be prevented for another 80 days from receiving any semblance of justice.

Mr. President, I am not out here to give the steel companies a rough time. They have made billions of dollars—paid by the American people. They are richer than they have ever been before. Only yesterday, when it looked as if the negotiations in the steel dispute were going to end up in a settlement, what happened? I state on the floor of the Senate that leaders in the steel industry, representing companies against which there is no strike, were in Washington consulting with the managers of the United States Steel Co., and others, telling them not to accept an agreement. Yes, I go on record as making that statement because I know whereof I speak. I know, for instance, that the illustrious Mr. Weir, one of the great steel magnates of this country, with a history of company unionism in his plant, was in Washington, and consulted on this particular strike situation; and yet he has no strike in his plant. The workers in the steel industry are entitled at least to some definite recognition from their Congress. They do not deserve to be punished and management does not deserve to be punished, but the American people are entitled to have steel. The workers are willing to work for their Government. The workers are willing to produce steel for America's fighting men and for their sons and their daughters; and the management says it is willing to produce it. Now, how are we going to get it produced under fair conditions? It can be produced under such conditions only while the Government of the United States operates the steel plants under provisions of law which insure just compensation for management and the employees, until a bargaining agreement can be concluded.

I have heard a great deal of talk about 50–50, about impartiality. There has been too much "horse and rabbit" talk here, and I would say that some people have a rabbit, for sure. That is called 50–50. Since the steelworkers' last contract was put into effect, the officers of these companies have had fantastic increases in salaries, running into thousands upon thousands of dollars. I have not heard Mr. Fairless or any of the other steel company officials say that they did not think they were worthy of an increase since December of 1950. Not only that, but I went on the RECORD to point out again and again that the steel companies have conditioned any increase in wages upon a price increase. This may all be in the past, but there has been far too much reference here to so-called impartiality, which is not impartiality at all. There are involved in this problem 650,000 workers, 150,000,000 Americans, and also 400,000 troops in Korea.

What does my amendment offer? My amendment offers the solution. My amendment offers steel production. My amendment offers some semblance of equity. It says to the steelworkers, "Go back to the mills and produce, and we will give you some of your due"; and it says to the management at the plant, "Open up your doors, heat up your furnaces, turn loose your technicians, and get us steel, first, and you will be properly compensated."

The Taft-Hartley law says none of that. All the Taft-Hartley law does, and all this Congress would be doing if it adopted the Byrd resolution, which politely, but not too politely, reminds the President to invoke the Taft-Hartley injunction process, would be to say to the workers in the steel industry, "You have been taking a licking since December 1950. We are going to spank you for another 80 days." That is all it says.

Is there any Member of this body who can stand here in reply and honestly say that these workers are not entitled to a wage increase? Is there anyone here who is willing to stand here and deny that Mr. Fairless has said that the workers are entitled to a wage increase? Do we not know that the steel companies have already offered an increase of between 16 and 21 cents an hour? Yet what would we be saying if we compelled the Taft-Hartley injunction process to be invoked? We would be saying to these working people, "It was good enough for you on December 1, 1950; and despite the fact that the cost of living has skyrocketed, you are going to take a licking for another 80 days." Not with my vote, Mr. President.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am much impressed by what the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has had to say, but I wonder whether two agencies are not involved in determining wages and working conditions, or wages and hours. That is, should not any wage increase relate in some way to what the Wage Stabilization Board has done? Let us suppose the Wage Stabilization Board said that 21 cents would be a fair increase, and yet the operating agency came along and said 10 cents or 15 cents would be a fair increase. Would the Senator accept an amendment to provide that any change made must be within the recommendation of the Wage Stabilization Board, if such a recommendation has been made?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was my intention to provide for that; my amendment was to be interpreted as being within the existing policies established by the Economic Stabilization Agency and any of its adjuncts. So I will accept the Senator's suggestion. I shall modify my amendment, if I may, under section 414, after the word "operated", to insert a colon and the words *"Provided,* That such adjustments are consistent with wage-stabilization policies." Would that meet the Senator's suggestion?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question on that point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want first to find out whether what I have said is what the Senator from Tennessee was suggesting.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I was suggesting that it be made consistent with the action of the Wage Stabilization Board, or with wage-stabilization policies, as set forth by the Wage Stabilization Board, if the Senator would amend it that way.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would accept that language.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota modify his amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I modify it at that point.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I think there is another side to this question. I think section 415, dealing with profits, should also be taken into consideration in connection with the item just referred to by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. In other words, if we are to consider ceilings or recommendations of the Wage Stabilization Board, consideration should also be given, so far as prices are concerned, to the limits set by the OPS. No efforts should be made to control profits in an unfair way.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from New York that my amendment was prepared in the light of the existing facts with respect to such matters as the Herlong amendment, the Capehart amendment, the wage stabilization policies, and the economic stabilization policies and formulas which are at present in the law. My amendment would in no way alter, diminish, or change the present law, insofar as economic stabilization is concerned. The Senator from New York has aptly pointed out a section which needed this legislative interpretation. There is no intent on the part of the Senator from Minnesota to cripple anyone's economic due or economic gain. My desire is to get the steel mills back into operation. My desire is to have this amendment operate within the wage stabilization, the price stabilization, and the over-all economic stabilization program. We are not trying to hold workers by force, so to speak, to a job. We are trying to give people a chance to live and let live, and to produce steel. That is what I am for. I am not trying to find a remedy for all the problems of the days to come. The Defense Production Act will continue for about 8 months, which is as long as the effect of this amendment would last.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that although the workers have been denied any increase in wages since December 1950 and have voluntarily waived their right to strike for a period of 150 days, it is now proposed on top of that, they shall be denied an increase in wages for another 80 days? In the meantime, has not management been the beneficiary of an increase, and have they not increased their incomes and profits on a larger scale than ever before in the history of the steel industry? Is it not also true that management would be the sole beneficiary of a delay in the settlement of this strike, because they keep their profits?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed they do.

Mr. LEHMAN. The workers do not receive any increase, but management keeps the profits, which their treasurers will pay out to the stockholders. Management is, therefore, the sole beneficiary of a delay in the settlement of the strike, is it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is eminently correct. What is more, Mr. President, a good deal of the steel which these companies produce will be produced at the expense of the taxpayers of the United States of America, for the armed services of our country, and to aid our allies.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should have liked to ask the Senator from Ohio this question. The Senator from Ohio made the point that settlements, even if injunctions were imposed upon labor, would be retroactive. I know of nothing in the law which requires that any settlement must be retroactive for the benefit of labor. The companies could, if they wanted to, go ahead and split their dividends with the stockholders.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed, they could.

Mr. LONG. They might be so kind as to give labor some of it, but that would seem unfair, because it would be money which should have been paid, in all fairness, as wages to labor, giving the money to labor only if labor agreed to certain terms.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Insofar as we have been able to ascertain from press reports and personal conferences, there has been no retroactive feature in any part of any company offer that went back later than March. Retroactivity does not retroact to the point where it started. It is somewhat like a recoil mechanism that loses some of its spring.

Mr. LONG. The fact is that under the Taft-Hartley law, if labor is required to work under an injunction, there is no requirement that any wage increase must be retroactive.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have tried to get the exact wording of section 414. As I understand, the new words added are these:

Provided, That such adjustments are consistent with the Wage Stabilization Board policies.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota if, under that wording of section 414, it would mean that the only adjustment of wages, hours, and working conditions which would be permitted would be in accordance with the findings and recommendations of the Wage Stabilization Board.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from Florida, as a point of clarification, that no recommendations could be permitted higher than that. Recommendations lower than that would be permitted.

I use as a precedent what happened in connection with the railroad companies. The Department of the Army actually gave a wage increase, which was not so large as that which was recommended by the emergency board, but it gave some wage increase. It would be my understanding, may I say to the Senator from Florida, that under the terms of this modification any wage adjustment would have to be consistent with Wage Stabilization Board policies as found by that Board. Not any higher, and with room down below.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would simply like to observe that under my interpretation of the wording—

That department or agency, with the approval of the President, may adjust wages, hours, and working conditions—

Under the Senator's amendment as modified, it would be limited entirely and would be synonymous and identical with the recommendations of the Wage Stabilization Board.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As the author of this amendment, I think I can make the legislative history read accurately. The Wage Stabilization Board could have made a regulation in terms of a formula. In this case it has made a recommendation in terms of wages. It does not compel the Department of Commerce, if the Secretary of Commerce should be the recipient of the steel mills, to apply the full recommendations of the Wage Stabilization Board. It means that the Secretary of Commerce, with the approval of the President, could select, choose, and apply such wage and salary adjustments and fringe benefits as may be necessary to insure production. He cannot go above it. No union shop is involved.

Mr. HOLLAND. The actual recommendation of the Wage Stabilization Board would not be considered, then, as a part of the Wage Stabilization Board policy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. What I tried to make clear to the Senator——

Mr. HOLLAND. I think I understand what the Senator wishes to do, and I am simply inviting his attention to the fact that, in my humble judgment, he is not going to accomplish that result through the words used.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If I had felt that the agency should be bound by it, I would have made it mandatory. The reason I do not make it mandatory is that in this particular case the Wage Stabilization Board has made a set of recommendations. All I am saying is that, under my amendment, no officer of the Government can pierce the ceiling, so to speak, of the stabilization formula. He cannot go higher than the recommendations

made by the Wage Stabilization Board. He can go lower. It is flexible and is a matter of discretion on the part of the officer in charge. I think we have got to provide that much leeway.

I may point out that even the parties to this dispute, as they negotiated at the White House, have negotiated within the recommendations of the Wage Stabilization Board, both labor and management. The amendment removes from the area of any Government dictation the matter of the union shop. One of the recommendations of the Wage Stabilization Board was the union shop. Under my amendment, the Government could not impose the union shop, but it could grant some adjustments in terms of wages, salaries, and other compensation.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. IVES. The Senator's amendment reads in part as follows:

> That department or agency, with the approval of the President, may adjust wages, hours, and working conditions, other than union shop, in such a manner as to insure fair and equitable treatment of employees of the enterprise or enterprises so operated.

I understand there is a modification already accepted. I should like to ask the Senator with reference to a modification at the end of section 415. I would add the following language:

> *Provided*, That price increases within policies of the Office of Price Stabilization shall be allowed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I will accept that modification.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator be willing to accept a further modification? The Senator from New York used the word "shall" rather than "may."

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thought the Senator said "may."

Mr. IVES. I said "shall," but I will not quibble. I understand it means "shall."

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will accept the word "may."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The language is not clear that the increases allowed shall not exceed the recommendations of the Wage Stabilization Board. I wonder if we could not make the language provide that the recommendations of the Wage Stabilization Board shall not be exceeded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. "Providing, That such adjustments are consistent with the wage-stabilization policies and do not exceed the adjustments recommended by the Wage Stabilization Board."

Mr. KEFAUVER. That would make it amply clear.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I accept that modification, Mr. President, and I ask that it be incorporated in the language of my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment. The Senator has one more minute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I had better quit modifying.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendment, and I will yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina is one of the finest opponents any man could have. He always gives one the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; but I never quit.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I commend the Senator from Minnesota for submitting and for his able presentation in advocating a proposal which would give to the President powers in the emergency which confronts the Nation. The Senator has recognized that, from the standpoint of the national security, no further delay can be tolerated in the handling of the Steel case. He would give to the President the direction he needs for the immediate handling of the Steel case, so that we can get production flowing. His amendment provides Congress with the time I think is needed to consider permanent legislation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In his remarks earlier today, the Senator from Oregon, said he preferred that we should legislate on the subject of seizure as a separate item. I have heard similiar sentiments expressed by other Members of the Senate in the corridors. I feel that we can take care of the immediate situation now, and then get the seizure phase, in terms of over-all legislation, back into committee and out of committee, as a distinct, separate legislative proposal. In so doing we could do a better and more honest job of legislating.

I feel that that is what motivated many Members of the Senate today to vote against the seizure amendments. I am convinced that many Senators are just as deeply concerned about having an effective law as are some of us who supported the seizure amendments, but they do not wish to rush headlong into it. I respect their judgment. All I ask is that they give the President their strongest backing now in the present critical dispute.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wonder if the Senator would object to striking the words "hours and working conditions other than the union shop"? The amendment proposes to settle the one controversy now existing, and if there is left in the amendment language empowering the President to negotiate concerning adjustments in hours and working conditions other than the union shop, he might have a fairly wide discretionary authority. For example, as I understand, it would leave the matter wide open for the President to negotiate from time to time on conditions covered by the words I have read, not confining him to presently existing conditions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to comply with the Senator's request, but I am afraid it is all covered by the term "wages." I should have put in "wages, salaries, and other compensation." I shall modify it to that point, and make it read, "may adjust wages, salaries, and other compensation."

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator strike out the word "hours"?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The words "other compensation," which we have used all the way through the amendment, includes so-called fringe benefits. I believe that is what the Senator is driving at.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator then strike the words "hours and working conditions"?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, and I will insert "wages, salaries, and other compensation."

Mr. LONG. The Senator would then strike out the words "hours and working conditions"?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator modifying his amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to modify the amendment, in section 414, after the word "President", in the fourth line of the paragraph, so as to read, "may adjust wages, salaries, and other compensation, other than the union shop," and to strike out the words, "hours and working conditions."

Mr. President, I wish I could feel certain in my own heart that I have convinced my colleagues. I keep looking over, with pleading eyes, to the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois, because I know he is going to have something to say. Then I look back and see the distinguished and able Senator from Ohio. If I could get those two men to stand up in support of my amendment, I would say this was a great day for the Republic—and I do not mean Republic Steel. I mean it would be a great day for the American people. I have frequently cast fleeting glances to see if I cannot catch a ray of hope. Now and then I do feel that there is a chance that possibly we are going to get the support we need because it is inconceivable to my mind that men who have given such distinguished leadership to this body and to the House of Representatives, men who aspire to give distinguished leadership, could at this hour deny to the Government of the United States the power to deal with this dispute, and deal with it capably.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I voted against the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma because it would apply to the selective-service law, which would have made it permanent legislation. My amendment was an amendment of the National Production Act, which will expire March 1, 1953. The amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], if it had been adopted, would have been permanent. I never would have voted for permanent legislation on a temporary national pro-

duction bill. I merely wish to make myself perfectly clear.

I desire also to suggest that I understand that when the amendment of the Senator from Virginia is adopted, if the Senate decides to adopt it, it can be amended again, because I know Congress is going to provide for some sort of seizure, pass some kind of law to remedy the maladjustment, I might say, of the steelworkers, who have received no increase in wages. I know they are entitled to a cost-of-living wage, and I have always said so. I think the steel industry itself is entitled to certain price increases, but that is not for the Congress to decide; that is for the Board appointed by Congress to determine.

I shall vote against the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, because I do not think we should have such an amendment agreed to until the Byrd amendment is voted upon.

I have nothing further to say. I do not expect the Senator to get the votes he got before. Perhaps he will get more tomorrow.

I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN obtained the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask to have it printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am always enamored of the soothing and dulcet tones of my esteemed friend the Senator from Minnesota. On occasion, I have been moved by the passionate persuasion the Senator brings to any subjects he discusses, but I think I am even more enamored of and intrigued by the delightful informality in which he modifies his own handiwork. If my memory serves me correctly, his amendment has been informally and very delightfully modified at least 5 times. I am confident that my esteemed friend from the great North Star State of Minnesota, where I once lived, probably knows what is in this amendment. As a matter of fact, after all the modifications, I do not believe any other Member of the Senate knows. I have been most diligent in trying to follow his argument, but I have found it difficult indeed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield with the utmost pleasure.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was going to suggest, since the Senator is somewhat confused about what is in my amendment, that it would be well to have the clerk read sections 414 and 415, because I believe that in that way the amendment will be more quickly clarified for him, with his receptive mind. I know he will quickly understand it, and then with his ability of expression, he will persuade others of its desirability.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That would be agreeable, except that the mustard plasters which are suggested would not of themselves cure the modified proposal which is now before the Senate.

In brief, Mr. President, this is simply a matter of the President seizing the steel plants. It is very useful for the current dispute. Should the men who work in defense plants go on strike before the dispute is settled, they, too, would come within the purview of the amendment, because it authorizes the seizure of all plants which produce steel products.

The President not only can seize, but he can continue to possess until two things happen. The first is that a plant might not be essential to the beautiful purposes that are recited in the bill. Or, secondly, the dispute might be settled. But the interesting thing is that even where a strike is settled, no operating agency that the President may determine upon, such as Mr. Tobin or Mr. Sawyer, would have any power to modify the union-shop provisions.

Even while the facilities are in the possession of the Government anything can be modified except the union-shop provision. As I understand, the parties have settled every substantive issue except the union-shop clause. So there is no great likelihood that the dispute will be settled so long as that feature remains in issue.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator referred to the union-shop provision. Does not the amendment provide that if a union shop is in existence, it may not be changed?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We are talking about a new amendment. This is the language:

That department or agency—

That is, the operating agency—

with the approval of the President, may adjust wages, hours, and working conditions—

Then there are penciled in the words—

other than union shop.

Mr. FERGUSON. "Other than union shop." Does not that indicate that if there is a union shop, that situation cannot be changed?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right. There could be no bargaining with respect to the union shop. No modification of it could be made, one way or the other.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would not this language permit the institution of a new union-shop provision?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It might.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does it? The language provides that if there is a union shop, it may not be changed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. How would it operate in the other direction? If there were no union shop, could the President's board put a union shop into effect?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know. I know that the amendment offered a while ago by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] turned out to be a one-way street.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. That is covered by the language on page 7, lines 7 to 10, inclusive, of the Monroney amendment, which reads as follows:

And provided further, That such recommendations shall not include any proposal for a change in the existing union shop, maintenance of membership, or similar arrangements between employers and employees.

That means that if such arrangements were in effect they could not be changed. But how would it operate in the other direction?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is the question. This is one of those "multum in parvo" proposals, in which we find much in little. I am always just a little alarmed by such proposals. However, in essence it is a seizure provision, with power to operate.

Finally, it sets up a board designated by the President to determine compensation, with authority to go to the Court of Claims if the award is renounced within 30 days.

I do not think it is necessary. It is all of the same kidney with most of the things we have been discussing today and on other days. I still believe that the most expeditious thing for us to do is to go back to the basic provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. This proposal is weak in the respect that it must pass the Senate, it must pass the House, and it must go to conference; and there is no assurance that the conference will complete its labors by the 1st of July. So the situation will be held in abeyance all that time, whereas in the case of the Taft-Hartley Act, it is the law. The President can use it this afternoon if he so desires; but he has not seen fit to use it.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York would like to ask his distinguished colleague from Illinois if he does not feel that under the terms of section 414, as written, management and labor would be empowered to reach any kind of agreement which the two might desire on the subject of the union shop?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If they can.

Mr. IVES. If they can. There is nothing which would prevent them from doing so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. IVES. The intention of this provision is to keep the Government out of it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course. That is one element in the present controversy which seems to be unsolved. The question is, Do we put the moral weight of Government on one side or the other?

That was the trouble in the Wage Stabilization problem. I never like to reproach anyone by saying that he is biased. However, I know something about Mr. Feinsinger's record. He was Chairman of the Board. I am not unmindful of the fact that when the Taft-Hartley Act was under consideration in the Senate, before I became a Member of this august deliberative body, he was the signer of a telegram in opposition to the Taft-Hartley proposal. He wrote an article for the Labor Monthly in 1950,

attacking the Taft-Hartley Act. Do Senators suppose that a man like that would not be slightly biased or prejudiced?

The same is true of some of the other members of the Wage Stabilization Board, who are characterized as public members. That situation has been covered in the press from time to time, and the facts are known. So we are back here as a result of the failure of the Wage Stabilization Board and the skirting of the Taft-Hartley Act.

It was said the other day by my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]—and I do not want to do my friend any injustice—that the Byrd proposal was merely a gesture. If it is a gesture and nothing more, then why the resistance and hostility toward adopting it? If it is innocuous, if it is merely a gesture, if it is only a flourish, why not make it unanimous?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. It has been resisted in season and out. All these various proposals are offered as substitutes for that which is already on the books as the solemn law of the land.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield first to my friend from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN. I did say that in my opinion it would be merely a gesture to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act. I repeat that I think it would be completely ineffectual. I think it would work a great hardship on the men who have voluntarily waived their claim to an increase in wages for a period of 150 days, and who would now, under the terms of the Taft-Hartley Act, be required to waive their claim for another 80 days. I said that to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act would be only a gesture, too, because I believed that it would make the people of this country feel that something was about to be accomplished. I know that it could not be accomplished. The Taft-Hartley law would not produce steel. It could not force men to work in the steel mills. Of course it is a gesture; and it is a gesture which I believe would deceive people into believing that something had been accomplished. I want to see something effective, which would do justice to management and to labor, and result in the production of steel, which is so greatly needed in our defense effort.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If my friend from New York thinks it is only a gesture, he ought to embrace it with vigorous enthusiasm, on the ground that it cannot do any harm. However, I believe that the psychological factor would be momentous for the country. I believe that it would come as a great refreshing and cleansing wave in the thinking of people, in the light of the concern and anxiety which is evident in the country today.

I come back to my original premise. There is still provision for a secret ballot on the last offer, as provided in the Taft-Hartley Act. I reaffirm what I said earlier this afternoon, that the President could with good grace have said to us in joint session, "Suppose you give me just enough authority to ignore the time provisions in the Taft-Hartley Act, and allow the men who have a substantive interest to ballot on the question." That would be the easy way, the effective way, and the certain way out. However, any of the proposals which have been offered would have to go through the Senate, through the House, through conference, and finally to the White House. In the light of the fortuities with which we are fully familiar, and the unpredictability and fallibility of the human mind, even at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, who can tell whether or not the President would approve it?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Is not the same thing true with respect to the Byrd amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, except that the Byrd amendment is nothing more than a request to the President. This has teeth in it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to ask the Senator whether or not it is a fact that one of the purposes of the Taft-Hartley law, during the 80-day period, is to avoid finality.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not the purpose to avoid invoking such a procedure as seizure, and to allow both industry and labor to continue their negotiations during that period?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not also a fact that, as a rule, if such negotiations lead to a settlement, the settlement is dated back to the time when the contract expired, so that the men do not actually lose the increased wages during the so-called waiting period of 80 days or 150 days, or whatever time may be represented by the period of negotiations?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not only is that true in the current case, but I am not familiar with a single bit of bargaining—and I have had a little to do with it—with respect to which there has not been a retroactive feature, so that there was no loss. There may be a momentary suspension of the rights of men, but always the settlement is dated back to a given day, so that there is no injustice so far as the money aspect of the bargaining is concerned.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Does not one of the problems lie in the fact that the situation is tied up with the stabilization picture, and the difficulty with making a retroactive wage decision is that there is no way in the present situation by which a retroactive award as to prices could be made to management?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is quite correct. There has been discussion about a possible increase of $4.50 a ton or $6 a ton. Management made the offer in this case prior to the first of the year. The situation goes back to the 21st or 22d of December. There was a target date established then. We not only assume but we know that it will be dated back to that time.

Notwithstanding that fact, management might come out at the little end of the horn in that they may not get what they believe they are entitled to get.

Mr. President, there is no need to labor the point any further. I say: Let us vote down the Humphrey amendment and let us vote it down with an overwhelming majority. Then let us return to the Byrd amendment and vote on it at an early hour.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There was some reference made to the proviso in the amendment with respect to "other than union shop." When the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] was engaged in colloquy with me we altered "wages, hours, and working conditions," in section 414, to read "wages, salaries, and other compensation." We eliminated "hours and working conditions." Therefore, "other than union shop" no longer would serve its original purpose and constitutes surplus language. It should not now be contained in the amendment.

With reference to the Byrd amendment, I believe the Senator from Illinois will agree with me that the most it does is make a request of the President of the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not bleeding and dying about the Byrd amendment. I have my own opinion about it. I shall cast my vote as I wish, just as the Senator from Illinois will cast his vote. But what I am saying is that regardless of what the Byrd amendment may offer in terms of advice and suggestion it still does not meet the entire situation. The President should still have the option of being able to use the Taft-Hartley law or seizure. What the Senator from Minnesota has proposed is seizure in this case, limited in duration of the effectiveness of the Defense Production Act and limited to the current dispute. It is a reasonable, fair, and middle-ground proposal. I had hoped that its reasonableness would receive not only the eloquent but the persuasive and the fervent support of the junior Senator from Illinois, as a patriot, in doing good work to get the dispute settled and steel production resumed in full gear.

Mr. President, the door is still open. The prodigal son can still return. There is warmth in my heart for the Senator from Illinois. I welcome him back into the fold. I know he will make the right decision when the hour comes. In the hour of decision I know the junior Senator from Illinois will be found in support, in his heart if not in his voice, of the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, never have I heard the Gospel of St. Paul so richly exemplified as by my friend from Minnesota when he speaks of faith, hope, and charity. I shall embrace that charitable spirit and rush on to a vote on the Byrd amendment. I think that is a

great contribution to make. I yield the remainder of my time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota wish to use any more of his time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I request the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the roll be dispensed with, that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded, and that we now proceed to vote on the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question now is on agreeing to the modified amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Minnesota to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

For the information of the Senate, the Chair will direct the clerk to read the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, as that amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia has been modified.

The CHIEF CLERK. The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, proposed by Mr. HUMPHREY to the amendment of Mr. BYRD, reads as follows:

SEC. 108. Title IV of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof, the following new sections:

"SEC. 412. Findings:

"The United States of America has undertaken and is exercising leadership in a global struggle for the preservation of democratic institutions;

"This Nation has made and is making great sacrifices to arm against and repel totalitarian aggression;

"The Armed Forces of the United States are deployed throughout the world to discourage aggression by totalitarian forces;

"The continued production of arms and material is vital to the security of the United States and the free nations associated with it; and

"The continuous production of steel and steel products is essential to the adequate production of arms and material required by the Armed Forces of the United States and the democratic nations dedicated to the preservation of freedom.

"SEC. 413. (a) The President of the United States is empowered to take possession of and operate all enterprises which produce steel and steel products and whose operations are interrupted by the current labor dispute.

"(b) The President shall continue to possess and operate any such enterprise or part thereof until

"(1) he finds that any such enterprise or part thereof is not essential to the production found necessary in section 412 or

"(2) the labor dispute which disrupted production is settled.

"SEC. 414. The President is empowered to designate an appropriate department or independent agency to operate any enterprise or enterprises of which possession is taken under sections 412 and 413. That department or agency with the approval of the President, may adjust wages, salares and other compensation in such a manner as to insure fair and equitable treatment of employees of the enterprise or enterprises so operated. Provided that such adjustments are consistent with policies as set forth by the Wage Stabilization Board and do not exceed the recommendations made by said Board.

"SEC. 415. The President is empowered to appoint a Compensation Board by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, which shall determine just compensation to be paid the owners of the enterprises of which possession is taken pursuant to sections 412 and 413: Provided, That price increases within policies of the Office of Price Stabilization may be allowed. The award of the Compensation Board shall be final and binding, unless within 30 days after the issuance of said award, a party moves to have the said award set aside or modified in the United States Court of Claims in accordance with the rules of said Court."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll. The Senators who favor the amendment, as modified, in the nature of a substitute will vote "yea"; Senators who oppose that amendment will vote "nay."

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maine would vote "nay."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] would each vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON]. If present and voting the Senator from Maine would vote "nay" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay" and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea" and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—32

Anderson	Hunt	McKellar
Chavez	Ives	Monroney
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Moody
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Morse
Douglas	Kefauver	Neely
Fulbright	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Green	Kilgore	Pastore
Hayden	Lehman	Sparkman
Hennings	Long	Tobey
Hill	Magnuson	Underwood
Humphrey	McFarland	

NAYS—47

Bennett	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Bridges	Hoey	Saltonstall
Butler, Md.	Holland	Schoeppel
Butler, Nebr.	Jenner	Seaton
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Case	Kem	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Martin	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Maybank	Stennis
Eastland	McCarran	Taft
Ellender	McCarthy	Thye
Ferguson	McClellan	Watkins
Flanders	Millikin	Welker
Frear	Mundt	Wiley
George	Nixon	Williams
Hendrickson	O'Conor	

NOT VOTING—17

Aiken	Carlson	Malone
Benton	Duff	McMahon
Brewster	Ecton	Murray
Bricker	Gillette	Russell
Cain	Langer	Young
Capehart	Lodge	

So Mr. HUMPHREY'S amendment, as modified, in the nature of a substitute for Mr. BYRD'S amendment, was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. For the information of the Senate, the clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, after line 16, it is proposed to insert the following:

Title V of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by adding a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 504. Resolved, That, by reason of the work stoppage now existing in the steel industry, the national safety is imperiled, and the Congress requests the President to immediately invoke the national emergency provisions (secs. 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, for the purpose of terminating such work stoppage."

Mr. BYRD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. MAYBANK. Am I correct in my understanding that if the amendment of the Senator from Virginia is agreed to, it can still be amended?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If agreed to, it cannot be amended. The bill, itself, may be amended in other respects, but the Byrd amendment cannot be amended after it is once adopted. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maine would vote "yea."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Masssachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON]. If present and voting the Senator from Maine would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea," and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—49

Bennett	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hoey	Schoeppel
Butler, Md.	Holland	Seaton
Butler, Nebr.	Jenner	Smathers
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Case	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Dirksen	Martin	Stennis
Dworshak	Maybank	Taft
Eastland	McCarran	Thye
Ellender	McCarthy	Underwood
Ferguson	McClellan	Watkins
Flanders	Millikin	Welker
Frear	Mundt	Wiley
Fulbright	Nixon	Williams
George	O'Conor	
Hendrickson	Robertson	

NAYS—30

Anderson	Hunt	McFarland
Chavez	Ives	McKellar
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Monroney
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Moody
Douglas	Kefauver	Morse
Green	Kerr	Neely
Hayden	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Hennings	Lehman	Pastore
Hill	Long	Sparkman
Humphrey	Magnuson	Tobey

NOT VOTING—17

Aiken	Carlson	Malone
Benton	Duff	McMahon
Brewster	Ecton	Murray
Bricker	Gillette	Russell
Cain	Langer	Young
Capehart	Lodge	

So the amendment of Mr. BYRD was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, after line 16, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 108. Title IV of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding, at the end thereof, the following new section:

"SEC. 412 (a) That title II of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, is amended by renumbering present sections 211 and 212 as sections 216 and 217, respectively, and inserting the following after section 210:

"'SEC. 211. Whenever the head of an appropriate department or independent agency reports to the President and the President finds, that a national emergency is threatened or exists because a stoppage of work or operations has resulted or threatens to result from a labor dispute (including the expiration of a collective-bargaining agreement) in a vital industry or plant which seriously affects the security of the United States, and the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service advises the President that all attempts at mediation and conciliation have been exhausted without success, the President shall issue a proclamation to that effect and call upon the parties to the dispute to refrain from a stoppage of work or operations, or, if such stoppage has occurred, to resume work and operations in the public interest.

"'PROCEDURE FOLLOWING PROCLAMATION

"'SEC. 212. (a) Immediately after issuing a proclamation pursuant to section 211, the President shall submit to the Congress for consideration and appropriate action a full statement of the case based upon such information as has been made available to him through the appropriate agencies of Government, together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make as to procedures for effecting final settlement of the dispute and, pending settlement, for maintaining operation of the enterprise or enterprises involved.

"'(b) The President may include a recommendation that the United States take possession of and operate the business enterprise or enterprises involved in the dispute. The President may make such additional reports and recommendations as he deems advisable. If the President recommends that the United States shall take possession of and operate such enterprise or enterprises, the President shall have authority to take such action forthwith. If the Congress by concurrent resolution within 10 days after the submission of such recommendation to it determines that such action should not have been or should not be taken, any property seized shall be returned to its owners and no future seizure shall take place during that dispute without congressional authorization by concurrent resolution: *Provided*, That during the period in which the United States shall have taken possession, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service shall continue to encourage the settlement of the dispute by the parties concerned, and the agency or department of the United States designated to operate such enterprise or enterprises shall have no authority to enter into negotiations with the employer or with the labor organization for a collective-bargaining contract or to alter the wages, hours, or the conditions of employment existing in such industry or plant prior to the dispute, except in conformity (in whole or in part) with the recommendations of the emergency board or an agreement of the parties: *Provided further*, That in case an emergency board assumes jurisdiction over any form of union security which requires an employee to join a union as a condition of continued employment the putting into effect of its union security recommendations during a period of Government possession shall require the acceptance of the labor organization and the employer concerned in the dispute. If the Congress or either House thereof shall have adjourned sine die or for a period longer than 3 days, the President shall convene the Congress, or such House forthwith for the purpose of consideration of an appropriate action pursuant to such statement and recommendations.

"'(c) After the issuance of a seizure order, it shall be the duty of any labor organization of which any employees who have been employed in the operation of such enterprise are members, and of the officers of such labor organization, to seek in good faith to induce such employees to refrain from a stoppage of work and not to engage in any strike, slow-down, or other concerted refusal to work, or stoppage of work, and if such stoppage of work has occurred, to seek in good faith to induce such employees to return to work and not to engage in any strike, slow-down, or other concerted refusal to work or stoppage of work until the dispute is settled or until possession of such enterprise is relinquished by the United States, whichever occurs sooner.

"'(d) After the issuance of a seizure order or any time thereafter, the President may direct the Attorney General to petition any district court, having jurisdiction of the parties, to enjoin such stoppage of work or operations, and if the court finds that the President has reasonable cause to believe that a national emergency is threatened or exists because a threatened or actual stoppage of work or operations may result or has resulted from a labor dispute (includ-

ing the expiration of a collective agreement) in a vital industry or plant which seriously affects the security of the Nation, it shall have jurisdiction to enjoin such stoppage of work or operations, or the continuing thereof, and to make such other orders as may be appropriate. In granting such injunction or relief, the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the act entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes, approved March 23, 1932" (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 29, secs. 101–115). Such injunction or order shall be dissolved when the dispute is settled or possession of an enterprise seized pursuant to this section is relinquished by the United States, whichever occurs sooner.

"'EMERGENCY BOARDS

"'SEC. 213. (a) After issuing such a proclamation, the President may appoint a board to be known as an "emergency board."

"'(b) Any emergency board appointed under this section shall promptly investigate the dispute, shall seek to induce the parties to reach a settlement of the dispute, and in any event shall, within a period of time to be determined by the President but not more than 30 days after the appointment of the board, make a written report to the President, unless the time is extended by agreement of the parties, with the approval of the board. Such report shall include the findings and recommendations of the board and shall be transmitted to the parties and be made public. The recommendations shall be consistent with all laws and regulations otherwise applicable to compensation, hours, and other terms and conditions and incidents of employment. The Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service shall provide for the board such stenographic, clerical, and other assistance and such facilities and services as may be necessary for the discharge of its functions.

"'(c) An emergency board shall be composed of a chairman and such other members as the President shall determine, and shall have power to sit and act in any place within the United States and to conduct such hearings either in public or in private, as it may deem necessary or proper, to ascertain the facts with respect to the causes and circumstances of the dispute.

"'(d) Members of an emergency board shall receive compensation at the rate of $75 for each day actually spent by them in the work of the board, together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses.

"'(e) For the purpose of any hearing or inquiry conducted by any board appointed under this title, the provisions of sections 8 (f), 9, and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 45 (f), 49, and 50, as amended), are hereby made applicable to the powers and duties of such board.

"'(f) When a board appointed under this section has been dissolved, its records shall be transferred to the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

"'(g) No member of an emergency board shall be an officer or employee of the organization of employees or any employer involved in the dispute.

"'SEC. 214. (a) In the event that the Government shall take possession of and operate any business enterprise or enterprises involved in a given dispute, the President shall designate the agency or department of Government which shall take possession of any business enterprise or enterprises including the properties thereof involved in the dispute and all other assets of the enterprise or enterprises necessary to such continued operation thereof as will protect the national security.

"'(b) Any enterprise or properties of which possession has been taken under this title shall be returned to the owners thereof as soon as (1) such owners have reached an agreement with the representatives of the employees in such enterprise settling the issues in dispute between them, or (2) the President finds that the continued possession and operation of such enterprise by the United States is no longer necessary under the terms of the proclamation provided for in section 211: *Provided*, That possession by the United States shall be terminated not later than 60 days after the issuance of a seizure order unless the period of possession is extended by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

"'(c) Beginning not later than 30 days after issuance of a seizure order, the United States shall impound and hold all income received from the operation thereof in trust for the payment of general operating expenses, just compensation to the owners as hereinafter provided in this subsection, and reimbursement to the United States for expenses incurred by the United States in the operation of the enterprise. Any income remaining shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. In determining just compensation to the owners of the enterprise, due consideration shall be given to the fact that if the United States had not initiated the procedures set forth in sections 211 to 215 of the act the owners' production would have been interrupted by a stoppage of work or operations, to the fact that the United States took or continued possession of such enterprise when its operation had been interrupted by a stoppage of work or operations or that stoppage of work or operations was imminent; to the fact that the United States would have returned such enterprise to its owners at any time when an agreement was reached settling the issues involved in such stoppage of work or operations; and to the value the use of such enterprise would have had to its owners in the light of the labor dispute prevailing, had they remained in possession during the period of Government operation: *Provided*, That any increase in wages or other compensation or any increase resulting from a change in the method of computing wages or other compensation which are agreed to by the parties retroactively for the period of Government operation or any portion of that period shall be deemed costs or expenses for such period.

"'(d) During the period in which possession of any enterprise has been taken by the United States under this section, the employer or employers or their duly designated representatives and the representatives of the employees in such enterprise shall be obligated to continue collective bargaining for the purpose of settling the issues in the dispute between them.

"'(e) (1) The President may appoint a compensation board to determine the amount to be paid as just compensation under this title to the owner of any enterprise of which possession is taken. For the purpose of any hearing or inquiry conducted by any such board the provisions relating to the conduct of hearings or inquiries by emergency boards as provided in section 213 of this title are hereby made applicable to any such hearing or inquiry. The members of compensation boards shall be appointed and compensated in accordance with the provisions of section 213 of this title.

"'(2) Upon appointing such compensation board the President shall make provision as may be necessary for stenographic, clerical, and other assistance and such facilities, services, and supplies as may be necessary to enable the compensation board to perform its functions.

"'(3) The award of the compensation board shall be final and binding, unless within 30 days after the issuance of said award, a party moves to have the said award set side or modified in the United States Court of Claims in accordance with the rules of said court.

"'SEC. 215. When a dispute arising under this title has been finally settled, the President shall submit to the Congress a full and comprehensive report of all the proceedings, together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make.'

"(b) Section 717 of this act, as amended, shall not apply to this section 412."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed so that it may be on the desks of Senators tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Hon. Ernest A. Tolin, to be United States district judge for the southern district of California.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of A. Carter Whitehead, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for the office of United States marshal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of United States marshals are confirmed en bloc.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William D. Sudia, to be assistant sanitarian in the Public Health Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified of all confirmations of today.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I note that the adversely reported nomination for the office of Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia is still carried on the calendar, whereas an act has been passed giving the power to the District Commissioners to make the appointment. Is it not timely that we indefinitely postpone that particular nomination?

Mr. McFARLAND. It might be well to look into it. I thank the Senator for calling my attention to the matter.

Mr. HOLLAND. It seems to be useless to continue to carry the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow Wednesday, June 11, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 10, 1952:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Hon. Ernest A. Tolin, to be United States district judge for the southern district of California.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

A. Carter Whitehead, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Virginia.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Benjamin F. Ellis, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Alabama.

Raymond E. Thomason, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Alabama.

John E. Hushing, to be United States marshal for the district of the Canal Zone.

Julius J. Wichser, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Indiana.

Rupert Hugo Newcomb, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Mississippi.

Frank Golden, to be United States marshal for the district of Nebraska.

William T. Brady, to be United States marshal for the district of New Jersey.

Gerald K. Nellis, to be United States marshal for the northern district of New York.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR CORPS

William D. Sudia, to be assistant sanitarian, effective date of acceptance.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 10, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore.

Rev. John W. Inzer, D. D., past national chaplain of the American Legion, of High Acres, Sylacauga, Ala., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, the God and Father of all mankind, as we humbly come before Thee this morning for a moment of worship and prayer, it seems most timely to remind ourselves of one of Thy great promises to Thy people, but a promise that carries with it important conditions on our part. Thou hast said: "If my people who are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my faith, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven and will forgive their sins, and heal their land."

Oh God, help us as a nation of God-fearing people this day to meet these conditions and be in a position to receive Thy great favor.

We thank Thee for this particular branch of our National Government; that these gentlemen are by and large men of ability, vision, integrity, and high purpose; that our founding fathers were wise to set up this House of Representatives as an effective check on other branches of our Government; and that this House is answerable every 2 years directly to the people. May they and all men always keep this important fact in mind.

We thank Thee for so many men in government who will not stoop to conquer, yield to expediency, compromise convictions, or be beaten down by unscrupulous pressure groups; or fail to speak their minds or vote their convictions. We thank Thee that we have patriotic citizens from Washington to Korea who are truly willing to die, that freedom may not perish from all the earth—men who put God and country above profit and advancement and even above home and life, men who put principle above party and service above self.

Oh God, save us this day from ignorance, stupidity, littleness, folly, selfishness, and sin. Give us a will with wisdom and courage to see the whole world safely through these gray days. Help us to see that these days are gray only and to not be afraid to walk through them, and to be faithful to perform our sacred duties.

Now, Heavenly Father, forgive us not only of our sins of omission and commission but also that other sin that at times is a more perilous sin—the sin of submission. Help us all this day to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with Thee our God and in the presence of our fellow men.

In the Master's name we ask it. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7005) entitled "An act to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes."

PROVISION FOR JOINT SESSION OF HOUSE AND SENATE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Con. Res. 220) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, June 10, 1952, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESSES MADE IN ORDER TODAY

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time today for the Speaker pro tempore to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore at 12 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 220. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of the two Houses of Congress on June 10, 1952.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 220 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore presided.

The Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and the Members of the United States Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker pro tempore and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the part of the House the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber, the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. PRIEST; the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. DOUGHTON; and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Arizona, Mr. McFARLAND; the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. BRIDGES; and the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. MAYBANK.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

At 12:30 o'clock p. m. the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members of the Congress, I have the distinguished honor of presenting to you the President of the United States.

CRISIS IN THE STEEL INDUSTRY—ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 496)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress, I should like to report to the Congress on certain events that have happened in connection with the current dispute in the steel industry since I last communicated with the Congress on that subject.

On April 9, I informed the Congress that I had taken action to provide for temporary operation of the steel mills by the Government. At that time, I indicated the reasons that had impelled me to take that action. I pointed out that the Congress might wish to take action providing for a different solution of the grave problem confronting the Nation as a result of the steel dispute. I also said that, if the Congress did not act, I would continue to do everything in my power to keep the steel industry operating and to bring about a settlement of the dispute.

The Congress took no action.

Accordingly, Government operation of the mills continued and intensive efforts were made to bring the parties into agreement. Meetings between the parties were held from April 9 to April 15, and on May 3 and 4. But their differences on a number of issues were so great that no settlement could be reached.

Meanwhile, some of the steel companies had instituted court proceedings for the purpose of challenging the President's power to keep the steel mills in operation. This case reached the Supreme Court, and on Monday, June 2, a majority of that Court decided that the President did not have the power, in this instance, to operate the mills. I immediately ordered that Government possession of the mills be relinquished.

On the same day, a strike was called and most of the steel industry was shut down. Thus, the situation that I had sought to avoid was brought about. I had managed to keep steel production going from the end of December to the second of June—a period of more than 150 days—even though the companies and the union had no collective bargaining contract. Now it has been made impossible for me to prevent a break in production.

Very shortly thereafter, I was informed there was a reasonable prospect that the parties might be able to reach a settlement of their dispute if they could be brought together again to negotiate.

I have said repeatedly that the ultimate and proper settlement of this matter can be achieved only by agreement between the parties. Consequently, I have sought at every opportunity to help bring about such an agreement. That, obviously, was the step that was called for in the circumstances prevailing last week. Moreover, it seemed essential that the negotiations be given every possible chance to succeed—that no other action be taken which would be likely to make either party unwilling or unable to negotiate in good faith.

That is the course that was followed. The parties were called back into negotiations. They met from Thursday, June 5, until Monday, June 9. Although they made some progress, they were not able to reach a final agreement. We are now, therefore, faced with the necessity of using some other means for getting the steel mills back into production.

When the negotiations were broken off last night, representatives of the parties indicated that they would "cooperate in assuring production of military requirements essential to our forces engaged in combating Communist aggressors." This morning, I have instructed Dr. Steelman, Acting Director of Defense Mobilization, and Mr. Lovett, Secretary of Defense, to arrange with the companies and the union to meet as many of our urgent military requirements as possible under this pledge.

It is impossible to determine at this time just how much steel can be obtained in this manner. We should be able to meet our most critical military needs. But, at the same time, we cannot expect to get enough steel in this way to meet all of the essential needs of the defense program.

The fact is that we need steel, not just for immediate combat requirements, but also for equipping all of our Armed Forces—and to help equip those of our allies. We need steel for constructing defense plants and new atomic energy installations. There are vital industrial requirements for steel—for such items as power generating equipment, freight cars, and oil producing equipment. These needs are urgent and must not be indefinitely delayed by a steel shut-down.

Our national security depends upon our total economic strength, and steel is a basic element in that strength.

Consequently, we are faced with the imperative need for getting most, if not all, of the Nation's steel mills back into production very promptly.

There are several possible courses of action that might be followed. However, I believe there are two main possibilities. One of these is Government operation of the steel mills. The other is the use of a labor injunction of the type authorized by the Taft-Hartley law. The Congress can choose either of these two courses. I cannot. I could only use the Taft-Hartley approach. In my judgment, that is by far the worse of the two approaches.

Consequently, I feel that I should put the facts before the Congress, recommend the course of action I deem best, and call upon the Congress—which has the power to do so—to make the choice.

I believe the Congress should make its choice with a view of bringing about three objectives: First, to secure essential steel production; second, to assure fair treatment to both parties, in accordance with sound price and wage stabilization policies; third, to encourage the parties to settle their differences through collective bargaining. Each of these objectives is important to the national interest, and the Congress should act to serve all of them.

I believe the course which is most likely to achieve these objectives is to enact legislation authorizing the Government to take over the steel plants and operate them temporarily until the parties reach a settlement. This is the course I recommend.

A seizure law, if properly drafted, can achieve the objectives of assuring steel production, treating both parties fairly, and encouraging collective bargaining. The key requirement of such a law, if it is to accomplish these ends, is to provide for fair and just compensation to the owners for the use of their property during a seizure, and fair and just compensation for the work of the employees.

The Constitution protects the owners of property during a period of Government operation by requiring that they be given just compensation—and they can appeal to the courts to enforce that requirement. The law should give similar protection to wage earners. This means that changes in wages and working conditions during seizure should not be prevented by law. If they were, the seizure would mean that workers would be compelled to work indefinitely without a change in wages, no matter how much a change might be justified. This is obviously not equal justice under law.

In order to be fair, the law must provide for a method of determining just compensation for the owners and the workers during the period of Government operation. This can be done by the establishment of special boards to work out specific proposals for the purpose, within the general framework of the Government's stabilization policies. In this way, the legislation can assure continued steel production, and fair treatment for both parties during Government operation.

Seizure should not, of course, be regarded as a means of determining the issues in dispute between management and the union. Those issues will have to be settled by the parties through their own collective bargaining. Legislation providing for Government operation will not prevent collective bargaining. As a matter of fact, the type of legislation I have described will undoubtedly increase the incentives for the parties to settle their differences through bargaining. The companies will face the possibility of receiving something less than their normal profits as just compensation. And the workers will face the prospect of getting less than they think they are entitled to. Indeed, I made this plain on May 3, when I informed the parties that Government changes in wages and working conditions would not be satisfactory to either side.

I therefore recommend that the Congress promptly enact seizure legislation such as I have described, which will restore full scale steel production, provide fair treatment for all concerned, and maintain incentives for both parties to reach agreement on the disputed issues through collective bargaining.

There is another course which the Congress could follow. That would be to enact legislation authorizing and directing the President to seek an injunction of the type authorized under the

Taft-Hartley Act, but without going through the formality of appointing a board of inquiry and waiting for its report.

I do not recommend that the Congress adopt the Taft-Hartley approach. I think it would be unwise, unfair, and quite possibly ineffective.

The Nation has already had the benefit of whatever could be gained by action under the Taft-Hartley Act. That act provides for two main things. It provides for a fact-finding board to investigate and report on the issues in dispute. In the steel case, we have already had the facts fully determined and reported by the Wage Stabilization Board. The Taft-Hartley Act also provides for injunctions against a shutdown for a total of 80 days. In the steel case the union already, even before April 8, had voluntarily postponed strike action for 99 days. Insofar as fact-finding and delay are concerned, therefore, the practical effects of the Taft-Hartley Act were achieved in this case some time ago.

Over and above these facts, however, there are other compelling reasons for not using an injunction of the Taft-Hartley type in the steel case. Its effect would be to require the workers to continue working for another long period without change in their wages and working conditions. This would be grossly unfair. The Wage Stabilization Board, the Government agency charged with responsibility in these matters, has found—and the companies have admitted—that the workers are entitled to improvements in wages and working conditions. The union members stayed at work, at Government request, during the time the case was being considered by the Wage Board, and later during the period of Government operation from April 8 to June 2. In these respects, the union and its members have cooperated fully with the Government in the public interest. And yet the effect of a Taft-Hartley labor injunction would be to penalize the workers and to give the advantage to the steel companies. I want to make it very plain to the Congress that the result of using a Taft-Hartley type injunction in this dispute would be to take sides with the companies and against the workers.

Furthermore, a Taft-Hartley injunction would take away management's incentive to bargain out the issues in dispute. The companies would have nothing to lose and everything to gain by delaying an agreement for as long as the injunction was in effect. Thus a Taft-Hartley injunction in this case would not only be unfair, it would hamper, rather than help, the collective bargaining negotiations.

Moreover, use of the Taft-Hartley law would not guarantee a restoration of full-scale steel production, which should be our primary objective. Nothing in the act can restore steel production immediately or automatically. As the Congress knows, the first step that must be taken under that act is to appoint a board of inquiry to investigate and report the facts of the matter. Previous experience indicates that it could take as much as a week or 10 days for such a board to complete its task. If such a board were appointed and made its report, and the Attorney General were directed to seek an injunction against a strike, the question would arise whether a court of equity would grant the Attorney General's request, in view of the union's previous voluntary 99-day postponement. Furthermore, even if an injunction were granted, there is no assurance that it would get the steel mills back in operation. I call the attention of the Congress to the fact that such an injunction did not get the coal mines back in operation in 1950.

If, however, the judgment of the Congress, contrary to mine, is that an injunction of the Taft-Hartley type should be used, there is a quicker way to do so than by appointing a board of inquiry under the Taft-Hartley Act. That would be for the Congress to enact legislation authorizing and directing the President to seek such an injunction, without waiting for any board to be appointed and to report.

I do not want to be misunderstood. I believe the Taft-Hartley procedure would be unfair, harmful, and futile—futile at least in helping to bring about a settlement, and perhaps also in restoring production. I hope very much that the Congress will decide that the Taft-Hartley type injunction should not be used at all and that seizure legislation should be enacted instead.

In any event, I hope the Congress will act quickly. The issue of peace or war hangs in the balance, and steel is a vital element in the outcome.

We are engaged, with other free countries, in a mighty effort to build up the military defenses of the free world. We must build up this military strength if we are to have a reasonable chance of preventing world war III. But we cannot do it without steel, for steel is the backbone of our defense production, and, indeed, of our whole industrial society.

Every action I have taken in the dispute in the steel industry, beginning last December, has been based on the paramount necessity for maintaining the production of essential steel products in the present defense emergency. When I took the extraordinary step of seizure in the absence of specific statutory authority, I pointed out that "with American troops facing the enemy on the field of battle, I would not be living up to my oath of office if I failed to do whatever is required to provide them with the weapons and ammunition they need for their survival." Now a majority of the Supreme Court have declared that I cannot take the action I believe necessary. But they have said very clearly that the Congress can.

Whatever may have been the intention of the Court's majority in setting limits on the President's powers, there can be no question of their view that the Congress can enact legislation to avoid a crippling work stoppage in the steel industry. Mr. Justice Black said the Congress "can authorize the taking of private property for public use. It can make laws regulating the relationships between employers and employees, prescribing rules designed to settle labor disputes, and fixing wages and working conditions." Mr. Justice Frankfurter said that by enacting the Taft-Hartley Act, the Congress in effect decided that "the only recourse for preventing a shutdown in any basic industry after failure of mediation, was Congress." Mr. Justice Jackson referred to "the ease, expedition and safety with which Congress can grant" emergency powers of the type needed to handle this crisis.

The issue is squarely up to the Congress. I hope the Congress will meet it by enacting fair and effective legislation.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m., the President, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The members of the President's Cabinet retired.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will stand in recess until 1:30 o'clock p. m., the bells to be rung at 1:15 p. m.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 1:30 p. m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.

REFERENCE OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President delivered to the joint session of the House and Senate be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have permission to sit during general debate in sessions of the House this afternoon.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

FEDERAL AID TO HIGHWAYS

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 7340) to amend and supplement the Federal-aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

KOJE ISLAND

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the American people can take heart from the firm and positive steps now apparent on Koje Island. No longer is there appeasement. No longer do American generals wait upon the demands of Communist prisoners. The Reds are now made to realize they are prisoners of war and as such if there is trouble it will be of their own making. They are treated fairly and according to the rules laid down at the Geneva Conference. That is much more than can be said for the treatment accorded Americans who are prisoners of the Reds.

The shameful spectacle of the propaganda value of American abasement before Red demands on Koje cannot be erased. But the strong leadership of General Clark and General Boatner is helpful assurance that there will be no repetition.

I think much light was thrown on this matter by hearings held in my subcommittee on yesterday, and I call attention of the House to the fact that those hearings will be available in printed form on tomorrow.

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN AT REUNION OF THE THIRTY-FIFTH DIVISION

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD an address made by the President of the United States at the reunion of the Thirty-fifth Division.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

(The address follows:)

Thank you very much. Governor, I thank you very much for that wonderful introduction. I hope I can live up to it. I am very happy to be with you again. I always enjoy these reunions. In my present position, I review a lot more parades, but this is one place where I can march in one, and that's unusual.

When I was in St. Louis 2 years ago at the thirtieth reunion of the Thirty-fifth Division, I talked to you about world peace, and about the necessity of building up the defensive strength of all the free nations. A great deal has happened since then. Today, I want to talk to you about the progress we have made since 1950. And I want to point out some of the dangers that now threaten us.

When I talked to you on June 10, 1950, I told you how the Soviet Union was threatening the peace of the world. I told you that the Soviet Union was engaged in a tremendous military build-up, and that we, together with our allies, had a long, hard road ahead of us. There were a lot of things on my mind when I made that speech to you in 1950.

You remember that the Soviet Union had set off its first atomic explosion in the fall of 1949. Shortly after that, I directed the top officials of our Government to make a new study of the foreign policies and the military potential of the Soviet Union, taking into account the fact that the Soviet Union now had the secret of the atomic bomb. I directed our officials to try to find out whether the Soviet Union was headed for war, and what we should do to deter and prevent such a conflict.

These officials worked together through the new National Security Council, under my direction, and came up with their preliminary answers in April 1950. These answers presented us with some very difficult problems.

A GROWING DANGER NOTED

It seemed clear, as a result of this study, that the United States and all other free nations were faced with a great and growing danger. It seemed clear that we could meet the danger only by mobilizing our strength—and the strength of our allies—to check and deter aggression.

This meant a great military effort in time of peace. It meant doubling or tripling the budget, increasing taxes heavily, and imposing various kinds of economic controls. It meant a great change in our normal peacetime way of doing things. These were the problems that were being laid on my desk at the time I spoke to you in St. Louis in 1950.

Just 3 weeks later, the Communists invaded the Republic of Korea. That made the danger clear to everyone. The invasion of Korea demonstrated to all free nations that they had to have much stronger defenses to prevent Soviet conquest.

As a result, the free nations have been moving forward since the middle of 1950 to build bigger defenses. Our own country has taken the lead, because we are the strongest of the free nations.

We have made a lot of progress in 2 years. We have reached a number of the goals we set for ourselves back in 1950. We still have a long way to go in many respects, but if we stick to our course we can create the kind of strong, free world that we need to guarantee security and peace.

We can win peace. And we are going to win the peace. Now there's been a lot of loose talk lately to the effect that our defense program has been a failure. Much of this talk is politically inspired—the kind of talk you would expect in an election year. But I want to set the record straight. I want the people to have the facts about our defense program and our national security.

AIR FORCE NOW 91 WINGS

Let me give you some examples. Two years ago we had an Air Force of 48 wings, with 400,000 men on duty and less than 9,000 planes in active use. Now we have an Air Force of 91 wings, with almost a million men on duty and nearly 15,000 planes in active use. These figures refer to the Air Force only. They do not include the big build-up of air power in the Navy and the Marine Corps.

The goal we set in 1950 called for a 95-wing Air Force by mid-summer 1952. Ninety-one of those wings are now operating, with new and better planes coming into service all the time. Within 2 months, we expect the four remaining wings to be in operation also.

In the last 2 years, we've tooled up the aircraft industry to produce the best planes being built anywhere in the world. And we are turning them out at better than four times the pre-Korea rate.

Some of you may not realize what a great accomplishment this really is. We all remember how rapidly our factories turned out planes in World War II and we are inclined to think we should be able to do the same thing now without any trouble at all.

But the program is a very different one today. There are two main reasons for this.

The first is that the planes we are building now are far heavier, far faster, and far more complicated than those we were building 7 years ago. A new jet fighter bears about as much relation to the old P–40 as a 1952 Cadillac or Chrysler does to a model T Ford. Both planes fly, and there the similarity ends. The design, the power unit, the fire controls, and everything else are different, and far more difficult to make. And it is the same way with all our new models.

The second reason is that we are in a race for technical supremacy. The nation that freezes its models too soon will be a nation with an obsolete, inferior air force.

In World War II it was my business to investigate the construction of airplanes. At that time it took 18 months to get a plane from the drawing board off the end of the line and when that plane came off the end of the line it was obsolete. We don't want to meet a situation like that and we are not going to have.

WORK FOR BETTER PLANES

The Air Force we are building now is an Air Force of the highest quality we can possibly provide. We are concentrating on production of the very latest types of planes—and we are constantly working to design and produce even better planes.

We are not trying to build the biggest air force in the world. We are trying to build the best one—backed up by the industrial capacity to expand it rapidly if need be, and keep it always up to date.

Of course, this costs money; it costs a lot of money. You may have heard some nonsense in recent days to the effect that we should save money on our national defense by building up a gigantic Air Force. Anyone who has that idea forgets that modern air power is a very expensive proposition.

Some of our new jet fighters cost as much as $600,000, nine times the price of the average fighter plane used in World War II.

A B–36 bomber costs $5,000,000 today, when everything is figured in, compared with only $800,000 for the B–29, 7 or 8 years ago.

The B–29 is just as obsolete now as the cars of 1938. We had new appropriations of more than $22,000,000,000 this coming fiscal year just for the Air Force, of which $11,000,000,000 is to buy new aircraft.

A big, powerful Air Force is an absolute necessity and we are going to have one. Don't let anybody tell you that it won't cost any money, it'll cost a lot of money.

PLANS FOR FURTHER EXPANSION

Our plans now call for building up from 95 to 143 active wings in 2 or 3 years. We have a similar expansion under way for the air units of the Navy. These will be terrifically powerful air forces when we get them all complete. And at the same time our aircraft industry will be ready to go rapidly into full-scale war production of the latest models, should that need ever arise. God forbid that it should ever arise.

We are making progress in building up our air forces here at home without in any way neglecting the needs of the forces in Korea.

There has been a terrible amount of misinformation about our situation in the air

in Korea. To hear some people talk, you would think we were completely outclassed over there—and at the mercy of the Russian-made enemy air force.

In the air combat in Korea our planes have knocked the Russians out at the rate of 8 to 1. You can read that in the newspapers if you want to. They can't prevent us from publishing that. You know that isn't true about our not being properly prepared in Korea.

Here are the facts. We have been able to maintain air supremacy over most of North Korea. That means we can bomb the enemy at will, almost anywhere in his territory. At the northern border, on the Yalu River, we do not have supremacy, but we do have clear superiority in air power—which means we can reach our objectives, even though we have to fight off opposition.

We owe a greater debt than we can ever pay to all the gallant airmen who have fought so valiantly to hold the Korea air for the United Nations. It is our duty to make sure they receive the finest and most efficient modern weapons and keep up the fight. And that we are doing. The United Nations forces in the air are being kept supplied with the planes they need for the tasks assigned to them.

All we have done and are doing to build up our air power is matched by our expanding land and sea power. The United States Army has been doubled in size these last 2 years. And it is being reequipped with the finest of modern weapons. These weapons would astonish you. We are getting these weapons now, in quantity. For example, one of our best new tanks is now coming off the production line at the rate of well over 300 a month—and the rate is rising very fast.

As for the Navy, there are twice as many ships in full operation now as before Korea. And our naval ships and weapons are improving all the time. There are some amazing new technical developments in the Navy. I shall have more to say on that subject next week, up in New London, Conn.

With all the progress we've made, we still have a long way to go before we reach the strength we now consider necessary to the national security. We have just about reached the objectives for this summer that were set out 2 years ago, when the mobilization program first began. If we can do as well in the next 2 years, we shall have a right to be proud of ourselves, and to feel that the world is safe.

Two years ago, when I was talking with you in St. Louis, I said a great deal about the need to help our allies build up their defensive power.

The study that was made by the National Security Council in 1950 made it perfectly plain we could be secure against the Communists menace only if other free nations were secure too—only if the strength of our allies was added to our own.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was just getting started at that time. To be effective it needed many things. It needed a more closely knit, a more clearly unified Europe behind it. And it needed real arms and real fighting forces.

Those were some of our problems 2 years ago, and great progress has been made in solving them.

TREATIES SENT TO SENATE

Just last week Secretary Acheson came back from Germany and France, and he brought with him a series of treaties and agreements vitally affecting the defense of Europe. I have sent these treaties and agreements to the Senate so that they can be ratified as soon as possible. These documents will make free Germany an equal member of the European community of free nations and will associate Germany in an integrated European defense force. This European defense force will be a part of the NATO forces under General Ridgway.

The plans for this European defense force are a tremendous step toward European unity and security. It is vitally important that we ratify the documents necessary to make this force a reality. Once these documents are in effect, there will be a new Europe, with a greater power to defend itself.

During these 2 years while this European army plan has been worked out, the European countries have been doing a great deal to build up their individual defense forces. Their air power, for example. With our help, there will be 60 wings in Europe under NATO command by the end of this year.

Within 2 years, if present plans are carried out—if everything is not ruined in this so-called economy drive—the number will have risen very substantially. Of course, these NATO forces will be equipped partly with American planes. But about 60 percent of their equipment will be French and British models. And these European planes are comparable to the best that we produce.

The story is the same with land forces and the sea forces under NATO command. Wherever you look you will find growing military strength in Europe, strength that we can count on.

This is the record of the things we have done. These last 2 years have been a period of great achievement. But our very successes have created a new danger for us—the danger of apathy and complacency.

NOTES INDIFFERENCE TO DANGER

So far, we have been able to avert world war III. Because of that fact, people are beginning to relax. Living in the middle of a world crisis for 2 years is beginning to make some of us indifferent to danger. Some people are forgetting about national security and thinking how nice it would be to economize and have lower taxes.

Well, everybody wants to economize and everybody wants lower taxes. But they don't want to economize and have lower taxes at the expense of the complete destruction of the free world and that's what we're faced with.

It is easy to fall into this attitude. You can find this attitude running through labor, through industry, through the Congress. But the cold fact is that we are still in great danger. We cannot tell what the Kremlin is planning. There may be new offensives in Korea. There may be new Koreas in other parts of the globe. The Communists may even be planning greater attacks than we have seen up to this point. We do not know. We cannot be sure.

There is no excuse for lying back and being indifferent to the national security. There is no justification for slashing appropriations for defense for the aid of our allies. But that is exactly what a group of short-sighted politicians are trying to do. And they are doing it for strictly political purposes, political propaganda, and political hocey. That's what it amounts to.

This is not the year to play around with meat axes in the field of national security. The Communists are building up forces in Korea and other parts of Asia. In Europe the Russians are threatening Berlin. Communist Parties are staging riots in Paris and Tokyo.

The Kremlin is not going to take a vacation just because we are having a presidential election in this country. Far from it. The Kremlin is going to make the most of this year to try to frighten the West—to try to undermine the morale of the free nations and split them apart.

WARNS OF PLAYING WITH FIRE

I am in favor of economy—of eliminating waste. But slashing appropriations for defense is not economy. It is playing with fire. The dollars that are saved in that way aren't going to help us much if we lack the planes—or tanks—or allies we need in the critical hour of danger.

Two years ago, when I talked to you in St. Louis, I spelled out the dangers we were facing, and the need for strong defense. Today, after 2 years of progress in building up those defenses—after 2 years of armed conflict against aggression—I am sure you will agree with me when I say we must not weaken, we must not waver, we must not relax in the effort we are making for the defense of the free world.

I think that every veteran knows what preparedness means. And I think it is the duty of every veteran to stand up and say—to his friends, to his local organization, to his Congressmen, and to his Senators:

"No false economy. No fooling around with the security of this country just for petty political gain; no trifling with the mighty effort of this great Nation to lead the world to peace."

I am sure that I can count on you people here today to take that stand.

I think you veterans also understand that the purpose of our defense program is peace. Peace is all we want in the world and that's all we have been trying to get ever since the two wars started. Peace is what I have been working for for the last seven long years.

The only reason in the world for our defense program and our Mutual Security program is to prevent aggression and to prevent another war. I am sure that goal is worth the price we are paying. I am confident that if we carry these programs forward successfully we can bring about peace in the world, and may God help us to bring it about.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PRISONER-OF-WAR CAMP ON KOJE ISLAND, KOREA

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Armed Services I present a privileged report on House Resolution 661.

The Clerk read the House resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Army is hereby requested to furnish to the House of Representatives, at the earliest practicable date, full and complete information with respect to all the circumstances surrounding—

(1) every act of insurgency or uprising of any consequence in the prisoner-of-war camp on Koje Island, Korea, and in other prisoner-of-war camps in Korea, and

(2) every Communist-inspired riot and disturbance of the peace of any consequence in Tokyo and other places in Japan, which has occurred since the departure of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact the report contains all of the information requested in the resolution offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will be gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that a

complete report has been made, which is what we want, so I have no objection to having it tabled. It will be printed in the RECORD?

MR. VINSON. Yes.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD in its entirety at this point.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

(The report follows:)

Reporting the Secretary of the Army To Furnish to the House of Representatives Full and Complete Information With Respect to Insurgency in Prisoner-of-War Camps in Korea and Communist-Inspired Disturbances of the Peace in Japan

Mr. VINSON, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted the following report:

JUNE 5, 1952.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. VINSON: Reference is made to your request to the Department of the Army for a report on House Resolution 661 and House Resolution 663, Eighty-second Congress, and to your request to the Department of Defense for a report on House Resolution 662, Eighty-second Congress. House Resolution 661 and House Resolution 662 request the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Defense, respectively, to furnish to the House of Representatives full information with respect to all circumstances surrounding every act of insurgency in Korean prisoner-of-war camps and every Communist-inspired riot in Japan which have occurred since the departure of General MacArthur. House Resolution 663 requests the Secretary of the Army to furnish to the House of Representatives full information with respect to all circumstances surrounding the reduction in grade of Charles F. Colson from Brigadier General to Colonel. The Secretary of Defense has delegated to the Department of the Army the responsibility for expressing the views of the Department of Defense on House Resolution 662.

In accordance with your requests, there are inclosed the following declassified documents:

(a) Background narrative as prepared by Gen. Mark Clark, of incidents which have occurred through May 20, 1952, at U. N. prison camps in Korea;

(b) A two-page chronological summary of events surrounding the capture of Colonel Dodd and the negotiations leading to his release;

(c) A six-page, more extensive chronological account of the events taking place principally between the capture and release of Colonel Dodd; and

(d) Statements of Colonels Dodd and Colson and General Yount, setting forth their comments on the incident.

Certain additional information on the Koje-Do incident which, in the national interest, remains classified is also being supplied your committee.

The above documents were declassified because the Congress and the public are entitled to the essential facts and because the case of Koje-Do, when appraised in the light of prior and subsequent events, clearly shows the insidious nature of the Communist enemy whom we are fighting.

With the delivery of this information to the committee, I believe that the objectives of House Resolutions 661, 662, and 663 are accomplished. Should your committee desire any further information, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK PACE, Jr.,
Secretary of the Army.

BACKGROUND NARRATIVE AS PREPARED BY THE UNITED NATIONS COMMAND OF INCIDENTS WHICH HAVE OCCURRED THROUGH MAY 20, 1952, AT U. N. PRISON CAMPS IN KOREA

In order to set the record straight once and for all, and to clarify the conflicting published accounts of incidents involving violence at U. N. prisoner-of-war camps, Headquarters, United Nations Command presents herewith a narrative account, based on official records, of what actually has transpired at U. N. prisoner-of-war camp No. 1 at Koje-Do and U. N. prisoner-of-war camp No. 10 at Pusan.

Three major attempts by fanatical Communist leaders to wrest control of the prisoner-of-war and civilian-internee compounds from U. N. authorities have erupted on Koje-Do since late in February of this year. However, it is now apparent that the build-up of trouble at the U. N. prisoner-of-war camp island off Korea's south shore started many months ago, and the pattern and purpose of Communist plotting have now been clearly demonstrated.

In the face of terrorism and open defiance on the part of the Communist leaders among the prisoners of war and civilian internees, the United Nations Command has adhered scrupulously to the principles of the Geneva Convention. The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) has had access at times to U. N. prisoner-of-war installations; it has submitted complete reports of its findings. These reports have indicated further that incidents of violence have stemmed directly from the action of the fanatical, die hard Communists.

Despite this humane treatment, the pattern of Communist plotting and violence has now become unmistakable. The United Nations Command has indicated in no uncertain terms that a continuance of this pattern will not be tolerated and that it is taking all necessary measures to secure and maintain uncontested control of all compounds in every prisoner-of-war installation.

For a number of months, North Korean and Chinese Communists prisoners of war, along with the many civilian internees (persons of South Korean origin impressed into the North Korean Peoples' Army and captured by the United Nation Command who, after screening by ROK CIC, were determined to be in fact South Koreans who served involuntarily in the NPKA) were tractable and cooperative. Well fed, well clothed, and humanely treated, they indicated no dissatisfaction with the conditions under which they were held. However, on June 8, 1951, the two ranking North Korean Army prisoners of war, Senior Colonels Hak Ku Lee and Crol Hong, wrote a long, rambling, and completely fictional diatribe against the treatment prisoners allegedly had been receiving at the hands of the United Nations. This letter, addressed to the International Red Cross at Geneva, Switzerland, was received by the United Nations Command in mid-July of 1951, but the two colonels took matters into their own hands by implementing what now appears to have been a carefully planned campaign to gain control over all prisoners and incite them to violence.

The first incident involving violence was staged by the North Korean officers in one of their own compounds—compound No. 3 of inclosure 7—on June 18, 1951. Demanding that they be given control of all compounds in inclosures 7, 8, and 9 on Koje-Do, these fanatical Communists attacked United Nations Command work details sent into their compound and rushed the compound gate in an attempt at mass escape. Republic of Korea guards broke up this attempt by firing into the group, leaving seven Communists dead and four wounded. Thus occurred the first incident of real violence on Koje-Do.

Following the riot of June 18-19, there was a period of quiet until August 16, when trouble flared anew. On that date, shouting, singing, demonstrating Communists on Koje-Do whipped themselves into a frenzy and began to stone U. N. personnel who finally had to resort to force to control the rioting. On exactly the same day, miles away from Koje-Do, in compound No. 6 at Pusan, a carbon copy of the Koje-Do rioting took place with almost identical results. Casualties at Koje-Do included 8 prisoners killed and 26 injured; at Pusan the casualties numbered 8 prisoners dead and 22 wounded.

During September Communist leaders within the various compounds carried on systematic campaigns of intimidation and violence designed to establish their leadership. Prisoners of war who resisted such attempts were often the victims of attacks during the hours of darkness which resulted in injury and occasionally death. In the period September 17-19, 1951, two compounds, 78 and 80, containing North Korean enlisted men, were the scene of violence between opposing factions battling for internal control. Casualties at the end of the period—all inflicted upon prisoners by other prisoners—totaled 31 injured and 20 killed.

On December 18, another major internal incident occurred—again created by North Korean Army enlisted men. This took place in compound 78—the first disturbance in this compound—when the prisoners started a rock fight with the Chinese Communist prisoners of war in nearby compound 72. U. N. troops quelled this disturbance after three prisoners of war had been injured. The next night 2 prisoners of war were injured by beatings in compound 78 and on December 23, U. N. medical authorities were unable to save the lives of 10 prisoners of war fatally beaten by their fellow inmates of this compound. On the same night, following the same pattern, civilian internees in compound 62 indulged in a mass demonstration, involving beatings of fellow prisoners, which brought death to 14 and injury to 24. Most, if not all of these internal incidents among prisoners of war were activated by purely factional motives. ICRC reports indicate that camp authorities did their utmost to prevent these occurrences with the means available.

It was in compound 62 that the first of the three major riots occurred which involved U. N. personnel. On February 18, 1952, approximately 1,500 of the 5,700 inmates suddenly attacked United States military personnel in the course of their duties. The revolt was crushed promptly and order restored—at a cost in lives of 1 American soldier and 75 inmates. One American soldier was wounded, 22 suffered minor injuries, and 139 inmates were injured.

The clash followed the entrance into the compound of United Nations Command personnel to ascertain which of these civilian internees were actually loyal South Koreans who had been forcibly impressed into the North Korean armed forces. It was evident that the Communists leaders in the compound were determined to block this orderly procedure by violence. Detailed planning and organization were indicated by the collection of weapons secretly manufactured by the Communist terrorists for the assault. Steel pickets, spiked wooden clubs, barbed wire flails, blackjacks, metal tent pole spikes, and sections of iron pipe were employed freely by the Communists, in addition to rocks and knives. Less than one-third of the compound inmates took part in the riot.

in Korea. To hear some people talk, you would think we were completely outclassed over there—and at the mercy of the Russian-made enemy air force.

In the air combat in Korea our planes have knocked the Russians out at the rate of 8 to 1. You can read that in the newspapers if you want to. They can't prevent us from publishing that. You know that isn't true about our not being properly prepared in Korea.

Here are the facts. We have been able to maintain air supremacy over most of North Korea. That means we can bomb the enemy at will, almost anywhere in his territory. At the northern border, on the Yalu River, we do not have supremacy, but we do have clear superiority in air power—which means we can reach our objectives, even though we have to fight off opposition.

We owe a greater debt than we can ever pay to all the gallant airmen who have fought so valiantly to hold the Korea air for the United Nations. It is our duty to make sure they receive the finest and most efficient modern weapons and keep up the fight. And that we are doing. The United Nations forces in the air are being kept supplied with the planes they need for the tasks assigned to them.

All we have done and are doing to build up our air power is matched by our expanding land and sea power. The United States Army has been doubled in size these last 2 years. And it is being reequipped with the finest of modern weapons. These weapons would astonish you. We are getting these weapons now, in quantity. For example, one of our best new tanks is now coming off the production line at the rate of well over 300 a month—and the rate is rising very fast.

As for the Navy, there are twice as many ships in full operation now as before Korea. And our naval ships and weapons are improving all the time. There are some amazing new technical developments in the Navy. I shall have more to say on that subject next week, up in New London, Conn.

With all the progress we've made, we still have a long way to go before we reach the strength we now consider necessary to the national security. We have just about reached the objectives for this summer that were set out 2 years ago, when the mobilization program first began. If we can do as well in the next 2 years, we shall have a right to be proud of ourselves, and to feel that the world is safe.

Two years ago, when I was talking with you in St. Louis, I said a great deal about the need to help our allies build up their defensive power.

The study that was made by the National Security Council in 1950 made it perfectly plain we could be secure against the Communists menace only if other free nations were secure too—only if the strength of our allies was added to our own.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was just getting started at that time. To be effective it needed many things. It needed a more closely knit, a more clearly unified Europe behind it. And it needed real arms and real fighting forces.

Those were some of our problems 2 years ago, and great progress has been made in solving them.

TREATIES SENT TO SENATE

Just last week Secretary Acheson came back from Germany and France, and he brought with him a series of treaties and agreements vitally affecting the defense of Europe. I have sent these treaties and agreements to the Senate so that they can be ratified as soon as possible. These documents will make free Germany an equal member of the European community of free nations and will associate Germany in an integrated European defense force. This European defense force will be a part of the NATO forces under General Ridgway.

The plans for this European defense force are a tremendous step toward European unity and security. It is vitally important that we ratify the documents necessary to make this force a reality. Once these documents are in effect, there will be a new Europe, with a greater power to defend itself.

During these 2 years while this European army plan has been worked out, the European countries have been doing a great deal to build up their individual defense forces. Their air power, for example. With our help, there will be 60 wings in Europe under NATO command by the end of this year.

Within 2 years, if present plans are carried out—if everything is not ruined in this so-called economy drive—the number will have risen very substantially. Of course, these NATO forces will be equipped partly with American planes. But about 60 percent of their equipment will be French and British models. And these European planes are comparable to the best that we produce.

The story is the same with land forces and the sea forces under NATO command. Wherever you look you will find growing military strength in Europe, strength that we can count on.

This is the record of the things we have done. These last 2 years have been a period of great achievement. But our very successes have created a new danger for us—the danger of apathy and complacency.

NOTES INDIFFERENCE TO DANGER

So far, we have been able to avert world war III. Because of that fact, people are beginning to relax. Living in the middle of a world crisis for 2 years is beginning to make some of us indifferent to danger. Some people are forgetting about national security and thinking how nice it would be to economize and have lower taxes.

Well, everybody wants to economize and everybody wants lower taxes. But they don't want to economize and have lower taxes at the expense of the complete destruction of the free world and that's what we're faced with.

It is easy to fall into this attitude. You can find this attitude running through labor, through industry, through the Congress. But the cold fact is that we are still in great danger. We cannot tell what the Kremlin is planning. There may be new offensives in Korea. There may be new Koreas in other parts of the globe. The Communists may even be planning greater attacks than we have seen up to this point. We do not know. We cannot be sure.

There is no excuse for lying back and being indifferent to the national security. There is no justification for slashing appropriations for defense for the aid of our allies. But that is exactly what a group of short-sighted politicians are trying to do. And they are doing it for strictly political purposes, political propaganda, and political hooey. That's what it amounts to.

This is not the year to play around with meat axes in the field of national security. The Communists are building up forces in Korea and other parts of Asia. In Europe the Russians are threatening Berlin. Communist Parties are staging riots in Paris and Tokyo.

The Kremlin is not going to take a vacation just because we are having a presidential election in this country. Far from it. The Kremlin is going to make the most of this year to try to frighten the West—to try to undermine the morale of the free nations and split them apart.

WARNS OF PLAYING WITH FIRE

I am in favor of economy—of eliminating waste. But slashing appropriations for defense is not economy. It is playing with fire. The dollars that are saved in that way aren't going to help us much if we lack the planes—or tanks—or allies we need in the critical hour of danger.

Two years ago, when I talked to you in St. Louis, I spelled out the dangers we were facing, and the need for strong defense. Today, after 2 years of progress in building up those defenses—after 2 years of armed conflict against aggression—I am sure you will agree with me when I say we must not weaken, we must not waver, we must not relax in the effort we are making for the defense of the free world.

I think that every veteran knows what preparedness means. And I think it is the duty of every veteran to stand up and say—to his friends, to his local organization, to his Congressmen, and to his Senators:

"No false economy. No fooling around with the security of this country just for petty political gain; no trifling with the mighty effort of this great Nation to lead the world to peace."

I am sure that I can count on you people here today to take that stand.

I think you veterans also understand that the purpose of our defense program is peace. Peace is all we want in the world and that's all we have been trying to get ever since the two wars started. Peace is what I have been working for for the last seven long years.

The only reason in the world for our defense program and our Mutual Security program is to prevent aggression and to prevent another war. I am sure that goal is worth the price we are paying. I am confident that if we carry these programs forward successfully we can bring about peace in the world, and may God help us to bring it about.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PRISONER-OF-WAR CAMP ON KOJE ISLAND, KOREA

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Armed Services I present a privileged report on House Resolution 661.

The Clerk read the House resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Army is hereby requested to furnish to the House of Representatives, at the earliest practicable date, full and complete information with respect to all the circumstances surrounding—

(1) every act of insurgency or uprising of any consequence in the prisoner-of-war camp on Koje Island, Korea, and in other prisoner-of-war camps in Korea, and

(2) every Communist-inspired riot and disturbance of the peace of any consequence in Tokyo and other places in Japan, which has occurred since the departure of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact the report contains all of the information requested in the resolution offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will be gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that a

complete report has been made, which is what we want, so I have no objection to having it tabled. It will be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD in its entirety at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

(The report follows:)

REQUESTING THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY TO FURNISH TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FULL AND COMPLETE INFORMATION WITH RESPECT TO INSURGENCY IN PRISONER-OF-WAR CAMPS IN KOREA AND COMMUNIST-INSPIRED DISTURBANCES OF THE PEACE IN JAPAN

Mr. VINSON, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted the following report:

JUNE 5, 1952.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. VINSON: Reference is made to your request to the Department of the Army for a report on House Resolution 661 and House Resolution 663, Eighty-second Congress, and to your request to the Department of Defense for a report on House Resolution 662, Eighty-second Congress. House Resolution 661 and House Resolution 662 request the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Defense, respectively, to furnish to the House of Representatives full information with respect to all circumstances surrounding every act of insurgency in Korean prisoner-of-war camps and every Communist-inspired riot in Japan which have occurred since the departure of General MacArthur. House Resolution 663 requests the Secretary of the Army to furnish to the House of Representatives full information with respect to all circumstances surrounding the reduction in grade of Charles P. Colson from Brigadier General to Colonel. The Secretary of Defense has delegated to the Department of the Army the responsibility for expressing the views of the Department of Defense on House Resolution 662.

In accordance with your requests, there are inclosed the following declassified documents:

(a) Background narrative as prepared by Gen. Mark Clark, of incidents which have occurred through May 20, 1952, at U. N. prison camps in Korea;

(b) A two-page chronological summary of events surrounding the capture of Colonel Dodd and the negotiations leading to his release;

(c) A six-page, more extensive chronological account of the events taking place principally between the capture and release of Colonel Dodd; and

(d) Statements of Colonels Dodd and Colson and General Yount, setting forth their comments on the incident.

Certain additional information on the Koje-Do incident which, in the national interest, remains classified is also being supplied your committee.

The above documents were declassified because the Congress and the public are entitled to the essential facts and because the case of Koje-Do, when appraised in the light of prior and subsequent events, clearly shows the insidious nature of the Communist enemy whom we are fighting.

With the delivery of this information to the committee, I believe that the objectives of House Resolutions 661, 662, and 663 are accomplished. Should your committee desire any further information, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK PACE, JR.,
Secretary of the Army.

BACKGROUND NARRATIVE AS PREPARED BY THE UNITED NATIONS COMMAND OF INCIDENTS WHICH HAVE OCCURRED THROUGH MAY 20, 1952, AT U. N. PRISON CAMPS IN KOREA

In order to set the record straight once and for all, and to clarify the conflicting published accounts of incidents involving violence at U. N. prisoner-of-war camps, Headquarters, United Nations Command presents herewith a narrative account, based on official records, of what actually has transpired at U. N. prisoner-of-war camp No. 1 at Koje-Do and U. N. prisoner-of-war camp No. 10 at Pusan.

Three major attempts by fanatical Communist leaders to wrest control of the prisoner-of-war and civilian-internee compounds from U. N. authorities have erupted on Koje-Do since late in February of this year. However, it is now apparent that the build-up of trouble at the U. N. prisoner-of-war camp island off Korea's south shore started many months ago, and the pattern and purpose of Communist plotting have now been clearly demonstrated.

In the face of terrorism and open defiance on the part of the Communist leaders among the prisoners of war and civilian internees, the United Nations Command has adhered scrupulously to the principles of the Geneva Convention. The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) has had access at times to U. N. prisoner-or-war installations; it has submitted complete reports of its findings. These reports have indicated further that incidents of violence have stemmed directly from the action of the fanatical, die hard Communists.

Despite this humane treatment, the pattern of Communist plotting and violence has now become unmistakable. The United Nations Command has indicated in no uncertain terms that a continuance of this pattern will not be tolerated and that it is taking all necessary measures to secure and maintain uncontested control of all compounds in every prisoner-of-war installation.

For a number of months, North Korean and Chinese Communists prisoners of war, along with the many civilian internees (persons of South Korean origin impressed into the North Korean Peoples' Army and captured by the United Nation Command who, after screening by ROK CIC, were determined to be in fact South Koreans who served involuntarily in the NPKA) were tractable and cooperative. Well fed, well clothed, and humanely treated, they indicated no dissatisfaction with the conditions under which they were held. However, on June 8, 1951, the two ranking North Korean Army prisoners of war, Senior Colonels Hak Ku Lee and Crol Hong, wrote a long, rambling, and completely fictional diatribe against the treatment prisoners allegedly had been receiving at the hands of the United Nations. This letter, addressed to the International Red Cross at Geneva, Switzerland, was received by the United Nations Command in mid-July of 1951, but the two colonels took matters into their own hands by implementing what now appears to have been a carefully planned campaign to gain control over all prisoners and incite them to violence.

The first incident involving violence was staged by the North Korean officers in one of their own compounds—compound No. 3 of inclosure 7—on June 18, 1951. Demanding that they be given control of all compounds in inclosures 7, 8, and 9 on Koje-Do, these fanatical Communists attacked United Nations Command work details sent into their compound and rushed the compound gate in an attempt at mass escape. Republic of Korea guards broke up this attempt by firing into the group, leaving seven Communists dead and four wounded. Thus occurred the first incident of real violence on Koje-Do.

Following the riot of June 18-19, there was a period of quiet until August 15, when trouble flared anew. On that date, shouting, singing, demonstrating Communists on Koje-Do whipped themselves into a frenzy and began to stone U. N. personnel who finally had to resort to force to control the rioting. On exactly the same day, miles away from Koje-Do, in compound No. 6 at Pusan, a carbon copy of the Koje-Do rioting took place with almost identical results. Casualties at Koje-Do included 9 prisoners killed and 25 injured: at Pusan the casualties numbered 8 prisoners dead and 22 wounded.

During September Communist leaders within the various compounds carried on systematic campaigns of intimidation and violence designed to established their leadership. Prisoners of war who resisted such attempts were often the victims of attacks during the hours of darkness which resulted in injury and occasionally death. In the period September 17-19, 1951, two compounds, 78 and 85, containing North Korean enlisted men, were the scene of violence between opposing factions battling for internal control. Casualties at the end of the period—all inflicted upon prisoners by other prisoners—totaled 31 injured and 20 killed.

On December 18, another major internal incident occurred—again created by North Korean Army enlisted men. This took place in compound 73—the first disturbance in this compound—when the prisoners started a rock fight with the Chinese Communist prisoners of war in nearby compound 72. U. N. troops quelled this disturbance after three prisoners of war had been injured. The next night 2 prisoners of war were injured by beatings in compound 73 and on December 23, U. N. medical authorities were unable to save the lives of 10 prisoners of war fatally beaten by their fellow inmates of this compound. On the same night, following the same pattern, civilian internees in compound 62 indulged in a mass demonstration, involving beatings of fellow prisoners, which brought death to 14 and injury to 24. Most, if not all of these internal incidents among prisoners of war were activated by purely factional motives. ICRC reports indicate that camp authorities did their utmost to prevent these occurrences with the means available.

It was in compound 62 that the first of the three major riots occurred which involved U. N. personnel. On February 18, 1952, approximately 1,500 of the 5,700 inmates suddenly attacked United States military personnel in the course of their duties. The revolt was crushed promptly and order restored—at a cost in lives of 1 American soldier and 75 inmates. One American soldier was wounded, 22 suffered minor injuries, and 139 inmates were injured.

The clash followed the entrance into the compound of United Nations Command personnel to ascertain which of these civilian internees were actually loyal South Koreans who had been forcibly impressed into the North Korean armed forces. It was evident that the Communists leaders in the compound were determined to block this orderly procedure by violence. Detailed planning and organization were indicated by the collection of weapons secretly manufactured by the Communist terrorists for the assault. Steel pickets, spiked wooden clubs, barbed wire flails, blackjacks, metal tent pole spikes, and sections of iron pipe were employed freely by the Communists, in addition to rocks and knives. Less than one-third of the compound inmates took part in the riot.

On March 13 violence flared anew in the second major incident involving U. N. personnel. Prisoners inside compound 92 stoned passing Republic of Korea troops and a work party from another compound, touching off an incident which resulted in the death of 12 North Korean Communist prisoners and the wounding of 26. One American officer was slightly injured and one Korean civilian was killed.

The third major incident on Koje-Do occurred on April 10 when Communist prisoners once again challenged camp authorities. This incident began with a violent Communist demonstration inside the barrier of compound 95 of inclosure No. 9. The several compounds of this inclosure containing North Korean Army enlisted men had been subjected to virulent Communist agitation, beatings, and intimidations since mid-September but never before had the leaders or the group as a whole openly challenged camp authority. In the efforts to restore order one prisoner of war was wounded. A United States Army captain and two United States soldiers, all unarmed, immediately entered the compound dispensary, just within the compound gates, to remove the wounded men to the hospital. They were forced to withdraw by the swarming Communists.

Brig. Gen. Francis T. Dodd, then camp commandant, promptly ordered the Communist leaders in the compound to permit the evacuation of the wounded Communist. When they refused, General Dodd ordered 100 guards, unarmed Republic of Korea soldiers, into the inclosure to bring out the casualty. The guards were promptly set upon with clubs and stones, and one was seized by the Communists and disappeared in the rioting mass. The armed guards outside the perimeter, in an attempt to protect the unarmed ROK soldiers, fired into the inclosure—wounding, among others, a United States Army officer and some Republic of Korea guard personnel.

At this point, the Communists staged a mass rush on the open gates. This attack was stopped by the prompt and determined action of an American officer and two American soldiers manning a jeep-mounted 30-caliber machine gun covering the gate to prevent any mass escape. In all, 3 Communists were killed and 60 wounded. Four ROK Army guards were killed, six wounded, and one American officer was slightly wounded.

Following this third major incident, on May 7, Communist prisoners of war seized General Dodd, the prison camp commandant, under circumstances which are now well known to the public. On May 20, 1952, prompt and firm action by United Nations Command personnel averted what might have been a serious incident at a hospital compound in Pusan. Communist prisoners of war who had been serving as hospital attendants in this compound had refused to admit medical personnel or to let their sick compatriots leave the compound to get medical attention. U. N. authorities directed the prisoner attendants to report to the compound gate for transfer to another inclosure, in order that the patients could later be handled without interference.

For half an hour announcements designed to segregate the agitators from the other prisoners went virtually unanswered. It soon became evident that the Communist prisoner of war leaders could resist by violence. At 7 a. m. armed United States military personnel moved into the compound where they met stiff opposition from prisoners wielding spears, barbed-wire flails, rocks, and other weapons.

The United States troops used a show of force to overcome the opposition. No shots were fired, the U. N. troops employing only riot control tactics. In gaining control of the compound, 1 prisoner was killed and 85 others suffered injuries, half of them minor. One member of the United Nations Forces suffered a minor wound. The situation was well in hand by 9 o'clock in the morning. The remaining two compounds at Pusan have now been brought under complete control by the U. N. authorities. No casualties resulted from these operations.

It is to be anticipated that hard-core Communist prisoners of war will continue their attempts to provoke the U. N. authorities into the use of force, only if for the purpose of providing the Communist propaganda machine opportunity to distort necessary disciplinary and security measures into "acts of barbarism" and other equally vicious and ridiculous allegations. The United Nations Command has indicated that it will not be deterred from its objective of implementing the provisions of the Geneva Convention and insuring that prisoners of war strictly observe their responsibilities.

SUMMARY OF EVENTS, KOJE-DO, KOREA, MAY 7 THROUGH MAY 10, 1952

The following is a chronological summary of circumstances surrounding the seizure of Brig. Gen. (now Col.) Francis T. Dodd and the negotiations resulting in his release. This summary covers only the period from May 7 through May 10. It nevertheless reveals that General Dodd's seizure was the culmination of a carefully formulated Communist plan to create incidents of violence in the prison camps which could be used for propaganda purposes and which would disrupt the United Nation's screening of prisoners that had proved so embarrassing to the Communists because such a great majority of prisoners had freely indicated that they would forcibly resist return to Communist control.

BACKGROUND

On February 20, 1952, Brig. Gen. Francis T. Dodd assumed command of United Nations Prisoner of War Camp No. 1, Koje-Do, Korea. By the time of General Dodd's seizure, approximately 100,000 prisoners had, in the screening process, already declared that they would forcibly resist return to Communist control and these had been removed from the island. Thus, at the time of General Dodd's seizure there were approximately 70,000 prisoners on this island—almost four times the total number of Federal prisoners today in penal institutions. These prisoners were housed in compounds, each of which was surrounded by a double barbed-wire fence. The compounds were so close together that prisoner communication between them was relatively easy. Although the inner gates of the sallyport to the compounds were locked, the outer gates were not always locked. Outside each compound were static and walking guards, tower guards, and perimeter lights.

In compound 76 there were 6,400 North Korean prisoners, almost all of whom were zealous Communists and violently hostile to U. N. personnel. Most of them had been able surreptitiously to arm themselves with knives and what home-made weapons they could fashion from sleeping cots, tent pegs, barbed wire and work tools. Due to this serious threat of violence U. N. personnel had not entered this compound since April when these prisoners began their violent demonstrations as they learned of the great number of prisoners in other compounds who were refusing to return to Communist control.

MAY 7, 1952

In midmorning General Dodd was informed by Lieutenant Colonel Raven, the commander of a military police battalion, that the prisoners in compound 76 were prepared to be rostered and verified provided they were granted an interview with General Dodd.

At 1:45 p. m., Colonel Raven arrived at compound 76 and, using a prisoner interpreter, began discussions through the fence with a spokesman for the prisoners.

About a half hour later, General Dodd arrived and joined the discussions which concerned certain alleged grievances of the prisoners. At that time there were present at the prison gate, in addition to General Dodd and Colonel Raven, 5 armed U. N. guards carrying weapons with fixed bayonets and loaded magazines, a truck driver and General Dodd's jeep driver. At the start of the discussions about 6 prisoners took part, but this number soon increased to about 15.

Shortly after the discussion began, a work detail of about 40 prisoners was permitted to pass through the gates under the supervision of two American noncommissioned officers. After the detail had come out, the gates were left open.

During the next 10 to 15 minutes the spokesman and leaders for the prisoners were permitted to step outside the gates. At 3:15 p. m. General Dodd decided that the interview was at an end. As he turned to leave, the prisoners closed one of the outside double gates, a whistle blew, and 20 prisoners rushed General Dodd and Colonel Raven. Colonel Raven, with the aid of the U. N. guards, managed to escape; however, General Dodd was so quickly surrounded that the guards could not use their weapons to secure his release. He was overpowered and dragged within the compound. The prisoners immediately closed the gates and raised a sign painted on ponchos, about 25 feet long which read: "We capture Dodd as long as our demand will be solved his safety is secured if there happen brutal act such as shooting, his life is danger." This sign could not have been painted in the interval between General Dodd's capture and the time it was put up. Soon after this, General Dodd sent through the wires a note in his own handwriting, saying that he was unharmed and requesting that representatives from the other compounds be sent into Compound 76 and that a telephone be installed to connect him with United States authorities on the island.

The Second Logistical Command, Brig. Gen. Paul F. Yount commanding, was immediately advised of Dodd's seizure and this command instructed that an effort be made to effect release of General Dodd through a senior PW officer. Accordingly, North Korean Col. Lee Hak Koo was summoned from another compound and directed to proceed to Compound 76 to order General Dodd's release.

In the meantime, Col. W. H. Craig, deputy commander and chief of staff, Second Logistical Command, on orders of General Yount, had left Pusan to assume temporary command at Koje. Colonel Craig had been instructed to demand General Dodd's release and to avoid any incident that was likely to cause an outbreak. Colonel Craig arrived at Koje at 4:40 p. m., directed that firearms not be used except as a last resort, placed the camp on full alert, and orally demanded General Dodd's release.

Lee Hak Koo and representatives from other compounds were then permitted to enter Compound 76 for a conference.

At 8 p. m., General Yount was informed of developments by Colonel Craig, and concurred in the actions taken. The prisoners' conference, with General Dodd present, began at 8 p. m., and lasted until approximately 11 p. m. The meeting was devoted to an attempt to gain General Dodd's authorization for formation of a prisoner-or-war association of one representative from each compound, the details to be worked out later. At 11 p. m. General Dodd reported that he was safe and that the meeting would resume at 10 o'clock the next morning. He asked that no troops be sent into the compound. He further reported at intervals during the night.

Some time in the evening Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, U. N. Commander in the Far East,

in Tokyo, was informed of General Dodd's seizure.

MAY 8, 1952

Colonel Craig caused automatic weapons to be manned, and took other security measures. At 12:15 p. m., the prisoners' conference reconvened and, through General Dodd, submitted to Colonel Craig demands for (1) formation of a prisoner-of-war association; (2) furnishing of certain supplies, such as tents, desks, pencils, paper, mimeograph machine, and two trucks; and (3) a complete telephone net for the prisoner-of-war association. General Dodd suggested that all of the demands except that for a telephone net be satisfied. At 3:45 p. m., Colonel Craig gave the prisoners until 5 o'clock that afternoon to present a list of terms for the release of General Dodd. At 5 p. m., Lee Hak Koo refused a broadcast demand to release General Dodd. At 5:45, General Dodd telephoned to say that the prisoners had not yet formulated the conditions for his release which Colonel Craig had requested.

At 9:50 p. m., Brig. Gen. (now Col.) Charles F. Colson, Chief of Staff, First Corps, who had been made available to General Yount by Eighth Army, arrived at Koje and assumed command. Meanwhile, General Ridgway and Gen. Mark W. Clark, who was to succeed Ridgway, had flown to Korea and had discussed this problem with General Van Fleet and Admiral Joy at Munsan. And at about 4:50 p. m., General Ridgway, in a message to General Van Fleet, Commanding General of the Eighth Army: (1) directed that General Van Fleet take necessary action to bring about the release without delay of General Dodd; (2) authorized use of whatever degree of force might, in General Van Fleet's judgment, be required to accomplish this mission; (3) directed that General Van Fleet take such further action as he deemed necessary to establish uncontested control of all Communist prisoners.

Implementing these orders, General Van Fleet, at 9:30 p. m., directed General Yount to make written demand for the release of General Dodd by an hour to be specified by General Yount; to issue an ultimatum to the Communists that General Dodd was no longer in command, that force would be used to free him, and that all prisoners in compound 76 would be held accountable for any injury to Generr ' Dodd; and to enter the compound by force after full daylight if General Dodd was not released by the specified hour.

General Yount, in passing these orders on to General Colson at 11 p. m., directed him: (1) to make written and broadcasted demand for release of General Dodd; (2) if General Dodd were not released by daylight, to repea: such demands; (3) to advise General Yount of the earliest date planned for forcible entry of the compound. At 11 o'clock that evening, General Dodd sent a message to General Colson stating that if force were used, the prisoners would kill him and break out of all compounds, simultaneously.

MAY 9, 1952

At 2:30 in the morning, General Colson, pursuant to his instructions from General Yount, demanded General Dodd's release. Lee Hak Koo said he would answer later in the morning. At 3:35 a. m., General Colson requested and received General Yount's authorization to delay until daybreak sending the ultimatum threatening force in order to allow tanks to arrive from the mainland. A second demand for General Dodd's immediate release was made on the prisoners at 6:35 a. m. in response to their request for paper. At 9 a. m. Lee Hak Koo replied to the 2:30 a. m. demand for General Dodd's release by asserting that General Dodd's seizure was proper and that the United Nations had violated the Geneva Convention. Forty-five minutes later he sent a letter replacing his earlier reply, in which he alleged inhumane treatment of prisoners and demanded that General Colson attend a meeting with General Dodd.

General Colson reconnoitered the area for the forcible entry, which was then planned for May 10. General Dodd told Colonel Craig by telephone of a meeting to begin at 10 a. m. and said that the prisoners wanted to be assured they would not be attacked at 10 a. m. because they planned to release General Dodd when the meeting was over at 12 noon. General Colson authorized Colonel Craig to state that if the prisoners would release General Dodd at noon, no forcible entry would be made between 10 a. m. and noon. Later General Dodd reported that the meeting would extend beyond noon, but General Colson gave no assurance beyond that time.

At 11:10 a. m., Brig. Gen. Charles W. Christenberry, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for the Eighth Army, called to get General Colson's plans so that General Van Fleet could discuss the matter with General Yount. General Christenberry stated that it was the wish of Generals Ridgway, Clark, and Van Fleet that in the event force was used, announcements were to be made that any prisoner who wanted to save himself could come out with his hands over his head and move to a designated spot. General Christenberry stated that General Colson had the authority to use vigorous methods to get General Dodd out and to maintain complete control. General Christenberry also authorized delay in the use of force as long as General Colson felt he could free General Dodd without it, and so long as matters did not get out of hand.

At 11:45 a. m., General Dodd again reported by telephone from within the compound that he had been conferring with the prisoners and that he might be released by 5 p. m. that day if certain allegations of the prisoners were answered satisfactorily. He also stated that he had approved certain details concerning the prisoner-of-war association.

At 12:15 p. m., General Dodd reported the prisoners' demand for further conferences to discuss alleged past mistreatment of prisoners and also issues concerning screening and repatriation. General Dodd, in this conversation, advised against forced entry and repeated his opinion that agreement could be reached by 5 p. m. that day.

Generals Van Fleet and Yount arrived at Koje at 1:25 that afternoon to discuss with General Colson the tactics to be used in making a forcible entry. During this visit they read the transcript of General Dodd's last telephone message.

Generals Van Fleet and Yount departed at 4:20 p. m. while General Dodd's conference with the prisoners was still in session. At 4:45 p. m. General Dodd read to General Colson over the telephone a message from Lee Hak Koo promising General Dodd's release when the conference was finished.

At 7:15 p. m., General Van Fleet reported to General Ridgway that General Colson had been directed through General Yount to demand release of General Dodd at 10 a. m., May 10, and if refused, to take positive action to empty the compound.

At 7:30 p. m., General Colson reported to General Yount that the conference between General Dodd and the prisoners was apparently a trial of General Dodd by a people's court which General Dodd felt was generally favorable to him. General Colson reported that General Dodd had stated that he would probably be released by noon May 10. General Colson requested authority to delay forcible entry. General Yount stated that he would seek authority from the Eighth Army for further delay and at 8 p. m. General Yount called General Colson back and reported that the Eighth Army had authorized such a delay until 10 a. m., May 10, and directed forcible entry at that time if General Dodd had not been released by then.

MAY 10, 1952

In the early morning, preparations for forcible entry continued. Tanks were combat-serviced, and Navy gunboats and road blocks were strategically placed. At 5:32 that morning, General Colson received from Lee Hak Koo the prisoners' first formal demands for a written reply on four points, namely, (1) allegations of mistreatment of prisoners and inhumane methods of warfare such as germ warfare, (2) issues involving repatriation, (3) issues involving screening and alleged rearming of prisoners, and (4) recognition of the PW association. General Colson faced the choice on the one hand of trying to work out an answer to these false allegations which would satisfy the prisoners, thus insuring General Dodd's release, or on the other hand of using force, which might have caused a general prison break, widespread killing of prisoners and U. N. personnel, and the execution of General Dodd.

General Colson decided to attempt to draft a reply. At 8:45 a. m., General Colson reported Lee Hak Koo's message to General Yount, discussed a proposed reply with General Yount and obtained General Yount's approval to extend the 10 a. m. deadline for forcible entry. During this conversation, General Yount stated that he would seek higher approval of certain aspects of the answer and informed General Colson that Eighth Army had, in general, authorized them to agree to anything reasonable. During these negotiations, General Van Fleet was at his command post in the north and his headquarters received the general substance of the negotiations piecemeal through General Yount who was directed through Maj. Gen. Orlando C. Mood, Chief of Staff of the Eighth Army, to "admit nothing that was untrue."

At 9 o'clock General Colson read to General Dodd over the telephone his proposed reply, but General Dodd reported that the prisoners were insisting upon a written response and in return had promised his release by noon.

At 10:05 a. m., General Colson read to General Yount his first written reply. General Yount approved the reply as written. General Colson then dispatched his first reply to compound 76. At 12:04 p. m., General Dodd reported various objections that the prisoners had to this reply. In preparing his second reply, General Colson accepted General Dodd's suggestions and discussed the gist of this proposed reply with General Yount by telephone at 12:45 p. m. This second reply created the false impression that the U. N. in the past had committed acts of violence against its prisoners by saying that "in the future" prisoners can expect humane treatment. This reply also gave rise to further erroneous implications by stating that there would be no "further" violence and no "more" forcible screening or "rearming" of prisoners.

At 4:45 p. m., General Colson read the text of this second reply to General Yount. The transcript of their telephone conversation indicates that certain key words such as "future" and "further" were not received by General Yount. General Yount approved the letter as he heard it and reported it to General Mood. General Colson dispatched this second reply to compound 76, where it was received at 5:20 that afternoon.

In the meantime, at about 2:25 that afternoon, General Van Fleet informed General Ridgway's Chief of Staff, Lt. Gen. Doyle O. Hickey, that the prisoners had submitted terms for release of General Dodd, that General Colson had replied but that General Van Fleet did not have the substance of his reply; that General Van Fleet felt agreement could be reached; and that General Van Fleet had authorized delay in using force if General Dodd's release appeared imminent. General Ridgway, in a message of reply to General Van Fleet, ordered that his

directive of May 8, which authorized the use of whatever force might be required to attain the release of General Dodd, be implemented at or shortly after full daylight, May 11, unless the situation was materially altered by then.

Upon the prisoners' insistence, General Colson's second letter was rewritten to refer to KPA (Korean People's Army) instead of NKPA (North Korean People's Army) and to add a sentence which said "I do admit" that there had been past violence. These changes were not cleared with General Yount. This third reply was received by the prisoners at 6:30 p. m., and accepted by them.

General Dodd was released at 9:30 that evening.

CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY OF MAJOR EVENTS FROM CAPTURE TO RELEASE OF GENERAL DODD

MAY 7

(Koje time)

3:15 p. m.: General Dodd seized by prisoners.

4:40 p. m.: Colonel Craig, chief of staff and deputy commander to General Yount, arrived to assume temporary command; demanded release of Dodd.

MAY 8

12:15 p. m.: General Dodd reported to Colonel Craig the prisoners' demands for a PW association, office supplies, and telephones.

4:50 p. m.: General Ridgway directed General Van Fleet to take necessary action to release Dodd and authorized him to use whatever force might be necessary.

9:30 p. m.: Message from General Van Fleet to General Yount directing preparations of plan to release General Dodd.

9:50 p. m.: General Colson, having been made available to General Yount by Eighth Army, arrived to assume command.

MAY 9

3:55 a. m.: General Colson requested and received authority from General Yount to delay final demand for release until daybreak, May 10, in order to allow arrival of tanks from Korea.

1:25 p. m.: General Van Fleet and General Yount arrived on Koje to discuss tactics to be used in forcible entry.

4:20 p. m.: General Van Fleet and General Yount departed.

8 p. m.: General Yount informed General Colson that Eighth Army had authorized delay until 10 a. m., May 10, but directed forcible entry at that time if General Dodd not released by then.

MAY 10

5:32 a. m.: General Colson received prisoners' first formal demand for written agreement on specified terms.

8:45 a. m.: General Colson reported demands to General Yount, who extended the 10 a. m. deadline.

10:05 a. m.: General Colson read to General Yount first proposed reply; General Yount approved.

12:04 p. m.: General Dodd reported to General Colson objections of prisoners to first reply.

4:45 p. m.: General Colson read to General Yount his second proposed reply not all of which, according to the transcript of the call, was received by General Yount. General Yount cleared this letter as received by him with General Mood, Eighth Army.

5:20 p. m.: Second reply received by prisoners; returned for rewriting and correction.

6:30 p. m.: Third reply (revision of second as requested by prisoners) received by prisoners, having been dispatched by General Colson without General Yount's approval. Accepted by prisoners.

9:30 p. m.: General Dodd released.

STATEMENT OF COL. FRANCIS T. DODD

Following is submitted for consideration in connection with recent Koje incident for which I have been reduced from the temporary grade of brigadier general to the rank of colonel:

Since April 8 the command at Koje was involved in several operations of highly classified nature. In these operations speed was the essence. Operations concerned selection and segregation of certain prisoners of war, shipment of some 80,000 to new camps, and subsequent preparation and submission of rosters to Panmunjom. Tight deadlines had been placed on all these operations by higher headquarters. Many times Communist prisoners of war created small incidents with a view toward interrupting the operation in progress. Through interviews with compound leaders I was able in a number of instances to quell disturbances which would have retarded prescribed deadlines. My headquarters was an operating rather than a policy-making agency. These interviews were conducted sometimes in my office, sometimes at the compound, depending upon the need for speed. I was often able to resolve the problem and continue the operation when the efforts of my subordinates had failed. In this particular instance I had gone to the gate to try to arrange for fingerprinting, which was absolutely necessary if we were to furnish accurate rosters. From the number of queries from higher headquarters concerning submission of rosters it was apparent that they were desired promptly and accurately.

Concerning the statement signed by General Colson for which he is being so severely criticized, it was either a question of signing that or accepting large-scale bloodshed. I feel that I was in the best position to evaluate the reaction of the prisoners of war. Because of a message which I had just seen from General Ridgway to Joint Chiefs of Staff, I feel that I was justified in assuming that large-scale bloodshed was unacceptable to the United Nations cause. There can be no question that such would have been the result had force been used. Saving my life by use of force was an impossibility, therefore this matter was not the main point at issue. The solution was the very best that could be obtained. It is regretted that it is not so considered by higher headquarters.

Notwithstanding my conviction that I acted honorably and in the best interest of my country, I accept the interpretation of my superiors without resentment and will continue to perform any assigned duty to the best of my ability.

STATEMENT OF COL. CHARLES F. COLSON

In the light of events which have happened since the release of Brigadier General Dodd on May 10, 1952, and information which has been furnished me that action against me is under contemplation because of certain portions of the contents of the letter which I signed and sent to the prisoner-of-war leaders in order to secure the release of General Dodd, I am making this statement in full explanation of my action in justification thereof.

There seems to be two main issues concerned in contents of the letter which I signed and delivered to the prisoner-of-war leaders in compound 76, which was the letter finally accepted as satisfactory by them and resulted in General Dodd's release.

These issues concern the statement in paragraph 1 of the letter, reading, "I do admit that there have been instances of bloodshed where many prisoners of war have been killed and wounded by U. N. forces," and also the statement in paragraph 3, "there will be no more forcible screening or any rearming of prisoners of war in this camp."

With reference to the first point, this statement was not included in the first letter nor in the second letter. Instead the statement "I am forced to tell you that we are not [using] and have not used poison gas, germ warfare weapons, or used prisoners of war for atomic bomb tests."

The leaders refused to accept this statement and demanded that since we denied these things that the statement should be omitted from the letter. But they demanded that we admit that there had been instances of bloodshed and prisoners of war killed and wounded by U. N. guards.

I discussed this point with General Yount, commanding general, second logistical command, and I told him that they were the instances which were being used as allegations against General Dodd in the Peoples Court which was then trying him in the compound. General Dodd had advised me that he had admitted these instances, as they had occurred, and that full investigations had been made and reports rendered to the international committee of the Red Cross in each instance. The prisoner-of-war leaders would not permit any statement to be included in the letter which would clarify or modify it by indicating that these instances were brought about by their own acts, and were justified under the Geneva Convention.

In my discussion of this point with General Yount, he said that such a statement could be made provided that we did not admit committing any crime, such as those described in the first paragraph of Lee Hak Koo's message No. 2, that is: "Barbarous treatment, torture, mass murdering, germ warfare, poison gas, and using prisoners of war for atomic bomb tests."

Based on this authority, I agreed to include the statement admitting instances of bloodshed and the killing and wounding of prisoners of war by U. N. forces, and included that statement in letter No. 3.

Letter No. 3 was written twice. Through inadvertence that particular statement was omitted unintentionally. Dodd called my attention to it by phone, and I agreed to rewrite the letter to include the statement. This I had done and was about to dispatch it when Dodd called again and said that in paragraph 2 the leaders wanted the letter N deleted from abbreviation NKPA, so that it would read KPA, as in paragraph 4.

I had the letter retyped with this change, destroyed the one which used the abbreviation NKPA, and dispatched the final letter No. 3 at 1815, May 10, 1952. This letter was accepted as satisfactory by the committee and led to the subsequent release of General Dodd at 2130 hours, May 10, 1952.

Regarding the second point at issue, in paragraph 3, pertaining to forcible screening, the leaders had demanded that we include such a statement, and would not agree to any different statement. This was agreed to by General Yount, who stated that as we were not employing forcible screening, any interpretation from this statement that we were could be forcibly denied. This was agreed for inclusion in the first letter and was never subsequently changed, nor did I receive any instructions to change or delete it during the time which elapsed from the preparation of the first letter to the dispatch of the third. Forcible screening is the term used by the prisoners of war for screening by use of force. No such screening had ever been done, although it had been contemplated. It was ruled out through action of higher headquarters because of the possible bloodshed which would have ensued if force had been used. The leaders demanded that the words "no more" be inserted in the letter and would not back down from that stand.

While being fully cognizant of the interpretation which could be placed on these statements for propaganda purposes, we felt

that they were the least that the Communists would accept to meet their demands as a satisfactory answer.

We fully expected that these statements would emphatically be refuted, explained, and shown to have been made under duress, with the life of General Dodd in the balance, as well as the lives of several thousand prisoners of war, besides the lives of our own troops and of the local civilian population, if the use of force was resorted to.

Further, such action (force) which would have resulted in the killing of thousands of prisoners of war, would have provided far greater propaganda material than the statements and admissions, which were capable of refutation and denial, having been forced through threats on the life of General Dodd.

Another factor involved was the possibility of the Communists using such an incident as a basis for retaliatory action against U. N. prisoners of war held by them.

To us on Koje-Do trying to work out a solution to the situation facing us, time was an all important element and was running short. I had been instructed to start the use of force by 10 o'clock on the morning of 10 May, unless in my opinion the chances of securing Dodd's release without force seemed to be possible. Later on the 10th, I received definite instructions to start use of force by early light on the morning of May 11 if Dodd was not released by them. We were prepared to do this.

As to the results of the use of force I would like to say this:

The leaders had sent me a note on the 9th of May, when evidence of our massing force first was noticed, stating that if we used force to secure the release of General Dodd, he would be killed, they would resist, and there would be a simultaneous outbreak in every compound on the island. Further that they were willing to die for their principles. There is no doubt but that these fanatical Communists meant this.

We were preparing a force to handle the situation in compound 76 and the adjacent compounds 77 and 78. There were over 6,000 prisoners in each of these compounds and a total of over 70,000 prisoners in the 14 occupied compounds.

These compounds can easily be breached by the masses of prisoners contained therein. The fence posts in all except a very few are mostly wooden posts and small tree trunks about 4 inches in diameter. They have been in the ground for 15 months and probably rotten. Many strands of wire on the inner fences have been loosened. The posts have not been braced on the outer side of either fence. There was no question in anyone's mind that a concerted effort on the part of the prisoners would be successful in breaching the fences in spite of the fire of the guards and machine guns. A breach of the compound would result in many of the guards being overrun, their weapons and ammunition seized and turned against the troops. Whether such a simultaneous break could be contained was a serious question in our minds—so much so that we had boats available to cover the coastlines of the island and to quickly remove the nurses, female workers and hostesses. The set-up of the compound areas is such that many troops would be cut off by escaped groups of prisoners who could get between them and the camp area which leads to the dock area where the warehouses are located.

This situation was so dangerous as to have a great weight in our plans and decisions. It was considered most important not to invoke force except as a last resort.

Weighing all these matters I felt that I was justified in giving in to some degree to the leaders' demands in order to avoid having to use force.

These conditions were well known to the Army commander, as well as the danger involved if force was used. It was in view of these that a second phase of the operation was countermanded, that of driving the prisoners out of compound No. 76 into No. 74 and subsequently into smaller compartments in No. 73 and No. 72. This was to be done even if General Dodd was released. This operation has been postponed until all compounds had been made thoroughly secure so as to prevent a mass breakout.

Furthermore, since this incident, plans are being made to construct new compounds either on the island or at other locations. This is in recognition of the insecure conditions of the present compounds.

The prisoners well recognize the insecurity of their compounds, and the fact that such large masses of them in these compounds gives them an advantage. They use this to the utmost as a threat, and it is the major reason why they cannot be controlled to any degree.

Another bad feature of the Koje-Do prisoner-of-war camp is the close proximity of several native villages, bordering on the compound area. In one instance, in the central valley, a native village is between two groups of compounds. Some 7,000 South Koreans live in these villages. They fear that an outbreak of prisoners would result in many of them being killed. Among these natives there are undoubtedly agents of the Communists, who through various means contact the prisoners of war and carry messages not only between compounds but to the outer world. The CIC has been unable to stop or break up this menace.

Although not mentioned as a point of issue, I would like to explain the other portions of the letter, particularly in paragraph 1.

The leaders demanded that they be assured that in the future the prisoners would receive humane treatment according to international law. I intended to see that the camp was run according to the principles of the Geneva Convention, as it always had been run. The prisoners of war refused to accept the statement made in the first letter that I would continue to follow that policy.

Also they required a statement that I would do all in my power to eliminate further violence and bloodshed. I would do that anyhow. After control of the prisoners was regained, and they were securely confined in smaller compounds of about 500 each, they would be less likely to ignore orders, and would become more manageable.

The statement that I would be responsible if such incidents happen in the future is merely a statement of the responsibility of any commander in such a situation, but the prisoners-of-war demanded that such a statement be included.

Paragraph 2 needs no comment.

Paragraph 3 has been adequately covered in the preceding remarks.

Paragraph 4. This pertains to a prisoner-of-war organization in which the senior officer, Col. Lee Hak Koo, was to be the chief leader, and each compound to have a compound leader. These leaders were to be allowed to meet periodically and present their grievances and requests to the camp commander. General Dodd had been thinking of setting up such an organization with a view to gaining better control through holding leaders responsible for acts of the other prisoners. The system is quite similar to that with which the Italian and German prisoner-of-war compounds were run during World War II. It is firmly believed that much good could be accomplished through such an organization, and I was willing to give it a try. Higher headquarters indicated a like attitude on this matter.

From the foregoing statement of facts, and conclusions to be drawn from them, I feel, first that my actions in preparing, signing, and delivering the letter to the Communist prisoner-of-war leaders was not only justified but bore the approval of headquarters above me. Further, that use of force would have created a far more serious situation that would have been more difficult to explain and counter, than to explain and refute the contents of the letter which was obtained under duress.

After due consideration of the offer made to me to present to the Senate Armed Services Committee my side of the case involving the seizure of Brig. Gen. Frank Dodd by prisoners-of-war at Koje-Do, Korea, and his subsequent release, I request that the previous statement sent by me to the Chief of Staff, United States Army, be presented to the committee in lieu of any further statement.

STATEMENT OF BRIG. GEN. PAUL F. YOUNT

I do not desire to make any personal statement relative to the seizure and ultimate release of General Dodd. I believe that essential pertinent facts are now available to the Department of the Army.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., June 10, 1952.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. VINSON: Under letter dated June 6, 1952, I sent to you certain material relating to House Resolutions 661, 662, and 663. This letter and the inclosed declassified material supplement my earlier letter by presenting material which is now available to the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army in Washington concerning Communist-inspired riots and disturbances of the peace of any consequence in Tokyo and other places in Japan which have occurred since the departure of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

I hope that this additional material, together with that already supplied, will provide the information contemplated by the resolutions. If you should wish any further information, we shall furnish it promptly.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK PACE, JR.,
Secretary of the Army.

REPORT ON COMMUNIST-INSPIRED RIOTS AND DISTURBANCES OF THE PEACE OF ANY CONSEQUENCE IN TOKYO AND OTHER PLACES IN JAPAN WHICH HAVE OCCURRED FROM THE DEPARTURE OF GENERAL OF THE ARMY DOUGLAS MACARTHUR THROUGH 2 JUNE 1952

In October 1951, at the Fifth National Representatives Conference, the Japanese Communist Party adopted a program of terrorism and militant antigovernment, anti-United States activity. Before that time, activities of Japanese Communists were marked by a general absence of violence; however, since October 1951, guided by periodic party directives prescribing types of activity, the Japanese Communists have carried on a campaign of riots and demonstrations. Most of these have been small incidents in which an individual policeman is attacked, a police box or tax office burned. In addition, however, there have been several incidents of greater consequence.

On February 21, 1952, demonstrations in support of the "anti-colonization" of Japan were held in approximately 21 localities in Japan. Demonstration groups of 200 to 300 students and laborers paraded carrying signs which called for opposition to Japanese rearmament and to conscription of Japanese youth for military service. Several demonstrations were held in the vicinity of United States military installations. In Tokyo, several demonstrations resulted in clashes with Japanese police in which at least 20 policemen were injured and approximately 30 demonstrators arrested.

While most May Day rallies in Japan were orderly, in several places there were disturbances. In Tokyo, 180,000 members of

labor unions and affiliated organizations gathered at Meiji Park to hear speeches by labor leaders, left wing Japanese politicians and American Socialist, Norman Thomas. The rally was sponsored by the left wing Socialist Japanese General Counsel of labor unions (SOHYO); available information indicates that members of the SOHYO unions did not participate in the violence which ensued. At approximately 11:30 before the speeches began, an estimated 50 Communists rushed the speaker's platform and caused a small riot. Within 30 minutes order was restored and the speeches were then delivered. At about 2:10 p. m., in violation of a Government regulation which prohibited demonstrations in the Palace Plaza which is near United States military installations, 7,000 Communist demonstrators, mostly students and Korean laborers armed with clubs, sticks and bamboo spears, streamed into the Plaza. Police armed with night sticks, side arms and tear gas attempted to bar the mob from the Plaza, and hand to hand clashes resulted. Before the Plaza was cleared, 33 United States vehicles were burned, and 2 United States sailors and 5 Japanese policemen were thrown into the moat but were rescued without injury. After the Plaza was cleared, the mob threw stones which broke windows in a United States dispensary and damaged 19 United States vehicles. By 10 p. m., demonstrations in Tokyo had almost ceased although small groups continued to demonstrate in outlying areas. The major targets of the rioters in these outlying areas of Tokyo were apparently Japanese police boxes. Two hundred and eighteen Japanese policemen were injured, 3 very seriously and 11 seriously. One demonstrator was fatally injured, 18 hospitalized and 60 arrested. No United States personnel suffered casualties.

In other May Day demonstrations, Communist students in Sendai clashed with police and three students were arrested. In Kyoto, 20,000 persons demonstrated and paraded. Some riots occurred in which 15 policemen were injured, a score of rioters arrested, and 1 United States Army vehicle stoned.

On May 9, 1951, in an aftermath of the May Day demonstrations, another clash between Japanese policemen and Communist students occurred in Tokyo. The National Students Self-Government Federation had taken a leading role in the May Day riots. Two policemen who entered the campus of Waseda University to check on the addresses of students who had participated in the May Day riot, were seized by university students. When the students refused to release the captured police, other police resorted to force and a clash between 1,000 students and club-swinging police followed. Fifty-six students and 25 policemen were injured.

In compliance with party directives, on May 30, 1952, Japanese Communists staged demonstrations to commemorate the 1949 killing of a Communist laborer by police. Two rioters were killed when approximately 300 demonstrators attacked the Itabaski police box. The largest demonstration in the Tokyo area occurred around the Shinjuku police station where several hundred rioters clashed with police. Smaller riots occurred in other cities, including Osaka, Sapporo, Fukuoka, and Kobe.

PRISONER-OF-WAR CAMP ON KOJE ISLAND, KOREA

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Armed Services, I present a privileged report on House Resolution 662.

The Clerk read the House resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Defense is hereby requested to furnish to the House of Representatives, at the earliest practicable date, full and complete information with respect to all the circumstances surrounding—

(1) every act of insurgency or uprising of any consequence in the prisoner-of-war camp on Koje Island, Korea, and in other prisoner-of-war camps in Korea, and

(2) every Communist-inspired riot and disturbance of the peace of any consequence in Tokyo and other places in Japan,

which has occurred since the departure of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand that complete information is given in the report?

Mr. VINSON. I do not know whether it is complete information. I am submitting all of the information that has been sent to the committee. I hope it is the complete information.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact the report contains the information called for in the resolution, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REDUCTION IN GRADE OF CHARLES F. COLSON FROM BRIGADIER GENERAL TO COLONEL

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Armed Services I present a privileged report on House Resolution 663.

The Clerk read the House resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Army is hereby requested to furnish to the House of Representatives, at the earliest practicable date, full and complete information with respect to all the circumstances surrounding the reduction in grade of Charles F. Colson from brigadier general to colonel resulting from his conduct of the negotiations for the release of Brig. Gen. (now Col.) Francis T. Dodd after the latter had been captured by Communist prisoners at the Koje Island, Korea, prisoner-of-war camp on May 7, 1952.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

(The report follows:)

REQUESTING THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY TO FURNISH TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FULL AND COMPLETE INFORMATION WITH RESPECT TO THE REDUCTION IN GRADE OF COL. CHARLES F. COLSON

Mr. VINSON, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted the following report:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., June 5, 1952.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. VINSON: Reference is made to your request to the Department of the Army for a report on House Resolution 661 and House Resolution 663, Eighty-second Congress, and to your request to the Department of Defense for a report on House Resolution 662, Eighty-second Congress. House Resolution 661 and House Resolution 662 request the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Defense, respectively, to furnish to the House of Representatives full information with respect to all circumstances surrounding every act of insurgency in Korean prisoner-of-war camps and every Communist-inspired riot in Japan which have occurred since the departure of General MacArthur. House Resolution 663 requests the Secretary of the Army to furnish to the House of Representatives full information with respect to all circumstances surrounding the reduction in grade of Charles F. Colson from brigadier general to colonel. The Secretary of Defense has delegated to the Department of the Army the responsibility for expressing the views of the Department of Defense on House Resolution 662.

In accordance with your requests, there are inclosed the following declassified documents:

(a) Background narrative as prepared by General Mark Clark, of incidents which have occurred through May 20, 1952, at U. N. prison camps in Korea.

(b) A two-page chronological summary of events surrounding the capture of Colonel Dodd and the negotiations leading to his release;

(c) A six-page, more extensive chronological account of the events taking place principally between the capture and release of Colonel Dodd; and

(d) Statements of Colonels Dodd and Colcon and General Yount, setting forth their comments on the incident.

Certain additional information on the Koje-Do incident which, in the national interest, remains classified is also being supplied your committee.

The above documents were declassified because the Congress and the public are entitled to the essential facts and because the case of Koje-Do, when appraised in the light of prior and subsequent events, clearly shows the insidious nature of the Communist enemy whom we are fighting.

With the delivery of this information to the committee, I believe that the objectives of House Resolutions 661, 662, and 663 are accomplished. Should your committee desire any further information, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK PACE, Jr.,
Secretary of the Army.

BACKGROUND NARRATIVE AS PREPARED BY THE UNITED NATIONS COMMAND OF INCIDENTS WHICH HAVE OCCURRED THROUGH MAY 20, 1952, AT U. N. PRISON CAMPS IN KOREA

In order to set the record straight once and for all, and to clarify the conflicting published accounts of incidents involving violence at U. N. prisoner-of-war camps, headquarters, United Nations Command, presents herewith a narrative account, based on official records, of what actually has transpired at U. N. prisoner-of-war camp No. 1 at Koje-Do and U. N. prisoner-of-war camp No. 10 at Pusan.

Three major attempts by fanatical Communist leaders to wrest control of the prisoners of war and civilian internee compounds from U. N. authorities have erupted on Koje-Do since late in February of this year. However, it is now apparent that the build-up of trouble at the U. N. prisoner-of-war camp island off Korea's south shore started many months ago, and the pattern and purpose of Communist plotting have now been clearly demonstrated.

In the face of terrorism and open defiance on the part of the Communist leaders among the prisoners of war and civilian internees, the United Nations Command has adhered scrupulously to the principles of the Geneva

Convention. The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) has had access at all times to the U. N. prisoner-of-war installations; it has submitted complete reports of its findings. These reports have indicated further that incidents of violence have stemmed directly from the action of the fanatical, die-hard Communists.

Despite this humane treatment, the pattern of Communist plotting and violence has now become unmistakable. The United Nations Command has indicated in no uncertain terms that a continuance of this pattern will not be tolerated and that it is taking all necessary measures to secure and maintain uncontested control of all compounds in every prisoner-of-war installation.

For a number of months North Korean and Chinese Communist prisoners of war, along with the many civilian internees—persons of South Korean origin impressed into the North Korean Peoples Army and captured by the United Nations Command, who, after screening by ROK CIC, were determined to be, in fact, South Koreans who served involuntarily in the NKPA—were tractable and cooperative. Well fed, well clothed, and humanely treated, they indicated no dissatisfaction with the conditions under which they were held. However, on June 8, 1951, the two ranking North Korean Army prisoners of war, Senior Cols. Hak Ku Lee and Crol Hong, wrote a long, rambling, and completely fictional diatribe against the treatment prisoners allegedly had been receiving at the hands of the United Nations. This letter, addressed to the International Red Cross at Geneva, Switzerland, was received by the United Nations Command in mid-July of 1951, but the two colonels took matters into their own hands by implementing what now appears to have been a carefully planned campaign to gain control over all prisoners and incite them to violence.

The first incident involving violence was staged by the North Korean officers in one of their own compounds—compound No. 3 of enclosure 7—on June 18, 1951. Demanding that they be given control of all compounds in enclosures 7, 8, and 9, on Koje-Do, these fanatical Communists attacked United Nations Command work details sent into their compound and rushed the compound gate in an attempt at mass escape. Republic of Korea guards broke up this attempt by firing into the group, leaving seven Communists dead and four wounded. Thus occurred the first incident of real volence on Koje-Do.

Following the riot of June 18–19, there was a period of quiet until August 15, when trouble flared anew. On that date, shouting, singing, demonstrating Communists on Koje-Do whipped themselves into a frenzy and began to stone U. N. personnel who finally had to resort to force to control the rioting. On exactly the same day, miles away from Koje-Do, in compound No. 6 at Pusan, a carbon copy of the Koje-Do rioting took place with almost identical results. Casualties at Koje-Do included 9 prisoners killed and 25 injured; at Pusan the casualties numbered 8 prisoners dead and 22 wounded.

During September Communist leaders within the various compounds carried on systematic campaigns of intimidation and violence designed to establish their leadership. Prisoners of war who resisted such attempts were often the victims of attacks during the hours of darkness which resulted in injury and occasionally death. In the period September 17–19, 1951, two compounds, Nos. 78 and 85, containing North Korean enlisted men, were the scene of violence between opposing factions battling for internal control. Casualties at the end of the period—all inflicted upon prisoners by other prisoners—totaled 31 injured and 20 killed.

On December 18 another major internal incident occurred—again created by North Korean Army enlisted men. This took place in compound No. 73—the first disturbance in this compound—when the prisoners started a rock fight with the Chinese Communist prisoners of war in nearby compound No. 72. U. N. troops quelled this disturbance after three prisoners of war had been injured. The next night 2 prisoners of war were injured by beatings in compound No. 73, and on December 23 U. N. medical authorities were unable to save the lives of 10 prisoners of war fatally beaten by their fellow inmates of this compound. On the same night, following the same pattern, civilian internees in compound No. 62 indulged in a mass demonstration, involving beatings of fellow prisoners, which brought death to 14 and injury to 24. Most, if not all, of these internal incidents among the prisoners of war were activated by purely factional motives. ICRC reports indicate that camp authorities did their utmost to prevent these occurrences with the means available.

It was in compound No. 62 that the first of the three major riots occurred which involved U. N. personnel. On February 18, 1952, approximately 1,500 of the 5,700 inmates suddenly attacked United States military personnel in the course of their duties. The revolt was crushed promptly and order restored—at a cost in lives of 1 American soldier and 75 inmates. One American soldier was wounded, 22 suffered minor injuries, and 139 inmates were injured.

The clash followed the entrance into the compound of United Nations Command personnel to ascertain which of these civilian internees were actually loyal South Koreans who had been forcibly impressed into the North Korean Armed Forces. It was evident that the Communist leaders in the compound were determined to block this orderly procedure by violence. Detailed planning and organization were indicated by the collection of weapons secretly manufactured by the Communist terrorists for the assault. Steel pickets, spiked wooden clubs, barbed-wire flails, blackjacks, metal tent-pole spikes, and sections of iron pipe were employed freely by the Communists, in addition to rocks and knives. Less than one-third of the compound inmates took part in the riot.

On March 13 violence flared anew in the second major incident involving U. N. personnel. Prisoners inside compound 92 stoned passing Republic of Korea troops and a work party from another compound, touching off an incident which resulted in the deaths of 12 North Korean Communist prisoners and the wounding of 26. One American officer was slightly injured and one Korean civilian was killed.

The third major incident on Koje-Do occurred on April 10 when Communist prisoners once again challenged camp authorities. This incident began with a violent Communist demonstration inside the barrier of compound 95 of enclosure No. 9. The several compounds of this enclosure containing North Korean Army enlisted men had been subjected to virulent Communist agitation, beatings, and intimidations since mid-September but never before had the leaders or the group as a whole openly challenged camp authority. In the efforts to restore order one prisoner of war was wounded. A United States Army captain and two United States soldiers, all unarmed, immediately entered the compound dispensary, just within the compound gates, to remove the wounded man to the hospital. They were forced to withdraw by the swarming Communists.

Brig. Gen. Francis T. Dodd, then camp commandant, promptly ordered the Communist leaders in the compound to permit the evacuation of the wounded Communist. When they refused, General Dodd ordered 100 guards, unarmed Republic of Korea soldiers, into the enclosure to bring out the casualty. The guards were promptly set upon with clubs and stones, and one was seized by the Communists and disappeared in the rioting mass. The armed guards outside the perimeter, in an attempt to protect the unarmed ROK soldiers, fired into the enclosure—wounding, among others, a United States Army officer and some Republic of Korea guard personnel.

At this point, the Communists staged a mass rush on the open gates. This attack was stopped by the prompt and determined action of an American officer and two American soldiers manning a jeep-mounted 30-caliber machine gun covering the gate to prevent any mass escape. In all, 3 Communists were killed and 60 wounded. Four ROK Army guards were killed, six wounded, and one American officer was slightly wounded.

Following this third major incident, on May 7, Communist prisoners of war seized General Dodd, the prison camp commandant, under circumstances which are now well known to the public. On May 20, 1952, prompt and firm action by United Nations Command personnel averted what might have been a serious incident at a hospital compound in Pusan. Communist prisoners of war who had been serving as hospital attendants in this compound had refused to admit medical personnel or to let their sick compatriots leave the compound to get medical attention. U. N. authorities directed the prisoner attendants to report to the compound gate for transfer to another enclosure, in order that the patients could later be handled without interference.

For half an hour announcements designed to segregate the agitators from the other prisoners went virtually unanswered. It soon became evident that the Communist prisoners-of-war leaders could resist by violence. At 7 a. m. armed United States military personnel moved into the compound where they met stiff opposition from prisoners wielding spears, barbed-wire flails, rocks, and other weapons.

The United States troops used a show of force to overcome the opposition. No shots were fired, the U. N. troops employing only riot-control tactics. In gaining control of the compound, 1 prisoner was killed and 85 others suffered injuries, half of them minor. One member of the United Nations Forces suffered a minor wound. The situation was well in hand by 9 o'clock in the morning. The remaining two compounds at Pusan have now been brought under complete control by the U. N. authorities. No casualties resulted from these operations.

It is to be anticipated that hard-core Communist prisoners of war will continue their attempts to provoke the U. N. authorities into the use of force, only if for the purpose of providing the Communist propaganda machine opportunity to distort necessary disciplinary and security measures into "acts of barbarism" and other equally vicious and ridiculous allegations. The United Nations Command has indicated that it will not be deterred from its objective of implementing the provisions of the Geneva Convention and insuring that prisoners of war strictly observe their responsibilities.

SUMMARY OF EVENTS, KOJE-DO, KOREA, MAY 7 THROUGH MAY 10, 1952

The following is a chronological summary of circumstances surrounding the seizure of Brig. Gen. (now Col.) Francis T. Dodd and the negotiations resulting in his release. This summary covers only the period from May 7 through May 10. It nevertheless reveals that General Dodd's seizure was the culmination of a carefully formulated Communist plan to create incidents of violence in the prison camps which could be used for propaganda purposes and which would disrupt the United Nations screening of prisoners that had proved so embarrassing to the Communists because such a great majority of prisoners had freely indicated that they would forcibly resist return to Communist control.

BACKGROUND

On February 20, 1952, Brig. Gen. Francis T. Dodd assumed command of United Nations Prisoner of War Camp No. 1, Koje-Do, Korea. By the time of General Dodd's seizure, approximately 100,000 prisoners had, in the screening process, already declared that they would forcibly resist return to Communist control and these had been removed from the island. Thus, at the time of General Dodd's seizure there was approximately 70,000 prisoners on this island—almost four times the total number of Federal prisoners today in penal institutions. These prisoners were housed in compounds, each of which was surrounded by a double barbed-wire fence. The compounds were so close together that prisoner communication between them was relatively easy. Although the inner gates to the sallyport to the compounds were locked, the outer gates were not always locked. Outside each compound were static and walking guards, tower guards, and perimeter lights.

In compound 76 there were 6,400 North Korean prisoners, almost all of whom were zealous Communists and violently hostile to U. N. personnel. Most of them had been able surreptitiously to arm themselves with knives and what homemade weapons they could fashion from sleeping cots, tent pegs, barbed wire and work tools. Due to this serious threat of violence U. N. personnel had not entered this compound since April when these prisoners began their violent demonstrations as they learned of the great number of prisoners in other compounds who were refusing to return to Communist control.

MAY 7, 1952

In midmorning General Dodd was informed by Lieutenant Colonel Raven, the commander of a military police battalion, that the prisoners in compound 76 were prepared to be rostered and verified provided they were granted an interview with General Dodd.

At 1:45 p. m., Colonel Raven arrived at compound 76 and, using a prisoner interpreter, began discussion through the fence with a spokesman for the prisoners.

About a half hour later, General Dodd arrived and joined the discussions which concerned certain alleged grievances of the prisoners. At that time there were present at the prison gate, in addition to General Dodd and Colonel Raven, 5 armed U. N. guards carrying weapons with fixed bayonets and loaded magazines, a truck driver and General Dodd's jeep driver. At the start of the discussions about six prisoners took part, but this number soon increased to about 15.

Shortly after the discussion began, a work detail of about 40 prisoners was permitted to pass through the gates under the supervision of two American noncommissioned officers. After the detail had come out, the gates were left open.

During the next 10 to 15 minutes the spokesman and leaders for the prisoners were permitted to step outside the gates. At 3:15 p. m. General Dodd decided that the interview was at an end. As he turned to leave, the prisoners closed one of the outside double gates, a whistle blew, and 20 prisoners rushed General Dodd and Colonel Raven. Colonel Raven, with the aid of the U. N. guards, managed to escape; however, General Dodd was so quickly surrounded that the guards could not use their weapons to secure his release. He was overpowered and dragged within the compund. The prisoners immediately closed the gates and raised a sign painted on ponchos, about 25 feet long which read: "We capture Dodd as long as our demand will be solved his safety is secured if there happen brutal act such as shooting, his life is danger." This sign could not have been painted in the interval between General Dodd's capture and the time it was put up. Soon after this, General Dodd sent through the wires a note in his own handwriting, saying that he was unharmed and requesting that representatives from the other compounds be sent into compound 76 and that a telephone be installed to connect him with United States authorities on the island.

The Second Logistical Command, Brig. Gen. Paul F. Yount commanding, was immediately advised of Dodd's seizure and this command instructed that an effort be made to effect release of General Dodd through a senior PW officer. Accordingly, North Korean Col. Lee Hak Koo was summoned from another compound and directed to proceed to compound 76 to order General Dodd's release.

In the meantime Col. W. H. Craig, deputy commander and chief of staff, Second Logistical Command, on orders of General Yount, had left Pusan to assume temporary command at Koje. Colonel Craig had been instructed to demand General Dodd's release and to avoid any incident that was likely to cause an outbreak. Colonel Craig arrived at Koje at 4:40 p. m., directed that firearms not be used except as a last resort, placed the camp on full alert, and orally demanded General Dodd's release.

Lee Hak Koo and representatives from other compounds were then permitted to enter compound 76 for a conference.

At 8 p. m., General Yount was informed of developments by Colonel Craig and concurred in the actions taken. The prisoners' conference, with General Dodd present, began at 8 p. m. and lasted until approximately 11 p. m. The meeting was devoted to an attempt to gain General Dodd's authorization for formation of a prisoner-of-war association of one representative from each compound, the details to be worked out later. At 11 p. m., General Dodd reported that he was safe and that the meeting would resume at 10 o'clock the next morning. He asked that no troops be sent into the compound. He further reported at intervals during the night.

Sometime in the evening Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, U. N. commander in the Far East, in Tokyo was informed of General Dodd's seizure.

MAY 8, 1952

Colonel Craig caused automatic weapons to be manned and took other security measures. At 12:15 p. m. the prisoners' conference reconvened and, through General Dodd, submitted to Colonel Craig demands for (1) formation of a prisoner-of-war association; (2) furnishing of certain supplies, such as tents, desks, pencils, paper, mimeograph machine and two trucks; and (3) a complete telephone net for the prisoner-of-war association. General Dodd suggested that all of the demands except that for a telephone net be satisfied. At 3:45 p. m. Colonel Craig gave the prisoners until 5 o'clock that afternoon to present a list of terms for the release of General Dodd. At 5 p. m. Lee Hak Koo refused a broadcast demand to release General Dodd. At 5:45 p. m. General Dodd telephoned to say that the prisoners had not yet formulated the conditions for his release which Colonel Craig had requested.

At 9:50 p. m. Brig. Gen. (now Col.) Charles F. Colson, chief of staff, First Corps, who had been made available to General Yount by Eighth Army, arrived at Koje and assumed command. Meanwhile, General Ridgway and Gen. Mark W. Clark, who was to succeed General Ridgway, had flown to Korea and had discussed this problem with General Van Fleet and Admiral Joy at Munsan. And at about 4:50 p. m. General Ridgway, in a message to General Van Fleet, commanding general of the Eighth Army: (1) Directed that General Van Fleet take necessary action to bring about the release without delay of General Dodd; (2) authorized use of whatever degree of force might, in General Van Fleet's judgment, be required to accomplish this mission; (3) directed that General Van Fleet take such further action as he deemed necessary to establish uncontested control of all Communist prisoners.

Implementing these orders, General Van Fleet, at 9:30 p. m., directed General Yount to make written demand for the release of General Dodd by an hour to be specified by General Yount; to issue an ultimatum to the Communists that General Dodd was no longer in command, that force would be used to free him, and that all prisoners in compound 76 would be held accountable for any injury to General Dodd; and to enter the compound by force after full daylight if General Dodd was not released by the specified hour.

General Yount, in passing these orders on to General Colson at 11 p. m., directed him: (1) to make written and broadcasted demand for release of General Dodd; (2) if General Dodd were not released by daylight, to repeat such demands; (3) to advise General Yount of the earliest date planned for forcible entry of the compound. At 11 o'clock that evening, General Dodd sent a message to General Colson stating that if force were used, the prisoners would kill him and break out of all compounds, simultaneously.

MAY 9, 1952

At 2:30 in the morning, General Colson, pursuant to his instructions from General Yount, demanded General Dodd's release. Lee Hak Koo said he would answer later in the morning. At 3:35 a. m., General Colson requested and received General Yount's authorization to delay until daybreak sending the ultimatum threatening force in order to allow tanks to arrive from the mainland. A second demand for General Dodd's immediate release was made on the prisoners at 6:35 a. m. in response to their request for paper. At 9 a. m., Lee Hak Koo replied to the 2:30 a. m. demand for General Dodd's release by asserting that General Dodd's seizure was proper and that the United Nations had violated the Geneva Convention. Forty-five minutes later he sent a letter replacing his earlier reply, in which he alleged inhumane treatment of prisoners and demanded that General Colson attend a meeting with General Dodd.

General Colson reconnoitered the area for the forcible entry, which was then planned for May 10. General Dodd told Colonel Craig by telephone of a meeting to begin at 10 a. m. and said that the prisoners wanted to be assured they would not be attacked at 10 a. m. because they planned to release General Dodd when the meeting was over at 12 noon. General Colson authorized Colonel Craig to state that if the prisoners would release General Dodd at noon, no forcible entry would be made between 10 a. m. and noon. Later General Dodd reported that the meeting would extend beyond noon, but General Colson gave no assurances beyond that time.

At 11:10 a. m., Brig. Gen. Charles W. Christenberry, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for the Eighth Army, called to get General Colson's plans so that General Van Fleet could discuss the matter with General Yount. General Christenberry stated that it was the wish of Generals Ridgway, Clark, and Van Fleet that in the event force was used, announcements were to be made that any prisoner who wanted to save himself could come out with his hands over his head and move to a designated spot. General Christenberry stated that General Colson had the authority to use vigorous methods to get General Dodd out and to maintain complete control. General Christenberry also authorized delay in the use of force as long as General Colson felt he could free General Dodd without it, and so long as matters did not get out of hand.

At 11:45 a. m., General Dodd again reported by telephone from within the compound that he had been conferring with the

prisoners and that he might be released by 5 p. m. that day if certain allegations of the prisoners were answered satisfactorily. He also stated that he had approved certain details concerning the prisoner of war association.

At 12:15 p. m., General Dodd reported the prisoners' demand for further conferences to discuss alleged past mistreatment of prisoners and also issues concerning screening and repatriation. General Dodd, in this conversation, advised against forced entry and repeated his opinion that agreement could be reached by 5 p. m. that day.

Generals Van Fleet and Yount arrived at Koje at 1:25 that afternoon to discuss with General Colson the tactics to be used in making a forcible entry. During this visit they read the transcript of General Dodd's last telephone message.

Generals Van Fleet and Yount departed at 4:20 p. m., while General Dodd's conference with the prisoners was still in session. At 4:45 p. m. General Dodd read to General Colson over the telephone a message from Lee Hak Koo promising General Dodd's release when the conference was finished.

At 7:15 p. m., General Van Fleet reported to General Ridgway that General Colson had been directed through General Yount to demand release of General Dodd at 10 a. m., May 10, and if refused, to take positive action to empty the compound.

At 7:30 p. m., General Colson reported to General Yount that the conference between General Dodd and the prisoners was apparently a trial of General Dodd by a "people's court" which General Dodd felt was generally favorable to him. General Colson reported that General Dodd had stated that he would probably be released by noon May 10. General Colson requested authority to delay forcible entry. General Yount stated that he would seek authority from the Eighth Army for further delay and at 8 p. m. General Yount called General Colson back and reported that the Eighth Army had authorized such a delay until 10 a. m. May 10, and directed forcible entry at that time if General Dodd had not been released by then.

MAY 10, 1952

In the early morning, preparations for forcible entry continued. Tanks were combat-serviced, and Navy gunboats and road blocks were strategically placed. At 5:32 that morning, General Colson received from Lee Hak Koo the prisoners' first formal demands for a written reply on four points, namely, (1) allegations of mistreatment of prisoners and inhumane methods of warfare such as germ warfare, (2) issues involving repatriation, (3) issues involving screening and alleged rearming of prisoners, and (4) recognition of the PW Association. General Colson faced the choice on the one hand of trying to work out an answer to the false allegations which would satisfy the prisoners, thus insuring General Dodd's release, or on the other hand of using force, which might have caused a general prison break, widespread killing of prisoners and U. N. personnel, and the execution of General Dodd.

General Colson decided to attempt to draft a reply. At 8:45 a. m., General Colson reported Lee Hak Koo's message to General Yount, discussed a proposed reply with General Yount and obtained General Yount's approval to extend the 10 a. m. deadline for forcible entry. During this conversation, General Yount stated that he would seek higher approval of certain aspects of the answer and informed General Colson that Eighth Army had, in general, authorized them to agree to anything reasonable. During these negotiations, General Van Fleet was at his command post in the North and his headquarters received the general substance of the negotiations piecemeal through General Yount who was directed through Maj. Gen. Orlando C. Mood, Chief of Staff of Eighth Army, to "admit nothing that was untrue."

At 9 o'clock General Colson read to General Dodd over the telephone his proposed reply, but General Dodd reported that the prisoners were insisting upon a written response and in return had promised his release by noon.

At 10:05 a. m., General Colson read to General Yount his first written reply. General Yount approved the reply as written. General Colson then dispatched his first reply to compound 76. At 12:04 p. m., General Dodd reported various objections that the prisoners had to this reply. In preparing his second reply, General Colson accepted General Dodd's suggestions and discussed the gist of this proposed reply with General Yount by telephone at 12:45 p. m. This second reply created the false impression that the U. N. in the past had committed acts of violence against its prisoners by saying that "in the future" prisoners can expect humane treatment. This reply also gave rise to further erroneous implications by stating that there would be no "further" violence and no "more" forcible screening or "rearming" of prisoners.

At 4:45 p. m., General Colson read the text of this second reply to General Yount. The transcript of their telephone conversation indicates that certain key words such as "future" and "further" were not received by General Yount. General Yount approved the letter as he heard it and reported it to General Mood. General Colson dispatched this second reply to Compound 76, where it was received at 5:20 that afternoon.

In the meantime, at about 2:25 that afternoon, General Van Fleet informed General Ridgway's Chief of Staff, Lt. Gen. Doyle O. Hickey, that the prisoners had submitted terms for release of General Dodd, that General Colson had replied but that General Van Fleet did not have the substance of his reply; that General Van Fleet felt agreement could be reached; and that General Van Fleet had authorized delay in using force if General Dodd's release appeared imminent. General Ridgway, in a message of reply to General Van Fleet, ordered that his directive of May 8, which authorized the use of whatever force might be required to attain the release of General Dodd, be implemented at or shortly after full daylight, May 11, unless the situation was materially altered by then.

Upon the prisoners' insistence, General Colson's second letter was rewritten to refer to KPA (Korean People's Army) instead of NKPA (North Korean People's Army) and to add a sentence which said "I do admit" that there had been past violence. These changes were not cleared with General Yount. This third reply was received by the prisoners at 6:30 p. m., and accepted by them.

General Dodd was released at 9:30 that evening.

CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY OF MAJOR EVENTS FROM CAPTURE TO RELEASE OF GENERAL DODD

MAY 7

(Koje time)

3:15 p. m.: General Dodd seized by prisoners.

4:40 p. m.: Colonel Craig, chief of staff and deputy commander to General Yount, arrived to assume temporary command; demanded release of Dodd.

MAY 8

12:15 p. m.: General Dodd reported to Colonel Craig the prisoners' demands for a POW association, office supplies, and telephones.

4:50 p. m.: General Ridgway directed General Van Fleet to take necessary action to release Dodd and authorized him to use whatever force might be necessary.

9:30 p. m.: Message from General Van Fleet to General Yount directing preparations of plan to release General Dodd.

9:50 p. m.: General Colson, having been made available to General Yount by Eighth Army, arrived to assume command.

MAY 9

3:55 a. m.: General Colson requested and received authority from General Yount to delay final demand for release until daybreak, May 10, in order to allow arrival of tanks from Korea.

1:25 p. m.: General Van Fleet and General Yount arrived on Koje to discuss tactics to be used in forcible entry.

4:20 p. m.: General Van Fleet and General Yount departed.

8:00 p. m.: General Yount informed General Colson that Eighth Army had authorized delay until 10 a. m., May 10, but directed forcible entry at that time if General Dodd not released by then.

MAY 10

5:32 a. m.: General Colson received prisoners' first formal demand for written agreement on specified terms.

8:45 a. m.: General Colson reported demands to General Yount, who extended the 10 a. m. deadline.

10:05 a. m.: General Colson read to General Yount first proposed reply; General Yount approved.

12:04 p. m.: General Dodd reported to General Colson objections of prisoners to first reply.

4:45 p. m.: General Colson read to General Yount his second proposed reply not all of which, according to the transcript of the call, was received by General Yount. General Yount cleared this letter as received by him with General Mood, Eighth Army.

5:20 p. m.: Second reply received by prisoners; returned for rewriting and correction.

6:30 p. m.: Third reply (revision of second as requested by prisoners) received by prisoners, having been dispatched by General Colson without General Yount's approval. Accepted by prisoners.

9:30 p. m.: General Dodd released.

STATEMENT OF COL. FRANCIS T. DODD

Following is submitted for consideration in connection with recent Koje incident for which I have been reduced from the temporary grade of brigadier general to the rank of colonel:

Since April 8 the command at Koje was involved in several operations of highly classified nature. In these operations speed was the essence. Operations concerned selection and segregation of certain prisoners of war, shipment of some 80,000 to new camps, and subsequent preparation and submission of rosters to Panmunjom. Tight deadlines had been placed on all these operations by higher headquarters. Many times Communist prisoners of war created small incidents with a view toward interrupting the operation in progress. Through interviews with compound leaders I was able in a number of instances to quell disturbances which would have retarded prescribed deadlines. My headquarters was an operating rather than a policy-making agency. These interviews were conducted sometimes in my office, sometimes at the compound, depending upon the need for speed. I was often able to resolve the problem and continue the operation when the efforts of my subordinates had failed. In this particular instance I had gone to the gate to try to arrange for fingerprinting, which was absolutely necessary if we were to furnish accurate rosters. From the number of queries from higher headquarters concerning submission of rosters it was apparent that they were desired promptly and accurately.

Concerning the statement signed by General Colson for which he is being so severely

criticized, it was either a question of signing that or accepting large-scale bloodshed. I feel that I was in the best position to evaluate the reaction of the prisoners of war. Because of a message which I had just seen from General Ridgway to Joint Chiefs of Staff, I feel that I was justified in assuming that large-scale bloodshed was unacceptable to the United Nations cause. There can be no question that such would have been the result had force been used. Saving my life by use of force was an impossibility, therefore this matter was not the main point at issue. The solution was the very best that could be obtained. It is regretted that it is not so considered by higher headquarters.

Notwithstanding my conviction that I acted honorably and in the best interest of my country, I accept the interpretation of my superiors without resentment and will continue to perform any assigned duty to the best of my ability.

STATEMENT OF COL. CHARLES F. COLSON

In the light of events which have happened since the release of Brigadier General Dodd on May 10, 1952, and information which has been furnished me that action against me is under contemplation because of certain portions of the contents of the letter which I signed and sent to the POW leaders in order to secure the release of General Dodd, I am making this statement in full explanation of my action and in justification thereof.

There seems to be two main issues concerned in contents of the letter which I signed and delivered to the prisoner-of-war leaders in compound 76, which was the letter finally accepted as satisfactory by them and resulted in General Dodd's release.

These issues concern the statement in paragraph 1 of the letter, reading "I do admit that there have been instances of bloodshed where many prisoners of war have been killed and wounded by U. N. forces," and also the statement in paragraph 3 "there will be no more forcible screening or any rearming of prisoners of war in this camp."

With reference to the first point, this statement was not included in the first letter nor in the second letter. Instead the statement "I am forced to tell you that we are not (using) and have not used poison gas, germ warfare weapons, or used prisoners of war for atomic bomb tests."

The leaders refused to accept this statement and demanded that since we denied these things that the statement should be omitted from the letter. But they demanded that we admit that there had been instances of bloodshed and prisoners of war killed and wounded by U. N. guards.

I discussed this point with General Yount, commanding general, Second Logistical Command, and I told him that they were the instances which were being used as allegations against General Dodd in the peoples court which was then trying him in the compound. General Dodd had advised me that he had admitted these instances, as they had occurred, and that full investigations had been made and reports rendered to the International Committee of the Red Cross in each instance. The prisoner-of-war leaders would not permit any statement to be included in the letter which would clarify or modify it by indicating that these instances were brought about by their own acts and were justified under the Geneva Convention.

In my discussion of this point with General Yount, he said that such a statement could be made provided that we did not admit committing any crime, such as those described in the first paragraph of Lee Hak Koos message No. 2, i. e.: Barbarous treatment, torture, mass murdering, germ warfare, poison gas, and using prisoners of war for atomic-bomb tests.

Based on this authority I agreed to include the statement admitting instances of bloodshed and the killing and wounding of prisoners of war by U. N. forces and included that statement in letter No. 3.

Letter No. 3 was written twice. Through inadvertence that particular statement was omitted unintentionally. Dodd called my attention to it by phone and I agreed to rewrite the letter to include the statement. This I had done and was about to dispatch it when Dodd called again and said that in paragraph 2, the leaders wanted the letter "N" deleted from abbreviation NKPA, so that it would read KPA as in paragraph 4.

I had the letter retyped with this change, destroyed the one which used the abbreviation NKPA, and dispatched the final letter No. 3 at 1815, May 10, 1952. This letter was accepted as satisfactory by the committee and led to the subsequent release of General Dodd at 2130 hours, May 10, 1952.

Regarding the second point at issue, in paragraph 3, pertaining to "forcible screening," the leaders had demanded that we include such a statement and would not agree to any different statement. This was agreed to by General Yount who stated that as we were not employing forcible screening, any interpretation from this statement that we were could be forcibly denied later. This was agreed for inclusion in the first letter and was never subsequently changed, nor did I receive any instructions to change or delete it during the time which elapsed from the preparation of the first letter to the dispatch of the third. Forcible screening is the term used by the PW's for screening by use of force. No such screening had ever been done, although it had been contemplated. It was ruled out through action of higher headquarters because of the possible bloodshed which would have ensued if force had been used. The leaders demanded that the words "no more" be inserted in the letter and would not back down from that stand.

While being fully cognizant of the interpretation which could be placed on these statements for propaganda purposes, we felt that they were the least that the Communists would accept to meet their demands as a satisfactory answer.

We fully expected that these statements would be emphatically refuted, explained, and shown to have been made under duress, with the life of General Dodd in the balance, as well as the lives of several thousand prisoners of war, besides the lives of our own troops and of the local civilian population, if the use of force was resorted to.

Further, such action (force), which would have resulted in the killing of thousands of prisoners of war, would have provided for greater propaganda material than the statements and admissions, which were capable of refutation and denial, having been forced through threats on the life of General Dodd.

Another factor involved was the possibility of the Communists using such an incident as a basis for retaliatory action against U. N. prisoners of war held by them.

To us on Koje-Do trying to work out a solution to the situation facing us time was an all-important element and was running short. I had been instructed to start the use of force by 10 o'clock on the morning of May 10, unless in my opinion the chances of securing Dodd's release without force seemed to be possible. Later on the 10th, I received definite instructions to start use of force by early light on the morning of May 11 if Dodd was not released by them. We were prepared to do this.

As to the results of the use of force, I would like to say this:

The leaders had sent me a note on the 9th of May, when evidence of our massing force first was noticed, stating that if we used force to secure the release of General Dodd, he would be killed, they would resist, and there would be a simultaneous outbreak in every compound on the island. Further, that they were willing to die for their principles. There is no doubt but that these fanatical Communists meant this.

We were preparing a force to handle the situation in compound 76 and the adjacent compounds 77 and 78. There were over 6,000 prisoners in each of these compounds and a total of over 70,000 prisoners in the 14 occupied compounds.

These compounds can easily be breached by the masses of prisoners contained therein. The fence posts in all except a very few are mostly wooden posts and small tree trunks about 4 inches in diameter. They have been in the ground for 15 months and probably rotten. Many strands of wire on the inner fences have been loosened. The posts have not been braced on the outer side of either fence. There was no question in anyone's mind that a concerted effort on the part of the prisoners would be successful in breaching the fences in spite of the fire of the guards and machine guns. A breach of the compound would result in many of the guards being overrun, their weapons and ammunition seized and turned against the troops. Whether such a simultaneous break could be contained was a serious question in our minds—so much so that we had boats available to cover the coastlines of the island and to quickly remove the nurses, female workers, and hostesses. The set-up of the compound areas is such that many troops would be cut off by escaped groups of prisoners who could get between them and the camp area which leads to the dock area where the warehouses are located.

This situation was so dangerous as to have a great weight in our plans and decisions. It was considered most important not to invoke force except as a last resort.

Weighing all these matters I felt that I was justified in giving in to some degree to the leaders' demands in order to avoid having to use force.

These conditions were well known to the Army commander, as well as the danger involved if force was used. It was in view of these that a second phase of the operation was countermanded, that of driving the prisoners out of compound 76 into No. 74 and subsequently into smaller compartments in 73 and 72. This was to be done even if General Dodd was released. This operation has been postponed until all compounds had been made thoroughly secure so as to prevent a mass breakout.

Furthermore, since this incident, plans are being made to construct new compounds either on the island or at other locations. This is in recognition of the insecure conditions of the present compounds.

The prisoners well recognize the insecurity of their compounds, and the fact that such large masses of them in these compounds gives them an advantage. They use this to the utmost as a threat, and it is the major reason why they cannot be controlled to any degree.

Another bad feature of the Koje-Do prisoner-of-war camp is the close proximity of several native villages, bordering on the compound area. In one instance, in the central valley, a native village is between two groups of compounds. Some 7,000 South Koreans live in these villages. They fear that an outbreak of prisoners would result in many of them being killed. Among these natives there are undoubtedly agents of the Communists, who through various means contact the prisoners of war and carry messages not only between compounds but to the outer world. The CIC has been unable to stop or break up this menace.

Although not mentioned as a point of issue, I would like to explain the other portions of the letter, particularly in paragraph 1.

The leaders demanded that they be assured that in the future the prisoners would receive humane treatment according to international law. I intended to see that the camp was run according to the principles of the Geneva Convention, as it always had been run. The prisoners of war refused to accept the statement made in the first letter that I would continue to follow that policy.

Also they required a statement that I would do all in my power to eliminate further violence and bloodshed. I would do that anyhow. After control of the prisoners was regained, and they were securely confined in smaller compounds of about 500 each, they would be less likely to ignore orders, and would become more manageable.

The statement that I would be responsible if such incidents happen in the future is merely a statement of the responsibility of any commander in such a situation, but the prisoners of war demanded that such a statement be included.

Paragraph 2 needs no comment.

Paragraph 3 has been adequately covered in the preceding remarks.

Paragraph 4. This pertains to a prisoner of war organization in which the senior officer, Col. Lee Hak Koo, was to be the chief leader, and each compound to have a compound leader. These leaders were to be allowed to meet periodically and present their grievances and requests to the camp commander. General Dodd had been thinking of setting up such an organization with view to gaining better control through holding leaders responsible for acts of the other prisoners. The system is quite similar to that with which the Italian and German prisoner of war compounds were run during World War II. It is firmly believed that much good could be accomplished through such an organization, and I was willing to give it a try. Higher headquarters indicated a like attitude on this matter.

From the foregoing statement of facts, and conclusions to be drawn from them, I feel, first that my actions in preparing, signing and delivering the letter to the Communist prisoners of war leaders was not only justified, but bore the approval of headquarters above me. Further, that use of force would have created a far more serious situation that would have been more difficult to explain and counter, than to explain and refute the contents of the letter which was obtained under duress.

After due consideration of the offer made to me to present to the Senate Armed Services Committee my side of the case involving the seizure of Brig. Gen. Frank Dodd by prisoners of war at Koje-Do, Korea, and his subsequent release, I request that the previous statement sent by me to the Chief of Staff, United States Army, be presented to the committee in lieu of any further statement.

STATEMENT OF BRIG. GEN. PAUL F. YOUNT

I do not desire to make any personal statement relative to the seizure and ultimate release of General Dodd. I believe that essential pertinent facts are now available to the Department of the Army.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the report contains all of the information submitted to the Armed Services Committee, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to know if the gentleman feels that the matter is covered in the report.

Mr. VINSON. Well, I will say to the gentlewoman that I have not read all of the facts. It was sent in this morning, and the 7 days run out today. But, I assure the gentlewoman that when these statements have been read in the RECORD and they do not contain what the resolution seeks to accomplish, we will try to get it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am sure the committee will try to get it. I think General Colson is an extremely fine man, and I have always felt that he was taking the blame for what was done by somebody else.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the reports on House resolutions 661 and 662 are identical, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in only one instance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PRISONER-OF-WAR CAMP ON KOJE ISLAND, KOREA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 664) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is hereby requested to furnish to the House of Representatives, at the earliest practicable date, full and complete information with respect to all the circumstances surrounding—

(1) every act of insurgency or uprising of any consequence in the prisoner-of-war camp on Koje Island, Korea, and in other prisoner-of-war camps in Korea, and

(2) every Communist-inspired riot and disturbance of the peace of any consequence in Tokyo and other places in Japan,

which has occurred since the departure of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk the unanimous report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

(The report follows:)

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, submitted the following report:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 9, 1952.

The Honorable JAMES P. RICHARDS,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. RICHARDS: Reference is made to your letter of May 29, 1952, requesting the comments of the Department of State on House Resolution 664. With respect to that portion of the resolution relating to uprisings in prisoner-of-war camps in Korea, I must point out that this is a matter pertaining primarily to responsibilities of the Department of Defense. I understand that the Department of Defense has made available to the appropriate committees of the Congress detailed information on this subject and has commented on House Resolutions 661 and 662 at the request of the Armed Services Committee.

With regard to that portion of the resolution relating to Communist-inspired riots in Tokyo, I must point out that any such occurrences during the period between the assumption by General Ridgway of his responsibilities as Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers in Japan and the effective date of the Treaty of Peace with Japan on April 28, 1952, would also relate primarily to the responsibilities of the Department of Defense. However, I have no knowledge of any serious riots or disturbances during that period. The disturbances that have taken place following April 28, 1952, relate, of course, to the internal affairs of a sovereign government. The Department of State has in the past made available to the Committee on Foreign Affairs all possible information relating to developments in foreign countries of interest to the committee, and will be glad to continue to do so in the future.

According to our information, the Communist-inspired riots which took place in Tokyo on May 1, 1952, and the subsequent, relatively minor, occurrence on May 30 were less serious than first reports in the press seemed to indicate. The May 1 disturbance resulted when approximately 7,000 Communist rioters took advantage of a normal, orderly May Day rally by Japanese labor. It was promptly repudiated by the labor organizations which the Communists had attempted to involve. The second incident, much narrower in scope, was a largely abortive attempt on the part of the Communists to develop violence in connection with a memorial service for certain so-called labor "martyrs." The Japanese Government, through its police, handled both situations in an effective manner.

Mr. Allison, Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs, will be glad to discuss either of these events with the Committee on Foreign Affairs. If additional information is desired, the Department of State will, of course, do everything possible to obtain and make available to the committee such information.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON.

Information has been received by the committee both from the Department of State and the Department of Defense which is pertinent to this resolution. The committee believes, however, that a more complete and coordinated report should be made available to the Congress.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 97]

Aandahl	Bray	Dawson
Abbitt	Brehm	Deane
Abernethy	Brooks	Delaney
Adair	Brown, Ohio	Denny
Albert	Buckley	Dingell
Anderson, Calif.	Burdick	Dorn
Anfuso	Bush	Eaton
Bates, Ky.	Carlyle	Ellsworth
Beall	Carnahan	Elston
Beckworth	Case	Engle
Belcher	Chudoff	Fenton
Betts	Cole, N. Y.	Fernandez
Blackney	Crawford	Frazier

Fugate	Latham	Sabath
Fulton	Lesinski	Sheppard
Furcolo	Magee	Short
Gore	Merrow	Smith, Miss.
Gwinn	Miller, Calif.	Spence
Hale	Miller, Md.	Springer
Hall,	Morano	Stanley
Edwin Arthur	Morgan	Steed
Hall,	Morris	Stigler
Leonard W.	Morrison	Stockman
Halleck	Morton	Sutton
Harden	Multer	Tackett
Harvey	Nelson	Teague
Hays, Ohio	O'Neill	Thomas
Heffernan	Ostertag	Vursell
Herter	O'Toole	Welch
James	Potter	Wickersham
Jenkins	Powell	Wier
Johnson	Rabaut	Williams, Miss.
Kennedy	Reece, Tenn.	Wilson, Ind.
Keogh	Riehlman	Wolverton
Kerr	Robeson	Wood, Ga.
King, Calif.	Roosevelt	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 322 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PRISONER-OF-WAR CAMPS ON KOJE ISLAND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 664 is similar to the two resolutions which have been reported out by the Armed Services Committee and tabled. Information has been received by the committee from both the Department of State and Department of Defense which is pertinent to this resolution. The committee feels, however, that a more complete and coordinated report should be made available to the Congress, and the committee reports favorably and unanimously on House Resolution 664 without amendment and recommends that the resolution do pass.

Mr. Speaker, on May 15, 1952, I introduced House Resolution 641 to authorize the Committee on Armed Services to investigate and study the capture of Brig. Gen. Francis T. Dodd by Communist prisoners at Koje Island, and the concessions made to such prisoners in return for his release. Some 2 weeks ago I stated in a speech on the floor that if action in this matter was not forthcoming soon, I would introduce a resolution of inquiry to the Armed Services Committee. I find that a resolution of this nature has already been introduced and considered by that committee.

I am again calling on the Armed Services Committee for a complete and thorough investigation of the Koje incident, and I am taking this occasion to urgently request of it that Colonel Dodd, Colonel Colson, and Brigadier General Yount be recalled to this country for personal interrogation. The Koje affair now, more than ever, calls for a searching congressional inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, a copy of House Resolution 641, follows:

House Resolution 641

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all the circumstances surrounding the capture of Brig. Gen. Francis T. Dodd by Communist prisoners at the Koje Island (Korea) prisoner-of-war camp on May 7, 1952, and the concessions subsequently made to such prisoners, in return for his release, by Brig. Gen. Charles F. Colson.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), on or before July 1, 1952, the results of its investigation and study together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, it Territories, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and doucments, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by an person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan will state his point of personal privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the CIO News of January 21, 1952, on page 12, the following statement was made:

CONGRESS PAL COMES TO AID OF JOE KAMP

It took 4 years for the Federal Government to get Joseph P. Kamp, operating head of the notorious Constitutional Educational League, into a jail cell after Congress cited him for contempt in 1947.

Now it looks as if it might take Uncle Sam that much more time to get him behind the bars again on another contempt citation, this one voted over the screaming protests of tory Republicans in 1950.

Kamp was cited on both occasions for the same offense—refusing to tell a congressional committee investigating lobbying, where he got the money to pay for the anti-labor, anti-Semitic, anti-New Deal and neo-Fascist propaganda his CEL has been dumping on the country.

Kamp fought his first conviction all the way to the United States Supreme Court. He was aided in his stalling, according to rumors, by wealthy and highly-placed friends who couldn't see anything wrong with his pro-Nazi vocalizing for big business and reaction.

He was convicted of the second offense last June.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the above statements with reference to antilabor and anti-Semitism is the further statement:

And last week Representative HOFFMAN (Republican, Michigan), one of the average American's bitterest enemies in Congress sponsored a resolution to rescind the second contempt citation. Kamp, he explained, has been granted a new trial.

The citation itself, he piously maintained, "resulted from an inquiry initiated at the instance of subversive elements," which he failed to identify.

The statement reflects upon the integrity and the patriotism in his official capacity of the Member from the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan and raises the question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan on the question of personal privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this time is taken, not because of any particular light which might be thrown on pending legislation to lessen the use of butter and which it is assumed will shortly be adopted, but in protest against the false and sometimes malicious charges of the CIO and other labor organizations so often carried in their publications against all who refuse to ever do their bidding. Their contention seems to be that any time anyone in Congress opposes anything they suggest he is un-American, lacks patriotism and ought to be in jail. This notwthstanding that often Members are in accord with their recommendations as for example those on UMT.

That matter with reference to Joseph Kamp comes about as follows: Members who were here at that time will recall that in 1945, I think it was, he refused to answer certain questions before the Elections Committee of the House. The committee at that time was headed by Mr. ANDERSON, who represented New Mexico, who was later Secretary of Agriculture and who is now a Member of the other body. There were Republicans, of course, on that committee. But it was then the fashion to ridicule any charge however well documented that an activity was dominated by Communists and that was a charge then made by Kamp, who was pro-American.

Mr. Kamp at that time refused to tell the committee where he received funds to put out the publications which he was issuing and many of which deplored the power of Communists in labor unions. It has always been my contention, many times stated on the floor of the House, that committees of Congress are without authority to inquire as to where individuals or corporations organizations of any kind receive their funds as long as the material put out by those committees, corporations and organizations does not come in conflict or is not in violation of any postal regulation, any municipal ordinance, any State statute or any Federal law, is not profane or vulgar; that any attempt on the part of Congress to curtain such activities by intimidating those who contribute to the publications which are being published is a denial of free speech and of free press. At least a partial denial of free thought, the expression of political or other opinion.

It will be recalled by those who are familiar with the situation that among the books put out by Mr. Kamp was one on the Constitution by Professor Norton. There were other books of like character. None of those books or none of those publications violated any law; nor was it claimed that they carried either profane, offensive, or obscene language or thought, but yet a committee of the Congress undertook by indirect means to stop the publication and the distribution of articles of that kind principally because they were anti-New Deal. No one seriously contended that they were a violation of

any lobbying or other statute or that there was anything unethical or offensive in any of them.

Then this second conviction came along for a second like refusal. I recall the House voted on the citation. I happened to be absent at the time, but there was a rather large number—I think 125 votes, on both sides of the aisle; it was not a partisan issue exactly—against citing Mr. Kamp. Nevertheless, he was cited by the House, he was tried here in Washington, and he was convicted. Later the conviction was reversed, the indictment quashed, and Kamp was discharged. Later in the appellate court, and under a similar indictment against Mr. Rumely for the same offense, the appellate court held that the Congress had no authority to make the investigation and Mr. Rumely vindicated. The power of Congress to limit a free press was denied. Recently hearings held and testimony taken by a so-called committee of the present Congress in California were, in my opinion, wholly without authority. I will put into the RECORD sometime with reference to that testimony the record where one member of the committee, not having been authorized by the chairman of the committee or by the committee itself, proceeded with an investigator to subpena books and papers and to examine files and records with reference to personal business.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I notice in the statement here it says that Representative HOFFMAN is one of the average American's bitterest enemies in Congress. This same group has frequently charged that those who voted for the Taft-Hartley bill and voted to override the President's veto as being enemies of the average American. I noticed the President this morning did not want to use the Taft-Hartley law. I suppose you and I and those who voted for the Taft-Hartley law would be classified as sort of an enemy of the average American. I do not know why the President does not want to use that law, and I think this group throws us into the same category relative to who our friends and our enemies are as to how we voted on this particular legislation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Some of the officials of CIO unions so classified all who voted for Taft-Hartley. You may remember that at least six CIO unions were finally thrown out of the CIO because they were controlled or dominated by Communists. You know that Lee Pressman, their general counsel, for years finally admitted he was a Communist. I do not know what the writer of this article in the CIO News had in mind at this particular time, but I do recall—well, I remember the A. F. of L., I think it was, down in New Jersey, at their annual convention, gave the executive committee of that organization authority to use as much as $4,000,000 to defeat Members of Congress, and I happened to be one of those named, as the committee might desire. I know that the CIO in this publication has time and time again characterized every Member of Congress, Members of the House and Members of the Senate, who voted in favor of the Taft-Hartley Act—and my colleagues will recall that the President's veto was overridden by both Houses by more than a two-thirds majority—there was a substantial number in both Houses over and above the two-thirds majority which rejected that veto which the President is now apparently attempting to enforce by his refusal to enforce the law of the land.

I recall that notwithstanding the President's statement that he would enforce the Taft-Hartley Act, he has failed to do so, that he seems to be dominated by a desire not only to have his own way but to trade his duty to enforce the law for political support. I recall that the CIO continued to characterize those who voted for it, those who spoke out against violence, which deprived Americans who should be free of their right to work, as enemies of the country, and I assume, of course, one of the reasons back of this publication was not only to bring about my defeat—which would not be of any importance except to me—but to defeat all other Members of the House who supported that remedial legislation and to bring to them fear of and obedience to the CIO. And I noticed since that in Ohio the judgment of the people there has been taken as to whether or not those who supported the Taft-Hartley Act were enemies of the country. The verdict of the employees was to the contrary. I notice that influential and supposedly wealthy industrialists, such as Paul Hoffman and Ernest Weir and those in similar businesses have repudiated the author of that law which they so long and so loudly demanded and which TAFT had so much to do with getting it adopted. I notice that while Senator TAFT has been charged with acting for them, for employers, that they have repudiated him in this campaign, and that the workers, the CIO members—now mark you—the CIO members, the workers, and the A. F. of L. boys, they have gone ahead—at least they did in Ohio—and convinced of the merit of that act, supported the Senator. My information is that the Senator, and, by the way, he is a candidate for the presidential nomination on the Republican ticket, I understand, received an overwhelming majority of the votes cast by the laboring men and women of Ohio, notwithstanding the fact that the officers of the organizations representing them having before that time bitterly denounced him and the law. That fact, to my mind, proves that one who supported that act was not, is not an enemy of America but in reality is a friend of America, of the employee, is trying to bring to this country what we might say we hear so much about, peace, not only peace abroad but here at home in industry, where if a man or woman wants to work, really desires to work—and I have been given to understand that not too many people now want to work—at hard work, but if they do, that then they should have the privilege of going to and from their places of work without being confronted with an armed picket line.

Phil Murray is and for years has been an advocate and an employer of violence on the picket line.

We have in Michigan a statute which makes it an offense to prevent men and women going freely to and from their places of employment. If that or similar laws were enforced, undoubtedly many of these strikes, perhaps even the steel strike, never would have been called, or at least would not extend over a long period of time, and it would not be necessary for the Congress to enact legislation, it would not be necessary for a President of the United States to come here, for perhaps the first time, so far as I know, though I am not a very good student of history, for a President to come before the Congress and ask whether or not he should enforce the law now on the books or whether some other legislation should be enacted. What a spectacle—a President who has twice taken an oath to enforce the law comes publicly before the Congress and, like a child, asks us to tell him to do his duty. A sorry confession of incompetency, a humiliating admission of cowardice, a shameful defiance of the law of the land, and because, he says, he thinks there is a better way.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 98]

Aandahl	Ellsworth	Morgan
Abbitt	Elston	Morris
Abernethy	Engle	Morrison
Adair	Evins	Morton
Albert	Fenton	Nelson
Anderson, Calif.	Frazier	O'Neill
Anfuso	Fugate	Ostertag
Bates, Ky.	Fulton	O'Toole
Beall	Gore	Potter
Beckworth	Gwinn	Powell
Belcher	Hale	Rabaut
Blackney	Hall,	Reece, Tenn.
Bray	Edwin Arthur	Richards
Brehm	Hall,	Riehlman
Brooks	Leonard W.	Robeson
Brown, Ohio	Halleck	Rogers, Fla.
Buckley	Harden	Roosevelt
Burdick	Hart	Sabath
Butler	Harvey	Sasscer
Carlyle	Hays, Ohio	Sheppard
Carnahan	Hébert	Short
Case	Heffernan	Spence
Celler	Herter	Springer
Chiperfield	Jenkins	Stanley
Chudoff	Johnson	Stigler
Cole, N. Y.	Kennedy	Stockman
Cox	Keogh	Sutton
Crawford	Kerr	Tackett
Dawson	Lesinski	Teague
Deane	McKinnon	Thomas
deGraffenried	Magee	Welch
Delaney	Merrow	Wickersham
Denny	Miller, Calif.	Williams, Miss.
Dingell	Miller, Md.	Wilson, Ind.
Dorn	Morano	Wolverton

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 326 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, just before the quorum call, which was made, I understand, so that in the event I did finish within a reasonable time, the bill which would enable the Navy to give the men in that service oleomargarine instead of butter, if brought up, might be given consideration by a majority of the House, I was speaking about the unusual situation which existed when a President of the United States appeared before the Congress asking whether or not he could use the existing law or whether the Congress should give him additional legislation which would permit him to evade his clear duty.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield gladly to our distinguished colleague who contributes so much to good legislation.

Mr. MASON. I am wondering whether the gentleman is speaking to a point of personal privilege or the privilege of the House, and my wonder is caused from this, that as I understand the article, while it named the gentleman from Michigan, it also said that anyone, practically speaking, who voted for the Taft-Hartley Act—and more than two-thirds of the House did—whether or not it was not the privilege of the House that he was invoking because of the attack upon better than two-thirds of both Houses? Is that the understanding?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, there are two questions there. Of course, the article carries the charge by inference at least, that all Members who advocate free speech, a free press, or who supported the Taft-Hartley Act are enemies of America if they do it in opposition to the CIO. I was speaking to the question of personal privilege and I did not send a resolution to the Clerk's desk as I would have been forced to do if it was a question of the privilege of the House that was raised. I did not speak to the question of privilege of the House because the House was not directly named. And, again, answering the second question, the attitude of the CIO as indicated by this and other publications applies not only to your humble servant from the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan but to every other Member, I assume, those on the majority side and over on our side of the aisle, and over in the other body who voted first to pass the act and then to override it or who failed to assist in the attempt to silence those who support constitutional government or who oppose any demand made by the CIO—so far as Phil Murray is concerned—there is no gray; everything is either black or white. If one does not do his bidding, he is a bad, bad man. You can do his bidding 99 times; if you fail on the one hundredth time, you are a traitor.

Mr. MASON. This is what I am leading up to, really. If the great majority of both Houses have had reflection, at least, upon their judgment by the CIO in their statements, by the same token whenever the President of the United States says that the great majority of both Houses, having voted for the Taft-Hartley Act, and that the Taft-Hartley Act is not the answer to our problems even if it has not been used, and asks for something else in place of the Taft-Hartley Act—is that not reflecting upon the judgment of the great majority of both Houses of the Congress and placing the judgment of one man above the judgment of the great majority of the Members of both Houses?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know of no other conclusion that can be reached but I do not want to question the purpose of the President in calling for special legislation. It may be that he is unduly influenced by his advisers—you get my point? It may be he does not understand, as he might, the purpose of the Taft-Hartley Act, or whether or not it would prove efficient. I gathered from his remarks that he had some doubt as to the wisdom of the law, that he did not want or intend to use or enforce it unless ordered to do so but I thought that the question of the wisdom of the Act was not now up to him; that the Congress in its wisdom, or its ignorance, having passed that act, it was his duty as with hand on the Bible he said he would execute the law—to now do so. But, again in these days and times I may be mistaken, because I notice one of the Supreme Court Justices said the other day that times have changed and gave that as an excuse or reason if you prefer—for his opinion that the provisions of the Constitution might be evaded. So, I do not know but my opinion would be that the President is trying to tell Murray and those who will follow his lead that he, the President, is willing to give them what they demand—law or no law—and is trying to throw upon the Congress the blame for a situation which he created.

Mr. MASON. I am not raising the question of the purpose of the President, I am raising the question as to the implication he has made that the great majority of both Houses of Congress do not know what they are doing or do not know what is effective legislation and, therefore, we must accept the judgment of one man in the place of that. It is not the purpose, it is the judgment that I am wondering about.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, there can be no uncertainty as to the answer to that query. It is evident from the President's veto of the Taft-Hartley Act, from his failure to use the Taft-Hartley Act, from his attempt to win the favor of union officials, turn their resentment against the Congress, that he not only thinks or pretends to think the Congress lacks judgment, but that he serves under Phil Murray in this matter. My only purpose in rising at this time was to refute the implication that a man was an enemy of his country just because the CIO news thought so or pretended to think so. I wanted to go further on that statement, and I tried to indicate that before. The workers in Ohio, the members of the two unions, or the three unions, or of all unions for that matter, the rank and file, do not now so construe that law, for by their votes they endorsed the Taft-Hartley Act, gave its author, BOB TAFT, such generous support when they last elected him Senator.

I know in my own district a majority of the union members go along with the law and are happy to have it, because it means they now have an opportunity to call in question as they never did before the acts of their own officers. It also gives them a better opportunity to call for an accounting of the funds which they pay into the union.

Another purpose which I had in mind was this: A man is not necessarily an enemy of his country just because he perhaps is overanxious to insist upon an adherence not only to laws but to rules and regulations of which he has approved, for example, to the rules of the House. I know that at times I have been a trial to some of my colleagues because I thought we should follow the adopted rules as set forth in our rule book in our committee hearings; because I have sometimes protested at what I have thought was an arbitrary and maybe an overbearing manner on the part of some, including myself, Members of the House in questioning witnesses, or going, as I suggested a while ago, clear across the continent to California, where one member of a committee, and an investigator, who admittedly received a fee of some $5,000 from individuals who were interested and participated in the hearings, engaging in what I considered unlawful searches and seizures. In my own committee I sometimes irritate some of my associates by insisting that they have a quorum present as required by the rule. For that irritation I am sorry, but must, at least on occasion, continue that course.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I wonder if the gentleman would comment on what is happening in our committee right now.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman mean what happened today?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes. I tried to get the committee not to hold a meeting at 2 o'clock on the ground that we were going to have matters under consideration on the floor. I was overruled. I do not quite understand what sort of committee is holding a meeting there now anyway. It is a special committee composed of whoever shows up; is that what the situation is? I wonder if the gentleman would explain that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did the gentleman object to the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I did. There were only three other Members present.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How many?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Three besides myself and the chairman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is, five of you?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes. What I would like to ask the gentleman, however, is this: What sort of a committee is this that is meeting, because I under-

stand it is a sort of special committee, to which nobody has been named, but whoever shows up immediately becomes a member. I wonder if the gentleman, being the ranking Republican on that committee, could explain to me and the rest of the House what rules govern it. What rules of the House or of the committee are they following in those hearings; does the gentleman know?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What are they holding hearings on? Is it the same session where I was present this morning?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes; it is to act on these various recommendations of the Hoover Commission, which have been sitting over there for some 8 or 9 months, and on which we have not had hearings. I am interested in the rules of procedure of a committee in the House, which they are supposed to be following. I wonder if the gentleman could throw some light on that?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. With reference to that special committee, I was advised by the chairman—I do not know whether he is here or not, but I think I can quote him fairly accurately, I was advised by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] that it was a special committee, and when I asked as to who was on that special committee, he said that he was chairman of that special committee, as of course is his right, and the gentleman conducts the hearings very efficiently, as we all know, and with due regard to the presence or absence of members of the committee—I always thought—and he said that the special committee consisted of the chairman and all those members of the full but only those members who were present at the time he called the committee to order. There were no members of the committee named. Whoever came in was a member of the special committee. When a member went out he ceased to be a member of the special committee—it was a kind of a now you see it—now you do not—an on again, off again Finnegan affair. I confess it to me is something new and novel in the way of special committees, but I am never too old to learn. Now, I am glad to attempt to be of assistance if I can to my young, able, inquiring, and industrious colleague from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am sure that a member who is objecting to that sort of procedure, and insisting upon following orderly procedure, certainly is not an enemy of the House or an enemy of our country.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did not think I was, and I think that the committee rules should be followed, and then we would know whether our action would be acceptable to the House.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman because that was my view too.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. Does not the gentleman think that this kind of thing can better be straightened out by the committee than it can on the floor of the House? I mean the question that the gentleman from Missouri has raised is a matter of committee procedure, which I do not believe has been presented to the whole committee, and if there is objection to it, it ought to be considered by the whole committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Certainly the committee can and in my judgment should handle it, but it is my inference drawn from what our colleague said that he made such an attempt but got just nowhere. If the committee sanctions something the gentleman contends is a violation of the rules, then his only remedy is to call the situation to the attention of the House, as he has just done. Of course, one difficulty grows out of the fact that the gentleman from Virginia, a subcommittee chairman, being afflicted, well, with an irresistible, commendable impulse to work all the time and to hold committee hearings when the full committee is sitting. Sometimes on these quorum calls I go down to his subcommittee to help him get a quorum, and then I am called up to the parent committee to help establish a quorum there. Well, we have a chairman and the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Virginia, working at the same time, and they want the rest, or at least some of us, to do the same thing, to be at the hearings each is holding, which is all right with me, but I cannot work in two places at the same minute. Many, many times at the full committee hearings Republicans outnumber Democrats 3 to 1, though on a vote the Democrats are either present in person or by proxy. This morning there were seven Republicans once and once one Democrat present.

Mr. HARDY. I just want to make this observation. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Michigan for his cooperation in assisting me to establish a quorum along with myself and anyone else, and he has been most helpful.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman has always been very courteous. I go there and report "present" and then he says, "Now you can go any time you want to. We do not need you any longer."

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman will agree that that is an understanding which we have had between ourselves.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Right you are; and it tends toward peace and harmony.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. The Taft-Hartley Act has not had the opportunity in this case for us to see whether it would work or not. I am wondering whether or not the President has some doubts, criticizing the act, as to whether or not, if he did put it into operation, that labor would vote against the strike. I find that in my district that many of the laboring people are becoming very impatient with strikes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course, I doubt very much whether some labor leaders want to go along with the bill introduced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], which, as I read it, authorizes the seizure of industry and the seizure of the union. I also understand that the last thing that labor wants is the Government saying that wages can be lowered. But, that is getting rather far afield from the original topic which I rose to discuss. I understand that proposed legislation having to do with the curtailment of the use of butter by the Navy will be postponed perhaps for this session, and that will give me time to collect my thoughts for another talk on this subject on another occasion. Therefore I now yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5678) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2096)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5678) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act, divided into titles, chapters, and sections according to the following table of contents, may be cited as the 'Immigration and Nationality Act'.

"TABLE OF CONTENTS

"TITLE I—GENERAL

"Sec. 101. Definitions.
"Sec. 102. Applicability of title II to certain nonimmigrants.
"Sec. 103. Powers and duties of the Attorney General and the Commissioner.
"Sec. 104. Powers and duties of the Secretary of State; Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs.
"Sec. 105. Liaison with internal security officers.

"TITLE II—IMMIGRATION

"Chapter 1—quota system

"Sec. 201. Numerical limitations; annual quota based upon national origin; minimum quotas.
"Sec. 202. Determination of quota to which an immigrant is chargeable.
"Sec. 203. Allocation of immigrant visas within quotas.
"Sec. 204. Procedure for granting immigrant status under section 101 (a) (27) (F) (i) or 203 (a) (1) (A).
"Sec. 205. Procedure for granting nonquota status or preference by reason of relationship.

"Sec. 206. Revocation of approval of petitions.
"Sec. 207. Unused quota immigrant visas.
"*Chapter 2—Qualifications for admission of aliens; travel control of citizens and aliens*
"Sec. 211. Documentary requirements.
"Sec. 212. General classes of aliens ineligible to receive visas and excluded from admission.
"Sec. 213. Admission of aliens on giving bond or cash deposit.
"Sec. 214. Admission of nonimmigrants.
"Sec. 215. Travel control of aliens and citizens in time of war or national emergency.
"*Chapter 3—Issuance on entry documents*
"Sec. 221. Issuance of visas.
"Sec. 222. Applications for visas.
"Sec. 223. Reentry permits.
"Sec. 224. Nonquota immigrant visas.
"*Chapter 4—Provisions relating to entry and exclusion*
"Sec. 231. Lists of aliens and citizen passengers arriving or departing; record of resident aliens and citizens leaving permanently for foreign country.
"Sec. 232. Detention of aliens for observation and examination.
"Sec. 233. Temporary removal for examination upon arrival.
"Sec. 234. Physical and mental examination.
"Sec. 235. Inspection by immigrant officers.
"Sec. 236. Exclusion of aliens.
"Sec. 237. Immediate deportation of aliens excluded from admission or entering in violation of law.
"Sec. 238. Entry through or from foreign contiguous territory and adjacent islands; landing stations.
"Sec. 239. Designation of ports of entry for aliens arriving by civil aircraft.
"Sec. 240. Records of admission.
"*Chapter 5—Deportation; adjustment of status*
"Sec. 241. General classes of deportable aliens.
"Sec. 242. Apprehension and deportation of aliens.
"Sec. 243. Countries to which aliens shall be deported; cost of deportation.
"Sec. 244. Suspension of deportation; voluntary departure.
"Sec. 245. Adjustment of status of nonimmigrant to that of person admitted for permanent residence.
"Sec. 246. Rescission of adjustment of status.
"Sec. 247. Adjustment of status of certain resident aliens to nonimmigrant status.
"Sec. 248. Change of nonimmigrant classification.
"Sec. 249. Record of admission for permanent residence in the case of certain aliens who entered prior to July 1, 1924.
"Sec. 250. Removal of aliens who have fallen into distress.
"*Chapter 6—Special provisions relating to alien crewmen*
"Sec. 251. Lists of alien crewmen; reports of illegal landings.
"Sec. 252. Conditional permits to land temporarily.
"Sec. 253. Hospital treatment of alien crewmen afflicted with certain diseases.
"Sec. 254. Control of alien crewmen.
"Sec. 255. Employment on passenger vessels of aliens afflicted with certain disabilities.
"Sec. 256. Discharge of alien crewmen.
"Sec. 257. Bringing in alien crewmen into United States with intent to evade immigration laws.
"*Chapter 7—Registration of aliens*
"Sec. 261. Aliens seeking entry into the United States.
"Sec. 262. Registration of aliens in the United States.
"Sec. 263. Provisions governing registration of special groups.
"Sec. 264. Forms and procedure.
"Sec. 265. Notices of change of address.
"Sec. 266. Penalties.
"*Chapter 8—General penalty provisions*
"Sec. 271. Prevention of unauthorized landing of aliens.
"Sec. 272. Bringing in alien subject to disability or afflicted with disease.
"Sec. 273. Unlawful bringing of aliens into United States.
"Sec. 274. Bringing in and harboring certain aliens.
"Sec. 275. Entry of alien at improper time or place; misrepresentation and concealment of facts.
"Sec. 276. Reentry of deported alien.
"Sec. 277. Aiding or assisting subversive alien to enter the United States.
"Sec. 278. Importation of aliens for immoral purposes.
"Sec. 279. Jurisdiction of district courts.
"Sec. 280. Collection of penalties and expenses.
"*Chapter 9—Miscellaneous*
"Sec. 281. Schedule of fees.
"Sec. 282. Printing of reentry permits and blank forms of manifests and crew lists.
"Sec. 283. Travel expenses and expense of transporting remains of immigration officers and employees who die outside the United States.
"Sec. 284. Members of the Armed Forces.
"Sec. 285. Disposal of privileges at immigrant stations.
"Sec. 286. Disposition of moneys collected under the provisions of this title.
"Sec. 287. Powers of immigration officers and employees.
"Sec. 288. Local jurisdiction over immigrant stations.
"Sec. 289. American Indians born in Canada.
"Sec. 290. Central file; information from other departments and agencies.
"Sec. 291. Burden of proof.
"Sec. 292. Right to counsel.
"TITLE III—NATIONALITY AND NATURALIZATION
"*Chapter 1—Nationality at birth and by collective naturalization*
"Sec. 301. Nationals and citizens at birth.
"Sec. 302. Persons born in Puerto Rico.
"Sec. 303. Persons born in the Canal Zone.
"Sec. 304. Persons born in Alaska.
"Sec. 305. Persons born in Hawaii.
"Sec. 306. Persons living in and born in the Virgin Islands.
"Sec. 307. Persons living in and born in Guam.
"Sec. 308. Nationals but not citizens at birth.
"Sec. 309. Children born out of wedlock.
"*Chapter 2—Nationality through naturalization*
"Sec. 310. Jurisdiction to naturalize.
"Sec. 311. Eligibility for naturalization.
"Sec. 312. Requirements as to understanding the English language, history, principles and form of government of the United States.
"Sec. 313. Prohibition upon the naturalization of persons opposed to government or law, or who favor totalitarian forms of government.
"Sec. 314. Ineligibility to naturalization of deserters from the Armed Forces of the United States.
"Sec. 315. Alien relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States because of alienage barred from citizenship.
"Sec. 316. Requirements as to residence, good moral character, attachment to the principles of the Constitution, and favorable disposition to the United States.
"Sec. 317. Temporary absence of persons performing religious duties.
"Sec. 318. Prerequisites to naturalization—burden of proof.
"Sec. 319. Married persons.
"Sec. 320. Children born outside of United states of one alien and one citizen parent.
"Sec. 321. Children born outside of United states of alien parent.
"Sec. 322. Child born outside of United States; naturalization on petition of citizen parent; requirements and exemptions.
"Sec. 323. Children adopted by United States citizens.
"Sec. 324. Former citizens regaining United States citizenship.
"Sec. 325. Nationals but not citizens of the United States; residence within outlying possessions.
"Sec. 326. Resident Philippine citizens excepted from certain requirements.
"Sec. 327. Former United States citizens losing citizenship by entering the armed forces of foreign countries during World War II.
"Sec. 328. Naturalization through service in the Armed Forces of the United States.
"Sec. 329. Naturalization through active-duty service in Armed Forces during World War I or World War II.
"Sec. 330. Constructive residence through service on certain United States vessels.
"Sec. 331. Alien enemies; naturalization under specified conditions and procedure.
"Sec. 332. Procedural and administrative provisions; executive functions.
"Sec. 333. Photographs.
"Sec. 334. Petition for naturalization; declaration of intention.
"Sec. 335. Investigation of petitioners; preliminary examinations on petitions.
"Sec. 336. Final hearing in open court; examination of petitioner before the court.
"Sec. 337. Oath of renunciation and allegiance.
"Sec. 338. Certificate of naturalization; contents.
"Sec. 339. Functions and duties of clerks.
"Sec. 340. Revocation of naturalization.
"Sec. 341. Certificates of citizenship; procedure.
"Sec. 342. Cancellation of certificates not to affect citizenship status.
"Sec. 343. Documents and copies issued by the Attorney General.
"Sec. 344. Fiscal provisions.
"Sec. 345. Mail relating to naturalization transmitted free of postage and registered.
"Sec. 346. Publication and distribution of citizenship textbooks from naturalization fees.
"Sec. 347. Compilation of naturalization statistics and payment for equipment.
"Sec. 348. Admissibility in evidence of testimony as to statements voluntarily made to officers or employees in the course of their official duties.

"*Chapter 3—loss of nationality*

"Sec. 349. Loss of nationality by native-born or naturalized citizen.
"Sec. 350. Dual nationals; divestiture of foreign nationality.
"Sec. 351. Restrictions on expatriation.
"Sec. 352. Loss of nationality by naturalized national.
"Sec. 353. Section 352 not effective as to certain persons.
"Sec. 354. Section 352 (a) (2) not effective as to certain persons.
"Sec. 355. Loss of American nationality through parent's expatriation; not effective until person attains age of twenty-five years.
"Sec. 356. Nationality lost solely from performance of acts or fulfillment of conditions.
"Sec. 357. Application of treaties; exceptions.

"*Chapter 4—miscellaneous*

"Sec. 358. Certificate of diplomatic or consular officer as to loss of American nationality.
"Sec. 359. Certificate of nationality for a person not a naturalized citizen for use in proceedings of a foreign state.
"Sec. 360. Judicial proceedings for reclaration of United States nationality in event of denial of rights and privileges as national.

"TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

"Sec. 401. Joint Congressional Committee.
"Sec. 402. Amendments to other laws.
"Sec. 403. Laws repealed.
"Sec. 404. Authorization of appropriations.
"Sec. 405. Savings clauses.
"Sec. 406. Separability.
"Sec. 407. Effective date.

"TITLE I—GENERAL

"*Definitions*

"SECTION 101. (a) As used in this Act—

"(1) The term 'administrator' means the administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the Department of State.

"(2) The term 'advocates' includes, but is not limited to, advises, recommends, furthers by overt act, and admits belief in.

"(3) The term 'alien' means any person not a citizen or national of the United States.

"(4) The term 'application for admission' has reference to the application for admission into the United States and not to the application for the issuance of an immigrant or nonimmigrant visa.

"(5) The term 'Attorney General' means the Attorney General of the United States.

"(6) The term 'border crossing identification card' means a document of identity bearing that designation issued to an alien who is lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or to an alien who is a resident in foreign contiguous territory, by a consular officer or an immigration officer for the purpose of crossing over the borders between the United States and foreign contiguous territory in accordance with such conditions for its issuance and use as may be prescribed by regulations.

"(7) The term 'clerk of court' means a clerk of a naturalization court.

"(8) The terms 'Commissioner' and Deputy Commissioner' mean the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and a Deputy Commisioner of Immigration and Naturalization, respectively.

"(9) The term 'consular officer' means any consular, diplomatic, or other officer of the United States designated under regulations prescribed under authority contained in this Act, for the purpose of issuing immigrant or nonimmigrant visas. In cases of aliens, in the Canal Zone and the outlying possessions of the United States, the term 'consular officer' means an officer designated by the Governor of the Canal Zone, or the governors of the outlying possessions, for the purpose of issuing immigrant or nonimmigrant visas under this Act.

"(10) The term 'crewman' means a person serving in any capacity on board a vessel or aircraft.

"(11) The term 'diplomatic visa' means a nonimmigrant visa bearing that title and issued to a nonimmigrant in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe.

"(12) The term 'doctrine' includes, but is not limited to, policies, practices, purposes, aims, or procedures.

"(13) The term 'entry' means any coming of an alien into the United States, from a foreign port or place or from an outlying possession, whether voluntarily or otherwise, except that an alien having a lawful permanent residence in the United States shall not be regarded as making an entry into the United States for the purposes of the immigration laws if the alien proves to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that his departure to a foreign port or place or to an outlying possession was not intended or reasonably to be expected by him or his presence in a foreign port or place or in an outlying possession was not voluntary: *Provided*, That no person whose departure from the United States was occasioned by deportation proceedings, extradition, or other legal process shall be held to be entitled to such exception.

"(14) The term 'foreign state' includes outlying possessions of a foreign state, but self-governing dominions or territories under mandate or trusteeship shall be regarded as separate foreign states.

"(15) The term 'immigrant' means every alien except an alien who is within one of the following classes of nonimmigrant aliens—

"(A) (i) an ambassador, public minister, or career diplomatic or consular officer who has been accredited by a foreign government recognized de jure by the United States and who is accepted by the President or by the Secretary of State, and the members of the alien's immediate family;

"(ii) upon a basis of reciprocity, other officials and employees who have been accredited by a foreign government recognized de jure by the United States, who are accepted by the Secretary of State, and the members of their immediate families; and

"(iii) upon a basis of reciprocity, attendants, servants, personal employees, and members of their immediate families, of the officials and employees who have a nonimmigrant status under (i) and (ii) above;

"(B) an alien (other than one coming for the purpose of study or of performing skilled or unskilled labor or as a representative of foreign press, radio, film, or other foreign information media coming to engage in such vocation) having a residence in a foreign country which he has no intention of abandoning and who is visiting the United States temporarily for business or temporarily for pleasure;

"(C) an alien in immediate and continuous transit through the United States, or an alien who qualifies as a person entitled to pass in transit to and from the United Nations Headquarters District and foreign countries, under the provisions of paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) of section 11 of the Headquarters Agreement with the United Nations (61 Stat. 758);

"(D) an alien crewman serving in good faith as such in any capacity required for normal operation and service on board a vessel (other than a fishing vessel having its home port or an operating base in the United States) or aircraft, who intends to land temporarily and solely in pursuit of his calling as a crewman and to depart from the United States with the vessel or aircraft on which he arrived or some other vessel or aircraft;

"(E) an alien entitled to enter the United States under and in pursuance of the provisions of a treaty of commerce and navigation between the United States and the foreign state of which he is a national, and the spouse and children of any such alien if accompanying or following to join him: (i) solely to carry on substantial trade, principally between the United States and the foreign state of which he is a national; or (ii) solely to develop and direct the operations of an enterprise in which he has invested, or of an enterprise in which he is actively in the process of investing, a substantial amount of capital;

"(F) an alien having a residence in a foreign country which he has no intention of abandoning, who is a bona fide student qualified to pursue a full course of study and who seeks to enter the United States temporarily and solely for the purpose of pursuing such a course of study at an established institution of learning or other recognized place of study in the United States, particularly designated by him and approved by the Attorney General after consultation with the Office of Education of the United States, which institution or place of study shall have agreed to report to the Attorney General the termination of attendance of each nonimmigrant student, and if any such institution of learning or place of study fails to make reports promptly the approval shall be withdrawn;

"(G) (i) a designated principal resident representative of a foreign government recognized de jure by the United States, which foreign government is a member of an international organization entitled to enjoy privileges, exemptions, and immunities as an international organization under the International Organizations Immunities Act (59 Stat. 669), accredited resident members of the staff of such representatives, and members of his or their immediate family;

"(ii) other accredited representatives of such a foreign government to such international organizations and the members of their immediate families;

"(iii) an alien able to qualify under (i) or (ii) above except for the fact that the government of which such alien is an accredited representative is not recognized de jure by the United States, or that the government of which he is an accredited representative is not a member of such international organization, and the members of his immediate family;

"(iv) officers, or employees of such international organizations, and the members of their immediate families;

"(v) attendants, servants, and personal employees of any such representative, officer, or employee, and the members of the immediate families of such attendants, servants, and personal employees;

"(H) an alien having a residence in a foreign country which he has no intention of abandoning (i) who is of distinguished merit and ability and who is coming temporarily to the United States to perform temporary services of an exceptional nature requiring such merit and ability; or (ii) who is coming temporarily to the United States to perform other temporary services or labor, if unemployed persons capable of performing such service or labor cannot be found in this country; or (iii) who is coming temporarily to the United States as an industrial trainee;

"(I) upon a basis of reciprocity, an alien who is a bona fide representative of foreign press, radio, film, or other foreign information media, who seeks to enter the United States solely to engage in such vocation, and the spouse and children of such a representative, if accompanying or following to join him.

"(16) The term 'immigrant visa' means an immigrant visa required by this Act and properly issued by a consular officer at his

office outside of the United States to an eligible immigrant under the provisions of this Act.

"(17) The term 'immigration laws' includes this Act and all laws, conventions, and treaties of the United States relating to the immigration, exclusion, deportation, or expulsion of aliens.

"(18) The term 'immigration officer' means any employee or class of employees of the Service or of the United States designated by the Attorney General, individually or by regulation, to perform the functions of an immigration officer specified by this Act or any section thereof.

"(19) The term 'ineligible to citizenship,' when used in reference to any individual, means, notwithstanding the provisions of any treaty relating to military service, an individual who is, or was at any time, permanently debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States under section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 885; 55 Stat. 844), or under section 4 (a) of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 605; 65 Stat. 76), or under any section of this Act, or any other Act, or under any law amendatory of, supplementary to, or in substitution for, any of such sections or Acts.

"(20) The term 'lawfully admitted for permanent residence' means the status of having been lawfully accorded the privilege of residing permanently in the United States as an immigrant in accordance with the immigration laws, such status not having changed.

"(21) The term 'national' means a person owing permanent allegiance to a state.

"(22) The term 'national of the United States' means (A) a citizen of the United States, or (B) a person who, though not a citizen of the United States, owes permanent allegiance to the United States.

"(23) The term 'naturalization' means the conferring of nationality of a state upon a person after birth, by any means whatsoever.

"(24) The term 'naturalization court', unless otherwise particularly described, means a court authorized by section 310 (a) of title III to exercise naturalization jurisdiction.

"(25) The term 'noncombatant service' shall not include service in which the individual is not subject to military discipline, court martial, or does not wear the uniform of any branch of the armed forces.

"(26) The term 'nonimmigrant visa' means a visa properly issued to an alien as an eligible nonimmigrant by a competent officer as provided in this Act.

"(27) The term 'nonquota immigrant' means—

"(A) an immigrant who is the child or the spouse of a citizen of the United States;

"(B) an immigrant, lawfully admitted for permanent residence, who is returning from a temporary visit abroad;

"(C) an immigrant who was born in Canada, the Republic of Mexico, the Republic of Cuba, the Republic of Haiti, the Dominican Republic, the Canal Zone, or an independent country of Central or South America, and the spouse or the child of any such immigrant, if accompanying or following to join him;

"(D) an immigrant who was a citizen of the United States and may, under section 324 (a) or 327 of title III, apply for reacquisition of citizenship;

"(E) an immigrant included within the second proviso to section 349 (a) (1) of title III;

"(F) (i) an immigrant who continuously for at least two years immediately preceding the time of his application for admission to the United States has been, and who seeks to enter the United States solely for the purpose of carrying on the vocation of minister of a religious denomination, and whose services are needed by such religious denomination having a bona fide organization in the United States; and (ii) the spouse or the child of any such immigrant, if accompanying or following to join him; or

"(G) an immigrant who is an employee, or an honorably retired former employee, of the United States Government abroad, and who has performed faithful service for a total of fifteen years, or more, and his accompanying spouse and children: *Provided*, That the principal officer of a Foreign Service establishment, in his discretion, shall have recommended the granting of nonquota status to such alien in exceptional circumstances and the Secretary of State approves such recommendation and finds that it is in the national interest to grant such status.

"(28) The term 'organization' means, but is not limited to, an organization, corporation, company, partnership, association, trust, foundation, or fund; and includes a group of persons, whether or not incorporated, permanently or temporarily associated together with joint action on any subject or subjects.

"(29) The term 'outlying possessions of the United States' means American Samoa and Swains Island.

"(30) The term 'passport' means any travel document issued by competent authority showing the bearer's origin, identity, and nationality if any, which is valid for the entry of the bearer into a foreign country.

"(31) The term 'permanent' means a relationship of continuing or lasting nature, as distinguished from temporary, but a relationship may be permanent even though it is one that may be dissolved eventually at the instance either of the United States or of the individual, in accordance with law.

"(32) The term 'quota immigrant' means any immigrant who is not a nonquota immigrant. An alien who is not particularly specified in this Act as a nonquota immigrant or a nonimmigrant shall not be admitted or considered in any manner to be either a nonquota immigrant or a nonimmigrant notwithstanding his relationship to any individual who is so specified or by reason of being excepted from the operation of any other law regulating or forbidding immigration.

"(33) The term 'residence' means the place of general abode; the place of general abode of a person means his principal actual dwelling place in fact, without regard to intent. Residence shall be considered continuous for the purposes of sections 350 and 352 of title III where there is a continuity of stay but not necessarily an uninterrupted physical presence in a foreign state or states or outside the United States.

"(34) The term 'Service' means the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice.

"(35) The term 'spouse', 'wife', or 'husband' do not include a spouse, wife, or husband by reason of any marriage ceremony where the contracting parties thereto are not physically present in the presence of each other, unless the marriage shall have been consummated.

"(36) The term 'State' includes (except as used in section 310 (a) of title III) Alaska, Hawaii, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands of the United States.

"(37) The term 'totalitarian party' means an organization which advocates the establishment in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship or totalitarianism. The terms 'totalitarian dictatorship' and 'totalitarianism' mean and refer to systems of government not representative in fact, characterized by (A) the existence of a single political party, organized on a dictatorial basis, with so close an identity between such party and its policies and the governmental policies of the country in which it exists, that the party and the government constitute an indistinguishable unit, and (B) the forcible suppression of opposition to such party.

"(38) The term 'United States', except as otherwise specifically herein provided, when used in a geographical sense, means the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands of the United States.

"(39) The term 'unmarried', when used in reference to any individual as of any time, means an individual who at such time is not married, whether or not previously married.

"(40) The term 'world communism' means a revolutionary movement, the purpose of which is to establish eventually a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in any or all the countries of the world through the medium of an internationally coordinated Communist political movement.

"(b) As used in titles I and II—

"(1) The term 'child' means an unmarried person under twenty-one years of age who is—

"(A) a legitimate child; or

"(B) a stepchild, provided the child had not reached the age of eighteen years at the time the marriage creating the status of stepchild occurred; or

"(C) a child legitimated under the law of the child's residence or domicile, or under the law of the father's residence or domicile, whether in or outside the United States, if such legitimation takes place before the child reaches the age of 18 years and the child is in the legal custody of the legitimating parent or parents at the time of such legitimation.

"(2) The terms 'parents', 'father', or 'mother' mean a parent, father, or mother only where the relationship exists by reason of any of the circumstances set forth in (1) above.

"(3) The term 'person' means an individual or an organization.

"(4) The term 'special inquiry officer' means any immigration officer who the Attorney General deems specially qualified to conduct specified classes of proceedings, in whole or in part, required by this Act to be conducted by or before a special inquiry officer and who is designated and selected by the Attorney General, individually or by regulation, to conduct such proceedings. Such special inquiry officer shall be subject to such supervision, and shall perform such duties, not inconsistent with this Act, as the Attorney General shall prescribe.

"(5) The term 'adjacent islands' includes Saint Pierre, Miquelon, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Bermuda, the Bahamas, Barbados, Jamaica, the Windward and Leeward Islands, Trinidad, Martinique, and other British, French, and Netherlands territory or possessions in or bordering on the Caribbean Sea.

"(c) As used in title III—

"(1) The term 'child' means an unmarried person under twenty-one years of age and includes a child legitimated under the law of the child's residence or domicile, or under the law of the father's residence or domicile, whether in the United States or elsewhere, and, except as otherwise provided in sections 320, 321, 322, and 323 of title III, a child adopted in the United States, if such legitimation or adoption takes place before the child reaches the age of sixteen years, and the child is in the legal custody of the legitimating or adopting parent or parents at the time of such legitimation or adoption.

"(2) The terms 'parent,' 'father,' and 'mother' include in the case of a posthumous child a deceased parent, father, and mother.

"(d) As used in chapter 3 of title III—

"(1) The term 'veteran' means a person who served in the armed forces of the United States at any time in an active-duty status during the period from April 21, 1898, to August 12, 1898, or from April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918, or from December 7, 1941, to December 31, 1946, all dates inclusive, and who was discharged therefrom under honorable conditions. The records of the armed forces shall be conclusive as to type of a discharge and as to whether the conditions

under which a discharge was given were honorable.

"(2) (A) The term 'Spanish-American War' relates to the period from April 21, 1898, to August 12, 1898; (B) the term 'World War I' relates to the period from April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918; and (C) the term 'World War II' relates to the period from December 7, 1941, to December 31, 1946, all dates inclusive.

"(e) For the purposes of this Act—

"(1) The giving, loaning, or promising of support or of money or any other thing of value to be used for advocating any doctrine shall constitute the advocating of such doctrine; but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as an exclusive definition of advocating.

"(2) The giving, loaning, or promising of support or of money or any other thing of value for any purpose to any organization shall be presumed to constitute affiliation therewith; but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as an exclusive definition of affiliation.

"(3) Advocating the economic, international, and governmental doctrines of world communism means advocating the establishment of a totalitarian Communist dictatorship in any or all of the countries of the world through the medium of an internationally coordinated Communist movement.

"(f) For the purposes of this Act—

"No person shall be regarded as, or found to be, a person of good moral character who, during the period for which good moral character is required to be established, is, or was—

"(1) a habitual drunkard;

"(2) one who during such period has committed adultery;

"(3) a member of one or more of the classes of persons, whether excludable or not, described in paragraphs (11), (12), and (31) of section 212 (a) of this Act; or paragraphs (9), (10), and (23) of section 212 (a), if the offense described therein, for which such person was convicted or of which he admits the commission, was committed during such period;

"(4) one whose income is derived principally from illegal gambling activities;

"(5) one who has been convicted of two or more gambling offenses committed during such period;

"(6) one who has given false testimony for the purpose of obtaining any benefits under this Act,

"(7) one who during such period has been confined, as a result of conviction, to a penal institution for an aggregate period of one hundred and eighty days or more, regardless of whether the offense, or offenses, for which he has been confined were committed within or without such period;

"(8) one who at any time has been convicted of the crime of murder.

"The fact that any person is not within any of the foregoing classes shall not preclude a finding that for other reasons such person is or was not of good moral character.

"(g) For the purposes of this Act any alien ordered deported (whether before or after the enactment of this Act) who has left the United States, shall be considered to have been deported in pursuance of law, irrespective of the source from which the expenses of his transportation were defrayed or of the place to which he departed.

"Applicability of title II to certain nonimmigrants

"SEC. 102. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, for so long as they continue in the nonimmigrant classes enumerated in this section, the provisions of this Act relating to ineligibility to receive visas and the exclusion or deportation of aliens shall not be construed to apply to nonimmigrants—

"(1) within the class described in paragraph (15) (A) (i) of section 101 (a), except those provisions relating to reasonable requirements of passports and visas as a means of identification and documentation necessary to establish their qualifications under such paragraph (15) (A) (i), and, under such rules and regulations as the President may deem to be necessary, the provisions of paragraph (27) of section 212 (a);

"(2) within the class described in paragraph (15) (G) (i) of section 101 (a), except those provisions relating to reasonable requirements of passports and visas as a means of identification and documentation necessary to establish their qualifications under such paragraph (15) (G) (i), and the provisions of paragraph (27) of section 212 (a); and

"(3) within the classes described in paragraphs (15) (A) (ii), (15) (G) (ii), (15) (G) (iii), or (15) (G) (iv) of section 101 (a), except those provisions relating to reasonable requirements of passports and visas as a means of identification and documentation necessary to establish their qualifications under such paragraphs, and the provisions of paragraphs (27) and (29) of section 212 (a).

"Powers and duties of the Attorney General and the Commissioner

"SEC. 103. (a) The Attorney General shall be charged with the administration and enforcement of this act and all other laws relating to the immigration and naturalization of aliens, except insofar as this act or such laws relate to the powers, functions, and duties conferred upon the President, the Secretary of State, the officers of the Department of State, or diplomatic or consular officers: *Provided, however,* That determination and ruling by the Attorney General with respect to all questions of law shall be controlling. He shall have control, direction, and supervision of all employees and of all the files and records of the Service. He shall establish such regulations; prescribe such forms of bond, reports, entries, and other papers; issue such instructions; and perform such other acts as he deems necessary for carrying out his authority under the provisions of this Act. He is authorized, in accordance with the civil-service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1949, to appoint such employees of the Service as he deems necessary, and to delegate to them or to any officer or employee of the Department of Justice in his discretion any of the duties and powers imposed upon him in this Act; he may require or authorize any employee of the Service or the Department of Justice to perform or exercise any of the powers, privileges, or duties conferred or imposed by this Act or regulations issued thereunder upon any other employee of the Service. He shall have the power and duty to control and guard the boundaries and borders of the United States against the illegal entry of aliens and shall, in his discretion, appoint for that purpose such number of employees of the Service as to him shall appear necessary and proper. He is authorized to confer or impose upon any employee of the United States, with the consent of the head of the Department or other independent establishment under whose jurisdiction the employee is serving, any of the powers, privileges, or duties conferred or imposed by this Act or regulations issued thereunder upon officers or employees of the Service. He may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, establish offices of the Service in foreign countries; and, after consultation with the Secretary of State, he may, whenever in his judgment such action may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act, detail employees of the Service for duty in foreign countries.

"(b) The Commissioner shall be a citizen of the United States and shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $17,500 per annum. He shall be charged with any and all responsibilites and authority in the administration of the Service and of this Act which are conferred upon the Attorney General as may be delegated to him by the Attorney General or which may be prescribed by the Attorney General.

"Powers and duties of the Secretary of State; Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs

"SEC. 104. (a) The Secretary of State shall be charged with the administration and the enforcement of the provisions of this Act and all other immigration and nationality laws relating to (1) the powers, duties and functions of diplomatic and consular officers of the United States, except those powers, duties and functions conferred upon the consular officers relating to the granting or refusal of visas; (2) the powers, duties and functions of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs; and (3) the determination of nationality of a person not in the United States. He shall establish such regulations; prescribe such forms of reports, entries and other papers; issue such instructions; and perform such other acts as he deems necessary for carrying out such provisions. He is authorized to confer or impose upon any employee of the United States, with the consent of the head of the department or independent establishment under whose jurisdiction the employee is serving, any of the powers, functions, or duties conferred or imposed by this act or regulations issued thereunder upon officers or employees of the Department of State or of the American Foreign Service.

"(b) There is hereby established in the Department of State a Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, to be headed by an administrator (with an appropriate title to be designated by the Secretary of State), with rank and compensation equal to that of an Assistant Secretary of State. The administrator shall be a citizen of the United States, qualified by experience, and shall maintain close liaison with the appropriate committees of Congress in order that they may be advised regarding the administration of this Act by consular officers. He shall be charged with any and all responsibility and authority in the administration of the Bureau and of this Act which are conferred on the Secretary of State as may be delegated to him by the Secretary of State or which may be prescribed by the Secretary of State. He shall also perform such other duties as the Secretary of State may prescribe.

"(c) Within the Bureau there shall be a Passport Office, a Visa Office, and such other offices as the Secretary of State may deem to be appropriate, each office to be headed by a director. The Directors of the Passport Office and the Visa Office shall be experienced in the administration of the nationality and immigration laws.

"(d) The functions heretofore performed by the Passport Division and the Visa Division of the Department of State shall hereafter be performed by the Passport Office and the Visa Office, respectively, of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs.

"(e) There shall be a General Counsel of the Visa Office, who shall be appointed by the Secretary of State and who shall serve under the general direction of the Legal Adviser of the Department of State. The General Counsel shall have authority to maintain liaison with the appropriate officers of the Service with a view to securing uniform interpretations of the provisions of this Act.

"(f) The Bureau shall be under the immediate jurisdiction of the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration.

"Liaison with internal security officers

"SEC. 105. The Commissioner and the administrator shall have authority to maintain

direct and continuous liaison with the Directors of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Central Intelligence Agency and with other internal security officers of the Government for the purpose of obtaining and exchanging information for use in enforcing the provisions of this Act in the interest of the internal security of the United States. The Commissioner and the administrator shall maintain direct and continuous liaison with each other with a view to a coordinated, uniform, and efficient administration of this Act, and all other immigration and nationality laws.

"TITLE II—IMMIGRATION

"CHAPTER 1—QUOTA SYSTEM

"Numerical limitations; annual quota based upon national origin; minimum quotas

"SEC. 201. (a) The annual quota of any quota area shall be one-sixth of 1 per centum of the number of inhabitants in the continental United States in 1920, which number, except for the purpose of computing quotas for quota areas within the Asia-Pacific triangle, shall be the same number heretofore determined under the provisions of section 11 of the Immigration Act of 1924, attributable by national origin to such quota area: *Provided*, That the quota existing for Chinese persons prior to the date of enactment of this Act shall be continued, and, except as otherwise provided in section 202 (e), the minimum quota for any quota area shall be one hundred.

"(b) The determination of the annual quota of any quota area shall be made by the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Attorney General, jointly. Such officials shall, jointly, report to the President the quota of each quota area, and the President shall proclaim and make known the quotas so reported. Such determination and report shall be made and such proclamation shall be issued as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act. Quotas proclaimed therein shall take effect on the first day of the fiscal year, or the next fiscal half year, next following the expiration of six months after the date of the proclamation, and until such date the existing quotas proclaimed under the Immigration Act of 1924 shall remain in effect. After the making of a proclamation under this subsection the quotas proclaimed therein shall continue with the same effect as if specifically stated herein and shall be final and conclusive for every purpose, except (1) insofar as it is made to appear to the satisfaction of such officials and proclaimed by the President, that an error of fact has occurred in such determination or in such proclamation, or (2) in the case provided for in section 202 (e).

"(c) There shall be issued to quota immigrants chargeable to any quota (1) no more immigrant visas in any fiscal year than the quota for such year, and (2) in any calendar month of any fiscal year, no more immigrant visas than 10 per centum of the quota for such year; except that during the last two months of any fiscal year immigrant visas may be issued without regard to the 10 per centum limitation contained herein.

"(d) Nothing in this Act shall prevent the issuance (without increasing the total number of quota immigrant visas which may be issued) of an immigrant visa to an immigrant as a quota immigrant even though he is a nonquota immigrant.

"(e) The quota numbers available under the annual quotas of each quota area proclaimed under this Act shall be reduced by the number of quota numbers which have been ordered to be deducted from the annual quotas authorized prior to the effective date of the annual quotas proclaimed under this Act under—

"(1) section 19 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended;

"(2) the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; and

"(3) any other Act of Congress enacted prior to the effective date of the quotas proclaimed under this Act.

"Determination of quota to which an immigrant is chargeable

"SEC. 202. (a) Each independent country, self-governing dominion, mandated territory, and territory under the international trusteeship system of the United Nations, other than the United States and its outlying possessions and the countries specified in section 101 (a) (27) (C), shall be treated as a separate quota area when approved by the Secretary of State. All other inhabited lands shall be attributed to a quota area specified by the Secretary of State. For the purposes of this Act, the annual quota to which an immigrant is chargeable shall be determined by birth within a quota area, except at—

"(1) an alien child, when accompanied by his alien parent or parents may be charged to the quota of the accompanying parent or of either accompanying parent if such parent has received or would be qualified for an immigrant visa, if necessary to prevent the separation of the child from the accompanying parent or parents, and if the quota to which such parent has been or would be chargeable is not exhausted for that fiscal year;

"(2) if an alien is chargeable to a different quota from that of his accompanying spouse, the quota to which such alien is chargeable may, if necessary to prevent the separation of husband and wife, be determined by the quota of the accompanying spouse, if such spouse has received or would be qualified for an immigrant visa and if the quota to which such spouse has been or would be chargeable is not exhausted for that fiscal year;

"(3) an alien born in the United States shall be considered as having been born in the country of which he is a citizen or subject, or if he is not a citizen or subject of any country then in the last foreign country in which he had his residence as determined by the consular officer;

"(4) an alien born within any quota area in which neither of his parents was born and in which neither of his parents had a residence at the time of such alien's birth may be charged to the quota area of either parent;

"(5) notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of this subsection, any alien who is attributable by as much as one-half of his ancestry to a people or peoples indigenous to the Asia-Pacific triangle defined in subsection (b) of this section, unless such alien is entitled to a nonquota immigrant status under paragraph (27) (A), (27) (B), (27) (D), (27) (E), (27) (F), or (27) (G) of section 101 (a), shall be chargeable to a quota as specified in subsection (b) of this section: *Provided*, That the child of an alien defined in section 101 (a) (27) (C), if accompanying or following to join him, shall be classified under section 101 (a) (27) (C), notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

"(b) With reference to determination of the quota to which shall be chargeable an immigrant who is attributable by as much as one-half of his ancestry to a people or peoples indigenous to the Asia-Pacific triangle comprising all quota areas and all colonies and other dependent areas situate wholly east of the meridian sixty degrees east of Greenwich, wholly west of the meridian one hundred and sixty-five degrees west, and wholly north of the parallel twenty-five degrees south latitude—

"(1) there is hereby established, in addition to quotas for separate quota areas comprising independent countries, self-governing dominions, and territories under the international trusteeship system of the United Nations situate wholly within said Asia-Pacific triangle, an Asia-Pacific quota of one hundred annually, which quota shall not be subject to the provisions of subsection (e);

"(2) such immigrant born within a separate quota area situate wholly within such Asia-Pacific triangle shall not be chargeable to the Asia-Pacific quota, but shall be chargeable to the quota for the separate quota area in which he was born;

"(3) such immigrant born within a colony or other dependent area situate wholly within said Asia-Pacific triangle shall be chargeable to the Asia-Pacific quota;

"(4) such immigrant born outside the Asia-Pacific triangle who is attributable by as much as one-half of his ancestry to a people or peoples indigenous to not more than one separate quota area, situate wholly within the Asia-Pacific triangle, shall be chargeable to the quota of that quota area;

"(5) such immigrant born outside the Asia-Pacific triangle who is attributable by as much as one-half of his ancestry to a people or peoples indigenous to one or more colonies or other dependent areas situate wholly within the Asia-Pacific triangle, shall be chargeable to the Asia-Pacific quota;

"(6) such immigrant born outside the Asia-Pacific triangle, who is attributable by as much as one-half of his ancestry to peoples indigenous to two or more separate quota areas situate wholly within the Asia-Pacific triangle, or to a quota area or areas and one or more colonies and other dependent areas situate wholly therein, shall be chargeable to the Asia-Pacific quota.

"(c) Any immigrant born in a colony or other component or dependent area of a governing country for which no separate or specific quota has been established, unless a nonquota immigrant as provided in section 101 (a) (27) of this Act, shall be chargeable to the quota of the governing country, except that (1) not more than one hundred persons born in any one such colony or other component or dependent area overseas from the governing country shall be chargeable to the quota of its governing country in any one year, and (2) any such immigrant, if attributable by as much as one-half of his ancestry to a people or peoples indigenous to the Asia-Pacific triangle, shall be chargeable to a quota as provided in subsection (b) of this section.

"(d) The provision of an immigration quota for a quota area shall not constitute recognition by the United States of the political transfer of territory from one country to another, or recognition of a government not recognized by the United States.

"(e) After the determination of quotas has been made as provided in section 201, revision of the quotas shall be made by the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Attorney General, jointly, whenever necessary, to provide for any change of boundaries resulting in transfer of territory from one sovereignty to another, a change of administrative arrangements of a colony or other dependent area, or any other political change, requiring a change in the list of quota areas or of the territorial limits thereof, but any increase in the number of minimum quota areas above twenty within the Asia-Pacific triangle shall result in a proportionate decrease in each minimum quota of such area in order that the sum total of all minimum quotas within the Asia-Pacific triangle shall not exceed two thousand. In the case of any change in the territorial limits of quota areas, not requiring a change in the quotas for such areas, the Secretary of State shall, upon recognition of such change, issue appropriate instructions to all consular offices concerning the change in the territorial limits of the quota areas involved.

"Allocation of immigrant visas within quotas

"SEC. 203. (a) Immigrant visas to quota immigrants shall be alloted in each fiscal year as follows:

"(1) The first 50 per centum of the quota of each quota area for such year, plus any portion of such quota not required for the issuance of immigrant visas to the classes specified in paragraphs (2) and (3), shall be made available for the issuance of immigrant visas (A) to qualified quota immigrants whose services are determined by the Attorney General to be needed urgently in the United States because of the high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability of such immigrants and to be substantially beneficial prospectively to the national economy, cultural interests, or welfare of the United States, and (B) to qualified quota immigrants who are the spouse or children of any immigrant described in clause (A) if accompanying him.

"(2) The next 30 per centum of the quota for each quota area for such year, plus any portion of such quota not required for the issuance of immigrant visas to the classes specified in paragraphs (1) and (3), shall be made available for the issuance of immigrant visas to qualified quota immigrants who are the parents of citizens of the United States, such citizens being at least twenty-one years of age.

"(3) The remaining 20 per centum of the quota for each quota area for such year, plus any portion of such quota not required for the issuance of immigrant visas to the classes specified in paragraphs (1) and (2), shall be made available for the issuance of immigrant visas to qualified quota immigrants who are the spouses or the children of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

"(4) Any portion of the quota for each quota area for such year not required for the issuance of immigrant visas to the classes specified in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) shall be made available for the issuance of immigrant visas to other qualified quota immigrants chargeable to such quota. Qualified quota immigrants of each quota area who are the brothers, sisters, sons, or daughters of citizens of the United States shall be entitled to a preference of not exceeding 25 per centum of the immigrant visas available for issuance for each quota area under this paragraph.

"(b) Quota immigrant visas issued pursuant to paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall, in the case of each quota area, be issued to eligible quota immigrants in the order in which a petition on behalf of each such immigrant is filed with the Attorney General as provided in section 204; and shall be issued in the first calendar month after receipt of notice of approval of such petition in which a quota number is available for an immigrant chargeable to such quota area.

"(c) Quota immigrant visas issued to aliens in the classes designated in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (a) shall, in the case of each quota, be issued to qualified quota immigrants strictly in the chronological order in which such immigrants are registered in each class on quota waiting lists which shall be maintained for each quota in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State.

"(d) In determining the order for consideration of applications for quota immigrant visas under subsection (a), consideration shall be given first to applications under paragraph (1), second to applications under paragraph (2), third to applications under paragraph (3), and fourth to applications under paragraph (4).

"(e) Every immigrant shall be presumed to be a quota immigrant until he establishes to the satisfaction of the consular officer, at the time of application for a visa, and to the immigration officers, at the time of application for admission, that he is a nonquota immigrant. Every quota immigrant shall be presumed to be a nonpreference quota immigrant until he establishes to the satisfaction of the consular officer and the immigration officers that he is entitled to a preference quota status under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a) or to a preference under paragraph (4) of such subsection.

"Procedure for granting immigrant status under section 101 (A) (27) (F) (i) or section 203 (a) (1) (A)

"SEC. 204. (a) In the case of any alien claiming in his application for an immigrant visa to be entitled to an immigrant status under section 101 (a) (27) (F) (i) or section 203 (a) (1) (A), the consular officer shall not grant such status until he has been authorized to do so as provided in this section.

"(b) Any person, institution, firm, organization, or governmental agency desiring to have an alien classified as an immigrant under section 101 (a) (27) (F) (i) or section 203 (a) (1) (A) shall file a petition with the Attorney General for such classification of the alien. The petition shall be in such form as the Attorney General may by regulations prescribe and shall state the basis for the need of the services of such alien and contain such additional information and be supported by such documentary evidence as may be required by the Attorney General. The petition shall be made under oath administered by any individual having authority to administer oaths, if executed in the United States, but, if executed outside the United States, administered by a consular officer.

"(c) After an investigation of the facts in each case and after consultation with appropriate agencies of the Government, the Attorney General shall, if he determines that the facts stated in the petition are true and that the alien in respect of whom the petition is made is eligible for an immigrant status under section 101 (a) (27) (F) (i) or section 203 (a) (1) (A), approve the petition and forward one copy thereof to the Department of State. The Secretary of State shall then authorize the consular officer concerned to grant such immigrant status.

"(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to entitle an immigrant, in respect of whom a petition under this section is approved, to enter the United States as an immigrant under section 101 (a) (27) (F) (i) or section 203 (a) (1) (A) if upon his arrival at a port of entry in the United States he is found not to be entitled to such classification.

"Procedure for granting nonquota status or preference by reason of relationship

"SEC. 205. (a) In the case of any alien claiming in his application for an immigrant visa to be entitled to a nonquota immigrant status under section 101 (a) (27) (A), or to a quota immigrant status under section 203 (a) (2) or 203 (a) (3), or to a preference under section 203 (a) (4), the consular officer shall not grant such status or preference until he has been authorized to do so as provided in this section.

"(b) Any citizen of the United States claiming that any immigrant is his spouse or child and that such immigrant is entitled to a nonquota immigrant status under section 101 (a) (27) (A), or any citizen of the United States claiming that any immigrant is his parent and that such immigrant is entitled to a quota immigrant status under section 203 (a) (2), or any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence claiming that any immigrant is his spouse or child and that such immigrant is entitled to a quota immigrant status under section 203 (a) (3), or any citizen of the United States claiming that any immigrant is his brother, sister, son, or daughter and that such immigrant is entitled to a preference under section 203 (a) (4) may file a petition with the Attorney General. The petition shall be in such form and shall contain such information and be supported by such documentary evidence as the Attorney General may by regulations prescribe. The petition shall be made under oath administered by any individual having authority to administer oaths, if executed in the United States, but, if executed outside the United States, administered by a consular officer.

"(c) After an investigation of the facts in each case the Attorney General shall, if he determines the facts stated in the petition are true and that the alien in respect of whom the petition is made is eligible for a nonquota immigrant status under section 101 (a) (27) (A), or for a quota immigrant status under section 203 (a) (2) or 203 (a) (3), or for a preference under section 203 (a) (4), approve the petition and forward one copy thereof to the Department of State. The Secretary of State shall then authorize the consular officer concerned to grant the nonquota immigrant status, quota immigrant status, or preference, as the case may be.

"(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to entitle an immigrant, in respect of whom a petition under this section is approved, to enter the United States as a nonquota immigrant under section 101 (a) (27) (A) if upon his arrival at a port of entry in the United States he is found not to be entitled to such classification, or to enter the United States as a quota immigrant under section 203 (a) (2) or 203 (a) (3) if upon his arrival at a port of entry in the United States he is found not to be entitled to such classification, or to enter the United States as a preference quota immigrant under section 203 (a) (4) if upon his arrival at a port of entry in the United States he is found not to be entitled to such preference.

"Revocation of approval of petitions

"SEC. 206. The Attorney General may, at any time, for what he deems to be good and sufficient cause, revoke the approval of any petition approved by him under section 204, section 205, or section 214 (c) of this title. Such revocation shall be effective as of the date of approval of any such petition. In no case, however, shall such revocation have effect unless there is mailed to the petitioner's last known address a notice of the revocation and unless notice of the revocation is communicated through the Secretary of State to the beneficiary of the petition before such beneficiary commences his journey to the United States. If notice of revocation is not so given, and the beneficiary applies for admission to the United States, his admissibility shall be determined in the manner provided for by sections 235 and 236.

"Unused quota immigrant visas

"SEC. 207. If a quota immigrant having an immigrant visa is excluded from admission to the United States and deported, or does not apply for admission to the United States before the expiration of the validity of the immigrant visa, or if an alien having an immigrant visa issued to him as a quota immigrant is found not to be a quota immigrant, no immigrant visa shall be issued in lieu thereof to any other immigrant.

"CHAPTER 2—QUALIFICATIONS FOR ADMISSION OF ALIENS; TRAVEL CONTROL OF CITIZENS AND ALIENS

"Documentary requirements

"SEC. 211. (a) No immigrant shall be admitted into the United States unless at the time of application for admission he (1) has a valid unexpired immigrant visa or was born subsequent to the issuance of such immigrant visa of the accompanying parent, (2) is properly chargeable to the quota specified in the immigrant visa, (3) is a nonquota immigrant if specified as such in the immigrant visa, (4) is of the proper status under the

quota specified in the immigrant visa, and (5) is otherwise admissible under this Act.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (20) of this Act, in such cases or in such classes of cases and under such conditions as may be by regulations prescribed, otherwise admissible aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence who depart from the United States temporarily may be readmitted to the United States by the Attorney General in his discretion without being required to obtain a passport, immigrant visa, reentry permit or other documentation.

"(c) The Attorney General may in his discretion, subject to subsection (d), admit to the United States any otherwise admissible immigrant not admissible under clause (2), (3), or (4) of subsection (a), if satisfied that such inadmissibility was not known to, and could not have been ascertained by the exercise of reasonable diligence by, such immigrant prior to the departure of the vessel or aircraft from the last port outside the United States and outside foreign contiguous territory, or, in the case of an immigrant coming from foreign contiguous territory, prior to the application of the immigrant for admission.

"(d) No quota immigrant within clause (2) or (3) of subsection (a) shall be admitted under subsection (c) if the entire number of immigrant visas which may be issued to quota immigrants under the same quota for the fiscal year, or the next fiscal year, has already been issued. If such entire number of immigrant visas has not been issued, the Secretary of State, upon notification by the Attorney General of the admission under subsection (c) of a quota immigrant within clause (2) or (3) of subsection (a), shall reduce by one the number of immigrant visas which may be issued to quota immigrants under the same quota during the fiscal year in which such immigrant is admitted, or, if the entire number of immigrant visas which may be issued to quota immigrants under the same quota for the fiscal year has been issued, then during the next following fiscal year.

"(e) Every alien making application for admission as an immigrant shall present a valid unexpired passport, or other suitable travel document, or document of identity and nationality, if such document is required under the regulations issued by the Attorney General.

"General classes of aliens ineligible to receive visas and excluded from admission

"SEC. 212. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the following classes of aliens shall be ineligible to receive visas and shall be excluded from admission into the United States:

"(1) Aliens who are feeble-minded;

"(2) Aliens who are insane;

"(3) Aliens who have had one or more attacks of insanity;

"(4) Aliens afflicted with psychopathic personality, epilepsy, or a mental defect;

"(5) Aliens who are narcotic drug addicts or chronic alcoholics;

"(6) Aliens who are afflicted with tuberculosis in any form, or with leprosy, or any dangerous contagious disease;

"(7) Aliens not comprehended within any of the foregoing classes who are certified by the examining surgeon as having a physical defect, disease, or disability, when determined by the consular or immigration officer to be of such a nature that it may affect the ability of the alien to earn a living, unless the alien affirmatively establishes that he will not have to earn a living;

"(8) Aliens who are paupers, professional beggars, or vagrants;

"(9) Aliens who have been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude (other than a purely political offense), or aliens who admit having committed such a crime, or aliens who admit committing acts which constitute the essential elements of such a crime; except that aliens who have committed only one such crime while under the age of eighteen years may be granted a visa and admitted if the crime was committed more than five years prior to the date of the application for a visa or other documentation, and more than five years prior to date of application for admission to the United States, unless the crime resulted in confinement in a prison or correctional institution, in which case such alien must have been released from such confinement more than five years prior to the date of the application for a visa or other documentation, and for admission, to the United States;

"(10) Aliens who have been convicted of two or more offenses (other than purely political offenses), regardless of whether the conviction was in a single trial or whether the offenses arose from a single scheme of misconduct and regardless of whether the offenses involved moral turpitude, for which the aggregate sentences to confinement actually imposed were five years or more;

"(11) Aliens who are polygamists or who practice polygamy or advocate the practice of polygamy;

"(12) Aliens who are prostitutes or who have engaged in prostitution, or aliens coming to the United States solely, principally, or incidentally to engage in prostitution; aliens who directly or indirectly procure or attempt to procure, or who have procured or attempted to procure or to import, prostitutes or persons for the purpose of prostitution or for any other immoral purpose; and aliens who are or have been supported by, or receive or have received, in whole or in part, the proceeds of prostitution or aliens coming to the United States to engage in any other unlawful commercialized vice, whether or not related to prostitution;

"(13) Aliens coming to the United States to engage in any immoral sexual act;

"(14) Aliens seeking to enter the United States for the purpose of performing skilled or unskilled labor, if the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified to the Secretary of State and to the Attorney General that (A) sufficient workers in the United States who are able, willing, and qualified are available at the time (of application for a visa and for admission to the United States) and place (to which the alien is destined) to perform such skilled or unskilled labor, or (B) the employment of such aliens will adversely affect the wages and working conditions of the workers in the United States similarly employed. The exclusion of aliens under this paragraph shall apply only to the following classes: (i) those aliens described in the nonpreference category of section 203 (a) (4), (ii) those aliens described in section 101 (a) (27) (C), (27) (D), or (27) (E) (other than the parents, spouses, or children of United States citizens or of aliens lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence), unless their services are determined by the Attorney General to be needed urgently in the United States because of the high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability of such immigrants and to be substantially beneficial prospectively to the national economy, cultural interest or welfare of the United States;

"(15) Aliens who, in the opinion of the consular officer at the time of application for a visa, or in the opinion of the Attorney General at the time of application for admission, are likely at any time to become public charges;

"(16) Aliens who have been excluded from admission and deported and who again seek admission within one year from the date of such deportation, unless prior to their reembarkation at a place outside the United States or their attempt to be admitted from foreign contiguous territory the Attorney General has consented to their reapplying for admission;

"(17) Aliens who have been arrested and deported, or who have fallen into distress and have been removed pursuant to this or any prior act, or who have been removed as alien enemies, or who have been removed at Government expense in lieu of deportation pursuant to section 242 (b), unless prior to their embarkation or reembarkation at a place outside the United States or their attempt to be admitted from foreign contiguous territory the Attorney General has consented to their applying or reapplying for admission;

"(18) Aliens who are stowaways;

"(19) Any alien who seeks to procure, or has sought to procure, or has procured a visa or other documentation, or seeks to enter the United States, by fraud, or by willfully misrepresenting a material fact;

"(20) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this Act, any immigrant who at the time of application for admission is not in possession of a valid unexpired immigrant visa, reentry permit, border crossing identification card, or other valid entry document required by this Act, and a valid unexpired passport, or other suitable travel document, or document of identity and nationality, if such document is required under the regulations issued by the Attorney General pursuant to section 211 (e);

"(21) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this Act, any quota immigrant at the time of application for admission whose visa has been issued without compliance with the provisions of section 203;

"(22) Aliens who are ineligible to citizenship, except aliens seeking to enter as nonimmigrants; or persons who have departed from or who have remained outside the United States to avoid or evade training or service in the armed forces in time of war or a period declared by the President to be a national emergency, except aliens who were at the time of such departure nonimmigrant aliens and who seek to reenter the United States as nonimmigrants;

"(23) Any alien who has been convicted of a violation of any law or regulation relating to the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs, or who has been convicted of a violation of any law or regulation governing or controlling the taxing, manufacture, production, compounding, transportation, sale, exchange, dispensing, giving away, importation, exportation, or the possession for the purpose of the manufacture, production, compounding, transportation, sale, exchange, dispensing, giving away, importation or exportation of opium, coca leaves, heroin, marihuana, or any salt derivative or preparation of opium or coca leaves, or isonipecaine or any addiction-forming or addiction-sustaining opiate; or any alien who the consular officer or immigration officers know or have reason to believe is or has been an illicit trafficker in any of the aforementioned drugs;

"(24) Aliens (other that those aliens who are native-born citizens of countries enumerated in section 101 (a) (27) (C) and aliens described in section 101 (a) (27) (B)) who seek admission from foreign contiguous territory or adjacent islands, having arrived there on a vessel or aircraft of a nonsignatory line, or if signatory, a noncomplying transportation line under section 238 (a) and who have not resided for at least two years subsequent to such arrival in such territory or adjacent islands;

"(25) Aliens (other than aliens who have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence and who are returning from a temporary visit abroad) over sixteen years of age, physically capable of reading, who cannot read and understand some language or dialect;

"(26) Any nonimmigrant who is not in possession of (A) a passport valid for a minimum period of six months from the date of the expiration of the initial period of his admission or contemplated initial period of stay authorizing him to return to the country from which he came or to proceed to and enter some other country during such period;

and (B) at the time of application for admission a valid nonimmigrant visa or border crossing identification card;

"(27) Aliens who the consular officer or the Attorney General knows or has reason to believe seek to enter the United States solely, principally, or incidentally to engage in activities which would be prejudicial to the public interest, or endanger the welfare, safety, or security of the United States;

"(28) Aliens who are, or at any time have been, members of any of the following classes:

"(A) Aliens who are anarchists;

"(B) Aliens who advocate or teach, or who are members of or affiliated with any organization that advocates or teaches, opposition to all organized government;

"(C) Aliens who are members of or affiliated with (i) the Communist Party of the United States, (ii) any other totalitarian party of the United States, (iii) the Communist Political Association, (iv) the Communist or any other totalitarian party of any State of the United States, of any foreign state, or of any political or geographical subdivision of any foreign state, (v) any section, subsidiary, branch, affiliate, or subdivision of any such association or party, or (vi) the direct predecessors or successors of any such association or party, regardless of what name such group or organization may have used, may now bear, or may hereafter adopt: Provided, That nothing in this paragraph, or in any other provision of this Act, shall be construed as declaring that the Communist Party does not advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means;

"(D) Aliens not within any of the other provisions of this paragraph who advocate the economic, international, and governmental doctrines of world communism or the establishment in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship, or who are members of or affiliated with any organization that advocates the economic, international, and governmental doctrines of world communism or the establishment in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship, either through its own utterances or through any written or printed publications issued or published by or with the permission or consent of or under the authority of such organization or paid for by the funds of, or funds furnished by, such organization;

"(E) Aliens not within any of the other provisions of this paragraph, who are members of or affiliated with any organization during the time it is registered or required to be registered under section 7 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, unless such aliens establish that they did not have knowledge or reason to believe at the time they became members of or affiliated with such an organization (and did not thereafter and prior to the date upon which such organization was so registered or so required to be registered have such knowledge or reason to believe) that such organization was a Communist organization;

"(F) Aliens who advocate or teach or who are members of or affiliated with any organization that advocates or teaches (i) the overthrow by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law; or (ii) the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers (either of specific individuals or of officers generally) of the Government of the United States or of any other organized government, because of his or their official character; or (iii) the unlawful damage, injury, or destruction of property; or (iv) sabotage;

"(G) Aliens who write or publish, or cause to be written or published, or who knowingly circulate, distribute, print, or display, or knowingly cause to be circulated, distributed, printed, published, or displayed, or who knowingly have in their possession for the purpose of circulation, publication, distribution, or display, any written or printed matter, advocating or teaching opposition to all organized government, or advocating or teaching (i) the overthrow by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law; or (ii) the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers (either of specific individuals or of officers generally) of the Government of the United States or of any other organized government, because of his or their official character; or (iii) the unlawful damage, injury, or destruction of property; or (iv) sabotage; or (v) the economic, international, and governmental doctrines of world communism or the establishment in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship;

"(H) Aliens who are members of or affiliated with any organization that writes, circulates, distributes, prints, publishes, or displays, or causes to be written, circulated, distributed, printed, published, or displayed, or that has in its possession for the purpose of circulation, distribution, publication, issue, or display, any written or printed matter of the character described in paragraph (G);

"(I) Any alien who is within any of the classes described in subparagraphs (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), and (H) of this paragraph because of membership in or affiliation with a party or organization or a section, subsidiary, branch, affiliate, or subdivision thereof, may, if not otherwise ineligible, be issued a visa if such alien establishes to the satisfaction of the consular officer when applying for a visa and the consular officer finds that (i) such membership or affiliation is or was involuntary, or is or was solely when under sixteen years of age, by operation of law, or for purposes of obtaining employment, food rations, or other essentials of living and where necessary for such purposes, or (ii) (a) since the termination of such membership or affiliation, such alien is and has been, for at least five years prior to the date of the application for a visa, actively opposed to the doctrine, program, principles, and ideology of such party or organization or the section, subsidiary, branch, or affiliate or subdivision thereof, and (b) the admission of such alien into the United States would be in the public interest. Any such alien to whom a visa has been issued under the provisions of this subparagraph may, if not otherwise inadmissible, be admitted into the United States if he shall establish to the satisfaction of the Attorney General when applying for admission to the United States and the Attorney General finds that (i) such membership or affiliation is or was involuntary, or is or was solely when under sixteen years of age, by operation of law, or for purposes of obtaining employment, food rations, or other essentials of living and when necessary for such purposes, or (ii) (a) since the termination of such membership or affiliation, such alien is and has been, for at least five years prior to the date of the application for admission, actively opposed to the doctrine, program, principles, and ideology of such party or organization or the section, subsidiary, branch, or affiliate or subdivision thereof, and (b) the admission of such alien into the United States would be in the public interest. The Attorney General shall promptly make a detailed report to the Congress in the case of each alien who is or shall be admitted into the United States under (ii) of this subparagraph;

"(29) Aliens with respect to whom the consular officer or the Attorney General knows or has reasonable ground to believe probably would, after entry, (A) engage in activities which would be prohibited by the laws of the United States relating to espionage, sabotage, public disorder, or in other activity subversive to the national security, (B) engage in any activity a purpose of which is the opposition to, or the control or overthrow of, the Government of the United States, by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means, or (C) join, affiliate with, or participate in the activities of any organization which is registered or required to be registered under section 7 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950;

"(30) Any alien, accompanying another alien ordered to be excluded and deported and certified to be helpless from sickness or mental or physical disability or infancy pursuant to section 237 (e), whose protection or guardianship is required by the alien ordered excluded and deported;

"(31) Any alien who at any time shall have, knowingly and for gain, encouraged, induced, assisted, abetted, or aided any other alien to enter or to try to enter the United States in violation of law.

"(b) The provisions of paragraph (25) of subsection (a) shall not be applicable to any alien who (1) is the parent, grandparent, spouse, daughter, or son of an admissible alien, or any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or any citizen of the United States, if accompanying such admissible alien, or coming to join such citizen or alien lawfully admitted, and if otherwise admissible, or (2) proves that he is seeking admission to the United States to avoid religious persecution in the country of his last permanent residence, whether such persecution be evidenced by overt acts or by laws or governmental regulations that discriminate against such alien or any group to which he belongs because of his religious faith. For the purpose of ascertaining whether an alien can read under paragraph (25) of subsection (a), the consular officers and immigration officers shall be furnished with slips of uniform size, prepared under direction of the Attorney General, each containing not less than thirty nor more than forty words in ordinary use, printed in plainly legible type, in one of the various languages or dialects of immigrants. Each alien may designate the particular language or dialect in which he desires the examination to be made and shall be required to read and understand the words printed on the slip in such language or dialect.

"(c) Aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence who temporarily proceeded abroad voluntarily and not under an order of deportation, and who are returning to a lawful unrelinquished domicile of seven consecutive years, may be admitted in the discretion of the Attorney General without regard to the provisions of paragraph (1) through (25) and paragraphs (30) and (31) of subsection (a). Nothing contained in this subsection shall limit the authority of the Attorney General to exercise the discretion vested in him under section 211 (b).

"(d) (1) The provisions of paragraphs (11) and (25) of subsection (a) shall not be applicable to any alien who in good faith is seeking to enter the United States as a nonimmigrant.

"(2) The provisions of paragraph (28) of subsection (a) of this section shall not be applicable to any alien who is seeking to enter the United States temporarily as a nonimmigrant under paragraph (15) (A) (iii) or (15) (G) (v) of section 101 (a).

"(3) Except as provided in this subsection, an alien (A) who is applying for a nonimmigrant visa and is known or believed by the consular officer to be ineligible for such visa under one or more of the paragraphs enumerated in subsection (a) (other than paragraphs (27) and (29)), may, after approval by the Attorney General of a recommendation by the Secretary of State or by the consular officer that the alien be admitted temporarily despite his inadmissibility, be granted such a visa and may be admitted

into the United States temporarily as a nonimmigrant in the discretion of the Attorney General, or (B) who is inadmissible under one or more of the paragraphs enumerated in subsection (a) (other than paragraphs (27) and (29)), but who is in possession of appropriate documents or is granted a waiver thereof and is seeking admission, may be admitted into the United States temporarily as a nonimmigrant in the discretion of the Attorney General.

"(4) Either or both of the requirements of paragraph (26) of subsection (a) may be waived by the Attorney General and the Secretary of State acting jointly (A) on the basis of unforeseen emergency in individual cases, or (B) on the basis of reciprocity with respect to nationals of foreign contiguous territory or of adjacent islands and residents thereof having a common nationality with such nationals, or (C) in the case of aliens proceeding in immediate and continuous transit through the United States under contracts authorized in section 238 (d).

"(5) The Attorney General may in his discretion parole into the United States temporarily under such conditions as he may prescribe for emergent reasons or for reasons deemed strictly in public interest any alien applying for admission to the United States, but such parole of such alien shall not be regarded as an admission of the alien and when the purposes of such parole shall, in the opinion of the Attorney General, have been served the alien shall forthwith return or be returned to the custody from which he was paroled and thereafter his case shall continue to be dealt with in the same manner as that of any other applicant for admission to the United States.

"(6) The Attorney General shall prescribe conditions, including exaction of such bonds as may be necessary, to control and regulate the admission and return of excludable aliens applying for temporary admission under this subsection. The Attorney General shall make a detailed report to the Congress in any case in which he exercises his authority under paragraph (3) of this subsection on behalf of any alien excludable under paragraphs (9), (10), and (28) of subsection (a).

"(7) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section, except paragraphs (20), (21), and (26), shall be applicable to any alien who shall leave Hawaii, Alaska, Guam, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands of the United States, and who seeks to enter the continental United States or any other place under the jurisdiction of the United States: *Provided*, That persons who were admitted to Hawaii under the last sentence of section 8 (a) (1) of the Act of March 24, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 456), and aliens who were admitted to Hawaii as nationals of the United States shall not be excepted by this paragraph from the application of paragraphs (20) and (21) of subsection (a) of this section, unless they belong to a class declared to be nonquota immigrants under the provisions of section 101 (a) (27) of this Act, other than subparagraph (C) thereof, or unless they were admitted to Hawaii with an immigration visa. The Attorney General shall by regulations provide a method and procedure for the temporary admission to the United States of the aliens described in this proviso. Any alien described in this paragraph, who is excluded from admission to the United States, shall be immediately deported in the manner provided by section 237 (a) of this Act.

"(8) Upon a basis of reciprocity accredited officials of foreign governments, their immediate families, attendants, servants, and personal employees may be admitted in immediate and continuous transit through the United States without regard to the provisions of this section except paragraphs (26), (27), and (29) of subsection (a) of this section.

"(e) Whenever the President finds that the entry of any aliens or of any class of aliens into the United States would be detrimental to the interests of the United States, he may by proclamation, and for such period as he shall deem necessary, suspend the entry of all aliens or any class of aliens as immigrants or nonimmigrants, or impose on the entry of aliens any restrictions he may deem to be appropriate.

"Admission of aliens on giving bond or cash deposit

"SEC. 213. Any alien excludable because he is likely to become a public charge or because of physical disability other than tuberculosis in any form, leprosy, or a dangerous contagious disease may, if otherwise admissible, be admitted in the discretion of the Attorney General upon the giving of a suitable and proper bond or undertaking approved by the Attorney General, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States and to all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof holding the United States and all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof harmless against such alien becoming a public charge. In lieu of such bond such alien may deposit in cash with the Attorney General such amount as the Attorney General may require, which amount shall be deposited by him in the United States Postal Savings System, a receipt therefor to be given the person furnishing such sums showing the fact and object of its receipt and such other information as the Attorney General may deem advisable. All accruing interest on such deposit during the time it shall be held in the United States Postal Savings System shall be paid to the person furnishing such sum. In the event such alien becomes a public charge, the Attorney General shall dispose of such deposit in the same manner as if it had been collected under a bond as provided in this section. In the event of the permanent departure from the United States, the naturalization, or the death of such alien, such sum shall be returned to the person by whom furnished, or to his legal representatives. The admission of such alien shall be a consideration for the giving of such bond, undertaking, or cash deposit. Suit may be brought thereon in the name and by the proper law officers of the United States for the use of the United States, or of any State, Territory, district, county, town, or municipality in which such alien becomes a public charge.

"Admission of nonimmigrants

"SEC. 214. (a) The admission to the United States of any alien as a nonimmigrant shall be for such time and under such conditions as the Attorney General may by regulations prescribe, including when he deems necessary the giving of a bond with sufficient surety in such sum and containing such conditions as the Attorney General shall prescribe, to insure that at the expiration of such time or upon failure to maintain the status under which he was admitted, or to maintain any status subsequently acquired under section 248, such alien will depart from the United States.

"(b) Every alien shall be presumed to be an immigrant until he establishes to the satisfaction of the consular officer, at the time of application for a visa, and the immigration officers, at the time of application for admission, that he is entitled to a nonimmigrant status under section 101 (a) (15). An alien who is an officer or employee of any foreign government or of any international organization entitled to enjoy privileges, exemptions, and immunities under the International Organizations Immunities Act, or an alien who is the attendant, servant, employee, or member of the immediate family of any such alien shall not be entitled to apply for or receive an immigrant visa, or to enter the United States as an immigrant unless he executes a written waiver in the same form and substance as is prescribed by section 247 (b).

"(c) The question of importing any alien as a nonimmigrant under section 101 (a) (15) (H) in any specific case or specific cases shall be determined by the Attorney General, after consultation with appropriate agencies of the Government, upon petition of the importing employer. Such petition shall be made and approved before the visa is granted. The petition shall be in such form and contain such information as the Attorney General shall prescribe. The approval of such a petition shall not, of itself, be construed as establishing that the alien is a nonimmigrant.

"Travel control of aliens and citizens in time of war or national emergency

"SEC. 215. (a) When the United States is at war or during the existence of any national emergency proclaimed by the President, or, as to aliens, whenever there exists a state of war between or among two or more states, and the President shall find that the interests of the United States require that restrictions and prohibitions in addition to those provided otherwise than by this section be imposed upon the departure of persons from and their entry into the United States, and shall make public proclamation thereof, it shall, until otherwise ordered by the President or the Congress, be unlawful—

"(1) for any alien to depart from or enter or attempt to depart from or enter the United States except under such reasonable rules, regulations, and orders, and subject to such limitations and exceptions as the President may prescribe;

"(2) for any person to transport or attempt to transport from or into the United States another person with knowledge or reasonable cause to believe that the departure or entry of such other person is forbidden by this section;

"(3) for any person knowingly to make any false statement in an application for permission to depart from or enter the United States with intent to induce or secure the granting of such permission either for himself or for another;

"(4) for any person knowingly to furnish or attempt to furnish or assist in furnishing to another a permit or evidence of permission to depart or enter not issued and designed for such other person's use;

"(5) for any person knowingly to use or attempt to use any permit or evidence of permission to depart or enter not issued and designed for his use;

"(6) for any person to forge, counterfeit, mutilate, or alter, or cause or procure to be forged, counterfeited, mutilated, or altered, any permit or evidence of permission to depart from or enter the United States;

"(7) for any person knowingly to use or attempt to use or furnish to another for use any false, forged, counterfeited, mutilated, or altered permit, or evidence of permission, or any permit or evidence of permission which, though originally valid, has become or been made void or invalid.

"(b) After such proclamation as is provided for in subsection (a) has been made and published and while such proclamation is in force, it shall, except as otherwise provided by the President, and subject to such limitations and exceptions as the President may authorize and prescribe, be unlawful for any citizen of the United States to depart from or enter, or attempt to depart from or enter, the United States unless he bears a valid passport.

"(c) Any person who shall willfully violate any of the provisions of this section, or of any order or proclamation of the President promulgated, or of any permit, rule, or

regulation issued thereunder, shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $5,000, or, if a natural person, imprisoned for not more than five years, or both; and the officer, director, or agent of any corporation who knowingly participates in such violation shall be punished by like fine or imprisonment, or both; and any vehicle, vessel, or aircraft together with its appurtenances, equipment, tackle, apparel, and furniture, concerned in any such violation, shall be forfeited to the United States.

"(d) The term 'United States' as used in this section includes the Canal Zone, and all territory and waters, continental or insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. The term 'person' as used in this section shall be deemed to mean any individual, partnership, association, company, or other incorporated body of individuals, or corporation, or body politic.

"(e) Nothing in this section shall be construed to entitle an alien to whom a permit to enter the United States has been issued to enter the United States, if, upon arrival in the United States, he is found to be inadmissible under any of the provisions of this Act, or any other law, relating to the entry of aliens into the United States.

"(f) The revocation of any proclamation, rule, regulation, or order issued in pursuance of this section shall not prevent prosecution for any offense committed, or the imposition of any penalties or forfeitures, liability for which was incurred under this section prior to the revocation of such proclamation, rule, regulation, or order.

"(g) Passports, visas, reentry permits, and other documents required for entry under this Act may be considered as permits to enter for the purposes of this section.

"CHAPTER 3—ISSUANCE OF ENTRY DOCUMENTS

"Issuance of visas

"SEC. 221. (a) Under the conditions hereinafter prescribed and subject to the limitations prescribed in this Act or regulations issued thereunder, a consular officer may issue (1) to an immigrant who has made proper application therefor, an immigrant visa which shall consist of one copy of the application provided for in section 222, visaed by such consular officer, and shall specify the quota, if any, to which the immigrant is charged, the immigrant's particular status under such quota, the particular nonquota category in which the immigrant is classified, if a nonquota immigrant, the date on which the validity of the visa shall expire, and such additional information as may be required; and (2) to a nonimmigrant who has made proper application therefor, a nonimmigrant visa, which shall specify the classification under section 101 (a) (15) of the nonimmigrant, the period during which the nonimmigrant visa shall be valid, and such additional information as may be required.

"(b) Each alien who applies for a visa shall be registered and fingerprinted in connection with his application, and shall furnish copies of his photograph signed by him for such use as may be by regulations required. The requirements of this subsection may be waived in the discretion of the Secretary of State in the case of any alien who is within that class of nonimmigrants enumerated in sections 101 (a) (15) (A), and 101 (a) (15) (G), or in the case of any alien who is granted a diplomatic visa on a diplomatic passport or on the equivalent thereof.

"(c) An immigrant visa shall be valid for such period, not exceeding four months, as shall be by regulations prescribed. A nonimmigrant visa shall be valid for such periods, as shall be by regulations prescribed. In prescribing the period of validity of a nonimmigrant visa in the case of nationals of any foreign country who are eligible for such visas, the Secretary of State shall, insofar as practicable, accord to such nationals the same treatment upon a reciprocal basis as such foreign country accords to nationals of the United States who are within a similar class. An immigrant visa may be replaced under the original quota number during the quota year in which the original visa was issued for a quota immigrant who establishes to the satisfaction of the consular officer that he was unable to use the original immigrant visa during the period of its validity because of reasons beyond his control and for which he was not responsible: Provided, the consular officer is in possession of the duplicate signed copy of the original visa, the immigrant is found by the consular officer to be eligible for an immigrant visa and the immigrant pays again the statutory fees for an application and an immigrant visa.

"(d) Prior to the issuance of an immigrant visa to any alien, the consular officer shall require such alien to submit to a physical and mental examination in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed. Prior to the issuance of a nonimmigrant visa to any alien, the consular officer may require such alien to submit to a physical or mental examination, or both, if in his opinion such examination is necessary to ascertan whether such alien is eligible to receive a visa.

"(e) Each immigrant shall surrender his immigrant visa to the immigration officer at the port of entry, who shall endorse on the visa the date and the port of arrival, the identity of the vessel or other means of transportation by which the immigrant arrived, and such other endorsements as may be by regulations required.

"(f) Each nonimmigrant shall present or surrender to the immigration officer at the port of entry such documents as may be by regulation required. In the case of an alien crewman not in possession of any individual documents other than a passport and until such time as it becomes practicable to issue individual documents, such alien crewman may be admitted, subject to the provisions of this title, if his name appears in the crew list of the vessel or aircraft on which he arrives and the crew list is visaed by a consular officer, but the consular officer shall have the right to exclude any alien crewman from the crew list visa.

"(g) No visa or other documentation shall be issued to an alien if (1) it appears to the consular officer, from statements in the application, or in the papers submitted therewith, that such alien is ineligible to receive a visa or such other documentation under section 212, or any other provision of law, (2) the application fails to comply with the provisions of this Act, or the regulations issued thereunder, or (3) the consular officer knows or has reason to believe that such alien is ineligible to receive a visa or such other documentation under section 212, or any other provision of law: Provided, That a visa or other documentation may be issued to an alien who is within the purview of section 212 (a) (7), or section 212 (a) (15), if such alien is otherwise entitled to receive a visa or other documentation, upon receipt of notice by the consular officer from the Attorney General of the giving of a bond or undertaking providing indemnity as in the case of aliens admitted under section 213.

"(h) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to entitle any alien, to whom a visa or other documentation has been issued, to enter the United States, if, upon arrival at a port of entry in the United States, he is found to be inadmissible under this Act, or any other provision of law. The substance of this subsection shall appear upon every visa application.

"(i) After the issuance of a visa or other documentation to any alien, the consular officer or the Secretary of State may at any time, in his discretion, revoke such visa or other documentation. Notice of such revocation shall be communicated to the Attorney General, and such revocation shall invalidate the visa or other documentation from the date of issuance; *Provided*, That carriers or transportation companies, and masters, commanding officers, agents, owners, charterers, or consignees, shall not be penalized under section 273 (b) for action taken in reliance on such visas or other documentation unless they received due notice of such revocation prior to the alien's embarkation.

"Applications for visas

"SEC. 222. (a) Every alien applying for an immigrant visa and for alien registration shall make application therefor in such form and manner and at such place as shall be by regulations prescribed. In the application the immigrant shall state his full and true name, and any other name which he has used or by which he has been known; age and sex; race and ethnic classification; the date and place of his birth; present address and places of previous residence; whether married or single, and the names and places of residence of spouse and children, if any; calling or occupation; personal description (including height, complexion, color of hair and eyes, and marks of identification); languages he can speak, read, or write; names and addresses of parents, and if neither parent living, then the name and address of his next of kin in the country from which he comes; port of entry into the United States; final destination, if any, beyond the port of entry; whether he has a ticket through to such final destination; whether going to join a relative or friend, and, if so, the name and complete address of such relative or friend; the purpose for which he is going to the United States; the length of time he intends to remain in the United States; whether or not he intends to remain in the United States permanently; whether he was ever arrested, convicted or was ever in prison or almshouse; whether he has ever been the beneficiary of a pardon or an amnesty; whether he has ever been treated in an institution or hospital or other place for insanity or other mental disease; if he claims to be a preference quota or a nonquota immigrant, the facts on which he bases such claim; whether or not he is a member of any class of individuals excluded from admission into the United States, or whether he claims to be exempt from exclusion under the immigration laws; and such additional information necessary to the identification of the applicant and the enforcement of the immigration and nationality laws as may be by regulations prescribed.

"(b) Every alien applying for an immigrant visa shall present a valid unexpired passport or other suitable travel document, or document of identity and nationality, if such document is required under the regulations issued by the Secretary of State. The immigrant shall furnish to the consular officer with his application two copies of a certification by the appropriate police authorities stating what their records show concerning the immigrant; two certified copies of any existing prison record, military record, and record of his birth; and two certified copies of all other records or documents concerning him or his case which may be required by the consular officer. One copy of each document so furnished shall be permanently attached to each copy of the application and become a part thereof. In the event that the immigrant establishes to the satisfaction of the consular officer that any document or record required by this subsection is unobtainable, the consular officer may permit the immigrant to submit in lieu of such document or record other satisfactory evidence of the fact to which such document or record would, if obtainable, pertain.

"(c) Every alien applying for a nonimmigrant visa and for alien registration shall make application therefor in such form and manner as shall be by regulations prescribed. In the application the alien shall state his full and true name, the date and place of his birth, his nationality, his race and ethnic

classification; the purpose and length of his intended stay in the United States; personal description (including height, complexion, color of hair and eyes, and marks of identification); his marital status; and such additional information necessary to the identification of the applicant and the enforcement of the immigration and nationality laws as may be by regulations prescribed.

"(d) Every alien applying for a nonimmigrant visa and alien registration shall furnish to the consular officer, with his application, a certified copy of such documents pertaining to him as may be by regulations required.

"(e) Except as may be otherwise prescribed by regulations, each copy of an application required by this section shall be signed by the applicant in the presence of the consular officer, and verified by the oath of the applicant administered by the consular officer. One copy of the application for an immigrant visa, when visaed by the consular officer, shall become the immigrant visa, and the other copy shall be disposed of as may be by regulations prescribed. The application for a nonimmigrant visa or other documentation as a nonimmigrant shall be disposed of as may be by regulations prescribed. The issuance of a nonimmigrant visa shall, except as may be otherwise by regulations prescribed, be evidenced by a stamp placed by the consular officer in the alien's passport.

"(f) The records of the Department of State and of diplomatic and consular offices of the United States pertaining to the issuance or refusal of visas or permits to enter the United States shall be considered confidential and shall be used only for the formulation, amendment, administration, or enforcement of the immigration, nationality, and other laws of the United States, except that in the discretion of the Secretary of State certified copies of such records may be made available to a court which certifies that the information contained in such records is needed by the court in the interest of the ends of justice in a case pending before the court.

"Reentry permits

"SEC. 223. (a) (1) Any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or (2) any alien lawfully admitted to the United States pursuant to clause 6 of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1924, between July 1, 1924, and July 5, 1932, both dates inclusive, who intends to depart temporarily from the United States may make application to the Attorney General for a permit to reenter the United States, stating the length of his intended absence or absences, and the reasons therefor. Such applications shall be made under oath, and shall be in such form, contain such information, and be accompanied by such photographs of the applicant as may be by regulations prescribed.

"(b) If the Attorney General finds (1) that the applicant under subsection (a) (1) has been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, or that the applicant under subsection (a) (2) has since admission maintained the status required of him at the time of his admission and such applicant desires to visit abroad and to return to the United States to resume the status existing at the time of his departure for such visit, (2) that the application is made in good faith, and (3) that the alien's proposed departure from the United States would not be contrary to the interests of the United States, the Attorney General may, in his discretion, issue the permit, which shall be valid for not more than one year from the date of issuance: *Provided*, That the Attorney General may in his discretion extend the validity of the permit for a period or periods not exceeding one year in the aggregate. The permit shall be in such form as shall be by regulations prescribed for the complete identification of the alien.

"(c) During the period of validity, such permit may be used by the alien in making one or more applications for reentry into the United States.

"(d) Upon the return of the alien to the United States the permit shall be presented to the immigration officer at the port of entry, and upon the expiration of its validity, the permit shall be surrendered to the Service.

"(e) A permit issued under this section in the possession of the person to whom issued, shall be accepted in lieu of any visa which otherwise would be required from such person under this Act. Otherwise a permit issued under this section shall have no effect under the immigration laws except to show that the alien to whom it was issued is returning from a temporary visit abroad; but nothing in this section shall be construed as making such permit the exclusive means of establishing that the alien is so returning.

"Nonquota immigrant visas

"SEC. 224. A consular officer, may, subject to the limitations provided in sections 204, 205, and 221, issue an immigrant visa to a nonquota immigrant as such upon satisfactory proof, under regulations prescribed under this Act, that the applicant is entitled to a nonquota immigrant status.

"CHAPTER 4—PROVISIONS RELATING TO ENTRY AND EXCLUSION

"Lists of alien and citizen passengers arriving or departing; record of resident aliens and citizens leaving permanently for foreign country

"SEC. 231. (a) Upon the arrival of any person by water or by air at any port within the United States from any place outside the United States, it shall be the duty of the master or commanding officer, or authorized agent, owner, or consignee of the vessel or aircraft, having any such person on board to deliver to the immigration officers at the port of arrival typewritten or printed lists or manifests of the persons on board such vessel or aircraft. Such lists or manifests shall be prepared at such time, be in such form and shall contain such information as the Attorney General shall prescribe by regulation as being necessary for the identification of the persons transported and for the enforcement of the immigration laws. This subsection shall not require the master or commanding officer, or authorized agent, owner, or consignee of a vessel or aircraft to furnish a list or manifest relating (1) to an alien crewman or (2) to any other person arriving by air on a trip originating in foreign contiguous territory, except (with respect to such arrivals by air) as may be required by regulations issued pursuant to section 239.

"(b) It shall be the duty of the master or commanding officer or authorized agent of every vessel or aircraft taking passengers on board at any port of the United States, who are destined to any place outside the United States, to file with the immigration officers before departure from such port a list of all such persons taken on board. Such list shall be in such form, contain such information, and be accompanied by such documents, as the Attorney General shall prescribe by regulation as necessary for the identification of the persons so transported and for the enforcement of the immigration laws. No master or commanding officer of any such vessel or aircraft shall be granted clearance papers for his vessel or aircraft until he or the authorized agent has deposited such list or lists and accompanying documents with the immigration officer at such port and made oath that they are full and complete as to the information required to be contained therein, except that in the case of vessels or aircraft which the Attorney General determines are making regular trips to ports of the United States, the Attorney General may, when expedient, arrange for the delivery of lists of outgoing persons at a later date. This subsection shall not require the master or commanding officer, or authorized agent, owner, or consignee of a vessel or aircraft to furnish a list or manifest relating (1) to an alien crewman or (2) to any other person departing by air on a trip originating in the United States who is destined to foreign contiguous territory, except (with respect to such departures by air) as may be required by regulations issued pursuant to section 239.

"(c) The Attorney General may authorize immigration officers to record the following information regarding every resident person leaving the United States by way of the Canadian or Mexican borders for permanent residence in a foreign country: Names, age, and sex; whether married or single; calling or occupation; whether able to read or write; nationality; country of birth; country of which citizen or subject; race; last permanent residence in the United States; intended future permanent residence; and time and port of last arrival in the United States; and if a United States citizen or national, the facts on which claim to that status is based.

"(d) If it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the master or commanding officer, owner, or consignee of any vessel or aircraft, or the agent of any transportation line, as the case may be, has refused or failed to deliver any list or manifest required by subsections (a) or (b), or that the list or manifest delivered is not accurate and full, such master or commanding officer, owner, or consignee, or agent, as the case may be, shall pay to the collector of customs at the port of arrival or departure the sum of $10 for each person concerning whom such accurate and full list or manifest is not furnished, or concerning whom the manifest or list is not prepared and sworn to as prescribed by this section or by regulations issued pursuant thereto. No vessel or aircraft shall be granted clearance pending determination of the question of the liability to the payment of such penalty, or while it remains unpaid, and no such penalty shall be remitted or refunded, except that clearance may be granted prior to the determination of such question upon the deposit with the collector of customs of a bond or undertaking approved by the Attorney General or a sum sufficient to cover such penalty.

"(e) The Attorney General is authorized to prescribe the circumstances and conditions under which the list or manifest requirements of subsections (a) and (b) may be waived.

"Detention of aliens for observation and examination

"SEC. 232. For the purpose of determining whether aliens (including alien crewmen) arriving at ports of the United States belong to any of the classes excluded by this Act, by reason of being afflicted with any of the diseases or mental or physical defects or disabilities set forth in section 212 (a), or whenever the Attorney General has received information showing that any aliens are coming from a country or have embarked at a place where any of such diseases are prevalent or epidemic, such aliens shall be detained on board the vessel or at the airport of arrival of the aircraft bringing them, unless the Attorney General directs their detention in a United States immigration station or other place specified by him at the expense of such vessel or aircraft except as otherwise provided in this Act, as circumstances may require or justify, for a sufficient time to enable the immigration officers and medical officers to subject such aliens to observation and an examination sufficient to determine whether or not they belong to the excluded classes.

"Temporary removal for examination upon arrival

"SEC. 233. (a) Upon the arrival at a port of the United States of any vessel or air-

craft bringing aliens (including alien crewmen) the immigration officers may order a temporary removal of such aliens for examination and inspection at a designated time and place, but such temporary removal shall not be considered a landing, nor shall it relieve vessels or aircraft, the transportation lines, or the masters, commanding officers, agents, owners, or consignees of the vessel or aircraft upon which such aliens are brought to any port of the United States from any of the obligations which, in case such aliens remain on board, would, under the provisions of this Act bind such vessels or aircraft, transportation lines, masters, commanding officers, agents, owners, or consignees. A temporary removal of aliens from such vessels or aircraft ordered pursuant to this subsection shall be made by an immigration officer at the expense of the vessels or aircraft or transportation lines, or the masters, commanding officers, agents, owners, or consignees of such vessels, aircraft or transportation lines, as provided in subsection (b) and such vessels, aircraft, transportation lines, masters, commanding officers, agents, owners, or consignees, shall, so long as such removal lasts, be relieved of responsibility for the safekeeping of such aliens: *Provided*, That such vessels, aircraft, transportation lines, masters, commanding officers, agents, owners, or consignees may with the approval of the Attorney General assume responsibility for the safekeeping of such aliens during their removal to a designated place for examination and inspection, in which event, such removal need not be made by an immigration officer.

"(b) Whenever a temporary removal of aliens is made under this section, the vessels or aircraft or transportation lines which brought them, and the masters, commanding officers, owners, agents, and consignees of the vessel, aircraft, or transportation line upon which they arrived shall pay all expenses of such removal to a designated place for examination and inspection or other place of detention and all expenses arising during subsequent detention, pending a decision on the aliens' eligibility to enter the United States and until they are either allowed to land or returned to the care of the transportation line or to the vessel or aircraft which brought them. Such expenses shall include maintenance, medical treatment in hospital or elsewhere, burial in the event of death, and transfer to the vessel, aircraft, or transportation line in the event of deportation, except where such expenses arise under section 237 (d), or in such cases as the Attorney General may prescribe in the case of aliens paroled into the United States temporarily under the provisions of section 212 (d) (5).

"(c) Any detention expenses and expenses incident to detention incurred (but not including expenses of removal to the place of detention) pursuant to sections 232 and 233 shall not be assessed under this Act against the vessel or aircraft or transportation line or the master, commanding officer, owner, agent, or consignee of the vessel, aircraft, or transportation line in the case of (1) any alien who arrived in possession of a valid unexpired immigrant visa, or (2) any alien who was finally admitted to the United States pursuant to this Act after such detention, or (3) any alien other than an alien crewman, who arrived in possession of a valid unexpired nonimmigrant visa or other document authorizing such alien to apply for temporary admission to the United States or an unexpired reentry permit issued to him, and (A) application for admission was made within one hundred and twenty days of the date of issuance of the visa or other document, or in the case of an alien in possession of a reentry permit, within one hundred and twenty days of the date on which the alien was last examined and admitted by the Service, or (B) in the event application for admission was made later than one hundred and twenty days of the date of issuance of the visa or other document or such examination and admission, if the vessel, aircraft, or transportation line or the master, commanding officer, owner, agent, or consignee of the vessel, aircraft, or transportation line establishes to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the ground of exclusion could not have been ascertained by the exercise of due diligence prior to the alien's embarkation, or (4) any person claiming United States nationality or citizenship and in possession of an unexpired United States passport issued to him by competent authority, or (5) any person claiming United States nationality or citizenship and in possession of a certificate of identity issued pursuant to section 360 (b) of this Act, or any other document of identity issued or verified by a consular officer which shows on its face that it is currently valid for travel to the United States and who was allowed to land in the United States after such detention.

"(d) Any refusal or failure to comply with the provisions of this section shall be punished in the manner specified in section 237 (b) of this Act.

"PHYSICAL AND MENTAL EXAMINATION

"SEC. 234. The physical and mental examination of arriving aliens (including alien crewmen) shall be made by medical officers of the United States Public Health Service, who shall conduct all medical examinations and shall certify, for the information of the immigration officers and the special inquiry officers, any physical and mental defect or disease observed by such medical officers in any such alien. If medical officers of the United States Public Health Service are not available, civil surgeons of not less than four years' professional experience may be employed for such service upon such terms as may be prescribed by the Attorney General. Aliens (including alien crewmen) arriving at ports of the United States shall be examined by at least one such medical officer or civil surgeon under such administrative regulations as the Attorney General may prescribe, and under medical regulations prepared by the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service. Medical officers of the United States Public Health Service who have had special training in the diagnosis of insanity and mental defects shall be detailed for duty or employed at such ports of entry as the Attorney General may designate, and such medical officers shall be provided with suitable facilities for the detention and examination of all arriving aliens who it is suspected may be excludable under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), or (5) of section 212 (a), and the services of interpreters shall be provided for such examination. Any alien certified under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), or (5) of section 212 (a) may appeal to a board of medical officers of the United States Public Health Service, which shall be convened by the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, and any such alien may introduce before such board one expert medical witness at his own cost and expense.

"Inspection by immigration officers

"SEC. 235. (a) The inspection, other than the physical and mental examination, of aliens (including alien crewmen) seeking admission or readmission to, or the privilege of passing through the United States shall be conducted by immigration officers, except as otherwise provided in regard to special inquiry officers. All aliens arriving at ports of the United States shall be examined by one or more immigration officers at the discretion of the Attorney General and under such regulations as he may prescribe. Immigration officers are hereby authorized and empowered to board and search any vessel, aircraft, railway car, or other conveyance, or vehicle in which they believe aliens are being brought into the United States. The Attorney General and any immigration officer, including special inquiry officers, shall have power to administer oaths and to take and consider evidence of or from any person touching the privilege of any alien or person he believes or suspects to be an alien to enter, reenter, pass through, or reside in the United States or concerning any matter which is material and relevant to the enforcement of this Act and the administration of the Service, and, where such action may be necessary, to make a written record of such evidence. Any person coming into the United States may be required to state under oath the purpose or purposes for which he comes, the length of time he intends to remain in the United States, whether or not he intends to remain in the United States permanently and, if an alien, whether he intends to become a citizen thereof, and such other items of information as will aid the immigration officer in determining whether he is a national of the United States or an alien and, if the latter, whether he belongs to any of the excluded classes enumerated in section 212. The Attorney General and any immigration officer, including special inquiry officers, shall have power to require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses before immigration officers and special inquiry officers and the production of books, papers, and documents relating to the privilege of any person to enter, reenter, reside in, or pass through the United States or concerning any matter which is material and relevant to the enforcement of this Act and the administration of the Service, and to that end may invoke the aid of any court of the United States. Any United States district court within the jurisdiction of which investigations or inquiries are being conducted by an immigration officer or special inquiry officer may, in the event of neglect or refusal to respond to a subpena issued under this subsection or refusal to testify before an immigration officer or special inquiry officer, issue an order requiring such persons to appear before an immigration officer or special inquiry officer, produce books, papers, and documents if demanded, and testify, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof.

"(b) Every alien (other than an alien crewman), and except as otherwise provided in subsection (c) of this section and in section 273 (d), who may not appear to the examining immigration officer at the port of arrival to be clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to land shall be detained for further inquiry to be conducted by a special inquiry officer. The decision of the examining immigration officer, if favorable to the admission of any alien, shall be subject to challenge by any other immigration officer and such challenge shall operate to take the alien, whose privilege to land is so challenged, before a special inquiry officer for further inquiry.

"(c) Any alien (including an alien crewman) who may appear to the examining immigration officer or to the special inquiry officer during the examination before either of such officers to be excludable under paragraph (27), (28), or (29) of section 212 (a) shall be temporarily excluded, and no further inquiry by a special inquiry officer shall be conducted until after the case is reported to the Attorney General together with any such written statement and accompanying information, if any, as the alien or his representative may desire to submit in connection therewith and such an inquiry or further inquiry is directed by the Attorney General. If the Attorney General is satisfied that the alien is excludable under any of such paragraphs on the basis of information of a confidential nature, the disclosure of which the Attorney General, in the exercise of his discretion, and after consultation with the

appropriate security agencies of the Government, concludes would be prejudicial to the public interest, safety, or security, he may in his discretion order such alien to be excluded and deported without any inquiry or further inquiry by a special inquiry officer. Nothing in this subsection shall be regarded as requiring an inquiry before a special inquiry officer in the case of an alien crewman.

"Exclusions of aliens

"SEC. 236. (a) A special inquiry officer shall conduct proceedings under this section, administer oaths, present and receive evidence, and interrogate, examine, and cross-examine the alien or witnesses. He shall have authority in any case to determine whether an arriving alien who has been detained for further inquiry under section 235 shall be allowed to enter or shall be excluded and deported. The determination of such special inquiry officer shall be based only on the evidence produced at the inquiry. No special inquiry officer shall conduct a proceeding in any case under this section in which he shall have participated in investigative functions or in which he shall have participated (except as provided in this subsection) in prosecuting functions. Proceedings before a special inquiry officer under this section shall be conducted in accordance with this section, the applicable provisions of sections 235 and 287 (b), and such regulations as the Attorney General shall prescribe, and shall be the sole and exclusive procedure for determining admissibility of a person to the United States under the provisions of this section. At such inquiry, which shall be kept separate and apart from the public, the alien may have one friend or relative present, under such conditions as may be prescribed by the Attorney General. A complete record of the proceedings and of all testimony and evidence produced at such inquiry, shall be kept.

"(b) From a decision of a special inquiry officer excluding an alien, such alien may take a timely appeal to the Attorney General, and any such alien shall be advised of his right to take such appeal. No appeal may be taken from a temporary exclusion under section 235 (c). From a decision of the special inquiry officer to admit an alien, the immigration officer in charge at the port where the inquiry is held may take a timely appeal to the Attorney General. An appeal by the alien, or such officer in charge, shall operate to stay any final action with respect to any alien whose case is so appealed until the final decision of the Attorney General is made. Except as provided in section 235 (c), such decision shall be rendered solely upon the evidence adduced before the special inquiry officer.

"(c) Except as provided in subsections (b) or (d), in every case where an alien is excluded from admission into the United States, under this Act or any other law or treaty now existing or hereafter made, the decision of a special inquiry officer shall be final unless reversed on appeal to the Attorney General.

"(d) If a medical officer or civil surgeon or board of medical officers has certified under section 234 that an alien is afflicted with a disease specified in section 212 (a) (6), or with any mental disease, defect, or disability which would bring such alien within any of the classes excluded from admission to the United States under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), or (5) of section 212 (a), the decision of the special inquiry officer shall be based solely upon such certification. No alien shall have a right to appeal from such an excluding decision of a special inquiry officer. If an alien is excluded by a special inquiry officer because of the existence of a physical disease, defect, or disability, other than one specified in section 212 (a) (6), the alien may appeal from the excluding decision in accordance with subsection (b) of this section, and the provisions of section 213 may be invoked.

"Immediate deportation of aliens excluded from admission or entering in violation of law

"SEC. 237. (a) Any alien (other than an alien crewman) arriving in the United States who is excluded under this Act, shall be immediately deported to the country whence he came, in accommodations of the same class in which he arrived, on the vessel or aircraft bringing him, unless the Attorney General, in an individual case, in his discretion, concludes that immediate deportation is not practicable or proper. The cost of the maintenance including detention expenses and expenses incident to detention of any such alien while he is being detained, as well as the transportation expense of his deportation from the United States, shall be borne by the owner or owners of the vessel or aircraft on which he arrived, except that the cost of maintenance (including detention expenses and expenses incident to detention while the alien is being detained prior to the time he is offered for deportation to the transportation line which brought him to the United States) shall not be assessed against the owner or owners of such vessel or aircraft if (1) the alien was in possession of a valid, unexpired immigrant visa, or (2) if the alien (other than an alien crewman) was in possession of a valid, unexpired nonimmigrant visa or other document authorizing such alien to apply for temporary admission to the United States or an unexpired reentry permit issued to him, and (A) such application was made within one hundred and twenty days of the date of issuance of the visa or other document, or in the case of an alien in possession of a reentry permit, within one hundred and twenty days of the date on which the alien was last examined and admitted by the Service, or (B) in the event the application was made later than one hundred and twenty days of the date of issuance of the visa or other document or such examination and admission, if the owner or owners of such vessel or aircraft established to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the ground of exclusion could not have been ascertained by the exercise of due diligence prior to the alien's embarkation, or (3) the person claimed United States nationality or citizenship and was in possession of an unexpired United States passport issued to him by competent authority.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any master, commanding officer, purser, person in charge, agent, owner, or consignee of any vessel or aircraft (1) to refuse to receive any alien (other than an alien crewman), ordered deported under this section back on board such vessel or aircraft or another vessel or aircraft owned or operated by the same interests; (2) to fail to detain any alien (other than an alien crewman) on board any such vessel or at the airport of arrival of the aircraft when required by this Act or if so ordered by an immigration officer, or to fail or refuse to deliver him for medical or other inspection, or for further medical or other inspection, as and when so ordered by such officer; (3) to refuse or fail to remove him from the United States to the country whence he came; (4) to fail to pay the cost of his maintenance while being detained as required by this section or section 233 of this title; (5) to take any fee, deposit, or consideration on a contingent basis to be kept or returned in case the alien is landed or excluded; or (6) knowingly to bring to the United States any alien (other than an alien crewman) excluded or arrested and deported under any provision of law until such alien may be lawfully entitled to reapply for admission to the United States. If it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that any such master, commanding officer, purser, person in charge, agent, owner, or consignee of any vessel or aircraft has violated any of the provisions of this section or of section 233 of this title, such master, commanding officer, purser, person in charge, agent, owner, or consignee shall pay to the collector of customs of the district in which port of arrival is situated or in which any vessel or aircraft of the line may be found, the sum of $300 for each violation. No such vessel or aircraft shall have clearance from any port of the United States while any such fine is unpaid or while the question of liability to pay any such fine is being determined, nor shall any such fine be remitted or refunded, except that clearance may be granted prior to the determination of such question upon the deposit with the collector of customs of a bond or undertaking approved by the Attorney General or a sum sufficient to cover such fine.

"(c) If the vessel or aircraft, by which any alien who has been ordered deported under this section arrived, has left the United States and it is impracticable to deport the alien within a reasonable time by another vessel or aircraft owned by the same person, the cost of deportation may be paid from the appropriation for the enforcement of this Act and recovered by civil suit from any owner, agent, or consignee of the vessel or aircraft.

"(d) The Attorney General, under such conditions as are by regulations prescribed, may stay the deportation of any alien deportable under this section, if in his judgment the testimony of such alien is necessary on behalf of the United States in the prosecution of offenders against any provision of this Act or other laws of the United States. The cost of maintenance of any person so detained resulting from a stay of deportation under this subsection and a witness fee in the sum of $1 per day for each day such person is so detained may be paid from the appropriation for the enforcement of this title. Such alien may be released under bond in the penalty of not less than $500 with security approved by the Attorney General on condition that such alien shall be produced when required as a witness and for deportation, and on such other conditions as the Attorney General may prescribe.

"(e) Upon the certificate of an examining medical officer to the effect that an alien ordered to be excluded and deported under this section is helpless from sickness or mental or physical disability, or infancy, if such alien is accompanied by another alien whose protection or guardianship is required by the alien ordered excluded and deported, such accompanying alien may also be excluded and deported, and the master, commanding officer, agent, owner, or consignee of the vessel or aircraft in which such alien and accompanying alien arrived in the United States shall be required to return the accompanying alien in the same manner as other aliens denied admission and ordered deported under this section.

"Entry through or from foreign contiguous territory and adjacent islands; landing stations

"SEC. 238. (a) The Attorney General shall have power to enter into contracts with transportation lines for the entry and inspection of aliens coming to the United States through foreign contiguous territory or through adjacent islands. In prescribing rules and regulations and making contracts for the entry and inspection of aliens applying for admission through foreign contiguous territory or through adjacent islands, due care shall be exercised to avoid any discriminatory action in favor of transportation companies transporting to such territory or islands aliens destined to the United States, and all such transportation companies shall be required, as a condition precedent to the inspection or examination under such rules and contracts at the ports of such contiguous territory or such adjacent islands of aliens brought thereto by them, to enter into a

contract which will require them to submit to and comply with all the requirements of this Act which would apply were they bringing such aliens directly to ports of the United States:

"(b) The Attorney General shall have power to enter into contracts with transportation lines for the entry and inspection of aliens coming to the United States from foreign contiguous territory or from adjacent islands. No such transportation line shall be allowed to land any such alien in the United States until and unless it has entered into any such contracts which may be required by the Attorney General.

"(c) Every transportation line engaged in carrying alien passengers for hire to the United States from foreign contiguous territory or from adjacent islands shall provide and maintain at its expense suitable landing stations, approved by the Attorney General, conveniently located at the point or points of entry. No such transportation line shall be allowed to land any alien passengers in the United States until such landing stations are provided, and unless such stations are thereafter maintained to the satisfaction of the Attorney General.

"(d) The Attorney General shall have power to enter into contracts including bonding agreements with transportation lines to guarantee the passage through the United States in immediate and continuous transit of aliens destined to foreign countries. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, such aliens may not have their classification changed under section 248.

"(e) As used in this section the terms 'transportation line' and 'transportation company' include, but are not limited to, the owner, charterer, consignee, or authorized agent operating any vessel or aircraft bringing aliens to the United States, to foreign contiguous territory, or to adjacent islands.

"Designation of ports of entry for aliens arriving by civil aircraft

"SEC. 239. The Attorney General is authorized (1) by regulation to designate as ports of entry for aliens arriving by aircraft any of the ports of entry for civil aircraft designated as such in accordance with law; (2) by regulation to provide such reasonable requirements for aircraft in civil air navigation with respect to giving notice of intention to land in advance of landing, or notice of landing, as shall be deemed necessary for purposes of administration and enforcement of this Act; and (3) by regulation to provide for the application to civil air navigation of the provisions of this Act where not expressly so provided in this Act to such extent and upon such conditions as he deems necessary. Any person who violates any regulation made under this section shall be subject to a civil penalty of $500 which may be remitted or mitigated by the Attorney General in accordance with such proceedings as the Attorney General shall by regulation prescribe. In case the violation is by the owner or person in command of the aircraft, the penalty shall be a lien upon the aircraft, and such aircraft may be libeled therefor in the appropriate United States court. The determination by the Attorney General and remission or mitigation of the civil penalty shall be final. In case the violation is by the owner or person in command of the aircraft, the penalty shall be a lien upon the aircraft and may be collected by proceedings in rem which shall conform as nearly as may be to civil suits in admiralty. The Supreme Court of the United States, and under its direction other courts of the United States, are authorized to prescribe rules regulating such proceedings against aircraft in any particular not otherwise provided by law. Any aircraft made subject to a lien by this section may be summarily seized by, and placed in the custody of, such persons as the Attorney General may by regulation prescribe. The aircraft may be released from such custody upon deposit of such amount not exceeding $500 as the Attorney General may prescribe, or of a bond in such sum and with such sureties as the Attorney General may prescribe, conditioned upon the payment of the penalty which may be finally determined by the Attorney General.

"Records of admission

"SEC. 240. (a) The Attorney General shall cause to be filed, as a record of admission of each immigrant, the immigrant visa required by section 221 (e) to be surrendered at the port of entry by the arriving alien to an immigration officer.

"(b) The Attorney General shall cause to be filed such record of the entry into the United States of each immigrant admitted under section 211 (b) and of each nonimmigrant as the Attorney General deems necessary for the enforcement of the immigration laws.

"CHAPTER 5—DEPORTATION; ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS

"General classes of deportable aliens

"SEC. 241. (a) Any alien in the United States (including an alien crewman) shall, upon the order of the Attorney General, be deported who—

"(1) at the time of entry was within one or more of the classes of aliens excludable by the law existing at the time of such entry;

"(2) entered the United States without inspection or at any time or place other than as designated by the Attorney General or is in the United States in violation of this Act or in violation of any other law of the United States;

"(3) hereafter, within five years after entry, becomes institutionalized at public expense because of mental disease, defect, or deficiency, unless the alien can show that such disease, defect, or deficiency did not exist prior to his admission to the United States;

"(4) is convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude committed within five years after entry and either sentenced to confinement or confined therefor in a prison or corrective institution for a year or more, or who at any time after entry is convicted of two crimes involving moral turpitude, not arising out of a single scheme of criminal misconduct, regardless of whether confined therefor and regardless of whether the convictions were in a single trial;

"(5) has failed to comply with the provisions of section 265 unless he establishes to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that such failure was reasonably excusable or was not willful, or has been convicted under section 266 (c) of this title, or under section 36 (c) of the Alien Registration Act, 1940, or has been convicted of violating or conspiracy to violate any provision of the act entitled 'An Act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes,' approved June 8, 1938, as amended, or has been convicted under section 1546 of title 18 of the United States Code;

"(6) is or at any time has been, after entry, a member of any of the following classes of aliens:

"(A) Aliens who are anarchists;

"(B) Aliens who advocate or teach, or who are members of or affiliated with any organization that advocates or teaches, opposition to all organized government;

"(C) Aliens who are members of or affiliated with (i) the Communist Party of the United States; (ii) any other totalitarian party of the United States; (iii) the Communist Political Association; (iv) the Communist or any other totalitarian party of any State of the United States, of any foreign state, or of any political or geographical subdivision of any foreign state; (v) any section, subsidiary, branch, affiliate, or subdivision of any such association or party; or (vi) the direct predecessors or successors of any such association or party, regardless of what name such group or organization may have used, may now bear, or may hereafter adopt: *Provided*, That nothing in this paragraph, or in any other provision of this Act, shall be construed as declaring that the Communist Party does not advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means;

"(D) Aliens not within any of the other provisions of this paragraph who advocate the economic, international, and governmental doctrines of world communism or the establishment in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship, or who are members of or affiliated with any organization that advocates the economic, international, and governmental doctrines of world communism or the establishment in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship, either through its own utterances or through any written or printed publications issued or published by or with the permission or consent of or under the authority of such organization or paid for by the funds of, or funds furnished by, such organization;

"(E) Aliens not within any of the other provisions of this paragraph, who are members of or affiliated with any organization during the time it is registered or required to be registered under section 7 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, unless such aliens establish that they did not have knowledge or reason to believe at the time they became members of or affiliated with such an organization (and did not thereafter and prior to the date upon which such organization was so registered or so required to be registered have such knowledge or reason to believe) that such organization was a Communist organization;

"(F) Aliens who advocate or teach or who are members of or affiliated with any organization that advocates or teaches (i) the overthrow by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law; or (ii) the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers (either of specific individuals or of officers generally) of the Government of the United States or of any other organized government, because of his or their official character; or (iii) the unlawful damage, injury, or destruction of property; or (iv) sabotage;

"(G) Aliens who write or publish, or cause to be written or published, or who knowingly circulate, distribute, print, or display, or knowingly cause to be circulated, distributed, printed, published, or displayed, or who knowingly have in their possession for the purpose of circulation, publication, distribution, or display, any written or printed matter, advocating or teaching opposition to all organized government, or advocating or teaching (i) the overthrow by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law; or (ii) the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers (either of specific individuals or of officers generally) of the Government of the United States or of any other organized government, because of his or their official character; or (iii) the unlawful damage, injury, or destruction of property; or (iv) sabotage; or (v) the economic, international, and governmental doctrines of world communism or the establishment in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship;

"(H) Aliens who are members of or affiliated with any organization that writes, circulates, distributes, prints, publishes, or displays, or causes to be written, circulated, distributed, printed, published, or displayed, or that has in its possession for the purpose of circulation, distribution, publication, issue,

or display, any written or printed matter of the character described in paragraph (G);

"(7) is engaged, or at any time after entry has engaged, or at any time after entry has had a purpose to engage, in any of the activities described in paragraph (27) or (29) of section 212 (a), unless the Attorney General is satisfied, in the case of any alien within category (C) of paragraph (29) of such section, that such alien did not have knowledge or reason to believe at the time such alien became a member of, affiliated with, or participated in the activities of the organization (and did not thereafter and prior to the date upon which such organization was registered or required to be registered under section 7 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 have such knowledge or reason to believe) that such organization was a Communist organization;

"(8) in the opinion of the Attorney General, has within 5 years after entry become a public charge from causes not affirmatively shown to have arisen after entry;

"(9) was admitted as a nonimmigrant and failed to maintain the nonimmigrant status in which he was admitted or to which it was changed pursuant to section 248, or to comply with the conditions of any such status;

"(10) entered the United States from foreign contiguous territory or adjacent islands, having arrived there on a vessel or aircraft of a nonsignatory transportation company under section 238 (a) and was without the required period of stay in such foreign contiguous territory or adjacent islands following such arrival (other than an alien who is a native-born citizen of any of the countries enumerated in section 101 (a) (27) (C) and an alien described in section 101 (a) (27) (B));

"(11) is, or hereafter at any time after entry has been, a narcotic drug addict, or who at any time has been convicted of a violation of any law or regulation relating to the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs, or who has been convicted of a violation of any law or regulation governing or controlling the taxing, manufacture, production, compounding, transportation, sale, exchange, dispensing, giving away, importation, exportation, or the possession for the purpose of the manufacture, production, compounding, transportation, sale, exchange, dispensing, giving away, importation or exportation of opium, coca leaves, heroin, marihuana, any salt derivative or preparation of opium or coca leaves or isonipecaine or any addiction-forming or addiction sustaining opiate;

"(12) by reason of any conduct, behavior or activity at any time after entry became a member of any of the classes specified in paragraph (12) of section 212 (a); or is or at any time after entry has been the manager, or is or at any time after entry has been connected with the management, of a house of prostitution or any other immoral place;

"(13) prior to, or at the time of any entry, or at any time within five years after any entry, shall have, knowingly and for gain, encouraged, induced, assisted, abetted, or aided any other alien to enter or to try to enter the United States in violation of law;

"(14) at any time after entry, shall have been convicted of possessing or carrying in violation of any law any weapon which shoots or is designed to shoot automatically or semiautomatically more than one shot without manual reloading, by a single function of the trigger, or a weapon commonly called a sawed-off shotgun;

"(15) at any time within five years after entry, shall have been convicted of violating the provisions of title I of the Alien Registration Act, 1940;

"(16) at any time after entry, shall have been convicted more than once of violating the provisions of title I of the Alien Registration Act, 1940; or

"(17) the Attorney General finds to be an undesirable resident of the United States by reason of any of the following, to wit: has been or may hereafter be convicted of any violation or conspiracy to violate any of the following Acts or parts of Acts or any amendment thereto, the judgment on such conviction having become final, namely: an Act entitled 'An Act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes,' approved June 15, 1917, or the amendment thereof approved May 16, 1918; sections 791, 792, 793, 794, 2388, and 3241, title 18, United States Code; an Act entitled 'An Act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes,' approved October 6, 1917; an Act entitled 'An act to prevent in time of war departure from and entry into the United States contrary to the public safety,' approved May 22, 1918; section 215 of this Act; an Act entitled 'An Act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes,' approved April 20, 1918; sections 2151, 2153, 2154, 2155, and 2156 of title 18, United States Code; an Act entitled 'An Act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States,' approved May 18, 1917, or any amendment thereof or supplement thereto; the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; the Selective Service Act of 1948; the Universal Military Training and Service Act; an Act entitled 'An Act to punish persons who make threats against the President of the United States,' approved February 14, 1917; section 871 of title 18, United States Code; an Act entitled 'An Act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes,' approved October 6, 1917, or any amendment thereof; the Trading With the Enemy Act; section 6 of the Penal Code of the United States; section 2384 of title 18, United States Code; has been convicted of any offense against section 13 of the Penal Code of the United States committed during the period of August 1, 1914, to April 6, 1917, or of a conspiracy occurring within said period to commit an offense under said section 13 or of any offense committed during said period against the Act entitled 'An Act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies,' approved July 2, 1890, in aid of a belligerent in the European war; section 960 of title 18, United States Code; or

"(18) has been convicted under section 278 of this Act or under section 4 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917.

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) (4) respecting the deportation of an alien convicted of a crime or crimes shall not apply (1) in the case of any alien who has subsequent to such conviction been granted a full and unconditional pardon by the President of the United States or by the Governor of any of the several States, or (2) if the court sentencing such alien for such crime shall make, at the time of first imposing judgment or passing sentence, or within thirty days thereafter, a recommendation to the Attorney General that such alien not be deported, due notice having been given prior to making such recommendation to representatives of the interested State, the Service, and prosecution authorities, who shall be granted an opportunity to make representations in the matter.

"(c) An alien shall be deported as having procured a visa or other documentation by fraud within the meaning of paragraph (19) of section 212 (a), and to be in the United States in violation of this Act within the meaning of subsection (a) (2) of this section, if (1) hereafter he or she obtains any entry into the United States with an immigrant visa or other documentation procured on the basis of a marriage entered into less than two years prior to such entry of the alien and which, within two years subsequent to any entry of the alien into the United States, shall be judicially annulled or terminated, unless such alien shall establish to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that such marriage was not contracted for the purpose of evading any provisions of the immigration laws; or (2) it appears to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that he or she has failed or refused to fulfill his or her marital agreement which in the opinion of the Attorney General was hereafter made for the purpose of procuring his or her entry as an immigrant.

"(d) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this section, the provisions of this section shall be applicable to all aliens belonging to any of the classes enumerated in subsection (a), notwithstanding (1) that any such alien entered the United States prior to the date of enactment of this Act, or (2) that the facts, by reason of which any such alien belongs to any of the classes enumerated in subsection (a), occurred prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

"(e) An alien, admitted as a nonimmigrant under the provisions of either section 101 (a) (15) (A) (i) or 101 (a) (15) (G) (i), and who fails to maintain a status under either of those provisions, shall not be required to depart from the United States without the approval of the Secretary of State, unless such alien is subject to deportation under subsection (a) (6) or (7) of this section.

"Apprehension and deportation of aliens

"SEC. 242. (a) Pending a determination of deportability in the case of any alien as provided in subsection (b) of this section, such alien may, upon warrant of the Attorney General, be arrested and taken into custody. Any such alien taken into custody may, in the discretion of the Attorney General and pending such final determination of deportability, (1) be continued in custody; or (2) be released under bond in the amount of not less than $500 with security approved by the Attorney General, containing such conditions as the Attorney General may prescribe; or (3) be released on conditional parole. But such bond or parole, whether heretofore or hereafter authorized, may be revoked at any time by the Attorney General, in his discretion, and the alien may be returned to custody under the warrant which initiated the proceedings against him and detained until final determination of his deportability. Any court of competent jurisdiction shall have authority to review or revise any determination of the Attorney General concerning detention, release on bond, or parole pending final decision of deportability upon a conclusive showing in habeas corpus proceedings that the Attorney General is not proceeding with such reasonable dispatch as may be warranted by the particular facts and circumstances in the case of any alien to determine deportability.

"(b) A special inquiry officer shall conduct proceedings under this section to determine the deportability of any alien, and shall administer oaths, present and receive evidence, interrogate, examine, and cross-examine the alien or witnesses, and, as authorized by the Attorney General, shall make determinations, including orders of deportation. Determination of deportability in any case shall be made only upon a record made in a proceeding before a special inquiry officer, at which the alien shall have reasonable opportunity to be present, unless by reason of the alien's mental incompetency it is impracticable for him to be present, in which case the Attorney General shall prescribe necessary and proper safeguards for the rights and privileges of such aliens. If any alien has been given a reasonable opportunity to be present at a proceeding under

this section, and without reasonable cause fails or refuses to attend or remain in attendance at such proceeding, the special inquiry officer may proceed to a determination in like manner as if the alien were present. In any case or class of cases in which the Attorney General believes that such procedure would be of aid in making a determination, he may require specifically or by regulation that an additional immigration officer shall be assigned to present the evidence on behalf of the United States and in such case such additional immigration officer shall have authority to present evidence, and to interrogate, examine and cross-examine the alien or other witnesses in the proceedings. Nothing in the preceding sentence shall be construed to diminish the authority conferred upon the special inquiry officer conducting such proceedings. No special inquiry officer shall conduct a proceeding in any case under this section in which he shall have participated in investigative functions or in which he shall have participated (except as provided in this subsection) in prosecuting functions. Proceedings before a special inquiry officer acting under the provisions of this section shall be in accordance with such regulations, not inconsistent with this Act, as the Attorney General shall prescribe. Such regulations shall include requirements that—

"(1) the alien shall be given notice, reasonable under all the circumstances, of the nature of the charges against him and of the time and place at which the proceedings will be held;

"(2) the alien shall have the privilege of being represented (at no expense to the Government) by such counsel, authorized to practice in such proceedings, as he shall choose;

"(3) the alien shall have a reasonable opportunity to examine the evidence against him, to present evidence in his own behalf, and to cross-examine witnesses presented by the Government; and

"(4) no decision of deportability shall be valid unless it is based upon reasonable, substantial, and probative evidence.

The procedure so prescribed shall be the sole and exclusive procedure for determining the deportability of an alien under this section. In any case in which an alien is ordered deported from the United States under the provisions of this Act, or of any other law or treaty, the decision of the Attorney General shall be final. In the discretion of the Attorney General, and under such regulations as he may prescribe, deportation proceedings, including issuance of a warrant of arrest, and a finding of deportability under this section need not be required in the case of any alien who admits to belonging to a class of aliens who are deportable under section 241 if such alien voluntarily departs from the United States at his own expense, or is removed at Government expense as hereinafter authorized, unless the Attorney General has reason to believe that such alien is deportable under paragraph (4), (5), (6), (7), (11), (12), (14), (15), (16), (17), or (18) of section 241 (a). If any alien who is authorized to depart voluntarily under the preceding sentence is financially unable to depart at his own expense and the Attorney General deems his removal to be in the best interest of the United States, the expense of such removal may be paid from the appropriation for the enforcement of this Act.

"(c) When a final order of deportation under administrative processes is made against any alien, the Attorney General shall have a period of six months from the date of such order, or, if judicial review is had, then from the date of the final order of the court, within which to effect the alien's departure from the United States, during which period, at the Attorney General's discretion, the alien may be detained, released on bond in an amount and containing such conditions as the Attorney General may prescribe, or released on such other condition as the Attorney General may prescribe. Any court of competent jurisdiction shall have authority to review or revise any determination of the Attorney General concerning detention, release on bond, or other release during such six-month period upon a conclusive showing in habeas corpus proceedings that the Attorney General is not proceeding with such reasonable dispatch as may be warranted by the particular facts and circumstances in the case of any alien to effect such alien's departure from the United States within such six-month period. If deportation has not been practicable, advisable, or possible, or departure of the alien from the United States under the order of deportation has not been effected, within such six-month period, the alien shall become subject to such further supervision and detention pending eventual deportation as is authorized in this section. The Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to arrange for appropriate places of detention for those aliens whom he shall take into custody and detain under this section. Where no Federal buildings are available or buildings adapted or suitably located for the purpose are available for rental, the Attorney General is hereby authorized, notwithstanding section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U. S. C. 5), or section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a), to expend, from the appropriation provided for the administration and enforcement of the immigration laws, such amounts as may be necessary for the acquisition of land and the erection, acquisition, maintenance, operation, remodeling, or repair of buildings, sheds, and office quarters (including living quarters for officers where none are otherwise available), and adjunct facilities, necessary for the detention of aliens. For the purposes of this section an order of deportation heretofore or hereafter entered against an alien in legal detention or confinement, other than under an immigration process, shall be considered as being made as of the moment he is released from such detention or confinement, and not prior thereto.

"(d) Any alien, against whom a final order of deportation as defined in subsection (c) heretofore or hereafter issued has been outstanding for more than six months, shall, pending eventual deportation, be subject to supervision under regulations prescribed by the Attorney General. Such regulations shall include provisions which will require any alien subject to supervision (1) to appear from time to time before an immigration officer for identification; (2) to submit, if necessary, to medical and psychiatric examination at the expense of the United States; (3) to give information under oath as to his nationality, circumstances, habits, associations, and activities, and such other information, whether or not related to the foregoing, as the Attorney General may deem fit and proper; and (4) to conform to such reasonable written restrictions on his conduct or activities as are prescribed by the Attorney General in his case. Any alien who shall willfully fail to comply with such regulations, or willfully fail to appear or to give information or submit to medical or psychiatric examination if required, or knowingly give false information in relation to the requirements of such regulations, or knowingly violate a reasonable restriction imposed upon his conduct or activity, shall upon conviction be guilty of a felony, and shall be fined not more than $1,000 or shall be imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"(e) Any alien against whom a final order of deportation is outstanding by reason of being a member of any of the classes described in paragraphs (4), (5), (6), (7), (11), (12), (14), (15), (16), (17), or (18) of section 241 (a), who shall willfully fail or refuse to depart from the United States within a period of six months from the date of the final order of deportation under administrative processes, or, if judicial review is had, then from the date of the final order of the court, or from the date of the enactment of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, whichever is the later, or shall willfully fail or refuse to make timely application in good faith for travel or other documents necessary to his departure, or who shall connive or conspire, or take any other action, designed to prevent or hamper or with the purpose of preventing or hampering his departure pursuant to such order of deportation, or who shall willfully fail or refuse to present himself for deportation at the time and place required by the Attorney General pursuant to such order of deportation, shall upon conviction be guilty of a felony, and shall be imprisoned not more than ten years: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not make it illegal for any alien to take any proper steps for the purpose of securing cancellation of or exemption from such order of deportation or for the purpose of securing his release from incarceration or custody: *Provided further*, That the court may for good cause suspend the sentence of such alien and order his release under such conditions as the court may prescribe. In determining whether good cause has been shown to justify releasing the alien, the court shall take into account such factors as (1) the age, health, and period of detention of the alien; (2) the effect of the alien's release upon the national security and public peace or safety; (3) the likelihood of the alien's resuming or following a course of conduct which made or would make him deportable; (4) the character of the efforts made by such alien himself and by representatives of the country or countries to which his deportation is directed to expedite the alien's departure from the United States; (5) the reason for the inability of the Government of the United States to secure passports, other travel documents, or deportation facilities from the country or countries to which the alien has been ordered deported; and (6) the eligibility of the alien for discretionary relief under the immigration laws.

"(f) Should the Attorney General find that any alien has unlawfully reentered the United States after having previously departed or been deported pursuant to an order of deportation, whether before or after the date of enactment of this act, on any ground described in any of the paragraphs enumerated in subsection (e), the previous order of deportation shall be deemed to be reinstated from its original date and such alien shall be deported under such previous order at any time subsequent to such reentry. For the purposes of subsection (e) the date on which the finding is made that such reinstatement is appropriate shall be deemed the date of the final order of deportation.

"(g) If any alien, subject to supervision or detention under subsections (c) or (d) of this section, is able to depart from the United States under the order of deportation, except that he is financially unable to pay his passage, the Attorney General may in his discretion permit such alien to depart voluntarily, and the expense of such passage to the country to which he is destined may be paid from the appropriation for the enforcement of this Act, unless such payment is otherwise provided for under this Act.

"(h) An alien sentenced to imprisonment shall not be deported until such imprisonment has been terminated by the release of the alien from confinement. Parole, probation, or possibility of rearrest or further confinement in respect of the same offense shall not be a ground for deferral of deportation.

"Countries to which aliens shall be deported; cost of deportation

"SEC. 243. (a) The deportation of an alien in the United States provided for in this Act, or any other Act or treaty, shall be directed by the Attorney General to a country promptly designated by the alien if that country is willing to accept him into its territory, unless the Attorney General, in his discretion, concludes that deportation to such country would be prejudicial to the interests of the United States. No alien shall be permitted to make more than one such designation, nor shall any alien designate, as the place to which he wishes to be deported, any foreign territory contiguous to the United States or any island adjacent thereto or adjacent to the United States unless such alien is a native, citizen, subject, or national of, or had a residence in such designated foreign contiguous territory or adjacent island. If the government of the country designated by the alien fails finally to advise the Attorney General within three months following original inquiry whether that government will or will not accept such alien into its territory, such designation may thereafter be disregarded. Thereupon deportation of such alien shall be directed to any country of which such alien is a subject, national, or citizen if such country is willing to accept him into its territory. If the government of such country fails finally to advise the Attorney General or the alien within three months following the date of original inquiry, or within such other period as the Attorney General shall deem reasonable under the circumstances in a particular case, whether that government will or will not accept such alien into its territory, then such deportation shall be directed by the Attorney General within his discretion and without necessarily giving any priority or preference because of their order as herein set forth either—

"(1) to the country from which such alien last entered the United States;

"(2) to the country in which is located the foreign port at which such alien embarked for the United States or for foreign contiguous territory;

"(3) to the country in which he was born;

"(4) to the country in which the place of his birth is situated at the time he is ordered deported;

"(5) to any country in which he resided prior to entering the country from which he entered the United States;

"(6) to the country which had sovereignty over the birthplace of the alien at the time of his birth; or

"(7) if deportation to any of the foregoing places or countries is impracticable, inadvisable, or impossible, then to any country which is willing to accept such alien into its territory.

"(b) If the United States is at war and the deportation, in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a), of any alien who is deportable under any law of the United States shall be found by the Attorney General to be impracticable, inadvisable, inconvenient, or impossible because of enemy occupation of the country from which such alien came or wherein is located the foreign port at which he embarked for the United States or because of reasons connected with the war, such alien may, in the discretion of the Attorney General, be deported as follows:

"(1) if such alien is a citizen or subject of a country whose recognized government is in exile, to the country in which is located that government in exile if that country will permit him to enter its territory; or

"(2) if such alien is a citizen or subject of a country whose recognized government is not in exile, then to a country or any political or territorial subdivision thereof which is proximate to the country of which the alien is a citizen or subject, or, with the consent of the country of which the alien is a citizen or subject, to any other country.

"(c) If deportation proceedings are instituted at any time within five years after the entry of the alien for causes existing prior to or at the time of entry, the cost of removal to the port of deportation shall be at the expense of the appropriation for the enforcement of this Act, and the deportation from such port shall be at the expense of the owner or owners of the vessels, aircraft, or other transportation lines by which such alien came to the United States, or if in the opinion of the Attorney General that is not practicable, at the expense of the appropriation for the enforcement of this Act: *Provided*, That the costs of the deportation of any such alien from such port shall not be assessed against the owner or owners of the vessels, aircraft, or other transportation lines in the case of any alien who arrived in possession of a valid unexpired immigrant visa and who was inspected and admitted to the United States for permanent residence. In the case of an alien crewman, if deportation proceedings are instituted at any time within five years after the granting of the last conditional permit to land temporarily under the provisions of section 252, the cost of removal to the port of deportation shall be at the expense of the appropriation for the enforcement of this Act and the deportation from such port shall be at the expense of the owner or owners of the vessels or aircraft by which such alien came to the United States, or if in the opinion of the Attorney General that is not practicable, at the expense of the appropriation for the enforcement of this Act.

"(d) If deportation proceedings are instituted later than five years after the entry of the alien, or in the case of an alien crewman later than five years after the granting of the last conditional permit to land temporarily, the cost thereof shall be payable from the appropriation for the enforcement of this Act.

"(e) A failure or refusal on the part of the master, commanding officer, agent, owner, charterer, or consignee of a vessel, aircraft, or other transportation line to comply with the order of the Attorney General to take on board, guard safely, and transport to the destination specified any alien ordered to be deported under the provisions of this Act, or a failure or refusal by any such person to comply with an order of the Attorney General to pay deportation expenses in accordance with the requirements of this section, shall be punished by the imposition of a penalty in the sum and manner prescribed in section 237 (b).

"(f) When in the opinion of the Attorney General the mental or physical condition of an alien being deported is such as to require personal care and attendance, the Attorney General shall, when necessary, employ a suitable person for that purpose who shall accompany such alien to his final destination, and the expense incident to such service shall be defrayed in the same manner as the expense of deporting the accompanied alien is defrayed, and any failure or refusal to defray such expenses shall be punished in the manner prescribed by subsection (e) of this section.

"(g) Upon the notification by the Attorney General that any country upon request denies or unduly delays acceptance of the return of any alien who is a national, citizen, subject, or resident thereof, the Secretary of State shall instruct consular officers performing their duties in the territory of such country to discontinue the issuance of immigrant visas to nationals, citizens, subjects, or residents of such country, until such time as the Attorney General shall inform the Secretary of State that such country has accepted such alien.

"(h) The Attorney General is authorized to withhold deportation of any alien within the United States to any country in which in his opinion the alien would be subject to physical persecution and for such period of time as he deems to be necessary for such reason.

"Suspension of deportation; voluntary departure

"SEC. 244. (a) As hereinafter prescribed in this section, the Attorney General may, in his discretion, suspend deportation and adjust the status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, in the case of an alien who—

"(1) applies to the Attorney General within five years after the effective date of this Act for suspension of deportation; last entered the United States more than two years prior to the date of enactment of this Act; is deportable under any law of the United States and is not a member of a class of aliens whose deportation could not have been suspended by reason of section 19 (d) of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended; and has been physically present in the United States for a continuous period of not less than seven years immediately preceding the date of such application, and proves that during all of such period he was and is a person of good moral character; and is a person whose deportation would, in the opinion of the Attorney General, result in exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to the alien or to his spouse, parent or child, who is a citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence; or

"(2) last entered the United States within two years prior to or at any time after the date of enactment of this Act; is deportable under any law of the United States solely for an act committed or status existing prior to or at the time of such entry into the United States and is not within the provisions of paragraph (4) of this subsection; was possessed of all of the requisite documents at the time of such entry into the United States; has been physically present in the United States for a continuous period of not less than five years immediately preceding his application under this paragraph, and proves that during all of such period he has been and is a person of good moral character; has not been served with a final order of deportation issued pursuant to this Act in deportation proceedings up to the time of applying to the Attorney General for suspension of deportation; and is a person whose deportation would, in the opinion of the Attorney General, result in exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to the alien or to his spouse, parent, or child, who is a citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence; or

"(3) last entered the United States within two years prior to, or at any time after the date of enactment of this Act; is deportable under any law of the United States for an act committed or status acquired subsequent to such entry into the United States and is not within the provisions of paragraph (4) or (5) of this subsection; was possessed of all of the requisite documents at the time of such entry into the United States; has been physically present in the United States for a continuous period of not less than five years immediately following the commission of an act, or the assumption of a status, constituting a ground for deportation, and proves that during all of such period he has been and is a person of good moral character; has not been served with a final order of deportation issued pursuant to this Act in deportation proceedings up to the time of applying to the Attorney General for suspension of deportation; and is a person whose deportation would, in the opinion of the Attorney General, result in exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to the alien or to his spouse, parent, or child, who is a citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence; or

"(4) last entered the United States within two years prior to, or at any time after the date of enactment of this Act; is deportable under paragraph (1) of section 241 (a) insofar as it relates to criminals, prostitutes or other immoral persons, subversives, violators of narcotic laws and similar classes or under paragraph (2) of section 241 (a), as a person

who entered the United States without inspection or at a time or place other than as designated by the Attorney General, or without the proper documents and is not within the provisions of paragraph (5) of this subsection; has been physically present in the United States for a continuous period of not less than ten years after such entry and immediately preceding his application under this paragraph and proves that during all of such period he has been and is a person of good moral character; has not been served with a final order of deportation issued pursuant to this Act in deportation proceedings up to the time of applying to the Attorney General for suspension of deportation; and is a person whose deportation would, in the opinion of the Attorney General, result in exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to the alien or to his spouse, parent, or child, who is a citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence; or

"(5) is deportable under paragraph (4), (5), (6), (7), (11), (12), (14), (15), (16), (17) or (18) of section 241 (a) for an act committed or status acquired subsequent to such entry into the United States or having last entered the United States within two years prior to, or at any time after the date of enactment of this Act, is deportable under paragraph (2) of section 241 (a) as a person who has remained longer in the United States than the period for which he was admitted; has been physically present in the United States for a continuous period of not less than ten years immediately following the commission of an act, or the assumption of a status, constituting a ground for deportation, and proves that during all of such period he has been and is a person of good moral character; has not been served with a final order of deportation issued pursuant to this Act in deportation proceedings up to the time of applying to the Attorney General for suspension of deportation; and is a person whose deportation would, in the opinion of the Attorney General, result in exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to the alien or to his spouse, parent, or child, who is a citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

"(b) Upon application by any alien who is found by the Attorney General to meet the requirements of paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a) of this section, the Attorney General may in his discretion suspend deportation of such alien. If the deportation of any alien is suspended under the provisions of this subsection, a complete and detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the case shall be reported to the Congress with the reasons for such suspension. Such reports shall be submitted on the first and fifteenth day of each calendar month in which Congress is in session. If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or, prior to the close of the session of the Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, either the Senate or the House of Representatives passes a resolution stating in substance that it does not favor the suspension of such deportation, the Attorney General shall thereupon deport such alien or authorize the alien's voluntary departure at his own expense under the order of deportation in the manner provided by law. If neither the Senate nor the House of Representatives shall, within the time above specified, pass such a resolution, the Attorney General shall cancel deportation proceedings. The provisions of this subsection relating to the granting of suspension of deportation shall not be applicable to any alien who is a native of any country contiguous to the United States or of any adjacent island, unless he establishes to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that he is ineligible to obtain a nonquota immigrant visa.

"(c) Upon application by any alien who is found by the Attorney General to meet the requirements of paragraph (4) or (5) of subsection (a) of this section, the Attorney General may in his discretion suspend deportation of such alien. If the deportation of any alien is suspended under the provisions of this subsection, a complete and detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the case shall be reported to the Congress with the reasons for such suspension. Such reports shall be submitted on the first and fifteenth day of each calendar month in which Congress is in session. If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or, prior to the close of the session of the Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, the Congress passes a concurrent resolution stating in substance that it favors the suspension of such deportation, the Attorney General shall cancel deportation proceedings. If within the time above specified the Congress does not pass such a concurrent resolution, or if either the Senate or House of Representatives passes a resolution stating in substance that it does not favor the suspension of the deportation of such alien, the Attorney General shall thereupon deport such alien in the manner provided by law.

"(d) Upon the cancellation of deportation in the case of any alien under this section, the Attorney General shall record the alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date the cancellation of deportation of such alien is made, and the Secretary of State shall, if the alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of entry and was not charged to the appropriate quota, reduce by one the quota of the quota area to which the alien is chargeable under section 202 for the fiscal year then current at the time of cancellation or the next following year in which a quota is available. No quota shall be so reduced by more than 50 per centum in any fiscal year.

"(e) The Attorney General may, in his discretion, permit any alien under deportation proceedings, other than an alien within the provisions of paragraph (4), (5), (6), (7), (11), (12), (14), (15), (16), (17), or (18) of section 241 (a), (and also any alien within the purview of such paragraphs if he is also within the provisions of paragraph (4) or (5) of subsection (a) of this section), to depart voluntarily from the United States at his own expense in lieu of deportation if such alien shall establish to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that he is, and has been, a person of good moral character for at least five years immediately preceding his application for voluntary departure under this subsection.

"Adjustment of status of nonimmigrant to that of person admitted for permanent residence

"SEC. 245. (a) The status of an alien who was lawfully admitted to the United States as a bona fide nonimmigrant and who is continuing to maintain that status may be adjusted by the Attorney General in his discretion (under such regulations as he may prescribe to insure the application of this paragraph solely to the cases of aliens who entered the United States in good faith as nonimmigrants) to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence as a quota immigrant or as a nonquota immigrant under section 101 (a) (27) (A), if (1) the alien makes application for adjustment, (2) the alien is admissible to the United States for permanent residence under this Act, (3) a quota or nonquota immigrant visa was immediately available to him at the time of his application for adjustment, (4) a quota or nonquota immigrant visa is immediately available to him at the time his application is approved, and (5) if claiming a nonquota status under section 101 (a) (27) (A) he has been in the United States for at least one year prior to acquiring that status. A quota immigrant visa shall be considered immediately available for the purposes of this subsection only if the portion of the quota to which the alien is chargeable is undersubscribed by applicants registered on a consular waiting list. Any alien who shall file an application for adjustment of his status under this section shall thereby terminate his nonimmigrant status.

"(b) Upon the approval of an application for adjustment made under subsection (a), the Attorney General shall record the alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date the order of the Attorney General approving the application for the adjustment of status is made, and the Secretary of State shall reduce by one the quota of the quota area to which the alien is chargeable under section 202 for the fiscal year current at the time such adjustment is made.

"Rescission of adjustment of status

"SEC. 246. (a) If, at any time within five years after the status of a person has been adjusted under the provisions of section 244 of this Act or under section 19 (c) of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the person was not in fact eligible for such adjustment of status, the Attorney General shall submit to the Congress a complete and detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the case. Such reports shall be submitted on the first and fifteenth day of each calendar month in which Congress is in session. If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or prior to the close of the session of the Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, the Congress passes a concurrent resolution withdrawing suspension of deportation, the person shall thereupon be subject to all provisions of this Act to the same extent as if the adjustment of status had not been made. If, at any time within five years after the status of a person has been otherwise adjusted under the provisions of section 245 or 249 of this Act or any other provision of law to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the person was not in fact eligible for such adjustment of status, the Attorney General shall rescind the action taken granting an adjustment of status to such person and cancelling deportation in the case of such person if that occurred and the person shall thereupon be subject to all provisions of this Act to the same extent as if the adjustment of status had not been made.

"(b) Any person who has become a naturalized citizen of the United States upon the basis of a record of a lawful admission for permanent residence, created as a result of an adjustment of status for which such person was not in fact eligible, and which is subsequently rescinded under subsection (a) of this section, shall be subject to the provisions of section 340 of this Act as a person whose naturalization was procured by concealment of a material fact or by willful misrepresentation.

"Adjustment of status of certain resident aliens to nonimmigrant status

"SEC. 247. (a) The status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence shall be adjusted by the Attorney General, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to that of a nonimmigrant under paragraph (15) (A), (15) (E), or (15) (G) of section 101 (a), if such alien had at the time of entry or subsequently acquires an occupational status which would, if he were seeking admission

to the United States, entitle him to a nonimmigrant status under such sections. As of the date of the Attorney General's order making such adjustment of status, the Attorney General shall cancel the record of the alien's admission for permanent residence, and the immigrant status of such alien shall thereby be terminated.

"(b) The adjustment of status required by subsection (a) shall not be applicable in the case of any alien who requests that he be permitted to retain his status as an immigrant and who, in such form as the Attorney General may require, executes and files with the Attorney General a written waiver of all rights, privileges, exemptions, and immunities under any law or any executive order which would otherwise accrue to him because of the acquisition of an occupational status entitling him to a nonimmigrant status under paragraph (15) (A), (15) (E), or (15) (G) of section 101 (a).

"Change of nonimmigrant classification

"SEC. 248. The Attorney General may, under such conditions as he may prescribe, authorize a change from any nonimmigrant classification to any other nonimmigrant classification in the case of any alien lawfully admitted to the United States as a nonimmigrant who is continuing to maintain that status, except an alien classified as a nonimmigrant under paragraph 15 (D) of section 101 (a), or an alien classified as a nonimmigrant under paragraph (15) (C) of section 101 (a) unless he applies to have his classification changed from a classification under paragraph (15) (C) to a classification under paragraph (15) (A) or (15) (G) of section 101 (a).

"Record of admission for permanent residence in the case of certain aliens who entered the United States prior to July 1, 1924

"SEC. 249. (a) A record of lawful admission for permanent residence may, in the discretion of the Attorney General and under such regulations as he may prescribe, be made in the case of any alien, if no such record is otherwise available and such alien shall satisfy the Attorney General that he—

"(1) entered the United States prior to July 1, 1924;

"(2) has had his residence in the United States continuously since such entry;

"(3) is a person of good moral character;

"(4) is not subject to deportation; and

"(5) is not ineligible to citizenship.

"(b) An alien in respect of whom a record of admission has been made as authorized by subsection (a), shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his entry prior to July 1, 1924.

"Removal of aliens who have fallen into distress

"SEC. 250. The Attorney General may remove from the United States any alien who falls into distress or who needs public aid from causes arising subsequent to his entry, and is desirous of being so removed, to the native country of such alien, or to the country from which he came, or to the country of which he is a citizen or subject, or to any other country to which he wishes to go and which will receive him, at the expense of the appropriation for the enforcement of this Act. Any alien so removed shall be ineligible to apply for or receive a visa or other documentation for readmission, or to apply for admission to the United States except with the prior approval of the Attorney General.

"CHAPTER 6—SPECIAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO ALIEN CREWMEN

"Lists of alien crewmen; reports of illegal landings

"SEC. 251. (a) Upon arrival of any vessel or aircraft in the United States from any place outside the United States it shall be the duty of the owner, agent, consignee, master, or commanding officer thereof to deliver to an immigration officer at the port of arrival (1) a complete, true, and correct list containing the names of all aliens employed on such vessel or aircraft, the positions they respectively hold in the crew of the vessel or aircraft, when and where they were respectively shipped or engaged, and those to be paid off or discharged in the port of arrival; or (2) in the discretion of the Attorney General, such a list containing so much of such information, or such additional or supplemental information, as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe. In the case of a vessel engaged solely in traffic on the Great Lakes, Saint Lawrence River, and connecting waterways, such lists shall be furnished at such times as the Attorney General may require.

"(b) It shall be the duty of any owner, agent, consignee, master, or commanding officer of any vessel or aircraft to report to an immigration officer, in writing, as soon as discovered, all cases in which any alien crewman has illegally landed in the United States from the vessel or aircraft, together with a description of such alien and any information likely to lead to his apprehension.

"(c) Before the departure of any vessel or aircraft from any port in the United States, it shall be the duty of the owner, agent, consignee, master, or commanding officer thereof, to deliver to an immigration officer at that port (1) a list containing the names of all alien employees who were not employed thereon at the time of the arrival at that port but who will leave such port thereon at the time of the departure of such vessel or aircraft and the names of those, if any, who have been paid off or discharged, and of those, if any, who have deserted or landed at that port, or (2) in the discretion of the Attorney General, such a list containing so much of such information, or such additional or supplemental information, as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe. In the case of a vessel engaged solely in traffic on the Great Lakes, Saint Lawrence River, and connecting waterways, such lists shall be furnished at such times as the Attorney General may require.

"(d) In case any owner, agent, consignee, master, or commanding officer shall fail to deliver complete, true, and correct lists or reports of aliens, or to report cases of desertion or landing, as required by subsections (a), (b), and (c), such owner, agent, consignee, master, or commanding officer, shall, if required by the Attorney General, pay to the collector of customs of any customs district in which the vessel or aircraft may at any time be found the sum of $10 for each alien concerning whom such lists are not delivered or such reports are not made as required in the preceding subsections. No such vessel or aircraft shall be granted clearance from any port at which it arrives pending the determination of the question of the liability to the payment of such fine, and if such fine is imposed, while it remains unpaid. No such fine shall be remitted or refunded. Clearance may be granted prior to the determination of such question upon deposit of a bond or a sum sufficient to cover such fine.

"(e) The Attorney General is authorized to prescribe by regulations the circumstances under which a vessel or aircraft shall be deemed to be arriving in, or departing from the United States or any port thereof within the meaning of any provision of this chapter.

"Conditional permits to land temporarily

"SEC. 252. (a) No alien crewman shall be permitted to land temporarily in the United States except as provided in this section, section 212 (d) (3), section 212 (d) (5), and section 253. If an immigration officer finds upon examination that an alien crewman is a nonimmigrant under paragraph (15) (D) of section 101 (a) and is otherwise admissible and has agreed to accept such permit, he may, in his discretion, grant the crewman a conditional permit to land temporarily pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Attorney General, subject to revocation in subsequent proceedings as provided in subsection (b), and for a period of time, in any event, not to exceed—

"(1) the period of time (not exceeding twenty-nine days) during which the vessel or aircraft on which he arrived remains in port, if the immigration officer is satisfied that the crewman intends to depart on the vessel or aircraft on which he arrived; or

"(2) twenty-nine days, if the immigration officer is satisfied that the crewman intends to depart, within the period for which he is permitted to land, on a vessel or aircraft other than the one on which he arrived.

"(b) Pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Attorney General, any immigration officer may, in his discretion, if he determines that an alien is not a bona fide crewman, or does not intend to depart on the vessel or aircraft which brought him, revoke the conditional permit to land which was granted such crewman under the provisions of subsection (a) (1), take such crewman into custody, and require the master or commanding officer of the vessel or aircraft on which the crewman arrived to receive and detain him on board such vessel or aircraft, if practicable, and such crewman shall be deported from the United States at the expense of the transportation line which brought him to the United States. Until such alien is so deported, any expenses of his detention shall be borne by such transportation company. Nothing in this section shall be construed to require the procedure prescribed in section 242 of this Act to cases falling within the provisions of this subsection.

"(c) Any alien crewman who willfully remains in the United States in excess of the number of days allowed in any conditional permit issued under subsection (a) shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $500 or shall be imprisoned for not more than six months, or both.

"Hospital treatment of alien crewmen afflicted with certain diseases

"SEC. 253. An alien crewman, including an alien crewman ineligible for a conditional permit to land under section 252 (a), who is found on arrival in a port of the United States to be afflicted with any of the disabilities or diseases mentioned in section 255, shall be placed in a hospital designated by the immigration officer in charge at the port of arrival and treated, all expenses connected therewith, including burial in the event of death, to be borne by the owner, agent, consignee, commanding officer, or master of the vessel or aircraft, and not to be deducted from the crewman's wages. No such vessel or aircraft shall be granted clearance until such expenses are paid, or their payment appropriately guaranteed, and the collector of customs is so notified by the immigration officer in charge. An alien crewman suspected of being afflicted with any such disability or disease may be removed from the vessel or aircraft on which he arrived to an immigration station, or other appropriate place, for such observation as will enable the examining surgeons to determine definitely whether or not he is so afflicted, all expenses connected therewith to be borne in the manner hereinbefore prescribed. In cases in which it appears to the satisfaction of the immigration officer in charge that it will not be possible within a reasonable time to effect a cure, the return of the alien crewman shall be enforced on, or at the expense of, the transportation line on which he came, upon such conditions as the Attorney General shall prescribe, to insure that the alien shall be properly cared for and protected, and that the spread of contagion shall be guarded against.

"Control of alien crewmen

"SEC. 254. (a) The owner, agent, consignee, charterer, master, or commanding officer of any vessel or aircraft arriving in the United States from any place outside thereof who fails (1) to detain on board the vessel, or in the case of an aircraft to detain at a place specified by an immigration officer at the expense of the airline, any alien crewman employed thereon until an immigration officer has completely inspected such alien crewman, including a physical examination by the medical examiner, or (2) to detain any alien crewman on board the vessel, or in the case of an aircraft at a place specified by an immigration officer at the expense of the airline, after such inspection unless a conditional permit to land temporarily has been granted such alien crewman under section 252 or unless an alien crewman has been permitted to land temporarily under section 212 (d) (5) or 253 for medical or hospital treatment, or (3) to deport such alien crewman if required to do so by an immigration officer, whether such deportation requirement is imposed before or after the crewman is permitted to land temporarily under section 212 (d) (5), 252, or 253, shall pay to the collector of customs of the customs district in which the port of arrival is located or in which the failure to comply with the orders of the officer occurs the sum of $1,000 for each alien crewman in respect of whom any such failure occurs. No such vessel or aircraft shall be granted clearance pending the determination of the liability to the payment of such fine, or while the fine remains unpaid, except that clearance may be granted prior to the determination of such question upon the deposit of a sum sufficient to cover such fine, or of a bond with sufficient surety to secure the payment thereof approved by the collector of customs. The Attorney General may, upon application in writing therefor, mitigate such penalty to not less than $200 for each alien crewman in respect of whom such failure occurs, upon such terms as he shall think proper.

"(b) Except as may be otherwise prescribed by regulations issued by the Attorney General, proof that an alien crewman did not appear upon the outgoing manifest of the vessel or aircraft on which he arrived in the United States from any place outside thereof, or that he was reported by the master or commanding officer of such vessel or aircraft as a deserter, shall be prima facie evidence of a failure to detain or deport such alien crewman.

"(c) If the Attorney General finds that deportation of an alien crewman under this section on the vessel or aircraft on which he arrived is impracticable or impossible, or would cause undue hardship to such alien crewman, he may cause the alien crewman to be deported from the port of arrival or any other port on another vessel or aircraft of the same transportation line, unless the Attorney General finds this to be impracticable. All expenses incurred in connection with such deportation, including expenses incurred in transferring an alien crewman from one place in the United States to another under such conditions and safeguards as the Attorney General shall impose, shall be paid by the owner or owners of the vessel or aircraft on which the alien arrived in the United States. The vessel or aircraft on which the alien arrived shall not be granted clearance until such expenses have been paid or their payment guaranteed to the satisfaction of the Attorney General. An alien crewman who is transferred within the United States in accordance with this subsection shall not be regarded as having been landed in the United States.

"Employment on passenger vessels of aliens afflicted with certain disabilities

"SEC. 255. It shall be unlawful for any vessel or aircraft carrying passengers between a port of the United States and a port outside thereof to have employed on board upon arrival in the United States any alien afflicted with feeble-mindedness, insanity, epilepsy, tuberculosis in any form, leprosy, or any dangerous contagious disease. If it appears to the satisfaction of the Attorney General, from an examination made by a medical officer of the United States Public Health Service, and is so certified by such officer, that any such alien was so afflicted at the time he was shipped or engaged and taken on board such vessel or aircraft and that the existence of such affliction might have been detected by means of a competent medical examination at such time, the owner, commanding officer, agent, consignee, or master thereof shall pay for each alien so afflicted to the collector of customs of the customs district in which the port of arrival is located the sum of $50. No vessel or aircraft shall be granted clearance pending the determination of the question of the liability to the payment of such sums, or while such sums remain unpaid, except that clearance may be granted prior to the determination of such question upon the deposit of an amount sufficient to cover such sums or of a bond approved by the collector of customs with sufficient surety to secure the payment thereof. Any such fine may, in the discretion of the Attorney General, be mitigated or remitted.

"Discharge of alien crewmen

"SEC. 256. It shall be unlawful for any person, including the owner, agent, consignee, charterer, master, or commanding officer of any vessel or aircraft, to pay off or discharge any alien crewman, except an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, employed on board a vessel or aircraft arriving in the United States without first having obtained the consent of the Attorney General. If it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that any alien crewman has been paid off or discharged in the United States in violation of the provisions of this section, such owner, agent, consignee, charterer, master, commanding officer, or other person, shall pay to the collector of customs of the customs district in which the violation occurred the sum of $1,000 for such violation. No vessel or aircraft shall be granted clearance pending the determination of the question of the liability to the payment of such sums, or while such sums remain unpaid, except that clearance may be granted prior to the determination of such question upon the deposit of an amount sufficient to cover such sums or of a bond approved by the collector of customs with sufficient surety to secure the payment thereof. Such fine may, in the discretion of the Attorney General, be mitigated to not less than $500 for each violation, upon such terms as he shall think proper.

"Bringing alien crewmen into United States with intent to evade immigration laws

"SEC. 257. Any person, including the owner, agent, consignee, master, or commanding officer of any vessel or aircraft arriving in the United States from any place outside thereof, who shall knowingly sign on the vessel's articles, or bring to the United States as one of the crew of such vessel or aircraft, any alien, with intent to permit or assist such alien to enter or land in the United States in violation of law, or who shall falsely and knowingly represent to a consular officer at the time of application for visa, or to the immigration officer at the port of arrival in the United States, that such alien is a bona fide member of the crew employed in any capacity regularly required for normal operation and services aboard such vessel or aircraft, shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding $5,000 for each such violation, for which sum such vessel or aircraft shall be liable and may be seized and proceeded against by way of libel in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the offense.

"CHAPTER 7—REGISTRATION OF ALIENS

"Aliens seeking entry into the United States

"SEC. 261. No visa shall be issued to any alien seeking to enter the United States until such alien has been registered and fingerprinted in accordance with section 221 (b), unless such alien has been exempted from being fingerprinted as provided in that section.

"Registration of aliens in the United States

"SEC. 262. (a) It shall be the duty of every alien now or hereafter in the United States, who (1) is fourteen years of age or older, (2) has not been registered and fingerprinted under section 221 (b) of this Act or section 30 or 31 of the Alien Registration Act, 1940, and (3) remains in the United States for thirty days or longer, to apply for registration and to be fingerprinted before the expiration of such thirty days.

"(b) It shall be the duty of every parent or legal guardian of any alien now or hereafter in the United States, who (1) is less than fourteen years of age, (2) has not been registered under section 221 (b) of this Act or section 30 or 31 of the Alien Registration Act, 1940, and (3) remains in the United States for thirty days or longer, to apply for the registration of such alien before the expiration of such thirty days. Whenever any alien attains his fourteenth birthday in the United States he shall, within thirty days thereafter, apply in person for registration and to be fingerprinted.

"Provisions governing registration of special groups

"SEC. 263. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 261 and 262, the Attorney General is authorized to prescribe special regulations and forms for the registration and fingerprinting of (1) alien crewmen, (2) holders of border-crossing identification cards, (3) aliens confined in institutions within the United States, (4) aliens under order of deportation, and (5) aliens of any other class not lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

"(b) The provisions of section 262 and of this section shall not be applicable to any alien who is in the United States as a nonimmigrant, under section 101 (a) (14) (A) or 101 (a) (14) (G) until the alien ceases to be entitled to such a nonimmigrant status.

"Forms and procedure

"SEC. 264. (a) The Attorney General and the Secretary of State jointly are authorized and directed to prepare forms for the registration and fingerprinting of aliens under section 261 of this title, and the Attorney General is authorized and directed to prepare forms for the registration and fingerprinting of aliens under section 262 of this title. Such forms shall contain inquiries with respect to (1) the date and place of entry of the alien into the United States; (2) activities in which he has been and intends to be engaged; (3) the length of time he expects to remain in the United States; (4) the police and criminal record, if any, of such alien; and (5) such additional matters as may be prescribed.

"(b) All registration and fingerprint records made under the provisions of this title shall be confidential, and shall be made available only to such persons or agencies as may be designated by the Attorney General.

"(c) Every person required to apply for the registration of himself or another under this title shall submit under oath the information required for such registration. Any person authorized under regulations issued by the Attorney General to register aliens under this title shall be authorized to administer oaths for such purpose.

"(d) Every alien in the United States who has been registered and fingerprinted under the provisions of the Alien Registration Act, 1940, or under the provisions of this Act shall

be issued a certificate of alien registration or an alien registration receipt card in such form and manner and at such time as shall be prescribed under regulations issued by the Attorney General.

"(e) Every alien, eighteen years of age and over, shall at all times carry with him and have in his personal possession any certificate of alien registration or alien registration receipt card issued to him pursuant to subsection (d). Any alien who fails to comply with the provisions of this subsection shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall upon conviction for each offense be fined not to exceed $100 or be imprisoned not more than thirty day, or both.

"Notices of change of address

"SEC. 265. Every alien required to be registered under this title, or who was required to be registered under the Alien Registration Act, 1940, as amended, who is within the United States on the first day of January following the effective date of this Act, or on the first day of January of each succeeding year shall, within thirty days following such dates, notify the Attorney General in writing of his current address and furnish such additional information as may by regulations be required by the Attorney General. Any such alien shall likewise notify the Attorney General in writing of each change of address and new address within ten days from the date of such change. Any such alien who is temporarily absent from the United States on the first day of January following the effective date of this Act, or on the first day of January of any succeeding year shall furnish his current address and other information as required by this section within ten days after his return. Any such alien in the United States in a lawful temporary residence status shall in like manner also notify the Attorney General in writing of his address at the expiration of each three-month period during which he remains in the United States, regardless of whether there has been any change of address. In the case of an alien for whom a parent or legal guardian is required to apply for registration, the notice required by this section shall be given by such parent or legal guardian.

"Penalties

"SEC 266. (a) Any alien required to apply for registration and to be fingerprinted in the United States who willfully fails or refuses to make such application or to be fingerprinted, and any parent or legal guardian required to apply for the registration of any alien who willfully fails or refuses to file application for the registration of such alien shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not to exceed $1,000 or be imprisoned not more than six months, or both.

"(b) Any alien or any parent or legal guardian in the United States of any alien who fails to give written notice to the Attorney General, as required by section 265 of this title, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not to exceed $200 or be imprisoned not more than thirty days, or both. Irrespective of whether an alien is convicted and punished as herein provided, any alien who fails to give written notice to the Attorney General, as required by section 265, shall be taken into custody and deported in the manner provided by chapter 5 of this title, unless such alien establishes to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that such failure was reasonably excusable or was not willful.

"(c) Any alien or any parent or legal guardian of any alien, who files an application for registration containing statements know by him to be false, or who procures or attempts to procure registration of himself or another person through fraud, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not to exceed $1,000, or be imprisoned not more than six months, or both; and any alien so convicted shall, upon the warrant of the Attorney General, be taken into custody and be deported in the manner provided in chapter 5 of this title.

"(d) Any person who with unlawful intent photographs, prints, or in any other manner makes, or executes, any engraving, photograph, print, or impression in the likeness of any certificate of alien registration or an alien registration receipt card or any colorable imitation thereof, except when and as authorized under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Attorney General, shall upon conviction be fined not to exceed $5,000 or be imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"CHAPTER 8—GENERAL PENALTY PROVISIONS

"Prevention of unauthorized landing of aliens

"SEC. 271. (a) It shall be the duty of every person, including the owners, masters, officers, and agents of vessels, aircraft, transportation lines, or international bridges or toll roads, other than transportation lines which may enter into a contract as provided in section 238, bringing an alien to, or providing a means for an alien to come to, the United States (including an alien crewman whose case is not covered by section 254 (a)) to prevent the landing of such alien in the United States at a port of entry other than as designated by the Attorney General or at any time or place other than as designated by the immigration officers. Any such person, owner, master, officer, or agent who fails to comply with the foregoing requirements shall be liable to a penalty to be imposed by the Attorney General of $1,000 for each such violation, which may, in the discretion of the Attorney General, be remitted or mitigated by him in accordance with such proceedings as he shall by regulation prescribe. Such penalty shall be a lien upon the vessel or aircraft whose owner, master, officer, or agent violates the provisions of this section, and such vessel or aircraft may be libeled therefor in the appropriate United States court.

"(b) Proof that the alien failed to present himself at the time and place designated by the immigration officer shall be prima facie evidence that such alien has landed in the United States at a time or place other than as designated by the immigration officers.

"Bringing in aliens subject to disability or afflicted with disease

"SEC. 272. (a) Any person who shall bring to the United States an alien (other than an alien crewman) who is (1) feeble-minded, (2) insane, (3) an epileptic, (4) afflicted with psychopathic personality, (5) a chronic alcoholic, (6) afflicted with tuberculosis in any form, (7) afflicted with leprosy or any dangerous contagious disease, or (8) a narcotic drug addict, shall pay to the collector of customs of the customs district in which the place of arrival is located for each and every alien so afflicted, the sum of $1,000 unless (1) the alien was in possession of a valid, unexpired immigrant visa, or (2) the alien was allowed to land in the United States, or (3) the alien was in possession of a valid unexpired nonimmigrant visa or other document authorizing such alien to apply for temporary admission to the United States or an unexpired reentry permit issued to him, and (A) such application was made within one hundred and twenty days of the date of issuance of the visa or other document, or in the case of an alien in possession of a reentry permit, within one hundred and twenty days of the date on which the alien was last examined and admitted by the Service, or (B) in the event the application was made later than one hundred and twenty days of the date of issuance of the visa or other document or such examination and admission, if such person establishes to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the existence of such disease or disability could not have been detected by the exercise of due diligence prior to the alien's embarkation.

"(b) Any person who shall bring to the United States an alien (other than an alien crewman) afflicted with any mental defect other than those enumerated in subsection (a) of this section, or any physical defect of a nature which may affect his ability to earn a living, as provided in section 212 (a) (7), shall pay to the collector of customs of the customs district in which the place of arrival is located for each and every alien so afflicted, the sum of $250, unless (1) the alien was in possession of a valid, unexpired immigrant visa, or (2) the alien was allowed to land in the United States, or (3) the alien was in possession of a valid unexpired nonimmigrant visa or other document authorizing such alien to apply for temporary admission to the United States or an unexpired reentry permit issued to him, and (A) such application was made within one hundred and twenty days of the date of issuance of the visa or other document, or in the case of an alien in possession of a reentry permit, within one hundred and twenty days of the date on which the alien was last examined and admitted by the Service, or (B) in the event the application was made later than one hundred and twenty days of the date of issuance of the visa or other document or such examination and admission, if such person establishes to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the existence of such disease or disability could not have been detected by the exercise of due diligence prior to the alien's embarkation.

"(c) No vessel or aircraft shall be granted clearance papers pending determination of the question of liability to the payment of any fine under this section, or while the fines remain unpaid, nor shall such fines be remitted or refunded; but clearance may be granted prior to the determination of such question upon the deposit of a sum sufficient to cover such fines or of a bond with sufficient surety to secure the payment thereof, approved by the collector of customs.

"(d) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to subject transportation companies to a fine for bringing to ports of entry in the United States aliens who are entitled by law to exemption from the excluding provisions of section 212 (a).

"(e) As used in this section, the term 'person' means the owner, master, agent, commanding officer, charterer, or consignee of any vessel or aircraft.

"Unlawful bringing of aliens into United States

"SEC. 273. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person, including any transportation company, or the owner, master, commanding officer, agent, charterer, or consignee of any vessel or aircraft, to bring to the United States from any place outside thereof (other than from foreign contiguous territory) any alien who does not have an unexpired visa, if a visa was required under this Act or regulations issued thereunder.

"(b) If it appears to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that any alien has been so brought, such person, or transportation company, or the master, commanding officer, agent, owner, charterer, or consignee of any such vessel or aircraft, shall pay to the collector of customs of the customs district in which the port of arrival is located the sum of $1,000 for each alien so brought and, except in the case of any such alien who is admitted, or permitted to land temporarily, in addition, a sum equal to that paid by such alien for his transportation from the initial point of departure, indicated in his ticket, to the port of arrival, such latter sum to be delivered by the collector of customs to the alien on whose account the assessment is made. No vessel or aircraft

shall be granted clearance pending the determination of the liability to the payment of such sums or while such sums remain unpaid, except that clearance may be granted prior to the determination of such question upon the deposit of an amount sufficient to cover such sums, or of a bond with sufficient surety to secure the payment thereof approved by the collector of customs.

"(c) Such sums shall not be remitted or refunded, unless it appears to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that such person, and the owner, master, commanding officer, agent, charterer, and consignee of the vessel or aircraft, prior to the departure of the vessel or aircraft from the last port outside the United States, did not know, and could not have ascertained by the exercise of reasonable diligence, that the individual transported was an alien and that a visa was required.

"(d) The owner, charterer, agent, consignee, commanding officer, or master of any vessel or aircraft arriving at the United States from any place outside thereof who fails to detain on board or at such other place as may be designated by an immigration officer any alien stowaway until such stowaway has been inspected by an immigration officer, or who fails to detain such stowaway on board or at such other designated place after inspection if ordered to do so by an immigration officer, or who fails to deport such stowaway on the vessel or aircraft on which he arrived or on another vessel or aircraft at the expense of the vessel or aircraft on which he arrived when required to do so by an immigration officer, shall pay to the collector of customs of the customs district in which the port of arrival is located the sum of $1,000 for each alien stowaway, in respect of whom any such failure occurs. Pending final determination of liability for such fine, no such vessel or aircraft shall be granted clearance, except that clearance may be granted upon the deposit of a sum sufficient to cover such fine, or of a bond with sufficient surety to secure the payment thereof approved by the collector of customs. The provisions of section 235 for detention of aliens for examination before special inquiry officers and the right of appeal provided for in section 236 shall not apply to aliens who arrive as stowaways and no such alien shall be permitted to land in the United States, except temporarily for medical treatment, or pursuant to such regulations as the Attorney General may prescribe for the ultimate departure or removal or deportation of such alien from the United States.

"Bringing in and harboring certain aliens

"SEC. 274. (a) Any person, including the owner, operator, pilot, master, commanding officer, agent, or consignee of any means of transportation who—

"(1) brings into or lands in the United States, by any means of transportation or otherwise, or attempts, by himself or through another, to bring into or land in the United States, by any means of transportation or otherwise;

"(2) knowing that he is in the United States in violation of law, and knowing or having reasonable grounds to believe that his last entry into the United States occurred less than three years prior thereto, transports, or moves, or attempts to transport or move, within the United States by means of transportation or otherwise, in furtherance of such violation of law;

"(3) willfully or knowingly conceals, harbors, or shields from detection, or attempts to conceal, harbor, or shield from detection, in any place, including any building or any means of transportation; or

"(4) willfully or knowingly encourages or induces, or attempts to encourage or induce, either directly or indirectly, the entry into the United States of—

any alien, including an alien crewman, not duly admitted by an immigration officer or not lawfully entitled to enter or reside within the United States under the terms of this Act or any other law relating to the immigration or expulsion of aliens, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,000 or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years, or both, for each alien in respect to whom any violation of this subsection occurs: *Provided, however,* That for the purposes of this section, employment (including the usual and normal practices incident to employment) shall not be deemed to constitute harboring.

"(b) No officer or person shall have authority to make any arrest for a violation of any provision of this section except officers and employees of the Service designated by the Attorney General, either individually or as a member of a class, and all other officers whose duty it is to enforce criminal laws.

"Entry of alien at improper time or place; misrepresentation and concealment of facts

"SEC. 275. Any alien who (1) enters the United States at any time or place other than as designated by immigration officers, or (2) eludes examination or inspection by immigration officers, or (3) obtains entry to the United States by a willfully false or misleading representation or the willful concealment of a material fact, shall, for the first commission of any such offenses, be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof be punished by imprisonment for not more than six months, or by a fine of not more than $500, or by both, and for a subsequent commission of any such offenses shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than two years, or by a fine of not more than $1,000, or both.

"Reentry of deported alien

"SEC. 276. Any alien who—

"(1) has been arrested and deported or excluded and deported, and thereafter

"(2) enters, attempts to enter, or is at any time found in, the United States, unless (A) prior to his reembarkation at a place outside the United States or his application for admission from foreign contiguous territory, the Attorney General has expressly consented to such alien's reapplying for admission; or (B) with respect to an alien previously excluded and deported, unless such alien shall establish that he was not required to obtain such advance consent under this or any prior Act,

shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof, be punished by imprisonment of not more than two years, or by a fine of not more than $1,000, or both.

"Aiding or assisting subversive alien to enter the United States

"SEC. 277. Any person who knowingly aids or assists any alien excludable under section 212 (a) (27), (28), or (29) to enter the United States, or who connives or conspires with any person or persons to allow, procure, or permit any such alien to enter the United States, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"Importation of alien for immoral purpose

"SEC. 278. The importation into the United States of any alien for the purpose of prostitution, or for any other immoral purpose, is hereby forbidden. Whoever shall, directly or indirectly, import, or attempt to import into the United States any alien for the purpose of prostitution or for any other immoral purposes, or shall hold or attempt to hold any alien for any such purpose in pursuance of such illegal importation, or shall keep, maintain, control, support, employ, or harbor in any house or other place for the purpose of prostitution or for any other immoral purpose, any alien, in pursuance of such illegal importation, shall, in every such case, be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 and by imprisonment for a term of not more than ten years. The trial and punishment of offenses under this section may be in any district to or into which such alien is brought in pursuance of importation by the person or persons accused, or in any district in which a violation of any of the provisions of this section occurs. In all prosecutions under this section, the testimony of a husband or wife shall be admissible and competent evidence against each other.

"Jurisdiction of district courts

"SEC. 279. The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of all causes, civil and criminal, arising under any of the provisions of this title. It shall be the duty of the United States attorney of the proper district to prosecute every such suit when brought by the United States. Notwithstanding any other law, such prosecutions or suits may be instituted at any place in the United States at which the violation may occur or at which the person charged with a violation under sections 275 or 276 may be apprehended. No suit or proceeding for a violation of any of the provisions of this title shall be settled, compromised, or discontinued without the consent of the court in which it is pending and any such settlement, compromise, or discontinuance shall be entered of record with the reasons therefor.

"Collection of penalties and expenses

"SEC. 280. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, the withholding or denial of clearance of or a lien upon any vessel or aircraft provided for in sections 231, 237, 239, 243, 251, 253, 254, 255, 256, 271, 272, or 273 of this title shall not be regarded as the sole and exclusive means or remedy for the enforcement of payment of any fine, penalty or expenses imposed or incurred under such sections, but, in the discretion of the Attorney General, the amount thereof may be recovered by civil suit, in the name of the United States, from any person made liable under any of such sections.

"CHAPTER 9—MISCELLANEOUS

"Schedule of fees

"SEC. 281. The following fees shall be charged:

"(1) For the furnishing and verification of each application for an immigrant visa (which shall include the furnishing and verification of the duplicate), $5;

"(2) For the issuance of each immigrant visa, $20;

"(3) For the issuance or each extension of a reentry permit, $10;

"(4) For the filing of each application for adjustment of status under sections 245 and 248, for the creation of a record of admission for permanent residence under section 249, or for suspension of deportation, $25;

"(5) For the issuance of each extension of stay to nonimmigrants, other than nonimmigrants described in section 101 (a) (15) (F) and, upon a basis of reciprocity, the nonimmigrants described in section 101 (a) (15) (A) (iii) or 101 (a) (15) (G) (v), $10;

"(6) For filing with the Attorney General of each petition under sections 204 (b), 205 (b), and 214 (c), $10; and

"(7) For approval of each application for, including issuance of each certificate of, admission to practice as attorney or representative before the Service, pursuant to such regulations as may be prescribed by the Attorney General, $25.

"The fees for the furnishing and verification of applications for visas by nonimmigrants of each foreign country and for the issuance of visas to nonimmigrants of each foreign country shall be prescribed by the Secretary of State in amounts corresponding, as nearly as practicable, to the total of all similar visa, entry, residence, or other fees, taxes, or charges assessed or levied against nationals of the United States by the foreign countries of which such nonimmigrants are nationals or stateless residents: *Provided*, That nonimmigrant visas issued to aliens coming to the United States in transit to and from the headquarters district of the United Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Headquarters Agreement shall be gratis.

"Printing of reentry permits and blank forms of manifest and crew lists

"SEC. 282. (a) Reentry permits issued under section 223 shall be printed on distinctive safety paper and shall be prepared and issued under regulations prescribed by the Attorney General.

"(b) The Public Printer is authorized to print for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, upon prepayment, copies of blank forms of manifests and crew lists and such other forms as may be prescribed and authorized by the Attorney General to be sold pursuant to the provisions of this title.

"Travel expenses and expense of transporting remains of officers and employees who die outside the United States

"SEC. 283. When officers, inspectors, or other employees of the Service are ordered to perform duties in a foreign country, or are transferred from one station to another, in the United States or in a foreign country, or while performing duties in any foreign country become eligible for voluntary retirement and return to the United States, they shall be allowed their traveling expenses in accordance with such regulations as the Attorney General may deem advisable, and they may also be allowed, within the discretion and under written orders of the Attorney General, the expenses incurred for the transfer of their wives and dependent children, their household effects and other personal property, including the expenses for packing, crating, freight, unpacking, temporary storage, and drayage thereof in accordance with the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 806; 5 U. S. C., sec. 73b–1). The expense of transporting the remains of such officers, inspectors, or other employees who die while in, or in transit to, a foreign country in the discharge of their official duties to their former homes in this country for interment, and the ordinary and necessary expenses of such interment and of preparation for shipment, are authorized to be paid on the written order of the Attorney General.

"Members of the Armed Forces

"SEC. 284. Nothing contained in this title shall be construed so as to limit, restrict, deny, or affect the coming into or departure from the United States of an alien member of the Armed Forces of the United States who is in the uniform of, or who bears documents identifying him as a member of, such Armed Forces, and who is coming to or departing from the United States under official orders or permit of such Armed Forces: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed to give to or confer upon any such alien any other privileges, rights, benefits, exemptions, or immunities under this Act, which are not otherwise specifically granted by this Act.

"Disposal of privileges at immigrant stations

"SEC. 285. (a) Subject to such conditions and limitations as the Attorney General shall prescribe, all exclusive privileges of exchanging money, transporting passengers or baggage, keeping eating houses, or other like privileges in connection with any United States immigrant station, shall be disposed of to the lowest responsible and capable bidder (other than an alien) in accordance with the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U. S. C. 5), and for the use of Government property in connection with the exercise of such exclusive privileges a reasonable rental may be charged. The feeding of aliens, or the furnishing of any other necessary service in connection with any United States immigrant station, may be performed by the Service without regard to the foregoing provisions of this subsection if the Attorney General shall find that it would be advantageous to the Government in terms of economy and efficiency. No intoxicating liquors shall be sold at any immigrant station.

"(b) Such articles determined by the Attorney General to be necessary to the health and welfare of aliens detained at any immigrant station, when not otherwise readily procurable by such aliens, may be sold at reasonable prices to such aliens through Government canteens operated by the Service, under such conditions and limitations as the Attorney General shall prescribe.

"(c) All rentals or other receipts accruing from the disposal of privileges, and all moneys arising from the sale of articles through Service-operated canteens, authorized by this section, shall be covered into the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation for the enforcement of this title.

"Disposition of moneys collected under the provisions of this title

"SEC. 286. (a) All moneys paid into the Treasury to reimburse the Service for detention, transportation, hospitalization, and all other expenses of detained aliens paid from the appropriation for the enforcement of this Act, and all moneys paid into the Treasury to reimburse the Service for expenses of landing stations referred to in section 238 (c) paid by the Service from the appropriation for the enforcement of this Act, shall be credited to the appropriation for the enforcement of this Act for the fiscal year in which the expenses were incurred.

"(b) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (a), or in any other provision of this title, all moneys received in payment of fees and administrative fines and penalties under this title shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided, however*, That all fees received from applicants residing in the Virgin Islands of the United States, and in Guam, required to be paid under section 281, shall be paid over to the Treasury of the Virgin Islands and to the Treasury of Guam, respectively.

"Powers of immigration officers and employees

"SEC. 287. (a) Any officer or employee of the Service authorized under regulations prescribed by the Attorney General shall have power without warrant—

"(1) to interrogate any alien or person believed to be an alien as to his right to be or to remain in the United States;

"(2) to arrest any alien who in his presence or view is entering or attempting to enter the United States in violation of any law or regulation made in pursuance of law regulating the admission, exclusion, or expulsion of aliens, or to arrest any alien in the United States, if he has reason to believe that the alien so arrested is in the United States in violation of any such law or regulation and is likely to escape before a warrant can be obtained for his arrest, but the alien arrested shall be taken without unnecessary delay for examination before an officer of the Service having authority to examine aliens as to their right to enter or remain in the United States;

"(3) within a reasonable distance from any external boundary of the United States, to board and search for aliens any vessel within the territorial waters of the United States and any railway car, aircraft, conveyance, or vehicle, and within a distance of twenty-five miles from any such external boundary to have access to private lands, but not dwellings, for the purpose of patrolling the border to prevent the illegal entry of aliens into the United States; and

"(4) to make arrests for felonies which have been committed and which are cognizable under any law of the United States regulating the admission, exclusion, or expulsion of aliens, if he has reason to believe that the person so arrested is guilty of such felony and if there is likelihood of the person escaping before a warrant can be obtained for his arrest, but the person arrested shall be taken without unnecessary delay before the nearest available officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the laws of the United States. Any such employee shall also have the power to execute any warrant or other process issued by any officer under any law regulating the admission, exclusion, or explusion of aliens.

"(b) Any officer or employee of the Service designated by the Attorney General, whether individually or as one of a class, shall have power and authority to administer oaths and to take and consider evidence concerning the privilege of any person to enter, reenter, pass through, or reside in the United States, or concerning any matter which is material or relevant to the enforcement of this Act and the administration of the Service; and any person to whom such oath has been administered, under the provisions of this Act, who shall knowingly or willfully give false evidence or swear to any false statement concerning any matter referred to in this subsection shall be guilty of perjury and shall be punished as provided by section 1621, title 18, United States Code.

"(c) Any officer or employee of the Service authorized and designated under regulations prescribed by the Attorney General, whether individually or as one of a class, shall have power to conduct a search, without warrant, of the person, and of the personal effects in the possession of any person seeking admission to the United States, concerning whom such officer or employee may have reasonable cause to suspect that grounds exist for exclusion from the United States under this Act which would be disclosed by such search.

"Local jurisdiction over immigrant stations

"SEC. 288. The officers in charge of the various immigrant stations shall admit therein the proper State and local officers charged with the enforcement of the laws of the State or Territory of the United States in which any such immigrant station is located in order that such State and local officers may preserve the peace and make arrests for crimes under the laws of the States and Territories. For the purpose of this section the jurisdiction of such State and local officers and of the State and local courts shall extend over such immigrant stations.

"American Indians born in Canada

"SEC. 289. Nothing in this title shall be construed to affect the right of American Indians born in Canada to pass the borders of the United States, but such right shall extend only to persons who possess at least 50 per centum of blood of the American Indian race.

"Central file; information from other departments and agencies

"SEC. 290. (a) There shall be established in the office of the Commissioner, for the use of the security and enforcement agencies of the Government of the United States, a central index, which shall contain the names of all aliens heretofore admitted to the United States, or excluded therefrom, insofar as such information is available from

the existing records of the Service, and the names of all aliens hereafter admitted to the United States, or excluded therefrom, the names of their sponsors of record, if any, and such other relevant information as the Attorney General shall require as an aid to the proper enforcement of this Act.

"(b) Any information in any records kept by any department or agency of the Government as to the identity and location of aliens in the United States shall be made available to the Service upon request made by the Attorney General to the head of any such department or agency.

"(c) The Federal Security Administrator shall notify the Attorney General upon request whenever any alien is issued a social security account number and social security card. The Administrator shall also furnish such available information as may be requested by the Attorney General regarding the identity and location of aliens in the United States.

"(d) A written certification signed by the Attorney General or by any officer of the Service designated by the Attorney General to make such certification, that after diligent search no record or entry of a specified nature is found to exist in the records of the Service, shall be admissible as evidence in any proceeding as evidence that the records of the Service contain no such record or entry, and shall have the same effect as the testimony of a witness given in open court.

"Burden of proof

"SEC. 291. Whenever any person makes application for a visa or any other document required for entry, or makes application for admission, or otherwise attempts to enter the United States, the burden of proof shall be upon such person to establish that he is eligible to receive such visa or such document, or is not subject to exclusion under any provision of this Act, and, if an alien, that he is entitled to the nonimmigrant, quota immigrant, or nonquota immigrant status claimed, as the case may be. If such person fails to establish to the satisfaction of the consular officer that he is eligible to receive a visa or other document required for entry, no visa or other document required for entry shall be issued to such person, nor shall such person be admitted to the United States unless he establishes to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that he is not subject to exclusion under any provision of this Act. In any deportation proceeding under chapter 5 against any person, the burden of proof shall be upon such person to show the time, place, and manner of his entry into the United States, but in presenting such proof he shall be entitled to the production of his visa or other entry document, if any, and of any other documents and records, not considered by the Attorney General to be confidential, pertaining to such entry in the custody of the Service. If such burden of proof is not sustained, such person shall be presumed to be in the United States in violation of law.

"Right to counsel

"SEC. 292. In any exclusion or deportation proceedings before a special inquiry officer and in any appeal proceedings before the Attorney General from any such exclusion or deportation proceedings, the person concerned shall have the privilege of being represented (at no expense to the Government) by such counsel, authorized to practice in such proceedings, as he shall choose.

"TITLE III—NATIONALITY AND NATURALIZATION

"CHAPTER 1—NATIONALITY AT BIRTH AND BY COLLECTIVE NATURALIZATION

"Nationals and citizens of the United States at birth

"SEC. 301. (a) The following shall be nationals and citizens of the United States at at birth:

"(1) a person born in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof;

"(2) a person born in the United States to a member of an Indian, Eskimo, Aleutian, or other aboriginal tribe: *Provided*, That the granting of citizenship under this subsection shall not in any manner impair or otherwise affect the right of such person to tribal or other property;

"(3) a person born outside of the United States and its outlying possessions of parents both of whom are citizens of the United States and one of whom has had a residence in the United States or one of its outlying possessions, prior to the birth of such person;

"(4) a person born outside of the United States and its outlying possessions of parents one of whom is a citizen of the United States who has been physically present in the United States or one of its outlying possessions for a continuous period of one year prior to the birth of such person, and the other of whom is a national, but not a citizen of the United States;

"(5) a person born in an outlying possession of the United States of parents one of whom is a citizen of the United States who has been physically present in the United States or one of its outlying possessions for a continuous period of one year at any time prior to the birth of such person;

"(6) a person of unknown parentage found in the United States while under the age of five years, until shown, prior to his attaining the age of twenty-one years, not to have been born in the United States;

"(7) a person born outside the geographical limits of the United States and its outlying possessions of parents one of whom is an alien, and the other a citizen of the United States who, prior to the birth of such person, was physically present in the United States or its outlying possessions for a period or periods totaling not less than ten years, at least five of which were after attaining the age of fourteen years: *Provided*, That any periods of honorable service in the Armed Forces of the United States by such citizen parent may be included in computing the physical presence requirements of this paragraph.

"(b) Any person who is a national and citizen of the United States at birth under paragraph (7) of subsection (a), shall lose his nationality and citizenship unless he shall come to the United States prior to attaining the age of twenty-three years and shall immediately following any such coming be continuously physically present in the United States for at least five years: *Provided*, That such physical presence follows the attainment of the age of fourteen years and precedes the age of twenty-eight years.

"(c) Subsection (b) shall apply to a person born abroad subsequent to May 24, 1934: *Provided, however*, That nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to alter or affect the citizenship of any person born abroad subsequent to May 24, 1934, who, prior to the effective date of this Act, has taken up a residence in the United States before attaining the age of sixteen years, and thereafter, whether before or after the effective date of this Act, complies or shall comply with the residence requirements for retention of citizenship specified in subsections (g) and (h) of section 201 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended.

"Persons born in Puerto Rico on or after April 11, 1899

"SEC. 302. All persons born in Puerto Rico on or after April 11, 1899, and prior to January 13, 1941, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, residing on January 13, 1941, in Puerto Rico or other territory over which the United States exercises rights of sovereignty and not citizens of the United States under any other Act, are hereby declared to be citizens of the United States as of January 13, 1941. All persons born in Puerto Rico on or after January 13, 1941, and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, are citizens of the United States at birth.

"Persons born in the Canal Zone or Republic of Panama on or after February 26, 1904

"SEC. 303. (a) Any person born in the Canal Zone on or after February 26, 1904, and whether before or after the effective date of this Act, whose father or mother or both at the time of the birth of such person was or is a citizen of the United States, is declared to be a citizen of the United States.

"(b) Any person born in the Republic of Panama on or after February 26, 1904, and whether before or after the effective date of this Act, whose father or mother or both at the time of the birth of such person was or is a citizen of the United States employed by the Government of the United States or by the Panama Railroad Company, or its successor in title, is declared to be a citizen of the United States.

"Persons born in Alaska on or after March 30, 1867

"SEC. 304. A person born in Alaska on or after March 30, 1867, except a noncitizen Indian, is a citizen of the United States at birth. A noncitizen Indian born in Alaska on or after March 30, 1867, and prior to June 2, 1924, is declared to be a citizen of the United States as of June 2, 1924. An Indian born in Alaska on or after June 2, 1924, is a citizen of the United States at birth.

"Persons born in Hawaii

"SEC. 305. A person born in Hawaii on or after August 12, 1898, and before April 30, 1900, is declared to be a citizen of the United States as of April 30, 1900. A person born in Hawaii on or after April 30, 1900, is a citizen of the United States at birth. A person who was a citizen of the Republic of Hawaii on August 12, 1898, is declared to be a citizen of the United States as of April 30, 1900.

"Persons living in and born in the Virgin Islands

"SEC. 306. (a) The following persons and their children born subsequent to January 17, 1917, and prior to February 25, 1927, are declared to be citizens of the United States as of February 25, 1927:

"(1) All former Danish citizens who, on January 17, 1917, resided in the Virgin Islands of the United States, and were residing in those islands or in the United States or Puerto Rico on February 25, 1927, and who did not make the declaration required to preserve their Danish citizenship by article 6 of the treaty entered into on August 4, 1916, between the United States and Denmark, or who, having made such a declaration have heretofore renounced or may hereafter renounce it by a declaration before a court of record;

"(2) All natives of the Virgin Islands of the United States who, on January 17, 1917, resided in those islands, and were residing in those islands or in the United States or Puerto Rico on February 25, 1927, and who were not on February 25, 1927, citizens or subjects of any foreign country;

"(3) All natives of the Virgin Islands of the United States who, on January 17, 1917, resided in the United States, and were residing in those islands on February 25, 1927, and who were not on February 25, 1927, citizens or subjects of any foreign country; and

"(4) All natives of the Virgin Islands of the United States who, on June 28, 1932, were residing in continental United States, the Virgin Islands of the United States, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, or any other insular possession or territory of the United States, and who, on June 28, 1932, were not citizens or subjects of any foreign country, regardless of their place of residence on January 17, 1917.

"(b) All persons born in the Virgin Islands of the United States on or after January 17,

1917, and prior to February 25, 1927, and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States are declared to be citizens of the United States as of February 25, 1927; and all persons born in those islands on or after February 25, 1927, and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, are declared to be citizens of the United States at birth.

"Persons living in and born in Guam

"SEC. 307. (a) The following persons, and their children born after April 11, 1899, are declared to be citizens of the United States as of August 1, 1950, if they were residing on August 1, 1950, on the island of Guam or other territory over which the United States exercises rights of sovereignty:

"(1) All inhabitants of the island of Guam on April 11, 1899, including those temporarily absent from the island on that date, who were Spanish subjects, who after that date continued to reside in Guam or other territory over which the United States exercises sovereignty, and who have taken no affirmative steps to preserve or acquire foreign nationality; and

"(2) All persons born in the island of Guam who resided in Guam on April 11, 1899, including those temporarily absent from the island on that date, who after that date continued to reside in Guam or other territory over which the United States exercises sovereignty, and who have taken no affirmative steps to preserve or acquire foreign nationality.

"(b) All persons born in the island of Guam on or after April 11, 1899 (whether before or after August 1, 1950) subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, are hereby declared to be citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That in the case of any person born before August 1, 1950, he has taken no affirmative steps to preserve or acquire foreign nationality.

"(c) Any person hereinbefore described who is a citizen or national of a country other than the United States and desires to retain his present political status shall have made, prior to August 1, 1952, a declaration under oath of such desire, said declaration to be in form and executed in the manner prescribed by regulations. From and after the making of such a declaration any such person shall be held not to be a national of the United States by virtue of this Act.

"Nationals but not citizens of the United States at birth

"SEC. 308. Unless otherwise provided in section 301 of this title, the following shall be nationals, but not citizens, of the United States at birth:

"(1) A person born in an outlying possession of the United States on or after the date of formal acquisition of such possession;

"(2) A person born outside the United States and its outlying possessions of parents both of whom are nationals, but not citizens, of the United States, and have had a residence in the United States, or one of its outlying possessions prior to the birth of such person; and

"(3) A person of unknown parentage found in an outlying possession of the United States while under the age of five years, until shown, prior to his attaining the age of twenty-one years, not to have been born in such outlying possession.

"Children born out of wedlock

"SEC. 309. (a) The provisions of paragraphs (3), (4), (5), and (7) of section 301 (a), and of paragraph (2) of section 308, of this title shall apply as of the date of birth to a child born out of wedlock on or after the effective date of this Act, if the paternity of such child is established while such child is under the age of twenty-one years by legitimation.

"(b) Except as otherwise provided in section 405, the provisions of section 301 (a) (7) shall apply to a child born out of wedlock on or after January 13, 1941, and prior to the effective date of this Act, as of the date of birth, if the paternity of such child is established before or after the effective date of this Act and while such child is under the age of twenty-one years by legitimation.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provision of subsection (a) of this section, a person born, on or after the effective date of this Act, outside the United States and out of wedlock shall be held to have acquired at birth the nationality status of his mother, if the mother had the nationality of the United States at the time of such person's birth, and if the mother had previously been physically present in the United States or one of its outlying possessions for a continuous period of one year.

"CHAPTER 2—NATIONALITY THROUGH NATURALIZATION

"Jurisdiction to naturalize

"SEC. 310. (a) Exclusive jurisdiction to naturalize persons as citizens of the United States is hereby conferred upon the following specified courts: District courts of the United States now existing, or which may hereafter be established by Congress in any State, District Courts of the United States for the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and for the District of Columbia and for Puerto Rico, the District Court of the Virgin Islands of the United States, and the District Court of Guam; also all courts of record in any State or Territory now existing, or which may hereafter be created, having a seal, a clerk, and jurisdiction in actions at law or equity, or law and equity, in which the amount in controversy is unlimited. The jurisdiction of all the courts herein specified to naturalize persons shall extend only to such persons resident within the respective jurisdiction of such courts, except as otherwise specifically provided in this title.

"(b) A person who petitions for naturalization in any State court having naturalization jurisdiction may petition within the State judicial district or State judicial circuit in which he resides, whether or not he resides within the county in which the petition for naturalization is filed.

"(c) The courts herein specified, upon request of the clerks of such courts, shall be furnished from time to time by the Attorney General with such blank forms as may be required in naturalization proceedings.

"(d) A person may be naturalized as a citizen of the United States in the manner and under the conditions prescribed in this title, and not otherwise.

"Eligibility for naturalization

"SEC. 311. The right of a person to become a naturalized citizen of the United States shall not be denied or abridged because of race or sex or because such person is married. Notwithstanding section 405 (b), this section shall apply to any person whose petition for naturalization shall hereafter be filed, or shall have been pending on the effective date of this Act.

"Requirements as to understanding the English language, history, principles, and form of Government of the United States

"SEC. 312. No person except as otherwise provided in this title shall hereafter be naturalized as a citizen of the United States upon his own petition who cannot demonstrate—

"(1) an understanding of the English language, including an ability to read, write, and speak words in ordinary usage in the English language: *Provided*, That this requirement shall not apply to any person physically unable to comply therewith, if otherwise qualified to be naturalized, or to any person who, on the effective date of this Act, is over fifty years of age and has been living in the United States for periods totaling at least twenty years: *Provided further*, That the requirements of this section relating to ability to read and write shall be met if the applicant can read or write simple words and phrases to the end that a reasonable test of his literacy shall be made and that no extraordinary or unreasonable condition shall be imposed upon the applicant; and

"(2) a knowledge and understanding of the fundamentals of the history, and of the principles and form of government of the United States.

"Prohibition upon the naturalization of persons opposed to government or law, or who favor totalitarian forms of government

"SEC. 313. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 405 (b), no person shall hereafter be naturalized as a citizen of the United States—

"(1) who advocates or teaches, or who is a member of or affiliated with any organization that advocates or teaches, opposition to all organized government; or

"(2) who is a member of or affiliated with (A) the Communist Party of the United States; (B) any other totalitarian party of the United States; (C) the Communist Political Association; (D) the Communist or other totalitarian party of any State of the United States, of any foreign state, or of any political or geographical subdivision of any foreign state; (E) any section, subsidiary, branch, affiliate, or subdivision of any such association or party; (F) the direct predecessors or successors of any such association or party, regardless of what name such group or organization may have used, may now bear, or may hereafter adopt; (G) who, regardless of whether he is within any of the other provisions of this section, is a member of or affiliated with any Communist-action organization during the time it is registered or required to be registered under the provisions of section 7 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950; or (H) who, regardless of whether he is within any of the other provisions of this section, is a member of or affiliated with any Communist-front organization during the time it is registered or required to be registered under section 7 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, unless such alien establishes that he did not have knowledge or reason to believe at the time he became a member of or affiliated with such an organization (and did not thereafter and prior to the date upon which such organization was so registered or so required to be registered have such knowledge or reason to believe) that such organization was a Communist-front organization; or

"(3) who, although not within any of the other provisions of this section, advocates the economic, international, and governmental doctrines of world communism or the establishment in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship, or who is a member of or affiliated with any organization that advocates the economic, international, and governmental doctrines of world communism or the establishment in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship, either through its own utterances or through any written or printed publications issued or published by or with the permission or consent of or under authority of such organization or paid for by the funds of such organization; or

"(4) who advocates or teaches or who is a member of or affiliated with any organization that advocates or teaches (A) the overthrow by force or violence or other unconstitutional means of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law; or (B) the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers (either of specific individuals or of officers generally) of the Government of the United States or of any other organized government because of his or their official character; or (C) the unlawful damage, injury, or destruction of property; or (D) sabotage; or

"(5) who writes or publishes or causes to be written or published, or who knowingly circulates, distributes, prints, or displays, or knowingly causes to be circulated, distributed, printed, published, or displayed, or who knowingly has in his possession for the purpose of circulation, publication, distribution, or display, any written or printed matter, advocating or teaching opposition to all organized government, or advocating (A) the overthrow by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law; or (B) the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers (either of specific individuals or of officers generally) of the Government of the United States or of any other organized government, because of his or their official character; or (C) the unlawful damage, injury, or destruction of property; or (D) sabotage; or (E) the economic, international, and governmental doctrines of world communism or the establishment in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship; or

"(6) who is a member of or affiliated with any organization that writes, circulates, distributes, prints, publishes, or displays, or causes to be written, circulated, distributed, printed, published, or displayed, or that has in its possession for the purpose of circulation, distribution, publication, issue, or display, any written or printed matter of the character described in subparagraph (5).

"(b) The provisions of this section or of any other section of this Act shall not be construed as declaring that any of the organizations referred to in this section or in any other section of this Act do not advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means.

"(c) The provisions of this section shall be applicable to any applicant for naturalization who at any time within a period of ten years immediately preceding the filing of the petition for naturalization or after such filing and before taking the final oath of citizenship is, or has been found to be within any of the classes enumerated within this section, notwithstanding that at the time the petition is filed he may not be included within such classes.

"(d) Any person who is within any of the classes described in subsection (a) solely because of past membership in, or past affiliation with, a party or organization may be naturalized without regard to the provisions of subsection (c) if such person establishes that such membership or affiliation is or was involuntary, or occurred and terminated prior to the attainment by such alien of the age of sixteen years, or that such membership or affiliation is or was by operation of law, or was for purposes of obtaining employment, food rations, or other essentials of living and where necessary for such purposes.

"Ineligibility to naturalization of deserters from the Armed Forces of the United States

"SEC. 314. A person who, at any time during which the United States has been or shall be at war, deserted or shall desert the military, air, or naval forces of the United States, or who, having been duly enrolled, departed, or shall depart from the jurisdiction of the district in which enrolled, or who, whether or not having been duly enrolled, went or shall go beyond the limits of the United States, with intent to avoid any draft into the military, air, or naval service, lawfully ordered, shall, upon conviction thereof by a court martial or a court of competent jurisdiction, be permanently ineligible to become a citizen of the United States; and such deserters and evaders shall be forever incapable of holding any office of trust or of profit under the United States, or of exercising any rights of citizens thereof.

"Alien relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States because of alienage barred from citizenship

"SEC. 315. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 4(05 (b), any alien who applies or has applied for exemption or discharge from training or service in the Armed Forces or in the National Security Training Corps of the United States on the ground that he is an alien, and is or was relieved or discharged from such training or service on such ground, shall be permanently ineligible to become a citizen of the United States.

"(b) The records of the Selective Service System or of the National Military Establishment shall be conclusive as to whether an alien was relieved or discharged from such liability for training or service because he was an alien.

"Requirements as to residence, good moral character, attachment to the principles of the Constitution, and favorable disposition to the United States

"SEC. 316. (a) No person, except as otherwise provided in this title, shall be naturalized unless such petitioner, (1) immediately preceding the date of filing his petition for naturalization has resided continuously, after being lawfully admitted for permanent residence, within the United States for at least five years and during the five years immediately preceding the date of filing his petition has been physically present therein for periods totaling at least half of that time, and who has resided within the State in which the petitioner filed the petition for at least six months, (2) has resided continuously within the United States from the date of the petition up to the time of admission to citizenship, and (3) during all the periods referred to in this subsection has been and still is a person of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States.

"(b) Absence from the United States of more than six months but less than one year during the period for which continuous residence is required for admission to citizenship, immediately preceding the date of filing the petition for naturalization, or during the period between the date of filing the petition and the date of final hearing, shall break the continuity of such residence, unless the petitioner shall establish to the satisfaction of the court that he did not in fact abandon his residence in the United States during such period.

"Absence from the United States for a continuous period of one year or more during the period for which continuous residence is required for admission to citizenship (whether preceding or subsequent to the filing of the petition for naturalization) shall break the continuity of such residence, except that in the case of a person who has been physically present and residing in the United States, after being lawfully admitted for permanent residence, for an uninterrupted period of at least one year, and who thereafter is employed by or under contract with the Government of the United States or an American institution of research recognized as such by the Attorney General, or is employed by an American firm or corporation engaged in whole or in part in the development of foreign trade and commerce of the United States, or a subsidiary thereof more than 50 per centum of whose stock is owned by an American firm or corporation, or is employed by a public international organization of which the United States is a member by treaty or statute and by which the alien was not employed until after being lawfully admitted for permanent residence, no period of absence from the United States shall break the continuity of residence if—

"(1) prior to the beginning of such period of employment (whether such period begins before or after his departure from the United States), but prior to the expiration of one year of continuous absence from the United States, the person has established to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that his absence from the United States for such period is to be on behalf of such Government, or for the purpose of carrying on scientific research on behalf of such institution, or to be engaged in the development of such foreign trade and commerce or whose residence abroad is necessary to the protection of the property rights in such countries of such firm or corporation, or to be employed by a public international organization of which the United States is a member by treaty or statute and by which the alien was not employed until after being lawfully admitted for permanent residence; and

"(2) such person proves to the satisfaction of the court that his absence from the United States for such period has been for such purpose.

"(c) The granting of the benefits of subsection (b) of this section shall not relieve the petitioner from the requirement of physical presence within the United States for the period specified in subsection (a) of this section, except in the case of those persons who are employed by, or under contract with, the Government of the United States. In the case of a person employed by or under contract with Central Intelligence Agency, the requirement in subsection (b) of an uninterrupted period of at least one year of physical presence in the United States may be complied with by such person at any time prior to filing a petition for naturalization.

"(d) No finding by the Attorney General that the petitioner is not deportable shall be accepted as conclusive evidence of good moral character.

"(e) In determining whether the petitioner has sustained the burden of establishing good moral character and the other qualifications for citizenship specified in subsection (a) of this section, the court shall not be limited to the petitioner's conduct during the five years preceding the filing of the petition, but may take into consideration as a basis for such determination the petitioner's conduct and acts at any time prior while registration proceedings or proceedings to require registration against an organization of which the petitioner is a member or affiliate are pending under section 13 or 14 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950.

"Temporary absence of persons performing religious duties

"SEC. 317. Any person who is authorized to perform the ministerial or priestly functions of a religious denomination having a bona fide organization within the United States, or any person who is engaged solely by a religious denomination or by an interdenominational mission organization having a bona fide organization within the United States as a missionary, brother, nun, or sister, who (1) has been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, (2) has at any time thereafter and before filing a petition for naturalization been physically present and residing within the United States for an uninterrupted period of at least one year, and (3) has heretofore been or may hereafter be absent temporarily from the United States in connection with or for the purpose of performing the ministerial or priestly functions of such religious denomination, or serving as a missionary, brother, nun, or sister, shall be considered as being physically present and residing in the United States, for the purpose of naturalization within the meaning of section 316 (a), notwithstanding any such absence from the United States, if he shall in all other respects comply with the requirements of the naturalization law. Such person shall prove to the satisfaction of the Attorney General and the naturalization court that his absence from the United States has been solely for

the purpose of performing the ministerial or priestly functions of such religious denomination, or of serving as a missionary, brother, nun, or sister.

"(f) Naturalization shall not be granted to a petitioner by a naturalization court to that period.

"Prerequisite to naturalization; burden of proof

"SEC. 318. Except as otherwise provided in this title, no person shall be naturalized unless he has been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence in accordance with all applicable provisions of this Act. The burden of proof shall be upon such person to show that he entered the United States lawfully, and the time, place, and manner of such entry into the United States, but in presenting such proof he shall be entitled to the production of his immigrant visa, if any, or of other entry document, if any, and of any other documents and records, not considered by the Attorney General to be confidential, pertaining to such entry, in the custody of the Service. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 405 (b), and except as provided in sections 327 and 328 no person shall be naturalized against whom there is outstanding a final finding of deportability pursuant to a warrant of arrest issued under the provisions of this or any other Act; and no petition for naturalization shall be finally heard by a naturalization court if there is pending against the petitioner a deportation proceeding pursuant to a warrant of arrest issued under the provisions of this or any other Act: *Provided*, That the findings of the Attorney General in terminating deportation proceedings or in suspending the deportation of an alien pursuant to the provisions of this Act, shall not be deemed binding in any way upon the naturalization court with respect to the question of whether such person has established his eligibility for naturalization as required by this title.

"Married persons

"SEC. 319. (a) Any person whose spouse is a citizen of the United States may be naturalized upon compliance with all the requirements of this title except the provisions of paragraph (1) of section 316 (a) if such person immediately preceding the date of filing his petition for naturalization has resided continuously, after being lawfully admitted for permanent residence, within the United States for at least three years, and during the three years immediately preceding the date of filing his petition has been living in marital union with the citizen spouse, who has been a United States citizen during all of such period, and has been physically present in the United States for periods totaling at least half of that time and has resided within the State in which he filed his petition for at least six months.

"(b) Any person, (1) whose spouse is (A) a citizen of the United States, (B) in the employment of the Government of the United States, or of an American institution of research recognized as such by the Attorney General, or of an American firm or corporation engaged in whole or in part in the development of foreign trade and commerce of the United States, or a subsidiary thereof, or of a public international organization in which the United States participates by treaty or statute, and (C) regularly stationed abroad in such employment, and (2) who is in the United States at the time of naturalization, and (3) who declares before the naturalization court in good faith an intention to take up residence within the United States immediately upon the termination of such employment abroad of the citizen spouse, may be naturalized upon compliance with all the requirements of the naturalization laws, except that no prior residence or specified period of physical presence within the United States or within the jurisdiction of the naturalization court or proof thereof shall be required.

"Child born outside of United States of one alien and one citizen parent at time of birth; conditions under which citizenship automatically acquired

"SEC. 320. (a) A child born outside of the United States, one of whose parents at the time of the child's birth was an alien and the other of whose parents then was and never thereafter ceased to be a citizen of the United States, shall, if such alien parent is naturalized, become a citizen of the United States, when—

"(1) such naturalization takes place while such child is under the age of sixteen years; and

"(2) such child is residing in the United States pursuant to a lawful admission for permanent residence at the time of naturalization or thereafter and begins to reside permanently in the United States while under the age of sixteen years.

"(b) Subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to an adopted child.

"Child born outside of United States of alien parents; conditions under which citizenship automatically acquired

"SEC. 321. (a) A child born outside of the United States of alien parents, or of an alien parent and a citizen parent who has subsequently lost citizenship of the United States, becomes a citizen of the United States upon fulfillment of the following conditions:

"(1) The naturalization of both parents; or

"(2) The naturalization of the surviving parent if one of the parents is deceased; or

"(3) The naturalization of the parent having legal custody of the child when there has been a legal separation of the parents or the naturalization of the mother if the child was born out of wedlock and the paternity of the child has not been established by legitimation; and if

"(4) Such naturalization takes place while such child is under the age of sixteen years; and

"(5) Such child is residing in the United States pursuant to a lawful admission for permanent residence at the time of the naturalization of the parent last naturalized under clause (1) of this subsection, or the parent naturalized under clause (2) or (3) of this subsection, or thereafter begins to reside permanently in the United States while under the age of sixteen years.

"(b) Subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to an adopted child.

"Child born outside of United States; naturalization on petition of citizen parent; requirements and exemptions

"SEC. 322. (a) A child born outside of the United States, one or both of whose parents is at the time of petitioning for the naturalization of the child, a citizen of the United States, either by birth or naturalization, may be naturalized if under the age of eighteen years and not otherwise disqualified from becoming a citizen by reason of sections 313, 314, 315, or 318 of this Act, and if residing permanently in the United States with the citizen parent, pursuant to a lawful admission for permanent residence, on the petition of such citizen parent, upon compliance with all the provisions of this title, except that no particular period of residence or physical presence in the United States shall be required. If the child is of tender years he may be presumed to be of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States.

"(b) Subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to an adopted child.

"Children adopted by United States citizens

"SEC. 323. (a) An adopted child may, if not otherwise disqualified from becoming a citizen by reason of sections 313, 314, 315, or 318 of this Act, be naturalized before reaching the age of eighteen years upon the petition of the adoptive parent or parents, upon compliance with all the provisions of this title, if the adoptive parent or parents are citizens of the United States, and the child—

"(1) was lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence;

"(2) was adopted before attaining the age of sixteen years; and

"(3) subsequent to such adoption has resided continuously in the United States in legal custody of the adoptive parent or parents for two years prior to the date of filing such petition.

"(b) In lieu of the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 (a) of this Act such child shall be required to establish only two years' residence and one year's physical presence in the United States during the two-year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition. If the child is of tender years he may be presumed to be of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States.

"Former citizens of United States regaining United States citizenship

"SEC. 324. (a) Any person formerly a citizen of the United States who (1) prior to September 22, 1922, lost United States citizenship by marriage to an alien, or by the loss of United States citizenship of such person's spouse, or (2) on or after September 22, 1922, lost United States citizenship by marriage to an alien ineligible to citizenship, may if no other nationality was acquired by an affirmative act of such person other than by marriage be naturalized upon compliance with all requirements of this title, except—

"(1) no period of residence or specified period of physical presence within the United States or within the State where the petition is filed shall be required;

"(2) the petition need not set forth that it is the intention of the petitioner to reside permanently within the United States;

"(3) the petition may be filed in any court having naturalization jurisdiction, regardless of the residence of the petitioner;

"(4) the petition may be heard at any time after filing if there is attached to the petition at the time of filing a certificate from a naturalization examiner stating that the petitioner and the witnesses have appeared before such examiner for examination.

"Such person, or any person who was naturalized in accordance with the provisions of section 317 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940, shall have, from and after her naturalization, the status of a native-born or naturalized citizen of the United States, whichever status existed in the case of such person prior to the loss of citizenship: *Provided*, That nothing contained herein or in any other provision of law shall be construed as conferring United States citizenship retroactively upon such person, or upon any person who was naturalized in accordance with the provisions of section 317 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940, during any period in which such person was not a citizen.

"(b) No person who is otherwise eligible for naturalization in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall be naturalized unless such person shall establish to the satisfaction of the naturalization court that she has been a person of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States for a period of not less than five years immediately

preceding the date of filing a petition for naturalization and up to the time of admission to citizenship, and, unless she has resided continuously in the United States since the date of her marriage, has been lawfully admitted for permanent residence prior to filing her petition for naturalization.

"(c) (1) A woman who was a citizen of the United States at birth and (A) who has or is believed to have lost her United States citizenship solely by reason of her marriage prior to September 22, 1922, to an alien, or by her marriage on or after such date to an alien ineligible to citizenship, (B) whose marriage to such alien shall have terminated subsequent to January 12, 1941, and (C) who has not acquired by an affirmative act other than by marriage any other nationality, shall, from and after taking the oath of allegiance required by section 337 of this title, be a citizen of the United States and have the status of a citizen of the United States by birth, without filing a petition for naturalization, and notwithstanding any of the other provisions of this title except the provisions of section 313: *Provided*, That nothing contained herein or in any other provision of law shall be construed as conferring United States citizenship retroactively upon such person, or upon any person who was naturalized in accordance with the provisions of section 317 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940, during any period in which such person was not a citizen.

"(2) Such oath of allegiance may be taken abroad before a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States, or in the United States before the judge or clerk of a naturalization court.

"(3) Such oath of allegiance shall be entered in the records of the appropriate embassy, legation, consulate, or naturalization court, and, upon demand, a certified copy of the proceedings, including a copy of the oath administered, under the seal of the embassy, legation, consulate, or naturalization court, shall be delivered to such woman at a cost not exceeding $5, which certified copy shall be evidence of the facts stated therein before any court of record or judicial tribunal and in any department or agency of the Government of the United States.

"Nationals but not citizens of the United States; residence within outlying possessions

"SEC. 325. A person not a citizen who owes permanent allegiance to the United States, and who is otherwise qualified, may, if he becomes a resident of any State, be naturalized upon compliance with the applicable requirements of this title, except that in petitions for naturalization filed under the provisions of this section residence and physical presence within the United States within the meaning of this title shall include residence and physical presence within any of the outlying possessions of the United States.

"Resident Philippine citizens excepted from certain requirements

"SEC. 326. Any person who (1) was a citizen of the Commonwealth of the Philippines on July 2, 1946, (2) entered the United States prior to May 1, 1934, and (3) has, since such entry, resided continuously in the United States shall be regarded as having been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence for the purpose of petitioning for naturalization under this title.

"Former United States citizens losing citizenship by entering the armed forces of foreign countries during World War II

"SEC. 327. (a) Any person who, (1) during World War II and while a citizen of the United States, served in the military, air, or naval forces of any country at war with a country with which the United States was at war after December 7, 1941, and before September 2, 1945, and (2) has lost United States citizenship by reason of entering or serving in such forces, or taking an oath or obligation for the purpose of entering such forces, may, upon compliance with all the provisions of title III of this Act, except section 316 (a), and except as otherwise provided in subsection (b), be naturalized by taking before any naturalization court specified in section 310 (a) of this title the oath required by section 337 of this title. Certified copies of such oath shall be sent by such court to the Department of State and to the Department of Justice.

"(b) No person shall be naturalized under subsection (a) of this section unless he—

"(1) is, and has been for a period of at least five years immediately preceding taking the oath required in subsection (a), a person of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States; and

"(2) has been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence and intends to reside permanently in the United States.

"(c) Any person naturalized in accordance with the provisions of this section, or any person who was naturalized in accordance with the provisions of section 323 of the Nationality Act of 1940, shall have, from and after such naturalization, the status of a native-born, or naturalized, citizen of the United States, whichever status existed in the case of such person prior to the loss of citizenship: *Provided*, That nothing contained herein, or in any other provision of law, shall be construed as conferring United States citizenship retroactively upon any such person during any period in which such person was not a citizen.

"(d) For the purposes of this section, World War II shall be deemed to have begun on September 1, 1939, and to have terminated on September 2, 1945.

"(e) This section shall not apply to any person who during World War II served in the armed forces of a country while such country was at war with the United States.

"Naturalization through service in the Armed Forces of the United States

"SEC. 328. (a) A person who has served honorably at any time in the Armed Forces of the United States for a period or periods aggregating three years, and who, if separated from such service, was never separated except under honorable conditions, may be naturalized without having resided, continuously immediately preceding the date of filing such person's petition, in the United States for at least five years, and in the State in which the petition for naturalization is filed for at least six months, and without having been physically present in the United States for any specified period, if such petition is filed while the petitioner is still in the service or within six months after the termination of such service.

"(b) A person filing a petition under subsection (a) of this section shall comply in all other respects with the requirements of this title, except that—

"(1) no residence within the jurisdiction of the court shall be required;

"(2) notwithstanding section 336 (c), such petitioner may be naturalized immediately if the petitioner be then actually in the Armed Forces of the United States, and if prior to the filing of the petition, the petitioner and the witnesses shall have appeared before and been examined by a representative of the Service;

"(3) the petitioner shall furnish to the Attorney General, prior to the final hearing upon his petition, a certified statement from the proper executive department for each period of his service upon which he relies for the benefits of this section, clearly showing that such service was honorable and that no discharges from service, including periods of service not relied upon by him for the benefits of this section, were other than honorable. The certificate or certificates herein provided for shall be conclusive evidence of such service and discharge.

"(c) In the case such petitioner's service was not continuous, the petitioner's residence in the United States and State, good moral character, attachment to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and favorable disposition toward the good order and happiness of the United States, during any period within five years immediately preceding the date of filing such petition between the periods of petitioner's service in the Armed Forces, shall be alleged in the petition filed under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, and proved at the final hearing thereon. Such allegation and proof shall also be made as to any period between the termination of petitioner's service and the filing of the petition for naturalization.

"(d) The petitioner shall comply with the requirements of section 316 (a) of this title, if the termination of such service has been more than six months preceding the date of filing the petition for naturalization, except that such service within five years immediately preceding the date of filing such petition shall be considered as residence and physical presence within the United States.

"(e) Any such period or periods of service under honorable conditions, and good moral character, attachments to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and favorable disposition toward the good order and happiness of the United States, during such service, shall be proved by duly authenticated copies of the records of the executive departments having custody of the records of such service, and such authenticated copies of records shall be accepted in lieu of compliance with the provisions of section 316 (a).

"Nationalization through active-duty service in the Armed Forces during World War I or World War II

"SEC. 329. (a) Any person who, while an alien or a noncitizen national of the United States, has served honorably in an active-duty status in the military, air, or naval forces of the United States during either World War I or during a period beginning September 1, 1939, and ending December 31, 1946, and who, if separated from such service, was separated under honorable conditions, may be naturalized as provided in this section if (1) at the time of enlistment or induction such person shall have been in the United States, the Canal Zone, American Samoa, or Swains Island, whether or not he has been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, or (2) at any time subsequent to enlistment or induction such person shall have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence. The executive department under which such person served shall determine whether persons have served honorably in an active-duty status, and whether separation from such service was under honorable conditions: *Provided, however*, That no person who is or has been separated from such service on account of alienage, or who was a conscientious objector who performed no military, air, or naval duty whatever or refused to wear the uniform, shall be regarded as having served honorably or having been separated under honorable conditions for the purposes of this section. No period of service in the Armed Forces shall be made the basis of a petition for naturalization under this section if the applicant has previously been naturalized on the basis of the same period of service.

"(b) A person filing a petition under subsection (a) of this section shall comply in

all other respects with the requirements of this title, except that—

"(1) he may be naturalized regardless of age, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 331 of this title;

"(2) no period of residence or specified period of physical presence within the United States or any State shall be required;

"(3) the petition for naturalization may be filed in any court having naturalization jurisdiction regardless of the residence of the petitioner;

"(4) service in the military, air, or naval forces of the United States shall be proved by a duly authenticated certification from the executive department under which the petitioner served or is serving, which shall state whether the petitioner served honorably in an active-duty status during either World War I or during a period beginning September 1, 1939, and ending December 31, 1946, and was separated from such service under honorable conditions; and

"(5) notwithstanding section 336 (c) of this title, the petitioner may be naturalized immediately if prior to the filing of the petition the petitioner and the witnesses shall have appeared before and been examined by a representative of the Service.

"(c) Citizenship granted pursuant to this section may be revoked in accordance with section 340 of this title if at any time subsequent to naturalization the person is separated from the military, air, or naval forces under other than honorable conditions, and such ground for revocation shall be in addition to any other provided by law. The fact that the naturalized person was separated from the service under other than honorable conditions shall be proved by a duly authenticated certification from the executive department under which the person was serving at the time of separation.

"(d) The eligibility for naturalization of any person who filed a petition for naturalization prior to January 1, 1947, under section 701 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (56 Stat. 182, 58 Stat. 886, 59 Stat. 658; 8 U. S. C. 1001), and which is still pending on the effective date of this Act, shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"Constructive residence through service on certain United States vessels

"SEC. 330. (a) (1) Any periods of time during all of which a person who was previously lawfully admitted for permanent residence has served honorably or with good conduct, in any capacity other than as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, (A) on board a vessel operated by the United States, or an agency thereof, the full legal and equitable title to which is in the United States; or (B) on board a vessel whose home port is in the United States, and (i) which is registered under the laws of the United States, or (ii) the full legal and equitable title to which is in a citizen of the United States, or a corporation organized under the laws of any of the several States of the United States, shall be deemed residence and physical presence within the United States within the meaning of section 316 (a) of this title, if such service occurred within five years immediately preceding the date such person shall file a petition for naturalization. Service on vessels described in clause (A) of this subsection shall be proved by duly authenticated copies of the records of the executive departments or agency having custody of the records of such service. Service on vessels described in clause (B) of this subsection may be proved by certificates from the masters of such vessels.

"(2) For the purposes of this subsection, any periods of time prior to September 23, 1950, during all of which any person had served honorably or with good conduct for an aggregate period of five years on any vessel described in section 325 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940 prior to its amendment by the Act of September 23, 1950, shall be deemed residence and physical presence within the United States within the meaning of section 316 (a) of this title, if such petition is filed within one year from the effective date of this Act. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 318, a person entitled to claim the exemptions contained in this paragraph shall not be required to establish a lawful admission for permanent residence.

"(3) For the purposes of this subsection, any periods of time prior to September 23, 1950, during all of which any person not within the provisions of paragraph (2) had, prior to September 23, 1950, served honorably or with good conduct on any vessel described in section 325 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940 prior to its amendment by the Act of September 23, 1950, and was so serving on September 23, 1950, shall be deemed residence and physical presence within the United States within the meaning of section 316 (a) of this title, if such person at any time prior to filing his petition for naturalization shall have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, and if such petition is filed on or before September 23, 1955.

"(b) Any person who was excepted from certain requirements of the naturalization laws under section 325 of the Nationality Act of 1940 prior to its amendment by the Act of September 23, 1950, and had filed a petition for naturalization under section 325 of the Nationality Act of 1940, may, if such petition was pending on September 23, 1950, and is still pending on the effective date of this Act, be naturalized upon compliance with the applicable provisions of the naturalization laws in effect upon the date such petition was filed: *Provided*, That any such person shall be subject to the provisions of section 313 and to those provisions of section 318 which relate to the prohibition against the naturalization of a person against whom there is outstanding a final finding of deportability pursuant to a warrant of arrest issued under the provisions of this or any other Act, or which relate to the prohibition against the final hearing on a petition for naturalization if there is pending against the petitioner a deportation proceeding pursuant to a warrant of arrest issued under the provisions of this or any other Act.

"Alien enemies; naturalization under specified conditions and procedure

"SEC. 331. (a) An alien who is a native, citizen, subject, or denizen of any country, state or sovereignty with which the United States is at war may, after his loyalty has been fully established upon investigation by the Attorney General, be naturalized as a citizen of the United States if such alien's petition for naturalization shall be pending at the beginning of the state of war and the petitioner is otherwise entitled to admission to citizenship.

"(b) An alien embraced within this section shall not have his petition for naturalization called for a hearing, or heard, except after ninety days' notice given by the clerk of the court to the Attorney General to be represented at the hearing, and the Attorney General's objection to such final hearing shall cause the petition to be continued from time to time for so long as the Attorney General may require.

"(c) The Attorney General may, in his discretion, upon investigation fully establishing the loyalty of any alien enemy who did not have a petition for naturalization pending at the beginning of the state of war, except such alien enemy from the classification of alien enemy for the purposes of this title, and thereupon such alien shall have the privilege of filing a petition for naturalization.

"(d) An alien who is a native, citizen, subject, or denizen of any country, state, or sovereignty with which the United States is at war shall cease to be an alien enemy within the meaning of this section upon the determination by proclamation of the President, or by concurrent resolution of the Congress, that hostilities between the United States and such country, state, or sovereignty have ended. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 405 (b), this subsection shall also apply to the case of any such alien whose petition for naturalization was filed prior to the effective date of this Act and which is still pending on that date.

"(e) Nothing contained herein shall be taken or construed to interfere with or prevent the apprehension and removal, consistent with law, of any alien enemy at any time prior to the actual naturalization of such alien.

"Procedural and administrative provisions; executive functions

"SEC. 332. (a) The Attorney General shall make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this chapter and is authorized to prescribe the scope and nature of the examination of petitioners for naturalization as to their admissibility to citizenship for the purpose of making appropriate recommendations to the naturalization courts. Such examination, in the discretion of the Attorney General, and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by him, may be conducted before or after the applicant has filed his petition for naturalization. Such examination shall be limited to inquiry concerning the applicant's residence, physical presence in the United States, good moral character, understanding of and attachment to the fundamental principles of the Constitution of the United States, ability to read, write, and speak English, and other qualifications to become a naturalized citizen as required by law, and shall be uniform throughout the United States.

"(b) The Attorney General is authorized to promote instruction and training in citizenship responsibilities of applicants for naturalization including the sending of names of candidates for naturalization to the public schools, preparing and distributing citizenship textbooks to such candidates as are receiving instruction in preparation for citizenship within or under the supervision of the public schools, preparing and distributing monthly an immigration and naturalization bulletin and securing the aid of and cooperating with official State and national organizations, including those concerned with vocational education.

"(c) The Attorney General shall prescribe and furnish such forms as may be required to give effect to the provisions of this chapter, and only such forms as may be so provided shall be legal. All certificates of naturalization and of citizenship shall be printed on safety paper and shall be consecutively numbered in separate series.

"(d) Employees of the Service may be designated by the Attorney General to administer oaths and to take depositions without charge in matters relating to the administration of the naturalization and citizenship laws. In cases where there is a likelihood of unusual delay or of hardship, the Attorney General may, in his discretion, authorize such depositions to be taken before a postmaster without charge, or before a notary public or other person authorized to administer oaths for general purposes.

"(e) A certificate of naturalization or of citizenship issued by the Attorney General under the authority of this title shall have the same effect in all courts, tribunals, and public offices of the United States, at home and abroad, of the District of Columbia, and of each State, Territory, and outlying possession of the United States, as a certificate

of naturalization or of citizenship issued by a court having naturalization jurisdiction.

"(f) Certifications and certified copies of all papers, documents, certificates, and records required or authorized to be issued, used, filed, recorded, or kept under any and all provisions of this Act shall be admitted in evidence equally with the originals in any and all cases and proceedings under this Act and in all cases and proceedings in which the originals thereof might be admissible as evidence.

"(g) The officers in charge of property owned or leased by the Government are authorized, upon the recommendation of the Attorney General, to provide quarters, without payment of rent, in any building occupied by the Service, for a photographic studio, operated by welfare organizations without profit and solely for the benefit of persons seeking to comply with requirements under the immigration and nationality laws. Such studio shall be under the supervision of the Attorney General.

"Photographs

"SEC. 333. (a) Three identical photographs of the applicant shall be signed by and furnished by each petitioner for naturalization or citizenship. One of such photographs shall be affixed by the clerk of the court to the original certificate of naturalization issued to the naturalized citizen and one to the duplicate certificate of naturalization required to be forwarded to the Service.

"(b) Three identical photographs of the applicant shall be furnished by each applicant for—

"(1) a record of lawful admission for permanent residence to be made under section 249 (a);

"(2) a certificate of derivative citizenship;

"(3) a certificate of naturalization or of citizenship;

"(4) a special certificate of naturalization;

"(5) a certificate of naturalization or of citizenship, in lieu of one lost, mutilated, or destroyed;

"(6) a new certificate of citizenship in the new name of any naturalized citizen who, subsequent to naturalization, has had his name changed by order of a court of competent jurisdiction or by marriage; and

"(7) a declaration of intention.

"One such photograph shall be affixed to each such certificate issued by the Attorney General and one shall be affixed to the copy of such certificate retained by the Service.

"Petition for naturalization; declaration of intention

"SEC. 334. (a) An applicant for naturalization shall make and file in the office of the clerk of a naturalization court, in duplicate, a sworn petition in writing, signed by the applicant in the applicant's own handwriting if physically able to write, and duly verified by two witnesses, which petition shall be on a form prescribed by the Attorney General and shall include averments of all facts which in the opinion of the Attorney General may be material to the applicant's naturalization, and required to be proved upon the hearing of such petition.

"(b) No person shall file a valid petition for naturalization unless (1) he shall have attained the age of eighteen years and (2) he shall have first filed an application therefor at an office of the Service in the form and manner prescribed by the Attorney General. An application for petition for naturalization by an alien shall contain an averment of lawful admission for permanent residence.

"(c) Petitions for naturalization may be made and filed during the term time or vacation of the naturalization court, and shall be docketed the same day as filed, but final action thereon shall be had only on stated days, to be fixed by rule of the court.

"(d) If the applicant for naturalization is prevented by sickness or other disability from presenting himself in the office of the clerk to make the petition required by subsection (a), such applicant may make such petition at such other place as may be designated by the clerk of court or by such clerk's authorized deputy.

"(e) Before a petition for naturalization may be made outside of the office of the clerk of the court, pursuant to subsection (d) above, or before a final hearing on a petition may be held or the oath of allegiance administered outside of open court, pursuant to sections 336 (a) and 337 (c) respectively of this title, the court must satisfy itself that the illness or other disability is sufficiently serious to prevent appearance in the office of the clerk of court and is of a permanent nature, or of a nature which so incapacitates the person as to prevent him from personally appearing in the office of the clerk of court or in court as otherwise required by law.

"(f) Any alien over eighteen years of age who is residing in the United States pursuant to a lawful admission for permanent residence may, upon an application prescribed, filed with, and approved by the Service, make and file in duplicate in the office of the clerk of court, regardless of the alien's place of residence in the United States, a signed declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States, in such form as the Attorney General shall prescribe. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as requiring any such alien to make and file a declaration of intention as a condition precedent to filing a petition for naturalization nor shall any such declaration of intention be regarded as conferring or having conferred upon any such alien United States citizenship or nationality or the right to United States citizenship or nationality, nor shall such declaration be regarded as evidence of such alien's lawful admission for permanent residence in any proceeding, action, or matter arising under this or any other Act.

"Investigation of petitioners; preliminary examinations on petitions

"SEC. 335. (a) At any time prior to the holding of the final hearing on a petition for naturalization provided for by section 336 (a), an employee of the Service, or of the United States designated by the Attorney General, shall conduct a personal investigation of the person petitioning for naturalization in the vicinity or vicinities in which such person has maintained his actual place of abode and in the vicinity or vicinities in which such person has been employed or has engaged in business or work for at least five years immediately preceding the filing of his petition for naturalization. The Attorney General may, in his discretion, waive a personal investigation in an individual case or in such cases or classes of cases as may be designated by him.

"(b) The Attorney General shall dsignate employees of the Service to conduct preliminary examinations upon petitions for naturalization to any naturalization court and to make recommendations thereon to such court. For such purposes any such employee so designated is hereby authorized to take testimony concerning any matter touching or in any way affecting the admissibility of any petitioner for naturalization, to administer oaths, including the oath of the petitioner for naturalization and the oaths of petitioner's witnesses to the petition for naturalization, and to require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses, including petitioner, before such employee so designated and the production of relevant books, papers, and documents, and to that end may invoke the aid of any court exercising naturalization jurisdiction as specified in section 310 of this title; and any such court may, in the event of neglect or refusal to respond to a subpena issued by any such employee so designated or refusal to testify before such employee so designated issue an order requiring such person to appear before such employee so designated, produce relevant books, papers, and documents if demanded, and testify; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof. The record of the preliminary examination authorized by this subsection shall be admissible as evidence in any final hearing conducted by a naturalization court designated in section 310 of this title.

"(c) The record of the preliminary examination upon any petition for naturalization may, in the discretion of the Attorney General, be transmitted to the Attorney General and the recommendation with respect thereto of the employee designated to conduct such preliminary examination shall when made also be transmitted to the Attorney General.

"(d) The recommendation of the employee designated to conduct any such preliminary examination shall be submitted to the court at the hearing upon the petition and shall include a recommendation that the petition be granted, or denied, or continued, with reasons therefor. In any case in which the recommendation of the Attorney General does not agree with that of the employee designated to conduct such preliminary examination, the recommendations of both such employee and the Attorney General shall be submitted to the court at the hearing upon the petition, and the officer of the Service in attendance at such hearing shall, at the request of the court, present both the views of such employee and those of the Attorney General with respect to such petition to the court. The recommendations of such employee and of the Attorney General shall be accompanied by duplicate lists containing the names of the petitioners, classified according to the character of the recommendations, and signed by such employee or the Attorney General, as the case may be. The judge to whom such recommendations are submitted shall, if he approve such recommendations, enter a written order with such exceptions as the judge may deem proper, by subscribing his name to each such list when corrected to conform to his conclusions upon such recommendations. One of each such lists shall thereafter be filed permanently of record in such court and the duplicate of each such list shall be sent by the clerk of such court to the Attorney General.

"(e) After the petition for naturalization has been filed in the office of the clerk of court, the petitioner shall not be permitted to withdraw his petition, except with the consent of the Attorney General. In cases where the Attorney General does not consent to withdrawal of the petition, the court shall determine the petition on its merits and enter a final order accordingly. In cases where the petitioner fails to prosecute his petition, the petition shall be decided upon its merits unless the Attorney General moves that the petition be dismissed for lack of prosecution.

"(f) As to each period and place of residence in the State in which the petitioner resides at the time of filing the petition, during the entire period of at least six months and immediately preceding the date of filing the petition, there shall be included in the petition for naturalization the affidavits of at least two credible witnesses, citizens of the United States, stating that each has personally known the petitioner to have been a resident at such place for such period, and that the petitioner is and during all such periods has been a person of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States.

"(g) At the hearing on the petition, residence in the State in which the petitioner

resides at the time of filing the petition, for at least six months immediately preceding the date of filing the petition, and the other qualifications required by subsection (a) of section 316 during such residence shall be proved by the oral testimony of at least two credible witnesses, citizens of the United States, in addition to the affidavits required by subsection (f) of this section to be included in the petition. At the hearing, residence and physical presence within the United States during the five-year period required by section 316 (a), but outside the State, or within the State but prior to the six months immediately preceding the date of filing the petition, and the other qualifications required by subsection (a) of section 316 during such period at such places, shall be proved either by depositions taken in accordance with subsection (d) of section 332, or oral testimony, of at least two such witnesses for each place of residence.

"(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (f) and (g) of this section, the requirements of subsection (a) of section 316 as to the petitioner's residence, good moral character, attachment to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and disposition toward the good order and happiness of the United States may be established by any evidence satisfactory to the naturalization court in those cases under subsection (b) of section 316 in which the alien has been absent from the United States because of his employment by or contract with the Government of the United States or an American institution of research, recognized as such by the Attorney General, or employment by an American firm or corporation engaged in whole or in part in the development of foreign trade and commerce of the United States or a subsidiary thereof, or employment by a public international organization in which the United States participates.

"(i) (1) A petitioner for naturalization who removes from the jurisdiction of the court in which his petition for naturalization is pending may, at any time thereafter, make application to the court for transfer of the petition to a naturalization court exercising jurisdiction over the petitioner's place of residence, or to any other naturalization court if the petition was not required to be filed in a naturalization court exercising jurisdiction over the petitioner's place of residence: *Provided*, That such transfer shall not be made without the consent of the Attorney General, and of the court to which the petition is transferred.

"(2) Where transfer of the petition is authorized the clerk of court in which the petition was filed shall forward a certified copy of the petition and the original record in the case to the clerk of court to which the petition is transferred, and proceedings on the petition shall thereafter continue as though the petition had originally been filed in the court to which transferred, except that the court to which the petition is transferred may in its discretion, require the production of two credible United States citizen witnesses to testify as to the petitioner's qualifications for naturalization since the date of such transfer.

"Final hearing in open court upon petitions for naturalization; final order under the hand of the court entered upon record; examination of petitioner and witnesses before the court

"SEC. 336. (a) Every final hearing upon a petition for naturalization shall be had in open court before a judge or judges thereof, and every final order which may be made upon such petition shall be under the hand of the court and entered in full upon a record kept for that purpose, and upon such final hearing of such petition the petitioner and the witnesses, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, shall be examined under oath before the court and in the presence of the court. If the petitioner is prevented by sickness or other disability from being in open court for the final hearing upon a petition for naturalization, such final hearing may be had before a judge or judges of the court at such place as may be designated by the court.

"(b) The requirement of subsection (a) of this section for the examination of the petitioner and the witnesses under oath before the court and in the presence of the court shall not apply in any case where an employee designated under section 335 (b) has conducted the preliminary examination authorized by subsection (b) of section 335; except that the court may, in its discretion, and shall, upon demand of the petitioner, require the examination of the petitioner and the witnesses under oath before the court and in the presence of the court.

"(c) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this title, no final hearing shall be held on any petition for naturalization nor shall any person be naturalized nor shall any certificate of naturalization be issued by any court within a period of thirty days after the filing of the petition for naturalization. The Attorney General may waive such period in an individual case if he finds that the waiver will be in the public interest and will promote the security of the United States. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, but except as provided in sections 328 (b) (2) and 329 (b) (5), in any case in which the final hearing on any petition for naturalization is scheduled to be held within sixty days preceding the holding of a general election within the territorial jurisdiction of the naturalization court, such final hearing may be held, but the petitioner shall not be permitted to take the oath required in section 337 (a) of this title prior to the tenth day next following such general election. In any case in which the oath is not taken at the time of the final hearing, the petitioner shall not be a citizen of the United States until such oath has been taken.

"(d) The Attorney General shall have the right to appear before any court in any naturalization proceedings for the purpose of cross-examining the petitioner and the witnesses produced in support of the petition concerning any matter touching or in any way affecting the petitioner's right to admission to citizenship, and shall have the right to call witnesses, including the petitioner, produce evidence, and be heard in opposition to, or in favor of, the granting of any petition in naturalization proceedings.

"(e) The clerk of court shall, if the petitioner requests it at the time of filing of the petition for naturalization, issue a subpena for the witnesses named by such petitioner to appear upon the day set for the final hearing, but in case such witnesses cannot be produced upon the final hearing other witnesses may be summoned upon notice to the Attorney General, in such manner and at such time as the Attorney General may by regulation prescribe. If it should appear after the petition has been filed that any of the verifying witnesses thereto are not competent, and it further appears that the petitioner has acted in good faith in producing such witnesses found to be incompetent, other witnesses may be substituted in accordance with such regulations.

"(f) It shall be lawful at the time and as a part of the naturalization of any person, for the court, in its discretion, upon the bona fide prayer of the petitioner included in the petition for naturalization of such person, to make a decree changing the name of said person, and the certificate of naturalization shall be issued in accordance therewith.

"Oath of renunciation and allegiance

"SEC. 337. (a) A person who has petitioned for naturalization shall, in order to be and before being admitted to citizenship, take in open court an oath (1) to support the Constitution of the United States; (2) to renounce and abjure absolutely and entirely all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty of whom or which the petitioner was before a subject or citizen; (3) to support and defend the Constitution and the laws of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; (4) to bear true faith and allegiance to the same; and (5) (A) to bear arms on behalf of the United States when required by the law, or (B) to perform noncombatant service in the Armed Forces of the United States when required by the law, or (C) to perform work of national importance under civilian direction when required by the law. Any such person shall be required to take an oath containing the substance of clauses (1) through (5) of the preceding sentence, except that a person who shows by clear and convincing evidence to the satisfaction of the naturalization court that he is opposed to the bearing of arms in the Armed Forces of the United States by reason of religious training and belief shall be required to take an oath containing the substance of clauses (1) through (4) and clauses (5) (B) and (5) (C), and a person who shows by clear and convincing evidence to the satisfaction of the naturalization court that he is opposed to any type of service in the Armed Forces of the United States by reason of religious training and belief shall be required to take an oath containing the substance of clauses (1) through (4) and clause 5 (C). The term 'religious training and belief' as used in this section shall mean an individual's belief in a relation to a Supreme Being involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation, but does not include essentially political, sociological, or philosophical views or a merely personal moral code. In the case of the naturalization of a child under the provisions of section 322 or 323 of this title the naturalization court may waive the taking of the oath if in the opinion of the court the child is unable to understand its meaning.

"(b) In case the person petitioning for naturalization has borne any hereditary title, or has been of any of the orders of nobility in any foreign state, the petitioner shall in addition to complying with the requirements of subsection (a) of this section, make under oath in open court in the court in which the petition for naturalization is made, an express renunciation of such title or order of nobility, and such renunciation shall be recorded in the court as a part of such proceedings.

"(c) If the petitioner is prevented by sickness or other disability from being in open court, the oath required to be taken by subsection (a) of this section may be taken before a judge of the court at such place as may be designated by the court.

"Certificate of naturalization; contents

"SEC. 338. A person admitted to citizenship by a naturalization court in conformity with the provisions of this title shall be entitled upon such admission to receive from the clerk of such court a certificate of naturalization, which shall contain substantially the following information: Number of petition for naturalization; number of certificate of naturalization; date of naturalization; name, signature, place of residence, autographed photograph, and personal description of the naturalized person, including age, sex, marital status, and country of former nationality; title, venue, and location of the naturalization court; statement that the court, having found that the petitioner intends to reside permanently in the United States, except in cases falling within the provisions of section 324 (a) of this title, had complied in all respects with all of the applicable provisions of the naturalization laws of the United States, and was entitled to be admitted a citizen of the United States of America, thereupon ordered that the pe-

titioner be admitted as a citizen of the United States of America; attestation of the clerk of the naturalization court; and seal of the court.

"Functions and duties of clerks

"SEC. 339. (a) It shall be the duty of the clerk of each and every naturalization court to forward to the Attorney General a duplicate of such petition for naturalization within 30 days after the close of the month in which such petition was filed, and to forward to the Attorney General certified copies of such other proceedings and orders instituted in or issued out of said court affecting or relating to the naturalization of persons as may be recruited from time to time by the Attorney General.

"(b) It shall be the duty of the clerk of each and every naturalization court to issue to any person admitted by such court to citizenship a certificate of naturalization and to forward to the Attorney General within 30 days after the close of the month in which such certificate was issued, a duplicate thereof, and to make and keep on file in the clerk's office a stub for each certificate so issued, whereon shall be entered a memorandum of all the essential facts set forth in such certificate, and to forward a duplicate of each such stub to the Attorney General within 30 days after the close of the month in which such certificate was issued.

"(c) It shall be the duty of the clerk of each and every naturalization court to report to the Attorney General, within 30 days after the close of the month in which the final hearing and decision of the court was had, the name and number of the petition of each and every person who shall be denied naturalization together with the cause of such denial.

"(d) Clerks of courts shall be responsible for all blank certificates of naturalization received by them from time to time from the Attorney General, and shall account to the Attorney General for them whenever required to do so. No certificate of naturalization received by any clerk of court which may be defaced or injured in such manner as to prevent its use as herein provided shall in any case be destroyed, but such certificates shall be returned to the Attorney General.

"(e) It shall be the duty of the clerk of each and every naturalization court to cause to be filed in chronological order in separate volumes, indexed, consecutively numbered, and made a part of the records of such court, all declarations of intention and petitions for naturalization.

"Revocation of naturalization

"SEC. 340. (a) It shall be the duty of the United States district attorneys for the respective districts, upon affidavit showing good cause therefor, to institute proceedings in any court specified in subsection (a) of section 310 of this title in the judicial district in which the naturalized citizen may reside at the time of bringing suit, for the purpose of revoking and setting aside the order admitting such person to citizenship and canceling the certificate of naturalization on the ground that such order and certificate of naturalization were procured by concealment of a material fact or by willful misrepresentation, and such revocation and setting aside of the order admitting such person to citizenship and such canceling of certificate of naturalization shall be effective as of the original date of the order and certificate, respectively: *Provided*, That refusal on the part of a naturalized citizen within a period of ten years following his naturalization to testify as a witness in any proceeding before a congressional committee concerning his subversive activities, in a case where such person has been convicted of contempt for such refusal, shall be held to constitute a ground for revocation of such person's naturalization under this subsection as having been procured by concealment of a material fact or by willful misrepresentation. If the naturalized citizen does not reside in any judicial district in the United States at the time of bringing such suit, the proceedings may be instituted in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia or in the United States district court in the judicial district in which such person last had his residence.

"(b) The party to whom was granted the naturalization alleged to have been procured by concealment of a material fact or by willful misrepresentation shall, in any such proceedings under subsection (a) of this section, have sixty days' personal notice unless waived by such party, in which to make answer to the petition of the United States; and if such naturalized person be absent from the United States or from the judicial district in which such person last had his residence, such notice shall be given either by personal service upon him or by publication in the manner provided for the service of summons by publication or upon absentees by the laws of the State or the place where such suit is brought.

"(c) If a person who shall have been naturalized after the effective date of this Act shall within five years next following such naturalization become a member of or affiliated with any organization, membership in or affiliation with which at the time of naturalization would have precluded such person from naturalization under the provisions of section 313, it shall be considered prima facie evidence that such person was not attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States and was not well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States at the time of naturalization, and in the absence of countervailing evidence it shall be sufficient in the proper proceeding to authorize the revocation and setting aside of the order admitting such person to citizenship and the cancellation of the certificate of naturalization as having been obtained by concealment of a material fact or by willful misrepresentation, and such revocation and setting aside of the order admitting such person to citizenship and such canceling of certificate or naturalization shall be effective as of the original date of the order and certificate, respectively.

"(d) If a person who shall have been naturalized shall, within five years after such naturalization, return to the country of his nativity, or go to any other foreign country, and take permanent residence therein, it shall be considered prima facie evidence of a lack of intention on the part of such person to reside permanently in the United States at the time of filing his petition for naturalization, and, in the absence of countervailing evidence, it shall be sufficient in the proper proceeding to authorize the revocation and setting aside of the order admitting such person to citizenship and the cancellation of the certificate of naturalization as having been obtained by concealment of a material fact or by willful misrepresentation, and such revocation and setting aside of the order admitting such person to citizenship and such canceling of certificate of naturalization shall be effective as of the original date of the order and certificate, respectively. The diplomatic and consular officers of the United States in foreign countries shall from time to time, through the Department of State, furnish the Department of Justice with statements of the names of those persons within their respective jurisdictions who have been so naturalized and who have taken permanent residence in the country of their nativity, or in any other foreign country, and such statements, duly certified, shall be admissible in evidence in all courts in proceedings to revoke and set aside the order admitting to citizenship and to cancel the certificate of naturalization.

"(e) The revocation and setting aside of the order admitting any person to citizenship and canceling his certificate of naturalization under the provisions of subsection (a) of section 338 of the Nationality Act of 1940 shall not, where such action takes place after the effective date of this Act, result in the loss of citizenship or any right or privilege of citizenship which would have been derived by or been available to a wife or minor child of the naturalized person had such naturalization not been revoked: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply in any case in which the revocation and setting aside of the order was the result of actual fraud.

"(f) Any person who claims United States citizenship through the naturalization of a parent or spouse in whose case there is a revocation and setting aside of the order admitting such parent or spouse to citizenship under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section on the ground that the order and certificate of naturalization were procured by concealment of a material fact or by willful misrepresentation shall be deemed to have lost and to lose his citizenship and any right or privilege of citizenship which he may have, now has, or may hereafter acquire under and by virtue of such naturalization of such parent or spouse, regardless of whether such person is residing within or without the United States at the time of the revocation and setting aside of the order admitting such parent or spouse to citizenship. Any person who claims United States citizenship through the naturalization of a parent or spouse in whose case there is a revocation and setting aside of the order admitting such parent or spouse to citizenship and the cancellation of the certificate of naturalization under the provisions of subsections (c) or (d) of this section, or under the provisions of section 329 (c) of this title on any ground other than that the order and certificate of naturalization were procured by concealment of a material fact or by willful misrepresentation, shall be deemed to have lost and to lose his citizenship and any right or privilege of citizenship which would have been enjoyed by such person had there not been a revocation and setting aside of the order admitting such parent or spouse to citizenship and the cancellation of the certificate of naturalization, unless such person is residing in the United States at the time of the revocation and setting aside of the order admitting such parent or spouse to citizenship and the cancellation of the certificate of naturalization.

"(g) When a person shall be convicted under section 1425 of title 18 of the United States Code of knowingly procuring naturalization in violation of law, the court in which such conviction is had shall thereupon revoke, set aside, and declare void the final order admitting such person to citizenship, and shall declare the certificate of naturalization of such person to be canceled. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred on the courts having jurisdiction of the trial of such offense to make such adjudication.

"(h) Whenever an order admitting an alien to citizenship shall be revoked and set aside or a certificate of naturalization shall be canceled, or both, as provided in this section, the court in which such judgment or decree is rendered shall make an order canceling such certificate and shall send a certified copy of such order to the Attorney General. In case such certificate was not originally issued by the court making such order, it shall direct the clerk of court in which the order is revoked and set aside to transmit a copy of such order and judgment to the court out of which such certificate of

naturalization shall have been originally issued. It shall thereupon be the duty of the clerk of the court receiving such certified copy of the order and judgment of the court to enter the same of record and to cancel such original certificate of naturalization, if there be any, upon the records and to notify the Attorney General of the entry of such order and of such cancellation. A person holding a certificate of naturalization or citizenship which has been canceled as provided by this section shall upon notice by the court by which the decree of cancellation was made, or by the Attorney General, surrender the same to the Attorney General.

"(i) The provisions of this section shall apply not only to any naturalization granted and to certificates of naturalization and citizenship issued under the provisions of this title, but to any naturalization heretofore granted by any court, and to all certificates of naturalization and citizenship which may have been issued heretofore by any court or by the Commissioner based upon naturalization granted by any court, or by a designated representative of the Commissioner under the provisions of section 702 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, or by such designated representative under any other act.

"(j) Nothing contained in this section shall be regarded as limiting, denying, or restricting the power of any naturalization court, by or in which a person has been naturalized, to correct, reopen, alter, modify, or vacate its judgment or decree naturalizing such person, during the term of such court or within the time prescribed by the rules of procedure or statutes governing the jurisdiction of the court to take such action.

"Certificates of citizenship; procedure

"SEC. 341. A person who claims to have derived United States citizenship through the naturalization of a parent or through the naturalization or citizenship of a husband, or who is a citizen of the United States by virtue of the provisions of section 1993 of the United States Revised Statutes, or of section 1993 of the United States Revised Statutes, as amended by section 1 of the Act of May 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 797), or who is a citizen of the United States by virtue of the provisions of subsection (c), (d), (e), (g), or (i) of section 201 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1139; 8 U. S. C. 603, 605), or 601), or of the Act of May 7, 1934 (48 Stat. 667), or of paragraph (3), (4), (5), or (7) of section 301 (a) of this title, or under the provisions of the Act of August 4, 1937 (50 Stat. 558), or under the provisions of section 203 or 205 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1139; U. S. C. 603, 605), or under the provisions of section 303 of this title, may apply to the Attorney General for a certificate of citizenship. Upon proof to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the applicant is a citizen, and that the applicant's alleged citizenship was derived as claimed, or acquired, as the case may be, and upon taking and subscribing before a member of the Service within the United States to the oath of allegiance required by this Act of a petitioner for naturalization, such individual shall be furnished by the Attorney General with a certificate of citizenship, but only if such individual is at the time within the United States.

"Cancellation of certificates issued by the Attorney General, the Commissioner or a Deputy Commissioner; action not to affect citizenship status

"SEC. 342. The Attorney General is authorized to cancel any certificate of citizenship, certificate of naturalization, copy of a declaration of intention, or other certificate, document or record heretofore issued or made by the Commissioner or a Deputy Commissioner or hereafter made by the Attorney General if it shall appear to the Attorney General's satisfaction that such document or record was illegally or fraudulently obtained from, or was created through illegality or by fraud practiced upon, him or the Commissioner or a Deputy Commissioner; but the person for or to whom such document or record has been issued or made shall be given at such person's last-known place of address written notice of the intention to cancel such document or record with the reasons therefor and shall be given at least sixty days in which to show cause why such document or record should not be canceled. The cancellation under this section of any document purporting to show the citizenship status of the person to whom it was issued shall affect only the document and not the citizenship status of the person in whose name the document was issued.

"Documents and copies issued by the Attorney General

"SEC. 343. (a) A person who claims to have been naturalized in the United States under section 323 of the Nationality Act of 1940 may make application to the Attorney General for a certificate of naturalization. Upon proof to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the applicant is a citizen and that he has been naturalized as claimed in the application, such individual shall be furnished a certificate of naturalization by the Attorney General, but only if the applicant is at the time within the United States.

"(b) If any certificate of naturalization or citizenship issued to any citizen or any declaration of intention furnished to any declarant is lost, mutilated, or destroyed, the citizen or declarant may make application to the Attorney General for a new certificate or declaration. If the Attorney General finds that the certificate or declaration is lost, mutilated, or destroyed, he shall issue to the applicant a new certificate or declaration. If the certificate or declaration has been mutilated, it shall be surrendered to the Attorney General before the applicant may receive such new certificate or declaration. If the certificate or declaration has been lost, the applicant or any other person who shall have, or may come into possession of it is hereby required to surrender it to the Attorney General.

"(c) The Attorney General shall issue for any naturalized citizen, on such citizen's application therefor, a special certificate of naturalization for use by such citizen only for the purpose of obtaining recognition as a citizen of the United States by a foreign state. Such certificate when issued shall be furnished to the Secretary of State for transmission to the proper authority in such foreign state.

"(d) If the name of any naturalized citizen has, subsequent to naturalization, been changed by order of any court of competent jurisdiction, or by marriage, the citizen may make application for a new certificate of naturalization in the new name of such citizen. If the Attorney General finds the name of the applicant to have been changed as claimed, the Attorney General shall issue to the applicant a new certificate and shall notify the naturalization court of such action.

"(e) The Attorney General is authorized to make and issue certifications of any part of the naturalization records of any court, or of any certificate of naturalization or citizenship, for use in complying with any statute, State or Federal, or in any judicial proceeding. No such certification shall be made by any clerk of court except upon order of the court.

"Fiscal provisions

"SEC. 344. (a) The clerk of court shall charge, collect, and account for the following fees:

"(1) For making, filing, and docketing a petition for naturalization, $10, including the final hearing on such petition, if such hearing be held, and a certificate of naturalization, if the issuance of such certificate is authorized by the naturalization court.

"(2) For receiving and filing a declaration of intention, and issuing a duplicate thereof, $5.

"(b) The Attorney General shall charge, collect, and account for the following fees:

"(1) For application for a certificate of naturalization or declaration of intention in lieu of a certificate or declaration alleged to have been lost, mutilated, or destroyed, $5.

"(2) For application for a certificate of citizenship, $5.

"(3) For application for the issuance of a special certificate of citizenship to obtain recognition, $5.

"(4) For application for a certificate of naturalization under section 323 of the Nationality Act of 1940, or under section 343 (a) of this title, $5.

"(5) For application for a certificate of citizenship in changed name, $5.

"(6) Reasonable fees in cases where such fees have not been established by law, to cover the cost of furnishing copies, whether certified or uncertified, of any part of the records, or information from the records, of the Service. Such fees shall not exceed a maximum of 25 cents per folio of one hundred words, with a minimum fee of 50 cents for any one such service, in addition to a fee of $1 for any official certification furnished under seal. No such fee shall be required from officers or agencies of the United States or of any State or any subdivision thereof, for such copies or information furnished for official use in connection with the official duties of such officers or agencies.

"(7) Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this subsection, no fee shall be charged or collected for an application for declaration of intention or a certificate of naturalization in lieu of a declaration or a certificate alleged to have been lost, mutilated, or destroyed, submitted by a person who was a member of the military or naval forces of the United States at any time after April 20, 1898, and before July 5, 1902; or at any time after April 5, 1917, and before November 12, 1918; or who served on the Mexican border as a member of the Regular Army or National Guard between June 1916 and April 1917; or who has served or hereafter serves in the military, air, or naval forces of the United States after September 16, 1940, and who was not at any time during such period or thereafter separated from such forces under other than honorable conditions, who was not a conscientious objector who performed no military duty whatever or refused to wear the uniform, or who was not at any time during such period or thereafter discharged from such military, air, or naval forces on account of alienage.

"(c) The clerk of any naturalization court specified in subsection (a) of section 310 (except the courts specified in subsection (d) of this section) shall account for and pay over to the Attorney General one-half of all fees up to the sum of $6,000, and all fees in excess of $6,000, collected by any such clerk in naturalization proceedings in any fiscal year.

"(d) The clerk of any United States district court (except in Alaska and in the District Court of the Virgin Islands of the United States and in the District Court of Guam) shall account for and pay over to the Attorney General all fees collected by any such clerk in naturalization proceedings: *Provided, however,* That the clerk of the District Court of the Virgin Islands of the United States and of the District Court of Guam shall report but shall not be required to pay over to the Attorney General the fees collected by any such clerk in naturalization proceedings.

"(e) The accounting required by subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall be

made and the fees paid over to the Attorney General by such respective clerks in their quarterly accounts which they are hereby required to render to the Attorney General within thirty days from the close of each quarter of each and every fiscal year, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Attorney General.

"(f) The clerks of the various naturalization courts shall pay all additional clerical force that may be required in performing the duties imposed by this title upon clerks of courts from fees retained under the provisions of this section by such clerks in naturalization proceedings.

"(g) All fees collected by the Attorney General and all fees paid over to the Attorney General by clerks of courts under the provisions of this title shall be deposited by the Attorney General in the Treasury of the United States: *Provided, however,* That all fees received from applicants residing in the Virgin Islands of the United States, and in Guam, required to be paid under subsection (b) of this section, shall be paid over to the treasury of the Virgin Islands and to the treasury of Guam, respectively.

"(h) During the time when the United States is at war no clerk of a United States court shall charge or collect a naturalization fee from an alien in the military, air, or naval service of the United States for filing a petition for naturalization or issuing a certificate of naturalization upon admission to citizenship, and no clerk of any State court shall charge or collect any fee for such services unless the laws of the State require such charge to be made, in which case nothing more than the portion of the fee required to be paid to the State shall be charged or collected. A report of all transactions under this subsection shall be made to the Attorney General as in the case of other reports required of clerks of courts by this title.

"(i) In addition to the other fees required by this title, the petitioner for naturalization shall, upon the filing of a petition for naturalization, deposit with and pay to the clerk of court a sum of money sufficient to cover the expenses of subpenaing and paying the legal fees of any witnesses for whom such petitioner may request a subpena, and upon the final discharge of such witnesses, they shall receive, if they demand the same from the clerk, the customary and usual witness fees from the moneys which the petitioner shall have paid to such clerk for such purpose, and the residue, if any, shall be returned by the clerk to the petitioner.

"Mail relating to naturalization transmitted free of postage and registered

"SEC. 345. All mail matter of whatever class, relating to naturalization, including duplicate papers required by law or regulation to be sent to the Service by clerks of courts addressed to the Department of Justice or the Service, or any official thereof, and endorsed 'Official Business', shall be transmitted free of postage and, if necessary, by registered mail without fee, and so marked.

"Authorization granted for publication and distribution of citizenship textbooks from naturalization fees

"SEC. 346. Authorization is hereby granted for the publication and distribution of the citizenship textbook described in subsection (b) of section 332 and for the reimbursement of the appropriation of the Department of Justice upon the records of the Treasury Department from the naturalization fees deposited in the Treasury through the Service for the cost of such publication and distribution, such reimbursement to be made upon statements by the Attorney General of books so published and distributed.

"Compilation of naturalization statistics and payment for equipment

"SEC. 347. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to prepare from the records in the custody of the Service a report upon those heretofore seeking citizenship to show by nationalities their relation to the numbers of aliens annually arriving and to the prevailing census populations of the foreign-born, their economic, vocational, and other classification, in statistical form, with analytical comment thereon, and to prepare such report annually hereafter. Payment for the equipment used in preparing such compilation shall be made from the appropriation for the enforcement of this Act by the Service.

"Admissibility in evidence of testimony as to statements voluntarily made to officers or employees in the course of their official duties

"SEC. 348. (a) It shall be lawful and admissible as evidence in any proceedings founded under this title, or any of the penal or criminal provisions of any law relating to immigration, naturalization, or citizenship, for any officer or employee of the United States to render testimony as to any statement voluntarily made to such officer or employee in the course of the performance of the official duties of such officer or employee by any defendant at the time or subsequent to the alleged commission of any crime or offense which may tend to show that such defendant did not have or could not have had knowledge of any matter concerning which such defendant is shown to have made affidavit, or oath, or to have been a witness pursuant to such law or laws.

"(b) In case any clerk of court shall refuse or neglect to comply with any of the provisions of section 339 (a), (b), or (c), such clerk of court shall forfeit and pay to the United States the sum of $25 in each and every case in which such violation or ommission occurs and the amount of such forfeiture may be recovered by the United States in a civil action against such clerk.

"(c) If any clerk of court shall fail to return to the Service or properly account for any certificate of naturalization furnished by the Service as provided in subsection (d) of section 339, such clerk of court shall be liable to the United States in the sum of $50, to be recovered in a civil action, for each and every such certificate not properly accounted for or returned.

"CHAPTER 3—LOSS OF NATIONALITY

"Loss of nationality by native-born or naturalized citizen

"SEC. 349. (a) From and after the effective date of this Act a person who is a national of the United States whether by birth or naturalization, shall lose his nationality by—

"(1) obtaining naturalization in a foreign state upon his own application, upon an application filed in his behalf by a parent, guardian, or duly authorized agent, or through the naturalization of a parent having legal custody of such persons: *Provided,* That nationality shall not be lost by any person under this section as the result of the naturalization of a parent or parents while such person is under the age of twenty-one years, or as the result of a naturalization obtained on behalf of a person under twenty-one years of age by a parent, guardian, or duly authorized agent, unless such person shall fail to enter the United States to establish a permanent residence prior to his twenty-fifth birthday: *And provided further,* That a person who shall have lost nationality prior to January 1, 1948, through the naturalization in a foreign state of a parent or parents, may, within one year from the effective date of this Act, apply for a visa and for admission to the United States as a nonquota immigrant under the provisions of section 101 (a) (27) (E); or

"(2) taking an oath or making an affirmation or other formal declaration of allegiance to a foreign state or a political subdivision thereof; or

"(3) entering, or serving in, the armed forces of a foreign state unless, prior to such entry or service, such entry or service is specifically authorized in writing by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense: *Provided,* That the entry into such service by a person prior to the attainment of his eighteenth birthday shall serve to expatriate such person only if there exists an option to secure a release from such service and such person fails to exercise such option at the attainment of his eighteenth birthday; or

"(4) (A) accepting, serving in, or performing the duties of any office, post, or employment under the government of a foreign state or a political subdivision thereof, if he has or acquires the nationality of such foreign state; or (B) accepting, serving in, or performing the duties of any office, post, or employment under the government of a foreign state or a political subdivision thereof, for which office, post, or employment an oath, affirmation, or declaration of allegiance is required; or

"(5) voting in a political election in a foreign state or participating in an election or plebiscite to determine the sovereignty over foreign territory; or

"(6) making a formal renunciation of nationality before a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States in a foreign state, in such form as may be prescribed by the Secretary of State; or

"(7) making in the United States a formal written renunciation of nationality in such form as may be prescribed by, and before such officer as may be designated by, the Attorney General, whenever the United States shall be in a state of war and the Attorney General shall approve such renunciation as not contrary to the interests of national defense; or

"(8) deserting the military, air, or naval forces of the United States in time of war, if and when he is convicted thereof by court martial and as the result of such conviction is dismissed or dishonorably discharged from the service of such military, air, or naval forces: *Provided,* That, notwithstanding loss of nationality or citizenship under the terms of this or previous laws by reason of desertion committed in time of war, restoration to active duty with such military, air, or naval forces in time of war or the reenlistment or induction of such a person in time of war with permission of competent military, air, or naval authority shall be deemed to have the immediate effect of restoring such nationality or citizenship heretofore or hereafter so lost; or

"(9) committing any act of treason against, or attempting by force to overthrow, or bearing arms against, the United States, if and when he is convicted thereof by a court martial or by a court of competent jurisdiction; or

"(10) departing from or remaining outside of the jurisdiction of the United States in time of war or during a period declared by the President to be a period of national emergency for the purpose of evading or avoiding training and service in the military, air, or naval forces of the United States. For the purposes of this paragraph failure to comply with any provision of any compulsory service laws of the United States shall raise the presumption that the departure from or absence from the United States was for the purpose of evading or avoiding training and service in the military, air, or naval forces of the United States.

"(b) Any person who commits or performs any act specified in subsection (a) shall be conclusively presumed to have done so voluntarily and without having been subjected to duress of any kind, if such person at the time of the act was a national of the state in which the act was performed and had been physically present in such state for a period or periods totaling ten years or more immediately prior to such act.

"Dual nationals; divestiture of nationality

"SEC. 350. A person who acquired at birth the nationality of the United States and of a foreign state and who has voluntarily sought or claimed benefits of the nationality of any foreign state shall lose his United States nationality by hereafter having a continuous residence for three years in the foreign state of which he is a national by birth at any time after attaining the age of twenty-two years unless he shall—

"(1) prior to the expiration of such three-year period, take an oath of allegiance to the United States before a United States diplomatic or consular officer in a manner prescribed by the Secretary of State; and

"(2) have his residence outside of the United States solely for one of the reasons set forth in paragraph (1), (2), (4), (5), (6), (7), or (8) of section 353, or paragraph (1) or (2) of section 354 of this title: *Provided, however,* That nothing contained in this section shall deprive any person of his United States nationality if his foreign residence shall begin after he shall have attained the age of sixty years and shall have had his residence in the United States for twenty-five years after having attained the age of eighteen years.

"Restrictions on expatriation

"SEC. 351. (a) Except as provided in paragraphs (7), (8), and (9) of section 349 of this title, no national of the United States can expatriate himself, or be expatriated, under this Act while within the United States or any of its outlying possessions, but expatriation shall result from the performance within the United States or any of its outlying possessions of any of the acts or the fulfillment of any of the conditions specified in this chapter if and when the national thereafter takes up a residence outside the United States and its outlying possessions.

"(b) A national who within six months after attaining the age of eighteen years asserts his claim to United States nationality, in such manner as the Secretary of State shall by regulation prescribe, shall not be deemed to have expatriated himself by the commission, prior to his eighteenth birthday, of any of the acts specified in paragraphs (2), (4), (5), and (6) of section 349 (a) of this title.

"Loss of nationality by naturalized national

"SEC. 352. (a) A person who has become a national by naturalization shall lose his nationality by—

"(1) having a continuous residence for three years in the territory of a foreign state of which he was formerly a national or in which the place of his birth is situated, except as provided in section 353 of this title, whether such residence commenced before or after the effective date of this Act;

"(2) having a continuous residence for five years in any other foreign state or states except as provided in sections 353 and 354 of this title, whether such residence commenced before or after the effective date of this Act.

"(b) (1) For the purpose of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section, the time during which the person had his residence abroad solely or principally for a reason or purpose within the scope of any provision of section 353 shall not be counted in computing quantum of residence.

"(2) For the purpose of paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section, the time during which the person had his residence abroad solely or principally for a reason or purpose within the scope of any provision of sections 353 and 354 shall not be counted in computing quantum of residence.

"Section 352 not effective as to certain persons

"SEC. 353. Section 352 (a) shall have no application to a national who—

"(1) has his residence abroad in the employment of the Government of the United States; or

"(2) is receiving compensation from the Government of the United States and has his residence abroad on account of disability incurred in its service; or

"(3) shall have had his residence in the United States for not less than twenty-five years subsequent to his naturalization and shall have attained the age of sixty years when the foreign residence is established; or

"(4) had his residence abroad on October 14, 1940, and temporarily has his residence abroad, or who thereafter has gone or goes abroad and temporarily has his residence abroad, solely or principally to represent a bona fide American educational, scientific, philanthropic, commercial, financial, or business organization, having its principal office or place of business in the United States, or a bona fide religious organization having an office and representative in the United States, or an international agency of an official character in which the United States participates, for which he receives a substantial compensation; or

"(5) has his residence abroad and is prevented from returning to the United States exclusively (A) by his own ill health; or (B) by the ill health of his parent, spouse, or child who cannot be brought to the United States, whose condition requires his personal care and attendance: *Provided,* That in such case the person having his residence abroad shall, at least every six months, register at the appropriate Foreign Service office and submit evidence satisfactory to the Secretary of State that his case continues to meet the requirements of this subparagraph; or (C) by reason of the death of his parent, spouse, or child: *Provided,* That in the case of the death of such parent, spouse, or child the person having his residence abroad shall return to the United States within six months after the death of such relative; or

"(6) has his residence abroad for the purpose of pursuing a full course of study of a specialized character or attending full-time an institution of learning of a grade above that of a preparatory school: *Provided,* That such residence does not exceed five years; or

"(7) is the spouse or child of an American citizen, and who has his residence abroad for the purpose of being with his American citizen spouse or parent who has his residence abroad for one of the objects or causes specified in paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), or (6) of this section, or paragraph (2) of section 354 of this title; or

"(8) is the spouse or child of an American national by birth who while under the age of twenty-one years had his residence in the United States for a period or periods totaling ten years, and has his residence abroad for the purpose of being with said spouse or parent; or

"(9) was born in the United States or one of its outlying possessions, who originally had American nationality and who, after having lost such nationality through marriage to an alien, reacquired it; or

"(10) has, by Act of Congress or by treaty, United States nationality solely by reason of former nationality and birth or residence in an area outside the continental United States: *Provided,* That subsections (b) and (c) of section 404 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (8 U. S. C. 804 (b) and (c)), shall not be held to be or to have been applicable to persons defined in this paragraph.

"Section 352 (a) (2) not applicable as to certain persons

"SEC. 354. Section 352 (a) (2) of this title shall have no application to a national—

"(1) who is a veteran of the Spanish-American War, World War I, or World War II, and the spouse, children, and dependent parents of such veteran whether such residence in the territory of a foreign state or states commenced before or after the effective date of this Act: *Provided,* That any such veteran who upon the date of the enactment of this Act has had his residence continuously in the territory of a foreign state of which he was formerly a national, or in which the place of his birth is situated for three years or more, and who has retained his United States nationality solely by reason of the provisions of section 406 (h) of the Nationality Act of 1940, shall not be subject to the provisions or requirements of section 352 (a) (1) of this title: *Provided further,* That the provisions of section 404 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, shall not be held to be or to have been applicable to veterans of World War II;

"(2) who has established to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State, as evidenced by possession of a valid unexpired United States passport or other valid document issued by the Secretary of State, that his residence is temporarily outside of the United States for the purpose of (A) carrying on a commercial enterprise which in the opinion of the Secretary of State will directly and substantially benefit American trade or commerce; or (B) carrying on scientific research on behalf of an institution accredited by the Secretary of State and engaged in research which in the opinion of the Secretary of State is directly and substantially beneficial to the interests of the United States; or (C) engaging in such work or activities, under such unique or unusual circumstances, as may be determined by the Secretary of State to be directly and substantially beneficial to the interests of the United States;

"(3) who is the widow or widower of a citizen of the United States and who has attained the age of sixty years, and who has had a residence outside of the United States and its outlying possessions for a period of not less than ten years during all of which period a marriage relationship has existed with a spouse who has had a residence outside of the United States and its outlying possessions in an occupation or capacity of the type designated in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), or (5) (A) of section 353, or paragraphs (1), (2), or (4) of this section;

"(4) who has attained the age of sixty years, and has had a residence outside of the United States and its outlying possessions for not less than ten years, during all of which period he has been engaged in an occupation of the type designated in paragraphs (1), (2), or (4) of section 353, or paragraph (2) of this section, and who is in bona fide retirement from such occupation; or

"(5) who shall have had his residence in the United States for not less than twenty-five years subsequent to his naturalization and prior to the establishment of his foreign residence.

"Loss of American nationality through parent's expatriation; not effective until person attains age of twenty-five years

"SEC. 355. A person having United States nationality, who is under the age of twenty-one and whose residence is in a foreign state with or under the legal custody of a parent who hereafter loses United States nationality under section 350 or 352 of this title, shall also lose his United States nationality if such person has or acquires the nationality of such foreign state: *Provided,* That, in such case, United States nationality shall not be lost as the result of loss of United States nationality by the parent unless and until the person attains the age of twenty-five years without having established his residence in the United States.

"Nationality lost solely from performance of acts or fulfillment of conditions

"SEC. 356. The loss of nationality under this chapter shall result solely from the performance by a national of the acts or fulfillment of the conditions specified in this chapter.

"Application of treaties; exceptions

"SEC. 357. Nothing in this title shall be applied in contravention of the provisions of any treaty or convention to which the United States is a party and which has been ratified by the Senate upon the effective date of this title: *Provided, however,* That no woman who was a national of the United States shall be deemed to have lost her nationality solely by reason of her marriage to an alien on or after September 22, 1922, or to an alien racially ineligible to citizenship on or after March 3, 1931, or, in the case of a woman who was a United States citizen at birth, through residence abroad following such marriage, notwithstanding the provisions of any existing treaty or convention.

"CHAPTER 4—MISCELLANEOUS

"Certificate of diplomatic or consular officer of the United States as to loss of American nationality under chapter IV Nationality Act of 1940, or under chapter 3 of this title

"SEC. 358. Whenever a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States has reason to believe that a person while in a foreign state has lost his United States nationality under any provision of chapter 3 of this title, or under any provision of chapter IV of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, he shall certify the facts upon which such belief is based to the Department of State, in writing, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State. If the report of the diplomatic or consular officer is approved by the Secretary of State, a copy of the certificate shall be forwarded to the Attorney General, for his information, and the diplomatic or consular office in which the report was made shall be directed to forward a copy of the certificate to the person to whom it relates.

"Certificate of nationality to be issued by the Secretary of State for a person not a naturalized citizen of the United States for use in proceedings of a foreign state

"SEC. 359. The Secretary of State is hereby authorized to issue, in his discretion and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by him, a certificate of nationality for any person not a naturalized citizen of the United States who presents satisfactory evidence that he is an American national and that such certificate is needed for use in judicial or administrative proceedings in a foreign state. Such certificate shall be solely for use in the case for which it was issued and shall be transmitted by the Secretary of State through appropriate official channels to the judicial or administrative officers of the foreign state in which it is to be used.

"Proceedings for declaration of United States nationality in the event of denial of rights and privileges as national

"SEC. 360. (a) If any person who is within the United States claims a right or privilege as a national of the United States and is denied such right or privilege by any department or independent agency, or official thereof, upon the ground that he is not a national of the United States, such person may institute an action under the provisions of section 2201 of title 28, United States Code, against the head of such department or independent agency for a judgment declaring him to be a national of the United States, except that no such action may be instituted in any case if the issue of such person's status as a national of the United States (1) arose by reason of, or in connection with any exclusion proceeding under the provisions of this or any other act, or (2) is in issue in any such exclusion proceeding. An action under this subsection may be instituted only within five years after the final administrative denial of such right or privilege and shall be filed in the district court of the United States for the district in which such person resides or claims a residence, and jurisdiction over such officials in such cases is hereby conferred upon those courts.

"(b) If any person who is not within the United States claims a right or privilege as a national of the United States and is denied such right or privilege by any department or independent agency, or official thereof, upon the ground that he is not a national of the United States, such person may make application to a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States in the foreign country in which he is residing for a certificate of identity for the purpose of traveling to a port of entry in the United States and applying for admission. Upon proof to the satisfaction of such diplomatic or consular officer that such application is made in good faith and has a substantial basis, he shall issue to such person a certificate of identity. From any denial of an application for such certificate the applicant shall be entitled to an appeal to the Secretary of State, who, if he approves the denial, shall state in writing his reasons for his decision. The Secretary of State shall prescribe rules and regulations for the issuance of certificates of identity as above provided. The provisions of this subsection shall be applicable only to a person who at some time prior to his application for the certificate of identity has been physically present in the United States, or to a person under sixteen years of age who was born abroad of a United States citizen parent.

"(c) A person who has been issued a certificate of identity under the provisions of subsection (b), and while in possession thereof, may apply for admission to the United States at any port of entry, and shall be subject to all the provisions of this Act relating to the conduct of proceedings involving aliens seeking admission to the United States. A final determination by the Attorney General that any such person is not entitled to admission to the United States shall be subject to review by any court of competent jurisdiction in habeas corpus proceedings and not otherwise. Any person described in this section who is finally excluded from admission to the United States shall be subject to all the provisions of this Act relating to aliens seeking admission to the United States.

"TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

"JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE

"SEC. 401. (a) There is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy (hereinafter referred to as the 'Committee') to be composed of ten members as follows: (1) five members who are members of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, three from the majority and two from the minority party to be appointed by the President of the Senate; and (2) five members who are members of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, three from the majority and two from the minority party to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"(b) No person shall continue to serve as a member of the Committee after he has ceased to be a member of the Committee on the Judiciary of either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

"(c) A vacancy in the membership of the Committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection and the Committee shall elect a Chairman from among its members.

"(d) It shall be the function of the Committee to make a continuous study of (1) the administration of this Act and its effect on the national security, the economy, and the social welfare of the United States, and (2) such conditions within or without the United States which in the opinion of the Committee might have any bearing on the immigration and nationality policy of the United States.

"(e) The Committee shall make from time to time a report to the Senate and the House of Representatives concerning the results of its studies together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

"(f) The Secretary of State and the Attorney General shall without delay submit to the Committee all regulations, instructions, and all other information as requested by the Committee relative to the administration of this Act; and the Secretary of State and the Attorney General shall consult with the Committee from time to time with respect to their activities under this Act.

"(g) The Committee or any duly authorized Subcommittee thereof is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; to procure such printing and binding as it deems advisable. The provisions of sections 102 and 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in case of any failure of any witnesses to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under the authority of this Act.

"(h) The members of the Committee shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Committee other than expenses in connection with meetings of the Committee held in the District of Columbia during such times as the Congress is in session.

"(i) The Committee is authorized, without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, to appoint and fix the compensation of such clerks, experts, consultants, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable. The Committee is authorized to reimburse the members of its staff for travel, subsistence, and the other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Committee other than expenses in connection with meetings of the Committee held in the District of Columbia during such times as the Congress is in session. The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives may assign members of the staff of the said committees to serve on the staff of the Committee, without additional compensation, except for the reimbursement of expenses incurred by such staff members as prescribed in this subsection.

"(j) The expenses of the Committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the Chairman of the Committee or by any member of the Committee duly authorized by the Chairman.

"(k) This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

"Amendments to other laws

"SEC. 402. (a) Section 1546 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 1546. Fraud and misuse of visas, permits, and other entry documents

"'Whoever, knowingly forges, counterfeits, alters, or falsely makes any immigrant or nonimmigrant visa, permit, or other document required for entry into the United States, or utters, uses, attempts to use, possesses, obtains, accepts, or receives any such visa, permit, or document, knowing it to be forged, counterfeited, altered, or falsely made, or to have been procured by means of any false claim or statement, or to have been otherwise procured by fraud or unlawfully obtained; or

"'Whoever, except under direction of the Attorney General or the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, or other proper officer, knowingly possesses any blank permit, or engraves, sells, brings into the United States, or has in his control or possession any plate in the likeness of a plate designed for the printing of permits, or makes any print, photograph, or impression in the likeness of any immigrant or nonimmigrant visa, permit or other document required for entry into the United States, or has in his possession a distinctive paper which has been adopted by the Attorney General or the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service for the printing of such visas, permits, or documents; or

"'Whoever, when applying for an immigrant or nonimmigrant visa, permit, or other document required for entry into the United States, or for admission to the United States personates another, or falsely appears in the name of a deceased individual, or evades or attempts to evade the immigration laws by appearing under an assumed or fictitious name without disclosing his true identity, or sells or otherwise disposes of, or offers to sell or otherwise dispose of, or utters, such visa, permit, or other document, to any person not authorized by law to receive such document; or

"'Whoever knowingly makes under oath any false statement with respect to a material fact in any application, affidavit, or other document required by the immigration laws or regulations prescribed thereunder, or knowingly presents any such application, affidavit, or other document containing any such false statement—

"'Shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.'

"(b) Chapter 69 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 1428 the following new section:

"'SEC. 1429. Penalties for neglect or refusal to answer subpena.

"'Any person who has been subpenaed under the provisions of subsection (e) of section 336 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to appear at the final hearing of a petition for naturalization, and who shall neglect or refuse to so appear and to testify, if in the power of such person to do so, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.'

"(c) Section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by deleting the language 'any immigrant inspector or any immigration patrol inspector' and by substituting therefor the language 'any immigration officer.'

"(d) Subsection (c) of section 8 of the Act of June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 631; 22 U. S. C. 611–621), entitled 'An Act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes', as amended, is hereby further amended by deleting the language 'sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (39 Stat. 889, 890), as amended.' and by substituting therefor the language 'sections 241, 242, and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.'

"(e) Section 4 of the Act of June 30, 1950 (Public Law 597, Eighty-first Congress, second session), entitled 'An Act to provide for the enlistment of aliens in the regular army' is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the dates or periods of service specified and designated in section 329 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the provisions of that section are applicable to aliens enlisted or reenlisted pursuant to the provisions of this Act and who have completed five or more years of military service, if honorably discharged therefrom. Any alien enlisted or reenlisted pursuant to the provisions of this Act who subsequently enters the United States, American Samoa, Swains Island, or the Canal Zone, pursuant to military orders shall, if otherwise qualified for citizenship, and after completion of five or more years of military service, if honorably discharged therefrom, be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence within the meaning of such section 329 (a).'

"(f) Section 201 of the Act of January 27, 1948 (Public Law 402, Eightieth Congress, second session, 62 Stat. 6) entitled 'An Act to promote the better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations' is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 201. The Secretary is authorized to provide for interchanges on a reciprocal basis between the United States and other countries of students, trainees, teachers, guest instructors, professors, and leaders in fields of specialized knowledge or skill and shall wherever possible provide these interchanges by using the services of existing reputable agencies which are successfully engaged in such activity. The Secretary may provide for orientation courses and other appropriate services for such persons from other countries upon their arrival in the United States, and for such persons going to other countries from the United States. When any country fails or refuses to cooperate in such program on a basis of reciprocity the Secretary shall terminate or limit such program, with respect to such country, to the extent he deems to be advisable in the interests of the United States. The persons specified in this section shall be admitted as nonimmigrants under section 101 (a) (15) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, for such time and under such conditions as may be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General. A person admitted under this section who fails to maintain the status under which he was admitted or who fails to depart from the United States at the expiration of the time for which he was admitted, or who engages in activities of a political nature detrimental to the interests of the United States, or in activities not consistent with the security of the United States, shall, upon the warrant of the Attorney General, be taken into custody and promptly deported pursuant to sections 241, 242, and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Deportation proceedings under this section shall be summary and the findings of the Attorney General as to matters of fact shall be conclusive. Such persons shall not be eligible for suspension of deportation under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.'

"(g) Paragraph 7 of section 1 of the Act of February 4, 1887, as amended (24 Stat. 379; 54 Stat. 899; 62 Stat. 602; 49 U. S. C. 1 (7)), is further amended by deleting the words 'immigration inspectors' and by substituting therefor the words 'immigration officers'.

"(h) (1) The first sentence of subsection (c) of section 3 of the Act of June 25, 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1009; 64 Stat. 219), is amended by deleting therefrom the language 'from the immigration quota for the country of the alien's nationality as defined in section 12 of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924 (8 U. S. C. 212)' and by substituting therefor the language 'from the annual quota to which an immigrant is chargeable as provided in section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act,'.

"(2) The second proviso to subsection (c) of section 3 of the Act of June 25, 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1009; 64 Stat. 219), is amended by deleting the language 'as defined in section 6 of the Act of May 26, 1924, as amended (8 U. S. C. 206),' and by substituting therefor 'as provided in section 203 (a) (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act,'.

"(3) The proviso to section 4 (a) of the Act of June 25, 1948, as amended, is amended by deleting the language 'the immigration quota of the country of the alien's nationality as defined in section 12 of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924,' and by substituting therefor the language 'the annual quota to which an immigrant is chargeable as provided in section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act,'.

"(4) Section 5 of the Act of June 25, 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1009; Public Law 60, Eighty-second Congress), is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 5. The quota to which an alien is chargeable for the purposes of this Act shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act and no eligible displaced person shall be issued an immigrant visa if he is known or believed by the consular officer to be subject to exclusion from the United States under any provision of the immigration laws, with the exception of section 212 (a) (14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; and all eligible displaced persons, eligible displaced orphans and orphans under section 2 (f) shall be exempt from paying visa fees and head taxes.'

"(5) Section 6 of the Act of June 25, 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1009; 64 Stat. 219), is further amended by deleting the language 'section 6 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (8 U. S. C. 206),' and by substituting therefor the language 'section 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act,'. The last sentence of section 6 of the Act of June 25, 1948, is amended by deleting the language 'sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended.' and by substituting therefor the language 'section 241, 242, and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.'

"(6) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 12 of the Act of June 25, 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1009; 64 Stat. 219), is amended by deleting the language 'section 12 of the Act of May 26, 1924, as amended,' and by substituting therefor the language 'section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act,'. Subsection (b) of section 12 of the Act of June 25, 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1009; 64 Stat. 219), is amended by deleting the language 'section 11 (f) of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924 (8 U. S. C. 211),' and by substituting therefor the language 'section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act,'. Subsection (b) of section 12 of the Act of June 25, 1948, as amended, is amended by deleting the language 'from the immigration quota of the country of nationality of the person who receives the visa as defined in section 12 of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924 (8 U. S. C. 212)' and by substituting therefor the language 'from the annual quota to which the person who receives the visa is chargeable as provided in section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act'. The last sentence of subsection (c) of section 12 of the Act of June 25, 1948, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"'Those provisions of section 5 of this Act which relate to section 212 (a) (14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be applicable to persons whose admission is authorized under the provisions of this section.'

"(i) (1) Section 1 of the Act of March 2, 1931 (46 Stat. 1467; 8 U. S. C. 109a), is amended by deleting the word 'inspectors' and by substituting therefor the words 'immigration officers'.

"(2) The Act of August 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 858; 8 U. S. C. 109c), is amended by deleting the word 'inspectors' and by substituting therefor the words 'immigration officers'.

"(j) Public Law 114, Eighty-second Congress, first session, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'That a person who, while a citizen of the United States, has lost citizenship of the United States solely by reason of having voted in a political election or plebiscite held in Italy between January 1, 1946, and April 18, 1948, inclusive, and who has not subsequent to such voting committed any act which, had he remained a citizen, would have operated to expatriate him, may be naturalized by taking, prior to two years from the enactment of this Act, before any naturalization court specified in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oath required by section 337 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Certified copies of such oath shall be sent by such diplomatic or consular officer or such court to the Department of State and to the Department of Justice. Such person shall have, from and after naturalization under this section, the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss: *Provided*, That no such person shall be eligible to take the oath required by section 337 of the Immigration and Nationality Act unless he shall first take an oath before any naturalization court specified in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, that he has done nothing to promote the cause of communism. The illegal or fraudulent procurement of naturalization under this amendment shall be subject to cancellation in the same manner as provided in section 340 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

"'SEC. 2. The Act of August 7, 1946 (Public Law 614; 60 Stat. 866), is hereby repealed.'

"Laws repealed

"SEC. 403. (a) The following Acts and all amendments thereto and parts of Acts and all amendments thereto are repealed:

"(1) Section 2164 of the Revised Statutes (8 U. S. C. 135);

"(2) Act of February 26, 1885 (23 Stat. 332);

"(3) Second paragraph under the heading 'Treasury Department' in Act of October 19, 1888 (25 Stat. 567; 8 U. S. C. 140);

"(4) Second and fourth sentences of section 7 of the Act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. 1085; 8 U. S. C. 102);

"(5) Section 8 of Act of March 3, 1893 (27 Stat. 570; 8 U. S. C. 172);

"(6) The last paragraph of section 10 of Act of April 30, 1900 (31 Stat. 143; 48 U. S. C. 504);

"(7) Section 3 of Act of April 29, 1902 (32 Stat. 177);

"(8) The proviso to the paragraph headed 'Bureau of Immigration' under caption 'Department of Commerce and Labor' in Act of February 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 684);

"(9) The proviso to the paragraph headed 'Enforcement of Chinese Exclusion Act' under caption 'Department of Commerce and Labor' in Act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1182);

"(10) Section 2 (e) of Act of February 9, 1909 (35 Stat. 614; 42 Stat. 596; 21 U. S. C. 175);

"(11) The last proviso to the first paragraph headed 'Expenses of Regulating Immigration' under caption 'Department of Commerce and Labor' in the Act of March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. 982; 8 U. S. C. 133);

"(12) The proviso to the first paragraph headed 'Immigration Service' under caption 'Department of Commerce and Labor' in the Act of March 4, 1911 (36 Stat. 1442);

"(13) Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 874);

"(14) Section 5b of Act of March 2, 1917 (39 Stat. 951; 48 Stat. 1245; 48 U. S. C. 733a–1);

"(15) Act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559; 22 U. S. C. 223–226b);

"(16) Act of October 16, 1918 (40 Stat. 1012; 8 U. S. C. 137);

"(17) Joint resolution of October 19, 1918 (40 Stat. 1014);

"(18) Act of May 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 593; 8 U. S. C. 157);

"(19) Act of December 20, 1920 (41 Stat. 1082; 8 U. S. C. 170);

"(20) The proviso to the paragraph headed 'Expenses, Passport Control Act' in the Act of March 2, 1921 (41 Stat. 1217; 22 U. S. C. 227);

"(21) Act of May 19, 1921 (42 Stat. 5);

"(22) Joint resolution of December 27, 1922 (42 Stat. 1065);

"(23) Act of May 26, 1924 (43 Stat. 153);

"(24) Act of February 25, 1925 (43 Stat. 976; 8 U. S. C. 202 (f));

"(25) The last proviso to the paragraph headed 'Bureau of Immigration' in title IV of the Act of February 27, 1925 (43 Stat. 1049; 8 U. S. C. 110);

"(26) Section 7 (d) of the Act of May 20, 1926 (44 Stat. 572; 49 U. S. C. 177 (d));

"(27) Act of May 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 657; 8 U. S. C. 231);

"(28) Act of May 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 654; 8 U. S. C. 241–246);

"(29) Act of April 2, 1928 (45 Stat 401; 8 U. S. C. 226a);

"(30) Act of March 4, 1929 (45 Stat. 1551; 8 U. S. C. 180–180d);

"(31) Act of February 18, 1931 (46 Stat. 1171; 8 U. S. C. 156a);

"(32) Act of March 17, 1932 (47 Stat. 67; 8 U. S. C. 137b–d);

"(33) Section 7 of Act of May 25, 1932, (47 Stat. 166; 8 U. S. C. 181);

"(34) Act of July 2, 1932 (47 Stat. 571; 8 U. S. C. 368b);

"(35) Sections 8 and 14 of the Act of March 24, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 462; 48 U. S. C. 1238; 48 Stat. 464; 48 U. S. C. 1244);

"(36) Section 3 of the Act of May 14, 1937 (50 Stat. 165; 8 U. S. C. 213a);

"(37) Act of August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 696, ch. 698);

"(38) Act of July 27, 1939 (53 Stat. 1133; 48 U. S. C. 1251–1257);

"(39) Title III of Act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 673; 8 U. S. C. 451–460);

"(40) Act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 715–716);

"(41) Section 2 of Act of August 16, 1940 (54 Stat. 788);

"(42) Act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1137);

"(43) Act of June 20, 1941 (55 Stat. 252; 22 U. S. C. 228, 229);

"(44) Section 2 of Act of December 17, 1943 (57 Stat. 601; 8 U. S. C. 212a);

"(45) Sections 4 and 5 of Act of July 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 417; 8 U. S. C. 212b, 212c);

"(46) Section 5 of the Act of May 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 122; 8 U. S. C. 732a);

"(47) The paragraph headed 'General provisions—Department of Justice' in Chapter III of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 843, Eighty-first Congress);

"(48) The Act of March 28, 1951 (Public Law 14, Eighty-second Congress, first session).

"(b) Except as otherwise provided in section 405, all other laws, or parts of laws, in conflict or inconsistent with this Act are, to the extent of such conflict or inconsistency, repealed.

"Authorization of appropriations

"SEC. 404. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"Savings clauses

"SEC. 405. (a) Nothing contained in this Act, unless otherwise specifically provided therein, shall be construed to affect the validity of any declaration of intention, petition for naturalization, certificate of naturalization, certificate of citizenship, warrant of arrest, order or warrant of deportation, order of exclusion, or other document or proceeding which shall be valid at the time this Act shall take effect; or to affect any prosecution, suit, action, or proceedings, civil or criminal, brought, or any status, condition, right in process of acquisition, act, thing, liability, obligation, or matter, civil or criminal, done or existing, at the time this Act shall take effect; but as to all such prosecutions, suits, actions, proceedings, statutes, conditions, rights, acts, things, liabilities, obligations, or matters the statutes or parts of statutes repealed by this Act are, unless otherwise specifically provided therein, hereby continued in force and effect. When an immigrant, in possession of an unexpired immigrant visa issued prior to the effective date of this Act, makes application for admission, his admissibility shall be determined under the provisions of law in effect on the date of the issuance of such visa. An application for suspension of deportation under section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, or for adjustment of status under section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, which is pending on the date of enactment of this Act, shall be regarded as a proceeding within the meaning of this subsection.

"(b) Except as otherwise specifically provided in title III, any petition for naturalization heretofore filed which may be pending at the time this Act shall take effect shall be heard and determined in accordance with the requirements of law in effect when such petition was filed.

"(c) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this Act, the repeal of any statute by this Act shall not terminate nationality heretofore lawfully acquired nor restore nationality heretofore lost under any law of the United States or any treaty to which the United States may have been a party.

"(d) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this Act, or any amendment thereto, fees, charges and prices for purposes specified in title V of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952 (Public Law 137, Eighty-second Congress, approved August 31, 1951), may be fixed and established in the manner and by the head of any Federal Agency as specified in that Act.

"(e) This Act shall not be construed to repeal, alter, or amend section 231 (a) of the Act of April 30, 1946 (60 Stat. 148; 22 U. S. C. 1281a), the Act of June 20, 1949 (Public Law 110, section 8, Eighty-first Congress, first session; 63 Stat. 208), the Act of June 5, 1950 (Public Law 535, Eighty-first Congress, second session), nor title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (Public Law 78, Eighty-second Congress, first session).

"Separability

"SEC. 406. If any particular provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"Effective date

"SEC. 407. Except as provided in subsection (k) of section 401, this Act shall take effect

at 12:01 antemeridian United States Eastern Standard Time on the one hundred eightieth day immediately following the date of its enactment."

And the Senate agree to the same.

PAT MCCARRAN,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
WILLIS SMITH,
HOMER FERGUSON,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
WILLIAM E. JENNER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
FRANK L. CHELF,
J. FRANK WILSON,
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
RUTH THOMPSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5678) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

In attempting to reconcile and compose the differences between the House and the Senate versions of H. R. 5678, the conferees have exerted every effort to perfect and refine the language of this necessarily complicated and involved legislative measure. The conferees have approached this task with particular care and in full realization of the fact that much of the criticism directed at this legislation from various quarters was based on misconstruction of its language by resorting to the use of quotations taken out of context and without reference to the intricate interplay of the many provisions of this bill.

The conferees believe that the final version of this legislation would preclude any strained construction which would distort its general purpose and its particular provisions.

In order to further clarify legislative intentions, the conferees have agreed to express in their respective statements certain of their unanimously held opinions, trusting that such statements will facilitate the task of the executive agencies charged with the administration of the proposed law.

(1) The provisions of both bills which provide for deportation of aliens who are convicted in the United States of certain criminal offenses have been unfortunately subjected to a misconstruction, distorting the true purpose of these provisions. In composing the differences between the Senate and the House versions, the conferees have refined the language so as to make it emphatically clear that the Attorney General may not (as has been erroneously charged) capriciously deport an alien solely on the basis of inconsequential, unwitting infraction of the law.

(2) Having extensively considered the problem of judicial review, the conferees are satisfied that procedures provided in the bill, adapted to the necessities of national security and the protection of economic and social welfare of the citizens of this country, remain within the framework and the pattern of the Administrative Procedure Act. The safeguard of judicial procedure is afforded the alien in both exclusion and deportation proceedings.

(3) In order to remove any fear that under the provisions of the bill certain religious, racial, or political persecutees would be arbitrarily excluded from admission to or deported from the United States, the conferees desire to make a few clarifying statements. Regarding the sections of the bill which provide for the exclusion of aliens convicted of two or more offenses, other than purely political offenses, it is the opinion of the conferees that those convictions which were obviously based on trumped-up charges or predicated upon repressive measures against racial, religious or political minorities, should be regarded as purely political in nature and should not result in the exclusion of the alien.

It is also the opinion of the conferees that the sections of the bill which provide for the exclusion of aliens who obtained travel documents by fraud or by willfully misrepresenting a material fact, should not serve to exclude or to deport certain bona fide refugees who in fear of being forcibly repatriated to their former homelands misrepresented their place of birth when applying for a visa and such misrepresentation did not have as its basis the desire to evade the quota provisions of the law or an investigation in the place of their former residence. The conferees wish to emphasize that in applying fair humanitarian standards in the administrative adjudication of such cases, every effort is to be made to prevent the evasion of law by fraud and to protect the interest of the United States.

In addition to perfecting and conforming changes, the legislation as recommended by the conferees, contains the following provisions which vary from the provisions of either the Senate or House versions of the bill:

(1) The Senate bill contained a provision which set minimum standards of "good moral character" to be applied where that expression is used in the bill. These standards were not included in the House bill. The conferees agreed to accept the Senate provision.

(2) The House bill contained a provision whereby persons of oriental stock who are the spouses or children of certain aliens may have their quota charge made in such a manner as to facilitate their entry into the United States and thus preclude the separation of families. This provision was not contained in the Senate bill. The conferees agreed to retain the provision of the House bill applicable to children.

(3) The Senate bill removed the 10 percent limitation which exists under the present law on the issuance of quota visas during the last 2 months of any fiscal year. This provision was not contained in the House bill. The conferees agreed to accept the Senate provision.

(4) The Senate bill contained a provision exempting certain relatives of citizens from literacy requirements for admission into the United States. This provision was not contained in the House bill. The conferees agreed to accept the Senate provision.

(5) The Senate bill precluded the continuation of the practice of preexamination whereby certain aliens in the United States were authorized to proceed to Canada for the purpose of adjusting their immigration status. The theory of the Senate bill was that the preexamination system was cumbersome, obsolete, and, as practiced, contained certain loopholes for the admission for permanent residence of undersirable aliens. A similar but not identical provision was contained in the House bill. The conferees agreed to retain the prohibition against preexamination, but modified other provisions of the legislation so that special classes of aliens lawfully in the United States in a temporary status may, under prescribed conditions, have their status adjusted to that of permanent residents without the necessity of leaving the United States.

(6) The Senate version of the bill excluded from admission to the United States aliens convicted of two or more offenses (regardless of whether they involved moral turpitude) for which an "aggregate possible sentence to confinement under the law" was more than 5 years. The House version would bar such alien if the sentences to confinement "actually imposed" had exceeded 5 years. The conferees agreed to the House version.

(7) The House bill contained a provision restoring citizenship to a limited number of persons who had lost American citizenship by voting in elections in Italy. This provision was not contained in the Senate bill. The conferees agreed to accept the House provision.

(8) The Senate bill prohibited the naturalization of an alien against whom deportation proceedings were pending. This provision was not contained in the House bill. The conferees agreed to retain the Senate provision exempting from it aliens who have served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States and who are seeking naturalization on this basis either while so serving or following their honorable discharge.

(9) The conferees have agreed to provide for a naturalization oath (similar to that contained in the House version) which would not violate bona fide religious convictions if such convictions are properly proved to the naturalization court in accordance with standards set up in the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, and incorporated in this legislation.

(10) In conforming the language of both House and Senate versions regarding grounds for deportation of aliens the conferees have provided for a statute of limitations (as contained in the House version) in accord with humanitarian principles, particularly in the cases of aliens where deportation would be based on mental disease or on economic distress. Similarly, the conferees believe that they have applied very broad standards of humanitarianism in composing the differences between both versions of this legislation as they appeared in the sections governing the granting of suspension of deportation.

(11) In composing the differences as they appeared in the various sections of the bill applicable to retention of United States citizenship by naturalized citizens who reside in excess of 5 years in a foreign country other than that in which their place of birth is located, the conferees have agreed to the House version providing for the retention of such citizenship in the case of a citizen who has resided in the United States for 25 years subsequent to his naturalization.

(12) In composing the differences between the Senate and House bills as they appeared in the section relating to termination of dual nationality, the conferees have modified the language so as to remove any doubt that the loss of United States citizenship could occur by any other than affirmative action taken by the dual national.

(13) The House bill provided for a joint congressional committee to maintain surveillance over the administration and operation of the act and to study continuously matters affecting the immigration and nationality policy of the United States. This provision was not contained in the Senate bill. The conferees agreed to accept the House provision.

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
FRANK L. CHELF,
J. FRANK WILSON,
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
RUTH THOMPSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the conferees who unanimously agreed on this conference report, I wholeheartedly urge this body to adopt the report.

In the spirit of splendid cooperation with the group representing the other body, after a free exchange of opinions and arguments, we have achieved our common purpose, namely, the preparation of a refined and perfected version of a fair and equitable code of all our immigration and nationality laws.

Several amendments accepted on the floor of the Senate brought the original Senate measure closer to the version of the bill that passed the House on April 25, 1952, and therefore, your conferees accepted practically all of those amendments.

On the other hand, the managers on the part of the Senate accepted most of the provisions inserted by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House and by the House itself.

The report before you now is substantially the House bill, the Senate having yielded to our version of the legislation, and the report now under consideration contains almost exactly the subject matter of the bill which passed the House by a large majority on April 25 of this year.

In addition, I wish to recommend to the membership of the House that it acquaint itself with several very important statements of policy as they appear in the statement filed by the managers on the part of the House.

I believe that I express the unanimous opinion of all the members of the committee of conference that the perfected language of this important legislation would not lend itself to misconstruction and misinterpretation similar to the one used in the vicious campaign of vilification directed against this legislation from certain quarters which I prefer not to identify at this time.

It is our firm and unanimous belief that we are presenting to the House a legislative measure which, after almost 4 years of painstaking and tedious efforts, will operate to the best interest of the United States and its people; a measure which will be of great benefit to the law-abiding future immigrant who wants to join us in good faith and share with us the blessings of our land and of our constitutional liberties.

However, while benefiting such welcomed guests and our future co-citizens, this measure will not benefit the subversive, the criminal, the gambler, the stowaway, the seaman who deserts his ship, and the alien who sneaks across our borders trying to take in our midst the place of a person who for years patiently waited abroad until his or her turn was reached.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if the gentleman will yield me time that I in turn may yield to others on our side who wish to speak?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman for that purpose a reasonable amount of my time.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, in supplementing what the gentleman from Pennsylvania had to say, I briefly call attention to the fact that this conference report represents the untiring effort not only of the members who composed the board of conferees, as we might call them, but also the staff of the committees of the House and of the other body. I hold in my hand a statement of some 10 pages in length of minor points in disagreement. These were all carefully gone over and examined.

Our report covers 129 pages, including the statement of the managers. The bill itself covers 161 pages. In all probability and without exaggeration or overstatement this is probably one of the best-worked-out bills that has been brought before the House in years. Just where the credit should go is hard to say. Two men who formerly were associated with us, the Honorable Ed Gossett, of Texas, no longer a Member of this body, made a very very valuable contribution to this bill; and the late Frank Fellows of Maine practically wore out his life in devotion to the preparation of this bill. Then there are the members of the committee staff, Mr. Besterman and Miss Benn on our side, and Mr. Arens and Miss Johnson on the Senate side have given of their time and energy to bring before this House a bill which I firmly believe will last for many, many years. It is a complete codification of the law. Four years were spent in its preparation. We have gone into every phase of it; we thought we would answer every question.

I do not know of a single bill about which there is greater misunderstanding or about which more misstatements have been made than this bill. Therefore, in view of that, I urge that the Members of this House accept the work of the conferees, not that there is any glorification in our part of it.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I want to pay tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman [Mr. WALTER] and the other members of the subcommittee for their work on this bill, which when considered in toto is, I think, a monumental piece of work. The net gains, the forward steps, the net advantages in this bill so outweigh those things than can be considered, as losses or backward steps or disadvantages that it seems to me there ought to be overwhelming support of it. Every Member, before voting against the report because the bill does not do all he believes it should in order to be just and equitable, ought to remind himself that he will be voting to continue present law, and thus voting for scandalously unjust and discriminatory provisions, for example, to give something less than wholly complete equality to orientals is certainly far better than to vote for total exclusion of them because of their race. Those are your only choices. I have no difficulty in choosing the course which vastly improves existing law. I want particularly to compliment the managers on the part of the House for their explanatory statement at the end of the conference report which cuts away in large degree the grounds of those who have misconstrued or misrepresented some provisions of the bill. It shows that a lot of the propaganda against it has been based on language which perhaps previously could be construed as ambiguous but which in the modified language of the law and in the language of the statement on the part of the managers of the House has now been so clarified that I think most of the objections that many sincere people have urged in the past have been removed. I wish to express my personal appreciation to the committee.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON].

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert as a part of my remarks a ruling of the Immigration and Naturalization Service holding that Filipinos who had been admitted to the Territory of Hawaii under section 8 (a) (1) of the act of March 24, 1934, the so-called Tydings-McDuffie Act, are permanent residents of the Territory of Hawaii.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the ruling was rendered on August 8, 1949, in the case of Ricardo Fermin. On the strength of this ruling, United States District Courts of Hawaii have already qualified a considerable number of Filipinos from among this group for naturalization.

I call attention to this ruling because the proceedings of the court that have come in consequence of it appear to meet all of the purposes of the amendment that I offered to H. R. 5678 when it was under consideration in the House.

The purpose of the amendment was to give this group of Filipinos now in Hawaii the status of permanent residents. The amendment was rejected. The argument was made that the Filipinos who had entered the country under this law had not been properly screened by the immigration authorities, and therefore, should not be granted permanent residence for purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws.

It appears now that this is not in accordance with rulings already made and that the amendment as proposed was unnecessary.

The ruling follows:

AUGUST 8, 1949.

In re Ricardo Fermin, A-6719397.

This record relates to a native of the Philippine Islands who entered the Territory of Hawaii at Kahalui, Maui, on April 28, 1946, as a laborer under contract to the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association under section 8 (a) (1) of the act of March 24, 1934. He was not inspected by this Service upon his arrival, but the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association is in possession of the manifest of the steamship *Maunawili* showing the subject's arrival on the date mentioned. The subject is desirous of being naturalized as a United States citizen, and in order to initiate proceedings leading to that end he has submitted a form N-300.

The questions presented are:

1. Whether the subject has been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence so as to be eligible for naturalization; and

2. Whether a certificate of arrival is required in the subject's case; and if so, whether a regular or a qualified certificate should be issued.

The subject is one of several thousand Filipino laborers admitted to the Territory of Hawaii under the last sentence of section 8 (a) (1) of the Philippine Independence Act of March 24, 1934, which became effective on May 1, 1934. Section 8 (a) of that act reads, in part, as follows:

"1. For the purposes of the Immigration Act of 1917, the Immigration Act of 1924 (except section 13 (c)), this section, and all other laws of the United States relating to the immigration, exclusion, or expulsion of aliens, citizens of the Philippine Islands who are not citizens of the United States shall be considered as if they were aliens. For such purposes the Philippine Islands shall be considered as a separate country and shall have for each fiscal year a quota of 50. This paragraph shall not apply to a person coming or seeking to come to the Territory of Hawaii who does not apply for and secure an immigration or passport visa, but such immigration shall be determined by the Department of the Interior on the basis of the needs of industries in the Territory of Hawaii.

"2. Citizens of the Philippine Islands who are not citizens of the United States shall not be admitted to the continental United States from the Territory of Hawaii (whether entering such Territory before or after the effective date of this section) unless they belong to a class declared to be nonimmigrants by section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1924 or to a class declared to be nonquota immigrants under the provisions of section 4 of such act other than subdivision (c) thereof or unless they were admitted to such Territory under an immigration visa. The Attorney General shall by regulations provide a method for such exclusion and for the admission of such excepted classes."

In the matter of Gran (A-6483063) the Board of Immigration Appeals affirmed a central office order of January 16, 1947, which affirmed the excluding decision of a Board of Special Inquiry in the case of a Filipino imported into Hawaii who subsequently left Hawaii for Japan as a civilian employee of the United States Army and thereafter desired to reenter Hawaii after an absence of 24 days. On May 27, 1947, this order was rescinded by the Board of Immigration Appeals, the appeal was sustained and it was ordered that the appellant be admitted for permanent residence. This subsquent order was made on the basis of a decision in the matter of Omo (A-6433310).

The Omo case involved a Filipino imported into Hawaii on March 15, 1946, under section 8 (a) (1) of the act of March 24, 1934. In August 1946 he departed for Guam as a civilian employee in the United States Army engineers, and on October 14, 1946, he applied for readmission to Hawaii. Central office order of April 1, 1947, affirmed by the Board of Immigration Appeals on May 23, 1947, without comment, ordered the appeal sustained and appellant admitted to Hawaii for permanent residence. This decision was predicated on the fact that the first portion of section 8 (a) (1) of the Philippine Independence Act provides that for immigration purposes, citizens of the Philippines who are not citizens of the United States shall be considered as if they were aliens and the last sentence provides that this paragraph shall not apply to those imported to Hawaii on a determination by the Department of the Interior. The conclusion was reached that Congress must have intended that the latter class of Philippine citizens were to continue to enter as prior thereto, that is, in the status of nationals, and that the appellant acquired permanent residence in Hawaii when admitted originally in March 1946.

From these decisions it follows that all citizens of the Philippine Islands who entered Hawaii under section 8 (a) (1) of the act of March 24, 1934, as did Gran and Omo, entered as nationals of the United States, and even though they were not inspected by this Service, they were lawfully admitted to Hawaii for permanent residence in the same manner as all citizens of the Philippine Islands admitted prior to the effective date of that act. The fact that citizens of the Philippine Islands who were not citizens of the United States were prohibited by section 8 (a) (2) of that act from being admitted to the continental United States from Hawaii unless they were nonimmigrants, as defined by section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1924, or nonquota immigrants as defined by section 4 of such act other than subdivision (c) thereof, or unless they were admitted to Hawaii with immigration visas, does not change that conclusion. Section 321A of the Nationality Act of 1940 provides in effect that a citizen of the Philippine Islands who entered the United States prior to May 1, 1934, the effective date of the act of March 24, 1934, may be naturalized without filing a declaration of intention or a certificate of arrival with his petition for naturalization. The basis for this legislation was that prior to that date such persons entered the United States as nationals of the United States and no records were made of their arrivals. The fact that Congress took cognizance of the fact that there were no records of such persons' arrivals and passed legislation enabling them to be naturalized without filing certificates of arrival with their petitions for naturalization is indicative that Congress considered such persons to be lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence and eligible for naturalization. Accordingly, citizens of the Philippine Islands who entered the United States subsequent to May 1, 1934, but according to law, in the same manner as those who entered prior thereto can likewise only be considered to be lawfully admitted for permanent residence. It is true that citizens of the Philippine Islands admitted to Hawaii under section 8 (a) (1) of the act of March 24, 1934, did not have the same freedom of entering the continental United States from Hawaii that other nationals of the United States had. However, that factor cannot give rise to the conclusion that such persons were not lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the Territory of Hawaii. Nor may that conclusion be drawn from the fact that persons admitted to Hawaii under section 8 (a) (1) of the act of March 24, 1934, were not mentioned by Congress in the enactment of section 321A of the Nationality Act. That section merely specified a certain group of Filipinos who may be naturalized without filing declarations of intention or certificates of arrival with their petitions for naturalization. No conclusive legislative intent may be inferred from that section concerning other citizens of the Philippine Islands.

The subject herein was admitted to Hawaii under section 8 (a) (1) of the act of March 24, 1934, and from the reasoning in the foregoing it must be concluded that he was lawfully admitted to the Territory of Hawaii for permanent residence.

Section 307 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940 requires that a petitioner for naturalization must have resided continuously within the "United States" for 5 years. Section 101 (d) of the Nationality Act defines for the purposes of that act the geographical United States as "The Continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands of the United States." Since by definition Hawaii is included as part of the geographical United States, it must be concluded that the subject's lawful admission to Hawaii for permanent residence under section 8 (a) (1) of the act of March 24, 1934, was a lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence so as to qualify him for naturalization.

Section 329 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940 reads as follows:

"No declaration of intention shall be made by any person who arrived in the United States after June 29, 1906, until such person's lawful entry for permanent residence shall have been established, and a certificate showing the date, place, and manner of arrival into the United States shall have been issued. It shall be the duty of the Commissioner or a Deputy Commissioner to cause to be issued such certificate."

Section 332 (c) of that act reads as follows:

"At the time of filing the petition for naturalization there shall be filed with the clerk of court, a certificate from the Service, if the petitioner arrives in the United States after June 29, 1906, stating the date, place, and manner of petitioner's arrival in the United States. * * *

"Title 8, Cer. 363.3, is the regulation concerned with the filing of a certificate of arrival with a petition for naturalization and states in part that 'unless specifically exempted by the Nationality Act of 1940' each petitioner for naturalization who entered the United States after June 29, 1906, shall file with his petition a certificate of arrival."

There is no provision in the Nationality Act of 1940 exempting citizens of the Philippine Islands who entered Hawaii under that act of March 24, 1934, from filing a certificate of arrival with their petitions for naturalization. Accordingly, the subject would be required to file a certificate of arrival with his petition for naturalization should he proceed that far in his naturalization proceedings. Under the provisions of section 329 (b), it is evident that a certificate of arrival must be issued before he can make a declaration of intention. It is to be noted that the first requirement of section 329 (b) is that the applicant shall have established a lawful entry into the United States for permanent residence. As discussed in the foregoing, the subject has complied with that requirement. The last sentence of section 329 (b) places the duty upon the Commissioner or a Deputy Commissioner of this Service to issue a certificate of arrival. In view of the subject's entry into Hawaii as a national of the United States, no record of

his entry was made by this Service and accordingly, no regular certificate of arrival may be issued. However, the subject should not be penalized and refused the right to file a declaration of intention merely because no such record was made. He is entitled to his day in court. In order for a judicial determination to be made of his eligibility for naturalization, it is suggested that a qualified certificate of arrival be issued for him stating the facts of his entry as shown by the manifest of the steamship *Maunawili* as furnished by the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, which certificate of arrival should set forth that the alien was not inspected under the immigration laws and that there is no immigration record of his entry. The field office should instruct the clerk of the naturalization court, issuing the declaration of intention, to strike out in the eleventh allegation the words "lawful entry for permanent residence" and to insert the word "arrival."

It is recommended that a qualified certificate of arrival be issued, as indicated above, and that it be forwarded to the district director for Honolulu, Hawaii, district with the subject's N-300 and a copy of this memorandum.

Submitted by:

————————,
Examiner.

Approved:

A. C. DEVANEY,
Acting Assistant Commissioner.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this means of expressing to the members of the committee, particularly the members of the conference committee, the appreciation which we of Hawaii, the farthermost part our our country, feel for the work they have done on this legislation. I have yet to hear a single voice of protest raised against the bill from people who stem from the Pacific. There is no change in the immigration laws of greater importance to our future in the Pacific than this bill which undoubtedly will be approved by the House today. I want to say that it is a great step forward in strengthening the position of our country in the Pacific and I most earnestly hope it will finally be enacted into law.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the two gentlemen from Pennsylvania, who have done such a splendid job and who are now handling this legislation, to page 112 of the committee report to language possibly in the act as it was originally sent here to the House.

Under subsection 3 it is stated that American citizens shall lose their nationality "by entering or serving in the armed forces of a foreign state," and so forth. May I now have the special attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]? I call his attention to subsection 3 on page 112 of the report, which language may have been in the bill as it passed the House, where American citizens can lose their nationality by entering or serving in the armed services of another state.

It so happens that in a great many instances where United States citizens are sent abroad, and perhaps have children born abroad, the children may have dual nationality under the laws of the foreign state in which they were born although they are duly registered American citizen children. Not infrequently the foreign state where they were born has impressed such American citizen young men into military service on reaching their eighteenth birthday against their will. This language, "upon entering or serving in the Armed Forces," I take it, is intended to mean a voluntary entering or serving in such Armed Forces?

Mr. WALTER. That is correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. I just wanted to clear up that point because it has been the case on several occasions where American citizens have actually been arrested and been forcibly inducted into the armed services of the foreign state in which they happened to have been born, and there was no intention on their part to commit an act that would cause them to lose their American citizenship.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this conference report. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Judge WALTER, and my colleague, on the minority side, Judge GRAHAM, have both established a very formidable facade to sustain this bill, but I think that the bill still has very serious imperfections which call for its defeat. I yield to no one in my admiration for the painstaking care and the technical knowledge and the general capability of my colleague from Pennsylvania, Judge WALTER, but I would be less than a Congressman and less than a man if I did not oppose what I thought was wrong. Nothing that was inherent in the substantive part of the bill has been changed by this conference report, only some procedural matters, I think, have been improved. I think the bill resulting from the conference report is wrong for four fundamental reasons:

First, it establishes a color line on immigration from the Caribbean, breaking down to a small quota of 100 per source per year the long-established procedure by which Negroes from the West Indies were admitted under the British quota.

Secondly, it aggravates the discrimination against immigration from South and Southeast Europe inherent in the 1924 quota immigration law with its retention of the 1920 date for ascertainment of the quotas based on population despite the censuses of 1940 and 1950, by taking 50 percent of the present quotas and limiting them to immigrants with special skills. If Members vote "aye" on this conference report it will affect millions of families with friends and relatives in many European countries, whom they are trying to help emigrate to the United States and who will be unable to qualify under quotas because of that provision.

Third, it adds jeopardy in status for those who come in as immigrants in regard to deportation and naturalization. I think in that the conference report has made some improvement but it still adds jeopardy to what existed before, and makes the time during which an immigrant can be deported very much longer than it was before.

Fourth, it curtails discretion which we have heretofore vested in the Attorney General, and makes that discretion apply only in exceptional and unusual hardship cases; a very much tighter definition than we had for the 19 (c) cases before in which deportation could be suspended by action of the Attorney General and review by Congress.

I think these issues are all fundamental. In addition to which there is in a new way the exclusion of Asiatics, because the bill now puts in a special status of a very limited number of 100 per annum prospective immigrants regardless of place of birth if of one-half or more Asiatic blood. If the Asiatic peoples do not resent that, I miss my guess.

For all of those reasons, which have been argued many times before, I am opposed to this conference report and I believe it should be rejected.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this conference report and shall vote against it. I would not want my opposition to the report, however, and to the bill, to reflect in any manner upon my admiration and respect for Judge WALTER for whom I have the highest regard. To my mind, there is no one in the House who possesses his knowledge, his experience, and general understanding of our immigration laws and policies. I believe he has attempted in a very expert way to deal with one of the most complicated issues with which this Congress is confronted. In good conscience, however, I must respectfully disagree with my good friend and I must vote against the conference report because I believe that the bill closes our door to the peoples of overpopulated lands who have much to offer our country. Of course we must have limits to our immigration quotas but such limitations must be reasonable and fair. The limitations proposed in this bill continue an unnatural, inflexible and unrealistic separate quota system inaugurated in an anti-immigration period of 1924.

This bill throws away a golden opportunity to cooperate with other peoples who are opposed to the threat of Soviet domination. It could offer the opportunity to demonstrate to the world that we practice the principles of justice which we preach that we are a nation of warmth, of friendship, and sympathy. This bill rejects that concept. It endorses a closed door policy established long ago, which by its quota limitations, acknowledged the superiority of one national group against another. It allowed 150,000 people a year from all over the world to come to this country, and

of that number, it allotted 66,000 numbers to Great Britain. It granted 18,000 to Eire, the balance to all other nations. Year after year, neither Great Britain nor Eire used their total quota and under the immigration laws, those numbers were lost. Nobody can use them. This bill continues the same system. Is this reasonable? Is it not better that such unused numbers be allotted to other nations such as Germany, Italy, and Greece whose quotas are oversubscribed in order that their nationals may come to this country?

I want to join with my colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS] in the position he has taken and the reasons he has given in opposition to the bill. I believe they are cogent and compelling ones; but if those reasons were not enough, I find an additional compelling reason in the tremendous powers accorded the State Department and its consulates, and to the Attorney General—power capable of being exercised arbitrarily, whimsically and capriciously, in many instances without the right of review by independent administrative agencies or by the courts. No such administrative power should be given without a check or review of some kind. None is provided in this bill. The consulates are the channels through which immigration flows to this country. We have a right to expect action based on reason, but I doubt that there is any Member in this House who has not experienced the frustration of trying and being unable to penetrate the reasons underlying a consul's rejection of a prospective immigrant who is seeking to join his relatives in this country. A groundless suspicion, a vague personal opinion by the consul, or perhaps a dyspeptic stomach, for all we know, may doom an immigrant and those awaiting him in this land to disillusionment and despair. There is no question that we must have security and protection from subversives and criminals who seek quota numbers. Such persons should be kept from our shores. I hold no brief for these and I am opposed to their coming to the United States; but I am not willing that the personal opinions of a consular officer, particularly when they are not founded upon reasonable or credible evidence, should be accepted as irrefutable and final to deny entry into the United States of persons who have fought the Communists and are opposed to communism. There have been such cases. Common sense insists that there should be provision for review of capricious, arbitrary action.

I endorse wholeheartedly the provision of this bill which grants naturalization to the Japanese. The first bill which I filed when I came to the Congress was to grant such rights of naturalization to the Japanese because I very much wanted to end the wrong perpetrated by the alien exclusion laws. The Japanese people have waited too long for the rectification of the know-nothing philosophy which subjected them to inferior status; but much as I desire the accomplishment of that goal, the other provisions in the bill which I consider to be detrimental to the best interests of our Nation overbalance this eminently worthy section.

Mr. Speaker, the district which I have the honor to represent draws its population from many parts of Europe and the Orient. We are cosmopolitan and proud of that fact, because we believe that we embody the essence of America—peoples of every ethnic and economic group, of all races and creeds and religions, fused in freedom and working to achieve the great American ideal of equal justice under law.

Our immigration laws should seek that same goal of equal justice under law. Our present law rejects that principle and discriminates against our friends in many of the lands of the free world. It discriminates against the Germans, the Italians, the Greeks, among other peoples. The law we are asked to pass today perpetuates that discrimination. I cannot vote for its approval.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this bill moves in the right direction, but it is rather restrictive. It leaves too many worthy people on the side lines. Therefore, in its present form, I oppose it.

To me, America is a geographical term, free from specific racial or religious connotation. How unlike other countries.

Spin the globe. Put your finger down, What country does your finger touch? India. You think of the Indians. Try again: France. You think of the French. Again: China. You think of the Chinese. Once again: The United States of America. Whom do you think of? What nationality? What religion?

By phone, call anyone in New York, New Orleans, Chicago, Los Angeles, or Texas. What nationality? What religion? What race? Does it matter? They are Americans.

America is a powerful word, an unusual country.

America. It is like an umbrella. People have come here from all over the world for protection against the poisoned rays of pride and prejudice.

God, it seems to me, played His trump card when He opened up America. People have come here each to live out his life in dignity and peace. To worship as each sees fit. And to allow others to do the same.

America is a beautiful word. It is neutral. It is soothing. It is all-embracing. Woe to any person or group which would seek to corner a monopoly of its love.

In approaching this immigration problem, I am afraid some have been blinded by the record of races and their points of origin. It seems to me too little confidence is placed in the strength and inspiration of America. In its ability, with effortless ease, to mold a unique citizen—a true human being.

I am not afraid of other countries, of other peoples. There is something about America. The word is powerful, clean, refreshing.

I hope that this bill will be adjusted, in time, to leave fewer worthy people on the sidelines.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Library of Congress to work up research data on the immigration quotas of all the countries of the world, free and iron curtain. It should be an exceedingly interesting study.

In spite of our many faults and the many limitations of this bill, the staff study the Library of Congress is preparing on the immigration situation, will, I am sure, continue to put the United States of America heads and shoulders above others in the world.

I shall ask unanimous consent to insert the staff study in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when it is prepared.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 99]

Aandahl	Flood	Ostertag
Abbitt	Frazier	O'Toole
Abernethy	Fugate	Phillips
Adair	Fulton	Potter
Albert	Gore	Poulson
Anfuso	Granger	Powell
Bailey	Gwinn	Rabaut
Barden	Hale	Ramsay
Bates, Ky.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Reed, Ill.
Beckworth	Halleck	Richards
Belcher	Harden	Riehlman
Blackney	Harvey	Robeson
Brehm	Hays, Ohio	Roosevelt
Brooks	Heffernan	Sabath
Brown, Ohio	Herter	Sasscer
Buckley	James	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Buffett	Jenkins	Sheppard
Burdick	Johnson	Short
Butler	Kennedy	Smith, Miss.
Carlyle	Keogh	Stanley
Carnahan	Kerr	Steed
Case	Lesinski	Stigler
Chudoff	McConnell	Stockman
Cole, N. Y.	Magee	Sutton
Crawford	Merrow	Tackett
Deane	Miller, Calif.	Vinson
Delaney	Miller, Md.	Welch
Denny	Morano	Wickersham
Dingell	Morgan	Williams, Miss.
Dorn	Morris	Wilson, Ind.
Doyle	Morrison	Wolverton
Elliott	Morton	Wood, Ga.
Ellsworth	Moulder	Woodruff
Elston	Nelson	
Fenton	O'Neill	
Fernandez		

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 322 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. JAVITS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JAVITS moves to recommit the conference report to the committee on conference.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 203, noes 53.

So the conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 8120) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the acting majority leader as to the changes in the program for this week.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, in response to the query made by the distinguished minority leader, the bill (H. R. 5012) to amend the naval rations statute, has been displaced on the program. On tomorrow, Wednesday, we will have first the conference report on the Federal-aid highway bill. The Committee on Rules has granted a rule on House Joint Resolution 477, extension of the statutory powers of the President. The rule calls for 2 hours of general debate. That will follow the conference report on the Federal Highway Act. The communications bill that was scheduled for Thursday has been displaced. Instead on Thursday we will consider H. R. 8120, the military-public-works bill, for which a rule was granted this afternoon, calling for 2 hours of general debate.

I might say also for the information of the Members that while next week's program has not yet been made, I think the Members will be interested to know that it is the plan to bring up on Monday the social-security bill under suspension of the rules. That is H. R. 7800.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is the one that gives the poor people the necessary and needful addition to the money they get now.

Mr. PRIEST. It is one that is in my opinion very important for the general welfare of all our people.

PROVISIONS FOR THE DURATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY

Mr. LYLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 677, Rept. No. 2138), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 477) to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but not beyond June 30, 1953. That after general debate which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia (at the request of Mr. LYLE), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 678, Rept. No. 2139), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8120) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 51

Mr. MITCHELL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 653, Rept. No. 2140), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That House Resolution 51, as amended, is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"The committee may report to the House at any time during the present Congress the results of any investigation made under authority of this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House."

RELATING TO THE THEFT OR RECEIPT OF STOLEN MAIL

Mr. MITCHELL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 679, Rept. No. 2143), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, that immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2198) to amend section 1708 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the theft or receipt of stolen mail matter generally. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for admendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

RECOMMITAL OF BILL

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that bill No. 1008 on the Private Calendar, H. R. 2181, be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THAT DINNER BELL

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial written by Alfred D. Stedman, one of the foremost agricultural authorities in the United States, appeared in the Sunday issue of the St. Paul Pioneer Press.

It appears to me that some facts presented in this short editorial should be of interest to every member of the Congress since it very concisely states a problem that confronts farmers today and one for which they have been unfairly and unjustly criticized.

Mr. Stedman might also have commented on the fact that many housewives purchase foods today that are prepared to put on the table that formerly she prepared in the kitchen, and as long as she desires that these foods be prepared she can expect to pay the cost of such services.

Our eating habits change from year to year. We desire that our consuming public continue to have the best possible food on their tables. We do feel that we must find ways for a greater portion of the food dollar to be returned to the farmer in order that he can continue to produce quality products.

THAT DINNER BILL

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

As in skinning a cat, there are different ways of telling a food price story. One is to confront Mrs. American Housewife with the blunt news that farm prices have tripled and that her food bill has more than tripled since prewar days.

So far as it goes, that simple, familiar, irearousing story is true; and it would be adequate if, through the years, everything else had remained the same. But the related fundamentals have meanwhile changed. So the fair and informative thing seems to be to tell the food story in the perspective of the related facts of life.

First, let us look at other cost trends, including farm operating costs, farm wage levels, and nonfood costs and services. They are all up—farm production costs to 250 percent; farm wage rates to 412 percent; and nonfood costs and services to 254 percent of 1935–1939 levels. These account for some but not all of the advance in food costs.

Next, let us inquire about trends since prewar in average consumer income which, after taxes are paid, remains available for spending and saving. That, in 1951 was up to 284 percent of the 1935–39 level. Having more money to spend, consumers bid food prices up higher.

But still that's not all the story. Food costs have outrun even the rise of incomes, really pinching those whose incomes have lagged behind the average. In prewar years, food took 23 percent of average spendable income. In 1951, it took 26 percent. That rise is still to be explained.

Where could Mrs. Housewife possibly turn for an explanation? Well, she might look at her dinner table. On the average, she is setting it much better now. She is serving 11 percent more food on the average than she did in 1935–39. That jump in quantity alone offsets most of the cost increase.

Then, if the housewife compares closely, she will note that her menu contains more of the nutritious foods that are expensive to produce but are good for the health, especially of her children. She is serving one-fifth more dairy products other than butter, nearly a fifth more meat, poultry, and fish, a third more eggs, and one-tenth more fruits and vegetables.

Finally, the housewife will notice that today she is buying much more of her food fresh frozen, otherwise refrigerated, selected, graded, and conveniently wrapped and processed. Thus she is getting more of services that, with labor as the largest item of expense and wages up 5 percent in the past year, cost more money, and less than half of her dollar spent for farm foods reaches the farmer.

So improvements in the amounts and kinds of food and in servicing tell the story. The same quantities of the same foods that took 23 percent of average income after taxes in 1935–39 would have taken only 19 percent in 1951.

The farmer is doing a lot better for himself and his family now with the housewife as a good spending customer than he did in 1935–39. But is that hurting the housewife? At average income, her husband is able to buy good food with the shortest working time in the world. She is paying more for more and better food, and is serving her family the healthiest diet in the world.

HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. McDONOUGH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to bring before the House some questions concerning the administration and running of the United States Post Office Department.

Mr. Speaker, to many of our people throughout the length and breadth of this great land the only contact with the Federal Government and its employees is through their local post offices. This contact has long been a friendly one on both sides and no one in the Federal service has more truly earned the affection and respect of the American people than the postal employees.

These people have taken pride in their work, it has, in the past, meant a great deal to them to keep up a high standard of work and of morale.

But, recently this picture has changed very radically.

Mr. Speaker, my information comes to me from the employees themselves and their accredited spokesmen, many of these people I am proud to call my friends.

They are distressed and concerned at what is happening to the postal service. They feel, and justly as I shall show later, that their high standards and fine morale are being blasted. I have heard this thought expressed dozens, nay hundreds of times and I sincerely believe for that reason, if for no other, that a committee of the House of Representatives should be appointed to investigate and report on conditions in the Post Office Department.

To this end I have this day introduced a resolution, to this effect and I trust that this study of the Department, so long overdue, will be undertaken in the near future.

I know that there is nothing less popular than to question the running of Government departments by appointed officials; they are the Brahmins of our modern civilization; they are the Pretorian guard of our modern Rome. But we are the Representatives of the people, duly elected by them, and we are greatly to blame, it seems to me, if we do not demand good, honest service from the executive branch of Government. When a Congressman is bold enough to stand in the well of this House and note laxness in any Government department, he or she is immediately accused of smearing devoted and patriotic civil servants and conscientious postal employees. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that is most certainly not my purpose, but the very reverse. What I am attacking is corruption at the top, and I am doing it as much for the rank and file of the Government employees as I am for the people back home that I have the honor to represent.

Now, some will say, why more investigations? Is there any reason for all of this?

Mr. Speaker, there is abundant reason for all this. The House is already familiar with the Boston Post Office scandals where, as a result of some investigations, 1,298 permanent and temporary employees were dismissed or resigned for malfeasance in office.

They were let off easy, only one man went to jail, and the rest were given light fines or nothing at all. Yet Assistant Postmaster General Burke said:

The Boston case stands out as the most aggravating case of its kind that we know of.

Now, I have here with me documents confirming scandals in the New York City office, Chicago, and in the State of Mississippi, and I shall take them up in order.

Finally, the curtailment order limiting delivery of the mail has caused a very great hardship to business and to our people.

Letters sometimes take 4 days to come from New York City to Washington; in the days of the stagecoach they made better time than that. This order was put in, in the name of economy, but the economy that it has effected is small, if

it exists at all. Nothing is more expensive and extravagant than to allow the mail to pile up as it does under this system. First-class mail often gets mixed with other classes of mail, thereby causing added inconvenience and loss to patrons.

Besides, the extra burden put on our letter carriers and other employees by the curtailment order is very great, and I can cite you many cases of illness and forced retirement that can definitely be traced to this order.

Some of the affairs that have happened under the present postal administration have been very much along the scandalous order. Take the case of Harold Ambrose, who started as a clerk in the postal service and rapidly rose to the position of Special Assistant to Postmaster General Donaldson at a salary of $10,000 a year. He was indicted on October 17, 1950, and pleaded guilty on January 8, 1951, to fraud charges. He admitted the conversion of $50,000 to his own use. This man used the Postmaster General's stationery to sell commemorative stamps. He is now serving from 2 to 7 years in a Federal penitentiary.

The Nation was shocked in March of 1951 when a 32-year-old veteran, who had been a German prisoner of war for 26 months, told how he paid $250 to get a job as a temporary mail carrier. This occurred in the State of Mississippi. The records developed that there were 48 jobs sold in this State. Because the Senators and Congressmen from Mississippi were Dixiecrats the authority to make selection among the top three eligibles on the civil-service register was taken away by the Postmaster General from the elected representatives of the people and given to unreliable people in the State of Mississippi. Again, like Pontius Pilate, the Postmaster General unctiously wrung his hands and disavowed responsibility.

In February of 1951 the story broke that temporary employees in the South Station in Boston, Mass., were drawing pay, but not actually working for this pay. One post-office clerk was on the clock in the post office in Boston, and being paid by the post office, although at the time he was enjoying himself on the sands of sunny Florida. The policeman on the beat, before starting his tour as a policeman, punched in at the post office and drew post-office pay for the time he was working as a policeman. It was reported that supervisors were being paid to punch the cards of men who were not working. After this situation had gone on for a long period of time and was quite generally well known in Boston, the postal administrators discovered the fact. Indictments were returned by the Federal grand jury against 114 employees. Eighty-four of these employees pleaded guilty. The career postmaster of Boston retired more or less under compulsion. This gross administrative confusion was lightly dismissed by the Postmaster General.

Again, in April 1952, another scandal rocked the once scandal-free Post Office Department when it was discovered that in the city of New York, supervisory positions were being sold to employees. Again an investigation and another scandal. The postmaster of New York City retired under fire.

On Saturday, May 31, 1952, the Chicago Daily News carried the story headlined "Quiz postal workers here on job selling." This investigation has not been concluded, but again it appears that scandal has reared its ugly head in the Post Office Department.

In the meantime, under the same administration, the postal employees have not fared so well. At Watervliet, N. Y., the rural carriers in that office had been working extremely long hours in order to serve their routes. Finally, in October 1951 a great deal of territory was taken from the rural route of one carrier and a new mounted route established. Usually, in cases where a mounted city delivery route is established in territory formerly served by a rural route, the rural carrier is tansferred to the new mounted route and in this way his salary is protected. In this particular case, however, the rural carrier was not given the mounted route and his salary was reduced from $3,257 a year to $2,670 a year. He made a protest to the postmaster at Watervliet—his organization protested to the Post Office Department in Washington. Nothing has been done to date to correct this injustice. This man has had his salary reduced by approximately $600. There is a vacant route to which he should be transferred, but the postmaster at Watervliet and the Post Office Department have refused to grant this man justice.

There are innumerable other cases of this type that could be related to establish the premise that the Post Office Department administration has been a lamentable failure under Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson. An investigation is sorely needed.

True, in time, after some Member takes the matter up, after these cases are brought up on the floor years later in fact, something is done. But, Mr. Speaker, that surely is not the way we are used to having the post office handled; it never used to be so, and our present Postmaster General had a great opportunity when he assumed his office; he was a career man; we all gave him our earnest and our heartfelt support. For that reason the employees believed that in him they would have an understanding and a sympathetic champion. Those of us who had worked on the committee felt the same way; we felt that here was someone who would know the fundamentals, the background, all the great traditions of the Post Office Department.

We have been bitterly disappointed, and so now it seems to me it is time that this Department be investigated in a thorough, impartial, and judicial manner.

Mr. Speaker, I brought with me some of the exhibits. I ask unanimous consent that they be included in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURNSIDE). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I have newspaper articles. This one is from the Washington Post in regard to the blanketing of postmasters under civil service. Many of us believe that is an extremely good thing, because we want to take the Department out of politics as much as possible. But there is grave danger that under the present administration many will be blanketed in who ought now to be given their walking papers.

[From the Washington Post of May 3, 1951]

DONALDSON WOULD END SENATE CONFIRMATION OF POSTMASTERS

(By Murrey Marder)

The remains of the political spoils system which still clings to postmaster jobs is a violation of at least "the spirit of the law," the Senate's investigation subcommittee was told yesterday.

Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson said the only way political influence will be removed from the appointments is by a law which ends the requirement for Senate confirmation of postmasters.

Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, said he was startled to learn that civil-service regulations specifically prohibit political affiliation from entering into such appointments.

With more curiosity than indignation, MUNDT said he was not questioning the fact that the party in power distributes the political plums.

"I understand the rules of the game and I'm not complaining about it," said MUNDT, noting that Republicans and Democrats both use such patronage when the opportunity presents itself.

"I wonder if we just can't have a fine display of candor here," he told Donaldson. "Say it's in the law and it's being violated every day."

IMPROVED AFTER 1938

Donaldson told the subcommittee, which is investigating the outright sale of postal jobs in Mississippi, that the selection of postmasters improved markedly after 1938 when they came under civil-service regulations.

The names of the top three postmasters in each civil-service examination are turned over to the political advisers designated, at present, by the Democratic National Committee. The adviser then recommends one of the three, and while political affiliation is not mentioned, it is obviously at issue said Donaldson.

"It has always been that way in both parties," said Donaldson—a nonpolitical appointee himself—and he told MUNDT and Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, who joined in the questioning: "I don't call it a violation of the law. It's a violation of the spirit of the law."

Donaldson and Subcommittee Chairman CLYDE R. HOEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, both said the Justice Department will be given investigation reports on the 48 acting postmaster and rural mail carrier jobs which were alleged paid for in Mississippi.

Eight of the forty-eight have already been fired in the alleged job sales by members of a proadministration Democratic committee group.

Donaldson said that as soon as he received evidence in February that money had changed hands in job appointments, he ordered his Department to discontinue relations with Mississippi's pro-Truman Democratic national committeeman, Clarence E. Hood.

The evidence indicates that Hood himself wasn't involved in the job selling, said Donaldson, "but some of the fellows associated with him" were.

Robert M. Moore, assistant to William M. Boyle, Jr., chairman of the Democratic National Committee, told the Senators the White House had no hand in the designation of Hood as Mississippi committeeman.

He said the selection, eliminating from the national committee, the anti-Truman Democrats who are in control of the party in Mississippi, was recommended by the credentials committee here. Hood was ousted when the job-sale charges were made.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I want to compliment my colleague from New York for the hard work which I know she has done in preparation for this address today which is so illuminating although disturbing to all of us, and also for the great research which went into her work in preparing this resolution. It seems to me that the gentlewoman has performed a great service in bringing this matter to our attention, and it is my hope that the resolution which she offered will receive favorable action, because this is certainly an area of our Government operations which deserves a very thorough inquiry.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution; and may I say that I could not have gotten all this information together and that I could not have gotten the exhibits that I have without the help of many employees and organization members in the Post Office Department. I have worked closely with them, and they have helped us.

I also have an article from the World-Telegram; and may I say that the Scripps-Howard papers have done a great deal of research and have worked hard in this field, telling of the paying of $250 by the veteran in Mississippi to secure a temporary position:

[From the New York World-Telegram of March 5, 1951]

VET TELLS OF PAYING TRUMANITES $250 FOR MISSISSIPPI MAIL-CARRIER JOB

(By Clark Porteous)

JACKSON, MISS., March 5.—A 32-year-old veteran who was a German prisoner of war for 26 months today told me how he paid $250 to the pro-Truman faction of the Democratic Party "to get my job" as a temporary mail carrier.

The veteran is James Quentin Dickerson, a farmer near Senatobia, Miss. His charges were made after the United States Senate was told that Federal jobs were being bought and sold in this State.

An investigation demanded by Mississippi's two Senators would look into the postal service and the new wage- and price-control set-up for Mississippi.

HAD SHORT TENURE

Mr. Dickerson said his career as a mail carrier lasted from last June 12 to March 1, when his 29-mile-long route was eliminated through a consolidation. He blamed the consolidation on the pro-Dixiecrat postmistress at Senatobia, whose son he had displaced.

Mr. Dickerson said the suggestion that a contribution to the pro-Trumanites might help him get a job originated with an old friend, C. B. Rowse, principal of the grade school at Coldwater, Miss. He recalled:

"Mr. Rowse said he knew the fellows at Jackson (party headquarters) and suggested that if I sent a contribution to the Democratic Party, it might help me get the job. I asked him how much and he said, 'Oh, $200 or $300.' I told him I was sort of broke, and would $250 be all right. He said he thought it would."

SENT CERTIFIED CHECK

Mr. Dickerson said he sent a certified check to the Democratic committee at Jackson. He said he also went to see B. C. Beasley, then organization secretary for the Democrats, and was promised by Mr. Beasley that he would get the job.

After the temporary appointment came through, Mr. Dickerson said, he thought he would get a chance to take an examination for permanent tenure. "But I didn't," he said. "I'm through now. If that's the way the Government does things, I don't want any part of it."

Mr. Dickerson said his yearly salary was $2,536, but with the wear and tear on his car, and the $250 job payment, he didn't break even.

DENIES CHARGES

School principal Rowse told me that two postal inspectors had been to see him and had accused him of being a "go-between" on job sales. He said he denied it and also refused to sign a statement that he had suggested Mr. Dickerson make a contribution.

Mr. Rowse said as a school man he always "tried to get along with the group in power to help get jobs for my graduates."

Behind the job-sale scandal lies a bitter rivalry between the pro-Truman Democrats in Mississippi and the States Rights or Dixiecrat Parties. States Righters say when the Trumanites tried to take over, the latter were balked of any patronage requiring United States Senate confirmation because of the opposition of Mississippi's two Senators, JAMES O. EASTLAND and JOHN C. STENNIS.

TELLS OF LETTER

So, the States Righters say, the Trumanites concentrated on the lower grades in the postal service, which don't require confirmation. Early in the attempted Trumanite take-over, postmasters received a circular letter from Mr. Beasley asking to be notified of all upcoming vacancies.

Mrs. Hermine Lamar, the pro-Dixiecrat postmistress at Senatobia, said, "I got one. The postal inspectors who were here the other day asked me for it but I couldn't find it. It asked that Beasley be notified of all prospective vacancies in the post offices, either through retirements, men going into service, or whatever."

I telephoned Mr. Beasley. He was retired as party organization secretary last October, officially because of his health.

RECALLS APPOINTMENT

He said he recalled the Dickerson appointment and that "Mrs. Lamar tried to give me a lot of trouble about that one." He said job seekers had made party contributions "but we've found evidence that postmasters in northern Mississippi did that before we took over.

"I don't think they (the States Rights Democrats) were worried about losing patronage for jobs like rural mail carriers. It was when the jobs in the price stabilization set-up came along that they got worried."

One way the Trumanites raised money was by sending all the rural mail carriers batches of $15 tickets to a Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner.

Paul M. Moore, a prominent States Righter of Calhoun City, said he told all the carriers he knew to refuse to pay, except one, a carrier who 3 weeks ago received permanent status in a job paying $3,600 to $3,800 a year.

I also have a letter here from a member of branch 2553 of the National Association of Letter Carriers, in which he encloses two telegrams. I am not going to go too deeply into how he got them. This is sent from Greer, S. C., and he tells me that these two telegrams were sent by Senator MAYBANK and Representative BRYSON in answer to pleas that the post office employees be paid during the late week when it was impossible to get funds for that purpose.

This gentleman says in this letter:

These telegrams were delivered to the post office and the postmaster opened them before we received them. In other words, they were addressed to employees but were opened by the postmaster.

His letter continues:

They were delivered that morning and were found late that afternoon up at the window, and he has never mentioned them from that time on.

This is the kind of abuse that is constantly brought to our attention. It happens in various post offices; it happens—I do not say always, but in many instances—where a postmaster feels that he has the power, that he cannot be removed, that he can run the office to suit himself.

I have had other cases where mail addressed to employees from the department in Washington has been opened by the postmasters at the office and not delivered to the employee. It seems to me thtat is a definite abridgment of their rights and I think we would all agree on that.

The next thing I would like to speak of because it is one that the people of the country are talking of more than anything else, due to the fact it hits every man and woman and certainly every businessman in the country, is the curtailment order limiting the delivery of mail to one delivery a day which has caused such very great hardship to business and to all our people. Letters sometimes take 4 days to come from New York City to Washington, D. C. In the days of the stagecoach they made better time than that.

This order was put in, in the name of economy, but the economy it has effected is very small, if there is any at all. Nothing is more expensive or extravagant than to have the mail pile up, as it does of necessity, under this system. First-class mail often gets mixed up with the other mail, thereby causing added inconvenience and great loss to the patrons. Besides this an extra burden is put on our letter carriers and other employees.

We have had many cases brought to our attention in committee, and in our offices of letter carriers who have suffered heart attacks brought on by this very thing of carrying a heavy pack all day long, in many instances having practically no time out for lunch, having

to grab a sandwich on someone's back porch, then never getting through, never feeling that the work has been finished, yet receiving all the complaints, because we must remember that the letter carrier is near to everyone. People in the country districts and in the small towns do not write to Washington; they complain to the letter carrier, they show him the envelopes, the cancelled dates and ask: Why did I not get this 3 or 4 days ago? Why did I not receive my check? and so on. So he is burdened physically and mentally, and, as I said, this is done in the name of economy.

There are other great economies that could be effected in this department and I believe under a careful scrutiny and a careful investigation we will find many ways. We have already suggestions made by the Hoover Commission, but never put into full effect. I understand that only the other day ex-President Hoover himself remarked on that very fact, and said that the Post Office Department is one department of Government for which he hoped the Hoover Commission would remain on the job so that these matters could be put right.

But to come back to this idea of economy, why is it that whenever that question comes up the heads of these Government departments invariably economize in a way that is going to hurt the average citizen? I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is great method in their madness. I think they want to have these protests brought to the Congress. I think they want to have the people say, as they quite naturally do, Why do you not make these appropriations? They have asked, "Why can I not get my pay check? I am told it is because you did not vote the money. Why can I not get my mail? It is because the Postmaster has had to curtail service due to your not voting the money."

Mr. Speaker, this is propaganda, and it is not very good propaganda, if we sift it through. The Postmaster, in my humble opinion, had a perfect right under the law to see that the postal employees were paid out of current receipts. He did not choose to do this or to exert the power that he had under the law. The Postmaster General could have found other and better ways to economize than by curtailing the service to our people. He did not choose to do that. In other words, it is exactly as though a man came home to his wife and said: "We have got to economize, we have got to stretch our budget, we have got to tighten our belts."

The next morning he gets up on a cold winter's day and sees his children go to school barefoot. What does he say then? "What is the idea? Why have the children no shoes and socks?" "Oh," she says, "that is because you want me to economize." How ridiculous.

In the first place the economy effected by this order is of a very dubious character. There probably is not very much to it. All it does is inconvenience people and when they complain they are told to come back and blame the Congress. We are up against that. We heard a very similar thing happen on the floor of this House today. We were told in no uncertain terms that all the troubles engendered by the present steel dispute could all be laid at the door of the Congress. We were given two alternatives: Take it and like it. It is a far cry from the days when the Legislative branch had equal power with the other two branches of Government.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that some of that power is gradually going to be restored. I hope that we as Representatives of the people will stand up boldly and demand that anything we hear in any department that is not being done in a proper way, in a legitimate way, in an economical and efficient way, be investigated and be corrected. We are here for that one purpose, it seems to me, to stand between the people and the encroachment of government. Let us try to do that even in cases where it seems difficult and let us start, I hope, soon, with this Post Office Department, this department so near to the people, this department with its many, many fine employees who are distressed, I can assure you, beyond measure, at what has happened to their service in which they take such pride.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am sure the gentlewoman from New York knows that the Postmaster General insists that his mail currently runs 100 to 1 in favor of his curtailment order.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Well, I can only say to the gentleman from New Jersey that I think he and I ought to send the Postmaster General a few samples of our mail, and I would also like to send him a few samples of things that happened to the small-business people of my district before this last Christmas, when in one instance a dealer ordered some Christmas cards to be delivered by the 12th of December and received them on January 1, 1952.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to the gentlewoman from New York that I happen to know one American lad who disagrees with the Postmaster General very seriously. Our Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office Appropriations had occasion recently to visit the Aleutian Islands. On Unimak we rode in an Army weasel over the mountains to Scotch Cap, where the Coast Guard has a complement of four men in charge of a beacon light and foghorn. One of the Guardsmen, we learned, subscribes to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He pays $1.50 per month to receive copies of the proceedings of the Congress, and when he saw two Congressmen at his station he said, "You know, I have one complaint to make. One of the worst things our Government ever did to the home folks was that curtailment of mail deliveries. I will never forget that."

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. May I also say to my friend from New Jersey that the service between our own country and the boys at the front, in Korea, has been very, very dreadful. I have had complaints, and I am sure you have, from many mothers and fathers of these boys who cannot get their mail through on time, and who do not hear from their sons; that is bad enough, but it seems to me it is far worse for these boys who are off there in that hell hole in Korea not at least to be able to hear regularly from the home folks.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentlewoman has brought up the case of Harold Ambrose, who used to be assistant to the Postmaster General. Long before—yes, months before he was caught in this stamp difficulty, for which he received a jail sentence—our subcommittee discovered he was sending out to the postmasters of the United States a weekly news letter at $10 per postmaster. We had that stopped by his chief, the Postmaster General.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. That is one reason I mentioned specifically the Ambrose case, may I say to my good colleague from New Jersey, because I want to make it very clear that most of the abuse stems from the heads in the Department. I am not saying that they are dishonest, but I am saying if they are not dishonest, they are culpably negligent. We have seen so many of these cases, and they have invariably tried to tell us when we criticized that we were criticizing the postal employees. We are not criticizing the postal employees. We are siding with the postal employees in the face of these very great abuses by some of the more important appointed people in the Department.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I should like to compliment the gentlewoman from New York on the very fine address she has made, and particularly on speaking out on behalf of the fine public servants we have in the postal service. I think we have no better public servants than the postal employees.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman. I am glad to have that reiterated over and over again, because it is a fact.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I, too, desire to compliment the gentlewoman on the presentation she has just made to the House. Things are coming to a pretty pass in this Nation when moral decadence has gone so far that today we begin to distrust even a great organization like the Post Office Department, which has been, as the gentlewoman has said, so close to the hearts of people all over the Nation. I think the postal employees themselves should be very grateful to the gentlewoman for bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I can assure the gentleman that, although I do not know that the postal employees want me to do it, I do know they feel this should be

aired and that we should understand their position on it.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I congratulate the gentlewoman on her very constructive address. It is one that I believe will bear fruit, because I think she has expressed what has been in the minds of a great many of the Members of this House from their own experience.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank my friend from New York.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. I, too, congratulate the gentlewoman from New York on the very fine talk she has given. Incidentally, I should like to ask this question. May it not be possible for the Post Office Committee to make some recommendations in regard to the appointment of postmasters?

I have had a great deal of correspondence during the past few weeks in regard to a vacancy in my district which is to be filled by a veteran because of the additional points he has over and above other members of the postal service. This man very recently borrowed a car from one of the prominent officials in that little town and under the influence of liquor he ran into a school bus. None of the children were seriously injured but they were all, of course, shaken up, and the back end of the bus was destroyed. In an effort to get out of this situation he backed into another car, which belonged to a very poor Baptist preacher who had no funds with which to repair his car, and so on.

This man is commonly known as the town drunkard, but, in spite of that fact, I am told he cannot be replaced by anyone else because he has already been certified and is going to be appointed to the job. I was told that we would have to name some specific situations.

The situation has not yet been settled. We have been definitely told that we will have to come in with a sworn statement and we will have to have many witnesses certify to the situation in spite of the fact that we have petitions from about 95 percent of the residents of that little community to have another appointment made.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. May I say to the gentlewoman that here again we have all been very lax in allowing the Department to make appointments such as the one she describes, and in allowing them to get away from the rules and evading the civil-service provisions which call for their making appointments from the three top people on the roster. They do not do that. They give every kind of excuse for not doing so, even to the point of giving the examinations in some instances to the same individual three and four times, and keeping such individuals on the payroll in a temporary status. I am very glad that the gentlewoman contributed that particular incident because it points up another thing, which under investigation, should be corrected.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. SAYLOR. I join with my other colleagues in congratulating the gentlewoman on the excellent presentation she has made because I feel she has done the veterans of the postal service a great service, and pays them a tremendous compliment. The veterans of the postal service are men and women who have given their lives to this service, and they are now being blighted in the public eye because of some few instances, which have been pointed out. The rank and file of the men who are in the postal service are sincere public servants, and are entitled to every protection that this committee of Congress can give to them.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. The gentleman is very right. I certainly hope that I have been able to bring that out fully in my presentation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG] is recognized for 30 minutes.

ARMY OF LIBERATION IN EUROPE

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to present to my colleagues who are present, and to get into the RECORD, a brief report of an investigation which I recently made in countries of Western Europe in regard to a great and unused military asset, namely, the many refugees and escapees from the countries behind the iron curtain who are ready and willing to join with us in the defense of Western Europe and of the free world. Mr. Speaker, we are strengthening our military forces in Western Europe and throughout the world in order to stand against a very serious threat of Communist aggression. Yet, we are not using one of the biggest assets we have in this fight. The whole burden of my report this afternoon will be a plea that the time has come to utilize this great asset, which we have in the refugees and escapees from the iron curtain countries of Eastern Europe. I make a plea that we establish an Army of Liberation from the available military personnel among those refugees and exiles from the countries bordering the Soviet Union which are now unhappily dominated and controlled by the Kremlin.

My colleagues will recall that in consideration of the Mutual Security Administration appropriation last August there was inserted in that bill an item known as the Kersten amendment. The amount involved was $100,000,000. The purpose of that appropriation item was to assist refugees and escapees, exiles, if you please, from those countries now dominated by the Kremlin, who have escaped and gotten into zones of Western Germany and into other areas of Western Europe, in finding themselves and in relocating and also in preparing them to assist us in standing against Communist aggression in Western Europe. Specifically, it was in the minds of many of us who supported that amendment to the appropriation bill that this money could be utilized through authorization of the State Department and the Mutual Security Administration, and then specifically by the Military Department, in order to bring into our military forces such available manpower as would be found among these refugees and exiles. We hoped they would be utilized in strengthening our NATO and western European defense forces.

I am sorry to report that, according to information given to me today by the responsible authority in the State Department, not one cent of that $100,000,000 has been utilized. I was assured, it is true, that plans are under way to utilize that money sometime. To give the State Department credit, they assure us that they have plans not only to assist those refugees in getting additional food and housing and taking care of their immediate needs, but they are hoping sometime to take up with other members of the NATO group the utilization of the able-bodied manpower that can be brought into our military defense.

I am only sorry that that has not been done long ago. I think the time has come to utilize this great asset that we have, namely, the burning desire of those refugees, those escapees, those exiles from behind the iron curtain, for the liberation of their own people and the reestablishment of freedom in their homelands. I refer specifically, of course, to those countries starting with the Baltic area, little countries now completely absorbed by the Soviet Union—Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania; and then farther down the map the great country of Poland, for whose freedom so many freedom-loving people went to war in 1939, 1940, and 1941; Czechoslovakia, now absorbed by the Soviet Union, at least as far as its political domination is concerned; and those other countries, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania. Those constitute the captive lands, filled with captive peoples who resent the enslavement that the Kremlin has forced upon them.

Now, the Kersten amendment will be explained further by my colleague [Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin], who is to speak after I conclude, but I can report that only a little more than $4,000,000 of that $100,000,000 has even been earmarked or authorized for expenditure. As I said a moment ago, not one cent has yet been spent. Yet we have here a great political asset, and a little expenditure of money would utilize it.

To determine just what an asset it is, I investigated as carefully as I could, in the brief time of 10 days that I had at my disposal, the actual status of some of these refugee people in Europe. I was particularly interested in interviewing that great Polish patriot and hero, Gen. W. Anders, who so valiantly led his Polish Army against the Nazis, standing shoulder to shoulder with Gen-

eral Clark's army in north Africa, then into Italy, and after the victory, from Italy he went into exile in London. There General Anders and his staff, his officers, many of his noncommissioned officers, are still sitting rusting away with their armies scattered throughout England and other countries waiting for the time when they can be utilized as a part of the defense of Western Europe.

I talked to General Anders at great length. I asked him several searching questions which he readily answered. I pause to pay tribute to the heroism of General Anders and his fine Polish people; they are in every respect a tribute to the same type of bravery that sent to our shores during our struggle for independence under General Washington such men as Generals Pulaski and Kosciusko and others from Poland who helped us fight for our freedom.

I grant you that 7 years have elapsed since 1945 when General Anders' army disbanded. I asked General Anders how many men he could put into uniform to supplement the western defense forces. He said at least 70,000. When I reminded him that these fighting men are now 7 years older than they were in 1945, that many of them were not as fit as they were at that time, he reminded me that the average age of those Polish fighters in 1944 and 1945 when they made such a brilliant struggle against nazism was far older than the average of our men; yet, he said, we will admit that they fought as bravely as our troops; and the reason was that they were fighting for their own freedom. He said they will make up in that same kind of bravery for the added age that may now be upon them.

I have here a report in the form of a joint memorandum to the Supreme Command of the Armed Forces of the Atlantic Pact in Europe, from the military representatives of the eight eastern central European countries residing in the west. The memorandum is the result of a meeting in Paris on the 12–15 of March, 1952, on the part of the following military leaders in exile:

Gen. W. Anders, of Poland.
Gen. D. Veltchev, of Bulgaria.
Gen. C. Kudlacek of Czechoslovakia.
Gen. A. Zako of Hungary.
Col. A. Rebane of Estonia.
Col. A. Silgailis of Latvia.
Col. J. Lanskornskis of Lithuania.
Gen. D. Petrescu, of Rumania.

These leaders form an unofficial military staff for the exiled groups from behind the iron curtain of Eastern Europe. All of them are intensely eager to give their activities reality and substance through an army of liberation. As result of the discussions of these leaders in Paris last March, and from previous meetings, we can piece together a picture of the military activities of the Moscow dominated regimes of Eastern Europe. I quote from a report given me by General Anders:

A gradual building up of the armed forces of eastern central Europe and their ever closer binding with the Soviet Red Army has been going on since 1949.

A Bureau of the Allied Armies with Marshall Bulganin at its head, was instituted in Moscow in 1949. At the beginning of 1950 the command over the satellite armies was taken over entirely by the Russians or by avowed Communists. Soviet officers were de facto placed in charge of all the senior commanding and staff posts. Local trained Communists filled posts of lower grades.

Military budgets were substantially increased and in 1951 stood as follows: Bulgaria, 20,000,000 leva; Czechoslovakia, 10,400,000 koruny; Hungary, 3,500,000 forints; Poland, 123,000,000 zlotys; Rumania, 62,000,000 lei.

A very intensive training of reserves was started in 1949. A modernization of the armed forces, and especially of the army, with respect to their armament, organization, and training is proceeding now at a full pace. The local industries have been increasing their efforts toward armament and equipment of the armed forces of the Soviet bloc.

It is, therefore, evident that the intention of the U. S. S. R. is to create soon, out of the armies of the Eastern Central Europe, a modern weapon of warfare totally bound with the Soviet armed forces.

The U. S. S. R. is in a position to use against Western Europe as many as 72 divisions made up of Central European military forces. One-fourth of those divisions are armored and motorized. It is, therefore, evident that a substantial satellite armed force, capable of heavy striking power, is in existence and ready to be used against the free world.

With the announcement of the creation of a new German Army, came a feeling of depression and hopelessness among our people of Eastern Europe. Communist propaganda has played up the creation of this German Army, in a way to instill fear throughout Central Europe. There is only one way to counteract this situation, and that is to bring into the western defense organization, military units of Eastern Europe who are still loyal to their own freedom and willing to help protect the freedom of Western Europe and the entire free world.

I end the quote of General Anders, the great Polish patriot and hero.

Now, assuming his figure of 70,000 Polish troops still in exile in England and elsewhere in Western Europe is entirely too high, assuming that some have become weak and flabby and diseased, assuming some of them cannot be found, suppose we reduce that figure to 30,000. The 30,000 will include many young men from Poland who escaped into the western zone of Germany and went farther on into England and elsewhere. Suppose that 30,000 could be used effectively. What a striking force that would be. Quickly they could be utilized. Quickly they could be put into uniform and equipped. They are already in Europe, where they are needed. They all have a burning desire to fight for their freedom. Suppose, and I put this supposition before some of our own military advisers in London and in Bonn and at NATO headquarters, you should cut that figure entirely in two and say that only 15,000 of these brave Poles could be used as combat troops. You would still have 15,000 more that could be used as auxiliary troops. And you can add to those a certain number from every one of the iron curtain countries.

It is true that no other country could furnish as many as Poland would, but Czechoslovakia could furnish at least 20,000 at the present time. Figures given me by General Anders and other leaders of these military units indicate there could be put into uniform promptly at least 120,000 effective combat troops from all the Eastern European countries.

Now, may I refer to some figures in regard to how many young men are being drafted from out of our homes and districts and States. It just happens that I added together the figures of the young men inducted from the States of Missouri, 14,421; California, 15,142; Illinois, 31,716; Texas, 12,679; and New York City and State, 46,691, for the period from May 1951 to the conclusion of April 1952. That totals 120,649 troops inducted off the farms, from out the schools and the workshops and the homes of that many States of our Nation. It equals just a little bit more than those from behind the iron curtain that could be put into uniform immediately and could take the places of those whom we are drafting from these five States alone. If you take the figures from other States you would find a comparable number from every one of them as compared to those that I have read. The army of liberation would relieve much of the pressure of the draft of our young manpower into the military forces.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. It is my understanding that real friends of General Anders are much concerned over the oft-repeated expression of American policy "containment of communism." What hope, they ask, does that extend to the liberty-loving people of Poland and other nations that want to be free from iron-curtain control? Does the gentleman have anything to say about that?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do, and I appreciate the gentleman's question. He has asked it at exactly the right time.

I have mentioned the great value of using these forces from a military standpoint. They are actually there and in being, ready to be equipped, to take their place in the fight for freedom and to take the places of those whom we are having to send from the United States. But there is a greater value of these troops, as the gentleman has indicated. Let me make it specific: The greatest value of establishing an army of liberation will be the hope that we give to these people, represented by General Anders and others, these people behind the iron curtain, that we are going to change our policy of containment and we are going to work steadily for the liberation of these people now enslaved by Soviet Russia. Personally, I believe that that would be even a greater value to our cause than the value of these men fighting militarily.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I think the gentleman from Missouri is making a very fine contribution to a world we want to have in the future. I refer particularly to a possibility that might result from amending the Geneva Convention, which would allow the combatants that we now have on Koje, who have declared against going back to Communist Russia or China or North Korea, to come into the South Korean Army immediately, right now, just as General Anders' army and his forces were allowed to come into the Allied Army after they were liberated from Soviet dungeons, after Russia knifed Poland in the back. We have to be ready for the Koje situation.

Lastly, if I may pursue the question further, I think we must address ourselves to this fact: if the guns go off and we have to advance against iron-curtain countries, there will be many escapees from their armies, and instead of having them clog roads and highways, blocking military movements, they will want to join the fight with us. The shame of it is there is no rule that allows any commander on the ground to take these people into his own force. A second important point is this, if wounded, orders prevent our medics from giving them attention. Perhaps all this can be done now—without amending the Geneva Convention.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman, a veteran of the Korean war himself, for his valuable contribution. It is true we need to amend the Geneva Convention in exactly the way the gentleman has said. We need also to place before the NATO countries, our allies, the 14 countries, the 13 working with us, the full proposition, and get them quickly to agree upon it. Time is of the essence in this matter. If we move quickly we can get the needed agreements which will permit the building up of this army. I protest, of course, if I need to, that our purpose is not to precipitate war but to build such strength, added to the strength we are already building in Western Europe, that the Kremlin tyrants would not dare to attack Western Europe or any other free area.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have very much enjoyed the gentleman's very fine address. I contrast his idea with the request of the administration to arm the Communists in China. The gentleman may remember there was a hearing before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and at that time Mr. Acheson, for General Marshall, asked for a large appropriation for the arming of the Communists in China, a very different proposition. The committee was assured by the Secretary of State after a question by me that the Communists would not use their arms against us. The gentleman's proposition is totally different, just the reverse of that.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentlewoman. I think my proposition to establish an army of liberation is entirely on the constructive side. Certainly it is in keeping with the spirit of what we free people are trying to do to bolster our defenses to strengthen the forces of the free world.

May I conclude by saying this: It is squarely in line with the progressive thinking of our leaders of both political parties, of all complexions of thought in this country, that we must move beyond the present policy of so-called containment. It is not fair to say to the people of Poland, or Czechoslovakia, or Bulgaria, or I might add to the people of Russia itself, and going across the Pacific, to the people of China, or any other area dominated by the Kremlin, that "We have forgotten you. We are going to seal you off and defend only our own free area."

I say we must move beyond that. We must abandon the policy of containment, we must move now into the area of liberation, assuring these people behind the iron curtain that they will have their rallying point in this army of liberation.

Our plan should be that each unit would be commanded by its own officers. They should rally under their own flag, they should wear their own uniform. They may be put together as an army, but I was assured by leaders of these military forces that if you give them the units that they desire, their own national unity under their own flag, under their own leaders, then very quickly this army of liberation can be assembled. I say to you that in its creation we would be not only adding to our strength but we would be giving hope and inspiration to the people now enslaved that some day through the efforts of their own patriots they too can be free.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

PUT $100,000,000 KERSTEN AMENDMENT TO MUTUAL SECURITY ACT INTO ACTION AS THE BEGINNING OF A NEW AND AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY OF LIBERATION

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri in the major part of his speech and also in his exchange with the gentleman from New Jersey, a veteran of the Korean war, I was reminded of the place and time of the great speech of Patrick Henry, one of the first great statesmen of this country, who based himself squarely on the proposition of liberty. The ringing words of the honorable gentleman from Missouri, I think, are a challenge to this Congress to step out with a bold, new foreign policy based upon the proposition of liberation.

Mr. Speaker, the black death swept Europe in the fourteenth century and left whole towns silent and ships at sea derelict. It destroyed over one-quarter of the population. There was really only one problem that confronted the people then, to which all other problems were subsidiary; how to combat the dread plague which threatened the physical life of all the people of the Western World.

There is a modern black death that today threatens the whole spiritual and much of the physical existence of all mankind: Aggressive, atheistic materialism controlled from the Kremlin which already enslaves nearly half of the world and extends its malignant influence throughout the globe.

Providence has placed the United States of America in the role of leadership to combat this plague of universal enslavement. Perhaps it was because our fathers had the moral courage to found the Nation on a true understanding of the nature of man and of his divine origin: That all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their Creator with the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Success or failure in the struggle against world communism is dependent upon the way or manner in which we oppose it. That way or manner is determined by our foreign policy. Of all issues that confront us, the issue of the kind of foreign policy we shall employ is paramount.

That issue confronts all candidates of both political parties. It confronts the 156,000,000 people of the United States. It will permanently affect the 2,500,000,000 people of the world.

All other issues are subservient to the issue of a sound American foreign policy.

The amount of taxes taken from every worker's paycheck; the price of food paid by every housewife; the value of bank deposits, insurance policies, pensions, and fixed salaries; the extent of our personal liberty, of free enterprise, of free collective bargaining; and of the choice of a place to work; controls over industry and agriculture; the fate of every able-bodied young man; the destiny of American troops in Europe; the deployment of the major part of our combat forces which are now tied down in Korea; every person, every family, every home, every village, every city, every State, our structure of government, the whole of our natural resources, our way of life, our very existence as a Nation is dependent on the ultimate success or failure of American foreign policy in dealing with Soviet aggression, the objective of which aggression is to make Stalin and his gangsters jailers for the world.

The foreign policy developed by the administration from 1947 to date is containment of communism. Such a policy would scarcely have been successful in the nineteenth century, let alone today. In the modern era where world-wide

espionage has been developed to a fine art, where propaganda can instantaneously circle the globe, where transportation and major weapons are intercontinental you cannot merely contain communism as it has been put into action by the satanically clever men of the Kremlin. When every third man in Italy and every fourth man in France is a member of this international conspiracy taking orders from Moscow can you contain communism at the iron curtain in Eastern Europe?

Containment is merely defensive and negative like our so-called police action in Korea, and the most that can be hoped from it is a stalemate and armed truce. Any truce with an aggressive criminal conspiracy can be neither successful nor honorable.

The Secretary of State has estimated that we should look forward to a policy of containment for about 20 years. No nation can indulge in the policy of containment under modern conditions and remain free. In a few more years we should have to be a garrison state—not too unlike Soviet Russia whose people do not know freedom as we do.

A long-term containment policy would bankrupt the United States. This year we have appropriated approximately $60,000,000,000 for defense against Communist aggression. We shall have to appropriate even larger sums as scientists invent newer, deadlier, and costlier weapons.

The weapons of 1952 will not be adequate for 1956. Consider the relative cost of a jet plane today over that of a fighter plane of World War II. Sixty billion dollars a year for 20 years would be $32,000 per family. It is more likely to be near $100,000 per family. Such a program would destroy, not only the American economy, which the Marxist confidently predict, but it would destroy America.

But above all the administration's containment policy is un-American, it is contrary to the principles of our Judeo-Christian civilization—it is basically immoral. It seeks to negotiate a peace with criminal tyrants based on a permanent half-slave, half-free world. It abandons and fails to make an ally of the most powerful force against communism in the world, the hatred of 800,000,000 of people who are enslaved by it.

The administration has abandoned the peoples of Poland, Czechoslovakia Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, as well as the peoples of the Baltic States, the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonians, the peoples of China and North Korea, and also the non-Russian people as well as the Russian people of the Soviet Union.

It has abandoned them all to the horrors of a permanent slave state, a state of patricide and matricide and fraticide and genocide. A new utopia where they are trying to make the new Soviet man the soulless socialist robot who will laugh and cry and march and shoot at the direction of the master planner.

The repeated public statements by our Secretary of State proclaiming a long term policy of containment gives Stalin complete confidence that we have abandoned the morals and principles that sustain our civilization. He therefore can with complete confidence risk the arming of 60 divisions in the captive nations of Eastern Europe which he would not dare to if these peoples had not been abandoned.

I charge that the policy of containment developed by Secretary of State Dean Acheson has delivered the 60 divisions of the Eastern European countries to Stalin.

In November of 1945, Mr. Acheson stated at Madison Square Garden, New York, that it was necessary for the peace of the world that the Soviet Union have friendly nations around its borders. Stalin relied upon that statement of Mr. Acheson and proceeded to make these nations friendly.

In January of 1950, Mr. Acheson clearly stated, in effect, that we would not defend Korea—that it was outside the defense perimeter of the United States. Stalin again took Mr. Acheson at his word and shortly thereafter proceeded to take over South Korea.

In the early part of 1951, the administration removed General MacArthur from Korea because he was fighting to win. When Stalin understood that our policy was not to win in Korea but merely to contain he again took us at our word that we were fighting not to win but only to contain. He then called for truce talks to give him the time to build up his Communist forces in North Korea so that we couldn't win.

There is something horrible about fighting only to negotiate with criminals. In this case the horror involves the abandonment of the 800,000,000 peoples of the Soviet Union and of the captive nations. There is a stopping of the wells of spiritual and moral sustenance that have made us great as a nation.

Today the President suddenly called upon the Congress to avoid any stoppage of the production of steel in this country. There is no doubt that we need every ton of steel in the defense effort of the United States. Steel constitutes a great part of the material force with which to oppose the Communists.

But the administration has long abandoned much of the spiritual and moral force that we need to win over communism by trying to negotiate for a half-slave, half-free world.

Leaders of the Republican Party are facing the issues squarely and denouncing the policy of containment and asking for a foreign policy based on our Declaration of Independence.

Such a foreign policy is a policy of liberation. John Foster Dulles has called for a new and bold foreign policy of liberation.

Senator TAFT in his foreign policy speech, June 1, called for a policy of liberation.

General Eisenhower at Abilene, Kans., called for an implementation of the principles of the Declaration of Independence.

Republican Members of Congress have already shown that there is an alternative to containment. Recently, my colleague, Congressman ALBERT P. MORANO, the gentleman from Connecticut, took a poll of the Republican Members of the House. One of the two questions submitted by Congressman MORANO to his Republican colleagues was: "Do you support the inclusion of the principles of national liberation and self-determination for all the Communist-enslaved peoples as planks in our party platform of 1952?"

On this question 82 Republican Congressmen declared themselves in favor of such a plank in the party platform and 7 declared themselves not in favor of such a platform. These principles of liberation and self-determination are a positive and effective alternative to the administration policy of perpetual defense. If we embark on this positive policy of rendering assistance to the peoples now enslaved by communism to enable them to eventually free themselves from the Communist tyranny, we can end this threat to our civilization at its very source.

The gentleman from Connecticut also asked his Republican colleagues how they regarded the resolutions—House Concurrent Resolutions 89, 94, 119, 120, 121, 123, 138, 139, and 168—which I introduced last year. Eighty-four Republican Congressmen declared their support of the resolutions, and five declared that they did not support the resolutions.

These resolutions reaffirm the historic friendship of the American people with the oppressed peoples in the Communist-dominated countries. These resolutions express the conviction of the American people that these suppressed peoples have the right of liberation and unqualified self-determination, and to the exercise of their basic inalienable rights and freedoms. Each of these resolutions refers to a different nation now enslaved by communism, namely, the Russian and non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union, Poles, Czechs, and Slovaks, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Rumanians, Albanians, and Chinese. They call upon the President to formulate a new and stronger foreign policy which would exclude all further agreements, commitments and recognition of the Communist regimes, and to explore methods whereby the American people may offer aid and moral support to active fighters now struggling for the liberation of their native lands.

The Republicans, though not in power in the administration, have tried to lead our country into a new foreign policy of liberation.

In August of last year the House passed an amendment to the mutual security law, which provides for $100,000,000 for persons who have escaped from or who reside in Communist-dominated countries, either to form them into military units of their own nationality, or for other purposes.

To date, over 8 months after its passage, so far as I can ascertain not one dollar of this fund has been used by the administration. The reason would seem to be quite obvious as to why the administration has not seen fit to implement this amendment. The amendment definitely is based upon the idea of the ultimate liberation of the nations that are now captives of communism.

The principal measure to be taken under my amendment and which is spelled out therein is the creation of national military units of escapees from behind the iron curtain. These military units should have their own national flags and emblems, their own distinctive uniforms or identifying insignia. The units should be attached to NATO or the American Army for command purposes. Free battalions of Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians, Rumanians, Bulgarians, Albanians, Chinese, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Byeorussians, Ukrainians, and Russians would be strong magnets of defection from Stalin's satellite armies and his own Soviet forces. They would weaken the will of the Communist forces to fight the west and might well be catalytic agents in the ultimate liberation of their native lands.

As these young men come through the iron curtain they should receive first aid and care at civilian border hostels. From there they should be taken on a voluntary basis, to military processing centers and formed into their respective national units. As these units would grow and strengthen the necessity for American troops in Europe would be greatly reduced. As one official in the Pentagon remarked to me, "One Pole, Czech, Hungarian, or other battalions of Eastern European nationals is worth a division of American, British, or French troops in opposing Stalin satellite armies." Such units would, according to a high American official just returned from Europe after spending 3½ years with iron-curtain refugees, disintegrate the morale of Red-controlled armies.

To put a hypothetical case: If America were taken over by the Reds and our Armed Forces were under the military control of the Soviets, what effect would the setting up of real American units with American uniforms and American battle flags on the Mexican or Canadian border have? What would be the effect on the will to fight for Stalin on the part of the average young American under this control? Would our sons fight for Stalin?

The possibilities for defection exist not only among the satellite countries of Eastern Europe, but within the Soviet Union itself. But let me assume for the moment that this policy of cutting away and isolating the Communist apparatus from the peoples it has victimized would only be successful in the satellite countries. In the event of war, let us examine how this would substantially and radically change the picture in Eastern Europe.

Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, recently stated that the Soviet armed forces presently consist of 175 Soviet divisions and 60 satellite divisions. The Council of the North Atlantic Treaty in Lisbon recently stated that NATO this year will have approximately 50 divisions in appropriate conditions of combat readiness.

Two hundred and thirty-five Soviet divisions against our hoped-for 50 divisions—more than 4 to 1 against us.

But if we create these free battalions of Hungarians, Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, and the others we let these people behind the iron curtain know in a most practical way that we are willing to assist them. Then in the event of war, the 60 satellite divisions, which Stalin is now counting on to fight on his side, may well turn their guns around and fight with us instead of against us. These victimized soldiers would come over to join the West singly or in groups, or by mass surrender as they did in the early part of World War II before the Germans mistreated them. Or they may create armed insurrections within their own territory.

To give one example of the effect of this amendment to the Mutual Security Act when it was passed I should like to quote from the statement of Maj. Gen. George H. Olmsted, as it was contained in George Dixon's column of May 15:

> Tucked away in the appropriations for foreign-military assistance—
>
> He said—
>
> was an item of $100,000,000. This fund was appropriated to provide sanctuary for, and take care of, deserters and defectors from behind the iron curtain.
>
> It worked beyond our wildest dreams. It got the biggest reaction from the Kremlin of anything we had done to date.
>
> It's the most effective piece of tit-for-tat that we've ever attempted.

Mr. Speaker, although the amendment seems to have given a strong ray of hope when it was passed, the failure to implement it will react to our detriment.

Mr. Speaker, these military units of escapees have not as yet been set up. The law authorizing them was signed by the President 8 months ago.

There is no justification for the failure to implement this law in respect to these military units and such failure is explained only by a blind adherence by the administration to the policy of containment and a rejection by the administration of a policy of liberation.

I think we have here the basic issue between the Democratic administration that has tied itself to the concept of half-slave, half-free world and the bold thinking by the Republican leaders of a foreign policy based on liberation.

Such a program offers our own American people a forseeable end to the continuous drafting of our people for military service, and for the dissipation of our blood and resources in stalemate Koreas around the world.

It provides something better for our American people than 20 years of confiscatory taxes, 20 more years of harassing bureaucratic restrictions, and 20 more years of burdensome armaments and the possible loss of our own liberties.

It provides a means of lifting this onerous burden from the backs of the American people by destroying the Communist threat of war at its very source.

But far more important than lifting this burden from the American people is lifting the infinitely greater burden of the enslaved peoples and the restoration to them of their God-given right to freedom. The peace the world wants is not a negotiated peace with Stalin and his gang of criminals, but a peace of liberty and justice for all.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House on tomorrow for 10 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

DISTRESSED AREAS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we just heard about the plea for the liberation of the people in foreign countries. I am interested in the liberation of the industries in our own country, particularly the smaller industries. There seems to be a complete lack of coordination and cooperation between the Pentagon, the national defense, and the War Production Board, formerly headed by Mr. Charles Wilson, in assisting smaller war plants, particularly in distressed areas. The Munitions Board states that they will help distressed areas and they will see to it that war industries go into those areas. The Smaller War Plants Corporation says that they will help distressed areas and send business there, but, as a matter of fact, nothing is going into those distressed areas. The administration is crying about helping business that needs help; it is crying about spreading industry; instead it is segregating in congested areas. Instead it is concentrating industry, or a great amount of it, in already greatly industrialized areas. The task force that goes about for smaller war plants, I think, is almost perfectly helpless. They cannot seem to help small industries, so far as I can tell. They are extremely interested and they are kind and make helpful suggestions, and make very frequent investigations, but when it comes to getting industry into distressed areas they seem powerless. It is not their fault. They have amassed a great amount of material, but they are not allowed to finish their work and give real results.

I do not understand, Mr. Speaker, why all of these things take place or do not take place. I have repeatedly gone to the Pentagon and asked for help. Others appear there and present fine pleas to help their industries insofar as the pro-

duction of a certain product is concerned. I have one industry in particular in mind at the moment that my own city is vitally concerned with.

The Federal Reserve Board has approved loans and assistance to this small business. Ordnance approved assistance, because the industry is making a very necessary product. Yet the Pentagon will not go along and order production in that industry. It seems that they do not care whether an industry goes into bankruptcy or not, when for a very small amount of money the industry could be kept producing and a necessary item be sent to the department that needs it. Payrolls, earned payrolls, have been withheld.

It is one of the most incredible things I have ever known and makes a perfect farce and mockery, as I have said before, insofar as the hastening of production and the actual wanting to help distressed areas are concerned. Their pious pronouncements and their promises are as idle as an idle ship upon a painted ocean. I do not believe the American public are going to take this very long. It is the most un-American thing I have ever seen in all of my experience in Washington, and that experience goes back to 1913. It is also one reason why defense production has been retarded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

IS TV RUNNING WILD?

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, is TV running wild? Many parents, educators, clergymen, and plain viewers think so.

When grownups are offended by what they see on their screens, we can imagine the effect on impressionable youngsters who have not learned to separate the good from the bad.

The social impact of this new medium of communication is beginning to alarm the Nation, because the televisers are not in a mood to discipline themselves.

Even atomic energy has to be controlled in one way or another, or it would destroy us physically.

So too must TV become subject to certain limitations before its unbridled power corrupts the taste, the intelligence, and the character of our youth.

Parents cannot be expected to stand guard over the TV sets all the late afternoon and evening. And they cannot possibly censor the programs on sets that operate outside the home.

Children are imitators.

They do what they see and hear.

They want excitement, but sometimes they get too much of it.

We were faced with a similar problem when movies first came on the scene. But at least we had fair warning as to what type of programs were showing in the various theaters, and we could keep our children away from those that were objectionable. In addition, public opinion went to work on the problem. The producers were scared into setting up a code of conduct of their own. Hollywood saw the light just in time to save its industry from exile or an iron-fisted censorship.

We do not want to see TV commit suicide.

Its possibilities for good, wholesome fun—for information, education, and religious inspiration—are too valuable to be endangered by a public uprising against its present sensationalism that might go to the extreme and result in suffocating controls.

The mass production of murder, aggravated assaults, horrors on TV has the effect of being a school for crime to open-mouthed youngsters.

And there are other sophisticated or "cheesecake" programs which are too revealing for their tender years.

There are ways of entertaining children without keeping them in a state of morbid tension, but the brains of the new industry are working at the tabloid level and are failing to create suitable and satisfying shows for young America.

I cannot understand why advertisers do not realize their greater responsibilities to the public in this very sensitive field. Surely they do not mean to sponsor programs that will lose business.

Theaters and professional sports events cannot be expected to give up their money-producing audiences just to satisfy, for free, the people who want these spectacles brought into their homes. Because of higher costs, advertisers cannot be expected to foot the whole bill. Until some method of sharing the expense is devised, we will not get the best in this type of entertainment on TV.

Surveys prove that the people are willing to pay for good movies, plays, operas, prize fights, and for better entertainment before and after supper, which may be called the children's hours.

The costs of television programs run to as much as 10 times the expense of similar programs on radio.

If the show is to go on and improve, there must be a combination of better taste and better financing.

The point is that the quality of present programs can be raised considerably without further investment of money.

Will television do this job itself, or must it be policed by Government because it is the juvenile delinquent of show business?

Unless, in the course of hearings now under way, the industry presents a code of decency and convinces us that it will be self-enforced, we shall have no choice but to impose controls.

We have already seen how the automobile has transformed our way of life. It will be as nothing compared with the influence exerted by a revolutionary means of communication.

Video, with its dual personality, is on the spot.

We cannot permit it to debase our standards and lead our youth astray.

I am hoping that it will come forward with a house-cleaning program of its own that will lift the standard of its presentations, and restore our wavering confidence in its ability to picture the best in American entertainment, sports, news reporting, education, and spirit, for the American home.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. RODINO in two separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GOLDEN and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. SITTLER in three separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENSEN and to include an exchange of correspondence.

Mr. SIEMINSKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SASSCER and to include an address by Admiral Fechteler.

Mr. ADDONIZIO and to include an editorial.

Mr. ANDERSON of California (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include a letter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in two instances, in each to include articles.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. GAVIN) and to include an editorial.

Mr. YORTY in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RADWAN and to include two editorials.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE and to include an address by Governor Stevenson.

Mr. HELLER (at the request of Mr. ROONEY) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER in four separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE in three separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BAKEWELL.

Mr. JONES of Missouri and to include an editorial commenting on the President's recent address at Springfield, Mo.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas and to include an editorial.

Mr. REES of Kansas in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include an editorial.

Mr. MANSFIELD to revise and extend the remarks he made this afternoon on House Resolution 644 and include certain material including a bill he introduced for an investigation of the Koje incident.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan and to include an editorial.

Mr. JUDD in three instances and to include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. COLE of Kansas and to include a speech and a biography, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $224.

Mr. SADLAK and to include a speech made by Charles Rozmarek at Atlantic City.

Mr. JAVITS in four instances and to include extraneous matter and to revise and extend the remarks he made on the conference report on the immigration bill and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CANFIELD and to include an editorial.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANDERSON of California and to include a letter.

Mr. SHEEHAN in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. KEATING) in two instances and in one to include an editorial and in the other a news item.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas (at the request of Mr. SIEMINSKI) and in include extraneous matter.

Mr. FURCOLO and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore:

H. R. 6133. An act to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 6661. An act to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926; and

H. R. 7005. An act to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2363. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 17, 1923.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 643. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vivian M. Graham and Herbert H. Graham;

H. R. 646. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ines B. Copp and George T. Copp;

H. R. 1826. An act for the relief of Ellis E. Gabbert; and

H. R. 1842. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ann Morrison.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ELLSWORTH (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for the balance of the week, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. DELANEY (at the request of Mr. PATTEN), on account of a death in his family.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. CELLER), indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 11, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1555. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Homer C. Boozer, Terry Davis, Leopold A. Fraczkowski, Earl W. Keating, and Charles A. Paris"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1556. A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949, as amended"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. House Resolution 661. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Army to furnish to the House of Representatives full and complete information with respect to insurgency in prisoner-of-war camps in Korea and Communist-inspired disturbances of the peace in Japan; without amendment (Rept. No. 2128). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. House Resolution 662. Resolution requesting the Secretary of Defense to furnish to the House of Representatives full and complete information with respect to insurgency in prisoner-of-war camps in Korea and Communist-inspired disturbances of the peace in Japan; without amendment (Rept. No. 2129). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. House Resolution 663. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Army to furnish to the House of Representatives full and complete information with respect to the reduction in grade of Col. Charles F. Colson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2130). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MANSFIELD: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 664. Resolution requesting the Secretary of State to furnish to the House of Representatives full and complete information with respect to insurgency in prisoner-of-war camps in Korea and Communist-inspired disturbances of the peace in Japan; without amendment (Rept. No. 2131). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FALLON: Committee of conference. H. R. 7340. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 2132). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1770. An act to amend the Administrative Procedure Act, and eliminate certain exemptions therefrom; with amendment (Rept. No. 2133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1536. An act to stabilize the economy of dependent residents of New Mexico using certain lands of the United States known as the North Lobato and El Pueblo tracts, originally purchased from relief program funds, and now administered under agreement by the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests, to effect permanent transfer of these lands, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1932. An act to authorize the establishment of facilities necessary for the detention of aliens in the administration and enforcement of the immigration laws, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. S. 2390. An act to amend section 302 (4) of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, relating to penalties; without amendment (Rept. No. 2136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. S. 3019. An act to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to extend the application of the special-inducement pay provided thereby to physicians and dentists, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LYLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 677. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 477, joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but not beyond June 30, 1953; with amendment (Rept. No. 2138). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 678. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 8120, a bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2139). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MITCHELL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 653. Resolution to amend House Resolution 51, relating to the authority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate matters within its jurisdiction; without amendment (Rept. No. 2140). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MITCHELL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 679. Resolution for consideration of S. 2198, an act to amend section 1708 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the theft or receipt of stolen mail matter generally; without amendment (Rept. No. 2141). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BUCKLEY: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 8127. A bill to amend the act of June 21, 1940, relating to the alteration of certain bridges over navigable waters, so as to include highway bridges, and for other

purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 8120. A bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1913. A bill for the relief of Milagros Aujero; without amendment (Rept. No. 2103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4634. A bill for the relief of Johann Komma; without amendment (Rept. No. 2104). Referred to the Committe of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4644. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred G. Kates and Ronald Kates; without amendment (Rept. No. 2105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4719. A bill for the relief of Yee Chin-ying and Yee Won-yi; without amendment (Rept. No. 2106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4758. A bill for the relief of Donald James Darmody; without amendment (Rept. No. 2107). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4842. A bill for the relief of Joseph Manchion; without amendment (Rept. No. 2108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4866. A bill for the relief of Emma Gazzaniga, Cecelia Trezzi, Clelia Mainetti, Bonosa Colombo, Emma Baldisserotto, Lina DalDosso, Lucia Paganoni, and Regina Pagani; without amendment (Rept. No. 2109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4890. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth R. Ekholm; without amendment (Rept. No. 2110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4891. A bill for the relief of the estate of Emil A. Pesnek; with amendment (Rept. No. 2111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FINE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4921. A bill for the relief of Silas B. Morris, without amendment (Rept. No. 2112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5111. A bill for the relief of Jaroslav, Bozena, Yvonka, and Jarda Ondricek; without amendment (Rept. No. 2113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5188. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pia Biondi; without amendment (Rept. No. 2114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5442. A bill for the relief of Martin A. Dekking; without amendment (Rept. No. 2115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5570. A bill for the relief of Paul Myung Ha Chung; with amendment (Rept. No. 2116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5578. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Alaska Railroad; with amendment (Rept. No. 2117). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5961. A bill for the relief of Frieda Margarete Eckert; without amendment (Rept. No. 2118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6356. A bill for the relief of William J. Martin; with amendment (Rept. No. 2119). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6445. A bill for the relief of Jacob Athias Robles and Esther de Castro Robles; with amendment (Rept. No. 2120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6732. A bill for the relief of the alien Ilona Lindelof; with amendment (Rept. No. 2121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6884. A bill for the relief of Yosiko Nakamura; without amendment (Rept. No. 2122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6940. A bill for the relief of Sayoko Uchida; without amendment (Rept. No. 2123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7052. A bill for the relief of Masuko Kosaka; without amendment (Rept. No. 2124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7235. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Campion; with amendment (Rept. No. 2125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FINE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7331. A bill for the relief of Andrianne Luis and John Luis; with amendment (Rept. No. 2126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7366. A bill for the relief of Erika O. Eder; with amendment (Rept. No. 2127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 8144. A bill to authorize works for development and furnishing of water supplies for waterfowl management, lower San Joaquin Valley, Central Valley project, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 8145. A bill to improve and extend the duration of Public Law 874 of the Eighty-first Congress, to extend the period during which appropriations may be made to pay entitlements under title II of Public Law 815 of the Eighty-first Congress, to provide temporary supplementary aid for schools in critical defense housing areas, to make grants to States to assist distressed school districts in construction of urgently needed school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 8146. A bill to amend the Judicial Code to permit the registration of judgments in or from the United States District Court for the District of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 8147. A bill to amend section 2255, title 28, United States Code, relating to remedies on motion attacking sentences on prisoners in Federal custody; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 8148. A bill to increase the amount of deduction allowed, for income-tax purposes, for medical and dental expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 8149. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 8150. A bill to provide price support for the 1952 crop of Maryland tobacco, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 8151. A bill to provide for the correction of inequities under the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. J. Res. 479. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a memorial to Dr. J. Finley Wilson, in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. Res. 680. Resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript, Reclamation Pays an Extra Dividend in Recreation and Conservation, with illustrations, as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. Res. 681. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct studies and investigations of matters within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of the rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 8152. A bill for the relief of Agnes Rosenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 8153. A bill for the relief of Nelson Shig-Liang Sheng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8154. A bill for the relief of Paula Vetter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOODROW W. JONES:

H. R. 8155. A bill for the relief of Corp. Jackson C. Gilbert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 8156. A bill for the relief of Col. William Henry Boshoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 8157. A bill for the relief of Salih Hougi, Bertha Catherine, Noor Elias, Isaac, and Mozelle Rose Hardoon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 8158. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Redo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 8159. A bill for the relief of P. Diacon Zadeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 8160. A bill for the relief of James Watanuki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 8161. A bill for the relief of Cosimo Damiano Campanelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 8162. A bill for the relief of Sadie Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar and George Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 8163. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Hobmeier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H. R. 8164. A bill for the relief of Prof. Max Horkheimer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 662. Resolution providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H. R. 2972) for the relief of Harold Joe Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

755. By the SPEAKER: Petition of city clerk, Chicago, Ill., relative to urging the United States Congress to cause a survey to be made of all waters of the Great Lakes Basin and to authorize the use of Federal funds to control lake levels on a long-term basis; to the Committee on Public Works.

756. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Victor H. White, Seattle, Wash., relative to redress of grievances as provided in article 1 of the amendments to the Constitution, relating to payment of $81 covering so-called social-security tax for the year 1951; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

757. Also, petition of the president of the National Institute of Municipal Clerks, Brookline, Mass., relative to going on record as opposing the assumption of local and States' rights by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

758. Also, petition of James J. Laughlin, Washington, D. C., relative to requesting the impeachment of Judge Edith H. Cockrill, judge of the juvenile court for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

